Date NAME: SAAD MISAR BUTT Reg. No: CS211246 CIASS. BSCS-5B COURSE: NUMERICAL COMPUTING COURSE INSTRUCTOR: SYED MUHAMMAD KHUBAIB ASSIGNMENT No. 2

		Date 2. Roverner 20 - 3	
Ī	83 x - 11y -4z = 95		
	7 x + 52y + 132 = 104.		
1	3 x + 8 4 + 292 = 71		
1	Compare the two method and explain which method		
	is better.		
	Solve	STATE CARRIED STATE	
	Checking diagonally dominant condition.		
	83 > 11+4 => 83 > 15		
	52 > 7+13 => 52 > 20		
	29 7 3+8 => 29 > 11 a	ll conditions are true.	
2	the second secon	The state of the state of the	
	X= 95+114+42 , y= 104-7,	(-132, z = 71 - 3x - 8y)	
	83	29.	
9	Lets suppose, 20 = 0, yo = 0 a	nd 20=0	
	Cyuars-Jacobi Method.	Guass-Siede Method.	
	1st Iteration	2st Iteration	
	x(y0,20)=(0,0)	X1 (Y0, 20) = (0,0).	
	X1 = 95+11(0)+4(0) = 95	x1 = 95+11(0)+410) = 95	
	83 83.	83. 83.	
	y1 (x0,20) = (0,0)	y1 (x1, 20) = (95 ,0)	
	y1=104-7(0)-13(0)=104=2	- 1- 1-	
	. Astronomy 18 32	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
	$2p(x_0, y_0) = (0,0)$	21(x1, x1) = (95, 1.845)	
	21 = 71 - 3(0) - 8(0) - 71	21 =71-3(33)-8(1.845)-1.820	
	29	29	
	Relative Approximate Error Ed	Relative Approximate Erros Ka	
	Eax = 35 -0 x 100 = 100:1.	(Eax) = 25-0 x 100 = 100%	
	95/83		
	$ Eay_i = 2-0 \times 100 = 100' .$	Eax1 = 1.845-0 x100=1007	
	Teacher's Signature RAZA Paper Products Page No		
_			

	Date20_
1 Eazy = 20 ×100 = 100'1.	[Eaxi] = 1.820-0 XD0 = 100.1
71 20	=> x1= 83, x1= 1.845, 21= 1.870
$\Rightarrow \chi_1 = \frac{a5}{63}, y_1 = 2, z_1 = \frac{71}{24}$	2ND Theration
2ND Iteration.	x2(Y1121) = (1.845, 1.820)
$x_2 = (y_1, z_1) = (2, \frac{71}{29})$	x2=95+11(1.845)+4(1.820) = [1446
x2= 95+11(2)+4(59)=11.527	8.3
83	V2 (x2, 21) = (1.476, 1.820)
$y_2(x_1, z_1) = (\frac{a5}{83}, \frac{71}{29})$ $y_2 = 104 - 7(\frac{a5}{83}) - 13(\frac{71}{29}) = 1.233$	
1/2 = 104 = 1 (83) = 1 29/ = 52.	34
Z=(x1, Y1) = (25/83, 2)	22 (x2, y2) = (1.476, 1.346)
22=71-3(95)-8(2)=[1-778]	22=71-3(1.476)-8(1.346) -11.924
29	27
Relative Approximate Error (Ea)	Relative Approximate Erros (Ga)
1 Cax = 1.21+ 83 X100 = 25.04/	Cax2 = 1.416+ 82 x100 + 22.45
1.524	1.476.
1-233 x100 = 162-20%	Eay2 = 1.346-1845 x100 = 37.07
15 1 1	1.346
1.778 x100= 37.61%	(Ca22 = 1.924 - 1.820 X100 = 5.401)
=> 1/2=1.527, 1/2=1.233, 22=1.778 =	1.924
2 KD T1 A.	3RD Itaation.
13(y2,22)=(1.233, 1.778).	X3 (Y2, 22) = (1.346, 1.924).
1 10 10 11 11 1233 14 1/1 1 1001	X3= 95+11 (1.346)+4(1A24) - 1.415
83	83
Ya (X2,22) = (1-527, 1-778)	13(x3,22) = (1.415,1.924)
	13 = 104 -7 (1415) -13 (1.924)
Y3 = 1.349	57.
	13 = 1.328
Teacher's Signature	
and the same of th	

	Date20
= 3(X2) Y2) = (1.527, 1.233)	23 (x31 y3) = (1.415, 1.328)
23= 71-3(1.527)-8(1.223)=[1.950]	23=71-3(1-415)-8(1-328)=1-93
29	24
Relative Approximate Ervor (6a)	Relative Approximate Error (E)
16ax = 1.394-1.577 x100 = 9.54.1.	1-415 1-415 x 100 = [4-31]
1 Cays = 1.349-1.233 x100 = 8.59.1.	Cays = 1.308 - 1.346 x00 = 1.35
1 Cazz = 1.950 -1.7781 x100 = 8.82%	1 Eazal = 1.935-1.904 ×100 = 0.56.
1.950	1935
=> x3=1-394, y3=1-349, 23=1.950	=> x3=1.415, y3=1.328, 23=1.935
Guass-Siedel method is	more efficient than Guass
Tarohi method as Guass	- Siedel method need
less number of iterations	to converge to the acress
solution and the rate o	of euror is less wit, orror
decreases at faster: vate.	
	The state of the s
	BOARD BOARD BOARD