Math 151A Homework #3

Nathan Solomon

November 8, 2024

Problem 0.1.

(a)

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left(x + \frac{a}{x} \right)$$
$$g(\sqrt{a}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{a} + \frac{a}{\sqrt{a}} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{a} \right) = \sqrt{a}$$

(b) We just showed g(p) = p, and since $g'(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{a}{x^2}\right)$, we also have g'(p) = 0. But since $g''(x) = \frac{a}{4x^3}$, $g''(p) = 1/(4\sqrt{a}) \neq 0$. $g \in C^2([a, b])$ is a function such that g(p) = p, g'(p) = 0, and $g''(p) \neq 0$, so by the theorem from lecture 7 on FPI convergence rate, p_n will converge quadratically (that is, with order $\alpha = 2$) to p for p_0 sufficiently close to p.

Problem 0.2.

- (a) $f(x) = e^x 1 x x^2/2 = x^3/6 + x^4/24 + x^5/120 + \cdots$, so f(0) = f'(0) = f''(0) = 0, but $f'''(0) = 1 \neq 0$. Therefore x = 0 is a zero of f with multiplicity 3.
- (b) Since the multiplicity of x = 0 is not 1, we are not guaranteed even linear convergence with Newton's method, but we are still guaranteed quadratic convergence with the modified version of Newton's method. That's why the modified version converges so much faster:

import math

```
def f(x):
    return math.exp(x) - 1 - x - x**2/2

def f_prime(x):
    return math.exp(x) - 1 - x

def f_prime_prime(x):
    return math.exp(x) - 1

def mu(x):
    return f(x) / f_prime(x)

def mu_prime(x):
    return 1 - f(x) * f_prime_prime(x) / f_prime(x)**2

def newtons_method(x_0, tolerance, max_iterations):
    print(f"\nNewton's_method_with_{x_0=},_{tolerance=},_{tolerance=})")
```

```
x_n = x_0
    n = 0
    residual = abs(f(x_n))
    print (f'' \{n=:02\} \cup \{x_n=:+1.8f\} \cup \{residual=:1.17f\}'')
    while abs(x_n) > tolerance and n < max_iterations:
        x_n = f(x_n) / f_prime(x_n)
        n += 1
        residual = abs(f(x_n))
        print (f'' \{n=:02\} \cup \{x_n=:+1.8f\} \cup \{residual=:1.17f\}'')
def modified_newtons_method(x_0, tolerance, max_iterations):
    print(f"\n Modified \n Newton's \n method \n with \n \{x_0=\}, \n \{tolerance=\}, \n \{max\_iterations=\}")
    x_n = x_0
    n = 0
    residual = abs(f(x_n))
    print(f"{n=:02}_{uu}{x_n=:+1.8f}_{uu}{residual=:1.17f}")
    while abs(x_n) > tolerance and n < max_iterations:
        x_n = mu(x_n) / mu_prime(x_n)
        n += 1
        residual = abs(f(x_n))
        print(f"{n=:02}_{u}{x_n=:+1.8f}_{u}{residual=:1.17f}")
newtons_method (1, 1e-6, 1000)
modified_newtons_method(1, 1e-6, 1000)
Newton's \_method\_with\_x\_0=1,\_tolerance=1e-06,\_max\_iterations=1000
n=00__x_n=+1.00000000__residual=0.21828182845904509
n=01__x_n=+0.69610560__residual=0.06753849522061861
n=02__x_n=+0.47811290__residual=0.02061871165303474
n=03__x_n=+0.32528512__residual=0.00623499263339255
n=04 x_n=+0.21985780 residual=0.00187302505944356
n=05__x_n=+0.14793388__residual=0.00056013544459508
n=06 x_n=+0.09923640 residual=0.00016700016443702
n=07__x_n=+0.06643295__residual=0.00004968763000134
n=08 x_n=+0.04441177 residual=0.00001476321366354
n=09__x_n=+0.02966279__residual=0.00000438240689480
n=10__x_n=+0.01979969__residual=0.00000130009935675
n=11__x_n=+0.01321069__residual=0.00000038553289180
n=12 x_n=+0.00881198 residual=0.00000011429490871
n=13 x_n=+0.00587681 residual=0.00000003387760031
n=14 x_n=+0.00391883 residual=0.0000001004026650
n=15__x_n=+0.00261298__residual=0.00000000297537972
n=16__x_n=+0.00174218__residual=0.00000000088169007
n=17__x_n=+0.00116154__residual=0.000000000026126051
n=18 x_n=+0.00077440 residual=0.0000000007741430
n=19 x_n=+0.00051628 residual=0.00000000002293816
n=20 x_n=+0.00034419 residual=0.00000000000679660
n=21 x_n=+0.00022947 residual=0.000000000000201381
n=22__x_n=+0.00015298__residual=0.000000000000059670
n=23__x_n=+0.00010200__residual=0.00000000000017688
n \! = \! 24 \! \, \lrcorner \, x_- n \! = \! +0.00006799 \, \lrcorner \, \lrcorner \, r \, e \, s \, i \, d \, u \, a \, l \! = \! 0.00000000000005248
n=25__x_n=+0.00004529__residual=0.00000000000001558
n=26__x_n=+0.00003009__residual=0.000000000000000465
```

```
n=27__x_n=+0.00001982__residual=0.000000000000000123
n=28 x_n=+0.00001356 residual=0.0000000000000033
n = 29 \, \text{Lex} \, \text{n} = +0.00000996 \, \text{Leresidual} = 0.0000000000000000021
n=30__x_n=+0.00000569__residual=0.000000000000000005
n=31__x_n=+0.00000869__residual=0.000000000000000007
n=33__x_n=+0.00000458__residual=0.000000000000000002
n=34 x_n=+0.00000261 residual=0.00000000000000007
n=35__x_n=-0.00001870__residual=0.00000000000000113
n=36__x_n=-0.00001223__residual=0.000000000000000031
n=37__x_n=-0.00000805__residual=0.0000000000000000008
n=39 x_n=-0.00000227 residual=0.00000000000000001
n=41 x_n=-0.00000760 residual=0.0000000000000011
n=42 x_n=-0.00000381 residual=0.00000000000000001
n=43 x_n=-0.00000305 residual=0.000000000000000001
n=44__x_n=-0.00000423__residual=0.0000000000000000005
n=45 x_n=+0.00000168 residual=0.000000000000000001
n=46__x_n=-0.00000534__residual=0.0000000000000000000
Modified_Newton's method with x_0=1, tolerance=1e-06, max_iterations=1000
     x_n = +1.000000000
                    residual = 0.21828182845904509
n = 00
n = 01
     x_n = -0.11308312
                    residual = 0.00023435150458198
n = 02
     x_n = -0.00103017
                     residual = 0.0000000018216402
n = 03
     x_n = -0.000000009
                     residual = 0.000000000000000003
```

(c) If we change the tolerance from 10^{-6} to 10^{-10} , Newton's method doesn't converge, even in 1000 iterations. This is not surprising – what did surprise me was to see that the modified version of Newton's method also did not converge, even in 1000 iterations. Although that modified method should converge quadratically in theory, round-off errors in the denominator of the iterate got in the way of that.

Problem 0.3.

```
\hat{p}_n converges to p=1 significantly faster than p_n does.
```

```
p = 1
def p(n):
    return 1 + 1 / n
def p_hat(n):
    return p(n) - (p(n+1) - p(n))**2 / (p(n+2) - 2 * p(n+1) + p(n))

for n in range(1, 8):
    print(f"{n=}_{-}{p(n)=:1.5 f}_{-}{p_hat(n)=:1.5 f}_{"})

n=1 p(n)=2.00000 p_hat(n)=1.25000
n=2 p(n)=1.50000 p_hat(n)=1.16667
n=3 p(n)=1.33333 p_hat(n)=1.12500
n=4 p(n)=1.25000 p_hat(n)=1.10000
n=5 p(n)=1.20000 p_hat(n)=1.08333
```

```
n=6 p(n)=1.16667 p_hat(n)=1.07143

n=7 p(n)=1.14286 p_hat(n)=1.06250
```

Problem 0.4.

(a) $P(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{n} f(x_k) L_{n,k}(x), \qquad L_{n,k}(x) := \prod_{i \in [0,n] \cap \mathbb{Z} - \{k\}} \frac{x - x_i}{x_k - x_i}.$ Let $n = 2, x_0 = 1, x_1 = 2, x_2 = 3$. Then $L_{2,0} = \frac{(x - 2)(x - 3)}{(1 - 2)(1 - 3)} = \frac{x^2 - 5x + 6}{2}$ $L_{2,1} = \frac{(x - 1)(x - 3)}{(2 - 1)(2 - 3)} = -x^2 + 4x - 3$ $L_{2,2} = \frac{(x - 1)(x - 2)}{(3 - 1)(3 - 2)} = \frac{x^2 - 3x + 2}{2}$ $P(x) = \ln(2)(-x^2 + 4x - 3) + \ln(3)\frac{x^2 - 3x + 2}{2}.$

(b) import math $\operatorname{def} P(x)$:
 return math.log(2) * (-x**2+4*x-3) + math.log(3) * (x**2-3*x+2)/2print(f"{P(1)=}")
print(f"{P(2)=}")
print(f"{P(3)=}")
print(f"{P(1.5)=}")
print(f"{P(2.4)=}")

P(1)=0.0
P(2)=0.6931471805599453
P(3)=1.0986122886681098
P(1.5)=0.3825338493364452
P(2.4)=0.889855072497425

When x = 1.5, the absolute error is 0.0229312587717192 and the relative error is 0.05655544290534098. When x = 2.4, the absolute error is 0.014386335143525164 and the relative error is 0.016432722871416054.

(c) This is a pretty bad method, but it shows that the error is maximized when x = 1.367, and that the error at that point is 0.024817.

```
def error(x):
    return abs(P(x) - math.log(x))
import numpy as np
for x in np.linspace(1,3,100):
    print(f"{x=:1.5f}_{-{error(x)=:1.5f}}")
print('\n')
# x=1.34343 error(x)=0.02474
# x=1.36364 error(x)=0.02482
# x=1.38384 error(x)=0.02479
for x in np.linspace(1.34,1.39,100):
    print(f"{x=:1.5f}_{-{error(x)=:1.10f}}")
```

```
# x=1.36677 error(x)=0.0248176530
# x=1.36727 error(x)=0.0248177110
# x=1.36778 error(x)=0.0248177061
```

Problem 0.5.

```
(a)
       P(x) = -0.00252225x^5 + 0.2866292x^4 - 10.793792x^3 + 157.31208x^2 + 1642.7517 + 179323
   import numpy as np
   # x is years since 1960, y is United States population (in thousands)
   x = [0, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50]
   y = [179.323, 203.302, 226.542, 249.633, 281.422, 308.746]
   N = 5
   assert len(x) = N + 1 and len(y) = N + 1
   V = np.vander(x, N+1)
   coeffs = np. linalg.inv(V) @ np. matrix([y]).T
   print("P(x) = " + " " ".join([f"{coeffs[i, 0]:+} x^{N-i}" for i in range(N+1)]))
   \mathbf{def} \ P(x):
       return round ((np.matrix([[x**(N-i) for i in range(N+1)]]) @ coeffs)[0, 0])
   for x in [0, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60]:
       print (f" year  \{1960+x\}: \{P(x)=:6\}")
   actual_value = 329.500
   print (f" Relative_error: _{abs(P(60)_-_actual_value)_/_actual_value}")
```

(b) This method significantly underestimates the US population in 2020. This is an example of the Runge phenomenon.

```
year 1960: P(x)=179323
year 1970: P(x)=203302
year 1980: P(x)=226542
year 1990: P(x)=249633
year 2000: P(x)=281422
year 2010: P(x)=308746
year 2020: P(x)=266165
Relative error: 0.1922154779969651
```