Problem 1:

Find the absolute and relative condition number for the following problems. Comment on the values of *x* for which the problem would be considered well-conditioned or ill-conditioned.

a)
$$f(x) = (\ln x)^2$$

b)
$$f(x) = ||x||_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}$$

c)
$$f(A) = [trace(A) \ det(A)]$$
 for 2x2 matrix A

Use $\|.\|_{\infty}$ norm in the formula for the condition number and treat the input as a vector of dimension 4, so your Jacobian becomes a 2 x 4 matrix.

d)
$$f(x,y) = \begin{bmatrix} xy & x^2 \\ y^2 & xy \end{bmatrix}$$

Use $\|.\|_1$ norm in the formula for the condition number and treat the output as a vector of dimension 4, so your Jacobian becomes a 4 x 2 matrix.

Problem 2:

Determine whether the following algorithms are backward stable, stable, or unstable:

a) Computation of
$$f(x,y) = x^2 - y^2$$
 as $\tilde{f}(x,y) = [fl(x) \otimes fl(x)] \ominus [fl(y) \otimes fl(y)]$

b) Computation of
$$f(x,y) = x^2 - y^2$$
 as $\tilde{f}(x,y) = [fl(x) \oplus fl(y)] \otimes [fl(x) \oplus fl(y)]$

c) Computation of
$$f(x) = 1/(1+x)$$
 as $\tilde{f}(x,y) = 1 \oslash [1 \oplus fl(x)]$

Problem 3:

Determine the accuracy of the algorithms in Problem 2. Which of the algorithms a) and b) is more accurate?

James Hahn Homework H5 absolute condition # relative condition H MATH1080 K(x)=1)1 (1x1) = = = 21n(x) (n2x $\hat{K}(x) = |J(x)| = |\frac{2}{x} |n(x)|$ Page 1/2 Well-conditioned when x is large because lim Tinx = 0.

Also, x should be >> 106 because of the natural log. III-conditioned for both small and negative x.

I included the negative condition because In(-x) is under. b. absolute condition # relative condition # SF = 11x+8x11-11x11 $K(x) = \frac{||18F||}{||F(x)||} = \frac{||8x||}{||8x||} = \boxed{1}$ = 11x11+118x11-11x11 = 118x11 11x11 11x11 R(x) = 118 F 11 = 118 x 11 = 1 Well-conditioned for all x because 1 is small. C. absolute condition # relative condition H $J(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & a_{22} & a_{21} \\ 1 & 0 & a_{12} & a_{11} \end{bmatrix}_{2x4}$ K(x)=11)(x)1100 11x1100 11F(x)1100 = $\left[\max \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{m} \max(x) \frac{\max(x)}{\max(tr(x), det(x))}\right]$ $\hat{K}(x) = \|J(x)\|_{\infty} = \max_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} J(x_j)_{i,j}$ Well-conditioned when all values of x are small d. absolute condition # relative condition # $K(x,y)=||J(x,y)||_{1}\frac{||Exy||_{1}}{||F(x,y)||_{1}}$ $\hat{K}(x,y) = \|J(x,y)\|_{1} = \max_{i=1}^{2} J(x,y)_{i}$ = max = J(x,y); max (x,y)

i=1 max (xy, x2, y2)

Well-conditioned when both x and y are small

(2) a.
$$\tilde{f}(x,y) = (f(x)) \oplus f(x)) \oplus (f(x)) \oplus f((x))$$

$$= (\left[x(1+\epsilon_{1})x(1+\epsilon_{1})\right](1+\epsilon_{2}) - \left[y(1+\epsilon_{2})y(1+\epsilon_{2})\right](1+\epsilon_{2})) \oplus \left[(x^{2}(1+\epsilon_{1})x(1+\epsilon_{2})) - \left[y(1+\epsilon_{2})y(1+\epsilon_{2})\right](1+\epsilon_{2})\right] \oplus \left[(x^{2}(1+\epsilon_{1})x(1+\epsilon_{2})) - y^{2}(1+\epsilon_{1})\right] \oplus \left[x^{2}(1+\epsilon_{2}) - y^{2}(1+\epsilon_{1})\right] \oplus \left[x^{2}(1+\epsilon_{2}) \oplus y(1+\epsilon_{2})\right] \oplus \left[x^{2}(1+\epsilon_{1}) \oplus y(1+\epsilon_{2}) \oplus y(1+\epsilon_{2}) \oplus y(1+\epsilon_{2}) \oplus y(1+\epsilon_{2}) \oplus y(1+\epsilon_{2}) \oplus y(1+\epsilon_{2})$$

$$= (x^{2}(1+\epsilon_{1}) \oplus y(1+\epsilon_{2}) \oplus$$

James Hahn
MATH1080
Homework #5

Page 2/2

Accuracy = $\Delta = O(K(x) \in Mach)$ Since the algorithm is backwards stable (this is theorem 15.1 in the book).

b. f(x,y) = x2-y2

This is the same algorithm as a) with the same conditioning numbers. Since it is also backwards stable, it has the same accuracy: $\Delta = G(K(x) \in Mach)$ where K(x) can be found in the previous problem.

C. $f(x) = \frac{1}{1+x}$ In problem 2 part c), we calculated $\Delta = \frac{\|\tilde{f}(x) - f(\tilde{x})\|}{\|f(\tilde{x})\|} \stackrel{?}{=} 2 \varepsilon_{mach} \approx 0 (\varepsilon_{mach})$

d. Additional question: Which is more accurate, a) or b)?

Answer: Neither. They have the same accuracy.