

Numerical Analysis Qualifying Exam Study Sheet

Trevor Loe

February 3, 2025

This document contains a brief overview of all the topics that I have found may appear on the numerical analysis qualifying exam. I have tried to organize the topics by similarity. The list of topics was started based off the UCLA qual website <https://ww3.math.ucla.edu/qualifying-exam-dates/> and appended as past qual problems were done.

Past numerical analysis qualifying exams can be found at <https://ww3.math.ucla.edu/past-qualifying-exams/>

Much of the material on undergraduate numerical analysis was taken from [4]. Material on numerical methods for ODEs was mainly taken from [1],[2], and [3]. Material for numerical methods on the one-way wave equation is taken from [5].

1 Interpolation

1.1 Lagrange Interpolation

If x_0, \dots, x_n are $n + 1$ distinct real numbers and f is defined on those numbers, then there is a unique, degree- n polynomial P such that

$$P(x_i) = f(x_i)$$

for all $i = 0, \dots, n$. The **n 'th Lagrange Interpolating Polynomial** is given by

$$\begin{aligned} L_{n,k}(x) &= \frac{(x - x_0)(x - x_1) \dots (x - x_{k-1})(x - x_{k+1}) \dots (x - x_n)}{(x_k - x_0) \dots (x_k - x_{k-1})(x_k - x_{k+1}) \dots (x_k - x_n)} \\ &= \prod_{i=0, i \neq k}^n \frac{(x - x_i)}{(x_k - x_i)} \end{aligned}$$

The unique polynomial P is then given by

$$P(x) = f(x_0)L_{n,0}(x) + f(x_1)L_{n,1}(x) + \dots + f(x_n)L_{n,n}(x)$$

1.2 Divided Differences

The divided differences for a function f and real numbers x_0, \dots, x_n is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} f[x_i] &= f(x_i) \\ f[x_i, x_{i+1}] &= \frac{f[x_{i+1}] - f[x_i]}{x_{i+1} - x_i} \end{aligned}$$

and the k th divided difference is given by

$$f[x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{i+k}] = \frac{f[x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{i+k}] - f[x_i, \dots, x_{i+k-1}]}{x_{i+k} - x_i}$$

If P is the polynomial made from the Lagrange interpolating polynomials above, then (Newton's Divided Difference Formula)

$$P(x) = f[x_0] + \sum_{k=1}^n f[x_0, \dots, x_k](x - x_0) \dots (x - x_{k-1})$$

If $f \in C^n[a, b]$ then there exists a number $\xi \in (a, b)$ such that

$$f[x_0, \dots, x_n] = \frac{f^{(n)}(\xi)}{n!}$$

1.3 Cubic Spline Interpolation

For a function f defined on $[a, b]$ and a set of nodes $a = x_0 < \dots < x_n = b$ the **cubic spline** interpolation is the piecewise-cubic function S such that

1. On each sub-interval $[x_j, x_{j+1}]$, S is a cubic function, denoted S_j
2. $S_j(x_j) = f(x_j)$, $S_j(x_{j+1}) = f(x_{j+1})$
3. $S_j(x_{j+1}) = S_{j+1}(x_{j+1})$
4. $S'_j(x_{j+1}) = S'_{j+1}(x_{j+1})$
5. $S''_j(x_{j+1}) = S''_{j+1}(x_{j+1})$

If $S''(x_0) = S''(x_n) = 0$, it is a natural or free boundary. If $S'(x_0) = f'(x_0)$ and $S'(x_n) = f'(x_n)$, it is a clamped boundary.

There is always a unique natural spline interpolating between n data points and a unique clamped spline interpolating between n data points (assuming that $f'(x_0)$ and $f'(x_n)$ are given).

If $f \in C^4[a, b]$ with $\max |f^{(4)}(x)| \leq M$ then there will be some constant C such that

$$|f(x) - S(x)| \leq C \max_j (x_j - x_{j+1})^4$$

for a clamped spline $C = \frac{5M}{384}$

2 Numerical Differentiation

Forward difference formula

$$f'(x) \approx \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h}$$

Backward difference formula

$$f'(x) \approx \frac{f(x) - f(x-h)}{h}$$

$(n+1)$ -point formula

$$f'(x_j) = \sum_{k=0}^n f(x_k) L'_k(x_j) + \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi(x_j))}{(n+1)!} \prod_{k=0, k \neq j} (x_j - x_k)$$

which comes from the error bound for the Lagrange interpolating polynomials.

Second derivative midpoint formula

$$f''(x_0) = \frac{1}{h^2} (f(x_0-h) - 2f(x_0) + f(x_0+h)) - \frac{h^2}{12} f^{(4)}(\xi)$$

3 Richardson Extrapolation

If your error is of the form

$$M = N(h) + K_1 h + K_2 h^2 + \dots$$

then you can define $N_2(h) = N(\frac{h}{2}) + (N(\frac{h}{2}) - N(h))$ to get

$$M = N_2(h) - \frac{K_2}{2} h^2 - \frac{3K_3}{4} h^3 + \dots$$

increasing the order of the approximation by 1.

4 Numerical Integration

4.1 Trapezoidal Rule

The trapezoidal rule comes from approximating the function by two points and using the trapezoid as an estimate for the integral

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx = \frac{h}{2}(f(a) + f(b)) - \frac{h^3}{12}f''(\xi)$$

where $h = b - a$

4.2 Simpson's Rule

For Simpson's rule we use 3 points

$$\int_{x_0}^{x_2} f(x)dx = \frac{h}{3}(f(x_0) + 4f(x_1) + f(x_2)) - \frac{h^5}{90}f^{(4)}(\xi)$$

where $h = (b - a)/2$ and the points are evenly spaced.

4.3 Newton-Cotes

The $(n+1)$ -point closed Newton-Cotes formula uses the points $x_0 = a$, $x_1 = a + h$, ..., $x_{n-1} = a + (n-1)h$, $x_n = b$ with $h = (b - a)/n$

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx \approx \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} a_i f(x_i)$$
$$a_i = \int_{x_0}^{x_n} L_i(x)dx = \int_{x_0}^{x_n} \prod_{j=0, j \neq i} \frac{x - x_j}{x_j - x_i} dx$$

The open version is the same thing but without the endpoints so $x_0 = a + h$ and $x_n = b - h$ with $h = (b - a)/(n+2)$

4.4 Composite Numerical Integration

Composite numerical integration is when we break up the integral into a bunch of smaller ones and then apply one of our rules for each one.

The composite Simpson's rule is

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx = \frac{h}{3} \left(f(x_0) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{n/2-1} f(x_{2j}) + 4 \sum_{j=1}^{n/2} f(x_{2j-1}) + f(x_n) \right) - \frac{(b-a)h^4}{180} f^{(4)}(\mu)$$

4.5 Romberg Integration

We apply Richardson Extrapolation to the composite trapezoid rule for numerical integration. Denote the integral approximation for $n = 1, 2, 4, 8, \dots$ by $R_{1,1}, R_{2,1}, \dots$. Then we can increase the order of our approximation via

$$R_{k,j} = R_{k,j-1} + \frac{1}{4^{j-1} - 1} (R_{k,j-1} - R_{k-1,j-1})$$

4.6 Gaussian Quadrature

We seek to approximate

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i f(x_i)$$

where the x_i are not necessarily easily spaced. The Gaussian quadrature is the choice of c_i 's and x_i 's such that the formula is exact for polynomials up to (and including) degree $2n - 1$. For $n = 2$ the optimal choice is

$$\int_{-1}^b f(x)dx \approx f\left(-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}\right) + f\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}\right)$$

which gives correct answers for polynomials of degree less than or equal to $2n - 1 = 3$.

For higher order accurate formulas, define P_n as the n 'th Legendre polynomial. The Legendre polynomials are monic and satisfy

$$\int_{-1}^1 P(x)P_n(x)dx = 0$$

if $P(x)$ is a polynomial of degree less than n . The first few are

$$P_0 = 1 \quad P_1(x) = x \quad P_2(x) = x^2 - 1/3 \quad P_3(x) = x^3 - 3/5x$$

Then let x_1, \dots, x_n be the roots of the n 'th Legendre polynomial. And let

$$c_i = \int_{-1}^1 \prod_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \frac{x - x_j}{x_j - x_i} dx$$

The above x_i 's and c_i 's define the n 'th order Gaussian quadrature, which is accurate for polynomials of degree $2n - 1$.

5 Iterative Methods

5.1 Fixed Point Iteration

If $g \in C[a, b]$ such that $|g'| < k$ for some constant $0 < k < 1$, then for any $p_0 \in [a, b]$, the sequence

$$p_{n+1} = g(p_n)$$

converges to a unique fixed point for g .

In fact this convergence is linear, meaning

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p_{n+1} - p^*}{p_n - p^*} = \lambda < 1$$

Note this it may converge faster, but it will be at least linear, always.

If, in addition, $g \in C^2[a, b]$ with $|g''| \leq M$ and $g'(p^*) = 0$, then for p_0 sufficiently close to p^* we get quadratic convergence. In fact for high enough n we have

$$|p_{n+1} - p^*| \leq \frac{M}{2} |p_n - p^*|^2$$

Quadratic convergence for fixed-point iteration can **only** occur if $g'(p^*) = 0$

5.2 Newton's Method

Newton's method for finding a root of $f \in C^2[a, b]$ is given by

$$p_{n+1} = p_n - \frac{f(p_n)}{f'(p_n)}$$

If started sufficiently close to p^* where p^* is a **simple** root, then Newton's method will converge quadratically. If p^* is a root of multiplicity m , then the modification to Newton's method given by

$$p_{n+1} = p_n - m \frac{f(p_n)}{f'(p_n)}$$

will converge quadratically. For a non-simple root of any order, we can apply Newton's method to the function $\mu(x) = \frac{f(x)}{f'(x)}$ giving

$$p_{n+1} = p_n - \frac{f(x)f'(x)}{(f'(x))^2 - f(x)f''(x)}$$

However, this is generally a dumb idea in practice because floating point error in the denominator causes the iterations to be thrown wildly off (boy, sure it great they make us study this modification then...).

6 Numerical Methods for ODEs

Generally, we consider ODEs of the form

$$\frac{dy}{dt} = f(y, t)$$

6.1 Stability and Consistency

A numerical scheme is 0-stable if, for two different solutions, x_n, z_n with potentially different initial conditions, but otherwise all things the same we can bound

$$|x_i - z_i| \leq K|x_0 - z_0|$$

for some constant K and all $i \leq N$ where $N = (b - a)/h$. This basically means that the solutions depend continuously on the initial conditions.

The **local truncation error** for a method is the difference between a the scheme and the actual ODE when applied to a solution. If the difference scheme is given by some update rule

$$y_{n+1} = \Phi_h(y_n)$$

then the local truncation error is defined as

$$y(t_{n+1}) = \Phi_h(y(t_n)) + \tau_n$$

where $y(t)$ is a solution to the ODE.

A numerical scheme is consistant if

$$\tau_n = o(h) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \tau_n/h = 0$$

We say that a numerical scheme is convergent of order p if

$$e_n = y_n - y(t_n) = \mathcal{O}(h^p)$$

where $y(t)$ solves the ODE and $e_0 = 0$ (initial conditions match).

Theorem: A numerical method that is both consistent and 0-stable is convergent.

For a 0-stable method, if $\tau_n = \mathcal{O}(h^p)$, then the method will be convergent of order $p - 1$.

The **Region of Absolute Stability** for a method is

$$S = \{\lambda h \in \mathbb{C} : y_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ when the scheme is applied to the model problem with } h\}$$

where the model problem is

$$y' = \lambda y$$

This means that, for $\lambda h \in S$, the scheme will have $y_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ when the step size is h , when applied to the model problem.

To get the region of absolute stability, you simply apply the method to $y' = \lambda y$ and find the conditions for $y_n \rightarrow 0$. For example, the region of absolute stability for forward euler is

$$\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |1 + z| \leq 1\}$$

6.2 Common Methods

6.2.1 Forward Euler

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + hf(t_n, y_n)$$

We find the local truncation error by plugging in $y(t)$ (an exact solution to the ODE) to get

$$y(t_{n+1}) = y(t_n) + hf(t_n, y(t_n)) + \tau_n$$

Then noting that

$$y(t_{n+1}) = y(t_n) + hf(t_n, y(t_n)) + \frac{h^2}{2}y''(\xi)$$

So we get

$$\tau_n = \frac{h^2}{2}y''(\xi)$$

Suppose f has Lipschitz constant L and y'' is bounded by M . Then we can get the global error as

$$\begin{aligned} |e_{n+1}| &= |y(t_{n+1}) - y_{n+1} = y(t_n) + hf(t_n, y(t_n)) - y_n - hf(t_n, y_n) + \tau_n| \\ &\leq |y(t_n) - y_n| + h|f(t_n, y(t_n)) - f(t_n, y_n)| + |\tau_n| \\ &\leq e_n + hL(y(t_n) - y_n) + |\tau_n| \\ &= (1 + hL)e_n + |\tau_n| \end{aligned}$$

So, by repeatedly applying this inequality we get

$$|e_n| \leq (1 + hL)e_{n-1} + |\tau_n| \leq (1 + hL)^2e_{n-2} + (1 + hL)|\tau_{n-1}| + |\tau_n|$$

etc. Finally arriving at

$$\begin{aligned} |e_n| &\leq (1 + hL)^n e_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (1 + hL)^j |\tau_j| \\ &\leq (1 + hL)^n e_0 + \max_{i=1, \dots, n} |\tau_i| \frac{(1 + hL)^n - 1}{1 - (1 + hL)} \\ &\leq (1 + hL)^n e_0 + \frac{h^2 M}{2} \frac{(1 + hL)^n - 1}{-hL} \\ &\leq \frac{h^2 M}{2} \frac{(1 + hL)^n - 1}{hL} \\ &= \frac{hM}{2L} ((1 + hL)^n - 1) \end{aligned}$$

Where we have assumed that $e_0 = 0$. Now we use the fact that $(1 + hL)^n \leq e^{nLh}$ and $nh = T$ (the length of the time interval we are considering to get

$$|e_n| \leq \frac{hM}{2L} (e^{TL} - 1) \leq \frac{hM}{2L} e^{TL}$$

So forward Euler is an order-1 method.

6.2.2 Backward Euler

The backward Euler method is an implicit scheme given by

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + hf(t_n, y_{n+1})$$

The local truncation error is found by noting that

$$y(t_{n+1}) = y(t_n) + hf(t_n, y(t_n)) + \frac{h^2}{2}y''(\xi)$$

and

$$f(t_n, y(t_{n+1})) = f(t_n, y(t_n)) + (y(t_{n+1}) - y(t_n))f_y(t_n, y(t_n)) + \mathcal{O}(h^2) = f(t_n, y(t_n)) + hf_y + \mathcal{O}(h^2)$$

So

$$y(t_n) + hf(t_n, y(t_n)) + \frac{h^2}{2}y''(\xi) = y(t_n) + h(f(t_n, y(t_n)) + hf_y + \mathcal{O}(h^2)) + \tau_n$$

Note that $ff_y = y''$ so

$$\tau_n = h^2y''(\xi)(\frac{1}{2} - 1) = -\frac{h^2}{2}y''(\xi)$$

If we let M be a bound on y'' and f have Lipschitz constant L . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} e_{n+1} &= |y(t_{n+1}) - y_{n+1}| = |y(t_n) + hf(t_n, y(t_{n+1})) + \tau_n - y_n - hf(t_{n+1}, y_{n+1})| \\ &\leq |y(t_n) - y_n| + hL|y(t_{n+1}) - y_{n+1}| + |\tau_n| \\ &= e_n + hLe_{n+1} + |\tau_n| \end{aligned}$$

So $e_{n+1} \leq \frac{e_n}{1-hL} + \frac{|\tau_n|}{1-hL}$ Repeatedly applying this formula gives

$$e_n \leq \frac{e_0}{(1-hL)^n} + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{|\tau_j|}{(1-hL)^{n-j}}$$

Our bound gives us that $|\tau_n| \leq \frac{Mh^2}{2}$ for all n so, assuming $e_0 = 0$ we get

$$e_n \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{Mh^2}{2} \frac{1}{(1-hL)^j}$$

We then apply the geometric sum formula to get

$$e_n \leq \frac{h^2M}{2} \frac{1 - \left(\frac{1}{1-hL}\right)^n}{1 - \frac{1}{1-hL}} = \frac{Mh^2}{2} \frac{(1 - \left(\frac{1}{1-hL}\right)^n)(1-hL)}{hL}$$

which we simplify as

$$e_n \leq \frac{Mh}{2L} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{1-hL}\right)^n\right)$$

Note that $\frac{1}{1-hL} = 1 + \frac{hL}{1-hL}$ and that

$$\left(1 + \frac{hL}{1-hL}\right)^n \leq e^{\frac{N h L}{1-hL}}$$

So

$$e_n \leq \frac{Mh}{2L} (1 + e^{\frac{N h L}{1-hL}}) = \frac{Mh}{2L} (1 + e^{\frac{TL}{1-hL}})$$

So implicit Euler is an order-1 method.

6.2.3 Heun's Method (Explicit Trapezoid, Modified Euler's Method)

Heun's method is given by the update rule

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + \frac{h}{2}(f(t_n, y_n) + f(t_{n+1}, y_n + hf(t_n, y_n)))$$

Heun's method will be an order 2 method.

6.2.4 Implicit Trapezoid

The implicit trapezoid method is given by the update rule

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + \frac{h}{2}(f(t_n, y_n) + f(t_{n+1}, y_{n+1}))$$

Numerical Methods for PDEs

The One-Way Wave Equation

The simplest one-way wave equation (and simplest PDE for that matter) is the

$$u_t + au_x = f(t, x)$$

for $x \in [x_0, x_1]$, $t \geq 0$, with initial data given by $u(0, x) = u_0(x)$.

The Method of Characteristics

Often the qual is concerned with the well-posedness of an IBVP. For a one-way wave equation, the standard way to do this is with the method of characteristics. Note that while the method is often used for *solving* equations, you do not necessarily need to solve the equation to determine if the problem is well-posed.

We can consider the one-way wave with variable coefficient

$$u_t + a(t, x)u_x = f(t, x)$$

Then we seek a transform of the form $t \rightarrow \tau$ and $x \rightarrow \xi$ such that the differential operator on the left hand side will simplify. This will be a specific curve in the xt -plane. Let us consider $x = x(\tau)$ and $t = t(\tau)$. Then

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}u(t(\tau), x(\tau)) = t'u_t + x'u_x$$

If we pick $t(\tau)$ such that $t' = 1$ and $x(\tau)$ such that $x' = a(t, x)$ then this will be accomplished. Immediately, we see that $t = \tau$ will work. The second condition will be satisfied if we can solve the ODE

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = a(x, t)$$

Once we do this we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}u(t, x(t)) = f(t, x)$$

We could equivalently write $w(t) = u(t, x(t))$ and solving the PDE becomes a problem of solving the ODE

$$w' = f(t, x)$$

The well-posedness of the problem will then come down to the solvability of this ODE and its dependence on initial conditions. Typically we will be concerned with solving the PDE on a bounded interval $[x_0, x_1]$. The characteristic curves we get from solving the ODE for $x(t)$ will inform the dependence on initial conditions. If $x(0)$ is outside the interval, but $x(t) \in [x_0, x_1]$ for some t later, then a value inside the specified interval will depend on an initial value outside the interval. Because the initial conditions $u_0(x)$ are only specified in the interval $[x_0, x_1]$ we will need more information, in the form of boundary values.

We can then say that for the problem on $x \in [a, b]$, if $x'(t) > 0$ when $x = x_0$ for any t then we will need boundary conditions on the boundary $x = x_0$. If $x'(t) < 0$ when $x = x_1$ for any t , then we will need boundary conditions on the boundary for $x = x_1$. Here $x(t)$ is the characteristic curve described above. Otherwise, we cannot specify boundary conditions and have a solution necessarily exist.

Often a will just be a function of x , $a(x)$, which case, we get $x'(t) = a(x)$, so the boundary conditions required will depend on the sign of $a(x_0)$ and $a(x_1)$.

Stability and the CLF Conditions

A numerical finite difference scheme approximating the one-way wave (or any PDE) is **stable** in stability region Γ (a region in the kh -plane) if there exists some integer J such that for any positive time T we have

$$h \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} |v_m^n|^2 \leq C_T h \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} |v_m^j|^2$$

for all $n \leq T/k$. where C_T can depend on T but not h or k . Note that this is saying

$$h\|v^n\|_{l_2} \leq C_T h \sum_{j=1}^J \|v^j\|_{l_2}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{l_2}$ denotes the spacial l_2 discrete norm. So stability states that every l_2 norm for each timestep is bounded by a constant times the sum of the first few l_2 norms.

The **Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy** condition states that, for a finite difference scheme, trying to approximate the one-way wave equation, if the scheme is of the form

$$v_m^{n+1} = \alpha v_{m-1}^n + \beta v_m^n + \gamma v_{m+1}^n$$

A necessary condition for stability of the scheme is

$$|a\lambda| \leq 1$$

where $\lambda = k/h$. This can be thought of as the condition that the speed propagation of information of the wave (given by a) is less than the speed at which the finite difference scheme calculates (which is given by the ratio between the temporal step size and spacial step size).

The CFL conditions will generally not be sufficient.

Consistency and The Lax-Richtmyer Equivalence Theorem

Consistency of a method say whether the difference operator approximates the differential operator. A finite difference scheme $P_{k,h}v = f$ is consistent with the differential equation $Pu = f$ if, for any smooth ϕ

$$P_{k,h}\phi - P\phi \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } h, k \rightarrow 0$$

The Lax Richtmyer Equivalence theorem tells us necessary and sufficient conditions for a finite difference scheme to be convergent. The theorem states that for a well-posed PDE problem, a consistent finite difference approximation will converge if and only if it is stable. So it should be thought of as

$$\text{consistency} + \text{stability} \iff \text{convergence}$$

The theorem will be useful for finding difference schemes for the one-way wave, heat equation, and wave equation. However it will **not** be useful for conservation laws, as the solutions to such problems may not be unique.

The **Crank-Nicolson Scheme** is given by

$$\frac{v_m^{n+1} - v_m^n}{k}$$

Von Neumann Analysis

This method for determining the stability of a method relies on the fact that the L_2 (discrete and continuous) norm is preserved under the Fourier transform, and that in the Fourier domain, derivatives become multiplication by $i\omega$. For a linear, constant-coefficient PDE, the finite difference scheme (when written in an update-rule form) will turn out to be

$$\hat{v}^{n+1}(\omega) = g(h\omega, k, h)\hat{v}^n(\omega)$$

we typically write $h\omega = \theta$. So the stability of a method will depend nicely on the initial conditions if and only if $|g| \leq 1$. Von Neumann analysis is the process of finding g .

The quickest way to do this is to plug in $v_m^n \rightarrow g^n e^{im\theta}$ into the scheme and then solve for g . Note that an increment of the index in the space domain shows up as multiplication by $e^{i\theta}$ in the Fourier domain.

The full theorem for stability with Von Neumann analysis states that if $g = g(\theta)$ the method is stable if and only if $|g| \leq 1$. And if $g = g(\theta, h, k)$, the method is stable if and only if

$$|g(\theta, h, k)| \leq 1 + \alpha k$$

Another important thing to remember is that the stability of a scheme will be independent of f . So when determining stability, we typically set $f = 0$ for simplicity.

Common Schemes and their Stability

The **Lax-Friedrich Scheme** is given by

$$\frac{v_m^{n+1} - \frac{1}{2}(v_{m+1}^n + v_{m-1}^n)}{k} + a \frac{v_{m+1}^n - v_{m-1}^n}{2h} = f_m^n$$

To analyze the stability of this scheme, we plug in $g^n e^{im\theta}$ to get

$$\frac{g^{n+1} e^{im\theta} - \frac{1}{2}(g^n e^{i(m+1)\theta} + g^n e^{i(m-1)\theta})}{k} + a \frac{g^n e^{i(m+1)\theta} - g^n e^{i(m-1)\theta}}{2h} = f_m^n$$

Now we set f_m^n for simplicity. Dividing the above expression by $g^n e^{im\theta}$ gives

$$g - \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\theta} + e^{-i\theta}) + \frac{a\lambda}{2}(e^{i\theta} - e^{-i\theta}) = 0$$

Solving for g gives

$$g = \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\theta} + e^{-i\theta}) - \frac{a\lambda}{2}(e^{i\theta} - e^{-i\theta}) = \cos(\theta) - ia\lambda \sin(\theta)$$

Then

$$|g|^2 = \cos^2(\theta) + a^2 \lambda^2 \sin^2(\theta)$$

which will be less than 1 if and only if $|a\lambda| \leq 1$. So the stability conditions for Lax-Friedrich is the same as the CFL condition.

Higher Dimensional Analogues

There may be higher-dimensional versions of the one-way wave equation such as those of the form

$$u_t + a(t, x, y)u_x + b(t, x, y)u_y = f(t, x, y)$$

The method of characteristics will work the same for the one-dimensional case, except that we will have $x'(t) = a(t, x, y)$ and $y'(t) = b(t, x, y)$ and the well-posedness will depend on x' and y' on the boundaries for x and y respectively.

References

- [1] Uri M. Ascher and Linda R. Petzold. “Chapter 3: Basic Methods, Basic Concepts”. In: *Computer Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations and Differential-Algebraic Equations*, pp. 37–72. DOI: 10.1137/1.9781611971392.ch3. eprint: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/1.9781611971392.ch3>. URL: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611971392.ch3>.
- [2] Uri M. Ascher and Linda R. Petzold. “Chapter 4: One-Step Methods”. In: *Computer Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations and Differential-Algebraic Equations*, pp. 73–122. DOI: 10.1137/1.9781611971392.ch4. eprint: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/1.9781611971392.ch4>. URL: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611971392.ch4>.
- [3] Uri M. Ascher and Linda R. Petzold. “Chapter 5: Linear Multistep Methods”. In: *Computer Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations and Differential-Algebraic Equations*, pp. 123–159. DOI: 10.1137/1.9781611971392.ch5. eprint: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/1.9781611971392.ch5>. URL: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611971392.ch5>.
- [4] R.L. Burden and J.D. Faires. *Numerical Analysis*. Cengage Learning, 2010. ISBN: 9780538733519. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=zXnSxY9G2JgC>.
- [5] John C. Strikwerda. *Finite Difference Schemes and Partial Differential Equations, Second Edition*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2004. DOI: 10.1137/1.9780898717938. eprint: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/1.9780898717938>. URL: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9780898717938>.