

```

etemp=e;
e=d;
if (fabs(p) >= fabs(0.5*q*etemp) || p <= q*(a-x) || p >= q*(b-x))
    d=CGOLD*(e=(x >= xm ? a-x : b-x));
The above conditions determine the acceptability of the parabolic fit. Here we
take the golden section step into the larger of the two segments.
else {
    d=p/q;                Take the parabolic step.
    u=x+d;
    if (u-a < tol1 || b-u < tol2)
        d=SIGN(tol1,xm-x);
}
} else {
    d=CGOLD*(e=(x >= xm ? a-x : b-x));
}
u=(fabs(d) >= tol1 ? x+d : x+SIGN(tol1,d));
fu=(*f)(u);
This is the one function evaluation per iteration.
if (fu <= fx) {
    if (u >= x) a=x; else b=x;                Now decide what to do with our func-
    SHFT(v,w,x,u)                             tion evaluation.
    SHFT(fv,fw,fx,fu)                         Housekeeping follows:
} else {
    if (u < x) a=u; else b=u;
    if (fu <= fw || w == x) {
        v=w;
        w=u;
        fv=fw;
        fw=fu;
    } else if (fu <= fv || v == x || v == w) {
        v=u;
        fv=fu;
    }
}
}
}
nrerror("Too many iterations in brent");
*xmin=x;
return fx;
}

```

CITED REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING:

- Brent, R.P. 1973, *Algorithms for Minimization without Derivatives* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall), Chapter 5. [1]
- Forsythe, G.E., Malcolm, M.A., and Moler, C.B. 1977, *Computer Methods for Mathematical Computations* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall), §8.2.

10.3 One-Dimensional Search with First Derivatives

Here we want to accomplish precisely the same goal as in the previous section, namely to isolate a functional minimum that is bracketed by the triplet of abscissas (a, b, c) , but utilizing an additional capability to compute the function's first derivative as well as its value.

Sample page from NUMERICAL RECIPES IN C: THE ART OF SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING (ISBN 0-521-43108-5)
 Copyright (C) 1988-1992 by Cambridge University Press. Programs Copyright (C) 1988-1992 by Numerical Recipes Software.
 Permission is granted for internet users to make one paper copy for their own personal use. Further reproduction, or any copying of machine-readable files (including this one), to any server computer, is strictly prohibited. To order Numerical Recipes books, diskettes, or CDROMs visit website <http://www.nr.com> or call 1-800-872-7423 (North America only), or send email to trade@cup.cam.ac.uk (outside North America).

In principle, we might simply search for a zero of the derivative, ignoring the function value information, using a root finder like `rtflsp` or `zbrent` (§§9.2–9.3). It doesn't take long to reject *that* idea: How do we distinguish maxima from minima? Where do we go from initial conditions where the derivatives on one or both of the outer bracketing points indicate that “downhill” is in the direction *out* of the bracketed interval?

We don't want to give up our strategy of maintaining a rigorous bracket on the minimum at all times. The only way to keep such a bracket is to update it using function (not derivative) information, with the central point in the bracketing triplet always that with the lowest function value. Therefore the role of the derivatives can only be to help us choose new trial points within the bracket.

One school of thought is to “use everything you've got”: Compute a polynomial of relatively high order (cubic or above) that agrees with some number of previous function and derivative evaluations. For example, there is a unique cubic that agrees with function and derivative at two points, and one can jump to the interpolated minimum of that cubic (if there is a minimum within the bracket). Suggested by Davidon and others, formulas for this tactic are given in [1].

We like to be more conservative than this. Once superlinear convergence sets in, it hardly matters whether its order is moderately lower or higher. In practical problems that we have met, most function evaluations are spent in getting globally close enough to the minimum for superlinear convergence to commence. So we are more worried about all the funny “stiff” things that high-order polynomials can do (cf. Figure 3.0.1b), and about their sensitivities to roundoff error.

This leads us to use derivative information only as follows: The sign of the derivative at the central point of the bracketing triplet (a, b, c) indicates uniquely whether the next test point should be taken in the interval (a, b) or in the interval (b, c) . The value of this derivative and of the derivative at the second-best-so-far point are extrapolated to zero by the secant method (inverse linear interpolation), which by itself is superlinear of order 1.618. (The golden mean again: see [1], p. 57.) We impose the same sort of restrictions on this new trial point as in Brent's method. If the trial point must be rejected, we *bisect* the interval under scrutiny.

Yes, we are fuddy-duddies when it comes to making flamboyant use of derivative information in one-dimensional minimization. But we have met too many functions whose computed “derivatives” *don't* integrate up to the function value and *don't* accurately point the way to the minimum, usually because of roundoff errors, sometimes because of truncation error in the method of derivative evaluation.

You will see that the following routine is closely modeled on `brent` in the previous section.

```
#include <math.h>
#include "nrutil.h"
#define ITMAX 100
#define ZEPS 1.0e-10
#define MOV3(a,b,c, d,e,f) (a)=(d);(b)=(e);(c)=(f);

float dbrent(float ax, float bx, float cx, float (*f)(float),
             float (*df)(float), float tol, float *xmin)
```

Given a function `f` and its derivative function `df`, and given a bracketing triplet of abscissas `ax`, `bx`, `cx` [such that `bx` is between `ax` and `cx`, and `f(bx)` is less than both `f(ax)` and `f(cx)`], this routine isolates the minimum to a fractional precision of about `tol` using a modification of Brent's method that uses derivatives. The abscissa of the minimum is returned as `xmin`, and

the minimum function value is returned as `dbrent`, the returned function value.

```

{
  int iter,ok1,ok2;           Will be used as flags for whether pro-
  float a,b,d,d1,d2,du,dv,dw,dx,e=0.0;   posed steps are acceptable or not.
  float fu,fv,fw,fx,olde,tol1,tol2,u,u1,u2,v,w,x,xm;

  Comments following will point out only differences from the routine brent. Read that
  routine first.
  a=(ax < cx ? ax : cx);
  b=(ax > cx ? ax : cx);
  x=w=v=bx;
  fw=fv=fx>(*f)(x);
  dw=dv=dx>(*df)(x);           All our housekeeping chores are dou-
  for (iter=1;iter<=ITMAX;iter++) {   bled by the necessity of moving
    xm=0.5*(a+b);                   derivative values around as well
    tol1=tol*fabs(x)+ZEPS;           as function values.
    tol2=2.0*tol1;
    if (fabs(x-xm) <= (tol2-0.5*(b-a))) {
      *xmin=x;
      return fx;
    }
    if (fabs(e) > tol1) {
      d1=2.0*(b-a);                 Initialize these d's to an out-of-bracket
      d2=d1;                          value.
      if (dw != dx) d1=(w-x)*dx/(dx-dw);  Secant method with one point.
      if (dv != dx) d2=(v-x)*dx/(dx-dv);  And the other.
      Which of these two estimates of d shall we take? We will insist that they be within
      the bracket, and on the side pointed to by the derivative at x:
      u1=x+d1;
      u2=x+d2;
      ok1 = (a-u1)*(u1-b) > 0.0 && dx*d1 <= 0.0;
      ok2 = (a-u2)*(u2-b) > 0.0 && dx*d2 <= 0.0;
      olde=e;                          Movement on the step before last.
      e=d;
      if (ok1 || ok2) {               Take only an acceptable d, and if
        if (ok1 && ok2)                 both are acceptable, then take
          d=(fabs(d1) < fabs(d2) ? d1 : d2);  the smallest one.
        else if (ok1)
          d=d1;
        else
          d=d2;
        if (fabs(d) <= fabs(0.5*olde)) {
          u=x+d;
          if (u-a < tol2 || b-u < tol2)
            d=SIGN(tol1,xm-x);
        } else {                       Bisect, not golden section.
          d=0.5*(e=(dx >= 0.0 ? a-x : b-x));
          Decide which segment by the sign of the derivative.
        }
      } else {
        d=0.5*(e=(dx >= 0.0 ? a-x : b-x));
      }
    } else {
      d=0.5*(e=(dx >= 0.0 ? a-x : b-x));
    }
    if (fabs(d) >= tol1) {
      u=x+d;
      fu>(*f)(u);
    } else {
      u=x+SIGN(tol1,d);
      fu>(*f)(u);
      if (fu > fx) {                   If the minimum step in the downhill
        *xmin=x;                       direction takes us uphill, then
        return fx;                       we are done.
      }
    }
  }
}

```

Sample page from NUMERICAL RECIPES IN C: THE ART OF SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING (ISBN 0-521-43108-5)
 Copyright (C) 1988-1992 by Cambridge University Press. Programs Copyright (C) 1988-1992 by Numerical Recipes Software.
 Permission is granted for internet users to make one paper copy for their own personal use. Further reproduction, or any copying of machine-readable files (including this one), to any server computer, is strictly prohibited. To order Numerical Recipes books, diskettes, or CDROMs visit website <http://www.nr.com> or call 1-800-872-7423 (North America only), or send email to trade@cup.cam.ac.uk (outside North America).

```

    }
}
du=(*df)(u);
if (fu <= fx) {
    if (u >= x) a=x; else b=x;
    MOV3(v,fv,dv, w,fw,dw)
    MOV3(w,fw,dw, x,fx,dx)
    MOV3(x,fx,dx, u,fu,du)
} else {
    if (u < x) a=u; else b=u;
    if (fu <= fw || w == x) {
        MOV3(v,fv,dv, w,fw,dw)
        MOV3(w,fw,dw, u,fu,du)
    } else if (fu < fv || v == x || v == w) {
        MOV3(v,fv,dv, u,fu,du)
    }
}
}
nrerror("Too many iterations in routine dbrent");
return 0.0;
}

```

Now all the housekeeping, sigh.

Never get here.

CITED REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING:

- Acton, F.S. 1970, *Numerical Methods That Work*; 1990, corrected edition (Washington: Mathematical Association of America), pp. 55; 454–458. [1]
- Brent, R.P. 1973, *Algorithms for Minimization without Derivatives* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall), p. 78.

10.4 Downhill Simplex Method in Multidimensions

With this section we begin consideration of multidimensional minimization, that is, finding the minimum of a function of more than one independent variable. This section stands apart from those which follow, however: All of the algorithms after this section will make explicit use of a one-dimensional minimization algorithm as a part of their computational strategy. This section implements an entirely self-contained strategy, in which one-dimensional minimization does not figure.

The *downhill simplex method* is due to Nelder and Mead [1]. The method requires only function evaluations, not derivatives. It is not very efficient in terms of the number of function evaluations that it requires. Powell's method (§10.5) is almost surely faster in all likely applications. However, the downhill simplex method may frequently be the *best* method to use if the figure of merit is “get something working quickly” for a problem whose computational burden is small.

The method has a geometrical naturalness about it which makes it delightful to describe or work through:

A *simplex* is the geometrical figure consisting, in N dimensions, of $N + 1$ points (or vertices) and all their interconnecting line segments, polygonal faces, etc. In two dimensions, a simplex is a triangle. In three dimensions it is a tetrahedron, not necessarily the regular tetrahedron. (The *simplex method* of linear programming,