

EQUADIFF 7

Shui-Nee Chow; K. J. Palmer

The accuracy of numerically computed orbits of dynamical systems

In: Jaroslav Kurzweil (ed.): Equadiff 7, Proceedings of the 7th Czechoslovak Conference on Differential Equations and Their Applications held in Prague, 1989. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig, 1990. Teubner-Texte zur Mathematik, Bd. 118. pp. 74--76.

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/702394>

Terms of use:

© BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1990

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

THE ACCURACY OF NUMERICALLY COMPUTED ORBITS OF DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS

CHOW S.-N., ATLANTA, GA, U.S.A.
PALMER K.J., CORAL GABLES, FL, U.S.A.

In their papers [2,3] Hammel, Yorke and Grebogi have given a procedure which determines the accuracy of numerically computed orbits of dynamical systems. They apply their procedure to maps which exhibit a large amount of *hyperbolicity*. However their procedure does not use the hyperbolicity explicitly. In this paper we give a procedure for one-dimensional maps which does use the hyperbolicity explicitly. Unlike the procedure of Hammel et al., our procedure works forward. After N iterates we can decide whether our theorem applies and, if it does, we can estimate how far the computed orbit is from a true orbit.

Now we state the main theorem. Let $f : [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$ be a C^2 function and let $\{y_n\}_{n=0}^{N+1}$ be a *pseudo-orbit* of this map, i.e., $|y_{n+1} - f(y_n)|$ is small for $n = 0, 1, \dots, N$. We define the quantities

$$\sigma = \sup_{n=0}^N \sum_{m=n}^N |Df(y_n)^{-1} Df(y_{n+1})^{-1} \dots Df(y_m)^{-1}|,$$

which measures the *expansiveness* of the map, and

$$\tau = \sup_{n=0}^N \left| \sum_{m=n}^N Df(y_n)^{-1} Df(y_{n+1})^{-1} \dots Df(y_m)^{-1} [y_{m+1} - f(y_m)] \right|.$$

It turns out that τ gives a good measure of how close the pseudo-orbit (of course, our numerically computed orbits will be pseudo-orbits) is to a true orbit.

THEOREM. *Let $f : [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$ be a C^2 function with*

$$M = \sup\{|D^2f(x)| : 0 \leq x \leq 1\}.$$

Let $\{y_n\}_{n=0}^{N+1}$ be a pseudo-orbit of f such that

$$2M\sigma\tau \leq 1.$$

Then there is an exact orbit $\{x_n\}_{n=0}^N$ with

$$(1 + 1/2(1 + \sqrt{1 - 2M\sigma\tau}))^{-1} \tau \leq \sup_{n=0}^N |x_n - y_n| \leq 2(1 + \sqrt{1 - 2M\sigma\tau})^{-1} \tau.$$

Outline of proof. Denote by S the set of sequences $\mathbf{x} = \{x_n\}_{n=0}^N$ with $|x_n - y_n| \leq \varepsilon$ for $n = 0, 1, \dots, N$, where

$$\varepsilon = 2\tau / (1 + \sqrt{1 - 2M\sigma\tau}).$$

S is a compact convex subset of \mathbf{R}^{N+1} . We define a mapping T on S . If $\mathbf{x} \in S$ we define

$$(T\mathbf{x})_n = y_n - \sum_{m=n}^N Df(y_n)^{-1} Df(y_{n+1})^{-1} \dots Df(y_m)^{-1} h_m \quad (n = 0, \dots, N),$$

where

$$h_n = f(x_n) - y_{n+1} - Df(y_n)(x_n - y_n).$$

It turns out that T is a continuous mapping of S into itself and so, by Brouwer's fixed point theorem, has a fixed point $\mathbf{x} = \{x_n\}_{n=0}^N$. This is the exact orbit that we wanted.

Note that the idea of this proof was suggested by the proofs of the *shadowing lemma* given in Palmer [4] and Chow, Lin and Palmer [1].

The Method of Computation

Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a C^2 mapping. Suppose our computer starts with a number y_0 in $[0, 1]$ and computes an orbit $\{y_n\}_{n=0}^{N+1}$ of f in single precision. $\{y_n\}$ will be, in fact, a pseudo-orbit. To use the theorem we have to find the quantities σ and τ . For large N it would not be practical to compute the sums $\sum_{m=n}^N$. Instead we calculate the quantities

$$\sigma_p = \sup_{n=0}^N \sum_{m=n}^{\min(n+p, N)} |Df(y_n)^{-1} \dots Df(y_m)^{-1}|,$$

$$\tau_p = \sup_{n=0}^N \left| \sum_{m=n}^{\min(n+p, N)} Df(y_n)^{-1} \dots Df(y_m)^{-1} [y_{m+1} - f(y_m)] \right|,$$

where p is an integer, $0 \leq p \leq N$, such that

$$\mu_p = \sup_{n=0}^{N-p} |Df(y_n)^{-1} \dots Df(y_{n+p})^{-1}| < 1.$$

It turns out that

$$\sigma \leq (1 - \mu_p)^{-1} \sigma_p, \quad \tau \leq (1 - \mu_p)^{-1} \tau_p. \quad (1)$$

The computation of μ_p, σ_p, τ_p is done in double precision. We have fully analyzed the effect of round-off error on these computations. Unless the hyperbolicity is very weak (i.e. σ is large and $\mu_p < 1$ only for large p), it turns out that the effect of round-off error is very slight.

Example. We consider the quadratic map $f(x) = ax(1-x)$ with $a = 3.8$. Then $M = 2a = 7.6$. The computations were done on an IBM compatible computer using Microsoft Quickbasic. For $N = 426,000, p = 30$ and $y_0 = .3$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_p &= 2.297433184600331 * 10^{-3}, \\ \sigma_p &= 375.6005726956602, \\ \tau_p &= 9.60282364278178 * 10^{-6}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the inequalities (1) and taking into account the round-off error, we find that

$$\sigma \leq 376.4658, \quad \tau \leq 9.624939 * 10^{-6}.$$

Then $2M\sigma\tau \leq .05507661$ and

$$2\tau / (1 + \sqrt{1 - 2M\sigma\tau}) \leq 9.76125 * 10^{-6}.$$

Our theorem enables us to conclude that during 426,000 iterates our computed orbit differs by at most $1/10^6$ from a true orbit. Note that the orbit was computed only in single precision, that is to an approximate accuracy of 7 decimal digits. So over 426,000 iterates we have only lost two digits of accuracy.

References

1. S.N. CHOW, X.B. LIN and K.J. PALMER, *A shadowing lemma with applications to semilinear parabolic equations*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 20(1989).
2. S.M. HAMMEL, J.A. YORKE and C. GREBOGI, *Do numerical orbits of chaotic dynamical processes represent true orbits*, J. Complexity 3(1987), 136-145.
3. S.M. HAMMEL, J.A. YORKE and C. GREBOGI, *Numerical orbits of chaotic processes represent true orbits*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 19(1988), 465-470.
4. K.J. PALMER, *Exponential dichotomies, the shadowing lemma and transversal homoclinic points*, Dynamics Reported 1(1988), 265-306.