Improvement of the convergence of the classical explicit Euler method using high time-step

Loïc MICHEL
*KU Leuven*
Department of Computer Science
Celestijnenlaan 200A
B - 3001 Heverlee

Abstract
This preliminary work\textsuperscript{1} presents a simple extension of the explicit Euler method in order to improve the accuracy of the solution for relative high time-step. The proposed method uses an explicit Euler scheme to compute firstly an inaccurate solution. Then, a decomposition of the solution into specific convergent series allows to refine the precision of the solution that does not depend \textit{a priori} on the chosen time-step.

\textsuperscript{1}This work is distributed under CC license http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/
1 Introduction

Despite its lack of accuracy that prevent it from being used as an ODE solver, the Euler method is known to be very easy to implement [1]. In particular, many efficient methods have been successfully implemented to solve ODE in a parallel way. For example, [2] introduced the possibility of parallelizing the computations requested to solve efficiently an Euler scheme. This method uses a predictor-corrector algorithm, applied to an implicit Euler scheme, and allows a faster simulation, especially if parallel computing is available [3]. Further analysis and stability proofs can be found e.g. in [3] [4] [5] [6]. Another parallelization methods and comparisons are also discussed in e.g. [7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14].

The proposed method is based on the explicit Euler scheme for which we aim to improve the convergence at each time-step. Based on the explicit Euler scheme properties, a specific series expansion of the solution at each time-step allows to get a more accurate precision of the solution.

The paper is structured as follows. Section II presents the outline of the method. Section III gives a brief overview of the acceleration algorithm used to increase the precision of the solution. Simulations results and some possible improvements may be found in Section IV. Some concluding remarks may be found in Section V.

2 Outline of the method

Consider a partial differential equation, eventually non-linear, such as:

\[
\frac{\partial y}{\partial t} = A(t)y(t) + B(t)u(t) \quad t \in [0, T_f]
\]

with the initial condition \( y(0) = y_0 \). \( u \) and \( y \) represent respectively the input and the solution of (1), which can be a scalar or a vector. To solve (1) and compute an initial solution over \([0, T_f]\), we use the explicit forward Euler method for which we assume initially that the time-step \( h_0 \) is large and ensure the stability. The equation (1) is rewritten in the discrete domain:

\[
\frac{y_{k_0+1}^0 - y_{k_0}^0}{h_0} = A_{k_0}y_{k_0}^0 + B_{k_0}u_{k_0}
\]

whose solution \( y_{k_0+1}^0 \) verifies for the \( k_0 + 1 \) time-iteration:

\[
y_{k_0+1}^0 = (I + A_{k_0}h_0)y_{k_0}^0 + B_{k_0}h_0u_{k_0} \iff y_{k_0+1}^0 = \mathcal{E}_{h_0}(y_{k_0}^0, u_{k_0})
\]

*This condition is a priori not necessary and may be investigated in a future work about the stability of the proposed method.*
The coefficient \( h_0 \) is the initial time-step such as the solution \( y^0 \) is calculated at each instant \( t_{k_0}^0 = k_0 h_0, k_0 \in \mathbb{N} \). \( A_{k_0} \) and \( B_{k_0} \) are "connected" to \( A(t) \) and \( B(t) \) and are described by specific relationships that depend on the smoothness of \( A(t) \) and \( B(t) \). We call \( I + A_{k_0} h_0 \), the dynamic matrix of the explicit Euler scheme. Symbolically, we introduce the operator \( \mathcal{E} \), as the Euler iteration in order to increase the solution from \( y_{k_0}^0 \) to \( y_{k_0+1}^0 \) corresponding to the \( k_0 + 1 \) step. \( y_{k_0}^0 \) is thus considered as an initial condition of the \( k_0 + 1 \) step.

We denote:

\[
\Psi^0 = \{ y_0, y^0(t^0_1), y^0(t^0_2), \ldots, y^0(t^0_{k_0}), \ldots, y^0(T_f) \}
\]

the set of the calculated solutions (with the time-step \( h_0 \)) at each instant \( t_{k_0}^0 = k_0 h_0 \). Consider now a smaller time-step \( h_1 = h_0/\delta_1 < h_0 \), with \( \delta_1 > 1 \), for which we obtain the set of the calculated solutions:

\[
\Psi^1 = \{ y_0, y^1(t^1_1), y^1(t^1_2), \ldots, y^1(t^1_{k_1}), \ldots, y^1(T_f) \}
\]

at each (same) instant \( t^1_{k_1} = k_1 h_1 = k_1 h_0/\delta_1 = k_0 h_0, k_1 > k_0 \). Therefore, by induction, we can deduce that for any time-step \( h_i = h_0/\delta_i < h_i-1 \) with \( \delta_i > \delta_{i-1} > 1 \), the set of the calculated solutions\(^1\)

\[
\Psi^i = \{ y_0, y^i(t^i_1), y^i(t^i_2), \ldots, y^i(t^i_{k_i}), \ldots, y^i(T_f) \}
\]

at each (same) instant \( t^i_{k_i} = k_i h_i = k_i h_0/\delta_i = k_{i-1} k_{i-1} = h_0 k_0, k_i > k_{i-1} \).

Similarly, we denote by \( \Psi^T \) the set of the "true" solutions:

\[
\Psi^T = \{ y_0, y^T(t^T_1), y^T(t^T_2), \ldots, y^T(t^T_{k_0}), \ldots, y^T(T_f) \}
\]

at each (same) instant \( t^T_{k_0} \). Note that since \( h_0 \) is the initial time-step and thus the "reference" time-step, \( y^T \) is computed at the same instants \( t^T_{k_0} \). Therefore, at each instant \( t^T_{k_0}, k_0 \in \mathbb{N} \), the solution is described as an (infinite) series composed of terms that are computed / deduced only from the dynamic matrix \( (I + A_{k_0} h_0) \) powers. Basically, at each instant \( t^T_{k_0} \), the solution (3) is described as a symbolic series (composed of the underlined terms of each \( \Psi^i, i \in \mathbb{N} \)):

\[
\Omega_{k_0} = (y^0(t^0_{k_0}), y^1(t^1_{k_1}), \ldots, y^i(t^i_{k_i}), \ldots) \xrightarrow{i \to \infty} \Omega^\text{lim}_{k_0}
\]

that converges to \( \Omega^\text{lim}_{k_0} \approx y^T(t^T_{k_0}) \). To obtain an accurate estimation of the limit \( \Omega^\text{lim}_{k_0} \), we will describe the \( \varepsilon \)-algorithm, which is a convergence accelerator algorithm, whose purpose is to compute the limit \( \Omega^\text{lim}_{k_0} \) from only a few terms of \( \Omega_{k_0} \).

\(^1\)In a similar way, using the \( \mathcal{E} \) operator, we may have:

\[
\Psi^i = \{ y_0, \mathcal{E}_{h_i}(y_0, u_0), \mathcal{E}_{h_i}(y^i(t^i_1), u_1), \ldots, \mathcal{E}_{h_i}(y^i(t^i_{k_i-1}), u_{k_i-1}) \ldots \}
\]
**Illustrative example:** Consider a linear second order system $\Sigma_1$, described by a state-space representation:

$$
\Sigma_1 := \begin{pmatrix}
\dot{x}_1 \\
\dot{x}_2
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
-1 & 5 \\
-5 & -1
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
x_1 \\
x_2
\end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix}
0 \\
1
\end{pmatrix} 10 \quad x_1(0) = 0, x_2(0) = 1
$$

(6)

Figure 1 presents the different solutions of $\Sigma_1$, relating to the different time-step and evolving in the phase-space $x_1 - x_2$. The "true solution" is the exact solution of $\Sigma_1$. Starting from a time-step $h_0$, that gives a very inaccurate solution, the solution is also computed considering $\delta_i, i = 1...5$.

![Figure 1: True solution of $\Sigma_1$ plotted in the phase-space in comparison with explicit Euler scheme with different time-steps $h_i$ (corresponding to the $\Psi_i$ series).](image)

Therefore, at each instant $t_{k_0}^0, k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the $\Psi_i$ series such as (denote $(x_1 \ x_2)^T$, the state-space vector):

$$
\Psi_0 = \begin{pmatrix}
0.5000 & 1.4000 & 2.4900 & 3.4980 & 4.1570 \\
1.9000 & 2.4600 & 2.5140 & 2.0176 & 1.0668
\end{pmatrix}
$$

for $h_0 = 0.1$

$$
\Psi_1 = \begin{pmatrix}
0.6000 & 1.4911 & 2.4295 & 3.1761 & 3.5565 \\
1.8150 & 2.2146 & 2.1270 & 1.6077 & 0.8168
\end{pmatrix}
$$

for $h_1 = h_0/2$

$$
\Psi_2 = \begin{pmatrix}
0.6256 & 1.5013 & 2.3850 & 3.0589 & 3.3806 \\
1.7805 & 2.1333 & 2.0185 & 1.5152 & 0.7893
\end{pmatrix}
$$

for $h_2 = h_0/3$
\[ \Psi_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.6427 & 1.5030 & 2.3440 & 2.9668 & 3.2522 \\ 1.7517 & 2.0705 & 1.9404 & 1.4552 & 0.7808 \end{pmatrix} \] for \( h_3 = h_0/5 \)

\[ \Psi_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.6492 & 1.5021 & 2.3254 & 2.9281 & 3.2007 \\ 1.7391 & 2.0445 & 1.9094 & 1.4329 & 0.7799 \end{pmatrix} \] for \( h_3 = h_0/1000 \)

and the resulting series \( \Omega_{k_0} \) (denote \( (x_1 \ x_2)^T \), the state-space vector):

\[ \Omega_{k_0=1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5000 & 0.6000 & 0.6256 & 0.6427 & 0.6492 \\ 1.9000 & 1.8150 & 1.7805 & 1.7517 & 1.7391 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \Omega_{k_0=1}^{lim} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.6630 \\ 1.7075 \end{pmatrix} \]

\[ \Omega_{k_0=2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.4000 & 1.4911 & 1.5013 & 1.5030 & 1.5021 \\ 2.4600 & 2.2146 & 2.1333 & 2.0705 & 2.0445 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \Omega_{k_0=2}^{lim} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.4963 \\ 1.9817 \end{pmatrix} \]

\[ \Omega_{k_0=3} = \begin{pmatrix} 2.4900 & 2.4295 & 2.3850 & 2.3440 & 2.3254 \\ 2.5140 & 2.1270 & 2.0185 & 1.9404 & 1.9094 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \Omega_{k_0=3}^{lim} = \begin{pmatrix} 2.2770 \\ 1.8379 \end{pmatrix} \]

\[ \Omega_{k_0=4} = \begin{pmatrix} 3.4980 & 3.1761 & 3.0589 & 2.9668 & 2.9281 \\ 2.0176 & 1.6077 & 1.5152 & 1.4552 & 1.4329 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \Omega_{k_0=4}^{lim} = \begin{pmatrix} 2.8346 \\ 1.3851 \end{pmatrix} \]

\[ \Omega_{k_0=5} = \begin{pmatrix} 4.1570 & 3.5565 & 3.3806 & 3.2522 & 3.2007 \\ 1.0668 & 0.8168 & 0.7893 & 0.7808 & 0.7799 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \Omega_{k_0=5}^{lim} = \begin{pmatrix} 3.0809 \\ 0.7836 \end{pmatrix} \]

At each instant \( t_{k_0}^0, k_0 \in \mathbb{N} \), given some terms of the series \( \Omega_{k_0} \), the use of an acceleration algorithm, allows to have an accurate estimation of \( \Omega_{k_0}^{lim} \). We call standard Euler-Shanks scheme, the application of the Shanks transform to the explicit Euler scheme.

To solve accurately the explicit Euler scheme with a high (stabilizing) time-step, one performs a first resolution using a high time-step \( h_0 \). Then, for each instant \( kh_0, k \in \mathbb{N} \) of the initial solution, some power computations of \( (I + A_{k_0}h_i) \) at different time-steps \( h_i \) give a sequence for which, the limit, and therefore, a good estimation of the true solution, is deduced using a convergence accelerator.
3 Shanks transform of numerical series

Consider \((S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) (also simply \(S_n\)), a real series that converges to a limit \(S_{\lim}\) for \(n > n_{\lim}\). To accelerate the convergence, one defines the transformation \(\Phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\), such as \(T_n = \Phi(S_n)\), whose limit is \(T_{\infty}\), implies that \(T_{\infty} - S_{\lim} = O(S_n - S_{\lim})\). In other words, we define the transformation \(\Phi\), such as the transformed series \(T_n\) from the series \(S_n\) reaches its limit \(S_{\lim}\) faster than \(S_n\).

Among the different methods that has been established to accelerate the convergence of a series \([15\ 16]\), we consider the \(\varepsilon\)-algorithm \([17\ 18\ 19]\) based on the Shanks transform \([20\ 21\ 22]\).

3.1 The \(\varepsilon\)-algorithm

Consider a series \(S_n\), for which we aim to estimate the limit \(S_{\lim}\). From a few terms of \(S_n\), the limit \(S_{\lim}\) can be extrapolated using the following algorithm:

\[
\begin{align*}
\varepsilon_{-1}^{(n)} &= 0, \\
\varepsilon_0^{(n)} &= S_n, \\
\varepsilon_{k+1}^{(n)} &= \varepsilon_{k-1}^{(n)} + (\varepsilon_{k+1}^{(n)} - \varepsilon_{k-1}^{(n)})^{-1}, \\
&\quad \text{for } k, n \in \mathbb{N}
\end{align*}
\]

(7)

where \(S_n\) is either a scalar or a vector.

The \(\varepsilon\)-algorithm can be described as a function \(S_n^* = S_{\varepsilon}(k, n, S_n)\) that extrapolates \(S_n\) and gives a new series \(S_n^*\) that converges faster to \(S_{\lim}\) (the limit \(S_{\lim}\) should be reached after a few terms of \(S_n^*\)), where \(S_n\) is the series for which we aim to estimate the limit \(S_{\lim}\); \(k\) and \(n\) are respectively the index of \(S_{\varepsilon}\) (\(k\) is also the order of the associated Shanks transform) and the (initial) index of \(S_n\).

Table 1 gives the number of terms of \(S_n\) and the corresponding number of computations that are requested in order to compute \(S_{\varepsilon}(k, n, S_n)\). Only even \(k\) number are considered and any index \(n\) from \(S_n\) may be considered ((\(k, n\)) \(\in \mathbb{N}\)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k)</th>
<th>nb. of operations</th>
<th>(S_n)</th>
<th>(S_{n+1})</th>
<th>(S_{n+2})</th>
<th>(S_{n+3})</th>
<th>(S_{n+4})</th>
<th>(S_{n+5})</th>
<th>(S_{n+6})</th>
<th>(S_{n+7})</th>
<th>(S_{n+8})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Table of computations of \(S_{\varepsilon}(k, n, S_n)\).

From this Table, we can deduce that the estimation of the limit \(S_{\lim}\) is more accurate when \(k\) and \(n\) are sufficiently high (depending on the convergence rate of "To compute the inverse in the vectorial case, considering a vector \(U\), we have: \(U^{-1} = \frac{U}{||U||^2}\)."
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However, higher index involve much more computations that may decrease the overall efficiency of the method. As a result, a compromise has to be found between $k$ and $n$ in order to get the most accurate $S_{lim}$ with a few terms of $S_n$. Two improvements could be considered:

- From the index $n$, instead of considering the consecutive terms $S_n, S_{n+1}, S_{n+2}, \cdots$ we define the map $\Theta : S_n \mapsto S^m_n$ such as the application $\Theta(S_n)$ modifies the series $S_n$ in order to rearrange ”pertinent” terms. For example, given the series:

  \[ S_n = \{ S_n, S_{n+1}, S_{n+2}, S_{n+3}, \cdots \} \]

  a linear map $\Theta(S_n)$ gives:

  \[ S^m_n = \{ S_n, S_{n+4}, S_{n+8}, S_{n+12}, \cdots \} \]  

  and a non-linear map would give for example:

  \[ S^m_n = \{ S_{\lfloor \exp(n) \rfloor}, S_{\lfloor \exp(n+1) \rfloor}, S_{\lfloor \exp(n+2) \rfloor}, S_{\lfloor \exp(n+3) \rfloor}, \cdots \} \]

  where $\lfloor . \rfloor$ is the floor function defined by $\lfloor x \rfloor = \max \{ m \in \mathbb{Z} | m \leq x \}$.

  The purpose of the linear map is to distribute uniformly the terms of the series $S_n$, whereas the non-linear map may emphasize the high index terms of $S_n$.

- To use more efficiently the $S_\varepsilon$ function and therefore to get a more accurate estimation of $S_{lim}$, one can consider repeated actions of $S_\varepsilon$ on $S_n$ [23].

### 3.2 Application to the explicit Euler scheme

To provide a ”generic” form of the explicit Euler induction, we assume that $A, B$ and $u$ are constants using the ”initial” time-step $h_0$. From the first recursive terms of [3]:

\[
\begin{align*}
    y^0_1 &= (I + h_0 A)y^0_0 + h_0 Bu \\
    y^0_2 &= (I + h_0 A)y^0_1 + h_0 Bu \\
    y^0_3 &= (I + h_0 A)y^0_2 + h_0 Bu \\
    y^0_{k_0+1} &= (I + h_0 A)y^0_{k_0} + h_0 Bu
\end{align*}
\]

we obtain the following definition of the explicit Euler scheme:

\[
y^0_{k_0+1} = (I + Ah_0)^{k_0} y^0_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{k_0-1} (I + Ah_0)^i h_0 Bu, \quad k_0 \in \mathbb{N}
\]  

(10)
According to the Section 2, to describe the explicit Euler scheme with lower time-step, we introduce the parameter $\delta_i$, that divides the time-step $h_0$ such as $h_i = h_0 / \delta_i$, and the time-iteration $k_i$, as a subdivision of $k_0$. Therefore, on the interval $k_i \in [k_0, k_0+1]$, the equation (10) is therefore rewritten:

$$y_{k_i+1} |_{\delta_i(y_{k_0})} = \left(I + Ah_0 \frac{h_i}{\delta_i}\right)^{k_i} y_{k_0} + \sum_{i=0}^{k_i-1} \left(I + \frac{h_0}{\delta_i}\right) \frac{h_0}{\delta_i} Bu, \quad k_i \in \mathbb{N} \quad (11)$$

The notation $y_{k_i+1} |_{\delta_i}$ refers to the fact that the solution is computed at the $k_i + 1$ th time-iteration with the time-step $h_0 / \delta_i$ (the referenced time-step is $h_0$). In other words, we deduce and retrieve the fact that if $k^0_k = \delta_i$, then $t^0_k = k_i h_0 / \delta_i = h_0$. It follows that the corresponding $\Omega_{k_0}$ (defined by (5)) vectors are defined by:

$$\Omega_{k_0} = (y_{\delta_1}^{i_1}(y_{k_0}), y_{\delta_2}^{i_2}(y_{k_0}), \ldots, y_{\delta_i}^{i_k}(y_{k_0}) \cdots) \xrightarrow{i \to \infty} \Omega_{k_0}^{lim} \quad (12)$$

Since the terms of $\Omega_{k_0}$ are directly computed from the parameters $\delta_i, i \in \mathbb{N}$, we can define in the same manner, the vector $\Delta_{k_0}$ that is in direct correspondence with $\Omega_{k_0}$:

$$\Delta_{k_0} = (0, \delta_1, \delta_2, \ldots, \delta_i, \cdots) \quad (13)$$

Then, for each time-iteration $k_0$, we define the accelerated vector $\Omega_{k_0}^*$ such as: $\Omega_{k_0}^* = S_\varepsilon(k, n, \Omega_{k_0})$. The estimated limit of $\Omega_{k_0}^*$ is noted $\hat{\Omega}_{k_0}^{*lim}$ and is given by the last term(s) of $\Omega_{k_0}^*$.

4 Examples and possible improvements ...

4.1 Linear second order system

Consider again the linear second order system $\Sigma_1$, described by the state-space representation:

$$\Sigma_1 := \begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}_1 \\ \dot{x}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 5 \\ -5 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} 10 \quad x_1(0) = 0, x_2(0) = 1 \quad (14)$$

Instead of applying the mapping $\Theta$ on $\Omega_{k_0}$ defined by (12), a more convenient way is to map the $\Delta_{k_0}$ vector defined by (13). Therefore, starting from a linear $\Delta_{k_0}$ vector, we can consider different map as examples. For example:

$$\delta_0 = 1 \quad \delta_{i+1} = \delta_i + 1$$

Tables 2, 3 and 4 give details about the execution of the $\varepsilon$-algorithm for $k_0 = 2$ considering different $k$ index and different maps $\Theta$. 
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Figure 2: Application of the $\varepsilon$-algorithm scheme to the explicit Euler integration of $\Sigma_1$. The big black circles represent the estimated limits $\hat{\Omega}_{k_0}^\text{lim}$, ($k_0 = 1...5$).

Table 2: Execution of the $\varepsilon$-algorithm for a $\Theta$ linear mapping (8) composed of 10 terms of $\Omega_{k_0}$ with $\delta_{10} = 400$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\min \delta_i \in \Delta$</th>
<th>$\max \delta_i \in \Delta$</th>
<th>error with the true solution (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Execution of the $\varepsilon$-algorithm for a $\Theta$ linear mapping (8) composed of 10 terms of $\Omega_{k_0}$ with $\delta_{10} = 300$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\min \delta_i \in \Delta_{k_0}$</th>
<th>$\max \delta_i \in \Delta_{k_0}$</th>
<th>error with the true solution (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We deduce that the choice of the map $\Theta$ and the index $k$ are very important to ensure a good accuracy of the estimated limit. An optimization process can be therefore applied to define optimal $\Theta$ and $k$ according to the smoothness of the system to solve. Nevertheless, good accuracy can be obtained for a small amount of $\Psi_i$ computations with a minimal time-step of the range of $h_0/100$, $h_0 = 0.1$ in our case.
Table 4: Execution of the $\varepsilon$-algorithm for a $\Theta$ exponential mapping composed of 10 terms of $\Omega_{k_0}$ with $\delta_{10} = 22026$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\min \delta_i \in \Delta_{k_0}$</th>
<th>$\max \delta_i \in \Delta_{k_0}$</th>
<th>error with the true solution (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applying the $\varepsilon$-algorithm to each vector $\Omega_{k_0}$, ($k_0 = 1...5$) results in the estimated limits $\hat{\Omega}_{k_0}^{lim}$, ($k_0 = 1...5$) represented by the big black circles in Figure 2.

4.2 Considerations about non-linear systems

Consider a non-linear first order system $\Sigma_2$, described by the ODE:

$$\Sigma_2 := \frac{dy(t)}{dt} + (t^2 - t - 3)y(t) = 3\sin(t - 0.25)$$

Equation (15) is of the form of (1) for which:

$$A(t) = t^2 - t - 3 \quad B(t) = 3\sin(t - 0.25)$$

The use of an initial high time-step $h_0$ may introduce some errors in the integration of $A(t)$ and $B(t)$, that prevent them to be defined as constant during an Euler iteration. To discretize $A(t)$ and $B(t)$, we define an interpolation function that may linearize (1) at $k_0$. A possible form is:

$$A_{k_0} = \frac{\alpha A_{k_0} + \alpha A_{k_0+1}}{\alpha + \beta}, \quad B_{k_0} = \frac{\gamma B_{k_0} + \delta B_{k_0+1}}{\gamma + \delta}$$

where $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\gamma$ and $\delta$ are real parameters that are adjusted according to the smoothness of $A_{k_0}$ and $B_{k_0}$.

Figure 3 presents the computation of the solution of $\Sigma_2$ with different time-steps in comparison with an high-resolution explicit Euler ($h = 10^{-7}$), that we assume in this case, as the ”true solution”. The accuracy of the linearization depends on the interpolation function and its parameters. In particular, if $\beta = \delta = 0$, then the solution is far from the ”true solution”.

As a result, we apply the same Euler-Shanks scheme to the linearized equation (1).

\footnote{Example taken from the Matlab\textsuperscript{®} documentation about ”ODE solvers”.

9}
4.3 Pre-Adaptive scheme

We propose a pre-adaptive scheme, that uses, at each instant $t_{k_0}^0$, the previous estimated limit $\hat{\Omega}_{k_0}^{lim}$ to recompute the initial solution of (1).

Starting from the initial condition $y_0$, a first Euler iteration is computed such as $y_1^0 = E_{h_0}(y_0^0, u_0)$ for the instant $t_{k_0}^0 = 1$. Then, several Euler iterations $E_{h_i}$ using different time-step $\delta_i$ give solutions at the same instant $t_{k_0}^0 = 1$ for which, as a result, the vector $\Omega_{k_0} = 1$ is computed. The $\varepsilon$-algorithm applied to $\Omega_{k_0} = 1$ gives the accelerated vector $\hat{\Omega}_{k_0}^{lim}$ and thus the estimated limit $\hat{\Omega}_{k_0}^{lim}$.

To compute the second Euler iteration, instead of taking $y_1^0$ as the initial condition, we take $\hat{\Omega}_{k_0}^{lim}$. Computing new Euler iterations (for different $\delta_i$) produce a vector $\Omega_{k_0} = 2$ at the instant $t_{k_0}^1 = 2$, for which the estimated limit $\hat{\Omega}_{k_0}^{lim}$ become the initial condition of the next Euler iterations...

As a result, using the $E$ operator, (4) is rewritten:

$$\Psi^i = \{y_0, E_{h_i}(y_0, u_0), E_{h_i}(\hat{\Omega}_{k_0}^{lim}, u_1), \cdots, E_{h_i}(\hat{\Omega}_{k_0}^{lim}, u_{k_0-1}), \cdots\} \quad (16)$$

To illustrate the application of the pre-adaptive scheme on the system $\Sigma_1$, we consider a $\Theta$ linear mapping $\Theta$ composed of 10 terms of $\Omega_{k_0}$ with $\delta_{10} = 400$. Table 5 presents a comparison between the ”standard” accelerated Euler scheme and the pre-adaptive accelerated Euler scheme for $k_0 = 2$. 

Figure 3: $\Sigma_2$ computed using a high resolution explicit Euler ($h = 10^{-7}$) in comparison with Explicit scheme with different time-steps.
Table 5: Comparison of the ”standard” scheme and the pre-adaptive scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k</th>
<th>min δ_i ∈ Δ_k₀</th>
<th>max δ_i ∈ Δ_k₀</th>
<th>error (%) - 'standard'</th>
<th>error (%) - pre-adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the first term of each vector Ω_k₀ is already defined by the previous estimated limit Ω_{k₀-1}^lim, then the following estimations are more accurate and the ε-algorithm would require less terms (low k index) than in the ”standard” case. Figure 4 presents the integration of the Σ₁ system with the initial time-step h₀ in the case of the ”standard” scheme and the pre-adaptive scheme. Ψᵃ converges a priori to the true solution Ψᵀ in a few iterations.

Moreover, one can consider also the application of the repeated ε-algorithm considering higher index k for the first terms of Ψᵃ.

Figure 4: Pre-adaptive scheme applied to Σ₁ in comparison with the ’standard’ case.

5 Conclusion

We presented a simple derivation of the explicit Euler scheme that uses a convergence accelerator algorithm in order to improve the precision of the resulting solution at each
instant. Simulations show encouraging results and show that the proposed method has the following features:

- The computations are based essentially on the power computation of the dynamic matrix \((I + A_{k_0} h_i)\) (thus, no matrices inversion).

- Since the power computations involve several time-steps (the initial time-step \(h_0\), and the different division \(\delta_i\) requested by the \(\varepsilon\)-algorithm), these computations may be parallelized.

- Multidimensional ODEs (linear or non-linear) can be \textit{a priori} considered.

Future investigations include the study of the stability of the proposed algorithm, the improvement of the series accelerator algorithm \cite{19} \cite{24} and the adaptive scheme (e.g. including a variable time-step scheme). Moreover, the association and implementation with existing standard, parallelization and multi-scale methods are also of interest. A demonstration code is available upon request to the author.

References


