Rounding Errors and Stability of Algorithms

Let N_{\min} , N_{\max} be the floating point numbers of smallest and largest magnitude in a finite precision system.

Let N_{\min} , N_{\max} be the floating point numbers of smallest and largest magnitude in a finite precision system.

For any normalized number x (which is not necessarily a floating point number in the system) such that $N_{\min} \le |x| \le N_{\max}$,

$$fl(x) = x(1+\delta), |\delta| \le u$$
 (*)

This will be called the fundamental representation/rounding rule.

Let N_{\min} , N_{\max} be the floating point numbers of smallest and largest magnitude in a finite precision system.

For any normalized number x (which is not necessarily a floating point number in the system) such that $N_{\min} \le |x| \le N_{\max}$,

$$fl(x) = x(1+\delta), |\delta| \le u$$
 (*)

This will be called the fundamental representation/rounding rule.

For normalized numbers floating point numbers x, y such that $N_{\min} \le |x \ op \ y| \le N_{\max}$,

$$fl(x \ op \ y) = (x \ op \ y)(1+\delta), \ |\delta| \le u \tag{1}$$

where 'op' is any of the operations $+,-,/,\times$ and the unit roundoff $u\approx 10^{-16}$ in IEEE double precision.

Let N_{\min} , N_{\max} be the floating point numbers of smallest and largest magnitude in a finite precision system.

For any normalized number x (which is not necessarily a floating point number in the system) such that $N_{\min} \le |x| \le N_{\max}$,

$$fl(x) = x(1+\delta), |\delta| \le u$$
 (*)

This will be called the fundamental representation/rounding rule.

For normalized numbers floating point numbers x, y such that $N_{\min} \le |x \ op \ y| \le N_{\max}$,

$$fl(x op y) = (x op y)(1 + \delta), |\delta| \le u$$
 (1)

where 'op' is any of the operations $+,-,/,\times$ and the unit roundoff $u\approx 10^{-16}$ in IEEE double precision.

This is desirable as it implies that the maximum relative error in the operation is of the order of unit roundoff.



Do similar statements hold for normalized numbers x and y that are not floating point numbers?

Do similar statements hold for normalized numbers x and y that are not floating point numbers?

Suppose, $N_{\min} \le |x|, |y|, |x \ op \ y| \le N_{\max}$. In such a case, x and y need to be rounded before performing the operation and

$$fl(x \ op \ y) = fl(fl(x) \ op \ fl(y)) = ((x(1+\epsilon_1)) \ op \ (y(1+\epsilon_2)))(1+\epsilon_3),$$
 where $|\epsilon_j| \le u, \ j=1,2,3.$

Do similar statements hold for normalized numbers x and y that are not floating point numbers?

Suppose, $N_{\min} \le |x|, |y|, |x \ op \ y| \le N_{\max}$. In such a case, x and y need to be rounded before performing the operation and

$$fl(x \ op \ y) = fl(fl(x) \ op \ fl(y)) = ((x(1+\epsilon_1)) \ op \ (y(1+\epsilon_2)))(1+\epsilon_3),$$

where $|\epsilon_j| \le u$, j = 1, 2, 3.

The answer depends on what 'op', x and y are.

Do similar statements hold for normalized numbers x and y that are not floating point numbers?

Suppose, $N_{\min} \le |x|, |y|, |x \ op \ y| \le N_{\max}$. In such a case, x and y need to be rounded before performing the operation and

$$fl(x \ op \ y) = fl(fl(x) \ op \ fl(y)) = ((x(1+\epsilon_1)) \ op \ (y(1+\epsilon_2)))(1+\epsilon_3),$$

where $|\epsilon_j| \le u$, j = 1, 2, 3.

The answer depends on what 'op', x and y are.

In the following

- $O(u) \rightarrow$ quantities whose absolute values are small multiples of unit roundoff u;
- $O(u^2) \rightarrow$ quantities whose absolute values are small multiples of u^2 and can be ignored.



If
$$op = \times$$
, or $op = /$,
$$fl(x op y) = (x op y)(1 + \epsilon), |\epsilon| \le 3u + O(u^2)$$
(2)

If
$$op = \times$$
, or $op = /$,
$$f(x \ op \ y) = (x \ op \ y)(1 + \epsilon), \ |\epsilon| \le 3u + O(u^2) \tag{2}$$

If
$$op = +$$
, or $op = -$,

$$fl(x \ op \ y) = (x \ op \ y) \left(1 + \left(\frac{x\epsilon_1}{x \ op \ y} \ op \ \frac{y\epsilon_2}{x \ op \ y}\right)\right), \quad (3)$$

where $|\epsilon_j| \leq 2u + O(u^2)$.

If
$$op = \times$$
, or $op = /$,
$$f(x \ op \ y) = (x \ op \ y)(1 + \epsilon), \ |\epsilon| \le 3u + O(u^2)$$
 (2)

If op = +, or op = -,

$$fl(x \ op \ y) = (x \ op \ y) \left(1 + \left(\frac{x\epsilon_1}{x \ op \ y} \ op \ \frac{y\epsilon_2}{x \ op \ y}\right)\right), \quad (3)$$

where $|\epsilon_j| \leq 2u + O(u^2)$.

However $\left|\frac{x\epsilon_1}{x \text{ op } y} \text{ op } \frac{y\epsilon_2}{x \text{ op } y}\right| \not\approx O(u)$ if $|x \text{ op } y| \ll |x|$ or $|x \text{ op } y| \ll |y|$.

If
$$op = \times$$
, or $op = /$,
$$f(x \ op \ y) = (x \ op \ y)(1 + \epsilon), \ |\epsilon| \le 3u + O(u^2)$$
 (2)

If op = +, or op = -,

$$fl(x \ op \ y) = (x \ op \ y) \left(1 + \left(\frac{x\epsilon_1}{x \ op \ y} \ op \ \frac{y\epsilon_2}{x \ op \ y}\right)\right), \quad (3)$$

where $|\epsilon_j| \leq 2u + O(u^2)$.

However
$$\left|\frac{x\epsilon_1}{x \text{ op } y} \text{ op } \frac{y\epsilon_2}{x \text{ op } y}\right| \not\approx O(u)$$
 if $|x \text{ op } y| \ll |x|$ or $|x \text{ op } y| \ll |y|$.

This is called *catastrophic cancellation* as it can result in sudden loss of accuracy.



Catastrophic Cancellation

Example 1: In the finite precision system (10, 3, -1, 2) with round to nearest rounding, f(100 - 99.95) = 0.

Example 2: The computation $z = 1 - \sqrt{1 - x^2}$ is prone to catastrophic cancellation for $x \approx 0$. The errors magnify when the computed value is multiplied by a large number.

This may be avoided by using the equivalent formulation $x^2/(1+\sqrt{1-x^2})$.

X	$10^{20}(1-\sqrt{1-x^2})$	$10^{20} \left(x^2 / (1 + \sqrt{1 - x^2}) \right)$
5.3105 <i>e</i> – 007	14100000	14101000
4.7895 <i>e</i> - 007	11469000	11470000
4.2684 <i>e</i> - 007	9114900	9109700
3.7474e - 007	7027700	7021400
3.2263 <i>e</i> - 007	5206900	5204600
2.7053 <i>e</i> - 007	3663700	3659200
2.1842 <i>e</i> - 007	2387000	2385400
1.6632 <i>e</i> - 007	1387800	1383000
1.1421 <i>e</i> – 007	655030	652200
6.2105 <i>e</i> - 008	199840	192850
1 <i>e</i> – 008	11102	5000



Swamping → Catastrophic Cancellation

If $0 < fl(a) \ll fl(b)$, or $fl(b) \ll 0 < fl(a)$, then $fl(a+b) \approx fl(b)$. This is called *swamping*.

$Swamping \rightarrow Catastrophic \ Cancellation$

If $0 < fl(a) \ll fl(b)$, or $fl(b) \ll 0 < fl(a)$, then $fl(a+b) \approx fl(b)$. This is called *swamping*.

Swamping can lead to catastrophic cancellation.

$Swamping \rightarrow Catastrophic \ Cancellation$

If $0 < fl(a) \ll fl(b)$, or $fl(b) \ll 0 < fl(a)$, then $fl(a+b) \approx fl(b)$. This is called *swamping*.

Swamping can lead to catastrophic cancellation.

Exercise: Perform GENP on

$$A = \left[\begin{array}{ccc} 0.1 & 10 & 9.985 \\ 1 & 0.05 & 0.15 \\ 1 & 0.04 & 0.19 \end{array} \right]$$

in the finite precision system (10, 3, -3, 2) with *round to nearest* as the rounding mode. Identify the computations where

- (a) swamping occurs;
- (b) catastrophic cancellation occurs;

Find *L* and *U* of the computed *LU* decomposition and compute $||A - LU||_1$. Repeat the calculations for GEPP.



Backward error Analysis and Stability of Algorithms

Some background

- In the early years of computing, the approach to understanding the accuracy of solution from algorithms involved bounding the rounding error at every stage of the computations.
- Apart from being practically very difficult in the presence of many computations, it was also not very successful as the risk of catastrophic cancellation which was not always possible to predict, loomed over the computations.
- Therefore, there was a general air of pessimism about the extent of errors in solutions computed via algorithms operating in a finite precision environment.
- ► In the early 1960s, a radically different approach to rounding error analysis was proposed by James Wilkinson.
- ▶ His idea was that instead of looking at errors at every stage of the computation, one should look at the computed answer from the algorithm as the exact answer of the same algorithm applied to perturbed data, the perturbations arising from a pushback of the errors in the computations back into data.

Backward Errors

- These relative perturbations to the data arising from the pushback are called the backward errors of the computed answer.
- If they are of the order of unit roundoff, then the algorithm is said to be backward stable or simply stable.
- Since working in finite precision environments and consequent rounding errors are inevitable for algorithms, the most that should be expected of them is that they are backward stable.
- After this, the accuracy of the computed solution depends upon the sensitivity of the problem to small changes in the data.
- ► The backward error analysis of the algorithm is combined with the sensitivity analysis of the problem to bound the relative errors in the solution.
- This approach separates the properties of the algorithm from those of the problem.
- To contrast with backward errors, the usual errors in computations are also referred to as forward errors.



Backward error analysis



James Hardy Wilkinson, FRS (1919-1986)

Systematic analysis of backward errors and backward stability was introduced by James Wilkinson.

Posteriori versus priori backward error analysis of GE

- The analysis of backward stability of algorithms is an analysis of the backward errors in the computations.
- ▶ For Gaussian Elimination one such (posteriori) analysis was already undertaken *after* solving a system of equations and using the residual vector associated with the computed solution to construct perturbed systems of equations of which the computed solution is an exact solution.
- This approach depends on the computed solution and can only say whether the algorithm is backward stable with respect to the given problem.
- ► To know about the backward stability property of an algorithm in general before using it to solve a problem a *priori backward error analysis* is required.

A priori backward error analysis

- This analysis is made without actually using the algorithm to solve a problem.
- ▶ It involves estimating maximum possible backward errors that can arise in standard arithmetic operations as an initial step.
- These are used to estimate maximum possible backward errors in the computed answer arising from the collective backward errors in the computations.
- ► The algorithm is declared to be backward stable if these maximum possible values of backward errors are O(u).
- As the analysis should hold for any problem that the algorithm is designed to solve, it cannot make assumptions about the input data and computed solution.
- However, sometimes these backward errors are guranteed to be of the order of unit roundoff only under certain conditions. In such cases the algorithm is conditionally backward stable.
- ▶ If no such conditions are required for backward stability, then the algorithm is *unconditionally backward stable*.



$$\frac{|f(x \ op \ y) - (x \ op \ y)|}{|x \ op \ y|} \rightarrow \text{ relative (forward) error in } (x \ op \ y).$$

$$\frac{|f(x \ op \ y) - (x \ op \ y)|}{|x \ op \ y|} \rightarrow \text{ relative (forward) error in } (x \ op \ y).$$

In contrast if

$$fl(x \ op \ y) = \hat{x} \ op \ \hat{y}$$

for some \hat{x}, \hat{y} , then,

$$\frac{|\hat{x} - x|}{|x|}, \frac{|\hat{y} - y|}{|y|} \rightarrow \text{ relative backward errors in } (x \text{ op } y).$$

$$\frac{|f(x \ op \ y) - (x \ op \ y)|}{|x \ op \ y|} \rightarrow \text{ relative (forward) error in } (x \ op \ y).$$

In contrast if

$$fl(x \ op \ y) = \hat{x} \ op \ \hat{y}$$

for some \hat{x}, \hat{y} , then,

$$\frac{|\hat{x}-x|}{|x|}, \frac{|\hat{y}-y|}{|y|} \rightarrow \text{ relative backward errors in } (x \text{ op } y).$$

The operation op is said to be backward stable if

$$\frac{|\hat{x}-x|}{|x|}$$
 and $\frac{|\hat{y}-y|}{|y|}$ are $O(u)$.

Since the relative representation error that arises when rounding normalized numbers with absolute values between N_{\min} and N_{\max} is very small, these may be ignored in the push back.

Since the relative representation error that arises when rounding normalized numbers with absolute values between N_{\min} and N_{\max} is very small, these may be ignored in the push back.

Therefore in backward error analysis it is assumed that all the standard arithmetic operations occur between floating point numbers.

Since the relative representation error that arises when rounding normalized numbers with absolute values between N_{\min} and N_{\max} is very small, these may be ignored in the push back.

Therefore in backward error analysis it is assumed that all the standard arithmetic operations occur between floating point numbers.

Theorem Let x, y be floating point numbers. Whenever op is any of the standard operations $+, -, /, \times$,

$$fl(x \ op \ y) = \hat{x} \ op \ \hat{y}$$

where $\hat{x} = x(1 + \delta_1)$ and $\hat{y} = y(1 + \delta_2)$ with $|\delta_j| \le u$, for j = 1, 2.

Since the relative representation error that arises when rounding normalized numbers with absolute values between N_{\min} and N_{\max} is very small, these may be ignored in the push back.

Therefore in backward error analysis it is assumed that all the standard arithmetic operations occur between floating point numbers.

Theorem Let x, y be floating point numbers. Whenever op is any of the standard operations $+, -, /, \times$,

$$fl(x \ op \ y) = \hat{x} \ op \ \hat{y}$$

where
$$\hat{x} = x(1 + \delta_1)$$
 and $\hat{y} = y(1 + \delta_2)$ with $|\delta_j| \le u$, for $j = 1, 2$.

Hence all the standard arithmetic operations between two floating point numbers are backward stable operations.

A fundamental result in backward error analysis

Theorem Let w_i , i = 1, ..., n, be floating point numbers. Then there exist γ_i , i = 1, ..., n, satisfying $|\gamma_i| \le (n-1)u + O(u^2)$, such that

$$fl\left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(1+\gamma_i). \tag{4}$$

irrespective of the order of summation.

A fundamental result in backward error analysis

Theorem Let w_i , i = 1, ..., n, be floating point numbers. Then there exist γ_i , i = 1, ..., n, satisfying $|\gamma_i| \le (n-1)u + O(u^2)$, such that

$$fl\left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(1+\gamma_i). \tag{4}$$

irrespective of the order of summation.

Corollary Let $u_i, w_i, i = 1, ..., n$, be floating point numbers. Then there exist $\gamma_i, i = 1, ..., n$, satisfying $|\gamma_i| \le nu + O(u^2)$, such that

$$fl\left(\sum_{i=1}^n u_i w_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i w_i (1 + \gamma_i). \tag{5}$$

irrespective of the order of summation.

