

# Re: Salamin–Brent algorithm

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007–06/msg04068.html>

---

- *From:* dgoldsmith\_89 <d.l.goldsmith@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Thu, 21 Jun 2007 21:54:29 –0700
- 

On Jun 21, 3:42 pm, Gerry Myerson <g...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote:

In article <1182447514.837296.169...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,

dgoldsmith\_89 <d.l.goldsm...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

if I can just download say like  
the first  $2^{100}$  binary digits (or  $16^{25}$  hex....

Um,  $2^{100}$  digits – where would you put them all? Seriously.

Right, I did the math in my head on my drive home today and estimated a terabyte for about  $2^{43}$  bits ( $2^3$  bits to a byte,  $10^{12} \approx 2^{40}$  bytes in a terabyte), and multiplying that by a thousand only gets us up to  $2^{46}$ , etc. Point realized, recognized, and understood.

Anyway, no one has computed more than a few billion digits (or bits, or whatever), which is way less than what you want.

In answer to your first message in this thread,  
I think you don't know what the big–oh notation means.

I've seen it used two different ways in two different contexts; I know the analysis meaning I imagine you think is the exclusively correct use of the notation, but I have also seen it used the way I used it.

DG

--

Gerry Myerson (g...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (i -> u for email)

Re: Salamin–Brent algorithm