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#### Abstract

This paper is focused on the construction and accurate implementation of the block generalized Milne-Simpson methods for step numbers $\mathrm{k}=2,3$ and 4 . The methods compute the solution of systems of initial value problems in ordinary differential equations on non- overlapping subintervals. The block methods derived are all convergent and the plot of their absolute stability regions shows that they are Astable. The accuracy of the block methods is illustrated using some stiff systems of ODEs. KEYWORDS: A-Stability, Block Multistep Method, Initial value Problems, Ordinary Differential Equations


## INTRODUCTION

Consider the numerical solution of the first order initial value problem of the form,

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime}=f(x, y), \quad y\left(x_{0}\right)=y_{0}, \quad x \in[a, b], \quad y \in R \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f$ is continuous and satisfies Lipchitz's condition which guarantees that a unique solution exist. The development of numerical methods for approximating the solution of (1) has in recent years received a great deal of attention and as such many researchers have constructed efficient methods for its solution.(Onumanyi, et al. 1994) in a bid to solve (1) constructed block methods using the multistep collocation method. These block methods share similar properties with the Runge-Kutta method for being self-starting and do not require special predictors or starting values.

Milne (1953) introduced the idea of block methods to generate starting values for predictor-corrector algorithms for solving ODEs. Authors who have also contributed in the theory of block methods include. (Ajie et al. 2014; Bond et al. 1979; Fatunla,1991; Kumleng, et al.2013; Henrici,1962; Nasir, et al. 2011; Onumanyi, et al. 1994; Rosser,1967; Shampine, et al. 1972).

In this paper, the construction of a new family of block generalized Milne-Simpson methods for step numbers $\mathrm{k}=2,3$, and 4 is considered. The continuous formulations of these block methods are obtained using the
multistep collocation method of (Onumanyi, et al. 1994). These formulations evaluated at some desired grid points gives discrete
schemes which are combined as block methods for the simultaneous integration of IVP's without requiring starting values.

## FORMULATION OF THE METHOD

The solution of the initial value problem in (1) is assumed to be the polynomial

$$
\begin{equation*}
y(x)=\sum_{j=0}^{s+r+1} a_{j} x^{j} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where s and r are the number of interpolation and collocation points respectively. From (2) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime}(x)=\sum_{j=0}^{s+r-1} j a_{j} x^{j-1} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting (3) into (1) gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(x, y)=\sum_{j=0}^{s+r-1} j a_{j} x^{j-1} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Collocating (3) at $x_{n+s}, s=0,1,2$ and interpolating (2) at $x=x_{n}$, gives a linear system of equations in the form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A X=U \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
X=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & x_{n} & x_{n}^{2} & x_{n}^{3} \\
0 & 1 & 2 x_{n} & 3 x_{n}^{2} \\
0 & 1 & 2 x_{n+1} & 3 x_{n+1}^{2} \\
0 & 1 & 2 x_{n+2} & 3 x_{n+2}^{2}
\end{array}\right], A=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
a_{0} & a_{1} & a_{2} & a_{3}
\end{array}\right]^{T}, U=\left[\begin{array}{c}
y_{n} \\
f_{n} \\
f_{n+1} \\
f_{n+2}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Solving (5) for $a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}$ and substituting the result into (2) gives the continuous form of the two step method as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
y(x)=a_{0} y_{n}+h \sum_{j=0}^{2} \beta_{j}(x) f_{n+j} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a_{0}=1$
$h \beta_{0}(x)=\left(\tau-\frac{3}{4} \frac{\tau^{2}}{h}+\frac{1}{6} \frac{\tau^{3}}{h^{2}}\right), h \beta_{I}(x)=\left(\frac{\tau^{2}}{h}-\frac{1}{3} \frac{\tau^{3}}{h^{2}}\right)$
$h \beta_{2}(x)=\left(-\frac{1}{4} \frac{\tau^{2}}{h}+\frac{1}{6} \frac{\tau^{3}}{h^{2}}\right)$
where $\tau=x-x_{n}, \tau \in[0,2 h]$.
Now evaluating (6) at the points $\tau=h, 2 h$ gives the two discrete methods which constitute the two step block generalized Milne Simpson method as:
$y_{n+1}-y_{n}=\frac{h}{12}\left(5 f_{n}+8 f_{n+1}-f_{n+2}\right)$
$y_{n+2}-y_{n}=\frac{h}{3}\left(f_{n}+4 f_{n+1}+f_{n+2}\right)$
Similarly, we obtain the continuous form of the three step generalized Milne Simpson method as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
y(x)=a_{1} y_{n+1}+h \sum_{j=0}^{3} \beta_{j}(x) f_{n+j} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a_{1}=1$
$\beta_{0}(x)=\left(-\frac{3}{8} h+\tau-\frac{11}{12} \frac{\tau^{2}}{h}+\frac{1}{3} \frac{\tau^{3}}{h^{2}}-\frac{1}{24} \frac{\tau^{4}}{h^{3}}\right)$
$\beta_{l}(x)=\left(\frac{3}{2} \frac{\tau^{2}}{h}-\frac{19}{24} h-\frac{5}{6} \frac{\tau^{3}}{h^{2}}+\frac{1}{8} \frac{\tau^{4}}{h^{3}}\right)$
$\beta_{2}(x)=\left(\frac{5}{24} h-\frac{3}{4} \frac{\tau^{2}}{h}+\frac{2}{3} \frac{\tau^{3}}{h^{2}}-\frac{1}{8} \frac{\tau^{4}}{h^{3}}\right)$
$\beta_{3}(x)=\left(\frac{1}{6} \frac{\tau^{2}}{h}-\frac{1}{6} \frac{\tau^{3}}{h^{2}}+\frac{1}{24} \frac{\tau^{4}}{h^{3}}-\frac{1}{24} h\right)$
where $\tau=x-x_{n}, \tau \in[0,3 h]$.
Now evaluating (8) at the points $\tau=0,2 h, 3 h$ gives the three discrete methods which constitute the three step block generalized Milne Simpson method as:
$y_{n+1}-y_{n}=\frac{h}{24}\left(9 f_{n}+19 f_{n+1}-5 f_{n+2}+f_{n+3}\right)$

$$
\begin{align*}
& y_{n+2}-y_{n+1}=\frac{1}{24} h\left(-f_{n}+13 f_{n+1}+13 f_{n+2}-f_{n+3}\right)  \tag{9}\\
& y_{n+3}-y_{n+1}=\frac{h}{3}\left(f_{n+1}+4 f_{n+2}+f_{n+3}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

The continuous form of the four step generalized Milne Simpson method is obtained as:
$y(x)=a_{2} y_{n+2}+h \sum_{j=0}^{4} \beta_{j}(x) f_{n+j}$
where $a_{2}=1$
$\beta_{0}(x)=\left(-\frac{29}{90} h+\tau-\frac{25}{24} \frac{\tau^{2}}{h}+\frac{35}{72} \frac{\tau^{3}}{h^{2}}-\frac{5}{48} \frac{\tau^{4}}{h^{3}}+\frac{1}{120} \frac{\tau^{5}}{h^{4}}\right)$
$\beta_{l}(x)=\left(\frac{2 \tau^{2}}{h}-\frac{13}{9} \frac{\tau^{3}}{h^{2}}+\frac{3}{8} \frac{\tau^{4}}{h^{3}}-\frac{62}{45} h-\frac{1}{30} \frac{\tau^{5}}{h^{4}}\right)$
$\beta_{2}(x)=\left(-\frac{3}{2} \frac{\tau^{2}}{h}+\frac{19}{12} \frac{\tau^{3}}{h^{2}}+\frac{1}{20} \frac{\tau^{5}}{h^{4}}-\frac{4}{15} h-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\tau^{4}}{h^{3}}\right)$
$\beta_{3}(x)=\left(\frac{2}{3} \frac{\tau^{2}}{h}-\frac{2}{45} h-\frac{1}{30} \frac{\tau^{5}}{h^{4}}-\frac{7}{9} \frac{\tau^{3}}{h^{2}}+\frac{7}{24} \frac{\tau^{4}}{h^{3}}\right)$
$\beta_{4}(x)=\left(\frac{1}{90} h-\frac{1}{8} \frac{\tau^{2}}{h}+\frac{11}{72} \frac{\tau^{3}}{h^{2}}+\frac{1}{120} \frac{\tau^{5}}{h^{4}}-\frac{1}{16} \frac{\tau^{4}}{h^{3}}\right)$
where $\tau=x-x_{n}, \tau \in[0,4 h]$.
Now evaluating (10) at the points $\tau=0, h, 3 h, 4 h$ gives the four discrete methods which constitute the four-step block generalized Milne Simpson method as:

$$
\begin{align*}
& y_{n}-y_{n+2}=\frac{h}{90}\left(-29 f_{n}-124 f_{n+1}-24 f_{n+2}-4 f_{n+3}+f_{n+4}\right) \\
& y_{n+1}-y_{n+2}=\frac{h}{720}\left(19 f_{n}-346 f_{n+1}-456 f_{n+2}+74 f_{n+3}-11 f_{n+4}\right)  \tag{11}\\
& y_{n+3}-y_{n+2}=\frac{h}{720}\left(11 f_{n}-74 f_{n+1}+456 f_{n+2}+346 f_{n+3}-19 f_{n+4}\right) \\
& y_{n+4}-y_{n+2}=\frac{1}{90} h\left(-f_{n}+4 f_{n+1}+24 f_{n+2}+124 f_{n+3}+29 f_{n+4}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

## Convergence analysis of our new Block Methods

## Order and Error constants of the block methods

Following Lambert (1973) and Fatunla (1991), the local truncation error associated with the general linear multistep method is the linear difference operator L defined as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
L[y(x), h]=\sum_{j=0}^{k}\left\{\alpha_{j} y\left(x_{n+j}\right)-\beta_{j} y^{\prime}\left(x_{n+j}\right\}\right. \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assuming that $y(x)$ is sufficiently differentiable, we expand (12) as a Taylor series about the point $x_{n}$ to obtain the expression:

$$
\begin{equation*}
L[y(x), h]=C_{0} y\left(x_{n}\right)+C_{1} h y^{\prime}\left(x_{n}\right)+\ldots+C_{q} h^{q} y^{q}\left(x_{n}\right)+\ldots \cong 0 \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the constant $C_{q}, q=0,1, \ldots$ are given as

$$
\begin{align*}
& C_{0}=\sum_{j=0}^{k} \alpha_{j}, \quad C_{1}=\sum_{j=0}^{k} j \alpha_{j}  \tag{14}\\
& C_{q}=\frac{1}{q!}\left(\alpha_{1}+2^{q} \alpha_{2}+\ldots+k^{q} \alpha_{k}\right)-\frac{1}{(q-1)!}\left(\beta_{1}+2^{q-1} \beta_{2}+\ldots+k^{q-1} \beta_{k}\right) \tag{15}
\end{align*}
$$

According to (13), the general linear multistep method has order p if $C_{0}=C_{1}=\ldots=C_{p-1}=C_{p}=0$, and $C_{p+1} \neq 0 . C_{p+1}$ is the error constant of the method and $C_{p+1} h^{p+1} y^{p+1}\left(x_{n}\right)$ is the principal local truncation error at the point $x_{n}$. Thus the local truncation error (LTE) is written as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
L T E=C_{p+1} h^{p+1} y^{p+1}\left(x_{n}\right)+O\left(h^{p+2}\right) \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Table 1: Order and error constants of the block methods (6),(9),(11)

| Method | Order P | Error constant $C_{p+1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(6)$ | $[3,3]^{T}$ | $\left[\frac{1}{24},-\frac{1}{90}\right]^{T}$ |
| $(9)$ | $[4,4,4]^{T}$ | $\left[-\frac{19}{720}, \frac{11}{720},-\frac{1}{90}\right]^{T}$ |
| $(11)$ | $[5,5,5,5]^{T}$ | $\left[-\frac{1}{90}, \frac{11}{1440}, \frac{11}{1440},-\frac{1}{90}\right]^{T}$ |

Since the order of each of the block methods is greater than one, we conclude that the block method is consistent.

Zero Stability
Definition: A block linear multistep method is said to be zero-stable if the roots of its first characteristic
polynomial $\rho(\lambda)$ defined by $\rho(\lambda)=\operatorname{det}\left(\lambda A^{(0)}-A^{(1)}\right) \quad$ satisfy
$\left|\lambda_{s}\right| \leq 1$ and every root satisfying $\left|\lambda_{s}\right| \leq 1$ have multiplicity not exceeding two, where $\lambda_{s}, s=1,2, \ldots, N$ are the roots of $\rho(\lambda)=0$.
For the block method (6), $\rho(\lambda)$ is obtained as:

Hence by Fatunla (1991), the block method (6) is zero-stable since the roots of the characteristic polynomial $\quad \rho(\lambda)$ satisfy the definition above and is consistent since its order $p>1$ and therefore convergent by Henrici (1962). Similar approach shows that the block methods (9) and (11) are also convergent since they are both zerostable and consistent.

## Region of Absolute Stability

To determine the absolute stability regions of the block methods (6), (9) and (11), we reformulate them as general linear methods of Burrage and Butcher (1980) where a partition of the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
\rho(\lambda) & =\operatorname{det}\left[\lambda\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right)-\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 1 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right)\right]=0 \\
& =\lambda(\lambda-1)=0 \\
& \Rightarrow \lambda_{1}=1 \text { and } \lambda_{2}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\left[\begin{array}{c}
Y  \tag{17}\\
Y_{n-i}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
A_{1} & B_{1} \\
A_{2} & B_{2}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
h f(y) \\
y_{n}
\end{array}\right]
$$

was used. The elements $A_{1}$ and $A_{2}$ are obtained from the coefficients of the collocation points while $B_{1}$ and $B_{2}$ are obtained from the coefficients of the interpolation points of the methods. The elements of $A_{1}, A_{2}, B_{1}$ and $B_{2}$ are then substituted into a Matlab code for plotting the stability regions of our block methods.
Writing the block method (6) in the form of (17) gives:

$$
\left[\begin{array}{c}
y_{n} \\
y_{n+1} \\
y_{n+2} \\
\cdots \\
y_{n+2} \\
y_{n+1}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & 0 & 0 & \vdots & 0 & 1 \\
\frac{5}{12} & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{-1}{12} & \vdots & 0 & 1 \\
\frac{1}{3} & \frac{4}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \vdots & 0 & 1 \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
\frac{1}{3} & \frac{4}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \vdots & 0 & 1 \\
\frac{5}{12} & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{-1}{12} & \vdots & 0 & 1
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
h f_{n} \\
h f_{n+1} \\
h f_{n+2} \\
\cdots \\
y_{n+1} \\
y_{n}
\end{array}\right]
$$

where $A_{1}=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{5}{12} & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{-1}{12} \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{4}{3} & \frac{1}{3}\end{array}\right] A_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}\frac{1}{3} & \frac{4}{3} & \frac{1}{3} \\ \frac{5}{12} & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{-1}{12}\end{array}\right] B_{1}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1\end{array}\right] B_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1\end{array}\right]$

Substituting the values of $A_{1}, A_{2}, B_{1}$ and $B_{2}$ into the MATLAB code for plotting stability regions produces the absolute stability region of the block method (6) as:


Figure 1: Absolute Stability Region of the Block method (6)

Similarly, the stability regions of the block methods (8) and (10) are obtained as follows:


Figure 2: Absolute Stability Region of the Block method (9)


Figure 3: Absolute Stability Region of the Block method (11)

The stability regions of the block methods derived show that the methods are all A - stable. The stability regions consist of the set of points in the complex plane outside the enclosed figures.

## NUMERICAL RESULTS

In order to verify the efficiency of the block methods (6),(9) and (11), we present some numerical experiments. The new block methods shall be compared with the analytic solution and the well-known MATLAB ODE solver ode 23 s for the problem without analytic solution.

## Problem 1.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{y}_{1}^{\prime}=-0.013 \mathrm{y}_{1}-1000 \mathrm{y}_{1} \mathrm{y}_{3} \\
& \mathrm{y}_{2}^{\prime}=-2500 \mathrm{y}_{2} \mathrm{y}_{3} \\
& \mathrm{y}_{3}^{\prime}=-0.013 \mathrm{y}_{1}-1000 \mathrm{y}_{1} \mathrm{y}_{3}-2500 \mathrm{y}_{2} \mathrm{y}_{3} \\
& \mathrm{y}_{1}(0)=1, \quad y_{2}(0)=1, \quad y_{3}(0)=0,0 \leq x \leq 20, h=0.1
\end{aligned}
$$

## Problem 2.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{y}_{1}^{\prime}=998 \mathrm{y}_{1}+1998 \mathrm{y}_{2} \\
& \mathrm{y}_{2}^{\prime}=-999 \mathrm{y}_{1}-1999 \mathrm{y}_{2} \\
& \mathrm{y}_{1}(0)=1, \quad y_{2}(0)=1, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 20, h=0.1 \\
& y_{1}(x)=4 e^{-x}-3 e^{-1000 x}, \quad y_{2}(x)=-2 e^{-x}+3 e^{-1000 x}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Problem 3

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{y}_{1}^{\prime}=-1002 \mathrm{y}_{1}+1000 \mathrm{y}_{2}^{2} \\
& \mathrm{y}_{2}^{\prime}=\mathrm{y}_{1}-\mathrm{y}_{2}\left(1+\mathrm{y}_{2}\right) \\
& \mathrm{y}_{1}(0)=1, \quad y_{2}(0)=1, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 20, h=0.1 \\
& y_{1}(x)=e^{-2 x}, y_{2}(x)=e^{-x}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Problem 4

$$
\begin{aligned}
& y_{1}^{\prime}=-8 y_{1}+7 y_{2} \\
& y_{2}^{\prime}=42 y_{1}-43 y_{2} \\
& \mathrm{y}_{1}(0)=1, \quad y_{2}(0)=8, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 20, h=0.1 \\
& y_{1}(x)=2 e^{-x}-e^{-50 x}, \quad y_{2}(x)=-2 e^{-x}+6 e^{-50 x}
\end{aligned}
$$



Figure 4: Solution curve to problem 1 using method (6)

## TETFUND/UNIMUBI/ARJ/3



Figure 5: Solution curve to problem 1 using method (9)


Figure 6: Solution curve to problem 1 using method (11)

Table 2: Absolute errors for problem 2 for the first component

| x | Method(6) | Method(9) | Method(11) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $4.44 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $2.56 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1.74 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 4 | $1.16 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $4.32 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $4.71 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| 6 | $2.35 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $7.02 \mathrm{E}-10$ | $4.78 \mathrm{E}-09$ |
| 8 | $4.25 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $1.11 \mathrm{E}-10$ | $1.73 \mathrm{E}-09$ |
| 10 | $7.19 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1.71 \mathrm{E}-11$ | $2.92 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| 12 | $1.17 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.61 \mathrm{E}-12$ | $4.74 \mathrm{E}-11$ |
| 14 | $1.84 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $3.93 \mathrm{E}-13$ | $7.49 \mathrm{E}-12$ |
| 16 | $2.85 \mathrm{E}-10$ | $2.56 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1.16 \mathrm{E}-12$ |
| 18 | $4.34 \mathrm{E}-11$ | $4.32 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $1.76 \mathrm{E}-13$ |
| 20 | $6.52 \mathrm{E}-12$ | $7.02 \mathrm{E}-10$ | $2.65 \mathrm{E}-14$ |

Table 3: Absolute errors for problem 3 for the first component

| x | Method(6) | $\operatorname{Method}(9)$ | Method(11) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $4.49 \mathrm{E}-02$ | $1.66 \mathrm{E}-02$ | $2.11 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| 4 | $1.59 \mathrm{E}-04$ | $1.86 \mathrm{E}-04$ | $2.42 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| 6 | $2.27 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $1.13 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $8.19 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 8 | $4.29 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $3.89 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $3.06 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| 10 | $1.24 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $1.20 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $1.10 \mathrm{E}-09$ |
| 12 | $2.82 \mathrm{E}-11$ | $2.76 \mathrm{E}-11$ | $2.65 \mathrm{E}-11$ |
| 14 | $5.79 \mathrm{E}-13$ | $5.72 \mathrm{E}-13$ | $5.59 \mathrm{E}-13$ |
| 16 | $1.13 \mathrm{E}-14$ | $1.13 \mathrm{E}-14$ | $1.11 \mathrm{E}-14$ |
| 18 | $2.16 \mathrm{E}-16$ | $2.16 \mathrm{E}-16$ | $2.14 \mathrm{E}-16$ |
| 20 | $4.07 \mathrm{E}-18$ | $4.06 \mathrm{E}-18$ | $1.67 \mathrm{E}-19$ |

Table 4: Absolute errors for problem 4 for the first component

| x | Method(6) | Method(9) | Method(11) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $2.14 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $1.29 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $8.70 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| 4 | $5.80 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $3.49 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $2.36 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| 6 | $1.18 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $7.08 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $4.78 \mathrm{E}-09$ |
| 8 | $2.12 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $1.28 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $8.63 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| 10 | $3.59 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.16 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $1.46 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| 12 | $5.83 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $3.51 \mathrm{E}-10$ | $2.37 \mathrm{E}-11$ |
| 14 | $9.21 \mathrm{E}-10$ | $5.54 \mathrm{E}-11$ | $3.74 \mathrm{E}-12$ |
| 16 | $1.42 \mathrm{E}-10$ | $8.57 \mathrm{E}-12$ | $5.79 \mathrm{E}-13$ |
| 18 | $2.17 \mathrm{E}-11$ | $1.31 \mathrm{E}-12$ | $8.81 \mathrm{E}-14$ |
| 20 | $3.26 \mathrm{E}-12$ | $1.96 \mathrm{E}-13$ | $1.33 \mathrm{E}-14$ |

## CONCLUSION

We have proposed block generalized Simpson-Milne methods for $\mathrm{k}=2,3$ and 4 with order three, four and five respectively for the numerical integration of ordinary differential equations. These block methods were found to be zero-stable, consistent and convergent. The numerical examples show that our block methods are highly accurate and compete favourably well with the MATLAB ode solver ode 23s.
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