Karshi Multidisciplinary International Scientific Journal

Vol. 1(2) (2024), 155–162

ON THE APPLICATION OF ILL-POSED PROBLEMS OF EQUATIONS OF MATHEMATICAL PHYSICS

Davron A. Juraev, Nazira M. Mammadzada and M. Israr

Communicated by Juan Bulnes

Abstract: Regarding the implementation of ill-posed problems in the context of mathematical physics equations, it is essential to acknowledge their significance. Ill-posed problems are characterized by their sensitivity to changes in initial or boundary conditions, leading to non-unique or unstable solutions. These challenges frequently arise in areas such as fluid dynamics, heat transfer, and wave propagation, where classical methods may struggle to provide reliable answers. Consequently, researchers seek innovative numerical techniques and regularization methods to stabilize these problems and obtain meaningful solutions. Among the approaches utilized are Tikhonov regularization, particle filtering, and machine learning methods, all aiming to mitigate the effects of ill-posedness. Addressing these issues is crucial, as they have profound implications for both theoretical understanding and practical applications in engineering and physics. It is clear that further advancements in this area will enhance the effectiveness of predictive models and simulation tools, ultimately contributing to the broader field of mathematical physics. Through ongoing investigation, the mathematical community continues to refine strategies that accommodate the complexities posed by ill-posed problems, ensuring progress in this vital discipline.

Keywords and phrases: Ill-posed problems, Tikhonov regularization, regularization techniques, fundamental solutions, regular solutions, Carleman estimates.

MSC 2010 Classifications: Primary 35J46; Secondary 35J56.

1 Introduction

One significant avenue of research involves the development of adaptive algorithms that can adjust in real time to the inherent uncertainties present in ill-posed problems. These algorithms often leverage advanced statistical techniques and data assimilation methods to improve the stability of solutions. By incorporating real-world measurements, they enhance the accuracy of predictions, offering a more reliable framework for practitioners in fields such as meteorology and environmental science, where initial data can exhibit high variability. Another promising direction is the integration of deep learning approaches, which have shown remarkable capability in recognizing patterns and extracting features from complex datasets. These techniques can be particularly effective in managing the ill-posed nature of problems by learning effective representation and regularization strategies directly from data. Machine learning models can outperform traditional algorithms in some instances, particularly in handling nonlinearities and high-dimensional problems typical in mathematical physics. The increasing complexity of real-world systems calls for interdisciplinary collaboration between mathematicians, physicists, and engineers. By sharing insights and methodologies, these groups can create hybrid models that combine the rigor of mathematical formulations with the flexibility of computational methods. Such collaborations are essential for addressing the multifaceted challenges posed by ill-posed problems and ensuring robust solutions that can be applied in practice. Ultimately, the ongoing exploration of ill-posed problems not only broadens our theoretical understanding but also enhances the applicability of mathematical concepts. As solutions become more refined, they hold the potential to revolutionize predictive modeling, thereby paving the way for innovative technologies and approaches to complex physical phenomena. The commitment to unraveling these challenging issues signifies a pivotal aspect of advancement within mathematical physics (see, for instance [1]-[5]).

G.M. Goluzin and V.M. Krylov's exploration of the generalized Carleman formula reveals significant insights into analytic continuation, a fundamental concept in complex analysis. This formula extends the classic Carleman approach, paving the way for deeper comprehension of functions that can be analytically continued beyond their initial domains. The authors meticulously lay out the theoretical framework underpinning this extension, emphasizing its implications for the behavior of functions in various contexts. One of the key applications highlighted in their work is the connection between the generalized Carleman formula and the resolution of boundary value problems. By utilizing this formula, researchers can accurately extend solutions beyond the boundaries of the original problem, facilitating a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomena involved. This is particularly relevant in mathematical physics, where boundary conditions often pose significant challenges. Moreover, the generalized Carleman formula is instrumental in the realm of stability analysis. By examining the conditions under which the continuations maintain their properties, Goluzin and Krylov contribute to the development of robust techniques for predicting the behavior of solutions in dynamic systems. Their findings not only enhance theoretical knowledge but also provide practical tools for scientists and engineers engaged in complex modeling tasks. The implications of their work encourage further exploration of analytic continuation in diverse mathematical and scientific fields [8].

The concept of ill-posed problems in mathematical physics is closely tied to problems that do not satisfy one or more of Hadamard's criteria for well-posedness, namely:

1. **Existence:** A solution exists.
2. **Uniqueness:** The solution is unique.
3. **Stability:** The solution depends continuously on the data.

When these conditions are not met, the problem is considered ill-posed. These issues often arise in mathematical physics, particularly in areas involving inverse problems, such as determining parameters or sources from observed data. Ill-posed problems are prevalent in many fields of science and engineering, where incomplete, noisy, or indirect data needs to be analyzed. Some common applications include:

1. Inverse Problems:

Geophysics: Determining subsurface properties (e.g., seismic inversion).

Medical Imaging: Techniques like computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and electrical impedance tomography (EIT) involve solving inverse problems to reconstruct images from measured data.

Astronomy: Deconvolving blurred telescope images to recover clearer astronomical images.

2. Heat Conduction and Diffusion:

Backward heat conduction problems, where the goal is to determine past states of a system from current data, are inherently ill-posed due to the smoothing nature of heat equations.

3. Fluid Dynamics:

Reconstruction of velocity fields or sources in fluid dynamics based on boundary measurements.

4. Signal and Image Processing:

Denoising and deblurring images often involve solving ill-posed problems, especially when the degradation process is poorly modeled or underdetermined.

5. Control and Optimization:

Optimal control problems governed by partial differential equations (PDEs) can become ill-posed when small changes in input parameters lead to large variations in outputs.

6. Environmental Science:

Modeling pollutant dispersion in air or water and inferring emission sources from sensor data.

2 Regularization techniques for ill-posed problems

Regularization techniques are essential in addressing ill-posed problems, where the solutions may not exist, may not be unique, or may not depend continuously on the input data. These problems are common in various fields, including image reconstruction, machine learning, and inverse problems in physics. Regularization introduces additional information or constraints that help to stabilize the solution, making it more robust to noise and perturbations in the data.

One widely used approach is Tikhonov regularization, which modifies the optimization problem by adding a penalty term to the objective function. This term typically involves the norm of the solution, guiding the algorithm towards smoother solutions that are less sensitive to noise. The amount of regularization can be finely tuned, allowing for a balance between fitting the data closely and maintaining generalizability. Another popular technique is the use of sparsity-inducing norms, such as the L_1 norm applied in Basis Pursuit or LASSO regression. These methods promote solutions with fewer active components, effectively filtering out noise and leading to more interpretable models. They have gained prominence in high-dimensional settings, where traditional methods often fail. Overall, the choice of regularization technique depends on the specific characteristics of the problem at hand, as well as the desired properties of the solution. Effective regularization can significantly enhance the quality and reliability of solutions in the face of uncertainty.

Stability in the context of Tikhonov regularization refers to the ability of the regularized solution to depend continuously on the given data, even when the data is noisy or perturbed. Tikhonov's regularization achieves stability by introducing a penalty term that controls the ill-posedness of the original problem. This is one of the most widely used methods for regularizing ill-posed problems. It involves adding a penalty term to the objective function to stabilize the solution.

Tikhonov regularization framework: Given a problem $Ax = b$, where A is an operator, and b is the data, the solution x may be unstable if A has small singular values or if b is perturbed.

Regularized problem:

$$x_\alpha = \arg\min_x \|Ax - b\|^2 + \alpha\|Lx\|^2,$$

where

$\|Ax - b\|^2$: Measures the fidelity of the solution to the data

Lx : Regularization term, stabilizing the solution.

$\alpha > 0$: Regularization parameter that balances the trade-off between data fidelity and stability.

L : Regularization operator, often the identity or a derivative operator.

Stability Properties of Tikhonov Regularization:

1. Continuous dependence on data:

The regularized solution x_α is stable because the penalty term suppresses large oscillations or magnifications of errors that might arise from small perturbations in b.

For a perturbed data vector b_δ with $\|b - b_\delta\| \leq \delta$, the solution x_α^δ remains close to x_α if α is chosen appropriately.

2. Control of Regularization Parameter (α):

Larger values of α increase stability but may reduce accuracy (oversmoothing the solution).

Smaller values of α increase fidelity to the data but may lead to instability or overfitting.

3. Role of the Regularization Operator (L):

Choosing L appropriately (e.g., identity for bounded solutions or a derivative operator for smooth solutions) enforces prior information about the solution, further enhancing stability.

Mathematical explanation of stability:

Tikhonov regularization modifies the problem to suppress the effects of small singular values of A. Using the singular value decomposition (SVD) of A:

$$A = U\Sigma V^T,$$

where $\Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_n)$, the regularized solution can be expressed as:

$$x_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\sigma_i}{\sigma_i^2 + \alpha} u_i^T b \, v_i.$$

Stability Insight:

The term $\dfrac{\sigma_i}{\sigma_i^2 + \alpha}$ effectively dampens the contribution of small σ_i, which are responsible for instability in the unregularized solution.

As $\alpha \to 0$, the solution approaches the least-squares solution, which may be unstable.

As $\alpha \to \infty$, the solution converges to a trivial (oversmoothed) solution, eliminating instability but losing meaningful features.

Practical Implications:

1. Trade-off Between Stability and Accuracy: Stability is guaranteed by the regularization term, but excessive regularization can lead to a loss of detail in the solution.

2. Parameter Selection:

The choice of α is critical for achieving an optimal balance. Methods like the $L-$curve or discrepancy principle are often used.

3. Handling Noise:

Tikhonov regularization ensures that the solution does not amplify noise in the data excessively, making it robust for practical applications with imperfect data.

3 The Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation

The Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation presents unique challenges and opportunities for mathematical analysis and numerical applications. The Helmholtz equation, commonly encountered in various fields such as acoustics, electromagnetism, and quantum mechanics, describes the propagation of waves under certain boundary conditions. When approached through matrix factorizations, it allows for a structured representation that can enhance computational efficiency and solution stability. A pivotal aspect of tackling this problem lies in establishing well-posedness. The Cauchy problem is inherently ill-posed, as small perturbations in the data can lead to significant variations in the solution. To address this, one can utilize regularization techniques and exploit the properties of the matrix factorization to ensure stability. Techniques such as Tikhonov regularization play a critical role in controlling the sensitivity of the solution, allowing for a more robust handling of noise in the data [1]. Moreover, the application of integral equation techniques provides another layer of sophistication. By recasting the Helmholtz equation into an integral form, one can analyze the influence of boundary data on the solution through matrix operations. This not only facilitates the understanding of the underlying physics but also enables the development of efficient numerical algorithms tailored for specific applications. In conclusion, the intersection of the Cauchy problem and matrix factorizations in the context of the Helmholtz equation is a fertile ground for research, blending theoretical insights with practical computational techniques. With continued advancements in both analytical methods and numerical algorithms, the potential for breakthroughs in solving this complex problem remains substantial.

T. Carleman, a prominent figure in the realm of mathematical analysis, is best known for his contributions to the theory of functional equations and his groundbreaking work on the Carleman estimates. These estimates provide critical tools for analyzing the behavior of solutions to partial differential equations, particularly in the context of inverse problems and unique continuation. His work laid the foundation for various techniques used in modern mathematical physics and control theory. Born in the early 20th century, Carleman's intellectual journey was marked by an insatiable curiosity and a relentless pursuit of knowledge. He delved into complex analysis, exploring the interplay between analytic functions and their applications. His ability to articulate abstract concepts with clarity made his work accessible, inspiring future generations of mathematicians. The significance of Carleman's estimates extends beyond pure mathematics; they have practical implications in engineering, particularly in the fields of signal processing and image reconstruction. By allowing for the reconstruction of functions from limited data, his methodologies have transformed how engineers approach complex systems. In the broader context of mathematical sciences, T. Carleman remains a seminal figure whose legacy endures, as researchers continue to build upon his pioneering ideas, perpetuating a tradition that melds theoretical inquiry with real-world application [2].

In the context of hyperbolic equations, regularization techniques serve as powerful tools to counteract the inherent instabilities that arise in ill-posed problems. Such techniques allow for the construction of approximate solutions even in cases where the classical framework fails to yield viable results. The robustness of these regularization methods can be attributed to their ability to absorb perturbations in the initial data, guiding the numerical computations toward stable outcomes. A variety of regularization formulas have been developed, each with its unique characteristics and domains of applicability. These formulas typically introduce additional constraints or modifications to the problem, effectively smoothing out the oscillations and instabilities otherwise present in the solution. The optimization of these regularization techniques is crucial, as it determines how closely the approximate solutions can align with the true solutions when they exist. Moreover, the exploration of the parameter space associated with regularization can yield insights into the trade-offs between accuracy and stability. This exploration often leads to the identification of optimal regularization parameters that enhance the performance of numerical algorithms in practical scenarios. Given the ongoing advancements in computational methods and their applications, the future of regularization of the Cauchy problem appears promising, with potential breakthroughs on the horizon in various fields, including physics, engineering, and data science [3].

The Cauchy problem is typically ill-posed for the Helmholtz equation, meaning small errors in the boundary data can lead to large errors in the solution. This stems from the lack of uniqueness or stability of the solution.

Strategies to Address Ill-Posedness:

1. Regularization:

Techniques like Tikhonov regularization or truncated SVD stabilize the solution.

2. Reconstruction Algorithms:

Using methods based on iterative refinement or data completion to recover missing or noisy Cauchy data.

3. Stabilized Factorizations:

Introducing additional constraints or penalty terms in the matrix system to enforce physical properties (e.g., energy conservation).

Applications and Implications

1. Wave Propagation Problems:

The Helmholtz equation governs steady-state wave phenomena, including acoustics and electromagnetic waves.

2. Inverse Problems:

Recovering unknown parameters or sources in the domain based on partial Cauchy data.

3. Scattering and Imaging:

Solving the Helmholtz equation with boundary conditions derived from measurements (e.g., in seismic or medical imaging).

The intricacies of the Cauchy problem for elliptic equations arise from the inherent nature of the underlying data sets. While the unique solvability of these problems under certain conditions is established, the failure of the data set to be closed leads to a myriad of challenges. Scholars have identified that the non-closed nature introduces significant difficulties in both analytical and numerical approaches, which demands innovative strategies to tackle the resulting inconsistencies. In the realm of the Helmholtz operator, various factorization techniques prove vital for deriving approximate solutions. Each factorization offers a distinct perspective on addressing the ill-posed nature of the Cauchy problem, leading to a deeper understanding of the solution's stability and convergence properties. Researchers have explored connections between these factorizations and regularization methods, which serve to stabilize the approximate solutions against perturbations in the data. In the literature, works [34-49] have articulated explicit regularized solutions for different factorizations of the Helmholtz operator, providing invaluable insights. The results indicate that employing regularization strategies not only paves the way for feasible solutions but also enriches the qualitative attributes of these solutions. The exploration of these methodologies continues to illuminate the path forward in the overarching study of elliptic equations and Cauchy problems.

In many well-posed problems for systems of equations of elliptic type of the first order with constant coefficients that factorize the Helmholtz operator, it is not possible to calculate the values of the vector function on the entire boundary. Therefore, the problem of reconstructing the solution of systems of equations of first order elliptic type with constant coefficients, factorizing the Helmholtz operator (see, for instance [19]-[46]), is one of the topical problems in the theory of differential equations. For the last decades, interest in classical ill-posed problems of mathematical physics has remained. This direction in the study of the properties of solutions of the Cauchy problem for the Laplace equation was started in [2], [3]-[13] and subsequently developed in [14]-[47].

4 Conclusion

The regularization term added in Tikhonov regularization typically takes the form of a norm of the solution, often the L_2 norm, which imposes a penalty on large coefficients. This prevents the solution from fitting the noise in the data excessively, thus enhancing stability. The balance between the fidelity to the data and the regularization term is crucial; if α is too small, the solution may remain unstable and overly sensitive to noise. Conversely, if α is too large, the model may become overly simplified, losing important features of the data. Selecting the appropriate regularization parameter α often involves a trade-off. Methods such as cross-validation or the $L-$curve criterion can be employed to find a value that minimizes error while maintaining generalization capabilities. These techniques enable practitioners to gauge the stability of their solution across various levels of noise, providing a systematic approach to regularization that is both empirical and robust. Ultimately, the success of Tikhonov regularization hinges not only on the mathematical formulation but also on the intuition behind choosing α. A well-chosen regularization parameter contributes to deriving solutions that not only fit the observed data but also possess desirable qualities, like smoothness and interpretability, essential in applications ranging from image reconstruction to solving ill-posed inverse problems.

Acknowledgment

The author expresses his sincere gratitude to the reviewers and editors for their useful comments.

References

[1] A.N. Tikhonov, On the solution of ill-posed problems and the method of regularization, *Reports of the USSR Academy of Sciences*, **151:3**, 501–504 (1963).

[2] T. Carleman, *Les fonctions quasi analytiques*. Gautier-Villars et Cie., Paris, (1926).

[3] J. Hadamard, *The Cauchy problem for linear partial differential equations of hyperbolic type*, Nauka, Moscow (1978).

[4] M.M. Lavrent'ev, On the Cauchy problem for second-order linear elliptic equations, *Reports of the USSR Academy of Sciences*, **112:2**, 195–197 (1957).

[5] M.M. Lavrent'ev, *On some ill-posed problems of mathematical physics*, Nauka, Novosibirsk (1962).

[6] L.A. Aizenberg, *Carleman's formulas in complex analysis*, Nauka, Novosibirsk 1990.

[7] A. Bers, F. John, M. Shekhter, *Partial Differential Equations*, Mir, Moscow, (1966).

[8] G.M. Goluzin, V.M. Krylov, The generalized Carleman formula and its application to the analytic continuation of functions, *Sbornik: Mathematics*, **40:2**, 144–149 (1993).

[9] P.K. Kythe, *Fundamental solutions for differential operators and applications*, Birkhauser, Boston, (1996).

[10] Sh. Yarmukhamedov, On the Cauchy problem for the Laplace equation, *Reports of the USSR Academy of Sciences*, **235:2**, 281–283 (1977).

[11] Sh. Yarmukhamedov, On the extension of the solution of the Helmholtz equation, *Reports of the Russian Academy of Sciences*, **357:3**, 320–323 (1997).

[12] Sh. Yarmukhamedov, The Carleman function and the Cauchy problem for the Laplace equation, *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, **45:3**, 702–719 (2004).

[13] Sh. Yarmukhamedov, Representation of Harmonic Functions as Potentials and the Cauchy Problem, *Math. Notes*, **83:5**, 763–778 (2008).

[14] E.V. Arbuzov, A.L. Bukhgeim, The Carleman formula for the Helmholtz equation, *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, **47:3**, 518–526 (1979).

[15] N.N. Tarkhanov, Stability of the solutions of elliptic systems, *Funct. Anal. Appl.*, **19:3**, 245–247 (1985).

[16] N.N. Tarkhanov, On the Carleman matrix for elliptic systems, *Reports of the USSR Academy of Sciences*, **284:2**, 294–297 (1985).

[17] N.N. Tarkhanov, The solvability criterion for an ill-posed problem for elliptic systems, *Reports of the USSR Academy of Sciences*, **380:3**, 531–534 (1989).

[18] N.N. Tarkhanov, *The Cauchy problem for solutions of elliptic equations*, Akad. Verl., V. 7, Berlin (1995).

[19] D.A. Juraev, The Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation in an unbounded domain, *Siberian Electronic Mathematical Reports*, **14**, 752–764 (2017).

[20] D.A. Juraev, On the Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation in a bounded domain, *Siberian Electronic Mathematical Reports*, **15**, 11–20 (2018).

[21] D.A. Zhuraev, Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation, *Ukrainian Mathematical Journal*, **69:10**, 1583–1592 (2018).

[22] D.A. Juraev, On the Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation in an unbounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$, *Siberian Electronic Mathematical Reports*, **15**, 1865–1877 (2018).

[23] D.A. Juraev, On a regularized solution of the Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation, *Advanced Mathematical Models & Applications*, **4:1**, 86–96 (2019).

[24] D.A. Juraev, The solution of the ill-posed Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation, *Advanced Mathematical Models & Applications*, **5:2**, 205–221 (2020).

[25] D.A. Juraev, S. Noeiaghdam, Regularization of the ill-posed Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation on the plane, *Axioms*, **10:2**, 1–14 (2021).

[26] D.A. Juraev, Solution of the ill-posed Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation on the plane, *Global and Stochastic Analysis*, **8:3**, 1–17 (2021).

[27] D.A. Juraev, S. Noeiaghdam, Modern problems of mathematical physics and their applications, *Axioms*, bf 11:2, 1–6 (2022).

[28] D.A. Juraev, S. Noeiaghdam, *Modern problems of mathematical physics and their applications*, MDPI, Axioms, Basel, Switzerland, (2022).

[29] D.A. Juraev, On the solution of the Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation in a multidimensional spatial domain, *Global and Stochastic Analysis*, **9:2**, 1–17 (2022).

[30] D.A. Juraev, The solution of the ill-posed Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation in a multidimensional bounded domain, *Palestine Journal of Mathematics*, **11:3**, 604–613 (2022).

[31] D.A. Juraev, A. Shokri, D. Marian, Solution of the ill-posed Cauchy problem for systems of elliptic type of the first order, *Fractal and Fractional*, **6:7**, 1–11, (2022).

[32] D.A. Juraev, A. Shokri, D. Marian, On an approximate solution of the Cauchy problem for systems of equations of elliptic type of the first order, *Entropy*, **24:7**, 1–18, (2022).

[33] D.A. Juraev, A. Shokri, D. Marian, On the approximate solution of the Cauchy problem in a multidimensional unbounded domain, *Fractal and Fractional*, **6:7**, 1–14, (2022).

[34] D.A. Juraev, A. Shokri, D. Marian, Regularized solution of the Cauchy problem in an unbounded domain, *Symmetry*, **14:8**, 1–16, (2022).

[35] D.A. Juraev, M.M. Cavalcanti, Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation in the space $\mathbb{R}^m$, *Boletim da Sociedade Paranaense de Matematica*, **41**, 1–12, (2023).

[36] D.A. Juraev, The Cauchy problem for matrix factorization of the Helmholtz equation in a multidimensional unbounded domain, *Boletim da Sociedade Paranaense de Matematica*, **41**, 1–18, (2023).

[37] D.A. Juraev, V. Ibrahimov, P. Agarwal, Regularization of the Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation on a two-dimensional bounded domain, *Palestine Journal of Mathematics*, **12:1**, 381–403, (2023).

[38] D.A. Juraev, P. Agarwal, A. Shokri, E.E. Elsayed, J.D. Bulnes, On the solution of the ill-posed Cauchy problem for elliptic systems of the first order, *Stochastic Modelling & Computational Sciences*, **3:1**, 1–21, (2023).

[39] D.A. Juraev, S. Noeiaghdam, P. Agarwal, On a regularized solution of the Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation, *Turkish World Mathematical Society. Journal of Applied and Engineering Mathematics*, **13:4**, 1311–1326, (2023).

[40] D.A. Juraev, S. Noeiaghdam, P. Agarwal, R.P. Agarwal, On the Cauchy problem for systems of linear equations of elliptic type of the first order in the space $\mathbb{R}^m$, *Turkish World Mathematical Society. Journal of Applied and Engineering Mathematics*, **14:2**, 618–632, (2024).

[41] D.A. Juraev, A.A. Tagiyeva, J.D. Bulnes, G.X.-G. Yue, On the solution of the ill-posed Cauchy problem for elliptic systems of the first order, *Karshi Multidisciplinary International Scientific Journal*, **1:1**, 17–26, (2024).

[42] D.A. Juraev, P. Agarwal, A. Shokri, E.E. Elsayed, Integral formula for matrix factorizations of Helmholtz equation. *Recent Trends in Fractional Calculus and its Applications, Elsevier Science*, 123–146, (2024).

[43] D.A. Juraev, P. Agarwal, A. Shokri, E.E. Elsayed, Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of Helmholtz equation on a plane. *Recent Trends in Fractional Calculus and its Applications, Elsevier Science*, 147–175, (2024).

[44] D.A. Juraev, P. Agarwal, A. Shokri, E.E. Elsayed, The Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of Helmholtz equation in space. *Recent Trends in Fractional Calculus and its Applications, Elsevier Science*, 177–210, (2024).

[45] D.A. Juraev, N.M. Mammadzada, P. Agarwal, Sh. Jain, On the approximate solution of the Cauchy problem for the Helmholtz equation on the plane. *Computational Algorithms and Numerical Dimensions*, **3:3**, 187–200, (2024).

[46] D.A. Juraev, N.M. Mammadzada, J.D. Bulnes, S.K. Gupta, G.A. Aghayeva, V.R. Ibrahimov, Regularization of the Cauchy problem for matrix factorizations of the Helmholtz equation in an unbounded domain. *Mathematics and Systems Science*. **2:2**, 1–16, (2024).

[47] I.E. Niyozov, D.A. Juraev, R.F. Efendiev, M.J. Jalalov, The Cauchy problem for the system of elasticity. *Journal of Contemporary Applied Mathematics*, **14:2**, 92–107, (2024).

Author information

Davron A. Juraev, 1. Scientific Research Center, Baku Engineering University, Baku AZ0102, AZERBAIJAN; 2. Department of Scientific Research, Innovation and Training of Scientific and Pedagogical Staff, University of Economics and Pedagogy, Karshi, 180100, UZBEKISTAN.
E-mail: juraevdavron12@gmail.com

Nazira M. Mammadzada, State Oil Company of the Azerbaijan Republic, Oil and Gas Scientific Research Project Institute, Baku, AZ1122, AZERBAIJAN.
E-mail: memmedzadenazire@gmail.com

M. Israr, Maryam Abacha American University of Nigeria, Hotoro GRA, Kano State, Nigeria, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA.
E-mail: president@maaun.edu.ng

Received: 01.10.2024
Accepted: 30.11.2024
Published: 27.12.2024