

Euclidean Affine Functions and Applications to Calendar Algorithms *

Cassio Neri †

Lorenz Schneider ‡

February 3, 2022

Abstract

We study properties of Euclidean affine functions (EAFs), namely those of the form $f(r) = (\alpha \cdot r + \beta) / \delta$, and their closely related expression $\hat{f}(r) = (\alpha \cdot r + \beta) \% \delta$, where r , α , β and δ are integers, and where $/$ and $\%$ respectively denote the quotient and remainder of Euclidean division. We derive algebraic relations and numerical approximations that are important for the efficient evaluation of these expressions in modern CPUs. Since simple division and remainder are particular cases of EAFs (when $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0$), the optimisations proposed in this paper can also be applied to them. Such expressions appear in some of the most common tasks in any computer system, such as printing numbers, times and dates. We use calendar calculations as the main application example because it is richer with respect to the number of EAFs employed. Specifically, the main application presented in this article relates to Gregorian calendar algorithms. We will show how they can be implemented substantially more efficiently than is currently the case in widely used C, C++, C# and Java open source libraries. Gains in speed of a factor of two or more are common.

Keywords: Euclidean Affine Functions, Integer Division, Calendar Algorithms

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): 65Y04, 68R01

1 Introduction

Divisions by constants appear in some of the most common tasks performed by software systems, including printing decimal numbers (division by powers of 10) and working with times (division by 24, 60 and 3600). Since division is the slowest of the four basic arithmetical operations, various authors [1, 5, 10, 16, 22] have proposed strength reduction optimisations (*i.e.*, the replacement of instructions with alternatives that are mathematically equivalent but faster) for integer divisions when divisors are constants known by the compiler. The algorithms proposed by Granlund and Montgomery [10] have been implemented by major compilers.

A typical example that will appear later in this article is the division

$$n/1461 = 2\,939\,745 \cdot n/2^{32}, \quad \forall n \in [0, 28\,825\,529].$$

*Submitted to the editors February 3, 2022

†JPMorgan Chase & Co, cassio.neri@jpmorgan.com (Opinions expressed in this paper are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the view of JP Morgan.)

‡EMLYON Business School, schneider@em-lyon.com.

The problem involves finding, for the given divisor 1461, the multiplier 2939745, the exponent 32, and the boundary 28825529 of the interval in which equality holds. Clearly, there are many possible solutions.

Remainder calculation is a closely related problem, also arising in the tasks mentioned above, although the cited works do not consider optimisations for this operation. Compilers are content to apply strength reduction to obtain the quotient r/δ and the remainder evaluating $r - \delta \cdot (r/\delta)$. For this reason, [13, 23] considered the problem of directly obtaining the remainder without first calculating the quotient.

This paper expands previous works in two ways. Firstly, it considers the more general setting of Euclidean affine functions (EAFs) $f(r) = (\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta$ where α , β and δ are integer constants and r is an integer variable. Secondly, it suggests optimisations that are even more effective in applications where both the quotient and the remainder need to be evaluated.

We derive EAF-related equalities that provide alternative ways of evaluating expressions commonly used in applications. (For instance, $r - \delta \cdot (r/\delta)$, which is used to obtain the remainder as explained above.) These equalities underpin optimisations, other than strength reduction, that take into account aspects of modern CPUs. Specifically, they foster instruction-level parallelism implemented by superscalar processors and they profit from the backward compatibility features that drove the design of the x86_64 instruction set.

Calendar calculations are a rich application field for our EAF results. Performed by various software systems, they tackle questions such as: What is the date today? For how many days do interest rates accrue over the period of a loan? Your mobile phone no doubt performed a similar calculation while you read this paragraph.

Our algorithms are substantially faster than those in widely used open source implementations, as shown by benchmarks against counterparts in glibc [7, 8] (Linux contains a similar implementation [14]), Boost [4], libc++ [15], .NET [17] and OpenJDK [19] (Android contains the same implementations [2]). Our algorithms are also faster than others found in the academic literature [3, 6, 11, 12, 20, 21].

The critical point setting apart implementations of calendar algorithms is how they deal with non-linearities caused by irregular month and year lengths. Some authors [14, 8, 17] resort to look-up tables, which can be costly when the L1-level cache is cold. They conduct linear searches on these tables, entailing branching that can cause stalls in the processor's execution pipeline. Others [3, 6, 11, 12, 4, 15, 20, 21] tackle the issue entirely through EAFs. Nevertheless, they do not go far enough and do not use the mathematical properties derived in this paper. To the best of our knowledge, the most successful attempt at achieving this efficiency is Baum [3]. This author provides some explanations, but appears to resort to trial and error when it comes to pre-calculating certain *magic numbers* used in his algorithm. We go further by providing a systematic and general framework for such calculations.

Our paper and its main contributions are organised as follows.

Section 2 introduces EAFs and derives some of their properties. Although they are common in applications, we were unable to find any systematic coverage of them. Hatcher [11] and Richards [21] appear to be aware of some of the results of Theorem 2.5, but they do not point to any proof.

Section 3 concerns efficient evaluations of EAFs. Theorems 3.2 and 3.4 generalise prior-known results on division to EAFs. Section 3.1 revisits those results and brings geometric insights to the problem. Theorem 3.11 concerns the efficient evaluation of residuals: they are to EAFs what remainders are to division. The optimisation proposed by Theorem 3.11 is fundamentally different from other optimisations, both in the present paper and in prior works, since it does not involve strength reduction. Indeed, this theorem shows how to break a data dependency present in the instructions currently emitted by compilers, enabling instruction-level parallelism, as we shall see in Example 3.12.

Section 4 provides a generic mathematical framework for calendars, which we use to study the Gregorian calendar. Efficient algorithms for this calendar are derived in Sections 5 and 6. Section 7 presents performance analysis.

We finish this introduction by setting the notation used throughout and recalling some well-known results.

On the totally ordered Euclidean domain of integer numbers $(\mathbb{Z}, +, \cdot, \leq)$, forward slash $/$ and percent $\%$ respectively denote the **quotient** and **remainder** of Euclidean division. More precisely, given $n, \delta \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\delta \neq 0$, there exist unique $q, r \in \mathbb{Z}$, with $0 \leq r < |\delta|$, such that $n = q \cdot \delta + r$. Then $n/\delta = q$ and $n\% \delta = r$. (These concepts, for non-negative operands, match the usual operators $/$ and $\%$ of many programming languages in the C-family.)

We follow the usual algebraic order of operation rules and, in accordance with C-style languages, we give $\%$ the same precedence as \cdot and $/$. Hence, $a \cdot b\%c = (a \cdot b)\%c$, $a\%b \cdot c = (a\%b) \cdot c$ and $a/b\%c = (a/b)\%c$, $a\%b/c = (a\%b)/c$. Moreover, $a + b\%c = a + (b\%c)$, and $a - b\%c = a - (b\%c)$. In general, $a \cdot b/c \neq a \cdot (b/c)$ and $(a + b)/c \neq a/c + b/c$. This indicates that these precedence rules are even more important than when working in algebraic fields. Nevertheless, we shall drop unnecessary parentheses henceforth.

The set of non-negative integer numbers is denoted by $\mathbb{Z}^+ = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} ; x \geq 0\}$.

On the totally ordered field of rational numbers $(\mathbb{Q}, +, \cdot, \leq)$, the reciprocal of $\delta \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}$ is denoted by δ^{-1} . For $n, \delta \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\delta \neq 0$, we shall write $n \cdot \delta^{-1} \in \mathbb{Q}$ to distinguish it from $n/\delta \in \mathbb{Z}$. If the former belongs to \mathbb{Z} , then $n \cdot \delta^{-1} = n/\delta$. This distinction is particularly important when dealing with inequalities. On the one hand, for $x, y, \delta \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\delta > 0$, we have $x \cdot \delta^{-1} \geq y \cdot \delta^{-1}$ if, and only if, $x \geq y$; and on the another hand $x/\delta \geq y/\delta$ if $x \geq y$, but the converse does not hold.

For any $x \in \mathbb{Q}$, there exist unique $\lfloor x \rfloor \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\lceil x \rceil \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\lfloor x \rfloor \leq x < \lfloor x \rfloor + 1$ and $\lceil x \rceil - 1 < x \leq \lceil x \rceil$. For any finite set X , the **number of elements** of X is denoted by $\#X$.

2 Euclidean affine functions

Multiplication by 60 converts hours to minutes. Conversely, division by 60 converts minutes to hours. If the amount of minutes in an hour were variable, these problems would be more complex. Since months and years have variable numbers of days, such complexities arise in calendar calculations. Different ways of tackling this problem appear across implementations with various degrees of performance. Nevertheless, similarities between calendar calculations and the previous linear problems are stronger than they might appear, as revealed by our study of EAFs.

Definition 2.1. A function $f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is a **Euclidean affine function, EAF** for short, if it has the form $f(r) = (\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta$ for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and fixed $\alpha, \beta, \delta \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\delta \neq 0$.

This terminology is ours. The analogues of EAFs in higher dimensions appear in Discrete Geometry and are called quasi-affine transformations. That area focuses on periodicity, tiling and other geometric aspects, whereas we are concerned with efficient calculations. We therefore use the term EAF to distinguish between these two approaches.

Definition 2.2. Let f be the EAF $f(r) = (\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta$. The **residual function** of f is $\hat{f}(r) = (\alpha \cdot r + \beta)\% \delta$ or, equivalently, $\hat{f}(r) = \alpha \cdot r + \beta - \delta \cdot f(r)$.

An important function related to $f(r) = r/\delta$ is its right inverse $\hat{f}(q) = \delta \cdot q$. If $\delta > 0$ and $r \in [\hat{f}(q), \hat{f}(q+1)[= [\delta \cdot q, \delta \cdot (q+1)[$, then $f(r) = q$ and $\hat{f}(r) = r - \delta \cdot (r/\delta) = r - \hat{f}(f(r)) = r - \hat{f}(q)$. As we shall see, Theorem 2.5 generalises these results and supports the following terminology.

Definition 2.3. Let f be the EAF $f(r) = (\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta$, with $\delta \geq \alpha > 0$. The **minimal right inverse** of f is the EAF $\hat{f}(q) = (\delta \cdot q + \alpha - \beta - 1)/\alpha$.

Lemma 2.4. Let f be the EAF $f(r) = (\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta$, with $\delta > 0$, and $g : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. For any $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $f(g(q) - 1) < f(g(q))$, we have:

$$r \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad f(r) = f(g(q)) \quad \implies \quad \hat{f}(r)/\alpha = r - g(q).$$

Proof. Since $\hat{f}(r) = \alpha \cdot r + \beta - \delta \cdot f(r)$, we have $\hat{f}(g(q)) = \alpha \cdot g(q) + \beta - \delta \cdot f(g(q))$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(r) &= \alpha \cdot r + \beta - \delta \cdot f(r) = \alpha \cdot (r - g(q)) + \alpha \cdot g(q) + \beta - \delta \cdot f(g(q)) \\ &= \alpha \cdot (r - g(q)) + \hat{f}(g(q)). \end{aligned}$$

We will show that $0 \leq \hat{f}(g(q)) < \alpha$ and it will follow that $\hat{f}(r)/\alpha = r - g(q)$. By definition of \hat{f} and $\%$ we obtain $\hat{f}(g(q)) \geq 0$. Suppose, by contradiction, that $\hat{f}(g(q)) \geq \alpha$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \cdot (g(q) - 1) + \beta &= \alpha \cdot g(q) + \beta - \alpha = \delta \cdot f(g(q)) + \hat{f}(g(q)) - \alpha \\ &\geq \delta \cdot f(g(q)). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing the above by δ gives $f(g(q) - 1) \geq f(g(q))$, which contradicts the assumption on q . \square

Theorem 2.5. Let f be the EAF $f(r) = (\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta$ with $\delta \geq \alpha > 0$. Then, for any r and $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have:

- (i). $f(\hat{f}(q)) = q$ and $f(\hat{f}(q) - 1) = q - 1$;
- (ii). $f(r) = q$ if, and only if, $r \in [\hat{f}(q), \hat{f}(q + 1)[$;
- (iii). $r \in [\hat{f}(f(r)), \hat{f}(f(r) + 1)[$ and $\hat{f}(r)/\alpha = r - \hat{f}(f(r))$.

Proof. Let $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ and set $n = \delta \cdot q + \alpha - \beta - 1$ so that $\hat{f}(q) = (\delta \cdot q + \alpha - \beta - 1)/\alpha = n/\alpha$.

(i): Since $0 \leq n\% \alpha \leq \alpha - 1$ and $\alpha \leq \delta$, we have:

$$0 \leq \alpha - 1 - n\% \alpha \leq \delta - 1 - n\% \alpha < \delta. \quad (1)$$

From $\hat{f}(q) = n/\alpha$, we obtain $\alpha \cdot \hat{f}(q) = n - n\% \alpha$ and

$$\alpha \cdot \hat{f}(q) + \beta = n + \beta - n\% \alpha = \delta \cdot q + \alpha - 1 - n\% \alpha.$$

This and Equation (1) yield $(\alpha \cdot \hat{f}(q) + \beta)/\delta = q$, that is, $f(\hat{f}(q)) = q$. Furthermore, the equality above gives:

$$\alpha \cdot (\hat{f}(q) - 1) + \beta = \delta \cdot q - 1 - n\% \alpha = \delta \cdot (q - 1) + \delta - 1 - n\% \alpha.$$

This and Equation (1) yield $(\alpha \cdot (\hat{f}(q) - 1) + \beta)/\delta = q - 1$, that is, $f(\hat{f}(q) - 1) = q - 1$.

(ii): Since $\delta \geq \alpha > 0$, f is non-decreasing. If $r \leq \hat{f}(q) - 1$, then $f(r) \leq f(\hat{f}(q) - 1) = q - 1$. If $\hat{f}(q) \leq r \leq \hat{f}(q + 1) - 1$, then $q = f(\hat{f}(q)) \leq f(r) \leq f(\hat{f}(q + 1) - 1) = q$ (the last equality follows from (i) applied to $q + 1$) and thus, $f(r) = q$. Finally, if $r \geq \hat{f}(q + 1)$, then $f(r) \geq f(\hat{f}(q + 1)) = q + 1$ (again from (i) applied to $q + 1$).

(iii): Since $\delta \geq \alpha > 0$, \hat{f} is strictly increasing and there thus exists $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $r \in [\hat{f}(p), \hat{f}(p + 1)[$. Using (i) and (ii) (for $q = p$) gives $f(\hat{f}(p)) = p$, $f(\hat{f}(p) - 1) = p - 1$ and $f(r) = p$. In particular, $f(\hat{f}(p) - 1) < f(\hat{f}(p))$ and $f(r) = f(\hat{f}(p))$. Lemma 2.4 (for $g = \hat{f}$ and $q = p$) therefore gives $\hat{f}(r)/\alpha = r - \hat{f}(p)$. Using $p = f(r)$ again yields $r \in [\hat{f}(f(r)), \hat{f}(f(r) + 1)[$ and $\hat{f}(r)/\alpha = r - \hat{f}(f(r))$. \square

From (i), \hat{f} is a right inverse of f . Item (ii) goes further, showing the minimum solution r for the equation $f(r) = q$ is $r = \hat{f}(q)$, hence the wording of Definition 2.3.

Example 2.6. Theorem 2.5 for $f(r_0) = (4 \cdot r_0 + 3)/146097$ and $\hat{f}(q) = 146097 \cdot q/4$ gives:

$$r_0 \in [\hat{f}(q), \hat{f}(q+1)[\implies (4 \cdot r_0 + 3)/146097 = q \quad \text{and} \quad (4 \cdot r_0 + 3)\%146097/4 = r_0 - \hat{f}(q).$$

Each side of last equality provides a way to evaluate the same quantity. To analyse performance trade-offs, we introduce auxiliary variables referring to partial results and compare both methods side-by-side:

<p style="text-align: center;">Calculation of $(4 \cdot r_0 + 3)\%146097/4$:</p> $n = 4 \cdot r_0 + 3,$ $q = n/146097,$ $u = n - 146097 \cdot q, \quad (\text{i.e., } u = n\%146097)$ $r = u/4,$	<p style="text-align: center;">Calculation of $r_0 - \hat{f}(q)$:</p> $n = 4 \cdot r_0 + 3,$ $q = n/146097,$ $v = 146097 \cdot q/4 \quad (\text{i.e., } v = \hat{f}(q)),$ $r = r_0 - v.$
---	---

For fairness of comparison, u is set to $n - 146097 \cdot q$ rather than $n\%146097$, since the former better represents the CPU instructions typically emitted by compilers to evaluate the latter. Both listings show exactly the same operations, the only difference being the order of the last two operations. Our preference for the left listing will be explained in the next steps of the Gregorian calendar algorithm. Indeed, the expressions above appear in these calculations and are followed by the evaluation of $4 \cdot r + 3$. If r is calculated as shown on the left, then $4 \cdot r + 3 = 4 \cdot (u/4) + 3$ and smart compilers reduce this expression to $u \mid 3$, where \mid denotes bitwise or.

Example 2.7. Theorem 2.5 for $f(r_1) = (4 \cdot r_1 + 3)/1461$ and $\hat{f}(q) = 1461 \cdot q/4$ gives:

$$r_1 \in [\hat{f}(q), \hat{f}(q+1)[\implies (4 \cdot r_1 + 3)/1461 = q \quad \text{and} \quad (4 \cdot r_1 + 3)\%1461/4 = r_1 - \hat{f}(q).$$

Example 2.8. Theorem 2.5 for $f(r_2) = (5 \cdot r_2 + 461)/153$ and $\hat{f}(m_0) = (153 \cdot m_0 - 457)/5$ gives:

$$r_2 \in [\hat{f}(m_0), \hat{f}(m_0+1)[\implies (5 \cdot r_2 + 461)/153 = m_0 \quad \text{and} \quad (5 \cdot r_2 + 461)\%153/5 = r_2 - \hat{f}(m_0).$$

3 Fast evaluation of Euclidean affine functions

This section covers optimisations for $(\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta$. The particular case $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0$ has been considered by many authors [1, 5, 10, 16, 22], who have derived strength reductions whereby r/δ is reduced to a multiplication and cheaper operations. Major compilers implement the algorithms of [10]. Faster algorithms exist but compilers are not able to use them. For instance, r might be restricted to a small interval but, unaware of this fact, the compiler must assume that r can take any allowed value for its type, usually in an interval of form $[0, 2^w[$. We change focus and instead of looking for an algorithm on a given interval, we start with the best algorithm we know and search the largest interval on which it can be applied. If such an interval is satisfactory for our application, then we use this algorithm.

When δ is a power of two, the evaluation of r/δ reduces to a bitwise shift, which is very cheap in binary CPUs. The Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic implies that δ is a power of two if, and only if, $2^k\% \delta = 0$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. For $(\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta$, a trivial reduction is also available when $2^k \cdot \alpha\% \delta = 0$. Indeed, we have $2^k \cdot \alpha = \delta \cdot (2^k \cdot \alpha/\delta)$, and setting $\alpha' = 2^k \cdot \alpha/\delta$ and $\beta' = 2^k \cdot \beta/\delta$ gives $2^k \cdot \alpha = \delta \cdot \alpha'$ and

$$(\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta = (2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot r + 2^k \cdot \beta) / (2^k \cdot \delta) = (\delta \cdot \alpha' \cdot r + 2^k \cdot \beta) / (2^k \cdot \delta) = (\alpha' \cdot r + \beta') / 2^k.$$

Conceptually, to evaluate $(\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta$ we multiply r by $\alpha \cdot \delta^{-1}$ and add the result to $\beta \cdot \delta^{-1}$. Assume, for the time being, that $\beta = 0$. We take an approximation $\alpha' \in \mathbb{Z}$ of $2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot \delta^{-1}$, where $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is carefully chosen, and evaluate $\alpha' \cdot r/2^k$. Two natural choices for α' are $\lceil 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot \delta^{-1} \rceil$ and $\lfloor 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot \delta^{-1} \rfloor$, covered by Theorems 3.2 and 3.4, respectively.

Lemma 3.1. *Let f be the EAF $f(r) = (\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta$. Then,*

$$\alpha \cdot (r/\delta) = f(r) - f(r\% \delta), \quad \forall r \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof. $f(r) = (\alpha \cdot (\delta \cdot (r/\delta) + r\% \delta) + \beta)/\delta = \alpha \cdot (r/\delta) + (\alpha \cdot (r\% \delta) + \beta)/\delta = \alpha \cdot (r/\delta) + f(r\% \delta)$. \square

The next theorem does not assume $2^k \cdot \alpha\% \delta \neq 0$, but when equality holds a simpler reduction can be made as seen above. The result becomes more interesting when we do have $2^k \cdot \alpha\% \delta \neq 0$, in which case $\lceil 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot \delta^{-1} \rceil = 2^k \cdot \alpha/\delta + 1$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and f be the EAF $f(r) = (\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta$ with $\delta > 0$. Set $\alpha' = 2^k \cdot \alpha/\delta + 1$, $\varepsilon = \delta - 2^k \cdot \alpha\% \delta$ and $\beta' = -\min\{\alpha' \cdot r - 2^k \cdot f(r) ; r \in [0, \delta[\}$. For $r \in [0, \delta[$ define:*

$$q(r) = \min\{p \in \mathbb{Z}^+ ; \varepsilon \cdot p + \alpha' \cdot r + \beta' - 2^k \cdot f(r) \geq 2^k\} \quad \text{and} \quad M(r) = \delta \cdot q(r) + r.$$

Let $N = \min\{M(r) ; r \in [0, \delta[\}$. Then,

$$(\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta = (\alpha' \cdot r + \beta')/2^k, \quad \forall r \in [0, N[.$$

Proof. First note that $q(r)$ is well-defined since $\varepsilon > 0$. So are $M(r)$ and N . Also, $\delta > 0$ implies $M(r) \geq 0$ and, consequently, $N \geq 0$. Nevertheless, we do not exclude the possibility that $N = 0$, in which case this theorem's conclusion is vacuously true. The sequel assumes that $N > 0$ and $r \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note that:

$$\varepsilon = \delta - (2^k \cdot \alpha - \delta \cdot (2^k \cdot \alpha/\delta)) = \delta \cdot (1 + 2^k \cdot \alpha/\delta) - 2^k \cdot \alpha = \delta \cdot \alpha' - 2^k \cdot \alpha. \quad (2)$$

It follows that $\delta \cdot \alpha' \cdot (r/\delta) - 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot (r/\delta) = \varepsilon \cdot (r/\delta)$. Hence,

$$\alpha' \cdot r - 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot (r/\delta) = \alpha' \cdot (\delta \cdot (r/\delta) + r\% \delta) - 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot (r/\delta) = \varepsilon \cdot (r/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (r\% \delta).$$

From the above and Lemma 3.1 we conclude that:

$$\alpha' \cdot r - 2^k \cdot f(r) = \varepsilon \cdot (r/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (r\% \delta) - 2^k \cdot f(r\% \delta). \quad (3)$$

Suppose further that $r \in [0, N[$. By definition, $N \leq M(r\% \delta)$ and hence $r < M(r\% \delta)$, i.e., $\delta \cdot (r/\delta) + r\% \delta < \delta \cdot q(r\% \delta) + r\% \delta$. It follows that $r/\delta < q(r\% \delta)$. From the definition of $q(r\% \delta)$ and the fact that $r/\delta \geq 0$, we obtain:

$$\varepsilon \cdot (r/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (r\% \delta) + \beta' - 2^k \cdot f(r\% \delta) < 2^k. \quad (4)$$

The definition of β' yields $\alpha' \cdot (r\% \delta) + \beta' - 2^k \cdot f(r\% \delta) \geq 0$. This and $\varepsilon \cdot (r/\delta) \geq 0$ mean that the left side of Equation (4) is non-negative. Therefore, Equation (3) yields $0 \leq \alpha' \cdot r + \beta' - 2^k \cdot f(r) < 2^k$ and the conclusion follows from Euclidean division by 2^k . \square

Example 3.3. *Theorem 3.2 for $k = 5$ and $f(m_0) = (153 \cdot m_0 - 457)/5$ yields $\alpha' = 980$, $\beta' = -2928$ and $N = 12$, that is,*

$$(153 \cdot m_0 - 457)/5 = (980 \cdot m_0 - 2928)/2^5, \quad \forall m_0 \in [0, 12[.$$

The next theorem does assume that $2^k \cdot \alpha\% \delta \neq 0$ and thus, $2^k \cdot \alpha/\delta = \lfloor 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot \delta^{-1} \rfloor$.

Theorem 3.4. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and f be the EAF $f(r) = (\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta$ with $\delta > 0$ and $2^k \cdot \alpha \% \delta > 0$. Set $\alpha' = 2^k \cdot \alpha/\delta$, $\varepsilon = 2^k \cdot \alpha \% \delta$ and $\beta' = \min\{2^k - 1 - (\alpha' \cdot r - 2^k \cdot f(r))\}$; $r \in [0, \delta[$. For $r \in [0, \delta[$ define:

$$q(r) = \min\{p \in \mathbb{Z}^+ ; -\varepsilon \cdot p + \alpha' \cdot r + \beta' - 2^k \cdot f(r) < 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad M(r) = \delta \cdot q(r) + r.$$

Let $N = \min\{M(r) ; r \in [0, \delta[$. Then,

$$(\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta = (\alpha' \cdot r + \beta')/2^k, \quad \forall r \in [0, N[.$$

Proof. The assumption $2^k \cdot \alpha \% \delta > 0$ means that $\varepsilon > 0$ and ensures that $q(r)$ is well-defined, as are $M(r)$ and N . Also, $\delta > 0$ implies $M(r) \geq 0$ and, consequently, $N \geq 0$. Nevertheless, we do not exclude the possibility that $N = 0$, in which case this theorem's conclusion is vacuously true. The sequel assumes that $N > 0$ and $r \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Note that:

$$\varepsilon = 2^k \cdot \alpha \% \delta = 2^k \cdot \alpha - \delta \cdot (2^k \cdot \alpha / \delta) = 2^k \cdot \alpha - \delta \cdot \alpha'. \quad (5)$$

It follows that $2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot (r/\delta) - \delta \cdot \alpha' \cdot (r/\delta) = \varepsilon \cdot (r/\delta)$. Hence,

$$\alpha' \cdot r - 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot (r/\delta) = \alpha' \cdot (\delta \cdot (r/\delta) + r \% \delta) - 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot (r/\delta) = -\varepsilon \cdot (r/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (r \% \delta).$$

From the above and Lemma 3.1 we conclude that:

$$\alpha' \cdot r - 2^k \cdot f(r) = -\varepsilon \cdot (r/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (r \% \delta) - 2^k \cdot f(r \% \delta). \quad (6)$$

Suppose further that $r \in [0, N[$. By definition $N \leq M(r \% \delta)$ and hence, $r < M(n \% \delta)$, i.e., $\delta \cdot (r/\delta) + r \% \delta < \delta \cdot q(r \% \delta) + r \% \delta$. Therefore, $r/\delta < q(r \% \delta)$. From the definition of $q(r \% \delta)$ and the fact that $r/\delta \geq 0$, we obtain:

$$-\varepsilon \cdot (r/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (r \% \delta) + \beta' - 2^k \cdot f(r \% \delta) \geq 0. \quad (7)$$

The definition of β' yields $\alpha' \cdot (r \% \delta) + \beta' - 2^k \cdot f(r \% \delta) \leq 2^k - 1 < 2^k$. This and $\varepsilon \cdot (r/\delta) \geq 0$ mean that the left side of Equation (7) is less than 2^k . Therefore, Equation (6) yields $0 \leq \alpha' \cdot r + \beta' - 2^k \cdot f(r) < 2^k$ and the conclusion follows from Euclidean division by 2^k . \square

Example 3.5. Theorem 3.4 for $k = 5$ and $f(m_0) = (153 \cdot m_0 - 457)/5$ yields $\alpha' = 979$, $\beta' = -2919$ and $N = 34$, namely:

$$(153 \cdot m_0 - 457)/5 = (979 \cdot m_0 - 2919)/2^5, \quad \forall m_0 \in [0, 34[. \quad (8)$$

Examples 3.3 and 3.5 give two fast alternatives for the same EAF. In this case, the latter has the advantage of being valid on a larger range, $[0, 34[$ as opposed to $[0, 12[$, but in other cases the opposite is true. For EAFs known prior to compilation, one can find both alternatives and select the one that is valid in the larger range. Compilers can do the same for EAFs found in source code. However, if the costs of finding the two alternatives need to be avoided, then a simple and fast-selecting criterion is based on the following heuristics. To maximise N we seek to maximise $q(r)$, which is the minimum value of p for which $\varepsilon \cdot p$ reaches a certain threshold. The smaller ε is, the larger p must be for this to happen. Hence, we choose the alternative with the smallest ε amongst its two possible values, namely, $\varepsilon_1 = \delta - 2^k \cdot \alpha \% \delta$ and $\varepsilon_2 = 2^k \cdot \alpha \% \delta$. (If δ is odd, then $\varepsilon_1 \neq \varepsilon_2$.) Another interpretation of this criterion is that it sets α' to the best approximation of $2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot \delta^{-1}$ given by $\lceil 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot \delta^{-1} \rceil$ or $\lfloor 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot \delta^{-1} \rfloor$. Indeed, if $2^k \cdot \alpha \% \delta \neq 0$, then Equations (2) and (5) give:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_1 &= \delta \cdot (2^k \cdot \alpha / \delta + 1) - 2^k \cdot \alpha = \delta \cdot \lceil 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot \delta^{-1} \rceil - 2^k \cdot \alpha, \\ \varepsilon_2 &= 2^k \cdot \alpha - \delta \cdot (2^k \cdot \alpha / \delta) = 2^k \cdot \alpha - \delta \cdot \lfloor 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot \delta^{-1} \rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_2$ if, and only if, $\lceil 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot \delta^{-1} \rceil - 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot \delta^{-1} < 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot \delta^{-1} - \lfloor 2^k \cdot \alpha \cdot \delta^{-1} \rfloor$.

Example 3.6. Theorem 3.4 for $k = 16$ and $f(r_2) = (5 \cdot r_2 + 461)/153$ yields $\alpha' = 2141$, $\beta' = 197913$ and $N = 734$, namely:

$$(5 \cdot r_2 + 461)/153 = (2141 \cdot r_2 + 197913)/2^{16}, \quad \forall r_2 \in [0, 734]. \quad (9)$$

In Theorems 3.2 and 3.4, α' and ε are obtained in $O(1)$ operations and β' is found by an $O(\delta)$ search. For each $r \in [0, \delta[$, $q(r)$ and $N(r)$ are calculated in $O(1)$ operations. N and the overall search for a fast EAF then have $O(\delta)$ time complexity. Since many EAFs featuring in calendar calculations have small divisors, finding more efficient alternatives for them is reasonably fast.

3.1 Fast division – the special case $\alpha = 1, \beta = 0$

This section examines r/δ with $\delta > 0$, i.e., the particular case of the EAF $f(r) = (\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta$ where $\alpha = 1$, $\beta = 0$ and $\delta > 0$.

For $\alpha = 1$, Theorems 3.2 and 3.4 set α' to $\lceil 2^k \cdot \delta^{-1} \rceil$ and $\lfloor 2^k \cdot \delta^{-1} \rfloor$, respectively. The former is the choice taken by [1, 5, 10] and the latter by [16]. Finally, [22] and an appendix to [5], consider both and, in this particular case, rigorously justify the heuristics we have suggested for choosing between the two approaches.

This section follows a more direct path but most of its results can be obtained from the above for $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0$. For instance, for $\alpha' > 0$, let $\beta' = -\min\{\alpha' \cdot r - 2^k \cdot f(r) ; r \in [0, \delta[\}$ as in Theorem 3.2. Since $f(r) = r/\delta = 0$ for $r \in [0, \delta[$, we have $\beta' = -\min\{\alpha' \cdot r ; r \in [0, \delta[\} = 0$. Hence, in contrast to the general case, there is no need for an $O(\delta)$ search to obtain β' . Similarly, $\beta' = \min\{2^k - 1 - (\alpha' \cdot r - 2^k \cdot f(r)) ; r \in [0, \delta[\}$, as defined by Theorem 3.4, can be proven to be $\alpha' + (2^k \% \delta - 1)$, the same value found in [16]. Theorem 3.4 assumes that $2^k \% \delta \geq 1$ and, in the definition of β' , had we subtracted $2^k \% \delta$ instead of 1 the proof would still work but β' would have a smaller value, namely, $\beta' = \alpha'$. In this case, the final reduction would be $r/\delta = \alpha' \cdot (r+1)/2^k$ as found in [5, 22]. In addition, by making β' smaller, $q(r)$, $M(r)$ and N also decrease. Hence, Theorem 3.4 obtains a range of validity that is no smaller than the one obtained in [5, 22].

The remainder of this section focuses on the round-up approach but the round-down alternative could be similarly considered. Our reasons for this are that the round-up approach is mostly used by compilers and that the appearance of the term $r + 1$ can potentially lead to an overflow.

Lemma 3.7. Let $\delta, k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $\delta > 0$. Set $\alpha' = 2^k/\delta + 1$ and $\varepsilon = \delta - 2^k \% \delta$. Then, $\alpha' \cdot \delta = 2^k + \varepsilon$ and for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have:

$$\alpha' \cdot n / 2^k = n/\delta \quad \text{if, and only if,} \quad 0 \leq \varepsilon \cdot (n/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (n \% \delta) < 2^k. \quad (10)$$

Proof. Taking $\alpha = 1$ in Theorem 3.2 gives the same α' and ε as here. Equation (2) then reads $\varepsilon = \alpha' \cdot \delta - 2^k$. Similarly, from Equation (3) with $f(n) = n/\delta$ and $f(n \% \delta) = n \% \delta / \delta = 0$ we obtain:

$$\alpha' \cdot n - 2^k \cdot (n/\delta) = \varepsilon \cdot (n/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (n \% \delta).$$

The result follows from Euclidean division by 2^k . □

Since $\alpha', \varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we have $0 \leq \varepsilon \cdot (n/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (n \% \delta)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. There is an illuminating geometric interpretation for the second part of the double inequality in Equation (10) that follows from mapping each $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ to $P_n = (n/\delta, n \% \delta)$ in the xy plane. Figure 1 shows, for $\delta = 5$, some points of particular interest labelled by their circled value. Notably, the origin $P_0 = (0/5, 0 \% 5)$, $P_1 = (1/5, 1 \% 5)$ and $P_5 = (5/5, 5 \% 5)$. Inequality $\varepsilon \cdot (n/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (n \% \delta) < 2^k$ states that P_n is below the line $\varepsilon \cdot x + \alpha' \cdot y = 2^k$, which is represented by the dotted line in Figure 1, for $k = 8$, $\varepsilon = 4$ and $\alpha' = 52$. Hence, Equation (10) means that a point below




Figure 1: The geometry of replacing n/δ with $\alpha' \cdot n/2^k$, where $\delta = 5$ and $k = 8$, $\alpha' = 2^k/\delta + 1 = 52$.

the line corresponds to $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $n/\delta = \alpha' \cdot n/2^k$ and a point above or on the line is related to n such that $n/\delta \neq \alpha' \cdot n/2^k$.

If the slope of the dotted line is not too steep (more precisely, $-\varepsilon \cdot \alpha'^{-1} \geq -1$), then the graph makes it obvious that the smallest N for which P_N is above or on the dotted line must lie on the line $y = \delta - 1 = 4$. In our case $N = 64$. For Theorem 3.2, with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0$, this means that $N = M(\delta - 1)$. In particular, we are not interested in either $M(r)$ or $q(r)$ when $r \neq \delta - 1$. This and $\beta' = 0$ turn finding a fast EAF and its interval of applicability $[0, N[$ into an $O(1)$ calculation rather than an $O(\delta)$ search as in the general case. These geometric ideas are present although algebraically disguised in the proof of Theorem 3.8.

The result of Theorem 3.8 also appears in [5]. In addition to providing the aforementioned geometric insights and an arguably simpler proof, we favour faster algorithms over range of applicability. In other words, we reduce division to multiplication and bitwise shift and find the largest N for which this optimisation yields correct results for all dividends in $[0, N[$. (In [5] N is called *critical value* and is denoted by N_{cr} .)

Theorem 3.8. *Let $\delta, k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $\delta > 0$. Set $\alpha' = 2^k/\delta + 1$, $\varepsilon = \delta - 2^k \% \delta$ and $N = \lceil \alpha' \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \rceil \cdot \delta - 1$. If $\varepsilon \leq \alpha'$, then:*

$$n/\delta = \alpha' \cdot n/2^k, \quad \forall n \in [0, N[.$$

Proof. Let $N' = N - \delta = (\lceil \alpha' \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \rceil - 2) \cdot \delta + \delta - 1$. We have $N'/\delta = \lceil \alpha' \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \rceil - 2$ and $N' \% \delta = \delta - 1$. Recall from Lemma 3.7 that $\alpha' \cdot \delta - \varepsilon = 2^k$. Therefore, using $\varepsilon \cdot \lceil \alpha' \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \rceil < \alpha' + \varepsilon$ we obtain:

$$\varepsilon \cdot (N'/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (N' \% \delta) = \varepsilon \cdot \lceil \alpha' \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \rceil - 2 \cdot \varepsilon + \alpha' \cdot \delta - \alpha' < 2^k. \quad (11)$$

Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $n < N$. We shall show that $0 \leq \varepsilon \cdot (n/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (n \% \delta) < 2^k$ and the result will follow from Lemma 3.7. Since ε , α' and r are non-negative, it is sufficient to show that $\varepsilon \cdot (n/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (n \% \delta) < 2^k$.

Assume first that $n \leq N'$. As a result, $n/\delta \leq N'/\delta$. Then use Equation (11) to obtain:

$$\varepsilon \cdot (n/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (n \% \delta) \leq \varepsilon \cdot (N'/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (\delta - 1) = \varepsilon \cdot (N'/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (N' \% \delta) < 2^k.$$

Now assume that $N' + 1 \leq n < N$. Then $(\lceil \alpha' \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \rceil - 1) \cdot \delta \leq n < (\lceil \alpha' \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \rceil - 1) \cdot \delta + \delta - 1$. Hence, $n/\delta = \lceil \alpha' \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \rceil - 1 = N'/\delta + 1 = N/\delta$. Since $n < N$, we must have $n \% \delta \leq N \% \delta - 1 = \delta - 2$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \cdot (n/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (n \% \delta) &\leq \varepsilon \cdot (N'/\delta + 1) + \alpha' \cdot (\delta - 2) = \varepsilon \cdot (N'/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (\delta - 1) + \varepsilon - \alpha' \\ &\leq \varepsilon \cdot (N'/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (N' \% \delta). \end{aligned}$$

The result follows from Equation (11). □

Remark 3.9. *If δ is not a power of two and $2^k \geq \delta \cdot (\delta - 2)$, then $\varepsilon \leq \alpha'$. Indeed, under these hypotheses we have $2^k/\delta \geq \delta - 2$ and $2^k \% \delta \geq 1$. It follows that $\delta - 2^k \% \delta \leq \delta - 1 \leq 2^k/\delta + 1$, i.e., $\varepsilon \leq \alpha'$.*

Example 3.10. Consider the division $n_2/1461$. For $k = 39$ the constants given by Theorem 3.8 are $\alpha' = 376\,287\,347$, $\varepsilon = 79$ and $N = 6\,958\,934\,390$. Since $\varepsilon \leq \alpha'$, this theorem gives:

$$n_2/1461 = 376\,287\,347 \cdot n_2/2^{39}, \quad \forall n_2 \in [0, 6\,958\,934\,390[. \quad (12)$$

Following [10], major compilers replace the expression on the left with the one on the right when n_2 is a 32-bit unsigned integer. (It is worth mentioning that $k = 39$ is the smallest value for which $N \geq 2^{32}$.)

For $k = 32$, the constants given by Theorem 3.8 are $\alpha' = 2\,939\,745$, $\varepsilon = 149$ and $N = 28\,825\,529$. Hence,

$$n_2/1461 = 2\,939\,745 \cdot n_2/2^{32}, \quad \forall n_2 \in [0, 28\,825\,529[. \quad (13)$$

Although the interval is smaller than the one for $k = 39$, it is large enough for the Gregorian calendar algorithm that we present later on. Example 3.12 will unveil the advantage of Equation (13) over Equation (12).

3.2 Fast evaluation of residual functions

Theorems 3.2 and 3.4 suggest optimisations for EAFs, generalising the current practice for divisions revisited by Theorem 3.8. Our next result extends the optimisation to residual functions.

Theorem 3.11. Let f and f' be EAFs given by $f(r) = (\alpha \cdot r + \beta)/\delta$ and $f'(r) = (\alpha' \cdot r + \beta')/\delta'$, with $\delta \geq \alpha > 0$, and assume that $f \equiv f'$ on $[a, b[$. If $a = \hat{f}(f(a))$ and $f'(a-1) < f'(a)$, then:

$$\hat{f}(r)/\alpha = \hat{f}'(r)/\alpha' \quad \forall r \in [a, b[.$$

Proof. Let $r \in [a, b[$ and set $q = f(r)$. From Theorem 2.5-(iii), we obtain $\hat{f}(r)/\alpha = r - \hat{f}(q)$. We will finish the proof by using Lemma 2.4 to show that $\hat{f}'(r)/\alpha' = r - \hat{f}(q)$.

Since $\delta \geq \alpha > 0$, both f and \hat{f} are non-decreasing. Hence, from $a \leq r \leq b-1$ we obtain $\hat{f}(f(a)) \leq \hat{f}(f(r)) \leq \hat{f}(f(b-1))$. By assumption, $a = \hat{f}(f(a))$ and Theorem 2.5-(iii) (for $r = b-1$) gives $b-1 \in [\hat{f}(f(b-1)), \hat{f}(f(b-1)+1)[$, in particular $\hat{f}(f(b-1)) \leq b-1$. Therefore, $a \leq \hat{f}(f(r)) \leq b-1$, in other words, $\hat{f}(q) \in [a, b[$.

Since $f \equiv f'$ in $[a, b[$ and $\hat{f}(q)$ is in this interval, we have $f'(\hat{f}(q)) = f(\hat{f}(q))$. Theorem 2.5-(i) yields $f(\hat{f}(q)) = q$ and thus $f'(\hat{f}(q)) = q = f(r)$.

Similarly, it can be shown that if $\hat{f}(q) - 1 \in [a, b[$, then $f'(\hat{f}(q) - 1) = q - 1$, specifically, $f'(\hat{f}(q) - 1) < f'(\hat{f}(q))$. On the other hand, if $\hat{f}(q) - 1 \notin [a, b[$, then we must have $\hat{f}(q) = a$ and the assumption on f' also gives $f'(\hat{f}(q) - 1) < f'(\hat{f}(q))$.

We have shown that $f'(\hat{f}(q) - 1) < f'(\hat{f}(q))$ and $f(r) = f'(\hat{f}(q))$. Then, Lemma 2.4 applied to f' (instead of f) and $g = \hat{f}$ gives $\hat{f}'(r)/\alpha' = r - \hat{f}(q)$. \square

Example 3.12. Consider the EAFs $f(n_2) = n_2/1461$, $\hat{f}(q) = q \cdot 1461$ and $f'(n_2) = 2\,939\,745 \cdot n_2/2^{32}$. Equation (13) shows that $f(n_2) = f'(n_2)$ for all $n_2 \in [a, b[= [0, 28\,825\,529[$. Simple calculations give $\hat{f}(f(0)) = 0$ and $f'(-1) = -1 < 0 = f'(0)$. Hence, it follows from Equation (13) and Theorem 3.11 that:

$$n_2/1461 = 2\,939\,745 \cdot n_2/2^{32} \quad \text{and} \quad n_2 \% 1461 = 2\,939\,745 \cdot n_2 \% 2^{32} / 2\,939\,745, \quad \forall n_2 \in [0, 28\,825\,529[.$$

Revisiting Example 2.7 we show three alternatives that can be used to obtain $q_2 = (4 \cdot r_1 + 3)/1461$ and $r_2 = r_1 - 1461 \cdot q_2/4$ side-by-side. The first evaluates r_2 as expressed. The second uses the expression

$(4 \cdot r_1 + 3) \% 1461 / 4$ seen in Example 2.7. The third is similar but replaces $n_2 / 1461$ and $n_2 \% 1461$ with the aforementioned alternatives.

$$\begin{array}{l} n_2 = 4 \cdot r_1 + 3, \\ q_2 = n_2 / 1461, \\ r_2 = r_1 - 1461 \cdot q_2 / 4, \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{l} n_2 = 4 \cdot r_1 + 3, \\ q_2 = n_2 / 1461, \\ r_2 = (n_2 - 1461 \cdot q_2) / 4, \text{ (i.e., } r_2 = n_2 \% 1461 / 4) \end{array} \right. \left| \begin{array}{l} n_2 = 4 \cdot r_1 + 3, \\ u_2 = 2939745 \cdot n_2, \\ q_2 = u_2 / 2^{32}, \\ r_2 = u_2 \% 2^{32} / 2939745 / 4. \end{array} \right.$$

We are interested in instructions emitted by compilers for the three listings above but, for clarity, we did not perform typical compiler optimisations (e.g., substituting division by 4 and 2^{32} with bitwise shifts). However, in the middle listing we did substitute $n_2 \% 1461$ with $n_2 - 1461 \cdot q_2$ for greater resemblance to emitted instructions and fairer comparison with the first listing. Compilers reduce division by 1461 to multiplication and bitwise shift, the same operations used to get u_2 and q_2 in the third listing. Therefore, up to and including the calculation of q_2 , the instructions for the three columns are the same and only the constants differ.

The calculation of r_2 in the first two listings requires three instructions: one multiplication, one subtraction and one bitwise shift ($/4$). For the third listing, there appear to be four: one bitwise `and` ($\%2^{32}$), one multiplication and one bitwise shift (compilers' reduction of $/2939745$), and another bitwise shift ($/4$). In fact, these two bitwise shifts collapse into one. Hence, there are also three instructions for the third listing. We conclude that the number of instructions is exactly the same for the three listings, but this is only part of the story. The breakthrough of the third listing is removing the dependency of r_2 on q_2 , seen in the first two listings, which forces the CPU to wait for the calculation of q_2 to finish before starting that of r_2 . In listing three, once u_2 is obtained, the evaluations of q_2 and r_2 can start concurrently. There is a small but worthwhile price to pay for this parallelisation and even that can be avoided in some platforms as we shall see now.

The calculations of q_2 and r_2 need u_2 to be stored in two different registers, which implies a `mov` from the register on which u_2 was originally obtained. This does not necessarily increase the number of instructions because instead of leaving the compiler to reduce division by 1461 to multiplication and a bitwise shift of 39 bits (see Equation (12)), we perform our own reduction (see Equation (13)) using 32 bits. For backward compatibility, x86-64 CPUs provide `mov` instructions that reset the upper 32 bits of 64 registers, effectively performing a `mov` and a bitwise `and` at the same time. Hence, the operation $\%2^{32}$ in the calculation of r_2 might come for free.

Example 3.13. Consider the EAFs $f(r_2) = (5 \cdot r_2 + 461) / 153$, $\hat{f}(m_0) = (153 \cdot m_0 - 457) / 5$, and $f'(r_2) = (2141 \cdot r_2 + 197913) / 2^{16}$. Equation (9) states that $f(r_2) = \hat{f}(f'(r_2))$ for all $r_2 \in [a, b[= [0, 734[$. Simple calculations give $\hat{f}(f(0)) = 0$ and $f'(-1) = 2 < 3 = f'(0)$. It follows from Equation (9) and Theorem 3.11 that:

$$\begin{aligned} (5 \cdot r_2 + 461) / 153 &= (2141 \cdot r_2 + 197913) / 2^{16} \quad \text{and} \\ (5 \cdot r_2 + 461) \% 153 / 5 &= (2141 \cdot r_2 + 197913) \% 2^{16} / 2141, \quad \forall r_2 \in [0, 734[. \end{aligned}$$

Example 2.8 shows that the left side of the last equation matches $d_0 = r_2 - (153 \cdot m_0 - 457) / 5$. Hence, as in Example 3.12, we have three alternatives for evaluating this quantity. The analysis of Example 3.12 also holds here and once $n_3 = 2141 \cdot r_2 + 197913$ is obtained the calculations of $m_0 = n_3 / 2^{16}$ and $d_0 = n_3 \% 2^{16} / 2141$ can start concurrently. Furthermore, in some platforms, the operation $\%2^{16}$ might come for free.

Example 3.14. In line with the previous examples, we have

$$\begin{aligned} n / 3600 &= 1193047 \cdot n / 2^{32}, & n \% 3600 &= 1193047 \cdot n \% 2^{32} / 1193047, & \forall n \in [0, 2257199[; \\ n / 60 &= 71582789 \cdot n / 2^{32}, & n \% 60 &= 71582789 \cdot n \% 2^{32} / 71582789, & \forall n \in [0, 97612919[; \\ n / 10 &= 429496730 \cdot n / 2^{32}, & n \% 10 &= 429496730 \cdot n \% 2^{32} / 429496730, & \forall n \in [0, 1073741829[. \end{aligned}$$

Compilers create a data dependency when evaluating the left side of the equalities above but not when the expressions on the right are used. The first two lines can be used in conversions of the seconds elapsed since the start of the day, a quantity in $[0, 86400[$, to hours, minutes and seconds. The third line can be used in conversions of non-negative integers up to 9 digits into their decimal representations.

3.3 Quick remainder – the special case $\alpha = 1, \beta = 0$

Again for this particular case, the EAF $f(n) = (\alpha \cdot n + \beta)/\delta$ simplifies to $f(n) = n/\delta$ and its residual function simplifies to $\hat{f}(n) = n\% \delta$. In this section we use Theorem 3.8 and Theorem 3.11 to derive an efficient way to calculate remainders.

Formally, Theorem 3.8 states how to replace n/δ with $\alpha' \cdot n/2^k$, where $\alpha' \approx 2^k \cdot \delta^{-1}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Theorem 3.11 then gives the equality $n\% \delta = (\alpha' \cdot n\% 2^k)/\alpha'$ and Theorem 3.8, again, suggests replacing division by α' with multiplication by an approximation of $2^k \cdot \alpha'^{-1}$ and division by 2^k . It turns out that $\delta \approx 2^k \cdot \alpha'^{-1}$ is the approximation we need and we obtain $n\% \delta = \delta \cdot (\alpha' \cdot n\% 2^k)/2^k$. This is the idea behind our next theorem.

Theorem 3.15. *Let $\delta, k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $\delta > 0$. Set $\alpha' = 2^k/\delta + 1$, $\varepsilon = \delta - 2^k\% \delta$ and $M = \lceil 2^k \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \rceil$. If $\varepsilon \leq \alpha'$, then:*

$$n\% \delta = \delta \cdot (\alpha' \cdot n\% 2^k)/2^k, \quad \forall n \in [0, M[. \quad (14)$$

Proof. Set $N = \lceil \alpha' \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \rceil \cdot \delta - 1 \geq \alpha' \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \cdot \delta - 1$. Recall from Lemma 3.7 that $\alpha' \cdot \delta = 2^k + \varepsilon$ and thus $N \geq (2^k + \varepsilon) \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} - 1 = 2^k \cdot \varepsilon^{-1}$. It follows that $N \geq M$. Theorem 3.8 gives:

$$n/\delta = \alpha' \cdot n/2^k, \quad \forall n \in [0, N[. \quad (15)$$

Hence, for the EAFs $f(n) = n/\delta$ and $f'(n) = \alpha' \cdot n/2^k$, Equation (15) states that $f \equiv f'$ on $[0, N[$. Simple calculations give $\hat{f}(f(0)) = \delta \cdot f(0) = 0$ and $f'(-1) < f'(0)$. Theorem 3.11 (for $\alpha = 1$ and $[a, b[= [0, N[$) therefore yields:

$$n\% \delta = (\alpha' \cdot n\% 2^k)/\alpha', \quad \forall n \in [0, N[. \quad (16)$$

Let $n \in [0, M[$ and set $m = \varepsilon \cdot (n/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (n\% \delta)$. Since $n < N$, we have $n/\delta \leq N/\delta = \lceil \alpha' \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \rceil - 1 < \alpha' \cdot \varepsilon^{-1}$. It follows that $0 \leq \varepsilon \cdot (n/\delta) < \alpha'$. Hence, $m/\alpha' = n\% \delta$ and $m\% \alpha' = \varepsilon \cdot (n/\delta)$. Moreover, Equation (15) and Lemma 3.7 give $0 \leq m < 2^k$. Since $\alpha' \cdot n = \alpha' \cdot (\delta \cdot (n/\delta) + n\% \delta) = 2^k \cdot (n/\delta) + \varepsilon \cdot (n/\delta) + \alpha' \cdot (n\% \delta) = 2^k \cdot (n/\delta) + m$, we conclude that $\alpha' \cdot n\% 2^k = m$.

Since $n < M$, we have $\varepsilon \cdot n < 2^k$, otherwise $n \geq 2^k \cdot \varepsilon^{-1}$ and then, $n \geq M$. Therefore:

$$0 \leq \varepsilon \cdot (m/\alpha') + \delta \cdot (m\% \alpha') = \varepsilon \cdot (n\% \delta) + \delta \cdot \varepsilon \cdot (n/\delta) = \varepsilon \cdot n < 2^k. \quad (17)$$

Using $\alpha' \cdot \delta = 2^k + \varepsilon$ again gives $2^k = \delta \cdot \alpha' - \varepsilon = (\delta - 1) \cdot \alpha' + \alpha' - \varepsilon$ and, since $0 \leq \alpha' - \varepsilon < \alpha'$, we obtain $2^k/\alpha' = \delta - 1$ and $2^k\% \alpha' = \alpha' - \varepsilon$, that is, $\delta = 2^k/\alpha' + 1$ and $\varepsilon = \alpha' - 2^k\% \alpha'$. Therefore, Equation (17) and Lemma 3.7 (with α' and δ interchanged) give $m/\alpha' = \delta \cdot m/2^k$, namely, $(\alpha' \cdot n\% 2^k)/\alpha' = \delta \cdot (\alpha' \cdot n\% 2^k)/2^k$.

Finally, Equation (16) yields $n\% \delta = (\alpha' \cdot n\% 2^k)/\alpha' = \delta \cdot (\alpha' \cdot n\% 2^k)/2^k$. \square

Example 3.16. *Revisiting Example 3.14, Theorem 3.15 gives*

$$\begin{aligned} n\% 3600 &= 3600 \cdot (1\,193\,047 \cdot n\% 2^{32})/2^{32}, & \forall n \in [0, 2\,255\,761[; \\ n\% 60 &= 60 \cdot (71\,582\,789 \cdot n\% 2^{32})/2^{32}, & \forall n \in [0, 97\,612\,894[; \\ n\% 10 &= 10 \cdot (429\,496\,730 \cdot n\% 2^{32})/2^{32}, & \forall n \in [0, 1\,073\,741\,824[. \end{aligned}$$

The expressions on the right side of the equals sign provide efficient ways of evaluating remainders. However, greater benefits are achieved when they are used in conjunction with the quotient expressions presented in Example 3.14.

The equality in Equation (14) also appears in [13]. As in other works, it focuses on obtaining the value $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ for which the equality holds on an interval of the form $[0, 2^w[$ or, in other words, $2^w \leq M$ as the next result shows.

Corollary 3.17. *Let $\delta, l, w \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $0 < \delta < 2^w$ and $\delta - 2^{w+l} \% \delta \leq 2^l$. Set $\alpha' = 2^{w+l}/\delta + 1$. Then,*

$$n \% \delta = \delta \cdot (\alpha' \cdot n \% 2^{w+l}) / 2^{w+l}, \quad \forall n \in [0, 2^w[.$$

Proof. Set $k = w + l$, $\varepsilon = \delta - 2^k \% \delta$ and $M = \lceil 2^k \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \rceil$. From Theorem 3.15, it is sufficient to show that $\varepsilon \leq \alpha'$ and $2^k \leq M$. Since $\delta < 2^w$ and $\varepsilon \leq 2^l$, we have $\delta \cdot \varepsilon < 2^{w+l} = 2^k$ and thus, $\varepsilon \leq 2^k / \delta < \alpha'$. We also have $M \geq 2^k \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \geq 2^k \cdot 2^{-l} = 2^w$. \square

4 Calendars

We begin this section with a mathematical framework that can be applied to all calendars, before specifically turning our attention to the Gregorian calendar.

Definition 4.1. *A **date** is an ordered pair $(y, x) \in \mathbb{Z} \times X$ and a **calendar** is a non-empty set of dates $C \subset \mathbb{Z} \times X$ such that for all $y \in \mathbb{Z}$ the set $\{x \in X ; (y, x) \in C\}$ is finite.*

Example 4.2. *In the most common interpretation, y is called **year** and x is the **day of the year**. Moreover, $X = \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $x = (m, d)$ is broken down into sub-coordinates, namely **month** m and **day (of the month)** d .*

Example 4.3. *In another interpretation the coordinates of a date $(c, x) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}^3$ are called **century** c and **day of the century** x and the sub-coordinates of $x = (y, m, d)$ are the **year of the century** y , **month** m and **day** d .*

We mostly use the interpretation of Example 4.2, although that of Example 4.3 appears, in passing, in Propositions 5.4 and 5.5. To ease notation, a date $(y, (m, d)) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}^2$ is identified with $(y, m, d) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$.

Under the lexicographical order of \mathbb{Z}^3 (considered throughout), any calendar $C \subset \mathbb{Z}^3$ is totally ordered and any bounded interval in C is finite. This observation supports the following definition.

Definition 4.4. *Let $C \subset \mathbb{Z}^3$ be a calendar and $e \in C$. The function $\rho : C \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ given by $\rho(x) = \#[e, x[$, if $x \geq e$, and $\rho(x) = -\#[x, e[$, if $x < e$, is called the **rata die** function with **epoch** e .*

The term rata die is usually [20] applied to the particular case where the epoch is 31 December 0000 in the proleptic Gregorian calendar but we shall use it regardless of the epoch.

Rata die functions are strictly increasing and thus invertible on their images. We are interested in developing algorithms to evaluate rata die functions and their inverses.

4.1 The Gregorian calendar

This calendar is used by most countries and is familiar to most readers. Nevertheless, we recall some of its properties. Although it is meaningless to refer to dates in the Gregorian calendar prior to its introduction

in 1582, we can extrapolate the calendar backwards indefinitely, yielding the so called **proleptic Gregorian calendar**. (See Richards [21].) For the sake of brevity, we drop the adjective *proleptic* and refer to the Gregorian calendar even when dealing with dates prior to 1582.

A year $y \in \mathbb{Z}$ is said to be a **leap year** if $y\%4 = 0$ and $y\%100 \neq 0$ or $y\%400 = 0$. The Gregorian calendar is defined by $G = \{(y, m, d) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 ; m \in [1, 12] \text{ and } d \in [1, L(y, m)]\}$, where $L(y, m)$ is the **length of month** m of year y as given by Table 1.

Table 1: Months of the Gregorian calendar.

m	Name	$L(y, m)$	m	Name	$L(y, m)$	m	Name	$L(y, m)$
1	January	31	5	May	31	9	September	30
2	February	28 or 29 ^(a)	6	June	30	10	October	31
3	March	31	7	July	31	11	November	30
4	April	30	8	August	31	12	December	31

(a) $L(y, 2) = 29$ if y is a leap year, or 28 otherwise.

From the definition of length of month we obtain:

$$\sum_{m=1}^{12} L(y, m) = \begin{cases} 366, & \text{if } y \text{ is a leap year,} \\ 365, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

4.2 The computational calendar

Borrowing Hatcher's [11, 12] terminology, we introduce a computational calendar that allows efficient evaluations of rata die functions and their inverses. This calendar is derived from G by rotating the months to place February last and setting its minimum to $e_0 = (0, 3, 0)$.

Let $P_1 : \mathbb{Z}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^3$ be the map defined by:

$$P_1(y_1, m_1, d_1) = (y_1 - \mathbf{1}_{\{m_1 \leq 2\}}, m_1 + 12 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{m_1 \leq 2\}}, d_1 - 1), \quad \forall (y_1, m_1, d_1) \in \mathbb{Z}^3.$$

Remark 4.5. *It is easy to see that P_1 is a strictly increasing bijection with*

$$P_1^{-1}(y_0, m_0, d_0) = (y_0 + \mathbf{1}_{\{m_0 \geq 13\}}, m_0 - 12 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{m_0 \geq 13\}}, d_0 + 1), \quad \forall (y_0, m_0, d_0) \in G_0. \quad (19)$$

The **computational calendar** is $G_0 = \{P_1(x_1) ; x_1 \in G \text{ and } P_1(x_1) \geq e_0\}$. By setting $e_1 = (0, 3, 1) \in G$ and noting that $P_1(e_1) = e_0$, the monotonicity of P_1 gives $G_0 = P(G_1)$, where $G_1 = \{x_1 \in G ; x_1 \geq e_1\}$.

Figure 2 illustrates the relationships between years and months in the Gregorian and computational calendars. Month $m_0 = 14$ of year 0 (generally, y_0) of the computational calendar corresponds to $m_1 = 2$ (February) of year 1 (generally, $y_0 + 1$) of the Gregorian calendar. Hence, if $y_1 = y_0 + 1$ is a leap year in the Gregorian calendar, then from Equation (18), year y_0 of the computational calendar will have 366 days; otherwise it will have 365 days.

If $(y_0, m_0, d_0) \in G_0$, then $m_0 \in [3, 15[$ and $d_0 \in [0, L(y_1, m_1)[$ where $(y_1, m_1, d_1) = P_1^{-1}(y_0, m_0, d_0)$. (See Table 2.)

Remark 4.6. *Table 2 shows that, except for $m_0 = 14$, $m_0 \mapsto L(y_1, m_1)$ is a periodic function and there are $153 = 31 + 30 + 31 + 30 + 31$ days in each 5-month period.*

Gregorian	y_1	...	0												1												...
	m_1	...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	...
Computational	m_0		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	...
	y_0		0												1												...

Figure 2: Years 0 and 1 in the Gregorian and computational calendars.

Table 2: Months of the computational calendar and their lengths.

m_0	Name	$L(y_1, m_1)^{(a)}$	m_0	Name	$L(y_1, m_1)^{(a)}$	m_0	Name	$L(y_1, m_1)^{(b)}$
3	March	31	8	August	31	13	January	31
4	April	30	9	September	30	14	February	28 or 29 ^(c)
5	May	31	10	October	31			
6	June	30	11	November	30			
7	July	31	12	December	31			

(a) $y_1 = y_0$, $m_1 = m_0$. (b) $y_1 = y_0 + 1$, $m_1 = m_0 - 12$. (c) $L(y_1, m_1) = 29$ if $y_1 = y_0 + 1$ is a leap year, or $L(y_1, m_1) = 28$ otherwise.

5 A rata die function on the computational calendar

e_0 , the minimum date in G_0 , is undoubtedly the most natural epoch for a rata die function ρ_0 on G_0 , $\rho_0(x_0) = \#[e_0, x_0[$ for all $x_0 \in G_0$.

For any $x_0 = (y_0, m_0, d_0) \in G_0$, integers y_0 , m_0 , d_0 and $\rho_0(x_0)$ are non-negative. Hence, implementations of G_0 can work exclusively on unsigned integer types, which are usually faster than signed ones.

Let $x_0 = (y_0, m_0, d_0) \in G_0$ and split $[e_0, x_0[$ into three disjoint intervals:

$$[e_0, x_0[= [(0, 3, 0), (y_0, 3, 0)[\cup [(y_0, 3, 0), (y_0, m_0, 0)[\cup [(y_0, m_0, 0), (y_0, m_0, d_0)[.$$

Hence, $\rho_0(x_0)$ is the sum of the number of elements of these three intervals, which we consider separately.

The **year count**, defined by $y_c(y_0) = \#[(0, 3, 0), (y_0, 3, 0)[$ is the number of dates prior to year y_0 :

$$y_c(y_0) = 365 \cdot y_0 + \#\{y'_0 \in [0, y_0[; y'_0 \text{ has 366 days } \}$$

Recalling that year y'_0 of the computational calendar has 366 days if, and only if, $y'_0 + 1$ is a leap year of the Gregorian calendar gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
y_c(y_0) &= 365 \cdot y_0 + \#\{y'_0 \in [0, y_0[; y'_0 + 1 \text{ is a leap year } \} \\
&= 365 \cdot y_0 + \#\{y \in [1, y_0 + 1[; y \text{ is a leap year } \} \\
&= 365 \cdot y_0 + \#\{y \in [1, y_0] ; y \% 4 = 0 \text{ and } y \% 100 \neq 0 \text{ or } y \% 400 = 0 \} \\
&= 365 \cdot y_0 + y_0/4 - y_0/100 + y_0/400.
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Remark 5.1. For all $y_0, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $y_0 + 400 \cdot z \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
y_c(y_0 + 400 \cdot z) &= 365 \cdot (y_0 + 400 \cdot z) + (y_0 + 400 \cdot z)/4 - (y_0 + 400 \cdot z)/100 + (y_0 + 400 \cdot z)/400 \\
&= 365 \cdot y_0 + y_0/4 - y_0/100 + y_0/400 + 146000 \cdot z + 100 \cdot z - 4 \cdot z + z \\
&= y_c(y_0) + 146097 \cdot z.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by adding $400 \cdot z$ years to a date, its rata die increases by $146097 \cdot z$. There are 146097 dates in any 400-year interval. Such intervals are called **leap cycles**.

The **month count** defined by $m_c(y_0, m_0) = \#[(y_0, 3, 0), (y_0, m_0, 0)[$ is the number of days between the 1st day of year y_0 and the 1st day of month m_0 of year y_0 . It can be obtained by adding the lengths of previous months in year y_0 . Since $m_0 = 14$ is the last month of the year, its length is not included in the summation and becomes irrelevant to m_c . Therefore, the year y_0 also becomes irrelevant to m_c , because the last month is the only one whose length depends on the year. In other words, $m_c(y_0, m_0) = m_c(m_0)$ as per Table 3.

m_0	$L(y_1, m_1)$	$m_c(m_0)$	m_0	$L(y_1, m_1)$	$m_c(m_0)$	m_0	$L(y_1, m_1)$	$m_c(m_0)$
3	31	0	8	31	153	13	31	306
4	30	31	9	30	184	14	(irrelevant)	337
5	31	61	10	31	214			
6	30	92	11	30	245			
7	31	122	12	31	275			

Some implementations [14, 8, 17] use look-up arrays to recover $m_c(m_0)$, but it can be expressed by an EAF:

$$m_c(m_0) = (153 \cdot m_0 - 457)/5, \quad \forall m_0 \in [3, 14]. \quad (21)$$

Variations of this formula have been found by many authors [3, 11, 12, 4, 15, 17, 20, 21], most often through a trial-and-error line fitting to the set of points $\{(m_0, m_c(m_0)) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 ; m_0 \in [3, 14]\}$. Remark 4.6 clarifies the matter. However, a simple textbook linear regression on the set $\{(m_0, m_c(m_0) + 0.5) \in \mathbb{Q}^2 ; m_0 \in [3, 14]\}$ finds $m_c(m_0) = (26256 \cdot m_0 - 78317)/858$. Using this EAF in Theorem 3.4 produces the same faster alternative seen in Example 3.5.

The **day count** defined by $d_c(y_0, m_0, d_0) = \#[(y_0, m_0, 0), (y_0, m_0, d_0)[$ is the number of dates since the 1st of month m_0 of year y_0 . Trivially, $d_c(y_0, m_0, d_0) = d_0$.

Putting together the above results yields the next proposition.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $(y_0, m_0, d_0) \in G_0$. Set:*

$$y_c = 365 \cdot y_0 + y_0/4 - y_0/100 + y_0/400, \quad m_c = (153 \cdot m_0 - 457)/5, \quad d_c = d_0.$$

Then, $\rho_0(y_0, m_0, d_0) = y_c + m_c + d_c$.

The calculations of Proposition 5.2 can be performed more efficiently by first computing the century.

Corollary 5.3. *Let $(y_0, m_0, d_0) \in G_0$. Set:*

$$q_1 = y_0/100, \quad y_c = 1461 \cdot y_0/4 - q_1 + q_1/4, \quad m_c = (979 \cdot m_0 - 2919)/2^5, \quad d_c = d_0.$$

Then, $\rho_0(y_0, m_0, d_0) = y_c + m_c + d_c$.

Proof. It suffices to show that the following alternatives for the expressions seen in Proposition 5.2 hold.

- (i). $1461 \cdot y_0/4 = 365 \cdot y_0 + y_0/4$: This follows from $1461 \cdot y_0 = 4 \cdot (365 \cdot y_0 + y_0/4) + y_0 \% 4$ and $0 \leq y_0 \% 4 < 4$.
- (ii). $(153 \cdot m_0 - 457)/5 = (979 \cdot m_0 - 2919)/2^5$: This follows from $m_0 \in [3, 14]$ and Equation (8).
- (iii). $y_0/400 = q_1/4$: This follows from $y_0/100/4 = y_0/400$.

□

5.1 Inverting the rata die function on the computational calendar

The computational calendar G_0 is unbounded from above and, thus, for any $r_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ a unique $x_0 \in G_0$ exists such that $\rho_0(x_0) = r_0$. The objective of this section is to find x_0 given that r_0 .

For $x_0 = (y_0, m_0, d_0) \in G_0$, the quotient $q = y_0/100$ is its **century**. Since $100 \cdot q \leq y_0 < 100 \cdot (q + 1)$, we have $(100 \cdot q, 3, 0) \leq x_0 < (100 \cdot (q + 1), 3, 0)$. The quantity $\#[(100 \cdot q, 3, 0), x_0[$ is the **day of the century** of x_0 . The next proposition retrieves the century and the day of the century from a rata die.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $x_0 \in G_0$ and r_0 be its rata die. Set:*

$$n_1 = 4 \cdot r_0 + 3, \quad q_1 = n_1/146097, \quad r_1 = n_1 \% 146097/4.$$

Then, q_1 is the century of x_0 and r_1 is its day of the century.

Proof. Write $x_0 = (y_0, m_0, d_0)$ and set $q = y_0/100$ and $r = \#[(100 \cdot q, 3, 0), x_0[$. We must prove that $q_1 = q$ and $r_1 = r$.

For $p \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, let $g(p) = \#[e_0, (100 \cdot p, 3, 0)[$. The definition of y_c gives $g(p) = y_c(100 \cdot p)$ and Equation (20) yields

$$\begin{aligned} g(p) &= 365 \cdot 100 \cdot p + 100 \cdot p/4 - 100 \cdot p/100 + 100 \cdot p/400 = 36524 \cdot p + p/4 \\ &= 146097 \cdot p/4. \end{aligned}$$

(The last equality is obtained as Item (i) in the proof of Corollary 5.3, using 36524 instead of 365.)

Since $r_0 = \#[e_0, x_0[= \#[e_0, (100 \cdot q, 3, 0)[+ \#[[(100 \cdot q, 3, 0), x_0[$, we have $r_0 = g(q) + r \geq g(q)$. Now, $x_0 < (100 \cdot (q + 1), 3, 0)$ and $r_0 = \#[e_0, x_0[< \#[e_0, (100 \cdot (q + 1), 3, 0)[= g(q + 1)$. Hence, $r_0 < g(q + 1)$, in other words, $r_0 \in [g(q), g(q + 1)[$. As seen in Example 2.6 (where $\hat{f} = g$):

$$(4 \cdot r_0 + 3)/146097 = q \quad \text{and} \quad (4 \cdot r_0 + 3) \% 146097/4 = r_0 - g(q).$$

These equalities mean that $q_1 = q$ and $r_1 = r$. □

For $x_0 = (y_0, m_0, d_0) \in G_0$, the remainder $y_0 \% 100$ is its **year of the century**. We have $(y_0, 3, 0) \leq x_0 < (y_0 + 1, 3, 0)$ and the quantity $\#[(y_0, 3, 0), x_0[$ is called the **day of the year** of x_0 . The next proposition starts where Proposition 5.4 left off, *i.e.*, at the day of the century, to obtain the year of the century and the day of the year.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $x_0 \in G_0$ and r_1 be its day of the century. Set:*

$$n_2 = 4 \cdot r_1 + 3, \quad q_2 = n_2/1461, \quad r_2 = n_2 \% 1461/4.$$

Then, q_2 is the year of the century of x_0 and r_2 is its day of the year.

Proof. Write $x_0 = (y_0, m_0, d_0)$ and set $q_1 = y_0/100$, $q = y_0 \% 100$ and $r = \#[(y_0, 3, 0), x_0[$. We must prove that $q_2 = q$ and that $r_2 = r$.

For $p \in [0, 100[$, it is easy to show that $(100 \cdot q_1 + p)/100 = 100 \cdot q_1/100 + p/100$ and $(100 \cdot q_1 + p)/400 = q_1/4 + p/400$. Let $g(p) = \#[(100 \cdot q_1, 3, 0), (100 \cdot q_1 + p, 3, 0)[$. The definition of y_c gives $g(p) = y_c(100 \cdot q_1 + p) - y_c(100 \cdot q_1)$ and Equation (20) yields:

$$\begin{aligned} g(p) &= 365 \cdot (100 \cdot q_1 + p) + (100 \cdot q_1 + p)/4 - (100 \cdot q_1 + p)/100 + (100 \cdot q_1 + p)/400 - y_c(100 \cdot q_1) \\ &= 365 \cdot p + p/4 = 1461 \cdot p/4. \end{aligned}$$

(The last equality is the same as Item (i) in the proof of Corollary 5.3.)

Since $y_0 = 100 \cdot q_1 + q$ and $r_1 = \#[(100 \cdot q_1, 3, 0), x_0[$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &= \#[(100 \cdot q_1, 3, 0), (y_0, 3, 0)[+ \#[(y_0, 3, 0), x_0[\\ &= \#[(100 \cdot q_1, 3, 0), (100 \cdot q_1 + q, 3, 0)[+ \#[(y_0, 3, 0), x_0[= g(q) + r \geq g(q). \end{aligned}$$

Since $x_0 < (y_0 + 1, 3, 0) = (100 \cdot q_1 + q + 1, 3, 0)$, we have $r_1 < \#[(100 \cdot q_1, 3, 0), (100 \cdot q_1 + q + 1, 3, 0)[= g(q+1)$ and it follows that $r_1 \in [g(q), g(q+1)[$. As seen in Example 2.7 (where $\hat{f} = g$):

$$(4 \cdot r_1 + 3)/1461 = q \quad \text{and} \quad (4 \cdot r_1 + 3)\%1461/4 = r_1 - g(q).$$

These equalities mean that $q_2 = q$ and that $r_2 = r$. □

Like Proposition 5.5, the following result provides calculations for year of century and day of year, but in a computationally more efficient way.

Corollary 5.6. *Let $x_0 \in G_0$ and r_1 be its day of the century. Set:*

$$n_2 = 4 \cdot r_1 + 3, \quad u_2 = 2939745 \cdot n_2, \quad q_2 = u_2/2^{32}, \quad r_2 = u_2\%2^{32}/2939745/4.$$

Then, q_2 is the year of the century of x_0 and r_2 is its day of the year.

Proof. Example 3.12 shows that the q_2 and r_2 set above match those of Proposition 5.5, provided that $n_2 \in [0, 28825529[$, which we shall prove now. Proposition 5.4 provides that $r_1 = n_1\%146097/4$ for some $n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$. From $0 \leq n_1\%146097 < 146097$, it easily follows that $3 \leq 4 \cdot r_1 + 3 < 146100$, in other words, $n_2 \in [3, 146100[$. □

The following proposition extracts the month and day from the day of the year.

Proposition 5.7. *Let $x_0 \in G_0$ and r_2 be its day of the year. Set:*

$$n_3 = 5 \cdot r_2 + 461, \quad q_3 = n_3/153, \quad r_3 = n_3\%153/5.$$

Then, q_3 is the month of x_0 and r_3 is its day.

Proof. Let $x_0 = (y_0, m_0, d_0)$. We must prove that $q_3 = m_0$ and that $r_3 = d_0$.

For $p \in [3, 15]$, let $g(p) = (153 \cdot p - 457)/5$. Equation (21) provides that if $p \in [3, 14]$, then $g(p) = m_c(p) = \#[(y_0, 3, 0), (y_0, p, 0)[$. By definition, $r_2 = \#[(y_0, 3, 0), x_0[$ can be written as:

$$r_2 = \#[(y_0, 3, 0), (y_0, m_0, 0)[+ \#[(y_0, m_0, 0), (y_0, m_0, d_0)[= g(m_0) + d_0 \geq g(m_0).$$

We shall now prove that $r_2 < g(m_0 + 1)$. If $m_0 < 14$, then $x_0 < (y_0, m_0 + 1, 0)$ and we obtain $r_2 = \#[(y_0, 3, 0), x_0[< \#[(y_0, 3, 0), (y_0, m_0 + 1, 0)[= m_c(m_0 + 1) = g(m_0 + 1)$. Now, if $m_0 = 14$, then $x_0 \leq (y_0, 14, L(y_0, 2))$ and it follows that $r_2 \leq \#[(y_0, 3, 0), (y_0, 14, L(y_0, 2))] \leq 366 < 367 = g(15) = g(m_0 + 1)$. Hence, $r_2 < g(m_0 + 1)$, in other words, $r_2 \in [g(m_0), g(m_0 + 1)[$. As seen in Example 2.8 (where $\hat{f} = g$):

$$(5 \cdot r_2 + 461)/153 = m_0 \quad \text{and} \quad (5 \cdot r_2 + 461)\%153/5 = r_2 - g(m_0).$$

These equalities mean that $q_3 = m_0$ and that $r_3 = d_0$. □

Remark 5.8. *In the proof of Proposition 5.7, we have shown that if r_2 is the day of the year of $(y_0, m_0, d_0) \in G_0$ and $m_0 < 14$, then $r_2 \in [m_c(m_0), m_c(m_0 + 1)[$. It follows that $m_0 \geq 13$ is equivalent to $r_2 \geq m_c(13) = 306$.*

Again, the following corollary improves the computational efficiency of the calculations of Proposition 5.7.

Corollary 5.9. *Let $x_0 \in G_0$ and r_2 be its day of the year. Set:*

$$n_3 = 2141 \cdot r_2 + 197913, \quad q_3 = n_3/2^{16}, \quad r_3 = n_3 \% 2^{16} / 2141.$$

Then, q_3 is the month of x_0 and r_3 is its day.

Proof. Example 3.13 shows that the q_3 and r_3 set above match those of Proposition 5.7, provided that $r_2 \in [0, 734[$, which we shall prove now. Proposition 5.5 provides that $r_2 = n_2 \% 1461 / 4$ for some $n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. From $0 \leq n_2 \% 1461 < 1461$, it easily follows that $0 \leq r_2 \leq 365$. \square

6 Rata die functions on the Gregorian calendar

Section 5 covered evaluation of a rata die function and its inverse on the computational calendar G_0 . This section adapts them to the Gregorian calendar.

G_0 allows implementations to work exclusively on unsigned integer types, which might be faster than signed ones. To avoid compromising this advantage, we only consider subsets of G that have a minimum. These calendars, their respective rata die functions and epochs are summarised in Table 4. For ease of reference, the first row is a reminder for G_0 .

Table 4: Gregorian-related calendars.

Calendar	Rata die	Epoch
$G_0 = P_1(G_1)$, where G_1 is defined below.	$\rho_0 : G_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$	$e_0 = (0, 3, 0) = P_1(e_1)$
$G_1 = \{x_1 \in G ; x_1 \geq e_1\}$	$\rho_1 : G_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$	$e_1 = (0, 3, 1)$
$G_2 = \{x_2 \in G ; x_2 \geq e_2\}$	$\rho_2 : G_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$	$e_2 = (z_2, 3, 1)$, where z_2 is a multiple of 400.
G_2 (as above)	$\rho_3 : G_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$	$e_3 \in G_2$.

The rows of Table 4 show increasing degrees of freedom of how epochs and minima can be set. For G_0 and ρ_0 there are no choices: epoch and the minimum date are set to $e_0 = (0, 3, 0)$. A match between the epoch and the minimum implies that ρ_0 is non-negative. Since e_0 's year is zero, dates in G_0 have non-negative years. The same holds for G_1 , ρ_1 and $e_1 = (0, 3, 1)$. For G_2 and ρ_2 , epoch and minimum also match and are set to $e_2 = (z_2, 3, 1)$, but z_2 can be any multiple of 400. Therefore, ρ_2 is also non-negative, although negative years are possible when $z_2 < 0$. Finally, ρ_3 provides a more flexible setting where any epoch and minimum can be chosen.

As we shall see, $\rho_1 = \rho_0 \circ P_1$. In general, maps from one calendar to another provide a way to express rata die functions. Conversely, rata die functions provide a way to map one calendar into another [12, 20, 21].

Proposition 6.1. *Let C and C' be calendars and let ρ and ρ' be their respective rata die functions with epochs $e \in C$ and $e' \in C'$. If $P : C \rightarrow C'$ is a strictly increasing bijection and $P(e) = e'$, then $\rho = \rho' \circ P$ and $\rho^{-1} = P^{-1} \circ \rho'^{-1}$ on $Im(\rho') = Im(\rho)$. Conversely, if $Im(\rho) = Im(\rho')$, then $\rho'^{-1} \circ \rho$ is a strictly increasing bijection from C to C' .*

Proof. Let $x \in C$ and assume that $x \geq e$. Since P is a strictly increasing bijection, we have $\rho(x) = \#[e, x[= \#P([e, x[) = \#[P(e), P(x)[= \#[e', P(x)[= \rho'(P(x))$. The case $x < e$ is treated analogously and we

conclude that $\rho = \rho' \circ P$. From this and well-known results on functions and their inverses, we obtain $\rho^{-1} = P^{-1} \circ \rho'^{-1}$ on $Im(\rho') = Im(\rho)$.

By definition, $\rho(x) \in Im(\rho) = Im(\rho')$ and $\rho'^{-1}(\rho(x)) \in C'$, in other words, $\rho'^{-1} \circ \rho$ is a map from C to C' . Since $\rho : C \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ and $\rho'^{-1} : Im(\rho') \rightarrow C'$ are strictly increasing surjective functions, hence bijections, their composition is again a strictly increasing bijection. \square

6.1 The non-negative rata die with epoch 1 March 0000

This section concerns the rata die function ρ_1 on $G_1 = \{x_1 \in G ; x_1 \geq e_1\}$ with epoch $e_1 = (0, 3, 1)$.

From Remark 4.5 and Proposition 6.1 applied to $C = G_1$, $C' = G_0$, $\rho = \rho_1$, $\rho' = \rho_0$, $e = e_1$, $e' = e_0$ and $P = P_1$ we obtain:

$$(y_1, m_1, d_1) \in G_1 \implies P_1(y_1, m_1, \rho_1) \in G_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_1(y_1, m_1, d_1) = \rho_0(P_1(y_1, m_1, d_1)) \quad (22)$$

and, conversely,

$$(y_0, m_0, d_0) \in G_0 \implies P_1^{-1}(y_0, m_0, \rho_0) \in G_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_0(y_0, m_0, d_0) = \rho_1(P_1^{-1}(y_0, m_0, d_0)). \quad (23)$$

6.2 Rata die with a chosen epoch

Let $z_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ be a multiple of 400 and $e_2 = (z_2, 3, 1)$. This section concerns two rata die functions: ρ_2 on $G_2 = \{x_2 \in G ; x_2 \geq e_2\}$ with epoch e_2 , and ρ_3 also on G_2 but with epoch $e_3 \in G_2$ arbitrarily chosen.

Let $P_2 : \mathbb{Z}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^3$ be the map $P_2(y_2, m_2, d_2) = (y_2 - z_2, m_2, d_2)$, which is a strictly increasing bijection with $P_2^{-1}(y_1, m_1, d_1) = (y_1 + z_2, m_1, d_1)$ and $P_2(e_2) = (0, 3, 1) = e_1$.

Let $(y_2, m_2, d_2) \in G_2$ and set $(y_1, m_1, d_1) = P_2(y_2, m_2, d_2)$. We have $m_1 = m_2 \in [1, 12]$, $d_1 = d_2 \in [1, L(y_2, m_2)]$ and, since $z_2 \% 400 = 0$, $y_2 - z_2$ is a leap year if, and only if, y_2 is a leap year. Hence, $L(y_2, m_2) = L(y_2 - z_2, m_2) = L(y_1, m_1)$ and it follows that $d_1 \in [1, L(y_1, m_1)]$. Therefore, $(y_1, m_1, d_1) \in G$. From $(y_2, m_2, d_2) \geq e_2$, we obtain $(y_1, m_1, d_1) \geq e_1$ and conclude that $(y_1, m_1, d_1) \in G_1$. Similarly, we can show that $P_2^{-1}(y_1, m_1, d_1) \in G_2$ for all $(y_1, m_1, d_1) \in G_1$ and thus, P_2 is a bijection from G_2 to G_1 .

Applying Proposition 6.1 to $C = G_2$, $C' = G_1$, $\rho = \rho_2$, $\rho' = \rho_1$, $e = e_2$, $e' = e_1$ and $P = P_2$ gives:

$$(y_2, m_2, d_2) \in G_2 \implies (y_2 - z_2, m_2, d_2) \in G_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_2(y_2, m_2, d_2) = \rho_1(y_2 - z_2, m_2, d_2) \quad (24)$$

and, reciprocally,

$$(y_1, m_1, d_1) \in G_1 \implies (y_1 + z_2, m_1, d_1) \in G_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_1(y_1, m_1, d_1) = \rho_2(y_1 + z_2, m_1, d_1). \quad (25)$$

Fix $e_3 \in G_2$ and let $\rho_3 : G_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be the rata die function with epoch e_3 . Let $x_2 \in G_2$. On the one hand, if $x_2 \geq e_3$, then $\#[e_2, x_2[= \#[e_2, e_3[+ \#[e_3, x_2[$, in other words, $\rho_2(x_2) = \rho_2(e_3) + \rho_3(x_2)$. On the other hand, if $x_2 < e_3$, then $\#[e_2, e_3[= \#[e_2, x_2[+ \#[x_2, e_3[$, in other words, $\rho_2(e_3) = \rho_2(x_2) - \rho_3(x_2)$. Therefore,

$$x_2 \in G_2 \implies \rho_3(x_2) = \rho_2(x_2) - \rho_2(e_3). \quad (26)$$

The next two propositions prove the correctness of our Gregorian calendar algorithms. Proposition 6.2 considers the calculation of the rata die function for any chosen epoch and Proposition 6.3 considers its inverse.

Proposition 6.2. Let ρ_2, ρ_3 be rata die functions on G_2 with epochs $e_2 = (z_2, 3, 1)$ and e_3 , respectively, where $z_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ is a multiple of 400. Given $(y_2, m_2, d_2) \in G_2$, set:

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} y_1 = y_2 - z_2, \\ m_1 = m_2, \\ d_1 = d_2, \end{array} \right| \begin{array}{l} y_0 = y_1 - \mathbf{1}_{\{m_1 \leq 2\}}, \\ m_0 = m_1 + 12 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{m_1 \leq 2\}}, \\ d_0 = d_1 - 1, \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{l} q_1 = y_0/100, \\ y_c = 1461 \cdot y_0/4 - q_1 + q_1/4, \\ m_c = (979 \cdot m_0 - 2919)/2^5, \\ d_c = d_0. \end{array} \right.$$

Then, $\rho_3(y_2, m_2, d_2) = y_c + m_c + d_c - \rho_2(e_3)$.

Proof. The first column and Equation (24) give $(y_1, m_1, d_1) \in G_1$ and $\rho_2(y_2, m_2, d_2) = \rho_1(y_1, m_1, d_1)$. The second column gives $(y_0, m_0, d_0) = P_1(y_1, m_1, d_1)$ and Equation (22) yields $(y_0, m_0, d_0) \in G_0$ and $\rho_1(y_1, m_1, d_1) = \rho_0(y_0, m_0, d_0)$. Hence, $\rho_2(y_2, m_2, d_2) = \rho_0(y_0, m_0, d_0)$, and from Corollary 5.3 we obtain $\rho_2(y_2, m_2, d_2) = y_c + m_c + d_c$. The result follows from Equation (26). \square

Proposition 6.3. Let ρ_2, ρ_3 be rata die functions on G_2 with epochs $e_2 = (z_2, 3, 1)$ and $e_3 \geq e_2$, respectively, where $z_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ is a multiple of 400. Given $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $r \geq -\rho_2(e_3)$, set $r_0 = r + \rho_2(e_3)$ and:

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} n_1 = 4 \cdot r_0 + 3, \\ q_1 = n_1/146097, \\ r_1 = n_1 \% 146097/4, \end{array} \right| \begin{array}{l} n_2 = 4 \cdot r_1 + 3, \\ u_2 = 2939745 \cdot n_2, \\ q_2 = u_2/2^{32}, \\ r_2 = u_2 \% 2^{32}/2939745/4, \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{l} n_3 = 2141 \cdot r_2 + 197913, \\ q_3 = n_3/2^{16}, \\ r_3 = n_3 \% 2^{16}/2141. \end{array} \right.$$

and:

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} y_0 = 100 \cdot q_1 + q_2, \\ m_0 = q_3, \\ d_0 = r_3, \end{array} \right| \begin{array}{l} y_1 = y_0 + \mathbf{1}_{\{r_2 \geq 306\}}, \\ m_1 = m_0 - 12 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{r_2 \geq 306\}}, \\ d_1 = d_0 + 1. \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{l} y_2 = y_1 + z_2, \\ m_2 = m_1, \\ d_2 = d_1. \end{array} \right. \quad (27)$$

Then, $\rho_3(y_2, m_2, d_2) = r$.

Proof. Since $r \geq -\rho_2(e_3)$, we have $r_0 = r + \rho_2(e_3) \geq 0$ and thus $x_0 \in G_0$ exists such that $\rho(x_0) = r_0$.

Proposition 5.4 provides that q_1 is the century of x_0 and that r_1 is its day of the century. Corollary 5.6 then yields that q_2 is the year of the century of x_0 and r_2 is its day of the year, while Corollary 5.9 states that q_3 is the month of x_0 and r_3 is its day.

Hence, the first column of Equation (27) reads $x_0 = (y_0, m_0, d_0)$. From Remark 5.8 we can substitute $\mathbf{1}_{\{r_2 \geq 306\}}$ with $\mathbf{1}_{\{m_0 \geq 13\}}$ and then, by Equation (19) the second column of Equation (27) becomes $(y_1, m_1, d_1) = P_1^{-1}(x_0)$ and Equation (23) gives $(y_1, m_1, d_1) \in G_1$ and $\rho_1(y_1, m_1, d_1) = \rho_0(x_0)$. Finally, Equation (25) and the third column of Equation (27) yield $(y_2, m_2, d_2) \in G_2$ and $\rho_2(y_2, m_2, d_2) = \rho_1(y_1, m_1, d_1) = \rho_0(x_0) = r_0 = r + \rho_2(e_3)$.

We have shown that $r = \rho_2(y_2, m_2, d_2) - \rho_2(e_3)$. Therefore, Equation (26) gives $\rho_3(y_2, m_2, d_2) = r$. \square

7 Performance analysis

We benchmarked our algorithms from Propositions 6.2 and 6.3 against counterparts in five of the most widely used C, C++, C# and Java libraries, as listed below:

- glibc** The GNU C Library [7, 8]. (The Linux Kernel contains a similar implementation [14].)
- Boost** The Boost C++ libraries [4].
- libc++** LLVM’s implementation of the C++ Standard Library [15].
- .NET** Microsoft .NET framework [17].
- OpenJDK** Oracle’s open source implementation of the Java Platform SE [19]. (Android uses the same code [2].)

We used source files as publicly available on 2 May 2020. Non-C++ implementations have been ported to this language and have all been slightly modified to achieve consistent (a) function signatures; (b) storage types (for years, months, days and rata dies); and (c) epoch (Unix epoch, *i.e.*, 1 January 1970). Some originals deal with date and time but our variants work on dates only. (Given the uniform durations of days, hours, minutes and seconds, it would be trivial to incorporate the time component to any dates-only algorithm. Moreover, Example 3.14 suggests improvements that are not used by major implementations.)

We did not include Microsoft’s C++ Standard Library because in May 2020 it did not yet implement these functionalities. For the same reason, libstdc++, the GNU implementation of the C++ Standard Library, is also absent. Furthermore, a forthcoming release of libstdc++ is expected to implement our algorithms.

We also considered our own implementations of algorithms described in the academic literature, namely, Baum [3], Fliegel and Flandern [6], Hatcher [11, 12, 21] and Reingold and Dershowitz [20].

Timings were obtained with the help of the Google Benchmark library [9], to which we delegated the task of producing statistically relevant results. The code was run on an Intel i7-10510U CPU at 4.9 GHz. Source code, available at [18], was compiled by GCC 10.2.0 at optimisation level -O3. Results vary across platforms but maintain qualitative consistency between them.

The table in Figure 3 shows the time taken by each algorithm to evaluate ρ_3 at 16 384 pseudo-random dates, uniformly distributed in $[(1570, 1, 1), (2370, 1, 1)]$ (*i.e.*, Unix epoch ± 400 years). They encompass the time spent scanning the array of dates (also shown). Subtracting the scanning time from that of each algorithm gives a fairer account of the time spent by the algorithm itself. The chart plots these adjusted timings relative to ours (Proposition 6.2).




Figure 3: Relative and absolute timings of rata die evaluations.

Similarly, the table in Figure 4 shows the time taken by each algorithm to evaluate ρ_3^{-1} at 16384 pseudo-random integer numbers uniformly distributed in $[-146097, 146097]$ (again, Unix epoch ± 400 years as per Remark 5.1). The chart displays adjusted times relative to ours (Proposition 6.3).




Figure 4: Relative and absolute timings of rata die inverse evaluations.

References

- [1] R. Alverson. Integer division using reciprocals. In *[1991] Proceedings 10th IEEE Symposium on Computer Arithmetic*, pages 186–190, 1991. doi.org/10.1109/ARITH.1991.145558.
- [2] Android. `ojluni/src/main/java/java/time/LocalDate.java`. tinyurl.com/ycsLtdnq, April 2017.
- [3] Peter Baum. Date algorithms. tinyurl.com/y44rgx2j, 1998.
- [4] Boost C++ Libraries. `include/boost/date_time/gregorian_calendar.ipp`. tinyurl.com/y4buxmmf, March 2020.
- [5] D. Cavagnino and A. E. Werbrouck. Efficient algorithms for integer division by constants using multiplication. *The Computer Journal*, 51(4):470–480, 11 2007. doi.org/10.1093/comjnl/bxm082.
- [6] Henry F. Fliegel and Thomas C. van Flandern. Letters to the editor: A machine algorithm for processing calendar dates. *Communications of the ACM*, 11(10):657–658, 10 1968. doi.org/10.1145/364096.364097.
- [7] GNU C Library. `time/mktime.c`. tinyurl.com/y42pkbhp, January 2020.
- [8] GNU C Library. `time/offtime.c`. tinyurl.com/yyr7uazb, January 2020.
- [9] Google. Benchmark v1.5.2. tinyurl.com/y29mh7q5, September 2020.
- [10] Torbjörn Granlund and Peter L. Montgomery. Division by invariant integers using multiplication. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 1994 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, PLDI '94, pages 61–72, New York, NY, USA, 1994. Association for Computing Machinery. doi.org/10.1145/178243.178249.
- [11] D. A. Hatcher. Simple formulae for julian day numbers and calendar dates. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 25(1):55–53, 03 1984. tinyurl.com/y2orpwfr.
- [12] D. A. Hatcher. Generalized equations for julian day numbers and calendar dates. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 26(2):151–155, 06 1985. tinyurl.com/y6ec7t3h.
- [13] Daniel Lemire, Owen Kaser, and Nathan Kurz. Faster remainder by direct computation: Applications to compilers and software libraries. *Software: Practice and Experience*, 49(6):953–970, 2019. doi.org/10.1002/spe.2689.

- [14] Linux Kernel. `kernel/time/timeconv.c`. tinyurl.com/y6x8so24, October 2018.
- [15] LLVM Project. `libcxx/include/chrono`. tinyurl.com/yytw67zb, April 2019.
- [16] D. J. Magenheimer, L. Peters, K. W. Pettis, and D. Zuras. Integer multiplication and division on the hp precision architecture. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 37(8):980–990, 1988. doi.org/10.1109/12.2248.
- [17] Microsoft .NET. `src/libraries/System.Private.CoreLib/src/System/DateTime.cs`. tinyurl.com/y4kej3mm, April 2020.
- [18] Cassio Neri and Lorenz Schneider. Gregorian calendar algorithms. github.com/cassioneri/calendar, 2020.
- [19] OpenJDK. `jdk/src/java.base/share/classes/java/time/localdate.java`. tinyurl.com/y92svzxw, August 2019.
- [20] Edward M. Reingold and Nachum Dershowitz. *Calendrical Calculations: The Ultimate Edition*. Cambridge University Press, USA, 4th edition, 2018. doi.org/10.1017/9781107415058.
- [21] Edward Graham Richards. *Mapping Time: The CALENDAR and its HISTORY*. Oxford University Press, 1998. tinyurl.com/y3uegvsu.
- [22] A. D. Robison. N-bit unsigned division via n-bit multiply-add. In *17th IEEE Symposium on Computer Arithmetic (ARITH'05)*, pages 131–139. IEEE, 2005. doi.org/10.1109/ARITH.2005.31.
- [23] Henry S. Warren. *Hacker's Delight*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2nd edition, 2013. tinyurl.com/y23o57kr.

Disclaimer

Opinions and estimates constitute our judgement as of the date of this Material, are for informational purposes only and are subject to change without notice. This Material is not the product of J.P. Morgan's Research Department and therefore, has not been prepared in accordance with legal requirements to promote the independence of research, including but not limited to, the prohibition on the dealing ahead of the dissemination of investment research. This Material is not intended as research, a recommendation, advice, offer or solicitation for the purchase or sale of any financial product or service, or to be used in any way for evaluating the merits of participating in any transaction. It is not a research report and is not intended as such. Past performance is not indicative of future results. Please consult your own advisors regarding legal, tax, accounting or any other aspects including suitability implications for your particular circumstances. J.P. Morgan disclaims any responsibility or liability whatsoever for the quality, accuracy or completeness of the information herein, and for any reliance on, or use of this material in any way. Important disclosures at: www.jpmorgan.com/disclosures