

Values for  $\text{Error}_2$  at major nodes are given for Day, Moore, and the present method in **Tables 4D, 4M, and 4** respectively. Again since  $\Delta u, \Delta p, \Delta q, f_u, f_p, f_q$  all vary monotonically over  $D$  it is essential to use averages taken from a central region ( $0.3 \leq x, y \leq 1.8$ ) for instance. The truncation error estimate in  $u(2.0, 2.0)$  at node (39, 39) when expressed in the mode of  $\text{Error}_2$  turns out to be: 2.35 which compares with the deviation from 100 of the terminal diagonal entry in Table 4.

## References

- DAY, J. T. (1966). A Runge-Kutta method for the numerical solution of the Goursat problem in hyperbolic partial differential equations, *Comp. J.*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 81-83.
- GARABEDIAN, P. R. (1964). *Partial Differential Equations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- MOORE, R. H. (1961). A Runge-Kutta Procedure for the Goursat problem in Hyperbolic Partial Differential Equations, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, Vol. 7, pp. 37-63.

## Correspondence

To the Editor  
The Computer Journal

Sir,

The method described by M. G. Cox (A bracketing technique for computing a zero of a function, this *Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 101-102) should be compared with the method proposed by W. M. Stone (A form of Newton's method with cubic convergence, *Quart. Appl. Math.*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 118-119) which uses the same information,  $f$  and  $f'$  at the two boundary points. While Stone's method requires solving a quadratic and selecting the proper root it has cubic convergence while Cox's method only converges quadratically.

Yours faithfully,  
WILLIAM SQUIRE

Department of Aerospace Engineering  
West Virginia University  
Morgantown  
West Virginia 26506  
USA  
23 June 1970

Dr. Cox replies:

In reply to Professor Squire's letter I have carried out a theoretical and practical comparison of the methods of Stone (1953) and Cox (1970) and I give here the main results. I shall refer to these methods as S and C respectively.

Stone assumes that at the start of the  $n$ th iteration bounds  $a_n$  and  $b_n$  such that  $f(a_n)f(b_n) < 0$  are available. He then shows that if  $x_{n+1}$  is the value obtained from his formula using  $a_n$  and  $b_n$ , then

$$x_{n+1} - \xi = \frac{(a_n - \xi)(b_n - \xi)}{b_n - a_n} P(x - \xi),$$

where  $\xi$  is the required zero and  $P(x - \xi)$  is a power series containing quadratic terms and higher in  $(a_n - \xi)$ ,  $(b_n - \xi)$  and  $(x_{n+1} - \xi)$ . It is not immediately evident from Stone's paper exactly how his method is implemented. However, since  $a_n$  and  $b_n$  are to straddle the zero it appears that at the end of the  $(n - 1)$ th iteration the following strategy is employed. If  $f(x_n)$  and  $f(a_{n-1})$  have the same sign then new bounds are given by setting  $a_n = x_n$  and  $b_n = b_{n-1}$ , otherwise  $a_n = a_{n-1}$  and  $b_n = x_n$ .

It follows that at the start of the  $n$ th iteration either  $a_n$  or  $b_n$  is set equal to  $x_n$ . Assume for sake of definiteness that  $a_n = x_n$ . Hence  $b_n$  must be equal to an earlier value  $x_{n-r}$ , say, where  $r \geq 1$ . Let  $\epsilon_n = x_n - \xi$ . If we assume that  $|\epsilon_n| < |\epsilon_{n-r}|$ , then asymptotically

$$|\epsilon_{n+1}| = C |\epsilon_n| \epsilon_{n-r}^2,$$

where  $C \rightarrow$  a positive constant. After taking logarithms and solving the resulting difference equation we find

$$|\epsilon_{n+1}| = K |\epsilon_n| P,$$

## Acknowledgements

The author acknowledges the friendly co-operation of Messrs. J. W. Maguire and R. Foyer of IBM Datacentre in Toronto. Sincere thanks are due to Miss Sandra Johnston of the University of Toronto and Mr. Bonaventure Thornburn, formerly of Canada Centre for Inland Waters and presently with the University of British Columbia, for their splendid and tireless assistance with programming and check calculations.

where  $K \rightarrow$  a positive constant and  $p$  is the real positive root of the equation  $t^{r+1} - t^r - 2 = 0$ . When  $r = 1$ ,  $p = 2$ . When  $r > 1$ ,  $1 < p < 2$ , and as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $p \rightarrow 1$ . These results may be interpreted as follows. In the most favourable case the bounds are replaced alternately and consequently  $p = 2$ ; i.e. the convergence is quadratic. If one bound remains fixed for  $r$  iterations ( $r > 1$ ), then the convergence is subquadratic ( $r = 2$  gives  $p = 1.696$ ,  $r = 3$  gives  $p = 1.544$ ,  $r = 4$  gives  $p = 1.451$ , etc.). In particular, convergence is at best quadratic and certainly not cubic as claimed by Stone.

In my paper I showed that in the least favourable case when one bound remains fixed and the other is replaced at each iteration the convergence of C is quadratic. In the most favourable case, when bounds are replaced alternately, the analysis of Jarratt (1966) can be used to show that the order is  $1 + 3^{\frac{1}{2}} = 2.732$ . Thus if  $p_s$  and  $p_c$  are the orders of S and C, respectively, then  $1 < p_s \leq 2 \leq p_c \leq 2.732$ . It follows that if the order is taken as a means of comparison then C is theoretically superior to (or at least as good as) S.

It is possible however that S possesses certain desirable properties in practice. In order to provide a partial test of such a possibility I have applied S to the same class of test functions as considered in my paper, viz. the class of randomly generated polynomials  $p_n(x)$  of degree  $n$ . This test was carried out 100 times for both  $n = 10$  and  $n = 30$  using initial bounds  $a_0 = 0$  and  $b_0 = 1$ . Each test was terminated when two successive estimates of the zero differed by  $\frac{1}{2} \times 10^{-8}$  or less. The table gives the average number of evaluations of the polynomial together with its derivative for the two methods.

Degree	C	S
10	4.95	9.41
30	5.15	19.84

The figures do not include the evaluations of  $p_n(x)$  and  $p_n'(x)$  at the initial bounds  $x = 0$  and 1, since they are common to both methods. On the evidence of these tests we conclude that C appears to be superior to S in practice.

It is possible of course that Professor Square has a different interpretation of Stone's method, for which the performance is better than I have observed. If this is the case I should be most interested to have details.

## References

- COX, M. G. (1970). A bracketing technique for computing a zero of a function, *The Computer Journal*, Vol. 13, pp. 101-102.
- JARRATT, P. (1966). A rational iteration function for solving equations, *The Computer Journal*, Vol. 9, pp. 304-307.
- STONE, W. M. (1953). A form of Newton's method with cubic convergence, *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics*, Vol. 11, pp. 118-119.

Yours faithfully,  
M. G. Cox

26 August 1970