

# Explanation to Wikipedia's Variation of Parameter

Vincent Tam

March 22, 2014

Wikipedia's explanation is too concise. [wiki12]

First, you have

$$y^{(n)}(x) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k(x) y^{(k)}(x) = b(x). \quad (\text{i})$$

Here,  $y$  means the general solution of (i).

I just use the notations in Wikipedia: For  $i$  between 1 and  $n$ , inclusive,  $y_i$  is the solution of the homogenous equation

$$y_i^{(n)}(x) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k(x) y_i^{(k)}(x) = 0. \quad (\text{ii})$$

Unlike Wikipedia, in equation (ii), the  $i$  under the summation sign is changed to  $k$  so as to avoid confusion of symbols. In other words, **we use  $i$  to represent  $c_i(x)$  and  $y_i(x)$ , while using  $k$  to represent the coefficient of the terms in (i) (i.e.  $a_k(x)$ ) and the derivatives of  $y_i(x)$  of different orders. (i.e.  $y_i^{(k)}(x)$**  Let  $y_p$  be the particular solution for the non-homogeneous ODE.

We make an educated guess like this:

$$\boxed{y_p(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x) y_i(x)} \quad (\text{iii})$$

where  $c_i(x)$  is a differentiable function for each  $i$ .

By doing so, we have created  $n$  unknowns (that is,  $c_i(x), i = 1, \dots, n$ ), and they are also known as *freedom*. We may make use of the freedom like this:

$$y_p'(x) = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c_i'(x) y_i(x) \right] + \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x) y_i'(x) \right] \quad (\text{iv})$$

Continuing the differentiation gives complicated expression, so we use our freedom to give some restrictions on  $c_i(x), i = 1, \dots, n$ . i.e. We set

$$\boxed{\sum_{i=1}^n c'_i(x) y_i(x) = 0} \quad (\text{v})$$

Why is there such a condition? It is because we want to simplify (iv) by ruling out *something*. (i.e. setting something to zero) What is *something*?

1.  $y_i(x) = 0$  or  $y'_i(x) = 0$  or  $c_i(x) = 0$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, n$

They are clearly unreasonable restrictions.

2.  $c'_i(x) = 0$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, n$

Then  $c_i(x)$  is a constant function for each  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . In other words,  $y_p(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x) y_i(x)$  is just linear combinations of  $y_i(x)$ . Remembering that  $y_i(x)$  are denoted as the solution of (ii), we conclude that this restriction can't be accepted.

Being too "strong", the above guesses fails. Thus, what we need to rule out is *either* one of the middle bracket in (iv). Why *must* it be the first one?

Otherwise assume that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x) y'_i(x) = 0, \quad (\text{vi})$$

which leads us to

$$y'_p(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c'_i(x) y_i(x) \quad (\text{vii})$$

Continue the above process of differentiating  $y_p(x)$ .

$$y''_p(x) = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c''_i(x) y_i(x) \right] + \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c'_i(x) y'_i(x) \right] \quad (\text{viii})$$

Making assumptions similar to (vi), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c'_i(x) y'_i(x) = 0; \text{ and} \quad (\text{ix})$$

$$y''_p(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c''_i(x) y_i(x) \quad (\text{x})$$

From (vi) and (ix), we know that if we carry out the process repeatedly, we get a system of "linear" equations with "unknowns"  $y'_i(x)$  (which is actually known

since  $y_i(x)$  have been found out from (ii).) The most insensible thing of this “system” is the “coefficient matrix” with entries  $c_i^{(k)}$  on the  $k$ -th row and the  $i$ -th column. For the sake of clarity, the “system” is illustrated below.

$$\begin{cases} c_1(x)y_1'(x) + c_2(x)y_2'(x) + \dots + c_n(x)y_n'(x) &= 0 \\ c_1'(x)y_1'(x) + c_2'(x)y_2'(x) + \dots + c_n'(x)y_n'(x) &= 0 \\ \vdots & \\ c_1^{(k)}(x)y_1'(x) + c_2^{(k)}(x)y_2'(x) + \dots + c_n^{(k)}(x)y_n'(x) &= 0 \end{cases} \quad (*)$$

We don't care about the range of  $k$  such that the R.H.S. of the last equation in the above system is zero, as well as the missing equation which can be yielded after substituting  $y_p^{(k)}(x)$  (for example, equations (vii) and (x)) into (i)

Therefore, equations (vi) to (\*) are all *wrong*. Instead, we should have

$$\boxed{y_p'(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x)y_i'(x)} \quad (\text{xi})$$

$$y_p''(x) = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c_i'(x)y_i'(x) \right] + \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x)y_i''(x) \right] \quad (\text{xii})$$

Again, we set

$$\boxed{\sum_{i=1}^n c_i'(x)y_i'(x) = 0} \quad (\text{xiii})$$

so that

$$\boxed{y_p''(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x)y_i''(x)}. \quad (\text{xiv})$$

For each  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ , we have

$$\boxed{\sum_{i=1}^n c_i'(x)y_i^{(k-1)}(x) = 0} \quad (\text{xv})$$

and

$$\boxed{y_p^{(k)}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x)y_i^{(k)}(x)}. \quad (\text{xvi})$$

Why *can't* we apply (xv) and (xvi) to the case of  $k = n$ ?  
Differentiating (xvi) with respect to  $x$ , we get

$$y_p^{(n)}(x) = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c_i'(x)y_i^{(n-1)}(x) \right] + \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x)y_i^{(n)}(x) \right] \quad (\text{xvii})$$

Recall from (i) that we have

$$y_p^{(n)}(x) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k(x) y_p^{(k)}(x) = b(x). \quad (\text{xviii})$$

Substitute (xvi) and (xvii) into (xviii),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c'_i(x) y_i^{(n-1)}(x) \right] + \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x) y_i^{(n)}(x) \right] + \\ & \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k(x) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x) y_i^{(k)}(x) \right] \right\} = b(x). \\ & \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c'_i(x) y_i^{(n-1)}(x) \right] + \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x) y_i^{(n)}(x) \right] + \\ & \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x) \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k(x) y_i^{(k)}(x) \right] \right\} = b(x). \\ & \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c'_i(x) y_i^{(n-1)}(x) \right] + \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x) \left[ y_i^{(n)} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k(x) y_i^{(k)}(x) \right] \right\} = b(x) \\ & \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c'_i(x) y_i^{(n-1)}(x) \right] + \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x) (0) \right] = b(x) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\boxed{\sum_{i=1}^n c'_i(x) y_i^{(n-1)}(x) = 0} \quad (\text{xix})$$

From equations (xv) and (xix),

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{llll} c'_1(x) y_1(x) + c'_2(x) y_2(x) & + \dots + c'_n(x) y_n(x) & = 0 \\ c'_1(x) y'_1(x) + c'_2(x) y'_2(x) & + \dots + c'_n(x) y'_n(x) & = 0 \\ \vdots & & & \\ c'_1(x) y_1^{(n-1)}(x) + c'_2(x) y_2^{(n-1)}(x) & + \dots + c'_n(x) y_n^{(n-1)}(x) & = 0 \\ c'_1(x) y_1^{(n)}(x) + c'_2(x) y_2^{(n)}(x) & + \dots + c'_n(x) y_n^{(n)}(x) & = b(x) \end{array} \right. \quad (\heartsuit)$$

By Cramer's Rule,

$$c'_i(x) = \frac{W_i(x)}{W(x)},$$

where  $W(x)$  is the Wronskian of  $y_i(x)$  and  $W_i(x)$  is the determinant of replacing the  $i$ -th column of  $W(x)$  by  $(0, 0, \dots, 0, b(x))$ . Hence,

$$c_i(x) = \int \frac{W_i(x)}{W(x)} dx. \quad (\text{xx})$$

Substitute (xx) into (iii),

$$y_p(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i(x) \int \frac{W_i(x)}{W(x)} dx$$

## References

- [wiki12] Variation of Parameters. (n.d.). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved October 26, 2013, from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Variation\\_of\\_parameters](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Variation_of_parameters)