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Preface

These lecture notes were prepared by the author for use in the upper division undergraduate course of numerical analysis (a three-quarter sequence) at the University of California at Santa Barbara. They were written with the intent to emphasize the foundations of numerical analysis rather than to present a long list of numerical methods for different mathematical problems.

We begin with an introduction to approximation theory and then use the different ideas of function approximation in the derivation and analysis of many numerical methods.

These notes are intended for undergraduate students with a solid mathematics background. The prerequisites are vector calculus, linear algebra, and an introductory course in analysis. Some rudimentary knowledge of differential equations and complex variables is desirable. It is also very important to have the ability to write simple computer codes to implement the numerical methods as this is an essential part of learning numerical analysis.

These notes are not in finalized form and may contain errors, misprints, and other inaccuracies and/or lack proper bibliographic references. They cannot be used or distributed without written consent from the author.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 What is Numerical Analysis?

This is an introductory course of numerical analysis, which comprises the design, analysis, and implementation of constructive methods and algorithms for the solution of mathematical problems.

Numerical analysis has vast applications both in mathematics and in modern science and technology. In the areas of the physical and life sciences, numerical analysis plays the role of a virtual laboratory by providing accurate solutions to the mathematical models representing a given physical or biological system in which the system’s parameters can be varied at will, in a controlled way. The applications of numerical analysis also extend to more modern areas such as data analysis, web search engines, social networks, and just about anything where computation is involved.

1.2 An Illustrative Example: Approximating a Definite Integral

The purpose of this chapter is to illustrate with one example some of the main principles and objectives of numerical analysis. The example is the calculation of a definite integral:

\[ I[f] = \int_a^b f(x)dx. \]  

(1.1)
In most cases we cannot find an exact value of $I[f]$ and very often we only know the integrand $f$ at a finite number of points in $[a, b]$. The problem is then to produce an approximation to $I[f]$ as accurate as we need and at a reasonable computational cost.

### 1.2.1 An Approximation Principle

One of the central ideas in numerical analysis is to approximate a given function or data by simpler functions which we can analytically evaluate, integrate, differentiate, etc. For example, we can approximate the integrand $f$ in $[a, b]$ by the segment of the straight line, a polynomial of degree at most 1, that passes through $(a, f(a))$ and $(b, f(b))$

$$f(x) \approx p_1(x) = f(a) + \frac{f(b) - f(a)}{b - a}(x - a). \quad (1.2)$$

and approximate the integral of $f$ by the integral of $p_1$, as Fig. 1.1 illustrates,

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx \approx \int_a^b p_1(x)dx = f(a)(b - a) + \frac{1}{2}[f(b) - f(a)](b - a) \quad (1.3)$$

That is

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx \approx \frac{(b - a)}{2}[f(a) + f(b)]. \quad (1.4)$$

The right hand side is known as the simple trapezoidal rule quadrature. A quadrature is a method to approximate an integral. How accurate is this approximation? Clearly, if $f$ is a linear polynomial or a constant, then the trapezoidal rule would give us the exact value of the integral, i.e. it would be exact. The underlying question is: how well does a polynomial of degree at most 1, $p_1$, satisfying

$$p_1(a) = f(a), \quad (1.5)$$

$$p_1(b) = f(b), \quad (1.6)$$

\footnote{There are simple and composite quadratures, as we will see shortly.}
approximate \( f \) on the interval \([a, b]\)? The approximation is exact at \( x = a \) and \( x = b \) because of (1.5)-(1.6) and is exact for all polynomials of degree \( \leq 1 \). In fact, we are going to prove that for \( x \in [a, b] \)

\[
f(x) - p_1(x) = \frac{1}{2} f''(\xi(x))(x - a)(x - b), \tag{1.7}
\]

for some \( \xi(x) \in (a, b) \).

If \( x = a \) or \( x = b \), then (1.7) holds trivially. So let us take \( x \) in \((a, b)\), \( x \neq a, x \neq b \), and define the following function of a new variable \( t \) as

\[
\phi(t) = f(t) - p_1(t) - [f(x) - p_1(x)] \frac{(t-a)(t-b)}{(x-a)(x-b)}. \tag{1.8}
\]

Then \( \phi \), as a function of \( t \), is \( C^2[a, b] \) and \( \phi(a) = \phi(b) = \phi(x) = 0 \). Since \( \phi(a) = \phi(x) = 0 \), by Rolle’s theorem there is \( \xi_1 \in (a, x) \) such that \( \phi'({\xi_1}) = 0 \) and similarly there is \( \xi_2 \in (x, b) \) such that \( \phi'({\xi_2}) = 0 \). Because \( \phi \) is \( C^2[a, b] \) we can apply Rolle’s theorem one more time, observing that \( \phi'({\xi_1}) = \phi'({\xi_2}) = 0 \), to get that there is a point \( \xi(x) \) between \( \xi_1 \) and \( \xi_2 \) such that \( \phi''(\xi(x)) = 0 \). Consequently,

\[
0 = \phi''(\xi(x)) = f''(\xi(x)) - [f(x) - p_1(x)] \frac{2}{(x-a)(x-b)}. \tag{1.9}
\]
and so
\[ f(x) - p_1(x) = \frac{1}{2} f''(\xi(x))(x - a)(x - b), \quad \xi(x) \in (a, b). \] (1.10)

We can now use (1.10) to find the accuracy of the simple trapezoidal rule. Assuming the integrand \( f \) is \( C^2[a,b] \)
\[ \int_a^b f(x)dx = \int_a^b p_1(x)dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b f''(\xi(x))(x - a)(x - b)dx. \] (1.11)

Now, \((x-a)(x-b)\) does not change sign in \([a,b]\) and \(f''\) is continuous so by the weighted mean value theorem for integrals, we have that there is \( \eta \in (a,b) \) such that
\[ \int_a^b f''(\xi(x))(x - a)(x - b)dx = f''(\eta) \int_a^b (x - a)(x - b)dx. \] (1.12)

The last integral can be easily evaluated by shifting to the midpoint, i.e., changing variables to \( x = y + \frac{1}{2}(a + b) \) then
\[ \int_a^b (x - a)(x - b)dx = \int_{\frac{b-a}{2}}^{\frac{b+a}{2}} y^2 - \left( \frac{b-a}{2} \right)^2 \, dy = -\frac{1}{6}(b - a)^3. \] (1.13)

Collecting (1.11) and (1.13) we get
\[ \int_a^b f(x)dx = \frac{(b-a)}{2} [f(a) + f(b)] - \frac{1}{12} f''(\eta)(b - a)^3, \] (1.14)

where \( \eta \) is some point in \((a,b)\). So in the approximation
\[ \int_a^b f(x)dx \approx \frac{(b-a)}{2} [f(a) + f(b)], \]
we make the error
\[ E[f] = -\frac{1}{12} f''(\eta)(b - a)^3. \] (1.15)
1.2. AN ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

1.2.2 Divide and Conquer

The error (1.15) of the simple trapezoidal rule grows cubically with the length of the interval of integration so it is natural to divide \([a, b]\) into smaller subintervals, \([x_0, x_1], [x_1, x_2], \ldots [x_{N-1}, x_N]\), apply the trapezoidal rule on each of them, and sum up the result. Figure 1.2 illustrates the idea for \(N = 5\). Let us take subintervals of equal length \(h = \frac{1}{N}(b - a)\), determined by the points \(x_0 = a, x_1 = x_0 + h, x_2 = x_0 + 2h, \ldots, x_N = x_0 + Nh = b\). Then

\[
\int_a^b f(x)dx = \int_{x_0}^{x_1} f(x)dx + \int_{x_1}^{x_2} f(x)dx + \ldots + \int_{x_{N-1}}^{x_N} f(x)dx
= \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} f(x)dx.
\] (1.16)

But we know

\[
\int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} f(x)dx = \frac{1}{2}[f(x_j) + f(x_{j+1})]h - \frac{1}{12}f''(\xi_j)h^3
\] (1.17)

for some \(\xi_j \in (x_j, x_{j+1})\). Therefore, we get

\[
\int_a^b f(x)dx = h \left[ \frac{1}{2}f(x_0) + f(x_1) + \ldots + f(x_{N-1}) + \frac{1}{2}f(x_N) \right] - \frac{1}{12}h^3 \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f''(\xi_j).
\]
The first term on the right hand side is called the composite trapezoidal rule quadrature:

\[
T_h[f] := h \left[ \frac{1}{2} f(x_0) + f(x_1) + \ldots + f(x_{N-1}) + \frac{1}{2} f(x_N) \right].
\]

(1.18)

Its error is

\[
E_h[f] = -\frac{1}{12} h^3 \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f''(\xi_j) = -\frac{1}{12} (b - a) h^2 \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f''(\xi_j) \right],
\]

(1.19)

where we have used that \( h = (b - a)/N \). The term in brackets is a mean value of \( f'' \) (it is easy to prove that it lies between the maximum and the minimum of \( f'' \)). Since \( f'' \) is assumed continuous (\( f \in C^2[a,b] \)), by the intermediate value theorem there is a point \( \xi \in (a,b) \) such that \( f''(\xi) \) is equal to the quantity in the brackets. Thus, it follows that

\[
E_h[f] = -\frac{1}{12} (b - a) h^2 f''(\xi),
\]

(1.20)

for some \( \xi \in (a,b) \).

### 1.2.3 Convergence and Rate of Convergence

We do not know what the point \( \xi \) is in (1.20). If we knew, the error could be evaluated and we would know the integral exactly, at least in principle, because

\[
I[f] = T_h[f] + E_h[f].
\]

(1.21)

But (1.20) gives us two important properties of the approximation method in question. First, (1.20) tell us that \( E_h[f] \to 0 \) as \( h \to 0 \). That is, the quadrature rule \( T_h[f] \) converges to the exact value of the integral as \( h \to 0 \).\(^2\) Recall \( h = (b - a)/N \), so as we increase \( N \) our approximation to the integral gets better and better. Second, (1.20) tells us how fast the approximation converges, namely quadratically in \( h \). This is the approximation’s rate of convergence. If we double \( N \) (or equivalently halve \( h \)), the error decreases by a factor of 4. We also say that the error is order \( h^2 \) and write \( E_h[f] = O(h^2) \). The Big ‘O’ notation is used frequently in numerical analysis.

\(^2\)Neglecting round-off errors introduced by the computer finite precision representation of numbers and by computer arithmetic.
1.2. AN ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

**Definition 1.1.** We say that $g(h)$ is order $h^\alpha$, and write $g(h) = O(h^\alpha)$, if there is a constant $C$ and $h_0$ such that $|g(h)| \leq Ch^\alpha$ for $0 \leq h \leq h_0$, i.e. for sufficiently small $h$.

**Example 1.1.** Let’s check the composite trapezoidal rule approximation for an integral we can compute exactly. Take $f(x) = e^x$ in $[0,1]$. The exact value of the integral is $e - 1$. The approximation for some values of $N$ is shown in Table 1.1. Observe how the error $|I[f] - T_{1/N}[f]|$ decreases by a factor

| $N$ | $T_{1/N}[f]$ | $|I[f] - T_{1/N}[f]|$ | Decrease factor |
|-----|--------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 16  | 1.718841128579994 | 5.59300120948579 $\times 10^{-4}$ | 0.250012206406039 |
| 32  | 1.718421660316327 | 1.398318572816137 $\times 10^{-4}$ | 0.250003051723810 |
| 64  | 1.718316786850094 | 3.495839104861176 $\times 10^{-5}$ | 0.250000762913303 |
| 128 | 1.718290568083478 | 8.73962443274526 $\times 10^{-6}$ | 0.250000762913303 |

(approximately) $1/4$ as $N$ is doubled, in accordance to (1.20).

### 1.2.4 Error Correction

We can get an upper bound for the error using (1.20) and the fact that $f''$ is bounded in $[a,b]$, i.e. $|f''(x)| \leq M_2$ for all $x \in [a,b]$ for some constant $M_2$. Then

$$|E_h[f]| \leq \frac{1}{12} (b-a)h^2 M_2. \tag{1.22}$$

However, this bound might not be an accurate estimate of the actual error. This can be seen from (1.19). As $N \to \infty$, the term in brackets converges to a mean value of $f''$, i.e.

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f''(\xi_j) \to \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b f''(x)dx = \frac{1}{b-a} [f'(b) - f'(a)], \tag{1.23}$$

as $N \to \infty$, which could be significantly smaller than the maximum of $|f''|$. Take for example $f(x) = \frac{1}{5}x^2 - \sin 2\pi x$ on $[0,1]$. Then, $\max |f''| = 1 + 4\pi^2$, whereas the mean value (1.23) is equal to 1. Thus, (1.22) can overestimate the error significantly.
Equation (1.19) and (1.23) suggest that asymptotically, that is for sufficiently small $h$, 

$$E_h[f] = C_2 h^2 + R(h),$$

where 

$$C_2 = -\frac{1}{12} [f'(b) - f'(a)]$$

and $R(h)$ goes to zero faster than $h^2$ as $h \to 0$, i.e. 

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{R(h)}{h^2} = 0.$$ 

We say that $R(h) = o(h^2)$ (little ‘o’ $h^2$).

**Definition 1.2.** A function $g(h)$ is little ‘o’ $h^\alpha$ if 

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{g(h)}{h^\alpha} = 0$$

and we write $g(h) = o(h^\alpha)$.

We then have 

$$I[f] = T_h[f] + C_2 h^2 + R(h).$$

and, for sufficiently small $h$, $C_2 h^2$ is an approximation of the error. If it is possible and computationally efficient to evaluate the first derivative of $f$ at the end points of the interval then we can compute directly $C_2 h^2$ and use this leading order approximation of the error to obtain the improved approximation 

$$\tilde{T}_h[f] = T_h[f] - \frac{1}{12} [f'(b) - f'(a)] h^2.$$ 

This is called the (composite) modified trapezoidal rule. It then follows from (1.27) that error of this “corrected approximation” is $R(h)$, which goes to zero faster than $h^2$. In fact, we will prove later in Chapter 7 that the error of the modified trapezoidal rule is $O(h^4)$.

Often, we only have access to values of $f$ and/or it is difficult to evaluate $f'(a)$ and $f'(b)$. Fortunately, we can compute a sufficiently good approximation of the leading order term of the error, $C_2 h^2$, so that we can use the same
error correction idea that we did for the modified trapezoidal rule. Roughly speaking, the error can be estimated by comparing two approximations obtained with different \( h \).

Consider (1.27). If we halve \( h \) we get

\[
I[f] = T_{h/2}[f] + \frac{1}{4}C_2h^2 + R(h/2).
\]

Subtracting (1.29) from (1.27) we get

\[
C_2h^2 = \frac{4}{3}(T_{h/2}[f] - T_h[f]) + \frac{4}{3}(R(h/2) - R(h)).
\]

The last term on the right hand side is \( o(h^2) \). Hence, for \( h \) sufficiently small, we have

\[
C_2h^2 \approx \frac{4}{3}(T_{h/2}[f] - T_h[f])
\]

and this could provide a good, computable estimate for the error, i.e.

\[
E_h[f] \approx \frac{4}{3}(T_{h/2}[f] - T_h[f]).
\]

The key here is that \( h \) has to be sufficiently small to make the asymptotic approximation (1.31) valid. We can check this by working backwards. If \( h \) is sufficiently small, then evaluating (1.31) at \( h/2 \) we get

\[
C_2\left(\frac{h}{2}\right)^2 \approx \frac{4}{3}(T_{h/4}[f] - T_{h/2}[f])
\]

and consequently the ratio

\[
q(h) = \frac{T_{h/2}[f] - T_h[f]}{T_{h/4}[f] - T_{h/2}[f]}
\]

should be approximately 4. Thus, \( q(h) \) offers a reliable, computable indicator of whether or not \( h \) is sufficiently small for (1.32) to be an accurate estimate of the error.

We can now use (1.31) and the idea of error correction to improve the accuracy of \( T_h[f] \) with the following approximation

\[
S_h[f] := T_h[f] + \frac{4}{3}(T_{h/2}[f] - T_h[f]) = \frac{4T_{h/2}[f] - T_h[f]}{3}.
\]

\[^3\]The symbol := means equal by definition.
1.2.5 Richardson Extrapolation

We can view the error correction procedure as a way to eliminate the leading order (in \(h\)) contribution to the error. Multiplying (1.29) by 4 and substracting (1.27) to the result we get

\[
I[f] = 4T_{h/2}[f] - T_h[f] + 4R(h/2) - R(h).
\] (1.36)

Note that \(S_h[f]\) is exactly the first term in the right hand side of (1.36) and that the last term converges to zero faster than \(h^2\). This very useful and general procedure in which the leading order component of the asymptotic form of error is eliminated by a combination of two computations performed with two different values of \(h\) is called Richardson’s Extrapolation.

**Example 1.2.** Consider again \(f(x) = e^x\) in \([0, 1]\). With \(h = 1/16\) we get

\[
q\left(\frac{1}{16}\right) = \frac{T_{1/32}[f] - T_{1/16}[f]}{T_{1/64}[f] - T_{1/32}[f]} \approx 3.9998
\] (1.37)

and the improved approximation is

\[
S_{1/16}[f] = \frac{4T_{1/32}[f] - T_{1/16}[f]}{3} = 1.718281837561771,
\] (1.38)

which gives us nearly 8 digits of accuracy (error \(\approx 9.1 \times 10^{-9}\)). \(S_{1/32}\) yields an error \(\approx 5.7 \times 10^{-10}\). It decreased by approximately a factor of 1/16. This would correspond to fourth order rate of convergence. We will see in Chapter 7 that indeed this is the case.

\(S_h[f]\) is superior than \(T_h[f]\) in accuracy but apparently at roughly twice the computational cost. However, if we group together the common terms in \(T_h[f]\) and \(T_{h/2}[f]\) we can compute \(S_h[f]\) at about the same computational cost as that of \(T_{h/2}[f]\):

\[
4T_{h/2}[f] - T_h[f] = 4\frac{h}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} f(a) + \sum_{j=1}^{2N-1} f(a + jh/2) + \frac{1}{2} f(b) \right] - h \left[ \frac{1}{2} f(a) + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} f(a + jh) + \frac{1}{2} f(b) \right] = \frac{h}{2} \left[ f(a) + f(b) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} f(a + kh) + 4 \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} f(a + kh/2) \right].
\]
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Therefore

\[ S_h[f] = \frac{h}{6} \left[ f(a) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} f(a + kh) + 4 \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} f(a + kh/2) + f(b) \right]. \quad (1.39) \]

The resulting quadrature formula \( S_h[f] \) is known as the composite Simpson’s rule and, as we will see in Chapter 7, can be derived by approximating the integrand by polynomials of degree \( \leq 2 \). Thus, based on cost and accuracy, the composite Simpson’s rule would be preferable to the composite trapezoidal rule, with one important exception: periodic smooth integrands integrated over their period (or multiple periods).

**Example 1.3.** Consider the integral

\[ \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{dx}{2 + \sin x}. \quad (1.40) \]

Using complex variables techniques (theory of residues) the exact integral can be computed and it is equal to \( \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \). Note that the integrand is smooth (has an infinite number of continuous derivatives) and periodic in \([0, 2\pi]\). If we use the composite trapezoidal rule to find approximations to this integral we obtain the results shown in Table 1.2.

| \(N\) | \(T_{2\pi/N}[f]\) | \(|I[f] - T_{2\pi/N}[f]|\) |
|-------|----------------|------------------|
| 8     | 3.627791516645356 | 1.927881769203665 \times 10^{-4} |
| 16    | 3.627598733591013 | 5.122577029226250 \times 10^{-9} |
| 32    | 3.627598728468435 | 4.440892098500626 \times 10^{-16} |

The approximations converge amazingly fast. With \(N = 32\), we already reach machine precision (with double precision we get about 16 digits of accuracy).

1.3 Super-Algebraic Convergence of the Composite Trapezoidal Rule for Smooth Periodic Integrands

Integrals of periodic integrands appear in many applications, most notably, in Fourier analysis.
Consider the definite integral

\[ I[f] = \int_0^{2\pi} f(x) \, dx, \]

where the integrand \( f \) is periodic in \([0, 2\pi]\) and has \( m > 1 \) continuous derivatives, i.e. \( f \in C^m[0, 2\pi] \) and \( f(x + 2\pi) = f(x) \) for all \( x \). Due to periodicity we can work in any interval of length \( 2\pi \) and if the function has a different period, with a simple change of variables, we can reduce the problem to one in \([0, 2\pi]\).

Consider the equally spaced points in \([0, 2\pi]\), \( x_j = jh \) for \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, N \) and \( h = 2\pi/N \). Because \( f \) is periodic \( f(x_0 = 0) = f(x_N = 2\pi) \) and the composite trapezoidal rule becomes

\[ T_h[f] = h \left[ \frac{f(x_0)}{2} + f(x_1) + \ldots + f(x_{N-1}) + \frac{f(x_N)}{2} \right] = h \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(x_j). \tag{1.41} \]

Being \( f \) smooth and periodic in \([0, 2\pi]\), it has a uniformly convergent Fourier Series:

\[ f(x) = \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (a_k \cos kx + b_k \sin kx) \tag{1.42} \]

where

\[ a_k = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(x) \cos kx \, dx, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots \tag{1.43} \]

\[ b_k = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(x) \sin kx \, dx, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots \tag{1.44} \]

Using the Euler formula\[4]

\[ e^{ix} = \cos x + i \sin x \tag{1.45} \]

we can write

\[ \cos x = \frac{e^{ix} + e^{-ix}}{2}, \tag{1.46} \]

\[ \sin x = \frac{e^{ix} - e^{-ix}}{2i} \tag{1.47} \]

\[^4i^2 = -1\] and if \( c = a + ib \), with \( a, b \in \mathbb{R} \), then its complex conjugate \( \bar{c} = a - ib \).
and the Fourier series can be conveniently expressed in complex form in terms of functions $e^{ikx}$ for $k = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots$ so that (1.42) becomes

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} c_k e^{ikx},$$  

(1.48)

where

$$c_k = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(x) e^{-ikx} dx.$$  

(1.49)

We are assuming that $f$ is real-valued so the complex Fourier coefficients satisfy $\overline{c_k} = c_{-k}$, where $\overline{c_k}$ is the complex conjugate of $c_k$. We have the relation $2c_0 = a_0$ and $2c_k = a_k - ib_k$ for $k = \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots$, between the complex and real Fourier coefficients.

Using (1.48) in (1.41) we get

$$T_h[f] = h \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} c_k e^{ikx} \right).$$  

(1.50)

Justified by the uniform convergence of the series we can exchange the finite and the infinite sums to get

$$T_h[f] = \frac{2\pi}{N} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} c_k \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} e^{ik \frac{2\pi}{N} j}.$$  

(1.51)

But

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} e^{ik \frac{2\pi}{N} j} = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left( e^{ik \frac{2\pi}{N} } \right)^j.$$  

(1.52)

Note that $e^{ik \frac{2\pi}{N}} = 1$ precisely when $k$ is an integer multiple of $N$, i.e. $k = lN$, $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and if so

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left( e^{ik \frac{2\pi}{N} } \right)^j = N \quad \text{for } k = lN.$$  

(1.53)
Otherwise, if \( k \neq lN \), then
\[
\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left( e^{ik \frac{2\pi}{N}} \right)^j = \frac{1 - \left( e^{ik \frac{2\pi}{N}} \right)^N}{1 - e^{ik \frac{2\pi}{N}}} = 0 \quad \text{for } k \neq lN \tag{1.54}
\]

Using (1.53) and (1.54) we thus get that
\[
T_h[f] = 2\pi \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} c_{lN}. \tag{1.55}
\]

On the other hand
\[
c_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} f(x) dx = \frac{1}{2\pi} I[f]. \tag{1.56}
\]

Therefore
\[
T_h[f] = I[f] + 2\pi \left[ c_N + c_{-N} + c_{2N} + c_{-2N} + \ldots \right], \tag{1.57}
\]

that is
\[
|T_h[f] - I[f]| \leq 2\pi \left[ |c_N| + |c_{-N}| + |c_{2N}| + |c_{-2N}| + \ldots \right]. \tag{1.58}
\]

So now, the relevant question is how fast the Fourier coefficients \( c_{lN} \) of \( f \) decay with \( N \). The answer is tied to the smoothness of \( f \). Doing integration by parts in the formula (1.49) for the Fourier coefficients of \( f \) we have
\[
c_k = \frac{1}{2\pi i k} \left[ \int_{0}^{2\pi} f'(x)e^{-ikx} dx - f(x)e^{-ikx} \bigg|_{0}^{2\pi} \right] \quad k \neq 0 \tag{1.59}
\]
and the last term vanishes due to the periodicity of \( f(x)e^{-ikx} \). Hence,
\[
c_k = \frac{1}{2\pi i k} \int_{0}^{2\pi} f'(x)e^{-ikx} dx \quad k \neq 0. \tag{1.60}
\]

Integrating by parts \( m \) times we obtain
\[
c_k = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left( \frac{1}{ik} \right)^m \int_{0}^{2\pi} f^{(m)}(x)e^{-ikx} dx \quad k \neq 0, \tag{1.61}
\]
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where \( f^{(m)} \) is the \( m \)-th derivative of \( f \). Therefore, for \( f \in C^m[0, 2\pi] \) and periodic

\[
|c_k| \leq \frac{A_m}{|k|^m},
\]

where \( A_m \) is a constant (depending only on \( m \)). Using this in (1.58) we get

\[
|T_h[f] - I[f]| \leq 2\pi A_m \left[ \frac{2}{N^m} + \frac{2}{(2N)^m} + \frac{2}{(3N)^m} + \ldots \right]
= \frac{4\pi A_m}{N^m} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2^m} + \frac{1}{3^m} + \ldots \right],
\]

and so for \( m > 1 \) we can conclude that

\[
|T_h[f] - I[f]| \leq \frac{C_m}{N^m}.
\]

Thus, in this particular case, the rate of convergence of the composite trapezoidal rule at equally spaced points is not fixed (to 2). It depends on the number of derivatives of \( f \) and we say that the accuracy and convergence of the approximation is spectral. Note that if \( f \) is smooth, i.e. \( f \in C^\infty[0, 2\pi] \) and periodic, the composite trapezoidal rule converges to the exact integral at a rate faster than any power of \( 1/N \) (or \( h \))! This is called super-algebraic convergence.
Chapter 2
Function Approximation

We saw in the introductory chapter that one key step in the construction of a numerical method to approximate a definite integral is the approximation of the integrand by a simpler function, which we can integrate exactly.

The problem of function approximation is central to many numerical methods. Given a continuous function \( f \) in an interval \([a, b]\), we would like to find a good approximation to it by functions from a certain class, for example algebraic polynomials, trigonometric polynomials, rational functions, radial functions, splines, neural networks, etc. We are going to measure the accuracy of an approximation using norms and ask whether or not there is a best approximation out of functions from a given family of functions. These are the main topics of this introductory chapter in approximation theory.

2.1 Norms

A norm on a vector space \( V \) over a field \( K \) (\( \mathbb{R} \) or \( \mathbb{C} \) for our purposes) is a mapping
\[
\| \cdot \| : V \to [0, \infty),
\]
which satisfy the following properties:

(i) \( \| x \| \geq 0 \ \forall x \in V \) and \( \| x \| = 0 \) iff \( x = 0 \).

(ii) \( \| x + y \| \leq \| x \| + \| y \| \ \forall x, y \in V \).

(iii) \( \| \lambda x \| = |\lambda| \| x \| \ \forall x \in V, \lambda \in K \).
If we relax (i) to just \( \|x\| \geq 0 \), we get a semi-norm.

We recall first some of the most important examples of norms in the finite dimensional case \( V = \mathbb{R}^n \) (or \( V = \mathbb{C}^n \)):

\[
\|x\|_1 = |x_1| + \ldots + |x_n|, \quad (2.1)
\]

\[
\|x\|_2 = \sqrt{|x_1|^2 + \ldots + |x_n|^2}, \quad (2.2)
\]

\[
\|x\|_\infty = \max\{|x_1|, \ldots, |x_n|\}. \quad (2.3)
\]

These are all special cases of the \( l^p \) norm:

\[
\|x\|_p = (|x_1|^p + \ldots + |x_n|^p)^{1/p}, \quad 1 \leq p \leq \infty. \quad (2.4)
\]

If we have weights \( w_i > 0 \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) we can also define a weighted \( l^p \) norm by

\[
\|x\|_{w,p} = (w_1|x_1|^p + \ldots + w_n|x_n|^p)^{1/p}, \quad 1 \leq p \leq \infty. \quad (2.5)
\]

All norms in a finite dimensional space \( V \) are equivalent, in the sense that for any two norms in \( V \), \( \| \cdot \|_\alpha \) and \( \| \cdot \|_\beta \), there are two constants \( c \) and \( C \) such that

\[
\|x\|_\alpha \leq C\|x\|_\beta, \quad (2.6)
\]

\[
\|x\|_\beta \leq c\|x\|_\alpha, \quad (2.7)
\]

for all \( x \in V \).

If \( V \) is a space of functions defined on an interval \([a, b]\), for example \( C[a, b] \), the corresponding norms to (2.1)-(2.4) are given by

\[
\|u\|_1 = \int_a^b |u(x)|\,dx, \quad (2.8)
\]

\[
\|u\|_2 = \left( \int_a^b |u(x)|^2\,dx \right)^{1/2}, \quad (2.9)
\]

\[
\|u\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in [a,b]} |u(x)|, \quad (2.10)
\]

\[
\|u\|_p = \left( \int_a^b |u(x)|^p\,dx \right)^{1/p}, \quad 1 \leq p \leq \infty \quad (2.11)
\]
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and are called the $L^1$, $L^2$, $L^\infty$, and $L^p$ norms, respectively. Similarly to (2.5) we can defined a weighted $L^p$ norm by

$$
\|u\|_p = \left( \int_a^b w(x)|u(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p}, \quad 1 \leq p \leq \infty,
$$

(2.12)

where $w$ is a given positive weight function defined in $[a,b]$. If $w(x) \geq 0$, we get a semi-norm.

**Lemma 1.** Let $\| \cdot \|$ be a norm on a vector space $V$ then

$$
| \|x\| - \|y\| | \leq \|x - y\|.
$$

(2.13)

This lemma implies that a norm is a continuous function (on $V$ to $\mathbb{R}$).

**Proof.** $\|x\| = \|x - y + y\| \leq \|x - y\| + \|y\|$ which gives that

$$
\|x\| - \|y\| \leq \|x - y\|.
$$

(2.14)

By reversing the roles of $x$ and $y$ we also get

$$
\|y\| - \|x\| \leq \|x - y\|.
$$

(2.15)

\[\square\]

2.2 Uniform Polynomial Approximation

There is a fundamental result in approximation theory: any continuous function can be approximated uniformly, i.e. using the $\| \cdot \|_\infty$ norm, with arbitrary accuracy by a polynomial. This is the celebrated Weierstrass approximation theorem. We are going to present a constructive proof of it due to Sergei Bernstein, which uses a class of polynomials that have found widespread applications in computer graphics and animation. Historically, the use of these so-called Bernstein polynomials in computer assisted design (CAD) was introduced by two engineers working in the French car industry: Pierre Bézier at Renault and Paul de Casteljau at Citroën.
2.2.1 Bernstein Polynomials and Bézier Curves

Given a function \( f \) on \([0,1]\), the Bernstein polynomial of degree \( n \geq 1 \) is defined by

\[
B_n f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} f(k/n) \binom{n}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-k},
\]

where

\[
\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n!}{(n-k)!k!}, \quad k = 0, \ldots, n
\]

are the binomial coefficients. Note that \( B_n f(0) = f(0) \) and \( B_n f(1) = f(1) \) for all \( n \). The terms

\[
b_{k,n}(x) = \binom{n}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-k}, \quad k = 0, \ldots, n,
\]

which are all nonnegative, are called the Bernstein basis polynomials and can be viewed as \( x \)-dependent weights that sum up to one:

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n} b_{k,n}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-k} = [x + (1-x)]^n = 1.
\]

Thus, for each \( x \in [0,1] \), \( B_n f(x) \) represents a weighted average of the values of \( f \) at \( 0, 1/n, 2/n, \ldots, 1 \). Moreover, as \( n \) increases the weights \( b_{k,n}(x) \), for \( 0 < x < 1 \), concentrate more and more around the points \( k/n \) close to \( x \) as Fig. 2.1 indicates for \( b_{k,n}(0.5) \).

For \( n = 1 \), the Bernstein polynomial is just the straight line connecting \( f(0) \) and \( f(1) \), \( B_1 f(x) = (1-x)f(0) + xf(1) \). Given two points \( P_0 \) and \( P_1 \) in the plane or in space, the segment of the straight line connecting them can be written in parametric form as

\[
B_1(t) = (1-t)P_0 + tP_1, \quad t \in [0,1].
\]

With three points, \( P_0, P_1, P_2 \), we can employ the quadratic Bernstein basis polynomials to get a more useful parametric curve

\[
B_2(t) = (1-t)^2P_0 + 2t(1-t)P_1 + t^2P_2, \quad t \in [0,1].
\]
Figure 2.1: The Bernstein basis (weights) $b_{k,n}(x)$ for $x = 0.5$, $n = 16$, 32, and 64. Note how they concentrate more and more around $k/n \approx x$ as $n$ increases.

Figure 2.2: Quadratic Bézier curve.
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Figure 2.3: Example of a composite, quadratic $C^1$ Bézier curve with two pieces.

This curve connects again $P_0$ and $P_2$ but $P_1$ can be used to control how the curve bends. More precisely, the tangents at the end points are $B_2'(0) = 2(P_1 - P_0)$ and $B_2'(1) = 2(P_2 - P_1)$, which intersect at $P_1$, as Fig. 2.2 illustrates. These parametric curves formed with the Bernstein basis polynomials are called Bézier curves and have been widely employed in computer graphics, specially in the design of vector fonts, and in computer animation. A Bezier curve of degree $n \geq 1$ can be written in parametric form as

$$B_n(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} b_{k,n}(t)P_k, \quad t \in [0,1]. \tag{2.22}$$

The points $P_0, P_1, \ldots, P_n$ are called control points. Often, low degree (quadratic or cubic) Bezier curves are pieced together to represent of complex shapes. These composite Bézier curves are broadly used in font generation. For example, the TrueType font of most computers today is generated with composite, quadratic Bézier curves while the Metafont used in these pages, via $\LaTeX$, employs composite, cubic Bézier curves. For each character, many pieces of Bézier curves are stitched together. To have some degree of smoothness ($C^1$), the common point for two pieces of a composite Bézier curve has to lie on the line connecting the two adjacent control points on either side as Fig. 2.3 shows.

Let us now do some algebra to prove some useful identities of the Bern-
stein polynomials. First, for \( f(x) = x \) we have,

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{k}{n} \binom{n}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-k} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{kn!}{n(n-k)!k!} x^k (1-x)^{n-k} \\
= x \sum_{k=1}^{n} \binom{n-1}{k-1} x^{k-1} (1-x)^{n-k} \\
= x^{n-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{n-1}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-1-k} \\
= x [x + (1-x)]^{n-1} = x.
\]

(2.23)

Now for \( f(x) = x^2 \), we get

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n} \left( \frac{k}{n} \right)^2 \binom{n}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-k} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{k}{n} \binom{n-1}{k-1} x^k (1-x)^{n-k} 
\]

(2.24)

and writing

\[
\frac{k}{n} = \frac{k-1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} = \frac{n-1}{n} \frac{k-1}{n-1} + \frac{1}{n},
\]

(2.25)

we have

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n} \left( \frac{k}{n} \right)^2 \binom{n}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-k} = \frac{n-1}{n} \sum_{k=2}^{n} \frac{k-1}{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k-1} x^k (1-x)^{n-k} \\
+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \binom{n-1}{k-1} x^k (1-x)^{n-k} \\
= \frac{n-1}{n} \sum_{k=2}^{n} \binom{n-2}{k-2} x^k (1-x)^{n-2-k} + \frac{x}{n} \\
= \frac{n-1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \binom{n-2}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-2-k} + \frac{x}{n}.
\]

Thus,

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n} \left( \frac{k}{n} \right)^2 \binom{n}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-k} = \frac{n-1}{n} x^2 + \frac{x}{n}.
\]

(2.26)
Now, expanding \((\frac{k}{n} - x)^2\) and using (2.19), (2.23), and (2.26) it follows that
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n} \left(\frac{k}{n} - x\right)^2 \binom{n}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-k} = \frac{1}{n} x(1-x). \tag{2.27}
\]

### 2.2.2 Weierstrass Approximation Theorem

**Theorem 2.1.** (Weierstrass Approximation Theorem) Let \(f\) be a continuous function in \([a,b]\). Given \(\epsilon > 0\) there is a polynomial \(p\) such that
\[
\max_{a \leq x \leq b} |f(x) - p(x)| < \epsilon.
\]

**Proof.** We are going to work on the interval \([0,1]\). For a general interval \([a,b]\), we consider the change of variables \(x = a + (b-a)t\) for \(t \in [0,1]\) so that \(F(t) = f(a + (b-a)t)\) is continuous in \([0,1]\).

Using (2.19), we have
\[
f(x) - B_nf(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left[ f(x) - f\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) \right] \binom{n}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-k}. \tag{2.28}
\]

Since \(f\) is continuous in \([0,1]\), it is also uniformly continuous. Thus, given \(\epsilon > 0\) there is \(\delta(\epsilon) > 0\), independent of \(x\), such that
\[
|f(x) - f(k/n)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ if } |x - k/n| < \delta. \tag{2.29}
\]

Moreover,
\[
|f(x) - f(k/n)| \leq 2\|f\|_{\infty} \text{ for all } x \in [0,1], k = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \tag{2.30}
\]

We now split the sum in (2.28) in two sums, one over the points such that \(|k/n - x| < \delta\) and the other over the points such that \(|k/n - x| \geq \delta\):
\[
f(x) - B_nf(x) = \sum_{|k/n - x| < \delta} \left[ f(x) - f\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) \right] \binom{n}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-k} + \sum_{|k/n - x| \geq \delta} \left[ f(x) - f\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) \right] \binom{n}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-k}. \tag{2.31}
\]
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Using (2.29) and (2.19) it follows immediately that the first sum is bounded by $\epsilon/2$. For the second sum we have

$$
\sum_{|k/n - x| \geq \delta} \left| f(x) - f \left( \frac{k}{n} \right) \right| \binom{n}{k} x^k (1 - x)^{n-k} \leq 2\|f\|_\infty \sum_{|k/n - x| \geq \delta} \binom{n}{k} x^k (1 - x)^{n-k} \\
\leq \frac{2\|f\|_\infty}{\delta^2} \sum_{|k/n - x| \geq \delta} \left( \frac{k}{n} - x \right)^2 \binom{n}{k} x^k (1 - x)^{n-k} \tag{2.32}
$$

Therefore, there is $N$ such that for all $n \geq N$ the second sum in (2.31) is bounded by $\epsilon/2$ and this completes the proof.

Figure 2.4 shows approximations of $f(x) = \sin(2\pi x)$ by Bernstein polynomials of degree $n = 10, 20, 40$. Observe that $\|f - B_n f\|_\infty$ decreases by roughly one half as $n$ is doubled, suggesting a slow $O(1/n)$ convergence even for this smooth function.

2.3 Best Approximation

We just saw that any continuous function $f$ on a closed interval can be approximated uniformly with arbitrary accuracy by a polynomial. Ideally, we would like to find the closest polynomial, say of degree at most $n$, to the function $f$ when the distance is measured in the supremum (infinity) norm, or in any other norm we choose. There are three important elements in this general problem: the space of functions we want to approximate, the norm, and the family of approximating functions. The following definition makes this more precise.

**Definition 2.1.** Given a normed, vector space $V$ and a subspace $W$ of $V$, $p^* \in W$ is called a best approximation of $f \in V$ by elements in $W$ if

$$
\|f - p^*\| \leq \|f - p\|, \quad \text{for all } p \in W. \tag{2.33}
$$
For example, the normed, vector space $V$ could be $C[a,b]$ with the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_{\sup}$ and $W$ could be the set of all polynomials of degree at most $n$, which henceforth we will denote by $\mathbb{P}_n$.

**Theorem 2.2.** Let $W$ be a finite-dimensional subspace of a normed, vector space $V$. Then, for every $f \in V$, there is at least one best approximation to $f$ by elements in $W$.

**Proof.** Since $W$ is a subspace $0 \in W$ and for any candidate $p \in W$ for best approximation to $f$ we must have

$$\|f - p\| \leq \|f - 0\| = \|f\|. \quad (2.34)$$

Therefore we can restrict our search to the set

$$F = \{p \in W : \|f - p\| \leq \|f\|\}. \quad (2.35)$$

$F$ is closed and bounded and because $W$ is finite-dimensional it follows that $F$ is compact. Now, the function $p \mapsto \|f - p\|$ is continuous on this compact set and hence it attains its minimum in $F$. \qed
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If we remove the finite-dimensionality of \( W \) then we cannot guarantee that there is a best approximation as the following example shows.

**Example 2.1.** Let \( V = C[0,1/2] \) and \( W \) be the space of all polynomials (clearly a subspace of \( V \)). Take \( f(x) = 1/(1-x) \) for \( x \in [0,1/2] \) and note that

\[
\frac{1}{1-x} - (1 + x + x^2 + \ldots + x^N) = \frac{x^{N+1}}{1-x}.
\]  

(2.36)

Therefore, given \( \epsilon > 0 \) there is \( N \) such that

\[
\max_{x\in[0,1/2]} \left| \frac{1}{1-x} - (1 + x + x^2 + \ldots + x^N) \right| = \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^N < \epsilon.
\]  

(2.37)

Thus, if there is a best approximation \( p^* \) in the supremum norm, necessarily \( \|f - p^*\|_\infty = 0 \), which implies

\[
p^*(x) = \frac{1}{1-x}
\]  

(2.38)

This is of course impossible since \( p \) is a polynomial.

Theorem 2.2 does not guarantee uniqueness of best approximation. Strict convexity of the norm gives us a sufficient condition.

**Definition 2.2.** A norm \( \| \cdot \| \) on a vector space \( V \) is strictly convex if for all \( f \neq g \) in \( V \) with \( \|f\| = \|g\| = 1 \) then

\[
\|\theta f + (1-\theta)g\| < 1, \quad \text{for all } 0 < \theta < 1.
\]

In other words, a norm is strictly convex if its unit ball is strictly convex.

Note the use of the strict inequality \( \|\theta f + (1-\theta)g\| < 1 \) in the definition. The \( p \)-norm is strictly convex for \( 1 < p < \infty \) but not for \( p = 1 \) or \( p = \infty \).

**Theorem 2.3.** Let \( V \) be a vector space with a strictly convex norm, \( W \) a subspace of \( V \), and \( f \in V \). If \( p^* \) and \( q^* \) are best approximations of \( f \) in \( W \) then \( p^* = q^* \).
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Proof. Let \( M = \| f - p^* \| = \| f - q^* \| \). If \( p^* \neq q^* \), by the strict convexity of the norm

\[
\left\| \theta \left( \frac{f - p^*}{M} \right) + (1 - \theta) \left( \frac{f - q^*}{M} \right) \right\| < 1, \quad \text{for all } 0 < \theta < 1. \tag{2.39}
\]

That is,

\[
\| \theta(f - p^*) + (1 - \theta)(f - q^*) \| < M, \quad \text{for all } 0 < \theta < 1. \tag{2.40}
\]

Taking \( \theta = 1/2 \) we get

\[
\| f - \frac{1}{2}(p^* + q^*) \| < M, \tag{2.41}
\]

which is impossible because \( \frac{1}{2}(p^* + q^*) \) is in \( W \) and cannot be a better approximation. \( \square \)

2.3.1 Best Uniform Polynomial Approximation

Given a continuous function \( f \) on an interval \([a, b]\) we know there is at least one best approximation \( p_n^* \) to \( f \), in any given norm, by polynomials of degree at most \( n \) because the dimension of \( \mathbb{P}_n \) is finite. The norm \( \| \cdot \|_\infty \) is not strictly convex so Theorem 2.3 does not apply. However, due to a special property (called the Haar property) of the vector space \( \mathbb{P}_n \), which is that the only element of \( \mathbb{P}_n \) that has more than \( n \) roots is the zero element, we will see that the best uniform approximation out of \( \mathbb{P}_n \) is unique and is characterized by a very peculiar property. Specifically, the error function

\[
e_n(x) = f(x) - p_n^*(x), \quad x \in [a, b], \tag{2.42}
\]

has to equioscillate at least \( n+2 \) points, between \( \| e_n \|_\infty \) and \( -\| e_n \|_\infty \). That is, there are \( k \) points, \( x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k \), with \( k \geq n + 2 \), such that

\[
\begin{align*}
e_n(x_1) &= \pm \| e_n \|_\infty, \\
e_n(x_2) &= -e_n(x_1), \\
e_n(x_3) &= -e_n(x_2), \\
& \vdots \\
e_n(x_k) &= -e_n(x_{k-1}). \tag{2.43}
\end{align*}
\]
2.3. **BEST APPROXIMATION**

For if not, it would be possible to find a polynomial of degree at most \( n \), with the same sign at the extremal points of \( e_n \) (at most \( n \) sign changes), and use this polynomial to decrease the value of \( \|e_n\|_{\infty} \). This would contradict the fact that \( p^*_n \) is a best approximation. This is easy to see for \( n = 0 \) as it is impossible to find a polynomial of degree 0 (a constant) with one change of sign. This is the content of the next result.

**Theorem 2.4.** The error \( e_n = f - p^*_n \) has at least two extremal points, \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \), in \([a, b]\) such that \( |e_n(x_1)| = |e_n(x_2)| = \|e_n\|_{\infty} \) and \( e_n(x_1) = -e_n(x_2) \) for all \( n \geq 0 \).

**Proof.** The continuous function \( |e_n(x)| \) attains its maximum \( \|e_n\|_{\infty} \) in at least one point \( x_1 \) in \([a, b]\). Suppose \( \|e_n\|_{\infty} = e_n(x_1) \) and that \( e_n(x) > -\|e_n\|_{\infty} \) for all \( x \in [a, b] \). Then, \( m = \min_{x\in[a,b]} e_n(x) > -\|e_n\|_{\infty} \) and we have some room to decrease \( \|e_n\|_{\infty} \) by shifting down \( e_n \) a suitable amount \( c \). In particular, if take \( c \) as one half the gap between the minimum \( m \) of \( e_n \) and \( -\|e_n\|_{\infty} \),

\[
c = \frac{1}{2} (m + \|e_n\|_{\infty}) > 0, \tag{2.44}
\]

and subtract it to \( e_n \), as shown in Fig. 2.5, we have

\[
-\|e_n\|_{\infty} + c \leq e_n(x) - c \leq \|e_n\|_{\infty} - c. \tag{2.45}
\]

Therefore, \( \|e_n - c\|_{\infty} = \|f - (p^*_n + c)\|_{\infty} = \|e_n\|_{\infty} - c < \|e_n\|_{\infty} \) but \( p^*_n + c \in \mathbb{P}_n \) so this is impossible since \( p^*_n \) is a best approximation. A similar argument can used when \( e_n(x_1) = -\|e_n\|_{\infty} \).

Before proceeding to the general case, let us look at the \( n = 1 \) situation. Suppose there are only two alternating extremal points \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) for \( e_1 \) as described in (2.43). We are going to construct a linear polynomial that has the same sign as \( e_1 \) at \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) and which can be used to decrease \( \|e_1\|_{\infty} \). Suppose \( e_1(x_1) = \|e_1\|_{\infty} \) and \( e_1(x_2) = -\|e_1\|_{\infty} \). Since \( e_1 \) is continuous, we can find small closed intervals \( I_1 \) and \( I_2 \), containing \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \), respectively, and such that

\[
e_1(x) > \frac{\|e_1\|_{\infty}}{2} \quad \text{for all } x \in I_1, \tag{2.46}
\]

\[
e_1(x) < -\frac{\|e_1\|_{\infty}}{2} \quad \text{for all } x \in I_2. \tag{2.47}
\]
Figure 2.5: If the error function $e_n$ does not equioscillate at least twice we could lower $\|e_n\|_\infty$ by an amount $c > 0$.

Figure 2.6: If $e_1$ equioscillates only twice, it would be possible to find a polynomial $q \in \mathbb{P}_1$ with the same sign around $x_1$ and $x_2$ as that of $e_1$ and, after a suitable scaling, use it to decrease the error.
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Since $I_1$ and $I_2$ are disjoint sets, we can choose a point $x_0$ between the two intervals. Then, it is possible to find $q \in \mathbb{P}_1$ that passes through $x_0$ and that is positive in $I_1$ and negative in $I_2$ as Fig. 2.6 depicts. We are now going to pick a suitable constant $\alpha > 0$ such that $\|f - p^*_1 - \alpha q\|_\infty < \|e_1\|_\infty$. Since $p^*_1 + \alpha q \in \mathbb{P}_1$ this would be a contradiction to the fact that $p^*_1$ is a best approximation.

Let $R = [a, b] \setminus (I_1 \cup I_2)$ and $d = \max_{x \in R} |e_1(x)|$. Clearly $d < \|e_1\|_\infty$. Choose $\alpha$ such that

$$0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2\|q\|_\infty} (\|e_1\|_\infty - d).$$

(2.48)

On $I_1$, we have

$$0 < \alpha q(x) < \frac{1}{2\|q\|_\infty} (\|e_1\|_\infty - d) q(x) \leq \frac{1}{2} (\|e_1\|_\infty - d) < e_1(x).$$

(2.49)

Therefore

$$|e_1(x) - \alpha q(x)| = e_1(x) - \alpha q(x) < \|e_1\|_\infty, \quad \text{for all } x \in I_1.$$  

(2.50)

Similarly, on $I_2$, we can show that $|e_1(x) - \alpha q(x)| < \|e_1\|_\infty$. Finally, on $R$ we have

$$|e_1(x) - \alpha q(x)| \leq |e_1(x)| + |\alpha q(x)| \leq d + \frac{1}{2} (\|e_1\|_\infty - d) < \|e_1\|_\infty.$$  

(2.51)

Therefore, $\|e_1 - \alpha q\|_\infty = \|f - (p^*_1 + \alpha q)\|_\infty < \|e_1\|_\infty$, which contradicts the best approximation assumption on $p^*_1$.

Theorem 2.5. (Chebyshev Equioscillation Theorem) Let $f \in C[a, b]$. Then, $p^*_n$ in $\mathbb{P}_n$ is a best uniform approximation of $f$ if and only if there are at least $n + 2$ points in $[a, b]$, where the error $e_n = f - p^*_n$ equioscillates between the values $\pm \|e_n\|_\infty$ as defined in (2.43).

Proof. We first prove that if the error $e_n = f - p^*_n$, for some $p^*_n \in \mathbb{P}_n$, equioscillates at least $n + 2$ times then $p^*_n$ is a best approximation. Suppose the contrary. Then, there is $q_n \in \mathbb{P}_n$ such that

$$\|f - q_n\|_\infty < \|f - p^*_n\|_\infty.$$  

(2.52)
Let \( x_1, \ldots, x_k \), with \( k \geq n + 2 \), be the points where \( e_n \) equioscillates. Then
\[
|f(x_j) - q_n(x_j)| < |f(x_j) - p_n^*(x_j)|, \quad j = 1, \ldots, k
\] (2.53)
and since
\[
f(x_j) - p_n^*(x_j) = -[f(x_{j+1}) - p_n^*(x_{j+1})], \quad j = 1, \ldots, k - 1
\] (2.54)
we have that
\[
q_n(x_j) - p_n^*(x_j) = f(x_j) - p_n^*(x_j) - [f(x_j) - q_n(x_j)]
\] (2.55)
changes signs \( k - 1 \) times, i.e. at least \( n + 1 \) times. But \( q_n - p_n^* \in \mathbb{P}_n \).
Therefore \( q_n = p_n^* \), which contradicts (2.52), and consequently \( p_n^* \) has to be a best uniform approximation of \( f \).

For the other half of the proof the idea is the same as for \( n = 1 \) but we need to do more bookkeeping. We are going to partition \([a, b]\) into the union of sufficiently small subintervals so that we can guarantee that \(|e_n(t) - e_n(s)| \leq \|e_n\|_\infty/2\) for any two points \( t \) and \( s \) in each of the subintervals. Let us label by \( I_1, \ldots, I_k \), the subintervals on which \(|e_n(x)|\) achieves its maximum \( \|e_n\|_\infty \).
Then, on each of these subintervals either \( e_n(x) > \|e_n\|_\infty/2 \) or \( e_n(x) < -\|e_n\|_\infty/2 \). We need to prove that \( e_n \) changes sign at least \( n + 1 \) times.

Going from left to right, we can label the subintervals \( I_1, \ldots, I_k \) as a (+) or \((-) \) subinterval depending on the sign of \( e_n \). For definiteness, suppose \( I_1 \) is a (+) subinterval then we have the groups
\[
\{I_1, \ldots, I_{k_1}\}, \quad (+)
\{I_{k_1+1}, \ldots, I_{k_2}\}, \quad (-)
\vdots
\{I_{k_m+1}, \ldots, I_k\}, \quad (-)^m.
\]
We have \( m \) changes of sign so let us assume that \( m \leq n \). We already know \( m \geq 1 \). Since the sets, \( I_{k_j} \) and \( I_{k_{j+1}} \) are disjoint for \( j = 1, \ldots, m \), we can select points \( t_1, \ldots, t_m \), such that \( t_j > x \) for all \( x \in I_{k_j} \) and \( t_j < x \) for all \( x \in I_{k_{j+1}} \). Then, the polynomial
\[
q(x) = (t_1 - x)(t_2 - x) \cdots (t_m - x)
\] (2.56)
has the same sign as \( e_n \) in each of the extremal intervals \( I_1, \ldots, I_k \) and \( q \in \mathbb{P}_n \).
The rest of the proof is as in the \( n = 1 \) case to show that \( p_n^* + \alpha q \) would be a better approximation to \( f \) than \( p_n^* \).
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Theorem 2.6. Let \( f \in C[a,b] \). The best uniform approximation \( p_n^* \) to \( f \) by elements of \( P_n \) is unique.

Proof. Suppose \( q_n^* \) is also a best approximation, i.e.

\[
\|e_n\|_\infty = \|f - p_n^*\|_\infty = \|f - q_n^*\|_\infty.
\]

Then, the midpoint \( r = \frac{1}{2}(p_n^* + q_n^*) \) is also a best approximation, for \( r \in P_n \) and

\[
\|f - r\|_\infty = \frac{1}{2}\|f - p_n^*\|_\infty + \frac{1}{2}\|f - q_n^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2}\|f - p_n^*\|_\infty + \frac{1}{2}\|f - q_n^*\|_\infty = \|e_n\|_\infty.
\]

Let \( x_1, \ldots, x_{n+2} \) be extremal points of \( f - r \) with the alternating property (2.43), i.e. \( f(x_j) - r(x_j) = (-1)^{m+j}\|e_n\|_\infty \) for some integer \( m \) and \( j = 1, \ldots, n+2 \). This implies that

\[
\frac{f(x_j) - p_n^*(x_j)}{2} + \frac{f(x_j) - q_n^*(x_j)}{2} = (-1)^{m+j}\|e_n\|_\infty, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n+2.
\]

(2.58)

But \( |f(x_j) - p_n^*(x_j)| \leq \|e_n\|_\infty \) and \( |f(x_j) - q_n^*(x_j)| \leq \|e_n\|_\infty \). As a consequence,

\[
f(x_j) - p_n^*(x_j) = f(x_j) - q_n^*(x_j) = (-1)^{m+j}\|e_n\|_\infty, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n+2,
\]

(2.59)

and it follows that

\[
p_n^*(x_j) = q_n^*(x_j), \quad j = 1, \ldots, n+2
\]

(2.60)

Therefore, \( q_n^* = p_n^* \).

\[\square\]

2.4 Chebyshev Polynomials

The best uniform approximation of \( f(x) = x^{n+1} \) in \([-1, 1]\) by polynomials of degree at most \( n \) can be found explicitly and the solution introduces one of the most useful and remarkable polynomials, the Chebyshev polynomials.
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Let \( p_n^* \in \mathbb{P}_n \) be the best uniform approximation to \( x^{n+1} \) in the interval \([-1, 1]\) and as before define the error function as \( e_n(x) = x^{n+1} - p_n^*(x) \). Note that since \( e_n \) is a monic polynomial (its leading coefficient is 1) of degree \( n + 1 \), the problem of finding \( p_n^* \) is equivalent to finding, among all monic polynomials of degree \( n + 1 \), the one with the smallest deviation (in absolute value) from zero.

According to Theorem 2.5 there exist \( n + 2 \) distinct points,

\[-1 \leq x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_{n+2} \leq 1,
\]

such that

\[e_n^2(x_j) = \|e_n\|_\infty^2, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, n + 2.\]

Now consider the polynomial

\[q(x) = \|e_n\|_\infty^2 - e_n^2(x).\]

Then, \( q(x_j) = 0 \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, n+2 \). Each of points \( x_j \) in the interior of \([-1, 1]\) is also a local minimum of \( q \), then necessarily \( q'(x_j) = 0 \) for \( j = 2, \ldots n + 1 \). Thus, the \( n \) points \( x_2, \ldots, x_{n+1} \) are zeros of \( q \) of multiplicity at least two. But \( q \) is a nonzero polynomial of degree \( 2n + 2 \) exactly. Therefore, \( x_1 \) and \( x_{n+2} \) have to be simple zeros and so \( x_1 = -1 \) and \( x_{n+2} = 1 \). Note that the polynomial \( p(x) = (1 - x^2)[e'_n(x)]^2 \in \mathbb{P}_{2n+2} \) has the same zeros as \( q \) and so \( p = cq \), for some constant \( c \). Comparing the coefficient of the leading order term of \( p \) and \( q \) it follows that \( c = (n + 1)^2 \). Therefore, \( e_n \) satisfies the ordinary differential equation

\[(1 - x^2)[e'_n(x)]^2 = (n + 1)^2 \left[ \|e_n\|_\infty^2 - e_n^2(x) \right].\]

We know \( e'_n \in \mathbb{P}_n \) and its \( n \) zeros are the interior points \( x_2, \ldots, x_{n+1} \). Therefore, \( e'_n \) cannot change sign in \([-1, x_2]\). Suppose it is nonnegative for \( x \in [-1, x_2] \) (we reach the same conclusion if we assume \( e'_n(x) \leq 0 \)) then, taking square roots in (2.64) we get

\[
\frac{e'_n(x)}{\sqrt{\|e_n\|_\infty^2 - e_n^2(x)}} = \frac{n + 1}{\sqrt{1 - x^2}}, \quad \text{for } x \in [-1, x_2].
\]

We can integrate this ordinary differential equation using the trigonometric substitutions \( e_n(x) = \|e_n\|_\infty \cos \phi \) and \( x = \cos \theta \), for the left and the right
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hand side respectively, to obtain

\[- \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{e_n(x)}{\|e_n\|_{\infty}} \right) = -(n + 1)\theta + C, \tag{2.66} \]

where \(C\) is a constant of integration. Choosing \(C = 0\) (so that \(e_n(1) = \|e_n\|_{\infty}\)) we get

\[e_n(x) = \|e_n\|_{\infty} \cos [(n + 1)\theta] \tag{2.67}\]

for \(x = \cos \theta \in [-1, x_2]\) with \(0 < \theta \leq \pi\). Recall that \(e_n\) is a polynomial of degree \(n + 1\) then so is \(\cos[(n + 1)\cos^{-1} x]\). Since these two polynomials agree in \([-1, x_2]\), (2.66) must also hold for all \(x\) in \([-1, 1]\).

**Definition 2.3.** The Chebyshev polynomial (of the first kind) of degree \(n\), \(T_n\) is defined by

\[T_n(x) = \cos n\theta, \quad x = \cos \theta, \quad 0 \leq \theta \leq \pi. \tag{2.68}\]

Note that (2.68) only defines \(T_n\) for \(x \in [-1, 1]\). However, once the coefficients of this polynomial are determined we can define it for any real (or complex) \(x\).

Using the trigonometry identity

\[\cos(n + 1)\theta + \cos(n - 1)\theta = 2 \cos n\theta \cos \theta, \tag{2.69}\]

we immediately get

\[T_{n+1}(\cos \theta) + T_{n-1}(\cos \theta) = 2T_n(\cos \theta) \cdot \cos \theta \tag{2.70}\]

and going back to the \(x\) variable we obtain the recursion formula

\[T_0(x) = 1, \quad T_1(x) = x, \tag{2.71}\]

\[T_{n+1}(x) = 2xT_n(x) - T_{n-1}(x), \quad n \geq 1,\]

which makes it more evident the \(T_n\) for \(n = 0, 1, \ldots\) are indeed polynomials of exactly degree \(n\). Let us generate a few of them.

\[T_0(x) = 1, \]
\[T_1(x) = x, \]
\[T_2(x) = 2x \cdot x - 1 = 2x^2 - 1, \]
\[T_3(x) = 2x \cdot (2x^2 - 1) - x = 4x^3 - 3x, \tag{2.72}\]
\[T_4(x) = 2x(4x^3 - 3x) - (2x^2 - 1) = 8x^4 - 8x^2 + 1 \]
\[T_5(x) = 2x(8x^4 - 8x^2 + 1) - (4x^3 - 3x) = 16x^5 - 20x^3 + 5x. \]
From these few Chebyshev polynomials, and from (2.71), we see that
\[ T_n(x) = 2^{n-1}x^n + \text{lower order terms} \] (2.73)
and that \( T_n \) is an even (odd) function of \( x \) if \( n \) is even (odd), i.e.
\[ T_n(-x) = (-1)^n T_n(x). \] (2.74)

The Chebyshev polynomials \( T_n \), for \( n = 1, 2, \ldots, 6 \) are plotted in Fig. 2.7.

Going back to (2.66), since the leading order coefficient of \( e_n \) is 1 and that of \( T_{n+1} \) is \( 2^n \), it follows that \( \|e_n\|_\infty = 2^{-n} \). Therefore
\[ p^*_n(x) = x^{n+1} - \frac{1}{2^n} T_{n+1}(x) \] (2.75)
is the best uniform approximation of \( x^{n+1} \) in \([-1, 1]\) by polynomials of degree at most \( n \). Equivalently, as noted in the beginning of this section, the monic polynomial of degree \( n \) with smallest supremum norm in \([-1, 1]\) is
\[ \tilde{T}_n(x) = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} T_n(x). \] (2.76)
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The zeros and extremal points of \( T_n \) are easy to find. Because \( T_n(x) = \cos n\theta \) and \( 0 \leq \theta \leq \pi \), the zeros occur when \( \theta \) is an odd multiple of \( \pi/2 \). Therefore,

\[
\bar{x}_j = \cos \left( \frac{(2j + 1) \pi}{n} \right) \quad j = 0, \ldots, n - 1
\]

(2.78)

are the zeros of \( T_n \).

The extremal points of \( T_n \) (the points \( x \) where \( T_n(x) = \pm 1 \)) correspond to \( n\theta = j\pi \) for \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, n \), that is

\[
x_j = \cos \left( \frac{j\pi}{n} \right), \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n.
\]

(2.79)

These points are called Chebyshev, Chebyshev-Lobatto, or Gauss-Lobatto points and are extremely useful in applications. We will simply call them Chebyshev points or nodes. Figure 2.8 shows the Chebyshev nodes for \( n = 16 \). Note that they are more clustered at the end points of the interval. Note
that \( x_j \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \) are local extremal points. Therefore

\[
T'_n(x_j) = 0, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, n - 1.
\]  

(2.80)

In other words, the Chebyshev points \( (2.79) \) are the \( n - 1 \) zeros of \( T'_n \) plus the end points \( x_0 = 1 \) and \( x_n = -1 \).

Using the Chain Rule we can differentiate \( T_n \) with respect to \( x \) we get

\[
T'_n(x) = -n \sin n\theta \frac{d\theta}{dx} = n \frac{\sin n\theta}{\sin \theta}, \quad (x = \cos \theta).
\]  

(2.81)

Therefore

\[
\frac{T'_{n+1}(x)}{n + 1} - \frac{T'_{n-1}(x)}{n - 1} = \frac{1}{\sin \theta} [\sin(n + 1)\theta - \sin(n - 1)\theta]
\]  

(2.82)

and since \( \sin(n + 1)\theta - \sin(n - 1)\theta = 2 \sin \theta \cos n\theta \), we get that

\[
\frac{T'_{n+1}(x)}{n + 1} - \frac{T'_{n-1}(x)}{n - 1} = 2T_n(x).
\]  

(2.83)

The polynomial

\[
U_n(x) = \frac{T'_n(x)}{n + 1} = \frac{\sin(n + 1)\theta}{\sin \theta}, \quad (x = \cos \theta)
\]  

(2.84)

of degree \( n \) is called the Chebyshev polynomial of second kind. Thus, the Chebyshev nodes \( (2.79) \) are the zeros of the polynomial

\[
q_{n+1}(x) = (1 - x^2)U_{n-1}(x).
\]  

(2.85)
Chapter 3

Interpolation

3.1 Polynomial Interpolation

One of the basic tools for approximating a function or a given data set is interpolation. In this chapter we focus on polynomial and piece-wise polynomial interpolation.

The polynomial interpolation problem can be stated as follows: Given \( n + 1 \) data points, \((x_0, f_0), (x_1, f_1), \ldots, (x_n, f_n)\), where \( x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n \) are distinct, find a polynomial \( p_n \in \mathbb{P}_n \), which satisfies the interpolation property:

\[
\begin{align*}
p_n(x_0) &= f_0, \\
p_n(x_1) &= f_1, \\
&\quad \vdots \\
p_n(x_n) &= f_n.
\end{align*}
\]

The points \( x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n \) are called interpolation nodes and the values \( f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n \) are data supplied to us or can come from a function \( f \) we are trying to approximate, in which case \( f_j = f(x_j) \) for \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, n \). Figure 3.1 illustrates the interpolation problem for \( n = 6 \).

Let us represent such polynomial as \( p_n(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + \cdots + a_n x^n \). Then, the interpolation property implies

\[
\begin{align*}
a_0 + a_1 x_0 + \cdots + a_n x_0^n &= f_0, \\
a_0 + a_1 x_1 + \cdots + a_n x_1^n &= f_1, \\
&\quad \vdots
\end{align*}
\]
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Figure 3.1: Given the data points \((x_0, f_0), \ldots, (x_n, f_n)\) (\(\bullet\), \(n = 6\)), the polynomial interpolation problem consists in finding a polynomial \(p_n \in \mathbb{P}_n\) such that \(p_n(x_j) = f_j\), for \(j = 0, 1, \ldots, n\).

\[
a_0 + a_1 x_n + \cdots + a_n x_n^n = f_n.
\]

This is a linear system of \(n + 1\) equations in \(n + 1\) unknowns (the polynomial coefficients \(a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n\)). In matrix form:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & x_0 & x_0^2 & \cdots & x_0^n \\
1 & x_1 & x_1^2 & \cdots & x_1^n \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
1 & x_n & x_n^2 & \cdots & x_n^n
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
a_0 \\
a_1 \\
\vdots \\
a_n
\end{bmatrix}
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
f_0 \\
f_1 \\
\vdots \\
f_n
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(3.1)

Does this linear system have a solution? Is this solution unique? The answer is yes to both. Here is a simple proof. Take \(f_j = 0\) for \(j = 0, 1, \ldots, n\). Then \(p_n(x_j) = 0\), for \(j = 0, 1, \ldots, n\) but \(p_n\) is a polynomial of degree at most \(n\), it cannot have \(n + 1\) zeros unless \(p_n \equiv 0\), which implies \(a_0 = a_1 = \cdots = a_n = 0\). That is, the homogenous problem associated with (3.1) has only the trivial solution. Therefore, (3.1) has a unique solution.

**Example 3.1.** As an illustration let us consider interpolation by a polynomial \(p_1 \in \mathbb{P}_1\). Suppose we are given \((x_0, f_0)\) and \((x_1, f_1)\) with \(x_0 \neq x_1\). We wrote \(p_1\) explicitly in the Introduction. We write it now in a different form:

\[
p_1(x) = \left(\frac{x - x_1}{x_0 - x_1}\right) f_0 + \left(\frac{x - x_0}{x_1 - x_0}\right) f_1.
\]

(3.2)
Clearly, this polynomial has degree at most 1 and satisfies the interpolation property:

\[ p_1(x_0) = f_0, \quad \text{(3.3)} \]
\[ p_1(x_1) = f_1. \quad \text{(3.4)} \]

**Example 3.2.** Given \((x_0, f_0), (x_1, f_1),\) and \((x_2, f_2),\) with \(x_0, x_1\) and \(x_3\) distinct, let’s construct \(p_2 \in \mathbb{P}_2\) that interpolates these points. The way we have written \(p_1\) in (3.2) is suggestive of how we can write \(p_2:\)

\[ p_2(x) = \frac{(x - x_1)(x - x_2)}{(x_0 - x_1)(x_0 - x_2)} f_0 + \frac{(x - x_0)(x - x_2)}{(x_1 - x_0)(x_1 - x_2)} f_1 + \frac{(x - x_0)(x - x_1)}{(x_2 - x_0)(x_2 - x_1)} f_2. \]

If we define

\[ l_0(x) = \frac{(x - x_1)(x - x_2)}{(x_0 - x_1)(x_0 - x_2)}, \quad \text{(3.5)} \]
\[ l_1(x) = \frac{(x - x_0)(x - x_2)}{(x_1 - x_0)(x_1 - x_2)}, \quad \text{(3.6)} \]
\[ l_2(x) = \frac{(x - x_0)(x - x_1)}{(x_2 - x_0)(x_2 - x_1)}, \quad \text{(3.7)} \]

then we simply have

\[ p_2(x) = l_0(x)f_0 + l_1(x)f_1 + l_2(x)f_2. \quad \text{(3.8)} \]

Note that each of the polynomials (3.5), (3.6), and (3.7) are exactly of degree 2 and they satisfy \(l_j(x_k) = \delta_{jk}\) \(^1\). Therefore, it follows that \(p_2\) given by (3.8) satisfies the interpolation property

\[ p_2(x_0) = f_0, \]
\[ p_2(x_1) = f_1, \quad \text{(3.9)} \]
\[ p_2(x_2) = f_2. \]

We can now write down the polynomial of degree at most \(n\) that interpolates \(n + 1\) given values, \((x_0, f_0), \ldots, (x_n, f_n),\) where the interpolation nodes

\(^1\delta_{jk}\) is the Kronecker delta, i.e. \(\delta_{jk} = 0\) if \(k \neq j\) and 1 if \(k = j\).
$x_0, \ldots, x_n$ are assumed distinct. Define

$$l_j(x) = \frac{(x - x_0) \cdots (x - x_{j-1})(x - x_{j+1}) \cdots (x - x_n)}{(x_j - x_0) \cdots (x_j - x_{j-1})(x_j - x_{j+1}) \cdots (x_j - x_n)} = \prod_{k=0}^{n} \frac{(x - x_k)}{(x_j - x_k)}, \text{ for } j = 0, 1, \ldots, n.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.10)

These are called the elementary Lagrange polynomials of degree $n$. For simplicity, we are omitting in the notation their dependence on the $n + 1$ nodes. Since $l_j(x_k) = \delta_{jk}$,

$$p_n(x) = l_0(x)f_0 + l_1(x)f_1 + \cdots + l_n(x)f_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n} l_j(x)f_j$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.11)

interpolates the given data, i.e., it satisfies the interpolation property $p_n(x_j) = f_j$ for $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Relation (3.11) is called the Lagrange form of the interpolating polynomial.

The following result summarizes our discussion.

**Theorem 3.1.** Given the $n + 1$ values $(x_0, f_0), \ldots, (x_n, f_n)$, for $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n$ distinct. There is a unique polynomial $p_n$ of degree at most $n$ such that $p_n(x_j) = f_j$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$.

**Proof.** $p_n$ in (3.11) is of degree at most $n$ and interpolates the data. Uniqueness follows from the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra, as noted earlier. Suppose there is another polynomial $q_n$ of degree at most $n$ such that $q_n(x_j) = f_j$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. Consider $r = p_n - q_n$. This is a polynomial of degree at most $n$ and $r(x_j) = p_n(x_j) - q_n(x_j) = f_j - f_j = 0$ for $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n$, which is impossible unless $r \equiv 0$. This implies $q_n = p_n$. \hfill \square

### 3.1.1 Equispaced and Chebyshev Nodes

There are two special sets of nodes that are particularly important in applications. The uniform or equispaced nodes in an interval $[a, b]$ are given by

$$x_j = a + jh, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n \quad \text{with } h = (b-a)/n.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.12)
These nodes yield very accurate and efficient trigonometric polynomial interpolation but are generally not good for (algebraic) polynomial interpolation as we will see later.

One of the preferred set of nodes for high order, accurate, and computationally efficient polynomial interpolation is the Chebyshev nodes, introduced in Section 2.4. In $[-1,1]$, they are given by

$$x_j = \cos\left(\frac{j\pi}{n}\right), \quad j = 0, \ldots, n,$$

(3.13)

and are the extremal points of the Chebyshev polynomial (2.68) of degree $n$. Note that these nodes are obtained from the equispaced points $\theta_j = j(\pi/n)$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ in $[0, \pi]$ by the one-to-one relation $x = \cos \theta$, for $\theta \in [0, \pi]$. As defined in (3.13), the nodes go from 1 to -1 so sometimes the alternative definition $x_j = -\cos(j\pi/n)$ is used. The Chebyshev nodes are not equally spaced and tend to cluster toward the end points of the interval (see Fig. 2.8). For a general interval $[a,b]$, we can do the simple change of variables

$$x = \frac{1}{2}(a + b) + \frac{1}{2}(b - a)t, \quad t \in [-1,1],$$

(3.14)

to obtain the corresponding Chebyshev nodes in $[a,b]$.

### 3.2 Connection to Best Uniform Approximation

Given a continuous function $f$ in $[a,b]$, its best uniform approximation $p_n^*$ in $\mathbb{P}_n$ is characterized by an error, $e_n = f - p_n^*$, which equioscillates, as defined in (2.43), at least $n+2$ times. Therefore $e_n$ has a minimum of $n + 1$ zeros and consequently, there exists $x_0,\ldots,x_n$ such that

$$p_n^*(x_0) = f(x_0),$$

$$p_n^*(x_1) = f(x_1),$$

$$\vdots$$

$$p_n^*(x_n) = f(x_n).$$

(3.15)

In other words, $p_n^*$ is the polynomial of degree at most $n$ that interpolates the function $f$ at $n+1$ zeros of $e_n$. Rather than finding these zeros, a natural
and more practical question is: given \((x_0, f(x_0)), (x_1, f(x_1)), \ldots, (x_n, f(x_n))\), where \(x_0, \ldots, x_n\) in \([a, b]\) are distinct, how close is the interpolating polynomial \(p_n \in \mathbb{P}_n\) of \(f\) at these nodes to the best uniform approximation \(p^*_n \in \mathbb{P}_n\) of \(f\)?

To obtain a bound for \(\|p_n - p^*_n\|_\infty\) we note that \(p_n - p^*_n\) is a polynomial of degree at most \(n\) which interpolates \(f - p^*_n\). Therefore, we can use Lagrange formula to represent it:

\[
p_n(x) - p^*_n(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} l_j(x)[f(x_j) - p^*_n(x_j)].
\] (3.16)

It then follows that

\[
\|p_n - p^*_n\|_\infty \leq \Lambda_n \|f - p^*_n\|_\infty,
\] (3.17)

where

\[
\Lambda_n = \max_{a \leq x \leq b} \sum_{j=0}^{n} |l_j(x)|
\] (3.18)

is called the Lebesgue constant and depends only on the interpolation nodes, not on \(f\). On the other hand, we have that

\[
\|f - p_n\|_\infty = \|f - p^*_n - p_n + p^*_n\|_\infty \leq \|f - p^*_n\|_\infty + \|p_n - p^*_n\|_\infty.
\] (3.19)

Using (3.17) we obtain

\[
\|f - p_n\|_\infty \leq (1 + \Lambda_n)\|f - p^*_n\|_\infty.
\] (3.20)

This inequality connects the interpolation error \(\|f - p_n\|_\infty\) with the best approximation error \(\|f - p^*_n\|_\infty\). What happens to these errors as we increase \(n\)? To make it more concrete, suppose we have a triangular array of nodes as follows:

\[
x_0^{(0)}
x_1^{(1)}
x_2^{(2)}
\vdots
x_n^{(n)}
\]

\[
x_0^{(n)}
x_1^{(n)}\ldots x_n^{(n)}
\]

\[
\vdots
\]

...
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where \( a \leq x_0^{(n)} < x_1^{(n)} < \cdots < x_n^{(n)} \leq b \) for \( n = 0, 1, \ldots \). Let \( p_n \) be the interpolating polynomial of degree at most \( n \) of \( f \) at the nodes corresponding to the \( n+1 \) row of (3.21). By the Weierstrass Approximation Theorem (\( p^*_n \) is a better approximation or at least as good as that provided by the Bernstein polynomial),

\[
\| f - p^*_n \|_\infty \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.
\]  

(3.22)

However, it can be proved that

\[
\Lambda_n > \frac{2}{\pi^2} \log n - 1
\]  

(3.23)

and hence the Lebesgue constant is not bounded in \( n \). Therefore, we cannot conclude from (3.20) and (3.22) that \( \| f - p_n \|_\infty \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \), i.e. that the interpolating polynomial, as we add more and more nodes, converges uniformly to \( f \). In fact, Bernstein and Faber proved in 1914 that given any distribution of points, organized in a triangular array (3.21), it is possible to construct a continuous function \( f \) for which its interpolating polynomial \( p_n \) (corresponding to the nodes on the \( n \)-th row of (3.21)) will not converge uniformly to \( f \) as \( n \to \infty \).

Convergence of polynomial interpolation depends on both the regularity of \( f \) and the distribution of the interpolation nodes. We will discuss this further in Section 3.8.

### 3.3 Barycentric Formula

The Lagrange form of the interpolating polynomial

\[
p_n(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} l_j(x) f_j
\]

is not convenient for computations. The evaluation of each \( l_j \) costs \( O(n) \) operations and there are \( n \) of these evaluations for a total cost of \( O(n^2) \) operations. Also, if we want to increase the degree of the polynomial we cannot reuse the work done in getting and evaluating a lower degree one. However, we can obtain a more efficient formula by rewriting the interpolating polynomial in the following way. Let

\[
\omega(x) = (x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n).
\]  

(3.24)
Then, differentiating this polynomial of degree $n+1$ and evaluating at $x = x_j$ we get

$$\omega'(x_j) = \prod_{k=0}^{n} (x_j - x_k), \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \quad (3.25)$$

Therefore, each of the elementary Lagrange polynomials may be written as

$$l_j(x) = \frac{\omega(x)}{\omega'(x_j)} = \frac{\omega(x)}{(x - x_j)\omega'(x_j)}, \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \quad (3.26)$$

for $x \neq x_j$ and $l_j(x_j) = 1$ follows from l’Hôpital rule.

Defining

$$\lambda_j = \frac{1}{\omega'(x_j)}, \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \quad (3.27)$$

we can recast Lagrange formula as

$$p_n(x) = \omega(x) \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{\lambda_j}{x - x_j} f_j. \quad (3.28)$$

This modified Lagrange formula is computationally more efficient than the original formula if we need to evaluate $p_n$ at more than one point. This is because the $\lambda_j$’s only depend on the interpolation nodes and can be precomputed for a one-time cost of $O(n^2)$ operations. After that, each evaluation of $p_n$ only costs $O(n)$ operations. Unfortunately, the $\lambda_j$’s as defined in (3.27) grow exponentially with the length of the interpolation interval so that (3.28) can only be used for moderate size $n$, without having to rescale the interval.

We can eliminate this problem by noting that from (3.11) with $f(x) \equiv 1$ it follows that

$$1 = \sum_{j=0}^{n} l_j(x) = \omega(x) \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{\lambda_j}{x - x_j}. \quad (3.29)$$

Dividing (3.28) by (3.29), we get the so-called barycentric formula for inter-
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Interpolation:

\[ p_n(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{\lambda_j}{x - x_j} f_j, \quad \text{for } x \neq x_j, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.30)

If \( x \) coincides with one of the nodes \( x_j \), the interpolation property \( p_n(x_j) = f_j \) should be used.

The numbers \( \lambda_j \) depend only on the nodes \( x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n \) and not on given values \( f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n \). We can obtain them explicitly for both the Chebyshev nodes (3.13) and for the equally spaced nodes (3.12) and can be precomputed efficiently for a general set of nodes.

3.3.1 Barycentric Weights for Chebyshev Nodes

The Chebyshev nodes are the zeros of \( q_{n+1}(x) = (1 - x^2)U_{n-1}(x) \), where \( U_{n-1}(x) = \sin n\theta / \sin \theta \), \( x = \cos \theta \) is the Chebyshev polynomial of the second kind of degree \( n - 1 \), with leading order coefficient \( 2^{n-1} \) [see Section 2.4]. Since the \( \lambda_j \)'s can be defined up to a multiplicative constant (which would cancel out in the barycentric formula) we can take \( \lambda_j \) to be proportional to \( 1/q'_{n+1}(x_j) \). Since

\[ q_{n+1}(x) = \sin \theta \sin n\theta, \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.31)

differentiating we get

\[ q'_{n+1}(x) = -n \cos n\theta - \sin n\theta \cot \theta. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.32)

Thus,

\[ q'_{n+1}(x_j) = \begin{cases} -2n, & \text{for } j = 0, \\ -(-1)^j n, & \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, n - 1, \\ -2n (-1)^n & \text{for } j = n. \end{cases} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.33)

We can factor out \(-n\) in (3.33) to obtain the barycentric weights for the Chebyshev points

\[ \lambda_j = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & \text{for } j = 0, \\ (-1)^j, & \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, n - 1, \\ \frac{1}{2} (-1)^n & \text{for } j = n. \end{cases} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.34)
Note that for a general interval \([a, b]\), the term \((a + b)/2\) in the change of variables (3.14) cancels out in (3.25) but we gain an extra factor of \([(b-a)/2]^n\). However, this factor can be omitted as it does not alter the barycentric formula. Therefore, the same barycentric weights (3.34) can also be used for the Chebyshev nodes in an interval \([a, b]\).

### 3.3.2 Barycentric Weights for Equispaced Nodes

For equispaced points, \(x_j = x_0 + jh, \ j = 0, 1, \ldots, n\) we have

\[
\lambda_j = \frac{1}{(x_j - x_0) \cdots (x_j - x_{j-1})(x_j - x_{j+1}) \cdots (x_j - x_n)}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{(jh)[(j-1)h] \cdots (h)(-h)(-2h) \cdots (j-n)h}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{(-1)^{n-j}h^n [j(j-1) \cdots 1][1 \cdot 2 \cdots (n-j)]}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{(-1)^{n-j}h^n n! \ j!(n-j)!}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{(-1)^n h^n n!} \ (-1)^j \binom{n}{j}.
\]

We can omit the factor \(1/((-1)^n h^n n!)\) because it cancels out in the barycentric formula. Thus, for equispaced nodes we can use

\[
\lambda_j = (-1)^j \binom{n}{j}, \ j = 0, 1, \ldots, n.
\]

Note that in this case the \(\lambda_j\)’s grow very rapidly with \(n\), limiting the use of the barycentric formula to only moderate size \(n\) for equispaced nodes. However, as we will see, equispaced nodes are not a good choice for accurate, high order polynomial interpolation in the first place.
3.3.3 BARYCENTRIC FORMULA

3.3.3 Barycentric Weights for General Sets of Nodes

The barycentric weights for a general set of nodes can be computed efficiently by using the definition (3.27), i.e.

\[
\lambda_j = \frac{1}{n} \prod_{\substack{k=0 \atop k \neq j}}^{n} (x_j - x_k), \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots n
\]  
(3.36)

and by noting the following. Suppose we have the barycentric weights for the nodes \(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}\) and let’s call these \(\lambda_{j}^{(m-1)}\), for \(j = 0, 1, \ldots, m - 1\). Then, the barycentric weights \(\lambda_{j}^{(m)}\) for the set of nodes \(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_m\) can be computed reusing the previous values:

\[
\lambda_{j}^{(m)} = \frac{\lambda_{j}^{(m-1)}}{x_j - x_m}, \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, \ldots m - 1
\]  
(3.37)

and for \(j = m\) we employ directly the definition:

\[
\lambda_{m}^{(m)} = \frac{1}{\prod_{k=0}^{m-1} (x_m - x_k)}.
\]  
(3.38)

Algorithm 3.1 shows the procedure in pseudo-code.

**Algorithm 3.1** Barycentric weights for general nodes

1: \(\lambda_0^{(0)} \leftarrow 1\)
2: for \(m = 1, \ldots, n\) do
3: \hspace{1em} for \(j = 0, \ldots, m - 1\) do
4: \hspace{2em} \(\lambda_j^{(m)} \leftarrow \frac{\lambda_j^{(m-1)}}{x_j - x_m}\)
5: \hspace{1em} end for
6: \hspace{1em} \(\lambda_m^{(m)} \leftarrow \frac{1}{\prod_{k=0}^{m-1} (x_m - x_k)}\)
7: end for
3.4 Newton’s Form and Divided Differences

There is another representation of the interpolating polynomial $p_n$ that is convenient for the derivation of some numerical methods and for the evaluation of relatively low order $p_n$. The idea of this representation, due to Newton, is to use successively lower order polynomials for constructing $p_n$.

Suppose we have gotten $p_{n-1} \in \mathbb{P}_{n-1}$, the interpolating polynomial of $(x_0, f_0), (x_1, f_1), \ldots, (x_{n-1}, f_{n-1})$ and we would like to obtain $p_n \in \mathbb{P}_n$, the interpolating polynomial of $(x_0, f_0), (x_1, f_1), \ldots, (x_n, f_n)$ by reusing $p_{n-1}$. The difference between these polynomials, $r = p_n - p_{n-1}$, is a polynomial of degree at most $n$. Moreover, for $j = 0, \ldots, n-1$

$$r(x_j) = p_n(x_j) - p_{n-1}(x_j) = f_j - f_j = 0. \quad (3.39)$$

Therefore, $r$ can be factored as

$$r(x) = c_n(x-x_0)(x-x_1)\cdots(x-x_{n-1}). \quad (3.40)$$

The constant $c_n$ is called the $n$-th divided difference of $f = [f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n]$ with respect to $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n$, and is usually denoted by $f[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$. Thus, we have

$$p_n(x) = p_{n-1}(x) + f[x_0, \ldots, x_n](x-x_0)(x-x_1)\cdots(x-x_{n-1}). \quad (3.41)$$

By the same argument, we have

$$p_{n-1}(x) = p_{n-2}(x) + f[x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}](x-x_0)(x-x_1)\cdots(x-x_{n-2}), \quad (3.42)$$

etc. So we arrive at Newton’s Form of $p_n$:

$$p_n(x) = f[x_0] + f[x_0, x_1](x-x_0) + \ldots + f[x_0, \ldots, x_n](x-x_0)\cdots(x-x_{n-1}). \quad (3.43)$$

Note that for $n = 1$,

$$p_1(x) = f[x_0] + f[x_0, x_1](x-x_0) \quad (3.44)$$

and the interpolation property gives

$$f_0 = p_1(x_0) = f[x_0], \quad (3.45)$$
$$f_1 = p_1(x_1) = f[x_0] + f[x_0, x_1](x_1-x_0). \quad (3.46)$$

(3.47)
Therefore
\[
f[x_0] = f_0, \quad (3.48)
\]
\[
f[x_0, x_1] = \frac{f_1 - f_0}{x_1 - x_0}, \quad (3.49)
\]
and
\[
p_1(x) = f_0 + \left( \frac{f_1 - f_0}{x_1 - x_0} \right) (x - x_0). \quad (3.50)
\]

Define \( f[x_j] = f_j \) for \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, n \). The following identity will allow us to compute all the required divided differences, order by order.

**Theorem 3.2.**

\[
f[x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_k] = \frac{f[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k] - f[x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}]}{x_k - x_0}. \quad (3.51)
\]

**Proof.** Let \( p_{k-1} \) be the interpolating polynomial of degree at most \( k - 1 \) of \((x_0, f_0), \ldots, (x_{k-1}, f_{k-1})\) and \( q_{k-1} \) the interpolating polynomial of degree at most \( k - 1 \) of \((x_1, f_1), \ldots, (x_k, f_k)\). Then
\[
p(x) = q_{k-1}(x) + \left( \frac{x - x_k}{x_k - x_0} \right) [q_{k-1}(x) - p_{k-1}(x)]. \quad (3.52)
\]
is a polynomial of degree at most \( k \) and for \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, k - 1 \)
\[
p(x_j) = f_j + \left( \frac{x_j - x_k}{x_k - x_0} \right) [f_j - f_j] = f_j.
\]
Moreover, \( p(x_0) = p_{k-1}(x_0) = f_0 \) and \( p(x_k) = q_{k-1}(x_k) = f_k \). Therefore, \( p = p_k \), the interpolation polynomial of degree at most \( k \) of the points \((x_0, f_0), (x_1, f_1), \ldots, (x_k, f_k)\). From \((3.43)\), the leading order coefficient of \( p_k \) is \( f[x_0, \ldots, x_k] \). Equating this with the leading order coefficient of \( p \)
\[
\frac{f[x_1, \ldots, x_k] - f[x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}]}{x_k - x_0},
\]
gives \((3.51)\). \( \square \)

To obtain the divided differences of \( p_n \) we construct a table using \((3.51)\), computing all first order divided differences, then the second order ones, etc. This process is illustrated in Table 3.1 for \( n = 3 \).
Table 3.1: Table of divided differences for \( n = 3 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( x_j )</th>
<th>( f_j )</th>
<th>1st order</th>
<th>2nd order</th>
<th>3rd order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( x_0 )</td>
<td>( f_0 )</td>
<td>( f[x_0, x_1] = \frac{f_1 - f_0}{x_1 - x_0} )</td>
<td>( f[x_0, x_1, x_2] = \frac{f[x_1, x_2] - f[x_0, x_1]}{x_2 - x_0} )</td>
<td>( f[x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3] = \frac{f[x_1, x_2, x_3] - f[x_0, x_1, x_2]}{x_3 - x_0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x_1 )</td>
<td>( f_1 )</td>
<td>( f[x_1, x_2] = \frac{f_2 - f_1}{x_2 - x_1} )</td>
<td>( f[x_1, x_2, x_3] = \frac{f[x_2, x_3] - f[x_1, x_2]}{x_3 - x_1} )</td>
<td>( f[x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3] = \frac{f[x_1, x_2, x_3] - f[x_0, x_1, x_2]}{x_3 - x_0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x_2 )</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>( f[x_2, x_3] = \frac{f_3 - f_2}{x_3 - x_2} )</td>
<td>( f[x_1, x_2, x_3] = \frac{f[x_2, x_3] - f[x_1, x_2]}{x_3 - x_1} )</td>
<td>( f[x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3] = \frac{f[x_1, x_2, x_3] - f[x_0, x_1, x_2]}{x_3 - x_0} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 3.3. Take the data set \((0, 1), (1, 2), (2, 5), (3, 10)\). Then

\[
\begin{align*}
0 & \quad 1 \\
1 & \quad 2 \quad \frac{2-1}{1-0} = 1 \\
2 & \quad 5 \quad \frac{5-2}{2-1} = 3 \quad \frac{3-1}{2-0} = 1 \\
3 & \quad 10 \quad \frac{10-5}{3-2} = 5 \quad \frac{5-3}{3-1} = 1 \quad \frac{1-1}{3-0} = 0
\end{align*}
\]

so

\[
p_3(x) = 1 + 1(x - 0) + 1(x - 0)(x - 1) + 0(x - 0)(x - 1)(x - 2) = 1 + x^2.
\]

After computing the divided differences, we need to evaluate \( p_n \) at a given point \( x \). This can be done efficiently by suitably factoring it. For example, for \( n = 3 \) we have

\[
p_3(x) = c_0 + c_1(x - x_0) + c_2(x - x_0)(x - x_1) + c_3(x - x_0)(x - x_1)(x - x_2) = c_0 + (x - x_0)\{c_1 + (x - x_1)\{c_2 + (x - x_2)c_3\}\}
\]

For general \( n \) we can use the Horner-like scheme in Algorithm 3.2 to get \( y = p_n(x) \), given the divided difference coefficients \( c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_n \) and the evaluation point \( x \).

**Algorithm 3.2 Horner Scheme to evaluate \( p_n \) at \( x \) in Newton’s form**

1: \( y \leftarrow c_n \)
2: for \( k = n - 1, \ldots, 0 \) do 
3: \( y \leftarrow c_k + (x - x_k) * y \)
4: end for
3.5 Cauchy Remainder

We now assume the data $f_j = f(x_j)$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ come from a sufficiently smooth function $f$, which we are trying to approximate with an interpolating polynomial $p_n$, and we focus on the error $f - p_n$ of such approximation.

In Chapter 1 we proved that if $x_0$, $x_1$, and $x$ are in $[a, b]$ and $f \in C^2[a, b]$ then
\[
f(x) - p_1(x) = \frac{1}{2} f''(\xi(x))(x - x_0)(x - x_1),
\]
where $p_1$ is the polynomial of degree at most 1 that interpolates $(x_0, f(x_0))$, $(x_1, f(x_1))$ and $\xi(x) \in (a, b)$. The general result about the interpolation error is the following theorem:

**Theorem 3.3.** Let $f \in C^{n+1}[a, b]$, $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n \in [a, b]$ distinct, $x \in [a, b]$, and $p_n$ be the interpolation polynomial of degree at most $n$ of $f$ at $x_0, \ldots, x_n$ then
\[
f(x) - p_n(x) = \frac{1}{(n+1)!} f^{(n+1)}(\xi(x))(x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n), \tag{3.53}
\]
where $\min\{x_0, \ldots, x_n, x\} < \xi(x) < \max\{x_0, \ldots, x_n, x\}$.

**Proof.** The right hand side of (3.53) is known as the Cauchy Remainder and the following proof is due to Cauchy.

For $x$ equal to one of the nodes $x_j$ the result is trivially true. Take $x$ fixed not equal to any of the nodes and define
\[
\phi(t) = f(t) - p_n(t) - [f(x) - p_n(x)] \frac{(t - x_0)(t - x_1) \cdots (t - x_n)}{(x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n)}. \tag{3.54}
\]
Clearly, $\phi \in C^{n+1}[a, b]$ and vanishes at $t = x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n, x$. That is, $\phi$ has at least $n + 2$ distinct zeros. Applying Rolle’s Theorem $n + 1$ times we conclude that there exists a point $\xi(x) \in (a, b)$ such that $\phi^{(n+1)}(\xi(x)) = 0$ (see Fig. reffig:CauchyThm for an illustration of the $n = 4$ case). Therefore,
\[
0 = \phi^{(n+1)}(\xi(x)) = f^{(n+1)}(\xi(x)) - [f(x) - p_n(x)] \frac{(n + 1)!}{(x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n)}
\]
from which (3.53) follows. Note that the repeated application of Rolle’s theorem implies that $\xi(x)$ is between $\min\{x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n, x\}$ and $\max\{x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n, x\}$.
Figure 3.2: Successive application of Rolle’s Theorem on $\phi(t)$ for Theorem 3.3, $n = 3$. 
Example 3.4. Let us find an approximation to \( \cos(0.8\pi) \) using interpolation of the values \((0, 1), (0.5, 0), (1, -1), (1.5, 0), (2, 1)\). We first employ Newton’s divided differences to find \( p_4 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( x_j )</th>
<th>( f_j )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus,

\[
p_4(x) = 1 - 2x + \frac{8}{3}x(x - 0.5)(x - 1) - \frac{8}{3}x(x - 0.5)(x - 1)(x - 1.5).
\]

Then, \( \cos(0.8\pi) \approx p_4(0.8) = -0.8176 \). Let us find an upper bound for the error using the Cauchy remainder. Since \( f(x) = \cos(\pi x) \), \( |f^{(5)}(x)| \leq \pi^5 \) for all \( x \). Therefore,

\[
|\cos(0.8\pi) - p_4(0.8)| \leq \frac{\pi^5}{5!} |(0.8 - 0)(0.8 - 0.5)(0.8 - 1)(0.8 - 1.5)(0.8 - 2)|
\approx 0.10.
\]  

This is a significant overestimate of the actual error \( |\cos(0.8\pi) - p_4(0.8)| \approx 0.0086 \) because we replaced \( f^{(5)}(\xi(x)) \) with a global bound of the fifth derivative. Figure 3.3 shows a plot of \( f \) and \( p_4 \). Note that the interpolation nodes are equispaced and the largest error is produced toward the end of the interpolation interval.

We have no control on the term \( f^{(n+1)}(\xi(x)) \) but we can choose the interpolation nodes \( x_0, \ldots, x_n \) so that the factor

\[
w(x) = (x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n)
\]

is smallest as possible in the infinity norm. The function \( w \) is a monic polynomial of degree \( n + 1 \) and we have proved in Section 2.4 that the Chebyshev
Figure 3.3: $f(x) = \cos(\pi x)$ in $[0, 2]$ and its interpolating polynomial $p_4$ at $x_j = j/2$, $j = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$.

polynomial $\tilde{T}_{n+1}$, defined in (2.76), is the monic polynomial of degree $n + 1$ with smallest infinity norm in $[-1, 1]$. Hence, if the interpolation nodes are taken to be the zeros of $\tilde{T}_{n+1}$, namely

$$x_j = \cos \left( \frac{(2j + 1) \pi}{n + 1} \right), \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \tag{3.57}$$

$\|w\|_\infty$ is minimized and $\|w\|_\infty = 2^{-n}$. Figure 3.4 shows a plot of $w$ for equispaced nodes and for the nodes (3.57) for $n = 10$ in $[-1, 1]$. For equispaced nodes, $w$ oscillates unevenly with much larger (absolute) values toward the end of the interval than around the center. In contrast, for the nodes (3.57), $w$ equioscillates between $\pm 1/2^n$, which is a small fraction of maximum amplitude of the equispaced-node $w$. The following theorem summarizes this observation.

**Theorem 3.4.** Let $\Pi_n$ be the interpolating polynomial of degree at most $n$ of $f \in C^{n+1}[-1, 1]$ with respect to the nodes (3.57) then

$$\|f - \Pi_n\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2^n(n + 1)!} \|f^{n+1}\|_\infty. \tag{3.58}$$
3.5. **CAUCHY REMAINDER**

Figure 3.4: The node polynomial $w(x) = (x - x_0) \cdots (x - x_n)$, for equispaced nodes and for the zeros of $T_{n+1}$ taken as nodes, $n = 10$.

The Chebyshev points,

$$x_j = \cos \left( \frac{j \pi}{n} \right), \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \quad (3.59)$$

which are the extremal points and not the zeros of the corresponding Chebyshev polynomial, do not minimize $\max_{x \in [-1, 1]} |w(x)|$. However, they are nearly optimal. More precisely, since the Chebyshev nodes (3.59) are the zeros of the (monic) polynomial [see (2.85) and (3.31)]

$$\frac{1}{2^{n-1}} (1 - x^2) U_{n-1}(x) = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \sin \theta \sin n \theta, \quad x = \cos \theta. \quad (3.60)$$

We have that

$$\|w\|_\infty = \max_{x \in [-1, 1]} \left| \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} (1 - x^2) U_{n-1}(x) \right| \leq \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}. \quad (3.61)$$

Thus, the Chebyshev nodes yield a $\|w\|_\infty$ of no more than a factor of two from the optimal value. Figure 3.5 compares $w$ for equispaced nodes and for the Chebyshev nodes. For the latter, $w$ is qualitatively very similar to that with the (3.57) nodes but, as we just proved, with an amplitude twice as large.
3.6 Divided Differences and Derivatives

We now relate divided differences to the derivatives of $f$ using the Cauchy remainder. Take an arbitrary point $t$ distinct from $x_0, \ldots, x_n$. Let $p_{n+1}$ be the interpolating polynomial of $f$ at $x_0, \ldots, x_n, t$ and $p_n$ that at $x_0, \ldots, x_n$. Then, Newton’s formula (3.41) implies

$$p_{n+1}(x) = p_n(x) + f[x_0, \ldots, x_n, t](x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n). \quad (3.62)$$

Noting that $p_{n+1}(t) = f(t)$ we get

$$f(t) = p_n(t) + f[x_0, \ldots, x_n, t](t - x_0)(t - x_1) \cdots (t - x_n). \quad (3.63)$$

Since $t$ was arbitrary we can set $t = x$ and obtain

$$f(x) = p_n(x) + f[x_0, \ldots, x_n, x](x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n), \quad (3.64)$$

and upon comparing with the Cauchy remainder we get

$$f[x_0, \ldots, x_n, x] = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi(x))}{(n+1)!}. \quad (3.65)$$
3.7. HERMITE INTERPOLATION

If we set \( x = x_{n+1} \) and relabel \( n + 1 \) by \( k \) we have

\[
f[x_0, ..., x_k] = \frac{1}{k!} f^{(k)}(\xi),
\]

where \( \min\{x_0, \ldots, x_k\} < \xi < \max\{x_0, \ldots, x_k\} \).

Suppose that we now let \( x_1, ..., x_k \to x_0 \). Then \( \xi \to x_0 \) and

\[
\lim_{x_1, ..., x_k \to x_0} f[x_0, ..., x_k] = \frac{1}{k!} f^{(k)}(x_0).
\]

We can use this relation to define a divided difference where there are coincident nodes. For example \( f[x_0, x_1] \) when \( x_0 = x_1 \) by \( f[x_0, x_0] = f'(x_0) \), etc. This is going to be very useful for interpolating both function and derivative values.

3.7 Hermite Interpolation

The Hermite interpolation problem is: given values of \( f \) and some of its derivatives at the nodes \( x_0, x_1, ..., x_n \), find the polynomial of smallest degree interpolating those values. This polynomial is called the Hermite Interpolation Polynomial and can be obtained with a minor modification to the Newton’s form representation.

For example: Suppose we look for a polynomial \( p \) of lowest degree which satisfies the interpolation conditions:

\[
\begin{align*}
p(x_0) &= f(x_0), \\
p'(x_0) &= f'(x_0), \\
p(x_1) &= f(x_1), \\
p'(x_1) &= f'(x_1).
\end{align*}
\]

We can view this problem as a limiting case of polynomial interpolation of \( f \) at two pairs of coincident nodes, \( x_0, x_0, x_1, x_1 \) and we can use Newton’s Interpolation form to obtain \( p \). The table of divided differences, in view of (3.67), is

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
  x_j & f_j & f_j & f_j \\
  \hline
  x_0 & f(x_0) & f(x_0) & f(x_0) \\
  x_0 & f(x_0) & f'(x_0) & f(x_0, x_1) \\
  x_1 & f(x_1) & f[x_0, x_1] & f[x_0, x_0, x_1] \\
  x_1 & f(x_1) & f'(x_1) & f[x_0, x_1, x_1] & f[x_0, x_0, x_1, x_1]
\end{array}
\]

(3.68)
and
\[ p(x) = f(x_0) + f'(x_0)(x - x_0) + f[x_0, x_0, x_1](x - x_0)^2 \\
+ f[x_0, x_0, x_1, x_1](x - x_0)^2(x - x_1). \] (3.69)

**Example 3.5.** Let \( f(0) = 1 \), \( f'(0) = 0 \) and \( f(1) = \sqrt{2} \). Find the Hermite Interpolation Polynomial.

We construct the table of divided differences as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( x_j )</th>
<th>( f_j )</th>
<th>( f'(0) = 0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( \sqrt{2} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1         | \( \sqrt{2} \) \((\sqrt{2} - 1)/(1 - 0) = \sqrt{2} - 1 \)| \( (\sqrt{2} - 1 - 0)/(1 - 0) = \sqrt{2} - 1 \)

and therefore
\[ p(x) = 1 + 0(x - 0) + (\sqrt{2} - 1)(x - 0)^2 = 1 + (\sqrt{2} - 1)x^2. \] (3.70)

### 3.8 Convergence of Polynomial Interpolation

From the Cauchy Remainder formula
\[ f(x) - p_n(x) = \frac{1}{(n+1)!}f^{(n+1)}(\xi(x))(x - x_0)(x - x_1)\cdots(x - x_n) \]

it is clear that the accuracy of the interpolating polynomial \( p_n \) of \( f \) depends on both the regularity of \( f \) and the distribution of the interpolation nodes \( x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n \).

The function
\[ f(x) = \frac{1}{1 + 25x^2} \quad x \in [-1, 1], \] (3.71)

provides a classical example due to Runge that illustrates the importance of node distribution. The function \( f \) in (3.71) is smooth. It has an infinite number of continuous derivatives, i.e. \( f \in C^\infty[-1, 1] \) (in fact \( f \) is real analytic in the whole real line, i.e. it has a convergent Taylor series to \( f(x) \) for every \( x \in \mathbb{R} \)). Nevertheless, for the equispaced nodes (3.12) \( p_n \) does not converge uniformly to \( f(x) \) as \( n \to \infty \). In fact it diverges quite dramatically toward the end points of the interval as Fig. 3.6 demonstrates. In contrast, as Fig. 3.7...
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Figure 3.6: Lack of convergence of the interpolant $p_n$ for $f(x) = 1/(1 + 25x^2)$ in $[-1, 1]$ using equispaced nodes. The first row shows plots of $f$ and $p_n$ ($n = 10, 20$) and the second row shows the corresponding error $f(x) - p_n(x)$.

Figure 3.7: Convergence of the interpolant $p_n$ for $f(x) = 1/(1 + 25x^2)$ in $[-1, 1]$ using Chebyshev nodes. The first row shows plots of $f$ and $p_n$ ($n = 10, 20$) and the second row shows the corresponding error $f(x) - p_n(x)$. 
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Figure 3.8: Fast convergence of the interpolant $p_n$ for $f(x) = e^{-x^2}$ in $[-1, 1]$. Plots of the error $f - p_n$, $n = 10, 20$ for both the equispaced (first row) and the Chebyshev nodes (second row).

shows, there is fast and uniform convergence of $p_n$ to $f$ when the Chebyshev nodes (3.13) are employed.

Now consider

$$f(x) = e^{-x^2}, \quad x \in [-1, 1].$$

(3.72)

The interpolating polynomial $p_n$ converges $f$, even when equispaced nodes are used. In fact, the convergence is amazingly fast. Figure 3.8 shows plots of the error $f - p_n$, $n = 10, 20$, for both equispaced and Chebyshev nodes. The interpolant $p_{10}$ has already more than 5 and 6 digits of accuracy for the equispaced and Chebyshev nodes, respectively. Note that the error when using Chebyshev nodes is significantly smaller and more equidistributed than when using equispaced nodes. For the latter, as we have seen earlier, the error is substantially larger toward the endpoints of the interval than around the center.

What is so special about $f(x) = e^{-x^2}$? The function $f(z) = e^{-z^2}$, $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is analytic in the whole complex plane\footnote{A function of a complex variable $f(z)$ is said to be analytic in an open set $D$ if it has}. Using complex variables analysis it
3.8. CONVERGENCE OF POLYNOMIAL INTERPOLATION

Figure 3.9: For uniform convergence to $f$ on $[-1, 1]$ of the interpolants $p_n$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, with equi-spaced nodes, $f$ must be analytic in shaded region.

can be shown that if $f$ is analytic in a sufficiently large region in the complex plane containing $[-1, 1]$ then $\|f - p_n\|_\infty \to 0$. Just how large the region of analyticity needs to be? it depends on the asymptotic distribution of the nodes as $n \to \infty$. We will show next that for equispaced nodes, $f$ must be analytic in the football-like region shown in Fig. 3.9 for $p_n$ to converge to $f$ in $[-1, 1]$, as $n \to \infty$. The Runge function (3.71) is not analytic in this region (it has singularities at $\pm i/5$) and hence the divergence of $p_n$. In contrast, for the Chebyshev nodes, it suffices that $f$ be analytic in any region containing $[-1, 1]$, however thin this region might be, to guarantee the uniform convergence of $p_n$ to $f$ in $[-1, 1]$, as $n \to \infty$.

Let us consider the interpolation error, evaluated at a complex point $z \in \mathbb{C}$:

$$f(z) - p_n(z) = f(z) - \sum_{j=0}^{n} l_j(z)f(x_j).$$

(3.73)

a derivative at every point of $D$. If $f$ is analytic in $D$ then all its derivatives exist and are analytic in $D$.

Of course, the same arguments can be applied for a general interval $[a, b]$.

The rest of this section uses complex variables results.
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Employing (3.26), we can rewrite this as

$$f(z) - p_n(z) = f(z) - \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{\omega(z)}{(z - x_j) \omega'(x_j)} f(x_j),$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.74)

where $\omega(z) = (z - x_0)(z - x_1) \cdots (z - x_n)$. Using the calculus of residues, the right hand side of (3.74) can be expressed as a contour integral:

$$f(z) - p_n(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_C \frac{\omega(z)}{\omega(\xi)} \frac{f(\xi)}{\xi - z} d\xi,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.75)

where $C$ is a positively oriented closed curve that encloses $[-1, 1]$ and $z$ but not any singularity of $f$. The integrand has a simple pole at $\xi = z$ with residue $f(z)$. It also has simple poles at $\xi = x_j$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ with corresponding residues $-f(x_j)\omega(z)/[(z - x_j)\omega'(x_j)]$, which produces $-p_n(z)$. Expression (3.75) is called Hermite formula for the interpolation remainder.

To estimate $|f(z) - p_n(z)|$ using (3.75) we need to estimate $|\omega(z)|/|\omega(\xi)|$ for $\xi \in C$ and $z$ inside $C$. To this end, it is convenient to choose a contour $C$ on which $|\omega(\xi)|$ is approximately constant for sufficiently large $n$. Note that

$$|\omega(\xi)| = \prod_{j=0}^{n} |\xi - x_j| = \exp \left( \sum_{j=0}^{n} \log |\xi - x_j| \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.76)

In the limit as $n \to \infty$, we can view the interpolation nodes as a continuum of a density $\rho$ (or limiting distribution), with

$$\int_{-1}^{1} \rho(x) dx = 1,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.77)

so that, for sufficiently large $n$,

the total number of nodes in $[\alpha, \beta] = (n + 1) \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} \rho(x) dx,$  \hspace{1cm} (3.78)

for $-1 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq 1$. Therefore, assuming the interpolation nodes have a limiting distribution $\rho$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \log |\xi - x_j| \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} \int_{-1}^{1} \log |\xi - x| \rho(x) dx.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.79)
Let us define the function
\[ \phi(\xi) = -\int_{-1}^{1} \log |\xi - x| \rho(x) dx. \] (3.80)

Then, for sufficiently large \( n \),
\[ |\omega(z)|/|\omega(\xi)| \approx e^{-(n+1)|\phi(z)-\phi(\xi)|}. \]

The level curves of \( \phi \), i.e. the set of points \( \xi \in \mathbb{C} \) such that \( \phi(\xi) = c \), with \( c \) constant, approximate large circles for very large and negative values of \( c \). As \( c \) is increased, the level curves shrink. Let \( z_0 \) be the singularity of \( f \) closest to the origin. Then, we can take any \( \epsilon > 0 \) and select \( C \) to be the level curve \( \phi(\xi) = \phi(z_0) + \epsilon \) so that \( f \) is analytic on and inside \( C \). Take \( z \) inside \( C \). From (3.75), (3.79), and (3.80)
\[ |f(z) - p_n(z)| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_C \frac{\omega(z)}{|\omega(\xi)|} \left| \frac{f(\xi)}{|\xi - z|} \right| ds \]
\[ \leq \text{constant} \ e^{-(n+1)|\phi(z)-(\phi(z_0)+\epsilon)|}. \] (3.81)

Therefore, it follows that \( |f(z) - p_n(z)| \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \) and the convergence is exponential. Note that this holds as long as \( z \) is inside the chosen contour \( C \). If \( z \) is outside the level curve \( \phi(\xi) = \phi(z_0) \), i.e. \( \phi(z) < \phi(z_0) \), then \( |f(z) - p_n(z)| \) diverges exponentially. Therefore, \( p_n \) converges (uniformly) to \( f \) in \([-1, 1]\) if and only if \( f \) is analytic on and inside the smallest level curve of \( \phi \) that contains \([-1, 1]\). More precisely, let \( \gamma \) be the supremum over all the values of \( c \) for which \([-1, 1]\) lies inside the level set curve \( \phi(\xi) = c \). Define the region
\[ D_\gamma = \{ z \in \mathbb{C} : \phi(z) \geq \gamma \}. \] (3.82)

Then, we have the following result.

**Theorem 3.5.** The \( f \) be analytic in any region containing \( D_\gamma \) in its interior. Then,
\[ |f(z) - p_n(z)| \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 0, \text{ uniformly, for } z \in D_\gamma. \] (3.83)

For equispaced nodes, the number of nodes is the same (asymptotically) for all intervals of the same length. Therefore, \( \rho \) is a constant. The normalization condition (3.77) implies that \( \rho(x) = 1/2 \) for equispaced points in \([-1, 1]\). It can be shown that with \( \rho(x) = 1/2 \) we get
\[ \phi(\xi) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \text{Re} \{(\xi + 1) \log(\xi + 1) - (\xi - 1) \log(\xi - 1)\}. \] (3.84)
The curve of $\phi$ that bounds $D_\gamma$ for equispaced nodes is the one that passes through $\pm 1$, has value $1 - \log 2$, and is shown in Fig. 3.9. It crosses the imaginary axis at $\pm 0.5255...i$. On the hand, the level curve that passes through $\pm i/5$ crosses the real axis at about $\pm 0.7267...$. Thus, there is uniform convergence of $p_n$ to $f$ in the reduced interval $[-0.72, 0.72]$.

The Chebyshev points $x_j = \cos \theta_j$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$, are equispaced in $\theta$ ($\theta_j = j\pi/n$) and since

$$\int_\alpha^\beta \rho(x) dx = \int_{\cos^{-1}\alpha}^{\cos^{-1}\beta} \rho(\cos \theta) \sin \theta d\theta,$$

then $\rho(\cos \theta) \sin \theta = \rho(x) \sqrt{1 - x^2}$ must be constant. Using (3.77), it follows the density for Chebyshev nodes is

$$\rho(x) = \frac{1}{\pi \sqrt{1 - x^2}}, \quad x \in [-1, 1].$$

With this distribution of nodes it can be shown that

$$\phi(\xi) = \log \frac{2}{|\xi + \sqrt{\xi^2 - 1}|}.$$  

The level curves of $\phi$ in this case are the points $\xi \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|\xi + \sqrt{\xi^2 - 1}| = c$, with $c$ constant. These are ellipses with foci at $\pm 1$ as shown in Fig. 3.10. The level curve that passes through $\pm 1$ degenerates into the interval $[-1, 1]$.

### 3.9 Piecewise Polynomial Interpolation

One way to avoid the oscillatory behavior of high-order interpolation when the interpolation nodes do not cluster appropriately is to employ low order polynomials in small subintervals.

Given the nodes $a = x_0 < x_1 \ldots < x_n = b$ we can consider the subintervals $[x_0, x_1], \ldots, [x_{n-1}, x_n]$ and construct in each a polynomial degree at most $k$ (for $k \geq 1$ small) that interpolates $f$. For $k = 1$, on each $[x_j, x_{j+1}]$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1$, we know there is a unique polynomial $s_j \in \mathbb{P}_1$ that interpolates $f$ at $x_j$ and $x_{j+1}$. Thus, there is a unique, continuous piecewise linear interpolant $s$ of $f$ at the given $n + 1$ nodes. We simply use $\mathbb{P}_1$ interpolation.
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for each of its pieces:

\[ s_j(x) = f_j + \frac{f_{j+1} - f_j}{x_{j+1} - x_j}(x - x_j), \quad x \in [x_j, x_{j+1}], \]  
\[ (3.88) \]

for \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1 \) and we have set \( f_j = f(x_j) \). Figure 3.11 shows an illustration of this piecewise linear interpolant \( s \).

Assuming that \( f \in C^2[a, b] \), we know that

\[ f(x) - s(x) = \frac{1}{2} f''(\xi(x))(x - x_j)(x - x_{j+1}), \quad x \in [x_j, x_{j+1}], \]  
\[ (3.89) \]

where \( \xi(x) \) is some point between \( x_j \) and \( x_{j+1} \). Then,

\[ \max_{x_j \leq x \leq x_{j+1}} |f(x) - p(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|f''\|_\infty \max_{x_j \leq x \leq x_{j+1}} |(x - x_j)(x - x_{j+1})|, \]  
\[ (3.90) \]

where \( \|f''\|_\infty \) is the sup norm of \( f'' \) over \( [a, b] \). Now, the max at the right hand side is attained at the midpoint \( (x_j + x_{j+1})/2 \) and

\[ \max_{x_j \leq x \leq x_{j+1}} |(x - x_j)(x - x_{j+1})| = \left( \frac{x_{j+1} - x_j}{2} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{4} h_j^2, \]  
\[ (3.91) \]
where \( h_j = x_{j+1} - x_j \). Therefore

\[
\max_{x_j \leq x \leq x_{j+1}} |f(x) - p(x)| \leq \frac{1}{8} \|f''\|_\infty h_j^2.
\]  
(3.92)

If we add more nodes, we can make \( h_j \) sufficiently small so that the error is smaller than a prescribed tolerance \( \delta \). That is, we can pick \( h_j \) such that \( \frac{1}{8} \|f''\|_\infty h_j^2 \leq \delta \), which implies

\[
h_j \leq \sqrt{\frac{8\delta}{\|f''\|_\infty}}.
\]  
(3.93)

This gives us an adaptive procedure to obtain a desired accuracy.

Continuous, piecewise quadratic interpolants \((k = 2)\) can be obtained by adding an extra point in each subinterval, say its midpoint, so that each piece \( s_j \in P_2 \) is the one that interpolates \( f \) at \( x_j, \frac{1}{2}(x_j + x_{j+1}), x_{j+1} \). For \( k = 3 \), we need to add 2 more points on each subinterval, etc. This procedure allows us to construct continuous, piecewise polynomial interpolants of \( f \) and if \( f \in C^{k+1}[a,b] \) one can simply use the Cauchy remainder on each subinterval to get a bound for the error, as we did for the piecewise linear case.
Sometimes a smoother piecewise polynomial interpolant \( s \) is needed. If we want \( s \in C^m[a,b] \) then on the first subinterval, \([x_0,x_1]\), we can take an arbitrary polynomial of degree at most \( k \) \((k + 1 \text{ degrees of freedom})\) but in the second subinterval the corresponding polynomial has to match \( m + 1 \) (continuity plus \( m \) derivatives) conditions at \( x_1 \) so we only have \( k - m \) degrees of freedom for it, and so on. Thus, in total we have \( k + 1 + (n - 1)(k - m) = n(k - m) + m + 1 \) degrees of freedom. For \( m = k \) we only have \( k + 1 \) degrees of freedom and since \( s \in \mathbb{P}_k \) on each subinterval, it must be a polynomial of degree at most \( k \) in the entire interval \([a,b]\). Moreover, since polynomials are \( C^\infty \) it follows that \( s \in \mathbb{P}_k \) on \([a,b]\) for \( m \geq k \). So we restrict ourselves to \( m < k \) and specifically focus on the case \( m = k - 1 \). These functions are called splines.

**Definition 3.1.** Given a partition
\[
\Delta = \{a = x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_n = b\} \quad (3.94)
\]
of \([a,b]\), the functions in the set
\[
\mathbb{S}_k^\Delta = \{ s : s \in C^{k-1}[a,b], \ s|_{[x_j,x_{j+1}]} \in \mathbb{P}_k, j = 0,1,\ldots,n-1 \} \quad (3.95)
\]
are called splines of degree \( k \) (or order \( k + 1 \)). The nodes \( x_j, j = 0,1,\ldots,n \), are called knots or breakpoints.

Note that if \( s \) and \( r \) are in \( \mathbb{S}_k^\Delta \) so is \( as + br \), i.e. \( \mathbb{S}_k^\Delta \) is a linear space, a subspace of \( C^{k-1}[a,b] \). The piecewise linear interpolant is a spline of degree 1. We are going to study next splines of degree 3.

### 3.10 Cubic Splines

Several applications require smoother approximations than that provided by a piece-wise linear interpolation. For example, continuity up to the second derivative is generally desired in computer graphics applications. With the \( C^2 \) requirement, we need to consider splines of degree \( k \geq 3 \). The case \( k = 3 \) is the most widely used and the corresponding splines are simply called cubic splines.

We consider here cubic splines that interpolate a set of values \( f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n \) at the nodes \( a = x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_n = b \), i.e. \( s \in \mathbb{S}_3^\Delta \) with \( s(x_j) = f_j, \ j = 0,1,\ldots,n \). We call such a function a cubic spline interpolant. Figure [3.12]
show an example of a cubic spline interpolating 5 data points. The cubic polynomial pieces ($s_j$ for $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$), appearing in different colors, are stitched together so that $s$ interpolates the given data and has two continuous derivatives. The same data points have been used in both Fig. 3.11 and Fig. 3.12. Note the striking difference of the two interpolants.

As we saw in Section 3.9, there are $n + 3$ degrees of freedom to determine $s \in S^3_\Delta$, two more than the $n + 1$ interpolation conditions. The two extra conditions could be the first or the second derivative of $s$ at the end points ($x = a, x = b$). Note that if $s \in S^3_\Delta$ then $s'' \in S^1_\Delta$, i.e. the second derivative of a cubic spline is a continuous, piece-wise linear spline. Consequently, $s''$ is determined uniquely by its $(n + 1)$ values

$$m_j = s''(x_j), \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n.$$  \hfill (3.96)

In the following construction of cubic spline interpolants we impose the $n + 1$ interpolation conditions plus two extra conditions to find the unique values $m_j, j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ that $s''$ must have at the nodes in order for $s$ to be $C^2[a, b]$. 

Figure 3.12: Cubic spline $s$ interpolating 5 data points. Each color represents a cubic polynomial constructed so that $s$ interpolates the given data, has two continuous derivatives, and $s''(x_0) = s''(x_4) = 0$. 

shows an example of a cubic spline interpolating 5 data points. The cubic polynomial pieces ($s_j$ for $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$), appearing in different colors, are stitched together so that $s$ interpolates the given data and has two continuous derivatives. The same data points have been used in both Fig. 3.11 and Fig. 3.12. Note the striking difference of the two interpolants.
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3.10.1 Natural Splines

Cubic splines with a vanishing second derivative at the first and last node, \( m_0 = 0 \) and \( m_n = 0 \), are called natural cubic splines. They are useful in graphics but not good for approximating a function \( f \), unless \( f \) happens to also have vanishing second derivatives at \( x_0 \) and \( x_n \).

We are now going to derive a linear system of equations for the values \( m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_{n-1} \) that define the natural cubic spline interpolant. Once this system is solved we obtain the spline piece by piece.

In each subinterval \([x_j, x_{j+1}]\), \( s \) is a polynomial \( s_j \in P_3 \), which we may represent as

\[
s_j(x) = A_j(x - x_j)^3 + B_j(x - x_j)^2 + C_j(x - x_j) + D_j,
\]

for \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1 \). To simplify the formulas below we let

\[
h_j = x_{j+1} - x_j.
\]

The spline \( s \) interpolates the given data. Thus, for \( j = 0, 1, \ldots n-1 \)

\[
s_j(x_j) = D_j = f_j,
\]

\[
s_j(x_{j+1}) = A_jh_j^3 + B_jh_j^2 + C_jh_j + D_j = f_{j+1}.
\]

Now \( s'_j(x) = 3A_j(x - x_j)^2 + 2B_j(x - x_j) + C_j \) and \( s''_j(x) = 6A_j(x - x_j) + 2B_j \).

Therefore, for \( j = 0, 1, \ldots n-1 \)

\[
s'_j(x_j) = C_j,
\]

\[
s'_j(x_{j+1}) = 3A_jh_j^2 + 2B_jh_j + C_j,
\]

and

\[
s''_j(x_j) = 2B_j,
\]

\[
s''_j(x_{j+1}) = 6A_jh_j + 2B_j.
\]

Since \( s'' \) is continuous

\[
m_{j+1} = s''(x_{j+1}) = s''_{j+1}(x_{j+1}) = s''_j(x_{j+1})
\]

and we can write (3.103)-(3.104) as

\[
m_j = 2B_j,
\]

\[
m_{j+1} = 6A_jh_j + 2B_j.
\]
We now write $A_j$, $B_j$, $C_j$, and $D_j$ in terms of the unknown values $m_j$ and $m_{j+1}$, and the known values $f_j$ and $f_{j+1}$. We have

\[
D_j = f_j, \\
B_j = \frac{1}{2}m_j, \\
A_j = \frac{1}{6h_j}(m_{j+1} - m_j)
\]

and substituting these values in (3.100) we get

\[
C_j = \frac{1}{h_j}(f_{j+1} - f_j) - \frac{1}{6}h_j(m_{j+1} + 2m_j).
\]

Let us collect all our formulas for the spline coefficients:

\[
A_j = \frac{1}{6h_j}(m_{j+1} - m_j), 
\]

(3.108)

\[
B_j = \frac{1}{2}m_j, 
\]

(3.109)

\[
C_j = \frac{1}{h_j}(f_{j+1} - f_j) - \frac{1}{6}h_j(m_{j+1} + 2m_j),
\]

(3.110)

\[
D_j = f_j,
\]

(3.111)

for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1$. So far we have only used that $s$ and $s''$ are continuous and that $s$ interpolates the given data. We are now going to impose the continuity of the first derivative of $s$ to determine equations for the unknown values $m_j$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1$. Substituting (3.108)-(3.111) in (3.102) we get

\[
s'_j(x_{j+1}) = 3A_j h_j^2 + 2B_j h_j + C_j
\]

\[
= 3\frac{1}{6h_j}(m_{j+1} - m_j)h_j^2 + 2\frac{1}{2}m_j h_j + \frac{1}{h_j}(f_{j+1} - f_j)
\]

\[
- \frac{1}{6}h_j(m_{j+1} + 2m_j)
\]

(3.112)

and decreasing the index by 1

\[
s'_{j-1}(x_j) = \frac{1}{h_{j-1}}(f_j - f_{j-1}) + \frac{1}{6}h_{j-1}(2m_j + m_{j-1}).
\]

(3.113)
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Continuity of the first derivative means $s'_{j-1}(x_j) = s'_j(x_j)$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$. Therefore, for $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$

$$\frac{1}{h_{j-1}}(f_j - f_{j-1}) + \frac{1}{6} h_{j-1}(2m_j + m_{j-1}) = C_j$$

$$= \frac{1}{h_j}(f_{j+1} - f_j) - \frac{1}{6} h_j(m_{j+1} + 2m_j)$$

which can be written as

$$h_{j-1}m_{j-1} + 2(h_{j-1} + h_j)m_j + h_jm_{j+1} =$$

$$-\frac{6}{h_{j-1}}(f_j - f_{j-1}) + \frac{6}{h_j}(f_{j+1} - f_j), \quad j = 1, \ldots, n - 1. \quad (3.115)$$

This is a linear system of $n-1$ equations for the $n-1$ unknowns $m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_{n-1}$. In matrix form

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
    a_1 & b_1 \\
    c_1 & a_2 & b_2 \\
    & c_2 & \ddots & \ddots \\
    \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
    & \ddots & \ddots & c_{n-2} & b_{n-2} \\
    & & c_{n-2} & a_{n-1}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
    m_1 \\
    m_2 \\
    \vdots \\
    \vdots \\
    \vdots \\
    m_{n-1}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
    d_1 \\
    \vdots \\
    \vdots \\
    \vdots \\
    \vdots \\
    d_{n-1}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.116)
$$

where

$$a_j = 2(h_{j-1} + h_j), \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1, \quad (3.117)$$

$$b_j = h_j, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-2, \quad (3.118)$$

$$c_j = h_j, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-2, \quad (3.119)$$

$$d_j = -\frac{6}{h_{j-1}}(f_j - f_{j-1}) + \frac{6}{h_j}(f_{j+1} - f_j), \quad j = 1, \ldots, n - 1. \quad (3.120)$$

Note that we have used $m_0 = m_n = 0$ in the first and last equation of this linear system. The matrix of the linear system (3.116) is strictly diagonally dominant, a concept we make precise in the definition below. A consequence of this property is that the matrix is nonsingular and therefore the linear system (3.116) has a unique solution. Moreover, this tridiagonal linear system can be solved efficiently with Algorithm 9.5. Once $m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_{n-1}$ are found, the spline coefficients can be computed from (3.108)-(3.111).
Definition 3.2. An \( n \times n \) matrix \( A \) with entries \( a_{ij}, i, j = 1, \ldots, n \) is strictly diagonally dominant if

\[
|a_{ii}| > \sum_{\substack{j=1 \atop j \neq i}}^{n} |a_{ij}|, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n. \quad (3.121)
\]

Theorem 3.6. Let \( A \) be a strictly diagonally dominant matrix. Then \( A \) is nonsingular.

Proof. Suppose the contrary, that is there is \( x \neq 0 \) such that \( Ax = 0 \). Let \( k \) be an index such that \( |x_k| = \|x\|_\infty \). Then, the \( k \)-th equation in \( Ax = 0 \) gives

\[
a_{kk}x_k + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \atop j \neq k}}^{n} a_{kj}x_j = 0 \quad (3.122)
\]

and consequently

\[
|a_{kk}| |x_k| \leq \sum_{\substack{j=1 \atop j \neq k}}^{n} |a_{kj}| |x_j|. \quad (3.123)
\]

Dividing by \( |x_k| \), which by assumption is nonzero, and using that \( |x_j|/|x_k| \leq 1 \) for all \( j = 1, \ldots, n \), we get

\[
|a_{kk}| \leq \sum_{\substack{j=1 \atop j \neq k}}^{n} |a_{kj}|, \quad (3.124)
\]

which contradicts the fact that \( A \) is strictly diagonally dominant.

Example 3.6. Find the natural cubic spline that interpolates \( (0, 0), (1, 1), (2, 16) \).

We know \( m_0 = 0 \) and \( m_2 = 0 \). We only need to find \( m_1 \) (only 1 interior node). The system (3.115) degenerates to just one equation. With \( h_0 = h_1 = 1 \) we have

\[
m_0 + 4m_1 + m_2 = 6[f_0 - 2f_1 + f_2] \Rightarrow m_1 = 21
\]
3.10. CUBIC SPLINES

In \([0, 1]\) we have

\[ A_0 = \frac{1}{6} (m_1 - m_0) = \frac{1}{6} \times 21 = \frac{7}{2}, \]
\[ B_0 = \frac{1}{2} m_0 = 0 \]
\[ C_0 = (f_1 - f_0) - \frac{1}{6} (m_1 + 2m_0) = 1 - \frac{1}{6} \times 21 = -\frac{5}{2}, \]
\[ D_0 = f_0 = 0. \]

Thus, \( s_0(x) = A_0(x - 0)^3 + B_0(x - 0)^2 + C_0(x - 0) + D_0 = \frac{7}{2}x^3 - \frac{5}{2}x. \)

In \([1, 2]\)

\[ A_1 = \frac{1}{6} (m_2 - m_1) = \frac{1}{6} (-21) = -\frac{7}{2}, \]
\[ B_1 = \frac{1}{2} m_1 = \frac{21}{2}, \]
\[ C_1 = (f_2 - f_1) - \frac{1}{6} (m_2 + 2m_1) = 16 - 1 - \frac{1}{6} (2 \times 21) = 8, \]
\[ D_1 = f_1 = 1. \]

and \( s_1(x) = -\frac{7}{2}(x - 1)^3 + \frac{21}{2} (x - 1)^2 + 8(x - 1) + 1. \) Therefore the natural cubic spline that interpolates the given data is

\[ s(x) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{7}{2}x^3 - \frac{5}{2}x & x \in [0, 1], \\
-\frac{7}{2}(x - 1)^3 + \frac{21}{2} (x - 1)^2 + 8(x - 1) + 1 & x \in [1, 2]. 
\end{cases} \]

3.10.2 Complete Splines

If we are interested in approximating a function with a cubic spline interpolant it is generally more accurate to specify the first derivative at the endpoints instead of imposing a vanishing second derivative. A cubic spline where we specify \( s'(a) \) and \( s'(b) \) is called a complete spline.

In a complete spline the values \( m_0 \) and \( m_n \) of \( s'' \) at the endpoints become unknowns together with \( m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_{n-1} \). Thus, we need to add two more equations to have a complete system for all the \( n + 1 \) unknown values \( m_0, m_1, \ldots, m_n \). Recall that

\[ s_j(x) = A_j(x - x_j)^3 + B_j(x - x_j)^2 + C_j(x - x_j) + D_j \]
and so $s'_j(x) = 3A_j(x - x_j)^2 + 2B_j(x - x_j) + C_j$. Therefore

$$s'_0(x_0) = C_0 = f'_0, \quad (3.125)$$
$$s'_{n-1}(x_n) = 3A_{n-1}h_{n-1}^2 + 2B_{n-1}h_{n-1} + C_{n-1} = f'_n, \quad (3.126)$$

where $f'_0 = f'(x_0)$ and $f'_n = f'(x_n)$. Substituting $C_0, A_{n-1}, B_{n-1},$ and $C_{n-1}$ from (3.108)-(3.110) we get

$$2h_0m_0 + h_0m_1 = \frac{6}{h_0}(f_1 - f_0) - 6f'_0, \quad (3.127)$$
$$h_{n-1}m_{n-1} + 2h_{n-1}m_n = -\frac{6}{h_{n-1}}(f_n - f_{n-1}) + 6f'_n. \quad (3.128)$$

If we append $\{(3.127)\}$ and $\{(3.127)\}$ at the top and the bottom of the system (3.115), respectively and set $h_{-1} = h_n = 0$ we obtain the following tridiagonal linear system for the values of the second derivative of the complete spline at the knots:

$$\begin{bmatrix}
    a_0 & b_0 & & & \\
    c_0 & a_1 & b_1 & & \\
     & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\
    & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
     & & & c_{n-1} & a_n \\
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
    m_0 \\
    m_1 \\
    \vdots \\
    \vdots \\
    m_n \\
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
    d_0 \\
    d_1 \\
    \vdots \\
    \vdots \\
    d_n \\
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.129)$$

where

$$a_j = 2(h_{j-1} + h_j), \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \quad (3.130)$$
$$b_j = h_j, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1, \quad (3.131)$$
$$c_j = h_j, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1, \quad (3.132)$$
$$d_0 = \frac{6}{h_0}(f_1 - f_0) - 6f'_0, \quad (3.133)$$
$$d_j = -\frac{6}{h_{j-1}}(f_j - f_{j-1}) + \frac{6}{h_j}(f_{j+1} - f_j), \quad j = 1, \ldots, n - 1, \quad (3.134)$$
$$d_n = -\frac{6}{h_{n-1}}(f_n - f_{n-1}) + 6f'_n. \quad (3.135)$$
As in the case of natural cubic splines, this linear system is also diagonally dominant (hence nonsingular) and can be solved efficiently with Algorithm 9.5.

It can be proved that if \( f \) is sufficiently smooth its complete spline interpolant \( s \) produces an error \( \| f - s \|_\infty \leq Ch^4 \), where \( h = \max_i h_i \), whereas for the natural cubic spline interpolant the error deteriorates to \( O(h^2) \) near the endpoints.

### 3.10.3 Minimal Bending Energy

Consider a curve given by \( y = f(x) \) for \( x \in [a, b] \) where \( f \in C^2[a, b] \). Its curvature is given by

\[
\kappa(x) = \frac{f''(x)}{[1 + (f'(x))^2]^{3/2}}
\]

and a measure of how much the curve "curves" or bends is its bending energy

\[
E_b = \int_a^b \kappa^2(x)dx.
\]

For curves with small \( |f'| \) compared to 1, \( \kappa(x) \approx f''(x) \) and \( E_b \approx \|f''\|^2_2 \). We are going to show that cubic splines interpolants are \( C^2 \) functions that have minimal \( \|f''\|_2 \), in a sense we make more precise below. To show this we are going to use the following two results.

**Lemma 2.** Let \( s \in S^3_\Delta \) be a cubic spline interpolant of \( f \in C^2[a, b] \) at the nodes \( \Delta = \{a = x_0 < x_1 \ldots < x_n = b\} \). Then, for all \( g \in S^1_\Delta \)

\[
\int_a^b [f''(x) - s''(x)]g(x)dx = [f'(b) - s'(b)]g(b) - [f'(a) - s'(a)]g(a).
\]

**Proof.**

\[
\int_a^b [f''(x) - s''(x)]g(x)dx = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} [f''(x) - s''(x)]g(x)dx.
\]

We can integrate by parts on each interval:

\[
\int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} [f''(x) - s''(x)]g(x)dx = [f'(x) - s'(x)]g(x)\bigg|_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} - \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} [f'(x) - s'(x)]g'(x)dx.
\]
Substituting this in (3.139) the boundary terms telescope and we obtain
\[
\int_a^b [f''(x) - s''(x)] g(x) dx = [f'(b) - s'(b)] g(b) - [f'(a) - s'(a)] g(a) - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} [f'(x) - s'(x)] g'(x) dx.
\]  
(3.141)

On each subinterval \([x_j, x_{j+1}]\), \(s''\) is constant and \(f - s\) vanishes at the end-points. Therefore, the last term is zero.

**Theorem 3.7.** Let \(s \in S^3_\Delta\) be the (natural or complete) cubic spline interpolant of \(f \in C^2[a, b]\) at the nodes \(\Delta = \{a = x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_n = b\}\). Then,
\[
\|s''\|_2 \leq \|f''\|_2.  
\]  
(3.142)

**Proof.**
\[
\|f'' - s''\|^2_2 = \int_a^b [f''(x) - s''(x)]^2 dx = \|f''\|^2_2 + \|s''\|^2_2 - 2 \int_a^b f''(x) s''(x) dx
\]  
= \|f''\|^2_2 - \|s''\|^2_2 - 2 \int_a^b [f''(x) - s''(x)] s''(x) dx.  
\]  
(3.143)

By Lemma 2 with \(g = s''\) the last term vanishes for the natural spline \((s''(a) = s''(b) = 0)\) and for the complete spline \((s'(a) = f'(a)\) and \(s'(b) = f'(b)\)) and we get the identify
\[
\|f'' - s''\|^2_2 = \|f''\|^2_2 - \|s''\|^2_2
\]  
(3.144)

from which the results follows. \(\square\)

In Theorem 3.7 \(f\) could be substituted for any sufficiently smooth interpolant \(g\) of the given data.

**Theorem 3.8.** Let \(s \in S^3_\Delta\) and \(g \in C^2[a, b]\) both interpolate the values \(f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n\) at the nodes \(\Delta = \{a = x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_n = b\}\). Then,
\[
\|s''\|_2 \leq \|g''\|_2,  
\]  
(3.145)

if either \(s''(a) = s''(b) = 0\) (natural spline) or \(s'(a) = g'(a)\) and \(s'(b) = g'(b)\) (complete spline).
3.11. **TRIGONOMETRIC INTERPOLATION**

3.10.4 **Splines for Parametric Curves**

In computer graphics and animation it is often required to construct smooth curves that are not necessarily the graph of a function but that have a parametric representation $x = x(t)$ and $y = y(t)$ for $t \in [a, b]$. Hence we need to determine two splines interpolating $(t_j, x_j)$ and $(t_j, y_j)$ ($j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$), respectively. Usually, only the position of the “control points” $(x_0, y_0), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$ is given and not the parameter values $t_0, t_1, \ldots, t_n$. In such cases, we can use the distances of consecutive control points to generate appropriate $t_j$’s as follows:

$$t_0 = 0, \quad t_j = t_{j-1} + \sqrt{(x_j - x_{j-1})^2 + (y_j - y_{j-1})^2}, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, n.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.146)

Figure 3.13 shows an example of this approach.

3.11 **Trigonometric Interpolation**

We now consider the important case of interpolation of a periodic array of data $(x_0, f_0), (x_1, f_1), \ldots, (x_N, f_N)$ with $f_N = f_0$, and $x_j = j(2\pi/N)$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, N$, by a trigonometric polynomial.

Figure 3.13: Example of a parametric spline representation to interpolate the given data points (in red).
Definition 3.3. A function of the form
\[ s_n(x) = \sum_{k=-n}^{n} c_k e^{ikx}, \tag{3.147} \]
where \( c_0, c_1, c_{-1}, \ldots, c_n, c_{-n} \) are complex or equivalently of the (real) form
\[ s_n(x) = \frac{1}{2} a_0 + \sum_{k=0}^{n} (a_k \cos kx + b_k \sin kx) \tag{3.148} \]
where the coefficients \( a_0, a_1, b_1, \ldots, a_n, b_n \) are real is called a trigonometric polynomial of degree at most \( n \).

The values to interpolate \( f_j, j = 0, 1, \ldots, N \) could come from a \((2\pi)\) periodic function, \( f(j \cdot 2\pi/N) = f_j \), or can simply be given data. Note that the interpolation nodes are equi-spaced points in \([0, 2\pi]\). One can accommodate periods \( \neq 2\pi \) by doing a simple scaling. Because of periodicity \((f_N = f_0)\), we only have \( N \) independent data points \((x_0, f_0), \ldots, (x_{N-1}, f_{N-1})\) or \((x_1, f_1), \ldots, (x_N, f_N)\). The interpolation problem is then to find a trigonometric polynomial of lowest degree, \( s_n \), such that \( s_n(x_j) = f_j \), for \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1 \). Such polynomial has \( 2n + 1 \) coefficients. If we take \( n = N/2 \) (assuming \( N \) even), we have \( N + 1 \) coefficients to be determined but only \( N \) interpolation conditions. An additional condition arises by noting that the sine term of highest wavenumber, \( k = N/2 \), vanishes at the equi-spaced nodes, \( \sin\left(\frac{N}{2} x_j\right) = \sin(j\pi) = 0 \). Thus, the coefficient \( b_{N/2} \) is irrelevant for interpolation and we can set it to zero. Consequently, we look for a trigonometric polynomial of the form
\[ s_{N/2}(x) = \frac{1}{2} a_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{N/2-1} (a_k \cos kx + b_k \sin kx) + \frac{1}{2} a_{N/2} \cos \left( \frac{N}{2} x \right). \tag{3.149} \]
The convenience of the \( 1/2 \) factor in the last term will be seen in the formulas we obtain below for the coefficients.

It is conceptually and computationally simpler to work with the corresponding trigonometric polynomial in complex form
\[ s_{N/2}(x) = \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2} c_k e^{ikx}, \tag{3.150} \]
\[5\text{Recall } 2 \cos kx = e^{ik} + e^{-ik} \text{ and } 2i \sin kx = e^{ik} - e^{-ik}\]
where the double prime in the summation sign means that the first and last terms ($k = -N/2$ and $k = N/2$) have a factor of $1/2$. It is also understood that $c_{-N/2} = c_{N/2}$, which is equivalent to the $b_{N/2} = 0$ condition in (3.149).

**Theorem 3.9.**

$$s_{N/2}(x) = \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2} c_k e^{ikx}$$

(3.151)

interpolates $(0, f_0), (2\pi/N, f_1), \ldots, ((N - 1)2\pi/N, f_{N-1})$ if and only if

$$c_k = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f_j e^{-ik2\pi j/N}, \quad k = -\frac{N}{2}, \ldots, \frac{N}{2}. \quad (3.152)$$

**Proof.** Substituting (3.152) in (3.151) we get

$$s_{N/2}(x) = \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2} c_k e^{ikx} = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f_j \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2} e^{ik(x-x_j)},$$

with $x_j = j2\pi/N$ and defining

$$l_j(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2} e^{ik(x-x_j)}$$

(3.153)

we obtain

$$s_{N/2}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} l_j(x)f_j. \quad (3.154)$$

Note that we have written $s_{N/2}$ in a form similar to the Lagrange form of polynomial interpolation. In view of (3.154), we only need to prove that for $j$ and $m$ in the range $0, \ldots, N-1$

$$l_j(x_m) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } m = j, \\ 0 & \text{for } m \neq j. \end{cases} \quad (3.155)$$
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Now,

\[ l_j(x_m) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2} e^{ik(m-j)2\pi/N} \]  

(3.156)

and \( e^{i(\pm N/2)(m-j)2\pi/N} = e^{\pm i(m-j)\pi} = (-1)^{(m-j)} \) so we can combine the first and the last term and remove the double prime from the sum:

\[ l_j(x_m) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2-1} e^{ik(m-j)2\pi/N} \]

\[ = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2-1} e^{i(k+N/2)(m-j)2\pi/N} e^{-i(N/2)(m-j)2\pi/N} \]

\[ = e^{-i(m-j)\pi} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} e^{ik(m-j)2\pi/N}. \]

Recall that (see Section 1.3)

\[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} e^{-ik(j-m)2\pi/N} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (\frac{j-m}{N}) \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \]  

(3.157)

Then, (3.155) follows and

\[ s_{N/2}(x_m) = f_m, \quad m = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1. \]  

(3.158)

Now suppose \( s_{N/2} \) interpolates \( (0, f_0), (2\pi/N, f_1), \ldots, ((N-1)2\pi/N, f_{N-1}) \). Then, the \( c_k \) coefficients of \( s_{N/2} \) satisfy

\[ \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2} c_k e^{ik2\pi j/N} = f_j, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1. \]  

(3.159)

Since \( c_{-N/2} = c_{N/2} \), we can write (3.159) equivalently as the linear system

\[ \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2-1} c_k e^{ik2\pi j/N} = f_j, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1. \]  

(3.160)
From the discrete orthogonality of the complex exponential (3.157), it follows that the matrix of coefficients of (3.160) has orthogonal columns and hence it is nonsingular. Therefore, (3.160) has a unique solution and thus the \(c_k\) coefficients must be those given by (3.152).

Using the relations
\[
c_0 = \frac{1}{2} a_0, \quad c_k = \frac{1}{2} (a_k - ib_k), \quad c_{-k} = \bar{c}_k, \quad k = 1, \ldots, n,
\]
we find that
\[
s_{N/2}(x) = \frac{1}{2} a_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{N/2-1} (a_k \cos kx + b_k \sin kx) + \frac{1}{2} a_{N/2} \cos \left(\frac{N}{2} x\right)
\]
interpolates \((0, f_0), (2\pi/N, f_1), \ldots, ((N-1)2\pi/N, f_{N-1})\) if and only if
\[
\begin{align*}
a_k &= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f_j \cos kx_j, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, N/2, \\
b_k &= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f_j \sin kx_j, \quad k = 1, \ldots, N/2 - 1.
\end{align*}
\]

A smooth periodic function \(f\) can be approximated very accurately by its Fourier interpolant \(s_{N/2}\). Figure 3.14 shows the approximation of \(f(x) = \sin x e^{\cos x}\) on \([0, 2\pi]\) by \(s_4\). The graph of \(f\) and of its Fourier interpolant are almost indistinguishable. Note also that derivatives of \(s_{N/2}\) can be easily computed
\[
s^{(p)}_{N/2}(x) = \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2} (ik)^p c_k e^{ikx}.
\]
The Fourier coefficients of the \(p\)-th derivative of \(s_{N/2}\) can thus be readily obtained from the discrete coefficients of \(f\) (the \(c_k\)’s). Once these Fourier coefficients are computed, we could get an accurate approximation \(s^{(p)}_{N/2}\) of \(f^{(p)}\).

Let us go back to the complex Fourier interpolant (3.150). Its coefficients \(c_k\) are periodic of period \(N\),
\[
c_{k+N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f_j e^{-i(k+N)x_j} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f_j e^{-ikx_j} e^{-ij2\pi} = c_k
\]
and in particular (for $k = -N/2$) $c_{-N/2} = c_{N/2}$. Using the interpolation property we have

$$f_j = \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2} c_k e^{ikx_j} = \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2-1} c_k e^{ikx_j}$$

(3.165)

and

$$\sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2-1} c_k e^{ikx_j} = \sum_{k=-N/2}^{-1} c_k e^{ikx_j} + \sum_{k=0}^{N/2-1} c_k e^{ikx_j}$$

(3.166)

$$= \sum_{k=N/2}^{N-1} c_k e^{ikx_j} + \sum_{k=0}^{N/2-1} c_k e^{ikx_j} = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} c_k e^{ikx_j},$$

where we have used that $c_{k+N} = c_k$. Combining this with the formula for the
3.12. THE FAST FOURIER TRANSFORM

$
c_k$’s we get Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT) pair

$$c_k = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f_j e^{-ikx_j}, \quad k = 0, \ldots, N - 1, \quad (3.167)$$

$$f_j = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} c_k e^{ikx_j}, \quad j = 0, \ldots, N - 1. \quad (3.168)$$

The set of discrete coefficients (3.167) is known as the DFT of the periodic array $f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_{N-1}$ and (3.168) is referred to as the Inverse DFT.

The direct evaluation of the DFT is computationally expensive, it requires $O(N^2)$ operations. However, there is a remarkable algorithm which achieves this in merely $O(N \log_2 N)$ operations. This algorithm is known as the Fast Fourier Transform.

### 3.12 The Fast Fourier Transform

The direct computation of either (3.167) or (3.168) requires $O(N^2)$ operations. As $N$ increasing, this computational cost quickly becomes prohibitive. In many applications $N$ could easily be on the order of thousands, millions, etc.

One of the top algorithms of all times is the Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) due to Cooley and Tukey (1965). We now look at the main ideas of this widely used algorithm.

Let us define $d_k = Nc_k$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1$. Then we can rewrite (3.167) as

$$d_k = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f_j \omega_N^{kj}, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1, \quad (3.169)$$

where $\omega_N = e^{-i2\pi/N}$.

Let $N = 2n$. Going back to (3.169), if we split the even-numbered and the odd-numbered points we have

$$d_k = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f_{2j} \omega_N^{2jk} + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f_{2j+1} \omega_N^{(2j+1)k} \quad (3.170)$$
But
\[ \omega_N^{2jk} = e^{-i2jk \frac{2\pi}{N}} = e^{-ijk \frac{2\pi}{N}} = \omega_n^{kj}, \quad (3.171) \]
\[ \omega_N^{(2j+1)k} = e^{-i(2j+1)k \frac{2\pi}{N}} = e^{-ik \frac{2\pi}{N}} e^{-i2jk \frac{2\pi}{N}} = \omega_N^k \omega_n^{kj}. \quad (3.172) \]

So denoting \( f_j^e = f_{2j} \) and \( f_j^o = f_{2j+1} \), we get
\[ d_k = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f_j^e \omega_n^{jk} + \omega_N^k \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f_j^o \omega_n^{jk} \quad (3.173) \]

We have reduced the problem to two DFT of size \( n = \frac{N}{2} \) plus \( N \) multiplications (and \( N \) sums). The numbers \( \omega_N^k, k = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1 \) only depend on \( N \) so they can be precomputed once and stored for other DFT of the same size \( N \).

If \( N = 2^p \), for \( p \) positive integer, we can repeat the process to reduce each of the DFT’s of size \( n \) to a pair of DFT’s of size \( n/2 \) plus \( n \) multiplications (and \( n \) additions), etc. We can do this \( p \) times so that we end up with 1-point DFT’s, which require no multiplications!

Let us count the number of operations in the FFT algorithm. For simplicity, let is count only the number of multiplications (the numbers of additions is of the same order). Let \( m_N \) be the number of multiplications to compute the DFT for a periodic array of size \( N \) and assume that \( N = 2^p \). Then
\[ m_N = 2m_{\frac{N}{2}} + N \]
\[ = 2m_{2^{p-1}} + 2^p \]
\[ = 2(2m_{2^{p-2}} + 2^{p-1}) + 2^p \]
\[ = 2^2m_{2^{p-2}} + 2 \cdot 2^p \]
\[ = \ldots \]
\[ = 2^p m_2 + p \cdot 2^p = p \cdot 2^p \]
\[ = N \log_2 N, \]
where we have used that \( m_2 = m_1 = 0 \) (no multiplication is needed for DFT of 1 point). To illustrate the savings, if \( N = 2^{20} \), with the FFT we can obtain the DFT (or the Inverse DFT) in order \( 20 \times 2^{20} \) operations, whereas the direct methods requires order \( 2^{40} \), i.e. a factor of \( \frac{1}{20} \times 2^{20} \approx 52429 \) more operations. The FFT can also be implemented efficiently when \( N \) is the product of small primes.
3.13 The Chebyshev Interpolant and the DCT

We take now a closer look at polynomial interpolation of a function \( f \) (in \([-1,1]\)) at the Chebyshev nodes

\[ x_j = \cos \left( \frac{j\pi}{n} \right), \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \]  

(3.174)

The unique interpolating polynomial \( p_n \in \mathbb{P}_n \) of \( f \) at the Chebyshev nodes, which we will call the \textit{Chebyshev interpolant}, can be evaluated efficiently using its barycentric representation (Section 3.3). However, there is another representation of \( p_n \) that is also computationally efficient (although the barycentric formula still beats it in most cases) and useful for obtaining fast converging methods for integration and differentiation. This alternative representation is based on an expansion of Chebyshev polynomials.

Since \( p_n \in \mathbb{P}_n \) there are unique coefficients \( c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_n \) such that

\[ p_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} c_k T_k(x) := \frac{c_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} c_k T_k(x) + \frac{c_n}{2} T_n(x). \]  

(3.175)

The \( 1/2 \) factor for \( k = 0, n \) is introduced for convenience to have one formula for all the \( c_k \)'s as we will see below. Under the change of variable \( x = \cos \theta \), for \( \theta \in [0, \pi] \) we get

\[ p_n(\cos \theta) = \frac{c_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} c_k \cos k\theta + \frac{1}{2} c_n \cos n\theta. \]  

(3.176)

Let \( \Pi_n(\theta) = p_n(\cos \theta) \) and \( F(\theta) = f(\cos \theta) \). By extending \( F \) evenly over \([-\pi, 0]\) (or over \([\pi, 2\pi]\)) and using Theorem 3.9 we conclude that \( \Pi_n(\theta) \) interpolates \( F(\theta) = f(\cos \theta) \) at the equally spaced points \( \theta_j = j\pi/n, \ j = 0, 1, \ldots, n \) if and only if

\[ c_k = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n} F(\theta_j) \cos k\theta_j, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \]  

(3.177)

These are the (Type I) \textit{Discrete Cosine Transform (DCT)} coefficients of \( F \) and we can compute them efficiently in \( O(n \log_2 n) \) operations with the fast DCT, an FFT-based algorithm which exploits that \( F \) is even and real.\footnote{Using the full FFT requires extending \( F \) evenly to \([\pi, 2\pi]\), doubling the size of the arrays, and is thus computationally less efficient than the fast DCT.}
Chapter 4

Least Squares

In this chapter we study the best approximation in the $L^2$ or the 2-norm, which is called the least squares approximation. We consider both approximation of continuous functions (using the $L^2$ norm) and discrete (data) sets (using the Euclidean, 2-norm). The theory is the same for both settings except that integrals are replaced by sums in the latter. Throughout this chapter $\| \cdot \|$ is the (weighted) $L^2$ or the 2-norm, unless otherwise noted.

4.1 Least Squares for Functions

Definition 4.1. A set of functions $\{\phi_0, ..., \phi_n\}$ defined on an interval $[a, b]$ is said to be linearly independent if

$$c_0\phi_0(x) + c_1\phi_1(x) + \ldots + c_n\phi_n(x) = 0, \quad \text{for all } x \in [a, b], \quad (4.1)$$

then $c_0 = c_1 = \ldots = c_n = 0$. Otherwise, it is said to be linearly dependent.

Example 4.1. The set of functions $\{\phi_0, ..., \phi_n\}$, where $\phi_k$ is a polynomial of degree exactly $k$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ is linearly independent on any interval $[a, b]$. For $c_0\phi_0(x) + c_1\phi_1(x) + \ldots + c_n\phi_n(x) = 0$ for all $x$ in a given interval $[a, b]$ implies $c_0 = c_1 = \ldots = c_n = 0$.

We are going to use the weighted $L^2$ norm. This is given in terms of the inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \int_a^b f(x)g(x)w(x)dx, \quad (4.2)$$
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where \( w(x) \geq 0 \) for all \( x \in (a, b) \)\(^1\) and the overline denotes the complex conjugate, by
\[
\|f\| = \sqrt{\langle f, f \rangle}.
\] (4.3)

**Definition 4.2.** Two functions \( f \) and \( g \) are orthogonal, with respect to the inner product \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \), if \( \langle f, g \rangle = 0 \).

**Theorem 4.1.** *Pythagorean Theorem.* If \( f \) and \( g \) are orthogonal, then
\[
\|f + g\|^2 = \|f\|^2 + \|g\|^2.
\] (4.4)

**Proof.**
\[
\|f + g\|^2 = \langle f + g, f + g \rangle = \langle f, f \rangle + \langle f, g \rangle + \langle g, f \rangle + \langle g, g \rangle = \|f\|^2 + \|g\|^2.
\] (4.5)

Given a continuous function \( f \) and a set of linearly independent, continuous functions \( \{\phi_0, \ldots, \phi_n\} \) both defined on \([a, b]\), the least squares problem is to find the best approximation to \( f \) in the \( L^2 \) norm by functions in
\[
W = \text{Span}\{\phi_0, \ldots, \phi_n\}.
\] (4.6)

Since \( W \) is finite-dimensional and the \( L^2 \) norm is strictly convex, we know (Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3) there is a unique best approximation \( f^* \in W \) to \( f \). That is, there is a unique \( f^* \in W \) such that
\[
\|f - f^*\| \leq \|f - g\|, \quad \forall g \in W.
\] (4.7)

This best approximation \( f^* \) is called the *least squares approximation* to \( f \) (by functions in \( W \)) because it minimizes the squared error \( \|f - g\|^2 \) over \( g \in W \). It has a geometric interpretation: the error \( f - f^* \) is orthogonal to \( W \):
\[
\langle f - f^*, g \rangle = 0, \quad \forall g \in W,
\] (4.8)
as Fig. 4.1 illustrates. That is, \( f^* \) is the *orthogonal projection* of \( f \) onto \( W \). Since all functions in \( W \) are linear combinations of \( \phi_0, \phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n \), this

\(^1\)More precisely, we will assume \( w(x) \geq 0 \), \( \int_a^b w(x)dx > 0 \), and \( \int_a^b x^k w(x)dx < +\infty \) for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots \). We call such a \( w \) an admissible weight function.
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The geometric characterization of the least squares approximation is equivalent to \( \langle f - f^*, \phi_j \rangle = 0 \) for \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, n \) and writing \( f^* = c_0 \phi_0 + \ldots + c_n \phi_n \) we obtain the normal equations

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n} \langle \phi_k, \phi_j \rangle c_k = \langle f, \phi_j \rangle, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \tag{4.9}
\]

We will show that this linear system of equations for \( c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_n \) has a unique solution but first let’s state and prove the geometric characterization of \( f^* \).

**Theorem 4.2.** The least squares approximation to \( f \) by functions in \( W \) is characterized by the geometric property (4.8).

**Proof.** By uniqueness of the least squares approximation (Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3) we only need to show that if \( f^* \in W \) satisfies the geometric property then it is a least squares approximation to \( f \).

Suppose \( f - f^* \) is orthogonal to \( W \) and let \( g \in W \). Then, \( f^* - g \) is also in \( W \) and hence orthogonal to \( f - f^* \). Therefore,

\[
\| f - g \|^2 = \| f - f^* + f^* - g \|^2 = \| f - f^* \|^2 + \| f^* - g \|^2,
\]

where we have used the Pythagorean theorem in the last equality. From (4.10) it follows that \( \| f - g \| \geq \| f - f^* \| \) for all \( g \in W \). \( \square \)

We now prove that if the set \( \{ \phi_0, \ldots, \phi_n \} \) is linearly independent then there is a unique solution \( c_0^*, \ldots, c_n^* \) of the normal equations (4.14), so that

Figure 4.1: Geometric interpretation of the least squares approximation \( f^* \) to \( f \) by functions in \( W \). The error \( f - f^* \) is orthogonal to \( W \).
$f^* = c_0^* \phi_0 + \ldots + c_n^* \phi_n$. Equivalently, we’ll show that the homogeneous system

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} (\phi_k, \phi_j) c_k = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \quad (4.11)$$

has only the trivial solution.

$$\left\| \sum_{k=0}^{n} c_k \phi_k \right\|^2 = \left\langle \sum_{k=0}^{n} c_k \phi_k, \sum_{k=0}^{n} c_k \bar{\phi}_k \right\rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{l=0}^{n} (\phi_k, \phi_l) c_k \bar{c}_l = \sum_{l=0}^{n} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n} (\phi_k, \phi_l) c_k \right) \bar{c}_l = \sum_{l=0}^{n} 0 \bar{c}_l = 0. \quad (4.12)$$

Therefore $\sum_{k=0}^{n} c_k \phi_k(x) = 0$ for all $x \in [a, b]$. By the linear independence of the set $\{\phi_0, \phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n\}$ it follows that $c_0 = c_1 = \ldots = c_n = 0$.

Orthogonality plays a central role in the least squares problem. But it is also important to keep in mind the minimization character of the solution. Indeed, if $f^*$ is the best $L^2$-approximation of $f$ in $W$ then for any fixed $g \in W$ $J(\epsilon) = \|f - f^* + \epsilon g\|^2$ has a minimum at $\epsilon = 0$. But

$$J(\epsilon) = \|f - f^*\|^2 + 2\epsilon \langle f - f^*, g \rangle + \epsilon^2 \|g\|^2. \quad (4.13)$$

This is a parabola opening upwards. Hence the minimum is at its critical point. Since $J'(\epsilon) = 2\langle f - f^*, g \rangle + 2\epsilon \|g\|^2$ and we know the minimum is attained at $\epsilon = 0$ it follows that $\langle f - f^*, g \rangle = 0$.

**Definition 4.3.** $\{\phi_0, ..., \phi_n\}$ is an orthogonal set if $\langle \phi_j, \phi_k \rangle = 0$ for all $j \neq k$ $(j, k = 0, 1, \ldots, n)$. If in addition $\|\phi_k\| = 1$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, n$, $\{\phi_0, ..., \phi_n\}$ is called an orthonormal set.

If $\{\phi_0, ..., \phi_n\}$ is an orthogonal set of functions, then the normal equations (4.14) simplify to

$$\langle \phi_k, \phi_k \rangle c_k = \langle f, \phi_k \rangle, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \quad (4.14)$$
which can be solved immediately to give
\[ c_k = \frac{1}{\|\phi_k\|^2} \langle f, \phi_k \rangle, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \tag{4.15} \]

These \( c_k \)'s are called \((generalized) Fourier coefficients\). They are a generalization of the familiar Fourier coefficients, obtained from the set of trigonometric functions \( \{1, \cos x, \sin x, \ldots, \cos nx, \sin nx\} \) or equivalently from the set \( \{e^{ix}, e^{-ix}, \ldots, e^{inx}, e^{-inx}\} \), as we will see next. Note that the Fourier coefficients \( \langle f, \phi_k \rangle \) are independent of \( n \). If we have computed \( c_k, k = 0, 1, \ldots, n \) and would like to increase \( n \) we just need to compute the new coefficients \( k > n \) and reuse the previously computed ones.

### 4.1.1 Trigonometric Polynomial Approximation

The set \( \{e^{ix}, e^{-ix}, \ldots, e^{inx}, e^{-inx}\} \) is an orthogonal set with the inner product \( \langle e^{ix}, e^{jx} \rangle = \int_{0}^{2\pi} e^{i(j-k)x} dx = 0, \) for \( j \neq k \). \( \tag{4.16} \)

Thus, the least squares approximation to a function \( f \) (defined on \([0,2\pi]\) and squared integrable), i.e. the best approximation in the \( L^2 \) norm, by a trigonometric polynomial of degree at most \( n \) (see Definition 3.3) is given by the truncated Fourier series of \( f \)

\[ f^*(x) = \sum_{k=-n}^{n} c_k e^{ikx}, \quad \tag{4.17} \]

\[ c_k = \frac{1}{2\pi} \langle f, e^{ikx} \rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} f(x) e^{-ikx} dx, \quad k = 0, \pm 1, \ldots, \pm n. \tag{4.18} \]

or equivalently

\[ f^*(x) = \frac{1}{2} a_0 + \sum_{k=0}^{n} (a_k \cos kx + b_k \sin kx), \quad \tag{4.19} \]

\[ a_k = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} f(x) \cos kx dx, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \quad \tag{4.20} \]

\[ b_k = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} f(x) \sin kx dx, \quad k = 1, \ldots, n. \quad \tag{4.21} \]
That is, the solution to the normal equations in this case are the (traditional) Fourier coefficients of \( f \). Assuming \( f \) is a smooth, \( 2\pi \)-periodic function (with a uniformly convergent Fourier series),

\[
f(x) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} c_k e^{ikx},
\]
(4.22)

the squared error is given by

\[
\| f - f^* \|^2 = \left\langle \sum_{|k|>n} |c_k|^2, \sum_{|j|>n} |c_j|^2 \right\rangle = 2\pi \sum_{|k|>n} |c_k|^2.
\]
(4.23)

If \( f \) is \( 2\pi \)-periodic and \( f \in C^m[0, 2\pi] \) for \( m \geq 1 \), its Fourier coefficients decay like \( |c_k| \leq A_m |k|^{-m} \) for some constant \( A_m \) \([\text{cf. (1.62)}]\). Then,

\[
\| f - f^* \|^2 \leq 2\pi A_m^2 \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^{2m}}
\]
(4.24)

and if we use the bound

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^{2m}} < \int_{n+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{x^{2m}} = \frac{1}{(2m - 1)(n + 1)^{2m-1}}
\]
(4.25)

we obtain

\[
\| f - f^* \| \leq \frac{C_m}{(n + 1)^{m-1/2}},
\]
(4.26)

for some constant \( C_m \).

In practice, we approximate the Fourier coefficients (4.18) with the composite trapezoidal rule at \( N \) equi-spaced-points

\[
c_k \approx \tilde{c}_k = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(j2\pi/N)e^{-ikj2\pi/N}.
\]
(4.27)

Now, substituting (4.22) with \( x = j2\pi/N \)

\[
\tilde{c}_k = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} c_l e^{ij2\pi/lN} \right) e^{-ikj2\pi/n}
\]
(4.28)
and using the discrete orthogonality of the complex exponential (3.157) we get
\[ \tilde{c}_k = c_k + c_{-N} + c_{k-N} + c_{-2N} + c_{k+2N} + \ldots \] (4.29)

For computational efficiency we take \( N = 2n \) and obtain the discrete Fourier coefficients \( \tilde{c}_k \) for \( k = -N/2, \ldots, N/2 - 1 \) with the FFT, i.e. in practice we use the Fourier interpolant
\[ s_{N/2}(x) = \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2} \tilde{c}_k e^{ikx} \] (4.30)

instead of \( f^* \). From (4.29), the error \( |\tilde{c}_k - c_k| \) depends on the decay of the Fourier coefficients \( c_{k \pm lN} \), \( l = 1, 2, \ldots, \) for \( |k \pm lN| \geq N/2 \) (given that \( |k| \leq N/2 \)). In particular, if \( f \) is periodic and \( f \in C^m[0, 2\pi] \) we can proceed as we did for \( c_0 \) in Section 1.3 to show that \( |\tilde{c}_k - c_k| = O(N^{-m}) \) for \( k = -N/2, \ldots, N/2 - 1 \). Thus, the additional error of using the Fourier interpolant instead of \( f^* \) is asymptotically the same order as the error of the least squares approximation.

### 4.1.2 Polynomial Approximation

Let us consider now the least squares approximation of \( f \) by algebraic polynomials of degree at most \( n \). If we choose \( \{1, x, \ldots, x^n\} \) as a basis for \( P_n \) and \( w \equiv 1 \), the least squares approximation can be written as \( f^*(x) = c_0 + c_1x + \ldots + c_nx^n \), where the coefficients \( c_k, k = 0, 1, \ldots, n \) are the solution of the normal equations (4.14). Thus, in principle we just need to solve this \( (n+1) \times (n+1) \) linear system of equations. There are however two problems with this approach:

1. It is difficult to solve this linear system numerically for even moderate \( n \) because the matrix of coefficients is very sensitive to small perturbations and this sensitivity increases rapidly with \( n \). For example, if we take the interval \([0, 1]\) the matrix of coefficients in the normal equations...
system is
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
1 & 2 & \cdots & n+1 \\
1 & \frac{1}{2} & \cdots & \frac{1}{n+2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
n+1 & n+2 & \cdots & 2n+1 \\
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
(4.31)

Numerical solutions in double precision (about 16 digits of accuracy) of a linear system with this matrix (known as the Hilbert matrix, of size $n + 1$) will lose all accuracy for $n \geq 11$.

2. If we want to increase the degree of the approximating polynomial we need to start all over again and solve a larger set of normal equations. That is, we cannot reuse the $c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_n$ we already found.

Fortunately, we can overcome these two problems with orthogonalization.

4.1.2.1 Gram-Schmidt Orthogonalization

Given a set of linearly independent functions $\{\phi_0, \ldots, \phi_n\}$ we can produce an orthogonal set $\{\psi_0, \ldots, \psi_n\}$ by doing the Gram-Schmidt procedure:

$$
\psi_0 = \phi_0,
\psi_1 = \phi_1 - r_{01}\psi_0,
$$

$$
\langle \psi_1, \psi_0 \rangle = 0 \Rightarrow r_{01} = \frac{\langle \psi_0, \phi_1 \rangle}{\langle \psi_0, \psi_0 \rangle}
$$

$$
\psi_2 = \phi_2 - r_{02}\psi_0 - r_{12}\psi_1,
$$

$$
\langle \psi_2, \psi_0 \rangle = 0 \Rightarrow r_{02} = \frac{\langle \psi_0, \phi_2 \rangle}{\langle \psi_0, \psi_0 \rangle}
$$

$$
\langle \psi_2, \psi_1 \rangle = 0 \Rightarrow r_{12} = \frac{\langle \psi_1, \phi_2 \rangle}{\langle \psi_1, \psi_1 \rangle},
$$

etc.
4.1. LEAST SQUARES FOR FUNCTIONS

We can write this procedure recursively as

\[ \psi_0 = \phi_0, \]

For \( k = 1, \ldots, n \)

\[ \psi_k = \phi_k - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} r_{jk} \psi_j, \quad r_{jk} = \frac{\langle \psi_j, \phi_k \rangle}{\langle \psi_j, \psi_j \rangle}. \]  

(4.32)

4.1.2.2 Orthogonal Polynomials

Let us take the set \( \{1, x, \ldots, x^n\} \) on an interval \([a, b]\). We can use the Gram-Schmidt process to obtain an orthogonal set \( \{\psi_0, \ldots, \psi_n\} \) of polynomials with respect to the inner product \((4.2)\). Each \( \psi_k, k = 0, \ldots, n \), is a polynomial of degree \( k \), determined up to a multiplicative constant (orthogonality is not changed). Suppose we select \( \psi_k, k = 0, 1, \ldots, n \) to be monic, i.e. the coefficient of \( x^k \) is 1. Then, \( \psi_{k+1} - x \psi_k \) is a polynomial of degree at most \( k \) and we can write

\[ \psi_{k+1} - x \psi_k = \sum_{j=0}^{k} c_j \psi_j, \]  

(4.33)

for some coefficients \( c_j, j = 0, \ldots, k \). Taking the inner product of \((4.33)\) with \( \psi_m \) for \( m = 0, \ldots, k - 2 \) we get

\[ -\langle x \psi_k, \psi_m \rangle = c_m \langle \psi_m, \psi_m \rangle, \quad m = 0, \ldots, k - 2. \]

But the left hand side is zero because \( x \psi_m \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1} \) and hence it is orthogonal to \( \psi_k \). Therefore, \( c_j = 0 \) for \( j = 0, \ldots, k - 2 \). Setting \( \alpha_k = -c_k \) and \( \beta_k = -c_{k-1} \) \((4.33)\) simplifies to

\[ \psi_{k+1} - x \psi_k = -\alpha_k \psi_k - \beta_k \psi_{k-1}. \]  

(4.34)

Taking the inner product of this expression with \( \psi_k \) and using orthogonality we get

\[ -\langle x \psi_k, \psi_k \rangle = -\alpha_k \langle \psi_k, \psi_k \rangle \]

and therefore

\[ \alpha_k = \frac{\langle x \psi_k, \psi_k \rangle}{\langle \psi_k, \psi_k \rangle}. \]
Similarly, taking the inner product of (4.34) with $\psi_{k-1}$ we obtain

$$-\langle x\psi_k, \psi_{k-1} \rangle = -\beta_k \langle \psi_{k-1}, \psi_{k-1} \rangle$$

but $\langle x\psi_k, \psi_{k-1} \rangle = \langle \psi_k, x\psi_{k-1} \rangle$ and $x\psi_{k-1} = \psi_k + p_{k-1}$, where $p_{k-1} \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1}$. Then,

$$\langle \psi_k, x\psi_{k-1} \rangle = \langle \psi_k, \psi_k \rangle + \langle \psi_k, p_{k-1} \rangle = \langle \psi_k, \psi_k \rangle,$$

where we have used orthogonality in the last equation. Therefore,

$$\beta_k = \frac{\langle \psi_k, \psi_k \rangle}{\langle \psi_{k-1}, \psi_{k-1} \rangle}.$$

Collecting the results we obtain a three-term recursion formula

$$\psi_0(x) = 1, \quad \psi_1(x) = x - \alpha_0, \quad \alpha_0 = \frac{\langle x\psi_0, \psi_0 \rangle}{\langle \psi_0, \psi_0 \rangle} \quad (4.35)$$

and for $k = 1, \ldots, n$

$$\psi_{k+1}(x) = (x - \alpha_k)\psi_k(x) - \beta_k \psi_{k-1}(x), \quad (4.36)$$

$$\alpha_k = \frac{\langle x\psi_k, \psi_k \rangle}{\langle \psi_k, \psi_k \rangle}, \quad (4.37)$$

$$\beta_k = \frac{\langle \psi_k, \psi_k \rangle}{\langle \psi_{k-1}, \psi_{k-1} \rangle}. \quad (4.38)$$

If the interval is symmetric with respect to the origin, $[-a, a]$, and the weight function is even, $w(-x) = w(x)$, the orthogonal polynomials have parity, i.e. $\psi_k(x) = (-1)^k \psi_k(-x)$. This follows from the simple change of variables $y = -x$. Define $\tilde{\psi}_j(x) = (-1)^j \psi_j(-x)$. Then, for $j \neq k$

$$\langle \tilde{\psi}_j, \tilde{\psi}_k \rangle = \int_{-a}^{a} \tilde{\psi}_j(x)\tilde{\psi}_k(x)w(x)dx$$

$$= (-1)^{j+k} \int_{-a}^{a} \psi_j(-x)\psi_k(-x)w(x)dx$$

$$= (-1)^{j+k} \int_{-a}^{a} \psi_j(y)\psi_k(y)w(y)dy = (-1)^{j+k} \langle \psi_j, \psi_k \rangle = 0. \quad (4.40)$$

Since the orthogonal polynomials are defined up to a multiplicative constant and we have fixed that by choosing them to be monic, we conclude that $\tilde{\psi}_k = \psi_k$, i.e. $\psi_k(x) = (-1)^k \psi_k(-x)$, for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, n.$
Example 4.2. Let \([a, b] = [-1, 1]\) and \(w(x) \equiv 1\). The corresponding orthogonal polynomials are known as the Legendre polynomials and are used in a variety of numerical methods. Because of the interval and weight function symmetry \(\psi_k^2\) is even and \(x\psi_k^2w\) is odd for all \(k\). Consequently, \(\alpha_k = 0\) for all \(k\).

We have \(\psi_0(x) = 1\) and \(\psi_1(x) = x\). We can now use the three-term recursion (4.37) to obtain

\[
\beta_1 = \frac{\int_{-1}^{1} x^2 dx}{\int_{-1}^{1} dx} = \frac{1}{3}
\]

and \(\psi_2(x) = x^2 - \frac{1}{3}\). Now for \(k = 2\) we get

\[
\beta_2 = \frac{\int_{-1}^{1} (x^2 - \frac{1}{3})^2 dx}{\int_{-1}^{1} x^2 dx} = \frac{4}{15}
\]

and \(\psi_3(x) = x(x^2 - \frac{1}{3}) - \frac{4}{15}x = x^3 - \frac{3}{5}x\). We now collect Legendre polynomials we have found:

\[
\psi_0(x) = 1, \\
\psi_1(x) = x, \\
\psi_2(x) = x^2 - \frac{1}{3}, \\
\psi_3(x) = x^3 - \frac{3}{5}x.
\]

Example 4.3. The Hermite polynomials are the orthogonal polynomials in \((-\infty, \infty)\) with the weight function \(^2w(x) = e^{-x^2/2}\). Again, due to symmetry \(\alpha_k = 0\), \(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}\). Let us find the first few Hermite polynomials. We have \(\psi_0(x) \equiv 1\), \(\psi_1(x) = 1\). Now,

\[
\beta_1 = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^2 e^{-x^2/2} dx}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^2/2} dx} = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} = 1, \\
\text{ (4.41)}
\]

\(^2\)There is an alternative definition with the weight \(w(x) = e^{-x^2}\)
and so $\psi_2(x) = x^2 - 1$.

$$\beta_2 = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (x^2 - 1) e^{-x^2/2} dx}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^2 e^{-x^2/2} dx} = \frac{2\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} = 2,$$

and $\psi_3(x) = x(x^2 - 1) - 2x = x^3 - 3x$. Thus, the first 4 Hermite polynomials are

$$\begin{align*}
\psi_0(x) &= 1, \\
\psi_1(x) &= x, \\
\psi_2(x) &= x^2 - 1, \\
\psi_3(x) &= x^3 - 3x.
\end{align*}$$

Example 4.4. Chebyshev polynomials

We introduced in Section 2.4 the Chebyshev polynomials. As we have seen, they have remarkable properties. We now add one more important property: orthogonality.

The Chebyshev polynomials are orthogonal with respect to the weight function $1/\sqrt{1-x^2}$. Indeed, recall $T_k(x) = \cos k\theta$, $(x = \cos \theta, \theta \in [0, \pi])$. Then,

$$\langle T_j, T_k \rangle = \int_{-1}^{1} T_j(x) T_k(x) \frac{dx}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} = \int_0^\pi \cos j\theta \cos k\theta d\theta = \begin{cases} 
\pi/2 & \text{for } j = k > 0, \\
0 & \text{for } j \neq k.
\end{cases}$$

(4.43)

and since $2\cos j\theta \cos k\theta = \cos(j+k)\theta + \cos(j-k)\theta$, we get for $j \neq k$

$$\langle T_j, T_k \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{j+k} \sin(j+k)\theta + \frac{1}{j-k} \sin(j-k)\theta \right]_0^\pi = 0.$$

Moreover, using $2\cos^2 k\theta = 1 + \cos 2k\theta$ we get $\langle T_k, T_k \rangle = \pi/2$ for $k > 0$ and $\langle T_0, T_0 \rangle = \pi$. Therefore,

$$\langle T_j, T_k \rangle = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{for } j \neq k, \\
\frac{\pi}{2} & \text{for } j = k > 0, \\
\pi & \text{for } j = k = 0.
\end{cases}$$

(4.44)

Finding $\alpha_k$ and $\beta_k$ in the three-term recursion formula (4.37) is in general a tedious process and is limited to our ability to evaluate the corresponding
integrals. Fortunately, the recursion coefficients are known for several orthogonal polynomials (e.g. Legendre, Hermite, Chebyshev, Laguerre). Moreover, in the discrete case, when the integrals are replaced by sums, $\alpha_k$ and $\beta_k$ can be evaluated directly with a simple computer code. Lastly, as we will see in Section 7.3.2, the three-term recursion formula can be used to cast the problem of finding the zeros of orthogonal polynomials into an eigenvalue problem more appropriate for computation.

**Theorem 4.3.** The zeros of orthogonal polynomials are real, simple, and they all lie in $(a, b)$.

**Proof.** Indeed, $\psi_k(x)$ is orthogonal to $\psi_0(x) = 1$ for each $k \geq 1$, thus

$$\int_a^b \psi_k(x)w(x)dx = 0$$

i.e. $\psi_k$ has to change sign in $[a, b]$ so it has a zero, say $x_1 \in (a, b)$. Suppose $x_1$ is not a simple root, then $q(x) = \psi_k(x)/(x - x_1)^2$ is a polynomial of degree $k - 2$ and so

$$0 = \langle \psi_k, q \rangle = \int_a^b \frac{\psi_k^2(x)}{(x - x_1)^2}w(x)dx > 0,$$

which is of course impossible. Assume that $\psi_k(x)$ has only $l$ zeros in $(a, b)$, $x_1, \ldots, x_l$. Then $\psi_k(x)(x - x_1)\cdots(x - x_l) = q_{k-l}(x)(x - x_1)^2\cdots(x - x_l)^2$, where $q_{k-l}(x)$ is a polynomial of degree $k - l$ which does not change sign in $[a, b]$. Then

$$\langle \psi_k, (x - x_1)\cdots(x - x_l) \rangle = \int_a^b q_{k-l}(x)(x - x_1)^2\cdots(x - x_l)^2w(x)dx \neq 0$$

but $\langle \psi_k, (x - x_1)\cdots(x - x_l) \rangle = 0$ for $l < k$. Therefore $l = k$. \hfill \qedsymbol

### 4.1.3 Convergence of Least Squares by Orthogonal Polynomials

The three-term recursion formula allows to generate sets of orthogonal polynomials $\{\psi_0, \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n\}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A natural question is if the least squares approximation improves with increasing $n$. 
Given \( f \in C[a, b] \), let us denote by \( s_n \) the least squares approximation to \( f \) by linear span of the first \( n + 1 \) orthogonal polynomials \( \{\psi_0, \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n\} \), i.e.

\[
s_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{\langle f, \psi_k \rangle}{\| \phi_k \|^2} \psi_k. \tag{4.47}
\]

Since \( s_n \) is the best approximation in the \( L^2 \) norm

\[
\| f - s_n \| \leq \| f - p^*_n \|; \tag{4.48}
\]

where \( p^*_n \) is the best uniform (i.e. sup norm) approximation to \( f \) in \( P_n \). Now, for any \( g \in C[a, b] \)

\[
\| g \|^2 = \langle g, g \rangle = \int_{a}^{b} |g(x)|^2 w(x)dx \leq \| g \|^2_\infty \int_{a}^{b} w(x)dx, \tag{4.49}
\]

and thus \( \| g \| \leq C \| g \|_\infty \). Together with (4.48) this implies

\[
\| f - s_n \| \leq C \| f - p^*_n \|_\infty. \tag{4.50}
\]

By Weierstrass approximation theorem \( \| f - p^*_n \|_\infty \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \). Therefore \( \| f - s_n \| \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \). Note that this does not imply \( \| f - s_n \|_\infty \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \). In fact it is generally not true for continuous functions.

Formally, to each \( f \in C[a, b] \) we can assign an orthogonal polynomial expansion

\[
f \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\langle f, \psi_k \rangle}{\| \phi_k \|^2} \psi_k. \tag{4.51}
\]

The partial sums of this expansion are precisely the least squares approximations of \( f \).

### 4.1.4 Chebyshev Expansions

The set of Chebyshev polynomials \( \{T_0, T_1, \ldots, T_n\} \) is orthogonal with respect to the inner product

\[
\langle f, g \rangle = \int_{-1}^{1} f(x)g(x) \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - x^2}} dx. \tag{4.52}
\]
Given \( f \in C[-1, 1] \), the least squares approximation \( s_n \), in the norm defined by the inner product \((4.52)\), by polynomials of degree at most \( n \) is given by

\[
s_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} c_k T_k(x), \quad x \in [-1, 1],
\]

where

\[
c_k = \frac{2}{\pi} (f, T_k) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{-1}^{1} f(x) T_k(x) \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx,
\]

for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots, n \), and the prime in the summation means the \( k = 0 \) term has a factor of \( 1/2 \), i.e. \( s_n = \frac{1}{2} c_0 + c_1 T_1 + \ldots + c_n T_n \).

It can be shown that if \( f \) is Lipschitz, then \( \|f - s_n\|_\infty \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \) and we can write

\[
f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k T_k(x), \quad x \in [-1, 1],
\]

where \( c_k = \frac{2}{\pi} (f, T_k), k = 0, 1, \ldots \) The right hand side of \((4.55)\) is called the Chebyshev expansion of \( f \).

Assuming \( f \) is smooth and using the orthogonality of the Chebyshev polynomials we have

\[
\|f - s_n\|^2 = \left< \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} c_k T_k, \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} c_k T_k \right> = \frac{\pi}{2} \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} |c_k|^2.
\]

Thus, the least squares error depends on the rate of decay of the Chebyshev coefficients \( c_k \) for \( k \geq n + 1 \).

There is a clear parallel with Fourier series. With the change of variables \( x = \cos \theta, \theta \in [0, \pi] \) \((4.54)\) becomes

\[
c_k = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{0}^{\pi} f(\cos \theta) \cos k\theta d\theta.
\]

If \( f \) is smooth so is \( F(\theta) = f(\cos \theta) \) as a function of \( \theta \). Moreover, the odd derivatives of \( F \) vanish at \( \theta = 0, \pi \) so that two successive integrations by parts of \((4.57)\) give

\[
\int_{0}^{\pi} F(\theta) \cos k\theta d\theta = -\frac{1}{k} \int_{0}^{\pi} F'(\theta) \sin k\theta d\theta = -\frac{1}{k^2} \int_{0}^{\pi} F''(\theta) \cos k\theta d\theta.
\]
Thus, if \( f \in C^m[-1,1] \) we can perform \( m \) integrations by parts to get that 
\[ |c_k| \leq A_m/k^m \quad (k > 0) \]
for some constant \( A_m \). Finally, by (4.24)-(4.26) we get
\[ \|f - s_n\| \leq C_m(n+1)^{-m+1/2}, \tag{4.59} \]
for some constant \( C_m \).

Often in applications, the Chebyshev interpolant is used instead of the least squares approximation. The coefficients (4.57) are approximated with the composite trapezoidal rule (3.177) at equi-spaced points in \( \theta \) and computed efficiently with the fast DCT as pointed out in Section 3.13. The error made by this approximation depends again on the high wavenumber decay of the Chebyshev coefficients. Indeed
\[
\tilde{c}_k = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n}'' f(\cos \theta_j) \cos k\theta_j
\]
\[
= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n}'' \left( \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} c_l \cos l\theta_j \right) \cos k\theta_j 
\]
\[
= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} c_l \left( \frac{2}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n}'' \cos k\theta_j \cos l\theta_j \right),
\tag{4.60}
\]
where \( \theta_j = j\pi/n \) and we employed in the second equality the Chebyshev expansion of \( f \) at \( x = \cos \theta_j \). Now,
\[
\sum_{j=0}^{n}'' \cos k\theta_j \cos l\theta_j = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{2n-1} \cos k\theta_j \cos l\theta_j 
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=0}^{2n-1} [\cos(k+l)\theta_j + \cos(k-l)\theta_j]. \tag{4.61}
\]

Then, by the discrete orthogonality of the complex exponential (3.157) we obtain the discrete orthogonality of the Chebyshev polynomials:
\[
\sum_{j=0}^{n}'' \cos k\theta_j \cos l\theta_j = \begin{cases} 
  n/2 & \text{if either } \frac{k+l}{2n} \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ or } \frac{k-l}{2n} \in \mathbb{Z}, \\
  n & \text{if both } \frac{k+l}{2n} \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } \frac{k-l}{2n} \in \mathbb{Z}, \\
  0 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases} \tag{4.62}
\]
Using this in (4.60) it follows that

\[ \tilde{c}_k = c_k + c_{2n-k} + c_{2n+k} + c_{4n-k} + c_{4n+k} + \ldots \]  

(4.63)

for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots, n \). Thus, a bound for the error \( |\tilde{c}_k - c_k| \) can be obtained from the asymptotic decay of the Chebyshev coefficients, just as in the Fourier case.

### 4.1.5 Decay of Chebyshev Coefficients for Analytic Functions

If we extend \( F(\theta) = f(\cos \theta) \) evenly to \([\pi, 2\pi]\), \( F(\theta) = F(2\pi - \theta), \theta \in [\pi, 2\pi] \), we get

\[ c_k = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(\cos \theta) \cos k\theta d\theta. \]  

(4.64)

In other words, the Chebyshev expansion of \( f(x) \) is the (cosine) Fourier expansion of \( f(\cos \theta) \).

To estimate the rate of decay of the Chebyshev coefficients we are going to go to the complex plane. Letting \( z = e^{i\theta} \), \( \cos \theta = \frac{1}{2}(z + 1/z) \), we turn (4.64) into

\[ c_k = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} f \left( \frac{z + 1/z}{2} \right) \left( z^k + 1/z^k \right) \frac{dz}{z}. \]  

(4.65)

The transformation

\[ w(z) = \frac{1}{2} \left( z + \frac{1}{z} \right) \]  

(4.66)

maps the unit circle \(|z| = 1\) into \([-1, 1]\), twice. On the other hand, for a circle \(|z| = \rho\) with \( \rho \neq 1 \) we have

\[ w(\rho e^{i\theta}) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \rho + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \cos \theta + i \frac{1}{2} \left( \rho - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \sin \theta. \]  

(4.67)

Writing \( w = u + iv \) we get

\[ \frac{u^2}{\left[ \frac{1}{2} (\rho + \rho^{-1}) \right]^2} + \frac{v^2}{\left[ \frac{1}{2} (\rho - \rho^{-1}) \right]^2} = 1, \]  

(4.68)
which is the equation of an ellipse \( E_\rho \) with major and minor semi-axes \( \frac{1}{\rho} (\rho + \rho^{-1}) \) and \( \frac{1}{\rho} (\rho - \rho^{-1}) \), respectively and foci at \((\pm 1,0)\). By symmetry, \( (4.66) \) maps the circle \(|z| = 1/\rho\) also into the ellipse \( E_\rho \).

**Theorem 4.4.** If \( f \) is analytic on and inside the ellipse \( E_\rho \), for some \( \rho > 1 \), then

\[
|c_k| \leq C \frac{1}{\rho^k}. \tag{4.69}
\]

**Proof.** From \( (4.65) \),

\[
|c_k| \leq \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1/\rho} f \left( \frac{z + 1/z}{2} \right) \frac{z^{k-1} dz}{z} \right| + \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|z|=\rho} f \left( \frac{z + 1/z}{2} \right) \frac{z^{-k-1} dz}{z} \right|, \tag{4.70}
\]

where we have used contour deformation (a consequence of Cauchy’s theorem) to change the integration deformation. Each term on the right hand side of \( (4.70) \) is bounded by \( M\rho^{-k} \), where \( M = \max_{z \in E_\rho} |f(z)| \).

### 4.1.6 Splines

Given a partition \( \Delta = \{a = x_0 < x_1 \ldots < x_n = b\} \), the set \( S_k^\Delta \) of splines of degree \( k \) is a subspace of \( C^{k-1}[a,b] \) of dimension \( n + k \). Given a continuous function \( f \) on \([a,b]\) we can consider the least squares approximation to it by functions in \( S^\Delta_k \). As an illustration we look now at the case of \( S^1_\Delta \), i.e. continuous, piecewise linear functions.

Set \( x_{-1} = x_0 \) and \( x_{n+1} = x_n \). The following set of “hat” functions

\[
\phi_j(x) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{x - x_{j-1}}{x_j - x_{j-1}}, & \text{for } x \in [x_{j-1}, x_j], \\
\frac{x_j - x_{j-1}}{x_{j+1} - x_j}, & \text{for } x \in [x_j, x_{j+1}], \\
0, & \text{otherwise,}
\end{cases} \tag{4.71}
\]

is a convenient basis for \( S^1_\Delta \). Figure 4.2 plots these functions for an equi-spaced partition with \( n = 6 \). Note that \( \phi_0 \) and \( \phi_n \) are only half “hat” functions. The first and the second parts of their definition, respectively, should be disregarded. Clearly, \( \phi_j \in S^1_\Delta \) for all \( j \). \( \{\phi_0, \phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n\} \) is not
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Figure 4.2: Basis “hat” functions \((n = 5, \text{equi-spaced nodes})\) for \(S_1^\Delta\).

an orthogonal set but each function is nonzero only in a small region (small support) and \(\phi_j(x_i) = \delta_{ij}\), for \(i, j = 0, 1, \ldots, n\).

Let us prove that \(\{\phi_0, \phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n\}\) is indeed a basis of \(S_1^\Delta\).

1) It is linearly independent, for if

\[
\sum_{j=0}^{n} c_j \phi_j(x) = 0, \quad \forall x \in [a, b],
\]

(4.72)

taking \(x = x_j\) and using \(\phi_j(x_i) = \delta_{ij}\), it follows that \(c_j = 0\) for \(j = 0, 1, \ldots, n\).

2) It spans \(S_1^\Delta\), for any \(s \in S_1^\Delta\) can be represented as

\[
s(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} s(x_j) \phi_j(x).
\]

(4.73)

The equality follows because the right hand side has the same values as \(s\) at \(x_j\) for \(j = 0, 1, \ldots, n\) and since they are both in \(S_1^\Delta\) they must be equal.

As we know we can represent the least squares approximation \(s^* \in S_1^\Delta\) to \(f\) as \(s^* = c_0^* \phi_0 + \ldots + c_n^* \phi_n\), where the \(c_k^*, k = 0, \ldots, n\), are the unique solution of the normal equations

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n} \langle \phi_k, \phi_j \rangle c_k = \langle f, \phi_j \rangle, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n.
\]

Now, \(\langle \phi_k, \phi_j \rangle = 0\) if \(\phi_k\) and \(\phi_j\) don’t overlap, i.e. \(|k - j| > 1\) and by direct
integration we get

\[ \langle \phi_j, \phi_j \rangle = \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_{j+1}} \phi_j^2(x) \, dx = \frac{1}{3} (h_{j-1} + h_j), \quad (4.74) \]

\[ \langle \phi_{j-1}, \phi_j \rangle = \int_{a}^{b} \phi_{j-1}(x) \phi_j(x) \, dx = \frac{1}{6} h_{j-1}, \quad (4.75) \]

\[ \langle \phi_{j+1}, \phi_j \rangle = \int_{a}^{b} \phi_{j+1}(x) \phi_j(x) \, dx = \frac{1}{6} h_j, \quad (4.76) \]

where \( h_j = x_{j+1} - x_j \). Hence, we obtain the tridiagonal linear system (note \( h_{-1} = h_n = 0 \))

\[ \frac{1}{6} h_j c_{j-1} + \frac{1}{3} (h_{j-1} + h_j) c_j + \frac{1}{6} h_{j-1} c_{j+1} = \langle f, \phi_j \rangle, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \quad (4.77) \]

This system is diagonally dominant and the solution can be found efficiently with Algorithm 9.5.

We close this section with one observation. The second derivative of the (complete or natural) cubic spline interpolant \( s \in S_3^{\Delta} \) of \( f \) is the \( L^2 \)-best approximation to \( f'' \) in \( S_1^{\Delta} \). That is,

\[ \| f'' - s'' \| \leq \| f'' - g \|, \quad \forall g \in S_1^{\Delta}. \quad (4.78) \]

This follows immediately from Lemma 2 by taking \( g = s'' \).

### 4.2 Discrete Least Squares Approximation

Suppose that we are given a data set \( (x_0, f_0), (x_1, f_1), \ldots, (x_N, f_N) \) and we want to find the best 2-norm approximation \( f^* \in W = \operatorname{span}\{\phi_0, \phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n\} \) to this data. We assume again that \( \{\phi_0, \phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n\} \) is a set of linearly independent functions and \( N \gg n \). The problem is same as the least squares problem for function approximation, except that now we measure the error using the (weighted) 2-norm:

\[ \| f - g \|^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{N} |f_j - g_j|^2 w_j = \langle f - g, f - g \rangle, \quad g \in W, \quad (4.79) \]
where \( g_j = g(x_j), \) \( w_j > 0, j = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \) are given weights, and the inner product is now
\[
\langle f, g \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{N} f_j \bar{g}_j w_j.
\] (4.80)

The solution is again characterized by the orthogonality of the error and we can write the solution \( f^* \in W \) explicitly when \( \{\phi_0, \phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n\} \) is an orthogonal set with respect to the inner product (4.80).

\( W = \mathbb{P}_n \) is often used for data fitting, particularly for small \( n. \) It is worth noting that when \( N = n \) the solution to the discrete least squares problem in \( \mathbb{P}_n \) is the interpolating polynomial \( p_n \) of the data for
\[
\|f - p_n\|^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{n} |f_j - p_n(x_j)|^2 w_j = 0.
\] (4.81)

The case \( W = \mathbb{P}_1 \) is also known as linear regression. Taking \( \phi_0(x) \equiv 1, \phi_1(x) = x \) the normal equations \( \sum_{k=0}^{N} \langle \phi_k, \phi_j \rangle c_k = \langle f, \phi_j \rangle, j = 0, 1, \) are
\[
\left( \sum_{j=0}^{N} 1 \right) c_0 + \left( \sum_{j=0}^{N} x_j \right) c_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{N} f_j, \] (4.82)
\[
\left( \sum_{j=0}^{N} x_j \right) c_0 + \left( \sum_{j=0}^{N} x_j^2 \right) c_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{N} x_j f_j. \] (4.83)

This 2 \( \times \) 2 linear system can be easily solved to obtain \( c_0 \) and \( c_1 \) and the least square approximation is \( f^*(x) = c_0 + c_1 x. \) For larger \( n, \) it is more appropriate to employ an orthogonal basis for \( \mathbb{P}_n. \) This can be obtained using the three-term recursion formula (4.37), which in this discrete setting is easy to implement because the coefficients \( \alpha_k \) and \( \beta_k \) are just simple sums instead of integrals.

**Example 4.5.** Suppose we are given the data set \((0, 1.1), (1, 3.2), (2, 5.1), (3, 6.9)\) and we would like to fit to a line (in the least squares sense). Performing the sums the normal equations of (4.82)-(4.83) become
\[
4c_0 + 6c_1 = 16.3, \] (4.84)
\[
6c_0 + 14c_1 = 34.1. \] (4.85)
Solving this $2 \times 2$ linear system we get $c_0 = 1.18$ and $c_1 = 1.93$. Thus, the Least Squares Approximation is

$$p_1^*(x) = 1.18 + 1.93x$$

and the square of the error is

$$\sum_{j=0}^{3} [f_j - (1.18 + 1.93x_j)]^2 = 0.023.$$

**Example 4.6.** Fitting to an exponential $y = ae^{bx}$. In this case the approximating function is not a linear combination of given (linearly independent) functions. Thus, the problem of finding the parameters $a$ and $b$ that minimize

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N} [f_j - ae^{bx_j}]^2$$

is a nonlinear problem. However, we can turn it into a linear problem by taking the natural log of $y = ae^{bx}$. We have $\ln y = \tilde{a} + bx$, where $\tilde{a} = \ln a$. Tabulating $(x_j, \ln f_j)$ we can obtain the normal equations

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{N} 1\right) \tilde{a} + \left(\sum_{j=0}^{N} x_j\right) b = \sum_{j=0}^{N} \ln f_j,$$

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{N} x_j\right) \tilde{a} + \left(\sum_{j=0}^{N} x_j^2\right) b = \sum_{j=0}^{N} x_j \ln f_j,$$

and solve this linear system for $\tilde{a}$ and $b$. Then $a = e^{\tilde{a}}$ and $b = b$.

If $b$ is given and we only need to determine $a$ then the problem is linear as we are looking a function of the form $a\phi_0$, where $\phi_0(x) = e^{bx}$. We only have one normal equation to solve

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{N} e^{2bx_j}\right) a = \sum_{j=0}^{N} f_j e^{bx_j},$$

from which we obtain

$$a = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{N} f_j e^{bx_j}}{\sum_{j=0}^{N} e^{2bx_j}}.$$
**Example 4.7.** Discrete orthogonal polynomials. Let us construct the first few orthogonal polynomials with respect to the discrete inner product with \( w_j = 1 \) and \( x_j = (j + 1)/10, j = 0, 1, \ldots, 9 \). We have \( \psi_0(x) = 1 \) and \( \psi_1(x) = x - \alpha_0 \), where

\[
\alpha_0 = \frac{\langle x\psi_0, \psi_0 \rangle}{\langle \psi_0, \psi_0 \rangle} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{9} x_j}{\sum_{j=0}^{9} 1} = 0.55.
\]

and hence \( \psi_1(x) = x - 0.55 \). Now,

\[
\psi_2(x) = (x - \alpha_1)\psi_1(x) - \beta_1\psi_0(x), \quad (4.90)
\]

\[
\alpha_1 = \frac{\langle x\psi_1, \psi_1 \rangle}{\langle \psi_1, \psi_1 \rangle} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{9} x_j(x_j - 0.55)^2}{\sum_{j=0}^{9} (x_j - 0.55)^2} = 0.55, \quad (4.91)
\]

\[
\beta_1 = \frac{\langle \psi_1, \psi_1 \rangle}{\langle \psi_0, \psi_0 \rangle} = 0.0825. \quad (4.92)
\]

Therefore, \( \psi_2(x) = (x - 0.55)^2 - 0.0825 \). We can now use these orthogonal polynomials to find the least squares approximation \( p^*_2 \) by polynomial of degree at most two of a set of data \((x_0, f_0), (x_1, f_1), \ldots, (x_9, f_9)\). Let us take \( f_j = x_j^2 + 2x_j + 3 \), for \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, 9 \). Clearly, the least squares approximation should be \( p^*_2(x) = x^2 + 2x + 3 \). Let us confirm this by using the orthogonal polynomials \( \psi_0, \psi_1 \) and \( \psi_2 \). The coefficients are given by

\[
c_0 = \frac{\langle f, \psi_0 \rangle}{\langle \psi_0, \psi_0 \rangle} = 4.485, \quad (4.93)
\]

\[
c_1 = \frac{\langle f, \psi_1 \rangle}{\langle \psi_1, \psi_1 \rangle} = 3.1, \quad (4.94)
\]

\[
c_2 = \frac{\langle f, \psi_2 \rangle}{\langle \psi_2, \psi_2 \rangle} = 1, \quad (4.95)
\]

which gives, \( p^*_2(x) = (x-0.55)^2-0.0825+(3.1)(x-0.55)+4.485 = x^2+2x+3 \).
4.3 High-dimensional Data Fitting

In many applications each data point contains many variables. For example, a value for each pixel in an image, or clinical measurements of a patient, etc. We can put all these variables in a vector \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) for \( d \gg 1 \). Associated with \( x \) there is a scalar quantity \( f \) that can be measured or computed so that our data set consists of the points \((x_j, f_j)\), with \( x_j \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( f_j \in \mathbb{R} \), for \( j = 1, \ldots, N \).

A central problem in machine learning is that of predicting \( f \) from a given large, high-dimensional dataset; this is called supervised learning. The simplest and most commonly used approach is to postulate a linear relation

\[
  f(x) = a_0 + a^T x
\]

and determine the bias coefficient \( a_0 \in \mathbb{R} \) and the vector \( a \in \mathbb{R}^d \) as a least squares solution, i.e. such that they minimize

\[
  \sum_{j=0}^{N} [f_j - (a_0 + a^T x_j)]^2.
\]

We have already talked about the case \( d = 1 \). Here we are interested in \( d \gg 1 \).

If we append an extra component, equal to 1, to each data vector \( x_j \) so that now \( x_j = [1, x_{j1}, \ldots, x_{jd}]^T \), for \( j = 1, \ldots, N \), we can write (4.96) as

\[
  f(x) = a^T x
\]

and the dimension \( d \) is increased by one, \( d \leftarrow d + 1 \). We are seeking a vector \( a \in \mathbb{R}^d \) that minimizes

\[
  J(a) = \sum_{j=0}^{N} [f_j - a^T x_j]^2.
\]

Putting the data \( x_j, j = 1, \ldots, N \), as rows of an \( N \times d \) matrix \( X \) and the \( f_j, j = 1, \ldots, N \), as the components of a (column) vector \( f \), i.e.

\[
  X = \begin{bmatrix}
    x_1 \\
    \vdots \\
    x_N
  \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad f = \begin{bmatrix}
    f_1 \\
    \vdots \\
    f_N
  \end{bmatrix}
\]

(4.99)
we can write (4.98) as
\[ J(a) = \langle f - Xa, f - Xa \rangle = \|f - Xa\|^2, \]  
(4.100)
where \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) is the standard inner product in \( \mathbb{R}^N \). Thus, we are looking for the least squares approximation \( f^* \) to \( f \) by functions in \( W = \text{Span}\{\text{columns of } X\} \). We can find this from its geometric characterization:
\[ \langle f - f^*, w \rangle = 0, \quad \forall w \in W. \]  
(4.101)
Since \( f - f^* \) is orthogonal to \( W \) if is orthogonal to each column of \( X \), i.e. \( X^T(f - f^*) = 0 \), writing \( f^* = Xa^* \) it follows that \( a^* \) should be a solution of
\[ X^T X a = X^T f. \]  
(4.102)
These are the normal equations of this least squares problem. If the columns of \( X \) are linearly independent, i.e. if for every \( a \neq 0 \) we have that \( Xa \neq 0 \), then the \( d \times d \) matrix \( X^T X \) is positive definite and hence nonsingular. Thus, in this case, there is a unique solution to \( \min_{a \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|f - Xa\|^2 \) given by
\[ a^* = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T f. \]  
(4.103)
The \( d \times N \) matrix
\[ X^\dagger = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T \]  
(4.104)
is called the pseudoinverse of the \( N \times d \) matrix \( X \). Note that if \( X \) were square and nonsingular \( X^\dagger \) would coincide with the inverse \( X^{-1} \).

Orthogonality is again central for the computation of a least squares approximation. Rather than working with the normal equations, whose matrix \( X^T X \) may be very sensitive to perturbations in the data such as noise for example, we use an orthogonal basis for the approximating subspace \( W = \text{Span}\{\text{columns of } X\} \) to find a solution. While in principle this can be done by applying the Gram-Schmidt process (cf. Section 4.1.2.1) to the columns of \( X \), this is a numerically unstable procedure. A more efficient method using a sequence of orthogonal transformations, known as Householder reflections (see Section 11.2), is usually preferred. Once this orthonormalization process is completed we get \( X = QR \) [see (8.30)], where
\[ Q = \begin{bmatrix} * & \cdots & * \\ \tilde{Q} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ * & \cdots & * \end{bmatrix}, \quad R = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{R} \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \]  
(4.105)
Here $Q$ is an $N \times N$ orthogonal matrix (i.e. $Q^T Q = QQ^T = I$). The $N \times d$ block $\tilde{Q}$ consists of columns that form an orthonormal basis for the column space of $X$ and $\tilde{R}$ is a $d \times d$ upper triangular matrix.

Using this factorization we have

$$\| f - Xa \|^2 = \| f - QRa \|^2 = \| Q^T (f - QRa) \|^2 = \| Q^T f - Ra \|^2. \quad (4.106)$$

Therefore, a solution to $\min_{a \in \mathbb{R}^d} \| f - Xa \|^2$ is obtained by solving the system $Ra = Q^T f$. Because of the zero block in $R$, the problem reduces to solving the $d \times d$ upper triangular system

$$\tilde{R}a = \tilde{Q}^T f. \quad (4.107)$$

If the matrix $X$ is full rank there is a unique solution to (4.107). Note however that the last $N - d$ equations in $Ra = Q^T f$ may be satisfied or not depending on $f$ but we have no control on them.
5.1 Floating Point Numbers

Floating point numbers are based on scientific notation in binary (base 2). For example

\[(1.0101)_2 \times 2^2 = (1 \cdot 2^0 + 0 \cdot 2^{-1} + 1 \cdot 2^{-2} + 0 \cdot 2^{-3} + 1 \cdot 2^{-4}) \times 2^2 \]
\[= (1 + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{16}) \times 4 = 5.25_{10}.\]

We can write any non-zero real number \(x\) in normalized, binary, scientific notation as

\[x = \pm S \times 2^E, \quad 1 \leq S < 2, \quad (5.1)\]

where \(S\) is called the significant or mantissa and \(E\) is the exponent. In general \(S\) is an infinite expansion of the form

\[S = (1.b_1 b_2 \cdots)_2.\]  

(5.2)

In a computer, a real number is represented in scientific notation but using a finite number of binary digits (bits). We call these floating point numbers. In single precision (SP), floating point numbers are stored in 32-bit words whereas in double precision (DP), used in most scientific computing applications, a 64-bit word is employed: 1 bit is used for the sign, 52 bits for \(S\), and 11 bits for \(E\). This memory limits produce a large but finite set of floating point numbers which can be represented in a computer. Moreover, the floating points numbers are not uniformly distributed!
The maximum exponent possible in DP would be $2^{11} = 2048$ but this is shifted to allow representation of small and large numbers so that we actually have $E_{\min} = -1022$, $E_{\max} = 1023$. Consequently, the min and max DP floating point number which can be represented in DP are

\begin{align*}
N_{\min} &= \min_{x \in DP} |x| = 2^{-1022} \approx 2 \times 10^{-308}, \\
N_{\max} &= \max_{x \in DP} |x| = (1.1\ldots.1)_2 \cdot 2^{1023} = (2 - 2^{-52}) \cdot 2^{1023} \approx 1.8 \times 10^{308}.
\end{align*}

(5.3) (5.4)

If in the course of a computation a number is produced which is bigger than $N_{\max}$ we get an overflow error and the computation would halt. If the number is less than $N_{\min}$ (in absolute value) then an underflow error occurs.

5.2 Rounding and Machine Precision

To represent a real number $x$ as a floating point number, rounding has to be performed to retain only the numbers of binary bits allowed in the significant. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and its binary expansion be $x = \pm(1.b_1 b_2 \cdots) \times 2^E$.

One way to approximate $x$ to a floating number with $d$ bits in the significant is to truncate or chop discarding all the bits after $b_d$, i.e.

\[ x^* = \text{chop}(x) = \pm(1.b_1 b_2 \cdots b_d)_2 \times 2^E. \]

(5.5)

In double precision $d = 52$.

A better way to approximate to a floating point number is to do rounding up or down (to the nearest floating point number), just as we do when we round in base 10. In binary, rounding is simpler because $b_{d+1}$ can only be 0 (we round down) or 1 (we round up). We can write this type of rounding in terms of the chopping described above as

\[ x^* = \text{round}(x) = \text{chop}(x + 2^{-(d+1)} \times 2^E). \]

(5.6)

**Definition 5.1.** Given an approximation $x^*$ to $x$ the absolute error is defined by $|x - x^*|$ and the relative error by $|\frac{x - x^*}{x}|$, $x \neq 0$.

The relative error is generally more meaningful than the absolute error to measure a given approximation.
5.3. CORRECTLY ROUNDED ARITHMETIC

The relative error in chopping and in rounding (called a round-off error) is
\[
\left| \frac{x - \text{chop}(x)}{x} \right| \leq \frac{2^{-d_2}2^E}{(1.b_1b_2 \cdots)2^E} \leq 2^{-d}, \quad (5.7)
\]
\[
\left| \frac{x - \text{round}(x)}{x} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2}2^{-d}. \quad (5.8)
\]
The number $2^{-d}$ is called machine precision or epsilon (eps). In double precision $\text{eps}=2^{-52} \approx 2.22 \times 10^{-16}$. The smallest double precision number greater than 1 is $1+\text{eps}$. As we will see below, it is more convenient to write (5.8) as
\[
\text{round}(x) = x(1 + \delta), \quad |\delta| \leq \text{eps}. \quad (5.9)
\]

5.3 Correctly Rounded Arithmetic

Computers today follow the IEEE standard for floating point representation and arithmetic. This standard requires a consistent floating point representation of numbers across computers and correctly rounded arithmetic.

In correctly rounded arithmetic, the computer operations of addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division are the correctly rounded value of the exact result. For example, if $x$ and $y$ are floating point numbers and $\oplus$ is the machine addition, then
\[
x \oplus y = \text{round}(x + y) = (x + y)(1 + \delta_+), \quad |\delta_+| \leq \text{eps}, \quad (5.10)
\]
and similarly for $\ominus$, $\otimes$, $\oslash$.

One important interpretation of (5.10) is the following. Assuming $x + y \neq 0$, write
\[
\delta_+ = \frac{1}{x + y}[\delta_x + \delta_y].
\]
Then
\[
x \oplus y = (x + y) \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{x + y}(\delta_x + \delta_y) \right] = (x + \delta_x) + (y + \delta_y). \quad (5.11)
\]
The computer $\oplus$ is giving the exact result but for a slightly perturbed data. This interpretation is the basis for Backward Error Analysis, which is used to study how round-off errors propagate in a numerical algorithm.
5.4 Propagation of Errors and Cancellation of Digits

Let $f_l(x)$ and $f_l(y)$ denote the floating point approximation of $x$ and $y$, respectively, and assume that their product is computed exactly, i.e.

$$ f_l(x) \cdot f_l(y) = x(1 + \delta_x) \cdot y(1 + \delta_y) = x \cdot y(1 + \delta_x + \delta_y + \delta_x \delta_y) \approx x \cdot y(1 + \delta_x + \delta_y), $$

where $|\delta_x|, |\delta_y| \leq \text{eps}$. Therefore, for the relative error we get

$$ \left\| \frac{x \cdot y - f_l(x) \cdot f_l(y)}{x \cdot y} \right\| \approx |\delta_x + \delta_y|, \quad (5.12) $$

which is acceptable.

Let us now consider addition (or subtraction):

$$ f_l(x) + f_l(y) = x(1 + \delta_x) + y(1 + \delta_y) = x + y + x\delta_x + y\delta_y $$

$$ = (x + y) \left(1 + \frac{x}{x + y} \delta_x + \frac{y}{x + y} \delta_y \right). $$

The relative error is

$$ \left| \frac{x + y - (f_l(x) + f_l(y))}{x + y} \right| = \left| \frac{x}{x + y} \delta_x + \frac{y}{x + y} \delta_y \right|. \quad (5.13) $$

If $x$ and $y$ have the same sign then $\frac{x}{x + y}, \frac{y}{x + y}$ are both positive and bounded by 1. Therefore the relative error is less than $|\delta_x + \delta_y|$, which is fine. But if $x$ and $y$ have different sign and are close in magnitude, the error could be largely amplified because $\left| \frac{x}{x + y} \right|, \left| \frac{y}{x + y} \right|$ can be very large.

Example 5.1. Suppose we have 10 bits of precision and

$$ x = (1.01011100 \ast \ast) \times 2^E, $$

$$ y = (1.01011000 \ast \ast) \times 2^E, $$

where the $\ast$ stands for inaccurate bits (i.e. garbage) that say were generated in previous floating point computations. Then, in this 10 bit precision arithmetic

$$ z = x - y = (1.00 \ast \ast \ast \ast \ast \ast \ast \ast \ast) \times 2^{E-6}. \quad (5.14) $$

We end up with only 2 bits of accuracy in $z$. Any further computations using $z$ will result in an accuracy of 2 bits or lower!
5.4. PROPAGATION OF ERRORS AND CANCELLATION OF DIGITS

Example 5.2. Sometimes we can rewrite the difference of two very close numbers to avoid digit cancellation. For example, suppose we would like to compute

\[ y = \sqrt{1 + x} - 1 \]

for \( x > 0 \) and very small. Clearly, we will have loss of digits if we proceed directly. However, if we rewrite \( y \) as

\[ y = (\sqrt{1 + x} + 1) \frac{\sqrt{1 + x} - 1}{\sqrt{1 + x} + 1} = \frac{x}{\sqrt{1 + x} + 1} \]

then the computation can be performed at nearly machine precision level.
Chapter 6
Numerical Differentiation

6.1 Finite Differences

Suppose \( f \) is a differentiable function and we’d like to approximate \( f'(x_0) \) given the value of \( f \) at \( x_0 \) and at neighboring points \( x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \). We could approximate \( f \) by its interpolating polynomial \( p_n \) at those points and use \( f'(x_0) \approx p_n'(x_0) \). There are several other possibilities. For example, we can approximate \( f'(x_0) \) by the derivative of the cubic spline of \( f \) evaluated at \( x_0 \), or by the derivative of the Least Squares Chebyshev expansion of \( f \):

\[
f'(x_0) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j T_j'(x_0),
\]

etc. We are going to focus here on simple, finite difference formulas obtained by differentiating low order interpolating polynomials.

Assuming \( x, x_0, \ldots, x_n \in [a, b] \) and \( f \in C^{n+1}[a, b] \), we have

\[
f(x) = p_n(x) + \frac{1}{(n+1)!} f^{(n+1)}(\xi(x)) \omega_n(x), \tag{6.1}
\]

for some \( \xi(x) \in (a, b) \) and

\[
\omega_n(x) = (x - x_0)(x - x_1) \cdots (x - x_n). \tag{6.2}
\]

Thus,

\[
f'(x_0) = p_n'(x_0) + \frac{1}{(n+1)!} \left[ \frac{d}{dx} f^{(n+1)}(\xi(x)) \omega_n(x) + f^{(n+1)}(\xi(x)) \omega_n'(x) \right]_{x=x_0}.
\]
But \( \omega_n(x_0) = 0 \) and \( \omega'_n(x_0) = (x_0 - x_1) \cdots (x_0 - x_n) \), thus
\[
f'(x_0) = p'_n(x_0) + \frac{1}{(n+1)!} f^{(n+1)}(\xi_0)(x_0 - x_1) \cdots (x_0 - x_n),
\]
(6.3)
where \( \xi_0 \) is between \( \min\{x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \) and \( \max\{x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \).

**Example 6.1.** Take \( n = 1 \) and \( x_1 = x_0 + h \) \((h > 0)\). In Newton’s form
\[
p_1(x) = f(x_0) + \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h}(x - x_0),
\]
(6.4)
and \( p'_1(x_0) = \frac{1}{h} [f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)] \). We obtain the forward difference formula for approximating \( f'(x_0) \)
\[
D^+_hf(x_0) := \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h}.
\]
(6.5)
From (6.3) the error in this approximation is
\[
f'(x_0) - D^+_hf(x_0) = \frac{1}{2!} f''(\xi_0)(x_0 - x_1) = -\frac{1}{2} f''(\xi_0)h.
\]
(6.6)

**Example 6.2.** Take again \( n = 1 \) but now \( x_1 = x_0 - h \). Then \( p'_1(x_0) = \frac{1}{h} [f(x_0) - f(x_0 - h)] \) and we get the backward difference formula for approximating \( f'(x_0) \)
\[
D^-hf(x_0) := \frac{f(x_0) - f(x_0 - h)}{h}.
\]
(6.7)
Its error is
\[
f'(x_0) - D^-hf(x_0) = \frac{1}{2} f''(\xi_0)h.
\]
(6.8)

**Example 6.3.** Let \( n=2 \) and \( x_1 = x_0 - h, \ x_2 = x_0 + h \). Then, \( p_2 \) in Newton’s form is
\[
p_2(x) = f[x_1] + f[x_1,x_0](x - x_1) + f[x_1,x_0,x_2](x - x_1)(x - x_0).
\]
Let us obtain the divided difference table:
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
x_0 - h & f(x_0 - h) & \frac{f(x_0) - f(x_0 - h)}{h} \\
x_0 & f(x_0) & \frac{f(x_0 + h) - 2f(x_0) + f(x_0 - h)}{2h^2} \\
x_0 + h & f(x_0 + h) & \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h}
\end{array}
\]
Therefore,
\[ p'_2(x_0) = \frac{f(x_0) - f(x_0 - h)}{h} + \frac{f(x_0 + h) - 2f(x_0) + f(x_0 - h)}{2h^2} \]
and thus
\[ p'_2(x_0) = \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0 - h)}{2h}. \]  (6.9)

This defines the centered difference formula to approximate \( f'(x_0) \)
\[ D^0_h f(x_0) := \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0 - h)}{2h}. \]  (6.10)

Its error is
\[ f'(x_0) - D^0_h f(x_0) = \frac{1}{3!} f'''(\xi_0)(x_0 - x_1)(x_0 - x_2) = -\frac{1}{6} f'''(\xi_0)h^2. \]  (6.11)

**Example 6.4.** Let \( n = 2 \) and \( x_1 = x_0 + h, x_2 = x_0 + 2h \). The table of divided differences is
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  x_0 & f(x_0) & \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h} \\
  x_0 + h & f(x_0 + h) & \frac{f(x_0 + 2h) - 2f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0)}{2h^2} \\
  x_0 + 2h & f(x_0 + 2h)
\end{array}
\]

Therefore,
\[ p'_2(x_0) = \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h} + \frac{f(x_0 + 2h) - 2f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0)}{2h^2}(-h) \]
and simplifying
\[ p'_2(x_0) = \frac{-f(x_0 + 2h) + 4f(x_0 + h) - 3f(x_0)}{2h}. \]  (6.12)

If we use this sided difference to approximate \( f'(x_0) \), the error is
\[ f'(x_0) - p'_2(x_0) = \frac{1}{3!} f'''(\xi_0)(x_0 - x_1)(x_0 - x_2) = \frac{1}{3} h^2 f'''(\xi_0), \]  (6.13)
which is twice as large as that of the centered finite difference formula.
Example 6.5. Tables 6.1 and 6.2 show the approximations of the derivative for \( f(x) = e^{-x} \) at \( x_0 = 0 \), obtained with the forward and the centered finite differences, respectively. The rate of convergence is evidence in the last column, the decrease factor. The error decreases by approximately a factor of 1/2 when \( h \) is halved for the forward difference (linear rate of convergence) and by approximately a factor of 1/4 for the centered difference (second order of convergence).

Table 6.1: Approximation of \( f'(0) \) for \( f(x) = e^{-x} \) using the forward finite difference. The decrease factor is \( \text{error}(\frac{h}{2})/\text{error}(h) \).

| \( h \) | \( D_h^+ f(0) \) | \( |D_h^+ f(0) - f'(0)| \) | Decrease factor |
|-------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| 0.20  | -0.90634623    | 0.09365377       |                |
| 0.10  | -0.95162582    | 0.04837418       | 0.51652147     |
| 0.05  | -0.97541151    | 0.02458849       | 0.50829781     |
| 0.025 | -0.98760352    | 0.01239648       | 0.50415789     |

Table 6.2: Approximation of \( f'(0) \) for \( f(x) = e^{-x} \) using the centered finite difference. The decrease factor is \( \text{error}(\frac{h}{2})/\text{error}(h) \).

| \( h \) | \( D_h^0 f(0) \) | \( |D_h^0 f(0) - f'(0)| \) | Decrease factor |
|-------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| 0.20  | -1.00668001    | 0.000668001      |                |
| 0.10  | -1.0016675     | 0.00166750       | 0.24962530     |
| 0.05  | -1.00041672    | 0.00041672       | 0.24990627     |
| 0.025 | -1.00010417    | 0.00010417       | 0.24997656     |

6.2 The Effect of Round-Off Errors

In numerical differentiation we take differences of values, which for small \( h \), could be very close to each other. As we know, this leads to loss of accuracy because of finite precision floating point arithmetic. Consider for example the centered difference formula. For simplicity let us suppose that \( h \) has an exact floating point representation and that we make no rounding error when doing the division by \( h \). That is, suppose that the the only source of round-off error is in the computation of the difference \( f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0 - h) \). Then
6.2. THE EFFECT OF ROUND-OFF ERRORS

\( f(x_0+h) \) and \( f(x_0-h) \) are replaced by \( f(x_0+h)(1+\delta_+) \) and \( f(x_0-h)(1+\delta_-) \), respectively with \( |\delta_+| \leq \text{eps} \) and \( |\delta_-| \leq \text{eps} \). Then

\[
\frac{f(x_0 + h)(1 + \delta_+)}{2h} - \frac{f(x_0 - h)(1 + \delta_-)}{2h} = \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0 - h)}{2h} + r_h,
\]

where

\[
r_h = \frac{f(x_0 + h)\delta_+ - f(x_0 - h)\delta_-}{2h}.
\]

Clearly, \(|r_h| \leq (|f(x_0 + h)| + |f(x_0 - h)|)\text{eps} \approx |f(x_0)|\text{eps} \). The approximation error or truncation error for the centered finite difference approximation is \(-\frac{1}{6}f'''(\xi_0)h^2\). Thus, the total error \( E(h) \) can be approximately bounded by \( \frac{1}{6}h^2M_3 + |f(x_0)|\text{eps} \). The minimum error occurs at \( h_0 \) such that \( E'(h_0) = 0 \), i.e.

\[
h_0 = \left( \frac{3 \text{eps} |f(x_0)|}{M_3} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \approx c \text{ eps}^{\frac{1}{3}} \tag{6.14}
\]

and \( E(h_0) = O(\text{eps}^2) \). We do not get machine precision! Figure 6.1 shows the behavior of the round-off and discretization errors as a function of \( h \) for the centered finite difference. When these two errors become comparable, around the point \( h_0 \), decreasing \( h \) further does not decrease the total error as roundoff errors start to dominate.

Higher order finite differences exacerbate the problem of digit cancellation. When \( f \) can be extended to an analytic function in the complex plane, Cauchy Integral Theorem can be used to evaluate the derivative:

\[
f'(z_0) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C \frac{f(z)}{(z - z_0)^2} dz, \tag{6.15}
\]

where \( C \) is a simple closed contour around \( z_0 \) and \( f \) is analytic on and inside \( C \). Parametrizing \( C \) as a circle of radius \( r \) we get

\[
f'(z_0) = \frac{1}{2\pi r} \int_0^{2\pi} f(x_0 + re^{it})e^{-it} dt. \tag{6.16}
\]

The integrand is periodic and smooth so it can be approximated with spectral accuracy with the composite trapezoidal rule.
Figure 6.1: Behavior of the round-off and discretization errors for the centered finite difference. The smallest total error is achieved for a value $h_0$ around the point where the two errors become comparable.
Another approach to obtain finite difference formulas to approximate derivatives is through Taylor expansions. For example,

\[ f(x_0 + h) = f(x_0) + f'(x_0)h + \frac{1}{2}f''(x_0)h^2 + \frac{1}{3!}f^{(3)}(x_0)h^3 + \frac{1}{4!}f^{(4)}(\xi_+)h^4, \]

\[ f(x_0 - h) = f(x_0) - f'(x_0)h + \frac{1}{2}f''(x_0)h^2 - \frac{1}{3!}f^{(3)}(x_0)h^3 + \frac{1}{4!}f^{(4)}(\xi_-)h^4, \]

where \( x_0 < \xi_+ < x_0 + h \) and \( x_0 - h < \xi_- < x_0 \). Then subtracting (6.17) from (6.18) we have

\[ \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0 - h)}{2h} = f'(x_0) + c_2h^2 + c_4h^4 + \cdots \]  

(6.19)

Similarly if we add (6.17) and (6.18) we obtain

\[ f(x_0 + h) + f(x_0 - h) = 2f'(x_0)h + \frac{2}{3!}f''(x_0)h^3 + \cdots \]

and consequently

\[ f''(x_0) = \frac{f(x_0 + h) - 2f(x_0) + f(x_0 - h)}{h^2} + \tilde{c}h^2 + \cdots \]  

(6.20)

The finite difference

\[ D_h^2 f(x_0) = \frac{f(x_0 + h) - 2f(x_0) + f(x_0 - h)}{h^2} \]  

(6.21)

is thus a second order approximation to \( f''(x_0) \), i.e., \( f''(x_0) - D_h^2 f(x_0) = O(h^2) \).

### 6.3 Richardson’s Extrapolation

From (6.19) we know that, asymptotically

\[ D_h^0 f(x_0) = f'(x_0) + c_2h^2 + c_4h^4 + \cdots \]  

(6.22)

We can apply Richardson extrapolation once to obtain a fourth order approximation. Evaluating (6.22) at \( h/2 \) we get

\[ D_{h/2}^0 f(x_0) = f'(x_0) + \frac{1}{4}c_2h^2 + \frac{1}{16}c_4h^4 + \cdots \]  

(6.23)
and multiplying this equation by 4, subtracting \( (6.22) \) to the result and dividing by 3 we get

\[
D_{h}^{\text{ext}} f(x_0) := \frac{4D_{h/2}^0 f(x_0) - D_h^0 f(x_0)}{3} = f'(x_0) + \tilde{c}_4 h^4 + \cdots \quad (6.24)
\]

The method \( D_{h}^{\text{ext}} f(x_0) \) has order of convergence 4 for about twice the amount of work of that \( D_{h}^0 f(x_0) \). Round-off errors are still \( O(\text{eps}/h) \) and the minimum total error will be when \( O(h^4) \) is \( O(\text{eps}/h) \), i.e. when \( h = \text{eps}^{1/5} \). The minimum error is thus \( O(\text{eps}^{4/5}) \) for \( D_{h}^{\text{ext}} f(x_0) \), about \( 10^{-14} \) in double precision with \( h = O(10^{-3}) \).
Chapter 7

Numerical Integration

We now revisit the problem of numerical integration that we used to introduced some principles of numerical analysis in Chapter 1.

The problem in question is to find accurate and efficient approximations to

\[ \int_a^b f(x)dx. \]

Numerical formulas to approximate a definite integral are called quadratures and, as we saw in Chapter 1, they can be elementary (simple) or composite.

We shall assume henceforth, unless otherwise noted, that the integrand is sufficiently smooth.

7.1 Elementary Simpson Quadrature

The elementary trapezoidal rule quadrature was derived by replacing the integrand \( f \) by its linear interpolating polynomial \( p_1 \) at \( a \) and \( b \), that is

\[ f(x) = p_1(x) + \frac{1}{2} f''(\xi)(x - a)(x - b), \quad (7.1) \]

for some \( \xi \) between \( a \) and \( b \) and thus

\[ \int_a^b f(x)dx = \int_a^b p_1(x)dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b f''(\xi)(x - a)(x - b)dx \]

\[ = \frac{1}{2} (b - a)[f(a) + f(b)] - \frac{1}{2} f''(\eta)(b - a)^3. \quad (7.2) \]
Thus, the approximation
\[
\int_a^b f(x)dx \approx \frac{1}{2} (b - a) [f(a) + f(b)]
\] (7.3)
has an error given by \(-\frac{1}{2} f''(\eta) (b - a)^3\).

We can add an intermediate point, say \(x_m = (a + b)/2\), and replace \(f\) by its quadratic interpolating polynomial \(p_2\) with respect to the nodes \(a, x_m\) and \(b\). For simplicity let’s take \([a, b] = [-1, 1]\). With the simple change of variables
\[x = \frac{1}{2} (a + b) + \frac{1}{2} (b - a) t, \quad t \in [-1, 1]\] (7.4)
we can obtain a quadrature formula for a general interval \([a, b]\).

Let \(p_2\) be the interpolating polynomial of \(f\) at \(-1, 0, 1\). The corresponding divided difference table is:

| 0 | \(f(0)\) | \(f(0) - f(-1)\) | \(f(1) - 2f(0) + f(-1)\) |
| 1 | \(f(1)\) | \(f(1) - f(0)\) | \(f(1) - 2f(0) + f(-1)\) |

Thus
\[p_2(x) = f(-1) + [f(0) - f(1)](x + 1) + \frac{f(1) - 2f(0) + f(-1)}{2} (x + 1)x.\] (7.5)

Now using the interpolation formula with remainder expressed in terms of a divided difference (3.64) we have
\[f(x) = p_2(x) + f[-1, 0, 1, x](x + 1)x(x - 1)\]
\[= p_2(x) + f[-1, 0, 1, x]x(x^2 - 1).\] (7.6)

Therefore
\[
\int_{-1}^1 f(x)dx = \int_{-1}^1 p_2(x)dx + \int_{-1}^1 f[-1, 0, 1, x]x(x^2 - 1)dx
\]
\[= 2f(-1) + 2[f(0) - f(-1)] + \frac{1}{3} [f(1) - 2f(0) + f(-1)] + E[f]
\]
\[= \frac{1}{3} [f(-1) + 4f(0) + f(1)] + E[f],\]
where
\[ E[f] = \int_{-1}^{1} f[-1, 0, 1, x] x(x^2 - 1)dx \] (7.7)
is the error. Note that \( x(x^2 - 1) \) changes sign in \([-1, 1]\) so we cannot use the Mean Value Theorem for integrals. However, if we add another node, \( x_4 \), we can relate \( f[-1, 0, 1, x] \) to the fourth order divided difference \( f[-1, 0, 1, x_4, x] \), which will make the integral in (7.7) easier to evaluate:
\[ f[-1, 0, 1, x] = f[-1, 0, 1, x_4] + f[-1, 0, 1, x_4, x](x - x_4). \] (7.8)
This identity is just an application of Theorem 3.2. Using (7.8)
\[ E[f] = f[-1, 0, 1, x_4] \int_{-1}^{1} x(x^2 - 1)dx + \int_{-1}^{1} f[-1, 0, 1, x, x]x(x^2 - 1)(x - x_4)dx. \]
The first integral is zero, because the integrand is odd. Now we choose \( x_4 \) symmetrically, \( x_4 = 0 \), so that \( x(x^2 - 1)(x - x_4) \) does not change sign in \([-1, 1]\) and
\[ E[f] = \int_{-1}^{1} f[-1, 0, 1, 0, x]x^2(x^2 - 1)dx = \int_{-1}^{1} f[-1, 0, 0, 1, x]x^2(x^2 - 1)dx. \] (7.9)
Now, using (3.66), there is \( \xi(x) \in (-1, 1) \) such that
\[ f[-1, 0, 0, 1, x] = \frac{f^{(4)}(\xi(x))}{4!}, \] (7.10)
and assuming \( f \in C^4[-1, 1] \), by the Mean Value Theorem for integrals, there is \( \eta \in (-1, 1) \) such that
\[ E[f] = \frac{f^{(4)}(\eta)}{4!} \int_{-1}^{1} x^2(x^2 - 1)dx = -\frac{4}{15} \frac{f^{(4)}(\eta)}{4!} = -\frac{1}{90} f^{(4)}(\eta). \] (7.11)
Summarizing, Simpson’s elementary quadrature for the interval \([-1, 1]\) is
\[ \int_{-1}^{1} f(x)dx = \frac{1}{3} [f(-1) + 4f(0) + f(1)] - \frac{1}{90} f^{(4)}(\eta). \] (7.12)
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Note that Simpson’s elementary quadrature gives the exact value of the integral when $f$ is polynomial of degree 3 or less (the error is proportional to the fourth derivative), even though we used a second order polynomial to approximate the integrand. We gain extra precision because of the symmetry of the quadrature around 0. In fact, we could have derived Simpson’s quadrature by using the Hermite (third order) interpolating polynomial of $f$ at $-1, 0, 0, 1$.

To obtain the corresponding formula for a general interval $[a, b]$ we use the change of variables (7.4)

\[
\int_{a}^{b} f(x)dx = \frac{1}{2}(b - a) \int_{-1}^{1} F(t)dt,
\]

where

\[
F(t) = f\left(\frac{1}{2}(a + b) + \frac{1}{2}(b - a)t\right),
\]

(7.13)

and noting that $F^{(k)}(t) = \left(\frac{b - a}{2}\right)^k f^{(k)}(x)$ we obtain Simpson’s elementary rule on the interval $[a, b]$:

\[
\int_{a}^{b} f(x)dx = \frac{1}{6}(b - a) \left[ f(a) + 4f\left(\frac{a + b}{2}\right) + f(b) \right] - \frac{1}{90}f^{(4)}(\eta) \left(\frac{b - a}{2}\right)^5.
\]

(7.14)

7.2 Interpolatory Quadratures

The elementary trapezoidal and Simpson rules are examples of interpolatory quadratures. This class of quadratures is obtained by selecting a set of nodes $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n$ in the interval of integration and by approximating the integral by that of the interpolating polynomial $p_n$ of the integrand at these nodes. By construction, such interpolatory quadrature is exact for polynomials of degree up to $n$, at least. We just saw that Simpson rule is exact for polynomial up to degree 3 and we used $p_2$ in its construction. The “degree gain” was due to the symmetric choice of the interpolation nodes. This leads us to two important questions:
1. For a given \( n \), how do we choose the nodes \( x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n \) so that the corresponding interpolation quadrature is exact for polynomials of the highest degree \( k \) possible?

2. What is that \( k \)?

Because orthogonal polynomials (Section 4.1.2.2) play a central role in the answer to these questions, we will consider the more general problem of approximating

\[
I[f] = \int_a^b f(x)w(x)dx,
\]

where \( w \) is an admissible weight function (\( w \geq 0, \int_a^b w(x)dx > 0 \), and \( \int_a^b x^k w(x)dx < +\infty \) for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots \), \( w \equiv 1 \) being a particular case. The interval of integration \([a, b]\) can be either finite or infinite (e.g. \([0, +\infty]\), \([-\infty, +\infty]\)).

**Definition 7.1.** We say that a quadrature \( Q[f] \) to approximate \( I[f] \) has degree of precision \( k \) if it is exact, i.e. \( I[P] = Q[P] \), for all polynomials \( P \) of degree up to \( k \) but not exact for polynomials of degree \( k + 1 \). Equivalently, a quadrature \( Q[f] \) has degree of precision \( k \) if \( I[x^m] = Q[x^m] \), for \( m = 0, 1, \ldots, k \) but \( I[x^{k+1}] \neq Q[x^{k+1}] \).

**Example 7.1.** The trapezoidal rule quadrature has degree of precision 1 while the Simpson quadrature has degree of precision 3.

For a given set of nodes \( x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n \) in \([a, b]\), let \( p_n \) be the interpolating polynomial of \( f \) at these nodes. In Lagrange form we can write \( p_n \) as (see Section 3.1)

\[
p_n(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} f(x_j)l_j(x),
\]

where

\[
l_j(x) = \prod_{\substack{k=0 \atop k \neq j}}^{n} \frac{(x - x_k)}{(x_j - x_k)}, \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, \ldots, n.
\]
are the elementary Lagrange polynomials. The corresponding interpolatory quadrature $Q_n[f]$ to approximate $I[f]$ is then given by

$$Q_n[f] = \sum_{j=0}^{n} A_j f(x_j), \quad A_j = \int_a^b l_j(x)w(x)dx, \text{ for } j = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \quad (7.18)$$

**Theorem 7.1.** Degree of precision of the interpolatory quadrature (7.18) is less than $2n + 2$

**Proof.** Suppose the degree of precision $k$ of (7.18) is greater or equal than $2n + 2$. Take $f(x) = (x - x_0)^2(x - x_1)^2 \cdots (x - x_n)^2$. This is polynomial of degree exactly $2n + 2$. Then

$$\int_a^b f(x)w(x)dx = \sum_{j=0}^{n} A_j f(x_j) = 0. \quad (7.19)$$

and on the other hand

$$\int_a^b f(x)w(x)dx = \int_a^b (x - x_0)^2 \cdots (x - x_n)^2 w(x)dx > 0 \quad (7.20)$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore $k < 2n + 2$. \hfill \Box

### 7.3 Gaussian Quadratures

We will now show that there is a choice of nodes $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n$ which yields the optimal degree of precision $2n + 1$ for an interpolatory quadrature. The corresponding quadratures are called Gaussian quadratures. To define them we recall that $\psi_k$ is the $k$-th orthogonal polynomial with respect to the inner product

$$< f, g > = \int_a^b f(x)g(x)w(x)dx, \quad (7.21)$$

if $< \psi_k, q > = 0$ for all polynomials $q$ of degree less than $k$. Recall also that the zeros of the orthogonal polynomials are real, simple, and contained in $[a, b]$ (see Theorem 4.3).

**Definition 7.2.** Let $\psi_{n+1}$ be the $(n + 1)$st orthogonal polynomial and let $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be its $n + 1$ zeros. Then the interpolatory quadrature (7.18) with the nodes so chosen is called a Gaussian quadrature.
Theorem 7.2. The interpolatory quadrature (7.18) has degree of precision $k = 2n + 1$ if and only if it is a Gaussian quadrature.

Proof. Let $f$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq 2n + 1$. Then, we can write

$$f(x) = q(x)\psi_{n+1}(x) + r(x), \quad (7.22)$$

where $q$ and $r$ are polynomials of degree $\leq n$. Now

$$\int_a^b f(x)w(x)dx = \int_a^b q(x)\psi_{n+1}(x)w(x)dx + \int_a^b r(x)w(x)dx \quad (7.23)$$

The first integral on the right hand side is zero because of orthogonality. For the second integral the quadrature is exact (it is interpolatory). Therefore

$$\int_a^b f(x)w(x)dx = \sum_{j=0}^n A_j r(x_j). \quad (7.24)$$

Moreover, $r(x_j) = f(x_j) - q(x_j)\psi_{n+1}(x_j) = f(x_j)$ for all $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. Thus,

$$\int_a^b f(x)w(x)dx = \sum_{j=0}^n A_j f(x_j). \quad (7.25)$$

This proves that the Gaussian quadrature has degree of precision $k = 2n + 1$. Now suppose that the interpolatory quadrature (7.18) has maximal degree of precision $2n + 1$. Take $f(x) = p(x)(x-x_0)(x-x_1)\cdots(x-x_n)$ where $p$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq n$. Then, $f$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq 2n + 1$ and

$$\int_a^b f(x)w(x)dx = \int_a^b p(x)(x-x_0)\cdots(x-x_n)w(x)dx = \sum_{j=0}^n A_j f(x_j) = 0.$$

Therefore, the polynomial $(x-x_0)(x-x_1)\cdots(x-x_n)$ of degree $n + 1$ is orthogonal to all polynomials of degree $\leq n$. Thus, it is a multiple of $\psi_{n+1}$.

Example 7.2. Consider the interval $[-1, 1]$ and the weight function $w \equiv 1$. The orthogonal polynomials are the Legendre Polynomials $1, x, x^2 - \frac{1}{3}, x^3 -$
\( \frac{3}{5}x, \cdots \). Take \( n = 1 \). The roots of \( \psi_2 \) are \( x_0 = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \) and \( x_1 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \). Therefore, the corresponding Gaussian quadrature is

\[
\int_{-1}^{1} f(x)dx \approx A_0 f\left(-\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\right) + A_1 f\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\right),
\]

(7.26)

where

\[
A_0 = \int_{-1}^{1} l_0(x)dx,
\]

(7.27)

\[
A_1 = \int_{-1}^{1} l_1(x)dx.
\]

(7.28)

We can evaluate these integrals directly or use the method of undetermined coefficients to find \( A_0 \) and \( A_1 \). The latter is generally easier and we illustrate it now. Using that the quadrature is exact for 1 and \( x \) we have

\[
2 = \int_{-1}^{1} 1dx = A_0 + A_1,
\]

(7.29)

\[
0 = \int_{-1}^{1} xdx = -A_0 \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} + A_1 \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}.
\]

(7.30)

Solving this \( 2 \times 2 \) linear system we get \( A_0 = A_1 = 1 \). So the Gaussian quadrature for \( n = 1 \) in \([-1,1]\) is

\[
Q_1[f] = f\left(-\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\right) + f\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\right).
\]

(7.31)

Let us compare this quadrature to the elementary trapezoidal rule. Take \( f(x) = x^2 \). The trapezoidal rule, \( T[f] \), gives

\[
T[x^2] = \frac{2}{2}[f(-1) + f(1)] = 2,
\]

(7.32)

whereas the Gaussian quadrature \( Q_1[f] \) yields the exact result:

\[
Q_1[x^2] = \left(-\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\right)^2 + \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\right)^2 = \frac{2}{3}.
\]

(7.33)
Example 7.3. Let us take again the interval \([-1, 1]\) but now \(w(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}\). As we know (see 2.4), \(\psi_{n+1} = T_{n+1}\), i.e. the Chebyshev polynomial of degree \(n + 1\). Its zeros are \(x_j = \cos \left[ \frac{2j+1}{2(n+1)} \pi \right]\) for \(j = 0, \ldots, n\). For \(n = 1\) we have

\[
\cos \left( \frac{\pi}{4} \right) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \cos \left( \frac{3\pi}{4} \right) = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

(7.34)

We can use again the method of undetermined coefficients to find \(A_0\) and \(A_1\):

\[
\pi = \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} \, dx = A_0 + A_1,
\]

(7.35)

\[
0 = \int_{-1}^{1} x \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} \, dx = -A_0 \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} + A_1 \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}},
\]

(7.36)

which give \(A_0 = A_1 = \frac{\pi}{2}\). Thus, the corresponding Gaussian quadrature to approximate \(\int_{-1}^{1} f(x) \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} \, dx\) is

\[
Q_1[f] = \frac{\pi}{2} \left[ f \left( -\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + f \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right].
\]

(7.37)

7.3.1 Convergence of Gaussian Quadratures

Let \(f \in C[a, b]\) and consider the interpolation quadrature (7.18). Can we guarantee that the error converges to zero as \(n \to \infty\), i.e.,

\[
\int_a^b f(x)w(x) \, dx - \sum_{j=0}^{n} A_j f(x_j) \to 0, \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty?
\]

The answer is no. As we know, convergence of the interpolating polynomial to \(f\) depends on the smoothness of \(f\) and the distribution of the interpolating nodes. However, if the interpolatory quadrature is Gaussian the answer is yes. This follows from the following special properties of the quadrature weights \(A_0, A_1, \ldots, A_n\) in the Gaussian quadrature.

Theorem 7.3. For a Gaussian quadrature all the quadrature weights are positive and sum up to \(\|w\|_1\), i.e.,

(a) \(A_j > 0\) for all \(j = 0, 1, \ldots, n\).
(b) \( \sum_{j=0}^{n} A_j = \int_{a}^{b} w(x)dx. \)

Proof. (a) Let \( p_k = t_k^2 \) for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \) These are polynomials of degree exactly equal to \( 2n \) and \( p_k(x_j) = \delta_{kj}. \) Thus,

\[
0 < \int_{a}^{b} t_k^2(x)w(x)dx = \sum_{j=0}^{n} A_j t_k^2(x_j) = A_k
\]

for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \)

(b) Take \( f(x) \equiv 1 \) then

\[
\int_{a}^{b} w(x)dx = \sum_{j=0}^{n} A_j.
\]

as the quadrature is exact for polynomials of degree zero. \( \square \)

We can now use these special properties of the Gaussian quadrature to prove its convergence for all \( f \in C[a, b]: \)

**Theorem 7.4.** Let

\[
Q_n[f] = \sum_{j=0}^{n} A_j f(x_j)
\]

be the Gaussian quadrature. Then

\[
E_n[f] := \int_{a}^{b} f(x)w(x)dx - Q_n[f] \to 0, \text{ as } n \to \infty .
\]

Proof. Let \( p_{2n+1}^* \) be the best uniform approximation to \( f \) (in the max norm, \( \|f\|_\infty = \max_{x \in [a, b]} |f(x)| \)) by polynomials of degree \( \leq 2n + 1. \) Then,

\[
E_n[f - p_{2n+1}^*] = E_n[f] - E_n[p_{2n+1}^*] = E_n[f]
\]

and therefore

\[
E_n[f] = E_n[f - p_{2n+1}^*] = \int_{a}^{b} [f(x) - p_{2n+1}^*(x)]w(x)dx - \sum_{j=0}^{n} A_j[f(x_j) - p_{2n+1}^*(x_j)].
\]
Taking the absolute value, using the triangle inequality, and the fact that the quadrature weights are positive we obtain
\[ |E_n[f]| \leq \int_a^b |f(x) - p_{2n+1}^*(x)|w(x)dx + \sum_{j=0}^n A_j|f(x_j) - p_{2n+1}^*(x_j)| \]
\[ \leq \|f - p_{2n+1}^*\|_\infty \int_a^b w(x)dx + \|f - p_{2n+1}^*\|_\infty \sum_{j=0}^n A_j \]
\[ = 2\|w\|_1\|f - p_{2n+1}^*\|_\infty \]
From the Weierstrass approximation theorem it follows that \( E_n[f] \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \).

Moreover, one can prove (using one of the Jackson Theorems) that if \( f \in C^m[a,b] \)
\[ |E_n[f]| \leq C(2n)^{-m}\|f^{(m)}\|_\infty. \quad (7.43) \]
That is, the rate of convergence is not fixed; it depends on the number of derivatives the integrand has. We say in this case that the approximation is spectral. In particular if \( f \in C^\infty[a,b] \) then the error decreases down to zero faster than any power of \( 1/(2n) \).

### 7.3.2 Computing the Gaussian Nodes and Weights

Orthogonal polynomials satisfy a three-term relation:
\[ \psi_{k+1}(x) = (x - \alpha_k)\psi_k(x) - \beta_k\psi_{k-1}(x), \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \quad (7.44) \]
where \( \beta_0 \) is defined by \( \int_a^b w(x)dx, \psi_0(x) = 1 \) and \( \psi_{-1}(x) = 0 \). Equivalently
\[ x\psi_k(x) = \beta_k\psi_{k-1}(x) + \alpha_k\psi_k(x) + \psi_{k+1}(x), \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \quad (7.45) \]
If we use the normalized orthogonal polynomials
\[ \tilde{\psi}_k(x) = \frac{\psi_k(x)}{\sqrt{\langle \psi_k, \psi_k \rangle}} \quad (7.46) \]
and recalling that
\[ \beta_k = \frac{\langle \psi_k, \psi_k \rangle}{\langle \psi_{k-1}, \psi_{k-1} \rangle} \]
then \( (7.45) \) can be written as
\[
\tilde{x}\tilde{\psi}_k(x) = \sqrt{\beta_k}\tilde{\psi}_{k-1}(x) + \alpha_k\tilde{\psi}_k(x) + \sqrt{\beta_{k+1}}\tilde{\psi}_{k+1}(x), \quad \text{for} \ k = 0, 1, \ldots, n.
\] (7.47)

Now evaluating this at a root \( x_j \) of \( \psi_{n+1} \) we get the eigenvalue problem
\[
x_jv_j = J_nv_j,
\] (7.48)
where
\[
J_n = \begin{bmatrix}
\alpha_0 & \sqrt{\beta_1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\sqrt{\beta_1} & \alpha_0 & \sqrt{\beta_2} & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{\beta_n} & \alpha_n
\end{bmatrix}, \quad v_j = \begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{\psi}_0(x_j) \\
\tilde{\psi}_1(x_j) \\
\vdots \\
\tilde{\psi}_{n-1}(x_j) \\
\tilde{\psi}_n(x_j)
\end{bmatrix}. \tag{7.49}
\]

That is, the Gaussian nodes \( x_j, j = 0, 1, \ldots, n \) are the eigenvalues of the Jacobi Matrix \( J_n \). One can show that the Gaussian weights \( A_j \), are given in terms of the first component \( v_{j,0} \) of the (normalized) eigenvector \( v_j \) (\( v_j^Tv_j = 1 \)):
\[
A_j = \beta_0v_{j,0}^2. \tag{7.50}
\]

There are efficient numerical methods (cf. Chapter 11) to solve the eigenvalue problem for a symmetric tridiagonal matrix and this is one of most popular approaches to compute the Gaussian nodes.

### 7.4 Clenshaw-Curtis Quadrature

Gaussian quadratures are optimal in terms of the degree of precision and offer superalgebraic convergence for smooth integrands. However, the computation of Gaussian weights and nodes carries a significant cost, for large \( n \). There is an ingenious interpolatory quadrature that is a close competitor to the Gaussian quadrature due to its efficient and fast rate of convergence. This is the Clenshaw-Curtis quadrature.

Suppose \( f \) is a smooth function in \([-1, 1]\) and we are interested in an accurate approximation of the integral
\[
\int_{-1}^{1} f(x)dx.
\]
7.4. CLENSHAW-CURTIS QUADRATURE

The idea is to use the Chebyshev nodes \( x_j = \cos(j\pi/n) \), \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, n \) as the nodes of the corresponding interpolatory quadrature. The degree of precision is only \( n \) (or \( n + 1 \) if \( n \) is even), not \( 2n + 1 \). However, as we know, for smooth functions the approximation by polynomial interpolation using the Chebyshev nodes converges very rapidly. Hence, for smooth integrands this particular interpolatory quadrature can be expected to converge fast to the exact value of the integral.

As seen in Section 3.13, the interpolating polynomial \( p_n \) of \( f \) at the Chebyshev nodes (the Chebyshev interpolant) can be represented as

\[
p_n(x) = \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a_k T_k(x) + \frac{a_n}{2} T_n(x),
\]

(7.51)

where the coefficients are given by

\[
a_k = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n} f(\cos \theta_j) \cos k\theta_j, \quad \theta_j = j\pi/n, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, n
\]

(7.52)

and can be computed fast with the FFT. With the change of variable \( x = \cos \theta, \theta \in [0, \pi] \), we have

\[
p_n(\cos \theta) = \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a_k \cos k\theta + \frac{a_n}{2} \cos n\theta
\]

(7.53)

and

\[
\int_{-1}^{1} f(x)dx = \int_{0}^{\pi} f(\cos \theta) \sin \theta d\theta.
\]

(7.54)

The quadrature is obtained by replacing \( f(\cos \theta) \) by \( p_n(\cos \theta) \)

\[
\int_{-1}^{1} f(x)dx \approx \int_{0}^{\pi} p_n(\cos \theta) \sin \theta d\theta.
\]

(7.55)

Substituting (7.53) for \( p_n(\cos \theta) \) we get

\[
\int_{0}^{\pi} p_n(\cos \theta) \sin \theta d\theta = \frac{a_0}{2} \int_{0}^{\pi} \sin \theta d\theta
\]

\[
+ \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a_k \int_{0}^{\pi} \cos k\theta \sin \theta d\theta
\]

\[
+ \frac{a_n}{2} \int_{0}^{\pi} \cos n\theta \sin \theta d\theta.
\]

(7.56)
With the aid of the trigonometric identity
\[ \cos k\theta \sin \theta = \frac{1}{2} [\sin(1 + k)\theta + \sin(1 - k)\theta] \] (7.57)
we can perform the integrals on the right hand side of (7.56) and taking \( n \) even we get the Clenshaw-Curtis quadrature:
\[
\int_{-1}^{1} f(x)dx \approx a_0 + \sum_{k=2}^{n-2} a_k \frac{2}{1 - k^2} + a_n \frac{1}{1 - n^2}.
\] (7.58)

For a general interval \([a, b]\) we simply use the change of variables
\[
x = \frac{a + b}{2} + \frac{b - a}{2} \cos \theta
\] (7.59)
for \( \theta \in [0, \pi] \) and thus
\[
\int_{a}^{b} f(x)dx = \frac{b - a}{2} \int_{0}^{\pi} F(\theta) \sin \theta d\theta,
\] (7.60)
where \( F(\theta) = f\left(\frac{a+b}{2} + \frac{b-a}{2} \cos \theta\right) \) and so the formula (7.58) gets an extra factor of \((b - a)/2\).

Figure 7.1 shows a comparison of the approximations obtained with the Clenshaw-Curtis quadrature and the composite Simpson quadrature, which we discuss next, for the integral of \( f(x) = e^x \) in \([0, 1]\). The Clenshaw-Curtis quadrature converges to the exact value of the integral amazingly fast. With just \( n = 8 \) nodes, it almost reaches machine precision while the composite Simpson rule requires more than 512 nodes for comparable accuracy.

### 7.5 Composite Quadratures

We saw in Section 1.2.2 that one strategy to improve the accuracy of a quadrature formula is to divide the interval of integration \([a, b]\) into small subintervals, use the elementary quadrature in each of them, and sum up all the contributions.

For simplicity, let us divide uniformly \([a, b]\) into \( N \) subintervals of equal length \( h = (b - a)/N \), \([x_j, x_{j+1}]\), where \( x_j = a + jh \) for \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1 \).
Figure 7.1: Comparison of Clenshaw-Curtis quadrature with the composite Simpson rule for the integral of $f(x) = e^x$ in $[0,1]$. The Clenshaw-Curtis almost reaches machine precision with just $n = 8$ nodes.
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If we use the elementary trapezoidal rule in each subinterval (as done in Section 1.2.2) we arrive at the composite trapezoidal rule:

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx = h \left[ \frac{1}{2} f(a) + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} f(x_j) + \frac{1}{2} f(b) \right] - \frac{1}{12} (b - a) h^2 f''(\eta), \quad (7.61)$$

where $\eta$ is some point in $(a,b)$.

To derive a corresponding composite Simpson quadrature we take $N$ even and apply the elementary Simpson quadrature in each of the $N/2$ intervals $[x_0, x_2], [x_2, x_4], \ldots [x_{N-2}, x_N]$. That is:

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx = \int_{x_0}^{x_2} f(x)dx + \int_{x_2}^{x_4} f(x)dx + \cdots + \int_{x_{N-2}}^{x_N} f(x)dx \quad (7.62)$$

and since the elementary Simpson quadrature applied to $[x_j, x_{j+2}]$ reads:

$$\int_{x_j}^{x_{j+2}} f(x)dx = \frac{h}{3} [f(x_j) + 4f(x_{j+1}) + f(x_{j+2})] - \frac{1}{90} f^{(4)}(\eta_j) h^5 \quad (7.63)$$

for some $\eta_j \in (x_j, x_{j+2})$, summing up all the $N/2$ contributions we get the composite Simpson quadrature:

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx = \frac{h}{3} \left[ f(a) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{N/2-1} f(x_{2j}) + 4 \sum_{j=1}^{N/2} f(x_{2j-1}) + f(b) \right] - \frac{1}{180} (b - a) h^4 f^{(4)}(\eta),$$

for some $\eta \in (a,b)$.

### 7.6 Modified Trapezoidal Rule

We are going to consider here a modification to the trapezoidal rule that will yield a quadrature with an error of the same order as Simpson’s rule. Moreover, this modified quadrature will give us some insight to the the asymptotic form of the trapezoidal rule error.

To simplify the derivation let us consider the interval $[0, 1]$ and let $p_3$ be the polynomial interpolating $f(0), f'(0), f(1), f'(1)$. Newton’s divided differences representation of $p_3$ is

$$p_3(x) = f(0) + f[0,0]x + f[0,0,1]x^2 + f[0,0,1,1]x^2(x-1), \quad (7.64)$$
and thus
\[
\int_0^1 p_3(x) dx = f(0) + \frac{1}{2} f'(0) + \frac{1}{3} f[0, 0, 1] - \frac{1}{12} f[0, 0, 1, 1]. \tag{7.65}
\]

Th divided differences are obtained in the tableau:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(f(0))</th>
<th>(f'(0))</th>
<th>(f(1) - f(0) - f'(0))</th>
<th>(f'(1) - f'(0))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>(f(0))</td>
<td></td>
<td>(f(1) - f(0))</td>
<td>(f'(1) + f'(0) + 2(f(0) - f(1)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(f(1))</td>
<td></td>
<td>(f'(1) - f(1) + f(0))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(f(1))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus,
\[
\int_0^1 p_3(x) dx = f(0) + \frac{1}{2} f'(0) + \frac{1}{3} [f(1) - f(0) - f'(0)] - \frac{1}{12} [f'(0) + f'(1) + 2(f(0) - f(1))] 
\]

and simplifying the right hand side we get
\[
\int_0^1 p_3(x) dx = \frac{1}{2} [f(0) + f(1)] + \frac{1}{12} [f'(0) - f'(1)], \tag{7.66}
\]

which is the simple trapezoidal rule plus a correction involving the derivative of the integrand at the end points.

We can obtain an expression for the error of this quadrature formula by recalling that the Cauchy remainder in the interpolation is
\[
f(x) - p_3(x) = \frac{1}{4!} f^{(4)}(\xi(x)) x^2 (x - 1)^2 \tag{7.67}
\]

and since \(x^2(x - 1)^2\) does not change sign in \([0, 1]\) we can use the mean value Theorem for integrals to get
\[
E[f] = \int_0^1 [f(x) - p_3(x)] dx = \frac{1}{4!} f^{(4)}(\eta) \int_0^1 x^2 (x - 1)^2 dx = \frac{1}{720} f^{(4)}(\eta) \tag{7.68}
\]

for some \(\eta \in (0, 1)\).
To obtain the quadrature in a general finite interval \([a, b]\) we use the change of variables \(x = a + (b - a)t, \ t \in [0, 1]\)

\[
\int_{a}^{b} f(x)dx = (b - a) \int_{0}^{1} F(t)dt,
\]

where \(F(t) = f(a + (b - a)t)\). Thus,

\[
\int_{a}^{b} f(x)dx = \frac{b - a}{2} [f(a) + f(b)] + \frac{(b - a)^2}{12} [f'(a) - f'(b)] + \frac{1}{720} f^{(4)}(\eta)(b - a)^5,
\]

for some \(\eta \in (a, b)\).

We can get a composite modified trapezoidal rule by subdividing \([a, b]\) in \(N\) subintervals of equal length \(h = \frac{b - a}{N}\), applying the simple rule in each subinterval and adding up all the contributions:

\[
\int_{a}^{b} f(x)dx = h \left[ \frac{1}{2} f(x_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} f(x_j) + \frac{1}{2} f(x_N) \right] - \frac{h^2}{12} [f'(b) - f'(a)] + \frac{1}{720} f^{(4)}(\eta)h^4.
\]

(7.71)

### 7.7 The Euler-Maclaurin Formula

We are now going to obtain a more general formula for the asymptotic form of the error in the trapezoidal rule quadrature. The idea is to use integration by parts with the aid of suitable polynomials. Let us consider again the interval \([0, 1]\) and define \(B_0(x) = 1, B_1(x) = x - \frac{1}{2}\), then

\[
\int_{0}^{1} f(x)dx = \int_{0}^{1} f(x)B_0(x)dx = \int_{0}^{1} f(x)B_1'(x)dx
\]

\[
= f(x)B_1(x)|_{0}^{1} - \int_{0}^{1} f'(x)B_1(x)dx
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} [f(0) + f(1)] - \int_{0}^{1} f'(x)B_1(x)dx
\]

(7.72)

We can continue the integration by parts using the Bernoulli Polynomials which satisfy

\[
B'_{k+1}(x) = (k + 1)B_k(x), \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots
\]

(7.73)
Since we start with $B_1(x) = x - \frac{1}{2}$ it is clear that $B_k(x)$ is a polynomial of degree exactly $k$ with leading order coefficient 1, i.e. monic. These polynomials are determined by the recurrence relation (7.73) up to a constant. The constant is fixed by requiring that $B_k(0) = B_k(1) = 0$, $k = 3, 5, 7, \ldots$ (7.74)

Indeed, 

$$B'_{k+1}(x) = (k + 1)B'_k(x) = (k + 1)kB_{k-1}(x)$$  (7.75)

and $B_{k-1}(x)$ has the form 

$$B_{k-1}(x) = x^{k-1} + a_{k-2}x^{k-2} + \ldots + a_1x + a_0.$$  (7.76)

Integrating (7.75) twice we get 

$$B_{k+1}(x) = k(k + 1) \left[ \frac{1}{k(k + 1)} x^{k+1} + \frac{a_{k-2}}{(k-1)k} x^k + \ldots + \frac{1}{2} a_0 x^2 + bx + c \right]$$  (7.77)

For $k + 1$ odd, the two constants of integration $b$ and $c$ are determined by the condition (7.74). The $B_k(x)$ for $k$ even are then given by $B_k(x) = B'_{k+1}(x)/(k + 1)$.

We are going to need a few properties of the Bernoulli polynomials. Because of construction, $B_k(x)$ is an even (odd) polynomial in $x - \frac{1}{2}$ is $k$ is even (odd). Equivalently, they satisfy the identity 

$$(-1)^k B_k(1 - x) = B_k(x).$$  (7.78)

This follows because the polynomials $A_k(x) = (-1)^k B_k(1 - x)$ satisfy the same conditions that define the Bernoulli polynomials, i.e. $A'_{k+1}(x) = (k + 1)A_k(x)$ and $A_k(0) = A_k(1) = 0$, for $k = 3, 5, 7, \ldots$ and since $A_1(x) = B_1(x)$ they have are the same. From (7.78) and (7.74) we get that 

$$B_k(0) = B_k(1), \quad k = 2, 3, \ldots$$  (7.79)

We define Bernoulli numbers as $B_k = B_k(0) = B_k(1)$, for $k = 2, 4, 6, \ldots$. This together with the recurrence relation (7.73) implies that 

$$\int_0^1 B_k(x)dx = \frac{1}{k+1} \int_0^1 B'_{k+1}(x)dx = \frac{1}{k+1} [B_{k+1}(1) - B_{k+1}(0)] = 0$$  (7.80)

for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$.
Lemma 3. The polynomials \( C_{2m}(x) = B_{2m}(x) - B_{2m}, \ m = 1, 2, \ldots \) do not change sign in \([0, 1]\).

Proof. We will prove it by contradiction. Let us suppose that \( C_{2m}(x) \) changes sign. Then it has at least 3 zeros and, by Rolle’s theorem, \( C'_{2m}(x) = B'_{2m}(x) \) has at least 2 zeros in \((0, 1)\). This implies that \( B_{2m-1}(x) \) has 2 zeros in \((0, 1)\). Since \( B_{2m-1}(0) = B_{2m-1}(1) = 0 \), again by Rolle’s theorem, \( B'_{2m-1}(x) \) has 3 zeros in \((0, 1)\), which implies that \( B_{2m-2}(x) \) has 3 zeros, ..., etc. We then conclude that \( B_{2l-1}(x) \) has 2 zeros in \((0, 1)\) plus the two at the end points, \( B_{2l-1}(0) = B_{2l-1}(1) \) for all \( l = 1, 2, \ldots \), which is a contradiction (for \( l = 1, 2 \)). □

Here are the first few Bernoulli polynomials

\[
B_0(x) = 1
\]
\[
B_1(x) = x - \frac{1}{2}
\]
\[
B_2(x) = \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{12} = x^2 - x + \frac{1}{6}
\]
\[
B_3(x) = \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^3 - \frac{1}{4} \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right) = x^3 - \frac{3}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{2}x
\]
\[
B_4(x) = \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^4 - \frac{1}{2} \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{7}{5 \cdot 48} = x^4 - 2x^3 + x^2 - \frac{1}{30}
\]

Let us retake the idea of integration by parts that we started in (7.72)

\[
- \int_0^1 f'(x)B_1(x)dx = -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 f'(x)B_2(x)dx
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2} B_2[f'(0) - f'(1)] + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 f''(x)B_2(x)dx
\]
and
\[
\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 f''(x)B_2(x)dx = \frac{1}{2 \cdot 3} \int_0^1 f''(x)B_3(x)dx \\
= \frac{1}{2 \cdot 3} \left[ f''(x)B_3(x)\bigg|_0^1 - \int_0^1 f'''(x)B_3(x)dx \right] \\
= -\frac{1}{2 \cdot 3} \int_0^1 f'''(x)B_3(x)dx = -\frac{1}{2 \cdot 3 \cdot 4} \int_0^1 f'''(x)B_4'(x)dx \\
= \frac{B_4}{4!} [f'''(0) - f'''(1)] + \frac{1}{4!} \int_0^1 f^{(4)}(x)B_4(x)dx.
\]

(7.87)

Continuing this way we arrive at the Euler-Maclaurin formula for the simple trapezoidal rule in [0, 1]:

**Theorem 7.5.**

\[
\int_0^1 f(x)dx = \frac{1}{2} [f(0) + f(1)] + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{B_{2k}}{(2k)!} [f^{(2k-1)}(0) - f^{(2k-1)}(1)] + R_m
\]

(7.88)

where

\[
R_m = \frac{1}{(2m + 2)!} \int_0^1 f^{(2m+2)}(x)[B_{2m+2}(x) - B_{2m+2}]dx
\]

(7.89)

and using (7.80), the Mean Value theorem for integrals, and Lemma 3

\[
R_m = \frac{1}{(2m + 2)!} \int_0^1 f^{(2m+2)}(\eta)[B_{2m+2}(x) - B_{2m+2}]dx = -\frac{B_{2m+2}}{(2m + 2)!} f^{(2m+2)}(\eta)
\]

(7.90)

for some \( \eta \in (0, 1) \).

It is now straightforward to obtain the Euler Maclaurin formula for the composite trapezoidal rule with equally spaced points:
Theorem 7.6. *(The Euler-Maclaurin Summation Formula)*

Let $m$ be a positive integer and $f \in C^{(2m+2)}[a, b]$, $h = \frac{b-a}{N}$ then

$$
\int_a^b f(x)dx = h \left[ \frac{1}{2} f(a) + \frac{1}{2} f(b) + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} f(a + jh) \right]
+ \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{B_{2k}}{(2k)!} h^{2k} [f^{2k-1}(a) - f^{2k-1}(b)]
- \frac{B_{2m+2}}{(2m+2)!} (b-a)h^{2m+2} f^{(2m+2)}(\eta). \quad \eta \in (a, b)
$$

*(7.91)*

**Remarks:** The error is in even powers of $h$. The formula gives $m$ corrections to the composite trapezoidal rule. For a smooth periodic function and if $b-a$ is a multiple of its period, then the error of the composite trapezoidal rule, with equally spaced points, decreases faster than any power of $h$ as $h \to 0$.

### 7.8 Romberg Integration

We are now going to apply successively Richardson’s Extrapolation to the trapezoidal rule. Again, we consider equally spaced nodes, $x_j = a + jh$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, N$, $h = (b-a)/N$, and assume $N$ is even

$$
T_h[f] = h \left[ \frac{1}{2} f(a) + \frac{1}{2} f(b) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} f(a + jh) \right] := h \sum_{j=0}^{N} f(a + jh), \quad (7.92)
$$

where $\sum^{\prime\prime}$ means that first and last terms have a $\frac{1}{2}$ factor.

We know from the Euler-Maclaurin formula that for a smooth integrand

$$
\int_a^b f(x)dx = T_h[f] + c_2 h^2 + c_4 h^4 + \cdots \quad (7.93)
$$

for some constants $c_2$, $c_4$, etc. We can do Richardson extrapolation to obtain a quadrature with a leading order error $O(h^4)$. If we have computed $T_{2h}[f]$ we can combine it with $T_h[f]$ to achieve this by noting that

$$
\int_a^b f(x)dx = T_{2h}[f] + c_2 (2h)^2 + c_4 (2h)^4 + \cdots \quad (7.94)
$$
we have

\[
\int_a^b f(x)\,dx = \frac{4T_h[f] - T_{2h}[f]}{3} + c_2 h^4 + c_6 h^6 + \cdots \tag{7.95}
\]

We can continue the Richardson extrapolation process but we can do this more efficiently if we reuse the work we have done to compute \(T_{2h}[f]\) to evaluate \(T_h[f]\). To this end, we note that

\[
T_h[f] = \frac{1}{2} T_{2h}[f] = h \sum_{j=0}^N f(a + jh) - h \sum_{j=0}^{N/2} f(a + 2jh) = h \sum_{j=1}^{N/2} f(a + (2j - 1)h)\]

If we let \(h_l = \frac{b-a}{2^l}\) then

\[
T_{h_l}[f] = \frac{1}{2} T_{h_{l-1}}[f] + h_l \sum_{j=1}^{2^{l-1}} f(a + (2j - 1)h_l). \tag{7.96}
\]

Beginning with the simple trapezoidal rule (two points) we can successively double the number of points in the quadrature by using (7.96) and immediately do extrapolation.

Let

\[
R(0, 0) = T_{h_0}[f] = \frac{b-a}{2} [f(a) + f(b)] \tag{7.97}
\]

and for \(l = 1, 2, \ldots, M\) define

\[
R(l, 0) = \frac{1}{2} R(l-1, 0) + h_l \sum_{j=1}^{2^{l-1}} f(a + (2j - 1)h_l). \tag{7.98}
\]

From \(R(0, 0)\) and \(R(1, 0)\) we can extrapolate to obtain

\[
R(1, 1) = R(1, 0) + \frac{1}{4 - 1} [R(1, 0) - R(0, 0)] \tag{7.99}
\]

We can generate a tableau of approximations like the following, for \(M = 4\)

| R(0, 0)   | R(1, 0) | R(1, 1) |
| R(2, 0)   | R(2, 1) | R(2, 2) |
| R(3, 0)   | R(3, 1) | R(3, 2) | R(3, 3) |
| R(4, 0)   | R(4, 1) | R(4, 2) | R(4, 3) | R(4, 4) |
Each of the $R(l,m)$ is obtained by extrapolation

$$R(l,m) = R(l,m - 1) + \frac{1}{4^m - 1}[R(l,m - 1) - R(l - 1, m - 1)].$$

and $R(4,4)$ would be the most accurate approximation (neglecting round off errors). This is the Romberg algorithm and can be written as:

$h = b - a$;

$R(0,0) = \frac{1}{2}(b - a)[f(a) + f(b)]$;

for $l = 1 : M$

$h = h/2$;

$R(1,0) = \frac{1}{2}R(l - 1, 0) + h \sum_{j=1}^{2^{l-1}} f(a + (2j - 1)h)$;

for $m = 1 : M$

$R(l,m) = R(l,m - 1) + \frac{1}{4^m - 1}[R(l,m - l) - R(l - 1, m - 1)];$

end

end
Chapter 8

Linear Algebra

8.1 Introduction

There are two main problems in numerical linear algebra: solving large linear systems of equations and finding eigenvalues and eigenvectors. Related to the latter there is also the problem of computing the singular value decomposition (SVD) of a (large) matrix.

Linear systems of equations appear in a wide variety of applications and are an indispensable tool in scientific computing. Given a nonsingular $n \times n$ matrix $A$ and a vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $n$ could be on the order of millions or billions, we would like to find the unique solution $x$, satisfying

$$Ax = b$$ (8.1)

or an accurate approximation $\tilde{x}$ to $x$. Henceforth we will assume, unless otherwise stated, that the matrix $A$ is real.

We will study direct methods (for example Gaussian elimination), which compute the solution (up to roundoff errors) in a finite number of steps and iterative methods, which starting from an initial approximation of the solution $x^{(0)}$ produce subsequent approximations $x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}, \ldots$ from a given recipe

$$x^{(k+1)} = G(x^{(k)}, A, b), \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots$$ (8.2)

where $G$ is a continuous function of the first variable. Consequently, if the iterations converge, $x^{(k)} \to x$ as $k \to \infty$, to the solution $x$ of the linear system $Ax = b$, then

$$x = G(x, A, b).$$ (8.3)
That is, $x$ is a fixed point of $G$.

One of the main strategies in the design of efficient numerical methods for linear systems is to transform the problem to one which is much easier to solve. Both direct and iterative methods use this strategy.

The eigenvalue problem for an $n \times n$ matrix $A$ consists of finding each or some of the scalars (the eigenvalues) $\lambda$ and the corresponding eigenvectors $v \neq 0$ such that

$$Av = \lambda v. \quad (8.4)$$

Equivalently, $(A - \lambda I)v = 0$ and so the eigenvalues are the roots of the characteristic polynomial of $A$

$$p(\lambda) = \det(A - \lambda I). \quad (8.5)$$

Clearly, we cannot solve this problem with a finite number of elementary operations (for $n \geq 5$ it would be a contradiction to Abel’s theorem) so iterative methods have to be employed. Also, $\lambda$ and $v$ could be complex even if $A$ is real. The maximum of the absolute value of the eigenvalues of a matrix is a useful concept in numerical linear algebra.

**Definition 8.1.** Let $A$ be an $n \times n$ matrix. The spectral radius $\rho$ of $A$ is defined as

$$\rho(A) = \max\{|\lambda_1|, \ldots, |\lambda_n|\}, \quad (8.6)$$

where $\lambda_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ are the eigenvalues (not necessarily distinct) of $A$.

Large eigenvalue-eigenvector problems arise in the study of steady state behavior of time-discrete Markov processes which are often used in a wide range of applications, such as finance, population dynamics, and data mining. The problem is to find an eigenvector $v$ associated with the eigenvalue 1, i.e. $v = Av$. Such $v$ is a probability vector so all its entries are positive, add up to 1, and represent the probabilities of the system (described by the Markov process) to be in a given state, in the limit as time goes to infinity. This eigenvector $v$ is in effect a fixed point of the linear transformation represented by the Markov matrix $A$.

The singular value decomposition (SVD) of a matrix is related to the eigenvalue problem and finds applications in image compression, model reduction techniques, data analysis, and many other fields. Given an $m \times n$
matrix $A$, the idea is to consider the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the square, $n \times n$ matrix $A^T A$ (or $A^* A$, where $A^*$ is the conjugate transpose of $A$ as defined below, if $A$ is complex). As we will see, the eigenvalues are all real and nonnegative and $A^T A$ has a complete set of orthogonal eigenvectors. The singular values of a matrix $A$ are the positive square roots of the eigenvalues of $A^T A$. Using this, it follows that any real $m \times n$ matrix $A$ has the singular value decomposition (SVD)

$$U^T A V = \Sigma,$$  \hspace{1cm} (8.7)

where $U$ is an orthogonal $m \times m$ matrix, $V$ is an orthogonal $n \times n$ matrix, and $\Sigma$ is a “diagonal” matrix of the form

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad D = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r),$$ \hspace{1cm} (8.8)

where $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \ldots \sigma_r > 0$ are the nonzero singular values of $A$.

### 8.2 Notation

A matrix $A$ with elements $a_{ij}$ will be denoted $A = (a_{ij})$, this could be a square $n \times n$ matrix or an $m \times n$ matrix. $A^T$ denotes the transpose of $A$, i.e. $A^T = (a_{ji})$.

A vector in $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ will be represented as the $n$-tuple

$$x = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{bmatrix}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (8.9)

The canonical vectors, corresponding to the standard basis in $\mathbb{R}^n$, will be denoted by $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_n$, where $e_k$ is the $n$-vector with all entries equal to zero except the $k$-th one, which is equal to one.

The inner product of two real vectors $x$ and $y$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is

$$\langle x, y \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i y_i = x^T y.$$ \hspace{1cm} (8.10)
If the vectors are complex, i.e. \( x \) and \( y \) in \( \mathbb{C}^n \) we define their inner product as
\[
\langle x, y \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \bar{x}_i y_i, \tag{8.11}
\]
where \( \bar{x}_i \) denotes the complex conjugate of \( x_i \).

With the inner product (8.10) in the real case or (8.11) in the complex case, we can define the Euclidean norm
\[
\|x\|_2 = \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle}. \tag{8.12}
\]

Note that if \( A \) is an \( n \times n \) real matrix and \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \) then
\[
\langle x, Ay \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \left( \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{ik} y_k \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{ik} x_i y_k
= \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{ik} x_i \right) y_k = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{ki}^T x_i \right) y_k, \tag{8.13}
\]
that is
\[
\langle x, Ay \rangle = \langle A^T x, y \rangle. \tag{8.14}
\]
Similarly in the complex case we have
\[
\langle x, Ay \rangle = \langle A^* x, y \rangle, \tag{8.15}
\]
where \( A^* \) is the conjugate transpose of \( A \), i.e. \( A^* = (\bar{a}_{ji}) \).

### 8.3 Some Important Types of Matrices

One useful type of linear transformations consists of those that preserve the Euclidean norm. That is, if \( y = Ax \), then \( \|y\|_2 = \|x\|_2 \) but this implies
\[
\langle Ax, Ax \rangle = \langle A^T A x, x \rangle = \langle x, x \rangle \tag{8.16}
\]
and consequently \( A^T A = I \).

**Definition 8.2.** An \( n \times n \) real (complex) matrix \( A \) is called orthogonal (unitary) if \( A^T A = I \) (\( A^* A = I \)).
Two of the most important types of matrices in applications are symmetric (Hermitian) and positive definite matrices.

**Definition 8.3.** An $n \times n$ real matrix $A$ is called symmetric if $A^T = A$. If the matrix $A$ is complex it is called Hermitian if $A^* = A$.

Symmetric (Hermitian) matrices have real eigenvalues, for if $v$ is an eigenvector associated to an eigenvalue $\lambda$ of $A$, we can assumed it has been normalized so that $\langle v, v \rangle = 1$, and

\[ \langle v, Av \rangle = \langle v, \lambda v \rangle = \lambda \langle v, v \rangle = \lambda. \quad (8.17) \]

But if $A^T = A$ then

\[ \lambda = \langle v, Av \rangle = \langle Av, v \rangle = \bar{\lambda} \langle v, v \rangle = \bar{\lambda}, \quad (8.18) \]

and $\lambda = \bar{\lambda}$ if and only if $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

**Definition 8.4.** An $n \times n$ matrix $A$ is called positive definite if it is symmetric (Hermitian) and $\langle x, Ax \rangle > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \neq 0$.

By the preceding argument the eigenvalues of a positive definite matrix $A$ are real because $A^T = A$. Moreover, if $Av = \lambda v$ with $\|v\|_2 = 1$ then $0 < \langle v, Av \rangle = \lambda$. Therefore, positive definite matrices have real, positive eigenvalues. Conversely, if all the eigenvalues of a symmetric matrix $A$ are positive then $A$ is positive definite. This follows from the fact that symmetric matrices are diagonalizable by an orthogonal matrix $S$, i.e. $A = SDS^T$, where $D$ is a diagonal matrix with the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$ (not necessarily distinct) of $A$. Then

\[ \langle x, Ax \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i y_i^2, \quad (8.19) \]

where $y = S^T x$. Thus a symmetric (Hermitian) matrix $A$ is positive definite if and only if all its eigenvalues are positive. Moreover, since the determinant is the product of the eigenvalues, positive definite matrices have a positive determinant.

We now review another useful consequence of positive definiteness.
Definition 8.5. Let \( A = (a_{ij}) \) be an \( n \times n \) matrix. Its leading principal submatrices are the square matrices

\[
A_k = \begin{bmatrix}
    a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1k} \\
    \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    a_{k1} & \cdots & a_{kk}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, n.
\]  

(8.20)

Theorem 8.1. All the leading principal submatrices of a positive definite matrix are positive definite.

Proof. Suppose \( A \) is an \( n \times n \) positive definite matrix. Then, all its leading principal submatrices are symmetric (Hermitian). Moreover, if we take a vector \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) of the form

\[
x = \begin{bmatrix}
    y_1 \\
    \vdots \\
    y_k \\
    0 \\
    \vdots \\
    0
\end{bmatrix},
\]  

(8.21)

where \( y = [y_1, \ldots, y_k]^T \in \mathbb{R}^k \) is an arbitrary nonzero vector then

\[
0 < \langle x, Ax \rangle = \langle y, A_k y \rangle
\]

which shows that \( A_k \) for \( k = 1, \ldots, n \) is positive definite. \( \square \)

The converse of Theorem 8.1 is also true but the proof is much more technical: \( A \) is positive definite if and only if \( \det(A_k) > 0 \) for \( k = 1, \ldots, n \).

Note also that if \( A \) is positive definite then all its diagonal elements are positive because \( 0 < \langle e_j, Ae_j \rangle = a_{jj}, \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, n. \)
8.4 Schur Theorem

**Theorem 8.2.** (Schur) Let \( A \) be an \( n \times n \) matrix, then there exists a unitary matrix \( T \) (\( T^*T = I \)) such that

\[
T^*AT = \begin{bmatrix}
\lambda_1 & b_{12} & b_{13} & \cdots & b_{1n} \\
b_{12} & \lambda_2 & b_{23} & \cdots & b_{2n} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
b_{1n} & b_{n-1,n} & b_{n-2,n} & \cdots & \lambda_n \\
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (8.22)
\]

where \( \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \) are the eigenvalues of \( A \) and all the elements below the diagonal are zero.

**Proof.** We will do a proof by induction. Let \( A \) be a \( 2 \times 2 \) matrix with eigenvalues \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \). Let \( u \) be a normalized, eigenvector \( u \) (\( u^*u = 1 \)) corresponding to \( \lambda_1 \). Then we can take \( T \) as the matrix whose first column is \( u \) and its second column is a unit vector \( v \) orthogonal to \( u \) (\( u^*v = 0 \)). We have

\[
T^*AT = \begin{bmatrix}
u^* \\
v^*
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & u^*A
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & u^*A v \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & u^*A v \\
0 & v^*A v \\
\end{bmatrix} \quad . \quad (8.23)
\]

The scalar \( v^*A v \) has to be equal to \( \lambda_2 \), as similar matrices have the same eigenvalues. We now assume the result is true for all \( k \times k \) \((k \geq 2)\) matrices and will show that it is also true for all \((k + 1) \times (k + 1)\) matrices. Let \( A \) be a \((k + 1) \times (k + 1)\) matrix and let \( u_1 \) be a normalized eigenvector associated with eigenvalue \( \lambda_1 \). Choose \( k \) unit vectors \( t_1, \ldots, t_k \) so that the matrix \( T_1 = [u_1 t_1 \ldots t_k] \) is unitary. Then,

\[
T_1^*AT_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
\lambda_1 & c_{12} & c_{13} & \cdots & c_{1,k+1} \\
0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \lambda_n \\
\end{bmatrix} \quad , \quad (8.24)
\]

where \( A_k \) is a \( k \times k \) matrix. Now, the eigenvalues of the matrix on the right hand side of (8.24) are the roots of \((\lambda_1 - \lambda) \det(A_k - \lambda I)\) and since this matrix is similar to \( A \), it follows that the eigenvalues of \( A_k \) are
remaining eigenvalues of $A$, $\lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_{k+1}$. By the induction hypothesis there is a unitary matrix $T_k$ such that $T_k^* A_k T_k$ is upper triangular with the eigenvalues $\lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_{k+1}$ sitting on the diagonal. We can now use $T_k$ to construct the $(k+1) \times (k+1)$ unitary matrix as

$$T_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \vdots & T_k \\ 0 & \end{bmatrix}$$

(8.25)

and define $T = T_1 T_{k+1}$. Then

$$T^* A T = T_{k+1}^* T_1^* A T_1 T_{k+1} = T_{k+1}^* (T_1^* A T_1) T_{k+1}$$

(8.26)

and using (8.24) and (8.25) we get

$$T^* A T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \vdots & T_k^* \\ 0 & & & & & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & c_{12} & c_{13} & \cdots & c_{1,k+1} \\ 0 & \vdots & A_k \\ 0 & & & & & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \vdots & T_k \\ 0 & & & & & \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & b_{12} & b_{13} & \cdots & b_{1,k+1} \\ \lambda_2 & b_{23} & \cdots & b_{2,k+1} & \vdots & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ b_{k,k+1} & \lambda_{k+1} \\ \end{bmatrix}.$$

8.5 $QR$ Factorization

Consider an $m \times n$ matrix $A$ with columns $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ and suppose these form a linearly independent set, i.e. $A$ is full rank. If we employ the Gram-Schmidt procedure to orthonormalize $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ we get (cf. Section 4.1.2.1) the
orthonormal set \{q_1, \ldots, q_n\} given by

\begin{align*}
    b_1 &= a_1, \\
    r_{11} &= \|b_1\|, \\
    q_1 &= a_1/r_{11}, \\
    \text{For } k = 2, \ldots, n \\
    b_k &= a_k - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} r_{jk} q_j, \quad r_{jk} = \langle q_j, a_k \rangle, \\
    r_{kk} &= \|b_k\|, \\
    q_k &= b_k/r_{kk}.
\end{align*}

(8.27)

Note that (8.27) implies that \(a_k\) is a linear combination of \(q_1, \ldots, q_k\) and since \(b_k = r_{kk} q_k\) we have

\begin{align*}
    a_k &= \sum_{j=1}^{k} r_{jk} q_j, \quad k = 1, \ldots n
\end{align*}

(8.28)

or in matrix form

\[
    A = \tilde{Q} \tilde{R}, \quad \tilde{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} q_1 & \cdots & q_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{R} = \begin{bmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} & \cdots & r_{1n} \\
    r_{21} & r_{22} & \cdots & r_{2n} \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    r_{n1} & \cdots & & r_{nn} \end{bmatrix}.
\]

(8.29)

The \(m \times n\) matrix \(\tilde{Q}\) has columns \(q_1, \ldots, q_n\) that are orthonormal. This is called a reduced \(QR\) factorization of \(A\). A full \(QR\) factorization of \(A\), where \(Q\) is an \(m \times m\) orthogonal matrix and \(R\) is an \(m \times n\) upper triangular matrix (in the sense shown below), can be obtained by appending \(\tilde{Q}\) with \(m - n\) orthonormal columns to complete an orthonormal basis of \(\mathbb{R}^m\) and a corresponding block of \(m - n\) rows of zeros to \(\tilde{R}\) as follows:

\[
    A = QR, \quad Q = \begin{bmatrix} \ast & \cdots & \ast \\
    \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    \ast & \cdots & \ast \end{bmatrix}, \quad R = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{R} \\
    0 & \cdots & 0 \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
    0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}.
\]

(8.30)
where the $m \times (m - n)$ block marked with *’s represents the added columns so that $Q^TQ = QQ^T = I$. Note that orthonormality is defined up to a sign. Since we are taking $r_{kk} = \|b_k\|$ it follows that there is a unique $QR$ factorization of the full rank matrix $A$ such that $r_{kk} > 0$, for all $k = 1, \ldots, n$.

The Gram-Schmidt procedure is not numerically stable; round-off error can destroy orthogonality when there are columns almost linearly dependent. We will see in Section 11.2 a stable method to obtain $QR$ by using a sequence of hyperplane reflections.

8.6 Norms

A norm on a vector space $V$ (for example $\mathbb{R}^n$ or $\mathbb{C}^n$) over $K = \mathbb{R}$ (or $\mathbb{C}$) is a mapping $\| \cdot \| : V \to [0, \infty)$, which satisfy the following properties:

(i) $\|x\| \geq 0 \ \forall x \in V$ and $\|x\| = 0$ iff $x = 0$.

(ii) $\|x + y\| \leq \|x\| + \|y\| \ \forall x, y \in V$.

(iii) $\|\lambda x\| = |\lambda| \|x\| \ \forall x \in V, \lambda \in K$.

Example 8.1.

$$\|x\|_1 = |x_1| + \ldots + |x_n|,$$
$$\|x\|_2 = \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle} = \sqrt{|x_1|^2 + \ldots + |x_n|^2},$$
$$\|x\|_\infty = \max\{|x_1|, \ldots, |x_n|\}.$$  

Lemma 4. Let $\| \cdot \|$ be a norm on a vector space $V$ then

$$\|x\| - \|y\| \leq \|x - y\|.$$  

This lemma implies that a norm is a continuous function (on $V$ to $\mathbb{R}$).

Proof. $\|x\| = \|x - y + y\| \leq \|x - y\| + \|y\|$ which gives that

$$\|x\| - \|y\| \leq \|x - y\|.$$  

By reversing the roles of $x$ and $y$ we also get

$$\|y\| - \|x\| \leq \|x - y\|.$$  

$\square$
We will also need norms defined on matrices. Let $A$ be an $n \times n$ matrix. We can view $A$ as a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and define its corresponding Euclidean norm

$$
\|A\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} |a_{ij}|^2}.
$$

(8.37)

This is called the Frobenius norm for matrices. A different matrix norm can be obtained by using a given vector norm and matrix-vector multiplication. Given a vector norm $\| \cdot \|$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (or in $\mathbb{C}^n$), it is easy to show that

$$
\|A\| = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|Ax\|}{\|x\|},
$$

(8.38)

satisfies the properties (i), (ii), (iii) of a norm for all $n \times n$ matrices $A$. That is, the vector norm induces a matrix norm.

**Definition 8.6.** The matrix norm defined by (10.1) is called the subordinate or natural norm induced by the vector norm $\| \cdot \|$.

**Example 8.2.**

$$
\|A\|_1 = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|Ax\|_1}{\|x\|_1},
$$

(8.39)

$$
\|A\|_\infty = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|Ax\|_\infty}{\|x\|_\infty},
$$

(8.40)

$$
\|A\|_2 = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|Ax\|_2}{\|x\|_2}.
$$

(8.41)

**Theorem 8.3.** Let $\| \cdot \|$ be an induced matrix norm then

(a) $\|Ax\| \leq \|A\| \|x\|$, 
(b) $\|AB\| \leq \|A\| \|B\|$.

**Proof.** (a) if $x = 0$ the result holds trivially. Take $x \neq 0$, then the definition (10.1) implies

$$
\frac{\|Ax\|}{\|x\|} \leq \|A\|
$$

(8.42)
that is $\|Ax\| \leq \|A\|\|x\|$.

(b) Take $x \neq 0$. By (a) $\|ABx\| \leq \|A\|\|Bx\| \leq \|A\|\|B\|\|x\|$ and thus

$$\frac{\|ABx\|}{\|x\|} \leq \|A\|\|B\|.$$  \hspace{1cm} (8.43)

Taking the max we get that $\|AB\| \leq \|A\|\|B\|$.

The following theorem offers a more concrete way to compute the matrix norms (8.39)-(8.41).

**Theorem 8.4.** Let $A = (a_{ij})$ be an $n \times n$ matrix then

(a) $\|A\|_1 = \max_j \sum_{i=1}^n |a_{ij}|$.

(b) $\|A\|_\infty = \max_i \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}|$.

(c) $\|A\|_2 = \sqrt{\rho(A^TA)}$,

where $\rho(A^TA)$ is the spectral radius of $A^TA$, as defined in (8.6).

**Proof.** (a)

$$\|Ax\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}x_j \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n |x_j| \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |a_{ij}| \right) \leq \left( \max_j \sum_{i=1}^n |a_{ij}| \right) \|x\|_1.$$  

Thus, $\|A\|_1 \leq \max_j \sum_{i=1}^n |a_{ij}|$. We just need to show there is a vector $x$ for which the equality holds. Let $j^*$ be the index such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |a_{ij^*}| = \max_j \sum_{i=1}^n |a_{ij}|$$  \hspace{1cm} (8.44)

and take $x$ to be given by $x_i = 0$ for $i \neq j^*$ and $x_{j^*} = 1$. Then, $\|x\|_1 = 1$ and

$$\|Ax\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}x_j \right| = \sum_{i=1}^n |a_{ij^*}| = \max_j \sum_{i=1}^n |a_{ij}|.$$  \hspace{1cm} (8.45)
(b) Analogously to (a) we have

\[ \|Ax\|_\infty = \max_i \left| \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}x_j \right| \leq \left( \max_i \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}| \right) \|x\|_\infty. \] (8.46)

Let \( i^* \) be the index such that

\[ \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{i^*j}| = \max_i \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}| \] (8.47)

and take \( x \) given by

\[ x_j = \begin{cases} \frac{a_{i^*j}}{|a_{i^*j}|} & \text{if } a_{i^*j} \neq 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } a_{i^*j} = 0. \end{cases} \] (8.48)

Then, \( |x_j| = 1 \) for all \( j \) and \( \|x\|_\infty = 1 \). Hence

\[ \|Ax\|_\infty = \max_i \left| \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}x_j \right| = \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{i^*j}| = \max_i \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}|. \] (8.49)

(c) By definition

\[ \|A\|_2^2 = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|Ax\|_2^2}{\|x\|_2^2} = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{x^T A^T A x}{x^T x} \] (8.50)

Note that the matrix \( A^T A \) is symmetric and all its eigenvalues are nonnegative. Let us label them in increasing order, \( 0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n \). Then, \( \lambda_n = \rho(A^T A) \). Now, since \( A^T A \) is symmetric, there is an orthogonal matrix \( Q \) such that \( Q^T A^T A Q = D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) \). Therefore, changing variables, \( x = Qy \), we have

\[ \frac{x^T A^T A x}{x^T x} = \frac{y^T D y}{y^T y} = \frac{\lambda_1 y_1^2 + \cdots + \lambda_n y_n^2}{y_1^2 + \cdots + y_n^2} \leq \lambda_n. \] (8.51)

Now take the vector \( y \) such that \( y_j = 0 \) for \( j \neq n \) and \( y_n = 1 \) and the equality holds. Thus,

\[ \|A\|_2 = \sqrt{\max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|Ax\|_2^2}{\|x\|_2^2}} = \sqrt{\lambda_n} = \sqrt{\rho(A^T A)}. \] (8.52)
Note that if $A^T = A$ then
\[ \|A\|_2 = \sqrt{\rho(A^T A)} = \sqrt{\rho(A^2)} = \rho(A). \] (8.53)

Let $\lambda$ be an eigenvalue of the matrix $A$ with eigenvector $x$, normalized so that $\|x\| = 1$. Then,
\[ |\lambda| = \|\lambda\||x\| = \|\lambda x\| = \|Ax\| \leq \|A\|||x\| = \|A\| \] (8.54)
for any matrix norm with the property $\|Ax\| \leq \|A\|||x\|$. Thus,
\[ \rho(A) \leq \|A\| \] (8.55)
for any induced norm. However, given an $n \times n$ matrix $A$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there is at least one induced matrix norm such that $\|A\|$ is within $\epsilon$ of the spectral radius of $A$.

**Theorem 8.5.** Let $A$ be an $n \times n$ matrix. Given $\epsilon > 0$ there is at least one induced matrix norm $\| \cdot \|$ such that
\[ \rho(A) \leq \|A\| \leq \rho(A) + \epsilon. \] (8.56)

**Proof.** By Schur’s Theorem, there is a unitary matrix $T$ such that
\[ T^* A T = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & b_{12} & b_{13} & \cdots & b_{1n} \\ \lambda_2 & b_{23} & \cdots & \cdots & b_{2n} \\ & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{n-1,n} & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ b_{n-1,n} & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \lambda_n \end{bmatrix} = U, \] (8.57)
where $\lambda_j$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$ are the eigenvalues of $A$. Take $0 < \delta < 1$ and define the diagonal matrix $D_\delta = \text{diag}(\delta, \delta^2, \ldots, \delta^n)$. Then
\[ D_\delta^{-1} U D_\delta = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \delta b_{12} & \delta^2 b_{13} & \cdots & \delta^{n-1} b_{1n} \\ \lambda_2 & \delta b_{23} & \cdots & \cdots & \delta^{n-2} b_{2n} \\ & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \delta b_{n-1,n} & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ \delta b_{n-1,n} & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \lambda_n \end{bmatrix}. \] (8.58)
Given $\epsilon > 0$, we can find $\delta$ sufficiently small so that $D_\delta^{-1} U D_\delta$ is “within $\epsilon$” of a diagonal matrix, in the sense that the sum of the absolute values of the off diagonal entries is less than $\epsilon$ for each row:

$$\sum_{j=i+1}^{n} |\delta^{j-i} b_{ij}| \leq \epsilon \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n. \quad (8.59)$$

Now,

$$D_\delta^{-1} U D_\delta = D_\delta^{-1} T^* A T D_\delta = (T D_\delta)^{-1} A (T D_\delta) \quad (8.60)$$

Given a nonsingular matrix $S$ and a matrix norm $\| \cdot \|$ then

$$\| A' \| = \| S^{-1} A S \| \quad (8.61)$$

is also a norm. Taking $S = T D_\delta$ and using the infinity norm we get

$$\| A' \| = \| (T D_\delta)^{-1} A (T D_\delta) \|_\infty$$

$$\leq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ \lambda_2 \\ \vdots \\ \lambda_n \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{\infty} + \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \delta b_{12} & \delta^2 b_{13} & \cdots & \delta^{n-1} b_{1n} \\ \delta b_{23} & 0 & \delta^2 b_{24} & \cdots & \delta^{n-2} b_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \delta b_{n-1,n} & \cdots & \delta b_{n-2,n} & 0 & \delta b_{n,n} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{\infty}$$

$$\leq \rho(A) + \epsilon.$$
8.7 Condition Number of a Matrix

Consider the $5 \times 5$ Hilbert matrix

$$H_5 = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{5} & 1 \\
\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{6} \\
\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{7} \\
\frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{7} & \frac{1}{8} \\
\frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{7} & \frac{1}{8} & \frac{1}{9}
\end{bmatrix}$$ (8.62)

and the linear system $H_5 x = b$ where

$$b = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{137}{60} \\
\frac{87}{60} \\
\frac{153}{140} \\
\frac{743}{840} \\
\frac{1879}{2520}
\end{bmatrix}.$$ (8.63)

The exact solution of this linear system is $x = [1, 1, 1, 1, 1]^T$. Note that $b \approx [2.28, 1.45, 1.09, 0.88, 0.74]^T$. Let us perturb $b$ slightly (about $\% 1$)

$$b + \delta b = \begin{bmatrix}
2.28 \\
1.46 \\
1.10 \\
0.89 \\
0.75
\end{bmatrix}.$$ (8.64)

The solution of the perturbed system (up to rounding at 12 digits of accuracy) is

$$x + \delta x = \begin{bmatrix}
0.5 \\
7.2 \\
-21.0 \\
30.8 \\
-12.6
\end{bmatrix}.$$ (8.65)
A relative perturbation of \( \| \delta b \|_2 / \| b \|_2 = 0.0046 \) in the data produces a change in the solution equal to \( \| \delta x \|_2 \approx 40 \). The perturbations gets amplified nearly four orders of magnitude!

This high sensitivity of the solution to small perturbations is inherent to the matrix of the linear system, \( H_5 \) in this example.

Consider the linear system \( Ax = b \) and the perturbed one \( A(x + \delta x) = b + \delta b \). Then, \( Ax + A\delta x = b + \delta b \) implies \( \delta x = A^{-1}\delta b \) and so

\[
\| \delta x \| \leq \| A^{-1} \| \| \delta b \|
\]

for any induced norm. But also \( \| b \| = \| Ax \| \leq \| A \| \| x \| \) or

\[
\frac{1}{\| x \|} \leq \| A \| \frac{1}{\| b \|}.
\]

Combining (8.66) and (8.67) we obtain

\[
\frac{\| \delta x \|}{\| x \|} \leq \| A \| \| A^{-1} \| \| \delta b \| / \| b \|.
\]

The right hand side of this inequality is actually a least upper bound, there are \( b \) and \( \delta b \) for which the equality holds.

**Definition 8.7.** Given a matrix norm \( \| \cdot \| \), the condition number of a matrix \( A \), denoted by \( \kappa(A) \) is defined by

\[
\kappa(A) = \| A \| \| A^{-1} \|.
\]

**Example 8.3.** The condition number of the \( 5 \times 5 \) Hilbert matrix \( H_5 \), (8.62), in the 2 norm is approximately \( 4.7661 \times 10^5 \). For the particular \( b \) and \( \delta b \) we chose we actually got a variation in the solution of \( O(10^4) \) times the relative perturbation but now we know that the amplification factor could be as bad as \( \kappa(A) \).

Similarly, if we perturbed the entries of a matrix \( A \) for a linear system \( Ax = b \) so that we have \( (A + \delta A)(x + \delta x) = b \) we get

\[
Ax + A\delta x + \delta A(x + \delta x) = b
\]

that is, \( A\delta x = -\delta A(x + \delta x) \), which implies that

\[
\| \delta x \| \leq \| A^{-1} \| \| \delta A \| \| x + \delta x \|
\]
for any induced matrix norm and consequently
\[
\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x + \delta x\|} \leq \|A^{-1}\| \|A\| \frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|} = \kappa(A) \frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}. \tag{8.72}
\]

Because, for any induced norm, 1 = \|I\| = \|A^{-1}\| \|A\| \leq \|A^{-1}\| \|A\|, we get that \(\kappa(A) \geq 1\). We say that \(A\) is ill-conditioned if \(\kappa(A)\) is very large.

**Example 8.4.** The Hilbert matrix is ill-conditioned. We already saw that in the 2 norm \(\kappa(H_5) = 4.7661 \times 10^5\). The condition number increases very rapidly as the size of the Hilbert matrix increases, for example \(\kappa(H_6) = 1.4951 \times 10^7\), \(\kappa(H_{10}) = 1.6025 \times 10^{13}\).

### 8.7.1 What to Do When \(A\) is Ill-conditioned?

There are two ways to deal with a linear system with an ill-conditioned matrix \(A\). One approach is to work with extended precision (using as many digits as required to obtain the solution up to a given accuracy). Unfortunately, computations using extended precision can be computationally expensive, several times the cost of regular double precision operations.

A more practical approach is often to replace the ill-conditioned linear system \(Ax = b\) by an equivalent linear system with a much smaller condition number. This can be done by for example by premultiplying by a matrix \(P^{-1}\) such that we have \(P^{-1}Ax = P^{-1}b\). Obviously, taking \(P = A\) gives us the smallest possible condition number but this choice is not practical so a compromise is made between \(P\) approximating \(A\) and the cost of solving linear systems with the matrix \(P\) to be low. This very useful technique, also employed to accelerate the convergence of some iterative methods, is called preconditioning.
Chapter 9

Linear Systems of Equations I

In this chapter we focus on a problem which is central to many applications: find the solution to a large linear system of \( n \) linear equations in \( n \) unknowns \( x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \)

\[
\begin{align*}
    a_{11}x_1 + a_{12}x_2 + \ldots + a_{1n}x_n &= b_1, \\
    a_{21}x_1 + a_{22}x_2 + \ldots + a_{2n}x_n &= b_2, \\
    &\vdots \\
    a_{n1}x_1 + a_{n2}x_2 + \ldots + a_{nn}x_n &= b_n,
\end{align*}
\]  

or written in matrix form

\[ A x = b \]  

(9.1)

where \( A \) is the \( n \times n \) matrix of coefficients

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
    a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\
    a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \cdots & a_{nn}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (9.3)
\]

\( x \) is a column vector whose components are the unknowns, and \( b \) is the given right hand side of the linear system

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    x_1 \\
    x_2 \\
    \vdots \\
    x_n
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix}
    b_1 \\
    b_2 \\
    \vdots \\
    b_n
\end{bmatrix}.
\]  

(9.4)
We will assume, unless stated otherwise, that $A$ is a nonsingular, real matrix. That is, the linear system (9.2) has a unique solution for each $b$. Equivalently, the determinant of $A$, $\det(A)$, is non-zero and $A$ has an inverse.

While mathematically we can write the solution as $x = A^{-1}b$, this is not computationally efficient. Finding $A^{-1}$ is several (about four) times more costly than solving $Ax = b$ for a given $b$.

In many applications $n$ can be on the order of millions or much larger.

9.1 Easy to Solve Systems

When $A$ is diagonal, i.e.

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & & \\ & a_{22} & \\ & & \ddots \\ & & & a_{nn} \end{bmatrix}$$  (9.5)

(all the entries outside the diagonal are zero and since $A$ is assumed non-singular $a_{ii} \neq 0$ for all $i$), then each equation can be solved with just one division:

$$x_i = b_i/a_{ii}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, n.$$  (9.6)

If $A$ is lower triangular and nonsingular,

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & & \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \\ & \vdots & \ddots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \cdots & a_{nn} \end{bmatrix}$$  (9.7)

the solution can also be obtained easily by the process of forward substitution:

$$x_1 = \frac{b_1}{a_{11}}$$
$$x_2 = \frac{b_2 - a_{21}x_1}{a_{22}}$$
$$x_3 = \frac{b_3 - [a_{31}x_1 + a_{32}x_2]}{a_{33}}$$
$$x_n = \frac{b_n - [a_{n1}x_1 + a_{n2}x_2 + \ldots + a_{n,n-1}x_{n-1}]}{a_{nn}}.$$  (9.8)
EASY TO SOLVE SYSTEMS

or in pseudo-code:

Algorithm 9.1 Forward Substitution
1: for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) do
2: \( x_i \leftarrow \left( b_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} a_{ij}x_j \right) / a_{ii} \)
3: end for

Note that the assumption that \( A \) is nonsingular implies that \( a_{ii} \neq 0 \) for all \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \) since \( \det(A) = a_{11}a_{22} \cdots a_{nn} \). Also observe that (9.8) shows that \( x_i \) is a linear combination of \( b_i, b_{i-1}, \ldots, b_1 \) and since \( x = A^{-1}b \) it follows that \( A^{-1} \) is also lower triangular.

To compute \( x_i \) we perform \( i - 1 \) multiplications, \( i - 1 \) additions/subtractions, and one division, so the total amount of computational work \( W(n) \) to do forward substitution is

\[
W(n) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} (i - 1) + n = n^2 - 2n,
\]

where we have used that

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} i = \frac{n(n - 1)}{2}.
\]

That is, \( W(n) = O(n^2) \) to solve a lower triangular linear system.

If \( A \) is nonsingular and upper triangular

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
    a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\
    0 & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    0 & 0 & \cdots & a_{nn}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

we solve the linear system \( Ax = b \) starting from \( x_n \), then we solve for \( x_{n-1} \),
etc. This is called *backward substitution*

\[
\begin{align*}
    x_n &= \frac{b_n}{a_{nn}}, \\
    x_{n-1} &= \frac{b_{n-1} - a_{n-1,n}x_n}{a_{n-1,n-1}}, \\
    x_{n-2} &= \frac{b_{n-2} - [a_{n-2,n-1}x_{n-1} + a_{n-2,n}x_n]}{a_{n-2,n-2}}, \\
    &\vdots \\
    x_1 &= \frac{b_1 - [a_{12}x_2 + a_{13}x_3 + \cdots + a_{1n}x_n]}{a_{11}}. \\
\end{align*}
\]

(9.12)

From this we deduce that \(x_i\) is a linear combination of \(b_i, b_{i+1}, \ldots b_n\) and so \(A^{-1}\) is an upper triangular matrix. In pseudo-code, we have

**Algorithm 9.2 Backward Substitution**

1: for \(i = n, n-1, \ldots, 1\) do
2: \(x_i \leftarrow \left( b_i - \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} a_{ij}x_j \right) / a_{ii} \)
3: end for

The operation count is the same as for forward substitution, \(W(n) = O(n^2)\).

### 9.2 Gaussian Elimination

The central idea of Gaussian elimination is to reduce the linear system \(Ax = b\) to an equivalent upper triangular system, which has the same solution and can readily be solved with backward substitution. Such reduction is done with an elimination process employing linear combinations of rows. We illustrate first the method with a concrete example:

\[
\begin{align*}
    x_1 + 2x_2 - x_3 + x_4 &= 0, \\
    2x_1 + 4x_2 - x_4 &= -3, \\
    3x_1 + x_2 - x_3 + x_4 &= 3, \\
    x_1 - x_2 + 2x_3 + x_4 &= 3. \\
\end{align*}
\]

(9.13)
To do the elimination we form an augmented matrix $A_b$ by appending one more column to the matrix of coefficients $A$, consisting of the right hand side $b$:

$$A_b = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 & 0 & -1 & -3 \\ 3 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 3 \\ 1 & -1 & 2 & 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9.14)$$

The first step is to eliminate the first unknown in the second to last equations, i.e. to produce a zero in the first column of $A_b$ for rows 2, 3, and 4:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 & 0 & -1 & -3 \\ 3 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 3 \\ 1 & -1 & 2 & 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & -3 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & -3 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & -3 & 3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9.15)$$

where $R_2 \leftarrow R_2 - 2R_1$ means that the second row has been replaced by the second row minus two times the first row, etc. Since the coefficient of $x_1$ in the first equation is 1 it is easy to figure out the number we need to multiply rows 2, 3, and 4 to achieve the elimination of the first variable for each row, namely 2, 3, and 1. These numbers are called multipliers. In general, to obtain the multipliers we divide the coefficient of $x_1$ in the rows below the first one by the nonzero coefficient $a_{11}$ ($2/1=2$, $3/1=3$, $1/1=1$). The coefficient we need to divide by to obtain the multipliers is called a pivot (1 in this case).

Note that the $(2,2)$ element of the last matrix in (9.15) is 0 so we cannot use it as a pivot for the second round of elimination. Instead, we proceed by exchanging the second and the third rows

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & -3 & -3 \\ 0 & -5 & 2 & -2 & 3 \\ 0 & -3 & 3 & 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & -3 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & -3 & 3 \\ 0 & -3 & 3 & 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9.16)$$

We can now use -5 as a pivot and do the second round of elimination:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -5 & 2 & -2 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & -3 & 3 \\ 0 & -3 & 3 & 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & -3 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 6 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 5 & 5 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9.17)$$
Clearly, the elimination step $R_3 \leftarrow R_3 - 0R_2$ is unnecessary as the coefficient to be eliminated is already zero but we include it to illustrate the general procedure. The last round of the elimination is

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 2 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & -5 & 2 & -2 & 3 \\
0 & 0 & 2 & -3 & -3 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{9}{5} & \frac{6}{5} & \frac{6}{5}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 2 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & -5 & 2 & -2 & 3 \\
0 & 0 & 2 & -3 & -3 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{39}{10} & \frac{39}{10}
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(9.18)

The last matrix, let us call it $U_b$, corresponds to the upper triangular system

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 2 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & -5 & 2 & -2 \\
0 & 0 & 2 & -3 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{39}{10}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x_1 \\
x_2 \\
x_3 \\
x_4
\end{bmatrix}
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
3 \\
-3 \\
\frac{39}{10}
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(9.19)

which we can solve with backward substitution to obtain the solution

$$
x = 
\begin{bmatrix}
x_1 \\
x_2 \\
x_3 \\
x_4
\end{bmatrix}
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
1 \\
-1 \\
0 \\
1
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

(9.20)

Each of the steps in the Gaussian elimination process are linear transformations and hence we can represent these transformations with matrices. Note, however, that these matrices are not constructed in practice, we only implement their effect (row exchange or elimination). The first round of elimination (9.15) is equivalent to multiplying (from the left) $A_b$ by the lower triangular matrix

$$
E_1 = 
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
-3 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(9.21)

that is

$$
E_1 A_b = 
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 2 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 2 & -3 & -3 \\
0 & -5 & 2 & -2 & 3 \\
0 & -3 & 3 & 0 & 3
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

(9.22)
9.2. GAUSSIAN ELIMINATION

The matrix $E_1$ is formed by taking the $4 \times 4$ identity matrix and replacing the elements in the first column below 1 by negative the multiplier, i.e. $\-2, \-3, \-1$. We can exchange rows 2 and 3 with a permutation matrix

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9.23)$$

which is obtained by exchanging the second and third rows in the $4 \times 4$ identity matrix,

$$PE_1A_b = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & \-1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \-5 & 2 & \-2 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & \-3 & \-3 \\ 0 & \-3 & 3 & 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9.24)$$

To construct the matrix associated with the second round of elimination we have to take $4 \times 4$ identity matrix and replace the elements in the second column below the diagonal by negative the multipliers we got with the pivot equal to $-5$:

$$E_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \-\frac{3}{5} & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9.25)$$

and we get

$$E_2PE_1A_b = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & \-1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \-5 & 2 & \-2 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & \-3 & \-3 \\ 0 & \frac{9}{5} & \frac{6}{5} & \frac{6}{5} & \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9.26)$$

Finally, for the last elimination we have

$$E_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \-\frac{9}{10} & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9.27)$$
and \( E_3E_2PE_1A_b = U_b \).

Observe that \( PE_1A_b = E_1'PA_b \), where

\[
E_1' = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-3 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
-2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (9.28)
\]

i.e., we exchange rows in advance and then reorder the multipliers accordingly. If we focus on the matrix \( A \), the first four columns of \( A_b \), we have the matrix factorization

\[
E_3E_2E_1'PA = U, \quad (9.29)
\]

where \( U \) is the upper triangular matrix

\[
U = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 2 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & -5 & 2 & -2 \\
0 & 0 & 2 & -3 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{39}{10}
\end{bmatrix}. \quad (9.30)
\]

Moreover, the product of upper (lower) triangular matrices is also an upper (lower) triangular matrix and so is the inverse. Hence, we obtain the so-called \( LU \) factorization

\[
PA = LU, \quad (9.31)
\]

where \( L = (E_3E_2E_1')^{-1} = E_1'^{-1}E_2'^{-1}E_3^{-1} \) is a lower triangular matrix. Now recall that the matrices \( E_1', E_2, E_3 \) perform the transformation of subtracting the row of the pivot times the multiplier to the rows below. Therefore, the inverse operation is to add the subtracted row back, i.e. we simply remove the negative sign in front of the multipliers,

\[
E_1'^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
3 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}, \quad E_2^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{3}{5} & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}, \quad E_3^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{9}{10} & 1
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

It then follows that

\[
L = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
3 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{9}{10} & 1
\end{bmatrix}. \quad (9.32)
\]
Note that $L$ has all the multipliers below the diagonal and $U$ has all the pivots on the diagonal. We will see that a factorization $PA = LU$ is always possible for any nonsingular $n \times n$ matrix $A$ and can be very useful.

We now consider the general linear system (9.1). The matrix of coefficients and the right hand size are

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \cdots & a_{nn} \end{bmatrix}, \quad b = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \\ \vdots \\ b_n \end{bmatrix},$$

respectively. We form the augmented matrix $A_b$ by appending $b$ to $A$ as the last column:

$$A_b = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} & b_1 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2n} & b_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \cdots & a_{nn} & b_n \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9.34)$$

In principle if $a_{11} \neq 0$ we can start the elimination. However, if $|a_{11}|$ is too small, dividing by it to compute the multipliers might lead to inaccurate results in the computer, i.e. using finite precision arithmetic. It is generally better to look for the coefficient of largest absolute value in the first column, to exchange rows, and then do the elimination. This is called partial pivoting. It is possible to then search for the element of largest absolute value in the first row and switch columns accordingly. This is called complete pivoting and works well provided the matrix is properly scaled. Henceforth, we will consider Gaussian elimination only with partial pivoting, which is less costly to apply.

To perform the first round of Gaussian elimination we do three steps:

1. Find the $\max_i |a_{i1}|$, let us say this corresponds to the $m$-th row, i.e. $|a_{m1}| = \max_i |a_{i1}|$. If $|a_{m1}| = 0$, the matrix is singular. Stop.

2. Exchange rows 1 and $m$.

3. Compute the multipliers and perform the elimination.
After these three steps, we have transformed $A_b$ into

$$
A_b^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix}
a_{11}^{(1)} & a_{12}^{(1)} & \cdots & a_{1n}^{(1)} & b_1^{(1)} \\
0 & a_{22}^{(1)} & \cdots & a_{2n}^{(1)} & b_2^{(1)} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & a_{n2}^{(1)} & \cdots & a_{nn}^{(1)} & b_n^{(1)}
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

(9.35)

This corresponds to $A_b^{(1)} = E_1 P_1 A_b$, where $P_1$ is the permutation matrix that exchanges rows 1 and $m$ ($P_1 = I$ if no exchange is made) and $E_1$ is the matrix to obtain the elimination of the entries below the first element in the first column. The same three steps above can now be applied to the smaller $(n - 1) \times n$ matrix

$$
\tilde{A}_b^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix}
a_{22}^{(1)} & \cdots & a_{2n}^{(1)} & b_2^{(1)} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
a_{n2}^{(1)} & \cdots & a_{nn}^{(1)} & b_n^{(1)}
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(9.36)

and so on. Doing this process $(n - 1)$ times, we obtain the reduced, upper triangular system, which can be solved with backward substitution.

In matrix terms, the linear transformations in the Gaussian elimination process correspond to $A_b^{(k)} = E_k P_k A_b^{(k-1)}$, for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1$ ($A_b^{(0)} = A_b$), where the $P_k$ and $E_k$ are permutation and elimination matrices, respectively. $P_k = I$ if no row exchange is made prior to the $k$-th elimination round (but recall that we do not construct the matrices $E_k$ and $P_k$ in practice). Hence, the Gaussian elimination process for a nonsingular linear system produces the matrix factorization

$$
U_b \equiv A_b^{(n-1)} = E_{n-1} P_{n-1} E_{n-2} P_{n-2} \cdots E_1 P_1 A_b.
$$

(9.37)

Arguing as in the introductory example we can rearrange the rows of $A_b$, with the permutation matrix $P = P_{n-1} \cdots P_1$ and the corresponding multipliers, as if we knew in advance the row exchanges that would be needed to get

$$
U_b \equiv A_b^{(n-1)} = E_{n-1}' E_{n-2}' \cdots E_1' P A_b.
$$

(9.38)
9.2. GAUSSIAN ELIMINATION

Since the inverse of \( E'_{n-1} E'_{n-2} \cdots E'_1 \) is the lower triangular matrix

\[
L = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\
l_{21} & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
l_{31} & l_{32} & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
l_{n1} & l_{n2} & \cdots & l_{n,n-1} & 1
\end{bmatrix},
\] (9.39)

where the \( l_{ij}, \ j = 1, \ldots, n-1, \ i = j+1, \ldots, n \) are the multipliers (computed after all the rows have been rearranged), we arrive at the anticipated factorization \( PA = LU \). Incidentally, up to sign, Gaussian elimination also produces the determinant of \( A \) because

\[
\det(PA) = \pm \det(A) = \det(LU) = \det(U) = a_1^{(1)} a_2^{(2)} \cdots a_n^{(n)}
\] (9.40)

and so \( \det(A) \) is plus or minus the product of all the pivots in the elimination process.

In the implementation of Gaussian elimination the array storing the augmented matrix \( A_b \) is overwritten to save memory. The pseudo code with partial pivoting (assuming \( a_{i,n+1} = b_i, \ i = 1, \ldots, n \)) is presented in Algorithm 9.3.

9.2.1 The Cost of Gaussian Elimination

We now do an operation count of Gaussian elimination to solve an \( n \times n \) linear system \( Ax = b \).

We focus on the elimination as we already know that the work for the step of backward substitution is \( O(n^2) \). For each round of elimination, \( j = 1, \ldots, n-1 \), we need one division to compute each of the \( n-j \) multipliers and \( (n-j)(n-j+1) \) multiplications and \( (n-j)(n-j+1) \) sums (subtracts) to perform the eliminations. Thus, the total number number of operations is

\[
W(n) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} [2(n-j)(n-j+1) + (n-j)] = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} [2(n-j)^2 + 3(n-j)]
\] (9.41)

and using (9.10) and

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{m} i^2 = \frac{m(m+1)(2m+1)}{6},
\] (9.42)
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Algorithm 9.3 Gaussian Elimination with Partial Pivoting

1: \textbf{for} $j = 1, \ldots, n - 1$ \textbf{do}
2: \hspace{1em} Find $m$ such that $|a_{mj}| = \max_{j \leq i \leq n} |a_{ij}|$
3: \hspace{1em} \textbf{if} $|a_{mj}| = 0$ \textbf{then} \hspace{1em} \triangleright Matrix is singular
4: \hspace{2em} \textbf{stop}
5: \hspace{1em} \textbf{end if}
6: \hspace{1em} $a_{jk} \leftrightarrow a_{mk}$, $k = j, \ldots, n + 1$ \hspace{1em} \triangleright Exchange rows
7: \hspace{1em} \textbf{for} $i = j + 1, \ldots, n$ \textbf{do}
8: \hspace{2em} $m \leftarrow a_{ij}/a_{jj}$ \hspace{1em} \triangleright Compute multiplier
9: \hspace{2em} $a_{ik} \leftarrow a_{ik} - m \ast a_{jk}$, $k = j + 1, \ldots, n + 1$ \hspace{1em} \triangleright Elimination
10: \hspace{2em} $a_{ij} \leftarrow m$ \hspace{1em} \triangleright Store multiplier
11: \hspace{1em} \textbf{end for}
12: \textbf{end for}
13: \textbf{for} $i = n, n - 1, \ldots, 1$ \textbf{do} \hspace{1em} \triangleright Backward Substitution
14: \hspace{1em} $x_i \leftarrow \left( a_{i,n+1} - \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} a_{ij}x_j \right) / a_{ii}$
15: \textbf{end for}

we get

$$W(n) = \frac{2}{3} n^3 + O(n^2).$$

(9.43)

Thus, Gaussian elimination is computationally rather expensive for large systems of equations.

9.3 \textit{LU} and Choleski Factorizations

If Gaussian elimination can be performed without row interchanges, then we obtain an \textit{LU} factorization of $A$, i.e. $A = LU$. This factorization can be advantageous when solving many linear systems with the same $n \times n$ matrix $A$ but different right hand sides because we can turn the problem $Ax = b$ into two triangular linear systems, which can be solved much more economically in $O(n^2)$ operations. Indeed, from $LUx = b$ and setting $y = Ux$ we have

$$Ly = b,$$
$$Ux = y.$$
Given $b$, we can solve the first system for $y$ with forward substitution and then we solve the second system for $x$ with backward substitution. Thus, while the $LU$ factorization of $A$ has an $O(n^3)$ cost, subsequent solutions to the linear system with the same matrix $A$ but different right hand sides can be done in $O(n^2)$ operations.

When can we obtain the factorization $A = LU$? the following result provides a useful sufficient condition.

**Theorem 9.1.** Let $A$ be an $n \times n$ matrix whose leading principal submatrices $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ are all nonsingular. Then, there exists an $n \times n$ lower triangular matrix $L$, with ones on its diagonal, and an $n \times n$ upper triangular matrix $U$ such that $A = LU$ and this factorization is unique.

**Proof.** Since $A_1$ is nonsingular then $a_{11} \neq 0$ and $P_1 = I$. Suppose now that we do not need to exchange rows in steps $2, \ldots, k - 1$ so that $A(k-1) = E_{k-1} \cdots E_2 E_1 A$, that is

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1k} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
a_{kk} & \cdots & a_{kk} & \cdots & a_{kn} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
a_{nk} & \cdots & a_{nk} & \cdots & a_{nn}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\
-m_{21} & \ddots \\
\vdots & \ddots & 1 \\
-m_{k1} & \cdots & \vdots \\
-m_{n1} & \cdots & \cdots & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1k} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
a_{k1} & a_{kk} & \cdots & a_{kn} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
a_{n1} & a_{nk} & \cdots & a_{nn}
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

The determinant of the boxed $k \times k$ leading principal submatrix on the left is $a_{11} a_{22}^{(2)} \cdots a_{kk}^{(k-1)}$ and this is equal to the determinant of the product of boxed blocks on the right hand side. Since the determinant of the first such block is one (it is a lower triangular matrix with ones on the diagonal), it follows that

$$a_{11} a_{22}^{(2)} \cdots a_{kk}^{(k-1)} = \det(A_k) \neq 0,$$

which implies that $a_{kk}^{(k-1)} \neq 0$ and so $P_k = I$ and we conclude that $U = E_{n-1} \cdots E_1 A$ and therefore $A = LU$.

Let us now show that this decomposition is unique. Suppose $A = L_1 U_1 = L_2 U_2$ then

$$L_2^{-1} L_1 = U_2 U_1^{-1}.$$
But the matrix on the left hand side is lower triangular (with ones in its diagonal) whereas the one on the right hand side is upper triangular. Therefore $L_2^{-1}L_1 = I = U_2U_1^{-1}$, which implies that $L_2 = L_1$ and $U_2 = U_1$. \hfill \Box

An immediate consequence of this result is that Gaussian elimination can be performed without row interchange for a SDD matrix, as each of its leading principal submatrices is itself SDD, and for a positive definite matrix, as each of its leading principal submatrices is itself positive definite, and hence non-singular in both cases.

**Corollary 1.** Let $A$ be an $n \times n$ matrix. Then $A = LU$, where $L$ is an $n \times n$ lower triangular matrix, with ones on its diagonal, and $U$ is an $n \times n$ upper triangular matrix if either

(a) $A$ is SDD or

(b) $A$ is symmetric positive definite.

In the case of a positive definite matrix the number number of operations can be cut down in approximately half by exploiting symmetry to obtain a symmetric factorization $A = BB^T$, where $B$ is a lower triangular matrix with positive entries in its diagonal. This representation is called Choleski factorization of the symmetric positive definite matrix $A$.

**Theorem 9.2.** Let $A$ be a symmetric positive definite matrix. Then, there is a unique lower triangular matrix $B$ with positive entries in its diagonal such that $A = BB^T$.

**Proof.** By Corollary 1, $A$ has an LU factorization. Moreover, from (9.46) it follows that all the pivots are positive and thus $u_{ii} > 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$. We can split the pivots evenly in $L$ and $U$ by letting $D = \text{diag}(\sqrt{u_{11}}, \ldots, \sqrt{u_{nn}})$ and writing $A = LDD^{-1}U = (LD)(D^{-1}U)$. Let $B = LD$ and $C = D^{-1}U$. Both matrices have diagonal elements $\sqrt{u_{11}}, \ldots, \sqrt{u_{nn}}$ but $B$ is lower triangular while $C$ is upper triangular. Moreover, $A = BC$ and because $A^T = A$ we have that $C^TB^T = BC$, which implies

$$B^{-1}C^T = C(B^T)^{-1}. \quad (9.48)$$

The matrix on the left hand side is lower triangular with ones in its diagonal while the matrix on the right hand side is upper triangular also with ones in its diagonal. Therefore, $B^{-1}C^T = I = C(B^T)^{-1}$ and thus, $C = B^T$.
and \( A = BB^T \). To prove that this Choleski factorization is unique we go back to the LU factorization, which we now is unique (if we choose \( L \) to have ones in its diagonal). Given \( A = BB^T \), where \( B \) is lower triangular with positive diagonal elements \( b_{11}, \ldots, b_{nn} \), we can write \( A = BD_B^{-1}D_BB^T \), where \( D_B = \text{diag}(b_{11}, \ldots, b_{nn}) \). Then \( L = BD_B^{-1} \) and \( U = D_BB^T \) yield the unique LU factorization of \( A \). Now suppose there is another Choleski factorization \( A = CC^T \). Then by the uniqueness of the LU factorization, we have

\[
L = BD_B^{-1}CD_C^{-1}, \quad (9.49) \\
U = D_BB^TD_CCT, \quad (9.50)
\]

where \( D_C = \text{diag}(c_{11}, \ldots, c_{nn}) \). Equation (9.50) implies that \( b_{ii}^2 = c_{ii}^2 \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) and since \( b_{ii} > 0 \) and \( c_{ii} > 0 \) for all \( i \), then \( D_C = D_B \) and consequently \( C = B \).

The Choleski factorization is usually written as \( A = LL^T \) and is obtained by exploiting the lower triangular structure of \( L \) and symmetry as follows. First, \( L = (l_{ij}) \) is lower triangular then \( l_{ij} = 0 \) for \( 1 \leq i < j \leq n \) and thus

\[
a_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} l_{ik}l_{jk} = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(i,j)} l_{ik}l_{jk}. \quad (9.51)
\]

Now, because \( A^T = A \) we only need \( a_{ij} \) for \( i \leq j \), that is

\[
a_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{i} l_{ik}l_{jk} \quad 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n. \quad (9.52)
\]

We can solve equations (9.52) to determine \( L \), one column at a time. If we set \( i = 1 \) we get

\[
a_{11} = l_{11}^2, \quad \rightarrow \quad l_{11} = \sqrt{a_{11}}, \\
a_{12} = l_{11}l_{21}, \\
\vdots \\
a_{1n} = l_{11}l_{n1}
\]
and this allows us to get the first column of $L$. The second column is now found by using (9.52) for $i = 2$

$$a_{22} = l_{21}^2 + l_{22}^2, \quad \rightarrow l_{22} = \sqrt{a_{22} - l_{21}^2},$$

$$a_{23} = l_{21}l_{31} + l_{22}l_{32},$$

$$\vdots$$

$$a_{2n} = l_{21}l_{n1} + l_{22}l_{n2},$$

etc. Algorithm 9.4 gives the pseudo code for the Choleski factorization.

**Algorithm 9.4 Choleski factorization**

1: for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ do \Comment{Compute column $i$ of $L$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$}
2: \hspace{1em} $l_{ii} \leftarrow \sqrt{(a_{ii} - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} l_{ik}^2)}$
3: \hspace{1em} for $j = i + 1, \ldots, n$ do
4: \hspace{2em} $l_{ji} \leftarrow (a_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} l_{ik}l_{jk})/l_{ii}$
5: \hspace{1em} end for
6: end for

### 9.4 Tridiagonal Linear Systems

If the matrix of coefficients $A$ has a triadiagonal structure

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & b_1 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & b_{n-1} \\ c_1 & a_2 & b_2 & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & b_{n-1} \\ & & & c_{n-1} & a_n \end{bmatrix}$$

(9.53)

its $LU$ factorization can be computed at an $O(n)$ cost and the corresponding linear system can thus be solved efficiently.

**Theorem 9.3.** If $A$ is triadiagonal and all of its leading principal submatrices
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are nonsingular then

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  a_1 & b_1 \\
  c_1 & a_2 & b_2 \\
  & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
  & & c_{n-1} & a_n & b_{n-1}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
  1 \\
  l_1 & 1 \\
  & \ddots & \ddots \\
  & & l_{n-1} & 1 \\
  & & & b_{n-1} & m_n
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(9.54)

where

\[m_1 = a_1,\]
\[l_j = c_j/m_j, \quad m_{j+1} = a_{j+1} - l_j b_j, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, n - 1,\]

(9.55) (9.56)

and this factorization is unique.

Proof. By Theorem 9.1 we know that \(A\) has a unique \(LU\) factorization, where \(L\) is unit lower triangular and \(U\) is upper triangular. We will show that we can solve uniquely for \(l_1, \ldots, l_{n-1}\) and \(m_1, \ldots, m_n\) so that (9.54) holds. Equating the matrix product on the right hand side of (9.54), row by row, we get

1st row: \(a_1 = m_1, \quad b_1 = b_1,\)
2nd row: \(c_1 = m_1 l_1, \quad a_2 = l_1 b_1 + m_2, \quad b_2 = b_2,\)
\vdots
\((n - 1)\)-st row: \(c_{n-2} = m_{n-2} l_{n-2}, \quad a_{n-1} = l_{n-2} b_{n-2} + m_{n-1}, \quad b_{n-1} = b_{n-1},\)
n-th row: \(c_{n-1} = m_{n-1} l_{n-1}, \quad a_n = l_{n-1} b_{n-1} + m_n\)

from which (9.55)-(9.56) follows. Of course, we need the \(m_j\)'s to be nonzero to use (9.56). We now prove this is the case.

Note that \(m_{j+1} = a_{j+1} - l_j b_j = a_{j+1} - \frac{c_j}{m_j} b_j.\) Therefore

\[m_{j+1} m_j = a_{j+1} m_j - b_j c_j, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, n - 1.\]

(9.57)

Thus,

\[\det(A_1) = a_1 = m_1,\]
\[\det(A_2) = a_2 a_1 - c_1 b_1 = a_2 m_1 - b_1 c_1 = m_1 m_2.\]

(9.58) (9.59)
We now do induction to show that \( \det(A_k) = m_1 m_2 \cdots m_k \). Suppose \( \det(A_j) = m_1 m_2 \cdots m_j \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, k - 1 \). Expanding by the last row we get
\[
\det(A_k) = a_k \det(A_{k-1}) - b_{k-1} c_{k-1} \det(A_{k-2})
\] (9.60)
and using the induction hypothesis and (9.57) it follows that
\[
\det(A_k) = m_1 m_2 \cdots m_{k-2} \left[ a_k m_{k-1} - b_{k-1} c_{k-1} \right] = m_1 \cdots m_k,
\] (9.61)
for \( k = 1, \ldots, n \). Since \( \det(A_k) \neq 0 \) for \( k = 1, \ldots, n \) then \( m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_n \) are all nonzero.

**Algorithm 9.5** Tridiagonal solver

1. \( m_1 \leftarrow a_1 \)
2. \( \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \) \( \triangleright \) Compute column \( L \) and \( U \)
3. \( l_j \leftarrow c_j / m_j \)
4. \( m_{j+1} \leftarrow a_{j+1} - l_i \ast b_j \)
5. \( \text{end for} \)
6. \( y_1 \leftarrow d_1 \) \( \triangleright \) Forward substitution on \( Ly = d \)
7. \( \text{for } j = 2, \ldots, n \) \( \triangleright \) Backward substitution on \( Ux = y \)
8. \( y_j \leftarrow d_j - l_{j-1} \ast y_{j-1} \)
9. \( \text{end for} \)
10. \( x_n \leftarrow y_n / m_n \)
11. \( \text{for } j = n - 1, n - 2, \ldots, 1 \)
12. \( x_j \leftarrow (y_j - b_j \ast x_{j+1}) / m_j \)
13. \( \text{end for} \)

### 9.5 A 1D BVP: Deformation of an Elastic Beam

We saw in Section 4.3 an example of a very large system of equations in connection with the least squares problem for fitting high dimensional data. We now consider another example which leads to a large linear system of equations.

Suppose we have a thin beam of unit length, stretched horizontally and occupying the interval \([0, 1]\). The beam is subjected to a load density \( f(x) \)
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at each point $x \in [0, 1]$, and pinned at end points. Let $u(x)$ be the beam deformation from the horizontal position. Assuming that the deformations are small (linear elasticity regime), $u$ satisfies

$$-u''(x) + c(x)u(x) = f(x), \quad 0 < x < 1,$$

(9.62)

where $c(x) \geq 0$ is related to the elastic, material properties of the beam. Because the beam is pinned at the end points we have the boundary conditions

$$u(0) = u(1) = 0.$$

(9.63)

The system (9.62)-(9.63) is called a *boundary value problem* (BVP). That is, we need to find a function $u$ that satisfies the ordinary differential equation (9.62) and the boundary conditions (9.63) for any given, continuous $f$ and $c$. The condition $c(x) \geq 0$ guarantees existence and uniqueness of solution to this problem.

We will construct a discrete model whose solution gives an accurate approximation to the exact solution at a finite collection of selected points (called nodes) in $[0, 1]$. We take the nodes to be equally spaced and to include the interval end points (boundary). So we choose a positive integer $N$ and define the nodes or grid points

$$x_0 = 0, x_1 = h, x_2 = 2h, \ldots, x_N = Nh, x_{N+1} = 1,$$

(9.64)

where $h = 1/(N + 1)$ is the *grid size* or node spacing. The nodes $x_1, \ldots, x_N$ are called interior nodes, because they lie inside the interval $[0, 1]$, and the nodes $x_0$ and $x_{N+1}$ are called boundary nodes.

We now construct a discrete approximation to the ordinary differential equation by replacing the second derivative with a second order finite difference approximation. As we know,

$$u''(x_j) = \frac{u(x_{j+1}) - 2u(x_j) + u(x_{j-1})}{h^2} + O(h^2).$$

(9.65)

Neglecting the $O(h^2)$ error and denoting the approximation of $u(x_j)$ by $v_j$ (i.e. $v_j \approx u(x_j)$) $f_j = f(x_j)$ and $c_j = c(x_j)$, for $j = 1, \ldots, N$, then at each interior node

$$-v_{j-1} - \frac{2v_j + v_{j+1}}{h^2} + c_j v_j = f_j, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, N$$

(9.66)
and at the boundary nodes, applying (9.63), we have

\[ v_0 = v_{N+1} = 0. \]  

(9.67)

Thus, (9.66) is a linear system of \( N \) equations in \( N \) unknowns \( v_1, \ldots, v_N \), which we can write in matrix form as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
2 + c_1 h^2 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\
-1 & 2 + c_2 h^2 & -1 & \ddots & & \\
0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\
\vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & \ddots & \ddots \\
0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & -1 & 2 + c_N h^2
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
v_1 \\
v_2 \\
\vdots \\
v_N
\end{bmatrix}
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
f_1 \\
f_2 \\
\vdots \\
f_N
\end{bmatrix}.
\]  

(9.68)

The matrix, let us call it \( A \), of this system is tridiagonal and symmetric. A direct computation shows that for an arbitrary, nonzero, column vector \( v = [v_1, \ldots, v_N]^T \)

\[
v^T A v = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left[ \left( \frac{v_j + c_j v_j}{h} \right)^2 + c_j v_j^2 \right] > 0, \quad \forall \, v \neq 0
\]  

(9.69)

and therefore, since \( c_j \geq 0 \) for all \( j \), \( A \) is positive definite. Thus, there is a unique solution to (9.68) and can be efficiently found with our tridiagonal solver, Algorithm 9.5. Since the expected numerical error is \( O(h^2) = O(1/(N+1)^2) \), even a modest accuracy of \( O(10^{-4}) \) requires \( N \approx 100 \).

### 9.6 A 2D BVP: Dirichlet Problem for the Poisson’s Equation

We now look at a simple 2D BVP for an equation that is central to many applications, namely Poisson’s equation. For concreteness here, we can think of the equation as a model for small deformations \( u \) of a stretched, square membrane fixed to a wire at its boundary and subject to a force density
9.6. A 2D BVP: DIRICHLET PROBLEM FOR THE POISSON'S EQUATION

Denoting by $\Omega$, and $\partial \Omega$, the unit square $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ and its boundary, respectively, the BVP is to find $u$ such that

$$-\Delta u(x, y) = f(x, y), \quad \text{for} \ (x, y) \in \Omega \quad (9.70)$$

and

$$u(x, y) = 0, \quad \text{for} \ (x, y) \in \partial \Omega. \quad (9.71)$$

In (9.70), $\Delta u$ is the Laplacian of $u$, also denoted as $\nabla^2 u$, and is given by

$$\Delta u = \nabla^2 u = u_{xx} + u_{yy} = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2}. \quad (9.72)$$

Equation (9.70) is Poisson’s equation (in 2D) and together with (9.71) specify a (homogeneous) Dirichlet problem because the value of $u$ is given at the boundary.

To construct a numerical approximation to (9.70)-(9.71), we proceed as in the previous 1D BVP example by discretizing the domain. For simplicity, we will use uniformly spaced grid points. We choose a positive integer $N$ and define the grid points of our domain $\Omega = [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ as

$$(x_i, x_j) = (ih, jh), \quad \text{for} \ i, j = 0, \ldots, N + 1, \quad (9.73)$$

where $h = 1/(N + 1)$. The interior nodes correspond to $1 \leq i, j \leq N$ and the boundary nodes are those corresponding to the remaining values of indices $i$ and $j$ ($i$ or $j$ equal 0 and $i$ or $j$ equal $N + 1$).

At each of the interior nodes we replace the Laplacian by its second order finite difference approximation, called the five-point discrete Laplacian

$$\nabla^2 u(x_i, y_j) = \frac{u(x_{i-1}, x_j) + u(x_{i+1}, y_j) + u(x_i, y_{j-1}) + u(x_i, y_{j+1}) - 4u(x_i, y_j)}{h^2} + O(h^2). \quad (9.74)$$

Neglecting the $O(h^2)$ discretization error and denoting by $v_{ij}$ the approximation to $u(x_i, y_j)$ we get:

$$-\frac{v_{i-1,j} + v_{i+1,j} + v_{i,j-1} + v_{i,j+1} - 4v_{ij}}{h^2} = f_{ij}, \quad \text{for} \ 1 \leq i, j \leq N. \quad (9.75)$$
This is a linear system of \(N^2\) equations for the \(N^2\) unknowns, \(v_{ij}, 1 \leq i, j \leq N\). We have freedom to order or label the unknowns any way we wish and that will affect the structure of the matrix of coefficients of the linear system but remarkably the matrix will be symmetric positive definite regardless of ordering of the unknowns!

The most common labeling is the so-called lexicographical order, which proceeds from the bottom row to top one, left to right, \(v_{11}, v_{12}, \ldots, v_{1N}, v_{21}, \ldots, \) etc. Denoting by \(v_1 = [v_{11}, v_{12}, \ldots, v_{1N}]^T\), \(v_2 = [v_{21}, v_{22}, \ldots, v_{2N}]^T\), etc., and similarly for the right hand side \(f\), the linear system (9.75) can be written in matrix form as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
T & -I & 0 & 0 \\
-I & T & -I & \\
0 & -I & T & -I \\
0 & 0 & -I & T
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
v_1 \\
v_2 \\
vdots \\
v_N
\end{bmatrix}
= h^2
\begin{bmatrix}
f_1 \\
f_2 \\
vdots \\
f_N
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(9.76)

Here, \(I\) is the \(N \times N\) identity matrix and \(T\) is the \(N \times N\) tridiagonal matrix

\[
T = \begin{bmatrix}
4 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 4 & -1 & \\
0 & -1 & 4 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & 4
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(9.77)

Thus, the matrix of coefficients in (9.76), is sparse, i.e. the vast majority of
its entries are zeros. For example, for $N = 3$ this matrix is

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
4 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 4 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 4 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & 0 & 4 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 4 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 4 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 4 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 4 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 4
\end{bmatrix}
$$

Gaussian elimination is hugely inefficient for a large system ($n > 100$) with a sparse matrix, as in this example. This is because the intermediate matrices in the elimination would be generally dense due to fill-in introduced by the elimination process. To illustrate the high cost of Gaussian elimination, if we merely use $N = 100$ (this corresponds to a modest discretization error of $O(10^{-4})$), we end up with $n = N^2 = 10^4$ unknowns and the cost of Gaussian elimination would be $O(10^{12})$ operations.

### 9.7 Linear Iterative Methods for $Ax = b$

As we have seen, Gaussian elimination is an expensive procedure for large linear systems of equations. An alternative is to seek not an exact (up to roundoff error) solution in a finite number of steps but an approximation to the solution that can be obtained from an iterative procedure applied to an initial guess $x^{(0)}$.

We are going to consider first a class of iterative methods where the central idea is to write the matrix $A$ as the sum of a non-singular matrix $M$, whose corresponding system is easy to solve, and a remainder $-N = A - M$, so that the system $Ax = b$ is transformed into the equivalent system

$$
Mx = Nx + b. \tag{9.78}
$$

Starting with an initial guess $x^{(0)}$, (9.78) defines a sequence of approximations generated by

$$
Mx^{(k+1)} = Nx^{(k)} + b, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots \tag{9.79}
$$

The main questions are
1. When does this iteration converge?

2. What determines its rate of convergence?

3. What is the computational cost?

But first we look at three concrete iterative methods of the form (9.79). Unless otherwise stated, \( A \) is assumed to be a non-singular \( n \times n \) matrix and \( b \) a given \( n \)-column vector.

### 9.8 Jacobi, Gauss-Seidel, and S.O.R.

If the all the diagonal elements of \( A \) are nonzero we can take \( M = \text{diag}(A) \) and then at each iteration (i.e. for each \( k \)) the linear system (9.79) can be easily solved to obtain the next iterate \( x^{(k+1)} \). Note that we do not need to compute \( M^{-1} \) nor do we need to do the matrix product \( M^{-1}N \) (and due to its cost it should be avoided). We just need to solve the linear system with the matrix \( M \), which in this case is trivial to do. We just solve the first equation for the first unknown, the second equation for the second unknown, etc., and we obtain the so-called Jacobi iterative method:

\[
    x_i^{(k+1)} = \frac{-\sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^n a_{ij} x_j^{(k+1)} + b_i}{a_{ii}}, \quad i = 1, 2, ..., n, \quad \text{and} \quad k = 0, 1, ...
\]  

(9.80)

The iteration could be stopped when

\[
    \frac{\|x^{(k+1)} - x^{(k)}\|_\infty}{\|x^{(k+1)}\|_\infty} \leq \text{Tolerance}. \tag{9.81}
\]

**Example 9.1.** Consider the \( 4 \times 4 \) linear system

\[
\begin{align*}
10x_1 - x_2 + 2x_3 &= 6, \\
-x_1 + 11x_2 - x_3 + 3x_4 &= 25, \\
2x_1 - x_2 + 10x_3 - x_4 &= -11, \\
3x_2 - x_3 + 8x_4 &= 15.
\end{align*}
\]  

(9.82)
It has the unique solution \((1, 2, -1, 1)\). Jacobi’s iteration for this system is

\[
\begin{align*}
x_1^{(k+1)} &= \frac{1}{10} x_2^{(k)} - \frac{1}{5} x_3^{(k)} + \frac{3}{5}, \\
x_2^{(k+1)} &= \frac{1}{11} x_1^{(k)} + \frac{1}{11} x_3^{(k)} - \frac{3}{11} x_4^{(k)} + \frac{25}{11}, \\
x_3^{(k+1)} &= -\frac{1}{5} x_1^{(k)} + \frac{1}{10} x_2^{(k)} + \frac{1}{10} x_4^{(k)} - \frac{11}{10}, \\
x_4^{(k+1)} &= -\frac{3}{8} x_2^{(k)} + \frac{1}{8} x_3^{(k)} + \frac{15}{8}.
\end{align*}
\]  

(9.83)

Starting with \(x^{(0)} = [0, 0, 0, 0]^T\) we obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
x^{(1)} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.60000000 \\ 2.27272727 \\ -1.10000000 \\ 1.87500000 \end{bmatrix}, \\
x^{(2)} &= \begin{bmatrix} 1.04727273 \\ 1.71590909 \\ -0.80522727 \\ 0.88522727 \end{bmatrix}, \\
x^{(3)} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.93263636 \\ 2.05330579 \\ -1.04934091 \\ 1.13088068 \end{bmatrix}.
\end{align*}
\]  

(9.84)

In the Jacobi iteration, when we evaluate \(x_2^{(k+1)}\) we have already \(x_1^{(k+1)}\) available. When we evaluate \(x_3^{(k+1)}\) we have already \(x_1^{(k+1)}\) and \(x_2^{(k+1)}\) available and so on. If we update the Jacobi iteration with the already computed components of \(x^{(k+1)}\) we obtained the Gauss-Seidel iteration:

\[
x_i^{(k+1)} = \frac{-\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} a_{ij} x_j^{(k+1)} - \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} a_{ij} x_j^{(k)}}{a_{ii}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots
\]  

(9.85)

The Gauss-Seidel iteration is equivalent to the iteration obtained by taking \(M\) as the lower triangular part of the matrix \(A\), including its diagonal.

**Example 9.2.** For the system \((9.82)\), starting again with the initial guess \([0, 0, 0, 0]^T\), Gauss-Seidel produces the following approximations

\[
\begin{align*}
x^{(1)} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.60000000 \\ 2.32727273 \\ -0.98727273 \\ 0.87886364 \end{bmatrix}, \\
x^{(2)} &= \begin{bmatrix} 1.03018182 \\ 2.03693802 \\ -1.0144562 \\ 0.98434122 \end{bmatrix}, \\
x^{(3)} &= \begin{bmatrix} 1.00658504 \\ 2.00355502 \\ -1.00252738 \\ 0.99835095 \end{bmatrix}.
\end{align*}
\]  

(9.86)
In an attempt to accelerate convergence of the Gauss-Seidel iteration, one could also put some weight in diagonal part of $A$, and split this into the matrices $M$ and $N$ of the iterative method (9.79). Specifically, we can write

$$\text{diag}(A) = \frac{1}{\omega} \text{diag}(A) - \frac{1 - \omega}{\omega} \text{diag}(A), \quad (9.87)$$

where the first term of the right hand side goes into $M$ and the last into $N$. This weighted iterative method can be written as

$$x^{(k+1)}_i = a_{ii}x_i^{(k)} - \omega \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} a_{ij}x_j^{(k+1)} + \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} a_{ij}x_j^{(k)} - b_i \right], \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots \quad (9.88)$$

Note that $\omega = 1$ corresponds to Gauss-Seidel. This iteration is generically called S.O.R. (successive over-relaxation), even though we refer to over-relaxation only when $\omega > 1$ and under-relaxation when $\omega < 1$. We will see (Theorem 9.8) that a necessary condition for convergence is that $0 < \omega < 2$.

### 9.9 Convergence of Linear Iterative Methods

To study the convergence of iterative methods of the form $Mx^{(k+1)} = Nx^{(k)} + b$, for $k = 0, 1, \ldots$ we use the equivalent iteration

$$x^{(k+1)} = Tx^{(k)} + c, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots \quad (9.89)$$

where

$$T = M^{-1}N = I - M^{-1}A \quad (9.90)$$

is called the iteration matrix and $c = M^{-1}b$.

The issue of convergence is that of existence of a fixed point for the map $F(x) = Tx + c$ defined for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. That is, whether or not there is an $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $F(x) = x$. For if the sequence defined in (9.89) converges to a vector $x$ then, by continuity of $F$, we would have $x = Tx + c = F(x)$. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and for any induced matrix norm we have

$$\|F(x) - F(y)\| = \|Tx - Ty\| \leq \|T\| \|x - y\|. \quad (9.91)$$
If for some induced norm $\|T\| < 1$, $F$ is a contracting map or contraction and we will show that this guarantees the existence of a unique fixed point. We will also show that the rate of convergence of the sequence generated by iterative methods of the form (9.89) is given by the spectral radius $\rho(T)$ of the iteration matrix $T$. These conclusions will follow from the following result.

**Theorem 9.4.** Let $T$ be an $n \times n$ matrix. Then the following statements are equivalent:

1. $\lim_{k \to \infty} T^k = 0$.
2. $\lim_{k \to \infty} T^k x = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
3. $\rho(T) < 1$.
4. $\|T\| < 1$ for at least one induced norm.

**Proof.** (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): For any induced norm we have that

$$\|T^k x\| \leq \|T^k\| \|x\| \quad (9.92)$$

and so if $T^k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ then $\|T^k x\| \to 0$, that is $T^k x \to 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (c): Let us suppose that $\lim_{k \to \infty} T^k x = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ but that $\rho(T) \geq 1$. Then, there is a eigenvector $v$ such that $Tv = \lambda v$ with $|\lambda| \geq 1$ and the sequence $T^k v = \lambda^k v$ does not converge, which is a contradiction.

(c) $\Rightarrow$ (d): By Theorem 8.5, for each $\epsilon > 0$, there is at least one induced norm $\|\cdot\|$ such that $\|T\| \leq \rho(T) + \epsilon$ from which the statement follows.

(d) $\Rightarrow$ (a): This follows immediately from $\|T^k\| \leq \|T\|^k$. 

**Theorem 9.5.** The iterative method (9.89) is convergent for any initial guess $x^{(0)}$ if and only if $\rho(T) < 1$ or equivalently if and only if $\|T\| < 1$ for at least one induced norm.

**Proof.** Let $x$ be the exact solution of $Ax = b$. Then

$$x - x^{(1)} = Tx + c - (Tx^{(0)} + c) = T(x - x^{(0)}), \quad (9.93)$$
from which it follows that the error of the $k$ iterate, $e_k = x^{(k)} - x$, satisfies
\[
e_k = T^k e_0,
\] (9.94)
for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ and where $e_0 = x - x^{(0)}$ is the error of the initial guess. The conclusion now follows immediately from Theorem 9.4.

The spectral radius $\rho(T)$ of the iteration matrix $T$ measures the rate of convergence of the method. For if $T$ is normal, then $\|T\|_2 = \rho(T)$ and from (9.94) we get
\[
\|e_k\|_2 \leq \rho(T)^k \|e_0\|_2.
\] (9.95)
But each $k$ we can find a vector $e_0$ for which the equality holds so $\rho(T)^k \|e_0\|_2$ is a least upper bound for the error $\|e_k\|_2$. If $T$ is not normal, the following results shows that, asymptotically $\|T^k\| \approx \rho(T)^k$, for any matrix norm.

**Theorem 9.6.** Let $T$ be any $n \times n$ matrix. Then, for any matrix norm $\| \cdot \|$ \[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \|T^k\|^{1/k} = \rho(T). \tag{9.96}
\]

**Proof.** We know that $\rho(T^k) = \rho(T)^k$ and that $\rho(T) \leq \|T\|$. Therefore
\[
\rho(T) \leq \|T^k\|^{1/k}. \tag{9.97}
\]
Now, for any given $\epsilon > 0$ construct the matrix $T_\epsilon = T/(\rho(T) + \epsilon)$. Then $\lim_{k \to \infty} T_\epsilon^k = 0$ as $\rho(T_\epsilon) < 1$. Therefore, there is an integer $K_\epsilon$ such that
\[
\|T_\epsilon^k\| = \frac{\|T^k\|}{(\rho(T) + \epsilon)^k} \leq 1, \text{ for all } k \geq K_\epsilon. \tag{9.98}
\]
Thus, for all $k \geq K_\epsilon$ we have
\[
\rho(T) \leq \|T^k\|^{1/k} \leq \rho(T) + \epsilon \tag{9.99}
\]
from which the results follows. \qed

**Theorem 9.7.** Let $A$ an $n \times n$ strictly diagonally dominant matrix. Then, for any initial guess $x^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$

(a) The Jacobi iteration converges to the exact solution of $Ax = b$. 
9.9. CONVERGENCE OF LINEAR ITERATIVE METHODS

(b) The Gauss-Seidel iteration converges to the exact solution of \( Ax = b \).

Proof. (a) The Jacobi iteration matrix \( T \) has entries \( T_{ii} = 0 \) and \( T_{ij} = -a_{ij}/a_{ii} \) for \( i \neq j \). Therefore,

\[
\|T\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \left| \frac{a_{ij}}{a_{ii}} \right| = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{1}{|a_{ii}|} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n |a_{ij}| < 1. \quad (9.100)
\]

(b) We will prove that \( \rho(T) < 1 \) for the Gauss-Seidel iteration. Let \( x \) be an eigenvector of \( T \) with eigenvalue \( \lambda \), normalized to have \( \|x\|_\infty = 1 \). Recall that \( T = I - M^{-1}A \). Then, \( Tx = \lambda x \) implies \( Mx - Ax = \lambda Mx \) from which we get

\[
- \sum_{j=i+1}^n a_{ij} x_j = \lambda \sum_{j=1}^i a_{ij} x_j = \lambda a_{ii} x_i + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} a_{ij} x_j. \quad (9.101)
\]

Now choose \( i \) such that \( \|x\|_\infty = |x_i| = 1 \) then

\[
|\lambda| |a_{ii}| \leq |\lambda| \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} |a_{ij}| + \sum_{j=i+1}^n |a_{ij}|
\]

\[
\sum_{j=i+1}^n |a_{ij}| \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} |a_{ij}| < \sum_{j=i+1}^n |a_{ij}| \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} |a_{ij}| = 1.
\]

where the last inequality was obtained by using that \( A \) is SDD. Thus, \( |\lambda| < 1 \) and so \( \rho(T) < 1 \).

\( \square \)

Theorem 9.8. A necessary condition for the S.O.R. iteration is \( 0 < \omega < 2 \).

Proof. We will show that \( \det(T) = (1-\omega)^n \) and because \( \det(T) \) is equal, up to a sign, to the product of the eigenvalues of \( T \) we have that \( |\det(T)| \leq \rho^n(T) \) and this implies that

\[
\rho(T) \geq |1 - \omega|. \quad (9.102)
\]
Since \( \rho(T) < 1 \) is required for convergence, the conclusion follows. Now, \( T = M^{-1}N \) and \( \det(T) = \det(M^{-1}) \det(N) \). From the definition of the S.O.R. iteration \( \text{(9.88)} \), we get that

\[
\frac{a_{ii}}{\omega} x_i^{(k+1)} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} a_{ij} x_j^{(k+1)} = \frac{a_{ii}}{\omega} x_i^{(k)} - \sum_{j=i}^{n} a_{ij} x_j^{(k)} + b_i. \tag{9.103}
\]

Therefore, \( M \) is lower triangular with \( \text{diag}(M) = \frac{1}{\omega} \text{diag}(A) \). Consequently, \( \det(M^{-1}) = \det(\omega \ \text{diag}(A)^{-1}) \). Similarly, \( \det(N) = \det((1/\omega - 1)\text{diag}(A)) \). Thus,

\[
\det(T) = \det(M^{-1}) \det(N) \\
= \det(\omega \ \text{diag}(A)^{-1}) \det((1/\omega - 1)\text{diag}(A)) \\
= \det(\text{diag}(A)^{-1}(1 - \omega)\text{diag}(A)) \\
= \det((1 - \omega)I) = (1 - \omega)^n. \tag{9.104}
\]

If \( A \) is positive definite S.O.R. converges for any initial guess. However, as we will see, there are more efficient iterative methods for positive definite linear systems.
Chapter 10

Linear Systems of Equations II

In this chapter we focus on some numerical methods for the solution of large linear systems $Ax = b$ where $A$ is a sparse, symmetric positive definite matrix. We also look briefly at the non-symmetric case.

10.1 Positive Definite Linear Systems as an Optimization Problem

Suppose that $A$ is an $n \times n$ symmetric, positive definite matrix and we are interested in solving $Ax = b$. Let $\bar{x}$ be the unique, exact solution of $Ax = b$. Since $A$ is positive definite, we can define the norm

$$\|x\|_A = \sqrt{x^T Ax}. \quad (10.1)$$

Henceforth we are going to denote the inner product of two vector $x, y$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ by $\langle x, y \rangle$, i.e

$$\langle x, y \rangle = x^T y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i y_i. \quad (10.2)$$

Consider now the quadratic function of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ defined by

$$J(x) = \frac{1}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|_A^2. \quad (10.3)$$

Note that $J(x) \geq 0$ and $J(x) = 0$ if and only if $x = \bar{x}$ because $A$ is positive definite. Therefore, $x$ minimizes $J$ if and only if $x = \bar{x}$. In optimization, the
function to be minimized (maximized), \( J \) in our case, is called the **objective function**.

For several optimization methods it is useful to consider the one-dimensional problem of minimizing \( J \) along a fixed direction. For given \( x, v \in \mathbb{R}^n \) we consider the so called **line minimization** problem consisting in minimizing \( J \) along the line that passes through \( x \) and is in the direction of \( v \), i.e

\[
\min_{t \in \mathbb{R}} J(x + tv).
\]  

(10.4)

Denoting \( g(t) = J(x + tv) \) and using the definition (10.3) of \( J \) we get

\[
g(t) = \frac{1}{2} \langle x - \bar{x} + tv, A(x - \bar{x} + tv) \rangle \\
= J(x) + \langle x - \bar{x}, Av \rangle t + \frac{1}{2} \langle v, Av \rangle t^2 \tag{10.5}
\]

This is a parabola opening upward because \( \langle v, Av \rangle > 0 \) for all \( v \neq 0 \). Thus, its minimum is given by the critical point

\[
0 = g'(t^*) = -\langle v, b - Ax \rangle + t^* \langle v, Av \rangle,
\]  

(10.6)

that is

\[
t^* = \frac{\langle v, b - Ax \rangle}{\langle v, Av \rangle} \tag{10.7}
\]

and the minimum of \( J \) along the line \( x + tv, t \in \mathbb{R} \) is

\[
g(t^*) = J(x) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\langle v, b - Ax \rangle^2}{\langle v, Av \rangle} \tag{10.8}
\]

Finally, using the definition of \( \| \cdot \|_A \) and \( A\bar{x} = b \), we have

\[
\frac{1}{2} \| x - \bar{x} \|^2_A = \frac{1}{2} \| x \|^2_A - \langle b, x \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \| \bar{x} \|^2_A \tag{10.9}
\]

and so it follows that

\[
\nabla J(x) = Ax - b. \tag{10.10}
\]
10.2 Line Search Methods

We just saw in the previous section that the problem of solving $Ax = b$, when $A$ is a symmetric positive definite matrix is equivalent to a convex, minimization problem of a quadratic objective function $J(x) = \| x - \bar{x} \|^2_A$. An important class of methods for this type of optimization problems is called **line search methods**.

Line search methods produce a sequence of approximations to the minimizer, in the form

$$x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + t_k v^{(k)}, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots,$$

where the vector $v^{(k)}$ and the scalar $t_k$ are called the **search direction** and the **step length** at the $k$-th iteration, respectively. The question then is how to select the search directions and the step lengths to converge to the minimizer. Most line search methods are of **descent** type because they require that the value of $J$ is decreased with each iteration. Going back to (10.5) this means that descent line search methods must satisfy the condition

$$\langle v^{(k)}, \nabla J(x^{(k)}) \rangle < 0,$$

which guarantees a decrease of $J$ for sufficiently small step length $t_k$.

Starting with an initial guess $x^{(0)}$, line search methods generate

$$x^{(1)} = x^{(0)} + t_0 v^{(0)}$$

$$x^{(2)} = x^{(1)} + t_1 v^{(0)} = x^{(0)} + t_0 v^{(0)} + t_1 v^{(1)},$$

e.tc., so that the $k$-th element of the sequence is $x^{(0)}$ plus a linear combination of $v^{(0)}, v^{(1)}, \ldots, v^{(k-1)}$:

$$x^{(k)} = x^{(0)} + t_0 v^{(0)} + t_1 v^{(0)} + \cdots + t_{k-1} v^{(k-1)}.$$

That is,

$$(x^{(k)} - x^{(0)}) \in \text{span}\{v^{(0)}, v^{(1)}, \ldots, v^{(k-1)}\}.$$  

Unless otherwise noted, we will take the step length $t_k$ to be given by the one-dimensional minimizer (10.7) evaluated at the $k$-step, i.e.

$$t_k = \frac{\langle v^{(k)}, r^{(k)} \rangle}{\langle v^{(k)}, A v^{(k)} \rangle}.$$  

(10.17)
where
\[
 r^{(k)} = b - Ax^{(k)} \tag{10.18}
\]
is the residual of the linear equation \( Ax = b \) associated with the approximation \( x^{(k)} \).

### 10.2.1 Steepest Descent

One way to satisfy the descent condition \( (10.12) \) is to choose \( v^{(k)} = -\nabla J(x^{(k)}) \), which is locally the fastest rate of decrease of \( J \). Recalling that \( \nabla J(x^{(k)}) = -r^{(k)} \), we take \( v^{(k)} = r^{(k)} \). The optimal step length is selected according to \( (10.17) \) so that we choose the line minimizer (in the direction of \( -\nabla J(x^{(k)}) \)) of \( J \). The resulting method is called steepest descent and, starting from an initial guess \( x^{(0)} \), is given by

\[
t_k = \frac{\langle r^{(k)}, r^{(k)} \rangle}{\langle r^{(k)}, Ar^{(k)} \rangle}, \tag{10.19}
\]

\[
x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + t_k r^{(k)}, \tag{10.20}
\]

\[
r^{(k+1)} = r^{(k)} - t_k Ar^{(k)}, \tag{10.21}
\]

for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots \). Formula \( (10.21) \), which comes from subtracting \( A \) times \( (10.20) \) to \( b \), is preferable to using the definition of the residual, i.e. \( r^{(k+1)} = b - Ax^{(k)} \), due to round-off errors.

If \( A \) is an \( n \times n \) diagonal, positive definite matrix, the steepest descent method finds the minimum in at most \( n \) steps. This is easy to visualize for \( n = 2 \) as the level sets of \( J \) are ellipses with their principal axes aligned with the coordinate axes. For a general, non-diagonal positive definite matrix \( A \), convergence of the steepest descent sequence to the minimizer of \( J \) and hence to the solution of \( Ax = b \) is guaranteed but it may not be reached in a finite number of steps.

### 10.3 The Conjugate Gradient Method

The steepest descent method uses an optimal search direction \( \text{locally} \) but not \( \text{globally} \) and as a result it converges in general very slowly to the minimizer.

A key strategy to accelerate convergence in line search methods is to widen our search space by considering the previous search directions, not just the current one. Obviously, we would like the \( v^{(k)} \)'s to be linear independent.
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Recall that \( (x^{(k)} - x^{(0)}) \in \text{span}\{v^{(0)}, v^{(1)}, \ldots, v^{(k-1)}\} \). We are going to denote

\[
V_k = \text{span}\{v^{(0)}, v^{(1)}, \ldots, v^{(k-1)}\} \tag{10.22}
\]

and write \( x \in x^{(0)} + V_k \) to mean that \( x = x^{(0)} + v \) with \( v \in V_k \).

The idea is to select \( v^{(0)}, v^{(1)}, \ldots, v^{(k-1)} \) such that

\[
x^{(k)} = \min_{x \in x^{(0)} + V_k} \|x - \bar{x}\|_A^2. \tag{10.23}
\]

If the search directions are linearly independent, as \( k \) increases our search space grows so the minimizer would be found in at most \( n \) steps, when \( V_n = \mathbb{R}^n \).

Let us derive a condition for the minimizer of \( J(x) = \frac{1}{2}\|x - \bar{x}\|_A^2 \) in \( x^{(0)} + V_k \). Suppose \( x^{(k)} \in x^{(0)} + V_k \). Then, there are scalars \( c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{k-1} \) such that

\[
x^{(k)} = x^{(0)} + c_0 v^{(0)} + c_1 v^{(1)} + \cdots + c_{k-1} v^{(k-1)}. \tag{10.24}
\]

For fixed \( v^{(0)}, v^{(1)}, \ldots, v^{(k-1)} \), define the following function of \( c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{k-1} \)

\[
G(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{k-1}) := J \left( x^{(0)} + c_0 v^{(0)} + c_1 v^{(1)} + \cdots + c_{k-1} v^{(k-1)} \right) \tag{10.25}
\]

Because \( J \) is a quadratic function, the minimizer of \( G \) is the critical point \( c_0^*, c_1^*, \ldots, c_{k-1}^* \)

\[
\frac{\partial G}{\partial c_j}(c_0^*, c_1^*, \ldots, c_{k-1}^*) = 0, \quad j = 0, \ldots, k-1. \tag{10.26}
\]

But by the Chain Rule

\[
0 = \frac{\partial G}{\partial c_j} = \nabla J(x^{(k)}) \cdot v^{(j)} = -\langle r^{(k)}, v^{(j)} \rangle, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, k-1. \tag{10.27}
\]

We have proved the following theorem.

**Theorem 10.1.** The vector \( x^{(k)} \in x^{(0)} + V_k \) minimizes \( \|x - \bar{x}\|_A^2 \) over \( x^{(0)} + V_k \), for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots \) if and only if

\[
\langle r^{(k)}, v^{(j)} \rangle = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, k-1. \tag{10.28}
\]

That is, the residual \( r^{(k)} = b - Ax^{(k)} \) is orthogonal to all the search directions \( v^{(0)}, \ldots, v^{(k-1)} \).
Let us go back to one step of a line search method, \( x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + t_k v^{(k)} \), where \( t_k \) is given by the one-dimensional minimizer (10.17). As we have done in the Steepest Descent method, we find that the corresponding residual satisfies \( r^{(k+1)} = r^{(k)} - t_k A v^{(k)} \). Starting with an initial guess \( x^{(0)} \), we compute \( r^{(0)} = b - A x^{(0)} \) and take \( v^{(0)} = r^{(0)} \). Then,

\[
\begin{align*}
x^{(1)} &= x^{(0)} + t_0 v^{(0)}, \\
r^{(1)} &= r^{(0)} - t_0 A v^{(0)}
\end{align*}
\] (10.29)

and

\[
\langle r^{(1)}, v^{(0)} \rangle = \langle r^{(0)}, v^{(0)} \rangle - t_0 \langle v^{(0)}, A v^{(0)} \rangle = 0
\] (10.31)

where the last equality follows from the definition (10.17) of \( t_0 \). Now,

\[
r^{(2)} = r^{(1)} - t_1 A v^{(1)}
\] (10.32)

and consequently

\[
\langle r^{(2)}, v^{(0)} \rangle = \langle r^{(1)}, v^{(0)} \rangle - t_1 \langle v^{(0)}, A v^{(1)} \rangle = -t_1 \langle v^{(0)}, A v^{(1)} \rangle.
\] (10.33)

Thus if

\[
\langle v^{(0)}, A v^{(1)} \rangle = 0
\] (10.34)

then \( \langle r^{(2)}, v^{(0)} \rangle = 0 \). Moreover, \( r^{(2)} = r^{(1)} - t_1 A v^{(1)} \) from which it follows that

\[
\langle r^{(2)}, v^{(1)} \rangle = \langle r^{(1)}, v^{(1)} \rangle - t_1 \langle v^{(1)}, A v^{(1)} \rangle = 0,
\] (10.35)

where in the last equality we have used the definition of \( t_1 \), (10.17). Thus, if condition (10.34) holds we can guarantee that \( \langle r^{(1)}, v^{(0)} \rangle = 0 \) and \( \langle r^{(2)}, v^{(j)} \rangle = 0, j = 0, 1, \ldots, k \) i.e. we satisfy the conditions of Theorem 10.1 for \( k = 1, 2 \).

**Definition 10.1.** Let \( A \) be an \( n \times n \) matrix. We say that two vectors \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \) are conjugate with respect to \( A \) if

\[
\langle x, Ay \rangle = 0.
\] (10.36)

We can now proceed by induction to prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 10.2.** Suppose \( v^{(0)}, \ldots, v^{(k-1)} \) are conjugate with respect to \( A \), then for \( k = 1, 2, \ldots \)

\[
\langle r^{(k)}, v^{(j)} \rangle = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, k - 1.
\]
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Proof. Let us do induction. We know the statement is true for $k = 1$. Suppose

$$\langle r^{(k-1)}, v^{(j)} \rangle = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, k - 2. \quad (10.37)$$

Recall that $r^{(k)} = r^{(k-1)} - t_{k-1} A v^{(k-1)}$ and so

$$\langle r^{(k)}, v^{(k-1)} \rangle = \langle r^{(k-1)}, v^{(k-1)} \rangle - t_{k-1} \langle v^{(k-1)}, A v^{(k-1)} \rangle = 0 \quad (10.38)$$

because of the choice (10.17) of $t_{k-1}$. Now, for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, k - 2$

$$\langle r^{(k)}, v^{(j)} \rangle = \langle r^{(k-1)}, v^{(j)} \rangle - t_{k-1} \langle v^{(j)}, A v^{(k-1)} \rangle = 0, \quad (10.39)$$

where the first term is zero because of the induction hypothesis and the second term is zero because the search directions are conjugate. \[\square\]

Combining Theorems 10.1 and 10.2 we get the following important conclusion.

**Theorem 10.3.** If the search directions, $v^{(0)}, v^{(1)}, \ldots, v^{(k-1)}$ are conjugate (with respect to $A$) then $x^{(k)} = x^{(k-1)} + t_{k-1} v^{(k-1)}$ is the minimizer of $\|x - \bar{x}\|_A^2$ over $x^{(0)} + V_k$.

10.3.1 Generating the Conjugate Search Directions

The conjugate gradient method, due to Hestenes and Stiefel, is an ingenious approach to generating efficiently the set of conjugate search directions. The idea is to modify the negative gradient direction, $r^{(k)}$, by adding information about the previous search direction, $v^{(k-1)}$. Specifically, we start with

$$v^{(k)} = r^{(k)} + s_k v^{(k-1)}, \quad (10.40)$$

where the scalar $s_k$ is chosen so that $v^{(k)}$ is conjugate to $v^{(k-1)}$ with respect to $A$, i.e.

$$0 = \langle v^{(k)}, A v^{(k-1)} \rangle = \langle r^{(k)}, A v^{(k-1)} \rangle + s_k \langle v^{(k-1)}, A v^{(k-1)} \rangle \quad (10.41)$$

which gives

$$s_k = -\frac{\langle r^{(k)}, A v^{(k-1)} \rangle}{\langle v^{(k-1)}, A v^{(k-1)} \rangle}. \quad (10.42)$$

Magically this simple construction renders all the search directions conjugate and the residuals orthogonal!
Theorem 10.4.

(a) $\langle r^{(i)}, r^{(j)} \rangle = 0, \ i \neq j.$
(b) $\langle v^{(i)}, Av^{(j)} \rangle = 0, \ i \neq j.$

Proof. By the choice of $t_k$ and $s_k$ it follows that

$$\langle r^{(k+1)}, r^{(k)} \rangle = 0, \quad (10.43)$$
$$\langle v^{(k+1)}, Av^{(k)} \rangle = 0, \quad (10.44)$$

for $k = 0, 1, \ldots$ Let us now proceed by induction. We know $\langle r^{(1)}, r^{(0)} \rangle = 0$ and $\langle v^{(1)}, v^{(0)} \rangle = 0$. Suppose $\langle r^{(i)}, r^{(j)} \rangle = 0$ and $\langle v^{(i)}, Av^{(j)} \rangle = 0$ holds for $0 \leq j < i \leq k$. We need to prove that this holds also for $0 \leq j < i \leq k + 1$.

In view of (10.43) and (10.44) we can assume $j < k$.

Now,

$$\langle r^{(k+1)}, r^{(j)} \rangle = \langle r^{(k)} - t_k Av^{(k)}, r^{(j)} \rangle = \langle r^{(k)}, r^{(j)} \rangle - t_k \langle r^{(j)}, Av^{(k)} \rangle = -t_k \langle r^{(j)}, Av^{(k)} \rangle,$$

where we have used the induction hypothesis on the orthogonality of the residuals for the last equality. But $v^{(j)} = r^{(j)} + s_j v^{(j-1)}$ and so $r^{(j)} = v^{(j)} - s_j v^{(j-1)}$. Thus,

$$\langle r^{(k+1)}, r^{(j)} \rangle = -t_k \langle v^{(j)} - s_j v^{(j-1)}, Av^{(k)} \rangle = -t_k \langle v^{(j)}, Av^{(k)} \rangle + t_k s_j \langle v^{(j-1)}, Av^{(k)} \rangle = 0, \quad (10.46)$$

Also for $j < k$

$$\langle v^{(k+1)}, Av^{(j)} \rangle = \langle r^{(k+1)} + s_{k+1} v^{(k)}, Av^{(j)} \rangle = \langle r^{(k+1)}, Av^{(j)} \rangle + s_{k+1} \langle v^{(k)}, Av^{(j)} \rangle = \langle r^{(k+1)}, \frac{1}{t_j} (r^{(j)} - r^{(j+1)}) \rangle = \frac{1}{t_j} \langle r^{(k+1)}, r^{(j)} \rangle - \frac{1}{t_j} \langle r^{(k+1)}, r^{(j+1)} \rangle = 0, \quad (10.47)$$
The conjugate gradient method is completely specified by \((10.11), (10.17), (10.40), (10.42)\). We are now going to do some algebra to get computationally better formulas for \(t_k\) and \(s_k\).

Recall that
\[
 t_k = \frac{\langle v^{(k)}, r^{(k)} \rangle}{\langle v^{(k)}, Av^{(k)} \rangle}.
\]

Now,
\[
 \langle v^{(k)}, r^{(k)} \rangle = \langle r^{(k)} + s_k v^{(k-1)}, r^{(k)} \rangle \\
 = \langle r^{(k)}, r^{(k)} \rangle + s_k \langle v^{(k-1)}, r^{(k)} \rangle = \langle r^{(k)}, r^{(k)} \rangle.
\]

Therefore
\[
 t_k = \frac{\langle r^{(k)}, r^{(k)} \rangle}{\langle r^{(k)}, Ar^{(k)} \rangle}. \tag{10.49}
\]

Let us now work with the numerator of \(s_{k+1}\), the inner product \(\langle r^{(k+1)}, Av^{(k)} \rangle\).

First recall that \(r^{(k+1)} = r^{(k)} - t_k Av^{(k)}\) and so \(t_k Av^{(k)} = r^{(k)} - r^{(k+1)}\). Therefore,
\[
 -\langle r^{(k+1)}, Av^{(k)} \rangle = \frac{1}{t_k} \langle r^{(k+1)}, r^{(k+1)} - r^{(k)} \rangle = \frac{1}{t_k} \langle r^{(k+1)}, r^{(k+1)} \rangle. \tag{10.50}
\]

And for the denominator, we have
\[
 \langle v^{(k)}, Av^{(k)} \rangle = \frac{1}{t_k} \langle v^{(k)}, r^{(k)} - r^{(k+1)} \rangle \\
 = \frac{1}{t_k} \langle v^{(k)}, r^{(k)} \rangle - \frac{1}{t_k} \langle v^{(k)}, r^{(k+1)} \rangle \\
 = \frac{1}{t_k} \langle r^{(k)} + s_k v^{(k-1)}, r^{(k)} \rangle \\
 = \frac{1}{t_k} \langle r^{(k)}, r^{(k)} \rangle + \frac{s_k}{t_k} \langle v^{(k-1)}, r^{(k)} \rangle = \frac{1}{t_k} \langle r^{(k)}, r^{(k)} \rangle. \tag{10.51}
\]

Thus, we can write
\[
 s_{k+1} = \frac{\langle r^{(k+1)}, r^{(k+1)} \rangle}{\langle r^{(k)}, r^{(k)} \rangle}. \tag{10.52}
\]

A pseudo-code for the conjugate gradient method is given in Algorithm 10.1. The main cost per iteration of the conjugate gradient method is the evaluation of \(Av^{(k)}\). If \(A\) is sparse then this product of \(a\) and a vector can be done
cheaply by avoiding to operate with the zeros of $A$. For example, for matrix in the solution of Poisson’s equation in 2D \[(9.76)\], the cost of computing $Av^{(k)}$ is just $O(n)$, where $n = N^2$ is the total number of unknowns.

\textbf{Algorithm 10.1} The conjugate gradient Method

1: Given $x^{(0)}$ and TOL, set $r^{(0)} = b - Ax^{(0)}$, $v^{(0)} = r^{(0)}$, and $k = 0$.
2: \textbf{while} $\|r^{(k)}\|_2 > \text{TOL}$ \textbf{do}
3: \hspace{1cm} $t_k \leftarrow \langle r^{(k)}, r^{(k)} \rangle / \langle v^{(k)}, Av^{(k)} \rangle$
4: \hspace{1cm} $x^{(k+1)} \leftarrow x^{(k)} + t_kv^{(k)}$
5: \hspace{1cm} $r^{(k+1)} \leftarrow r^{(k)} - t_kAv^{(k)}$
6: \hspace{1cm} $s_{k+1} \leftarrow \langle r^{(k+1)}, r^{(k+1)} \rangle / \langle r^{(k)}, r^{(k)} \rangle$
7: \hspace{1cm} $v^{(k+1)} \leftarrow r^{(k+1)} + s_{k+1}v^{(k)}$
8: \hspace{1cm} $k \leftarrow k + 1$
9: \textbf{end while}

\textbf{Theorem 10.5.} Let $A$ be an $n \times n$ symmetric positive definite matrix, then the conjugate gradient method converges to the exact solution (assuming no round-off errors) of $Ax = b$ in at most $n$ steps.

\textit{Proof.} By Theorem \[10.4\] the residuals are orthogonal hence linearly independent. After $n$ steps, $r^{(n)}$ is orthogonal to $r^{(0)}, r^{(1)}, \ldots, r^{(n-1)}$. Since the dimension of the space is $n$, $r^{(n)}$ has to be the zero vector. \qed

\section{10.4 Krylov Subspaces}

In the conjugate gradient method we start with an initial guess $x^{(0)}$, compute the residual $r^{(0)} = b - Ax^{(0)}$ and set $v^{(0)} = r^{(0)}$. We then get $x^{(1)} = x^{(0)} + t_0r^{(0)}$
and evaluate the residual \( r^{(1)} \), etc. If we use the definition of the residual we have

\[
r^{(1)} = b - Ax^{(1)} = b - Ax^{(0)} - t_0 Am^{(0)} = r^{(0)} - t_0 Ar^{(0)}
\]

so that \( r^{(1)} \) is a linear combination of \( r^{(0)} \) and \( Ar^{(0)} \). Similarly,

\[
x^{(2)} = x^{(1)} + t_1 v^{(1)}
\]

\[
= x^{(0)} + t_0 r^{(0)} + t_1 r^{(1)} + t_1 s_0 r^{(0)}
\]

\[
= x^{(0)} + (t_0 + t_1 s_0) r^{(0)} + t_1 r^{(1)}
\]

so that \( r^{(2)} = b - Ax^{(2)} \) is a linear combination of \( r^{(0)} \), \( Ar^{(0)} \), and \( A^2 r^{(0)} \) and so on.

**Definition 10.2.** The set \( \mathcal{K}_k(r^{(0)}, A) = \text{span}\{r^{(0)}, Ar^{(0)}, ..., A^{k-1}r^{(0)}\} \) is called the Krylov subspace of degree \( k \) for \( r^{(0)} \).

Krylov subspaces are central to an important class of numerical methods that rely on getting approximations through matrix-vector multiplication like the conjugate gradient method.

The following theorem provides a reinterpretation of the conjugate gradient method. The approximation \( x^{(k)} \) is the minimizer of \( \|x - \overline{x}\|^2_\lambda \) over \( \mathcal{K}_k(r^{(0)}, A) \).

**Theorem 10.6.** \( \mathcal{K}_k(r^{(0)}, A) = \text{span}\{r^{(0)}, ..., r^{(k-1)}\} = \text{span}\{v^{(0)}, ..., v^{(k-1)}\} \).

**Proof.** We will proof it by induction. The case \( k = 1 \) by construction. Let us now assume that it holds for \( k \) and we will prove that it also holds for \( k + 1 \).

By the induction hypothesis \( r^{(k)}, v^{(k-1)} \in \mathcal{K}_k(r^{(0)}, A) \) then

\[
Av^{(k-1)} \in \text{span}\{Ar^{(0)}, ..., A^{k-1}r^{(0)}\}
\]

but \( r^{(k)} = r^{(k-1)} - t_{k-1} Av^{(k-1)} \) and so

\[
r^{(k)} \in \mathcal{K}_{k+1}(r^{(0)}, A).
\]

Consequently,

\[
\text{span}\{r^{(0)}, ..., r^{(k)}\} \subseteq \mathcal{K}_{k+1}(r^{(0)}, A).
\]

We now prove the reverse inclusion,

\[
\text{span}\{r^{(0)}, ..., r^{(k)}\} \supseteq \mathcal{K}_{k+1}(r^{(0)}, A).
\]
Note that \( A^k r^{(0)} = A(A^{k-1} r^{(0)}) \). But by the induction hypothesis

\[
\text{span}\{r^{(0)}, Ar^{(0)}, \ldots, A^{k-1} r^{(0)}\} = \text{span}\{v^{(0)}, \ldots, v^{(k-1)}\}.
\]

Given that

\[
A^k r^{(0)} = A(A^{k-1} r^{(0)}) \in \text{span}\{Av^{(0)}, \ldots, Av^{(k-1)}\}
\]

and since

\[
Av^{(j)} = \frac{1}{t_j} (r^{(j)} - r^{(j+1)})
\]

it follows that

\[
A^k r^{(0)} \in \text{span}\{r^{(0)}, r^{(1)}, \ldots, r^{(k)}\}.
\]

Thus,

\[
\text{span}\{r^{(0)}, \ldots, r^{(k)}\} = \mathcal{K}_{k+1}(r^{(0)}, A).
\]

For the last equality we observe that \( \text{span}\{v^{(0)}, \ldots, v^{(k)}\} = \text{span}\{v^{(0)}, v^{(k)}, r^{(k)}\} \) because \( v^{(k)} = r^{(k)} + s_k v^{(k-1)} \) and by the induction hypothesis

\[
\text{span}\{v^{(0)}, \ldots, v^{(k)}, r^{(k)}\} = \text{span}\{r^{(0)}, Ar^{(0)}, \ldots, A^k r^{(0)}, r^{(k)}\} = \text{span}\{r^{(0)}, r^{(1)}, \ldots, r^{(k)}, r^{(k)}\} = \mathcal{K}_{k+1}(r^{(0)}, A).
\] (10.55)

\[\square\]

### 10.5 Convergence of the Conjugate Gradient Method

Let us define the initial error as \( e^{(0)} = x^{(0)} - \bar{x} \). Then \( Ae^{(0)} = Ax^{(0)} - A\bar{x} \) implies that

\[
r^{(0)} = -Ae^{(0)}.
\] (10.56)

For the conjugate gradient method \( x^{(k)} \in x^{(0)} + \mathcal{K}_k(r^{(0)}, A) \) and in view of (10.56) we have that

\[
x^{(k)} - \bar{x} = e^{(0)} + c_1 Ae^{(0)} + c_2 A^2 e^{(0)} + \cdots + c_k A^k e^{(0)},
\] (10.57)
10.5. CONVERGENCE OF THE CONJUGATE GRADIENT METHOD

for some real constants $c_1, \ldots, c_k$. In fact,

$$\|x^{(k)} - \bar{x}\|_A = \min_{p \in \tilde{P}_k} \|p(A)e^{(0)}\|_A,$$

(10.58)

where $\tilde{P}_k$ is the set of all polynomials of degree $\leq k$ and that are equal
to one at 0. Since $A$ is symmetric positive definite all its eigenvalues are
real and positive. Let’s order them as $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_n$, with
associated orthonormal eigenvectors $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$. Then, we can write $e^{(0)} = \alpha_1 v_1 + \ldots + \alpha_n v_n$ for some scalars $\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n$ and

$$p(A)e^{(0)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} p(\lambda_j) \alpha_j v_j.$$  

(10.59)

Therefore,

$$\|p(A)e^{(0)}\|_A^2 = \langle p(A)e^{(0)}, Ap(A)e^{(0)} \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{n} p^2(\lambda_j) \lambda_j \alpha_j^2$$

and since

$$\|e^{(0)}\|_A^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j \alpha_j^2$$

(10.61)

we get

$$\|e^{(k)}\|_A \leq \min_{p \in \tilde{P}_k} \max_j |p(\lambda_j)| \|e^{(0)}\|_A.$$  

(10.62)

The min max term can be estimated using the Chebyshev polynomial $T_k$
with the change of variables

$$f(\lambda) = \frac{2\lambda - \lambda_1 - \lambda_n}{\lambda_n - \lambda_1}$$

(10.63)

to map $[\lambda_1, \lambda_n]$ to $[-1, 1]$. The polynomial

$$p(\lambda) = \frac{1}{T_k(f(0))} T_k(f(\lambda))$$

(10.64)
is in \( \tilde{P}_k \) and since \( |Tk(f(\lambda))| \leq 1 \)

\[
\max_j |p(\lambda_j)| = \frac{1}{|Tk(f(0))|}.
\]  

(10.65)

Now

\[
|Tk(f(0))| = \left| Tk \left( \frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_n}{\lambda_n - \lambda_1} \right) \right| = \left| Tk \left( \frac{\lambda_n / \lambda_1 + 1}{\lambda_n / \lambda_1 - 1} \right) \right| = \left| Tk \left( \frac{\kappa_2(A) + 1}{\kappa_2(A) - 1} \right) \right|
\]

(10.66)

because \( \kappa_2(A) = \lambda_n / \lambda_1 \) is the condition number of \( A \) in the 2-norm. Now we use an identity of Chebyshev polynomials, namely if \( x = (z + 1/z)/2 \) then \( T_k(x) = (z^k + 1/z^k)/2 \). Noting that

\[
\frac{\kappa_2(A) + 1}{\kappa_2(A) - 1} = \frac{1}{2}(z + 1/z)
\]

(10.67)

for

\[
z = (\sqrt{\kappa_2(A)} + 1)/(\sqrt{\kappa_2(A)} - 1)
\]

(10.68)

we obtain

\[
\left| Tk \left( \frac{\kappa_2(A) + 1}{\kappa_2(A) - 1} \right) \right|^{-1} \leq 2 \left( \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_2(A)} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa_2(A)} + 1} \right)^k.
\]

(10.69)

Thus we get the upper bound error estimate for the error in the conjugate gradient method:

\[
\|e^{(k)}\|_A \leq 2 \left( \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_2(A)} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa_2(A)} + 1} \right)^k \|e^{(0)}\|_A.
\]

(10.70)
Chapter 11

Eigenvalue Problems

In this chapter we take a brief look at two numerical methods for the standard eigenvalue problem, i.e. of finding eigenvalues $\lambda$ and eigenvectors $v$ of an $n \times n$ matrix $A$. One is a simple iteration for finding a dominant eigenvalue of a matrix (the power method) and the other is a much more expensive iteration for finding all the eigenvalues of general matrix (the QR method). Both iterations can be accelerated by doing a suitable (inverse) shift. Special orthogonal transformations, known as Householder reflections play an important role in several of the most commonly used eigenvalue and SVD methods. Thus, we devote a section to them and their use to obtain the QR factorization employed by the QR method for eigenvalues.

11.1 The Power Method

Suppose that $A$ has a dominant eigenvalue:

$$|\lambda_1| > |\lambda_2| \geq \cdots \geq |\lambda_n|$$  \hspace{1cm} (11.1)

and a complete set of eigenvector $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ associated to $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$, respectively. Then, each vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ can be written in terms of the eigenvectors as

$$v = c_1 v_1 + \cdots + c_n v_n$$  \hspace{1cm} (11.2)

and

$$A^k v = c_1 \lambda_1^k v_1 + \cdots + c_n \lambda_n^k v_n = c_1 \lambda_1^k \left[ v_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{n} \frac{c_j}{c_1} \left( \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_1} \right)^k v_j \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (11.3)
Therefore \( A^k v/c_1 \lambda_1^k \rightarrow v_1 \) and we get a method to determine \( v_1 \) and \( \lambda_1 \). To avoid overflow we normalize the approximating vector at each iteration as Algorithm 11.1 shows. The rate of convergence of the power method is determined by the ratio \( \lambda_2/\lambda_1 \). From (11.3), \( |\lambda^{(k)} - \lambda| = O(|\lambda_2/\lambda_1|^k) \), where \( \lambda^{(k)} \) is the approximation to \( \lambda_1 \) at the \( k \)-th iteration.

The power method is useful and efficient for computing the dominant eigenpair \( \lambda_1, v_1 \) when \( A \) is sparse, so that the evaluation of \( Av \) is economical, and when \( |\lambda_2/\lambda_1| << 1 \).

One can use shifts in the matrix \( A \) to decrease \( |\lambda_2/\lambda_1| \) and improve convergence. We apply the power method with the shifted matrix \( A - sI \), where the shift \( s \) is chosen to accelerated convergence. For example, suppose \( A \) is symmetric and has eigenvalues 100, 90, 50, 40, 30, 30 the matrix \( A - 60I \) has eigenvalues 40, 30, -10, -20, -30, -30 and the power method would converge at a rate of 30/40 = 0.75 instead of a rate of 90/100 = 0.9.

A variant of the shift power method is the inverse power method, which applies the iteration to the matrix \( (A - sI)^{-1} \). The inverse is not actually computed; instead the linear system \( (A - sI)v^{(k)} = v^{(k-1)} \) is solved at every iteration. The method will converge to the eigenvalue \( \lambda_j \) for which \( |\lambda_j - s| \) is the smallest and so with an appropriate choice for \( s \) it is possible to converge to each of the eigenpairs of \( A \).

### 11.2 Householder Reflections and QR

One of the most general methods for finding eigenvalues is the QR method, which makes repeated use of QR factorizations. Thus, before we describe this eigenvalue method (next section) it is appropriate to present first a stable
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method to obtain the QR factorization of an \( m \times n \) matrix \( A \). To this effect, we choose the method of Householder, which is based on the observation that one can reduce \( A \) to an upper triangular form by applying a sequence of elementary, orthogonal transformations of the type made precise in the following definition.

**Definition 11.1.** Let \( v \in \mathbb{R}^n, v \neq 0 \), a Householder reflection is an \( n \times n \) matrix of the form

\[
P = I - 2 \frac{vv^T}{\langle v, v \rangle}.
\]

Note that \( P \) is a symmetric and orthogonal matrix, i.e. \( P^T = P \) and \( P^T P = I \). Orthogonal matrices preserve the 2-norm:

\[
\langle Pu, Pu \rangle = \langle P^T Pu, u \rangle = \langle u, u \rangle.
\]

Thus,

\[
\|Pu\| = \|u\|.
\]

Moreover, \( Pv = -v \) and \( Pu = 0 \) for all \( u \) orthogonal to \( v \). Therefore, \( Pu \) may be interpreted as the reflection of \( u \) across the hyperplane with normal \( v \), \( \text{span}\{v\}^\perp = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle v, w \rangle = 0\} \). Since the eigenvalues of \( P \) are 1 (with eigenvectors in \( \text{span}\{v\} \), with multiplicity 1) and 0 (with eigenvectors in \( \text{span}\{v\}^\perp \), with multiplicity \( n - 1 \)) the determinant of \( P \) is -1.

The central idea is to find a Householder reflection that turns a given, nonzero vector \( a \in \mathbb{R}^n \) into a multiple of \( e_1 = [1, 0, \ldots, 0] \in \mathbb{R}^n \). That is, we want \( v \) such that \( Pa = \gamma e_1 \), for some \( \gamma \in \mathbb{R} \), which implies \( v \in \text{span}\{e_1, a\} \).

Writing \( v = a + \alpha e_1 \) we have

\[
Pa = a - 2 \frac{\langle v, a \rangle}{\langle v, v \rangle} v = \left[ 1 - 2 \frac{\langle v, a \rangle}{\langle v, v \rangle} \right] a - 2\alpha \frac{\langle v, a \rangle}{\langle v, v \rangle} e_1.
\]

Thus, we need

\[
2\alpha \frac{\langle v, a \rangle}{\langle v, v \rangle} = 1.
\]

But

\[
\langle v, a \rangle = \langle a, a \rangle + \alpha a_1,
\]

\[
\langle v, v \rangle = \langle a, a \rangle + 2\alpha a_1 + \alpha^2.
\]
Consequently, (11.8) implies
\[ 2 \langle a, a \rangle + \alpha a_1 = \langle a, a \rangle + 2\alpha a_1 + \alpha^2. \]  
(11.11)
from which it follows \( \alpha^2 = \langle a, a \rangle. \) Therefore, \( \alpha = \pm \|a\| \) and
\[ v = a \pm \|a\| e_1, \]  
(11.12)
\[ Pa = \mp \|a\| e_1. \]  
(11.13)
Note that we have a choice of a sign for \( v \). To avoid dividing by a possibly small \( \langle v, v \rangle \) when applying \( P \), we select the sign in front of the \( \|a\| e_1 \) term in \( v \) as follows
\[ v = \begin{cases} 
  a + \|a\| e_1 & \text{if } a_1 > 0, \\
  a - \|a\| e_1 & \text{if } a_1 < 0.
\end{cases} \]  
(11.14)

Example 11.1. Let \( a = [-2, 2, 1, 4]^T \). Then, \( \|a\| = 5 \) and
\[ v = a - \|a\| e_1 = [-7, 2, 1, 4]^T. \]  
(11.15)
(11.16)
Let’s verify that \( Pa = \|a\| e_1 = 5e_1 \):
\[ Pa = \begin{pmatrix} -2 \\
 2 \\
 1 \\
 4 \\
 \end{pmatrix} - 2 \frac{35}{70} \begin{pmatrix} -7 \\
 2 \\
 1 \\
 4 \\
 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 5 \\
 0 \\
 0 \\
 0 \\
 \end{pmatrix}. \]  
(11.17)

We now describe the Householder procedure, which is very similar to Gaussian elimination. Let \( A \) be an \( m \times n \). We assume here \( m \geq n \) and \( A \) full rank (dimension of column space equal to \( n \)). First, we transform the matrix \( A \) so that its first column \( a_1 \) becomes a multiple of \( e_1 \) by using the Householder reflection \( P_1 = I - 2v_1v_1^T/\langle v_1, v_1 \rangle \), where
\[ v_1 = a_1 + \text{sign}(a_{11})\|a_1\| e_1. \]  
(11.18)
That is,
\[ P_1 A = \begin{pmatrix} * & * & \cdots & * \\
 0 & x & \cdots & x \\
 \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
 0 & x & \cdots & x \\
 \end{pmatrix}. \]  
(11.19)
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Now, we repeat the process for the $(m - 1) \times (n - 1)$ block marked with x’s, etc. After $n$ steps, we obtain the $m \times n$ upper triangular matrix

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} r_{11} & \cdots & r_{12} \\
0 & \ddots & \vdots \\
\vdots & \ddots & r_{nn} \\
0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (11.20)$$

If we let $A^{(0)} = A$, we can view mathematically the step $j$ of this process as

$$A^{(j)} = P_jA^{(j-1)}, \quad (11.21)$$

where $P_j$ is the $m \times m$ orthogonal matrix

$$P_j = \begin{bmatrix} I_{j-1} & 0 \\
0 & \tilde{P}_j \end{bmatrix}. \quad (11.22)$$

Here $I_{j-1}$ is the identity matrix of size $(j - 1) \times (j - 1)$, the zeros stand for zero blocks, and $\tilde{P}_j$ is the $(m - j + 1) \times (m - j + 1)$ Householder matrix needed at this step. Thus, we get

$$P_n \cdots P_1 A = R. \quad (11.23)$$

Noting that $P_n \cdots P_1$ is orthogonal and setting $Q = P_1 \cdots P_n$ we get $A = QR$.

We now discuss implementation. In actual computations, the Householder matrices are never form. We instead compute their effect taking into account their particular structure as a rank-one modification to the identity matrix. For example, to evaluate $Pu$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we first compute

$$\beta = \frac{2}{\langle v, v \rangle} = \left(\|a\|^2 + \|a\| |a_1|\right)^{-1}, \quad (11.24)$$

the inner product $\langle u, v \rangle$, and set

$$Pu = u - \beta \langle u, v \rangle v. \quad (11.25)$$
Similarly, when we need to apply a Householder transformation to a matrix $A$ we do

$$\beta = \frac{2}{\langle v, v \rangle},$$

$$w = \beta A^T v,$$

$$PA = A - vw^T,$$

i.e. first we compute the vector $w$ and then we modify $A$ with the outer product $-vw^T$. Note that the latter is simply the matrix with entries $-v_iw_j$. Thus, this is much more economical than computing the full matrix product.

During the QR Householder procedure, if memory is an issue, the lower triangular part of $A$ could be overwritten to store the vectors $v_j$’s which define each of the employed Householder transformations. However, there is not enough space to store all the components of each $v$ because for $v_j$ we need $m-j+1$ array entries and we only have $m-j$ available. One approach to overcome this is to store the diagonal elements of $A^{(j)}$ is a separate one-dimensional array to free up the needed space to store the $v_j$’s. The Householder method is presented in pseudocode in Algorithm 11.2.

In applications, very often $Q^T f$ or $Qf$, for $f \in \mathbb{R}^n$, is needed instead of the full orthogonal matrix $Q$. Again, these products should be computed exploiting the simple structure of a Householder matrix. For example to compute $Q^T f = P_n \cdots P_1 f$ we apply repeatedly, for $j = 1, \ldots, n$, $f \leftarrow P_j f$. If needed, $Q = P_1 \cdots P_n$ can be computed similarly using repeatedly (11.26)-(11.28).

### 11.3 The QR Method for Eigenvalues

The most successful numerical method for the eigenvalue problem of a general square matrix $A$ is the QR method. It is based on the QR factorization of a matrix. Here $Q$ is a unitary (orthogonal in the real case) matrix and $R$ is upper triangular.

Given an $n \times n$ matrix $A$, we set $A_1 = A$, obtain its QR factorization

$$A_1 = Q_1 R_1$$

and define $A_2 = R_1Q_1$ so that

$$A_2 = R_1Q_1 = Q_1^*AQ_1,$$
Algorithm 11.2 Householder QR

function HV(a) ▷ Computes the Householder vector $v$
    Compute $\|a\|$ and set $v \leftarrow a$
    if $\|a\| \neq 0$ then
        $v[1] \leftarrow a[1] + \text{sign}(a[1])\|a\|$.
    end if
end function

function HPA(A, v) ▷ Performs $PA$
    $\beta \leftarrow 2/\langle v, v \rangle$
    $w \leftarrow \beta A^T v$
    $A \leftarrow A - wv^T$
end function

function HQR(A) ▷ Householder’s QR factorization, $m \geq n$
    for $j = 1, \ldots, n$ do
        $v[j : m] \leftarrow \text{HV}(A[j : m, j])$
        $A[j : m, j : n] \leftarrow \text{HPA}(A[j : m, j : n], v[j : m])$
        $r[j] \leftarrow A[j, j]$ ▷ Store the diagonal to free up space for $v_j$
        $A[j : m, j] \leftarrow v[j : m]$ ▷ Store $v_j$ in the lower triangular part of $A$
    end for
end function
etc. The $k+1$-st similar matrix is generated by

$$A_{k+1} = R_k Q_k = Q_k^* A_k Q_k = (Q_1 \cdots Q_k)^* A (Q_1 \cdots Q_k).$$

(11.31)

It can be proved that if $A$ is diagonalizable and with distinct eigenvalues in modulus then the sequence of matrices $A_k$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ produced by the QR method will converge to a diagonal matrix with the eigenvalues of $A$ on the diagonal. There is no convergence proof for a general matrix $A$ but the method is remarkably robust and fast to converge.

**Example 11.2.** Consider the matrix the $5 \times 5$ matrix

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 12 & 13 & 10 & 7 & 7 \\ 13 & 18 & 9 & 8 & 15 \\ 10 & 9 & 10 & 4 & 12 \\ 7 & 8 & 4 & 4 & 6 \\ 7 & 15 & 12 & 6 & 18 \end{bmatrix}$$

(11.32)

the $A_{20} = R_{19} Q_{19}$ produced by the QR method gives the eigenvalues of $A$ within 4 digits of accuracy

$$A_{20} = \begin{bmatrix} 51.7281 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 \\ 0.0000 & 8.2771 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 \\ 0.0000 & 0.2077 & 4.6405 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 \\ 0.0000 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 & -2.8486 & 0.0000 \\ 0.0000 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 & 0.2028 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (11.33)$$

**11.4 Reductions Prior to Applying the QR Method.**

The QR method has remarkable applicability to general square matrices but it is computationally expensive. Each step in the iteration has an $O(n^3)$ cost for an $n \times n$ matrix. To decrease this high cost, in practice the method is only applied to matrices that has been already suitably reduced. Specifically, for a general $n \times n$ matrix $A$ we construct an orthogonal matrix $P$ such that
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$PTAP$ is an upper Hessenberg matrix which is a matrix of the form:

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
* & * & \cdots & \cdots & * \\
* & * & \cdots & \cdots & * \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & * & \cdots & \cdots & * \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & * & *
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(11.34)

or to a tridiagonal matrix if the original matrix is symmetric (or Hermitian). These pre-processing reductions make sense because the matrices $A_k$ (11.31) in each iteration of the $QR$ eigenvalue algorithm preserve the Hessenberg form. Moreover, the reductions can be effectively done via using Householder transformations. We go over next the procedure for a symmetric matrix. The reduction of a general square matrix to Hessenberg form is similar.

Given an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix $A$ we first consider the vector $a_1 := [a_{21}, \ldots, a_{n1}]^T$ and find a Householder transformation $\tilde{P}_1$ (from $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$) that renders $a_1$ a multiple of $e_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Note that by symmetry the same transformation can be produced on the first row by $a_1^T \tilde{P}_1$. Thus, if we define

$$
P_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & * & *
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(11.35)

Then (noting that $P_1^T = P_1$),

$$
P_1^T AP_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
* & * & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
* & x & \cdots & x \\
0 & x & \cdots & x \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
0 & x & \cdots & x
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

(11.36)

The same procedure can now be applied to the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ sub-matrix marked with x’s, etc. We can summarize the reduction as follows. Setting $A_1 = A$ we obtain

$$
A_{k+1} = P_k^T A_k P_k, \quad k = 1, \ldots, n - 2.
$$

(11.37)
Here, $P_k$ is the orthogonal matrix formed with the Householder transformation $\tilde{P}_k$ of the $k$-th step:

$$P_k = \begin{bmatrix} I_k & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{P}_k \end{bmatrix},$$

(11.38)

where $I_k$ is the $k \times k$ identity matrix and the zeros represents zero blocks of the corresponding size. After $n - 2$ steps the resulting matrix $A_{n-1}$ is tridiagonal.

Since

$$A_{k+1} = P_k^T A_k P_k = P_k^T P_{k-1}^T A_{k-1} P_{k-1} P_k$$

(11.39)

it follows that

$$A_{n-1} = P_{n-2}^T \cdots P_1^T A P_1 \cdots P_{n-2}.$$  

(11.40)

Moreover, symmetry implies that $P_{n-2}^T \cdots P_1^T = (P_1 \cdots P_{n-2})^T$. Thus, defining $P = P_1 \cdots P_{n-2}$ we obtain

$$A_{n-1} = P^T AP.$$  

(11.41)

To summarize, given a symmetric matrix $A$, there is an orthogonal and symmetric matrix $P$, constructed with Householder transformations, such that $P^T AP$ is tridiagonal.

For symmetric tridiagonal matrices there are also specialized algorithms to find a particular eigenvalue or set of eigenvalue, to any desired accuracy, located in a given interval by using bisection (e.g. the method of Givens).

Householder reflections are also used in the effective Golub-Reinsch method to compute the SVD of an $m \times n$ matrix ($m \geq n$). Rather than applying directly the $QR$ algorithm to $A^T A$, which could result in a loss of accuracy, this method uses Householder transformations to reduce $A$ to bidiagonal form. Then, the SVD of this bidiagonal matrix is obtain using other orthogonal transformations related to the $QR$ method with a shift.
Chapter 12

Non-Linear Equations

12.1 Introduction

In this chapter we consider the problem of finding zeros of a continuous function \( f \), i.e. solving \( f(x) = 0 \) for example \( e^x - x = 0 \) or a system of nonlinear equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
    f_1(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) &= 0, \\
    f_2(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) &= 0, \\
    &\vdots \\
    f_n(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) &= 0.
\end{align*}
\]  

(12.1)

We are going to write this generic system in vector form as

\[ f(x) = 0, \]  

(12.2)

where \( f : U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \). Unless otherwise noted the function \( f \) is assumed to be smooth in its domain \( U \).

We are going to start with the scalar case, \( n = 1 \) and look a very simple but robust method that relies only on the continuity of the function and the existence of a zero.

12.2 Bisection

Suppose we are interested in solving a nonlinear equation in one unknown

\[ f(x) = 0, \]  

(12.3)
where \( f \) is a continuous function on an interval \([a, b]\) and has at least one zero there.

Suppose that \( f \) has values of different sign at the end points of the interval, i.e.

\[
f(a)f(b) < 0.
\] (12.4)

By the Intermediate Value Theorem, \( f \) has at least one zero in \((a, b)\). To locate a zero we bisect the interval and check on which subinterval \( f \) changes sign. We repeat the process until we bracket a zero within a desired accuracy.

The Bisection algorithm to find a zero \( x^* \) is shown below.

---

**Algorithm 12.1 The Bisection Method**

1: Given \( f, a \) and \( b \) (\( a < b \)), \( TOL \), and \( N_{\text{max}} \), set \( k = 1 \) and do:

2: \textbf{while} \((b - a) > TOL\) and \( k \leq N_{\text{max}}\) \textbf{do}

3: \hspace{0.5cm} \( c = (a + b)/2 \)

4: \hspace{0.5cm} \textbf{if} \( f(c) == 0 \) \textbf{then}

5: \hspace{1cm} \( x^* = c \) \hspace{0.5cm} \triangleright \text{This is the solution}

6: \hspace{0.5cm} \textbf{stop}

7: \hspace{0.5cm} \textbf{end if}

8: \hspace{0.5cm} \textbf{if} \( \text{sign}(f(c)) == \text{sign}(f(a)) \) \textbf{then}

9: \hspace{1cm} \( a \leftarrow c \)

10: \hspace{0.5cm} \textbf{else}

11: \hspace{1cm} \( b \leftarrow c \)

12: \hspace{0.5cm} \textbf{end if}

13: \hspace{0.5cm} \( k \leftarrow k + 1 \)

14: \hspace{0.5cm} \textbf{end while}

15: \( x^* \leftarrow (a + b)/2 \)

---

### 12.2.1 Convergence of the Bisection Method

With the bisection method we generate a sequence

\[
c_k = \frac{a_k + b_k}{2}, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots
\] (12.5)
where each $a_k$ and $b_k$ are the endpoints of the subinterval we select at each bisection step (because $f$ changes sign there). Since

$$b_k - a_k = \frac{b - a}{2^{k-1}}, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots$$  \hfill (12.6)$$

and $c_k = \frac{a_k + b_k}{2}$ is the midpoint of the interval then

$$|c_k - x^*| \leq \frac{1}{2}(b_k - a_k) = \frac{b - a}{2^k}$$  \hfill (12.7)$$

and consequently $c_k \to x^*$, a zero of $f$ in $[a, b]$.

### 12.3 Rate of Convergence

We now define in precise terms the rate of convergence of a sequence of approximations to a value $x^*$.

**Definition 12.1.** Suppose a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to $x^*$ as $n \to \infty$. We say that $x_n \to x^*$ of order $p$ ($p \geq 1$) if there is a positive integer $N$ and a constant $C$ such that

$$|x_{n+1} - x^*| \leq C |x_n - x^*|^p, \quad \text{for all } n \geq N.$$  \hfill (12.8)$$

or equivalently

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{|x_{n+1} - x^*|}{|x_n - x^*|^p} = C.$$  \hfill (12.9)$$

$C < 1$ for $p = 1$.

**Example 12.1.** The sequence generated by the bisection method converges linearly to $x^*$ because

$$\frac{|c_{n+1} - x^*|}{|c_n - x^*|} \leq \frac{\frac{b-a}{2^{n+1}}}{\frac{b-a}{2^n}} = \frac{1}{2}.$$  \hfill (12.10)$$

Let’s examine the significance of the rate of convergence. Consider first, $p = 1$, linear convergence. Suppose

$$|x_{n+1} - x^*| \approx C|x_n - x^*|, \quad n \geq N.$$  \hfill (12.10)$$
Then
\[ |x_{N+1} - x^*| \approx C|x_N - x^*|, \]
\[ |x_{N+2} - x^*| \approx C|x_{N+1} - x^*| \approx C(C|x_N - x^*|) = C^2|x_N - x^*|. \]

Continuing this way we get
\[ |x_{N+k} - x^*| \approx C^k|x_N - x^*|, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots \quad (12.11) \]

and this is the reason of the requirement \( C < 1 \) for \( p = 1 \). If the error at the \( N \) step, \( |x_N - x^*| \), is small enough it will be reduced by a factor of \( C^k \) after \( k \) more steps. Setting \( C^k = 10^{-d_k} \), then the error \( |x_N - x^*| \) will be reduced approximately
\[ d_k = \left( \log_{10} \frac{1}{C} \right) k \quad (12.12) \]
digits.

Let us now do a similar analysis for \( p = 2 \), quadratic convergence. We have
\[ |x_{N+1} - x^*| \approx C|x_N - x^*|^2, \]
\[ |x_{N+2} - x^*| \approx C|x_{N+1} - x^*|^2 \approx C(C|x_N - x^*|^2)^2 = C^3|x_N - x^*|^4, \]
\[ |x_{N+3} - x^*| \approx C|x_{N+2} - x^*|^2 \approx C(C^3|x_N - x^*|^4)^2 = C^7|x_N - x^*|^8. \]

It is easy to prove by induction that
\[ |x_{N+k} - x^*| \approx C^{2^k-1}|x_N - x^*|^{2^k}, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots \quad (12.13) \]

To see how many digits of accuracy we gain in \( k \) steps beginning from \( x_N \), we write \( C^{2^k-1}|x_N - x^*|^{2^k} = 10^{-d_k}|x_N - x^*| \), and solving for \( d_k \) we get
\[ d_k = \left( \log_{10} \frac{1}{C} + \log_{10} \frac{1}{|x_N - x^*|} \right) (2^k - 1). \quad (12.14) \]

It is not difficult to prove that for the general \( p > 1 \) and as \( k \to \infty \) we get \( d_k = \alpha_p p^k \), where \( \alpha_p = \frac{1}{p-1} \log_{10} \frac{1}{C} + \log_{10} \frac{1}{|x_N - x^*|} \).
12.4 Interpolation-Based Methods

Assuming again that \( f \) is a continuous function in \([a, b]\) and \( f(a)f(b) < 0 \) we can proceed as in the bisection method but instead of using the midpoint \( c = \frac{a+b}{2} \) to subdivide the interval in question we could use the root of linear polynomial interpolating \((a, f(a))\) and \((b, f(b))\). This is called the method of false position. Unfortunately, this method only converges linearly and under stronger assumptions than the Bisection Method.

An alternative approach to use interpolation to obtain numerical methods for \( f(x) = 0 \) is to proceed as follows: Given \( m + 1 \) approximations to the zero of \( f \), \( x_0, \ldots, x_m \), construct the interpolating polynomial of \( f \), \( p_m \), at those points, and set the root of \( p_m \) closest to \( x_m \) as the new approximation to the zero of \( f \). In practice, only \( m = 1, 2 \) are used. The method for \( m = 1 \) is called the Secant method and we will look at it in some detail later. The method for \( m = 2 \) is called Muller’s Method.

12.5 Newton’s Method

If the function \( f \) is smooth, say at least \( C^2[a, b] \), and we have already a good approximation \( x_0 \) to a zero \( x^* \) of \( f \) then the tangent line of \( f \) at \( x_0 \),

\[
y = f(x_0) + f'(x_0)(x - x_0)
\]

provides a good approximation to \( f \) in a small neighborhood of \( x_0 \), i.e.

\[
f(x) \approx f(x_0) + f'(x_0)(x - x_0).
\]

(12.15)

Then we can define the next approximation as the zero of that tangent line, i.e.

\[
x_1 = x_0 - \frac{f(x_0)}{f'(x_0)},
\]

(12.16)

e tc. At the \( k \) step or iteration we get the new approximation \( x_{k+1} \) according to:

\[
x_{k+1} = x_k - \frac{f(x_k)}{f'(x_k)}, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots
\]

(12.17)

This iteration is called Newton’s method or Newton-Raphson’s method. There are some conditions for this method to work and converge. But when it does
converge it does it at least quadratically. Indeed, a Taylor expansion of \( f \) around \( x_k \) gives

\[
f(x) = f(x_k) + f'(x_k)(x - x_k) + \frac{1}{2}f''(\xi_k)(x - x_k)^2,
\]

(12.18)

where \( \xi_k \) is a point between \( x \) and \( x_k \). Evaluating at \( x = x^* \) and using that \( f(x^*) = 0 \) we get

\[
0 = f(x_k) + f'(x_k)(x^* - x_k) + \frac{1}{2}f''(\xi_k)(x^* - x_k)^2,
\]

(12.19)

which we can recast as

\[
x^* = x_k - \frac{f(x_k)}{f'(x_k)} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{f''(\xi_k)}{f'(x_k)}(x^* - x_k)^2 = x_{k+1} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{f''(\xi_k)}{f'(x_k)}(x^* - x_k)^2.
\]

(12.20)

Thus,

\[
|x_{k+1} - x^*| = \frac{1}{2}\frac{|f''(\xi_k)|}{|f'(x_k)|}|x_k - x^*|^2.
\]

(12.21)

So if the sequence \( \{x_k\}_{k=0}^\infty \) generated by Newton’s method converges then it does so at least quadratically.

**Theorem 12.1.** Let \( x^* \) be a simple zero of \( f \) (i.e. \( f(x^*) = 0 \) and \( f'(x^*) \neq 0 \)) and suppose \( f \in C^2 \). Then there’s a neighborhood \( I_\epsilon \) of \( x^* \) such that Newton’s method converges to \( x^* \) for any initial guess in \( I_\epsilon \).

**Proof.** Since \( f' \) is continuous and \( f'(x^*) \neq 0 \) we can choose \( \epsilon > 0 \), sufficiently small so that \( f'(x) \neq 0 \) for all \( x \) such that \( |x - x^*| \leq \epsilon \) (this is \( I_\epsilon \)) and that \( \epsilon M(\epsilon) < 1 \) where

\[
M(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\max_{x \in I_\epsilon} |f''(x)|}{\min_{x \in I_\epsilon} |f'(x)|}.
\]

This is possible because \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} M(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{|f''(x^*)|}{|f'(x^*)|} < +\infty \).

The condition \( \epsilon M(\epsilon) < 1 \) allows us to guarantee that \( x^* \) is the only zero of \( f \) in \( I_\epsilon \), as we show now. A Taylor expansion of \( f \) around \( x^* \) gives

\[
f(x) = f(x^*) + f'(x^*)(x - x^*) + \frac{1}{2}f''(\xi)(x - x^*)^3
\]

\[
= f'(x^*)(x - x^*) \left( 1 + (x - x^*) \frac{1}{2} \frac{f''(\xi)}{f'(x^*)} \right),
\]

(12.22)
and since
\[ |(x - x^*) \frac{\frac{1}{2} f''(\xi)}{f'(x^*)}| = |x - x^*| \frac{\frac{1}{2} |f''(\xi)|}{|f'(x^*)|} \leq \epsilon M(\epsilon) < 1 \] (12.23)

\( f(x) \neq 0 \) for all \( x \in I_\epsilon \) unless \( x = x^* \). We will now show that Newton’s iteration is well defined starting from any initial guess \( x_0 \in I_\epsilon \). We prove this by induction. From (12.21) with \( k = 0 \) it follow that \( x_1 \in I_\epsilon \) as
\[ |x_1 - x^*| = |x_0 - x| \frac{\frac{1}{2} f''(\xi_0)}{f'(x_0)} \leq \epsilon^2 M(\epsilon) \leq \epsilon. \] (12.24)

Now assume that \( x_k \in I_\epsilon \) then again from (12.21)
\[ |x_{k+1} - x^*| = |x_k - x| \frac{\frac{1}{2} f''(\xi_k)}{f'(x_k)} \leq \epsilon^2 M(\epsilon) < \epsilon \] (12.25)

so \( x_{k+1} \in I_\epsilon \). Now,
\[ |x_{k+1} - x^*| \leq |x_k - x^*| M(\epsilon) = |x_k - x^*| \epsilon M(\epsilon) \]
\[ \leq |x_{k-1} - x^*| (\epsilon M(\epsilon))^2 \]
\[ \vdots \]
\[ \leq |x_0 - x^*| (\epsilon M(\epsilon))^{k+1} \]

and since \( \epsilon M(\epsilon) < 1 \) it follows that \( x_k \to x^* \) as \( k \to \infty \).

The need for a good initial guess \( x_0 \) for Newton’s method should be emphasized. In practice, this is obtained with another method, like bisection.

### 12.6 The Secant Method

Sometimes it could be computationally expensive or not possible to evaluate the derivative of \( f \). The following method, known as the secant method, replaces the derivative by the secant:
\[ x_{k+1} = x_k - \frac{f(x_k)}{f(x_k) - f(x_{k-1})}, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots \] (12.26)
Note that since $f(x^*) = 0$

$$x_{k+1} - x^* = x_k - x^* - \frac{f(x_k) - f(x^*)}{f(x_k) - f(x_{k-1})},$$

$$= x_k - x^* - \frac{f(x_k) - f(x^*)}{f(x_k, x_{k-1})}$$

$$= (x_k - x^*) \left(1 - \frac{f(x_k - x^*)}{f(x_k, x_{k-1})}\right)$$

$$= (x_k - x^*) \left(1 - \frac{f(x_k, x^*)}{f(x_k, x_{k-1})}\right)$$

$$= (x_k - x^*) \left(\frac{f[x_{k-1}, x_k] - f[x_k, x^*]}{f[x_{k-1}, x_k] - f[x_k, x_{k-1}]}\right)$$

$$= (x_k - x^*) (x_{k-1} - x^*) \frac{f[x_{k-1}, x_k, x^*]}{f[x_{k-1}, x_k, x_{k-1}]}$$

If $x_k \to x^*$, then $\frac{f[x_{k-1}, x_k, x^*]}{f[x_{k-1}, x_k]} \to \frac{\frac{1}{2}f''(x^*)}{f'(x^*)}$ and $\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{x_{k+1} - x^*}{x_k - x^*} = 0$, i.e. the sequence generated by the secant method would converge faster than linear.

Defining $e_k = |x_k - x^*$|, the calculation above suggests

$$e_{k+1} \approx c e_k e_{k-1}. \quad (12.27)$$

Let’s try to determine the rate of convergence of the secant method. Starting with the ansatz $e_k \approx A e_{k-1}^p$ or equivalently $e_{k-1} = \left(\frac{1}{A} e_k\right)^{1/p}$ we have

$$e_{k+1} \approx c e_k e_{k-1} \approx c e_k \left(\frac{1}{A} e_k\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

which implies

$$\frac{A^{1+\frac{1}{p}}}{c} \approx e_k^{1-p+\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (12.28)$$
Since the left hand side is a constant we must have $1 - p + \frac{1}{p} = 0$ which gives $p = \frac{1 \pm \sqrt{5}}{2}$, thus

$$p = \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 1.61803$$  \hspace{1cm} (12.29)

gives the rate of convergence of the secant method. It is better than linear, but worse than quadratic. Sufficient conditions for local convergence are as in Newton’s method.

### 12.7 Fixed Point Iteration

Newton’s method is a particular example of a functional iteration of the form

$$x_{k+1} = g(x_k), \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots$$

with the particular choice of $g(x) = x - \frac{f(x)}{f'(x)}$. Clearly, if $x^*$ is a zero of $f$ then $x^*$ is a fixed point of $g$, i.e. $g(x^*) = x^*$. We will look at fixed point iterations as a tool for solving $f(x) = 0$.

**Example 12.2.** Suppose we want to solve $x - e^{-x} = 0$ in $[0, 1]$. Then if we take $g(x) = e^{-x}$, a fixed point of $g$ corresponds to a zero of $f$.

**Definition 12.2.** Let $g$ is defined in an interval $[a, b]$. We say that $g$ is a contraction or a contractive map if there is a constant $L$ with $0 \leq L < 1$ such that

$$|g(x) - g(y)| \leq L|x - y|, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in [a, b].$$  \hspace{1cm} (12.30)

If $x^*$ is a fixed point of $g$ in $[a, b]$ then

$$|x_k - x^*| = |g(x_k-1) - g(x^*)| \leq L|x_{k-1} - x^*| \leq L^2|x_{k-2} - x^*| \leq \cdots \leq L^k|x_0 - x^*| \to 0, \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$
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Theorem 12.2 (Contraction Mapping Theorem). If $g$ is contraction on $[a, b]$ and maps $[a, b]$ into $[a, b]$ then $g$ has a unique fixed point $x^*$ in $[a, b]$ and the fixed point iteration converges to it for any $[a, b]$. Moreover

(a) 
\[ |x_k - x^*| \leq L^k |x_0 - x^*| \]

(b) 
\[ |x_k - x^*| \leq \frac{L^k}{1 - L} |x_1 - x_0| \]

Proof. We already proved (a). Since $g : [a, b] \rightarrow [a, b]$, the fixed point iteration $x_{k+1} = g(x_k), k = 0, 1, \ldots$ is well-defined and

\[ |x_{k+1} - x_k| = |g(x_k) - g(x_{k-1})| \]
\[ \leq L |x_k - x_{k-1}| \]
\[ \leq \ldots \]
\[ \leq L^k |x_1 - x_0|. \]

Now, for $n \geq m$

\[ x_n - x_m = x_n - x_{n-1} + x_{n-1} - x_{n-2} + \ldots + x_{m+1} - x_m \quad (12.31) \]

and so

\[ |x_n - x_m| \leq |x_n - x_{n-1}| + |x_{n-1} - x_{n-2}| + \ldots + |x_{m+1} - x_m| \]
\[ \leq L^{n-1} |x_1 - x_0| + L^{n-2} |x_1 - x_0| + \ldots + L^m |x_1 - x_0| \]
\[ \leq L^m |x_1 - x_0| \left( 1 + L + L^2 + \ldots L^{n-1-m} \right) \]
\[ \leq L^m |x_1 - x_0| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} L^j = \frac{L^m}{1 - L} |x_1 - x_0|. \]

Thus, given $\epsilon > 0$, there is $N$ such

\[ \frac{L^N}{1 - L} |x_1 - x_0| \leq \epsilon \quad (12.32) \]

and thus for $n \geq m \geq N$, $|x_n - x_m| \leq \epsilon$, i.e. $\{x_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $[a, b]$ so it converges to a point $x^* \in [a, b]$. But

\[ |x_k - g(x^*)| = |g(x_{k-1}) - g(x^*)| \leq L |x_{k-1} - x^*|, \quad (12.33) \]
and so \( x_k \to g(x^*) \) as \( k \to \infty \) i.e. \( x^* \) is a fixed point of \( g \).

Suppose that there are two fixed points, \( x_1, x_2 \in [a, b] \), \( |x_1 - x_2| = |g(x_1) - g(x_2)| \leq L|x_1 - x_2| \Rightarrow (1 - L)|x_1 - x_2| \leq 0 \) but \( 0 \leq L < 1 \Rightarrow |x_1 - x_2| = 0 \Rightarrow x_1 = x_2 \) i.e the fixed point is unique. \( \Box \)

If \( g \) is differentiable in \((a, b)\), then by the mean value theorem

\[
g(x) - g(y) = g'(\xi)(x - y), \quad \text{for some } \xi \in [a, b]
\]
and if the derivative is bounded by a constant \( L \) less than 1, i.e. \( |g'(x)| \leq L \) for all \( x \in (a, b) \), then \( |g(x) - g(y)| \leq L|x - y| \) with \( 0 \leq L < 1 \), i.e. \( g \) is contractive in \([a, b]\).

**Example 12.3.** Let \( g(x) = \frac{1}{4}(x^2 + 3) \) for \( x \in [0, 1] \). Then \( 0 \leq g(x) \leq 1 \) and \( |g'(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \) for all \( x \in [0, 1] \). So \( g \) is contractive in \([0, 1]\) and the fixed point iteration will converge to the unique fixed point of \( g \) in \([0, 1]\).

Note that

\[
x_{k+1} = g(x_k) - g(x^*) = g'(\xi_k)(x_k - x^*), \quad \text{for some } \xi_k \in [x_k, x^*].
\]

Thus,

\[
\frac{x_{k+1} - x^*}{x_k - x^*} = g'(\xi_k)
\]

(12.34)

and unless \( g'(x^*) = 0 \), the fixed point iteration converges linearly, when it does converge.

### 12.8 Systems of Nonlinear Equations

We now look at the problem of finding numerical approximation to the solution(s) of a nonlinear system of equations \( f(x) = 0 \), where \( f : U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n \).

The main approach to solve a nonlinear system is fixed point iteration

\[
x_{k+1} = G(x_k), \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots
\]

(12.35)

where we assume that \( G \) is defined on a closed set \( B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( G : B \to B \).
The map $G$ is a contraction (with respect to some norm, $\| \cdot \|$) if there is a constant $L$ with $0 \leq L < 1$ and
\[
\| G(x) - G(y) \| \leq L \| x - y \|, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in B.
\] (12.36)

Then, as we know, by the contraction map principle, $G$ has a unique fixed point and the sequence generated by the fixed point iteration (12.35) converges to it.

Suppose that $G$ is $C^1$ on some convex set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, for example a ball. Consider the linear segment $x + t(y - x)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$ with $x, y$ fixed in $B$. Define the one-variable function
\[
h(t) = G(x + t(y - x)).
\] (12.37)

Then, by the Chain Rule, $h'(t) = DG(x + t(y - x))(y - x)$, where $DG$ stands for the derivative matrix of $G$. Then, using the definition of $h$ and the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus we have
\[
G(y) - G(x) = h(1) - h(0) = \int_0^1 h'(t) dt
= \left[ \int_0^1 DG(x + t(y - x)) dt \right] (y - x).
\] (12.38)

Thus if there is $0 \leq L < 1$ such that
\[
\| DG(x) \| \leq L, \quad \text{for all } x \in B,
\] (12.39)
for some subordinate norm $\| \cdot \|$. Then
\[
\| G(y) - G(x) \| \leq L \| y - x \|
\] (12.40)
and $G$ is a contraction (in that norm). The spectral radius of $DG$, $\rho(DG)$ will determine the rate of convergence of the corresponding fixed point iteration.

### 12.8.1 Newton’s Method

By Taylor theorem
\[
f(x) \approx f(x_0) + Df(x_0)(x - x_0)
\] (12.41)
so if we take $x_1$ as the zero of the right hand side of (12.41) we get

$$x_1 = x_0 - [Df(x_0)]^{-1}f(x_0).$$  \hspace{1cm} (12.42)

Continuing this way, Newton’s method for the system of equations $f(x) = 0$ can be written as

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - [Df(x_k)]^{-1}f(x_k).$$  \hspace{1cm} (12.43)

In the implementation of Newton’s method for a system of equations we solve the linear system $Df(x_k)w = -f(x_k)$ at each iteration and update $x_{k+1} = x_k + w$. 
Chapter 13

Numerical Methods for ODEs

13.1 Introduction

In this chapter we study numerical methods for the initial value problem (IVP):
\[
\frac{dy(t)}{dt} = f(t, y(t)), \quad t_0 < t \leq T, \quad (13.1)
\]
\[
y(t_0) = \alpha. \quad (13.2)
\]

Here, \( f \) is a given function of the independent variable \( t \) and the unknown function \( y \), and \( \alpha \) is a constant. Often, \( t \) represents time but not necessarily. Equation (13.2) is called the initial condition. Without loss of generality we will often take \( t_0 = 0 \), unless otherwise noted.

The time derivative is also frequently denoted with a dot (especially in physics) or an apostrophe
\[
\frac{dy}{dt} = \dot{y} = y'. \quad (13.3)
\]

In (13.1)-(13.2), \( y \) and \( f \) may be vector-valued, in which case we have an IVP for a system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs). We will not write the dependence of \( y \) on \( t \) in the ODE; we will simply write \( y' = f(t, y) \).

Example 13.1.
\[
y' = t \sin y, \quad 0 < t \leq 2\pi, \quad (13.4)
\]
\[
y(0) = \alpha. \quad (13.5)
\]
Example 13.2.

\[
\begin{align*}
y_1' &= y_1 y_2 - y_2^2, \\
y_2' &= -y_2 + t^2 \cos y_1, \quad 0 < t \leq T, \\
y_1(0) &= \alpha_1, \quad y_2(0) = \alpha_2.
\end{align*}
\]

These two are examples of first order ODEs. It is the type of IVP’s we will focus on. Higher order ODEs can be written as first order systems by introducing new variables as we illustrate in the next two examples.

Example 13.3. The Harmonic Oscillator.

\[y'' + k^2 y = 0.\]

If we define

\[
\begin{align*}
y_1 &= y, \\
y_2 &= y', \\
y_3 &= y''
\end{align*}
\]

we get

\[
\begin{align*}
y_1' &= y_2, \\
y_2' &= -k^2 y_1.
\end{align*}
\]

Example 13.4.

\[y''' + 2yy'' + \cos y' + e^t = 0.\]

Introducing the variables

\[
\begin{align*}
y_1 &= y, \\
y_2 &= y', \\
y_3 &= y''
\end{align*}
\]

we obtain the first order system:

\[
\begin{align*}
y_1' &= y_2, \\
y_2' &= y_3, \\
y_3' &= -2y_1 y_3 - \cos y_2 - e^t.
\end{align*}
\]
If \( f \) does not depend explicitly on \( t \) we call the ODE (or the system of ODEs) \textbf{autonomous}. We can turn a non-autonomous system into an autonomous one by introducing \( t \) as a new variable.

**Example 13.5.** Consider the ODE

\[
y' = \sin t - y^2. \tag{13.17}
\]

If we define

\[
y_1 = y, \tag{13.18}
y_2 = t, \tag{13.19}
\]

we can write this ODE as the autonomous system

\[
y'_1 = \sin y_2 - y_1^2, \\
y'_2 = 1. \tag{13.20}
\]

Continuity of \( f \) guarantees \textit{local} existence of solutions but not uniqueness. We need an extra assumption on \( f \) to ensure uniqueness of solutions.

**Definition 13.1.** A function \( f \) defined on \([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d\) is \textit{uniformly Lipschitz} in \( y \), if there is a constant \( L \geq 0 \) such that

\[
\|f(t, y) - f(t, w)\| \leq L\|y - w\| \tag{13.21}
\]

for all \( t \in [0, T] \) and all \( y, w \in \mathbb{R}^d \).

Note that if \( f \) is differentiable, the Lipschitz condition is equivalent to boundedness of \( f_y \), i.e. if there is \( L \geq 0 \) such that

\[
\left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(t, y) \right\| \leq L. \tag{13.22}
\]

for all \( t \in [0, T] \) and all \( y \in \mathbb{R}^d \). For a system \((y, f \in \mathbb{R}^d)\), \( f_y \) is derivative matrix of \( f \) with respect to \( y \) (see Section \[12.8\]). It is usually easier to check \((13.22)\) than to use directly the definition \((13.21)\) of Lipschitz continuity.

We now state a fundamental theorem of existence and uniqueness of solutions of the IVP \((13.1)-(13.2)\).
Theorem 13.1 (Existence and Uniqueness). Let
\[ D = \{(t, y) : t \in [0, T], y \in \mathbb{R}^n\}. \] (13.23)

If \( f \) is continuous in \( D \) and uniformly Lipschitz in \( y \), the IVP (13.1)-(13.2) has a unique solution for each \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d \).

Example 13.6.
\[
\begin{align*}
y' &= y^{1/2}, \quad 0 < t, \\
y(0) &= 0.
\end{align*}
\] (13.24)

The partial derivative
\[
\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} = \frac{1}{2} y^{-1/2}
\] (13.25)
is not continuous around 0. While \( f \) is continuous, it is not Lipschitz in \( y \). Clearly, \( y \equiv 0 \) is a solution of this initial value problem but so is \( y(t) = \frac{1}{4} t^2 \). There is no uniqueness of solution for this IVP.

Example 13.7.
\[
\begin{align*}
y' &= \frac{1}{2} y^2, \quad 0 < t \leq 3, \\
y(0) &= 1.
\end{align*}
\] (13.26)

We can integrate to obtain
\[
y(t) = \frac{2}{2 - t},
\] (13.27)
which becomes unbounded as \( t \to 2 \). There is a unique solution for \( t \in [0, 2) \) but there is no solution in \([0, 3]\). Note that
\[
\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} = y
\] (13.28)
is unbounded (because \( y \) is so). The function \( f \) is not uniformly Lipschitz in \( y \) for \((t, y) \in [0, 3] \times \mathbb{R}\).
The IVP (13.1)-(13.2) can be reformulated as

\[ y(t) = \alpha + \int_{0}^{t} f(s, y(s)) ds. \]  

(13.29)

This is an integral equation for the unknown function \( y \). In particular, if \( f \) does not depend on \( y \) the problem is reduced to the approximation of the definite integral

\[ \int_{0}^{t} f(s) ds, \] 

(13.30)

for which a numerical quadrature can be applied.

The numerical methods we will study next deal with the more general and important case when \( f \) depends on the unknown \( y \). The methods produce an approximation to the exact solution of IVP (assuming uniqueness) at a set of discrete points \( 0 = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_N \leq T \). For simplicity in the presentation, we will assume these points are equispaced,

\[ t_n = n\Delta t, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, N \text{ and } \Delta t = T/N, \] 

(13.31)

but they do not have to be. \( \Delta t \) is called the step size. We will write a numerical method for an IVP as an algorithm to go from one discrete time, \( t_n \), to the next one, \( t_{n+1} \). With that in mind, it is useful to transform the ODE (or the ODE system) into an integral equation by integrating from \( t_n \) to \( t_{n+1} \):

\[ y(t_{n+1}) = y(t_n) + \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} f(t, y(t)) dt. \]  

(13.32)

This equation provides a useful framework for the construction of some numerical methods using quadratures.

### 13.2 A First Look at Numerical Methods

Let us denote by \( y^n \) the approximation\(^1\) produced by the numerical method of the exact solution at \( t_n \), i.e.

\[ y^n \approx y(t_n). \] 

(13.33)

\(^1\)We use a superindex for the time approximation, instead of the most commonly employed subindex notation, to facilitate the transition to numerical methods for PDEs.
Starting from (13.32), if we approximate the integral using only \( f \) evaluated at the lower integration limit

\[
\int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} f(t, y(t)) \, dt \approx f(t_n, y(t_n))(t_{n+1} - t_n) = f(t_n, y(t_n)) \Delta t
\]

(13.34)

and replace \( f(t_n, y(t_n)) \) by \( f(t_n, y^n) \), we obtain the so called forward Euler method:

\[
y^0 = \alpha, \\
y^{n+1} = y^n + \Delta t f(t_n, y^n), \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1.
\]

(13.35) (13.36)

This provides an explicit formula to advance from one time step to the next. The approximation \( y^{n+1} \) at the future step only depends on the approximation \( y^n \) at the current step. The forward Euler method is an example of an explicit one-step method.

**Example 13.8.** Consider the initial value problem:

\[
y' = -\frac{1}{5} y - e^{-t/5} \sin t, \quad 0 < t \leq 2\pi,
\]

(13.37)

\[
y(0) = 1.
\]

(13.38)

To use the forward Euler method for this problem we start with \( y^0 = 1 \) and proceed with the iteration (13.36) with \( f(t_n, y^n) = -\frac{1}{5} y^n - e^{-t_n/5} \sin t_n \). Figure 13.1 shows the forward Euler approximation with \( \Delta t = 2\pi/20 \) and the exact solution, \( y(t) = e^{-t/5} \cos t \).

Note we just compute an approximation \( y^n \) of the solution at the discrete points \( t_n = n \Delta t \), for \( n = 0, 1, \ldots, N \). However, the numerical approximation is often plotted using a continuous curve that passes through all the points \( (t_n, y^n), \, n = 0, 1, \ldots, N \) (i.e. an interpolant).

If we approximate the integral in (13.32) employing only the upper limit of integration and replace \( f(t_{n+1}, y(t_{n+1})) \) by \( f(t_{n+1}, y^{n+1}) \) we obtain the backward Euler method:

\[
y^0 = \alpha, \\
y^{n+1} = y^n + \Delta t f(t_{n+1}, y^{n+1}), \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1.
\]

(13.39) (13.40)

Note that now \( y^{n+1} \) is defined implicitly in (13.40). Thus, to update the approximation we need to solve this equation for \( y^{n+1} \), for each \( n = 0, \ldots, N - 1 \).
13.2. A FIRST LOOK AT NUMERICAL METHODS

If $f$ is nonlinear, we would generally need to employ a numerical method to solve $y - F(y) = 0$, where $F(y) = \Delta t f(t_{n+1}, y) + y^n$. This is equivalent to finding a fixed point of $F$. By the contraction mapping theorem (Theorem 12.2), we can guarantee a unique solution $y^{n+1}$ if $\Delta t L < 1$ (where $L$ is the Lipschitz constant of $f$). In practice, an approximation to $y^{n+1}$ is obtained by performing a limited number of fixed point iterations $y^{(k+1)} = F(y^{(k)})$, $k = 0, 1, \ldots, K$, or by a few iterations of Newton’s method for $y - F(y) = 0$ with $y^n$ as initial guess. The backward Euler method is an implicit one-step method.

We can employ more accurate quadratures as the basis for our numerical methods. For example, if we use the trapezoidal rule

$$
\int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} f(t, y(t)) dt \approx \frac{\Delta t}{2} [f(t_n, y(t_n)) + f(t_{n+1}, y(t_{n+1}))]
$$

and proceed as before, we get the trapezoidal rule method:

$$
y^0 = \alpha, \tag{13.42}
$$

$$
y^{n+1} = y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} [f(t_n, y^n) + f(t_{n+1}, y^{n+1})], \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots N - 1. \tag{13.43}
$$
Like the backward Euler method, this is an implicit one-step method.

We will see later an important class of one-step methods, known as Runge-Kutta (RK) methods, which use intermediate approximations to the derivative (i.e. to \( f \)) and a corresponding quadrature. For example, if we employ the midpoint rule quadrature and the approximation

\[
f\left( t_{n+1/2}, y(t_{n+1/2}) \right) \approx f \left( t_{n+1/2}, y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} f(t_n, y^n) \right), \tag{13.44}
\]

where \( t_{n+1/2} = t_n + \Delta t/2 \), we obtain the explicit midpoint Runge-Kutta method

\[
y^{n+1} = y^n + \Delta t f \left( t_{n+1/2}, y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} f(t_n, y^n) \right). \tag{13.45}
\]

Another possibility is to approximate the integrand \( f \) in (13.32) by an interpolating polynomial of \( f \) evaluated at \( m \) previous approximations \( y^n, y^{n-1}, \ldots, y^{n-(m-1)} \). To simplify the notation, let us write

\[
f^n = f(t_n, y^n), \quad f^{n-1} = f(t_{n-1}, y^{n-1}), \quad \text{etc.} \tag{13.46}
\]

For example, if we replace \( f \) in \([t_n, t_{n+1}]\) by the linear polynomial \( p_1 \) interpolating \((t_n, f^n)\) and \((t_{n-1}, f^{n-1})\),

\[
p_1(t) = \frac{(t - t_{n-1})}{\Delta t} f^n - \frac{(t - t_n)}{\Delta t} f^{n-1} \tag{13.47}
\]

we get

\[
\int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} f(t, y(t)) dt \approx \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} p_1(t) dt = \frac{\Delta t}{2} [3f^n - f^{n-1}] \tag{13.48}
\]

and the corresponding numerical method is

\[
y^{n+1} = y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} [3f^n - f^{n-1}], \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots N - 1. \tag{13.49}
\]

This is a two-step method because to determine \( y^{n+1} \) we need the approximations at the previous two steps, \( y^n \) and \( y^{n-1} \). Numerical methods that require approximations of more than one step to determine the approximation at the future step are called multistep methods. Note that to start using (13.49), i.e. \( n = 1 \), we need \( y^0 \) and \( y^1 \). For \( y^0 \) we use the initial condition, \( y^0 = \alpha \),
and for $y^1$ we can employ a one-step method of comparable accuracy. All multistep methods require this initialization process where approximations to $y^1, \ldots, y^{n-1}$ have to be generated with one-step methods before we can apply the multistep formula.

Numerical methods can also be constructed by approximating $y'$ using finite differences or interpolation. For example, the central difference approximation

$$y'(t_n) \approx \frac{y(t_n + \Delta t) - y(t_n - \Delta t)}{2\Delta t} \approx \frac{y^{n+1} - y^{n-1}}{2\Delta t}$$

produces the two-step method

$$y^{n+1} = y^{n-1} + 2\Delta t f^n.$$ (13.51)

If we approximate $y'(t_{n+1})$ by the derivative of the polynomial interpolating $y^{n+1}$ and some previous approximations we obtain a class of methods known as backward differentiation formula (BDF) methods. For instance, let $p_2 \in \mathbb{P}_2$ be the polynomial that interpolates $(t_{n-1}, y^{n-1})$, $(t_n, y^n)$, and $(t_{n+1}, y^{n+1})$. Then

$$y'(t_{n+1}) \approx p_2'(t_{n+1}) = \frac{3y^{n+1} - 4y^n + y^{n-1}}{2\Delta t},$$ (13.52)

which gives the BDF method

$$\frac{3y^{n+1} - 4y^n + y^{n-1}}{2\Delta t} = f^{n+1}, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots N - 1.$$ (13.53)

Note that this is an implicit multistep method.

## 13.3 One-Step and Multistep Methods

As we have seen, there are two broad classes of methods for the initial value problem (13.1)-(13.2): one-step methods and multistep methods.

Explicit one-step methods can be written in the general form

$$y^{n+1} = y^n + \Delta t \Phi(t_n, y^n, \Delta t)$$ (13.54)

for some continuous function $\Phi$. For example $\Phi(t, y, \Delta t) = f(t, y)$ for the forward Euler method and $\Phi(t, y, \Delta t) = f \left( t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}, y + \frac{\Delta t}{2} f(t, y) \right)$ for the midpoint RK method. For an implicit one-step method $\Phi$ is also a function of $y^{n+1}$.
A general, \( m \)-step \((m > 1)\) linear multistep method has the form

\[
a_{m}y^{n+1} + a_{m-1}y^{n} + \ldots + a_{0}y^{n-(m-1)} = \Delta t \left[ b_{m}f^{n+1} + b_{m-1}f^{n} + \ldots + b_{0}f^{n-(m-1)} \right],
\]

(13.55)

for some coefficients \(a_{0}, a_{1}, \ldots, a_{m}\) and \(b_{0}, b_{1}, \ldots, b_{m}\) with \(a_{m} \neq 0\). If \(b_{m} \neq 0\) the multistep is implicit otherwise it is explicit. This class of methods are called linear because the right hand size in (13.55) is a linear function of the values of \(f^j\) for \(j = n - (m-1), \ldots, n+1\). There are also nonlinear multistep methods, where the hand side is a nonlinear function of \(f\), and which are useful for some specialized IVP’s. We will limit the discussion here to the more widely used linear multistep methods and simply call them multistep methods.

Shifting the index by \(m - 1\), we can also write an \(m\)-step \((m > 1)\) method as

\[
\sum_{j=0}^{m} a_{j}y^{n+j} = \Delta t \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_{j}f^{n+j}.
\]

(13.56)

### 13.4 Local and Global Error

At each time step in the numerical approximation of an IVP there is an error associated with evolving the solution from \(t_{n}\) to \(t_{n+1}\) with the numerical method instead of using the ODE (or the integral equation). There is also an error due to employing \(y^n\) instead of \(y(t_n)\) as the starting point. After several time steps, these local errors accumulate in the global error of the approximation. Let us make the definition of these errors more precise.

**Definition 13.2.** The local discretization or truncation error \(\tau^{n+1}(\Delta t)\) at \(t_{n+1}\) is given by

\[
\tau^{n+1}(\Delta t) = \frac{y(t_{n+1}) - \tilde{y}^{n+1}}{\Delta t},
\]

(13.57)

where \(\tilde{y}^{n+1}\) is computed by doing one step of the numerical method starting with the exact value \(y(t_{n})\) for a one-step method and with \(y(t_{n}), y(t_{n-1}), \ldots, y(t_{n-m+1})\) for an \(m\)-step method.
Definition 13.3. The global error $e^n(\Delta t)$ at $t_n$ is given by

$$e^n(\Delta t) = y(t_n) - y^n,$$  \hfill (13.58)

where $y(t_n)$ and $y^n$ are the exact solution of the initial value problem and the numerical approximation at $t_n$, respectively.

Figure 13.2 shows the global error and the local discretization error times $\Delta t$ at $t_6 = 6\Delta t$ for the forward Euler method applied to the IVP (13.37)-(13.38) with $\Delta t = 2\pi/10$. Note that the $\Delta t r^6$ is the local error made by taking only one step of the numerical method starting from the exact initial condition $y(t_5)$ whereas $e^6$ is the global error of the approximation after six time steps starting from $y^0 = \alpha = 1$.

For an explicit one-step method the local truncation error is simply

$$r^{n+1}(\Delta t) = \frac{y(t_{n+1}) - [y(t_n) + \Delta t \Phi(t_n, y(t_n), \Delta t)]}{\Delta t}.$$  \hfill (13.59)
That is,

\[ \tau^{n+1}(\Delta t) = \frac{y(t_{n+1}) - y(t_n)}{\Delta t} - \Phi(t_n, y(t_n), \Delta t) \] (13.60)

For an explicit multistep method \((b_m = 0)\),

\[ \tau^{n+m}(\Delta t) = \frac{y(t_{n+m}) - \tilde{y}^{n+m}}{\Delta t}, \] (13.61)

where

\[ a_m\tilde{y}^{n+m} = - \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} a_j y(t_{n+j}) + \Delta t \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_j f(t_{n+j}, y(t_{n+j})). \] (13.62)

Substituting (13.62) into (13.61) we get

\[ \tau^{n+m}(\Delta t) = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j y(t_{n+j}) - \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_j f(t_{n+j}, y(t_{n+j})), \] (13.63)

where we assumed, without loss of generality, that \(a_m = 1\). Since \(y' = f(t, y)\), we also have

\[ \tau^{n+m}(\Delta t) = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j y(t_{n+j}) - \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_j y'(t_{n+j}). \] (13.64)

For implicit methods we can also use (13.63) for the local truncation error because it is (13.61) up to a multiplicative factor. Indeed, let

\[ \tilde{\tau}^{n+m}(\Delta t) = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j y(t_{n+j}) - \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_j f(t_{n+j}, y(t_{n+j})). \] (13.65)

Then,

\[ \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j y(t_{n+j}) = \Delta t \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_j f(t_{n+j}, y(t_{n+j})) + \Delta t \tilde{\tau}^{n+m}(\Delta t). \] (13.66)

On the other hand \(\tilde{y}^{n+m}\) in the definition of the local error is computed using

\[ a_m\tilde{y}^{n+m} + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} a_j y(t_{n+j}) = \Delta t \left[ b_m f(t_{n+m}, \tilde{y}_{n+m}) + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} b_j f(t_{n+j}, y(t_{n+j})) \right]. \] (13.67)
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Subtracting (13.67) to (13.66) and using \( a_m = 1 \) we get

\[
y(t_{n+m}) - \tilde{y}^{n+m} = \Delta t \ b_m \left[ f(t_{n+m}, y(t_{n+m})) - f(t_{n+m}, \tilde{y}^{n+m}) \right]
+ \Delta t \ \tau^{n+k}(\Delta t).
\] (13.68)

Assuming \( f \) is a scalar \( C^1 \) function, from the mean value theorem we have

\[
f(t_{n+m}, y(t_{n+m})) - f(t_{n+m}, \tilde{y}^{n+m}) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(t_{n+m}, \eta) \left[ y(t_{n+m}) - \tilde{y}^{n+m} \right],
\]

for some \( \eta \) between \( y(t_{n+m}) \) and \( \tilde{y}^{n+m} \). Substituting this into (13.68) and solving for \( y(t_{n+m}) - \tilde{y}^{n+m} \) we get

\[
\tau^{n+m}(\Delta t) = \left[1 - \Delta t \ b_m \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(t_{n+m}, \eta)\right]^{-1} \tau^{n+m}(\Delta t).
\] (13.69)

If \( f \) is a vector valued function (a system of ODEs), the partial derivative in (13.69) is a derivative matrix. A similar argument can be made for an implicit one-step method if the increment function \( \Phi \) is Lipschitz in \( y \) and we use absolute values in the errors. Thus, (13.60) and (13.63) can be used as the definition of the local truncation error for one-step and multi-step methods, respectively. With this definition, we can view the local truncation error as a measure of how well the exact solution of the initial value problem satisfies the numerical method formula.

**Example 13.9.** The local truncation error for the forward Euler method is

\[
\tau^{n+1}(\Delta t) = \frac{y(t_{n+1}) - y(t_n)}{\Delta t} - f(t_n, y(t_n)).
\] (13.70)

Taylor expanding the exact solution around \( t_n \) we have

\[
y(t_{n+1}) = y(t_n) + \Delta t \ y'(t_n) + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta t)^2 y''(\eta_n)
\]

for some \( \eta_n \) between \( t_n \) and \( t_{n+1} \). Using \( y' = f \) and substituting (13.71) into (13.70) we get

\[
\tau^{n+1}(\Delta t) = \frac{1}{2} y''(\eta_n) \Delta t.
\] (13.72)

Thus, assuming the exact solution is \( C^2 \), the local truncation error of the forward Euler method is \( O(\Delta t) \).
To simplify notation we will henceforth write $O(\Delta t)^k$ instead of $O((\Delta t)^k)$.

**Example 13.10.** For the explicit midpoint Runge-Kutta method we have

$$
\tau^{n+1}(\Delta t) = \frac{y(t_{n+1}) - y(t_n)}{\Delta t} - f\left(t_{n+1/2}, y(t_n) + \frac{\Delta t}{2} f(t_n, y(t_n))\right). \tag{13.73}
$$

Taylor expanding $f$ around $(t_n, y(t_n))$ we obtain

$$
f\left(t_{n+1/2}, y(t_n) + \frac{\Delta t}{2} f(t_n, y(t_n))\right) = f(t_n, y(t_n))
\quad + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(t_n, y(t_n))
\quad + \frac{\Delta t}{2} f(t_n, y(t_n)) \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(t_n, y(t_n))
\quad + O(\Delta t)^2. \tag{13.74}
$$

But $y' = f$, $y'' = f'$ and

$$f' = \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} y' = \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} f. \tag{13.75}
$$

Therefore

$$f\left(t_{n+1/2}, y(t_n) + \frac{\Delta t}{2} f(t_n, y(t_n))\right) = y'(t_n) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta t y''(t_n) + O(\Delta t)^2. \tag{13.76}
$$

On the other hand

$$y(t_{n+1}) = y(t_n) + \Delta t y'(t_n) + \frac{1}{2} (\Delta t)^2 y''(t_n) + O(\Delta t)^3. \tag{13.77}
$$

Substituting (13.76) and (13.77) into (13.73) we get

$$\tau^{n+1}(\Delta t) = O(\Delta t)^2. \tag{13.78}
$$

In the previous two examples the methods are one-step. We now obtain the local truncation error for a particular multistep method.

**Example 13.11.** Let us consider the 2-step Adams-Bashforth method (13.49). We have

$$
\tau^{n+2}(\Delta t) = \frac{y(t_{n+2}) - y(t_{n+1})}{\Delta t} - \frac{1}{2} \left[3 f(t_{n+1}, y(t_{n+1})) - f(t_n, y(t_n))\right]. \tag{13.79}
$$
and using $y' = f$

$$\tau^{n+2} = \frac{y(t_{n+2}) - y(t_{n+1})}{\Delta t} - \frac{1}{2} [3y'(t_{n+1}) - y'(t_n)].$$  \hfill (13.80)

Taylor expanding $y(t_{n+2})$ and $y'(t_n)$ around $t_{n+1}$ we have

$$y(t_{n+2}) = y(t_{n+1}) + y'(t_{n+1})\Delta t + \frac{1}{2} y''(t_{n+1})(\Delta t)^2 + O(\Delta t)^3,$$ \hfill (13.81)

$$y'(t_n) = y'(t_{n+1}) - y''(t_{n+1})\Delta t + O(\Delta t)^2.$$ \hfill (13.82)

Substituting these expressions into (13.80) we get

$$\tau^{n+2}(\Delta t) = y'(t_{n+1}) + \frac{1}{2} y''(t_{n+1})\Delta t$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} [2y'(t_{n+1}) - \Delta t y''(t_{n+1})] + O(\Delta t)^2$$ \hfill (13.83)

$$= O(\Delta t)^2.$$

13.5 Order of a Method and Consistency

As we have seen, if the exact solution of the IVP $y' = f(t, y)$, $y(0) = \alpha$ is sufficiently smooth, the local truncation error can be expressed as $O(\Delta t)^p$, for some positive integer $p$ and sufficiently small $\Delta t$.

**Definition 13.4.** A numerical method for the initial value problem (13.1)-(13.2) is said to be of order $p$ if its local truncation error is $O(\Delta t)^p$.

Euler’s method is order 1 or first order. The midpoint Runge-Kutta method and the 2-step Adams-Bashforth method are order 2 or second order.

The local truncation error can be viewed as a measure of how well the exact solution of the IVP $y' = f(t, y)$, $y(0) = \alpha$ satisfies the numerical method formula. Thus, a natural requirement is that the numerical method formula approaches $y' = f(t, y)$ as $\Delta t \to 0$ and not some other equation. This motivates the following definition.

**Definition 13.5.** We say that a numerical method is consistent (with the ODE of the IVP) if

$$\lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \left( \max_{0 \leq n \leq N-1} |\tau^{n+1}(\Delta t)| \right) = 0.$$ \hfill (13.84)

Equivalently, if the method is at least of order 1.
For one-step methods, we have

$$
\tau^{n+1}(\Delta t) = \frac{y(t_{n+1}) - y(t_n)}{\Delta t} - \Phi(t_n, y(t_n), \Delta t).
$$

(13.85)

Since 

$$
\frac{y(t_{n+1}) - y(t_n)}{\Delta t}
$$

converges to 

$$
y'(t_n)
$$

as 

$$\Delta t \to 0
$$

and 

$$
y' = f(t, y),
$$

a one-step method is consistent with the ODE 

$$
y' = f(t, y)
$$

if and only if

$$
\Phi(t, y, 0) = f(t, y).
$$

(13.86)

To find a consistency condition for a multistep method, we expand 

$$
y(t_{n+j})
$$

and 

$$
y'(t_{n+j})
$$

around 

$$
t_n
$$


$$
y(t_{n+j}) = y(t_n) + (j\Delta t)y'(t_n) + \frac{1}{2!}(j\Delta t)^2y''(t_n) + \ldots
$$

(13.87)

$$
y'(t_{n+j}) = y'(t_n) + (j\Delta t)y''(t_n) + \frac{1}{2!}(j\Delta t)^2y'''(t_n) + \ldots
$$

(13.88)

and substituting in the definition of the local error (13.63) we get a multistep method is consistent if and only if

$$
a_0 + a_1 + \ldots + a_m = 0,
$$

(13.89)

$$
a_1 + 2a_2 + \ldots ma_m = b_0 + b_1 + \ldots + b_m.
$$

(13.90)

All the methods that we have seen so far are consistent (with 

$$
y' = f(t, y)
$$

).

13.6 Convergence

A basic requirement of the approximations generated by a numerical method is that they get better and better as we take smaller step sizes. That is, we want the approximations to approach the exact solution at each fixed 

$$
t = n\Delta t
$$

as 

$$\Delta t \to 0.
$$

Definition 13.6. A numerical method for the IVP (13.1) - (13.2) is convergent if the global error converges to zero as 

$$\Delta t \to 0
$$

with 

$$t = n\Delta t
$$

fixed i.e.

$$
\lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \left[ y(n\Delta t) - y^n \right] = 0.
$$

(13.91)

Note that for a multistep method the initialization values 

$$y^1, \ldots, y^{m-1}
$$

must converge to 

$$y(0) = \alpha
$$

as 

$$\Delta t \to 0.
$$

\footnote{We assume \( \Phi \) is continuous as stated in the definition of one-step methods.}
If we consider a one-step method and the definition (13.60) of the local truncation error, the exact solution satisfies

$$y(t_{n+1}) = y(t_n) + \Delta t \Phi(t_n, y(t_n), \Delta t) + \Delta t \tau^{n+1}$$

(13.92)

while the approximation is given by

$$y^{n+1} = y^n + \Delta t \Phi(t_n, y^n, \Delta t).$$

(13.93)

Subtracting (13.93) from (13.92) we get a difference equation for the global error

$$e^{n+1}(\Delta t) = e^n(\Delta t) + \Delta t [\Phi(t_n, y(t_n), \Delta t) - \Phi(t_n, y^n, \Delta t)] + \Delta t \tau^{n+1}(\Delta t).$$

(13.94)

The growth of the global error as we take more and more time steps is linked not only to the local truncation error but also to the increment function $\Phi$. To have a controlled error growth, we need an additional assumption on $\Phi$, namely that it is Lipschitz in $y$, i.e. there is $L \geq 0$ such that

$$|\Phi(t, y, \Delta t) - \Phi(t, w, \Delta t)| \leq L |y - w|$$

(13.95)

for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $y$ and $w$ in the relevant domain of existence of the solution. Recall that for a consistent one-step method $\Phi(t, y, 0) = f(t, y)$ and we assume $f(t, y)$ is Lipschitz in $y$ to guarantee existence and uniqueness of the IVP. Thus, the Lipschitz assumption on $\Phi$ is somewhat natural.

Taking absolute values (or norms in the vector case) in (13.94), using the triangle inequality and (13.95) we obtain

$$|e^{n+1}(\Delta t)| \leq (1 + \Delta t L)|e^n(\Delta t)| + \Delta t |\tau^{n+1}(\Delta t)|.$$ 

(13.96)

For a method of order $p$, $|\tau^{n+1}(\Delta t)| \leq C(\Delta t)^p$, for sufficiently small $\Delta t$. Therefore,

$$|e^{n+1}(\Delta t)| \leq (1 + \Delta t L)|e^n(\Delta t)| + C(\Delta t)^p + 1 \leq (1 + \Delta t L)[(1 + \Delta t L)|e^{n-1}(\Delta t)| + C(\Delta t)^{p+1}] + C(\Delta t)^{p+1} \leq \ldots$$

$$\leq (1 + \Delta t L)^{n+1}|e^0(\Delta t)| + C(\Delta t)^{p+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n} (1 + \Delta t L)^j$$

(13.97)
and summing up the geometric sum we get

\[ |e^{n+1}(\Delta t)| \leq (1 + \Delta t L)^{n+1} |e^0(\Delta t)| + \left[ \frac{(1 + \Delta t L)^{n+1} - 1}{\Delta t L} \right] C(\Delta t)^{p+1}. \]  

(13.98)

Now \(1 + t \leq e^t\) for all real \(t\) and consequently \((1 + \Delta t L)^n \leq e^{n\Delta t L} = e^{tL}\). Since \(e^0(\Delta t) = 0\),

\[ |e^n(\Delta t)| \leq \left[ \frac{e^{tL} - 1}{\Delta t L} \right] C(\Delta t)^{p+1} < \frac{C}{L} e^{tL} (\Delta t)^p. \]  

(13.99)

Therefore, the global error goes to zero like \((\Delta t)^p\) as \(\Delta t \to 0\), keeping \(t = n\Delta t\) fixed. We have thus established the following important result.

**Theorem 13.2.** A consistent \((p \geq 1)\) one-step method with a Lipschitz in \(y\) increment function \(\Phi\) is convergent.

The Lipschitz condition on \(\Phi\) allowed us to bound the growth of the local truncation error as more and more time steps are taken. This controlled error growth, which is called numerical stability, was achieved through the bound

\[ (1 + \Delta t L)^n \leq \text{constant}. \]  

(13.100)

**Example 13.12.** The forward Euler method is order 1 and hence consistent. Since \(\Phi = f\) and we are assuming that \(f\) is Lipschitz in \(y\), by the previous theorem the forward Euler method is convergent.

**Example 13.13.** Prove that the midpoint Runge-Kutta method is convergent (assuming \(f\) is Lipschitz in \(y\)).

The increment function in this case is

\[ \Phi(t, y, \Delta t) = f \left( t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}, y + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \cdot f(t, y) \right). \]  

(13.101)
13.7. RUNGE-KUTTA METHODS

Therefore

\[ |\Phi(t, y, \Delta t) - \Phi(t, w, \Delta t)| = \left| f \left( t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}, y + \frac{\Delta t}{2} f(t, y) \right) - f \left( t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}, w + \frac{\Delta t}{2} f(t, w) \right) \right| \]

\[ \leq L \left| y + \frac{\Delta t}{2} f(t, y) - w - \frac{\Delta t}{2} f(t, w) \right| \]

\[ \leq L |y - w| + \frac{\Delta t}{2} L |f(t, y) - f(t, w)| \]

\[ \leq \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} L \right) L |y - w| \leq \tilde{L} |y - w| . \quad (13.102) \]

where \( \tilde{L} = (1 + \frac{\Delta t_0}{2} L) L \) and \( \Delta t \leq \Delta t_0 \), i.e. for sufficiently small \( \Delta t \). This proves that \( \Phi \) is Lipschitz in \( y \) and since the midpoint Runge-Kutta method is of order 2, it is consistent and therefore convergent.

The exact solution of the IVP at \( t_{n+1} \) is determined uniquely from its value at \( t_n \). In contrast, multistep methods use not only \( y^n \) but also \( y^{n-1}, \ldots, y^{n-(m-1)} \) to produce \( y^{n+1} \). The use of more than one step introduces some peculiarities to the theory of stability and convergence of multistep methods. We will cover these topics separately after we take a look at the most widely used class of one-step methods: the Runge-Kutta methods.

13.7 Runge-Kutta Methods

Runge-Kutta (RK) methods are based on replacing the integral in

\[ y(t_{n+1}) = y(t_n) + \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} f(t, y(t)) dt \quad (13.103) \]

with a quadrature formula and using accurate enough intermediate approximations for the integrand \( f \) (the derivative of \( y \)). For example, if we use the trapezoidal rule quadrature

\[ \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} f(t, y(t)) dt \approx \frac{\Delta t}{2} \left[ f(t_n, y(t_n)) + f(t_{n+1}, y(t_{n+1})) \right] \quad (13.104) \]
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and the approximations $y(t_n) \approx y^n$ and $y^{n+1} \approx y^n + \Delta t f(t_n, y^n)$, we obtain an RK method known as the improved Euler method or Heun method:

$$K_1 = f(t_n, y^n),$$
$$K_2 = f(t_n + \Delta t, y^n + \Delta t K_1),$$
$$y^{n+1} = y^n + \Delta t \left[ \frac{1}{2} K_1 + \frac{1}{2} K_2 \right].$$

Note that $K_1$ and $K_2$ are approximations to the derivative of $y$ at $t_n$ and $t_{n+1}$, respectively. This is a two-stage method. In the first stage, $K_1$ is computed and in the second stage $K_2$ is obtained using $K_1$. The last step, Eq. (13.107), employs the selected quadrature to update the approximation.

**Example 13.14.** The midpoint RK method (13.45) is also a two-stage RK method and can be written as

$$K_1 = f(t_n, y^n),$$
$$K_2 = f \left( t_n + \frac{\Delta t}{2}, y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} K_1 \right),$$
$$y^{n+1} = y^n + \Delta t K_2.$$

We know from Example [13.10] that the midpoint RK is order 2. The improved order method is also order 2. Obtaining the order of an RK method using Taylor expansions becomes a long, tedious process because the number of terms in the derivatives of $f$ grows rapidly ($y' = f$, $y'' = f_t + f_y f$, $y''' = f_{tt} + 2 f_{ty} f + f_{yy} f^2 + f_{yy} f + f_{yy}^2$, etc.).

One of the most popular RK method is the following 4-stage (and fourth order) explicit RK, known as the classical fourth order RK:

$$K_1 = f(t_n, y^n),$$
$$K_2 = f \left( t_n + \frac{\Delta t}{2}, y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} K_1 \right),$$
$$K_3 = f \left( t_n + \frac{\Delta t}{2}, y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} K_2 \right),$$
$$K_4 = f(t_n + \Delta t, y^n + \Delta t K_3),$$
$$y^{n+1} = y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{6} \left[ K_1 + 2 K_2 + 2 K_3 + K_4 \right].$$
A general $s$-stage RK method can be written as

\begin{align*}
K_1 &= f \left( t_n + c_1 \Delta t, y^n + \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^{s} a_{1j} K_j \right), \\
K_2 &= f \left( t_n + c_2 \Delta t, y^n + \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^{s} a_{2j} K_j \right), \\
&\vdots \\
K_s &= f \left( t_n + c_s \Delta t, y^n + \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^{s} a_{sj} K_j \right), \\
y^{n+1} &= y^n + \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^{s} b_j K_j.
\end{align*}

(13.112)

RK methods are determined by the constants $c_1, \ldots, c_s$ that specify the quadrature points, the coefficients $a_{1j}, \ldots, a_{sj}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, s$ used to obtain approximations of the solution at the intermediate quadrature points, and the quadrature coefficients $b_1, \ldots, b_s$. Consistent RK methods need to satisfy the conditions

\begin{align*}
\sum_{j=1}^{s} a_{ij} &= c_i, \quad (13.113) \\
\sum_{j=1}^{s} b_j &= 1. \quad (13.114)
\end{align*}

To define an RK method it is enough to specify the coefficients $c_j$, $a_{ij}$ and $b_j$ for $i, j = 1, \ldots, s$. These coefficients are often displayed in a table, called the Butcher tableau (after J.C. Butcher) as shown in Table 13.1.

For an explicit RK method, the matrix of coefficients $A = (a_{ij})$ is lower triangular with zeros on the diagonal, i.e. $a_{ij} = 0$ for $i \leq j$. The zeros of $A$ are usually not displayed in the Butcher tableau.

**Example 13.15.** Tables 13.2, 13.4 show the Butcher tableaux of some explicit RK methods.

Implicit RK methods are useful for some initial values problems with disparate time scales as we will see later. To reduce the computational work
Table 13.1: Butcher tableau for a general RK method.

| c_1 | a_{11} & \ldots & a_{1s} |
|-----|--------|\ldots|--------|
| \vdots | \vdots | \ddots | \vdots |
| c_s | a_{s1} & \ldots & a_{ss} |
| b_1 | \ldots | b_s |

Table 13.2: Improved Euler.

\[
\begin{array}{c|cc}
0 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline
1 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2}
\end{array}
\]

Table 13.3: Midpoint RK.

\[
\begin{array}{c|cc}
0 & & \\
\hline
\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0
\end{array}
\]

Table 13.4: Classical fourth order RK.

\[
\begin{array}{c|cccc}
0 & & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\
\hline\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{array}
\]

needed to solve for the unknown $K_1, \ldots, K_s$ (each $K$ is vector-valued for a system of ODEs) in an implicit RK method, two particular types of implicit RK methods are usually employed. The first type is the *diagonally implicit* RK method or DIRK which has $a_{ij} = 0$ for $i < j$ and at least one $a_{ii}$ is nonzero. The second type has also $a_{ij} = 0$ for $i < j$ but with the additional condition that $a_{ii} = \gamma$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, s$ and $\gamma$ is a constant. The corresponding methods are called *singly diagonally implicit* RK or SDIRK.

**Example 13.16.** Tables 13.5-13.8 show some examples of DIRK and SDIRK.
13.8 Adaptive Stepping

So far we have considered a fixed $\Delta t$ throughout the entire computation of an approximation to the IVP of an ODE or of a system of ODEs. We can vary $\Delta t$ as we march up in $t$ to maintain the approximation within a given error bound. The idea is to obtain an estimate of the error using two different methods.

Table 13.5: Backward Euler.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$1$</th>
<th>$1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13.6: Implicit mid-point rule RK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\frac{1}{2}$</th>
<th>$\frac{1}{2}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13.7: Hammer and Hollingworth DIRK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$0$</th>
<th>$0$</th>
<th>$0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{2}{3}$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{1}$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{1}{4}$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{4}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13.8: Two-stage, order 3 SDIRK ($\gamma = \frac{3+\sqrt{3}}{6}$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\gamma$</th>
<th>$\gamma$</th>
<th>$0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1 - \gamma$</td>
<td>$1 - 2\gamma$</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.8 Adaptive Stepping
methods, one of order $p$ and one of order $p + 1$, and employ this estimate to decide whether the size of $\Delta t$ is appropriate or not at the given time step.

Let $y^{n+1}$ and $w^{n+1}$ be the numerical approximations updated from $y^n$ using the method of order $p$, and $p + 1$, respectively. Then, we estimate the error at $t_{n+1}$ by

$$e^{n+1}(\Delta t) \approx w^{n+1} - y^{n+1}. \quad (13.115)$$

If $|w^{n+1} - y^{n+1}| \leq \delta$, where $\delta$ is a prescribed tolerance, then we maintain the same $\Delta t$ and use $w^{n+1}$ as initial condition for the next time step. If $|w^{n+1} - y^{n+1}| > \delta$, we decrease $\Delta t$ (e.g. we set it to $\Delta t/2$), recompute $y^{n+1}$ and $w^{n+1}$, obtain the new estimate of the error (13.115), etc.

One-step methods allow for straightforward use of variable $\Delta t$. Variable step, multistep methods can also be derived but are not used much in practice due to more limited stability properties.

### 13.9 Embedded Methods

For computational efficiency, adaptive stepping as described above is implemented reusing as much as possible evaluations of $f$, the derivative of $y$, because this is the most expensive part of RK methods. So the idea is to embed, with minimal additional $f$ evaluations, an RK method inside another. The following example illustrates this.

Consider the improved Euler method (second order) and the Euler method (first order). We can embed them as follows

$$K_1 = f(t_n, y^n), \quad (13.116)$$

$$K_2 = f(t_n + \Delta t, y^n + \Delta tK_1), \quad (13.117)$$

$$w^{n+1} = y^n + \Delta t \left[ \frac{1}{2}K_1 + \frac{1}{2}K_2 \right], \quad (13.118)$$

$$y^{n+1} = y^n + \Delta tK_1. \quad (13.119)$$

Note that the approximation of the derivative $K_1$ is used for both methods. The computation of the higher order method (13.118) only costs an additional evaluation of $f$. 
13.10 Multistep Methods

Multistep methods use approximations from more than one step to obtain the approximation at the next time step. Linear multistep methods can be written in the general form

\[
\sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j y^{n+j} = \Delta t \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_j f^{n+j},
\]

(13.120)

where \( m \geq 2 \) is the number of previous steps the method employs.

Multistep methods only require one evaluation of \( f \) per time step because the other previously computed values of \( f \) are stored. Thus, multistep methods have generally lower computational cost per time step than one-step methods of the same order. The trade-off is reduced numerical stability as we will see later.

We used in Section 13.2 interpolation and finite differences to construct some examples of multistep methods. It is possible to build also multistep methods by choosing the coefficients \( a_0, \ldots, a_m \) and \( b_0, \ldots, b_m \) so as to achieve a desired maximal order for a given \( m \geq 2 \) and/or to have certain stability properties.

Two classes of multistep methods, both derived from interpolation, are among the most commonly used multistep methods. These are the explicit and implicit Adams methods.

13.10.1 Adams Methods

We constructed in Section 13.2 the two-step Adams-Barshforth method

\[
y^{n+1} = y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \left[ 3f^n - f^{n-1} \right], \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots, N - 1,
\]

where \( f^n = f(t_n, y^n) \) and \( f^{n-1} = f(t_{n-1}, y^{n-1}) \). An m-step explicit Adams method, also called Adams-Bashforth, can be derived by starting with the integral formulation of the IVP,

\[
y(t_{n+1}) = y(t_n) + \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} f(t, y(t)) dt,
\]

(13.121)

and replacing the integrand with the interpolating polynomial \( p \in \mathbb{P}_{m-1} \) of \( (t_j, f^j) \) for \( j = n - m + 1, \ldots, n \). Recall that \( f^j = f(t_j, y^j) \). If we represent
p in Lagrange form we have
\[ p(t) = \sum_{j=n-m+1}^{n} l_j(t) f^j, \]  
(13.122)

where
\[ l_j(t) = \prod_{k=n-m+1}^{n} \frac{(t-t_k)}{(t_j-t_k)}, \quad \text{for } j = n-m+1, \ldots, n. \]  
(13.123)

Thus, the m-step explicit Adams method has the form
\[ y^{n+1} = y^n + \Delta t \left[ b_{m-1} f^n + b_{m-2} f^{n-1} + \cdots + b_0 f^{n-m+1} \right], \]  
(13.124)

where
\[ b_{j-(n-m+1)} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} l_j(t) dt, \quad \text{for } j = n-m+1, \ldots, n. \]  
(13.125)

Here are the first three explicit Adams methods, 2-step, 3-step, and 4-step, respectively:
\[ y^{n+1} = y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \left[ 3f^n - f^{n-1} \right], \]  
(13.126)
\[ y^{n+1} = y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{12} \left[ 23f^n - 16f^{n-1} + 5f^{n-2} \right], \]  
(13.127)
\[ y^{n+1} = y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{24} \left[ 55f^n - 59f^{n-1} + 37f^{n-2} - 9f^{n-3} \right]. \]  
(13.128)

The implicit Adams methods, also called Adams-Moulton methods, are derived by including \((t_{n+1}, f^{n+1})\) in the interpolation. That is, \(p \in \mathbb{P}_m\) is now the polynomial interpolating \((t_j, f^j)\) for \(j = n-m+1, \ldots, n+1\). Here are the first three implicit Adams methods:
\[ y^{n+1} = y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{12} \left[ 5f^{n+1} + 8f^n - f^{n-1} \right], \]  
(13.129)
\[ y^{n+1} = y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{24} \left[ 9f^{n+1} + 19f^n - 5f^{n-1} + f^{n-2} \right], \]  
(13.130)
\[ y^{n+1} = y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{720} \left[ 251f^{n+1} + 646f^n - 264f^{n-1} + 106f^{n-2} - 19f^{n-3} \right]. \]  
(13.131)
13.10.2 D-Stability and Dahlquist Equivalence Theorem

Recall that we can write a general multistep method as

\[ \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j y^{n+j} = \Delta t \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_j f^{n+j}. \]

The coefficients \( a_j \)'s and \( b_j \)'s define two characteristic polynomials of the multistep method:

\[ \rho(z) = a_m z^m + a_{m-1} z^{m-1} + \ldots + a_0, \quad (13.132) \]
\[ \sigma(z) = b_m z^m + b_{m-1} z^{m-1} + \ldots + b_0. \quad (13.133) \]

Consistency, given by the conditions (13.89)-(13.90), can be equivalently expressed as

\[ \rho(1) = 0, \quad (13.134) \]
\[ \rho'(1) = \sigma(1). \quad (13.135) \]

Numerical stability is related to the notion of a uniform bound (independent of \( n \)) of the amplification of the local error in the limit as \( n \to \infty \) and \( \Delta t \to 0 \) [see bound (13.100) for one-step methods]. Thus, it is natural to consider the equation:

\[ a_m y^{n+m} + a_{m-1} y^{n+m-1} + \ldots + a_0 y^n = 0. \quad (13.136) \]

This is a homogeneous linear difference equation. Since \( a_m \neq 0 \), we can easily solve for \( y^{n+m} \) in terms of the previous values \( m \) values. So given the initial values \( y^0, y^1, \ldots, y^{m-1} \), there is a unique solution of (13.136). Let us look for a solution of the form \( y^n = c\xi^n \), where \( c \) is a constant and the \( n \) in \( \xi^n \) is a power not a superindex. Plugging this ansatz in (13.136) we obtain

\[ c\xi^n \left[ a_m \xi^m + a_{m-1} \xi^{m-1} + \ldots + a_0 \right] = 0. \quad (13.137) \]

If \( c\xi^n = 0 \) we get the trivial solution \( y^n \equiv 0 \), for all \( n \). Otherwise, \( \xi \) has to be a root of the polynomial \( \rho \).

If \( \rho \) has \( m \) distinct roots, \( \xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_m \), the general solution of (13.136) is

\[ y^n = c_1\xi_1^n + c_2\xi_2^n + \ldots + c_m\xi_m^n, \quad (13.138) \]
where \( c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_m \) are determined uniquely from the \( m \) initial values \( y^0, y^1, \ldots, y^{m-1} \).

If the roots are not all distinct, the solution of (13.136) changes as follows: If for example \( \xi_1 = \xi_2 \) is a double root, i.e. a root of multiplicity 2 \( [\rho(\xi_1) = 0, \rho'(\xi_1) = 0 \text{ but } \rho''(\xi_1) \neq 0] \) then \( y^n = n\xi_1^n \) is also a solution of (13.136).

Let’s check this is indeed the case. Substituting \( y^n = n\xi_1^n \) in (13.136) we get

\[
\begin{align*}
a_m(n + m)\xi_1^{n+m} + a_{m-1}(n + m - 1)\xi_1^{n+m-1} + \ldots + a_0n\xi_1^n \\
= \xi_1^n \left[ a_m(n + m)\xi_1^m + a_{m-1}(n + m - 1)\xi_1^{m-1} + \ldots + a_0n \right] \\
= \xi_1^n \left[ n\rho(\xi_1) + \xi_1\rho'(\xi_1) \right] = 0.
\end{align*}
\]

Thus, when there is one double root, the general solution of (13.136) is

\[
y^n = c_1\xi_1^n + c_2n\xi_1^n + c_3\xi_3^n + \ldots + c_m\xi_m^n. \quad (13.140)
\]

If there is a triple root, say \( \xi_1 = \xi_2 = \xi_3 \), the general solution of (13.136) is given by

\[
y^n = c_1\xi_1^n + c_2n\xi_1^n + c_3n(n - 1)\xi_1^n + \ldots + c_m\xi_m^n, \quad (13.141)
\]

and so on and so forth.

We need the solution \( y^n \) of (13.136) to remain bounded as \( n \to \infty \) for otherwise it will not converge to \( y(t) = \alpha \), the solution of \( y' = 0, y(0) = \alpha \). Thus, we need that all the roots \( \xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_m \) of \( \rho \) satisfy:

1. \( |\xi_j| \leq 1, \text{ for all } j = 1, 2, \ldots, m. \)
2. If \( \xi_k \) is a root of multiplicity greater than one then \( |\xi_k| < 1. \)

(a) and (b) are known as the root condition.

Since the exact solution \( y(t) \) is bounded, the global error is bounded as \( \Delta t \to 0 \ (n \to \infty) \) if and only if the numerical approximation \( y^n \) is bounded as \( \Delta t \to 0 \ (n \to \infty) \). This motivates the following central concept in the theory of multistep methods.

**Definition 13.7.** A multistep method is D-stable (or zero-stable) if the zeros of \( \rho \) satisfy the root condition.

**Example 13.17.** All the \( m \)-step \( (m > 1) \) methods in the Adams family have

\[
\rho(\xi) = \xi^m - \xi^{m-1}. \quad (13.142)
\]

The roots of \( \rho \) are 1 (with multiplicity one) and 0. Hence, the Adams methods are all D-stable.
13.10. MULTISTEP METHODS

As we have seen, D-stability is necessary for convergence of a multistep method. It is truly remarkable that D-stability, together with consistency, is also sufficient for convergence. In preparation for this fundamental result, let us go back to the general linear multistep method. Without loss of generality we take \( a_m = 1 \) and write a general multistep method as

\[
y^{n+m} + a_{m-1}y^{n+m-1} + \ldots + a_0y^n = c_{n+m},
\]

where

\[
c_{n+m} = \Delta t \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_j f^{n+j}.
\]

For \( c_{n+m} \) given, (13.143) is an inhomogeneous linear difference equation. We will show next that we can express the solution of (13.143) in terms of \( m \) particular solutions of the homogeneous equation \((c_{n+m} = 0)\), the \( m \) initial values, and the right hand side in a sort of Discrete Duhamel’s principle. For a multistep method, \( c^{n+m} \) actually depends on the solution itself so we proceed formally to find the aforementioned solution representation.

Let \( y^n_k \), for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots, m - 1 \), be the solution of the homogeneous equation with initial values \( y^n_k = \delta_{n,k}, n = 0, 1, \ldots, m - 1 \), and let \( w^n_k \) for \( k = m, m + 1, \ldots \) be the solution of the “unit impulse equation”

\[
w^{n+m}_k + a_{m-1}w^{n+m-1}_k + \ldots + a_0w^n_k = \delta_{n,k-m},
\]

with initial values \( w^0_k = w^1_k = \ldots = w^{m-1}_k = 0 \). Then, the solution of (13.143) with initial values \( y^0 = \alpha_0, y^1 = \alpha_1, \ldots, y^{m-1} = \alpha_{m-1} \) can be written as

\[
y^n = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \alpha_k y^n_k + \sum_{k=m}^{n} c_k w^n_k, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots
\]

The first sum enforces the initial conditions and is a solution of the homogeneous equation (13.136). Since \( w^n_k = 0 \) for \( n < k \) we can extend the second sum to \( \infty \). Let

\[
z^n = \sum_{k=m}^{n} c_k w^n_k = \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} c_k w^n_k.
\]

Then

\[
\sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j z^{n+j} = \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} c_k w^{n+j}_k = \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} c_k \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j w^{n+j}_k = c_{n+m}, \quad (13.148)
\]
i.e. \( z^n \) is a solution of (13.143). Finally, we can interpret (13.145) as a homogeneous problem with \( m \) “delayed” initial values 0, 0, \ldots, 0, 1. Hence, \( w_k^n = y_{m-1}^{n-k-1} \) and we arrive at the following representation of the solution of (13.143)

\[
y^n = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \alpha_k y_k^n + \sum_{k=m}^n c_k y_{m-1}^{n-m-1-k}, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots
\]

(13.149)

where \( y_{m-1}^{n} = 0 \) for \( n < 0 \).

**Theorem 13.3. (Dahlquist Equivalence Theorem)** A multistep method is convergent if and only if it is consistent and D-stable.

**Proof. Necessity of D-stability.** If a multistep method is convergent for all initial values \( y' = f(t, y), y(0) = \alpha \) with \( f \) continuous and Lipschitz in \( y \), then so is for \( y' = 0, y(0) = 0 \) whose solution is \( y(t) = 0 \). In this case \( y_n \) satisfies (13.136). One of the solutions of this equation is \( y^n = \Delta t \xi^n \), where \( \xi \) is a root of the characteristic polynomial \( \rho \) (13.132). Note that \( y^n = \Delta t \xi^n \) satisfies the convergence requirement that \( y_k \to 0 \) for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots, m-1 \) as \( \Delta t \to 0 \).

If \( |\xi| > 1 \), for fixed \( t = \Delta tn \) \((0 < t \leq T)\), \( |y^n| = \Delta t |\xi|^n = t |\xi|^n /n \) does not converge to zero as \( n \to \infty \). Similarly, if \( \xi \) is a root of multiplicity greater than 1 and \( |\xi| = 1 \), \( y^n = \Delta tn \xi^n \) is a solution and \( |y^n| = \Delta tn |\xi|^n = t |\xi|^n = t \) does not converge to zero as \( n \to \infty \).

**Necessity of consistency.** Consider the particular initial value \( y' = 0, y(0) = 1 \), whose solution is \( y(t) = 1 \). Again, \( y^n \) satisfies (13.136). Setting \( y^0 = y^1 = \ldots = y^{m-1} = 1 \) we can obtain \( y^n \) for \( n \geq m \) from (13.136). If the method converges, then \( y^n \to 1 \) as \( n \to \infty \). Using this in (13.136) implies that \( a_m + a_{m-1} + \ldots + a_0 = 0 \) or equivalently \( \rho(1) = 0 \). Now, consider the initial value, \( y' = 1, y(0) = 0 \). Then, the multistep method satisfies

\[
a_m y^{n+m} + a_{m-1} y^{n+m-1} + \ldots + a_0 y^n = \Delta t (b_m + b_{m-1} + \ldots + b_0). \quad (13.150)
\]

We are now going to find of this equation of the form \( y^n = An \Delta t \) for a suitable constant \( A \). First, note that \( y^k = A_k \Delta t \) converges to zero as \( \Delta t \to 0 \) for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots, m-1 \), as required. Substituting \( y^n = An \Delta t \) into (13.150) we get

\[
A \Delta t [a_m (n + m) + a_{m-1} (n + m - 1) + \ldots + a_0 n] = \Delta t (b_m + b_{m-1} + \ldots + b_0)
\]
and splitting the left hand side,
\[ A\Delta t [a_m + a_{m-1} + \ldots + a_0] + A\Delta t [ma_m + (m-1)a_{m-1} + \ldots + a_1] = \Delta t(b_m + b_{m-1} + \ldots + b_0). \] (13.151)

Using \( \rho(1) = 0 \) this simplifies to
\[ A\Delta t [ma_m + (m-1)a_{m-1} + \ldots + a_1] = \Delta t(b_m + b_{m-1} + \ldots + b_0), \] (13.152)
i.e. \( A\rho'(1) = \sigma(1) \). Since D-stability is necessary for convergence \( \rho'(1) \neq 0 \) and consequently \( A = \sigma(1)/\rho'(1) \) and \( y^n = \frac{\sigma(1)}{\rho'(1)}n\Delta t \) is a solution of (13.150). For fixed \( t = n\Delta t \), \( y^n \) should converge to \( t \) as \( n \to \infty \). Therefore, we must have \( \sigma(1) = \rho'(1) \), which together with \( \rho(1) = 0 \), implies consistency.

**Sufficiency of consistency and D-stability.** From the definition of the local truncation error (13.63)
\[ \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j y(t_{n+j}) = \Delta t \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_j f(t_{n+j}, y(t_{n+j})) + \Delta t \tau^{n+m}(\Delta t). \] (13.153)
Subtracting (13.120) to this equation we get
\[ \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j e^n(t_j) = c_{n+m}, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, N - m, \] (13.154)
where \( e^n(t_j) = y(t_j) - y^n \) is the global error at \( t_j \) and
\[ c_{n+m} = \Delta t \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_j [f(t_{n+j}, y(t_{n+j})) - f^n(t_{n+j})] + \Delta t \tau^{n+m}(\Delta t). \] (13.155)
Then, using (13.149) we can represent the solution of (13.154) as
\[ e^n(\Delta t) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} e^k(\Delta t)y^n_k + \sum_{k=0}^{n-m} c_{k+m}y^{n-1-k}_{m-1}, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, N. \] (13.156)
Since the method is D-stable, the solutions of the homogeneous linear difference equation, \( y^n_k, k = 0, 1, \ldots m - 1, \) are bounded, i.e. there is \( M \) such that \( |y^n_k| \leq M, \; k = 0, 1, \ldots m - 1 \) and all \( n \). Then,
\[ |e^n(\Delta t)| \leq mM \max_{0 \leq k \leq m-1} |e^k(\Delta t)| + M \sum_{k=0}^{n-m} |c_{k+m}|, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, N. \] (13.157)
Moreover, using the Lipschitz continuity of \( f \) and the bound of the local truncation error
\[
|c_{k+m}| \leq \Delta t \left[ L b \sum_{j=0}^{m} |e^{k+j}(\Delta t)| + C(\Delta t)^p \right],
\] (13.158)
where \( L \) is the Lipschitz constant and \( b = \max_j |b_j| \). Therefore,
\[
|e^n(\Delta t)| \leq mM \max_{0 \leq k \leq m-1} |e^k(\Delta t)| + (n-m+1)M\Delta t \left[ (m+1)Lb \max_{0 \leq k \leq n} |e^k(\Delta t)| + C(\Delta t)^p \right],
\] (13.159)
for \( n = 0, 1, \ldots, N \). Let \( E^n = \max_{0 \leq k \leq n} |e^k(\Delta t)| \) (we omit the dependance of \( E^n \) on \( \Delta t \) to simplify the notation). Then, we can write (13.159) as
\[
|e^n(\Delta t)| \leq mME^{m-1} + (n-m+1)M\Delta t [(m+1)LbE^n + C(\Delta t)^p].
\] (13.160)
Since \( E^n = |e^{k'}(\Delta t)| \) for some \( 0 \leq k' \leq n \), we can replace the left hand side of (13.160) by \( E^n \) and because \( m > 1 \) it follows that
\[
E^n \leq \tilde{C}n\Delta t E^n + mME^{m-1} + MCn(\Delta t)^{p+1},
\] (13.161)
where \( \tilde{C} = (m+1)MLb \). Therefore,
\[
\left( 1 - \tilde{C}n\Delta t \right) E^n \leq mME^{m-1} + MCn(\Delta t)^{p+1}.
\] (13.162)
If we restrict the integration up to \( T_1 = 1/(2\tilde{C}) \), i.e. \( \tilde{C}n\Delta t \leq 1/2 \), we have
\[
E^n \leq 2M \left[ mE^{m-1} + T_1 C(\Delta t)^p \right], \quad 0 \leq n \leq T_1/\Delta t
\] (13.163)
and going back to the definition of \( E^n \) we obtain
\[
|e^n(\Delta t)| \leq 2M \left[ mE^{m-1} + T_1 C(\Delta t)^p \right], \quad 0 \leq n \leq T_1/\Delta t.
\] (13.164)
The term \( E^{m-1} \) depends only on the \( m \) initialization values of the multistep method. For a consistent method \( p \geq 1 \) and \( E^{m-1} \to 0 \) as \( \Delta t \to 0 \). Hence (13.164) implies convergence on the interval \([0, T_1]\), where \( T_1 = 1/(2\tilde{C}) \). We
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can repeat the argument on the interval \([T_1, 2T_1]\), using the estimate of the error (13.164) for the first \(m\) values \(e^{k_1-(m-1)}, e^{k_1-(m-2)}, \ldots, e^{k_1}\), where \(k_1 = [T_1/\Delta t]\), and obtain convergence in \([T_1, 2T_1]\). Continuing with this process a finite number of times, \(J = [T/T_1]\), we can prove convergence on the intervals

\[
[0, T_1], [T_1, 2T_1], \ldots, [(J-1)T_1, T].
\]

The pointwise error bound on each of these interval depends on the error bound of the previous interval as follows

\[
E_j \leq 2M \left[ mE_{j-1} + T_1 C(\Delta t)^p \right], \quad j = 1, \ldots, J,
\]

where \(E_j\) is the (pointwise) error bound on \([(j-1)T_1, jT_1]\) and \(E_0 = E^{m-1}\). Defining \(A = 2Mm\) and \(B = 2MT_1 C(\Delta t)^p\), we get for the error bound of the last interval

\[
E_J \leq AE_{J-1} + B \leq A \left[ AE_{J-2} + B \right] + B = A^2 E_{J-2} + AB + B \\
\leq A^2 \left[ AE_{J-3} + B \right] + AB + B = A^3 E_{J-3} + (A^2 + A + 1)B \\
\vdots \\
\leq A^J E_0 + (A^{J-1} + A^{J-2} + \ldots + 1)B.
\]

Therefore, we obtain the error bound

\[
|e^n(\Delta t)| \leq (2Mm)^J E^{m-1} + S(\Delta t)^p, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, N,
\]

where \(S = [(2Mm)^{J-1} + (2Mm)^{J-2} + \ldots + 1](2MT_1 C)\), which establishes the convergence of a consistent, D-stable multistep method, and shows the dependence of the global error on the initialization error and on the truncation error.

13.11 A-Stability

So far we have talked about numerical stability in the sense of a bounded growth of the error, or equivalently of the boundedness of the numerical approximation in the limit as \(\Delta t \to 0\) \((n \to \infty)\). There is another type of numerical stability which gives us some guidance on the actual size of \(\Delta t\) one
can take for a stable computation using a given ODE numerical method. This type of stability is called linear stability, absolute stability, or A-stability. It is based on the behavior of a numerical method for the simple linear problem:

\[ y' = \lambda y, \quad y(0) = 1, \]

where \( \lambda \) is a complex number. The exact solution is \( y(t) = e^{\lambda t} \).

Let us look at the forward Euler method applied to this model problem:

\[
y^{n+1} = y^n + \Delta t \lambda y^n = (1 + \Delta t \lambda)y^n
= (1 + \Delta t \lambda)(1 + \Delta t \lambda)y^{n-1} = (1 + \Delta t \lambda)^2 y^{n-1}
= \ldots = (1 + \Delta t \lambda)^{n+1} y^0 = (1 + \Delta t \lambda)^{n+1}.
\]

Thus, \( y^n = (1 + \Delta t \lambda)^n \). Evidently, in order for this numerical approximation to remain bounded as \( n \to \infty \) (long time behavior) we need

\[
|1 + \Delta t \lambda| \leq 1.
\]

This puts a constraint on the size of \( \Delta t \) we can take for a stable computation with the forward Euler method. For example, if \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( \lambda < 0 \), we need to take \( \Delta t \leq 2/|\lambda| \). Denoting \( z = \Delta t \lambda \), the set

\[
S = \{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |1 + z| \leq 1 \},
\]

i.e. the unit disk centered at \(-1\) is the region of A-stability of the forward Euler method.

Runge-Kutta methods applied to the linear problem produce a solution of the form

\[
y^{n+1} = R(\Delta t \lambda)y^n,
\]

where \( R \) is a rational function, \( R(z) = \frac{P(z)}{Q(z)} \), where \( P \) ands \( Q \) are polynomials. In particular, when the RK method is explicit \( R \) is just a polynomial. For an RK method, the region of A-stability is given by the set

\[
S = \{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |R(z)| \leq 1 \}.
\]

\( R \) is called the stability function of the RK method. Figure shows the A-stability regions for explicit RK methods of order 1 (Euler) through 4. Note that as the order increases so does the A-stability region.
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Figure 13.3: A-Stability regions for explicit RK methods of order 1–4.

Example 13.18. The improved Euler method. We have

\[ y^{n+1} = y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} [\lambda y^n + \lambda (y^n + \Delta t \lambda y^n)] , \]  

that is

\[ y^{n+1} = \left[ 1 + \Delta t \lambda + \frac{1}{2} (\Delta t \lambda)^2 \right] y^n . \]

The stability function is therefore

\[ R(z) = 1 + z + \frac{z^2}{2} . \]  

Observe that

\[ R(\Delta t \lambda) \approx e^{\Delta t \lambda} \text{ to third order in } \Delta t , \]  

as it should, because the method is second order. The A-stability region, i.e. the set of all complex numbers \( z \) such that \(|R(z)| \leq 1\) is the RK2 region shown in Fig. 13.3.

Example 13.19. The backward Euler method. In this case we have,

\[ y^{n+1} = y^n + \Delta t \lambda y^{n+1} , \]  

That is, \( R(\Delta t \lambda) \approx e^{\Delta t \lambda} \to third order in } \Delta t, as it should, because the method is second order. The A-stability region, i.e. the set of all complex numbers \( z \) such that \(|R(z)| \leq 1\) is the RK2 region shown in Fig. 13.3. \]
and solving for \( y^{n+1} \) we obtain

\[
y^{n+1} = \left[ \frac{1}{1 - \Delta t \lambda} \right] y^n. \tag{13.180}
\]

So its stability function is \( R(z) = 1/(1 - z) \) and its A-stability region is therefore the set of complex numbers \( z \) such that \(|1 - z| \geq 1\), i.e. the exterior of the unit disk centered at 1 as shown in Fig. 13.4(a).

**Example 13.20.** The implicit trapezoidal rule method. We have

\[
y^{n+1} = y^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} (\lambda y^n + \lambda y^{n+1}) \tag{13.181}
\]

and solving for \( y^{n+1} \) we get

\[
y^{n+1} = \left[ 1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \lambda \right] \left[ 1 - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \lambda \right] y^n. \tag{13.182}
\]

Thus, the region of A-stability of the (implicit) trapezoidal rule method is the set complex numbers \( z \) such that

\[
\left| \frac{1 + \frac{z}{2}}{1 - \frac{z}{2}} \right| \leq 1 \tag{13.183}
\]

and this is the entire left half complex plane, \( \text{Re}\{z\} \leq 0 \) [Fig. 13.4(b)]

**Definition 13.8.** A method is called A-stable if its linear stability region contains the left half complex plane.

The trapezoidal rule method and the backward Euler method are both A-stable.

Let us consider now A-stability for linear multistep methods. When we applied an m-step \((m > 1)\) method to the linear ODE \(13.169\) we get

\[
\sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j y^{n+j} - \Delta t \lambda \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_j y^{n+j} = 0. \tag{13.184}
\]
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Figure 13.4: Region of A-stability for (a) backward Euler and (b) the trapezoidal rule method.

This is a constant coefficients, linear difference equation. We look for solutions of this equation in the form $y^n = c\xi^n$ as we have done earlier. Substituting into (13.184) we have

$$c\xi^n \sum_{j=0}^{m} (a_j - \Delta t\lambda b_j)\xi^j = 0. \quad (13.185)$$

If $c\xi^n = 0$ we get the trivial solution $y^n \equiv 0$, otherwise $\xi$ must be root of the polynomial

$$\pi(\xi, z) = (a_m - zb_m)\xi^m + (a_{m-1} - zb_{m-1})\xi^{m-1} + \ldots + (a_0 - zb_0), \quad (13.186)$$

where $z = \Delta t\lambda$. We can write $\pi(\xi, z)$ in terms of the characteristic polynomials $\rho$ (13.132) and $\sigma$ (13.133) of the multistep method as

$$\pi(\xi, z) = \rho(\xi) - z\sigma(\xi). \quad (13.187)$$

Hence, for the numerical approximation $y^n$ to remain bounded as $n \to \infty$ we need that all the roots of the polynomial $\pi$ satisfy the root condition.

**Definition 13.9.** The region of A-stability of a linear multistep method is the set

$$\mathcal{S} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : all \ the \ roots \ of \ \pi(\xi, z) \ satisfy \ the \ root \ condition\}. \quad (13.188)$$
Recall that consistency for a multistep method translates into the following conditions $\rho(1) = 0$ and $\rho'(1) = \sigma(1)$. The first condition implies that $\pi(1; 0) = 0$. Because the zeros of a polynomial depend continuously on its coefficients, it follows that $\pi$ has a root $\xi_1(z)$ for $z$ in the neighborhood of zero. Such root is called the principal root of $\pi(\xi, z)$ and it can be shown that $\xi_1(z) = e^z + O(z^{p+1})$ for a method of order $p$. Thus, it carries the expected approximation to the exact solution $e^z$. The other roots of $\pi(\xi, z)$ are called parasitic roots.

**Example 13.21.** Consider the 2-step method

$$y^{n+1} + 4y^n - 5y^{n-1} = \Delta t \left[ 4f^n + 2f^{n-1} \right]. \quad (13.189)$$

Then

$$\rho(\xi) = \xi^2 + 4\xi - 5 = (\xi - 1)(\xi + 5), \quad (13.190)$$

$$\sigma(\xi) = 4\xi + 2. \quad (13.191)$$

Thus, $\rho(1) = 0$ and $\rho'(1) = \sigma(1)$ and the method is consistent. However, the roots of $\rho$ are 1 and $-5$ and hence the method is not $D$-stable. Therefore, by Dahlquist Equivalence Theorem, it is not convergent. Note that

$$\pi(\xi, z) = \xi^2 + 4(1 - z)\xi - (5 + 2z) \quad (13.192)$$

has roots

$$\xi_{\pm} = -2 + 2z \pm 3\sqrt{1 - \frac{2}{3}z + \frac{4}{9}z^2} \quad (13.193)$$

and for small $|z|$ we have

$$\sqrt{1 - \frac{2}{3}z + \frac{4}{9}z^2} = 1 - \frac{1}{3}z + \frac{1}{6}z^2 + \frac{1}{18}z^3 + O(z^4) \quad (13.194)$$

$$\xi_+ = 1 + z + \frac{1}{2}z^2 + \frac{1}{6}z^3 + O(z^4) = e^z + O(z^4) \quad \text{principal root.} \quad (13.195)$$

$$\xi_- = -5 + 3z + O(z^2) \quad \text{parasitic root.} \quad (13.196)$$

Note that this 2-step, explicit method is third order. However, it is completely useless!
13.12. \textit{Numerically Stiff ODES and L-Stability}

In applications we often have systems of ODEs that have two or more disparate time scales. For example, a process that evolves very fast in a slowly varying environment or a reaction of several chemicals with vastly different
reaction rates. This type of problems are called numerically stiff and, as we will see, explicit numerical methods fail miserably when applied to them. In fact, numerically stiff systems are often defined as those systems for which explicit numerical methods fail.

Consider the function

\[ y(t) = \alpha e^{\lambda t} + \sin 2\pi t, \tag{13.197} \]

where \( \alpha, \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( \lambda \) is negative with large absolute value. Thus, for \( \alpha \neq 0 \), \( y \) has two components: an exponentially decaying, transient part and a slowly (order one time scale) varying sinusoidal part. It is easy to verify that \( y \) in (13.197) is the solution of the IVP

\[
\begin{align*}
  y'(t) &= \lambda [y(t) - \sin 2\pi t] + 2\pi \cos 2\pi t, \quad 0 < t \leq 1 \\
  y(0) &= \alpha.
\end{align*} \tag{13.198} \tag{13.199}
\]

For concreteness, let us take \( \lambda = -1000 \). Figure 13.7 shows \( y(t) \) for \( \alpha = 0.75 \). Clearly, \( y(t) \) quickly approaches the steady part, \( \sin 2\pi t \). This will be the case for any other non-zero initial value \( \alpha \).
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The explicit (forward) Euler method applied to (13.198)-(13.199) requires $\Delta t < 2/1000 = 1/500$ for A-stability. Figure 13.8 presents the approximation for $t \in [0, 0.25]$ obtained with the forward Euler method for $\Delta t = 1/512$, close to the boundary of $S$. Observe that the Euler approximation approaches the steady solution but with an oscillatory behavior. The method fails to adequately capture the fast transient and the smooth evolution of the exact solution, despite the small $\Delta t$. The accuracy is clearly not $O(\Delta t)$!

We now consider the implicit (backward) Euler method to solve (13.198)-(13.199) again with $\lambda = -1000$ and $\Delta t = 1/512$. Figure 13.9 compares the backward Euler approximation with the exact solution and shows this method produces a smooth and accurate approximation. The backward Euler method is A-stable so for $\lambda < 0$ there is no stability restriction for $\Delta t$. This is advantageous when are interested in reaching quickly the steady state by taking a large $\Delta t$ and do not care too much about the ultra fast transient.

The backward Euler method is only first order accurate. It is tempting to replace it with a second order A-stable method, like the trapezoidal rule method. After all, the latter has about the same computational cost as the former but its order is higher. Well, as Fig. 13.10 demonstrates, the
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Figure 13.8: Forward Euler approximation and exact solution of (13.198)-(13.199) with $\alpha = 0.75$ and $\lambda = -1000$ for $t \in [0, 0.25]$. $\Delta t = 1/512$.

Figure 13.9: Backward Euler approximation and exact solution of (13.198)-(13.199) with $\alpha = 0.75$ and $\lambda = -1000$ for $t \in [0, 0.25]$. $\Delta t = 1/512$. 
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Figure 13.10: Trapezoidal rule approximation compared with the backward Euler approximation and the exact solution of (13.198)-(13.199) with $\alpha = 0.75$ and $\lambda = -1000$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. $\Delta t = 0.05$.

The trapezoidal rule method is actually a poor choice for this stiff problem; the first order, backward Euler method turns out to be more accurate than the second order trapezoidal rule method in the stiff regime $|\lambda \Delta t|$ large (we used $\Delta t = 0.05$).

This behavior can be explained in terms of the stability function $R$. Recall that for the trapezoidal rule method

$$R(z) = \frac{1 + \frac{1}{2}z}{1 - \frac{1}{2}z},$$

(13.200)

with $z = \lambda \Delta t$. In this example, $z = -50$ and $R(-50) = -24/26 \approx -0.923$, which is close to $-1$. Hence, the trapezoidal rule approximation decays very slowly toward the solution’s steady state part and does so with oscillations because of the negative sign in $R(z)$. In contrast, for the backward Euler method $R(-50) = 1/51 \approx 0.0196$ and the decay is fast and nonoscillatory.

Note that if we take the initial condition $\alpha = 0$ the numerical stiffness of the initial value problem (13.198)-(13.199) disappears and the trapezoidal
rule method approximates more accurately the exact solution $y(t) = \sin 2\pi t$ than the backward Euler method for the same $\Delta t$, as expected.

As we have just seen, the behavior $|R(z)| \to 0$ as $|z| \to \infty$ is desirable for some stiff problems where the solution or some components of the solution have fast decay. This motivates the following definition.

**Definition 13.10.** A one-step method is L-stable if it is A-stable and

$$
\lim_{|z|\to\infty} |R(z)| = 0.
$$

(13.201)

**Example 13.22.** The backward Euler method is A-stable and has stability function $R(z) = 1/(1 - z)$. Therefore, it is L-stable. The trapezoidal rule method, while A-stable is not L-stable for $|R(z)| \to 1$ as $|z| \to \infty$.

Let us consider now the linear system

$$
y' = Ay + f(t),
$$

(13.202)

where $y, f \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $A$ is an $n \times n$ matrix. If $A$ has distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_n$, with corresponding eigenvectors $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$, and all the eigenvalues have a negative real part, the general solution consists of a transient part and a steady state part, just as in the scalar example that motivated this section. Specifically, the general solution of $y' = Ay + f(t)$ can be written as

$$
y(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k e^{\lambda_k t} v_k + s(t),
$$

(13.203)

where the $a_k$’s are constants determined by the initial condition and $s(t)$ represents the steady state. Let $\lambda_p$ and $\lambda_q$ be the eigenvalues with the largest and the smallest absolute value of the real part, i.e. $|\text{Re}\{\lambda_p\}| = \max_j |\text{Re}\{\lambda_j\}|$ and $|\text{Re}\{\lambda_q\}| = \min_j |\text{Re}\{\lambda_j\}|$. For an explicit method, $|\text{Re}\{\lambda_p\}|$ limits the size of $\Delta t$ to be in the A-stability region while $|\text{Re}\{\lambda_q\}|$ dictates how long we need to time-step to reach the steady state; the smaller $|\text{Re}\{\lambda_q\}|$ the longer we need to compute. Hence, the ratio of the fastest to slowest time scale

$$
S_r = \frac{|\text{Re}\{\lambda_p\}|}{|\text{Re}\{\lambda_q\}|}
$$

(13.204)
is a measure of the numerical stiffness for this linear system.

Often, numerically stiff ODE systems are nonlinear. We can get some estimate of their degree of stiffness by linearization. The idea is that small perturbations in the solution are governed by a linear system and if this is numerically stiff, then so is the nonlinear system.

Consider the autonomous nonlinear system \( y' = f(y) \) and write

\[
y(t) = y(t^*) + \epsilon w(t),
\]

for small \( \epsilon \). Here, \( y(t^*) \) is just a given state, for example \( y(t_n) \). Now, Taylor expand \( f(y) \) around \( y(t^*) \), retaining only up the \( O(\epsilon) \) term,

\[
f(y(t)) \approx f(y(t^*)) + \epsilon \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(y(t^*))w(t).
\]

Substituting (13.205) and (13.206) into \( y' = f(y) \), we find the perturbation \( w(t) \) approximately satisfies the linear ODE system

\[
w'(t) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(y(t^*))w(t) + \frac{1}{\epsilon} f(y(t^*)).
\]

Then, at least locally (i.e. in a neighborhood of \( t^* \)) the variation of the solution is approximately governed by (13.207). Thus, one approximate indicator of numerical stiffness could be the stiffness ratio \( S_r \) of the Jacobian matrix \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(y(t^*)) \). However, if the Jacobian varies significantly in the time interval of interest, \( S_r \) might not a good stiffness indicator. In practice, numerical stiffness is often assessed by using two error estimators. One for an explicit method and the other for a lower order approximation but that outperforms the explicit method in the stiff limit. If the error estimate for the lower order method is smaller than that of the explicit method repeatedly over several time-steps, it is viewed as an indication that the explicit method is inadequate, the IVP is considered stiff, and the explicit method is replaced by a suitable implicit one.

**Example 13.23.** The van der Pol system

\[
y_1' = y_2 - y_1^3 + 2\mu y_1, \tag{13.208}
y_2' = -y_1, \tag{13.209}
\]

is a simple model of an RLC electric circuit; \( y_1 \) and \( y_2 \) are related to the current and voltage, respectively, and the parameter \( \mu \) controls the resistance.
This ODE system has only one equilibrium point, \((0, 0)\). Let’s look at the Jacobian evaluated at \((0, 0)\)

\[
\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(0, 0) = \begin{bmatrix} 2\mu & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.
\] (13.210)

The eigenvalues of this matrix are

\[
\lambda = \mu \pm \sqrt{\mu^2 - 1}.
\] (13.211)

For moderate values of \(|\mu|\) the system could be integrated with an explicit method. However, for very negative values of \(\mu\) it becomes numerically stiff. For example, if \(\mu = -100\) the corresponding stiffness ratio is

\[
S_r = \left| \frac{\mu - \sqrt{\mu^2 - 1}}{\mu + \sqrt{\mu^2 - 1}} \right| \approx 4 \times 10^4.
\] (13.212)
Chapter 14

Numerical Methods for PDE’s

14.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a brief introduction to the vast topic of numerical methods for partial differential equations. We focus the discussion on finite difference methods. Other important classes of numerical methods for PDEs, not treated here, are the finite element method and spectral methods.

We will introduce the main concepts (truncation error, consistency, stability, and convergence) through one example, the heat equation in one spatial dimension, as done in the classical text by Richtmyer and Morton.

14.2 Key Concepts through One Example

Consider a thin rod or wire of length \( l \), with an initial temperature distribution \( f \) and whose left and right endpoints are kept at fixed temperatures \( u_L \) and \( u_R \), respectively. Assuming the rod is homogeneous, the temperature \( u(t,x) \) at a later time \( t \) and at a point \( x \) in the rod satisfies the heat equation problem:

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_t(t,x) &= Du_{xx}(t,x), & 0 < x < l, & 0 < t \leq T, \\
    u(0,x) &= f(x), & 0 < x < l, \\
    u(t,0) &= u_L, & u(t,l) = u_R,
\end{align*}
\]

where \( D > 0 \) is the rod’s diffusion coefficient and \( T \) is the final time we are interested to look at the solution. This is a Dirichlet problem because
we are specifying the value of the solution at the boundary, Eq. (14.3). For simplicity, we are going to take \( u_R = u_L = 0 \) and \( l = \pi \). This homogeneous Dirichlet problem can be solved analytically, using the method of separation of variables. Having a representation of the exact solution will be very helpful in the discussion of the fundamental aspects of the numerical approximations.

Assuming,

\[
    u(t, x) = \phi(t) \psi(x) \quad (14.4)
\]

and substituting into the heat equation (14.1) we get \( \phi' \psi = D \phi \psi'' \). Or rearranging

\[
    \frac{\phi'}{D \phi} = \frac{\psi''}{\psi}. \quad (14.5)
\]

The expression on the left hand side of (14.5) is a function of \( t \) only while that on the right hand side is a function of \( x \) only. Therefore they are both equal to a constant. This constant has to be negative since \( D > 0 \) and the temperature cannot grow exponentially in time. We write this constant as \( -\lambda^2 \) and get the two linear ODEs

\[
    \psi'' + \lambda^2 \psi = 0, \quad (14.6) \\
    \phi' + \lambda^2 D \phi = 0. \quad (14.7)
\]

The first equation, (14.6), is that of a harmonic oscillator whose general solution is

\[
    \psi(x) = a \cos \lambda x + b \sin \lambda x. \quad (14.8)
\]

The boundary condition at \( x = 0 \) implies \( a = 0 \), while the boundary condition at \( x = \pi \) gives that \( \lambda \) has to be an integer, which we can assume to be positive since \( b \sin(-\lambda x) = -b \sin(\lambda x) \) and we can absorb the sign in \( b \). So we set \( \lambda = k \) for all \( k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \). On the other hand, the solutions of (14.7) are a constant times \( \exp(-k^2 D t) \). Thus, for every \( k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \) and constant \( b_k \),

\[
    b_k \exp(-k^2 D t) \sin kx \text{ is a solution of the heat equation which vanishes at the boundary. We find the general solution by superposition:}
\]

\[
    u(t, x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k e^{-k^2 D t} \sin kx. \quad (14.9)
\]
The coefficients $b_k$ are determined from the initial condition (14.2):

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k \sin kx. \quad (14.10)$$

In other words, the $b_k$’s are the sine Fourier coefficients of the initial temperature distribution $f$, i.e.

$$b_k = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi} f(x) \sin kx \, dx, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots \quad (14.11)$$

Going back to the solution (Eq. 14.9), we can write it as

$$u(t, x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \hat{u}_k(t) \sin kx, \quad (14.12)$$

where $\hat{u}_k(t) = b_k e^{-k^2Dt}$ is the amplitude of each harmonic mode (each $\sin kx$), which decays exponentially for $t > 0$. Thus, even for a merely continuous initial condition, an accurate approximation can be obtained by truncating the series (14.12) with just a few terms.

Suppose the initial temperature is the tent function

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 
  x & 0 \leq x \leq \frac{\pi}{2}, \\
  \pi - x & \frac{\pi}{2} < x \leq \pi.
\end{cases} \quad (14.13)$$

We can evaluate (14.11) exactly using integration by parts. In general, we would have to approximate them using a quadrature. As we know (see Section 1.3), the natural quadrature here is the equi-spaced composite trapezoidal rule. It provides spectral accuracy for a periodic integrand (integrated over one or multiple periods) and can be evaluated fast with the FFT as described in Section 3.12. Figure 14.1 shows snapshots of the solution at different times. Note that even though the initial temperature distribution $f$ is just continuous, the solution at any $t > 0$ is smooth and decays monotonically in time.

While the preceding method based on a Fourier expansion yields an exact representation of the solution, ultimately approximations have to be made to obtain the Fourier coefficients of the initial condition and to truncate the series. The method is also quite limited in its applicability. Finite difference
methods offer a much broader applicability and are widely used in both linear and nonlinear PDE problems.

In finite difference methods, we start by laying out a grid on the computational space. In our example, the computational space is the rectangle $[0, \pi] \times [0, T]$ in the $xt$ plane. For simplicity, we employ a uniform grid, i.e., one created by a uniform partition of $[0, \pi]$ and $[0, T]$ as shown in Fig. 14.2. We select positive integers $M$ and $N$ so that our grid or mesh is defined by the nodes

$$(t_n, x_j) = (n \Delta t, j \Delta x), \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, N, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, M, \quad (14.14)$$

where $\Delta t = T/N$ is the temporal mesh size or time step size and $\Delta x = \pi/M$ is the spatial mesh size. We look for an approximation

$$u^n_j \approx u(t_n, x_j) \quad (14.15)$$

of the solution at the interior nodes $(t_n, x_j), n = 1, 2, \ldots, N, j = 1, 2, \ldots, M - 1$. To this end, we approximate the derivatives with finite differences (Chapter 6). For example, if we use forward in time and centered in space finite
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Figure 14.2: Grid in the $xt$-plane. The interior nodes (where an approximation to the solution is sought), the boundary points, and initial value nodes are marked with black, blue, and green dots, respectively.

differences we get

$$\frac{u_j^{n+1} - u_j^n}{\Delta t} = D \frac{u_{j+1}^n - 2u_j^n + u_{j-1}^n}{(\Delta x)^2}, \quad (14.16)$$

for $n = 0, 2, \ldots, N - 1$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, M - 1$, with boundary conditions $u_0^n = 0$, $u_M^n = 0$, and initial condition $u_j^0 = f(x_j)$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, M$. We can solve explicitly for $u_j^{n+1}$ and march up in time, starting from the initial condition, using:

For $n = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1$,

$$u_j^{n+1} = u_j^n + \alpha [u_{j+1}^n - 2u_j^n + u_{j-1}^n], \quad (14.17)$$

where

$$\alpha = D\Delta t/(\Delta x)^2. \quad (14.18)$$

Note that the boundary conditions are used for $j = 1$ and $j = M - 1$. This is an explicit finite difference scheme and is straightforward to implement. The resulting approximation, however, depends crucially on whether $\alpha \leq 1/2$ or $\alpha > 1/2$. As Fig. 14.3(a)-(c) shows, for $\alpha = 0.55$ the numerical approximation does not vary smoothly; it has oscillations whose amplitude grows with $n$ and
has no resemblance with the exact solution. Clearly, the approximation for \( \alpha = 0.55 \) is numerically unstable in the sense that \( u_j^n \) is not bounded as \( n \to \infty \). In contrast, for \( \alpha = 0.50 \) [Fig. 14.3(d)] the numerical approximation has the expected smooth and monotone behavior and approximates well the exact solution.

The following simple estimate offers some clue on why there is a marked difference in the numerical approximation depending on whether \( \alpha \leq 1/2 \).

From (14.17) we can rewrite the finite difference scheme as

\[
    u_{j+1}^n = \alpha u_{j+1}^n + (1 - 2\alpha)u_j^n + \alpha u_{j-1}^n \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, M - 1. \tag{14.19}
\]

Note that \( \alpha > 0 \) (since \( D > 0 \)) and if \( \alpha \leq 1/2 \) then \( 1 - 2\alpha \geq 0 \). Taking the absolute value in (14.19) and using the triangle inequality we get

\[
    |u_{j+1}^n| \leq \alpha|u_{j+1}^n| + (1 - 2\alpha)|u_j^n| + \alpha|u_{j-1}^n| \tag{14.20}
\]

Now, taking the maximum over \( j \) and denoting \( \|u^{n+1}\|_\infty = \max_j |u_{j+1}^n| \) and similarly for \( u^n \), we obtain

\[
    \|u^{n+1}\|_\infty \leq \alpha\|u^n\|_\infty + (1 - 2\alpha)\|u^n\|_\infty + \alpha\|u^n\|_\infty = [\alpha + (1 - 2\alpha) + \alpha]\|u^n\|_\infty = \|u^n\|_\infty. \tag{14.21}
\]

That is

\[
    \|u^{n+1}\|_\infty \leq \|u^n\|_\infty \tag{14.22}
\]

for all (integers) \( n \geq 0 \). Numerical schemes with this property are called monotone; the size of numerical approximation (in some norm) does not increase from one time step to the next. Using (14.22) repeatedly all the way down to \( n = 0 \) we have

\[
    \|u^n\|_\infty \leq \|u^{n-1}\|_\infty \leq \|u^{n-2}\|_\infty \leq \ldots \leq \|u^0\|_\infty \tag{14.23}
\]

and thus

\[
    \|u^n\|_\infty \leq \|u^0\|_\infty \tag{14.24}
\]

for all (integers) \( n \geq 0 \). Since the initial condition \( u^0 = f \) is bounded we have that the numerical approximation remains bounded as \( n \to \infty \). Thus, numerical method for \( \alpha \leq 1/2 \) is stable.
Figure 14.3: Numerical approximations of the heat equation with the forward in time-centered in space finite difference scheme for $\alpha = 0.55$, after (a) 30 time steps, (b) 40 time steps, (c) 100 time steps and for $\alpha = 0.5$ (d) plotted at different times. In all the computations $\Delta x = \pi/128$. 
14.2.1 von Neumann Analysis of Numerical Stability

The heat equation is a linear PDE with constant coefficients. This allowed us to use a Fourier (sine) series to arrive at the exact solution \( (14.9) \). Specifically, we separated the problem into an \( x \) and a \( t \) dependence. For the former, we found that for each \( k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \), \( \sin kx \) is the solution of \( \psi'' = -k^2 \psi \) that vanishes at 0 and \( \pi \), i.e., \( \sin kx \) is an eigenfunction of the second derivative operator on the space of \( C^2[0,\pi] \) functions vanishing at the boundary. We can do a similar separation of variables to represent the solution of the finite difference scheme

\[
 u_j^{n+1} = u_j^n + \alpha \left[ u_{j+1}^n - 2u_j^n + u_{j-1}^n \right],
\]

(14.25)

with the boundary conditions \( u_0^n = u_M^n = 0 \) for all \( n \). To this effect, we note that the vector whose components are \( \sin(kj\Delta x) \), \( j = 1, \ldots, M-1 \), with \( \Delta x = \pi/M \), is an eigenvector of the centered, finite difference operator

\[
 \delta^2 u_j := u_{j-1} - 2u_j + u_{j+1}
\]

(14.26)

with vanishing boundary conditions (at \( j = 0, M \)), i.e. of the \( (M-1) \times (M-1) \) matrix

\[
 \begin{bmatrix}
 -2 & 1 & & & \\
 1 & -2 & 1 & & \\
 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\
 & & 1 & & \\
 & & & 1 & -2
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

(14.27)

To prove this and to simplify the algebra we employ the complex exponential

\[
 e^{ikj\Delta x} = \cos(kj\Delta x) + i \sin(kj\Delta x), \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, M-1.
\]

(14.28)

We have

\[
 \delta^2 e^{ikj\Delta x} = [e^{-ik\Delta x} - 2 + e^{ik\Delta x}] e^{ikj\Delta x}
\]

\[
 = -2 [1 - \cos(k\Delta x)] e^{ikj\Delta x}.
\]

(14.29)

Taking the imaginary part, we obtain

\[
 \delta^2 \sin(kj\Delta x) = -2 [1 - \cos(k\Delta x)] \sin(kj\Delta x).
\]

(14.30)
This result and (14.12) suggest to look for solutions of the finite difference scheme (14.26) of the form

$$ u^n_j = \hat{u}^n_k \sin(kj\Delta x), \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{Z}^+. $$

(14.31)

Substituting this in (14.26), and cancelling the common factor $\sin(kj\Delta x)$, we obtain

$$ \hat{u}^n_{k+1} - [1 - 2\alpha(1 - \cos(k\Delta x))] \hat{u}^n_k = 0. $$

(14.32)

For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, this is a constant coefficient, this linear difference equation (in the super-index) whose solutions are of the form

$$ \hat{u}^n_k = b_k \xi^n, $$

(14.33)

where $b_k$ is a constant determined by the initial condition $b_k = \hat{u}^0_k$, $n$ in $\xi^n$ is a power, and

$$ \xi = 1 - 2\alpha [1 - \cos(k\Delta x)]. $$

(14.34)

The function $\xi$ is called the amplification factor of the finite difference scheme because it determines how the amplitude of a Fourier mode grows or decays each time step, the discrete counterpart to $e^{-Dk^2\Delta t}$. Note that $\xi$ depends on $k\Delta x$, henceforth we will emphasize this dependence by writing $\xi(k\Delta x)$.

Using linearity of the finite difference scheme (14.26) we can write its solution as

$$ u^n_j = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k \xi^n(k\Delta x) \sin(kj\Delta x), \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, M - 1. $$

(14.35)

Since $u^0_j = f(j\Delta x)$ it follows that the coefficients $b_k$ are the sine coefficients of the initial condition $f$ and are thus given by (14.11). Therefore,

$$ |u^n_j| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |b_k| |\xi(k\Delta x)|^n. $$

(14.36)

If $|\xi(k\Delta x)| \leq 1$ for all possible values of $k\Delta x$, then

$$ |u^n_j| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |b_k| = \text{constant}, $$

(14.37)
where we have assumed that the initial condition has an absolutely convergent sine series. That is, the numerical approximation is guaranteed to be bounded as \( n \to \infty \) if \( |\xi(k\Delta x)| \leq 1 \). On the other hand if for some \( k^* \), \( |\xi(k^*\Delta x)| > 1 \), then the corresponding Fourier mode, \( b_k \cdot \xi \sin(k^*j\Delta x) \), will grow without a bound as \( n \to \infty \) if the initial condition has a nonzero \( b_k \). Setting \( \theta = k\Delta x \), we conclude that the finite difference scheme (14.17) is numerically stable if and only if

\[
|\xi(\theta)| \leq 1, \quad \forall \theta \in [0, \pi],
\]

and using (14.34) this condition translates into

\[
-1 \leq 1 - 2\alpha(1 - \cos \theta) \leq 1, \quad \forall \theta \in [0, \pi].
\]

Since \( \alpha > 0 \) the second inequality is always satisfied. From the first inequality, noting that the maximum of \( 1 - \cos \theta \) occurs for \( \theta = \pi \), we obtain that the scheme (14.17) is numerically stable if and only if

\[
\alpha \leq 1/2.
\]

This is the same condition we found earlier using a maximum norm estimate. However, the Fourier analysis for the finite difference scheme, which is commonly called von Neumann analysis, offers additional information on what happens if \( \alpha > 1/2 \). If \( I |\xi(k\Delta x)| > 1 \) for some \( k \), the corresponding Fourier mode will not be bounded as \( n \to \infty \). The mode that becomes most unstable is the one for which \( |\xi| \) is the largest, i.e. when \( k\Delta x \approx \pi \) or equivalently \( k \approx \pi/\Delta x \). This is precisely the highest wave number (\( k = M - 1 \) in this case) mode we can resolve with a mesh of size \( \Delta x \). Going back to our numerical experiment in Fig. 14.3(a)-(c) we see that the oscillations in the numerical approximation with \( \alpha > 1/2 \) have a wavelength of approximately \( 2\Delta x \). Moreover, the oscillations appear first in a localized region around the point where the underlying exact solution is less regular, the peak of the tent. The short wavelength of the oscillations, its initial localized appearance, and fast amplitude growth as \( n \) increases are a telltale of numerical instability.

It is important to note that due to the linearity of the finite difference scheme and its constant coefficients, we only need to examine the behavior of individual Fourier modes of the numerical approximation. This is the basis of the von Neumann analysis: to examine how the finite difference scheme evolves a (complex) Fourier mode \( \xi^*e^{ikj\Delta x} \). The focus of this analysis is on
stability at the interior nodes, not at the boundary, so the problem need not have periodic or homogeneous boundary conditions. For non-periodic boundary conditions, the stability of the numerical scheme at the boundary has to be considered separately.

For some finite difference schemes, $\xi$ might also be a function of $\Delta t$. In this case the stability condition for the amplification factor has the milder form

$$|\xi(k\Delta x, \Delta t)| \leq 1 + C\Delta t, \quad (14.41)$$

where $C$ is a constant or equivalently, $|\xi|^2 \leq 1 + \tilde{C}\Delta t$ for some constant $\tilde{C}$. The condition for $|\xi|^2$ is generally easier to check than (14.41) because it avoids the square root when $\xi$ is complex.

### 14.2.2 Order of a Method and Consistency

It is instructive to compare the representations (14.9) and (14.35) of the exact solution and of the solution of the forward in time and centered in space finite difference scheme, respectively. It is clear that the amplification factor $\xi(k\Delta x)$ should be an approximation of $e^{-k^2D\Delta t}$ for sufficiently small $\Delta t$ and $\Delta x$. Keeping $\alpha = D\Delta t/(\Delta x)^2$ fixed, we have $k^2D\Delta t = \alpha(k\Delta x)^2 = \alpha\theta^2$ and Taylor expanding

$$\xi(\theta) = 1 - 2\alpha \left[ \frac{1}{2}\theta^2 - \frac{1}{24}\theta^4 + \ldots \right] \quad (14.42)$$

$$e^{-\alpha\theta^2} = 1 - \alpha\theta^2 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\theta^4 + \ldots, \quad (14.43)$$

from which it follows that

$$\xi(k\Delta x) = e^{-k^2D\Delta t} + O(\Delta t)^2. \quad (14.44)$$

This is reminiscent of the approximation of $e^{\lambda \Delta t}$ by the stability function for a first order one-step method (Section 13.11) and which gives the local truncation error of said method (up to the factor $y(t_n)$). Indeed, (14.44) is a consequence of the fact that the finite difference scheme (14.16) provides a $O(\Delta t)$ approximation to the time derivative and an $O(\Delta x)^2$ approximation to the spatial second derivative.
**Definition 14.1.** The local discretization or truncation error \( \tau_j^{n+1}(\Delta t, \Delta x) \) at \((t_{n+1}, x_j)\) is given by

\[
\tau_j^{n+1}(\Delta t, \Delta x) = \frac{u(t_{n+1}, x_j) - \tilde{u}_j^{n+1}}{\Delta t},
\]

where \( \tilde{u}_j^{n+1} \) is computed by doing one step of the numerical method starting with the exact solution of the PDE IVP at time \( t_n \) for a one-step method or at times \( t_n - (m-1), \ldots, t_n-1, t_n \) for a \((m > 1)\) multistep method.

The local discretization error of the finite difference scheme (14.16) at a point \((x_j, t_{n+1})\) is thus given by

\[
\tau_j^{n+1}(\Delta t, \Delta x) = \frac{u(t_{n+1}, x_j) - u(t_n, x_j)}{\Delta t} - D u(t_n, x_{j+1}) - 2u(t_n, x_j) + u(t_n, x_{j-1}) (\Delta x)^2,
\]

where \( u(t, x) \) is the exact solution of the PDE IVP\(^1\). As in the ODE case, the local truncation error can be interpreted as a measure of how well the exact solution of the PDE satisfies the finite difference scheme locally.

Assuming the exact solution has enough continuous derivatives, we can Taylor expand the right hand side of (14.46) around \((t_n, x_j)\) to find

\[
\tau_j^{n+1}(\Delta t, \Delta x) = u_t - Du_{xx} + \frac{1}{2}u_{tt}\Delta t - \frac{D}{12}u_{xxxx}(\Delta x)^2 + O(\Delta t)^2 + O(\Delta x)^4,
\]

where all the derivatives on the right hand side are evaluated at \((t_n, x_j)\). Since \( u \) is the exact solution, we have that

\[
\tau_j^{n+1}(\Delta t, \Delta x) = O(\Delta t) + O(\Delta x)^2
\]

and we say that the finite difference method is of order 1 in time and of order 2 in space.

**Definition 14.2.** A finite difference scheme is consistent with the PDE it is approximating at a fixed point \((t_{n+1}, x_j)\) if

\[
\tau_j^{n+1}(\Delta t, \Delta x) \to 0, \quad \text{as } \Delta t, \Delta x \to 0.
\]

\(^1\)Note that the finite difference operators, the forward in time and the standard second difference in space, can be defined at any point \((x, t)\), not necessarily a grid point. Thus, the local truncation error is well-defined at each \((t, x)\).
Consistency means that the exact solution of the PDE satisfies increasingly better the finite difference scheme as $\Delta t, \Delta x \to 0$. This is a necessary requirement for the finite difference scheme to approximate the PDE in question and not another equation. However, as we have seen, consistency is not sufficient to guarantee the finite difference approximation will get better as the mesh is refined. We also need stability ($\alpha \leq 1/2$ in this particular case).

### 14.2.3 Convergence

At a fixed point $(t, x)$, we want $u^n_j$ to be an accurate approximation of $u(t, x)$ and to improve as $\Delta t, \Delta x \to 0$, keeping $t = n\Delta t, x = j\Delta x$ fixed.

**Definition 14.3.** The global error of the finite difference approximation at point $(t_n, x_j)$ is given

$$e^n_j(\Delta t, \Delta x) = u(t_n, x_j) - u^n_j,$$  \hspace{1cm} (14.50)

where $u(t_n, x_j)$ and $u^n_j$ are the exact solution and the numerical approximation at $(t_n, x_j)$, respectively.

Because of the linearity of the finite difference scheme it is easy to derive an equation for the global error and using both stability and consistency prove convergence of the numerical approximation to the exact solution, i.e $e^n_j \to 0$ as $\Delta t, \Delta x \to 0$, keeping $t = n\Delta t, x = j\Delta x$ fixed.

Using (14.46) it follows that the exact solution satisfies

$$u(t_{n+1}, x_j) = \alpha u(t_n, x_{j+1}) + (1 - 2\alpha)u(t_n, x_j) + \alpha u(t_n, x_{j-1}) + \Delta t \tau^{n+1}_j(\Delta t, \Delta x)$$  \hspace{1cm} (14.51)

and subtracting (14.19) from this equation we obtain

$$e^{n+1}_j = \alpha e^n_{j+1} + (1 - 2\alpha)e^n_j + \alpha e^n_{j-1} + \Delta t \tau^{n+1}_j(\Delta t, \Delta x).$$  \hspace{1cm} (14.52)

Taking the absolute value, using the triangle inequality, and the stability condition $\alpha \leq 1/2$ we have

$$|e^{n+1}_j| \leq \alpha |e^{n+1}_{j+1}| + (1 - 2\alpha)|e^n_j| + \alpha |e^n_{j-1}| + \Delta t |\tau^{n+1}_j(\Delta t, \Delta x)|.$$  \hspace{1cm} (14.53)

Now, taking the maximum over $j$, and using that (14.48) implies there exist constants $C_1$ and $C_2$ such that $|\tau^n_j(\Delta t, \Delta x)| \leq C_1\Delta t + C_2(\Delta x)^2$ for sufficiently small $\Delta t$ and $\Delta x$, we obtain

$$\|e^{n+1}\|_\infty \leq \|e^n\|_\infty + C_1(\Delta t)^2 + C_2\Delta t(\Delta x)^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (14.54)
where again $\|u^{n+1}\|_\infty = \max_j |u_j^{n+1}|$, etc. Applying repeatedly this inequality it follows that

$$
\|e^n\|_\infty \leq \|e^{n-1}\|_\infty + C_1(\Delta t)^2 + C_2\Delta t(\Delta x)^2 \\
\leq \|e^{n-2}\|_\infty + 2 \left[ C_1(\Delta t)^2 + C_2\Delta t(\Delta x)^2 \right] \\
\ldots \\
\leq \|e^0\|_\infty + n \left[ C_1(\Delta t)^2 + C_2\Delta t(\Delta x)^2 \right].
$$

But $n\Delta t \leq T$ and $\|e^0\|_\infty = 0$ ($u_0$ coincides with the initial condition), therefore

$$
\|e^n\|_\infty \leq T \left[ C_1\Delta t + C_2(\Delta x)^2 \right],
$$

for all $n$. The fact that the terms in the rectangular brackets go to zero as $\Delta t, \Delta x \to 0$ is a restatement of consistency and from this the convergence of the numerical approximation follows.

### 14.2.4 The Lax Equivalence Theorem

We just seen in one example the importance of consistency and stability in the notion of convergence. It is clear that both consistency and stability are necessary for convergence; for without consistency we would not be solving the correct problem in the limit as $\Delta t, \Delta x \to 0$ and without stability the numerical approximation (and therefore the global error) would not remain bounded as $n \to \infty$. For the case of well-posed, linear PDE IVP’s consistency and stability are also sufficient for the convergence of a finite difference scheme. This is the content of the following fundamental theorem in the theory of finite difference methods.

**Theorem 14.1.** The Lax Equivalence Theorem. A consistent finite difference scheme for a well-posed, linear initial value PDE problem is convergent if and only if it is stable.

A rigorous proof of this result requires advanced functional analysis tools and will not be presented here.

### 14.3 The Method of Lines

One approach to construct numerical methods for PDE initial value problems is to discretize in space but leave time dependence continuous. This produces
a large ODE system to which, in principle, one can apply a suitable ODE method. This construction is known as the method of lines because times varies along the lines defined by the spatial nodes as Fig. 14.4 suggests.

To illustrate this approach let’s consider again the one-dimensional heat equation and discretize the second derivative with respect to \( x \) using the standard, centered, second finite difference but leaving time continuous:

\[
\frac{du_j(t)}{dt} = \frac{D}{(\Delta x)^2} (u_{j-1}(t) - 2u_j(t) + u_{j+1}(t)), \quad j = 1, \ldots, M - 1, \tag{14.57}
\]

\[
u_j(0) = f(x_j), \quad j = 1, \ldots, M - 1, \tag{14.58}
\]

where \( u_0(t) = 0 \) and \( u_M(t) = 0 \) and we are interested in solving this ODE system for \( 0 < t \leq T \). If we applied the forward Euler method to this ODE system we get the forward in time-centered in space scheme (14.16) we have analyzed in detail.
14.4 The Backward Euler and Crank-Nicolson Methods

The forward in time-centered in space scheme (14.16) has a somewhat restrictive stability constraint, \( \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2} \), i.e.

\[
\Delta t \leq \frac{1}{2D} (\Delta x)^2.
\]  (14.59)

This is a quadratic stability constraint in \( \Delta x \). For example, with \( D = 5 \), even for a modest spatial resolution of \( \Delta t = 0.01 \) we require a fairly small \( \Delta t \), less than \( 10^{-5} \) and the constraint becomes more severe for \( D \) large. The computational cost associated with such small time-steps can be significant in higher spatial dimensions.

As we saw in Chapter 13 implicit methods offer larger A-stability regions than the corresponding explicit ones. In particular, the backward Euler method is A-stable. Let’s use the method of lines and apply the backward Euler method to (14.57). We obtain

\[
\frac{u_{j}^{n+1} - u_{j}^{n}}{\Delta t} = D \frac{u_{j+1}^{n+1} - 2u_{j}^{n+1} + u_{j-1}^{n+1}}{(\Delta x)^2}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, M - 1,
\]  (14.60)

with the initial condition \( u_{j}^{0} = f(x_{j}), \quad j = 1, \ldots, M - 1 \), and the boundary conditions \( u_{0}^{n+1} = 0, \quad u_{M}^{n+1} = 0 \). This is an implicit scheme. At each time step \( n \), to update the numerical approximation for the future time step \( n+1 \) we need to solve this linear system for the \( M - 1 \) unknowns, \( u_{1}^{n+1}, \ldots, u_{M-1}^{n+1} \).

Using again \( \alpha = D \Delta t/(\Delta x)^2 \) we can write (14.60) as

\[
-\alpha u_{j-1}^{n+1} + (1 + 2\alpha)u_{j}^{n+1} - \alpha u_{j+1}^{n+1} = u_{j}^{n}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, M - 1.
\]  (14.61)

This is of course a tridiagonal linear system. It is also diagonally dominant and hence nonsingular. In fact it is also positive definite. Thus there is a unique solution and we can find it efficiently in \( O(M) \) operations using the tridiagonal solver, Algorithm 9.5.

Let us look at the stability of (14.60) via von Neumann analysis. As before, we look at how the finite difference scheme evolves a Fourier mode \( u_{j}^{n} = \xi^{n} e^{ikj\Delta x} \). Plugging this into (14.60) we get

\[
\xi^{n+1} e^{ikj\Delta x} = \xi^{n} e^{ikj\Delta x} + \alpha \left[ \xi^{n+1} e^{ik(j-1)\Delta x} - 2\xi^{n+1} e^{ikj\Delta x} + \xi^{n+1} e^{ik(j+1)\Delta x} \right].
\]
14.4. THE BACKWARD EULER AND CRANK-NICOLSON METHODS

Cancelling out the common factor $\xi^n e^{ikj\Delta x}$ and using that $\cos \theta = \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\theta} + e^{-i\theta})$ we obtain

$$\xi(k\Delta x) = \frac{1}{1 + 2\alpha(1 - \cos(k\Delta x))}. \quad (14.62)$$

Since $\alpha > 0$ and $\cos \theta \leq 1$ we have that

$$|\xi(k\Delta x)| \leq 1 \quad (14.63)$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, regardless of the value of $\alpha$. Because there is no restriction on $\Delta t$ to satisfy (14.63) we say that the backward in time-centered in space scheme (14.60) is unconditionally stable. It is easy to see that scheme (14.60) is first order in time and second order in space.

If we now use the method of lines again and the trapezoidal rule for the ODE system (14.57) we get the following second order in time and second order in space scheme:

$$\frac{u_{j}^{n+1} - u_{j}^{n}}{\Delta t} = \frac{D}{2} \left[ \frac{u_{j+1}^{n+1} - 2u_{j}^{n+1} + u_{j-1}^{n+1}}{(\Delta x)^2} + \frac{u_{j+1}^{n} - 2u_{j}^{n} + u_{j-1}^{n}}{(\Delta x)^2} \right], \quad (14.64)$$

for $j = 1, \ldots, M - 1$ with $u_{j}^{0} = f(x_{j})$, $j = 1, \ldots, M - 1$, and $u_{0}^{n+1} = 0$, $u_{M}^{n+1} = 0$. This implicit method is known as Crank-Nicolson. As in the backward Euler method, we have a tridiagonal (diagonally dominant) linear system to solve for $u_{j}^{n+1}$, $j = 1, \ldots, M - 1$ at each time step which can be done with the tridiagonal solver.

Let’s do von Neumann analysis for the Crank-Nicolson method. Substituting a Fourier mode $u_{j}^{n} = \xi^n e^{ikj\Delta x}$ in (14.64) and cancelling the common term we get that the amplification factor is given by

$$\xi(k\Delta x) = \frac{1 - \alpha(1 - \cos(k\Delta x))}{1 + \alpha(1 - \cos(k\Delta x))} \quad (14.65)$$

and consequently

$$|\xi(k\Delta x)| \leq 1 \quad (14.66)$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, independent of the value of $\alpha$, that is, the Crank-Nicolson method is also unconditionally stable. However, note that $|\xi(k\Delta x)| \to 1$ as $\alpha \to \infty$ (recall that the trapezoidal rule method is not L-stable, i.e. not accurate in the stiff limit). Thus, for large $\alpha$, $\xi$ is not an accurate approximation of $e^{-k^2 D \Delta t}$, particularly for the high wavenumber modes (large $|k|$). As a result, the Crank-Nicolson method is not a good choice for problems with non-smooth data and large $\alpha$. 
14.5 Neumann Boundary Conditions

We look now briefly at how to apply a Neumann boundary condition. Consider again the heat equation in the interval \([0, \pi]\) and suppose there is a homogeneous Neumann boundary condition on \(x = 0\), i.e. \(u_x(t, 0) = 0\) and a homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition at \(x = \pi\). Note that now the value of the solution at \(x = 0\) is unknown (we only know its derivative). Thus, for each \(n\) we need to find the \(M\) values \(u^n_0, u^n_1, \ldots, u^n_{M-1}\). For concreteness, let’s consider the forward in time-centered in space scheme. As before

\[
u_{j+1}^n = u_j^n + \alpha \left[u_{j+1}^n - 2u_j^n + u_{j-1}^n\right], \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, M - 1, \quad (14.67)
\]

with \(\alpha = D\Delta t/(\Delta x)^2\). But now we also need an equation to update \(u_0^n\). If we take \(j = 0\) at (14.67) we get

\[
u_{0}^{n+1} = u_0^n + \alpha \left[u_1^n - 2u_0^n + u_{-1}^n\right]. \quad (14.68)
\]

However, this equation involves \(u_{-1}^n\), an approximation corresponding to the point \(x_{-1} = -\Delta x\), outside of the domain as Fig. 14.5 shows. We can eliminate this so-called ghost point by using the Neumann boundary condition:

\[
0 = u_x(t_n, 0) \approx \frac{u^n_1 - u^n_{-1}}{2\Delta x}, \quad (14.69)
\]

where we are approximating the spatial derivative at \(x = -\Delta x\) using the centered difference. With this approximation \(u^n_{-1} = u^n_1\) and substituting this in (14.68) we obtain

\[
u_{0}^{n+1} = u_0^n + 2\alpha \left[u_1^n - u_0^n\right]. \quad (14.70)
\]

This equation together with (14.67) gives us the complete scheme.

14.6 2D and the ADI Method

We are going to consider now the heat equation in a rectangular domain \(\Omega = [0, L_x] \times [0, L_y]\) as an example of an initial value problem in more than
one spatial dimension. The problem is to find \( u(t, x, y) \) for \( 0 < t \leq T \) and \( (x, y) \in \Omega \) such that

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_t(t, x, y) &= D \nabla^2 u(t, x, y), \quad (x, y) \in \Omega, \quad 0 < t \leq T, \quad (14.71) \\
    u(0, x, y) &= f(x, y), \quad (x, y) \in \Omega, \quad (14.72) \\
    u(t, x, y) &= g(x, y), \quad (x, y) \in \partial \Omega. \quad (14.73)
\end{align*}
\]

In (14.71), \( \nabla^2 u = u_{xx} + u_{yy} \) is the Laplacian of \( u \), also denoted \( \Delta u \) and \( \partial \Omega \) in (14.73) denotes the boundary of \( \Omega \).

As in the one-dimensional case, we start by discretizing the domain. For simplicity, we are going to use a uniform grid. To this effect we choose positive integers \( M_x \) and \( M_y \) to partition \( [0, L_x] \) and \( [0, L_y] \), respectively and generate the grid points or nodes

\[
(x_l, y_m) = (l\Delta x, m\Delta y), \quad l = 0, 1, \ldots, M_x, \quad m = 0, 1, \ldots, M_y. \quad (14.74)
\]

where \( \Delta x = L_x/M_x \) and \( \Delta y = L_y/M_y \) are the grid sizes in the \( x \) and \( y \) direction, respectively. Also for simplicity we discretize time uniformly, \( t_n = n\Delta t, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, N \) with \( \Delta t = T/N \), but variable time stepping can be useful in many problems. We seek for a numerical approximation \( u^n_{l,m} \) of \( u(t_n, x_l, y_m) \) at the interior nodes \( l = 1, \ldots, M_x - 1, \quad m = 1, M_y - 1 \) and for \( n = 1, \ldots, N \).

We now approximate the Laplacian of \( u \) at the interior nodes using centered finite differences for the second derivatives:

\[
\nabla^2 u(t_n, x_l, y_m) \approx \frac{u^n_{l-1,m} - 2u^n_{l,m} + u^n_{l+1,m}}{(\Delta x)^2} + \frac{u^n_{l,m-1} - 2u^n_{l,m} + u^n_{l,m+1}}{(\Delta y)^2}. \quad (14.75)
\]

Let us introduce the following notation for the second finite differences:

\[
D^2_{\Delta x} u^n_{l,m} = \frac{u^n_{l-1,m} - 2u^n_{l,m} + u^n_{l+1,m}}{(\Delta x)^2}, \quad (14.76)
\]

\[
D^2_{\Delta y} u^n_{l,m} = \frac{u^n_{l,m-1} - 2u^n_{l,m} + u^n_{l,m+1}}{(\Delta y)^2}. \quad (14.77)
\]

Then, assuming \( u \) is smooth enough,

\[
\nabla^2 u(t_n, x_l, y_m) = D^2_{\Delta x} u^n_{l,m} + D^2_{\Delta y} u^n_{l,m} + O(\Delta x)^2 + O(\Delta y)^2. \quad (14.78)
\]

\( ^2 \)We prefer not to use \( \Delta u \) for the Laplacian when discussing numerical methods to avoid confusion with the common notation employed for numerical increments or variations, such as \( \Delta u = u(x + h) - u(x) \).
The finite difference \( D_x^2 u_{l,m}^n + D_y^2 u_{l,m}^n \) is called the 5-point discrete Laplacian because it uses 5 grid points to approximate \( \nabla^2 u(t_n, x_l, y_m) \).

The explicit forward in time (forward Euler) can be written as

\[
u_{l,m}^{n+1} = u_{l,m}^n + \Delta t D \left[ D_x^2 u_{l,m}^n + D_y^2 u_{l,m}^n \right], \tag{14.79}
\]

for \( n = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1 \) and \( l = 1, \ldots, M_x - 1, m = 1, \ldots, M_y - 1 \). As in the one-dimensional case this scheme has a quadratic stability constraint. Unless the diffusion coefficient \( D \) is very small, it is better to employ an implicit method. For example, the Crank-Nicolson method can be written as

\[
u_{l,m}^{n+1} = u_{l,m}^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} D \left[ D_x^2 u_{l,m}^{n+1} + D_y^2 u_{l,m}^{n+1} + D_x^2 u_{l,m}^n + D_y^2 u_{l,m}^n \right], \tag{14.80}
\]

for \( n = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1 \) and \( l = 1, \ldots, M_x - 1, m = 1, \ldots, M_y - 1 \). This is a linear system of \((M_x - 1) \times (M_y - 1)\) equations in the same number of unknowns. The structure of the matrix of coefficients, depends on how we label the unknowns. The most common labeling is the so-called lexicographical order, bottom to top and left to right: \( u_{1,1}^n, u_{1,2}^n, \ldots, u_{1,M_y - 1}^n, u_{2,1}^n, u_{2,2}^n, \ldots, u_{2,M_y - 1}^n, \ldots \), etc. (see Section 9.6). The result is a block tridiagonal, linear system which is symmetric and positive definite. This system could be solved with the (preconditioned) conjugate gradient method but it is more efficient to use the following approach which splits the differentiation in each direction:

\[
u_{l,m}^{n+1} = u_{l,m}^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} D \left[ D_x^2 u_{l,m}^{n+1} + D_y^2 u_{l,m}^{n+1} \right], \tag{14.81}
\]

\[
u_{l,m}^{n+1} = u_{l,m}^* + \frac{\Delta t}{2} D \left[ D_x^2 u_{l,m}^* + D_y^2 u_{l,m}^{n+1} \right]. \tag{14.82}
\]

Equation (14.81) can be viewed as a half-step to produce an intermediate approximation \( u_{l,m}^* \) by considering the differentiation in \( x \) implicitly and that in \( y \) explicitly. In the second half-step, Eq. (14.82), the situation is reversed; the differentiation in \( y \) is implicit while that in \( y \) is evaluated explicitly. The scheme (14.81)-(14.82) is called the Alternating Direction Implicit method or ADI.

Note that each half-step, gives us a tridiagonal linear system of equations, as in the one dimensional case, which can be solved efficiently with the tridiagonal solver. However, we need a boundary condition for \( u_{l,m}^* \). It is easy to show that

\[
u_{l,m}^* = u(t_n + \Delta t/2, x_l, y_m) + O(\Delta t) + O(\Delta x)^2 + O(\Delta y)^2. \tag{14.83}
\]
Thus, we could take as boundary condition for $u^*$ the boundary value of $u(t_n + \Delta t/2, x_l, y_m)$. It is remarkable that the second half-step corrects the $O(\Delta t)$ discretization error of the first half step to produce an $O(\Delta t)^2$ method that is also unconditionally stable!

14.7 Wave Propagation and Upwinding

We now look at a simple model for wave propagation. As we will see, numerical methods for these type of equations must obey a condition (so-termed CFL condition) to ensure the numerical approximation evolves with the correct speed of propagation and need to take into account the direction of the flow (upwinding).

The model is the initial-value problem for the one-way wave equation:

$$u_t + au_x = 0,$$
$$u(0, x) = f(x),$$

where $a$ is constant and we are considering the problem, for the moment, in the entire real line. This problem can be solved easily by using the method of characteristics which consists on employing curves (called characteristics) along which the PDE reduces to a simple ODE which can be readily integrated. For (14.84), the characteristics $X(t)$ are the curves that satisfy

$$\frac{dX(t)}{dt} = a$$
$$X(0) = x_0,$$

where $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ is a starting point (we get one curve for each value of $x_0$). Thus, the characteristics for (14.84)-(14.85) are the curves

$$X(t) = x_0 + at, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Figure 14.6 displays a few characteristics in the $xt$ plane. Let us look at $u$ along the characteristics. We have

$$\frac{du(t, X(t))}{dt} = u_t + u_x \frac{dX}{dt} = u_t + au_x = 0.$$
Thus, \( u \) is constant along the characteristic lines \( X(t) = x_0 + at \) and consequently
\[
    u(t, X(t)) = u(0, X(0)) = f(x_0) = f(X(t) - at) .
\] (14.90)

The solution to the initial value problem (14.84)-(14.85) is therefore
\[
    u(t, x) = f(x - at) ,
\] (14.91)

which corresponds to a traveling wave moving with speed \( a \); the solution is just a translation of the initial condition \( f \). If \( a > 0 \) the wave moves to the left and if \( a < 0 \) it moves to the right.

Suppose \( a > 0 \) and consider the finite difference scheme
\[
    \frac{u_{j}^{n+1} - u_{j}^{n}}{\Delta t} + a \frac{u_{j+1}^{n} - u_{j}^{n}}{\Delta x} = 0 .
\] (14.92)

The local truncation error of this scheme is
\[
    \tau_j^{n+1}(\Delta t, \Delta x) = \frac{u(t_{n+1}, x_j) - u(t_n, x_j)}{\Delta t} + a \frac{u(t_n, x_{j+1}) - u(t_n, x_j)}{\Delta x} = O(\Delta t) + O(\Delta x) ,
\] (14.93)

assuming the exact solution is sufficiently smooth. Thus, the method (14.92) is consistent with \( u_t + au_x = 0 \). Let’s do von Neumann analysis to look at
the stability of this scheme. As in the example of the heat equation we take
an individual Fourier mode \( u^n_j = \xi^n e^{ikj\Delta x} \) and see how this evolves under
the finite difference scheme. Substituting \( u^n_j = \xi^n e^{ikj\Delta x} \) into (14.92) we get

\[ \xi^n e^{ikj\Delta x} \left( \frac{\xi - 1}{\Delta t} + a \frac{e^{ik\Delta x} - 1}{\Delta x} \right) = 0 \]  (14.94)

and cancelling the common term and setting \( \lambda = a\Delta t/\Delta x \) we obtain that
the amplification factor satisfies

\[ \xi = 1 + \lambda - \lambda e^{ik\Delta x}. \]  (14.95)

Since \( \xi \) is complex let’s compute the square of its modulus

\[ |\xi|^2 = (1 + \lambda - \lambda \cos \theta)^2 + (\lambda \sin \theta)^2, \]  (14.96)

where we have set \( \theta = k\Delta x \). Developing the square and using \( \sin^2 \theta + \cos^2 \theta = 1 \) we have

\[ |\xi|^2 = 1 + 2(1 + \lambda)\lambda - 2(1 + \lambda)\lambda \cos \theta. \]  (14.97)

Now, \( \lambda > 0 \) because \( a > 0 \). Thus, except for \( \theta = \pi/2 \)

\[ |\xi|^2 > 1 + 2(1 + \lambda)\lambda - 2(1 + \lambda)\lambda = 1. \]  (14.98)

Consequently, the scheme is unstable regardless of the value of \( \Delta t \). On the
other hand if \( a < 0 \) then \( \lambda < 0 \). It follows that

\[ |\xi|^2 \leq 1, \text{ if and only if } -1 \leq \lambda < 0. \]  (14.99)

In other words, the scheme (14.92) is stable for \( a < 0 \) if and only if

\[ |a| \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} \leq 1. \]  (14.100)

This stability constraint is known as the CFL condition (after Courant, Friedrichs,
and Lewy). An interpretation of this condition is that the numerical speed
\( \Delta x/\Delta t \) had to be greater or equal than the actual speed of propagation \( |a| \).
Similarly, for \( a > 0 \) the scheme

\[ \frac{u^{n+1}_j - u^n_j}{\Delta t} + a \frac{u^n_j - u^{n-1}_j}{\Delta x} = 0 \]  (14.101)
is stable if and only if the CFL condition $a\Delta t/\Delta x \leq 1$ is satisfied. The approximation of $au_x$ by a backward or forward finite difference depending on whether $a$ is positive or negative, respectively is called upwinding, because we are using the direction of the flow (propagation) for our discretization:

$$au_x \approx \begin{cases} \frac{u^n_j - u^n_{j-1}}{\Delta t} & \text{if } a > 0, \\ \frac{u^{n+1}_j - u^n_j}{\Delta t} & \text{if } a < 0. \end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (14.102)

Let us look at another finite difference scheme for $u_t + au_x = 0$, this one with a centered difference to approximate $u_x$:

$$\frac{u^{n+1}_j - u^n_j}{\Delta t} + a\frac{u^{n+1}_j - u^n_j}{2\Delta x} = 0$$ \hspace{1cm} (14.103)

It is easy to show that

$$\tau^{n+1}_j(\Delta t, \Delta x) = O(\Delta t) + O(\Delta x)^2$$ \hspace{1cm} (14.104)

if the exact solution of $u_t + au_x = 0$ is smooth enough. Thus, the scheme is consistent. Let's do von Neumann analysis. Set $u^n_j = \xi^n e^{ikj\Delta x}$, we get

$$\xi^{n+1} e^{ikj\Delta x} = \xi^n e^{ikj\Delta x} - \frac{\lambda}{2} \xi^n [e^{i(k+1)j\Delta x} - e^{i(k-1)j\Delta x}]$$

(14.105)

cancelling $\xi^n e^{ikj\Delta x}$, setting $\theta = k\Delta x$ and using

$$\sin \theta = \frac{e^{i\theta} - e^{-i\theta}}{2i}$$ \hspace{1cm} (14.106)

we find that the amplification factor satisfies

$$\xi = 1 - i\lambda \sin \theta.$$ \hspace{1cm} (14.107)

Consequently

$$|\xi|^2 = 1 + \lambda^2 \sin^2 \theta > 1$$ \hspace{1cm} (14.108)

except for $\theta = 0, \pi$. Therefore, scheme (14.103) is unstable.

The following finite difference scheme is an example of a method that is not constructed by a direct discretization of the PDE and provides a stable
modification of the second order in space scheme \((14.103)\). First we note that since \(u_t + au_x = 0\) then

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_t &= -au_x, \\
    u_{tt} &= -au_{xt} = -a(u_t)_x = -a(-au_x)_x = a^2 u_{xx},
\end{align*}
\]

where we assumed the exact solution has continuous second derivatives. Moreover,

\[
\begin{align*}
    u(t + \Delta t) = u(t, x) + u_t(t, x) \Delta t + \frac{1}{2} u_{tt}(t, x)(\Delta t)^2 + O(\Delta t)^3 \\
    = u(t, x) - au_x(t, x) \Delta t + \frac{1}{2} a^2 u_{xx}(t, x)(\Delta t)^2 + O(\Delta t)^3,
\end{align*}
\]

where we have used \((14.109)\) and \((14.110)\). Employing a centered, second order discretization for \(u_x\) and \(u_{xx}\) we obtain the following finite difference scheme:

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_j^{n+1} &= u_j^n - \frac{\lambda}{2} (u_{j+1}^n - u_{j-1}^n) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} (u_{j+1}^n - 2u_j^n + u_{j-1}^n),
\end{align*}
\]

with \(\lambda = a\Delta t/\Delta x\) as before and is considered to be fixed. This numerical scheme is called Lax-Wendroff. By construction,

\[
\tau_j^{n+1}(\Delta t, \Delta x) = O(\Delta t)^2 + O(\Delta x)^2
\]

so this is a consistent, second order method in space and time. It supports a Fourier mode \(u_j^n = \xi^n e^{ikj\Delta x}\) provided

\[
\xi = 1 - i\lambda \sin \theta - \lambda^2 (1 - \cos \theta)
\]

with \(\theta = k\Delta x\). Therefore,

\[
|\xi|^2 = 1 - 4\lambda^2 \sin^2 \frac{1}{2} \theta + 4\lambda^4 \sin^4 \frac{1}{2} \theta + \lambda^2 \sin^2 \theta,
\]

where we have used \(1 - \cos \theta = 2 \sin \frac{1}{2} \theta\). The right hand side of \(14.116\), let’s call it \(g(\theta)\), is an analytic and periodic function of \(\theta\). Thus, it achieves its extreme values at the critical points \(g'(\theta) = 0:\)

\[
g'(\theta) = -4\lambda^2 \sin \frac{1}{2} \theta \cos \frac{1}{2} \theta + 8\lambda^2 \sin^3 \frac{1}{2} \theta \cos \frac{1}{2} \theta + 2\lambda^2 \sin \theta \cos \theta.
\]
Therefore, $g'(\theta) = 0$ only for $\theta = 0, \pm \pi$. Moreover, $g(0) = 1$ so we only need to consider $\theta = \pm \pi$. Now,

$$|\xi|^2 \leq g(\pm \pi) = 1 - 4\lambda^2 + 4\lambda^4$$

and $1 - 4\lambda^2 + 4\lambda^4 \leq 1$ implies $-4\lambda^2(1 - \lambda^2) \leq 0$ from which it follows that

$$|\lambda| \leq 1.$$  \hfill (14.119)

The Lax-Wendroff scheme is stable provided the CFL condition (14.119) is satisfied.

Our last example is the two-step method

$$u_{n+1}^j - u_{n-1}^j = 2\Delta t + a u_{n+1}^j - u_{n-1}^j = 0.$$ \hfill (14.120)

This multistep finite difference scheme is known as the *leap frog* method. Like, the Lax-Wendroff, the leap frog is consistent and second order in space and time. As a multistep method, it requires another method to initialize it, i.e. to compute $u_1^j$. Any of the one-step step methods seen in this section could be used to that effect. Again, to do von Neumann analysis we substitute $u_j^n = \xi^ne^{ikj\Delta x}$ into the scheme. We obtain that the amplification factor in this case satisfies a quadratic equation (this is a two-step method):

$$\xi^2 + 2i\lambda \sin \theta \xi - 1 = 0,$$ \hfill (14.121)

with $\theta = k\Delta x$ and $\lambda = a\Delta t/\Delta x$ as before. The solutions of this quadratic equation are

$$\xi_\pm = -i\lambda \sin \theta \pm \sqrt{1 - \lambda^2 \sin^2 \theta}.$$ \hfill (14.122)

If the roots are distinct then both Fourier modes $\xi^ne^{ikj\Delta x}$ and $\xi^ne^{ikj\Delta x}$ are solutions of the scheme and if $\xi_+ = \xi_-$ then $\xi^ne^{ikj\Delta x}$ and $n\xi^ne^{ikj\Delta x}$ are.

If $|\lambda| > 1$, for $\theta = \pi/2$ we have $|\xi_-| = |\lambda| + \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 1} > 1$. Therefore, the leap frog scheme is unstable for $|\lambda| > 1$. Now, for $|\lambda| \leq 1$

$$|\xi_+|^2 = |\xi_-|^2 = 1 - \lambda^2 \sin^2 \theta + \lambda^2 \sin^2 \theta = 1.$$ \hfill (14.123)

In this case $\xi_+ = \xi_-$ only when $|\lambda| = 1$ (and $\theta = \pi/2$) and because $n\xi^ne^{ikj\Delta x}$ is a solution, the leap frog scheme is stable if and only if $|\lambda| < 1$. 

14.8 Advection-Diffusion

We now consider a PDE which models the combined effects of one-way wave propagation (also called advection) and diffusion. The equation is

\[ u_t + au_x = Du_{xx}, \quad (14.124) \]

where \( D > 0 \) and the equation is supplemented with initial and boundary conditions. Let's consider the following finite difference scheme

\[ \frac{u_j^{n+1} - u_j^n}{\Delta t} + a \frac{u_{j+1}^n - u_{j-1}^n}{2\Delta x} = D \frac{u_{j+1}^n - 2u_j^n + u_{j-1}^n}{(\Delta x)^2}. \quad (14.125) \]

This is a first order in time and second order in space method. With \( \alpha = D\Delta t/(\Delta x)^2 \) fixed, the advection term contributes an \( O(\Delta t) \) term to the amplification factor in von Neumann analysis so (14.41) applies and the stability is dictated by discretization of the (higher order) diffusion term. Thus, (14.125) is stable if and only if \( \alpha \leq 1/2 \).

Using the definitions of \( \lambda \) and \( \alpha \), (14.125) can be written as

\[ u_j^{n+1} = (1 - 2\alpha)u_j^n + (\alpha - \frac{\lambda}{2})u_{j+1}^n + (\alpha + \frac{\lambda}{2})u_{j-1}^n. \quad (14.126) \]

Recall that for \( D = 0 \) (14.125) is unstable so it is important to examine the behavior of the numerical scheme when diffusion is much smaller than advection. To quantify this, we introduce a numerical Péclet number

\[ \mu = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\alpha} \right). \quad (14.127) \]

Then, we can write (14.126) as

\[ u_j^{n+1} = (1 - 2\alpha)u_j^n + \alpha (1 - \mu)u_{j+1}^n + \alpha (1 + \mu)u_{j-1}^n. \quad (14.128) \]

If \( |\mu| \leq 1 \) and \( \alpha \leq 1/2 \), we have

\[ |u_j^{n+1}| \leq (1 - 2\alpha) |u_j^n| + \alpha (1 - \mu) |u_{j+1}^n| + \alpha (1 + \mu) |u_{j-1}^n| \quad (14.129) \]

and taking the maximum over \( j \)

\[ \|u^{n+1}\|_\infty \leq [1 - 2\alpha + \alpha (1 - \mu) + \alpha (1 + \mu)] \|u^n\|_\infty = \|u^n\|_\infty. \quad (14.130) \]
Therefore

\[ \| u^{n+1} \|_\infty \leq \| u^n \|_\infty \text{ for all } n \]  

(14.131)

and the scheme is monotone. Thus, if \( \alpha \leq 1/2 \) and \( |\mu| \leq 1 \) scheme (14.125) is both stable and monotone. If \( |\mu| > 1 \) there is no monotonicity and the numerical solution could be oscillatory but the oscillations will remain bounded as the scheme is stable for \( \alpha \leq 1/2 \). The condition for monotonicity \( |\mu| \leq 1 \) means that

\[ \Delta x \leq \frac{2D}{|a|}. \]  

(14.132)

This is a condition on the \( \Delta x \) needed to resolve the length scale associated with the diffusion process. It is not a stability constraint!

One way to avoid the oscillations when \( |\mu| > 1 \) is to use upwinding to approximate \( au_x \). For example, for \( a > 0 \)

\[ \frac{u_j^{n+1} - u_j^n}{\Delta t} + a \frac{u_j^n - u_{j-1}^n}{\Delta x} = D \frac{u_{j+1}^n - 2u_j^n + u_{j-1}^n}{(\Delta x)^2}, \]  

(14.133)

which we can rewrite as

\[ u_j^{n+1} = [1 - 2\alpha(1 + \mu)] u_j^n + \alpha u_{j+1}^n + \alpha (1 + 2\mu) u_{j-1}^n. \]  

(14.134)

Thus, we get monotonicity when \( 1 - 2\alpha(1 + \mu) \geq 0 \) i.e. when

\[ 2\alpha(1 + \mu) \leq 1 \]  

(14.135)

or equivalently

\[ 2D \frac{\Delta t}{(\Delta x)^2} \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta x a}{2D} \right) \leq 1. \]  

(14.136)

Thus, for \( a/D \) large (advection dominating diffusion) we get a much milder condition, close to the CFL.

### 14.9 The Wave Equation

Consider a stretched string of length \( L \) pinned at its end points. Assuming small deformations from its stretched horizontal state, the string vertical
displacement at the time $t$ and at the point $x$, $u(t, x)$, satisfies the wave equation

$$u_{tt}(t, x) = a^2 u_{xx}(t, x) \quad 0 < x < L, \quad t > 0,$$  
(14.137)

with initial conditions $u(0, x) = f(x)$, $u_t(0, x) = g(x)$, and boundary conditions $u(t, 0) = u(t, L) = 0$. Here, $a > 0$ is the speed of propagation.

It is instructive to consider the pure initial value problem (the so-called Cauchy problem) for the wave equation:

$$u_{tt}(t, x) = a^2 u_{xx}(t, x) \quad -\infty < x < \infty, \quad t > 0,$$  
(14.138)

$$u(0, x) = f(x),$$  
(14.139)

$$u_t(0, x) = g(x).$$  
(14.140)

Using the characteristic coordinates

$$\mu = x + at,$$  
(14.141)

$$\eta = x - at$$  
(14.142)

and defining

$$U(\mu, \eta) = u(t(\mu, \eta), x(\mu, \eta))$$  
(14.143)

we have

$$U_{\mu} = u_t \frac{1}{2a} + u_x \frac{1}{2},$$  
(14.144)

$$U_{\mu \eta} = -u_{tt} \frac{1}{4a^2} + u_{tx} \frac{1}{4a} - u_{xt} \frac{1}{4a} + \frac{1}{4} u_{xx}$$  
(14.145)

and assuming $u$ has continuous second derivatives we get

$$U_{\mu \eta} = -\frac{1}{4a^2} [u_{tt} - a^2 u_{xx}] = 0.$$  
(14.146)

that it $U$ has the form

$$U(\mu, \eta) = F(\mu) + G(\eta)$$  
(14.147)

for some functions $F$ and $G$, to be determined by the initial conditions. Note that, going back to the original variables,

$$u(t, x) = F(x + at) + G(x - at).$$  
(14.148)
Figure 14.7: Solution of the pure initial value problem for the wave equation consists of a wave traveling to the left, \( F(x + at) \), plus one traveling to the right, \( G(x - at) \). Here \( a > 0 \).

So the solutions consists of the sum of a wave traveling to the left and one traveling to the right as Fig. 14.7 illustrates.

At \( t = 0 \)

\[
F(x) + G(x) = f(x), \quad (14.149)
\]

\[
aF'(x) - aG'(x) = g(x). \quad (14.150)
\]

Integrating (14.150) we get

\[
F(x) - G(x) = \frac{1}{a} \int_0^x g(s)ds + C, \quad (14.151)
\]

where \( C \) is a constant. Combining (14.149) and (14.151) we find

\[
F(x) = \frac{1}{2} f(x) + \frac{1}{2a} \int_0^x g(s)ds + \frac{1}{2} C, \quad (14.152)
\]

\[
G(x) = \frac{1}{2} f(x) - \frac{1}{2a} \int_0^x g(s)ds - \frac{1}{2} C, \quad (14.153)
\]
and therefore the solution to the pure initial value problem of the wave equations \( u_{tt} - a^2 u_{xx} = 0 \) is given by
\[
    u(t, x) = \frac{1}{2} [f(x + at) + f(x - at)] + \frac{1}{2a} \int_{x-at}^{x+at} g(s) ds,
\]
(14.154)
an expression which is known as D’Alembert’s formula.

Let us go back to the original initial boundary value problem for the deformations of a string. Consider the following finite difference scheme
\[
    \frac{u^{n+1}_j - 2u^n_j + u^{n-1}_j}{(\Delta t)^2} = \frac{a^2 u^1_{j+1} - 2u^n_j + u^n_{j-1}}{(\Delta x)^2},
\]
(14.155)
where \( \Delta x = L/M \) and the interval \([0, L]\) has been discretized with the equispaced points \( x_j = j\Delta x \), for \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, M \). This scheme is clearly a second order, both in space and time, and hence consistent with the wave equation. It is also a two-step method. To initialize this multistep scheme we use \( u^0_j = f(x_j) \) for \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, M - 1 \), from the first initial condition, \( u(0, x) = f(x) \), and to obtain \( u^1_j \) we can employ the second initial condition, \( u_t(0, x) = g(x) \), as follows
\[
    g(x_j) = u_t(0, x_j) \approx \frac{u^1_j - u^0_j}{\Delta t}
\]
(14.156)
that is
\[
    u^1_j = u^0_j + \Delta t \ g(x_j), \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, M - 1.
\]
(14.157)
Let us do von Neumann to look at the stability of (14.155). Substituting \( u^n_j = \xi^n e^{ikj\Delta x} \) into (14.155) and cancelling the common term we find that
\[
    \xi - 2 + \frac{1}{\xi} = -4\lambda^2 \sin^2 \frac{1}{2} \theta,
\]
(14.158)
where, as before, \( \lambda = a\Delta t/\Delta x \) and \( \theta = k\Delta x \). We can write (14.158) as
\[
    \left( \sqrt{\xi} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\xi}} \right)^2 = \left( \pm 2i\lambda \sin \frac{1}{2} \theta \right)^2
\]
(14.159)
and thus
\[
    \sqrt{\xi} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\xi}} = \pm 2i\lambda \sin \frac{1}{2} \theta.
\]
(14.160)
Multiplying (14.160) by $\sqrt{\xi}$ we get
\[
\xi \pm 2i\sqrt{\xi} \lambda \sin \frac{1}{2} \theta - 1 = 0. \tag{14.161}
\]
This is a quadratic equation for $\sqrt{\xi}$ and its roots are
\[
\xi^{1/2} = \pm i\lambda \sin \frac{1}{2} \theta \pm \sqrt{1 - \lambda^2 \sin^2 \frac{1}{2} \theta} \tag{14.162}
\]
and consequently
\[
\xi = \left( \sqrt{1 - \lambda^2 \sin^2 \frac{1}{2} \theta \pm i\lambda \sin \frac{1}{2} \theta} \right)^2. \tag{14.163}
\]
Thus, $|\xi| \leq 1$ if and only if $|\lambda| \leq 1$. Also $\xi_+ = \xi_-$ for $\theta = 0$ or if $|\lambda| = 1$ and $\theta = \pi$. Recall that with equal roots, $n\xi n^{-1} e^{ikj\Delta x}$ is also a solution of the numerical scheme. However, since the wave equation is a second order PDE in time, it allows linearly growing solutions like $Ct$ so the mode $n\xi n^{-1} e^{ikj\Delta x}$ with $|\xi| = 1$ is permissible here. We conclude that the scheme (14.155) is stable if and only if it satisfies the CFL condition
\[
|\lambda| \leq 1. \tag{14.164}
\]