

Download the file `LAB-DAY4.tgz` into a directory of your choice and unpack it using the tar command.

```
> tar -zxvf LAB-DAY4.tgz
```

It will create a directory `LAB-DAY4` containing three fortran90 files

```
> cd LAB-DAY4
> ls
harmonic.f90
numerical_derivative.f90
numerical_integration.f90
```

## NUMERICAL INTEGRATION

The code `numerical_integration.f90` is performing numerical integration by the rectangular rule for  $f(x) = \cos(x)$  between 0 and  $\pi/2$ . Compile the code

```
> gfortran numerical_integration.f90 -o num_int.x
```

Read the code and convince yourself that the code does what you would expect from it, or modify it as needed.

Run the code and reproduce the following table of integrated values and errors as a function of the number  $N$  of sub-intervals used; plot the error vs  $N$  on a log-log graph.

Integration: Rectangular rule

N	value	error
2	1.34076	0.34076
4	1.18347	0.18347
8	1.09496	0.09496
16	1.04828	0.04828
32	1.02434	0.02434



## Integration: Simpson's rule

N	value	error
2		
4		
8		
16		
32		
64		
128		
256		
512		
1024		

What happens when N becomes very large ( $N \approx 10^6 - 10^8$  or larger) ?

## NUMERICAL DIFFERENTIATION

Code `numerical_derivative.f90` implements the numerical derivative of  $f(x) = \cos(x)$  by the asymmetric discretization.

Choose a value of  $x$ .

Run the code for several discretization step between 0.1 and  $10^{-8}$ .

Plot the error in log-log scale and compare the behavior with the “theoretical” estimate.

### First derivative, asymmetric step

h	value	error
0.1		
0.05		
0.02		
0.01		
0.005		
0.002		
0.001		
0.0005		
0.0002		
0.0001		

Modify the code in order to implement the symmetric difference and the second derivative.

Repeat the error analysis and compare with the “theoretical” estimates.

### First derivative, symmetric step & 2<sup>nd</sup> derivative

h	value	error	value	error
0.1				
0.05				
0.02				
0.01				
0.005				
0.002				
0.001				
0.0005				
0.0002				



Does the solution decay exponentially at large value of  $x$  ?

Does the situation improve if you optimize the eigenvalue energy by bisection, and/or you improve the integration by reducing the discretization ?

optimize the eigenvalue ?      Yes/ No

improve discretization ?      Yes/No

Forget about normalization for now and verify how the eigenvalue estimates improve reducing the discretization....

h	n	# nodes	energy	error
0.1				
0.05				
0.02				
0.01				
0.005				
0.002				
0.001				
0.0005				
0.0002				
0.0001				

OK but what about normalization ? Why does the solution explodes ?

Focus on the classical forbidden region.

Express the general solution in term of two independent solutions, one exponentially decreasing and one exponentially increasing. What happens when, due to numerical error, the two solutions are mixed ?

Modify the code so as to use a **stable integration scheme** in the classical forbidden region. In this way you can obtain a normalizable solution.

Compare with the classical probability for the GS, the first few excited states and an high energy state.

Can you modify the code to implement the **Numerov's integration scheme** and verify the higher accuracy that can be obtained for a given discretization ?