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#### Abstract

In this paper, we propose and analyze new predictor-corrector method based on the quasinewton approach for solving a nonlinear system of equations using the trapezoidal and midpoint quadrature formulas. A simple and flexible iterative method is proposed to determine the real roots of a system of nonlinear equations. The proposed method is the weight combination of Midpoint and Trapezoidal (MT). Numerical results of the method show that the proposed algorithm is robust.
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## 1. Introduction

Solving equations is very important in applied mathematics, since most of the mathematical models relating to scientific problems involve finding some values which are the solutions of equations. Those equations usually cannot be solved analytically, but require a numerical scheme to approximate the solutions [4]. Iterative algorithms for solving a system of nonlinear algebraic equations date back to the seminal work of Isaac Newton. We consider the standard problem of identifying the solution of a system of nonlinear equations is

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(x)=0 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the function $F: R^{n} \rightarrow R^{n}$ is a nonlinear differentiable function and $n$ is large. The value of $x$ is then called a solution or root of this equation and may be just one of many equations. The disadvantages of the Newton method arise from the need to calculate and invert the Jacobian matrix $J(x)$ at each iteration. Quasi-Newton methods were introduced because of the weaknesses of the Newton method. The most successful and simplest quasi-Newton method for solving nonlinear systems of equations is the Broyden method [14]. Broyden method was introduced due to its being a powerful alternative to Newton method, and hence it reduces the amount of calculation at each iteration, but the number of iterations needed to converge to a solution has increased, which inversely reduced the convergence order from quadratic to superlinear. Broyden method is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{k+1}=x_{k}-B_{k}^{-1} F\left(x_{k}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $x:=\left\{x_{1}, \cdots, x_{n}\right\}, F:=F_{1}, \cdots, F_{n}$ and $B_{k}$ is an $n \times n$ matrix which is an approximation of the Newton Jacobian $J=F^{\prime}\left(x_{k}\right)=\frac{\partial \vec{F}_{i}}{\partial x_{j}}$, such that the quasi-Newton equation

$$
B_{k+1}\left(x_{k+1}-x_{k}\right)=F\left(x_{k+1}\right)-F\left(x_{k}\right)
$$

is satisfied for each $k$. Recently, several iterative methods have been developed to solve nonlinear equations and the system of nonlinear equations. These methods have been improved using Taylor series, quadrature formula $[2,3,5,19,20]$, homotopy perturbation method and decomposition techniques [13, 16, 12, 6]. Quadrature-based Broyden-like methods have also been proposed [17, 14] and

[^0]the references therein. A Broyden-like method using the trapezoidal rule was proposed by [17] in order to solve a system of nonlinear equations and reduce the number of iterations of the Classical Broyden method. Also [14] used the weighted combination of the midpoint and simpson quadrature formulas to propose a Broyden-like. Our aim in this work is to present alternative methods that will reduce the number of iterations required by the classical Broyden method to converge to a solution preserving its local order of convergence. The proposed methods is two-step in nature, where the first step is the classical Broyden method and the second step is our quadrature-based Broyden method. In Section 2, the derivation process of MT is given, Numerical results were discussed in Section 3 and section 4 is for the conclusion.

## 2. Derivation process of the proposed method

Let $F: D \subset R^{n} \rightarrow R^{n}$ be a sufficiently differentiable function in the convex set $D \subset R^{n}$ and let $x^{*}$ be a zero of the nonlinear system of equations (1). For any $x, y \in D$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
F(y) & =F(x)+F^{\prime}(x)(y-x)+\frac{1}{2!} F^{\prime \prime}(x)(y-x)^{2}+\cdots+\frac{1}{(r-1)!} F^{r-1}(y-x)^{r-1} \\
& +\int_{0}^{1} \frac{(1-t)^{r-1}}{r!} F^{r}(x-t(y-x))(y-x)^{r} d t
\end{aligned}
$$

is verified from Taylor's series. Then for $r=1$, we have

$$
F(y)=F(x)+\int_{0}^{1} F^{\prime}(x-t(y-x))(y-x) d t
$$

from which we obtain, for $k t h$ iteration $x_{k}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(y)=F\left(x_{k}\right)+\int_{0}^{1} F^{\prime}\left(x_{k}-t\left(y-x_{k}\right)\right)\left(y-x_{k}\right) d t \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

An estimation of Equation (3) with the weight combination of the Midpoint and Trapezoidal quadratures for $y=\bar{x}$ gives:

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \approx F\left(x_{k}\right)+\frac{1}{4}\left(J_{F}\left(x_{k}\right)+2 J_{F}\left(\frac{x_{k}+\bar{x}}{2}\right)+J_{F}(\bar{x})\right)\left(\bar{x}-x_{k}\right) d t \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

So a new approximation $x_{k+1}$ of $\bar{x}$ is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{k+1}=x_{k}-4\left[J_{F}\left(x_{k}\right)+2 J_{F}\left(\frac{x_{k}+x_{k+1}}{2}\right)+J_{F}\left(x_{k+1}\right)\right] \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, if we replace $J_{F}\left(x_{k}\right), J_{F}\left(x_{k+1}\right)$ and $J_{F}\left(\frac{x_{k}+x_{k+1}}{2}\right)$ by $B\left(x_{k}\right), B\left(x_{k+1}\right)$ and $B\left(\frac{x_{k}+x_{k+1}}{2}\right)$ respectively and use the same procedure as in $[2,1,19]$, we have

$$
x_{k+1}=x_{k}-4\left[B\left(x_{k}\right)+2 B\left(\frac{x_{k}+x_{k+1}}{2}\right)+B\left(x_{k+1}\right)\right]^{-1} F\left(x_{k}\right)
$$

which is an implicit equation because we have $x_{k+1}$ on both sides. In order to avoid the implicit nature of this equation, we use the $(k+1)$ th iteration of the Broydens method $m_{k}=x_{k}-B_{k}^{-1} F\left(x_{k}\right)$ in the right hand side. Thus we have

$$
x_{k+1}=x_{k}-4\left[B\left(x_{k}\right)+2 B\left(\frac{x_{k}+m_{k}}{2}\right)+B\left(m_{k}\right)\right]^{-1} F\left(x_{k}\right)
$$

which gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{k+1}=x_{k}-4\left[B\left(x_{k}\right)+2 B\left(z_{k}\right)+B\left(m_{k}\right)\right]^{-1} F\left(x_{k}\right) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $z_{k}=\left(\frac{x_{k}+m_{k}}{2}\right)$. Suppose we set $B_{k}=4\left[B\left(x_{k}\right)+2 B\left(z_{k}\right)+B\left(m_{k}\right)\right]$, then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{k+1}=x_{k}-4 B_{k}^{-1} F\left(x_{k}\right) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence we have the following two-step method using initial matrix $B_{0}=I$ and an initial guess $x_{0}$.
For a given $x_{0}$ using initial matrix $B_{0}=I$, compute the approximates solution $x_{k+1}$ by the iterative schemes

$$
\begin{gather*}
m_{k}=x_{k}-B_{k}^{-1} F\left(x_{k}\right) \\
x_{k+1}=x_{k}-4\left[B\left(x_{k}\right)+2 B\left(z_{k}\right)+B\left(m_{k}\right)\right]^{-1} F\left(x_{k}\right) \tag{8}
\end{gather*}
$$

for $z_{k}=\left(\frac{x_{k}+m_{k}}{2}\right), k=0,1, \cdots$

## 3. Numerical Results and Discussion

In order to evaluate the performance of the proposed method, we apply the method to solve five (5) benchmark problems using eight (8) dimensions of 5-1065 variables. A comparison of the numerical test results of our new method is made with those of the following three well-known methods:

- Classical Broyden Method [9]
- Trapezoidal Broyden Method [17]
- Midpoint-Simpson Broyden Method [14]

The comparison was done on the number of iterations and the CPU time in seconds. The computational experiments were carried out using MATLAB 2012b with a double precission arithmetic. The program is designed to terminate whenever the number of iterations reaches 500 . We used a stopping criteria $\left\|F\left(x_{k}\right)\right\| \leq 10^{-12}$ for the computer programs if no $x_{k}$ satisfies. A failure is reported (denoted by '-') in the tabulated result.

## List of Tested Problems

Problem 1 [1]
$F_{i}(x)=x_{i} x_{i+1}-1$,
$F_{n}(x)=x_{n} x_{1}-1$.
$i=1,2, \cdots, n-1$ and $x_{0}=(0.8,0.8, \cdots, 0.8)^{T}$.
Problem 2 [7]
$F_{i}(x)=x_{i} x_{i+1}-1$,
$F_{n}(x)=x_{n} x_{1}-1$.
$i=1,2, \cdots, n-1$ and $x_{0}=(2,2, \cdots, 2)^{T}$.
Problem 3 [19]
$F_{i}(x)=x_{i}^{2}-\cos \left(x_{i}-1\right)$,
$i=1,2, \cdots, n$ and $x_{0}=(2,2, \cdots, 2)^{T}$.
Problem 4 [7]
$F_{i}(x)=x_{i}^{2}-1$,
$i=1,2, \cdots, n$ and $x_{0}=(0.5,0.5, \cdots, 0.5)^{T}$.

Problem 5 [18]
$F_{i}(x)=\exp \left(x_{i}^{2}-1\right)-\cos \left(1-x_{i}^{2}\right)$,
$i=1,2, \cdots, n$ and $x_{0}=(0.5,0.5, \cdots, 0.5)^{T}$.
Problem 6 [18]
$F_{i}(x)=\exp \left(x_{i}\right)-1$,
$i=1,2, \cdots, n$ and $x_{0}=(0.5,0.5, \cdots, 0.5)^{T}$.
Table 1. Numerical Results for Systems (1) - (6)

| Prob | n | CB |  | TB |  | MSB |  | MT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NI | CPU | NI | CPU | NI | CPU | NI | CPU |
| 1 | 5 | 6 | 0.051 | 4 | 0.048 | 3 | 0.039 | 4 | 0.045 |
|  | 15 | 6 | 0.065 | 4 | 0.084 | 3 | 0.062 | 4 | 0.078 |
|  | 35 | 5 | 0.155 | 5 | 0.164 | 3 | 0.103 | 4 | 0.137 |
|  | 65 | 5 | 0.215 | 5 | 0.389 | 3 | 0.247 | 4 | 0.329 |
|  | 165 | 5 | 0.515 | 5 | 0.574 | 4 | 0.437 | 4 | 0.511 |
|  | 365 | 6 | 1.521 | 5 | 1.424 | 4 | 1.648 | 4 | 1.101 |
|  | 665 | 6 | 2.794 | 5 | 2.469 | 4 | 2.351 | 4 | 2.118 |
|  | 1065 | 6 | 5.131 | 5 | 4.463 | 4 | 4.225 | 4 | 3.717 |
| 2 | 5 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 0.058 | 5 | 0.059 |
|  | 15 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 0.063 | 5 | 0.093 |
|  | 35 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 0.131 | 5 | 0.161 |
|  | 65 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 0.241 | 5 | 0.338 |
|  | 165 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 0.510 | 6 | 0.634 |
|  | 365 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 2.895 | 6 | 1.218 |
|  | 665 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 2.663 | 6 | 2.862 |
|  | 1065 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 5.648 | 6 | 5.174 |
| 3 | 5 | 12 | 0.061 | 22 | 0.179 | 6 | 0.071 | 7 | 0.105 |
|  | 15 | 12 | 0.163 | 24 | 0.385 | 6 | 0.088 | 7 | 0.139 |
|  | 35 | 12 | 0.296 | - | - | 6 | 0.175 | 7 | 0.414 |
|  | 65 | 12 | 1.386 | 24 | 1.873 | 6 | 0.380 | 7 | 0.422 |
|  | 165 | 12 | 1.703 | - | - | 6 | 0.739 | 7 | 1.123 |
|  | 365 | 14 | 6.819 | - | - | 7 | 3.069 | 7 | 3.290 |
|  | 665 | 14 | 13.169 | - | - | 7 | 4.311 | 7 | 7.393 |
|  | 1065 | 15 | 16.180 | - | - | 7 | 7.489 | 7 | 6.322 |
| 4 | 5 | 6 | 0.053 | 5 | 0.044 | 4 | 0.078 | 4 | 0.040 |
|  | 15 | 6 | 0.069 | 5 | 0.134 | 4 | 0.056 | 4 | 0.075 |
|  | 35 | 6 | 0.143 | 5 | 0.155 | 4 | 0.179 | 4 | 0.163 |
|  | 65 | 6 | 1.063 | 5 | 0.333 | 4 | 0.629 | 4 | 0.252 |
|  | 165 | 6 | 0.895 | 5 | 0.613 | 4 | 1.019 | 4 | 0.758 |
|  | 365 | 6 | 3.135 | 5 | 1.784 | 4 | 2.824 | 4 | 1.556 |
|  | 665 | 6 | 4.059 | 5 | 3.419 | 4 | 3.441 | 4 | 2.681 |
|  | 1065 | 6 | 7.439 | 5 | 6.685 | 4 | 6.497 | 4 | 4.961 |
| 5 | 5 | - | - | 5 | 0.075 | - | - | 7 | 0.054 |
|  | 15 | - | - | 5 | 0.089 | - | - | 7 | 0.207 |
|  | 35 | - | - | 5 | 0.280 | - | - | 7 | 0.382 |
|  | 65 | - | - | 5 | 0.453 | - | - | 7 | 0.682 |
|  | 165 | - | - | 5 | 0.982 | - | - | 7 | 1.340 |
|  | 365 | - | - | 5 | 3.596 | - | - | 7 | 5.396 |
|  | 665 | - | - | 5 | 6.012 | - | - | 7 | 7.350 |
|  | 1065 | - | - | 5 | 8.088 | - | - | 7 | 10.247 |
| 6 | 5 | 6 | 0.042 | 5 | 0.067 | 4 | 0.035 | 4 | 0.047 |
|  | 15 | 6 | 0.072 | 5 | 0.099 | 4 | 0.073 | 4 | 0.074 |
|  | 35 | 6 | 0.138 | 5 | 0.162 | 4 | 0.108 | 4 | 0.142 |
|  | 65 | 6 | 0.388 | 5 | 0.356 | 4 | 0.857 | 4 | 0.437 |
|  | 165 | 6 | 0.767 | 5 | 0.669 | 4 | 0.519 | 4 | 0.514 |
|  | 365 | 6 | 2.554 | 5 | 3.133 | 4 | 3.615 | 4 | 2.034 |
|  | 665 | 6 | 6.492 | 5 | 3.839 | 4 | 4.833 | 4 | 4.276 |
|  | 1065 | 6 | 8.312 | 5 | 6.393 | 4 | 5.578 | 4 | 5.774 |

Table 1 shows that our new method is comparable with the other methods. The numerical results in Table 1 clearly shows that the method have better results compared to CB and the TB in terms of number of iteration and in terms of the CPU time, it is competitive with all the compared methods. It is clear from the table that the other methods failed to solve some problems while our method solve $100 \%$ of the test problems which confirm the superiority(in terms of robustness) of our method over others, although the MSB is the most efficient of all the methods. We use the performance profile proposed by [11] in Figure 1 and it shows the results obtained are encouraging and competitive with the MSB method in terms of number of iterations. To better compare the numerical performance of the four methods, we used the comparison indices proposed by [15]. Table 2 shows that in terms of robustness, MT is superior to CB, TB, and MSB. The robustness of our method confirms the stability of our algorithm and thus less prone to error. The robustness of the solvers are: CB $(67 \%)$, TB $(67 \%)$, MSB $(83 \%)$, MT $(100 \%)$ of successes. Hence, these observations grant further authentication of the advantages of the proposed method to $\mathrm{CB}, \mathrm{TB}$ and MSB for

Table 2. Robustness Indices

|  | CB | TB | MSB | MT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R | 0.6667 | 0.6667 | 0.8333 | 1.0000 |



Figure 1. Performance profile for the compared methods in terms of the number of iterations
solving large scale systems of nonlinear equations.

## 4. Conclusion

We have shown that one can use the approach of approximating Jacobian matrices via the Midpoint and Trapezoidal quadrature formulas and obtained effective updates maintaining the local order of convergence of the classical Broyden method. Numerical experiments show a strong indication that the proposed Broyden-like method exhibit enhanced performance with respect to number of iterations in most of the tested problems. Using the comparison indices proposed by [15], it shows that the method is highly robust. However, we intend to extend the method in future to problems with much higher dimensions.
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