

ON GLOBAL ERROR ESTIMATION AND CONTROL FOR INITIAL VALUE PROBLEMS*

J. LANG[†] AND J. G. VERWER[‡]

Abstract. This paper addresses global error estimation and control for initial value problems for ordinary differential equations. The focus lies on a comparison between a novel approach based on the adjoint method combined with a small sample statistical initialization and the classical approach based on the first variational equation. Control is achieved through tolerance proportionality. Both approaches are found to work well and to enable estimation and control in a reliable manner.

Key words. numerical integration for ODEs, global error estimation, global error control, defects and local errors, tolerance proportionality, adjoint method, small sample statistical initialization

AMS subject classifications. 65L05, 65L06, 65L20, 65L70, 65M20

DOI. 10.1137/050646950

1. Introduction. Suppose one is given in \mathbb{R}^m the initial value problem for the system of ODEs

$$(1.1) \quad w' = F(t, w), \quad w(0) = w_0, \quad 0 < t \leq T,$$

and a sequence of approximations w_n to its exact solution values $w(t_n)$ computed by a numerical integration method at a certain time grid

$$(1.2) \quad 0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n < \cdots < t_{N-1} < t_N = T.$$

Hereby the major research concerns are efficiency—how to get the w_n at minimal CPU costs (if $m \gg 1$)—and reliability—how large are the global errors

$$(1.3) \quad \varepsilon_n = w(t_n) - w_n, \quad n = 0, \dots, N.$$

In the past, numerical ODE research has focused on the efficiency question. The reliability question has received much less attention in spite of the by now twenty years old survey paper [23]. Existing popular codes focus on efficiency by adaptively optimizing time grids (1.2) in accordance with local error control. Such a control makes sense if solutions exhibit sharp changes at local intervals much smaller than the total interval $[0, T]$ and are smooth elsewhere. However, local errors (errors made within a single integration step) may substantially differ from the global ones (1.3). This largely depends on the conditioning (stability) of the system (1.1) at hand (sensitivity to growth in time of perturbations of w_0 and $F(t, w)$). If a system is well-conditioned, a well-designed local error control [20, 21] will work out reliably. But if the conditioning is bad, even the best-designed local error control should not be trusted.

For global error control it is necessary to take into account the conditioning of system (1.1), similar to the matrix condition number in numerical linear algebra.

*Received by the editors December 5, 2005; accepted for publication (in revised form) February 13, 2007; published electronically June 19, 2007.

<http://www.siam.org/journals/sisc/29-4/64695.html>

[†]Darmstadt University of Technology, Schlossgartenstrasse 7, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany (lang@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de).

[‡]Center for Mathematics and Computer Science, P.O. Box 94079, 1090 GB Amsterdam, The Netherlands (Jan.Verwer@cwi.nl).

Herewith it is desirable to avoid strict a priori error bounds as these can be overly pessimistic, e.g., when fortunate cancellation effects occur. Taking into account the conditioning of system (1.1) is best done during actual computation. This requires at least two full integrations over $[0, T]$, in both the classical (forward-forward) and the adjoint (forward-backward) approaches. In recent years the adjoint approach has gained popularity for a posteriori error estimation purposes [2, 6, 13, 17], in particular for PDEs where it is used for goal-oriented adaptive control, that is, control of relevant physical quantities [1, 5, 7].

Our interest in this paper lies in estimation and control of the global errors (1.3), i.e., for the ODE initial value problem (1.1). Specifically, regarding estimation we will compare a novel approach based on the adjoint method combined with a small sample statistical initialization proposed by Cao and Petzold [2] to the classical approach based on the first variational equation. For both, global control is achieved by exploiting the property of tolerance proportionality derived from local control [20]. As a typical integration method we will use the existing Runge–Kutta–Rosenbrock method ROS3P [16]. Both approaches are found to work well and to enable estimation and control in a reliable manner.

2. The classical (forward-forward) approach.

2.1. The perturbed system. In the spirit of backward error analysis and following an approach proposed in [26] (see also [23, 24]), let us suppose that there exists a nearby solution $v(t) \approx w(t)$, that is the exact solution of a perturbed system

$$(2.1) \quad v' = F(t, v) + r(t), \quad v(0) = v_0, \quad 0 < t \leq T,$$

with perturbation $v_0 - w_0$ at $t = 0$ and perturbation $r(t)$ for $0 < t \leq T$. Assuming F to be continuously differentiable, so that the mean-value theorem for vector functions is applicable, the error function

$$(2.2) \quad e(t) = v(t) - w(t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

then satisfies

$$(2.3) \quad e' = A(t)e + r(t), \quad e(0) = v_0 - w_0, \quad 0 < t \leq T,$$

where

$$(2.4) \quad A(t) = \int_0^1 F'(t, v(t) + (s-1)e(t)) ds = \int_0^1 F'(t, w(t) + se(t)) ds.$$

Here F' denotes the Jacobian matrix with respect to the dependent variable. As we speak of perturbations we tacitly assume that $e(0)$ is significantly smaller than w_0 and likewise that $r(t)$ is significantly smaller than $F(t, v(t))$. The error function $e(t)$ can be expressed as

$$(2.5) \quad e(t) = \Phi^{-1}(t)\Phi(0)e(0) + \Phi^{-1}(t) \int_0^t \Phi(s)r(s) ds,$$

where the $m \times m$ fundamental matrix solution $\Phi(t)$ solves $\Phi'(t) = -\Phi(t)A(t)$. Note that $\Phi(t) = \Phi(0)\exp(-At)$ for constant A , where $\Phi(0)$ is an arbitrary nonsingular matrix. Apparently, the product $\Phi^{-1}(t)\Phi(s)$, $0 \leq s \leq t$, governs growth or decay of $e(t)$ in time and thus determines the conditioning of (1.1).

Remark 2.1. For practical purposes the fundamental matrix solution concept is clearly of little use. An a priori bound which sometimes can be used in practice is based on the logarithmic matrix norm. Let $\mu(A(t))$ denote the logarithmic matrix norm of $A(t)$, and suppose $\mu(A(t)) \leq \omega$, with ω a constant valid for all $t \in [0, T]$. Then, with $\|\cdot\|$ denoting the associated vector norm in \mathbb{R}^m , there holds [3, 12]

$$(2.6) \quad \|e(t)\| \leq e^{\omega t} \|e(0)\| + \int_0^t e^{\omega(t-s)} \|r(s)\| ds, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

This a priori bound is useful for strictly negative ω . Let for simplicity $e(0) = 0$, and suppose that $\|r(t)\|$ is uniformly bounded by a small number δ_r . Then

$$(2.7) \quad \|e(t)\| \leq \frac{1}{\omega} (e^{\omega t} - 1) \delta_r,$$

uniformly bounding $e(t)$ in norm by $\delta_r/|\omega|$ for infinite time if $\omega < 0$. Due to the negative logarithmic norm this is an instance of a well-conditioned ODE system (1.1). On the other hand, with a positive logarithmic norm the bound predicts exponential growth in time. Then we speak of an ill-conditioned ODE system, provided the bound is realistic or even sharp. However, any result of this sort depends on the chosen vector norm since $\mu(A(t))$ depends on the norm. More precisely, it can happen that $\mu(A(t)) \gg 0$, even if in a global sense the problem is well-conditioned; see, e.g., [3] and Example I.2.5 in [12]. Also, for hard problems from practice, finding estimates of ω may be very cumbersome.

For properly using the perturbed system in the classical (forward-forward) approach for p th order consistent one-step integration methods, it is helpful to associate (2.3) with the well-known first variational equation for the global error ε_n of such a one-step method. For this purpose we adopt for the one-step method the general Henrici notation [9]

$$(2.8) \quad w_{n+1} = w_n + \tau_n \Psi(t_n, w_n; \tau_n), \quad \tau_n = t_{n+1} - t_n,$$

and introduce its local error

$$(2.9) \quad \delta_n = w(t_{n+1}) - w(t_n) - \tau_n \Psi(t_n, w(t_n); \tau_n).$$

Assuming now a constant step size τ (for simplicity only), p th order consistency, and a sufficiently smooth solution, the local error defined at $(t, w(t))$

$$(2.10) \quad \delta(t) = w(t + \tau) - w(t) - \tau \Psi(t, w(t); \tau)$$

possesses an expansion of the form $\delta(t) = \tau \rho(t) + \mathcal{O}(\tau^{p+2})$. Hence in this notation the principal error function $\rho(t) = \mathcal{O}(\tau^p)$. Next, let $G(t) = F'(t, w(t))$. With this local expansion at hand the global error ε_n is then known to possess an expansion $\varepsilon_n = \eta(t_n) + \mathcal{O}(\tau^{p+1})$, where $\eta(t)$ is the solution of the first variational equation

$$(2.11) \quad \eta' = G(t)\eta + \rho(t), \quad \eta(0) = 0, \quad 0 < t \leq T.$$

We refer to [9, section 3.3] and [8, section II.8] for further details. One can now connect (2.3) to (2.11). To that end put $e(0) = 0$ (this bears no restriction) and approximate $A(t) = G(t) + \mathcal{O}(e(t))$ by $G(t)$, so that (2.3) is replaced by

$$(2.12) \quad e' = G(t)e + r(t), \quad e(0) = 0, \quad 0 < t \leq T.$$

Apparently, by implementing a proper choice of the defect $r(t)$, solving (2.3) or likewise (2.12) will in leading order amount to solving the first variational equation (2.11) for the true global error. We will illustrate this next.

Remark 2.2. In spite of the fact that the asymptotic theory behind (2.11) is classical in the sense that F is assumed Lipschitz without taking into account stiffness ($\tau\|F'(w)\| \gg 1$), we will use it successfully for stiff problems in section 4. For success it is important that the stiffness does not enter the defect computation. We prevent this by filtering; see (2.23). Equally important is validity of the asymptotics, that is, the local error is well approximated by its leading term. For smooth, sufficiently differentiable solutions this always holds for linear multistep methods. For Runge–Kutta-type methods applied to semidiscrete PDEs, this generally holds with periodic boundary conditions. With prescribed boundary conditions, such as Dirichlet conditions, it also holds for Runge–Kutta methods, except that temporal error coefficients can get large on fine grids due to order reduction. In such cases smaller step sizes are needed to catch the leading local error term with sufficient accuracy. As is well known, this may also be needed with stiff problems not originating from PDEs.

2.2. Interpolation and defect computation. We define the nearby solution $v(t)$ by piecewise cubic Hermite interpolation of the given approximation sequence. Hence at every subinterval $[t_n, t_{n+1}]$, $n = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$, we form

$$(2.13) \quad P(t) = w_n + (t - t_n) \mathcal{A}_n + (t - t_n)^2 \mathcal{B}_n + (t - t_n)^3 \mathcal{C}_n, \quad t_n \leq t \leq t_{n+1},$$

and choose the coefficients such that $P(t_n) = w_n$, $P(t_{n+1}) = w_{n+1}$ and $P'(t_n) = F_n$, $P'(t_{n+1}) = F_{n+1}$, where $F_n = F(t_n, w_n)$ and $F_{n+1} = F(t_{n+1}, w_{n+1})$. This gives

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_n &= F_n, \\ \mathcal{B}_n &= (3w_{n+1} - 3w_n - \tau F_{n+1} - 2\tau F_n) / \tau^2, \\ \mathcal{C}_n &= (2w_n - 2w_{n+1} + \tau F_n + \tau F_{n+1}) / \tau^3. \end{aligned}$$

Were one to interpolate (smooth) exact solution values $w(t), w'(t)$ at $t = t_n$ and $t = t_{n+1}$, then

$$(2.15) \quad \mathcal{A} = w^{(1)}, \quad \mathcal{B} = \frac{1}{2}w^{(2)} - \frac{1}{24}\tau^2w^{(4)} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^3), \quad \mathcal{C} = \frac{1}{6}w^{(3)} + \frac{1}{12}\tau w^{(4)} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2),$$

where the expressions are evaluated at $t = t_n$. Writing $t = t_n + s\tau$, $0 \leq s \leq 1$, yields

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{aligned} P(t) &= w(t) + \frac{1}{24}(2s^3 - s^2 - s^4)\tau^4w^{(4)}(t_n) + \mathcal{O}(\tau^5), \\ P'(t) &= w'(t) + \frac{1}{24}(6s^2 - 2s - 4s^3)\tau^3w^{(4)}(t_n) + \mathcal{O}(\tau^4), \end{aligned}$$

so that at every subinterval $[t_n, t_{n+1}]$ the defect function $d(t) = P'(t) - F(t, P(t))$ satisfies

$$(2.17) \quad d(t) = P'(t) - w'(t) + F(t, w(t)) - F(t, P(t)) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}(\tau^3), & s \neq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \mathcal{O}(\tau^4), & s = \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Here we have assumed that F is Lipschitz and have used that $6s^2 - 2s - 4s^3 = 0$ for $s = \frac{1}{2}$.

In actual application the interpolation is based on numerical approximations of order p . By assuming exact local solution values at $t = t_n$ and corresponding local Taylor expansions of w_{n+1}, F_{n+1} , it then follows in the same way as above that $d(t) =$

$\mathcal{O}(\tau^q)$, where $q = \min(p, 3)$, and with the special value $s = \frac{1}{2}$ we have $q = \min(p, 4)$. Hence the cubic Hermite polynomial can be used up to consistency order $p = 3$, and when using only $s = \frac{1}{2}$ even up to order $p = 4$. In the remainder we will employ the defect $d(t)$ halfway to the step intervals, that is,

$$(2.18) \quad d(t_{n+1/2}) = \frac{3w_{n+1} - 3w_n}{2\tau} - \frac{F_n + F_{n+1}}{4} - F\left(t_{n+1/2}, \frac{w_n + w_{n+1}}{2} + \frac{\tau}{8}(F_n - F_{n+1})\right).$$

Now let $w_n = w(t_n)$, and consider local expansions

$$(2.19) \quad w_{n+1} = w + \tau w' + \sum_{k=2}^p \frac{\tau^k}{k!} w^{(k)} + \frac{\tau^{p+1}}{(p+1)!} C_{p+1} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^{p+2}),$$

with the right-hand side evaluated at $w = w(t_n)$ and an empty sum for $p = 1$. Hence the ρ -term in the local error expansion at $t = t_n$ then reads

$$(2.20) \quad \rho_n = \frac{\tau^p}{(p+1)!} \left(w^{(p+1)}(t_n) - C_{p+1} \right),$$

and inserting the expansion for w_{n+1} into $d(t_{n+1/2})$ will reveal

$$(2.21) \quad d(t_{n+1/2}) = -\frac{3}{2} \rho_n + \mathcal{O}(\tau^{p+1}), \quad 1 \leq p \leq 3.$$

The cubic Hermite defect halfway to the step interval thus can be used to retrieve in leading order the local error of any one-step method of order $1 \leq p \leq 3$.

Finally we connect (2.12) and (2.11) by putting $r(t_{n+1/2}) = \frac{2}{3} d(t_{n+1/2})$ in the stepwise frozen version of (2.12), i.e.,

$$(2.22) \quad e' = F'(t_n, w_n)e + r(t_{n+1/2}), \quad t_n < t \leq t_{n+1}, \quad n = 0, \dots, N - 1,$$

which will be integrated for the global error estimation. In this manner we actually work in leading order with the stepwise frozen version of the first variational equation (2.11) for the true global error (both $G(t)$ and $\rho(t)$ are frozen at $t = t_n$) multiplied by -1 , i.e., $e = -\eta$ in first-order approximation. Within the more general setting of continuous Runge–Kutta methods, this use of defects and relations like (2.21) was discussed earlier; see, e.g., [4, 10, 11, 21, 22]. Trivially, multiplying $r(t_{n+1/2})$ by a certain constant multiplies the solution by the same constant (if $e(0) = 0$). This simple property forms the basis for tolerance proportionality, which we shall use for attempting control over the global errors (in both the classical and the novel approaches).

2.3. The example integration formulas. As the example integrator for the comparison between the adjoint and the classical approaches, we have used an A-stable scheme, viz., the third-order Runge–Kutta–Rosenbrock scheme ROS3P [16]. To save space we refer to [15, 16] for details.

The implemented step size strategy by which the time grid (1.2) is generated with ROS3P is standard, except that, different from [16], the defect $r(t_{n+1/2})$ is used. So for local control we work with

$$(2.23) \quad Est = (I - \gamma\tau_n A)^{-1} r(t_{n+1/2}), \quad A = F'(t_n, w_n),$$

where γ is a ROS3P coefficient. The common filter $(I - \gamma\tau_n A)^{-1}$ serves to damp spurious stiff components which would otherwise be amplified through the F -evaluations

within $r(t_{n+1/2})$.¹ Note that, while the local error is $\mathcal{O}(\tau_n^4)$, this estimate is $\mathcal{O}(\tau_n^3)$ by which we asymptotically have tolerance proportionality [20].

Let $D_n = \|Est\|$, with $\|\cdot\|$ the L_2 -norm.² The step is accepted if $D_n \leq Tol_n$, where $Tol_n = Tol_A + Tol_R \|w_n\|$, with Tol_A and Tol_R given tolerances. Otherwise the step is rejected and redone. In both cases the new step size is determined by the standard rule $\tau_{new} = \min(1.5, \max(2/3, 0.9r))\tau_n$, where $r = (Tol_n/D_n)^{1/3}$. After each step size change we adjust τ_{new} to $\tau_{n+1} = (T - t_n) / \lfloor (1 + (T - t_n)/\tau_{new}) \rfloor$ so as to guarantee to reach the end point T with a step of averaged normal length. The initial step size τ_0 is prescribed and is adjusted similarly.

Simultaneously, (2.22) is integrated by means of the implicit midpoint rule

$$(2.24) \quad e_{n+1} = e_n + \tau_n A \left(\frac{e_{n+1} + e_n}{2} \right) + \tau_n r(t_{n+1/2}), \quad A = F'(t_n, w_n),$$

implemented in the equivalent form

$$(2.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{e}_{n+1} &= 2e_n + \frac{1}{2}\tau_n A \tilde{e}_{n+1} + \tau_n r(t_{n+1/2}), \\ e_{n+1} &= \tilde{e}_{n+1} - e_n. \end{aligned}$$

The main additional costs for (2.25) come from an extra decomposition since $\gamma \neq \frac{1}{2}$ (assuming a direct solve). Due to freezing $G(t)$ and $\rho(t)$ at $t = t_n$ as discussed above, the second-order midpoint rule (2.24) is a first-order method when interpreted for solving the first variational equation (2.11). As a result, the associated local error takes the form $C(t_n)\tau_n^2 + \text{h.o.t.}$, where the leading error constant $C(t_n) = \mathcal{O}(\tau_{max}^3)$ as it is proportional to $\eta(t)$, which itself is $\mathcal{O}(\tau_{max}^3)$. Consequently, the global error approximations e_n satisfy $e_n = -\epsilon_n + \mathcal{O}(\tau_{max}^4)$.

2.4. The control rule. Suppose ROS3P and (2.25) have delivered a numerical solution w_N and a global error estimate e_N at time $t_N = T$. We then verify whether

$$(2.26) \quad \|e_N\| \leq C_{control} Tol_N, \quad Tol_N = Tol_A + Tol_R \|w_N\|,$$

where $C_{control} \approx 1$, typically > 1 . If (2.26) holds, the true global error is considered small enough relative to the chosen tolerance, and w_N is accepted. Otherwise, the computation with ROS3P and (2.25) is redone over $[0, T]$ with the same (small) τ_0 and the adjusted tolerances

$$(2.27) \quad Tol_A = Tol_A \times fac, \quad Tol_R = Tol_R \times fac, \quad fac = Tol_N / \|e_N\|.$$

The primary aim of global error estimation is to provide an additional check on accuracy. Especially when the problem at hand is ill-conditioned (unstable), this is useful since local control will not detect instability so that ϵ_N might be substantially larger than the imposed tolerance. The second (control) computation with ROS3P (and (2.25) for an additional check) serves to reduce ϵ_N to the imposed tolerance level. If all is going well, with (2.26) we thus count on the quality of the global error estimation and with (2.27) on tolerance proportionality, thus expecting that reducing the local error estimates with the factor fac will reduce ϵ_N by fac [20].

¹The defect contains a new F -evaluation, which in turn contains $F(t_n, w_n)$ and $F(t_{n+1}, w_{n+1})$, indicating that two filter steps would be needed. Our practical experience is that one filter step is sufficient, although we know of at least one hypothetical problem (the Kaps problem given at page 215 of [3]) for which two filter steps are appropriate.

²By L_2 -norm we mean the weighted inner product norm, i.e., $\|v\|^2 = v^T v / m$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$. This norm will also be used for the adjoint approach.

Remark 2.3. It is possible to avoid (2.27) by storing the whole step size sequence (1.2) from the first run over $[0, T]$ and to carry out the second computation on a new step size sequence obtained by dividing all intervals $[t_n, t_{n+1}]$ into $\lceil 1/fac^{1/3} \rceil$ equal subintervals. We then count only on the quality of (2.26) and even would have the possibility to also use global Richardson extrapolation for global error estimation for an additional check. However, we then also give up local control. This renders no problem if all is going well, but it might result in numerical instability which otherwise would have been detected by local control.

3. The adjoint (forward-backward) approach. Like for the classical approach the analysis of the adjoint approach starts from the perturbed system derived in section 2.1.

3.1. Error representation for scalar-derived functions. The error representation formula (2.5) reveals that an approximation of $\Phi^{-1}(t)\Phi(s)$, $0 \leq s \leq t$, would be desirable to estimate the sensitivity of (1.1) with respect to perturbations $v_0 - w_0$ and $r(t)$. Instead of computing these matrix products, which is in general far too expensive or even unattainable, we first derive error estimates for a scalar-derived function. The analysis is based on the adjoint method, which has been used successfully to obtain goal-oriented a posteriori error estimation for an adaptive error control for PDEs (see [1, 5, 7]) and ODEs (see [2, 6, 13, 17]).

Let $M(w(t))$ be the scalar quantity of interest. Then one has for the error in M

$$(3.1) \quad \Delta M(t) := M(v(t)) - M(w(t)) = \overline{M}(t) e(t),$$

with row vector

$$(3.2) \quad \overline{M}(t) = \int_0^1 M'(v(t) + (s-1)e(t)) ds = \int_0^1 M'(w(t) + se(t)) ds.$$

Hence, using (2.5),

$$(3.3) \quad \Delta M(t) = \overline{M}(t)\Phi^{-1}(t)\Phi(0)e(0) + \overline{M}(t)\Phi^{-1}(t) \int_0^t \Phi(s)r(s) ds.$$

Solving backward in time the adjoint equation

$$(3.4) \quad \phi'(s) = -A^T(s)\phi(s), \quad \phi(t) = \overline{M}^T(t), \quad 0 \leq s < t,$$

and taking into account that $\Phi^{-T}(s)$ is the fundamental matrix of this equation if (and only if) $\Phi(t)$ is the fundamental matrix of (2.3) defined in (2.5), one gets

$$(3.5) \quad \phi^T(s) = \overline{M}(t)\Phi^{-1}(t)\Phi(s).$$

Thus

$$(3.6) \quad \Delta M(t) = \phi^T(0)e(0) + \int_0^t \phi^T(s)r(s) ds, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Formula (3.6) serves as the fundamental relation to derive a strategy for global error estimation. The adjoint solution value $\phi^T(0)$ measures sensitivity of $M(w(t))$ with respect to $e(0)$. Likewise, the integral term measures sensitivity with respect to the defects.

Remark 3.1. In principle one may consider quantities $M(w(t)) = \xi_i^T w(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, where ξ_i is the i th unit vector in \mathbb{R}^m . Then $\Delta M(t) = \xi_i^T e(t) = e^{(i)}(t)$, the i th component of the error vector $e(t)$. Thus $\overline{M}^T(t) = \xi_i$. Denoting by ψ_i the solution of (3.4) with ξ_i as the initial value, one gets from (3.6)

$$(3.7) \quad \xi_i^T e(t) = e^{(i)}(t) = \psi_i^T(0)e(0) + \int_0^t \psi_i^T(s)r(s) ds.$$

In this way all components of the error vector $e(t)$ could be computed at the price of solving the adjoint equation m times. However, if $m \gg 1$, one would have to solve a tremendous number of adjoint systems, making this method impractical. The best choice would be $M(w(t)) = e^T(t)w(t)/(m\|e(t)\|)$ [2]. Then $\Delta M(t) = \|e(t)\|$ directly from (3.1), but one does not have $e(t)$. The choice of appropriate initial conditions for the adjoint system is the main challenge for the adjoint approach [2, 7].

Remark 3.2. To set up the adjoint equation (3.4) we have to replace $A^T(s)$ by a suitable approximation in the neighborhood of $v(s)$. Thus the adjoint equation depends on the solution of the original ODE. A first possibility is to store the forward solution for every time step to determine the adjoint equation. Alternatively, the solution is stored at only a few selected times $0 = T_0 < T_1 < \dots < T_K = T$. As the adjoint equation solver marches backwards in time from T_k to T_{k-1} , one recomputes the solution over that time interval using the previously stored solution T_{k-1} as the initial value. This approach reduces the storage requirements at the price of a second forward solution. The need to make the forward equation available to the adjoint equation is a drawback of the adjoint approach. Solution storage is of course not needed for linear systems (1.1) of type $w' = A(t)w + g(t)$. On the other hand, in all cases all defects must be stored. Another drawback of the adjoint approach is that it is defined for single output times t at which estimation is wanted. In other words, if estimation is wanted at multiple times t , the adjoint solution must be computed separately for each value of t .

3.2. Global error estimation. We have implemented global error estimation applying ROS3P to solve (1.1) as described in section 2.3 and using (3.6) and the small sample statistical method proposed by Cao and Petzold for backward differentiation formula (BDF) methods [2] (see also [14] for more details). The main idea is to replace the vectors ξ_i in (3.7) by a small number of orthonormal vectors z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k , which are selected uniformly and randomly from the unit sphere S_{m-1} in m dimensions. Instead of computing accurate error estimates of global errors, we try to approximate them with a high probability.

Let $\eta_i(t) = |z_i^T e(t)|$. Then an estimate for $\|e(t)\|$ is given by

$$(3.8) \quad \|e(t)\| \approx g_k(t) = \frac{E_k}{E_m} \sqrt{\frac{1}{m}(\eta_1^2(t) + \eta_2^2(t) + \dots + \eta_k^2(t))},$$

where $E_1 = 1$, $E_2 = 2/\pi$, and for $n > 2$

$$(3.9) \quad E_n = \begin{cases} \frac{1 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdots (n-2)}{2 \cdot 4 \cdot 6 \cdots (n-1)} & \text{for } n \text{ odd,} \\ \frac{2}{\pi} \cdot \frac{2 \cdot 4 \cdot 6 \cdots (n-2)}{1 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdots (n-1)} & \text{for } n \text{ even.} \end{cases}$$

E_n can be estimated by $\sqrt{2/(\pi(n-1/2))}$. The “ \approx ” in (3.8) has to be understood in the sense of probability. More precisely, the expected value of the random variable

$g_k(t)$ is given by $E(g_k(t)) = \|e(t)\|$ (see [14], Theorem 3.1). For $k = m$ the vectors z_1, \dots, z_k form an orthonormal basis in \mathbb{R}^m , and hence from the definition in (3.8) we get for $k = m$ directly the identity $g_m(t) = \|e(t)\|$.

The important question now is, what is the probability that the estimator $g_k(t)$ provides upper and lower bounds for $\|e(t)\|$? Let $c > 1$ be a given factor. Then one has for two and three random vectors [14]

$$(3.10) \quad P\left(\frac{g_2(t)}{c} \leq \|e(t)\| \leq c g_2(t)\right) \approx 1 - \frac{\pi}{4c^2},$$

$$(3.11) \quad P\left(\frac{g_3(t)}{c} \leq \|e(t)\| \leq c g_3(t)\right) \approx 1 - \frac{32}{3\pi^2 c^3}.$$

To achieve 99% probability of accuracy, for example, one can use $k = 2$ for $c = 10$ and $k = 3$ for $c = 5$. In [2] it is pointed out that in practice usually at most two or three random vectors are sufficient, although without giving numerical evidence because in their numerical experiments $k = m$. Hence the small sample statistical method was not tested in [2].

Remark 3.3. To generate vectors uniformly and randomly on S_{m-1} one can use the following procedure: Let $\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(m)}$ be normally distributed independent random variables with mean zero and variance one. Then the vector $\lambda/\|\lambda\|$ is uniformly and randomly distributed over S_{m-1} where $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(m)})^T$ [25].

The small sample statistical method described above thus will be used to estimate $\|e(T)\|$. We first select random vectors $\hat{z}_1, \dots, \hat{z}_k$ from S_{m-1} and construct an orthonormal basis z_1, \dots, z_k for their span by using a Gram–Schmidt procedure or a QR decomposition. Then we solve the corresponding adjoint equations

$$(3.12) \quad \phi'_i(s) = -A^T(s) \phi_i(s), \quad \phi_i(T) = z_i,$$

for $\phi_i, i = 1, \dots, k$. From (3.1) and (3.6) with $\Delta M(T) = z_i^T e(T)$ we have for each ϕ_i the identity

$$(3.13) \quad z_i^T e(T) = \phi_i^T(0)e(0) + \int_0^T \phi_i^T(s)r(s) ds.$$

In the following we assume $e(0) = 0$. Using (3.8) and recalling $\eta_i(T) = |z_i^T e(T)|$ we get

$$(3.14) \quad g_k(T) = \frac{E_k}{E_m} \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\int_0^T \phi_i^T(s)r(s) ds \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

The integral terms must be approximated (recall that with $k = m$ and an exact computation of these integrals we have $\|e(T)\| = g_m(T)$). We integrate (3.12) using the second-order implicit midpoint rule on the same grid as selected to solve (1.1) by means of ROS3P, but now backward in time starting from z_i ,

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\phi}_{i,n} &= 2\phi_{i,n+1} + \frac{\tau_n}{2} A^T \tilde{\phi}_{i,n}, \quad A^T = \left(F' \left(t_{n+1/2}, \frac{w_n + w_{n+1}}{2} \right) \right)^T, \\ \phi_{i,n} &= \tilde{\phi}_{i,n} - \phi_{i,n+1}, \quad n = N - 1, \dots, 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for larger problems one cannot store all Jacobians A from the forward integration, so one has to recompute them. The practical need for recomputing Jacobians

is another drawback of the adjoint approach. Further note that, like in the forward approach, A^T is an accurate approximation to the integrated Jacobian $A(t)$ defined in (2.4) as long as the global error $e(t)$ is sufficiently small. The adjoint problems are not coupled and hence can be solved in parallel. Also recomputing Jacobians for use in the backward in time midpoint rule is needed only once, that is, once for all adjoint problems.

To approximate the integrals in (3.14) we use the 1-point, second-order Gaussian formula for each integration interval to obtain

$$(3.16) \quad g_k(T) \approx \frac{E_k}{E_m} \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \tau_n \frac{\phi_{i,n}^T + \phi_{i,n+1}^T}{2} r(t_{n+1/2}) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where the residual $r(t_{n+1/2})$ is computed in exactly the same way as within the classical approach described in sections 2.2 and 2.3; i.e., we take $r(t_{n+1/2}) = \frac{2}{3}d(t_{n+1/2})$.

3.3. The control rule. The possible need for a second forward computation with ROS3P is decided on the same control rule as in the classical approach, which we described in section 2.4. Hence also for the adjoint approach we rely on tolerance proportionality for the global error control. If a second forward computation is decided, then for an additional error check we apply (3.15) once again for the already chosen random vectors z_i taken as initial values, similar to the additional error check in the classical approach.

Remark 3.4. The conditioning of system (1.1) with respect to small perturbations $r(t)$ can be estimated using (3.14). There holds

$$(3.17) \quad \|e(T)\| \approx |g_k(T)| \leq K_T \cdot \max_{0 \leq s \leq T} \|r(s)\|,$$

with the condition number

$$(3.18) \quad K_T = K_T(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k) = \frac{E_k \sqrt{m}}{E_m} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\int_0^T \|\phi_i(s)\| ds \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

If K_T is small, a well-designed defect-based local error control will work out well. But if K_T is large, one could end up with a global error much larger than the imposed local tolerance. As proposed in [5] for parabolic problems, and discussed in [2] for BDF methods, one could tighten the local tolerance for the second ROS3P run within (2.27) through $fac = 1/K_T$. However, when taking norms in (3.17), favorable effects of error cancellation and nearly zero defect values are completely ignored, and therefore the new local tolerance can be extremely pessimistic. Indeed, this is observed for the example system of section 4.4. Its condition number computed from (3.18) with $k = 2$, while using the 1-point, second-order Gaussian formula, is huge, being about 10^{20} . On the other hand, the integral terms in (3.14) are of moderate size due to cancellation and many zero entries in the defect function $r(s)$. So for the example system of section 4.4, the use of the condition number K_T for global error control is impossible. In fact, K_T is of the same size as the a priori condition number $K_{\mu_2} = (e^{\omega T} - 1)/\omega$, based on the logarithmic matrix norm μ_2 , given in (2.7). Inserting the accurate bound $\omega = 100$, which in this case is just the largest eigenvalue of the Jacobian matrix due to symmetry [12], yields $K_{\mu_2} \approx 5.2 \times 10^{19}$.

4. Numerical illustrations. Numerical results are given for (i) a 2-dimensional unstable nonstiff example problem from [2], (ii) the 3-dimensional stable stiff Robertson chemical kinetics problem [8], (iii) a 100-dimensional unstable semidiscrete diffusion-reaction problem (an often used test problem from combustion theory [12]), and (iv) a 400-dimensional unstable semidiscrete diffusion-reaction problem (from pattern formation and often called the bistable Allen–Cahn problem). For the semidiscrete problems spatial errors are left out of consideration; i.e., we compare to a highly accurate ODE reference solution.

All four problems are solved with $Tol_A = Tol_R = Tol$ for the four tolerance values $Tol = 10^{-l}$, $l = 3, 4, 5, 6$, using one and the same initial step size $\tau_0 = 10^{-5}$. If after the first attempt (2.26) is violated with $C_{control} = 1$, a second attempt is carried out with the same τ_0 and the automatically adjusted new value for Tol through (2.27). Needless to say, $C_{control} = 1$ is too stringent. We use it here only for the sake of illustrating the good performance of the global control rule (2.27). It will be clear from the tables of results whether a second attempt was necessary.

The tables of results contain the following quantities $Tol_N = Tol(1 + \|w_N\|)$ from (2.26): for the classical approach the ratio $\|\varepsilon_N\|/\|e_N\|$ of the true global error and the estimated global error, for the adjoint approach the ratio $\|\varepsilon_N\|/g_k(T)$ of the true global error and the estimated global error defined by (3.16), and for both approaches the ratio $\|\varepsilon_N\|/Tol_N$. The first and second ratios serve to illustrate the quality of the estimation, while the third does this for the control. In addition, the numbers of accepted and rejected ROS3P steps are given.

Finally, for the small sample statistical initialization used in the adjoint method, $k = m$ orthonormal random vectors were used for the two small-sized problems, whereas for the other two much larger problems we used only two random vectors. So only for the two larger problems was the small sample statistical initialization tested, and for the two small-sized problems the classical and adjoint approach should give identical results, except for minor implementation differences. Also observe that the randomness of the initialization will lead to differences in the results when computations are repeated, although minor ones.

4.1. A low-dimensional nonstiff ODE system. The first test problem is the 2-dimensional unstable linear system [2]

$$(4.1) \quad w' = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2(1+t)} & -2t \\ 2t & \frac{1}{2(1+t)} \end{pmatrix} w, \quad w(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad 0 < t \leq T = 10,$$

with increasing oscillatory solution $w_1(t) = \cos(t^2)\sqrt{1+t}$, $w_2(t) = \sin(t^2)\sqrt{1+t}$. Table 4.1 shows the results for the classical approach. Since $k = m = 2$, the adjoint approach results are identical except for negligible implementation differences. The quality of the global error estimates is very high, and the second runs based on tolerance proportionality yield perfect control for all tolerances.

4.2. A low-dimensional stiff ODE system. Our second test problem is the well-known Robertson problem from the stiff ODE field [8]

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} w_1' &= -4.0 \times 10^{-2} w_1 + 10^4 w_2 w_3, & w_1(0) &= 1, \\ w_2' &= 4.0 \times 10^{-2} w_1 - 10^4 w_2 w_3 - 3.0 \times 10^7 w_2^2, & w_2(0) &= 0, \\ w_3' &= 3.0 \times 10^7 w_2^2, & w_3(0) &= 0, \quad 0 < t \leq T = 1. \end{aligned}$$

TABLE 4.1
Low-dimensional nonstiff ODE system: classical approach.

| Tol | Tol_N | $\ \epsilon_N\ /Tol_N$ | $\ \epsilon_N\ /\ e_N\ $ | Accept | Reject |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------|--------|
| 10^{-3} | 3.32×10^{-3} | 8.16 | 1.02 | 1031 | 4 |
| 1.25×10^{-4} | 3.34×10^{-3} | 1.03 | 1.01 | 2044 | 0 |
| 10^{-4} | 3.34×10^{-4} | 8.23 | 1.01 | 2201 | 0 |
| 1.22×10^{-5} | 3.34×10^{-4} | 1.00 | 1.00 | 4415 | 0 |
| 10^{-5} | 3.34×10^{-5} | 8.20 | 1.00 | 4719 | 0 |
| 1.22×10^{-6} | 3.35×10^{-5} | 1.00 | 1.00 | 9419 | 0 |
| 10^{-6} | 3.35×10^{-6} | 8.19 | 1.00 | 10146 | 0 |
| 1.22×10^{-7} | 3.35×10^{-6} | 1.00 | 1.00 | 20426 | 0 |

TABLE 4.2
A low-dimensional stiff ODE system: adjoint approach.

| Tol | Tol_N | $\ \epsilon_N\ /Tol_N$ | $\ \epsilon_N\ /g_3(T)$ | Accept | Reject |
|-----------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------|--------|
| 10^{-3} | 1.56×10^{-3} | 7.39×10^{-5} | 1.05 | 29 | 0 |
| 10^{-4} | 1.56×10^{-4} | 1.05×10^{-3} | 0.94 | 31 | 0 |
| 10^{-5} | 1.56×10^{-5} | 8.68×10^{-3} | 1.01 | 40 | 1 |
| 10^{-6} | 1.56×10^{-6} | 7.64×10^{-2} | 1.02 | 62 | 2 |

This stiff problem is highly stable, resulting in global errors much smaller than imposed local tolerances (the effect of the small initial $\tau_0 = 10^{-5}$ is less strong). So global error control is redundant here, and no control runs were carried out. The global error estimation appears to work very well for this stiff problem. Table 4.2 shows results of the adjoint approach. Since $k = m = 3$, the results of the classical approach again are identical, except for negligible implementation differences. These exist only for the column for the values of $\|\epsilon_N\|/g_3(T)$. The corresponding values $\|\epsilon_N\|/\|e_N\|$ for the classical approach are $(1.07, 1.02, 1.03, 1.04)^T$.

4.3. High-dimensional stiff ODE system I. Our third ODE test system is derived from spatially discretizing the well-known 1D combustion example problem (see, e.g., [12, p. 434] for the 2D version)

$$(4.3) \quad u_t = u_{xx} + \frac{1}{4} (2 - u) e^{20(1-1/u)}, \quad 0 < x < 1, \quad 0 < t \leq T = 0.28,$$

subjected to the initial condition $u(x, 0) = 1$, the zero Neumann boundary condition $u_x = 0$ at $x = 0$, and the Dirichlet boundary condition $u = 1$ at $x = 1$. The spatial discretization is done by second-order central differencing on a uniform hybrid grid (because of the Neumann condition) with mesh width $1/100.5$, resulting in a 100-dimensional ODE system $w' = F(w)$. We have chosen this system because it requires variable step sizes and it is unstable. The instability emanates from the reaction term whose derivative ranges between approximately $+1000$ and -5500 ; see [12] for details. Furthermore, the 100-dimensional ODE system poses a challenging test for the small sample statistical method using $k = 2$ only.

For the classical approach Table 4.3 reveals an excellent estimation of the global error and likewise a high quality of the control for all tolerances. Observe that for $Tol = 10^{-6}$ the second control run is redundant. Regarding the adjoint approach we emphasize the high quality of the small sample statistical method. From inequality (3.10) one would expect the ratios $\|\epsilon_N\|/g_2(T)$ to lie asymptotically between 0.1 and 10.0 with 99% probability. Table 4.4, however, shows ratio values ranging between

TABLE 4.3
High-dimensional stiff ODE system I: classical approach.

| Tol | Tol_N | $\ \epsilon_N\ /Tol_N$ | $\ \epsilon_N\ /\ e_N\ $ | Accept | Reject |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------|--------|
| 10^{-3} | 2.83×10^{-3} | 2.56 | 1.25 | 529 | 33 |
| 4.91×10^{-4} | 2.84×10^{-3} | 1.03 | 1.20 | 680 | 32 |
| 10^{-4} | 2.84×10^{-4} | 2.64 | 1.13 | 1183 | 18 |
| 4.30×10^{-5} | 2.84×10^{-4} | 1.11 | 1.09 | 1586 | 11 |
| 10^{-5} | 2.84×10^{-5} | 2.09 | 1.05 | 2622 | 5 |
| 5.02×10^{-6} | 2.84×10^{-5} | 0.85 | 1.03 | 3318 | 3 |
| 10^{-6} | 2.84×10^{-6} | 0.91 | 1.00 | 5736 | 3 |

TABLE 4.4
High-dimensional stiff ODE system I: adjoint approach.

| Tol | Tol_N | $\ \epsilon_N\ /Tol_N$ | $\ \epsilon_N\ /g_2(T)$ | Accept | Reject |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------|--------|
| 10^{-3} | 2.83×10^{-3} | 2.56 | 1.35 | 529 | 33 |
| 5.26×10^{-4} | 2.84×10^{-3} | 1.06 | 1.38 | 664 | 32 |
| 10^{-4} | 2.84×10^{-4} | 2.64 | 0.92 | 1183 | 18 |
| 3.47×10^{-5} | 2.84×10^{-4} | 0.84 | 0.92 | 1708 | 8 |
| 10^{-5} | 2.84×10^{-5} | 2.09 | 0.76 | 2622 | 5 |
| 3.66×10^{-6} | 2.84×10^{-5} | 0.57 | 0.76 | 3695 | 4 |
| 10^{-6} | 2.84×10^{-6} | 0.91 | 0.72 | 5736 | 3 |
| 7.93×10^{-7} | 2.84×10^{-6} | 0.65 | 0.72 | 6204 | 3 |

0.72 and 1.38. Taking k larger with this large dimension m is no option. For example, doubling k to 4 does not lead to a notable improvement yet increases the costs for the global error estimation. Noting the small deviations from 1.0 of all listed ratios, especially after the control run, both approaches perform excellently with respect to estimation and control.

4.4. High-dimensional stiff ODE system II. Similar to the third, the fourth test problem was chosen because it is unstable, again challenging global error control. It is derived from spatially discretizing the following version of the bistable Allen-Cahn equation:

$$(4.4) \quad u_t = 10^{-2} u_{xx} + 100u(1 - u^2), \quad 0 < x < 2.5, \quad 0 < t \leq T = 0.5,$$

with the initial function and Dirichlet boundary values taken from the exact wave front solution $u(x, t) = (1 + e^{\lambda(x-\alpha t)})^{-1}$, $\lambda = 50\sqrt{2}$, $\alpha = 1.5\sqrt{2}$. Uniform second-order central discretization in space yields our ODE test system, now with $m = 400$ components. The instability emanates from the unstable stationary state $u = 0$. Further, since $m = 400$ and $k = 2$, this problem also poses an even more challenging test for the small sample statistical method.

Table 4.5 reveals again a high quality of the global error estimation for the classical approach and the control process also works very well. The ratios for $\|\epsilon_N\|/Tol_N$ lie between 0.71 and 0.93 after the control run. Observe that for $Tol = 10^{-5}$, 10^{-6} the control runs are redundant. In actual practice, taking the control parameter $C_{control} > 1$ in (2.26), this would also hold for the other tolerances. For the adjoint approach, the ratios $\|\epsilon_N\|/g_2(T)$ given in Table 4.6 range from 0.53 to 2.56, which is by a factor of 4 better than one would expect from inequality (3.10). The adjoint approach does not require a second run for $Tol = 10^{-4}$, 10^{-6} , and for the other cases

TABLE 4.5
High-dimensional stiff ODE system II: classical approach.

| Tol | Tol_N | $\ \epsilon_N\ /Tol_N$ | $\ \epsilon_N\ /\ e_N\ $ | Accept | Reject |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------|--------|
| 10^{-3} | 1.65×10^{-3} | 1.29 | 0.77 | 373 | 0 |
| 6.01×10^{-4} | 1.65×10^{-3} | 0.71 | 0.83 | 446 | 0 |
| 10^{-4} | 1.65×10^{-4} | 0.95 | 0.93 | 833 | 0 |
| 9.84×10^{-5} | 1.65×10^{-4} | 0.93 | 0.93 | 838 | 0 |
| 10^{-5} | 1.65×10^{-5} | 0.82 | 0.97 | 1835 | 0 |
| 10^{-6} | 1.65×10^{-6} | 0.76 | 0.98 | 3998 | 0 |

TABLE 4.6
High-dimensional stiff ODE system II: adjoint approach.

| Tol | Tol_N | $\ \epsilon_N\ /Tol_N$ | $\ \epsilon_N\ /g_2(T)$ | Accept | Reject |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------|--------|
| 10^{-3} | 1.65×10^{-3} | 1.29 | 0.53 | 373 | 0 |
| 4.09×10^{-4} | 1.65×10^{-3} | 0.45 | 0.57 | 510 | 0 |
| 10^{-4} | 1.65×10^{-4} | 0.95 | 1.40 | 833 | 0 |
| 10^{-5} | 1.65×10^{-5} | 0.82 | 0.78 | 1835 | 0 |
| 9.45×10^{-6} | 1.65×10^{-5} | 0.78 | 0.78 | 1870 | 0 |
| 10^{-6} | 1.65×10^{-6} | 0.76 | 2.56 | 3998 | 0 |

the control is also very efficient (only a factor 0.45 to 0.78 off the imposed tolerance after the control run).

5. Summary and main conclusions. Inspired by [2] and related earlier literature, e.g., [1, 5, 6, 7, 13], we have discussed and compared classical global error estimation based on the first variational equation to a recent more novel approach based on the adjoint equation. The common starting point for both approaches is the perturbed equation with the residual or defect function defined by piecewise, cubic Hermite interpolation. As a base integrator for the comparison we have chosen the third-order, A-stable Runge–Kutta–Rosenbrock method ROS3P. We have also implemented global error control, for which we have used the property of tolerance proportionality for both the classical and the adjoint approaches.

On the basis of the four example problems, ranging from nonstiff to stiff, the computational effort of each of the two approaches, and the insight from the analysis, we have come to three main conclusions. (i) The classical approach is remarkably reliable, with respect to both estimation and control. Although well known in the numerical ODE literature, it seems that the virtue of this approach has been insufficiently brought forward, since as yet this form of global error estimation and control is far less popular than the commonly used local techniques. (ii) Most notable for the adjoint approach is the excellent performance of the small sample statistical method which forms the heart of the method. We have applied it successfully using only $k = 2$ random vectors for dimensions $m = 100, 400$ (in [2] it was not tested since there $k = m \leq 2$). With $k = 2$ the computational costs are only marginally higher than those of the classical approach. Were we to omit the second control run, then our Matlab runs in the adjoint case would be on average only about 15% more costly in CPU time. Omitting the second control run can make a difference, because in the adjoint case the second control run can be significantly more expensive than in the classical case due to the need of reevaluating many Jacobian matrices. (iii) The main

disadvantage of the adjoint approach is the need either to store the whole approximation sequence $(w_n; 0 \leq 1 \leq N)$ or to store part of it and to carry out a second forward computation. When using Jacobians, as is the case for ROS3P, storage becomes truly a handicap with large problems calling for Jacobian reevaluations and hence additional CPU costs.

Something we haven't discussed in this paper is that the adjoint approach can give precious sensitivity information which can be used to advantage for a different step size adaptation (see, e.g., [17]). Such information is not available within the classical approach. Our step size adaptation is standard and based on local error control. Other approaches based on a posteriori information and the adjoint approach do exist and are claimed to give better results for global error control; see [17, 18, 19].

REFERENCES

- [1] R. BECKER AND R. RANNACHER, *An optimal control approach to a posteriori error estimation in finite element methods*, Acta Numer., 10 (2001), pp. 1–102.
- [2] Y. CAO AND L. PETZOLD, *A posteriori error estimation and global error control for ordinary differential equations by the adjoint method*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 26 (2004), pp. 359–374.
- [3] K. DEKKER AND J.G. VERWER, *Stability of Runge-Kutta Methods for Stiff Nonlinear Differential Equations*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [4] W.H. ENRIGHT, *Continuous numerical methods for ODEs with defect control*, J. Comput. Appl. Math., 125 (2000), pp. 159–170.
- [5] K. ERIKSSON, C. JOHNSON, AND A. LOGG, *Adaptive computational methods for parabolic problems*, in Encyclopedia of Computational Mechanics, E. Stein, R. de Borst, and J.R. Hughes, eds., Wiley, New York, 2004.
- [6] D. ESTEP, *A posteriori error bounds and global error control for approximation of ordinary differential equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 32 (1995), pp. 1–48.
- [7] D. ESTEP, M. LARSSON, AND R. WILLIAMS, *Estimating the Error of Numerical Solutions of Systems of Reaction-Diffusion Equations*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 146, AMS, Providence, RI, 2000.
- [8] E. HAIRER, S.P. NØRSETT, AND G. WANNER, *Solving Ordinary Differential Equations I - Nonstiff Problems*, second ed., Springer Ser. Comput. Math., Springer, Berlin, 1993.
- [9] P. HENRICI, *Discrete Variable Methods in Ordinary Differential Equations*, Wiley, New York, 1962.
- [10] D.J. HIGHAM, *Robust defect control with Runge-Kutta schemes*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 26 (1989), pp. 1175–1183.
- [11] D.J. HIGHAM, *Runge-Kutta defect control using Hermite-Birkhoff interpolation*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 12 (1991), pp. 991–999.
- [12] W. HUNSDORFER AND J.G. VERWER, *Numerical Solution of Time-Dependent Advection-Diffusion-Reaction Equations*, Springer Ser. Comput. Math. 33, Springer, Berlin, 2003.
- [13] C. JOHNSON, *Error estimates and adaptive time-step control for a class of one-step methods for stiff ordinary differential equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 25 (1988), pp. 908–926.
- [14] C.S. KENNEY AND A.J. LAUB, *Small-sample statistical condition estimates for general matrix functions*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 15 (1994), pp. 36–61.
- [15] J. LANG, *Adaptive Multilevel Solution of Nonlinear Parabolic PDE Systems. Theory, Algorithm and Applications*, Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng. 16, Springer, New York, 1994.
- [16] J. LANG AND J.G. VERWER, *ROS3P - An accurate third-order Rosenbrock solver designed for parabolic problems*, BIT, 41 (2001), pp. 731–738.
- [17] K.-S. MOON, A. SZEPESSY, R. TEMPONE, AND G. ZOUARIS, *Convergence rates for adaptive approximation of ordinary differential equations*, Numer. Math., 96 (2003), pp. 99–129.
- [18] K.-S. MOON, A. SZEPESSY, R. TEMPONE, AND G. ZOUARIS, *A variational principle for adaptive approximation of ordinary differential equations*, Numer. Math., 96 (2003), pp. 131–152.
- [19] K.-S. MOON, E. VON SCHWERIN, A. SZEPESSY, AND R. TEMPONE, *An adaptive algorithm for ordinary stochastic and partial differential equations*, Contemp. Math. 383 (2006), pp. 325–344.
- [20] L.F. SHAMPINE, *Numerical Solution of Ordinary Differential Equations*, Chapman and Hall, New York, 1994.

- [21] L.F. SHAMPINE, *Error estimation and control for ODEs*, J. Sci. Comp., 25 (2005), pp. 3–16.
- [22] L.F. SHAMPINE, *Solving ODEs and DDEs with residual control*, Appl. Numer. Math., 52 (2005), pp. 113–127.
- [23] R.D. SKEEL, *Thirteen ways to estimate global error*, Numer. Math., 48 (1986), pp. 1–20.
- [24] H.J. STETTER, *Economical global error estimation*, in Stiff Differential Systems, R.A. Willoughby, ed., Plenum, New York, 1974, pp. 245–258.
- [25] G. WATSON, *Statistics on Spheres*, Univ. Arkansas Lect. Notes Math. Sci. 6, Wiley, New York, 1983.
- [26] P.E. ZADUNAISKY, *On the estimation of errors propagated in the numerical integration of ordinary differential equations*, Numer. Math., 27 (1976), pp. 21–39.