

## Problem 1

Apologies in advance, I didn't figure out a convenient way to write the power laws on the plots themselves. So instead:

1. Runge Error power law is about  $n^3$
2.  $|x|$  error power law is about  $n^5$
3. Step error power law is about  $n^4$

## Problem 2

1.  $f(x) = x^8$

Since  $f(x)$  is a simple monomial of degree 8, our use of 5 quadrature points guarantees that we will get an exact solution for any number  $n$  of subdomains, since Gauss Quadrature is exact for polynomials up to order  $2N + 1$ , which is 11 even for  $n = 1$ . Therefore, there is no power law dependency.

2.  $f(x) = |x - 1/\sqrt{2}|^3$

The power law for this is about  $h^4$ . Thinking about possible polynomial representations of this function, this would need comparatively few basis functions to provide a decent approximation, but significantly more than  $x^8$ .

3.  $f(x) = H(x - 1/\sqrt{2})$

The power law for this is about  $h^2$  (splitting hairs here). This is because this function is highly nonlinear,

4.  $f(x) = 1/\sqrt{x}$  The power law for this is about  $\sqrt{h}$ . The error convergence is slow largely due to the singularity, which is difficult to capture with polynomial basis functions.

## Problem 3

### 1. Eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $\mathbf{T}_\alpha$

I ran out of time to figure this out properly other than investigating test cases on MATLAB. Sorry!

### 2. Positive Definite

Since  $\mathbf{T}_\alpha$  is symmetric, it will be positive definite if all of its eigenvalues are real and positive. From part (1) above, it's clear that the eigenvalues will all be positive if  $\alpha$  satisfies the following inequality:

$$\alpha > 2 \cos \left( \frac{j\pi}{n+1} \right)$$

In any finite case,  $\alpha = 2$  will always result in a positive definite matrix.

### 3. Convergence Factors and Iteration Ratio

(a) The convergence factor of any iteration scheme is defined as  $\rho(\mathbf{G}) = \max(|\lambda_i|)$ .

In this case, write

$$\mathbf{G} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & & & \\ & \frac{1}{2} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & & \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}_0$$

Giving that the convergence factor of the Jacobi scheme explicitly is

$$\rho(G)_J = \left| \cos \left( \frac{\pi}{n+1} \right) \right|$$

Since the convergence matrix's largest magnitude eigenvalue will be the one associated with  $j = 1$ .

(b) Observe from our convergence requirement:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{e}^n\|_2 &\leq \rho^n \|\mathbf{e}^0\|_2 \\ \implies n &\approx \frac{\log \epsilon}{\log \rho} \\ \implies \rho^n &\approx \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

We expect that  $2n_{GS} = n_J$  from class, thus we have that

$$\rho(G_{GS}) \approx \rho(G_J)^2 = \left| \cos \left( \frac{\pi}{n+1} \right) \right|^2$$

- (c) Based on discussions in class, we expect the ratio of number of Jacobi iterations to Gauss-Seidel iterations to be half for a given level of convergence.

#### 4. Implementation

- (a) I found
- (b) The convergence rates found here align with what I found earlier—Gauss-Seidel is twice as fast as Jacobi, and Jacobi is incredibly slow since I found earlier that  $\rho(G_J) \approx 0.9995$ .
- (c) I expect the convergence rate for an arbitrary vector will be the same.