Divide-and-Conquer: Matrix Multiplication Strassen's Algorithm

Matrix Multiplication Problem

Matrix Multiplication. Given two matrices:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1k} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \dots & a_{2k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \dots & a_{nk} \end{pmatrix} \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} & \dots & b_{1m} \\ b_{21} & b_{22} & \dots & b_{2m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{k1} & b_{k2} & \dots & b_{km} \end{pmatrix}$$

Return matrix C
$$C = \begin{pmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} & \dots & c_{1m} \\ c_{21} & c_{22} & \dots & c_{2m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{n1} & c_{n2} & \dots & c_{nm} \end{pmatrix} \quad c_{ij} = \sum_{r=1}^{k} a_{ir} \cdot b_{rj}.$$

Step 1: Straightforward Solution.

Algorithm MatrixMultiply solves the Matrix Multiplication problem in a straightforward manner.

Algorithm

Analysis

Correctness is straightforward: the algorithm implements faith-fully the definition of the matrix multiplication.

Runtime. Let us assume that $n = \Theta(N)$, $m = \Theta(N)$ and $k = \Theta(N)$. Let us estimate the runtime complexity of Algorithm MatrixMultiply by counting the most expensive operations in the algorithm: the multiplications.

The c = c+A[i][s]*B[s][j] assignment statement will be executed exactly $n \cdot m \cdot k$ times. With the assumptions about, we obtain our bound on the runtime of the algorithm: $T(N) = \Theta(N^3)$.

A Divide-And-Conquer Algorithm for Matrix Multiplication

Note: For the sake of simplicity (but without loss of generality) assume that we are multiplying to square $n \times n$ matrices A and B, i.e., m = n and k = n.

Key Observation: Matrix Multiplication can be performed blockwise.

Let

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} X & Y \\ Z & W \end{pmatrix}, B = \begin{pmatrix} P & Q \\ R & S \end{pmatrix},$$

where $X = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & \dots & a_{1\frac{n}{2}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{\frac{n}{2}1} & \dots & a_{\frac{n}{2}\frac{n}{2}} \end{pmatrix}, Y = \begin{pmatrix} a_{1\frac{n}{2}+1} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{\frac{n}{2}\frac{n}{2}+1} & \dots & a_{\frac{n}{2}n} \end{pmatrix}$, and so on

Then, in fact,

$$A \cdot B = \left(\begin{array}{cc} XP + YR & XQ + YS \\ ZP + WR & ZQ + WS \end{array}\right)$$

Here XP, Y R, XQ, Y S, ZP, WR, ZQ and WS are products of the respective matrices X, Y, Z, W, P, Q, R, S and the + operator is the element-by-element matrix addition.

Using this observation, we can devise a divide-and-conquer algorithm for multiplying matrices

Algorithm

```
Algorithm MatrixSum(n, A[1..n][1..n], B[1..n][1..n])
begin
C[1..n][1..n];
for i = 1 to n do
for j = 1 to n do
C[i][j] = A[i][j] + B[i][j];
end for;
return(C);
end
```

Analysis

Consider the running time of the Algorithm MatrixSum. The assignment operation in that algorithm is performed n2 times, so, the running time of the algorithm is O(n2) ($\Theta(n2)$, in fact).

Now, we can devise the recurrence relation to represent the running time of Algorithm MMDC. Algorithm MMDC reduces solving problem of multiplying of two $n \times n$ matrices to eight problems of multiplying $n/2 \times n/2$ matrices, and computing four $O(n^2)$ matrix sums. Therefore, the recurrence relation for Algorithm MMDC is:

 $T(n) = 8T(n/2) + O(n^2)$

To solve this recurrence relation, observe that in terms of the Master Theorem a = 8, b = 2 and $\log_b(a) = 3$ and $f(n) = O(n^2) = o(n^{\log_a(b)} \in 0) = o(n^{3-0.2} \text{ for } \in 0.2)$. Therefore, by the Master Theorem,

$$T(n) = O(n^3)$$

This does not improve upon the straightforward algorithm, but as we saw before with finding second largest number problem, this gives us a set up to devise a better algorithm that would not be possible without Divide-and- Conquer.

Strassen's Algorithm

In 1969, Volker Strassen, a German mathematician, observed that we can eliminate one matrix multiplication operation from each round of the divide- and-conquer algorithm for matrix multiplication.

Consider again two $n \times n$ matrices

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} X & Y \\ Z & W \end{pmatrix}, B = \begin{pmatrix} P & Q \\ R & S \end{pmatrix}$$

We recall

$$A \cdot B = \left(\begin{array}{cc} XP + YR & XQ + YS \\ ZP + WR & ZQ + WS \end{array}\right)$$

Strassen's Algorithm is based on observing that XP + YR, XQ + YS, ZP + WR and ZQ + WS can be computed with only seven (instead of eight as in Algorithm MMDC) matrix multiplication operations, as follows.

First, compute the following seven matrices:

$$P_{1} = X(Q - S)$$

$$P_{2} = (X + Y)S$$

$$P_{3} = (Z + W)P$$

$$P_{4} = W(R - P)$$

$$P_{5} = (X + W)(P + S)$$

$$P_{6} = (Y - W)(R + S)$$

$$P_{7} = (X - Z)(P + Q)$$

Note: Computing each of the P1, ..., P7 matrices requires one matrix multiplication operation per matrix.

Second: observe the following equalities:

$$P_{5}+P_{4}-P_{2}+P_{6} = (X+W)(P+S)+W(R-P)-(X+Y)S+(Y-W)(R+S) = XP+XS+WP+WS+WR-WP-XS-YS+YR-WR+YS-WS = XP + YR$$

$$P_1 + P_2 = X(Q - S) + (X + Y)S = XQ - XS + XS + YS = XS + YS$$

$$P_3 + P_4 = (Z + W)P + W(R - P) = ZP + WP + WR - WP = \mathbf{ZP} + \mathbf{WR}$$

$$P_1 + P_5 - P_3 - P_7 = X(Q-S) + (X+W)(P+S) - (Z+W)P - (X-Z)(P+Q) = XQ - XS + XP + XS + WP + WS - ZP - WP - XP + ZP - XQ + ZQ = \mathbf{ZQ} + \mathbf{WS}$$

That is,

$$A \cdot B = \begin{pmatrix} P_5 + P_4 - P_2 + P_6 & P_1 + P_2 \\ P_3 + P_4 & P_1 + P_5 - P_3 - P_7 \end{pmatrix}$$

Analysis

We note that a direct implementation of Strassen's Algorithm involves seven recursive calls to multiplication problems of size $n/2 \times n/2$, but also involves significantly more calls to MatrixSum algorithm that runs in quadratic time. Nevertheless, the f(n) function in terms of the Master Theorem remains f(n) = $O(n^2)$, while the entire recurrence relation becomes

$$T(n) = 7T(n/2) + O(n2)$$

By Master Theorem, because $n^2 = o(n \log_2 7 - \epsilon)$, the running time of the Strassen's Algorithm is

$$T(n) = O(n^{\log_2 7}) = O(n^{2.81})$$

Note. This is not a tight upper bound on the algorithmic complexity of matrix multiplication. The current best algorithmic bound is $O(n^{2.3728})$. This algorithm, however, and other algorithms similar to it have a very large multiplicative constant associated with the computation, that it is not practical to use.