• Problem:

suppose you want to find the value of x which satisfies the relation:

$$f(x) = 0 \qquad x \in [a, b]$$

namely the **root** of the equation!

• Bolzano's theorem (or intermediate value theorem):

If f(x) is a continuous function inside [a,b] and it takes values f(a) and f(b) in a and b, then it also takes any value between f(a) and f(b) at some point inside the interval!

An important corollary of this theorem is that:
 if the function changes its sign in *f*(*a*) and *f*(*b*),
 then it must have a root inside [*a*,*b*]!



- A very immediate method to find the root of the equation could then be:
  - Fix the precision  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$  with which one wants to find the solution;
  - Divide [a,b] in N subsequent subintervals  $[x_i,x_{i+1}]$ , i=0, ..., N and  $x_0=a, x_N=b, \Delta x = |x_{i+1} - x_i| \le \epsilon$ ;
  - Scan all the subintervals and find the one for which:  $f(x_i) \cdot f(x_{i+1}) < 0$
  - Now we have determined the zero with a precision equal to  $\Delta x$ :  $\alpha = \frac{1}{2} (x_i + x_{i+1}) \pm \frac{1}{2} \Delta x$

• In a graphical representation for *N*=10:



• The solution is:  $\alpha = (x_6 + x_7)/2$ 

- This is a good method only when the number *N* of subintervals is not too high, since for each subinterval  $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$  one has to evaluate the product  $f(x_i) \cdot f(x_{i+1})N$  times, in the worst case!
- A more efficient algorithm: the bisection algorithm!
  - It belongs to the class of "divide-and-conquer" algorithms
  - Like other algorithms of the same kind (e.g. FFT, we will see later) lowers the number of required operations.

- The idea is to build up a sequence of smaller and smaller subintervals by halving the interval at the previous step!
- At the first step of the sequence, one starts with an interval a<sub>0</sub>=a, b<sub>0</sub>=b.
- Then one evaluates the midpoint  $x_0$  between  $a_0$ and  $b_0$ :  $x_0 = \frac{1}{2}(a_0 + b_0)$
- Now, unless the zero is exactly in x<sub>0</sub>, it stays either in [a<sub>0</sub>,x<sub>0</sub>] or in [x<sub>0</sub>,b<sub>0</sub>].

- This is realized by looking at the products:  $f(a_0) \cdot f(x_0)$  and  $f(x_0) \cdot f(b_0)$
- One of the two has to be < 0!
- In case it is the first one, we let:

$$a_1 = a_0, b_1 = x_0;$$

• In case it is the second one, we let:

$$a_1 = x_0, b_1 = b_0;$$

and so on...













- How many iterations are needed in order to compute the value of the zero with a given precision  $\varepsilon$ ?
- We know that, at each iteration, the interval is halved, namely the width  $w_i$  of the interval in which the zero is at the *i*-th iteration is:

$$w_0 = b_0 - a_0 = b - a$$
 at iteration  $i = 0;$   
 $w_1 = b_1 - a_1 = \frac{1}{2}w_0 = \frac{1}{2}(b - a)$  at iteration  $i = 1;$   
 $w_2 = b_2 - a_2 = \frac{1}{2}w_1 = \frac{1}{2^2}(b - a)$  at iteration  $i = 2;$ 

 $\mathbf{\Omega}$ 

• At the *n*-th iteration we have:

$$w_n = \frac{1}{2^n}(b-a)$$

• We stop the procedure when:

$$w_n \le \epsilon \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{1}{2^n}(b-a) \le \epsilon$$
  
$$\Rightarrow \quad \log_2 \left[ \frac{1}{2^n}(b-a) \right] \le \log_2 \epsilon$$
  
$$\Rightarrow \quad -\log_2(2^n) + \log_2(b-a) \le \log_2 \epsilon$$
  
$$\Rightarrow \quad \log_2 \left[ \frac{(b-a)}{\epsilon} \right] \le n$$

- Pros:
  - The algorithm always gives a solution (provided that the initial interval does indeed contains a zero!)!
  - > The number of iterations required is known a priori independently of the particular function f(x)!
- Cons:
  - The algorithm can be very slow (large n!) if the initial interval (b-a) is large and the required precision (ɛ) is small!

- The idea of Newton's algorithm is to find a succession of subsequent approximations of the solution.
- Lagrange's mean value theorem:

Let be f(x) a real function which is continuous and differentiable on the interval [a,b]. Then, there exists some c in [a,b] such that:

$$f'(c) = \frac{f(b) - f(a)}{b - a}$$

• Now, let  $\alpha$  be the root of the equation and  $x_0$  a value close to  $\alpha$ . Then, by applying the previous theorem to the interval  $[x_0, \alpha]$ :

$$f'(c) = \frac{f(\alpha) - f(x_0)}{\alpha - x_0}$$

that is, there must be a value c in  $[x_0, \alpha]$  which satisfies the equation:

$$\alpha = x_0 - \frac{f(x_0)}{f'(c)}$$

since  $f(\alpha) = 0!$ 

- Of course, if we knew the point c, we would have solved the problem, since the relation above gives us the value of  $\alpha$ .
- We can then try to find a new value for the solution,  $x_1$ , by approximating c with  $x_0$ :

$$x_1 = x_0 - \frac{f(x_0)}{f'(x_0)}$$

 In an analogous way, we can build up a successions of values (hopefully!) closer and closer to the solution, as:

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \frac{f(x_k)}{f'(x_k)}$$

• Geometrical interpretation:



• At the subsequent step:



- Pros:
  - > The convergence of the method is very fast!
  - It does not depend on the width of the interval in which the root is located, but only on the initial guess x<sub>0</sub>;
- Cons:
  - However, the method may also not converge, it depends on the shape of the function f(x);
  - The number of iterations is not fixed a priori, but depends on x<sub>0</sub>!

- Two examples:
  - > Find the root of the equation:

$$e^x - 1.5 = 0$$

- in the interval [0,3];
- Find the root of the equation:

$$\frac{x}{3/2 + \sin(\pi x)} - \frac{1}{2} = 0$$

in the interval [0,6].

• In the first case:

$$f(x) = e^x - 1.5;$$
  
$$f'(x) = e^x.$$

• In the second one:

$$f(x) = \frac{x}{3/2 + \sin(\pi x)} - \frac{1}{2};$$
  
$$f'(x) = \frac{3/2 + \sin(\pi x) - x\pi \cos(\pi x)}{[3/2 + \sin(\pi x)]^2}$$















































- In general, the **best thing to do** is:
  - At first, use a method that always converges, like the bisection method, even if it converges slowly, with a rough precision, in order to limit the interval in which the zero is supposed to exist;
  - Then, use Newton's method to find a quickly converging solution;
  - In case the second step does not converge, try a different initial guess.

As often happens in life, a fair amount of "good luck" is fundamental!

• Quite often, one needs to find the roots of a multi-dimensional system of transcendental equations, like:

$$\begin{cases} f_1(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= 0\\ f_2(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= 0\\ \dots &= 0\\ f_n(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= 0 \end{cases}$$

where  $f_i$  are *n* functions:

$$f_i:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$$

- Just to keep things simple, we can make an analogy with the one-dimensional case.
- We notice that:

$$x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} - \frac{f[x^{(k)}]}{f'[x^{(k)}]}$$

can be re-written as:  $f'[x^{(k)}] \cdot [x^{(k+1)} - x^{(k)}] = f'[x^{(k)}] \cdot \delta x^{(k)} = -f[x^{(k)}]$ that is, the product of the derivative by the "correction" to the  $x^{(k)}$  is equal to  $-f[x^{(k)}]$ .

- In *n* dimensions:
  - > The derivative is substituted by the gradient of f;
  - > The scalar  $x^{(k)}$  becomes a vector  $\overline{x^{(k)}}$  as well as the "correction"  $\delta x^{(k)}$  becomes a vector  $\overline{\delta x^{(k)}}$ ;
  - The product becomes a "dot product" between the gradient and the  $\delta x^{(k)}$ .
- That is, for the *i*-th function  $f_i$  we have:

$$\nabla f_i[\bar{x}^{(k)}] \cdot \delta \bar{x}^{(k)} = -f_i[\bar{x}^{(k)}]$$

• Which may be written explicitly as:

$$\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_1}\Big|_{\bar{x}^{(k)}} \delta x_1^{(k)} + \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_2}\Big|_{\bar{x}^{(k)}} \delta x_2^{(k)} + \dots + \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_n}\Big|_{\bar{x}^{(k)}} \delta x_n^{(k)} = -f_1[\bar{x}^{(k)}]$$

$$\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_1}\Big|_{\bar{x}^{(k)}} \delta x_1^{(k)} + \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_2}\Big|_{\bar{x}^{(k)}} \delta x_2^{(k)} + \dots + \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_n}\Big|_{\bar{x}^{(k)}} \delta x_n^{(k)} = -f_2[\bar{x}^{(k)}]$$

$$\dots =$$

$$\frac{\partial f_n}{\partial x_1}\Big|_{\bar{x}^{(k)}} \delta x_1^{(k)} + \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial x_2}\Big|_{\bar{x}^{(k)}} \delta x_2^{(k)} + \dots + \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial x_n}\Big|_{\bar{x}^{(k)}} \delta x_n^{(k)} = -f_n[\bar{x}^{(k)}]$$
or, in matrix form:
$$J|_{\bar{x}^{(k)}} \delta \bar{x}^{(k)} = -\begin{pmatrix} f_1[\bar{x}^{(k)}]\\ f_2[\bar{x}^{(k)}]\\ \dots\\ f_n[\bar{x}^{(k)}] \end{pmatrix}$$

• Where *J* is the Jacobian matrix:



• The "correction"  $\delta x^{(k)}$  is then given by the solution of a linear system of equations!

• Example (*n* = 2!):

$$\begin{cases} f_1(x,y) &= x^2 + y^2 - 1 = 0\\ f_2(x,y) &= x + y - 1 = 0 \end{cases}$$

- The first equation of the system represents a circle with center in the origin and radius = 1.
- The second equation represents the straight line inclined of  $3\pi/4$  with respect to the *x* axis.
- The solution of such a system is given by the intersections between the two curves:



• The Jacobian matrix, evaluated in *x*<sup>(k)</sup>, is then given by:

$$J|_{\bar{x}^{(k)}} = \begin{pmatrix} 2x & 2y \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \Big|_{\bar{x}^{(k)}} = \begin{pmatrix} 2x^{(k)} & 2y^{(k)} \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

therefore the "correction"  $\delta x^{(k)}$  is given by the solution of the system:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2x^{(k)} & 2y^{(k)} \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \delta x^{(k)} \\ \delta y^{(k)} \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} x^2 + y^2 - 1 \\ x + y - 1 \end{pmatrix} \Big|_{\bar{x}^{(k)}}$$
$$= - \begin{pmatrix} [x^{(k)}]^2 + [y^{(k)}]^2 - 1 \\ x^{(k)} + y^{(k)} - 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Where the  $x^{(k)}$  and  $y^{(k)}$  are known, and therefore we get the "correction"  $\delta x^{(k)}$  as:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \delta x^{(k)} \\ \delta y^{(k)} \end{pmatrix} = -J^{-1}|_{\bar{x}^{(k)}} \begin{pmatrix} [x^{(k)}]^2 + [y^{(k)}]^2 - 1 \\ x^{(k)} + y^{(k)} - 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$= -\frac{1}{x^{(k)} - y^{(k)}} \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & -y^{(k)} \\ -1/2 & x^{(k)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} [x^{(k)}]^2 + [y^{(k)}]^2 - 1 \\ x^{(k)} + y^{(k)} - 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and, finally, the next approximation of the solution, given by:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x^{(k+1)} \\ y^{(k+1)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x^{(k)} \\ y^{(k)} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \delta x^{(k)} \\ \delta y^{(k)} \end{pmatrix}$$

• By implementing this in a code, we get, for instance when:  $x^{(0)}=0.3$ ,  $y^{(0)}=0.2$ ,  $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$ :

Iter.	$x^{(k+1)}$	$y^{(k+1)}$	$ \delta ar{x}^{(k)} $
1	3.65	-2.65	4.398300
2	2.11468	-1.11468	2.17127
3	1.38476	-0.38476	1.03227
4	1.08366	-0.08366	0.42581
5	1.00600	-0.00600	0.10983
6	1.00004	$-3.55232 \times 10^{-5}$	0.00843
7	1.00000	$-1.26181 \times 10^{-9}$	$5.02356 \times 10^{-5}$

which converges to (1.0,0.0)!

• Instead, when:  $x^{(0)}=0.1$ ,  $y^{(0)}=0.3$ ,  $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$ :

Iter.	$x^{(k+1)}$	$y^{(k+1)}$	$ \delta ar{x}^{(k)} $
1	-1.25	2.25	2.37171
2	-0.44643	1.44643	1.13642
3	-0.10529	1.10529	0.48244
4	-0.00916	1.00916	0.13595
5	$-8.23523 \times 10^{-5}$	1.00008	0.01283
6	$-6.78078 \times 10^{-9}$	1.00000	0.00012
7	$-9.31642 \times 10^{-17}$	1.0	$9.58948 \times 10^{-9}$

which converges to (0.0, 1.0)!