

As everyone knows, *ratios* can be written in many ways. For example, the ratio of two to three can be written as 2:3, or $2/3$, or $\frac{2}{3}$, or $\frac{2}{3}$, or $3\overline{)2}$, or $2\div 3$, or $\frac{1}{3}\times 2$, and so on. The *value* of that ratio can also be written in many ways, with the two most popular being $0.666\dots$ and $0.6\overline{66}$.

Converting a ratio into its value is taught in early childhood as the process of “long division”. In early PPC issues, this was referred to as “converting fractions to decimal” or “infinite division.” However, the reverse process is what is the concern of this paper: converting *decimals to fractions (aka values to ratios)*.

THE PROBLEM: Everybody thinks that Euclid said everything there is to say about converting decimals to fractions 2300 years ago. [Note: Chapter 4 of Euclid’s *Elements* is called “The Neglected Book of Euclid”. Book Ten is all about irrational numbers and is the origin of continued fractions.] That conviction has probably prevented anybody from looking for a better method than Euclid’s. Until now.

“It’ll be a revelation to a lot of people that anything new ever happens in mathematics at all. Mathematics is moving fast nowadays.” — Ian Stewart, in *The Problems of Mathematics*, 1987, Oxford University Press, ISBN 0-19-219262-0 (HB), 0-19-286148-4 (PBK)

[Insert explanation of Continued Fractions here, e.g. $\frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{2+\frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{3}}}}} = \frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{2+\frac{1}{3}}} = \frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{\frac{7}{3}}} = \frac{1}{1+\frac{3}{7}} = \frac{1}{\frac{10}{7}} = \frac{7}{10} = 0.7$

The Continued Fraction method has Two Fatal Flaws: $\frac{1}{FP(x)}$ throws away digits at every step, and it misses more solutions than it finds.]

THE STERN-BROCOT TREE: Finds all the answers that Continued Fractions misses, and is more accurate than Continued Fractions, but it’s so slow that it’s useless.

THE SOLUTION: I have discovered a marvelous algorithm for converting decimals to fractions (which unfortunately these margins are too small to contain) that totally avoids the $1/FP(x)$ operation and all of its roundoff error accumulation. In fact, this new algorithm finds all of the closest fractions to any real number, even pathological cases like the evil number 0.99999999975, in under 5 seconds when written entirely in User RPL with local variables instead of stack manipulations!

Since all of the literature uses $\frac{p_i}{q_i}$ or simply $\frac{p}{q}$ to symbolize the ratios obtained by the continued fraction method, I wanted to call my new algorithm (and HP49 program) $\rightarrow P/Q$. However, you can’t have a

division sign in a command name, so I changed the Division sign into a D. Hence, →PDQ (“Convert to P Divided by Q”).

EXAMPLE 1:

The HP48’s description in Craig Finseth’s “HP Database” Hall of Fame includes this bug report:

The sequence:

```
STD 19 1/x e-12 - \->Q
```

Produces a fraction that clearly has not been reduced to lowest terms.

Namely, it returns this ludicrous fraction:

```
1.0101010101E20 / 1.91919191922E21
```

The HP49 “solves” this problem by converting these to integers and reducing it to:

```
3367003367 / 63973063974
```

But that’s just the same bad answer with a cosmetic makeover. Neither of these fractions evaluate to the original input; they are both off by 1 in the last place.

The best possible answer (and therefore, to my mind, the ONLY answer) is:

```
2719978241 / 51679586580
```

which exactly evaluates to the input. Although this answer can be found with my old DEC2FRAC program, it would take a lot of trial and error to do so since DEC2FRAC requires you to know the upper limit of the denominator. It can also be found with the Stern-Brocot Tree method, but it would take a very long time. It is missed entirely by the continued fraction method. The only way to find it within one’s lifetime is with →PDQ, which finds the answer in 3.4 seconds.

EXAMPLE 2:

According to the HP manuals, the accuracy of the →Q function can be reduced by using smaller FIX settings, and the highest accuracy that can be obtained is in STD mode.

Therefore, in STD mode, the →Q command should always give results that are of the same or greater accuracy than at smaller FIX settings.

But such is not the case. Although STD →Q returns ratios of larger integers than FIX →STD, they are not necessarily more accurate.

For example (first in STD mode, then in 10 FIX mode):

$3 \sqrt{}$ In DUP STD →Q → 750826905227/1366864203080
→NUM – → -.000000000003 (off by 3 in the 12th place)

$3 \sqrt{}$ In DUP 10 FIX →Q → 379013/689985
→NUM – → -.000000000001 (off by 1 in the 12th place)

(The best fraction, 782647/1424792, is missed by →Q and DEC2FRAC, but is found by →PDQ.)

Therefore STD →Q is here less accurate than 10 FIX →Q, even though the ratio it yields contains larger integers and therefore ought to be more accurate.

This is just one example. This behavior is not rare, however. STD →Q is less accurate than 10 FIX →Q in an uncountable number of cases; it seems that any randomly picked number has roughly an 8% chance of showing the same behavior.

EXAMPLE 3:

$2 \sqrt{}$ STD →Q → 941664/665857 (accurate to all 12 digits) ...
...But the fraction 665857/470832 is accurate to all 12 digits too,
yet there is no way to obtain this “better” result from →Q.

$3 \sqrt{}$ STD →Q → 978122/564719 (accurate to all 12 digits) ...
...But the fraction 716035/413403 is accurate to all 12 digits too,
yet there is no way to obtain this “better” result from →Q.

Examples of this kind abound. Of course, →PDQ finds the best answers. It *always* does.

EXAMPLE 4:

All of the following inputs to the following functions are converted exactly to the best possible fraction by →PDQ, but cannot be obtained by the continued fraction method:

\sqrt{x} :
2,3,12,13,24,26,32,47,48,51,54,56,57,58,59,62,63,65,67,70,72,74,78,82,83,84,85,89,96,102...

$\sqrt[3]{x}$:

2,4,6,9,11,13,14,16,31,36,37,41,47,55,58,65,70,71,74,82,86,88,90,91,92,98,103...

LN(X):

3,5,12,15,23,24,26,31,32,33,35,37,41,49,52,58,66,73,77,82,85,87,89,91,93,95,97,101...

LOG(X):

2,4,5,7,8,15,17,18,21,26,34,35,37,42,45,46,49,53,56,61,70,74,76,77,83,84,86,87,91,92,93,96,98,101...

SIN(X degrees):

2,4,6,11,12,14,16,17,19,20,26,27,31,33,38,40,44,51,57,60,62,63,64,65,67,71,72,74,76,81,87,88...

TAN(X degrees):

2,3,5,9,11,14,15,16,17,19,24,28,31,32,36,39,40,47,52,53,54,59,60,62,66,69,75,76,79...

ACOSH(X):

6,8,9,11,13,15,16,19,25,27,33,37,39,45,52,55,57,61,63,66,69,71,83,86,87,107...

ASINH(X):

2,4,7,9,16,17,21,22,30,36,38,44,47,49,52,55,56,59,60,65,67,68,69,71,79,80,88,89,90,92,93,99,103...

APPENDIX:

Here's the actual continued-fraction expansion of the actual value of π . Calculated by Derive with NUMBER.MTH loaded. Accuracy set to 500 digits. Notice the large partial quotient 20776, unmentioned in any literature I've seen (old books say 292 is the largest known partial quotient; newer books are mum on the subject).

```

00:  3 7 15 1 292 1 1 1 2 1
10:  3 1 14 2 1 1 2 2 2 2
20:  1 84 2 1 1 15 3 13 1 4
30:  2 6 6 99 1 2 2 6 3 5
40:  1 1 6 8 1 7 1 2 3 7
50:  1 2 1 1 12 1 1 1 3 1
60:  1 8 1 1 2 1 6 1 1 5
70:  2 2 3 1 2 4 4 16 1 161
80:  45 1 22 1 2 2 1 4 1 2
90:  24 1 2 1 3 1 2 1 1 10
100: 2 5 4 1 2 2 8 1 5 2
110: 2 26 1 4 1 1 8 2 42 2
120: 1 7 3 3 1 1 7 2 4 9
130: 7 2 3 1 57 1 18 1 9 19
140: 1 2 18 1 3 7 30 1 1 1
150: 3 3 3 1 2 8 1 1 2 1

```



160: 15 1 2 13 1 2 1 4 1 12
 170: 1 1 3 3 28 1 10 3 2 20
 180: 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 5 3
 190: 2 1 6 1 4 1 120 2 1 1
 200: 3 1 23 1 15 1 3 7 1 16
 210: 1 2 1 21 2 1 1 2 9 1
 220: 6 4 127 14 5 1 3 13 7 9
 230: 1 1 1 1 1 5 4 1 1 3
 240: 1 1 29 3 1 1 2 2 1 3
 250: 1 1 1 3 1 1 10 3 1 3
 260: 1 2 1 12 1 4 1 1 1 1
 270: 7 1 1 2 1 11 3 1 7 1
 280: 4 1 48 16 1 4 5 2 1 1
 290: 4 3 1 2 3 1 2 2 1 2
 300: 5 20 1 1 5 4 1 436 8 1
 310: 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 5 1 2
 320: 1 3 6 11 4 3 1 1 1 2
 330: 5 4 6 9 1 5 1 5 15 1
 340: 11 24 4 4 5 2 1 4 1 6
 350: 1 1 1 4 3 2 2 1 1 2
 360: 1 58 5 1 2 1 2 1 1 2
 370: 2 7 1 15 1 4 8 1 1 4
 380: 2 1 1 1 3 1 1 1 2 1
 390: 1 1 1 1 9 1 4 3 15 1
 400: 2 1 13 1 1 1 3 24 1 2
 410: 4 10 5 12 3 3 21 1 2 1
 420: 34 1 1 1 4 15 1 4 44 1
 430: 4 20776 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 23
 440: 1 7 2 1 94 55 1 1 2 1
 450: 1 3 1 1 32 5 1 14 1 1
 460: 1 1 1 3 50 2 16 5 1 2
 470: 1 4 6 3 1 3 3 1 2 2
 480: 2 5 2 2 2 28 1 1 13 1
 490: 5 43 1 ...

REFERENCES FOR MATHEMATICAL ARCHEOLOGY :

Filler comment: “2549491779/811528438 will yield 18 accurate digits for pi.” *65 NOTES*, V1 N7 (December 1974) P1b. [Note: π 17.3 PDQ yields a better answer: 1068966896/340262731.]

“Fractions” by David A. Kemper, *65 NOTES*, V3 N5 P14. An HP-65 program for D→F and F→D. Uses continued fractions, 1/FP(x).

“Fractions” by David A. Kemper, *65 NOTES*, V3 N9 P27. An HP-97 program for D→F and F→D with optional mixed number display for improper fractions. Same logic as his HP-65 program in V3 N5 P14.



“HP-25 Decimal to Fraction” by John Kennedy & Jim Davidson, *65 NOTES*, V4 N1 P16-19. “The decimal to fraction conversion appearing in this month’s HP-25 Library (elsewhere in this issue) has minimal execution time and handles the computations in an astute manner. ... The main idea behind such a program is to multiply F [the decimal number] by successive integers until an integer is obtained.” Sample running time: $\pi \rightarrow 355/113$ in 16 seconds; $104348/33215$ in 45 minutes! [Note: π 9.3 PDQ $\rightarrow 104348/33215$ in .87 seconds].

“Number Theory” (P17b-19c) and “Decimal-to-Fraction Conversion (HP-25)” (P20c) by John Kennedy and Jim Davidson, *65 NOTES*, V4 N6. Program on page 61. Introduced and thoroughly explained the continued fraction method. “Of course every number represented in a digital computer is a rational number. A decimal number in the HP-25 is really a fraction whose numerator is the integer with the same digits as x and whose denominator is an appropriate power of 10.” [THEY ALMOST HAD IT!] Sample running time: $\pi \rightarrow 104348/33215$ in 10 seconds. “Since the calculator works with rational numbers only, it is always possible to achieve an exact (at least to the limits of the machine) rational approximation.” [Note: Not true! E.g. .9999999975 and just about any other value with a sufficiently large partial quotient.]

“Decimals & Fractions” by John Kennedy, *PPC Journal* V5 N6 (July 1978) P17b. “If one were to choose a number at random from the real number system then the probability that the number chosen is transcendental is 1 and the probability that the number chosen is a rational or non-transcendental irrational is 0. So perhaps you can begin to understand why such numbers are so important.”

“34C Decimal to Fraction” by Thomas S. Cox, *PPC Calculator Journal*, V7 N2 (Feb-Mar 1980) P11d. Same logic as horrible HP-25 program in V4N1P19; $\pi \rightarrow 355/113$ in 19 seconds.

“Converting a Decimal to a Fraction” by Stanley Becker, *PPC Calculator Journal* V9 N5 (Aug 1982) P22b. TI-59 program. Stores all the partial quotients like HP’s $\rightarrow Q$ function does and like the HP32SII does. An input of the golden ratio takes 33 registers and 10 minutes. Continued fractions, $1/FP(x)$.

“HP-75 Number To Fraction” by Anthony J. Mechelynck, *Computer Journal of PPC*, V2 N4 (Jul/Aug 1983) P25d. Continued Fractions, $1/FP(x)$.

“HP-15C Decimal to Fraction Conversion” by Bob Hall, *PPC Journal* V12 N1 P13

“Decimal to Fraction Conversion Using Farey Fractions” by Bob Hall, *PPC Journal* V12 N4 (April 1985) P38a-c.

“DF” HP-41 Decimal-to-Fraction program, PPC ROM. Continued fractions, $1/FP(x)$.

“Decimal Number to Fraction Once More” by Roger K. Heinsohn, *CHHU Chronicle* V2 N7 (Nov/Dec 1985) P42b. HP-41 program. Uses same technique as PPC ROM.

“Decimal-To-Fraction Conversion” by Joseph K. Horn, *HPX Exchange*, V1 N4 (July 1987 - March 1988) P5c. “For example, what fraction approximates PI to 8 digits? CALL D2F(PI,8,A,B) and then DISP A;B. $103993/33102$ is a good approximation of PI.” [Note: π 8 PDQ yields a better answer: $100798/32085$.]

HP-67 Math Pac by HP: Uses continued fractions for D→F on pages 02-01 through 02-06.

Sparcom Math Pro Pac; uses Joe Horn's DEC2FRAC algorithm in its FRACT function which finds intermediate convergents but suffers from $1/FP(x)$ error accumulation.

Hardy & Wright's *Number Theory*, chapters X (Continued Fractions) and XI (Approximation of Irrationals by Rationals) brush "intermediate convergents" under the rug, since they have low Hurwitz accuracies. "Good approximation" and "best approximation" are defined on page 151.

The "final word" on the subject (referenced as the definitive work by others) is *Best Lower and Upper Approximations to Irrational Numbers* by Clark Kimberling, professor of Mathematics at the University of Evansville (Indiana). He makes a distinction between "best approximate" and "nearest approximate", to wit: $|qa-pl| < |ca-bl|$ means that p/q is a "best approximate" to a , which is stronger (or "better") than $|a-p/q| < |a-b/c|$ which means that p/q is nearer a than any b/c having $c < q$. "Given a positive irrational number a , the principal convergents p_i/q_i to a are well known to be the best approximates to a ." He cites as his expert sources these two books:

Serge Lang, *Introduction to Diophantine Approximations*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1966.

Oskar Perron, *Die Lehre von den Kettenbrüchen*, Chelsea, New York, 1950.

Computing Science: On the Teeth of Wheels by Brian Hayes, *American Scientist*, Volume 88, No. 4 (July-August 2000), available online at:

<http://www.sigmaxi.org/amsci/issues/Comsci00/compsci2000-07.htm>

Covers the Stern-Brocot Tree better than Knuth does. "The Zeroth Law of Gearwork: The number of teeth on a gear must be an integer." Also: "The fact is, the design of simple gear trains is no longer a computationally interesting problem. I am reminded of those prodigies who spent years of their lives calculating digits of the decimal expansion of π . I cannot help wondering which of my own labors will appear equally quaint and pathetic to some future reader who ransacks libraries for old volumes of *American Scientist*." [Answer: this one; me; 3 years later.]

Concrete Mathematics by Graham, Knuth & Patashnik (1994), pages 116-123 is about the Stern-Brocot Tree. It ends with, "A little fudging is needed at the end to make sure that there aren't infinitely many R 's [partial quotients]"

So That's Why 22/7 is Used for PI! by Maurice J. Burke and Diana L. Taggart, *Mathematics Teacher* V95 N3 (March 2002) P164-169. "The next better approximation to π does not occur until the denominator is 16604." [Note: That's an intermediate convergent, missed by the continued fraction algorithm. PDQ finds it if the accuracy is specified just a hair above $355/113$'s accuracy; try 6.57477 or thereabouts. In any case, it's proof that the NCTM considers intermediate convergents to be "better", unlike most mathematicians. But the NCTM dismisses the creeping inaccuracy of $1/FP(x)$ by saying, "More precise does not necessarily mean more useful."