

Irregular Input Data in Convergence Acceleration and Summation Processes: General Considerations and Some Special Gaussian Hypergeometric Series as Model Problems

Ernst Joachim Weniger*

Institut für Physikalische und Theoretische Chemie

Universität Regensburg, D-93040 Regensburg, Federal Republic of Germany

(Submitted to Computer Physics Communications – 2 March 2000)

Sequence transformations accomplish an acceleration of convergence or a summation in the case of divergence by detecting and utilizing regularities of the elements of the sequence to be transformed. For sufficiently large indices, certain asymptotic regularities normally do exist, but the leading elements of a sequence may behave quite irregularly. The Gaussian hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ is well suited to illuminate problems of that kind. Sequence transformations perform quite well for most parameters and arguments. If, however, the third parameter c of a nonterminating hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1$ is a negative real number, the terms initially grow in magnitude like the terms of a mildly divergent series. The use of the leading terms of such a series as input data leads to unreliable and even completely nonsensical results. In contrast, sequence transformations produce good results if the leading irregular terms are excluded from the transformation process. Similar problems occur also in perturbation expansions. For example, summation results for the infinite coupling limit k_3 of the sextic anharmonic oscillator can be improved considerably by excluding the leading terms from the transformation process. Finally, numerous new recurrence formulas for the ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ are derived.

PACS numbers: 02.30.Gp, 02.30.Mv, 03.65.-w

I. INTRODUCTION

In mathematics and in the mathematical treatment of scientific problems, slowly convergent or divergent sequences and series occur abundantly. Accordingly, many techniques for the acceleration of convergence and the summation of divergent series have been invented, and some of them are even older than calculus (see for instance pp. 90 - 91 of [1] or p. 249 of [2]).

Sequence transformations are principal tools to overcome convergence problems. Let us assume that $\{s_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a slowly convergent or divergent sequence, whose elements s_n may for example be the partial sums of an infinite series:

$$s_n = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k. \quad (1.1)$$

The basic assumption of all sequence transformations is that a sequence element s_n can for all indices $n \geq 0$ be partitioned into a (generalized) limit s and a remainder or truncation error r_n according to

$$s_n = s + r_n. \quad (1.2)$$

The conventional approach of evaluating an infinite series consists in adding up so many terms that the remainders r_n ultimately become negligible. Unfortunately, this is not always feasible because of obvious practical limitations. Moreover, adding up further terms does not work in the case of a divergent series since their terms usually increase in magnitude with increasing index.

Alternatively, one could try to determine approximations to the remainders r_n and to eliminate them from the sequence elements s_n . At least conceptually, this is what a sequence transformation tries to accomplish. Thus, the original sequence $\{s_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is transformed into a new sequence $\{s'_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ whose elements have the same (generalized) limit s but different remainders r'_n :

$$s'_n = s + r'_n. \quad (1.3)$$

The transformation process was successful if the transformed remainders r'_n have superior numerical properties. For example, in the literature on extrapolation methods it is said that a sequence transformation accelerates convergence if the transformed remainders r'_n vanish more rapidly than the original remainders r_n according to

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r'_n}{r_n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s'_n - s}{s_n - s} = 0. \quad (1.4)$$

Similarly, a divergent sequence $\{s_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$, whose remainders r_n do not vanish as $n \rightarrow \infty$, is transformed into convergent sequence $\{s'_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ if the transformed remainders r'_n vanish as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

During the last years, considerable progress has been reached in this field, as documented by the large number of recent monographs [3–10] and review articles [11,12]. Moreover, numerous applications of sequence transformations have been reported in the literature. For example, the present author has applied sequence transformations successfully in such diverse fields as the evaluation of special functions [12–17], the evaluation of molecular multicenter integrals of exponentially decaying functions [18–22], the summation of strongly divergent quantum mechanical perturbation expansions [13,23–31], and the extrapolation of crystal orbital and cluster calculations for oligomers to their infinite chain limits of stereoregular quasi-one-dimensional organic polymers [32,33].

It should be noted that Padé approximants [34], which in applied mathematics and in theoretical physics have

become the standard tool to overcome convergence problems with power series, can be considered to be a special class of sequence transformations since the partial sums of a power series are transformed into a doubly indexed sequence of rational functions.

As described above, sequence transformations try at least in principle to construct approximations to the actual remainders which are then eliminated from the input data. This is done by detecting and utilizing regularities in the behavior of the elements of the sequence to be transformed. For sufficiently large indices n , one can expect that certain asymptotic regularities do exist. However, sequence transformations are normally used with the intention of avoiding the asymptotic domain, i.e., the transforms are constructed from the *leading* elements of the input sequence. Unfortunately, sequence elements s_n with small indices n often behave irregularly. In such a case, a straightforward application of a sequence transformation may be ineffective and even lead to completely nonsensical results. Instead, one should analyze the behavior of the input data as a function of the index and exclude highly irregular sequence elements from the transformation process if necessary. In this way, one has a much better chance of obtaining good and reliable transformation results. It is the intention of this article to describe and classify some of the problems, which can result from irregular input data, and to discuss strategies to overcome them.

Sequence transformations are needed most in cases in which apart from the numerical values of a few elements of a slowly convergent or divergent sequence only very little is known. This is a situation which is not uncommon in scientific applications as for example the summation of strongly divergent perturbation expansions as they occur quantum mechanics or in quantum field theory. Thus, it would in principle be desirable to discuss problems with irregular input data also via examples of numerically determined input data. However, the lack of detailed knowledge about the behavior of the elements of such a sequence makes it hard to fully understand the numerical problems as well as to develop strategies to overcome them. Consequently, complications of that kind are discussed in this article predominantly via suitable mathematical model problems.

In Section II, some formal aspect of sequence transformations are discussed, in particular the concept of a *path* in the table of a transformation. In this way, different approaches for the determination of the approximations to the (generalized) limit of the input sequence can be classified and formalized. Moreover, the concept of a path helps to understand the impact of irregular input data on the performance of sequence transformations.

At least some of the problems mentioned above can be illuminated by considering the Gaussian hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ which is defined by a power series that converges in the interior of the unit circle. This function does not only depend on an argument z but also on three essentially arbitrary parameters a , b , and c . As

discussed in Section III, the convergence of the hypergeometric series can for most values of the parameters a , b , and c be accelerated quite effectively by a variety of different sequence transformations. Moreover, it is in this way frequently possible to associate a finite value to a hypergeometric series even if its argument does not lie in the interior of the unit circle.

However, as discussed in Section IV, the situation changes dramatically if the third parameter c of the hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1$ is a negative real number. Then, the terms of this series first increase with increasing summation index even for $|z| < 1$ and produce partial sums which look like the elements of a mildly divergent sequence. Only for sufficiently large indices, the terms decrease in magnitude and ultimately produce a convergent result. Accordingly, the leading partial sums of such a hypergeometric series display a highly irregular behavior, and they should not be used as input data for a sequence transformation. If the leading irregular coefficients are skipped and only regular coefficients with higher indices are used as input data, then sequence transformations are again able to produce good and reliable results.

Section V contains a summary. In Appendix A, the properties of the sequence transformations, which are used in this article, are discussed. Problems with irregular input data occur also quite frequently in the mathematical treatment of scientific problems. In Appendix B, it is shown that the convergence of extensive summation calculations for the so-called infinite coupling limit k_3 of the sextic anharmonic oscillator can be improved considerably by excluding the leading irregular coefficients of the divergent perturbation series from the transformation process. Finally, numerous new recurrence formulas for the hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ are derived in Appendix C.

II. ORDER-CONSTANT AND INDEX-CONSTANT PATHS

In this Section, some aspects of sequence transformations are discussed which admittedly look very formal. Nevertheless, they should not be ignored since they may be very consequential in practical applications.

Obviously, a computational algorithm can only involve a finite number of arithmetic operations. Consequently, a sequence transformation \mathcal{T} can only use finite subsets of the original sequence $\{s_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ for the computation of new sequence elements s'_m . In addition, these finite subsets normally consist of consecutive elements. Accordingly, only subsets of the type $\{s_n, s_{n+1}, \dots, s_{n+l}\}$ will be considered in this article.

All the commonly used sequence transformations \mathcal{T} can be represented by infinite sets of doubly indexed quantities $T_k^{(n)}$ with $k, n \geq 0$ that can be displayed in a two-dimensional array which is called the *table* of \mathcal{T} .

Here, the convention is used that the superscript n

always indicates the minimal index occurring in the finite subset of sequence elements used for the computation of a given $T_k^{(n)}$. The subscript k – usually called the *order* of the transformation – is a measure for the complexity of the transformation process which yields $T_k^{(n)}$.

The elements $T_k^{(n)}$ of the table of \mathcal{T} are gauged in such a way that $T_0^{(n)}$ corresponds to an untransformed sequence element,

$$T_0^{(n)} = s_n. \quad (2.1)$$

An increasing value of k implies that the complexity of the transformation process increases. Moreover, $l = l(k)$ also increases. This means that for every $k, n \geq 0$ the sequence transformation \mathcal{T} produces a new transform according to

$$T_k^{(n)} = \mathcal{T}(s_n, s_{n+1}, \dots, s_{n+l(k)}). \quad (2.2)$$

The exact relationship, which connects k and l , is specific for a given sequence transformation \mathcal{T} .

Let us assume that a sequence transformation \mathcal{T} should be used to speed up the convergence of some sequence $\{s_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ to its limit $s = s_\infty$. One can try to obtain a better approximation to s by proceeding on an in principle unlimited variety of different *paths* in the table of \mathcal{T} . Two extreme types of paths – and also those which are predominantly used in practical applications – are *order-constant* paths

$$T_k^{(n)}, T_k^{(n+1)}, T_k^{(n+2)}, \dots \quad (2.3)$$

with fixed transformation order k and $n \rightarrow \infty$, and *index-constant* paths

$$T_k^{(n)}, T_{k+1}^{(n)}, T_{k+2}^{(n)}, \dots \quad (2.4)$$

with fixed minimal index n and $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Order-constant and index-constant paths differ significantly. It is not even *a priori* clear that these two types of paths lead to the same limit in the case of an arbitrary sequence $\{s_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$. However, for the sake of simplicity this potential complication will be ignored here, and we shall always tacitly assume that order-constant and index-constant paths lead to the same limit.

In the case of an order-constant path, a *fixed* number of $l+1$ sequence elements $\{s_n, s_{n+1}, \dots, s_{n+l}\}$ is used for the computation of $T_k^{(n)}$, and the starting index n of this string of fixed length is increased successively until either convergence is achieved or the number of available elements of the input sequence is exhausted.

In the case of an index-constant path, the starting index n is kept fixed at a low value (usually $n = 0$ or $n = 1$) and the transformation order k is increased and with it the number of elements contained in the subset $\{s_n, s_{n+1}, \dots, s_{n+l(k)}\}$. Thus, on an index-constant path it is always tried to compute from a given set of input

data that element $T_k^{(n)}$ which has the highest possible transformation order k .

In order to clarify the differences between order-constant and index-constant paths, let us consider the probably best known sequence transformation, Wynn's epsilon algorithm [35]:

$$\epsilon_{-1}^{(n)} = 0, \quad \epsilon_0^{(n)} = s_n, \quad (2.5a)$$

$$\epsilon_{k+1}^{(n)} = \epsilon_{k-1}^{(n+1)} + 1/[\epsilon_k^{(n+1)} - \epsilon_k^{(n)}]. \quad (2.5b)$$

Wynn [35] showed that if the input data s_n for the epsilon algorithm are the partial sums

$$f_n(z) = \sum_{\nu=0}^n \gamma_\nu z^\nu \quad (2.6)$$

of a (formal) power series for some function $f(z)$, then the elements $\epsilon_{2k}^{(n)}$ with *even* subscripts are Padé approximants to f according to

$$\epsilon_{2k}^{(n)} = [n + k/k]. \quad (2.7)$$

Here, the notation of the monograph by Baker and Graves-Morris [34] is used, i.e., a Padé approximant $[l/m]$ corresponds to the ratio of two polynomials $P_l(z)$ and $Q_m(z)$, which are of degrees l and m , respectively, in z . In contrast, the elements $\epsilon_{2k+1}^{(n)}$ with *odd* subscripts are only auxiliary quantities which diverge if the whole process converges.

It follows from (2.7) that the epsilon algorithm (2.5) effects the following transformation of the partial sums (2.6) to Padé approximants:

$$\{f_n(z), f_{n+1}(z), \dots, f_{n+2k}(z)\} \longrightarrow [n + k/k]. \quad (2.8)$$

Thus, if we use a window consisting of $2k+1$ partial sums $f_{n+j}(z)$ with $0 \leq j \leq 2k$ on an order-constant path and increase the minimal index n successively, the epsilon algorithm produces the following sequence of Padé approximants:

$$[n + k/k], [n + k + 1/k], \dots, [n + k + m/k], \dots \quad (2.9)$$

Only $2k+1$ partial sums are used for the computation of the Padé approximants, although many more are known. Obviously, the available information is not exploited optimally on such an order-constant path.

Moreover, the degree of the numerator polynomial of a Padé approximant $[n + k + m/k]$ increases with increasing $m \geq 0$, whereas the degree of the denominator polynomial remains fixed. Thus, these Padé look unbalanced. Instead, it seems to be much more natural to use *diagonal* Padé approximants, i.e., Padé approximants with numerator and denominator polynomials of equal degree, or – if this is not possible – to use Padé approximants with degrees of the numerator and denominator polynomials that differ as little as possible.

This approach has in principle many theoretical as well as practical advantages. For example, Wynn could show that if the partial sums $f_0(z), f_1(z), \dots, f_{2n}(z)$ of a Stieltjes series are used for the computation of Padé approximants, then the diagonal approximant $[n/n]$ provides the most accurate approximation to the corresponding Stieltjes function $f(z)$, and if the partial sums $f_0(z), f_1(z), \dots, f_{2n+1}(z)$ are used for the computation of Padé approximants, then either $[n+1/n]$ or $[n/n+1]$ provides the most accurate approximation (Theorem 5 of [36]). A detailed discussion of Stieltjes series and their special role in the theory of Padé approximants can for instance be found in Section 5 of the monograph by Baker and Graves-Morris [34].

Thus, it is apparently an obvious idea to try to use either diagonal Padé approximants or their closest neighbors whenever possible. Let us assume that the partial sums $f_0(z), f_1(z), \dots, f_m(z)$ are known. If m is even or odd, $m = 2\mu$ or $m = 2\mu + 1$, respectively, the elements of the epsilon table with the highest possible transformation orders are given by the transformations

$$\{f_0(z), f_1(z), \dots, f_{2\mu}(z)\} \longrightarrow \epsilon_{2\mu}^{(0)} = [\mu/\mu], \quad (2.10)$$

$$\{f_1(z), f_2(z), \dots, f_{2\mu+1}(z)\} \longrightarrow \epsilon_{2\mu}^{(1)} = [\mu + 1/\mu]. \quad (2.11)$$

With the help of the notation $\llbracket x \rrbracket$ for the integral part of x , which is the largest integer ν satisfying $\nu \leq x$, these two relationships can be expressed by a single equation (Eq. (4.3-6) of [12]):

$$\begin{aligned} &\{f_{m-2\llbracket m/2 \rrbracket}(z), f_{m-2\llbracket m/2 \rrbracket+1}(z), \dots, f_m(z)\} \\ &\longrightarrow \epsilon_{2\llbracket m/2 \rrbracket}^{(m-2\llbracket m/2 \rrbracket)} = [m - \llbracket m/2 \rrbracket / \llbracket m/2 \rrbracket]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

For $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, these transformations correspond to the following staircase sequence in the Padé table (Eq. (4.3-7) of [12]):

$$\begin{aligned} &[0/0], [1/0], [1/1], \dots \\ &\dots, [\nu/\nu], [\nu + 1/\nu], [\nu + 1/\nu + 1], \dots \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

This staircase sequence exploits the available information optimally if the partial sums $f_m(z)$ with $m \geq 0$ are computed successively and if after the computation of each new partial sum the element of the epsilon table with the highest possible *even* transformation order is computed. Moreover, the Padé approximants obtained in this way look balanced since the degrees of their numerator and denominator polynomials differ as little as possible.

The example of Wynn's epsilon algorithm strongly indicates that index-constant paths are at least in principle computationally more efficient than order-constant paths since they exploit the available information optimally. This is in general also true for all other sequence transformations considered in this article.

Another serious disadvantage of order-constant paths is that they cannot be used for the summation of divergent sequences and series since increasing n in the set

$\{s_n, s_{n+1}, \dots, s_{n+l}\}$ of input data normally only increases divergence.

In view of the examples given above, it is apparently an obvious idea to use exclusively index-constant paths, and preferably those which start at a very low index n , for instance at $n = 0$ or $n = 1$. This is certainly a good idea if all elements of the input sequence contain roughly the same amount of useful information. If, however, the leading terms of the sequence to be transformed behave irregularly, they cannot contribute useful information, or – to make things worse – they contribute *wrong* information. In such a case it is usually necessary to exclude the leading elements of the input sequence from the transformation process. Thus, it is preferable to use either an order-constant path or an index-constant path with a sufficiently large starting index n . The use of an order-constant path has the additional advantage that the diminishing influence of irregular input data with small indices n should become obvious from the transformation results as n increases.

Finally, an important theoretical advantage of order-constant paths should also be mentioned. Normally, it is much easier to perform a theoretical convergence analysis of a sequence transformation on an order-constant path than on an index-constant path. As the starting index n of the string $\{s_n, s_{n+1}, \dots, s_{n+l}\}$ of input data becomes large, asymptotic approximations to the sequence elements s_n can be used. Often, this greatly simplifies a theoretical analysis. In the case of index-constant paths, such a simplification is not possible because not all input data have large indices. Accordingly, theoretical convergence properties of sequence transformations are studied almost exclusively on order-constant paths. Notable exceptions are two articles by Sidi [37,38] where the convergence properties of sequence transformations on both order-constant and index-constant paths are analyzed.

III. THE GAUSSIAN HYPERGEOMETRIC FUNCTION

The Gaussian hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ is one of the most important special functions of mathematical physics, and its properties are discussed in numerous books, for example in those by Abramowitz and Stegun [39], Erdélyi, Magnus, Oberhettinger, and Tricomi [40], Magnus, Oberhettinger, and Soni [41], Seaborn [42], Slater [43], Spanier and Oldham [44], Temme [45], and Wang and Guo [46].

The hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ is defined via the corresponding hypergeometric series (p. 37 of [41])

$${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a)_m (b)_m}{(c)_m m!} z^m, \quad (3.1)$$

where $(a)_m = \Gamma(a + m)/\Gamma(a)$ is a Pochhammer symbol (see for example p. 3 of [41]). The series (3.1) terminates

after a finite number of terms if either a or b is a negative integer. Otherwise, it converges in the interior of the unit circle, i.e., for $|z| < 1$, and it diverges for $|z| > 1$. On the boundary $|z| = 1$ of the unit circle, the series (3.1) diverges if $\text{Re}(a + b - c) \geq 1$, it converges *absolutely* for $\text{Re}(a + b - c) < 0$, and it converges *conditionally* for $0 \leq \text{Re}(a + b - c) < 1$, the point $z = 1$ being excluded.

Thus, a nonterminating hypergeometric series does not suffice for the computation of the corresponding hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$, which is in general a multivalued function defined in the whole complex plane with branch points at $z = 1$ and $z = \infty$. Instead, techniques which permit an analytic continuation from the interior to the exterior of the unit circle are needed.

Sequence transformations can be used to accelerate the convergence of a hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1$ or to sum it in the case of divergence, which corresponds to an analytic continuation. Let us for example consider the following elementary special case of a hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1$ (Eq. (15.1.3) of [39]):

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(1+z) &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^m z^{m+1}}{m+1} \\ &= z {}_2F_1(1, 1; 2; -z). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

The infinite series converges only for $|z| < 1$, whereas the logarithm is with the exception of the cut along $-\infty < z \leq -1$ defined in the whole complex plane.

In Table I, Wynn's epsilon algorithm, Eq. (2.5), Brezinski's theta algorithm, Eq. (A9), Levin's transformation $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$, Eq. (A22), and the closely related sequence transformation $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$, Eq. (A25), are applied to the partial sums

$$s_n(z) = \sum_{m=0}^n \frac{(-1)^m z^{m+1}}{m+1} \quad (3.3)$$

of the hypergeometric series (3.2) for $z = 7/2$. The approximations to the limit in Table I were always chosen in such a way that the transforms with the highest possible transformation order were computed from a given set of input data. Thus, in the case of the epsilon algorithm, the approximations to the limit were chosen according to (2.12), in the case of the theta algorithm, they were chosen according to (A13), and in the case of the sequence transformations $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$ and $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$, they were chosen according to (A26).

The second column of Table I, which displays the partial sums (3.3), shows that the hypergeometric series (3.2) for $\ln(1+z)$ diverges quite strongly for $z = 7/2$. Nevertheless, it is apparently possible to sum this divergent series to its correct value.

The results in Table I also show that Wynn's epsilon algorithm, which in the case of a power series produces Padé approximants according to (2.7), is contrary to a widespread belief not necessarily the most powerful

transformation. The theta algorithm and in particular the two Levin-type transformations $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$ and $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$, which use the first term neglected in the partial sum as a remainder estimate according to (A21), produce significantly better summation results.

The other sequence transformations discussed in Appendix A give better results than Wynn's epsilon algorithm, but are less effective than the transformations $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$ and $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$. For example, the two approximations with the highest possible transformation orders, which Aitken's iterated Δ^2 process (A4) produces from the partial sums $s_0(z)$, $s_1(z)$, \dots , $s_{15}(z)$ according to (A7), are

$$\mathcal{A}_7^{(0)} = 1.504\,077\,397\,173, \quad (3.4)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_7^{(1)} = 1.504\,077\,396\,169. \quad (3.5)$$

Similarly, the iteration (A15) of Brezinski's theta algorithm produces according to (A19) the approximants

$$\mathcal{J}_4^{(2)} = 1.504\,077\,404\,830, \quad (3.6)$$

$$\mathcal{J}_5^{(0)} = 1.504\,077\,394\,094. \quad (3.7)$$

These results show that sequence transformations can be very useful. Nevertheless, in the case of a *real* real argument z it is actually not necessary to use sequence transformations for doing the analytic continuations or for speeding up convergence. Instead, it is often simpler to exploit some known mathematical properties: Unless certain linear combinations of the parameters a , b , and c are positive or negative integers, a hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ can be expressed as the sum of two other ${}_2F_1$'s with a transformed argument $w = 1 - z$, $w = 1/z$, $w = 1/(1 - z)$, or $w = 1 - 1/z$, respectively. Thus, the argument w of the two resulting hypergeometric series can normally be chosen in such a way that the two new series in w either converge, if the original series in z diverges, or that they converge more rapidly if the original series converges too slowly to be numerically useful.

For example, if $|1 - z| < 1$ and if $c - a - b$ is not a positive or negative integer, then we can use the analytic continuation formula (Eq. (15.3.6) of [39])

$$\begin{aligned} &{}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(c)\Gamma(c-a-b)}{\Gamma(c-a)\Gamma(c-b)} {}_2F_1(a, b; a+b-c+1; 1-z) \\ &\quad + \frac{\Gamma(c)\Gamma(a+b-c)}{\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)} (1-z)^{c-a-b} \\ &\quad \times {}_2F_1(c-a, c-b; c-a-b+1; 1-z). \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Let us now assume that z is only slightly smaller than 1. Then, the convergence of the original hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ will be very bad. However, the two hypergeometric series on the right-hand side with argument $1 - z$ will converge rapidly in the vicinity of $z = 1$.

With the help of this or similar analytic continuation formulas it is normally possible to compute a hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ with *real* argument z effectively since it is possible to find for every argument $z \in (-\infty, +\infty)$ two hypergeometric series with an argument $|w| \leq 1/2$ (see p. 127 of [45] or Table I of [47]).

Unfortunately, this approach does not necessarily work in the case of complex arguments z . Consider the points

$$z_{1,2} = \frac{1 \pm \sqrt{3}}{2}, \quad (3.9)$$

which both lie on the boundary of the circle of convergence because of $|z_{1,2}| = 1$. In practice, it is either impossible or not feasible to evaluate a nonterminating hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1$ by adding up its terms if its argument z lies on the boundary of the unit circle. Consequently, something has to be done to speed up convergence or to accomplish a summation in the case of divergence. Unfortunately, the analytic continuation formulas of the type of (3.8) do not improve the situation if $z = z_{1,2}$ since

$$1 - z_{1,2} = z_{2,1}, \quad (3.10a)$$

$$1/z_{1,2} = z_{2,1}, \quad (3.10b)$$

$$1/(1 - z_{1,2}) = z_{1,2}, \quad (3.10c)$$

$$1 - 1/z_{1,2} = z_{1,2}. \quad (3.10d)$$

Hence, the analytic continuation formulas cannot help if the z is close to $z_{1,2}$.

However, sequence transformations work for $z = z_{1,2}$. Let us consider the following elementary special case of a hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1$ (p. 38 of [41]):

$$(1+z)(1-z)^{-2\alpha-1} = {}_2F_1(2\alpha, \alpha+1; \alpha; z). \quad (3.11)$$

For $\alpha > 0$, the hypergeometric series converges in the interior of the unit circle, but it diverges on its boundary.

In Table II, Wynn's epsilon algorithm, Eq. (2.5), and Levin's transformation $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$, Eq. (A22), are used to sum the hypergeometric series (3.11) with $\alpha = 1/3$ on the boundary of the unit circle, i.e., they are applied to the partial sums

$$s_n(z) = \sum_{m=0}^n \frac{(2/3)_m (4/3)_m}{(1/3)_m m!} z^m \quad (3.12)$$

with $z = z_1 = (1 + i\sqrt{3})/2$.

The partial sums (3.12) in the second column of Table II display a very unusual sign pattern and grow slowly in magnitude. Nevertheless, both the epsilon algorithm as well as the Levin transformation are apparently able to sum the hypergeometric series (3.11) for $z = (1 + i\sqrt{3})/2$.

The other sequence transformations discussed in Appendix A are apparently also able to sum the hypergeometric series (3.11) for $z = (1 + i\sqrt{3})/2$. They give better results than Wynn's epsilon algorithm, but are less effective than Levin's transformations $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$. The two

approximations with the highest possible transformation orders, that can be produced from the partial sums $s_0(z), s_1(z), \dots, s_{15}(z)$ by Aitken's iterated Δ^2 process (A4), by Brezinski's theta algorithm (A9) and its iteration (A15), and by the Levin-type transformation (A25), are

$$\mathcal{A}_7^{(0)} = -1.113\,340\,798\,057 + i\,1.326\,827\,896\,288, \quad (3.13)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_7^{(1)} = -1.113\,340\,798\,408 + i\,1.326\,827\,896\,424, \quad (3.14)$$

$$\theta_8^{(2)} = -1.113\,340\,797\,528 + i\,1.326\,827\,893\,689, \quad (3.15)$$

$$\theta_{10}^{(0)} = -1.113\,340\,799\,160 + i\,1.326\,827\,895\,539, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\mathcal{J}_4^{(2)} = -1.113\,340\,798\,249 + i\,1.326\,827\,894\,967, \quad (3.17)$$

$$\mathcal{J}_5^{(0)} = -1.113\,340\,798\,314 + i\,1.326\,827\,895\,955, \quad (3.18)$$

$$\delta_{14}^{(0)}(1, s_0(z)) = -1.113\,340\,798\,314 + i\,1.326\,827\,895\,955, \quad (3.19)$$

$$\delta_{15}^{(0)}(1, s_0(z)) = -1.113\,340\,798\,414 + i\,1.326\,827\,896\,325. \quad (3.20)$$

The numerical results presented here should suffice to support the claim of the author that sequence transformations can be extremely useful numerical tools for the evaluation of special functions in general [12–17] and for the evaluation of Gaussian hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1$ in special. Moreover, the numerical results shown above indicate that a computational algorithm, which would be capable of evaluating of a hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1$ with essentially arbitrary *complex* argument z and parameters a, b , and c , should be a suitable combination of analytic continuation formulas of the type of (3.8) with sequence transformations.

Here it should be taken into account that a hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1$ depends on four essentially arbitrary complex quantities a, b, c , and z . This makes the development of a *general* algorithm for its computation difficult since a very large variety of special cases and computationally different situations have to be taken into account. Consequently, the development of such an algorithm would first require extensive numerical studies which – although undeniably interesting – would clearly be beyond the scope of this article.

IV. HYPERGEOMETRIC SERIES WITH A NEGATIVE THIRD PARAMETER

It is a direct consequence of its definition (3.1) that a hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ terminates after a

finite number of terms if either a or b is a negative integer. Moreover, ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ makes sense if both a and c are negative integers such that $a = -m$ and $c = -m - k$ with $k, m = 1, 2, \dots$:

$${}_2F_1(-m, b; -m - k; z) = \sum_{\mu=0}^m \frac{(-m)_\mu (b)_\mu}{(-m - k)_\mu \mu!} z^\mu. \quad (4.1)$$

If c is a negative integer and if neither a nor b is a negative integer, then it follows from (3.1) that the hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ is in general undefined. However, the following limit exists for $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ (p. 38 of [41]):

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow -m} \frac{1}{\Gamma(c)} {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = \frac{(a)_{m+1} (b)_{m+1} z^{m+1}}{(m+1)!} \times {}_2F_1(a + m + 1, b + m + 1; m + 2; z). \quad (4.2)$$

If c is not a negative integer, there are no problems with Pochhammer symbols in the denominators of the terms of the series that could become zero. Nevertheless, unpleasant numerical problems occur even if c is just a nonintegral negative real number. These problems can be demonstrated convincingly by trying to accelerate the convergence of two hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ which differ only by the sign of the third parameter c .

For that purpose, we consider in Table III and in Tables IV and V, respectively, the hypergeometric series with $a = 3/7$, $b = 5/2$, $z = 77/100$, and $c = \pm 7/2$.

In Table III, Wynn's epsilon algorithm, Eq. (2.5), Brezinski's theta algorithm, Eq. (A9), and the Levin-type transformations $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$, Eq. (A22), and $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$, Eq. (A25), are applied to the partial sums

$$s_n(z) = \sum_{m=0}^n \frac{(3/7)_m (5/2)_m}{(7/2)_m m!} z^m \quad (4.3)$$

of the hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(3/7, 5/2; 7/2; z)$ with $z = 77/100$. The results in Table III show that the convergence of this series can indeed be accelerated quite effectively by sequence transformations. This is also true for the other sequence transformations discussed in Appendix A. The approximations with the highest transformation orders, that can be obtained from the partial sums $s_0(z)$, $s_1(z)$, \dots , $s_{16}(z)$ by Aitken's iterated Δ^2 process (A4) and by the iteration (A15) of Brezinski's theta algorithm, are

$$\mathcal{A}_7^{(1)} = 1.463\,807\,099\,629, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_8^{(0)} = 1.463\,807\,099\,563. \quad (4.5)$$

$$\mathcal{J}_5^{(0)} = 1.463\,807\,143\,254, \quad (4.6)$$

$$\mathcal{J}_5^{(1)} = 1.463\,807\,103\,421. \quad (4.7)$$

In Tables IV and V, we now consider a hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1$ which is identical with the one in Table III except that its third parameter is negative, i.e., we now

have $c = -7/2$. Thus, in Table IV we use Aitken's iterated Δ^2 process, Eq. (A4), Wynn's epsilon algorithm, Eq. (2.5), and Brezinski's theta algorithm, Eq. (A9), for the acceleration of the convergence of the partial sums

$$s_n(z) = \sum_{m=0}^n \frac{(3/7)_m (5/2)_m}{(-7/2)_m m!} z^m. \quad (4.8)$$

of the hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(3/7, 5/2; -7/2; z)$ with $z = 77/100$, and in Table V we use the iteration of Brezinski's theta algorithm, Eq. (A15), and the Levin-type transformations $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$, Eq. (A22), and $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$, Eq. (A25).

So far, the transformation results had always been very good as well as very reliable. In contrast, the results in Tables IV and V are very bad and not reliable at all. For small transformation orders n , all transformations produce results which are by 5 orders of magnitude too small, and in the case of Brezinski's theta algorithm, the wrong results even seem to have converged with an accuracy of 4 decimal digits. For increasing transformation orders n , there occur sudden and unmotivated sign changes, and only if n approaches 30, at least the epsilon algorithm in Table IV and the Levin transformation $d_n^{(0)}$ in Table V converge to the correct result. For $n = 30$, the other transformations show no indication of convergence and produce results which are still by some orders of magnitude too small.

How can the disturbingly bad performance of sequence transformations in Tables IV and V be explained. The terms of a hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ satisfy the 2-term recursion

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(a)_{n+1} (b)_{n+1} z^{n+1}}{(c)_{n+1} (n+1)!} \\ &= \frac{(a+n)(b+n)z}{(c+n)(n+1)} \frac{(a)_n (b)_n z^n}{(c)_n n!}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Obviously, the factor $(a+n)(b+n)z/[(c+n)(n+1)]$ on the right-hand side determines whether the terms increase or decrease in magnitude with increasing n . As long as this factor is greater than one in magnitude, the terms increase with increasing n , and as soon as this factor is smaller than one, the terms decrease.

Thus, we only have to determine those values of n which satisfy

$$\left| \frac{(a+n)(b+n)z}{(c+n)(n+1)} \right| = 1 \quad (4.10)$$

for given a , b , c , and z in order to find out for which values of the index n the terms of a hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ change their growth pattern.

In the case of the hypergeometric series in Table III with $a = 3/7$, $b = 5/2$, $c = 7/2$, and $z = 77/100$, there is no $n > 0$ which satisfies condition (4.10). This implies that the terms of this series decrease monotonously in magnitude with increasing $n \geq 0$. Moreover, the results

in Table III show that the convergence of this series can be accelerated quite effectively.

In the case of the hypergeometric series in Tables IV and V with $c = -7/2$, the situation is more complicated since condition (4.10) is satisfied by $n \approx 22$. Thus, the terms of this series initially increase up to $n = 22$, and only for $n > 22$ they decrease and ultimately produce a convergent result. Accordingly, the partial sums (4.8) of this hypergeometric series initially look like the partial sums of a mildly divergent series, and only for $n > 22$, they behave like the partial sums of a convergent series. Therefore, it should not be too surprising that sequence transformations perform poorly if they use as input data only the partial sums (4.8) with $n \leq 22$. However, even for $22 \leq n \leq 30$, only the epsilon algorithm and the Levin transformation $d_n^{(0)}$ ultimately converge to the correct result. This provides strong evidence that the irregular input data with small indices n have a detrimental effect on the performance of sequence transformations with large transformation orders, which also use input data with a correct behavior.

We can test the hypothesis, that the irregular behavior of the initial partial sums (4.8) with $n \leq 22$ leads to the poor performance of sequence transformations in Tables IV and V, by skipping the terms up to $n = 22$ in the transformation processes. Accordingly, Wynn's epsilon algorithm, Eq. (2.5), and the Levin-type transformations $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$, Eq. (A22), and $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$, Eq. (A25), use in in Table VI the modified partial sums

$$s_n^{(22)}(z) = \sum_{m=0}^{n+22} \frac{(3/7)_m (5/2)_m}{(-7/2)_m m!} z^m \quad (4.11)$$

of the hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(3/7, 5/2; -7/2; z)$ with $z = 77/100$ as input data. This approach is possible since all sequence transformations considered in this article are quasi-linear, i.e., they satisfy (A30).

The results in Table VI indeed confirm our hypothesis since they are nearly as good as the results in Table III, at least with respect to the transformation orders that are needed to achieve a given relative accuracy.

The other sequence transformations discussed in Appendix A produce results that are less good than those shown in Table VI. The two approximations with the highest possible transformation orders, that can be produced from the partial sums $s_0^{(22)}(z)$, $s_1^{(22)}(z)$, \dots , $s_{20}^{(22)}(z)$ by Aitken's iterated Δ^2 process (A4), by Brezinski's theta algorithm (A9) and its iteration (A15), are

$$\mathcal{A}_9^{(1)} = 1.010\,147\,722\,439 \cdot 10^{+5}, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{10}^{(0)} = 1.010\,147\,537\,701 \cdot 10^{+5}. \quad (4.13)$$

$$\theta_{12}^{(1)} = 1.011\,462\,051\,628 \cdot 10^{+5}, \quad (4.14)$$

$$\theta_{12}^{(2)} = 1.011\,462\,011\,501 \cdot 10^{+5}, \quad (4.15)$$

$$\mathcal{J}_7^{(0)} = 1.010\,233\,908\,825 \cdot 10^{+5}, \quad (4.16)$$

$$\mathcal{J}_7^{(1)} = 1.010\,176\,054\,786 \cdot 10^{+5}. \quad (4.17)$$

The results in Table VI show that a hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1$ with a negative third parameter can be evaluated reliably with the help of sequence transformations if the nonregular leading terms are excluded from the transformation processes. Unfortunately, this may lead to new problems since the number of terms, that initially grow in magnitude, may become quite large, in particular if z is close to one. For example, if we increase the argument of the hypergeometric series in Table VI from $z = 77/100$ to $z = 87/100$ or to $z = 97/100$, then the number of terms, which initially grow in magnitude and have to be skipped, grow from $n = 22$ to $n = 40$ or even to $n = 179$. Moreover, more negative values of c also increase the number of terms that have to be skipped. For instance, if we consider the hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(3/7, 5/2; -13/2; z)$ with $z = 77/100$, $z = 87/100$, or $z = 97/100$, then we obtain $n = 35$, $n = 63$, or $n = 279$, respectively. These examples show that it is in principle possible to construct hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1$ which can only be evaluated reliably with the help of sequence transformations if a very large number of terms is skipped in the transformation process.

In the case of a Gaussian hypergeometric series, this poses no unsurmountable problems. Firstly, it is a triviality to compute the terms, even for very large indices. Consequently, a brute force evaluation of a Gaussian hypergeometric series by adding up the terms is possible as long as the argument is not too close to the boundary of the circle of convergence. Secondly, the highly developed mathematical theory of these functions makes it possible to simplify the numerical task with the help of known transformation formulas. For example, if the number of terms, that have to be skipped, is large because the argument z of the hypergeometric series with a negative third parameter is close to one, then it may be a good idea to use the analytic continuation formula (3.8). This would not necessarily solve the principal problems due to a negative third parameter, but the argument $1 - z$ of the two new hypergeometric series would then be small.

However, the probably simplest approach would be the use of recurrence formulas. In this approach, one would have to evaluate two hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1$ with suitable positive values of the third parameter, for example with the help of sequence transformations, and to compute recursively the numerical value of desired hypergeometric series with a negative third parameter. Of course, many recurrence formulas are known. Nevertheless, numerous new three-term recurrence formulas satisfied by the Gaussian hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ are derived in Appendix C.

Unfortunately, these alternative approaches are in general not available if we have to evaluate an infinite series whose terms are determined numerically and only behave like the terms of a hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ with a negative third parameter. In such a case, it cannot be excluded that the number of terms, that have to be skipped, would be so large that their computation would no longer be feasible. Then, neither the conventional

process of successively adding up the terms of the series nor sequence transformations would be able to provide reliable approximations to the value of such an infinite series.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A sequence transformation is a rule \mathcal{T} which transforms a sequence $\{s_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ with the (generalized) limit s to another sequence $\{s'_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ having the same (generalized) limit s but different remainders $r'_n = s'_n - s$. The transformation process was successful if the new sequence has better numerical properties than the original sequence. For example, a sequence transformation \mathcal{T} accelerates convergence, if the transformed remainders $r'_n = s'_n - s$ converge more rapidly than the original remainders $r_n = s_n - s$ according to (1.4), and \mathcal{T} sums a divergent sequence, whose remainders r_n do not vanish as $n \rightarrow \infty$, to its generalized limit s if the transformed remainders r'_n approach zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

As discussed in Section II, a sequence transformation \mathcal{T} can be represented by an infinite set of doubly indexed quantities $T_k^{(n)}$ with $k, n \geq 0$ that can be displayed in a two-dimensional array called the table of \mathcal{T} . The superscript n denotes the minimal index occurring in the finite string $\{s_n, s_{n+1}, \dots, s_{n+l}\}$ of sequence elements used for the computation of a given $T_k^{(n)}$. The subscript k – usually called the order of the transformation – is a measure for the complexity of the transformation process which yields $T_k^{(n)}$.

A convergence acceleration or summation process tries to obtain a better approximation to the (generalized) limit of the input sequence by proceeding on a certain path in the table of \mathcal{T} . There is an in principle unlimited variety of different paths, but in practical applications either order-constant paths defined in (2.3) or index-constant paths defined in (2.4) are normally used.

On an order-constant path, a set $\{s_n, s_{n+1}, \dots, s_{n+l}\}$ of input data of fixed length is used and the starting index n of this set is increased successively. In contrast, an index-constant path uses sets of input data of increasing length, and it is always tried to compute from a given set of input data that element $T_k^{(n)}$ which has the highest possible transformation order k .

Order-constant and index-constant paths differ substantially. For example, on an index-constant path the available information is exploited more efficiently than on an order-constant path. Accordingly, index-constant paths normally produce better transformation results. Moreover, order-constant paths cannot be used for the summation of a divergent sequence since increasing n in the set $\{s_n, s_{n+1}, \dots, s_{n+l}\}$ of input data normally only increases divergence.

If, however, the leading elements of the input sequence $\{s_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ behave irregularly, the principal advantages of index-constant paths can easily turn into disadvantages:

If the sets $\{s_n, s_{n+1}, \dots, s_{n+l}\}$ of input data with increasing l have a sufficiently small starting index n , then all transforms $T_k^{(n)}$ will be affected by irregular input data, albeit to a different degree. As shown by Tables IV and V, this can lead to unreliable or even completely nonsensical transformation results. In such a case, it is necessary to exclude the irregular input data from the transformation process. This can be accomplished by using either an order-constant path or an index-constant path with a sufficiently large starting index.

In Section III, the Gaussian hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ is discussed, which is in general a multi-valued function defined in the whole complex plane with branch points at $z = 1$ and ∞ . However, it is defined by the power series (3.1) which only converges for $|z| < 1$. Accordingly, sequence transformations can either be used for speeding up convergence or for accomplishing an analytic continuation in the case of divergence. In Table I, an alternating hypergeometric series for $\ln(1+z)$ is summed effectively by sequence transformations for an argument $z = 7/2$ which is far away from the unit circle, and in Table II, another special hypergeometric series, which converges only in the interior of the unit circle, is evaluated for an argument $z = (1 + i\sqrt{3})/2$ that is located on the boundary of the unit circle.

For most parameters a , b , and c , sequence transformations greatly facilitate the evaluation of a hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1$, and the good transformation results presented in Tables I and II are fairly typical. However, as discussed in Section IV, there is an important and instructive exception: If the third parameter c of a hypergeometric series is a negative real number, then the terms of this series initially increase in magnitude and look even for $|z| < 1$ like the terms of a mildly divergent series. Only for sufficiently large values of the index, the terms decrease and ultimately produce a convergent result.

The use of these irregular terms as input data seriously affects the performance of sequence transformations and leads to unreliable and sometimes even completely nonsensical results. This is demonstrated by applying in Table III and in Tables IV and V, respectively, sequence transformations to the partial sums of the hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ with $a = 3/7$, $b = 5/2$, $z = 77/100$, and $c = \pm 7/2$.

In Table III, sequence transformations are applied to the hypergeometric series with the positive value of the third parameter. As expected, the transformation results are very good. However, in Tables IV and V, where the hypergeometric series with the negative value of the third parameter is considered, the transformation results are both unreliable and bad.

Nevertheless, it is possible to compute the hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(3/7, 5/2; -7/2; 77/100)$ efficiently and reliably with the help of sequence transformations. However, one cannot use an index-constant path with a small minimal index, as it was done in Tables IV and V. Instead, one should either use an order-constant path or an

index-constant path with a sufficiently large minimal index, as it was done in Table VI, where all irregular terms were excluded from the transformation processes.

The sequence transformations, which are used in this article, are all described in Appendix A. The use of several transformations was quite intentional. The author wanted to make clear that problems due to irregular input data are not restricted to some special sequence transformations only. Of course, the results in Tables IV and V show that different sequence transformations respond differently to irregular input data. However, this is quite helpful and can protect us against misinterpretations. For example, in Table IV Brezinski's theta algorithm produced transformation results which seemed to have converged with an accuracy of 4 decimal digits, but were actually by 5 orders of magnitude too small. Fortunately, the other transformations in Tables IV and V produced different results, which provided strong evidence that the transformation results were unreliable. Consequently, it is recommendable to use in convergence acceleration and summation processes more than a single transformation whenever possible. This is particularly important if numerically determined data are to be transformed, about which very little is known. If several different sequence transformations produce consistent results, then it is very likely that these results are indeed correct although it is of course clear that purely numerical results cannot be a substitute for a rigorous mathematical proof.

It looks like a contradiction that in Appendix B only the Levin-type transformation (A25) was used for the computation of the infinite coupling limit k_3 of the sextic anharmonic oscillator. However, the divergent perturbation series (B9), whose leading coefficients also show an irregular behavior, constitutes a very demanding summation problem, for which the other transformations discussed in Appendix A are not powerful enough.

Here, it should be emphasized once more that the two examples considered in this article – the Gaussian hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ with a negative third parameter and the divergent perturbation series (B9) for the infinite coupling limit k_3 – are comparatively simple model problems, and the leading irregular terms of their series expansions pose no unsurmountable computational problems. This is largely due to the fact that it is relatively easy to find out which terms behave irregularly. In the case of the perturbation series (B9), we are in the fortunate situation that the leading large- n asymptotics (B10) of the coefficients $c_n^{(3)}$ is known, and in the case of the hypergeometric series, one only has to solve (4.10) in order to find out for which indices n the terms change their growth pattern. Moreover, in the case of a ${}_2F_1$ there are numerous alternative computational approaches. For example, with the help of recurrence formulas the evaluation of Gaussian hypergeometric series with a negative third parameter can be avoided completely. Consequently, in Appendix C numerous new

recurrence formulas satisfied by a ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ are derived.

Finally, the author wishes to express his hope that this article will inspire additional research on the evaluation of special functions with the help of sequence transformations. There can be no doubt that sequence transformations are normally extremely useful tools for the evaluation of special functions, and since the terms of the series expansions for special functions are comparatively simple and explicitly known, we can even hope to gain additional insight from those cases in which sequence transformations fail to produce good transformation results.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks the Fonds der Chemischen Industrie for financial support.

APPENDIX A: SEQUENCE TRANSFORMATIONS

This appendix gives a short description of all the sequence transformations that are used in this article. Further details plus additional references can be found in [6,7,12]. Here, the same notation as in [12] is used.

One of the oldest sequence transformations (see for instance pp. 90 - 91 of [1]) is Aitken's Δ^2 formula [48]:

$$\mathcal{A}_1^{(n)} = s_n - \frac{[\Delta s_n]^2}{\Delta^2 s_n}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

The (forward) difference operator Δ acts for all integers $n \geq 0$ on a function $f(n)$ according to

$$\Delta f(n) = f(n+1) - f(n). \quad (\text{A2})$$

The Aitken formula (A1) is by construction exact for model sequences of the type $s_n = s + c\lambda^n$ with $c \neq 0$ and $\lambda \neq 1$. If the numerical values of three consecutive elements s_n , s_{n+1} , and s_{n+2} of this model sequence are known, then the (generalized) limit s of this sequence can be computed according to

$$\mathcal{A}_1^{(n)} = s, \quad (\text{A3})$$

no matter whether the sequence converges ($|\lambda| < 1$) or diverges ($|\lambda| > 1$).

The power and practical usefulness of Aitken's Δ^2 formula is of course limited since it is designed to eliminate only a single exponential term from the elements of the model sequence mentioned above. However, the quantities $\mathcal{A}_1^{(n)}$ can again be used as input data in (A1). Hence, the Δ^2 process can be iterated, yielding the following nonlinear recursive scheme [12, Eq. (5.1-15)]:

$$\mathcal{A}_0^{(n)} = s_n, \quad (\text{A4a})$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{k+1}^{(n)} = \mathcal{A}_k^{(n)} - \frac{[\Delta \mathcal{A}_k^{(n)}]^2}{\Delta^2 \mathcal{A}_k^{(n)}}. \quad (\text{A4b})$$

In this article, the difference operator Δ acts only on the superscript n and not on the subscript k of a doubly indexed quantity like $\mathcal{A}_k^{(n)}$. A more detailed discussion of Aitken's iterated Δ^2 process as well as additional references can for instance be found in Section 5 of [12] or in [49]. The iteration of other sequence transformations is discussed in [50].

In the case of Aitken's iterated Δ^2 process, the approximation to the limit of the input sequence with the highest possible transformation order depends upon the index m of the last sequence element s_m which was used in the recursion. If m is either even or odd, $m = 2\mu$ or $m = 2\mu + 1$, respectively, the approximations to the limit are chosen according to

$$\{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{2\mu}\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_\mu^{(0)}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{2\mu+1}\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_\mu^{(1)}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

As in the case of Wynn's ϵ algorithm, these two relationships can with the help of the notation $\llbracket x \rrbracket$ for the integral part of x be expressed by a single equation (Eq. (5.2-6) of [12]):

$$\begin{aligned} &\{s_{m-2\llbracket m/2 \rrbracket}, s_{m-2\llbracket m/2 \rrbracket+1}, \dots, s_m\} \\ &\longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\llbracket m/2 \rrbracket}^{(m-2\llbracket m/2 \rrbracket)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

The behavior of many practically relevant convergent sequences $\{s_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ can be characterized by the asymptotic condition

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s_{n+1} - s}{s_n - s} = \rho, \quad (\text{A8})$$

where $s = s_\infty$ is the limit of the sequence $\{s_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$. This condition closely resembles the well known ratio test for infinite series. A convergent sequence satisfying (A8) with $|\rho| < 1$ is called *linearly* convergent, and it is called *logarithmically* convergent if $\rho = 1$.

It is one of the major weaknesses of the otherwise very powerful and very useful epsilon algorithm (2.5) that it does not work in the case of logarithmic convergence. Brezinski showed that this principal weakness can be overcome by a suitable modification of the recursive scheme (2.5), which leads to the so-called theta algorithm [51]:

$$\theta_{-1}^{(n)} = 0, \quad \theta_0^{(n)} = s_n, \quad (\text{A9a})$$

$$\theta_{2k+1}^{(n)} = \theta_{2k-1}^{(n+1)} + 1/[\Delta \theta_{2k}^{(n)}], \quad (\text{A9b})$$

$$\theta_{2k+2}^{(n)} = \theta_{2k}^{(n+1)} + \frac{[\Delta \theta_{2k}^{(n+1)}][\Delta \theta_{2k+1}^{(n+1)}]}{\Delta^2 \theta_{2k+1}^{(n)}}. \quad (\text{A9c})$$

As in the case of Aitken's iterated Δ^2 process (A4), it is assumed that the difference operator Δ acts only upon the superscript n and not on the subscript k .

Again, the approximation to the limit of the input sequence depends upon the index m of the last sequence element s_m which was used in the recursion. If we have $m = 3\mu$, $m = 3\mu + 1$, or $m = 3\mu + 2$, respectively, the approximations to the limit with the highest transformation orders are chosen according to

$$\{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{3\mu}\} \longrightarrow \theta_{2\mu}^{(0)}, \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{3\mu+1}\} \longrightarrow \theta_{2\mu}^{(1)}, \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$\{s_2, s_3, \dots, s_{3\mu+2}\} \longrightarrow \theta_{2\mu}^{(2)}. \quad (\text{A12})$$

These three relationships can be expressed by a single equation (Eq. (10.2-8) of [12]):

$$\begin{aligned} &\{s_{m-3\llbracket m/3 \rrbracket}, s_{m-3\llbracket m/3 \rrbracket+1}, \dots, s_m\} \\ &\longrightarrow \theta_{2\llbracket m/3 \rrbracket}^{(m-3\llbracket m/3 \rrbracket)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A13})$$

Further details on the theta algorithm as well as additional references can be found in Section 2.9 of [6] or in Sections 10 and 11 of [12].

As for example discussed in [50], new sequence transformations can be constructed by iterating explicit expressions for sequence transformations with low transformation orders. The best known example of such an iterated sequence transformation is probably Aitken's iterated Δ^2 process (A4) which is obtained by iterating (A1).

The same approach is also possible in the case of the theta algorithm (A9). A suitable closed-form expression, which may be iterated, is (Eq. (10.3-1) of [12])

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta_2^{(n)} &= s_{n+1} \\ &- \frac{[\Delta s_n][\Delta s_{n+1}][\Delta^2 s_{n+1}]}{[\Delta s_{n+2}][\Delta^2 s_n] - [\Delta s_n][\Delta^2 s_{n+1}]}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A14})$$

The iteration of this expression yields the following nonlinear recursive scheme (Eq. (10.3-6) of [12]):

$$\mathcal{J}_0^{(n)} = s_n, \quad (\text{A15a})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{k+1}^{(n)} &= \mathcal{J}_k^{(n+1)} - \\ &\frac{[\Delta \mathcal{J}_k^{(n)}][\Delta \mathcal{J}_k^{(n+1)}][\Delta^2 \mathcal{J}_k^{(n+1)}]}{[\Delta \mathcal{J}_k^{(n+2)}][\Delta^2 \mathcal{J}_k^{(n)}] - [\Delta \mathcal{J}_k^{(n)}][\Delta^2 \mathcal{J}_k^{(n+1)}]}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A15b})$$

In convergence acceleration and summation processes, the iterated transformation $\mathcal{J}_k^{(n)}$ has similar properties as Brezinski's theta algorithm from which it was derived: Both transformations are very powerful as well as very versatile. $\mathcal{J}_k^{(n)}$ is not only an effective accelerator for linear convergence as well as able to sum divergent alternating series, but it is also able to accelerate the convergence of many logarithmically convergent sequences and series [12,50,52-56].

Again, the approximation to the limit of the input sequence depends upon the index m of the last sequence element s_m which was used in the recursion. If we have $m = 3\mu$, $m = 3\mu + 1$, or $m = 3\mu + 2$, respectively, the approximations to the limit with the highest transformation orders are chosen according to

$$\{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{3\mu}\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_\mu^{(0)}, \quad (\text{A16})$$

$$\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{3\mu+1}\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_\mu^{(1)}, \quad (\text{A17})$$

$$\{s_2, s_3, \dots, s_{3\mu+2}\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_\mu^{(2)}. \quad (\text{A18})$$

These three relationships can be expressed by a single equation (Eq. (10.4-7) of [12]):

$$\begin{aligned} & \{s_{m-3\llbracket m/3 \rrbracket}, s_{m-3\llbracket m/3 \rrbracket+1}, \dots, s_m\} \\ & \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_{\llbracket m/3 \rrbracket}^{(m-3\llbracket m/3 \rrbracket)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A19})$$

So far, only sequence transformations were considered which use as input data the elements of the sequence to be transformed. However, in some cases structural information on the dependence of the remainders r_n on the index n is available. For example, it is well known that the truncation error of a convergent series with strictly alternating and monotonously decreasing terms is bounded in magnitude by the first term not included in the partial sum and has the same sign as this term (see for instance p. 132 of [2]). The first term neglected is also the best simple estimate for the truncation error of a strictly alternating nonterminating hypergeometric series ${}_2F_0(\alpha, \beta; -x)$ with $\alpha, \beta, x > 0$ (Theorem 5.12-5 of [57]). Such an information on the behavior of the truncation errors can be extremely helpful in a convergence acceleration or summation process. Unfortunately, the sequence transformations considered so far are not able to benefit from it.

A convenient way of incorporating such an information into the transformation process consists in the use of remainder estimates $\{\omega_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$. Because of the explicit incorporation of the information contained in the remainder estimates, sequence transformations of that kind are potentially very powerful and as well as very versatile.

The best-known example of such a sequence transformation is Levin's transformation [58] which is both very versatile and very powerful [6,12,59–61]:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n, \omega_n) \\ &= \frac{\sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \frac{(\zeta + n + j)^{k-1}}{(\zeta + n + k)^{k-1}} \frac{s_{n+j}}{\omega_{n+j}}}{\sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \frac{(\zeta + n + j)^{k-1}}{(\zeta + n + k)^{k-1}} \frac{1}{\omega_{n+j}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A20})$$

The shift parameter ζ has to be positive in order to admit $n = 0$ in (A20). The most obvious choice, which is always used in this article, is $\zeta = 1$. Recurrence formulas for the

numerator and denominator sums of $\mathcal{L}_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n, \omega_n)$ can be found in Section 7.2 of [12].

Levin's transformation is based on the assumption that the remainders r_n of the input sequence can for all $n \geq 0$ be approximated by a remainder estimate ω_n , which should be chosen such that $s_n - s = \omega_n [c + O(n^{-1})]$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, multiplied by a polynomial in $1/(n + \zeta)$ with $\zeta > 0$. Levin [58] introduced several simple remainder estimates for infinite series which give rise to several variants of Levin's sequence transformation. Further details on Levin's transformation can for instance be found in Section 7 of [12].

In this article, we only consider the remainder estimate

$$\omega_n = \Delta s_n = a_{n+1}, \quad (\text{A21})$$

which was first proposed by Smith and Ford [59]. It yields the following variant of Levin's transformation (Eq. (7.3-9) of [12]):

$$d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n) = \mathcal{L}_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n, \Delta s_n). \quad (\text{A22})$$

Levin's transformation is based on the implicit assumption that the ratio $[s_n - s]/\omega_n$ can be expressed as a power series in $1/(n + \zeta)$. A different class of sequence transformations can be derived by assuming that the ratio $[s_n - s]/\omega_n$ can be expressed as a so-called factorial series according to (Section 8 of [12])

$$s_n = s + \omega_n \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j / (n + \zeta)_j, \quad (\text{A23})$$

where $(n + \zeta)_j = \Gamma(n + j + \zeta)/\Gamma(n + \zeta)$ is a Pochhammer symbol (p. 3 of [41]). In this way, the sequence transformation (Eq. (8.2-7) of [12])

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{S}_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n, \omega_n) \\ &= \frac{\sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \frac{(\zeta + n + j)_{k-1}}{(\zeta + n + k)_{k-1}} \frac{s_{n+j}}{\omega_{n+j}}}{\sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \frac{(\zeta + n + j)_{k-1}}{(\zeta + n + k)_{k-1}} \frac{1}{\omega_{n+j}}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A24})$$

can be derived which is formally very similar to Levin's sequence transformation. The only difference between the transformations $\mathcal{L}_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n, \omega_n)$ and $\mathcal{S}_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n, \omega_n)$ is that the powers $(\zeta + n + j)^{k-1}$ in (A20) are replaced by the Pochhammer symbols $(\zeta + n + j)_{k-1}$ in (A24). Again, the shift parameter ζ has to be positive in order to admit $n = 0$ in (A24), and the most obvious choice is also $\zeta = 1$ which is exclusively used in this article. Recurrence formulas for the numerator and denominator sums of $\mathcal{S}_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n, \omega_n)$ can be found in Section 8.3 of [12].

If we use the remainder estimate (A21) also in (A24), we obtain the following sequence transformation (Eq. (8.4-4) of [12]):

$$\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n) = \mathcal{S}_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n, \Delta s_n). \quad (\text{A25})$$

It was shown in several articles that the transformation (A24) as well as its variant (A25) can be very effective [12–17, 21, 23–27, 29–31, 62–65], in particular if strongly divergent alternating series are to be summed.

In the case of the transformations (A22) and (A25), the approximation to the limit with the highest transformation order is given by

$$\{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{m+1}\} \longrightarrow \Xi_m^{(0)}(\zeta, s_0), \quad (\text{A26})$$

where $\Xi_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$ stands for either $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$ or $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$.

If the input data s_n are the partial sums of a (formal) power series for some function $f(z)$ according to (2.6), $s_n = f_n(z)$, then the transformations (A22) and (A25) produce rational functions $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, f_n(z))$ and $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, f_n(z))$, whose numerator and denominator polynomials are of degrees $k+n$ and k in z , respectively (Eqs. (4.25) and (4.26) of [25]). Moreover, the rational approximants $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, f_n(z))$ and $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, f_n(z))$ satisfy the following asymptotic error estimates as $z \rightarrow 0$ (Eqs. (4.28) and (4.29) of [25]),

$$f(z) - d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, f_n(z)) = O(z^{k+n+2}), \quad (\text{A27})$$

$$f(z) - \delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, f_n(z)) = O(z^{k+n+2}), \quad (\text{A28})$$

which are very similar to the well known accuracy-through-order relationships satisfied by Padé approximants [34].

It is a typical feature of all sequence transformations discussed in this Appendix that they are both *homogeneous* and *translative*: If the elements of two sequences $\{s_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ and $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ satisfy

$$\sigma_n = a s_n + b, \quad (\text{A29})$$

where a and b are suitable constants, then

$$\mathcal{T}(\sigma_n, \sigma_{n+1}, \dots) = a \mathcal{T}(s_n, s_{n+1}, \dots) + b. \quad (\text{A30})$$

Sequence transformations \mathcal{T} satisfying this condition are called *quasi-linear* in the book by Brezinski and Redivo Zaglia [6]. In Section 1.4 of this book, a detailed discussion of the properties of quasi-linear sequence transformations as well as further references can be found.

APPENDIX B: THE INFINITE COUPLING LIMIT OF THE SEXTIC ANHARMONIC OSCILLATOR

The detrimental effect of the irregular behavior of the leading elements of a sequence in convergence acceleration and summation processes is not restricted to mathematical model problems but occurs also in the mathematical treatment of scientific problems.

This will be shown by performing extensive summation calculations for the so-called strong coupling limit k_3 of the sextic anharmonic oscillator. The quartic ($m = 2$), sextic ($m = 3$), and octic ($m = 4$) anharmonic oscillators are defined by the Hamiltonians

$$\hat{H}(\beta) = \hat{p}^2 + \hat{x}^2 + \beta \hat{x}^{2m}, \quad m = 2, 3, 4, \quad (\text{B1})$$

and the strong coupling limit k_m of the ground state energy eigenvalue $E^{(m)}(\beta)$ of this Hamiltonian is defined by

$$k_m = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} E^{(m)}(\beta) / \beta^{1/(m+1)}. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Ever since the seminal work of Bender and Wu [66–68], the divergent weak coupling perturbation expansion

$$E^{(m)}(\beta) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n^{(m)} \beta^n \quad (\text{B3})$$

for the ground state energy of an anharmonic oscillator has been considered to be the model example of a strongly divergent quantum mechanical perturbation expansion which has to be summed in order to produce numerically useful results. Accordingly, there is an extensive literature on the summation of the divergent perturbation expansions of the anharmonic oscillators (see for example [14, 27–30, 66–72] and references therein).

In addition to the divergent weak coupling expansion (B3), there is also a strong coupling expansion [69]

$$E^{(m)}(\beta) = \beta^{1/(m+1)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} K_n^{(m)} \beta^{-2n/(m+1)}. \quad (\text{B4})$$

It can be shown that this expansion converges for sufficiently large values of β [69–71]. However, the computation of the perturbative coefficients $K_n^{(m)}$ is very difficult (see for example [29] and references therein).

It follows from (B2), (B3), and (B4) that the infinite coupling limit k_m corresponds to the leading coefficient of the strong coupling expansion (B4) according to

$$k_m = K_0^{(m)}. \quad (\text{B5})$$

The weak coupling perturbation expansion (B3) cannot be used in a straightforward way for a calculation of the strong coupling limit k_m . However, this can be accomplished comparatively easily with the help of the following *renormalized* weak coupling perturbation expansion (Eqs. (3.30) – (3.31) of [25]):

$$E^{(m)}(\beta) = (1 - \kappa)^{-1/2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n^{(m)} \kappa^n. \quad (\text{B6})$$

This expansion is based on a renormalization scheme introduced by Vinette and Čížek [72]. In this approach, the original coupling constant $\beta \in [0, \infty)$ is transformed

into a renormalized and explicitly m -dependent coupling constant $\kappa \in [0, 1)$ according to (Eq. (3.19) of [25])

$$\beta = \frac{1}{B_m} \frac{\kappa}{(1 - \kappa)^{(m+1)/2}}, \quad (\text{B7})$$

where (Eq. (3.17) of [25])

$$B_m = \frac{m(2m-1)!!}{2^{m-1}}. \quad (\text{B8})$$

For the sextic ($m = 3$) case, these expressions correspond to $B_3 = 45/4$ and $\beta = 4\kappa/[45(1 - \kappa)^2]$.

Thus, the infinite coupling limits k_3 of the sextic anharmonic oscillator can be expressed by the renormalized weak coupling expansion (B6) according to (Eqs. (3.43) and (3.44) of [25])

$$k_3 = [45/4]^{1/4} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n^{(3)}. \quad (\text{B9})$$

The summation of either this or the perturbation series (B6) with $m = 3$, from which (B9) was derived, is a formidable computational problem. This follows at once from the large- n asymptotics of the renormalized perturbative coefficients for the sextic anharmonic oscillator (Eq. (3.34) of [25]):

$$c_n^{(3)} \sim (-1)^{n+1} \frac{(128)^{1/2}}{\pi^2} \times \Gamma(2n + 1/2) (64/[45\pi^2])^n, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B10})$$

It should be noted that the summation of the perturbation series (B9) for k_3 is much more demanding than the summation of the divergent asymptotic expansions for special functions since their coefficients c_n grow essentially like $n!$ [12–14,16]. Although Padé approximants – or equivalently Wynn’s epsilon algorithm – are in principle capable of summing alternating divergent power series whose coefficients c_n grow essentially like $(2n)!$ in magnitude, the convergence of Padé approximants is too slow to be practically useful. Moreover, it was shown in [25] that the Levin transformation (A22) produces in the case of the perturbation expansions for the anharmonic oscillators sequences of approximants which initially seem to converge but which ultimately diverge. In contrast, the Levin-type transformation (A25) produces comparatively good results.

Thus, in analogy to [25] we sum the perturbation series (B9) with the help of the Levin-type transformation $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$ defined in (A25). It was shown in several articles that the sequence transformation (A25) as well as the transformation (A24), from which it was derived, is apparently very effective, in particular if strongly divergent alternating series are to be summed [12–17,21,23–27,29–31,62–65].

In our summation calculations for k_3 we use the renormalized coefficients $c_\nu^{(3)}$ with $0 \leq \nu \leq 300$. The coefficients were calculated using the exact rational arithmetics of Maple by solving a system of nonlinear difference equations as described in the Appendix of [25].

Unfortunately, Eq. (A22) in the Appendix of [25], which specifies the system of nonlinear equations, contains a typographical error. Correct is

$$4j G_j^{(n)} = 2(j+1)(2j+1) G_{j+1}^{(n)} + \frac{1}{B_m} G_{j-m}^{(n-1)} - G_{j-1}^{(n-1)} - 2 \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} G_1^{(k)} G_j^{(n-k)}. \quad (\text{B11})$$

The topic of this article is the study of the impact of irregular input data on the performance of sequence transformations. Accordingly, we have to investigate whether the renormalized coefficients $c_n^{(3)}$ behave irregularly for small indices n . For that purpose, we list in Table VII selected renormalized coefficients $c_n^{(3)}$ as well as the corresponding ratios

$$\mathcal{C}_n^{(3)} = \frac{(-1)^{n+1} \pi^2 c_n^{(3)}}{\sqrt{128} \Gamma(2n + 1/2)} \left(\frac{45\pi^2}{64} \right)^n, \quad (\text{B12})$$

that are obtained by dividing the renormalized coefficients $c_n^{(3)}$ by the leading order of their large- n asymptotics according to (B10).

The last column in Table VII shows quite clearly that the renormalized coefficients $c_n^{(3)}$ deviate for small values of n considerably from their larger-order behavior. Firstly, the coefficients $c_0^{(3)}$ and $c_1^{(3)}$ apparently possess “wrong” sign. Secondly, the coefficients $c_n^{(3)}$ initially decrease in magnitude, and only for $n \geq 4$ they grow as they should according to (B10). Nevertheless, it is only a relatively mild irregularity, which affects only a few of the available coefficients $c_\nu^{(3)}$ with $0 \leq \nu \leq 300$.

The impact of the irregular coefficients $c_n^{(3)}$ with small indices n can be checked by computing for $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and for $n \leq 299 - l$ the approximants

$$k_3^{(n,l)} = \delta_n^{(0)}(1, s_0^{(l)}), \quad (\text{B13})$$

to the infinite coupling limit k_3 of the sextic anharmonic oscillator. Here, $\delta_n^{(0)}$ is the Levin-type transformation (A25), and

$$s_n^{(l)} = [45/4]^{1/4} \sum_{\nu=0}^{n+l} c_\nu^{(3)} \quad (\text{B14})$$

is a partial sum of the perturbation series (B9) which skips the first l terms in the transformation process.

In Table VIII, the approximants $k_3^{(l,n)}$ with the three highest possible values of $n \leq 299 - l$ are listed for $l \leq 12$.

If we compare the results with the extremely accurate result of Vinette and Čížek (Eq. (69) of [72])

$$k_3 = 1.144\,802\,453\,797\,052\,763\,765\,457\,534\,149\,549, \quad (\text{B15})$$

which was obtained nonperturbatively, we see that we gain 5 decimal digits by skipping the first 7 terms of the perturbation series (B9) for k_3 . For $l \geq 8$, the accuracy of the summation results deteriorates again.

This is a very remarkable gain of accuracy, if we take into account that the summation of the perturbation series (B9) is a formidable task and that the leading terms $c_n^{(3)}$ display an only relatively mild irregularity, as shown in Table VII. Nevertheless, the results show quite clearly that the transformation order is not the only criterion which affects the performance of a sequence transformation. The results in Table VIII show that may be more effective to use smaller sets of more regular input data.

APPENDIX C: RECURRENCE FORMULAS FOR THE GAUSSIAN HYPERGEOMETRIC FUNCTION

Many three-term recurrence formulas satisfied by the Gaussian hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ are known. For example, on pp. 557 - 558 of [39] or on pp. 46 - 47 of [41], the following formulas can be found:

$$(c-a){}_2F_1(a-1, b; c; z) + [2a-c-(a-b)z]{}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) + a(z-1){}_2F_1(a+1, b; c; z) = 0, \quad (C1)$$

$$(c-b){}_2F_1(a, b-1; c; z) + [2b-c-(b-a)z]{}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) + b(z-1){}_2F_1(a, b+1; c; z) = 0, \quad (C2)$$

$$c(1-c)(1-z){}_2F_1(a, b; c-1; z) + c[c-1-(2c-a-b-1)z]{}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) + (c-a)(c-b)z{}_2F_1(a, b; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C3)$$

$$(b-a){}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) + a{}_2F_1(a+1, b; c; z) - b{}_2F_1(a, b+1; c; z) = 0, \quad (C4)$$

$$(b-c){}_2F_1(a, b-1; c; z) + (c-a-b){}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) + a(1-z){}_2F_1(a+1, b; c; z) = 0, \quad (C5)$$

$$c[a-(c-b)z]{}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) - ac(1-z){}_2F_1(a+1, b; c; z) + (c-a)(c-b)z{}_2F_1(a, b; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C6)$$

$$(1-c){}_2F_1(a, b; c-1; z) + (c-a-1){}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) + a{}_2F_1(a+1, b; c; z) = 0, \quad (C7)$$

$$(a-c){}_2F_1(a-1, b; c; z) + (c-a-b){}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) + b(1-z){}_2F_1(a, b+1; c; z) = 0, \quad (C8)$$

$$(a-c){}_2F_1(a-1, b; c; z) + (c-b){}_2F_1(a, b-1; c; z) + (b-a)(1-z){}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) - (c){}_2F_1(a-1, b; c; z) = 0, \quad (C9)$$

$$+ c(1-z){}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) + (c-b)z{}_2F_1(a, b; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C10)$$

$$(c-a){}_2F_1(a-1, b; c; z) - (c-1)(1-z){}_2F_1(a, b; c-1; z) + [a-1-(c-b-1)z]{}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = 0, \quad (C11)$$

$$c[b-(c-a)z]{}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) - bc(1-z){}_2F_1(a, b+1; c; z) + (c-a)(c-b)z{}_2F_1(a, b; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C12)$$

$$(1-c){}_2F_1(a, b; c-1; z) + (c-b-1){}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) + b{}_2F_1(a, b+1; c; z) = 0, \quad (C13)$$

$$(-c){}_2F_1(a, b-1; c; z) + c(1-z){}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) + (c-a)z{}_2F_1(a, b; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C14)$$

$$(c-b){}_2F_1(a, b-1; c; z) - (c-1)(1-z){}_2F_1(a, b; c-1; z) + [b-1-(c-a-1)z]{}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = 0. \quad (C15)$$

It is a typical feature of these recurrence formulas that there is a hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ plus two other ${}_2F_1$'s which differ with respect to only *one* of the three parameters by ± 1 . However, recurrence formulas, which contain a hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$ plus two other ${}_2F_1$'s which differ with respect to *two* or even *three* parameters by ± 1 , can be constructed comparatively easily. For that purpose, we combine those of the recurrence formulas given above, whose the third parameter c assumes at least two different values, with the linear transformation formulas (see for example p. 559 of [39] or p. 47 of [41])

$${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = (1-z)^{c-a-b}{}_2F_1(c-a, c-b; c; z) \quad (C16)$$

$$= (1-z)^{-a}{}_2F_1(a, c-b; c; z/(z-1)) \quad (C17)$$

$$= (1-z)^{-b}{}_2F_1(c-a, b; c; z/(z-1)). \quad (C18)$$

For the derivation of new recurrence formulas, we replace in (C3) a by $c-a$ and b by $c-b$. This yields:

$$c(1-c)(1-z){}_2F_1(c-a, c-b; c-1; z) + c[c-1-(a+b-1)z]{}_2F_1(c-a, c-b; c; z) + abz{}_2F_1(c-a, c-b; c+1; z) = 0. \quad (C19)$$

If we now combine this relationship with the linear transformation (C16), we obtain the following recurrence formula, where all three parameters of the hypergeometric functions change simultaneously:

$$c(1-c){}_2F_1(a-1, b-1; c-1; z) + c[c-1-(a+b-1)z]{}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) + abz(1-z){}_2F_1(a+1, b+1; c+1; z) = 0. \quad (C20)$$

If we now proceed in (C6), (C7), and in (C10) - (C15) in exactly the same way, we obtain the following recurrence formulas:

$$\begin{aligned}
& c(c-a-bz) {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& - c(c-a) {}_2F_1(a-1, b; c; z) \\
& + abz(1-z) {}_2F_1(a+1, b+1; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C21)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1-c) {}_2F_1(a-1, b-1; c-1; z) \\
& + (a-1)(1-z) {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& + (c-a) {}_2F_1(a-1, b; c; z) = 0, \quad (C22)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& c {}_2F_1(a+1, b; c; z) \\
& - c {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& - bz {}_2F_1(a+1, b+1; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C23)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& a(1-z) {}_2F_1(a+1, b; c; z) \\
& + (1-c) {}_2F_1(a-1, b-1; c-1; z) \\
& + [c-a-1-(b-1)z] {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = 0, \quad (C24)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& c(c-b-az) {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& - c(c-b) {}_2F_1(a, b-1; c; z) \\
& + abz(1-z) {}_2F_1(a+1, b+1; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C25)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1-c) {}_2F_1(a-1, b-1; c-1; z) \\
& + (b-1)(1-z) {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& + (c-b) {}_2F_1(a, b-1; c; z) = 0, \quad (C26)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& c {}_2F_1(a, b+1; c; z) \\
& - c {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& - az {}_2F_1(a+1, b+1; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C27)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& b(1-z) {}_2F_1(a, b+1; c; z) \\
& + (1-c) {}_2F_1(a-1, b-1; c-1; z) \\
& + [c-b-1-(a-1)z] {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = 0. \quad (C28)
\end{aligned}$$

Not all of these recurrence formulas are independent. For example, (C21) and (C25) can be transformed into each other by interchanging a and b . This is also true for the pairs (C22) and (C26), (C23) and (C27), and (C24) and (C28), which can be transformed into each other by interchanging a and b .

For the derivation of recurrence formulas which differ with respect to two parameters by ± 1 , we replace in (C3) a by $c-a$ and z by $z/(z-1)$. This yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{c(1-c)}{1-z} {}_2F_1\left(c-a, b; c-1; \frac{z}{z-1}\right) \\
& + \frac{c[c-1+(a-b)z]}{z-1} {}_2F_1\left(c-a, b; c; \frac{z}{z-1}\right) \\
& + \frac{a(c-b)z}{z-1} {}_2F_1\left(c-a, b; c+1; \frac{z}{z-1}\right) = 0. \quad (C29)
\end{aligned}$$

If we now combine this relationship with the linear transformation (C18), we obtain the following recurrence formula, where the first and the third parameter of the hypergeometric series change simultaneously:

$$\begin{aligned}
& c(1-c) {}_2F_1(a-1, b; c-1; z) \\
& - c[c-1+(a-b)z] {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& + a(c-b) {}_2F_1(a+1, b; c+1; z) = 0. \quad (C30)
\end{aligned}$$

If we now proceed in (C6), (C7), and in (C10) - (C15) in exactly the same way, we obtain the following recurrence formulas:

$$\begin{aligned}
& c[c-a+(a-b)z] {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& - c(c-a) {}_2F_1(a-1, b; c; z) \\
& - a(c-b) {}_2F_1(a+1, b; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C31)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1-c) {}_2F_1(a-1, b; c-1; z) \\
& + (a-1) {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& + (c-a) {}_2F_1(a-1, b; c; z) = 0, \quad (C32)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& c(1-z) {}_2F_1(a+1, b; c; z) \\
& - c {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& + (c-b) {}_2F_1(a+1, b; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C33)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& a(1-z) {}_2F_1(a+1, b; c; z) \\
& + (1-c) {}_2F_1(a-1, b; c-1; z) \\
& + [c-a-1+(a-b)z] {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = 0, \quad (C34)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& c[b+(a-b)z] {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& - bc(1-z) {}_2F_1(a, b+1; c; z) \\
& - a(c-b) {}_2F_1(a+1, b; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C35)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1-c) {}_2F_1(a-1, b; c-1; z) \\
& + (c-b-1) {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& + b(1-z) {}_2F_1(a, b+1; c; z) = 0, \quad (C36)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& c {}_2F_1(a, b-1; c; z) \\
& - c {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& + az {}_2F_1(a+1, b; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C37)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& (c-b) {}_2F_1(a, b-1; c; z) \\
& + (1-c) {}_2F_1(a-1, b; c-1; z) \\
& + [b-1+(a-b)z] {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = 0. \quad (C38)
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we replace in (C3) b by $c-b$ and z by $z/(z-1)$. This yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{c(1-c)}{1-z} {}_2F_1\left(a, c-b; c-1; \frac{z}{z-1}\right) \\
& + \frac{c[c-1-(a-b)z]}{z-1} {}_2F_1\left(a, c-b; c; \frac{z}{z-1}\right) \\
& + \frac{(c-a)bz}{z-1} {}_2F_1\left(a, c-b; c+1; \frac{z}{z-1}\right) = 0. \quad (C39)
\end{aligned}$$

If we now combine this relationship with the linear transformation (C17), we obtain the following recurrence formula, where the second and the third parameter of the hypergeometric series change simultaneously:

$$\begin{aligned}
& c(1-c) {}_2F_1(a, b-1; c-1; z) \\
& + c[c-1-(a-b)z] {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& - (c-a) {}_2F_1(a, b+1; c+1; z) = 0. \quad (C40)
\end{aligned}$$

If we now proceed in (C6), (C7), and in (C10) - (C15) in exactly the same way, we obtain the following recurrence formulas:

$$\begin{aligned}
& c[(a-b)z-a] {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& + ac(1-z) {}_2F_1(a+1, b; c; z) \\
& + (c-a)bz {}_2F_1(a, b+1; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C41) \\
& (1-c) {}_2F_1(a, b-1; c-1; z) \\
& + (c-a-1) {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& + a(1-z) {}_2F_1(a+1, b; c; z) = 0, \quad (C42) \\
& c {}_2F_1(a-1, b; c; z) \\
& - c {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& + bz {}_2F_1(a, b+1; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C43) \\
& (c-a) {}_2F_1(a-1, b; c; z) \\
& + (1-c) {}_2F_1(a, b-1; c-1; z) \\
& + [a-1-(a-b)z] {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = 0, \quad (C44) \\
& c[c-b-(a-b)z] {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& - c(c-b) {}_2F_1(a, b-1; c; z) \\
& - (c-a)bz {}_2F_1(a, b+1; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C45) \\
& (1-c) {}_2F_1(a, b-1; c-1; z) \\
& + (b-1) {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& + (c-b) {}_2F_1(a, b-1; c; z) = 0, \quad (C46) \\
& c(1-z) {}_2F_1(a, b+1; c; z) \\
& - c {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) \\
& + (c-a)z {}_2F_1(a, b+1; c+1; z) = 0, \quad (C47) \\
& b(1-z) {}_2F_1(a, b+1; c; z) \\
& + (1-c) {}_2F_1(a, b-1; c-1; z) \\
& + [c-b-1-(a-b)z] {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = 0. \quad (C48)
\end{aligned}$$

The two groups of recursions (C30) - (C38) and (C40) - (C48), respectively, are not independent. They can be transformed into each other by interchanging a and b .

* Internet: joachim.weniger@chemie.uni-regensburg.de

- [1] C. Brezinski, *History of Continued Fractions and Padé Approximants* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991).
- [2] K. Knopp, *Theorie und Anwendung der unendlichen Reihen* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1964).
- [3] C. Brezinski, *Accélération de la Convergence en Analyse Numérique* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977).
- [4] C. Brezinski, *Algorithmes d'Accélération de la Convergence - Étude Numérique* (Editions Technip, Paris, 1978).
- [5] C. Brezinski, *Padé-Type Approximation and General Orthogonal Polynomials* (Birkhäuser, Basel, 1980).
- [6] C. Brezinski and M. Redivo Zaglia, *Extrapolation Methods* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991).
- [7] J. Wimp, *Sequence Transformations and Their Applications* (Academic Press, New York, 1981).
- [8] G.I. Marchuk and V.V. Shaidurov, *Difference Methods and Their Extrapolations* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983).

- [9] J.-P. Delahaye, *Sequence Transformations* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988).
- [10] C.B. Liem, T. Lü, and T.M. Shih, *The Splitting Extrapolation Method* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1995).
- [11] A.J. Guttmann, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena* **13**, edited by C. Domb and J.L. Lebowitz (Academic Press, London, 1989), p. 3.
- [12] E.J. Weniger, *Comput. Phys. Rep.* **10**, 189 (1989).
- [13] E.J. Weniger, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **32**, 291 (1990).
- [14] E.J. Weniger and J. Čížek, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **59**, 471 (1990).
- [15] E.J. Weniger, in *Nonlinear Numerical Methods and Rational Approximation II*, edited by A. Cuyt (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1994), p. 269.
- [16] E.J. Weniger, *Comput. Phys.* **10**, 496 (1996).
- [17] U.D. Jentschura, P.J. Mohr, G. Soff, and E.J. Weniger, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **116**, 28 (1999).
- [18] J. Grotendorst, E.J. Weniger, and E.O. Steinborn, *Phys. Rev. A* **33**, 3706 (1986).
- [19] H.H.H. Homeier and E.J. Weniger, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **92**, 1 (1995).
- [20] E.J. Weniger, J. Grotendorst, and E.O. Steinborn, *Int. J. Quantum Chem. Symp.* **19**, 181 (1986).
- [21] E.J. Weniger and E.O. Steinborn, in *Numerical Determination of the Electronic Structure of Atoms, Diatomic and Polyatomic Molecules*, edited by M. Defranceschi and J. Delhalle (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1989), p. 341.
- [22] E.O. Steinborn and E.J. Weniger, *J. Mol. Struct. (Theochem)* **210**, 71 (1990).
- [23] E.J. Weniger, J. Čížek, and F. Vinette, *Phys. Lett. A* **156**, 169 (1991).
- [24] E.J. Weniger, *Numer. Algorithms* **3**, 477 (1992).
- [25] E.J. Weniger, J. Čížek, and F. Vinette, *J. Math. Phys.* **34**, 571 (1993).
- [26] E.J. Weniger, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **57**, 265 (1996); Erratum, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **58**, 319 (1996).
- [27] E.J. Weniger, *Ann. Phys. (NY)* **246**, 133 (1996).
- [28] J. Čížek, E.J. Weniger, P. Bracken, P., and V. Špirko, *Phys. Rev. E* **53**, 2925 (1996).
- [29] E.J. Weniger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 2859 (1996).
- [30] E.J. Weniger, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 5165 (1997).
- [31] U. Jentschura, J. Becher, E.J. Weniger, and G. Soff, *Resummation of QED perturbation series by sequence transformations and prediction of perturbative coefficients*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, submitted, Los Alamos preprint hep-ph/9911265.
- [32] E.J. Weniger and C.-M. Liegener, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **38**, 55 (1990).
- [33] J. Cioslowski and E.J. Weniger, *J. Comput. Chem.* **14**, 1468 (1993).
- [34] G.A. Baker, Jr., and P. Graves-Morris, *Padé Approximants*, 2nd edition (Cambridge U.P., Cambridge, 1996).
- [35] P. Wynn, *Math. Tables Aids Comput.* **10**, 91 (1956).
- [36] P. Wynn, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **4**, 805 (1968).
- [37] A. Sidi, *Math. Comput.* **33**, 315 (1979).
- [38] A. Sidi, *Math. Comput.* **35**, 833 (1980).
- [39] M. Abramowitz and I.A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, 10th printing (National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C., 1972).
- [40] A. Erdélyi, W. Magnus, F. Oberhettinger, and F.G. Tric

- comi, *Higher Transcendental Functions I* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1953).
- [41] W. Magnus, F. Oberhettinger, and R.P. Soni, *Formulas and Theorems for the Special Functions of Mathematical Physics* (Springer-Verlag, New York).
 - [42] J.B. Seaborn, *Hypergeometric Functions and Their Applications* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991).
 - [43] L.J. Slater, *Generalized Hypergeometric Functions* (Cambridge U.P., Cambridge, 1960).
 - [44] J. Spanier and K.B. Oldham, *An Atlas of Functions* (Hemisphere Publishing, Washington, 1987).
 - [45] N.M. Temme, *Special Functions – An Introduction to the Classical Functions of Mathematical Physics* (Wiley, New York, 1996).
 - [46] Z.X. Wang and D.R. Guo, *Special Functions* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989).
 - [47] R.C. Forrey, J. Comput. Phys. **137**, 79 (1997).
 - [48] A.C. Aitken, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh **46**, 289 (1926).
 - [49] E.J. Weniger, *Prediction properties of Aitken’s iterated Δ^2 process, of Wynn’s epsilon algorithm, and of Brezinski’s iterated theta algorithm*, to appear in the special edition “Extrapolation and Convergence Acceleration Methods” of J. Comput. Appl. Math. (edited by C. Brezinski), Los Alamos preprint math/0002111.
 - [50] E.J. Weniger, Comput. Phys. Commun. **64**, 19 (1991).
 - [51] C. Brezinski, C.R. Acad. Sc. Paris **273**, 727 (1971).
 - [52] S. Bhowmick, R. Bhattacharya, and D. Roy, Comput. Phys. Commun. **54**, 31 (1989).
 - [53] P. Sablonniere, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **19**, 55 (1987).
 - [54] P. Sablonniere, Numer. Algor. **1**, 177 (1991).
 - [55] P. Sablonniere, Numer. Algor. **3**, 401 (1992).
 - [56] P. Sablonniere, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **62** (1995) 103.
 - [57] B.C. Carlson, *Special Functions of Applied Mathematics* (Academic Press, New York, 1977).
 - [58] D. Levin, Int. J. Comput. Math. B **3**, 371 (1973).
 - [59] D.A. Smith and W.F. Ford, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **16**, 223 (1979).
 - [60] D.A. Smith and W.F. Ford, Math. Comput. **38**, 481 (1982).
 - [61] H.H.H. Homeier, *Scalar Levin-type sequence transformations*, to appear in the special edition “Extrapolation and Convergence Acceleration Methods” of J. Comput. Appl. Math. (edited by C. Brezinski).
 - [62] D. Roy, R. Bhattacharya, and S. Bhowmick, Comput. Phys. Commun. **93**, 159 (1996).
 - [63] R. Bhattacharya, D. Roy, and S. Bhowmick, Comput. Phys. Commun. **101**, 213 (1996).
 - [64] D. Roy, R. Bhattacharya, and S. Bhowmick, Comput. Phys. Commun. **113**, 131, (1998).
 - [65] A. Sarkar, D. Sen, S. Haldar, and D. Roy, Mod. Phys. Lett. B **12**, 639 (1998).
 - [66] C.M. Bender and T.T. Wu, Phys. Rev. **184**, 1231 (1969).
 - [67] C.M. Bender and T.T. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **27**, 461 (1971).
 - [68] C.M. Bender and T.T. Wu, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 1620 (1973).
 - [69] B. Simon, Ann. Phys. (NY) **58**, 76 (1970).
 - [70] L. Skála, J. Čížek, and J. Zamastil, J. Phys. A **32**, L123 (1999).
 - [71] L. Skála, J. Čížek, and J. Zamastil, J. Phys. A **32**, 5715 (1999).
 - [72] F. Vinette and J. Čížek, J. Math. Phys. **32**, 3392 (1991).

TABLES

TABLE I. Summation of the divergent hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(1, 1; 2; -z) = \ln(1+z)$ for $z = 7/2$ with the help of Wynn's epsilon algorithm, Brezinski's theta algorithm, and the Levin-type transformations $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$ and $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$.

n	$s_n(z)$ Eq. (3.3)	$\epsilon_{2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}^{(n-2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor)}$ Eq. (2.5)	$\theta_{2\lfloor n/3 \rfloor}^{(n-3\lfloor n/3 \rfloor)}$ Eq. (A9)	$d_n^{(0)}(1, s_0(z))$ Eq. (A22)	$\delta_n^{(0)}(1, s_0(z))$ Eq. (A25)
0	$0.350\ 000 \times 10^1$	3.500 000 000 000	3.500 000 000 000	3.500 000 000 000	3.500 000 000 000
1	$-0.262\ 500 \times 10^1$	$-2.625\ 000\ 000\ 000$	$-2.625\ 000\ 000\ 000$	1.662 500 000 000	1.662 500 000 000
2	$0.116\ 667 \times 10^2$	1.662 500 000 000	11.666 666 666 667	1.471 337 579 618	1.471 337 579 618
3	$-0.258\ 490 \times 10^2$	1.317 528 735 632	1.561 447 811 448	1.507 573 834 307	1.502 377 638 599
4	$0.791\ 948 \times 10^2$	1.521 596 244 131	1.447 356 630 824	1.504 123 629 505	1.504 105 974 245
5	$-0.227\ 183 \times 10^3$	1.488 926 130 389	1.579 131 944 444	1.504 012 642 929	1.504 105 974 245
6	$0.691\ 950 \times 10^3$	1.506 184 895 833	1.505 133 549 503	1.504 083 039 403	1.504 083 649 440
7	$-0.212\ 289 \times 10^4$	1.502 565 692 760	1.503 300 027 415	1.504 078 127 161	1.504 078 473 952
8	$0.663\ 440 \times 10^4$	1.504 338 769 814	1.504 815 718 579	1.504 077 213 984	1.504 077 564 801
9	$-0.209\ 511 \times 10^5$	1.503 911 593 667	1.504 085 412 192	1.504 077 398 663	1.504 077 421 623
10	$0.668\ 209 \times 10^5$	1.504 110 270 747	1.504 071 710 932	1.504 077 400 367	1.504 077 400 332
11	$-0.214\ 781 \times 10^6$	1.504 058 264 517	1.504 082 144 389	1.504 077 396 419	1.504 077 397 274
12	$0.695\ 009 \times 10^6$	1.504 081 563 208	1.504 077 411 492	1.504 077 396 733	1.504 077 396 845
13	$-0.226\ 181 \times 10^7$	1.504 075 121 301	1.504 077 381 028	1.504 077 396 787	1.504 077 396 786
14	$0.739\ 713 \times 10^7$	1.504 077 927 290	1.504 077 411 335	1.504 077 396 776	1.504 077 396 778
15	$-0.242\ 963 \times 10^8$	1.504 077 120 833	1.504 077 396 437	1.504 077 396 776	1.504 077 396 776
Exact		1.504 077 396 776	1.504 077 396 776	1.504 077 396 776	1.504 077 396 776

TABLE II. Summation of the hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(2/3, 4/3; 1/3; z) = (1+z)(1-z)^{-5/3}$ for $z = (1+i\sqrt{3})/2$ with the help of Wynn's epsilon algorithm and Levin's transformation $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$.

n	$s_n(z)$ Eq. (3.12)	$\epsilon_{2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}^{(n-2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor)}$ Eq. (2.5)	$d_n^{(0)}(1, s_0(z))$ Eq. (A22)
0	1.00 000	1.000 000 000	1.000 000 000 000
1	$2.33\ 333 + i2.30\ 940$	$2.333\ 333\ 334 + i2.309\ 401\ 077$	$-0.531\ 737\ 773\ 153 + i1.384\ 198\ 772\ 334$
2	$0.38\ 889 + i5.67\ 728$	$-0.531\ 737\ 773 + i1.384\ 198\ 772$	$-1.131\ 921\ 176\ 770 + i1.411\ 935\ 517\ 843$
3	$-4.54\ 938 + i5.67\ 728$	$-0.953\ 868\ 768 + i1.632\ 539\ 413$	$-1.120\ 276\ 444\ 364 + i1.322\ 600\ 394\ 819$
4	$-7.49\ 177 + i0.58\ 091$	$-1.136\ 352\ 936 + i1.326\ 189\ 971$	$-1.112\ 622\ 137\ 231 + i1.326\ 484\ 602\ 288$
5	$-4.11\ 180 - i5.27\ 337$	$-1.115\ 979\ 051 + i1.318\ 232\ 359$	$-1.113\ 364\ 776\ 960 + i1.326\ 919\ 577\ 184$
6	$3.46\ 967 - i5.27\ 337$	$-1.111\ 974\ 302 + i1.326\ 730\ 914$	$-1.113\ 348\ 742\ 255 + i1.326\ 817\ 605\ 791$
7	$7.64\ 993 + i1.96\ 705$	$-1.113\ 209\ 082 + i1.327\ 290\ 958$	$-1.113\ 338\ 972\ 201 + i1.326\ 827\ 801\ 234$
8	$3.09\ 756 + i9.85\ 197$	$-1.113\ 429\ 777 + i1.326\ 838\ 273$	$-1.113\ 340\ 931\ 714 + i1.326\ 828\ 116\ 649$
9	$-6.72\ 205 + i9.85\ 197$	$-1.113\ 348\ 679 + i1.326\ 799\ 292$	$-1.113\ 340\ 813\ 708 + i1.326\ 827\ 863\ 160$
10	$-11.9\ 767 + i0.75\ 063$	$-1.113\ 334\ 783 + i1.326\ 827\ 026$	$-1.113\ 340\ 793\ 311 + i1.326\ 827\ 897\ 184$
11	$-6.38\ 818 - i8.92\ 900$	$-1.113\ 340\ 291 + i1.326\ 829\ 768$	$-1.113\ 340\ 798\ 965 + i1.326\ 827\ 896\ 881$
12	$5.43\ 724 - i8.92\ 900$	$-1.113\ 341\ 213 + i1.326\ 827\ 964$	$-1.113\ 340\ 798\ 476 + i1.326\ 827\ 896\ 233$
13	$11.6\ 655 + i1.85\ 859$	$-1.113\ 340\ 832 + i1.326\ 827\ 770$	$-1.113\ 340\ 798\ 438 + i1.326\ 827\ 896\ 343$
14	$5.12\ 954 + i13.1\ 791$	$-1.113\ 340\ 767 + i1.326\ 827\ 891$	$-1.113\ 340\ 798\ 455 + i1.326\ 827\ 896\ 339$
15	$-8.54\ 354 + i13.1\ 791$	$-1.113\ 340\ 796 + i1.326\ 827\ 905$	$-1.113\ 340\ 798\ 453 + i1.326\ 827\ 896\ 338$
Exact		$-1.113\ 340\ 798 + i1.326\ 827\ 896$	$-1.113\ 340\ 798\ 453 + i1.326\ 827\ 896\ 338$

TABLE III. Acceleration of the convergence of the hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(3/7, 5/2; 7/2; z)$ for $z = 77/100$ with the help of Wynn's epsilon algorithm, Brezinski's theta algorithm, and the Levin-type transformations $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$ and $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$.

n	$s_n(z)$ Eq. (4.3)	$\epsilon_{2\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket}^{(n-2\llbracket n/2 \rrbracket)}$ Eq. (2.5)	$\theta_{2\llbracket n/3 \rrbracket}^{(n-3\llbracket n/3 \rrbracket)}$ Eq. (A9)	$d_n^{(0)}(1, s_0(z))$ Eq. (A22)	$\delta_n^{(0)}(1, s_0(z))$ Eq. (A25)
0	1.000 000 000 000	1.000 000 000 000	1.000 000 000 000	1.000 000 000 000	1.000 000 000 000
1	1.235 714 285 714	1.235 714 285 714	1.235 714 285 714	1.411 927 877 947	1.411 927 877 947
2	1.336 547 619 048	1.411 927 877 947	1.336 547 619 048	1.448 820 807 146	1.448 820 807 146
3	1.387 972 619 048	1.441 496 598 639	1.485 041 451 400	1.459 648 832 810	1.460 767 058 064
4	1.416 691 503 663	1.457 490 562 327	1.471 789 761 447	1.462 687 260 952	1.463 271 135 352
5	1.433 666 279 063	1.461 253 523 425	1.467 349 021 834	1.463 515 006 731	1.463 725 027 496
6	1.444 100 773 353	1.463 029 920 830	1.463 655 490 309	1.463 733 041 236	1.463 795 467 606
7	1.450 702 748 500	1.463 503 143 435	1.463 758 479 471	1.463 788 732 403	1.463 805 515 965
8	1.454 973 597 660	1.463 711 233 069	1.463 790 047 799	1.463 802 617 705	1.463 806 889 463
9	1.457 785 549 506	1.463 770 364 632	1.463 806 019 078	1.463 806 018 807	1.463 807 072 295
10	1.459 663 708 382	1.463 795 262 347	1.463 806 921 084	1.463 806 841 297	1.463 807 096 230
11	1.460 933 204 660	1.463 802 626 156	1.463 807 092 160	1.463 807 038 364	1.463 807 099 326
12	1.461 799 964 188	1.463 805 637 323	1.463 807 125 890	1.463 807 085 259	1.463 807 099 724
13	1.462 396 866 847	1.463 806 552 580	1.463 807 118 461	1.463 807 096 360	1.463 807 099 774
14	1.462 811 003 597	1.463 806 919 041	1.463 807 119 752	1.463 807 098 978	1.463 807 099 781
15	1.463 100 213 038	1.463 807 032 663	1.463 807 119 214	1.463 807 099 593	1.463 807 099 781
16	1.463 303 343 588	1.463 807 077 439	1.463 807 118 928	1.463 807 099 737	1.463 807 099 782
Exact	1.463 807 099 782	1.463 807 099 782	1.463 807 099 782	1.463 807 099 782	1.463 807 099 782

TABLE IV. Acceleration of the convergence of the hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(3/7, 5/2; -7/2; z)$ for $z = 77/100$ with the help of Aitken's iterated Δ^2 process, Wynn's epsilon algorithm, and Brezinski's theta algorithm.

n	$s_n(z)$ Eq. (4.8)	$\mathcal{A}_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}^{(n-2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor)}$ Eq. (A4)	$\epsilon_{2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}^{(n-2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor)}$ Eq. (2.5)	$\theta_{2\lfloor n/3 \rfloor}^{(n-3\lfloor n/3 \rfloor)}$ Eq. (A9)
0	1.000 000 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	1.000 000 000 000 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	1.000 000 000 000 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	1.000 000 000 000 $\cdot 10^{+0}$
1	7.642 857 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	7.642 857 142 857 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	7.642 857 142 857 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	7.642 857 142 857 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
2	9.457 857 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.668 280 871 671 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.668 280 871 671 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	9.457 857 142 857 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
3	6.063 807 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.275 261 324 042 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.275 261 324 042 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.485 759 131 562 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
4	3.070 461 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	8.535 660 811 732 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.609 189 507 196 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.494 334 311 697 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
5	2.491 700 $\cdot 10^{+1}$	8.361 725 059 741 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.157 392 107 013 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.453 777 105 530 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
6	1.010 158 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	8.516 151 469 394 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.896 493 143 013 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.487 841 750 682 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
7	2.839 789 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	8.209 992 692 837 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	4.152 615 385 984 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.486 139 776 736 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
8	6.390 582 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	8.549 782 290 518 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.979 200 475 641 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	8.486 753 544 589 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
9	1.236 512 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	9.170 319 462 988 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.579 725 923 915 $\cdot 10^{+1}$	8.486 400 009 032 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
10	2.143 447 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	8.324 631 947 362 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	-9.032 991 315 812 $\cdot 10^{+1}$	8.486 226 769 041 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
11	3.416 644 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	7.319 750 281 906 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	-4.871 173 637 209 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	8.486 314 552 725 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
12	5.097 263 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	8.296 736 361 657 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	9.550 458 201 456 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	8.486 265 235 534 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
13	7.207 772 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	2.786 711 790 541 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	3.152 031 922 861 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	8.486 238 887 649 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
14	9.751 014 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	2.417 040 069 989 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	9.017 022 343 102 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	8.486 245 607 105 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
15	1.271 111 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	2.660 054 094 715 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	9.807 349 664 879 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	8.486 241 968 013 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
16	1.605 569 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	1.583 428 788 102 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	1.006 124 741 024 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	8.486 240 157 205 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
17	1.973 906 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	2.773 669 575 356 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	1.009 114 496 621 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	8.485 741 255 417 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
18	2.370 573 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	2.553 560 837 044 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	1.009 964 826 770 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	8.486 242 524 145 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
19	2.789 405 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	2.384 039 609 516 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	1.010 111 063 638 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	8.486 355 858 960 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
20	3.223 965 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	2.454 155 706 579 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	1.010 153 078 626 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	8.492 820 131 138 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
21	3.667 836 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	2.384 021 379 340 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	1.010 161 882 819 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	8.486 069 295 394 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
22	4.114 878 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	2.454 149 413 545 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	1.010 164 516 908 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	8.470 533 544 441 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
23	4.559 414 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	7.889 100 799 808 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	1.010 165 130 151 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	2.015 803 318 335 $\cdot 10^{+0}$
24	4.996 370 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	7.855 297 113 412 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	1.010 165 321 636 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	8.519 514 381 837 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
25	5.421 360 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	7.916 396 789 254 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	1.010 165 369 332 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	1.185 791 071 696 $\cdot 10^{+0}$
26	5.830 726 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	7.874 382 737 052 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	1.010 165 384 712 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	-6.192 361 264 079 $\cdot 10^{+0}$
27	6.221 545 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	7.780 517 151 440 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	1.010 165 388 746 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	-2.153 607 969 121 $\cdot 10^{+0}$
28	6.591 599 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	7.781 235 296 899 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	1.010 165 390 075 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	-7.845 642 420 775 $\cdot 10^{+0}$
29	6.939 333 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	7.780 882 446 428 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	1.010 165 390 438 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	2.998 151 673 644 $\cdot 10^{+2}$
30	7.263 789 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	7.781 060 228 285 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	1.010 165 390 560 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	3.199 681 242 234 $\cdot 10^{+1}$
Exact	1.010 165 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	1.010 165 390 611 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	1.010 165 390 611 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	1.010 165 390 611 $\cdot 10^{+5}$

TABLE V. Acceleration of the convergence of the hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(3/7, 5/2; -7/2; z)$ for $z = 77/100$ with the help of the iteration of Brezinski's theta algorithm and the Levin-type transformations $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$ and $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$.

n	$s_n(z)$ Eq. (4.8)	$\mathcal{J}_{\llbracket n/3 \rrbracket}^{(n-3\llbracket n/3 \rrbracket)}$ Eq. (A15)	$d_n^{(0)}(1, s_0(z))$ Eq. (A22)	$\delta_n^{(0)}(1, s_0(z))$ Eq. (A25)
0	1.000 000 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	1.000 000 000 000 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	1.000 000 000 000 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	1.000 000 000 000 $\cdot 10^{+0}$
1	7.642 857 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	7.642 857 142 857 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.668 280 871 671 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.668 280 871 671 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
2	9.457 857 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	9.457 857 142 857 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.384 394 404 076 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.384 394 404 076 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
3	6.063 807 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.485 759 131 562 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.564 401 754 536 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.543 029 016 450 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
4	3.070 461 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	8.494 334 311 697 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.410 428 387 954 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.451 555 013 928 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
5	2.491 700 $\cdot 10^{+1}$	8.453 777 105 530 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.581 719 847 922 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.511 715 495 996 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
6	1.010 158 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	8.487 877 036 926 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.339 732 531 530 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.466 755 128 315 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
7	2.839 789 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	8.485 959 518 738 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.765 035 290 451 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.504 596 561 867 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
8	6.390 582 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	8.489 925 522 131 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	7.853 488 289 879 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.469 220 701 568 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
9	1.236 512 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	8.486 664 090 804 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.019 118 632 891 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	8.505 456 725 376 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
10	2.143 447 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	8.335 704 458 916 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	3.141 144 923 964 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	8.465 273 890 370 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
11	3.416 644 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	8.497 498 135 494 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	2.776 012 986 506 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	8.513 020 606 999 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
12	5.097 263 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	8.501 342 364 535 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	-7.045 936 018 531 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	8.452 752 921 910 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
13	7.207 772 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	8.498 411 613 838 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	3.717 678 472 983 $\cdot 10^{+1}$	8.532 975 348 760 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
14	9.751 014 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	8.497 632 848 220 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	-1.858 061 858 604 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	8.421 055 650 264 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
15	1.271 111 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	8.497 961 772 597 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.044 967 163 943 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	8.583 855 953 130 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
16	1.605 569 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	8.498 474 972 833 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	-7.005 065 553 184 $\cdot 10^{+3}$	8.338 036 004 332 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
17	1.973 906 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	7.503 910 591 903 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	3.081 110 326 042 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	8.721 871 069 015 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
18	2.370 573 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	8.499 855 007 426 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.465 687 756 463 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	8.104 110 955 846 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
19	2.789 405 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	7.414 199 029 835 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	9.719 482 708 581 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	9.126 025 807 834 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
20	3.223 965 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	6.852 823 777 347 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.014 869 541 810 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	7.392 774 724 769 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
21	3.667 836 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	6.800 566 895 738 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.009 649 257 196 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	1.040 040 245 220 $\cdot 10^{+0}$
22	4.114 878 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	6.778 745 199 478 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.010 218 868 540 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	5.070 943 906 098 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
23	4.559 414 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	6.776 231 440 878 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.010 160 173 901 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	1.469 832 601 187 $\cdot 10^{+0}$
24	4.996 370 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	6.777 792 652 237 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.010 165 871 479 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	-3.005 355 825 647 $\cdot 10^{-1}$
25	5.421 360 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	6.807 217 929 960 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.010 165 348 613 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	3.008 947 036 607 $\cdot 10^{+0}$
26	5.830 726 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	6.775 201 071 781 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.010 165 394 094 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	-3.273 286 658 302 $\cdot 10^{+0}$
27	6.221 545 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	6.796 867 331 534 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.010 165 390 335 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	8.821 765 469 703 $\cdot 10^{+0}$
28	6.591 599 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	1.050 749 944 450 $\cdot 10^{+0}$	1.010 165 390 631 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	-1.477 966 683 169 $\cdot 10^{+1}$
29	6.939 333 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	-6.085 082 692 546 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.010 165 390 609 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	3.183 343 913 267 $\cdot 10^{+1}$
30	7.263 789 $\cdot 10^{+4}$	-6.037 663 167 562 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	1.010 165 390 611 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	-6.136 838 085 955 $\cdot 10^{+1}$
Exact	1.010 165 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	1.010 165 390 611 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	1.010 165 390 611 $\cdot 10^{+5}$	1.010 165 390 611 $\cdot 10^{+5}$

TABLE VI. Acceleration of the convergence of the hypergeometric series ${}_2F_1(3/7, 5/2; -7/2; z)$ for $z = 77/100$ with the help of Wynn's epsilon algorithm and the Levin-type transformations $d_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$ and $\delta_k^{(n)}(\zeta, s_n)$.

n	$s_n^{(22)}(z)$ Eq. (4.11)	$\epsilon_{2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}^{(n-2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor)}$ Eq. (2.5)	$d_n^{(0)}(1, s_0^{(22)}(z))$ Eq. (A22)	$\delta_n^{(0)}(1, s_0^{(22)}(z))$ Eq. (A25)
0	$4.114\ 878 \cdot 10^4$	$4.114\ 877\ 834\ 479 \cdot 10^4$	$4.114\ 877\ 834\ 479 \cdot 10^4$	$4.114\ 877\ 834\ 479 \cdot 10^4$
1	$4.559\ 414 \cdot 10^4$	$4.559\ 413\ 879\ 729 \cdot 10^4$	$3.018\ 541\ 281\ 910 \cdot 10^5$	$3.018\ 541\ 281\ 910 \cdot 10^5$
2	$4.996\ 370 \cdot 10^4$	$3.018\ 541\ 281\ 910 \cdot 10^5$	$1.806\ 947\ 255\ 600 \cdot 10^5$	$1.806\ 947\ 255\ 600 \cdot 10^5$
3	$5.421\ 360 \cdot 10^4$	$2.051\ 523\ 999\ 854 \cdot 10^5$	$1.359\ 244\ 863\ 515 \cdot 10^5$	$1.297\ 795\ 854\ 790 \cdot 10^5$
4	$5.830\ 726 \cdot 10^4$	$8.720\ 589\ 218\ 810 \cdot 10^4$	$1.163\ 496\ 269\ 997 \cdot 10^5$	$1.101\ 826\ 174\ 021 \cdot 10^5$
5	$6.221\ 545 \cdot 10^4$	$9.074\ 241\ 989\ 747 \cdot 10^4$	$1.074\ 151\ 889\ 285 \cdot 10^5$	$1.032\ 936\ 136\ 116 \cdot 10^5$
6	$6.591\ 599 \cdot 10^4$	$1.032\ 456\ 488\ 505 \cdot 10^5$	$1.034\ 564\ 538\ 627 \cdot 10^5$	$1.013\ 474\ 447\ 563 \cdot 10^5$
7	$6.939\ 333 \cdot 10^4$	$1.025\ 201\ 938\ 923 \cdot 10^5$	$1.018\ 351\ 267\ 311 \cdot 10^5$	$1.009\ 927\ 590\ 147 \cdot 10^5$
8	$7.263\ 789 \cdot 10^4$	$1.008\ 495\ 311\ 117 \cdot 10^5$	$1.012\ 445\ 529\ 468 \cdot 10^5$	$1.009\ 872\ 220\ 781 \cdot 10^5$
9	$7.564\ 538 \cdot 10^4$	$1.009\ 077\ 057\ 226 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 614\ 403\ 464 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 079\ 938\ 133 \cdot 10^5$
10	$7.841\ 602 \cdot 10^4$	$1.010\ 227\ 941\ 973 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 172\ 932\ 578 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 153\ 214\ 789 \cdot 10^5$
11	$8.095\ 384 \cdot 10^4$	$1.010\ 204\ 695\ 588 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 117\ 444\ 530 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 544\ 386 \cdot 10^5$
12	$8.326\ 588 \cdot 10^4$	$1.010\ 164\ 792\ 364 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 135\ 304\ 199 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 871\ 909 \cdot 10^5$
13	$8.536\ 159 \cdot 10^4$	$1.010\ 165\ 026\ 181 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 152\ 575\ 006 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 498\ 236 \cdot 10^5$
14	$8.725\ 217 \cdot 10^4$	$1.010\ 165\ 383\ 969 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 160\ 984\ 017 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 400\ 397 \cdot 10^5$
15	$8.895\ 003 \cdot 10^4$	$1.010\ 165\ 386\ 674 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 164\ 122\ 704 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 389\ 960 \cdot 10^5$
16	$9.046\ 835 \cdot 10^4$	$1.010\ 165\ 390\ 431 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 091\ 529 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 390\ 292 \cdot 10^5$
17	$9.182\ 068 \cdot 10^4$	$1.010\ 165\ 390\ 507 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 339\ 419 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 390\ 569 \cdot 10^5$
18	$9.302\ 057 \cdot 10^4$	$1.010\ 165\ 390\ 603 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 388\ 497 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 390\ 609 \cdot 10^5$
19	$9.408\ 137 \cdot 10^4$	$1.010\ 165\ 390\ 607 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 393\ 632 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 390\ 611 \cdot 10^5$
20	$9.501\ 598 \cdot 10^4$	$1.010\ 165\ 390\ 610 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 392\ 321 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 390\ 611 \cdot 10^5$
Exact	$1.010\ 165 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 390\ 611 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 390\ 611 \cdot 10^5$	$1.010\ 165\ 390\ 611 \cdot 10^5$

TABLE VII. Selected coefficients $c_n^{(3)}$ of the renormalized weak coupling expansion (B6) as well as the corresponding ratios $\mathcal{C}_n^{(3)}$ defined by Eq. (B12).

n	$c_n^{(3)}$	$\mathcal{C}_n^{(3)}$
0	1.000 000 000	-0.49218
1	-3.333 333 333 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	-1.51799
2	-9.074 074 074 $\cdot 10^{-2}$	0.32773
3	3.451 646 091 $\cdot 10^{-1}$	0.34954
4	-3.064 808 585	0.44181
5	4.145 321 167 $\cdot 10^{+1}$	0.51354
6	-8.011 680 849 $\cdot 10^{+2}$	0.57041
7	2.103 995 759 $\cdot 10^{+04}$	0.61602
8	-7.225 346 394 $\cdot 10^{+05}$	0.65320
9	3.148 105 306 $\cdot 10^{+07}$	0.68398
10	-1.698 432 299 $\cdot 10^{+09}$	0.70986
11	1.112 192 278 $\cdot 10^{+11}$	0.73188
12	-8.693 791 326 $\cdot 10^{+12}$	0.75085
13	7.998 709 458 $\cdot 10^{+14}$	0.76734
14	-8.558 133 512 $\cdot 10^{+16}$	0.78181
15	1.053 809 185 $\cdot 10^{+19}$	0.79460
25	3.966 243 637 $\cdot 10^{+42}$	0.87072
50	-8.551 437 639 $\cdot 10^{+114}$	0.93301
75	4.053 097 428 $\cdot 10^{+198}$	0.95481
100	-4.540 614 326 $\cdot 10^{+289}$	0.96591
125	1.552 803 192 $\cdot 10^{+386}$	0.97263
150	-1.248 762 212 $\cdot 10^{+487}$	0.97714
175	4.338 412 567 $\cdot 10^{+591}$	0.98037
200	-1.952 374 463 $\cdot 10^{+699}$	0.98280
225	4.623 901 073 $\cdot 10^{+809}$	0.98470
250	-2.864 322 271 $\cdot 10^{+922}$	0.98622
275	2.654 720 800 $\cdot 10^{+1037}$	0.98746
300	-2.331 943 009 $\cdot 10^{+1154}$	0.98850

TABLE VIII. Infinite coupling limit k_3 of the sextic anharmonic oscillator. Convergence of the approximants $k_3^{(n,l)}$ defined by Eq. (B13) with the three highest possible values of $n \leq 299 - l$ for $0 \leq l \leq 12$.

l	n	$k_3^{(n,l)}$
0	297	1.144 802 453 797 051 992 831
	298	1.144 802 453 797 052 042 002
	299	1.144 802 453 797 052 088 337
1	296	1.144 802 453 797 052 586 551
	297	1.144 802 453 797 052 601 411
	298	1.144 802 453 797 052 615 225
2	295	1.144 802 453 797 052 759 384
	296	1.144 802 453 797 052 761 860
	297	1.144 802 453 797 052 764 077
3	294	1.144 802 453 797 052 783 941
	295	1.144 802 453 797 052 783 501
	296	1.144 802 453 797 052 783 043
4	293	1.144 802 453 797 052 775 728
	294	1.144 802 453 797 052 775 182
	295	1.144 802 453 797 052 774 657
5	292	1.144 802 453 797 052 767 958
	293	1.144 802 453 797 052 767 714
	294	1.144 802 453 797 052 767 482
6	291	1.144 802 453 797 052 764 644
	292	1.144 802 453 797 052 764 570
	293	1.144 802 453 797 052 764 501
7	290	1.144 802 453 797 052 763 692
	291	1.144 802 453 797 052 763 725
	292	1.144 802 453 797 052 763 758
8	289	1.144 802 453 797 052 765 158
	290	1.144 802 453 797 052 764 915
	291	1.144 802 453 797 052 764 334
9	288	1.144 802 453 797 052 746 941
	289	1.144 802 453 797 052 719 382
	290	1.144 802 453 797 052 727 384
10	287	1.144 802 453 797 049 918 777
	288	1.144 802 453 797 053 441 988
	289	1.144 802 453 797 055 805 549
11	286	1.144 802 453 797 422 201 710
	287	1.144 802 453 797 325 472 977
	288	1.144 802 453 796 999 625 608
12	285	1.144 802 453 789 565 166 506
	286	1.144 802 453 760 484 424 039
	287	1.144 802 453 769 883 065 332