Rajkumar Soni, 2024, 12:5
ISSN (Online): 2348-4098
ISSN (Print): 2395-4752

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology

An Open Access Journal

Numerical Analysis of Integral Equations in Physical Systems

Assistant Professor Rajkumar Soni[1], Assistant Professor Rahul Kaushik[2]
Department Of Mathematics[1], Department Of Physics[2]

Abstract- Integral equations form the mathematical backbone of many physical models, enabling precise formulation of heat transfer and wave propagation phenomena, particularly in unbounded or complex domains. This paper reviews key numerical approaches—including collocation, Galerkin, Nyström, spectral, and fast boundary-element methods—focusing on their theoretical foundations, convergence properties, and computational efficiency. Benchmark problems in transient conduction and acoustic scattering illustrate each method's accuracy and cost trade-offs. We find that while spectral and fast-multipole–accelerated solvers offer superior precision for smooth kernels, collocation and Galerkin schemes remain robust for singular and non-smooth geometries. Future work should explore adaptive discretization, machine-learning–enhanced kernels, and multiphysics extensions.

Keywords: Integral equations; numerical methods; boundary element method; heat transfer; wave propagation; fast multipole method; sparse-grid discretization.

I. INTRODUCTION

Integral-equation formulations arise naturally when one seeks to model physical phenomena in domains with complicated boundaries or extending to infinity. By recasting partial differential equations as integral equations—via Green's functions or fundamental solutions—one can enforce boundary conditions exactly on interfaces and avoid artificial truncation of unbounded regions. This approach is especially advantageous for problems in heat transfer and wave propagation, where domain complexity and radiation conditions at infinity would otherwise demand elaborate meshing or absorbing layers.

In heat-transfer applications, boundary-integral representations of the transient conduction equation enable precise tracking of temperature evolution on material interfaces without discretizing the entire volume. For example, single- and double-layer heat potentials reduce a three-dimensional conduction problem to surface integrals, offering significant computational savings for bodies embedded in large or infinite media. Similarly, in acoustics and electromagnetics, boundary-integral formulations of the Helmholtz and wave equations allow accurate treatment of scattering and radiation by obstacles, with the fields represented entirely in terms of unknown surface densities.

Despite their elegance, most integral-equation models resist closed-form solutions, particularly when kernels exhibit singular behavior or when geometric features are non-smooth. Analytical techniques are thus limited to simple geometries or low-dimensional cases, driving the need for robust numerical schemes. Over the past decades, methods such as collocation, Galerkin, Nyström (quadrature), spectral expansions, and fast-multipole accelerations have matured into powerful tools for discretizing and solving integral equations with controllable error and computational cost.

This paper provides a systematic review of these numerical approaches, examining their theoretical foundations, convergence properties, and algorithmic complexity. We first outline the classification of integral equations and the role of various kernel functions. Next, we discuss each numerical method in detail, highlighting strengths and limitations. We then illustrate their application to benchmark problems in transient heat conduction and acoustic scattering, comparing accuracy and efficiency. Finally, we synthesize the findings in a comparative discussion, identify current challenges, and suggest future research directions.

II. MATHEMATICAL FOUNDATIONS

Classification of Integral Equations

Integral equations are broadly categorized by their limits of integration and kernel behavior. Fredholm equations involve fixed integration limits:

$$u(x)=f(x)+\lambda\int_a^b K(x,s)\,u(s)\,\mathrm{d}s,$$

while Volterra equations feature variable upper limits:

$$u(x)=f(x)+\lambda\int_a^x K(x,s)\,u(s)\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

Both types are further divided into first–kind (unknown appears only under the integral) and second–kind (unknown appears both inside and outside the integral). Kernels K(x,s) may be regular smooth and bounded—or singular, exhibiting weak (e.g., logarithmic) or strong (e.g., algebraic) singularities along x=s. Second–kind equations with regular kernels typically yield well-conditioned systems under discretization, whereas first–kind or singular-kernel problems often require specialized quadrature or regularization techniques to achieve stable numerical solutions.

Kernels and Physical Interpretation

In heat-transfer models, the heat kernel

$$G(x,s,t)=\frac{1}{(4\pi\alpha t)^{n/2}}\exp\left(-\frac{\|x-s\|^2}{(4\alpha t)}\right)$$

serves as the fundamental solution of the transient conduction equation in nnn dimensions, encapsulating both diffusion rates (through thermal diffusivity α\alphaα) and temporal decay. Boundary-integral formulations replace volumetric discretization with surface integrals of single- and double-layer heat potentials, yielding efficient representations for bodies in infinite media . In wave-propagation contexts (acoustics, electromagnetics), Green's functions for the Helmholtz or wave equations—solutions of

ΔG+k2G=−δ—encode radiation and scattering physics. These kernels are oscillatory and singular at the source point, requiring careful treatment in numerical quadrature and fast-evaluation schemes.

Well-Posedness and Regularity

Well-posedness ensures that an integral equation has a unique solution that depends continuously on the data f(x). For second–kind Fredholm equations with square-integrable kernels, classical results guarantee existence and uniqueness under mild conditions on λ (e.g., |λ|not an eigenvalue of the homogeneous equation) . Regularity analyses establish smoothness of the solution u(x) based on kernel and right-hand-side smoothness: a smooth, non-singular kernel yields correspondingly smooth u. For singular kernels or first–kind equations, existence and uniqueness may fail without additional compatibility or moment conditions; in such cases, one often invokes Tikhonov regularization or projects onto appropriate function spaces to restore well-posedness . Continuous dependence on data underpins error estimates for numerical methods, enabling convergence proofs and adaptive refinement strategies (Atkinson, 1997; Kress, 1999).

III. NUMERICAL METHODS FOR INTEGRAL EQUATIONS

Accurate and efficient discretization of integral equations underpins their success in modeling physical systems. We review five principal classes of numerical schemes—collocation, Galerkin, Nyström, spectral, and fast boundary-element methods—highlighting their formulation, error behavior, and computational trade-offs.

Collocation Methods ϕ \lambda

Collocation methods approximate the unknown density u(s)u(s)u(s) by a finite expansion in piecewise–polynomial basis functions (e.g., splines or Lagrange polynomials) and enforce the integral equation at a discrete set of collocation points {xi}\{x_i\}{xi}. For a second–kind Fredholm equation, one writes (Brunner, 2004).

$$\mathrm{U_N(s)=} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j \quad \phi_n \quad \mathrm{u_n}(xi) \quad +$$

$$\lambda \sum_{J=1}^{N} c_j \int_a^b k\,(x_i\,,s)\;\phi_j(\mathrm{s})\mathrm{d}s$$

$$_j \int_a^b K\,(x_i,\mathrm{s}.\;\phi\mathrm{j}$$

Choice of nodes (e.g., Gauss, Lobatto) and basis degree directly influences convergence: with sufficiently smooth kernels, collocation schemes exhibit algebraic convergence of order O(hp) for degree-p polynomials, provided nodes avoid kernel singularities . Error estimates typically rely on kernel regularity and interpolation theory; singular kernels may require graded meshes or singularity subtraction to maintain convergence rates. Collocation's simplicity and ease of implementation make it attractive, though conditioning deteriorates for large N without preconditioning. (Brunner, 2004).

Galerkin and Bubnov–Galerkin Approaches

In the Galerkin framework, one seeks v_N in a finite-dimensional trial space v_N spanned by basis functions {ϕj}, and imposes orthogonality of the residual against a (possibly different) test space w_N

$$\langle u_N - \mathrm{f} - \lambda K \mathrm{u_N}, \psi_i \rangle = 0,\ \psi_i \in \mathrm{W_N}.$$

The Bubnov–Galerkin variant takesVN=WN. Typical choices include orthogonal polynomials (Legendre, Chebyshev), which yield well-conditioned mass and stiffness matrices under smooth kernels. Implemented via boundary-element matrices, the Galerkin method leads to dense linear systems whose entries involve inner products of kernels with basis pairs. Convergence is often spectral (exponential) in the polynomial degree for analytic kernels, and algebraic for limited smoothness. Galerkin's variational nature ensures stability and error bounds in appropriate Sobolev norms (Jerri, 1985).

Nyström (Quadrature) Methods

Nyström methods discretize the integral operator by replacing the continuous integral with a high-order quadrature rule. For a second-kind equation, one approximates

$$\int_a^b K(x,s)\mathrm{u(s)ds} \approx \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_j K(\mathrm{x,s_j})\mathrm{u(s_j)},$$

yielding a collocation-like linear system at nodes {sj}. When kernels are weakly singular (e.g., logarithmic), specialized quadrature corrections—such as product integration or Kress's smoothing—restore high-order accuracy . Nyström schemes are straightforward to implement and achieve O(hp) convergence for regular kernels; however, kernel singularities and endpoint behaviors demand careful quadrature design. The resulting system matrix often has favorable conditioning relative to first-kind formulations (Hackbusch, 1995).

Spectral and Fast Methods

Spectral methods expand u(s) in global bases Chebyshev or Fourier modes—and enforce the integral equation at collocation points or in a Galerkin sense. For smooth kernels and geometries, spectral collocation exhibits exponential convergence in the number of modes N. However, dense mode interactions and kernel singularities can inflate computational cost and compromise conditioning (Slevinsky & Olver, 2015).

To accelerate layer-potential evaluations in boundary-element contexts, fast algorithms such as the Fast Multipole Method (FMM) and Quadrature by Expansion (QBX) have been developed. QBX constructs local expansions of singular kernels around source points, enabling accurate evaluation near boundaries without mesh refinement; when coupled with FMM, it reduces the computational complexity from O(N2) to nearly O(N) for N boundary degrees of freedom. These hybrid spectral–fast techniques deliver high precision in wave-propagation and heat-transfer simulations at large scale (Klöckner et al., 2012).

Comparison of Method Efficiency & Conditioning

Conditioning: Second-kind formulations with regular kernels generally produce well-conditioned systems; first-kind or singular-kernel problems suffer from ill-

conditioning that grows with N and demands regularization or specialized preconditioners.
Computational Cost: Collocation and Nyström methods require O(N2) work for dense matrices but are simple to code. Galerkin approaches incur additional assembly cost for inner products. Spectral methods achieve superior convergence but still involve dense operations. Fast multipole–accelerated QBX reduces per-iteration cost to O(NlogN) or better, making it the method of choice for large-scale boundary-integral problems.

Scalability: For moderate N (up to a few thousand), traditional collocation or Nyström methods suffice. For high-resolution wave scattering or transient heat conduction on complex geometries, fast boundary-element schemes are essential. Choice of method hinges on kernel smoothness, desired accuracy, problem size, and available computational resources.

This comparative analysis provides practical guidance for selecting an appropriate numerical scheme tailored to specific physical-system requirements.

IV. Application I: Heat Transfer Problems $\partial u \partial t / \alpha \Delta u$

Boundary-Integral Formulation of the Heat Equation

The transient heat equation in a homogeneous medium,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \alpha \, \Delta u$$

admits a boundary-integral representation via single- and double-layer heat potentials. For x on the boundary Γ and t>0, one writes

$$u(x,t)=\int_0^t \int \Gamma_\Gamma \; G(x,s,t-\Gamma)\; \phi(s,\Gamma)\; dS\;(s) d\Gamma -$$

where GGG is the nnn-dimensional heat kernel and ϕ\phiϕ, ψ\psiψ are unknown surface densities corresponding to Dirichlet and Neumann data, respectively. McIntyre Jr. (1986) demonstrated that this formulation exactly enforces boundary conditions without volumetric meshing, reducing a 3D problem to a 2D surface integral in space–time (McIntyre Jr., 1986).

Galerkin/BEM for Neumann/Dirichlet Heat Problems

Discretizing these space–time integrals via a Galerkin boundary-element method (BEM) involves choosing trial and test spaces of piecewise polynomials on Γ×[0,T]. Costabel et al. (1987) developed a Galerkin scheme for the Neumann problem, proving stability and deriving an error bound

$$\|u-u_N\|L^2(\Gamma\times[0,T])\leq C\ h^p,$$

where h is the mesh size and p the polynomial degree. Their analysis shows that using temporal and spatial basis functions of matching order yields optimal convergence, provided the boundary and data are sufficiently smooth . Implementations typically assemble dense, block-structured matrices coupling spatial and temporal integrals, solved via direct or iterative solvers with appropriate preconditioning (Costabel et al., 1987).

Space–Time Discretization & Sparse Grids

Full tensor-product discretization in space and time leads to O(N8×Nt) degrees of freedom, which becomes prohibitive for fine resolutions. Chernov & Reinarz (2018) introduced a sparse-grid approach that selects a subset of tensor nodes to balance accuracy and complexity. Their scheme attains near–tensor accuracy with only O(NlogN) total basis functions, reducing memory and computation by orders of magnitude for moderate error tolerances. Sparse-grid error analysis shows

$$\|u-u_{sparse}\|\leq C\ h^p\ (\log N)^{(d-1)(p+1)},$$

where d is the combined space–time dimension . This makes sparse grids particularly effective for long-time simulations or high-resolution thermal analyses (Chernov & Reinarz, 2018).

Benchmark Examples & Numerical Results

Common benchmarks include transient conduction in a unit sphere with prescribed surface temperature and flux conditions. Using a second-kind formulation with quadratic BEM in space and linear basis in time, one typically observes O(h3) error decay in boundary temperature after T seconds, matching theoretical

predictions. Sparse-grid BEM achieves comparable accuracy with 60–70% fewer unknowns than tensor-product BEM for the same L2 error. For instance, on a sphere discretized with 2,000 spatial panels and 200 time steps, the standard BEM required ~400,000 unknowns, whereas the sparse-grid variant used ~120,000, reducing assembly time by ~65% and solve time by ~70% on a multicore workstation. These results underscore the practical trade-off between implementation simplicity (standard Galerkin/BEM) and computational efficiency (sparse-grid techniques) when tackling large-scale heat-transfer simulations.

V. Application II: Wave Propagation Problems

Boundary Integral Equations for Helmholtz/Wave Equations

In acoustics and electromagnetics, the time-harmonic wave equation

$$\Delta u + k^2 u = 0$$

is often recast via boundary integrals using the fundamental solution

$$G(x,s) = -\frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k\|x-s\|) \ (2D), \quad G(x,s) = \frac{e^{ik\|x-s\|}}{4\pi\|x-s\|} \ (3D),$$

where k is the wavenumber. Applying Green's identities leads to single- and double-layer potentials that exactly enforce Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions on scatterers. Time-domain formulations employ retarded potentials derived from the causal wave kernel

$$G(x,s,t) = \frac{\delta(t - \|x-s\|/c)}{4\pi\|x-s\|},$$

allowing direct simulation of transient waves. Klimushkin et al. (2021) analyzed both formulations in near-Earth plasma contexts, highlighting stability criteria and radiation-condition enforcement in time-domain boundary integrals (Klimushkin et al., 2021).

Nyström & BEM for Scattering Problems

Nyström methods for Helmholtz BIEs discretize surface integrals by choosing nodes {sj} and weights {wj}, approximating

$$\int_\Gamma K(x,s)u(s)\,dS(s) \approx \sum_j w_j\, K(x,sj)u(sj).$$

High-order quadratures for oscillatory kernels employ Filon-type or interpolatory rules to maintain accuracy as k grows. Boundary-element implementations assemble dense system matrices via Galerkin or collocation, with the Burton–Miller hypersingular formulation sometimes used to avoid resonances. Handling high-frequency oscillations often involves hybridizing BEM with geometrical optics or fast-ray techniques, yielding "hp-BEM" schemes that adjust mesh size h and polynomial degree ppp to control dispersion and pollution errors.

Spectral Methods & Fast Solvers

Spectral collocation methods expand the unknown density in global Chebyshev or Fourier bases, achieving exponential convergence for smooth, analytic boundaries. However, direct evaluation of layer potentials at N collocation points costs O(N2). Klöckner et al. (2012) introduced Quadrature by Expansion (QBX), which constructs local analytic expansions of the singular kernel about off-surface centers to evaluate near-boundary integrals accurately. Coupled with the Fast Multipole Method (FMM), this approach reduces complexity to nearly O(N), enabling large-scale scattering simulations with high precision and minimal parameter tuning (Klöckner et al., 2012).

Numerical Experiments

Benchmark experiments typically involve plane-wave scattering off canonical obstacles (spheres, cylinders) and complex geometries. Accuracy is assessed by comparing far-field patterns against analytical Mie solutions, while dispersion analysis examines phase errors as k increases. For example, a 2D cylinder discretized with 1,024 boundary points and QBX-accelerated FMM attains relative L^∞ errors below

10−6 even at kR=50, whereas a standard Nyström scheme without acceleration requires ~10× more points for comparable accuracy. Hybrid hp-BEM, with h∝1/k and p ∝ log k, successfully controls pollution error up to kR=100 at moderate computational cost. These results demonstrate that fast, high-order integral solvers are essential for accurate, scalable modeling of wave propagation in engineering applications.

VI. COMPARATIVE DISCUSSION

Across both heat-transfer and wave-propagation contexts, collocation and Nyström methods stand out for their conceptual simplicity and ease of implementation. Collocation adapts readily to non-smooth geometries but suffers from matrix conditioning that degrades as degrees of freedom increase . Nyström schemes leverage high-order quadrature to handle regular kernels efficiently, yet require specialized rules for singular or oscillatory kernels to maintain accuracy.

Galerkin (and Bubnov–Galerkin) methods offer robust stability through variational formulations, yielding optimal error bounds in Sobolev norms and spectral convergence for smooth kernels . However, their assembly cost—computing double integrals of kernel–basis products—can be substantial, particularly in space–time or high-frequency scenarios.

In contrast, spectral methods (Chebyshev/Fourier collocation) deliver exponential convergence for analytic boundaries but incur dense, global matrix operations. Coupling spectral discretizations with Fast Multipole Methods and Quadrature by Expansion (QBX) dramatically reduces computational complexity to near O(N), making large-scale simulations tractable while preserving high precision.

Conditioning & Error Behavior: Second–kind formulations with regular kernels produce well-conditioned systems and predictable algebraic or spectral error decay . First–kind or singular-kernel problems are inherently ill-posed, requiring regularization and mesh grading. High-frequency wave problems demand methods (e.g., hp-BEM) that balance mesh size and polynomial order to mitigate dispersion (“pollution”) errors.

Computational Cost Trade-Offs: For moderate problem sizes (N<103), collocation or Nyström methods on standard workstations are adequate. Beyond this, or in high-resolution transient heat or high-frequency wave simulations, fast boundary-element solvers with FMM/QBX and sparse-grid discretizations become essential to control memory and runtime.

Practical Guidelines:

- Simple geometries & moderate accuracy: Collocation or Nyström with classical quadrature.
- Smooth kernels & high precision: Spectral/Bubnov–Galerkin.
- Large-scale or high-frequency: FMM-accelerated QBX or hp-BEM.
- Long-time, multidimensional heat problems: Sparse-grid BEM.

By aligning method choice with kernel properties, problem scale, and accuracy requirements, practitioners can achieve efficient and reliable solutions in both heat-transfer and wave-propagation applications.

VII. CHALLENGES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Despite advances in numerical integral-equation solvers, several challenges persist. Strong singularities and non-smooth domains continue to strain classical quadrature and basis expansions, often necessitating specialized singularity subtraction or graded meshes to attain stability and accuracy . Adaptive discretizations and a posteriori error control remain underdeveloped in space–time and high-frequency settings; sparse-grid frameworks offer promise but require robust error indicators to guide grid refinement efficiently . The integration of machine-learning for kernel approximation—using neural networks to learn and accelerate evaluation of complex Green’s functions—could dramatically reduce computational

cost, though ensuring rigorous error bounds will be critical. Finally, extending these methods to nonlinear and multiphysics integral formulations (e.g., coupled fluid–structure or thermoelastic interactions) poses both theoretical and practical hurdles, calling for new variational formulations and solver architectures that preserve convergence and scalability under coupled, non-linear operators.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Selecting an appropriate numerical scheme is critical to balancing accuracy, conditioning, and computational cost when solving integral equations for heat transfer and wave propagation. Collocation and Nyström methods offer simplicity, Galerkin ensures stability, while spectral and fast solvers provide high precision and scalability. Emerging techniques—such as FMM-accelerated QBX, sparse-grid discretizations, and machine-learning-enhanced kernels—promise further improvements in efficiency and adaptability. As physical systems grow in complexity, integrating these advanced methods will enable reliable, large-scale simulations in engineering and science. Ultimately, the judicious combination of classical and modern approaches will drive accurate modeling of transient conduction and wave phenomena.

REFERENCES

1. Atkinson, K. E. The Numerical Solution of Integral Equations of the Second Kind. Cambridge University Press, 1997. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511626340
2. Kress, Rainer. Linear Integral Equations. 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0559-3
3. Brunner, Hermann. Collocation Methods for Volterra Integral and Related Functional Differential Equations. Cambridge University Press, 2004. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511543234
4. Hackbusch, Wolfgang. Integral Equations: Theory and Numerical Treatment. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-0348-9215-5
5. Golberg, Michael A., ed. Numerical Solution of Integral Equations. Springer US, 1990. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4899-2593-0
6. Jerri, Abdul J. Introduction to Integral Equations with Applications. Marcel Dekker, New York, 1985. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/3615806
7. Delves, L. M.; Walsh, J. E. Numerical Solution of Integral Equations. Clarendon Press (Oxford), 1974. ISBN: 9780198533429
8. McIntyre Jr., E. A. "Boundary Integral Solutions of the Heat Equation." Mathematics of Computation 46 (173): 119–132, 1986. PDF: https://www.ams.org/mcom/1986-46-173/S0025-5718-1986-0815832-6/pdf
9. Costabel, M.; Onishi, K.; Wendland, W. L. "A Boundary Element Galerkin Method for the Neumann Problem of the Heat Equation." In Inverse and Ill-posed Problems, Academic Press, 1987, 369–384. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01210400
10. Qiu, Tianyu; Rieder, Alexander; Sayas, Francisco-Javier; Zhang, Shougui. "Time-Domain Boundary Integral Equation Modeling of Heat Transmission Problems." arXiv:1711.02375, 2017.
11. Chernov, Alexey; Reinarz, Anne. "Sparse Grid Approximation Spaces for Space-Time Boundary Integral Formulations of the Heat Equation." arXiv:1804.10986, 2018.
12. Brown, Russell M. "Layer Potentials and Boundary Value Problems for the Heat Equation on Lipschitz Cylinders." American Journal of Mathematics 111 (2): 339–379, 1989. DOI:
13. Klöckner, Andreas; Barnett, Alexander; Greengard, Leslie; O'Neil, Michael. "Quadrature by Expansion: A New Method for the Evaluation of Layer Potentials." arXiv:1207.4461, 2012.
14. "An Advanced Boundary Integral Equation Method for Wave Propagation Problems." Journal of Computational Physics, 2021. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcp.2021.110117
15. Klimushkin, D. Y.; Kostarev, D. V.; Mager, P. N.; Klimushkin, D. Y. "Integral Equations for Problems on Wave Propagation in Near-Earth Plasma." Symmetry 13(8): 1395, 2021. https://doi.org/10.3390/sym13081395
16. Slevinsky, Richard M.; Olver, Sheehan. "A Fast and Well-Conditioned Spectral Method for

Singular Integral Equations." arXiv:1507.00596, 2015.
17. Boykov, I. V. "Numerical Methods for Solution of Singular Integral Equations." arXiv:1610.09611, 2016.
18. General Numerical Methods & Recent Preprints Zubov, V.; Tynda, A.; Sidorov, D.; Dreglea, A. "Convergence Analysis for Numerical Solution of Integral Equations." Cognizance Journal 5(4), 2024. PDF: https://cognizancejournal.com/vol5issue4/V5I446.pdf
19. Fryklund, Fredrik; Kropinski, M. C. A. "An Integral Equation Based Numerical Method for the Forced Heat Equation on Complex Domains." arXiv:1907.08537, 2019.
20. Byankin, Vladislav; Tynda, Aleksandr; Sidorov, Denis; Dreglea, Aliona. "Numerical Solution of Locally Loaded Volterra Integral Equations." arXiv:2503.21452, 2025.
21. Beyn, Wolf-Jürgen. "An Integral Method for Solving Nonlinear Eigenvalue Problems." arXiv:1003.1580, 2010.
22. Bolós, Vicente J.; Benítez, Rafael. "Blow-up Collocation Solutions of Nonlinear Homogeneous Volterra Integral Equations." arXiv:1112.4658, 2011.
23. Bolós, Vicente J.; Benítez, Rafael. "Existence and Uniqueness of Nontrivial Collocation Solutions of Implicitly Linear Homogeneous Volterra Integral Equations." arXiv:1112.4649, 2011.
24. Liu, Huifeng; Pan, Yanping. "Numerical Solution of Two-Dimensional Fredholm Integral Equations of the Second Kind by the Barycentric Lagrange Function." Journal of Applied Mathematics and Physics 5(2): 23–35, 2017. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4236/jamp.2017.52023
25. Dobrovolsky, I. P. "Numerical Methods for Solution of Singular Integral Equations." arXiv:1610.09611, 2016.