

Computational Physics  
Final Exam

---

Name: Rounak Chatterjee

Dept: DNAP

mail: Penrounak97@gmail.com

Rounak.chatterjee@tifr.res.in

1) Gauss Elimination with a Computer or only two floating point digit. Hence whenever there are more number of digits than permitted by the computer we will round it off via ~~norm~~  
standard rounding off rules.

Given  $Ax = b$ , where

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 4 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -3 \end{pmatrix}, b = \begin{pmatrix} 9 \\ -5 \\ -9 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

We can write the rectangular joint matrix  $(A|b)$  and apply row reduction followed by back substitution to solve the equation.

$$\therefore (A|b) =$$

$$\left( \begin{array}{ccc|c} 4 & 1 & 2 & 9 \\ 2 & 4 & -1 & -5 \\ 1 & 1 & -3 & -9 \end{array} \right)$$

$$R_1 \rightarrow R_1 / 4$$

$$\Rightarrow \left( \begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 0.25 & 0.5 & 2.25 \\ 2 & 4 & -1 & -5 \\ 1 & 1 & -3 & -9 \end{array} \right)$$

$$R_2 \rightarrow R_2 - 2R_1, R_3 \rightarrow R_3 - R_1$$

$$\Rightarrow \left( \begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 0.25 & 0.5 & 2.25 \\ 0 & 3.5 & -2.0 & -9.5 \\ 0 & 0.75 & -3.5 & 11.3 \end{array} \right)$$

$$R_2 \rightarrow R_2 - 0.5R_1$$

$$\Rightarrow \left( \begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 0.25 & 0.50 & 2.3 \\ 0 & 1 & -0.57 & -2.7 \\ 0 & 0.25 & -3.5 & -11.3 \end{array} \right)$$

$$R_3 \rightarrow R_3 - 0.75R_1$$

$$\Rightarrow \left( \begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 0.25 & 0.50 & 2.3 \\ 0 & 1 & -0.57 & -2.7 \\ 0 & 0.75 & -3.5 & -11.3 \end{array} \right)$$

$$\Rightarrow \left( \begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 0.25 & 0.50 & 2.3 \\ 0 & 1 & -0.57 & -2.7 \\ 0 & 0 & -3.1 & -9.2 \end{array} \right)$$

$$R_3 \rightarrow R_3 / -3.1$$

$$\Rightarrow \left( \begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 0.25 & 0.50 & 2.3 \\ 0 & 1 & -0.57 & -2.7 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 3.0 \end{array} \right)$$

Hence we do back substitution as,

$$x_3 = 3.0$$

$$x_2 - 0.57x_3 = -2.7$$

$$\Rightarrow x_2 = -2.7 + 0.57 \times 3.0$$

$$= -0.99$$

$$x_1 + 0.25x_2 + 0.5x_3 = 2.3$$
$$\Rightarrow x_4 = 2.3 - 0.25(-0.99) - 0.5(3.0)$$
$$\Rightarrow x_4 = 1.0$$

$$1. \quad \overline{(x_1, x_2, x_3)^T} = \overline{(1.0, -0.99, 3.0)^T}$$

(Ans)

This is the solution to the problem.

## ② Packages to Use.

Since I prefer using Python the most, I have made an attempt to quote the relevant python libraries useful for the following usages.

(a) For Fourier Transform the best package is `numpy.fft`, it can compute

1D  $\rightarrow$  `numpy.fft.fft` & `ifft`

2D  $\rightarrow$  `numpy.fft.rfftn` & `irfftn`

or nD  $\rightarrow$  `numpy.fft.fftn` & `ifftn`,

(b) Computing QR decomposition

`numpy.linalg.qr(matrix)`

is a function that can compute QR decomposition

(c) Million lognormal distributed number:

`numpy.random.lognormal(mean=0.0, sigma=1.0, size=1e6)`

d) Solving initial value problem using explicit Runge Kutta 8th order algorithm:

`scipy.integrate.DOP853()`.

We can also use

`scipy.integrate.solve_ivp()`

but we must give in parameter  
method = "DOP853" to make it  
solve using explicit RK8.

e) The singular value decomposition can be done by numpy method.  
numpy.linalg.svd(matrix)

f) To sample from a 548-dimensional PDF, we can do it by first sampling it from a standard normal and then using that distribution, we can sample other PDFs, the function is

numpy.random.Generator.multivariate\_normal().  
where we can input a 546 dimension mean to sample 546 dimensional random points.

g) Even though there is no explicit description of the fact that the ~~solve~~ following module uses Adaptive step size, but experience says that it does.  
The module is:

scipy.integrate.solve\_ivp()

Until dense = True is not set, the module computes an ODE using adaptive step control.

h) The package that can do this very easily is called

~~Sci~~ Scikit-monaco

The name of the function is,

Skmonaco.mcquad()

This can do a definite integral using uniform sampling based monte carlo on an n-dimensional function.

- i> To solve a coupled system of Boundary value problems, the package that we can use is:
- scipy.integrate.solve\_bvp().
- j> for a general 10x10 matrix, where eigen values ~~are to~~ and vectors are to be computed, we use the function.

numpy.linalg.eig()

3) If A is a bidiagonal Matrix and we're to solve the equation

$$An = b, \quad n = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^T \text{ and} \\ b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)^T$$

Plus to figure out the complexity, we must see that when we're executing a Gauss elimination procedure, then how many steps will be actually executing per pass step in the n-step loop.

Now  $A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & a_{32} & a_{33} & a_{34} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & a_{nn} \end{bmatrix}$

so if we were to solve Gauss elimination on this the conjugate Matrix will be written,

$$\left[ \begin{array}{cccc|c} a_{11} & a_{12} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & b_1 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} & \cdots & 0 & b_2 \\ 0 & a_{32} & a_{33} & a_{34} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & a_{n-1} & a_{nn} & b_n \end{array} \right]$$

step 1:  $R_p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{a_{11}}} R_1, \quad R_2 \rightarrow R_2 - a_{21} \cdot R_1$

which will yield

$$\left[ \begin{array}{cccc|c} 1 & a_{12}/a_{11} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & b_1/a_{11} \\ 0 & a_{22} - \frac{a_{21}}{a_{11}} a_{12} & a_{23} & \cdots & 0 & b_2 - \frac{b_1}{a_{11}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & a_{n-1} & a_{nn} & b_n \end{array} \right]$$

$$= \left[ \begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & a_{12}' & \dots & b_1' \\ 0 & a_{22}' & a_{23}' & 0 & b_2' \\ 0 & a_{32}' & a_{33}' & a_{34}' & b_3' \end{array} \right]$$

now if we take the next block and apply same steps as:

$$R_2 \rightarrow \frac{R_2}{a_{22}'}, \quad R_3 \rightarrow R_3 - a_{32}' R_2$$

we will again get.

$$\left[ \begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & a_{12}' & \dots & b_1' \\ 0 & a_{23}' & \dots & b_2' \\ 0 & a_{33}' & a_{34}' & b_3' \end{array} \right]$$

Now if we design the computer code / Algorithm to only consider the computation of ~~dividing~~ on non-zero elements, then we can easily follow that per ~~step~~ step we only need a fixed number of computations, for example for the  $i=1$  step we need 3 divisions and 3 multiplications and only ~~two~~ ~~one~~ 3 subtraction (because the element above  $a_{23}$  is zero so no computation needed).

In this way we need only  $9$  computation for  $(n-1)$  steps and only  $3$  computation for the last step which is just ~~this~~ three divisions to make the last diagonal element unity, so for these steps we need steps =  $9(n-1) + 3$   
 $= 9n - 6$  steps.

finally for back substitution we will have  
the last step as.

$$x_n = b_n$$

while other steps will have form

$$x_i + a_{i+1}^1 x_{i+1} = b_i^1 \quad (i=1, \dots, n-1)$$

$$\Rightarrow x_i = b_i^1 - a_{i+1}^1 x_{i+1}$$

which is two computations per step  
Do to tot computations

$$= 2(n-1)$$

thus tot no. of steps for tridiagonal  
matrix is:

$$5n-6 + 2n-2 = \cancel{9n-6} \quad 11n-8$$

If we write this in the  $O$ -notation  
then  $O(19n^8) \approx O(n)$ .

This shows that solution of a Tridiagonal Matrix is just an  $O(n)$  computation provided we design ~~any~~ computer algorithm to neglect any calculation that includes ~~a zero element~~ the elements that don't fall in the tridiagonal ~~and zero set~~.

~~Tridi~~  $Ax = b$  solve  $\Rightarrow O(n)$

process

4>e) To justify the above result, we will refer to Wiener Khinchin theorem. This theorem says that the power spectral density of a data distribution is equal to its averaged two point correlation function, we can write this as:

$$P(k) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\zeta \left[ \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2x} \int_{-x}^{x} d\eta R(x, x + \zeta) \right] \exp(-ik\zeta)$$

Where  $R(x, x + \zeta)$

$$= E [f_x(x) f_x(x + \zeta)]$$

where  $f_x(x)$  is a restricted function given as:

$$f_x(x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & x \leq x \\ 0, & x > x \end{cases}$$

This is done to make function follow Dirichlet criterion.

Now for our case  $f(n) = n$  and the process is isotropic.

Then we can write

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2N} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\eta_1 R(\eta_1, \eta_1 + \xi) = R(\xi)$$

and since  $R(\xi)$  is computed on a function  $f(n) = n$  over a uniform distribution it quite appears.

Let  $R(\xi) = 1$ .

Hence we will have

$$P(k) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dn R(\xi) e^{-ik\xi} d\xi$$

$$P(k) = 2\pi \delta(k)$$

This ~~process~~ immediate tells us that the power spectral density must be a delta function; and higher the number of samples, the power spectral density will be a dirac delta function, ~~which~~ centered around  $k=0$ , which justifies the result of the plot.

5> Even though there are no hard and fast criteria to choose from while deciding to use a software, there are a few points that I can come up with to categorize the softwares.

- (i) We must be well aware of the capabilities of the software and how much it's relevant to the kind of work we're seeking to undertake. Many softwares specialize in different categories and we must make sure to look for these specialities and consider them. For example if our scientific work needs image processing, MATLAB is a very powerful software with well established libraries that can do good image processing.
- (ii) The flexibility of the package is a very important factor to look into. Flexibility in the sense that how much compatible it is to handle

various kinds of data, its usage of its various modules, their ease of use and relevance etc; etc. A well documented and flexible library makes the scientific work easier making us invest lesser time in ~~exp~~ hardcore computation issues and maximizing our time investment on the physics at hand. One of the best example is Python, which due to its very flexible code structure is very easy to use and ~~oper~~ operate.

<iii> Precision of output → Some times scientific work require very precise data handling capabilities and large data handling capabilities also. ~~Then~~ we must examine whether the software handles precision, error propagation and mitigation upto an acceptable level. Also we must check whether the random number generators are random enough. All these go into deciding in the choice of the software. In recent years most software handle these very well.

<iv> ~~The one major point~~ ~~The last point~~ is the consideration of cost. Like every useful thing, the judgement boils down to the cost of the software also and more importantly the value for money.

> finally the major concerns come under the tag of speed and compatibility. Mostly a well debugged library made available for most common environments are desirable.

And also the fact that it has good enough algorithms that are optimized to get most effective speed of computation.

## 87. Justification of Solution.

Computationally we have obtained  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  but how do we deduce it's correct?

If we look closely at the equations

$$y_1' = 32y_1 + 66y_2 + 2/3n + 2/3 \rightarrow (1)$$

$$y_2' = -66y_1 - 133y_2 - y_3 n - 1/3 \rightarrow (2)$$

Multiplying 2 with eqn: (1) and adding with eqn (2)  $y_1$  yields:

$$2y_1' + y_2' = -2y_1 - y_2 + (n+1)$$

$$= (2y_1 + y_2)' + (2y_1 + y_2) = (n+1)$$

Let us denote  $y = 2y_1 + y_2$

$$\Rightarrow y' + y = (n+1)$$

This is a linear ODE in  $y$

$$\text{where } y(0) = 2y_1(0) + y_2(0)$$

$$= 2/3 + 1/3 = 1.$$

Using this we can find.

$$y(n) = \exp(-n) + n.$$

Now what we can do is plot

the sum of  $2y_1(n) + y_2(n)$  vs  $n$

computed numerically and compare

with  $y(n) = \exp(-n) + n$ .

A graph doing this thing is done in the code and one can very well observe that they match exactly telling us that the solution obtained is justified.

That's all for today. See you next time.

7) We know that a Linear congruential Pseudo Random number generator is given by the form

$x_0 \Rightarrow$  seed, then

$$x_{i+1} = (ax_i + c) \bmod m$$

where  $x_0 = \text{seed}$   $a = \text{multiplier}$

$c = \text{increment}$  and  $m = \text{modulus}$

This is a common method to generate random numbers provided the constants are chosen ~~such~~ well enough.

(a) For a chosen generator of type.

$$a=2, c=1, m=5, x_0=1$$

$$x_0 = 1$$

$$x_1 = (2 \cdot 1 + 1) \bmod 5 = 3 \bmod 5 = 3$$

$$x_2 = (2 \cdot 3 + 1) \bmod 5 = 7 \bmod 5 = 2$$

$$x_3 = (2 \cdot 2 + 1) \bmod 5 = 5 \bmod 5 = 0$$

$$x_4 = (2 \cdot 0 + 1) \bmod 5 = 1 \bmod 5 = 1 = x_0$$

Thus the sequence will go as:

$$\{1, 3, 2, 0, 1, \dots\}$$

This is an example of a congruential generator that repeats its seed after some time.

(b) One of the Best Congruential random generator used to produce pseudo random numbers have the following parameters  
 $x_0 = 1, a = 1103515245, c = 12345, m = 2^{31}$ . } → one way to think!

This is a very powerful pseudorandom no. of generator using congruential generator where the seed  $x_0 = 1$  hardly ever returns.

To depict its power we have written a python code that runs it for a sufficiently large number of iterations, to see if  $x_0 = 1$  was ever obtained back. Another way of thinking is that the congruent generator is locked in a constant loop such that it can never get out of it. In that case it will never come back. So we choose.

$$x_0 = 3, a = 2, c = 0, m = 6$$

$$\therefore x_0 = 3.$$

$$x_1 = 2 \cdot 3 \bmod 6 = 6 \bmod 6 = 0,$$

$$x_2 = 2 \cdot 0 \bmod 6 = 0 \bmod 6 = 0$$

The sequence goes as,

$$\{3, 0, 0, \dots\}$$

Thus the cycle is locked into a single cycle and it literally can never come back to its seed value  $x_0 = 3$ .