Advances in Theoretical and Applied Mathematics
ISSN 0973-4554 Volume 12, Number 2 (2017), pp. 153-164

https://dx.doi.org/10.37622/ATAM/12.2.2017.153.164

# Numerical Methods for Differential Equations: A Mathematical Review

**Dr. Shubhangi Kavishwar**[1]

[1]*Department of Mathematics, College of Engineering Pune, Pune, India*

**Abstract**

Numerical methods play a central role in the study of differential equations when exact analytical solutions are unavailable or difficult to obtain. This review presents a concise mathematical overview of major numerical approaches for ordinary and partial differential equations. The discussion emphasizes core analytical criteria such as consistency, stability, and convergence, followed by a brief account of one-step and multistep methods for ordinary differential equations and major discretization frameworks for partial differential equations, including finite difference, finite volume, finite element, and spectral methods. The paper concludes with a comparative discussion highlighting how the choice of method depends on the structure of the governing problem, including considerations of smoothness, conservation, geometry, stiffness, and discontinuities.

**Keywords:** numerical methods, differential equations, finite difference method, finite volume method, finite element method, spectral methods, stability, convergence.

## Introduction

Differential equations occupy a central place in mathematics because they provide a systematic language for describing change, interaction, and evolution in continuous systems. They arise naturally in the modeling of physical, biological, and engineered phenomena, where rates of variation are linked to underlying laws or constraints. In many important cases, however, exact analytical solutions are either unavailable or too complicated to be of practical use. This limitation has made numerical methods an essential part of modern mathematical analysis, allowing approximate solutions to be constructed with controllable accuracy and interpreted in a computational setting [6, 3].

The development of numerical methods for differential equations reflects a broader shift in mathematical practice, in which computation complements theory rather than merely serving as a secondary aid. For ordinary differential equations, this development produced one-step and multistep procedures that approximate solution trajectories through discrete updates. For partial differential equations, the challenge is greater, since one must approximate both spatial and temporal variation while also accounting for structural features such as conservation, irreg- ular geometry, boundary behavior, and discontinuities. As a result, a wide range of numerical frameworks has emerged, each based on a distinct discretization philosophy and each suited to different classes of problems [6, 3].

The mathematical study of numerical methods is not limited to the construction of algorithms. It also requires a careful examination of the analytical properties that make approximation meaningful. Concepts such as consistency, stability, and convergence provide the basic criteria by which a numerical method is judged, and they remain fundamental in both the ordinary and partial differential equation settings [6, 3]. In addition, many important problems demand attention to qualitative features of the continuous model itself. For example, conservation laws motivate conservative discretizations, stiff systems require methods with strong stability behavior, and solutions with sharp gradients or discontinuities call for schemes that balance accuracy with robustness [7, 5, 4].

For this reason, there is no universally best numerical method for all differential equations. Some methods are valued for simplicity and directness, some for geometric flexibility, some for conservative properties, and others for their ability to achieve very high accuracy for smooth solutions. Even across distinct areas of application, review literature repeatedly shows that numerical method selection is guided by recurring mathematical considerations such as dis- cretization strategy, stability requirements, conservation, smoothness, and the treatment of interfaces or singular behavior [1, 2, 4].

The purpose of the present paper is not to provide an exhaustive survey of all numerical methods, but rather to offer a concise mathematical synthesis of the principal approximation frameworks used for differential equations. The discussion is intentionally selective and focuses on core analytical ideas rather than on domain-specific applications. Section II outlines the principal mathematical criteria used in the analysis of numerical methods. Section III reviews major ap- proaches for ordinary differential equations, with emphasis on one-step and multistep methods. Section IV surveys the principal numerical frameworks for partial differential equations, includ- ing finite difference, finite volume, finite element, and spectral methods. Section V compares these approaches at a conceptual level, highlighting how the choice of method depends on the character of the underlying problem. The paper concludes with brief remarks on the continuing importance of mathematical judgment in numerical approximation.

**Mathematical Criteria for Numerical Methods**

A numerical method for a differential equation replaces a continuous problem by a discrete ap- proximation whose solution can be computed at a finite set of

points. This replacement is useful only if the discrete problem reflects the behavior of the original equation in a mathematically meaningful way. For this reason, the analysis of numerical methods is guided by a few central criteria, namely consistency, stability, and convergence [6, 3].
To make these ideas concrete, consider the initial value problem

$$y'(t) = f(t, y), \qquad y(t_0) = y_0 \tag{1}$$

A one-step numerical method may be written in the form

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + h\Phi(t_n, y_n; h) \tag{2}$$

where $h$ is the step size and $\Phi$ is the increment function defining the scheme. The exact solution *y(t)* generally does not satisfy (2) exactly, and the discrepancy between the two leads to the notion of truncation error.
Consistency measures whether the discrete formula reproduces the differential equation as the discretization becomes finer. For the method (2), the local truncation error at step $n$ may be expressed as

$$\tau_n = \frac{y(t_{n+1}) - y(t_n)}{h} + \Phi(t_n, y(t_n); h) \tag{3}$$

The method is consistent if $\tau_n \to 0$ as $h \to 0$. In other words, when the mesh is refined, the numerical update law should approach the original differential equation. This is the most basic requirement for any approximation scheme, since an inconsistent method does not even target the correct continuous problem [6, 3].
For partial differential equations, the same idea appears through the approximation of derivatives, fluxes, or weak forms. For example, if

$$u_x(x_i) \approx \frac{u_{i+1} - u_{i-1}}{2h} \tag{4}$$

then Taylor expansion shows that the approximation error is $O(h^2)$, so the discrete operator tends to the continuous derivative as $h \to 0$. Thus, consistency ensures that the algebraic form of the scheme is a correct approximation to the original equation, but by itself it says nothing about how numerical errors behave during computation.
That question is addressed by stability. Stability concerns the response of a numerical method to perturbations arising from round-off, data approximation, or previously accumulated dis- cretization error. A stable method prevents such perturbations from growing uncontrollably under repeated iteration. In the ordinary differential equation setting, stability is often studied through the linear test equation

$$y' = \lambda y, \tag{5}$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Applying the forward Euler method gives

$$y_{n+1} = (1 + h\lambda) y_n, \tag{6}$$

Hence the discrete solution remains bounded only when

$$(1 + h\lambda) < 1 \tag{7}$$

This example shows that even a simple consistent method may fail if the step size is too large relative to the problem. Stability therefore describes the ability of a scheme to control error propagation under iteration [6].

In partial differential equations, stability is often tied to the structure of the equation itself. For conservation laws and hyperbolic systems, one is concerned not only with boundedness but also with the prevention of nonphysical oscillations near steep gradients or discontinuities. This leads to ideas such as monotonicity, entropy consistency, and discrete maximum principles [5, 4]. In diffusion-dominated problems, stability may be connected with time-step restrictions or coercivity of the associated bilinear form. Thus, stability is not a single universal condition, but a general principle requiring that the discrete problem behave in a controlled manner under perturbation.

Convergence is the decisive criterion linking the numerical solution back to the original dif- ferential equation. A method is convergent if the numerical approximation approaches the exact solution as the discretization parameters tend to zero. For a sequence of approximations $y_n \approx y(t_n)$, convergence means that

$$\max_{0 \le n \le N} \left| y_n - y(t_n) \right| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad h \to 0. \tag{8}$$

For partial differential equations, an analogous condition is imposed in an appropriate norm as the mesh is refined. Convergence is the ultimate justification for a numerical method, since it ensures that discrete computation approximates the true mathematical solution rather than merely producing a plausible sequence of numbers [6, 3].

These three criteria are deeply related. Consistency guarantees that the discrete equations approximate the correct continuous model, while stability ensures that errors do not overwhelm the computation. Convergence then follows when both properties work together appropriately. In the theory of linear multistep methods, this relationship is especially explicit: consistency together with zero-stability implies convergence [6]. Similar ideas also guide the analysis of partial differential equations, although the nonlinear and multidimensional setting is often much more delicate [3].

In addition to consistency, stability, and convergence, the analysis of numerical methods often involves structural criteria arising from the differential equation itself. Conservation laws moti- vate methods that preserve flux balances at the discrete level, which is one of the main reasons finite volume methods are important [7, 5]. Weak formulations motivate finite element meth- ods, where approximation is carried out in finite-dimensional function spaces. Smooth solutions favor high-order or spectral approximations, whereas discontinuous solutions require methods that suppress spurious oscillations and respect entropy or monotonicity constraints [3, 4]. These considerations show that the quality of a numerical method is not determined solely by formal order of accuracy, but by how well the discrete scheme reflects the analytical character of the underlying problem.

The criteria discussed in this section therefore provide the mathematical foundation for the study of numerical methods. They explain why numerical approximation is more than algorithm design: it is a disciplined attempt to preserve, within a discrete setting, the essential behavior of a continuous problem. The next sections apply these ideas to the principal numerical methods for ordinary and partial differential equations.

**Numerical Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations**

Consider the initial value problem

$$\frac{dy}{dt} = f(t, y), \qquad y(t_0) = y_0, \tag{9}$$

where the objective is to approximate the solution at a discrete set of points $t_n = t_0 + nh$, with step size $h > 0$. Numerical methods for ordinary differential equations replace the continuous evolution of (9) by a recurrence relation that generates approximations $y_n \approx y(t_n)$. The basic mathematical problem is therefore to construct update formulas that are accurate, stable, and computationally feasible [6].

A simple starting point is the forward Euler method,

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + hf(t_n + y_n) \tag{10}$$

which is obtained by truncating the Taylor expansion of the exact solution after the first deriva- tive term. Although (10) is easy to implement, it is only first-order accurate and may perform poorly when stability restrictions are severe. A more accurate family of one-step methods is given by Runge–Kutta schemes, which compute

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + h\sum_{i=1}^{s} b_i k_i \tag{11}$$

where the stage values $k_i$ are defined by

$$k_i = f\left(t_n + c_i h, y_n + h\sum_{j=1}^{s} a_{i,j} k_j\right), \quad i = 1,2,\ldots,s \tag{12}$$

These methods achieve higher order by sampling the vector field $f$ at carefully chosen interme- diate points within each time step [6]. In explicit Runge–Kutta methods, the coefficients satisfy $a_{ij} = 0$ for $j \geq i$, whereas implicit variants allow stronger stability properties at the cost of solving algebraic equations at each step.

A second major class consists of multistep methods, in which the next approximation depends on several previously computed values. A general linear multistep method can be written as

$$y_{n+1} = y_n + h\sum_{i=1}^{s} b_i k_i \tag{13}$$

with constants $\alpha_j$ and $\beta_j$. The Adams–Bashforth and Adams–Moulton families arise as partic- ular choices of these coefficients, with the former being explicit and the latter implicit [6]. The advantage of multistep methods is that they can attain high order with fewer function evalua- tions per step, but their analysis is more delicate because the propagation of error depends on the characteristic structure of the recurrence relation.

The local truncation error of a numerical method measures how well the exact solution satisfies the discrete update formula. For example, a one-step method has order $p$ if its local truncation error is $O(h^{p+1})$. However, as emphasized in the modern theory of numerical analysis, formal order alone is not sufficient. For multistep methods in particular, convergence depends on both consistency and stability. The classical framework developed in the twentieth century showed that a linear multistep method is convergent if it is consistent and zero-stable, thereby linking the approximation properties of the scheme to the behavior of its error propagation mechanism [6].

An important test problem for stability is the linear equation

$$y' = \lambda y, \tag{14}$$

where $\lambda \in C$. Applying a numerical method to (14) yields a recurrence whose amplification behavior depends on the product $z = h\lambda$. For the forward Euler method, one obtains

$$y_{n+1} = (1+z)y_n, \tag{15}$$

so stability requires $|1+z| < 1$. This illustrates why explicit methods may become ineffective for stiff problems, where $\lambda$ may have a large negative real part and force the use of very small step sizes. In such cases, implicit methods are preferred because their stability regions are typically much larger [6].

Thus, the theory of numerical methods for ordinary differential equations is built around a small set of core mathematical ideas: discrete evolution, order of approximation, recurrence structure, and stability under repeated time stepping. One-step methods provide flexibility and conceptual simplicity, whereas multistep methods use previously computed information more economically. The study of these methods forms a natural foundation for the broader numerical treatment of partial differential equations, where similar ideas reappear together with the added difficulty of spatial discretization.

**Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations**

Partial differential equations involve unknown functions of several independent variables and often describe the interaction of spatial variation with temporal evolution. In contrast with or- dinary differential equations, numerical approximation now requires the discretization of space, and frequently of time as well. A typical model problem may be written as

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L}(u) = 0, \tag{16}$$

where $L$ denotes a spatial differential operator. The construction of numerical methods then amounts to replacing $L$ by a discrete operator and studying the resulting algebraic or semi- discrete system [3].

A basic example is the finite difference method, in which derivatives are replaced by difference quotients on a mesh. For a function $u(x)$ defined on grid points $x_i = ih$, the first derivative may be approximated by

$$u_x(x_i) \approx \frac{u_{i+1} - u_i}{h} \tag{17}$$

or by the central difference formula

$$u_x(x_i) \approx \frac{u_{i+1} - u_{i-1}}{2h} \tag{18}$$

Similarly, the second derivative may be approximated by

$$u_{xx}(x_i) \approx \frac{u_{i+1} - 2u_i - u_{i-1}}{h^2} \tag{19}$$

These formulas convert differential equations into systems of algebraic relations among nodal values. For example, the heat equation

$$u_t = \alpha u_{xx} \tag{20}$$

may be discretized explicitly as

$$u_i^{n+1} = u_i^n + \frac{\alpha \Delta t}{h^2}\left(u_{i+1}^n - 2u_i^n + u_{i-1}^n\right) \tag{21}$$

which illustrates how spatial and temporal discretization combine in practice. Finite difference methods are direct and effective on regular grids, but their flexibility is limited when geometry becomes complex or when the solution

contains strong discontinuities [3].
The finite volume method begins instead from the integral form of a conservation law. For a one-dimensional equation

$$u_t + f(u)_x = 0 \tag{22}$$

integration over a control volume $\left[ x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}} \right]$ gives

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} u(x,t)dx + f\left( u(x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}, t) \right) - f\left( u(x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}, t) \right) = 0 \tag{23}$$

Defining the cell average

$$\bar{u}_i(t) = \frac{1}{\Delta x}\int_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} u(x,t)dx, \tag{24}$$

one obtains the semi-discrete finite volume form

$$\frac{d\bar{u}_i}{dt}\frac{1}{\Delta x}\left( F_{i+\frac{1}{2}} - F_{i-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \tag{25}$$

where $F_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ is a numerical flux at the cell interface [7, 5]. This formulation makes local con-
servation explicit, since the flux leaving one cell enters the neighboring cell with opposite sign. For this reason, finite volume methods are particularly appropriate for conservation laws and for problems in which physically meaningful flux balance must be preserved.
The finite element method is based on weak formulation. Consider, for instance, the boundary value problem

$$-u''(x) = f(x), \quad x \in (a,b), \quad u(a) = u(b) = 0. \tag{26}$$

Multiplying by a test function v and integrating gives

$$\int_a^b -u''(x)v(x)dx = \int_a^b f(x)v(x)dx. \tag{27}$$

After integration by parts and use of the boundary conditions, one obtains the weak form

$$\int_a^b -u'(x)v'(x)dx = \int_a^b f(x)v(x)dx. \tag{28}$$

The finite element approximation then seeks uh in a finite-dimensional space $V_h$ such that

$$\int_a^b -u_h'(x)v_h'(x)dx = \int_a^b f(x)v(x)dx \quad \text{for all } v_h \in V_h, \tag{29}$$

This variational structure is one of the main strengths of the finite element method. It accom- modates irregular geometries, piecewise polynomial approximations, and generalized notions of solution in a mathematically systematic way [3].

Spectral methods follow a different idea by representing the solution through global basis func- tions. A typical approximation has the form

$$uN(x,t) = \sum_{k=0}^{N} a_k(t)\phi_k(x) \quad (30)$$

where $\{\phi_k\}$ is a family of orthogonal polynomials or trigonometric basis functions. The coeffi- cients $a_k(t)$ are then determined by enforcing the governing equation in a Galerkin, collocation, or related sense. When the exact solution is smooth, spectral methods can achieve very rapid convergence as $N$ increases, often outperforming low-order local methods in accuracy per de- gree of freedom [3]. Their weakness is that this global structure makes them more sensitive to discontinuities and localized irregularities.

These four frameworks therefore embody distinct mathematical viewpoints. Finite differences approximate derivatives directly, finite volumes enforce integral conservation, finite elements approximate weak formulations in finite-dimensional spaces, and spectral methods use global basis expansions for high-order approximation. Each has its own analytical strengths, and none is universally optimal. The choice among them depends on the type of equation, the geometry of the domain, the regularity of the solution, and the structural properties that must be preserved in the numerical approximation [3, 7, 5, 4].

**Choosing Among Methods**

The preceding sections show that numerical methods for differential equations are not merely different computational procedures, but different mathematical frameworks for approximation. Their usefulness depends on the nature of the differential equation and on the properties one wishes to preserve in the numerical solution. The choice of a method is therefore best understood as a problem of matching the structure of the discrete scheme to the structure of the continuous model [3].

For ordinary differential equations, the main issue is the construction of a reliable time-stepping process. One-step methods are often preferred for their flexibility and self-contained structure, while multistep methods may be attractive when efficiency over long integrations is important [6]. The central question is usually whether the method can deliver sufficient accuracy without losing stability under repeated iteration. This becomes especially important for stiff systems, where implicit methods are often more appropriate than explicit ones.

For partial differential equations, method selection depends more strongly on the mathematical form of the governing equation. When the problem is posed on a simple domain and the solution is expected to remain smooth, finite difference methods may provide a direct and efficient approximation. Their appeal lies in the straightforward replacement of derivatives by difference quotients and in the ease with which they can be implemented on structured meshes [3]. However, this simplicity becomes less advantageous when the geometry is irregular or when boundary treatment is complicated.

Finite volume methods become especially valuable when conservation is a central feature of the problem. Since they are derived from the integral balance of fluxes over control volumes, they preserve local conservation in a natural way and therefore adapt well to hyperbolic conservation laws and related transport problems [7, 5]. Their importance increases when discontinuities, shocks, or steep gradients are present, because in such settings a conservative formulation is often essential for obtaining meaningful approximations. At the same time, these methods require careful numerical flux design in order to balance accuracy with stability and non-oscillatory behavior [5, 4].

Finite element methods are often preferred when geometric flexibility and variational structure are important. Their weak-form framework is well suited to boundary value problems on irregular domains and to situations where the natural mathematical formulation already lives in a function space setting. In such cases, the method benefits from its ability to use local basis functions on non-uniform meshes while remaining closely connected to the analytical structure of the problem [3].

Spectral methods are most attractive when the solution is sufficiently smooth and very high accuracy is required. Because they approximate the solution by global basis expansions, they can converge rapidly with comparatively few degrees of freedom when the regularity assumptions are favorable [3]. Their limitations become visible when the solution contains discontinuities or strongly localized irregularities, since the global character of the approximation may then produce oscillatory behavior.

In broad terms, finite difference methods prioritize direct derivative approximation, finite volume methods prioritize conservation, finite element methods prioritize variational flexibility, and spectral methods prioritize high-order accuracy for smooth solutions. This comparison makes clear that the differences among methods are not merely technical, but arise from distinct mathematical viewpoints.

Review literature across several areas of applied mathematics also shows that method choice often depends on whether the problem is formulated differentially, integrally, or in weak form, and on whether interfaces, multi-scale features, or discontinuities dominate the analysis [1, 2]. This does not mean that each application requires an entirely new theory, but rather that recurring mathematical themes such as conservation, coupling, mesh structure, and regularity influence the design of suitable numerical approximations.

It follows that no single method can be regarded as universally superior. A method that per- forms well for smooth solutions on regular grids may fail in the presence of discontinuities; a method that is geometrically flexible may be less natural for strictly conservative problems; and a highly accurate global approximation may lose robustness when local irregularities domi- nate. The proper choice therefore rests on a balance among consistency, stability, convergence, conservation, geometric adaptability, and the regularity of the expected solution [3, 7, 4].

In this sense, selecting a numerical method is itself a mathematical judgment. It requires understanding not only how a scheme is constructed, but also what aspects of the differential equation it captures most faithfully. Numerical analysis is therefore not simply about devising approximations, but about choosing approximations that respect the essential character of the continuous problem.

**Conclusion**

Numerical methods have become indispensable in the study of differential equations because they make it possible to approximate problems for which exact analytical solutions are unavail- able or impractical. At the same time, their importance is not merely computational. As the present review has emphasized, numerical methods are rooted in clear mathematical princi- ples, and their study requires attention to consistency, stability, convergence, and the structural properties of the equations being approximated [6, 3].

For ordinary differential equations, the central ideas emerge through discrete time-stepping, the distinction between one-step and multistep methods, and the role of stability in repeated iter- ation. For partial differential equations, the mathematical landscape becomes broader, leading to several major discretization frameworks. Finite difference methods provide direct approxi- mations of derivatives, finite volume methods preserve local conservation through flux balance, finite element methods arise naturally from weak formulations, and spectral methods offer high- order global approximation for sufficiently smooth solutions [3, 7, 5].

A central conclusion of this review is that no numerical method is universally best. Each method reflects a distinct approximation philosophy, and its suitability depends on the mathematical character of the underlying problem. Questions of smoothness, stiffness, conservation, geometry, and discontinuity all influence the choice of an appropriate numerical framework [6, 4]. The se- lection of a method is therefore not a purely technical matter, but an extension of mathematical analysis itself.

In this sense, numerical analysis may be viewed as a bridge between continuous theory and discrete computation. Its purpose is not only to generate approximate answers, but to do so in a way that preserves the essential features of the original problem as faithfully as possible. Even within the concise scope of the present review, it is clear that the enduring value of numerical methods lies in this combination of analytical rigor, computational practicality, and mathematical judgment.

**References**

[1] B. Gallinet, J. Butet, and O. J. F. Martin, "Numerical methods for nanophotonics: Stan- dard problems and future challenges," *Laser & Photonics Reviews*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 577– 603, 2015.

[2] G. Hou, J. Wang, and A. Layton, "Numerical methods for fluid-structure interaction—A review," *Communications in Computational Physics*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 337–377, 2012.
[3] E. Tadmor, "A review of numerical methods for nonlinear partial differential equations,"
*Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 507–554, 2012.
[4] S. Pirozzoli, "Numerical methods for high-speed flows," *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*, vol. 43, pp. 163–194, 2011.
[5] T. J. Barth and M. Ohlberger, "Finite volume methods: Foundation and analysis," in *Encyclopedia of Computational Mechanics*, E. Stein, R. de Borst, and T. J. R. Hughes, Eds. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.
[6] J. C. Butcher, "Numerical methods for ordinary differential equations in the 20th century,"
*Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 125, no. 1–2, pp. 1–29, 2000.
[7] R. Eymard, T. Gallouët, and R. Herbin, "Finite volume methods," in *Handbook of Numer- ical Analysis*, vol. 7, P. G. Ciarlet and J. L. Lions, Eds. Elsevier, 2000, pp. 713–1020.