Volume 11, Issue 3, March – 2026 International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology
ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar1593

Stability and Precision in Adaptive Finite Difference and Fourier Transform Numerical Analysis of Dynamic Systems and Partial Differential Equations

Hameed Hasan Obaid Anous Yasaria[1]

[1]Directorate of Education in Karbala

Publication Date: 2026/04/07

Abstract: This study addresses the challenge between global spectral accuracy and shock-capturing capability in nonlinear PDE simulations. Fourier spectral methods suffer from Gibbs phenomena near discontinuities, while finite difference methods exhibit dispersion and phase errors. A novel adaptive hybrid scheme is proposed that combines high-order finite difference operators with Fourier spectral differentiation. The method employs a spatial smoothness sensor to dynamically weight both approaches based on local solution behavior. Stability is ensured through a rigorous analysis satisfying a modified CFL condition. The scheme achieves spectral-level accuracy in smooth regions while suppressing spurious oscillations near nonsmooth areas. Numerical results demonstrate reduced L2 error and competitive computational efficiency compared to standard methods.

How to Cite: Hameed Hasan Obaid Anous Yasaria (2026) Stability and Precision in Adaptive Finite Difference and Fourier Transform Numerical Analysis of Dynamic Systems and Partial Differential Equations. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology,* 11(3), 3455-3463. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar1593

I. INTRODUCTION

The correct formulation of dynamical systems and Partial Differential Equations (PDEs) helps greatly in the mathematical modelling of complex physical phenomena: from signal processing to the study of the movement of fluids and the dynamics of structures. The groundwork for understanding the development of continuous systems in time and space has been laid through these mathematical tools. The ability of the equations to be solved analytically becomes greatly diminished when the requirements of accurate simulations escalate.

However, owing to the above challenges of the conventional method, there has been an emerging need to apply numeric analysis in order to fill the existing divide between the development of the theory and the applications. Given the fact that the development of the theory of the fractional differential equations remains complex, the establishment of efficient control methods and the study of the stability of the said nonlinear systems has also been of prime importance in recent research (Jiang, 2025). To add to the above challenges of the macroscopic level of engineering, there has been a substantiated need at the nano-level of structural dynamics (Awrejcewicz et al., 2021).

The greatest challenge in the area of numeric approximations involves balancing the accuracy of the solution and the efficiency of the computation. The usage of conventional discretization methodologies in models described by complex boundary conditions, as well as those involving stochastic components, remains a challenge. A state-of-the-art review has shown that, although the current state of the art has made it possible to provide a numeric solution to fractional stochastic PDEs, the development of a general framework that guarantees the solution’s convergence without involving exponentially expensive processing requirements remains a topic of active research (Moghaddam et al., 2024). The situation can be rendered even worse in explicit numeric models due to the CFL constraint.

Finite Difference Methods (FDM) and Spectral (or Transform-based) Methods are the two broad classifications of the existing numerical methods that have been employed to surmount the mentioned limitations. Owing to their convenience in the coding procedure and their ability to address the boundary constraints directly, Finite Difference Methods are employed. In an effort to improve the stability boundaries of the diffusion reaction type of equations and retain the efficiency of the explicit time marching procedure simultaneously, existing research has explored the possibility of improving the performance of explicit Finite Difference Methods (Jalghaf et al., 2021). Nevertheless, without the recourse to high-order stencils, Finite Difference Methods often suffer from dispersion errors and reduced precision.

On the contrary, spectral and Fourier transform methods are best suited in high-precision computations due to their "spectral accuracy" in which the strength of the solution's error becomes exponentially smaller with the increasing number of solved modes. Spectral methods have been found to be efficient in tackling difficult problems like the numerical solution of fractional stochastic delay differential equations due to the relevant stability analysis that confirms the improved characteristics of spectral methods in the mentioned field (Li et al., 2024). Meanwhile, the introduction of integral transforms like the Shehu transform along with the modified homotropy perturbation approach has been found to be promising in the solution of the conformable fractional nonlinear PDEs due to the efficiency of the transform methods in tackling non-standard problems (Liaqat et al., 2023).

There are no comprehensive and flexible models available in the existing body of knowledge that could simultaneously harness the benefits of Finite Difference Methods and Fourier Transform methods, despite their strengths. Although the standard Finite Difference Model may perhaps be less precise when considering the behavior of high frequency phenomena, the standard spectrum models might find it difficult to consider complex regions and localized points of discontinuity. Accordingly, this paper hypothesizes the development of a novel approach to the numerical solution of problems by combining the benefits of the Fourier Transform method and the Adaptive Finite Difference method. The aim of this study is to develop a robust approach that can be flexible enough to respond to the local requirements of dynamical systems through the interaction of concepts of stability and accuracy.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The emergence of discretization methods in general, and Finite Difference Methods (FDM) and Finite Element Methods (FEM) in particular, has been crucial to the advancement of the field of numerical analysis of dynamical systems and partial differential equations (PDEs). The quest to improve the accuracy at points of discontinuity and boundaries has been an area of immense research today. The complexity of high order cell centered difference methods has been recently investigated, particularly at boundaries across blocks. In shock and distorted problems, where standard low-order methods fail to satisfactorily model the physical phenomena without developing spurious oscillations (Liao et al., 2025), this has been particularly important.

There has also been considerable progress in the field of stabilization methodologies as a result of the need to achieve stabilization in mesh-based methods. Numerical instability problems encountered in numerically modelling convicted flows can be efficiently alleviated through the combination of high-order schemes and sub cell stabilization methodologies, as exemplified in the extension of high order Discontinuous Galer kin formulations for the level set reinitialization procedure (Yüksel, 2023). In addition, the development of the finite element method through the introduction of high order enriching functions has been driven by the requirements of achieving accuracy in electrodynamic simulations in order to model wave propagation phenomena accurately without overly refining the mesh (Du et al., 2022).

Temporal stability remains a dominating constraint factor, essentially bounded by the Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy condition, at least in the context of recent progress in spatial discretization. In the general context of the Finite Cell Method, recent work has been concerned with the CFL condition from the theory viewpoint and has presented novel insights concerning the bounds of stability of explicit time stepping algorithms (Bürchner et al., 2025). This situation illustrates the typical trade-off existing in grid-based discretization methods.

A complex treatment of boundaries and spatially improved resolutions often cause a drastic reduction of the maximum allowable time step size, which increases the computation effort of large time-scale problems.

The concept of Fourier Transform and spectrum remains predominant in problems requiring a high level of accuracy and spectral convergence, especially in periodic domains, along with the development of grid methods. The application of Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) has also been studied in the context of micromechanics, and FFT methods remain an efficient alternative to FEM in computing unit cells and an effective method for tackling boundary value problems in heterogeneous materials (Lucarini et al., 2021).

Fourier spectrum methods can be applied to the simulation of coarsening and pattern evolution in energy models as well as phase field models and interface evolution. The methods work exceptionally well in the simulation of the diffuse interface, which signifies the phase transition and can be a rather computationally expensive task when accomplished through low-order difference methods (Owolabi et al., 2025). Mixed Fourier series with one-dimensional smooth closed-form functions of compact support have also been explored in order to improve the treatment of non-periodic signals, thus closing the gap existing between the principles of harmonic analysis and the principles of efficient signal reconstruction (Páez-Rueda et al., 2023).

The theory underlying the above transform methods remains the focal point of foundational as well as educational research. Proper application of the above algorithms needs comprehensive understanding of the Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT), especially when the discrete data sets are derived from a continuous dynamical system (Brigola, 2025). The principles of dynamical adaptation and response evaluation of the system find ample applications in engineering disciplines and transcend basic computations. For example, the dynamic link adaptation algorithms applied in the telecommunication sector can be used to maximize filter-band multicarrier communication networks (Tiwana et al., 2022).

In a way, there is also the same need in the field of manufacturing and structural dynamics to arrive at reliable models of performance and failure of materials when predicting the service life behavior of the 3D printable hybrid polymer bearings through the method of Fused Deposition Modelling (FDM) (Doğan & Karaçay, 2025). The study of the structural dynamics that follows makes clear the general need of proper models of prediction, though the letters 'FDM' actually represent a production method this time.

Table 1 Summary of Reviewed Methodologies

Reference	Focus Area	Key Contribution/Methodology
(Liao et al., 2025)	Finite Difference Method	Addressed boundary treatments in high-order FDM for shocks and distortions.
(Yüksel, 2023)	Discontinuous Galerkin	Proposed subcell stabilization for level set reinitialization.
(Du et al., 2022)	Finite Element Method	Introduced high-order enrichment functions for elastodynamic analysis.
(Bürchner et al., 2025)	Stability Analysis	derived new CFL conditions for the finite cell method.
(Lucarini et al., 2021)	FFT & Micromechanics	Reviewed FFT approaches for simulating heterogeneous materials.
(Owolabi et al., 2025)	Spectral Methods	Applied Fourier spectral methods to phase field and interface dynamics.
(Páez-Rueda et al., 2023)	Signal Processing	Explored mixed Fourier series with compact support functions.
(Brigola, 2025)	Fourier Theory	Foundational analysis of Discrete Fourier Transforms.
(Tiwana et al., 2022)	Adaptive Systems	Investigated dynamic link adaptation in network systems.
(Doğan & Karaçay, 2025)	Structural Dynamics	Analyzed service life behavior of components (via 3D printing FDM).

A distinctive difference in modern numerical methods becomes apparent when synthesizing the assessed information. On the one hand, the grid methods (FDM, FEM) mentioned in (Liao et al., 2025), (Du et al., 2022), and (Bürchner et al., 2025) achieved significant advances in the treatment of complex boundary conditions and local meshes, yet remain limited due to the CFL stability restrictions and dispersion errors at high frequencies. By contrast, spectral and Fourier methods (Lucarini et al., 2021), (Owolabi et al., 2025), (Brigola, 2025) are preferable regarding global dynamics computation accuracy and efficiency, yet often face problems when confronted with complex boundaries and local discontinuities.

The identified research gap involves the lack of a unified and adaptive framework that integrates the precision of the Fourier Transform's spectrum resolution capability and the local flexibility of Finite Difference methods. There is limited research work concerning the development of a hybrid solver method that automatically switches or combines the two mentioned mathematical models according to the estimated errors within the context of real-time computation of partial differential equations, although adaptive methodologies do exist in specific contexts like network paths (Tiwana et al., 2022) and specific stabilizing methods (Yüksel, 2023). As opposed to adapting the method according to the dynamical behavior of the system at hand, the existing hybrid models are mostly static and rely on the application of one method to the global region or predefined regions. An effort aims to fill this research gap through the development of an algorithm combining the maximum possible levels of precision and stability.

III. MATHEMATICAL FORMULATION OF HIGH-ORDER FINITE DIFFERENCE SCHEMES

The first, and most important, component of the proposed hybrid model therefore resides in the efficient, high-order discretization of the spatial grid. Though global accuracy for the solution is the benefit that spectral methods provide, such schemes are necessarily unable to provide the necessary locality to accurately model the behavior near discontinuities. As such, the following section formally develops the high-order Finite Difference formulation, beginning with the definition of the central difference fourth-order differential operator – the 'shock-capturing' component of the adaptive scheme.

➢ *Discretization and Taylor Series Expansions*

To convert the continuous partial differential equation into a solvable algebraic system, we must first define the discrete computational domain.

Definition 3.1 (The Grid Function and Spatial Discretization). Let Ω=[L_0,L_1]⊂R be the spatial domain. We define a uniform partition of Ω consisting of N sub-intervals of equal length Δx=(L_1-L_0)/N. The set of discrete collocation points is given by X={x_j|x_j=L_0+jΔx,j=0,1,…,N-1}. A grid function u_j (t) is defined as the approximation of the continuous solution u(x,t) at these discrete points, such that u_j (t)≈u(x_j,t).

The derivation of finite difference coefficients relies fundamentally on the assumption that the solution u(x,t) is sufficiently smooth within the local stencil, allowing for polynomial approximation. This is formalized by Taylor's Theorem.

Theorem 3.1 (Taylor's Theorem with Lagrange Remainder). Let f:R→R be a function that is n+1 times differentiable on an open interval containing a and x. Then, the value of the function at x can be expanded as:

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{f^{(k)}(a)}{k!}(x-a)^k + R_n(x),$$

Where the remainder term is given by $R_n(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi)}{(n+1)!}(x-a)^{n+1}$ for some ξ between a and x. Derivation of Finite Difference Coefficients. To approximate the first derivative u_j' at node x_j with high-order accuracy, we employ the method of undetermined coefficients using a linear combination of function values at neighboring grid points. By applying Theorem 3.1, we expand the neighboring terms $u_{j\pm k} = u(x_j \pm k\Delta x)$ around x_j. For a generic central difference scheme, we seek coefficients q_k such that $\sum\ q_k u_{j+k} \approx u_j'$. The order of accuracy is determined by the highest power of Δx that is eliminated from the truncation error. For the specific requirements of this research, which demands a balance between computational cost and precision, we proceed to construct a fourth-order scheme.

- *Construction of the Fourth-Order Central Difference Operator*

Standard second-order schemes often introduce excessive dissipation or dispersion errors that degrade the solution quality over long integration times. Consequently, we employ a five-point stencil to achieve fourth-order accuracy.

Proposition 3.1 (Fourth-Order Central Difference Operator). Let $u(x) \in C^5(\mathbb{R})$. The first spatial derivative $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}$ at point x_j can be approximated by the linear operator $\mathcal{D}_{FD}^{(4)}$ defined as:

$$\mathcal{D}_{FD}^{(4)}[u]_j = \frac{-u_{j+2} + 8u_{j+1} - 8u_{j-1} + u_{j-2}}{12\Delta x}.$$

Proof 3.1 (Consistency and Truncation Error). We prove the proposition by substituting the Taylor series expansions of the stencil points into Equation (3.2). Let $h = \Delta x$. Expanding $u(x+h), u(x-h), u(x+2h)$, and $u(x-2h)$ up to the fifth order yields:

$$u_{j\pm1} = u_j \pm hu_j' + \frac{h^2}{2}u_j'' \pm \frac{h^3}{6}u_j'' + \frac{h^4}{24}u_j^{(4)} \pm \frac{h^5}{120}u_j^{(5)} + O(h^6)$$
$$u_{j\pm2} = u_j \pm 2hu_j' + \frac{4h^2}{2}u_j'' \pm \frac{8h^3}{6}u_j'' + \frac{16h^4}{24}u_j^{(4)} \pm \frac{32h^5}{120}u_j^{(5)} + O(h^6)$$

Constructing the numerator of the operator in (3.2):

$$8(u_{j+1} - u_{j-1}) = 16hu_j' + \frac{8h^3}{3}u_j'' + \frac{h^5}{15}u^{(5)}{}_j + O(h^7)$$

$$-(u_{j+2} - u_{j-2}) = -4hu_j' - \frac{8h^3}{3}u_j'' - \frac{8h^5}{15}u_j^{(5)} + O(h^7)$$

Summing (3.5) and (3.6) eliminates the third derivative terms:

$$\text{Numerator } = 12hu_j' - \frac{7h^5}{15}u_j^{(5)} + O(h^7).$$

Dividing by the denominator $12h$, we obtain:

$$\mathcal{D}_{FD}^{(4)}[u]_j = u_j' - \frac{7h^4}{180}u^{(5)}{}_j + O(h^6).$$

The leading error term is proportional to h^4, proving that the operator is fourth-order accurate, $O(\Delta x^4)$.

Remark 3.1 (Dispersion Errors). While Proposition 3.1 guarantees high convergence rates for well-resolved waves, the truncation error depends on the fifth derivative $u^{(5)}$. For high-frequency modes where derivatives grow with the wavenumber k (i.e., $u^{(n)} \sim k^n$), this error becomes significant. This manifests as numerical dispersion, where high-frequency wave components travel at incorrect velocities, causing phase lag. This limitation motivates the necessity of the hybrid spectral approach detailed in later chapters.

- *Stability Analysis via Von Neumann Method*

To ensure the numerical solution remains bounded over time, we perform a linear stability analysis.

Definition 3.2 (The Amplification Factor). The amplification factor $G(\xi)$ is a complex scalar that quantifies the growth or decay of a Fourier mode over a single time step. We assume a solution of the form $u_j^n = E^n e^{i\xi x_j}$, where ξ is the wavenumber and $i = \sqrt{-1}$. The scheme is stable if $|G(\xi)| \leq 1$ for all $\xi \in [-\pi/\Delta x, \pi/\Delta x]$.

Theorem 3.2 (Stability Condition for Explicit Integration). For a semi-discrete system $\frac{du}{dt} = \mathcal{L}(u)$, discretized by an explicit time-marching scheme with stability region $\mathcal{S}$, the numerical solution is stable if and only if the scaled eigenvalues $\lambda\Delta t$ of the spatial operator $\mathcal{L}$ lie entirely within $\mathcal{S}$ for all resolvable wavenumbers.

Example 3.1 (Stability of 4th Order Advection). Consider the linear advection equation $u_t + cu_x = 0$. Using the operator from Proposition 3.1, the spatial discretization in Fourier space is derived by substituting the ansatz $e^{i\xi j\Delta x}$:

$$\frac{du_j}{dt} = -c\left(\frac{-e^{2i\theta} + 8e^{i\theta} - 8e^{-i\theta} + e^{-2i\theta}}{12\Delta x}\right)u_j, \text{ where } \theta = \xi\Delta x.$$

Using the Euler identity $e^{ix} - e^{-ix} = 2i\sin(x)$, this simplifies to:

$$\lambda(\theta) = -i\frac{c}{\Delta x}\left(\frac{8\sin(\theta) - \sin(2\theta)}{6}\right).$$

The eigenvalues λ are purely imaginary. For the classical RK4 time integration, the stability region encompasses a segment of the imaginary axis up to approximately $\pm 2.82i$. Thus, stability requires:

$$\Delta t\left|\max_{\theta}\lambda(\theta)\right| \leq 2.82 \Rightarrow \frac{c\Delta t}{\Delta x}\cdot(1.37) \leq 2.82.$$

This imposes the Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy (CFL) constraint CFL $\lesssim 2.06$, which dictates the maximum allowable time step for the finite difference component of our hybrid solver.

IV. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF FOURIER SPECTRAL METHODS

In spectral methods, the solution is reconstructed from a global combination of mutually orthogonal basis functions, as opposed to the use of local polynomial approximations as in the finite difference method. While the finite difference method requires information throughout the entire domain, it provides what can be described as having “infinite-order” accuracy for well-behaved problems. In this section, the differentiation operator expressed in the frequency domain, the Fourier bases, and the theoretical limitations underlying the adaptive scheme that the paper proposes are discussed.

➢ *Orthogonal Basis Functions and Fourier Series*

The efficiency of spectral methods stems from the orthogonality properties of the trigonometric polynomials on a periodic domain.

Definition 4.1 (The Discrete Fourier Transform). Let $u \in \mathbb{C}^N$ be a grid function defined on the uniform collocation points $x_j = 2\pi j/N$ for $j = 0, \ldots, N-1$. The Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT) maps the physical space values u_j to the spectral coefficients $\hat{u}_k$ via the linear transformation:

$$\hat{u}_k = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} u_j e^{-ikx_j}, k = -\frac{N}{2}, \ldots, \frac{N}{2} - 1.$$

Conversely, the physical solution is recovered via the Inverse Discrete Fourier Transform (IDFT):

$$u_j = \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2-1} \hat{u}_k e^{ikx_j}.$$

Property 4.1 (Orthogonality). The complex exponentials $\phi_k(x) = e^{ikx}$ form an orthogonal basis on the discrete set of points x_j. Specifically, the discrete inner product satisfies:

$$\langle \phi_k, \phi_m \rangle_N = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} e^{ikx_j} e^{-imx_j} = \begin{cases} N \text{ if } k = m (\mathrm{mod} N), \\ 0 \text{ if } k = m (\mathrm{mod} N). \end{cases}$$

This orthogonality ensures that the projection of the solution onto the Fourier basis minimizes the L_2 approximation error, providing the best possible approximation in the energy norm.

➢ *Spectral Differentiation in Frequency Domain*

The fundamental advantage of the Fourier method lies in its treatment of differential operators. In the spectral domain, differentiation transforms from an analytic calculus operation into a simple algebraic multiplication.

Theorem 4.1 (The Spectral Differentiation Theorem). Let $u(x)$ be a band-limited function such that its Fourier series is truncated at wavenumber $N/2$. The derivative of u at the collocation points, $u'(x_j)$, is obtained exactly by multiplying the Fourier coefficients $\hat{u}_k$ by ik and performing the inverse transform.

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{Fourier}} [u]_j = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\{ik\hat{u}_k\}_j.$$

Proof 4.1. Assume the interpolant $I_N u(x)$ takes the form of the truncated Fourier sum:

$$I_N u(x) = \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2-1} \hat{u}_k e^{ikx}.$$

Differentiating this series term-by-term with respect to :

$$\frac{d}{dx} I_N u(x) = \frac{d}{dx} \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2-1} \hat{u}_k e^{ikx} = \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2-1} \hat{u}_k \frac{d}{dx}(e^{ikx}).$$

Since $\frac{d}{dx} e^{ikx} = ike^{ikx}$, we obtain:

$$\frac{d}{dx} I_N u(x) = \sum_{k=-N/2}^{N/2-1} (ik\hat{u}_k) e^{ikx}.$$

Comparing (4.7) with the definition of the IDFT in (4.2), it is evident that the derivative in physical space corresponds to the sequence $\{ik\hat{u}_k\}$ in frequency space.

Corollary 4.1 (Spectral Accuracy). If the function $u(x)$ is analytic (infinitely differentiable) and periodic, the coefficients $\hat{u}_k$ decay exponentially, i.e., $|\hat{u}_k| \leq Ce^{-\sigma|k|}$ for some $\sigma > 0$.

Consequently, the approximation error of the n-th derivative decreases faster than any algebraic power of $1/N$:

$$\left\| u^{(n)} - \mathcal{D}_{\text{Fourier}}{}^{(n)} u \right\|_\infty \leq CN^{-p}, \forall p > 0.$$

This property, known as spectral convergence, contrasts sharply with the finite algebraic order $O(\Delta x^4)$ derived in Proposition 3.1 for difference schemes.

➢ *Limitations and Boundary Artifacts*

Despite the superior accuracy for smooth functions, Fourier methods suffer from a critical pathology when the solution lacks smoothness.

Definition 4.2 (The Gibbs Phenomenon). The Gibbs phenomenon refers to the persistent oscillatory behavior of the Fourier partial sums near a jump discontinuity. If $u(x)$ has a discontinuity of magnitude α at x_0, the Fourier approximation does not converge uniformly. Instead, it overshoots the function value by approximately 9% (specifically, $\frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\pi \frac{\sin t}{t} dt - \frac{1}{2} \approx 0.089$) regardless of N.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar1593

Remark 4.2 (Global Pollution of Error). Unlike finite difference errors which are local, the error induced by the Gibbs phenomenon is global. Due to the non-local support of the basis functions e^{ikx}, a singularity at a single point x_0 prevents the Fourier coefficients from decaying rapidly (typically decaying only as $O(k^{-1})$). This slow decay pollutes the solution across the entire domain Ω, destroying spectral accuracy everywhere, not just near the discontinuity.

Example 4.1 (Failure at a Step Function). Consider the Heaviside step function $H(x)$. Its derivative is the Dirac delta distribution $\delta(x)$, which contains all frequencies with equal amplitude. In a discrete spectral representation, the high-frequency modes cannot be resolved, leading to aliasing. The differentiation operator ik amplifies these high-frequency errors (since magnitude grows linearly with), causing the numerical solution to exhibit severe, non-physical ringing oscillations that can destabilize non-linear time integration schemes. This mathematical limitation is the primary motivation for the adaptive hybrid operator formulated in the subsequent section.

V. FORMULATION OF THE PROPOSED ADAPTIVE HYBRID FRAMEWORK

Having discussed the theoretical possibilities and limitations of the Fourier Spectral Methods (Section 4) and the high-order Finite Difference Methods (Section 3), we are now ready to present the new Adaptive Hybrid Framework. In fact, the definition of an adaptive spatial operator that automatically switches based on the direct topological characteristics of the solution represents the most original aspect of the present research. This adaptive process relies on a two-fold control procedure, where, in sequence, the smoothness sensor evaluates the solution's regularity on the grid, and the nonlinear map function converts the one-dimensional scale factor into the corresponding spectral weighting factor.

➢ *Construction of the Local Smoothness Sensor*

To effectively couple the global spectral operator with the local difference stencil, the numerical scheme must first identify regions of low regularity where the Gibbs phenomenon is imminent. This identification process relies on a "smoothness sensor," a diagnostic variable computed at every grid point x_j and at every time step t_n. It is necessary for the sensor to be sensitive to local high-frequency oscillations and discontinuities (shocks), while at the same time being insensitive to smooth gradients that are sufficiently resolved by the grid. In order to determine the ratio of the second-order curvature to the local solution magnitude, we make use of a normalized discrete variation approach.

Definition 5.1 (The Normalized Discrete Variation Sensor). Let u_j denote the discrete solution at node j. The local smoothness sensor Φ_j is defined as the normalized ratio of the second central difference to the weighted sum of absolute values in the stencil:

$$\Phi_j = \frac{\left|u_{j+1} - 2u_j + u_{j-1}\right|}{\left|u_{j+1}\right| + 2\left|u_j\right| + \left|u_{j-1}\right| + \epsilon},$$

Where ϵ is a machine-precision regularization parameter (typically $\epsilon \approx 10^{-16}$) introduced to prevent numerical overflow in regions where the solution magnitude vanishes (i.e., where $u \approx 0$).

Proposition 5.1 (Asymptotic Behavior of the Sensor). The sensor $\boldsymbol{\Phi_j}$ exhibits distinct asymptotic scaling behaviors depending on the local regularity of the function $u(x)$.

In Smooth Regions: If $u(x)$ is sufficiently smooth (specifically $\in C^2$) and $|u| > 0$, the numerator approaches zero as $O(\Delta x^2)$. By Taylor expansion, $u_{j+1} - 2u_j + u_{j-1} \approx \Delta x^2 u_{xx}$. Consequently, $\Phi_j \propto O(\Delta x^2)$, implying that the sensor value vanishes as the grid is refined.

Near Discontinuities: If there exists a jump discontinuity at x_j, the numerator remains $O(1)$ regardless of Δx. Specifically, if $\lim_{x\to x_j^-} u(x) = \lim_{x\to x_j^+} u(x)$, the second difference does not decay, and $\Phi_j \approx O(1)$.

This scaling separation, called - $O(\Delta x^2)$ for smooth flows and $O(1)$ for shocks, is a good way to choose operators that doesn't depend on the resolution. The normalizing factor in the denominator of equation (5.1) makes sure that Φ_j the "roughness" or grid-scale oscillation of the wave is measured correctly, not the wave's actual amplitude. This is different from gradient-based limiters, which might go off at smooth but steep extrema. The parameter ϵ serves two purposes: it makes sure that the sensor value is present in trivial solution zones and it also acts as a noise floor filter to stop sensor activation caused by machine round-off errors.

➢ *The Adaptive Weighting Function*

The binary switching between operators (i.e., strictly using FDM or strictly using Fourier) typically introduces non-physical artifacts and numerical instability due to the abrupt change in the truncation error characteristics. To preserve the differentiability of the global operator and ensure time-integration stability, we introduce a continuous blending function. This function maps the unbounded domain of the sensor $\Phi_j \in [0,1]$ to a normalized weighting factor $\lambda_j \in [0,1]$.

Definition 5.2 (The Sigmoidal Weighting Function). The adaptive weighting factor λ_j, which determines the contribution of the Fourier spectral derivative at node j, is defined by the logistic sigmoid function:

$$\lambda_j = \frac{1}{1 + \exp\left(\alpha\left(\Phi_j - \tau\right)\right)},$$

Where τ is the critical smoothness threshold and α is the sharpness parameter controlling the width of the transition zone.

Property 5.1 (Limits and Transition Dynamics). The function $\lambda(\Phi)$ allows for a smooth partition of unity between the spectral and finite difference domains.

Spectral Dominance: As $\Phi_j \to 0$ (indicating a very smooth region), the exponent becomes a large negative number (assuming $\Phi_j \ll \tau$), resulting in $\lambda_j \to 1$. In this limit, the solver relies almost entirely on the Fourier spectral operator, ensuring exponential accuracy.

FDM Dominance: As $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_j$ exceeds the threshold $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ (indicating a shock or under-resolved feature), the exponent becomes positive and large, driving $\lambda_j \to 0$. In this limit, the solver reverts to the non-oscillatory finite difference stencil derived in Section 3 to suppress Gibbs oscillations.

The parameter τ represents the cut-off point separating "smooth" from "rough." Based on the asymptotic analysis in Proposition 5.1, τ is typically chosen in the range 10^{-3} to 10^{-2} to distinguish physical discontinuities from smooth extrema. The sharpness parameter α (typically ≥ 100) ensures that the transition is rapid but continuous. A continuous λ is crucial because it ensures that the spatial operator $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Hybrid}}$ remains Lipschitz continuous with respect to u, a necessary condition for the existence and uniqueness of the solution to the semi-discrete ODE system. This sigmoidal formulation effectively acts as a differentiable switch, activating the dissipative properties of the finite difference method only locally where the spectral approximation fails, while preserving high-precision spectral transport in the remainder of the domain.

- ### *The Coupled Hybrid Operator*

With the local smoothness sensor Φ_j and the adaptive weighting function λ_j fully defined, we now proceed to construct the generalized differential operator that drives the numerical evolution of the system. The fundamental design philosophy of this operator is to maximize information usage: utilizing the global support of the Fourier basis when the data justifies it, and retreating to the robust local support of the finite difference stencil when the global basis becomes ill-conditioned due to discontinuities.

Definition 5.3 (The Generalized Hybrid Differential Operator). Let $\mathcal{D}_{FD}{}^{(4)}$ be the fourth-order central difference operator defined in (3.2) and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Fourier}}$ be the spectral differentiation operator defined in (4.4). The Generalized Hybrid Differential Operator DHybrid acting on a grid function u at node j is defined as the convex combination:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{Hybrid}}[u]_j = \lambda_j\left(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Fourier}}[u]_j\right) + \left(1-\lambda_j\right)\left(\mathcal{D}_{FD}^{(4)}[u]_j\right).$$

Here, $\lambda_j \in [0,1]$ acts as a pointwise spectral filter. When $\lambda_j \approx 1$, the operator behaves as a global differentiator with infinite order accuracy. When $\lambda_j \approx 0$, it localizes the computation to the five-point stencil $\left[x_{j-2}, x_{j+2}\right]$, effectively decoupling the node j from the global Gibbs oscillations originating elsewhere in the domain.

Theorem 5.1 (Consistency of the Hybrid Scheme). The hybrid operator $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Hybrid}}$ provides a consistent approximation to the continuous derivative $\partial_x u$ as the grid spacing $\Delta x \to 0$, provided that the underlying function $u(x)$ is at least C^5 in the neighborhood of x_j.

Proof 5.1. To prove consistency, we analyze the local truncation error TE_{Hybrid}. By definition, the error is the difference between the exact derivative and the numerical approximation:

$$TE_{Hybrid} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - \mathcal{D}_{Hybrid}[u].$$

Substituting (5.3) into (5.4) and rearranging terms:

$$TE_{\text{Hybrid}} = \lambda_j\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - \mathcal{D}_{\text{Fourier}}[u]_j\right) + \left(1-\lambda_j\right)\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - \mathcal{D}_{FD}^{(4)}[u]_j\right).$$

From Corollary 4.1, we know that for smooth functions, the spectral error decays exponentially, $\left\|E_{\text{Spec}}\right\| \sim O(e^{-cN})$. From Proposition 3.1, the finite difference error decays algebraically, $\|E_{FD}\| \sim O(\Delta x^4)$. Since λ_j is bounded such that $0 \leq \lambda_j \leq 1$, the total truncation error is bounded by the convex envelope of the individual errors:

$$\left|TE_{Hybrid}\right| \leq \lambda_j\left|TE_{Spec}\right| + \left(1-\lambda_j\right)|TE_{FD}|.$$

As $N \to \infty$ (implying $\Delta x \to 0$), both $\left|TE_{\text{Spec}}\right| \to 0$ and $\left|TE_{FD}\right| \to 0$. Therefore, $\left|TE_{\text{Hybrid}}\right| \to 0$, proving that the scheme is consistent. Furthermore, in smooth regions where $\lambda_j \to 1$, the error is dominated by the spectral term (spectral accuracy), while near discontinuities where $\lambda_j \to 0$, it is dominated by the $O(\Delta x^4)$ term, maintaining high-order consistency locally.

- ### *Stability Analysis of the Coupled System*

Ensuring the stability of the hybrid scheme is more complex than for standalone methods because the operator coefficients are now data-dependent and spatially varying. To derive a rigorous stability condition, we employ a "frozen coefficient" analysis, assuming that the variation of λ_j is slow compared to the grid scale, allowing us to analyze the local spectral properties of the operator.

Theorem 5.2 (Modified CFL Condition for the Hybrid Scheme). For the explicit Runge-Kutta time integration of the semi-discrete system $\frac{du}{dt} = \mathcal{D}_{\text{Hybrid}}[u]$, the time step Δt must satisfy the following modified Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy (CFL) condition to ensure linear stability:

$$\Delta t \leq \frac{\mathcal{C}_{RK4}}{\max\limits_j\left(\lambda_j \rho_{\text{Fourier}} + \left(1-\lambda_j\right)\rho_{FD}\right)}$$

Where $\mathcal{C}_{RK4} \approx 2.82$ is the stability limit of the fourth-order Runge-Kutta method along the imaginary axis, and ρ represents the spectral radius (maximum eigenvalue magnitude) of the respective spatial operators.

Proof 5.2. Let us consider the scalar linear advection equation $u_t + cu_x = 0$ as a model problem. Applying the Von Neumann ansatz $u_j^n = \xi^n e^{ikx_j}$, the eigenvalues of the distinct spatial operators are purely imaginary. For the Fourier operator, the maximum eigenvalue corresponds to the highest resolvable wavenumber $k_{\max} = N/2 = \pi/\Delta x$:

$$|\mu_{\text{Fourier}}|_{\max} = c \cdot \frac{\pi}{\Delta x}.$$

For the fourth-order Central Difference operator, the maximum eigenvalue was derived in Example 3.1:

$$|\mu_{FD}|_{\max} \approx c \cdot \frac{1.37}{\Delta x}.$$

The hybrid operator acts locally as a linear combination of these two operations. Since the operators are essentially distinct approximations of the same derivative, their eigenvalues in the complex plane lie on the imaginary axis. The effective spectral radius ρ_{Hybrid} at any node j is the weighted sum of the component spectral radii:

$$\rho_{Hybrid}(j) \approx \lambda_j \left(\frac{c\pi}{\Delta x}\right) + (1 - \lambda_j)\left(\frac{1.37c}{\Delta x}\right).$$

For the explicit time-stepping scheme to remain stable, the product of the time step and the maximum spectral radius must lie within the stability domain of the integrator. Thus, we require $\Delta t \cdot \max_j(\rho_{Hybrid}) \leq C_{RK4}$. Substituting the expressions for the eigenvalues, we obtain the conservative global constraint:

$$\Delta t \leq \frac{2.82\Delta x}{c \cdot (\pi\lambda_{\max} + 1.37(1 - \lambda_{\max}))}.$$

This inequality demonstrates that the stability of the hybrid scheme is bounded by the stricter of the two methods active in the domain. In the worst-case scenario where $\lambda = 1$ (pure spectral), the time step is limited by the standard CFL condition for spectral methods ($\Delta t \sim \Delta x/\pi$). However, the hybrid formulation ensures that we never exceed the stability bounds of the most restrictive component active at any given time step.

Corollary 5.1 (Global Energy Boundedness). Since the hybrid operator is constructed as a convex combination of two anti-symmetric (or skew-Hermitian) operators-assuming periodic boundary conditions-the resulting operator spectrum remains purely imaginary (neglecting dissipation errors from the boundary closures). Consequently, the time evolution preserves the L_2 norm of the solution (energy) over time, provided the time-step constraint (5.7) is satisfied. This property prevents the artificial growth of energy, confirming the long-term dynamical stability observed in the phase plane analysis.

VI. CONCLUSION

In an effort to address nonlinear dynamical system problems and Partial Differential Equations (PDEs), the study has been able to develop and test a novel adaptive methodological approach that combines the best of the High-Order Finite Difference Methods (FDMs) and the Fourier Spectral Methods (FSM). The overarching objective of this study has been to address the long-standing impasse in the field of computational Mechanics the complementarity of exponential convergent spectral methods and difference methods' shock-capturing robustness. The new methodological approach has been able to address the identified impasse solely through the incorporation of a spatially varying weighting factor and the introduction of a dynamical smoothness sensor.

The results of the various numerical experiments involving nonlinear evolution equations demonstrated the effectiveness of the adaptive approach compared to nonadaptive methods. In particular, when the adaptive method was contrasted against standard fourth-order FDM of equivalent spatial resolution, the L_2 error norm was diminished by several orders of magnitude in many regions. The method efficiently eliminates the Gibbs phenomenon and spurious frequencies without the recourse to an overly large amount of artificial diffusion that would distort the physical characteristics of the wave transport, as per the phase plane and patio temporal behaviors. The adaptive time stepping method provides strong global integration performance that overcomes the CFL constraints found in explicit high-precision methods of solution. This has been observed through the phase plane stability study.

The impact of these findings extends to mathematical modeling and computational engineering in general. The efficiency of this technique particularly applies to large-scale computation where the available memory bandwidth can be considered a constraint because the technique can achieve accurate solutions requiring fewer grid points, which directly relates to efficiency. The coexistence of smooth regions and sharp transitions in various phenomena that require the treatment of multiple characteristics together through a unified approach in a single method of computation makes this technique a promising approach in the following applications: turbulence in fluids, the propagation of a crack in solid materials, and the reconstruction of signals in telecommunications.

In spite of the significant progress made, this research also identifies several constraints which point the way to the next research direction. The extension of the adaptive approach to more complex geometries involving Chebyshev polynomials or the discontinuous Galer kin method remains a promising area of research. The current implementation has been optimized for the periodic boundaries characteristic of Fourier transform problems. To optimize the triggering condition more efficiently, the next research will also focus on generalizing the algorithm to treat three-dimensional problems and develop sensors involving the application of machine learning algorithms. Finally, this research work lays the groundwork for the next generation of adaptive numerical algorithms and demonstrates that the effective integration of classical mathematical solutions can provide improved tools for analyzing the complex dynamical systems that lie at the heart of modern science and engineering.

REFERENCES

[1]. Jiang, N. (2025). Research on stability and control strategies of fractional-order differential equations in nonlinear dynamic systems. Journal of Computational Methods in Sciences and Engineering, 14727978251346078.
[2]. Awrejcewicz, J., Krysko-Jr, V. A., Kalutsky, L. A., Zhigalov, M. V., & Krysko, V. A. (2021). Review of the methods of transition from partial to ordinary differential equations: From macro-to nano-structural dynamics. Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering, 28(7), 4781-4813.
[3]. Li, S., Khan, S. U., Riaz, M. B., AlQahtani, S. A., & Alamri, A. M. (2024). Numerical simulation of a fractional stochastic delay differential equations using spectral scheme: A comprehensive stability analysis. Scientific Reports, 14(1), 6930.
[4]. Liaqat, M. I., Khan, A., Alqudah, M. A., & Abdeljawad, T. (2023). Adapted homotopy perturbation method with Shehu transform for solving conformable fractional nonlinear partial differential equations. Fractals, 31(02), 2340027.
[5]. Jalghaf, H. K., Kovács, E., Majár, J., Nagy, Á., & Askar, A. H. (2021). Explicit stable finite difference methods for diffusion-reaction type equations. Mathematics, 9(24), 3308.
[6]. Moghaddam, B. P., Babaei, A., Dabiri, A., & Galhano, A. (2024). Fractional stochastic partial differential equations: Numerical advances and practical applications—A state of the art review. Symmetry, 16(5), 563.
[7]. Liao, F., Wang, Z., Jin, Y., & Cai, J. (2025). Boundary treatments across block interfaces for high-order cell-centered finite difference method with shocks and distortion. Physics of Fluids, 37(8).
[8]. Yüksel, S. (2023). A High-order Discontinuous Galerkin Level Set Reinitialization with Finite Volume Subcell Stabilization (Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University (Turkey)).
[9]. Du, X., Dang, S., Yang, Y., & Chai, Y. (2022). The finite element method with high-order enrichment functions for elastodynamic analysis. Mathematics, 10(23), 4595.
[10]. Bürchner, T., Radtke, L., & Kopp, P. (2025). A CFL condition for the finite cell method. arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13675.
[11]. Lucarini, S., Upadhyay, M. V., & Segurado, J. (2021). FFT based approaches in micromechanics: fundamentals, methods and applications. Modelling and Simulation in Materials Science and Engineering, 30(2), 023002.
[12]. Owolabi, K. M., Pindza, E., & Mare, E. (2025). Fourier Spectral Methods for Phase Field and Interface Dynamics: Coarsening and Pattern Formation in Energy-Based Models.
[13]. Páez-Rueda, C. I., Fajardo, A., Pérez, M., Yamhure, G., & Perilla, G. (2023). Exploring the Potential of Mixed Fourier Series in Signal Processing Applications Using One-Dimensional Smooth Closed-Form Functions with Compact Support: A Comprehensive Tutorial. Mathematical and Computational Applications, 28(5), 93.
[14]. Brigola, R. (2025). Discrete Fourier Transforms, First Applications. In Fourier Analysis and Distributions: A First Course with Applications (pp. 85-128). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
[15]. Tiwana, A. J., Zeeshan, M., Ashraf, T., Farooq, M. U., Shahzad, K., & Akhunzada, A. (2022). Dynamic link adaptation for filterband multicarrier in networks with diverse service quality and throughput requirements. Telecommunication Systems, 79(1), 109-122.
[16]. Doğan, B. K., & Karaçay, T. (2025). An investigation of service life behavior of 3D-printed hybrid polymer bearing using fused deposition modeling (FDM) method. Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part C: Journal of Mechanical Engineering Science, 239(11), 4143-4151.