In [1]:	Using matplotlib backend: nbAgg Populating the interactive namespace from numpy and matplotlib  1. (Spectral differentiation)
In [2]:	a)
	Arguments N: Total number of iterations uj: Samples of u(t) at j=0,1,,N  Return uprim: real part of the inverse fast fourier tansform of dk ''' #apply fft
	<pre>ucap=fft(uj) n=int((N-1)/2) #computing dk, j is complex dk1=[] dk2=[] for k in range(0,n+1):     dk_1=j*k*ucap[k]     dk1.append(dk_1) for k in range(-n,0):     dk_2=j*k*ucap[k]</pre>
	<pre>dk2.append(dk_2)  dk=dk1 + dk2 uprim=real(ifft(dk)) return uprim</pre> b)
In [3]:	<pre>tj6=zeros(N) for j in range(N): #for N odd     tj6[j]=(2*pi*j)/N  uj6=u(tj6) up63=uprime(uj6,N)</pre>
	<pre>print('Derivatives of u for N=63; \n', up63)  Derivatives of u for N=63; [ 0.00000000e+00 -3.60866539e-15   6.31593543e-14 -3.60910596e-15    2.70683129e-14 -1.44363285e-14 -2.34591887e-14 -2.88733064e-14    -2.52638371e-14 -8.43104723e-15 -9.11854707e-15   1.04925271e-14    5.78055075e-15 -2.58122714e-15   8.06537512e-15   4.02579294e-14    1.49068716e-14 -4.16863997e-14   1.33009658e-14   4.26662212e-15    -5.61338824e-14 -2.34037662e-14 -3.91931414e-14 -3.92958928e-17    2.03578888e-14 -1.87652639e-14   3.62120408e-14   1.44187154e-14    8.98496269e-15   1.50157260e-14   1.44863539e-14   2.93853640e-14</pre>
	4.29063870e-15 -6.83658983e-14 1.72336611e-14 2.29386014e-14 -1.44187154e-14 -2.48069734e-15 5.70312639e-14 1.64437694e-14 4.36828371e-15 -2.22923740e-14 2.75041507e-14 -4.38495255e-15 -6.54460285e-14 -1.33009658e-14 -2.65953773e-15 -3.81162005e-14 -1.90054935e-14 -9.58220386e-15 2.60530235e-14 3.53665648e-14 -1.72395057e-14 1.42086390e-14 8.43104723e-15 4.61894668e-15 -5.14487884e-14 9.30769158e-15 -9.46526093e-15 -1.64037132e-15 -3.16614468e-14 3.71192847e-14 5.90363166e-14]
In [4]:	<pre>N=127 tj1=zeros(N) for j in range(N): #for N odd     tj1[j]=(2*pi*j)/N  uj1=u(tj1) up127=uprime(uj1,N) print('Derivatives of u for N=127; \n', up127)</pre>
	Derivatives of u for N=127; [-2.36325395e-13 -1.89776454e-13 -2.80524510e-13 -1.28904761e-13 8.59365073e-14 -1.71873015e-13 -1.71873015e-13 0.00000000e+00 8.41461634e-14 -1.14582010e-13 -8.59365073e-14 -9.30978829e-14 -5.72910048e-14 -5.01296292e-14 1.79034390e-15 -1.60235779e-13 -4.78916994e-14 4.29682536e-14 -1.43227512e-14 1.14582010e-13 -5.72910048e-14 2.00518517e-13 0.00000000e+00 1.71873015e-13 -4.29682536e-14 -8.59365073e-14 -8.59365073e-14 -2.43486771e-13 0.000000000e+00 -1.14582010e-13 2.86455024e-13 -2.86455024e-14
	2.00518517e-13
	1.07420634e-13
In [5]:	4.29682536e-14 2.00518517e-13 0.00000000e+00 5.72910048e-14 1.14582010e-13 2.29164019e-13 1.71873015e-13]  Correct Derivatives
In [6]:	<pre>#for N=63 uexact=up(tj6) Error63=uexact-up63 #for N=127 uexact=up(tj1) Error127=uexact-up127  figure(1) plot(tj6,Error63) title('A graph of Error against tj, for n=63')</pre>
	ylabel('Error') xlabel('tj') show()  A graph of Error against tj, for n=63
	4- 2- ½ 0- -2-
	$\begin{bmatrix} -2 \\ -4 \\ -6 \end{bmatrix}$ $\begin{bmatrix} -8 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$ $\begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$ $\begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 5 \end{bmatrix}$ $\begin{bmatrix} 5 \\ 6 \end{bmatrix}$
In [7]:	
	A graph of Error against tj, for n=127
	2 -
	-6 -
In [8]:	h=(2*pi)/N  #computing N by N matrix DN  DN=zeros((N,N))  DN[N-1,N-2]=-1  DN[N-1,0]=1  for j in range(0,N-1):
In [9]:	<pre>for j in range(0, N-1):     DN[j,j]=0     DN[j,j-1]=-1     DN[j,j+1]=1     DN1=(1/(2*h))*DN     #computing DN*uj'     up=matmul(DN1, transpose(uj))     return(up)  #for N=63 N=63</pre>
	<pre>N=63 uapp6=uapp(uj6, N=63) print('Approximate derivative of uj, for N=63; \n',uapp6,'\n')  #for N=127 N=127 uapp1=uapp(uj1, N=127) print('Approximate derivative of uj, for N=127; \n',uapp1)  #error #for N=63</pre>
	<pre>uexact6=up(tj6) Error6=uexact6-uapp6  #for N=127 uexact1=up(tj1) Error1=uexact1-uapp1  Approximate derivative of uj, for N=63; [ 5.01250784   0.01540083  -4.99317052  -6.66339618  -5.30770166  -3.14863042  -1.46149004  -0.30287277   0.71881508   2.0499095   3.98021027   6.06030942   6.46601939   3.29546465  -2.23621873  -6.13047339  -6.36116917  -4.43375793</pre>
	-2.3955685 -0.95303551 0.096774 1.19076568 2.74915002 4.86487851 6.5620818 5.65627971 1.1596331 -4.19656497 -6.63318923 -5.71126031 -3.56112532 -1.74772102 -0.50920268 0.50357729 1.73974945 3.54982155 5.70096962 6.63580421 4.21968362 -1.12935048 -5.64109289 -6.56625587 -4.87664041 -2.75922485 -1.19754851 -0.10210447 0.94672966 2.38620215 4.42186932 6.35439095 6.14135661 2.26497653 -3.26914372 -6.45938719 -6.06912208 -3.99192094 -2.05856394 -0.72473361 0.29744382 1.45414808 3.13789248 5.2964482 6.662374 ]  Approximate derivative of uj, for N=127; [5.56900399 3.16495835 0.06865415 -3.04322287 -5.48747285 -6.84974493
	-7.09855327 -6.50149364 -5.44013237 -4.24873205 -3.13945557 -2.204089         -1.45146035 -0.846809 -0.33838753 0.12961866 0.61323502 1.16850764         1.84991198 2.70212055 3.7398339 4.91327319 6.06686103 6.91649777         7.08629984 6.23437267 4.24035002 1.35047642 -1.843853 -4.62476585         -6.44507176 -7.12019962 -6.81772676 -5.89663385 -4.72433886 -3.56511019         -2.55544658 -1.73221231 -1.0740489 -0.53376336 -0.05632186 0.41432879         0.93422655 1.55896793 2.33879011 3.30374027 4.43475676 5.62315762         6.63615156 7.12467825 6.71263767 5.16821612 2.58203844 -0.57624972         -3.60396953 -5.85299204 -6.98326578 -7.03500951 -6.31423461 -5.2035429         -4.01582527 -2.93726793 -2.03964252 -1.32022076 -0.73919751 -0.2433479
	0.22330076  0.71676614  1.29304141  2.00561002  2.89522458  3.96687061  5.15281647  6.272331  7.0173758  7.00592563  5.92482764  3.71921778  0.71291225  -2.45483192  -5.07735527  -6.67068409  -7.12791316  -6.67037408  -5.67194525  -4.48532319  -3.34886441  -2.37597814  -1.5886673  -0.95827886  -0.43504293  0.03656032  0.51257241  1.04904533  1.70113533  2.51663884  3.51857126  4.67337266  5.84956842  6.78835  7.12508037  6.49698332  4.72444817  1.97541901  -1.21573953  -4.1324941  -6.1724564  -7.07276362  -6.94034408  -6.11164467  -4.96430832  -3.78766155  -2.74255347  -1.88243621  -1.19455434  -0.63499842  -0.14947538  0.31805463  0.82361444  1.42306203  2.1684977  3.09583975  4.19885069  5.39013951  6.46310158  7.08779943  6.8819105 ]
In [10]:	<pre>plot(tj6,Error6) title('A graph of Error against tj, for n=63') ylabel('Error') xlabel('tj') show()</pre>
	0.8 - 0.6 - 0.4 - 0.2 - 0.2 - 0.2 - 0.8 - 0.8 - 0.9 -
	覧 0.0 - -0.2 - -0.4 - -0.6 -
In [11]:	<pre>plot(tj1,Error1) title('A graph of Error against tj, for n=127') ylabel('Error') xlabel('tj')</pre>
	A graph of Error against tj, for n=127  0.20 -  0.15 -
	0.10 - 0.05 -
	-0.10 -
	-0.15 -
	According to both results, Fourier is more accurate than the centered second order accurate difference formula, because Fourier depicts almost the actual figure for the error between the first correct derivatives and the approximated unlike the centered one. In fourier the amplitudes of the oscillations are almost the same, which nearly depicts the sunisoidal nature of the error, nearing to simple hamonic motion unlike the centered one. The amplitude of Oscillation in fourier are large to almost dividing it by 10 to obatin that in the centered approximation, meaning that the oscillations amplitude in fourier are uniform, while in centered they increase and suddenly decrease and vice versa, making predictions difficult.  For both methods, when N is increased from 63 to 127, the curves smoothen, meaning the bigger the N the better the results. However, in fourier the amplitudes of the oscillations remain constant even if N changes, but in Centered, the amplitude Drops with increasing N, and my a big magnitude.
In [12]:	According to both results, Fourier is more accurate than the centered second order accurate difference formula, because Fourier depicts almost the actual figure for the error between the first correct derivatives and the approximated unlike the centered one. In fourier the amplitudes of the oscillations are almost the same, which nearly depicts the sunisoidal nature of the error, nearing to simple hamonic motion unlike the centered one. The amplitude of Oscillation in fourier are large to almost dividing it by 10 to obatin that in the centered approximation, meaning that the oscillations amplitude in fourier are uniform, while in centered they increase and suddenly decrease and vice versa, making predictions difficult.  For both methods, when N is increased from 63 to 127, the curves smoothen, meaning the bigger the N the better the results. However, in fourier the amplitudes of the oscillations remain constant even if N changes, but in Centered, the amplitude Drops with increasing N, and my a big magnitude.  2. (Discrete convolution)  Computing b using fft
In [12]:	According to both results, Fourier is more accurate than the centered second order accurate difference formula, because Fourier depicts almost the actual figure for the error between the first correct derivatives and the approximated unlike the centered one. In fourier the amplitudes of the oscillations are almost the same, which nearly depicts the sunisoidal nature of the error, nearing to simple hamonic motion unlike the centered one. The amplitude of Oscillation in fourier are large to almost dividing it by 10 to obatin that in the centered approximation, meaning that the oscillations amplitude in fourier are uniform, while in centered they increase and suddenly decrease and vice versa, making predictions difficult.  For both methods, when N is increased from 63 to 127, the curves smoothen, meaning the bigger the N the better the results. However, in fourier the amplitudes of the oscillations remain constant even if N changes, but in Centered, the amplitude Drops with increasing N, and my a big magnitude.  2. (Discrete convolution)  Computing b using fft  N=64; sig=0.1  #functions  def a(t):     return((1/(sig*sqrt(2*pi)))*(exp((-0.5*(t**2))/sig**2)))  def x(t):     return((1+0.95*cos(16*t))*cos(2*t)  #computing tl tl=zeros(N)  for 1 in range(N):     t[t]=p+t ((2*pi*1)/N)  #compute the DFTs of a and x  acap=fft(a(t1))  #compute the DFTs of a and x  acap=fft(x(t1))
In [12]:	d)  According to both results, Fourier is more accurate than the centered second order accurate difference formula, because Fourier depicts almost the actual figure for the error between the first correct derivatives and the approximated unlike the centered one. In fourier the amplitudes of the oscillations are indust the same, which nearly depicts the sunsoidal nature of the error, nearing to simple harmonic motion unlike the centered one. The amplitudes of Oscillation in fourier are large to almost dividing it by 30 to obtain that in the centered approximation, meaning that the oscillations amplitude in fourier are uniform, while in centered they increase and suddenly decrease and vice versa, making predictions difficult.  For both methods, when N is increased from 63 to 127, the curves smoothen, meaning the bigger the N the better the results. However, in fourier the amplitudes of the oscillations remain constant even if N changes, but in Centered, the amplitude Drops with increasing N, and my a big magnitude.  2. (Discrete convolution)  Computing b using fft  N=64; sig=0.1  #computing till=pi.*  #computing till=pi.*  #computing till=pi.*  #computing till=pi.*  #computing till=pi.*  #compute the DFTs of a and x acception beap beap=[]  for in in range(N):  =cil[1]=pi.*  #compute the inverse  bi=real(iffr(bcap))  #compute the inverse  bi=real(iffr(bcap))  =cap.append(acap[m] *xcap[m])  #compute the inverse  bi=real(iffr(bcap))  #cap.append(acap[m] *xcap[m])  #cap.append(acap[m] *xcap[m])  #cap.append(acap[m] *xcap[m])  #cap.append(acap[m] *xcap[m])  #cap.append(acap[m] *xcap
In [12]:	cd)  According to both results, Fourier is more accurate than the centered second order accurate difference formula, because Fourier depicts almost the accual figure for the error between the first correct derivatives and the approximated unlike the centered one. In fourier the amplitudes of the oscillations are almost the same, which nearly depicts the sunsoidal nature of the error, nearing to simple hamonic motion unlike the centered one. The amplitude of Oscillation in fourier are large to almost dividing it by 10 to obtain that in the centered approximation, meaning that the oscillations amplitude in fourier are uniform, while in centered they increase and suddenly decrease and vice versa, making predictions difficult.  For both methods, when N is increased from 63 to 127, the curves smoothen, meaning the bigger the N the better the results. However, in fourier the amplitudes of the oscillations remain constant even if N changes, but in Centered, the amplitude Drops with increasing N, and my a big magnitude.  2. (Discrete convolution)  Computing b using fft  N=64;sig=0.1  #functions  def a(t)  **cuttor(1/(sig*sqrt(2*pi)))**(exp((-0.5*(t**2))/sig**2)))  def x(t):  **eturn(1+6.85*cos(16*t))**cos(2*t)  #compute the DFTs of a and x  acap=fft(a(t1))  **cospate the DFTs of a and x  acap=fft(a(t1))  **cospate the Jinverse Df=real(ifft(bcap))  print(b=-,bf)  b=[1.03301958e+01 0.80119038e+00 9.88935564e+00 8.27648867e+00  7*.16313018e+00 5.88449569e+00 3.76493438e+00 5.983238e+00  2.3473416e-15 1.9832828e+00 3.76493438e+00 5.983238e+00
	cd)  According to both results, Fourier is more accurate than the centered second order accurate difference formula, because Fourier depicts almost the actual figure for the error between the first correct derivatives and the approximated unlike the centered one. In fourier the amplitudes of the contraction one among the state scalar to a scalar and a processing and a scalar and a processing and a scalar
	cd)  According to both results. Fourier is more accurate than the centered second order accurate difference formula, because Fourier depicts almost the actual figure for the error between the first correct derivatives and the approximated unlike the centered one. In fourier the antiquity of the actual figure for the error between the first correct derivatives and the approximated unlike the centered one. In fourier the amplitude of the conditions are windown the same, which many depicts the suitabilial nature of the ror, nearing to simple harmonic motion unlike the centered one. In fourier the amplitude of Cociliation in fourier are uniform, while in centered they increase and suiderly decrease and vice verse, naking predictions difficult.  For both methods, when N is increased from 63 to 127, the curves smoothen, meaning the bigger the N like better the results. However, in fourier the amplitude Drops with increasing N and finy a big magnitude.  2. (Discrete convolution)  Computing b using fft  N=64; sig=9.1  **Computing b using fft*  Computing b using ff6  **Computing b using ff6*  Computing b using ff6*
	c)  According to both results. Fourier is more accurate than the centered second order accurate difference formula. Because Fourier depressions the social figure for the error between the first correct delivatives and the approximated united the centered one. In fourier the complexion of the controllations are almost the social figure for the excitors and anticost the source. And for could design the second order of the controllation and anticost the source of the error, incurring to simple harvance, and approximation, reading on the excitorious and anticost the source are undorrow, while in centred they increase and sustediety decrease and view terms, miseing proclations distinct.  Per their hardlash, she this discussed from 65 in 327, fine access smoothers, morning the beigger the Life below the results. Movement of the angulatives of the coolisions remain constant event if in characters, the emplicate Drops with increasing N, and my sit day magnitude.  2. (Discrete convolution)  Computing b using fft   **Source of the convolution of the excitorious and my sit day magnitude.  **Source of the convolution of the excitorious and my sit day magnitude.  **Source of the convolution of the excitorious and my sit day in the control of the excitorious and my sit day in the convolution of the excitorious and my sit day in the control of the excitorious and my sit day in the convolution of the excitorious and my sit day in the convolution of the excitorious and my sit day in the convolution of the excitorious and my sit day in the convolution of the excitorious and my sit day in the excitorious and my sit day in the convolution of the excitorious and my sit day in the excitorious and my
In [13]:	c)  According to both results. Fourier's more accurate than the centered abound order accurate difference formula, because Fourier depotics about the united by the process of the process of the improvision of the improvisi
In [13]:	d)  According to both results. Florenis man accounts that he credited stacked cred account difference formus, because Fourier disposed almost the subtail byte for the embro for between the first corest devictives and the aground unlike the corelesed one. In facilities a minute the subtail byte for the embro for between the first corest devictives and the aground unlike the corelesed one. In facilities a minute the certified of the control and and the control and and an account on control the certified of the certified and an account of the certified and an account on the certified and account on the certified account on the certified and account on the certified and account on the certified and account on the certified account on the certified and account on the certified account on
In [13]:	d)  According bith remain, folder in row a come from the content improved of miscone different frontal accounts of the content
In [13]:	d)  According to both models, Fource is some accurate two the content councer and accurate which according the content of the
In [13]:	d)  According to with richial Forest is these outcome and the control control of the control of
In [13]:	d)  According to bell musts have in more accounts that the colored second core accounts of the booth come in the order of the colored data to be the colored colored to the colored to
In [13]:	d)  of the second special control where a second subministration of the second street of the
In [12]:  In [13]:  In [16]:	c)
In [14]:  In [16]:	comparing the control of the control of control of control of the control of control of the control of control of the control of control of control of the control of
In [14]:  In [16]:	d)  Amenia, a individual come in the agreement with commerciators and standard material and advantage in the form of the commerciators and the agreement of
In [13]: In [16]: Out [17]:	d)  where the control of the control
In [14]:  In [16]:	c)
In [13]: In [16]:  In [17]:	d)  Service of the control of the co
In [13]: In [16]:  In [17]:	c)  According to the control of the
In [13]:  In [16]:  In [17]:  Out [17]:	Columning the second se
In [13]: In [16]:  In [17]:	d)  Or any property of the second control of
In [13]:  In [16]:  In [20]:	d)  Activation of the following state of the second state of the s
In [13]: In [16]: Unt [17]: Out [18]:	d)  Computing b using fit  Computing b using
In [13]:  In [16]:  In [20]:	d)  Objection of the control of the
<pre>In [13]: In [16]: In [17]: Out [17]: Out [18]:</pre>	d)  Objection of the property

3. (Fast Solutions of tridingonal linear Systems) Show that row I of this Systems Simplistes to I Un (29 Cos (The) +b) Sin (Tile) = 5 fe Sin (Tile) The Alex "Solution from (40), at the Johnow mui-1 + bui + 9 mill= F, for fo=fn=ch=ches An J=1 940 + b4, +942 = f, , 40=0 but  $U_j = 2^{\frac{N-1}{2}} U_k Sin (Mik)$ The Draw of Up = 25 Un Sin (The) U2 2 2 2 Die Sin 2716) So then potting U, and Uz into 940+64, +942=4 24 \( \tag{The Sin (The)} + 29 \( \tag{Uhe Sin (271k)} = 2\) \( \frac{1}{14} \) \( \tag{Sin (71k)} \) The Che (bin (The) + on sin (27k) )= It in (The)

Then Trigonometry Sur 20= 2 suno cro Smalle 2 Smile Contile 2 ( b sin ( Tb) + 29 Costac) Sontac) = 5 fc Sin ( To)

 $\frac{N-1}{2} \operatorname{Che} \left[ 2a \operatorname{Co} \left[ \frac{7k}{N} \right] + b \right] \operatorname{Sin} \left[ \frac{71(N-1)}{N} \right] = \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \hat{f}_k \operatorname{Sin} \left( \frac{71(N+1)}{N} \right)$ D) from (a)

N-1

Ule (2000 (Me) +b) Sin (Mile) = Zin (Mile), 29(00 (MK)+6) Sin Tik (De = 2 [Sm (Tile)] fe Sinthile (29 Cos (TK) +6) (te 5 [Sin (Tile)] the
KEN (The we can conclude. About De hour - Chi (29 CO (TRC) fb) Ûr = Fc 1, Sme A the Equation, tem Z Sin Tick on both Sido Ok = fe, KZ1, --, N-1 29 CD (TE)+6 To Obtoin the solution to (10) De need to Obtain the values of U,

But U = glts Ji=1 and to get U; we used U, and

from dos So from (b)

The = fre From (9) of = 1 = 1 Sin (Tile) thou Uk = Ak 1 F Sin (Tik) 20, Cos (MK) + 6 in fourt (a) have have the value of Uj = 2 D Ule Sin (Tik) Us = 2 / F Si (Tick)

Note of the Sinthick

Read (Tick) + b Which's the Solution for (10), so with that we Uz AF Where A=1 is the limens of A = | 9 by -- 1 | 9 by -- 1 |

end f= ft J=N-1

4. Implicit 70 methods. e) Generalize the technique above to derive an Implicit, three point, fourth -order occurate FD formula for the following BVP: U" (x) + K2U(x) = f(x), a 6x66 - 0 Using form berg [1, 9.67], Equatrien 1 Can be L-1-12 4 -5/2 4/3 -1/2] 4 + k2 4 = f + O(h4) Differentiating @ both sides with respect to x twise, we obtain: u"(x1+ k24"(x)= f"(x), a < x < b Bosed on (13), we obtain 14[1-4 6-4 1]4+ K2[1-2 1]u= 12[1 -2 1]f +och2) ---- 0 Combining Equations & end 3 using horser Combina tron, we obterin  $(2) + \frac{h^2}{12}(3)$ This is the Same or, 12 [0 1-2 10] 4 + k2 [/2 5/6 /2] 4 = [1/2 5/6 1/2]f + O(L4) factoring out he on the best hand Side, we obtain 1 [1-2 1] Ut K2h2 [1 10 1] 4 ] = 1 [1 10 1] f + O(4)

Which simpletons fo

1 [1+(kh)2 -2+5(kh)2 1+kh22] U = 1 [1 10 1] f + O(4)

Which is an implicit, three point, fourth order

accurate FD formula, similar to equation (11)

6

```
%computing u using DST
N=100;
a=1;
b=-2;
h=pi/N;
j = [1:N-1];
xj=h*j;
f=(h^2)*tanh(4*sin(pi*j/N));
ft=transpose(f);
%Obtaining fcap
fcap=dst(ft);
%Obtaining ucap
uc=2*a*cos(pi*j/N) + b;
ucap=fcap./transpose(uc);
%obtaing u from ucap
u=idst(ucap);
fprintf('%10s %16.8e\n',u);
%ploting the solution of u
plot(xj,u,'*');
ylabel('u(x)');
xlabel('x');
title('A graph of u against x');
```

```
-4.375795e-02 -8.73925476e-02
-1.307843e-01
              -1.73821216e-01
-2.164010e-01 -2.58432845e-01
-2.998381e-01 -3.40549912e-01
-3.805122e-01 -4.19678848e-01
-4.580122e-01 -4.95481690e-01
-5.320629e-01 -5.67736156e-01
-6.024858e-01 -6.36299427e-01
-6.691670e-01 -7.01080751e-01
-7.320343e-01 -7.62022613e-01
-7.910417e-01 -8.19088438e-01
-8.461601e-01 -8.72254798e-01
-8.973707e-01 -9.21506537e-01
-9.446612e-01 -9.66833728e-01
-9.880235e-01 -1.00822978e+00
-1.027452e+00 -1.04569027e+00
-1.062944e+00
              -1.07921216e+00
-1.094495e+00
              -1.10879337e+00
-1.122106e+00 -1.13443243e+00
              -1.15612831e+00
-1.145773e+00
-1.165497e+00 -1.17388028e+00
-1.181277e+00 -1.18768782e+00
-1.193112e+00 -1.19755057e+00
-1.201003e+00
              -1.20346831e+00
-1.204948e+00
              -1.20544091e+00
-1.204948e+00 -1.20346831e+00
-1.201003e+00 -1.19755057e+00
-1.193112e+00 -1.18768782e+00
-1.181277e+00 -1.17388028e+00
-1.165497e+00 -1.15612831e+00
```

9/24/2020 No3

```
-1.145773e+00
             -1.13443243e+00
-1.122106e+00
              -1.10879337e+00
-1.094495e+00 -1.07921216e+00
-1.062944e+00
              -1.04569027e+00
-1.027452e+00
              -1.00822978e+00
-9.880235e-01
              -9.66833728e-01
-9.446612e-01
              -9.21506537e-01
-8.973707e-01
             -8.72254798e-01
-8.461601e-01 -8.19088438e-01
-7.910417e-01 -7.62022613e-01
-7.320343e-01 -7.01080751e-01
-6.691670e-01 -6.36299427e-01
-6.024858e-01 -5.67736156e-01
-5.320629e-01 -4.95481690e-01
-4.580122e-01 -4.19678848e-01
-3.805122e-01 -3.40549912e-01
-2.998381e-01 -2.58432845e-01
-2.164010e-01 -1.73821216e-01
-1.307843e-01 -8.73925476e-02
-4.375795e-02
```

Published with MATLAB® R2020a

9/26/2020 relative2

```
%Calculating relative two norm of the error in the approximate solution
l=[7:16];
h=1./(2.^{l});
k=150;
u0=1; u1=0;
L2Norm=zeros(10,1);
for ii=1:10
    N=1/h(ii);
    j = [1:N-1]';
    x=h(ii)*j;
    uaprox=numerical(k,h(ii),u0);
    uexact=u_ex(x,k);
    L2Norm(ii)=relat(uaprox,uexact);
end
loglog(h,L2Norm)
polyfit(log(h),log(L2Norm),1)
ylabel('L2Norm')
xlabel('h')
title('A graph of L2Norm against h')
fprintf('since the slope of the graph is 3.60697 which is approximately 4, hence the graph converges as <math>O(h^4)')
%exact solution
function uexact=u_ex(xj,k)
c=1/k^2;
uexact=c+(1-c)*cos(k*xj)-(c+(1-c)*cos(k))*(csc(k))*sin(k*xj);
%Numerical solution
function uaprox=numerical(k,h,u0)
%N=1000;
N=1/h;
j=[1:N-1]';
a=(1+(1/12)*(k*h)^2)/(h^2);
b=(-2+(5/6)*(k*h)^2)/(h^2);
xj=j/N;
f=zeros(N-1,1);
f(j)=1;
%boundary condition
f(1)=f(1) - a*u0;
%obtaining fcap
fcap=dst(f);
%Obtaining ucap
uc=2*a*cos(pi*j/N) + b;
ucap=fcap./uc;
%obtaing u from ucap
uaprox=idst(ucap);
end
%Relative two norm
function Re=relat(uaprox,uexact)
error = (uaprox - uexact).^2;
Re=sqrt(sum(error)/sum(uexact.^2));
end
```

```
ans = 3.6097 16.7657
```

9/26/2020 relative2

since the slope of the graph is 3.60697 which is approximately 4, hence the graph converges as  $0(h^4)$ 

Published with MATLAB® R2020a