

$$3. (a) (i) \quad f(x, f(x, f(x, \dots, f(x, x)))) \dots$$

$$\text{Now, } f(x, x) = x^2(1 + \epsilon_1)$$

So, multiplying $(n-1)$ times to get x^n will give:-

$$\begin{aligned} & x^n (1 + \epsilon_{n-1}) (1 + \epsilon_{n-2}) \dots (1 + \epsilon_1) \\ & \equiv x^n (1 + \epsilon_{n-1} + \epsilon_{n-2} + \dots + \epsilon_1) \quad (\text{first order in } \epsilon_i) \\ & \leq x^n (1 + \overline{n-1} \epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

↪ bounded by machine epsilon.

So, $\epsilon_{\text{repeated multiplication}} = (n-1) \epsilon$ (this is the upper bound)

* we have assumed x is a perfect machine number.

(ii) again, assuming x is a perfect machine number,

$$f(\exp(f(n, f(\ln x))))$$

$$= f(\exp(n f(\ln x (1 + \epsilon_{\ln}))))$$

$$= f(\exp(n \ln x (1 + \epsilon_{\ln}) (1 + \epsilon_{\text{mult}})))$$

↪ due to logarithm

$$= \exp(n \ln x (1 + \epsilon_{\ln}) (1 + \epsilon_{\text{mult}})) (1 + \epsilon_e)$$

↪ due to multiplication of $\ln x$ with n .

$$= e^{n \ln x (1 + \epsilon_{\ln}) (1 + \epsilon_{\text{mult}})} (1 + \epsilon_e)$$

↪ due to exponential

$$\Rightarrow e^{n \ln x (1 + \epsilon_{\ln} + \epsilon_{\text{mult}})} (1 + \epsilon_e) \quad \left| \text{upto 1st order in } \epsilon. \right.$$

$$= e^{n \ln x} e^{n \ln x (\epsilon_{\ln} + \epsilon_{\text{mult}})} (1 + \epsilon_e)$$

$$\Rightarrow e^{n \ln x} (1 + n \ln x (\epsilon_{\ln} + \epsilon_{\text{mult}}) + \dots) (1 + \epsilon_e)$$

$$\Rightarrow e^{n \ln x} (1 + (n \ln x) (\epsilon_{\ln} + \epsilon_{\text{mult}}) + \epsilon_e) \quad \left| \text{to 1st order in } \epsilon. \right.$$

So; $n \ln \alpha \{1 + \epsilon\}$ where $\boxed{\epsilon = \epsilon_e + n \ln \alpha (\epsilon_{\ln} + \epsilon_m)}$

Now; assuming an upper bound of ϵ (machine epsilon) on all our relative errors ($\epsilon_e, \epsilon_{\ln}, \epsilon_m$):-

$$\epsilon_{\text{taking logarithm method}} = \boxed{\epsilon + 2\epsilon n \ln \alpha}$$

Now; repeated multiplication is better if:-

$$(n-1)\epsilon < \epsilon + 2\epsilon n \ln \alpha$$

$$\Rightarrow n-1 < 1 + 2n \ln \alpha$$

$$\Rightarrow 2n \ln \alpha > n-2$$

$$\Rightarrow \ln \alpha > \frac{n-2}{2n}$$

$$\text{or } \boxed{\alpha > e^{\frac{n-2}{2n}}}$$

or equivalently when:-

$$n(1 - 2 \ln \alpha) < 2$$

$$\text{or; } \boxed{n < \frac{2}{1 - 2 \ln \alpha}}$$

(b) $a^a = e^{a \ln a}$. (for this to be just a mathematical tool for analysis, we assume no error in computing exponential).

(1) a is an exact machine number and a has a relative error ϵ_a .

$$\text{So; } \cancel{fl(e^{a \ln a})} \quad fl(\exp(fl(a) fl(\ln a))) \quad \left| \begin{array}{l} \text{Not considering error from product.} \end{array} \right.$$

$$= \exp(a(1 + \epsilon_a) \ln a (1 + \epsilon_{\ln}))$$

$$a \ln a + a \epsilon_a \ln a + a \epsilon_{\ln} \ln a + O(\epsilon^2) \quad \left| \begin{array}{l} \text{error due to logarithm} \end{array} \right.$$

$$\Rightarrow e^{a \ln a} (1 + a \epsilon_a \ln a + a \epsilon_{\ln} \ln a) \quad \left| \begin{array}{l} \text{to first order in } \epsilon_s. \end{array} \right.$$

So, relative error = $a \epsilon_a \ln x + a \epsilon_{\ln} \ln x$.

Now, in our manipulation, $x^a \rightarrow e^{a \ln x}$ we assumed that exponential and logarithm would be carried out flawlessly. In that case;

$$\boxed{\text{relative error} = a \epsilon_a \ln x.}$$

(ii) For a being an exact machine # but not x :-

$$x^a \rightarrow e^{a \ln x}$$

So, $fl(\exp(fl(a fl(\ln x))))$

$\Rightarrow \exp(a \ln(x(1+\epsilon_x)))$

↓ If we consider all errors

Not considering error from product or exponential or logarithm

then, $\exp(a \ln(x(1+\epsilon_x))(1+\epsilon_m))(1+\epsilon_e)$

But because solution is needed only in terms of $\epsilon_x, \epsilon_a, a \& m$; we do not consider ϵ_m and ϵ_e .

→ exponential multiplication from x not being a machine #.

$$\exp(a \ln(x(1+\epsilon_x))) = e^{a \ln(x + x \epsilon_x)}$$

$$\Rightarrow e^{a \ln x + a \ln(1+\epsilon_x)} = e^{a \ln x} \{1 + a \ln(1+\epsilon_x) + \dots\}$$

$$\Rightarrow e^{a \ln x} \{1 + a(\epsilon_x + O(\epsilon_x^2))\}$$

$$\Rightarrow e^{a \ln x} (1 + a \epsilon_x)$$

So, $\boxed{\text{relative error} = a \epsilon_x.}$

Assuming ϵ_2 and ϵ_a are usually very small; comparable to machine precision; the relative ~~see~~ errors in either scenario could become significant if a is very large.

The effect of $\ln a$ in case of part (i) should not be problematic as a is scaled down by a logarithm.