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## NUMERICAL ANALYSIS

When handling problems using mathematical techniques it is usually necessary to establish a model, and to write down equations expressing the constraints and physical laws that apply. These equations must now be solved and a choice presents itself. One way is to proceed using conventional methods of mathematics, obtaining a solution in the form of a formula, or set of formulae. Another method is to express the equations in such a way that they may be solved computationally, ie by using methods of numerical analysis. This will lead directly to quantitative results, however if enough such results are obtained then qualitative results may emerge. Using these methods, large and complex physical systems may be modelled, and otherwise intractable problems can be solved with the help of modern computer systems.

## Interpolation

We sometimes know the value of a function $f(x)$ at a set of points, without knowing the analytic expression for $f(x)$ that would allow us to calculate its value at some arbitrary point. Often the points at which we know the value of $f(x)$ are equally spaced, but not always. The task is to estimate $f(x)$ for a given value of $x$ by, in some sense, drawing a smooth curve through (and perhaps beyond) the known values. If the desired value is in between the smallest and largest x -values already know, then the process is called interpolation. If x is outside that range, it is called extrapolation, which is considerably more hazardous. As a simple illustration, let us consider linear interpolation.
Before the advent of computers, if it was required, for example, to find the square root of a number x , a table of such numbers was consulted. If the number did not appear in the table, then the two numbers above and below x were used, and interpolation provided the solution. For example, suppose we wanted the square root of 2.155 and had a table such as shown below:

| $\mathbf{n}$ | $\sqrt{\mathrm{n}}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2.140 | 1.46287 |
| 2.150 | 1.46629 |
| 2.160 | 1.46969 |
| 2.170 | 1.47309 |

The difference between the square roots of 2.15 and 2.16 is 0.0034 . Since 2.155 is half-way between 2.15 and 2.16 we could assume that its square root was half-way between the square roots of 2.15 and 2.16 . This gives $2.155=1.46799$.
Had we wanted 2.153 we would have added 0.3 times 0.0034 to 2.15 . This is the process of LINEAR INTERPOLATION, in which we assume a linear variation between the two known values to predict intermediate values.

Suppose we have a set of m numbers $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, \ldots, x_{m}$ and that corresponding to each $x_{i}$ there is a $y_{i}$, where y and x are related by some function $\mathrm{f}: y=f(x)$. If we are given a value of x (not equal to one of the $x_{i}$ ) we want to find a value of y obtained by linear interpolation. Naturally we assume some functional relationship does indeed exist between x and y , and it is our responsibility to ensure that this is a valid assumption. Suppose that the required value of the variable x falls between the $\mathrm{k}^{\text {th }}$ and $\mathrm{k}+1^{\text {th }}$ known values of x [we assume that the $\mathrm{x}^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ are ordered in an ascending sequence so that $x_{1}<x_{2}<x_{3}<\ldots<x_{m}$ ]

$$
\therefore \quad x_{k} \leq \bar{x} \leq x_{k+1}
$$

and we want to calculate the corresponding value of y . To do this, we draw a line segment joining the points $\left(x_{k}, y_{k}\right)$ and $\left(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}\right)$


We then find the point on that line with an x -coordinate of $\bar{x}$.
The equation of the line through $\left(x_{k}, y_{k}\right)$ and $\left(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}\right)$ is found by equating the slope of AB to that of BC :

$$
\text { i.e. } \quad \frac{y-y_{k}}{x-x_{k}}=\frac{y_{k+1}-y_{k}}{x_{k+1}-x_{k}} \quad \therefore y=y_{k}+\frac{\left(x-x_{k}\right)\left(y_{k+1}-y_{k}\right)}{x_{k+1}-x_{k}}
$$

Therefore, to find the required value of y we insert $\bar{x}$ for x :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\therefore \bar{y}=y_{k}+\frac{\left(\bar{x}-x_{k}\right)\left(y_{k+1}-y_{k}\right)}{x_{k+1}-x_{k}} \tag{}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consider a simple example:
Suppose we have tabulated the values of $y=x^{2}$ for all integer $x$. Find $6.5^{2}$.
$x_{k}=6, y_{k}=36, x_{k+1}=7, y_{k+1}=49 \quad$ and $\bar{x}=6.5$
$\operatorname{Using}(*) \quad \bar{y}=36+\frac{(6.5-6)(49-36)}{7-6}=36+0.5 \times 13=42.5$
The correct value of 6.5 is 42.25 the error $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{T}}=-0.25$.
[Error $=$ true value - calculated value].

## A General Approach to Interpolation

We could investigate methods of interpolation using higher order polynomials, but although quadratic interpolation, for example, is likely to be more accurate than linear interpolation, it is by no means certain to provide sufficient accuracy all the time. We need to develop a general method which will also enable extra accuracy to be attained without having to resort to a new set of calculations. In order to do this we need to introduce the idea of a difference table.

## Difference Table

As before, suppose that we have a set of values of an unknown function $y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}, \ldots, y_{n}$ corresponding to a set of values of the (known) independent variable $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, \ldots, x_{n}$ where $x_{1}<x_{2}<x_{3}<\ldots<x_{n}$.

A reliable formula for interpolation, to obtain the value of y corresponding to any x (where $x_{1}<x_{2}<x_{3}<\ldots<x_{n}$ ) will employ all the given information - ie it will be based on the values of the $\mathrm{n}+1$ data entries. Instead of using these directly it is more convenient to use relationships dependent on these values. The relationship

$$
y_{r+1}-y_{r}
$$

is called the first difference of $y_{r}$, denoted by $\Delta y_{r}: \quad \Delta y_{r}=y_{r+1}-y_{r}$
Similarly, the relationship $\Delta y_{r+1}-\Delta y_{r}$ is the second difference: $\quad \Delta^{2} y_{r}=\Delta y_{r+1}-\Delta y_{r}$
For example, $\quad \Delta^{2} y_{0}=\Delta y_{1}-\Delta y_{0}=\left(y_{2}-y_{1}\right)-\left(y_{1}-y_{0}\right)=y_{2}-2 y_{1}+y_{0}$

Similarly

$$
\Delta^{2} y_{1}=\Delta y_{2}-\Delta y_{1}=\left(y_{3}-y_{2}\right)-\left(y_{2}-y_{1}\right)=y_{3}-2 y_{2}+y_{1}
$$

In general terms:

$$
\Delta^{2} y_{r}=y_{r+2}-2 y_{r+1}+y_{r} \quad r=0,1,2, \ldots, n-2
$$

The third differences are

$$
\Delta^{3} y_{r}=y_{r+3}-3 y_{r+2}+3 y_{r+1}-y_{r} \quad r=0,1,2, \ldots, n-3
$$

Clearly, successive differences can be calculated and put into a table such as that shown below:

| $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{y}$ | $\Delta y$ | $\Delta^{2} y$ | $\Delta^{3} y$ | $\Delta^{4} y$ | $\Delta^{5} y$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $x_{0}$ | $y_{0}$ | $\Delta y_{0}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $x_{1}$ | $y_{1}$ | $\Delta y_{1}$ | $\Delta^{2} y_{0}$ |  |  |  |
| $x_{2}$ | $y_{2}$ |  | $\Delta^{2} y_{1}$ | $\Delta^{3} y_{0}$ |  | $\Delta^{4} y_{0}$ |
| $x_{3}$ | $y_{3}$ | $\Delta y_{2}$ | $\Delta^{2} y_{2}$ | $\Delta^{3} y_{1}$ | $\Delta^{4} y_{1}$ | $\Delta^{5} y_{0}$ |
| $x_{4}$ | $y_{4}$ | $\Delta y_{3}$ | $\Delta^{2} y_{3}$ | $\Delta^{3} y_{2}$ |  |  |
| $x_{5}$ | $y_{5}$ | $\Delta y_{4}$ |  |  |  |  |

The polynomial interpolation formula, dependent on the $n+1$ entries, can be expressed in terms of these differences.

| $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{y}$ | $\Delta y$ | $\Delta^{2} y$ | $\Delta^{3} y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | -2 |  |  |  |
| 1 | -1 | 1 | 2 |  |
| 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| 3 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| 4 | 14 | 7 | 2 | 0 |
| 5 | 23 | 9 | 2 | 0 |
| 6 | 34 | 11 |  |  |

In this example, all the differences after the second are zero. This is no coincidence - the nth differences of an $n$-degree polynomial are always constant, higher differences being zero.

## Errors in a Difference Table

The first step in any interpolation procedure is the formation of a difference table from the given data. Since this often involves a large number of additions and subtractions it is an inevitable source of error. It is of interest to note how errors propagate in a difference table. Suppose y is subject to an error :

| $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{y}$ | $\Delta y$ | $\Delta^{2} y$ | $\Delta^{3} y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $x_{0}$ | $y_{0}$ | $\Delta y_{0}$ |  |  |
| $x_{1}$ | $y_{1}$ | $\Delta y_{1}$ | $\Delta^{2} y_{0}$ |  |
| $x_{2}$ | $y_{2}$ | $\Delta y_{2}+\varepsilon$ | $\Delta^{2} y_{1}+\varepsilon$ | $\Delta^{3} y_{0}+\varepsilon$ |
| $x_{3}$ | $y_{3}+\varepsilon$ | $\Delta y_{3}-\varepsilon$ | $\Delta^{2} y_{2}-2 \varepsilon$ | $\Delta^{3} y_{1}-3 \varepsilon$ |
| $x_{4}$ | $y_{4}$ | $\Delta y_{4}$ | $\Delta^{2} y_{3}+\varepsilon$ | $\Delta^{3} y_{2}+3 \varepsilon$ |
| $x_{5}$ | $y_{5}$ | $\Delta y_{5}$ | $\Delta^{2} y_{4}$ | $\Delta^{3} y_{3}-\varepsilon$ |
| $x_{6}$ | $y_{6}$ |  |  |  |

The error in the third difference column, for example, appears in four terms, with error coefficients given by the binomial coefficients of $(1-\varepsilon)^{3}$.

## The Newton-Gregory Interpolation Formula

The unique polynomial satisfying any $n+1$ values is of degree $n$ :

$$
p(x)=A_{0}+A_{1} x+A_{2} x^{2}+\ldots+A_{n} x^{n}
$$

The $n+1$ constants $A_{i}$ being found from the $n+1$ linear equations obtained by substituting in the data.

## The Forward Interpolation Formula

Suppose the $(\mathrm{n}+1)$ values are $\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{i}}\right) \mathrm{i}=0,1,2, \ldots, \mathrm{n}$. We can write the polynomial as:

$$
p(x)=a_{0}+\left(x-x_{0}\right) a_{1}+\left(x-x_{0}\right)\left(x-x_{1}\right) a_{2}+\ldots
$$

If the equal intervals between successive values is h , then $x_{r}-x_{s}=(r-s) h$.
We then have the $\mathrm{n}+1$ equations for the $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
y_{r} & =a_{0}+r h a_{1}+r(r-1) h^{2} a_{2}+\ldots+r(r-1)(r-2) \ldots(r-n+1) h^{n} a_{n} \\
& =a_{0}+\sum_{t=1}^{n} r(r-1)(r-2) \ldots(r-t+1) h^{t} a_{t} \quad \text { with } r=0, \ldots, n
\end{aligned}
$$

Forming successive differences gives:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Delta y_{r}=y_{r+1}-y_{r}=h a_{1}+\sum_{t=2}^{n} t\{r(r-1)(r-2) \ldots(r-t+2)\} h^{t} a_{t} \\
& \Delta^{2} y_{r}=\Delta y_{r+1}-\Delta y_{r}=2 h^{2} a_{2}+\sum_{t=3}^{n} t(t-1)\{r(r-1)(r-2) \ldots(r-t+3)\} h^{t} a_{t} \\
& \Delta^{3} y_{r}=\Delta^{2} y_{r+1}-\Delta^{2} y_{r}=3 \cdot 2 h^{3} a_{3}+\sum_{t=4}^{n} t(t-1)(t-2)\{r(r-1)(r-2) \ldots(r-t+4)\} h^{t} a_{t} \\
& \Delta^{n-1} y_{r}=(n-1)!h^{n-1} a_{n-1}+\{n(n-1)(n-2) \ldots 2\} r h^{n} a_{n} \\
& \Delta^{n} y_{r}=n!h^{n} a_{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

From the above set of equations we may show that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a_{0}=y_{0} \\
& a_{1}=\Delta y_{0} / h \\
& a_{2}=\Delta^{2} y_{0} /\left(2!h^{2}\right) \\
& a_{3}=\Delta^{3} y_{0} /\left(3!h^{3}\right) \\
& \cdot \\
& \cdot \\
& a_{n}=\Delta^{n} y_{0} /\left(n!h^{n}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence the polynomial is $p(x)=y_{0}+\frac{x-x_{0}}{h} \Delta y_{0}+\frac{\left(x-x_{0}\right)\left(x-x_{1}\right)}{h^{2}} \frac{\Delta^{2} y}{2!}+\ldots$
if we write $x-x_{0}=k h \quad$ where $0 \leq k \leq n \quad$ then

$$
p(x)=y_{0}+k \Delta y_{0}+k(k-1) \frac{\Delta^{2} y_{0}}{2!}+\ldots+k(k-1)(k-2) \ldots(k-n+1) \frac{\Delta^{n} y_{0}}{n!}
$$

By looking at the difference table we can see that this formula uses the values along the diagonal of the differences of y - it is a FORWARD DIFFERENCE formula. It is therefore used for interpolation near the beginning of a table where k is small.

Since the coefficients are binomial the formula may be written

$$
y \cong y_{0}+\sum_{r=1}^{n}{ }^{k} C_{r} \Delta^{r} y_{0}
$$

## Example (i)

(i) In the following table, use the Newton-Gregory Forward Interpolation formula to find
(a) $\mathrm{f}(2.4)$
(b) $\mathrm{f}(8.7)$.

| $\mathbf{x}$ | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{f ( \mathbf { x } )}$ | 9.68 | 10.96 | 12.32 | 13.76 | 15.28 |

Solution Form a difference table and note that all differences $>2$ are zero.

| $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{y = f ( \mathbf { x } )}$ | $\Delta y$ | $\Delta^{2} y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 9.68 |  |  |
| 4 | 10.96 | 1.28 |  |
| 6 | 12.32 | 1.36 | 0.08 |
| 8 | 13.76 | 1.44 | 0.08 |
| 10 | 15.28 | 1.52 | 0.08 |
|  |  |  |  |

(a) $\mathrm{x}=2.4 ; \mathrm{x}=2 ; \mathrm{h}=2 ; \mathrm{k}=0.2$
we get $f(2.4) \cong 9.68+\frac{2.4-2}{2} \times 1.28+\frac{(2.4-2)(2.4-4)}{4} \times \frac{0.08}{2}$
so $\quad f(2.4) \cong 9.68+0.2 \times 1.28+0.1 \times(-1.6) \times 0.04=9.9296$
(b) $\mathrm{x}=8.7 ; \mathrm{x}=2 ; \mathrm{h}=2 ; \mathrm{k}=3.35$
we get $f(8.7) \cong 9.68+3.35 \times 1.25+3.35 \times 2.35 \times 0.04=14.2829$

## Example (ii)

In the following table of $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{X}}$ use the Newton-Gregory formula of forward interpolation to calculate
(a) $e^{0.12}$,
(b) $e^{2.00}$.

| $\mathbf{x}$ | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{x}}$ | 1.1052 | 1.8221 | 3.0042 | 4.9530 | 8.1662 |

Solution: Form a difference table.

Note that in this case there is no difference column that is constant. This is to be expected since $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{X}}$ cannot be represented by a polynomial function of finite degree.

| $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{x}}$ | $\Delta y$ | $\Delta^{2} y$ | $\Delta^{3} y$ | $\Delta^{4} y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.1 | 1.1052 |  |  |  |  |
| 0.6 | 1.8221 | 0.7169 |  |  |  |
| 1.1 | 3.0042 | 1.1821 | 0.4652 |  | 0.3015 |
| 1.6 | 4.9530 | 1.9488 | 0.7667 |  |  |
| 2.1 | 8.1662 | 3.2132 | 1.2644 | 0.4977 | 0.1962 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

(a) With $\mathrm{x}=0.12, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{O}}=0.1, \mathrm{~h}=0.5, \mathrm{k}=0.04$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\therefore \quad e^{0.12} \cong 1.1052+0.04 \times 0.7169+0.04 \times(-0.96) \frac{0.4652}{2} \\
+0.04 \times(-0.96) \times(-1.96) \frac{0.3015}{6}+0.04 \times(-0.96) \times(-1.96) \times(-2.96) \frac{0.1962}{24}
\end{array}
$$

$\therefore \quad \mathrm{e}^{0.12}=1.1269$
(correct value to 5 d.p. is 1.12750)
(b) $\mathrm{x}=2, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{O}}=0.1, \mathrm{~h}=0.5, \mathrm{k}=3.8$
$e^{2} \cong 1.1052+2.72422+2.47486+0.96239+0.12525$
$\therefore e^{2} \cong 7.3919$ (to 4 dp ). (correct value 7.3891 to 4 dp )

In Example (i) the interpolation formula is identical with $f(x)$, which is a quadratic function, and the results for $f(2.4)$ and $f(8.7)$ will therefore be correct to the number of decimal places retained.
In example (ii) the function $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{x}}$ is replaced by a 4th degree polynomial which takes the value of $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{X}}$ at the five given entries. Because the successive difference decrease, higher differences are relatively small and the value of the estimate converges. From direct calculation it turns out that the error in the estimate for $e^{0.12}$ is about 0.05 percent and for $e^{2.00}$ it is about 0.04 percent. It is important to note that interpolation may not always yield a valid result. Consider the following example:

## Example (iii)

Use the Newton-Gregory forward interpolation formula to estimate $f(2.5)$ from the following data:

| $\mathbf{x}$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{f ( \mathbf { x } )}$ | 1 | 2 | 6 | 24 | 120 |

Solution: Form the forward difference table:

| $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ | $\Delta y$ | $\Delta^{2} y$ | $\Delta^{3} y$ | $\Delta^{4} y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 4 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 11 |  |
| 5 | 24 | 18 | 14 | 64 | 53 |
| 6 | 120 | 96 | 78 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

With $\mathrm{x}=2.5, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{o}}=2, \mathrm{~h}=1$ then $\mathrm{k}=0.5$ and we obtain

$$
f(2.5) \cong 1+0.5-0.375+0.6875-2.0703=-0.2578
$$

The function $f(x)$ in this example happens to be the GAMMA FUNCTION written

$$
\Gamma(x)=(x-1)!
$$

providing x is a positive integer.

In fact the value of $f(2.5)$ is known to be 1.3293, and the value estimated by interpolation is obviously incorrect. The reason for this is that the successive differences are increasingly rapidly and the series obtained from the formula is divergent. The values of $f(x)$ are increasing so rapidly that it is not possible for a fourth-degree polynomial to represent the function accurately even though it is exact at the five given values. In other words, there is not enough information given - it is necessary to fix the value of the function at more closely spaced intervals of x since it is varying so rapidly.

## The Newton-Gregory Backward Interpolation Formula

The formula derived in the previous section is appropriate when the required value $\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{O}}, \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{O}}\right)$ lies near the beginning of the tabulated data. When $\left(\mathrm{x}_{0}, \mathrm{y}_{0}\right)$ is near the end of the table, it is necessary to find a polynomial satisfying the ( $\mathrm{n}+1$ ) values ( $\mathrm{x}_{-\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{y}_{-\mathrm{i}}$ ), $\mathrm{i}=0,1,2, \ldots, \mathrm{n}$. This may be achieved in a parallel manner to the previous section. It follows that the backward formula is
$y=f(x) \cong y_{0}+k \nabla y_{0}+k(k+1) \frac{\nabla^{2} y_{0}}{2!}+k(k+1)(k+2) \frac{\nabla^{3} y_{0}}{3!}+\ldots+k(k+1) \ldots(k+n-1) \frac{\nabla^{n} y_{0}}{n!}$
which may alternatively be written as
$y \cong y_{0}+\sum_{r=1}^{n}{ }^{k+r-1} C_{r} \nabla^{r} y_{0} \quad$ where $\quad{ }^{k+r-1} C_{r}=\frac{k(k+1)(k+2) \ldots(k-r+1)}{r!}$
The following table shows the paths of the forward and backward interpolation formulae through the difference table for $\mathrm{n}=5$.

| $x_{-5}$ | $y_{-5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $x_{-4}$ | $y_{-4}$ |  |  |  |  | $\nabla^{5} y_{0}$ | Backward |
| $x_{-3}$ | $y_{-3}$ |  |  |  | $\nabla^{4} y_{0}$ |  |  |
| $x_{-2}$ | $y_{-2}$ |  |  | $\nabla^{3} y_{0}$ |  |  |  |
| $x_{-1}$ | $y_{-1}$ |  |  | $\nabla^{2} y_{0}$ |  |  |  |
| $x_{0}$ | $y_{0}$ | $y_{0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $x_{1}$ | $y_{1}$ | $\Delta y_{0}$ | $\Delta^{2} y_{0}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $x_{2}$ | $y_{2}$ |  |  | $\Delta^{3} y_{0}$ | $\Delta^{4} y_{0}$ |  |  |
| $x_{3}$ | $y_{3}$ |  |  |  |  | $\Delta^{5} y_{0}$ | Forward |
| $x_{4}$ | $y_{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $x_{5}$ | $y_{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Example

Apply the backward formula to find $e^{2.00}$ in Example (ii) of the previous section.

| $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{2 . 0 0}}$ | $\Delta y$ | $\Delta^{2} y$ | $\Delta^{3} y$ | $\Delta^{4} y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.1 | 1.1052 |  |  |  |  |
| 0.6 | 1.8221 | 0.7169 |  |  |  |
| 1.1 | 3.0042 | 1.1821 | 0.4652 |  | 0.3015 |
| 1.6 | 4.9530 | 1.9488 | 0.7667 | 0.4977 | 0.1962 |
| 2.1 | 8.1662 | 3.2132 | 1.2644 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

We have: $\mathrm{x}=2.0, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{O}}=2.10, \mathrm{~h}=0.5$ and $\mathrm{k}=-0.2$

$$
\begin{aligned}
e^{2.00} & \cong 8.1662-0.2 \times 3.2132-0.2 \times 0.8 \times \frac{1.2644}{2}-0.2 \times 0.8 \times 1.8 \times \frac{0.4977}{6}+\ldots \\
& =7.3920 .
\end{aligned}
$$

It has been observed that the two Newton-Gregory formulae use the information in the difference table obtained by proceeding through the table along different paths. Both formulae will give accurate results when the interval $h$ in the given data is not too large (compared with the variability in the driving function) and providing always that higher differences decrease in value and eventually become negligible.

## Test Exercises

1. Form a difference table from the following data and deduce that $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{x})$ is a quadratic function.

Use the table to find $f(0)$.
Use the Newton-Gregory forward interpolation formula based on $\mathrm{x}=0$ to find $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{x})$.

| $\mathbf{x}$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ | 3.00 | 4.28 | 5.88 | 7.8 | 10.04 |

2. Use an appropriate interpolation formula to estimate $f(16.4)$ and $f(23.5)$ from the following data table:

| $\mathbf{x}$ | 16 | 18 | 20 | 22 | 24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{f ( \mathbf { x } )}$ | 261.3 | 293.7 | 330.0 | 372.2 | 422.3 |

## Central differences

We have already defined the forward difference operator by

$$
\Delta y_{r}=y\left(x_{r}+h\right)-y\left(x_{r}\right)=y_{r+1}-y_{r}
$$

and the backwards difference operator by

$$
\nabla y_{r}=y\left(x_{r}\right)-y\left(x_{r}-h\right)=y_{r}-y_{r-1}
$$

We now define the central difference operator, $\delta$, by

$$
\delta y_{r}=y\left(x_{r}+\frac{h}{2}\right)-y\left(x_{r}-\frac{h}{2}\right)=y_{r+\frac{1}{2}}-y_{r-\frac{1}{2}}
$$

The forwards and backwards difference operators may be written in terms of the central difference operator

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta y_{r} & =y\left(x_{r}+h\right)-y\left(x_{r}\right)=y\left\{\left(x_{r}+\frac{h}{2}\right)+\frac{h}{2}\right\}-y\left\{\left(x_{r}+\frac{h}{2}\right)-\frac{h}{2}\right\} \\
& =\delta y\left(x_{r}+\frac{h}{2}\right)=\delta y_{r+\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly it may be shown that $\nabla y_{r}=\delta y\left(x_{r}-\frac{h}{2}\right)=\delta y_{r-\frac{1}{2}}$
The difference table, expressed in terms of central differences is as follows $x$

| $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{y}$ | $\delta y$ | $\delta^{2} y$ | $\delta^{3} y$ | $\delta^{4} y$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $x_{0}$ | $y_{0}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $x_{1}$ | $y_{1}$ | $\delta y_{\frac{1}{2}}$ |  | $\delta y_{\frac{1}{2}}$ |  |
| $x_{2}$ | $y_{2}$ | $\delta_{\frac{3}{2}}$ | $\delta^{2} y_{1}$ | $\delta^{3} y_{\frac{3}{2}}$ |  |
| $x_{3}$ | $y_{3}$ | $\delta_{\frac{5}{2}}$ | $\delta^{2} y_{2}$ | $\delta^{3} y_{\frac{5}{2}}$ | $\delta^{4} y_{2}$ |
| $x_{4}$ | $y_{4}$ | $\delta^{2} y_{3}$ |  | $\delta^{3} y_{\frac{7}{2}}$ | $\delta^{4} y_{3}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

We may develop an interpolation formula in terms of central differences. We first define the shift operator E by Ey $y_{r}=y_{r+1}$

Now, $\quad \Delta y_{r}=y_{r+1}-y_{r} \quad \therefore y_{r+1}=y_{r}+\Delta y_{r}=(1+\Delta) y_{r}$ so $\quad E y_{r}=(1+\Delta) y_{r} \quad \therefore E \equiv 1+\Delta$

Also

$$
\Delta y_{r}=\delta y_{r+\frac{1}{2}}=\delta E^{\frac{1}{2}} y_{r}
$$

Note that $\quad E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta y_{r}=E^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(y_{r+\frac{1}{2}}-y_{r}\right)=E^{\frac{1}{2}} y_{r+\frac{1}{2}}-E^{\frac{1}{2}} y_{r}=y_{r+1}-y_{r}$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { so } & E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta y_{r}=\Delta y_{r}=\delta E^{\frac{1}{2}} y \quad \Rightarrow \text { the operators E and } \delta \text { commute } \\
\therefore & \Delta \equiv E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta \\
\text { and } & E \equiv 1+\Delta \equiv 1+E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta \\
\therefore & \therefore \\
\therefore & \Delta^{2} \equiv \delta^{2}+E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3} \equiv\left(E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta\right)\left(E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta\right) \equiv E \delta^{2} \equiv\left(1+E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta\right) \delta^{2} \\
&
\end{array}
$$

$$
\text { and } \quad \Delta^{3} \equiv \Delta \Delta^{2} \equiv E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta\left(\delta^{2}+E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3}\right) \equiv E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3}+E \delta^{4} \equiv E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3}+\left(1+E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta\right) \delta^{4}
$$

$$
\therefore \quad \Delta^{3} \equiv E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3}+\delta^{4}+E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{5}
$$

We may substitute in the Newton-Gregory forward formula

$$
\begin{aligned}
y\left(x_{r}+k h\right) & =(1+\Delta)^{k} y_{r} \\
& =\left[1+k \Delta+k(k-1) \frac{\Delta^{2}}{2!}+k(k-1)(k-2) \frac{\Delta^{3}}{3!}+\ldots\right] y_{r} \\
= & {\left[1+k E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta+\frac{k(k-1)}{2!}\left(\delta^{2}+E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3}\right)+\frac{k(k-1)(k-2)}{3!}\left(E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3}+\delta^{4}+E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{5}\right)+\ldots\right] y_{r} } \\
= & {\left[1+k E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta+\frac{k(k-1)}{2!} \delta^{2}+\frac{k(k-1)(k-2)}{3!} E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3}+\ldots\right] y_{r} }
\end{aligned}
$$

We now consider the relationship between backward differences and central differences.
By definition $\quad \nabla y_{r+1}=y_{r+1}-y_{r} \quad \therefore y_{r}=y_{r+1}-\nabla y_{r+1}=(1-\nabla) y_{r+1}$
Also $\quad E y_{r}=y_{r+1}$ and $y_{r}=E^{-1} y_{r+1} \quad \therefore \quad E^{-1} \equiv(1-\nabla)$
Also by definition $\nabla y_{r+1}=y_{r+1}-y_{r}=\delta y_{r+\frac{1}{2}}=\delta E^{-\frac{1}{2}} y_{r+1} \quad \therefore \nabla \equiv \delta E^{-\frac{1}{2}}$
or alternatively $\quad \nabla \equiv \delta E^{-\frac{1}{2}}$

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl} 
& & \nabla^{2} & =\left(E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta\right)\left(E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta\right)=E^{-1} \delta^{2}=(1-\nabla) \delta^{2}=\left(1-E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta\right) \delta^{2} \\
\therefore & \nabla^{2} & =\delta^{2}-E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3} \\
& & \nabla^{3} & \equiv E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta\left(\delta^{2}-E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3}\right)=E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3}-E^{-1} \delta^{4}=E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3}-\left(1-E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta\right) \delta^{4} \\
\therefore & \nabla^{3} & \equiv E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3}-\delta^{4}+E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{5}
\end{array}
$$

We may substitute in the Newton-Gregory backward formula

$$
\begin{aligned}
& y\left(x_{r}+k h\right)=(1-\nabla)^{-k} y_{r} \\
& \quad=\left[1+k \nabla+k(k+1) \frac{\nabla^{2}}{2!}+k(k+1)(k+2) \frac{\nabla^{3}}{3!}+\ldots\right] y_{r} \\
& =\left[1+k E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta+\frac{k(k+1)}{2!}\left(\delta^{2}-E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3}\right)+\frac{k(k+1)(k+2)}{3!}\left(E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3}-\delta^{4}+E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{5}\right)+\ldots\right] y_{r} \\
& =\left[1+k E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta+\frac{k(k+1)}{2!} \delta^{2}+\frac{k(k+1)(k+2)}{3!} E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{3}+\ldots\right] y_{r}
\end{aligned}
$$

We now take the average of the forward and backward formulae and obtain

$$
y\left(x_{r}+k h\right)=\left[1+k\left\{\frac{E^{-\frac{1}{2}}+E^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2}\right\} \delta+\frac{k^{2}}{2!} \delta^{2}+\frac{k(k-1)(k+1)}{3!}\left\{\frac{E^{-\frac{1}{2}}+E^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2}\right\} \delta^{3}+\frac{k^{2}\left(k^{2}-1\right)}{4!} \delta^{4}+\ldots\right] y_{r}
$$

(The $\delta^{4}$ term may be derived in the same way as the other terms were derived).
We introduce a final operator $\mu=\frac{E^{-\frac{1}{2}}+E^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2}$, called the averaging operator.

The function of this averaging operator can be seen from the following:

$$
\mu \delta y_{r}=\mu\left(y_{r+\frac{1}{2}}-y_{r-\frac{1}{2}}\right)=\left\{\frac{E^{-\frac{1}{2}}+E^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2}\right\}\left(y_{r+\frac{1}{2}}-y_{r-\frac{1}{2}}\right)=\frac{y_{r}+y_{r+1}-y_{r-1}-y_{r}}{2}=\frac{y_{r+1}-y_{r-1}}{2}
$$

We have finally derived Stirling's formula for interpolating in terms of central differences.

## Stirling's formula

$$
y\left(x_{r}+k h\right)=\left[1+k \mu \delta+\frac{k^{2}}{2!} \delta^{2}+\frac{k(k-1)(k+1)}{3!} \mu \delta^{3}+\frac{k^{2}\left(k^{2}-1\right)}{4!} \delta^{4}+\ldots\right] y_{r}
$$

We may see how the terms relate to the difference table

| $\mathbf{x}$ | y | $\delta y$ | $\delta^{2} y$ | $\delta^{3} y$ | $\delta^{4} y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $x_{0}$ | $y_{0}$ | $\delta y_{\frac{1}{2}}$ | $\delta^{2} y_{1}$ |  |  |
| $x_{1}$ | $y_{1}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $x_{r-2}$ | $y_{r-2}$ | $\delta y_{r-\frac{3}{2}}$ | $\delta^{2} y_{r-1}$ |  | $\delta^{4} y_{r}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $x_{r-1}$ | $y_{r-1}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\delta y_{r-\frac{1}{2}}$ |  | $\delta^{3} y_{r-\frac{1}{2}}$ |  |
| $x_{r}$ | $y_{r}$ |  | $\delta^{2} y_{r}$ |  |  |
|  |  | $\delta y_{r+\frac{1}{2}}$ |  | $\delta^{3} y_{r+\frac{1}{2}}$ |  |
| $x_{r+1}$ | $y_{r+1}$ |  | $\delta^{2} y_{r+1}$ |  |  |
|  |  | $\delta y_{r+\frac{3}{2}}$ |  |  |  |
| $x_{r+2}$ | $y_{r+2}$ |  |  |  |  |

Note that $\mu \delta y_{r}=\left\{\frac{E^{-\frac{1}{2}}+E^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2}\right\} \delta y_{r}=\frac{1}{2}\left(E^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta y_{r}+E^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta y_{r}\right)=\frac{1}{2}\left(\delta y_{r-\frac{1}{2}}+\delta y_{r+\frac{1}{2}}\right)$
ie $\mu \delta y_{r}$ is the average of the two differences highlighted in column 3 of the table.
Similarly $\mu \delta^{3} y_{r}=\frac{1}{2}\left(\delta^{3} y_{r-\frac{1}{2}}+\delta^{3} y_{r+\frac{1}{2}}\right)$ and is the mean of the two differences in boxes in column 5 of the table.

Stirling's formula is useful for interpolating near the middle of a table, as the following example illustrates.

## Example

Use Stirling's formula, with the difference table for $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{X}}$ to obtain $\mathrm{e}^{1.3}$.

| $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{x}}$ | $\delta y$ | $\delta^{2} y$ | $\delta^{3} y$ | $\delta^{4} y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.1 | 1.1052 |  |  |  |  |
| 0.6 | 1.8221 | 0.7169 |  |  |  |
| 1.1 | 3.0042 | 1.1821 | 0.4652 |  | 0.3015 |
| 1.6 | 4.9530 | 1.9488 | 0.7667 | 0.4977 | 0.1962 |
| 2.1 | 8.1662 | 3.2132 | 1.2644 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Solution

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x=x_{r}+k h \quad x=1.3, x_{r}=1.1, h=0.5 \quad k=\frac{x-x_{r}}{h}=0.4 \\
& \\
& e^{1.3} \approx 3.0042+0.4\left(\frac{1.1821+1.9488}{2}\right)+\frac{0.4^{2}}{2} 0.7667 \\
& +\frac{0.4(0.4-1)(0.4+1)}{3!}\left(\frac{0.3015+0.4977}{2}\right)+\frac{0.4^{2}\left(0.4^{2}+1\right)}{4!} 0.1962+\ldots \\
& \therefore \quad e^{1.3} \approx 3.0042+0.62618+0.061336-0.0223776-0.0010987=3.6682 \\
& \\
& \left.\quad \text { (Exact result } \mathrm{e}^{1.3}=3.6693, \text { to } 4 \mathrm{dp}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## NUMERICAL DIFFERENTIATION

Differentiation is a very important mathematical process and a great deal of effort has been devoted to the development of analytic techniques of finding the derivatives of various mathematical functions. It often occurs, however, that it is not possible to utilise these traditional methods. This happens when:
(i) The function is too complex
(ii) The function is unknown (when data are collected from some experiment).

In this section numerical techniques are described which provide an estimate of the derivative of a tabulated function.

Imagine that you have a procedure which computes a function $f(x)$ and you want to find its derivative $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}(\mathrm{x})$. Easy? The definition of the derivative is the limit, as $\mathrm{h} \rightarrow 0$ of

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

practically suggests an algorithm: Pick a small value $h$, evaluate $f(x)$ and $f(x+h)$ and apply the above formula. The above procedure, however, contains two main sources of error: truncation error and roundoff error. The roundoff error depends upon the machine used to carry out the computation - it is necessary to ensure that the value used for $h$ is exactly represented by the machine. Truncation error comes from the higher order terms in the Taylor series expansion:

$$
f(x+h)=f(x)+h f^{\prime}(x)+\frac{1}{2} h^{2} f^{\prime \prime}(x)+\frac{1}{6} h^{3} f^{\prime \prime \prime}(x)+\ldots
$$

which leads to $\frac{f(x+h)-f(x)}{h}=f^{\prime}(x)+\frac{1}{2} h f^{\prime \prime}(x)+\ldots$
We will investigate methods of using difference tables to evaluate the derivatives of a function numerically. From page 6, the Newton-Gregory forward polynomial is:
$f\left(x_{k}\right) \approx P_{n}\left(x_{k}\right)=f_{0}+k \Delta f_{0}+{ }^{k} C_{2} \Delta^{2} f_{0}+\ldots+{ }^{k} C_{n} \Delta^{n} f_{0} \quad$ where $k=\left(x-x_{0}\right) / h$

Differentiating the above equation, remembering that $\frac{d P}{d x}=\frac{d P}{d k} \frac{d k}{d x}$

$$
f^{\prime}\left(x_{k}\right) \approx P_{n}^{\prime}\left(x_{k}\right)=\frac{1}{h}\left\{\Delta f_{0}+\frac{1}{2}(2 k-1) \Delta^{2} f_{0}+\frac{1}{2}\left(3 k^{2}-6 k+2\right) \Delta^{3} f_{0}+\ldots\right\}
$$

We can simplify this considerably if we take $\mathrm{k}=0$, giving a derivative corresponding to $x=x_{0}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right) \approx \frac{1}{h}\left\{\Delta f_{0}-\frac{1}{2} \Delta^{2} f_{0}+\frac{1}{3} \Delta^{3} f_{0}-\frac{1}{4} \Delta^{4} f_{0}+\ldots-(-1)^{n} \frac{1}{n} \Delta^{n} f_{0}\right\} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

## Example

Use the data in the table below to estimate $y^{\prime}(1.7)$.
Use $\mathrm{h}=0.2$ and find the result using $1,2,3$ and 4 terms of the formula.

| $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{x}}$ | $\Delta y$ | $\Delta^{2} y$ | $\Delta^{3} y$ | $\Delta^{4} y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.3 | 3.669 |  |  |  |  |
| 1.5 | 4.482 | 0.813 |  |  |  |
| 1.7 | 5.474 | 0.992 | 0.179 | 0.041 |  |
| 1.9 | 6.686 | 1.212 | 0.220 | 0.048 | 0.007 |
| 2.1 | 8.166 | 1.480 | 0.268 | 0.060 | 0.012 |
| 2.3 | 9.974 | 1.808 | 0.328 | 0.072 | 0.012 |
| 2.5 | 12.182 | 2.208 | 0.400 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

With one term : $\quad y^{\prime}(1.7)=\frac{1}{0.2}(1.212)=6.060$
With two terms $\quad: \quad y^{\prime}(1.7)=\frac{1}{0.2}\left(1.212-\frac{1}{2} 0.268\right)=5.390$
With three terms : $\quad y^{\prime}(1.7)=\frac{1}{0.2}\left(1.212-\frac{1}{2} 0.268+\frac{1}{3} 0.060\right)=5.490$
With four terms $\quad: \quad y^{\prime}(1.7)=\frac{1}{0.2}\left(1.212-\frac{1}{2} 0.268+\frac{1}{3} 0.060-\frac{1}{4} 0.012\right)=5.475$
The data in the table are for $\mathrm{y}=\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{X}}$, rounded to 3 dp .
The error in the derivative is rather small for 4 terms, which can be anticipated since the fourth differences are approximately constant. This function is well-represented by a 4 th degree polynomial.
The above formula (1) for derivatives is a forward-difference approximation, for which the fit provided by the interpolating polynomial is not symmetrical about $x_{0}$ - interpretation is more accurate near the centre of the range of fit.

For most purposes it is better to use central differences for the purpose of evaluating derivatives. We use Stirling's formula as the basis of derivatives in an analogous manner to the Newton-Gregory formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& y\left(x_{r}\right)=\left\{1+k \mu \delta y_{r}+\frac{k^{2}}{2!} \delta^{2} y_{r}+\frac{k(k-1)(k+1)}{3!} \mu \delta^{3} y_{r}+\frac{k^{2}\left(k^{2}-1\right)}{4!} \delta^{4} y_{r}+\ldots .\right\} \\
& k=\left(x-x_{r}\right) / h
\end{aligned}
$$

and using the fact that $\frac{d y}{d x}=\frac{d y}{d k} \frac{d k}{d x}$

Differentiating gives $y^{\prime}\left(x_{r}\right)=\frac{1}{h}\left\{\mu \delta+k \delta^{2} y_{r}+\frac{3 k^{2}-1}{3!} \mu \delta^{3} y_{r}+\frac{4 k^{3}-2 k}{4!} \mu \delta^{4} y_{r}+\ldots\right\}$
Using $\quad \frac{d^{2} y}{d x^{2}}=\frac{d}{d x} \frac{d y}{d x}=\frac{d}{d k} \frac{d y}{d x} \frac{d k}{d x}=\frac{d}{d k} \frac{d y}{d x} \frac{1}{h} \quad$ we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
y^{\prime \prime}\left(x_{r}\right) & =\frac{1}{h^{2}}\left\{\delta^{2} y_{r}+\frac{6 k}{3!} \mu \delta^{3} y_{r}+\frac{12 k^{2}-2}{4!} \delta^{4} y_{r}+\ldots\right\} \\
& =\frac{1}{h^{2}}\left\{\delta^{2} y_{r}+k \mu \delta^{3} y_{r}+\frac{12 k^{2}-2}{4!} \delta^{4} y_{r}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Summary of results At a tabular point $\mathrm{k}=0$ and so

$$
\begin{aligned}
& y^{\prime}\left(x_{r}\right)=\frac{1}{h}\left\{\mu \delta y_{r}-\frac{1}{6} \mu \delta^{3} y_{r}+\frac{1}{30} \mu \delta^{5} y_{r}+\ldots\right\} \\
& y^{\prime \prime}\left(x_{r}\right)=\frac{1}{h^{2}}\left\{\delta^{2} y_{r}-\frac{1}{12} \delta^{4} y_{r}+\ldots\right\} \\
& y^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(x_{r}\right) \approx \frac{1}{h^{3}} \mu \delta^{3} y_{r} \\
& y^{i v}\left(x_{r}\right) \approx \frac{1}{h^{4}} \delta^{4} y_{r}
\end{aligned}
$$

Higher derivatives may be obtained in exactly the same way.
Writing the expressions out in full:

$$
\begin{gathered}
y^{\prime}\left(x_{r}\right) \approx \frac{1}{h} \mu \delta y_{r}=\frac{1}{h}\left[\frac{\delta y_{r-\frac{1}{2}}+\delta y_{r+\frac{1}{2}}}{2}\right]=\frac{1}{2 h}\left(y_{r}-y_{r-1}+y_{r+1}-y_{r}\right)=\frac{y_{r+1}-y_{r-1}}{2 h} \\
y^{\prime \prime}\left(x_{r}\right) \approx \frac{1}{h^{2}} \delta^{2} y_{r}=\frac{1}{h^{2}} \delta\left(\delta y_{r}\right)=\frac{1}{h^{2}} \delta\left(y_{r+\frac{1}{2}}-y_{r-\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\
=\frac{1}{h^{2}}\left[y_{r+1}-y_{r}-y_{r}+y_{r-1}\right]=\frac{y_{r+1}-2 y_{r}+y_{r-1}}{h^{2}}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Example 1

Use the tabulated values of $\mathrm{y}=\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{X}}$ to approximate $d y / d x$ and $d^{2} y / d x^{2}$ at $\mathrm{x}=1.1$.

$$
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\mathbf{x} & \mathbf{y}=\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{x}} & \delta y & \delta^{2} y & \delta^{3} y & \delta^{4} y \\
0.1 & 1.1052\left(y_{0}\right) & & & & \\
0.6 & 1.8221\left(y_{1}\right) & 0.7169 & & 0.4652 & \\
\\
1.1 & 3.0042\left(y_{2}\right) & 1.1821 & & 0.7667 & 0.3015 \\
1.6 & 4.9530\left(y_{3}\right) & 1.9488 & & 0.4977 & 0.1962 \\
2.1 & 8.1662\left(y_{4}\right) & 3.2132 & 1.2644 & & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & & & &
\end{array}
$$

$$
\frac{d y_{2}}{d x} \approx \frac{y_{3}-y_{1}}{2 h}=\frac{4.9530-1.8221}{1}=3.1309
$$

$$
\text { (exact value } 3.0042 \text {, to } 4 \text { d.p.) }
$$

$$
\frac{d^{2} y_{2}}{d x^{2}} \approx \frac{1}{h^{2}}\left(y_{3}-2 y_{2}+y_{1}\right)=\frac{1}{0.5^{2}}(4.9530-2 \times 3.0042+1.8221)=3.0668
$$

$$
\text { (exact value } 3.0042 \text {, to } 4 \text { d.p.) }
$$

## Test Exercises

1. The following table is for $\mathrm{y}=1+\log \mathrm{x}$. Determine estimates of $\mathrm{y}^{\prime}$ at $\mathrm{x}=0.15,0.19$ and 0.23 using
(a) one term, (b) two terms, (c) three terms of equation (1) at the beginning of this section. Determine the errors by comparison with the analytical values.

| $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{y}=(\mathbf{1}+\log \mathbf{x})$ | $\Delta y$ | $\Delta^{2} y$ | $\Delta^{3} y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.15 | 0.1761 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.17 | 0.2304 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.19 | 0.2788 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.21 | 0.3222 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.23 | 0.3617 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.25 | 0.3979 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.27 | 0.4314 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.29 | 0.4624 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.31 | 0.4914 |  |  |  |

2. A central-difference approximation for derivatives is more accurate than using a forwarddifference approximation. Repeat Exercise 1(b) but use appropriate central difference formulae and compare the errors.

## NUMERICAL SOLUTION OF DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

Problems involving ordinary differential equations (ODEs) can always be reduced to the study of sets of first order differential equations. For example, the second order equation:

$$
\frac{d^{2} y}{d x^{2}}+q(x) \frac{d y}{d x}=r(x)
$$

can be re-written as two first-order equations:

$$
\frac{d y}{d x}=z(x) \quad \frac{d z}{d x}=r(x)-q(x) z(x)
$$

where z is a new variable. We shall therefore just consider first-order ODEs. Also, we shall consider initial value problems in which all the y values are known at some starting x value. The underlying idea of any method for solving the initial value problem is to rewrite the dy's and dx's in the formula above as finite steps $\Delta y$ and $\Delta x$ and multiply the equations by $\Delta x$. This gives algebraic formulas for the change in the functions when the independent variable x is "stepped" by one "stepsize" $\Delta x$. In the limit of small stepsize, a good approximation to the underlying differential equation is achieved. Literal implementation of this procedure results in Euler's method, below, which is NOT recommended for practical use because it is computationally inefficient. Euler's method is conceptually important, however, in that one way or another all practical methods come down to the same idea: add small icrements to your functions corresponding to derivatives (right-hand sides of the equations), multiplied by stepsizes.

## EULER's METHOD

Suppose we must solve the equation $\frac{d y}{d x}=f(x, y)$, given that $y=y_{0}$ when $x=x_{0}$.
Divide the range of values of x into n equal steps $x_{0}, x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}$.
The step width is then given by: $h=\frac{x_{n}-x_{0}}{n}$


$$
y_{1}=y_{0}+\left.h \frac{d y}{d x}\right|_{x_{0}}=y_{0}+h f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& y_{2}=y_{1}+h f\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right) \\
& \vdots \\
& \vdots \\
& y_{n}= \\
& =y_{n-1}+h f\left(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Example $1 \quad \frac{d y}{d x}=y^{2}-x \quad$ Find $y(2.3)$ given $y(2)=3$.
Take $\mathrm{h}=0.1$ :

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
y_{1}=y_{0}+0.1\left(y_{0}{ }^{2}-x_{0}\right) & x_{0}=2, y_{0}=3 \\
y_{i+1}=y_{i}+0.1\left(y_{i}^{2}-x_{i}\right) &
\end{array}
$$

| $\mathbf{i}$ | $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}}$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}{ }^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}^{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1}\left(\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}{ }^{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}}\right)$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{1}}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 2.0 | 3.000 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |


| $\mathbf{i}$ | $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}}$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}^{\mathbf{2}-\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}}}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1}\left(\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}^{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{- \mathbf { x } _ { \mathbf { i } }} \mathbf{)}\right.$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{1}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 2.0 | 3.000 | 9.000 | 7.000 | 0.700 | 3.700 |
| 1 | 2.1 | 3.700 | 13.690 | 11.590 | 1.159 | 4.859 |
| 2 | 2.2 | 4.859 | 23.610 | 21.410 | 2.141 | 7.000 |
| 3 | 2.3 | 7.000 |  |  |  |  |

Example 2 $\frac{d y}{d x}=x+y \quad$ Find $\mathrm{y}(0.05)$ correct to 5 d.p. given that $\mathrm{y}(0)=2$

$$
\begin{array}{cll}
\text { Take h=0.01: } \quad \begin{array}{l}
y_{i+1}=y_{i}+0.01\left(x_{0}+y_{0}\right), \quad y_{0}=2, \quad x_{0}=0 \\
\therefore
\end{array} y_{i+1}=y_{i}+0.01 y_{i}{ }^{\prime}
\end{array}
$$

| $\mathbf{i}$ | $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}}$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}{ }^{\prime}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1} \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}{ }^{\prime}$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{1}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 2 | 0.02 | 2.02 |
| 1 | 0.01 | 2.02 | 2.03 | 0.0203 | 2.0403 |
| 2 | 0.02 | 2.0403 | 2.0603 | 0.020603 | 2.060903 |
| 3 | 0.03 | 2.060903 | 2.090903 | 0.02090903 | 2.08181203 |
| 4 | 0.04 | 2.08181203 | 2.12181203 | 0.0212181203 | 2.1030301503 |
| 5 | 0.05 | 2.1030301503 |  |  |  |

Example 3

$$
\frac{d y}{d x}=2(1+x)-y \quad \text { Find } y \text { for } x=2.0(0.2) 3.0, \text { given } y(2)=5
$$

## Take h=0.2

$$
y_{i+1}=y_{i}+0.2 y_{i}^{\prime}
$$

| $\mathbf{i}$ | $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}}$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}{ }^{\mathbf{}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 2.2 | 5.2 | 1.2 |
| 2 | 2.4 | 5.44 | 1.36 |
| 3 | 2.6 | 5.712 | 1.488 |
| 4 | 2.8 | 6.0096 | 1.5904 |
| 5 | 3.0 | 6.32768 |  |


| Example 4 | $\frac{d y}{d x}=1+x-y$ | Find y for $\mathrm{x}=1.0(0.2) 2.0$, given $\mathrm{y}(1)=2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Take $\mathrm{h}=0.2$ | $y_{i+1}=y_{i}+0.2 y_{i}{ }^{\prime}$ |
| i | $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $y_{i} \quad y_{i}{ }^{\prime}$ |
| 0 | 1.0 | 20 |
| 1 | 1.2 | 20.2 |
| 2 | 1.4 | 2.04 0.36 |
| 3 | 1.6 | 2.1120 .488 |
| 4 | 1.8 | 2.20960 .5904 |
| 5 | 2.0 | 2.32768 0.67232 |

## EXERCISES

Solve the following ODEs to obtain the required values of y , under the given initial conditions:

1. If $\frac{d y}{d x}=x+y$ find y for $\mathrm{x}=0,(0.1), 0.5$, given that $\mathrm{y}(0)=1$.
(Solution: 1.0, 1.1, 1.22, 1.362, 1.5282, 1.72102)
2. If $\frac{d y}{d x}=1+x y$ find $y$ for $x=0,(0.1), 0.5$, given that $\mathrm{y}(0)=1$.
(Solution: 1.0, 1.1, 1.211, 1.3352, 1.4753, 1.6343)
3. Solve the above two equations by analytic methods and check your numerical results from questions 1 and 2.

## SECOND-ORDER ODEs

To solve first order ODEs, one boundary/initial condition was required; for second order ODEs it becomes necessary to have two. We approximate the second derivative by the first term of the central difference formula presented earlier in this booklet. We can see from the following diagram how this can be derived geometrically:


Approximate slope at B may be given by:
(1) $\mathrm{BC}: \frac{d y}{d x} \approx \frac{y_{1}-y_{0}}{h} \quad$ (Forward difference)
(2) $\mathrm{AB}: \frac{d y}{d x} \approx \frac{y_{0}-y_{-1}}{h} \quad$ (Backward difference)
(3) $\mathrm{AC}: \frac{d y}{d x} \approx \frac{y_{1}-y_{-1}}{2 h} \quad$ (Central difference)

For the second derivative: $\quad \frac{d^{2} y}{d x^{2}} \approx \frac{\frac{y_{1}-y_{0}}{h}-\frac{y_{0}-y_{-1}}{h}}{h}=\frac{y_{1}-2 y_{0}+y_{-1}}{h^{2}}$

Example 1

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\frac{d^{2} y}{d x^{2}}=y & \text { Find } \mathrm{y}(0.6), \text { given } \mathrm{y}(0)=1, \mathrm{y}(0.1)=1.1 \\
\mathrm{~h}=0.1 & \frac{y_{i+1}-2 y_{i}+y_{i-1}}{h^{2}}=y_{i} \Rightarrow y_{i+1}=2.01 y_{i}-y_{i-1}
\end{array}
$$

| $\mathbf{i}$ | $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}}$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 1}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}} \mathbf{\mathbf { y } _ { \mathbf { i } \mathbf { - 1 } }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.211 |
| 1 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 1.33411 |
| 2 | 0.2 | 1.211 | 1.4705611 |
| 3 | 0.3 | 1.33411 | 1.6217178 |
| 4 | 0.4 | 1.6705611 | 1.7890917 |
| 5 | 0.5 | 1.7890917 |  |
| 6 | 0.6 |  |  |

## Example 2

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\frac{d^{2} y}{d x^{2}}=4 y & \text { Find } \mathrm{y}(0.6), \text { given } \mathrm{y}(0)=0.5, \mathrm{y}(0.1)=6.0 \\
\mathrm{~h}=0.1 & \frac{y_{i+1}-2 y_{i}+y_{i-1}}{h^{2}}=y_{i} \Rightarrow y_{i+1}=2.01 y_{i}-y_{i-1}
\end{array}
$$

$\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{i}}$
6.0
11.56
17.2356
23.083556
29.162348
35.532762

$$
2.01 \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{i}}-\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{i}-1}
$$

$$
11.56
$$

$$
17.2356
$$

$$
23.083556
$$

$$
29.162348
$$

$$
35.532762
$$

Example 3

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\frac{d^{2} y}{d x^{2}}-\frac{d y}{d x}-2 y=0 \quad \text { Find } \mathrm{y}(0.05) \text {,given } \mathrm{y}(0)=3, \mathrm{y}(0.01)=3.1 \\
\therefore & \frac{y_{i+1}-2 y_{i}+y_{i-1}}{h^{2}}-\frac{y_{i+1}-y_{i-1}}{2 h}-2 y_{i}=0 \\
\therefore & \left(y_{i+1}-2 y_{i}+y_{i-1}\right)-\frac{h}{2}\left(y_{i+1}-y_{i-1}\right)-2 h^{2} y_{i}=0 \\
\therefore & y_{i+1}\left(1-\frac{h}{2}\right)=2 y_{i}-y_{i-1}+\frac{h}{2} y_{i-1}-2 h^{2} y_{i} \\
\therefore & y_{i+1}=\left[\left(2-2 h^{2}\right) y_{i}+\left(\frac{h}{2}-1\right) y_{i-1}\right] /\left[1-\frac{h}{2}\right] \\
\therefore & y_{i+1}=1.0050251\left(1.9998 y_{i}-0.995 y_{i-1}\right)
\end{array}
$$

$$
\mathbf{i}
$$

$\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{i}}$
3
3.1
3.2305326
3.3928834
3.5886515
3.8197649
$1.9998 y_{i}-0.995 y_{i-1}$
3.21438
3.3759191
3.5707083
3.8006662

## IMPROVED EULER METHOD (IEM)

The ordinary Euler method may be improved by estimating the slope over the interval between points by the average of the slopes at the beginning and the end. We know the slope at the start point, so we can use this to estimate the $y$-value of the end point. From this we can estimate the slope at the end point. Taking the mean of the two slopes, we can then predict the true $y$-value with greater accuracy.


Estimate of $y_{1}$ based on slope at $x_{0}$ :
Estimate of $y_{1}$ based on slope at $x_{1}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bar{y}_{1}=y_{0}+h f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \\
& \bar{y}_{1}=y_{0}+h f\left(x_{1}, \bar{y}_{1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Take $y_{1}=\frac{1}{2}\left(\overline{y_{1}}+\overline{y_{1}}\right)=y_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h\left\{f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)+f\left(x_{1}, \overline{y_{1}}\right)\right\}$

This will set up an iterative scheme as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& y_{1(1)}=y_{0}+h f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \\
& y_{1(2)}=y_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h\left\{f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)+f\left(x_{1}, y_{1(1)}\right)\right\} \\
& y_{1(3)}=y_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h\left\{f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)+f\left(x_{1}, y_{1(2)}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Summary of the method

The steps in the method are as follows:

1. We start with the given equation $y^{\prime}=f(x, y)$, and with the initial condition that $y=y_{0}$ at $x=x_{0}$. We have to determine values of $y$ for $x=x_{0}$ to $x_{n}$ step $h$.
2. From the equation and the initial values we can determine $y_{0}^{\prime}=f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$. This is the ordinary Euler method.
3. We now know $x_{0}, y_{0}, y_{0}^{\prime}$ and $h$, and can therefore calculate
(a)

$$
\underline{x_{1}}=x_{0}+h
$$

(b) $\quad \overline{y_{1}}=y_{0}+h y_{0}^{\prime} \quad$ (again, this is the same step as the ordinary Euler method)
(c) We now calculate $f\left(x_{1}, \overline{y_{1}}\right)$, and then we can estimate
(d)

$$
y_{1}=y_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h\left\{y_{0}^{\prime}+f\left(x_{1}, \overline{y_{1}}\right)\right\}
$$

4. This is the first estimate of $y_{1}$. We can, if we wish, repeat steps (c) and (d) in 3 above, replacing $\bar{y}_{1}$ with the calculated value $y_{1}$ and thereby finding an improved estimate of $y_{1}$. This is known as the recursive method. We can continue to employ this recursion until we obtain enough accuracy (i.e. until the $n^{\text {th }}$ decimal place remains unchanged).
5. Finally, we can calculate $y_{1}^{\prime}=f\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)$ and repeat steps 3 and 4 to find $x_{2}$ and $y_{2}$. This is then repeated for all the values of $y$ that we are required to find.

Example 1 Apply the Improved Euler Method, without recursion, to solve:

$$
\frac{d y}{d x}=x+y \quad \text { for } \mathrm{x}=0.0 \text { to } 0.5 \text { step } 0.1 \text {, given that } \mathrm{y}(0)=1 \text {. }
$$

We proceed in a step-by-step routine: we have the equation $y^{\prime}=x+y$.
Initial conditions $\Rightarrow \quad x_{0}=0, y_{0}=1 \quad \therefore y_{0}^{\prime}=x_{0}+y_{0}=1$.
Also $\quad h=0.1 \quad \therefore x_{1}=x_{0}+h=0.1$
(a) First calculate the value $\bar{y}_{1}=y_{0}+h y_{0}^{\prime}=1+0.1 \times 1=1.1$
(b) $\quad y_{1}=y_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h\left\{y_{0}^{\prime}+f\left(x_{1}, \bar{y}_{1}\right)\right\}=1+0.05 \times\{1+(0.1+1.1)\}=1.11$
(c) So we have $x_{1}=0.1, y_{1}=1.1 \quad \therefore y_{1}^{\prime}=0.1+1.11=1.21$
(d) We now take these last results in place of $x_{0}, y_{0}$ and $y_{0}^{\prime}$ in the above calculations, and find the corresponding values for the next interval : $x_{2}, y_{2}$ and $y_{2}^{\prime}$. These values are shown in the following table:

| $\mathbf{n}$ | $x_{n}$ | $y_{n}$ | $y_{n}^{\prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 1 | 0.1 | 1.11 | 1.21 |
| 2 | 0.2 | 1.24205 | 1.44205 |
| 3 | 0.3 | 1.398465 | 1.698465 |
| 4 | 0.4 | 1.581804 | 1.981804 |
| 5 | 0.5 | 1.794893 | 2.294893 |

We now use recursion to obtain improved estimates of $y$.
As before, we have $x_{0}=0, x_{1}=0.1, y_{0}=1$ and $y_{0}^{\prime}=1$.
We next calculate, as before, $\bar{y}_{1}=y_{0}+h y_{0}^{\prime}=1.1$

$$
\text { and estimate } \quad y_{1}=y_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h\left\{y_{0}^{\prime}+f\left(x_{1}, \bar{y}_{1}\right)\right\}=1+0.05 \times(1+1.2)=1.11
$$

So far, this is all identical to the previous calculation, however, instead of stopping now and using this value as the final estimate for $y_{1}$ we substitute this value back into the last formula above in place of $\bar{y}_{1}$. For the value found so far we use the notation $y_{1(1)}$.

We therefore proceed to find: $y_{1(2)}=y_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h\left\{y_{0}^{\prime}+f\left(x_{1}, y_{1(1)}\right)\right\}=1+0.05 \times\left(1+0.1+y_{1(1)}\right)$

We now have a recursion relation which can be simplified by multiplying out the constants to give:

$$
y_{1(n)}=1.055+0.05 y_{1(n-1)}
$$

and we can then tabulate the values of $y_{1(n)}$ for increasing values of n :

| $\mathbf{n}$ | $y_{1(n)}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1.1 |
| 2 | 1.11 |
| 3 | 1.1105 |
| 4 | 1.110525 |
| 5 | 1.1105263 |
| 6 | 1.1105263 |

Note that after 5 iterations we have achieved 7 decimal place accuracy in the solution and that the estimate without recursion is in error by 0.0005263 , or $0.0474144 \%$.

## Example 1

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d y}{d x}=x^{2} y \quad x_{0}=1, \quad x_{1}=1.1, \quad y_{0}=3, \quad f(x, y)=x^{2} y \\
& y_{1(1)}=y_{0}+h f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \\
& y_{1(i+1)}=y_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h\left[f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)+f\left(x_{1}, y_{1(i)}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

here

$$
y_{1(1)}=3+0.1(3)
$$

$$
y_{1(i+1)}=3+0.05\left(3+1.1^{2} y_{1(i)}\right)=3.15+0.0605 y_{1(i)}
$$

| $\mathbf{i}$ | $\mathbf{y 1}_{\mathbf{1} \mathbf{( i )}}$ | $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{1})}=\mathbf{= 3 . 1 5 + 0 . 0 6 0 5} \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{i})}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 3 | 3.34965 |
| 1 | 3.3 | 3.35265 |
| 2 | 3.34965 | 3.35283 |
| 3 | 3.35265 | 3.35285 |
| 4 | 3.35283 |  |

Example $2 \quad \frac{d y}{d x}=\frac{1}{y^{2}} \quad x_{0}=1, \quad x_{1}=1.1, \quad y_{0}=1, \quad f(x, y)=\frac{1}{y^{2}}$

Euler's Method:

$$
y_{1}=y_{0}+h f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)=1+0.1\left(\frac{1}{1}\right)=1.1
$$

Improved Euler Method: $\quad y_{1(1)}=y_{0}+h f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$

$$
y_{1(i+1)}=y_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h\left[f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)+f\left(x_{1}, y_{1(i)}\right)\right]
$$

here

$$
\begin{aligned}
& y_{1(1)}=1.1 \\
& y_{1(i+1)}=1+\frac{1}{2} 0.1\left(1+\frac{1}{y_{1(i)}{ }^{2}}\right)=1.05+\frac{0.05}{y_{1(i)}{ }^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

i
0
$\mathbf{y}_{1(i)}$
1
11
$\mathbf{y}_{1(i+1)=1.05+0.05 / y 1(i)}{ }^{2}$
1

$$
1.09132
$$

2

$$
1.09198
$$

3

$$
1.09193
$$

4

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1.09132 \\
& 1.09198 \\
& 1.09193
\end{aligned}
$$

Exact Solution: $\quad \frac{d y}{d x}=\frac{1}{y^{2}} \quad \therefore y^{2} d y=d x \quad \frac{y^{3}}{3}=x+c \quad \therefore y=\sqrt[3]{3 x-2}$
$\therefore \mathrm{y}(1.1) \cong 1.091392$

Example 3

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d y}{d x}=x+y \quad x_{0}=0, \quad x_{1}=0.1, \quad y_{0}=1, \quad f(x, y)=x+y \\
& y_{1(1)}=y_{0}+h f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \\
& y_{1(i+1)}=y_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h\left[f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)+f\left(x_{1}, y_{1(i)}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

## for $\mathbf{y}_{1}$

here

$$
\begin{aligned}
& y_{1(1)}=1+0.1(1)=1.1 \\
& y_{1(i+1)}=1+0.05\left(1+0.1+y_{1(i)}\right)=1.055+0.05 y_{1(i)}
\end{aligned}
$$

| $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{i})}$ | $\mathbf{y}_{1(\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{1})}=\mathbf{1 . 0 5 5 + \mathbf { 0 . 0 5 }} \mathbf{\mathbf { y } _ { \mathbf { 1 } ( \mathbf { i } ) }}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1.1 | 1.11 |
| 1.11 | 1.1105 |
| 1.1105 | 1.110525 |
| 1.110525 | 1.1105263 |
| 1.1105263 | 1.1105263 |
| 1.1105263 |  |

$$
\therefore \quad y_{1} \cong 1.1105263
$$

for $\mathbf{y} \mathbf{2}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x_{1}=0.1, \quad x_{2}=0.2, \quad y_{1}=1.1105623, \quad f(x, y)=x+y \\
& y_{1(1)}=y_{0}+h f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \\
& y_{1(i+1)}=y_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h\left[f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)+f\left(x_{1}, y_{1(i)}\right)\right] \\
& \text { here } \\
& f\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)=x_{1}+y_{1}=1.2105263 \\
& y_{2(1)}=1.1105263+0.1(1.2105263)=1.2315789 \\
& y_{2(i+1)}=1.1105263+0.05\left(1.2105263+0.2+y_{2(i)}\right)=1.1810526+0.05 y_{2(i)} \\
& \mathbf{y}_{2(\mathrm{i}+1)}=\mathbf{1 . 1 8 1 0 5 2 6 + 0 . 0 5} \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{2}(\mathrm{i})} \\
& 1.2426315 \\
& 1.2431842 \\
& 1.2432118 \\
& 1.2432132 \\
& 1.2432133 \\
& \therefore \quad y_{2} \cong 1.2432133
\end{aligned}
$$

## THE RUNGE-KUTTA METHOD

The Euler method, which has the formula

$$
y_{n+1}=y_{n}+h f\left(x_{n}, y_{n}\right)
$$

advances a solution from $x_{n}$ to $x_{n+1} \equiv x_{n}+h$. The formula is non-symmetric - it advances a solution through an interval $h$ using derivative information only at the beginning of the interval, as illustrated in the figure below:


There are several reasons why Euler's method is not recommended for practical use, among them (i) it is not very accurate when compared with other methods run at the equivalent stepsize and (ii) it is not very stable. Consider, however, the use of a step like in the above illustration to take a "trial" step to the midpoint of the interval. Then use the value of both x and y at that midpoint to compute the "real" step across the whole interval. The following diagram illustrates the method:


Mathematically, this can be written as $\quad k_{1}=h f\left(x_{n}, y_{n}\right)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& k_{2}=h f\left(x_{n}+\frac{1}{2} h, y_{n}+\frac{1}{2} k_{1}\right) \\
& y_{n+1}=y_{n}+k_{2}+O\left(h^{3}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

This procedure is called the second-order Runge-Kutta method (a method is conventionally called $n^{\text {th }}$ order if its error term is $O\left(h^{n+1}\right)$ ).

We need not stop there. There are a number of ways of evaluating the right-hand-side $f(x, y)$ that all agree to first order, but that have different coefficients of higher-order error terms. Adding up the right combination of these, we can eliminate the error terms order by order. This is the basic idea of the Runge-Kutta method. By far the most commonly used of these methods is the classical fourth-order Runge-Kutta formula:

## Fourth-Order Runge-Kutta Formula

$$
\begin{aligned}
& k_{1}=h f\left(x_{n}, y_{n}\right) \\
& k_{2}=h f\left(x_{n}+\frac{1}{2} h, y_{n}+\frac{1}{2} k_{1}\right) \\
& k_{3}=h f\left(x_{n}+\frac{1}{2} h, y_{n}+\frac{1}{2} k_{2}\right) \\
& k_{4}=h f\left(x_{n}+h, y_{n}+k_{3}\right) \\
& y_{n+1}=y_{n}+\frac{1}{6} k_{1}+\frac{1}{3} k_{2}+\frac{1}{3} k_{2}+\frac{1}{6} k_{3}+O\left(h^{5}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

The fourth-order Runge-Kutta method required four evaluations of the right hand side per step $h$. This will be superior to the second-order method if at least twice as large a step is possible for the same accuracy. Is this so? The answer is: often, perhaps even usually, but not always. This emphasises the fact that high order does not always mean high accuracy. A good system should exert some adaptive control over its own progress, making frequent changes to its stepsize to maintain the error within predetermined limits. This, however, is beyond the scope of this unit.

Example 1

$$
\text { Solve } \frac{d y}{d x}=x+y, \quad \text { given that } y(0)=1
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
x_{0}=0, y_{0}=1, y_{0}^{\prime}=1, h=0.1 \quad x_{1}=x_{0}+h=0.1 \\
k_{1}=h y_{0}^{\prime}=0.1 & \\
k_{2}=h f(0+0.05,1+0.05)=h f(0.05,1.05) & \therefore k_{2}=0.11 \\
k_{3}=h f(0+0.05,1+0.055)=h f(0.05,1.055) & \therefore k_{3}=0.1105 \\
k_{4}=0.12105 & \\
\therefore \quad y_{1}=1.110342 &
\end{array}
$$

## Exercises

1. Using the 4th order Runge Kutta method,
(a) compute an estimate of $\mathrm{x}(0.75)$ for the initial value problem:

$$
\frac{d x}{d t}=x+t+x t, \quad x(0)=1
$$

using a step size of $h=0.15$.
(Solution: 3.2345)
(b) compute an estimate of $\mathrm{x}(2)$ for the initial value problem

$$
\frac{d x}{d t}=\frac{1}{x+t}, \quad x(1)=2
$$

using a step size of $h=0.1$.
2. Solve $y^{\prime}=x+y$ with $y=1$ at $x=0$.

Determine the function values for y for $\mathrm{x}=0(0.1) 0.5$.
(Solution: 1.0,1.110342,1.242806,1.399718,1.583649,1.797442)
3. Solve $y^{\prime}=y^{2}-x y$ with $y=0.4$ at $x=0$.

Determine the function values for y for $\mathrm{x}=0(0.2) 1.0$.
(Solution: 0.4, 0.4259, 0.4374, 0.4319, 0.4085, 0.3689)
4. Solve $y^{\prime}=\frac{y-x}{y+x}$ with $y=1$ at $x=0$.

Determine the function values for y for $\mathrm{x}=0(0.2) 1.0$.
(Solution: 1.0, 1.1679, 1.2902, 1.3817, 1.4497, 1.4983)

