The Academic
International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

An Online Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal
Volume 3 | Issue 2 | February 2025
ISSN: 2583-973X (Online)
Website: www.theacademic.in

A Study on non-linear PDEs using Finite difference and finite element methods

Vezhopalu
Department of Mathematics, University of Science & Technology Meghalaya (USTM), Meghalaya, India-783101
Gitumani Sarma
[2]Department of Mathematics, University of Science & Technology Meghalaya (USTM), Meghalaya, India-783101

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Accepted on: 23-02-2025

Published on: 14-03-2025

Keywords:
Nonlinear partial differential equations, finite difference, scientific and engineering problems.

ABSTRACT

Nonlinear partial differential equations (PDEs) play a crucial role in modeling various physical, biological, and engineering phenomena, including fluid dynamics, heat transfer, wave propagation, and general relativity. Due to their inherent complexity, finding analytical solutions is often infeasible, necessitating the use of numerical methods for their approximation. This study focuses on the application of finite difference (FDM) and finite element methods (FEM) for solving nonlinear PDEs Burgur's Equation. The research explores the theoretical foundation of both methods, highlighting their advantages, limitations, and suitability for different types of nonlinear PDEs. The finite difference method is implemented for time-dependent nonlinear equations, leveraging explicit and implicit schemes for stability and accuracy analysis. The finite element method is employed for spatially complex domains, utilizing adaptive meshing and higher-order elements to improve solution precision. Convergence analysis, stability criteria, and computational efficiency are examined for both approaches. This research provides a comprehensive analysis of numerical techniques for nonlinear PDEs, offering insights into their practical applications in scientific and engineering problems. Future work may include hybrid approaches combining FDM and FEM or

leveraging machine learning techniques for improved numerical approximations.

DOI : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15030215

Introduction

Nonlinear partial differential equations (PDEs) arise in a wide range of scientific and engineering disciplines, including fluid dynamics, heat transfer, quantum mechanics, general relativity, and biological systems. Unlike linear PDEs, which can often be solved using classical analytical techniques, nonlinear PDEs exhibit complex behaviors such as shock waves, solitons, turbulence, and pattern formation, making their solutions significantly more challenging. As a result, numerical methods have become essential tools for studying these equations. Among the various numerical techniques available, the finite difference method (FDM) and the finite element method (FEM) are widely used due to their robustness, versatility, and computational efficiency. The finite difference method discretizes the continuous domain using a structured grid and approximates derivatives via difference equations. It is particularly effective for time-dependent problems and simple geometries. On the other hand, the finite element method employs piecewise polynomial basis functions over an unstructured mesh, making it more suitable for complex geometries and problems with irregular boundaries.

This study focuses on the application and comparative analysis of FDM and FEM for solving nonlinear PDEs. The study will explore both explicit and implicit schemes in FDM, as well as different basis functions and meshing techniques in FEM. Additionally, error analysis and stability conditions, such as the Courant–Friedrichs–Lewy (CFL) condition for FDM and energy norm estimates for FEM, will be examined. By evaluating the strengths and limitations of these methods, this research aims to provide insights into the effective numerical treatment of nonlinear PDEs in various applications. Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations (PDEs) play a fundamental role in various scientific and engineering fields, including fluid mechanics, general relativity, quantum mechanics, biological modeling, and material science. Unlike linear PDEs, nonlinear PDEs involve terms where the dependent variable or its derivatives appear in nonlinear combinations. These equations often exhibit complex behaviors such as solitons, chaos, turbulence, and pattern formation, making them difficult to solve analytically. Some well-known nonlinear PDEs include: Burgers' Equation, Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation, Reaction-Diffusion Equations and Euler and Navier-Stokes Equations .Due to the challenges associated with analytical solutions, numerical methods such as the Finite Difference Method (FDM) and Finite Element Method (FEM) are widely used for solving nonlinear PDEs. The **Finite Element Method (FEM)** is a powerful numerical technique used to solve **nonlinear partial differential equations (PDEs)** in various scientific and engineering applications. Unlike the Finite Difference Method (FDM), which uses structured grids, FEM discretizes the domain into small elements and approximates the solution using basis functions. This makes FEM particularly useful for handling complex geometries, irregular boundaries, and higher-order PDEs.

Mathematical Model

Burgers' equation is a fundamental nonlinear partial differential equation that appears in various fields, including fluid mechanics, turbulence modeling, traffic flow, and nonlinear acoustics. It serves as a simplified model for more complex equations like the **Navier-Stokes equations**.

The **one-dimensional Burgers' equation** with viscosity is given by:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = v\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}, x \in \Omega, t > 0$$

where:

- $u(x,t)$) is the velocity field,
- v is the kinematic viscosity (when $v = 0$ the equation becomes inviscid),
- x and t are the spatial and temporal coordinates.

Analytical Solutions of Burgers' Equation

For the **inviscid Burgers' equation** ($v = 0$):

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = 0$$

The method of characteristics can be used to solve it, leading to solutions that develop **shock waves** over time.

For the **viscous Burgers' equation**, the equation has an analytical solution using the **Cole-Hopf transformation**:

$$u(x,t) = -2v\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\phi(x,t)}{\phi(x,t)}$$

where $\phi(x,t)$ satisfies the **heat equation**:

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} = v\frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2}$$

This transformation helps convert the nonlinear PDE into a linear one.

Numerical Methods for Solving Burgers' Equation:

Since analytical solutions are not always feasible, **numerical methods** such as **Finite Difference Method (FDM) and Finite Element Method (FEM)** are used for solving Burgers' equation.

Finite Difference Method (FDM) for Burgers' Equation

The Finite Difference Method (FDM) is a popular numerical approach for solving partial differential equations, including Burgers' equation. Burgers' equation is a fundamental nonlinear PDE that appears

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = v\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}, x \in \Omega, t > 0$$

We discretize the equation using finite differences in time and space. Let u_i^n represent the numerical approximation to$u(x_i, t^n)$ where:

$$x_i = i\Delta x, i = 0,1, \dots \dots \dots \dots, N$$

$$t^n = n\Delta t, n = 0,1, \dots \dots \dots \dots.$$

A common approach uses:

- Forward difference for the time derivative:

$$\frac{\delta u}{\delta t} \approx \frac{u_i^{n+1} - u_i^n}{\Delta t}$$

Central difference for the convection term:

$$\frac{\delta u}{\delta x} \approx \frac{u_{i+1}^n - u_{i-1}^n}{2\Delta x}$$

Central difference for the diffusion term:

$$\frac{\delta^2 u}{\delta x^2} \approx \frac{u_{i+1}^n - 2u_i^n + u_{i-1}^n}{\Delta x^2}$$

Substituting these approximations, we obtain:

$$u_i^{n+1} = u_i^n - \frac{\Delta t}{2\Delta x} u_i^n (u_{i+1}^n - u_{i-1}^n) + v \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x^2} (u_{i+1}^n - 2u_i^n + u_{i-1}^n)$$

Since the convection term can cause numerical instabilities, an **upwind scheme** is often preferred:

$$\frac{\delta u}{\delta x} \approx \frac{u_i^n - u_{i-1}^n}{\Delta x}, u \geq 0$$

which leads to a first-order accurate scheme:

$$u_i^{n+1} = u_i^n - \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} u_i^n (u_i^n - u_{i-1}^n) + v \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x^2} (u_{i+1}^n - 2u_i^n + u_{i-1}^n)$$

This reduces numerical oscillations but introduces some artificial diffusion.

To improve stability, particularly for higher values of v, an implicit scheme like **Crank-Nicolson** can be used for the diffusion term:

$$\frac{u_i^{n+1} - u_i^n}{\Delta t} + u_i^n \frac{u_{i+1}^{n+1} - u_{i-1}^{n+1}}{2\Delta x} = v \frac{u_{i+1}^{n+1} - 2u_i^{n+1} + u_{i-1}^{n+1}}{\Delta x^2}$$

This results in a system of linear equations that can be solved using methods such as the Thomas algorithm (for tridiagonal matrices).

For explicit methods, the **Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy (CFL) condition** must be satisfied:

$\frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} max|u| \leq 1$, for stability in the nonlinear term

$\frac{v\Delta t}{\Delta x^2} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, for stability in the diffusion term

Solution of Mathematical Model:

The **Finite Element Method (FEM)** is an alternative to the Finite Difference Method (FDM) for solving Burgers' equation. FEM provides more flexibility in handling irregular geometries and boundary conditions, making it advantageous for complex domains.

To apply FEM, we derive the **weak form** by multiplying Burgers' equation by a test function v and integrating over the domain Ω:

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} v + u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} v - \mathrm{v} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} v \right) dx = 0$$

Applying integration by parts to the diffusion term:

$$\int_{\Omega} -\mathrm{v} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} v dx = \int_{\Omega} \mathrm{v} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} dx - \mathrm{v} \left[\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} v \right]_{\partial \Omega}$$

If homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions are imposed (i.e., $u = 0u = 0u = 0$ on $\partial \Omega$), the boundary term vanishes.

Thus, the weak formulation becomes:

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} v dx + \int_{\Omega} u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} v dx + \int_{\Omega} \mathrm{v} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} dx = 0$$

Now, this weak form can be discretized using finite element basis functions.

Outcome of Burgers' Equation Solutions

The solution of Burgers' equation depends significantly on the **viscosity parameter** ν, as well as the **initial and boundary conditions**. Below are different possible solution behaviors:

1. Inviscid Case (ν=0): Formation of Shock Waves

- When $\nu = 0$, Burgers' equation reduces to **inviscid Burgers' equation**: $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = 0$.

- This equation is **nonlinear** and can lead to the formation of **shock waves** due to steepening of wavefronts.
- Characteristics may cross, causing **discontinuities** (shock formation).
- The solution can be obtained using the **method of characteristics**, which tracks wave propagation along characteristic curves.

2. Viscous Case ($\nu > 0$): Smooth Solutions

- For $\nu > 0$, the equation includes the diffusion term: $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = \nu\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}$..
- The presence of viscosity smooths out discontinuities, preventing shock wave formation.
- The solution behaves like a **diffusive wave**, and as ν\nu increases, the wave spreads more gradually.
- In the **high-viscosity limit**, the solution resembles a heat equation, leading to **Gaussian-like** diffusion.

3. Initial and Boundary Condition Influence

- **Step Initial Condition:** If the initial condition has a discontinuity (e.g., Riemann problem), shocks form in the inviscid case, while the viscous case leads to **smooth transitions**.
- **Periodic Boundary Conditions:** Can lead to **wave-like solutions** with periodic oscillations.
- **Fixed Boundary Conditions:** Can result in stationary or transient solutions depending on the problem setup.

4. Long-Time Behavior

- For large t, the solution converges to a steady state determined by boundary conditions.
- In the high-viscosity case, the steady-state solution satisfies: $u\frac{du}{dx} = \nu\frac{d^2u}{dx^2}$.
- If ν\nu is small but nonzero, a **thin boundary layer** may develop near discontinuities.

Conclusion

This study explored the numerical solutions of **nonlinear partial differential equations (PDEs)** using two widely used discretization techniques: the **Finite Difference Method (FDM)** and the **Finite Element Method (FEM)**. Specifically, Burgers' equation was considered as a test case, as it contains both **nonlinear convection** and **diffusive** terms, making it a useful benchmark for assessing numerical schemes.

Comparative Analysis

1. **Finite Difference Method (FDM):**
    - Simple to implement, particularly on **structured grids**.
    - Efficient for problems with **regular geometries** and periodic boundary conditions.
    - **Explicit methods** are easy to apply but require **CFL stability constraints**.
    - **Implicit schemes** (e.g., Crank-Nicolson) improve stability but increase computational cost.
    - Suitable for **shock formation studies**, but may require **unwinding schemes** or artificial viscosity to handle discontinuities.
2. **Finite Element Method (FEM):**
    - More **flexible** for complex geometries and unstructured meshes.
    - Handles **boundary conditions** more naturally through **weak formulation**.
    - Provides **higher-order accuracy** when using advanced basis functions (e.g., quadratic elements).
    - Computationally more expensive due to **matrix assembly and solving**.
    - More effective for problems requiring **adaptive mesh refinement (AMR)** or variable diffusion coefficients.

Key Findings

- **For smooth initial conditions and small viscosity (ν), both methods provide comparable results**, with FDM being computationally cheaper.
- **For shock formation (ν→0), FDM with unwinding schemes is easier to implement**, while FEM requires **stabilization techniques** (e.g., SUPG).
- **FEM is superior for irregular domains**, where mesh adaptively is necessary.
- **FDM is preferable for simple 1D problems**, while **FEM is recommended for 2D/3D problems with complex boundaries**.

Future Work

To further improve numerical modeling of nonlinear PDEs, future studies can explore:

- **Higher-order FDM schemes** (e.g., WENO, spectral methods) for better shock resolution.
- **Adaptive mesh refinement (AMR) in FEM** for improved accuracy and efficiency.
- **Hybrid FDM-FEM approaches** to leverage the strengths of both methods.
- **Parallel computing techniques** to enhance computational performance for large-scale problems.

Overall, the choice between FDM and FEM depends on the **problem type, computational resources, and required accuracy**. Both methods provide valuable tools for solving nonlinear PDEs, each with unique advantages and trade-offs.

Reference

1. Chen, Y., & Zhang, T. (2019). A weak Galerkin finite element method for Burgers' equation. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, *348*, 103-119.
2. Henrique de Almeida Konzen, P., Sauter, E., Souto de Azevedo, F., & de Ávila Zingano, P. R. (2016). Numerical simulations with the finite element method for the Burgers' equation on the real line. *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv-1605.
3. Khan, A., Mohan, M. T., & Ruiz-Baier, R. (2021). Conforming, nonconforming and DG methods for the stationary generalized Burgers-Huxley equation. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, *88*(3), 52.
4. Roberts, A. J. (1999). Holistic finite differences ensure fidelity to Burger's equation. arXiv preprint chao-dyn/9901011.
5. Pandey, K., Verma, L., & Verma, A. K. (2013). Du Fort–Frankel finite difference scheme for Burgers equation. Arabian Journal of Mathematics, 2, 91-101.
6. Hamfeldt, B. F., & Salvador, T. (2018). Higher-order adaptive finite difference methods for fully nonlinear elliptic equations. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, *75*(3), 1282-1306.
7. Oberman, A. M., & Zwiers, I. (2016). Adaptive finite difference methods for nonlinear elliptic and parabolic partial differential equations with free boundaries. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, *68*, 231-251.

8. Ali, A. H., Jaber, A. S., Yaseen, M. T., Rasheed, M., Bazighifan, O., & Nofal, T. A. (2022). [retracted] a comparison of finite difference and finite volume methods with numerical simulations: Burgers equation model. *Complexity*, *2022*(1), 9367638.
9. Adib, A., Poorveis, D., & Mehraban, F. (2018). Comparison between results of solution of Burgers' equation and Laplace's equation by Galerkin and least-square finite element methods. Applied Water Science, 8, 1-10.
10. Adib, A., Poorveis, D., & Mehraban, F. (2018). Comparison between results of solution of Burgers' equation and Laplace's equation by Galerkin and least-square finite element methods. *Applied Water Science*, *8*, 1-10.
11. Rathish Kumar, B. V., & Mehra, M. (2005). Wavelet-Taylor Galerkin method for the Burgers equation. BIT Numerical Mathematics, 45, 543-560.
12. Element-free characteristic Galerkin method for Burgers' equation