

Ex11 – Report

Rafael Kueng

Some remarks:

- The first three plots are solutions for task1, 2 and 3; with  $N = 51$ , i.e.  $51 \times 51 = 2601$  grid points, and left run until the max change epsilon of a node in one run was  $< 10e-4$ . (run A)
- The 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> plots are with  $N=101$ , 10201 grid points, epsilon  $< 10e-6$  (run B)
- Plots 7,8 and 9 are done with low resolution ( $N = 21$ , 441 grid points) but high epsilon =  $10e-10$ .
- It seems like the numpy python gradient function has got a bug, as they look quite strange, whereas the values and the contours look ok.
- Statistics:
  - Run A: (runtime ~3min)
    - task1: Jacobi: 160, Seidel 81 steps
    - task2: Jacobi: 153, Seidel 78 steps
    - task2: Jacobi: 212, Seidel 153 steps
  - Run B: (runtime ~15min)
    - task1: Jacobi: 6070, Seidel 3036 steps
    - task2: Jacobi: 4682, Seidel 2364 steps
    - task2: Jacobi: 6892, Seidel 3840 steps
  - Run C: (runtime ~1min)
    - task1: Jacobi: 1246, Seidel 624 steps
    - task2: Jacobi: 1190, Seidel 601 steps
    - task2: Jacobi: 1278, Seidel 656 steps
- Comparing the results, one can say, for this problem, the resolution is not as important as the epsilon, but costs heavily CPU-time. ( $O^2$ ). Also for some reason the Gauss-Seidel algorithm takes around half as many steps to reach a certain precession as does Jacobi relaxation.

















