

PROBABILISTIC ROUNDING ERROR ANALYSIS FROM A STATISTICAL PERSPECTIVE*

YIMING FANG[†] AND LI CHEN[†]

Abstract. The conventional probabilistic rounding error analysis in numerical linear algebra provides worst-case bounds with an associated failure probability, which can still be pessimistic. In this paper, we develop a new probabilistic rounding error analysis from a statistical perspective. By assuming both the data and the relative error are independent random variables, we derive the approximate closed-form expressions for the expectation and variance of the rounding errors in various key computational kernels. Our analytical expressions have three notable characteristics: they are statistical and do not involve a failure probability; they are sharper than other deterministic and probabilistic bounds, using mean square error as the metric; they are correct to all orders of unit roundoff and valid for any dimension. Furthermore, numerical experiments validate the accuracy of our derivations and demonstrate that our analytical expressions are generally at least two orders of magnitude tighter than alternative worst-case bounds, exemplified through the inner products. We also discuss a scenario involving inner products where the underlying assumptions are invalid, i.e., input data are dependent, rendering the analytical expressions inapplicable.

Key words. rounding error analysis, floating-point arithmetic, inner products, matrix-matrix products, triangular systems, LU factorization

MSC codes. 65G50, 65F05

1. Introduction. Rounding error analysis is a crucial method for assessing the numerical stability of algorithms, aiming to refine it based on the intrinsic properties obtained [21]. Classical rounding error analysis obtains backward error bounds involving the constant $\gamma_n = nu / (1 - nu)$ for a dimension n and unit roundoff u [12, Section 3], which offer reasonable backward errors and valuable insights for double-precision arithmetic and moderate dimensions n .

Nevertheless, the above classical rounding error analysis is very pessimistic about the problem with large dimensions and low-precision arithmetic [15]. For example, considering half-precision arithmetic **fp16** (where $u \approx 5 \times 10^{-4}$), it is clear that we cannot obtain any useful information for a problem dimension with a few thousand because $nu > 1$ and γ_n is unmeaning. Notably, machine learning algorithms always involve much larger dimensions of thousands and millions.

To address the pessimistic problem of the classical rounding error analysis, probabilistic rounding error analysis has garnered significant attention. This method models relative errors δ_i as random variables to provide more accurate estimates of their average behavior. Neumann and Goldstine [20] linearized the forward error p as a sum, utilizing the central limit theorem to derive the probability distribution of p . To avoid the assumption that n is sufficiently large for using the central limit theorem, Higham and Mary [18] utilized a concentration inequality to yield the bounds proportional to \sqrt{nu} but its bounds are still pessimistic. By assuming the data and the relative errors are random variables, Higham and Mary further derived tighter bounds and proposed a new algorithm for matrix-matrix products in [14]. Moreover, Ipsen and Zhou [18] derived forward error bounds for inner products with a clear relationship between failure probability and relative error. Additionally, the probabilistic forward error bounds for three classes of mono-precision summation algorithms were derived

* Submitted to the journal's Numerical Algorithms for Scientific Computing section.

[†]CAS Key Laboratory of Wireless-Optical Communications, University of Science and Technology of China, No.96, JinZhai Road Baohe District, Hefei, Anhui, 230026, P.R.China (fym1219@mail.ustc.edu.cn, chenli87@ustc.edu.cn).

in [11].

The aforementioned works conducted the probabilistic rounding error analysis from a worst-case bound perspective. Nevertheless, the corresponding bounds rely on a pessimistic failure probability to determine their validity [18]. There is little research on how to obtain much sharper and more accurate results from a statistical perspective. Note that Constantinides and Dahlqvist [5, 6] derived closed-form expressions for the distribution of the rounding errors under scalar computation when input data are random variables. However, to the best of our knowledge, the expectation and variance of the rounding errors for vector and matrix computation are still unknown. Compared to scalar computation, vector and matrix computation involve higher dimensions and different element combinations, leading to the progressive accumulation of rounding errors.

Motivated by the above observations, in this paper, we give the probabilistic rounding error analysis for random input from a statistical perspective and derive approximate closed-form expressions for the expectation and variance of the rounding errors. Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

Statistical analytical expressions. Previous work has predominantly focused on the worst-case bounds [12–14, 18]. In contrast, we analyze the rounding errors from a statistical perspective. Specifically, we derive the expectation and variance of the rounding errors and provide their approximate closed-form expressions by rigorous proof. This methodology avoids the potentially pessimistic union bound for the probabilities, expanding the applicability of our analysis.

General framework for the analysis of linear algebra algorithms. We extend the results for scalar computation in [5, 6] to a much wider variety of linear algebra algorithms. This includes inner products, matrix-vector products, matrix-matrix products, the solution of triangular systems, and LU factorization, all of which are key computational kernels. Consequently, our comprehensive framework facilitates probabilistic rounding error analysis for various algorithms. For example, by leveraging results from the solution of triangular systems and LU factorization, we can determine the expectation and variance of the rounding errors for linear systems $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$.

Sharper analytical expressions. The most existing literature has almost exclusively focused on deriving the worst-case bounds, encompassing both deterministic loose bounds [12, 18] and probabilistic bounds depending on a pessimistic failure probability to ascertain their validity [13, 14, 18]. Moreover, some of these bounds are exact only in the first-order term and contain higher-order terms such as “ $+\mathcal{O}(u^2)$ ” [14]. It’s noteworthy that when employing low-precision arithmetic, the $\mathcal{O}(u^2)$ term may become significant, even for moderate dimensions n . Our analytical expressions are instead correct to all orders. To further demonstrate the superiority of our analytical expressions, the mean square error (MSE) of the computed results, i.e., the mean square of the rounding errors, serves as the metric for comparing our analytical expressions with other worst-case bounds [12–14, 18]. Numerical experiments demonstrate that our analytical expressions are generally at least two orders of magnitude tighter than alternative worst-case bounds, exemplified through the inner products.

The paper is organized as follows. We first provide the probabilistic floating-point arithmetic model in section 2. Then, we apply this model in section 3 to different numerical linear algebra algorithms, including inner products, matrix-vector products, matrix-matrix products, the solution of triangular systems, and LU factorization. In section 4, we conduct a series of numerical experiments to validate our analytical expressions thoroughly. We summarize the conclusions in section 5.

2. Probabilistic floating-point arithmetic model. We first recall some basic definitions of floating-point arithmetic. A floating-point number system \mathbb{F} is a subset of real numbers whose elements can be expressed as [12]

$$(2.1) \quad f = \pm m \times \eta^{e-t+1},$$

where $\eta = 2$ is the base, the integer t is the precision, the integer e is the exponent within the range $e_{\min} \leq e \leq e_{\max}$, and the integer m is significand satisfying $0 \leq m \leq \eta^t - 1$. Table 2.1 provides parameters for four floating-point arithmetic according to the IEEE standard [1].

Table 2.1: Parameters for Four Floating-point Arithmetic

	(sig., exp.) ⁽¹⁾	u ⁽²⁾	x_{\min} ⁽³⁾	x_{\max} ⁽⁴⁾
bf16	(8, 8)	3.91×10^{-3}	1.18×10^{-38}	3.39×10^{38}
fp16	(11, 5)	4.88×10^{-4}	6.10×10^{-5}	6.55×10^4
fp32	(24, 8)	5.96×10^{-8}	1.18×10^{-38}	3.40×10^{38}
fp64	(53, 11)	4.88×10^{-16}	2.22×10^{-308}	1.80×10^{308}

⁽¹⁾ (sig., exp.) represents number of bits in significand and exponent.

⁽²⁾ $u = \frac{1}{2}\eta^{1-t}$ is unit roundoff.

⁽³⁾ x_{\min} is smallest normalized positive number.

⁽⁴⁾ x_{\max} is largest finite number.

Then, considering the round to nearest (RTN), the standard floating-point arithmetic can be given in the following model.

MODEL 2.1 (Standard floating-point arithmetic model [12]). *Denote by u the unit roundoff. The floating-point system \mathbb{F} adheres to a standard arithmetic model if, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$. One has*

$$(2.2) \quad \mathbf{fl}(x \text{ op } y) = (x \text{ op } y)(1 + \delta), \quad |\delta| \leq u, \quad \text{op} \in \{+, -, \times, /\},$$

where $\mathbf{fl}(x \text{ op } y)$ is the correctly rounded (to nearest) value of $x \text{ op } y$.

Note that the bound of the relative error δ provided by Model 2.1 is only a worst-case scenario, which will be very pessimistic for numerical analysis [15]. When the inputs are random variables, δ can be further assumed to be a random variable for a more precise characterization of the relative error [6, 13, 14]. Specifically, the following probabilistic model of relative error is presented.

MODEL 2.2 (Probabilistic model of the input data and relative error). *Consider the input data are independent random variables. In the computation process, the relative error δ in Model 2.1 associated with every pair of operands are independent random variables sampled from a given distribution \mathcal{D}_{LST} and satisfy $|\delta| \leq u$, where the probability density function (PDF) of δ is given by [5, 6]*

$$(2.3) \quad f_{\delta}(t) \approx \begin{cases} \frac{3}{4u} & t \in \left[-\frac{u}{2}, \frac{u}{2}\right] \\ \frac{1}{2u} \left(\frac{u}{t} - 1\right) + \frac{1}{4u} \left(\frac{u}{t} - 1\right)^2 & t \in \left[-u, -\frac{u}{2}\right) \cup \left(\frac{u}{2}, u\right] \end{cases}.$$

Compared to [14, Model 2], we do not need the input data to be bounded. It is interesting to note from Model 2.2 that the distribution of the relative error δ in (2.3) can be approximately a deterministic distribution, which is independent of their

input distribution [5]. Furthermore, we can calculate the expectation and variance of δ using (2.3) as follows:

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\delta) &\approx \int_{-u}^{-\frac{u}{2}} t \left[\frac{1}{2u} \left(\frac{u}{x} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{4u} \left(\frac{u}{t} - 1 \right)^2 \right] dt + \int_{-\frac{u}{2}}^{\frac{u}{2}} t \frac{3}{4u} dt \\ &+ \int_{\frac{u}{2}}^u t \left[\frac{1}{2u} \left(\frac{u}{t} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{4u} \left(\frac{u}{t} - 1 \right)^2 \right] dt = 0, \end{aligned}$$

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\delta) &\approx \mathbb{E}(\delta^2) - [\mathbb{E}(\delta)]^2 = \mathbb{E}(\delta^2) \\ &= \int_{-u}^{-\frac{u}{2}} t^2 \left[\frac{1}{2u} \left(\frac{u}{t} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{4u} \left(\frac{u}{t} - 1 \right)^2 \right] dt + \int_{-\frac{u}{2}}^{\frac{u}{2}} t^2 \frac{3}{4u} dx \\ &+ \int_{\frac{u}{2}}^u t^2 \left[\frac{1}{2u} \left(\frac{u}{t} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{4u} \left(\frac{u}{t} - 1 \right)^2 \right] dt = \frac{1}{6} u^2 \triangleq \sigma^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, based on Model 2.2, we can obtain the probabilistic floating-point arithmetic in the following lemma.

LEMMA 2.3 (Probabilistic floating-point arithmetic [5]). *The floating-point system \mathbb{F} adheres to a probabilistic arithmetic model if, for any random variable $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$, we have*

$$(2.6) \quad \mathbf{fl}(x \text{ op } y) = (x \text{ op } y) (1 + \delta) = (x \text{ op } y) + \Delta, \quad \delta \sim \mathcal{DIST}, \quad \text{op} \in \{+, -, \times, /\},$$

where $\Delta = (x \text{ op } y) \delta$ is the rounding error, and the PDF of δ is shown in (2.3).

Based on Model 2.2 and (2.4), we observe that the rounding error Δ is uncorrelated with the input because

$$\mathbb{E}\{(x \text{ op } y) \Delta\} = \mathbb{E}\{(x \text{ op } y)^2 \delta\} = \mathbb{E}\{(x \text{ op } y)^2\} \mathbb{E}(\delta) = 0 = \mathbb{E}\{(x \text{ op } y)\} \mathbb{E}(\Delta).$$

Model 2.2 and corresponding Lemma 2.3 are not always realistic. For instance, real-world inputs may lack randomness. Additionally, repeated pairs of operands may result in the same δ , i.e., they are dependent. Nevertheless, the question is whether these assumptions effectively model the actual rounding errors encountered in our computations (See similar comments of Hull and Swenson [17] and Kahan [19], as discussed in [13, 14]). We will show that the outcomes obtained under Model 2.2 closely approximate the actual results through numerical experiments in section 4.

Note that many rounding error analyses depend on Model 2.1, and hence can potentially obtain the distribution (or expectation and variance) of their rounding errors if they can utilize Model 2.2. Moreover, Lemma 2.3 only addresses the distribution of rounding error for scalar computations. When dealing with vector and matrix computations, the complexity and tediousness of calculations make it challenging to derive their rounding error expectation and variance. In the next section, we will provide some examples of numerical linear algebra based on Model 2.2.

3. Application to numerical linear algebra. In this section, we give the rounding error analysis on various algorithms in numerical linear algebra by leveraging Model 2.2. Our goal is to derive the approximate closed-form expressions for the expectation and variance of the rounding errors. Before discussing the rounding errors, we introduce a useful lemma regarding the expectation and variance.

LEMMA 3.1 (Expectation and variance of products of random variables [7, Sec. 2]). *Denote x and y are independent random variables. Then, the expectation and variance of their products xy are given by*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(xy) &= \mathbb{E}(x) \mathbb{E}(y), \\ \text{Var}(xy) &= \text{Var}(x) \text{Var}(y) + \text{Var}(y) [\mathbb{E}(x)]^2 + \text{Var}(x) [\mathbb{E}(y)]^2,\end{aligned}$$

Further, if and only if $\mathbb{E}(x) = \mathbb{E}(y) = 0$, we have

$$\text{Var}(xy) = \text{Var}(x) \text{Var}(y).$$

3.1. Inner products. We apply Model 2.2 to compute the inner product of two vectors, and the expectation and variance of the rounding error are derived in the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.2 (Inner products). *Let $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ be independent random vectors. The entries x_i for $i = 1$ to n are sampled from a distribution with mean μ_x and variance σ_x^2 , while the entries y_i for $i = 1$ to n are sampled from a distribution with mean μ_y and variance σ_y^2 . If $s = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{y}$ is computed in floating-point arithmetic under Model 2.2, the expectation and variance of the rounding error Δs are given by*

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbb{E}(\Delta s) = 0,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}(\Delta s) &\approx \tau \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^n + \frac{(1 + \sigma^2)^2 [(1 + \sigma^2)^{n-1} - 1]}{\sigma^2} - n \right] \\ &+ 2\mu_x^2 \mu_y^2 \left[\frac{(1 + \sigma^2)^2 [(1 + \sigma^2)^{n-1} - 1]}{\sigma^4} - \frac{(n-1)(1 + \sigma^2)}{\sigma^2} - \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \right]\end{aligned}$$

$$(3.2) \quad \triangleq \tilde{h}(\mu_x, \sigma_x, \mu_y, \sigma_y, n, \sigma),$$

where σ is defined in (2.5), and $\tau = \sigma_x^2 \sigma_y^2 + \sigma_x^2 \mu_y^2 + \sigma_y^2 \mu_x^2 + \mu_x^2 \mu_y^2$.

Proof. Assume that the sum $s_n = x_1 y_1 + \dots + x_n y_n$ is evaluated from left to right [12]. Using the Model 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{s}_1 &= \mathbf{fl}(x_1 y_1) = x_1 y_1 (1 + \delta_1), \\ \hat{s}_2 &= \mathbf{fl}(\hat{s}_1 + \mathbf{fl}(x_2 y_2)) = (\hat{s}_1 + x_2 y_2 (1 + \delta_2)) (1 + \delta_3) \\ &= x_1 y_1 (1 + \delta_1) (1 + \delta_3) + x_2 y_2 (1 + \delta_2) (1 + \delta_3),\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_i \sim \text{dist}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. For simplification, we denote

$$\prod_i^{(n)} (1 + \delta_i) = \underbrace{(1 + \delta_i) \cdots (1 + \delta_j)}_{n \text{ terms}}, \quad i \neq j.$$

Then, for $n = 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{s}_3 &= \mathbf{fl}(\hat{s}_2 + \mathbf{fl}(x_3 y_3)) = (\hat{s}_2 + x_3 y_3 (1 + \delta_4)) (1 + \delta_5) \\ &= x_1 y_1 \prod_i^{(3)} (1 + \delta_i) + x_2 y_2 \prod_i^{(3)} (1 + \delta_i) + x_3 y_3 \prod_i^{(2)} (1 + \delta_i).\end{aligned}$$

The pattern is clear. Overall, we have

$$\hat{s} = \hat{s}_n = x_1 y_1 \prod_i^{(n)} (1 + \delta_i) + \sum_{k=2}^n x_k y_k \prod_i^{(n-k+2)} (1 + \delta_i).$$

Therefore, the rounding error Δs is given by

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta s &= \hat{s} - s \\ &= x_1 y_1 \left[\prod_i^{(n)} (1 + \delta_i) - 1 \right] + \sum_{k=2}^n x_k y_k \left[\prod_i^{(n-k+2)} (1 + \delta_i) - 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since x_i, y_i, δ_i are independent of each other and have mean zero, the expectation and variance of Δs can be derived by using (3.3) and Lemma 3.1 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\Delta s) &= \mathbb{E}(x_1) \mathbb{E}(y_1) \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\prod_i^{(n)} (1 + \delta_i) - 1 \right] \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=2}^n \mathbb{E}(x_k) \mathbb{E}(y_k) \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\prod_i^{(n-k+2)} (1 + \delta_i) - 1 \right] \right) \\ &= 0. \\ \text{Var}(\Delta s) &= \{ \text{Var}(x_1 y_1) + [\mathbb{E}(x_1 y_1)]^2 \} \text{Var} \left(\left[\prod_i^{(n)} (1 + \delta_i) - 1 \right] \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=2}^n \{ \text{Var}(x_k y_k) + [\mathbb{E}(x_k y_k)]^2 \} \text{Var} \left(\left[\prod_i^{(n-k+2)} (1 + \delta_i) - 1 \right] \right) \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{k=2}^{2M} \text{Cov} \left(x_1 y_1 \left[\prod_i^{(n)} (1 + \delta_i) - 1 \right], x_k y_k \left[\prod_i^{(n-k+2)} (1 + \delta_i) - 1 \right] \right) \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{j=2}^{2M-1} \sum_{k=j+1}^{2M} \text{Cov} \left(x_j y_j \left[\prod_i^{(n-j+2)} (1 + \delta_i) - 1 \right], x_k y_k \left[\prod_i^{(n-k+2)} (1 + \delta_i) - 1 \right] \right) \\ &= \tau \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^n - 1 \right] + \tau \sum_{k=2}^n \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{n-k+2} - 1 \right] \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{k=2}^n \mathbb{E} \left(x_1 y_1 x_k y_k \left[\prod_i^{(n-k+1)} (1 + \delta_i^2) - 1 \right] \right) \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{j=2}^n \sum_{k=j+1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(x_j y_j x_k y_k \left[\prod_i^{(n-k+1)} (1 + \delta_i^2) - 1 \right] \right) \\ &= \tau \left\{ \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^n - 1 \right] + \sum_{k=2}^n \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{n-k+2} - 1 \right] \right\} \\ &\quad + 2 \mu_x^2 \mu_y^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left[\frac{(1 + \sigma^2) \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{n-i} - 1 \right]}{\sigma^2} - n + i \right] \\ &= \tau \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^n + \frac{(1 + \sigma^2)^2 \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{n-1} - 1 \right]}{\sigma^2} - n \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$+ 2\mu_x^2\mu_y^2 \left[\frac{(1 + \sigma^2)^2 [(1 + \sigma^2)^{n-1} - 1]}{\sigma^4} - \frac{(n-1)(1 + \sigma^2)}{\sigma^2} - \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \right],$$

where

$$\tau = \text{Var}(x_k y_k) + [\mathbb{E}(x_k y_k)]^2 = \sigma_x^2 \sigma_y^2 + \sigma_x^2 \mu_y^2 + \sigma_y^2 \mu_x^2 + \mu_x^2 \mu_y^2, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n. \quad \square$$

Theorem 3.2 reveals that the variance of the rounding error correlated with the variance, mean and the dimension of input, and precision. Specifically, when the input distribution and precision are constant, the rounding error variance grows exponentially with the input dimension. Furthermore, for the fixed input distribution and dimension, the rounding error variance tends to zero as the precision increases.

3.2. Matrix-vector and matrix-matrix products. Building on the rounding error analysis for inner products, we can obtain the following theorems for matrix-vector and matrix-matrix products, respectively.

THEOREM 3.3 (Matrix-vector products). *Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ be independent. Assume that the elements of \mathbf{A} are sampled from a distribution with mean μ_a and variance σ_a^2 , while the entries \mathbf{b} are sampled from a distribution with mean μ_b and variance σ_b^2 . If $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{b}$ is computed in floating-point arithmetic under Model 2.2, the expectation and autocorrelation matrix of the rounding error $\Delta\mathbf{y}$ are given by*

$$(3.4) \quad \mathbb{E}(\Delta\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{0}_{m \times 1},$$

$$(3.5) \quad \mathbf{R}_{\Delta\mathbf{y}} \approx \text{diag}(\hbar, \dots, \hbar),$$

where $\hbar = \hbar(\mu_a, \sigma_a, \mu_b, \sigma_b, n, \sigma)$.

Proof. The vector \mathbf{y} is obtained by m inner products, i.e., $y_i = \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{x}$, where \mathbf{a} is the i th row of \mathbf{A} . Therefore, using Theorem 3.2, we have

$$\hat{y}_i = \mathbf{f}l(\mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{b} + \Delta\hat{y}_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, m\},$$

where

$$\mathbb{E}(\Delta\hat{y}_i) = 0,$$

$$\text{Var}(\Delta\hat{y}_i) \approx \hbar(\mu_a, \sigma_a, \mu_b, \sigma_b, n, \sigma),$$

$$\mathbb{E}(\Delta\hat{y}_i \Delta\hat{y}_j) = 0, \quad i \neq j.$$

Note that $\Delta\mathbf{y} = [\Delta\hat{y}_1, \Delta\hat{y}_2, \dots, \Delta\hat{y}_m]$, and we can know that

$$\mathbb{E}(\Delta\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{0}_{m \times 1},$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\Delta\mathbf{y}} = \mathbb{E}\{\Delta\mathbf{y}\Delta\mathbf{y}^T\} \approx \text{diag}(\hbar, \dots, \hbar). \quad \square$$

THEOREM 3.4 (Matrix-matrix products). *Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ be independent. Assume that the elements of \mathbf{A} are sampled from a distribution with mean μ_a and variance σ_a^2 , while the entries \mathbf{B} are sampled from a distribution with mean μ_b and variance σ_b^2 . If $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}$ is computed in floating-point arithmetic under Model 2.2, the expectation and autocorrelation matrix of the rounding error $\Delta\mathbf{C}$ are given by*

$$(3.6) \quad \mathbb{E}(\Delta\mathbf{C}) = \mathbf{0}_{m \times p},$$

$$(3.7) \quad \mathbf{R}_{\Delta\mathbf{C}} \approx \text{diag}(p\hbar, \dots, p\hbar).$$

Proof. The matrix \mathbf{C} can be obtained by p matrix-vector products, i.e., $\mathbf{c}_j = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{b}_j$, where \mathbf{c}_j and \mathbf{b}_j are the j th row of \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{B} , respectively. Then the following proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.3, omitted for conciseness. \square

Similar to Theorem 3.2, Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 3.4 also elucidates the influence of three crucial factors on the variance of the rounding error: the mean, variance, and dimension of input, and the precision.

3.3. Triangular systems. To derive the expectation and variance of the rounding error for triangular systems, an assumption about the input distribution is unavoidable. Without loss of generality, a lower triangular matrix is considered. Specifically, we assume that the lower triangular matrix $\mathbf{T} = (t_{ij})$ is obtained by the Cholesky factorization of a symmetric positive matrix \mathbf{A} , where \mathbf{A} follows the Wishart distribution $\mathcal{W}_n(m, \mathbf{I}_n)$, and m represents the DoF. Then, $t_{ij}, 1 \leq j \leq i \leq n$ are independently distributed, $t_{ii}^2 \sim \chi_{m-i+1}^2, 1 \leq i \leq n$ and $t_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1), 1 \leq j < i \leq n$ [10, Theorem 3.3.4].

THEOREM 3.5 (Solution of triangular systems). *Let $\mathbf{T} = (t_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be non-singular and lower triangular matrix, where $t_{ij}, 1 \leq j \leq i \leq n$ are independently distributed, $t_{ii}^2 \sim \chi_{m-i+1}^2, 1 \leq i \leq n$ and $t_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1), 1 \leq j < i \leq n$. Let the elements of $\mathbf{b} = (b_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ follow independent normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. If triangular systems $\mathbf{T}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ is solved by substitution in floating-point arithmetic under Model 2.2, provided that $m > n + 1$, the expectation and variance of the rounding error $\Delta x_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ can be expressed as*

$$(3.8) \quad \mathbb{E}(\Delta x_i) = 0,$$

$$(3.9) \quad \text{Var}(\Delta x_i) \approx \frac{(1 + \sigma^2)^i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \text{Var}(x_j) (1 + \sigma_{\psi_j}^2) (1 + \sigma^2)^{i-j+2}}{m - i - 1} - \text{Var}(x_i),$$

where

$$(3.10) \quad \sigma_{\psi_i}^2 = \frac{\text{Var}(\Delta x_i)}{\text{Var}(x_i)}, \quad \text{Var}(x_i) = \frac{1}{m - i - 1} + \frac{1}{m - i - 1} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \text{Var}(x_j).$$

Proof. Since \mathbf{T} is lower triangular, we have [8, Algorithm 3.1.3]

$$(3.11) \quad x_i = \frac{b_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_{ij}x_j}{t_{ii}} = \frac{b_i}{t_{ii}} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{t_{ij}x_j}{t_{ii}} \triangleq z_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} c_j x_j, \quad i = 1 : n.$$

Note that $t_{ii}^2 \sim \chi_{m-i+1}^2, 1 \leq i \leq n$ and $b_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, and we have

$$z_i = \frac{b_i}{t_{ii}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m-i+1}}t, \quad t \sim \mathcal{T}_{m-i+1}, \quad i = 1 : n,$$

$$c_j = \frac{t_{ij}}{t_{ii}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m-i+1}}t, \quad t \sim \mathcal{T}_{m-i+1}, \quad j = 1 : i - 1,$$

where \mathcal{T}_{m-i+1} is the student's t-distribution with $m-i+1$ DoF. Then, the expectation, variance, and covariance of z_i and c_j are given by

$$(3.12) \quad \mathbb{E}(z_i) = \mathbb{E}(c_j) = 0, \quad i = 1 : n, j = 1 : i - 1,$$

$$(3.13) \quad \mathbb{E}(z_i) = \text{Var}(c_j) = \frac{1}{m - i - 1}, \quad i = 1 : n, j = 1 : i - 1,$$

$$(3.14) \quad \text{Cov}(z_i, c_j) = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{b_i t_{ij}}{t_{ii}^2}\right) - \mathbb{E}(z_i) \mathbb{E}(c_j) = 0, \quad i = 1 : n, j = 1 : i - 1.$$

Substituting (3.12) and (3.13) into (3.11), yielding

$$(3.15) \quad \mathbb{E}(x_i) = \mathbb{E}(z_i) - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{E}(c_j x_j) = 0,$$

$$(3.16) \quad \text{Var}(x_i) = \text{Var}(z_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \text{Var}(c_j x_j) = \frac{1}{m-i-1} + \frac{1}{m-i-1} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \text{Var}(x_j).$$

Further, when (3.11) is computed in floating-point arithmetic from left to right under Model 2.2, we have

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{x}_i &= \mathbf{fl}\left(\frac{\mathbf{fl}\left(b_i - \mathbf{fl}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbf{fl}(t_{ij} \hat{x}_j)\right)\right)}{t_{ii}}\right) \\ &= \frac{b_i \prod_k^{(i-1)} (1 + \delta_k) - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_{ij} \hat{x}_j \prod_k^{(i-j+1)} (1 + \delta_k)}{t_{ii}} (1 + \delta_n) \\ &= \frac{b_i \prod_k^{(i)} (1 + \delta_k) - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_{ij} \hat{x}_j \prod_k^{(i-j+2)} (1 + \delta_k)}{t_{ii}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that (3.17) involves \hat{x}_j for $j = 1 : i - 1$. To simplify, we define the relative error of x_j as ψ_j , which has a mean of zero and variance $\sigma_{\psi_j}^2$, i.e.,

$$(3.18) \quad \hat{x}_j = x_j + \Delta x_j \triangleq x_j (1 + \psi_j), \quad j = 1 : i - 1.$$

Utilizing Lemma 3.1, we obtain

$$(3.19) \quad \text{Var}(\Delta x_j) = \text{Var}(x_j \psi_j) = \text{Var}(x_j) \sigma_{\psi_j}^2, \quad j = 1 : i - 1.$$

Then, we substitute (3.18) into (3.17) and have

$$\hat{x}_i = \frac{b_i \prod_k^{(i)} (1 + \delta_k) - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_{ij} x_j (1 + \psi_j) \prod_k^{(i-j+2)} (1 + \delta_k)}{t_{ii}}.$$

Hence, the rounding error Δx_i can be expressed as

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta x_i &= \hat{x}_i - x_i \\ &= \frac{b_i}{t_{ii}} \left[\prod_k^{(i)} (1 + \delta_k) - 1 \right] - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{t_{ij} x_j}{t_{ii}} \left[\left(1 + \sigma_{\psi_j}^2\right) \prod_k^{(i-j+2)} (1 + \delta_k) - 1 \right] \\ &= z_i \left[\prod_k^{(i)} (1 + \delta_k) - 1 \right] - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} c_j x_j \left[\left(1 + \sigma_{\psi_j}^2\right) \prod_k^{(i-j+2)} (1 + \delta_k) - 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting (3.12), (3.13) and (3.14) into (3.20), we can obtain the expectation and variance of the rounding error Δx_i as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}(\Delta x_i) = \mathbb{E}(z_i) \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\prod_k^{(i)} (1 + \delta_k) - 1\right]\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{E}(c_j) \mathbb{E}(x_j) \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\left(1 + \sigma_{\psi_j}^2\right) \prod_k^{(i-j+2)} (1 + \delta_k) - 1 \right] \right) \\
& = 0 \\
\text{Var}(\Delta x_i) & = \text{Var}(z_i) \text{Var} \left(\left[\prod_k^{(i)} (1 + \delta_k) - 1 \right] \right) \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \text{Var}(c_j) \text{Var}(x_j) \text{Var} \left(\left[\left(1 + \sigma_{\psi_j}^2\right) \prod_k^{(i-j+2)} (1 + \delta_k) - 1 \right] \right) \\
& \approx \frac{(1 + \sigma^2)^i - 1}{m - i - 1} + \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \text{Var}(x_j) \left[\left(1 + \sigma_{\psi_j}^2\right) (1 + \sigma^2)^{i-j+2} - 1 \right]}{m - i - 1} \\
& = \frac{(1 + \sigma^2)^i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \text{Var}(x_j) \left(1 + \sigma_{\psi_j}^2\right) (1 + \sigma^2)^{i-j+2} - \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \text{Var}(x_j)\right)}{m - i - 1} \\
& = \frac{(1 + \sigma^2)^i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \text{Var}(x_j) \left(1 + \sigma_{\psi_j}^2\right) (1 + \sigma^2)^{i-j+2} - (m - i - 1) \text{Var}(x_i)}{m - i - 1} \\
& = \frac{(1 + \sigma^2)^i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \text{Var}(x_j) \left(1 + \sigma_{\psi_j}^2\right) (1 + \sigma^2)^{i-j+2}}{m - i - 1} - \text{Var}(x_i),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_{\psi_j}^2$ and $\text{Var}(x_i)$ are given in (3.19) and (3.16), respectively. And the proof is done. \square

Theorem 3.5 indicates that the variance of the rounding error correlates with the previously derived outcomes. This correlation is reasonable, as solving triangular systems involves iterative processes, as depicted in (3.11). Additionally, when other parameters remain constant, the variance of the rounding error decreases as the DoF increases. This decrease occurs because a higher DoF results in an increased variance of t_{ii} .

3.4. LU factorization. To derive the expectation and variance of the rounding error for LU factorization, we need to make an assumption on the distribution of the input matrix. Specifically, we assume that the input matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is symmetric positive and follows the Wishart distribution $\mathcal{W}_n(m, \mathbf{I}_n)$, where m is the DoF. Then, the Doolittle form of Gaussian elimination gives the following recurrences for the LU factors [12, Algorithm 9.2]:

$$(3.21) \quad \left. \begin{aligned} u_{kj} &= a_{kj} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} l_{ki} u_{ij} & j = k : n \\ l_{ik} &= \left(a_{ik} - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} l_{ij} u_{jk} \right) / u_{kk} & i = k + 1 : n \end{aligned} \right\} k = 1 : n$$

The distribution of the lower triangular matrix $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the upper triangular matrix $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and expected values in (3.21) are given in the following two lemmas.

LEMMA 3.6 (Distribution of \mathbf{L} and \mathbf{U}). *Given symmetric positive matrix $\mathbf{A} \sim \mathcal{W}_n(m, \mathbf{I}_n)$ and provided that $m > n + 1$, the distribution of the LU factors of \mathbf{A} can be summarized as follows:*

- For the upper triangular matrix $\mathbf{U} = (u_{ij})$, if $i = j$, we have

$$u_{ii} \sim \chi_{\nu}^2, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

If $i \neq j$, we have its PDF, i.e.,

$$f_{u_{ij}}(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu-1}{2})}{2\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})}, & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}2^{\frac{\nu}{2}-1}\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} (|z|)^{\frac{\nu-1}{2}} K_{\frac{\nu-1}{2}}(|z|), & \text{else} \end{cases}, \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq n.$$

where $\nu = m - i + 1$, and $K_n(y)$ is the modified Bessel function of the second kind.

- For the lower triangular matrix $\mathbf{L} = (l_{ij})$, we have

$$l_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m-j+1}} t_j, \quad t_j \sim \mathcal{T}_{m-j+1}, \quad 1 \leq j < i \leq n.$$

Proof. For the Cholesky factorization $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{R}$, where $\mathbf{R} = (r_{ij})$ is a upper triangular matrix with $r_{ii} > 0$, we have $r_{ij}, 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ are independently distributed, $r_{ii}^2 \sim \chi_{m-i+1}^2, 1 \leq i \leq n$ and $r_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1), 1 \leq i < j \leq n$ [10, Theorem 3.3.4]. Note that the relationship between LU factorization and Cholesky factorization can be established through the LDL^T factorization, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{L}^T = \mathbf{D}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{R}, \quad \mathbf{L} = \mathbf{R}^T\mathbf{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(r_{11}^2, \dots, r_{nn}^2).$$

Therefore, for the upper triangular matrix $\mathbf{U} = (u_{ij})$, if $i = j$, we have

$$u_{ii} = r_{ii}^2 \sim \chi_{m-i+1}^2, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Then, if $i \neq j$, we have $u_{ij} = r_{ii}r_{ij}$. Given $r_{ii}^2 \sim \chi_{m-i+1}^2$ and $r_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, the joint PDF of r_{ii} and r_{ij} can be expressed as

$$f_{r_{ii}, r_{ij}}(x, y) = f_{r_{ii}}(x) f_{r_{ij}}(y) = \begin{cases} \frac{x^{\nu-1} e^{-\frac{x^2+y^2}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}2^{\frac{\nu}{2}-1}\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} & x > 0 \\ 0 & x \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

where $\nu = m - i + 1$. Then the PDF of u_{ij} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f_{u_{ij}}(z) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{|x|} f\left(x, \frac{z}{x}\right) dx = \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{1}{x} f\left(x, \frac{z}{x}\right) dx \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}2^{\frac{\nu}{2}-1}\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} (|z|)^{\frac{\nu-1}{2}} K_{\frac{\nu-1}{2}}(|z|), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows [9, Eq. (3.478.4)], and $K_n(y)$ is the modified Bessel function of the second kind. Moreover, note that $K_n(y) \rightarrow \infty$ when $y \rightarrow 0$. We can use the asymptotic form for small arguments of the Bessel function [2] and have

$$f_{u_{ij}}(z) = \frac{(|z|)^{\frac{\nu-1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}2^{\frac{\nu}{2}-1}\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu-1}{2})}{2} \left(\frac{2}{|z|}\right)^{\frac{\nu-1}{2}} = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu-1}{2})}{2\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})}, \quad |z| \rightarrow 0.$$

For the lower triangular matrix $\mathbf{L} = (l_{ij})$, we have

$$l_{ij} = \frac{r_{ji}}{r_{jj}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m-j+1}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{m-j+1}r_{ji}}{r_{jj}} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m-j+1}} t_j, \quad 1 \leq j < i \leq n.$$

where $t_j \sim \mathcal{T}_{m-j+1}$. Hence, the lemma holds. \square

Lemma 3.6 reflects the fact that the off-diagonal elements in each row of \mathbf{U} also share the same distribution, while the off-diagonal elements in each column of \mathbf{L} share the same distribution.

LEMMA 3.7 (Expected values in (3.21)). *Given a symmetric positive matrix $\mathbf{A} \sim \mathcal{W}_n(m, \mathbf{I}_n)$ and provided that $m > n+3$, if the LU factorization of \mathbf{A} is computed via (3.21), we can have the expected values in (3.21) as follows:*

- Denote $q_i = l_{ki}u_{ij}$, $1 \leq i \leq k-1, k \leq j \leq n, 1 \leq k \leq n$. If $j = k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(q_i) &= 1, \quad \text{Var}(q_i) = 2, \quad \text{Cov}(q_s, q_t) = 0, \quad s \neq t, \\ \text{Cov}(a_{kk}, q_i) &= \mathbb{E}(a_{kk}q_i) = 2. \end{aligned}$$

If $j \neq k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(q_i) &= 0, \quad \text{Var}(q_i) = 1, \quad \text{Cov}(q_s, q_t) = 0, \quad s \neq t, \\ \text{Cov}(a_{kj}, q_i) &= \mathbb{E}(a_{kj}q_i) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

- Denote $p_j = \frac{l_{ij}u_{jk}}{u_{kk}}$, $k+1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq k-1, 1 \leq k \leq n$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}(p_j) = 0, \quad \text{Var}(p_j) = \frac{1}{(m-k-1)(m-k-3)}, \quad \text{Cov}(p_s, p_t) = 0.$$

- Denote $o_i = \frac{a_{ik}}{u_{kk}}$, $k+1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq k-1, 1 \leq k \leq n$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(o_i) &= 0, \quad \text{Var}(o_i) = \frac{m-4}{(m-k-1)(m-k-3)}, \\ \text{Cov}(o_i, p_j) &= \mathbb{E}(o_i p_j) = \frac{1}{(m-k-1)(m-k-3)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From the proof of Lemma 3.6, we derive $l_{ij} = \frac{r_{ji}}{r_{jj}}$ and $u_{ij} = r_{ii}r_{ij}$. Subsequently, we can obtain $q_i = r_{ik}r_{ij}$, $p_j = \frac{r_{ji}r_{jk}}{r_{kk}^2}$, and $o_i = \frac{r_{ki} + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} r_{ji}r_{jk}}{r_{kk}}$. Note that the distribution of r_{ij} is already known, thus concluding the proof. \square

Next, based on the two lemmas above, the expectation and variance of the rounding errors for LU factors are presented in the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.8 (LU factorization). *Given a symmetric positive matrix $\mathbf{A} \sim \mathcal{W}_n(m, \mathbf{I}_n)$ and provided that $m > n+3$, if the LU factorization of \mathbf{A} is computed via (3.21) in float-point arithmetic under Model 2.2, the expectation and variance of the rounding errors for LU factors can be expressed as follows:*

- For the upper triangular matrix $\mathbf{U} = (u_{kj})$, if $j = k$, the expectation and variance of the rounding errors Δu_{kk} is given by

$$(3.22) \quad \mathbb{E}(\Delta u_{kk}) = 0,$$

$$(3.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\Delta u_{kk}) &\approx (m^2 - 4) \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-1} - 1 \right] + 3 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 + \sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2) (1 + \sigma_{\eta_i}^2) (1 + \sigma^2)^{k-i+1} \\ &\quad - 3(k-1) - 2(m+2) \left[\frac{(1 + \sigma^2) \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-2} - 1 \right]}{\sigma^2} - k + 2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

If $j \neq k$, the expectation and variance of the rounding errors Δu_{kj} is given by

$$(3.24) \quad \mathbb{E}(\Delta u_{kj}) = 0,$$

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\Delta u_{kj}) &\approx (m-2) \left[(1+\sigma^2)^{k-1} - 1 \right] + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (1+\sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2) (1+\sigma_{\eta_i}^2) (1+\sigma^2)^{k-i+1} \\ &\quad - 2 \frac{(1+\sigma^2) \left[(1+\sigma^2)^{k-2} - 1 \right]}{\sigma^2} + k-3, \quad k \leq j \leq n, \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2 = (m-i-1) \text{Var}(\Delta l_{ki})$, $\sigma_{\eta_i}^2 = \frac{\text{Var}(\Delta u_{ij})}{m-i+1}$, $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, $1 \leq k \leq n$.

- For the lower triangular matrix $\mathbf{L} = (l_{ik})$, the expectation and variance of the rounding errors Δl_{ik} is given by

$$(3.26) \quad \mathbb{E}(\Delta l_{ik}) = 0,$$

$$(3.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\Delta l_{ik}) &\approx \frac{m-6}{(m-k-1)(m-k-3)} \left[(1+\sigma_{\eta_k}^2) (1+\sigma^2)^k - 1 \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{(1+\sigma_{\eta_k}^2) \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (1+\sigma_{\epsilon_j}^2) (1+\sigma_{\eta_j}^2) (1+\sigma^2)^{k-j+2} - k+1}{(m-k-1)(m-k-3)} \\ &\quad - \frac{2 \left[(1+\sigma_{\eta_k}^2) \frac{(1+\sigma^2)^2 \left[(1+\sigma^2)^{k-2} - 1 \right]}{\sigma^2} - k+2 \right]}{(m-k-1)(m-k-3)}, \quad k+1 \leq i \leq n, \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_{\eta_k}^2 = \frac{\text{Var}(\Delta u_{kk})}{(m-k+1)(m-k+3)}$, $1 \leq k \leq n$.

Proof. First, we derive the expectation and variance of the rounding error for u_{kj} . When (3.21) is evaluated in float-point arithmetic from left to right under Model 2.2, the computed \hat{u}_{kj} satisfies

$$(3.28) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{u}_{kj} &= \mathbf{fl} \left(a_{kj} - \mathbf{fl} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{fl} \left(\hat{l}_{ki} \hat{u}_{ij} \right) \right) \right) \\ &= a_{kj} \prod_r^{(k-1)} (1+\delta_r) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \hat{l}_{ki} \hat{u}_{ij} \prod_r^{(k-i+1)} (1+\delta_r), \quad 1 \leq k \leq n, k \leq j \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.5, we define the relative error of l_{ki} , $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ and u_{ij} , $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ as ϵ_i and η_i , which have a mean of zero and variance $\sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2$ and $\sigma_{\eta_i}^2$, respectively. Then we have

$$(3.29) \quad \hat{l}_{ki} = l_{ki} (1 + \epsilon_i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq k-1,$$

$$(3.30) \quad \hat{u}_{ij} = u_{ij} (1 + \eta_i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq k-1.$$

Further, based on Lemma 3.1, the variance of ϵ_i and η_i can be expressed as

$$(3.31) \quad \sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2 = \frac{\text{Var}(\Delta l_{ki})}{\text{Var}(l_{ki})}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k-1,$$

$$(3.32) \quad \sigma_{\eta_i}^2 = \frac{\text{Var}(\Delta u_{ij})}{\text{Var}(u_{ij})}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k-1.$$

Substituting (3.29) and (3.30) into (3.28), yielding

$$\hat{u}_{kj} = a_{kj} \prod_r^{(k-1)} (1+\delta_r) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} l_{ki} u_{ij} (1+\epsilon_i) (1+\eta_i) \prod_r^{(k-i+1)} (1+\delta_r).$$

Using the definition of Lemma 3.7, the rounding error Δu_{kj} can be expressed as

$$(3.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta u_{kj} &= \hat{u}_{kj} - u_{kj} \\ &= a_{kj} \left[\prod_r^{(k-1)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right] - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q_i \left[(1 + \epsilon_i) (1 + \eta_i) \prod_r^{(k-i+1)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the distribution of a_{kj} and q_i differ on the condition with $j = k$ and $j \neq k$. Therefore, if $j = k$, according to Lemma 3.1, Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.7, the expectation and variance of Δu_{kk} can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\Delta u_{kk}) &= 0, \\ \text{Var}(\Delta u_{kk}) &= \text{Var} \left(a_{kk} \left[\prod_r^{(k-1)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right] \right) \\ &+ \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q_i \left[(1 + \epsilon_i) (1 + \eta_i) \prod_r^{(k-i+1)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right] \right) \\ &- 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \text{Cov} \left(a_{kk} \left[\prod_r^{(k-1)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right], q_i \left[(1 + \epsilon_i) (1 + \eta_i) \prod_r^{(k-i+1)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right] \right) \\ &\approx (m^2 + 2m) \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-1} - 1 \right] + 3 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left[(1 + \sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2) (1 + \sigma_{\eta_i}^2) (1 + \sigma^2)^{k-i+1} - 1 \right] \\ &- 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} \left(a_{kk} q_i \left[\prod_r^{(k-i)} (1 + \delta_r^2) - 1 \right] \right) \\ &= (m^2 + 2m) \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-1} - 1 \right] + 3 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left[(1 + \sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2) (1 + \sigma_{\eta_i}^2) (1 + \sigma^2)^{k-i+1} - 1 \right] \\ &- 2(m+2) \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-i} - 1 \right] \\ &= (m^2 - 4) \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-1} - 1 \right] + 3 \left[\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 + \sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2) (1 + \sigma_{\eta_i}^2) (1 + \sigma^2)^{k-i+1} - k + 1 \right] \\ &- 2(m+2) \left[\frac{(1 + \sigma^2) \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-2} - 1 \right]}{\sigma^2} - k + 2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $j \neq k$, the expectation and variance of Δu_{kj} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\Delta u_{kj}) &= 0, \\ \text{Var}(\Delta u_{kj}) &= \text{Var} \left(a_{kj} \left[\prod_r^{(k-1)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right] \right) \\ &+ \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q_i \left[(1 + \epsilon_i) (1 + \eta_i) \prod_r^{(k-i+1)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right] \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -2 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \text{Cov} \left(a_{kj} \left[\prod_r^{(k-1)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right], q_i \left[(1 + \epsilon_i)(1 + \eta_i) \prod_r^{(k-i+1)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right] \right) \\
 & \approx m \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-1} - 1 \right] + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left[(1 + \sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2)(1 + \sigma_{\eta_i}^2)(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-i+1} - 1 \right] \\
 & -2 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-i} - 1 \right] \\
 & = (m-2) \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-1} - 1 \right] + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 + \sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2)(1 + \sigma_{\eta_i}^2)(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-i+1} \\
 & -2 \frac{(1 + \sigma^2) \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-2} - 1 \right]}{\sigma^2} + k - 3.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, the expectation and variance of the rounding error for l_{ik} are presented as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{l}_{ik} & = \mathbf{fl} \left(\frac{\mathbf{fl} \left(a_{ik} - \mathbf{fl} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{fl} \left(\hat{l}_{ij} \hat{u}_{jk} \right) \right) \right)}{\hat{u}_{kk}} \right), \quad k+1 \leq i \leq n \\
 & = \frac{a_{ik} \prod_r^{(k-1)} (1 + \delta_r) - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \hat{l}_{ij} \hat{u}_{jk} \prod_r^{(k-j+1)} (1 + \delta_r)}{\hat{u}_{kk}} (1 + \delta_o) \\
 & \stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{a_{ik} \prod_r^{(k)} (1 + \delta_r) - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} l_{ij} u_{jk} \left(1 + \sigma_{\epsilon_j}^2 \right) \left(1 + \sigma_{\eta_j}^2 \right) \prod_r^{(k-j+2)} (1 + \delta_r)}{u_{kk} (1 + \eta_k)} \\
 & \stackrel{(c)}{\approx} \frac{a_{ik} \prod_r^{(k)} (1 + \delta_r) - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} l_{ij} u_{jk} \left(1 + \sigma_{\epsilon_j}^2 \right) \left(1 + \sigma_{\eta_j}^2 \right) \prod_r^{(k-j+2)} (1 + \delta_r)}{u_{kk}} (1 - \eta_k),
 \end{aligned}$$

where we use (3.29) and (3.29) and define $\eta_k = \frac{\hat{u}_{kk} - u_{kk}}{u_{kk}}$ with the mean zero and variance $\sigma_{\eta_k}^2 = \frac{\text{Var}(\Delta u_{kk})}{\text{Var}(u_{kk}) + [\mathbb{E}(u_{kk})]^2}$ at the (b), and (c) follows the Taylor expansion. Then, utilizing the definition of Lemma 3.7, the rounding error Δl_{ik} can be expressed as

$$\Delta l_{ik} \approx o_i \left[(1 - \eta_k) \prod_r^{(k)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right] - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} p_j \left[(1 - \eta_k)(1 + \epsilon_j)(1 + \eta_j) \prod_r^{(k-j+2)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right]. \blacksquare$$

Therefore, based on Lemma 3.1, Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.7, the expectation and variance of Δl_{ik} can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Var}(\Delta l_{ik}) & \approx \text{Var} \left(o_i \left[(1 - \eta_k) \prod_r^{(k)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right] \right) \\
 & + \text{Var} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} p_j \left[(1 - \eta_k)(1 + \epsilon_j)(1 + \eta_j) \prod_r^{(k-j+2)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right] \right) \\
 & - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \text{Cov} \left(o_i \left[(1 - \eta_k) \prod_r^{(k)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right], p_j \left[(1 - \eta_k)(1 + \epsilon_j)(1 + \eta_j) \prod_r^{(k-j+2)} (1 + \delta_r) - 1 \right] \right) \\
 & \approx \frac{(m-4) \left[(1 + \sigma_{\eta_k}^2)(1 + \sigma^2)^k - 1 \right]}{(m-k-1)(m-k-3)} + \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left[(1 + \sigma_{\eta_k}^2)(1 + \sigma_{\epsilon_j}^2)(1 + \sigma_{\eta_j}^2)(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-j+2} - 1 \right]}{(m-k-1)(m-k-3)}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -2 \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} \left(o_i p_j \left[(1 + \eta_k^2) \prod_i^{(k-j+1)} (1 + \delta_i^2) - 1 \right] \right) \\
&= \frac{(m-4) \left[(1 + \sigma_{\eta_k}^2) (1 + \sigma^2)^k - 1 \right]}{(m-k-1)(m-k-3)} + \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left[(1 + \sigma_{\eta_k}^2) (1 + \sigma_{\epsilon_j}^2) (1 + \sigma_{\eta_j}^2) (1 + \sigma^2)^{k-j+2} - 1 \right]}{(m-k-1)(m-k-3)} \\
&- \frac{2 \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left[(1 + \sigma_{\eta_k}^2) (1 + \sigma^2)^{k-j+1} - 1 \right]}{(m-k-1)(m-k-3)} \\
&= \frac{(m-6) \left[(1 + \sigma_{\eta_k}^2) (1 + \sigma^2)^k - 1 \right]}{(m-k-1)(m-k-3)} + \frac{(1 + \sigma_{\eta_k}^2) \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} (1 + \sigma_{\epsilon_j}^2) (1 + \sigma_{\eta_j}^2) (1 + \sigma^2)^{k-j+2} - k + 1}{(m-k-1)(m-k-3)} \\
&- \frac{2}{(m-k-1)(m-k-3)} \left[(1 + \sigma_{\eta_k}^2) \frac{(1 + \sigma^2)^2 \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^{k-2} - 1 \right]}{\sigma^2} - k + 2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the theorem holds. \square

Theorem 3.8 reveals that when other parameters are fixed, the variance of the rounding error for $u_{k,j}$ increases with the DoF, whereas for $l_{i,k}$, it decreases. This is because of the different distribution of the LU factors (see Lemma 3.6). Moreover, we can find that the variance of the rounding error is independent of the dimension n .

4. Numerical experiments. In this section, we conduct a series of numerical experiments to validate the accuracy of our derivations presented in section 3.


The experiments are performed using MATLAB R2023b. While most computations are conducted in single precision, subsection 4.1.3 employs `fp16` and `bfloat16` arithmetic. MATLAB `single.m` function simulates single precision, and the rounding function `chop.m` introduced in [16] is used for simulating `fp16` and `bfloat16` arithmetic. Exact results for inner products and other matrix computations are obtained in double precision.

To ensure reproducibility, we initialize the random number generator with `rng(1)` at the start of each script generating a figure in this section. Each experiment is repeated 10000 times for various problem dimensions n and degrees of freedom m . Randomly generated matrices and vectors are employed, comparing different input distributions, including random uniform $\mathcal{U}(0, 1)$, random uniform $\mathcal{U}(-1, 1)$, random Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, random Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(1, 1)$, and random chi χ_m^2 distribution.


Moreover, we use loops to implement the inner product and other matrix computations in MATLAB, where each operation involves rounding. This approach is necessary because MATLAB functions rely on the specifics of how the underlying BLAS operation is coded and optimized. For example, the accumulation of sums may involve extra precision for intermediate quantities, leading to inaccuracies in our results [4]. Additionally, given the small value of σ^2 (approximately 10^{-16} for single precision), we employ the MATLAB `vpa.m` and `digital.m` functions to ensure accurate numerical computation of our analytical expressions, with 1000 significant digits specified.

4.1. Inner products. We first show the numerical results for inner products $s = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{y}$ to validate the correctness of (3.2) and give some insights.


4.1.1. Different input random vectors. We consider the case that the entries of the input vectors have different distributions. Specifically, uniform $\mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ and $\mathcal{U}(-1, 1)$ distributions, as well as Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $\mathcal{N}(1, 1)$ distributions. As shown in Figure 1, the comparison between Simulated variance and Analytical variance, i.e., (3.1), of the rounding error for the computation in single precision is illustrated. We can find that the analytical and simulated curves are very tight




(a) Random uniform $\mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ vectors.



(b) Random uniform $\mathcal{U}(-1, 1)$ vectors.



(c) Random Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ vectors.



(d) Random Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(1, 1)$ vectors.

Fig. 1: Comparison between simulated variance and analytical variance, i.e., (3.1), of the rounding error for the computation in single precision of the inner product with different input distribution.

in different distributions, confirming our derived results' correctness. Moreover, the variance of the rounding error grows exponentially with the input dimension since the rounding errors accumulate along the vector dimension. Note that inputs with zero mean exhibit lower variances than those with nonzero mean. Thus, we can adjust the inputs to have zero means to obtain more accurate numerical results like the authors in [14].

4.1.2. Compared with other worst-case bounds. We employ the MSE of the computed results as our comparative metric against other worst-case bounds. Both the deterministic bounds [12, 18] and the probabilistic bounds [13, 14, 18] are considered. The metric can be mathematically formulated as:

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbb{E} \left(|\hat{s} - s|^2 \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(|\Delta s|^2 \right).$$

From Theorem 3.2, we have

$$(4.2) \quad \mathbb{E} \left(|\hat{s} - s|^2 \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\Delta s^2 \right) = \text{Var} \left(\Delta s \right) \approx \hbar \left(\mu_x, \sigma_x, \mu_y, \sigma_y, n, \sigma \right).$$




Fig. 2: Comparison between the analytical results and other worst-case bounds for the computation in single precision of the inner product with different input distribution. Here, $\lambda = 1$ and $\zeta = 10^{-16}$.

Then, for the worst-case bounds and using [13, Theorem 3.1], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}(|\hat{s} - s|^2) &= \mathbb{E}(|\mathbf{x}^T \Delta \mathbf{y}|^2), \quad |\Delta \mathbf{y}| \leq \gamma |\mathbf{y}| \\
 &\leq \mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 \|\Delta \mathbf{y}\|^2) \leq \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 \|\mathbf{y}\|^2) \\
 &= \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{x}\|^2) \mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{y}\|^2) \\
 (4.3) \quad &= \gamma^2 n^2 (\mu_x^2 + \sigma_x^2) (\mu_y^2 + \sigma_y^2),
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(4.4) \quad \gamma = \begin{cases} \frac{nu}{1-nu}, & \text{deterministic} \\ \exp\left(\lambda\sqrt{nu} + \frac{nu^2}{1-nu}\right) - 1, & \text{probabilistic} \end{cases}.$$

Next, base on the probabilistic bound in [14, Theorem 3.2], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}(|\hat{s} - s|^2) &\leq \mathbb{E}\left(\left|\left(\lambda|\mu_x\mu_y|n^{\frac{3}{2}} + (\lambda^2 + 1)C_xC_y n\right)u + \mathcal{O}(u^2)\right|^2\right) \\
 (4.5) \quad &\approx \left(\lambda|\mu_x\mu_y|n^{\frac{3}{2}} + (\lambda^2 + 1)C_xC_y n\right)^2 u^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $|x_i| \leq C_x$ and $|y_i| \leq C_y$ for $i = 1 : n$.

Finally, we utilize [18, Theorem 3.2 & 3.3], yielding

$$(4.6) \quad \mathbb{E}(|\hat{s} - s|^2) \leq n \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k=1}^n c_k^2\right),$$

$$(4.7) \quad \mathbb{E}(|\hat{s} - s|^2) \leq 2 \ln(2/\zeta) \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k=1}^n c_k^2\right),$$

where $c_1 = |x_1 y_1| \beta_n$, $c_k = |x_k y_k| \beta_{n-k+2}$, $\beta_k = (1+u)^k - 1$, $2 \leq k \leq n$ and ζ is failure probability of (4.7).




Fig. 3: Comparison between simulated variance and analytical variance of the rounding error for the computation in lower precision of the inner product with different input distribution with random Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ vectors.

Therefore, using (4.2), (4.3), (4.5), (4.6) and (4.7), we compare the analytical outcomes with other worst-case bounds for computing the inner product with random uniform $\mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ and $\mathcal{U}(-1, 1)$ vectors in single precision, as illustrated in Figure 2a and Figure 2b, respectively. It’s clear that our analytical results align much more closely with the actual MSE than two deterministic and three probabilistic ($\lambda = 1$ [13] and $\zeta = 10^{-16}$ [18]) bounds for MSE. Specifically, the analytical expression tends to be at least two orders of magnitude tighter than other worst-case bounds.

4.1.3. Lower precision arithmetic. Now we repeat the experiment conducted in subsection 4.1.1 using Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ distribution, but this time employing precision lower than single precision to compute the inner product $s = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{y}$. The simulation results using `fp16` and `bfloat16` arithmetic are depicted in Figure 3a and Figure 3b, respectively. Notably, our analytical results remain highly consistent with the simulated curves even at lower precision, affirming the accuracy of our derivation.

4.2. A case where Model 2.2 is invalid. In this section, we explore a scenario where Model 2.2 fails and analytical results are inaccurate, using the computation of the inner product $s = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{y}$. Specifically, we consider *large dependent* input vectors of dimension $n = 10^8$ with $x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $y_i = x_i h, h \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. As illustrated in Figure 4a, we depict the simulated and analytical variances at each loop iteration i of the inner products. Notably, while the analytical and simulated curves closely match for $i = 1 : 10^5$, a significant gap emerges for $i > 10^5$, indicating the invalidity of Model 2.2 in this context. This discrepancy arises because the distribution of the relative error δ changes with the large dependent input vectors. Although (2.3) in Model 2.2 provides a reasonable approximation for $i = 1 : 10^5$, it does not hold for $i > 10^5$, as evidenced by Figure 4b.

4.3. Matrix-vector and matrix-matrix products. This section considers the computation of matrix-vector and matrix-matrix products in single precision. Using the matrix-matrix product $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}$ as a case study, where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, we plot the simulated and analytical curves for the autocorrelation matrix element $\mathbf{R}_{\Delta \mathbf{C}}(2, 2)$, demonstrating the impact of dimension m , n , and p as depicted in




Fig. 4: Computation in single precision of the inner product $s = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{y}$ with dependent random vectors of dimension $n = 10^8$.





Fig. 5: Comparison between simulated autocorrelation matrix and analytical autocorrelation matrix, i.e., (3.7), of the rounding error for the computation in single precision of the matrix-matrix product with different dimensions using the second-row second-column element $\mathbf{R}_{\Delta C}(2, 2)$ as an example.


Figure 5. We can observe that the analytical results accurately anticipate variations in different dimensions, affirming the correctness of our derived outcomes. Additionally, the autocorrelation matrix of the rounding error remains unaffected by m , as illustrated in Figure 5c.

4.4. Triangular systems. Next, in this section, we present the solution of triangular systems $\mathbf{T}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$. For simplification, the variance of the rounding error for x_3 is shown as an example. From Theorem 3.5, we have

$$\text{Var}(\Delta x_3) \approx \frac{(1 + \sigma^2)^3 + \sum_{j=1}^2 \text{Var}(x_j) (1 + \sigma_{\psi_j}^2)}{m - 4} (1 + \sigma^2)^{i-j+2} - \text{Var}(x_3)$$



(a) Variance of Δx_3 as a function of DoF m . Here, $n = 5$.



(b) Variance of Δx_3 as a function of dimension n . Here, $m = 1050$.

Fig. 6: Comparison between simulated variance and analytical variance of the rounding error for the solution of triangular systems in single precision using x_3 as an example.

$$(4.8) \quad = \frac{(1 + \sigma^2)^3 + \frac{(1 + \sigma^2)^5}{m-2} + \frac{(m-1)(1 + \sigma_{\psi_2}^2)(1 + \sigma^2)^3}{(m-2)(m-3)}}{m-4} - \text{Var}(x_3),$$

where

$$\sigma_{\psi_2}^2 = \frac{[(1 + \sigma^2)^2 - 1][m + (1 + \sigma^2)^2 - 1]}{m-1},$$

$$\text{Var}(x_3) = \frac{(m-2)(m-3) + 2m-4}{(m-2)(m-3)(m-4)}.$$


In Figure 6, we compare simulated variance and analytical variance of the rounding error for the solution of triangular systems in single precision by (4.8). Similar to the case for inner products and matrix-matrix products, the analytical and simulated curve is still very tight. Moreover, it is observed that the variance of the rounding error is independent of the input dimension and mainly depends on DoF m .

4.5. LU factorization. Finally, we consider the rounding error of LU factorization $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}$. For simplification, the variances of the rounding errors for u_{33} , u_{35} and l_{43} are shown as an example. Using Theorem 3.8 with $k = 3$, we can obtain


$$(4.9) \quad \text{Var}(\Delta u_{33}) \approx (m^2 - 4) \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^2 - 1 \right] + 3 \left\{ (1 + \sigma^2)^2 \left[(1 + \sigma_{\epsilon_2}^2) (1 + \sigma_{\eta_2}^2) + (1 + \sigma^2)^2 \right] - 2 \right\} - 2(m+2)\sigma^2,$$

$$(4.10) \quad \text{Var}(\Delta u_{3j}) \approx (m-2) \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^2 - 1 \right] + (1 + \sigma^2)^4 + (1 + \sigma_{\epsilon_2}^2) (1 + \sigma_{\eta_2}^2) (1 + \sigma^2)^2 - 2(1 + \sigma^2), \quad j \neq 3,$$


$$\text{Var}(\Delta l_{i3}) \approx \frac{(1 + \sigma_{\eta_3}^2) (1 + \sigma^2)^3 - 1}{m-6} + \frac{(1 + \sigma_{\eta_3}^2) \left[(1 + \sigma^2)^5 + (1 + \sigma_{\epsilon_2}^2) (1 + \sigma_{\eta_2}^2) (1 + \sigma^2)^3 \right] - 2}{(m-4)(m-6)}$$




(a) Variance of Δu_{33} as a function of DoF m . Here, $n = 5$.




(b) Variance of Δu_{35} as a function of DoF m . Here, $n = 5$.




(c) Variance of Δl_{43} as a function of DoF m . Here, $n = 5$.



(d) Variance of Δu_{33} as a function of dimension n . Here, $m = 1050$.



(e) Variance of Δu_{35} as a function of dimension n . Here, $m = 1050$.



(f) Variance of Δl_{43} as a function of dimension n . Here, $m = 1050$.

Fig. 7: Comparison between simulated variance and analytical variance of the rounding error for the computation in single precision of LU factorization using u_{33} , u_{53} and l_{43} as an example.

$$(4.11) \quad - \frac{2 \left[(1 + \sigma_{\eta_3}^2) (1 + \sigma^2)^2 - 1 \right]}{(m-4)(m-6)},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\epsilon_2}^2 &= \frac{(m-6) \left[1 + \frac{(m^2-4)\sigma^2 + 3[(1+\sigma^2)^3-1]}{m^2-1} \right] + \frac{(m^2-4)\sigma^2 + 3[(1+\sigma^2)^3-1]}{m^2-1} (1+\sigma^2)^4 - 1}{m-5}, \\ \sigma_{\eta_2}^2 &= \frac{(m-2)\sigma^2 + (1+\sigma^2)^3 - 1}{m-1}, \\ \sigma_{\eta_3}^2 &= \frac{(m^2-4) \left[(1+\sigma^2)^2 - 1 \right] + 3 \left\{ (1+\sigma^2)^2 \left[(1+\sigma_{\epsilon_2}^2) (1+\sigma_{\eta_2}^2) + (1+\sigma^2)^2 \right] - 2 \right\}}{m^2-2m} \\ &\quad - \frac{2(m+2)\sigma^2}{m^2-2m}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we compare the simulated and analytical variance of the rounding error for solving triangular systems in single precision using equations (4.9), (4.10), and (4.11) in Figure 7. Consistent with the findings in subsection 4.4, our analytical results accurately predict the trend of the actual variance, validating our derivation. Furthermore, the variance of the rounding error depends solely on the DoF and precision, remaining uncorrelated with the dimension of \mathbf{A} .

5. Conclusions. We have performed the probabilistic rounding error analysis from a statistical perspective and provided approximate closed-form expressions for the expectation and variance of the rounding errors under a probabilistic model of the input data and the relative error.

The analysis has covered inner products, matrix-vector products, matrix-matrix products, the solution of triangular systems, and LU factorization. For all these computational kernels applied to random data, the analytical expressions accurately predict the growth of error with the dimension. Moreover, the analytical expressions are correct for any orders and any n , not limited to sufficiently large n as required by results based on the central limit theorem.

The numerical experiments confirmed the accuracy of the analytical expressions and demonstrated that they are generally at least two orders of magnitude tighter than alternative worst-case bounds [12–14,18], using MSE as the metric. Moreover, we have also identified a case involving inner products where the underlying assumptions do not hold and the analytical expressions do not apply. This occurs with large dependent vectors, as the distribution of the relative error changes with increasing dimension. Care is required in applying and interpreting our analytical expressions.

In future work, we will investigate further applications of our probabilistic analysis, like the solution of linear systems. Moreover, the analysis will be modified to further extend for mixed-precision algorithms of inner products and matrix-matrix products in [3].

REFERENCES

- [1] *IEEE standard for floating-point arithmetic*, IEEE Std 754-2008, (2019), pp. 1–70, <https://doi.org/10.1109/IEEESTD.2008.4610935>.
- [2] M. ABRAMOWITZ AND I. A. STEGUN, *Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables*, vol. 55, US Government printing office, 1948.
- [3] P. BLANCHARD, N. J. HIGHAM, AND T. MARY, *A class of fast and accurate summation algorithms*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 42 (2020), pp. A1541–A1557, <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1257780>, <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1257780>.
- [4] A. M. CASTALDO, R. C. WHALEY, AND A. T. CHRONOPOULOS, *Reducing floating point error in dot product using the superbloc family of algorithms*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 31 (2009), pp. 1156–1174, <https://doi.org/10.1137/070679946>.
- [5] G. CONSTANTINIDES, F. DAHLQVIST, Z. RAKAMARIĆ, AND R. SALVIA, *Rigorous roundoff error analysis of probabilistic floating-point computations*, in International Conference on Computer Aided Verification, Springer, 2021, pp. 626–650, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-81688-9_29.
- [6] F. DAHLQVIST, R. SALVIA, AND G. A. CONSTANTINIDES, *A probabilistic approach to floating-point arithmetic*, in 2019 53rd Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers, 2019, pp. 596–602, <https://doi.org/10.1109/IEEECONF44664.2019.9048893>.
- [7] F. FRISHMAN, *On the arithmetic means and variances of products and ratios of random variables*, in A Modern Course on Statistical Distributions in Scientific Work: Volume 1—Models and Structures Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute held at the University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada July 29–August 10, 1974, Springer, 1975, pp. 401–406, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-010-1842-5_32.
- [8] G. H. GOLUB AND C. F. VAN LOAN, *Matrix Computations*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 4th ed., 2013.
- [9] I. S. GRADSHTEYN AND I. M. RYZHIK, *Table of integrals, series, and products*, Academic Press, New York, NY, USA, 7 ed., 2014.
- [10] A. K. GUPTA AND D. K. NAGAR, *Matrix variate distributions*, Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2018.
- [11] E. HALLMAN AND I. C. IPSEN, *Precision-aware deterministic and probabilistic error bounds for floating point summation*, Numer. Math., 155 (2023), pp. 83–119, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00211-023-01370-y>.
- [12] N. J. HIGHAM, *Accuracy and stability of numerical algorithms*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2 ed., 2002, <https://doi.org/10.1137/1>.

- 9780898718027.
- [13] N. J. HIGHAM AND T. MARY, *A new approach to probabilistic rounding error analysis*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 41 (2019), pp. A2815–A2835, <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1226312>.
 - [14] N. J. HIGHAM AND T. MARY, *Sharper probabilistic backward error analysis for basic linear algebra kernels with random data*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 42 (2020), pp. A3427–A3446, <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1314355>, <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1314355>.
 - [15] N. J. HIGHAM AND T. MARY, *Mixed precision algorithms in numerical linear algebra*, Acta Numerica, 31 (2022), pp. 347–414, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/acta-numerica/article/mixed-precision-algorithms-in-numerical-linear-algebra/43CA701BA29251B5790C653E66F46197>.
 - [16] N. J. HIGHAM AND S. PRANESH, *Simulating low precision floating-point arithmetic*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 41 (2019), pp. C585–C602, <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1251308>.
 - [17] T. E. HULL AND J. R. SWENSON, *Tests of probabilistic models for propagation of roundoff errors*, Communications of the ACM, 9 (1966), pp. 108–113, <https://doi.org/10.1145/365170.365212>.
 - [18] I. C. F. IPSEN AND H. ZHOU, *Probabilistic error analysis for inner products*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 41 (2020), pp. 1726–1741, <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1270434>, <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1270434>.
 - [19] W. KAHAN, *The improbability of probabilistic error analyses for numerical computations*, manuscript, 1996, <https://people.eecs.berkeley.edu/~simwkahan/improber.pdf>.
 - [20] J. VON NEUMANN AND H. H. GOLDSTINE, *Numerical inverting of matrices of high order*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 53 (1947), pp. 1021–1099, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9904-1947-08909-6>.
 - [21] J. H. WILKINSON, *Modern error analysis*, SIAM rev., 13 (1971), pp. 548–568, <https://doi.org/10.1137/1013095>.