## Section 8.2: Accuracy of numerical methods

## Main Topics:

- Accuracy of Euler's method,
- Error terms
- Taylor expansions

Recall Euler's method for the initial value problem

$$
y^{\prime}(t)=f(t, y) \quad \text { with initial condition } y\left(t_{0}\right)=y_{0}
$$

Goal: to approximate the solution $y=\phi(t)$ by a piecewise linear function on some interval $[a, b]$, where $a=t_{0}$.
Tools: the given function $f(t, y)$ and the given initial condition $y\left(t_{0}\right)=y_{0}$.
Grid: choose mesh points

$$
a=t_{0}<t_{1}<t_{2}<\cdots<t_{N}=b
$$

and split the interval $[a, b]$ as

$$
[a, b]=\left[a=t_{0}, t_{1}\right] \cup\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right] \cup \cdots \cup\left[t_{N-1}, t_{N}=b\right]
$$

To simplify, all intervals will be supposed to have equal length $h$.
Euler's algorithm: for $n=1,2, \cdots, N$, the approximation $y_{n}$ of $\phi\left(t_{n}\right)$ is recursevely defined, according to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& t_{n+1}=t_{n}+h \\
& y_{n+1}=y_{n}+h f\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Example:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& y^{\prime}(t)=1-t+4 y \\
& y(0)=1
\end{aligned}
$$

So:

$$
f(t, y)=1-t+4 y, \quad t_{0}=0 \quad \text { and } \quad y_{0}=1
$$

Take $[a, b]=\left[t_{0}, b\right]=[0,2]$ and compare Euler's approximations for different choices of the step size $h$ with the exact solution

$$
y=\phi(t)=\frac{1}{4} t-\frac{3}{16}+\frac{19}{16} e^{4 t}
$$

| A comparison of results for the numerical solution of $\frac{d y}{d t}=1-t+4 y, y(0)=1$ using <br> the Euler method for different step sizes $h$. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $t$ | $h=0.05$ | $h=0.025$ | $h=0.01$ | $h=0.001$ | Exact |
| 0.0 | 1.0000000 | 1.0000000 | 1.0000000 | 1.0000000 | 1.0000000 |
| 0.1 | 1.5475000 | 1.5761188 | 1.5952901 | 1.6076289 | 1.6090418 |
| 0.2 | 2.3249000 | 2.4080117 | 2.4644587 | 2.5011159 | 2.5053299 |
| 0.3 | 3.4333560 | 3.6143837 | 3.7390345 | 3.8207130 | 3.8301388 |
| 0.4 | 5.0185326 | 5.3690304 | 5.6137120 | 5.7754844 | 5.7942260 |
| 0.5 | 7.2901870 | 7.9264062 | 8.3766865 | 8.6770692 | 8.7120041 |
| 1.0 | 45.588400 | 53.807866 | 60.037126 | 64.382558 | 64.897803 |
| 1.5 | 282.07187 | 361.75945 | 426.40818 | 473.55979 | 479.25919 |
| 2.0 | 1745.6662 | 2432.7878 | 3029.3279 | 3484.1608 | 3540.2001 |
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Accurate if $h=0.001$, but... 2000 steps to move from $t=0$ to $t=2$.

## Errors in numerical approximations

Several sources of errors (step size, rounding off, ...)
So several types of errors have to be considered.

## Set:

$\phi\left(t_{n}\right)=$ exact value of solution at time $t_{n}$
$y_{n}=$ approximation of solution at time $t_{n}$ by Euler's algorithm
$Y_{n}=$ rounded-off value for $y_{n}$ (finite number of digits)
Local truncation error: $e_{n}$
It is the difference between the exact solution and its numerical approximation at the single step $t_{n}$ assuming that all steps from 1 to $n-1$ are correct.
So it is equal to $\phi\left(t_{n}\right)-y_{n}$ if we assume that $\phi\left(t_{1}\right)=y_{1}, \ldots, \phi\left(t_{n-1}\right)=y_{n-1}$.
Global truncation error: $\quad E_{n}=\phi\left(t_{n}\right)-y_{n}$ (without any assumption on the previous steps)
It is the cumulative effect of the local truncation errors at each step, up to the $n$-th step.
Round-off error: $\quad R_{n}=y_{n}-Y_{n}$
Result of rounding-off of the correct value $y_{n}$ due to computer limitations.
Total error at the step $t_{n}: \quad \phi\left(t_{n}\right)-Y_{n}$
Bound for the total error at $t_{n}$ :

$$
\left|\phi\left(t_{n}\right)-Y_{n}\right|=\left|\left(\phi\left(t_{n}\right)-y_{n}\right)+\left(y_{n}-Y_{n}\right)\right| \leq\left|\phi\left(t_{n}\right)-y_{n}\right|+\left|y_{n}-Y_{n}\right| \leq\left|E_{n}\right|+\left|R_{n}\right|
$$

Bound for the total error at $t_{n}$ :

$$
\text { Absolute value of total error at } t_{n}=\left|\phi\left(t_{n}\right)-Y_{n}\right| \leq\left|E_{n}\right|+\left|R_{n}\right|
$$

So:
estimating $\left|E_{n}\right|$ and $\left|R_{n}\right| \Rightarrow$ estimating the accuracy of Euler's method.

- the round-off error $R_{n}$ is hard to estimate, as more random in nature (it depends on the type of computer one uses).
- the global truncation error $E_{n}$ coincide with the local truncation error $e_{n}$ if all previous steps are exact.

This is what we do in the following.
More precisely: Suppose that $y_{1}=\phi\left(t_{1}\right), \ldots, y_{n}=\phi\left(t_{n}\right)$. Then we estimate

$$
\left|E_{n+1}\right|=\left|e_{n+1}\right|=\left|\phi\left(t_{n+1}\right)-y_{n+1}\right|
$$

## Estimation errors by Taylor expansions

Taylor expansion of $\phi$ about $t_{n}$ :

$$
\phi\left(t_{n}+h\right)=\phi\left(t_{n}\right)+\phi^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right) h+\frac{1}{2} \phi^{\prime \prime}\left(\bar{t}_{n}\right) h^{2}
$$

where $\bar{t}_{n}$ is some point in the interval $\left(t_{n}, t_{n}+h\right)$.
Recall Euler's approximation

$$
y_{n+1}=y_{n}+h f\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right)
$$

Substracting both equations, we get:

$$
\phi\left(t_{n+1}\right)-y_{n+1}=\left(\phi\left(t_{n}\right)-y_{n}\right)+h\left(f\left(t_{n}, \phi\left(t_{n}\right)\right)-f\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{2} \phi^{\prime \prime}\left(\bar{t}_{n}\right) h^{2}
$$

We now apply this formula to the true solution, i.e. take $y_{n}=\phi\left(t_{n}\right)$, and get:

$$
e_{n+1}=\frac{1}{2} \phi^{\prime \prime}\left(\bar{t}_{n}\right) h^{2}
$$

So, the local truncation error is proportional to the square $h^{2}$ of the step size.

We found: $e_{n+1}=\frac{1}{2} \phi^{\prime \prime}\left(\bar{t}_{n}\right) h^{2}$
Problem: how to compute $\phi^{\prime \prime}\left(\bar{t}_{n}\right)$ if we do not know $\phi(t)$ ?
Recall that $\phi^{\prime}(t)=f(t, \phi(t))$.
By the chain rule, we see that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi^{\prime \prime}(t) & =f_{t}(t, \phi(t))+f_{y}(t, \phi(t)) \phi^{\prime}(t) \\
& =f_{t}(t, \phi(t))+f_{y}(t, \phi(t)) f(t, \phi(t))
\end{aligned}
$$

But there still the issue of $\bar{t}_{n}$.
One option is to consider the maximum possible value $M$ of $\left|\phi^{\prime \prime}(t)\right|$ (i.e. of the right-hand side of the above equation, which we can compute) on the full interval $[a, b]$. Then one has

$$
\left|e_{n}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2} M h^{2}
$$

Conversely: if we want the absolute value of the local truncation error to be no greater than some fixed value $\epsilon$, we have to choose a step size $h$ such that:

$$
h \leq \sqrt{2 \epsilon / M}
$$

## Example:

Back to the example $\quad \frac{d y}{d t}=1-t+4 y$ with initial condition $y(0)=1$
The exact solution $\phi(t)=\frac{1}{16}\left(4 t-3+19 e^{4 t}\right)$ gives us the best estimate for $\phi^{\prime \prime}$.
We have $\phi^{\prime \prime}(t)=19 e^{4 t}$ and hence

$$
e_{n+1}=\frac{19 e^{4 \bar{t}_{n}} h^{2}}{2} \text { for some } \bar{t}_{n} \in\left(t_{n}, t_{n}+h\right)
$$

Suppose step size is $h=0.05$.
The error in first step is

$$
e_{1}=\phi\left(t_{1}\right)-y_{1}=\frac{19 e^{4 \bar{t}_{0}} 0.0025}{2} \text { for some } 0<\bar{t}_{0}<0.05
$$

Now since $e^{4 \bar{t}_{0}}<e^{0.2}$ we get that

$$
e_{1} \leq \frac{19 e^{0.2} 0.0025}{2} \simeq 0.02901
$$

Note also that $e^{4 \bar{t}_{0}}>1$, and thus

$$
e_{1}>19 \times 0.0025 / 2=0.02375
$$

In other words, we have bounded the local error

$$
0.02375<e_{1} \leq 0.02901
$$

In other words, we have bounded the local error

$$
0.02375<e_{1} \leq 0.02901
$$

Note that the actual error is 0.02542 .
So our bounds are not too bad!
We can proceed similarly for the next steps $t_{2}, t_{3}, \cdots$.
We find that the error becomes progressively worse with increasing $t$.

