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# ROUNDING ERRORS IN ALTERNATING DIRECTION METHODS FOR PARABOLIC PROBLEMS 

H. H. Rachford, Jr.

Recently, the rouding error growth in solving a Crank-Nicolson difference analogue of a general second order parabolic problem with smooth coefficients in one space variable was analyzed [1]. It was shown that to maintain a fixed bound on roundinginduced errors the word length of the floating mantissa must be increased in proportion to the logarithm of the number of time-distance mesh points as the time and distance steps, $k$ and $h$, are taken to zero at constant $k / h$. The present work shows that the analysis can be extended to the $p$-dimensional case when the computation is done using a stable, consistent, two-level alternating direction procedure. In this case, the required increase in word length is proportional to $\log \left(p^{2} \bar{N} \bar{M}^{2}\right)$ where $\bar{N}$ is the maximum number of grid points in any line in $R_{h}$, the mesh covering the spatial domain, and $\bar{M}$ is the number of time steps.
Let $L(u) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{p}\left[\left(\partial / \partial x_{i}\right)\left(\bar{\alpha}(x, t)\left(\partial u / \partial x_{i}\right)\right)+\xi(x, t)\left(\partial u / \partial x_{i}\right)\right]+\gamma(x, t) u$, and consider

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(u)=\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}+f(x, t) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

in a bounded region $R \times(0, T]$, where $R \subset \boldsymbol{R}^{p}, \bar{\alpha}, \xi$, and $\gamma$ are scalar valued continuous function of $x \in R^{p}$ and time, $t, 0<\alpha_{0} \leqq \bar{\alpha} \leqq \alpha_{m}, \gamma \leqq 0$, and $u$ is specified such that fourth distance derivatives of $u$ are bounded. We consider the operators

$$
\begin{gathered}
-L_{h_{i}} w(P, t) \equiv \bar{\nabla}_{i}\left(\bar{\alpha}\left(P_{i}^{+1 / 2}, t\right) \nabla_{i} w(P, t)\right)+\left(\frac{1}{2 h_{i}}\right) \xi(P, t)\left[w\left(P_{i}^{+}, t\right)-w\left(P_{i}^{-}, t\right)\right] \\
+ \\
+\gamma(P, t) w(P, t) / p
\end{gathered}
$$

where the grid of points $R_{h}$ over $R$ is generated by the increment vector $h=\left(h_{1}, \ldots\right.$ $\left.\ldots, h_{p}\right), P \in R_{h}$ is defined by $P=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{i}, \ldots, x_{p}\right), P_{i}^{ \pm}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{i} \pm h_{i}, \ldots, x_{p}\right)$, $P^{ \pm 1 / 2}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{i}+h_{i / 2}, \ldots, x_{p}\right), \quad \nabla_{i} w(P)=\left[w\left(P_{i}^{+}\right)-w(P)\right] h_{i}^{-1}$ and $\bar{\nabla}_{i} w(P)=$ $\nabla_{i} w\left(P_{i}^{-}\right)$. The Crank-Nicolson difference analogue of (1) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
w\left(P, t_{n+1}\right)+\frac{1}{2} k \sum_{i=1}^{p} L_{n_{i}}\left[w\left(P, t_{n+1}\right)+w\left(P, t_{n}\right)\right]=w\left(P, t_{n}\right)-k f\left(P, t_{n}+\frac{1}{2} k\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

which relates the values of the approximation $w$ at points of $\left(R_{h} \cup C_{h}\right) \times\left\{t_{n}\right\}$, where $t_{n}=n k, n=0,1, \ldots, K-1, K=T / k$, and where the points $C_{h}$ are points on $\partial R \times\left\{t_{n}\right\}$. We let $N_{h}$ be the number of points of $R_{h}$ and $\|v\|=\left(h_{1}, \ldots, h_{p} \sum_{R_{h}} v_{i}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}$ for all $v \in \boldsymbol{R}^{N_{n}}$. The relation (2) is evidently of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
(I+A) w_{n+1}+B w_{n}=g_{n}, \quad n=0,1, \ldots, K-1 \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A$ and $B$ depend also on $n$. Letting $\sum_{i=1}^{p} A_{i}=A$ and noting that $\left(I+A_{i}\right) w=z$ is readily solved, the alternating direction form of (4) is

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(I+A_{1}\right) \beta_{n+1}^{(1)}+\sum_{j=2}^{p} A_{j} \beta_{n}+B_{\beta_{n}}=g_{n}  \tag{5a}\\
& \left(I+A_{i}\right) \beta_{n+1}^{(i)}=\beta_{n+1}^{(i-1)}+A_{i} \beta_{n}, \quad i=2, \ldots, p \tag{5b}
\end{align*}
$$

and the approximation for $u_{n+1}, \beta_{n+1}$ is taken to be $\beta_{n+1}^{(p)}$.
The computations using (5) produce not $\left\{\beta_{n}\right\}$ but a sequence $\left\{\hat{\beta}_{n}\right\}$, which differs from $\left\{\beta_{n}\right\}$ due to rounding. We follow the type of analysis of Wilkinson [2] and write $\beta_{n+1}^{(i)}=Q_{i} d_{i}, \hat{\beta}_{n+1}^{(i)}=\hat{Q}_{i} \hat{d}_{i}$, where

$$
d_{1}=g_{n}-\left(B+A-A_{1}\right) \beta_{n}, \quad d_{i}=\beta_{n+1}^{(i-1)}+A_{t} \beta_{n}, \quad i=2, \ldots, p,
$$

and

$$
\hat{d}_{1}=g_{n}-\left(B+A-A_{1}\right) \hat{\beta}_{n}+e_{1}, \quad \hat{d}_{i}=\hat{\beta}_{n+1}^{(i-1)}+A_{i} \hat{\beta}_{n}+e_{i}, \quad i=2, \ldots, p
$$

where $e_{i}$ is the error introduced in computing $\hat{d}_{i}$ from the stated arguments, $Q_{i}=\left(I+A_{i}\right)^{-1}$, and $\hat{Q}_{i}$ is a matrix approximating $Q_{i}$ whose existence and exact form depend upon the procedure used to solve (5).

We assume several quantities relevant to the problem to be solved:

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left\|\left(I+A_{i}\right)^{-1}\right\|<1 / \delta, \quad \delta>0,  \tag{6a}\\
\max \left(\left\|g_{n}\right\|+2 \sum_{i}\left\|A_{i} \beta_{n}\right\|+\left\|B \beta_{n}\right\|,\left\|\beta_{n}\right\|\right) \leqq \beta,  \tag{6b}\\
\left\|R_{i}\right\| \leqq M(\tau), \tag{6c}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $R_{i}=\hat{Q}_{i} Q_{i}^{-1}-I$, and $\tau$ is the number of floating base $N$ digits in the mantissa. The existence of $\beta$ and $\delta$ follow from consistency and stability of (5).

From (5), (6), and an examination of $\prod_{i=j}^{q} \hat{Q}_{i}-\prod_{i=j}^{q} Q_{i}$, we conclude that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left\|v_{n+1}\right\| \leqq\left[(1+M)^{p}-1\right] \delta^{-p}\left[g_{n}+\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left\|A_{j} \beta_{n}\right\|+\left\|(B+A) \beta_{n}\right\|\right]+  \tag{7}\\
+\varrho\left(\varrho^{p}-1\right)(\varrho-1)^{-1} \eta_{n}+\left[\|G\|+\| \sum_{j=1}^{p}\left(\prod_{i=j}^{p} \widehat{Q}_{i}-\prod_{i=j}^{p} Q_{i}\right) A_{j}-\right. \\
\left.-\left(\prod_{j=1}^{p} \hat{Q}_{j}-\prod_{j=1}^{p} Q_{j}\right)(B+A) \|\right]\left\|v_{n}\right\|
\end{gather*}
$$

where $v_{n}=\hat{\beta}_{n}-\beta_{n}, \varrho=(1+M) / \delta, \eta_{n}$ is a bound on $\left\|e_{i}\right\|$, and $G \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{p} \prod_{i=j}^{p} Q_{i} A_{j}-$ $-\prod_{k=1}^{p} Q_{k}(B+A)$. It will be seen to be important below that $G$ is the matrix such that $\beta_{n+1}=G \beta_{n}+H g_{n}$ from (5); hence, by stability of (5), $\|G\| \leqq 1+C_{0} k$ for all $n$. Using the methods of (2), we find that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\eta_{n}=\left[\left(k_{1}+S\right) \beta+\left(k_{2}+\beta \delta^{-p}+\alpha\right)\left\|v_{n}\right\|\right] v /(1-\zeta v), \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
k_{1}=\max \left\{1+(1+v) N_{0}[\||B|\|+a(p-1)],\right. & \left.\left[1+(1+v) a N_{0}\right]\right\}, \\
k_{2}=\max \left\{[\||B|\|+a(p-1)]\left[1+(1+v) N_{0}\right],\right. & \left.a\left[(1+v) N_{0}+1\right]\right\},
\end{array}
$$

and $a$ is a bound on $\left\|\left|A_{i}\right|\right\|, v=s N^{1-\tau_{1}}, s=\frac{1}{2}$ or 1 as rounding or chopping occurs in storage, $\tau_{1}=\tau-\log _{N} 1.053, N_{0}$ is the maximum number of sums taken for any element of any matrix-by-vector multiplication in $d_{i}, \mu=\varrho^{p}-\delta^{-p}, S=\mu+\delta^{-p}$, $\alpha=\mu Y, Y=A \sum_{j=1}^{p}\left\|A_{j}\right\|+\|B+A\|$, and $\zeta=\varrho\left(\varrho^{p}-1\right)(\varrho-1)^{-1}$, It follows from
(8) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|v_{n}\right\| \leqq \varphi_{2}\left(\varphi_{1}^{n}-1\right)\left(\varphi_{1}-1\right)^{-1}, \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\varphi_{1}=\left[\|G\|+\alpha+v \zeta\left(k_{2}+\alpha+\beta \delta^{-p}\right)(1-\zeta \nu)^{-1}\right]$ and $\varphi_{2}=\left[\mu+\zeta v\left(k_{1}+\right.\right.$ $\left.+S)(1-\zeta v)^{-1}\right] \beta$. We assume now that $h$ is fixed and that the computations are carried out sothat $M$ decreases at least linearly with $v$. Expansion of $\alpha$ shows that $\alpha=c_{1}^{\prime} M+O\left(M^{2}\right)$ for $M$ small. Thus, if $M=\check{c_{1}} v / c_{1}^{\prime}$ and we choose $v=\check{c}_{1} k$, then $\alpha \leqq c_{1} k$; hence, $\varphi_{1}=1+c_{3} k+O\left(k^{2}\right)$. Since $\mu=c_{4} k+O\left(k^{2}\right), \varphi_{2} \leqq \beta c_{5} k$ for $k$ small, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|v_{n}\right\| \leqq c_{5} T e^{c_{3} T} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

This is satisfactory as it is exactly the same result that would obtain were $L(u)=$ $=\partial u / \partial t$ an ordinary differential equation in $t$.
The question of real interest arises when $h / k=c$ while $k \rightarrow 0$. A suitable ordering of $P \in R_{h}$ yields $A_{i}$ as a diagonal set of $m$ tridiagonal blocks, each irreducible for $h_{i}$ sufficiently small, where $m$ is the number of physical rows of points of $R_{h}$ in $R$ associated with the $i$ th direction. Thus, the solution of $\left(I+A_{i}\right) w=z$ is the solution of im independent tridiagonal systems of the form

$$
\left(\begin{array}{c}
b_{1}, c_{1}, 0, \ldots, 0,  \tag{11}\\
a_{2}, b_{2}, c_{2}, \ldots, \\
\ldots, \ldots, \ldots \\
0,
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
w_{1} \\
\cdot \\
\cdot
\end{array}\right) \equiv \Gamma_{\mathrm{s}} w=r_{i} \bar{d}=d ; \quad s=1, \ldots, m
$$

where $\bar{d}$ is an $m$-segment of $z$ and $r_{i}$ is a normalizing factor so that for $h_{i}$
sufficiently small
i) $\tilde{\delta}+\left|a_{j}\right|+\left|c_{j}\right|<b_{j}\left(1-4 v-3 v^{2}-v^{3}\right) ; j=1, \ldots, J$,
ii) $-1 \leqq a_{i}, c_{j}<0 ; j=1, \ldots, J-1 ; i=2, \ldots, J$, the left hand equality holding for some row of some $\Gamma_{s} ; s=1, \ldots, m$,
iii) $a_{1}=c_{J}=0$,
iv) $\tilde{\delta}>0$.

It is easy to see that $\left\|\Gamma_{s}\right\|_{\infty}<\tilde{\delta}^{-1}$, hence, $\delta=1$ suffices for (6a). Analysis of the floating point operations involved in (11) shows [1] indeed that $\widehat{Q}_{i}$ does exist with $M$ of ( 6 c ) given by

$$
M=\left(15+2\|\Gamma\|_{\infty}\right) \nu \tilde{\delta}^{-1}+O\left(\nu \tilde{\delta}^{-1}\right)^{2}
$$

Taking $v=c_{2} h_{j} k^{2}, h_{j} \leqq h_{i}$, assuming $h_{i} / k=c$ fixed as $k \rightarrow 0$ leads to $v \tilde{\delta}^{-1}=$ $=\alpha_{m} c_{2} k^{2} / 2 c+O\left(k^{3}\right)$, where $\alpha_{m}=\max _{P \in R_{h}} \bar{\alpha}\left(P_{i}^{ \pm 1 / 2}\right)$. For k small, $\varphi_{1}$ and $\varphi_{2}$ of (9) now satisfy: $\varphi_{1} \leqq 1+c_{3}^{\prime} k$, and $\varphi_{2} \leqq c_{5}^{\prime} k^{2}$ for any $c_{1}^{3}>c_{0}+69 \alpha_{m}^{2} p^{2} c_{2} c^{-3}$, and $c_{5}^{\prime}>c_{2} c^{-1} \alpha_{m} \beta p\left(12 p-\frac{11}{2}\right)$.

The following theorem follows from the analysis outlined above.
Theorem. Let (1) be solved in a hypercube using (5) which is assumed to be stable and consistent with $c_{0}$ independent of $p$. Computation is performed with $\tau$-digit floating- $N$ arithmetic. If $N^{-\tau}=\hat{c}_{2} h_{j} p^{-2} k^{2}, h_{j} \leqq h_{i}, i=1,2, \ldots p, h_{j}=c k$, and if $\hat{\beta}_{n}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{n}$ are the computed and exact solutions for (5), respectively, then as $k \rightarrow 0$

$$
\left\|\hat{\beta}_{n}-\beta_{n}\right\| \leqq k c_{5}^{\prime \prime} T e^{c^{\prime \prime}{ }_{3} T},
$$

where $c_{3}^{\prime \prime}>c_{0}+73 s N \bar{\alpha}_{M}^{2} \hat{c}_{2} c^{-3}, \quad c_{5}^{\prime \prime}>1.053 s N \hat{c}_{2} c^{-1} \bar{\alpha}_{M} \beta\left[12-11(2 p)^{-1}\right]$ and $s$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ or 1 as rounding or truncation occurs, respectively.

Although the analysis has ignored the variations of $A$ and $B$ with $n$, we need only note that the bounds may be interpreted over all $n$, and that stability implies $\left\|G_{n}\right\| \leqq$ $\leqq 1+C_{0} k$ independent of $n$ to complete the proof. Further, the analysis does not assume symmetry of $A_{i}$, but only the inequalities (12). Thus, for any shape region approximated with difference relations of positive type we shall expect the theorem to hold.
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