# The numerical solution of second-order differential equations not containing the first derivative explicitly 

By R. E. Scraton

Several methods are obtained for the numerical solution of the differential equation $y^{\prime \prime}=f(x, y)$ starting from initial values of $y$ and $y^{\prime}$ at some point $x_{0}$. These methods may be considered as generalizations of the Runge-Kutta method and De Vogelaere's method.

## Some previously known methods

Collatz (1960) has shown that for the equation $y^{\prime \prime}=f(x, y)$ the standard fourth-order Runge-Kutta process can be put into the simplified form

$$
\begin{align*}
& k_{0}=h^{2} f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \\
& k_{1}=h^{2} f\left(x_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h, y_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{8} k_{0}\right) \\
& k_{2}=h^{2} f\left(x_{0}+h, y_{0}+h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{2} k_{1}\right)  \tag{A}\\
& y_{1}=y_{0}+h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{6}\left(k_{0}+2 k_{1}\right)+\mathrm{O}\left(h^{5}\right) \\
& h y_{1}^{\prime}=h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{6}\left(k_{0}+4 k_{1}+k_{2}\right)+\mathrm{O}\left(h^{6}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

This process requires three evaluations of the function $f(x, y)$ for each step; unless $f(x, y)$ is a very simple function, these evaluations comprise the bulk of the computational work.

De Vogelaere has shown (1955) that the same degree of accuracy can be obtained with only two function evaluations per step. His process may be put in the form

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rlr}
y_{\ddagger} & =y_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{6}\left(F_{0}-\frac{1}{4} F_{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) & +\mathrm{O}\left(h^{4}\right) \\
y_{1} & =y_{0}+h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{6}\left(F_{0}+2 F_{\frac{1}{2}}\right) & +\mathrm{O}\left(h^{5}\right)  \tag{B}\\
h y_{\mathrm{i}}^{\prime} & =h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{6}\left(F_{0}+4 F_{\ddagger}+F_{1}\right) & +\mathrm{O}\left(h^{6}\right)
\end{array}\right\}
$$

where $F_{p}=h^{2} f\left(x_{p}, y_{p}\right)$. This process requires the value of $F_{-\frac{1}{2}}$ from the previous step and is therefore not selfstarting. For the initial step $F_{-\frac{1}{2}}$ may be obtained from

$$
y_{-\frac{1}{2}}=y_{0}-\frac{1}{2} h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{8} F_{0} \quad+\mathrm{O}\left(h^{3}\right) .
$$

A similar procedure must be used at each change of interval.

It will be noted that in both the above processes, the error in $h y^{\prime}$ is of a higher order than that in $y$. This is essential if the order of accuracy is to be preserved
throughout the tabulation, for each subsequent value of $y$ contains, in effect, the sum of all previous values of $h y^{\prime}$.

## Runge-Kutta type processes

A general process of the Runge-Kutta type is of the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
& k_{0}=h^{2} f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \\
& k_{r}=h^{2} f\left(x_{0}+a_{r} h, y_{0}+a_{r} h y_{0}^{\prime}+\sum_{s=0}^{r-1} b_{r s} k_{s}\right) \\
& \quad r=1,2, \ldots, n . \\
& y_{1}=y_{0}+h y_{0}^{\prime}+W_{0} k_{0}+\sum_{r=1}^{n} W_{r}\left(1-a_{r}\right) k_{r} \\
& h y_{1}^{\prime}=h y_{0}^{\prime}+\sum_{r=0}^{n} W_{r} k_{r} .
\end{aligned}
$$

It is possible to write down a set of equations for the unknowns $a_{r}, W_{r}, b_{r s}$, depending on the order of accuracy required. The solution of these equations involves some cumbersome algebra which need not be discussed here; the general method is described in detail by Collatz (1960).

Below are given fifth- and sixth-order processes requiring four and five function evaluations per step, respectively. Neither of these processes is unique; it is possible to derive a variety of similar processes.

## Fifth-order process

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
\begin{array}{rl}
k_{0}=h^{2} f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \\
k_{1}= & h^{2} f\left(x_{0}+\frac{1}{4} h, y_{0}+\frac{1}{4} h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{32} k_{0}\right)
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{r}
k_{2}=h^{2} f\left(x_{0}+\frac{7}{10} h, y_{0}+\frac{7}{10} h y_{0}^{\prime}\right. \\
\\
\left.\quad-\frac{7}{1000} k_{0}+\frac{63}{250} k_{1}\right)
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{r}
k_{3}=h^{2} f\left(x_{0}+h, y_{0}+h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{2}{7} k_{0}+\frac{3}{14} k_{2}\right)
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{r}
y_{1}=y_{0}+h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{14} k_{0}+\frac{8}{27} k_{1}+\frac{25}{189} k_{2} \\
\\
\quad+\mathrm{O}\left(h^{6}\right)
\end{array} \\
h y_{1}^{\prime}=h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{14} k_{0}+\frac{32}{81} k_{1}+\frac{250}{567} k_{2}+\frac{5}{54} k_{3}  \tag{C}\\
\quad+\mathrm{O}\left(h^{7}\right)
\end{array}\right)
$$

## Sixth-order process

$$
\begin{align*}
& k_{0}=h^{2} f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \\
& k_{1}=h^{2} f\left(x_{0}+\frac{1}{4} h, y_{0}+\frac{1}{4} h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{32} k_{0}\right) \\
& k_{2}=h^{2} f\left(x_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h, y_{0}+\frac{1}{2} h y_{0}^{\prime}-\frac{1}{24} k_{0}+\frac{1}{6} k_{1}\right) \\
& k_{3}=h^{2} f\left(x_{0}+\frac{3}{4} h, y_{0}+\frac{3}{4} h y_{0}^{\prime}\right. \\
& \left.+\frac{3}{32} k_{0}+\frac{1}{8} k_{1}+\frac{1}{16} k_{2}\right)  \tag{D}\\
& k_{4}=h^{2} f\left(x_{0}+h, y_{0}+h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{3}{7} k_{1}\right. \\
& \left.-\frac{1}{14} k_{2}+\frac{1}{7} k_{3}\right) \\
& y_{1}=y_{0}+h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{90}\left(7 k_{0}+24 k_{1}+6 k_{2}+8 k_{3}\right) \\
& +\mathrm{O}\left(h^{7}\right) \\
& h y_{1}^{\prime}=h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{90}\left(7 k_{0}+32 k_{1}+12 k_{2}\right. \\
& \left.+32 k_{3}+7 k_{4}\right)+\mathrm{O}\left(h^{8}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

It is tempting to assume from processes (A), (C) and (D) that it is always possible to derive an $n$ th-order process requiring ( $n-1$ ) function evaluations per step; this is not, however, correct. It may be possible to obtain a seventh-order process requiring only six function evaluations, though no such process has been obtained; it can be shown that an eighth-order process would require at least eight, and a ninth-order at least ten. Processes of this complexity would be of little practical use.

## Methods based on Radau Quadrature

It was shown by Radau (1880) that for any value of $n$ a closed quadrature formula may be obtained in the form
$\int_{x_{0}}^{x_{1}} g(x) d x=h\left[W_{0} g\left(x_{0}\right)+\sum_{r=1}^{n-1} W_{r} g\left(x_{0}+a_{r} h\right)+W_{n} g\left(x_{1}\right)\right]$

$$
+\mathrm{O}\left(h^{2 n+1}\right)
$$

It can be deduced that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& y_{1}=y_{0}+h y_{0}^{\prime}+W_{0} F_{0}+\sum_{r=1}^{n-1} W_{r}\left(1-a_{r}\right) F_{a_{r}} \\
& +\mathrm{O}\left(h^{2 n!1}\right) \\
& h y_{1}^{\prime}=h y_{0}^{\prime}+W_{0} F_{0}+\sum_{r=1}^{n-1} W_{r} F_{a_{r}}+W_{n} F_{1} \\
& +\mathrm{O}\left(h^{2 n+2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $F_{p}=h^{2} y_{p}^{\prime \prime}=h^{2} f\left(x_{p}, y_{p}\right)$. A process based on these formulae would be of the $2 n$th order and yet require only $n$ function evaluations per step, thus improving on the Runge-Kutta processes. It is necessary, however. to obtain the intermediate values of $F$ correct to order $h^{2 n+1}$ and this entails the evaluation of
the corresponding $y$ to order $h^{2 n-1}$. These latter values must be obtained by extrapolation using the data of previous steps; the processes are not therefore selfstarting, but require special starting procedures.

The simplest Radau formula ( $n=1$ ) is the trapezium rule, which gives rise to the trivial process:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rl}
y_{1} & =y_{0}+h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{2} F_{0}  \tag{E}\\
h y_{i}^{\prime} & =h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{2}\left(F_{0}+F_{1}^{3}\right) \\
h \mathrm{O}\left(h^{4}\right)
\end{array}\right\}
$$

This requires no starting procedure.
With $n=2$, the appropriate Radau formula is Simpson's rule, and the corresponding process is De Vogelaere's process (B). Higher-order processes of this type may thus be regarded as generalizations of De Vogelaere's process.

Radau's four-point formula ( $n=3$ ) is

$$
\int_{x_{0}}^{x_{1}} g(x) d x=\frac{h}{12}\left(g_{0}+5 g_{a}+5 g_{1-a}+g_{1}\right)+\mathrm{O}\left(h^{7}\right)
$$

where $a=\frac{5-\sqrt{ } 5}{10}=0.2763,9320$. The corresponding process is given below:

$$
\begin{align*}
y_{a} & =y_{0}+0 \cdot 2763,9320 h y_{0}^{\prime} \\
& +0 \cdot 0645,7768 F_{0}-0 \cdot 0387,4353 F_{-a} \\
& +0 \cdot 0187,1543 F_{a-1}-0 \cdot 0063,5398 F_{-1} \\
y_{t-a} & =y_{0}+0 \cdot 7236,0680 h y_{0}^{\prime}  \tag{6}\\
& +0 \cdot 2971,1983 F_{a}-0 \cdot 1294,4272 F_{0} \\
& +0 \cdot 1098,7164 F_{-a}-0 \cdot 0157,4536 \mathrm{~F}_{a-1}  \tag{F}\\
& +\mathrm{O}\left(h^{6}\right) \\
y_{1} & =y_{0}+h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{12} F_{0}+0 \cdot 3015,0283 F_{a} \\
& +0 \cdot 1151,6383 F_{1-a} \\
& +\mathrm{O}\left(h^{7}\right) \\
h y_{1}^{\prime} & =h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{12}\left(F_{0}+5 F_{a}+5 F_{1-a}+F_{1}\right) \\
& \\
& +\mathrm{O}\left(h^{8}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

For the initial step, the values of $F_{-a}, F_{a-1}, F_{-1}$, can be obtained to an adequate degree of accuracy from the following values of $y$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& y_{-\frac{1}{2}}=y_{0}-\frac{1}{2} h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{8} F_{0}+\mathrm{O}\left(h^{3}\right) \\
& y_{-1}=y_{0}-h y_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{6}\left(F_{0}+2 F_{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)+\mathrm{O}\left(h^{5}\right) \\
& y_{-a}=y_{0}-0 \cdot 2763,9320 h y_{0}^{\prime}+0 \cdot 0286,1197 F_{0} \\
&+0 \cdot 0121,3107 F_{-\frac{1}{2}}-0 \cdot 0025,4644 F_{-1} \\
&+\mathrm{O}\left(h^{5}\right) \\
& y_{a-1}=y_{0}-0 \cdot 7236,0680 h y_{0}^{\prime}+0 \cdot 1180,5469 F_{0} \\
&+0 \cdot 1612,0227 F_{-\frac{1}{2}}-0 \cdot 0174,5356 F_{-1} \\
&+\mathrm{O}\left(h^{5}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Table 1
Solutions, obtained by various methods, to the differential equation $y^{\prime \prime}=-x y$, where $y=1$ and $y^{\prime}=0$ when $x=0$

| $x$ | CORRECT <br> solution | METHOD (A) runge-kutta | METHOD (B) de vogelafe | Method (c) <br> 5th-ORDER | METHOD (D) 6TH-ORDER | $\underset{\text { RADAU }}{\operatorname{METHOD}(F)}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0 \cdot 0$ | $1 \cdot 000000$ | $1 \cdot 000000$ | $1 \cdot 000000$ | $1 \cdot 000000$ | $1 \cdot 000000$ | $1 \cdot 000000$ |
| $0 \cdot 5$ | $0 \cdot 979253$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.979167 \\ (-86) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.979219 \\ (-34) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.979258 \\ (+5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.979253 \\ (-) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \cdot 979254 \\ (+1) \end{array}$ |
| $1 \cdot 0$ | $0 \cdot 838812$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.838609 \\ (-203) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \cdot 838704 \\ (-108) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.838824 \\ (+12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.838812 \\ (-) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \cdot 838814 \\ (+2) \end{array}$ |
| 1.5 | $0 \cdot 497890$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.497757 \\ (-133) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \cdot 497830 \\ (-60) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.497915 \\ (+25) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \cdot 497890 \\ (-) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \cdot 497894 \\ (+4) \end{array}$ |
| $2 \cdot 0$ | $-0.014979$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0 \cdot 014487 \\ (+492) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0 \cdot 014571 \\ (+408) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.014947 \\ (+32) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.014976 \\ (+3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.014976 \\ (+3) \end{array}$ |
| $2 \cdot 5$ | $-0.509797$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0 \cdot 508159 \\ (+1638) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0 \cdot 508499 \\ (+1298) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.509806 \\ (-9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0 \cdot 509791 \\ (+6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0 \cdot 509807 \\ (-10) \end{array}$ |
| $3 \cdot 0$ | -0.694729 | $\begin{array}{r} -0.692671 \\ (+2058) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.693099 \\ (+1630) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.694857 \\ (-128) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.694723 \\ (+6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.694757 \\ (-28) \end{array}$ |

The figures in brackets show the errors in units of the sixth decimal place.

This process is of the same order of accuracy as process (D), though it requires two fewer function evaluations per step.

For $n>3$, the extrapolation must make use of the values of both $y$ and $F$ obtained during the previous step; alternatively, the values of $F$ from the previous two steps may be used. In either case, there is a considerable increase in the complexity of the starting procedure, and this to a large extent limits the usefulness of such processes.

## Numerical example

It is not practicable to make a theoretical comparison of the truncation errors of the various methods, owing
to the complexity of the error terms in the Runge-Kutta type processes. Nor is it intended to discuss here the question of stability.

In order to illustrate the accuracy which can be obtained, a numerical example is shown in Table 1. This shows the solution of the differential equation $y^{\prime \prime}=-x y$, where $y=1$ and $y^{\prime}=0$ when $x=0$, obtained by the various methods, with an interval $h=0 \cdot 5$. Alongside is shown the correct solution, which is easily obtained in terms of Bessel functions. It will be seen that methods (D) and (F) yield results of considerable accuracy in spite of the large interval used.
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