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Abstract — For a second kind integral equation with a kernel which is less smooth along the diagonal, an approximate solution obtained by using a method proposed by the author in an earlier paper, is shown to have a higher rate of convergence than the iterated Galerkin solution. The projection is chosen to be either the orthogonal projection or an interpolatory projection onto a space of piecewise polynomials. The size of the system of equations that needs to be solved, in order to compute the proposed solution, remains the same as in the Galerkin method. The improvement of the proposed solution is illustrated by a numerical example.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Let

\[ u - T u = f \]  

(1.1)

denote a second kind integral equation, where \( T \) is a compact linear integral operator defined on a complex Banach space \( X \) and \( f \) and \( u \) belong to \( X \). It is assumed that \((I - T)\) is invertible, so that (1.1) has a unique solution.

As, in general, (1.1) can not be solved exactly, an approximate solution is obtained by replacing the operator \( T \) by a finite rank operator. If \( \pi_n \) is a sequence of finite rank projections converging to the Identity operator \( I \) pointwise, then in the classical Galerkin method (1.1) is approximated by

\[ u_n - \pi_n T \pi_n u_n = \pi_n f. \]

In [15], Sloan proposed an improvement of the Galerkin solution by using iteration techniques. Since then the superconvergence properties of the Sloan iterate have been studied by many authors (see Chandler [4], Chatelin [5], Chatelin–Lebbar [6,7], Graham–Joe–Sloan [8], Richter [13], Schock [14], Sloan [16,17], Sloan–Burn–Datyner [18], Spence–Thomas [19]). In [12] Lin–Zhang–Yan have proposed interpolation post-processing technique as an alternative to the iteration technique.
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Recently in Kulkarni [11] a new method based on projections is proposed for approximate solution of (1.1). Under the assumption that the kernel of the integral operator $T$ and the right hand side $f$ are smooth, it is shown in [11] that, while it is necessary to solve a system of equations of the same size as for the Galerkin method, the resulting solution obtained converges faster than the Galerkin and the Sloan solution.

The aim of this paper is to extend the results of [11] to the case when the kernel $k$ fails to be sufficiently differentiable because of discontinuities along the diagonal. In the case of orthogonal projections onto a space of piecewise polynomials, it is shown that the order of convergence in the iterated version of the proposed method is higher than the Sloan solution. In the case of interpolatory projection, it is well known that, in general, Sloan solution does not improve upon the Galerkin solution, but there is an improvement in the case of the interpolatory projection at the Gauss points. In this paper it is shown the proposed solution always improves upon the Galerkin solution. This paper extensively uses results from Atkinson–Potra [2] and Chatelin–Lebbar [7].

The paper has been organized as follows. In Section 2, the method proposed in [11] is recalled along with the relevant results and notations are set. Also, the type of kernel which is considered in this paper is specified and some results from [2] and [7] are cited for the future reference. Precise orders of convergence in the case of the orthogonal projection as well as the interpolatory projection are obtained in Section 3. Section 4 is devoted to numerical results.

2. METHOD AND NOTATION

Let $\pi_n$ be a sequence of finite rank projections converging to the Identity operator pointwise. In Kulkarni [11] it is proposed to approximate $T$ by the following finite rank operator

$$T_n^M = \pi_n T \pi_n + \pi_n T (I - \pi_n) + (I - \pi_n) T \pi_n.$$  

Then since $T$ is compact,

$$\|T - T_n^M\| = \|(I - \pi_n) T (I - \pi_n)\| \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$  

The corresponding approximation of (1.1) becomes

$$u_n^M - (\pi_n T \pi_n + \pi_n T (I - \pi_n) + (I - \pi_n) T \pi_n) u_n^M = f$$  

while the iterative refinement is defined by

$$\tilde{u}_n^M = T u_n^M + f.$$  

The following result is quoted from [11].

**Theorem 2.1.** For all large $n$, $I - T_n^M$ is invertible,

$$\|u - u_n^M\| \leq C \|(I - \pi_n) T (I - \pi_n)\|.$$  

\[\text{Eq. (2.3)}\]
and
\[ \|u - \tilde{u}_M^n\| \leq C(\|T(I - \pi_n)T(I - \pi_n)u\| + \|T(I - \pi_n)T(I - \pi_n)\|\|u - u_M^n\|) \tag{2.4} \]

where \( C \) is a constant independent of \( n \).

Throughout this paper \( C \) denotes a generic constant independent of \( n \).

The reduction of (2.1) to a linear system of equations is done as follows (see Kulkarni [11]). Applying \( \pi_n \) and \( I - \pi_n \) to equation (2.1) we obtain
\[
\begin{align*}
\pi_n u_n^M - \pi_n T (I - \pi_n) T (I - \pi_n) u_n^M &= \pi_n f \tag{2.5} \\
(I - \pi_n) u_n^M - (I - \pi_n) T (I - \pi_n) u_n^M &= (I - \pi_n) f. \tag{2.6}
\end{align*}
\]

Let \( w_n^M = \pi_n u_n^M \). The substitution for \( (I - \pi_n) u_n^M \) from equation (2.6) in equation (2.5) gives us
\[
\begin{align*}
w_n^M - (\pi_n T \pi_n + \pi_n T (I - \pi_n) T \pi_n) w_n^M &= \pi_n f + \pi_n T (I - \pi_n) f \tag{2.7}
\end{align*}
\]

which is equivalent to a linear system of equations of size equal to the dimension of the space \( \pi_n X \). We then have
\[
\begin{align*}
u_n^M &= w_n^M + (I - \pi_n) T w_n^M + (I - \pi_n) f. \tag{2.8}
\end{align*}
\]

Let \( \alpha \) and \( \gamma \) be integers such that \( \alpha \geq \gamma, \alpha \geq 0, \) and \( \gamma \geq -1 \). We assume that the kernel \( k \) is of the following form:
\[
k(s,t) = \begin{cases} 
k_1(s,t), & 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1 \\
k_2(s,t), & 0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1
\end{cases}
\]

with \( k_1 \in C^\alpha([0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1]), k_2 \in C^\alpha([0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1]) \). If \( \gamma \geq 0 \), then it is assumed that \( k \in C^\gamma([0,1] \times [0,1]) \) and if \( \gamma = -1 \), then the kernel \( k \) may have a discontinuity of the first kind along the line \( s = t \). Following Chatelin and Lebbar [7], the class of kernels of the above form is denoted by \( \mathcal{C}(\alpha, \gamma) \).

Consider the integral operator
\[
(Tx)(s) = \int_0^1 k(s,t)x(t)\,dt, \quad s \in [0,1] \tag{2.9}
\]

where the kernel \( k \in \mathcal{C}(\alpha, \gamma) \). Then the operator \( T : L^\gamma[0,1] \to C[0,1] \) is compact. In fact, the range of \( T, R(T) \), is contained in \( C^\gamma[0,1] \), where \( \gamma_1 = \min\{\gamma + 1, \alpha\} \).

For \( x \in C^\gamma[0,1] \), we define
\[
\|x\|_{\gamma} = \sum_{i=0}^{\gamma} \|x^{(i)}\|_1
\]
where \( x^{(i)} \) denotes the \( i \)th derivative of \( x \). For any integer \( n \), let \( \Delta^{(n)} \) denote a quasi-uniform partition of \([0,1]\):

\[
0 = t_0^{(n)} < t_1^{(n)} < \cdots < t_n^{(n)} = 1.
\]

Let \( r \geq 0 \) and let \( \mathcal{P}_{r,\Delta^{(n)}} \) denote the space of all piecewise polynomials of degree \( \leq r \) on each of the subintervals \([t_{i-1}^{(n)}, t_i^{(n)}]\). For the sake of notational simplicity, the index \( n \) is dropped. Henceforth we write \( \Delta = \Delta^{(n)} \), \( \Delta_i = \Delta^{(n)} = [t_{i-1}^{(n)}, t_i^{(n)}] \), \( t_i = t_i^{(n)} \), \( h_i = h_i^{(n)} = t_i^{(n)} - t_{i-1}^{(n)} \), and \( h = h^{(n)} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{ h_i^{(n)} \} \). For \( \nu \geq 0 \), set

\[
C_\Delta^{\nu} = \{ x \in L^\nu : y|\Delta_i \in C_\Delta^{\nu}(\Delta_i), i = 1, \ldots, n \}.
\]

The following result is a particular case of Theorem 4.1 of Atkinson–Potra [2].

Let \( T \) be the integral operator defined by (2.9). Then \( T \) is a continuous map from \( C_\Delta^{\alpha} \) to \( C_\Delta^{\alpha} \). If \( x \in C_\Delta^{\alpha} \), then

\[
(Tx)^{(\mu)}(s) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial^\mu}{\partial s^\mu} k(s,t)x(t) \, dt, \quad 0 \leq \mu \leq \gamma_1.
\]  (2.10)

For \( s \notin \Delta \), we have

\[
(Tx)^{(\gamma_1)}(s) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial^{\gamma_1+1}}{\partial s^{\gamma_1+1}} k(s,t)x(t) \, dt + \frac{\partial^{\gamma_1}}{\partial s^{\gamma_1}} k_1(s,s)x(s) - \frac{\partial^{\gamma_1}}{\partial s^{\gamma_1}} k_2(s,s)x(s).
\]  (2.11)

Thus

\[
\|(Tx)^{(\mu)}\|_\infty \leq C\|x\|_\infty, \quad 0 \leq \mu \leq \gamma_1 + 1.
\]  (2.12)

### 3. ORDERS OF CONVERGENCE

In this section the main results are proved. In the case of the orthogonal projection onto a space of piecewise polynomials, the orders of convergence of \( n_0^M \) and \( n_0^M \) are obtained, whereas in the case of the interpolatory projection, the order of convergence of \( n_0^M \) is obtained.

#### 3.1. Orthogonal projection

Let \( P_n \) be the restriction to \( L^\infty[0,1] \) of the orthogonal projection from \( L^2[0,1] \) onto \( \mathcal{P}_{r,\Delta} \). The following result is standard (see Chatelin–Lebbar [7]). Let

\[
\beta = \min\{ \alpha, r + 1 \}.
\]

There is a constant \( C \) such that for any \( x \in C_\Delta^{\beta} \):

\[
\|(I - P_n)x\|_\infty \leq C\|x^{(\beta)}\|_\infty h_\beta^\beta.
\]  (3.1)
Let
\[ \beta_1 = \min\{\beta, \gamma + 1\} = \min\{\alpha, r + 1, \gamma + 1\} \]
and
\[ \beta_2 = \min\{\beta, \gamma + 2\} = \min\{\alpha, r + 1, \gamma + 2\}. \]

Also, if \( x \in C^{\beta_1}_\Lambda \), then
\[ \| (I - P_n)x \|_\infty \leq C \| x^{(\beta_1)} \|_\infty h^{\beta_1}. \] (3.2)

We quote the following estimate from Chatelin–Lebbar [7] for future reference.

Let \( T \) be an integral operator with kernel \( k \in \mathcal{C}(\alpha, \gamma) \) and let \( x \in C^{\beta_1}_\Lambda \). Then
\[ \| T(I - P_n)x \|_\infty \leq C \| x^{(\beta_1)} \|_\infty h^{\beta_1 + \beta_2}. \] (3.3)

As in the proof of Lemma 9 of [7], it can be shown that if \( x \in C^{\beta_1}_\Lambda \), then
\[ \| T(I - P_n)x \|_\infty \leq C \| x^{(\beta_1)} \|_\infty h^{\beta_1 + \beta_2}. \] (3.4)

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \( T \) be an integral operator with a kernel \( k \in \mathcal{C}(2\alpha, \gamma) \) and \( P_n \) be the orthogonal projection onto \( \mathcal{P}_\Delta \). Assume also that the integral equation \( u - Tu = f, \ f \in C^\alpha_\Lambda \), is uniquely solvable. Then, for \( n \) large enough, (2.1) has a unique solution,
\[ \| u - u^M_n \| = O(h^{\beta + \min\{\beta + \beta_1, \gamma + 2\}}) \] (3.5)
and
\[ \| u - u^M_n \| = O(h^{\beta + \beta_1 + \min\{\beta + \beta_1, \gamma + 2\}}). \] (3.6)

**Proof.** Since \( f \in C^\alpha_\Lambda \), it follows from Theorem 3 of Chatelin–Lebbar [7] that \( u \in C^\alpha_\Lambda \). Since \( P_n u \in C^\infty_\Lambda \), it follows that \( u - P_n u \in C^\alpha_\Lambda \). As \( T \) is a continuous map from \( C^\alpha_\Lambda \) to \( C^\alpha_\Lambda \), \( T(I - P_n)u \in C^\alpha_\Lambda \). Applying (3.2) we obtain
\[ \| (I - P_n)T(I - P_n)u \|_\infty \leq C \| (T(I - P_n)u)^{(\beta_1)} \|_\infty h^{\beta_1}. \] (3.7)

It follows from (2.10) that
\[ (T(I - P_n)u)^{(\beta_1)}(s) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial^{\beta_1}}{\partial s^{\beta_1}} k(s, t)(I - P_n)u(t) \, dt. \]

Since the kernel \( \ell(s, t) = \frac{\partial^{\beta_1} k(s, t)}{\partial s^{\beta_1}} \in \mathcal{C}(\alpha, \gamma - \beta_1) \), by (3.3) we get
\[ \| (T(I - P_n)u)^{(\beta_1)} \|_\infty \leq C \| u^{(\beta)} \|_\infty h^{\beta + \min\{\beta + \beta_1 + 2\}}. \] (3.8)

The estimate (3.5) follows from (2.3), (3.7), and (3.8).
Also, by (3.4) and (3.8),
\[ \| T(I - P_n) T(I - P_n)u \|_\infty \leq C \| (T(I - P_n)u)(\beta_1) \|_\infty h^{\beta_1 + \beta_2} \leq C \| u(\beta) \|_\infty h^{\beta_1 + \beta_2}. \] (3.9)

By using (2.12) and (3.4), we obtain
\[ \| T(I - P_n) T(I - P_n)u \|_\infty \leq C \| (T(I - P_n)u)(\beta_1) \|_\infty h^{\beta_1 + \beta_2} \leq C \| u(\beta) \|_\infty h^{\beta_1 + \beta_2}. \] (3.10)

Hence
\[ \| T(I - P_n) T \| = O(h^{\beta_1 + \beta_2}). \] (3.10)

As a consequence, using (3.5) and the fact that \( \| P_n \| \leq C \), a constant independent of \( n \), we have
\[ \| T(I - P_n) T(I - P_n)\| \| u - u_M \| = O(h^{\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \min\{\beta + \beta_1, \gamma + 2\}}). \] (3.11)

Combining (2.4), (3.9), and (3.11), we obtain the estimate (3.6). \( \square \)

**Remark 3.1.** The Galerkin and the iterated Galerkin solutions satisfy respectively the following two equations.

\( u^G_n - P_n T^2 u^G_n = P_n f \)
\( u^S_n - T P_n u^S_n = f. \)

We quote the following results from Chatelin–Lebbar [7] for comparison.

If the kernel \( k \in C(\alpha, \gamma) \), then
\[ \| u - u^G_n \| = O(h^\beta) \] (3.12)
\[ \| u - u^S_n \| = O(h^{\beta + \beta_2}). \] (3.13)

Let \( \alpha \geq 1 \). Then it is clear from the above estimates that \( u^S_n \) converges to \( u \) faster than \( u^G_n \). Also, from the estimates (3.5), (3.6), and (3.13), we see that \( u^M_n \) converges to \( u \) faster than \( u^G_n \) and \( u^S_n \).

If \( \gamma \geq 0 \) and \( \beta < \gamma + 2 \), then \( \beta_2 = \beta < \min\{\beta + \beta_1, \gamma + 2\} \). Hence \( u^M_n \) converges to \( u \) faster than \( u^G_n \). If \( \beta \geq \gamma + 2 \), then \( \beta_2 = \min\{\beta + \beta_1, \gamma + 2\} = \gamma + 2 \) and the rate of convergence of both \( u^G_n \) and \( u^M_n \) to \( u \) is \( \beta + \gamma + 2 \).

Thus, if \( r + 1 \leq \alpha \) and \( r \leq \gamma \), then \( \beta = \beta_1 = \beta_2 = r + 1 \) and from the estimates (3.12), (3.13), (3.5), and (3.6) we get
\[ \| u - u^G_n \| = O(h^{r+1}) \] (3.14)
\[ \| u - u^S_n \| = O(h^{2r+2}). \] (3.15)
\[ \| u - u^M_n \| = O(h^{\min\{3r+3, r+\gamma+3\}}). \] (3.16)
\[ \| u - \tilde{u}^M_n \| = O(h^{\min\{4r+2, r+\gamma+4\}}). \] (3.17)
If \( r + 1 \leq \alpha \) and \( r > \gamma \), then \( \beta = r + 1, \beta_1 = \gamma + 1 \) and \( \beta_2 = \gamma + 2 \). Then

\[
\|u - u_n^G\| = O(h^{r+1}) \tag{3.18}
\]
\[
\|u - u_n^S\| = O(h^{r+\gamma+3}) \tag{3.19}
\]
\[
\|u - u_n^M\| = O(h^{r+\gamma+3}) \tag{3.20}
\]
\[
\|u - \hat{u}_n^M\| = O(h^{r+2\gamma+5}). \tag{3.21}
\]

If the kernel \( k \) is only continuous, then \( \gamma = 0 \). Then, for the piecewise constant functions, that is, \( r = 0 \), from (3.14)–(3.17) we have

\[
\|u - u_G^n\| = O(h) \tag{3.18}
\]
\[
\|u - u_S^n\| = O(h^2) \tag{3.19}
\]
\[
\|u - u_M^n\| = O(h^3) \tag{3.20}
\]
\[
\|u - \hat{u}_n^M\| = O(h^4). \tag{3.21}
\]

whereas for piecewise linear functions, that is, \( r = 1 \), from (3.18)–(3.21) we obtain

\[
\|u - u_G^n\| = O(h^2) \tag{3.18}
\]
\[
\|u - u_S^n\| = O(h^4) \tag{3.19}
\]
\[
\|u - u_M^n\| = O(h^4) \tag{3.20}
\]
\[
\|u - \hat{u}_n^M\| = O(h^6). \tag{3.21}
\]

### 3.2. Interpolatory projection

For \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), let

\[
\tau_{i_1} < \tau_{i_2} < \cdots < \tau_{i(r+1)}
\]

be \( r + 1 \) distinct points in \([t_{i-1}, t_i]\) and let

\[
A = \{\tau_{ij}, \ i = 1, \ldots, n, \ j = 1, \ldots, r+1\}
\]

be the set of the collocation points. Let

\[
Q_n : C_\Delta[0,1] \to \mathcal{P}_{r,\Delta}
\]

be the interpolatory projection defined as follows.

\[
Q_n x \in \mathcal{P}_{r,\Delta}, \quad (Q_n x)(\tau_{ij}) = x(\tau_{ij}), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad 1 \leq j \leq r+1.
\]

If \( \tau_{i_1} = t_{i-1} \) and \( \tau_{i(r+1)} = t_i \), \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), then \( Q_n x \in C[0,1] \). We quote the following estimate from Chatelin–Lebbar [7].

There is a constant \( C \) such that for any \( x \in C_\Delta^r \),

\[
\|(I - Q_n)x\|_\infty \leq C\|x^{\beta}\|_\infty h^\beta. \tag{3.22}
\]
Similarly, if \( x \in C_\Delta^{\beta_1} \), then
\[
\| (I - Q_n) x \|_\infty \leq C \| x(\beta_1) \|_\infty h^{\beta_1},
\] (3.23)
and if \( x \in C_\Delta^{\beta_2} \), then
\[
\| (I - Q_n) x \|_\infty \leq C \| x(\beta_2) \|_\infty h^{\beta_2}. \tag{3.24}
\]

Let
\[
\beta_3 = \min\{ \alpha, 2r + 2, r + \gamma + 3 \}, \quad \beta_4 = \min\{ \alpha, 2r + 2, r + \gamma + 2 \}.
\]

If the kernel \( k \in C(\alpha, \gamma) \) with \( \alpha \geq r + 1 \) and the collocation points are the Gauss points, then
\[
\| T(I - Q_n)x \|_\infty \leq C \| x(\beta_3) \|_\infty h^{\beta_3}. \tag{3.25}
\]

**Theorem 3.2.** Let \( T \) be an integral operator with a kernel \( k \in C(\alpha, \gamma) \) and let \( Q_n \) be the interpolatory projection onto \( \mathcal{P}_r \Delta \) described above. Assume that the integral equation \( u - Tu = f \), \( f \in C_\Delta^{\alpha} \), is uniquely solvable. Then
\[
\| u - u^M \| = O(h^{\beta_3 + \beta_4}). \tag{3.26}
\]

If \( T \) is an integral operator with a kernel \( k \in C(2\alpha, \gamma) \) with \( \alpha \geq r + 1 \) and the set \( A \) of collocation points consists of Gauss points, then
\[
\| u - u^M \| = O(h^{\beta_1 + \beta_2}). \tag{3.27}
\]

**Proof.** Since \( u \in C_\Delta^{\alpha} \), by (3.22),
\[
\| (I - Q_n)u \|_\infty \leq C \| u(\beta) \|_\infty h^{\beta}. \tag{3.28}
\]

Also, for \( x \in C_\Delta \), by (3.24) and (2.12),
\[
\| (I - Q_n)Tx \|_\infty \leq C \| (Tx)(\beta_2) \|_\infty h^{\beta_2} \leq C \| x \|_\infty h^{\beta_2}.
\]

Hence
\[
\| (I - Q_n)T \| \leq Ch^{\beta_2}. \tag{3.29}
\]

The estimate (3.26) follows from (2.3), (3.28), and (3.29).

If \( \alpha \geq r + 1 \) and the collocation points are the Gauss points, then on applying (3.23) we obtain
\[
\| (I - Q_n)T(I - Q_n)u \|_\infty \leq C \| (I(I - Q_n)u)(\beta_1) \|_\infty h^{\beta_1}. \tag{3.30}
\]
As in the proof of Theorem 3.1 it follows from (2.10) that
\[
(T(I - Q_n)u)^{(\beta_1)}(s) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial^{\beta_1}}{\partial s^{\beta_1}} k(s, t)(I - Q_n)u(t) \, dt.
\]
Since by assumption, the kernel \( k \in C(2\alpha, \gamma) \), the kernel \( \ell(s, t) = \frac{\partial^{\beta_1}}{\partial s^{\beta_1}} k(s, t) \in C(\alpha, \gamma - \beta_1) = C(\alpha, -1) \). Hence by (3.25) we get
\[
\|(T(I - Q_n)u)^{(\beta_1)}\|_{\infty} \leq C\|u\|_{\beta_1, \infty} h^{\beta_1}.
\]
(3.31)

The estimate (3.27) follows from (2.3), (3.30) and (3.31).

\[\square\]

**Remark 3.2.** If the interpolation points are not Gauss points, the iteration does not improve the order of convergence. Hence only the order of convergence of \( u^n_M \) is given. However, in the case of interpolation at the Gauss points, as is observed in the numerical example, the iteration is expected to improve the order of convergence. It was not possible to obtain an estimate for \( \|u - \tilde{u}_n^M\| \) justifying this improvement.

The collocation and the iterated collocation solutions satisfy respectively the following two equations.
\[
u_n^C - Q_nTQ_nu_n^C = Q_nf
\]
\[
u_n^S - TQ_nu_n^S = f.
\]

We quote the following results from Chatelin–Lebbar [7] for comparison.

If the kernel \( k \in C(\alpha, \gamma) \), then
\[
\|u - u_n^C\| = O(h^\beta).
\]
(3.32)

In general, \( u_n^S \) does not improve upon \( u_n^C \).

A comparison of (3.26) and (3.32) shows that while \( u_n^S \) converges to \( u \) at the same rate as \( u_n^C \), \( u_n^M \) converges faster than \( u_n^C \). If \( \alpha \geq r + 1 \), then while
\[
\|u - u_n^C\| = O(h^{r+1})
\]
we have
\[
\|u - u_n^M\| = O(h^{r+1+\min\{r+1,\gamma+2\}}).
\]

Let \( \gamma \geq 0 \). If we consider the space of piecewise linear continuous functions with respect to a partition \( \Delta \) of \([0, 1]\) and if the collocation points are chosen to be the the partition points \( t_i, i = 0, 1, \ldots, n \), then since \( r = 1 \), we obtain
\[
\|u - u_n^C\| = O(h^2)
\]
whereas
\[
\|u - u_n^M\| = O(h^4).
\]
This result is illustrated by a numerical example.

In the case of collocation at Gauss points, with $\alpha \geq r + 1$, we have (Chatelin–Lebbar [7])

$$\|u - u_n^S\| = O(h^\beta).$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.33)

It is seen from (3.32) and (3.33) that $u_n^S$ converges faster as compared to $u_n^C$. In this case, if $\alpha \geq 2r + 2$ and $r \leq \gamma$, then

$$\beta_1 = \beta_2 = r + 1, \quad \beta_3 = \beta_4 = 2r + 2.$$  

Thus, using (3.33) and (3.27) we get

$$\|u - u_n^S\| = O(h^{2r+2})$$

and

$$\|u - u_n^M\| = O(h^{3r+3}).$$

On the other hand, if $r > \gamma$, then

$$\beta_1 = \gamma + 1, \quad \beta_2 = \gamma + 2, \quad \beta_3 = r + \gamma + 3, \quad \beta_4 = r + \gamma + 2.$$  

As a consequence, using (3.33) and (3.27) we get

$$\|u - u_n^S\| = O(h^{r+\gamma+3})$$

and

$$\|u - u_n^M\| = O(h^{r+2\gamma+3}).$$

In this case, $u_n^M$ converges faster than $u_n^S$ if $\gamma > 0$. If $\gamma = 0$, then both $u_n^S$ and $u_n^M$ converge to $u$ at the rate of $r + 3$.

4. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We consider the integral equation

$$u(s) - \int_0^1 k(s,t)u(t)\,dt = f(s), \quad 0 \leq s \leq 1$$

where

$$k(s,t) = \begin{cases} s(1-t), & 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1 \\ t(1-s), & 0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

and the right hand side is so chosen that the exact solution is

$$u(s) = s^{9/2}.$$  
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Table 1.

| $n$ | $| (u - u_C^n)(\frac{2}{3}) |$ | $\mu_1$ | $| (u - u_M^n)(\frac{2}{3}) |$ | $\mu_2$ |
|-----|------------------|-----|------------------|-----|
| 4   | $3.9 \times 10^{-2}$ | 2.2 $\times 10^{-4}$ |  |  |  |
| 8   | $1.2 \times 10^{-2}$ | 1.80 | $1.7 \times 10^{-5}$ | 3.70 |  |
| 16  | $2.6 \times 10^{-3}$ | 2.11 | $9.4 \times 10^{-7}$ | 4.16 |  |
| 32  | $6.7 \times 10^{-4}$ | 1.95 | $6.2 \times 10^{-8}$ | 3.92 |  |
| 64  | $1.7 \times 10^{-4}$ | 2.03 | $3.8 \times 10^{-9}$ | 4.04 |  |
| 128 | $4.2 \times 10^{-5}$ | 1.99 | $2.4 \times 10^{-10}$ | 3.98 |  |
| 256 | $1.0 \times 10^{-5}$ | 2.01 | $1.5 \times 10^{-11}$ | 4.01 |  |
| 512 | $2.6 \times 10^{-6}$ | 2.00 | $9.3 \times 10^{-13}$ | 3.99 |  |

Thus $u \in C^4[0,1]$, but $u \notin C^5[0,1]$. Let $P_1$ be the space of piecewise linear continuous functions with respect to the uniform partition of $[0,1]$:

$$0 < \frac{1}{n} < \frac{2}{n} < \cdots < \frac{n-1}{n} < 1$$

and $Q_n : C[0,1] \to P_1$, be the interpolatory projection defined by

$$Q_n u \left( \frac{i}{n} \right) = u \left( \frac{i}{n} \right), \quad i = 0, 1, \ldots, n.$$ 

Since the dimension of $P_1$ is $n+1$, (2.7) is equivalent to a system of linear equations of size $n+1$.

In this example we have $\alpha = \infty$, $\gamma = 0$, and $r = 1$. Thus $\beta = \beta_2 = 2$. Hence by the estimates (3.32) and (3.26), we have

$$\| u - u_C^n \| = O(h^2)$$

and

$$\| u - u_M^n \| = O(h^4).$$

In the computation of the matrices representing $Q_n T Q_n$ and $Q_n T^2 Q_n$, the operator $T$ is replaced by a discrete operator $T_m$. In the case of $Q_n T Q_n$, the operator $T_m$ is obtained on replacing the integration in $T$ by the composite Simpson quadrature with respect to $\Delta$ and is given by

$$T_m x(s) = \frac{1}{6n} k(s,0)x(0) + \frac{1}{3n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} k \left( s, \frac{2i-1}{2n} \right) x \left( \frac{2i-1}{2n} \right)$$

$$+ \frac{2}{3n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} k \left( s, \frac{i}{n} \right) x \left( \frac{i}{n} \right) + \frac{1}{6n} k(s,1)x(1), \quad s \in [0,1].$$

On the other hand, since the kernel $k$ is only continuous along the diagonal $s = t$, in the matrix representing $Q_n T^2 Q_n$, the integration is replaced by the composite Simpson quadrature with respect to an uniform partition of $[0,1]$ with mesh $1/(2n)$.
Thus the collocation points are the Gauss points. Since 
have

Note that in this case the Sloan solution $u^S$ has the same order of convergence as the collocation solution $u^C$ and $\tilde{u}^M$ and $u^M$ have the same orders of convergence.

In Table 1 the error between the exact solution $u$ and the collocation solution $u^C_n$ as the approximating space. Let $Q_n : C_\Delta[0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{0, \Delta}$ be the interpolatory projection defined by

$$Q_n u \left( \frac{2i-1}{2n} \right) = u \left( \frac{2i-1}{2n} \right), \quad i = 1, \ldots, n.$$ 

Thus the collocation points are the Gauss points. Since $\alpha = \infty$, $\gamma = 0$, and $r = 0$, we have $\beta = \beta_1 = 1$ and $\beta_3 = \beta_4 = 2$. Hence by the estimates (3.32), (3.33), and (3.27), we have

$$\| u - u^C_n \| = O(h)$$

$$\| u - u^S_n \| = O(h^2)$$

and

$$\| u - u^M_n \| = O(h^3).$$

Since the collocation points $\xi_i$ are the interior points of $[t_{i-1}, t_i]$, the integration in the evaluation of the matrix corresponding to $Q_n T Q_n$ is replaced by the composite Simpson rule associated with an uniform partition of mesh $1/(2n)$, whereas in the representation of $Q_n T^2 Q_n$, the composite Simpson rule associated with the uniform partition of mesh $1/(4n)$ is used.

The computed orders of convergence in the collocation method, Sloan method, New method and the iterated New method are denoted by $\mu_1$, $\mu_2$, $\mu_3$, and $\mu_4$, respectively, and are given in Table 2 along with the error at $2/3$.

| $n$ | $|(u - u^{C_n}(\frac{2}{3})| \mu_1$ | $|(u - u^{S_n}(\frac{2}{3})| \mu_2$ | $|(u - u^{M_n}(\frac{2}{3})| \mu_3$ | $|(u - \tilde{u}^{M_n}(\frac{2}{3})| \mu_4$ |
|-----|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 4   | $3.9 \times 10^{-2}$           | $1.1 \times 10^{-3}$          | $8.6 \times 10^{-5}$          | $1.5 \times 10^{-5}$          |
| 8   | $2.4 \times 10^{-2}$           | $0.70$                        | $3.6 \times 10^{-4}$          | $1.65$                        | $1.7 \times 10^{-5}$          | $2.33$                        | $6.3 \times 10^{-7}$          | $4.55$                        |
| 16  | $1.1 \times 10^{-2}$           | $1.15$                        | $8.8 \times 10^{-5}$          | $2.03$                        | $1.7 \times 10^{-6}$          | $3.37$                        | $5.2 \times 10^{-8}$          | $3.62$                        |
| 32  | $5.8 \times 10^{-3}$           | $0.92$                        | $2.3 \times 10^{-5}$          | $1.95$                        | $2.3 \times 10^{-7}$          | $2.82$                        | $2.9 \times 10^{-9}$          | $4.17$                        |
| 64  | $2.8 \times 10^{-3}$           | $1.04$                        | $5.6 \times 10^{-6}$          | $2.02$                        | $2.7 \times 10^{-8}$          | $3.09$                        | $1.9 \times 10^{-10}$         | $3.91$                        |
| 128 | $1.4 \times 10^{-3}$           | $0.98$                        | $1.4 \times 10^{-6}$          | $1.99$                        | $3.6 \times 10^{-9}$          | $2.96$                        | $1.1 \times 10^{-11}$         | $4.60$                        |
| 256 | $7.1 \times 10^{-4}$           | $1.01$                        | $3.5 \times 10^{-7}$          | $2.00$                        | $4.4 \times 10^{-10}$         | $3.02$                        | $7.3 \times 10^{-13}$         | $4.68$                        |
| 512 | $3.5 \times 10^{-4}$           | $1.00$                        | $8.8 \times 10^{-8}$          | $2.00$                        | $5.5 \times 10^{-11}$         | $2.99$                        | $4.5 \times 10^{-14}$         | $4.32$                        |
We see that the computed orders of convergence given in the above table match with the predicted values. The order of convergence for $\tilde{u}_n$ is about 4. It is seen from the above table that $u_M^n$ improves upon $u_C^n$ and $u_S^n$, whereas $\tilde{u}_M^n$ improves upon $u_M^n$.
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