

## Notes on the Recurrence Techniques for the Calculation of Bessel Functions $J_\nu(x)$ and $I_\nu(x)$

SABURO MAKINOCHI\*

### 1. Introduction

J.C.P. Miller [1] originally devised the recurrence techniques for the calculation of modified Bessel functions  $I_n(x)$ . Since then his algorithm has been applied to the computation of Bessel functions  $J_\nu(x)$ ,  $I_\nu(x)$  [2-8] and some other functions with a similar behavior (for example, [9]).

F.W.J. Olver obtained the strict upper bounds for the errors in the values yielded by the algorithm [10].

The purpose of this paper is to describe a method to determine the economical points  $M_E$  for given  $x > 0$ , from which the downward recursion processes start in order to generate  $J_\nu(x)$  and  $I_\nu(x)$  accurate to  $p$  significant digits respectively. As a consequence of them, the values of  $M_E$  are shown for  $p \leq 30$  and  $0.1 \leq x \leq 100$ .

In this paper, we denote hereafter the order by  $(\nu+n)$ , where  $0 \leq \nu < 1$  and  $n$  is a non-negative integer.

### 2. Economical Points $M_E$ for Generating $J_{\nu+n}(x)$

The process to find  $J_{\nu+n}(x)$  by the Miller's algorithm is known as follows:

First, we choose moderately a positive integer  $M$  larger than  $x$  and  $n$ . Secondly, we construct a sequence of trial values  $F_{\nu+m-1}(x)$ ,  $m=M, M-1, \dots, 1$ , by the use of the recurrence relation

$$F_{\nu+m-1}(x) = \frac{2(\nu+m)}{x} F_{\nu+m}(x) - F_{\nu+m+1}(x) \quad (1)$$

starting with the initial values

$$F_{\nu+M+1}(x) = 0, \quad F_{\nu+M}(x) = a, \quad (2)$$

where  $a$  is an arbitrary non-zero constant.

If  $M$  is taken sufficiently large, the trial value  $F_{\nu+n}(x)$  so obtained turns out to be approximately proportional to  $J_{\nu+n}(x)$ . Therefore, the approximation for  $J_{\nu+n}(x)$  is obtained by the relation

---

This paper first appeared in Japanese in *Joho Shori* (the Journal of the Information Processing Society of Japan), Vol. 6, No. 4 (1965), pp. 194-201, and Vol. 6, No. 5 (1965), pp. 247-252.

The details of these two papers were shown in English in *Technology Reports of the Osaka University*, Vol. 15 (1965), pp. 185-201, and Vol. 15 (1965), pp. 203-216. The first of them is entitled "Note on the recurrence techniques for the calculation of Bessel functions  $J_\nu(x)$ ," and the second "Note on the recurrence techniques for the calculation of Bessel functions  $I_\nu(x)$ ."

\* Faculty of Engineering, Osaka University.

$$J_{\nu+n}(x) \approx F_{\nu+n}(x)/\alpha_0, \quad (3)$$

where the normalizing factor  $\alpha_0$  is given, for example, in the form

$$\left(\frac{2}{x}\right)^\nu \sum_{m=0}^{L/2} \frac{(\nu+2m)}{m!} \Gamma(\nu+m) F_{\nu+2m}(x) = \alpha_0, \quad (4.1)$$

by making use of a positive even integer  $L \leq M$ . For  $\nu=0$ , (4.1) reduces to

$$F_0(x) + 2 \sum_{m=1}^{L/2} F_{2m}(x) = 2 \sum_{m=0}^{L/2} F_{2m}(x) = \alpha_0. \quad (4.2)$$

Now, let us first consider the minimum value of  $M$ ,  $M_{\min}$ , by which we can guarantee a predetermined accuracy of the normalizing factor  $\alpha_0$  for given  $x$ . Later, we shall discuss a method to determine an appropriate value  $M_E (\geq M_{\min})$  as easily as possible.

If we can obtain  $M_E$ , we may take

$$L = 2[M_E/2], \quad (5)$$

where  $[M_E/2]$  is the largest integer not greater than  $M_E/2$ .

Since  $F_{\nu+M+1}(x)$  can be treated as the linear combination of the regular and irregular Bessel functions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\nu+M+1}(x) &= \alpha J_{\nu+M+1}(x) + \beta Y_{\nu+M+1}(x) \\ F_{\nu+n}(x) &= \alpha J_{\nu+n}(x) + \beta Y_{\nu+n}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Assuming  $J_{\nu+n}(x) \neq 0$ , we write

$$\frac{J_{\nu+M+1}(x)}{J_{\nu+n}(x)} \frac{Y_{\nu+n}(x)}{Y_{\nu+M+1}(x)} = \varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}. \quad (7)$$

Using the first of (2), (6) and (7), we obtain

$$\left[ J_{\nu+n}(x) - \frac{F_{\nu+n}(x)}{\alpha} \right] / J_{\nu+n}(x) = \varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}. \quad (8)$$

Since  $\varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n} \rightarrow 0$  as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$F_{\nu+n}(x) = \alpha J_{\nu+n}(x). \quad (9)$$

By the aid of an addition theorem, we obtain

$$\left(\frac{2}{x}\right)^\nu \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\nu+2m)}{m!} \Gamma(\nu+m) (\alpha J_{\nu+2m}(x)) = \alpha. \quad (10)$$

Let us consider the absolute error of  $\alpha_0$  in the form:

$$\Delta\alpha = \alpha - \alpha_0.$$

The relative error of  $\alpha_0$  can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} &= \left(\frac{2}{x}\right)^\nu \sum_{m=0}^{[M/2]} \frac{(\nu+2m)}{m!} \Gamma(\nu+m) \frac{J_{\nu+M+1}(x)}{Y_{\nu+M+1}(x)} Y_{\nu+2m}(x) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{2}{x}\right)^\nu \sum_{m=[M/2]+1}^{\infty} \frac{(\nu+2m)}{m!} \Gamma(\nu+m) J_{\nu+2m}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (11.1)$$

For  $\nu=0$ , we write  $\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} = \left(\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha}\right)_{\nu=0}$ . Then, Eq. (11.1) reduces to

$$\left(\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha}\right)_{\nu=0} = 2J_{M+1}(x) \left[ \sum_{m=0}^{[M/2]} \frac{Y_{2m}(x)}{Y_{M+1}(x)} + \sum_{m=[M/2]+1}^{\infty} \frac{J_{2m}(x)}{J_{M+1}(x)} \right]. \quad (11.2)$$

If  $\mu \gg x$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} J_\mu(x) &\approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mu}} \left(\frac{ex}{2\mu}\right)^\mu, \\ Y_\mu(x) &\approx -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi\mu}} \left(\frac{ex}{2\mu}\right)^{-\mu}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

and if  $m$  is a large enough positive integer, we get

$$\Gamma(\nu+m) \approx m^\nu \Gamma(m) \quad (13)$$

for  $0 < \nu < 1$ .

From (11.1) with the aids of (12) and (13), it is clear that  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha > 0$ , and that  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  is a monotone decreasing function of  $\nu$ , since  $M \gg x$  (see, Example 2). Therefore,  $M_{\min}$  which satisfies the condition

$$\Delta\alpha/\alpha < 0.5 \times 10^{-p} \quad (14)$$

for any  $\nu$  must be determined so as to satisfy the inequality

$$\left(\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha}\right)_{\nu=0} < 0.5 \times 10^{-p}. \quad (15)$$

In order to find about three correct significant digits in  $(\Delta\alpha/\alpha)_{\nu=0}$ , we may take several members of each term in the brackets on the right hand side of (11.2). That is to say, we have only to compute the last several members of the first term and the first several members of the second term. For the present purpose it is only necessary to obtain about three correct significant digits in  $J_{M+1}(x)$  by the use of a mathematical table or any suitable approximation.

Next, let us consider how to determine an approximation  $M_E$  for  $M_{\min}$ , using a function  $J_{M+1}(x)$  alone and not using other functions  $J_{2m}(x)$ ,  $Y_{2m}(x)$  and  $Y_{M+1}(x)$ .

Since  $M \gg x$ , by writing

$$x/2 = u \quad \text{and} \quad M - u = v,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Y_M(x)}{Y_{M+1}(x)} &< \frac{u}{v}, \quad \frac{Y_{M-1}(x)}{Y_M(x)} < \frac{u}{u-1}, \quad \dots \\ \frac{J_{M+1}(x)}{J_M(x)} &< \frac{u}{v+1}, \quad \frac{J_{M+2}(x)}{J_{M+1}(x)} < \frac{u}{v+2}, \quad \dots \end{aligned}$$

With the aids of these inequalities and (11.2), we find that

(i) if  $M$  is even,

$$\left(\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha}\right)_{\nu=0} < 2J_{M+1}(x) \left[ \frac{u}{v} + \frac{u}{v+2} + \frac{u^3}{v(v-1)(v-2)} + \frac{u^3}{(v+2)(v+3)(v+4)} + \dots \right] \quad (16.1)$$

and

(ii) if  $M$  is odd,

$$\left(\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha}\right)_{\nu=0} < 2J_{M+1}(x) \left[ 1 + \frac{u^2}{v(v+1)} + \frac{u^2}{(v+2)(v+3)} + \dots \right]. \quad (16.2)$$

Table 1.  $M_E$  and  $N_E$  for generating  $J_{\nu+n}(x)$ .  
 (E.g.,  $M_E=6$ ,  $N_E=3$  for  $p=10$  and  $x=0.3$ )  
 (With respect to  $N_E$ , see paragraph 3)

$\begin{matrix} x \\ p \end{matrix}$	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	
10	5 (3)	6 (4)	6 (3)	8 (5)	8 (5)	8 (5)	8 (5)	10 (7)	10 (7)	
20	10 (6)	11 (6)	12 (7)	13 (8)	14 (8)	14 (8)	15 (9)	16 (10)	16 (10)	
30	14 (8)	16 (9)	17 (10)	18 (10)	20 (12)	20 (12)	20 (11)	22 (13)	22 (13)	
$\begin{matrix} x \\ p \end{matrix}$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
10	10 (6)	13 (9)	16 (11)	18 (13)	20 (14)	21 (15)	23 (17)	24 (17)	26 (19)	
20	16 (9)	20 (12)	24 (16)	26 (17)	30 (20)	32 (22)	34 (23)	36 (25)	38 (27)	
30	22 (13)	28 (17)	32 (20)	35 (22)	38 (25)	40 (26)	44 (30)	46 (31)	48 (33)	
$\begin{matrix} x \\ p \end{matrix}$	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
10	28 (21)	42 (33)	55 (45)	68 (57)	80 (68)	92 (79)	103 (90)	115 (101)	126 (111)	138 (123)
20	40 (28)	56 (41)	72 (56)	86 (68)	99 (80)	112 (92)	124 (103)	137 (115)	149 (126)	161 (137)
30	50 (34)	69 (50)	86 (64)	101 (77)	115 (90)	129 (102)	142 (114)	156 (127)	168 (137)	181 (150)

Hence, using only  $J_{M+1}(x)$  accurate to a few significant digits, we can find the minimum value of  $M$ , i.e.  $M_E$ , for given  $x$  which makes the right hand side of (16.1) or (16.2) smaller than  $0.5 \times 10^{-p}$ . In this procedure, we may take several terms in the brackets on the right hand side of (16.1) or (16.2). Consequently, one can obtain easily an approximation  $M_E$  for  $M_{\min}$  by the methods described above.

We have obtained the values of  $M_E$  for  $p=9, 10, 18, 20, 30$  and  $0.01 \leq x \leq 100$ . Some of them are shown in Table 1. The values of  $M_E$  for  $p=10$  agree entirely with the optimum values of  $M$  obtained experimentally by I. Uoki [6].

### 3. The Error in the Approximation of $J_{\nu+n}(x)$

If  $M \geq M_E$ ,  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha < 0.5 \times 10^{-p}$ . With the aid of (8), neglecting the terms of higher order than  $(\Delta\alpha/\alpha)^2$ , we have

$$\frac{F_{\nu+n}(x)}{\alpha_0} \approx J_{\nu+n}(x) (1 - \varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}) \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} \right). \quad (17)$$

For given  $x$  and  $M$ , let us consider the largest value of  $n$ ,  $N$ , which satisfies

$$|\varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}| < 0.5 \times 10^{-p}. \quad (18)$$

If  $n \leq N$ ,  $(\Delta\alpha/\alpha)\varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}$  is negligible small because of the above definitions. Therefore, we may write the absolute error  $\Delta_{\nu+n}$  in an approximation of  $J_{\nu+n}(x)$  as follows:

$$\Delta_{\nu+n} = J_{\nu+n}(x) - \frac{F_{\nu+n}(x)}{\alpha_0}$$

$$\approx J_{\nu+n}(x) \left( \varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n} - \frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} \right). \quad (19)$$

Case 1:  $J_{\nu+n}(x) \neq 0$ .

The relative error  $\delta_{\nu+n}$  in  $F_{\nu+n}(x)/\alpha_0$  is written in the form:

$$\delta_{\nu+n} \approx \varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n} - \frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha}. \quad (20)$$

It is obvious that

$$0 < \varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n} < 0.5 \times 10^{-p} \quad \text{for } x \leq n \leq N,$$

$$\left| \varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n} \right| \ll \left| \frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} \right| \quad \text{for } n < x.$$

When  $M \geq M_E (\geq M_{\min})$ , therefore, we find from (20) that

$$|\delta_{\nu+n}| < 0.5 \times 10^{-p} \quad \text{for } n \leq N.$$

In other words, we can obtain approximation of  $J_{\nu+n}(x)$  accurate to  $p$  significant digits for  $0 \leq n \leq N$  by making use of  $M \geq M_E$ .

Using (12), we can find that  $\varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}$  is a monotone decreasing function of  $\nu$ . Hence we shall denote again by  $N$  the largest value of  $n$  which satisfies the inequality

$$\frac{J_{M+1}(x)}{J_n(x)} \frac{Y_n(x)}{Y_{M+1}(x)} < 0.5 \times 10^{-p} \quad (21)$$

for given  $p$ ,  $x$  and  $M$ . We write  $N = N_E$  when  $M = M_E$ , and show also the values of  $N_E$  in Table 1.

Case 2:  $J_{\nu+n}(x) \approx 0$ .

In this case, the absolute error of  $F_{\nu+n}(x)/\alpha_0$  must be considered. From (19) we get

$$\Delta_{\nu+n} \approx \frac{J_{\nu+M+1}(x)}{Y_{\nu+M+1}(x)} Y_{\nu+n}(x) - J_{\nu+n}(x) \frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha}.$$

If  $x$  is a zero of  $J_{\nu+n}(x)$  which is accurate to  $p$  significant digits, then

$$|J_{\nu+n}(x)| \approx 10^{-p}.$$

On the other hand,  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha < 0.5 \times 10^{-p}$  and  $\left| \frac{J_{\nu+M+1}(x)}{Y_{\nu+M+1}(x)} Y_{\nu+n}(x) \right|$  is smaller than or nearly equal to  $10^{-2p}$  for  $M \geq M_E$ . Therefore,  $|\Delta_{\nu+n}|$  is nearly equal to  $10^{-2p}$ . Moreover, we can easily find that

$$\frac{J_{\nu+n}(x)}{J_{\nu+n+1}(x)} - \frac{F_{\nu+n}(x)}{F_{\nu+n+1}(x)} \approx \frac{\Delta_{\nu+n}}{J_{\nu+n+1}(x)}.$$

Then, the magnitude of the difference between  $J_{\nu+n}(x)/J_{\nu+n+1}(x)$  and  $F_{\nu+n}(x)/F_{\nu+n+1}(x)$  is also as small as the order of  $10^{-2p}$ .

It is interesting to note that a zero of  $J_{\nu+n}(x)$  accurate to about  $2p$  significant digits can be obtained by using  $M = M_E$  which guarantees the values of functions  $J_{\nu+n+r}(x)$ ,  $r = 1, 2, \dots$ , accurate only to  $p$  significant digits.

#### 4. A Method for Evaluating the Zeros of $J_{\nu+n}(x)$

Applying the recurrence technique, we consider now to evaluate the zeros of  $J_{\nu+n}(x)$  by the Newton's iteration [11].

If  $x_i$  is an approximation for a zero of  $J_{\nu+n}(x)$ , a better approximation  $x_{i+1}$  can be obtained in the form\*:

$$x_{i+1} = x_i - \frac{J_{\nu+n}(x_i)}{J'_{\nu+n}(x_i)}, \quad i=0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (22)$$

As is known,

$$J'_{\nu+n}(x) = \frac{1}{2}(J_{\nu+n-1}(x) - J_{\nu+n+1}(x)),$$

$$J_{\nu+n-1}(x_i) \approx -J_{\nu+n+1}(x_i).$$

By these reasons, Eq. (22) may be written approximately in the form:

$$x_{i+1} = x_i + \frac{F_{\nu+n}(x_i)}{F_{\nu+n+1}(x_i)}. \quad (23)$$

The procedure of computing the second term on the right hand side of (23) is as follows:

(i) Choose  $M$  slightly larger than  $M_E$  for given  $p$  and  $x \geq x_i$ , when we want to evaluate a zero accurate to  $2p$  significant digits.

(ii) Construct a sequence of trial values

$$F_{\nu+M+1}(x_i), F_{\nu+M}(x_i), F_{\nu+M-1}(x_i), \dots, F_{\nu+n+1}(x_i), F_{\nu+n}(x_i) \quad (24)$$

discarding the values corresponding to the functions of smaller order than  $(\nu+n)$ .

(iii) Divide  $F_{\nu+n}(x_i)$  by  $F_{\nu+n+1}(x_i)$ .

Thus there is no need to compute the function values themselves. This is very convenient for saving the computing time and simplifying the program especially when  $\nu \neq 0$ . Moreover, it must be noted that we can easily determine the number of positive zeros ( $\neq 0$ ) of  $J_{\nu+n}(x)$  on a given interval by making use of such a sequence as (24), since the sequence of functions  $\{J_{\nu+n}(x)\}$  constructs a Sturm's chain.

#### 5. Economical Points $M_E$ for Generating $I_{\nu+n}(x)$

The economical points  $M_E$  for generating  $I_{\nu+n}(x)$  can be determined essentially in the same way that is described in paragraph 2. The details of the process will be shown below.

Now, let us consider the process to find  $I_{\nu+n}(x)$  by the Miller's algorithm. For given  $x$  and  $n$ , we first choose moderately a positive integer  $M > n$ . Next, we construct a sequence of trial values  $G_{\nu+m-1}(x)$ ,  $m=M, M-1, \dots, 1$ , by the use of the recurrence relation

$$G_{\nu+m-1}(x) = \frac{2(\nu+m)}{x} G_{\nu+m}(x) + G_{\nu+m+1}(x), \quad (25)$$

---

\* A starting value  $x_0$  is easily obtained by the McMahon series.

starting with the initial values

$$G_{\nu+M+1}(x)=0, \quad G_{\nu+M}(x)=a. \quad (26)$$

Since  $M$  is taken appropriately large, we can write

$$I_{\nu+n}(x) \approx G_{\nu+n}(x)/\alpha_0. \quad (27)$$

In this case, we assume that the normalizing factor  $\alpha_0$  is given by the relation

$$2\left(\frac{2}{x}\right)^\nu \frac{\Gamma(1+\nu)}{\Gamma(1+2\nu)} \sum_{m=0}^L \frac{(\nu+m)}{m!} \Gamma(2\nu+m) (e^{-x} G_{\nu+m}(x)) = \alpha_0, \quad (28.1)$$

using a positive integer  $L \leq M$ . For  $\nu=0$ , (28.1) reduces to

$$e^{-x} \left( G_0(x) + 2 \sum_{m=1}^L G_m(x) \right) = 2 \sum_{m=0}^L (e^{-x} G_m(x)) = \alpha_0. \quad (28.2)$$

Let us consider to determine an optimum value  $M_E$  not smaller than the minimum value of  $M$ , which guarantees the normalizing factor  $\alpha_0$  accurate to  $p$  significant digits for given  $x$ . If  $M_E$  is determined, we may take

$$L = M_E. \quad (29)$$

Denoting  $\bar{K}_{\nu+n}(x) = (-)^n K_{\nu+n}(x)$ , we may write

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\nu+M+1}(x) &= \alpha I_{\nu+M+1}(x) + \beta \bar{K}_{\nu+M+1}(x) \\ G_{\nu+n}(x) &= \alpha I_{\nu+n}(x) + \beta \bar{K}_{\nu+n}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Assuming  $I_{\nu+n}(x) \neq 0$ , we introduce again the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n} &= \frac{I_{\nu+M+1}(x)}{I_{\nu+n}(x)} \frac{\bar{K}_{\nu+n}(x)}{\bar{K}_{\nu+M+1}(x)} \\ &= (-)^{M-n+1} \frac{I_{\nu+M+1}(x)}{I_{\nu+n}(x)} \frac{K_{\nu+n}(x)}{K_{\nu+M+1}(x)}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

With the aids of the first of (26), (30) and (31), we obtain

$$\left[ I_{\nu+n}(x) - \frac{G_{\nu+n}(x)}{\alpha} \right] / I_{\nu+n}(x) = \varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}. \quad (32)$$

Since  $\varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n} \rightarrow 0$  as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$G_{\nu+n}(x) = \alpha I_{\nu+n}(x). \quad (33)$$

Following an addition theorem, we have

$$2\left(\frac{2}{x}\right)^\nu \frac{\Gamma(1+\nu)}{\Gamma(1+2\nu)} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\nu+m)}{m!} \Gamma(2\nu+m) (\alpha e^{-x} I_{\nu+m}(x)) = \alpha. \quad (34)$$

Denoting by  $\Delta\alpha$  the absolute error in the approximation of  $\alpha$  as before, we can write

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} = \frac{\Delta\alpha_1}{\alpha} + \frac{\Delta\alpha_2}{\alpha}, \quad (35)$$

where

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha_1}{\alpha} = 2\left(\frac{2}{x}\right)^\nu \frac{\Gamma(1+\nu)}{\Gamma(1+2\nu)} \sum_{m=0}^M \frac{(\nu+m)}{m!} \Gamma(2\nu+m) e^{-x} \frac{I_{\nu+M+1}(x)}{K_{\nu+M+1}(x)} K_{\nu+m}(x), \quad (36.1)$$

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha_2}{\alpha} = 2\left(\frac{2}{x}\right)^\nu \frac{\Gamma(1+\nu)}{\Gamma(1+2\nu)} \sum_{m=M+1}^{\infty} \frac{(\nu+m)}{m!} \Gamma(2\nu+m) (e^{-x} I_{\nu+m}(x)). \quad (36.2)$$

Then it is clear that  $\Delta\alpha_1/\alpha < 0$ ,  $\Delta\alpha_2/\alpha > 0$  and  $|\Delta\alpha_1/\alpha| < |\Delta\alpha_2/\alpha|$ . Therefore, we see that  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha > 0$ .

If  $\mu \gg x$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} I_\mu(x) &\approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mu}} \left(\frac{ex}{2\mu}\right)^\mu, \\ K_\mu(x) &\approx \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}} \left(\frac{ex}{2\mu}\right)^{-\mu}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

From (35) with the aids of (13) and (37), it is clear that  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  is a monotone increasing function of  $\nu$  when  $M \gg x$ . In some cases when  $M$  is not large enough compared with  $x$ ,  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  is also a monotone increasing function of  $\nu$  (see, Example 3). Accordingly, we see that  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  takes the maximum value as  $\nu \rightarrow 1$  for given  $x$  and  $M$ .

Substituting  $\nu=1$  into (36.1) and (36.2) respectively, we have

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha_1}{\alpha} = e^{-x} I_{M+2}(x) \left[ -(M+1) + M \frac{K_{M+1}(x)}{K_{M+2}(x)} + 2 \frac{K_M(x)}{K_{M+2}(x)} - \dots \right], \quad (38.1)$$

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha_2}{\alpha} = e^{-x} [(M+2)I_{M+1}(x) + (M+3)I_{M+2}(x) + 2I_{M+3}(x) + \dots]. \quad (38.2)$$

As a behavior of modified Bessel functions, we have the inequalities as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{M+1}(x) &> I_{M+2}(x) > I_{M+3}(x) > \dots, \\ K_{M+2}(x) &> K_{M+1}(x) > K_M(x) > \dots. \end{aligned}$$

Then, with the aids of (38.1) and (38.2) we obtain

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} < e^{-x} [(M+2)I_{M+1}(x) + (M+3)I_{M+2}(x)]. \quad (39)$$

If we get  $I_{M+1}(x)$  and  $I_{M+2}(x)$  accurate to a few significant figures respectively by the use of any mathematical table or approximating formula, then we can easily determine the minimum of  $M$  which satisfies

$$e^{-x} [(M+2)I_{M+1}(x) + (M+3)I_{M+2}(x)] < 0.25 \times 10^{-p}. \quad (40)$$

The minimum value of  $M$  so obtained is the value for  $M_E$  described before, and it satisfies the inequality

$$\Delta\alpha/\alpha < 0.25 \times 10^{-p} \quad (41)$$

for any  $\nu$ . From (39) and (40), it is clear that  $M_E$  is somewhat larger than or equal to the minimum of  $M$  which satisfies the inequality (41).

We have obtained the values of  $M_E$  for  $p=9, 10, 18, 20, 30$  and  $0.01 \leq x \leq 100$ . Some of them are indicated in Table 2. For  $x \geq 50$  and comparatively small  $p$ , we find that  $M_E < x$ . It must be noted that there is no such a case for  $J_{\nu+n}(x)$ .

The reason why the upper bound for  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  has been chosen to be equal to  $0.25 \times 10^{-p}$  will be discussed in the next paragraph.



Table 2.  $M_E$  and  $N_E$  for generating  $I_{\nu+n}(x)$ .  
 (E.g.,  $M_E=8, N_E=5$  for  $p=10$  and  $x=0.3$ )  
 (With respect to  $N_E$ , see paragraph 6)

$\begin{matrix} x \\ p \end{matrix}$	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	
10	6 (4)	7 (5)	8 (5)	8 (5)	9 (6)	9 (6)	10 (7)	10 (7)	10 (6)	
20	10 (6)	12 (7)	13 (8)	14 (9)	15 (9)	15 (9)	16 (10)	17 (11)	17 (11)	
30	15 (9)	17 (10)	18 (11)	19 (11)	20 (12)	21 (13)	22 (14)	23 (14)	23 (14)	
$\begin{matrix} x \\ p \end{matrix}$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
10	11 (7)	14 (10)	16 (11)	17 (11)	19 (13)	20 (14)	22 (16)	23 (16)	24 (17)	
20	18 (12)	22 (14)	24 (15)	27 (18)	29 (19)	31 (21)	33 (22)	34 (23)	36 (24)	
30	24 (15)	29 (18)	32 (20)	35 (22)	38 (25)	40 (26)	42 (27)	44 (29)	46 (30)	
$\begin{matrix} x \\ p \end{matrix}$	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
10	25 (17)	34 (24)	41 (29)	47 (34)	52 (38)	57 (41)	61 (44)	65 (47)	69 (50)	73 (53)
20	38 (26)	50 (35)	59 (41)	67 (47)	74 (52)	80 (56)	86 (61)	92 (65)	97 (69)	102 (73)
30	48 (32)	63 (43)	74 (51)	84 (58)	92 (64)	100 (70)	107 (75)	113 (79)	120 (84)	126 (89)

6. *The Error in the Approximation of  $I_{\nu+n}(x)$*

If  $M \geq M_E$ , then  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha < 0.25 \times 10^{-p}$ . Neglecting the terms of higher order than  $(\Delta\alpha/\alpha)^2$ , we find that

$$\frac{G_{\nu+n}(x)}{\alpha_0} \approx I_{\nu+n}(x)(1 - \epsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}) \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} \right). \tag{42}$$

Now, we denote by  $N$  the largest value of  $n$  which holds

$$|\epsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}| < 0.25 \times 10^{-p} \tag{43}$$

for given  $p, x$  and  $M$ . Then, we can discard  $(\Delta\alpha/\alpha)\epsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}$  because of the above definitions. So that, the absolute error  $A_{\nu+n}$  in the approximation  $G_{\nu+n}(x)/\alpha_0$  for  $I_{\nu+n}(x)$  is written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\nu+n} &= I_{\nu+n}(x) - \frac{G_{\nu+n}(x)}{\alpha_0} \\ &\approx I_{\nu+n}(x) \left( \epsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n} - \frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Therefore, the relative error in  $G_{\nu+n}(x)/\alpha_0$  can be represented in the form:

$$\delta_{\nu+n} \approx \epsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n} - \frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha}. \tag{45}$$

Then, we may consider

$$|\delta_{\nu+n}| \leq |\epsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}| + \left| \frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} \right|. \tag{46}$$

Accordingly, from (46) with the aids of (41) and (43) we find that

$$|\delta_{\nu+n}| < 0.5 \times 10^{-p} \text{ for } n \leq N.$$

Namely, if  $M \geq M_E$  we can generate  $I_{\nu+n}(x)$  accurate to  $p$  significant digits for  $0 \leq n \leq N$ .

It is clear that  $|\varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}|$  is also a monotone decreasing function of  $\nu$ . Hence, we denote again by  $N$  the largest value of  $n$  which holds

$$\frac{I_{M+1}(x)}{I_n(x)} \frac{K_n(x)}{K_{M+1}(x)} < 0.25 \times 10^{-p}. \quad (47)$$

We write  $N = N_E$  when  $M = M_E$  for given  $p$  and  $x$ , and show also the values of  $N_E$  in Table 2.

Let us now consider the minimum of  $M$ ,  $M_{\min}$ , by which we can obtain  $I_{\nu+n}(x)$  accurate to  $p$  significant digits. That is to say, suppose that  $M_{\min}$  satisfies the condition

$$|\delta_{\nu+n}| < 0.5 \times 10^{-p} \quad (48)$$

for any  $\nu$  when  $p$  and  $x$  are given. We will show the relation  $M_{\min}$  and  $M_E$ .

If  $n \ll N$ , then  $|\varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}| \ll |\Delta\alpha/\alpha|$ . So that we find from (46)

$$|\delta_{\nu+n}| \approx |\Delta\alpha/\alpha| \text{ for } n \ll N.$$

Therefore,  $M_{\min}$  may hold

$$\Delta\alpha/\alpha < 0.5 \times 10^{-p} \quad (49)$$

as well as (48). However, we have determined  $M_E$  so as to satisfy the inequality  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha < 0.25 \times 10^{-p}$ . Consequently, it is clear that  $M_E$  is nearly equal to  $M_{\min}$ , and that  $M_E \geq M_{\min}$ .

Since  $|\delta_{\nu+n}| \leq |\varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}| + |\Delta\alpha/\alpha|$ , we are not able to set an upper bound for  $|\varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}|$  under the conditions (48) and (49). In other words, it is actually difficult in these circumstances to determine the largest value of order  $n$ , i.e.  $N$ .

Table 3. Computed values of  $J_n(30)$ , using  $M=55$ ,  $L=54$ .

$n$	$F_n(30)/\alpha_0$			$\Delta_n$	$\delta_n$	$\varepsilon_{M,n}$
55	5.3605	54054	32144 (-11)	5.06 (-12)	8.62 (-2)	8.62 (-2)
54	1.9655	36486	58453 (-10)	1.54 (-12)	7.76 (-3)	7.76 (-3)
53	6.5398	75946	27216 (-10)	4.78 (-13)	7.31 (-4)	7.31 (-4)
...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
46	1.4463	11623	21019 (-6)	2.13 (-16)	1.47 (-10)	1.88 (-10)
45	3.9157	69889	72646 (-6)	-5.37 (-17)	-1.37 (-11)	2.66 (-11)
44	1.0300	99804	59692 (-5)	-3.74 (-16)	-3.63 (-11)	4.00 (-12)
43	2.6300	49104	51165 (-5)	-1.04 (-15)	-3.97 (-11)	6.42 (-13)
42	6.5093	74295	00315 (-5)	-2.62 (-15)	-4.02 (-11)	1.10 (-13)
41	1.5596	19892	14972 (-4)	-6.29 (-15)	-4.03 (-11)	2.02 (-14)
...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
2	7.8451	24607	64292 (-2)	-3.16 (-12)	-4.03 (-11)	-6.73 (-20)
1	-1.1875	10626	21412 (-1)	4.79 (-12)	-4.03 (-11)	3.05 (-20)
0	-8.6367	98358	45234 (-2)	3.48 (-12)	-4.03 (-11)	-5.83 (-20)

By this reason, we have determined  $M_E$  and  $N_E$  setting the upper bounds for  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  and  $|\varepsilon_{\nu+M, \nu+n}|$  to be equal to  $0.25 \times 10^{-p}$  respectively.

7. Numerical Examples

*Example 1.* Using  $M=55$  and  $L=54$ , let us find  $J_n(30)$ . The computed results are shown in Table 3. It is seen that the ten significant digits of  $J_n(30)$  are accurate for  $0 \leq n \leq 45$ . For  $n \leq 41$ ,  $|\varepsilon_{M, n}|$  are so small that  $\delta_n$  are nearly equal to a constant  $-4.03 \times 10^{-11}$ . Consequently,  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha \approx 4.03 \times 10^{-11}$  is obtained in this example.

*Example 2.* Using again  $M=55$  and  $L=54$ , let us find  $J_\nu(30)$  for  $\nu=0, 1/4, 1/2, 3/4$  and  $39/40$ . The results are shown in Table 4. It is clear that the larger the value of  $\nu$ , the smaller the value of  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  ( $\approx |\delta_\nu|$ ), and that  $J_\nu(30)$  are obtained accurately to ten significant digits.

*Example 3.* The values of  $I_\nu(100)$ , which are correct at least to ten significant digits for  $\nu=0, 1/4, 1/2, 3/4, 39/40$  and  $99/100$ , are shown in Table 5. These computed values are obtained by making use of  $M=L=73$  (see, Table 2). It is clear that the value of  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  ( $\approx |\delta_\nu|$ ) becomes larger with increasing  $\nu$ , and that all values of  $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$  are smaller than  $2.5 \times 10^{-11}$ .

8. Conclusion

To determine  $M_E$  and  $N_E$  for given  $p$  and  $x$  is very convenient for the purpose of obtaining the predetermined accuracy for  $J_{\nu+n}(x)$  and  $I_{\nu+n}(x)$  yielded by the Miller's algorithm, and making these function tables by a computer.

Using  $M=M_E$  and  $N_E$  for  $p=30$  shown in Tables 1 and 2, we have obtained the mathematical tables of  $J_n(x), J_\nu(x), I_n(x)$  and  $I_\nu(x)$  for the ranges

Table 4. Computed values of  $J_\nu(30)$ , using  $M=55, L=54$ .

$\nu$	$F_\nu(30)/\alpha_0$	$ \mathcal{A}_\nu $	$ \delta_\nu $
0	-8.6367 98358 <u>45234</u> (-2)	3.48 (-12)	4.03 (-11)
1/4	-1.2460 44300 <u>13096</u> (-1)	4.29 (-12)	3.44 (-11)
1/2	-1.4392 96533 <u>74639</u> (-1)	4.24 (-12)	2.95 (-11)
3/4	-1.4176 16910 <u>44798</u> (-1)	3.57 (-12)	2.52 (-11)
39/40	-1.2190 67728 <u>79151</u> (-1)	2.67 (-12)	2.19 (-11)

Table 5. Computed values of  $I_\nu(100)$ , using  $M=L=73$ .

$\nu$	$G_\nu(100)/\alpha_0$	$ \mathcal{A}_\nu $	$ \delta_\nu $
0	1.0737 51707 <u>13156</u> (42)	4.82 (29)	4.48 (-13)
1/4	1.0734 14516 <u>64668</u> (42)	1.35 (30)	1.26 (-12)
1/2	1.0724 03582 <u>54554</u> (42)	3.23 (30)	3.01 (-12)
3/4	1.0707 20814 <u>87736</u> (42)	6.94 (30)	6.48 (-12)
39/40	1.0686 34505 <u>80441</u> (42)	1.30 (31)	1.21 (-11)
99/100	1.0684 76234 <u>00686</u> (42)	1.35 (31)	1.26 (-11)

$$n=0(1)N_E \quad \nu = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{5}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{1}{5} \right) \frac{4}{5}$$

$$x=0.01(0.01)0.1(0.1)1(1)10(10)100.$$

The calculations of these functions were carried out on the NEAC-2206 at the Computing Center of Osaka University. All computations were performed with triple-length floating point arithmetic, i.e. thirty-three decimal digits. Accordingly, the computed results are accurate to twenty-nine significant digits at least.

Although no details are shown in this paper, we have also obtained the mathematical tables of  $Y_{\nu+n}(x)$  and  $K_{\nu+n}(x)$  accurate to twenty-nine places respectively. The tables of  $Y_{\nu+n}(x)$  are designed in just the same way as in the case of the tables of  $J_{\nu+n}(x)$ . The values of  $K_{\nu+n}(x)$  are tabulated for the same ranges of  $(\nu+n)$  and  $x(\leq 2)$  as those for which the values of  $I_{\nu+n}(x)$  are covered.

### Acknowledgement

The author wishes to thank Prof. K. Joh for suggesting the problem and also for many helpful discussions and valuable criticisms given during the preparation of this paper.

### References

- [1] British Association for the Advancement of Science, "Bessel functions, Part II," Mathematical Tables, Vol. X, Cambridge University Press (1952), p. xvii.
- [2] FOX, L., A short table for Bessel functions of integer orders and large arguments. *Royal Society Shorter Mathematical Tables*, 3, Cambridge University Press (1954).
- [3] STEGUN, I. A. AND M. ABRAMOWITZ, Generation of Bessel functions on high speed computers. *MTAC*, 11 (1957), 255-257.
- [4] RANDELS, J. B. AND R. F. REEVES, Note on empirical bounds for generating Bessel functions, *Comm. Assoc. Comput. Mach.*, 1 (May 1958), 3-5.
- [5] GOLDSTEIN, M. AND R. M. THALER, Recurrence techniques for the calculation of Bessel functions, *MTAC*, 13 (1959), 102-108.
- [6] UNO, T., Formulas of approximating functions for digital computers, No. 2. *Report of Cooperative Research Group of Mathematical Science in Japan (Suri Kagaku Sogo Kenkyu, Dai IV Han, Dai 5 Bunkakai)*, 1962, p. 80, (in Japanese).
- [7] HITOTUMATU, S., Note on the computation of Bessel functions through recurrence formula. *Jour. Math. Soc. Japan*, 15 (1963), 353-359.
- [8] JONES, C. W., A short table for the Bessel functions  $I_{n+1/2}(x)$ ,  $(2/\pi)K_{n+1/2}(x)$ . *Royal Society Shorter Mathematical Tables, No. 1*, Cambridge University Press (1952).
- [9] CORBATÓ, F. J. AND URETSKY J. L., Generation of spherical Bessel functions in digital computers. *Jour. Assoc. Comput. Mach.*, 6 (1959), 336-375.
- [10] OLVER, F. W. J., Error analysis of Miller's recurrence algorithm, *Math. Comp.*, 18 (1964), 65-74.
- [11] MAKINOCHI, S., Zeros of Bessel functions  $J_\nu(x)$  and  $Y_\nu(x)$  accurate to twenty-nine significant digits. *Technol. Repts. Osaka Univ.*, 16 (1966), 1-44.