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#### Abstract

In this work, two new iterative methods are proposed for finding simple roots of non-linear equations. The new methods are the modifications of the existing work proposed by Rafiullah and Jabeen (New eighth and sixteenth order iterative methods to solve nonlinear equations, International Journal of Applied and Computational Mathematics 3 (2017), 2467 - 2476). The first method obtained is of fifth-order two-step with memory method while the second scheme is three-point eight-order optimal without memory method. Firstly, the Hermite interpolation polynomial is employed to eliminate the first derivative. To maintain order, the conversion to a memory scheme was accomplished by introducing self-accelerated parameters, all without requiring any new function evaluations. Additionally, the Gauss quadrature approach was incorporated for the first derivative, aiming to attain optimal eighth-order convergence. In particular, the efficiency index is increased from 1.4953 to 1.7099 and 1.5157 to 1.6817 for fifth- and eighth-orders respectively. Some real-life applicationbased problems, such as Kepler's equation, an ocean engineering problem, Planck's radiation law, a blood rheology model, and the charge between two parallel plates were presented to validate and demonstrate the superiority of the proposed scheme. Another benefit of the proposed scheme is on the restriction of the Newton's method that $f^{\prime}(v) \neq 0$ can be eliminated close to the root.
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## 1. Introduction

In many contemporary scientific disciplines, especially in the realms of computational and applied mathematics, the usage of root-finding algorithms has grown importance. In this day and age, modern computer programs such as Matlab, SageMath, Maple, Mathcad and MATHEMATICA among others can be used to perform a wide range of root-finding techniques. In order to find the simple root of non-linear equations of the type

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(v)=0, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f: D \subset R \rightarrow R$ is a scalar function on an open interval $D$. The search for the polynomial's roots is the most significant among them, since it has an immense impact on a variety of other domains of modern research in addition to applied and computational mathematics. Mathematical study alone does not satisfy the need to solve nonlinear equations due to the fact that many partial, ordinary, integral, and integro-differential equations frequently result in systems of nonlinear equations after being discretized. Generally speaking, nonlinear phenomena are constructed using models containing nonlinear equations, and they are not just found in academics. These equations are used frequently in daily life for tasks like measuring rocket speed determining a system's eigenvalues, computing the simple harmonic oscillation (Avallone and Baumeister [3]), determining the compressibility of gases (Chaudhary et al. [5]), measuring the variation of the local heat (Jaturonglumlert and Kiatsiriroat [19]), discussing the aging model of a cell's energy-producing organelle (mitochondria) etc. Technical problems of this nature often cannot be solved analytically, demanding the employment of iterative techniques. They must therefore be managed using numerical methods having higher order of convergence and reasonable computational cost. In this way, Newton's method (Ortega [33]) is one of the oldest technique for solving such equations given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v_{n+1}=v_{n}-\frac{f\left(v_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Traub [50] demonstrated that Scheme (2) possesses the second-order of convergence.
Recently, the research and development of multi-point iterative algorithms have recently attracted more attention to obtain higher order of convergence with decrease in computational cost. Nowadays, lot of attention is given to multi-point iterative methods with memory that employs one or more self accelerated parameters, e.g, Abdullah et al. [1], Choubey and Jaiswal [7], Choubey et al. [10], Kansal et al. [20], and Wang and Zhang [54], etc. to accelearte order of convergence without any extra function evaluations. Furthermore, the most popular approaches for comparing the effectiveness of iterative methods is the efficiency index, which can be calculated using the formula $r^{\frac{1}{q}}$, where $r$ is the iterative scheme's convergence order and $q$ is the number of functions that must be found during each iteration. As mentioned by Kung and Traub [26] in his conjecture that the iterative scheme is optimal if fulfills the convergence order as $2^{q-1}$ where $q$ represents number of functional evaluations. Several authors have developed efficient iterative algorithms of various kinds. The composition technique is the preferred approach for building an optimal method, along with the use of various approximations and interpolations to reduce the number of functional evaluations. Various fourth- and eighth order optimal iterative algorithms have been developed, see e.g., Chun and Lee [11], Kung and Traub [26], Liu and Wang [28], Pandey et al. [35], Parimala et al. [36], Rafiullah and Jabeen [40], Sharma and Arora [45] and the references cited therein.

In this paper, we proposed a new two-point with memory scheme of fifth order and an optimal eighth-order without memory scheme. The main goal for employing these techniques is to construct an efficient root-finding approaches and to develop an approximation for derivatives. The new methods are the modifications of the existing work proposed by Rafiullah and Jabeen [40]. The primary driving force behind this research can be attributed by combining Hermite Interpolation polynomial to remove first derivative. Furthermore, self accelerated parameters are employed to preserve order of convergence without any new functional evaluations.In addition, we combine Gauss Quadrature approach for the first derivative, to achieve the eighthorder of convergence with optimality. The rest of the paper is discussed as follows. In Section 2 and its subsections, the new schemes and their convergence analysis is illustrated. In Section 3 , some application based problems are provided to illustrate theoretical findings. Section 4 ends with the conclusion.

## 2. Construction of the Proposed Methods

Rafiullah [39] proposed the following iterative method without memory for solving non linear equations as:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
u_{n}=v_{n}-\frac{f\left(v_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)},  \tag{3}\\
v_{n+1}=u_{n}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)}-\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}\right]^{2} \frac{f^{\prime \prime}\left(u_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

The iterative method (3) denoted by $M R 1$ involves five evaluations of the function having an efficiency index $r^{\frac{1}{f}}=5^{\frac{1}{5}}=1.3797$. To reduce the number of function evaluations, Rafiullah and Jabeen [40] modified (3) and derived two new iterative methods of fifth and eighth-order without memory methods. Finite difference and Lagrange interpolation were utilized to remove $f^{\prime \prime}\left(u_{n}\right)$ and $f^{\prime}\left(w_{n}\right)$ respectively and is given by:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
u_{n}=v_{n}-\frac{f\left(v_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)} \\
v_{n+1}=u_{n}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)^{2}\left(f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)-f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)\right)}{2\left(f\left(v_{n}\right)-f\left(u_{n}\right)\right) f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)^{2}} \tag{4}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

and

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
u_{n}=v_{n}-\frac{f\left(v_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}, \\
w_{n}=u_{n}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)^{2}\left(f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)-f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)\right)}{2\left(f\left(v_{n}\right)-f\left(u_{n}\right)\right) f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)^{2}},  \tag{5}\\
v_{n+1}=w_{n}-\frac{f\left(w_{n}\right)\left(\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-w_{n}\right)\left(u_{n}-w_{n}\right)\right)}{-f\left(w_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-2 w_{n}-u_{n}\right)+f\left(u_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-w_{n}\right)^{2}-f\left(u_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-z_{n}\right)^{2}} .
\end{array}\right\}
$$

The method defined by (4) denoted by $M R 2$ holds the order as five and involves four function evaluations with efficiency index $5^{\frac{1}{4}}=1.4953$ while (5) is of eighth order involving five function evaluations per cycle with efficiency index $8^{\frac{1}{5}}=1.5157$.

Removing one more derivative in (4) with respect to $y$ plays a significant role to develop an optimal iterative methods of order four. At this point, we will approximate $f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)$ by the use Hermite interpolating polynomial of second degree. Towards this end, let us suppose that

$$
\begin{align*}
& R(k)=\sum_{j=0}^{2} c_{j}\left(k-u_{n}\right)^{j},  \tag{6}\\
& R^{\prime}(k)=c_{1}+2 c_{2}\left(k-u_{n}\right), \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

where $c_{0}, c_{1}$ and $c_{2}$ are unknown parameters and can be found by applying the following conditions as

$$
R\left(v_{n}\right)=f\left(v_{n}\right), R^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)=f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right), R\left(u_{n}\right)=f\left(u_{n}\right) \text { and } R^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)=f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) .
$$

While utilizing the interpolation conditions, the following systems of equations are obtained:

$$
\begin{align*}
& R\left(v_{n}\right)=c_{0}=f\left(v_{n}\right), \\
& R^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)=c_{1}=f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right), \\
& R\left(u_{n}\right)=c_{0}+c_{1}\left(u_{n}-v_{n}\right)+c_{2}\left(u_{n}-v_{n}\right)^{2}=f\left(u_{n}\right),  \tag{8}\\
& R^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)=c_{1}+2 c_{2}\left(u_{n}-v_{n}\right)=f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

On solving (8), the desired outcome is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)=\left(2 \frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)-f\left(v_{n}\right)}{u_{n}-v_{n}}\right)-f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)=R\left(v_{n}, u_{n}\right) . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

So, the iterative method (4) and (5) becomes:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
u_{n}=v_{n}-\frac{f\left(v_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)},  \tag{10}\\
v_{n+1}=u_{n}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)}{R\left(v_{n}, u_{n}\right)}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)^{2}\left(f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)-R\left(v_{n}, u_{n}\right)\right)}{2\left(f\left(v_{n}\right)-f\left(u_{n}\right)\right) f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)^{2}} .
\end{array}\right\}
$$

The iterative method defined by (10) is an optimal fourth-order method with only three function evaluations. The error equation of 10 is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
-d_{2} d_{3} e_{n}^{4}+O\left(e_{n}^{5}\right) \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since, the main motive of this study is to minimize the cost of function evaluations of (4) while preserving the order of convergence. So, we attempt to hold the order of convergence as five while converting (10) to with memory scheme without any new functional evaluation. For that purpose, parameter $T$ is added in the initial step of method defined by (10) as:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
u_{n}=v_{n}-\frac{f\left(v_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)-T f\left(v_{n}\right)},  \tag{12}\\
v_{n+1}=u_{n}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)}{R\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)^{2}\left(f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)-R\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)\right)}{2\left(f\left(v_{n}\right)-f\left(u_{n}\right)\right) f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)^{2}}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

The error expression for the iterative scheme (12) is as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
e_{n, u}= & u_{n}-\beta \\
= & \left(d_{2}-T\right) e_{n}^{2}+\left(-2 d_{2}^{2}-T^{2}+2 d_{2} T+2 d_{3}\right) e_{n}^{3}+\left(T^{3}+5 T d_{2}^{2}-4 d_{2}^{3}\right. \\
& \left.-4 T c_{3}+d_{2}\left(7 d_{3}-3 T^{2}\right)-3 d_{4}\right) e_{n}^{4}+O\left(e_{n}^{5}\right),  \tag{13}\\
e_{n, v}= & v_{n}-\beta \\
= & \left(T-d_{2}\right) d_{3} e_{n}^{4}+\left(-10 T d_{2}^{3}+5 d_{2}^{5}+\left(T^{2}-2 d_{3}\right) d_{3}+d_{2}^{2}\left(5 T^{2}+2 d_{3}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+2 T d_{4}-2 d_{2}\left(T d_{3}+d_{4}\right)\right) e_{n}^{5}+O\left(e_{n}^{6}\right) . \tag{14}
\end{align*}
$$

where $e_{n, v}=v_{v}-\beta, e_{n, u}=u_{n}-\beta$ and $c_{i}=\frac{f^{(i)}(\beta)}{i!f^{\prime}(\beta)}$ for $i=2,3, \ldots$ and $T \in R$. It can be observed that order of convergence remains consistent when $T \neq d_{2}$. We assume $T=d_{2}=\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(\beta)}{f^{\prime}(\beta)}$ to improve order of convergence and will the parameter $T$ with $T_{n}$. Now, $T_{n}$ is evaluated by the use of current and previous information in such a way that satisfies the condition $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{n}=d_{2}=f^{\prime \prime}(\beta) / 2 f^{\prime}(\beta)$ such that fourth asymptotic convergence in the error expression (14) should be zero.

First, we consider distinct values of $T$ are considered to improve order of (14) as fallows:
Method 1:

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{n}=\frac{H_{2}^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}{2 f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}, \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $H_{2}(v)=f\left(v_{n}\right)+f\left[v_{n}, v_{n}\right]\left(v-v_{n}\right)+f\left[v_{n}, v_{n}, u_{n-1}\right]\left(v-v_{n}\right)^{2}$ and $H_{2}^{\prime \prime}(v)=2 f\left[v_{n}, v_{n}, u_{n-1}\right]$.
Method 2:

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{n}=\frac{H_{3}^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}{2 f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $H_{3}(v)=H_{2}(v)+f\left[v_{n}, v_{n}, u_{n-1}, v_{n-1}\right]\left(v-v_{n}\right)^{2}\left(v-u_{n-1}\right)$ and $H_{3}^{\prime \prime}(v)=2 f\left[v_{n}, v_{n}, u_{n-1}\right]+$ $2 f\left[v_{n}, v_{n}, u_{n-1}, u_{n-1}\right]\left(v_{n}-u_{n-1}\right)$.
Method 3:

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{n}=\frac{H_{4}^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}{2 f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $H_{4}(v)=H_{3}(v)+f\left[v_{n}, v_{n}, u_{n-1}, v_{n-1}, v_{n-1}\right]\left(v-v_{n}\right)^{2}\left(v-u_{n-1}\right)\left(v-v_{n-1}\right)$ and $H_{4}^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{n}\right)=$ $2 f\left[v_{n}, v_{n}, u_{n-1}\right]-\left(2 f\left[v_{n}, u_{n-1}, v_{n-1}, v_{n-1}\right]\left(v_{n}-u_{n-1}\right)-4 f\left[v_{n}, v_{n}, u_{n-1}, v_{n-1}\right]\right)$.

To obtain a with memory scheme, we replace T with $T_{n}$ as:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
u_{n}=v_{n}-\frac{f\left(v_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)-T_{n} f\left(v_{n}\right)},  \tag{18}\\
v_{n+1}=u_{n}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)}{R\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)^{2}\left(f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)-R\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)\right)}{2\left(f\left(v_{n}\right)-f\left(u_{n}\right)\right) f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)^{2}}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

The scheme (18) is represented by $A S 1$.
Note. The condition $H_{s}^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)=f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)$ fulfilled by the Hermite interpolation polynomial $H_{s}(v)$ for $s=2,3,4$. So, $T_{n}=\frac{H_{s}^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}{2^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}$ can be expressed as $T_{n}=\frac{H_{s}^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}{2 H_{s}^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}(s=2,3,4)$.
Theorem 2.1. Let $s$ be the degree of the Hermite interpolating polynomial $H_{s}$ that interpolates a function $f$ at interpolation nodes $v_{n}, v_{n}, l_{0}, \ldots, l_{s-2}$ embedded in an interval $I$ and the derivative $f^{(s+1)}$ is continuous in I and the Hermite polynomial $H_{s}\left(v_{n}\right)=f\left(v_{n}\right), H_{s}^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)=f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)$, $H_{s}\left(l_{i}\right)=f\left(l_{i}\right)(i=0,1,2, \ldots, s-2)$. Let $e_{l, i}=l_{i}-\beta(i=0,1,2, \ldots, s-2)$ denote the errors and assume that
(i) all nodes $v_{n}, l_{0}, \ldots, l_{s-2}$ are fairly close to the root $\beta$.
(ii) The condition holds $e_{n}=O\left(e_{l, 0}, \ldots, e_{l, s-2}\right)$ holds. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{s}^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{n}\right)=2 f^{\prime}(\beta)\left(c_{2}-(-1)^{s-1} c_{s+1} \prod_{i=0}^{s-2} e_{l, i}+3 d_{3} e_{n}\right) \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{n}=\frac{H_{s}^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}{2 f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)} \sim\left(d_{2}-(-1)^{s-1} c_{s+1} \prod_{i=0}^{s-2} e_{l, i}+\left(3 d_{3}-2 d_{2}^{2}\right) e_{n}\right) \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{n}-c_{2} \sim\left(-(-1)^{s-1} c_{s+1} \prod_{i=0}^{s-2} e_{l, i}+\left(3 d_{3}-2 d_{2}^{2}\right) e_{n}\right) \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. The error equation of the Hermite interpolation polynomial is computed as fallows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(v)-H_{s}(v)=\frac{f^{(s+1)}(\psi)}{(s+1)!}\left(v-v_{n}\right)^{2} \prod_{i=0}^{s-2}\left(v-l_{i}\right), \quad(\psi \in I) . \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

On differentiating equation (22) twice at point $v=v_{n}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{s}^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{n}\right)=f^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{n}\right)-2 \frac{f^{(s+1)}(\psi)}{(s+1)!} \prod_{i=0}^{s-2}\left(v_{n}-l_{i}\right), \quad(\psi \in I) \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

At point $v_{n} \in I$ and $\psi \in I$ the Taylor's series expansion of $f^{\prime}$ about the zero $\beta$ of $f$ provides

$$
\begin{align*}
& f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)=f^{\prime}(\beta)\left(1+2 d_{2} e_{n}+3 d_{3} e_{n}^{2}+O\left(e_{n}^{3}\right)\right),  \tag{24}\\
& f^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{n}\right)=f^{\prime}(\beta)\left(2 d_{2}+6 d_{3} e_{n}+O\left(e_{n}^{2}\right)\right) \tag{25}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{(s+1)}(\psi)=f^{\prime}(\beta)\left((s+1)!c_{s+1}+(s+2)!c_{s+2} e_{\psi}+O\left(e_{\psi}^{2}\right)\right), \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $e_{\psi}=\psi-\beta$. Substituting (25), (26) in (23), we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{s}^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{n}\right)=2 f^{\prime}(\beta)\left(c_{2}-(-1)^{(s-1)} c_{s+1} \prod_{j=0}^{s-2} e_{p, j}+3 c_{3} e_{n}\right) \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{H_{s}^{\prime \prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}{2 f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)} \sim\left(d_{2}-(-1)^{(s-1)} d_{s+1} \prod_{i=0}^{s-2} e_{l, i}+\left(3 d_{3}-2 d_{2}^{2}\right) e_{n}\right), \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

hence

$$
T_{n} \sim\left(d_{2}-(-1)^{s-1} c_{s+1} \prod_{i=0}^{s-2} e_{l, i}+\left(3 d_{3}-2 d_{2}^{2}\right) e_{n}\right)
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{n}-d_{2} \sim\left(-(-1)^{s-1} d_{s+1} \prod_{i=0}^{s-2} e_{l, i}+\left(3 d_{3}-2 d_{2}^{2}\right) e_{n}\right) . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

To determine the convergence order of an iterative technique (18), we apply the idea of $R$ order of convergence (Ortega and Rheinboldt [34]) and the following statement (Alefeld and Herzberger [2]).

Theorem 2.2. If the approximation errors $e_{i}=v_{i}-\beta$ acquired in an iterative root finding method IM satisfy

$$
e_{q+1} \sim \prod_{j=0}^{s-2}\left(e_{q-j}\right)^{s_{i}}, \quad q \geq q\left(\left\{e_{q}\right\}\right),
$$

then the inequality is fulfilled $O_{R}(I M, \beta) \geq m^{*}$ where $O_{R}(I M, \beta)$ is the $R$-order of convergence of iterative method and $m^{*}$ is unique positive solution of the expression $m_{n+1}-\sum_{j=0}^{n} s_{i} m^{n-i}=0$.

For the new iterative scheme with memory (18), the following convergence theorem can be established.

Theorem 2.3. Let $T_{n}$ which is determined by (15) to (17) in the iterative technique iterative scheme (18) be the variable parameter. If an initial approximation $v_{0}$ is close enough to simple root $\beta$ of $f(v)$ then for the iterative methods (18) the $R$-order of convergence for the corresponding expressions (15) to (17) of $T_{n}$ with memory is at least 4.56, 4.79, and 5, respectively.

Proof. Let $\left\{v_{n}\right\}$ be the sequence formed by the Iterative Method (IM) converging to $\beta$ of $f(v)$ with $R$-order of convergence as $O_{R}(I M, \beta) \geq x$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
e_{n+1} \sim D_{n, x} e_{n}^{x} \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

By taking $n \rightarrow \infty$ then the asymptotic error constant $D_{x}$ of Iterative Method (IM) will tend to $D_{n, x}$ and hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
e_{n+1} \sim D_{n, x}\left(D_{n-1, x} e_{n-1}^{x}\right)^{x}=D_{n, x}\left(D_{n-1, x} e_{n-1}^{x^{2}}\right) \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

With the aid of (15)-(17) and $T_{n}$, the error equation of with memory iterative scheme (15) can be constructed as:

$$
\begin{align*}
& e_{n, u}=u_{n}-\beta \sim\left(d_{2}-T_{n}\right) e_{n}^{2}  \tag{33}\\
& e_{n+1}=v_{n}-\beta \sim B_{n, 4}\left(T_{n}-d_{2}\right) e_{n}^{4} \tag{34}
\end{align*}
$$

where $B_{n, 4}$ is a varying parameter evaluated from (14).
Method 1 (Evaluation of $T_{n}$ by (15)): The computation of $T_{n}$ is identical to the derivation of (31). Let us assume that $y$ is the R -order of convergence of the iterative scheme $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$, thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
e_{n, u} \sim D_{n, y} e_{n}^{y} \sim D_{n, y}\left(D_{n-1, x} e_{n-1}^{x}\right)^{y} \sim D_{n, x} D_{n-1, y}^{x} e_{n-1}^{x y} . \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

By applying Theorem 2.1 for $s=2$ and $l_{0}=u_{n-1}$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{n}-c_{2} \sim d_{3} e_{l, 0}=d_{3} e_{n-1, u} \tag{36}
\end{equation*}
$$

By using the expressions (33)-(34) and (36), we achieve the following:

$$
\begin{equation*}
e_{n, u} \sim-d_{3} e_{n-1, u}\left(D_{n-1, x} e_{n-1}^{x}\right)^{2} \sim-d_{3} D_{n-1, x} D_{n-1, y}^{2} e_{n-1}^{2 x+y} \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
e_{n+1} & \sim d_{3} e_{n-1, u} B_{n, 4} e_{n, 4} \\
& \sim B_{n, 4} d_{3}\left(D_{n-1, y} e_{n-1}^{y}\right)\left(D_{n-1, x} e_{n-1}^{x}\right)^{4} \\
& \sim B_{n, 4} d_{3} D_{n-1, y} D_{n-1, x}^{4} e_{n-1}^{4 x+y} . \tag{38}
\end{align*}
$$

By contrasting the powers of $e_{n-1}$ in the relation pairs (35)-(37) and (32)-(38), the following systems of equations are obtained:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
2 x+y=x y  \tag{39}\\
4 x+y=x^{2}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

$x=4.5616$ and $y=2.5615$ satisfy the solution of the system of equations (39). In light of this, when $L n$ is estimated, the $R$-order of convergence of the iterative method (35)-(37) is at least 4.5616.

Method 2 (Computation of $T_{n}$ by (16)): Applying Theorem 2.1 for $s=3, l_{0}=u_{n-1}$ and $l_{1}=v_{n-1}$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{n}-d_{2} \sim-d_{4} e_{l, 0} e_{l, 1}=-d_{4} e_{n-1, u} e_{n-1}, \tag{40}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now from (33), (34) and (40), we achieve

$$
\begin{equation*}
e_{n, u} \sim\left(d_{2}-T_{n}\right) e_{n}^{2} \sim d_{4} e_{n-1} e_{n-1, u}\left(D_{n-1, x} e_{n-1}^{x}\right)^{2} \sim c_{4} D_{n-1, y} D_{n-1, x}^{2} e_{n-1}^{2 x+y+1} \tag{41}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
e_{n+1} & \sim-B_{n, 4} d_{4} e_{n-1, u} e_{n-1} e_{n}^{4} \\
& \sim-B_{n, 4} c_{4}\left(D_{n-1, y} e_{n-1}^{y}\right) e_{n-1}\left(D_{n-1, x} e_{n-1}^{x}\right)^{4} \\
& \sim-B_{n, 4} c_{4} D_{n-1, y} D_{n-1, x}^{4} e_{n-1}^{4 x+y+1} . \tag{42}
\end{align*}
$$

By equating the indices of $e_{n-1}$ with the help of relations (35)-(41) and (32)-(42), resulting equations are obtained as:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
2 x+y+1=r p  \tag{43}\\
4 x+2 y+1=r^{2}
\end{array}\right\} .
$$

$r=4.7913$ and $p=2.7912$ specify the solution to system of equations (43). Therefore, for with memory iterative technique (16)-(18) the $R$-order of convergence is at least 4.7913.

Method 3 (Computation of $T_{n}$ by (17): Applying Theorem 2.1 for $s=4, l_{0}=u_{n-1}$ and $l_{1}=l_{2}=v_{n-1}$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{n}-d_{2} \sim d_{5} e_{l, 0} e_{l, 1} e_{l, 2}=d_{4} e_{n-1, u} e_{n-1}^{2} \tag{44}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now from (33), (34) and (44), we achieve

$$
\begin{equation*}
e_{n, u} \sim\left(d_{2}-T_{n}\right) e_{n}^{2} \sim-d_{5} e_{n-1}^{2} e_{n-1, u}\left(D_{n-1, x} e_{n-1}^{x}\right)^{2} \sim-c_{5} D_{n-1, y} D_{n-1, x}^{2} e_{n-1}^{2 x+y+2} \tag{45}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
e_{n+1} & \sim B_{n, 4} d_{5} e_{n-1, u} e_{n-1}^{2} e_{n}^{4} \\
& \sim B_{n, 4} d_{4}\left(D_{n-1, y} e_{n-1}^{y}\right) e_{n-1}^{2}\left(D_{n-1, x} e_{n-1}^{x}\right)^{4} \\
& \sim B_{n, 4} d_{4} D_{n-1, y} D_{n-1, x}^{4} e_{n-1}^{4 x+y+2} . \tag{46}
\end{align*}
$$

By equating the indices of $e_{n-1}$ with the help of relations (35)-(41) and (32)-(42), the resulting equations are obtained as below:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
2 x+y+2=r p  \tag{47}\\
4 x+y+2=r^{2}
\end{array}\right\} .
$$

$r=5.00$ and $p=3.00$ specify the solution to system of equations (47). Therefore, for with memory iterative technique (17)-(18) the $R$-order of convergence is at least 4.7913.

### 2.1 Optimal Eight-Order Method

In this subsection, we attempt to construct an optimal eighth-order iterative method while preserving the order. Since, the iterative method (5) is of eighth-order with five function evaluations. If we take Kung and Traub's notion of optimality into consideration then (5) denoted by $S S 1$ is not optimal given as;

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
u_{n}=v_{n}-\frac{f\left(v_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}, \\
w_{n}=u_{n}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)^{2}\left(f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)-f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)\right)}{2\left(f\left(v_{n}\right)-f\left(u_{n}\right)\right) f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)^{2}},  \tag{48}\\
v_{n+1}=w_{n}-\frac{f\left(w_{n}\right)\left(\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-w_{n}\right)\left(u_{n}-w_{n}\right)\right)}{-f\left(w_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-2 w_{n}-u_{n}\right)+f\left(u_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-w_{n}\right)^{2}-f\left(u_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-z_{n}\right)^{2}} .
\end{array}\right\}
$$

By replacing the approximating value of $f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)$ defined by (9) into (48), we have

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
u_{n}=v_{n}-\frac{f\left(v_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}, \\
v_{n+1}=u_{n}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)}{R\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)^{2}\left(f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)-R\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)\right)}{2\left(f\left(v_{n}\right)-f\left(u_{n}\right)\right) f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)^{2}},  \tag{49}\\
v_{n+1}=w_{n}-\frac{f\left(w_{n}\right)\left(\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-w_{n}\right)\left(u_{n}-w_{n}\right)\right)}{-f\left(w_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-2 w_{n}-u_{n}\right)+f\left(u_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-w_{n}\right)^{2}-f\left(u_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-z_{n}\right)^{2}} .
\end{array}\right\}
$$

The error equation for (49) is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
3 d_{2}^{2} d_{3}^{2} e_{n}^{7}+O\left(e_{n}^{8}\right) \tag{50}
\end{equation*}
$$

It can be observed from (49) that the iterative method (48) is of seventh-order. Since, reduction of function evaluation also decreased the convergence order ,so our aim is not yet achieved. Main motive is to decrease both the function evaluation and preserving the order. To achieve goal for finding the most suitable approximation to make it optimal. Instead of using Lagrange interpolation in the third step of (5) proposed by Rafiullah and Jabeen [40] to approximate $f^{\prime}\left(w_{n}\right)$, we utilized the Gauss quadrature approach by considering the Newton's formula in order to derive Gauss quadrature approximation as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime}\left(w_{n}\right)=g^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)+\int_{v_{n}}^{w_{n}} f^{\prime \prime}(s) d s . \tag{51}
\end{equation*}
$$

By means of weight function the second derivative in (51) can be approximated:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{v_{n}}^{w_{n}} f^{\prime \prime}(s) d s=c_{1} f\left(v_{n}\right)+c_{2} f\left(u_{n}\right)+c_{3} f\left(w_{n}\right)+c_{4} f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right) . \tag{52}
\end{equation*}
$$

For finding the parameters $c_{1}, c_{2}, c_{3}$ and $c_{4}$. We employ four functions $f(s)=1, f(s)=s$, $f(s)=s^{2}$ and $f(s)=s^{3}$ in order to obtain a family of four equations as:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
c_{1}+c_{2}+c_{3}=0  \tag{53}\\
c_{1} v_{n}+c_{2} u_{n}+c_{3} w_{n}+c_{4}=0 \\
c_{1} v_{n}^{2}+c_{2} u_{n}^{2}+c_{3} w_{n}^{2}+2 c_{4} v_{n}=2\left(w_{n}-v_{n}\right), \\
c_{1} v_{n}^{3}+c_{2} u_{n}^{3}+c_{3} w_{n}^{3}+3 c_{4} v_{n}^{2}=3\left(w_{n}^{2}-v_{n}^{2}\right) .
\end{array}\right\}
$$

The solution of the system of equations (53) is specified by four constants $c_{1}, c_{2}, c_{3}$ and $c_{4}$ and consequently by substituting these values into (51), we obtain the value of $f^{\prime}\left(w_{n}\right)$ as:

$$
\begin{align*}
f^{\prime}\left(w_{n}\right)= & -\frac{\left.u_{n}-w_{n}\right)\left(3 v_{n}-2 u_{n}-w_{n}\right)}{\left(v_{n}-w_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)^{2}} f\left(v_{n}\right)+\frac{\left(v_{n}-w_{n}\right)^{2}}{\left(u_{n}-w_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)^{2}} f\left(v_{n}\right) \\
& -\frac{\left(v_{n}+2 u_{n}-3 w_{n}\right)}{\left(v_{n}-w_{n}\right)\left(u_{n}-w_{n}\right)} f\left(w_{n}\right)+\frac{\left(2 v_{n}+u_{n}-w_{n}\right)}{\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)} f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right) . \tag{54}
\end{align*}
$$

On simplifying the expression (54) and substituting it in the last step of (5). We achieve the following:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
u_{n}=v_{n}-\frac{f\left(v_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)-f\left(v_{n}\right)}, \\
v_{n+1}=u_{n}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)}{R\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)^{2}\left(f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)-R\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)\right)}{2\left(f\left(v_{n}\right)-f\left(u_{n}\right)\right) f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)^{2}},  \tag{55}\\
v_{n+1}=w_{n}-g\left(w_{n}\right) \frac{\left(v_{n}-w_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right)^{2}\left(u_{n}-w_{n}\right)}{E f\left(v_{n}\right)+F f\left(u_{n}\right)+G f\left(w_{n}\right)+H f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)},
\end{array}\right\}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E=-\left(u_{n}-w_{n}\right)^{2}\left(3 v_{n}-2 u_{n}-w_{n}\right), \\
& F=\left(v_{n}-w_{n}\right)^{3}, \\
& G=-\left(v_{n}-v_{n}\right)^{2}\left(v_{n}+2 u_{n}-3 w\right), \\
& H=\left(u_{n}-w_{n}\right)^{2}\left(v_{n}-w_{n}\right)\left(v_{n}-u_{n}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The error expression for (51) is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{2}^{2} d_{3}\left(d_{2} d_{3}-d_{4}\right) e_{n}^{8}+O\left(e_{n}^{9}\right) \tag{56}
\end{equation*}
$$

It may be noted that our proposed iterative method (49) denoted by $S Z 1$ satisfies the hypothesis of Kung and Traub and hence is an optimal eighth-order iterative method requiring only four function evaluations.

### 2.2 Convergence Analysis of Optimal Eighth-Order Method

Theorem 2.4. Let $\beta \in D$ be a simple root of a sufficiently differentiable function $f: D \subseteq R \rightarrow R$ within an open interval $D$. Then, the three-step without memory method (49) possesses optimal eighth order of convergence with four functional evaluations per iteration, and the asymptotic error is given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{2}^{2} d_{3}\left(d_{2} d_{3}-d_{4}\right) e_{n}^{8}+O\left(e_{n}^{9}\right) . \tag{57}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $e_{n}=v_{n}-\beta$ be the error term in the $n$th iteration. Assuming that $f(\beta)=0$ and applying the Taylor's series expansion for function $f\left(v_{n}\right)$ around $\beta$, we obtain:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f\left(v_{n}\right)=f^{\prime}(\beta)\left[e_{n}+d_{2} e_{n}^{2}+d_{3} e_{n}^{3}+d_{4} e_{n}^{4}+d_{5} e_{n}^{5}+d_{6} e_{n}^{6}+d_{7} e_{n}^{7}+d_{8} e_{n}^{8}+O\left(e_{n}\right)^{9}\right] \tag{58}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $d_{k}=\frac{f^{k}(\beta)}{k f^{\prime}(\beta)}$ for $k \in N$. Similarly, applying Taylor's series expansion for the function $g^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)$ around $\beta$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)=f^{\prime}(\beta)\left[1+2 d_{2} e_{n}+3 d_{3} e_{n}^{2}+4 d_{4} e_{n}^{3}+5 d_{5} e_{n}^{4}+6 d_{6} e_{n}^{5}+7 d_{7} e_{n}^{6}+8 d_{8} e_{n}^{7}+9 d_{9} e_{n}^{7}+O\left(e_{n}\right)^{9}\right] . \tag{59}
\end{equation*}
$$

On dividing (58) by (59), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{g\left(v_{n}\right)}{g^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}=e_{n}-d_{2} e_{n}^{2}+2\left(d_{2}^{2}-d_{3}\right) e_{n}^{3}+\left(-4 d_{2}^{3}+7 d_{2} d_{3}-3 d_{4}\right) e_{n}^{4}+O\left(e_{n}\right)^{5} . \tag{60}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting (60) in the first step of (55), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.v_{n}=\beta+d_{2} e_{n}^{2}+\left(-2 d_{2}^{2}+d_{2}\right) e_{n}^{3}+\left(4 d_{2}^{3}-7 d_{2} d_{3}+3 d_{4}\right) e_{n}^{4}+O\left(e_{n}\right)^{5}\right] \tag{61}
\end{equation*}
$$

Applying Taylor's series expansion for the function $f\left(v_{n}\right)$ around $\beta$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
f\left(u_{n}\right)=f^{\prime}(\beta)\left[d_{2} e_{n}^{2}+\left(-2 d_{2}^{2}+d_{2}\right) e_{n}^{3}+\left(5 d_{2}^{3}-7 d_{2} d_{3}+3 d_{4}\right) e_{n}^{4}+O\left(e_{n}\right)^{5}\right] \tag{62}
\end{equation*}
$$

Also, from the second step of (55) with the aid of (58) and (62), we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& f\left(v_{n}\right)-f\left(u_{n}\right)=e_{n}+\left(2 d_{2}^{2}-d_{3}\right) e_{n}^{3}+\left(-5 d_{2}^{3}+7 d_{2} d_{3}-2 d_{4}\right) e_{n}^{4}+O\left(e_{n}\right)^{5}  \tag{63}\\
& 2\left(\frac{f\left(v_{n}\right)-f\left(v_{n}\right)}{v_{n}-u_{n}}\right)-f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)= \\
& \tag{64}
\end{align*}
$$

and with the help of (62), (63) and (64), we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)\left(f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)-f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)\right)}{2\left(f\left(v_{n}\right)-f\left(u_{n}\right)\right) f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)^{2}} \\
& \quad=d-2^{3} e_{n}^{4}+\left(-4 d-2^{4}+\frac{1}{2}\left(4 d_{2}^{2}\right)\left(-2 d_{2}^{2}+2 d_{3}\right)+d_{2}^{2}\left(6 d_{3}-2\left(d_{2}^{2}+d_{3}\right)\right)\right) e_{n}^{5}+O\left(e_{n}\right)^{6} . \tag{65}
\end{align*}
$$

Substitute (62), (63), (64) and (65) in the second step of (55), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
w_{n}=\beta+\left(3 d_{2}^{3}-d_{2} d_{3}\right) e_{n}^{4}-2\left(9 d_{2}^{4}+10 d_{2}^{2} d_{3}+d_{2}^{2}+d_{2} d_{4}\right) e_{n}^{5}+O\left(e_{n}\right)^{6} . \tag{66}
\end{equation*}
$$

Again, we apply Taylor's series for the function $f\left(w_{n}\right)$ around $\beta$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
f\left(w_{n}\right)=f^{\prime}(\beta)\left[\left(3 d_{2}^{3}-d_{2} d_{3}\right) e_{n}^{4}-2\left(9 d_{2}^{4}+10 d_{2}^{2} d_{3}+d_{2}^{2}+d_{2} d_{4}\right) e_{n}^{5}+O\left(e_{n}\right)^{6}\right] . \tag{67}
\end{equation*}
$$

With the aid of (58), (59), (62), (63), (66) and (67), we obtain the following

$$
\begin{align*}
& E f\left(v_{n}\right)=\left(-(u-w)^{2}(3 v-2 u-w)\right) f\left(v_{n}\right)=-3 d_{2}^{2} e_{n}^{5}+O\left(e_{n}\right)^{6},  \tag{68}\\
& F f\left(u_{n}\right)=(v-w)^{3} f\left(u_{n}\right)=e_{n}^{3}+\left(-9 d_{2}^{4}+3 d_{2} d_{3}\right) e_{n}^{6}+O\left(e_{n}\right)^{7},  \tag{69}\\
& G f\left(w_{n}\right)=(v-u)^{2}(v+2 u-3 w) f\left(w_{n}\right)=e_{n}^{3}+\left(d_{2}^{2}+4 d_{3}+2\left(-2 d_{2}^{2}+d_{2}^{3}\right)\right) e_{n}^{5}+O\left(e_{n}\right)^{6},  \tag{70}\\
& H f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)=(u-w)^{2}(v-w)(v-u) g^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)=d_{2}^{2} e_{n}^{6}+\left(-d_{2}^{3}+2 d_{2}+\left(-2 d_{2}^{2}+2 d_{2}\right)\right) e_{n}^{7}+O\left(e_{n}\right)^{8} \tag{71}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
(v-w)(v-u)^{2}(u-w)=d_{2} e_{n}^{5}+\left(-4 d_{2}^{2}+2 d_{3}\right) e_{n}^{6}+O\left(e_{n}\right)^{7} . \tag{72}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, we employ (66)-(72) in the last step of the proposed method (55), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
e_{n+1}=d_{2}^{2} d_{3}\left(d_{2} d_{3}-d_{4}\right) e_{n}^{8}+O\left(e_{n}^{9}\right) \tag{73}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, our proposed method (55) is eighth-order optimal iterative method with the evaluation of three functions and one of the first derivative. Note that the efficiency index of our proposed method is $8^{\frac{1}{4}} \approx 1.6818$ which is better than Newton's method and others available in the literature.

## 3. Numerical Implementations

In order to demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed method, we performed some numerical simulations with existing with and without memory methods. A few numerical schemes that can be practically compared to the suggested scheme are briefly described in this section. Some fifth order methods are:

XW1 Fifth-order with memory scheme given in [54].

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
u_{n}=v_{n}-\frac{f\left(v_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)+L_{n} f\left(v_{n}\right)},  \tag{74}\\
v_{n+1}=u_{n}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)}{2 L_{n} f\left(v_{n}\right)+f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}\left(1+\frac{2 f\left(u_{n}\right)}{f\left(v_{n}\right)}+a\left(\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)}{f\left(v_{n}\right)}\right)^{2}\right),
\end{array}\right\}
$$

where $a \in R$ denoted by XW1, and
XW2 Fifth-order with memory scheme given [55].

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
u_{n}=v_{n}-\frac{f\left(v_{n}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)+L_{n} f\left(v_{n}\right)},  \tag{75}\\
v_{n+1}=u_{n}-\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right)}{2 L_{n} f\left(v_{n}\right)+f^{\prime}\left(v_{n}\right)}+\left(\frac{f\left(v_{n}\right)+(2+b) f\left(u_{n}\right)}{f\left(v_{n}\right)+b f\left(u_{n}\right)}\right),
\end{array}\right\}
$$

where $b \in R$ denoted by XW2.
NN1: Modified Halley's method of fifth-order given in [30].
NN2: Fifth-order Noor's method given in [31].
KU1: Chebshew Haley's method of fifth-order given in [23].
KU2: Fifth-order method proposed by Kou et al. [24].
FG1: Newton type method with fifth-order convergence given in [15].
HC1: Fifth-order method by Ham and Chun [18].
MR1: Rafiullah's fifth order method given in [39].
MR2: Rafiullah and Jubeen's method of fifth-order given in [40],
and some optimal eight orders are CP1 [11], JK1 [45], KS1 [26], LT1 [28], NS2 [9], SM1 [36], SS1 [35], SQ1 [40] and our proposed method SZ1.

In Tables 1.5 and 640, we have presented the absolute residual error $\left|f\left(v_{n}\right)\right|$ for each test function, approximated roots ( $v_{n}$ ), error in the consecutive iterations $\left|v_{n}-v_{n-1}\right|$, CPU time in seconds and the Computational Order of Convergence (COC) for all the compared methods. All the numerical results have been tabulated. Tables 15 5 and 6 shows the numerical comparisons of various two points iterative methods of fifth-order convergence and eighth-order optimal iterative methods respectively. It is clearly visible that our results are superior and efficient than existing with and without memory methods. Figures 1 and 2 shows that our proposed methods are quite superior than other existing schemes currently in use. Besides computational order of convergence, CPU time is also one of the best way to compare the effectiveness of the iterative methods. At this juncture, with the help of Mathematica 11 the command "Timeused [ ]" is used to calculate the CPU time. The numerical results were performed with the Mathematica 11 system running under Windows 10 PRo with an installed memory of 10 GB having a processor Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-3727U CPU @ 1.80 GHz 2.30 GHz speed and system type 64 -bit operating system. The COC has been calculated by using the usual formula [57]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
C O C \sim \frac{\ln \left|f\left(v_{n+1}\right) / f\left(v_{n}\right)\right|}{\ln \left|f\left(v_{n}\right) / f\left(v_{n-1}\right)\right|}, \tag{76}
\end{equation*}
$$

to verify the hypothesized convergence rate and assess computational effectiveness.

Table 1. Numerical comparisons of two-point methods with memory for $f_{1}$

| Fun. | Method | Guess | $\left\|v_{n}-v_{n-1}\right\|$ | $\log \left\|f\left(v_{n}\right)\right\|$ | COC | CPU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f_{1}$ | WX1 (74)-(15), $T_{0}=0.5$ | 1.3 | $3.4305 \mathrm{e}-54$ | 8.0355e-203 | 3.7392 | 1.421 |
|  | WX1 (74)-(16), $T_{0}=0.5$ |  | $1.8380 \mathrm{e}-56$ | $4.0614 \mathrm{e}-224$ | 4.0000 | 1.657 |
|  | WX1 (74)-(17), $T_{0}=0.5$ |  | $3.0817 \mathrm{e}-56$ | $3.5465 \mathrm{e}-223$ | 4.0000 | 1.657 |
|  | WX2 (75)-(15), $T_{0}=0.5$ |  | $3.4304 \mathrm{e}-54$ | 8.6015e-203 | 3.7392 | 0.938 |
|  | WX2 (75)-(16), $T_{0}=0.5$ |  | $1.8380 \mathrm{e}-56$ | $4.3475 \mathrm{e}-224$ | 4.0000 | 1.062 |
|  | WX2 (75)-(17), $T_{0}=0.5$ |  | $3.0816 \mathrm{e}-56$ | 3.7963e-223 | 4.0000 | 1.169 |
|  | AS1 (18)-15), $T_{0}=0.5$ |  | $4.0003 \mathrm{e}-145$ | 7.1437e-663 | 4.5612 | 1.047 |
|  | AS1 (18)-(16), $T_{0}=0.5$ |  | $1.1630 \mathrm{e}-174$ | $7.5549 \mathrm{e}-836$ | 4.7917 | 1.0 |
|  | AS1 (18)-(17), $T_{0}=0.5$ |  | $1.4154 \mathrm{e}-195$ | 1.1278e-977 | 5.0000 | 1.031 |
|  | NN1 |  | $4.9217 \mathrm{e}-146$ | $1.1741 \mathrm{e}-729$ | 5.0000 | 1.39 |
|  | NN2 |  | NC |  |  |  |
|  | KU1 |  | $1.0191 \mathrm{e}-38$ | 6.3923e-117 | 3.0000 | 1.231 |
|  | KU2 |  | $1.3669 \mathrm{e}-164$ | $1.9747 \mathrm{e}-823$ | 5.0000 | 1.169 |
|  | FG1 |  | $1.3321 \mathrm{e}-117$ | $3.2378 \mathrm{e}-586$ | 5.0000 | 1.293 |
|  | HC1 |  | $3.1028 \mathrm{e}-105$ | 5.2842e-524 | 5.0000 | 1.124 |
|  | MR1 |  | $9.6964 \mathrm{e}-117$ | $1.8264 \mathrm{e}-506$ | 5.0000 | 1.454 |
|  | MR2 |  | $1.6557 \mathrm{e}-98$ | $3.2631 \mathrm{e}-490$ | 5.0000 | 1.422 |

Table 2. Numerical comparisons of two-point methods with memory for $f_{2}$

| Fun. | Method | Guess | $\left\|v_{n}-v_{n-1}\right\|$ | $\log \left\|f\left(v_{n}\right)\right\|$ | COC | CPU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f_{2}$ | WX1 (74)-(15), $T_{0}=-0.5$ | 17.3 | $3.9401 \mathrm{e}-55$ | $6.4333 \mathrm{e}-218$ | 4.0000 | 0.812 |
|  | WX1 (74)-(16), $T_{0}=-0.5$ |  | $3.8674 \mathrm{e}-55$ | $5.9712 \mathrm{e}-218$ | 4.0000 | 0.751 |
|  | WX1 (74)-(17), $T_{0}=-0.5$ |  | $3.8656 \mathrm{e}-55$ | $5.9602 \mathrm{e}-218$ | 4.0000 | 0.936 |
|  | WX2 (75)-(15), $T_{0}=-0.5$ |  | 1.4073e-38 | $4.11085 \mathrm{e}-151$ | 4.0000 | 0.907 |
|  | WX2 (75)-(16), $T_{0}=-0.5$ |  | 1.3776e-38 | $3.7753 \mathrm{e}-151$ | 4.0000 | 0.907 |
|  | WX2 (75)-(17), $T_{0}=-0.5$ |  | $1.3769 \mathrm{e}-38$ | $3.7672 \mathrm{e}-151$ | 4.0000 | 0.843 |
|  | AS1 18)-15, $T_{0}=-0.5$ |  | $6.2854 \mathrm{e}-105$ | 8.6344e-479 | 4.5629 | 0.851 |
|  | AS1 (18)-(16), $T_{0}=-0.5$ |  | $7.6668 \mathrm{e}-117$ | 8.3397e-561 | 4.7914 | 0.797 |
|  | AS1 18)-17), $T_{0}=-0.5$ |  | $4.0246 \mathrm{e}-122$ | 6.8758e-611 | 5.0000 | 0.757 |
|  | NN1 |  | $1.4085 \mathrm{e}-126$ | $1.5697 \mathrm{e}-634$ | 5.0000 | 2.25 |
|  | NN2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | KU1 |  | 13.8548e-45 | 6.3923e-136 | 3.0000 | 2.164 |
|  | KU2 |  | $2.0640 \mathrm{e}-160$ | $7.4235 \mathrm{e}-802$ | 5.0000 | 1.999 |
|  | FG1 |  | $2.7055 \mathrm{e}-181$ | $3.9086 \mathrm{e}-507$ | 5.0000 | 2.314 |
|  | HC1 |  | $1.3321 \mathrm{e}-117$ | $3.2378 \mathrm{e}-586$ | 5.0000 | 1.093 |
|  | MR1 |  | $9.6964 \mathrm{e}-117$ | $1.8264 \mathrm{e}-506$ | 5.0000 | 1.454 |
|  | MR2 |  | $1.6557 \mathrm{e}-98$ | $3.2631 \mathrm{e}-490$ | 5.0000 | 1.422 |

Table 3. Numerical comparisons of two-point methods with memory for $f_{3}$

| Fun. | Method | Guess | $\left\|v_{n}-v_{n-1}\right\|$ | $\log \left\|f\left(v_{n}\right)\right\|$ | COC | CPU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f_{3}$ | WX1 (74)-(15), $T_{0}=-0.6$ | 0.1 | $1.7158 \mathrm{e}-37$ | $3.9640 \mathrm{e}-140$ | 3.7302 | 1.546 |
|  | WX1 (74)-(16), $T_{0}=-0.6$ |  | 9.7898e-40 | 9.3927e-159 | 4.0000 | 1.984 |
|  | WX1 (74)-(17), $T_{0}=-0.6$ |  | $1.1982 \mathrm{e}-39$ | $2.3348 \mathrm{e}-158$ | 4.0000 | 2.455 |
|  | WX2 (75)-(15), $T_{0}=-0.6$ |  | $1.7724 \mathrm{e}-37$ | $4.4735 \mathrm{e}-140$ | 3.7302 | 2.017 |
|  | WX2 (75)-16), $T_{0}=-0.6$ |  | 1.0306e-39 | $1.1537 \mathrm{e}-158$ | 4.0000 | 1.889 |
|  | WX2 (75)-(17), $T_{0}=-0.6$ |  | $1.2612 \mathrm{e}-39$ | $2.8657 \mathrm{e}-158$ | 4.0000 | 2.032 |
|  | AS1 (18)-15), $T_{0}=-0.6$ |  | $1.5409 \mathrm{e}-140$ | 9.5677e-640 | 4.5610 | 1.157 |
|  | AS1 (18)-(16), $T_{0}=-0.6$ |  | $5.0078 \mathrm{e}-157$ | 3.1845e-751 | 4.7914 | 1.093 |
|  | AS1 (18)-(17), $T_{0}=-0.6$ |  | $4.1341 \mathrm{e}-169$ | 5.8438e-844 | 5.0000 | 1.023 |
|  | NN1 |  | $4.8790 \mathrm{e}-152$ | $3.3750 \mathrm{e}-758$ | 5.0000 | 1.25 |
|  | NN2 |  | NC |  |  |  |
|  | KU1 |  | $3.1751 \mathrm{e}-36$ | 5.2098e-108 | 3.0000 | 1.157 |
|  | KU2 |  | $1.4914 \mathrm{e}-153$ | 9.6075e-766 | 5.0000 | 1.124 |
|  | FG1 |  | 1.8883e-149 | 3.5412e-745 | 5.0000 | 1.172 |
|  | HC1 |  | $3.9969 \mathrm{e}-134$ | 4.6174e-668 | 5.0000 | 1.218 |
|  | MR1 |  | $4.8790 \mathrm{e}-152$ | 3.3750e-668 | 5.0000 | 1.328 |
|  | MR2 |  | $2.5948 \mathrm{e}-128$ | 7.5386e-639 | 5.0000 | 1.157 |

Table 4. Numerical comparisons of two-point methods with memory for $f_{4}$

| Fun. | Method | Guess | $\left\|v_{n}-v_{n-1}\right\|$ | $\log \left\|f\left(v_{n}\right)\right\|$ | COC | CPU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f_{4}$ | WX1 (74)-(15), $T_{0}=-0.8$ | -0.3 | $3.6201 \mathrm{e}-24$ | $2.0609 \mathrm{e}-93$ | 4.0000 | 1.031 |
|  | WX1 (74)-(16), $T_{0}=-0.8$ |  | $3.6201 \mathrm{e}-24$ | $2.0609 \mathrm{e}-93$ | 4.0000 | 1.079 |
|  | WX1 (74)-(17), $T_{0}=-0.8$ |  | 3.6201e-24 | $2.0609 \mathrm{e}-93$ | 4.0000 | 0.938 |
|  | WX2 (75)-15), $T_{0}=-0.8$ |  | $6.7591 \mathrm{e}-18$ | 9.1836e-68 | 4.0000 | 1.234 |
|  | WX2 (75)-(16), $T_{0}=-0.8$ |  | $6.7591 \mathrm{e}-18$ | 9.1836e-68 | 4.0000 | 1.234 |
|  | WX2 (75)-17), $T_{0}=-0.8$ |  | $6.7591 \mathrm{e}-18$ | 9.1836e-68 | 4.0000 | 1.031 |
|  | AS1 (18)-15, $T_{0}=-0.8$ |  | $1.6606 \mathrm{e}-169$ | $4.6319 \mathrm{e}-784$ | 4.5687 | 1.187 |
|  | AS1 (18)-16), $T_{0}=-0.8$ |  | $6.1245 \mathrm{e}-157$ | 9.2552e-790 | 4.7914 | 1.047 |
|  | AS1 (18)-17), $T_{0}=-0.8$ |  | $6.1245 \mathrm{e}-157$ | 9.2552e-791 | 5.0000 | 1.016 |
|  | NN1 |  | $3.7926 \mathrm{e}-113$ | 1.2642e-620 | 5.0000 | 1.116 |
|  | NN2 |  | NC |  |  |  |
|  | KU1 |  | 1.1176e-48 | $1.6106 \mathrm{e}-153$ | 3.0000 | 1.281 |
|  | KU2 |  | $1.7200 \mathrm{e}-143$ | 5.2108e-646 | 5.0000 | 1.062 |
|  | FG1 |  | 1.5166e-76 | 1.2036e-379 | 5.0000 | 1.171 |
|  | HC1 |  | $2.8385 \mathrm{e}-67$ | 6.4491e-333 | 5.0000 | 1.134 |
|  | MR1 |  | $3.7926 \mathrm{e}-113$ | $1.2642 \mathrm{e}-620$ | 5.0000 | 1.391 |
|  | MR2 |  | $5.1038 \mathrm{e}-65$ | $1.7316 \mathrm{e}-321$ | 5.0000 | 1.254 |

Table 5. Numerical comparisons of two-point methods with memory for $f_{5}$

| Fun. | Method | Guess | $\left\|v_{n}-v_{n-1}\right\|$ | $\log \left\|f\left(v_{n}\right)\right\|$ | COC | CPU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f_{5}$ | WX1 (74)-(15), $T_{0}=0.2$ | -0.7 | $4.2787 \mathrm{e}-23$ | $2.1357 \mathrm{e}-90$ | 4.0000 | 1.275 |
|  | WX1 (74)-(16), $T_{0}=0.2$ |  | $3.7591 \mathrm{e}-23$ | 1.2723e-90 | 4.0000 | 1.312 |
|  | WX1 (74)-(17), $T_{0}=0.2$ |  | $3.8562 \mathrm{e}-23$ | $1.4091 \mathrm{e}-90$ | 4.0000 | 1.032 |
|  | WX2 (75)-(15), $T_{0}=0.5$ |  | $4.4061 \mathrm{e}-22$ | $3.6113 \mathrm{e}-86$ | 4.0000 | 1.126 |
|  | WX2 (75)-(16), $T_{0}=0.5$ |  | $4.2939 \mathrm{e}-22$ | $3.2571 \mathrm{e}-86$ | 4.0000 | 1.133 |
|  | WX2 (75)-(17), $T_{0}=0.5$ |  | $4.3252 \mathrm{e}-22$ | $3.3532 \mathrm{e}-86$ | 4.0000 | 1.173 |
|  | AS1 (18)-(15), $T_{0}=0.5$ |  | $3.7746 \mathrm{e}-98$ | $7.5571 \mathrm{e}-448$ | 4.5619 | 0.952 |
|  | AS1 (18)-(16), $T_{0}=0.5$ |  | $0.968 \mathrm{e}-124$ | $1.7825 \mathrm{e}-592$ | 4.7921 | 0.75 |
|  | AS1 (18)-(17), $T_{0}=0.5$ |  | $1.3804 \mathrm{e}-138$ | 1.5096e-694 | 5.0000 | 0.985 |
|  | NN1 |  | $7.6041 \mathrm{e}-121$ | 8.9942e-604 | 5.0000 | 1.328 |
|  | NN2 |  | NC |  |  |  |
|  | KU1 |  | $1.7832 \mathrm{e}-31$ | $5.6152 \mathrm{e}-95$ | 3.0000 | 1.163 |
|  | KU2 |  | $5.0251 \mathrm{e}-117$ | 8.5918e-585 | 5.0000 | 1.361 |
|  | FG1 |  | $2.6308 \mathrm{e}-80$ | 8.7918e-581 | 5.0000 | 1.422 |
|  | HC1 |  | $1.7524 \mathrm{e}-101$ | $3.2098 \mathrm{e}-506$ | 5.0000 | 1.5 |
|  | MR1 |  | $6.6725 \mathrm{e}-96$ | $3.2927 \mathrm{e}-478$ | 5.0000 | 1.563 |
|  | MR2 |  | 7.6185e-95 | 7.0787e-473 | 5.0000 | 1.469 |

Table 6. Numerical comparisons of three-point eighth-order optimal iterative method for $f_{1}$

| Fun. | Method | Guess | $\left\|v_{n}-v_{n-1}\right\|$ | $\log \left\|f\left(v_{n}\right)\right\|$ | COC | CPU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f_{1}$ | CP1 | 1.6 | $4.3250 \mathrm{e}-81$ | $5.6478 \mathrm{e}-645$ | 8.0000 | 0.64 |
|  | JK1 |  | $7.2905 \mathrm{e}-74$ | $1.9965 \mathrm{e}-586$ | 8.0000 | 0.625 |
|  | KS1 |  | $2.4890 \mathrm{e}-77$ | $1.1976 \mathrm{e}-614$ | 8.0000 | 0.594 |
|  | LT1 |  | $1.9319 \mathrm{e}-76$ | $9.9145 \mathrm{e}-607$ | 8.0000 | 0.688 |
|  | NS2 |  | $2.3239 \mathrm{e}-80$ | $2.4319 \mathrm{e}-639$ | 8.0000 | 1.031 |
|  | SM1 |  | $6.0467 \mathrm{e}-79$ | $2.9856 \mathrm{e}-628$ | 8.0000 | 0.827 |
|  | SS1 |  | $3.6491 \mathrm{e}-86$ | $1.0338 \mathrm{e}-685$ | 8.0000 | 0.953 |
|  | SQ1 |  | $7.2303 \mathrm{e}-94$ | $1.7802 \mathrm{e}-748$ | 7.9930 | 0.983 |
|  | SZ1 |  | $8.0760 \mathrm{e}-82$ | $5.3290 \mathrm{e}-651$ | 8.0000 | 0.506 |

Table 7. Numerical comparisons of three-point eighth-order optimal iterative method for $f_{2}$

| Fun. | Method | Guess | $\left\|v_{n}-v_{n-1}\right\|$ | $\log \left\|f\left(v_{n}\right)\right\|$ | COC | CPU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f_{2}$ | CP1 | 21.2 | $3.0658 \mathrm{e}-13$ | $1.5013 \mathrm{e}-103$ | 8.0000 | 1.015 |
|  | JK1 |  | $2.2938 \mathrm{e}-8$ | 6.3586e-64 | 8.0000 | 0.905 |
|  | KS1 |  | 1.0655e-17 | 8.2236e-139 | 8.0000 | 0.954 |
|  | LT1 |  | $1.3183 \mathrm{e}-13$ | 9.9295e-106 | 7.9844 | 0.89 |
|  | NS2 |  | $4.6355 \mathrm{e}-15$ | 1.3566e-117 | 8.0000 | 0.797 |
|  | SM1 |  | 7.0279e-16 | $2.2022 \mathrm{e}-124$ | 7.9921 | 1.001 |
|  | SS1 |  | $5.1565 \mathrm{e}-7$ | $9.7507 \mathrm{e}-53$ | 8.0000 | 1.016 |
|  | SQ1 |  | $1.1754 \mathrm{e}-16$ | $5.6704 \mathrm{e}-131$ | 7.9930 | 1.014 |
|  | SZ1 |  | $6.4244 \mathrm{e}-20$ | $2.5960 \mathrm{e}-157$ | 8.0000 | 0.738 |

Table 8. Numerical comparisons of three-point eighth-order optimal iterative method for $f_{3}$

| Fun. | Method | Guess | $\left\|v_{n}-v_{n-1}\right\|$ | $\log \left\|f\left(v_{n}\right)\right\|$ | COC | CPU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f_{3}$ | CP1 | -.2 | $2.3578 \mathrm{e}-56$ | $7.5862 \mathrm{e}-446$ | 8.0000 | 0.704 |
|  | JK1 |  | $7.6198 \mathrm{e}-51$ | $4.0917 \mathrm{e}-401$ | 8.0000 | 0.971 |
|  | KS1 |  | $1.7676 \mathrm{e}-55$ | $6.3227 \mathrm{e}-439$ | 8.0000 | 0.716 |
|  | LT1 |  | $5.0788 \mathrm{e}-57$ | $1.9377 \mathrm{e}-451$ | 8.0000 | 0.703 |
|  | NS2 |  | $2.4596 \mathrm{e}-57$ | $1.8498 \mathrm{e}-452$ | 8.0000 | 0.702 |
|  | SM1 |  | $7.6703 \mathrm{e}-55$ | $4.7560 \mathrm{e}-446$ | 8.0000 | 0.687 |
|  | SS1 |  | $1.5906 \mathrm{e}-47$ | $2.4078 \mathrm{e}-374$ | 8.0000 | 0.688 |
|  | SQ1 |  | $1.0833 \mathrm{e}-55$ | $7.5457 \mathrm{e}-451$ | 7.9930 | 0.953 |
|  | SZ1 |  | $4.2680 \mathrm{e}-58$ | $4.8195 \mathrm{e}-460$ | 8.0000 | 0.61 |

Table 9. Numerical comparisons of three-point eighth-order optimal iterative method for $f_{4}$

| Fun. | Method | Guess | $\left\|v_{n}-v_{n-1}\right\|$ | $\log \left\|f\left(v_{n}\right)\right\|$ | COC | CPU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f_{4}$ | CP1 | 0.4 | $3.2642 \mathrm{e}-35$ | $2.1851 \mathrm{e}-281$ | 8.0000 | 0.829 |
|  | JK1 |  | $3.6433 \mathrm{e}-28$ | $2.9671 \mathrm{e}-224$ | 8.0000 | 1.046 |
|  | KS1 |  | $1.9083 \mathrm{e}-35$ | $2.2069 \mathrm{e}-289$ | 8.0000 | 0.844 |
|  | LT1 |  | $2.7060 \mathrm{e}-35$ | $1.1527 \mathrm{e}-289$ | 8.0000 | 0.922 |
|  | NS2 |  | $6.2714 \mathrm{e}-18$ | $9.8945 \mathrm{e}-142$ | 7.9867 | 1.062 |
|  | SM1 |  | $2.8624 \mathrm{e}-37$ | $2.4078 \mathrm{e}-297$ | 8.0000 | 0.954 |
|  | SS1 |  | $3.6548 \mathrm{e}-36$ | $3.1543 \mathrm{e}-289$ | 8.0000 | 0.953 |
|  | SQ1 |  | $1.4656 \mathrm{e}-32$ | $7.5457 \mathrm{e}-251$ | 7.9930 | 0.957 |
|  | SZ1 |  | $1.9083 \mathrm{e}-37$ | $2.2069 \mathrm{e}-299$ | 8.0000 | 0.823 |

Table 10. Numerical comparisons of three-point eighth-order optimal iterative method for $f_{5}$

| Fun. | Method | Guess | $\left\|v_{n}-v_{n-1}\right\|$ | $\log \left\|f\left(v_{n}\right)\right\|$ | COC | CPU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $f_{5}$ | CP1 | 0.4 | $1.1039 \mathrm{e}-47$ | $6.2072 \mathrm{e}-379$ | 8.0000 | 0.923 |
|  | JK1 |  | $1.1087 \mathrm{e}-39$ | $2.6875 \mathrm{e}-314$ | 8.0000 | 0.937 |
|  | KS1 |  | $7.6727 \mathrm{e}-53$ | $4.8119 \mathrm{e}-453$ | 8.0000 | 0.953 |
|  | LT1 |  | $6.6309 \mathrm{e}-42$ | $6.1128 \mathrm{e}-333$ | 8.0000 | 0.969 |
|  | NS2 |  | $8.9850 \mathrm{e}-38$ | $7.3697 \mathrm{e}-300$ | 8.0000 | 0.937 |
|  | SM1 |  | $3.5670 \mathrm{e}-45$ | $2.9461 \mathrm{e}-359$ | 8.0000 | 0.954 |
|  | SS1 |  | $7.8895 \mathrm{e}-44$ | $1.5630 \mathrm{e}-347$ | 8.0000 | 0.923 |
|  | SQ1 |  | $7.8895 \mathrm{e}-55$ | $9.1702 \mathrm{e}-439$ | 8.0000 | 0.916 |
|  | SZ1 |  | $7.6727 \mathrm{e}-57$ | $4.8119 \mathrm{e}-493$ | 8.0000 | 0.891 |



Figure 1. Graphs comparing the methods for each test function based on CPU time


Figure 2. Graphs comparing the methods for each test function based on the error in consecutive iteration $\left|v_{n}-v_{n-1}\right|$

Example 3.1 (Kepler's Equation (Aerospace Engineering Problem) [48]). Let's look at the Kepler's equation in astronomy, which is written as follows.

$$
\begin{equation*}
P=M-e \sin (M), \quad M \in[0,2 \pi], e \in[0,1] . \tag{77}
\end{equation*}
$$

The eccentricity $e$ and mean anomaly $M$ are key components of the Kepler's equation. A point traveling in a Keplerian orbit can be located by using the eccentric anomaly $E$. In particular, when $e=0.9$ and $M=0.6$ the equation reduces to

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{1}(v)=v-0.9 \sin (v)-0.6, \tag{78}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the unknown eccentric anomaly $E$ is represented by the variable $v$. The above equation (78) converges to the 1.4975894133904085 using $v_{0}=1.8$ as the first guess. Table 1 presents the comparison findings.

Example 3.2. German physicist Max Planck developed the mathematical formula known as Planck's radiation law in 1900 to describe the spectral-energy distribution of radiation emitted by a black body given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(\lambda)=\frac{8 \pi c h_{p} \lambda^{-5}}{e^{\frac{c h_{p}}{\lambda B_{k} T}-1}} \tag{79}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\lambda=$ Wavelength of the radiation,
$h_{p}=$ Planck's constant,
$B_{k}=$ Boltzmann constant,
$T=$ Absolute temperature of the Blackbody raditaion,
$C=$ Speed of light.
The wavelength that best fits the highest energy density is what we are looking for. For that purpose using (79), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{8 \pi C h_{c}}{\lambda^{7} B_{k} T\left(\exp \left(C h_{c} / \lambda B_{k} T-1\right)^{2}\right.}\left[5 \lambda B_{k} T+\left(-5 \lambda B_{k} T+C h_{c}\right) \exp \left(C h_{c} \lambda B_{k} T\right)\right] \tag{80}
\end{equation*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{8 \pi C h_{c} \lambda^{-6}}{\left(\exp \left(C h_{c} / \lambda B_{k} T-1\right)\right.}\left[\frac{C h_{c} / \lambda B_{k} T\left(\exp \left(C h_{c} / \lambda B_{k} T\right)\right.}{\left(\exp \left(C h_{c} / \lambda B_{k} T-1\right)\right.}-5\right]=R S \tag{81}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is clear that when $S=0$, there is a maximum for $f$, that is, when

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{C h_{c} / \lambda B_{k} T\left(\exp \left(C h_{c} / \lambda B_{k} T\right)\right.}{\left(\exp \left(C h_{c} / \lambda B_{k} T-1\right)\right.}=5 . \tag{82}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us take $v=\frac{C P_{h}}{\lambda B_{k} T}$, then equation (82) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{2}(v)=e^{-v}+\frac{v}{5}-1 . \tag{83}
\end{equation*}
$$

As mentioned in [38] the approximate root of the equation (83) is $x \approx 4.965114$. Consequently, using the following formula, it is possible to roughly predict the wavelength of radiation where the energy density is maximum:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda \approx \frac{C h_{c}}{4.965114 B_{k} T} . \tag{84}
\end{equation*}
$$

Example 3.3 (Ocean Engineering Problem). In ocean engineering. variable $h$ in the equation below indicates the height of a reflected standing wave in a port

$$
\begin{equation*}
h=h_{0}\left[\sin \left(\frac{2 \pi v}{\lambda}\right)+\cos \left(\frac{2 \pi t s}{\lambda}\right)+e^{-v}\right], \tag{85}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $v$ is the distance from the wave's source and $t$ is the amount of time after the wave was formed. The wave's velocity, its height at the source, and its wavelength are all represented by the symbols $s, h_{0}$, and $\lambda$, respectively. The aforementioned equation reduces to the following nonlinear equation for specific values of $\lambda=16, t=12, s=48$, and $h=0.4 h_{0}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{3}(v)=e^{-v}+\sin \left(\frac{\pi v}{8}\right) \cos (72 \pi)-0.4 \tag{86}
\end{equation*}
$$

The comparison results are presented in Table 2
Example 3.4 (Fluid Permeability in Biogels [43]). The hydraulic permeability and the pressure gradient to fluid velocity in the extracellular fibre matrix can be defined using the nonlinear model shown below:

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{f}(v)^{3}-20 p\left(1-v^{2}\right)=0 \tag{87}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $p$ denotes its particular hydraulic permeability, $R_{f}$ denotes the radius of the fiber and $v \in[0,1]$ represents the porosity of the medium. Let us suppose that $p=0.4655$ and $R_{f}=-100 \times 10^{-} 9$, we achieve a polynomial of third degree as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{4}(v)=-100 \times 10^{-9} v^{3}+9.3100 v^{2}-18.6200 v+9.3100 . \tag{88}
\end{equation*}
$$

Example 3.5. The following equation describes the path of an electron traverses in the region between two parallel plates by considering the multi factor effect:

$$
\begin{equation*}
r(t)=r_{0}+\left(v_{0}+q_{0} \frac{E}{m \phi} \sin \phi t_{0}\left(t-t_{0}\right)+\psi\right)\left(t-t_{0}\right)+q_{0} \frac{E_{0}}{m \phi^{2}}(\cos (\phi t+\psi)+\sin (\phi t+\psi)), \tag{89}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the position and velocity of an electron is given by $r_{0}$ and $v_{0}$ respectively at time $t_{0}$, $q_{0}$ and $m$ are the charge and mass of an electron at rest and $E_{0} \sin \phi(t)+\psi$ represents the $R F$ electric field between the plates. If specific parameters are chosen, then equation (89) can be expressed as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{5}(v)=\frac{\pi}{4}-\frac{\cos v}{2}+v=0 . \tag{90}
\end{equation*}
$$

The root of equation (90) is $\zeta=-0.3090932715417949$.

## 4. Conclusion

In this presented work, a novel family of two and three-point methods for evaluating simple roots of non-linear equations was introduced. As the primary objective of this research article is to increase the computational efficiency by reducing number of function evaluations while preserving the order. For that purpose, distinct approximations of self-accelerating parameters formed by Hermite Interpolating Polynomials were employed without performing any further calculations. The approximation of Gauss quadrature was utilized to eliminate an additional derivative for achieving optimal eighth-order convergence. Based on numerical data, the novel method appears to be an effective method for solving these issues and finding simple roots.
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