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## The origins

Introduced by Gosper as a mutation of continued fractions:

- gives rise to a gcd algorithm akin to Euclid's.
- quotients are powers of two:
- small information parcel.
- employs only shifts and substractions.
- appears to be simple and efficient.
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More recently:
$\triangleright$ Shallit studied its worst-case performance in 2016.
$\triangleright$ We consider its average performance!
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$$
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| $a$ | $p$ | $q$ | $r$ | $2^{a} p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 13 | 31 | 5 | 26 |
| 2 | 5 | 26 | 6 | 20 |
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| 0 | 8 | 12 | 4 | 8 |
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- Ended with $(0,8)$, what is the gcd? $\Rightarrow$ parasitic powers of 2 .
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We studied the average number of steps over $\Omega_{N}$, posed by Shallit.
Main result [RVV18].
Mean number of steps $E_{N}[K]$ and shifts $E_{N}[S]$ are $\Theta(\log N)$.
More precisely

$$
E_{N}[K] \sim k \log N, \quad E_{N}[S] \sim \frac{\log 3-\log 2}{2 \log 2-\log 3} E_{N}[K]
$$

for an explicit constant $k \doteq 1.49283 \ldots$ given by

$$
k=\frac{2}{H}, \quad H=\frac{1}{\log (4 / 3)}\left(\frac{\pi^{2}}{6}+2 \sum_{j} \frac{(-1)^{j}}{2^{j} j^{2}}-(\log 2) \frac{\log 27}{\log 16}\right)
$$
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The continued fraction expansion ends (is finite) when we get 0 .

## The CL dynamical system [Chan05]



The $\operatorname{map} T: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}$

Branches
For $x \in \mathcal{I}_{a}:=\left[2^{-a-1}, 2^{-a}\right]$

$$
x \mapsto T_{a}(x):=\frac{2^{-a}}{x}-1 .
$$

where $a(x):=\left\lfloor\log _{2}(1 / x)\right\rfloor$.

Inverse branches

$$
h_{a}(x):=\frac{2^{-a}}{1+x}, \quad \mathcal{H}:=\left\{h_{a}: a \in \mathbb{N}\right\},
$$

and at depth $k$

$$
\mathcal{H}^{k}:=\left\{h_{a_{1}} \circ \cdots \circ h_{a_{k}}: a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k} \in \mathbb{N}\right\} .
$$

## Dynamical system $(\mathcal{I}, T)$



The map for the CL algorithm The map for Euclid's algorithm.
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In general $T^{k}(x)$ has density

$$
\mathbf{H}^{k}[g](x)=\sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}^{k}}\left|h^{\prime}(x)\right| g(h(x)) .
$$

$\Longrightarrow$ Transfer operator $H_{s}$ extends $\mathbf{H}$, introducing a variable $s$

$$
\mathbf{H}_{s}[g](x)=\sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}}\left|h^{\prime}(x)\right|^{s} g(h(x)) .
$$

## Principles of dynamical analysis [Vallée,Flajolet,Baladi,. . .]:

## Generating functions.

- $\mathbf{H}_{s}$ describes all executions of depth 1 .
- $\mathbf{H}_{s}^{2}=\mathbf{H}_{s} \circ \mathbf{H}_{s}$ describes all executions of depth 2 .
- 
- and $\left(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{H}_{s}\right)^{-1}=\mathbf{I}+\mathbf{H}_{s}+\mathbf{H}_{s}^{2}+\ldots$ describes all executions.
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## Reduced denominators and inverse branches

Euclidean algorithm:

- Homographies

$$
h_{m}(x)=\frac{1}{m+x}
$$

with $\operatorname{det} h_{m}=-1$.

- For $h=h_{m_{1}} \circ \cdot \circ \circ h_{m_{k}}$

$$
h(0)=\frac{p}{q} \Rightarrow\left|h^{\prime}(0)\right|=\frac{1}{q^{2}},
$$

$p / q$ reduced.
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Problem: Denominator retrieved is engorged by powers of two.
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## Recording the dyadic behaviour

Solution: Dyadic numbers $\mathbb{Q}_{2}$ !
Dyadic topology $=$ Divisibility by 2 constraints,
using the dyadic norm $|\cdot|_{2}$.

- Introduce dyadic component
$\Rightarrow$ mixed dynamical system $(x, y) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathbb{Q}_{2}$
- Incorporate $\mathbb{Q}_{2}$ into the Transfer Operator?

Idea works!
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\underline{h}_{a}(x, y)=\left(h_{a}(x), h_{a}(y)\right), \quad(x, y) \in \underline{\mathcal{I}} .
$$

Evolution is lead by the real component, which determines $a$.

- For Transfer operator $\Rightarrow$ need change of variables formula! Haar (translation invariant) measure $\nu$ on $\mathbb{Q}_{2}$ has one!


## Functional space $\mathcal{F}$ for the extended operator $\underline{\mathbf{H}}_{s}$

Real component directs the dynamical system:

- sections $F_{y}$ fixing $y \in \mathbb{Q}_{2}$ asked to be $C^{1}(\mathcal{I})$.
- the dyadic component follows, demanding only integrability of
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## We can finish the dynamical analysis!
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