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A new one-parameter family of methods for finding simple zeros of non-linear functions is developed. Each member of the family requires four evaluations of the given function and only one evaluation of the derivative per step. The order of the method is 16.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Newton's method for computing a simple zero $\zeta$ of a non-linear equation $f(x)=0$ has been modified in a number of ways. For example, Ostrowski [14] discusses a third-order method that evaluates the function $f$ at every substep but only requires the derivative $f'$ at every other substep. He also introduced a fourth-order scheme that uses the same information. King [9] has shown that there is a family of such methods. Traub [15] introduced a third-order method which requires one function and two derivative evaluation per step. Jarratt [6] developed a fourth-order method which uses the same information. King [8] developed a fifth-order scheme that requires two evaluations of $f$ and $f'$. Werner [16] introduced a method of order $1 + \sqrt{2}$ that requires one evaluation of $f$ and $f'$. And recently, the author [13] developed a family of sixth-order methods that requires 3 evaluations of $f$ and one of $f'$.
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Here we construct a method of order 16. An iteration consists of one Newton substep followed by a substep of “modified” Newton (i.e., using the derivative of \( f \) at the first substep instead of the current one) and then two substeps of inverse interpolation.

Let us recall the definition of order (see e.g. [15]).

**Definition 1** Let \( x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_i \) be a sequence converging to \( \zeta \). Let

\[
\varepsilon_i = x_i - \zeta.
\]  

(1)

If there exists a real number \( p \) and a nonzero constant \( C \) such that

\[
\frac{|\varepsilon_{i+1}|}{|\varepsilon_i|^p} \rightarrow C
\]  

(2)

then \( p \) is called the order of the sequence.

There are two other concepts related to order; one measures the information used and the other measures the efficiency.

**Definition 2** The informational usage \( d \) of a scheme is defined as the number of new pieces of information required per iteration.

**Definition 3** The informational efficiency \( \text{EFF} \) of a scheme is defined as the order \( p \) divided by the informational usage \( d \).

\[
\text{EFF} = \frac{p}{d}
\]  

(3)

**Definition 4** The efficiency index \( *\text{EFF} \) is defined by

\[
*\text{EFF} = p^{1/d}
\]  

(4)

where \( p \) and \( d \) are as in definition 3. (This term was introduced by Ostrowski [14]).

In the following section we develop the scheme. Section 3 will be devoted to compare the efficiency of all known methods. Section 4 contains a small numerical example.
2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE METHOD

Let

\[ w_n = x_n - \frac{f(x_n)}{f'(x_n)} \]

\[ z_n = w_n \frac{f(w_n) - f(x_n) + Af(w_n)}{f'(x_n)f(x_n) + (A-2)f(w_n)} \] \hspace{1cm} (5)

\[ t_n = z_n \frac{f(z_n) - f(w_n)}{f'(x_n)f(x_n) - 3f(w_n)}. \]

If we let \( x_{n+1} = t_n \) we obtain the sixth-order family in [13]. Suppose we compute \( x_{n+1} \) by inverse interpolation. Let

\[ R(f(x)) = a + b(f(x) - f(x_n)) + c(f(x) - f(x_n))^2 \]

\[ + d(f(x) - f(x_n))^3 + e(f(x) - f(x_n))^4 \] \hspace{1cm} (6)

be a polynomial of degree four satisfying

\[ x_n = R(f(x_n)) \]

\[ \frac{1}{f'(x_n)} = R'(f(x_n)) \] \hspace{1cm} (7)

\[ w_n = R(f(w_n)) \]

\[ z_n = R(f(z_n)) \]

\[ t_n = R(f(t_n)) \]

It is easy to see from the first two equations of (7) that

\[ a = x_n \] \hspace{1cm} (8)

\[ b = \frac{1}{f'(x_n)} \]
Thus, if we use the notations,

\[ \delta = \delta_n - x_n \]

\[ F_\delta = f(\delta_n) - f(x_n) \]

\[ \phi_\delta = \frac{\delta}{F_\delta^2} = \frac{1}{F_\delta f'(x_n)}, \text{ for } \delta = w, z, t \]

then the last three equations of (7) will give

\[ c + dF_w + eF_w^2 = \phi_w \]

\[ c + dF_z + eF_z^2 = \phi_z \]

\[ c + dF_t + eF_t^2 = \phi_t. \]

Solving these equations we have:

\[ e = \frac{\phi_t - \phi_z}{F_t - F_z} \frac{\phi_w - \phi_z}{F_w - F_z} \]

\[ d = \frac{\phi_t - \phi_z}{F_t - F_z} - e(F_t + F_z) \]

\[ c = \phi_t - dF_t - eF_t^2. \]

Once the coefficients were computed, then

\[ x_{n+1} = R(0) = x_n - \frac{f(x_n)}{f'(x_n)} + cf^2(x_n) - df^3(x_n) + ef^4(x_n). \]

We would like to show that the scheme (5), (12) is of order \( p = 14 \). To this end, we use a result of Traub [15].

**Theorem (Traub)** Let \( x_i, x_{i-1}, \ldots, x_{i-n} \) be \( n+1 \) approximations to a zero \( \zeta \) of \( f \). Let \( Q_{n,\gamma} \) be the interpolatory polynomial at \( y_i, y_{i-1}, \ldots, y_{i-n} \) in the sense of

\[ Q^{(k_j)}_{n,\gamma}(y_{i-j}) = \mathcal{I}^{(k_j)}(y_{i-j}) \text{ for } j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n \]

\[ k_j = 0, 1, \ldots, \gamma_j - 1, \quad \gamma_j \geq 1 \]
where $F$ is the inverse of $f$.

Define a new approximation to $\zeta$ by

$$x_{i+1} = Q_{n, \gamma}(0),$$

and let

$$e_i = x_i - \zeta,$$

then

$$e_{i+1} = M_i \prod_{j=0}^{n} e_{i-j}^j$$

for suitable constants $M_i$.

In our case

$$n = 3$$

$$\gamma_0 = \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$$

$$\gamma_3 = 2.$$ 

Note that

$$e_i \sim e_i^{6},$$

$$e_{i-1} \sim e_{i-3}^{4}.$$  

(The scheme constructed from the first two substeps of (5) is of order 4, see [9]), and

$$e_{i-2} \sim e_{i-3}^{2}.$$ 

Substituting these in (16) yields

$$e_{i+1} \sim e_{i-3}^{6} e_{i-3}^{4} e_{i-3}^{2} e_{i-3}^{2} = e_{i-3}^{14}.$$ 

Thus the order is $p = 14$. 

One can improve the order of this scheme just by replacing the third substep of (5) by a step similar to the fourth one. Let
\[
T(f(x)) = z + \beta(f(x) - f(x_n)) + \gamma(f(x) - f(x_n))^2 + \delta(f(x) - f(x_n))^3
\]
be a cubic polynomial satisfying
\[
x_n = T(f(x_n))
\]
\[
\frac{1}{f'(x_n)} = T'(f(x_n))
\]
\[
w_n = T(f(w_n))
\]
\[
z_n = T(f(z_n))
\]
Clearly,
\[
z = x_n
\]
\[
\beta = \frac{1}{f'(x_n)}.
\]
Using the notations of (9), the last two equations of (22) will be
\[
\gamma + \delta F_w = \phi_w
\]
\[
\gamma + \delta F_z = \phi_z.
\]
The coefficients \( \gamma, \delta \) are given by
\[
\delta = \frac{\phi_w - \phi_z}{F_w - F_z}
\]
\[
\gamma = \phi_w - \delta F_w
\]
Once the coefficients were computed, then
\[
t_n = T(0) = x_n - \frac{f(x_n)}{f'(x_n)} + \gamma f^2(x_n) - \delta f^3(x_n).
\]
In order to obtain the order of the scheme composed of the first two sub-
steps of (5), (26) and (12), one uses (16). To this end, we need $e_i$ which is the error at the third substep. It can be computed from (16)

$$e_i = M_{i-1}e_{i-1}e_{i-2}e_{i-3}^2.$$  \hfill (27)

Combining (16), (27) with (18)–(19) one obtains

$$e_{i+1} \sim e_{i-3}^{16}$$

Thus, the order $p = 16$.

3. EFFICIENCY OF ITERATIVE METHODS

In Section 1 we stated two definitions for efficiency. In the following we compare the efficiency of all methods mentioned in Section 1 with our new method. This is done in two tables. In Table I the methods listed in decreasing order of informational efficiency. This shows that our new method is the most efficient one. In Table II we list the methods in decreasing order of efficiency index. Our new method comes second, next to Muller's method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Informational Usage</th>
<th>EFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neta</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neta</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>7.275</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson and Björck</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secant</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>1.618</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Pegasus</td>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neta</td>
<td>[13]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarratt</td>
<td>[6]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrowski</td>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murakami</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>$1+\sqrt{2}$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrowski</td>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traub</td>
<td>[15]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steffensen</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Informational Usage</th>
<th>*EFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neta</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Pegasus</td>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson and Björck</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neta</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>7.275</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secant</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>1.618</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrowski</td>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarratt</td>
<td>[6]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neta</td>
<td>[13]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>$1 + \sqrt{2}$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murakami</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrowski</td>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traub</td>
<td>[15]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steffensen</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

Let $f(x) = x^3 + \ln(1 + x)$ where $\ln$ denotes the logarithm to the natural base. Hence $\zeta = 0$. Starting at $x_0 = 0.1$, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4 and 0.5 we compute $x_1$ by our lower order ($p=14$) algorithm. Calculations were done in double precision arithmetic on IBM 370/148 computer.

Results are summarized in the following table. The parameter $A$ that appears in the algorithm was chosen $A = 2$.

### TABLE III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x_0$</th>
<th>$x_1$</th>
<th>$x_0^{14}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3904.10^{-15}</td>
<td>10^{-14}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.9487.10^{-15}</td>
<td>0.1638.10^{-9}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.5323.10^{-8}</td>
<td>0.4783.10^{-7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.3075.10^{-6}</td>
<td>0.2684.10^{-5}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.2899.10^{-6}</td>
<td>0.6104.10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note that $x_1$ is closer to $\zeta$ than $x_0^4$. In order to reliably determine the order one would have to use higher precision, see e.g. [2].
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