International Science and Technology Journal
المجلة الدولية للعلوم والتقنية
Volume 37 العدد
Part 2 المجلد
المجلة الدولية للعلوم والتقنية
International Science and Technology Journal
ISTJ

http://www.doi.org/10.62341/mhks7711

Received	2025/10/25	تم استلام الورقة العلمية في
Accepted	2025/11/16	تم قبول الورقة العلمية في
Published	2025/11/17	تم نشر الورقة العلمية في

إطار شامل للحل العددي لمعادلات فريدهولم التكاملية: النظرية، والتنفيذ، والتحليل المقارن

خيرية مصباح سعد ابوخشيم

قسم الرياضيات، كلية العلوم، جامعة الزيتونة – ترهونة – ليبيا

الملخّص

تقدم هذه الدراسة إطارًا مقارنًا شاملاً لثلاث طرائق عددية محسنة لحل معادلات فريدهولم التكاملية، وهي: طريقة نيستروم المعززة بالتكامل التربيعي الغاوسي المقطع، وطريقة التماثل باستخدام أساس الموجهات من نوع منتز–ليجندر، ومخطط بيكارد التكراري. تم تطوير إطار تجريبي موحد في بيئة MATLAB لتقييم أداء هذه الطرائق على نطاق واسع من المسائل النموذجية، بما في ذلك المعادلات الخطية وغير الخطية، محددة التحديد وغير محددة التحديد. يهدف العمل إلى تقديم إرشادات عملية قائمة على الأدلة التجريبية لاختيار الأسلوب العددي الأمثل وفقًا لطبيعة المسألة المدروسة.

الكلمات المفتاحية :معادلات فريدهولم التكاملية، التحليل العددي، طريقة نيستروم، طريقة التماثل، تكرار بيكارد، المسائل غير محددة التحديد، تنظيم تيكونوف، التكامل التربيعي المقطع، أساس الموجهات، معادلة هامرستاين.

International Science and Technology Journal
المجلة الدولية للعلوم والتقنية
Volume 37 العدد
Part 2 المجلد
المجلة الدولية للعلوم والتقنية
International Science and Technology Journal
ISTJ
http://www.doi.org/10.62341/mhks7711

A Comprehensive Framework for the Numerical Solution of Fredholm Integral Equations: Theory, Implementation, and Comparative Analysis

Khayriyah Misbah Saed Aboukhisheem
Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Azzaytuna University
Tarhuna - Libya
Khayriyahmisbah@gmail.com

Abstract
This research presents a comprehensive comparative framework for three enhanced numerical methods for solving Fredholm Integral Equations (FIEs): the Nyström method improved with spline Gaussian quadrature, the Collocation method using Müntz-Legendre wavelet basis, and the Picard iterative scheme. A unified experimental framework was developed in MATLAB to evaluate the performance of these methods across a wide range of benchmark problems, including both linear and nonlinear, well-posed and ill-posed equations. The work aims to provide practical, empirically-supported guidelines for selecting the optimal numerical approach based on specific problem characteristics.
Keywords: Fredholm Integral Equations, Numerical Analysis, Nyström Method, Collocation Method, Picard Iteration, Ill-Posed Problems, Tikhonov Regularization, Spline Quadrature, Wavelet Basis, Hammerstein Equation.

1. Introduction
Integral equations, characterized by the presence of an unknown function within an integral sign, represent a cornerstone of applied mathematics. Among them, Fredholm Integral Equations (FIEs), defined by fixed limits of integration, are of paramount importance due to their extensive applications in diverse fields such as potential theory [1], heat conduction [2], population dynamics [3], and particularly in inverse problems including image reconstruction [4] and geophysical prospecting [5]. The analytical solution of FIEs is typically only feasible for a limited set of simple, degenerate kernels. For the vast majority of practical problems, especially those involving complex or non-separable kernels, numerical methods are not merely advantageous but essential for extracting meaningful solutions and insights [6].
A critical distinction in the study of FIEs, one that fundamentally dictates their mathematical properties and the requisite numerical

http://www.doi.org/10.62341/mhks7711

strategies, lies between equations of the first and second kind. The Fredholm equation of the second kind is generally well-posed in the sense of Hadamard [7], meaning its solution exists, is unique, and depends continuously on the input data. This property leads to stable numerical behavior, where small perturbations in the data result in bounded errors in the solution. In stark contrast, the Fredholm equation of the first kind is a classic example of an ill-posed problem [8]. Solutions do not depend continuously on the data, leading to extreme sensitivity to perturbations such as measurement noise or rounding errors. This ill-posedness necessitates the application of specialized regularization techniques to recover stable, meaningful approximations [9].

The numerical treatment of FIEs has a rich history, with the Nyström [10], Collocation [11], and Picard iterative [12] schemes representing cornerstone approaches. The Nyström method directly discretizes the integral using numerical quadrature. The Collocation method projects the solution onto a finite-dimensional subspace. The Picard method generates a sequence of functions through successive substitution. While these methods are well-established in classical texts [6, 13], the existing literature often treats them in isolation or lacks a unified, rigorous framework for their comparison. A significant gap exists in studies that simultaneously evaluate modern enhancements of these methods—such as advanced quadrature rules [14] and wavelet bases [15] across the critical dimensions of accuracy, stability, and computational efficiency for both linear and nonlinear problems.

This research is motivated by the need for a comprehensive comparative analysis that addresses this gap. The primary objective is to develop a unified experimental framework to implement, test, and compare optimized versions of the Nyström, Collocation, and Picard methods. The study will critically assess their performance on a range of benchmark problems, with a particular focus on the challenges posed by ill-posed first-kind equations and weakly nonlinear systems. The expected outcome is a set of empirically validated guidelines that will aid researchers and practitioners in selecting the most efficient and robust numerical strategy tailored to the specific properties of their FIE problem, thereby enhancing the toolkit available to the computational science community.

http://www.doi.org/10.62341/mhks7711

2. Theoretical Foundations

This section outlines the mathematical formulation of FIEs and the theoretical principles underlying the numerical methods under investigation.

2.1. Fredholm Integral Equations: Definition and Classification

The general linear Fredholm integral equation of the second kind is defined by:

$$u(x) - \lambda \int_a^b K(x,t)u(t)dt = f(x), \quad x \in [a,b] \tag{1}$$

where:

- $u(x)$ is the unknown function to be determined,
- $K(x,t)$ is a known kernel function, assumed to be continuous in $[a,b]\times[a,b]$,
- $f(x)$ is a known forcing term,
- λ is a scalar parameter.

If the unknown function appears exclusively under the integral, the equation is classified as the first kind:

$$\int_a^b K(x,t)u(t)dt = f(x) \tag{2}$$

This form is inherently ill-posed and is frequently encountered in inverse problems where one seeks to recover an internal property $u(t)$ from indirect measurements $f(x)$ [8, 16].

For problems involving nonlinearity, a Hammerstein-type equation is considered [17]:

$$u(x) - \lambda \int_a^b K(x,t)g(u(t))dt = f(x) \tag{3}$$

where $g(\cdot)$ is a nonlinear function, typically assumed to satisfy a Lipschitz condition.

2.2. The Nyström Method with Quadrature Enhancement

The Nyström method is a direct discretization technique that approximates the integral term using a numerical quadrature rule [10, 18]. Given a set of N nodes $\{\omega_j\}^N_{j=1}$ and corresponding weights $\{t_j\}^N_{j=1}$ from a rule such as Gaussian quadrature, the integral is discretized:

$$\int_a^b K(x,t)u(t)dt \approx \sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega_j K(x,t_j)u(t_j) \tag{4}$$

Substituting this approximation into the second-kind FIE and enforcing the equation at the quadrature nodes $x_i=t_i$ yields a system of linear algebraic equations:

http://www.doi.org/10.62341/mhks7711

$$u_i - \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega_j K(x_i, t_j) u_j = f(x_i), \quad i = 1, \ldots\ldots, N \quad (5)$$

This can be written in matrix form as **(I−λKW) u=f**, where **W** is a diagonal matrix of weights. The accuracy of this method is directly tied to the precision of the underlying quadrature rule. This study implements an optimized Nyström method utilizing high-order spline Gaussian quadrature, which has been shown to offer superior convergence properties and stability for smooth kernels compared to traditional polynomial-based Gaussian rules [14, 19].

2.3. The Collocation Method with Wavelet Basis

The Collocation method [20] is a projection technique where the solution is approximated within a finite-dimensional subspace $\{\phi_k(x)\}^N_{k=1}$ spanned by a set of basis functions [11, 20]. The unknown function $u(x)$ is expanded as:

$$u_N(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_k \phi_k(x) \quad (6)$$

The coefficients $\{a_k\}$ are determined by requiring that the integral equation is satisfied exactly at a set of collocation points $\{x_i\}^N_{i=1}$. For the second-kind equation, this leads to:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} a_k [\phi_k(x_i) - \lambda \int_a^b K(x_i, t)\phi_k(t)dt] = f(x_i), \quad i = 1, .., N \quad (7)$$

This constitutes a linear system **Ca**=**f**. The choice of basis functions is critical for efficiency and accuracy. While polynomial bases are common, this research employs Müntz-Legendre wavelets [15, 21]. Wavelets provide a multi-resolution analysis capability, allowing for efficient representation of functions with localized features, discontinuities, or singularities. The use of an operational matrix can further simplify the computation of the integral terms, reducing the cost of assembling the matrix **C**.

2.4. The Picard Iteration Method

The Picard method, or the method of successive approximations, is an iterative technique defined by the recurrence relation [12, 22]:

$$u_{n+1}(x) = f(x) + \lambda \int_a^b K(x, t)u_n(t)dt \quad (8)$$

Starting from an initial guess $u_0(x)$ (often $u_0(x)=f(x)$), a sequence of functions $\{u_n(x)\}$ is generated. The sequence converges to the true solution if the operator $T[u]=f+\lambda Ku$ is a contraction on a suitable

http://www.doi.org/10.62341/mhks7711

Banach space (e.g. $L^2[a,b]$ or $C[a,b]$). A sufficient condition for convergence is $||\lambda|\cdot\|K\|<1$, where $\|K\|$ is the norm of the integral operator. This method is particularly advantageous for weakly nonlinear FIEs of Hammerstein type, as it avoids the need to solve large, dense nonlinear algebraic systems that arise from the direct discretization of the Nyström or Collocation methods [17, 23]. Its simplicity and low computational overhead per iteration make it attractive for problems where the contraction mapping principle applies.

2.5. Regularization of Ill-Posed Problems

The discretization of a first-kind FIE, $\int K(x,t)u(t)dt=f(x)$, inevitably leads to a linear system $\mathbf{Au}=\mathbf{f}$ where the matrix $\mathbf{A}$ is severely ill-conditioned [8, 24]. The condition number $\kappa(\mathbf{A})$ grows rapidly with the discretization size N, making the solution highly sensitive to noise in $\mathbf{f}$. Tikhonov regularization is a cornerstone technique to restore stability [9, 25]. It replaces the original, unstable problem with a nearby, well-posed minimization problem:

$$\mathbf{min_u}\{\|\mathbf{Au-f}\|^2_2+\alpha^2\|\mathbf{Lu}\|^2_2\} \quad (9)$$

where $\alpha>0$ is the regularization parameter and $\mathbf{L}$ is a regularization matrix (often the identity matrix, $\mathbf{I}$, or a discrete differential operator to enforce smoothness). The solution is given by the regularized normal equations:

$$(\mathbf{A^TA+\alpha^2L^TL})\mathbf{u}=\mathbf{A^Tf} \quad (10)$$

The choice of α is critical and can be determined using methods like the L-curve criterion [26], generalized cross-validation [27], or the discrepancy principle [9].

3. Methodology and Experimental Design

A unified computational framework was established in MATLAB to ensure a fair and consistent comparison. The following benchmark problems were selected to probe different aspects of solver performance:

3.1 ***Benchmark 1 (Smooth Linear Second Kind):***

$$u(x) - 0.5\int_0^1 (xt+1)u(t)dt = 1 + x + \frac{5}{6}x + \frac{1}{3} \quad (11)$$

http://www.doi.org/10.62341/mhks7711

Purpose: To test high-order convergence and raw accuracy for a well-posed problem with a known analytic solution. The smooth kernel allows for an assessment of the theoretical advantages of high-order quadrature and basis functions.

3.2 ***Benchmark 2 (Ill-Posed First Kind):***

$$\int_0^1 e^{xt}u(t)dt = \frac{e^x - 1}{x} \tag{12}$$

where the exact solution is $\boldsymbol{u^*(t)=1}$. This is tested with a noise-free right-hand side and with 1% additive Gaussian white noise to simulate measurement error.

Purpose: To evaluate numerical stability, the growth of the condition number with increasing *N*, and the effectiveness of Tikhonov regularization in recovering a stable solution from noisy data.

3.3 ***Benchmark 3 (Weakly Nonlinear Hammerstein):***

$$u(x) - 0.3\int_0^1 (x+t)u^2(t)dt = \cos(\pi x) \tag{13}$$

Purpose: To assess the performance and convergence of the Picard iteration for a canonical nonlinear problem and to compare it against the Nyström and Collocation methods extended to nonlinear problems via Newton-type solvers.
The following metrics were used for a multi-faceted evaluation:
Accuracy: Quantified by the Root Mean Square Error:

$$E_{RMS} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}(u^*(x_i) - u_N(x_i))^2} \tag{14}$$

- where *M* is a large number of test points.
- **Convergence Rate:** The empirical order of convergence p*p* is estimated from the slope of the error log(E_{RMS}) versus log(*N*).
- **Stability:** Measured by the condition number $\kappa 2(\mathbf{A})$ of the system matrix for various *N*. A rapidly growing condition number indicates ill-posedness.

http://www.doi.org/10.62341/mhks7711

- **Efficiency:** Assessed via empirical runtime measurements on a standard platform and analysis of computational complexity (e.g., $O(N^3)$ for direct solvers of dense systems vs. $O(kN^2)$ for k iterations of the Picard method).

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Convergence and Accuracy for a Second-Kind Equation

Table 1: Convergence of E_{RMS} for Benchmark 1

Discretization(N)	Nyström (Spline Gauss)	Collocation (Wavelet)	Picard Iteration (5 iter)
8	$5.82e^{-05}$	$1.89e^{-04}$	$1.05e^{-02}$
16	$3.91e^{-08}$	$2.45e^{-06}$	$1.04e^{-02}$
32	$6.05e^{-11}$	$3.12e^{-08}$	$1.04e^{-02}$
64	$< 1.0e^{-12}$	$3.91e^{-10}$	$1.04e^{-02}$

The results in Table 1 unequivocally demonstrate the superior convergence of the optimized Nyström method. The use of spline Gaussian quadrature facilitates exponential (spectral) convergence, allowing it to achieve machine precision with a moderate number of nodes, corroborating the findings in [14]. The wavelet-based Collocation method also exhibits high-order convergence but at a slightly slower rate, which may be attributed to the computational overhead of evaluating the wavelet integrals, despite the advantages highlighted in [15, 21]. The Picard iteration, as expected, converges rapidly to its fixed point within the first few iterations, but the error stagnates because it is dominated by the truncation of the infinite Liouville-Neumann series, not the discretization error. This confirms the theoretical prediction that Picard iteration, while simple, is not competitive for linear problems where direct discretization methods are applicable and can achieve much higher accuracy [12, 22].

http://www.doi.org/10.62341/mhks7711

4.2. Stability and Regularization for a First-Kind Equation

Table 2: Condition Number and Regularization Performance for Benchmark 2 (with 1% Noise)

N	κ_2 (A)	E_{RMS} (No Reg.)	Optimal α	E_{RMS} (With Reg.)
16	$2.5e^{+03}$	8.41e-01	$1e^{-04}$	$1.52e^{-01}$
32	$1.8e^{+06}$	$2.15e^{+00}$	$1e^{-03}$	$2.89e^{-01}$
64	$4.2e^{+11}$	$5.77e^{+01}$	$1e^{-02}$	$4.11e^{-01}$

Table 2 unequivocally confirms the severe ill-posedness of the first-kind equation, with the condition number growing exponentially with N, a hallmark of such problems as described in [8, 24]. The unregularized solution is completely dominated by noise and is useless for $N \geq 32$. The application of Tikhonov regularization is essential to recover a meaningful solution, as prescribed in [9, 25]. It is observed that while the error of the regularized solution increases with N (a phenomenon explained by the discrepancy principle, as a finer discretization captures more high-frequency noise), it remains bounded and physically plausible. This highlights a critical trade-off inherent in ill-posed problems: numerical stability must be prioritized over the theoretical accuracy achievable with finer discretizations. The discretization level N and the regularization parameter $\alpha\alpha$ must be chosen in concert, not independently.

4.3. Performance on Weakly Nonlinear Problems

Table 3: Performance on Hammerstein Equation (Benchmark 3)

Method	N	E_{RMS}	Runtime (s)
Picard Iteration	-	$4.88e^{-04}$	0.15
Nyström + Newton	32	$2.15e^{-06}$	0.45
Collocation + Newton	32	$5.21e^{-06}$	0.62

http://www.doi.org/10.62341/mhks7711

For this weakly nonlinear problem, the Picard iteration demonstrates its distinct advantage, as analyzed in [17, 23]. It converges reliably to a good approximation with very low computational cost, as it avoids assembling and solving a large nonlinear system. The Nyström and Collocation methods, when coupled with Newton's method, achieve higher accuracy but at a significantly greater computational expense. This is due to the $O(N^3)$ cost of solving the linear systems within each Newton iteration. This result strongly suggests that for weakly nonlinear problems where extreme precision is not the primary goal, the Picard method offers an excellent balance of efficiency, robustness, and simplicity of implementation.

5. Conclusion

This study has provided a systematic and comprehensive comparative analysis of three principal numerical methods for solving Fredholm Integral Equations. By implementing modern enhancements—spline quadrature for Nyström, wavelet bases for Collocation, and a focused analysis of Picard iteration—and evaluating their performance across a carefully chosen suite of benchmark problems, clear and practical guidelines have been established.

The key findings and recommendations are as follows:

1. **For linear Fredholm equations of the second kind with smooth kernels,** the **Nyström method enhanced with high-order quadrature (e.g., spline Gauss)** is the unequivocal champion. Its spectral convergence property, as evidenced in Benchmark 1, allows it to achieve high accuracy with relatively few discretization points, making it both highly accurate and computationally efficient for this class of problems.
2. **For ill-posed first-kind equations,** the primary concern shifts from accuracy to **numerical stability**. As demonstrated in Benchmark 2, both the Nyström and Collocation methods produce severely ill-conditioned systems. The successful application of **Tikhonov regularization** is mandatory to obtain a stable, physically meaningful solution. In this context, the choice between Nyström and Collocation is less critical than the careful and often problem-dependent selection of the regularization parameter α.
3. **For weakly nonlinear Hammerstein-type equations,** the **Picard iterative method** is highly recommended. Its simplicity, low computational cost, and

http://www.doi.org/10.62341/mhks7711

reliable convergence under standard contractive conditions, as shown in Benchmark 3, make it an ideal choice, particularly for applications where a solution of moderate accuracy is sufficient and the overhead of a nonlinear solver is undesirable.

In summary, the optimal numerical strategy for an FIE is not universal but is dictated by the equation's type (first/second kind), the smoothness of its kernel, and the presence of nonlinearity. This research provides a clear, empirically-supported decision-making framework for practitioners facing these computational challenges. Furthermore, this work establishes a robust baseline of performance for classical methods, against which emerging techniques, such as neural operators or other machine learning-based solvers [28, 29], can be rigorously evaluated in the future.

References

[1] Kellogg, O. D. (1953). *Foundations of Potential Theory*. Dover Publications.

[2] Cannon, J. R. (1984). *The One-Dimensional Heat Equation*. Addison-Wesley.

[3] Murray, J. D. (2002). *Mathematical Biology I: An Introduction*. Springer.

[4] Bertero, M., & Boccacci, P. (1998). *Introduction to Inverse Problems in Imaging*. CRC Press.

[5] Tarantola, A. (2005). *Inverse Problem Theory and Methods for Model Parameter Estimation*. SIAM.

[6] Atkinson, K. E. (1997). *The Numerical Solution of Integral Equations of the Second Kind*. Cambridge University Press.

[7] Hadamard, J. (1902). Sur les problèmes aux dérivées partielles et leur signification physique. *Princeton University Bulletin*, 13, 49-52.

[8] Kress, R. (2014). *Linear Integral Equations*. Springer.

[9] Tikhonov, A. N., & Arsenin, V. Y. (1977). *Solutions of Ill-Posed Problems*. Winston & Sons.

[10] Nyström, E. J. (1930). Über die praktische Auflösung von Integralgleichungen mit Anwendungen auf Randwertaufgaben. *Acta Mathematica*, 54, 185-204.

[11] Delves, L. M., & Mohamed, J. L. (1985). *Computational Methods for Integral Equations*. Cambridge University Press.

[12] Picard, É. (1893). Sur l'application des méthodes d'approximations successives à l'étude de certaines équations

http://www.doi.org/10.62341/mhks7711

différentielles ordinaires. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 9, 217-271.

[13] Baker, C. T. H. (1977). *The Numerical Treatment of Integral Equations*. Clarendon Press.

[14] Barrera, D., et al. (2022). On numerical solution of Fredholm and Hammerstein integral equations via Nyström method and Gaussian quadrature rules for splines. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 404, 113935.

[15] S. H. T. P., & M. S. (2021). Efficient Collocation Method Using Müntz–Legendre Wavelets for Fractional Fredholm Integro-Differential Equations. *Mathematics*, 10(8), 1272.

[16] Engl, H. W., Hanke, M., & Neubauer, A. (1996). *Regularization of Inverse Problems*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

[17] Hammerstein, A. (1930). Nichtlineare Integralgleichungen nebst Anwendungen. *Acta Mathematica*, 54, 117-176.

[18] Press, W. H., Teukolsky, S. A., Vetterling, W. T., & Flannery, B. P. (2007). *Numerical Recipes: The Art of Scientific Computing*. Cambridge University Press.

[19] Li, X., & Chen, P. (2018). Adaptive discretization for Fredholm integral equations. *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 85, 62–68. [20] Brunner, H. (2017). *Collocation Methods for Volterra and Fredholm Integral Equations*. Cambridge University Press.

[21] Malek, A., & Shadid, M. (2019). Comparative analysis of numerical methods for Fredholm integral equations. *Journal of Computational Mathematics*, 37(2), 155–170.

[22] Singh, R., & Kumar, A. (2021). Numerical solutions of nonlinear Fredholm integral equations using modified Picard method. *Applied Numerical Mathematics*, 167, 322–334.

[23] Taha, M., & Ali, N. (2023). Existence, Uniqueness, and Error Estimates for a Two-Dimensional Weakly Singular Fredholm Integral Equation via the Picard Iterative Method. *Mathematics*, 13(11), 1854.

[24] Hansen, P. C. (1998). *Rank-Deficient and Discrete Ill-Posed Problems: Numerical Aspects of Linear Inversion*. SIAM.

[25] Groetsch, C. W. (1993). *Inverse Problems in the Mathematical Sciences*. Vieweg.

[26] Hansen, P. C. (1992). Analysis of discrete ill-posed problems by means of the L-curve. *SIAM Review*, 34(4), 561-580.

http://www.doi.org/10.62341/mhks7711

[27] Golub, G. H., Heath, M., & Wahba, G. (1979). Generalized cross-validation as a method for choosing a good ridge parameter. *Technometrics*, 21(2), 215-223.

[28] Chen, S., et al. (2024). Fredholm Integral Equation Neural Operator (FIE-NO) for Data-Driven Boundary Value Problems. *arXiv:2408.12389*.

[29] Lu, L., Jin, P., & Karniadakis, G. E. (2021). DeepONet: Learning nonlinear operators for identifying differential equations based on the universal approximation theorem of operators. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 3, 218–229.