random floating-point number. They are not very random for that purpose; see Knuth [1]. Examples of acceptable uses of these random bits are: (i) multiplying a signal randomly by $\pm 1$ at a rapid "chip rate," so as to spread its spectrum uniformly (but recoverably) across some desired bandpass, or (ii) Monte Carlo exploration of a binary tree, where decisions as to whether to branch left or right are to be made randomly.

Now we do not want you to go through life thinking that there is something special about the primitive polynomial of degree 18 used in the above examples. (We chose 18 because $2^{18}$ is small enough for you to verify our claims directly by numerical experiment.) The accompanying table [2] lists one primitive polynomial for each degree up to 100 . (In fact there exist many such for each degree. For example, see $\S 7.7$ for a complete table up to degree 10.)
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### 7.5 Random Sequences Based on Data Encryption

In Numerical Recipes' first edition, we described how to use the Data Encryption Standard (DES) [1-3] for the generation of random numbers. Unfortunately, when implemented in software in a high-level language like C, DES is very slow, so excruciatingly slow, in fact, that our previous implementation can be viewed as more mischievous than useful. Here we give a much faster and simpler algorithm which, though it may not be secure in the cryptographic sense, generates about equally good random numbers.

DES, like its progenitor cryptographic system LUCIFER, is a so-called "block product cipher" [4]. It acts on 64 bits of input by iteratively applying (16 times, in fact) a kind of highly nonlinear bit-mixing function. Figure 7.5 .1 shows the flow of information in DES during this mixing. The function $g$, which takes 32 -bits into 32 -bits, is called the "cipher function." Meyer and Matyas [4] discuss the importance of the cipher function being nonlinear, as well as other design criteria.

DES constructs its cipher function $g$ from an intricate set of bit permutations and table lookups acting on short sequences of consecutive bits. Apparently, this function was chosen to be particularly strong cryptographically (or conceivably as some critics contend, to have an exquisitely subtle cryptographic flaw!). For our purposes, a different function $g$ that can be rapidly computed in a high-level computer language is preferable. Such a function may weaken the algorithm cryptographically. Our purposes are not, however, cryptographic: We want to find the fastest $g$, and smallest number of iterations of the mixing procedure in Figure 7.5.1, such that our output random sequence passes the standard tests that are customarily applied to random number generators. The resulting algorithm will not be DES, but rather a kind of "pseudo-DES," better suited to the purpose at hand.

Following the criterion, mentioned above, that $g$ should be nonlinear, we must give the integer multiply operation a prominent place in $g$. Because 64-bit registers are not generally accessible in high-level languages, we must confine ourselves to multiplying 16-bit


Figure 7.5.1. The Data Encryption Standard (DES) iterates a nonlinear function $g$ on two 32-bit words, in the manner shown here (after Meyer and Matyas [4]).
operands into a 32 -bit result. So, the general idea of $g$, almost forced, is to calculate the three distinct 32 -bit products of the high and low 16 -bit input half-words, and then to combine these, and perhaps additional fixed constants, by fast operations (e.g., add or exclusive-or) into a single 32 -bit result.

There are only a limited number of ways of effecting this general scheme, allowing systematic exploration of the alternatives. Experimentation, and tests of the randomness of the output, lead to the sequence of operations shown in Figure 7.5.2. The few new elements in the figure need explanation: The values $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$ are fixed constants, chosen randomly with the constraint that they have exactly 161 -bits and 160 -bits; combining these constants via exclusive-or ensures that the overall $g$ has no bias towards 0 or 1 bits.

The "reverse half-words" operation in Figure 7.5.2 turns out to be essential; otherwise, the very lowest and very highest bits are not properly mixed by the three multiplications. The nonobvious choices in $g$ are therefore: where along the vertical "pipeline" to do the reverse; in what order to combine the three products and $C_{2}$; and with which operation (add or exclusive-or) should each combining be done? We tested these choices exhaustively before settling on the algorithm shown in the figure.

It remains to determine the smallest number of iterations $N_{i t}$ that we can get away with. The minimum meaningful $N_{i t}$ is evidently two, since a single iteration simply moves one 32-bit word without altering it. One can use the constants $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$ to help determine an appropriate $N_{i t}$ : When $N_{i t}=2$ and $C_{1}=C_{2}=0$ (an intentionally very poor choice), the generator fails several tests of randomness by easily measurable, though not overwhelming, amounts. When $N_{i t}=4$, on the other hand, or with $N_{i t}=2$ but with the constants $C_{1}, C_{2}$ nonsparse, we have been unable to find any statistical deviation from randomness in sequences of up to $10^{9}$ floating numbers $r_{i}$ derived from this scheme. The combined strength of $N_{i t}=4$ and nonsparse $C_{1}, C_{2}$ should therefore give sequences that are random to tests even far beyond those that we have actually tried. These are our recommended conservative


Figure 7.5.2. The nonlinear function $g$ used by the routine psdes.
parameter values, notwithstanding the fact that $N_{i t}=2$ (which is, of course, twice as fast) has no nonrandomness discernible (by us).

Implementation of these ideas is straightforward. The following routine is not quite strictly portable, since it assumes that unsigned long integers are 32 -bits, as is the case on most machines. However, there is no reason to believe that longer integers would be in any way inferior (with suitable extensions of the constants $C_{1}, C_{2}$ ). C does not provide a convenient, portable way to divide a long integer into half words, so we must use a combination of masking (\& $0 x f f f f$ ) with left- and right-shifts by 16 bits ( $\ll 16$ and $\gg 16$ ). On some machines the half-word extraction could be made faster by the use of C's union construction, but this would generally not be portable between "big-endian" and "little-endian" machines. (Big- and little-endian refer to the order in which the bytes are stored in a word.)

## \#define NITER 4

void psdes(unsigned long *lword, unsigned long *irword)
"Pseudo-DES" hashing of the 64-bit word (lword,irword). Both 32-bit arguments are returned hashed on all bits.
\{
unsigned long i,ia,ib,iswap,itmph=0,itmpl=0;
static unsigned long c1[NITER]=\{
0xbaa96887L, 0x1e17d32cL, 0x03bcdc3cL, 0x0f33d1b2L\};
static unsigned long c2[NITER]=\{ 0x4b0f3b58L, 0xe874f0c3L, 0x6955c5a6L, 0x55a7ca46L\};
for (i=0;i<NITER;i++) \{
Perform niter iterations of DES logic, using a simpler (non-cryptographic) nonlinear function instead of DES's.

```
        ia=(iswap=(*irword)) ~ c1[i];
        itmpl = ia & Oxffff;
itmph = ia >> 16;
The bit-rich constants c1 and (below)
    c2 guarantee lots of nonlinear mix-
    ing.
ib=itmpl*itmpl+ ~(itmph*itmph);
*irword=(*lword) - (((ia = (ib >> 16)
        ((ib & Oxffff) << 16)) ~ c2[i])+itmpl*itmph);
*lword=iswap;
}
}
```

The routine ran4, listed below, uses psdes to generate uniform random deviates. We adopt the convention that a negative value of the argument idum sets the left 32 -bit word, while a positive value $i$ sets the right 32 -bit word, returns the $i$ th random deviate, and increments idum to $i+1$. This is no more than a convenient way of defining many different sequences (negative values of idum), but still with random access to each sequence (positive values of idum). For getting a floating-point number from the 32 -bit integer, we like to do it by the masking trick described at the end of $\S 7.1$, above. The hex constants 3F800000 and 007FFFFF are the appropriate ones for computers using the IEEE representation for 32-bit floating-point numbers (e.g., IBM PCs and most UNIX workstations). For DEC VAXes, the correct hex constants are, respectively, 00004080 and FFFF007F. For greater portability, you can instead construct a floating number by making the (signed) 32-bit integer nonnegative (typically, you add exactly $2^{31}$ if it is negative) and then multiplying it by a floating constant (typically $2 .^{-31}$ ).

An interesting, and sometimes useful, feature of the routine ran4, below, is that it allows random access to the $n$th random value in a sequence, without the necessity of first generating values $1 \cdots n-1$. This property is shared by any random number generator based on hashing (the technique of mapping data keys, which may be highly clustered in value, approximately uniformly into a storage address space) $[5,6]$. One might have a simulation problem in which some certain rare situation becomes recognizable by its consequences only considerably after it has occurred. One may wish to restart the simulation back at that occurrence, using identical random values but, say, varying some other control parameters. The relevant question might then be something like "what random numbers were used in cycle number 337098901?" It might already be cycle number 395100273 before the question comes up. Random generators based on recursion, rather than hashing, cannot easily answer such a question.

## float ran4(long *idum)

Returns a uniform random deviate in the range 0.0 to 1.0 , generated by pseudo-DES (DESlike) hashing of the 64-bit word (idums,idum), where idums was set by a previous call with negative idum. Also increments idum. Routine can be used to generate a random sequence by successive calls, leaving idum unaltered between calls; or it can randomly access the $n$th deviate in a sequence by calling with idum $=n$. Different sequences are initialized by calls with differing negative values of idum.
\{
void psdes(unsigned long *lword, unsigned long *irword);
unsigned long irword,itemp,lword;
static long idums $=0$;
The hexadecimal constants jflone and jflmsk below are used to produce a floating number between 1. and 2. by bitwise masking. They are machine-dependent. See text.
\#if defined(vax) || defined(_vax_) || defined(__vax__) || defined(VAX)
static unsigned long jflone $=0 x 00004080$;
static unsigned long jflmsk = 0xffff007f;
\#else
static unsigned long jflone $=0 \times 3 f 800000$;
static unsigned long jflmsk $=0 x 007 f f f f f ;$

```
    psdes(&lword,&irword); "Pseudo-DES" encode the words.
    itemp=jflone | (jflmsk & irword); Mask to a floating number between 1 and
++(*idum);
return (*(float *)&itemp)-1.0;
}
```

The accompanying table gives data for verifying that ran4 and psdes work correctly on your machine. We do not advise the use of ran4 unless you are able to reproduce the hex values shown. Typically, ran4 is about 4 times slower than ran0 ( $\S 7.1$ ), or about 3 times slower than ran1.

| Values for Verifying the Implementation of psdes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| idum | before psdes call | after psdes call (hex) |  | ran4 (idum) |  |  |
|  | lword | irword | lword | irword | VAX | PC |
| -1 | 1 | 1 | $604 D 1 D C E$ | 509 C 0 C 23 | 0.275898 | 0.219120 |
| 99 | 1 | 99 | D97F8571 | A66CB41A | 0.208204 | 0.849246 |
| -99 | 99 | 1 | 7822309 D | 64300984 | 0.034307 | 0.375290 |
| 99 | 99 | 99 | D7F376F0 | 59BA89EB | 0.838676 | 0.457334 |
| Successive calls to psdes with arguments $-1,99,-99$, and 1, should produce exactly the <br> lword and irword values shown. Masking conversion to a returned floating random value <br> is allowed to be machine dependent; values for VAX and PC are shown. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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### 7.6 Simple Monte Carlo Integration

Inspirations for numerical methods can spring from unlikely sources. "Splines" first were flexible strips of wood used by draftsmen. "Simulated annealing" (we shall see in $\S 10.9$ ) is rooted in a thermodynamic analogy. And who does not feel at least a faint echo of glamor in the name "Monte Carlo method"?

