
Subject: Re: fix(4.70*100) is... 469
Posted by [mmeron](#) on Thu, 19 Apr 2007 05:56:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article <f06eqm\$412\$1@news.ucalgary.ca>, "Jean H."
<jghasban@DELTHIS.ucalgary.ANDTHIS.ca> writes:
>>> so how can it be the float accuracy problem if the difference
>>> between the expected and the real value is 256 times bigger than the
>>> float error?
>>>
>> Careful here. The smallest float provides relative accuracy, meaning
>> the difference between exact and stored value X doesn't exceed
>> $X * (\text{machar}()) \cdot \text{eps}$. This is well satisfied here.
>>
>> Mati Meron | "When you argue with a fool,
>> meron@cars.uchicago.edu | chances are he is doing just the same"
>
> I don't understand why one should multiply epsilon by X why would
> the acceptable difference between expect and real value be a function of
> the value? ... $X = 100.0$ $Y = 900.0$ they both have the same number
> of significant digits, so why would the max acceptable difference be
> IDL> print, 100.0 * epsilon
> 1.19209e-005
> IDL> print, 900.0 * epsilon
> 0.000107288
>
>
> Also, if one must really multiply epsilon by X, does it mean that there
> is an error on http://www.dfanning.com/math_tips/razoredge.html, at the
> last line of the page?
>
> IDL> print,abs(0.9 - (0.6+0.3)) lt (machar()).eps
>
> should it be
> IDL> print,abs(0.9 - (0.6+0.3)) lt 0.9 * (machar()).eps
>
> ???
>
> I admit to be lost on this issue... and it scares me as I might have to
> check/change all my codes!!!!
>
> Do you have a reference at hand on this?
>
Consider what "same number of significant digits mean. For example,
consider that $1.23456 \cdot 10^{20}$ and $1.23456 \cdot 10^{(-20)}$ have same number of
significant digits.

Mati Meron | "When you argue with a fool,

