

MITOCW | Part II: Differential Equations, Lec 6: Power Series Solutions

The following content is provided under a Creative Commons license. Your support will help MIT OpenCourseWare continue to offer high-quality educational resources for free. To make a donation or view additional materials from hundreds of MIT courses, visit MIT OpenCourseWare at ocw.mit.edu.

HERBERT

Hi, today, we're going to emphasize the role of power series in the solution of linear differential equations. And

GROSS:

let me just say at the outset that we have paid no attention to nonlinear differential equations in this course. And we won't pay any attention to the nonlinear equation simply because the nonlinear equation is very, very difficult to handle. We usually tackle it only by special cases. And, even of more importance, most of the problems that we have to tackle are at least reasonably well approximated by linear differential equations.

Now what I'd like to do before we launch into power series today is to pull together everything that we've said so far about linear differential equations. And, rather than to drone on here saying that, I thought that I would write the summary on the board, and we could go through this fairly rapidly together.

At any rate, the lecture for today is power series solutions, but the summary to date is this. Given the general linear differential equation L of y equals f of x with non-constant coefficients, this equation always has a general solution, provided p , q , and f are continuous. Not only does the solution exist, but the solution is always given by $y_{\text{sub } h}$ plus $y_{\text{sub } p}$ where $y_{\text{sub } h}$ is the general solution of L of y equals 0, and $y_{\text{sub } p}$ is any solution, in other words, a particular solution, of L of y equals f of x .

And then you see the rest of our study has been how do you find $y_{\text{sub } h}$ and how do you find $y_{\text{sub } p}$. The point is it's very easy to find $y_{\text{sub } h}$ if L of y has constant coefficients. That was the first case that we tackled.

If L of y has constant coefficient, then $y_{\text{sub } h}$ has one of these three forms, depending on what? This is the case that holds if the roots of the characteristic equation are real and unequal. This is the form that holds if the roots are real but equal. And this is the equation that holds if the reals are non-- if the roots are non-real where α is the real part of the root, and β is the imaginary part of the root, OK?

As far as $y_{\text{sub } p}$ was concerned, recall that the method of undetermined coefficients yields $y_{\text{sub } p}$ when L of y has constant coefficients and when f of x has the very special form e to the mx or x to the n or cosine mx or sine mx . We then turned our attention to variation of parameters, and the key point about variation of parameters was that, by use of variation of parameters, we could always obtain a $y_{\text{sub } p}$ when $y_{\text{sub } h}$ was known.

By the way, in particular, notice that, if we are dealing with constant coefficients, then we do know $y_{\text{sub } h}$. That's what we were just talking about earlier. So, in particular, the variation of parameters method will work whenever we have constant coefficients because we know $y_{\text{sub } h}$ in that case.

But quite in general, you see, even if the coefficients aren't constant, variation of parameters works. And, in fact, once we know $y_{\text{sub } h}$ -- say $y_{\text{sub } h}$ is $c_1 u_1$ plus $c_2 u_2$, then $y_{\text{sub } p}$ is $g_1 u_1$ plus $g_2 u_2$ where g_1 prime and g_2 prime satisfy this pair of equations.

The other important thing about variation of parameters was that it reduces the order of L of y equals 0 once one solution of the equation is known. And that, you see, completes our summary. What we want to tackle next is what's still lacking. And that is that the success of the method known as variation of parameters hinges on the fact that we have the general solution of the homogeneous equation.

In other words, our next problem is to find the general solution of $L(y) = 0$ when the coefficients are not constant. In other words, if I can find this general solution of $L(y) = 0$ when coefficients are not constant, then, you see, I can use the method of variation of parameters, which always yields y_p once y_h is known, to find the particular solution. Then $y_p + y_h$ will be my general solution.

At any rate, it's into this environment that we introduce the concept of power series. And the key theorem in using power series is this. Let's suppose that $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ are analytic. And, by the way, I've used that word for complex valued functions.

Analytic meant that all of the derivatives existed. It meant that the function could be expanded or represented by a convergent power series. That's the meaning of analytic, even in the real case. When I say that p and q are analytic for absolute value of $x - x_0$ less than some value R , what I mean is that p and q can be represented by convergent power series for all x , which are within R of some fixed point x_0 .

But, at any rate, all I'm saying is, if p and q are analytic in this interval, then every solution of this equation, every solution which exists, which is defined at $x = x_0$, is itself analytic, at least in the same interval that p and q were analytic. In other words, what this means is that, in the first part of our review, we said, lookit, as long as p , q , and f are continuous, there will always be a general solution.

Now we're going one step further or maybe several steps further. We're saying, lookit, as long as p and q are not only just continuous, but they also happen to be analytic, we can not only guarantee that there'll be a general solution, but we can guarantee, more to the point, that whatever solution there is will be found in the form of a convergent power series. And that gives us the step that we need to solve problems by this technique.

Now what I'm going to do is this. I am going to start with an example that we already knew how to solve before. First of all, notice that the equation $y'' + y = 0$, first of all, has constant coefficients. And notice that the lead in to today's lesson was we we're going to tackle situations where we didn't have constant coefficients. This does have constant coefficients. And, even more to the point, solution is known.

In fact, what is the solution here? It's $y = \text{arbitrary constant} \times \sin x + \text{arbitrary constant} \times \cos x$. I picked one with constant coefficients where the solution was known simply so that we could illustrate what the method is.

By the way, notice that, in this particular problem, $p(x)$, which is the coefficient of y' , is 0. $q(x)$, the coefficient of y , is 1. And, certainly, 0 and 1 are analytic functions. In fact, their power series-- the power series for 0 is 0. And the power series for 1 is 1. So, certainly, our coefficients meet the requirement.

And what we do is we start off saying, OK, if any solution exists, it must look like a power series. Let's go find it. Notice this is a glorified version of undetermined coefficients. We say, lookit, let's assume that our solution has the form of a power series, in other words, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n$, where all I have to know now are the values of the a_n 's. And, if you don't like the sigma notation here, all we're saying is we're trying for a solution in the form $y = a_0 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + \text{et cetera}$, where this series is a convergent power series.

And why is convergent power series important? Well, the answer, recall from part one of our course that, in the interval of convergence, the power series behaves precisely like a polynomial. We can add power series term by term. We can subtract them term by term. We can multiply them the way we do polynomials.

We can integrate term by term. We can differentiate term by term. We can rearrange the terms the way we wish, et cetera. In other words, it has all of the niceties of a finite polynomial expression.

At any rate, what I then do is, because I'm assuming this is a convergent power series, I differentiate this thing term by term. And, if I differentiate this, notice what I'm doing. I differentiate each term here, but, because I can - because I can differentiate term by term, a very nice generic way of doing this is notice that this is the n -th term. The derivative of this term would be what? n an x to the n minus 1, n an x to the n minus 1.

Notice that, every time you differentiate, a term drops out. Like, when I differentiate this, the a_0 term drops out. When I differentiate this, the a_1 one term drops out. So what I do is I differentiate the general expression inside the sigma sign and then start the index of summation one up further. In other words, instead of going from 0 to infinity, I now go from 1 to infinity.

In a similar way, y double prime, I differentiate this term by term. That's n times n minus 1 times a sub n times x to the n minus 2. And now my sum goes from 2 to infinity. That's what I've written over here.

Now I'm trying to find out what the a 's are equal to. I could actually call these y sub p 's. See, I'm looking for a particular solution perhaps, not particular in the sense of a solution, but this is a trial.

Maybe it should have been a T over here, y sub T . I'm looking for a trial solution over here, a trial solution. I take y_T double prime, y_T , plug it in here, and see what this means. And, simply replacing y double prime by this and y by this, I see that this is the equation that must be satisfied identically.

Now the point is the only way a power series can be identically equal to 0 is if coefficient by coefficient the power series is 0. Now what has me bugged a little bit here is that the exponents don't match up. You see, notice that the general term here has an exponent n , and the general term here has an exponent n minus 2.

A very nice trick that I can use here is I say, you know, why don't I jack up n by 2 every place I see it? In other words, let me replace n by n plus 2. I'll jack it up by 2. And, to compensate for that, I'll lower the summation of index-- the index summation by 2 every place I see it.

Now let me show you what that means so that we don't get too confused on that. Let's suppose I had written down here summation n goes from 0 to infinity a sub n . This means what? a_0 plus a_1 plus a_2 , et cetera.

Suppose, for some reason, I would like to either lower or raise the index here. Let's suppose I want to lower the index. In other words, I want each-- I want the subscript here to be k less than what it was before. In other words, I'm going to replace a sub n by a sub n minus k .

I claim that all I have to do is start my counting process at n equals k now, instead of n equals 0. In fact, look what this says. When n is k , n minus k is 0. So the first term here is a_0 . The next term would be k plus 1. k plus 1 minus k is 1. So the next term would be a_1 , et cetera. And this is just another way of saying this.

So the idea is, if I want to get this to be an n , that means I have to raise everything by 2 inside the summation sign. So I will lower everything by 2 outside the summation sign.

Now, to do that, notice what that's going to do. My sum here will now go from 0 to infinity. This will become n plus 2. This will become n plus 1.

You see, I'm raising it by 2. Every place I'm seeing an n , I'm replacing it by $n + 2$. This becomes a sub $n + 2$, and this will become n . In summary, then this expression is the same as summation, n goes from 0 to infinity, $n + 2$ times $n + 1$ a sub $n + 2$ x to the n plus summation, n goes from 0 to infinity, an x to the n . And that must be identically zero.

Now the point is that the exponents now line up. I'm starting the sum in both series at the same place. And, consequently, because these are assumed to be convergent power series, I can add them term by term. If I add them term by term, that means I come inside the summation sign here.

x to the n is a common factor. I factor that out. And what's left is what? $n + 2$ times $n + 1$ times a sub $n + 2$ plus a sub n , that's this expression here. And this is what must be identically zero.

Now the point is that the only way that a convergent power series can be identically zero is if each coefficient is 0. And that's how I now handle the undetermined coefficients. I come to the conclusion that, because this is to be identically zero, every one of these terms must be itself 0. Setting this equal to zero and solving for a sub $n + 2$ in terms of a sub n , I find that a sub $n + 2$ must be minus a_n over $n + 2$ times $n + 1$.

And what this tells me is that I now know what a term looks like as soon as I know the one that comes two before it. You see, notice that this tells me how to find a sub $n + 2$ once I happen to know what a sub n is. Now, lookit, before I can get to two away from a particular subscript, I must be at least at the second subscript. In other words, it seems that this recipe will tell me how to find a sub 2 in terms of a sub 0, how to find a sub 4 in terms of a sub 2, how to find a sub 3 in terms of a sub 1, but it gives me no hold on what a sub 0 and a sub 1 must be.

So I say, OK, what I will do is I will use this recipe, recognizing that I am free to pick a_0 and a_1 completely arbitrarily. Now look at what happens here. If I pick a_0 and a_1 arbitrarily, what does the recipe tell me? If I pick n to be 0, the recipe says what? a sub $n + 2$, a sub 2, is minus a_0 over $n + 2$ times $n + 1$. That's just 2 times 1. a sub 2 is just minus a_0 over 2 factorial.

In a similar way, the recipe tells me that a sub 4 is minus a sub 2 over 4 times 3. You see, in this case, I take n to be 2. So $n + 2$ is 4. And, if I now say a sub $n + 2$ is minus a sub n over $n + 2$ times $n + 1$, this just says that a_4 is minus a sub 2 over 4 times 3.

I know what a sub 2 is from here. So I can now express a sub 2 in terms of a sub 0. In fact, it now turns out that a sub 4 is a sub 0 over 4 factorially-- 4 factorial.

Similarly, a sub 6 is minus a sub 4 over 6 times 5. a sub 4 is a_0 over 4 factorial. So, substituting that value of a_4 in here, I get that a_6 is minus a_0 over 6 factorial. And, without beating this thing to death, notice that I can find every even subscript of a , a_2 , a_4 , a_6 , a_8 , et cetera, in terms of a_0 times something. In fact, I think you can see what's starting to develop over here.

In a similar way, picking n to be 1 so that $n + 2$ is 3, the recipe a sub $n + 2$ equals minus a sub n over $n + 2$ times $n + 1$ says that a_3 is minus a_1 over 3 times 2. That's minus a_1 over 3 factorial.

Similarly, a_5 is minus a_3 over 5 times 4. Noticing that a_3 is minus a_1 over 3 factorial, I see that a_5 is a_1 over 5 factorial. And, without going on further here, notice that a_3 , a_5 , a_7 , a_9 , a_{11} , et cetera, will all be expressible in terms of a_1 .

And, in fact, I think you see what's happening here, that the terms will alternate in sign, and the coefficients will be things like what? 1, 1 over 3 factorial, 1 over 5 factorial, 1 over 7 factorial, et cetera. But I'll leave those details to you because I think that's the easy part to meditate upon.

But now what we're saying is I now know what all these coefficients look like in terms of a_0 and a_1 . Remember what I'm looking for. I'm looking for a power series solution that's y equals a_0 plus $a_1 x$ plus $a_2 x$ squared, et cetera.

We're assuming that this is a convergent power series. That means I can group the terms any way that I want. In particular, since all of the even subscripts seem to be expressible all in terms of a_0 , and all the odd subscripts seem to be expressible in terms of a_1 , let me group the terms with even powers together and the terms with odd powers together.

And now, remembering what a_2 and a_4 are-- remember, a_2 was minus x squared-- was minus a_0 over 2 factorial. a_4 was a_0 over 4 factorial, et cetera. I now factor out a_0 from here. And, substituting in the values of a_2 , a_4 , a_6 , et cetera, that we found from before, this tells me that the coefficient that multiplies a_0 is 1 minus x squared over 2 factorial plus x to the fourth over 4 factorial, et cetera.

And, similarly, since a_3 is minus a_1 over 3 factorial, and a_5 was a_1 over 5 factorial, et cetera, I can now express all of these in terms of a_1 . I factor out a_1 . And what's left this x minus x cubed over 3 factorial plus x to the fifth over 5 factorial, et cetera. And now it appears that my solution is this plus this.

Keep in mind that a_0 and a_1 are arbitrary constants. By the ratio test, even if I didn't know what these series represented, I can show that these series converge absolutely for all finite values of x , but that's not too crucial here. The important point is that, even though it may be implicit, this does name some function of x , whatever it happens to be. This names some function of x , whatever it happens to be.

I can find particular solutions by choosing a_0 and a_1 to be certain fixed constants that I want them to be. These two power series are not constant multiples of one another, as you can see by a glance. Therefore, these two solutions are linearly independent. And, consequently, I now have a general solution here, even though this may be awkward for me.

Well, the reason that I picked constant coefficients and y double prime plus y equals 0 was that I wanted our first experience to be pleasant, at least in the sense that we would get a feeling for what the answer meant. Keep in mind that, if I had never heard of sine x and cosine x , this solution here would make sense.

But, if I happen to recall that the power series expansion for cosine x is precisely this, it just happens, you see, as an afterthought that this is cosine x . This also happens to be sine x . Notice now what this tells me is that the solution to I've found is a_0 cosine x plus a_1 sine x . And that just happens to agree with the result that I already knew.

Now, rather than have you feel that I've wasted your time by giving you something that you've already known, let me go one step further and give you the same kind of a problem. Only now, I'm going to give you one that you couldn't solve before and, in fact, I don't think you could solve now if you don't use power series.

And the example I have in mind is almost the same as the one we just did. Instead of $y'' + y = 0$, I pick $y'' + xy = 0$. And now you see I'm back-- not back, but now I have arrived at the case of non-constant coefficients. You see the coefficient of y is x , and that's not a constant. So you see now I'm at a bona fide problem where I couldn't find y in the trivial way that I could if the coefficients all happened to be constant.

Now the way I tackle this is precisely the same way as before. What I do is I again try for a solution in the form $y = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n$. And what I must do now is to determine what the a_n 's are.

And, again, as before, I find y' the same mechanical way as before. I differentiate term by term, meaning, generically, I differentiate this to get this. And, similarly, to get y'' , I differentiate this term to get this one, OK?

And now what I do, in terms of my so-called trial solution-- see, remember, these are trial solutions-- I'm going to try to feed these back into here and see if that will tell me what the coefficients a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3 , et cetera have to look like. Now, if I do that, you see, I get what? y'' is just this term here.

And now I want x times y . That means I have to take this y and multiply it by x . Multiplying by x on the outside, since we're assuming that this is a convergent series, that means I can multiply term by term. Therefore, I can bring the x inside, and that makes this x^{n+1} , rather than x^n . And so I wind up with the fact that I now want to find the constants a_0, a_1 , et cetera, from this particular relationship.

You see what's happened here? This is just y'' . This is y multiplied by x . That's why that $n+1$ is in here. And that must be identically zero.

Now what I'm going to do is the same trick as before. What I'm going to do is I want to add these term by term. And I notice that their exponents are different. In fact, this exponent is three larger for each value of n than this one, right? $n+1$ minus the quantity $n-2$ is 3.

So what I want to do is I want to lower this subscript-- this exponent by 3. So I'm going to inside the integral-- I'm sorry, inside the summation sign, I am going to replace n by $n-3$. And, in line with our previous note, to compensate for this, instead of my summation going from 0 to infinity here, it will now go from 3 to infinity. In other words, I am now simply going to replace this by the equivalent sum, $n=3$ to infinity, $a_{n-3} x^{n-2}$, all right?

And you see, if I do that, what I will end up with is simply this expression here. And now a new wrinkle comes up that didn't happen before, but I just wanted to make sure a few funny things happened here so I can tell you directly what's going on. And then we can drill with the remaining fine points in the exercises.

But the key point here is, lookit, I've got the exponents lined up now. But look at the indices of summation. One begins at 2, and the other begins at 3. And it seems that they're out of phase.

All I want you to observe is that, to make this start at 3, I could split off separately the term that corresponds to $n=2$. In other words, notice that, when $n=2$, what I have is what? $2 \times 1 \times a_2 x^0$. In other words, all I have is $2 a_2$ when n is equal to 2.

So what I can do is I'll split that n equals 2 term off separately. That's $2 a_2$. Then what's left is the sum as n goes from 3 to infinity.

You see, splitting off these terms isn't hard at all. All you do is, if these don't match up, take the smaller index, and split off the number of terms necessary so that the resulting sum will begin at a higher index matching this one. Since they only differed by 1 here, I only have to split off the n equals 2 term.

Now what I have is what? I have $2 a_2$ plus this summation, now going from 3 to infinity, plus this summation, which also goes from 3 to infinity. And now, since both the exponents and the indices match up, now I can add term by term for these convergent power series. I bring these inside one integral sign. See, the sigma of a sum is the sum of the sigmas. I add these up term by term.

So that leaves me what? I have my $2 a_2$ still outside here. And then, inside the sigma notation, from 3 to infinity, I have what? n times n minus 1 times a_{n-2} plus a_{n-3} , that whole quantity, times x to the n minus 2. And that must be identically zero.

Now the only way that this can be identically zero is if each coefficient is 0. By the way, notice that, since the first term that appears here corresponds to n equals 3, when n equals 3, the exponent here is 1. So notice that this is my only constant term. All the terms in here begin with at least a factor of x in them. Since my power series, to be identically zero, must have all of its coefficients identically zero, it means that not only must each of these be 0, but $2 a_2$, which is my constant term on the left-hand side, that must also be 0.

So, in other words, to summarize this up, what we're saying so far is that, for this to be identically zero, a_2 must be 0. And, once n is at least as big as 3, this condition here must be obeyed. What condition? That the expression in brackets must be 0 for each n once n is at least as big as 3.

In other words, then, in summary, a_2 is 0. And, for n at least as big as 3, a_{n-2} is minus a_{n-3} over n times n minus 1. And keep in mind the way I got that quite trivially was I set this equal to 0. I transposed the a_{n-3} , divided through by n times n minus 1, and solved for a_{n-2} .

What this tells me now is that, once I know a particular a , look at what this tells me. This says, to find a_{n-2} , once I know what the a was three before this one, I'm home free. In other words, to find a_4 , all I have to know is a_1 . To find a_5 , all I have to know is a_2 . You see? To find a_6 , all I have to know is a_3 , et cetera.

So the idea is I can now pick a_0 and a_1 at random, just as before. And now, using this recipe with n equal to 3, I have that a_3 is minus a_0 over 3 times 2. a_6 is minus a_3 over 6 times 5.

And, remembering what a_3 is in terms of a_0 , this tells me that a_6 is a_0 over 5 times 6 times 3 times 2. And this is not a misprint that the four is missing here. This is not a factorial. You see, I have a way of generating what these coefficients look like, but now I've picked a problem where I may not remember or recognize what power series I'm getting.

That's irrelevant again. All I'm saying is I can determine a_3 , a_6 , a_9 , et cetera, just knowing what a_0 is. And, just knowing what a_1 is, I can determine a_4 . Just by using this recipe with n equal to 4, a_4 is minus a_1 over 4 times 3. a_7 is minus a_4 over 7 times 6, using that same recipe.

Putting in the value of a_4 from here into here, I have that a_7 is a_1 over 7 times 6 times 4 times 3. And this keeps on going. I can now find a_{10} in terms of a_7 . That will give me a_{10} in terms of a_1 , et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Finally, to find a_5 or a_8 , notice that, using the same recipe, a_5 is minus a_2 over 5 times 4. But, since a_2 is 0, a_5 will be 0. And, similarly, because a_5 is 0, a_8 will be 0 and so will a_{11} and a_{14} , et cetera.

Now the idea is the series that I was looking for, being a convergent series, can be rearranged. You see, the idea in this problem was that I would like to group the exponents according to whether they are divisible by 3, leave a remainder of 1 when I divide by 3, or leave a remainder of 2 when I divide by 3.

So I group the terms this way-- see, a_0 plus a_{3x} cubed plus a_{6x} to the sixth, et cetera, plus a_{1x} plus a_{4x} to the fourth, et cetera, plus a_{2x} squared plus a_{5x} fifth, et cetera-- the idea being that I know how to express a_3 , a_6 , a_9 in terms of a_0 . I know how to express a_4 , a_7 , a_{10} , et cetera, in terms of a_1 . And I know how to express a_5 , a_8 , et cetera, in terms of a_2 . In fact, in this simple case, which turned out nicely, they all turned out to be 0, these coefficients.

So what's left is what? Replacing a_4 , a_7 , et cetera, by what they look like in terms of a_1 and a_3 , a_6 , et cetera, by what they look like in terms of a_0 , I wind up with y equals a_0 times $1 - x^3$ over 3×2 plus x to the sixth over $6 \times 5 \times 3 \times 2$, et cetera, plus a_1 times this thing here.

Now the only difference between this problem and the previous one was that, in the previous one, I happened to recognize what well-known function had this as a power series. In this case, I don't know that, but this is no less a bona fide solution than we had in the previous case.

This is a convergent power series. We give it a name-- h of x , k of x . If this were the solution to an important enough problem, we would say, lookit, instead of calling it h of x and k of x , let's give it a special name because it's going to come up over and over again.

I'm not going to go into this. If I do go into it all, it'll be very lightly in the exercises. But things like that you may have heard, in terms of name dropping, Bessel functions and the like, Legendre polynomials, these were all special power series solutions to very special differential equations where the equation itself was so important an application that the power series that represented the equation was given a special name.

So you see, in terms of power series solutions, one extremely powerful use of power series is that it's used to help us find solutions of the homogeneous equation L of y equals 0. And, once we have the general solution of the equation L of y equals 0, we can then use variation of parameters to find a solution of L of y equals f of x . Then we add these two solutions together to get the general solution.

And that ends our theory on linear differential equations, except for one more topic called the Laplace transform that I would like to introduce for you to see. And so I will have one more lecture in the guise of linear differential equations in order that I can bring up the Laplace transform, but that won't be until next time. Until next time then, goodbye.

Funding for the publication of this video was provided by the Gabriella and Paul Rosenbaum Foundation. Help OCW continue to provide free and open access to MIT courses by making a donation at ocw.mit.edu/donate.