

Multistep methods

The other major class of nonstiff solvers use previous values of y_k

The best-behaved are the **Adams methods** (Adams, 1893)

Go back to the quadrature formula:

<https://powcoder.com>

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} f(\tau, y(\tau)) d\tau$$

Add WeChat powcoder

Basic idea:

- use previous f values $f_k \equiv f(t_k, y_k)$, $k = n, n-1, \dots$ to construct a polynomial interpolant
- integrate the interpolant (extrapolation) to get y_{n+1}

Adams-Bashforth methods

A family of **explicit** multistep methods

Example

Use f_n only \rightarrow Euler's Method = AB1

our previous derivation using LH rectangle rule

Example

Use $f_n, f_{n-1} \rightarrow$ linear interpolant \rightarrow 2nd order 2-step method AB2

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + h \left[\frac{3}{2} f_n - \frac{1}{2} f_{n-1} \right]$$

Note: we need 2 starting values y_0, y_1 to start this

Multistep methods are not self-starting

Need to use another method to start them off.

Why bother?

Same idea → AB3:

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + \frac{h}{12} [23f_n - 16f_{n-1} + 5f_{n-2}]$$

AB4 etc.

Why bother?

Assignment Project Exam Help

<https://powcoder.com>

Add WeChat powcoder

AB methods need only 1 function evaluation per step

⇒ very efficient compared to RK methods!

Properties of AB methods

stability analysis more complicated for multistep methods

i.e. harder to guarantee 0 stability

But Adams methods are well-behaved ...

<https://powcoder.com>

All Adams methods are 0-stable

⇒ **All Adams methods are convergent**

For Adams-Bashforth methods, regions of absolute stability shrink rapidly with increasing order (Diagram)

To improve linear stability behavior look at **implicit methods**.

Adams-Moulton methods

Assignment Project Exam Help

Back to derivation but now include f_{n+1} in the interpolant

<https://powcoder.com>

→ y_{n+1} appears on both sides of the equation, so must solve a nonlinear equation (or system) at each time step

Add WeChat powcoder

→ a family of implicit multistep methods — **Adams-Moulton methods** (Adams 1883)

Backward Euler method

Example

0th degree interpolating thru f_{n+1} use RH rectangle rule

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + hf_{n+1} = y_n + hf(t_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$$

Backward Euler method = AM0 (1st order implicit method)

$$\text{RAS: } \{h\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |1 - h\lambda| > 1\}$$

Backward Euler method is 1st order convergent and A-stable!

Trapezoid method

Example

put linear interpolant thru f_n, f_{n+1} and integrate over $[t_n, t_{n+1}]$ (trapezoid rule) \rightarrow **implicit trapezoid rule** = AM1

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + \frac{h}{2}[f_n + f_{n+1}] = y_n + \frac{h}{2}[f(t_n, y_n) + f(t_{n+1}, y_{n+1})]$$

Error of trapezoid rule $\sim h^3 \rightarrow$ 2nd order method

RAS: $\{h\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < 0\}$

Trapezoid method is 2nd order convergent and A-stable!

Implemented in variable-step manner in MATLAB's ode23t

Predictor-corrector methods

In practice, we don't solve AM methods to convergence
instead just do **1 iteration of the fixed point iteration**

Example

Solve trapezoid method

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + \frac{h}{2} [f(t_n, y_n) + f(t_{n+1}, y_{n+1})] \equiv g(y_{n+1})$$

using the fixed point iteration

$$y_{n+1}^{(k+1)} = g(y_{n+1}^{(k)}) = y_n + \frac{h}{2} [f(t_n, y_n) + f(t_{n+1}, y_{n+1}^{(k)})]$$

but need initial guess for y_{n+1} !

use corresponding AB method (explicit) of same order to get initial guess

$y_{n+1}^{(0)}$

→ **Predictor-Corrector pair** (Moulton, Milne 1926)

Adams-Bashforth-Moulton

Use AB (explicit) to get initial guess \hat{y}_{n+1} — the **predictor** step
 then use AM method (1 iteration of fixed point iteration) to get y_{n+1} —
 the **corrector** step

Assignment Project Exam Help

Example

AB2-AM1 (both 2nd order)

$$\hat{y}_{n+1} = y_n + h\left[\frac{3}{2}f_n - \frac{1}{2}f_{n-1}\right] \text{ Predict}$$

$$\hat{f}_{n+1} = f(t_{n+1}, \hat{y}_{n+1}) \text{ Evaluate}$$

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + \frac{h}{2}[f_n + \hat{f}_{n+1}] \text{ Correct}$$

$$f_{n+1} = f(t_{n+1}, y_{n+1}) \text{ Evaluate (ready for next step)}$$

PECE

Overall → an explicit method with 2 function evaluations per step but
 much bigger stability regions (than AB)

Modern Adams codes

In practice, modern Adams codes are variable-step (messy) and variable order — not for amateurs

Example

<https://powcoder.com>

Mathematica's `NDSolve` (500,000 lines of C)

Add WeChat powcoder

Example

MATLAB's `ode113` — Adams methods of orders 1–13
(700 lines of MATLAB)

Summary of nonstiff solvers

1-step (RK)	Multistep (Adams)
<p>expensive for high order p</p> <p>$\geq p$ Fevals per step</p> <p>stability region grows with order</p> <p>0-stable \implies convergent</p> <p>variable-step \rightarrow simple code</p> <p>self-starting</p> <p>general purpose solver</p>	<p>easy to get high order</p> <p>2 Fevals per step (Pred-Corr)</p> <p>stability region shrinks with order</p> <p>0-stable \implies convergent</p> <p>variable step/order \rightarrow complex code</p> <p>start with low order or RK</p> <p>best if problem very smooth</p> <p>or tight tolerances</p> <p>or f very expensive</p>

Stiff solvers

The methods we have seen so far (except implicit trapezoid method = AM1) have had finite regions of absolute stability.

⇒ if $\operatorname{Re}(hJ) \ll 0$, the stepsize will need to be tiny for accurate numerical solution

⇒ h determined by stability, not accuracy

What happens if you try a nonstiff variable-step solver (e.g. ode23) on a stiff problem?

Demo

A nonstiff solver on a stiff problem

If h is outside stability region, the 2 estimates will vary a lot (due to error growth)

→ the solver thinks h is too big (for accuracy reasons) so cuts h down

⇒ solver keeps going happily, just with very small steps, so as to keep h inside the stability region

Moral: a nonstiff solver will solve a stiff problem — just takes a long time to do it!

The Dahlquist Barrier

To avoid this problem need methods with unbounded stability domains, such as A-stable methods

The Backward Euler (Implicit Trapezoid) methods are A-stable, but only 1st (2nd) order resp.

Can we do better? No

<https://powcoder.com>

Theorem

No A-stable multistep method has order > 2 (Dahlquist 1963)

To get around the Dahlquist barrier, we weaken our requirement from A-stability.

Problems with sharp transients typically have λ near the negative real axis, not near the imaginary axis (**oscillatory ODEs**)

\implies A-stability is too strong for most stiff problems

$A(\alpha)$ -stability

\Rightarrow weaken **A-stability** to require

<https://powcoder.com>

for λh in a wedge about negative real axis i.e. doesn't include region near imaginary axis \rightarrow **$A(\alpha)$ -stability**

then the Dahlquist barrier doesn't apply

\rightarrow higher order methods?

BDF methods

The first common class of methods to have these properties were the **BDF methods** (Curtiss & Hirschfelder 1953, Gear 1971), which we get by approximating y' not $\int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} f dt$. Start from

$$y'(t_{n+1}) = f(t_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$$

\Rightarrow we'll have only 1 f i.e. $f_{n+1} \rightarrow$ an implicit method
Now approximate the LHS by the derivative of the polynomial interpolant thru $t_{n+1}, t_n, t_{n-1} \dots$

Example

Use $t_{n+1}, t_n \rightarrow$ **B**ackward **D**ifference **F**ormula

$$y' \approx \frac{y_{n+1} - y_n}{h}$$

\rightarrow Backward Euler method = AM0 = BDF1

BDF1-5

Example

Use $t_{n+1}, t_n, t_{n-1} \rightarrow$ Assignment Project Exam Help

$$y_{n+1} - \frac{4}{3}y_n + \frac{1}{3}y_{n-1} = \frac{2}{3}hf_{n+1}$$

= BDF2 — a 2nd order A-stable, L-stable method Add WeChat powcoder

Proceeding in the same way \rightarrow BDF3, BDF4, BDF5 with stability regions showing $A(\alpha)$ stability.

BDF methods have traded in A-stability near the imaginary axis for L-stability \rightarrow first general purpose stiff solvers

Solving implicit methods

These stability regions only hold if we solve nonlinear equations to convergence – how to do this?

Example

use Backward Euler to illustrate

Can we use fixed point iteration?

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + hf(t_{n+1}, y_{n+1}) \equiv g(y_{n+1})$$

Fixed point iteration only converges if $|g'(x^*)| < 1$ (a **contraction mapping**)

In our case $g' = h \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} = hJ$ so the restriction $|g'(x^*)| < 1 \implies$

$$|hJ| < 1$$

which then puts the same restrictions on stepsize that we must lift to solve stiff problems

Moral: cannot use fixed-point iteration to solve implicit equations for stiff problems

Modern stiff solvers

Variable-step variable-order codes based on BDF or similar methods

Example

[Assignment Project Exam Help](https://powcoder.com)

Mathematica's `NDSolve` switches between Adams methods and BDF methods when it thinks ODE has become stiff.

<https://powcoder.com>

Example

[Add WeChat powcoder](https://powcoder.com)

Matlab's `ode15s` uses similar methods and has an option to use BDF

All MATLAB's IVP solvers have the same calling sequence

⇒ just replace `ode23` by `ode113` or `ode15s` to use a different solver!

Is that all?

NO

Implicit RK solvers (Butcher, 1964):

- are all convergent
- can be A-stable and high-order
- can be L-stable and high-order
- can be proved stable for nonlinear nonautonomous problems

BUT take a lot more work! :-)

Example

MATLAB ode23tb

2nd order A-stable, AND L-stable

Assignment Project Exam Help

End of Week 11

<https://powcoder.com>

Add WeChat powcoder