

Ben Sauerwine  
 Numerical Analysis Homework 6

**Kincaid 9.2.2) Prove that the stability condition for the method defined by the Crank-Nicolson Method,**

$$\frac{\theta}{h^2}(v_{i+1,j} - 2v_{i,j} + v_{i-1,j}) + \frac{1-\theta}{h^2}(v_{i+1,j-1} - 2v_{i,j-1} + v_{i-1,j-1}) = \frac{1}{k}(v_{i,j} - v_{i,j-1})$$

is the inequality  $s \leq (2 - 4\theta)^{-1}$  if  $0 \leq \theta < \frac{1}{2}$ , but if  $\frac{1}{2} \leq \theta \leq 1$  there is no restriction on  $s$ .

Recall that  $s = \frac{k}{h^2}$ .

Rewriting the above equation a bit, I have:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta s(v_{i+1,j} - 2v_{i,j} + v_{i-1,j}) + (1-\theta)s(v_{i+1,j-1} - 2v_{i,j-1} + v_{i-1,j-1}) &= v_{i,j} - v_{i,j-1} \\ \theta s(v_{i+1,j} - 2v_{i,j} + v_{i-1,j}) - v_{i,j} &= -(1-\theta)s(v_{i+1,j-1} - 2v_{i,j-1} + v_{i-1,j-1}) - v_{i,j-1} \\ \theta s v_{i+1,j} - (2\theta s + 1)v_{i,j} + \theta s v_{i-1,j} &= -(1-\theta)s v_{i+1,j-1} + (2(1-\theta)s - 1)v_{i,j-1} - (1-\theta)s v_{i-1,j-1} \end{aligned}$$

Expressing this in matrix form, I have:

$$\begin{aligned} -\theta s v_{i+1,j} + (2\theta s + 1)v_{i,j} - \theta s v_{i-1,j} &= (1-\theta)s v_{i+1,j-1} - (2(1-\theta)s - 1)v_{i,j-1} + (1-\theta)s v_{i-1,j-1} \\ (I + \theta s B)V_j &= (I - (1-\theta)s B)V_{j-1} \end{aligned}$$

Where  $V_j = \begin{bmatrix} \dots \\ v_{i-1,j} \\ v_{i,j} \\ \dots \end{bmatrix}$  and  $B = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & 0 & 0\dots \\ -1 & 2 & -1 & 0\dots \\ 0 & -1 & 2 & -1\dots \\ 0\dots & 0\dots & -1\dots & 2\dots \end{bmatrix}$ .

Since the eigenvalues of  $B$  are  $2(1 - \cos \phi_i)$  with  $(\cos \phi_i \neq \pm 1)$ , I see that the condition for stability becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (I + \theta s B)^{-1} (I - (1-\theta)s B) \right\| &< 1 \\ \left| (1 + 2\theta s(1 - \cos \phi))^{-1} (1 - 2(1-\theta)s(1 - \cos \phi)) \right| &< 1 \\ \left| \frac{1 - 2(1-\theta)s(1 - \cos \phi)}{1 + 2\theta s(1 - \cos \phi)} \right| &< 1 \end{aligned}$$

Now I notice that for all choices of  $\theta$  in the range  $\frac{1}{2} \leq \theta \leq 1$ , the portion in the absolute value is necessarily positive, and further that the numerator is strictly less than or equal to the denominator:

$$1 - 2(1 - \theta)s(1 - \cos \phi) \leq 1 + 2\theta s(1 - \cos \phi)$$

$$-2(1 - \theta)s(1 - \cos \phi) \leq 2\theta s(1 - \cos \phi)$$

$$-(1 - \theta) \leq \theta$$

$$\theta - 1 \leq \theta$$

This is true for all  $\theta$  and makes no restriction on  $s$ .

However, if  $\theta < \frac{1}{2}$ , a different situation arises whereby this ratio can drop below zero, and the absolute value can break the inequality. Differentiation shows that the local maxima are at  $\phi = n\pi$ , where  $n$  is an integer. The condition that  $(\cos \phi_i \neq \pm 1)$  indicates that in this case I may take the inequality to be  $\leq$  because the border cases will never be included. Since  $\cos \phi_i = 1$  clearly satisfies the inequality, then, I must constrain:

$$\left| \frac{1 - 4(1 - \theta)s}{1 + 4\theta s} \right| \leq 1$$

$$\frac{4(1 - \theta)s - 1}{1 + 4\theta s} \leq 1$$

$$4(1 - \theta)s - 1 \leq 1 + 4\theta s$$

$$4s - 8\theta s \leq 2$$

$$s \leq (2 - 4\theta)^{-1}$$

just as expected.

**Kincaid 9.7.4) Carry out a stability analysis on this numerical procedure:**

$$\frac{1}{2k}(v_{j,n+1} - v_{j,n-1}) = \frac{\alpha}{2h}(v_{j+1,n} - v_{j-1,n})$$

**For the problem:**

$$u_t = \alpha u_x$$

$$u(x,0) = f(x)$$

First, define  $s \equiv \frac{k\alpha}{2h}$ .

Then, I have:

$$v_{j,n+1} = 2s(v_{j+1,n} - v_{j-1,n}) + v_{j,n-1}$$

Using a Fourier argument, I take  $v_{j,n} = e^{ij\theta h} e^{n\lambda k}$ , with  $i = \sqrt{-1}$ .

Now I have under substitution:

$$e^{ij\theta h} e^{(n+1)\lambda k} = 2s(e^{i(j+1)\theta h} - e^{i(j-1)\theta h}) e^{n\lambda k} + e^{ij\theta h} e^{(n-1)\lambda k}$$

$$e^{\lambda k} = 2s(e^{i\theta h} - e^{-i\theta h}) + e^{-\lambda k}$$

$$e^{\lambda k} - e^{-\lambda k} = 4is \sin \theta h$$

Multiplying both sides by their complex conjugate, I have

$$e^{2\lambda k} + e^{-2\lambda k} - 2 = 16s^2 \sin^2 \theta h$$

For stability, I require  $|e^{\lambda k}| \leq 1$ . Then, I have:

$$(e^{\lambda k})^2 = 16s^2 \sin^2 \theta h + 2 - e^{-2\lambda k}$$

$$x \equiv |e^{\lambda k}|$$

$$x^2 = 16s^2 \sin^2 \theta h + 2 - \frac{1}{x^2}$$

$$x^4 - (16s^2 \sin^2 \theta h + 2)x^2 + 1 = 0$$

Using Mathematica to find the roots of this equation, one sees that there are two roots that must be considered, each of which must have  $x \equiv |e^{\lambda k}| \leq 1$  individually for all  $\theta$ .

$$x^2 = 1 + 8s^2 \sin^2 \theta h - 4\sqrt{s^2 \sin^2 \theta h + 4s^4 \sin^4 \theta h}$$

$$x^2 = 1 + 8s^2 \sin^2 \theta h + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(2 + 16s^2 \sin^2 \theta h)^2 - 4}$$

Looking at the first one,

$$x^2 = 1 + 8s^2 \sin^2 \theta h - 4\sqrt{s^2 \sin^2 \theta h + 4s^4 \sin^4 \theta h} \leq 1 + 8s^2 \sin^2 \theta h - 4\sqrt{4s^4 \sin^4 \theta h} = 1$$

I see then that the first root certainly has  $x^2 \leq 1$  and so that  $x = |e^{\lambda k}| \leq 1$  for all  $s$ .

Looking at the second one,

$$x^2 = 1 + 8s^2 \sin^2 \theta h + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(2 + 16s^2 \sin^2 \theta h)^2 - 4}$$

Certainly, here the worst case occurs for  $\sin^2 \theta h = 1$ :

$$x^2 = 1 + 8s^2 + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(2 + 16s^2)^2 - 4}$$

This, however, clearly has  $x^2 = |e^{\lambda k}|^2 > 1$  for all real  $s$ .

So, I see that this procedure is unstable for all choices of  $s$ .

**Kincaid 9.7.5) Investigate the stability of Euler's method:**

$$v_{j,n+1} = v_{j,n} + \frac{\alpha k}{2h} (v_{j+1,n} - v_{j-1,n})$$

**for the equation:**

$$\begin{aligned} u_t &= \alpha u_x \\ u(x,0) &= f(x) \end{aligned}$$

Using a Fourier argument, I take  $v_{j,n} = e^{ij\theta h} e^{n\lambda k}$ , with  $i = \sqrt{-1}$ .

Further, I define  $s \equiv \frac{k\alpha}{2h}$ .

$$e^{\lambda k} = 1 + s(e^{i\theta h} - e^{-i\theta h})$$

$$e^{\lambda k} = 1 + 2is \sin \theta h$$

Multiplying each side by its complex conjugate,

$$|e^{\lambda k}|^2 = 1 + 2s^2 \sin^2 \theta h$$

However, I see that in the worst case:

$$|e^{\lambda k}|^2 = 1 + 2s^2 > 1$$

This indicates that then  $|e^{\lambda k}| > 1$  for all non-zero choices of  $s$ , so that Euler's method is unstable for this equation.