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## Introduction

In this paper, we prove a lower bound for a problem -- finding the mean Euclidean distance between N points in 2 -space -- by methods drawn from complex function theory. The crucial fact we shall use is that two complex functions (under the appropriate caveats) can either be identical everywhere, or else they can be identical (almost) nowhere; there is no in-between possibility.

Because of this, a well-behaved function can be continued uniquely everywhere, given its values in any interval, no matter how small. If it has singularities, we can continue it along any path that circumvents them; this may cause the function to become multivalued (depending on whether we circumvent a singularity from the left or from the right), in which case we say it has a many-sheeted Riemann surface ${ }^{\dagger}$.

The square-root function, used in the definition of the mean distance, has asheeted Riemann surface; that is, a square root can have 2 values. This causes the mean distance to have very many possible values. Using analytic continuation, we show that any algorithm that computes it on the reals has to compute it everywhere, and must therefore give equally many different results on the different sheets. A simple argument of accounting for all this ambiguity shows that this implies a large complexity.

The methods used here should be applicable to other algorithms that use functions with nontrivial Riemann surfaces (e.g. the harmonic mean distance in 2-space, or the gravitational potential energy of $N$ stars).
I wish to thank D.Jefferson for some most valuable discussions.

[^0]Straight-line algorithms
Let $N$ points $\left(X_{i}, Y_{j}\right)$ be given in 2-space. The mean distance $D$ between them is defined as

where $M$ is $N(N-1) / 2$.
We can consider $D$ as a function of $2 N$ complex variables. For each of the $M$ square roots, there are (complex) points where that square root alone is singular, and all the others are analytic ${ }^{\dagger}$. Continuing $D$ on a contour around such a point will reverse the sign of the relevant square root, leaving the others unchanged. Therefore, the Riemann hypersurface of $D$ has $2^{M}$ sheets, and each can be continued to any of the others.

Consider now any straight-line algorithm $A$ to compute $D$, using the five arithmetic operations $+,-, *, /$ and square-root.

A can be considered to apply to complex inputs as well as real ones, and computes some function f, meromorphic (=analytic, except for poles) on its Riemann surface. On the reals, $f=D$. We can therefore apply, from ch.II of [2], their
"Theorem 4: If $f_{1}$ is analytic in a domain $D_{1}$, and $f_{2}$ in a domain $D_{2}$, if the intersection of $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$ is a nonempty domain, and if $f_{1}(z), f_{2}(z)$ have equal values in a real environment of a point of $D_{1} \cdot D_{2}$, then $f_{1}(z), f_{2}(z)$ are analytic continuations of each other; i.e. there exists a unique function $f(z)$ analytic in $D_{1}+D_{2}$ which coincides with $f_{1}$ in $D_{1}$ and with $f_{2}$ in $D_{2} .^{" \prime}$ (N.B. $z$ is a complex vector; the extension to meromorphic functions is trivial, by removing small neighbourhoods of the singularities from the domains $D_{1}, D_{2}$ )
We therefore find that $f$ and $D$ are the same complex function. By choosing the appropriate continuation paths, it is seen that they have the same minimal Riemann surface. Therefore, the full analytic continuation of $f$ is $2^{\mathrm{M}}$-valued almost everywhere.

This high degree of ambiguity can only result from square-root steps, since all our other operations are unambiguous. Let us try to account for all the ambiguity:
${ }_{\text {for }}$ the square root of $\left(X_{1}-X_{2}\right)^{2}+\left(Y_{1}-Y_{2}\right)^{2}$, such a point is given by $X_{k}=Y_{k}=k, k>1$;
$X_{1}=1 ; Y_{1}=2+i$. This does not hold in $1-$ spac. $X_{1}=1 ; Y_{1}=2+i$. This does not hold in 1 -space.

If, at each square-root operation of $A$, we choose a branch of the square-root function, $f$ becomes single-valued. Since these choices must give us $2^{M}$ different results, there must be at least $M$ of them; thus, $A$ must include $M$ square-root operations. We have thus proved:

Theorem 1: If we are limited to $+,-, *, /$ and square-root operations, the mean distance in 2-space has complexity $O\left(N^{2}\right)$.

The extension to higher dimension is trivial, since $K$-space includes 2-space.
In the following sections, we shall remove some of the restrictions on $A$.

## Decisions

If $A$ is not a straight-line algorithm, but includes decision steps, we cannot use the previous section's proof of theorem 1. Let A have some bounded number of decision steps in it. Each decision can go one of two ways, and therefore, depending on the input data, $A$ behaves like one out of a finite family of straight-line algorithms $A_{1}, A_{2}, \ldots$ . For every real input set, at least one of the $A_{i}$ gives the right answer $D$. Let $A_{i}$ compute the function $f_{i}$, meromorphic on its Riemann hypersurface.

We shall now prove, by reductio ad absurdum, that at least one of the $f_{i}$ is equal to $D$ everywhere. For suppose not. Then none of the functions $f_{j}-D$ is idntically zero. By theorem 11.4 of [2], they cannot vanish on any real neighbourhood. Since each $f_{i}$-D is continuous almost everywhere ${ }^{\dagger}$, every real neighbourhood (i.e. non-empty open set) contains a neighbourhood in which it nowhere vanishes (since it contains a point at which $f_{i}-D$ is continuous and nonzero).

Let us now choose some neighbourhood $N_{0}$. It must contain a neighbourhood $N_{1}$ in which $f_{1}-D$ nowhere vanishes. This $N_{1}$ must contain a neighbourhood $N_{2}$ in which $f_{2}$-D nowhere vanishes. Continuing, we find a neighbourhood in which none of the $f_{i}$-D ever vanishes, but their product is identically zero; which is absurd. Q.E.D.

Therefore, A must reduce, for some inputs, to a straight-line algorithm that gives $D$ everywhere, and theorem 1 applies even if decisions are allowed.

In particular, since the absolute value function (on the reals) can be computed by decisions and arithmetic steps, it does not heip in speeding up the computation of the mean distance.
ttechnically, it is continuous in an open set, dense in real 2 N -space.

## Higher-order roots

It might seem that theorem 1 is limited to a computation model that allows,,$+- \neq / /$, and square roots only, and that higher-order roots may get round the lower bound of $M$ operations. But permutation-group considerations forbid this:

Consider the set of $2^{\mathrm{M}}$ values of (1) in some singularity-free region. The various possible closed paths, from this region to itself, along which analytic continuation is carried out, generate a group of permutations between these $2^{M}$ values. All elements of this group are of characteristic 2 ; that is, if we go twice along any closed path, every sheet of the Riemann hypersurface returns to itself.

We can do the analytic continuation, along a path, not only of the final values given by algorithms $A^{\prime}$ and $T$, but also of every intermediate value. If, at some stage of $A^{\prime}$, we take (e.g) a 4 -th root, the result of this step has a fourfold multiplicity (=number of branches), but the structure of that multiplicity is all wrong: the 4 values of this step divide into two pairs, and there is a continuation path such that going twice around it will lead from one member of the pair to the other ${ }^{\dagger}$.

In the final result, such a double path leaves everything invariant; the extra multiplicity is therefore "wasted", and this step only contributes a factor of 2 to the multiplicity of the final result, since that result can only depend on whether we choose an odd, or an even, branch of the root, but not on which of the even branches, (or which of the odd ones), we choose.

Therefore, high-order roots (and, for similar reasons, logarithms) have no effect on theorem 1. They can be used to reduce the number of square roots, but not of total
operations.
${ }^{\dagger}$ If, for instance, we take the 4 -th root of 1 , the 2 pairs are $\pm 1$ and $\pm i$.
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## Introduction

It has recently [1] been shown that the mean euclidean distance $D$ between $N$ points in 2 -space requires $O\left(N^{2}\right)$ steps to compute. In this paper, we shall show that, if any finite relative error $\epsilon$ is permitted, there is an $O(N \log N)$ algorithm that computes D to within $+\mathbb{D}$.

To do this, we define a series of metrics for 2-space. The mean distance for each metric takes only $O(N \log N)$ steps, and these metrics approximate the Euclidean metric to within closer and closer tolerances.

The results of this paper have been derived independentiy by $D$. Jefferson (private communication).

## A foolish metric

The crudest metric we shall consider defines the length $|V|$ of the vector $V=(X, Y)$ to be the absolute value of $X$. The rule $|a V|=a|V|$ (a positive scalar, $V$ vector) does hold for this metric, but the unit "circle" is an infinite strip, parallel to the $Y$ axis, of width 2. Let us call this metric $F$.

## Fancier metrics

If we rotate this foolish metric $F$ (i.e. use the projection on some line different from the $X$-axis), we get a different, equally foolish, metric. The length of a vector, under all such metrics, is a convex, piecewise linear, function of the vector. This property (and also $|\mathrm{aV}|=\mathrm{a}|\mathrm{V}|$ ), remains true if we add two or more such metrics, defining the new length of a vector to be the sum of its lengths under the different metrics we add. Therefore, the new unit "circle" is a convex polygon; in general, it will have twice as many edges as there are metrics added up. This can be verified by considering which combinations of the linear parts of the various foolish metrics are possible.
If we rotate $F$ by $K * 180^{\circ} / \mathrm{L}$ for $\mathrm{K}=0, \ldots, \mathrm{~L}-1$, and add up the resulting metrics, the unit "circle" will be a regular $2 L-$ gon ${ }^{\dagger}$. As $L$ gets bigger, it will look more and more like a circle ${ }^{\ddagger}$. Since $|\mathrm{aV}|=\mathrm{a}|\mathrm{V}|$, this is enough to ensure that these metrics (scaled by a suitable multiplicative constant) converge to the Euclidean metric.

```
\({ }^{\dagger}\) For \(L=2\), we get the \(L^{1}\) norm \(|V|=|X|+|Y|\).
*This follows from its convexity and 2 L -fold rotational symmetry
```


## Finding the mean distance

Since, under all our metrics, the length of a vector is the sum of its $F$ measure and of similar measures, it is enough to compute the mean $F$-distance, which is


If we sort the $N$ points by their $X$ coordinate, this number equals

$$
\frac{2}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i<j}\left(x_{j}-x_{i}\right)
$$

If we collect terms, we find that each $X_{j}$ appears as many times as the number of $j-s$ which are less than $i$, minus the number of $j-s$ which are greater than $i$. The sum therefore equals


Thus, the mean $F$ distance (and therefore, the mean distances under all our metrics) can be found in $O(N \log N)$ steps.
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