

2.4 (5)

2.5 (5) (25)

2.6 (5)

3.1 1, (4, 11, 16, 17), 19, (23, 29, 32), 33, 34

3.2 7, (8, 9, 13, 17, 29) 30

2.4-2.6 were done with Maple - see end of solns.

3.1 4) I will do these synthetically, as in class

$$\begin{array}{r|rr}
 5 & -6 & 1 \\
 6 & -5 & 10 \\
 \hline
 -R_1 + R_2 & 1 & 1 & 9 \\
 \hline
 & 6 & -5 & 10 \\
 & 1 & 1 & 9 \\
 \hline
 -6R_1 + R_2 & 0 & -11 & -49 \\
 \hline
 & 1 & 1 & 9 \\
 R_2 / 11 & 0 & 1 & 4 \\
 \hline
 -R_2 + R_1 & 1 & 0 & 5 \\
 & 0 & 1 & 4
 \end{array}$$

← stands for $\begin{cases} 5x - 6y = 1 \\ 6x - 5y = 10 \end{cases}$

← stands for $\begin{cases} x = 5 \\ y = 4 \end{cases}$, so that's the solution

$$\begin{aligned}
 5(5) - 6(4) &= 1 \checkmark \\
 6(5) - 5(4) &= 10 \checkmark
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 5 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{array}{r|rrr}
 11) & 2 & 7 & 3 & 11 \\
 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 2 \\
 & 3 & 7 & 9 & -12 \\
 \hline
 R_2 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 2 \\
 R_1 & 2 & 7 & 3 & 11 \\
 & 3 & 7 & 9 & -12 \\
 \hline
 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 2 \\
 -2R_1 + R_2 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 7 \\
 -3R_1 + R_3 & 0 & -2 & 3 & -18 \\
 \hline
 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 2 \\
 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 7 \\
 2R_2 + R_3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -4 \\
 \hline
 -2R_3 + R_1 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 10 \\
 R_3 + R_2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 \\
 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -4 \\
 \hline
 -3R_2 + R_1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 \\
 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -4
 \end{array}$$

← $\begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \\ -4 \end{bmatrix}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 2(1) + 7(3) + 3(-4) &= 23 - 12 = 11 \checkmark \\
 1(1) + 3(3) + 2(-4) &= 10 - 8 = 2 \checkmark \\
 3(1) + 7(3) + 9(-4) &= 24 - 36 = -12 \checkmark
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{r|rrr}
 16) & 1 & -3 & 2 & 6 \\
 & 1 & 4 & -1 & 4 \\
 & 5 & 6 & 1 & 20 \\
 \hline
 & 1 & -3 & 2 & 6 \\
 -R_1 + R_2 & 0 & 7 & -3 & -2 \\
 -5R_1 + R_3 & 0 & 21 & -9 & -10 \\
 \hline
 & 1 & -3 & 2 & 6 \\
 & 0 & 7 & -3 & -2 \\
 -3R_2 + R_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -4
 \end{array}$$

← $0x + 0y + 0z = -4$
 has no sol'n
 so also original
 system is
inconsistent

$$\begin{array}{r|l}
 2 & -1 & 4 & 7 \\
 3 & 2 & -2 & 3 \\
 5 & 1 & 2 & 15 \\
 \hline
 -R_1 + R_2 & 1 & 3 & -6 & -4 \\
 & 3 & 2 & -2 & 3 \\
 & 5 & 1 & 2 & 15 \\
 \hline
 & 1 & 3 & -6 & -4 \\
 -3R_1 + R_2 & 0 & -7 & 16 & 15 \\
 -5R_1 + R_3 & 0 & -14 & 32 & 35 \\
 \hline
 & 1 & 3 & -6 & -4 \\
 & 0 & -7 & 16 & 15 \\
 -2R_2 + R_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 5
 \end{array}$$

inconsistent

32) a) two planes in $\mathbb{R}^3$
 are either parallel
 [so no points are on them],
 or they intersect in a line
 [so ∞ 'ly many points
 are on them]
 or they are identical [so ∞ int]
 Since the solution set to

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_1x + b_1y + c_1z &= d_1 \\
 a_2x + b_2y + c_2z &= d_2
 \end{aligned}$$

is exactly the set of points common to two planes, we deduce it is either
 empty (parallel planes) or ∞ (intersecting line)
 or equal planes

b) if $d_1 = d_2 = 0$ then $\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ is in both planes, so they do intersect, hence
 intersection is infinite.

$$\begin{aligned}
 3.2 \quad 8) \quad x_1 - 10x_2 + 3x_3 - 13x_4 &= 5 \\
 x_3 + 3x_4 &= 10
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{let } x_4 = t$$

$$\text{then } x_3 = 10 - 3t$$

$$\text{let } x_2 = s$$

$$\text{then } x_1 = 5 + 10s - 3(10 - 3t) + 13t$$

$$\text{so } \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \\ x_4 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -25 \\ 0 \\ 10 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + s \begin{bmatrix} 10 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + t \begin{bmatrix} 22 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 23) \quad y'' + 4y &= 0; \quad y(x) = A \cos 2x + B \sin 2x \\
 y'(x) &= -2A \sin 2x + 2B \cos 2x \\
 y(0) &= 3 = A \quad A = 3 \\
 y'(0) &= 8 = 2B \quad B = 4 \\
 \boxed{y} &= 3 \cos 2x + 4 \sin 2x
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 29) \quad 6y'' - 5y' + y &= 0 \\
 y(x) &= A e^{x/2} + B e^{x/3} \\
 y' &= \frac{1}{2} A e^{x/2} + \frac{1}{3} B e^{x/3}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$y(0) = 7 = A + B$$

$$y'(0) = 11 = \frac{1}{2}A + \frac{1}{3}B, \text{ or } 66 = 3A + 2B$$

$$\begin{array}{r|l}
 A+B &= 7 \\
 3A+2B &= 66 \\
 \hline
 & 1 & 1 & 7 \\
 & 3 & 2 & 66 \\
 \hline
 & 1 & 1 & 7 \\
 -3R_1 + R_2 & 0 & -1 & 45 \\
 \hline
 \text{old } R_2 + R_1 & 1 & 0 & 52 \\
 & 0 & 1 & -45
 \end{array}$$

$$A = 52, B = -45$$

$$y(x) = 52e^{x/2} - 45e^{x/3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 52 - 45 &= 7 \checkmark \\
 26 - 15 &= 11 \checkmark
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 9) \quad 2x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 &= 0 \\
 3x_2 - x_3 - 2x_4 &= 2 \\
 3x_3 + 4x_4 &= 9 \\
 x_4 &= 6
 \end{aligned}$$

$$x_4 = 6$$

$$3x_3 = 9 - 24 = -15; \quad x_3 = -5$$

$$3x_2 = 2 + (-5) + 2(6) = 9; \quad x_2 = 3$$

$$2x_1 = -3 - (-5) - 6 = -4$$

$$x_1 = -2$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \\ x_4 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -2 \\ 3 \\ -5 \\ 6 \end{bmatrix}$$

93.2 13)

$$\begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 3 & 3 & 13 \\ 2 & 5 & 4 & 23 \\ 2 & 7 & 8 & 29 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 3 & 3 & 13 \\ -2R_1+R_2 & 0 & -1 & -3 \\ -2R_1+R_3 & 0 & 1 & 3 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 3 & 3 & 13 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ -R_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 0 & -3 & 4 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}$$

$$x_3 = t$$

$$x_2 = 3 - 2t$$

$$x_1 = 4 + 3t$$

$$\text{so } \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 3 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + t \begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ -2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

29 a) row p is the only issue:

$$R_p \rightarrow cR_p \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}cR_p = R_p$$

in A in B back to A

b) clear

$$c) R_q \rightarrow cR_p + R_q \rightarrow [cR_p + R_q] - cR_p = R_q$$

d) (a)-(c) show each row op is reversible. So if we do

$$Op_1$$

$$Op_2$$

$$Op_3$$

$$\vdots$$

$$Op_h$$

to A in order to get B then doing

$$Op_h^{-1}$$

$$Op_{h-1}^{-1}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$Op_2^{-1}$$

$$Op_1^{-1}$$

returns us back to A.

17)

$$\begin{array}{cccc|c} 1 & -4 & -3 & -3 & 2 \\ 2 & -6 & -5 & -5 & 5 \\ 3 & -1 & -4 & -5 & -7 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{cccc|c} 1 & -4 & -3 & -3 & 2 \\ -2R_1+R_2 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ -3R_1+R_3 & 0 & 11 & 5 & -13 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{cccc|c} 1 & -4 & -3 & -3 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -18 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & -1 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{cccc|c} 1 & -4 & -3 & -3 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -18 \\ R_3 & 0 & 2 & 1 & -1 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{cccc|c} 1 & -4 & -3 & -3 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -18 \\ -2R_3+R_2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 37 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{cccc|c} 1 & -4 & -3 & -3 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -18 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 37 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{cccc|c} 1 & -4 & 0 & 6 & 113 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -18 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 37 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{cccc|c} 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 41 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -18 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 37 \end{array}$$

(didn't do anything)

$$3R_3+R_1$$

$$4R_2+R_1$$

$$x_4 = t$$

$$x_3 = 37 - 3t$$

$$x_2 = -18 + t$$

$$x_1 = 41 - 2t$$

$$\text{so } \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \\ x_4 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 41 \\ -18 \\ 37 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + t \begin{bmatrix} -2 \\ 1 \\ -3 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

check:

well, we can get smaller numbers by letting $t = 20$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 41-40 \\ -18+20 \\ 37-60 \\ 20 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ -23 \\ 20 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$1 - 8 + 69 - 60 = 2 \checkmark$$

$$2 - 12 + 115 - 100 = 5 \checkmark$$

$$3 - 2 + 92 - 100 = -7 \checkmark$$

yea!

$$\begin{array}{r} 18 \\ 11 \\ \hline 18 \\ 18 \\ \hline 178 \\ -13 \\ \hline 185 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 37 \\ 3 \\ \hline 111 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{r} 18 \\ 4 \\ \hline 72 \\ -72 \\ \hline 4! \end{array}$$

3

This is the work for #5 in sections 2.4-2.6, and for #25 in section 2.6
2.5 #5:

```
> restart;with(DEtools):
> deqn:=diff(y(x),x)=y(x)-x-1;
dsolve({deqn,y(0)=1},y(x)); #exact solution.
```

$$y(x) = x + 2 - e^x$$

Find exact solution by hand: You were supposed to find this solution by hand, using the fact that the DE is linear. You probably figured out that the integrating factor is $\exp(-x)$, and proceeded as follows:

$$\frac{dy}{dx} - y = -x - 1$$

$$\left[\frac{d}{dx} \right] e^{-x} y = e^{-x} (-x - 1)$$

$$e^{-x} y = e^{-x} x + 2 e^{-x} + C$$

$$y = x + 2 + C e^x$$

$$1 = 2 + C$$

$$y = x + 2 - e^x$$

Now we will do Euler as requested, first with $h=1$, between $x=0$ and $x=5$:

```
> x0:=0.0: xn:=0.5: y0:=1.0: n:=5: h:=(xn-x0)/n;
#specify initial values, number of steps, and size
> f:=(x,y)->y-x-1: #this is the slope function f(x,y)
#in dy/dx = f(x,y), for #5.
> x:=x0: y:=y0: #initialize x,y for the do loop
```

```
> for i from 1 to n do
k:=f(x,y): #current slope, use : to suppress output
y:=y + h*k: #new y value via Euler
x:=x + h: #updated x-value:
print(x,y,x+2-exp(x)); #display current values,
#and compare to exact solution.
#`od` ends a do loop
od:
.1000000000, 1.0, .994829082
```

```
.2000000000, .9900000000, .978597242
.3000000000, .9690000000, .950141192
.4000000000, .9359000000, .908175302
.5000000000, .8894900000, .851278729
```

Change h to 0.05, and display results every 0.1:

```
> x:=x0: y:=y0:n:=10:h:=0.05:
for i from 1 to n do
k:=f(x,y): #current slope, use : to suppress output
y:=y + h*k: #new y value via Euler
x:=x + h: #updated x-value:
if frac(1/2)=0 #only print at multiples of 0.1
then print(x,y,x+2-exp(x)); #display current values,
#and compare to exact solution.
#end of if clause
#`od` ends a do loop
od:
.10, .9975, .994829082
```

```
.20, .98449375, .978597242
.30, .9599043594, .950141192
.40, .9225445563, .908175302
.50, .8711053733, .851278729
```

2.5 #5: improved Euler with step size 0.1, same DEqn:

```
> x:=x0: y:=y0:n:=5:h:=0.1:
for i from 1 to n do
k1:=f(x,y): #left slope
k2:=f(x+h,y+h*k1): #right slope approx.
k:=(k1+k2)/2:
y:=y + h*k: #new y value via Euler
x:=x + h: #updated x-value:
print(x,y,x+2-exp(x)); #display current values,
#and compare to exact solution.
#`od` ends a do loop
od:
.1, .9950000000, .994829082
.2, .9789750000, .978597242
.3, .9507673750, .950141192
.4, .9090979494, .908175302
.5, .8525332341, .851278729
```

Notice we did much better than with unimproved Euler, getting the correct answer to two decimal places.

2.6 #5) Same differential equation, with Runge Kutta, two steps to 0.5:

```
> x:=x0: y:=y0:n:=2:h:=0.25:
for i from 1 to n do
#stolen Runge-Kutta code
k1:=f(x,y): #left-hand slope
k2:=f(x+h/2,y+h*k1/2): #first guess at midpoint slope
k3:=f(x+h/2,y+h*k2/2): #second guess at midpoint slope
k4:=f(x+h,y+h*k3): #guess at right-hand slope
k:=(k1+2*k2+2*k3+k4)/6: #Simpson's approximation for the
integral
x:=x+h:
#z update
```

```

y:=y+h*k;
Print(x,y,x^2-exp(x)); #display current values and exact sol.
od:

```

```

25. 9659830729, 965974583
50. 8513005309, 851278729

```

Good to almost 4 decimal places!!!

2.5 #25) Improved Euler, with n=50 subintervals:

```

> t0:=0: v0:=49.0: n:=50: h:=.2:
t:=t0: v:=v0:
f:=(t,v)->-.04*v-9.8:
> for i from 1 to n do
  k1:=f(t,v): #left slope
  k2:=f(t+h,v+h*k1): #right slope approx.
  k:=(k1+k2)/2:
  v:=v + h*k: #new v value via Euler
  t:= t+ h: #updated t-value:
  if frac(1/5)=0 then
    print(t,v,294*exp(-t/25)-245);
    #display current values,
    #and compare to exact solution, when time is a
    #whole second
  fi:
od: #''od'' ends a do loop

```

```

1.0, 37.47221636, 37.4720951
2.0, 26.39643881, 26.3962058
3.0, 15.75494416, 15.7546084
4.0, 5.530704084, 5.5302740
5.0, -4.292642013, -4.2931586
6.0, -13.73081325, -13.7314088
7.0, -22.79891241, -22.7995800
8.0, -31.51145004, -31.5121831
9.0, -39.88236779, -39.8831601
10.0, -47.92506060, -47.9259065

```

Looks very close.

2.5 #25) Improved Euler, with n=100 subintervals:

```

> t0:=0: v0:=49.0: n:=100: h:=.1:
t:=t0: v:=v0:
f:=(t,v)->-.04*v-9.8:
t:=t0: v:=v0:
> for i from 1 to n do
  k1:=f(t,v): #left slope

```

Page 3

```

k2:=f(t+h,v+h*k1): #right slope approx.
k:=(k1+k2)/2:
v:=v + h*k: #new v value via Euler
t:= t+ h: #updated t-value:
if frac(1/10)=0 then
  print(t,v,294*exp(-t/25)-245);
  #display current values,
  #and compare to exact solution, when time is a
  #whole second
fi:

```

```

od: #''od'' ends a do loop
1.0, 37.47212533, 37.4720951
2.0, 26.39626391, 26.3962058
3.0, 15.75469208, 15.7546084
4.0, 5.53081164, 5.5302740
5.0, -4.293029838, -4.2931586
6.0, -13.73126040, -13.7314088
7.0, -22.79941363, -22.7995800
8.0, -31.51200039, -31.5121831
9.0, -39.88296265, -39.8831601
10.0, -47.92569564, -47.9259065

```

There is not much difference between n=50 and n=100 time steps, and both approximations are very close to the exact solution.

How to approximate time to apex and impact velocity after 9.41 seconds:

We can narrow in on the time of zero velocity, we can see from above that it's between 4 and 5 seconds. By linear interpolation it seems to be near 4.6 seconds. I can rerun Euler between 4 and 5 time between 4.5 and 4.7 seconds:

```

> t0:=4.0: v0:=5.530381164: n:=100: h:=.01:
#narrowing in...
t:=t0: v:=v0:
f:=(t,v)->-.04*v-9.8:
t:=t0: v:=v0:
> for i from 1 to n do
  k1:=f(t,v): #left slope
  k2:=f(t+h,v+h*k1): #right slope approx.
  k:=(k1+k2)/2:
  v:=v + h*k: #new v value via Euler
  t:= t+ h: #updated t-value:
  if (1 >= 50) and (1 <= 70)
    then
      print(t,v,294*exp(-t/25)-245);
      #display current values,
      #and compare to exact solution, in our interval of

```

Page 4

concern
fi:

od: fi: ends a do loop

4.50, .5695473697, .5694422
4.51, .4713391963, .4712340
4.52, .3731702983, .3730652
4.53, .2750406600, .2749356
4.54, .1769502657, .1768452
4.55, .0788909974, .0787941
4.56, -.01911285359, -.0192178
4.57, -.1170856100, -.1171906
4.58, -.2150191851, -.2151241
4.59, -.3129135946, -.3130185
4.60, -.4107688542, -.4108737
4.61, -.5085849795, -.5086897
4.62, -.6063619862, -.6064667
4.63, -.7040998899, -.7042046
4.64, -.8017987063, -.8019034
4.65, -.8994584510, -.8995631
4.66, -.9970791396, -.9971837
4.67, -.1094660788, -.10947653
4.68, -.1192203411, -.11923079
4.69, -.1289707025, -.12898115
4.70, -.1387171645, -.13872761

so we see that zero velocity occurs at about t=4.56 seconds, in agreement with section 2.3.

We could use the identical method to estimate the impact velocity after 9.41 seconds - rerun Euler between 9 and 10 seconds and display results in a subinterval. (If we didn't know that the impact occurred then we could find a numerical approximation by doing a numerical integration of the velocity function!.)