

long long

depends on either `sizeof(int) < sizeof(long)` or `sizeof(long) < sizeof(long long)`, portability is needlessly restricted. Relying instead on only the guaranteed⁴ property that `sizeof(int) < sizeof(long long)` avoids such portability issues since the relative sizes of the `long` and `long long` integral types continue to evolve.

When precise control of size *in the implementation* (as opposed to in the interface) matters, consider using one of the standard signed, `intn_t`, or unsigned, `uintn_t`, integer aliases provided, since C++11, in `<cstdint>` and summarized here in Table 1.

Table 1: Useful typedefs found in `<cstdint>` (since C++11)

| Exact Size (optional) ^a | Fastest integral type having at least <i>N</i> bits | Smallest integer type having at least <i>N</i> bits |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| <code>int8_t</code> | <code>int_fast8_t</code> | <code>int_least8_t</code> |
| <code>int16_t</code> | <code>int_fast16_t</code> | <code>int_least16_t</code> |
| <code>int32_t</code> | <code>int_fast32_t</code> | <code>int_least32_t</code> |
| <code>int64_t</code> | <code>int_fast64_t</code> | <code>int_least64_t</code> |
| <code>uint8_t</code> | <code>uint_fast8_t</code> | <code>uint_least8_t</code> |
| <code>uint16_t</code> ^a | <code>uint_fast16_t</code> | <code>uint_least16_t</code> |
| <code>uint32_t</code> | <code>uint_fast32_t</code> | <code>uint_least32_t</code> |
| <code>uint64_t</code> | <code>uint_fast64_t</code> | <code>uint_least64_t</code> |

^a The compiler doesn’t need to fabricate the exact-width type if the target platform doesn’t support it.

Note: Also see `intmax_t`, the maximum width integer type, which might be different from all of the above.

See Also

- “Binary Literals” (§1.2, p. 142) explains how programmers can specify binary constants directly in the source code; large binary values might fit only in a **long long** or even **unsigned long long**.
- “Digit Separators” (§1.2, p. 152) describes visually separating digits of large **long long** literals.

Further Reading

- For rationale behind adding the 64-bit integral type to the language, see the original proposal, “Adding the **long long** type to C++,” [adamczyk05](#).

⁴Due to the unfathomable amount of software that would stop working if an `int` were ever anything but exactly *four* bytes, we — along with the late Richard Stevens of Unix fame (see [stevens93](#), section 2.5.1., “ANSI C Limits,” pp. 31–32, specifically row 6, column 4 of Figure 2.2, p. 32) — are prepared to *guarantee* that it will never become as large as a **long long** for any general-purpose computer.