
**EE2-08C: Numerical Analysis of ODEs/PDEs using Matlab**

1. **RL Circuit**

The following is the script HeunRL.m, which implements the Heun method for a function, Vin, passed to it:




The function implements the improved Euler method as so:

1. Find the number of steps we will need to take by dividing the total length of x-axis we will be working on (i.e. time) by the step size
2. Rearrange the ODE given to us to get an equation for the gradient at the current point
3. Get a predicted next y-axis value corresponding to our next time point using the Euler method
4. Use the equation from **ii.** to get a prediction of the gradient at the next point using the next time value and our predicted y-axis value from **iii.**
5. A better estimate for the gradient between the current and next values is the average of their gradients
6. The voltage across the inductor is the input voltage minus the voltage across the resistor
7. The next y-axis value is the current value plus the step size multiplied by the average gradient from **v.**

I tested this function with various different input signals. These are the results:

**Input: Heaviside – h = 0.001, tf = 0.01**

With a 5V Heaviside input to the RL circuit, the output voltage varies as shown in the graph:



Our differential equation is:

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?L%5Cfrac%7Bd%7D%7Bdt%7D%20i%28t%29%20&plus;%20Ri%28t%29%20%3D%20V_%7Bin%7D%28t%29

Taking the Laplace transform gives:

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?LsI%28s%29&plus;LI%280%29%20&plus;%20RI%28s%29%20%3D%20V_%7Bin%7D%28s%29

Since i(0) = 0, this simplifies to:

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?LsI%28s%29&plus;%20RI%28s%29%20%3D%20V_%7Bin%7D%28s%29

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?I%28s%29%28Ls&plus;%20R%29%20%3D%20V_%7Bin%7D%28s%29

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?I%28s%29%20%3D%20%5Cfrac%20%7BV_%7Bin%7D%28s%29%7D%7B%28Ls&plus;%20R%29%7D

Also, we know that the voltage across an inductor is the product of the current and the reactance, and the transform of the reactance is *sL*:

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?V_%7BL%7D%28s%29%20%3D%20I%28s%29X%28s%29%20%3D%20I%28s%29sL

Substituting I(s) using the previous equation we derived gives:

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?V_%7BL%7D%28s%29%20%3D%20%5Cfrac%7BsLV_%7Bin%7D%28s%29%7D%7BsL&plus;R%7D

Our Vin is a Heaviside function, which has a transform of 1/s, so substituting this is gives us:

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?V_%7BL%7D%28s%29%20%3D%20%5Cfrac%7B1%7D%7Bs%7D%5Ccdot%5Cfrac%7BsL%7D%7BsL&plus;R%7D%20%3D%20%5Cfrac%7BL%7D%7BsL&plus;R%7D


Taking the inverse transform gives:

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?V_%7BL%7D%28t%29%20%3D%20e%5E%7B-t%5Cfrac%7BR%7D%7BL%7D%7D


Which explains the exponentially decaying shape of the curve we get.

**Input: Exponential Decay – h = 0.001, tf = 0.02**


* **τ = 0.3ms**



* **τ = 3ms**



* **τ = 30ms**

****


We can see that as τ gets smaller, the response tends towards a horizontal line at y = 0. This is because a small τ value causes the exponent to be very negative, so the exponential term becomes very small and significantly outweighs whatever constant factor it is being multiplied by (in this case 5). The zero input response of this circuit gives zero output, and that is what the graph portrays.

If τ is larger, the absolute value of the exponent becomes small, and the exponential term tends to 1, meaning it is insignificant in comparison to the constant factor, so our input essentially becomes equivalent to the Heaviside input shown earlier, which is why the graphs are similar.


The reason the graph dips below the 0V mark for a short time with exponential input is that the input voltage is decreasing, and a drop in voltage causes a negative change in current. Since the output voltage is proportional to the change in current, the output voltage becomes negative. However, as the exponentially decaying input starts to approach 0, the drop in voltage over time decreases and so the negative change in current becomes less significant, which makes our output graph level out.

**Input: 5V Sine Wave**


* **T = 300µs, h = 0.001, tf = 0.04**

****

* **T = 3ms, h = 0.001, tf = 0.04**

****

* **T = 60ms, h = 0.001, tf = 0.4**

****

A sinusoidal input to our RL circuit produces a sinusoidal output, as the output is proportional to the rate of change of current, and oscillating change in voltage means that the current will also oscillate.

A low frequency input will have a lower amplitude output because the changes in voltage are less steep, so the response from the inductor will be smaller.


The exact solution can be calculated using the following:

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?%5Cfrac%7Bd%7D%7Bdt%7Di%28t%29%20&plus;%20ai%28t%29%20%3D%20%5Cfrac%7B%5Cbar%7BV%7D_%7Bin%7D%7D%7BL%7D%20sin%28%5Comega%20t%29http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?a%20%3D%20%5Cfrac%20%7BR%7D%7BL%7D%2C%20%5Comega%20%3D%20%5Cfrac%20%7B2%20%5Cpi%7D%7BT%7D

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?%5Cfrac%7Bd%7D%7Bdt%7Di%28t%29%20&plus;%20%5Cfrac%7BR%7D%7BL%7Di%28t%29%20%3D%20%5Cfrac%7B%5Cbar%7BV%7D_%7Bin%7D%7D%7BL%7D%20sin%28%5Cfrac%20%7B2%20%5Cpi%7D%7BT%7D%20t%29


http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?%5Cmu%20%28t%29%3D%20e%5E%7B%5Cint%20a%5C%20dt%7D%20%3D%20e%20%5E%7Bat%7D****http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?P%28t%29%20%3D%20a%2C%5C%20Q%28t%29%20%3D%20%5Cfrac%7B%5Cbar%7BV%7D_%7Bin%7D%7D%7BL%7Dsin%28%5Comega%20t%29Now we solve this first order ODE:

Since i(0) = 0:


 ****

**** Substituting this into our equation for Vout finally gives us:

Plotting our Heun approximation against the exact solution with a step size of *0.002* yielded this graph:




As you can see, there is a lot of error between the approximation and the exact solution. Decreasing the step size to *0.0002* yields a much better approximation:




To compare our Heun approximation with the exact solution, we use the two concepts of local truncation error and global truncation error. Local truncation error is calculated by taking the difference between two contiguous points on the approximated plot, and also on the exact plot, then finding the difference between those two values. We repeat this process for many values of h, and plot each of these on a graph.

Global truncation is found by calculating the sum of the differences between each contiguous point on the approximated plot, and finding the average of those. Then calculate the same value for the exact plot, and find the different between the two. Again, repeat this for many values of h, and plot on a graph. The reason we do this is that different h values will produce data sets of differing lengths, so we can’t compare them directly.

We plot the graphs with log scales so that we can find the order of error by calculating the gradient.



Calculating the gradient of the global truncation error gives us a gradient of about 2, so the global error is O(h2)




Calculating the gradient of the local truncation error gives us a gradient of about 3, so the local error is O(h3)


These values match the algebraic solutions for the truncation errors, so our Heun method is correct.

**Input: 5V Square Wave**


* **T = 300us, h = 0.001, tf = 0.04**

****

* **T = 3ms, h = 0.001, tf = 0.04**

****


* **T = 60ms, h = 0.001, tf = 0.4**

****


Looking at the T=60ms response, we see that the circuit treats the input as several Heaviside inputs, with opposing signs. When the frequency is higher, the system does not have time to reach a steady state by the time the next edge occurs, so the output oscillates a lot more.

1. **RLC Circuit**

Script ruka\_.m that implements the 4th-order Runge-Kutte




Script LCR.m that implements the 4th-order Runge-Kutte and the equation of the system:

****

In the following graphs, we will plot current instead of voltage, at this more accurately represents how the amplitude changes inversely proportionally to the damping factor.

**Input: 5V Heaviside:**

****


This graph shows the output with all the given input parameters. The signal fades with a damping factor given by:

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?%5Czeta%20%3D%20%5Cfrac%7BR%7D%7B2%7D%5Csqrt%7B%5Cfrac%7BC%7D%7BL%7D%7D


, which in the case of the given values is 0.3019. Changing R to be equal to

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?R%20%3D%20%5Cfrac%7B2%7D%7B%5Csqrt%7B%5Cfrac%7BC%7D%7BL%7D%7D%7D

Causes zeta to become 1, and produces the following graph which demonstrates critical damping:




**Input: 5V Impulse:**



The response for an impulsive input is very similar to that of a Heaviside input. The Heaviside response is caused by the sudden change in voltage, which we also get from an impulse, so for these purposes they are effectively equivalent.


**Input: 5V Square Wave:**

* **f = 5Hz**

****

The square wave is equivalent to a repetition of the Heaviside input with alternating positive and negative voltage changes, so the response reflects that: for every positive edge there is a sharp positive spike in output which decays, and vice versa for a negative edge. (The amplitude of the input has been reduced from its actual value by a factor of R in this plot to for demonstration purposes, so the input and output can be shown on the same scale but keep the same proportion as with the voltage output.)

* **f = 500Hz**

****


Here, the frequency is too high, and the output signal does not have a chance to decay before the next edge comes in, so the output oscillates as shown.

* **f = 109Hz**

The resonant frequency can be found using the formula:

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?%5Comega%20_%7B0%7D%20%3D%20%5Cfrac%7B1%7D%7B2%5Cpi%5Csqrt%7BLC%7D%7D


In the case of our given parameters, this evaluates to around 109Hz. Using this frequency for our square wave gives us the following response:




Since we are using the resonant frequency, resonance occurs in the system and the output is sinusoidal and amplified past the input amplitude. (Again, the amplitude of the input has been reduced)

**Input: 5V Sine Wave:**


* **f = 5Hz**

****

* **f = 109Hz**

****

* **f = 500Hz**

****

The output is proportional to the derivative of the charge, i.e. the second derivative of the current, and the second derivative of a sinusoid is still a sinusoid. So, since the input is a sinusoid, the output will be also.

Remember that zeta is around 0.3, meaning that the output is underdamped. This causes oscillations that you can see in the beginning of the 5Hz and 500Hz plots. The reason it is not as visible in the 109Hz plot is that 109Hz is the resonant frequency and the oscillations caused by underdamping are of the same frequency as the resonant frequency.


1. **Van der Pol Oscillator**

A Van der Pol oscillator is governed by the differential equation:

http://latex.codecogs.com/gif.latex?%5Cfrac%7Bd%5E2x%7D%7Bdt%5E2%7D-%5Cepsilon%281-x%5E2%29%5Cfrac%7Bdx%7D%7Bdt%7D%20&plus;%20x%20%3D%200


The second term dictates the damping, so epsilon can be considered a damping factor. When modelling a Van der Pol oscillator, we plot two graphs – firstly a plot of our function, x, against time, t, and also a ‘phase portrait’, which is a plot of x against its derivative.

We begin with a zero input, for which the system still starts and settles into a stable oscillation. When epsilon is 0, we get the following plots:




We see that x(t) does not decay, which supports the fact that our damping factor is 0.

Increasing epsilon to 0.5 produces a plot with a damped x(t) and a spiral shaped phase portrait:




The phase portrait is a plot of x against its derivative. For every point in x(t), its slope is calculated, which is a vector that is plotted on our portrait. For a signal of constant amplitude, the phase portrait is a circle, as the radius of the circle stays constant, as shown in the diagram below. When the signal suffers attenuation, the amplitude of x(t) varies, and so does the radius of the circle you plot, which produces the spiral-like portraits from signals with a non-zero epsilon.



*Phase plot of sine wave*

As epsilon grows larger, x(t) becomes distorted, but the amplitude is more consistent so the phase portrait is less spiralled:



The line starting from the centre of the phase portrait appears because the signal starts at x = 0, so the amplitude was low for a short while. We also notice that increasing epsilon increases the period of the signal.