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What is Arb?

- Arbitrary-precision numerical library with rigorous error bounds
- ~100,000 lines of C code, GPL v2+, developed since 2012
- Dependencies: GMP (or MPIR), MPFR, FLINT
- Python/Sage interfaces in progress
- http://fredrikj.net/arb/
Representing numbers

**arb** type (real mid-rad interval, “ball”):

\[
\left[3.14159265358979323846264338328 \pm 8.65 \cdot 10^{-31}\right]
\]

arbitrary-precision floating-point

30-bit precision

**acb** type (complex rectangular “ball”):

\[
[1.414213562 \pm 3.74 \cdot 10^{-10}] + [1.732050808 \pm 4.32 \cdot 10^{-10}]i
\]

**Goal**

- \{cost of interval arithmetic\} = (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \{cost of floating-point\}
- \{effort for error analysis\} = \epsilon \cdot \{effort with floating-point\}

See also: iRRAM, Mathemagix, MPFS
Example: the partition function

\( p(n) \): number of ways \( n \) can be written as a sum of positive integers

\[
p(10) = 42
\]

\[
p(100) = 190569292
\]

\[
p(1000) = 24061467864032622473692149727991
\]

Current record, set in 2014 with Arb:

\[
p(10^{20}) = 18381765 \ldots 88091448 \text{ (11,140,086,260 digits)}
\]

The Hardy-Ramanujan-Rademacher formula

\[
p(n) = \frac{1}{\pi \sqrt{2}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{k} A_k(n) \frac{d}{dn} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n - \frac{1}{24}}} \sinh \left[ \frac{\pi}{k} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3} \left( n - \frac{1}{24} \right)} \right] \right)
\]

Compute approximation \( y \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( |p(n) - y| < 0.5 \), round.

For \( n = 10^{20} \): 1.7 billion terms, 200 CPU hours, 130 GB memory
Inclusion property

Mathematical function: \( f(x) = y \)
Implemented function: \( F(X) = Y \)

**Guarantee:** \( x \in X \Rightarrow y \in Y \)

- We make **no formal guarantees** about **tightness** of \( Y \)
- We can always fall back to \( Y = [\pm \infty] \)
- Usually behaves like floating-point + error analysis (but automatic)
- User can check if output is good enough, implement adaptivity
Example: easy rigorous numerical evaluation (via Python)

```python
def N(f):
    prec = ctx.prec; guard = 10
    try:
        while 1:
            ctx.prec = prec + guard; y = f()
            if y.rel_accuracy_bits() >= prec:
                return y
            guard *= 2
    finally:
        ctx.prec = prec

>>> N(lambda: (arb(163).sqrt() * arb.pi()).exp() - 640320**3 - 744)
[-7.49927402801814e-13 ± 3.12e-28]

# 0.9 seconds in Arb
# 200 seconds in mpmath
# 100,000 seconds in Mathematica!

>>> N(lambda: acb.bessel_j(10000 + 10000j, 10000 * arb.pi()))
[-1.20973469401861e+5438 ± 4.77e+5423] + [1.21911522763864e+5438 ± 3.09e+5423]j

>>> ctx.dps = 30; N(lambda: acb(100).erf() - 1)
[-6.40596142492173203902133914859e-4346 ± 3.61e-4376]
```
Special functions in Arb

- Mathematical constants: $\pi, \gamma, \ldots$
- Elementary functions: $\exp(z), \log(z), \sin(z), \arcsin(z), \ldots$
- Gamma functions: $\Gamma(z), \log \Gamma(z), \psi(z)$
- Zeta functions: $\zeta(s, z), \Li_s(z)$
- Bessel functions: $J_a(z), K_a(z)$
- Exponential integrals: $\Gamma(a, z), E_a(z), \text{erf}(z), \text{erfc}(z)$
- Hypergeometric functions (in progress): $pF_q(\ldots, \ldots, z), U(a, b, z)$
- Theta/elliptic/modular: $\theta(z, \tau), \wp(z, \tau), K(m), j(\tau), \text{agm}(x, y)$
- Discrete: partition numbers $p(n)$, Bernoulli numbers $B_n, \ldots$

- **Complex arguments** generally supported
- **Power series arguments** partially supported
Power series in Arb

Arithmetic in $\mathbb{R}[[x]]/\langle x^n \rangle$ and $\mathbb{C}[[x]]/\langle x^n \rangle$ is an essential feature

Applications

- Explicit computation of number sequences
- Limit computations (removing singularities)
- Numerical integration
- Isolating function zeros

- Fast + numerically stable multiplication using scaling, splitting into blocks and multiplying exactly over $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ via FLINT
- Effective bit complexity with $\text{prec} \sim n$ is typically $O(n^{2+\varepsilon})$
- Elementary functions (exp, log, ...) cost $O(1)$ multiplications
- Fast algorithms for some special functions
Example: high-order derivatives of $\zeta(s)$

Keiper-Li coefficients $\{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are defined by

$$\log \left( 2 \xi \left( \frac{x}{x-1} \right) \right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n x^n, \quad \xi(s) = \frac{1}{2} s(s-1)\pi^{-s/2} \Gamma(s/2) \zeta(s)$$

Keiper (1992): Riemann hypothesis $\Rightarrow \forall n : \lambda_n > 0$
Li (1997): Riemann hypothesis $\Leftarrow \forall n : \lambda_n > 0$

Keiper conjectured $2\lambda_n \approx \log n - \log(2\pi) + \gamma - 1$

Experimental verification

Evaluate at $s \rightarrow s + x \in \mathbb{C}[[x]]/\langle x^{n+1} \rangle$, read off coefficients.
Need working precision of $\approx n$ bits for accurate value of $\lambda_n$.
Complexity: $O(n^{2+\varepsilon})$ (theory), implemented $O(n^{3+\varepsilon})$. 

Fredrik Johansson (INRIA-Bordeaux) Special functions in the Arb library 2015 9 / 37
### Timings for Keiper-Li coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n = 1000$</th>
<th>$n = 10000$</th>
<th>$n = 100000$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Error bound</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power sum, 16 threads</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>65402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Power sum, CPU time)</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td>(693)</td>
<td>(1042210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernoulli numbers</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail (binary splitting)</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logarithm of power series</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log $\Gamma(1 + x)$ power series</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power series composition</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total wall time (s)</strong></td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memory</strong></td>
<td>8 MB</td>
<td>730 MB</td>
<td>48700 MB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Computed: $\lambda_{100000} = 4.62580782406902231409416038 \ldots$ (+2900 digits)

Keiper’s asymptotic formula: $\lambda_{100000} \approx 4.62613$
Example: rigorous numerical integration

\[ \int_a^b f(t)dt = F_N(c) - F_N(-c) + O \left( \left( \frac{r}{R} \right)^N \right), \quad c = (b - a)/2 \]

\(F_N\): integrated order-\(N\) Taylor polynomial at \(m = (a + b)/2\)

Input: \(f, a, b, r, R\). Algorithm subdivides until \(|b - a| < r\), bounds error and chooses \(N\) using Cauchy integral formula (\(|f(t)|\) on \(R\)-circle).
Example: incomplete elliptic integral “ab initio”

\[ F(6 + 6i, 1/2), \quad F(\phi, m) = \int_0^\phi \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - m\sin^2 t}} \, dt \]

\[ R = 0.5, \quad r = 0.2 \quad \text{branch points} \quad (n + 1/2)\pi \pm \log(1 + \sqrt{2})i \]
It’s slow, but it works

30 digits:
\[ [7.41433... \pm 6.46e-29] + [1.84734... \pm 6.59e-30]j \]
cpu/wall(s): 0.06 0.069

200 digits:
\[ [7.41433... \pm 2.58e-199] + [1.84734... \pm 6.21e-200]j \]
cpu/wall(s): 1.24 1.268

1000 digits:
\[ [7.41433... \pm 5.05e-999] + [1.84734... \pm 4.09e-1000]j \]
cpu/wall(s): 53.07 57.271

To do
- More automation, better adaptivity
- Singularities (e.g. \( f(x) = \log^\alpha(x) x^\beta g(x) \))
- Faster algorithms (Gauss-Legendre, double exponential, ...)
- ODEs
What's in computing a function?

Example (simplified):

\[ f(x) = e^x = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^k}{k!} \]

Input: \( X = [m \pm r] \) with \( x \in X \)

\[ f(X) \subseteq [A \pm E], \quad A = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{X^k}{k!}, \quad \left| \sum_{k=N}^{\infty} \frac{X^k}{k!} \right| \leq E \]

Using ball arithmetic

Upper bound

Better error propagation:

\[ f(X) \subseteq [A \pm (E_1 + E_2)], \quad A = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{m^k}{k!}, \quad \left| \frac{m^k}{k!} \right| \leq E_1, \quad \sup_{t \in X} |e^m - e^t| \leq E_2 \]
Many possibilities for error propagation...

\[ f(x) = e^x, \text{ input } X = [m \pm r] \text{ with } x \in X \]

**Best interval:** \( \left[ \frac{1}{2}(a + b) \pm \frac{1}{2}(b - a) \right] \) where \( a = e^{m-r}, b = e^{m+r} \)

**Best midpoint, best radius:** \( [e^m \pm r'] \) where \( r' = e^m(e^r - 1) \)

**Best midpoint, generic radius:** \( [e^m \pm r'] \) where \( r' = r \cdot (\sup_{t \in X} |f'(t)|) = r \cdot e^{m+r} \)

**Automatic propagation:** \( e^X = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{X^k}{k!} \) (depends on algorithm).
Acceptable for *point values* but may lead to *exponential slowdown* when used for *subdivision*!

**Trimming:** \( [0.54402111 \pm 0.1] \rightarrow [0.544 \pm 0.101] \)
Algorithm selection

For many functions, we want **different algorithms** for **different input**

Must also choose **internal parameters** (such as the number of terms $N$)

**Philosophy**

Choose heuristically, verify rigorously

- Heuristic step: choose $N$ given $(x, prec)$
- Rigorous step: evaluate $\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} a_k x^k$, bound $\sum_{k=N}^{\infty} a_k x^k$

Make optimization orthogonal to correctness

Heuristics are easy to understand, fast (can use double precision)

It’s sometimes fine to give up ($\sin(2^{2^{30}}) \in [-1, 1]$)
Code reliability – unit tests

- For each function, generate many \((10^3 - 10^6)\) random inputs **non-uniformly**:
  - Integers, near-integers
  - Strange binary expansions like \(0.1011111111100000000000000001\)
  - Extremely large/small parts

- For each input, test **interval contract**:
  - Verify functional equation, for example: \(X \subseteq \exp(\log(X))\)
  - Compare different algorithms: \(f_A(X) \cap f_B(X) \neq \emptyset\)
  - Compare with different prec and \(N\)

- Deliberately **insert bugs** in the function. If the test code passes, the test is too weak. Strengthen the test until it fails!

- Tests must pass **valgrind** (no memory leaks, reading uninitialized memory, out of bounds accesses).
Elementary functions

**Building blocks:** exp, sin, cos, log, atan

Below $\approx 4096$ bits:

- Low-level code, fixed-point arithmetic using mpn layer of GMP
- Lookup tables and other dirty tricks
- Manual error analysis

Above $\approx 4096$ bits:

- High-level code, ball arithmetic and big-integer arithmetic
- exp, atan using bit-burst evaluation (some speedup over MPFR)
- log, sin, cos currently via MPFR (should reimplement)
Elementary functions - performance

Input: \( x = 1 + \sqrt{2} \)
Performance at quad and quad-double precision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prec</th>
<th>exp</th>
<th>sin</th>
<th>cos</th>
<th>log</th>
<th>atan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPFR</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>libquadmath</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPFR</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>12.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>20.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timings in microseconds.
Recipe for elementary functions

\[
\begin{align*}
\exp(x) & \quad \sin(x), \cos(x) \quad \log(1 + x) \quad \text{atan}(x) \\
\downarrow & \\
\text{Domain reduction using } \pi \text{ and } \log(2) & \\
\downarrow & \\
x & \in [0, \log(2)) \quad x \in [0, \pi/4) \quad x \in [0, 1) \quad x \in [0, 1) \\
\downarrow & \\
\text{Argument-halving } r \approx 8 \text{ times} & \\
\exp(x) &= [\exp(x/2)]^2 \\
\log(1 + x) &= 2 \log(\sqrt{1 + x}) \\
\downarrow & \\
x & \in [0, 2^{-r}) \\
\downarrow & \\
\text{Taylor series (or bit-burst algorithm)} &
\end{align*}
\]
Better recipe at medium precision

\[
\begin{align*}
\exp(x), \sin(x), \cos(x), \log(1 + x), \atan(x) \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Domain reduction using } \pi \text{ and } \log(2) \\
\downarrow \\
x \in [0, \log(2)), x \in [0, \pi/4), x \in [0, 1), x \in [0, 1) \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Lookup table with } 2^r \approx 2^8 \text{ entries} \\
\exp(t + x) = \exp(t) \exp(x) \\
\log(1 + t + x) = \log(1 + t) + \log(1 + x/(1 + t)) \\
\downarrow \\
x \in [0, 2^{-r}) \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Taylor series}
\end{align*}
\]
Optimizing lookup tables

\( m = 2 \) tables with \( 2^5 + 2^5 \) entries gives same reduction as
\( m = 1 \) table with \( 2^{10} \) entries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>( m )</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>Entries</th>
<th>Size (KiB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>exp</td>
<td>( \leq 512 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>11.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exp</td>
<td>( \leq 4608 )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23+32</td>
<td>30.9375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sin</td>
<td>( \leq 512 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>12.6875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sin</td>
<td>( \leq 4608 )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26+32</td>
<td>32.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cos</td>
<td>( \leq 512 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>12.6875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cos</td>
<td>( \leq 4608 )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26+32</td>
<td>32.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log</td>
<td>( \leq 512 )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>128+128</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log</td>
<td>( \leq 4608 )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32+32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atan</td>
<td>( \leq 512 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atan</td>
<td>( \leq 4608 )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32+32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>236.6875</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taylor series of elementary functions

Example: \( \text{atanh}(x)/x \)

\[
1 + \frac{x^2}{3} + \frac{x^4}{5} + \frac{x^6}{7} + \frac{x^8}{9} + \frac{x^{10}}{11} + \frac{x^{12}}{13} + \frac{x^{14}}{15} + \frac{x^{16}}{17} + \frac{x^{18}}{19} + \frac{x^{20}}{21} + \frac{x^{22}}{23}
\]

(We use the Taylor series of exp, sinh, sin, cos, atan, atanh. The algorithms are almost identical.)
Rectangular splitting

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 + \frac{x^2}{3} + \frac{x^4}{5} + \frac{x^6}{7} \\
+ x^8 \left[ \frac{1}{9} + \frac{x^2}{11} + \frac{x^4}{13} + \frac{x^6}{15} \right] \\
+ x^{16} \left[ \frac{1}{17} + \frac{x^2}{19} + \frac{x^4}{21} + \frac{x^6}{23} \right]
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Inner polynomials: powers \(x^2, x^4, x^6\)

Outer polynomial in \(x^8\): Horner’s rule

**Optimal:** split at \(\sqrt{\text{number of terms}}\)
Multiplying instead of dividing

$X + Y \cdot c$ is much cheaper than $X + Y / c$

\[
\frac{1}{3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7} \left[ (3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7) + (5 \cdot 7)x^2 + (3 \cdot 7)x^4 + (3 \cdot 5)x^6 \right] \
+ \frac{1}{9 \cdot 11 \cdot 13} \left[ (11 \cdot 13)x^8 + (9 \cdot 13)x^{10} + (9 \cdot 11)x^{12} \right] \
+ \frac{1}{15 \cdot 17 \cdot 19} \left[ (17 \cdot 19)x^{14} + (15 \cdot 19)x^{16} + (15 \cdot 17)x^{18} \right] \
+ \frac{1}{21 \cdot 23} \left[ 23x^{20} + 21x^{22} \right]
\]

**Optimal:** minimize number of divisions subject to $c < 2^{64}$ (or $c < 2^{32}$)
Combined rectangular splitting and denominator collection

**Problem**: optimal points for nonscalar multiplications and scalar divisions don’t coincide!

Bad solution: extra nonscalar multiplications:

\[
\frac{1}{A}[(\ldots) + x^8(\ldots)] + x^8 \frac{1}{B}[(\ldots) + x^8(\ldots)]
\]

Bad solution: extra scalar divisions:

\[
\frac{1}{A}[(\ldots)] + x^8\left[\frac{1}{A}(\ldots) + \frac{1}{B}[(\ldots) + x^8(\ldots)]\right]
\]

Better solution: 1 scalar mul + 1 scalar div instead of 1 scalar div

\[
\frac{1}{A}[(\ldots) + x^8[(\ldots) + \frac{A}{B}[(\ldots) + x^8(\ldots)]]]
\]
Implementation and correctness

- Fixed-point arithmetic: \( n + 1 \) words for value in \([0, 2^{64})\) with ulp \(2^{-64n}\)
- Signed values are implicit or use twos complement (tricky)
- Verification of Taylor series algorithm uses a separate computation
  - Summation is executed with symbolic variables that track possible range of values + possible range of error
  - Overflow is checked to be impossible at each step
  - Bound for the final ulp error at the end
- Error analysis by hand for all other steps
- Lookup tables are tested against MPFR
- Unit tests check \(10^5\) to \(10^6\) randomly generated inputs
Mathematical constants

\(\pi, e, \log(2),\) Catalan’s constant (etc.) use generic code for asymptotically fast (binary splitting) evaluation of hypergeometric series

\[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f(k), \quad f(k+1)/f(k) \in \mathbb{Q}(k)\]

Euler’s constant \((\gamma = 0.577\ldots)\) uses the fastest known algorithm, due to Brent and McMillan (1980). Requires asymptotic expansions related to Bessel functions.

Until recently, this algorithm was heuristic! Error bounds derived in 2013 in joint work with Richard Brent.


Ball arithmetic useful for performance: \(p\)-bit numbers vs \(O(p \log p)\)
Input: $x = 1 + \sqrt{2}$
Gamma, zeta, polylogarithms

\[ \Gamma(s) \quad \log \Gamma(s) \quad \psi(s) = \frac{\Gamma'(s)}{\Gamma(s)} \]

\[ \zeta(s, z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (z + k)^{-s} \quad \text{Li}_s(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} z^k k^{-s} \]

Standard methods: Stirling’s series, Euler-Maclaurin summation, functional equations

Some new bounds for error terms

Some new tricks to make things fast

More details in:

- Arb documentation
An amazing algorithm for Bernoulli numbers

How to generate $B_0, B_1, \ldots, B_{10,000}$ in two seconds!

$$B_{2n} = (-1)^{n+1} \frac{2(2n)!}{(2\pi)^{2n}} \zeta(2n), \quad \zeta(s) = 1 + \frac{1}{2^s} + \frac{1}{3^s} + \frac{1}{4^s} + \ldots$$

Go backwards and recycle the powers:

$$\frac{1}{k^{s-2}} = \frac{1}{k^s} \cdot k^2 \leftarrow \text{multiply bignum by single word}$$

Complexity is $O(n^{3+\varepsilon})$, but in practice an order of magnitude faster than the $O(n^{2+\varepsilon})$ power series algorithm.

I first saw this algorithm in a blog post by Remco Bloemen
http://2pi.com/09/11/even-faster-zeta-calculation
Elliptic and modular functions

Elliptic functions ($\wp(z, \tau)$ and derivatives), modular forms (Dedekind $\eta$-function, $j$-invariant, Eisenstein series, ...) are computed using theta series, e.g.:

$$\theta_3(z, \tau) = 1 + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q^{n^2} \cos(2n\pi z), \quad q = \exp(\pi i \tau)$$

Modular transformations $\tau \rightarrow (a\tau + b)/(c\tau + d)$ are applied until approximately $|q| < \exp(-\pi \sqrt{3}/2) \approx 0.0659$.

Complete elliptic integrals $K(m)$, $E(m)$ are computed using the arithmetic-geometric mean.

To be done: incomplete elliptic integrals, more versions (Jacobian elliptic functions, etc.)
Hypergeometric functions

Many special functions can be expressed using

\[ pFq(a_1 \ldots a_p; b_1 \ldots b_q; z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a_1)_k \cdots (a_p)_k}{(b_1)_k \cdots (b_q)_k} \frac{z^k}{k!} \]

Most important special cases: confluent functions \((0F_1, 1F_1, 2F_0)\), Gauss hypergeometric function \(2F_1\).

Arb supports evaluation for \(a_i, b_i, z \in \mathbb{C} \) or \(\mathbb{C}[[x]]/\langle x^n \rangle\), assuming that the sum is (rapidly) convergent. The tail is bounded nearly optimally by a geometric series:

\[ \left| \sum_{k=N}^{\infty} T(k) \right| \leq |T(N)| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C^k \]
Confluent hypergeometric functions

Building blocks and glue

- Convergent series $\,_{0}F_{1}(a, z), \,_{1}F_{1}(a, b, z)$
- Asymptotic series for $U(a, b, z)$ or $\,_{2}F_{0}(a, b, 1/z)$ as $|z| \to \infty$ (error bounds: Olver, DLMF 13.7)
- Ball arithmetic & power series arithmetic

Many special cases

- Exponential integrals $\Gamma(a, z), E_a(z), \text{erf}(z), \text{erfc}(z)$
- Bessel functions $K_a(z), K_a(z)$
- (To be done: $Y_a(z), I_a(z)$, Airy, Kelvin, Whittaker functions . . .)
Example: modified Bessel function of the second kind

**Case 1:** $|z| \approx \infty$: asymptotic series

$$K_a(z) = \left(\frac{\pi}{2z}\right)^{1/2} e^{-z} U^*(a + \frac{1}{2}, 2a + 1, 2z), \quad U^* \sim 2 F_0(\ldots, -\frac{1}{2z})$$

**Case 2:** $|z| \approx 0$ and $a \notin \mathbb{Z}$: convergent series

$$K_a(z) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\pi}{\sin(\pi a)} \left[ \left(\frac{z}{2}\right)^{-a} {}_0\tilde{F}_1 \left(1 - a, \frac{z^2}{4}\right) - \left(\frac{z}{2}\right)^a {}_0\tilde{F}_1 \left(1 + a, \frac{z^2}{4}\right) \right]$$

**Case 3:** $|z| \approx 0$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$: parameter limit

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} K_{a+\varepsilon}(z)$$

as in (Case 2), but with $\mathbb{C}[[\varepsilon]]/\langle \varepsilon^2 \rangle$ arithmetic
To do for hypergeometric functions

- Tune working precision, algorithm selection
- Reduced cancellation / better error propagation
  - Bounds for function derivatives needed
- Lots of low-level optimization (save precious CPU cycles)
- Complete algorithm for $\,_2F_1$ (and $\,_3F_2$ . . . ?)
- Bit-burst evaluation (see Mezzarobba’s NumGfun)
- Asymptotic expansions for higher hypergeometrics?
  - Error bounds needed