## MT414: Numerical Analysis <br> Homework 1 <br> Answers

1. Let $f(x)=x e^{x^{2}}$.
(a) Find the fourth Taylor polynomial $P_{4}(x)$ for $f(x)$ about $x_{0}=0$.
(b) Find an upper bound for $\left|f(x)-P_{4}(x)\right|$ for $x \in[0,0.4]$.
(c) Approximate $\int_{0}^{0.4} f(x) d x$ using $\int_{0}^{0.4} P_{4}(x) d x$.
(d) Find an upper bound for the error in the computation in part ( $c$ ) by using your answer to part (b).
(e) Approximate $f^{\prime}(0.2)$ by computing $P_{4}^{\prime}(0.2)$. Use the correct answer for $f^{\prime}(0.2)$ (to 5 decimal places) to compute the relative error in your computation.
Answer: (a) We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(x) & =x e^{x^{2}} \\
f^{\prime}(x) & =e^{x^{2}}+2 x^{2} e^{x^{2}}=\left(1+2 x^{2}\right) e^{x^{2}} \\
f^{\prime \prime}(x) & =4 x e^{x^{2}}+\left(1+2 x^{2}\right)(2 x) e^{x^{2}}=\left(6 x+4 x^{3}\right) e^{x^{2}} \\
f^{(3)}(x) & =\left(6+12 x^{2}\right) e^{x^{2}}+\left(6 x+4 x^{3}\right)(2 x) e^{x^{2}}=\left(6+24 x^{2}+8 x^{4}\right) e^{x^{2}} \\
f^{(4)}(x) & =\left(48 x+32 x^{3}\right) e^{x^{2}}+\left(6+24 x^{2}+8 x^{4}\right)(2 x) e^{x^{2}}=\left(60 x+80 x^{3}+16 x^{5}\right) e^{x^{2}} \\
f^{(5)}(x) & =\left(60+240 x^{2}+80 x^{4}\right) e^{x^{2}}+\left(60 x+80 x^{3}+16 x^{5}\right)(2 x) e^{x^{2}}=\left(60+360 x^{2}+240 x^{4}+32 x^{6}\right) e^{x^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

We have $f(0)=0, f^{\prime}(0)=1, f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0, f^{(3)}(0)=6$ and $f^{(4)}(0)=0$. This means that $P_{4}(x)=x+x^{3}$
(b) We know that $f(x)=P_{4}(x)+E_{4}(x)$, where $E_{4}(x)=f^{(5)}(\xi) x^{5} / 120$, where $0 \leq \xi \leq x$. Because $x \in[0,0.4]$, the largest possible value of $E_{4}(x)$ is given by $f^{(5)}(0.4)(0.4)^{5} / 120$. We can also say that $f^{(5)}(0.4) \leq 124 e^{0.4^{2}} \leq 146$, using 12-digit arithmetic, so $f^{(5)}(\xi) \leq 146$. Therefore, $\left|f(x)-P_{4}(x)\right|=\left|E_{4}(x)\right| \leq$ $146 \cdot 0.4^{5} / 120 \leq 0.0125$.
(c) We can approximate $\int_{0}^{0.4} f(x) d x$ by

$$
\left.\int_{0}^{0.4} P_{4}(x) d x=\int_{0}^{0.4}\left(x+x^{3}\right) d x=\frac{x^{2}}{2}+\frac{x^{4}}{4}\right]_{0}^{0.4}=\frac{0.4^{2}}{2}+\frac{0.4^{4}}{4}=0.0864
$$

(d) The absolute error in this computation is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\int_{0}^{0.4} f(x) d x-\int_{0}^{0.4} P_{4}(x) d x\right| & \leq \int_{0}^{0.4}\left|f(x)-P_{4}(x)\right| d x \\
& =\int_{0}^{0.4}\left|E_{4}(x)\right| d x \leq \int_{0}^{0.4} 0.0125 d x=0.0125 \cdot 0.4=0.005
\end{aligned}
$$

However, the relative error is possibly as large as $\frac{0.005}{0.0864-0.005} \leq 0.07$, so our answer is not quite correct to 2 decimal places.
(e) We have $P_{4}^{\prime}(x)=1+3 x^{2}$, so $P_{4}^{\prime}(0.2)=1.12$. We can compute that $f^{\prime}(0.2)=1.1241$, so the relative error is 0.0036 .
2. Use the Intermediate Value Theorem and Rolle's Theorem to show that the equation $x^{3}+2 x+k=0$ has exactly one real solution, regardless of the value of the constant $k$.
Answer: Let $f(x)=x^{3}+2 x+k$. Suppose that there are two unequal numbers $a$ and $b$ so that $f(a)=f(b)=0$. Rolle's Theorem then says that there is a value $c$ between $a$ and $b$ so that $f^{\prime}(c)=0$. However, $f^{\prime}(c)=3 c^{2}+2$, and the equation $3 c^{2}+2=0$ has no solutions for any value of $c$.

Therefore, there is at most one real solution. How can we be sure that there is at least one solution? Here's an argument that is probably much too detailed: If $|k| \leq 1$, then $f(2) \geq 0$ and $f(-2) \leq 0$, so the Intermediate Value Theorem can be applied to deduce that there must be a solution. If $|k|>1$, then $f(|k|)>0$, and $f(-|k|)<0$, so we again can apply the Intermediate Value Theorem.
3. Perform the following calculations
(i) exactly,
(ii) using three-digit chopping arithmetic, and
(iii) using three-digit rounding arithmetic.
(iv) Compute the relative errors in parts (ii) and (iii).
(a) $\frac{4}{5}+\frac{1}{3}$
(b) $\frac{4}{5} \cdot \frac{1}{3}$
(c) $\left(\frac{1}{3}-\frac{3}{11}\right)+\frac{3}{20}$
(d) $\left(\frac{1}{3}+\frac{3}{11}\right)-\frac{3}{20}$

Answer: We have

| $\mathbf{a}$ | $\mathbf{b}$ | $\mathbf{c}$ | $\mathbf{d}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Exact | $\frac{17}{15}$ | $\frac{4}{15}$ | $\frac{139}{660}$ | $\frac{301}{660}$ |
|  | 3-digit chopping |  |  |  |
| Relative error |  |  |  |  |
| 3-digit rounding | 1.13 | 0.266 | 0.211 | 0.455 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Relative error | 0.003 | 0.0025 | 0.002 | 0.00233 |
|  | 1.13 | 0.266 | 0.21 | 0.456 |
| 0.003 | 0.0025 | 0.0029 | 0.000133 |  |

4. Suppose that two points $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$ and $\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)$ are on a straight line with $y_{1} \neq y_{0}$. Two formulas are available to compute the $x$-intercept of the line:

$$
x=\frac{x_{0} y_{1}-x_{1} y_{0}}{y_{1}-y_{0}} \quad \text { and } \quad x=x_{0}-\frac{\left(x_{1}-x_{0}\right) y_{0}}{y_{1}-y_{0}}
$$

(a) Show that both formulas are algebraically correct.
(b) Suppose that $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)=(1.31,3.24)$ and $\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)=(1.93,4.76)$. Use three-digit rounding arithmetic to compute the $x$-intercept using both of the formulas. Which method is better and why?
Answer: (a) We should be a bit careful here to avoid dividing by 0 . It is potentially unsafe to write that the equation of the line is $\frac{y-y_{0}}{x-x_{0}}=\frac{y_{1}-y_{0}}{x_{1}-x_{0}}$, because potentially $x_{0}=x_{1}$. However, we are told that $y_{0} \neq y_{1}$, so we can instead write the equation of the line as $\frac{x-x_{0}}{y-y_{0}}=\frac{x_{1}-x_{0}}{y_{1}-y_{0}}$. We can cross-multiply and write this instead as $x-x_{0}=y-y_{0}\left(\frac{x_{1}-x_{0}}{y_{1}-y_{0}}\right)$.

The $x$-intercept is the point on the line at which $y=0$, so we can substitute $y=0$ into this equation and get $x-x_{0}=\left(-y_{0}\right)\left(\frac{x_{1}-x_{0}}{y_{1}-y_{0}}\right)$, or $x=x_{0}-\frac{\left(x_{1}-x_{0}\right) y_{0}}{y_{1}-y_{0}}$, which is the given formula.

Now we can simplify:

$$
x=x_{0}-\frac{\left(x_{1}-x_{0}\right) y_{0}}{y_{1}-y_{0}}=\frac{x_{0}\left(y_{1}-y_{0}\right)}{y_{1}-y_{0}}-\frac{\left(x_{1}-x_{0}\right) y_{0}}{y_{1}-y_{0}}=\frac{x_{0} y_{1}-x_{1} y_{0}}{y_{1}-y_{0}} .
$$

(b) The first formula gives the answer -0.00658 , while the second formula gives the answer -0.0100 . In this case, the second formula is better. The first one involved subtracting $x_{0} y_{1}-x_{1} y_{0}$. Because $x_{0} y_{1}=6.24$ and $x_{1} y_{0}=6.25$, the result of the subtraction has only one significant digit.

We can check this by working to 10 significant digits. In that case, the first formula gives -0.0115789474 and the second gives -0.0115789470 . Surely the answer is closer to -0.01 than to -0.00658 .
5. The Taylor polynomial of degree $n$ for $f(x)=e^{x}$ is $\sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{x^{i}}{i!}$. Use the Taylor polynomial of degree 9 and three-digit chopping arithmetic to find an approximation to $e^{-5}$ using each of the following methods:
(a) $e^{-5} \approx \sum_{i=0}^{9} \frac{(-5)^{i}}{i!}=\sum_{i=0}^{9} \frac{(-1)^{i} 5^{i}}{i!}$.
(b) $e^{-5}=\frac{1}{e^{5}} \approx \frac{1}{\sum_{i=0}^{9} \frac{5^{i}}{i!}}$.
(c) Use your calculator to approximate $e^{-5}$ to 8 places. Which formula, (a) or (b), gave the most accuracy, and why?

Answer: We have

| $i$ | $i!$ | $5^{i}$ | $\frac{5^{i}}{i!}$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1.00 |
| 1 | 1 | 5 | 5.00 |
| 2 | 2 | 25 | 12.5 |
| 3 | 6 | 125 | 20.8 |
| 4 | 24 | 625 | 26.0 |
| 5 | 120 | 3120 | 26.0 |
| 6 | 720 | 15600 | 21.6 |
| 7 | 5040 | 78000 | 15.4 |
| 8 | 40300 | 390000 | 9.67 |
| 9 | 362000 | 1950000 | 5.38 |

The formula in part $(a)$ gives $1.00-5.00+12.5-20.8+26.0-26.0+21.6-15.4+9.67-5.38=-1.81$. This is obviously incorrect, because $e^{-5}>0$. The formula in part $(b)$ gives $1 /(1.00+5.00+12.5+20.8+$ $26.0+26.0+21.6+15.4+9.67+5.38)=1 / 141=0.00709$. To 8 places, $e^{-5} \approx 0.0067379470$.

The formula in part ( $b$ ) becomes a bit better if we add the numbers in increasing order, to avoid losing precision. We have $1 /(1.00+5.00+5.38+9.67+12.5+15.4+20.8+21.6+26.0+26.0)=1 / 143=0.00699$.

The difficulty with the formula in part $(a)$ is that it can involve subtracting nearly equal numbers, resulting in a loss of precision.
6. Suppose that $f l(y)$ is a $k$-digit rounding approximation to $y$. Show that

$$
\left|\frac{y-f l(y)}{y}\right| \leq 0.5 \times 10^{-k+1}
$$

Answer: Suppose that $y=0 . d_{1} d_{2} d_{3} \ldots \times 10^{n}$. If $d_{k+1}<5$, then $f l(y)=0 . d_{1} d_{2} \ldots d_{k} \times 10^{n}$, and therefore

$$
\left|\frac{y-f l(y)}{y}\right|=\left|\frac{0.0 \ldots 0 d_{k+1} \ldots}{0 . d_{1} d_{2} \ldots}\right|<\frac{5 \times 10^{-k-1}}{0.1}=5 \times 10^{-k}=0.5 \times 10^{-k+1} .
$$

If $d_{k+1} \geq 5$, then $f l(y)=\left(0 . d_{1} d_{2} \ldots d_{k}+10^{-k}\right) \times 10^{n}$, and then

$$
\left|\frac{y-f l(y)}{y}\right|=\left|\frac{0.0 \ldots 0 d_{k+1} \ldots-10^{-k}}{0 . d_{1} d_{2} \ldots}\right| \leq \frac{5 \times 10^{-k-1}}{0.1}=0.5 \times 10^{-k+1}
$$

