

```
>> [p] = NDD([-0.1 0 0.2 0.3 0.35], [1.81818 2 2.5 2.85714 3.07692])
```

```
p =
```

```
1.8182
1.8182
2.2727
3.2467
4.9968
```

```
>> x = -0.4:0.001:0.6;
```

```
>> Pn = p(1) + p(2)*(x+0.1) + p(3)*(x+0.1).*(x-0) + p(4)*(x+0.1).*(x-0).*(x-0.2) + p(5)*(x+0.1).*(x-0).*(x-0.2).*(x-0.3);
```

```
>> Fn = 2./(1-x);
```

```
>> A = [1,-0.1,0.01,-0.001,0.0001,1.81818;1,0,0,0,0,2;1,0.2,0.04,0.008,0.0016,2.5;1,0.3,0.09,0.027,0.0081,2.85714;1,0.35,0.1225,0.042875,0.01500625,3.07692];
```

```
>> C = rref(A)
```

```
C =
```

```
1.0000    0    0    0    0    2.0000
    0    1.0000    0    0    0    2.0105
    0    0    1.0000    0    0    1.9980
    0    0    0    1.0000    0    1.2479
    0    0    0    0    1.0000    4.9968
```

```
>> Ln = 1.81818.*((x).*(x-0.2).*(x-0.3).*(x-0.35))./((-0.1)*(-0.1 - 0.2)*(-0.1-0.3)*(-0.1-0.35))) + 2.*((x+0.1).*(x-0.2).*(x-0.3).*(x-0.35))./((0.1)*(-0.2)*(-0.3)*(-0.35))) + 2.5.*((x+0.1).*(x).*(x-0.3).*(x-0.35))./((0.3)*(0.2)*(-0.1)*(-0.15))) + 2.85714.*((x+0.1).*(x).*(x-0.2).*(x-0.35))./((0.4)*(0.3)*(0.1)*(-0.05))) + 3.07692.*((x+0.1).*(x).*(x-0.2).*(x-0.3))./((0.45)*(0.35)*(0.15)*(0.05)));
```

```
>> Mn=2+((8996/4375).*x)+((15734/7875).*(x.*x))+((3931/3150).*(x.*x.*x))+((1574/315).*(x.*x.*x.*x));
```

```
>> plot(x,Pn,x,Fn)
```

```
>> plot(x,Fn,x,Pn,x,Mn,x,Ln)
```

```
>> plot(x,Fn,x,Pn,x,Mn)
```

```
>> plot(x,Fn,x,Pn,x,Mn,x,Ln)
```

```
>> plot(x,Fn,x,Pn,x,Ln)
```

```
>> plot(x,Fn,x,Pn,x,Mn,x,Ln)
```

```
>> %The graph of all the functions caught me out at first as i thought one of the functions wasn't there
```

```
>> %But it was just demonstrating the numerical stability between lagrange/NDD and monomial
```

```
>> %This upon further reflection is pretty inline with what I was expecting, if not to in-line
```

```
>>
```