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1. (a) The local truncation error is given by

$$
\tau_{n+1}(\Delta t)=\frac{y_{n+1}-z_{n+1}}{\Delta t}
$$

where $y_{n+1}=y\left(t_{n+1}\right)$ is the exact solution at time $t_{n+1}$ and $z_{n+1}$ the numerical approximation after one step with $w_{n}=y_{n}$ as starting point.
The Taylor series around $t_{n}$ for $y_{n+1}$ is:

$$
y_{n+1}=y_{n}+\Delta t y_{n}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{2} \Delta t^{2} y_{n}^{\prime \prime}+\mathcal{O}\left(\Delta t^{3}\right)
$$

The formula for $z_{n+1}$ is

$$
z_{n+1}=y_{n}+\frac{1}{2} \Delta t f\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right)+\frac{1}{2} \Delta t f\left(t_{n}+\Delta t, y_{n}+\Delta t f\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right)\right)
$$

which has as Taylor series around $\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
z_{n+1}=y_{n} & +\frac{1}{2} \Delta t f\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right) \\
& +\frac{1}{2} \Delta t\left[f\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right)+\Delta t \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+\Delta t f\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right)+\mathcal{O}\left(\Delta t^{2}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Using $y_{n}^{\prime}=f\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right)$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
y_{n}^{\prime \prime} & =\left(y_{n}^{\prime}\right)^{\prime} \\
& =\frac{d f}{d t}\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right), \\
& =\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right)+y_{n}^{\prime} \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right), \\
& =\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right)+f\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}\left(t_{n}, y_{n}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

this becomes

$$
z_{n+1}=y_{n}+\Delta t y_{n}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{2} \Delta t^{2} y_{n}^{\prime \prime}+\mathcal{O}\left(\Delta t^{3}\right)
$$

Hence, this gives

$$
y_{n+1}-z_{n+1}=\mathcal{O}\left(\Delta t^{3}\right),
$$

and hence $\tau_{n+1}(\Delta t)=\mathcal{O}\left(\Delta t^{2}\right)$ because

$$
\tau_{n+1}=\frac{\mathcal{O}\left(\Delta t^{3}\right)}{\Delta t}=\mathcal{O}\left(\Delta t^{2}\right)
$$

(b) Consider the test equation $y^{\prime}=\lambda y$, then it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
k_{1} & =\lambda \Delta t w_{n} \\
k_{2} & =\lambda \Delta t\left(w_{n}+\lambda \Delta t w_{n}\right) \\
& =\left(\lambda \Delta t+(\lambda \Delta t)^{2}\right) w_{n} \\
w_{n+1} & =w_{n}+\frac{1}{2} \lambda \Delta t w_{n}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda \Delta t+(\lambda \Delta t)^{2}\right) w_{n} \\
& =\left(1+\lambda \Delta t+\frac{1}{2}(\lambda \Delta t)^{2}\right) w_{n} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence the amplification factor is given by

$$
Q(\lambda \Delta t)=1+\lambda \Delta t+\frac{1}{2}(\lambda \Delta t)^{2}
$$

(c) To this extent, we determine the eigenvalues of the matrix $A$. Subsequently, these eigenvalues are substituted into the amplification factor. The eigenvalues of $A$ are given by $\lambda_{1}=-2, \lambda_{2}=-3$ and $\lambda_{3}=-4$, as $A$ is a lower-triangular matrix. These eigenvalues can also be found by deriving the characteristic equation $\operatorname{det}(A-\lambda I)=0$ and solving for $\lambda$.
Substitution of $\lambda_{3}=-4$ in the amplification factor gives

$$
Q(-4 \Delta t)=1-4 \Delta t+8 \Delta t^{2} \Delta t^{2}
$$

For stability it must hold

$$
|Q(-4 \Delta t)| \leq 1
$$

which results in the inequalities

$$
-1 \leq 1-4 \Delta t+8 \Delta t^{2} \leq 1
$$

as $\Delta t$ is real.
The left inequality gives:

$$
\begin{aligned}
-1 & \leq 1-4 \Delta t+8 \lambda^{2}, \\
\Rightarrow 0 & \leq 2-4 \Delta t+8 \Delta t^{2}, \\
\Rightarrow 0 & \leq 1-2 \Delta t+4 \Delta t^{2},
\end{aligned}
$$

which is satisfied for any $\Delta t$ as the discriminant $D=(-2)^{2}-4 \cdot 4 \cdot 1=-12<0$ and substitution of $\Delta t=1$ gives $0 \leq 3$.
The right inequality gives:

$$
\begin{aligned}
1-4 \Delta t+8 \lambda^{2} & \leq 1 \\
\Rightarrow-4 \Delta t+8 \Delta t^{2} & \leq 0 \\
\Rightarrow-4+8 \Delta t & \leq 0 \\
\Rightarrow 8 \Delta t & \leq 4 \\
\Rightarrow \Delta t & \leq \frac{1}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Because $\lambda_{1}>\lambda_{2}>\lambda_{3}$, the stability is determined by $\lambda_{3}=-4$. Alternatively, one can show that for $\lambda_{1}=-2$ the constraint

$$
\Delta t \leq 1
$$

is found and similarly for $\lambda_{2}=-3$ the constraint

$$
\Delta t \leq \frac{2}{3}
$$

is found.
Hence for $\Delta t \leq \frac{1}{2}$, it follows that the method applied to the given system is stable. Note that this conclusion holds for all of the eigenvalues of $A$.
(d) The given method, applied to the system $\underline{y}^{\prime}=A \underline{y}+\underline{f}$, gives

$$
\left\{\begin{aligned}
\underline{k}_{1} & =\Delta t\left(A \underline{w}_{n}+\underline{f}\left(t_{n}\right)\right) \\
\underline{k}_{2} & =\Delta t\left(A\left(\underline{w}_{n}+\underline{k}_{1}\right)+\underline{f}\left(t_{n}+\Delta t\right)\right) \\
\underline{w}_{n+1} & =\underline{w}_{n}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\underline{k}_{1}+\underline{k}_{2}\right)
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

With the initial condition and $\Delta t=\frac{1}{2}$, this gives

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\underline{k}_{1}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
1 / 2 \\
0 \\
0
\end{array}\right] \\
\underline{k}_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
1 / 2 \\
0
\end{array}\right] \\
\underline{w}_{1}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
1 / 4 \\
1 / 4 \\
0
\end{array}\right]
\end{array}\right.
$$

2. (a) Let $y_{j}=y\left(x_{j}\right)$, and let $x_{n}=1$, hence $h=1 / n$, then

$$
\begin{align*}
& y_{j-1}=y\left(x_{j}-h\right)=y_{j}-h y^{\prime}\left(x_{j}\right)+h^{2} / 2 y^{\prime \prime}\left(x_{j}\right)-h^{3} / 3!y^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(x_{j}\right)+O\left(h^{4}\right) ; \\
& y_{j+1}=y\left(x_{j}+h\right)=y_{j}+h y^{\prime}\left(x_{j}\right)+h^{2} / 2 y^{\prime \prime}\left(x_{j}\right)+h^{3} / 3!y^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(x_{j}\right)+O\left(h^{4}\right) \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

From the above expressions, it can be seen that

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime}\left(x_{j}\right)=\frac{y_{j-1}-2 y_{j}+y_{j+1}}{h^{2}}+O\left(h^{2}\right), \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and hence the error is $O\left(h^{2}\right)$. This gives the following discretisation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{-w_{j-1}+2 w_{j}-w_{j+1}}{h^{2}}+w_{j}=2 e^{x_{j}}, \quad \text { for } j=1 \ldots n \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $x_{j}=j h$ and $w_{j} \approx y_{j}$ is the numerical (finite difference) solution neglecting the error.
(b) Furthermore, we use a virtual gridnode near $x=1, x_{n+1}=1+h$, with

$$
\begin{equation*}
0=y^{\prime}(1)=\frac{y_{n+1}-y_{n-1}}{2 h}+O\left(h^{2}\right), \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

hence the error is $O\left(h^{2}\right)$. Neglecting the error, and substitution into the discretisation equation $j=n$, yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{-2 w_{n-1}+2 w_{n}}{h^{2}}+w_{n}=2 e . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

(c) The boundary condition $y(0)=2$ at $x=0$ yields $w_{0}=2$, and the equation for $j=1$ becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{2 w_{1}-w_{2}}{h^{2}}+w_{1}=\frac{2}{h^{2}}+2 e^{h} . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

We get, using $h=1 / 3$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
18 w_{1}-9 w_{2}+w_{1}=18+2 e^{\frac{1}{3}} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $j=2$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
-9 w_{1}+18 w_{2}-9 w_{3}+w_{2}=2 e^{2 / 3} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $j=3=n$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
-18 w_{2}+18 w_{3}+w_{3}=2 e . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence, the system of equations reads

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
19 w_{1}-9 w_{2}=18+2 e^{\frac{1}{3}}  \tag{10}\\
-9 w_{1}+19 w_{2}-9 w_{3}=2 e^{2 / 3} \\
-18 w_{2}+19 w_{3}=2 e
\end{array}\right.
$$

This linear system does not have a symmetric matrix. Division of the third equation by 2 makes the discretisation matrix symmetric:

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
19 w_{1}-9 w_{2}=18+2 e^{\frac{1}{3}}  \tag{11}\\
-9 w_{1}+19 w_{2}-9 w_{3}=2 e^{2 / 3} \\
-9 w_{2}+\frac{19}{2} w_{3}=e
\end{array}\right.
$$

Therefore $A$ and $b$ are given by

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
19 & -9 & 0 \\
-9 & 19 & -9 \\
0 & -9 & \frac{19}{2}
\end{array}\right], \quad \text { and } \quad b=\left[\begin{array}{c}
18+2 e^{\frac{1}{3}} \\
2 e^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
e
\end{array}\right]
$$

3. (a) The Taylor polynomial $P_{1}(x)$ of $f(x)$ around $b$ is given by

$$
P_{1}(x)=f(b)+(x-b) f^{\prime}(b)
$$

whereas the truncation error is:

$$
f(x)-P_{1}(x)=\frac{(x-b)^{2}}{2} f^{\prime \prime}(\xi), \text { with } \xi \in[a, b]
$$

Integrating $P_{1}(x)$ gives:

$$
\int_{a}^{b} P_{1}(x) d x=\int_{a}^{b} f(b)+(x-b) f^{\prime}(b) d x=(b-a) f(b)-\frac{(a-b)^{2}}{2} f^{\prime}(b) .
$$

Suppose that $M_{2}=\max _{\xi \in[a, b]}\left|f^{\prime \prime}(\xi)\right|$. This implies that $\left|f(x)-P_{1}(x)\right| \leq$ $\frac{(x-b)^{2}}{2} M_{2}$. Integrating this formula gives:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\int_{a}^{b} f(x) d x-\left((b-a) f(b)-\frac{(a-b)^{2}}{2} f^{\prime}(b)\right)\right| & \leq \int_{a}^{b}\left|f(x)-P_{1}(x)\right| d x \\
=\int_{a}^{b} \frac{(x-b)^{2}}{2}\left|f^{\prime \prime}(\xi(x))\right| d x & \leq \int_{a}^{b} \frac{(x-b)^{2}}{2} M_{2} d x \\
& =\frac{(b-a)^{3}}{6} M_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

(b) The composite rule $I(h)$ is:

$$
I(h)=h \sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(f\left(x_{j}\right)-\frac{h}{2} f^{\prime}\left(x_{j}\right)\right) .
$$

For $h=\frac{1}{2}, n=2, a=0$ and $b=1$ the composite rule becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
I\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) & =\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{2}\left(f\left(\frac{1}{2} j\right)-\frac{1}{4} f^{\prime}\left(\frac{1}{2} j\right)\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{2}\left(f\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)-\frac{1}{4} f^{\prime}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)+f(1)-\frac{1}{4} f^{\prime}(1)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Using $f(x)=x^{3}$ and $f^{\prime}(x)=3 x^{2}$ gives:

$$
\begin{aligned}
I\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) & =\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{8}-\frac{3}{16}+1-\frac{3}{4}\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{2} \frac{6}{32} \\
& =\frac{3}{32} \\
& =0.09375 .
\end{aligned}
$$

The difference with the exact answer $\int_{0}^{1} x^{3} d x=\frac{1}{4}$ is

$$
\int_{0}^{1} x^{3} d x-I\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)=\frac{1}{4}-\frac{3}{32}=\frac{5}{32}=0.15625 .
$$

(c) For the comparison we provide the following table for the composite methods:

| Aspect | New method | Trapezoidal rule |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of <br> function <br> evaluations | $2 n$ | $n+1$ |
| Truncation <br> error | $\frac{(b-a) h^{2}}{6} M$ | $\frac{(b-a) h^{2}}{12} M$ |
| Rounding <br> errors <br> from | $f$ and $f^{\prime}$ | $f$ |

where $M=\max _{x \in[a, b]}\left|y^{\prime \prime}(x)\right|$.
Comparing the two methods, one can conclude:

- the new method has a worse behaviour with respect to rounding errors, because rounding errors of $f^{\prime}$ also play a role;
- the new method costs $n-1$ function evaluations more than the Trapezoidal rule;
- the truncation error of the new method is two times as large as the truncation error of the Trapezoidal rule.
Conclusion: the new method is worse than the Trapezoidal rule, so the preference should be the Trapezoidal rule.

