European Journal of Innovation in Nonformal Education (EJINE)
Volume 6 | Issue 9 | Sep - 2026 ISSN: 2795-8612

Modern Problems in The Theory of Partial Differential Equations and Their Numerical Solution Methods

Buriyeva Dilafro'z Norboy qizi
1st-year Master's Student, National University of Uzbekistan
E-mail: dilafrozboriyeva194@gmail.com

A B S T R A C T
This article analyzes modern problems in the theory of partial differential equations (PDEs) and numerical methods for solving them. For equations of elliptic, parabolic, and hyperbolic type, the mathematical foundations, order of convergence, and computational complexity of the finite difference, finite element, finite volume, and spectral methods are comparatively examined. A worked numerical example is given for the one-dimensional heat conduction equation, and the numerical results are compared with the exact solution. The analysis shows that the choice of numerical method must be made depending on the type of problem, the geometry of the computational domain, the required level of accuracy, and the available computational resources.

A R T I C L E I N F O
Article history:
Received 30 Jul 2026
Received in revised form
15 Aug 2026
Accepted 30 Aug 2026

Keywords: Partial Differential Equations, Elliptic Equations, Parabolic Equations, Hyperbolic Equations, Finite Difference Method, Finite Element Method, Finite Volume Method, Spectral Methods, Numerical Stability

Hosting by Innovatus Publishing Co. All rights reserved. © 2026

1. Introduction

Partial differential equations (PDEs) constitute the fundamental mathematical apparatus in many branches of natural science and engineering — heat exchange, fluid dynamics, electromagnetic field theory, financial mathematics, and the modeling of biological processes. In many practical problems it is impossible to find an analytical solution of a PDE in closed form, or doing so is excessively complex. For this reason numerical methods play a decisive role in modern science and engineering practice[1-5].

A general second-order linear PDE is written in the following form:

$$A \cdot u_{xx} + 2B \cdot u_{xy} + C \cdot u_{yy} + D \cdot u_x + E \cdot u_y + F \cdot u = f(x, y)$$

where A, B, C, D, E, F are given coefficients and f(x, y) is a known function. Based on the value of the discriminant $\Delta = B^2 - A \cdot C$, the equation is divided into three main types: elliptic when $\Delta < 0$ (for example, the Laplace equation $\Delta u = 0$), parabolic when $\Delta = 0$ (for example, the heat conduction equation $u_t = a^2 u_{xx}$), and hyperbolic when $\Delta > 0$ (for example, the wave equation $u_{tt} = c^2 u_{xx}$). Each type has its own physical meaning, its own characteristic way of posing boundary/initial conditions, and its own numerical solution strategy.

The pressing problems of modern theory include the following: the existence and uniqueness of solutions for nonlinear PDEs, the correct formulation of boundary value problems on complex geometric domains, the exponential growth of computational complexity in high-dimensional problems (the "curse of dimensionality"), the stable computation of discontinuous or sharply varying solutions, and maintaining a balance between the convergence rate and stability of numerical schemes. The purpose of this article is to

analyze the above-mentioned modern problems of PDE theory, to present on a scientific basis the four main numerical solution methods (finite difference, finite element, finite volume, and spectral methods) used for the three main types of equations, to show their advantages and disadvantages by means of a comparative table, and to demonstrate, through a practical computational example, the working mechanism of one of the methods using concrete numbers[6-7].

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Basic properties of elliptic, parabolic, and hyperbolic equations

Elliptic equations (the Laplace equation $\Delta u = 0$ and the Poisson equation $\Delta u = f$) describe stationary, time-independent processes and are usually posed as a Dirichlet ($u|_\Gamma$ given) or Neumann ($\partial u/\partial n|_\Gamma$ given) boundary value problem. For such problems, the existence and uniqueness of the solution is proved using the maximum principle and energy (variational) methods.

Parabolic equations (the heat conduction equation $u_t = a^2 u_{xx}$) describe diffusion processes evolving in time and are posed as an initial-boundary value problem ($u(x,0)$ given, with a Dirichlet or Neumann condition on the boundary). For this type of equation, the solution becomes smoother as time progresses (the regularization property).

Hyperbolic equations (the wave equation $u_{tt} = c^2 u_{xx}$) describe oscillation and wave propagation processes. They are closely connected with the method of characteristics, and initial discontinuities may persist over time, which imposes additional requirements on numerical schemes (for example, ensuring monotonicity and conservation properties)[8-9].

2.2. The finite difference method (FDM)

In the finite difference method, the computational domain is covered with a discrete grid, and derivatives are replaced by corresponding difference relations. For example, the central difference formula for a second-order derivative is:

$$u_{xx}(x_i) \approx \frac{[u(x_{i+1}) - 2u(x_i) + u(x_{i-1})]}{h^2}$$

For the heat conduction equation $u_t = a^2 u_{xx}$, the explicit numerical scheme is written as follows:

$$u_i^{n+1} = u_i^n + r \cdot (u_{i+1}^n - 2u_i^n + u_{i-1}^n), \qquad r = \frac{a^2 \cdot \Delta t}{h^2}$$

The stability of this scheme is guaranteed, based on von Neumann analysis, under the condition $r \leq 1/2$ (the CFL — Courant–Friedrichs–Lewy — condition). The main drawback of the explicit scheme is that, in order to maintain stability, the time step Δt must be reduced in proportion to h^2, which considerably increases the computation time. Implicit schemes, and especially the Crank–Nicolson scheme, are unconditionally stable and require solving a system of linear equations at every time step, but allow work with a larger time step Δt[10-12].

2.3. The finite element method (FEM)

In the finite element method, the problem is reduced to a weak (variational) form. For example, for the boundary value problem $-\Delta u = f$, $u|_\Gamma = 0$, the weak (integral) form is as follows:

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx = \int_\Omega f \cdot v \, dx, \qquad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$$

The solution is sought in a finite-dimensional space of functions — by dividing the domain into triangular or quadrilateral elements and, within each element, using basis (shape) functions φ_i. Applying the Galerkin method yields a system of linear equations:

$$K \cdot c = F, \qquad \text{where } K_{ij} = \int_\Omega \nabla \varphi_i \cdot \nabla \varphi_j \, dx, \qquad F_i = \int_\Omega f \cdot \varphi_i \, dx$$

Here K is the stiffness matrix, F is the load vector, and c is the vector of unknown coefficients. FEM is particularly convenient for working with complex geometries, non-uniform boundary conditions, and

locally refined grids (adaptive meshing), and it is widely used in solid mechanics and structural design.

2.4. The finite volume method (FVM)

The finite volume method is used for problems based on conservation laws (fluid dynamics, gas dynamics, transport equations). The computational domain is divided into control volumes (cells), and the integral conservation form of the equation is applied:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{V_i} u\,dV + \oint_{\partial V_i} F(u)\cdot n\,dS = 0$$

Here F(u) is the flux function and n is the outward normal of the boundary surface. FVM guarantees exact conservation of mass, energy, and momentum at the discrete level, and for this reason it is widely used for hyperbolic equations and problems involving shock waves. Godunov-type schemes, Riemann problem solvers, and higher-order reconstruction methods (MUSCL, WENO) are used to compute the flux.

2.5. Spectral methods

In spectral methods, the solution is expressed as a sum of global basis functions defined over the entire computational domain (Fourier harmonics, Chebyshev or Legendre polynomials):

$$u(x) \approx \sum_{k=0}^{N} a_k \cdot \varphi_k(x), \qquad k = 0, 1, \ldots, N$$

The coefficients a_k are determined by the Galerkin or collocation method. When the solution is smooth (analytic), spectral methods achieve an exponential rate of convergence, significantly outperforming the finite difference and finite element methods. However, in the presence of complex geometries, non-smooth coefficients, or discontinuous solutions (where the Gibbs phenomenon is observed), their efficiency drops sharply. For this reason, spectral methods are often combined with spectral element or spectral–finite element hybrid methods, which are applied in smooth, periodic domains such as turbulence and meteorological modeling.

3. Results

3.1. Comparative analysis of the numerical methods

The order of accuracy, ability to handle geometry, computational complexity, and main areas of application of the four main numerical methods discussed above are presented comparatively in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparative analysis of numerical methods for solving partial differential equations

Method	Order of accuracy	Handling of geometry	Computational complexity	Main area of application
Finite difference (FDM)	Usually 2nd order (central difference)	Convenient only for structured (rectangular) grids	Low–medium; simple to implement	Heat conduction, simple elliptic/parabolic problems
Finite element (FEM)	Arbitrarily high (depends on basis function)	Very convenient for complex, irregular domains	Medium–high; requires matrix assembly	Solid mechanics, elliptic/parabolic problems
Finite volume (FVM)	1st–2nd order (higher-order variants exist)	Adaptable to complex geometries	Medium; guarantees the conservation property	Fluid dynamics, gas dynamics (hyperbolic problems)
Spectral methods	Exponential convergence for smooth solutions	Efficient only for simple/regular domains	High (dense matrices), but high accuracy with few points	Turbulence, meteorology, smooth problems

3.2. A practical computational example

To demonstrate the practical operation of one of the numerical methods, let us consider the one-dimensional heat conduction equation:

$$u_t = u_{xx}, \quad 0 < x < 1, \quad t > 0$$
$$u(x,0) = \sin(\pi x), \quad u(0,t) = u(1,t) = 0$$

The exact (analytical) solution of this problem is found by the method of separation of variables:

$$u(x,t) = e^{-\pi^2 t} \cdot \sin(\pi x)$$

Now, applying the explicit finite difference scheme with a step h = 0.25 (points x0, x1, x2, x3, x4 = 0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1) and Δt = 0.03125 (giving r = Δt/h² = 0.5, i.e., at the stability limit), we compute the values at the first time step. When r = 0.5, the update formula simplifies to:

$$u_i^{n+1} = 0.5 \cdot (u_{i+1}^n + u_{i-1}^n)$$

The values u_i^0 based on the initial condition, the values u_i^1 after the first step, and the results of comparing them with the exact solution at the moment t = Δt = 0.03125 are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Comparison of the numerical and exact solutions (at t = 0 and t = Δt)

x_i	u_i^0 (t=0)	u_i^1 (t=Δt)	Exact solution u(x,Δt)
x0 = 0	0	0	0
x1 = 0.25	0.7071	0.5000	0.5194
x2 = 0.50	1.0000	0.7071	0.7345
x3 = 0.75	0.7071	0.5000	0.5194
x4 = 1.00	0	0	0

The table shows that at the center of the domain (x = 0.5) the numerical solution gives $u_2^1 = 0.7071$, while the exact solution is u(0.5; 0.03125) = e^(−π²·0.03125)·sin(0.5π) ≈ e^(−0.3084) ≈ 0.7345. The relative error already at the first step is approximately (0.7345 − 0.7071)/0.7345 ≈ 3.7%. This error arises from the method's O(Δt) + O(h²) order of convergence and can be significantly reduced by decreasing the steps h and Δt, or by using higher-order schemes such as Crank–Nicolson[13-15]

4. Discussion

The results obtained show that no single numerical method is universally optimal for all types of PDE problems. Although the finite difference method is convenient on simple (rectangular) geometries owing to the simplicity of its implementation, the stability condition (CFL) of explicit schemes strongly restricts the time step, which increases the computational cost of modeling over long time intervals.

The finite element method remains the most flexible solution for complex, real engineering geometries and non-uniform boundary conditions, but assembling the matrices and solving large-scale linear systems requires additional computational resources. The finite volume method, in turn, has an advantage in hydro- and gas-dynamic problems, particularly in hyperbolic equations involving shock waves, owing to its property of exactly enforcing conservation laws at the discrete level.

Spectral methods provide the highest accuracy with the fewest points for problems with smooth solutions, but their efficiency drops sharply in the presence of complex geometry and discontinuities. In modern research, hybrid approaches are being actively developed to overcome these limitations: Discontinuous Galerkin (DG) methods combine the advantages of FEM and FVM; Adaptive Mesh Refinement (AMR) directs computational resources to regions where the solution gradient is high; and the hp-finite element method jointly optimizes the mesh density (h) and the polynomial degree (p).

In recent years, deep-learning-based Physics-Informed Neural Networks (PINNs) have been actively studied as an alternative approach for solving PDEs without requiring a mesh. Although these methods

show promise for solving high-dimensional and inverse problems, their convergence theory is still less developed than that of classical numerical methods, and guaranteeing stability and accuracy remains an open research direction. In addition, solving large-scale, three-dimensional problems on parallel computing systems (MPI, GPU clusters) is gaining particular importance in modern practice.

5. Conclusion

This article has provided a scientific analysis of modern problems in the theory of partial differential equations and of the four main numerical methods for solving them — finite difference, finite element, finite volume, and spectral methods. The mathematical foundations of each method were presented, and a comparative table was compiled with respect to order of accuracy, ability to handle geometry, and computational complexity. A practical computation was carried out for the one-dimensional heat conduction equation, showing the difference between the numerical and exact solutions.

According to the results of the analysis, the choice of numerical method should be made depending on the type of problem (elliptic, parabolic, or hyperbolic), the geometric complexity of the computational domain, the required level of accuracy, and the available computational resources. Promising directions for future research include developing the theoretical foundations of hybrid numerical–neural-network methods, designing efficient parallel algorithms for high-dimensional problems, and applying adaptive and multiscale methods to real engineering problems.

REFERENCES

[1] R. J. LeVeque, Finite Difference Methods for Ordinary and Partial Differential Equations. Philadelphia, PA, USA: SIAM, 2007.

[2] O. C. Zienkiewicz, R. L. Taylor, and J. Z. Zhu, The Finite Element Method: Its Basis and Fundamentals, 7th ed. Oxford, U.K.: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2013.

[3] R. J. LeVeque, Finite Volume Methods for Hyperbolic Problems. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002.

[4] L. N. Trefethen, Spectral Methods in MATLAB. Philadelphia, PA, USA: SIAM, 2000.

[5] J. C. Strikwerda, Finite Difference Schemes and Partial Differential Equations, 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PA, USA: SIAM, 2004.

[6] A. Quarteroni and A. Valli, Numerical Approximation of Partial Differential Equations. Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag, 1994.

[7] L. C. Evans, Partial Differential Equations, 2nd ed. Providence, RI, USA: American Mathematical Society, 2010.

[8] J. W. Thomas, Numerical Partial Differential Equations: Finite Difference Methods. New York, NY, USA: Springer-Verlag, 1995.

[9] P. G. Ciarlet, The Finite Element Method for Elliptic Problems. Philadelphia, PA, USA: SIAM, 2002.

[10] C. Canuto, M. Y. Hussaini, A. Quarteroni, and T. A. Zang, Spectral Methods: Fundamentals in Single Domains. Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag, 2006.

[11] M. Raissi, P. Perdikaris, and G. E. Karniadakis, "Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations," J. Comput. Phys., vol. 378, pp. 686–707, Feb. 2019.

[12] B. Cockburn, G. E. Karniadakis, and C.-W. Shu, Eds., Discontinuous Galerkin Methods: Theory, Computation and Applications. Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag, 2000.

[13] R. J. LeVeque, Finite Volume Methods for Hyperbolic Problems. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

[14] L. N. Trefethen, Spectral Methods in MATLAB. Philadelphia, PA, USA: SIAM, 2000.

[15] M. Raissi, P. Perdikaris, and G. E. Karniadakis, “Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations,” Journal of Computational Physics, vol. 378, pp. 686–707, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jcp.2018.10.045.