

On the definition of the stability region of multistep methods

Lajos Lóczi*

January 30, 2019

Abstract

The usual definition of the stability region of implicit multistep methods often implies that there are some isolated points of stability within the region of instability of the numerical method. These isolated stable points may appear when the leading coefficient of the characteristic polynomial of the method vanishes—they cannot be detected by the well-known root locus method, and their existence renders many results about stability regions problematic. It is suggested that the definition of the stability region should exclude such isolated points.

1 Introduction

The aim of this short note is to point out the presence of certain isolated points of stability within the region of instability of some common implicit numerical methods. We argue that these points should not be included in the definition of the stability region.

Stability properties of a broad class of numerical methods (including Runge–Kutta methods, linear multistep methods, or multistep multiderivative methods) for solving initial value problems of the form

$$y'(t) = f(t, y(t)), \quad y(t_0) = y_0 \quad (1)$$

can be analyzed by studying the stability region of the method. When an s -stage k -step method ($s \geq 1$, $k \geq 1$ fixed positive integers) with constant step size $h > 0$ is applied to the linear test equation

$$y' = \lambda y \quad (\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \text{ fixed, } y(0) = y_0 \text{ given}),$$

the method yields a numerical solution y_n ($n \in \mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$) that satisfies a recurrence relation of the form [1]

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{j=0}^s \sum_{\ell=0}^k a_{j,\ell} \mu^j y_{n+\ell} = 0, & n \in \mathbb{N}, \\ a_{j,\ell} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \sum_{j=0}^s |a_{j,k}| > 0, \quad \mu := h\lambda. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

*Lloczi@inf.elte.hu, Department of Numerical Analysis, Faculty of Informatics, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

The characteristic polynomial associated with the method takes the form

$$\Phi(\zeta, \mu) := \sum_{j=0}^s \sum_{\ell=0}^k a_{j,\ell} \mu^j \zeta^\ell \quad (\zeta \in \mathbb{C}, \mu \in \mathbb{C}). \quad (3)$$

The stability region of the method is defined [3] as

$$\mathcal{S} := \{\mu \in \mathbb{C} : \text{all roots } \zeta_m(\mu) \text{ of } \zeta \mapsto \Phi(\zeta, \mu) \text{ satisfy } |\zeta_m(\mu)| \leq 1, \quad (4)$$

and multiple roots satisfy $|\zeta_m(\mu)| < 1\}$.

Remark 1.1 In [1], we have $\mu \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ in (4) instead of $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$.

The above definition (4) characterizes the boundedness of the sequence y_n ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) generated by the numerical method (2) for any possible set of initial values y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{k-1} and step size $h > 0$.

Example 1.2 A linear k -step method [2, 3] approximating the solution of the initial value problem (1) can be written as

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^k (\alpha_\ell y_{n+\ell} - h\beta_\ell f_{n+\ell}) = 0, \quad (5)$$

where the numbers $\alpha_\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta_\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ ($\ell = 0, \dots, k$) are the method coefficients, $\alpha_k \neq 0$, t_m is defined as $t_0 + mh$ ($m \in \mathbb{N}$), and f_m stands for $f(t_m, y_m)$. The numerical solution y_n approximates the exact solution y at time t_n . For $k = 1$ we have a one-step method, while for $k \geq 2$ the scheme is called a multistep method. The method is implicit, if $\beta_k \neq 0$. By setting

$$\varrho(\zeta) := \sum_{\ell=0}^k \alpha_\ell \zeta^\ell \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(\zeta) := \sum_{\ell=0}^k \beta_\ell \zeta^\ell,$$

the associated characteristic polynomial (3) is $\Phi(\zeta, \mu) = \varrho(\zeta) - \mu\sigma(\zeta)$.

Example 1.3 Multiderivative multistep methods (or generalized multistep methods) extend the above class of methods by evaluating the derivatives of f at certain points as well. For example, a second-derivative k -step method [3] has the form

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^k (\alpha_\ell y_{n+\ell} - h\beta_\ell f_{n+\ell} - h^2\gamma_\ell g_{n+\ell}) = 0,$$

where $g_m := g(t_m, y_m)$ with $g(t, y) := \partial_1 f(t, y) + \partial_2 f(t, y) \cdot f(t, y)$, and the method is determined by the real coefficients α_ℓ ($\alpha_k \neq 0$), β_ℓ and γ_ℓ . The associated characteristic polynomial (3) is now $\Phi(\zeta, \mu) = \sum_{\ell=0}^k (\alpha_\ell - \mu\beta_\ell - \mu^2\gamma_\ell)\zeta^\ell$.

2 Vanishing leading coefficient of the characteristic polynomial

The characteristic polynomial of the implicit Euler method with $s = k = 1$ is $\Phi(\zeta, \mu) = (1 - \mu)\zeta - 1$. We have $1 \in \mathcal{S}$, because $\Phi(\zeta, 1) = 0$ has no roots in \mathbb{C} , so (4) is satisfied vacuously. For $\mu \neq 1$, $\Phi(\zeta, \mu) = 0$ if and only if $\zeta = 1/(1 - \mu)$. Hence

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\mu \in \mathbb{C} : |\mu - 1| \geq 1\} \cup \mathcal{E} \quad (6)$$

with $\mathcal{E} = \{1\}$. In particular, $1 \in \partial\mathcal{S}$, the boundary of \mathcal{S} .

Motivated by the above example, let us rewrite Φ in (3) as $\Phi(\zeta, \mu) =: \sum_{\ell=0}^k C_\ell(\mu)\zeta^\ell$ with suitable polynomials C_ℓ . The leading coefficient C_k does not vanish identically because of the assumption $\sum_{j=0}^s |a_{j,k}| > 0$ in (2), or $\alpha_k \neq 0$ in Examples 1.2 and 1.3. For implicit methods, C_k is a polynomial of degree at least 1, so the finite set

$$\mathcal{E} := \{\mu \in \mathbb{C} : C_k(\mu) = 0\} \quad (7)$$

is non-empty.

Besides the implicit Euler method, there are many examples of classical implicit numerical methods when all the complex roots of the polynomial $\Phi(\cdot, \mu^*)$ have modulus strictly less than 1 for some $\mu^* \in \mathcal{E}$, hence $\mu^* \in \mathcal{S}$.

Example 2.1 *The characteristic polynomial of the 2-step BDF method [3] is $\Phi(\zeta, \mu) = (3 - 2\mu)\zeta^2 - 4\zeta + 1$. Its stability region is depicted in Figure 1. Now $\mathcal{E} = \{3/2\} \subset \mathcal{S}$, because the unique root of $\Phi(\zeta, 3/2) = 0$ is $\zeta = 1/4$.*

Example 2.2 *For several other BDF, implicit Adams, or Enright methods [3] (see Figure 1) we have the inclusion $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{S}$.*

Now we point out some consequences of the definition (4).

Observation 1. If the step size $h > 0$ of the method (2) is chosen in a way that $\mu = h\lambda \in \mathcal{E}$, then the order of the recurrence becomes strictly less than k , hence, in general, the initial values y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{k-1} cannot be chosen arbitrarily.

Observation 2. Recursions with almost zero leading coefficients can be highly unstable with respect to small perturbations. This renders the corresponding numerical method useless in practice. For example, let us consider the recursion corresponding to the 2-step BDF method $(3 - 2\mu)y_{n+2} - 4y_{n+1} + y_n = 0$. For $\mu = 3/2 \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} y_n = 0$ for any starting value y_0 , but for small $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < |\mu - 3/2| < \varepsilon$, the sequence $|y_n|$ quickly “blows up” for generic starting values, since the absolute value of one root of the characteristic polynomial $(3 - 2\mu)\zeta^2 - 4\zeta + 1 = 0$ is large.

Observation 3. One way to study \mathcal{S} —or, more precisely, $\partial\mathcal{S}$ (the boundary of \mathcal{S})—in the complex plane is to plot the *root locus curve* corresponding to the method [3].

For methods in Example 1.2, Φ is linear in μ , so $\Phi(\zeta, \mu) = 0$ implies $\mu = \varrho(\zeta)/\sigma(\zeta)$ (for $\sigma(\zeta) \neq 0$). The root locus curve is then the parametric curve

$$[0, 2\pi) \ni \vartheta \mapsto \mu(\vartheta) := \frac{\varrho(e^{i\vartheta})}{\sigma(e^{i\vartheta})}. \quad (8)$$

For methods in Example 1.3, the equation $\Phi(e^{i\vartheta}, \mu) = 0$ is quadratic in μ and can be solved to obtain two root locus curves

$$[0, 2\pi) \ni \vartheta \mapsto \mu_{1,2}(\vartheta) \quad (9)$$

corresponding to the method. In general, the root locus curve of the method (2) is defined in [1, Definition (2.21)] as

$$\Gamma := \{\mu \in \overline{\mathbb{C}} : \exists \zeta \text{ with } |\zeta| = 1 \text{ and } \Phi(\zeta, \mu) = 0\}.$$

Simple examples show that the root locus curve Γ can be a *proper subset* of the boundary of the stability region $\partial\mathcal{S}$. In [1, Corollary 2.6] it is shown however that for methods satisfying Property C (see [3, Definition 4.7] or [1, Formula (2.9)]), one has $\partial\mathcal{S} = \Gamma$.

According to [3, Section V.4], all one-step methods have Property C, so, for example, the implicit Euler method also has. And indeed, applying [1, Proposition 2.7] to the implicit Euler method we get that the polynomials $\varrho(\zeta) = \zeta - 1$ and $\sigma(\zeta) = \zeta$ have no common roots and ϱ/σ is univalent on the set $\{z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}} : |z - 1| \geq 1\}$, so $Q(\mu) = 1/(1 - \mu)$ has Property C, thus $\partial\mathcal{S} = \Gamma$. Since now $\Phi(\zeta, 1) = \varrho(\zeta) - \sigma(\zeta) = -1$, we see that $1 \notin \Gamma = \partial\mathcal{S}$. On the other hand, we have seen in (6) that $1 \in \partial\mathcal{S}$ due to definition (4). This apparent contradiction seems to indicate that the authors of [1] interpreted definition (4) *intuitively*: a root $\zeta = \infty$ is tacitly introduced as soon as the leading coefficient $C_k(\mu)$ becomes zero. So [1, Corollary 2.6], for example, actually relies on Definition 3.1 below, rather than on definition (4).

Remark 2.3 *In Figure 1, elements of the set $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E}$ (the red dots) are the isolated elements of $\partial\mathcal{S}$, and are not part of the corresponding root locus curves. We remark that there are examples where an isolated element of $\partial\mathcal{S}$ is found on the root locus curve.*

3 Conclusion

Based on the above observations it seems reasonable to refine the definition of the stability region of multistep methods as follows (affecting only the class of implicit methods).

Definition 3.1 *The stability region of a linear multistep or multiderivative multistep method with $k \geq 1$ step(s) and with stability polynomial (3) is defined as*

$$\mathcal{S} := \{\mu \in \mathbb{C} : \text{the degree of } \Phi(\cdot, \mu) \text{ is exactly } k, \\ \text{all roots } \zeta_m(\mu) \text{ of } \zeta \mapsto \Phi(\zeta, \mu) \text{ satisfy } |\zeta_m(\mu)| \leq 1, \text{ and multiple roots satisfy } |\zeta_m(\mu)| < 1\}.$$

Remark 3.2 *Definition 3.1 with the non-vanishing leading coefficient essentially appears, for example, in [4, Section 2.1] (where it is formulated for linear multistep methods, that is, for $s = 1$ in (2)), or in [5, Section 2].*




Figure 1: The *left* figure shows the stability region of the 2-step BDF method in brown and red according to definition (4). The red dot is the unique element of $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E} = \{3/2\}$. The *right* figure shows the stability region of the 3-step Enright method (member of the family presented in Example 1.3) in brown and red. For this method we have $\Phi(\zeta, \mu) = \left(\frac{19\mu^2}{180} - \frac{307\mu}{540} + 1\right) \zeta^3 + \left(-\frac{19\mu}{40} - 1\right) \zeta^2 + \frac{\mu}{20} \zeta - \frac{7\mu}{1080}$, so $\mathcal{E} = \{(307 \pm i\sqrt{28871}) / 114\}$ (represented by the two red dots) and $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{S}$.

References

- [1] R. Jeltsch, O. Nevanlinna, *Stability and Accuracy of Time Discretizations for Initial Value Problems*, Numer. Math., Vol. 40, 245–296 (1982)
- [2] E. Hairer, S. Nørsett, G. Wanner, *Solving Ordinary Differential Equations I. Nonstiff Problems*, Springer, Berlin (2009)
- [3] E. Hairer, G. Wanner, *Solving Ordinary Differential Equations II. Stiff and Differential-Algebraic Problems*, Springer, Berlin (2002)
- [4] M. N. Spijker, *The existence of stepsize-coefficients for boundedness of linear multistep methods*, Appl. Numer. Math., Vol. 63, 45–57 (2013)
- [5] M. N. Spijker, *Stability and boundedness in the numerical solution of initial value problems*, Math. Comp., Vol. 86, No. 308, 2777–2798 (2017)