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## Preamble

How to use this document: Check your marked assignment solutions for boxed numbers. Each boxed number corresponds to a comment in this document. If any points are deducted from your solution related to a comment, the number of points deducted is included in brackets after that comment.

For example,
7. Page 555, exercise 6.

1 Did not check stability of equilibria (-2)
means that in question 7 (which is exercise 6 on page 555 of Hirsch, Smale, Devaney), you forgot to check the stability of equilibria, and so I deducted two points.

All questions are marked out of 10 .
Note: Only the most commonly applicable comments are included here. Your assignment may have some additional, specific comments.

## Comments

1. Page 57, exercise 2.

Each part of this question was marked out of five points.
1 Note that the eigenvectors for the matrix in canonical form ( $J=T^{-1} A T$ ) are always $e_{1}=(1,0)$ and $e_{2}=(0,1)$ (the standard basis vectors for $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ ) so you don't actually have to solve for them to write out the general solution to $Y^{\prime}=J Y$ - that's one reason why canonical form is nice!

2 Similar matrices, like $J$ and $A$ (which are similar by the equation $J=T^{-1} A T$ ), always have the same eigenvalues, so you don't have to solve for the eigenvalues of $J$ since you've already found the eigenvalues of $A$.
3. Page 58, exercise 6.

1 The question asks that you sketch regions of the ab-plane where the canonical form of the system is different, not where the system has different types of phase portraits. The question of which regions in the $a b$-plane have different canonical forms is simpler though if you did identify the different phase portraits (which is more work) that's at least good practice!
There are four distinct canonical forms $J$ for the case where $A$ is a $2 \times 2$ matrix:
i. Real, distinct eigenvalues $\lambda, \mu$ :

$$
J=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\lambda & 0 \\
0 & \mu
\end{array}\right)
$$

ii. Repeated eigenvalue $\lambda$, where geom $(\lambda)=2$ :

$$
J=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\lambda & 0 \\
0 & \lambda
\end{array}\right)
$$

iii. Repeated eigenvalue $\lambda$, where $\operatorname{geom}(\lambda)=1$ :

$$
J=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\lambda & 1 \\
0 & \lambda
\end{array}\right)
$$

iv. Complex conjugate eigenvalues $\lambda=\alpha \pm i \beta$ :

$$
J=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\alpha & \beta \\
-\beta & \alpha
\end{array}\right)
$$

Away from $(a, b)=(0,0)$, we are always in the case i , because we always have real, distinct eigenvalues - even if one of them is 0 - so you don't have to single out the cases where one eigenvalue is 0 as different (see the solutions for more detail). The only point in the $a b$-plane that has a canonical form that is different than case i is $(a, b)=(0,0)$, because at this point, the system has the canonical form $J=A=0$. This is case ii, not iii.

2 Did not sketch the $a b$-plane (as the question asks) and did not identify the different canonical forms, but your eigenvalue analysis is correct - see comment 1 . (-2)
3 You did sketch the $a b$-plane and correctly deduced the various phase portraits in the system, but you did not identify the different canonical forms - see comment 1 . (-1)

4 Did not sketch the $a b$-plane (as the question asks) but otherwise correctly identified the different canonical forms. (-1)
5 Just because $\lambda=0$ is a repeated eigenvalue for $(a, b)=(0,0)$ does not immediately imply that the canonical form is case iii above (there's also case ii for repeated eigenvalues) see explanation in comment 1 and the solutions. (-1)
4. Page 59, exercise 11.

1 Either missing or incorrect phase portrait/phase portrait description - see solutions. (-3)
5. Page 59, exercise 13.

1 The statement you're proving here is actually the Cayley-Hamilton theorem, which actually holds for any $n \times n$ matrix $A$ (and not just in the $2 \times 2$ case you've been asked to show in this question).
2 You can't assume that $A$ satisfies its own characteristic equation when that's actually what you're trying to prove here (that would be circular reasoning).
6. Page 59, exercise 14.

1 You should have prefaced your proof with the statement, "Either $V \in \mathbb{R}^{2}$ is an eigenvector of $A$ with eigenvalue $\lambda$, or it is not", to make it clear that your proof works for all $V \in \mathbb{R}^{2}$.
2 Make sure you show that your candidate eigenvector $W=(A-\lambda I) V$ is non-zero, as eigenvectors are (by definition) non-zero vectors. (-1)

