1 - 9 Further ODEs reducible to Bessel's ODE

Find a general solution in terms of J_{ν} and Y_{ν} . Indicate whether you could also use $J_{-\nu}$ instead of Y_{ν} . Use the indicated substitution.

1.
$$x^2 y'' + x y' + (x^2 - 16) y = 0$$

Clear["Global`*"]

e1 =
$$\{x^2 y''[x] + x y'[x] + (x^2 - 16) y[x] == 0\}$$

e2 = DSolve[e1, y, x]
 $\{(-16 + x^2) y[x] + x y'[x] + x^2 y''[x] == 0\}$

$$\{\{y \rightarrow Function[\{x\}, BesselJ[4, x] C[1] + BesselY[4, x] C[2]]\}\}$$

The above answer matches the text's. I believe that **FullSimplify** is needed to check **DSolve** in this case because Bessels are special functions.

3.
$$9 x^2 y'' + 9 x y' + (36 x^4 - 16) y = 0 (x^2 = z)$$

Clear["Global`*"]

e1 =
$$\{9 x^2 y''[x] + 9 x y'[x] + (36 x^4 - 16) y[x] == 0\}$$

e2 = DSolve[e1, y[x], x, Assumptions $\rightarrow x^2 \rightarrow z$]
 $\{(-16 + 36 x^4) y[x] + 9 x y'[x] + 9 x^2 y''[x] == 0\}$

$$\left\{\left\{y\left[x\right]\rightarrow \text{BesselJ}\left[-\frac{2}{3},\ x^2\right]\text{C[1] Gamma}\left[\frac{1}{3}\right] + \text{BesselJ}\left[\frac{2}{3},\ x^2\right]\text{C[2] Gamma}\left[\frac{5}{3}\right]\right\}\right\}$$

PossibleZeroQ[BesselJ[
$$-\frac{2}{3}$$
, x^2] Gamma[$\frac{1}{3}$] - BesselY[$\frac{2}{3}$, x^2]]

False

It appears that the yellow answer above does not agree with the text answer.

5.
$$4 \times y'' + 4 y' + y = 0 \left(\sqrt{x} = z \right)$$

Clear["Global`*"]

e1 =
$$\{4 \times y''[x] + 4 y'[x] + y[x] == 0\}$$

e2 = DSolve[e1, y[x], x, Assumptions $\rightarrow \sqrt{x} \rightarrow z$]
 $\{y[x] + 4 y'[x] + 4 \times y''[x] == 0\}$
 $\{\{y[x] \rightarrow BesselJ[0, \sqrt{x}] C[1] + 2 BesselY[0, \sqrt{x}] C[2]\}\}$

The answer above agrees with the text answer, as I interpret it. It appears that C[2] and the 2 factor in the second term need to be combined.

7.
$$y'' + k^2 x^2 y = 0$$
 $\left(y = u \sqrt{x}, \frac{1}{2} k x^2 = z \right)$

Clear["Global`*"] $e1 = \{y''[x] + k^2 x^2 y[x] == 0\}$ e2 = DSolve[e1, y[x], x, Assumptions \rightarrow {y[x] \rightarrow u \sqrt{x} , k $x^2 \rightarrow z$ }] $\{k^2 x^2 y[x] + y''[x] = 0\}$

$$\left\{ \left\{ y[x] \rightarrow C[1] \text{ ParabolicCylinderD} \left[-\frac{1}{2}, (-1)^{1/4} \sqrt{2} \sqrt{k} x \right] + C[2] \text{ ParabolicCylinderD} \left[-\frac{1}{2}, (-1)^{3/4} \sqrt{2} \sqrt{k} x \right] \right\} \right\}$$

PossibleZeroQ[ParabolicCylinderD[
$$-\frac{1}{2}$$
, $(-1)^{1/4} \sqrt{2} \sqrt{k} x$] + ParabolicCylinderD[$-\frac{1}{2}$, $(-1)^{3/4} \sqrt{2} \sqrt{k} x$] - \sqrt{x} BesselJ[$\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$ k x²] - BesselY[$\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$ k x²]]

False

It appears that Mathematica's answer does not equal that of the text.

9.
$$xy'' - 5y' + xy = 0 (y = x^3u)$$

Clear["Global`*"] $e1 = \{x y''[x] - 5 y'[x] + x y[x] == 0\}$ e2 = DSolve[e1, y, x, Assumptions \rightarrow y[x] \rightarrow x³ u] ${x y [x] - 5 y' [x] + x y'' [x] == 0}$ $\{ \{ y \rightarrow Function [\{x\}, x^3 BesselJ[3, x] C[1] + x^3 BesselY[3, x] C[2]] \} \}$

```
e1 /. e2 // FullSimplify
{{True}}
```

The above answer agrees with the text's.

11 - 15 Hankel and modified Bessel functions

11. Hankel functions. Show that the Hankel functions (10) form a basis of solutions of Bessel's equation for any ν .

Clear["Global`*"]

```
H_{\vee}^{(1)}(x) = J_{\vee}(x) + i Y_{\vee}(x)
H_{V}^{(2)}(x) = J_{V}(x) - i Y_{V}(x)
```

```
e1 = c1 (jv + iv) + c2 (jv - iv) = 0
c2 (jv - iyv) + c1 (jv + iyv) = 0
```

Above: inserted definitions. It is necessary to change the symbols, I suppose Mathematica recognzied the traditional forms of the Bessels.

```
e2 = Expand[e1]
c1 jv + c2 jv + ic1 yv - ic2 yv = 0
e3 = Collect[e2, {jv, yv}]
(c1 + c2) jv + (ic1 - ic2) yv = 0
e4 = e3 /. (ic1 - ic2) \rightarrow i (c1 - c2)
(c1 + c2) jv + i (c1 - c2) yv = 0
```

 $\mathbf{j}\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{y}\mathbf{v}$ are known to be linearly independent. (Multiplying one of them by i will not change their linear independence.) That means that the above equation can only be true if (c1+c2) and (c1-c2) are both zero.

```
Solve [(c1 + c2) = 0 \&\& (c1 - c2) = 0, \{c1, c2\}]
\{\{c1 \to 0, c2 \to 0\}\}
```

The above tells me that the two expressions, which were definitions of the Hankel functions, are linearly independent.