LEON Q. BRIN

Tea Time Numerical Analysis

Experiences in Mathematics

SOUTHERN
CONNECTICUT
STATE
UNIVERSITY

Contents

Preface

About Tea Time Numerical Analysis

Thank you for giving *Tea Time Numerical Analysis* a read. This textbook was born out of a desire to contribute a viable, complete, and completely free, Numerical Analysis textbook for instructors and students of mathematics. When this project began (summer 2012), there were traditionally published (very expensive hardcover) textbooks, notably the excellent *Numerical Analysis* by Burden and Faires, which was in its ninth edition. As you might guess by the number of editions, this text is a classic. It is one of very few numerical analysis texts geared for the mathematician, not the scientist or engineer. In fact, I studied from an early edition in the mid 1990's! And there were a couple of freely available websites, notably the popular http://nm.mathforcollege.com/, complete with video lectures. However, no resource I could find included a complete, single-pdf downloadable textbook designed for mathematics classes. To be just that is the ultimate goal of *Tea Time Numerical Analysis*.

I should apologize up front for the lack of conformance to the typical format of a college textbook, however. The phrase "tea time" is meant to do more than give the book a catchy title. It is meant to describe the general nature of the discourse within. Much of the material will be presented as if it were being told to a student during tea time at University, but with the benefit of careful planning. There will be no big blue boxes highlighting the main points, no stream of examples after a short introduction to a topic, and no theorem-proof theorem-proof structure. Instead, the necessary terms and definitions and theorems and examples will be woven into a more conversational style. My hope is that this blend of formal and informal mathematics will be easier to digest, and dare I say, students will be more invited to do their reading in this format. The content is meant to help guide the student's thoughts through the mathematics.

In an effort to avoid completely alienating those who enjoy a more typical presentation, there will be a summary of the key concepts at the end of each conversation, and a number of the exercises will be solved in complete detail in the appendix. So, one can get a closer-to-typical presentation by reading the key concepts and then skipping to the exercises with solutions, bypassing the discourse altogether! I hope most readers won't choose to do so, but it is an option. I should add, though, that this may be the preferred means of use by instructors. In any case, the exercises with solutions will be critical reading for most, despite their location in the back of the book. Learning by example is often the most effective means, so readers are strongly encouraged to read the exercises with solutions, contemplate their solutions, and then turn to the back of the book for full disclosure of the solutions. The hope is that readers will be more apt to consider solving the exercises on their own before looking at the solutions. Their placement in the appendix is only for this purpose—not to imply that they are of secondary importance.

The topical coverage in *Tea Time Numerical Analysis* will be fairly typical. The book starts with an introductory chapter, followed by root finding methods, followed by interpolation, and finally numerical calculus. This covers what, at SCSU, constitutes a first semester course on numerical analysis. Future efforts may add chapters on linear algebra and differential equations, making it a full year course. As this book is intended for use as a free download or an inexpensive print-on-demand volume, no effort has been made to keep the page count low or to spare copious diagrams and colors. In fact, I have taken the inexpensive mode of delivery as liberty to do quite the opposite. I have added many passages and diagrams that are not strictly necessary for the study of numerical analysis, but are at least peripherally related, and may be of interest to some readers. Most of these passages will be presented as digressions, so they will be easy to identify. For example, Taylor's Theorem plays such a central role in the subject that not only its statement is presented. Its proof and a bit of history are added as "gory details". Of course

they can be skipped, but are included to provide a more complete understanding of this fundamental theorem of numerical analysis. For another example, as a fan of dynamical systems, I found it impossible to refrain from including a section on visualizing Newton's Method. The powerful and beautiful pictures of Newton's Method as a dynamical system should be eyebrow-raising and question-provoking even if only tangentially important. There are, of course, other examples of somewhat atypical content, but each is there to enhance the reader's understanding or appreciation of the subject, even if the material is not strictly necessary for an introductory study of numerical analysis.

Along the way, implementation of the numerical methods in the form of computer code will also be discussed. While one could simply ignore the programming sections and exercises and still get something out of this text, it is my firm belief that full appreciation for the content can not be achieved without getting your hands dirty and doing some programming. It would be nice if readers have had at least some minimal exposure to programming whether it be Java, or C, or even web programming. But I have made every effort to give a complete introduction to Octave programming, so even those who have never written even a one-line program will be able to participate in this part of the study.

GNU Octave was chosen as the programming language for two reasons. First, MATLAB is perhaps the most widely used and best known language for numerical computation. GNU Octave (Octave for short) is a MATLAB clone. In this case, the clone has an extreme advantage over the original. MATLAB is far from free in any sense of the word. Octave is offered freely to anyone and everyone (http://www.gnu.org/software/octave/). It is free to download and use. Its source code is free to download and study. And anyone is welcome to modify or add to the code if so inclined.

Though it is easy to produce GNU Octave programs that will not run in MATLAB, by design nearly any program written in MATLAB will run in Octave without modification. In order to maintain both a MATLAB-compatible presentation and a free computing experience, I have made considerable effort to ensure that every line of Octave in this book will run verbatim under MATLAB. Even with this earnest effort, it is possible that some of the code will not run under MATLAB. I'd be happy to hear if you find such an instance! Please let me know.

As it is expected that most readers will use Octave for all programming in the course, there are subsections dedicated to programming and, in particular, Octave. There are also numerous exercises where Octave is required or highly recommended, each marked with the Octave logo, .

I hope you enjoy your reading of *Tea Time Numerical Analysis*. It was my pleasure to write it. Feedback is always welcome.

<div style="text-align: right">

Leon Q. Brin
brinl1@southernct.edu

</div>

How to Use the text

How to Get Octave

Where to Get the Code

Acknowledgments

Preliminaries

1.1 Accuracy

Measuring Error

Numerical methods are designed to approximate one thing or another. Sometimes roots, sometimes derivatives or definite integrals, or curves, or solutions of differential equations. As numerical methods produce only approximations to these things, it is important to have some idea how accurate they are. Sometimes accuracy comes down to careful algebraic analysis—sometimes careful analysis of the calculus, and often careful analysis of Taylor polynomials. But before we can tackle those details, we should discuss just how error, and therefore accuracy, is measured.

There are two basic measurements of accuracy: absolute error and relative error. Suppose that p is the value we are approximating, and $\tilde{p}$ is an approximation of p. Then $\tilde{p}$ misses the mark by exactly the quantity $\tilde{p} - p$, the so-called error. Of course, $\tilde{p} - p$ will be negative when $\tilde{p}$ misses low. That is, when the approximation $\tilde{p}$ is less than the exact value p. On the other hand, $\tilde{p} - p$ will be positive when $\tilde{p}$ misses high. But generally, we are not concerned with whether our approximation is too high or too low. We just want to know how far off it is. Thus, we most often talk about the absolute error, $|\tilde{p} - p|$. You might recognize the expression $|\tilde{p} - p|$ as the distance between $\tilde{p}$ and p, and that's not a bad way to think about absolute error.

The absolute error in approximating $p = \pi$ by the rational number $\tilde{p} = \frac{22}{7}$ is $|\frac{22}{7} - \pi| \approx 0.00126$. The absolute error in approximating π^5 by the rational number $\frac{16525}{54}$ is $|\frac{16525}{54} - \pi| \approx 0.00116$. The absolute errors in these two approximations are nearly equal. To make the point more transparent, $\pi \approx 3.14159$ and $\frac{22}{7} \approx 3.14285$ while $\pi^5 \approx 306.01968$ and $\frac{16525}{54} \approx 306.01851$. Each approximation begins to differ from its respective exact value in the thousandths place. And each is off by only 1 in the thousandths place.

But there is something more going on here. π is near 3 while π^5 is near 300. To approximate π accurate to the nearest one hundredth requires the approximation to agree with the exact value in only 3 place values—the ones, tenths, and hundredths. To approximate π^5 accurate to the nearest one hundredth requires the approximation to agree with the exact value in 5 place values—the hundreds, tens, ones, tenths, and hundredths. To use more scientific language, we say that $\frac{22}{7}$ approximates π accurate to 3 significant digits while $\frac{16525}{54}$ approximates π^5 accurate to 5 significant digits. Therein lies the essence of relative errors—weighing the absolute error against the magnitude of the number being approximated. This is done by computing the ratio of the error to the exact value. Hence the relative error in approximating π by $\frac{22}{7}$ is $\dfrac{|\frac{22}{7} - \pi|}{|\pi|} \approx 4.02(10)^{-4}$ while the relative error in approximating π^5 by $\frac{16525}{54}$ is $\dfrac{|\frac{16525}{54} - \pi^5|}{|\pi^5|} \approx 3.81(10)^{-6}$. The relative errors differ by a factor of about 100 (equivalent to about two significant digits of accuracy) even though the absolute errors are nearly equal. In general, the relative error in approximating p by $\tilde{p}$ is given by $\dfrac{|\tilde{p} - p|}{|p|}$.

Sources of Error

There are two general categories of error. Algorithmic error and floating-point error. Algorithmic error is any error due to the approximation method itself. That is, these errors are unavoidable even if we do exact

calculations at every step. Floating-point error is error due to the fact that computers and calculators generally do not do exact arithmetic, but rather do floating-point arithmetic.

Crumpet 1: IEEE Standard 754

Floating-point values are stored in binary. According to the IEEE Standard 754, which most computers use, the mantissa (or significand) is stored using 52 bits, or binary places. Since the leading bit is always assumed to be 1 (and therefore not actually stored), each floating point number is represented using 53 consecutive binary place values. Now let's consider how 1/7 is represented exactly. In binary, one seventh is equal to $0.001001001\ldots$ because $\frac{1}{7} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-3i} = \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{64} + \frac{1}{512} + \cdots$. To see that this is true, remember from calculus that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-3i} &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(2^{-3}\right)^i \\
&= \frac{2^{-3}}{1 - 2^{-3}} \\
&= \frac{1/8}{7/8} \\
&= \frac{1}{7}.
\end{aligned}
$$

But in IEEE Standard 754, $\frac{1}{7}$ is chopped to

$$1.0010010010010010010010010010010010010010010010010010 \times (2)^{-3}$$

or $\sum_{i=1}^{18} 2^{-3i}$ which is exactly $\frac{2573485501354569}{18014398509481984}$. The floating point error in calculating 1/7 is therefore

$$
\left| \frac{2573485501354569}{18014398509481984} - \frac{1}{7} \right| = \frac{1}{126100789566373888} \approx 7.93(10)^{-18}.
$$

References

IEEE-754 Analysis, http://babbage.cs.qc.cuny.edu/IEEE-754/.

   What Every Computer Scientist Should Know About Floating-Point Arithmetic, David Goldberg, http://docs.oracle.com/cd/E19957-01/806-3568/ncg_goldberg.html.

In floating-point arithmetic, a calculator or computer typically stores its values with about 16 significant digits. For example, in a typical computer or calculator (using double precision arithmetic), the number $\frac{1}{7}$ is stored as about 0.1428571428571428 while the exact value is $0.1428571428571428\ldots$. In the exact value, the pattern of 142857 repeats without cease while in the floating point value, the repetition ceases after the third 8. The value is chopped to 16 decimal places in the floating-point representation. So the floating point error in calculating 1/7 is around $5(10)^{-17}$. I say "around" or "about" in this discussion because these claims are not precisely true, but the point is made. There is a small error in representing 1/7 as a floating point real number. And the same is true about all real numbers save a finite set.

Yes, there is some error in the floating-point representation of real numbers, but it is always small in comparison to the size of the real number being represented. The relative error is around 10^{-17}, so it may seem that the consideration of floating-point error is strictly an academic exercise. After all, what's an error of $7.93(10)^{-18}$ among friends? Is anyone going to be upset if they are sold a ring that is .1428571428571284921 inches wide when it should be .14285714285714285714 inches wide? Clearly not. But it is not only the error in a single calculation (sum, difference, product, or quotient) that you should be worried about. Numerical methods require dozens, thousands, and even millions of computations. Small errors can be compounded. Try the following experiment.

Experiment 1

Use your calculator or computer to calculate the numbers $p_0, p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_7$ as prescribed here:

- $p_0 = \pi$

- $p_1 = 10p_0 - 31$

- $p_2 = 100p_1 - 41$

- $p_3 = 100p_2 - 59$

- $p_4 = 100p_3 - 26$

- $p_5 = 100p_4 - 53$

- $p_6 = 100p_5 - 58$

- $p_7 = 100p_6 - 97$

According to your calculator or computer, p_7 is probably something like one of these:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
0.93116 & \text{(Octave)} \\
.9311599796346854 & \text{(Maxima)} \\
1 & \text{(CASIO } fx\text{-115ES)}
\end{array}
$$

However, a little algebra will show that $p_7 = 10000000000000\pi - 31415926535897$ exactly (which is approximately 0.932384). Even though p_0 is a very accurate approximation of π, after just a few (carefully selected) computations, round-off error has caused p_7 to have only one or two significant digits of accuracy!

This experiment serves to highlight the most important cause of floating-point error: subtraction of nearly equal numbers. We repeatedly subtract numbers whose tens and ones digits agree. Their two leading significant digits match. For example, $10\pi - 31 = 31.415926\ldots - 31$. 10π is held accurate to about 16 digits (31.41592653589793) but $10\pi - 31$ is held accurate to only 14 significant digits (0.41592653589793). Each subsequent subtraction decreases the accuracy by two more significant digits. Indeed, p_7 is represented with only 2 significant digits. We have repeatedly subtracted nearly equal numbers. Each time, some accuracy is lost. The error grows.

In computations that don't involve the subtraction of nearly equal quantities, there is the concern of algorithmic error. For example, let $f(x) = \sin x$. Then one can prove from the definition of derivative that

$$
f'(1) = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{\sin(1+h) - \sin(1-h)}{2h}.
$$

Therefore, we should expect, in general, that $\tilde{p}(h) = \frac{\sin(1+h) - \sin(1-h)}{2h}$ is a good approximation of $f'(1)$ for small values of h; and that the smaller h is, the better the approximation is.

Experiment 2

Using a calculator or computer, compute $\tilde{p}(h)$ for $h = 10^{-2}$, $h = 10^{-3}$, and so on through $h = 10^{-7}$. Your results should be something like this:

h	$\tilde{p}^*(h)$
10^{-2}	0.5402933008747335
10^{-3}	0.5403022158176896
10^{-4}	0.5403023049677103
10^{-5}	0.5403023058569989
10^{-6}	0.5403023058958567
10^{-7}	0.5403023056738121

The second column is labeled $\tilde{p}^*(h)$ to indicate that the approximation $\tilde{p}(h)$ is calculated using approximate (floating-point) arithmetic, so it is technically an approximation of the approximation. Since $f'(1) = \cos(1) \approx .5403023058681398$, each approximation is indeed reasonably close to the exact value. Taking a closer look, though, there is something more to be said. First, the algorithmic error of $\tilde{p}(10^{-2})$ is

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{p}(10^{-2}) - f'(1)| &= \left| 50 \left(\sin\left(\frac{101}{100}\right) - \sin\left(\frac{99}{100}\right) \right) - \cos(1) \right| \\
&\approx 9.00(10)^{-6}
\end{aligned}
$$

accurate to three significant digits. That is, if we compute $\tilde{p}(10^{-2})$ using exact arithmetic, the value still misses $f'(1)$ by about $9(10)^{-6}$. The floating-point error is only how far the computed value of $\tilde{p}(10^{-2})$,

what we have labeled $\tilde{p}^*(10^{-2})$ in the table, deviates from the exact value of $\tilde{p}(10^{-2})$. That is, the floating-point error is given by $|\tilde{p}^* - \tilde{p}|$:

$$\left| 0.5402933008747335 - 50 \left(\sin \left(\frac{101}{100} \right) - \sin \left(\frac{99}{100} \right) \right) \right| \approx 1.58(10)^{-17},$$

as small as one could expect. The absolute error $|\tilde{p}^*(10^{-2}) - f'(1)| = |0.5402933008747335 - \cos(1)|$ is essentially all algorithmic. The round-off error is dwarfed by the algorithmic error. The fact that we have used floating-point arithmetic is negligible.

On the other hand, the algorithmic error of $\tilde{p}(10^{-7})$ is

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{p}(10^{-7}) - f'(1)| &= \left| 5000000 \left(\sin \left(\frac{10000001}{10000000} \right) - \sin \left(\frac{9999999}{10000000} \right) \right) - \cos(1) \right| \\
&\approx 9.00(10)^{-16}
\end{aligned}
$$

accurate to three significant digits. But we should be a little bit worried about the floating-point error since $\sin \left(\frac{10000001}{10000000} \right) \approx 0.8414710388$ and $\sin \left(\frac{9999999}{10000000} \right) \approx .8414709307$ are nearly equal. We are subtracting numbers whose five leading significant digits match! Indeed, the floating-point error is, again $|\tilde{p}^* - \tilde{p}|$, or

$$\left| 0.5403023056738121 - 5000000 \left(\sin \left(\frac{10000001}{10000000} \right) - \sin \left(\frac{9999999}{10000000} \right) \right) \right| \approx 1.94(10)^{-10}.$$

Perhaps this error seems small, but it is very large compared to the algorithmic error of about $9(10)^{-16}$. So, in this case, the error is essentially all due to the fact that we are using floating-point arithmetic! This time, the algorithmic error is dwarfed by the round-off error. Luckily, this will not often be the case, and we will be free to focus on algorithmic error alone.

Crumpet 2: Chaos

Edward Lorenz was perhaps the first to recognize the mathematical phenomenon now called chaos. In the 1960's he was busy trying to model weather systems in an attempt to improve weather forecasting. As the story goes, he was running a simulation when he needed to leave briefly. When he came back, the simulation was complete, but he wanted to rerun the simulation from a certain point just to double check. He programmed the computer to restart the simulation, only this time he rounded off his numbers a bit. When the simulation ran again, he noticed a completely different result! Was this a case of floating-point error? No. Here's an egregiously simplified version of what happened. Let $f(x) = 4x(1-x)$ and set $p_0 = 1/7$. Now compute $p_1 = f(p_0)$, $p_2 = f(p_1)$, $p_3 = f(p_2)$, and so on until you have $p_{40} = f(p_{39})$. You should find that $p_{40} \approx 0.080685$. Now set $p_0 = 1/7 + 10^{-12}$ (so we can run the same computation only with an initial value that differs from the original by 10^{-12}). Compute as before, $p_1 = f(p_0)$, $p_2 = f(p_1)$, $p_3 = f(p_2)$, and so on until you have $p_{40} = f(p_{39})$. This time you should find that $p_{40} \approx 0.91909$—a completely different result! If you go back and run the two calculations using 100 significant digit arithmetic, you will find that beginning with $p_0 = 1/7$ leads to $p_{40} \approx .080736$ while beginning with $p_0 = 1/7 + 10^{-12}$ leads to $p_{40} \approx 0.91912$. In other words, it is not the fact that we are using floating-point approximations that makes these two computations turn out drastically different. Using 1000 significant digit arithmetic would not change the conclusion, nor would any more precise calculation. This is a demonstration of what's known as sensitivity to initial conditions, a feature of all chaotic systems including the weather. Now you know why long-term weather prediction is simply not possible. The errors are algorithmic.

Experiment 3

Let $a = 77617$ and $b = 33096$, and compute

$$333.75b^6 + a^2(11a^2b^2 - b^6 - 121b^4 - 2) + 5.5b^8 + \frac{a}{2b}.$$

You will probably get a number like $-1.180591620717411(10)^{21}$ even though the exact value is $-\frac{54767}{66192} \approx -.8273960599468214$. That's an incredible error! But it's not because your calculator or computer has any problem calculating each term to a reasonable degree of accuracy. Try it.

$$
\begin{aligned}
333.75b^6 &= 43860575084639316193070383\mathcal{1}040 \\
a^2(11a^2b^2 - b^6 - 121b^4 - 2) &= -7917111779274712207494296632228773890 \\
5.5b^8 &= 7917111340668961361101134701524942848 \\
\frac{a}{2b} &= \frac{77617}{66192} \approx 1.172603940053179
\end{aligned}
$$

The reason the calculation is so poor is that nearly equal values are subtracted after each term is calculated. $a^2(11a^2b^2 - b^6 - 121b^4 - 2)$ and $5.5b^8$ have opposite signs and match in their greatest 7 significant digits, so calculating their sum decreases the accuracy by about 7 significant digits. To make matters worse, $a^2(11a^2b^2 - b^6 - 121b^4 - 2) + 5.5b^8 = -43860575084639316193070383\mathcal{1}042$, which has the opposite sign of $333.75b^6$ and matches it in every place value except the ones. That's 29 digits! So we lose another 29 significant digits of accuracy in adding this sum to $333.75b^6$. Doing the calculation exactly, the sum $333.75b^6 + a^2(11a^2b^2 - b^6 - 121b^4 - 2) + 5.5b^8$ is -2. But the computation needs to be carried out to 37 significant digits to realize this. Calculation using only about 16 significant digits, as most calculators and computers do, results in 0 signifcant digits of accuracy since 36 digits of accuracy are lost during the calculation. That's why you can get a number like $-1.180591620717411(10)^{21}$ for your final answer instead of the exact answer $\frac{a}{2b} - 2 \approx -.8273960599468214$.

What may be even more surprising is that a simple rearrangement of the expression leads to a completely different result. Try computing

$$
(333.75 - a^2)b^6 + a^2(11a^2b^2 - 121b^4 - 2) + 5.5b^8 + \frac{a}{2b}
$$

instead. This time you will likely get a number like 1.172603940053179. Again the result is entirely inaccurate, and the reason is the same. This time the individual terms are

$$
\begin{aligned}
(333.75 - a^2)b^6 &= -7917110903377385049079188237280149504 \\
a^2(11a^2b^2 - 121b^4 - 2) &= -437291576312021946464244793346 \\
5.5b^8 &= 7917111340668961361101134701524942848 \\
\frac{a}{2b} &= \frac{77617}{66192} \approx 1.172603940053179
\end{aligned}
$$

so the problem persists. We still end up subtracting numbers of nearly equal value. The difference between this calculation and the last is rounding. In the first case, rounding caused two of the large numbers to disagree in their last significant digit, so they added up to something huge. In the second case, the sum of the first three terms turns out to be 0 because the large numbers agree in all significant digits. Note that in the second case, the final result is simply the value of $\frac{a}{2b}$.

As these examples show, sometimes floating-point error and sometimes algorithmic error can spoil a calculation. In general, it is very difficult to catch floating-point error, though. Algorithmic error is much more accessible. And most of the algorithms we will explore are not susceptible to floating point error. In almost all cases, the lion's share of the error will be algorithmic.

References

Rump, *Algorithms for Verified Inclusions: Theory and Practice*, Moore, R. E. (ed.), Reliability in Computing: The Role of Interval Methods in Scientific Computing, Academic Press, Boston, 1988, pp. 109–126. Loh and Walster, *Rump's Example Revisited*, Reliable Computing, Vol. 8, No. 3 (2002), pp. 245-248.

Key Concepts

p The exact value being approximated.

$\tilde{p}$ An approximation of the value p.

Absolute error: $|\tilde{p} - p|$ is known as the absolute error in using $\tilde{p}$ to approximate the value p.

Relative error: $\dfrac{|\tilde{p} - p|}{|p|}$ is known as the relative error in using $\tilde{p}$ to approximate the value p.

Accuracy: We say that $\tilde{p}$ is accurate to n significant digits if the leading n significant digits of $\tilde{p}$ match those of p. More precisely, we say that $\tilde{p}$ is accurate to $d(\tilde{p}) = \log\left|\frac{p}{\tilde{p}-p}\right|$ significant digits.

Floating-point arithmetic: Arithmetic using numbers represented by a fixed number of significant digits.

Algorithmic error: Error caused solely by the algorithm or equation involved in the approximation, $|\tilde{p} - p|$ where $\tilde{p}$ is an approximation of p and is computed using exact arithmetic.

Truncation error: Algorithmic error due to use of a partial sum in place of a series. In this type of error, the tail of the series is truncated—thus the name.

Floating-point error: Error caused solely by the fact that a computation is done using floating-point arithmetic, $|\tilde{p}^* - \tilde{p}|$ where $\tilde{p}^*$ is computed using floating-point arithmetic, $\tilde{p}$ is computed using exact arithmetic, and both are computed according to the same formula or algorithm.

Roundoff error: Another name for floating-point error.

Octave

The computations of this section can easily be done using Octave. All you need are arithmetic operations and a few standard functions like the absolute value and sine and cosine. Luckily, none of these is very difficult using Octave. The arithmetic operations are done much like they would be on a calculator. There is but one important distinction. Most calculators will accept an expression like `3x` and understand that you mean $3 \times x$, but Octave will not. The expression `3x` causes a syntax error in Octave. Octave needs you to specify the operation as in `3*x`.

Standard functions like absolute value, sine, and cosine (and many others) have simple abbreviations in Octave. They all take one argument, or input. Think function notation and it will become clear how to find the sine or absolute value of a number. You need to type the name of the function, a left parenthesis, the argument, and a right parenthesis, as in `sin(7.2)`. Some common functions and their abbreviations are listed in Table 1.1. Functions and arithmetic operations can be combined in the obvious

Table 1.1: Some common functions and their Octave abbreviations.

Function	Octave	Function	Octave	Function	Octave
$n!$	`factorial(n)`	$\sin(x)$	`sin(x)`	$\cos(x)$	`cos(x)`
$|x|$	`abs(x)`	$\tan(x)$	`tan(x)`	$\cot(x)$	`cot(x)`
e^x	`exp(x)`	$\sin^{-1}(x)$	`asin(x)`	$\cos^{-1}(x)$	`asin(x)`
$\ln(x)$	`log(x)`	$\tan^{-1}(x)$	`atan(x)`	$\cot^{-1}(x)$	`acot(x)`
$\sqrt{x}$	`sqrt(x)`	$\sinh(x)$	`sinh(x)`	$\cosh(x)$	`cosh(x)`
$\lfloor x \rfloor$	`floor(x)`	$\lceil x \rceil$	`ceil(x)`	b^x	`b^x`

way. A few examples from this section appear in Table 1.2. There are two thing to observe. First,

Table 1.2: Octave computations of some expressions.

Expression	Octave	Result
$\left|\frac{22}{7} - \pi\right|$	`abs(22/7-pi)`	0.0012645
$\frac{\left|\frac{16525}{54} - \pi^5\right|}{|\pi^5|}$	`abs(16525/54-pi^5)/abs(pi^5)`	3.8111e-06
$\frac{\sin(1.01) - \sin(0.99)}{0.02}$	`(sin(1.01)-sin(0.99))/0.02`	0.54029

Octave notation is very much like calculator notation. Second, by default Octave displays results using 5 significant digits. Don't be fooled into thinking Octave has only computed those five digits of the result, though. In fact, Octave has computed at least 15 digits correctly. And if you want to know what they are, use the `format('long')` command. This command only needs to be used once per session. All numbers printed after this command is run will be shown with 15 significant digits. For example, `1/7` will produce `0.142857142857143` instead of just `0.14286`. If you would like to go back to the default format, use the `format()` command with no arguments. We will discuss finer control over output later. For now, here are a few ways you might do experiment 1 using Octave. The only differences are the amount of output

and the format of the output. The numbers are being calculated exactly the same way and with exactly the same precision.

Experiment 1 in Octave, example 1

```
octave:1> p0=pi;
octave:2> p1=10*p0-31; p2=100*p1-41; p3=100*p2-59;
octave:3> p4=100*p3-26; p5=100*p4-53; p6=100*p5-58;
octave:4> p7=100*p6-97
p7 =  0.93116
```

Experiment 1 in Octave, example 2

```
octave:1> format('long')
octave:2> p0=pi
p0 =  3.14159265358979
octave:3> p1=10*p0-31
p1 =  0.415926535897931
octave:4> p2=100*p1-41
p2 =  0.592653589793116
octave:5> p3=100*p2-59
p3 =  0.265358979311600
octave:6> p4=100*p3-26
p4 =  0.535897931159980
octave:7> p5=100*p4-53
p5 =  0.589793115997963
octave:8> p6=100*p5-58
p6 =  0.979311599796347
octave:9> p7=100*p6-97
p7 =  0.931159979634685
```

Experiment 1 in Octave, example 3

```
octave:1> 10*pi-31
ans =  0.41593
octave:2> 100*ans-41
ans =  0.59265
octave:3> 100*ans-59
ans =  0.26536
octave:4> 100*ans-26
ans =  0.53590
octave:5> 100*ans-53
ans =  0.58979
octave:6> 100*ans-58
ans =  0.97931
octave:7> 100*ans-97
ans =  0.93116
```

Experiment 3 in Octave

```
octave:1> a=77617;
octave:2> b=33096;
octave:3> t1=333.75*b^6;
octave:4> t2=a^2*(11*a^2*b^2-b^6-121*b^4-2);
octave:5> t3=5.5*b^8;
octave:6> t4=a/(2*b);
octave:7> t1+t2+t3+t4
ans = -1.18059162071741e+21
octave:8> t1=(333.75-a^2)*b^6;
octave:9> t2=a^2*(11*a^2*b^2-121*b^4-2);
```

```
octave:10> t1+t2+t3+t4
ans =   1.17260394005318
```

In the end, the way you choose to complete an exercise in Octave will be a matter of preference, and will depend on your goal. You should ask yourself questions like the following. How many significant digits do I need? How many intermediate results do I need to see? Which ones? The answers to such questions should guide your solution.

When needed, Octave has abbreviations for most common constants. Table 1.3 shows the three most common.

Table 1.3: Some Octave constants.

Constant	Octave	Result
e	e	2.7183
π	pi	3.1416
i	i or j	0 + 1i

Exercises

1. Besides roundoff error, how may the accuracy of a numerical calculation be adversely affected?

2. Compute the absolute and relative errors in the approximation of π by 3.

3. Calculate the absolute error in approximating p by $\tilde{p}$.

   (a) $p = 123$; $\tilde{p} = \frac{1106}{9}$ [S]

   (b) $p = \frac{1}{e}$; $\tilde{p} = .3666$

   (c) $p = 2^{10}$; $\tilde{p} = 1000$ [S]

   (d) $p = 24$; $\tilde{p} = 48$

   (e) $p = \pi^{-7}$; $\tilde{p} = 10^{-4}$ [S]

   (f) $p = (0.062847)(0.069234)$; $\tilde{p} = 0.0042$

4. Calculate the relative errors in the approximations of question 3. [S]

5. How many significant digits of accuracy do the approximations of question 3 have? [S]

6. Compute the absolute error and relative error in approximations of p by $\tilde{p}$.

   (a) $p = \sqrt{2}$, $\tilde{p} = 1.414$

   (b) $p = 10^{\pi}$, $\tilde{p} = 1400$

   (c) $p = 9!$, $\tilde{p} = \sqrt{18\pi}(9/e)^9$

7. Calculate $\dfrac{1103\sqrt{8}}{9801}$ using Octave.

8. The number in question 7 is an approximation of $1/\pi$. Using Octave, find the absolute and relative errors in the approximation.

9. Using Octave, calculate

   (a) $\lfloor \ln(234567) \rfloor$

   (b) $e^{\lceil \ln(234567) \rceil}$

   (c) $\sqrt[3]{\lfloor \sin(e^{5.2}) \rfloor}$

   (d) $-e^{i\pi}$

   (e) $4\tan^{-1}(1)$

   (f) $\dfrac{\lfloor \cos(3) - \sqrt[5]{\ln(3)} \rfloor}{\lceil \arctan(3) - e^3 \rceil}$

10. Find $f(2)$ using Octave.

    (a) $f(x) = e^{\sin(x)}$ [S]

    (b) $f(x) = \sin(e^x)$

    (c) $f(x) = \tan^{-1}(x - 0.429)$ [S]

    (d) $f(x) = x - \tan^{-1}(0.429)$

    (e) $f(x) = 10^x/5!$ [A]

    (f) $f(x) = 5!/x^{10}$

11. All of these equations are mathematically true. Nonetheless, floating point error causes some of them to be false according to Octave. Which ones? HINT: Use the boolean operator == to check. For example, to check if $\sin(0) = 0$, type `sin(0)==0` into Octave. `ans=1` means true (the two sides are equal according to Octave—no roundoff error) and `ans=0` means false (the two sides are not equal according to Octave—roundoff error).

    (a) $(2)(12) = 9^2 - 4(9) - 21$

    (b) $e^{3\ln(2)} = 8$

    (c) $\ln(10) = \ln(5) + \ln(2)$

    (d) $g(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}) = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ where $g(x) = \sqrt[3]{x^2 + x}$

    (e) $\lfloor 153465/3 \rfloor = 153465/3$

    (f) $3\pi^3 + 7\pi^2 - 2\pi + 8 = ((3\pi + 7)\pi - 2)\pi + 8$

12. Find an approximation $\tilde{p}$ of p with absolute error .001. [S]

    (a) $p = \pi$ [S]

    (b) $p = \sqrt{5}$

    (c) $p = \ln(3)$ [S]

    (d) $p = \sqrt{23}^{\sqrt{23}}$

    (e) $p = \frac{10}{\ln(1.1)}$ [S]

    (f) $p = \tan(1.57079)$

13. Find an approximation $\tilde{p}$ of p with relative error .001 for each value of p in question 12. [S]

14. $\tilde{p}$ approximates what value with absolute error .0005?

    (a) $\tilde{p} = .2348263818643$ [A]
    (b) $\tilde{p} = 23.89627345677$
    (c) $\tilde{p} = -8.76257664363$

15. Repeat question 14 except with relative error .0005. [A]

16. $\tilde{p}$ approximates p with absolute error $\frac{1}{100}$ and relative error $\frac{3}{100}$. Find p and $\tilde{p}$. [A]

17. $\tilde{p}$ approximates p with absolute error $\frac{3}{100}$ and relative error $\frac{1}{100}$. Find p and $\tilde{p}$.

18. Suppose $\tilde{p}$ must approximate p with relative error at most 10^{-3}. Find the largest interval in which $\tilde{p}$ must lie if $p = 900$.

19. The number e can be defined by $e = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(1/n!)$. Compute the absolute error and relative error in the following approximations of e:

    (a) $\sum_{n=0}^{5} \frac{1}{n!}$

    (b) $\sum_{n=0}^{10} \frac{1}{n!}$

20. The golden ratio, $\dfrac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$, is found in nature and in mathematics in a variety of places. For example, if F_n is the nth Fibonacci number, then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{F_{n+1}}{F_n} = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$$

Therefore, F_{11}/F_{10} may be used as an approximation of the golden ratio. Find the relative error in this approximation. HINT: The Fibonacci sequence is defined by $F_0 = 1$, $F_1 = 1$, $F_n = F_{n-1} + F_{n-2}$ for $n \geq 2$.

21. Find values for p and $\tilde{p}$ so that the relative and absolute errors are equal. Make a general statement about conditions under which this will happen. [A]

22. Find values for p and $\tilde{p}$ so that the relative error is greater than the absolute error. Make a general statement about conditions under which this will happen.

23. Find values for p and $\tilde{p}$ so that the relative error is less than the absolute error. Make a general statement about conditions under which this will happen.

24. Calculate (i) $\tilde{p}^*$ using a calculator or computer, (ii) the absolute error, $|\tilde{p}^* - p|$, and (iii) the relative error, $\frac{|\tilde{p}^* - p|}{|p|}$. Then use the given value of $\tilde{p}$ to compute (iv) the algorithmic error, $|\tilde{p} - p|$ and (v) the round-off error, $|\tilde{p}^* - \tilde{p}|$.

    (a) Let $f(x) = x^4 + 7x^3 - 63x^2 - 295x + 350$ and let $p = f'(-2)$. The value $\tilde{p} = \frac{f(-2+10^{-7}) - f(-2-10^{-7})}{2(10)^{-7}}$ is a good approximation of p. $\tilde{p}$ is exactly 8.99999999999999. [A]

    (b) Let $f'(x) = e^x \sin(10x)$ and $f(0) = 0$ and let $p = f(1)$. It can be shown that $p = \frac{1}{101}e(\sin 10 - 10\cos 10) + \frac{10}{101}$. Euler's method produces the approximation $\tilde{p} = \frac{1}{10}\sum_{i=1}^{10} e^{i/10}\sin i$. Accurate to 28 significant digits, $\tilde{p}$ is $0.2071647018159241499410798569$.

    (c) Let $a_0 = \frac{5+\sqrt{5}}{8}$ and $a_{n+1} = 4a_n(1 - a_n)$, and consider $p = a_{51}$. It can be shown that $p = a_{51} = \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{8}$. The most direct algorithm for calculating a_{51} is to calculate $a_1, a_2, a_3, \ldots a_{51}$ in succession, according to the given recursion relation. Use this algorithm to compute $\tilde{p}^*$ and $\tilde{p}$.

1.2   Taylor Polynomials

One of the cornerstones of numerical analysis is Taylor's Theorem about which you learned in Calculus.
A short study bears repeating here, however.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that $f(x)$ has $n+1$ derivatives on (a,b), and $x_0 \in (a,b)$. Then for each $x \in (a,b)$,
there exists a ξ, depending on x, lying strictly between x and x_0 such that*

$$f(x) = f(x_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\frac{f^{(j)}(x_0)}{j!}(x - x_0)^j \right) + \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi)}{(n+1)!}(x - x_0)^{n+1}.$$

Proof. Let I be the open interval between x and x_0 and $\overline{I}$ be the closure of I. Since $I \subset \overline{I} \subset (a,b)$ and
f has $n+1$ derivatives on (a,b), we have that $f, f', f'', \ldots, f^{(n)}$ are all continuous on $\overline{I}$ and that $f^{(n+1)}$
exists on I. We now define

$$F(z) = f(x) - f(z) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{f^{(j)}(z)}{j!}(x - z)^j$$

and will prove the theorem by showing that $F(x_0) = \frac{(x-x_0)^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} f^{(n+1)}(\xi)$ for some $\xi \in I$. Note that $F'(z)$,
a telescoping sum, is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
F'(z) &= -f'(z) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[\frac{f^{(j+1)}(z)}{j!}(x - z)^j - \frac{f^{(j)}(z)}{(j-1)!}(x - z)^{j-1} \right] \\
&= -f'(z) - \left[\frac{f^{(n+1)}(z)}{n!}(x - z)^n - f'(z) \right] \\
&= -\frac{f^{(n+1)}(z)}{n!}(x - z)^n.
\end{aligned}
$$

Now define $g(z) = F(z) - \left(\frac{x-z}{x-x_0} \right)^{n+1} F(x_0)$. It is easy to verify that g satisfies the premises of Rolle's
theorem. Indeed, $g(x_0) = g(x) = 0$ and the continuity and differentiability criteria are met. By Rolle's
theorem, there exists $\xi \in I$ such that $g'(\xi) = 0 = F'(\xi) + (n+1)\frac{(x-\xi)^n}{(x-x_0)^{n-1}} F(x_0)$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
F(x_0) &= -F'(\xi)\frac{(x - x_0)^{n+1}}{(n+1)(x - \xi)^n} \\
&= \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi)}{n!(n+1)}(x - x_0)^{n+1} \\
&= \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi)}{(n+1)!}(x - x_0)^{n+1}.
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

We will use the notation

$$T_n(x) = f(x_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\frac{f^{(j)}(x_0)}{j!}(x - x_0)^j \right)$$

and call this the nth Taylor polynomial of f expanded about x_0. We will also use the notation

$$R_n(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi)}{(n+1)!}(x - x_0)^{n+1}$$

and call this the remainder term for the nth Taylor polynomial of f expanded about x_0.

Crumpet 3: ξ

ξ is the (lower case) fourteenth letter of the Greek alphabet and is pronounced `ksee`. It is customary,
but, of course, not necessary to use this letter for the unknown quantity in Taylor's theorem. The
capital version of ξ is Ξ, a symbol rarely seen in mathematics.

It will not be uncommon, for sake of brevity, to call $T_n(x)$ the nth Taylor polynomial and $R_n(x)$ the remainder term when the function and center of expansion, x_0, are either unspecified or clear from context.

In calculus, you likely focused on the Taylor polynomial, or Taylor series, and did not pay much attention to the remainder term. The situation is quite the reverse in numerical analysis. Algorithmic error can often be ascertained by careful attention to the remainder term, making it more critical than the Taylor polynomial itself. The Taylor polynomial will, however, be used to derive certain methods, so won't be entirely neglected.

The most important thing to understand about the remainder term is that it tells us precisely how well $T_n(x)$ approximates $f(x)$. From Taylor's theorem, $f(x) = T_n(x) + R_n(x)$, so the absolute error in using $T_n(x)$ to approximate $f(x)$ is given by $|T_n(x) - f(x)| = |R_n(x)|$. But $|R_n(x)| = \left| \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi)}{(n+1)!}(x - x_0)^{n+1} \right|$ for some ξ between x and x_0. Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
|T_n(x) - f(x)| = |R_n(x)| \quad &\leq \quad \max_\xi \left| \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi)}{(n+1)!}(x - x_0)^{n+1} \right| \\
&= \quad \frac{|x - x_0|^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} \max_\xi \left| f^{(n+1)}(\xi) \right|.
\end{aligned}
$$

We learn several things from this observation:

1. The remainder term is precisely the error in using $T_n(x)$ to approximate $f(x)$. Hence it is sometimes referred to as the error term .

2. The absolute error in using $T_n(x)$ to approximate $f(x)$ depends on three factors:

   (a) $|x - x_0|^{n+1}$
   (b) $\frac{1}{(n+1)!}$
   (c) $|f^{(n+1)}(\xi)|$

3. We can find an upper bound on $|T_n(x) - f(x)|$ by finding an upper bound on $\left| f^{(n+1)}(\xi) \right|$.

Figure 1.2.1: For small n, $T_n(x)$ is a good approximation only for small x.

Because $|R_n(x)|$ measures exactly the absolute error $|T_n(x) - f(x)|$, we will be interested in conditions that force $|R_n(x)|$ to be small. According to observation 2, there are three quantities to consider. First, $|x - x_0|^{n+1}$, or $|x - x_0|$, the distance between x and x_0. The approximation $T_n(x)$ will generally be better for x closer to x_0. Second, $\frac{1}{(n+1)!}$. This suggests that the more terms we use in our Taylor polynomial (the greater n is), the better the approximation will be. Finally, $|f^{(n+1)}(\xi)|$, the magnitude of the $(n+1)^{st}$ derivative of f. The tamer this derivative, the better $T_n(x)$ will approximate $f(x)$. Be warned, however, these are just rules of thumb for making $|R_n(x)|$ small. There are exceptions to these rules.

Figure 1.2.2: The actual error $|T_n(x) - f(x)|$ is often much smaller than the theoretical bound.

To see these factors in action, consider $f(x) = \ln(x)$ expanded about $x_0 = e^2$. According to Taylor's theorem,

$$T_2(x) = 2 + \frac{x - e^2}{e^2} - \frac{(x - e^2)^2}{2e^4} \quad \text{and} \quad R_2(x) = \frac{1}{3\xi^3}(x - e^2)^3;$$

$$T_{11}(x) = 2 + \sum_{j=1}^{11} \left(\frac{(-1)^{j-1}(x - e^2)^j}{je^{2j}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad R_{11}(x) = \frac{-1}{12\xi^{12}}(x - e^2)^{12}.$$

After you have convinced yourself these formulas are correct, suppose that we are interested in approximating $\ln(x)$ with an absolute error of no more than 0.1. Since $|\xi^{-3}|$ and $|\xi^{-12}|$ are decreasing functions of ξ, they attain their maximum values on a closed interval at the lower endpoint of that interval. Hence for $x \geq e^2$, we have $|R_2(x)| \leq \max_{\xi \in [e^2, x]} \left| \frac{1}{3\xi^3}(x - e^2)^3 \right| = \frac{1}{3e^6}(x - e^2)^3$. But for $0 < x < e^2$, we have $|R_2(x)| \leq \max_{\xi \in [x, e^2]} \left| \frac{1}{3x^3}(x - e^2)^3 \right| = \frac{1}{3x^3}(e^2 - x)^3$. To determine where these remainders are less than 0.1, we need to solve the equations $\frac{1}{3e^6}(x - e^2)^3 = 0.1$ and $\frac{1}{3x^3}(e^2 - x)^3 = 0.1$. The values we seek are $x = \left(1 + \sqrt[3]{\frac{3}{10}}\right)e^2 \approx 12.33$ and $x = \frac{\sqrt[3]{8100} + 10\sqrt[3]{90} - 30}{13\sqrt[3]{90}}e^2 \approx 4.427$. So Taylor's theorem guarantees that $T_2(x)$ will approximate $\ln(x)$ to within 0.1 over the entire interval $[4.427, 12.33]$. Since $e^2 \approx 7.389$, $T_2(x)$ approximates $\ln(x)$ to within 0.1 from about 3 below e^2 to about 5 above e^2. In other words, as long as x is close enough to $x_0 = e^2$, the approximation is good. A similar calculation for $R_{11}(x)$ reveals that $T_{11}(x)$ is guaranteed to approximate $\ln(x)$ to within 0.1 over the interval $[3.667, 14.89]$. In other words, for a larger value of n, x doesn't need to be as close to x_0 to achieve the same accuracy.

But remember, these are only theoretical bounds on the errors. The actual errors are often much smaller than the bounds. For example, our analysis gives the upper bound $|R_2(3)| \leq \frac{1}{3 \cdot 3^3}(e^2 - 3)^3 \approx 1.05$ where the actual error, $|T_2(3) - \ln(3)| = \left| 2 + \frac{3 - e^2}{e^2} - \frac{(3 - e^2)^2}{2e^4} - \ln(3) \right| \approx .131$. The bound is about 8 times the actual error. If we take this point a bit further, the graphs of $T_2(x)$ and $T_{11}(x)$ versus $\ln(x)$ (and a bit of calculation we will discuss later) reveal that $T_2(x)$ actually approximates $\ln(x)$ to within 0.1 over the interval $[3.296, 13.13]$ and $T_{11}(x)$ actually approximates $\ln(x)$ to within 0.1 over the interval $[0.9030, 15.33]$. These intervals are a bit larger than the theoretical guaranteed intervals. See Figure 1.2.2. This figure reveals something else too. $T_2(18)$ does a much better job of approximating $\ln(18)$ than does $T_{11}(18)$. It's not always the case that more terms means a better approximation.

We now turn our attention to perhaps the most often analyzed Taylor polynomials—those for the sine and cosine functions. They provide examples with beautiful visualization and simple analysis. The nth Taylor polynomial for $f(x) = \cos(x)$ expanded about 0 is

$$\begin{aligned} T_n(x) &= \cos(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\frac{\frac{d^j}{dx^j}(\cos(x)) \big|_{x=0}}{j!}(x - 0)^j \right) \\ &= \cos(0) - \sin(0) \cdot x - \frac{\cos(0)}{2}x^2 + \frac{\sin(0)}{6}x^3 + \frac{\cos(0)}{24}x^4 - \cdots \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{24}x^4 - \cdots \end{aligned}$$

and its remainder term is

$$R_n(x) = \frac{\frac{d^{n+1}}{dx^{n+1}}(\cos(x))\big|_{x=\xi}}{(n+1)!}(x-0)^{n+1}$$

$$= \frac{x^{n+1}}{(n+1)!}\begin{cases} -\sin(\xi) & \text{when } n \bmod 4 \equiv 0 \\ -\cos(\xi) & \text{when } n \bmod 4 \equiv 1 \\ \sin(\xi) & \text{when } n \bmod 4 \equiv 2 \\ \cos(\xi) & \text{when } n \bmod 4 \equiv 3 \end{cases}.$$

Since the sine and cosine functions are bounded between -1 and 1 we know that

$$-\frac{|x|^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} \le R_n(x) \le \frac{|x|^{n+1}}{(n+1)!}.$$

There are two ways this remainder term will be small. First, if x is close to 0, then $|x|$ is small, making $R_n(x)$ small. Second, if n is large, then $\frac{1}{(n+1)!}$ is small, making $R_n(x)$ small. In other words, for small values of n, the remainder term is small for small values of x. $T_n(x)$ is a good approximation of $\cos(x)$ for such combinations of x and n. On the other hand, for large values of n, the remainder term is small even for large values of x. For example, $|R_{61}(x)| \le \frac{|x|^{62}}{62!}$, so $|R_{61}(x)|$ will remain less than 1 for all x with magnitude less than $\sqrt[62]{62!} \approx 23.933$. Figures 1.2.1 and 1.2.3 illustrate these points.

Figure 1.2.3: For large n, $T_n(x)$ is a good approximation even for large x.

Key Concepts

Rolle's theorem: Suppose that $f(x)$ is continuous on $[a,b]$ and differentiable on (a,b). If $f(a) = f(b)$, then there exists $\xi \in (a,b)$ such that $f'(\xi) = 0$.

Taylor's theorem: Suppose that $f(x)$ has $n+1$ derivatives on (a,b), and $x_0 \in (a,b)$. Then for each $x \in (a,b)$, there exists ξ, depending on x, lying strictly between x and x_0 such that

$$f(x) = f(x_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(\frac{f^{(j)}(x_0)}{j!}(x-x_0)^j\right) + \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi)}{(n+1)!}(x-x_0)^{n+1}.$$

n^{th} **Taylor polynomial:** $T_n(x) = f(x_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(\frac{f^{(j)}(x_0)}{j!}(x-x_0)^j\right)$.

Maclaurin polynomial: A Taylor polynomial expanded about $x_0 = 0$ is also called a Maclaurin polynomial.

Remainder term: $R_n(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi)}{(n+1)!}(x-x_0)^{n+1}$ is precisely $-(T_n(x) - f(x))$.

error term: Another name for the remainder term.

Crumpet 4: The original theorem of Brook Taylor

The original theorem of Brook Taylor was published in his opus magnum *Methodus Incrementorum Directa & Inversa* of 1715. In *Methodus*, it appears as the second corollary to Proposition VII Theorem III, bearing faint resemblence to any modern statement of the theorem.

There is no mention of a remainder term. There is no use of the familiar $f(x)$-type function notation. It's written in Latin. And there is no laundry list of hypotheses.

Here is the original statement of Taylor's theorem in English as translated by Ian Bruce. PROPO-SITION VII. THEOREM III: There are two variable quantities, z & x, of which z is regularly increased by the given increment $\dot{z}$, and $n\dot{z} = v$, $v - \dot{z} = \dot{v}$, $\dot{v} - \dot{z} = \ddot{v}$, and thus henceforth. Moreover, I say that in the time z increases to $z + v$, x increases likewise to become $x + x\frac{v}{1\dot{z}} + x\frac{v\dot{v}}{1\cdot2\dot{z}^2} + x\frac{v\dot{v}\ddot{v}}{1\cdot2\cdot3\dot{z}^3} + \&c.$ COROLLARY II: If for the evanescent increments, the fluxions of the proportionals themselves are writ-ten, now with all the $\ddot{v}$, $\dot{v}$, v, v, v, &c. equal to the time z uniformly flows to become $z + v$, x becomes $x + \dot{x}\frac{v}{1\dot{z}} + \ddot{x}\frac{v^2}{1\cdot2\dot{z}^2} + \dddot{x}\frac{v^3}{1\cdot2\cdot3\dot{z}^3} + \&c \ldots$

Crumpet 5: Interpretation of the original theorem of Brook Taylor

---

Unfortunately, the English translation of Taylor's theorem is only moderately helpful to anyone who is not well acquainted with early 18th century mathematics. In 1715, function notation was still 20 years in the making. Today, we would interpret the declaration of the two variables as declaring that x is a function of z. The claim in Theorem III is that we can rewrite $x(z+v)$ as $x + \dot{x}\frac{v}{1\dot{z}} + \ddot{x}\frac{v\dot{v}}{1\cdot 2\dot{z}^2} + \dddot{x}\frac{v\dot{v}\dot{v}}{1\cdot 2\cdot 3\dot{z}^3} + \&$c. Just as x should be interpreted as a function of z so should $\dot{x}$, $\ddot{x}$, and $\dddot{x}$. More precisely, $\dot{x}$ means $x(z+\dot{z}) - x(z)$, the amount x is incremented as z is incremented by $\dot{z}$. Likewise, $\ddot{x}$ is the amount $\dot{x}$ is incremented as z is incremented by $\dot{z}$, so $\ddot{x} = \dot{x}(z+\dot{z}) - \dot{x}(z) = \Big[x(z+2\dot{z}) - x(z+\dot{z})\Big] - \Big[x(z+\dot{z}) - x(z)\Big] = x(z+2\dot{z}) - 2x(z+\dot{z}) + x(z)$. Similarly, $\dddot{x}$ is the amount $\ddot{x}$ is incremented as z is incremented by $\dot{z}$. Now would be a good time to break from reading to verify that $\dddot{x} = x(z+3\dot{z}) - 3x(z+2\dot{z}) + 3x(z+\dot{z}) - x(z)$, that $\ddddot{x} = x(z+4\dot{z}) - 4x(z+3\dot{z}) + 6x(z+2\dot{z}) - 4x(z+\dot{z}) + x(z)$, and so on. With this understanding and the conventions $\underset{0}{x}$ for x, $\underset{1}{x}$ for $\dot{x}$, $\underset{2}{x}$ for $\ddot{x}$, $\overset{0}{v}$ for v, $\overset{1}{v}$ for $\dot{v}$, $\overset{2}{v}$ for $\ddot{v}$, and so on, it is then an algebraic exercise to see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
x(z+n\dot{z}) &= \sum_{j=0}^{n} \binom{n}{j} \underset{j}{x} = \underset{0}{x} + \underset{1}{x}\frac{n}{1} + \underset{2}{x}\frac{n(n-1)}{1\cdot 2} + \underset{3}{x}\frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{1\cdot 2\cdot 3} + \cdots + \underset{n}{x}\frac{n(n-1)\cdots 1}{1\cdot 2\cdot 3\cdots n} \\
&= \underset{0}{x} + \underset{1}{x}\frac{n\dot{z}}{1\dot{z}} + \underset{2}{x}\frac{n\dot{z}(n-1)\dot{z}}{1\cdot 2\dot{z}^2} + \underset{3}{x}\frac{n\dot{z}(n-1)\dot{z}(n-2)\dot{z}}{1\cdot 2\cdot 3\dot{z}^3} + \cdots + \underset{n}{x}\frac{n\dot{z}(n-1)\dot{z}\cdots 1\dot{z}}{1\cdot 2\cdot 3\cdots n\dot{z}^n} \\
&= \underset{0}{x} + \underset{1}{x}\frac{v}{1\dot{z}} + \underset{2}{x}\frac{v\overset{1}{v}}{1\cdot 2\dot{z}^2} + \underset{3}{x}\frac{v\overset{1}{v}\overset{2}{v}}{1\cdot 2\cdot 3\dot{z}^3} + \cdots + \underset{n}{x}\frac{v\overset{1}{v}\overset{2}{v}\cdots\overset{n}{v}}{1\cdot 2\cdot 3\cdots n\dot{z}^n}.
\end{aligned}
$$

This calculation is essentially Taylor's proof of Theorem III.

Corollary II (which we would consider the theorem) is not proved by Taylor beyond the "obvious" application of Newton's theory of fluxions. In today's language, corollary II follows by applying the limit as $n \to \infty$ to the expression from Theorem III. It makes for another nice exercise to verify that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\underset{k}{x}}{\dot{z}^k} = x^{(k)}(z)$, the kth derivative of x. And one final exercise to see that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \overset{k}{v} = v$. As Taylor took these results for granted, so shall we. Applying them to Theorem III, we see that $x(z+v) = x(z) + x'(z)\frac{v}{1!} + x''(z)\frac{v^2}{2!} + x'''(z)\frac{v^3}{3!} + \cdots$. In the notation of Taylor, $\frac{\dot{x}}{\dot{z}}$ is the first derivative of x, $\frac{\ddot{x}}{\dot{z}^2}$ is the second derivative of x, and so on. So we in fact have $x + \dot{x}\frac{v}{1\dot{z}} + \ddot{x}\frac{v^2}{1\cdot 2\dot{z}^2} + \dddot{x}\frac{v^3}{1\cdot 2\cdot 3\dot{z}^3} + \&$c as claimed.

It is interesting that Theorem III is true for any function x defined on the interval $[x, x+v]$. No matter if x is differentiable, or even continuous. It is a statement about finite differences. It is the corollary that requires many more assumptions because that is where we pass to the limit.

Octave

Two things that will come in handy time and again when using Octave are inline functions and `.m` files. Creating an inline function is a simple way to make a "custom" function in Octave. Creating a `.m` file is an organized way to execute a number of commands and save your work for later.

In the last section we saw many built-in functions like `sin(x)`, `log(x)`, and `abs(x)`. These have predefined meaning in Octave. But what if you want to define $f(x) = 3x^2$? There is no built-in "3 x squared" function. That's where an inline function is useful. The syntax for an inline function is

$$\texttt{name = inline('function definition')}$$

where `name` is the name of the function and `function definition` is its formula. In the case of $f(x) = 3x^2$, the Octave code looks like `f=inline('3*x^2')`. Then you can use `f` the same way you would use `sin` or `log` or `abs`. Write the name of the function, left parenthesis, argument, right parenthesis. So, after defining `f` with the `f=inline('3*x^2')` statement, `f(7)` will result in 147:

```
octave:1> f=inline('3*x^2');
octave:2> f(7)
ans =   147
```

Now we may complete Experiment 1 of section 1.1 a fourth way. Instead of doing the computations on the command line, we can create a text file with the commands in it. Saved as a .m file, Octave will recognize it as a list of instructions. If you are familiar with programming, this way of working with Octave will come very naturally. Writing a .m file is the equivalent of writing a program. After it is written, it needs to be processed. On the Octave command line, a .m file is run by typing the name of the file, without the .m. That's it, so it isn't exactly like writing a program. There is no compiling. It's a little bit more like scripting that way.

To begin, use any text editor you like to create the list of commands. Note well, Microsoft Word, LibreOffice, and other word processors are not text editors. They are word processors. They have font formatting features, page set up features, and so on. Now imagine your last report or letter to Mom and remove all the formatting, save separation of paragraphs. That's a text file. No bold, no centering, no images, no special fonts, no margins, no pages. Just the typed words. There is no need for all the decorations a word processor allows. All Octave needs is a list of commands. The only formatting you will need is the line feed (new line) and tabs. If you don't already have a favorite text editor (and maybe even if you do), you should use the one that comes with Octave. If you use this program, you will have no problems. So, first create the text document **experiment1.m** exactly as shown here:

```
format('long')
p1 = 10*pi-31
p2 = 100*p1-41
p3 = 100*p2-59
p4 = 100*p3-26
p5 = 100*p4-53
p6 = 100*p5-58
p7 = 100*p6-97
```

Then, on the Octave command line, type **experiment1** to get the results:

```
octave:1> experiment1
p1 =   0.415926535897931
p2 =   0.592653589793116
p3 =   0.265358979311600
p4 =   0.535897931159980
p5 =   0.589793115997963
p6 =   0.979311599796347
p7 =   0.931159979634685
```

This way of writing Octave commands has two distinct advantages. First, if you make errors, it's a simple matter to correct them. Just edit the text file and save the changes. Second, you have a record of your work. You can share it, print it, or just save it for later. There is only one real disadvantage. It's more involved than just executing a few commands on the command line. So, for simple computations, it is more headache than necessary.

Note well that the .m file has to be saved in the same directory from which Octave was started. This type of detail will be taken care of for you if you use an IDE, but if you are using a command line and text editor, you need to be sure .m files are saved to the proper location.

Exercises

1. Find $T_3(x)$ and $R_3(x)$ for the function expanded about x_0.

   (a) $f(x) = \sin(x)$; $x_0 = 0$. [S]
   (b) $f(x) = \sin(x)$; $x_0 = \pi/2$.
   (c) $f(x) = \sin(x)$; $x_0 = \pi$. [S]
   (d) $f(x) = e^x$; $x_0 = 0$.
   (e) $f(x) = e^x$; $x_0 = \ln 2$.
   (f) $f(x) = x\sin(x)$; $x_0 = 0$. [A]

   (g) $f(x) = \cos^2(x)$; $x_0 = 0$.

2. Let $f(x) = 4x^3 - 2x^2 + 8x - 9$.

   (a) Find $T_3(x)$ and $R_3(x)$ expanded about $x_0 = 0$.
   (b) Find $T_3(x)$ and $R_3(x)$ expanded about $x_0 = 2$.
   (c) Make a conjecture based on your answers to parts (a) and (b). Can you prove it?

3. Find the 36th Maclaurin Polynomial for $f(x) = e^x$.

4. Suppose $f(x)$ is a function whose fourth derivative exists on the whole real line, $(-\infty, \infty)$, and that $f(2) = 3$, $f'(2) = -1$, $f''(2) = 2$, and $f'''(2) = -1$.

   (a) Write down the third Taylor polynomial for $f(x)$ expanded about $x_0 = 2$.

   (b) Use the Taylor polynomial to approximate $f(4)$.

   (c) Find a bound on the absolute error of the approximation using the fact that

   $$-3 \le f^{(4)}(\xi) \le 5$$

   for all $\xi \in [2, 4]$.

5. Compute the 3rd Taylor Polynomial for $f(x) = x^5 - 2x^4 + x^3 - 9x^2 + x - 1$ expanded about $x_0 = 1$.

6. Find the second Taylor Polynomial for $f(x) = \csc x$ expanded about $x_0 = \dfrac{\pi}{4}$. Here are some facts you may find useful:

   $$f'(x) = -\csc(x)\cot(x) \quad \csc(x) = \frac{1}{\sin(x)}$$

   $$f''(x) = \csc(x)(1 + 2\cot^2(x)) \quad \cot(x) = \frac{\cos(x)}{\sin(x)}$$

7. The hyperbolic sine, $\sinh(x)$, and hyperbolic cosine, $\cosh(x)$, are derivatives of one another. That is,

   $$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}(\sinh(x)) = \cosh(x)$$

   and

   $$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}(\cosh(x)) = \sinh(x).$$

   Find the remainder term, R_{43}, associated with the 43rd Maclaurin polynomial for $f(x) = \cosh(x)$.

8. ⟳ Use an `inline` function to evaluate the Taylor polynomial $T_4(x) = 1 - \frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{24}x^4$ at the given value of x. [S]

   (a) 0

   (b) $\frac{1}{2}$

   (c) 1

   (d) π

9. ⟳ Use an `inline` function to evaluate the Taylor polynomial $T_3(x) = 1 + x + \frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{6}x^3$ at the given value of x.

   (a) 0

   (b) $\frac{3}{2}$

   (c) 2

   (d) e [A]

10. ⟳ Write and run a .m file that finds all the answers for exercise 8. [S]

11. ⟳ Write and run a .m file that finds all the answers for exercise 9.

12. Find $\xi(x)$ as guaranteed by Taylor's theorem in the following situation.

   (a) $f(x) = \cos(x)$, $x_0 = 0$, $n = 3$, $x = \pi$. [A]

   (b) $f(x) = e^x$, $x_0 = 0$, $n = 3$, $x = \ln 4$.

   (c) $f(x) = \ln(x)$, $x_0 = 1$, $n = 4$, $x = 2$.

13. Let $f(x) = x^3$.

   (a) Find the second Taylor polynomial, $P_2(x)$, about $x_0 = 0$.

   (b) Find the remainder term, $R_2(0.5)$, and the the actual error in using $P_2(0.5)$ to approximate $f(0.5)$.

   (c) Repeat part (a) using $x_0 = 1$.

   (d) Repeat part (b) using the polynomial from part (c).

14. Find the second Taylor polynomial, $P_2(x)$, for $f(x) = e^x \cos x$ about $x_0 = 0$.

   (a) Use $P_2(0.5)$ to approximate $f(0.5)$. Find an upper bound on the error $|f(0.5) - P_2(0.5)|$ using the remainder term and compare it to the actual error.

   (b) Find a bound on the error $|f(x) - P_2(x)|$ good on the interval $[0, 1]$.

   (c) Approximate $\int_0^1 f(x)\,dx$ by calculating $\int_0^1 P_2(x)\,dx$ instead.

   (d) Find an upper bound for the error in (c) using $\int_0^1 |R_2(x)|\,dx$ and compare the bound to the actual error.

15. Let $f(x) = e^x$.

   (a) Find the nth Maclaurin polynomial $P_n(x)$ for $f(x)$.

   (b) Find a bound on the error in using $P_4(2)$ to approximate $f(2)$.

   (c) How many terms of the Maclaurin polynomial would you need to use in order to approximate $f(2)$ to within 10^{-10}? In other words, for what n does $P_n(2)$ have an error bound less than or equal to 10^{-10}?

16. Find the fourth Taylor Polynomial for $\ln x$ expanded about $x_0 = 1$.

17. What is the 50th term of $T_{100}(e^x)$ expanded about $x_0 = 6$?

18. The Maclaurin series for the arctangent function converges for $-1 < x \le 1$ and is given by

   $$\arctan x - \lim_{n \to \infty} P_n(x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-1)^{i+1} \frac{x^{2i-1}}{2i-1}.$$

   Use the fact that $\tan(\pi/4) = 1$ to determine the number of terms, n, of the series that need to be summed to ensure that $|4P_n(1) - \pi| < 10^{-3}$.

19. Exercise 18 details a rather inefficient means of obtaining an approximation to π. The method can be improved substantially by observing that $\pi/4 = \arctan \frac{1}{2} + \arctan \frac{1}{3}$ and evaluating the series for the arctangent at $\frac{1}{2}$ and at $\frac{1}{3}$. Determine the number of terms that must be summed to ensure an approximation to π within 10^{-3}.

20. For $f(x) = \tan^{-1}(x)$,

$$f^{(n)}(0) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ (-1)^{(n-1)/2}(n-1)! & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

Find the nth Maclaurin polynomial $P_n(x)$ for f.

21. How many terms of the Maclaurin Series of $\sin x$ are needed to guarantee an approximation with error no more than 10^{-2} for any value of x between 0 and 2π?

22. Suppose you are approximating $f(x) = e^x$ using the tenth Maclaurin Polynomial. Find the largest interval over which the approximation is guaranteed to be accurate to within 10^{-3}.

23. Find a bound on the error in approximating e^{10} by using the twenty-fifth Taylor polynomial of $g(x) = e^x$ expanded about $x_0 = 0$.

24. Find a bound on the error of the approximation

$$e^2 \approx 1 + 2 + \frac{1}{2}(2)^2 + \frac{1}{6}(2)^3 + \frac{1}{24}(2)^4 + \frac{1}{120}(2)^5$$

according to Taylor's Theorem. Compare this bound to the actual error.

25. Suppose $f^{(8)}(x) = e^x \cos x$ for some function f. Find a bound on the error in approximating $f(x)$ over the interval $[0, \pi/2]$ using $T_7(f)$ expanded about $x_0 = 0$.

26. Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{x}$, and $x_0 = 5$. [S]

    (a) Find $T_2(x)$.
    (b) Find $R_2(x)$.
    (c) Use $T_2(x)$ to approximate $f(1)$ and $f(9)$.
    (d) Find a theoretical upper bound on the absolute error of each of the approximations in part (c).
    (e) Find a theoretical lower bound on the absolute error of each of the approximations in part (c).
    (f) Find the actual absolute error for each of the approximations in part (c). Verify that they are indeed between the theoretical bounds.
    (g) Sketch graphs of $f(x)$ and $T_2(x)$ on the same set of axes for $x \in [1, 9]$.

27. Let $f(x) = \ln(1 + x)$ and $x_0 = 0$.

    (a) Find $T_3(x)$.
    (b) Find $R_3(x)$.
    (c) Use $T_3(x)$ to approximate $f(1)$ and $f(26)$.
    (d) Find a theoretical upper bound on the absolute error of each of the approximations in part (c).
    (e) Find a theoretical lower bound on the absolute error of each of the approximations in part (c).

(f) Find the actual absolute error for each of the approximations in part (c). Verify that they are indeed between the theoretical bounds.

(g) Sketch graphs of $f(x)$ and $T_2(x)$ on the same set of axes for $x \in [1, 26]$.

28. Suppose $f(x)$ is such that $-3 \le f^{(10)}(x) \le 7$ for all $x \in [0, 10]$. Find lower and upper bounds on the absolute error in using $T_9(x)$ expanded about $x_0 = 3$ to approximate

    (a) $f(0)$.
    (b) $f(10)$.

29. Suppose you wish to approximate the value of $-e^4 \sin 4$ using separate Maclaurin polynomials (Taylor polynomials expanded about $x_0 = 0$) for the sine and exponential functions instead of a single Maclaurin polynomial for the function $f(x) = -e^x \sin x$. How many terms of each would you need in order to get accuracy within 10^{-20}? Ignore roundoff error.

30. Find a theoretical upper bound, as a function of x, for the absolute error in using $T_4(x)$ to approximate $f(x)$.

    (a) $e^x \sin x$; $x_0 = 0$.
    (b) e^{-x^2}; $x_0 = 0$. [S]
    (c) $\frac{10}{x} + \sin(10x)$; $x_0 = \pi$.

31. The Maclaurin Series for $f(x) = e^{-x}$ is

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^i}{i!} x^i = 1 - x + \frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{6}x^3 + \dots$$

Find a bound on the error in approximating $1/e$ by $1 - 1 + 1/2 - 1/6 + 1/24$.

32. The Taylor series for $f(x) = e^x$ is $T(x) = 1 + x + \frac{1}{2!}x^2 + \frac{1}{3!}x^3 + \frac{1}{4!}x^4 + \frac{1}{5!}x^5 + \cdots$. This series converges to $f(x)$ for all values of x. In particular, for $x = 1$, this means that

$$f(1) = T(1) = 1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2!}(1)^2 + \frac{1}{3!}(1)^3 + \frac{1}{4!}(1)^4 + \cdots$$

Simplifying this equation, we see that

$$e = 1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{24} + \frac{1}{120} + \cdots$$

Use Taylor Series to find infinite sums that sum to

    (a) $\ln(2)$
    (b) $2/3$
    (c) $\pi/4$
    (d) $\sqrt{2}$

1.3   Speed

Besides accuracy, there is nothing more important about a numerical method than speed. There is almost always a trade off between one and the other, however. Fast computations are often not particularly accurate, and accurate calculations are often not particularly fast. There are certain algorithms that produce accurate results quickly, however. Deriving them, or identifying them once derived is what numerical analysis is all about.

The first type of numerical method we will encounter produces a sequence of approximations that, when everything is working, approach some desired value, say p. With these methods, we will get a sequence $\langle p_n \rangle$ with $\lim_{n \to \infty} p_n = p$. You should be familiar with the concept of the limit of a sequence from Calculus, but the purpose there was much different from ours here. Generally, you were concerned with whether a given sequence converged at all. And when it did converge, and you were very lucky, you were able to determine the limit. In numerical analysis, we know certain sequences converge, and are only interested in how quickly they do so.

Simple observation (and a little common sense) can tell you which cars on a highway are traveling faster than which. Simple observation (and a little common sense) will also often tell you which sequences converge faster than which. Consider the sequences in Table 1.4 which all converge to $e \approx 2.71828182845904$.

Table 1.4: Some sequences that converge to e.

n	q_n	r_n	s_n	t_n
0	3	3	3	3
1	2.9436563656918	2.86799618929986	2.82129001274358	2.78177393100014
2	2.89858145824525	2.78315514435127	2.73850656616954	2.72150682612711
3	2.86252153228801	2.73974041668143	2.71973377603211	2.71829014894701
4	2.83367359152222	2.72324781752852	2.71830229432561	2.71828182851442
5	2.81059523890958	2.71899828870116	2.71828184916891	2.71828182845904
6	2.79213255681947	2.71833715075158	2.71828182845934	2.71828182845904
7	2.77736241114739	2.71828369688657	2.71828182845904	2.71828182845904
8	2.76554629460972	2.71828184959225	2.71828182845904	2.71828182845904
9	2.75609340137958	2.71828182851528	2.71828182845904	2.71828182845904
10	2.74853108679547	2.71828182845907	2.71828182845904	2.71828182845904
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$

$\langle t_n \rangle$ is accurate to 15 significant digits by the sixth term; $\langle s_n \rangle$ is accurate to 15 significant digits by the eighth term; $\langle r_n \rangle$ is still not accurate to 15 significant digits by the eleventh term, but seems likely to gain 15 significant digits of accuracy on the twelfth term; and $\langle q_n \rangle$ is only accurate to 2 significant digits by the eleventh term, so seems likely to take considerably more than twelve terms to gain 15 significant digits of accuracy. Since they all started at 3, it seems reasonable to say that, ordered from fastest to slowest, they are $\langle t_n \rangle$, $\langle s_n \rangle$, $\langle r_n \rangle$, $\langle q_n \rangle$. And that is correct as we will see soon. But just like knowing which cars are faster than which is different from knowing has fast each is going, knowing which sequences canverge faster than which is different from knowing how quickly each one converges. To measure the speed of a given car, you need access to its spedometer or a radar gun. To measure the order of convergence (speed) of a sequence, you need a definition and a little algebra.

Order of convergence of a sequence

Suppose the sequence $\langle p_n \rangle$ converges to p. Then we say $\langle p_n \rangle$ converges with order $\alpha \geq 1$ if

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{|p_{n+1} - p|}{|p_n - p|^\alpha} = \lambda$$

for some real number $\lambda > 0$.

Let's see how to use this definition to calculate the orders of convergence of the sequences in Table 1.4. According to the definition, α, should it exist, gives the speed (or order) of convergence of a sequence. Now assuming that α does exist, we have that $\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{|p_{n+1} - p|}{|p_n - p|^\alpha} = \lambda$, so for large enough n,

$$\frac{|p_{n+1} - p|}{|p_n - p|^\alpha} \approx \frac{|p_{n+2} - p|}{|p_{n+1} - p|^\alpha} \approx \lambda.$$

In particular, we can solve for α to find $\alpha \approx \dfrac{\ln \left| \frac{p_{n+2}-p}{p_{n+1}-p} \right|}{\ln \left| \frac{p_{n+1}-p}{p_n-p} \right|}$.

Crumpet 6: Order of Convergence Less than or equal to 1?

There is no such thing as an order of convergence less than one because if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{|p_{n+1}-p|}{|p_n-p|^\alpha} = \lambda$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{|p_{n+1}-p|}{|p_n-p|} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{|p_{n+1}-p|}{|p_n-p|^\alpha} \cdot |p_n-p|^{\alpha-1},$$

a contradiction. On the one hand, the ratio test implies that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{|p_{n+1}-p|}{|p_n-p|}$ exists and is less than or equal to 1. On the other hand, $\alpha < 1 \implies \alpha - 1 < 0$ so for $|p_n-p|$ small, $|p_n-p|^{\alpha-1}$ is large. Hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{|p_{n+1}-p|}{|p_n-p|^\alpha} \cdot |p_n-p|^{\alpha-1}$ does not exist. To be rigorous, let M be any real number. Then there exists an N_1 such that $n > N_1$ implies $\frac{|p_{n+1}-p|}{|p_n-p|^\alpha} > 0.9\lambda$. There also exists N_2 such that $n > N_2$ implies $|p_n-p| < \left(\dfrac{0.9\lambda}{M} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$, so $|p_n-p|^{\alpha-1} > \frac{M}{0.9\lambda}$. Letting $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$ we have that $n > N$ implies both $\frac{|p_{n+1}-p|}{|p_n-p|^\alpha} > 0.9\lambda$ and $|p_n-p|^{\alpha-1} > \frac{M}{0.9\lambda}$. Hence, for $n > N$, we have

$$\frac{|p_{n+1}-p|}{|p_n-p|} = \frac{|p_{n+1}-p|}{|p_n-p|^\alpha} \cdot |p_n-p|^{\alpha-1} > 0.9\lambda \cdot \frac{M}{0.9\lambda} = M.$$

Therefore, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{|p_{n+1}-p|}{|p_n-p|}$ does not exist. When $\alpha = 1$, it must be that $\lambda \leq 1$ because otherwise the ratio test implies that $\langle |p_n-p| \rangle$ diverges, and therefore $\langle p_n \rangle$ diverges.

For example, $\dfrac{\ln \left| \frac{q_2-e}{q_1-e} \right|}{\ln \left| \frac{q_1-e}{q_0-e} \right|} \approx \dfrac{\ln \left| \frac{2.8985-e}{2.9436-e} \right|}{\ln \left| \frac{2.9436-e}{3-e} \right|} \approx 1$ and $\dfrac{\ln \left| \frac{q_{10}-e}{q_9-e} \right|}{\ln \left| \frac{q_9-e}{q_8-e} \right|} = \dfrac{\ln \left| \frac{2.7485-e}{2.7560-e} \right|}{\ln \left| \frac{2.7560-e}{2.7655-e} \right|} \approx 1$. And if we try other sets of three consecutive terms of $\langle q_n \rangle$, we get the same results. The order of convergence of $\langle q_n \rangle$ is about 1. Of course, we would need a formula for $|q_n - e|$ to determine whether the limit were truly 1, but we have some evidence. Repeating the calculations for $\langle r_n \rangle$, $\langle s_n \rangle$, and $\langle t_n \rangle$, we get approximate orders of convergence 1.322, 1.618, and 2, respectively. Again we see that, ordered from fastest to slowest, they are $\langle t_n \rangle$, $\langle s_n \rangle$, $\langle r_n \rangle$, $\langle q_n \rangle$.

If you attempted to calculate the orders of convergence yourself, you may have noticed that more information is needed to use s_n with $n > 6$ or t_n with $n > 4$. All of these terms in the table are equal so the formula for α fails to produce a real number! A more useful table for calculating orders of convergence is one listing absolute errors: In additon to making it easier to calculate α, this chart makes it painfully

Table 1.5: Absolute errors.

n	$\|q_n - e\|$	$\|r_n - e\|$	$\|s_n - e\|$	$\|t_n - e\|$
0	$2.817(10)^{-1}$	$2.817(10)^{-1}$	$2.817(10)^{-1}$	$2.817(10)^{-1}$
1	$2.253(10)^{-1}$	$1.497(10)^{-1}$	$1.03(10)^{-1}$	$6.349(10)^{-2}$
2	$1.802(10)^{-1}$	$6.487(10)^{-2}$	$2.022(10)^{-2}$	$3.224(10)^{-3}$
3	$1.442(10)^{-1}$	$2.145(10)^{-2}$	$1.451(10)^{-3}$	$8.32(10)^{-6}$
4	$1.153(10)^{-1}$	$4.965(10)^{-3}$	$2.046(10)^{-5}$	$5.538(10)^{-11}$
5	$9.231(10)^{-2}$	$7.164(10)^{-4}$	$2.07(10)^{-8}$	$2.453(10)^{-21}$
6	$7.385(10)^{-2}$	$5.532(10)^{-5}$	$2.953(10)^{-13}$	$4.817(10)^{-42}$
7	$5.908(10)^{-2}$	$1.868(10)^{-6}$	$4.263(10)^{-21}$	$1.856(10)^{-83}$
8	$4.726(10)^{-2}$	$2.113(10)^{-8}$	$8.777(10)^{-34}$	$2.757(10)^{-166}$
9	$3.781(10)^{-2}$	$5.623(10)^{-11}$	$2.608(10)^{-54}$	$6.084(10)^{-332}$
10	$3.024(10)^{-2}$	$2.22(10)^{-14}$	$1.595(10)^{-87}$	$2.961(10)^{-663}$

obvious that our common sense conclusion about which sequences converge faster than which was quite

right. Just compare the accuracy (absolute errors) of the eleventh terms.

So now we can calculate orders of convergence , but what does it all mean? What does the order of convergence tell us about successive terms in the sequence? Solving the approximation $\frac{|p_{n+1}-p|}{|p_n-p|^\alpha} \approx \lambda$ gives us that $|p_{n+1}-p| \approx \lambda|p_n-p|^\alpha$. So, roughly speaking, convergence of order α means that, for large enough n, the approximation p_{n+1} is about $\lambda|p_n-p|^{\alpha-1}$ times closer to the limit p than is p_n. To rephrase in terms of significant digits of accuracy, a little bit of algebra:

$$
\begin{aligned}
|p_{n+1}-p| &\approx \lambda|p_n-p|^\alpha \\
\left|\frac{p_{n+1}-p}{p}\right| &\approx \lambda\left|\frac{p_n-p}{p}\right|^\alpha \cdot |p|^{\alpha-1} \\
-\log\left|\frac{p_{n+1}-p}{p}\right| &\approx -\log\left|\frac{p_n-p}{p}\right|^\alpha - \log\left(\lambda|p|^{\alpha-1}\right) \\
d(p_{n+1}) &\approx \alpha d(p_n) - \log\left(\lambda|p|^{\alpha-1}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Based on this calculation, we conclude these rules of thumb:

1. for linear convergence ($\alpha = 1$), $d(p_{n+1}) \approx d(p_n) - \log\lambda$, so each term has a fixed number more significant digits of accuracy (approximately equal to $-\log\lambda$) than the previous;

2. for quadratic convergence ($\alpha = 2$), $d(p_{n+1}) \approx 2d(p_n) - \log\left(\lambda|p|\right)$, so each term has double the number of significant digits of accuracy of the previous, give or take some;

3. for cubic convergence ($\alpha = 3$), $d(p_{n+1}) \approx 3d(p_n) - \log\left(\lambda|p|^2\right)$, so each term has triple the number of significant digits of accuracy of the previous, give or take some;

and so on. Summarizing, for large n, you can expect that each term will have $-\log\left(\lambda|p|^{\alpha-1}\right)$ more than α times as many significant digits of accuracy as the previous term. We can see this claim in action by calculating λ for the sequences $\langle t_n\rangle$, $\langle s_n\rangle$, $\langle r_n\rangle$, and $\langle q_n\rangle$. Using the fact that $\lambda \approx \frac{|p_{n+1}-p|}{|p_n-p|^\alpha}$, we find that $\lambda = 0.8$ for each sequence. Therefore, $\langle q_n\rangle$ should show each term having $-\log 0.8 \approx .1$ more significant digits of accuracy than the previous. More sensibly, this means the sequence will show about one more significant digit of accuracy every ten terms. This is born out by observing that q_0 has error about $3(10)^{-1}$ while q_{10} has error about $3(10)^{-2}$. For $\langle r_n\rangle$, we should expect each term to have about $-\log(0.8 \cdot e^{.322}) \approx -0.04$ more than 1.322 times as many significant digits of accuracy as the previous. For example, r_3 has about $\log\left|\frac{e}{2.145(10)^{-2}}\right| \approx 2.1$ significant digits of accuracy while r_4 has about $1.322(2.1) - .04 \approx 2.73$ significant digits of accuracy, r_5 has $1.322(2.73) - .04 \approx 3.57$ significant digits of accuracy, and so on until r_8 has about 8.1 significant digits of accuracy. Again this is born out by the table as $\log\left|\frac{e}{r_8-e}\right| = \log\left|\frac{e}{2.113(10)^{-8}}\right| \approx 8.1$. Though we can do a similar calculation for $\langle t_n\rangle$, it's easier just to eyeball it since all we need to see is that the exponent in the scientific notation doubles, give or take a little, from one term to the next. Indeed it does as it goes from 1 to 2 to 3 to 6 to 11, and so on.

Note that in all this analysis, we have ignored the requirement that n be "large". That was acceptable in this case since these sequences were contrived so that even $n = 0$ was large enough! In practical applications this will not be the case.

To appreciate just how much faster one order of convergence is over another, consider the relation

$$d(p_{n+1}) \approx \alpha d(p_n) - \log\left(\lambda|p|^{\alpha-1}\right)$$

again. Now suppose we know that $d(p_{n_0}) = d_{n_0}$ for some particular n_0 large enough that the approximation is reasonable. Then it can be shown that, for $\alpha > 1$,

$$d(p_{n_0+k}) \approx (d_{n_0} - C)\alpha^k + C$$

where $C = \dfrac{\log\left(\lambda|p|^{\alpha-1}\right)}{\alpha - 1}$.

Crumpet 7: Solving a Recurrence Relation

The relation $d(p_{n+1}) \approx \alpha d(p_n) - \log\left(\lambda|p|^{\alpha-1}\right)$ is an example of a recurrence relation. In particular, a first order linear nonhomogeneous recurrence relation with constant coefficients since it has the form

$$a_{n+1} = k_1 a_n + k_2$$

where k_1 and k_2 are constants. Linear nonhomogeneous recurrence relations can be solved by summing a homogeneous solution and a particular solution. For the particular solution, we seek a solution of the form $a_n = A$ (for all n) by substituting this assumed solution into the recurrence relation. Doing so gives $A = k_1 A + k_2$, so $A = \frac{k_2}{1-k_1}$ is such a solution. For the homogeneous solution, we seek a sequence of the form $a_n = r^n$ that satisfies $a_{n+1} = k_1 a_n + 0$. Substituting our assumed solution into the modified (homogeneous) recurrence relation gives $r^{n+1} = k_1 r^n$. Rearranging, $r^n(r - k_1) = 0$ so $r = 0$ or $r = k_1$. Notice that Bk_1^n is also a solution for any constant B. This includes the solution $a_n = 0$ which would arise from setting $r = 0$. Finally, putting the particular and homogeneous solutions together, the solution of $a_{n+1} = k_1 a_n + k_2$ is $a_n = Bk_1^n + \frac{k_2}{1-k_1}$ for any constant B. In the case of $d(p_{n+1}) \approx \alpha d(p_n) - \log\left(\lambda|p|^{\alpha-1}\right)$, $k_1 = \alpha$ and $k_2 = -\log\left(\lambda|p|^{\alpha-1}\right)$ so $d(p_n) = B\alpha^n + \frac{\log\left(\lambda|p|^{\alpha-1}\right)}{\alpha-1}$. The value of B is determined by substituting any known element of the sequence into this formula and solving for B. Supposing $d(p_{n_0}) = d_{n_0}$ yields $d(p_n) = \left(d_{n_0} - \frac{\log\left(\lambda|p|^{\alpha-1}\right)}{\alpha-1}\right)\alpha^n + \frac{\log\left(\lambda|p|^{\alpha-1}\right)}{\alpha-1}$.

The important thing to see here is that $d(p_{n_0+k})$ is an exponential function when $\alpha > 1$. The number of significant digits of accuracy grows exponentially with base α. As we saw before, for $\alpha = 1$, the number of significant digits grows linearly. In calculus you learned that any exponential function grows much faster than any polynomial function, so it is reasonable and correct to conclude that sequences converging with orders greater than 1 are markedly faster converging than are sequences converging with linear ($\alpha = 1$) order.

But be careful. Based on this same memory of calculus, you would also conclude that the sequence $\langle 2^{-n} \rangle$ converges to 0 much faster than does $\langle n^{-2} \rangle$. By some measures, that's true, but not by all measures. Consider the orders of convergence of these two sequences. We seek values α_1 and α_2 such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{|2^{-(n+1)} - 0|}{|2^{-n} - 0|^{\alpha_1}} = \lambda_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{|(n+1)^{-2} - 0|}{|n^{-2} - 0|^{\alpha_2}} = \lambda_2$$

for some real numbers λ_1 and λ_2. A little bit of algebra will lead to solutions:

$$\frac{|2^{-(n+1)} - 0|}{|2^{-n} - 0|^{\alpha_1}} = \frac{2^{-n-1}}{2^{-\alpha_1 n}} = 2^{(\alpha_1-1)n-1}$$

$$\text{while}$$

$$\frac{|(n+1)^{-2} - 0|}{|n^{-2} - 0|^{\alpha_2}} = \frac{n^{2\alpha_2}}{n^2 + 2n + 1}.$$

The only way $\lim_{n\to\infty} 2^{(\alpha_1-1)n-1}$ will be a nonzero constant is if $\alpha_1 = 1$. The only way $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{n^{2\alpha_2}}{n^2+2n+1}$ will be a nonzero constant is if the leading coefficients of the numerator and denominator are equal. That means α_2 must be 1 as well. So $\langle 2^{-n} \rangle$ and $\langle n^{-2} \rangle$ both converge to zero with linear order. They are equally extremely slow to converge by this measure! Still, something should not feel quite right about claiming that $\langle 2^{-n} \rangle$ and $\langle n^{-2} \rangle$ converge at the same speed.

Rate of Convergence of a Sequence

For sequences that converge with linear order, we need a finer measure than order to determine which is faster than which. Recall from calculus,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{2^{-n}}{n^{-2}} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{n^2}{2^n}$$

$$= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{2n}{2^n \ln 2}$$

$$= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{2}{2^n (\ln 2)^2} = 0,$$

indicating that $\langle 2^{-n} \rangle$ approaches 0 much faster than does $\langle n^{-2} \rangle$. You may also recall comparisons between power functions:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{n^{-p}}{n^{-q}} = 0$$

whenever $p > q > 0$; and between exponential functions:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{a^{-n}}{b^{-n}} = 0$$

whenever $a > b \geq 1$; and between the two:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{a^{-n}}{n^{-q}} = 0$$

whenever $a > 1$. In other words, sequences of the form $\langle \frac{1}{a^n} \rangle$ converge to zero faster than sequences of the form $\langle \frac{1}{n^p} \rangle$ whenever $a > 1$. The sequence $\langle \frac{1}{a^n} \rangle$ converges to zero faster than $\langle \frac{1}{b^n} \rangle$ whenever $a > b \geq 1$. The sequence $\langle \frac{1}{n^p} \rangle$ converges to zero faster than $\langle \frac{1}{n^q} \rangle$ whenever $p > q > 0$. Not all functions are as simple as these, but we can use these as our yard sticks. Suppose $\langle p_n \rangle$ converges to p, $\langle b_n \rangle$ converges to 0 and $|p_n - p| \leq \lambda |b_n|$ for some constant λ and all sufficiently large n. Then we say that $\langle p_n \rangle$ converges to p with rate of convergence $O(b_n)$, read "big-oh of b_n". Since we are familiar with sequences of the forms $\langle \frac{1}{a^n} \rangle$ for some constant $a > 1$ and $\langle \frac{1}{n^p} \rangle$ for some constant $p > 0$, and they are simple enough, typically $\langle b_n \rangle$ will be one of them. For example, $\langle \frac{2n+1}{4n} \rangle$ converges to $\frac{1}{2}$, and

$$\left| \frac{2n+1}{4n} - \frac{1}{2} \right| = \frac{1}{4n} \leq \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{n},$$

so $\langle \frac{2n+1}{4n} \rangle$ converges with rate $O(\frac{1}{n})$. We may also say that $\frac{2n+1}{4n} = \frac{1}{2} + O(\frac{1}{n})$ to convey exactly the same message. Normally, when we find a rate of convergence, we try to find the fastest converging sequence from our stock of simple examples that satisfies the definition. In this case, there is none faster.

Basically all the sequences studied in any depth in calculus converge with linear order. So what does it take to converge with a higher order? Let's have a look at $\langle e^{-2^n} \rangle$.

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{|e^{-2^{n+1}} - 0|}{|e^{-2^n} - 0|^\alpha} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{e^{-2 \cdot 2^n}}{e^{-\alpha 2^n}} = 1$$

when $\alpha = 2$. So $\langle \frac{1}{e^{2^n}} \rangle$ is quadratically convergent. Essentially, it takes an exponentially growing exponent to converge with an order greater than 1.

Crumpet 8: Approximating π

The sequence

$$\frac{1103 \cdot 2^{3/2}}{9801}, \quad \frac{1130173253125}{313826716467 \cdot 2^{7/2}}, \quad \frac{10293474773907866609545}{1116521080257783321 \cdot 2^{23/2}}, \cdots$$

converges to $\frac{1}{\pi}$. Its terms are given by the formula

$$\left\langle \frac{\sqrt{8}}{9801} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{(4j)!(1103 + 26390j)}{(j!)^4 \cdot 396^{4j}} \right\rangle_{n=0,1,2,3,\ldots}$$

of Srinivasa Ramanujan. For all practical purposes, it converges very quickly. The first term already has about 8 significant digits of accuracy:

$$\frac{1103 \cdot 2^{3/2}}{9801} \approx 0.31830987844047012321768445317$$

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \approx 0.31830988618379067153776752674,$$

and the second has about 16:

$$\left| \frac{1130173253125}{313826716467 \cdot 2^{7/2}} - \frac{1}{\pi} \right| \approx 6.48(10)^{-17},$$

double the accuracy of the first term. The third term is already more than double-precision accurate.

It's tempting to believe, or hope, the sequence is quadratically convergent, but it is not. The third term has an accuracy of about 24 significant digits. Each term in the sequence is approximately 8 significant digits more accurate than the previous—the hallmark of a linearly convergent sequence.

Key Concepts

Order of convergence The sequence $\langle p_n \rangle$ converges to p with order of convergence $\alpha \geq 1$ if

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{|p_{n+1} - p|}{|p_n - p|^\alpha} = \lambda$$

for some real number $\lambda > 0$.

Absolute error For a sequence $\langle p_n \rangle$ that converges to p with order α, the absolute errors of consecutive terms are related by the approximation

$$|p_{n+1} - p| \approx \lambda |p_n - p|^\alpha$$

for large enough n.

Significant digits of accuracy For a sequence $\langle p_n \rangle$ that converges to p with order α, the numbers of significant digits of accuracy of consecutive terms are related by the approximation

$$d(p_{n+1}) \approx \alpha d(p_n) - \log\left(\lambda |p|^{\alpha-1}\right)$$

for large enough n. In closed form (for $\alpha \neq 1$)

$$d(p_{n+k}) = (d_n - C)\alpha^k + C$$

where $C = \dfrac{\log\left(\lambda |p|^{\alpha-1}\right)}{\alpha - 1}$.

Rate of convergence The sequence $\langle p_n \rangle$ converges to p with rate of convergence $O(b_n)$ if $\langle b_n \rangle$ converges to 0 and

$$|p_n - p| \leq \lambda |b_n|$$

for some constant λ and all sufficiently large n.

Octave

An invaluable tool in any kind of programming is looping. When you need to perform some procedure multiple times for varying input, a loop is probably the right solution. While there are several types of loops available in Octave, we will discuss only `for` loops right now. The idea is to have a variable, sometimes called a counter, that counts how many times the procedure has been performed. When the procedure has been performed the desired number of times, the looping ends, and the program continues from there. You almost certainly encountered this idea before you ever wrote a computer program. If you ever went to the fair and paid a dollar to toss a dozen rings in hopes of landing one on the neck of a soda bottle, you have experienced looping. You may have even counted the rings as you tossed them. You were the counter! You had to perform the procedure of throwing a ring into the field of bottles 12 times. So, perhaps you threw one and counted to yourself "1". Then you threw another and counted "2". And another and counted "3". And so on through "12". When the last ring was tossed, you continued about your day at the fair.

The `for` loop is an abstract analogy of this situation. Suppose you want to calculate 1!, 2!, 3!, and so on through 12!. In Octave, you could create the following `.m` file and run it.

```
factorial(1)
factorial(2)
factorial(3)
factorial(4)
```

```
factorial(5)
factorial(6)
factorial(7)
factorial(8)
factorial(9)
factorial(10)
factorial(11)
factorial(12)
```

But this can be tedious and not particularly reader-friendly, especially if we are interested in doing some computation many more than 12 times. The purpose of the loop is to reduce the repetitiveness of this approach. We want to perform the procedure of calculating the factorial of 12 different integers, so a loop is appropriate. The syntax for the loop is to set up the counter, write the code to perform the procedure, and mark the end of the loop. It looks something like this.

```
for j=first:last
   do something.
end%for
```

This will cause Octave to perform the procedure once for each integer from `first` to `last`, including both `first` and `last`. The value of the counter, `j` in this case, may be used in the procedure. So to calculate 1! through 12!, we might write

```
for j=1:12
   factorial(j)
end%for
```

This will produce exactly the same output as the program with one line for each factorial. And if later you want to calculate 1! through 20! instead, all you have to do is change the 12 to a 20. The `for` loop is your friend!

Now suppose we want to calculate α for each set of three consecutive values of $|s_n - e|$ from Table 1.5. Since there are 9 such sets, we need to create a loop that will run through 9 times. And inside the loop, we will need to perform the calculation $\alpha = \dfrac{\ln\left|\frac{s_{n+2}-e}{s_{n+1}-e}\right|}{\ln\left|\frac{s_{n+1}-e}{s_n-e}\right|}$. But before we can start, we need to tell Octave about the 11 values from the table. The most convenient way to do so is in an array. An array is like a vector. It has components. In this case, each component will hold one value from the table. And the syntax for creating the array is a lot like vector notation. We will use square brackets to delimit the components of the array, and we will separate the components by commas. So, the first line of our Octave code will look like this.

```
errs = [2.817*10^(-1), 1.03*10^(-1), 2.022*10^(-2), 1.451*10^(-3), ...
        2.046*10^(-5), 2.07*10^(-8), 2.953*10^(-13), 4.263*10^(-21), ...
        8.777*10^(-34), 2.608*10^(-54), 1.595*10^(-87)]
```

The ellipses (three consecutive dots) at the ends of the first two lines are needed to tell Octave that the command continues onto the next line. Without them, separating a single command over multiple lines will cause a syntax error. Starting a new line in Octave is the signal to start a new command as well.

Now Octave knows the values of $|s_n - e|$. Using this vector is a lot like using subscripts. The first value, $2.817(10)^{-1}$, is called `errs(1)`. The second is called `errs(2)`. The third is called `errs(3),` and so on. The length of the array `errs` can be retrieved using the `length()` function of Octave. The command `length(errs)-2` will be used instead of hard-coding the 9. So we can finish the Octave code like so.

```
errs = [2.817*10^(-1), 1.03*10^(-1), 2.022*10^(-2), 1.451*10^(-3), ...
        2.046*10^(-5), 2.07*10^(-8), 2.953*10^(-13), 4.263*10^(-21), ...
        8.777*10^(-34), 2.608*10^(-54), 1.595*10^(-87)];
for j=1:length(errs)-2
   alpha = log(errs(j+2)/errs(j+1))/log(errs(j+1)/errs(j))
end%for
```

This code produces these results:

```
alpha =   1.6182
alpha =   1.6181
alpha =   1.6176
alpha =   1.6182
alpha =   1.6180
alpha =   1.6180
alpha =   1.6180
alpha =   1.6180
alpha =   1.6180
```

Not bad, but we can do better. Let's calculate α, λ, and $d(s_n)$ by two different methods—directly and using the formula $d(p_{n+1}) \approx \alpha d(p_n) - \log\left(\lambda|p|^{\alpha-1}\right)$. Then let's display the results in a nicely formatted table.

We will need the `disp()` command and a two-index array. The `disp()` command is used to display some text or some quantity. When used for text, the text needs to be delimited by single quotation marks. When used for quantities, not. So, we might have an Octave program output the word "hello" with the command `disp('hello')` or have it output the value of ln(2) with the command `disp(log(2))`. The `disp()` command can also handle variables, so if `p1` and `p2` have been assigned values, then we can display their difference using `disp(p2-p1)`. A two-index array can be thought of as a table, or a matrix. It holds values in what can be imagined as rows and columns. So, instead of having `errs(j)` as we did before, we may have `errs(j,k)` where `j` indicates the row and `k` indicates the column. The program

```
A(2,4) = 7;
disp(A);
```

produces

```
    0    0    0    0
    0    0    0    7
```

OK, back to the task at hand. We will combine everything we have learned about Octave into one program.

```
errs = [2.817*10^(-1), 1.03*10^(-1), 2.022*10^(-2), 1.451*10^(-3), ...
     2.046*10^(-5), 2.07*10^(-8), 2.953*10^(-13), 4.263*10^(-21), ...
     8.777*10^(-34), 2.608*10^(-54), 1.595*10^(-87)];

d = inline('-log(x/exp(1))/log(10)');
for j=1:9
    % alpha:
  T(j,1) = log(errs(j+2)/errs(j+1))/log(errs(j+1)/errs(j));
    % lambda:
  T(j,2) = errs(j+2)/errs(j+1)^T(j,1);
    % d (explicit):
  T(j,3) = d(errs(j+2));
end

alpha = 1.61804;
lambda = 0.8;
constant = log(lambda*exp(alpha-1))/log(10);
T(1,4) = T(1,3);
for j=2:9
    % d (recursive)
  T(j,4) = alpha * T(j-1,4) - constant;
end%for

disp('      alpha     lambda    d (expl)     d (rec)');
disp('  ---------------------------------------------');
disp(T)
```

produces

```
    alpha      lambda    d (expl)    d (rec)
--------------------------------------------
  1.61816     0.80015    2.12851     2.12851
  1.61814     0.80010    3.27263     3.27252
  1.61764     0.79855    5.12339     5.12356
  1.61822     0.80158    8.11832     8.11863
  1.61797     0.79941   12.96403    12.96477
  1.61804     0.80045   20.80458    20.80601
  1.61805     0.80059   33.49095    33.49346
  1.61804     0.80031   54.01799    54.02225
  1.61804     0.80031   87.23153    87.23866
```

It is worth taking some time to make sure you understand all the lines of this program. It uses assignment, built-in functions, inline functions, simple output, arrays, and `for` loops. The `%` on a line tells Octave to ignore it and everything on the line that follows. These tidbits are called comments. They are strictly for the human user to document what the program does. Lengthy programs should always be documented so any user of the program will be better able to understand what it does. Here the comments are simple, but they may be much more elaborate.

Exercises

1. Some convergent sequences and their limits are given. Find the order of convergence for each.

   (a) $\left\langle \dfrac{n!}{n^n} \right\rangle \to 0$

   (b) $\left\langle \dfrac{1}{3^{e^n}} \right\rangle \to 0$ [S]

   (c) $\left\langle \dfrac{2^{2^n} - 2}{2^{2^n} + 3} \right\rangle \to 1$ [S]

   (d) $\left\langle \dfrac{n^2}{1 + n^2} \right\rangle \to 1$ [A]

   (e) $\left\langle \dfrac{e^n}{e^{e^n}} \right\rangle \to 0$

2. Show that the sequence $\left\langle \dfrac{n+1}{n-1} \right\rangle$ converges to 1 linearly.

3. Show that the sequence $p_n = 2^{1-2^n}$ is quadratically convergent.

4. Give an example of a sequence which converges to 0 with order $\alpha = 10$.

5. Approximate the order of convergence of the sequence p_n and explain your answer.

n	$\dfrac{\|p_{n+1}-p\|}{\|p_n-p\|^{1.2}}$	$\dfrac{\|p_{n+1}-p\|}{\|p_n-p\|^{1.3}}$	$\dfrac{\|p_{n+1}-p\|}{\|p_n-p\|^{1.4}}$
25	$9.07(10)^{-6}$	.0110	13.39
26	$1.88(10)^{-7}$	.00303	48.65
27	$1.01(10)^{-9}$	.000530	277.8
28			

6. Some linearly convergent sequences and their limits are given. Find the (fastest) rate of convergence of the form $O\left(\frac{1}{n^p}\right)$ or $O\left(\frac{1}{a^n}\right)$ for each. If this is not possible, suggest a reasonable rate of convergence.

   (a) $6, \dfrac{6}{7}, \dfrac{6}{49}, \dfrac{6}{343}, \dfrac{6}{2401}, \ldots \to 0$

   (b) $\left\langle \dfrac{11n-2}{n+3} \right\rangle \to 11$

   (c) $\left\langle \dfrac{\sin n}{\sqrt{n}} \right\rangle \to 0$ [S]

   (d) $\left\langle \dfrac{4}{10^n + 35n + 9} \right\rangle \to 0$ [S]

   (e) $\left\langle \dfrac{4}{10^n - 35n - 9} \right\rangle \to 0$ [S]

   (f) $\left\langle \dfrac{2n}{\sqrt{n^2 + 3n}} \right\rangle \to 2$ [A]

   (g) $\left\langle \dfrac{5^n - 2}{5^n + 3} \right\rangle \to 1$

   (h) $\langle \sqrt{n + 47} - \sqrt{n} \rangle \to 0$ [A]

   (i) $\left\langle \dfrac{n^2}{3n^2 + 1} \right\rangle \to \dfrac{1}{3}$

   (j) $\left\langle \dfrac{\pi}{e^n - \pi^n} \right\rangle \to 0$

   (k) $\left\langle \dfrac{n^2}{2^n} \right\rangle \to 0$ [S]

   (l) $\left\langle \dfrac{7 + \cos(5n)}{n^3 + 1} \right\rangle \to 0$

   (m) $\left\langle \dfrac{8n^2}{3n^2 + 12} + \dfrac{n}{3n + 10} \right\rangle \to 3$

   (n) $\left\langle \dfrac{2n^2 + 3n}{1 - n^2} \right\rangle \to -2$ [A]

   (o) $\left\langle \dfrac{3n^5 - 5n}{1 - n^5} \right\rangle \to -3$

7. Find the rate of convergence of
   $$\lim_{h \to 0} (2 - e^h) = 1.$$

8. Find the rate of convergence of
   $$\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{\sin(h) - e^h + 1}{h} = 0.$$

9. Find the rates of convergence of the following sequences as $n \to \infty$.

   (a) $\displaystyle \lim_{n \to \infty} \sin \frac{1}{n} = 0$

   (b) $\displaystyle \lim_{n \to \infty} \sin \frac{1}{n^2} = 0$

(c) $\displaystyle\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\sin\frac{1}{n}\right)^2 = 0$

(d) $\displaystyle\lim_{n\to\infty}[\ln(n+1) - \ln(n)] = 0$

10. Find the rates of convergence of the following functions as $h \to 0$.

(a) $\displaystyle\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{\sin h}{h} = 1$

(b) $\displaystyle\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{1 - \cos h}{h} = 0$

(c) $\displaystyle\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{\sin h - h\cos h}{h} = 0$

(d) $\displaystyle\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{1 - e^h}{h} = -1$

11. Find the rate of convergence of

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{h^2 + \cos h - e^h}{h} = -1.$$

12. Show that

$$(\sin h)(1 - \cos h) = 0 + O(h^3).$$

13. 🌐 Write an Octave program (.m file) that uses a loop and the `disp()` command to produce the following output (powers of 7). [S]

```
1
7
49
343
2401
16807
117649
823543
5764801
40353607
```

14. 🌐 Write an Octave program (.m file) that uses a loop and the `disp()` command to output the first 10 powers of 5 starting with 5^0.

15. 🌐 Write an Octave program (.m file) that uses a loop, an array, and the disp() command to find the values of $f(n) = \dfrac{2^{2^n} - 2}{2^{2^n} + 3}$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, 4, 6, 10$. [S]

16. 🌐 Write an Octave program (.m file) that uses a loop, an array, and the disp() command to find the values of $f(n) = \dfrac{2n}{\sqrt{n^2 + 3n}}$ for $n = 0, 2, 5, 10, 100, 1000, 20000$.

17. 🌐 The following Octave code is intended to calculate the sum

$$\sum_{k=1}^{30}\frac{1}{k^2}$$

but it does not. Find as many mistakes in the code as you can. Classify each mistake as either a compilation error (an error that will prevent the program from running at all) or a bug (an error that will not prevent the program from running, but will cause improper calculation of the sum).

```
sum=1;
for k=1:30
   sum=sum+1.0/k*k;
end
diss(sum)
```

18. Some sequences do not have an order of convergence. Let $p_n = \frac{2^n}{n!}$.

(a) Show that $\lim_{n\to\infty} p_n = 0$.

(b) Show that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{|p_{n+1}|}{|p_n|} = 0$.

(c) Show that $\left\langle\frac{|p_{n+1}|}{|p_n|^\alpha}\right\rangle$ diverges for any $\alpha > 1$.

19. Use the rules of thumb for order of convergence to approximate the number of iterations it will take to achieve 12 significant digits of accuracy of π for each order of convergence. Assume each sequence starts with one significant digit of accuracy.

(a) $\alpha = 1$, $\lambda = 0.8$

(b) $\alpha = 1$, $\lambda = 0.5$ [S]

(c) $\alpha = 1$, $\lambda = 0.1$

(d) $\alpha = 1.5$

(e) $\alpha = 2$ [A]

(f) $\alpha = 3$

20. Prove that the order of convergence of a sequence is unique.

21. 🌐 Write a `for` loop that outputs the sequence of numbers.

(a) $7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15$

(b) $20, 19, 18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13$

(c) $12, 12.333, 12.667, 13, 13.333, 13.667, 14$

(d) $1, 9, 25, 49, 81, 121, 169, 225, 289, 361, 441$

(e) $1, .5, .25, .125, .0625, .03125, .015625$

1.4   Recursive Procedures

The Mathemagician

MATHEMAGICIAN: I have here an ordinary bed sheet. Nothing up my sleeves. No secret pockets. Maybe just a touch of magic dust. But other than that, an ordinary bed sheet. When lain flat it is, of course one layer thick. As I take these corners in my hands and place them over the opposite corners, folding the bed sheet in half, how many layers thick does it become?

AUDIENCE: Two!

MATHEMAGICIAN: Very good. Allow me to fold it in half again. Now how many layers thick has it become?

AUDIENCE: Four!

MATHEMAGICIAN: Excellent. Watch very closely as I fold it for a third time. Think hard and tell me how many layers thick is the folded sheet now.

AUDIENCE: Six! (from a few) Eight! (from more)

MATHEMAGICIAN: That's right. Eight. So much for the warm up. I shall now have my lovely assistant bring out another perfectly ordinary bed sheet. This time already folded. Crystal! The bed sheet please ... (Crystal brings out the bedsheet, already folded). Again, an ordinary bed sheet. This time folded. I shall now fold it in half as I have done before and ask again, how many layers thick has the sheet become?

AUDIENCE: (Mostly silent–just some murmurings)

MATHEMAGICIAN: I see. Well, I don't know either...

AUDIENCE: (Laughing)

MATHEMAGICIAN: ...but I can tell you it has twice as many as it had before!

AUDIENCE: (Mostly silent–just a few groans)

MATHEMAGICIAN: I know. I know. A cheap parlor trick. But wait! Watch as I slowly unfold the sheet, one fold at a time. One! ... Two! (he peers toward the sky as if in though) ... Three! ... (again seemingly deep in thought) ... Four! ... Four times folded in half and now, as you can plainly see, the sheet is three layers thick. The first fold was in thirds. (he peers off into space, waves his wand, stares deep into the eyes of the audience) Forty-eight!!!

AUDIENCE: (Silent but clearly wanting of an explanation)

MATHEMAGICIAN: The sheet started 3 layers thick, and was doubled in thickness four times ... 3 ... 6 ... 12 ... 24 ... 48.

Though it was meant to seem like a wise crack, the observation that folding a sheet in half doubles the number of layers was the key to counting the layers in the folded sheet. Recursive procedures are magical in the same way. They seem to hold nothing of value when, in fact, they hold the key. They are based on the principle that no matter what the current state of affairs (no matter how many layers thick the sheet is), following the procedure (folding it in half) will produce a predictable result (double the thickness).

Perhaps the simplest numerical example of this idea comes from thinking of a bag of marbles—an opaque bag with an unknown number of marbles inside. One marble is added, and you are asked how many are inside. Of course the best you can say is something like "one more than there were before." Even though you do not know how many marbles are in the bag to begin with, when one is added to the bag, you know the new total is one more than the previous total. This is recursive thinking.

Figure 1.4.1: 2×3 and 6×9 grids can be tiled with trominos.

Figure 1.4.2:   A $2^n \times 2^n$ grid can be (almost) tiled recursively.

Trominos

Connect three squares edge-to-edge in the shape of an L, and you have a tromino. Trominos aren't used in games like dominoes are, but are often used in interesting mathematical questions involving tiling. Tiling means covering without overlapping trominos and without having any parts of trominos lying outside the shape being tiled. For example, a 2×3 grid can be tiled with trominos as can a 6×9 grid . See Figure 1.4.1. If n is a positive integer, then a $2^n \times 2^n$ grid can almost be tiled with trominos. All but one square can be covered. Try it, first with a 2×2 grid. That one's not too hard. Then try it with a 4×4 grid or an 8×8 grid.

How about a 1024×1024 grid? I can't recommend that you actually get yourself a 1024×1024 grid of squares and start filling in with trominos. It would take $349,525$ trominos. You may not finish in your lifetime! Instead, it is time to start thinking recursively. Use the previous result in your answer. The same way you can just say the marble bag "has one more than before", we can phrase the solution to tiling the 1024×1024 grid in terms of the tiling of the 512×512 grid. Here's how it goes. Take a 1024×1024 grid and section it off into four 512×512 subgrids by dividing it down the middle both horizontally and vertically. In the upper left 512×512 grid, tile all but the bottom right corner. In the lower left 512×512 grid, tile all but the upper right corner. In the lower right grid, tile all but the upper left corner. Finally, in the upper right 512×512 grid, tile all but the upper right corner (Figure 1.4.2). This leaves room for a single L-shaped tromino in the middle, and one square left over. That's it! It should feel a little bit like cheating since we didn't specify how to deal with the 512×512 grid, but the same argument applies to the 512×512 grid. You can section it off into four subgrids, tile those and be done.

The same tiling argument can be made for any $2^n \times 2^n$ grid based on the $2^{n-1} \times 2^{n-1}$ tiling, except

Figure 1.4.3:   The 32×32 grid recursively tiled.

when $n = 1$. You just have to tile the 2×2 grid yourself! But once that's done, you have a complete solution for any $2^n \times 2^n$ grid. A similar exception applies to every recursive procedure. The recursion is only good most of the time. At some point, you have to get your hands dirty and supply a solution or answer. Such an answer is often called an initial condition.

Crumpet 9: Proof by induction

Proof by induction also uses a sort of recursive thinking. In the method, one must prove that a claim is true for some value of the variable. This part is analogous to having an initial condition. Then one must prove that the truth of the claim for the value n implies the truth of the claim for $n + 1$. This is analogous to the recursive relationship between states. In fact, the construction of a tiling for the $2^n \times 2^n$ grid based on the $2^{n-1} \times 2^{n-1}$ grid plus the tiling of the 2×2 grid just presented essentially form a proof by induction that the $2^n \times 2^n$ grid, save one corner, can be tiled by trominos for any $n \geq 1$. In this way, all proofs by induction boil down to the ability to see the recursive relationship between states.

In 1954, Solomon Golomb pubished a proof by induction that the $2^n \times 2^n$ grid minus *any* single square (not necessarily a corner), called a deficient square, can be tiled by trominoes. Can you construct a (recursive) tiling of a $2^n \times 2^n$ deficient square? You may use the tiling of a $2^k \times 2^k$ grid minus one corner in your construction.

Reference

S. W. Golomb, "Checker Boards and Polyominoes," Amer. Math. Monthly, 61 (1954), 675-682.

Octave

Custom functions

As any modern useful programming language does, Octave allows custom functions beyond those that can be written as a single `inline` formula. Let's say you are interested in the maximum value a function takes over an evenly spaced set of values. That function has a very special purpose and is not commonly used. Consequently, it is not built into any programming language, so if you really want a function that does that, it is your job to write it. Similarly, if you want a function that calculates the symmedian point of

a triangle, you need to write it. In fact, most anything computational beyond evaluating basic functions will not be built into Octave.

Custom functions are written around three basic pieces of information: a name for the function, a list of inputs, and a description of the output. These three things should be well defined before the work of writing the function begins. Actually writing the function involves simply telling Octave the desired name, inputs, and how to determine the output. The basic format for a function is this:

```
function ans = myName(input1, input2, ... )
  ...
  ans = final answer;
end%function
```

The first line holds the name of the function and a list of inputs. The rest of the function is dedicated to computing the output, `ans`.

The function that determines the maximum value of a function over an evenly spaced set of values might be written following these steps. First, we decide to name it "maxOverMesh". Notice there are no spaces and no special characters in the name. There's a very limited supply of non-alphabetic characters that can go into the name of a function. It's usually safe to assume an underscore and numbers are acceptable, but you can't count on anything else! It's best to keep it at that. Second, we need to think about what inputs are necessary for this function. Of course, the function to maximize is required, and somehow the mesh of points where it should be checked needs to be specified. There are multiple ways to do this, but perhaps the one that is easiest for the user is to require the lower end point, upper end point, and number of intervals in the mesh. Finally, we need to write some code that will take those inputs and determine the maximum value of the function over the mesh. One way to do it is this:

```
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
%  maxOverMesh() written by Leon Q. Brin 21 January 2013  %
%  INPUT: Interval [a,b]; function f; and number of       %
%         subintervals n.                                 %
%  OUTPUT: maximum value of the function over the end      %
%         points of the subintervals.                     %
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
function ans = maxOverMesh(f,a,b,n)
  ans = f(a);
  for i=1:n
    x = (i*b + (n-i)*a)/n;
    F = f(x);
    if (F>ans) ans = F;
  end%for
end%function
```

It is good practice to preface each function you write with a comment containing a three-point description of the function—the name, inputs, and output. If you or anyone else looks at it later, you will have a quick summary of how to use the function and for what.

Whatever the last value assigned to `ans` when the function is complete will be the output of the function. The function starts by assigning the value of the function at the left end point to `ans`. Then it loops through the rest of the subinterval end points, calculating the value of the function at each one. Each time it finds a value higher than `ans`, it (re-)assigns `ans` to that value. At the end of the loop, the greatest value of the function has been assigned to `ans`.

To use a custom function, save it in a `.m` file with the same name as that of the function. For example, the `maxOverMesh()` function would be saved in a file named `maxOverMesh.m`. Then your custom function can be called just as any built-in Octave function as long as the `.m` file is saved in the same directory in which the program using it is saved. Or, if using it from the command line, the working directory of Octave (the one from which Octave was started, unless explicitly changed during your session) must be the directory in which the `.m` file is saved:

```
octave:1> maxOverMesh(inline('(x^2-6*x+8)*exp(x)'), 0, 4, 99)
ans =  8.6728
octave:2> f = inline('(x^2+3*x-5)/(x^2-3*x+5)')
f = f(x) = (x^2+3*x-5)/(x^2-3*x+5)
octave:3> maxOverMesh(f, -5, 5, 225)
ans =  2.6362
```

Recursive functions

Thinking recursively, what would you say if I asked you what 10! was? Think about it for a moment before reading on. That's right! 10 factorial is just 10 times 9!:

$$
\begin{aligned}
10! &= 10 \cdot 9 \cdot 8 \cdot 7 \cdot 6 \cdot 5 \cdot 4 \cdot 3 \cdot 2 \cdot 1 \\
&= 10 \cdot (9 \cdot 8 \cdot 7 \cdot 6 \cdot 5 \cdot 4 \cdot 3 \cdot 2 \cdot 1) \\
&= 10 \cdot (9!).
\end{aligned}
$$

No need to come up with a number. Just a recursive idea, because of course the idea works just as well for 9!, and so on ... up to (or should I say down to?) a point. At what point is it no longer true that $n! = n \cdot (n-1)!$? When $n = 0$. We need to specify that $0! = 1$ and not rely on recursive thinking in this case. But only this case!

Let's see how this recursive calculation works for 5!. According to the recursion, $5! = 5 \cdot 4!$. But $4! = 4 \cdot 3!$ so we have $5! = 5 \cdot (4 \cdot 3!)$. But $3! = 3 \cdot 2!$ so we now have $5! = 5(4(3 \cdot 2!))$. Continuing, $2! = 2 \cdot 1! = 2 \cdot 1 \cdot 0!$ so we now have $5! = 5(4(3(2(1 \cdot 0!))))$. And now the recursion stops and we simply plug in 1 for 0! to find out that $5! = 5(4(3(2(1(1)))))$. Maybe you were expecting $5 \cdot 4 \cdot 3 \cdot 2 \cdot 1$ for a final result instead. Of course you get 120 either way, so from the standpoint of getting things right, either way is fine. Pragmatically, the point is moot. Computing factorials recursively is dreadfully inefficient and impossible beyond the maximum depth of recursion for the programming language in use, so should never be used in practice anyway. Its only value is as an exercise in recursive thinking and programming.

Generally, a recursive function will look like this:

```
function ans = recFunction(input1, input2, ... )
  if (recursion does not apply)
    return appropriate ans
  else
    return recFunction(i1, i2, ... )
  end%if
end%function
```

Determining whether the recursion applies is the first item of business. If not, an appropriate output must be supplied. Otherwise, the recursive function simply calls itself with modified inputs. Since the recursive (wise-guy) definition of $n!$ is $n \cdot (n-1)!$ and applies whenever $n > 0$, and $0! = 1$, the recursive factorial function might look like this:

```
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
%  recFactorial() written by Leon Q. Brin 21 January 2013  %
%        is a recursively defined factorial function.      %
%  INPUT: nonnegative integer n.                           %
%  OUTPUT: n!                                              %
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
function ans = recFactorial(n)
  if (n==0)
    ans = 1;
  else
    ans = n*recFactorial(n-1);
  end%if
end%function
```

Note the == when checking if **n** equals 1. This is not a typographical error. This is very important. All programming languages must distinguish between assignments and conditions. On paper, it may seem natural to write $x = 3$ when you want to set x equal to 3. It may also seem natural to write "if $x = 3$, everything is good." We use the "equation" $x = 3$ exactly the same way on paper to mean two very different things. When we set $x = 3$ we are making a statement, or assignment of the value 3 to the variable x. But when we write "if $x = 3$..." we are making a hypothetical statement, or a conditional statement. The value of x is unkown. In Octave the distinction is made by using a single equals sign, =, to mean assignment and two equals signs, ==, to mean conditional equals.

Exercises

1. ⟳ Write a .m file with a function that takes one input, squares it, and returns the result. Your file should

   (a) contain a comment block at the beginning containing your name, the date, and an explanation of what the program does and how to use it.

   (b) have a function of the form `foo(x)` in it that returns the square of its input (argument) `x`.

   Make sure to test your function from the Octave command prompt.

2. ⟳ The Octave function `foo(x)` is shown below.

   ```
   function res = foo(x)
     if (x<1)
       res = 0;
     else
       half = x/2;
       floorhalf = floor(half);
       if (half == floorhalf)
         res = 0 + foo(floorhalf);
       else
         res = 1 + foo(floorhalf);
       endif
     endif
   endfunction
   ```

   (a) Find `foo(2)`.

   (b) Find `foo(23)`.

3. ⟳ Write a recursive Octave function that will calculate

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{i}$$

4. ⟳ Write a recursive Octave function that calculates a_n for any $n \geq 0$ given

$$a_0 = 100,000$$
$$a_n = 1.05a_{n-1} - 1200, \quad n > 0.$$

5. The Fibonacci sequence, $\langle F_n \rangle$, is recursively defined by

$$F_{n+1} = F_n + F_{n-1}, \quad n \geq 1$$
$$F_0 = 1$$
$$F_1 = 1$$

   so the first few terms are $1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8$.

   (a) Write a recursive function that calculates the nth Fibonacci number. Your function should have one argument, n.

   (b) Write a function that uses a for loop to calculate the nth Fibonacci number. Your function should have one argument, n.

   (c) Write a program that calls the function from 5a to calculate F_{30}.

   (d) Write a program that calls the function from 5b to calculate F_{30}.

   (e) Which code is simpler (recursive or nonrecursive)?

   (f) Which code is faster?

   (g) Which code is more accurate?

   NOTE: $F_{30} = 1346269$.

6. Let the sequence $\langle a_n \rangle$ be defined by

$$a_{n+1} = \frac{1}{4} \left| 5a_n^2 - 30a_n + 25 \right|, \quad n \geq 1$$
$$a_0 = \frac{17 + 2\sqrt{7}}{5}.$$

   (a) Calculate a_1, a_2 and a_3 exactly.

   (b) Find a_{20} and a_{51} exactly.

   (c) Write a recursive function that calculates the nth term of the sequence. Your function should have one argument, n. Write a program that calls this function to calculate a_1, a_2, a_3, a_{20}, and a_{51}.

   (d) Write a function that uses a for loop to calculate the nth term of the sequence. Your function should have one argument, n. Write a program that calls this function to calculate a_1, a_2, a_3, a_{20}, and a_{51}.

   (e) Which code is simpler (recursive or nonrecursive)?

   (f) Which function is faster?

   (g) Which code is more accurate, and why?

   (h) Which function is better, and why?

   (i) Do you trust either function to calculate a_{600} accurately? If not, why not?

7. Trominos, part 1. [A]

   (a) Recursively speaking, how many trominos are needed to tile a $2^n \times 2^n$ grid, save one corner?

   (b) What is the greatest (integer) value of n for which the recursive definition does not apply?

   (c) For the value of n of part 7b, how many trominos are needed?

8. ⟳ Trominos, part 2. [S]

   (a) Write a recursive Octave function for calculating the number of trominos needed to tile a $2^n \times 2^n$ grid, save one corner.

   (b) Use your function to verify that $349,525$ trominos are needed to tile a 1024×1024 grid, save one corner.

9. The Tower of Hanoi, part 1. The Tower of Hanoi is a game played with a number of different sized disks stacked on a pole in decreasing size, the largest on the bottom and the smallest on top. There are two other poles, initially with no disks on them. The goal is to move the entire stack of disks to one of the initially empty poles following two rules. You are allowed to move only one disk at a time from one pole to another. You may never place a disk upon a smaller one. [S]

(a) Starting with a stack of three disks, what is the minimum number of moves it takes to complete the game? Answer this question with a number.

(b) Starting with a stack of four disks, what is the minimum number of moves it takes to complete the game?

    i. Answer this question recursively.

    ii. Answer this question with a number based on your recursive answer.

10. The Tower of Hanoi, part 2. [S]

(a) Starting with a "stack" of one disk, what is the minimum number of moves it takes to complete the game?

(b) Use your answer to (a) plus a generalization of your answer to question 9(b)i to write a recursive Octave function for calculating the minimum number of moves it takes to complete the game with a stack of n disks.

(c) Use your Octave function to verify that it takes a minimum of 1023 moves to complete the game with a stack of 10 disks.

11. The Tower of Hanoi, part 3. The Tower of Hanoi with adjacency requirement. Suppose the rules of The Tower of Hanoi are modified so that each disk may only be moved to an adjacent pole, and the goal is to move the entire stack from the left-most pole to the right-most pole.

(a) What is the minimum number of moves it takes to complete the game with a "stack" of one disk?

(b) Find a recursive formula for the minimum number of moves it takes to complete the game with a stack of n disks, $n > 1$.

(c) Write a recursive Octave function for the minimum number of moves to complete the game with a stack of n disks.

(d) Use your Octave function to compute the minimum number of moves it takes to complete the game with a stack of 5 disks. 10 disks.

12. Stirling numbers of the second kind, part 1. Let $S(n, k)$ be the number of ways to partition a set of n elements into k nonempty subsets. A partition of a set A is a collection of subsets of A such that each element of the set A must be an element of exactly one of the subsets. The order of the subsets is irrelevant as the partition is a collection (a set of sets). For example, the partition $\{\{1\}, \{2, 3\}, \{4\}\}$ is a partition of $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. $\{\{4\}, \{1\}, \{2, 3\}\}$ is the same partition of $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

(a) Find $S(10, 1)$. [S]

(b) Find $S(3, 2)$.

(c) Find $S(4, 3)$.

(d) Find $S(4, 2)$. [S]

(e) Find $S(8, 8)$.

13. Stirling numbers of the second kind, part 2. [S]

(a) Find $S(n, 1)$.

(b) Find $S(n, n)$.

14. Stirling numbers of the second kind, part 3. Let $A = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, n\}$. [A]

(a) How many partitions of A into k nonempty subsets include the subset $\{n\}$? Give an answer in terms of Stirling numbers of the second kind.

(b) How many partitions of A into k nonempty subsets do not include the subset $\{n\}$? Give an answer in terms of Stirling numbers of the second kind. Hint, consider partitions of $B = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, n - 1\}$ into k nonempty subsets.

15. Stirling numbers of the second kind, part 4.

(a) Use your answers to questions 13 and 14 to derive a recursive formula with initial conditions for the number of ways a set of n elements can be partitioned into k subsets.

(b) Write a recursive Octave function that calculates Stirling numbers of the second kind.

(c) Use your Octave function to verify that $S(10, 4) = 34105$.

16. A set of blocks contains some that are 1 inch high and some that are 2 inches high. How many ways are there to make a stack of blocks 15 inches high? [S]

17. A male bee (drone) has only one parent since drones are the unfertilized offspring of a queen bee. A female bee (queen) has two parents. Therefore, 0 generations back, a male bee has one ancestor (the bee himself). 1 generation back, the bee also has 1 ancestor (the bee's mother). 2 generations back, the bee has 2 ancestors (the mother's two parents). How many direct ancestors does a male bee have n generations back?

18. Argue that any polygon can be triangulated (covered with non-overlapping triangles). An example of a triangulation of a dodecagon follows.

19. In questions 5 and 6, you should have noticed that the recursive functions were slower than their for loop counterparts. How many times slower? Why is the Fibonacci recursion so many more times slower than its for loop counterpart?

20. Let the sequences $\langle b_n \rangle$ and $\langle c_n \rangle$ be defined as follows.

$$b_0 \;=\; \frac{1}{3}; \quad b_{n+1} = 4b_n - 1, \quad n \geq 0$$

$$c_0 \;=\; \frac{1}{10}; \quad c_{n+1} = 4c_n(1 - c_n), \quad n \geq 0$$

(a) Write a function that uses a for loop to calculate the nth term of $\langle b_n \rangle$. Your function should have one argument, n.

(b) Write a function that uses a for loop to calculate the nth term of $\langle c_n \rangle$. Your function should have one argument, n.

(c) Write a program that calls these functions to calculate b_{30} and c_{30}. How accurate are these calculations? HINT $b_{30} = \frac{1}{3}$ and $c_{30} = .32034$ accurate to 5 decimal places.

(d) Can you think of a way to make these calculations more dependable (more accurate)?

Root Finding

2.1 Bisection

In Section 1.2 (page 12), we claimed that "$T_2(x)$ actually approximates $\ln(x)$ to within 0.1 over the interval $[3.296, 13.13]$", with a promise that we would discuss the calculation later. It is now later. First, we rephrase the claim as "the distance between $T_2(x)$ and $\ln(x)$ is less than or equal to 0.1 for all $x \in [3.296, 13.13]$." In other words,

$$|T_2(x) - \ln(x)| < \frac{1}{10} \quad \text{for all } x \in [3.296, 13.13].$$

One way to begin solving this inequality is to consider the pair of equations $T_2(x) - \ln(x) = \pm\frac{1}{10}$. With a focus on solving

$$T_2(x) - \ln(x) = \frac{1}{10}, \tag{2.1.1}$$

recall that $T_2(x) = 2 + \frac{x - e^2}{e^2} - \frac{(x - e^2)^2}{2e^4}$. We are thus looking to solve the equation

$$2 + \frac{x - e^2}{e^2} - \frac{(x - e^2)^2}{2e^4} - \ln(x) = \frac{1}{10}.$$

Finally, having written the equation in full detail, it should come as no surprise that we will not be solving for x exactly. There is no analytic method for solving such an equation. Generally, equations with both polynomial terms and transcendental terms will not be solvable. However, from the graph in Figure 1.2.2, we can get a first approximation of the solution. We are looking for the place where $T_2(x)$ exceeds $\ln(x)$ by 0.1. Since the two graphs essentially overlap at $x = 6$, we might aver that $T_2(6)$ exceeds $\ln(x)$ by *less than* 0.1 there. Since there is a reasonably large gap between the graphs at $x = 2$, we might also aver that $T_2(2)$ exceeds $\ln(x)$ by *more than* 0.1 there. In other words, $T_2(2) - \ln(2) > \frac{1}{10}$ while $T_2(6) - \ln(6) < \frac{1}{10}$. Since $T_2(x) - \ln(x)$ is continuous on the interval $[2, 6]$, the Intermediate Value theorem guarantees there is a value $c \in (2, 6)$ such that $T_2(c) - \ln(c) = \frac{1}{10}$. It is this value of c we are after. And we know it is between 2 and 6. It's a start, but we can do better!

What about 4? Well, $T_2(4) - \ln(4) \approx .04986 < 0.1$, so now we know $T_2(4)$ exceeds $\ln(4)$ by *less than* 0.1. Now the Intermediate Value theorem tells us that c is between 2 and 4 ($T_2(2)$ exceeds $\ln(x)$ by *more than* 0.1). Shall we check on $x = 3$? Yes. $T_2(3) - \ln(3) \approx .131 > 0.1$, so now we know $T_2(3)$ exceeds $\ln(3)$ by *more than* 0.1. Recapping, $T_2(4) - \ln(4) < 0.1$ while $T_2(3) \ln(3) > 0.1$. By the Intermediate Value theorem again, we know c is between 3 and 4. And we may continue the process, limited only by our patience. This is the process we call the bisection method:

1. Identify an interval $[a, b]$ such that either a or b overshoots the mark while the other undershoots it.

2. Calculate the midpoint, m, of the identified interval.

3. If a and m both overshoot or both undershoot the mark, the desired value lies in $[m, b]$.

4. If b and m both overshoot or both undershoot the mark, the desired value lies in $[a, m]$.

5. Return to step 2 using the newly identified interval.

Figure 2.1.1: $+$ indicates $T_2(x) - \ln(x) > \frac{1}{10}$ and $-$ indicates $T_2(x) - \ln(x) < \frac{1}{10}$.

Using a $+$ sign for values of x for which $T_2(x) - \ln(x)$ overshoots the desired value $\frac{1}{10}$ and a $-$ sign for values of x for which $T_2(x) - \ln(x)$ undershoots the desired value $\frac{1}{10}$, we may diagram this procedure, including the next two iterations, as in Figure 2.1.1. We might also reproduce the calculations in a table:

a	m	b	$T_2(a) - \ln(a)$	$T_2(m) - \ln(m)$	$T_2(b) - \ln(b)$
2	4	6	.3116	.04986	.002582
2	3	4	.3116	0.131	.04986
3	3.5	4	0.131	0.0824	.04986
3	3.25	3.5			

No matter how the procedure is understood, the sequence of approximations

$$4, \ 3, \ 3.5, \ 3.25, \ \dots$$

is produced. What is the next value? Answer on page 45.

Not only do we have a sequence of numbers approaching the solution, we know for certain that 4 is accurate to within 2 units of the exact value. 3 is accurate to within 1 unit. 3.5 is accurate to within 0.5 units. And 3.25 is accurate to within 0.25 units. In general, each approximation is accurate to within half the length of the interval from which it was computed as midpoint. After all, the exact value is guaranteed to lie within the interval. The farthest the midpoint can possibly be from the exact value is half the length of the interval.

Though the method works perfectly well as described, normally the equation to be solved is simplified so that one side is zero. In that way, the other side can be thought of as a function whose roots are desired. Plus, it simplifies the implementation of the method slightly. For example, we would consider solving the equation

$$T_2(x) - \ln(x) - \frac{1}{10} = 0$$

instead of 2.1.1. Then the procedure boils down to finding a root of $f(x) = T_2(x) - \ln(x) - \frac{1}{10}$. This is why this method is called a root-finding method. It is used to find zeros, or roots, of functions. In this light, we might summarize the first 8 iterations of this procedure as follows:

a	m	b	$f(a)$	$f(m)$	$f(b)$
2	4	6	>0	<0	<0
2	3	4	>0	>0	<0
3	3.5	4	>0	<0	<0
3	3.25	3.5	>0	>0	<0
3.25	3.375	3.5	>0	<0	<0
3.25	3.3125	3.375	>0	<0	<0
3.25	3.28125	3.3125	>0	>0	<0
3.28125	3.296875	3.3125			

Notice two things. The actual values of $f(a)$, $f(m)$, and $f(b)$ are not needed. Only their sign is important because all we need to do is maintain one endpoint where the function is greater than 0 (overshoots) and one where the function is less than 0 (undershoots). Furthermore, the $f(a)$ and $f(b)$ columns are not strictly necessary either. If the procedure is carried out faithfully, they will never change sign. In fact, that's what it means to carry out the procedure faithfully! In steps 3 and 4, you choose which subinterval to keep by maintaining opposite signs of the function on opposite endpoints.

As the last line indicates, the desired value is approximately 3.296 as promised. The right endpoint, 13.13, is determined by finding a root of the function $g(x) = T_2(x) - \ln(x) + \frac{1}{10}$. Give it a shot! Start with $a = 10$ and $b = 14$, for example. Solution on page 45.

Though it works, the only real point of carrying out the procedure using a table is to make sure you understand exactly how it works. If we were actually to use the method in practice, we would write a

short computer program instead. Computers are very good at repetitious calculations, something at which humans are not particularly adept. In this procedure, we need to calculate a midpoint, decide whether this midpoint should then become the left or right endpoint, make it so, and repeat.

That leaves only one question—how many repetitions, or iterations, should we compute? And that depends on the user. Perhaps an answer to within 10^{-2} of the exact value will suffice, and maybe only 10^{-6} accuracy will do. The program we write should be flexible enough to calculate the answer to whatever accuracy is desired, within reason. With that in mind, here is some pseudo-code for the bisection method.

The Bisection Method (pseudo-code)

Though technically not necessary for coding, when we can, we will preface each method's pseudo-code with mathematical assumptions that guarantee success. The implication is that if the method is run in a situation where the assumptions are not met, then the method should not be expected to provide dependable results. It may or may not give useful information. The old adage "garbage in...garbage out" applies!

Assumptions: f is continuous on $[a, b]$. $f(a)$ and $f(b)$ have opposite signs.

Input: Interval $[a, b]$; function f; desired accuracy *tol*; maximum number of iterations N.

Step 1: Set $err = |b - a|$; $L = f(a)$;

Step 2: For $j = 1 \ldots N$ do Steps 3-5:

    Step 3: Set $m = \frac{a+b}{2}$; $M = f(m)$; $err = err/2$;

    Step 4: If $M = 0$ or $err \leq tol$ then return m;

    Step 5: If $LM < 0$ then set $b = m$; else set $a = m$ and $L = M$;

Step 6: Print "Method failed. Maximum iterations exceeded."

Output: Approximation m within *tol* of exact root, or message of failure.

As noted earlier, this method should calculate a midpoint (Step 3), decide whether this midpoint should then become the left or right endpoint (Step 5), make it so (Step 5), and repeat some number of times (Steps 1, 2, and 4). Much of the code is dedicated to determining when to stop. This is typical of numerical methods. The calculations are half the battle. Controling the calculations is the other half. If we didn't have to worry about stopping, the pseudo-code might look something like this:

Step 1: Set $L = f(a)$;

Step 2: Set $m = \frac{a+b}{2}$; $M = f(m)$;

Step 3: If $LM < 0$ then set $b = m$; else set $a = m$ and $L = M$;

Step 4: Go to Step 2.

There would be no need for j, *err*, *tol*, or N, making the algorithm quite a bit simpler. Of course, programmed this way, the program would never stop, so j, *err*, *tol*, and N, are indeed necessary. Nonetheless, this pseudo-code without the ability to stop is important. It can be thought of as the guts of the program. This is the code that executes the method. Sometimes it is easiest to start with the guts and then add the controls afterward.

As for determining whether the midpoint should become the left or right endpoint, Step 5 (Step 3 of the guts) uses a somewhat slick method. By slick, I mean short, efficient, and not immediately obvious. The sign of $LM = f(a) \cdot f(m)$ is checked. If it is negative ($LM < 0$) then m should become the right endpoint (should replace b) because this means $f(a)$ and $f(m)$ have opposite signs. That's the only way LM can be negative. On the other hand, if $LM > 0$ then we know $f(a)$ and $f(m)$ have the same sign, so m should become the left endpoint (should replace a). In Step 3 the midpoint is calculated without any fanfare.

The rest of the code is there to make sure the program doesn't do more than necessary and doesn't end up spinning its wheels indefinitely. It is important to be able to separate, at least in your mind, the guts of the program from the stopping logic. As for the stopping logic, in Step 4, we stop if $err \leq tol$ as we should. But we also check the unlikely event that $M = 0$ in which case we happened to hit the root exactly so should quit. Though it could be argued overkill to set a maximum number of iterations, N, in this program, it's a good habit to get into. Some numerical methods provide no guarantee the required tolerance will ever be reached. For these methods, a fallback exit criterion is needed. Also, if *tol* were accidentally set to a negative value, it would certainly never be reached. The algorithm would have no way to stop without N.

Analysis of the bisection method

There are two good reasons to study the bisection method. First, its assumptions for guaranteed success are much simpler to verify than those of other methods. Even so, be somewhat cautious. Faithful execution of any numerical method is subject to proper programming, accurate computation, and proper input. Programmers and users are not infallible. Nor are computers. Remember the lessons of Section 1.1. At the same time you should be wary of the results, you should temper your skepticism with a good dose of confidence in the method. It is only in rare circumstances that the computer will be the source of any problems.

Second, error analysis is straightforward. Let $m_1 = \frac{a+b}{2}$, the midpoint of $[a, b]$. Let succeeding midpoints be m_2, m_3, m_4, and so on. Then the Intermediate Value theorem guarantees $|m_j - p| \leq \frac{b-a}{2^j}$ for some root p of $f(x)$. As we learned in section 1.3, this means the sequence $\langle m_n \rangle$ converges to p with linear order, and rate of convergence $O\left(\frac{1}{2^n}\right)$. This method should be considered slow to converge because it does so with linear order. But among those methods with linear order, it should be considered fast. The error decays exponentially—faster than any polynomial decay.

Key Concepts

The Intermediate Value Theorem: Suppose f is a continuous function on $[a, b]$ and y is between $f(a)$ and $f(b)$. Then there is a number c between a and b such that $f(c) = y$.[1]

Iteration: (1) Repeating a computation or other process, using the output of one computation as the input of the next.

Iteration: (2) Any of the intermediate results of an iteration. Also called an iterate.

The bisection method: Produces a sequence of approximations $\langle m_j \rangle$ that converges to some root in $[a, b]$.

Error bound for the bisection method: The error of approximation m_j is no more than $\frac{b-a}{2^j}$. That is, $|m_j - p| \leq \frac{b-a}{2^j}$ for some root p of $f(x)$.

Convergence for the bisection method: The bisection method converges with linear order and has rate of convergence $O\left(\frac{1}{2^n}\right)$.

Octave

Roughly half the work in writing pseudo-code for the bisection method was dedicated to the logic of the method—the determination of when to stop. In programming, this type of logic is handled by `if then [else]` statements, and variations thereof. It is common practice in programming to use square brackets to denote something that is optional. So the template `if then [else]` should be read to mean that logic is handled by `if then` statements or `if then else` statements. The exact syntax looks like this:

```
if (condition)
  execute code here
[else
  execute code here]
end%if
```

Again, the square brackets indicate optional code.

The `if then` statement works as you might imagine. In the `if then` form of the statement, all code between **then** and **end** is executed whenever the **condition** is true. It is skipped whenever the **condition** is false. The `if then else` form of the statement is similar. All code between **then** and **else** is executed whenever the **condition** is true. The code between **else** and **end** is skipped in this case. Exactly the reverse happens when the **condition** is false. The code between **then** and **else** is skipped while the code between **else** and **end** is executed. The simplest use of an `if then else` statement might look like this.

```
if (n>10)
  disp('n is big')
else
```

---

[1]The word "between" in this theorem can be interpreted as inclusive or exclusive of the endpoint values as long as the same interpretation is made for each instance of the word.

```
  disp('n is small')
end%if
```

In Octave, `if then [else]` statements are written almost exactly as they are in pseudocode. In fact, much of the pseudo-code in this text will translate nearly verbatim into Octave. One notable exception is the symbol used in the `condition`. Octave requires a boolean operator in the condition. That is, an operator that will evaluate to either true or false. The `=` operator assigns a value to a variable. It is not a boolean operator so should not be used in an if condition. Instead, `==` (two equals signs) should be used. This table summarizes the six most common boolean operators in Octave.

Comparison	Operator
greater than, less than	>, <
greater than or equal, less than or equal	>=, <=
equal	==
not equal	!=

If you needed to check if $x \geq 0$, you would use `if (x>=0)` in Octave. If you needed to check if t equaled 1, you would use `if (t==1)` in Octave. And so on.

Technically, an `if then` statement is concluded with an `end` statement. However, to emphasize the type of statement being ended, we will make a habit of ending an `if then` statement with `end%if` and ending a `for` loop with `end%for`. The `%if` and `%for` are just comments since they start with `%`. Consequently, they are not strictly necessary, but they may aid in the readability of your code, especially when you have nested constructs. When you have an `if` statement inside a `for` loop or vice versa, using `end` to end both of them is not as informative as using `end%if` and `end%for`.

An Octave program to find a root of $f(x) = 2 + \frac{x-e^2}{e^2} - \frac{(x-e^2)^2}{2e^4} - \ln(x) - \frac{1}{10}$ between 2 and 6 to within 10^{-4} using the bisection method with a maximum of 100 iterations might look like this.

```
f = inline('2+(x-exp(2))/exp(2)-(x-exp(2))^2/(2*exp(4))-log(x)-1/10');
a=2;
b=6;
err=b-a;
L=f(a);
for i=1:100
  m=(a+b)/2;
  M=f(m);
  err=err/2;
  if (M==0 || err<=10^-4)
    disp(m);
    return;
  end%if
  if (L*M<0)
    b=m;
  else
    a=m;
    L=m;
  end%if
end%for
disp('Method failed. Maximum iterations exceeded.');
```

This code would produce the correct result, `3.2952`. Compare this code to the pseudo-code. You will see the main difference is syntax. However, there is one major disadvantage to writing the code this way. In order to change the function, the endpoints, the tolerance, or the maximum number of iterations, the code needs to be modified in just the right place. That is no real disadvantage if you never need to run the bisection method again. But, generally, we should imagine that we will be running the methods we write many times over with different inputs. Or that we will be handing our code over to someone else to run many times over with different inputs. Imagine me handing you this code and asking you to find a root of $f(x) = \cos x - x$ between 0 and 3 to within 10^{-6}. It is not good practice to hard code the inputs to a method. Instead, they should be given as inputs to a programmed function. In Octave, this is done in a `.m` file. That doesn't mean that we will simply take the code as written and save it in a `.m` file. The `.m` file will assume that the inputs—interval $[a, b]$; function f; desired accuracy tol; maximum number of iterations N—will be supplied from another source—the user. The code inside the .m file should execute properly regardless of the (yet unknown) inputs. The syntax for an Octave function is:

```
function result=name(input1,input2,...)
  execute these lines
end%function
```

`function` is a keyword that tells Octave a function is to be defined. `result` is the name of the variable that holds the answer, or result, of the function. `name` is the name of the function. It must also be the name of the .m file. A completed `bisection.m` file might look like this:

```
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
%  Bisection method written by Leon Q. Brin 09 July 2012  %
%  Purpose: Implementation of the bisection method        %
%  INPUT: Interval [a,b]; function f; tolerance tol; and  %
%         maximum number of iterations maxits.            %
%  OUTPUT: root res to within tol of exact or message of  %
%         failure.                                        %
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
function res=bisection(a,b,f,tol,maxits)
  err=b-a;
  L=f(a);
  for i=1:maxits
    m=(a+b)/2;
    M=f(m);
    err=err/2;
    if (M==0 || err<=tol)
      res=m;
      return;
    end%if
    if (L*M<0)
      b=m;
    else
      a=m;
      L=m;
    end%if
  end%for
  res='Method failed. Maximum iterations exceeded.';
end%function
```

Writing this way has not only the advantage of being easily reusable. It is also simpler! No need to worry about what function the root of which is desired; or over what interval; and so on. And it more closely resembles the pseudo-code. Once written and properly functioning, it can be saved as a .m file and never be looked at again (except for study). It just works! If you hand it off to someone to use, they should be able to use it without modification. Now finding a root of $f(x) = 2 + \frac{x-e^2}{e^2} - \frac{(x-e^2)^2}{2e^4} - \ln(x) - \frac{1}{10}$ between 2 and 6 to within 10^{-4} using the bisection method with a maximum of 100 iterations might look like this.

```
octave:9>
  f = inline('2+(x-exp(2))/exp(2)-(x-exp(2))^2/(2*exp(4))-log(x)-1/10');
octave:10> bisection(2,6,f,10^-4,100)
ans =  3.2952
```

After `bisection.m` is written, the bisection() function becomes part of the Octave language. It can be called just like any built-in function. As a second example, we can find a root of $f(x) = \cos x - x$ between 0 and 3 like so:

```
octave:12> bisection(0,3,inline('cos(x)-x'),10^-5,100)
ans =  0.73909
```

Exercises

1. Write an Octave function implementing the bisection method as shown on this page. Save it as a .m file for future use.

2. Use the Intermediate Value Theorem to show that the function has a root in the indicated interval.

   (a) $f(x) = 3 - x - \sin x$; $[2,3]$

   (b) $g(x) = 3x^4 - 2x^3 - 3x + 2$; $[0,1]$

(c) $g(x) = 3x^4 - 2x^3 - 3x + 2$; $[0, 0.9]$ [S]

(d) $h(x) = 10 - \cosh(x)$; $[-3, -2]$

(e) $f(t) = \sqrt{4 + 5\sin t} - 2.5$; $[-6, -5]$

(f) $g(t) = \frac{3t^2 \tan t}{1 - t^2}$; $[21.5, 22.5]$ [S]

(g) $h(t) = \ln(3 \sin t) - \frac{3t}{5}$; $[1, 2]$

(h) $f(r) = e^{\sin r} - r$; $[-20, 20]$

(i) $g(r) = \sin(e^r) + r$; $[-3, 3]$

(j) $h(r) = 2^{\sin r} - 3^{\cos r}$; $[1, 3]$

3. Create a table showing three iterations of the bisection method with the function and starting interval indicated in question 2. [S]

4. Use your `bisection.m` code to find a root of the function in the interval of question 2 to within 10^{-8}. [A]

5. Use the bisection method to find p_3 for the given function on the given interval. Do this without a computer program. Just use a pencil, paper, and a calculator. You may check your answers with a computer program if you wish. [A]

   (a) $f(x) = \sqrt{x} - \cos x$ on $[0, 1]$

   (b) $f(x) = 3(x+1)(x - \frac{1}{2})(x-1)$ on $[-1.25, 2.5]$

6. Use the Bisection Method to find x_4 for $g(x) = x \sin x + 1$ on $[9, 10]$.

7. Use the bisection method to find x_3 for the equation $x \cos x - \ln x = 0$ on the interval $[7, 8]$.

8. Use the bisection method to find a root of $g(x) = \sin x - x^2$ between 0 and 1 with absolute error no more than $1/4$.

9. Approximate the root of $g(x) = 2 + x - e^x$ between 1 and 2 to within 0.05 of the exact value using the bisection method.

10. There are 21 roots of the function $f(x) = \cos(x)$ on the interval $[0, 65]$. To which root will the bisection method converge, starting with $a = 0$ and $b = 65$? [A]

11. Find a bound on the number of iterations needed to achieve an approximation with accuracy 10^{-3} to the solution of $x^3 + x - 4 = 0$ on the interval $[1, 4]$ using the bisection method. Do not actually compute the approximation. Just find the bound. [S]

12. Find a bound on the number of iterations needed to achieve an approximation with accuracy 10^{-4} to the solution of $x^3 - x - 1 = 0$ on the interval $[1, 2]$ using the bisection method. Do not actually compute the approximation. Just find the bound.

13. The graph of $f(x)$ over the interval $[0.75, 2]$ is shown below. Notice $f(x)$ has three roots on this interval: approximately .795, 1.06, and 1.59. To which of the three roots does the bisection method converge if we let $a = .75$ and $b = 2$? How do you know?

14. Suppose you are trying to find the root of $f(x) = x - e^{-x}$ using the bisection method. Find an integer a such that the interval $[a, a+2]$ is an appropriate one in which to start the search.

15. Find a lower bound on the number of iterations it would take to guarantee accuracy of 10^{-20} in question 6.

16. How many steps (iterations) of the bisection method are necessary to guarantee a solution with 10^{-10} accuracy if a root is known to be within $[4.5, 5.3]$? [A]

17. Suppose you are using the bisection method on an interval of length 3. How many iterations are necessary to guarantee accuracy of the approximation to within 10^{-6}?

18. Suppose a function g satisfies the assumptions of the bisection method on the given interval. Starting with that interval, how many iterations are needed to approximate the root to within the given tolerance?

   (a) $[-7, 10]$; 10^{-6}

   (b) $[5, 9]$; 10^{-3}

   (c) $[9, 15]$; 10^{-10}

   (d) $[-6, -1]$; 10^{-105} (assume the computer calculates with 300 significant digits so round-off error is not a problem)

19. 🌀 1 is a root of $f(x) = \ln(x^4 - x^3 - 7x^2 + 13x - 5)$ that can not be found by the bisection method.

   (a) Use a graph of the function near 1 to explain why. You may use the Octave code below to produce an appropriate graph.

   (b) Run the bisection method on f over the interval $[0.8, 1.2]$ anyway. What happens instead of finding the root?

```
x=0.8:.01:1.2;
f=inline("log(x.^4-x.^3-7*x.^2+13*x-5)");
plot(x,f(x))
```

20. 🌀 4 is a root of $g(x) = |\sin(\pi x)|$ that can not be found by the bisection method.

   (a) Use a graph of the function near 4 to explain why. You may use the Octave code below to produce an appropriate graph.

   (b) Run the bisection method on f over the interval $[0.8, 1.2]$ anyway. What happens instead of finding the root?

```
x=3.5:.05:4.5;
f=inline("abs(sin(pi*x))");
plot(x,f(x))
```

21. Let $f(x) = \sin(x^2)$. f is continuous on $[4, 5]$, but $f(4) < 0$ and $f(5) < 0$, so the assumptions of the bisection method are not met. Nonetheless, using the bisection method as described in the pseudo-code on f over the interval $[4, 5]$ *does* produce a root. Explain. [S]

22. The functions in questions 2e, 2f, and 2g all fail to meet the assumptions of the bisection method on the interval $[-4, -0.5]$. For each one, explain how so.

23. ⟳ Write an Octave function called `collatz` that takes one integer input, n, and returns $3n + 1$ if n is odd and $n/2$ if n is even. Save it as a `collatz.m` file. Use an `if then else` statement in your function. HINT: Use the Octave ceiling function. If `ceil(n/2)` equals `n/2`, then `n` must be even (no remainder when divided by 2). Use your `collatz` function to calculate [A]

    (a) `collatz(17)`
    (b) `collatz(10)`
    (c) `collatz(109)`
    (d) `collatz(344)`

24. ⟳ Write your own absolute value function called `absval` (`abs` is already defined by Octave, so it is best to use a different name) that takes a real number input and returns the absolute value of the input. Use an `if then else` statement in your function. Save it as `absval.m` and test it on the following computations.

    (a) $|-3|$
    (b) $|123.2|$
    (c) $\left|\pi - \frac{22}{7}\right|$
    (d) $|10 - \pi^2|$

25. $f(x) = \sin(x^2)$ has five roots on the interval $[7, 8]$. $f(7) < 0$, $f(8) > 0$, and f is continuous on $[7, 8]$, so the assumptions of the bisection method are met. The method will converge to a root.

    (a) Use your `bisection.m` file (Exercise 1) to determine which one. [A]
    (b) Find 4 different intervals for which the bisection method will converge to the other four roots in $[7, 8]$.

26. The function shown has roots at approximately 2.41, 4.11, 5.62, 7.01, 8.32, 9.57, 10.78, and 11.94. To which root will the bisection method converge with the given starting interval?

    (a) $[2, 3]$

    (b) $[6, 8]$
    (c) $[2, 6]$
    (d) $[5, 9]$
    (e) $[10, 12]$ Note: the assumptions of the bisection are not met on this interval. Nonetheless, the method as outlined in the pseudo-code *will* converge to a root!

27. Find an interval of length 1 over which the bisection method may be applied in order to find a root of $f(x) = x^4 - 7.6746x^3 - 40.7477022x^2 + 200.9894434x + 319.0914281$.

28. The following algorithm is one possible incarnation of the bisection method.

    Assumptions: f is continuous on $[a, b]$. $f(a)$ and $f(b)$ have opposite signs.
    Input: Interval $[a, b]$; function f
    Step 1: For $j = 1 \ldots 15$ do Steps 2 and 3:
        Step 2: Set $m = \frac{a+b}{2}$;
        Step 3: If $f(a)f(m) < 0$ then set $b = m$; else set $a = m$;
    Step 4: Print m.
    Output: Approximation m.

    (a) Apply this algorithm to the function $f(x) = (x)(x - 2)(x + 2)$ over the interval $[-3, 3]$. Which root will this algorithm approximate?

    (b) How accurate is the approximation guaranteed to be according to the formula

    $$|p_n - p| \le \frac{b - a}{2^n}?$$

    (c) How accurate is the approximation in reality? Compare this to the bound in (b).

    (d) Modify the algorithm so it will approximate a different root using the same starting interval.

    (e) Modify the algorithm so it does not use multiplication.

29. Use the following pseudo-code to write a slightly different implementation of the bisection method. Refer to Table 1.1 if you are unsure how to program the quantity $\lceil (\ln(b - a) - \ln(TOL))/\ln 2 \rceil$. The while loop is discussed on page 61.

    Input function f, endpoints a and b; tolerance TOL.

    Return approximate solution p and $f(p)$ and the number of iterations done N_0.

    Step 1 Set $i = 1$; $FA = f(a)$; $N_0 = \lceil (\ln|b - a| - \ln(TOL))/\ln 2 \rceil$;

    Step 2 While $i \le N_0$ do Steps 3-6.
        Step 3 Set $p = (a + b)/2$; $FP = f(p)$;
        Step 4 If $FP = 0$ then
            Return$(p, f(p), N_0)$; STOP.
        Step 5 Set $i = i + 1$;
        Step 6 If $FA \cdot FP > 0$ then
            Set $a = p$; $FA = FP$;
            else
            Set $b = p$;

Step 7 Return(p, $f(p)$, N_0);
STOP.

(a) Discuss the advantages/disadvantages of this algorithm compared to the one in the class slides.

(b) Where does the calculation $N_0 = \lceil (\ln(b - a) - \ln(TOL))/\ln 2 \rceil$ come from?

30. Use the code you wrote for question 29 to find solutions accurate to within 10^{-5} for the following problems.

(a) $x - 2^x = 0$ on $[0, 1]$

(b) $e^x - x^2 + 3x - 2 = 0$ on $[0, 1]$

(c) $2x \cos(2x) - (x+1)^2 = 0$ on $[-3, -2]$ and on $[-1, 0]$

31. Find an approximation of $\sqrt{3}$ correct to within 10^{-4} using the bisection method. Write an essay on how you solved this problem. Include your bisection code, what function and what interval you used and why.

32. A trough of length L has a cross section in the shape of a semicircle with radius r. When filled with water to within a distance h of the top, the volume V of water is

$$V = L \left[0.5\pi r^2 - r^2 \arcsin\left(\frac{h}{r}\right) - h\sqrt{r^2 - h^2} \right]$$

Suppose $L = 10$ ft, $r = 1$ ft, and $V = 12.4$ ft^3. Find the depth of the water in the trough to within 0.01 ft. Note: In Octave, use `asin(x)` for $\arcsin(x)$ and `pi` for π.

Answers

What is the next value?: $T_2(3.25) - \ln(3.25) \approx .10429$, which overshoots the mark. So 3.25 becomes the new left endpoint, and the next value is $\frac{3.25+3.5}{2} = 3.375$, the midpoint of 3.25 and 3.5.

The right endpoint is 13.13: Starting with $a = 10$ and $b = 14$, note that $g(a) \approx .088 > 0$ and $g(b) \approx -.044 < 0$, so g of the left endpoint should always be positive and g of the right endpoint should always be negative:

a	m	b	$g(m)$	
10	12	14	.044	$\Rightarrow m$ becomes left endpoint
12	13	14	.006	$\Rightarrow m$ becomes left endpoint
13	13.5	14	$-.017$	$\Rightarrow m$ becomes right endpoint
13	13.25	13.5	$-.005$	$\Rightarrow m$ becomes right endpoint
13	13.125	13.25	.0004	$\Rightarrow m$ becomes left endpoint
13.125	13.1875	13.25	$-.002$	$\Rightarrow m$ becomes right endpoint
13.125	13.15625	13.1875	$-.0009$	$\Rightarrow m$ becomes right endpoint
13.125	13.140625	13.15625	$-.0002$	$\Rightarrow m$ becomes right endpoint
13.125	13.1328125	13.140625		

2.2   Fixed Point Iteration

Grab your calculator. Anything with a cosine button will do nicely. Presuming you have a simple scientific calculator, press the all-clear button, usually marked `AC` or just `C`. The screen should now display 0. Press the cosine button, which should be marked `cos`. The screen should display 1. Press the cosine button again. The screen should display $0.540302\ldots$. Repeat. Repeat again. In fact, continue pressing the cosine button until you notice a pattern.

If you have a fancier calculator with a previous-answer button, usually marked `Ans`, press 0 and then `Enter` or `=`. Then press the cosine button and then the previous-answer button. Then press `Enter` or `=` to do the computation. The first time around, the screen should display 1 (just as with a scientific calculator). To repeat, however, just press `Enter` or `=` again. This will repeat the last computation. In this case, the cosine of the previous answer. The screen should display $0.540302\ldots$. Now repeat until you notice a pattern.

After about 30 repetitions, or, as we will call them, iterations, your calculator should display a number like $0.739083847\ldots$. And no matter how many times you repeat, or iterate, the calculation, it won't change much. In fact, once it reaches $0.7390851332\ldots$, it won't change at all (unless your calculator shows more decimal places—after about 90 iterations, a calculator showing 15 decimal places will display 0.739085133215161 and it won't change from there). What that means is $\cos(0.7390851332\ldots) = 0.7390851332\ldots$. And we call $0.7390851332\ldots$ a fixed point of the cosine function. The value is fixed (does not change) when the cosine function is applied. Put another way, at $0.7390851332\ldots$, the input and output of the cosine function are equal.

Perhaps a whole series of questions now comes to mind. Why does this work? What if we start with a number other than 0? Does this work with any function? Can we predict when it will or won't work? Can we find roots this way? Is convergence fast? In this section and the next, we will give at least partial answers to all of these questions. We start with "Why does this work?".

Consider solving the system

$$\begin{cases} y = \cos(x) \\ y = x \end{cases}.$$

One way to do so is by the method of substitution. If we substitute $y = x$ into $y = \cos x$ we get $x = \cos x$ or $\cos x = x$. The solutions of the system coincide exactly with the fixed points of the cosine function, for any solution of $\cos x = x$ is a value x that is fixed by the cosine. Since systems of two equations in two unknowns can be solved, at least approximately, by graphing, this suggests that we might take a look at the graph of the system in order to learn more about what is happening during iteration.

Figure 2.2.1: Finding the fixed point of $\cos(x)$.

(a)   (b)

Figure 2.2.1(a) shows the graphs of $y = \cos(x)$ and $y = x$ over the interval $[0,1]$. We can see the intersection at around $(0.75, 0.75)$ so we should think that the fixed point is around 0.75 (which of course we know is true from our calculator experiment). Figure 2.2.1(b) illustrates the exercise of computing $\cos(0), \cos(1), \cos(0.540302\ldots), \ldots$. Following the vertical line segment from $(0,0)$ to $(0,1)$ represents calculating $\cos(0)$. Following the horizontal continuation from $(0,1)$ to $(1,1)$ and subsequently the vertical line segment from $(1,1)$ to $(1,0.540302\ldots)$ represents calculating $\cos(1)$. Following the horizontal line from $(1,0.540302\ldots)$ to $(0.540302\ldots, 0.540302\ldots)$ and subsequently the vertical line from

$(0.540302\ldots, 0.540302\ldots)$ to $(0.540302\ldots, 0.857553\ldots)$ represents calculating $\cos(0.540302\ldots)$, and so on. With each pair of line segments, one going horizontally from the graph of $y = \cos(x)$ to the graph of $y = x$ followed by one going vertically from the line $y = x$ to the graph of $y = \cos(x)$, another iteration is shown. Figure 2.2.1(b) is sometimes called a web diagram, and is commonly used to illustrate the concept of iteration. That the path of the web diagram tends toward $(0.739085\ldots, 0.739085\ldots)$ is an unavoidable consequence of the geometry of the graph of $\cos(x)$.

What if we start with a number other than 0? Using figure 2.2.1, you should be able to convince yourself that convergence to the point $(0.7390851332\ldots, 0.7390851332\ldots)$ is assured for any initial value between 0 and 1. Try it. Start anywhere on the line $y = x$. Proceed vertically to the graph of $y = \cos(x)$. Then horizontally to the line $y = x$. And repeat. You should find that the path of the web diagram always tends toward the intersection of the graphs. Now consider starting with any real number, r. The cosine of any real number is a number in the interval $[-1, 1]$ so $\cos(r) \in [-1, 1]$. And the cosine of any number in the interval $[-1, 1]$ is a number in the interval $[0, 1]$ so $\cos(\cos(r)) \in [0, 1]$. That is, the second iteration is in the interval from 0 to 1. So after only two iterations, any initial value will become a value between 0 and 1. And our web diagram implies that further iteration will lead to the fixed point. So, regardless of the initial value, iteration leads to the fixed point. And the preceeding argument forms the seed for a proof of this fact.

Not all functions are so well behaved, however. For example, $1^2 = 1$. In other words, 1 is a fixed point of the function $y = x^2$. However, iteration starting with any number other than 1 or -1 does not lead to this fixed point. If we start with any number greater than 1 and square it, it becomes greater. And if we square the result, it becomes greater still. And squaring again only increases the value, without bound. Hence, iteration starting with any value greater than 1 (or less than -1) does not lead to convergence to the fixed point 1. Nor does iteration starting with any number of magnitude less than 1. Figure 2.2.2 illustrates iteration of $y = x^2$ with initial value 0.9. Follow the web diagram from the point $(0.9, 0.9)$

Figure 2.2.2: Visualizing the iteration of $f(x) = x^2$.

vertically to the graph of $y = x^2$ and then horizontally back to the line $y = x$, and so on, to check for yourself. This is a nice illustration of the fact that the square of any number between 0 and 1, exclusive, is smaller than the number itself. With starting values between -1 and 1 exclusive of ± 1, iteration gives a sequence converging to 0, not 1. To summarize, excepting -1 and 1, no initial value will produce a sequence converging to 1 under iteration of the function $y = x^2$.

There is a fundamental difference between the fixed point $0.7390851332\ldots$ of $f(x) = \cos(x)$ and the fixed point 1 of $g(x) = x^2$. Fixed point iteration converges to $0.7390851332\ldots$ under $f(x) = \cos(x)$ for any initial value. Fixed point iteration fails to converge to 1 under $g(x) = x^2$ for all initial values but ± 1.[2] Examining the graphs of $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ each superimposed against the line $y = x$ in the neighborhood of their respective fixed points can give a clue [Figure 2.2.3] as to the difference. True, $f(x)$ has a negative slope at its fixed point while $g(x)$ has a positive slope at its fixed point. You can see this from the graphs or you can "do the calculus". The important difference, though, is more subtle. It's not the sign of the slope at the fixed point that matters. It's the magnitude of the slope at the fixed point that matters. For

---

[2]For a third type of behavior, fixed point iteration converges to 0 under $g(x)$ for initial values near 0, but not for others!

Figure 2.2.3: Left: $f(x) = \cos(x)$ and $y = x$. Right: $g(x) = x^2$ and $y = x$.

smooth functions, neighborhoods of points with slopes of magnitude greater than 1 tend to be expansive. That is, points move away from one another under application of the function. However, neighborhoods of points with slopes of magnitude less than 1 tend to be contractive. That is, points move toward one another under application of the function.

Proposition 2. *If $h(x)$ is differentiable on (a, b) with $|h'(x)| < 1$ for all $x \in (a, b)$, then whenever $x_1, x_2 \in (a, b)$, $|h(x_2) - h(x_1)| < |x_2 - x_1|$.*

Proof. Let $x_1, x_2 \in (a, b)$ and, without loss of generality, let $x_2 > x_1$ so that we may properly refer to the interval from x_1 to x_2. Since $h(x)$ is continuous on $[x_1, x_2]$ and differentiable on (x_1, x_2), the mean value theorem gives us $c \in (x_1, x_2) \subseteq (a, b)$ such that $h'(c) = \left| \frac{h(x_2) - h(x_1)}{x_2 - x_1} \right|$. But $h'(c) < 1$ by assumption, so $h'(c) = \left| \frac{h(x_2) - h(x_1)}{x_2 - x_1} \right| < 1$, from which we immediately conclude that $|h(x_2) - h(x_1)| < |x_2 - x_1|$.   □

Moreover, a function whose derivative has magnitude less than 1 can only cross the line $y = x$ one time. Once it has crossed, it can never "catch up" because that would require a slope greater than 1, the slope of the line $y = x$.

Proposition 3. *Suppose $h(x)$ is continuous on $[a, b]$, differentiable on (a, b) with $|h'(x)| < 1$ for all $x \in (a, b)$, and $h([a, b]) \subseteq [a, b]$. Then h has a unique fixed point in $[a, b]$.*

Proof. If $h(a) = a$ or $h(b) = b$, we have proved existence, so suppose $h(a) \neq a$ and $h(b) \neq b$. Since $h([a, b]) \subseteq [a, b]$ it must be the case that $h(a) > a$ and $h(b) < b$. It immediately follows that $h(a) - a > 0$ and $h(b) - b < 0$. Since the auxiliary function $f(x) = h(x) - x$ is continuous on $[a, b]$, the Intermediate Value Theorem guarantees the existence of $c \in (a, b)$ such that $f(c) = 0$. By substitution, $h(c) - c = 0$, implying $h(c) = c$, so c is a fixed point of h. The existence of a fixed point is established. Now suppose $c_1 \in [a, b]$ and $c_2 \in [a, b]$ are distinct fixed points of h. Then

$$\frac{h(c_1) - h(c_2)}{c_1 - c_2} = \frac{c_1 - c_2}{c_1 - c_2} = 1.$$

By the mean value theorem, there exists c_3 between c_1 and c_2 such that $h'(c_3) = 1$, contradicting the fact that $|h'(x)| < 1$ for all $x \in (a, b)$. Hence it is impossible that c_1 and c_2 are distinct.   □

Hence we can reasonably expect that when the derivative at a fixed point has magnitude less than 1, iteration is a viable method for approximating (finding) the fixed point, but when the derivative at a fixed point has magnitude greater than 1, iteration is not a viable method of approximating the fixed point. We must be careful, though, not to take this rule of thumb as absolute. It only applies to so called well-behaved functions. In this case, that the function has a continuous first derivative in the neighborhood of the fixed point is well-behaved enough. The following theorem establishes that fixed point iteration will converge in a neighborhood of a fixed point if the magnitude of the function's derivative is less than 1 there.

Theorem 4. *(Fixed Point Convergence Theorem) Given a function $f(x)$ with continuous first derivative and fixed point $\hat{x}$, if $|f'(\hat{x})| < 1$ then there exists a neighborhood of $\hat{x}$ in which fixed point iteration converges to the fixed point for any initial value in the neighborhood.*

Proof. By continuity, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $|f'(x)| < 1$ for all $x \in (\hat{x} - \varepsilon, \hat{x} + \varepsilon)$. Let $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$ and set $M = \max\limits_{x \in [\hat{x} - \delta, \hat{x} + \delta]} |f'(x)|$. Now suppose x_0 is a particular but arbitrary value in $(\hat{x} - \delta, \hat{x} + \delta)$. As in proposition 2, the Mean Value Theorem is applied. This time, we are guaranteed $c \in (\hat{x} - \delta, \hat{x} + \delta)$ such that $f'(c) = \frac{f(\hat{x}) - f(x_0)}{\hat{x} - x_0}$. But $|f'(c)| \leq M$ so $|f(\hat{x}) - f(x_0)| \leq M|\hat{x} - x_0|$. Furthermore $\hat{x}$ is a fixed point, so $f(\hat{x}) = \hat{x}$, from which it follows that $|\hat{x} - f(x_0)| \leq M|\hat{x} - x_0|$. Now we define $x_k = f(x_{k-1})$ for all $k \geq 1$ and prove by induction that $|\hat{x} - x_k| \leq M^k|\hat{x} - x_0|$ for all $k \geq 1$. Since $x_1 = f(x_0)$, we have already shown $|\hat{x} - x_1| \leq M|\hat{x} - x_0|$, so the claim is true when $k = 1$. Now suppose $|\hat{x} - x_k| \leq M^k|\hat{x} - x_0|$ for some particular but arbitrary value $k \geq 1$. Note that $|\hat{x} - x_k| \leq M^k|\hat{x} - x_0|$ implies $x_k \in (\hat{x} - \delta, \hat{x} + \delta)$ so we apply the Mean Value Theorem as before and conclude that $|\hat{x} - f(x_k)| \leq M|\hat{x} - x_k|$. Substituting x_{k+1} for $f(x_k)$ and using the inductive hypothesis, we have $|\hat{x} - x_{k+1}| \leq M \cdot M^k|\hat{x} - x_0| = M^{k+1}|\hat{x} - x_0|$. Hence we have $0 \leq |\hat{x} - x_k| \leq M^k|\hat{x} - x_0|$. Of course $\lim\limits_{k \to \infty} 0 = 0$ and $\lim\limits_{k \to \infty} M^k|\hat{x} - x_0| = 0$, so by the squeeze theorem, $\lim\limits_{k \to \infty} |\hat{x} - x_k| = 0$. $\square$

As suggested earlier, we should not expect fixed point iteration to converge when the derivative at a fixed point has magnitude greater than one. In fact, more or less the opposite happens. There is a neighborhood of the fixed point in which fixed point iteration is guaranteed to escape the neighborhood for any initial value in the neighborhood not equal to the fixed point itself. Given that fact, it is tempting to think that perhaps the Fixed Point Convergence Theorem could be strengthened to a bi-directional implication, an if-and-only-if claim. And it "almost" can. What can be said here has direct parallels to the ratio test for series. Recall, for any sequence of real numbers $a_0, a_1, a_2, \ldots$, the limit $L = \lim\limits_{k \to \infty} \left| \dfrac{a_{k+1}}{a_k} \right|$ helps determine the convergence of $\sum\limits_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k$ in the following way:

- If $L < 1$, then $\sum\limits_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k$ converges (absolutely).

- If $L > 1$, then $\sum\limits_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k$ diverges.

- If $L = 1$, then $\sum\limits_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k$ may converge (absolutely or conditionally) or may diverge.

Analogously, for any function $f(x)$ with continuous first derivative and fixed point $\hat{x}$, the derivative $f'(\hat{x})$ helps determine the convergence of the fixed point iteration method in the following way:

- If $|f'(\hat{x})| < 1$, then fixed point iteration converges to $\hat{x}$ for any initial value in some neighborhood of $\hat{x}$.

- If $|f'(\hat{x})| > 1$, then fixed point iteration escapes some neighborhood of $\hat{x}$ for any initial value in the neighborhood other than $\hat{x}$.

- If $|f'(\hat{x})| = 1$, then fixed point iteration may converge to $\hat{x}$ for any initial value in some neighborhood of $\hat{x}$; or may escape some neighborhood for any initial value in the neighborhood other than $\hat{x}$; or may have no neighborhood in which all initial values lead to convergence and no neighboorhood in which all values other than $\hat{x}$ escape.

The graphs in Figure 2.2.4 of functions with derivative equal to one at their fixed point help illustrate this last case.

For one of these functions, fixed point iteration converges for all values in a neighborhood of the fixed point. For another of these functions, fixed point iteration escapes some neighborhood of the fixed point for all initial values in the neighborhood except the fixed point itself. And for the third of these functions, fixed point iteration converges to the fixed point for some initial values and escapes a neighborhood of the fixed point for others (and *every* neighborhood of the fixed point will have both types of initial values). Can you tell which is which? Figure it out by creating web diagrams for each. Answer on page 55.

The proof of the Fixed Point Convergence Theorem can easily be extended to include initial values in any neighborhood of the fixed point in which the magnitude of the derivative remains less than 1. The size

Figure 2.2.4: Convergence behavior when the derivative at the fixed point is 1.

and symmetry of the interval are not important. For example, $f(x) = \frac{1}{8}x^3 - x^2 + 2x + 1$ has a fixed point at $\hat{x} = 2$. The proof of the Fixed Point Convergence Theorem establishes convergence to 2 in a symmetric interval about 2 such as $[1.9, 2.1]$. But this interval is far from the largest neighborhood of initial values for which fixed point iteration converges to 2. We can find bounds on the largest such interval by solving the equation $|f'(x)| = 1$. To that end:

$$\frac{3}{8}x^2 - 2x + 2 = \pm 1$$
$$3x^2 - 16x + 16 = \pm 8$$
$$3x^2 - 16x + 24 = 0 \quad or \quad 3x^2 - 16x + 8 = 0$$
$$x = \frac{8 \pm i2\sqrt{2}}{3} \quad or \quad x = \frac{8 \pm 2\sqrt{10}}{3}$$
$$\frac{8 - 2\sqrt{10}}{3} \approx 0.558 \quad and \quad \frac{8 + 2\sqrt{10}}{3} \approx 4.775,$$

so we should expect fixed point iteration to converge to 2 on any closed interval contained in

$$\left(\frac{8 - 2\sqrt{10}}{3}, \frac{8 + 2\sqrt{10}}{3} \right).$$

Now, if we have the computer execute fixed point iteration for a large number of evenly spaced initial values, say 100, on the interval $[-2, 8]$ and record the results on a number line where we color an initial value black if it does not converge to 2 and green if it does converge to 2 (we will call such diagram a convergence diagram), we get

,

which shows that fixed point iteration converges to 2 on approximately $[-0.5, 6.5]$. Indeed, the experiment confirms that fixed point iteration converges on any closed interval contained in $\left(\frac{8-2\sqrt{10}}{3}, \frac{8+2\sqrt{10}}{3} \right)$ as predicted. But the diagram shows convergence on an even larger set. We can conclude that the Fixed Point Convergence Theorem gives sufficient but not necessary conditions for convergence in a neighborhood of a fixed point.

A graph of the function $f(x)$ superimposed on the line $y = x$ (Figure 2.2.5) gives some insight as to why the bounds $\frac{8 \pm 2\sqrt{10}}{3}$ do not tell a complete story. By imagining the web diagram for any initial value between the two fixed points other than 2, that is -0.61 and 6.61, you should be able to convince yourself that fixed point iteration converges to 2 for anhy initial value in the interval $(-0.61, 6.61)$. Can you prove it? Graphs like those in Figures 2.2.3, 2.2.4, and 2.2.5 are indispensible and should always be consulted when trying to understand fixed point iteration, but they should not be relied upon as proof. For that, we need to rely on theorems like the Fixed Point Convergence Theorem.

Figure 2.2.5: $f(x) = \frac{1}{8}x^3 - x^2 + 2x + 1$ and the line $y = x$

Crumpet 10: One interesting quadratic

Trying to find roots of the logistic equation

$$g(x) = (\alpha - 1)x - \alpha x^2$$

by applying fixed point iteration to the corresponding function $f(x) = x + g(x) = \alpha x(1 - x)$ is a famous exercise in dynamical systems which has a nasty habit of not working! Complete the following investigation to see what happens.

1. Show that $f(x) = \alpha x(1 - x)$ as claimed.

2. For each of the values $\alpha = 2.5$, $\alpha = 3.2$, $\alpha = 3.833$, and $\alpha = 4$, do the following.

   (a) Find the positive fixed point of f (root of g) analytically (using a pencil, paper, and some algebra).

   (b) Set $x_0 = 0.1$ and use a computer program to calculate x_{975} through x_{1000}.

   (c) Examine the 26 iterations of part (b) and describe what you see.

3. Draw a connection between your results from part 2 and the following diagram.

4. Use the diagram to predict a value of α for which you would expect fixed point iteration to lead to x_{975} through x_{1000} cycling through 4 different values. Check your prediction.

Figure 2.2.6: Convergence diagrams for 6 functions with the same fixed points.

black: does not converge; green: converges to 3; red: converges to $1 + \sqrt{3}$; blue: converges to $1 - \sqrt{3}$

Root Finding

When successful, fixed point iteration finds solutions of an equation of the form $f(x) = x$. A root finding problem requires the solution of an equation of the form $g(x) = 0$. However, the equation $f(x) = x$ has exactly the same solutions as the equation $f(x) - x = 0$, so finding fixed points of $f(x)$ is equivalent to finding roots of $g(x) = f(x) - x$. Indeed, we can rephrase the example of finding fixed points of $f(x) = \frac{1}{8}x^3 - x^2 + 2x + 1$ as the problem of finding roots of $g(x) = f(x) - x = \frac{1}{8}x^3 - x^2 + x + 1$. But it is the opposite problem that is much more common. We have the question of finding the roots of a function and need to rephrase it in terms of a fixed point problem.

Suppose we want the roots of $g(x) = -x^3 + 5x^2 - 4x - 6$. We can rephrase the question of solving $g(x) = 0$ as the problem of finding the fixed points of many different functions! But you will have to ignore some sage advice of your algebra teacher to derive them! The key is to use algebra to rewrite the equation $-x^3 + 5x^2 - 4x - 6 = 0$ as an equation of the form $x = f(x)$. The simplest way is to add x to both sides of the equation. This manipulation and several others are shown in the following list.

- $-x^3 + 5x^2 - 4x - 6 = 0 \Rightarrow -x^3 + 5x^2 - 3x - 6 = x$

- $-x^3 + 5x^2 - 4x - 6 = 0 \Rightarrow -x^3 + 5x^2 - 6 = 4x \Rightarrow \frac{-x^3 + 5x^2 - 6}{4} = x$

- $-x^3 + 5x^2 - 4x - 6 = 0 \Rightarrow -x^3 - 4x - 6 = -5x^2 \Rightarrow \frac{x^3 + 4x + 6}{5} = x^2 \Rightarrow \pm\sqrt{\frac{x^3 + 4x + 6}{5}} = x$

- $-x^3 + 5x^2 - 4x - 6 = 0 \Rightarrow 5x^2 - 4x - 6 = x^3 \Rightarrow \sqrt[3]{5x^2 - 4x - 6} = x$

Can you see what has been done for each one? Thus we have five candidates for fixed point iteration, $f_1(x) = -x^3 + 5x^2 - 3x - 6$, $f_2(x) = \frac{-x^3 + 5x^2 - 6}{4}$, $f_3(x) = \sqrt{\frac{x^3 + 4x + 6}{5}}$, $f_4(x) = -\sqrt{\frac{x^3 + 4x + 6}{5}}$, and $f_5(x) = \sqrt[3]{5x^2 - 4x - 6}$, all of which will potentially give roots of $g(x)$. There is a sixth function we will discuss in much more detail later: $f_6(x) = \frac{2x^3 - 5x^2 - 6}{3x^2 - 10x + 4}$ [3]. The roots of $g(x)$ are $1 - \sqrt{3} \approx -0.73$, $1 + \sqrt{3} \approx 2.73$, and 3, so we will consider convergence diagrams over the interval $[-2, 5]$. Fixed point iteration converges to different fixed points for the different functions despite the fact that all 6 functions have exactly the same three fixed points. The convergence diagrams of Figure 2.2.6 are color-coded to reflect this fact. Black indicates lack of convergence just as before. Green, red, and blue indicate convergence to 3, $1 + \sqrt{3}$, and $1 - \sqrt{3}$, respectively. Notice that only f_6 provides convergence for, as far as we can tell, every intial value in $[-2, 5]$, and is also the only one for which fixed point iteration converges to different fixed points for different initial values. See if you can understand why each function has the convergence behavior it

---

[3] By calculating $f_6(1 - \sqrt{3})$, $f_6(1 + \sqrt{3})$, and $f_6(3)$, you can verify that f_6 has these three values as fixed points as well.

does by looking at the graphs of $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_6$. Pay special attention to the graphs around $1 + \sqrt{3}$ and 3. Looks can be deceiving in that area because the two fixed points are so close together. Also, see if you can find two initial values in $[-2, 5]$ for which fixed point iteration on f_6 does not converge. What happens instead? For an extra challenge, see if you can find a third point in $[-2, 5]$ for which fixed point iteration on f_6 does not converge. Hint: you may need to use a computer algebra system to find such a point exactly or use fixed point iteration to approximate it! Answers on page .

The Fixed Point Iteration Method (pseudo-code)

Though we spent a lot of time talking about how to determine whether we should expect the fixed point iteration method to converge or not, none of that information is strictly relevant to coding the method. Any implementation of the method should allow the user to try fixed point iteration for any function with any initial value. It is the user's responsibility to understand that when the assumptions are not met, the results are unpredictable. Remember, "garbage in...garbage out."

The fixed point iteration method presents a problem that the bisection method did not. In the bisection method, there was a simple and convenient formula for an upper bound on the error. To provide something similar in the fixed point iteration method, one would have to sacrifice simplicity or convenience or both, but the benefits do not outweigh the sacrifice. Instead, a more general stopping criterion is used. When two consecutive iterations are closer to one another than a given tolerance, the method stops. At this point, the difference between iterations, say x_k and x_{k+1}, is smaller than the tolerance. For a sequence derived from fixed point iteration, $x_{k+1} = f(x_k)$, so $|x_{k+1} - x_k| = |f(x_k) - x_k|$. When $|x_{k+1} - x_k|$ is small, $|f(x_k) - x_k|$ is small, so $f(x_k) \approx x_k$. x_k is "almost" a fixed point.

Assumptions: f is differentiable. f has a fixed point $\hat{x}$. x_0 is in a neighborhood $(\hat{x} - \delta, \hat{x} + \delta)$ where the magnitude of f' is less than one.

Input: Initial value x_0; function f; desired accuracy *tol*; maximum number of iterations N.

Step 1: For $j = 1 \ldots N$ do Steps 2-4:

Step 2: Set $x = f(x_0)$;

Step 3: If $|x - x_0| \leq$ *tol* then return x;

Step 4: Set $x_0 = x$;

Step 5: Print "Method failed. Maximum iterations exceeded."

Output: Approximation x near exact fixed point, or message of failure.

Key Concepts

Fixed point: x_0 is a fixed point of the function $f(x)$ if $f(x_0) = x_0$.

Fixed point iteration: Calculating the sequence $x_0, x_1 = f(x_0), x_2 = f(x_1), x_3 = f(x_2), \ldots$ given the function f and initial value x_0.

Attractive fixed point: A fixed point is called attractive (or attracting) if there is a neighborhood of the fixed point in which fixed point iteration converges for all initial values in the neighborhood.

Repulsive fixed point: A fixed point is called repulsive (or repelling) if fixed point iteration escapes some neighborhood of the fixed point for any initial value in the neighborhood other than the fixed point itself.

Mean Value Theorem: If f is continuous on $[a, b]$ and has a derivative on (a, b), then there exists $c \in (a, b)$ such that $f'(c) = \frac{f(b) - f(a)}{b - a}$.

Fixed Point Convergence Theorem: Given a function $f(x)$ with continuous first derivative and fixed point $\hat{x}$, if $|f'(\hat{x})| < 1$ then there exists a neighborhood of $\hat{x}$ in which fixed point iteration converges to the fixed point for any initial value in the neighborhood.

Exercises

1. Write an Octave implementation of the fixed point iteration method. Save it as a `.m` file for future use.

2. (i) Decide whether or not the hypotheses of the Mean Value Theorem are met for the function over the interval. (ii) If the hypotheses are met, find a value c as guaranteed by the theorem.

   (a) $f(x) = 3 - x - \sin x$; $[2, 3]$

(b) $g(x) = 3x^4 - 2x^3 - 3x + 2$; $[0, 1]$

(c) $g(x) = 3x^4 - 2x^3 - 3x + 2$; $[0, 0.9]$ [S]

(d) $h(x) = 10 - \cosh(x)$; $[-3, -2]$ [A]

(e) $f(t) = \sqrt{4 + 5\sin t} - 2.5$; $[-6, -5]$

(f) $g(t) = \frac{3t^2 \tan t}{1 - t^2}$; $[20, 23]$ [S]

(g) $h(t) = \ln(3\sin t) - \frac{3t}{5}$; $[2, 4]$ [A]

(h) $f(r) = e^{\sin r} - r$; $[-20, 20]$ [A]

(i) $g(r) = \sin(e^r) + r$; $[-3, 3]$

(j) $h(r) = 2^{\sin r} - 3^{\cos r}$; $[1, 3]$

3. Find the fixed point(s) of the function exactly. Use algebra.

(a) $f(x) = \sqrt[3]{2x^3 - x^2 - x}$

(b) $f(x) = \frac{\ln(2}{2}$

(c) $f(x) = \log(x^2 - 3x) - 1 + x$ [A]

(d) $g(x) = 3x^2 + 5x + 1$ [A]

(e) $g(x) = x + \frac{5000}{1 + 2e^{-3t}} - 2500$

(f) $g(x) = e^{\ln(x+1) - 3}$

(g) $h(x) = \sqrt{4x^2 + 4x + 1}$

(h) $h(x) = x - 10 + 3^x + 25 \cdot 3^{-x}$ [S]

(i) $h(x) = x + 6 - 3\log_5(2x)$

4. Find at least two candidate functions, $f_1(x)$ and $f_2(x)$, for finding roots of $g(x)$ via fixed point iteration. In other words, convert the problem of finding a root of g into a problem of finding a fixed point of f_1 or f_2.

(a) $g(x) = 7x^2 + 5x - 9$

(b) $g(x) = x + \cos x$

(c) $g(x) = 6x^5 + 12x^2 - 8$ [A]

(d) $g(x) = x^2 - e^{3x+4}$ [S]

(e) $g(x) = 7x - 3\cos(\pi x - 2) + \ln|2x^2 + 4x - 8|$

(f) $g(x) = 3^{x^2 - 5x + 1} - 2^{-x^2 - 5x - 1}$ [A]

5. Compute the first 5 iterations of the fixed point iteration method using the given function and initial value. Based on these 5 iterations, do you expect the method to converge?

(a) $f(x) = 3 - \sin x$; $x_0 = 2$

(b) $g(x) = 10 + x - \cosh(x)$; $x_0 = -3$ [S]

(c) $h(t) = \ln(3\sin t) + \frac{2t}{5}$; $t_0 = 1$ [A]

(d) $w(r) = 2^{\sin r} - 3^{\cos r} + r$; $r_0 = 1$

6. Use your Octave function from question 1 with the function and initial value in question 5. Set the tolerance to 10^{-10} and the maximum iterations to 100. Does the method converge within 100 iterations? If so, to what value? Report at least 10 significant digits. [S] [A]

7. Construct a web diagram for each function/initial value pair in question 5. [S] [A]

8. Compare the results from question 6 with the results of question 7. Are they consistent with one another?

9. Use proposition 3 to show that $g(x) = 2x(1 - x)$ has a unique fixed point on $[0.3, 0.7]$.

10. Let $f(x) = \frac{3x^2 - 1}{6x + 4}$. [S]

(a) Show that f has a unique fixed point on $[-4, -0.9]$.

(b) Use fixed-point iteration to find an approximation to the fixed point that is accurate to within 10^{-2}.

11. Let $g(x) = \pi + 0.5\sin(x/2)$.

(a) Show that g has a unique fixed point on $[0, 2\pi]$.

(b) Use fixed-point iteration to find an approximation to the fixed point that is accurate to within 10^{-2}.

12. Show that the Fixed Point Iteration Method applied to $f(x) = \sqrt[3]{8 - 4x}$ will converge to a root of $g(x) = x^3 + 4x - 8$ for any initial value $x_0 \in [1.2, 1.5]$. [S]

13. Show that fixed point iteration is guaranteed to converge to the fixed point of

$$f(x) = (\sqrt{2})^x$$

for any $x_0 \in [1, 3]$. HINT: $f'(x) = \frac{1}{2}\ln(2) \cdot (\sqrt{2})^x$.

14. Let $g(x) = x^2 - 3x - 2$.

(a) Find a function f on which fixed point iteration will converge to a root of g.

(b) Use your function to find a root of g to within 10^{-3} of the exact value.

(c) State the initial value you used and how many iterations it took to get the approximation.

15. Use Fixed Point Iteration with $p_0 = -1$ to approximate a root of $g(x) = x^3 - 3x + 3$ accurate to the nearest 10^{-4}.

16. Use a fixed-point iteration method to find an approximation of $\sqrt{3}$ that is accurate to within 10^{-4}. What function and initial value did you use?

17. The function $f(x) = x^4 + 2x^2 - x - 3$ has two roots. One of them is in $[-1, 0]$ and the other is in $[1, 2]$.

(a) In preparation for finding a root of $f(x)$ using fixed point iteration, one way to manipulate the equation $x^4 + 2x^2 - x - 3 = 0$ is to add x to both sides. This gives

$$x = x^4 + 2x^2 - 3$$

Draw appropriate graphs to determine whether iteration of the function $g(x) = x^4 + 2x^2 - 3$ will find the root in $[-1, 0]$. How about the root in $[1, 2]$? Explain how you came to your conclusions.

(b) Manipulate the equation $x^4 + 2x^2 - x - 3 = 0$ in such a way that fixed point iteration does work to find the root in $[-1, 0]$. Draw the graphs that demonstrate that your method will work.

(c) Does the same manipulation allow you to find the root in $[1, 2]$? If not, find another manipulation that will. Again, show the graphs that demonstrate that your method will work.

(d) Use your method(s) from parts 17b and 17c to find the two roots accurate to 3 decimal places.

18. Fixed point iteration on $f(x) = \sqrt[3]{2x^3 - x^2 - x}$ will not converge to a fixed point. However, fixed point iteration on the function $g(x) = \sqrt[3]{x^2 + x}$ will converge to approximately 1.618033988749895 for any x_0 in $[0.5, 3.5]$. [A]

(a) How many iterations does it take to achieve 10^{-4} accuracy using $g(x)$ with $x_0 = 2.5$?

(b) Explain why $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ have the same fixed points.

19. Find a zero (any zero) of $g(x) = x^2 + 10 \cos x$ accurate to within 10^{-4} using fixed point iteration. State

(a) the function f to which you fixed point iteration

(b) the initial value, x_0, you used

(c) how many iterations it took

20. Let c be a nonzero real number. Argue that any fixed point of $f(x) = xe^{c \cdot g(x)}$ is a root of g.

21. Approximate $\sqrt{3}$ using the method suggested by question 20.

22. Suppose $g(\hat{x}) = 0$ and g has a continuous first derivative. Argue that there exists a value c for which fixed point iteration on $f(x) = x + cg(x)$ will converge to $\hat{x}$ on some neighborhood of $\hat{x}$.

23. Find a value of c for which fixed point iteration is guaranteed to converge for the function $f(x) = x + c(x - 5 \cos x)$ with any initial value $x_0 \in [0, \pi/2]$. Explain. [A]

24. Let $g(x) = \frac{1}{2}^x + \frac{1}{5}^x - 10^{-5}$.

(a) Show that if $g(x)$ has a zero at p, then the function $f(x) = x + cg(x)$ has a fixed point at p.

(b) Find a value of c for which fixed point iteration of $f(x)$ will successfully converge for any starting value, p_0, in the interval $[16, 17]$. Sketch the graphs that demonstrate that your choice of c is appropriate.

(c) Use the function from part 24b with the value of c you have determined to find a root of $g(x)$ accurate to within 10^{-4}. State the value you used for p_0. Show the last 3 iterations. How many iterations did it take?

25. Prove that for $f(x) = \cos x$, fixed point iteration converges for any initial value.

26. The Fixed Point Convergence Theorem can be strengthened. The requirement that the first derivative be continuous can be replaced. Modify the proof in the text to show the following claim.

   Given a differentiable function $f(x)$ with fixed point $\hat{x}$, if $|f'(x)| \leq M < 1$ for all x in some neighborhood of $\hat{x}$, then fixed point iteration converges to the fixed point for any initial value in the neighborhood.

27. Create three graphs similar to those in Figure 2.2.4 to analyze the situation when the derivative at the fixed point equals -1. Does the situation differ from that when the derivative at the fixed point equals 1?

Answers

Figure 2.2.4: From left to right: every neighborhood of the fixed point will have both types of initial values; point iteration converges for all values in a neighborhood of the fixed point; fixed point iteration escapes some neighborhood of the fixed point for all initial values in the neighborhood except the fixed point itself

Figure 2.2.6: When its denominator is zero, $f_6(x)$ will be undefined (there is a vertical asymptote in the graph), so we solve $3x^2 - 10x + 4 = 0$ to find two intial values for which fixed point iteration will fail (since the first iteration will be undefined). They are $x = \frac{5 \pm \sqrt{13}}{3} \approx .4648$ and 2.868. To find a third point for which fixed point iteration will fail, we solve the equation $f_6(x) = \frac{5 + \sqrt{13}}{5}$ (we could just as easily have solved $f_6(x) = \frac{5 - \sqrt{13}}{5}$ instead). Then the second iteration will be undefined since the first iteration will be $\frac{5 + \sqrt{13}}{5}$. The only real solution is approximately 1.055909763230534, which can be found by fixed point iteration on $\sqrt[3]{\frac{\sqrt{13}x^2 + 10x^2 - \frac{10\sqrt{13}x}{3} - \frac{50x}{3} + \frac{4\sqrt{13}}{3} + \frac{38}{3}}{2}}$. Prove it. Note, though, the claim that fixed point iteration will fail is based on the assumption of *exact* arithmetic. The fact that any reasonable implementation of the fixed point iteration method will involve floating point arithmetic might provide just enough error for the method to converge even for these initial values.

2.3   Order of Convergence for Fixed Point Iteration

Suppose f is a function with fixed point $\hat{x}$ and $f'(\hat{x})$ exists. Let $x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots$ be a sequence derived from fixed point iteration ($x_{k+1} = f(x_k)$ for all $k \geq 1$) such that $\lim\limits_{k \to \infty} x_k = \hat{x}$ and $x_k \neq \hat{x}$ for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. Then

$$\frac{|x_{n+1} - \hat{x}|}{|x_n - \hat{x}|^1} = \left| \frac{f(x_n) - f(\hat{x})}{x_n - \hat{x}} \right|$$

and

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left| \frac{f(x_n) - f(\hat{x})}{x_n - \hat{x}} \right| = |f'(\hat{x})|. \tag{2.3.1}$$

Therefore, fixed point iteration is linearly convergent as long as $f'(\hat{x}) \neq 0$. The following proposition could be presented as a corollary to the Fixed Point Convergence Theorem since much of the argument simply repeats what was noted there, but we choose to present it as a separate claim based on equation 2.3.1. To be more precise, we have the following result.

Proposition 5. *(Fixed Point Error Bound) Let f be a differentiable function with fixed point $\hat{x}$ and let $[a, b]$ be an interval containing $\hat{x}$. If $|f'(x)| \leq M < 1$ for all $x \in [a, b]$ and $f([a, b]) \subseteq [a, b]$, then for any initial value $x_0 \in [a, b]$, fixed point iteration, with $x_{k+1} = f(x_k)$ for all $k \geq 0$, gives an approximation of $\hat{x}$ with absolute error no more than $M^k |x_0 - \hat{x}|$.*

Proof. An elementary induction proof (requested in the exercises) will establish that $x_k \in [a, b]$ for all $k \geq 0$. We proceed to prove the error bound. The absolute error in approximating $\hat{x}$ by x_0 is $|x_0 - \hat{x}| = M^0 |x_0 - \hat{x}|$ so the claim is true for $k = 0$. Now suppose the claim is true for some particular but arbitrary $k \geq 0$. By the Mean Value Theorem, there is a c in the interval from $\hat{x}$ to x_k such that $f'(c) = \frac{f(x_k) - f(\hat{x})}{x_k - \hat{x}}$. Since $\hat{x}$ and x_k are both in $[a, b]$, so is c. It follows that $|f'(c)| \leq M$, so $|f(x_k) - f(\hat{x})| \leq M |x_k - \hat{x}|$. But $\hat{x}$ is a fixed point of f, so $f(\hat{x}) = \hat{x}$, from which it follows that $|f(x_k) - \hat{x}| \leq M |x_k - \hat{x}|$, and therefore that $|x_{k+1} - \hat{x}| \leq M |x_k - \hat{x}|$. By the inductive hypothesis, $|x_k - \hat{x}| \leq M^k |x_0 - \hat{x}|$, so $|x_{k+1} - \hat{x}| \leq M \cdot M^k |x_0 - \hat{x}| = M^{k+1} |x_0 - \hat{x}|$. $\square$

When $f'(\hat{x}) = 0$, equation 2.3.1 shows that fixed point iteration does not converge linearly. For any sequence $\langle p_n \rangle$ converging to p, if $\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{|p_{n+1} - p|}{|p_n - p|} = 0$ we say the sequence is superlinearly convergent or that convergence is faster than linear.

Consider the functions $f(x) = \frac{1}{8}x^3 - x^2 + 2x + 1$ and $f_1(x) = -x^3 + 5x^2 - 3x - 6$ from section 2.2. Recall 2 is a fixed point of f and 3 is a fixed point of f_1 and observe that $f'(2) = \frac{3}{8} \cdot 2^2 - 2 \cdot 2 + 2 = -\frac{1}{2}$ and $f_1'(3) = -3 \cdot 3^2 + 10 \cdot 3 - 3 = 0$ Consequently, we should expect fixed point iteration of f_1 to converge to 3 faster than that of f converges to 2. With $s_0, s_1, s_2, \ldots = 1.75, f(1.75), f(f(1.75)), \ldots$ and $t_0, t_1, t_2, \ldots = 2.75, f_1(2.75), f_1(f_1(2.75)), \ldots$, table 2.1 shows the relative speeds of convergence. $\langle s_n \rangle$ is

Table 2.1: Comparing order of convergence for fixed point iteration when the derivative at the fixed point is not zero, s_n, to that when the derivative at the fixed point is zero, t_n.

n	$|2 - s_n|$	$|3 - t_n|$
0	$2.5(10)^{-1}$	$2.5(10)^{-1}$
1	$1.074(10)^{-1}$	$2.343(10)^{-1}$
2	$5.644(10)^{-2}$	$2.068(10)^{-1}$
3	$2.740(10)^{-2}$	$1.623(10)^{-1}$
4	$1.388(10)^{-2}$	$1.010(10)^{-1}$
5	$6.894(10)^{-3}$	$3.984(10)^{-2}$
6	$3.459(10)^{-3}$	$6.286(10)^{-3}$
7	$1.726(10)^{-3}$	$1.578(10)^{-4}$
8	$8.640(10)^{-4}$	$9.966(10)^{-8}$
9	$4.318(10)^{-4}$	$3.973(10)^{-14}$
10	$2.159(10)^{-4}$	$6.317(10)^{-27}$

converging linearly as expected, and $\langle t_n \rangle$ seems to be converging quadratically. The last four exponents in the $|3 - t_n|$ column are $-4, -8, -14, -27$, indicating that the number of significant digits of accuracy is approximately doubling with each iteration. In other words, the error of one term is roughly the square of the previous error (meaning $\alpha = 2$ in the definition of order of convergence).

Table 2.2: Accelerating the convergence of a linearly converging sequence.

n	c_n	a_n	$|c_n - c|$	$|a_n - c|$	$\left|\frac{a_n - c}{c_n - c}\right|$	$\frac{|a_{n+1} - c|}{|a_n - c|^2}$
0	1	.728010	$2.609(10)^{-1}$	$1.107(10)^{-2}$	.0934	.0110
1	.5403	.733665	$1.987(10)^{-1}$	$5.419(10)^{-3}$	.0639	44.19
2	.8575	.736906	$1.184(10)^{-1}$	$2.178(10)^{-3}$	.0400	74.17
3	.6542	.738050	$8.479(10)^{-2}$	$1.034(10)^{-3}$	.0274	217.9
4	.7934	.738636	$5.439(10)^{-2}$	$4.490(10)^{-4}$	.0180	419.4
5	.7103	.738876	$3.771(10)^{-2}$	$2.085(10)^{-4}$	.0122	1034
6	.7639	.738992	$2.487(10)^{-2}$	$9.289(10)^{-5}$	.0081	
7	.7221					
8	.7504					

Taylor's Theorem will provide the proof we need that this convergence really is quadratic. Suppose f has a third derivative in a neighborhood of $\hat{x}$. Define $e_n = \hat{x} - x_n$. Then according to Taylor's Theorem, $\hat{x} = f(\hat{x}) = f(x_n + e_n) = f(x_n) + e_n f'(x_n) + \frac{1}{2} e_n^2 f''(x_n) + O(e_n^3)$. But $f(x_n) = x_{n+1}$ so we get

$$\hat{x} - x_{n+1} = e_{n+1} = e_n f'(x_n) + \frac{1}{2} e_n^2 f''(x_n) + O(e_n^3). \tag{2.3.2}$$

Also from Taylor's Theorem, $f'(\hat{x}) = f'(x_n + e_n) = f'(x_n) + e_n f''(x_n) + O(e_n^2)$. But $f'(\hat{x}) = 0$ so

$$f'(x_n) = -e_n f''(x_n) - O(e_n^2). \tag{2.3.3}$$

Substituting 2.3.3 into 2.3.2,

$$
\begin{aligned}
e_{n+1} &= e_n(-e_n f''(x_n) - O(e_n^2)) + \frac{1}{2} e_n^2 f''(x_n) + O(e_n^3) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} e_n^2 f''(x_n) + O(e_n^3).
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence $\frac{\hat{x} - x_{n+1}}{(\hat{x} - x_n)^2} = \frac{e_{n+1}}{e_n^2} = -\frac{1}{2} f''(x_n) + O(e_n)$ and

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{|\hat{x} - x_{n+1}|}{|\hat{x} - x_n|^2} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left| \frac{1}{2} f''(x_n) + O(e_n) \right| = \left| \frac{1}{2} f''(\hat{x}) \right|,$$

showing that convergence is at least quadratic. If $f''(\hat{x})$ happens to be 0, then the convergence is superquadratic.

To summarize, on the off-chance that, at a fixed point $\hat{x}$, $f'(\hat{x}) = 0$, fixed point iteration is successful and fast for initial values near $\hat{x}$. But when $f'(\hat{x}) \neq 0$, fixed point iteration may fail to converge to $\hat{x}$, and when it does converge, the convergence is slow. There is a quick fix (quick to implement, not quick to explain) for some of this deficiency when $f'(\hat{x}) \neq 0$, however. We will first concentrate on the speed of convergence.

Let the sequence $\langle c_n \rangle$ be defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_0 &= 1 \\
c_k &= \cos(c_{k-1}), \quad k > 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

You should be able to verify that the first few terms of this sequence are (approximately)

$$1, .5403, .8575, .6542, .7934, \ldots$$

This is exactly the sequence you created in the calculator experiment on page 46 of section 2.2. Define a new sequence $\langle a_n \rangle$ by

$$a_n = c_n - \frac{(c_{n+1} - c_n)^2}{c_{n+2} - 2c_{n+1} + c_n}.$$

Table 2.2 shows the first few terms of each sequence along with some error analysis. As promised, the sequence $\langle a_n \rangle$ is converging more quickly than $\langle c_n \rangle$, evidenced by the fact that $\left| \frac{a_n - c}{c_n - c} \right|$ is tending to zero. The last column of the table indicates that the convergence of $\langle a_n \rangle$ to c is not quadratic, however.

More generally, suppose $\langle p_n \rangle$ is any sequence that converges linearly to p. Then we have $\lim\limits_{n \to \infty} \frac{|p - p_{n+1}|}{|p - p_n|} = \lambda \neq 0$, so we should expect $\frac{|p - p_{n+2}|}{|p - p_{n+1}|} \approx \frac{|p - p_{n+1}|}{|p - p_n|} \approx \lambda$ for large enough n, from which we get $|(p - p_{n+2})(p - p_n)| \approx |p - p_{n+1}|^2$. Assuming $p - p_{n+2}$ and $p - p_n$ have the same sign for large n[4], we can remove the absolute values to find

$$
\begin{aligned}
(p - p_{n+2})(p - p_n) &\approx (p - p_{n+1})^2 \\
p^2 - (p_{n+2} + p_n)p + p_{n+2}p_n &\approx p^2 - 2p_{n+1}p + p_{n+1}^2 \\
(-p_{n+2} + 2p_{n+1} - p_n)p &\approx -p_{n+2}p_n + p_{n+1}^2 \\
p &\approx \frac{p_{n+2}p_n - p_{n+1}^2}{p_{n+2} - 2p_{n+1} + p_n}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, we may take any three consecutive terms of $\langle p_n \rangle$ and predict p from this formula. For large enough n, this prediction will be a much better estimate of p than is p_n. But just as we were able to claim $|(p - p_{n+2})(p - p_n)| \approx |p - p_{n+1}|^2$, it must also be the case that $p_{n+2}p_n \approx p_{n+1}^2$, so the numerator of our approximation is nearly zero. Of course that means the denominator must be nearly zero as well since the quotient is p, a value that may not be zero. To avoid some of the error inherent in this calculation, it is advisable to compute the algebraically equivalent approximation

$$
p \approx p_n - \frac{(p_{n+1} - p_n)^2}{p_{n+2} - 2p_{n+1} + p_n} \tag{2.3.4}
$$

instead. Let's go back and revisit the sequence $\langle s_n \rangle$ and apply this approximation.

Define $a_n = s_n - \frac{(s_{n+1} - s_n)^2}{s_{n+2} - 2s_{n+1} + s_n}$ and consider table 2.3 comparing the two sequences $\langle s_n \rangle$ and $\langle a_n \rangle$.

Table 2.3: Comparing fixed point iteration when the derivative at the fixed point is not zero, s_n, to the Aitken's delta-squared sequence, a_n.

n	s_n	$\|2 - s_n\|$	a_n	$\|2 - a_n\|$
0	1.75	$2.5(10)^{-1}$	1.99506842493985	$4.931(10)^{-3}$
1	2.107421875	$1.074(10)^{-1}$	1.999022858310434	$9.771(10)^{-4}$
2	1.943559146486223	$5.644(10)^{-2}$	1.999737171760319	$2.628(10)^{-4}$
3	2.027401559734717	$2.740(10)^{-2}$	1.999937151202653	$6.284(10)^{-5}$
4	1.986114080555812	$1.388(10)^{-2}$	1.999983969455146	$1.603(10)^{-5}$
5	2.006894420349172	$6.894(10)^{-3}$		
6	1.996540947531514	$3.459(10)^{-3}$		

$\langle a_n \rangle$ converges significantly faster than the linearly convergent sequence from which is was derived, just as before! The fact that $|2 - a_n| \approx |2 - s_{n+2}|^2$ is evidence of this claim, but the convergence of $\langle a_n \rangle$ is still linear. Make sure you can calculate the a_n in this table yourself before reading on.

On a practical note, there is no sense in calculating all the terms $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{n-2}$ as done in the table. The terms of $\langle a_n \rangle$ are dependent only on those of $\langle s_n \rangle$ so a_{n-2} can be calculated just as well without having calculated $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{n-3}$. The table shows all of them only for illustrative purposes and so you can get some practice with formula 2.3.4. The important thing to notice is that a_n has approximately twice as many significant digits of accuracy as does s_{n+2}. Consequently, a_0 is a much better approximation than is s_2.

Crumpet 11: Aitken's delta-squared method is designed for any linearly convergent sequence, not just sequences derived from fixed point iteration.

The derivation of 2.3.4, referred to as Aitken's delta-squared formula, makes no reference to fixed point iteration. In fact it makes no assumptions about the origin of the sequence. It makes no difference. It may be a sequence of partial sums, a sequence of partial products, a sequence derived from any

---

[4]This will happen in the common events that the $\hat{x} - x_n$ all have the same sign or the $\hat{x} - x_n$ have alternating signs, so this is not an unrealistic assumption.

Table 2.4: Steffensen's Method applied to $f(x) = \cos x$.

n	a_n	$g(a_n)$	$g(g(a_n))$	$|a_n - c|$	$\frac{|a_{n+1}-c|}{|a_n-c|^2}$
0	1	.5403023058681398	.8575532158463934	$2.609(10)^{-1}$	.162
1	.7280103614676171	.7464997560452203	.7340702837365296	$1.107(10)^{-2}$	.148
2	.7390669669086738	.7390973701357808	.7390768902228948	$1.816(10)^{-5}$	.148
3	.7390851331660755	.739085133248225	.739085133192888	$4.908(10)^{-11}$	.148
4	.7390851332151607			$3.063(10)^{-17}$	

recurrence relation, a sequence derived from number theory, or anything else. The only important characteristics are that the sequence converges and it does so linearly.

The sum $\frac{1}{1} - \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{5} - \frac{1}{7} + \frac{1}{9} - \cdots$ converges to $\frac{\pi}{4}$ linearly so Aitken's delta-squared method should be helpful. If we let $p_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{2k-1}$ be the nth partial sum, then $p_2 = \frac{13}{15}$, $p_3 = \frac{76}{105}$, $p_4 = \frac{263}{315}$, and $p_5 = \frac{2578}{3465}$. Aitken's extrapolation gives $a_2 = \frac{13}{15} - \frac{(\frac{76}{105} - \frac{13}{15})^2}{\frac{263}{315} - 2\frac{76}{105} + \frac{13}{15}} = \frac{1321}{1680}$ and $a_3 = \frac{76}{105} - \frac{(\frac{263}{315} - \frac{76}{105})^2}{\frac{2578}{3465} - 2\frac{263}{315} + \frac{76}{105}} = \frac{989}{1260}$. $\frac{|\frac{\pi}{4} - p_4|^2}{|\frac{\pi}{4} - a_2|} \approx 2.6$ and $\frac{|\frac{\pi}{4} - p_5|^2}{|\frac{\pi}{4} - a_3|} \approx 3.5$ so extrapolation gives an error less than the square of the error in the original sequence.

Perhaps this fact gives you an idea. Once s_2 is calculated, we can use equation 2.3.4, also known as Aitken's delta-squared method, to calculate a better approximation than we already have. And once we have this good approximation, it seems a bit silly to cast it aside and continue computing $s_3 = f(s_2), s_4 = f(s_3)$, and so on. What if we use a_0 in place of s_3 in our iteration? In other words, we would have $s_1 = f(s_0), s_2 = f(s_1), s_3 = a_0, s_4 = f(s_3)$, and so on. That should improve s_3, s_4, and s_5. And once we have s_5 we again have three consecutive fixed point iterations, so we can apply Aitken's delta squared method again. Instead of calculating $s_6 = f(s_5)$, we can get what should be a better approximation by using equation 2.3.4 on s_3, s_4, and s_5. In other words, $s_6 = a_3$, $s_7 = f(s_6)$, $s_8 = f(s_7)$. Again, we have three consecutive fixed point iterations, so $s_9 = a_6$, and so on. This gives the sequence

$$1.75, \qquad 2.107421875, \qquad 1.943559146486222,$$
$$1.995068424939850, \quad 2.002459692429676, \quad 1.998768643123618,$$
$$1.999997974970982, \quad 2.000001012513483, \quad 1.999999493743001,$$
$$1.999999999999658, \quad 2.000000000000170, \quad 1.999999999999914,$$
$$1.999999999999999, \qquad \cdots$$

which converges to 2 very quickly compared to $\langle s_n \rangle$. If we consider the calculations of $s_1, s_2, s_4, s_5, s_7, s_8, \ldots$ to be intermediary and focus on the subsequence $s_0, s_3, s_6, s_9, \ldots = s_0, a_0, a_3, a_6, \ldots$ as a sequence itself we have

$$1.75, \ 1.995068424939850, \ 1.999997974970982, \ 1.999999999999658, \ 1.999999999999999, \ldots$$

which converges very rapidly! The construction of this subsequence as a sequence in and of itself is called Steffensen's Method and the convergence is quadratic as long as $\langle s_n \rangle$ is convergent. The following is a heuristic argument that Steffensen's Method gives quadratic convergence. As seen, the error in s_2 is not significantly different from the error in s_0. But a_0 has an error approximately equal to the square of the error in s_2, so the error in a_0 is approximately the square of the error in s_0. Similarly, the error in s_5 is not significantly different from that in $a_0 = s_3$. But the error in a_1 is approximately the square of the error in s_5, so the error in a_1 is approximately the square of the error in a_0. Similarly, the error in a_{n+1} is approximately the square of the error in a_n.

Applying Steffensen's method to the function $f(x) = \cos x$ with $x_0 = 1$, we can accelerate the convergence of the sequence $\langle c_n \rangle$ dramatically. Table 2.4 shows the first few terms of $\langle a_n \rangle$ with some error analysis. The last column of the table indicates that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{|a_{n+1} - c|}{|a_n - c|^2} \approx .148$$

and, consequently, that the sequence $\langle a_n \rangle$ converges quadratically.

Finally, we have two ways to get quick convergence from fixed point iteration. One, we simply iterate when the function has derivative zero at the fixed point. Two, we use Steffensen's Method.

Figure 2.3.1: Convergence diagrams for 5 functions with the same fixed points—Steffensen's Method.

black: does not converge; green: converges to 3; red: converges to $1 + \sqrt{3}$; blue: converges to $1 - \sqrt{3}$

Convergence Diagrams

Speeding up fixed point iteration only takes care of one deficiency of the method. There is still the problem of divergence from fixed points where the derivative of the function has magnitude equal to or greater than 1. Steffensen's Method helps. Compare Figure 2.3.1 with Figure 2.2.6. The convergence diagrams for Steffensen's Method show convergence over larger intervals of initial values. Moreover, where f_1 and f_2 are concerned, Steffensen's Method finds all three fixed points, just as fixed point iteration on f_6 did.

Steffensen's Method (pseudo-code)

Since Steffensen's Method is particularly prone to floating-point error, we do a preliminary check for convergence before the Aitken's delta-squared step. This helps prevent large errors or division by zero in Step 4.

> **Assumptions:** Fixed point iteration converges to a fixed point of f with initial value x_0.
>
> **Input:** Initial value x_0; function f; desired accuracy *tol*; maximum number of iterations N.
>
> **Step 1:** For $j = 1 \ldots N$ do Steps 2-6:
>
>> **Step 2:** Set $x_1 = f(x_0)$; $x_2 = f(x_1)$
>> **Step 3:** If $|x_2 - x_1| \leq$ *tol* then return x_2
>> **Step 4:** Set $x = x_0 - \frac{(x_1 - x_0)^2}{x_2 - 2x_1 + x_0}$
>> **Step 5:** If $|x - x_0| \leq$ *tol* then return x;
>> **Step 6:** Set $x_0 = x$;
>
> **Step 7:** Print "Method failed. Maximum iterations exceeded."
>
> **Output:** Approximation x near exact fixed point, or message of failure.

Key Concepts

Aitken's delta-squared Method: If $\langle p_n \rangle$ converges to p linearly, the sequence $\langle a_n \rangle$ defined by $a_n = p_n - \frac{(p_{n+1} - p_n)^2}{p_{n+2} - 2p_{n+1} + p_n}$ converges to p superlinearly.

Fixed Point Error Bound: Let f be a differentiable function with fixed point $\hat{x}$ and let $[a, b]$ be an interval containing $\hat{x}$. If $|f'(x)| \leq M < 1$ for all $x \in [a, b]$ and $f([a, b]) \subseteq [a, b]$, then for any initial value $x_0 \in [a, b]$, fixed point iteration, with $x_{k+1} = f(x_k)$ for all $k \geq 0$, gives an approximation of $\hat{x}$ with absolute error no more than $M^k |x_0 - \hat{x}|$.

Fixed Point Iteration Order of Convergence: Suppose f is a function with fixed point $\hat{x}$ and $f'(\hat{x})$ exists. Let $x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots$ be a sequence derived from fixed point iteration ($x_{k+1} = f(x_k)$ for all

$k \geq 1$) such that $\lim\limits_{k \to \infty} x_k = \hat{x}$ and $x_k \neq \hat{x}$ for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. Then the sequence $\langle x_n \rangle$ converges linearly to $\hat{x}$ if $f'(\hat{x}) \neq 0$ and at least quadratically if $f'(\hat{x}) = 0$.

Steffensen's Method: A modification of fixed point iteration where every third term is calculated using Aitken's delta-squared method.

Superlinear convergence: If the sequence $p_0, p_1, p_2, \ldots$ converges to p and $\lim\limits_{k \to \infty} \dfrac{|p_{k+1} - p|}{|p_k - p|} = 0$, then the sequence is said to converge superlinearly.

Superquadratic convergence: If the sequence $p_0, p_1, p_2, \ldots$ converges to p and $\lim\limits_{k \to \infty} \dfrac{|p_{k+1} - p|}{|p_k - p|^2} = 0$, then the sequence is said to converge superquadratically.

Octave

In section 1.3, we learned about `for` loops. With a `for` loop, you have to know how many times you want the loop to run or at least you need a maximum. You can quit a `for` loop before it is done by exiting (returning) from the function. There are times, however, when you don't know how many times you need a loop to run and you don't even have a convenient maximum at hand. In this case, a `while` loop is more appropriate. A `while` loop will continue to loop as long as a certain condition is met, and you set the condition. The syntax for a while loop is

```
while (condition)
  do something.
end%while
```

but must be used with caution. `for` loops always have an end, but `while` loops do not if programmed carelessly. If the `condition` of a `while` loop is never met, the loop runs indefinitely! Here is a simple example of a `while` loop that never ends. Do not run it!

```
i=0;
while (i<12)
  disp("Help! I'm stuck in a never-ending loop!!")
end%while
```

The problem is `i` is set less than 12 and never changes so always remains less than 12. Thus the condition of this `while` loop is always met. This loop can easily be modified to terminate. If we increment `i` inside the loop, it will end. This modification of the never-ending loop does end and displays a messge 12 times:

```
i=0;
while (i<12)
  disp("That's better. I can handle a dozen iterations.")
  i=i+1;
end%while
```

Incidentally, any `for` loop can be replaced by a `while` loop like this one.

We are human. Inevitably, we will program a while loop that never ends. What to do once it starts running? Of course, you can power down the machine, but that is a little like bringing your coffee mug to the kitchen using a bull dozer. There is an easier way. You can simply stop the application in which you are running Octave. If you are using a command line (terminal) window or the Octave GUI, you can simply close it. But, if you remember, you can also press `Ctrl-c`. That is, tap the c key while holding down the `Ctrl` key. This will interrupt the never-ending loop.

For a more practical example, the bisection method can easily be re-programmed using a while loop. First, the pseudo-code:

Assumptions: f is continuous on $[a, b]$. $f(a)$ and $f(b)$ have opposite signs.

Input: Interval $[a, b]$; function f; desired accuracy *tol*.

Step 1: Set $m = \frac{a+b}{2}$; $err = |b - a|/2$; $L = f(a)$;

Step 2: While $err > tol$ do Steps 3-5:

Step 3: Set $m = \frac{a+b}{2}$; $M = f(m)$; $err = err/2$;

Step 4: If $M = 0$ then return m;

Step 5: If $LM < 0$ then set $b = m$; else set $a = m$ and $L = M$;

Step 6: Return m.

Output: Approximation m within *tol* of exact root.

Now the Octave code. If you decide to use this code, it should be saved in a file named `bisectionWhile.m`.

```
function p = bisectionWhile(f,a,b,tol)
  p = a + (b-a)/2;
  err = abs(b-a);
  FA = f(a);
  while (err>tol)
    p = a + (b-a)/2;
    FP = f(p);
    err=err/2;
    if (FP == 0)
      return
    end%if
    if (FA*FP > 0)
      a = p;
      FA = FP;
    else
      b = p;
    end%if
  end%while
end%function
```

Use this code with caution! It can run as a never-ending loop! If the function is called with a negative value for `tol`, as in `bisectionWhile(g,1,2,-10)`, it will run until forcibly stopped (using `Ctrl-c` or shutting down the Octave app) as `err` will always be greater than -10.

Error checking

The most useful software includes error checking. In the case of the `bisectionWhile` function, we want to avoid the endless loop in every instance we can imagine. Adding a couple lines at the beginning of the function provides some security:

```
function p = bisectionWhile(f,a,b,tol)
  if (tol<=0)
    p = "ERROR:tol must be positive.";
    return
  end%if
  p = a + (b-a)/2;
  err = abs(b-a);
  FA = f(a);
  while (err>tol)
    p = a + (b-a)/2;
    FP = f(p);
    err=err/2;
    if (FP == 0)
      return
    end%if
    if (FA*FP > 0)
      a = p;
      FA = FP;
    else
      b = p;
    end%if
  end%while
end%function
```

In general, having your program check for input errors like this is called error checking or validation . Most of the time, we will write code assuming the input is valid and will not do any error checking. This makes the programming simpler, but also allows for problems like never-ending loops!

Exercises

1. Supply the proof that $x_k \in [a, b]$ for all $k \geq 0$ in proposition 5.

2. Show that
$$\frac{p_{n+2}p_n - p_{n+1}^2}{p_{n+2} - 2p_{n+1} + p_n}$$
and
$$p_n - \frac{(p_{n+1} - p_n)^2}{p_{n+2} - 2p_{n+1} + p_n}$$
are algebraically equivalent.

3. Write an Octave function that implements Steffensen's Method.

4. ⟳ Write an Octave program (`.m` file) that uses a `while` loop and the `disp()` command to output the first 10 powers of 5 starting with 5^0.

5. ⟳ Write an Octave program (`.m` file) that uses a `while` loop, an array, and the `disp()` command to find the values of $f(n) = \dfrac{2^{2^n} - 2}{2^{2^n} + 3}$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, 4, 6, 10$. [S]

6. ⟳ Write an Octave program (`.m` file) that uses a `while` loop, an array, and the `disp()` command to find the values of $f(n) = \dfrac{2n}{\sqrt{n^2 + 3n}}$ for $n = 0, 2, 5, 10, 100, 1000, 20000$.

7. ⟳ The following Octave code is intended to calculate the sum
$$\sum_{k=1}^{30} \frac{1}{k^2}$$
but it does not. Find as many mistakes in the code as you can. Classify each mistake as either a compilation error (an error that will prevent the program from running at all) or a bug (an error that will not prevent the program from running, but will cause improper calculation of the sum).

```
sum=1;
k=1;
while k<30
   sum=sum+1.0/k*k;
end
diss(sum)
```

8. ⟳ Write a `while` loop that outputs the sequence of numbers.

   (a) $7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15$
   (b) $20, 19, 18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13$
   (c) $12, 12.333, 12.667, 13, 13.333, 13.667, 14$
   (d) $1, 9, 25, 49, 81, 121, 169, 225, 289, 361, 441$
   (e) $1, .5, .25, .125, .0625, .03125, .015625$

9. The function $g(x) = \sqrt[3]{5 - 3x}$ satisfies the hypotheses of proposition 5 over the interval $[1, 1.3]$. Find a bound on the number of iterations required to find the fixed point to within 10^{-5} accuracy starting with initial value x_0 of your choice.

10. Fixed point iteration on the function $g(x) = \sqrt[3]{x^2 + x}$ will converge to approximately 1.618033988749895 for any x_0 in $[0.5, 3.5]$. [A]

    (a) Find a bound on the number of iterations it will take to achieve 10^{-4} accuracy with $x_0 = 2.5$.
    (b) How many iterations does it actually take to achieve 10^{-4} accuracy with $x_0 = 2.5$?

11. Let $f(x) = \frac{3x^2 - 1}{6x + 4}$. In exercise 10 of section 2.2, you were asked to show that f has a unique fixed point on $[-4, -0.9]$. [S]

    (a) Find a bound on the number of iterations required to approximate the fixed point to with 10^{-2} accuracy using fixed point iteration with any initial value in $[-4, -0.9]$.
    (b) Use fixed point iteration with $x_0 = -4$ to find an approximation to the fixed point that is accurate to within 10^{-2}. The fixed point is $x = -1$.
    (c) Compare the bound to the actual number of iterations needed.

12. Show that $g(x) = \pi + 0.5\sin(x/2)$ has a unique fixed point on $[0, 2\pi]$.

    (a) Find a bound on the number of iterations required to achieve 10^{-2} accuracy using fixed point iteration with any initial value in $[0, 2\pi]$.
    (b) Use fixed-point iteration with $x_0 = 0$ to find an approximation to the fixed point that is accurate to within 10^{-2}. The fixed point is $x =$???.
    (c) Compare the bound to the actual number of iterations needed.

13. Calculate two iterations of Steffensen's method for $g(x) = \sqrt[3]{x^2 + x}$ with $x_0 = 2.5$. [A]

14. Use Steffensen's Method to find the root of $g(x) = x^4 - 2x^3 - 4x^2 + 4x + 4$ in $[2, 3]$ accurate to five siginificant digits. [A]

15. Compute a_0, a_1, and a_2 of Aitken's delta-squared Method for the sequence in problem 2 on page 27. Since the sequence has an undefined term at $n = 1$, start the sequence $\left\langle \frac{n+1}{n-1} \right\rangle$ with $n = 2$. In other words, consider the sequence in problem 2 on page 27 to be $3, 2, \frac{5}{3}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{7}{5} \ldots$ so $p_0 = 3$, $p_1 = 2$, $p_2 = \frac{5}{3}$, and so on.

16. The following sequences are linearly convergent. Generate the first five terms of the sequence $\langle a_n \rangle$ using Aitken's delta-squared calculation.

    (a) $p_0 = 0.5$, $p_n = (2 - e^{p_{n-1}} + p_{n-1}^2)/3$ for $n \geq 1$ [S]
    (b) $p_0 = 0.75$, $p_n = \sqrt{e^{p_{n-1}}/3}$ for $n \geq 1$

17. Use Aitken's delta squared method to find $p = \lim_{n \to \infty} p_n$ accurate to 3 decimal places.

$$p_n = \{-2, \ -1.85271, \ -1.74274, \ -1.66045,$$
$$-1.59884, \ -1.55266, \ -1.51804,$$
$$-1.49208, \ -1.47261, \ \ldots\}$$

18. the sequence $\langle a_n \rangle$ of question 15 converges faster than does the sequence in problem 2 on page 27. If you were to apply Aitken's delta-squared Method to the sequence $\langle a_n \rangle$, would you expect the convergence to be even faster? Explain. [A]

19. Recall from calculus that $\lim_{n \to \infty} n \sin\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) = 1$. Therefore, if we let $p_n = n \sin\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$, then the sequence $\langle p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots \rangle \approx \langle .84147, .95885, .98158, \ldots \rangle$ converges to 1, albeit very slowly. Generate the first three terms of the sequence $\langle a_n \rangle$ using Aitken's delta-squared calculation. Does it seem to be approaching 1 faster than does $\langle p_n \rangle$?

20. Fixed point iteration applied to $f(x) = \sin(x)$ with $x_0 = 1$ takes $29,992$ iterations to reach a number below 0.01 on its way to the fixed point 0. Incidentally, $x_{29992} \approx 0.099999$. How many iterations does it take Steffensen's Method with $x_0 = 1$ to reach a number below 0.01? Comment. [S]

21. Let $f(x) = 1 + (\sin x)^2$ and $p_0 = 1$. Find a_1 and a_2 of Steffensen's method with a calculator. [A]

22. Compute the first three iterations of Steffensen's Method applied to $g(x) = (\sqrt{2})^x$ using $p_0 = 3$.

23. Steffensen's method is applied to a function $f(x)$ using $p_0 = 1$. If $f(f(p_0)) = 3$ and $a_1 = 0.75$, what is $f(p_0)$? [A]

24. Find the fixed point of $f(x) = x - 0.002(e^x \cos(x) - 100)$ in $[5, 6]$ using Steffensen's Method. [A]

25. In question 24 you found a fixed point $\hat{x}$. For what function $g(x)$ is $\hat{x}$ a root?

26. Of the root finding methods we have surveyed so far (Bisection, Fixed Point, Newton's, Secant, and Steffensen's), which one do you feel is the best? Why?

27. Write a `while` loop that outputs the numbers $1, .5, .25, .125, .0625, .03125, .015625, \ldots$ until it reaches a number below 10^{-4}.

2.4   Newton's Method

In section 2.3 we addressed some of the deficiency in fixed point iteration, but delayed deep discussion of the mysterious function f_6 of the root finding investigation on page 52. The time has come to discuss f_6 in some detail. We start with some number crunching. Recall that $f_6(x) = \frac{2x^3 - 5x^2 - 6}{3x^2 - 10x + 4}$ and let $x_0 = 4$. Proceeding with fixed point iteration,

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_1 = f_6(x_0) &= 3.5 \\
x_2 = f_6(x_1) &\approx 3.217391304347826 \\
x_3 = f_6(x_2) &\approx 3.072749058541597 \\
x_4 = f_6(x_3) &\approx 3.013730618589344 \\
x_5 = f_6(x_4) &\approx 3.000683798275568 \\
x_6 = f_6(x_5) &\approx 3.000001860777997 \\
x_7 = f_6(x_6) &\approx 3.000000000013848.
\end{aligned}
$$

You can see two things. The sequence $x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots$

1. is converging to (the fixed point) 3; and

2. it looks like the convergence is quadratic since, starting with x_4 to x_5, the number of significant digits is roughly doubling with each iteration.

In the analysis in section 2.3 on page 56, we found that fixed point iteration converges quadraticly (or better) only when the derivative at the fixed point is zero. These observations should lead you to believe $f_6'(3) = 0$. Let's check. First, the derivative $f_6'(x) = \frac{6x^4 - 40x^3 + 74x^2 - 4x - 60}{(3x^2 - 10x + 4)^2}$ (you should verify this). Evaluating the numerator at the fixed point, $x = 3$, we get $6(3)^4 - 40(3)^3 + 74(3)^2 - 4(3) - 60 = 486 - 1080 + 666 - 12 - 60 = 0$. So we have convergence to a fixed point where the derivative of the function is zero, and we indeed have that convergence is quadratic.

Starting with $x_0 = 2$, fixed point iteration on f_6 converges to $1 + \sqrt{3}$, and starting with $x_0 = -1$, fixed point iteration converges to $1 - \sqrt{3}$. You should be able to verify this from the convergence diagram in Figure 2.2.6 or from calculating the first several iterations for each yourself. What you do not get from the convergence diagram is the speed of convergence. For that, you need to look at the iterates. You should do so. Does convergence look quadratic in these cases too? Answer on page 72.

From the convergence diagram, we see that fixed point iteration will converge for virtually any initial value, and all three fixed points can be estimated by fixed point iteration. Moreover, from our calculations, it looks like convergence is quadratic for all three. It's hard to ask for more from a function. Fast convergence to any fixed point! So whence did f_6 come?

Suppose $g(x)$ is differentiable and $g(\hat{x}) = 0$ so g has a root at $\hat{x}$. Consider $f(x) = x - \frac{g(x)}{g'(x)}$. $\hat{x}$ is a fixed point of f as long as $g'(\hat{x}) \neq 0$:

$$
f(\hat{x}) = \hat{x} - \frac{g(\hat{x})}{g'(\hat{x})} = \hat{x} - \frac{0}{g'(\hat{x})} = \hat{x}.
$$

Moreover, as long as g has a second derivative near $\hat{x}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
f'(\hat{x}) &= 1 - \frac{g'(\hat{x}) \cdot g'(\hat{x}) - g(\hat{x})g''(\hat{x})}{g'(\hat{x}) \cdot g'(\hat{x})} \\
&= 1 - 1 + \frac{0 \cdot g''(\hat{x})}{g'(\hat{x}) \cdot g'(\hat{x})} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

From these calculations, we conclude if $g(x)$ is twice differentiable, $g(\hat{x}) = 0$ and $g'(\hat{x}) \neq 0$, then fixed point iteration of $f(x)$ with initial value in a neighborhood of $\hat{x}$ will converge quadratically to $\hat{x}$. What a great way to turn a root finding problem into a fixed point problem!

Now is a good time to recall that f_6 was just one of 6 candidate functions designed to find the roots of $g(x) = -x^3 + 5x^2 - 4x - 6$ by fixed point iteration. Indeed, $g'(x) = -3x^2 + 10x - 4$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
x - \frac{g(x)}{g'(x)} &= x - \frac{-x^3 + 5x^2 - 4x - 6}{-3x^2 + 10x - 4} \\
&= \frac{2x^3 - 5x^2 - 6}{3x^2 - 10x + 4} \\
&= f_6(x).
\end{aligned}
$$

Using fixed point iteration on $f_6(x) = x - \frac{g(x)}{g'(x)}$ to find roots of $g(x)$, as done here, is called Newton's Method.

A Geometric Derivation of Newton's Method

The following figure shows how to compute the first two iterations of Newton's Method on $g(x) = -x^3 + 5x^2 - 4x - 6$ with initial value $x_0 = -2.5$ geometrically.

To compute x_1, the tangent line to g at $(x_0, g(x_0))$ is drawn and its intersection with the x-axis is x_1. Similarly, the tangent line to g at $(x_1, g(x_1))$ is drawn and its intersection with the x-axis is x_2. And so on. For example, $(x_0, g(x_0)) = (-2.5, 50.875)$ and $g'(x_0) = g'(-2.5) = -47.75$. Hence the "rise" $(0 - 50.875)$ over the "run" $(x_1 + 2.5)$ between $(-2.5, 50.875)$ and $(x_1, 0)$ must equal -47.75. We thus have $\frac{-50.875}{x_1 + 2.5} = -47.75$ so

$$x_1 = \frac{-50.875}{-47.75} - 2.5 \approx -1.43455497382199.$$

In symbols, the "rise" $(-g(x_0))$ over the "run" $(x_1 - x_0)$ must equal $g'(x_0)$. In other words,

$$\frac{-g(x_0)}{x_1 - x_0} = g'(x_0) \Rightarrow$$
$$\frac{-g(x_0)}{g'(x_0)} = x_1 - x_0 \Rightarrow$$
$$x_1 = x_0 - \frac{g(x_0)}{g'(x_0)}.$$

Similar calculation shows $x_2 = x_1 - \frac{g(x_1)}{g'(x_1)}$, and more generally $x_{n+1} = x_n - \frac{g(x_n)}{g'(x_n)}$. This recurrence relation describes Newton's Method—iterating the function $f(x) = x - \frac{g(x)}{g'(x)}$.

Newton's Method (pseudo-code)

Unlike Steffensen's Method, the denominator appearing in Newton's Method is not expected to approach zero as the iterates converge, so generally there is much less trouble with stability of the calculation and no intermediate checks are done before computing one iteration from the previous.

Assumptions: g is twice differentiable. g has a root at $\hat{x}$. x_0 is in a neighborhood $(\hat{x} - \delta, \hat{x} + \delta)$ where the magnitude of $f'(x) = 1 - \frac{g'(x) \cdot g'(x) - g(x)g''(x)}{g'(x) \cdot g'(x)}$ is less than one.

Input: Initial value x_0; function g and its derivative g'; desired accuracy *tol*; maximum number of iterations N.

Step 1: For $j = 1 \ldots N$ do Steps 2-4:

Step 2: Set $x = x_0 - \frac{g(x_0)}{g'(x_0)}$;

Step 3: If $|x - x_0| \leq tol$ then return x;

Step 4: Set $x_0 = x$;

Step 5: Print "Method failed. Maximum iterations exceeded."

Output: Approximation x near exact fixed point, or message of failure.

Table 2.5: The Secant Method applied to $g(x) = -x^3 + 5x^2 - 4x - 6$ with $x_0 = 5$ and $x_1 = x_0 + g(x_0) = -21$.

n	x_n	$\lvert 3 - x_n \rvert$
0	5	$2(10)^0$
1	-21	$2.4(10)^1$
2	4.9415730337078	$1.941(10)^0$
3	4.8869924815972	$1.886(10)^0$
4	4.0502898397912	$1.050(10)^0$
5	3.7088949488497	$7.088(10)^{-1}$
6	3.412824115541	$4.128(10)^{-1}$
7	3.232292913133	$2.322(10)^{-1}$
8	3.1141957095727	$1.141(10)^{-1}$
9	3.0465011115969	$4.650(10)^{-2}$
10	3.0132833760752	$1.328(10)^{-2}$
11	3.0020189248976	$2.018(10)^{-3}$
12	3.0001014520965	$1.014(10)^{-4}$
13	3.0000008128334	$8.128(10)^{-7}$
14	3.0000000003297	$3.297(10)^{-10}$

Secant Method

The greatest weakness of Newton's Method is the requirement that g' be known and used in the calculation. The derivative is not always accessible or manageable or even known, though. In such a case, it is better to use Steffensen's Method or the Secant Method. The Secant Method is derived by replacing the g' of Newton's Method with a difference quotient. In order for this to make any sense, though, we will need to restate Newton's Method in terms of x_n. In Newton's Method we are iterating $f(x) = x - \frac{g(x)}{g'(x)}$ so $x_{n+1} = x_n - \frac{g(x_n)}{g'(x_n)}$.

Now suppose you have a function g and some iterate x_{n-1}. That is enough to locate one point on the graph of g, namely $(x_{n-1}, g(x_{n-1}))$. But we need another point in order to form a difference quotient (the slope of the line through two points). So suppose we have a second value, x_n, near x_{n-1}. Then $\frac{g(x_n) - g(x_{n-1})}{x_n - x_{n-1}} \approx g'(x_n)$ so we can substitute $\frac{g(x_n) - g(x_{n-1})}{x_n - x_{n-1}}$ for $g'(x_n)$ in Newton's Method. This yields the Secant Method, $x_{n+1} = x_n - g(x_n) / \left(\frac{g(x_n) - g(x_{n-1})}{x_n - x_{n-1}} \right)$, which simplifies to

$$x_{n+1} = x_n - g(x_n) \frac{x_n - x_{n-1}}{g(x_n) - g(x_{n-1})}. \tag{2.4.1}$$

Notice this is not quite a fixed point iteration scheme. Each iteration depends on the previous *two* values, not one. The analysis we've done so far does not apply, but there's hope that convergence will be fast since this method is a reasonable approximation of Newton's Method near a root, assuming g is differentiable near there. Table 2.5 provides evidence that the Secant Method indeed converges quickly. In the particular case of $g(x) = -x^3 + 5x^2 - 4x - 6$ with $x_0 = 5$ and $x_1 = x_0 + g(x_0) = -21$, it takes a while to settle in, but after the first 8 iterations or so, convergence is very fast. Not quite quadratic, but superlinear for sure.

Crumpet 12: The Secant Method converges with order $\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2}$.

Suppose g is a function with root $\hat{x}$, $g'(\hat{x}) \neq 0$, and $g'''(x)$ exists in a neighborhood of $\hat{x}$. Let $x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots$ be a sequence derived from the Secant Method ($x_{n+1} = x_n - g(x_n)\frac{x_n - x_{n-1}}{g(x_n) - g(x_{n-1})}$ for all $k \geq 2$) such that $\lim_{k \to \infty} x_k = \hat{x}$. Define $e_n = x_n - \hat{x}$ so $x_n = \hat{x} + e_n$. Making this substitution into 2.4.1 we have

$$e_{n+1} = e_n - g(\hat{x} + e_n) \frac{e_n - e_{n-1}}{g(\hat{x} + e_n) - g(\hat{x} + e_{n-1})}. \tag{2.4.2}$$

Taylor's Theorem allows $g(\hat{x} + e_k) = g(\hat{x}) + e_k g'(\hat{x}) + \frac{1}{2} e_k^2 g''(\hat{x}) + O(e_k^3)$. Noting that $g(\hat{x}) = 0$ and

substituting into 2.4.2,

$$
\begin{aligned}
e_{n+1} &= e_n - (e_n - e_{n-1})\frac{e_n g'(\hat{x}) + \frac{1}{2}e_n^2 g''(\hat{x}) + O(e_n^3)}{(e_n - e_{n-1})g'(\hat{x}) + \frac{1}{2}(e_n^2 - e_{n-1}^2)g''(\hat{x}) + O(e_{n-1}^3)} \\[2mm]
&= e_n - \frac{e_n + \frac{e_n^2 g''(\hat{x})}{2g'(\hat{x})} + O(e_n^3)}{1 + \frac{(e_n + e_{n-1})g''(\hat{x})}{2g'(\hat{x})} + \frac{O(e_{n-1}^3)}{(e_n - e_{n-1})}} \\[2mm]
&= \frac{e_n\left(1 + \frac{(e_n + e_{n-1})g''(\hat{x})}{2g'(\hat{x})} + \frac{O(e_{n-1}^3)}{(e_n - e_{n-1})}\right) - \left(e_n + \frac{e_n^2 g''(\hat{x})}{2g'(\hat{x})} + O(e_n^3)\right)}{1 + \frac{(e_n + e_{n-1})g''(\hat{x})}{2g'(\hat{x})} + \frac{O(e_{n-1}^3)}{(e_n - e_{n-1})}} \\[2mm]
&= \frac{e_n e_{n-1}\frac{g''(\hat{x})}{2g'(\hat{x})} + \frac{e_n}{e_n - e_{n-1}}O(e_{n-1}^3) + O(e_n^3)}{1 + \frac{(e_n + e_{n-1})g''(\hat{x})}{2g'(\hat{x})} + \frac{O(e_{n-1}^3)}{(e_n - e_{n-1})}}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.4.3}
$$

Using equality 2.4.3 to find a value α for which $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{|\hat{x} - x_{n+1}|}{|\hat{x} - x_n|^\alpha} = \lambda \neq 0$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{|\hat{x} - x_{n+1}|}{|\hat{x} - x_n|^\alpha} &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{|e_{n+1}|}{|e_n|^\alpha} \\[2mm]
&= \lim_{n\to\infty}\left|\frac{e_n^{1-\alpha}e_{n-1}\frac{g''(\hat{x})}{2g'(\hat{x})} + \frac{e_n^{1-\alpha}}{e_n - e_{n-1}}O(e_{n-1}^3) + O(e_n^{3-\alpha})}{1 + \frac{(e_n + e_{n-1})g''(\hat{x})}{2g'(\hat{x})} + \frac{O(e_{n-1}^3)}{(e_n - e_{n-1})}}\right| \\[2mm]
&= \lambda \neq 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

But $\lim_{n\to\infty} e_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} e_{n-1} = 0$. Hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} e_n^{1-\alpha}e_{n-1}$ must not be 0 or divergent, for if it were, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{|\hat{x} - x_{n+1}|}{|\hat{x} - x_n|^\alpha}$ would be 0 or divergent, respectively. Consequently, there is a positive constant C such that $\lim_{n\to\infty}|e_n^{1-\alpha}e_{n-1}| = \lim_{n\to\infty}|e_{n+1}^{1-\alpha}e_n| = C \Rightarrow \lim_{n\to\infty}|e_{n+1}e_n^{1/(1-\alpha)}| = C^{1/(1-\alpha)}$. Now we have

$$
\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{|e_{n+1}|}{|e_n|^\alpha} = \lambda \neq 0 \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{|e_{n+1}|}{|e_n|^{1/(\alpha-1)}} = C^{1/(1-\alpha)} \neq 0.
$$

Since the order of convergence of a sequence is unique (Exercise 20 of section 1.3) it must be that $\alpha = 1/(\alpha - 1)$ or $\alpha^2 - \alpha - 1 = 0$. The quadratic formula supplies the desired result.

So far we have only applied Newton's Method and the Secant Method to the cubic polynomial $g(x) = -x^3 + 5x^2 - 4x - 6$, a task not strictly necessary. The rational roots theorem, a basic tool from pre-calculus, would give you the roots exactly. The method would have you check $\pm 1, \pm 2, \pm 3$, and ± 6 as possible roots of g. Assuming you did your checks by synthetic division, your work might look something like this:

$$
\begin{array}{r|rrrr}
3 & -1 & 5 & -4 & -6 \\
  &   & -3 & 6 & 6 \\
\hline
  & -1 & 2 & 2 & \boxed{0}
\end{array}
$$

meaning $g(x) = (x - 3)(-x^2 + 2x + 2)$. The other two roots would then come from the quadratic formula applied to $-x^2 + 2x + 2$ and would be $\frac{-2 \pm \sqrt{4+8}}{-2} = 1 \pm \sqrt{3}$.

Crumpet 13: Solving the cubic

The solutions of the quadratic equation $ax^2 + bx + c = 0$ are given by the well-known quadratic equation. Less well-known, and significantly more involved, is any formula for the solutions of the cubic equation $ax^3 + bx^2 + cx + d = 0$. One method of solution follows. First, we let

$$
\begin{aligned}
p &= \frac{3ac - b^2}{3a^2} \quad \text{and} \\[2mm]
q &= \frac{2b^3 - 9abc + 27a^2 d}{27a^3}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then we set

$$w^3 = -\frac{q}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{q^2}{4} + \frac{p^3}{27}}.$$

Third, we set w_1, w_2, and w_3 to the three possible (complex) values of w. Finally, the three solutions of $ax^3 + bx^2 + cx + d = 0$ are

$$x_i = w_i - \frac{p}{3w_i} - \frac{b}{3a}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

This is essentially the method of Cardano, published in the 16th century!

For example, to solve the equation $-x^3 + 5x^2 - 4x - 6 = 0$, we start with

$$
\begin{aligned}
p &= \frac{3(-1)(-4) - 5^2}{3(-1)^2} = -\frac{13}{3} \quad \text{and} \\
q &= \frac{2 \cdot 5^3 - 9(-1)(5)(-4) + 27(-1)^2(-6)}{27(-1)^3} = \frac{92}{27}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
w^3 &= -\frac{92}{2 \cdot 27} - \sqrt{\frac{92^2}{4 \cdot 27^2} - \frac{13^3}{27^2}} \\
&= -\frac{46}{27} - \frac{\sqrt{92^2 - 4 \cdot 13^3}}{54} \\
&= -\frac{46}{27} - \frac{\sqrt{-324}}{54} \\
&= -\frac{46}{27} - \frac{i}{3}.
\end{aligned}
$$

In polar form, $w^3 = \frac{13\sqrt{13}}{27} e^{i(\tan^{-1}(9/46) - \pi)}$ so we may set $w_1 = \frac{\sqrt{13}}{3} e^{i(\tan^{-1}(9/46) - \pi)/3}$, one of the cube roots of w^3. Unfortunately, finding the angle $(\tan^{-1}(9/46) - \pi)/3$ exactly amounts to solving a cubic equation! However, with a calculator in hand, one can get the approximation -0.982793723247329, which in the end will be good enough. So, the real part of w_1 is approximately $\frac{\sqrt{13}}{3} \cos(-0.982793723247329) \approx .6666666666666667$ and the imaginary part is approximately $\frac{\sqrt{13}}{3} \sin(-0.982793723247329) \approx -1$. w_1 is suspiciously close to $\frac{2}{3} - i$. And we can check, $\left(\frac{2}{3} - i\right)^3 = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^3 + 3\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^2(-i) + 3 \cdot \frac{2}{3}(-i)^2 + (-i)^3 = \frac{8}{27} - \frac{12}{9}i - 2 + i = -\frac{46}{27} - \frac{1}{3}i$. Therefore, $w_1 = \frac{2}{3} - i$ and we let $w_2 = \left(\frac{2}{3} - i\right)\left(-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}i\right) = \frac{3\sqrt{3} - 2}{6} + \frac{3 + 2\sqrt{3}}{6}i$ and $w_3 = \left(\frac{2}{3} - i\right)\left(-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}i\right) = \frac{-3\sqrt{3} - 2}{6} + \frac{3 - 2\sqrt{3}}{6}i$. Finally,

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_1 &= w_1 + \frac{13}{9w_1} + \frac{5}{3} = w_1 + \frac{13\overline{w_1}}{9|w_1|^2} + \frac{5}{3} = w_1 + \overline{w_1} + \frac{5}{3} = 3 \\
x_2 &= w_2 + \frac{13}{9w_2} + \frac{5}{3} = w_2 + \frac{13\overline{w_2}}{9|w_2|^2} + \frac{5}{3} = w_2 + \overline{w_2} + \frac{5}{3} = \sqrt{3} + 1 \\
x_3 &= w_3 + \frac{13}{9w_3} + \frac{5}{3} = w_3 + \frac{13\overline{w_3}}{9|w_3|^2} + \frac{5}{3} = w_3 + \overline{w_3} + \frac{5}{3} = -\sqrt{3} + 1
\end{aligned}
$$

For an equation you most likely did not see in pre-calculus, or calculus for that matter, consider $x - e^x \cos\sqrt{e^{2x} - x^2} = 0$. You might try to solve this equation exactly, with a pencil and paper, but you would soon run into a dead end. This equation can not be solved explicitly. The best you can hope for is to approximate the solutions with a numerical method. To get some idea what we are in for, look at the graph of $x - e^x \cos\sqrt{e^{2x} - x^2}$ in Figure 2.4.1. The function oscillates wildly, and only oscillates more wildly as x increases. The graph crosses the x-axis 29 times on the interval from 0 to 4.5 so has 29 roots there! They are

$$.3181315052047641, \ 1.668024051576096, \ 2.062277729598284,$$
$$2.439940377216816, \ 2.653191974038697, \ldots$$

and can be found by Newton's Method with initial values $0, 1.5, 2, 2.4, 2.6, \ldots$. Can you find the next root?

Figure 2.4.1: The graph of $x - e^x \cos \sqrt{e^{2x} - x^2}$ crosses the x-axis infinitely many times.

Secant Method (pseudo-code)

A straightforward implementation of the Secant Method can easily be inefficient due to the number of times g appears in formula on page 67. The pseudo-code below takes great care not to compute each value of g more than once. If it seems more complicated than necessary, this is likely the source of the complication.

Assumptions: g has a root at $\hat{x}$. g is differentiable in a neighborhood of $\hat{x}$. x_0 and x_1 are sufficiently close to $\hat{x}$.

Input: Initial values x_0 and x_1; function g; desired accuracy tol; maximum number of iterations N.

Step 1: Set $y_0 = g(x_0)$; $y_1 = g(x_1)$

Step 2: For $j = 1 \ldots N$ do Steps 3-5:

    Step 3: Set $x = x_1 - y_1 \frac{x_1 - x_0}{y_1 - y_0}$;

    Step 4: If $|x - x_1| \leq tol$ then return x;

    Step 5: Set $x_0 = x_1$; $y_0 = y_1$; $x_1 = x$; $y_1 = g(x_1)$

Step 6: Print "Method failed. Maximum iterations exceeded."

Output: Approximation x near exact fixed point, or message of failure.

Seeded Secant Method (pseudo-code)

The greatest drawback to the Secant Method is the necessity of two initial values. They should be near one another, but how near, and how do you determine? These are tough questions, and the answers are complicated at best. One reasonable approach is to let $x_1 = x_0 + g(x_0)$. Assuming x_0 is near a root, $g(x_0)$ will be small, so x_1 will be near x_0. Taking this approach relieves the user from the burden of selecting a second initial value. There are times when such automated selection is not desirable, so both methods have their place. This method only works well when the initial approximation is good.

Assumptions: g has a root at $\hat{x}$. g is differentiable in a neighborhood of $\hat{x}$. x_0 is sufficiently close to $\hat{x}$.

Input: Initial value x_0; function g; desired accuracy tol; maximum number of iterations N.

Step 1: Set $y_0 = g(x_0)$; $x_1 = x_0 + y_0$; $y_1 = g(x_1)$

Step 2: For $j = 1 \ldots N$ do Steps 3-5:

    Step 3: Set $x = x_1 - y_1 \frac{x_1 - x_0}{y_1 - y_0}$;

    Step 4: If $|x - x_1| \leq tol$ then return x;

    Step 5: Set $x_0 = x_1$; $y_0 = y_1$; $x_1 = x$; $y_1 = g(x_1)$

Step 6: Print "Method failed. Maximum iterations exceeded."

Output: Approximation x near exact fixed point, or message of failure.

Key Concepts

Rational Roots Theorem: If the polynomial $p(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + \cdots + a_k x^k$ has rational coefficients, then any rational roots of p are in the set $\left\{ \frac{n}{d} : n \text{ is a factor of } a_0 \text{ and } d \text{ is a factor of } a_k \right\}$.

Synthetic division: A method for calculating the quotient of a polynomial by a monomial. Example on page 68.

Newton's Method: A root finding method that generally converges to a root of $g(x)$ quadratically, but requires the use of the derivative. In this method, x_0 is chosen and $x_{n+1} = x_n - \frac{g(x_n)}{g'(x_n)}$ is computed for each $n > 0$.

Secant Method: A root finding method that generally converges to a root of $g(x)$ with order approximately 1.618, but does not require the use of the derivative. In this method, x_0 and x_1 are chosen and $x_{n+1} = x_n - g(x_n)\frac{x_n - x_{n-1}}{g(x_n) - g(x_{n-1})}$ is computed for each $n > 0$.

Seeded Secant Method: A modification of the Secant method where x_0 is chosen and $x_1 = x_0 + g(x_0)$.

Exercises

1. Write Octave code that implements Newton's method as a function.

2. Write Octave code that implements the Secant method as a function.

3. Write Octave code that implements the Seeded Secant method as a function.

4. Use your Secant method function from question 2 with a tolerance of 10^{-5} to find a solution of

   (a) $e^x + 2^{-x} + 2\cos x - 6 = 0$ using $1 \le x_0 \le 2$.
   (b) $\ln(x-1) + \cos(x-1) = 0$ using $1.3 \le x_0 \le 2$.
   (c) $2x\cos x - (x-2)^2 = 0$ using $2 \le x_0 \le 3$. [A]
   (d) $2x\cos x - (x-2)^2 = 0$ using $3 \le x_0 \le 4$. [A]
   (e) $(x-2)^2 - \ln x = 0$ using $1 \le x_0 \le 2$.
   (f) $(x-2)^2 - \ln x = 0$ using $e \le x_0 \le 4$.

5. Repeat exercise 4 using your Newton's method code from question 1. [A]

6. Repeat exercise 4 using your Seeded Secant method code from question 3. [A]

7. Repeat exercise 4 using a tolerance of 10^{-10}. Taking this new value as the exact value, did using a tolerance of 10^{-5} give a result accurate to within 10^{-5} of the exact value? [A]

8. Let $g(x) = \frac{100}{x^2}\sin\left(\frac{10}{x}\right)$ and $x_0 = 1.25$. Find x_1 and x_2 of Newton's method. [S]

9. Let $g(x) = 2\ln(1 + x^2) - x$. Find x_{14} using Newton's method with

   (a) $x_0 = 5$
   (b) $x_0 = 1.2$ [A]

10. Let $g(x) = 2\ln(1 + x^2) - x$. Find x_2 and x_3 using the Secant Method with

    (a) $x_0 = 5$ and $x_1 = 6$ [S]
    (b) $x_0 = 1$ and $x_1 = 2$

11. Compare the secant method and Newton's method based on questions 4 and 5. Which finds roots in fewer iterations? Which one fails least often? Which is better?

12. Compute the first three iterations of Newton's Method applied to $g(x) = x - (\sqrt{2})^x$ with $x_0 = 3$.

13. Find a value of x_0 for which Newton's Method will fail to converge to a root of $g(x) = 2 + x - e^x$.

14. Explain why Newton's Method fails to converge for the the function $g(x) = x^2 + x + 1$ with $x_0 = 1$.

15. Let $g(x) = \dfrac{2\ln(1 + x^2) - x}{1 + x^2}$. Using Newton's method to find a root of $g(x)$ with $x_0 = 5$ yields $x_{14} = 8.6624821192$ and with $\tilde{x}_0 = 1.2$ yields $\tilde{x}_{14} = 0$. Compare the values of x_{14} and $\tilde{x}_{14}$ with the fourteenth iterations from question 9 and explain any similarities or differences. [A]

16. Let $g(x) = e^{3x} - 27x^6 + 27x^4 e^x - 9x^2 e^{2x}$ and let $p_0 = 4$. Find p_{10} using Newton's Method. HINT: $g'(x) = 3e^{3x} - 18(x + x^2)e^{2x} + 27(x^4 + 4x^3)e^x - 162x^5$. [A]

17. Newton's Method does not introduce spurious solutions. Suppose $f(x) = x - \frac{g(x)}{g'(x)}$ and $g'(\hat{x}) \ne 0$. Prove that $\hat{x}$ is a root of g if and only if $\hat{x}$ is a fixed point of f. Hint: one direction is proven in the text of this section.

18. The polynomial $g(x) = x^4 + 2x^3 - x - 3$ has a root $\hat{x} \approx 1.097740792$. Find the largest neighborhood (a, b) of $\hat{x}$ such that Newton's Method converges to $\hat{x}$ for any initial value $x_0 \in (a, b)$. [S]

19. Use Newton's Method to find a negative solution of

    $$0 = 12x^4 - 13x^3 + 7x^2 + x - 130$$

    accurate to the nearest 10^{-4}. What initial value did you use? How many iterations did it take?

20. Consider the function $g(x) = e^{6x} + 3(\ln 2)^2 e^{2x} - (\ln 8)e^{4x} - (\ln 2)^3$. Compute enough iterations of Newton's method with $x_0 = 0$ to approximate a zero of g with tolerance 0.0002. Construct the Aitken's delta-squared sequence $\langle a_n \rangle$. Is the order of convergence improved? [A]

21. As with Newton's Method, the Secant Method can easily be described geometrically: Draw the line through the two points $(x_0, f(x_0))$ and $(x_1, f(x_1))$. Find the intersection of this line with the x-axis. The x-coordinate of the intersection is x_2. Find x_3 by intersecting the line through $(x_1, f(x_1))$ and $(x_2, f(x_2))$ with the x-axis. And so on. Graph the polynomial $p(x) = x^3 - 3x + 3$, and demonstrate the first iteration of the Secant Method graphically for $x_0 = -1$ and $x_1 = -2$. [S]

22. Suppose you are using the Secant Method with $x_0 = 1$ and $x_1 = 1.1$ to find a root of $f(x)$.

    (a) Find x_2 given that $f(1) = 0.3$ and $f(1.1) = 0.23$.

    (b) Create a sketch (graph) that illustrates the calculation. HINT: x_2 will be located where the line through $(x_0, f(x_0))$ and $(x_1, f(x_1))$ crosses the x-axis.

23. Use the graph of g to answer the following questions. g has roots at $-2\pi, -\pi, \pi$, and 2π. [A]

    (a) To which root will Newton's Method converge if $x_0 = 2.5$?

    (b) What will happen if $x_0 = 0$?

    (c) Find a positive integer value of x_0 for which Newton's Method will converge to 2π.

    (d) Find a negative value of x_0 for which Newton's Method will converge to 2π.

24. Graph the polynomial $p(x) = x^3 - 3x + 3$, and demonstrate Newton's Method graphically for $x_0 = -1$.

25. ⟳ The method of false position, or *regula falsi*, incorporates the ideas of both the secant method and the bisection method. To find a root of f using false position,

    (a) begin with two initial values, a and b, such that $f(a)$ and $f(b)$ have opposite signs, as in the bisection method;

    (b) calculate x as in the secant method, using a and b in place of x_0 and x_1;

    (c) set either a or b equal to x depending on which one will preserve opposite signs of $f(a)$ and $f(b)$, as in the bisection method;

    (d) repeat step (b).

Write Octave code implementing the method of false position.

26. ⟳ Use your code from question 25 to find a root of the function in the interval of question 2 on page 42 to within 10^{-8}. Compare your answer to that from question from question 4 on page 43. [A]

27. The sum of two numbers is 20. If each number is added to its square root, the product of the two sums is 172.2. Determine the two numbers to within 10^{-4} of their exact values. [S]

28. Find a value of x_0 for which Newton's Method will fail to converge to a root of $f(x) = 2 + x - e^x$.

29. Find an example of a situation in which Newton's Method will fail on the second iteration (i.e., x_1 may be calculated but x_2 may not). [S]

30. Let $h(x) = 2.2x^3 - 6.6x^2 + 4.4x$ and let $g(x) = h^{\circ 3}(x)$. That is, $g(x) = h(h(h(x)))$. Approximate a root of $g'(x)$.

31. For what values of x_0, approximately, will Newton's Method converge to -2.5?

32. For the function shown in question 31, find x_2 and x_3 for the Secant method with $x_0 = -10$ and $x_1 = 6$.

33. Let
$$f(x) = 10 - \int_0^x \frac{e^t}{1+t}\, dt.$$
Approximate the positive root of f. [A]

Answers

Quadratic convergence?

n	x_n	x_n
0	2	-1
1	2.5	$-.7647058823529411$
2	2.666666666666667	$-.7326286052763475$
3	2.722222222222227	$-.7320509933083684$
4	2.731741086881274	$-.7320508075688965$
5	2.732050478023325	
6	2.732050807568503	
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
	2.732050807568877	$-.7320508075688772$

The convergence looks quadratic since the number of significant digits of accuracy roughly doubles with the last couple of iterations.

Next root? The next root is approximately 2.872257717171606. This can be found using Newton's method with $x_0 = 2.81$, for example. Note this computation is very sensitive to initial conditions because there are so many roots near one another. Starting with $x_0 = 2.8$, for example, leads to the root at 9.662623060421268!

2.5   Bracketing and Stopping

Newton's Method revisited

Bracketing: false position, safeguarded Newton's method, Brent's method.

Stopping

Discuss relative error versus absolute error. How to compute error when you don't know the exact solution!

2.6 More Convergence Diagrams

The cubic function $g(x) = 1 - x^3$ has one real root, 1. But it also has two complex roots. If you have studied complex analysis, you probably know what the other two are. And even if you have not studied complex analysis, you can figure them out by basic techniques of pre-calculus. Since 1 is a root, you can use synthetic division to deflate the polynomial:

$$
\begin{array}{r|rrrr}
1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
 & & -1 & -1 & -1 \\
\hline
 & -1 & -1 & -1 & \boxed{0}
\end{array}
$$

This division shows that $g(x) = (x-1)(-x^2-x-1)$, so the other two roots are the solutions of the equation $-x^2 - x - 1 = 0$, thus deflating the problem to a quadratic. The solutions are $\frac{1 \pm \sqrt{1-4}}{-2} = -\frac{1}{2} \pm i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$. By the way, you may also recognize $1 - x^3$ as one of the special forms of polynomials, the difference of cubes.

Of course this is all fascinating, but what does this have to do with numerical analysis? What may surprise you is that Fixed Point Iteration (and therefore Newton's Method), the Secant Method, and Steffensen's Method can all be used to find complex roots just as well as real ones! In fact, the algorithms need no modification! The programming language used to implement the methods, of course, does need to be able to handle complex number arithmetic. Octave does so without ado.

First, finding a root of $g(x) = 1 - x^3$ and finding a fixed point of $f(x) = 1/x^2$ are equivalent. Why? Answer on page . Setting $x_0 = -1 + i$ and applying Newton's Method and the Secant Method to $g(x) = 1 - x^3$, and Steffensen's Method to $f(x) = 1/x^2$ we get the following:

i	Steffensen's	Secant	Newton's
		x_i	
0	$-1 + i$	$-1 + i$	$-1 + i$
1	$-0.85 + 0.8i$	$-0.66666666 + 0.83333333i$	$-0.66666666 + 0.83333333i$
2	$-0.60313824 + 0.67770639i$	$-0.55034016 + 0.82376444i$	$-0.50869191 + 0.84109987i$
3	$-0.39846066 + 0.84671567i$	$-0.49763752 + 0.85554014i$	$-0.49932999 + 0.86626917i$
4	$-0.51660491 + 0.84998590i$	$-0.49932718 + 0.86627140i$	$-0.49999991 + 0.86602490i$
5	$-0.49910537 + 0.86543351i$	$-0.50000774 + 0.86602504i$	$-0.50000000 + 0.86602540i$
6	$-0.50000228 + 0.86602568i$	$-0.49999999 + 0.86602540i$	
7	$-0.50000000 + 0.86602540i$	$-0.50000000 + 0.86602540i$	
8	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$

Each sequence quickly converges to the complex root $-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}i$. And this is not a fluke or a contrived example. Generally, these methods work just as well in the complex plane as they do on the real line. One can find real roots starting with complex numbers too. If we change the initial value x_0 to $1 + i$, Newton's Method converges to 1, for example.

Having expanded our view of the methods to include complex numbers, there is a new type of convergence diagram to consider. We can now look at convergence patterns for the three methods over a host of initial values in the complex plane, not just the real line. Figure 2.6.1 shows convergence diagrams for Newton's Method with $g(x) = 1 - x^3$, the Seeded Secant Method with $g(x) = 1 - x^3$, and Steffensen's Method with $f(x) = 1/x^2$. Each diagram covers the part of the complex plane with real parts in $[-5, 5]$ and imaginary parts in $[-3.75, 3.75]$. The top left corner of each diagram represents initial value $-5 + 3.75i$ and the bottom right corner represents initial value $5 - 3.75i$. The center of each diagram represents the the initial value 0. The colors correspond to the three roots, red to 1, green to $-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}i$, and blue to $-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}i$. Black corresponds to failure to converge. The different intensities of red, green, and blue correspond to the number of iterations the method took to converge. The greater the intensity, the fewer iterations. We can see that for $x_0 = 5 - 3.75i$, Newton's Method and the Seeded Secant Method both converge to $-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}i$, because the upper right hand corner of each diagram is colored green. Steffensen's Method, on the other hand, fails to converge to any root if begun with $x_0 = 5 - 3.75i$, evidenced by the blackness in the upper right hand corner of the convergence diagram.

The dwell represents the maximum number of iterations allowed, so actually the black dots represent initial values for which convergence was not achieved within a number of iterations equal to or less than the dwell. That's different from claiming the method does not converge at all for these initial values. There's a chance that some of the blackened initial values would still lead to convergence if allowed more iterations.

Figure 2.6.1: Convergence diagrams over the complex plane.

From top to bottom:
Newton's Method with

$$g(x) = 1 - x^3$$

and dwell 20;
Seeded Secant Method with

$$g(x) = 1 - x^3$$

and dwell 40;
Steffensen's Method with

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{x^2}$$

and dwell 40.
Each diagram covers the part of the complex plane with real parts in $[-5, 5]$ and imaginary parts in $[-3.75, 3.75]$.

Figure 2.6.2: A vertical line and its image under the exponential function.

Two things are very striking about these convergence diagrams. First, the Seeded Secant Method and Newton's Method converge for a much larger set of initial values than does Steffensen's Method. This is, at least in part, due to the function chosen. For other functions, there may be a fixed point scheme for which Steffensen's Method converges on large sets of initial values too. Second, the patterns of colors are extremely intricate, even fractal in nature. Predicting to which root a method will converge for a given initial value, and indeed whether it will converge at all, are very difficult questions! And this analysis is done on a rather benign (simple) function.

Consider now a much more complicated problem—finding the roots of $g(z) = e^z - z$ or, equivalently, finding the fixed points of $f(z) = e^z$. A graph of $f(z)$ (over the real numbers) will quickly convince you that there are no real number solutions. It will take some thought to determine the nature of any complex solutions.

To that end, fix a real number a_0 and consider the vertical line in the complex plane, $L_{a_0} = \{a_0 + ib : b \in \mathbb{R}\}$. The image of L_{a_0} under the exponential function is a circle with radius e^{a_0} centered at the origin. Indeed, $e^{a_0+ib} = e^{a_0}e^{ib} = e^{a_0}(\cos b + i \sin b)$. Thus b parametrizes the circle about the origin with radius e^{a_0}. Now, suppose L_{a_0} contains a fixed point, $\hat{z} = a_0 + i\hat{b}$, of the exponential function, $f(z) = e^z$. Then $\hat{z} = f(\hat{z})$, or $a_0 + i\hat{b} = e^{a_0}(\cos \hat{b} + i \sin \hat{b})$. We conclude that the line and the circle intersect at the fixed point. Every fixed point of f is necessarily an intersection of the line L_{a_0} with the circle C_{a_0} for some a_0. Figure 2.6.2 shows a representative example. In fact, the diagram shows an interesting case: $x = a_0 \approx 2.439940377216816$. The coordinates of the two instersections are

$$(2.439940377216816, \pm 11.2098911414971).$$

The interesting thing is $e^{2.439940377216816+11.2098911414971i} \approx 2.439940377216816 - 11.2098911414971i$ and $e^{2.439940377216816-11.2098911414971i} \approx 2.439940377216816 + 11.2098911414971i$. The two points are images of one another under the exponential function! What we have found here are called periodic points. If we let $z_1 = 2.439940377216816 - 11.2098911414971i$ and $z_2 = 2.439940377216816 + 11.2098911414971i$, then $e^{z_1} = z_2$ and $e^{z_2} = z1$. Hence if we iterate $z_2 = f(z_1)$, $z_3 = f(z_2)$, $z_4 = f(z_3)$, $z_5 = f(z_4)$, and so on, the sequence $z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, \ldots$ actually looks like

$$z_1, z_2, z_1, z_2, z_1, z_2, \ldots.$$

The sequence just flops back and forth between z_1 and z_2 in a periodic fashion. We call such values period 2 points. They are not fixed points of $f(z)$ but they are fixed points of $f(f(z))$!

Crumpet 14: Periodic points.

If a sequence $\langle p_n \rangle$ has the form

$$p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k, p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k, p_1, \ldots, \qquad k > 1$$

then we say p_1 is a period k point (and $p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_k$ are too!).

Figure 2.6.3: More convergence diagrams over the complex plane.

From left to right: Newton's Method with $g(z) = z - e^z$ and dwell 20; Secant Method with $g(z) = z - e^z$ and dwell 40; Steffensen's Method with $f(z) = e^z$ and dwell 40. Each diagram covers the part of the complex plane with real parts in $[-10, 30]$ and imaginary parts in $[0, 73]$.

On the other hand, $\hat{z} = 2.062277729598284 + 7.588631178472513i$ is (approximately) a fixed point of $f(z)$ since

$$e^{2.062277729598284+7.588631178472513i} = 2.062277729598284 + 7.588631178472513i.$$

Moreover, the conjugate of $\hat{z}$, $\overline{\hat{z}} = 2.0622377729598284 - 7.588631178472513i$ is also a fixed point. Verify it with a calculator or wih Octave!

Generally, if $\hat{z}$ is a fixed point of e^z then so is $\overline{\hat{z}}$:

$$\hat{z} = e^{\hat{z}} \implies \overline{\hat{z}} = \overline{e^{\hat{z}}} = e^{\overline{\hat{z}}}.$$

So if we find one fixed point, we actually have found two, the fixed point and its conjugate.

We're ready to get back to considering intersections of L_{a_0} and C_{a_0}. Assume $a_0 + ib$ is a fixed point of e^z. Then $a_0 + ib = e^{a_0+ib} = e^{a_0}(\cos b + i \sin b)$, so

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &= e^{a_0} \cos b \\ b &= e^{a_0} \sin b \end{aligned} \tag{2.6.1}$$

Now, because $a_0 + ib$ is a point of intersection, it is on C_{a_0}, so $a_0^2 + b^2 = e^{2a_0} \Rightarrow b = \pm\sqrt{e^{2a_0} - a_0^2}$. Finally, substituting $b = \sqrt{e^{2a_0} - a_0^2}$ into 2.6.1, we find an intersection point will be a fixed point if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &= e^{a_0} \cos \sqrt{e^{2a_0} - a_0^2} \\ &\text{and} \\ \sqrt{e^{2a_0} - a_0^2} &= e^{a_0} \sin \sqrt{e^{2a_0} - a_0^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6.2}$$

You should pause long enough to consider why it is not necessary to substitute $b = -\sqrt{e^{2a_0} - a_0^2}$ into 2.6.1. Hint: make the substitution and simplify. You should find out that the two equations you get are equivalent to those in 2.6.1.

For example, $2.439940377216816 - 11.2098911414971i$ and $2.062277729598284 + 7.588631178472513i$ both satisfy the first equation of 2.6.2, but $2.439940377216816 - 11.2098911414971i$ does not satisfy the second while $2.062277729598284 + 7.588631178472513i$ does. So, as observed earlier, $2.439940377216816 - 11.2098911414971i$ is not a fixed point but $2.062277729598284 + 7.588631178472513i$ is.

Do you recognize the first equation of 2.6.2? We first saw it on page 69 in section 2.4. As noted there, the smallest five solutions are

$$.3181315052047641,\ 1.668024051576096,\ 2.062277729598284,$$
$$2.439940377216816,\ 2.653191974038697, \ldots$$

The values 2.062277729598284 and 2.439940377216816 provided the examples for this discussion. What about the other three values in this list? Do they give fixed points of the exponential function? Period two points? Something else? Take a moment to investigate. Answers are on page 82. Using Octave to investigate 2.062277729598284, which we know is a fixed point:

```
octave:1> format('long')
octave:2> a0=2.062277729598284
a0 =  2.06227772959828
octave:3> b=sqrt(exp(2*a0)-a0^2)
b =  7.58863117847251
octave:4> exp(a0+I*b)
ans =  2.06227772959828 + 7.58863117847251i
```

verifies that $e^{a_0+ib} = a_0 + ib$ for $a_0 = 2.062277729598284$, at least to machine precision. The exact value of the fixed point is not known, but that is the nature of numerical analysis.

Figure 2.6.3 shows convergence to 12 of the fixed points of e^z, one for each of the 12 different colors. The coordiantes of each fixed point can be approximated by locating the spot of greatest intensity within each colored band.

As was done in Figure 2.6.3, convergence diagrams for the Secant Method can be created by setting $x_1 = x_0 + \delta$ for some small number δ. It does not matter whether δ is real or complex. Selecting x_1 automatically this way allows the diagram to show convergence or divergence based on x_0 alone, just as is done for the other convergence diagrams. You will notice that the convergence diagram for the Secant Method and the convergence diagram for Newton's Method are quite similar. For sufficiently small δ, this will be the case in general. The Secant Method convergence diagram and the Newton's Method convergence diagram for the same function over the same region will look very much the same. The only significant difference will be the number of iterations needed for convergence. The Secant Method will need more iterations to converge.

Exercises

1. Match the function with its Newton's Method convergence diagram. The real axis passes through the center of each diagram, and the imaginary axis is represented, but is not necessarily centered. [S]

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(x) &= 56 - 152x + 140x^2 - 17x^3 - 48x^4 + 9x^5 \\
g(x) &= (x^2)(\ln x) + (x-3)e^x \\
h(x) &= 1 + 2x + 3x^2 + 4x^3 + 5x^4 + 6x^5 \\
l(x) &= (\ln x)(x^3 + 1)
\end{aligned}
$$

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

2. Match the function with its Newton's Method convergence diagram. The real axis passes through the center of each diagram, and the imaginary axis is represented, but is not necessarily centered. [A]

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(x) &= \sin x \\
g(x) &= \sin x - e^{-x} \\
h(x) &= e^x + 2^{-x} + 2\cos x - 6 \\
l(x) &= x^4 + 2x^2 + 4
\end{aligned}
$$

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

3. Find a polynomial that has the following roots and no others.

(a) $-7, 2, 1 \pm 5i$

(b) $-7, 2, 1 + 5i$

(c) $-4, -1, 2, \pm 2i$ [S]

(d) $-4, -1, 2, 2i$ [S]

(e) $0, -1 \pm i, 1 \pm i$

(f) $-3 + i, -2 - i, -3i, 1 - 2i$

4. Create Newton's Method convergence diagrams for the polynomials of question 3. Make sure you capture a region that shows at least a small area converging to each root. Download Octave code from SourceForge.

5. The functions $f(x) = e^x$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{x^2+1}$ have no roots, real or complex. Find at least two others that also have no roots.

6. Let $f(x) = \frac{x^2 - 7x + 10}{2} + \sin(3x)$.

   (a) Find all the real roots of f. This is not a polynomial, so deflation will not work. Instead, graph the function and use Newton's method to find the real roots accurate to 10^{-8}. There are four of them.

   (b) Create a Newton's method convergence diagram for f to see if there are any complex roots. If so, use Newton's method to approximate them. Use the convergence diagram to help you choose initial values.

   (c) Can you find all the roots of f?

7. Match the function with its Seeded Secant method convergence diagram. The real axis passes through the center of each diagram, and the imaginary axis is represented, but is not necessarily centered. [S]

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(x) &= \sin x \\
g(x) &= \sin x - e^{-x} \\
h(x) &= e^x + 2^{-x} + 2\cos x - 6 \\
l(x) &= 56 - 152x + 140x^2 - 17x^3 - 48x^4 + 9x^5
\end{aligned}
$$

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

8. Match the function with its Seeded Secant method convergence diagram. The real axis passes through the center of each diagram, and the imaginary axis is represented, but is not necessarily centered. [A]

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(x) &= x^4 + 2x^2 + 4 \\
g(x) &= (x^2)(\ln x) + (x - 3)e^x \\
h(x) &= 1 + 2x + 3x^2 + 4x^3 + 5x^4 + 6x^5 \\
l(x) &= (\ln x)(x^3 + 1)
\end{aligned}
$$

(a)   (b)

(c)   (d)

9. Create Seeded Secant method convergence diagrams for the polynomials of question 3. Make sure you capture a region that shows at least a small area converging to each root. Download Octave code from SourceForge.

10. The Newton's method convergence diagram for one polynomial is much like the Newton's method convergence diagram for another. Interesting changes in the Newton's method convergence diagrams and Seeded Secant method convergence diagrams can be achieved by multiplying a polynomial by a non-polynomial function with no roots. Create Newton's method and Seeded Secant method convergence diagrams for products of functions in question 3 with functions in question 5.

11. Discuss the relative strengths and weaknesses of Newton's Method, the Secant Method, and the Seeded Secant Method.

Answers

Why equivalent? The equations $g(x) = 0$ and $f(x) = x$ have exactly the same solutions. $g(x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow 1 - x^3 = 0 \Leftrightarrow 1 = x^3 \Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{x^2} = x \Leftrightarrow f(x) = x$.

Nature of roots? .3181315052047641 is a fixed point of the exponential function:

```
octave:1> format('long')
octave:2> a0=.3181315052047641;
octave:3> b=sqrt(exp(2*a0)-a0^2)
b =  1.33723570143069
octave:4> exp(a0+I*b)
ans =  0.318131505204764 + 1.337235701430689i
```

1.668024051576096 is a period two point of the exponential function:

```
octave:1> format('long')
octave:2> a0=1.668024051576096;
octave:3> b=sqrt(exp(2*a0)-a0^2)
b =  5.03244706448616
octave:4> exp(a0+I*b)
ans =  1.66802405157609 - 5.03244706448616i
```

2.653191974038697 is a fixed point of the exponential function:

```
octave:5> a0=2.653191974038697;
octave:6> b=sqrt(exp(2*a0)-a0^2)
b =  13.9492083345332
octave:7> exp(a0+I*b)
ans =   2.65319197403878 + 13.94920833453319i
```

2.7   Roots of Polynomials

Synthetic division revisited

You may recall using the rational roots theorem and synthetic division to find roots of polynomials of degree 3 or more in algebra. The process was something like this. You made a list of possible roots based on the rational roots theorem. You checked each one using synthetic division until you either found a root or ran out of candidates. It is possible that was as far as your class took the process, but there is more to say.

Suppose we have a polynomial $p(x)$ and a number t. Synthetic division gives coefficients of $q(x)$ such that $p(x) = q(x) \cdot (x - t) + p(t)$. For example, the synthetic division

$$
\begin{array}{c|cccc}
 & \multicolumn{4}{c}{p(x)} \\
t & & & & \\
\hline
-3 & -4 & 2 & 3 & -6 \\
 & & 12 & -42 & 117 \\
\hline
 & -4 & 14 & -39 & \boxed{111} \\
 & \multicolumn{3}{c}{\underbrace{}_{q(x)}} & \underbrace{}_{p(t)}
\end{array}
$$

tells us that $p(x) = -4x^3 + 2x^2 + 3x - 6 = (-4x^2 + 14x - 39)(x + 3) + 111$. While it is a small burden to evaluate the expression $-4x^3 + 2x^2 + 3x - 6$ when $x = -3$, it is no burden at all to evaluate $(-4x^2 + 14x - 39)(x + 3) + 111$ when $x = -3$. The $(x + 3)$ factor is zero, so it doesn't matter to what $(-4x^2 + 14x - 39)$ evaluates. The product is zero and $(-4x^2 + 14x - 39)(x + 3) + 111$ evaluates to 111. Therefore, $p(-3) = 111$. Synthetic division gives a quick way to evaluate a polynomial. The number at the end of the division is the value of the polynomial at the value of the divisor.

More generally, here is a dissection of the division of $p(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + \cdots + a_n x^n$ by $x - t$ using synthetic division:

$$
\begin{array}{c|ccccc}
t & a_n & a_{n-1} & a_{n-2} & \cdots & a_0 \\
\hline
 & & a_n t & a_n(a_n t + a_{n-1}) & \cdots & a_n(\cdots a_n(a_n(a_n t + a_{n-1}) + a_{n-2}) + \cdots + a_1) \\
\hline
 & a_n & a_n t + a_{n-1} & a_n(a_n t + a_{n-1}) + a_{n-2} & \cdots & \boxed{p(t)}
\end{array}
$$

Beginning with t in the upper left corner, we end up with $p(t)$ in the lower right corner. It is not only when the number in the lower right corner is zero do we find something of interest. Every synthetic division gives something of interest! The number in the bottom right corner is $p(t)$ whether it turns out to be zero or not. And there is more.

The numbers a_n, $a_n t + a_{n-1}$, $a_n(a_n t + a_{n-1}) + a_{n-2}$, and so on, appearing in the bottom row of the synthetic division give the coefficients of the quotient, $q(x)$. Every synthetic division gives a decomposition of the polynomial into quotient and remainder. Thus, with every synthetic division, we get an equivalent expression of the form $q(x) \cdot (x - t) + p(t)$. There is still more.

Differentiating the equation $p(x) = q(x) \cdot (x - t) + p(t)$ with respect to x gives

$$ p'(x) = q'(x) \cdot (x - t) + q(x). $$

Hence $p'(t) = q'(t) \cdot (t - t) + q(t) = q(t)$. So, not only do the numbers in the bottom row give the coefficients of the quotient, they double as coefficients appropriate for evaluating $p'(t)$. Returning to the previous example, if we desire to calculate $p'(-3)$, we simply continue the synthetic division as in

$$
\begin{array}{c|cccc}
-3 & -4 & 2 & 3 & -6 \\
 & & 12 & -42 & 117 \\
\hline
-3 & -4 & 14 & -39 & \boxed{111} \\
 & & 12 & -78 & \\
\hline
 & -4 & 26 & \boxed{-117} &
\end{array}
$$

and find out $p'(-3) = -117$. The procedure of calculating $p(t)$ and $p'(t)$ by simultaneous synthetic divisions is known as Horner's method and is especially convenient for use in Newton's method. If we were trying to find a root of $p(x) = -4x^3 + 2x^2 + 3x - 6$ with initial approximation $x_0 = -3$ we would have, at this point, $x_1 = x_0 - \frac{p(x_0)}{p'(x_0)} = -3 - \frac{111}{-117} \approx -2.05128$. Yet there is more.

Finding all the roots of polynomials

When we happen upon a root of the polynomial $p(x)$, the result of the synthetic divsion, $p(x) = q(x)(x - t) + p(t)$, reduces to $p(x) = q(x)(x - t)$ since t is a root, meaning $p(t) = 0$. In this case, we have a factorization of $p(x)$. The rest of the roots of p are exactly the roots of q, so having found one root, we have reduced the problem of finding roots of p to (a) noting the root we have found plus (b) finding the roots of the polynomial q, a polynomial of one degree less than that of p. In this way, we have deflated the problem of finding the n roots of the nth degree polynomial p to finding the $n-1$ roots of the $(n-1)$-degree polynomial q. Taking it a step further, when we have found a root of q, we can use synthetic division to reduce the problem again. We (a) note the root of q and (b) continue searching for roots of the quotient, an $(n-2)$-degree polynomial. We continue this way, deflating the problem by one degree each time we find a root until we have reduced the problem to a 2nd degree polynomial. At this point, we have a quadratic polynomial and can use the quadratic equation to find the last two roots.

For example, -1.18985 is (approximately) a root of $p(x) = -4x^3 + 2x^2 + 3x - 6$. Synthetic division of $p(x)$ by $(x + 1.18985)$ gives

$$
\begin{array}{r|rrrr}
-1.18985 & -4 & 2 & 3 & -6 \\
         &   & 4.7594 & -8.04267 & 6.00002 \\
\hline
         & -4 & 6.7594 & -5.04267 & \boxed{0.00002}
\end{array}
$$

The (near) zero in the box at the bottom-right indicates that -1.18985 is approximately a root. There is no appreciable remainder upon division of $-4x^3 + 2x^2 + 3x - 6$ by $x + 1.18985$. Moreover, the numbers $-4, 6.7594, -5.04267$ in the bottom row give the coefficients of $q(x)$. Thus, we find from this division that $-4x^3 + 2x^2 + 3x - 6 =\approx (-4x^2 + 6.7594x - 5.04267)(x + 118985)$. We can now find the other two roots by locating the roots of $q(x) = -4x^2 + 6.7594x - 5.04267$. Using the quadratic formula, they are

$$
\frac{-6.7594 \pm \sqrt{6.7594^2 - 4(-4)(-5.04267)}}{-8} \approx .84493 \pm .73944i.
$$

Our process will lead us to finding n roots of any n^{th} degree polynomial. It is important to note that some of these roots may be complex and some of them may be repeated.

Crumpet 15: The Fundamental Theorem of Algebra

The process of finding one root of a given polynomial, deflating, and finding another mirrors quite closely the mathematical theorems of algebra. The Fundamental Theorem of Algebra states that every polynomial with complex coefficients and degree at least one has a complex root. Thus our search for a root is not in vain! We can then write our polynomial in factored form and continue. The Fundamental Theorem says that there is again a root of the deflated polynomial. And if we keep track of all the roots as we find them, we end up writing our polynomial in the form

$$p(x) = a(x - r_1)^{e_1}(x - r_2)^{e_2} \cdots (x - r_k)^{e_k}, \tag{2.7.1}$$

where a is a nonzero constant, $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_k$ are the k distinct complex roots, and $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_k$ are the so-called (positive integer) multiplicities of the roots. From this form, we see that the degree of the polynomial equals the sum of the multiplicities, $e_1 + e_2 + \cdots + e_k$. This is what we mean when we say the number of roots, counting multiplicity, is equal to the degree of the polynomial. Thus when searching for the roots of a polynomial of degree n, we know we are looking for n roots, but not necessarily n distinct roots. Some of them may be repeated and the repetitions are accounted for in the multiplicities. To formalize the claim in equation 2.7.1, we have the follwing theorem.

Theorem 6. *(Fundamental Factorization Theorem) If $n \geq 1$ and p is a degree n polynomial, then*

$$p(x) = a(x - r_1)^{e_1}(x - r_2)^{e_2} \cdots (x - r_k)^{e_k}$$

for some constant $a \neq 0$, roots $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_k$, and positive integer exponents $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_k$ where

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} e_j = n.$$

Proof. Suppose $n = 1$ so $p(x)$ takes the form $ax + b$ with $a \neq 0$. Then $p(x) = a(x - (-\frac{b}{a}))^1$ and thus takes the required form. Now suppose all polynomials of some degree $n \geq 1$ take the required form and let p be a polynomial of degree $n + 1$. By the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra, p has a root. Call it ρ. Then $x - \rho$ is a factor of p so p can be written as $p(x) = (x - \rho) \cdot q(x)$ for some polynomial q of degree n. By the inductive hypothesis, we have that q takes the required form, so

$$p(x) = (x - \rho) \cdot a(x - r_1)^{e_1}(x - r_2)^{e_2} \cdots (x - r_k)^{e_k}$$

where $e_1 + e_2 + \cdots + e_k = n$. If ρ is distinct from $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_k$, then p takes the form

$$p(x) = a(x - r_1)^{e_1}(x - r_2)^{e_2} \cdots (x - r_k)^{e_k}(x - \rho)^1.$$

If ρ equals one of $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_k$, say r_j, then p takes the form

$$p(x) = a(x - r_1)^{e_1}(x - r_2)^{e_2} \cdots (x - r_j)^{e_j+1} \cdots (x - r_k)^{e_k}.$$

In either case, p takes the required form and the proof is complete. $\square$

Pseudo-pseudo-code for this procedure might look something like this:

Assumptions: p is a polynomial of degree $n > 2$.

Input: Polynomial $p(x)$; tolerance *tol*; maximum number of iterations N.

Step 1: For $i = 1$ to $n - 2$ do Steps 2-5:

Step 2: Find a root x_0 of $p(x)$ [using *tol*, N, and some root-finding method];
Step 3: If error trying to find x_0 then
return "Method failed. Root of degree $n - i + 1$ not found.";
Step 4: Factor $p(x)$ as $q(x) \cdot (x - x_0)$;
Step 5: Set $x_i = x_0$; $p(x) = q(x)$;

Output: Approximate roots.

To refine the pseudo-pseudo-code into pseudo-code, we will use Newton's Method, assisted by Horner's Method, in Step 2. The usual drawback of Newton's Method, the requirement that the derivative be known and calculated, is but a small inconvenience when Horner's Method is employed. But how do we represent polynomials in a computer program so that we can accomplish Steps 4 and 5? The same way we implement code to execute Horner's Method. Pseudo-code for Horner's method, with an array:

Assumptions: p is a polynomial of degree $n \geq 1$.

Input: array $[c]$ of coefficients of $p(x) = c_1 + c_2 x + c_3 x^2 + \cdots + c_{n+1} x^n$; x_0.

Step 1: Set $y = c_{n+1}$; $z = c_{n+1}$;

Step 2: For $j = n, n - 1, \ldots, 2$ do Step 3

Step 3: Set $y = x_0 y + c_j$; $z = x_0 z + y$;

Step 4: Set $y = x_0 y + c_1$;

Output: $y = p(x_0)$ and $z = p'(x_0)$.

As in synthetic division, there is no need to retain the variable to various exponents. Only the coefficients are needed to define a polynomial. So, in the program, a polynomial is represented by an array of numbers. Putting together our pseudo-pseudo code, Newton's Method and Horner's Method into a single program, we have a method for finding all the roots of a polynomial:

Assumptions: p is a polynomial of degree $n > 2$ and c_1, the constant coefficient of p, is nonzero.

Input: array $[c]$ of coefficients of $p(x) = c_1 + c_2 x + c_3 x^2 + \cdots + c_{n+1} x^n$; tolerance *tol*; maximum number of iterations N; initial value x_0.

Step 1: Set $m = n$;

Step 2: For $i = 1$ to $n - 2$ do Steps 3-13:

Step 3: Set $k = 0$; Set $x = x_0$;

Step 4: While $|x - x_0| > tol$ or $k = 0$ do Steps 5-12:

> **Step 5:** If $k = N$ then return "Method failed. Not all roots found."
>
> **Step 6:** Set $x_0 = x$;
>
> **Step 7:** Set $d_m = c_{m+1}$; $z = c_{m+1}$;
>
> **Step 8:** For $j = m, m-1, \ldots, 2$ do Step 9
>
>> **Step 9:** Set $d_{j-1} = x_0 d_j + c_j$; $z = x_0 z + d_{j-1}$;
>
> **Step 10:** Set $y = x_0 d_1 + c_1$;
>
> **Step 11:** Set $x = x_0 - \frac{y}{z}$;
>
> **Step 12:** Set $k = k + 1$;

Step 13: Set $r_i = x$; $[c] = [d]$; $m = m - 1$;

Step 14: Set $D = \sqrt{c_2^2 - 4c_1 c_3}$; $s_1 = -c_2 + D$; $s_2 = -c_2 - D$;

Step 15: If the real part of c_2 is negative, then set $r_{n-1} = \frac{s_1}{2c_3}$ and $r_n = \frac{2c_1}{s_1}$; else set $r_{n-1} = \frac{s_2}{2c_3}$ and $r_n = \frac{2c_1}{s_2}$;

Output: Array $[r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n]$ of approximate roots.

Steps 4 through 12 implement Newton's Method to find a single root, using Horner's Method in Steps 7 through 10 to calculte the value of the polynomial and its derivative at x_0. Care is taken to calculate and store the coefficients $[d]$ of the quotient for easy referral in Step 13. It is assumed that the square root calculated in Step 14 is the principle branch of the complex square root. Steps 14 and 15 utilize an alternate form of the quadratic formula that avoids the subtraction of nearly equal quantities so much as possible.

Crumpet 16: Alternate Quadratic Formula

When the roots of $p(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$ are small, the numerator of the quadratic formula, $x = \frac{-b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a}$, is necessarily small. In this case, it is best to match the signs of $-b$ and $\pm\sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}$ in order to avoid subtracting quantities of nearly equal value. Choosing the sign of the square root term this way gives one of the roots as accurately as possible, but leaves the other root undetermined. Multiplying both numerator and denominator by the conjugate of the numerator gives an alternate expression of the quadratic formula:

$$\frac{-b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a} \cdot \frac{-b \mp \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{-b \mp \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}} = \frac{b^2 - (b^2 - 4ac)}{2a(-b \mp \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac})}$$

$$= \frac{4ac}{2a(-b \mp \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac})}$$

$$= \frac{2c}{-b \mp \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}.$$

Expanding, we have

$$\frac{-b + \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a} = \frac{2c}{-b - \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}$$

and

$$\frac{-b - \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a} = \frac{2c}{-b + \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}.$$

However, there is little that can be done at this point if zero happens to be a double root. In this instance, both c_1 and c_2 will be zero or nearly zero, making both s_1 and s_2 very small. This is why the set of assumptions includes the stipulation $c_1 \neq 0$. This ensures that zero is not a root of p.

Newton's method and polynomials

There is one more issue to address regarding the use of Newton's Method for finding roots of polynomials. For a polynomial with real coefficients, if x_0 is real, so will be x_1, and x_2, and every successive iteration!

There will be no hope of finding complex roots. This is not a problem if the polynomial has at most two complex roots. The real roots will be found and the resulting quadratic will hold the two complex roots. The complex roots will be uncovered by the quadratic formula. In general, though, we can not count on a polynomial having at most two complex roots. Our method should work for polynomials with arbitrarily many complex roots, including the case when all roots are complex.

The fix is not difficult, with one proviso. Mathematically, Newton's method and Horner's Method work just as well with complex numbers as they do with real numbers. As long as the programming language you are using can handle complex numbers, just begin with a complex (not purely real) initial approximation x_0, and complex roots will be found! Even so, it is possible that all the real roots are found first and what remains will be a polynomial with more than two complex roots and no real roots. This is where the inaccuracy of floating point arithmetic is actually helpful! Neither the coefficients nor the value of x_0 will be purely real due to roundoff error. The complex roots will generally be found.

Müller's Method

Another very fast method for finding roots of equations is Müller's method. In principle, it is very much like the secant method. With the secant method, two initial approximations p_0 and p_1 are made. The secant line through the points $(p_0, f(p_0))$ and $(p_1, f(p_1))$ is drawn and its intersection with the x-axis gives p_2. With Müller's method, three initial approximations p_0, p_1, and, p_2 are needed. The parabola through the points $(p_0, f(p_0))$, $(p_1, f(p_1))$, and $(p_2, f(p_2))$ is drawn and its intersection with the x-axis gives p_3. There are a couple of issues to deal with, however. First, if the parabola so drawn crosses the x-axis at all, it crosses it twice. We need to choose one of the zeros for p_3. Second, it is possible the parabola will not cross the x-axis at all.

Solving the problem of which root to choose is simple. We assume the approximation p_2 is better than the others, so we choose the root that is closest to p_2. Actually, that solves the second "problem" too. Even when the parabola does not cross the x-axis, it has zeros. They are complex. And we do not worry about that. We simply take the complex root that is closest to p_2. This has the nice advantage that even when the coefficients of $p(x)$ are all real and p_0, p_1, and, p_2 are all real, and all the roots of $p(x)$ are complex, it will find a complex root.

As to the business of finding the parabola passing through $(p_0, f(p_0))$, $(p_1, f(p_1))$, and $(p_2, f(p_2))$, we will seek a parabola $P(x)$ of the form

$$P(x) = a(x - p_2)^2 + b(x - p_2) + c.$$

Making the substitutions $x = p_i$ and $P(x) = f(p_i)$ leads to the three equations

$$\begin{aligned}
f(p_0) &= a(p_0 - p_2)^2 + b(p_0 - p_2) + c \\
f(p_1) &= a(p_1 - p_2)^2 + b(p_1 - p_2) + c \\
f(p_2) &= c
\end{aligned}$$

So we find out immediately that $c = f(p_2)$ and we must solve the simultaneous equations

$$\begin{aligned}
f(p_0) - f(p_2) &= a(p_0 - p_2)^2 + b(p_0 - p_2) \\
f(p_1) - f(p_2) &= a(p_1 - p_2)^2 + b(p_1 - p_2)
\end{aligned}$$

for a and b. The solution is

$$\begin{aligned}
b &= \frac{(p_0 - p_2)^2(f(p_1) - f(p_2)) - (p_1 - p_2)^2(f(p_0) - f(p_2))}{(p_0 - p_2)(p_1 - p_2)(p_0 - p_1)} \\
a &= \frac{(p_1 - p_2)(f(p_0) - f(p_2)) - (p_0 - p_2)(f(p_1) - f(p_2))}{(p_0 - p_2)(p_1 - p_2)(p_0 - p_1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now plugging a, b, and c into the quadratic formula gives us roots $x = p_2 - \frac{2}{b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}$. To choose the one closest to p_2, we compare $|b + \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}|$ with $|b - \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}|$ and use the larger. This gives us the smallest value for $|x - p_2|$, the distance of the root from p_2.

For example, we will use Müller's method with $p_0 = 1$, $p_1 = 2$, and $p_2 = 3$ to find a root of $f(x) = x^3 + 1$.

We calculate

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta_0 &= f(p_0) - f(p_2) = 2 - 28 = -26 \\
\delta_1 &= f(p_1) - f(p_2) = 9 - 28 = -19 \\
h_0 &= p_0 - p_2 = -2 \\
h_1 &= p_1 - p_2 = -1 \\
h_2 &= p_0 - p_1 = -1
\end{aligned}
$$

so we get $c = 28$, $b = \frac{h_0^2 \delta_1 - h_1^2 \delta_0}{h_0 h_1 h_2} = \frac{4(-19) - 1(-26)}{-2} = 25$, and $a = \frac{h_1 \delta_0 - h_0 \delta_1}{h_0 h_1 h_2} = \frac{-1(-26) - (-2)(-19)}{-2} = 6$. A close look at the graphs of $f(x)$ and $P(x) = 6x^2 + 25x + 28$ shows that they do meet three times (at the required points), and that $P(x)$ does not have real roots:

$b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac} = 25 \pm \sqrt{625 - 672} = 25 \pm i\sqrt{47}$. Since $|25 + i\sqrt{47}| = |25 - i\sqrt{47}|$, it does not matter which root we take. Selecting $p_3 = p_2 - \frac{2c}{b - \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}$, we get $p_3 = 3 - \frac{56}{25 - i\sqrt{47}} = \frac{11}{12} - \frac{\sqrt{47}}{12}i$. Continuing this process gives the iterates $0.75238 - 0.75810i$, $0.57069 - 0.84288i, \ldots, 0.50000 - 0.86603i$, converging to $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}i$.

Crumpet 17: Order of convergence for Müller's Method

The order of convergence of Müller's Method to a simple root (one that is not repeated) is

$$
\left(\frac{\sqrt{11}}{3\sqrt{3}} + \frac{19}{27} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} + \frac{4}{9 \left(\frac{\sqrt{11}}{3\sqrt{3}} + \frac{19}{27} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}} + \frac{1}{3} \approx 1.839286755214161
$$

and to a double root,

$$
\left(\frac{\sqrt{139}}{24\sqrt{3}} + \frac{8}{27} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} + \frac{7}{36 \left(\frac{\sqrt{139}}{24\sqrt{3}} + \frac{8}{27} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}} + \frac{1}{6} \approx 1.233751928528259.
$$

Reference: A Method for Solving Algebraic Equations Using an Automatic Computer, David E. Muller, *Mathematical Tables and Other Aids to Computation*, Vol. 10, No. 56 (Oct., 1956), pp. 208-215.

The following chart summarizes the relative strengths and weaknesses of Newton's Method, the Secant Method, and Müller's Method.

	Newton's	Secant	Müller's
Initial values needed	1	2	3
Derivative needed?	Yes	No	No
Order of Convergence[5]	2	≈ 1.618	≈ 1.839
Automatic discovery of complex roots?	No	No	Yes
Simplified in the case of polynomials?	Yes	No	No

Key Concepts

Synthetic division: A method for dividing a polynomial $p(x)$ by a monomial $(x - x_0)$ using only addition, multiplication, and the coefficients of p. The process is identical to evaluating a polynomial by nesting. Synthetic division simply provides an organizational tool so that nesting can be accomplished simply with pencil and paper.

Horner's Method: A method where the value of a polynomial and its derivative at a single point are calculated simultaneously via synthetic division.

Müller's Method: A root-finding method similar to the Secant Method where instead of using a secant line a parabola is used.

Deflation: The method of replacing a polynomial $p(x)$ by the product of a monomial $(x - x_0)$ and a polynomial $q(x)$ of degree one less than that of the original polynomial.

Exercises

1. ⟳ Write an Octave function that calculates the roots of a quadratic function using the alternate quadratic formula when appropriate. The first line of your function should be

   ```
   function [r1,r2] = quadraticRoots(a,b,c)
   ```

   where `r1` and `r2` are the roots of $p(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$. This way, the values `r1` and `r2` are returned by the function in an array. The function is called like this:

   ```
   [s,t]=quadraticRoots(1,2,3),
   ```

   setting `s` to the value of one of the roots and `t` to the other. Test your code well by comparing outputs of your function to hand/calculator computations.

2. ⟳ Write an Octave function that implements Horner's method. The first line of your function should be

   ```
   function [p,pprime] = horner(x0,c)
   ```

   where `c` is an array containing the coefficients of the polynomial, `x0` is the number at which to evaluate it, `p` is the value of the polynomial at `x0`, and `pprime` is the value of the derivative of the polynomial at `x0`. This way, the values `p` and `pprime` are returned by the function in an array. The function is called like this:

   ```
   [y,yy]=horner(-2,[5,4,3,2,1]),
   ```

   setting `y` to the value of the polynomial and `yy` to the value of its derivative. Test your code well by comparing outputs of your function to hand/calculator computations.

3. ⟳ Write an Octave function that implements Newton's method with Horner's method. The first line of your function should be

   ```
   function x = newtonhorner(c,x0,tol,N)
   ```

   where `c` is an array containing the coefficients of the polynomial, `x0` is the initial value, `tol` is the tolerance, and `N` is the maximum number of iterations before giving up. The code should be similar to code you wrote to implement Newton's method before, but this code will only work for polynomials. Inside your `newtonhorner` function, DO NOT write Horner's method code. Just call the `horner` function you wrote in question 2. Test your code well by comparing outputs of your function to outputs from the code you wrote in question 1 on page 71.

4. ⟳ Complete the code for the deflate function begun here.

   ```
   % This function will deflate a polynomial
   % given a root.
   % INPUT: coefficients c of the polynomial;
   %        a root r of the polynomial.
   % OUTPUT: coefficients d of the deflated
   %         polynomial.
   function d = deflate(c,r)

   end%function
   ```

5. ⟳ Write an Octave function implementing Müller's method.

6. Use Horner's method/synthetic division to find $g(2)$ and $g'(2)$. Do not use a computer.

   (a) $g(x) = 3x^3 + 12x^2 - 13x - 8$ [S]
   (b) $g(x) = -7 + 8x - 3x^2 + 5x^3 - 2x^4$ [A]

7. Use Horner's method to calculate $g(-2)$ and $g'(-2)$ where $g(x) = 4x^4 - 5x^3 + 6x - 7$. Do not use a computer.

8. Use your work from question 6 to help execute two iterations of Newton's method using a pencil, paper, calculator, and Horner's method/synthetic division. Use initial value $x_0 = 2$. [S] [A]

9. Use your work from question 7 to help execute two iterations of Newton's method using a pencil, paper, calculator, and Horner's method/synthetic division. Use initial value $x_0 = -2$.

10. Compute x_2 of Newton's Method by hand (using Horner's method/synthetic division) for $f(x) = x^3 + 4x - 8$ starting with $x_0 = 0$.

11. Find x_2 of Newton's Method by hand (using Horner's method/synthetic division) for $f(x) = x^4 - 2x^3 - 4x^2 + 4x + 4$ using $x_0 = 2$.

12. Using Horner's Method as an aid, and not using your calculator, find the first iteration of Newton's Method for the function $f(x) = 2x^3 - 10x + 1$ using $x_0 = 2$.

13. Demonstrate two iterations of Newton's Method (using Horner's method/synthetic division) applied to $f(x) = 5x^3 - 2x^2 + 7x - 3$ with $p_0 = 1$ by hand.

14. Find all the roots of the polynomial as follows. Use Newton's method with tolerance 10^{-5} to approximate a root of the polynomial. You may use your `newtonhorner` function from question 3. Then use synthetic division to deflate the polynomial one degree. Do not use a computer for deflation. Then use Newton's method with tolerance 10^{-5} to approximate a root of the deflated polynomial. Then use synthetic division to deflate the deflated polynomial one degree. Repeat until the deflated polynomial is quadratic. Once this happens, use the quadratic formula (or alternate quadratic formula) to find the last two roots.

    (a) $g(x) = x^4 + 6x^3 - 59x^2 + 144x - 144$ [S]

    (b) $g(x) = -280 + 909x - 154x^2 - 178x^3 + 54x^4 + 9x^5$ [A]

15. Find all the roots of the polynomial as follows. Use Newton's method with tolerance 10^{-5} to approximate a root of the polynomial. You may use your `newtonhorner` function from question 3. Then use synthetic division to deflate the polynomial one degree. You may use your `deflate` function from question 4 for deflation. Then use Newton's method with tolerance 10^{-5} to approximate a root of the deflated polynomial. Then use synthetic division to deflate the deflated polynomial one degree. Repeat until the deflated polynomial is quadratic. Once this happens, use the quadratic formula to find the last two roots. You may use your `quadraticRoots` function from question 1 for solving the quadratic.

    (a) $g(x) = x^4 - 2x^3 - 12x^2 + 16x - 40$ [S]

    (b) $g(x) = 56 - 152x + 140x^2 - 17x^3 - 48x^4 + 9x^5$ [A]

16. For each root you found in question 14 except the first one, use it as an initial approximation in Newton's method with tolerance 10^{-5} to see if you can refine your roots. Do they change? [S] [A]

17. $f(x) = x^3 - 1.255x^2 - .9838x + 1.2712$ has a root at $x = 1.12$.

    (a) Use Newton's method with an initial approximation $x_0 = 1.13$ to attempt to find this root. Explain what happens.

    (b) Find all the roots of $f(x)$.

18. In 1224, Leonardo of Pisa, better known as Fibonacci, answered a mathematical challenge of John of Palermo in the presence of Emperor Frederick II: Find a root of the equation $x^3 + 2x^2 + 10x = 20$. He first showed that the equation had no rational roots and no Euclidean irrational roots—that is, no root in any of the forms $a \pm \sqrt{b}$, $\sqrt{a} \pm \sqrt{b}$, $\sqrt{a \pm \sqrt{b}}$, or $\sqrt{\sqrt{a} \pm \sqrt{b}}$, where a and b are rational numbers. He then approximated the only real root using an algebraic technique of Omar Khayyam involving the intersection of a circle and a parabola. His answer was given in the base 60 number system as

$$1 + 22\left(\frac{1}{60}\right) + 7\left(\frac{1}{60}\right)^2 + 42\left(\frac{1}{60}\right)^3 +$$
$$33\left(\frac{1}{60}\right)^4 + 4\left(\frac{1}{60}\right)^5 + 40\left(\frac{1}{60}\right)^6.$$

How accurate was his approximation?

19. Calculate the value of the polynomial at the given value of x in two different ways. (i) Use your `horner` function from question 2; and (ii) use an `inline()` function. Then (iii) compare the two results using Octave's `==` operator.

    (a) $p(x) = x^4 - 2x^3 - 12x^2 + 16x - 40$ at $x = \sqrt{3}$ [S]

    (b) $q(x) = 56 - 152x + 140x^2 - 17x^3 - 48x^4 + 9x^5$ at $x = \pi/2$ [A]

    (c) $r(x) = x^6 + 11x^4 - 34x^3 - 130x^2 - 275x + 819$ at $\frac{1 - \sqrt{5}}{2}$ [A]

    (d) $s(x) = 5x^{10} + 3x^8 - 46x^6 - 102x^4 + 365x^2 + 1287$ at $\frac{1}{e}$

20. Write an Octave function that uses your functions from questions 1, 3, and 4 to find all the roots of a polynomial. Test your function well on polynomials of various degrees for which you know the roots. You may base your function on the pseudo-code on page 86, but your code should be significantly simpler since you are calling functions instead of writing their code. [A]

21. Use your code from question 20 to find all the solutions of the equation. [A]

    (a) $x^5 + 11x^4 - 34x^3 - 130x^2 - 275x + 819 = 0$

    (b) $5x^5 + 3x^4 - 46x^3 - 102x^2 + 365x + 1287 = 0$

22. Find all the roots of $g(x) = 25x^3 - 105x^2 + 148x - 174$.

23. Recall that there are some similarities between the secant method and Müller's method. They each require multiple initial approximations. They each involve calculating the zero of some function passing through these initial points. They both give superlinear convergence to simple roots. And, of course, they are both root finding methods. Let's tweak the idea in the following way. To find roots of g, start as with the secant method,

using two approximations, x_0 and x_1. Then, instead of using the zero of a line through $(x_0, g(x_0))$ and $(x_1, g(x_1))$, find the function of the form

$$h(x) = ax^3 + b$$

passing through $(x_0, g(x_0))$ and $(x_1, g(x_1))$. Let x_2 be the zero of h. Then repeat with x_1 and x_2 to get x_3, and so on.

(a) Let $g(x) = 2\ln(1 + x^2) - x$, $x_0 = 5$ and $x_1 = 6$. Find x_2 using this method.

(b) Find a formula for x_2 given any function $g(x)$ and any initial conditions x_0 and x_1. Your formula should be in terms of x_0, x_1, $g(x_0)$, and $g(x_1)$.

(c) Find a general formula for x_n in terms of x_{n-2}, x_{n-1}, $g(x_{n-2})$, and $g(x_{n-1})$.

(d) 🌀 Write an Octave function that implements this method and prints out each iteration.

(e) 🌀 Use your Octave function to decide whether the order of convergence for this method is linear or superlinear.

24. Pick a function whose root(s) you know exactly. Use Müller's method to find one of the roots. Use three consecutive iterations to estimate the order of convergence.

25. The errors in three consecutive iterations of Müller's method are shown in the table. Use this information to estimate the order of convergence.

n	$|x_n - x|$
12	$1.53627(10)^{-349}$
13	$1.67365(10)^{-642}$
14	$1.83922(10)^{-1181}$

26. The graph of $f(x)$ is shown. Find distinct sets of values p_0, p_1, and p_2 for which Müller's Method

(a) will lead to a complex value for p_3.

(b) will lead to the root at $x \approx 4.4$.

(c) will lead to the root at $x \approx 2.8$.

27. 🌀 The function shown in question 26 is $f(x) = \frac{x^2 - 7x + 10}{2} + \sin(3x)$. Use this information to test your conjectures in question 26.

Interpolation

3.1 A root-finding challenge

We open this chapter by combining its content with that of the previous chapter. In the present chapter, we will discuss interpolating functions, functions whose graphs must contain a prescribed set of points, and interpolation, the exercise of finding such a function. In the previous chapter, we discussed approximating roots of functions by numerical computation. Putting these ideas together in the present section, we present an interpolating function, which we will call f, and challenge the reader to find all 6 roots of f, f', and a particular antiderivative of f as accurately and efficiently as possible. Graphs of the three functions and the definition of f follow. Should you accept the challenge, be prepared to use all of what you know about root-finding and Octave. This problem is not easily solved!

The function f and its antiderivative

The function

which we will call F, could easily be mistaken for a cubic or higher degree polynomial, but it is far from so nice. First, its domain is the interval $[0, 1]$, so the graph shown is the entire graph. Second, it has but two derivatives. Third, its definition is a touch unusual. More on that soon.

What we have here is the antiderivative of a fractal interpolating function. An interpolating function is a function that contains a set of prescribed points. This one happens to be fractal in nature, thus a *fractal* interpolating function. The fractal interpolating function, f, passes through

$$(0, .123), \ (.33, -.123), \ \text{and} \ (1, .5) \tag{3.1.1}$$

in such a way that the graph shown is that of its antiderivative. The unusual nature of the definition of F is derived from the unusual nature of the definition of f:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} f_1 + c_1 \frac{x}{\alpha} + d_1 f\left(\frac{x}{\alpha}\right), & 0 \le x \le \alpha \\ f_2 + c_2 \frac{x-\alpha}{1-\alpha} + d_2 f\left(\frac{x-\alpha}{1-\alpha}\right), & \alpha \le x \le 1 \end{cases}$$

where

$$f_1 = \frac{8979}{100000}, \ c_1 = -\frac{34779}{100000}, \ d_1 = \frac{27}{100}$$
$$f_2 = -\frac{75891}{550000}, \ c_2 = \frac{317391}{550000}, \ d_2 = \frac{67}{550}$$
$$\alpha = \frac{33}{100}.$$

Crumpet 18: Fractal Interpolating Functions

Fractal interpolating functions are not restricted to passing through three points. Actually, three is the minimum. In general, for $n \geq 3$, suppose $x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_n$. The linear fractal interpolating function (there are other types of fractal interpolating functions) passing through each of the points

$$(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$$

and having domain $[x_1, x_n]$ is defined by the linear transformations

$$L_i \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & 0 \\ c_i & d_i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} e_i \\ f_i \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1.$$

The a_i, c_i, e_i, and f_i are calculated based on the requirement that the function interpolate the given points. In particular, we require

$$L_i \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ y_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_i \\ y_i \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } L_i \begin{pmatrix} x_n \\ y_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{i+1} \\ y_{i+1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The d_i are free parameters with the restriction $|d_i| < 1$. It is a straightforward algebraic exercise to show

$$a_i = \frac{x_{i+1} - x_i}{x_n - x_1}$$
$$c_i = \frac{y_{i+1} - y_i - d_i(y_n - y_1)}{x_n - x_1}$$
$$e_i = x_i - a_i x_1$$
$$f_i = y_i - c_i x_1 - d_i y_1.$$

In concert, the L_i define the function f, each L_i responsible for the subset $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ of the domain. $L_i \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_i x + e_i \\ c_i x + d_i y + f_i \end{pmatrix}$, so as L_i takes x to $a_i x + e_i$, it simultaneously takes y to $c_i x + d_i y + f_i$. Noting that L_i takes this action on the function f, we must have that $f(a_i x + e_i) = c_i x + d_i f(x) + f_i$ on $[x_1, x_n]$, or equivalently,

$$f(x) = f_i + c_i \left(\frac{x - e_i}{a_i} \right) + d_i f \left(\frac{x - e_i}{a_i} \right) \text{ on } [x_i, x_{i+1}].$$

Putting all the pieces together, f is defined by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} h_1(x), & x_1 \leq x \leq x_2 \\ h_2(x), & x_2 \leq x \leq x_3 \\ \vdots \\ h_{n-1}(x), & x_{n-1} \leq x \leq x_n \end{cases}$$

where

$$h_i(x) = f_i + c_i \left(\frac{x - e_i}{a_i} \right) + d_i f \left(\frac{x - e_i}{a_i} \right).$$

Consequently, $F(x) = \int_{x_1}^x f(t)\,dt$ is defined by

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} \int_{x_1}^x h_1(t)dt, & x_1 \leq x \leq x_2 \\ F(x_2) + \int_{x_2}^x h_2(t)dt, & x_2 \leq x \leq x_3 \\ \vdots \\ F(x_{n-1}) + \int_{x_{n-1}}^x h_{n-1}(t)dt, & x_{n-1} \leq x \leq x_n \end{cases}$$

without qualification, and $f'(x)$ is defined by

$$f'(x) = \begin{cases} h'_1(x), & x_1 \le x \le x_2 \\ h'_2(x), & x_2 < x \le x_3 \\ \quad \vdots \\ h'_{n-1}(x), & x_{n-1} < x \le x_n \end{cases}$$

as long as f' exists! If $\left|\frac{d_i}{a_i}\right| < 1$ for all i, then the derivative will exist almost everywhere, but will generally be discontinuous. If we also have $h'_i(x_{i+1}) = h'_{i+1}(x_{i+1})$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-2$, then the derivative will exist and will be continuous.

Reference

Michael F. Barnsley, *Fractals Everywhere*, , chapter VI.

The definition of f is self-referential. Its values are defined by, among other terms, values of itself! This makes evaluating the function a bit different from evaluating a typical function. For example, by virtue of the fact that f passes through the points 3.1.1, we must have $f(0) = .123$, $f(.33) = -.123$, and $f(1) = .5$, facts we can check easily enough. According to the definition,

$$f(0) = f_1 + d_1 f(0) = .08979 + .27 f(0)$$

so $f(0)$ is defined in part by itself. We need to solve the equation $f(0) = .08979 + .27 f(0)$ to find $f(0)$. Thus we have $f(0) = \frac{.08979}{.73} = .123$, as promised. Again according to the definition,

$$f(1) = f_2 + c_2 + d_2 f(1) = -\frac{75891}{550000} + \frac{317391}{550000} + \frac{67}{550} f(1).$$

Solving for $f(1)$, we have $f(1) = \frac{-\frac{75891}{550000} + \frac{317391}{550000}}{1 - \frac{67}{550}} = \frac{1}{2}$, as promised. Since $\alpha = .33$, the definition actually gives two ways to calculate $f(.33)$. According to the first part of f,

$$\begin{aligned} f(.33) = f(\alpha) &= f_1 + c_1 + d_1 f(1) \\ &= \frac{8979}{100000} - \frac{34779}{100000} + \frac{27}{100} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \\ &= -.123. \end{aligned}$$

Now is a good time to verify that $f(\alpha) = -.123$ according to the second part of f as well. Try it! Calculating other values of f can be a bit more challenging, but there are still a few that are not so bad. $\alpha^2 < \alpha$ and $\alpha + (1 - \alpha)\alpha > \alpha$, so

$$\begin{aligned} f(\alpha^2) &= f_1 + c_1\alpha + d_1 f(\alpha) \\ &= \frac{8979}{100000} - \frac{34779}{100000} \cdot \frac{33}{100} + \frac{27}{100} \cdot \left(-\frac{123}{1000}\right) \\ &= -.0581907 \\ f(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)\alpha) &= f_2 + c_2\alpha + d_2 f(\alpha) \\ &= -\frac{75891}{550000} + \frac{317391}{550000} \cdot \frac{33}{100} + \frac{67}{550} \cdot \left(-\frac{123}{1000}\right) \\ &= \frac{2060703}{55000000} \\ &= .037467\overline{27} \end{aligned}$$

With a similar level of difficulty, you can now calculate

$$f(\alpha^3),\ f(\alpha(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)\alpha)),\ f(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)\alpha^2),$$
$$\text{and } f(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)\alpha)).$$

More generally, once you have calculated $f(x)$ for some value x, you can then calculate $f(\alpha x)$ and $f(\alpha + (1-\alpha)x)$ from it.

Now that we have a handle on f, we define F by $F(x) = \int_0^x f(t)\,dt$ for all $x \in [0,1]$. Integrating $f(x)$ we have

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} f_1 x + \frac{c_1 x^2}{2\alpha} + \alpha d_1 F\left(\frac{x}{\alpha}\right), & 0 \le x \le \alpha \\ F(\alpha) + f_2(x-\alpha) + \frac{c_2(x-\alpha)^2}{2(1-\alpha)} + (1-\alpha)d_2 F\left(\frac{x-\alpha}{1-\alpha}\right), & \alpha \le x \le 1 \end{cases}$$

where again both formulas are applicable when $x = \alpha$. Just like f, F is self-referential. We must go through the same process in finding values of F as we did finding values of f. To get started, $F(0) = \alpha d_1 F(0) \Rightarrow (1 - \alpha d_1) \cdot F(0) = 0$, but α and d_1 are both less than 1, so $1 - \alpha d_1 \ne 0$. Therefore,

$$F(0) = \frac{0}{1 - \alpha d_1} = 0.$$

We could have computed this value by integration just as well: $F(0) = \int_0^0 f(t)\,dt = 0$. Now, according to the formula,

$$F(1) = F(\alpha) + (1-\alpha)\left(f_2 + \frac{c_2}{2} + d_2 F(1)\right)$$
$$\text{and}$$
$$F(\alpha) = \alpha\left(f_1 + \frac{c_1}{2} + d_1 F(1)\right),$$

a system of two equations in the two unknowns, $F(\alpha)$ and $F(1)$. Its solution is

$$F(\alpha) = -\frac{121012947}{6081400000} \approx -.01989886325517151$$
$$F(1) = \frac{5361861}{60814000} \approx 0.0881682014009932.$$

Now that we have the few values, $F(0)$, $F(\alpha)$, and $F(1)$, we can calculate others as before. The values $F(\alpha x)$ and $F(\alpha + (1-\alpha)x)$ will both depend on the value of $F(x)$. So we can compute $F(\alpha^2)$ and $F(\alpha + (1-\alpha)\alpha)$:

$$\begin{aligned} F(\alpha^2) &= f_1 \alpha^2 + \frac{c_1 \alpha^3}{2} + \alpha d_1 F(\alpha) \\ &= \frac{10678194456039}{6081400000000000} \\ &\approx .001755877668964219 \\ F(\alpha + (1-\alpha)\alpha) &= F(\alpha) + f_2(1-\alpha)\alpha + \frac{c_2(1-\alpha)\alpha^2}{2} + (1-\alpha)d_2 F(\alpha) \\ &= -\frac{94196657189979}{3040700000000000} \\ &\approx -.03097860926430723. \end{aligned}$$

Now you can calculate $F(\alpha^3)$, $F(\alpha(\alpha + (1-\alpha)\alpha))$, $F(\alpha + (1-\alpha)\alpha^2)$, and $F(\alpha + (1-\alpha)(\alpha + (1-\alpha)\alpha))$ yourself. You shouldn't worry about calculating these values exactly. That would require a computer algebra system with arbitrary precision and is not really the point. The point is to make sure you understand how to do the calculations. Use a calculator or Octave and the approximate values already calculated.

The derivative of f and more graphs

The function f has a continuous derivative. In fact, the parameters defining f were specifically chosen so the derivative would exist and be continuous. Differentiating f gives us

$$f'(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{c_1}{\alpha} + \frac{d_1}{\alpha} f'\left(\frac{x}{\alpha}\right), & 0 \le x \le \alpha \\ \frac{c_2}{1-\alpha} + \frac{d_2}{1-\alpha} f'\left(\frac{x-\alpha}{1-\alpha}\right), & \alpha \le x \le 1 \end{cases}$$

Figure 3.1.1: Graph of f.

Figure 3.1.2: Graph of f'.

and we can check as before that the definition is consistent when $x = \alpha$:

$$f'(0) = \frac{c_1}{\alpha} + \frac{d_1}{\alpha}f'(0) \Rightarrow f'(0) = \frac{c_1}{\alpha - d_1} = -\frac{11593}{2000} = -5.7965$$

$$f'(1) = \frac{c_2}{1 - \alpha} + \frac{d_2}{1 - \alpha}f'(1) \Rightarrow f'(1) = \frac{c_2}{1 - \alpha - d_2} = \frac{105797}{100500} \approx 1.052706467661692$$

$$f'(\alpha) = \frac{c_1}{\alpha} + \frac{d_1}{\alpha}f'(1) = -\frac{141949}{737000} \approx -.1926037991858887$$

$$f'(\alpha) = \frac{c_2}{1 - \alpha} + \frac{d_2}{1 - \alpha}f'(0) = -\frac{141949}{737000} \approx -.1926037991858887.$$

Other values of f' can be computed as done for f and F. The graphs of f and f' are shown in Figures 3.1.1 and 3.1.2.

That's it. Now see if you can find the roots of the three functions. The following Octave code will help you evaluate the functions at any points, a real time saver!

Octave

```
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
% Written by Dr. Len Brin                  19 February 2014 %
% Purpose: Calculate values of the fractal interpolating %
%          function, f, passing through                 %
%          (0,f_0), (alpha,f_alpha), and (1,f_1),       %
%          its derivative and its integral.             %
% INPUT: value at which to evaluate, x; array of values, %
%          f = [f_0,f_alpha,f_1]; alpha; scaling factors %
%          d1 and d2.                                    %
```

```
% OUTPUT: y=f'(x); yy=f(x); yyy=F(x).                              %
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
function [y,yy,yyy] = fractalInterpolator(x,f,alpha,d1,d2)
  f1=f(1)*(1-d1);
  c1=f(2)-d1*f(3)-f1;
  f2=f(2)-d2*f(1);
  c2=(1-d2)*f(3)-f2;
  F1=(alpha*(f1+c1/2)+(1-alpha)*(f2+c2/2))/(1-(1-alpha)*d2-alpha*d1);
  FA=alpha*(f1+c1/2+d1*F1);
  l=0;
  r=1;
  a=[];
  if (alpha>1/2)
    its=floor(log(10^-16)/log(alpha));
  else
    its=floor(log(10^-16)/log(1-alpha));
  end%if
  for i=1:its
    if (alpha>1/2)
      h = (r-l)*alpha;
      m = l+h;
    else
      h = (r-l)*(1-alpha);
      m = r-h;
    end%if
    if (x<m)
      a(i)=0;
      r=m;
    else
      a(i)=1;
      l=m;
    end%if
  end%for
  x=0;
  y=c1/(alpha-d1);
  yy=f(1);
  yyy=0;
  for i=its:-1:1
    if (a(i)==0)
      y=(c1+d1*y)/alpha;
      yy=c1*x+d1*yy+f1;
      yyy=alpha*(f1*x+c1/2*x*x+d1*yyy);
      x=alpha*x;
    else
      y=(c2+d2*y)/(1-alpha);
      yy=c2*x+d2*yy+f2;
      yyy=FA+(1-alpha)*(f2*x+c2/2*x*x+d2*yyy);
      x=alpha+(1-alpha)*x;
    end%if
  end%for
end%function
```

Answers

Evaluating f: The following are a few values of f:

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(\alpha^3) &\approx .03620418000000000 \\
f(\alpha(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)\alpha)) &\approx -.09176089063636364 \\
f(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)\alpha^2) &\approx -.08222890363636364 \\
f(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)\alpha)) &\approx .1846063473223140.
\end{aligned}
$$

Evaluating F: The following are a few values of F:

$$
\begin{aligned}
F(\alpha^3) &\approx .002702687013731212 \\
F(\alpha(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)\alpha)) &\approx -.003859289400223274 \\
F(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)\alpha^2) &\approx -.02753062961856850 \\
F(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)\alpha)) &\approx -.01466250212441314.
\end{aligned}
$$

3.2   Lagrange Polynomials

A function that is required to have a graph passing through some set of prescribed points is called an interpolating function, and we say that such a function interpolates the prescribed points. Further, the exercise of finding such a function is called interpolation.

In exercise 3a of section 2.6, you are asked to find a polynomial with roots at $-7, 2$, and $1 \pm 5i$ (and no others). The function, therefore, must be a polynomial and have a graph passing through the points

$$(-7, 0), \ (2, 0), \ (1 + 5i, 0), \ \text{and } (1 - 5i, 0). \tag{3.2.1}$$

In retrospect, then, the question could have been phrased as: find a polynomial passing through the points 3.2.1 (and not having any roots besides -7, 2, $1 + 5i$, and $1 - 5i$), a question of interpolation. We now expand upon this idea by considering polynomials with graphs passing through points with arbitrary ordinates (not just 0).

We start on familiar ground. The polynomial $p(x) = (x + 7)(x - 2)$ has roots -7 and 2 so has a graph passing through $(-7, 0)$ and $(2, 0)$. Suppose we want to modify p so it also passes through $(-1, 1)$. That is, we want $p(-7) = 0$, $p(-1) = 1$, and $p(2) = 0$. Beginning with $p(x) = (x + 7)(x - 2)$, we already have $p(-7) = 0$ and $p(2) = 0$, so really we only need to concentrate on $p(-1) = 1$. As is, $p(-1) = (-1 + 7)(-1 - 2) = 6(-3) = -18$, a far cry from 1. But $p(x) = (x + 7)(x - 2)$ is not the only polynomial passing through $(-7, 0)$ and $(2, 0)$. Let a be any real number and note that $q(x) = a(x + 7)(x - 2)$ also passes through $(-7, 0)$ and $(2, 0)$. If we choose a such that $q(-1) = 1$, we have the desired function:

$$q(-1) = a(-1 + 7)(-1 - 2) = -18a = 1 \Rightarrow a = -\frac{1}{18}.$$

$q(x) = -\frac{1}{18}(x + 7)(x - 2)$ passes through all three of the points, $(-7, 0)$, $(2, 0)$, and $(-1, 1)$. But let us not lose sight of whence this came. $-\frac{1}{18} = \frac{1}{p(-1)}$, so, actually, the desired function can be written as $q(x) = \frac{p(x)}{p(-1)}$. Indeed, $q(-7) = \frac{p(-7)}{p(-1)} = 0$, $q(2) = \frac{p(2)}{p(-1)} = 0$, and $q(-1) = \frac{p(-1)}{p(-1)} = 1$.

Now suppose we want a polynomial passing through $(-7, 0)$, $(2, 0)$, and $(-1, \sqrt{2})$. As before, we know $p(x) = (x + 7)(x - 2)$ has the desired roots and $q(x) = \frac{p(x)}{p(-1)}$ has the nice feature that $q(-1) = 1$. We use these two facts to come up with an answer. In fact, without doing any calculation, we know the polynomial

$$l(x) = \frac{p(x)}{p(-1)}\sqrt{2}$$

is the desired function. Take a moment to check that $l(-7) = 0$, $l(2) = 0$, and $l(-1) = \sqrt{2}$, and understand its construction. This idea is the seed for what is called the Lagrange form of interpolating polynomials.

We are now ready to let the ordinates fly! Suppose we would like a polynomial passing through $(-7, y_1)$, $(2, y_2)$, and $(-1, y_3)$. We know the polynomial $p_3(x) = (x + 7)(x - 2)$ has zeros at -7 and 2, so the polynomial $l_3(x) = \frac{p_3(x)}{p_3(-1)}y_3$ has zeros at -7 and 2 and, conveniently, $l_3(-1) = y_3$. This is a good first step. It has the correct ordinate at -1 and zeros at -7 and 2. Similarly, we can construct the polynomial $p_2(x) = (x + 7)(x + 1)$ with zeros at -7 and -1, from which we can construct the polynomial $l_2(x) = \frac{p_2(x)}{p_2(2)}y_2$ with zeros at -7 and -1 and, conveniently, $l_2(2) = y_2$. This is a good second step. It has the correct ordinate at 2 and zeros at -7 and -1. Now consider the sum $(l_3 + l_2)$. $l_3(-1) = y_3$ and $l_2(-1) = 0$, so $(l_3 + l_2)(-1) = y_3$. Similarly, $l_3(2) = 0$ and $l_2(2) = y_2$, so $(l_3 + l_2)(2) = y_2$. Moreover, $(l_3 + l_2)(-7) = 0$. We now have a polynomial passing through two of the three required points and having a zero at the abscissa of the third point. If we had a polynomial with the correct ordinate at -7 and zeros at 2 and -1, we could add it to the sum and be done. But this is exactly the type of polynomial we have been constructing! We let $p_1(x) = (x + 1)(x - 2)$ and $l_1(x) = \frac{p_1(x)}{p_1(-7)}y_1$, and note that l_1 has the correct ordinate at -7 and zeros at 2 and -1, just as we needed. Finally, the desired polynomial is $(l_1 + l_2 + l_3)$. Table 3.1 summarizes the construction.

And now we are ready for complete generalization. Suppose $n \geq 1$ and $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are n distinct real numbers. We use the notation $P_n(x)$ for the polynomial of least degree interpolating the points

$$(x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n).$$

Setting $p_i(x) = \prod_{\substack{j=0 \\ j \neq i}}^{n}(x - x_j) = (x - x_0)\cdots(x - x_{i-1})(x - x_{i+1})\cdots(x - x_n)$, one formula for P_n is

$$L_n(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{p_i(x)}{p_i(x_i)}y_i. \tag{3.2.2}$$

Table 3.1: A polynomial passing through $(-7, y_1)$, $(2, y_2)$, and $(-1, y_3)$.

x	$l_1(x) = \frac{p_1(x)}{p_1(-7)} y_1$	$l_2(x) = \frac{p_2(x)}{p_2(2)} y_2$	$l_3(x) = \frac{p_3(x)}{p_3(-1)} y_3$	$(l_1 + l_2 + l_3)(x)$
-7	y_1	0	0	y_1
2	0	y_2	0	y_2
-1	0	0	y_3	y_3

As written, L_n is called the *Lagrange form* of P_n. For sake of brevity, it is often called the Lagrange interpolating polynomial, or even Lagrange polynomial. However, the interpolating polynomial of least degree by any other name would be but P_n. We will adhere to the practice of calling it the interpolating polynomial of least degree, or use the notation P_n, when the form is unimportant and will add the phrase *Lagrange form*, or use the notation L_n, when it is.

The main use for interpolating polynomials in numerical analysis is to approximate non-polynomial functions in the following way. Suppose we know the value of f at a selection of points. That is, we know $f(x_0) = y_0, f(x_1) = x_1, \ldots, f(x_n) = y_n$ and perhaps not much more. The interpolating polynomial of least degree passing through the $n + 1$ points

$$(x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$$

will, by construction, agree with f at $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and we can say with some precision how closely this interpolating polynomial agrees with f at other points as well. The values of the interpolating polynomial at these "other points" are what we refer to as approximations of the non-polynomial function.

Setting $a = \min(x_0, \ldots, x_n, x)$ and $b = \max(x_0, \ldots, x_n, x)$, we have the following result. If f has $n + 1$ derivatives on (a, b) and $f, f', f'', \ldots, f^{(n)}$ are all continuous on $[a, b]$, then there is a value $\xi_x \in (a, b)$ such that

$$f(x) - P_n(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x)}{(n+1)!}(x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n). \tag{3.2.3}$$

Ironically, this result is proven by considering the Lagrange form of an interpolating polynomial in t that is equal to the error at x and equal to zero at each x_i. That polynomial is

$$\Lambda(t) = [P_n(x) - f(x)] \frac{(t - x_0)(t - x_1) \cdots (t - x_n)}{(x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n)}.$$

Crumpet 19: Λ

Λ is the (capital) eleventh letter of the Greek alphabet and is pronounced `lam-duh`. The lower case version, λ, appears much more commonly in mathematics and often represents an eigenvalue.

Subtracting this polynomial from the error, $e(t) = P_n(t) - f(t)$, we have a function,

$$g(t) = e(t) - \Lambda(t),$$

that is zero for all $t = x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n, x$. Since $g, g', \ldots, g^{(n)}$ are all continuous on $[a, b]$ and $g^{(n+1)}$ exists on (a, b), by Generalized Rolle's Theorem, there is a value $\xi_x \in (a, b)$ such that $g^{(n+1)}(\xi_x) = 0$. On the other hand,

$$
\begin{aligned}
g^{(n+1)}(\xi_x) &= e^{(n+1)}(\xi_x) - \Lambda^{(n+1)}(\xi_x) \\
&= P_n^{(n+1)}(\xi_x) - f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x) - \Lambda^{(n+1)}(\xi_x),
\end{aligned}
$$

and P_n is a polynomial of degree at most n. Hence, $P_n^{(n+1)}(t) = 0$ for all t and we have $g^{(n+1)}(\xi_x) = -f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x) - \Lambda^{(n+1)}(\xi_x) = 0$. It follows that

$$f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x) = -\Lambda^{(n+1)}(\xi_x).$$

But, Λ is a polynomial of degree $n+1$ in t, so its $(n+1)^{st}$ derivative with respect to t is constant with respect to t. We write Λ as

$$\Lambda(t) = \frac{P_n(x) - f(x)}{(x-x_0)(x-x_1)\cdots(x-x_n)}\left[t^{n+1} + b_n t^n + \cdots + b_0 t^0\right]$$

for some constants $b_n, b_{n-1}, \ldots, b_0$, and consequently,

$$\Lambda^{(n+1)}(t) = \frac{P_n(x) - f(x)}{(x-x_0)(x-x_1)\cdots(x-x_n)}\cdot(n+1)!,$$

and we have, by substitution,

$$f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x) = \frac{f(x) - P_n(x)}{(x-x_0)(x-x_1)\cdots(x-x_n)}\cdot(n+1)!$$

or, equivalently,

$$\frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi)}{(n+1)!}(x-x_0)(x-x_1)\cdots(x-x_n) = f(x) - P_n(x)$$

as desired.

Figure 3.2.1 shows interpolating polynomials for three different functions. The x-coordinates of the prescribed points are the same for each interpolating polynomial. The x-coordinates are

$$0, .1951846177977887, .3554400571592862, .4823905248516196, .9138095996128959, \text{ and } 1.$$

The four numbers between 0 and 1 were selected by a random number generator. The interpolating polynomial closely resembles the function only in the first case. The sixth derivative of f helps explain why.

Our error term,

$$\frac{f^{(6)}(\xi)}{6!}(x-x_0)(x-x_1)\cdots(x-x_5)$$

implies that the sixth derivative of f and the polynomial $h(x) = \frac{(x-x_0)(x-x_1)\cdots(x-x_5)}{6!}$ determine how much f and L_6 will differ. By bounding both $\left|f^{(6)}\right|$ and $|h|$ over the interval $[0,1]$, we can get a bound on the difference between f and L_6. The graphs of $f^{(6)}$ are shown in Figure 3.2.1. The graph of h is

so $\max_{x\in[0,1]}|h(x)|$ occurs around 0.75. We can use a root-finding method applied to h' to find that the maximum of $|h|$ is approximately $h(.7409254943919) \approx 2.506891519629(10)^{-6}$, a relatively small number. On the other hand, for $f(x) = e^{\sin\left((x+1)^2\right)}$, we find $\max_{x\in[0,1]}\left|f^{(6)}(x)\right| \approx f^{(6)}(.6677170541644) \approx 44013.74605321$, a relatively large number. Their product,

$$\max_{x\in[0,1]}|h(x)| \cdot \max_{x\in[0,1]}\left|f^{(6)}(x)\right| \approx .11,$$

gives a bound on the error. The absolute furthest L_6 can be from f over the interval $[0,1]$ is 0.11, a relatively small number. The actual error is considerably smaller, so can barely be noticed in the top left graph of Figure 3.2.1.

Figure 3.2.1: Three interpolating functions. From top to bottom, $e^{\sin\left((x+1)^2\right)}$, $\sin\left(e^{(x+1)^2}\right)$, and a fractal function as defined in section 3.1. f is shown in black and the interpolant, L_6, in red.

$f(x)$ and $L_6(x)$ $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad f^{(6)}(x)$

For $f(x) = \sin\left(e^{(x+1)^2}\right)$, we find $\max_{x\in[0,1]}\left|f^{(6)}(x)\right| \approx f^{(6)}(1) \approx 8.552147927657737(10)^{13}$, a relatively large number. This time the product,

$$\max_{x\in[0,1]} |h(x)| \cdot \max_{x\in[0,1]} \left|f^{(6)}(x)\right| \approx 2.1439307114460004(10)^8,$$

is a huge number relative to the values of f. So the theoretical error bound does not predict good results for this interpolation. In fact, it suggests that the interpolation could have been much much worse! L_6 might have differed from f by over 2 million, a fact that should be worrisome considering f takes values between -1 and 1. An approximation that is off by even 1 is completely useless for this particular f. As it is, we should not be surprised that L_6 is not a good approximation of f since the error term can be quite large. Nonetheless, the method is sound. Failure to approximate f well should not be seen as a flaw in the method. Rather, it should be seen as a flaw in its application. If we really wanted to approximate f well, we would need to find a different set of points over which to interpolate.

For the fractal function in the bottom left of Figure 3.2.1, our error estimate is entirely irrelevant. The sixth derivative of f does not exist. In fact, even the first derivative of f does not exist. We have no way to estimate the error except to look at the graphs. And as we see, L_6 again does a very poor job of approximating f. Failure, again, should not be seen as a flaw in the method, but rather in its application. Approximating a function with an interpolating polynomial presumes that the function has sufficient derivatives.

Crumpet 20: Bernstein polynomials

Suppose f is a continuous function on the interval $[0,1]$, and define the polynomial

$$B_n(x) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{n} \binom{n}{\nu} f\left(\frac{\nu}{n}\right) x^\nu (1-x)^{n-\nu}, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$$

Then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} B_n(x) = f(x)$$

uniformly. That is, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \max\{|B_n(x) - f(x)| : x \in [0,1]\} = 0$. The B_n are Bernstein polynomials. Shown below are B_4, B_{20}, B_{100}, and B_{500} for the fractal function in figure 3.2.1.

An application of interpolating polynomials

Again we find ourselves connecting the content of the previous chapter with that of the current. The secant method is actually an application of interpolating polynomials to root-finding. The secant line whose slope is used to calculate any given iteration can be viewed as an interpolating line! It passes through two points lying on g. Hence it is an approximation of g.

Having taken this point of view, we can now imagine generalizing the method by using the derivative of a higher degree interpolating polynomial to approximate g' at each step. Such a generalized method, which we will call Sidi's k^{th} degree Method[1], is summarized by the formula

$$x_{n+1} = x_n - \frac{g(x_n)}{p'_{n,k}(x_n)}$$

where $p_{n,k}$ is the interpolating polynomial passing through the points

$$(x_n, g(x_n)), (x_{n-1}, g(x_{n-1})), \dots, (x_{n-k}, g(x_{n-k})).$$

When $k = 1$, this is exactly the Secant Method. When $k = 2$, this method uses the same parabola as does Müller's Method, but in a different way. In Müller's Method, the next iteration is found by locating a root of the interpolating polynomial. In this method, the next iteration is found by locating a root of a tangent line to the interpolating polynomial.

As k increases, more initial values are needed, but the order of convergence increases as a benefit. Letting α_k be the order of convergence of Sidi's k^{th} degree method, we have $\alpha_1 = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 1.618$, the order of convergence of the Secant Method, and

$$\alpha_2 \approx 1.839, \ \alpha_3 \approx 1.928, \ \alpha_4 \approx 1.966.$$

For any k, Sidi's Method has an order of convergence less than 2 (the order of convergence of Newton's Method) but it approaches 2 as k increases.

At this point, you might wonder just how practical such a method might be. After all, calculating a new Lagrange interpolating polynomial and evaluating its derivative at each step can be a cumbersome process. We will take up this issue in the next section.

Neville's Method

The Lagrange form of an interpolating polynomial is as convenient as it gets for a human. With a little care and patience, it is possible to write down such a polynomial without even the aid of a calculator. However, adding points to the interpolation and evaluating the polynomial for non-interpolated points can be cumbersome tasks. Consider a simple example: the polynomial interpolating $f(x) = e^x$ at $x = 0, 1, 2$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_2(x) &= \frac{(x-1)(x-2)}{(0-1)(0-2)}e^0 + \frac{(x-0)(x-2)}{(1-0)(1-2)}e^1 + \frac{(x-0)(x-1)}{(2-0)(2-1)}e^2 \\
&= \frac{(x-1)(x-2)}{2} + \frac{x(x-2)}{-1}e + \frac{x(x-1)}{2}e^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Evaluating $L_2(1.5)$, for example, requires either

1. computing the values of the three separate terms, each a quadratic polynomial, and adding:

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_2(1.5) &= \frac{(1.5-1)(1.5-2)}{2} + \frac{1.5(1.5-2)}{-1}e + \frac{1.5(1.5-1)}{2}e^2 \\
&= -.125 + .75e + .375e^2 \\
&\approx 4.684607408443278
\end{aligned}
$$

   or

2. the unpleasant business of simplifying L_2 into a simpler form and then evaluating:

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_2(x) &= \frac{(x-1)(x-2)}{2} + \frac{x(x-2)}{-1}e + \frac{x(x-1)}{2}e^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(x^2 - 3x + 2) - e(x^2 - 2x) + \frac{e^2}{2}(x^2 - x) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{2} - e + \frac{e^2}{2}\right)x^2 + \left(-\frac{3}{2} + 2e - \frac{e^2}{2}\right)x + 1 \\
&\approx 1.47624622100628x^2 + 0.242035607452765x + 1
\end{aligned}
$$

   so $L_2(1.5) \approx 1.47624622100628(1.5)^2 + 0.242035607452765(1.5) + 1 = 4.684607408443277.$

---

[1]Avram Sidi, *Generalization Of The Secant Method For Nonlinear Equations*, Applied Mathematics E-Notes, 8(2008), 115-123. Applied Mathematics E-Notes, 8(2008), 115-123. Available free at mirror sites of http://www.math.nthu.edu.tw/~amen/.

Method 2 is better if you have more points at which to evaluate, and method 1 is better if you plan to add points of interpolation. However, neither method is particularly convenient. Even less convenient than evaluating the polynomial is the task of requiring another point of interpolation. Previous work is of limited use. And we haven't even begun to discuss the trouble of writing a computer program to automate the calculations. Neville's Method can be used to overcome these limitations when the value of the polynomial at a specific point is required.

Neville's Method is based on the observation that interpolating polynomials can be constructed recursively. Suppose $P_{k,l}$ is the polynomial of degree at most l interpolating the data

$$(x_k, f(x_k)), (x_{k+1}, f(x_{k+1})), \ldots, (x_{k+l}, f(x_{k+l})).$$

Then, by definition, $P_{0,n}$ is the polynomial of degree at most n interpolating the data

$$(x_0, f(x_0)), (x_1, f(x_1)), \ldots, (x_n, f(x_n)).$$

Moreover, $P_{0,n}$ can be computed using the recursive formula

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{i,m+1}(x) &= \frac{(x - x_{i+m+1})P_{i,m}(x) - (x - x_i)P_{i+1,m}(x)}{x_i - x_{i+m+1}} \\
P_{i,0}(x) &= f(x_i), \qquad i = 0, \ldots, n.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2.4}$$

This claim can be checked by noting five things:

1. $P_{i,0}$ is the degree 0 polynomial interpolating the one datum $(x_i, f(x_i))$.

2. $P_{i,m}$ and $P_{i+1,m}$ are polynomials of degree at most m, so $P_{i,m+1}$ is a polynomial of degree at most $m + 1$.

3. $P_{i,m+1}(x_i) = \dfrac{(x_i - x_{i+m+1})P_{i,m}(x_i)}{x_i - x_{i+m+1}} = P_{i,m}(x_i) = f(x_i).$

4. For any $j = i + 1, \ldots, i + m$,

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{i,m+1}(x_j) &= \frac{(x_j - x_{i+m+1})P_{i,m}(x_j) - (x_j - x_i)P_{i+1,m}(x_j)}{x_i - x_{i+m+1}} \\
&= \frac{(x_j - x_{i+m+1})f(x_j) - (x_j - x_i)f(x_j)}{x_i - x_{i+m+1}} \\
&= \frac{f(x_j)\left[(x_j - x_{i+m+1}) - (x_j - x_i)\right]}{x_i - x_{i+m+1}} \\
&= f(x_j).
\end{aligned}$$

5. $P_{i,m+1}(x_{i+m+1}) = \dfrac{-(x_{i+m+1} - x_i)P_{i+1,m}(x_{i+m+1})}{x_i - x_{i+m+1}} = P_{i+1,m}(x_{i+m+1}) = f(x_{i+m+1}).$

A rigorous proof by induction on m, requested in the exercises, should follow closely these notes. Points 1 and 2 establish that $P_{k,l}$ has degree at most l. Points 3 through 5 establish that $P_{k,l}$ interpolates the points $(x_k, f(x_k)), (x_{k+1}, f(x_{k+1})), \ldots, (x_{k+l}, f(x_{k+l}))$. Formula 3.2.4 succinctly summarizes Neville's Method.

While Neville's Method (formula 3.2.4) can be used to find formulas for interpolating polynomials as in

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{0,1}(x) &= \frac{(x - x_1)P_{0,0}(x) - (x - x_0)P_{1,0}(x)}{x_0 - x_1} \\
&= \frac{x - x_1}{x_0 - x_1}f(x_0) + \frac{x - x_0}{x_1 - x_0}f(x_1),
\end{aligned}$$

it is normally used to find the value of an interpolating polynomial at a specific point. We earlier determined that $L_2(1.5) = 4.684607408443277$ for the polynomial, $L_2(x)$, interpolating $f(x) = e^x$ at $x = 0, 1, 2$. We now find this value using Neville's Method. $P_{0,0}(1.5) = f(0) = 1$, $P_{1,0}(1.5) = f(1) \approx$

Table 3.2: Neville's Method example, calculating $P_{0,2}(1.5)$.

x_i	$P_{i,0} = f(x_i)$	$P_{i,1}$	$P_{i,2}$
0	1	3.577422742688568	4.684607408443278
1	2.718281828459045	5.053668963694848	
2	7.38905609893065		

2.718281828459045, and $P_{2,0}(1.5) = f(2) \approx 7.38905609893065$. So

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{0,1}(1.5) &= \frac{(1.5 - x_1)P_{0,0}(1.5) - (1.5 - x_0)P_{1,0}(1.5)}{x_0 - x_1} \\
&= \frac{(1.5 - 1)(1) - (1.5 - 0)(2.718281828459045)}{0 - 1} \\
&\approx 3.577422742688568 \\
P_{1,1}(1.5) &= \frac{(1.5 - x_2)P_{1,0}(1.5) - (1.5 - x_1)P_{2,0}(1.5)}{x_1 - x_2} \\
&= \frac{(1.5 - 2)(2.718281828459045) - (1.5 - 1)(7.38905609893065)}{1 - 2} \\
&\approx 5.053668963694848 \\
P_{0,2}(1.5) &= \frac{(1.5 - x_2)P_{0,1}(1.5) - (1.5 - x_0)P_{1,1}(1.5)}{x_0 - x_2} \\
&= \frac{(1.5 - 2)(3.577422742688568) - (1.5 - 0)(5.053668963694848)}{0 - 2} \\
&\approx 4.684607408443278.
\end{aligned}
$$

A tabulation of the computation may make it easier to internalize the recursion and imagine how this process might be automated. Table 3.2 shows such a tabulation. The use of this recursive formula may be more difficult than direct computation for a human being, but for a computer, using the recursion is much quicker and simpler as evidenced by a look at the pseudo-code.

Assumptions: $P_n(x)$ is the degree at most n polynomial interpolating the data

$$(x_0, f(x_0)), (x_1, f(x_1)), \ldots, (x_n, f(x_n))$$

and the value $P_n(\hat{x})$ is desired.

Input: Value $\hat{x}$; abscissas $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n$; ordinates $f(x_0), f(x_1), \ldots, f(x_n)$.

Step 1: For $i = 0 \ldots n$ do Step 2:

Step 2: Set $P_{i,0} = f(x_i)$;

Step 3: For $j = 1 \ldots n$ do Steps 4-5:

Step 4: For $i = 0 \ldots n - j$ do Step 5:

Step 5: Set $P_{i,,j} = \frac{(\hat{x} - x_{i+j})P_{i,j-1} - (\hat{x} - x_i)P_{i+1,j-1}}{x_i - x_{i+j}}$

Output: Table of values, P. $P_{0,n}$ holds the desired value, $L_n(\hat{x})$.

Uniqueness

There are some subtleties we have thus far glossed over. When we introduced the Lagrange form, we casually stated "L_n is called the *Lagrange form* of P_n", implying that the Lagrange form gives the interpolating polynomial *of least degree* (since P_n is defined as such)! This fact is far from obvious. Nonetheless, we went on as if it were obvious that L_n and P_n were one and the same polynomial. Worse yet, when we came around to discussing Neville's Method, we calculated $P_{0,2}(1.5)$ and compared it to $L_2(1.5)$ from earlier with the implication that they should be the same, again as if it were simply given that $P_{0,2}$ and L_2 should be the same polynomial. The following result shows that our blind faith that P_n, L_n, and $P_{0,n}$ amount to different names for the same object was not misplaced (by virtue of the fact that they all interpolate the same data and have degree at most n).

Theorem 7. *The polynomial, P_n, of least degree interpolating the data $(x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$ exists and is unique. Moreover, any interpolating polynomial of degree at most n is equal to P_n.*

Proof. By construction, L_n interpolates the data. Moreover, the degree of L_n is at most n since it is the sum of polynomials p_i each with degree exactly n. Thus P_n exists and has degree at most n [at this point, we must admit that the degree of P_n may be less than that of L_n]. Now suppose q is any polynomial interpolating $(x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$ with degree n or less. Then the polynomial $f = P_n - q$ also has degree n or less. Moreover, $f(x_i) = P_n(x_i) - q(x_i) = y_i - y_i = 0$ for all $i - 0, \ldots, n$. Thus f has $n+1$ roots. Alas, the only way f can have $n+1$ roots and have degree n or less is if f is identically 0. Hence $f(x) = P_n(x) - q(x) = 0$, implying $P_n(x) = q(x)$ for all x.   □

Octave

The indices presented in the pseudo-code are predicated on indexing starting with 0, as in the mathematical description. In Octave, however, indices can not be 0. They are always positive integers. A slight modification of the indices is required to accommodate this discrepancy.

```
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
% Written by Leon Brin                           22 March 2014 %
% Purpose: This function implements Neville's method for       %
%          computing the value P(xhat) of the interpolating   %
%          polynomial P passing through the data (x(1),y(1)),  %
%          (x(2),y(2)),...,(x(n),y(n)).                        %
% INPUT: value xhat; array x of abscissas; array y of         %
%          ordinates.                                         %
% OUTPUT: table of values Q; Q(1,n)=P(xhat).                   %
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
function Q = nevilles(xhat,x,y)
  n=length(x);
  for i=1:n
    Q(i,1)=y(i);
  end%for
  for j=2:n
    for i=1:n+1-j
      Q(i,j)=((xhat-x(i+j-1))*Q(i,j-1)-(xhat-x(i))*Q(i+1,j-1))/(x(i)-x(i+j-1));
    end%for
  end%for
end%function
```

Key Concepts

Interpolating function: A function whose graph is required to pass through a set of prescribed points.

Interpolating polynomial: A polynomial whose graph is required to pass through a set of prescribed points.

Interpolating polynomial of least degree: The polynomial of least degree interpolating a given set of $n+1$ data points is unique. We denote this polynomial by P_n.

Interpolating polynomial of degree at most n: The polynomial interpolating $n+1$ distinct points has degree at most n and is equal to the polynomial of least degree interpolating the points.

Generalized Rolle's theorem: Suppose that f has n derivatives on (a, b) and $f, f', f'', \ldots, f^{(n-1)}$ are all continuous on $[x_0, x_n]$. If $f(x_0) = f(x_1) = \cdots = f(x_n)$ for some $x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_n$, then there exists $\xi \in (a, b)$ such that $f^{(n)}(\xi) = 0$.

Lagrange form of an interpolating polynomial: The Lagrange form, L_n, of the polynomial of degree at most n interpolating the points $(x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$ is given by the formula

$$L_n(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{p_i(x)}{p_i(x_i)} y_i,$$

where $p_i(x) = \prod_{\substack{j=0 \\ j \neq i}}^{n} (x - x_j) = (x - x_0) \cdots (x - x_{i-1})(x - x_{i+1}) \cdots (x - x_n)$.

Interpolation error: For P_n, the interpolating polynomial of least degree passing through the $n+1$ points $(x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$, there is a value $\xi_x \in (a, b)$ such that

$$f(x) - P_n(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x)}{(n+1)!}(x - x_0)(x - x_1)\cdots(x - x_n),$$

assuming f has $n+1$ derivatives on (a, b) and $f, f', f'', \ldots, f^{(n)}$ are all continuous on $[a, b]$, and where $a = \min(x_0, \ldots, x_n, x)$ and $b = \max(x_0, \ldots, x_n, x)$.

Sidi's Method: A root-finding method summarized by the formula

$$x_{n+1} = x_n - \frac{f(x_n)}{p'_{n,k}(x_n)}$$

where $p_{n,k}$ is the interpolating polynomial passing through the points

$$(x_n, f(x_n)), (x_{n-1}, f(x_{n-1})), \ldots, (x_{n-k}, f(x_{n-k})).$$

Neville's Method: A method for computing the interpolating polynomial of least degree or values of it based on the recursive relation

$$P_{i,m+1}(x) = \frac{(x - x_{i+m+1})P_{i,m}(x) - (x - x_i)P_{i+1,m}(x)}{x_i - x_{i+m+1}}$$

$$P_{i,0}(x) = f(x_i)$$

where $P_{k,l}$ is the polynomial of least degree interpolating the data

$$(x_k, f(x_k)), (x_{k+1}, f(x_{k+1})), \ldots, (x_{k+l}, f(x_{k+l})).$$

Exercises

1. Write down the Lagrange interpolating polynomial passing through $(1, 2)$, $(1.5, -0.83)$, and $(2.11, -1)$.

2. Find a polynomial that passes through the four points

   $$(0, 0), \ (1, 2), \ (4, -3), \text{ and } (10, -1).$$

3. Construct the (at most) quadratic Lagrange Polynomial interpolating the data.

   (a) $(1, 1)$, $(2, 1)$, and $(3, 2)$

   (b) $(0, 10)$, $(30, 58)$, $(1029, -32)$

   (c) $(-10, 10)$, $(20, 58)$, $(1019, -32)$ [S]

   (d)

x	$f(x)$
5	15
200	2
10	15

   (e)

x	$f(x)$
-5	15
-2	2
3	15

4. Suppose the data from question 3 were taken from an appropriately differentiable function f. Use the interpolating polynomial you found in question 3 to estimate $f(1.3)$. [S]

5. Find the estimate in question 4 using Neville's Method. [S]

6. Given the following data for $f(x)$, approximate $f(0.3)$ using an interpolating polynomial of degree at most

   (a) 1

   (b) 2

   (c) 3

x	0	1	2	3
$f(x)$	0.8	0.7	0.75	0.5

7. Given the following data for $f(x)$, approximate $f(3)$ using an interpolating polynomial of degree at most [S]

   (a) 1

   (b) 2

   (c) 3

x	2	3.5	4	5
$f(x)$	0.8	0.7	0.75	0.5

8. Use interpolating polynomials of degrees one, two, and three to approximate each of the following:

   (a) $f(0.43)$ if $f(0) = 1$, $f(0.25) = 1.64872$, $f(0.5) = 2.71828$, $f(0.75) = 4.48169$.

   (b) $f(0.18)$ if $f(0.1) = -0.29004986$, $f(0.2) = -0.56079734$, $f(0.3) = -0.81401972$, $f(0.4) = -1.0526302$. [S]

   (c) $f(2.26)$ if $f(1) = 1.654$, $f(1.5) = -2.569$, $f(2) = -1.329$, $f(2.5) = 1.776$. [S]

(d) $f(11.26)$ if $f(10) = -0.7865$, $f(11) = -1.2352$, $f(12) = -0.8765$, $f(13) = 0.0021$.

9. Let $x_0 = 1$, $x_1 = 1.25$, and $x_2 = 1.6$. Using data at these x_i, construct interpolating polynomials of degrees at most one and at most two and use them to approximate $f(1.4)$. Find the absolute errors.

   (a) $f(x) = \sin \pi x$ [S]

   (b) $f(x) = \sqrt[3]{x-1}$

   (c) $f(x) = e^{2x-4}$

   (d) $f(x) = \ln(10x)$

10. Use formula 3.2.3 to find theoretical error bounds for the approximations in question 9. Compare the bound to the actual error. [S]

11. A Lagrange interpolating polynomial is constructed for the function $f(x) = (\sqrt{2})^x$ using $x_0 = 0$, $x_1 = 1$, $x_2 = 2$, $x_3 = 3$. It is used to approximate $f(1.5)$. Find a bound on the error in this approximation.

12. Find the polynomial referred to in question 11. Then

    (a) use the polynomial to approximate $f(1.5)$.

    (b) calculate the actual error of this approximation, and compare it to the bound you calculated in question 11.

13. ⟳ Use Neville's Method to find the approximation in question 11.

14. The height of a model rocket is given at several times in the following table. Approximate the height of the rocket at time $t = 0.6$ sec using at least two different sets of points. Comment on which approximation is likely most accurate.

Time (sec)	Height (ft)
0.53238	30.0534
0.56040	32.7929
0.58842	35.4956
0.61644	38.1575

15. The following table results from using Neville's Method to approximate $f(0.4)$.

0	1	2.6	$P_{0,2}$	3.016
0.25	2	$P_{1,1}$	2.96	
0.5	$P_{2,0}$	2.4		
0.75	8			

Determine $f(0.5)$. [A]

16. $L_3(x) = -7x^3 + 57x^2 - 134x + 78$ is the degree (at most) 3 interpolating polynomial for the data in the table. Find ω. [A]

x	0.5	0.8	ω	1.4
y	24.375	3.696	0	-17.088

17. Let $P_3(x)$ be the interpolating polynomial for the data $(0,0)$, $(0.5, y)$, $(1,3)$, $(2,2)$. Find y if the coefficient of x^3 in $P_3(x)$ is 6.

18. Let $f(x) = \sqrt{x - x^2}$ and $P_2(x)$ be the interpolating polynomial on $x_0 = 0$, x_1, and $x_2 = 1$. Find the largest value of x_1 in $(0,1)$ for which $f(0.5) - P_2(0.5) = -0.25$.

19. The interpolating polynomial on $n+1$ points does not always have degree n. It has degree at most n. Plot the data $(1,1)$, $(2,3)$, $(3,5)$, and $(4,7)$, and make a conjecture as to the degree of the polynomial interpolating these four points. What led you to your conjecture?

20. Use Neville's Method to find the polynomial described in question 19. Does it have the degree you expected?

21. Let

$$x_j = 1 - \frac{1}{j+1} \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$$
$$f(x) = 5 + 3x^{2014}$$
$$P_n(x) = \text{the interpolating polynomial}$$
$$\text{passing through}$$
$$(x_0, f(x_0)), \ldots, (x_n, f(x_n)).$$

Find

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} P_n(1).$$

[A]

22. Let $f(x) = e^{-x}$. Two different numbers are chosen at random from the interval $[0,1]$, say x_0 and x_1. Then the points $(x_0, f(x_0))$ and $(x_1, f(x_1))$ are used to get a linear Lagrange interpolation approximation to f over the interval $[0,1]$. Find a bound (good for the entire interval and every pair of points x_0 and x_1) for the error in using this approximation.

23. Supply the inductive proof that $P_{0,n}$ is the polynomial of degree at most n interpolating the data $(x_0, f(x_0)), (x_1, f(x_1)), \ldots, (x_n, f(x_n))$. See notes on page 106.

3.3   Newton Polynomials

In this section, we are interested in an efficient automated process for calculating interpolating polynomials. The Lagrange form of an interpolating polynomial is best suited for pencil and paper calculations, not computer automation. Neville's method is well suited for computing the value of an interpolating polynomial at a particular point, not calculation of the polynomial itself. True, Neville's Method *can* be used to calculate the interpolating polynomials themselves, but it lends itself to this task no better than the Lagrange form. Presently, we will discover how the same recursive formula used in Neville's Method is used to derive a very efficient, computer-friendly method for calculating interpolating polynomials themselves. The result of the computation is a set of coefficients for the Newton form of a polynomial.

Suppose we have already computed the polynomial $N_n(x)$ interpolating the data

$$(x_0, f(x_0)), (x_1, f(x_1)), \ldots, (x_n, f(x_n)).$$

We now wish to compute the polynomial $N_{n+1}(x)$ interpolating the data

$$(x_0, f(x_0)), (x_1, f(x_1)), \ldots, (x_{n+1}, f(x_{n+1})),$$

and we would like to recycle the work we have already done (much the same way we could add a point of interpolation in Neville's Method and reuse all previous work)! One way to attack the problem is to find a polynomial $q(x)$ such that

$$N_{n+1}(x) = N_n(x) + q(x).$$

If the attack is to be successful, we must have $q(x) = N_{n+1}(x) - N_n(x)$ for all x, and, in particular, $q(x_j) = N_{n+1}(x_j) - N_n(x_j)$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n+1$. But $N_{n+1}(x_j) - N_n(x_j) = f(x_j) - f(x_j) = 0$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$, and $N_{n+1}(x_{n+1}) - N_n(x_{n+1}) = f(x_{n+1}) - N_n(x_{n+1})$. In other words, we seek the polynomial q interpolating the points

$$(x_0, 0), (x_1, 0), \ldots, (x_n, 0), (x_{n+1}, (f - N_n)(x_{n+1})).$$

Ironically, this is a job for the Lagrange form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
q(x) &= \frac{(x - x_0) \cdots (x - x_n)}{(x_{n+1} - x_0) \cdots (x_{n+1} - x_n)}(f - N_n)(x_{n+1}) \\
&= \frac{(f - N_n)(x_{n+1})}{(x_{n+1} - x_0) \cdots (x_{n+1} - x_n)}(x - x_0) \cdots (x - x_n). \qquad (3.3.1)
\end{aligned}
$$

But $\frac{(f - N_n)(x_{n+1})}{(x_{n+1} - x_0) \cdots (x_{n+1} - x_n)}$ is just a constant, so we replace it by a_{n+1} so that we have $q(x) = a_{n+1}(x - x_0) \cdots (x - x_n)$. Of course we can calculate a_{n+1} using the formula $\frac{(f - N_n)(x_{n+1})}{(x_{n+1} - x_0) \cdots (x_{n+1} - x_n)}$, but there is a better way, which we will see shortly. We can also learn from the upcoming computation the most convenient form for N_n.

When $n = 0$, q has the form $a_1(x - x_0)$; when $n = 1$, q has the form $a_2(x - x_0)(x - x_1)$; when $n = 2$, q has the form $a_3(x - x_0)(x - x_1)(x - x_2)$; and so on. Of course $N_0(x) = a_0$ is constant since it is the interpolating polynomial of least degree passing through a single point. So $N_1(x) = N_0(x) + a_1(x - x_0)$ immediately takes the form $a_0 + a_1(x - x_0)$; $N_2(x)$ immediately takes the form $a_0 + a_1(x - x_0) + a_2(x - x_0)(x - x_1)$; $N_3(x)$ immediately takes the form $a_0 + a_1(x - x_0) + a_2(x - x_0)(x - x_1) + a_3(x - x_0)(x - x_1)(x - x_2)$; and so on. This would suggest that the most convenient form for N_{n+1}, the one that requires no simplification, is

$$N_{n+1}(x) = a_0 + a_1(x - x_0) + a_2(x - x_0)(x - x_1) + \cdots + a_{n+1}(x - x_0) \cdots (x - x_n). \qquad (3.3.2)$$

Given in this form, the unknown quantity, a_{n+1}, appears as the coefficient of the x^{n+1} term. Consequently, a_{n+1} is *potentially* the leading coefficient of N_{n+1}. If a_{n+1} were zero, then we would not call it the leading coefficient. We will facilitate the rest of this discussion by introducing the following term. For an interpolating polynomial on $k + 1$ points, the coefficient of its x^k term is called its **potential leading coefficient** (even if it happens to be zero). Since this potential leading coefficient is the crux of our problem, we focus attention on determining the potential leading coefficient of any interpolating polynomial.

Here is where the recursive formula

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{i,m+1}(x) &= \frac{(x - x_{i+m+1})P_{i,m}(x) - (x - x_i)P_{i+1,m}(x)}{x_i - x_{i+m+1}} \\
P_{i,0}(x) &= f(x_i)
\end{aligned}
$$

used in devising Neville's Method comes in handy. In as much as $P_{i,m}$ and $P_{i+1,m}$ both have degree at most m, their potential leading coefficients are the coefficients of their x^m terms. It follows that the coefficient of the x^{m+1} term of $(x - x_{i+m+1})P_{i,m}(x)$ equals the potential leading coefficient of $P_{i,m}(x)$, and, similarly, the coefficient of the x^{m+1} term of $(x - x_i)P_{i+1,m}$ equals the potential leading coefficient of $P_{i+1,m}$. Therefore the coefficient of the x^{m+1} term of $(x - x_{i+m+1})P_{i,m}(x) - (x - x_i)P_{i+1,m}(x)$ is the difference of the potential leading coefficients of $P_{i,m}$ and $P_{i+1,m}$. To simplify the discussion, we use the notation $f_{i,j}$ for the potential leading coefficient of $P_{i,j}$. Now the coefficient of the x^{m+1} term of $(x - x_{i+m+1})P_{i,m}(x) - (x - x_i)P_{i+1,m}(x)$ is just $f_{i,m} - f_{i+1,m}$. Hence the potential leading coefficient $f_{i,m+1}$ of $P_{i,m+1}$ (the coefficient of the x^{m+1} term of $P_{i,m+1}$) is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{i,m+1} &= \frac{f_{i,m} - f_{i+1,m}}{x_i - x_{i+m+1}} \qquad\qquad (3.3.3) \\
f_{i,0} &= f(x_i).
\end{aligned}
$$

Crumpet 21: DividedDifferences

While we choose to use the notation $f_{i,j}$ for the potential leading coefficient of $P_{i,j}$, it is much more customary to use the expanded notation $f[x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_{i+j}]$ for this quantity, and to call it a jth divided difference.

Finally, we have a formula for the potential leading coefficient that recycles previous calculations. Since N_{n+1} and $P_{0,n+1}$ interpolate the same set of points and both have degree at most $n+1$, they are equal by theorem 7. Therefore, their potential leading coefficients, a_{n+1} and $f_{0,n+1}$ are equal. By recursion 3.3.3, we then have $a_{n+1} = f_{0,n+1} = \frac{f_{0,n} - f_{1,n}}{x_0 - x_{n+1}}$.

It can not be stressed enough that we have not discovered a new polynomial. We have only discovered a new way to calculate the same old interpolating polynomials. N_n, L_n, and $P_{0,n}$ all interpolate the same data and all have degree at most n. They are therefore equal by theorem 7. Just the forms in which they are written possibly differ. The polynomial form in equation 3.3.2 is called the Newton form.

Crumpet 22: Newton Polynomials

Typically, the Newton form and divided differences are presented completely independent of Neville's recursive formula, an approach that takes considerably more work to develop. There are reasons to do so, however. Refraining from the use of Neville's formula follows more closely the historical development of the subject since Newton (1643–1727) preceeded Neville (1889-1961) by over 200 years! Moreover, following the historical development more naturally leads to further study of divided differences.

As an example, take the polynomial interpolating $f(x) = e^x$ at $x = 0, 1, 2$, as we did in the discussion of Neville's Method on page 105. $f_{0,0} = f(0) = 1$, $f_{1,0} = f(1) \approx 2.718281828459045$, and $f_{2,0} = f(2) \approx 7.38905609893065$. So

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{0,1} &= \frac{f_{0,0} - f_{1,0}}{x_0 - x_1} = \frac{1 - 2.718281828459045}{0 - 1} \\
&\approx 1.718281828459045 \\
f_{1,1} &= \frac{f_{1,0} - f_{2,0}}{x_1 - x_2} = \frac{2.718281828459045 - 7.38905609893065}{1 - 2} \\
&\approx 4.670774270471606 \\
f_{0,2} &= \frac{f_{0,1} - f_{1,1}}{x_0 - x_2} = \frac{1.718281828459045 - 4.670774270471606}{0 - 2} \\
&\approx 1.47624622100628.
\end{aligned}
$$

Table 3.3: Newton form example, calculating $N_2(x)$.

x_i	$f_{i,0} = f(x_i)$	$f_{i,1}$	$f_{i,2}$
0	1	1.718281828459045	1.47624622100628
1	2.718281828459045	4.670774270471606	
2	7.38905609893065		

Therefore, $N_2(x) = 1 + 1.718281828459045(x) + 1.47624622100628(x)(x - 1)$. $f_{0,i}$ are the coefficients of N_n. Though this computation is manageable without a table, it is most convenient to tabulate the values of $f_{i,j}$ as they are computed (just as is the case for Neville's Method). This is true for both humans and computers! A tabulation of the computation makes it easier to internalize the recursion and imagine how this process might be automated. Table 3.3, which is is called a table of divided differences (or divided difference table), shows such a tabulation. Adding a data point to the interpolation is as easy as computing another diagonal of coefficients (just like Neville's Method).

Sidi's Method

We now return attention to Sidi's k^{th} degree root-finding method,

$$x_{n+1} = x_n - \frac{g(x_n)}{p'_{n,k}(x_n)},$$

where $p_{n,k}$ is the interpolating polynomial passing through the points

$$(x_n, g(x_n)), (x_{n-1}, g(x_{n-1})), \ldots, (x_{n-k}, g(x_{n-k})).$$

In its Newton form,

$$p_{n,k}(x) = g_{n,0} + g_{n-1,1}(x - x_n) + g_{n-2,2}(x - x_n)(x - x_{n-1}) + \cdots + g_{n-k,k}(x - x_n) \cdots (x - x_{n-k}),$$

so

$$p'_{n,k}(x_n) = g_{n-1,1} + g_{n-2,2}(x_n - x_{n-1}) + \cdots + g_{n-k,k}(x_n - x_{n-1}) \cdots (x_n - x_{n-k}). \tag{3.3.4}$$

In particular,

$$p'_{n,2}(x_n) = g_{n-1,1} + (x_n - x_{n-1})g_{n-2,2}$$

and

$$p'_{n,3}(x_n) = g_{n-1,1} + (x_n - x_{n-1})g_{n-2,2} + (x_n - x_{n-1})(x_n - x_{n-2})g_{n-3,3}$$

and so on. As a nested product,

$$p'_{n,k}(x_n) = g_{n-1,1} + (x_n - x_{n-1}) \left[g_{n-2,2} + (x_n - x_{n-2}) \left[\cdots + (x_n - x_{n-k}) \left[g_{n-k,k} \right] \cdots \right] \right].$$

The nested form is particularly efficient for implementation.

> **Assumptions:** g is k times differentiable.
>
> **Input:** Initial values $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_k$; diagonal entries $g_{k,0}, g_{k-1,1}, \ldots, g_{0,k}$ of the divided difference table for g.
>
> **Step 1:** Set $s = g_{0,k}$;
>
> **Step 2:** For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$ do Step 3:
>
> > **Step 3:** Set $s = (x_k - x_i)s + g_{i,k-i}$;
>
> **Step 4:** Set $x_{k+1} = x_k - \dfrac{g_{k,0}}{s}$;
>
> **Output:** Approximation x_{k+1}.

While this pseudo-code is good as far as it goes, it is far from complete. The most obvious deficiency is that it only executes one step of Sidi's Method. A less obvious deficiency is that its input and output do not match in type or quantity, so at the end of the routine, the computer is still not ready to compute another iteration. What we get from this routine is x_{k+1}. What we need to run it again are the two arrays $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_k$ and $g_{k,0}, g_{k-1,1}, \ldots, g_{0,k}$. In order to prepare these arrays for the next iteration, we must re-index the values of x_i and then compute new values for the $g_{i,k-i}$.

Assumptions: g is k times differentiable.

Input: Initial values $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_k$; diagonal entries $g_{k,0}, g_{k-1,1}, \ldots, g_{0,k}$ of the divided difference table for g.

Step 1: Set x_{k+1} according to Sidi's Method applied to $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_k$ and $g_{k,0}, g_{k-1,1}, \ldots, g_{0,k}$;

Step 2: Set $g_{k+1,0} = g(x_{k+1})$;

Step 3: For $i = k, k-1, \ldots, 1$ do Step 4:

Step 4: Set $g_{i,k+1-i} = \dfrac{g_{i+1,k-i} - g_{i,k-i}}{x_{k+1} - x_i}$;

Output: Approximations $x_1, \ldots, x_{k+1}$ and corresponding diagonal entries $g_{k+1,0}, g_{k,1}, \ldots, g_{1,k}$ of the divided difference table for g.

This new pseudo-code, which utilizes the previous pseudo-code in its first step is an improvement. Now the input and output match in type and quantity, meaning the output of this routine may be used as input for the next iteration. However, this routine still only calculates one step of Sidi's Method. Moreover, we have been ignoring another issue. Each of the routines spelled out in pseudo-code so far assume we have the diagonal entries of the corresponding divided difference table. It is not good practice to make the user of the code worry about this detail. The routine we write should supply these values. After all, the end-user, the person trying to find a root of a function, will only have immediate access to the function and some number of initial values. The routine must supply the rest. Finally, we present pseudo-code in the spirit of other root-finding methods.

Assumptions: g has a root at $\hat{x}$; g is k times differentiable; $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_k$ are sufficiently close to $\hat{x}$.

Input: Initial values $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_k$; function g; desired accuracy tol; maximum number of iterations N.

Step 1: For $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k$ do Step 2:

Step 2: Set $g_{i,0} = g(x_i)$;

Step 3: For $j = 1, 2, \ldots, k$ do Steps 4-5:

Step 4: For $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k-j$ do Step 5:

Step 5: Set $g_{i,j} = \dfrac{g_{i+1,j-1} - g_{i,j-1}}{x_{i+j} - x_i}$

Step 6: For $i = 1 \ldots N$ do Steps 7-11:

Step 7: Compute $x = x_{k+1}$ according to Sidi's Method applied to $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_k$ and $g_{k,0}, g_{k-1,1}, \ldots, g_{0,k}$;

Step 8: If $|x - x_k| \le tol$ then return x;

Step 9: Compute $g_{k+1,0}, g_{k,1}, \ldots, g_{1,k}$;

Step 10: Set $x_0 = x_1$; $x_1 = x_2$; $\cdots$ $x_{k-1} = x_k$; $x_k = x$;

Step 11: Set $g_{k,0} = g_{k+1,0}$; $g_{k-1,1} = g_{k,1}$; $\cdots$ $g_{0,k} = g_{1,k}$;

Step 12: Print "Method failed. Maximum iterations exceeded."

Output: Approximation x near exact fixed point, or message of failure.

As complete as this latest pseudo-code is, it leaves one item unaddressed. It requires k initial values to run Sidi's k^{th} degree method. When we encountered the secant method, we noted that needing two initial values as opposed to one was a disadvantage. The disadvantage is only magnified in Sidi's Method where $k + 1$ initial values are required. However, just as with the secant method, we can automatically generate initial values if needed. If Sidi's Method is given one initial value, x_0, and we are trying to find a root of the function g, then we can set $x_1 = x_0 + g(x_0)$ just as we did for the secant method. You may recall, this was not particularly successful, however. The secant method often failed to converge with this selection of initial condition.

Much less is known about Sidi's method and how the selection of intial values affects convergence. It might make an interesting project to analyze good and bad practices for selecting initial values. In any case, if you have initial values $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_j$ with $1 < j < k$, the remaining $k + 1 - j$ intial values can be found using Sidi's Method of degree j (on $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_j$) to get x_{j+1} followed by using Sidi's Method of degree $j + 1$ (on $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{j+1}$) to get x_{j+2} followed by using Sidi's Method of degree $j + 2$ (on $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{j+2}$) to get x_{j+3}, and so on until x_k is computed.

Octave

As is the case with Neville's Method, the Octave code follows identically its corresponding pseudo-code except that indices have been modified to accommodate indexing beginning with 1, not 0.

```
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
% Written by Dr. Len Brin            1 April 2014 %
% Purpose: Implementation of Sidi's Method        %
% INPUT: function g; initial values x0,x1,...,xk; %
%         tolerance TOL; maximum number of        %
%         iterations N                            %
% OUTPUT: approximation X and number of iterations %
%         i; or message of failure                %
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
function [X,j] = sidi(x, TOL, N, g)
  n=length(x);
  for i=1:n
    G(i,1)=g(x(i));
  end%for
  for j=2:n
    for i=1:n+1-j
      G(i,j)=(G(i+1,j-1)-G(i,j-1))/(x(i+j-1)-x(i));
    end%for
  end%for
  for i=1:N
    s=G(1,n);
    for j=2:n-1
      s=(x(n)-x(j))*s+G(j,n+1-j);
    end%for
    X=x(n)-G(n,1)/s;
    if (abs(X-x(n))<TOL)
      return
    end%if
    G(n+1,1)=g(X);
    for j=n:-1:2
      G(j,n+2-j)=(G(j+1,n+1-j)-G(j,n+1-j))/(X-x(j));
    end%for
    for j=1:n-1
      x(j)=x(j+1);
    end%for
    x(n)=X;
    for j=1:n
      G(n+1-j,j)=G(n+2-j,j);
    end%for
  end%for
  X = "Method failed. Maximum iterations exceeded.";
end%function
```

More divided differences

Divided difference tables are generally computed for the sake of finding coefficients for one interpolating polynomial, and one interpolating polynomial only. However, each table of divided differences is rife with representations of interpolating polynomials. One of the strengths of a divided difference table is that its entries may be reused should more data be added. This same property can be thought of in reverse. Suppose you have a divided difference table computed over 4 data values but you are only interested in an at most degree 2 interpolating polynomial. The divided difference table

$$
\begin{array}{c|cccc}
x_0 & f_{0,0} & f_{0,1} & f_{0,2} & f_{0,3} \\
x_1 & f_{1,0} & f_{1,1} & f_{1,2} \\
x_2 & f_{2,0} & f_{2,1} \\
x_3 & f_{3,0}
\end{array}
$$

actually gives us two different at most quadratic interpolating polynomials with four representations for each! First, the table was devised to compute the interpolating polynomial

$$P_3(x) = f_{0,0} + f_{0,1}(x - x_0) + f_{0,2}(x - x_0)(x - x_1) + f_{0,3}(x - x_0)(x - x_1)(x - x_2).$$

Notice that if we simply truncate the $f_{0,3}(x - x_0)(x - x_1)(x - x_2)$ term, we still have an interpolating polynomial with nodes x_0, x_1, x_2. We can support this claim in at least two ways. First, the term $f_{0,3}(x - x_0)(x - x_1)(x - x_2)$ is 0 at x_0, x_1, x_2 so it does not contribute to the interpolation at the nodes x_0, x_1, x_2. Second, we can "reverse engineer" the table, simply erasing the bottom-most diagonal. The remaining table is still a legitimate divided difference table since none of the remaining entries depends on any of the erased entries:

$$\begin{array}{c|ccc} x_0 & f_{0,0} & f_{0,1} & f_{0,2} \\ x_1 & f_{1,0} & f_{1,1} & \\ x_2 & f_{2,0} & & \end{array}$$

So

$$P_2(x) = f_{0,0} + f_{0,1}(x - x_0) + f_{0,2}(x - x_0)(x - x_1)$$

is one of the degree at most 2 interpolating polynomials. Erasing the top row of the table also leaves a legitimate divided difference table:

$$\begin{array}{c|ccc} x_1 & f_{1,0} & f_{1,1} & f_{1,2} \\ x_2 & f_{2,0} & f_{2,1} & \\ x_3 & f_{3,0} & & \end{array}$$

so

$$Q_2(x) = f_{1,0} + f_{1,1}(x - x_1) + f_{1,2}(x - x_1)(x - x_2)$$

is another degree at most 2 interpolating polynomial. Notice that P_2 and Q_2 are not just different representations of the same polynomial. They are two different polynomials! P_2 interpolates over the nodes x_0, x_1, x_2 while Q_2 interpolates over the nodes x_1, x_2, x_3.

The bottom diagonals of each truncated table give degree at most 2 interpolating polynomials as well. Remember, $f_{i,j}$ represents the potential leading coefficient of the interpolating polynomial over the nodes $x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_{i+j}$. Hence

$$\tilde{Q}_2(x) = f_{3,0} + f_{2,1}(x - x_3) + f_{1,2}(x - x_3)(x - x_2)$$

interpolates over the nodes x_3, x_2, x_1 and

$$\tilde{P}_2(x) = f_{2,0} + f_{1,1}(x - x_2) + f_{0,2}(x - x_2)(x - x_1)$$

interpolates over the nodes x_2, x_1, x_0. These are not new polynomials. These are new representations for P_2 and Q_2. Actually, $\tilde{P}_2 = P_2$ and $\tilde{Q}_2 = Q_2$.

The critical feature of each of these interpolating polynomial representations is that each successive coefficient depends on all the same nodes as its predecessor, plus one new one. For example, $f_{2,0}$ depends on x_2, $f_{1,1}$ depends on x_2 and x_1, and $f_{0,2}$ depends on x_2, x_1, and x_0. Hence, these three coefficients can be used to produce the interpolating polynomial over the nodes x_0, x_1, x_2 in the form of polynomial $\tilde{P}_2$ (which, as we have already noted, equals P_2). Another representation for the same polynomial can be written by utilizing $f_{1,0}$ (which depends on x_1), $f_{0,1}$ (which depends on x_1 and x_0), and $f_{0,2}$ (which depends on x_1, x_0, x_2):

$$\hat{P}_2(x) = f_{1,0} + f_{0,1}(x - x_1) + f_{0,2}(x - x_1)(x - x_0)$$

to give a representation of the polynomial interpolating over x_0, x_1, x_2 (which therefore must equal P_2). There is one more representation of P_2 that can be extracted from the original divided difference table. It comes from the coefficients $f_{1,0}, f_{1,1}, f_{0,2}$. Can you write it down? Answer on page 120. There are two more representations of Q_2 that can be extracted from the original divided difference table. Can you write them down? Answers on page 120.

Key Concepts

Newton form of an interpolating polynomial: The Newton form, N_n, of the polynomial of degree at most n interpolating the points $(x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$ is

$$N_n(x) = a_0 + a_1(x - x_{i_0}) + a_2(x - x_{i_0})(x - x_{i_1}) + \cdots + a_n(x - x_{i_0}) \cdots (x - x_{i_{n-1}})$$

for n distinct indices $i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_{n-1}$ from the set $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. The Newton form for a particular set of data is not unique.

potential leading coefficient: For an interpolating polynomial on $k + 1$ points, the coefficient of its x^k term is called its potential leading coefficient.

divided differences: The coefficients of the Newton form of an interpolating polynomial are called divided differences.

Exercises

1. Modify the Neville's Method pseudo-code on page 107 to produce pseudo-code for computing the coefficients of N_n.

2. Modify the Neville's Method Octave code on page 108 to produce octave code for computing the coefficients of N_n. Test it by computing N_2 interpolating $f(x) = e^x$ at $x = 0, 1, 2$ and comparing your result to that on page 112.

3. Let $f(0.1) = 0.12$, $f(0.2) = 0.14$, $f(0.3) = 0.13$, and $f(0.4) = 0.15$.

    (a) Find the leading coefficient of the polynomial of least degree interpolating these data.

    (b) Suppose, additionally, that $f(0.5) = 0.11$. Use your previous work to find the leading coefficient of the polynomial of least degree interpolating all of the data.

4. Find a Newton form of the polynomial of degree at most 3 interpolating the points $(1, 2)$, $(2, 2)$, $(3, 0)$ and $(4, 0)$. [S]

5. Use the method of divided differences to find the at most second degree polynomial interpolataing the points $(0, 10)$, $(30, 58)$, $(1029, -32)$. [A]

6. Use divided differences to find an interpolating polynomial for the data $f(1) = 0.987$, $f(2.2) = -0.123$, and $f(3) = 0.432$. [S]

7. Create a divided differences table for the following data using only pencil and paper.

$$f(1.2) = 2.2 \quad f(1.4) = 2.1 \quad f(1.6) = 2.3$$

    (a) What is the interpolating polynomial of degree at most 2? Does it actually have degree 2?

    (b) Write down two distinct linear interpolating polynomials for this data based on your table.

8. Use divided differences to find the at most cubic polynomial of exercise 19 of section 3.2. Does it have the expected degree? [A]

9. Find the degree at most two interpolationg polynomial of the form

$$p_n(x) = a_0 + a_1(x - x_0) + a_2(x - x_0)(x - x_1) + \cdots + a_n(x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_{n-1})$$

for the data in the table.

x	2	3	4
$f(x)$	3	5	4

10. Use the Octave code from question 2 to compute the interpolating polynomial of at most degree four for the data:

x	$f(x)$
0.0	-6.00000
0.1	-5.89483
0.3	-5.65014
0.6	-5.17788
1.0	-4.28172

Then add $f(1.1) = -3.9958$ to the table, and compute the interpolating polynomial of degree at most 5 using a calculator. You may use the Octave code to check your work. [S]

11. ⟳ Use the Octave code from question 2 to find interpolating polynomials of degrees (at most) one, two, and three for the following data. Approximate $f(8.4)$ using each polynomial.

$$f(8.1) = 16.94410, \ f(8.3) = 17.56492,$$
$$f(8.6) = 18.50515, \ f(8.7) = 18.82091$$

12. Find a bound on the error in using the interpolating polynomial of question 6 to approximate $f(2)$ assuming that all derivatives of f are bounded between -2 and 1 over the interval $[1, 3]$. [S]

13. Regarding the polynomial of question 9,

    (a) use the polynomial to approximate $f(2.5)$; and

    (b) assuming $f \in C^3$, find a theoretical bound on the error of approximating $f(x)$ on the interval $[2, 4]$.

14. [A]

    (a) Find an error bound, in terms of $f^{(4)}(\xi_{8.4})$, for the approximation $P_3(8.4)$ in question 11.

    (b) Find an error bound, in terms of $f^{(4)}(x)$, for the approximation $P_3(x)$ in question 11 good for any $x \in [8.1, 8.7]$.

    (c) Suppose $f^{(4)}(x) = x \cos x - e^x$ for the function $f(x)$ of question 11. Use this information to find an error bound for the approximation $P_3(x)$ good for any $x \in [8.1, 8.7]$.

15. Buck spilled coffee on his divided differences table, obscuring several numbers. Nevertheless, there is enough legible information to find the at most degree 3 polynomial interpolating the data. Find it. [A]

16. Show that the polynomial interpolating the following data has degree 3.

x	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
$f(x)$	1	4	11	16	13	-4

17. For a function f, Newton's divided difference formula gives the interpolating polynomial

$$N_3(x) = 1 + 4x + 4x(x - 0.25) + \frac{16}{3}x(x - 0.25)(x - 0.5)$$

on the nodes $x_0 = 0$, $x_1 = 0.25$, $x_2 = 0.5$, $x_3 = 0.75$. Find $f(0.75)$. [S]

18. Match the function with its Seeded Sidi method convergence diagram. In each case, Sidi's 6th degree method was used. The real axis passes through the center of each diagram, and the imaginary axis is represented, but is not necessarily centered. [S]

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(x) &= \sin x \\
g(x) &= \sin x - e^{-x} \\
h(x) &= e^x + 2^{-x} + 2\cos x - 6 \\
l(x) &= 56 - 152x + 140x^2 - 17x^3 - 48x^4 + 9x^5
\end{aligned}
$$

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

19. Match the function with its Seeded Sidi method convergence diagram. The real axis passes through the center of each diagram, and the imaginary axis is represented, but is not necessarily centered. [A]

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(x) &= x^4 + 2x^2 + 4 \\
g(x) &= (x^2)(\ln x) + (x-3)e^x \\
h(x) &= 1 + 2x + 3x^2 + 4x^3 + 5x^4 + 6x^5 \\
l(x) &= (\ln x)(x^3 + 1)
\end{aligned}
$$

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

20. You have found the following Octave function with no comments (boo to the author of the function!).

```
function ans = foo(x,y,x0)
  n = length(x);
  ans = 0;
  for i=1:n
```

```
      a=1;
      for j=1:n
        if (j==i)
          a=a*y(i);
        else
          a=a*(x0-x(j))/(x(i)-x(j));
        endif
      endfor
      ans=ans+a;
    endfor
  endfunction
```

What is the output (`ans`) of the Octave command

$$\texttt{foo([1.1,1.2,1.3,1.4],[.78,.81,.79,.75],1.2)}$$

and why?

Answers

P_2 **from** $f_{1,0}, f_{1,1}, f_{0,2}$: $\overline{P}_2(x) = f_{1,0} + f_{1,1}(x - x_1) + f_{0,2}(x - x_1)(x - x_2)$

Q_2 **two new ways:** $\hat{Q}_2(x) = f_{2,0} + f_{1,1}(x - x_2) + f_{1,2}(x - x_2)(x - x_1)$ and $\overline{Q}_2(x) = f_{2,0} + f_{2,1}(x - x_2) + f_{1,2}(x - x_2)(x - x_3)$

Numerical Calculus

4.1   Rudiments of Numerical Calculus

The basic idea

$g(x) = x - \frac{2\pi}{3}\sin(x)$ has a root between 0 and π. You are trying various methods and become interested in how the choice of initial value affects the results. Using Newton's Method, you do some research into how the choice of x_0 affects x_2. You run some tests and come up with the following data.

x_0	x_2
93/70	2.084603181618954
95/70	2.055494116570853
97/70	2.030278824314539
99/70	2.009751835391139
101/70	1.993574976724822
103/70	1.981091507449763
105/70	1.971614474758557

Using fixed point iteration on $f(x) = \frac{2\pi}{3}\sin(x)$, you decide to examine how the choice of x_0 affects x_{10}, not x_2 since fixed point iteration generally converges slowly. You run some tests on this method and come up with the following data.

x_0	x_{10}
1/7	1.949880891899200
2/7	1.951091775564697
3/7	1.923339403354019
4/7	1.941460911122824
5/7	1.960870620285721
6/7	1.965674866641883
1	1.961228252911260

In the Newton's Method experiment, x_2 is a function of x_0, and in the fixed point iteration experiment, x_{10} is a function of x_0. So you start to think of them completely independently from the original root-finding question. As they sit in their tabular form, they are just two functions for which you know a handful of values and not much more. What do these functions look like? Do we have enough information to perhaps find their derivatives, and hence local extrema? Can we find their antiderivatives? This is the stuff of numerical calculus. We can certainly approximate these things.

In chapter 3 we learned how to approximate functions by interpolation, so we know we can use the tabular data to approximate the functions themselves. But what about their derivatives and integrals? Well, polynomials are easy to differentiate and integrate. Perhaps we can use the derivatives and integrals of interpolating polynomials to approximate the derivatives and integrals of $x_2(x_0)$ and $x_{10}(x_0)$. Indeed we can!

In order to avoid the confusion of using x_0 for multiple purposes, we will rename our functions $\nu(x)$ for $x_2(x_0)$ and $\varphi(x)$ for $x_{10}(x_0)$. Hence we have $\nu(93/70) = 2.0846\ldots$, $\nu(95/70) = 2.0554\ldots$, and so on. Similarly, we have now $\varphi(1/7) = 1.9498\ldots$, $\varphi(2/7) = 1.9510\ldots$, and so on. We will also take up the

practice of calling the x-coordinates of the prescribed interpolation points nodes. Hence the nodes we have for ν are 93/70, 95/70, and so on. The nodes we have for φ are 1/7, 2/7, and so on.

Crumpet 23: ν and φ

ν is the (lower case) thirteenth letter of the Greek alphabet and is pronounced `noo`. φ is the (lower case) twenty-first letter of the Greek alphabet and is pronounced `fee`. The letter `fee` is also written ϕ, but in mathematics it is much more common to see the variant φ, perhaps to avoid confusion between `fee` and the empty set, $\emptyset$. The capital versions of ν and φ are N and Φ, respectively.

We begin by considering interpolating polynomials on three nodes. For ν, we use the nodes 93/70, 99/70, and 1.5, and get

$$P_{2,\nu}(x) = .07673215587088045x^2 - .07445530457646088x + 1.95895140161684.$$

For φ, we use the nodes 1/7, 4/7, and 1, and get

$$P_{2,\varphi}(x) = 2.498590686342254x^2 - 7.726543017101505x + 7.939599956140455.$$

We have added a second subscript to P_2 in order to distinguish the interpolating polynomial for ν from that for φ. Now we can approximate derviatives and integrals for both ν and φ using $P_{2,\nu}$ and $P_{2,\varphi}$, respectively:

$$\nu'(x) \approx P'_{2,\nu}(x) = 4.997181372684508x - 7.726543017101505$$
$$\varphi'(x) \approx P'_{2,\varphi}(x) = .1534643117417609x - .07445530457646088$$
$$\int \nu\,dx \approx \int P_{2,\nu}dx = .8328635621140847x^3 - 3.863271508550753x^2 + 7.939599956140455x + C$$
$$\int \varphi\,dx \approx \int P_{2,\varphi}dx = .02557738529029348x^3 - .03722765228823044x^2 + 1.95895140161684x + D.$$

So, for example,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nu'(1.4) &\approx P'_{2,\nu}(1.4) \\
&= 4.997181372684508(1.4) - 7.726543017101505 \\
&= -.7304890953431942 \\
\varphi'(0.5) &\approx P'_{2,\varphi}(0.5) \\
&= .1534643117417609(0.5) - .07445530457646088 \\
&= .002276851294419568
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{1.4}^{1.5} \nu(x)dx &\approx \int_{1.4}^{1.5} P_{2,\nu}(x)dx \\
&= \left[.8328635621140847x^3 - 3.863271508550753x^2 + 7.939599956140455x\right]_{1.4}^{1.5} \\
&= .1991481658283149 \\
\int_0^1 \varphi(x)dx &\approx \int_0^1 P_{2,\varphi}(x)dx \\
&= \left[.02557738529029348x^3 - .03722765228823044x^2 + 1.95895140161684x\right]_0^1 \\
&= 1.947301134618903.
\end{aligned}
$$

That's it! This exercise encapsulates the entire strategy. Given some values of an otherwise unknown function, we will approximate the unkown function with a polynomial. We will then approximate derivatives and integrals of the unknown function by differentiating and integrating the polynomial. There is

Table 4.1: Estimating the derivatives and integrals of ν and φ.

quantity	using P_2	using P_6
$\nu'(1.4)$	$-.7304890953431942$	$-.7178145479410887$
$\varphi'(0.5)$	$.002276851294419568$	$.1447147284558277$
$\int_{1.4}^{1.5} \nu(x)dx$	$.1991481658283149$	$.1991932206801721$
$\int_0^1 \varphi(x)dx$	1.947301134618903	1.925578216262883

very little more to be said about the idea. There is, however, a lot more to be said about automation, accuracy, and efficiency, the focus of the rest of the chapter. But before we tackle those issues, we will have another look and ν and φ.

Using all the nodes of ν, and the help of a computer algebra system, we compute the sixth degree interpolating polynomial

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{6,\nu}(x) \quad = \quad & -1342.393417879939x^6 + 11632.43754466623x^5 - 41996.4789301455x^4 \\
& +80851.91317212582x^3 - 87536.60487741232x^2 + 50528.3026241064x \\
& -12144.27629915625.
\end{aligned}
$$

Using all the nodes of φ (and a comuter algebra system) we compute the sixth degree interpolating polynomial

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{6,\varphi}(x) \quad = \quad & -25.41848741926543x^6 + 97.00017832506126x^5 - 147.1805326076494x^4 \\
& +111.7996194440324x^3 - 43.71110414341027x^2 + 8.049781257197147x \\
& +1.421773396945804.
\end{aligned}
$$

Again we have added a second subscript in order to distinguish the interpolating polynomial for ν from that for φ. Now we can get second estimates for $\nu'(1.4)$, $\varphi'(0.6)$, $\int_{1.4}^{1.5} \nu \, dx$, and $\int_0^1 \varphi \, dx$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nu'(1.4) \quad &\approx \quad P'_{6,\nu}(1.4) \approx -.7178145479410887 \\
\varphi'(0.5) \quad &\approx \quad P'_{6,\varphi}(0.5) \approx .1729311759579151 \\
\int_{1.4}^{1.5} \nu(x)dx \quad &\approx \quad \int_{1.4}^{1.5} P_{6,\nu}(x)dx \approx .1991932206801721 \\
\int_0^1 \varphi(x)dx \quad &\approx \quad \int_0^1 P_{6,\varphi}(x)dx \approx 1.925578216262883.
\end{aligned}
$$

Table 4.1 summarizes the eight estimates we have made so far. The first four digits of the estimates of $\int_{1.4}^{1.5} \nu(x)dx$ agree, and the first two of $\int_0^1 \varphi(x)dx$ agree. So there is some agreement for the estimates of the integrals. The estimates for the derivatives don't agree quite as well, however. The estimates for $\nu'(1.4)$ only agree in their first significant digit. They both suggest $\nu'(1.4) \approx -.7$. But there is essentially no agreement between the estimates of $\varphi'(0.5)$. One approximation is more than 60 times the other! Based on this simple analysis, we should have a hard time believing either estimate of $\varphi'(0.5)$. And we should only trust the first few digits of the others. We will see later that we can use this type of comparison to have the computer decide whether an approximation is good or not.

Issues

There are three issues with the method of estimating derivatives and integrals just outlined.

1. **Efficiency.** For illustrative purposes and understanding the basic concept of numerical calculus, it is a good idea to calculate some interpolating polynomials as done in the previous subsection. However, it is cumbersome and time-consuming to do so. We will dedicate significant energy into finding shortcuts to this direct method, thus making it more efficient and practical.

2. **Automation.** Numerical methods are meant to be run by a computer, not a human with a calculator. We need to find ways that a computer can handle interpolating polynomials. This issue has intimate ties with efficiency. After all, what will make an algorithm efficient is if it can be executed quickly by a computer!

3. **Accuracy.** So far we have done very little to determine how accurate our approximations are. We need to get a better handle on the error terms in order to understand how to use the method accurately.

Presently, we make strides toward addressing all three of these issues, but we leave the bulk of it for the upcoming sections.

In chapter 3 we labeled the nodes of an interpolating function $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n$. It will be beneficial to begin calling them $x_0 + \theta_0 h, x_0 + \theta_1 h, \ldots, x_0 + \theta_n h$ instead. And for most of our analysis, we will use $x_0 + \theta h$ instead of x for the point at which we desire an estimate. One might call this substitution a change of variables or a recalibration of the x-axis.

To see how this helps with the analysis, consider the degree at most 2 interpolating polynomial of f with nodes

$$x_0 + \theta_0 h, \ x_0 + \theta_1 h, \ \text{and} \ x_0 + \theta_n h.$$

In the notation of chapter 3, we have

$$P_2(x) = \frac{(x - x_1)(x - x_2)}{(x_0 - x_1)(x_0 - x_2)} f(x_0) + \frac{(x - x_0)(x - x_2)}{(x_1 - x_0)(x_1 - x_2)} f(x_1) + \frac{(x - x_0)(x - x_1)}{(x_2 - x_0)(x_2 - x_1)} f(x_2),$$

but with the new notation, we replace x_0 by $x_0 + \theta_0 h$, x_1 by $x_0 + \theta_1 h$, x_2 by $x_0 + \theta_2 h$, and x by $x_0 + \theta h$, giving us

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_2(x_0 + \theta h) \ &= \ \frac{(\theta - \theta_1)(\theta - \theta_2)}{(\theta_0 - \theta_1)(\theta_0 - \theta_2)} f(x_0 + \theta_0 h) \\
&+ \frac{(\theta - \theta_0)(\theta - \theta_2)}{(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(\theta_1 - \theta_2)} f(x_0 + \theta_1 h) \\
&+ \frac{(\theta - \theta_0)(\theta - \theta_1)}{(\theta_2 - \theta_0)(\theta_2 - \theta_1)} f(x_0 + \theta_2 h).
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.1.1}
$$

For the most part, we have just swapped x for θ and x_i for θ_i. This benign-looking change is actually a huge step forward! This formula makes it apparent that the actual values of the x_i are not important. It is only their location relative to some base point, x_0, measured by some characteristic length, h, that matters. θ and the θ_i are those measures. Essentially this makes x_0 the origin and h the unit of measure on the x-axis. We measure all values by how many lengths of h they are from x_0.

To illustrate the benefit, let us assume that we have three nodes, equally spaced, so the least and greatest nodes are the same distance from the third, middle node. Setting the central node as the base point, x_0, and the characteristic length, h, to the distance from this central node to the others, we can then label them

$$x_0 - h, \ x_0, \ \text{and} \ x_0 + h.$$

And we have already arrived at the essential point. It doesn't matter if the set of nodes is $\{1, 2, 3\}$ or $\{80, 90, 100\}$ or $\{-4.3, -4.2, -4.1\}$. In each of these sets, we have three nodes, one of which is the midpoint of the other two. Each set of nodes is equal to the set $\{x_0 - h, x_0, x_0 + h\}$ for some values of x_0 and h. Hence, if we can do any analysis with the set $\{x_0 - h, x_0, x_0 + h\}$, then we get information about working with any of the sets of nodes $\{1, 2, 3\}$ or $\{80, 90, 100\}$ or $\{-4.3, -4.2, -4.1\}$ and so on.

Back to the set of nodes $\{x_0 - h, x_0, x_0 + h\}$. For this set of nodes, we have $\theta_0 = -1$, $\theta_1 = 0$, and $\theta_2 = 1$. Substituting into 4.1.1,

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_2(x_0 + \theta h) \ &= \ \frac{(\theta)(\theta - 1)}{(-1)(-2)} f(x_0 - h) + \frac{(\theta + 1)(\theta - 1)}{(1)(-1)} f(x_0) + \frac{(\theta + 1)(\theta)}{(2)(1)} f(x_0 + h) \\
&= \ \frac{\theta^2 - \theta}{2} f(x_0 - h) + (1 - \theta^2) f(x_0) + \frac{\theta^2 + \theta}{2} f(x_0 + h).
\end{aligned}
$$

Now this formula can be used to get the interpolating parabola over any set of three equally spaced nodes.

In an attempt to apply this formula to ν, consider the nodes $93/70$, $99/70$, and $105/70$. Since $\frac{99}{70} - \frac{93}{70} = \frac{105}{70} - \frac{99}{70}$, we have a set of nodes of the form $\{x_0 - h, x_0, x_0 + h\}$ with $x_0 = \frac{99}{70}$ and $h = \frac{6}{70} = \frac{3}{35}$. It just

so happens that $1.4 = \frac{99}{70} - \frac{1}{6} \cdot \frac{3}{35}$, so we use $\theta = -\frac{1}{6}$ to calculate $P_{2,\nu}(1.4)$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{2,\nu}(1.4) &= P_{2,\nu}\left(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h\right) \\
&= \frac{\left(-\frac{1}{6}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{6}}{2}\nu\left(\frac{93}{70}\right) + \left(1 - \left(-\frac{1}{6}\right)^2\right)\nu\left(\frac{99}{70}\right) + \frac{\left(-\frac{1}{6}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{6}}{2}\nu\left(\frac{105}{70}\right) \\
&= \frac{7\nu\left(\frac{93}{70}\right) + 70\nu\left(\frac{99}{70}\right) - 5\nu\left(\frac{105}{70}\right)}{72} \\
&= \frac{7(2.084603181618954) + 70(2.009751835391139) - 5(1.971614474758557)}{72} \\
&= 2.019677477429439.
\end{aligned}
$$

This seems a pretty good estimate since it is between $\nu(93/70) \approx 2.085$ and $\nu(99/70) \approx 2.009$ but significantly closer to 2.009. After all, 1.4 is between $93/70 \approx 1.328$ and $99/70 \approx 1.414$ but significantly closer to 1.414. Equation 3.2.3 gives us some idea how good we might expect this estimate to be.

But let's back this calculation up just a couple steps. The constants of the $\frac{7\nu\left(\frac{93}{70}\right) + 70\nu\left(\frac{99}{70}\right) - 5\nu\left(\frac{105}{70}\right)}{72}$ step were determined purely from the values of θ and the θ_i. And the $\frac{93}{70}$, $\frac{99}{70}$, and $\frac{105}{70}$ are just the three nodes, $x_0 - h, x_0, x_{x+h}$, so what we really have here is a prescription, or formula, for the value $P_2(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h)$ for *any* degree at most 2 interpolating polynomial over the nodes $x_0 - h$, x_0, and $x_0 + h$:

$$
\nu\left(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h\right) \approx P_{2,\nu}\left(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h\right) = \frac{7\nu(x_0 - h) + 70\nu(x_0) - 5\nu(x_0 + h)}{72}.
$$

And there is nothing special about the particular ν in this formula either. None of the constants $-\frac{1}{6}$, 7, 70, -5, nor 72 is dependent on ν, but rather only dependent on the spacing of the nodes. Therefore, given any function f, we can extract from this calculation the succinct approximation formula

$$
f\left(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h\right) \approx \frac{7f(x_0 - h) + 70f(x_0) - 5f(x_0 + h)}{72}. \tag{4.1.2}
$$

This formula illustrates the real purpose in reframing the values of the x_i in terms of x_0, h, and the θ_i. This way, we get formulas applicable to a whole class of nodes, not just one particular set of nodes.

As for φ, the nodes $\frac{1}{7}$, $\frac{4}{7}$, and 1 are equally spaced, so the set $\{\frac{1}{7}, \frac{4}{7}, 1\}$ has the form $\{x_0 - h, x_0, x_0 + h\}$ where $x_0 = \frac{4}{7}$ and $h = \frac{3}{7}$. Not by accident, it happens that $\frac{4}{7} - \frac{1}{6} \cdot \frac{3}{7} = 0.5$, so $\varphi(0.5) = \varphi(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h)$ where $x_0 = \frac{4}{7}$ and $h = \frac{3}{7}$. Now we can use formula 4.1.2 to approximate $\varphi(0.5)$!

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi(0.5) &\approx P_{2,\varphi}(0.5) = \frac{7\varphi(x_0 - h) + 70\varphi(x_0) - 5\varphi(x_0 + h)}{72} \\
&= \frac{7(1.9498808918992) + 70(1.941460911122824) - 5(1.96122825291126)}{72} \\
&= 1.94090678829633.
\end{aligned}
$$

This time, we have completely circumvented any direct calculation and evaluation of $P_{2,\varphi}$. Formula 4.1.2 allows us to calculate $P_{2,\varphi}(0.5)$ directly from the values of φ at the three nodes. No need to calculate, refer back to, evaluate, or simplify $P_{2,\varphi}$! All of that has been done in deriving the formula. Very quick. Very efficient.

Stencils

A formula such as 4.1.2 is only applicable to a set of nodes and point of evaluation with the same geometry (relative positioning) as those used to derive the formula. Therefore, it will be important to keep track of the geometry used to derive such formulas. To that end, we often refer to a particular set of nodes with its corresponding point of evaluation as a stencil. For example, the nodes $x_0 - h$, x_0, $x_0 + h$ with point of evaluation $x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h$ form a stencil—a relative positioning of points that can be scaled (by changing the value of h) and translated (by changing the value of x_0). On a number line, this particular stencil looks like

x_0 can be located anywhere and h can be any size, even negative. It is this flexibility that makes formulas like 4.1.2 useful.

Now let's suppose we do not have evenly spaced data, but we are interested in a point midway between two others. An appropriate three-point stencil would use the nodes $x_0 - h$, the leftmost node, $x_0 + h$, the rightmost node, $x_0 + \theta_1 h$ for some θ_1 between -1 and 1, the middle node, and point of evaluation x_0, the point midway between the leftmost and rightmost nodes. For $\theta_1 = \frac{1}{3}$, this stencil looks like

$$x_0 - h \qquad\qquad x_0 + \frac{1}{3}h \qquad x_0 + h$$

$$x_0$$

And we can derive a formula for $P_2(x_0)$ based on the values of f at the three nodes. Plugging $\theta = 0$, $\theta_0 = -1$, $\theta_1 = \frac{1}{3}$, and $\theta_2 = 1$ into equation 4.1.1, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_2(x_0) &= \frac{(-\frac{1}{3})(-1)}{(-\frac{4}{3})(-2)}f(x_0 - h) + \frac{(1)(-1)}{(\frac{4}{3})(-\frac{2}{3})}f(x_0 + \frac{1}{3}h) + \frac{(1)(-\frac{1}{3})}{(2)(\frac{2}{3})}f(x_0 + h) \\
&= \frac{f(x_0 - h) + 9f(x_0 + \frac{1}{3}h) - 2f(x_0 + h)}{8},
\end{aligned}
$$

again a succinct formula applicable to any function f. No need to calculate the interpolating polynomial or evaluate it directly for any data that fit this stencil. That part has already been done and simplified.

Derivatives

Derivative formulas can be derived likewise. Once derived for a given stencil, they can be used very easily and efficiently for other data fitting the same stencil. We now find the formula for the first derivative, $P_2'(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h)$, over the stencil

$$x_0 - h \qquad\qquad x_0 \qquad\qquad x_0 + h$$

$$x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h$$

used earlier. We begin by recognizing that in 4.1.1 x is a function of θ. In particular, $x(\theta) = x_0 + h\theta$, so $\frac{d}{d\theta}x(\theta) = h$. By the chain rule, $\frac{d}{d\theta}P_2(\theta) = \frac{d}{dx}P_2(x) \cdot \frac{d}{d\theta}x(\theta) = h\frac{d}{dx}P_2(x)$. From equation 4.1.1, we then have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dx}P_2(x) &= \frac{\frac{d}{d\theta}P_2(\theta)}{h} \\
&= \frac{(\theta - \theta_1) + (\theta - \theta_2)}{h(\theta_0 - \theta_1)(\theta_0 - \theta_2)}f(x_0 + \theta_0 h) \\
&\quad + \frac{(\theta - \theta_0) + (\theta - \theta_2)}{h(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(\theta_1 - \theta_2)}f(x_0 + \theta_1 h) \\
&\quad + \frac{(\theta - \theta_0) + (\theta - \theta_1)}{h(\theta_2 - \theta_0)(\theta_2 - \theta_1)}f(x_0 + \theta_2 h).
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.1.3}
$$

In particular, when $\theta_0 = -1$, $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_2 = 1$, and $\theta = -\frac{1}{6}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_2'\left(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h\right) &= \frac{-\frac{1}{6} - \frac{7}{6}}{h(-1)(-2)}f(x_0 - h) + \frac{\frac{5}{6} - \frac{7}{6}}{h(1)(-1)}f(x_0) + \frac{\frac{5}{6} - \frac{1}{6}}{h(2)(1)}f(x_0 + h) \tag{4.1.4} \\
&= \frac{-2f(x_0 - h) + f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)}{3h}.
\end{aligned}
$$

We now have a formula for $P_2'(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h) \approx f'(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h)$ for the stencil with nodes $x_0 - h$, x_0, $x_0 + h$ and $x = x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h$. We can now apply this formula to approximate $\nu'(1.4)$ and $\varphi'(0.5)$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nu'(1.4) &\approx \frac{-2\nu(\frac{93}{70}) + \nu(\frac{99}{70}) + \nu(\frac{105}{70})}{3(\frac{3}{35})} \\
&= \frac{-2(2.084603181618954) + 2.009751835391139 + 1.971614474758557)}{9/35} \\
&= -.7304890953430477.
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice this is not exactly what we got in table 4.1 for $\nu'(1.4)$ using P_2. The two estimates differ in the last few digits. This is due to floating-point error affecting the calculations in different ways. Generally there is more error in calculating directly from the interpolating polynomial because the data are processed much more heavily. Best not to trust the last several digits in either calculation, however. Now

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi'(0.5) &\approx \frac{-2\varphi(\frac{1}{7}) + \varphi(\frac{4}{7}) + \varphi(1)}{3(\frac{3}{7})} \\
&= \frac{-2(1.9498808918992) + 1.941460911122824 + 1.96122825291126)}{9/7} \\
&= .002276851294420679.
\end{aligned}
$$

Again, this is close to the approximation in table 4.1, but not exactly the same due to different floating-point errors for the two calculations. But the point is made. Using a formula based on a stencil is preferable to working directly from the interpolating polynomial. It is easier, more efficient, and can be automated.

Before moving on to integration, we make one more observation. When trying to approximate f using an interpolating polynomial, it does not make much sense to consider a stencil like

,

where the point of evaluation is one of the nodes. We know, by definition of P_n, that $P_n(x_i) = f(x_i)$ for each node x_i. Hence the "formula" would be $f(x_i) = P_2(x_i)$, and it would be exact, not an approximation. And not particularly informative since this is one of the facts from which we calculated P_2! On the other hand, it does make sense to consider such a stencil when trying to approximate derivatives of f. There is no guarantee the derivative of P_n will agree with the derivative of f anywhere, even at the nodes. Substituting $\theta_0 = -1$, $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_2 = 1$, and $\theta = 0$ into 4.1.3, we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_2'(x_0) &= \frac{1}{h(-1)(-2)} f(x_0 - h) + \frac{1 + (-1)}{h(1)(-1)} f(x_0) + \frac{1}{h(2)(1)} f(x_0 + h) \\
&= \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0 - h)}{2h},
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.1.5}
$$

for example.

Integrals

For integration formulas, we use a modified stencil. We need the nodes plus the endpoints of integration, which will be identified by square brackets, [for the left endpoint and] for the right endpoint. But the process is analogous. We find a formula for the interpolating polynomial and, in place of integrating the unknown function, we integrate the interpolating polynomial.

Following this procedure, we can derive a formula for the integral of f over the stencil

,

for example. The algebra is straightforward but tedious, so we do not show it here. It is best to use a computer algebra system to derive such a formula. The result, an approximation of the integral over $[x_0 + 2.5h, x_0 + 6h]$ using nodes x_0, $x_0 + h$, $x_0 + 2h$, $x_0 + 3h$, $x_0 + 4h$, $x_0 + 5h$, and $x_0 + 6h$, is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{x_0 + 2.5h}^{x_0 + 6h} f(x)dx &\approx \frac{h}{138240} [42056 f(x_0 + 6h) + 201831 f(x_0 + 5h) + 63357 f(x_0 + 4h) \\
&\quad + 195902 f(x_0 + 3h) - 28518 f(x_0 + 2h) + 10731 f(x_0 + h) - 1519 f(x_0)].
\end{aligned}
$$

This formula can now be used to approximate $\int_{1.4}^{1.5} \nu(x)dx$ instead of integrating the interpolating polynomial directly as done on page 123. You are invited to plug in the appropriate values of ν and compare your answer to the one in table on page 123. Answer on page 130.

The stencil for the approximation of $\int_0^1 \varphi(x)dx$ using $P_{6,\varphi}$ looks like

different from the one we used to approximate $\int_{1.4}^{1.5} \nu(x)dx$. Consequently, the approximation formula is different too. We need a formula for the integral over $[x_0 - h, x_0 + 6h]$ with nodes x_0, $x_0 + h$, $x_0 + 2h$, $x_0 + 3h$, $x_0 + 4h$, $x_0 + 5h$, and $x_0 + 6h$. The nodes are the same as before, but the interval of integration is different. The result is

$$
\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} f(x)dx \quad \approx \quad \frac{h}{8640} [5257f(x_0 + 6h) - 5880f(x_0 + 5h) + 59829f(x_0 + 4h)
$$
$$
-81536f(x_0 + 3h) + 102459f(x_0 + 2h) - 50568f(x_0 + h) + 30919f(x_0)] (4.1.6)
$$

Again, a computer algebra system should be used to derive such a formula. You are now invited to plug in the appropriate values of φ to approximate $\int_0^1 \varphi(x)dx$ and compare your result to the one in table on page 123. Answer on page 130.

Key Concepts

node: the abscissa (first coordinate) of a data point used in interpolation.

polynomial approximation: approximating the value of a function, its derivative or integral based on the corresponding value of an interpolating polynomial.

stencil: relative positioning of the abscissas used in a polynomial approximation.

Exercises

1. Derive an approximation formula for the first derivative over the stencil


   following these steps. [S]

   (a) Write down $L_1(x)$, the Lagrange form of the interpolating polynomial passing through the points

   $$(x_0, f(x_0)) \quad \text{and} \quad (x_1, f(x_1)).$$

   (b) Calculate the derivative $L_1'(x)$.

   (c) Substitute $x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h$ for x and $x_0 + h$ for x_1 in your formula from (b) and simplify.

2. Derive an approximation formula for the first derivative over the stencil

   following these steps.

   (a) Write down $L_1(x(\theta)) = L_1(x_0 + \theta h)$, the Lagrange form of the interpolating polynomial passing through the points

   $$(x_0, f(x_0)) \quad \text{and} \quad (x_0 + h, f(x_0 + h))$$

   in terms of θ, h, and x_0.

   (b) Calculate the derivative $\frac{d}{dx}L_1(x(\theta))$. Remember, $x(\theta) = x_0 + \theta h$, and use the chain rule.

(c) Substitute $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ into your formula from (b) and simplify. [A]

3. Derive an approximation formula for the first derivative over the stencil

   following these steps.

   (a) Calculate $N_2(x)$, the Newton form of the interpolating polynomial passing through the points

   $$(x_0, f(x_0)), \ (x_1, f(x_1)), \ \text{and} \ (x_2, f(x_2)).$$

   (b) Calculate the derivative $N_2'(x)$.

   (c) Substitute $x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h$ for x, $x_0 + h$ for x_1, and $x_0 + 2h$ for x_2 in your formula from (b) and simplify. [A]

4. Derive an approximation formula for the second derivative over the stencil

   following these steps. [S]

   (a) Calculate $N_2(x(\theta)) = N_2(x_0 + \theta h)$, the Newton form of the interpolating polynomial passing through the points

   $$(x_0, f(x_0)), \ (x_0 + h, f(x_0 + h)),$$
   $$\text{and} \ (x_0 + 2h, f(x_0 + 2h))$$

   in terms of θ, h, and x_0.

   (b) Calculate the derivative $\frac{d^2}{dx^2}N_2(x(\theta))$. Remember, $x(\theta) = x_0 + \theta h$, and use the chain rule.

(c) Substitute $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ into your formula from (b) and simplify.

5. Formula 4.1.5 and the formula you got from question 1 should be different. However, they were derived over essentially the same stencil—two nodes with the point of evaluation centered between them. Only the labels on the stencils were different. In other words, they were derived from the same geometry, so, in some sense, must be the same. In question 1, x_0 plays the same role as $x_0 - h$ does in 4.1.5. Moreover, in question 1, the distance from the point of evaluation to either node is $\frac{h}{2}$ while in 4.1.5, that distance is h. Make the substitution x_0 for $x_0 - h$ in 4.1.5. Then make the substitution $\frac{h}{2}$ for the h in the denominator of 4.1.5. With these substitutions, formula 4.1.5 should match exactly the formula you got in question 1. In other words, different labelings in a stencil produce different labelings in the associated formula. Nothing more.

6. Use formula 4.1.6 to approximate the integral.

   (a) $\int_{-4}^{3} e^x dx$ [A]

   (b) $\int_{-1}^{6} \sin x \, dx$

   (c) $\int_{10}^{17} \frac{1}{x-5} dx$ [S]

   (d) $\int_{-3}^{4} \left(x^5 - 4\right) dx$

   (e) $\int_{0}^{1} e^{-x} dx$ [A]

   (f) $\int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \cos x \, dx$

   (g) $\int_{1}^{2} \frac{1}{x} dx$ [A]

   (h) $\int_{4}^{6.1} \left(9 - x^4\right) dx$

7. For each integral in question 6, (i) calculate the integral exactly, and (ii) calculate the absolute error in the approximation. [S] [A]

8. Let $f(x) = (x-1)^2 \sin x$. Use formula 4.1.4 to approximate $f'(0)$ using

   (a) $h = 1$
   (b) $h = \frac{1}{2}$ [A]
   (c) $h = \frac{1}{4}$
   (d) $h = \frac{1}{8}$

9. Calculate the absolute error in each approximation of question 8. Does the error get smaller as h gets smaller? [A]

10. Derive an approximation formula over the stencil

   (a) for the value of the function.

(b) for the first derivative.

(c) for the second derivative.

(d) for the third derivative. What can you say about this formula?

11. The polynomial $p(x) = 3x^4 - 2x^2 + x - 7$ is an interpolating polynomial for f. Use p to approximate

   (a) $f(1)$
   (b) $f(2)$ [A]
   (c) $f'(1)$
   (d) $f'(2)$ [S]
   (e) $\int_{0}^{1} f(x)dx$
   (f) $\int_{0}^{2} f(x)dx$ [A]

12. The polynomial $q(x) = -7x^4 + 3x^2 - x + 4$ is an interpolating polynomial for g. Use q to approximate

   (a) $g(1)$ [A]
   (b) $g(2)$
   (c) $g'(1)$ [A]
   (d) $g'(2)$
   (e) $\int_{0}^{1} g(x)dx$ [S]
   (f) $\int_{0}^{2} g(x)dx$

13. Use 4.1.3 to find the formula for the first derivative over the stencil

   (a)
   (b)
   (c)
   (d)
   (e)
   (f)
   (g)
   (h)

14. Find a general approximation formula for the integral using two nodes by doing the following.

   (a) Write down the (linear) interpolating polynomial with nodes $x_0 + \theta_2 h$ and $x_0 + \theta_3 h$.

(b) Integrate the polynomial over the interval $[x_0 + \theta_0 h, x_0 + \theta_1 h]$.

(c) Simplify. [A]

15. Use the general approximation formula you derived in question 14 to find an approximation formula over the stencil.

(a)

$x_0 \qquad\qquad x_0 + \frac{4}{3} h \quad x_0 + 2h$ [A]

(b)

$x_0 \qquad x_0 + \frac{2}{3} h \quad x_0 + \frac{4}{3} h \quad x_0 + 2h$

(c)

$x_0 \quad x_0 + \frac{1}{3} h \qquad x_0 + \frac{4}{3} h \quad x_0 + 2h$ [S]

(d)

$x_0 - \frac{1}{3} h \qquad\qquad x_0 + \frac{4}{3} h \quad x_0 + 2h$
x_0

(e)

$x_0 \qquad\qquad\qquad x_0 + h$ [A]

16. A general three point formula for the first derivative using $f(x_0)$, $f(x_0+\alpha h)$, and $f(x_0+2h)$, $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\alpha \neq 2$, is given by

$$f'(x_0) = \frac{1}{2h}\left[-\frac{2+\alpha}{\alpha}f(x_0)\right.$$
$$+\frac{4}{\alpha(2-\alpha)}f(x_0+\alpha h)$$
$$\left.-\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}f(x_0+2h)\right] + O(h^2)$$

Use Taylor expansions of $f(x_0+\alpha h)$ and $f(x_0+2h)$ to derive the given formula.

Answers

$\int_{x_0+2.5h}^{x_0+6h} f(x)dx$:

$$\frac{1/35}{138240}[42056(1.971614474758557) + 201831(1.981091507449763)$$
$$+63357(1.993574976724822) + 195902(2.009751835391139)$$
$$-28518(2.030278824314539) + 10731(2.055494116570853)$$
$$-1519(2.084603181618954)]$$

$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} f(x)dx$:

$$\frac{1/7}{8640}[5257(1.96122825291126) - 5880(1.965674866641883)$$
$$+59829(1.960870620285721) - 81536(1.941460911122824)$$
$$+102459(1.923339403354019) - 50568(1.951091775564697)$$
$$+30919(1.9498808918992)]$$

4.2 Undetermined Coefficients

The basic idea

According to equation 3.2.3, the difference between f and an interpolating polynomial is a multiple of $f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x)$. In other words, the error in approximating f by the interpolating polynomial P_n depends directly on $f^{(n+1)}$. But $f^{(n+1)}(x)$ is identically zero whenever f is a polynomial of degree less than $n+1$. Consequently, $(f - P_n)(x)$ is identically zero in this case. At the risk of sounding redundant, this last thought is worthy of repeating. If f is any polynomial of degree less than $n+1$, then P_n, computed for any set of $n+1$ nodes, equals f exactly, for all x. As a result, derivatives of P_n and integrals of P_n are not just approximations of the corresponding derivatives and integrals of f. They are exact becuase $P_n = f$ for all x. This observation can be used to derive formulas for derivatives and integrals without ever computing P_n or its derivatives or integrals!

All the formulas we have been deriving for approximating derivatives and integrals of the arbitrary function f have taken the form

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i f(x_i)$$

where $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are the nodes of the interpolating polynomial, places where the value of f is known, and the a_i are constants resulting from the derivation. The Method of Undetermined Coefficients takes a direct approach to calculating the constants a_i. Knowing that the "approximation" formula must be exact for all polynomials of degree $0, 1, \ldots, n$, we can create $n+1$ equations in the $n+1$ unkowns, $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n$. The solution of the resulting system of equations gives the values of the coefficients.

Derivatives

We seek an approximation of the kth derivative of f based on knowledge of the values $f(x_0 + \theta_0 h), f(x_0 + \theta_1 h), \ldots, f(x_0 + \theta_n h)$. To be precise, we desire an approximation of the form

$$f^{(k)}(x_0 + \theta h) \approx \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i f(x_0 + \theta_i h). \tag{4.2.1}$$

Due to equation 3.2.3, the approximation must be exact for all polynomials of degree n or less. In particular, it must be exact for the polynomials $p_j(x) = (x - x_0)^j$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. Symbolically, it must be that

$$p_j^{(k)}(x_0 + \theta h) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i p_j(x_0 + \theta_i h)$$

for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. Notice the approximation has become an (*exact*) equality. Noting that $p_j(x_0 + \theta_i h) = ((x_0 + \theta_i h) - x_0)^j = (\theta_i h)^j$, the system of equations becomes

$$p_j^{(k)}(x_0 + \theta h) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} (\theta_i h)^j a_i \tag{4.2.2}$$

for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. It is the solution of this system that will yield the a_i.

Crumpet 24: Vandermonde Matrices

In general, a system of linear equations may have zero, one, or many solutions. However, system 4.2.2 has a special form. In each equation, the constants $(\theta_i h)^j$ form a geometric progression. Such a matrix of coefficients is called a Vandermonde matrix, and it is known that as long as the θ_i are distinct, this system will have one solution.

To illustrate, suppose we have the stencil

$$x_0 - h \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad x_0 + h$$

and are interested in formulas for both the first and second derivatives of f (at x_0). For this stencil, $\theta = 0$, $\theta_0 = -1$, $\theta_1 = 0$, and $\theta_2 = 1$, so we are looking for formulas of the forms

$$
\begin{aligned}
f'(x_0) &\approx a_0 f(x_0 - h) + a_1 f(x_0) + a_2 f(x_0 + h) \\
&\quad\text{and} \\
f''(x_0) &\approx b_0 f(x_0 - h) + b_1 f(x_0) + b_2 f(x_0 + h).
\end{aligned}
$$

Each of these formulas must be exact when $f = p_0$, when $f = p_1$, and when $f = p_2$. These three requirements give three equations in the three unknowns.

Beginning with the first derivative formula, we detail system 4.2.2 with $k = 1$ and $n = 2$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_0'(x_0) &= a_0 p_0(x_0 - h) + a_1 p_0(x_0) + a_2 p_0(x_0 + h) \\
p_1'(x_0) &= a_0 p_1(x_0 - h) + a_1 p_1(x_0) + a_2 p_1(x_0 + h) \\
p_2'(x_0) &= a_0 p_2(x_0 - h) + a_1 p_2(x_0) + a_2 p_2(x_0 + h)
\end{aligned}
$$

By definition, $p_0(x) = (x - x_0)^0 = 1$ so $p_0'(x_0) = 0$; $p_1(x) = (x - x_0)^1 = x - x_0$ so $p_1'(x_0) = 1$; and $p_2(x) = (x - x_0)^2$ so $p_2'(x) = 2(x - x_0)$ giving $p_2'(x_0) = 0$. Substituting this information into the equations above,

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &= a_0 + a_1 + a_2 \\
1 &= -h a_0 + h a_2 \\
0 &= h^2 a_0 + h^2 a_2.
\end{aligned}
$$

The system can be solved by substitution, elimination, or computer algebra system. The solution is $a_0 = \frac{-1}{2h}$, $a_1 = 0$, and $a_2 = \frac{1}{2h}$, giving the approximation formula

$$f'(x_0) \approx \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0 - h)}{2h}$$

just as we got on page 127 in formula 4.1.5.

The second derivative formula is derived in the same manner. Since the second derivative formula must be exact when $f = p_0$, when $f = p_1$, and when $f = p_2$, the a_i must satisfy

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_0''(x_0) &= b_0 p_0(x_0 - h) + b_1 p_0(x_0) + b_2 p_0(x_0 + h) \\
p_1''(x_0) &= b_0 p_1(x_0 - h) + b_1 p_1(x_0) + b_2 p_1(x_0 + h) \\
p_2''(x_0) &= b_0 p_2(x_0 - h) + b_1 p_2(x_0) + b_2 p_2(x_0 + h),
\end{aligned}
$$

system 4.2.2 with $k = 2$ and $n = 2$. Notice the right-hand sides are exactly the same as they are for the first derivative formula, save the name change from a_i to b_i. Only the left-hand side changes substantively. $p_0''(x) = 0$ so $p_0''(x_0) = 0$; $p_1''(x) = 0$ so $p_1(x_0) = 0$; and $p_2''(x) = 2$ so $p_2''(x_0) = 2$. Making these substitutions into the equations above,

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &= b_0 + b_1 + b_2 \\
0 &= -h b_0 + h b_2 \\
2 &= h^2 b_0 + h^2 b_2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Again, the system can be solved by substitution, elimination, or computer algebra system. The solution is $b_0 = b_2 = \frac{1}{h^2}$ and $b_1 = \frac{2}{h^2}$, giving the approximation formula

$$f''(x_0) \approx \frac{f(x_0 + h) - 2f(x_0) + f(x_0 - h)}{h^2}.$$

Integrals

The idea for estimating integrals is identical to that of estimating derivatives. The mechanics only change nominally. Where there were derivatives before, we will have integrals now. We seek an approximation of $\int_a^b f(x)\,dx$ based on knowledge of the values $f(x_0 + \theta_0 h), f(x_0 + \theta_1 h), \ldots, f(x_0 + \theta_n h)$:

$$\int_a^b f(x)\,dx \approx \sum_{i=0}^n a_i f(x_0 + \theta_i h). \qquad (4.2.3)$$

The approximation will be exact for all polynomials of degree n or less. In particular, it will be exact for $p_j(x) = (x - x_0)^j$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. Therefore, the system of equations

$$\int_a^b p_j(x)dx = \sum_{i=0}^n (\theta_i h)^j a_i \qquad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n \qquad (4.2.4)$$

must be satisfied by the a_i.

To illustrate, suppose we have the stencil

For this stencil, $a = x_0 - h$, $b = x_0 + 6h$, and $\theta_i = ih$, $i = 0, 1, \ldots, 6$. Therefore we will have a system of seven equations in the seven unknowns. First, the left-hand sides:

$$\int_a^b p_0(x)dx = \int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} p_0(x)dx = \int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} 1 dx = (x - x_0)\big|_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} = 7h$$

$$\int_a^b p_1(x)dx = \int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} p_1(x)dx = \int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} (x - x_0)dx = \frac{1}{2}(x - x_0)^2\Big|_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} = \frac{35}{2}h^2$$

$$\int_a^b p_2(x)dx = \int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} p_2(x)dx = \int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} (x - x_0)^2 dx = \frac{1}{3}(x - x_0)^3\Big|_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} = \frac{217}{3}h^3$$

$$\int_a^b p_3(x)dx = \int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} p_3(x)dx = \int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} (x - x_0)^3 dx = \frac{1}{4}(x - x_0)^4\Big|_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} = \frac{1295}{4}h^4$$

$$\int_a^b p_4(x)dx = \int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} p_4(x)dx = \int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} (x - x_0)^4 dx = \frac{1}{5}(x - x_0)^5\Big|_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} = \frac{7777}{5}h^5$$

$$\int_a^b p_5(x)dx = \int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} p_5(x)dx = \int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} (x - x_0)^5 dx = \frac{1}{6}(x - x_0)^6\Big|_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} = \frac{46655}{6}h^6$$

$$\int_a^b p_6(x)dx = \int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} p_6(x)dx = \int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} (x - x_0)^6 dx = \frac{1}{7}(x - x_0)^7\Big|_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} = 39991h^7.$$

Now putting them together with the right-hand sides (and swapping sides):

$$\sum_{i=0}^6 (\theta_i h)^0 a_i = a_0 + a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4 + a_5 + a_6 = 7h$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^6 (\theta_i h)^1 a_i = ha_1 + 2ha_2 + 3ha_3 + 4ha_4 + 5ha_5 + 6ha_6 = \frac{35}{2}h^2$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^6 (\theta_i h)^2 a_i = h^2 a_1 + 4h^2 a_2 + 9h^2 a_3 + 16h^2 a_4 + 25h^2 a_5 + 36h^2 a_6 = \frac{217}{3}h^3$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^6 (\theta_i h)^3 a_i = h^3 a_1 + 8h^3 a_2 + 27h^3 a_3 + 64h^3 a_4 + 125h^3 a_5 + 216h^3 a_6 = \frac{1295}{4}h^4$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^6 (\theta_i h)^4 a_i = h^4 a_1 + 16h^4 a_2 + 81h^4 a_3 + 256h^4 a_4 + 625h^4 a_5 + 1296h^4 a_6 = \frac{7777}{5}h^5$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^6 (\theta_i h)^5 a_i = h^5 a_1 + 32h^5 a_2 + 243h^5 a_3 + 1024h^5 a_4 + 3125h^5 a_5 + 7776h^5 a_6 = \frac{46655}{6}h^6$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^6 (\theta_i h)^6 a_i = h^6 a_1 + 64h^6 a_2 + 729h^6 a_3 + 4096h^6 a_4 + 15625h^6 a_5 + 46656h^6 a_6 = 39991h^7$$

The system again may be solved by substitution, elimination, or computer algebra, at least in principle. Not many humans have sufficient patience and precision to solve such a system with paper and pencil,

though. Trusting a computer algebra system, the solution is $a_0 = \frac{30919}{8640}h$, $a_1 = -\frac{2107}{360}h$, $a_2 = \frac{34153}{2880}h$, $a_3 = -\frac{1274}{135}h$, $a_4 = \frac{19943}{2880}h$, $a_5 = -\frac{49}{72}h$, and $a_6 = \frac{5257}{8640}h$ giving the approximation formula

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+6h} f(x)dx \quad \approx \quad \frac{h}{8640}\left[5257f(x_0+6h) - 5880f(x_0+5h) + 59829f(x_0+4h) - 81536f(x_0+3h)\right.$$

$$\left. +102459f(x_0+2h) - 50568f(x_0+h) + 30919f(x_0)\right] \tag{4.2.5}$$

just as we got on page 128 in formula 4.1.6.

Practical considerations

We have used stencils like

and

not because the results are particularly helpful, but rather to (a) illustrate the methods and (b) emphasize that these methods work in general for any stencil you may dream up. Most of the differentiation and integration formulas presented in numerical analysis sources stick to a small host of regularly spaced stencils where, for derivatives the point of evaluation is a node, and for integrals, all the nodes lie between the endpoints or there are nodes at both endpoints. It is possible the regularly-spaced stencils are all you will ever need, but it is good to know that you can derive appropriate formulas for more unusual stencils should the need arise.

As for their derivation, the main advantage of the method of undetermined coefficients over working directly with interpolating polynomials is the ease of automation and lessening of the necessary and often laborious algebra needed. In the method of undetermined coefficients, the only polynomials that need to be differentiated or integrated are the polynomials $p_j = (x-x_0)^j$, a much simpler task than integrating or differentiating interpolating polynomials. Formulas with up to three or four nodes can be handled this way with pencil and paper. The trade off is the necessity of solving a system of equations, again a simpler task than differentiating and simplifying interpolating polynomials of degree 3 or 4. As a final benefit to the method of undetermined coefficients, it is a general solution technique used not only in numerical analysis for deriving calculus approximations, but in other studies as well, particularly differential equations. The method is applicable whenever the *form* of a solution or formula is known, but the constants (coefficients) remain a mystery.

Crumpet 25: Undetermined Coefficients in Differential Equations

---

In differential equations, we know that a particular solution of the equation

$$y - 2y' + 3y'' = 5\sin x \tag{4.2.6}$$

has the form $y = A\sin x + B\cos x$, but we do not immediately know the values of A and B. They are undetermined coefficients (at this point). They are determined by substituting the known form into the equation being solved.

$$y' = A\cos x - B\sin x$$
$$y'' = -A\sin x - B\cos x$$

So the equation being solved becomes

$$(A\sin x + B\cos x) - 2(A\cos x - B\sin x) + 3(-A\sin x - B\cos x) = 5\sin x.$$

Collecting the coefficients of $\sin x$ and $\cos x$ on the left side,

$$(-2A + 2B)\sin x + (-2A - 2B)\cos x = 5\sin x.$$

We now match coefficients on left and right sides to get the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} -2A + 2B &= 5 \\ -2A - 2B &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

whose solution is $A = -\frac{5}{4}$ and $B = \frac{5}{4}$. Therefore, $y = -\frac{5}{4}\sin x + \frac{5}{4}\cos x$ solves equation 4.2.6.

Conceptually, this process is no different from the method of undetermined coefficients used in deriving numerical calculus formulas. The solution to some problem is known, save for some (undetermined) coefficients. The parameters of the problem require the coefficients to satisfy some system of linear equations. The system is solved, and the solution to the original problem is consequently known completely, coefficients determined.

When we get involved with stencils with more than 3 or 4 nodes, solving the resulting (relatively large) system of linear equations by hand is not a task to which most of us would look forward. However, it is a standard calculation any computer algebra system can do easily and efficiently. Yes, it is advisable to use a computer algebra system to derive formulas as complicated as 4.1.6. We have used Maxima[1] to handle or double check a number of the more tedious calculations presented in this text.

Crumpet 26: wxMaxima

The best way to solve a large system of linear equations is with the aid of a computer algebra system. Figure 4.2.1 shows how wxMaxima may be used to derive formula 4.2.5.

Notice the similarities between Maxima code and Octave code. Maxima allows for statements, print statements, variable assignments, arrays, and suppression of output. The syntax for these things is not the same, but the principles behind them are. Once you have learned how to do these things in one language, learning how to do them in another is usually straightforward

Also notice the main difference between Maxima and Octave. Maxima was designed for synbolic manipulation while Octave was designed for numerical computation. Octave can be made to do symbolic calculation and Maxima can be made to do numerical computation, but the old carpenter's adage "use the right tool for the job" is worth consideration. Maxima is much more adept at symbolic manipulation than is Octave, and Octave is much more adept at number crunching than is Maxima.

Reference

http://andrejv.github.io/wxmaxima/

It is unusual to use stencils with more than five nodes anyway. It is not because the formulas for more nodes are significantly more complicated or difficult to use, however. As evidenced by formula 3.2.3, the error term for an interpolating polynomial involves higher and higher derivatives of f as more nodes are added. This is generally fine as long as f has sufficiently many derivatives and the values of the high derivatives are not prohibitively large. However, numerical methods are often employed when the smoothness of f is known to be limited, the high derivatives are known to be large, or the properties of its derivatives are unknown completely. For these functions, stencils with fewer nodes, which give rise to formulas with lower order error terms, are often *more accurate*, not less. And in the case of unknown smoothness, the lower order methods have a better chance of being accurate.

As a final note, some care must be taken not to ask too much of a derivative formula. With $n + 1$ nodes, the error term for the interpolating polynomial involves $f^{(n+1)}$, so there is no hope of using these

---

[1]See http://maxima.sourceforge.net/

Figure 4.2.1: wxMaxima deriving an integration formula

nodes to estimate $f^{(n+1)}$ or any higher derivatives at any point. If you, however, forget this fact, it shows up in a direct way in the method of undetermined coefficients. If $k > n$, then the system of equations with undetermined coefficients becomes

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} (\theta_i h)^j a_i = 0, \qquad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$$

because the kth derivative of p_j is identically 0 for all $j \leq n < k$. The only solution to this system is $a_0 = a_1 = \cdots = a_n = 0$ giving the "approximation" formula

$$f^{(k)}(x_0 + \theta h) = 0.$$

Indeed, this is exact for all polynomials of degree n or less. However, the error in using this formula is exactly $f^{(k)}(x_0 + \theta h)$, a relative error of exactly 1, making it completely useless.

Stability

In Experiment 2 on page 3, section 1.1, we took a brief look at approximating the first derivative of $f(x) = \sin x$ using the fact that

$$f'(1) = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{\sin(1+h) - \sin(1-h)}{2h}.$$

The conclusion we drew was that this computation was highly susceptible to floating-point error. If calculations are done exactly, then we expect $\frac{\sin(1+h)-\sin(1-h)}{2h}$ to approximate $f'(1)$ better and better as h becomes smaller and smaller. Not so for floating-point calculations, as the experiment revealed. There was a point at which making h smaller made the approximation worse! And this example is not unique. This problem always arises when approximating f' using the centered difference formula

$$f'(x) \approx \frac{f(x+h) - f(x-h)}{2h}. \tag{4.2.7}$$

But how can we predict at what value of h that might happen without comparing our results to the exact value of the derivative? After all, numerical differentiation is employed most often when the exact formula for the derivative is unknown or prohibitively difficult to compute.

Suppose f can be computed to near machine precision. In typical floating point calculations, including Octave, that means a relative floating-point error of approximately 10^{-15} or absolute floating-point error $\varepsilon_f \approx 10^{-15}|f(x)|$. Since we assume h is small, we can approximate both $|\tilde{f}(x+h) - f(x+h)|$ and $|\tilde{f}(x-h) - f(x-h)|$ by ε_f giving an absolute error of approximately $2\varepsilon_f$ in calculating the numerator $f(x+h) - f(x-h)$. Assuming h is calculated exactly, we have the absolute error

$$\varepsilon_r = |\tilde{f}'(x) - f'(x)| \approx \frac{2\varepsilon_f}{2h} = \frac{\varepsilon_f}{h} = \frac{|f(x)|}{10^{15}} \cdot \frac{1}{h}. \tag{4.2.8}$$

As we will see shortly, the algorithmic error, ε_a, is caused by truncation and equals $\left| \frac{f'''(\xi)}{6} h^2 \right|$ for some value of ξ near x. Since ξ is near x, we approximate $f'''(\xi)$ by $f'''(x)$ and conclude that

$$\varepsilon_a \approx \frac{|f'''(x)|}{6} h^2. \tag{4.2.9}$$

We now minimize the value of $\varepsilon_r + \varepsilon_a$ by setting its derivative (with respect to h) equal to zero and solving the resulting equation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 = \frac{d}{dh}(\varepsilon_r + \varepsilon_a) \quad &\approx \quad \frac{d}{dh}\left(\frac{|f(x)|}{10^{15}} \cdot \frac{1}{h} + \frac{|f'''(x)|}{6} \cdot h^2 \right) \\
&= \quad -\frac{|f(x)|}{10^{15}} \cdot \frac{1}{h^2} + \frac{|f'''(x)|}{3} \cdot h \\
&\Rightarrow \\
\frac{|f'''(x)|}{3} \cdot h \quad &\approx \quad \frac{|f(x)|}{10^{15}} \cdot \frac{1}{h^2} \\
h^3 \quad &\approx \quad \frac{|f(x)|}{|f'''(x)|} \cdot \frac{3}{10^{15}} \\
h \quad &\approx \quad \sqrt[3]{\frac{3|f(x)|}{|f'''(x)|}} \cdot 10^{-5}.
\end{aligned}
$$

For Experiment 2 on page 3, this means we should expect the optimal value of h to be around $\sqrt[3]{\frac{3\sin(1)}{\sin(1)}} \cdot 10^{-5} \approx 1.44(10)^{-5}$. We reproduce the table from Experiment 2 here with the addition of a third column, the actual absolute error:

h	$\tilde{p}^*(h)$	$|\tilde{p}^*(h) - f'(1)|$
10^{-2}	0.5402933008747335	$9.00(10)^{-6}$
10^{-3}	0.5403022158176896	$9.00(10)^{-8}$
10^{-4}	0.5403023049677103	$9.00(10)^{-10}$
10^{-5}	0.5403023058569989	$1.11(10)^{-11}$
10^{-6}	0.5403023058958567	$2.77(10)^{-11}$
10^{-7}	0.5403023056738121	$1.94(10)^{-10}$

Indeed, when $h = 10^{-5}$, we get our best results! However, the prediction of the optimal value of h was based on knowledge of f''', something we generally will not be able to do. Unless we happen to know that $\frac{|f(x)|}{|f'''(x)|}$ is far from 1, we assume it is reasonably close to 1, in which case the optimal value of h is around 10^{-5}. Similar estimates can be made for other derivative formulas.

Because numerical differentiation is so sensitive to floating-point error, we say that it is unstable. The root-finding methods and numerical integration we have discussed are all stable methods. Their sensitivity to floating-point error is commensurate with that of calculating f.

Key Concepts

undetermined coefficients: A method for solving problems in which the solution is known save for a set of (undetermined) coefficients.

Exercises

1. Using the method of undetermined coefficients, derive an approximation formula for the first derivative over the stencil.

   (a)
   x_0 ... $x_0 + h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h$

   (b) [A] x_0 ... $x_0 + h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{1}{4}h$

   (c) x_0 ... $x_0 + h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h$

   (d) [S] x_0 ... $x_0 + h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{3}{4}h$

   (e) x_0 ... $x_0 + h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h$

   (f) [A] $x_0 - h$ ... x_0 ... $x_0 + h$

   (g) $x_0 - h$ ... x_0 ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{1+\sqrt{7}}{3}h$

   (h) [A] $x_0 - h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... $x_0 + 3h$

   (i) $x_0 - h$ ... x_0 ... $x_0 + h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$

   (j) [S] x_0 ... $x_0 + h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h$

   (k) $x_0 - h$ ... x_0 ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{1+\sqrt{7}}{3}h$

   (l) [A] $x_0 - h$ ... x_0 ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... $x_0 + h$ ... $x_0 + 3h$

2. Using the method of undetermined coefficients, derive an approximation formula for the second derivative over the stencil.

   (a) x_0 ... $x_0 + h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h$

   (b) [A] $x_0 - h$ ... x_0 ... $x_0 + h$

   (c) $x_0 - h$ ... x_0 ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{1+\sqrt{7}}{3}h$

   (d) [A] $x_0 - h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... $x_0 + 3h$

   (e) $x_0 - h$ ... x_0 ... $x_0 + h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$

   (f) [S] x_0 ... $x_0 + h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h$

   (g) $x_0 - h$ ... x_0 ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{1+\sqrt{7}}{3}h$

   (h) [A] $x_0 - h$ ... x_0 ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... $x_0 + h$ ... $x_0 + 3h$

3. Use the method of undetermined coefficients to derive an approximation formula over the stencil

   x_0 ... $x_0 + h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... $x_0 + 3h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h$

   (a) for the value of the function.

   (b) for the first derivative.

   (c) for the second derivative.

   (d) for the third derivative. What can you say about this formula?

   (e) compare the method of undetermined coefficients to the direct method employed in question 10 of section 4.1.

4. Use the method of undetermined coefficients to derive an approximation formula over the stencil.

   (a) x_0 ... $x_0 + \frac{4}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$

   (b) [S] x_0 ... $x_0 + \frac{2}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$

   (c) x_0 ... $x_0 + \frac{1}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + h$

   (d) [A] x_0 ... $x_0 + h$

   (e) x_0 ... $x_0 + \frac{4}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$

   (f) [A] x_0 ... $x_0 + \frac{2}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{4}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$

   (g) $x_0 - \frac{1}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{4}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... x_0

   (h) [A] x_0 ... $x_0 + h$

   (i) x_0 ... $x_0 + \frac{4}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$

   (j) [A] x_0 ... $x_0 + \frac{2}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{4}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$

   (k) $x_0 - \frac{1}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{4}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$ ... x_0

   (l) [S] x_0 ... $x_0 + h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$

   (m) x_0 ... $x_0 + \frac{2}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + \frac{4}{3}h$ ... $x_0 + 2h$

5. Using the method of undetermined coefficients, find a general approximation formula for $\int_{x_0+\theta_0 h}^{x_0+\theta_1 h} f(x)dx$ using the two nodes $x_0 + \theta_2 h$ and $x_0 + \theta_3 h$.

4.3 Error Analysis

Errors for first derivative formulas

In section 3.2, we found that if f has sufficient derivatives, then f and P_n, an interpolating polynomial of degree at most n, differ according to equation 3.2.3 on page 101, copied here for convenience:

$$f(x) - P_n(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x)}{(n+1)!}(x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n).$$

We can use this formula to derive a concise formula for the error in approximating $f'(x)$ by $P_n'(x)$.

As done in section 3.2, suppose $n \geq 1$ and $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are n distinct real numbers. Set $w(x) = (x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n)$, $a = \min(x_0, \ldots, x_n, x)$, and $b = \max(x_0, \ldots, x_n, x)$. We know from equation 3.2.3 that, assuming f has $n + 1$ derivatives on (a, b) and $f', f'', \ldots, f^{(n)}$ are all continuous on $[a, b]$, for each $x \in [a, b]$,

$$f(x) - P_n(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x)}{(n+1)!}w(x)$$

for some $\xi_x \in (a, b)$. Hence

$$f'(x) - P_n'(x) = \frac{d}{dx}\left[\frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x)}{(n+1)!}\right]w(x) + \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x)}{(n+1)!}w'(x).$$

Since w vanishes at each node, this formula simplifies nicely when x is a node. Without loss of generality, we evaluate for $x = x_0$ and get

$$f'(x_0) - P_n'(x_0) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi_{x_0})}{(n+1)!}w'(x_0).$$

This expression can be simplified further by noting that

$$w'(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \prod_{\substack{j=0 \\ i \neq j}}^{n}(x - x_j) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} p_i(x).$$

But $p_i(x_0) = 0$ for all i except $i = 0$, so

$$w'(x_0) = p_0(x_0) = (x_0 - x_1)(x_0 - x_2) \cdots (x_0 - x_n).$$

Substituting this expression for w', we have the first derivative error formula

$$f'(x_0) - P_n'(x_0) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi_{x_0})}{(n+1)!}(x_0 - x_1)(x_0 - x_2) \cdots (x_0 - x_n).$$

Making the substitutions $x_0 + \theta_i h$ for x_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, to get a formula in terms of h and the θ_i:

$$f'(x_0 + \theta_0 h) - P_n'(x_0 + \theta_0 h) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi_{x_0})}{(n+1)!}(-\theta_1 h)(-\theta_2 h) \cdots (-\theta_n h).$$

This error formula simplifies just a bit:

$$f'(x_0) - P_n'(x_0) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi)}{(n+1)!}\theta_1 \theta_2 \cdots \theta_n(-h)^n. \tag{4.3.1}$$

For the stencil

$n = 4$, $\theta_1 = -1$, $\theta_2 = 1$, $\theta_3 = 2$, and $\theta_4 = 3$, so the error in calculating f' over this stencil is

$$\frac{f^{(5)}(\xi)}{120}(-1)(1)(2)(3)(-h)^4 = -\frac{f^{(5)}(\xi)}{20}h^4.$$

Error terms for the first derivative over other stencils are computed similarly. Table 4.2 summarizes some common first derivative formulas, including error terms.

Notice that the error term contains $(x_0 - x_1)(x_0 - x_2) \cdots (x_0 - x_n)$, the product of the differences between the point of evaluation and all other nodes, as a factor. When the differences between the point of evaluation and the other nodes is small, the product is small. Consequently, first derivative approximation formulas are generally more accurate when the point of evaluation is centrally located among the nodes. Hence, we might expect a first derivative formula involving nodes $x_0 < x_1 < x_2$ to be more accurate when the point of evaluation is x_1 rather than when the point of evaluation is x_0 or x_2. The same can be said about higher derivative formulas. The more centrally located the point of evaluation, the more accurate the approximation.

Errors for other formulas

It is tempting to think we can simply repeat the procedure we used with first derivatives, taking the second derivative of $f(x) - P_n(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x)}{(n+1)!} w(x)$ to find the error for second derivative estimates, and the third derivative of $f(x) - P_n(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x)}{(n+1)!} w(x)$ to find the error for third derivative estimates, and so on. Alas the matter is not so simple. Higher derivatives of $f(x) - P_n(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x)}{(n+1)!} w(x)$ involve derivatives of the factor $\frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x)}{(n+1)!}$ which do not vanish even when x is a node. Since ξ_x is entirely unknown, so are its derivatives, making this approach unworkable. Other methods for producing precise bounds for certain higher derivative formulas or certain integral formulas are limited in scope.

There is, however, a general method for determining *good enough* error terms for any derivative or integral formula. We replace each evaluation of f in the approximation by a Taylor series expanded about x_0 and simplify. This gives an expression for the approximation in terms of $f(x_0)$, $f'(x_0)$, $f''(x_0)$, and so on. We compare it to the Taylor series representation of the quantity being estimated. The difference between the two is the error. In summary, that's it. Making a rigorous argument of this method takes some care and is worthy of an example. We demonstrate the method for the approximation of the first derivative over the stencil

Again, we choose this stencil not because the stencil is generally useful, but rather to emphasize that the *method* is generally useful.

In subsection 4.1 on page 126, we derived the approximation

$$f'\left(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h\right) \approx \frac{-2f(x_0 - h) + f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)}{3h}. \tag{4.3.2}$$

The left hand side, the quantity being approximated, as a Taylor series looks like

$$f'\left(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h\right) = f'(x_0) - \frac{1}{6}hf''(x_0) + \frac{1}{72}h^2 f'''(x_0) - \frac{1}{1296}h^3 f^{(4)}(x_0) + \cdots .$$

The terms of the right hand side, the approximation, as Taylor series look like

$$f(x_0 - h) = f(x_0) - hf'(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f''(x_0) - \frac{1}{6}h^3 f'''(x_0) + \frac{1}{24}h^4 f^{(4)}(x_0) - \cdots$$
$$f(x_0) = f(x_0)$$
$$f(x_0 + h) = f(x_0) + hf'(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}h^3 f'''(x_0) + \frac{1}{24}h^4 f^{(4)}(x_0) + \cdots .$$

We now substitute these Taylor series into the right hand side of 4.3.2 and simplify. To facilitate the algebra, we begin by summing $-2f(x_0 - h) + f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)$:

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
-2f(x_0 - h) & = & -2f(x_0) + 2hf'(x_0) - h^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{3}h^3 f'''(x_0) - \frac{1}{12}h^4 f^{(4)}(x_0) - \cdots \\
f(x_0) & = & f(x_0) \\
f(x_0 + h) & = & f(x_0) + hf'(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}h^3 f'''(x_0) + \frac{1}{24}h^4 f^{(4)}(x_0) + \cdots \\
\hline
-2f(x_0 - h) + f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h) & = & 3hf'(x_0) - \frac{1}{2}h^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^3 f'''(x_0) - \frac{1}{24}h^4 f^{(4)}(x_0) + \cdots .
\end{array}
$$

Hence we have

$$\frac{-2f(x_0 - h) + f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)}{3h} = \frac{3hf'(x_0) - \frac{1}{2}h^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^3 f'''(x_0) - \frac{1}{24}h^4 f^{(4)}(x_0) + \cdots}{3h}$$

$$= f'(x_0) - \frac{1}{6}hf''(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}h^2 f'''(x_0) - \frac{1}{72}h^3 f^{(4)}(x_0) + \cdots.$$

For the error, $e(h) = f'\left(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h\right) - \frac{-2f(x_0-h)+f(x_0)+f(x_0+h)}{3h}$, we then get

$$\left(f'(x_0) - \frac{1}{6}hf''(x_0) + \frac{1}{72}h^2 f'''(x_0) - \frac{1}{1296}h^3 f^{(4)}(x_0) + \cdots \right)$$

$$- \left(f'(x_0) - \frac{1}{6}hf''(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}h^2 f'''(x_0) - \frac{1}{72}h^3 f^{(4)}(x_0) + \cdots \right)$$

$$= -\frac{11}{72}h^2 f'''(x_0) + \frac{17}{1296}h^3 f^{(4)}(x_0) + \cdots.$$

We now know that we have an error of the form $O(h^2 f'''(\xi_h))$, the form of the remaining term with least degree, but we do not have rigorous proof of that fact. Think of what has been done so far as discovery. Now that we know the f''' terms do not cancel, we go back and truncate all the Taylor series after the f'' terms, replacing higher order derivatives with an error term, and "redo" the algebra. We thus have

$$f'\left(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h\right) = f'(x_0) - \frac{1}{6}hf''(x_0) + \frac{1}{72}h^2 f'''(\xi_1)$$

$$f(x_0 - h) = f(x_0) - hf'(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f''(x_0) - \frac{1}{6}h^3 f'''(\xi_2)$$

$$f(x_0) = f(x_0)$$

$$f(x_0 + h) = f(x_0) + hf'(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}h^3 f'''(\xi_3)$$

where $\xi_1 \in (x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h, x_0)$, $\xi_2 \in (x_0 - h, x_0)$, and $\xi_3 \in (x_0, x_0 + h)$. And now when we compute $e(h) = f'\left(x_0 - \frac{1}{6}h\right) - \frac{-2f(x_0-h)+f(x_0)+f(x_0+h)}{3h}$, we know all the terms involving f, f', and f'' vanish. The only terms left are those involving f''':

$$e(h) = \frac{1}{72}h^2 f'''(\xi_1) - \frac{-2(-\frac{1}{6}h^3 f'''(\xi_2)) + \frac{1}{6}h^3 f'''(\xi_3)}{3h}$$

$$= \frac{1}{72}h^2 f'''(\xi_1) - \frac{1}{9}h^2 f'''(\xi_2) - \frac{1}{18}h^2 f'''(\xi_3)$$

$$= \frac{h^2}{9}\left[\frac{1}{8}f'''(\xi_1) - f'''(\xi_2) - \frac{1}{2}f'''(\xi_3) \right].$$

The final formality is that of converting this expression into big-oh notation:

$$|e(h)| = \left| \frac{h^2}{9}\left[\frac{1}{8}f'''(\xi_1) - f'''(\xi_2) - \frac{1}{2}f'''(\xi_3) \right] \right|$$

$$\leq \frac{h^2}{9}\left[\left| \frac{1}{8}f'''(\xi_1) \right| + |f'''(\xi_2)| + \left| \frac{1}{2}f'''(\xi_3) \right| \right]$$

$$\leq \frac{h^2}{9} \cdot \frac{13}{8} \max\{|f'''(\xi_1)|, |f'''(\xi_2)|, |f'''(\xi_3)|\}$$

$$= h^2 \cdot M|f'''(\xi_h)|$$

for some $\xi_h \in (x_0 - h, x_0 + h)$ and $M = \frac{13}{72}$ (the value of ξ_h is ξ_1, ξ_2, or ξ_3). We conclude

$$e(h) = O(h^2 f'''(\xi_h)).$$

In general, ξ_h is guaranteed to be between the least node and the greatest node. In the case of an integral approximation, the endpoints of integration are treated as nodes for the purpose of locating ξ_h.

Gaussian quadrature

Ultimately, the accuracy of a numerical calculus formula is measured by its error term, a quantity having the form $O(h^n f^{(k)}(\xi_h))$. If we are interested in the rate of convergence, we consider n, the power of h

appearing in the error term. The greater the power, the speedier the convergence. However, if we are interested in the largest class of polynomials for which the formula is exact, we need to consider the value k, the order of the derivative appearing in the error term. The greater k is, the larger the class of polynomials for which the formula is exact. In fact, if the error term contains a factor of $f^{(k)}(\xi_h)$, then the formula is exact for all polynomials up to (and including) degree $k-1$. The further implication is that there are degree k polynomials for which the formula is not exact, for if this were not the case, then the error term would involve a higher derivative. We call the value $k-1$ the degree of precision. Formally, the degree of precision of a numerical calculus formula is the integer m such that the formula is exact for all polynomials of degree up to and including m but is not exact for all polynomials of degree $m+1$. Gaussian quadrature formulas aim to maximize the degree of precision for integral formulas.

The numerical derivatives and integrals over a stencil with $n+1$ points that we have derived so far are exact for all polynomials up to degree n as they must be. They have degree of precision at least n. As it turns out, a select few have degree of precision greater than n. Consider the second derivative approximation over the stencil

$$\xrightarrow{\qquad \underset{\bullet}{-1} \qquad\qquad \underset{\circledcirc}{0} \qquad\qquad \underset{\bullet}{1} \qquad}.$$

The stencil has three points, so we expect it to be exact for all polynomials up to degree 2 (and it is). However, its error term is $O(h^2 f^{(4)}(\xi_h))$, indicating that the formula is exact for all polynomials up to degree 3. The degree of precision is actually 3, not 2. The first derivative formula over the same stencil is similar. Though it has an error term of $\frac{h^2}{6}f'''(\xi_h)$, indicating that the formula has degree of precision 2 as expected, the formula itself only involves two of the three points available! The coefficient of $f(x_0)$ turns out to be zero. It follows that we can derive the same formula using the stencil

$$\xrightarrow{\qquad \underset{\bullet}{-1} \qquad\qquad \underset{\circ}{0} \qquad\qquad \underset{\bullet}{1} \qquad},$$

having only two points yet having degree of precision 2. Several other centered differences have this attribute. The Newton-Cotes formulas with an odd number of nodes also have this property. Their error terms exceed degree of precision expectations by one degree. We noted earlier that a centrally located point of evaluation tends to increase accuracy, and now we see that the increase can be dramatic.

What we might gather from these observations is that it is not only the number of nodes that determines the error term of a numerical calculus formula. The location of the nodes is also important. Up to now, we have only seen how node location affects derivative approximation. We know that centrally locating the point of evaluation generally increases accuracy. We now take up the question of how to locate nodes in order to increase the accuracy of integral formulas. The idea of a centralized point of evaluation has no meaning in this context, however. Integrals do not have a single point of evaluation. They are taken over an interval. It is the locations of the nodes relative to the endpoints of evaluation that are important. We now find out where to put the nodes to attain the greatest degree of precision for any given number of nodes.

Let G_n be the nth Legendre polynomial, defined recursively by

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{n+1}(x) &= \frac{(2n+1)xG_n(x) - nG_{n-1}(x)}{n+1} \\
G_0(x) &= 1 \\
G_1(x) &= x.
\end{aligned}
$$

We set the θ_i equal to the roots of G_n to derive the n-point quadrature formula over the interval $[x_0 - h, x_0 + h]$ with greatest degree of precision possible. With placement of the nodes chosen, we force the formula to be exact for polynomials up to degree $n-1$ as we did earlier. The difference this time is, due to the particular values of θ_i, the resulting formula will be exact for all polynomials up to degree $2n-1$. When the nodes are placed at the roots of the nth Legendre polynomial, we get a quadrature formula for $\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx$ that exceeds the expected degree of precision by n, the number of nodes!

We demonstrate for $n=1$ and $n=3$.

$$G_1(x) = x$$

has for its only root, 0. Hence we seek a formula of the form

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx \approx a_0 f(x_0)$$

which is exact for polynomials up to degree 0. The one equation for the one unknown, a_0, is

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} (1)dx = a_0(1)$$

or $2h = a_0$. Hence we have

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx \approx 2hf(x_0),$$

which we claim has degree of precision 1, not 0. Indeed, for $f(x) = x - x_0$,

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx = \frac{1}{2}(x - x_0)^2 \Big|_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} = 0$$

and

$$2hf(x_0) = 2h(x_0 - x_0) = 0,$$

so it is exact for degree one polynomials. However, for $f(x) = (x - x_0)^2$,

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx = \frac{1}{3}(x - x_0)^3 \Big|_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} = \frac{2}{3}h^3$$

and

$$2hf(x_0) = 2h(x_0 - x_0)^2 = 0,$$

so it is not exact for all degree two polynomials. Therefore its degree of precision is 1. Note the formula $\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx \approx 2hf(x_0)$ is equivalent to the Midpoint Rule as found in Table 4.5.

Now

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_2(x) &= \frac{3xG_1(x) - G_0(x)}{2} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(3x^2 - 1)
\end{aligned}
$$

so

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_3(x) &= \frac{5xG_2(x) - 2G_1(x)}{3} \\
&= \frac{\frac{5}{2}(3x^3 - x) - 2x}{3} \\
&= \frac{5(3x^3 - x) - 4x}{6} \\
&= \frac{15x^3 - 9x}{6} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(5x^3 - 3x),
\end{aligned}
$$

which has roots $-\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}, 0, \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}$. Hence we seek a formula of the form

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx \approx a_0 f\left(x_0 - \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right) + a_1 f(x_0) + a_2 f\left(x_0 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)$$

which is exact for polynomials up to degree 2. The three equations for the three unknowns are

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} (1)dx = 2h = a_0 + a_1 + a_2$$

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} (x - x_0)dx = 0 = -\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}ha_0 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}ha_2$$

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} (x - x_0)^2 dx = \frac{2}{3}h^3 = \frac{3}{5}h^2 a_0 + \frac{3}{5}h^2 a_2.$$

The solution is

$$a_0 = a_2 = \frac{5}{9}h \quad \text{and} \quad a_1 = \frac{8}{9}h,$$

so the quadrature formula is

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx \approx \frac{h}{9}\left[5f\left(x_0 - \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right) + 8f(x_0) + 5f\left(x_0 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)\right].$$

The formula was derived to be exact for polynomials up to degree 2, so its degree of precision is at least 2. We claim the degree of precision is actually 5. For $f(x) = (x - x_0)^3$,

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx = \frac{1}{4}(x - x_0)^4\Big|_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} = 0$$

and

$$\frac{h}{9}\left[5f\left(x_0 - \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right) + 8f(x_0) + 5f\left(x_0 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)\right] = \frac{h}{9}\left[5\left(-\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)^3 + 0 + 5\left(\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)^3\right] = 0,$$

so it is exact for degree three polynomials. For $f(x) = (x - x_0)^4$,

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx = \frac{1}{5}(x - x_0)^5\Big|_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} = \frac{2}{5}h^5$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{h}{9}\left[5f\left(x_0 - \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right) + 8f(x_0) + 5f\left(x_0 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)\right] &= \frac{h}{9}\left[5\left(-\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)^4 + 0 + 5\left(\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)^4\right] \\ &= \frac{5}{9}h\left[\frac{9}{25}h^4 + \frac{9}{25}h^4\right] \\ &= \frac{2}{5}h^5,\end{aligned}$$

so it is exact for degree four polynomials. For $f(x) = (x - x_0)^5$,

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx = \frac{1}{6}(x - x_0)^6\Big|_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} = 0$$

and

$$\frac{h}{9}\left[5f\left(x_0 - \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right) + 8f(x_0) + 5f\left(x_0 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)\right] = \frac{h}{9}\left[5\left(-\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)^5 + 0 + 5\left(\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)^5\right] = 0,$$

so it is exact for degree five polynomials. However, for $f(x) = (x - x_0)^6$,

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx = \frac{1}{7}(x - x_0)^7\Big|_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} = \frac{2}{7}h^7$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{h}{9}\left[5f\left(x_0 - \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right) + 8f(x_0) + 5f\left(x_0 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)\right] &= \frac{h}{9}\left[5\left(-\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)^6 + 0 + 5\left(\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)^6\right] \\ &= \frac{5}{9}h\left[\frac{27}{125}h^6 + \frac{27}{125}h^6\right] \\ &= \frac{3}{25}h^7,\end{aligned}$$

so it is not exact for all degree six polynomials. Its degree of precision is 5. The formula is listed as the second Gaussian quadrature formula in table 4.5.

We can also find the degree of precision of any numerical calculus formula by observing the form of its error term. If the error term has the form $O(h^n f^{(k)}(\xi_h))$, then its degree of precision is $k - 1$.

Some standard formulas

Tables 4.2 , 4.3 , 4.4 , and 4.5 summarize some standard formulas for derivatives and integrals. Notice there are no one-point formulas for any derivatives, no two-point formulas for second derivatives or higher, and no three-point formulas for third derivatives or higher. The stencils have been streamlined to show only the values of θ_i. Hence the stencil

appears in the table as

Key Concepts

Degree of precision: The integer m such that a numerical calculus formula is exact for all polynomials of degree up to and including m but is not exact for all polynomials of degree $m + 1$.

Error terms: Error terms for numerical calculus approximations can be found by replacing all occurrences of f in an approximation formula by Taylor series expansions about x_0 and reducing.

Gaussian quadrature: A quadrature method which maximizes the degree of precision relative to the number of nodes used.

Quadrature: Another name for a numerical integration formula.

Weighted Mean Value Theorem: Assume that f and g are continuous on $[a, b]$. If g never changes sign and is nonnegative in $[a, b]$, then we have that,

$$\int_a^b f(x)g(x)dx = f(c) \int_a^b g(x)dx$$

for some c in (a, b).

Exercises

1. Let $f(x) = e^x - \sin x$. Complete the following table using the approximation formula

$$f'(x_0) \approx \frac{-3f(x_0) + 4f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0 + 2h)}{2h}.$$

h	approximate $f'(2)$	abs. error
.01		
.005		
−.005		
−.01		

Is it OK to use negative values for h?

2. For each value of x in the table, use the most accurate three-point formula to approximate $f'(x)$. [A]

x	$f(x)$	$f'(x)$
−2.7	0.054797	
−2.5	0.11342	
−2.3	0.65536	
−2.1	0.98472	

3. Approximate the integral using Simpson's rule.

(a) $\int_{-0.5}^{0} x \ln(x+1)dx$ [S]

(b) $\int_1^3 \ln(x+1)\, dx$

Table 4.2: Some standard first derivative formulas.

Name	Formula	Stencil
2-point formulas		
Forward Difference	$f'(x_0) = \dfrac{-f(x_0) + f(x_0+h)}{h} - \dfrac{h}{2}f''(\xi_h)$	
Backward Difference	$f'(x_0) = \dfrac{-f(x_0-h) + f(x_0)}{h} + \dfrac{h}{2}f''(\xi_h)$	
3-point formulas		
Forward Difference	$f'(x_0) = \dfrac{-3f(x_0) + 4f(x_0+h) - f(x_0+2h)}{2h} + \dfrac{h^2}{3}f'''(\xi_h)$	
Centered Difference	$f'(x_0) = \dfrac{-f(x_0-h) + f(x_0+h)}{2h} + \dfrac{h^2}{6}f'''(\xi_h)$	
Backward Difference	$f'(x_0) = \dfrac{f(x_0-2h) - 4f(x_0-h) + 3f(x_0)}{2h} + \dfrac{h^2}{3}f'''(\xi_h)$	
5-point formulas		
Forward Difference	$f'(x_0) = \dfrac{-25f(x_0) + 48f(x_0+h) - 36f(x_0+2h) + 16f(x_0+3h) - 3f(x_0+4h)}{12h} + \dfrac{h^4}{5}f^{(5)}(\xi_h)$	
	$f'(x_0) = \dfrac{-3f(x_0-h) - 10f(x_0) + 18f(x_0+h) - 6f(x_0+2h) + f(x_0+3h)}{12h} + \dfrac{h^4}{20}f^{(5)}(\xi_h)$	
Centered Difference	$f'(x_0) = \dfrac{f(x_0-2h) - 8f(x_0-h) + 8f(x_0+h) - f(x_0+2h)}{12h} + \dfrac{h^4}{30}f^{(5)}(\xi_h)$	
	$f'(x_0) = \dfrac{-f(x_0-3h) + 6f(x_0-2h) - 18f(x_0-h) + 10f(x_0) + 3f(x_0+h)}{12h} + \dfrac{h^4}{20}f^{(5)}(\xi_h)$	
Backward Difference	$f'(x_0) = \dfrac{3f(x_0-4h) - 16f(x_0-3h) + 36f(x_0-2h) - 48f(x_0-h) + 25f(x_0)}{12h} + \dfrac{h^4}{5}f^{(5)}(\xi_h)$	

Table 4.3: Some second derivative formulas.

Name	Formula	Stencil
3-point formulas		
Forward Difference	$f''(x_0) = \dfrac{f(x_0) - 2f(x_0+h) + f(x_0+2h)}{h^2} + O(hf^{(3)}(\xi_h))$	
Centered Difference	$f''(x_0) = \dfrac{f(x_0-h) - 2f(x_0) + f(x_0+h)}{h^2} + O(h^2 f^{(4)}(\xi_h))$	
4-point formulas		
Forward Difference	$f''(x_0) = \dfrac{2f(x_0) - 5f(x_0+h) + 4f(x_0+2h) - f(x_0+3h)}{h^2} + O(h^2 f^{(4)}(\xi_h))$	
	$f''(x_0) = \dfrac{f(x_0-h) - 2f(x_0) + f(x_0+h)}{h^2} + O(h^2 f^{(4)}(\xi_h))$	
5-point formulas		
Forward Difference	$f''(x_0) = \dfrac{35f(x_0) - 104f(x_0+h) + 114f(x_0+2h) - 56f(x_0+3h) + 11f(x_0+4h)}{12h^2} + O(h^3 f^{(5)}(\xi_h))$	
	$f''(x_0) = \dfrac{11f(x_0-h) - 20f(x_0) + 6f(x_0+h) + 4f(x_0+2h) - f(x_0+3h)}{12h^2} + O(h^3 f^{(5)}(\xi_h))$	
Centered Difference	$f''(x_0) = \dfrac{-f(x_0-2h) + 16f(x_0-h) - 30f(x_0) + 16f(x_0+h) - f(x_0+2h)}{12h^2} + O(h^4 f^{(6)}(\xi_h))$	

Table 4.4: Some third derivative formulas.

Name	Formula	Stencil
4-point formulas		
Forward Difference	$$f'''(x_0) = \frac{-f(x_0) + 3f(x_0 + h) - 3f(x_0 + 2h) + f(x_0 + 3h)}{h^3} + O(h)f^{(4)}(\xi_h)$$	$0\ 1\ 2\ 3$
	$$f'''(x_0) = \frac{-f(x_0 - h) + 3f(x_0) - 3f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0 + 2h)}{h^3} + O(hf^{(4)}(\xi_h))$$	$-1\ 0\ 1\ 2$
	$$f'''(x_0) = \frac{-f(x_0 - 2h) + 3f(x_0 - h) - 3f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)}{h^3} + O(hf^{(4)}(\xi_h))$$	$-2\ -1\ 0\ 1$
Backward Difference	$$f'''(x_0) = \frac{-f(x_0) + 3f(x_0 + h) - 3f(x_0 + 2h) + f(x_0 + 3h)}{h^3} + O(hf^{(4)}(\xi_h))$$	$-3\ -2\ -1\ 0$
5-point formulas		
Forward Difference	$$f'''(x_0) = \frac{-5f(x_0) + 18f(x_0 + h) - 24f(x_0 + 2h) + 14f(x_0 + 3h) - 3f(x_0 + 4h)}{2h^3} + O(h^2 f^{(5)}(\xi_h))$$	$0\ 1\ 2\ 3\ 4$
	$$f'''(x_0) = \frac{-3f(x_0 - h) + 10f(x_0) - 12f(x_0 + h) + 6f(x_0 + 2h) - f(x_0 + 3h)}{2h^3} + O(h^2 f^{(5)}(\xi_h))$$	$-1\ 0\ 1\ 2\ 3$
Centered Difference	$$f'''(x_0) = \frac{-f(x_0 - 2h) + 2f(x_0 - h) - 2f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0 + 2h)}{2h^3} + O(h^2 f^{(5)}(\xi_h))$$	$-2\ -1\ 0\ 1\ 2$
	$$f'''(x_0) = \frac{f(x_0 - 3h) - 6f(x_0 - 2h) + 12f(x_0 - h) - 10f(x_0) + 3f(x_0 + h)}{2h^3} + O(h^2 f^{(5)}(\xi_h))$$	$-3\ -2\ -1\ 0\ 1$
Backward Difference	$$f'''(x_0) = \frac{3f(x_0 - 4h) - 14f(x_0 - 3h) + 24f(x_0 - 2h) - 18f(x_0 - h) + 5f(x_0)}{2h^3} + O(h^2 f^{(5)}(\xi_h))$$	$-4\ -3\ -2\ -1\ 0$

Table 4.5: Some integration formulas.

Name	Formula	Stencil
	open Newton-Cotes formulas	
Midpoint Rule	$\displaystyle\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} f(x)dx = 2hf(x_0+h) + O(h^3 f''(\xi_h))$	
	$\displaystyle\int_{x_0}^{x_0+3h} f(x)dx = \frac{3h}{2}\left[f(x_0+h) + f(x_0+2h)\right] + O(h^3 f''(\xi_h))$	
	$\displaystyle\int_{x_0}^{x_0+4h} f(x)dx = \frac{4h}{3}\left[2f(x_0+h) - f(x_0+2h) + 2f(x_0+3h)\right] + O(h^5 f^{(4)}(\xi_h))$	
	$\displaystyle\int_{x_0}^{x_0+5h} f(x)dx = \frac{5h}{24}\left[11f(x_0+h) + f(x_0+2h) + f(x_0+3h) + 11f(x_0+4h)\right] + O(h^5 f^{(4)}(\xi_h))$	
	closed Newton-Cotes formulas	
Trapezoidal Rule	$\displaystyle\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx = \frac{h}{2}\left[f(x_0) + f(x_0+h)\right] + O(h^3 f''(\xi_h))$	
Simpson's Rule	$\displaystyle\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} f(x)dx = \frac{h}{3}\left[f(x_0) + 4f(x_0+h) + f(x_0+2h)\right] + O(h^5 f^{(4)}(\xi_h))$	
Simpson's $\frac{3}{8}$ Rule	$\displaystyle\int_{x_0}^{x_0+3h} f(x)dx = \frac{3h}{8}\left[f(x_0) + 3f(x_0+h) + 3f(x_0+2h) + f(x_0+3h)\right] + O(h^5 f^{(4)}(\xi_h))$	
Bode's Rule	$\displaystyle\int_{x_0}^{x_0+4h} f(x)dx = \frac{2h}{45}\left[7f(x_0) + 32f(x_0+h) + 12f(x_0+2h) + 32f(x_0+3h) + 7f(x_0+4h)\right] + O(h^7 f^{(6)}(\xi_h))$	
	Gaussian quadrature formulas	
	$\displaystyle\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx = h\left[f\left(x_0 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}h\right) + f\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}h\right)\right] + O(h^5 f^{(4)}(\xi_h))$	
	$\displaystyle\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx = \frac{h}{9}\left[5f\left(x_0 - \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right) + 8f(x_0) + 5f\left(x_0 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}h\right)\right] + O(h^7 f^{(6)}(\xi_h))$	

(c) $\int_{-0.25}^{0.25} (\cos x)^2 dx$ [A]

(d) $\int_1^3 e^{\sin x}\, dx$

(e) $\int_1^2 x^4\, dx$ [A]

4. Do question 4 using the Trapezoidal rule. [S] [A]

5. Do question 4 using the Midpoint rule. [S] [A]

6. Find the error of the approximation in question 3. [S] [A]

7. Find the error of the approximation in question 4. [S] [A]

8. Find the error of the approximation in question 5. [S] [A]

9. Find the error in approximating $\int_{-7}^{11}(32x^2 + \sqrt{7}x - 2)dx$ using Simpson's $\frac{3}{8}$ Rule.

10. Find the error in approximating $\int_{-17}^{36}(32x^5 + 7x^3 - 2)dx$ using Bode's Rule. [A]

11. For the following values of f, x_0, and h, use the formula

$$f'(x_0) = \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0 - h)}{2h} - \frac{h^2}{6}f'''(\xi)$$

to approximate $f'(x_0)$.

(a) $f(x) = e^x$; $x_0 = 2$; $h = 0.1$. [S]

(b) $f(x) = (\cosh 2x)^2 - \sin x$; $x_0 = \pi$; $h = 0.05$. [A]

(c) $f(x) = \ln(2x - 3) + 5x$; $x = 10$; $h = 1$.

12. Compute both a lower bound and an upper bound on the error for the approximation in question 11. Verify that the actual error is between these bounds. [S] [A]

13. For each part of question 11, find the value of ξ guaranteed by the formula. [S] [A]

14. State the degree of precision of the closed Newton-Cotes formula on 5 nodes, Bode's Rule.

15. State the degree of precision of the five point formula. [S]

$$f'(x_0) = \frac{1}{12h}\left[-25f(x_0) + 48f(x_0 + h) - 36f(x_0 + 2h)\right.$$
$$\left. +16f(x_0 + 3h) - 3f(x_0 + 4h)\right] + \frac{h^4}{5}f^{(5)}(\xi)$$

16. Find the degree of precision of the quadrature formula

$$\int_3^5 f(x)\, dx \approx \frac{1}{2}\left[3f\left(\frac{11}{3}\right) + f(5)\right].$$

17. Find the error term for the quadrature method, and state its degree of precision.

(a) $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)\, dx \approx hf(x_0)$ [A]

(b) $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)\, dx \approx hf\left(x_0 + \frac{h}{4}\right)$

(c) $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx \approx \frac{h}{4}\left[3f\left(x_0 + \frac{2}{3}h\right) + f(x_0)\right]$ [S]

(d) $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} f(x)dx \approx \frac{h}{2}\left[3f\left(x_0 + \frac{4}{3}h\right) + f(x_0)\right]$

(e) $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+3h} f(x)dx \approx \frac{3h}{4}\left[f(x_0) + 3f(x_0 + 2h)\right]$ [A]

(f) $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} f(x)dx \approx \frac{h}{2}\left[f\left(x_0 - \frac{h}{2}\right) + 3f\left(x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h\right)\right]$

(g) $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} f(x)dx \approx \frac{h}{3}\left[f(x_0 - h) - 2f(x_0) + 7f(x_0 + h)\right]$ [A]

(h) $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+3h} f(x)dx \approx 3h\left[3f\left(x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h\right) - 6f(x_0 + h) + 4f\left(x_0 + \frac{3}{4}h\right)\right]$

(i) $\displaystyle\int_{x_0}^{x_0+3h} f(x)dx \approx -\frac{h}{12}\left[208f\left(x_0+\frac{3}{2}h\right) - 891f(x_0+h) + 1344f\left(x_0+\frac{3}{4}h\right) - 625f\left(x_0+\frac{3}{5}h\right)\right]$ [A]

18. Find the error term for the derivative approximation:

(a) $f'(x_0) \approx \dfrac{f(x_0+2h) - f(x_0)}{2h}$ [A]

(b) $f'(x_0) \approx \dfrac{f(x_0+2h) - f(x_0-h)}{3h}$

(c) $f'(x_0) \approx \dfrac{-3f(x_0) + 4f(x_0+\frac{h}{2}) - f(x_0+h)}{h}$ [S]

(d) $f'(x_0) \approx \dfrac{-13f(x_0-10h) - 12f(x_0+5h) + 25f(x_0+8h)}{270h}$

(e) $f'(x_0) \approx \dfrac{-7f(x_0+h) + 416f(x_0+\frac{1}{2}h) - 2916f(x_0+\frac{1}{3}h) + 5632f(x_0+\frac{1}{4}h) - 3125f(x_0+\frac{1}{5}h)}{12h}$ [A]

(f) $f''(x_0) \approx \dfrac{2f(x_0-h) - 3f(x_0) + f(x_0+2h)}{3h^2}$

(g) $f''(x_0) \approx \dfrac{7f(x_0-5h) - 12f(x_0) + 5f(x_0+7h)}{210h^2}$ [A]

(h) $f''(x_0) \approx \dfrac{5f(x_0-5h) - 12f(x_0+2h) + 7f(x_0+7h)}{210h^2}$

(i) $f''(x_0) \approx \dfrac{5f(x_0-2h) + 32f(x_0-h) - 60f(x_0) + 25f(x_0+2h) - 2f(x_0+4h)}{60h^2}$ [A]

19. Diffy Rence writes down the following approximation:

$$f''(3.0) \approx 25[\sin(2.8) - 2\sin(3.0) + \sin(3.2)].$$

What is $f(x)$? [S]

20. Let $f(x) = \sin x$.

(a) Find a bound on the error of the approximation

$$f'(6) \approx \frac{-3\sin 6 + 4\sin 6.1 - \sin 6.2}{0.2}$$

according to the appropriate error term.

(b) Compare this bound to the actual error.

21. What can you say about the error in approximating the first derivative of

$$f(x) = -13x^4 + 17x^3 - 15x^2 + 12x - 99$$

using a 5-point formula?

22. Let $f(x) = 3x^3 - 2x^2 + x$.

(a) Compute the error (not a bound on the error) in estimating $f'(2)$ using the forward difference

$$\frac{f(x_0+h) - f(x_0)}{h}$$

with $h = 0.1$.

(b) Find $\xi_{0.1}$ as guaranteed by the error term.

23. Let $f(x) = \sin x$. Find a bound on the error of the approximation.

(a) $f''(3.0) \approx 25[\sin(2.8) - 2\sin(3.0) + \sin(3.2)]$ [A]

(b) $f''(3.0) \approx 1600\,[2\sin(3.0) - 5\sin(3.025) + 4\sin(3.05) - \sin(3.075)]$

(c) $f'''(3.0) \approx 500000\,[-5\sin(3.0) + 18\sin(3.01) - 24\sin(3.02) + 14\sin(3.03) - 3\sin(3.04)]$ [S]

(d) $f'''(3.0) \approx 1000\,[-\sin(2.8) + 3\sin(2.9) - 3\sin(3.0) + \sin(3.1)]$

(e) $\displaystyle\int_3^4 f(x)dx \approx \frac{1}{6}\,[\sin(3) + 4\sin(3.5) + \sin(4)]$

(f) $\displaystyle\int_3^4 f(x)dx \approx \frac{1}{2}\left[\sin\left(\frac{7}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\right) + \sin\left(\frac{7}{2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\right)\right]$ [S]

24. Suppose you have the following data on a function f. [S]

$$\begin{array}{c|ccccc} x & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ f(x) & -0.2381 & -0.3125 & -0.4545 & -0.8333 & -5 \end{array}$$

(a) Approximate $f'(4)$ and $f'(2)$ using 5-point formulas.

(b) Which approximation would you expect to be more accurate, and why?

(c) Did it turn out that way? The data came from $f(x) = \frac{1}{x-4.2}$.

25. Refer to the quadrature method

$$\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)\, dx = \frac{h}{2}\left[f\left(x_0 + \frac{h}{3}\right) + f\left(x_0 + \frac{2h}{3}\right) \right] + \frac{h^3}{36} f''(\xi)$$

in all of the following questions. [A]

(a) What is the rate of convergence?

(b) What is the degree of precision?

(c) Use the method to approximate $\int_0^\pi \sin x\, dx$.

(d) Find a bound on the error of this approximation.

(e) Compare the bound to the actual error.

26. The Trapezoidal rule applied to $\int_0^2 f(x)dx$ gives the value 5, and the Midpoint rule gives the value 4. What value does Simpson's rule give?

27. The Trapezoidal Rule applied to $\int_0^2 f(x)\, dx$ gives the value 4, and Simpson's Rule gives the value 2. What is $f(1)$? [A]

28. When approximating $f'''(x_0)$ using five nodes, the rate of convergence will be at least what? [A]

29. Show that the average of the forward difference, $\frac{-f(x_0)+f(x_0+h)}{h}$, and backward difference, $\frac{-f(x_0-h)+f(x_0)}{h}$, approximations of $f'(x_0)$ gives the central difference approximation, $\frac{f(x_0+h)-f(x_0-h)}{2h}$, of $f'(x_0)$.

30. Chuck was "approximating" a definite integral using Simpson's Rule. As you can see from his work below, he was integrating a cubic polynomial. Calculate the error he incurred even though you can not read all the coefficients. [A]

31. Repeat 30 supposing Chuck was using the Trapezoidal Rule. [A]

32. Sketch the graph of a function $f(x)$, and indicate on it values for x_0 and h so that the backward difference $\frac{f(x_0)-f(x_0-h)}{h}$ gives a **better** approximation of $f'(x_0)$ than does the central difference $\frac{f(x_0+h)-f(x_0-h)}{2h}$.

33. Sketch the graph of a function $f(x)$ for which the Trapezoidal Rule gives a better approximation of $\int_0^1 f(x)\, dx$ than does Simpson's Rule, and explain how you know. [S]

34. Suppose a 5 point formula is used to approximate $f''(x_0)$ for stepsizes $h = 0.1$ and $h = 0.02$. If $E_{0.1}$ represents the error in the approximation for $h = 0.1$ and $E_{0.02}$ represents the error in the approximation for $h = 0.02$, what would you expect $\frac{E_{0.1}}{E_{0.02}}$ to be, approximately? [S]

35. A general three point formula using nodes x_0, $x_0 + \alpha h$, and $x_0 + 2h$, $(\alpha \neq 0, 2)$ is given by

$$f'(x_0) \approx \frac{1}{2h}\left[-\frac{2+\alpha}{\alpha} f(x_0) + \frac{4}{\alpha(2-\alpha)} f(x_0 + \alpha h) - \frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha} f(x_0 + 2h) \right].$$

(a) Show that this formula reduces to one of the standard formulas when $\alpha = 1$.

(b) Find the error term for this formula.

36. Find three different approximations for $f'(0.2)$ using three-point formulas. [A]

x	$f(x)$
0	1
0.1	1.10517
0.2	1.22140
0.3	1.34986
0.4	1.49182

The graph of $f'''(x)$ is shown below. Use it to rank your three approximations in order from least expected error to greatest expected error, and explain why you ranked them the way you did.

37. Verify numerically that the error in using the formula $f'(x_0) = \frac{-2f(x_0-h)-3f(x_0)+6f(x_0+h)-f(x_0+2h)}{6h}$ to approximate $f'(3)$ using the function $f(x) = (\cos 3x)^2 + \ln x$ is really $O(h^3)$.

38. Numerically approximate the best estimate that can be obtained from the formula

$$f'(3) = \frac{-2f(3-h) - 3f(3) + 6f(3+h) - f(3+2h)}{6h}$$

with double precision (standard Octave) computation and $f(x) = (\cos 3x)^2 + \ln x$. What value of h gives this optimal approximation? [A]

39. Find the degree of precision of the quadrature formula

$$\int_{-1}^{1} f(x)dx = f\left(-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}\right) + f\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}\right).$$

40. The quadrature formula $\int_{0}^{2} f(x)dx = c_0 f(0) + c_1 f(1) + c_2 f(2)$ is exact for all polynomials of degree less than or equal to 2. Determine c_0, c_1, and c_2.

4.4   Composite Integration

In section 4.3 we supplied error terms that took the form $O(h^k f^{(l)}(\xi_h))$. As a prime example, the Trapezoidal Rule, $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx = \frac{h}{2}[f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)] + O(h^3 f''(\xi_h))$, has error term $O(h^3 f''(\xi_h))$. This conclusion follows directly from a Taylor series analysis, but what does it mean?

Error terms for derivative approximations are comparatively easy to understand. Consider the first derivative approximation $f'(x_0) = \frac{-f(x_0 - h) + f(x_0 + h)}{2h} + \frac{h^2}{6} f'''(\xi_h)$. The smaller h is, the smaller the error in approximating $f'(x_0)$ is (as long as the $f'''(\xi_h)$ term doesn't counteract the benefit of shrinking h). Error terms for integral approximations are not as straightforward because, in each case, the quantity being approximated depends on h. Changing h in the integration formula also changes the quantity being approximated. This is true of each formula in table 4.5. The trapezoidal rule is as good an example as any. The left hand side, the quantity being approximated, is $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx$, so smaller h means approximating the integral over a smaller interval. So how does having a smaller error in approximating a different number tell us anything about the potential benefit of computing with smaller values of h? Careful study of the trapezoidal rule will reveal the answer.

According to the trapezoidal rule, $\frac{h}{2}[f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)]$ approximates the integral of f over the interval $[x_0, x_0 + h]$. If h is replaced by $h/2$, the resulting approximation, $\frac{h}{4}[f(x_0) + f(x_0 + \frac{h}{2})]$, is an approximation of the integral of f over the interval $[x_0, x_0 + \frac{h}{2}]$. It is no longer an approximation of the integral over $[x_0, x_0 + h]$! To use the trapezoidal rule to approximate the original quantity, the integral of f over $[x_0, x_0 + h]$, using $h/2$ instead of h requires two applications of the trapezoidal rule—one over the interval $[x_0, x_0 + \frac{h}{2}]$ and one over the interval $[x_0 + \frac{h}{2}, x_0 + h]$. The sum of these two approximations is an approximation for the integral of f over $[x_0, x_0 + h]$. Reducing h further requires more applications of the trapezoidal rule over more intervals. In general, reducing h to $\frac{h}{n}$ for any whole number n requires n applications of the trapezoidal rule:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx &= \int_{x_0}^{x_0 + \frac{h}{n}} f(x)dx + \int_{x_0 + \frac{h}{n}}^{x_0 + 2\frac{h}{n}} f(x)dx + \cdots + \int_{x_0 + (n-1)\frac{h}{n}}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx \\
&\approx \frac{h}{2n}\left[f(x_0) + f\left(x_0 + \frac{h}{n}\right)\right] + \frac{h}{2n}\left[f\left(x_0 + \frac{h}{n}\right) + f\left(x_0 + 2\frac{h}{n}\right)\right] + \\
&\quad \cdots + \frac{h}{2n}\left[f\left(x_0 + (n-1)\frac{h}{n}\right) + f(x_0 + h)\right].
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.4.1}
$$

Decomposing $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx$ into the sum $\int_{x_0}^{x_1} f(x)dx + \int_{x_1}^{x_2} f(x)dx + \cdots + \int_{x_{n-1}}^{x_n} f(x)dx$ and summing approximations of these integrals is called composite integration.

As for using the trapezoidal rule to do the approximating, the error in a single application of the trapezoidal rule is $O(h^3 f''(\xi_h))$. The error in the above sum is therefore bounded by $\sum_{i=1}^{n} M\left(\frac{h}{n}\right)^3 f''(\xi_i) = Mh\left(\frac{h}{n}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f''(\xi_i)$ where $x_0 + (i-1)\frac{h}{n} < \xi_i < x_0 + i\frac{h}{n}$. Assuming f'' is continuous on $[x_0, x_0 + h]$, the intermediate value theorem allows us to replace $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f''(\xi_i)$ with $f''(\xi_n)$ for some $\xi_n \in (x_0, x_0 + h)$ because $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f''(\xi_i)$ is the average of the $f''(\xi_i)$, which is no more than the maximum of the $f''(\xi_i)$ and no less than the minimum of the $f''(\xi_i)$. Making this replacement gives us the error bound $Mh\left(\frac{h}{n}\right)^2 f''(\xi_n)$. In conclusion, the trapezoidal rule used multiple times when necessary to approximate $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx$ actually has error $O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^2 f''(\xi_n)\right)$, where n is the number of subintervals used in the calculation and ξ_n depends on n. Now the nature of the error is clearer. It is measured by how many subintervals are used in the calculation. More subintervals (greater n) means less error (assuming the benefit of more subintervals is not counteracted by the f'' factor). Other composite integration formulas are similar. If a single-interval quadrature formula has error $O(h^k f^{(l)}(\xi_h))$, then the corresponding composite version has error $O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{k-1} f^{(l)}(\xi_n)\right)$. More intervals generally means smaller error.

Composite Trapezoidal Rule

Equation 4.4.1 encapsulates the composite trapezoidal rule but does not represent the most efficient way to use it. Simplifying the expression will help. Notice that all of the function evaluations except $f(x_0)$

Table 4.6: Minimum number of intervals to achieve certain accuracies using the composite trapezoidal rule to approximate $\int_0^3 e^{-x^2} dx$.

accuracy	$2.2(10)^{-2}$	$5(10)^{-5}$	10^{-5}	10^{-7}	10^{-11}	10^{-15}
subintervals	2	3	8	75	7453	> 745300

and $f(x_0 + h)$ occur twice, so we can condense the formula to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx &\approx \frac{h}{2n}\left[f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)\right] + \frac{h}{n}\left[f\left(x_0 + \frac{h}{n}\right) + \cdots + f\left(x_0 + (n-1)\frac{h}{n}\right)\right] \\
&= \frac{h}{2n}\left[f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h) + 2\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} f\left(x_0 + i\frac{h}{n}\right)\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

This leads to the following pseudo-code where we make the substitutions $a = x_0$ and $b = x_0 + h$.

Assumptions: f has a continuous second derivative on $[a, b]$.

Input: Function f; interval over which to integrate $[a, b]$; number of subintervals n.

Step 1: Set $s = \frac{b-a}{n}$; $I = \frac{f(a)+f(b)}{2}$;

Step 2: For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$ do Step 3:

   Step 3: Set $I = I + f(a + is)$;

Step 4: Set $I = sI$;

Output: Approximate value of $\int_a^b f(x)dx$.

Other composite integration formulas should be simplified likewise to minimize the number of times f is evaluated.

Adaptive quadrature

$$
\int_0^3 e^{-x^2} dx \approx 4.57837939409486
$$

and it is simple enough to approximate this value with the composite trapezoidal rule. Table 4.6 shows the minimum number of subintervals needed to achieve various accuracies, assuming the calculations are done with enough significant digits that floating point error does not overwhelm the calculation. It should be apparent that achieving high accuracy results using the

---

Crumpet 27: error function

The error function is defined as
$$
\mathrm{erf}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^x e^{-t^2} dt
$$
and is critical in the study of statistics as it is used to calculate probabilities associated with the normal distribution. The factor $\frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}$ comes from the fact that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-t^2} dt = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}$, an interesting fact itself.

Computer algebra systems will have the error function built-in just as they do the sine or logarithm functions. Hence the easiest way to evaluate $\int_0^3 e^{-x^2} dx$ is to have a computer algebra system (or perhaps your calculator) compute $\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}\mathrm{erf}(3)$.

---

trapezoidal rule is not practical. It requires too many computations. We will take up this deficiency in the next section. For now, let's analyze the usefulness of the error bound $O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^2 f''(\xi_n)\right)$. Assuming $f''(\xi_n)$ is roughly constant, we should expect to improve our estimate from an accuracy of $2.2(10)^{-2}$ to

an accuracy of $5(10)^{-5}$, an increase in accuracy of $\frac{2.2(10)^{-2}}{5(10)^{-5}} \approx 440$ times, by increasing the number of subintervals by a factor of about $\sqrt{440} \approx 21$. In other words, we should expect it to take approximately 42 subintervals to achieve $5(10)^{-5}$ accuracy based on accuracy of $2.2(10)^{-2}$ with 2 intervals. Since it only takes 3, we conclude that the assumption that $f''(\xi_2) \approx f''(\xi_3)$ is bad! Luckily, the badness of this assumption actually works in our favor. It takes less, not more, than the expected number of intervals to achieve $5(10)^{-5}$ accuracy. On the other hand, increasing the accuracy from $5(10)^{-5}$ to 10^{-5}, an increase by a factor of 5, we should expect to need about $\sqrt{5} \approx 2.2$ times as many subintervals. $3 \times 2.2 = 6.6$, so the 8 needed is just about what we would expect. Similarly, to increase the accuracy from 10^{-5} to 10^{-7}, an increase in accuracy by a factor of 100, we should expect to need about 10 times as many subintervals. Indeed, 75 is about 10 times as many as 8. Likewise, to increase accuracy by a factor of $10,000$ (as in going from 10^{-7} to 10^{-11} or from 10^{-11} to 10^{-15}), we should expect to need to increase the number of subintervals by a factor of 100. Indeed, the table bears this estimate out as well.

Just remember, if f'' does not exist or is wildly discontinuous, or just wildly varying, the assumption that $f''(\xi_n)$ is constant could be a bad one no matter how many subintervals are used. The more common case is when f'' is continuous and reasonably tame, though. Even in this case, when the number of subintervals is small, the assumption is often not a good one, but when the number of subintervals is large, it is a pretty reliable assumption. The exact number of subintervals needed before this assumption is reasonable changes from one function to another, however.

Taking this lesson to heart, we approximate

$$\int_0^3 \left(x - e^x \cos \sqrt{e^{2x} - x^2}\right) dx$$

using the trapezoidal rule with 50 subintervals and find that it is accuracte to within about 10^{-1} of the exact value. How many subintervals should we expect to need to achieve 10^{-3} accuracy? About 10 times as many, or about 500. With 500 subintervals, we actually attain accuracy of about $.997(10)^{-3}$, spot on! The assumption that $f''(\xi_n)$ is constant seems to be valid for this integral with $n \geq 50$ (and maybe for some $n < 50$ too). Alas, this is the type of analysis that can not be done in practice. In practice, we calculate integrals numerically because we don't know how to compute their values exactly! In "real life" situations, we have no way of knowing how accurate an integral estimate is with 3 or 50 or 500 or 3000 subintervals. We need the computer to estimate errors as it calculates, just as we had it do for root-finding algorithms.

Even though we know the assumption is not perfect, especially for small n, we assume $f''(\xi_n)$ is constant, so the error of the trapezoidal rule becomes $O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^2\right)$. The f'' factor is subsumed by the implied constant of the big-oh notation. Accordingly, halving the number of intervals can be expected to increase the error by a factor of about 4. Introducing the notation $T_k(a,b)$ for the composite trapezoidal rule approximation of $\int_a^b f(x)dx$ with k subintervals and $e_k = \int_a^b f(x)dx - T_k(a,b)$ for its error,

$$e_n \approx M\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad e_{2n} \approx M\left(\frac{1}{2n}\right)^2$$

so

$$\frac{e_n}{e_{2n}} \approx \frac{M\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^2}{M\left(\frac{1}{2n}\right)^2} = 4, \quad \text{which implies} \quad e_n \approx 4e_{2n}.$$

Because $\int_a^b f(x)dx = T_2(a,b) + e_2 = T_1(a,b) + e_1$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_2(a,b) - T_1(a,b) &= e_1 - e_2 \\
&\approx 4e_2 - e_2 \\
&= 3e_2
\end{aligned}
$$

so $e_2 \approx \frac{1}{3}(T_2(a,b) - T_1(a,b))$. Explicitly,

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx - T_2(a,b) \approx \frac{1}{3}(T_2(a,b) - T_1(a,b)).$$

We now have a way of approximating the error numerically, a significant breakthrough! The error is approximately one third the difference between the trapezoidal rule approximations with one subinterval and with two.

To harness this knowledge, we need to incorporate this estimate into our calculation. Suppose we wish to estimate $\int_a^b f(x)dx$ to within an accuracy of *tol*. We begin by calculating $T_2(a,b)$ and $T_1(a,b)$. If $\frac{1}{3}|T_2(a,b)-T_1(a,b)| < tol$, we are done. $T_2(a,b)$ is our approximation. In the more likely case that $\frac{1}{3}|T_2(a,b)-T_1(a,b)| \geq tol$, we divide the interval $[a,b]$ into two subintervals, $[a,\frac{a+b}{2}]$ and $[\frac{a+b}{2},b]$ and compare our error estimates on these subintervals to $\frac{tol}{2}$. If $\frac{1}{3}\left|T_2(a,\frac{a+b}{2})-T_1(a,\frac{a+b}{2})\right| < \frac{tol}{2}$, we are done with the subinterval $[a,\frac{a+b}{2}]$. $T_2(a,\frac{a+b}{2})$ is a satisfactory approximation of $\int_a^{\frac{a+b}{2}} f(x)dx$. If not, we bisect the interval again and compare error estimates to $\frac{tol}{4}$. On the other half of $[a,b]$, if $\frac{1}{3}\left|T_2(\frac{a+b}{2},b)-T_1(\frac{a+b}{2},b)\right| < \frac{tol}{2}$, we are done with the subinterval $[\frac{a+b}{2},b]$. $T_2(\frac{a+b}{2},b)$ is a satisfactory approximation of $\int_{\frac{a+b}{2}}^b f(x)dx$. If not, we bisect the interval again and compare error estimates to $\frac{tol}{4}$. Each time a subinterval fails to meet the error tolerance, we divide it in half and try again. The process will normally end successfully because, with each subinterval division, we will generally have the error decreasing by a factor of 4 while the error requirement is decreasing by a factor of only 2. In the end, the sum of the T_2 estimates where the error tolerance is met will be our approximation for $\int_a^b f(x)dx$.

The simplest way to code this algorithm is to use a recursive function. It is possible to do without, but the record keeping is burdensome. Depending on the programming language you are using, the trade off may be simplicity for speed. Some languages do not handle recursive functions quickly.

Assumptions: f has a continuous second derivative on $[a,b]$.

Input: Function f; interval over which to integrate $[a,b]$; tolerance *tol*.

Step 1: Set $m = \frac{b+a}{2}$; $I_1 = T_1(a,b)$; $I_2 = T_2(a,b)$;

Step 2: If $|I_2 - I_1| < 3tol$ then return I_2;

Step 3: Do Steps 1-5 with inputs f; $[a,\frac{a+b}{2}]$; and $\frac{tol}{2}$; and set A equal to the result;

Step 4: Do Steps 1-5 with inputs f; $[\frac{a+b}{2},b]$; and $\frac{tol}{2}$; and set B equal to the result;

Step 5: Return $A + B$;

Output: Approximate value of $\int_a^b f(x)dx$.

A tabulated example of such a computation might help clarify any confusion over how this algorithm works. The following table approximates the integral $\int_0^3 \ln(3+x)dx$ with a tolerance of .006.

a	b	$T_1(a,b)$	$T_2(a,b)$	$\frac{1}{3}\|T_2(a,b)-T_1(a,b)\|$	*tol*	
0	3	4.33555	4.42389	.02944	.00600	✘
0	1.5	1.95201	1.96732	.00510	.00300	✘
0	0.75	0.90763	**0.90997**	.00077	.00150	✔
0.75	1.5	1.05968	**1.06124**	.00051	.00150	✔
1.5	3	2.47187	**2.47961**	.00257	.00300	✔

$$\int_0^3 \ln(3+x)dx \approx 0.90997 + 1.06124 + 2.47961 = 4.45082$$

The calculation in the table requires 7 evaluations of f and underestimates the integral by about .00390. In order of occurrence, the evaluations happen at $x = 0, 3, 1.5, .75, .375, 1.125, 2.25$. The composite trapezoidal rule with 7 evaluations (6 subintervals each of length .5) underestimates the integral by about .00346. The non-adaptive composite trapezoidal rule gives a slightly better estimate with essentially the same amount of computation. But remember, it is not necessarily efficiency we are after. It is automatic error estimates. The adaptive Trapezoidal Rule does something the conventional composite Trapezoidal Rule does not. It monitors itself for accuracy, so when the routine completes, you not only get an estimate, but you can have some confidence in its accuracy *even when you have no way to calculate the integral exactly* for comparison.

Key Concepts

Composite numerical integration: Dividing the interval of integration into a number of subintervals, applying a simple quadrature formula to each subinterval and summing the results.

Adaptive numerical integration: Leveraging the error term of a simple quadrature formula in order to obtain automatic calculation of the number and nature of subintervals needed to obtain a definite integral with some prescribed accuracy.

Exercises

1. Use the composite midpoint rule with 3 subintervals to approximate

   (a) $\int_1^3 \ln(\sin(x))dx$ [S]

   (b) $\int_5^7 \sqrt{x \cos x}\, dx$

   (c) $\int_1^4 \frac{e^x \ln(x)}{x} dx$ [A]

   (d) $\int_{10}^{13} \sqrt{1 + \cos^2 x}\, dx$

   (e) $\int_{\ln 3}^{\ln 7} \frac{e^x}{1 + x} dx$ [A]

   (f) $\int_0^1 \frac{x^2 - 1}{x^2 + 1} dx$

2. Redo question 1 using the composite trapezoidal rule. [S] [A]

3. Redo question 1 using the composite Simpson's rule. [S] [A]

4. Redo question 1 using the composite Simpson's $\frac{3}{8}$ rule. [S] [A]

5. Redo question 1 using the composite version of the quadrature rule [S] [A]
$$\int_{x_0}^{x_0+3h} f(x)dx = \frac{3h}{2}\left[f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0 + 2h)\right].$$

6. Use a composite version of the quadrature rule
$$\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)\, dx \approx \frac{h}{2}\left[f\left(x_0 + \frac{h}{3}\right) + f\left(x_0 + \frac{2h}{3}\right)\right]$$
   with three subintervals to approximate
$$\int_0^3 \frac{x^3}{x^3 + 1} dx.$$

7. Use the (simple) trapezoidal rule on $\int_0^\pi \sin^4 x\, dx$ to help estimate the number of intervals $[0, \pi]$ must be divided into in order to approximate $\int_0^\pi \sin^4 x\, dx$ to within 10^{-4} using the *composite* Trapezoidal rule. NOTE: $\int_0^\pi \sin^4 x\, dx = \frac{3}{8}\pi$. [S]

8. Repeat question 7 using the midpoint rule. [A]

9. Repeat question 7 using Simpson's rule.

10. Suppose composite Simpson's rule with 100 subintervals was used to estimate $\int_5^{12} f(x)\, dx$, and the absolute error turned out to be less than 10^{-5}. What function might $f(x)$ have been?

11. Derive a summation formula for the composite version of

    (a) the Midpoint Rule.

    (b) Simpson's Rule. [A]

    (c) Simpson's $\frac{3}{8}$ Rule. [A]

    (d) the quadrature formula

$$\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)\, dx \approx \frac{h}{2}\left[f\left(x_0 + \frac{h}{3}\right) + f\left(x_0 + \frac{2h}{3}\right)\right].$$

12. Based on our discussion of composite integration, the error term for composite Simpson's Rule applied to $\int_a^b f(x)\, dx$ with n subintervals is $O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^4 f^{(4)}(\xi_n)\right)$. With a bit more work, it can be shown that the error term is actually $-\frac{b-a}{90}h^4 f^{(4)}(\xi_n)$ where $h = \frac{b-a}{n}$. No big-oh needed. This error is exact for some $\xi_n \in [a, b]$. Use this error term to find a theoretical bound on the error in estimating
$$\int_2^4 \frac{1}{1 - x}\, dx$$
using (composite) Simpson's Rule with $h = 0.1$.

13. Why does the composite trapezoidal rule ALWAYS (for any h) give an underestimate of
$$\int_0^\pi \sin x\, dx?$$

14. Demonstrate geometrically and with some words the approximation of $\int_7^8 \frac{x \sin x}{8}\, dx$ using the composite trapezoidal rule with 4 trapezoids (that is, 4 subintervals).

15. Approximate $\int_1^3 \ln(\sin(x))dx$ using adaptive Simpson's method with tolerance 0.002. [S]

16. Use adaptive Simpson's Method to approximate $\int_0^1 \ln(x + 1)dx$ accurate to within 10^{-4}. [A]

17. Derive a quadrature formula for
$$\int_a^b f(x)\, dx$$
using unspecified nodes $a \leq x_0 < x_1 \leq b$. In other words, derive a "General Trapezoidal Rule" where x_0 and x_1 are allowed to be any two distinct values in $[a, b]$.

18. In your formula from question 17, make the substitutions $x_0 = a$, $x_1 = b$, and $x_1 - x_0 = h$, and show that it thus reduces to the Trapezoidal Rule.

19. Let $I = \int_0^2 x^2 \ln(x^2 + 1)\, dx$. [A]

    (a) Approximate I using the Midpoint Rule.

    (b) Use your answer to (a) to estimate the number of subintervals needed to approximate I to within 10^{-4}. NOTE: $I = \frac{24 \ln(5) - 6 \tan^{-1}(2) - 4}{9}$.

20. Let $I = \int_0^2 x^2 \ln(x^2 + 1)\, dx$.

    (a) Approximate I using Simpson's Rule.

    (b) Use your answer to (a) to estimate the number of subintervals needed to approximate I to within 10^{-4}. NOTE: $I = \frac{24 \ln(5) - 6 \tan^{-1}(2) - 4}{9}$.

21. Use Octave to calculate the estimate suggested in question 19b. Is the absolute error less than 10^{-4}? [A]

22. Use Octave to calculate the estimate suggested in question 20b. Is the absolute error less than 10^{-4}?

23. Use the composite trapezoidal rule to estimate $\int_0^1 \ln(x+1)dx$ accurate to within 10^{-6}.   How many subintervals are needed? [S]

24. Repeat question 23 using the composite midpoint rule.

25. Use composite Simpson's rule to estimate $\int_0^1 \ln(x+1)dx$ accurate to within 10^{-6}.   How many subintervals are needed?

26. Repeat question 25 using composite Simpson's $\frac{3}{8}$ rule. [A]

27. Write an Octave function that implements adaptive Simpson's Rule as a recursive function. Some notes about the structure: [A]

   (a) The inputs to the function should be $f(x)$, a, b, and a maximum overall error, tol.

   (b) The output of the function should be the estimate and, if you are feeling particularly stirred, the number of function evaluations.

28. Use your code from question 27 to approximate $\int_1^3 \ln(\sin(x))dx$ with tolerance 0.002. [A]

29. Use your code from question 27 to approximate $\int_0^1 \ln(x+1)dx$ accurate to within 10^{-4}.

30. (i) Use your code from question 27 to approximate the integral using $tol = 10^{-5}$. (ii) Calculate the actual error of the approximation. (iii) Is the approximation accurate to within 10^{-5} as requested?

   (a) $\int_0^{2\pi} x \sin(x^2)dx$ [A]

   (b) $\int_{0.1}^2 \frac{1}{x}\,dx$

   (c) $\int_0^2 x^2 \ln(x^2+1)\,dx$

   NOTE: $\int_0^2 x^2 \ln(x^2+1)\,dx = \frac{24\ln(5)-6\tan^{-1}(2)-4}{9}$.

31. Write an Octave function that implements the General Trapezoidal Rule of question 1 in such a way that x_0 and x_1 are chosen at random.

32. Write an Octave function that implements a composite version of the quadrature method in question 31.

33. Do some numerical experiments to compare the (standard) composite Trapezoidal Rule to the (random) composite Trapezoidal Rule of question 32. What do you find?

4.5   Extrapolation

In calculus you undboubtedly encountered Euler's constant, e, which you were probably told is approximately 2.718, or maybe just 2.7. And unless you were involved in a digits-of-e memorization contest, you probably never saw more digits of e than your calculator could show. We're about the change that. The first 50 digits of e are

$$2.7182818284590452353602874713526624977572470936999.$$

How many of them do you remember? Not to worry if it is not very many. No quiz on the digits of e is imminent.

Crumpet 28: Digits of e

The first 1000 digits of e, 50 per line, are

```
2.7182818284590452353602874713526624977572470936999
59574966967627724076630353547594571382178525166427
42746639193200305992181741359662904357290033429526
05956307381323286279434907632338298807531952510190
11573834187930702154089149934884167509244761460668
08226480016847741185374234544243710753907774499206
95517027618386062613313845830007520449338265602976
06737113200709328709127443747047230696977209310141
69283681902551510865746377211125238978442505695369
67707854499699679468644549059879316368892300987931
27736178215424999229576351482208269895193668033182
52886939849646510582093923982948879332036250944311
73012381970684161403970198376793206832823764648042
95311802328782509819455815301756717361332069811250
99618188159304169035159888851934580727386673858942
28792284998920868058257492796104841984443634632449
68487560233624827041978623209002160990235304369941
84914631409343173814364054625315209618369088870701
67683964243781405927145635490613031072085103837505
10115747704171898610687396965521267154688957035035
```

However, do you recall from calculus that

$$\lim_{h \to 0}(1 + h)^{1/h} = e?$$

Can you prove it? Proof on page . Based on this fact, we might use

$$\tilde{e}(h) = (1 + h)^{1/h}$$

to approximate e. No time like the present!

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{e}(0.01) &\approx 2.704813829421529 \\
\tilde{e}(0.005) &\approx 2.711517122929293 \\
\tilde{e}(0.0025) &\approx 2.714891744381238 \\
\tilde{e}(0.00125) &\approx 2.716584846682473 \\
\tilde{e}(0.000625) &\approx 2.717432851769196.
\end{aligned}
$$

Sadly, this sequence of approximations is not converging very quickly. We have two digits of accuracy in the first approximation and still only three digits of accuracy in the fifth. We could, of course, continue to make h smaller to get more accurate approximations, but based on the slow improvement observed so far, this does not seem like a very promising route. Instead, we can combine the estimates we already have to get an improved approximation. This idea should remind you, at least on the surface, of Aitken's delta-squared method. In that method, we combined three consecutive approximations to form another that was generally a better approximation than any of the original three. We will do something similar here, combining inadequate approximations to find better ones. We will name the various new approxmations for continued reuse.

$$
\begin{aligned}
2\tilde{e}(0.005) - \tilde{e}(0.01) &\equiv \tilde{e}_1(0.01) = 2.718220416437056 \\
2\tilde{e}(0.0025) - \tilde{e}(0.005) &\equiv \tilde{e}_1(0.005) = 2.718266365833184 \\
2\tilde{e}(0.00125) - \tilde{e}(0.0025) &\equiv \tilde{e}_1(0.0025) = 2.718277948983707 \\
2\tilde{e}(0.000625) - \tilde{e}(0.00125) &\equiv \tilde{e}_1(0.00125) = 2.718280856855920.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5.1}
$$

Each of these new approximations is accurate to 5 or 6 significant digits! Already a significant improvement. We can combine them further to find yet better approximations:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{4\tilde{e}_1(0.005) - \tilde{e}_1(0.01)}{3} &\equiv \tilde{e}_2(0.01) = 2.718281682298560 \\
\frac{4\tilde{e}_1(0.0025) - \tilde{e}_1(0.005)}{3} &\equiv \tilde{e}_2(0.005) = 2.718281810033881 \\
\frac{4\tilde{e}_1(0.00125) - \tilde{e}(0.0025)}{3} &\equiv \tilde{e}_2(0.0025) = 2.718281826146657.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5.2}
$$

The first of these approximations is accurate to seven significant digits, the second to eight, and the third to nine! And we can combine them further:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{8\tilde{e}_2(0.005) - \tilde{e}_2(0.01)}{7} &\equiv \tilde{e}_3(0.01) = 2.718281828281785 \\
\frac{8\tilde{e}_2(0.0025) - \tilde{e}_2(0.005)}{7} &\equiv \tilde{e}_3(0.005) = 2.718281828448482.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5.3}
$$

Now we have approximations accurate to ten and eleven significant digits! Looking back, we took five approximations that had no better than 3 significant digits of accuracy and combined them to get two approximations that were accurate to at least 10 significant digits each. Magic! Okay, not magic, mathemagic! Here is how it works.

Suppose we are approximating p using the formula $\tilde{p}(h)$, and we know that

$$
\tilde{p}(h) = p + c_1 \cdot h^{m_1} + c_2 \cdot h^{m_2} + c_3 \cdot h^{m_3} + \cdots .
$$

Then

$$
\tilde{p}(\alpha h) = p + c_1 \cdot (\alpha h)^{m_1} + c_2 \cdot (\alpha h)^{m_2} + c_3 \cdot (\alpha h)^{m_3} + \cdots .
$$

Now if we multiply the second equation by α^{-m_1} and subtract the first from it, the h^{m_1} terms vanish, and we get an approximation with error term beginning with $c_2 \cdot h^{m_2}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha^{-m_1}\tilde{p}(\alpha h) &= & \alpha^{-m_1}p + c_1 \cdot h^{m_1} + c_2\alpha^{m_2-m_1} \cdot h^{m_2} + c_3\alpha^{m_3-m_1} \cdot h^{m_3} + \cdots \\
-[\tilde{p}(h) &= & p + c_1 \cdot h^{m_1} + c_2 \cdot h^{m_2} + c_3 \cdot h^{m_3} + \cdots] \\
\hline
\alpha^{-m_1}\tilde{p}(\alpha h) - \tilde{p}(h) &= & (\alpha^{-m} - 1)p + c_2(\alpha^{m_2-m_1} - 1) \cdot h^{m_2} + c_3(\alpha^{m_3-m_1} - 1) \cdot h^{m_3} + \cdots
\end{aligned}
$$

With a little rearranging,

$$
\frac{\alpha^{-m_1}\tilde{p}(\alpha h) - \tilde{p}(h)}{\alpha^{-m_1} - 1} = p + d_2 \cdot h^{m_2} + d_3 \cdot h^{m_3} + \cdots \tag{4.5.4}
$$

for some constants $d_2, d_3, \ldots$. If $m_2 > m_1$, then this method will tend to improve on the two approximations $\tilde{p}(h)$ and $\tilde{p}(\alpha h)$ by combining them into a single approximation with error commensurate with some constant multiple of h^{m_2}. This calculation is the basis for Richardson's Extrapolation.

It just so happens $\tilde{e}(h)$ has exactly the form needed.

$$
\tilde{e}(h) = e + c_1 h + c_2 h^2 + c_3 h^3 + c_4 h^4 + O(h^5) \tag{4.5.5}
$$

for some constants c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4. The actual values of the constants are not relevant for this computation. To understand the computation of $\tilde{e}_1$, we use equation 4.5.4 with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $m_1 = 1$ to get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{e}_1(h) &= \frac{2\tilde{e}\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) - \tilde{e}(h)}{2-1} \\
&= 2e + c_1 h + \frac{1}{2}c_2 h^2 + \frac{1}{4}c_3 h^3 + \frac{1}{8}c_4 h^4 + O(h^5) \\
&\quad - \left[e + c_1 h + c_2 h^2 + c_3 h^3 + c_4 h^4 + O(h^5)\right] \\
&= e + d_2 h^2 + d_3 h^3 + d_4 h^4 + O(h^5)
\end{aligned}
$$

for some constants d_2, d_3, d_4. $\tilde{e}_1(h)$ is the formula that gave us the round of approximations accurate to 5 or 6 significant digits. It is not hard to find the constants d_i in terms of the constants c_i, but, again, the values of the constants are immaterial and can only serve to complicate further refinements. What is important is the form of the error. Now that we know $\tilde{e}_1(h) = e + d_2 h^2 + d_3 h^3 + d_4 h^4 + O(h^5)$, we find $\tilde{e}_2(h)$ using formula 4.5.4 with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $m_1 = 2$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{e}_2(h) &= \frac{4\tilde{e}_1\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) - \tilde{e}_1(h)}{3} \\
&= e + k_3 h^3 + k_4 h^4 + O(h^5)
\end{aligned}
$$

for some constants k_3 and k_4. $\tilde{e}_2(h)$ is the formula that gave us the round of approximtions accurate to 7 to 9 significant digits. We can again use formula 4.5.4, this time with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $m_1 = 3$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{e}_3(h) &= \frac{8\tilde{e}_2\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) - \tilde{e}_2(h)}{7} \\
&= e + l_4 h^4 + O(h^5)
\end{aligned}
$$

for some constant l_4. $\tilde{e}_3(h)$ is the formula that gave us the approximations accurate to 10 and 11 significant digits. Now is a good time to see if you can use the expression for $\tilde{e}_3(h)$ and formula 4.5.4 to derive an $O(h^5)$ formula for $\tilde{e}_4(h)$. Then use your formula to compute $\tilde{e}_4(0.01)$ using the previously given values of $\tilde{e}_3(0.01)$ and $\tilde{e}_3(0.005)$. How accurate is $\tilde{e}_4(0.01)$? Answers on page 167.

As a special case, Richardson's Extrapolation with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ applied to any approximation of the form

$$
\tilde{p}_0(h) = p + c_1 h + c_2 h^2 + c_3 h^3 + \cdots
$$

gives the recursively defined refinements

$$
\tilde{p}_k(h) = \frac{2^k \tilde{p}_{k-1}\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) - \tilde{p}_{k-1}(h)}{2^k - 1}, \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \ldots
$$

which are expected to increase in accuracy as k increases. For other α or other forms of error, the formula for $\tilde{p}_k(h)$ changes according to 4.5.4.

Crumpet 29: A Taylor polynomial for $\tilde{e}(h)$

$\tilde{e}$ is undefined at 0, so its derivatives at 0 are as well. However, if we extend the definition of $\tilde{e}$ to

$$
\tilde{e}(h) = \begin{cases} (1+h)^{1/h} & \text{if } h \neq 0 \\ e & \text{if } h = 0 \end{cases},
$$

thus defining $\tilde{e}$ at 0, then $\tilde{e}(h)$ becomes infinitely differentiable at 0, and its fifth Taylor polynomial, for example, is:

$$
\tilde{e}(h) = e - \frac{e}{2} \cdot h + \frac{11e}{24} \cdot h^2 - \frac{7e}{16} \cdot h^3 + \frac{2447e}{5760} \cdot h^4 + \frac{f^{(5)}(\xi)}{120} h^5
$$

for some $\xi \in (0, h)$.

Differentiation

Using extrapolation, high order differentiation approximation formulas can be derived from low order formulas. We begin with the lowest order approximation, $f'(x_0) = \dfrac{-f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)}{h} - \dfrac{h}{2} f''(\xi_h)$. The standard error term, $-\frac{h}{2} f''(\xi_h)$ does not give the error in the form $c \cdot h^{m_1} + O(h^{m_2})$ as required by Richardson's extrapolation, so we return to Taylor series to determine the $O(h^{m_2})$ term:

$$f(x_0 + h) = f(x_0) + hf'(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}h^3 f'''(x_0) + \cdots$$

so

$$\frac{-f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)}{h} = f'(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}hf''(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}h^2 f'''(x_0) + \cdots .$$

Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
f'(x_0) - \frac{-f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)}{h} &= -\frac{1}{2}hf''(x_0) - \frac{1}{6}h^2 f'''(x_0) - \cdots \\
&= c_1 h + O(h^2)
\end{aligned}
$$

and extrapolation will yield an $O(h^2)$ formula. Letting $\tilde{p}(h) = \frac{-f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)}{h}$, $\alpha = 2$, and $m_1 = 1$, formula 4.5.4 tells us the approximation

$$\frac{\frac{1}{2}\tilde{p}(2h) - \tilde{p}(h)}{\frac{1}{2} - 1}$$

will be an $O(h^2)$ formula for $f'(x_0)$. Simplifying,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\frac{1}{2}\tilde{p}(2h) - \tilde{p}(h)}{\frac{1}{2} - 1} &= \frac{\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{-f(x_0) + f(x_0 + 2h)}{2h}\right] - \frac{-f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)}{h}}{-\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{\frac{-f(x_0) + f(x_0 + 2h)}{4h} - \frac{-4f(x_0) + 4f(x_0 + h)}{4h}}{-\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{\frac{3f(x_0) - 4f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0 + 2h)}{4h}}{-\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{-3f(x_0) + 4f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0 + 2h)}{2h}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence we have $f'(x_0) = \frac{-3f(x_0) + 4f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0 + 2h)}{2h} + O(h^2)$, but this is not news. This is the first 3-point formula in table 4.2! Other high order derivative formulas can be derived by extrapolation too, but, generally, nothing new is learned from the result. We simply have a new way of deriving high order differentiation formulas.

Integration

Applying extrapolation to definite integrals is more rewarding. We begin with any composite integration formula and apply Richardson's extrapolation. We now consider the composite trapezoidal rule and use the notation $T_k(a, b)$ to represent the approximation of $\int_a^b f(x)dx$ using the trapezoidal rule with k subintervals.

Before continuing we need to have a good idea what it means for the composite trapezoidal rule to have error term $O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^2\right)$. In essence, it means we should expect the error to decrease by a factor of about 4 when the number of intervals is doubled. We should expect the error to decrease by a factor of about 9 when the number of intervals is tripled. And generally we should expect the error to decrease by a factor of about β^2 when the number of intervals is multiplied by β. To see this effect in action, consider the definite integral

$$\int_0^1 \sin x \, dx$$

whose exact value is $1 - \cos(1) \approx .4596976941318602$. The absolute errors of $T_5(0,1)$, $T_{10}(0,1)$, and $T_{15}(0,1)$ are

$$\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_5(0,1) \right| \approx 1.533(10)^{-3}$$

$$\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{10}(0,1) \right| \approx 3.831(10)^{-4}$$

$$\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{15}(0,1) \right| \approx 1.702(10)^{-4}$$

We should expect $\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_5(0,1) \right|$ to be about four times $\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{10}(0,1) \right|$ and nine times $\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{15}(0,1) \right|$. To check, we compute the ratios:

$$\frac{\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_5(0,1) \right|}{\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{10}(0,1) \right|} = \frac{1.533(10)^{-3}}{3.831(10)^{-4}} \approx 4.001$$

$$\frac{\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_5(0,1) \right|}{\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{15}(0,1) \right|} = \frac{1.533(10)^{-3}}{1.702(10)^{-4}} \approx 9.007.$$

What should you expect the ratio $\frac{\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{10}(0,1) \right|}{\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{15}(0,1) \right|}$ to be about? Answer on page 167.

Finally, we apply Richardson's extrapolation with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $m_1 = 2$ to produce the higher order estimate,

$$T_{k,1}(a,b) \equiv \frac{4T_{2k}(a,b) - T_k(a,b)}{3}.$$

We defer to numerics to get a handle on the error term of the refinement $T_{k,1}$. We begin by collecting some data. Continuing with the analysis of $\int_0^1 \sin x \, dx$, note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_5(0,1) &\approx .4581643459604436 \\
T_{10}(0,1) &\approx .4593145488579763 \\
T_{20}(0,1) &\approx .4596019197882473 \\
T_{40}(0,1) &\approx .4596737512942187.
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence

$$T_{5,1}(0,1) = \frac{4T_{10}(0,1) - T_5(0,1)}{3} \approx .4596979498238206$$

$$T_{10,1}(0,1) = \frac{4T_{20}(0,1) - T_{10}(0,1)}{3} \approx .4596977100983375$$

$$T_{20,1}(0,1) = \frac{4T_{40}(0,1) - T_{20}(0,1)}{3} \approx .4596976951295424$$

and

$$\frac{\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{5,1}(0,1) \right|}{\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{10,1}(0,1) \right|} \approx 16.01$$

$$\frac{\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{10,1}(0,1) \right|}{\left| \int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{20,1}(0,1) \right|} \approx 16.00.$$

When we double the number of subintervals, the error is decreased by a factor of 16. That's 2^4, not 2^3 as we might have expected! The first refinement takes us from a $O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n} \right)^2 \right)$ approximation to a $O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n} \right)^4 \right)$ approximation. In other words, the error of $T_{n,1}$ is $O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n} \right)^4 \right)$.

Table 4.7: Romberg's Method

T_1	$T_{1,1}$	$T_{1,2}$	$T_{1,3}$	$\cdots$
T_2	$T_{2,1}$	$T_{2,2}$	$\vdots$	
T_4	$T_{4,1}$	$\vdots$		
T_8	$\vdots$			
$\vdots$				

Now that we know the error of $T_{n,1}$ is $O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^4\right)$ we can extrapolate again. Applying Richardson's extrapolation with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $m_1 = 4$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{5,2}(0,1) &= \frac{16T_{10,1}(0,1) - T_{5,1}(0,1)}{15} \approx .4596976941166387 \\
T_{10,2}(0,1) &= \frac{16T_{20,1}(0,1) - T_{10,1}(0,1)}{15} \approx .4596976941316228.
\end{aligned}
$$

We now have approximations $T_{5,2}$ and $T_{10,2}$ whose errors are only about $1.522(10)^{-11}$ and $2.374(10)^{-13}$, respectively. Use this information to calculate $T_{5,3}$ and its absolute error. Answers on page 167.

The method of combining Richardson's extrapolation with the trapezoidal rule is known as Romberg's Method or Romberg integration. The calculation is often tabulated for organizational purposes as in Table 4.7. Rows are added until the differences $|T_{k,n} - T_{k,n+1}|$ and $|T_{2k,n} - T_{k,n+1}|$ are both less than some tolerance.

Though Richardson's extrapolation may be applied to any composite integration formula, the computations of the error terms above help explain why the trapezoidal rule is the right one to use. We might infer from our calculations (and it can be proven true) that the error term of the composite trapezoidal rule contains only even powers of $\frac{1}{n}$. To be explicit, we have

$$
\int_a^b f(x)dx = T_n(a,b) + c_2\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^2 + c_4\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^4 + c_6\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^6 + \cdots
$$

so each refinement increases the least degree in the error term by 2, not 1. Skipping the odd degrees makes this particular choice very efficient. But this method comes with a price. Hidden within c_2 is the assumption that f has a continuous second derivative. Hidden within c_4 is the assumption that f has a continuous fourth derivative. And so on. The accuracy of each refinement depends on f having two more continuous derivatives. The more refinements we do, the smoother f must be for this method to work. For this reason, it is advisable to use Romberg's Method only when the integrand is known to have sufficient derivatives.

Key Concepts

Richardson's extrapolation: If approximation $\tilde{p}$ is know to have the form

$$
\tilde{p}(h) = p + c_1 h^{m_1} + O(h^{m_2})
$$

then the approximation

$$
\frac{\alpha^{-m_1}\tilde{p}(\alpha h) - \tilde{p}(h)}{\alpha^{-m_1} - 1}
$$

will have error $O(h^{m_2})$.

Romberg integration: The application of Richardson's extrapolation to the trapezoidal method.

Exercises

1. One can use Taylor Polynomials to show that

$$
\pi = \frac{1}{h}\sin(h\pi) + K_2 h^2 + K_4 h^4 + K_6 h^6 + \cdots.
$$

Therefore, $N(h) = \frac{1}{h}\sin(h\pi)$ is an $O(h^2)$ approximation of π. Use Richardson's Extrapolation to derive an $O(h^4)$ approximation of π. [A]

2. It is interesting to note that we can reverse engi-

neer Richardson refinements in order to approximate the c_i of equation 4.5.5 on page 161. For example, $\tilde{e}(h) = e + c_1 h + O(h^2)$, and we assume the $O(h^2)$ term is relatively small, so we can rearrange this equation to find

$$\frac{\tilde{e}(h) - e}{h} \approx c_1.$$

To take a specific example, $\frac{\tilde{e}(.005)-e}{.005} = \frac{2.711517122929293-e}{.005} \approx -1.35$ so $c_1 \approx -1.35$. If we pay careful attention to how the constants are affected as we refine our initial approximations, we can find c_2, c_3, and c_4 as well.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{e}_1(h) &= 2\tilde{e}\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) - \tilde{e}(h) \\
&= 2e + c_1 h + \frac{c_2}{2}h^2 + \frac{c_3}{4}h^3 + \frac{c_4}{8}h^4 + O(h^5) \\
&\quad -(e + c_1 h + c_2 h^2 + c_3 h^3 + c_4 h^4 + O(h^5)) \\
&= e - \frac{c_2}{2}h^2 - \frac{3c_3}{4}h^3 - \frac{7c_4}{8}h^4 + O(h^5).
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, $\tilde{e}_1(h) - e \approx -\frac{c_2}{2}h^2$, from which we conclude

$$\frac{-2(\tilde{e}_1(h) - e)}{h^2} \approx c_2.$$

(a) Use this formula and the values in 4.5.1 to verify that $c_2 \approx 1.24$.

(b) Approximate c_3 using values in 4.5.2.

(c) Approximate c_4 using values in 4.5.3.

(d) Compare these approximations of c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 to the exact values in crumpet 29.

3. Suppose N approximates M according to $N(h) = M + K_1 h^3 + K_2 h^5 + K_3 h^7 + \cdots$. Of what order will $N_3(h)$ (the third generation Richardson's extrapolation) be? [A]

4. Suppose N approximates M according to $N(h) = M + K_1 h^2 + K_2 h^4 + K_3 h^6 + \cdots$. What would you expect the value of

$$\frac{|M - N(h/3)|}{|M - N(h/4)|}$$

to be for small h, approximately? [A]

5. $N(h) = \frac{1-\cos h}{h^2}$ can be used to approximate [A]

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{1 - \cos h}{h^2}$$

(a) Compute $N(1.0)$ and $N(0.5)$.

(b) Compute $N_1(1.0)$, the first Richardson's Extrapolation, assuming

    i. $N(h)$ has an error of the form $K_1 h + K_2 h^2 + K_3 h^3 + \cdots$

    ii. $N(h)$ has an error of the form $K_2 h^2 + K_4 h^4 + K_6 h^6 + \cdots$

(c) Which of the assumptions in part 5b do you think gives the correct error and why?

6. The backward difference formula can be expressed as

$$f'(x_0) = \frac{1}{h}[f(x_0) - f(x_0 - h)]$$
$$+ \frac{h}{2}f''(x_0) - \frac{h^2}{6}f'''(x_0) + O(h^3)$$

(a) Use Richardson's extrapolation to derive an $O(h^2)$ formula for $f'(x_0)$.

(b) The formula you derived should look familiar. What formula does it look like? Is it exactly the same? Why or why not?

7. Derive an $O(h^3)$ formula for approximating M that uses $N(h)$, $N(\frac{h}{2})$, and $N(\frac{h}{3})$, and is based on the assumption that [S]

$$M = N(h) + K_1 h + K_2 h^2 + K_3 h^3 + \cdots.$$

8. The following data give estimates of the integral $M = \int_0^{3\pi/2} \cos x\, dx$.

$$N(h) = 2.356194 \qquad N(h/2) = -0.4879837$$
$$N(h/4) = -0.8815732 \qquad N(h/8) = -0.9709157$$

Assuming $M - N(h) = K_1 h^2 + K_2 h^4 + K_3 h^6 + \cdots$, find a third Richardson's extrapolation for M. [S]

9. Suppose that $N(h)$ is an approximation of M for every $h > 0$ and that

$$M - N(h) = K_1 h + K_2 h^2 + K_3 h^3 + \cdots$$

for some constants $K_1, K_2, K_3, \ldots$. Use the values $N(h)$, $N(h/3)$, and $N(h/9)$ to produce an $O(h^3)$ approximation of M. [A]

10. Use Romberg integration to compute the integral with tolerance 10^{-4}.

(a) $\displaystyle\int_1^3 \ln(\sin(x))dx$ [S]

(b) $\displaystyle\int_5^7 \sqrt{x \cos x}\, dx$

(c) $\displaystyle\int_1^4 \frac{e^x \ln(x)}{x}dx$ [A]

(d) $\displaystyle\int_{10}^{13} \sqrt{1 + \cos^2 x}\, dx$

(e) $\displaystyle\int_{\ln 3}^{\ln 7} \frac{e^x}{1 + x}dx$ [A]

(f) $\displaystyle\int_0^1 \frac{x^2 - 1}{x^2 + 1}dx$

(g) $\displaystyle\int_0^2 x^2 \ln(x^2 + 1)dx$ [A]

11. ⟳ Write a Romberg integration Octave function. [A]

12. ⟳ (i) Use your code from question 11 to approximate the integral using $tol = 10^{-5}$. (ii) Calculate the actual error of the approximation. (iii) Is the approximation accurate to within 10^{-5} as requested?

(a) $\displaystyle\int_0^{2\pi} x \sin(x^2)dx$ [A]

(b) $\displaystyle\int_{0.1}^2 \frac{1}{x}\, dx$

(c) $\displaystyle\int_0^2 x^2 \ln(x^2 + 1)\, dx$

NOTE: $\int_0^2 x^2 \ln(x^2 + 1)\, dx = \frac{24\ln(5) - 6\tan^{-1}(2) - 4}{9}$.

13. Compare the results of question 12 with those of question 30 on page 159.

Answers

$\lim_{h \to 0} (1 + h)^{1/h} = e$: Begin by noting $\ln\left[(1+h)^{1/h}\right] = \frac{\ln(1+h)}{h}$. Set

$$
\begin{aligned}
L &= \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{\ln(1 + h)}{h} \\
&= \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{\frac{d}{dh}(\ln(1 + h))}{\frac{d}{dh}(h)} \\
&= \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{1}{1 + h} \\
&= 1.
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus $L = 1$, and due to continuity of the exponential function, e^x,

$$
e = e^L = e^{\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{\ln(1+h)}{h}} = \lim_{h \to 0} e^{\frac{\ln(1+h)}{h}} = \lim_{h \to 0} e^{\ln\left[(1+h)^{1/h}\right]}
$$
$$
= \lim_{h \to 0} (1 + h)^{1/h}.
$$

$\tilde{e}_4(h)$: We use formula 4.5.4 with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, $m = 4$, and $n = 5$ to find

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{e}_4(h) &= \frac{16\tilde{e}_3\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) - \tilde{e}_3(h)}{15} \\
&= e + O(h^5).
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying this formula to $\tilde{e}_3(0.01)$ and $\tilde{e}_3(0.005)$ we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{e}_4(0.01) &= \frac{16(2.718281828448482) - 2.718281828281785}{15} \\
&= 2.718281828459595,
\end{aligned}
$$

a value that is accurate to 13 significant digits!

error ratio: We should expect $\left|\frac{\int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{10}}{\int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{15}}\right|$ to be about $1.5^2 = 2.25$ because 15 (the number of intervals used in the approximation of the denominator) is 1.5 times 10 (the number of intervals used in the approximation of the numerator).

$T_{5,3}$ **and its error:** $\left|\frac{\int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{5,2}}{\int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{10,2}}\right| \approx \frac{1.522(10)^{-11}}{2.374(10)^{-13}} \approx 64$ so

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{5,3} &= \frac{64 T_{10,2} - T_{5,2}}{63} \approx .4596976941318606 \\
\left|\int_0^1 \sin x \, dx - T_{5,3}\right| &\approx 4(10)^{-16}
\end{aligned}
$$

Chapter 5

Generalized Interpolation

5.1 Osculating Polynomials

The Taylor polynomials of Section 1.2 and Interpolating polynomials of Chapter 3 provide different ways to fit polynomials to data. Taylor polynomials require the value of the polynomial at a single point t_0 and the values of its derivatives at t_0 up to some degree k. Interpolating polynomials require the values of the polynomial at several points $t_0, t_1, \ldots, t_n$ and none of its derivatives at any of those points. Incidentally, we will continue to use t for the independent variable for the remainer of this section. The reason for the switch will become apparent.

Osculating polynomials require the values of a function at any number of points, say $t_0, t_1, \ldots, t_n$ and any number of derivatives at those points, say k_0 derivatives at t_0, k_1 derivatives at t_1, and so on. Thus a Taylor polynomial is the special case of an osculating polynomial specified by $n = 1$ points and any number of derivatives k at that point. An interpolating polynomial is the special case of an osculating polynomial specified by any number of points n and $k = 0$ derivatives at each point. Within the spectrum of osculating polynomials, Taylor polynomials and interpolating polynomials thus find themselves at opposite ends. Any polynomial specified by its value at more than one point and at least one derivative at one of those points is neither a Taylor polynomial nor an interpolating polynomial, but rather a hybrid we call an osculating polynomial.

The most often used osculating polynomial is the Hermite polynomial, in which the values of the polynomial and its first derivative are both given at each node. Among the Hermite polynomials, the most often used are the (at most) third degree, or cubic, polynomials. Data at two nodes is sufficient to specify such a polynomial since a third degree polynomial has four parameters. In this case, we wish to find a polynomial p that passes through (t_0, y_0) and (t_1, y_1) with derivative $\dot{y}_0$ at t_0 and $\dot{y}_1$ at t_1. In the spirit of the Lagrange form, we seek parameters c and d such that

$$p(t) = \frac{t - t_1}{t_0 - t_1} y_0 + \frac{t - t_0}{t_1 - t_0} y_1 + \frac{(t - t_1)^2 (t - t_0)}{(t_0 - t_1)^2} c + \frac{(t - t_0)^2 (t - t_1)}{(t_1 - t_0)^2} d.$$

The first two terms form the interpolating polynomial passing through the required points. The last two terms are zero at t_0 and t_1 so do not affect this interpolation. Moreover, the last two terms are chosen so that their derivatives are convenient at t_0 and t_1. The derivative of $\frac{(t-t_1)^2(t-t_0)}{(t_0-t_1)^2}$ is 1 at t_0 and 0 at t_1. The derivative of $\frac{(t-t_0)^2(t-t_1)}{(t_1-t_0)^2}$ is 0 at t_0 and 1 at t_1. These characteristics ensure simple values for c and d. To find out exactly what they are, it remains to force $\dot{p}(t_0) = \dot{y}_0$ and $\dot{p}(t_1) = \dot{y}_1$. To that end,

$$\dot{p}(x) = \frac{y_1 - y_0}{t_1 - t_0} + 2\frac{(t - t_1)(t - t_0)}{(t_0 - t_1)^2} c + 2\frac{(t - t_0)(t - t_1)}{(t_1 - t_0)^2} d + \frac{(t - t_1)^2}{(t_0 - t_1)^2} c + \frac{(t - t_0)^2}{(t_1 - t_0)^2} d.$$

In particular,

$$\dot{p}(t_0) = \frac{y_1 - y_0}{t_1 - t_0} + c$$

and

$$\dot{p}(t_1) = \frac{y_1 - y_0}{t_1 - t_0} + d.$$

Therefore, we need only that $c = \dot{y}_0 - \frac{y_1 - y_0}{t_1 - t_0}$ and $d = \dot{y}_1 - \frac{y_1 - y_0}{t_1 - t_0}$. Hence the desired cubic is

$$p(t) = \frac{t - t_1}{t_0 - t_1} y_0 + \frac{t - t_0}{t_1 - t_0} y_1 + \frac{(t - t_1)^2 (t - t_0)}{(t_0 - t_1)^2} (\dot{y}_0 - m) + \frac{(t - t_0)^2 (t - t_1)}{(t_1 - t_0)^2} (\dot{y}_1 - m) \tag{5.1.1}$$

where $m = \frac{y_1 - y_0}{t_1 - t_0}$.

Also in the spirit of the Lagrange form, this form of the Hermite cubic polynomial is convenient for humans. It is formulaic and requires only the calculation of the difference quotient m. We will call it the Human form of the Hermite cubic polynomial. A more computer-friendly form, which we will refer to as the Computer form of the Hermite cubic is obtained via divided differences. In general, for an osculating polynomial where the first k derivatives are specified at t_i, t_i and y_i must be repeated $k + 1$ times in the divided differences table. Quotients that would otherwise be undefined as a result of the repetition are replaced by the specified derivatives, first derivatives for first divided differences, second derivatives for second divided differences, and so on.

For the cubic Hermite polynomial p passing through (t_0, y_0) and (t_1, y_1) with derivative $\dot{y}_0$ at t_0 and $\dot{y}_1$ at t_1, the table looks like so,

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
t_0 & y_0 & y_0' \\
t_0 & y_0 & \\
t_1 & y_1 & y_1' \\
t_1 & y_1 &
\end{array} \quad ,$$

with the four remaining entries to be filled by the usual divided difference method. Can you compute them in general (in terms of $t_0, t_1, y_0, y_1, \dot{y}_0, \dot{y}_1$)? Answers on page . Using the results, we write down the interpolating polynomial in two ways:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(t) &= y_0 + [\dot{y}_0](t - t_0) + \left[\frac{y_1 - y_0}{(t_1 - t_0)^2} - \frac{\dot{y}_0}{t_1 - t_0} \right] (t - t_0)^2 \\
&\quad + \left[\frac{\dot{y}_1 + \dot{y}_0}{(t_1 - t_0)^2} - 2 \frac{y_1 - y_0}{(t_1 - t_0)^3} \right] (t - t_0)^2 (t - t_1)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
p(t) &= y_1 + [\dot{y}_1](t - t_1) + \left[\frac{\dot{y}_1}{t_1 - t_0} - \frac{y_1 - y_0}{(t_1 - t_0)^2} \right] (t - t_1)^2 \\
&\quad + \left[\frac{\dot{y}_1 + \dot{y}_0}{(t_1 - t_0)^2} - 2 \frac{y_1 - y_0}{(t_1 - t_0)^3} \right] (t - t_1)^2 (t - t_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Bèzier Curves

Bèzier curves are parametric curves, with parameter $t \in [0, 1]$, connecting two points. The simplest Bèzier curve is a straight line, parametrized by linear functions. For example, the simplest Bèzier curve from $(-1, 2)$ to $(5, -2)$ is given by the parametric linear functions

$$\begin{aligned}
x(t) &= (1 - t)(-1) + t(5) \\
y(t) &= (1 - t)(2) + t(-2),
\end{aligned}$$

which we choose to write down in Lagrange form. Remember, $t \in [0, 1]$. You can check that $(x(0), y(0)) = (-1, 2)$ and $(x(1), y(1)) = (5, -2)$. These equations describe the one and only straight line segment from $(-1, 2)$ to $(5, -2)$ and give the one and only linear Bèzier curve between them. There are other parametrizations, but they are not Bèzier curves.

There are, however, infinitely many parametric quadratic functions connecting $(-1, 2)$ to $(5, -2)$ even with the restrictions $t \in [0, 1]$, $(x(0), y(0)) = (-1, 2)$, and $(x(1), y(1)) = (5, -2)$. We begin with

$$\begin{aligned}
x(t) &= a_x + b_x t + c_x t^2 \\
y(t) &= a_y + b_y t + c_y t^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Forcing $(x(0), y(0)) = (-1, 2)$, we need

$$\begin{aligned}
x(0) &= a_x = -1 \\
y(0) &= a_y = 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Forcing $(x(1), y(1)) = (5, -2)$, we need

$$
\begin{aligned}
x(1) &= a_x + b_x + c_x = -1 + b_x + c_x = 5 \\
y(1) &= a_y + b_y + c_y = 2 + b_y + c_y = -2
\end{aligned}
$$

or

$$
\begin{aligned}
b_x + c_x &= 6 \\
b_y + c_y &= -4.
\end{aligned}
$$

These restrictions imposes only four conditions on the six unknowns, so we still have two degrees of freedom. Any particular Bèzier curve is prescribed by specifying a control point distinct from the two endpoints. The two linear Bèzier curves, one connecting $(-1, 2)$ to the control point and the other connecting the control point to $(5, -2)$, then determine the quadratic Bèzier curve. Suppose $\vec{B}_{1,0}(t)$ is the linear Bèzier curve from $(-1, 2)$ to the control point and $\vec{B}_{1,1}(t)$ is the linear Bèzier curve from the control point to $(5, -2)$. These two curves define a family of linear Bèzier curves, namely the set of linear Bèzier curves from $\vec{B}_{1,0}(t_0)$ to $\vec{B}_{1,1}(t_0)$, where $t_0 \in [0, 1]$. Letting $\vec{B}_{2,0,t_0}(t)$ be the linear Bèzier curve from $\vec{B}_{1,0}(t_0)$ to $\vec{B}_{1,1}(t_0)$, the point $\vec{B}_{2,0,t_0}(t_0)$ is on the quadratic Bèzier curve from $(-1, 2)$ to $(5, -2)$ via the given control point. The collection of all such points is the quadratic Bèzier curve we are after. Different control points determine different quadratics. For example, if we have $(0, 4)$ as our control point,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\vec{B}_{1,0}(t) &= \begin{pmatrix} (1-t)(-1) \\ (1-t)(2) + t(4) \end{pmatrix} \\
\vec{B}_{1,1}(t) &= \begin{pmatrix} t(5) \\ (1-t)(4) + t(-2) \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}
$$

so $\vec{B}_{2,0,t_0}(t) = (1-t)\vec{B}_{1,0}(t_0) + t\vec{B}_{1,1}(t_0)$ or

$$
\vec{B}_{2,0,t_0}(t) = (1-t) \begin{pmatrix} (1-t_0)(-1) \\ (1-t_0)(2) + t_0(4) \end{pmatrix} + t \begin{pmatrix} t_0(5) \\ (1-t_0)(4) + t_0(-2) \end{pmatrix}
$$

and then

$$
\vec{B}_{2,0,t_0}(t_0) = (1-t_0) \begin{pmatrix} (1-t_0)(-1) \\ (1-t_0)(2) + t_0(4) \end{pmatrix} + t_0 \begin{pmatrix} t_0(5) \\ (1-t_0)(4) + t_0(-2) \end{pmatrix}.
$$

But the notation $\vec{B}_{2,0,t_0}(t_0)$ is cumbersome and we are really interested in a parametrization of the quadratic anyway, not the linear Bèzier curve $\vec{B}_{2,0,t_0}$. Letting $\vec{B}_{2,0}(t) = \vec{B}_{2,0,t}(t)$, we get the quadratic Bèzier curve from $(-1, 2)$ to $(5, -2)$ via control point $(0, 4)$:

$$
\vec{B}_{2,0}(t) = (1-t) \begin{pmatrix} (1-t)(-1) \\ (1-t)(2) + t(4) \end{pmatrix} + t \begin{pmatrix} t(5) \\ (1-t)(4) + t(-2) \end{pmatrix}.
$$

You can check that $\vec{B}_{2,0}(0) = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\vec{B}_{2,0}(1) = \begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix}$ and that $\vec{B}_{2,0}(t)$ is quadratic.

With some algebra, the expression for $\vec{B}_{2,0}$ can be simplified, but leaving it unsimplified emphasizes whence it came. It is the result of nested linear interpolations. We now use this idea to define the Bèzier curve from $\vec{P}_0$ to $\vec{P}_n$ via control points $\vec{P}_1, \vec{P}_2, \ldots, \vec{P}_{n-1}$. Commonly, $\vec{P}_0$ and $\vec{P}_n$ are also considered control points and so this same Bèzier is also referred to as the Bèzier curve with control points $\vec{P}_0, \vec{P}_1, \ldots, \vec{P}_n$. Such a Bèzier curve will have degree at most $n - 1$. We begin by defining the linear Bèzier curves

$$
\vec{B}_{1,i}(t) = (1-t)\vec{P}_i + (t)\vec{P}_{i+1}, \qquad i = 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1. \tag{5.1.2}
$$

Then

$$
B_{j,i}(t) = (1-t)\vec{B}_{j-1,i} + (t)\vec{B}_{j-1,i+1}, \qquad j = 2, 3, \ldots, n; \ i = 0, 1, \ldots, n - j. \tag{5.1.3}
$$

With this definition, $B_{n,0}(t)$ is the desired degree at most $n - 1$ Bèzier curve.

Extending our previous example, we add the control point $(5, 1)$ so we have

$$
\vec{P}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}, \ \vec{P}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix}, \ \vec{P}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \ \vec{P}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix}.
$$

Figure 5.1.1: Three points on a cubic Bèzier curve constructed by recursive linear interpolation.

Then, by equation 5.1.2,

$$\vec{B}_{1,0}(t) = (1-t)\vec{P}_0 + (t)\vec{P}_1 = (1-t)\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} + t\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -1+t \\ 2+2t \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\vec{B}_{1,1}(t) = (1-t)\vec{P}_1 + (t)\vec{P}_2 = (1-t)\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix} + t\begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 5t \\ 4-3t \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\vec{B}_{1,2}(t) = (1-t)\vec{P}_2 + (t)\vec{P}_3 = (1-t)\begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + t\begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ 1-3t \end{pmatrix}.$$

And by equation 5.1.3,

$$\vec{B}_{2,0}(t) = (1-t)\vec{B}_{1,0}(t) + (t)\vec{B}_{1,1}(t) = (1-t)\begin{pmatrix} -1+t \\ 2+2t \end{pmatrix} + t\begin{pmatrix} 5t \\ 4-3t \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -1+2t+4t^2 \\ 2+4t-5t^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\vec{B}_{2,1}(t) = (1-t)\vec{B}_{1,1}(t) + (t)\vec{B}_{1,2}(t) = (1-t)\begin{pmatrix} 5t \\ 4-3t \end{pmatrix} + t\begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ 1-3t \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 10t-5t^2 \\ 4-6t \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\vec{B}_{3,0}(t) = (1-t)\vec{B}_{2,0}(t) + (t)\vec{B}_{2,1}(t) = (1-t)\begin{pmatrix} -1+2t+4t^2 \\ 2+4t-5t^2 \end{pmatrix} + t\begin{pmatrix} 10t-5t^2 \\ 4-6t \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} -1+3t+12t^2-9t^3 \\ 2+6t-15t^2+5t^3 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.1.4}$$

$\vec{B}_{3,0}(t)$ is the cubic Bèzier curve from $\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$ to $\begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix}$ via control points $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Figure 5.1.1 shows this Bèzier curve and the construction of three of its points via recursive linear interpolation. The blue points lie along the linear Bèzier curves $\vec{B}_{1,0}, \vec{B}_{1,1}, \vec{B}_{1,2}$. The orange points lie along the quadratic Bèzier curves $\vec{B}_{2,0}$ and $\vec{B}_{2,1}$. The black points lie along the cubic Bèzier curve. The graphs of the quadratics have been suppressed to avoid overcomplicating the figure.

Figure 5.1.1 may help you grasp the recursion, but maybe more importantly may help you understand the relationship between the control points and the Bèzier curve. For example, upon close examination, you may be led to believe the line segments $\vec{B}_{1,0}$ and $\vec{B}_{1,2}$ are tangent to the cubic Bèzier curve $\vec{B}_{3,0}$ at $\vec{P}_0$ and $\vec{P}_3$, respectively. Close examination of the formulas will confirm it.

According to formulas 5.1.2 and 5.1.3, the (at most) cubic Bèzier curve with control points $\vec{P}_0, \vec{P}_1, \vec{P}_2, \vec{P}_3$ is computed thus:

$$\vec{B}_{1,0}(t) = (1-t)\vec{P}_0 + (t)\vec{P}_1$$
$$\vec{B}_{1,1}(t) = (1-t)\vec{P}_1 + (t)\vec{P}_2$$
$$\vec{B}_{1,2}(t) = (1-t)\vec{P}_2 + (t)\vec{P}_3$$

so

$$\vec{B}_{2,0}(t) = (1-t)\vec{B}_{1,0}(t) + (t)\vec{B}_{1,1}(t) = (1-t)\left[(1-t)\vec{P}_0 + (t)\vec{P}_1\right] + t\left[(1-t)\vec{P}_1 + (t)\vec{P}_2\right]$$

$$= (1-t)^2\vec{P}_0 + 2t(1-t)\vec{P}_1 + t^2\vec{P}_2$$

$$\vec{B}_{2,1}(t) = (1-t)\vec{B}_{1,1}(t) + (t)\vec{B}_{1,2}(t) = (1-t)\left[(1-t)\vec{P}_1 + (t)\vec{P}_2\right] + t\left[(1-t)\vec{P}_2 + (t)\vec{P}_3\right]$$

$$= (1-t)^2\vec{P}_1 + 2t(1-t)\vec{P}_2 + t^2\vec{P}_3$$

so

$$
\begin{aligned}
\vec{B}_{3,0}(t) &= (1-t)\vec{B}_{2,0}(t) + (t)\vec{B}_{2,1}(t) \\
&= (1-t)\left[(1-t)^2\vec{P}_0 + 2t(1-t)\vec{P}_1 + t^2\vec{P}_2\right] + t\left[(1-t)^2\vec{P}_1 + 2t(1-t)\vec{P}_2 + t^2\vec{P}_3\right] \quad (5.1.5) \\
&= (1-t)^3\vec{P}_0 + 3t(1-t)^2\vec{P}_1 + 3t^2(1-t)\vec{P}_2 + t^3\vec{P}_3.
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence $\frac{d}{dt}\vec{B}_{3,0}(t) = -3(1-t)^2\vec{P}_0 + 3\left[(1-t)^2 - 2t(1-t)\right]\vec{P}_1 + 3\left[2t(1-t) - t^2\right]\vec{P}_2 + 3t^2\vec{P}_3$, from which it follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left.\frac{d}{dt}\vec{B}_{3,0}(t)\right|_{t=0} &= -3\vec{P}_0 + 3\vec{P}_1 = 3(\vec{P}_1 - \vec{P}_0) \\
\left.\frac{d}{dt}\vec{B}_{3,0}(t)\right|_{t=1} &= -3\vec{P}_2 + 3\vec{P}_3 = 3(\vec{P}_3 - \vec{P}_2).
\end{aligned}
$$

Indeed, the derivative of $\vec{B}_{3,0}$ at 0 is in the directon of the line segment from $\vec{P}_1$ to $\vec{P}_2$, and the derivative of $\vec{B}_{3,0}$ at 1 is in the direction of the line segment from $\vec{P}_2$ to $\vec{P}_3$. Moreover, the derivatives are exactly three times the differences of appropriate control points.

Thus the Bèzier cubic with control points $\vec{P}_0, \vec{P}_1, \vec{P}_2, \vec{P}_3$ is easily defined as parametric cubic Hermite polynomials. To facilitate the description of the parametrization, let $\vec{P}_i = (x_i, y_i)$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Then $x(t)$ is the cubic Hermite polynomial with $x(0) = x_0$, $\dot{x}(0) = 3(x_1 - x_0)$, $x(1) = x_3$, and $\dot{x}(1) = 3(x_3 - x_2)$, and $y(t)$ is the cubic Hermite polynomial with $y(0) = y_0$, $\dot{y}(0) = 3(y_1 - y_0)$, $y(1) = y_3$, and $\dot{y}(1) = 3(y_3 - y_2)$.

We close this section by computing the Bèzier curve from $\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$ to $\begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix}$ via control points $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ using equation 5.1.1 and comparing our results to 5.1.4. With $x(0) = -1$, $\dot{x}(0) = 3$, $x(1) = 5$, and $\dot{x}(1) = 0$ (and the understood substitution of x for y), equation 5.1.1 gives $m = \frac{5+1}{1-0} = 6$ and

$$
x(t) = \frac{t-1}{-1}(-1) + \frac{t}{1}(5) + \frac{(t-1)^2 t}{1}(3-6) + \frac{t^2(t-1)}{1}(-6).
$$

Using equation 5.1.1 with $y(0) = 2$, $\dot{y}(0) = 6$, $y(1) = -2$, and $\dot{y}(1) = -9$ gives $m = \frac{-2-2}{1-0} = -4$ and

$$
y(t) = \frac{t-1}{-1}(2) + \frac{t}{1}(-2) + \frac{(t-1)^2 t}{1}(6+4) + \frac{t^2(t-1)}{1}(-9+4).
$$

While these equations are complete, it is difficult to compare them to 5.1.4 without some simplification. Can you show

$$
\begin{aligned}
x(t) &= -1 + 3t + 12t^2 - 9t^3 \\
y(t) &= 2 + 6t - 15t^2 + 5t^3
\end{aligned}
$$

as required? Answer on page 176.

Crumpet 30: Bézier curves and CAGD

Bézier curves were originally developed around 1960 by employees at french automobile manufacturing companies. Paul de Casteljau of Citroën was first, but Pierre Bèzier of Renault popularized the method so has his name associated with the polynomials.

Nowadays, almost all computer aided graphic design, or CAGD, software uses Bèzier curves, particularly cubic, for drawing smooth objects. CAGD software with cubic Bèzier tools will display the four control points and allow the user to move them about. In fact, the software will draw the two linear Bèzier curves at the endpoints as well. This gives the user "handles" to manipulate the curve. Some software will include the third linear Bèzier curve as well. The three of them together form a so-called control polygon. Since the relationship between the control points and the curve is intuitive, manipulation of the control points, whether it be by handles or control polygons, provides a means for swift modeling of smooth shapes.

Some shapes are too intricate to model with a single cubic Bèzier curve, however. To handle such shapes, CAGD software allows a user to string cubic Bèzier curves together end to end, forming a composite, or piecewise, Bèzier curve, such as that shown here.

This particular curve is made of two cubic Bèzier curves, one with control points $\vec{P}_0, \vec{P}_1, \vec{P}_2, \vec{P}_3$ and the other with control points $\vec{P}_3, \vec{P}_4, \vec{P}_5, \vec{P}_6$. Since Bèzier curves are intended to model smooth objects, software will provide the option of forcing derivative matching at a common point such as $\vec{P}_3$. This is done by making sure the common point is on the line segment between the two adjacent control points ($\vec{P}_2$ and $\vec{P}_4$ in this diagram).

Free open source software such as Inkscape, LibreOffice Drawing, and Dia provide Bezier curve drawing tools, but not all of them use the technical term. Inkscape has a Bezier curve tool by that name, but LibreOffice Drawing's Bezier curve tool is simply called "curve", and Dia's tool for single Bezier curves only, not composite, goes by the name of "Bezierline".

References

Barnhill, Robert E. and Riesenfeld, Richard F. editors, "Computer aided geometric design : proceedings of a conference held at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, March 18-21, 1974", Academic Press, New York, 1974.
de Casteljau, Paul de Faget, "De Casteljau's autobiography: My time at Citroën", *Computer Aided Geometric Design* **16** (7): 583–586, August 1999.
AMS: http://www.ams.org/samplings/feature-column/fcarc-bezier
Inkscape: http://www.inkscape.org/
Dia: http://sourceforge.net/projects/dia-installer/
LibreOffice: http://www.libreoffice.org/

Key Concepts

Exercises

1. Suppose $H(x) = x^5 - 3x^4 + 2x^3 - 6x + 2$ is a Hermite polynomial interpolating the data

x	$f(x)$	$f'(x)$
0	2	-6
1	-4	
2	-10	2

   collected from a function f. Find the missing datum.

2. Find parametric equations for the Bèzier curve. The ends of the "handles" are the four control points.

3. The Bèzier Curve

$$
\begin{aligned}
x(t) &= 11t^3 - 18t^2 + 3t + 5 \\
y(t) &= t^3 + 1
\end{aligned}
$$

has control points $(5, 1)$, $(6, 1)$, and $(1, 2)$. Find the fourth control point.

4. Find the Hermite polynomial interpolating the data.

| x	$f(x)$	$f'(x)$
1	2	1
5	3	-1

5. The osculating polynomial $p(x)$ passing through $(x_0, f(x_0))$ with $P'(x_0) = f'(x_0)$, $P''(x_0) = f''(x_0)$, and $P'''(x_0) = f'''(x_0)$ is also called what? Be as specific as you can.

6. Find the Hermite polynomial of degree (at most) 5 interpolating the data.

x	$f(x)$	$f'(x)$
0	2	1
0.5	2	0
1	2	1

7. A Hermite polynomial $H(x)$ is constructed using the data

x	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.8
$f(x)$	0.8	0.6	0.3	0.5
$f'(x)$	1.5	-1.2	-5.3	-2

   (a) Find $(H \circ H)'(0.6)$. That is, the derivative of $H(H(x))$ evaluated at $x = 0.6$.

   (b) Find $(f \circ f)'(0.8)$.

8. Refer to the following graph.

   (a) The graph can not be the graph of a single cubic Bèzier curve. Why not?

   (b) The graph is that of a composite cubic Bèzier curve. At least how many cubic Bèzier curves have been spliced together, and why?

9. A cubic polar Bèzier curve is the unique (parametrized) cubic polar function $(r(t), \theta(t))$ satisfying the following data.

t	$r(t)$	$\theta(t)$	$\dot{r}(t)$	$\dot{\theta}(t)$
0	r_0	θ_0	δ_0	μ_0
1	r_1	θ_1	δ_1	μ_1

   (a) A standard cubic Bèzier curve is given by the control points $(0,0)$, $(2,0)$, $(0,1)$, and $(0,3)$ (in that order). Convert this data into polar coordinate data. Recall that the conversion from Cartesian coordinates to polar coordinates involves the formulas

   $$r = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \tan\theta = \frac{y}{x}.$$

   (b) Find the cubic polar Bèzier curve based on your results from (a).

10. Write down but do not simplify the parametric equations of the Bèzier curve with control points $(-1, 2)$, $(-3, 2)$, $(3, 1)$, and $(3, 0)$.

11. The Hermite interpolating polynomial for the following data has the form $H(x) = a_0 + a_1(x - 0.3) + a_2(x - 0.3)^2 + $ _____ .

x	$f(x)$	$f'(x)$
0.30	0.295	-0.155
0.32	0.314	-0.149
0.35	0.342	-0.139

   (a) Fill in the missing part of the form of $H(x)$.

   (b) What is the maximum possible degree of $H(x)$?

   (c) Find a_0 and a_1.

12. Construct the Bèzier polynomials for the control points $(1, 1)$, $(2, 1.5)$, $(7, 1.5)$, $(6, 2)$.

13. Construct the divided differences table that led to the Hermite polynomial

   $$p(x) = 2 - (x - 1) + \frac{1}{4}(x - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{4}(x - 1)^2(x - 3).$$

14. What is the minimum number of cubic Bèzier curves in the diagram, and why?

15. Let $g(x) = (\sqrt{2})^x$.

   (a) Using $x_0 = 1$ and $x_1 = 2$, find a Hermite interpolating polynomial for g.

   (b) Use the Hermite polynomial to approximate $g(1.5)$.

   (c) Calculate the actual error of this approximation, and compare it to the error you got in question

   (d) Which polynomial approximated $g(1.5)$ with smaller absolute error, the Hermite or the Lagrange interpolating polynomial?

16. Find equations for the cubic polynomials that make up the composite Bézier curve.

17. Find a polynomial that passes through the points $(0,0)$ and $(4,-3)$ and whose derivative passes through the points $(0,1)$ and $(4,1)$.

18. Construct the Hermite interpolating polynomial for the given data. Do this using a pencil, paper and calculator, or a spreadsheet. Do not use Octave code.

x	$f(x)$	$f'(x)$
0.1	-0.29004996	-2.8019975
0.2	-0.56079734	-2.6159201
0.3	-0.81401972	-2.4533949

19. The data in question 18 were generated using $f(x) = x^2 \cos(x) - 3x$.

    (a) Approximate $f(0.18)$ using the polynomial from question 18.

    (b) Calculate the absolute error of this approximation.

20. Find a bound on the error of the approximation in question 19a. Compare this theoretical bound to the actual error (computed in #19b).

21. Compare the Hermite polynomial pseudo-code in the class slides to the code we wrote in class. Explain any differences.

22. A car traveling along a straight road is clocked at a number of points. The data from the observations are given in the following table, where the time is in seconds, the distance is in feet, and the speed is in feet per second.

Time	0	3	5	8	13
Distance	0	225	383	623	993
Speed	75	77	80	74	72

    (a) Compute a Hermite interpolating polynomial for the data.

    (b) Use your polynomial from part (a) to predict the position (distance) of the car and its speed when $t = 10$ seconds.

    (c) Determine whether the car ever exceeds the 55 mph speed limit on the road. If so, what is the first time the car exceeds this speed?

    (d) What is the predicted maximum speed for the car?

NOTES: Speed is the derivative of distance.

$$55\frac{\text{miles}}{\text{hour}} = 55\frac{\text{miles}}{\text{hour}} \times \frac{5280 \text{ feet}}{\text{mile}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hour}}{3600 \text{ seconds}}$$
$$\approx 80.67\frac{\text{feet}}{\text{second}}$$

23. Complete the following code.

```
##################################################################
# Written by Dr. Len Brin                        13 March 201
# MAT 322
# Purpose: Evaluate an interpolating polynomial at the value z
# INPUT: number z
#        Data x0,x1,...,xn used to calculate the polynomial
#        Coefficients a0;0, a1;0,1, ... an;0,1,...,n as an array
# OUTPUT: P(z), the value of the interploating polynomial at z
##################################################################
function ans = divDiffEval2(z,x,c)
  n = length(x);
  ans = c(n);
  for i=1:n-1
    ans=(z-x(???))*ans+c(???);
  endfor
endfunction
```

Answers

Hermite polynomial computer form: The four remaining entries are

$$f_{1,1} = \frac{y_1 - y_0}{t_1 - t_0}$$

$$f_{0,2} = \frac{f_{1,1} - \dot{y}_0}{t_1 - t_0} = \frac{y_1 - y_0}{(t_1 - t_0)^2} - \frac{\dot{y}_0}{t_1 - t_0}$$

$$f_{1,2} = \frac{\dot{y}_1 - f_{1,1}}{t_1 - t_0} = \frac{\dot{y}_1}{t_1 - t_0} - \frac{y_1 - y_0}{(t_1 - t_0)^2}$$

$$f_{0,3} = \frac{f_{1,2} - f_{0,2}}{t_1 - t_0} = \frac{\dot{y}_1 + \dot{y}_0}{(t_1 - t_0)^2} - 2\frac{y_1 - y_0}{(t_1 - t_0)^3}$$

Bézier curve via Hermite cubics: The simplification may be done as follows.

$$
\begin{aligned}
x(t) &= \frac{t-1}{-1}(-1) + \frac{t}{1}(5) + \frac{(t-1)^2 t}{1}(3-6) + \frac{t^2(t-1)}{1}(-6) \\
&= (t-1) + 5t - 3t(t-1)^2 - 6t^2(t-1) \\
&= 6t - 1 - 3t(t^2 - 2t + 1) - 6t^3 + 6t^2 \\
&= 6t - 1 - 3t^3 + 6t^2 - 3t - 6t^3 + 6t^2 \\
&= -9t^3 + 12t^2 + 3t - 1
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
y(t) &= \frac{t-1}{-1}(2) + \frac{t}{1}(-2) + \frac{(t-1)^2 t}{1}(6+4) + \frac{t^2(t-1)}{1}(-9+4) \\
&= -2(t-1) - 2t + 10t(t-1)^2 - 5t^2(t-1) \\
&= -2t + 2 - 2t + 10t(t^2 - 2t + 1) - 5t^3 + 5t^2 \\
&= 2 - 4t + 10t^3 - 20t^2 + 10t - 5t^3 + 5t^2 \\
&= 5t^3 - 15t^2 + 6t + 2.
\end{aligned}
$$

5.2   Splines

Cubic Splines

Spline for airplane model.

Exercises

x	$f(x)$
0.1	-0.62
0.2	-0.28
0.3	0.0066
0.4	0.24

1. What problem with polynomial interpolation does cubic spline interpolation solve?

2. Write down the system of equations that would need to be solved in order to find the cubic spline through $(0, -9)$, $(1, -13)$, and $(2, -29)$ with free boundary conditions. Do not attempt to solve the system, but be sure to indicate how to form the cubic spline from the solution of the system.

3. Set up, but so not solve, the equations which could be solved to find the free cubic spline through the points $(1, 1)$, $(2, 3)$, and $(4, 2)$.

4. List three reasons that might make you use a Bèzier curve rather than a Lagrange polynomial to model a certain graph.

5. Write down a system of equations that could be solved in order to find the free cubic spline through the following data points. Do not solve the system.

6. When constructing a cubic spline, there are four types of conditions that must be satisfied: (i) Interpolation of the data, (ii) First derivative matching at section boundaries, (iii) Second derivative matching at section boundaries, (iv) Endpoint conditions.

   (a) How many of each type of condition are there for a cubic spline that must pass through n data points, $n \geq 2$?

   (b) Argue that the total number of conditions is equal to the number of unknowns available.

Ordinary Differential Equations

6.1   Taylor Methods

ODE solvers based on Taylor polynomials

Exercises

1. Use Euler's Method with step size $h = 0.5$ to approximate $y(2)$.

$$\frac{dy}{dx} = 3x^3 - y$$
$$y(1) = 3$$

2. Explain geometrically, and in your own words, modified Euler's method.

3. Execute two steps of Euler's method for solving $\dot{y} = ty$ with $y(1) = -0.5$ and $h = 0.25$, thus approximating $y(1.5)$.

6.2 Runge-Kutta Methods

Approximations of Taylor Methods. Euler's method, Midpoint method, Improved Euler's, Heun's. RK-4 and the order 4 half of RK45. Higher order?

Exercises

1. Execute one step of Runge-Kutta order four for solving $\dot{y} = ty$ with $y(1) = -0.5$ and $h = 0.5$, thus approximating $y(1.5)$. Compare your answer to that of section .

2.

6.3 Adaptive Runge-Kutta Methods

Paired methods

Put multi-step methods in exercises

Solutions to Selected Exercises

Section 1.1

3a: $|\tilde{p} - p| = \left| \frac{1106}{9} - 123 \right| = \frac{1}{9} \approx 0.111$

3c: $|\tilde{p} - p| = |1000 - 2^{10}| = |1000 - 1024| = 24$

3e: $|\tilde{p} - p| = |10^{-4} - \pi^{-7}| = \left| 0.0001 - \frac{1}{\pi^7} \right| \approx 2.3109(10)^{-4}$, using the Octave command

$$\texttt{abs(10\^-4-pi\^-7)}.$$

4a: $\dfrac{|\tilde{p} - p|}{|p|} = \dfrac{\left| \frac{1106}{9} - 123 \right|}{123} = \dfrac{1}{1107} \approx 9.03(10)^{-4}$

4c: $\dfrac{|\tilde{p} - p|}{|p|} = \dfrac{|1000 - 2^{10}|}{2^{10}} = \dfrac{3}{128} \approx 0.0234$

4e: $\dfrac{|\tilde{p} - p|}{|p|} = \dfrac{|10^{-4} - \pi^{-7}|}{\pi^{-7}} = 1 - \dfrac{\pi^7}{10000} \approx 0.69797$, using the Octave command

$$\texttt{abs(10\^-4-pi\^-7)/pi\^-7}.$$

5a: $\log \left| \dfrac{p}{\tilde{p} - p} \right| = \log \left| \dfrac{123}{\frac{1106}{9} - 123} \right| \approx 3.0$

5c: $\log \left| \dfrac{p}{\tilde{p} - p} \right| = \log \left| \dfrac{2^{10}}{1000 - 2^{10}} \right| \approx 1.6$

5e: $\log \left| \dfrac{p}{\tilde{p} - p} \right| = \log \left| \dfrac{\pi^{-7}}{10^{-4} - \pi^{-7}} \right| \approx 0.15616$, using the Octave command

$$\texttt{log(pi\^-7/abs(10\^-4-pi\^-7))/log(10)}.$$

10a: $f(2) = e^{\sin(2)}$. In Octave: $\texttt{exp(sin(2))}$, which gives 2.4826.

10c: $f(2) = \tan^{-1}(2 - 0.429)$. In Octave: $\texttt{atan(2-0.429)}$, which gives 1.0039.

12a: We need to find $\tilde{p}$ such that $|\tilde{p} - \pi| = 0.001$, so $\tilde{p} - \pi = \pm 0.001$, so $\tilde{p} = \pi \pm 0.001$. There are two possible solutions, $\pi - 0.001 \approx 3.14059$ and $\pi + 0.001 \approx 3.14259$.

12c: We need to find $\tilde{p}$ such that $|\tilde{p} - \ln(3)| = 0.001$, so $\tilde{p} - \ln(3) = \pm 0.001$, so $\tilde{p} = \ln(3) \pm 0.001$. There are two possible solutions, $\ln(3) - 0.001 \approx 1.09761$ and $\ln(3) + 0.001 \approx 1.09961$.

12e: We need to find $\tilde{p}$ such that $\left| \tilde{p} - \frac{10}{\ln(1.1)} \right| = 0.001$, so $\tilde{p} - \frac{10}{\ln(1.1)} = \pm 0.001$, so $\tilde{p} = \frac{10}{\ln(1.1)} \pm 0.001$. There are two possible solutions, $\frac{10}{\ln(1.1)} - 0.001 \approx 104.91958$ and $\frac{10}{\ln(1.1)} + 0.001 \approx 104.92158$.

13a: We need to find $\tilde{p}$ such that $\frac{|\tilde{p} - \pi|}{\pi} = 0.001$, so $\tilde{p} - \pi = \pm 0.001\pi$, so $\tilde{p} = \pi(1 \pm 0.001)$. There are two possible solutions, $\pi(0.999) \approx 3.13845$ and $\pi(1.001) \approx 3.14473$.

13c: We need to find $\tilde{p}$ such that $\frac{|\tilde{p} - \ln(3)|}{\ln(3)} = 0.001$, so $\tilde{p} - \ln(3) = \pm 0.001 \ln(3)$, so $\tilde{p} = \ln(3)(1 \pm 0.001)$. There are two possible solutions, $\ln(3)(0.999) \approx 1.09751$ and $\ln(3)(1 + 0.001) \approx 1.09971$.

13e: We need to find $\tilde{p}$ such that $\frac{\left|\tilde{p} - \frac{10}{\ln(1.1)}\right|}{\frac{10}{\ln(1.1)}} = 0.001$, so $\tilde{p} - \frac{10}{\ln(1.1)} = \pm 0.001 \frac{10}{\ln(1.1)}$, so $\tilde{p} = \frac{10}{\ln(1.1)}(1 \pm 0.001)$. There are two possible solutions, $\frac{10}{\ln(1.1)}(0.999) \approx 104.81566$ and $\frac{10}{\ln(1.1)}(1.001) \approx 105.02550$.

Section 1.2

1a: From Taylor's theorem, $T_3(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{3} \frac{f^{(k)}(x_0)}{k!}(x - x_0)^k = f(x_0) + f'(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0) + \frac{f''(x_0)}{2!} \cdot (x - x_0)^2 + \frac{f'''(x_0)}{3!} \cdot (x - x_0)^3$ for any function f with enough derivatives. So to find $T_3(x)$, we need to evaluate f, f', f'', f''' at $x_0 = 0$. To that end, $f(x) = \sin(x)$, so $f'(x) = \cos(x)$, $f''(x) = -\sin(x)$, and $f'''(x) = -\cos(x)$. Therefore $f(x_0) = \sin(0) = 0$, $f'(x_0) = \cos(0) = 1$, $f''(x_0) = -\sin(0) = 0$, and $f'''(x_0) = -\cos(0) = -1$. Substituting this information into the formula for $T_3(x)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_3(x) &= 0 + 1 \cdot (x - 0) + \frac{0}{2!} \cdot (x - 0)^2 + \frac{-1}{3!} \cdot (x - 0)^3 \\
&= x - \frac{1}{6}x^3.
\end{aligned}
$$

Also from Taylor's Theorem, we know $R_3(x) = \frac{f^{(4)}(\xi)}{4!}(x - x_0)^4$ for any function f with enough derivatives. So we need to evaluate $f^{(4)}(x)$ at $x = \xi$. To that end, $f^{(4)}(x) = \sin(x)$ so $f^{(4)}(\xi) = \sin(\xi)$. Hence

$$
R_3(x) = \frac{\sin(\xi)}{24}x^4.
$$

1c: From Taylor's theorem, $T_3(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{3} \frac{f^{(k)}(x_0)}{k!}(x - x_0)^k = f(x_0) + f'(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0) + \frac{f''(x_0)}{2!} \cdot (x - x_0)^2 + \frac{f'''(x_0)}{3!} \cdot (x - x_0)^3$ for any function f with enough derivatives. So to find $T_3(x)$, we need to evaluate f, f', f'', f''' at $x_0 = \pi$. To that end, $f(x) = \sin(x)$, so $f'(x) = \cos(x)$, $f''(x) = -\sin(x)$, and $f'''(x) = -\cos(x)$. Therefore $f(x_0) = \sin(\pi) = 0$, $f'(x_0) = \cos(\pi) = -1$, $f''(x_0) = -\sin(\pi) = 0$, and $f'''(x_0) = -\cos(\pi) = 1$. Substituting this information into the formula for $T_3(x)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_3(x) &= 0 + (-1) \cdot (x - \pi) + \frac{0}{2!} \cdot (x - \pi)^2 + \frac{1}{3!} \cdot (x - \pi)^3 \\
&= \pi - x + \frac{1}{6}(x - \pi)^3.
\end{aligned}
$$

Also from Taylor's Theorem, we know $R_3(x) = \frac{f^{(4)}(\xi)}{4!}(x - x_0)^4$ for any function f with enough derivatives. So we need to evaluate $f^{(4)}(x)$ at $x = \xi$. To that end, $f^{(4)}(x) = \sin(x)$ so $f^{(4)}(\xi) = \sin(\xi)$. Hence

$$
R_3(x) = \frac{\sin(\xi)}{24}(x - \pi)^4.
$$

8: (a) 1 (b) 0.87760 (c) 0.54167 (d) 0.12391

```
octave:1> f=inline('1-x^2/2+x^4/24')
f = f(x) = 1-x^2/2+x^4/24
octave:2> f(0)
ans =  1
octave:3> f(1/2)
ans =  0.87760
octave:4> f(1)
ans =  0.54167
octave:5> f(pi)
ans =  0.12391
```

10: `taylorExercise.m`:

```
f=inline('1-x^2/2+x^4/24');
f(0)
f(1/2)
f(1)
f(pi)
```


Running `taylorExercise.m`:


```
octave:1> taylorExercise
ans =  1
ans =  0.87760
ans =  0.54167
ans =  0.12391
```


26: (a) From Taylor's theorem, $T_2(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{2} \frac{f^{(k)}(x_0)}{k!}(x-x_0)^k = f(x_0) + f'(x_0) \cdot (x-x_0) + \frac{f''(x_0)}{2!} \cdot (x-x_0)^2$ for any function f with enough derivatives. So to find $T_2(x)$, we need to evaluate f, f', and f'' at $x_0 = 5$. To that end, $f(x) = \frac{1}{x}$, so $f'(x) = -\frac{1}{x^2}$, and $f''(x) = \frac{2}{x^3}$. Therefore $f(x_0) = \frac{1}{5}$, $f'(x_0) = -\frac{1}{25}$, and $f''(x_0) = \frac{2}{125}$. Substituting this information into the formula for $T_2(x)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_2(x) &= \frac{1}{5} + \left(-\frac{1}{25}\right) \cdot (x-5) + \frac{2/125}{2!} \cdot (x-5)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{5} - \frac{x-5}{25} + \frac{(x-5)^2}{125}.
\end{aligned}
$$

(b) From Taylor's Theorem, $R_2(x) = \frac{f^{(3)}(\xi)}{3!}(x-x_0)^3$ for any function f with enough derivatives. So we need to evaluate $f'''(x)$ at $x = \xi$. To that end, $f'''(x) = -\frac{6}{x^4}$ so $f'''(\xi) = -\frac{6}{\xi^4}$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_2(x) &= \frac{-6/\xi^4}{6}(x-5)^3 \\
&= -\frac{(x-5)^3}{\xi^4}.
\end{aligned}
$$

(c) $f(1) \approx T_2(1) = \frac{1}{5} - \frac{1-5}{25} + \frac{(1-5)^2}{125} = \frac{1}{5} + \frac{4}{25} + \frac{16}{125} = \frac{61}{125}$ and $f(9) \approx T_2(9) = \frac{1}{5} - \frac{9-5}{25} + \frac{(9-5)^2}{125} = \frac{1}{5} - \frac{4}{25} + \frac{16}{125} = \frac{21}{125}$

(d) The bounds are 64 and $\frac{64}{625}$ respectively. According to Taylor's Theorem, the absolute error $|f(x) - T_2(x)| = |R_2(\xi)|$ for some ξ strictly between x and x_0. So we can obtain a theoretical bound by bounding $|R_2(x)|$ over all values of ξ between x and x_0. For $x = 1$, $R_2(1) = -\frac{(1-5)^3}{\xi^4} = -\frac{64}{\xi^4}$. Hence, $|f(1) - T_2(1)| \le \max_{\xi \in [1,5]} \frac{64}{\xi^4}$. Since $\frac{64}{\xi^4}$ is a decreasing function of ξ over the interval from 1 to 5, its maximum value is obtained at $\xi = 1$. Finally, we can conclude $|f(1) - T_2(1)| \le 64$. Similarly, $|f(9) - T_2(9)| \le \max_{\xi \in [5,9]} \frac{64}{\xi^4}$. We get a much smaller bound, though, since we are finding our bound over the interval from 5 to 9. $|f(9) - T_2(9)| \le \frac{64}{5^4} = \frac{64}{625}$.

(e) The bounds are $\frac{64}{625}$ and $\frac{64}{6561}$ respectively. Just as we can find an upper bound on the absolute error, we can find a lower bound. The same analysis applies up to the point where we maximized the remainder term over an interval of ξ values. The only change is that we now must minimize this funtion over the interval. So $|f(1) - T_2(1)| \ge \min_{\xi \in [1,5]} \frac{64}{\xi^4}$ and $|f(9) - T_2(9)| \ge \min_{\xi \in [5,9]} \frac{64}{\xi^4}$. Since $\frac{64}{\xi^4}$ is a decreasing function of ξ over the interval from 1 to 5 (and over the interval from 5 to 9), its minimum value is obtained at the right endpoint. So $|f(1) - T_2(1)| \ge \frac{64}{5^4} = \frac{64}{625}$ and $|f(9) - T_2(9)| \ge \frac{64}{9^4} = \frac{64}{6561}$.

(f) $|f(1) - T_2(1)| = \left|\frac{1}{1} - \frac{61}{125}\right| = \frac{64}{125} = 0.5120$. Indeed $\frac{64}{625} \le \frac{64}{125} \le 64$. $|f(9) - T_2(9)| = \left|\frac{1}{9} - \frac{21}{125}\right| = \frac{64}{1125} \approx .0568$. Indeed $\frac{64}{625} \le \frac{64}{1125} \le \frac{64}{6561}$.

(g)

30b: Perhaps it may initially come as a surprise, but we do not need to find $T_4(x)$ in order to answer this question. The matter of error is entirely taken up by the remainder term. So we need only calculate $R_4(x)$. This does, however, require us to find the first 5 derivatives of $f(x)$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(x) &= e^{-x^2} \\
f'(x) &= -2xe^{-x^2} \\
f''(x) &= -2e^{-x^2} + (-2x)(-2xe^{-x^2}) \\
&= 2(2x^2 - 1)e^{-x^2} \\
f'''(x) &= 2[4xe^{-x^2} + (2x^2 - 1)(-2xe^{-x^2})] \\
&= -4(2x^3 - 3x)e^{-x^2} \\
f^{(4)}(x) &= -4[(6x^2 - 3)e^{-x^2} + (2x^3 - 3x)(-2xe^{-x^2})] \\
&= -4(-4x^4 + 12x^2 - 3)e^{-x^2} \\
f^{(5)}(x) &= -4[(-16x^3 + 24x)e^{-x^2} + (-4x^4 + 12x^2 - 3)(-2xe^{-x^2})] \\
&= -8(4x^5 - 20x^3 + 15x)e^{-x^2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, $R_4(x) = \frac{f^{(5)}(\xi)}{5!}x^5 = \frac{-8(4\xi^5 - 20\xi^3 + 15\xi)e^{-\xi^2}}{120}x^5 = \frac{x^5}{15}\left(4\xi^5 - 20\xi^3 + 15\xi\right)e^{-\xi^2}$. For any given value of x, we are faced with maximizing the absolute value of this expression over all ξ between 0 and x. We may ignore the $\frac{x^5}{15}$ factor which is independent of ξ, and focus on finding extrema of $\left(4\xi^5 - 20\xi^3 + 15\xi\right)e^{-\xi^2}$. Sometimes, at this point, the expression requiring optimization is easy enough to handle using standard calculus techniques—finding critical points and evaluating. However, in this case, that would involve finding the roots of a sixth degree polynomial. Ironically, techniques we will learn later in this course would be helpful right now, but as it is, we have no way to do that in general. The best we can do is have a look at a graph and hope it helps. Letting $g(\xi) = \left(4\xi^5 - 20\xi^3 + 15\xi\right)e^{-\xi^2}$, we proceed by graphing $g(\xi)$:

With the goal of maximization in mind, it makes sense to take note of the relative extrema. The function appears to have 6 relative extrema and seems to approach zero as ξ approaches $\pm\infty$. To confirm that these observations are facts, we start by calculating $g'(\xi) = -(8\xi^6 - 60\xi^4 + 90\xi^2 - 15)$. Since a sixth degree polynomial has at most 6 distinct roots, g has at most 6 relative extrema. Since we can see 6 relative extrema on the graph, there are no others. Also,

$$\lim_{\xi \to \pm\infty} -(8\xi^6 - 60\xi^4 + 90\xi^2 - 15) = 0$$

since the exponential factor dominates the polynomial factor. We would possibly not have thought to consider these two facts if it were not for the graph. But there's more. The graph appears to be odd. Again, we can verify that this is indeed the case:

$$
\begin{aligned}
g(-\xi) &= \left(4(-\xi)^5 - 20(-\xi)^3 + 15(-\xi)\right) e^{-(-\xi)^2} \\
&= -(4\xi^5 - 20\xi^3 + 15\xi)e^{-\xi^2} \\
&= -g(\xi).
\end{aligned}
$$

Due to this symmetry, we may focus on finding extrema for positive values of ξ. And since we are ultimately interested in maximizing $|g|$, it is a good time to consider the graph of $|g(\xi)|$ over $\xi \in [0, 4]$:

Finally, we can tackle the maximization. The relative maximum, marked with a red plus, will be the key to the answer. Let the coordinates of this point be $(\hat{\xi}, g(\hat{\xi}))$. Then, since $|g(\xi)|$ is increasing on the interval from 0 to $\hat{\xi}$, we can conclude that

$$\max_{\xi \in [0,x]} |g(\xi)| = |g(x)| = g(x)$$

for all x between 0 and $\hat{\xi}$. Moreover,

$$\max_{\xi \in [0,x]} |g(\xi)| = |g(\hat{\xi})| = g(\hat{\xi})$$

for all $x \geq \hat{\xi}$. By symmetry, we can conclude that $\max_{\xi \in [x,0]} |g(\xi)| = g(x)$ for x between $-\hat{\xi}$ and 0, and $\max_{\xi \in [x,0]} |g(\xi)| = g(\hat{\xi})$ for all $x \leq -\hat{\xi}$. Putting it all together,

$$|T_4(x) - f(x)| = |R_4(x)| \leq \begin{cases} \frac{x^5}{15} g(x) & \text{if } |x| < \hat{\xi} \\ \frac{x^5}{15} g(\hat{\xi}) & \text{if } |x| \geq \hat{\xi} \end{cases}.$$

Granted, we do not know the values of $\hat{\xi}$ or $g(\hat{\xi})$, but we can approximate them using a graphing calculator: $(\hat{\xi}, g(\hat{\xi})) \approx (.43607, 4.0892)$.

Section 1.3

1b: We need to find α such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1/3^{e^{n+1}}}{(1/3^{e^n})^\alpha} = \lambda$ for some $\lambda \neq 0$. So, taking a close look at $\frac{1/3^{e^{n+1}}}{(1/3^{e^n})^\alpha}$ should help:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1/3^{e^{n+1}}}{(1/3^{e^n})^\alpha} &= \frac{\left(3^{e^n}\right)^\alpha}{3^{e^{n+1}}} \\
&= \frac{3^{\alpha e^n}}{3^{e^{n+1}}} \\
&= \frac{3^{\alpha e^n}}{3^{e \cdot e^n}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Consequently, if $\alpha = e$, then $\frac{1/3^{e^{n+1}}}{(1/3^{e^n})^\alpha} = 1$, from which if follows that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1/3^{e^{n+1}}}{(1/3^{e^n})^\alpha} = 1$. Therefore, the order of convergence is $\alpha = e$.

1c: We need to find α such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\left|\frac{2^{2^{n+1}}-2}{2^{2^{n+1}}+3}-1\right|}{\left|\frac{2^{2^n}-2}{2^{2^n}+3}-1\right|^\alpha} = \lambda$ for some $\lambda \neq 0$. So, taking a close look at

$\frac{\left|\frac{2^{2^{n+1}}-2}{2^{2^{n+1}}+3}-1\right|}{\left|\frac{2^{2^n}-2}{2^{2^n}+3}-1\right|^\alpha}$ should help:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\left|\frac{2^{2^{n+1}}-2}{2^{2^{n+1}}+3}-1\right|}{\left|\frac{2^{2^n}-2}{2^{2^n}+3}-1\right|^\alpha} &= \frac{\left|\frac{2^{2^{n+1}}-2}{2^{2^{n+1}}+3}-\frac{2^{2^{n+1}}+3}{2^{2^{n+1}}+3}\right|}{\left|\frac{2^{2^n}-2}{2^{2^n}+3}-\frac{2^{2^n}+3}{2^{2^n}+3}\right|^\alpha} \\
&= \frac{\left|\frac{-5}{2^{2^{n+1}}+3}\right|}{\left|\frac{-5}{2^{2^n}+3}\right|^\alpha} \\
&= 5^{1-\alpha}\frac{\left(2^{2^n}+3\right)^\alpha}{2^{2^{n+1}}+3}.
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\alpha = 2$, the leading terms in both numerator and denominator of the resulting fraction will match. This is strong evidence that $\alpha = 2$ is the right choice. Let's try it:

$$
\begin{aligned}
5^{1-2}\frac{\left(2^{2^n}+3\right)^2}{2^{2^{n+1}}+3} &= \frac{1}{5}\cdot\frac{2^{2\cdot2^n}+6\cdot2^{2^n}+3}{2^{2^{n+1}}+3} \\
&= \frac{1}{5}\cdot\frac{2^{2^{n+1}}+6\cdot2^{2^n}+3}{2^{2^{n+1}}+3} \\
&= \frac{1}{5}\cdot\frac{1+6\cdot2^{-2^n}+3\cdot2^{-2^{n+1}}}{1+3\cdot2^{-2^{n+1}}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

In the last step, we have divided both numerator and denominator by $2^{2^{n+1}}$ to make taking the limit as n approaches ∞ simple:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\left|\frac{2^{2^{n+1}}-2}{2^{2^{n+1}}+3}-1\right|}{\left|\frac{2^{2^n}-2}{2^{2^n}+3}-1\right|^2} &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{5}\cdot\frac{1+6\cdot2^{-2^n}+3\cdot2^{-2^{n+1}}}{1+3\cdot2^{-2^{n+1}}} \\
&= \frac{1}{5}.
\end{aligned}
$$

So, the order of convergence is $\alpha = 2$.

6c: To begin, we are looking for a function of the form $\frac{C}{n^p}$ or the form $\frac{K}{a^n}$ that will be at least as great as $\left|\frac{\sin n}{\sqrt{n}}\right|$ for large n. In the end, though, we want the smallest such function (up to a constant). The key to the solution is to note that $|\sin n| \leq 1$ for all n:

$$
\left|\frac{\sin n}{\sqrt{n}}\right| = \frac{|\sin n|}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{1}{n^{1/2}}.
$$

Since this inequality will not hold for any higher power of n, the rate of convergence is $O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right)$.

6d: To begin, we are looking for a function of the form $\frac{C}{n^p}$ or the form $\frac{K}{a^n}$ that will be at least as great as $\left|\frac{4}{10^n+35n+9}\right|$ for large n. In the end, though, we want the smallest such function (up to a constant). The key to the solution is to note that $10^n + 35n + 9 > 10^n$ for all n:

$$\left|\frac{4}{10^n+35n+9}\right| = \frac{4}{10^n+35n+9} \le \frac{4}{10^n}.$$

Since this inequality will not hold for any base greater than 10, the rate of convergence is $O\left(\frac{1}{10^n}\right)$.

6e: To begin, we are looking for a function of the form $\frac{C}{n^p}$ or the form $\frac{K}{a^n}$ that will be at least as great as $\left|\frac{4}{10^n-35n-9}\right|$ for large n. In the end, though, we want the smallest such function (up to a constant). The key to the solution is dealing with the fact that $10^n - 35n - 9 < 10^n$ for all n:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\frac{4}{10^n-35n-9}\right| &= \frac{8}{2\cdot 10^n - 70n - 18} \\
&= \frac{8}{10^n + (10^n - 70n - 18)} \\
&\le \frac{8}{10^n}
\end{aligned}
$$

for sufficiently large n since $10^n - 70n - 18 \ge 0$ for all large n. Since no similar inequality will hold for any base greater than 10, the rate of convergence is $O\left(\frac{1}{10^n}\right)$. Notice we have the same rate of convergence as in question 6d even though we ended up with a larger constant. The rate of convergence is not dependent on the constant needed in the inequality.

6k: To begin, we are looking for a function of the form $\frac{C}{n^p}$ or the form $\frac{K}{a^n}$ that will be at least as great as $\left|\frac{n^2}{2^n}\right|$ for large n. In the end, though, we want the smallest such function (up to a constant). Let $2 > \varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Notice that $\frac{n^2}{2^n} \le \frac{1}{(2-\varepsilon)^n}$ for large n by rearranging the inequality like so: $\frac{n^2}{2^n} \le \frac{1}{(2-\varepsilon)^n}$ if and only if $n^2 \le \frac{2^n}{(2-\varepsilon)^n}$ if and only if $n^2 \le \left(\frac{2}{2-\varepsilon}\right)^n$. We know this last inequality to be true for sufficiently large n because $\frac{2}{2-\varepsilon} > 1$, and exponential functions dominate polynomial functions. Hence we can use any rate of convergence of the form $O\left(\frac{1}{(2-\varepsilon)^n}\right)$, but there is no smallest such function. Hence, we are left simply using $O\left(\frac{n^2}{2^n}\right)$ as the rate of convergence.

13: One possible `.m` file is:

```
for j=0:9
  disp(7^j)
end%for
```

15: One possible `.m` file is:

```
f=inline('(2^(2^x)-2)/(2^(2^x)+3)');
n=[0,1,2,4,6,10];
for i=1:6
  disp(f(n(i)))
end%for
```

19b: For a sequence with linear order of convergence, we know the number of significant digits increases by approximately $-\log\lambda$ with each iteration, so we need to find the smallest k such that $1 - k\log(0.5) \ge 12$. Solving the equation $1 - k\log(0.5) = 12$ for k:

$$
\begin{aligned}
1 - k\log(0.5) &= 12 \\
-k\log(0.5) &= 11 \\
k &= \frac{11}{-\log(0.5)} \approx 36.54.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, it will take 37 iterations, using the rule of thumb. Remember, this estimate is only good as long as $\frac{|p_{n+1}-p|}{|p_n-p|} \approx \lambda$. So, if the actual value of the ratio is significantly different from λ, the estimate of 37 iterations could be significantly off.

Section 1.4

8: (a)

```
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
%  trominos() written by Leon Q. Brin 14 February 2013  %
%        is a recursively defined function for           %
%        calculating the number of trominos needed to    %
%        cover an n X n grid of squares, save one corner %
%  INPUT: nonnegative integer n.                         %
%  OUTPUT: T(n)                                          %
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
function ans = trominos(n)
  if (n==0)
    ans = 0;
  else
    ans = 1+4*trominos(n-1);
  end%if
end%function
```

(b)

```
octave:1> trominos(10)
ans =  349525
```

9: (a) 7. Follow this sequence of moves:

(b) i. Consider the following set of moves.

This demonstrates that the 4-disk game can be completed by completing the 3-disk game twice (the first and last moves) plus one extra move (moving the bottom disk). There is no quicker way to do it because the top 3 disks must be moved off the bottom one before the bottom one can move. Then the bottom one must move, and must take at least one move. Then the three top disks must be put back on top of the bottom disk. Since we already know the minimum number of moves to move a stack of 3 disks, this diagram shows a minimum number of moves to complete the 4-disk game.
ii. It takes a minimum of $2 \cdot 7 + 1$, or 15, moves to complete the 4-disk game.

10: (a) One—just move the disk to another peg.
(b)

```
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
%  hanoi() written by Leon Q. Brin 14 February 2013     %
%        is a recursively defined function for          %
%        calculating the number of moves needed to      %
%        complete the Tower of Hanoi with n disks.      %
%  INPUT: posititive integer n.                         %
%  OUTPUT: H(n)                                         %
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
function ans = hanoi(n)
  if (n==1)
    ans = 1;
  else
    ans = 1+2*hanoi(n-1);
  end%if
end%function
```

(c)

```
octave:1> hanoi(10)
ans =  1023
```

12a: This is asking for the number of ways to partition a set of 10 elements into a single nonempty subset. There is only one way since there is only one subset allowed. That is, the "partition" contains just the set itself. So, $S(10, 1) = 1$.

12d: This question is asking for the number of ways to partition a set of 4 elements into two nonempty subsets. As implied by the question, the actual elements of the set are immaterial, so we can work with any set of four elements and arrive at the correct answer. Consider the set $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta\}$. The list of all partitions can be categorized into those where one of the subsets has 1 element, one of the sets has 2 elements, or one of the sets has 3 elements. One does not have a partition of nonempty subsets if one of the sets contains 0 or 4 elements. Here is the list of partitions where one of the sets has exactly one element:

$$\{\{\alpha\}, \{\beta, \gamma, \delta\}\}, \ \{\{\beta\}, \{\alpha, \gamma, \delta\}\}, \ \{\{\gamma\}, \{\alpha, \beta, \delta\}\}, \ \{\{\delta\}, \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}\}$$

Note that this is also the list of all partitions where one of the sets has exactly three elements. Here is the list of partitions where one of the sets has exactly two elements (and therefore the other set also has two elements):

$$\{\{\alpha, \beta\}, \{\gamma, \delta\}\}, \ \{\{\alpha, \gamma\}, \{\beta, \delta\}\}, \ \{\{\alpha, \delta\}, \{\beta, \gamma\}\}$$

There are no other partitions. Since we have listed 7 partitions, $S(4, 2) = 7$.

13: (a) $S(n, 1)$ is the number of ways to partition a set of n elements into 1 nonempty subset. Of course, this is 1. The only such partition contains the set itself.
(b) $S(n, n)$ is the number of ways to partition a set of n elements into n nonempty subsets. Since the set contains only n elements and we need to divide them among n subsets, each subset of the partition must contain exactly one element, thus forming a partition of singleton sets. Since order does not matter in a partition, there is only one way to do this. Thus, $S(n, n) = 1$.

16: 987. If we take a stack that is $n - 1$ inches high and add a block that is 1 inch high, we have a stack that is n inches high with the top block being 1 inch tall. If we take a stack that is $n - 2$ inches high and add a block that is 2 inches high, we have a stack that is n inches high with the top block being 2 inches tall. Any stack created by adding a 1-inch block to a stack that is $n - 1$ inches tall is necessarily different from a stack created by adding a 2-inch block to a stack that is $n - 2$ inches tall since the top blocks are different. Now, if we take all the stacks that are $n - 1$ inches high and add 1-inch blocks to them, we have all the stacks that are n inches high and have a 1-inch block on top. And if we take all the stacks that are $n - 2$ inches high and add 2-inch blocks to them, we have all the stacks that are n inches high and have a 2-inch block on top. There are no other n-inch high stacks since any such stack will either have a 1-inch block or a 2-inch block on top. Therefore, the number of n-inch high stacks is just the the number of $(n - 1)$-inch stacks

plus the number of $(n-2)$-inch stacks. Of course, this doesn't make sense for $n = 1$ or $n = 2$, so we need to specify that there is exactly 1 way to create a stack of blocks 1 inch high (one 1-inch block), and there are exactly two ways to create a stack of blocks 2 inches high (two 1-inch blocks or one 2-inch block). Now we can use the recursive answer to find out how many ways of building taller stacks. The number of 3-inch stacks is the number of 2-inch stacks plus the number of 1-inch stacks, or $2 + 1 = 3$. The number of 4-inch stacks is the number of 3-inch stacks plus the number of 2-inch stacks, or $3 + 2 = 5$. The number of 5-inch stacks is the number of 4-inch stacks plus the number of 3-inch stacks, or $5 + 3 = 8$. Continuing this way reveals the following table:

n	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
number of n-inch stacks	13	21	34	55	89	144	233	377	610	987

Section 2.1

2c: Since g is a polynomial, it is continuous on $[0, 0.9]$. $g(0) = 2$ and $g(0.9) = -.1897$ so g has opposite signs on the endpoints of $[0, 0.9]$. Therefore, the Intermediate Value Theorem guarantees a root on the interval $[0, 0.9]$.

2f: The discontinuities of g are at ± 1 due to the $(1 - t^2)$ factor in the denominator and at odd multiples of $\frac{\pi}{2}$ due to the $(\tan t)$ factor in the numerator. None of these discontinuities occurs in the interval $[21.5, 22.5]$, so g is continuous on it. $g(21.5) \approx 1.6 > 0$ and $g(22.5) \approx -1.6 < 0$ so g has opposite signs on the endpoints of $[21.5, 22.5]$. Therefore, the Intermediate Value Theorem guarantees a root on the interval $[21.5, 22.5]$. Incidentally, the discontinuities closest to $[21.5, 22.5]$ are $\frac{13\pi}{2} \approx 20.42$ and $\frac{15\pi}{2} \approx 23.56$.

3: There is no single correct table for executing the bisection method. Anything that shows successive choices of interval and accompanying computations will do.

For $g(x) = 3x^4 - 2x^3 - 3x + 2$ on $[0, 0.9]$:

a	$g(a)$	b	$g(b)$	m	$g(m)$
0	2	.9	$-.1897$	.45	.5907
.45		.9		.675	$-.01731$
.45		.675		.5625	

The third iteration of the bisection method is 0.5625.

For $g(t) = \frac{3t^2 \tan t}{1 - t^2}$ on $[21.5, 22.5]$:

a	$g(a)$	b	$g(b)$	m	$g(m)$
21.5	1.608	22.5	-1.676	22	$-.02660$
21.5		22		21.75	.7393
21.75		22		21.875	

The third iteration of the bisection method is 21.875.

11: The error, $|m_j - p| \leq \frac{b-a}{2^j}$, and we need this quantity to be less than or equal to 10^{-3}. So we need to solve the inequality $\frac{b-a}{2^j} \leq 10^{-3}$ for j. $b - a = 4 - 1 = 3$, so we need to find j such that $\frac{3}{2^j} \leq 10^{-3}$:

$$\ln\left(\frac{3}{2^j}\right) \leq \ln(10^{-3})$$

$$\ln(3) - \ln(2^j) \leq -3\ln(10)$$

$$\ln(3) + 3\ln(10) \leq j\ln(2)$$

$$\frac{\ln(3) + 3\ln(10)}{\ln(2)} \leq j$$

So we need $j \geq \frac{\ln(3) + 3\ln(10)}{\ln(2)} \approx 11.55$. The least integer satisfying this inequality is 12. We need 12 iterations.

21: $\sin(4^2) = \sin(16) < 0$ and $\sin(5^2) = \sin(25) < 0$ so the assumptions of the bisection are not met on $[4, 5]$ as stated. However, if the bisection method is run anyway, the first iteration will be 4.5 and $\sin(4.5^2) > 0$. No matter which endpoint (left or right) becomes 4.5, the assumptions of the bisection method will be met from her on. It will work as prescribed starting with the second iteration, and therefore will return a root.

Section 2.2

2c: (i) g does satisfy the hypotheses of the Mean Value Theorem on $[0, 0.9]$. The hypotheses of the Mean Value Theorem require a function to be continuous on the closed interval $[a, b]$ and have a derivative on the open interval (a, b). In this question, $a = 0$ and $b = 0.9$. Since g is a polynomial, it is continuous over all real numbers. Therefore g is continuous over $[0, 0.9] = [a, b]$. Furthermore, g' is a polynomial and exists over all real numbers, so g has a derivative on $(0, 0.9) = (a, b)$. **Remark:** g actually satisfies the hypotheses of the Mean Value Theorem on any closed interval, as do all polynomials.

(ii) We need to find c such that $g'(c) = \frac{g(b) - g(a)}{b - a}$. To begin, $g'(x) = 12x^3 - 6x^2 - 3$, $g(0) = 2$, and $g(0.9) = 3(.9)^4 - 2(.9)^3 - 3(.9) + 2 = -.1897$. So we need to solve $12c^3 - 6c^2 - 3 = \frac{-.1897 - 2}{.9 - 0}$ for c:

$$12c^3 - 6c^2 - 3 = \frac{-2433}{1000}$$

$$12c^3 - 6c^2 - \frac{567}{1000} = 0.$$

We can not solve this equation using basic techniques of algebra since the cubic does not factor. However, we know the solution is between 0 and 0.9, so we can apply the bisection method to get an answer! Using Octave with a tolerance of 10^{-10}, we get

```
ans = 0.622093084518565.
```

2f: g does not satisfy the hypotheses of the Mean Value Theorem on $[20, 23]$. The discontinuities of g are at ± 1 due to the $(1 - t^2)$ factor in the denominator and at odd multiples of $\frac{\pi}{2}$ due to the $(\tan t)$ factor in the numerator. The discontinuity at $\frac{13\pi}{2} \approx 20.42$ is in the interval $[20, 23]$, so g is not continuous over the given interval.

3h: We are asked to find the fixed points of h. By definition, a fixed point of h satisfies the equation $h(x) = x$, so we are looking for all such values. $h(x) = x - 10 + 3^x + 25 \cdot 3^{-x}$ so we need to solve $x - 10 + 3^x + 25 \cdot 3^{-x} = x$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
x - 10 + 3^x + 25 \cdot 3^{-x} &= x \\
-10 + 3^x + 25 \cdot 3^{-x} &= 0 \\
3^x - 10 + 25 \cdot 3^{-x} &= 0 \\
3^x \cdot 3^x - 3^x \cdot 10 + 3^x \cdot 25 \cdot 3^{-x} &= 0 \\
(3^x)^2 - 10 \cdot 3^x + 25 &= 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

$(3^x)^2 - 10 \cdot 3^x + 25$ is quadratic in 3^x so we can try to factor. This quadratic does factor:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3^x - 5)^2 &= 0 \\
3^x - 5 &= 0 \\
3^x &= 5 \\
\log_3 3^x &= \log_3 5 \\
x &= \log_3 5.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore there is one fixed point of h, $x = \log_3 5 \approx 1.465$.

4d: We are looking for roots of $g(x) = x^2 - e^{3x+4}$, so we need to solve the equation $x^2 - e^{3x+4} = 0$ for x. In order to do so with a fixed point method, we need to manipulate this equation into one of the form $f(x) = x$ using algebra. The simplest way is to add x to both sides. This gives us $x + x^2 - e^{3x+4} = x$, so we may take $f_1(x) = x + x^2 - e^{3x+4}$. Another way to transform the equation

$x^2 - e^{3x+4} = 0$ is to "solve" for the x in the x^2 term. Adding e^{3x+4} to both sides, we have $x^2 = e^{3x+4}$ and now applying the square root to both sides we have $|x| = \sqrt{e^{3x+4}}$ or $x = \pm e^{(3x+4)/2}$. We may now set $f_2(x) = e^{(3x+4)/2}$ or $f_2(x) = -e^{(3x+4)/2}$.

Remark: We can also "solve" for the x in the exponential:

$$\begin{aligned}
x^2 - e^{3x+4} &= 0 \\
x^2 &= e^{3x+4} \\
\ln x^2 &= \ln(e^{3x+4}) \\
2\ln x &= 3x + 4 \\
2\ln x - 4 &= 3x \\
\frac{2\ln x - 4}{3} &= x.
\end{aligned}$$

This gives another candidate function, $f_3(x) = \frac{2\ln x - 4}{3}$.

Remark: There are always infinitely many ways to turn the equation $g(x) = 0$ into an equation of the form $f(x) = x$. We can multiply both sides by any nonzero real number, c, and then add x to both sides. This gives the infinitely many candidates $f_c(x) = x + cg(x)$.

Remark: See question 20 for another infinite set of candidates.

5b: We are asked to calculate the first 5 iterations of the Fixed Point Iteration Method applied to $g(x) = 10 + x - \cosh(x)$ beginning with (initial value) $x_0 = -3$. We have to apply g to x_0, then apply g to the result to get a new result, then apply g to the new result to get a newer result, then apply g to the newer result to get yet another result, and so on, until we have 5 results:

$$\begin{aligned}
x_0 &= -3 \\
x_1 = g(x_0) &= 10 - 3 - \cosh(-3) \approx -3.067661995777765 \\
x_2 = g(x_1) &= 10 + x_1 - \cosh(x_1) \approx -3.836725126419593 \\
x_3 = g(x_2) &= 10 + x_2 - \cosh(x_2) \approx -17.03418648356706 \\
x_4 = g(x_3) &= 10 + x_3 - \cosh(x_3) \approx -12497508.54310043 \\
x_5 = g(x_4) &= 10 + x_4 - \cosh(x_4) \approx \text{'floating point overflow'}
\end{aligned}$$

So the first 5 iterations are (approximately) -3.067, -3.836, -17.03, $-1.249(10)^7$, and a floating point error. It does not look like fixed point iteration is converging on a fixed point. The numbers are getting larger in magnitude with each iteration.

Remark: Calculators and computers using standard floating point arithmetic will not be able to calculate $\cosh(-12497508.54310043)$ because it is too big! Thus the overflow. It does not mean it can not be calculated. It's just too large for a floating point calculator. Using a computer algebra system with capability to handle such numbers, we find that

$$x_5 \approx -4.97(10)^{5427598}.$$

x_5 has over 5 million digits to the left of the decimal point! Indeed, the magnitude of each iteration is greater than the last.

**6b:** Using Octave with a properly programmed fixed point iteration function, we get the following:

```
fixedPointIteration(inline('10+x-cosh(x)'),-3,1e-10,100)
ans = Method failed---maximum number of iterations reached
```

The method does not converge in 100 iterations.

Remark: As we find out in question 5b, this iteration causes an overflow in just 5 iterations.

**7b:** The web diagram will look something like this:

Remark: The line $y = x$ is not set at a 45° angle because the aspect ratio of the graph is not $1 : 1$. The y-axis covers a length of 20, from -20 to 0 while the x-axis covers a length of only 3, from -5 to -2.

10: (a) To establish that f has a unique fixed point on $[-4, -.9]$, we will show that f is continuous on $[-4, -.9]$, $f([-4, -.9]) \subseteq [-4, -.9]$ and $|f'(x)| \leq 1$ for all $x \in (-4, -.9)$. Proposition 3 gives us the result.

(i) f is continuous on $[-4, -.9]$ because its only discontinuity is at $x = -\frac{2}{3}$, where the denominator, $6x + 4$, is zero, and $-\frac{2}{3} \approx -.6666$ is not in $[-4, -.9]$.

(ii) We find the absolute extrema of f over $[-4, -.9]$. $f'(x) = \frac{18x^2 + 24x + 6}{36x^2 + 48x + 16} = \frac{3(x+1)(3x+1)}{2(3x+2)^2}$ has zeroes at $x = -1$ and $x = -\frac{1}{3}$ and is undefined at $x = -\frac{2}{3}$. The only relevant critical value is -1, so we check $f(-4) = -\frac{47}{20} = -2.35$, $f(-1) = -1$, and $f(-.9) = -\frac{143}{140} \approx -1.021$. Hence $f([-4, -.9]) \subseteq [-2.35, -1] \subseteq [-4, -0.9]$. **Remark:** For many functions, we can be happy enough with visual evidence or at least use the graph to verify our conclusions. In this question, the graph of f for both x and y values from -4 to $-.9$ looks like

The graph of the function does not leave the view through the top (no values greater than $-.9$) or the bottom (no values less than -4), so $f([-4, -.9]) \subseteq [-4, -.9]$.

(iii) We find the absolute extrema of f' over $[-4, -.9]$. $f''(x) = \frac{3}{27x^3 + 54x^2 + 36x + 8} = \frac{3}{(3x+2)^3}$ has no zeroes and is undefined only at $x = -\frac{2}{3}$. There are no relevant critical values, so we check $f'(-4) = \frac{99}{200} = 0.495$ and $f'(-.9) = -\frac{51}{98} \approx -.5204$. Hence $-\frac{51}{98} \leq f'(x) \leq \frac{99}{200}$ for all $x \in (-4, -.9)$, which means $|f'(x)| \leq \frac{51}{98} < 1$ for all $x \in (-4, -.9)$. **Remark:** As with check (ii), we can be happy enough with visual evidence or at least use the graph to verify our conclusions. In this question, the graph of f' for $x \in [-4, -.9]$ and $y \in [-1, 1]$ looks like

The graph of the function does not leave the view through the top (no values greater than 1) or the bottom (no values less than -1), so $|f'(x)| < 1$ for all $x \in (-4, -.9)$.

(b) Using the fixed point iteration method as described in the text with tolerance 10^{-2} and $x_0 = -4$, we get $x_6 = -1.00000176319$, and we presume this is accurate to within 10^{-2} of the actual fixed point. **Remark:** Since we don't have a dependable way to calculate the error, it is possible that the final answer will not be within tolerance of the actual root. In this case, though, the actual fixed point is -1, so we are well within bounds.

12: First, $f(x) = \sqrt[3]{8 - 4x} = x \implies 8 - 4x = x^3 \implies x^3 + 4x - 8 = 0$, so any fixed point of f is a root of g. It remains to show that the Fixed Point Iteration Method will converge to a fixed point of f for any initial value $x_0 \in [1.2, 1.5]$. According to the Fixed Point Convergence Theorem, we need to establish that $[1.2, 1.5]$ is a neighborhood of a fixed point in which the magnitude of the derivative is less than 1.

(i) To establish that there is a fixed point in $[1.2, 1.5]$, note that f is continuous and that $f(1.2) - 1.2 = \sqrt[3]{\frac{16}{5}} - 1.2 \approx .27 > 0$ and $f(1.5) - 1.5 = \sqrt[3]{2} - 1.5 \approx -.24 < 0$. The Intermediate Value Theorem guarantees there will be a value $c \in (1.2, 1.5)$ such that $f(c) - c = 0$, or $f(c) = c$.

(ii) We need to establish that the magnitude of the derivative of f is less than 1 for all $x \in (1.2, 1.5)$. $f'(x) = -\frac{4}{3(8-4x)^{2/3}}$ and $f''(x) = -\frac{32}{9(8-4x)^{5/3}}$. Since $f''(x) < 0$ for all $x \in (1.2, 1.5)$, we know f' is decreasing over this interval. For this reason and the fact that $f'(x) < 0$ for all $x \in (1.2, 1.5)$, we know $|f'(x)|$ is bounded by $|f'(1.5)| = \left| -\frac{2\sqrt[3]{2}}{3} \right| \approx .84 < 1$.

This completes the proof.

Section 2.3

5: Because there is no particular pattern to the values n is to take, we will store the six values in an array. Then we will loop over the array to get the values of f.

```
n=[0,1,2,4,6,10];
f=inline('(2^(2^x)-2)/(2^(2^x)+3)');
i=1;
while (i<7)
  disp(f(n(i)));
  i=i+1;
end%while
```

produces the following output:

```
0
  0.285714285714286
  0.736842105263158
  0.999923709546987
  1
NaN
```

Remark: We can avoid the NaN, read "Not a Number", on the sixth value by rewriting the function as the algebraically equivalent `f=inline('(1-2*2^-(2^x))/(1+3*2^-(2^x))');`. With this one change to the above program, the following output is produced:

```
0
  0.285714285714286
  0.736842105263158
  0.999923709546987
  1
  1
```

This works because `2^(2^10)`, which equals 2^{1024}, produces an overflow while `2^-(2^10)`, which equals 2^{-1024}, evaluates to 0. $2^{1024} \approx 1.8(10)^{308}$ is too big to be represented as a standard floating point value.

11:

(a) Proceeding according to proposition 5, we will need an initial error and a bound on the magnitude of the derivative of f.

(i) All we know about the initial value, x_0, and the fixed point, $\hat{x}$, is that they both lie in $[-4, -.9]$, so the best we can do for an initial error is the width of the interval. Thus we take $|x_0 - \hat{x}| = 3.1$.

(ii) In 10 of section 2.2, we established the fact that $|f'(x)| \leq \frac{51}{98} < 1$. Hence we have $M = \frac{51}{98}$.

Therefore, we know $|x_k - \hat{x}| \leq 3.1 \cdot \left(\frac{51}{98}\right)^k$, and we need this quantity to be less than 10^{-11}:

$$3.1 \cdot \left(\frac{51}{98}\right)^k < 10^{-11}$$

$$\left(\frac{51}{98}\right)^k < \frac{1}{3.1(10)^{11}}$$

$$k \ln\left(\frac{51}{98}\right) < \ln\left(\frac{1}{3.1(10)^{11}}\right)$$

$$k > \frac{-\ln\left(3.1(10)^{11}\right)}{\ln\left(\frac{51}{98}\right)} \approx 40.51.$$

Hence 41 iterations will suffice for any initial value in $[-4, -.9]$.

Remark: The inequality must switch from $<$ to $>$ in the last step because we are dividing by $\ln\left(\frac{51}{98}\right)$, which is negative.

(b) $x_0 = -4$, $x_1 = f(x_0) = -2.35$, $x_2 = f(x_1) \approx -1.541336633663366$, $x_3 = f(x_2) \approx -1.167517670666227$, $x_4 = f(x_3) \approx -1.028014489100897$, $x_5 = f(x_4) \approx -1.001085950365354$, $x_6 = f(x_5) \approx -1.00000176318809$, and $x_7 = f(x_6) \approx -1.000000000004663$. It takes 7 iterations to come up with an estimate within 10^{-11} of the actual fixed point, -1.

(c) The theoretical bound is 41 while the actual number of iterations is 7. The bound is nearly six times the actual! This is not a very tight bound.

Remark: The reason the bound is so loose is because the derivative at the fixed point is zero. The estimate of proposition 5 does not account for this case where we know the convergence is quadratic or better.

16a:

n	p_n	a_n
0	0.5	0.561988756944332
1	0.601278729299872	0.561866608212375
2	0.537085822867345	0.561825316563408
3	0.577447787437750	0.561806983439330
4	0.551960054193125	0.561800167282529
5	0.568006282119217	
6	0.557785998713916	

20: The tenth iteration of Steffensen's Method is 0.01462973293 while the eleventh is 0.009752946539, so it takes but 11 iterations to reach a number below 0.01. This is an incredible acceleration of convergence—from $29,992$ iterations to 11.

Section 2.4

8: Newton's (fixed point iteration) Method requires iteration of the function $f(x) = x - \frac{g(x)}{g'(x)}$, so we need to know $g'(x)$. The derivative of g is

$$g'(x) = -\frac{200\sin\left(\frac{10}{x}\right)}{x^3} - \frac{1000\cos\left(\frac{10}{x}\right)}{x^4}.$$

Therefore,

$$x_1 = 1.25 - \frac{g(1.25)}{g'(1.25)} = \frac{\frac{100}{1.25^2}\sin\left(\frac{10}{1.25}\right)}{-\frac{200\sin\left(\frac{10}{1.25}\right)}{1.25^3} - \frac{1000\cos\left(\frac{10}{1.25}\right)}{1.25^4}} \approx 2.76794916279264$$

and

$$x_2 = x_1 - \frac{g(x_1)}{g'(x_1)} = \frac{\frac{100}{x_1^2}\sin\left(\frac{10}{x_1}\right)}{-\frac{200\sin\left(\frac{10}{x_1}\right)}{x_1^3} - \frac{1000\cos\left(\frac{10}{x_1}\right)}{x_1^4}} \approx 3.07240930016243.$$

Remark: Though it is not strictly needed in its simplified form,

$$f(x) = x - \frac{g(x)}{g'(x)} = \frac{3x^2\sin\left(\frac{10}{x}\right) + 10x\cos\left(\frac{10}{x}\right)}{2x\sin\left(\frac{10}{x}\right) + 10\cos\left(\frac{10}{x}\right)}.$$

Therefore, $x_1 = \frac{3\cdot1.25^2\sin\left(\frac{10}{1.25}\right) + 10(1.25)\cos\left(\frac{10}{1.25}\right)}{2(1.25)\sin\left(\frac{10}{1.25}\right) + 10\cos\left(\frac{10}{1.25}\right)} \approx 2.76794916279264$, and x_2 may be computed using this expression as well.

10a: The formula for the Secant Method is

$$x_{n+1} = x_n - g(x_n)\frac{x_n - x_{n-1}}{g(x_n) - g(x_{n-1})}.$$

When $n = 1$, we get $x_2 = x_1 - g(x_1)\frac{x_1 - x_0}{g(x_1) - g(x_0)}$, so in this example,

$$x_2 = 6 - g(6)\frac{6 - 5}{g(6) - g(5)} \approx 10.15086029699136.$$

When $n = 2$, we get $x_3 = x_2 - g(x_2)\frac{x_2 - x_1}{g(x_2) - g(x_1)}$, so in this example,

$$x_3 = x_2 - g(x_2)\frac{x_2 - 6}{g(x_2) - g(6)} \approx 8.43462052844703.$$

18: Since Newton's Method is a fixed point iteration method, we may use the fixed point convergence theorem to find such an interval. As indicated in exercise 26 on page 55, though, we are guaranteed convergence over any neighborhood of the root where the iterated function f has a derivative with magnitude less than 1. To that end, $f(x) = x - \frac{g(x)}{g'(x)} = x - \frac{x^4 + 2x^3 - x - 3}{4x^3 + 6x^2 - 1}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} f'(x) &= 1 - \frac{(4x^3 + 6x^2 - 1)^2 - (12x^2 + 12x)(x^4 + 2x^3 - x - 3)}{(4x^3 + 6x^2 - 1)^2} \\ &= \frac{(12x^2 + 12x)(x^4 + 2x^3 - x - 3)}{(4x^3 + 6x^2 - 1)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

A graph of f' in the neighborhood of 1.097740792,

$$f(x) = \frac{(12\,x^2 + 12\,x)\,(x^4 + 2\,x^3 - x - 3)}{(4\,x^3 + 6\,x^2 - 1)^2}$$

,

seems to indicate that $|f'(x)| < 1$ for all x from just about 0.9 to ∞. This is an acceptable answer, but if we would like to be more precise about the lower bound and prove our assertion, there is considerable work to do. First, the roots of $4x^3 + 6x^2 - 1$ are around -1.4, -0.5, and 0.4, so there are no asymptotes in the interval under consideration. f' is continuous there. To locate the lower end of this interval, we solve the equation $f'(x) = -1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{(12x^2 + 12x)(x^4 + 2x^3 - x - 3)}{(4x^3 + 6x^2 - 1)^2} &= -1 \\
(12x^2 + 12x)(x^4 + 2x^3 - x - 3) &= -(4x^3 + 6x^2 - 1)^2 \\
12\,x^6 + 36x^5 + 24x^4 - 12x^3 - 48x^2 - 36x &= -16x^6 - 48x^5 - 36x^4 + 8x^3 + 12x^2 - 1 \\
28x^6 + 84x^5 + 60x^4 - 20x^3 - 60x^2 - 36x + 1 &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The real solutions of this equation are, in decreasing order, approximately 0.871748, 0.026590, -1.026590, and -1.871748. A graph of $28x^6 + 84x^5 + 60x^4 - 20x^3 - 60x^2 - 36x + 1$ will point you in the right direction, and Newton's Method can be used to find these roots. The one we seek is 0.871748. This value marks the lower end of the desired interval. To verify that the interval is unbounded above, we solve $f'(x) = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{(12x^2 + 12x)(x^4 + 2x^3 - x - 3)}{(4x^3 + 6x^2 - 1)^2} &= 1 \\
(12x^2 + 12x)(x^4 + 2x^3 - x - 3) &= (4x^3 + 6x^2 - 1)^2 \\
12\,x^6 + 36x^5 + 24x^4 - 12x^3 - 48x^2 - 36x &= 16x^6 + 48x^5 + 36x^4 - 8x^3 - 12x^2 + 1 \\
0 &= 4x^6 + 12x^5 + 12x^4 + 4x^3 + 36x^2 + 36x + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

The real solutions of this equation are, in decreasing order, approximately -0.028593 and -0.971407. Again, a graph will point you in the right direction, and Newton's Method can be used to find these roots. There are no solutions of $f'(x) = \pm 1$ greater than the root 1.097740792. We conclude that $|f'(x)| < 1$ for all $x \in (0.87175, \infty)$, so Newton's Method will converge to $\hat{x} \approx 1.097740792$ for any initial value in $(0.87175, \infty)$. Finally, by looking at the graph of $f(x)$,

$$f(x) = x - \frac{x^4 + 2\,x^3 - x - 3}{4\,x^3 + 6\,x^2 - 1}$$

,

we see that the interval from the asymptote around 0.4 to the root maps into the interval from the root to infinity. Therefore, Newton's Method converges to 1.097740792 for all initial values between the asymptote near 0.4 to 0.87175 as well. Finally, we use Newton's Method to get a more accurate value for the asymptote near 0.4. It turns out to be 0.366025403784439, so we conclude that Newton's Method will converge to the root $\hat{x} \approx 1.097740792$ for any initial value in $(0.36602540378444, \infty)$.

Remark: Depending on how rigorously you want your answer shown, you may start with the graph of f as above, approximate the asymptote near 0.4, and proceed straight to the final answer. This conclusion can be justified (graphically) by assuming that the graph of f is more or less linear to the right of the part shown and imagining the web diagram for any value in this interval. To make this argument slightly more rigorous, note that f has a slant asymptote, $y = \frac{3}{4}x$, as x approaches ∞, so the assumption that the graph of f is more or less a straight line to the right of the part shown is valid.

21:

$$f(x) = x^3 - 3x + 3$$

27: The sum of two numbers, call them x and y, is 20, so $x + y = 20$. If each number is added to its square root, the product of the two sums is 172.2, so $(x + \sqrt{x})(y + \sqrt{y}) = 172.2$. Hence we need to solve the system

$$
\begin{aligned}
x + y &= 20 \\
(x + \sqrt{x})(y + \sqrt{y}) &= 172.2
\end{aligned}
$$

of two equations with two unknowns. Since this system is not linear, our best hope is to use substitution. The first equation gives us $y = 20 - x$. Substituting this value of y in the second equation gives us

$$(x + \sqrt{x})(20 - x + \sqrt{20 - x}) = 172.2$$

or $(x + \sqrt{x})(20 - x + \sqrt{20 - x}) - 172.2 = 0$. It is a solution of this last equation we seek. Without having any idea what the roots might be besides the reasonable assumption that they are between 0 and 20, it is not clear what initial values to use. With a few different attempts, you are likely to find some that work. For example, applying the Secant Method to $g(x) = (x + \sqrt{x})(20 - x + \sqrt{20 - x}) - 172.2$ with $x_0 = 9$ and $x_1 = 10$ gives 9.149620618, which is accurate to all digits shown, in just 9 iterations. The other number is $20 - 9.149620618 = 10.850379382$. We can verify this is a solution by calculating

$$(9.149620618 + \sqrt{9.149620618})(10.850379382 + \sqrt{10.850379382})$$

which is very nearly 172.2.

29: Newton's Method will fail to find a root of g on the second iteration if $g'(x_1) = 0$. For example, let $g(x) = x^3 - 3x + 3$. Then $g'(x) = 3x^2 - 3$ has zeroes when $x = \pm 1$. So we need a value x_0 such that $x_1 = 1$ or $x_1 = -1$. We need to find any solution of $x_1 = x_0 - \frac{g(x_0)}{g'(x_0)} = x - \frac{x^3 - 3x + 3}{3x^2 - 3} = \pm 1$. One

such solution follows.

$$
\begin{aligned}
x - \frac{x^3 - 3x + 3}{3x^2 - 3} &= 1 \\
\frac{2x^3 - 3}{3x^2 - 3} &= 1 \\
2x^3 - 3 &= 3x^2 - 3 \\
2x^3 - 3x^2 &= 0 \\
x^2(2x - 3) &= 0
\end{aligned}
$$

so either of the initial values $x_0 = 0$ or $x_0 = \frac{3}{2}$ will produce the desired result.

Remark: The equation $x - \frac{x^3 - 3x + 3}{3x^2 - 3} = -1$ has only one real solution, but it is irrational. It is, accurate to 20 significant digits, 1.0786168885087585968. Setting $x_0 = 1.078616888508759$ as in the following Octave code does not fail, however! There is enough roundoff error that x_1 is not exactly -1 and $g'(x_1)$ is not exactly zero, so the method proceeds to find the result. It takes 99 iterations to settle in on the solution, but it gets there. x_1 displays as `-0.999999999999999` and x_2 displays as `7.50599937895082e+14`.

```
format('long')
f=inline('x^3-3*x+3')
fp=inline('3*x^2-3')
x0=1.0786168885087585968
c=1;
for i=1:120
  x=x0-f(x0)/fp(x0)
  if (abs(x-x0)<1e-15)
    c
    return
  end%if
  x0=x;
  c=c+1;
end%for
```

Section 2.6

1: Before trying to match any functions with their diagrams, we take stock of the functions available. f and h are polynomials of degree 5 and therefore have at most 5 distinct roots. l is the product of the natural logarithm with a third degree polynomial. The polynomial has three roots and the logarithm has one distinct from those of the polynomial, so l has four roots. Now looking at the diagrams, we can match two functions with their diagrams. Diagram (d) has patches of nine different colors, indicating nine roots within the area shown. Since functions f, h, and l have fewer than 9 roots, function g must match with diagram (d). Along the same lines, diagrams (a) and (b) both show 5 roots, so l can not match either of those. l has only four roots. By process of elimination, function l matches with diagram (c). That leaves (a) and (b) to match with f and h. Both diagrams show 5 roots, but there is a fundamental difference between the two. The real axis passes horizontally through the center of each diagram. Diagram (a) has one patch covering the entire real axis, indicating only one real root while diagram (b) has three patches covering the real axis, indicating three real roots. The graph of f,

,

clearly shows that f has three roots, so f matches with (b) and h matches with (a). To recap,

$$
\begin{aligned}
f &\leftrightarrow \text{(b)} \\
g &\leftrightarrow \text{(d)} \\
h &\leftrightarrow \text{(a)} \\
l &\leftrightarrow \text{(c)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

3c: For each root r, the polynomial must have a factor of $(x - r)$ and no other factors. This polynomial must have factors of $(x - (-4))$, $(x - (-1))$, $(x - 2)$, $(x - 2i)$, and $(-(-2i))$, making $p(x) = (x+4)(x+1)(x-2)(x-2i)(x+2i)$ one solution.

> **Remark:** $q(x) = a(x+4)(x+1)(x-2)(x-2i)(x+2i)$ where a is any nonzero complex number is another solution.

> **Remark:** Though it is not necessary to multiply the factors, $p(x) = x^5 + 3x^4 - 2x^3 + 4x^2 - 24x - 32$.

3d: For each root r, the polynomial must have a factor of $(x - r)$ and no other factors. This polynomial must have factors of $(x - (-4))$, $(x - (-1))$, $(x - 2)$, and $(x - 2i)$, making $p(x) = (x+4)(x+1)(x-2)(x-2i)$ one solution.

> **Remark:** $q(x) = a(x+4)(x+1)(x-2)(x-2i)$ where a is any nonzero complex number is another solution.

> **Remark:** Though it is not necessary to multiply the factors, $p(x) = x^4 + (3 - 2i)x^3 - (6 + 6i)x^2 - (8 - 12i)x + 16i$. Notice that not all the coefficients are real numbers. This is consistent with the conjugate roots theorem stating that if a polynomial with real coefficients has complex roots, they must come in conjugate pairs.

7: f is periodic and has infinitely many roots regularly spread across the real axis. The only diagram showing roots of this nature is (a) so f matches with (a). g and f differ only by a small amount for large real values so we should expect to see infinitely many more or less regularly spaced roots on the positive real axis. The only diagram with roots of this nature is (d) so g matches with (d). l is a fifth degree polynomial so has at most 5 roots. Diagram (b) shows 8 colors so 8 roots. Therefore, h matches with (b) and l matches with (c). To recap,

$$
\begin{aligned}
f &\leftrightarrow \text{(a)} \\
g &\leftrightarrow \text{(d)} \\
h &\leftrightarrow \text{(b)} \\
l &\leftrightarrow \text{(c)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Section 2.7

6a: $g(2) = 38$ and $g'(2) = 71$:

$$
\begin{array}{r|rrrr}
2 & 3 & 12 & -13 & -8 \\
  &   & 6 & 36 & 46 \\
\hline
2 & 3 & 18 & 23 & \boxed{38} \\
  &   & 6 & 48 & \\
\hline
  & 3 & 24 & \boxed{71} &
\end{array}
$$

8a: From 6a, $g(2) = 38$ and $g'(2) = 71$, so $x_1 = 2 - \frac{38}{71} = \frac{104}{71}$. $g(\frac{104}{71}) = \frac{2911104}{357911}$ and $g'(\frac{104}{71}) = \frac{209027}{5041}$:

$$
\begin{array}{r|rrrr}
\frac{104}{71} & 3 & 12 & -13 & -8 \\
 & & \frac{312}{71} & \frac{121056}{5041} & \frac{5774392}{357911} \\
\hline
\frac{104}{71} & 3 & \frac{1164}{71} & \frac{55523}{5041} & \boxed{\frac{2911104}{357911}} \\
 & & \frac{312}{71} & \frac{153504}{5041} & \\
\hline
 & 3 & \frac{1476}{71} & \boxed{\frac{209027}{5041}} &
\end{array}
$$

so $x_2 = \frac{104}{71} - \frac{2911104/357911}{209027/5041} = \frac{2689672}{2120131} \approx 1.268634815490175$.

14a: `newtonhorner([-144,144,-59,6,1],1,1e-5,100)` returns `ans = 3`.

$$
\begin{array}{r|rrrrr}
3 & 1 & 6 & -59 & 144 & -144 \\
  &   & 3 & 27 & -96 & 144 \\
\hline
  & 1 & 9 & -32 & 48 & \boxed{0}
\end{array}
$$

so the deflated polynomial is $x^3 + 9x^2 - 32x + 48$. `newtonhorner([48,-32,9,1],3,1e-5,100)` returns `ans = -12`.

$$
\begin{array}{r|rrrr}
-12 & 1 & 9 & -32 & 48 \\
    &   & -12 & 36 & -48 \\
\hline
    & 1 & -3 & 4 & \boxed{0}
\end{array}
$$

so the deflated polynomial is $x^2 - 3x + 4$ which is quadratic. The quadratic formula gives the remaining roots, $\frac{3 \pm \sqrt{9 - 4(4)}}{2} = \frac{3 + i\sqrt{7}}{2}$ and $\frac{3 - i\sqrt{7}}{2}$. To recap, the four roots are $3, -12, \frac{3+i\sqrt{7}}{2}, \frac{3-i\sqrt{7}}{2}$.

15a: `format('long'); c=[-40,16,-12,-2,1]; newtonhorner(c,1,1e-5,100)` returns

$$
\text{ans} = -3.54823289798023
$$

so -3.54823289798023 is one root. `c=deflate(c,ans)` returns

```
c =

   -11.27321716194279   7.68642249426964   -5.54823289798023   1.00000000000000
```

so the deflated polynomial is approximately $x^3 - 5.5482x^2 + 7.6864x - 11.2732$ and the coefficients of this polynomial are now contained in array `c`. `newtonhorner(c,-3.5,1e-5,100)` returns `ans = 4.38111344099655` so 4.38111344099655 is another root. `c=deflate(c,ans)` returns

```
c =

    2.57313975402986   -1.16711945698368   1.00000000000000
```

so the deflated polynomial is approximately $x^2 - 1.1671x + 2.5731$ and the coefficients of this polynomial are now contained in array `c`. Since we have deflated the polynomial to a quadratic, we find the last two roots using the quadratic formula. `[s,t]=quadraticRoots(c(3),c(2),c(1))` returns

```
s =   0.583559728491838 + 1.494188006012761i
t =   0.583559728491838 - 1.494188006012761i.
```

To recap, the roots are

$$-3.54823289798023$$
$$4.38111344099655$$
$$0.583559728491838 + 1.494188006012761i$$
$$0.583559728491838 - 1.494188006012761i.$$

16a: `c=[-40,16,-12,-2,1]; newtonhorner(c,-3.54823289798023,1e-5,100)`

returns

`ans = -3.54823289797970.`

`c=[-40,16,-12,-2,1]; newtonhorner(c,4.38111344099655,1e-5,100)`

returns

`ans = 4.38111344099594.`

`c=[-40,16,-12,-2,1]; newtonhorner(c,0.583559728491838+1.494188006012761i,1e-5,100)`

returns

`ans = 0.583559728491879 + 1.494188006011256i.`

`c=[-40,16,-12,-2,1]; newtonhorner(c,0.583559728491838-1.494188006012761i,1e-5,100)`

returns

`ans = 0.583559728491879 - 1.494188006011256i.`

Each attempt to refine the roots returns a slightly different answer, but none change within the first five decimal places. The approximate roots of the approximate deflated polynomials are all within 10^{-5} of the exact roots of the original polynomial without refinement.

19a: (i) `format('long'); horner(sqrt(3),[-40,16,-12,-2,1])` returns `ans = -49.6794919243112`. Notice we only get the value of the polynomial, the first entry of the array of return values. This is the default behavior if the function is not set equal to an array.

(ii) `p=inline('x^4-2*x^3-12*x^2+16*x-40'); p(sqrt(3))` returns `ans = -49.6794919243112` so they certainly look like they are returning the same value.

(iii) `horner(sqrt(3),[-40,16,-12,-2,1]) == p(sqrt(3))` returns `ans = 0`, however, so internally, the results are not exactly the same! We can conclude that the `inline` function evaluation is not done by nesting (synthetic division).

Remark: `horner(3,[-40,16,-12,-2,1]) == p(3)` returns `ans = 1`, so for the integer input 3, the two methods do result in exactly the same value.

Section 3.2

3c: We begin by constructing three polynomials—the first with roots at the second two data points and a value of 1 at the first, the second polynomial with roots at the first and third data points and a value of 1 at the second, the third polynomial with roots at the first and second data points and a value of 1 at the third. Those polynomials are

$$l_1(x) = \frac{(x-20)(x-1019)}{(-10-20)(-10-1019)}$$
$$l_2(x) = \frac{(x+10)(x-1029)}{(20+10)(20-1029)}$$
$$l_3(x) = \frac{(x+10)(x-20)}{(1019+10)(1019-20)}.$$

We then multiply l_i by y_i and sum the products:

$$P_2(x) = \frac{(x-20)(x-1019)}{(-10-20)(-10-1019)}(10) + \frac{(x+10)(x-1019)}{(20+10)(20-1019)}(58)$$
$$+ \frac{(x+10)(x-20)}{(1019+10)(1019-20)}(-32).$$

4c: Estimating (or approximating) the value of a function f using an interpolating polynomial means to evaluate the polynomial there instead.

$$f(1.3) \approx P_2(1.3) = \frac{(1.3-20)(1.3-1019)}{(-10-20)(-10-1019)}(10) + \frac{(1.3+10)(1.3-1019)}{(20+10)(20-1019)}(58)$$
$$+ \frac{(1.3+10)(1.3-20)}{(1019+10)(1019-20)}(-32)$$
$$\approx 28.427$$

5c: Neville's method is best executed on a computer or in a tabular format. $f(1.3) \approx P_{0,2}(1.3)$. The tabular format is shown here:

x_i	$P_{i,0} = y_i$	$P_{i,1}$	$P_{i,2}$
-10	10	28.08	28.427
20	58	$59.\overline{684}$	
1019	-32		

$$P_{0,1} = \frac{(1.3-20)(10) - (1.3+10)(58)}{(-10-20)} = 28.08$$
$$P_{1,1} = \frac{(1.3-1019)(58) - (1.3-20)(-32)}{(20-1019)} = 59.\overline{684}$$
$$P_{0,2} = \frac{(1.3-1019)P_{0,1} - (1.3+10)P_{1,1}}{(-10-1019)} \approx 28.427$$

7: Since the interpolating polynomial error term contains the product $(x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n)$, we should choose data near the point of estimation x. This way, the product is minimized and we arrive at what is likely to be the best approximation possible with the given data. It does not always work this way (perhaps it would make a good exercise to find an example where using the data nearest the point of estimation does not give the best estimate) but we have the best chance of good results this way. For the degree at most 1 polynomial, we will use the data at 2 and 3.5 since these are the two abscissas nearest 3. For the degree at most 2 polynomial, we will use the data at 2, 3.5, and 4 since these are the three abscissas nearest 3. For the degree at most 3 polynomial we have no choice but to use all of the data. Here is where Neville's Method shines! The first estimate uses the first two data points. The second estimate uses these same two plus a third. The last estimate uses these three plus a fourth. We can reuse each of the first two calculations in the next by creating a single Neville's Method table. With the data in the table in the order in which we would like to use them, we get

x_i	$P_{i,0} = y_i$	$P_{i,1}$	$P_{i,2}$	$P_{i,3}$
2	.8	$.7\overline{3}$	$.691\overline{6}$	$.63\overline{8}$
3.5	.7	.65	$.5\overline{3}$	
4	.75	1		
5	.5			

$P_{0,1}$ gives the at most degree 1 estimate. $P_{0,2}$ gives the at most degree 2 estimate, and $P_{0,3}$ gives the at most degree 3 estimate.

(a) $P_{0,1}(3) = \frac{(3-3.5)(.8)-(3-2)(.7)}{2-3.5} = 0.7\overline{3}$.

(b) $P_{1,1}(3) = \frac{(3-4)(.7)-(3-3.5)(.75)}{3.5-4} = 0.65$; $P_{0,2}(3) = \frac{(3-4)(.7\overline{3})-(3-2)(.65)}{2-4} = .691\overline{6}$

(c) $P_{2,1}(3) = \frac{(3-5)(.75)-(3-4)(.5)}{4-5} = 1$; $P_{1,2}(3) = \frac{(3-5)(.65)-(3-3.5)(1)}{3.5-5} = .5\overline{3}$; $P_{0,3}(3) = \frac{(3-5)(.691\overline{6})-(3-2)(.5\overline{3})}{2-5} = .63\overline{8}$

8b: Since the interpolating polynomial error term contains the product $(x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n)$, we should choose data near the point of estimation x. This way, the product is minimized and we arrive at what is likely to be the best approximation possible with the given data. It does not always work this way (perhaps it would make a good exercise to find an example where using the data nearest the point of estimation does not give the best estimate) but we have the best chance of good results this way. For the degree at most 1 polynomial, we will use the data at .1 and .2 since these are the two abscissas nearest .18. For the degree at most 2 polynomial, we will use the data at .1, .2, and .3 since these are the three abscissas nearest .18. For the degree at most 3 polynomial we have no choice but to use all of the data. Here is where Neville's Method shines! The first estimate uses the first two data points. The second estimate uses these same two plus a third. The last estimate uses these three plus a fourth. We can reuse each of the first two calculations in the next by creating a single Neville's Method table. With the data listed in the Octave function in the order in which we would like to use them, we get

```
>> nevilles(.18,[.1,.2,.3,.4],[-.29004986,-.56079734,-.81401972,-1.0526302])
ans =

   -0.290049860000000   -0.506647844000000   -0.508049852000000   -0.508143074400000
   -0.560797340000000   -0.510152864000000   -0.508399436000000    0.000000000000000
   -0.814019720000000   -0.527687144000000    0.000000000000000    0.000000000000000
   -1.052630200000000    0.000000000000000    0.000000000000000    0.000000000000000
```

For the interpolating polynomial of degree at most one, $f(.18) \approx P_{0,1}(.18) = -.506647844$. For the interpolating polynomial of degree at most two, $f(.18) \approx P_{0,2}(.18) = -.508049852$. For the interpolating polynomial of degree at most three, $f(.18) \approx P_{0,3}(.18) = -.5081430744$.

8c: Since the interpolating polynomial error term contains the product $(x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n)$, we should choose data near the point of estimation x. This way, the product is minimized and we arrive at what is likely to be the best approximation possible with the given data. It does not always work this way (perhaps it would make a good exercise to find an example where using the data nearest the point of estimation does not give the best estimate) but we have the best chance of good results this way. For the degree at most 1 polynomial, we will use the data at 2 and 2.5 since these are the two abscissas nearest 2.26. For the degree at most 2 polynomial, we will use the data at 2, 2.5, and 1.5 since these are the three abscissas nearest 2.26. For the degree at most 3 polynomial we have no choice but to use all of the data. Here is where Neville's Method shines! The first estimate uses the last two data points. The second estimate uses these same two plus a third. The final uses these three plus a fourth. We can reuse each of the first two calculations in the next by creating a single Neville's Method table. With the data listed in the Octave function in the order in which we would like to use them, we get

```
>> nevilles(2.26,[2,2.5,1.5,1],[-1.329,1.776,-2.569,1.654])
ans =

   -1.32900    0.28560    0.05285    0.28036
    1.77600    0.73320   -0.82219    0.00000
   -2.56900   -8.98796    0.00000    0.00000
    1.65400    0.00000    0.00000    0.00000
```

For the interpolating polynomial of degree at most one, $f(2.26) \approx P_{0,1}(2.26) = -.28560$. For the interpolating polynomial of degree at most two, $f(2.26) \approx P_{0,2}(2.26) = .05285$. For the interpolating polynomial of degree at most three, $f(2.26) \approx P_{0,3}(2.26) = .28036$.

9a: Since the interpolating polynomial error term contains the product $(x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n)$, we should choose data near the point of estimation x. This way, the product is minimized and we arrive at what is likely to be the best approximation possible with the given data. It does not always work this way (perhaps it would make a good exercise to find an example where using the data nearest the point of estimation does not give the best estimate) but we have the best chance of good results this way. For the degree at most 1 polynomial, we will use the data at 1.25 and 1.6 since these are the two abscissas nearest 1.4. For the degree at most 2 polynomial, we have no choice but to use all of the data. We can use Neville's Method or the Langrange form in this case. Neither method provides

obvious advantage over the other. To begin, $f(1) = \sin \pi = 0$; $f(1.25) = \sin 1.25\pi \approx -.70711$; $f(1.6) = \sin(1.6\pi) \approx -.95106$.

Lagrange form: (degree at most 1) $L_1(x) = \frac{x-1.6}{1.25-1.6}(-.70711) + \frac{x-1.25}{1.6-1.25}(-.95106)$ so $f(1.4) \approx L_1(1.4) = \frac{1.4-1.6}{1.25-1.6}(-.70711) + \frac{1.4-1.25}{1.6-1.25}(-.95106) = -.81166$.

(degree at most 2) $L_2(x) = \frac{(x-1.25)(x-1.6)}{(1-1.25)(1-1.6)}(0) + \frac{(x-1)(x-1.6)}{(1.25-1)(1.25-1.6)}(-.70711) + \frac{(x-1)(x-1.25)}{(1.6-1)(1.6-1.25)}(-.95106)$ so $f(1.4) \approx L_2(1.4) = \frac{(1.4-1)(1.4-1.6)}{(1.25-1)(1.25-1.6)}(-.70711) + \frac{(1.4-1)(1.4-1.25)}{(1.6-1)(1.6-1.25)}(-.95106) = -.918232$.

Neville's Method: We use the same table for both the degree at most 1 and degree at most 2 polynomials:

x_i	$P_{i,0} = y_i$	$P_{i,1}$	$P_{i,2}$
1.25	$-.70711$	$.16414 - .697x$	$3.5524x^2 - 10.82134x + 7.26894$
1.6	$-.95106$	$1.5851 - 1.5851x$	
1	0		

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{0,1}(x) &= \frac{(x-1.6)(-.70711) - (x-1.25)(-.95106)}{1.25-1.6} = .16414 - .697x \\
P_{1,1}(x) &= \frac{(x-1)(-.95106)}{1.6-1} = 1.5851 - 1.5851x \\
P_{0,2}(x) &= \frac{(x-1)P_{0,1}(x) - (x-1.25)P_{1,1}(x)}{1.25-1} = 3.5524x^2 - 10.82134x + 7.26894
\end{aligned}
$$

(degree at most 1) $P_{0,1}(1.4) = .16414 - .697(1.4) = -.8166$
(degree at most 2) $P_{0,2}(1.4) = 3.5524(1.4)^2 - 10.82134(1.4) + 7.26894 = -.918232$

10a: (degree at most 1) $f(1.4) - P_1(1.4) = \frac{f^{(2)}(\xi_{1.4})}{2!}(1.4 - 1.25)(1.4 - 1.6)$ so our bound is

$$
\begin{aligned}
|f(1.4) - P_1(1.4)| &\le .015 \max_{x \in [1.25, 1.6]} |\pi^2 \sin \pi x| \\
&= .015\pi^2 |\sin(1.5\pi)| \\
&< .149
\end{aligned}
$$

The actual absolute error is $|f(1.4) - P_1(1.4)| = |\sin(1.4\pi) + .8166| \approx .134$, which is rather near the bound.

(degree at most 2) $f(1.4) - P_2(1.4) = \frac{f^{(3)}(\xi_{1.4})}{3!}(1.4 - 1.25)(1.4 - 1.6)(1.4 - 1)$ so our bound is

$$
\begin{aligned}
|f(1.4) - P_2(1.4)| &\le .002 \max_{x \in [1.25, 1.6]} |\pi^3 \cos \pi x| \\
&= .002\pi^3 \cos(1.25\pi) \\
&< .0439
\end{aligned}
$$

The actual absolute error is $|f(1.4) - P_2(1.4)| = |\sin(1.4\pi) + .918232| \approx .0328$, which is again reasonably close to the bound.

Section 3.3

4: The Newton form of an interpolating polynomial follows from a table of divided differences. Recursion 3.3.3 is used to compute the entries in the table, as in Table 3.3. Answers will depend on the order in which the data are listed in the table and on how the data are read from the table. Placing the data in the table in the order given in the question, we have

x_i	$f_{i,0} = f(x_i)$	$f_{i,1}$	$f_{i,2}$	$f_{i,3}$
1	2	0	-1	$2/3$
2	2	-2	1	
3	0	0		
4	0			

Reading the coefficients across the first row, we use $f_{0,0}$, $f_{0,1}$, $f_{0,2}$, and $f_{0,3}$. This is a valid sequence to read from the table since each coefficient depends on the same data as the previous plus one point. $f_{0,0}$ depends on x_0; $f_{0,1}$ depends on x_0 and x_1; $f_{0,2}$ depends on x_0, x_1, and x_2; and $f_{0,3}$ depends on x_0, x_1, x_2, and x_3. Therefore one answer is

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{0,3}(x) &= 2 + 0(x-1) - 1(x-1)(x-2) + \frac{2}{3}(x-1)(x-2)(x-3) \\
&= 2 - (x-1)(x-2) + \frac{2}{3}(x-1)(x-2)(x-3).
\end{aligned}
$$

The sequence of coefficients $f_{1,0}$, $f_{2,1}$, $f_{1,2}$, $f_{0,3}$ is not a valid sequence to choose. $f_{1,0}$ depends on x_1 but $f_{2,1}$ depends on x_2 and x_3, two completely different data values from the first. With some study, you might be able to draw the conclusion, and maybe even prove, that any sequence of coefficients starting in the first column and progressing to the right one column at a time and either jumping up one row or remaining in the same row with each change of column forms a valid sequence. For example, we can use coefficients $f_{2,0}$, $f_{1,1}$, $f_{1,2}$, $f_{0,3}$ because $f_{2,0}$ depends on x_2; $f_{1,1}$ depends on x_2 and x_1; $f_{1,2}$ depends on x_2, x_1, and x_3; and $f_{0,3}$ depends on x_2, x_1, x_3, and x_0. And the order in which new dependencies are encountered matters. The $(x - x_i)$ monomials must appear in the same order. Therefore another answer is

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{0,3}(x) &= 0 - 2(x-3) + 1(x-3)(x-2) + \frac{2}{3}(x-3)(x-2)(x-4) \\
&= -2(x-3) + (x-3)(x-2) + \frac{2}{3}(x-3)(x-2)(x-4).
\end{aligned}
$$

Other possible answers garnered from this same divided difference table are

$$
P_{0,3}(x) = (x-4)(x-3) + \frac{2}{3}(x-4)(x-3)(x-2)
$$

$$
P_{0,3}(x) = -2(x-3) - (x-3)(x-2) + \frac{2}{3}(x-3)(x-2)(x-1).
$$

With some algebra and a bit of patience, each of the four forms above can be reduced to

$$
P_{0,3}(x) = \frac{2}{3}x^3 - 5x^2 + \frac{31}{3}x - 4.
$$

6: Recursion 3.3.3 is used to compute the entries in the table, as in Table 3.3. Answers will depend on the order in which the data are listed in the table and on how the data are read from the table. Placing the data in the table in the order given in the question, we have

x_i	$f_{i,0} = f(x_i)$	$f_{i,1}$	$f_{i,2}$
1	.987	$-.925$	.809375
2.2	$-.123$	.69375	
3	.432		

Reading the coefficients across the first row, we use $f_{0,0}$, $f_{0,1}$, and $f_{0,2}$. This is a valid sequence to read from the table since each coefficient depends on the same data as the previous, plus one point. $f_{0,0}$ depends on x_0; $f_{0,1}$ depends on x_0 and x_1; and $f_{0,2}$ depends on x_0, x_1, and x_2. Therefore one answer is

$$
P_{0,2}(x) = .987 - .925(x-1) + .809375(x-1)(x-2.2).
$$

The sequence of coefficients $f_{0,0}$, $f_{1,1}$, $f_{1,2}$ is not a valid sequence to choose. $f_{0,0}$ depends on x_0 but $f_{1,1}$ depends on x_1 and x_2, two completely different data values from the first. Not to mention $f_{1,2}$, which is not even part of the table. With some study, you might be able to draw the conclusion, and maybe even prove, that any sequence of coefficients starting in the first column and progressing to the right one column at a time and either jumping up one row or remaining in the same row with each change of column forms a valid sequence. For example, we can use coefficients $f_{1,0}$, $f_{0,1}$, $f_{0,2}$ because $f_{1,0}$ depends on x_1; $f_{1,1}$ depends on x_1 and x_2; and $f_{0,2}$ depends on x_1, x_2, and x_0. And the order in which new dependencies are encountered matters. The $(x - x_i)$ monomials must appear in the same order. Therefore another answer is

$$
P_{0,2}(x) = -.123 - .925(x-2.2) + .809375(x-2.2)(x-1)
$$

The other two possible answers garnered from this same divided difference table are

$$P_{0,2}(x) \quad = \quad -.123 + .69375(x - 2.2) + .809375(x - 2.2)(x - 3)$$
$$P_{0,2}(x) \quad = \quad .432 + .69375(x - 3) + .809375(x - 3)(x - 2.2).$$

With some algebra and a bit of patience, each of the four forms above can be reduced to

$$P_{0,2}(x) = .809375x^2 - 3.515x + 3.692625.$$

10: Answers will depend on the order in which the data are listed in the Octave call and on how the data are read from the table. Placing the data in the Ocatve command in the same order they are listed in the question, your Octave code should produce something like

```
dividedDiffs([0,.1,.3,.6,1],[-6,-5.89483,-5.65014,-5.17788,-4.28172])
ans =
```

```
   -6.00000    1.05170    0.57250    0.21500    0.06302
   -5.89483    1.22345    0.70150    0.27802    0.00000
   -5.65014    1.57420    0.95171    0.00000    0.00000
   -5.17788    2.24040    0.00000    0.00000    0.00000
   -4.28172    0.00000    0.00000    0.00000    0.00000
```

One possibility for the interpolating polynomial of degree (at most) four is

$$P_{0,4}(x) \quad = \quad -6 + 1.05170x + .5725x(x - .1) + .215x(x - .1)(x - .3)$$
$$+ .06302x(x - .1)(x - .3)(x - .6).$$

See discussion of question 4 above for other possibilities. Adding the point $(1.1, -3.9958)$ to the table, we get (accurate to 5 decimal places)

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{5,0} \quad &= \quad -3.9958 \\
f_{4,1} \quad &= \quad \frac{-4.28172 + 3.9958}{1 - 1.1} = 2.8592 \\
f_{3,2} \quad &= \quad \frac{2.2404 - 2.8592}{.6 - 1.1} = 1.2376 \\
f_{2,3} \quad &= \quad \frac{.95171 - 1.2376}{.3 - 1.1} = .35736 \\
f_{1,4} \quad &= \quad \frac{.27802 - .35736}{.1 - 1.1} = .07934 \\
f_{0,5} \quad &= \quad \frac{.06302 - .07934}{0 - 1.1} = .01484.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we can add one more term to $P_{0,4}$ to get (one possible representation of) $P_{0,5}$:

$$P_{0,5}(x) \quad = \quad -6 + 1.05170x + .5725x(x - .1) + .215x(x - .1)(x - .3)$$
$$+ .06302x(x - .1)(x - .3)(x - .6) + .01484x(x - .1)(x - .3)(x - .6)(x - 1).$$

12: Since N_n, L_n, $P_{0,n}$, and P_n are all the same polynomial except possibly the form in which they are written, the error term for a Newton polynomial is the same as that for a Lagrange polynomial:

$$f(x) - P_n(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi_x)}{(n+1)!}(x - x_0)(x - x_1)\cdots(x - x_n).$$

In this particular case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x) - P_n(x) \quad &= \quad \frac{f^{(3)}(\xi_2)}{3!}(2 - 1)(2 - 2.2)(2 - 3) \\
&= \quad \frac{1}{30}f^{(3)}(\xi_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Since all derivatives are bounded between -2 and 1 over the interval $[1,3]$, $|f^{(3)}(\xi_2)| \leq 2$ and therefore the error has bound

$$|f(x) - P_n(x)| \leq \frac{2}{30} = \frac{1}{15} = .0\overline{6}.$$

17: Since 0.75 is one of the nodes (it is x_3), N_3 and f agree there. That is what it means for N_3 to interpolate the data at x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(.75) &= N_3(.75) \\
&= 1 + 4(.75) + 4(.75)(.75 - .25) + \frac{16}{3}(.75)(.75 - .25)(.75 - .5) \\
&= 6.
\end{aligned}
$$

18: f is periodic and has infinitely many roots regularly spread across the real axis. The only diagram showing roots of this nature is (d) so f matches with (d). g and f differ only by a small amount for large real values so we should expect to see infinitely many more or less regularly spaced roots on the positive real axis. The only diagram with roots of this nature is (a) so g matches with (a). l is a fifth degree polynomial so has at most 5 roots. Diagram (b) shows 8 colors so 8 roots. Therefore, h matches with (b) and l matches with (c). To recap,

$$
\begin{aligned}
f &\leftrightarrow (d) \\
g &\leftrightarrow (a) \\
h &\leftrightarrow (b) \\
l &\leftrightarrow (c).
\end{aligned}
$$

Section 4.1

1: (a) $L_1(x) = \dfrac{x - x_1}{x_0 - x_1} f(x_0) + \dfrac{x - x_0}{x_1 - x_0} f(x_1)$ (b) $L_1'(x) = \dfrac{f(x_0)}{x_0 - x_1} + \dfrac{f(x_1)}{x_1 - x_0} = \dfrac{f(x_1) - f(x_0)}{x_1 - x_0}$ (c) $L'(x_0 + \frac{h}{2}) = \dfrac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{x_0 + h - x_0} = \dfrac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h}$ so

$$
f'\left(x_0 + \frac{h}{2}\right) \approx \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h}.
$$

4: (a) The Newton form of an interpolating polynomial derives from a table of divided differences whether it is a single value or a formula for a general case. The divided differences table for this case is

$$
\begin{array}{c|cccc}
x_0 & f(x_0) & \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h} & \frac{f(x_0 + 2h) - 2f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0)}{2h^2} \\
x_0 + h & f(x_0 + h) & \frac{f(x_0 + 2h) - f(x_0 + h)}{h} & \\
x_0 + 2h & f(x_0 + 2h) & &
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{0,1} &= \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{(x_0 + h) - x_0} = \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h} \\
f_{1,1} &= \frac{f(x_0 + 2h) - f(x_0 + h)}{(x_0 + 2h) - (x_0 + h)} = \frac{f(x_0 + 2h) - f(x_0 + h)}{h} \\
f_{0,2} &= \frac{f_{1,1} - f_{0,1}}{(x_0 + 2h) - x_0} = \frac{\frac{f(x_0 + 2h) - f(x_0 + h)}{h} - \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h}}{2h} \\
&= \frac{f(x_0 + 2h) - 2f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0)}{2h^2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, one possibility for the Newton form is

$$
N_2(x) = f(x_0) + \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h}(x - x_0) + \frac{f(x_0 + 2h) - 2f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0)}{2h^2}(x - x_0)(x - (x_0 + h)).
$$

Making the substitution $x_0 + \theta h$ for x,

$$
N_2(x_0 + \theta h) = f(x_0) + [f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)]\theta + \left[\frac{f(x_0 + 2h) - 2f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0)}{2}\right](\theta)(\theta - 1).
$$

(b) $\frac{dx}{d\theta} = h$ and $\frac{d}{d\theta}N_2(x(\theta)) = \frac{d}{dx}N_2(x) \cdot \frac{dx}{d\theta}$ so $\frac{d}{dx}N_2(x) = \frac{d}{d\theta}N_2(x(\theta)) \div \frac{dx}{d\theta} = \frac{\frac{d}{d\theta}N_2(x(\theta))}{h}$.

Similarly, we get $\frac{d^2}{dx^2}N_2(x) = \frac{\frac{d^2}{d\theta^2}N_2(x(\theta))}{h^2}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dx}N_2(x) &= \frac{[f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)] + \frac{f(x_0+2h)-2f(x_0+h)+f(x_0)}{2}(2\theta - 1)}{h} \\
\frac{d^2}{dx^2}N_2(x) &= \frac{\frac{f(x_0+2h)-2f(x_0+h)+f(x_0)}{2}(2)}{h \cdot h} \\
&= \frac{f(x_0 + 2h) - 2f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0)}{h^2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

(c) $N_2''(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h) = \frac{f(x_0+2h)-2f(x_0+h)+f(x_0)}{h^2}$ so

$$
f''\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) \approx \frac{f(x_0 + 2h) - 2f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0)}{h^2}.
$$

6c: To use this formula, we need $x_0 - h = 10$ and $x_0 + 6h = 17$, a system of two equations with two unknowns whose solution is $x_0 = 11$ and $h = 1$. Plugging these values into formula 4.1.6:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{10}^{17} \frac{1}{x-5}dx &\approx \frac{1}{8640}[5257f(17) - 5880f(16) + 59829f(15) \\
&\quad -81536f(14) + 102459f(13) - 50568f(12) + 30919f(11)] \\
&= \frac{1}{8640}\left[5257 \cdot \frac{1}{12} - 5880 \cdot \frac{1}{11} + 59829 \cdot \frac{1}{10}\right. \\
&\quad \left. -81536 \cdot \frac{1}{9} + 102459 \cdot \frac{1}{8} - 50568 \cdot \frac{1}{7} + 30919 \cdot \frac{1}{6}\right] \\
&\approx 0.8753962951271979.
\end{aligned}
$$

7c: (i) $\int_{10}^{17} \frac{1}{x-5}dx = \ln|x-5|\big|_{10}^{17} = \ln(12) - \ln(5) = \ln\frac{12}{5} \approx 0.8754687373539001$ (ii) The absoute error is the absolute value of the difference between the approximation and the exact value: $|\ln\frac{12}{5} - 0.8753962951271979| \approx 7.24(10)^{-5}$.

11d: To approximate some quantity in regard to a non-polynomial function, we simply evaluate the corresponding quantity for the interpolating polynomial. That means in this case, $f'(2) \approx p'(2)$. But $p'(x) = 12x^3 - 4x + 1$ so $f'(2) \approx 12 \cdot 2^3 - 4 \cdot 2 + 1 = 89$.

12e: To approximate some quantity in regard to a non-polynomial function, we simply evaluate the corresponding quantity for the interpolating polynomial. That means in this case, $\int_0^1 g(x)dx \approx \int_0^1 q(x)dx$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_0^1 g(x)dx &\approx \int_0^1 (-7x^4 + 3x^2 - x + 4)dx \\
&= \left[-\frac{7}{5}x^5 + x^3 - \frac{1}{2}x^2 + 4x\right]_0^1 \\
&= -\frac{7}{5} + 1 - \frac{1}{2} + 4 \\
&= \frac{31}{10} = 3.1
\end{aligned}
$$

13d: To use this formula, we only need substitute proper values for θ and the θ_i. θ must be 0 since the point of evaluation is at x_0 (which equals $x_0 + 0h$). It does not matter which stencil point gives which θ_i, but the θ_i come from the fact that the nodes are $x_0 - h$, $x_0 + 2h$, and $x_0 + 3h$. That gives

us $-1, 2$, and 3 for the θ_i. Setting $\theta_0 = -1$, $\theta_1 = 2$, and $\theta_2 = 3$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
f'(x) &\approx P_2'(x) \\
&= \frac{(0-2)+(0-3)}{h(-1-2)(-1-3)}f(x_0 - h) \\
&\quad + \frac{(0-(-1))+(0-3)}{h(2-(-1))(2-3)}f(x_0 + 2h) \\
&\quad + \frac{(0-(-1))+(0-2)}{h(3-(-1))(3-2)}f(x_0 + 3h) \\
&= -\frac{5}{12h}f(x_0 - h) + \frac{2}{3h}f(x_0 + 2h) + \frac{-1}{4h}f(x_0 + 3h) \\
&= \frac{-5f(x_0 - h) + 8f(x_0 + 2h) - 3f(x_0 + 3h)}{12h}.
\end{aligned}
$$

15c: The integral over this stencil is from x_0 to $x_0 + 2h$ so $\theta_0 = 0$ and $\theta_1 = 2$. The nodes are $x_0 + \frac{1}{3}h$ and $x_0 + \frac{4}{3}h$ so θ_2 and θ_3 are $\frac{1}{3}$ and $\frac{4}{3}$. It does not matter which is which. Setting $\theta_2 = \frac{1}{3}$ and $\theta_3 = \frac{4}{3}$, the formula from question 14c becomes $-\frac{h}{2} \cdot \frac{2-0}{\frac{4}{3}-\frac{1}{3}}\left((2 \cdot \frac{1}{3} - 2 - 0)f(x_0 + \frac{4}{3}h) - (2 \cdot \frac{4}{3} - 2 - 0)f(x_0 + \frac{1}{3}h)\right)$, which simplifies to

$$
\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} f(x)dx \approx \frac{2h}{3}\left[f\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{3}h\right) + 2f\left(x_0 + \frac{4}{3}h\right)\right]
$$

Section 4.2

1d: We are trying to find the undetermined coefficients a_i of formula 4.2.1. We solve system 4.2.2 to do so. The stencil of this question has 2 nodes, x_0 and $x_0 + h$, and point of evaluation $x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h$, so in system 4.2.2 we have $n = 1$, $\theta_0 = 0$ and $\theta_1 = 1$, and $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$. Because we are deriving a first derivative formula, we also have $k = 1$. Therefore the system we need to solve is

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_0'\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) &= a_0 p_0(x_0) + a_1 p_0(x_0 + h) \\
p_1'\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) &= a_0 p_1(x_0) + a_1 p_1(x_0 + h).
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, $p_0(x) = 1$ so $p_0'(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h) = 0$; and $p_1(x) = x - x_0$ so $p_1'(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h) = 1$. Substituting this information into the system,

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &= a_0 + a_1 \\
1 &= a_1 h.
\end{aligned}
$$

From the second equation, $a_1 = \frac{1}{h}$. Substituting into the first equation, $0 = a_0 + \frac{1}{h}$ so $a_0 = -\frac{1}{h}$. Our approximation, formula 4.2.1, becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
f'\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) &\approx -\frac{1}{h}f(x_0) + \frac{1}{h}f(x_0 + h) \\
&= \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h}.
\end{aligned}
$$

That formula should look familiar!

1j: We are trying to find the undetermined coefficients a_i of formula 4.2.1. We solve system 4.2.2 to do so. The stencil of this question has 4 nodes, x_0, $x_0 + h$, $x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h$, and $x_0 + 2h$ with point of evaluation $x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h$, so in system 4.2.2 we have $n = 3$, $\theta_0 = 0$, $\theta_1 = 1$, $\theta_2 = \frac{3}{2}$, $\theta_3 = 2$, and $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$. Because we

are deriving a first derivative formula, we also have $k = 1$. Therefore the system we need to solve is

$$p_0'\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) = a_0 p_0(x_0) + a_1 p_0(x_0 + h) + a_2 p_0(x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h) + a_3 p_0(x_0 + 2h)$$

$$p_1'\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) = a_0 p_1(x_0) + a_1 p_1(x_0 + h) + a_2 p_1(x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h) + a_3 p_1(x_0 + 2h)$$

$$p_2'\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) = a_0 p_2(x_0) + a_1 p_2(x_0 + h) + a_2 p_2(x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h) + a_3 p_2(x_0 + 2h)$$

$$p_3'\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) = a_0 p_2(x_0) + a_1 p_2(x_0 + h) + a_2 p_2(x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h) + a_3 p_2(x_0 + 2h)$$

Now, $p_0(x) = 1$ so $p_0'(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h) = 0$; $p_1(x) = x - x_0$ so $p_1'(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h) = 1$; $p_2(x) = (x - x_0)^2$ so $p_2'(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h) = h$; and $p_3(x) = (x - x_0)^3$ so $p_3'(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h) = \frac{3}{4}h^2$. Substituting this information into the system,

$$0 = a_0 + a_1 + a_2 + a_3$$

$$1 = a_1 h + a_2 \cdot \frac{3}{2}h + a_3 \cdot 2h$$

$$h = a_1 h^2 + a_2 \cdot \frac{9}{4}h^2 + a_3 \cdot 4h$$

$$\frac{3}{4}h^2 = a_1 h^3 + a_2 \cdot \frac{27}{8}h^3 + a_3 \cdot 8h.$$

The first equation is the only one in which a_0 appears so we concentrate on solving the last three equations, which simplify to:

$$\frac{2}{h} = 2a_1 + 3a_2 + 4a_3$$

$$\frac{4}{h} = 4a_1 + 9a_2 + 16a_3$$

$$\frac{6}{h} = 8a_1 + 27a_2 + 64a_3.$$

From the first equation, $2a_1 = \frac{2}{h} - 3a_2 - 4a_3$ so $4a_1 = \frac{4}{h} - 6a_2 - 8a_3$ and $8a_1 = \frac{8}{h} - 12a_2 - 16a_3$. Substituting into the second and third equations, respectively,

$$\frac{4}{h} = \frac{4}{h} - 6a_2 - 8a_3 + 9a_2 + 16a_3$$

$$\frac{6}{h} = \frac{8}{h} - 12a_2 - 16a_3 + 27a_2 + 64a_3$$

which simplifies to

$$0 = 3a_2 + 8a_3$$

$$-\frac{2}{h} = 15a_2 + 48a_3.$$

From the first equation, $a_3 = -\frac{3}{8}a_2$. Substituting into the last equation, $-\frac{2}{h} = 15a_2 + 48(-\frac{3}{8}a_2)$, which simplifies to $-\frac{2}{h} = -3a_2$ so

$$a_2 = \frac{2}{3h}.$$

Back-substituting, $a_3 = -\frac{3}{8}a_2 = -\frac{3}{8}\left(\frac{2}{3h}\right)$ so

$$a_3 = -\frac{1}{4h}.$$

Continuing the back-substitution, $2a_1 = \frac{2}{h} - 3a_2 - 4a_3 = \frac{2}{h} - 3\left(\frac{2}{3h}\right) - 4\left(-\frac{1}{4h}\right)$, which simplifies to $2a_1 = \frac{1}{h}$ so

$$a_1 = \frac{1}{2h}.$$

Finally, $a_0 = -a_1 - a_2 - a_3 = -\frac{1}{2h} - \frac{2}{3h} + \frac{1}{4h}$ so

$$a_0 = -\frac{11}{12h}.$$

Our approximation, formula 4.2.1, thus becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
f'\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) &\approx \frac{11}{12h}f(x_0) + \frac{1}{2h}f(x_0 + h) + \frac{2}{3h}f(x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h) - \frac{1}{4h}f(x_0 + 2h) \\
&= \frac{-11f(x_0) + 6f(x_0 + h) + 8f(x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h) - 3f(x_0 + 2h)}{12h}.
\end{aligned}
$$

2f: We are trying to find the undetermined coefficients a_i of formula 4.2.1. We solve system 4.2.2 to do so. The stencil of this question has 4 nodes, x_0, $x_0 + h$, $x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h$, and $x_0 + 2h$ with point of evaluation $x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h$, so in system 4.2.2 we have $n = 3$, $\theta_0 = 0$, $\theta_1 = 1$, $\theta_2 = \frac{3}{2}$, $\theta_3 = 2$, and $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$. Because we are deriving a first derivative formula, we also have $k = 1$. Therefore the system we need to solve is

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_0''\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) &= a_0 p_0(x_0) + a_1 p_0(x_0 + h) + a_2 p_0(x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h) + a_3 p_0(x_0 + 2h) \\
p_1''\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) &= a_0 p_1(x_0) + a_1 p_1(x_0 + h) + a_2 p_1(x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h) + a_3 p_1(x_0 + 2h) \\
p_2''\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) &= a_0 p_2(x_0) + a_1 p_2(x_0 + h) + a_2 p_2(x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h) + a_3 p_2(x_0 + 2h) \\
p_3''\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) &= a_0 p_2(x_0) + a_1 p_2(x_0 + h) + a_2 p_2(x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h) + a_3 p_2(x_0 + 2h)
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, $p_0(x) = 1$ so $p_0''(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h) = 0$; $p_1(x) = x - x_0$ so $p_1''(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h) = 0$; $p_2(x) = (x - x_0)^2$ so $p_2''(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h) = 2$; and $p_3(x) = (x - x_0)^3$ so $p_3''(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h) = 3h$. Substituting this information into the system,

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &= a_0 + a_1 + a_2 + a_3 \\
0 &= a_1 h + a_2 \cdot \frac{3}{2}h + a_3 \cdot 2h \\
2 &= a_1 h^2 + a_2 \cdot \frac{9}{4}h^2 + a_3 \cdot 4h \\
3h &= a_1 h^3 + a_2 \cdot \frac{27}{8}h^3 + a_3 \cdot 8h.
\end{aligned}
$$

The first equation is the only one in which a_0 appears so we concentrate on solving the last three equations, which simplify to:

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &= 2a_1 + 3a_2 + 4a_3 \\
\frac{8}{h^2} &= 4a_1 + 9a_2 + 16a_3 \\
\frac{24}{h^2} &= 8a_1 + 27a_2 + 64a_3.
\end{aligned}
$$

From the first equation, $2a_1 = -3a_2 - 4a_3$ so $4a_1 = -6a_2 - 8a_3$ and $8a_1 = -12a_2 - 16a_3$. Substituting into the second and third equations, respectively,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{8}{h^2} &= -6a_2 - 8a_3 + 9a_2 + 16a_3 \\
\frac{24}{h^2} &= -12a_2 - 16a_3 + 27a_2 + 64a_3
\end{aligned}
$$

which simplifies to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{8}{h^2} &= 3a_2 + 8a_3 \\
\frac{24}{h^2} &= 15a_2 + 48a_3.
\end{aligned}
$$

Five times the first equation minus the second equation yields $\frac{16}{h^2} = -8a_3$ so

$$
a_3 = -\frac{2}{h^2}.
$$

Back-substituting, $\frac{8}{h^2} = 3a_2 + 8a_3 = 3a_2 + 8(-\frac{2}{h^2})$ so

$$a_2 = \frac{8}{h^2}.$$

Continuing the back-substitution, $2a_1 = -3a_2 - 4a_3 = -3(\frac{8}{h^2}) - 4(-\frac{2}{h^2})$, which simplifies to $2a_1 = -\frac{16}{h^2}$ so

$$a_1 = -\frac{8}{h^2}.$$

Finally, $a_0 = -a_1 - a_2 - a_3 = \frac{8}{h^2} - \frac{8}{h^2} + \frac{2}{h^2}$ so

$$a_0 = \frac{2}{h^2}.$$

Our approximation, formula 4.2.1, thus becomes

$$f'\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) \approx \frac{2}{h^2}f(x_0) - \frac{8}{h^2}f(x_0 + h) + \frac{8}{h^2}f(x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h) - \frac{2}{h^2}f(x_0 + 2h)$$

$$= \frac{2f(x_0) - 8f(x_0 + h) + 8f(x_0 + \frac{3}{2}h) - 2f(x_0 + 2h)}{h^2}.$$

4b: We are trying to find the undetermined coefficients a_i of formula 4.2.3. We solve system 4.2.4 to do so. The stencil of this question has 1 node, $x_0 + \frac{2}{3}h$ and endpoints of integration x_0 and $x_0 + 2h$, so in system 4.2.4 we have $n = 0$, $a = x_0$ and $b = x_0 + 2h$. Therefore the "system" we need to solve is

$$\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} p_0(x)dx = a_0 p_0(x_0).$$

Now, $p_0(x) = 1$ so $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} p_0(x)dx = \int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} dx = 2h$. Substituting this information into the system,

$$2h = a_0.$$

Our approximation, formula 4.2.3, becomes

$$\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} f(x)dx \approx 2hf\left(x_0 + \frac{2}{3}h\right).$$

4l: We are trying to find the undetermined coefficients a_i of formula 4.2.3. We solve system 4.2.4 to do so. The stencil of this question has 3 nodes, x_0, $x_0 + h$, and $x_0 + 2h$ with endpoints of integration x_0 and $x_0 + 2h$, so in system 4.2.4 we have $n = 2$, $a = x_0$ and $b = x_0 + 2h$. Therefore the system we need to solve is

$$\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} p_0(x)dx = a_0 p_0(x_0) + a_1 p_0(x_0 + h) + a_2 p_0(x_0 + 2h)$$

$$\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} p_1(x)dx = a_0 p_1(x_0) + a_1 p_1(x_0 + h) + a_2 p_1(x_0 + 2h)$$

$$\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} p_2(x)dx = a_0 p_2(x_0) + a_1 p_2(x_0 + h) + a_2 p_2(x_0 + 2h)$$

Now, $p_0(x) = 1$ so $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} p_0(x)dx = \int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} dx = 2h$; $p_1(x) = x - x_0$ so $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} p_1(x)dx = \int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h}(x - x_0)dx = \frac{1}{2}(x - x_0)^2\big|_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} = 2h^2$; and $p_2(x) = (x - x_0)^2$ so $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} p_2(x)dx = \int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h}(x - x_0)^2dx = \frac{1}{3}(x - x_0)^3\big|_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} = \frac{8}{3}h^3$. Substituting this information into the system,

$$\begin{aligned}
2h &= a_0 + a_1 + a_2 \\
2h^2 &= a_1 h + a_2(2h) \\
\frac{8}{3}h^3 &= a_1 h^2 + a_2(4h^2).
\end{aligned}$$

The first equation is the only one in which a_0 appears so we concentrate on the last two equations, which simplify to:

$$2h = a_1 + 2a_2$$
$$\frac{8}{3}h = a_1 + 4a_2.$$

From the first equation, $a_1 = 2h - 2a_2$. Substituting into the second equation, $\frac{8}{3}h = 2h - 2a_2 + 4a_2$, which simplifies to $\frac{2}{3}h = 2a_2$, so

$$a_2 = \frac{1}{3}h.$$

Back-substituting, $a_1 = 2h - 2a_2 = 2h - 2(\frac{1}{3}h)$ so

$$a_1 = \frac{4}{3}h.$$

Finally, $a_0 = 2h - a_1 - a_2 = 2h - \frac{4}{3}h - \frac{1}{3}h$ so

$$a_0 = \frac{1}{3}h.$$

Our approximation, formula 4.2.3, thus becomes

$$\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} f(x)dx \approx \frac{1}{3}hf(x_0) + \frac{4}{3}hf(x_0 + h) + \frac{1}{3}f(x_0 + 2h)$$
$$= \frac{h}{3}\left[f(x_0) + 4f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0 + 2h)\right].$$

You may recognize this formula as Simpson's Rule!

Section 4.3

3a: Simpson's Rule for integral approximation is $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} f(x)dx = \frac{h}{3}\left[f(x_0) + 4f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0 + 2h)\right]$.

To apply it to the integral $\int_{-0.5}^{0} x\ln(x + 1)dx$ we need to identify f, x_0, and h. In the formula, x_0 is the lower limit of integration, so we have $x_0 = -0.5$ in this question. In the formula, the length of the interval of integration is $2h$, so we have $2h = 0.5$ in this question, or $h = 0.25$. In the formula, f is the integrand, so we have $f(x) = x\ln(x + 1)$. With the parameters identified, we plug them into the right side of Simpson's Rule and we have our estimate:

$$\int_{-0.5}^{0} x\ln(x + 1)dx \approx \frac{.25}{3}\left[-0.5\ln(0.5) + 4(-0.25)\ln(.75) + 0\ln(1)\right]$$
$$\approx 0.05285463856097945.$$

4a: Trapezoidal Rule for integral approximation is $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx = \frac{h}{2}\left[f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)\right]$. To apply it to the integral $\int_{-0.5}^{0} x\ln(x + 1)dx$ we need to identify f, x_0, and h. In the formula, x_0 is the lower limit of integration, so we have $x_0 = -0.5$ in this question. In the formula, the length of the interval of integration is h, so we have $h = 0.5$ in this question. In the formula, f is the integrand, so we have $f(x) = x\ln(x + 1)$. With the parameters identified, we plug them into the right side of the Trapezoidal Rule and we have our estimate:

$$\int_{-0.5}^{0} x\ln(x + 1)dx \approx \frac{.5}{2}\left[-0.5\ln(0.5) + 0\ln(1)\right]$$
$$\approx 0.08664339756999316.$$

5a: Midpoint Rule for integral approximation is $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} f(x)dx = 2hf(x_0 + h)$. To apply it to the integral $\int_{-0.5}^{0} x\ln(x+1)dx$ we need to identify f, x_0, and h. In the formula, x_0 is the lower limit of integration, so we have $x_0 = -0.5$ in this question. In the formula, the length of the interval of integration is $2h$, so we have $2h = 0.5$ in this question, or $h = 0.25$. In the formula, f is the integrand, so we have $f(x) = x\ln(x+1)$. With the parameters identified, we plug them into the right side of the Trapezoidal Rule and we have our estimate:

$$\int_{-0.5}^{0} x\ln(x+1)dx \approx 2(.25)(-0.25\ln(0.75))$$
$$\approx 0.03596025905647261.$$

6a: Using integration by parts,

$$\int_{-0.5}^{0} x\ln(x+1)dx = \frac{x^2}{2}\ln(x+1)\Big|_{-0.5}^{0} - \frac{1}{2}\int_{-0.5}^{0}\frac{x^2}{x+1}dx$$
$$= -\frac{(-0.5)^2}{2}\ln(0.5) - \frac{1}{2}\int_{-0.5}^{0}\left(x - 1 + \frac{1}{x+1}\right)dx$$
$$= -.125\ln(.5) - \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{x^2}{2} - x + \ln|x+1|\right]_{-0.5}^{0}$$
$$= -.125\ln(.5) + \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{.25}{2} + .5 + \ln(.5)\right]$$
$$= .3125 + .375\ln(.5)$$
$$\approx 0.05256980729002053$$

so the error is $|0.05285463856097945 - 0.05256980729002053| \approx 2.8483(10)^{-4}$.

7a: See above for the exact evaluation of the integral. The error follows as $|0.08664339756999316 - 0.05256980729002053| \approx 0.034073$.

8a: See above for the exact evaluation of the integral. The error follows as $|0.03596025905647261 - 0.05256980729002053| \approx 0.016609$.

11a: $-\frac{h^2}{6}f'''(\xi_h)$ is the error term for this approximation formula. The remainder of the equation is the approximation. We simply plug the given information into the approximation formula:

$$f'(x_0) \approx \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0 - h)}{2h}$$
$$= \frac{e^{2.1} - e^{1.9}}{2(.1)}$$
$$\approx 7.401377351441916.$$

12a: The error term, $-\frac{h^2}{6}f'''(\xi_h)$, dictates the error. As in Taylor's Theorem, this error term is exact for some value of ξ_h. Finding a bound on the error means minimizing or maximizing $|\frac{h^2}{6}f'''(\xi_h)|$ over all possible values of ξ_h. The possible values of ξ_h are all values between the least node and the greatest node, a fact that follows from Taylor's Theorem. For this question, $h = .1$ and $f'''(\xi) = e^{\xi}$, so a lower bound for the error is

$$\frac{.1^2}{6}\min_{\xi\in[1.9,2.1]} e^{\xi}$$

and an upper bound is

$$\frac{.1^2}{6}\max_{\xi\in[1.9,2.1]} e^{\xi}.$$

But e^{ξ} is an increasing function, so its minimum value over $[1.9, 2.1]$ occurs at 1.9 and its maximum at 2.1. Hence we have the error between $\frac{.01}{6}e^{1.9}$ and $\frac{.01}{6}e^{2.1}$, or as floating point approximations, 0.01114315740379878 and 0.01361028318761275. $f'(x) = e^x$ so $f'(2) = e^2$ exactly. The actual error is thus $|e^2 - 7.401377351441916| \approx 0.01232125251126526$, which is between the bounds.

13a: The full details of the formula include the implied qualification "for some $\xi_h \in (x_0 - h, x_0 + h)$", the interval being decided by the least and greatest nodes. So we search for a value of ξ_h so that

$$f'(x_0) = \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0 - h)}{2h} - \frac{h^2}{6} f'''(\xi_h)$$

and $\xi_h \in (x_0 - h, x_0 + h)$. f, x_0, and h are given, so we substitute them into this equation and solve. But first, note $f'(x) = e^x$ and $f'''(x) = e^x$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
e^2 &= \frac{e^{2.1} - e^{1.9}}{.2} - \frac{.1^2}{6} e^{\xi_h} \\
\frac{.01}{6} e^{\xi_h} &= \frac{e^{2.1} - e^{1.9} - .2e^2}{.2} \\
e^{\xi_h} &= \frac{6}{.002} \left[e^{2.1} - e^{1.9} - .2e^2 \right] \\
\xi_h &= \ln(3000(e^{2.1} - e^{1.9} - .2e^2)) \\
&\approx 2.00049999404725,
\end{aligned}
$$

and $\xi_h \in (1.9, 2.1)$ as required.

15: The degree of precision is 4 since the error term involves the fifth derivative of f. The fifth derivative of any polynomial of degree 4 or less is identically zero, so if f is any polynomial of degree 4 or less, the error in using the approximation formula is zero.

17c: The error in any approximation formula is the difference between the two sides. One side holds the exact quantity and the other holds the approximation. To find the error, we subtract the two sides from one another, expand each appearance of f in a Taylor series about x_0 and simplify. The term of least degree remaining determines the error term.

The left side of this approximation is $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx$, so replace $f(x)$ by $f(x_0) + (x - x_0)f'(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}(x - x_0)^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}(x - x_0)^3 f'''(x_0) + \cdots$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx &= \int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} \left[f(x_0) + (x - x_0)f'(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}(x - x_0)^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}(x - x_0)^3 f'''(x_0) + \cdots \right] dx \\
&= \left[xf(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}(x - x_0)^2 f'(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}(x - x_0)^3 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{24}(x - x_0)^4 f'''(x_0) + \cdots \right]_{x_0}^{x_0+h} \\
&= hf(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f'(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}h^3 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{24}h^4 f'''(x_0) + \cdots .
\end{aligned}
$$

The right side of the approximation includes $f(x_0 + \frac{2}{3}h)$, so this expression is also expanded in a Taylor series:

$$f\left(x_0 + \frac{2}{3}h \right) = f(x_0) + \frac{2}{3}hf'(x_0) + \frac{2}{9}h^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{4}{81}h^3 f'''(x_0) + \cdots .$$

Substitute these expansions into the difference of the two sides and simplify. The error is

$$
\left(hf(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f'(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}h^3 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{24}h^4 f'''(x_0) + \cdots \right)
$$
$$
- \frac{h}{4} \left[3\left(f(x_0) + \frac{2}{3}hf'(x_0) + \frac{2}{9}h^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{4}{81}h^3 f'''(x_0) + \cdots \right) + f(x_0) \right]
$$
$$
=
$$
$$
\left(hf(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f'(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}h^3 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{24}h^4 f'''(x_0) + \cdots \right)
$$
$$
- \left(hf(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f'(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}h^3 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{27}h^4 f'''(x_0) + \cdots \right)
$$
$$
=
$$
$$
\frac{1}{216}h^4 f'''(x_0) + \cdots .
$$

Work done heretofore is informal evidence that the error term is $O(h^4 f'''(\xi_h))$. To formalize, we truncate the Taylor series, making them Taylor polynomials of convenient degree, *with* error terms! The error terms from the Taylor polynomials become the error term for the approximation formula. Beginning with the left side of the formula, the exact value:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx &= \int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} \left[f(x_0) + (x-x_0)f'(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}(x-x_0)^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}(x-x_0)^3 f'''(\xi_x) \right] dx \\
&= \left[xf(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}(x-x_0)^2 f'(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}(x-x_0)^3 f''(x_0) \right]_{x_0}^{x_0+h} \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad + \int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} \frac{1}{6}(x-x_0)^3 f'''(\xi_x)dx \\
&= hf(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f'(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}h^3 f''(x_0) + \int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} \frac{1}{6}(x-x_0)^3 f'''(\xi_x)dx
\end{aligned}
$$

for some unknown function ξ_x of x. Now, the $f(x_0 + \frac{2}{3}h)$ term from the right side of the formula, the approximate value:

$$
f\left(x_0 + \frac{2}{3}h \right) = f(x_0) + \frac{2}{3}hf'(x_0) + \frac{2}{9}h^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{4}{81}h^3 f'''(\xi_1)
$$

for some $\xi_1 \in (x_0, x_0 + h)$. Subtracting the two sides, we know all terms with derivative lower than the third will drop out since none of those terms have changed since our discovery. The error is therefore

$$
\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} \frac{1}{6}(x-x_0)^3 f'''(\xi_x)dx - \frac{h}{4} \cdot 3 \cdot \frac{4}{81}h^3 f'''(\xi_1).
$$

The Weighted Mean Value Theorem allows us to replace $\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} \frac{1}{6}(x-x_0)^3 f'''(\xi_x)dx$ by $\frac{1}{6}f'''(c) \int_{x_0}^{x_0+h}(x-x_0)^3 dx = \frac{1}{24}h^4 f'''(c)$ for some $c \in (x_0, x_0 + h)$. The error term thus becomes

$$
\frac{1}{24}h^4 f'''(c) - \frac{1}{27}h^4 f'''(\xi_1)
$$

for some $c \in (x_0, x_0 + h)$ and some $\xi_h \in (x_0, x_0 + h)$. The final formality is to replace this term with big-O notation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{1}{24}h^4 f'''(c) - \frac{1}{27}h^4 f'''(\xi_1) \right| &\leq h^4 \left(\frac{1}{24}|f'''(c)| + \frac{1}{27}|f'''(\xi_1)| \right) \\
&\leq h^4 \left(\frac{1}{24} + \frac{1}{27} \right) \max\{|f'''(c)|, |f'''(\xi_1)|\} \\
&= Mh^4 |f'''(\xi_h)|
\end{aligned}
$$

for some $\xi_h \in (x_0, x_0 + h)$ and $M = \frac{1}{24} + \frac{1}{27} = \frac{17}{216}$ (the value of ξ_h is either c or ξ_1). Hence the error is $O(h^4 f'''(\xi_h))$.

18c: The error in any approximation formula is the difference between the two sides. One side holds the exact quantity and the other holds the approximation. To find the error, we subtract the two sides from one another, expand each appearance of f in a Taylor series about x_0 and simplify. The term of least degree remaining determines the error term. $f'(x_0) \approx \dfrac{-3f(x_0) + 4f(x_0 + \frac{h}{2}) - f(x_0 + h)}{h}$

The left side of this approximation is $f'(x_0)$, so its Taylor expansion is itself! The right side of the approximation includes $f(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h)$ and $f(x_0 + h)$, so these expressions are expanded in Taylor series:

$$
\begin{aligned}
f\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h \right) &= f(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}hf'(x_0) + \frac{1}{8}h^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{48}h^3 f'''(x_0) + \cdots \\
f(x_0 + h) &= f(x_0) + hf'(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}h^3 f'''(x_0) + \cdots .
\end{aligned}
$$

To simplify the display of the algebra, we begin by summing $-3f(x_0) + 4f(x_0 + \frac{h}{2}) - f(x_0 + h)$:

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
-3f(x_0) & = & -3f(x_0) \\
4f(x_0 + \tfrac{1}{2}h) & = & 4f(x_0) + 2hf'(x_0) + \tfrac{1}{2}h^2 f''(x_0) + \tfrac{1}{12}h^3 f'''(x_0) + \cdots \\
-f(x_0 + h) & = & -f(x_0) - hf'(x_0) - \tfrac{1}{2}h^2 f''(x_0) - \tfrac{1}{6}h^3 f'''(x_0) + \cdots \\
\hline
-3f(x_0) + 4f(x_0 + \tfrac{h}{2}) - f(x_0 + h) & = & hf'(x_0) - \tfrac{1}{12}h^3 f'''(x_0) + \cdots.
\end{array}
$$

The difference of the two sides is then

$$
f'(x_0) - \frac{hf'(x_0) - \tfrac{1}{12}h^3 f'''(x_0) + \cdots}{h} = \frac{1}{12}h^2 f'''(x_0).
$$

Work done heretofore is informal evidence that the error term is $O(h^2 f'''(\xi_h))$. To formalize, we truncate the Taylor series, making them Taylor polynomials of convenient degree, *with* error terms! The error terms from the Taylor polynomials become the error term for the approximation formula. The left side, again, is a Taylor expansion! Now, the $f(x_0 + \tfrac{1}{2}h)$ and $f(x_0 + h)$ terms from the right side of the formula:

$$
f\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{2}h\right) = f(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}hf'(x_0) + \frac{1}{8}h^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{48}h^3 f'''(\xi_1)
$$

$$
f\left(x_0 + h\right) = f(x_0) + hf'(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f''(x_0) + \frac{1}{6}h^3 f'''(\xi_2)
$$

for some $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in (x_0, x_0 + h)$. Subtracting the two sides, we know all terms with derivative lower than the third will drop out since none of those terms have changed since our discovery. The remaining terms, those with the third derivative in them, is the error and is

$$
\frac{-4 \cdot \tfrac{1}{48}h^3 f'''(\xi_1) + \tfrac{1}{6}h^3 f'''(\xi_2)}{h} = h^2 \left(\frac{1}{6}f'''(\xi_2) - \frac{1}{12}f'''(\xi_1)\right)
$$

for some $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in (x_0, x_0 + h)$. The final formality is to replace this term with big-O notation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left| h^2 \left(\frac{1}{6}f'''(\xi_2) - \frac{1}{12}f'''(\xi_1)\right)\right| & \leq h^2 \left(\frac{1}{6}|f'''(\xi_2)| + \frac{1}{12}|f'''(\xi_1)|\right) \\
& \leq h^2 \left(\frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{12}\right)\max\{|f'''(\xi_2)|, |f'''(\xi_1)|\} \\
& = Mh^2 |f'''(\xi_h)|
\end{aligned}
$$

for some $\xi_h \in (x_0, x_0 + h)$ and $M = \frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{12} = \frac{1}{4}$ (the value of ξ_h is either ξ_2 or ξ_1). Hence the error is $O(h^2 f'''(\xi_h))$.

19: Diffy Rence is using a second derivative formula with $x_0 = 3$ since the left side is $f''(3.0)$. On the right side, we see a term with $\sin(3)$ in it. This is likely $\sin(x_0)$ from one of the second derivative formulas. We also see $\sin(2.8)$ and $\sin(3.2)$ which look likely to play the roles of $\sin(x_0 - h)$ and $\sin(x_0 + h)$ in the approximation formula used. Looking at table 4.3 for a formula with $f(x_0 - h)$, $f(x_0)$, and $f(x_0 + h)$ in it, we find $f''(x_0) = \frac{f(x_0-h)-2f(x_0)+f(x_0+h)}{h^2} + O(h^2 f^{(4)}(\xi_h))$. Continuing with the hypothesis that we have $f(x) = \sin(x)$, $x_0 = 3$, and $h = .2$, we plug into the formula to find

$$
\begin{aligned}
f''(3) & \approx \frac{\sin(2.8) - 2\sin(3) + \sin(3.2)}{.2^2} \\
& = 25\left[\sin(2.8) - 2\sin(3) + \sin(3.2)\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

We conclude that $f(x) = \sin x$.

23c: First, we need to identify the formula being used. Since this is a third derivative formula with $x_0 = 3$ and evaluations of f at $3, 3.01, 3.02, 3.03, 3.04$, this is a five-point formula with $h = .01$. The formula used is this one from table 4.4:

$$
f'''(x_0) = \frac{-5f(x_0) + 18f(x_0 + h) - 24f(x_0 + 2h) + 14f(x_0 + 3h) - 3f(x_0 + 4h)}{2h^3} + O(h^2 f^{(5)}(\xi_h))
$$

so the error term is $O(h^2 f^{(5)}(\xi_h))$. The error is therefore bounded by

$$
k(.01)^2 \max_{x \in [3, 3.04]} \left| f^{(5)}(x)\right|
$$

for some constant k dependent on the *method*, not the function f or the nodes used. Now,

$$\max_{x \in [3,3.04]} \left| f^{(5)}(x) \right| = \max_{x \in [3,3.04]} |\cos(x)|$$
$$= |\cos(3.04)|.$$

A bound on the error is therefore $0.0001k \cos(3.04)$ or $9.9485(10)^{-5}k$ for some k dependent on the *method*.

23f: First, we need to identify the formula being used. The unusual points of evaluation in the approximation identify it quickly as

$$\int_{x_0-h}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx = h \left[f\left(x_0 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}h \right) + f\left(x_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}h \right) \right] + O(h^5 f^{(4)}(\xi_h))$$

with $x_0 = 3.5$, $h = 0.5$, and error term $O(h^5 f^{(4)}(\xi_h))$. The error is therefore bounded by

$$k(.5)^5 \max_{x \in [3,4]} \left| f^{(4)}(x) \right|$$

for some constant k dependent on the *method*, not the function f or the nodes used. Now,

$$\max_{x \in [3,4]} \left| f^{(4)}(x) \right| = \max_{x \in [3,4]} |\sin(x)|$$
$$= |\sin(4)|.$$

A bound on the error is therefore $0.03125k \sin(4)$ or $0.023651k$ for some k dependent on the *method*.

24: (a) We are given only 5 nodes, so we must use them all for each approximation. The nodes are (thankfully) evenly spaced so we can use one of the formulas in table 4.2. There are two nodes to the left of 2 and two to the right, so we need to use the five-point formula with nodes $x_0 - 2h$, $x_0 - h$, x_0, $x_0 + h$, and $x_0 + 2h$ to approximate $f'(2)$. All four of the nodes other than 4 are to the left of 4 so we need to use the five-point formula with nodes $x_0 - 4h$, $x_0 - 3h$, $x_0 - 2h$, $x_0 - h$, and x_0 to approximate $f'(4)$. Hence

$$f'(2) \approx \frac{-.2381 - 8(-.3125) + 8(-.8333) - (-5)}{12(1)}$$
$$= 0.049625$$
$$f'(4) \approx \frac{3(-.2381) - 16(-.3125) + 36(-.4545) - 48(-.8333) + 25(-5)}{12(1)}$$
$$= -8.089825.$$

(b) We should expect the approximation of $f'(2)$ to be better because the error term for the formula used is $\frac{h^4}{30}f^{(5)}(\xi_h)$ where the error term for the formula used in approximating $f'(4)$ is $\frac{h^4}{5}f^{(5)}(\xi_h)$, six times greater. Another reason we should expect the $f'(2)$ approximation to be better is because 2 is centrally located amongst the nodes where 4 is as far from centrally located as possible!
(c) $f'(x) = -\frac{1}{(x-4.2)^2}$ so $f'(2) = -\frac{25}{121}$ and $f'(4) = -25$. The absolute errors are

$$|f'(2) - 0.049625| \approx 0.2562365702479338$$
$$|f'(4) - (-8.089825)| \approx 16.910175$$

and the relative errors are

$$\left| \frac{0.2562365702479338}{f'(2)} \right| \approx 1.240185$$
$$\left| \frac{16.910175}{f'(4)} \right| \approx 0.6764070000000001.$$

So, as expected the absolute error in the approximation of $f'(2)$ is smaller than that of $f'(4)$, but the relative errors, which are perhaps more important, are exactly the opposite in comparison!

33: The function shown below ($\lambda = 2.584739179873929$) is one example.

The area of trapezoid $CDEF$ represents the approximation by the trapezoidal rule (which is where it gets its name). The function $f(x)$ was chosen so that the two brownish areas are (very nearly) equal, one above line segment CD and one below. This means the trapezoidal rule approximation will be (very nearly) exact. Moreover, since the point A is not on line segment CD, the approximation by Simpson's Rule will not be (very nearly) exact. Other examples can be created similarly. To summarize, any example of a smooth function where the following occur will work.

- The areas above and below the line segment from $(0, f(0))$ to $(1, f(1))$ are equal.

- $(.5, f(.5))$ does not lie on the line segment from $(0, f(0))$ to $(1, f(1))$.

REMARK: Non-smooth functions with the two properties above also provide examples. The reason we chose to give a smooth example is because the errors for non-smooth functions are completely unpredictable (since they don't possess the required number of derivatives), and hence it is not as surprising in that case that we can find examples where the Trapezoidal Rule outdoes Simpson's Rule. The Trapezoidal Rule and Simpson's Rule can not be applied reliably to functions without sufficient derivatives.

REMARK: The question did not request a formula, so any hand-sketched graph with the two properties above would suffice. Since we have a formula, however, we can demonstrate numerically the result. For the function f pictured above,

$$\int_0^1 f(x)dx \approx 3.443097449311693$$
$$\text{Trapezoidal Rule} = \frac{f(0) + f(1)}{2} \approx 3.443097449311694$$
$$\text{Simpson's Rule} = \frac{f(0) + 4f(.5) + f(1)}{6} \approx 3.632535470843161.$$

34: Five-point formulas for the second derivative have error term $O(h^3 f^{(5)}(\xi_h))$ or $O(h^4 f^{(6)}(\xi_h))$ so $E_{.1} = k(.1)^3 f^{(5)}(\xi_{.1})$ or $E_{.1} = k(.1)^4 f^{(6)}(\xi_{.1})$ and $E_{.02} = k(.02)^3 f^{(5)}(\xi_{.02})$ or $E_{.02} = k(.02)^4 f^{(6)}(\xi_{.02})$. Assuming $f^{(5)}(\xi_{.1}) \approx f^{(5)}(\xi_{.02})$ if the error term is $O(h^3 f^{(5)}(\xi_h))$ or that $f^{(6)}(\xi_{.1}) \approx f^{(6)}(\xi_{.02})$ if the error term is $O(h^4 f^{(6)}(\xi_h))$, we should expect

$$\frac{E_{.1}}{E_{.02}} = \frac{k(.1)^3 f^{(5)}(\xi_{.1})}{k(.02)^3 f^{(5)}(\xi_{.02})} \approx \left(\frac{.1}{.02}\right)^3 = 125$$

or

$$\frac{E_{.1}}{E_{.02}} = \frac{k(.1)^4 f^{(6)}(\xi_{.1})}{k(.02)^4 f^{(6)}(\xi_{.02})} \approx \left(\frac{.1}{.02}\right)^4 = 625.$$

Section 4.4

1a: Divide the interval of integration, $[1, 3]$ into 3 subintervals of equal length and apply the midpoint rule to each of the subintervals. The sum of the three estimates is the answer.

interval	midpoint rule
$[1, 1 + \frac{2}{3}]$	$\frac{2}{3} \ln(\sin(1 + \frac{1}{3})) \approx -0.0189755760325961$
$[1 + \frac{2}{3}, 2 + \frac{1}{3}]$	$\frac{2}{3} \ln(\sin(2)) \approx -0.06338869073010707$
$[2 + \frac{1}{3}, 3]$	$\frac{2}{3} \ln(\sin(2 + \frac{2}{3})) \approx -0.5216503391783174$

$$\int_1^3 \ln(\sin(x))dx \approx -0.6040146059410205$$

2a: Divide the interval of integration, $[1, 3]$ into 3 subintervals of equal length and apply the trapezoidal rule to each of the subintervals. The sum of the three estimates is the answer.

interval	trapezoidal rule
$[1, 1 + \frac{2}{3}]$	$\frac{1}{3} \left(\ln(\sin(1)) + \ln(\sin(1 + \frac{2}{3})) \right) \approx -0.05906878811071457$
$[1 + \frac{2}{3}, 2 + \frac{1}{3}]$	$\frac{1}{3} \left(\ln(\sin(1 + \frac{2}{3})) + \ln(\sin(2 + \frac{1}{3})) \right) \approx -0.1096099655624244$
$[2 + \frac{1}{3}, 3]$	$\frac{1}{3} \left(\ln(\sin(2 + \frac{1}{3})) + \ln(\sin(3)) \right) \approx -0.7607906360781023$

$$\int_1^3 \ln(\sin(x))dx \approx -0.9294693897512412$$

3a: Divide the interval of integration, $[1, 3]$ into 3 subintervals of equal length and apply Simpson's rule to each of the subintervals. The sum of the three estimates is the answer. Let $f(x) = \ln(\sin(x))$.

interval	Simpson's rule
$[1, 1 + \frac{2}{3}]$	$\frac{1}{9} \left(f(1) + 4f(1 + \frac{1}{3}) + f(1 + \frac{2}{3}) \right) \approx -0.03233998005863559$
$[1 + \frac{2}{3}, 2 + \frac{1}{3}]$	$\frac{1}{9} \left(f(1 + \frac{2}{3}) + 4f(2) + f(2 + \frac{1}{3}) \right) \approx -0.0787957823408795$
$[2 + \frac{1}{3}, 3]$	$\frac{1}{9} \left(f(2 + \frac{1}{3}) + 4f(2 + \frac{2}{3}) + f(3) \right) \approx -0.6013637714782457$

$$\int_1^3 \ln(\sin(x))dx \approx -0.7124995338777608$$

4a: Divide the interval of integration, $[1, 3]$ into 3 subintervals of equal length and apply Simpson's $\frac{3}{8}$ rule to each of the subintervals. The sum of the three estimates is the answer. Let $f(x) = \ln(\sin(x))$.

interval	Simpson's $\frac{3}{8}$ rule
$[1, 1 + \frac{2}{3}]$	$\frac{1}{12} \left(f(1) + 3f(1 + \frac{2}{9}) + 3f(1 + \frac{4}{9}) + f(1 + \frac{2}{3}) \right) \approx -0.03227403251196553$
$[1 + \frac{2}{3}, 2 + \frac{1}{3}]$	$\frac{1}{12} \left(f(1 + \frac{2}{3}) + 3f(1 + \frac{8}{9}) + 3f(2 + \frac{1}{9}) + f(2 + \frac{1}{3}) \right) \approx -0.07868946204953159$
$[2 + \frac{1}{3}, 3]$	$\frac{1}{12} \left(f(2 + \frac{1}{3}) + 3f(2 + \frac{5}{9}) + 3f(2 + \frac{7}{9}) + f(3) \right) \approx -0.5965852934114506$

$$\int_1^3 \ln(\sin(x))dx \approx -0.7075487879729477$$

5a: Divide the interval of integration, $[1, 3]$ into 3 subintervals of equal length and apply the quadrature rule to each of the subintervals. The sum of the three estimates is the answer. Let $f(x) = \ln(\sin(x))$.

interval	quadrature rule
$[1, 1 + \frac{2}{3}]$	$\frac{1}{3} \left(f(1 + \frac{2}{9}) + f(1 + \frac{4}{9}) \right) \approx -0.02334244731238252$
$[1 + \frac{2}{3}, 2 + \frac{1}{3}]$	$\frac{1}{3} \left(f(1 + \frac{8}{9}) + f(2 + \frac{1}{9}) \right) \approx -0.068382627545234$
$[2 + \frac{1}{3}, 3]$	$\frac{1}{3} \left(f(2 + \frac{5}{9}) + f(2 + \frac{7}{9}) \right) \approx -0.5418501791892335$

$$\int_1^3 \ln(\sin(x))dx \approx -0.63357525404685$$

7: The trapezoidal rule applied to $\int_0^\pi \sin^4 x \, dx$ gives

$$\frac{\pi}{2} \left(\sin^4(0) + \sin^4(\pi) \right) = 0,$$

which has absolute error $\frac{3}{8}\pi$. Since the trapezoidal rule has error term $O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right)$, dividing the interval of integration into n subintervals should decrease the error by a factor of about $\frac{1}{n^2}$. Therefore, we need to solve the equation $\frac{\frac{3}{8}\pi}{n^2} = 10^{-4}$:

$$\frac{\frac{3}{8}\pi}{n^2} = 10^{-4}$$

$$\frac{\frac{3}{8}\pi}{10^{-4}} = n^2$$

$$\sqrt{\frac{\frac{3}{8}\pi}{10^{-4}}} = n$$

$$n \approx 108.5.$$

Increasing the number of intervals by a factor of 109 should do the trick. Since our initial estimate used but one interval, we need to use 109 intervals to achieve 10^{-4} accuracy.

15: Let $S_k(a, b)$ mean applying composite Simpson's rule to the interval $[a, b]$ with k subintervals and e_k mean the error in $S_k(a, b)$. We now repeat the analysis we did in deriving the adaptive trapezoidal rule but applied to Simpson's rule:

$$e_n \approx M \left(\frac{1}{n} \right)^4 \quad \text{and} \quad e_{2n} \approx M \left(\frac{1}{2n} \right)^4$$

so

$$\frac{e_n}{e_{2n}} \approx \frac{M \left(\frac{1}{n} \right)^4}{M \left(\frac{1}{2n} \right)^4} = 16, \quad \text{which implies} \quad e_n \approx 16 e_{2n}.$$

Because $\int_a^b f(x) dx = S_2(a, b) + e_2 = S_1(a, b) + e_1$,

$$S_2(a, b) - S_1(a, b) = e_1 - e_2$$
$$\approx 16 e_2 - e_2$$
$$= 15 e_2$$

so $e_2 \approx \frac{1}{15}(S_2(a, b) - S_1(a, b))$. Explicitly,

$$\int_a^b f(x) dx - S_2(a, b) \approx \frac{1}{15}(S_2(a, b) - S_1(a, b)).$$

Now we know what quantity to use in order to estimate the error. We tabulate the necessary computations:

a	b	$S_1(a, b)$	$S_2(a, b)$	$\frac{1}{15}\left|S_2(a, b) - S_1(a, b)\right|$	tol	
1	3	−0.837026	−0.730741	0.00708	.002	✗
1	2	−0.046286	−0.045560	$4.8(10)^{-5}$	.001	✔
2	3	−0.684454	−0.661383	0.00153	.001	✗
2	2.5	−0.134349	−0.134243	$7.0(10)^{-6}$	.0005	✔
2.5	3	−0.527034	−0.523129	0.00026	.0005	✔

$$\int_1^3 \ln(\sin(x)) dx \approx -0.045560 - 0.134243 - 0.523129 = -0.702932$$

23: First,

$$\int_0^1 \ln(x + 1) dx = [(x + 1)\ln(x + 1) - x - 1]_0^1$$
$$= 2\ln 2 - 2 - (-1)$$
$$= 2\ln 2 - 1$$
$$\approx 0.3862943611198906.$$

Now we need to get an estimate using the composite trapezoidal rule with a small number of intervals, say 10 or 20. This part of the computation is mere speculation. Really, any number of intervals that will not give the desired accuracy will suffice:

$$T_{10}(0,1) = 0.385877936745754.$$

The error with 10 subintervals is

$$|0.3862943611198906 - 0.385877936745754| \approx 4.16424374136581(10)^{-4}.$$

Since the error term for the composite trapezoidal rule (assuming $f''(\xi_h)$ is constant, as we do in deriving the adaptive method) is $O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right)$, we expect the error to decrease by a factor of n^2 as the number of intervals is increased by a factor of n. The needed factor of decrease is

$$\frac{10^{-6}}{4.16424374136581(10)^{-4}} \approx 0.00240139641699267.$$

Therefore, the necessary factor of increase is $\sqrt{\frac{1}{0.00240139641699267}} \approx 20.406$. Our "test" calculation used 10 intervals, so we need to use $10 \cdot 20.406 = 204.06$, or rounding up, 205 intervals to achieve 10^{-6} accuracy.

REMARK: Another way to find the necessary factor of increase is to solve the equation

$$\frac{4.16424374136581(10)^{-4}}{n^2} = 10^{-6}.$$

This comes from the fact that increasing the number of intervals by a factor of n decreases the error by a factor of n^2. Thus we take the known error (of $T_{10}(0,1)$), divide by n^2 and set it equal to the desired accuracy, 10^{-6}. The solution, of course, is $n \approx 20.406$, the factor of increase.

REMARK: We have used the Octave code

```
#######################################################
# Written by Dr. Len Brin          2 April 2012   #
# MAT 322 Numerical Analysis I                    #
# Purpose: Implementation of composite Trapezoidal #
# rule                                            #
# INPUT: function f, interval endpoints a and b,   #
#        number of subintervals n                 #
# OUTPUT: approximate integral of f(x) from a to b #
#######################################################
function integral = compositeTrapezoidal(f,a,b,n)
  h = (b-a)/n;
  s = 0;
  for i = 1:n-1
    s = s + f(a+i*h);
  end#for
  integral = h*(f(a)+2*s+f(b))/2;
end#function
```

to calculate $T_{10}(0,1)$:

```
>> f=inline('log(x+1)');
>> compositeTrapezoidal(f,0,1,10)
ans =   0.385877936745754
```

REMARK: Using the code above to calculate the approximation with 205 subintervals:

```
>> compositeTrapezoidal(f,0,1,205)
ans =   0.386293369647938
```

and it has error

```
>> 0.3862943611198906-ans
ans =    9.91471952871414e-07
```

just less than 10^{-6}.

Section 4.5

7: We need to combine $N(h)$, $N(\frac{h}{2})$, and $N(\frac{h}{3})$ so that terms involving h and h^2 vanish, leaving h^3 as the lowest order term.

$$
\begin{aligned}
N(h) &= M - K_1 h - K_2 h^2 - K_3 h^3 - \cdots \\
N\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) &= M - \frac{1}{2}K_1 h - \frac{1}{4}K_2 h^2 - \frac{1}{8}K_3 h^3 - \cdots \\
N\left(\frac{h}{3}\right) &= M - \frac{1}{3}K_1 h - \frac{1}{9}K_2 h^2 - \frac{1}{27}K_3 h^3 - \cdots
\end{aligned}
$$

so $N(h) + aN(\frac{h}{2}) + bN(\frac{h}{3})$ is

$$
(1 + a + b)M - \left(1 + \frac{a}{2} + \frac{b}{3}\right)K_1 h - \left(1 + \frac{a}{4} + \frac{b}{9}\right)K_2 h^2 - \left(1 + \frac{a}{8} + \frac{b}{27}\right)K_3 h^3 - \cdots .
$$

Therefore we need to find a and b such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
1 + \frac{a}{2} + \frac{b}{3} &= 0 \\
1 + \frac{a}{4} + \frac{b}{9} &= 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

The solution of the system is $a = -8$ and $b = 9$. Calculating,

$$
N(h) - 8N\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) + 9N\left(\frac{h}{3}\right) = 2M + O(h^3)
$$

so our $O(h^3)$ estimate for M is

$$
\frac{N(h) - 8N(\frac{h}{2}) + 9N(\frac{h}{3})}{2}.
$$

REMARK: We can work directly by Richardson's extrapolation (at least to begin) as well. Using Richardson's extrapolation with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $m_1 = 1$, we can combine $N(h)$ and $N(\frac{h}{2})$ to get an $O(h^2)$ approximation:

$$
N_1(h) = 2N\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) - N(h).
$$

Using Richardson's extrapolation with $\alpha = \frac{2}{3}$ and $m_1 = 1$, we can combine $N(\frac{h}{2})$ and $N(\frac{h}{3})$ to get another $O(h^2)$ approximation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{N}_1\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) &= \frac{\frac{3}{2}N(\frac{h}{3}) - N(\frac{h}{2})}{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= 3N\left(\frac{h}{3}\right) - 2N\left(\frac{h}{2}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Both N_1 and $\hat{N}_1$ are $O(h^2)$ approximations, so we can combine them to get the $O(h^3)$ approximation. Unfortunately the Richardson's extrapolation formula does not apply. It assumes the same constants in each approximation. But the general idea does. We need to combine these approximations

$$
\begin{aligned}
N_1(h) &= M + \frac{1}{2}K_2 h^2 + \frac{3}{4}K_3 h^3 + \cdots \\
\hat{N}_1\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) &= M + \frac{1}{6}K_2 h^2 + \frac{5}{36}K_3 h^3 + \cdots
\end{aligned}
$$

to eliminate the h^2 term. By inspection, we need $3\hat{N}_1(\frac{h}{2}) - N_1(h)$:

$$
3\hat{N}_1\left(\frac{h}{2}\right) - N_1(h) = 2M - \frac{1}{3}K_3 h^3 - \cdots .
$$

Therefore, the $O(h^3)$ approximation for M we are looking for is

$$
\begin{aligned}
N_2(h) &= \frac{3\hat{N}_1(\frac{h}{2}) - N_1(h)}{2} \\
&= \frac{3\left[3N(\frac{h}{3}) - 2N(\frac{h}{2})\right] - \left[2N(\frac{h}{2}) - N(h)\right]}{2} \\
&= \frac{N(h) - 8N(\frac{h}{2}) + 9N(\frac{h}{3})}{2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

8: For the first extrapolation, we use formula 4.5.4 with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $m_1 = 2$:

$$
N_1(h) = \frac{4N(\frac{h}{2}) - N(h)}{3},
$$

which leaves $N_1(h) = M + l_2 h^4 + l_3 h^6 + \cdots$. We get a second round of refinements from formula 4.5.4 with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $m_1 = 4$:

$$
N_2(h) = \frac{16N_1(\frac{h}{2}) - N_1(h)}{15},
$$

which leaves $N_2(h) = M + c_3 h^6 + \cdots$. We get a third round of refinements from formula 4.5.4 with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $m_1 = 6$:

$$
N_3(h) = \frac{64N_2(\frac{h}{2}) - N_2(h)}{63}.
$$

Tabulating the computation, it goes something like this:

N	N_1	N_2	N_3
2.356194			
-0.4879837	-1.436042		
-0.8815732	-1.012769	-0.9845514	
-0.9709157	-1.000696	-0.9998916	-1.000135

The third Richardson extrapolation is -1.000135. Not bad considering the exact value of the integral is -1.

10: To summarize the method, let $N_0(k) = T_k(1,3)$, the trapezoidal rule itself applied with k subintervals. Then since the error of the trapezoidal rule only contains even powers,

$$
N_j(k) = \frac{4^j N_{j-1}(2k) - N_{j-1}(k)}{4^j - 1}
$$

for $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. To six significant figures, the following table summarizes the process.

k	$N_0(k)$	$N_1(k)$	$N_2(k)$	$N_3(k)$	$N_4(k)$	$N_5(k)$	$N_6(k)$
1	-2.13074	-0.837026	-0.723655	-0.705067	-0.702555	-0.702340	-0.702330
2	-1.16045	-0.730741	-0.705358	-0.702564	-0.702340	-0.702330	
4	-0.838170	-0.706944	-0.702608	-0.702341	-0.702330		
8	-0.739751	-0.702879	-0.702345	-0.702330			
16	-0.712097	-0.702378	-0.702330				
32	-0.704808	-0.702333					
64	-0.702952						

To (Octave) machine accuracy,

$$
\int_1^3 \ln(\sin(x))dx \approx -0.702330215031025
$$

Answers to Selected Exercises

Section 1.1

10e: 0.83333

14a: .2353263818643 and .2343263818643

15a: .2349438537911 and .2347090273506

16: $(p, \tilde{p}) \in \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{97}{300}\right), \left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{103}{300}\right), \left(-\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{97}{300}\right), \left(-\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{103}{300}\right) \right\}$

21: $p = \pm 1$ and $\tilde{p}$ is anything; or $p = \tilde{p} \neq 0$.

24a: (i) 8.99999974990351 (ii) $2.5009649(10)^{-7}$ (iii) $2.7788499(10)^{-8}$ (iv) $(10)^{-14}$ (v) $2.5009647(10)^{-7}$

Section 1.2

1f: $T_3(x) = x^2$. $R_3(x) = \frac{\xi \sin(\xi) - 4\cos(\xi)}{24} x^4$.

9d: 10.760

12a: $\xi(\pi) = \cos^{-1}\left(\frac{12\pi^2 - 48}{\pi^4}\right) \approx 0.7625$.

Section 1.3

1d: $\alpha = 1$

6f: $O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$

6h: $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$

6n: $O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$

19e: 4 iterations

Section 1.4

7: (a) 1 more than 4 times the number required for the $2^{n-1} \times 2^{n-1}$ grid. (b) 0 (c) 0

14: (a) $S(n-1, k-1)$ (b) $k \cdot S(n-1, k)$

Section 2.1

4c: In 27 iterations, we get 0.666666664928, which is within 10^{-8} of an actual root.

4f: In 27 iterations, we get 21.9911485687, which is within 10^{-8} of an actual root.

5: (a) 0.625 (b) 1.09375

10: $\frac{37\pi}{2}$

16: 33

23: One possible `collatz.m` file is

```
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
% Written by        on                                   %
% Purpose: implementation of the collatz function %
% INPUT: integer n                                       %
% OUTPUT: n/2 or 3n+1 depending on whether n is   %
%         even or odd                                    %
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
function res=collatz(n)
  if (ceil(n/2)==n/2)
    res=n/2
  else
    res=3*n+1
  end%if
end%function
```

25: (a) $\sqrt{20\pi}$

Section 2.2

2d: (i) The hypotheses of the MVT are met. (ii) $c \approx -2.540793513382845$.

2g: (i) The hypotheses of the MVT are not met.

2h: (i) The hypotheses of the MVT are met. (ii) $c \approx 17.41987374102208$.

3c: -2 and 5

3d: -1 and $-\frac{1}{3}$

4c: $f_1(x) = \sqrt[5]{\frac{4-3x^2}{2}}$ and $f_2(x) = \sqrt{\frac{4-3x^5}{6}}$. There are many others.

4f: $f_1(x) = \frac{(x^2-5x+1)(\log_2 3)-x^2-1}{5}$ and $f_2(x) = \sqrt{(\log_2 3)(x^2-5x+1)-5x-1}$. There are many others.

5c: $1.326008542399018, 1.598751095046933, 1.737721941251104, 1.779703798972744, 1.788512049183622$; the sequence seems to be converging.

6c: 1.79047660196506

7c: The web diagram over $[.8, 2]$ is:

18: (a) 15 (b) The equations $g(x) = x$ and $f(x) = x$ are equivalent.

23: $-\frac{1}{4}$

Section 2.3

10: (a) 15. HINT: It is valid to bound the derivative over the interval $[1.618033988749895, 2.5]$ instead of the entire interval $[.5, 3.5]$. Why? On the other hand, if you do consider the whole interval $[.5, 3.5]$, you get a bound of 43. (b) It actually takes 15 iterations.

13: $a_1 \approx 1.942415717$ and $a_2 \approx 1.623271404$

14: 2.732050809. HINT: use $f(x) = \sqrt[4]{2x^3 + 4x^2 - 4x - 4}$. Why?

15: $a_0 = 3$, $a_1 = \frac{3}{2}$, and $a_2 = \frac{4}{3}$

18: No. Aitken's delta-squared Method is designed to speed up linearly convergent sequences, not super-linearly convergent sequences.

21: $a_1 \approx 2.152904629$ and $a_2 \approx 1.873464044$

23: $\frac{3}{2}$ or 0

24: $\hat{x} \approx 5.259185715$

Section 2.4

4c: Using $x_0 = 2$ and $x_1 = 3$, we find $x_8 = 1.47883214766643$.

4d: Using $x_0 = 3$ and $x_1 = 4$, we find $x_{10} = 0.948434069243393$.

5c: Using $x_0 = 2.5$, we find $x_6 = 1.47883214733021$.

5d: Using $x_0 = 3.5$, we find $x_7 = 0.948434069919634$.

6c: Using $x_0 = 2.5$, we find $x_{18} = 0.948434068437721$.

6d: Using $x_0 = 3.5$, we find $x_{15} = 0.948434069313413$.

7c: Using $x_0 = 2$ and $x_1 = 3$, we find $x_{10} = 1.47883214733021$. The difference between x_{10} and x_8 is about $3.3(10)^{-10}$, so x_8 was indeed accurate to within 10^{-5}.

7d: Using $x_0 = 3$ and $x_1 = 4$, we find $x_{12} = 0.948434069919636$. The difference between x_{12} and x_{10} is about $6.7(10)^{-10}$, so x_{10} was indeed accurate to within 10^{-5}.

9b: $x_{14} = 0.580055888962675$.

15b: $x_{14} = 0.580055888962675$. This is different from 0. Why?

16: $x_{10} = 3.739599358563032$.

20: $x_{16} = 3.7201766622615984(10)^{-4}$, $x_{17} = 2.4933434933779863(10)^{-4}$, and $x_{18} = 1.6752024023472534(10)^{-4}$. $a_{16} = 3.7404947721983783(10)^{-6}$ so Aitken's delta-squared method DOES speed up convergence.

23: (a) π (b) Newton's Method will fail because $g'(0) = 0$. (c) 6 (d) Something near -7.5 will do.

26c: In 18 iterations, we get 0.666666668082383, which is within 10^{-8} of an actual root. This is the same root found by the bisection method, but the bisection method took longer, 27 iterations.

26f: In 9 iterations, we get 21.9911485743912, which is within 10^{-8} of an actual root. This is the same root found by the bisection method, but the bisection method took longer, 27 iterations.

33: 3.555963292212723

Section 2.6

2: f and (a), g and (d), h and (b), l and (c)

8: f and (b), g and (c), h and (d), l and (a)

Section 2.7

6b: $g(2) = 5$ and $g'(2) = -8$

8b: $x_1 = \frac{21}{8}$ and $x_2 = \frac{241003}{100544}$

14b: -8, -2.33333, 0.33333, $2 + i$, $2 - i$

15b: -2, 0.76393, 5.23607, $0.66667 + 0.57735i$, $0.66667 - 0.57735i$

16b: They do change, but not within the first five decimal places.

19b: (i) -109.372462336481 (ii) -109.372462336481 (iii) `ans = 0`

19c: (i) 948.990683139955 (ii) 948.990683139955 (iii) `ans = 1`

20:

```
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
% Written by Dr. Len Brin         15 January 2014 %
% Purpose: Implementation of Newton's Method      %
%          for polynomials of the form            %
%    p(x) = c1 + c2*x + c3*x^2 + ... + c(n+1)*x^n  %
%          using Horner's Method, n > 1.          %
% INPUT: coefficients c; tolerance tol; maximum    %
%          number of iterations N                 %
% OUTPUT: approximations to all roots, roots       %
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
function roots = newthornall(c,tol,N,x0)
  n=length(c)-1;
  for i=1:n-2
    res=newtonhorner(c,x0,tol,N)
    roots(i)=res;
    x0=roots(i);
    c=deflate(c,x0);
  end%for
  [roots(n-1),roots(n)]=quadraticRoots(c(3),c(2),c(1));
end%function
```

Remark: This code is often successful, but can easily come up empty. For example,

$$\text{newthornall}([56,-152,140,-17,-48,9],1e-5,100,2)$$

returns

```
res =  0.763932022500484
res =  5.23606797749979
res = Method failed---maximum number of iterations reached
error: newthornall: A(I) = X: X must have the same size as I
error: called from:
error:   .../newthornall.m at line 16, column 13
```

It fails to come up with the third real root, -2. After finding the first two roots, the polynomial has been deflated to

$$14.00000000000065 - 16.99999999999987x +$$
$$6.00000000000002x^2 + 9.00000000000000x^3.$$

With this cubic and initial value 5.23606797749979, Newton's method does not converge to -2. On the other hand, `newthornall([56,-152,140,-17,-48,9],1e-5,100,-2)` returns

```
res = -2
res =  0.763932022500211
res =  5.23606797749979
ans =

 Columns 1 and 2:

  -2.000000000000000 + 0.000000000000000i    0.763932022500211 + 0.000000000000000i

 Columns 3 and 4:

   5.236067977499789 + 0.000000000000000i    0.666666666666667 + 0.577350269189623i

 Column 5:

   0.666666666666667 - 0.577350269189623i
```

Having found -2 first, it has no problem finding the other roots.

21: (a)

$$1.5858$$
$$-13$$
$$4.4142$$
$$-2 + 2.2361i$$
$$-2 - 2.2361i$$

(b)

$$3 - 1.4142i$$
$$-2.6$$
$$-2 + 2.2361i$$
$$-2 - 2.2361i$$
$$3 + 1.4142i$$

Section 3.2

15: 4

16: 3, $\frac{18+\sqrt{142}}{7}$, or $\frac{18-\sqrt{142}}{7}$

21: 8

Section 3.3

5: $P_2(x) = -0.001642458785316x^2 + 1.64927376355948x + 10$

8: $P_3(x) = 2x - 1$. Is degree 1 what you expected?

14: (a) $\frac{3}{40000} f^{(4)}(\xi_{8.4})$ (b) $8.7364(10)^{-5} \max\limits_{x \in [8.1, 8.7]} \left| f^{(4)}(x) \right|$ (c) $.52501$

15: $0.5x^3 + 1.5x^2 + 0.335x + 0.951$

19: f and (b), g and (c), h and (d), l and (a)

Section 4.1

2cc: $f'\left(x_0 + \frac{h}{2}\right) \approx \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h}$

3cc: $f'\left(x_0 + \frac{h}{2}\right) \approx \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h}$

6: (a) 20.32712878304436 (e) 0.6321205268681437 (g) 0.2325441461772505

7: (a) (i) $e^3 - e^{-4}$ (ii) 0.2599074987454273 (e) (i) $1 - e^{-1}$ (ii) $3.196041398201288(10)^{-8}$ (g) (i) $\ln 2$ (ii) $1.2110575916990385(10)^{-5}$

8b: 1.19336533331362

9b: $.19336533331362$

11b: 35

11f: $\frac{28}{15}$

12a: -1

12c: -23

13b: $f'(x_0 + 3h) \approx \frac{7f(x_0 + 2h) - 15f(x_0) + 8f(x_0 - h)}{6h}$

13f: $f'(x_0 - h) \approx \frac{-f(x_0 + 2h) + 9f(x_0) - 8f(x_0 - h)}{6h}$

13h: $f'(x_0) \approx \frac{-f(x_0 + 3h) + 9f(x_0 + h) - 8f(x_0)}{6h}$

14c: $\int_{x_0 + \theta_0 h}^{x_0 + \theta_1 h} f(x)dx \approx -\frac{h}{2} \cdot \frac{\theta_1 - \theta_0}{\theta_3 - \theta_2} \left((2\theta_2 - \theta_1 - \theta_0)f(x_0 + \theta_3 h) - (2\theta_3 - \theta_1 - \theta_0)f(x_0 + \theta_2 h)\right)$

15a: $\int_{x_0}^{x_0 + 2h} f(x)dx \approx \frac{h}{2}\left[f(x_0) + 3f\left(x_0 + \frac{4}{3}h\right)\right]$

15e: $\int_{x_0}^{x_0 + h} f(x)dx \approx \frac{h}{2}\left[f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)\right]$

Section 4.2

1: (b) $f'\left(x_0 + \frac{h}{4}\right) \approx \dfrac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h}$

(f) $f'(x_0 - h) \approx \dfrac{-3f(x_0 - h) + 4f(x_0) - f(x_0 + h)}{2h}$

(h) $f'(x_0 - h) \approx \dfrac{-7f(x_0 - h) + 16f(x_0 + 2h) - 9f(x_0 + 3h)}{12h}$

(l) $f'(x_0) \approx \dfrac{-3f(x_0 - h) - 10f(x_0) + 18f(x_0 + h) - 6f(x_0 + 2h) + f(x_0 + 3h)}{12h}$

2: (b) $f''(x_0 - h) \approx \dfrac{f(x_0 - h) - 2f(x_0) + f(x_0 + h)}{h^2}$

(d) $f''(x_0 - h) \approx \dfrac{f(x_0 - h) - 4f(x_0 + 2h) + 3f(x_0 + 3h)}{6h^2}$

(h) $f''(x_0) \approx \dfrac{11f(x_0 - h) - 20f(x_0) + 6f(x_0 + h) + 4f(x_0 + 2h) - f(x_0 + 3h)}{12h^2}$

4: (d) $\displaystyle\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx \approx hf(x_0)$

(f) $\displaystyle\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} f(x)dx \approx h\left(f\left(x_0+\frac{2}{3}h\right)+f\left(x_0+\frac{4}{3}h\right)\right)$

(h) $\displaystyle\int_{x_0}^{x_0+h} f(x)dx \approx \frac{h}{2}\left(f(x_0)+f(x_0+h)\right)$

(j) $\displaystyle\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} f(x)dx \approx \frac{h}{2}\left(3f\left(x_0+\frac{2}{3}h\right)+f(x_0+2h)\right)$

Section 4.3

2: $f'(-2.7) \approx -0.9151775$; $f'(-2.5) \approx 1.5014075$; $f'(-2.3) \approx 2.17825$; $f'(-2.1) \approx 1.11535$

3c: 0.4897985468241977

3e: $149/24 = 6.208\overline{3}$

4: (c) 0.4693956404725931 (e) $17/2 = 8.5$

5: (c) 0.5 (e) $81/16 = 5.0625$

6: (c) $8.57775220962087(10)^{-5}$ (e) $0.008\overline{3}$

7: (c) 0.02031712882950837 (e) 2.3

8: (c) 0.0102872306978985 (e) 1.1375

10: 0

11b: 288666.8155482048

12b: lower: 1565.147456974753 upper: 2334.925631788689 actual: 1915.502415038936

13b: 3.142092629759007

17a: error term: $O(h^2 f'(\xi))$ degree of precision: 0

17e: error term: $O(h^4 f'''(\xi))$ degree of precision: 2

17g: error term: $O(h^4 f'''(\xi))$ degree of precision: 2

17i: error term: $O(h^5 f^{(4)}(\xi))$ degree of precision: 3

18a: $O(hf''(\xi))$

18e: $O(h^4 f^{(5)}(\xi))$

18g: $O(hf'''(\xi))$

18i: $O(h^3 f^{(5)}(\xi))$

23a: $0.0134k$ for some constant k depending on the approximation formula, not the function $\sin x$.

25: (a) $O(h^3)$ (b) 1 (c) $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\pi \approx 2.720699046351327$ (d) $\frac{\pi^3}{36} \approx 0.8612854633416616$ (e) actual absolute error: 0.7206990463513265

27: $-\frac{1}{2}$

28: $O(h^2)$

30: 0

31: 10506.03569166666

36: approximation 1: $\frac{-3(1.22140)+4(1.10517)-1}{-.2} = 1.2176$; approximation 2: $\frac{1.34986-1.10517}{.2} = 1.22345$; approximation 3: $\frac{-3(1.22140)+4(1.34986)-1.49182}{.2} = 1.2171$; rank: 3,1,2; Other answers are acceptable.

38: 2.58629507364657; $h = .0000474853515625$

Section 4.4

1: (c) 17.52961733248352 (e) 1.560867019857898

2: (c) 19.3773960369059 (e) 1.569045013890161

3: (c) 18.14554356729098 (e) 1.563593017868653

4: (c) 18.14441877898906 (e) 1.563592239944993

5: (c) 17.73342635968343 (e) 1.561774648629937

8: 141

11b:

$$\int_{x_0}^{x_0+2h} f(x)dx \approx \frac{h}{3n}\left[f(x_0) + f(x_0+2h) + 2\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} f\left(x_0+2i\frac{h}{n}\right) + 4\sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(x_0+(2i-1)\frac{h}{n}\right)\right]$$

11c:

$$\int_{x_0}^{x_0+3h} f(x)dx \quad \approx \quad \frac{3h}{8n}\left[f(x_0) + f(x_0+3h) + 2\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} f\left(x_0+3i\frac{h}{n}\right)\right.$$
$$\left. +3\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(f\left(x_0+(3i-2)\frac{h}{n}\right) + f\left(x_0+(3i-1)\frac{h}{n}\right)\right)\right]$$

16: 0.386259562814567

19: (a) 1.386294361119891 (b) 132

21: 3.109198655184147; yes

26: 0.3862939349171364; 5

27: A straightforward implementation, `adaptSimp()`:

```
######################################################
# Written by Leon Brin                 15 May 2014  #
# Purpose: Implementation of adaptive Simpson's     #
# rule                                              #
# INPUT: function f, interval endpoints a and b,    #
#        desired accuracy TOL.                      #
# OUTPUT: approximate integral of f(x) from a to b  #
#         within TOL of actual.                     #
######################################################

function res = adaptSimp(f,a,b,TOL)
  h = (b-a)/4;
  f0 = f(a);
  f1 = f(a+h);
  f2 = f(a+2*h);
  f3 = f(a+3*h);
  f4 = f(b);
  error = abs(h*(f0-4*(f1+f3)+6*f2+f4))/45;
  if (error <= TOL)
    res = h/3*(f0+4*(f1+f3)+2*f2+f4);
  else
    res = adaptSimp(f,a,a+2*h,TOL/2) + adaptSimp(f,a+2*h,b,TOL/2);
  endif
endfunction
```

A pair of functions that minimizes the number of evaluations of f, `aSimp()` and `adaptiveSimpsons()`:

```
##################################################
# Written by Leon Brin              15 May 2014  #
# Purpose: Wrapper for aSimp()                   #
# INPUT: function f, interval endpoints a and b, #
#        desired accuracy TOL.                   #
# OUTPUT: approximate integral of f(x) from a to b #
#         within TOL of actual.                  #
##################################################
function res = adaptiveSimpsons(f,a,b,TOL)
  res = aSimp(f,a,b,f(a),f((a+b)/2),f(b),TOL);
end#function


##################################################
# Written by Leon Brin              15 May 2014  #
# Purpose: Implementation of adaptive Simpson's  #
# rule                                           #
# INPUT: function f, interval endpoints a and b, #
#        f0=f(a), f2=f((a+b)/2), f4=f(b), desired #
#        accuracy TOL.                           #
# OUTPUT: approximate integral of f(x) from a to b #
#         within TOL of actual.                  #
##################################################
function res = aSimp(f,a,b,f0,f2,f4,TOL)
  h = (b-a)/4;
  f1 = f(a+h);
  f3 = f(a+3*h);
  error = abs(h*(f0-4*(f1+f3)+6*f2+f4))/45;
  if (error <= TOL)
    res = h/3*(f0+4*(f1+f3)+2*f2+f4);
  else
    res = aSimp(f,a,a+2*h,f0,f1,f2,TOL/2) + aSimp(f,a+2*h,b,f2,f3,f4,TOL/2);
  end#if
end#function
```

REMARK: `aSimp()` and `adaptiveSimpsons()` must be contained in separate `.m` files. `adaptiveSimpsons()` is the only one that should be used directly.

28: >> f=inline('log(sin(x))');
>> adaptiveSimpsons(f,1,3,.002)
ans = -0.70293

30a: (a) (i)

>> format('long');
>> f=inline('x*sin(x^2)');
>> adaptiveSimpsons(f,0,2*pi,10^-5)
ans =   0.603500307287469

(ii) $\left| \frac{1-\cos(4}{2} - 0.603500307287469 \right| \approx 6.175(10)^{-7}$ (iii) yes

Section 4.5

1: $\dfrac{8\sin\left(\frac{\pi h}{2}\right) - \sin(\pi h)}{3h}$

3: $O(h^9)$

4: $\frac{16}{9}$

5: (a) $N(1.0) \approx 0.4596976941318602$ and $N(0.5) \approx 0.489669752438509$
(b) (i) $N_1(1.0) \approx 0.5196418107451577$ (ii) $N_1(1.0) \approx 0.4996604385407252$
(c) assumption (i) because it yields an approximation with error about half that of $N(1.0)$, just what would be expected if assumption (i) were true.

REMARK: $\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{1 - \cos h}{h^2} = \frac{1}{2}$.

9: $\dfrac{N(h) - 12N(h/3) + 27N(h/9)}{16}$

10: (c) 18.1436194387278 (e) 1.56359161739838 (g) 3.10928992861842

11: The following code works, but is not very efficient and depends on a working compositeTrapezoidal() function. In fact, the inefficiency is due to calling the compositeTrapezoidal() function. Each time compositeTrapezoidal() is called, it recalculates values of f that it already calculated last time it was called. Avoiding this repetition of work would make the routine much more efficient. Can you think of a way to accomplish this?

```
######################################################
# Written by Dr. Len Brin               16 May 2014 #
# Purpose: Implementation of Romberg integration    #
# INPUT: function f, interval endpoints a and b,    #
#        tolerance tol                              #
# OUTPUT: approximate integral of f(x) from a to b #
######################################################
function integral = romberg(f,a,b,tol)
  N(1,1)=compositeTrapezoidal(f,a,b,1);
  N(2,1)=compositeTrapezoidal(f,a,b,2);
  N(2,2)=(4*N(2,1)-N(1,1))/3;
  i=2;
  while (abs(N(i,i)-N(i,i-1))>tol || abs(N(i,i)-N(i-1,i-1))>tol)
    i=i+1;
    N(i,1)=compositeTrapezoidal(f,a,b,2^(i-1));
    for j=2:i
      m=4^(j-1);
      N(i,j)=(m*N(i,j-1)-N(i-1,j-1))/(m-1);
    end#for
  end#while
  integral=N(i,i);
end#function
```

12a: (i)

```
>> romberg(inline('x*sin(x^2)'),0,2*pi,10^-5)
ans =  0.603500924593406
```

(ii) $\left| \dfrac{1 - \cos(4\pi^2)}{2} - 0.603500924593406 \right| \approx 2.34(10)^{-10}$ (iii) yes, and not just barely

Index