**Static Methods**

**Moving Mesh**

* Korteweg-de Vries
  + Example 1
    - Infrequent adaption
    - Mesh lags behind the wave front
    - Linear increase in error with time
  + Example 2
    - Frequent adaption
    - Increase in computation time
    - Mesh is able to keep up with the wave over the given time interval
    - However, there the error still experiences a linear (or quadratic?) increase with time
* Burgers
  + Example 1
    - infrequent adaption
    - high number of nodes yet still experiencing numerical oscillations when the two steep fronts combine (as shown in the error plot)
  + Example 2
    - Frequent adaption fixes the numerical oscillations
    - Increase in computation time
    - Error plot shows a minimal bump in error when the fronts combine
    - Effective node placement as we see very few have been used to approximate the flat regions

**Mesh Refinement**

* Burgers
  + Example 1
    - Infrequent adaption
    - Results in numerical oscillations similar to before
    - Error once again explodes when the fronts combine
  + Example 2
    - Frequent adaption
    - Steep fronts are approximated well until they combine
    - The constraints of the uniform base mesh mean we are using too many nodes to approximate the flat regions (unlike the moving mesh method)
    - Error plot shows us the two steep fronts are approximated well until they combine. The humps are an artefact of the steep front moving through the uniformly spaced base grid

**Dynamic Method**

* Burgers
  + The largest error is experienced after the very first step because of the initial uniform grid’s ineffective node placement
  + With a small number of nodes and infrequent adaption this method still performs the best.