

Q1

$$(a) 7.54 \cdot 10^2 + 4.26 \cdot 10^1 = 7.54 \cdot 10^2 + 0.426 \cdot 10^2$$

$$= 7.966 \cdot 10^2 \approx 7.97 \times 10^2 \checkmark$$

Answer: 7.97×10^2

$$(b) 1.01 \cdot 10^5 \times 4.04 \cdot 10^{-2} = 4.0804 \times 10^3 \approx 4.08 \times 10^3 \checkmark$$

Answer: 4.08×10^3

$$(c) 5.25 \cdot 10^{-7} \times (-2.02) \cdot 10^{-5} = -10.6050 \times 10^{-12}$$

$$= -0.106050 \times 10^{-10} \approx -0.11 \times 10^{-10} \checkmark$$

Answer: -0.11×10^{-10}

$$(d) -6.06 \cdot 10^6 \times (2.02 \cdot 10^4) = -12.2412 \times 10^{10} \text{ too big!}$$

Answer: $-\text{Inf}$ \checkmark

$$(e) ((6.06 \cdot 10^6) \times (2.02 \cdot 10^4)) - ((5.05 \cdot 10^5) \times (3.03 \cdot 10^5))$$

$$= (+\text{Inf}) - (+\text{Inf}) = \text{NaN}$$

Answer: NaN \checkmark

Q2

(a) Take $x = \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_{\text{machine}}$ where $\epsilon_{\text{mach}} = \beta^{1-p}$ in IEEE double-precision system.

$$f(\sqrt{1+x} - 1) = f(\sqrt{1} - 1) = f(1 - 1) = 0 = A$$

There is a rounding error in the computation $1+x$.

So the Relative Error:

$$RE = \frac{A - T}{T} = \frac{0 - T}{T} = \frac{-T}{T} = -1 \checkmark$$

The magnitude of this R.E $\gg \epsilon_{\text{mach}}$.

Therefore, there is a very large relative error.

Q2(b) ✓

$$\sqrt{1+X} - 1 = \frac{(\sqrt{1+X} - 1)(\sqrt{1+X} + 1)}{\sqrt{1+X} + 1} = \frac{1+X - 1}{\sqrt{1+X} + 1} = \frac{X}{\sqrt{1+X} + 1}$$

New expression: $\frac{X}{\sqrt{1+X} + 1}$ call it N.E

Proof: (δ_i 's are rounding errors)

$$f(N.E) = \frac{X}{((\sqrt{1+X}(1+\delta_1)) \cdot (1+\delta_2) + 1)(1+\delta_3)} \cdot (1+\delta_4)$$

$$\approx \frac{X}{\sqrt{1+X} + 1} \cdot \frac{1+\delta_4}{(\sqrt{1+\delta_1} \cdot (1+\delta_2)) \cdot (1+\delta_3)}$$

Explain:
Since $(\sqrt{1+\delta_1} \cdot (1+\delta_2))$ is very small, we can just ignore the effect on 1 and pull it out.

$$\begin{aligned} R.E &= \frac{A-T}{T} = \frac{f(N.E) - T}{T} \\ &= \frac{1+\delta_4}{(\sqrt{1+\delta_1} \cdot (1+\delta_2)) \cdot (1+\delta_3)} \\ &= (1+\hat{\delta}_1)(1+\hat{\delta}_2)(1+\hat{\delta}_3)(1+\delta_4) \end{aligned}$$

Assume $\hat{\delta}_i \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot 1.01 \epsilon_{mach}$ and $\delta_i \leq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{mach}$ ✓

Therefore, the R.E is very small under the condition that there is no overflow and underflow.

Q3

→
Next page

Q3

$$(a) \|x\|_1 = 3 + 5 + 1 = 9 \quad \checkmark$$

$$(b) \|x\|_2 = \sqrt{9 + 25 + 1} = \sqrt{35} \quad \checkmark$$

$$(c) \|x\|_\infty = \max\{3, 5, 1\} = 5 \quad \checkmark$$

$$(d) \|A\|_1 = \max\{6, 10, 7\} = 10 \quad \checkmark$$

$$(e) \|A\|_\infty = \max\{6, 9, 8\} = 9 \quad \checkmark$$

Q4

$$\text{Call LHS} = \|Ax\|_v, \text{ RHS} = \|A\|_m \|x\|_v$$

$$\text{RHS} = \left(\max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|Ax\|_v}{\|x\|_v} \right) \|x\|_v$$

by definition (2).

Since $\|x\|_v$ is a number, we can put it inside the max function and it won't change the result. ✓

$$\Rightarrow \text{RHS} = \max_{x \neq 0} \left\{ \frac{\|Ax\|_v}{\|x\|_v} \|x\|_v \right\} = \max_{x \neq 0} \|Ax\|_v$$

By comparing LHS and RHS, it is obviously true that:

$$\|Ax\|_v \leq \max_{x \neq 0} \|Ax\|_v$$

Since a particular value of $\|Ax\|_v$ would be less than taking max among all x 's.

$$\text{Therefore, } \|Ax\|_v \leq \|A\|_m \|x\|_v \quad \checkmark$$

CASE $\vec{x} = \vec{0}$

EXAMINER'S REPORT

1	5
2	10
3	5
4	5
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Total	25