

1

1.a

```
1 function Euler(m,c,g,t0,v0,tn,n)
2 fprintf('values of t\tapproximations v(t)\n')
3 fprintf('%8.3f%19.4f\n', t0, v0)
4 h=(tn-t0)/n;
5 t=t0;
6 v=v0;
7 for i=1:n
8     v=v+(g-c/m*v)*h;
9     t=t+h;
10    fprintf('%8.3f%19.4f\n', t, v)
11 end
```

1.b

```
Euler (72.7,12.5,9.81,0,0,10,20)
values of t      approximations v(t)
0.000           0.0000
0.500           4.9050
1.000           9.3883
1.500           13.4862
2.000           17.2318
2.500           20.6554
3.000           23.7846
3.500           26.6449
4.000           29.2592
4.500           31.6488
5.000           33.8330
5.500           35.8294
6.000           37.6541
6.500           39.3220
7.000           40.8465
7.500           42.2399
8.000           43.5136
8.500           44.6777
9.000           45.7418
9.500           46.7144
10.000          47.6034
```

diary off

1.c

Euler (72.7, 12.5, 8.87, 0, 0, 10, 20)

values of t approximations v(t)

0.000	0.0000
0.500	4.4350
1.000	8.4887
1.500	12.1940
2.000	15.5806
2.500	18.6762
3.000	21.5056
3.500	24.0918
4.000	26.4556
4.500	28.6162
5.000	30.5911
5.500	32.3962
6.000	34.0461
6.500	35.5542
7.000	36.9326
7.500	38.1925
8.000	39.3441
8.500	40.3967
9.000	41.3588
9.500	42.2382
10.000	43.0420

diary off

1.d

v_approx=47.6034

v_approx =

47.6034

v_true=(9.81*72.7/12.5)*(1-exp(-1*12.5*10/72.7))

v_true =

46.8322

err_relative=abs(1-(v_approx/v_true))

err_relative =

0.0165

diary off

2

2.a

```
1 function Euler2(m,k,g,t0,v0,tn,n)
2 fprintf('values of t\tapproximations v(t)\n')
3 fprintf('%8.3f%19.4f\n', t0, v0)
4 h=(tn-t0)/n;
5 t=t0;
6 v=v0;
7 for i=1:n
8     v=v+(g-k/m*v^2)*h;
9     t=t+h;
10    fprintf('%8.3f%19.4f\n', t, v)
11 end
```

2.b

Euler2(43.5,0.234,9.81,0,0,15,60)	
values of t	approximations v(t)
0.000	0.0000
0.250	2.4525
0.500	4.8969
0.750	7.3172
1.000	9.6977
1.250	12.0237
1.500	14.2818
1.750	16.4600
2.000	18.5481
2.250	20.5379
2.500	22.4232

2.750	24.1995
3.000	25.8645
3.250	27.4173
3.500	28.8589
3.750	30.1914
4.000	31.4180
4.250	32.5431
4.500	33.5713
4.750	34.5082
5.000	35.3592
5.250	36.1303
5.500	36.8273
5.750	37.4559
6.000	38.0216
6.250	38.5300
6.500	38.9860
6.750	39.3945
7.000	39.7599
7.250	40.0865
7.500	40.3779
7.750	40.6378
8.000	40.8695
8.250	41.0757
8.500	41.2592
8.750	41.4223
9.000	41.5674
9.250	41.6962
9.500	41.8106
9.750	41.9122
10.000	42.0023
10.250	42.0823
10.500	42.1532
10.750	42.2161
11.000	42.2718
11.250	42.3213
11.500	42.3651
11.750	42.4039
12.000	42.4382
12.250	42.4687
12.500	42.4957

12.750	42.5196
13.000	42.5407
13.250	42.5595
13.500	42.5761
13.750	42.5908
14.000	42.6038
14.250	42.6153
14.500	42.6255
14.750	42.6346
15.000	42.6426

`diary` off

2.c

```
v_approx=42.6426
```

```
v_approx =
```

```
42.6426
```

```
v_true=sqrt(9.81*43.5/0.234)*tanh(sqrt  
      (9.81*0.234/43.5)*15)
```

```
v_true =
```

```
42.6175
```

```
err_relative=abs(1-(v_approx/v_true))
```

```
err_relative =
```

```
5.8784e-04
```

`diary` off

3

Below is a function to approximate e^{-x} directly from its MacLaurin series expansion, and a sample output using it to approximate e^{-3} .

```
1 function exp_inv_1(x,n)
```

```

2 s=0;
3 sgn=1;
4 fprintf("n\tapproximation e^-x\trelative error\n");
5 for i=0:n
6     s=s+sgn*(x^i)/factorial(i);
7     sgn = sgn*-1;
8     fprintf("%d\t\t%.4f\t\t%.4f\n", i, s, abs(1-s/
9         exp(-1*x)));
9 end

```

```

exp_inv_1(3,5)
n      approximation e^-x      relative error
0          1.0000          19.0855
1         -2.0000          41.1711
2          2.5000          49.2138
3         -2.0000          41.1711
4          1.3750          26.6176
5         -0.6500          14.0556
diary off

```

Below is a function to approximate e^{-x} by taking the inverse of the MacLaurin series expansion of e^x , and a sample output using it to approximate e^{-3} .

```

1 function exp_inv_2(x,n)
2 s=0;
3 fprintf("n\tapproximation e^x\trelative error\n");
4 for i=0:n
5     s=s+(x^i)/factorial(i);
6     fprintf("%d\t\t%.4f\t\t%.4f\n", i, 1/s, abs
7         (1-(1/s)/exp(-1*x)));
7 end

```

```

exp_inv_2(3,5)
n      approximation e^x      relative error
0          1.0000          19.0855
1          0.2500           4.0214
2          0.1176           1.3630
3          0.0769           0.5450
4          0.0611           0.2266
5          0.0543           0.0916
diary off

```

We can see when using the first method that the relative error did not appear to begin converging to any value as we increased n , while the second method's relative error appears to be getting smaller as n increases. Note that the first method always gives a polynomial, so its limits as $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$ are ∞ or $-\infty$ (except when $n = 0$, of course), but the second method gives the inverse of a polynomial, so its limits as $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$ are 0. Overall, the series of functions given by the second method look much more similar to one another than those given by the first, perhaps leading to a more stable approximation.