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Submit your solutions online through Gradescope.

1. (Quadrature rules)
a. Show that

$$
\frac{1}{h} \int_{0}^{h} u(x) \mathrm{d} x \approx u\left(\frac{h}{2}\right)
$$

is a second-order approximation in $h$.
b. Compute (polynomial) interpolatory quadrature weights for the rule,

$$
\int_{0}^{1} f(x) \mathrm{d} x \approx w_{1} f(0)+w_{2} f\left(\frac{1}{3}\right)+w_{3} f(1)
$$

What is the polynomial degree of exactness for this rule?
c. Compute quadrature weights for the rule,

$$
f^{\prime}(0)+\int_{-1}^{1} f(x) \mathrm{d} x \approx w_{-1} f(-1)+w_{0} f(0)+w_{1} f(1) .
$$

that is exact for all quadratic polynomials.
2. (FD convergence)

For the boundary value problem,

$$
-u^{\prime \prime}(x)=f(x), \quad u(0)=u(1)=0,
$$

with $f$ given, consider the standard 3-point stencil finite-difference approximation,

$$
-D_{+} D_{-} u_{j}=f_{j}, \quad j \in[M],
$$

where for a given $M \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$
u_{j} \approx u\left(x_{j}\right), \quad x_{j}:=j h, \quad h:=\frac{1}{M+1},
$$

with $u_{0}=u_{M+1}=0$. Prove that in the scaled $\ell^{1}$ norm,

$$
\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{1, h}:=h \sum_{j \in[M]}\left|u_{j}\right| \approx \int_{0}^{1}|u(x)| \mathrm{d} x,
$$

that this scheme is convergent to second order in $h$. You may cite without proof any results given in class/on the slides.
3. (ODE convergence)

For the ODE system $\boldsymbol{u}^{\prime}(t)=\boldsymbol{f}(t, \boldsymbol{u})$ with initial condition $\boldsymbol{u}(0)$ given and $\boldsymbol{f}$ globally Lipschitz continuous in $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{M}$ uniformly in $t$, show that backward Euler with the initial state $\boldsymbol{u}_{0}=\boldsymbol{u}(0)$ is convergent to first order as defined on slide D06-S07.
4. (Regions of stability)
a. Compute the stability/amplification factor for Crank-Nicolson and show that it is the left half-plane.
b. Compute the stability/amplification factor for the following scheme,

$$
\boldsymbol{u}_{n+1}=\boldsymbol{u}_{n}+\frac{k}{4} \boldsymbol{f}\left(t_{n}, \boldsymbol{u}_{n}\right)+\frac{3 k}{4} \boldsymbol{f}\left(t_{n}+\frac{2}{3} k, \boldsymbol{u}_{n}+\frac{2}{3} k \boldsymbol{f}\left(t_{n}, \boldsymbol{u}_{n}\right)\right)
$$

and plot the corresponding stability region, using software if desired. (This scheme is called Ralston's method.)
5. (ODE solvers)

Consider the IVP,

$$
\boldsymbol{u}^{\prime}(t)=\boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{u}, \quad(\boldsymbol{u}(0))_{j}=j(-1)^{j}, \quad \boldsymbol{A}=C^{2}\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
-2 & 1 & &  \tag{1}\\
1 & -2 & 1 & \\
& \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
& & 1 & -2
\end{array}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{10 \times 10}
$$

where $j \in[10], \boldsymbol{A}$ is symmetric and tridiagonal, and $C \in \mathbb{R}$. We'll compute numerical solutions in this problem up to a terminal time $T=1$.
a. Take $C=3$. Implement both Forward Euler and Crank-Nicolson solvers for this IVP, and demonstrate that the schemes exhibit the expected orders of convergence (with respect to the time discretization parameter $k$ ) for each method. (You may use any norm on $\boldsymbol{u}$.) Briefly discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each scheme.
b. Take $C=10$. Again discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each scheme, using numerical results to support your conclusions.

