

MATH2250 HW4: [2.4]: 4*. [2.5] 4*, 12* [2.6] 4*, 14*. [3.1] 10*, 24*.

[2.4.4]

We modify the MATLAB file to the following:

```
x0 = 0;  
y0 = 1;  
x_end = 1/2;  
N = round((x_end - x0)/h);  
f = @(x,y) x-y;  
y = @(x) 2*exp(-x) + x - 1;  
[xE,yE] = Euler(f,x0,y0,h,N)
```

For $h = .25$, when we run the code, we find:

xE =

0 0.2500000000000000 0.5000000000000000

yE =

1.0000000000000000 0.7500000000000000 0.6250000000000000

Now, we change the stepsize:

$h = 0.1$;

And run the code again:

xE =

0 0.1000000000000000 0.2000000000000000 0.3000000000000000
0.4000000000000000 0.5000000000000000

yE =

```
1.0000000000000000 0.9000000000000000 0.8200000000000000 0.7580000000000000
0.7122000000000000 0.6809800000000000
```

We can add the following line to get the exact value:

```
y(1/2)
```

which prints:

```
ans =
```

```
0.713061319425267
```

From this, we see that clearly the smaller stepsize gets closer to the appropriate endpoint.

[2.5.4] We don't need to change the code much from the previous problem except we now want the improved Euler:

```
x0 = 0;
y0 = 1;
x_end = 1/2;
h=.1;
N = round((x_end - x0)/h);
f = @(x,y) x-y;
y = @(x) 2*exp(-x) + x - 1;
[xH,yH] = Heun(f,x0,y0,h,N)
```

When we run this code, we get:

xH =

```
0 0.1000000000000000 0.2000000000000000 0.3000000000000000
0.4000000000000000 0.5000000000000000
```

yH =

```
1.0000000000000000 0.9100000000000000 0.8380500000000000 0.7824352500000000
0.741603901250000 0.714151530631250
```

We can also add the line to evaluate our true solution at our x values:

y(xH)

which, when we run the code, we get:

ans =

```
1.0000000000000000 0.909674836071919 0.837461506155964 0.781636441363436
0.740640092071279 0.713061319425267
```

[2.5.12]

We first note that we can solve this equation using separation of variables and get:

$$y(x) = (x-4)/(x-2);$$

Thus, we input the appropriate information to MATLAB:

```
x0 = 0;
y0 = 2;
x_end = 1;
h=.01;
hprint = 0.2;
N = round((x_end - x0)/h);
f = @(x,y) 0.5*(y-1).^2;
y = @(x) (x-4)./(x-2);
```

And we only want to print out the values at multiples of 0.2, which we set through "hprint" and adding the lines:

```
Nprint = (hprint/h);
xH(1: Nprint: N+1)
yH(1: Nprint: N+1)
```

We also want the error, so we add:

```
errH = error(yH, y(xH));
errH( 1: Nprint: N+1)
```

When we run this code, we get our x values, our estimates and our error:

ans =

```
0 0.200000000000000 0.400000000000000 0.600000000000000
0.800000000000000 1.000000000000001
```

ans =

```
2.000000000000000 2.111109405511450 2.249995144764673 2.428560562358296
2.666643673934022 2.999950378641234
```

ans =

1.0e-04 *

```
0 0.008079156291342 0.021578823676075 0.044743230548829
0.086222747420206 0.165404529224311
```

Now, we just change h=.005; and rerun the code:

ans =

```
0 0.2000000000000000 0.4000000000000000 0.6000000000000000
0.8000000000000001 1.0000000000000001
```

ans =

```
2.0000000000000000 2.111110683574705 2.249998782737158 2.428568703654960
2.666660898989120 2.999987547105968
```

ans =

```
1.0e-05 *
```

```
0 0.020251724486860 0.054100570759077 0.112202442855768
0.216287908050283 0.415096467791069
```

It's hopefully clear the error is much smaller.

[2.6.4] We make the same adjustments to the code:

```
x0 = 0;
y0 = 1;
h = .1;
x_end = .5;
f = @(x,y) x-y;
y = @(x) 2*exp(-x) + x -1;
[xRK,yRK] = RK(f,x0,y0,h,N)
```

The result of this is:

xRK =

```
0 0.1000000000000000 0.2000000000000000 0.3000000000000000
0.4000000000000000 0.5000000000000000
```

```
yRK =
```

```
1.0000000000000000 0.9096750000000000 0.837461802812500 0.781636844002356
0.740640577834981 0.713061868846760
```

Again, printing out the actual values:

```
y(.25)
```

```
y(.5)
```

```
yields:
```

```
ans =
```

```
0.807601566142810
```

```
ans =
```

```
0.713061319425267
```

[2.6.14] The analytical solution to this problem is $y(x) = 1/(1-\ln(x))$.

We make the modifications to the code:

```
x0 = 1;
```

```
y0 = 1;
```

```
h = .2;
```

```
x_end = 2;
```

```
N = round((x_end - x0)/h);
```

```
f = @(x,y) (y.^2)./x;
y = @(x) 1./(1-log(x));
[xRK,yRK] = RK(f,x0,y0,h,N)
errH = error(yRK, y(xRK))
```

This prints out:

xRK =

```
1.0000000000000000 1.2000000000000000 1.4000000000000000 1.6000000000000000
1.8000000000000000 2.0000000000000000
```

yRK =

```
1.0000000000000000 1.222956630312213 1.507040214072426 1.886666579836635
2.425585598791186 3.257945975145435
```

errH =

```
1.0e-03 *
0 0.014726417798490 0.036977434634832 0.073559863222352
0.141270756894174 0.290091943244311
```

We can change the stepsize to be h=0.1; which prints out

xRK =

Columns 1 through 7

1.000000000000000 1.100000000000000 1.200000000000000 1.300000000000000
1.400000000000000 1.500000000000000 1.600000000000001

Columns 8 through 11

1.700000000000001 1.800000000000001 1.900000000000001 2.000000000000001

yRK =

Columns 1 through 7

1.000000000000000 1.105350676686513 1.222973307490987 1.355680230036072
1.507091839230711 1.681980540462488 1.886795177176907

Columns 8 through 11

2.130491517621662 2.425903117720137 2.792115468058515 3.258821408636764

errH =

1.0e-04 *

Columns 1 through 7

0 0.004950553104641 0.010898482218918 0.018163704610930
0.027227088240970 0.038812119636889 0.054037395903431

Columns 8 through 11

0.074702767105681 0.103852202359298 0.146957568992027 0.214627081998646

[3.1.10]

$$x + 3y + 2z = 2$$

$$2x + 7y + 7z = -1$$

$$2x + 5y + 2z = 7$$

We want to eliminate the x values:

$$x + 3y + 2z = 2$$

$$0x + 1y + 3z = -5$$

$$0x - 1y - 2z = 3$$

Now we want to eliminate the y values:

$$x + 3y + 2z = 2$$

$$0x + 1y + 3z = -5$$

$$0x + 0y + 1z = -2$$

From this, it's immediately clear that $z = -2$, and we can substitute this back into the second equation to find that $y = 1$ and substitute that back into the first equation to find that $x = 3$.

[3.1.24]

It's easy to verify that $y(x) = A \cosh 3x + B \sinh 3x$ is a solution to the differential equation

$$y'' - 9 = 0.$$

To do so, just plug in for y . I will omit the details of this here. The new idea in this problem is to find A, B such that the boundary conditions:

$$y(0) = 5, \quad y'(0) = 12$$

are indeed satisfied.

The first boundary condition says that, when we plug in $x = 0$, we get:

$$y(0) = A \cosh 0 + B \sinh 0 = A = 5,$$

since we know $\cosh 0 = 1$ and $\sinh 0 = 0$. The second condition, we have to take the derivative of our solution:

$$y'(x) = 3A \sinh 3x + 3B \cosh 3x,$$

and we can readily verify the second boundary condition:

$$y'(0) = 3A \sinh 0 + 3B \cosh 0 = 3B = 12 \quad \implies \quad B = 4.$$