## МАТЕМАТИЧЕСКОЕ И ПРОГРАММНОЕ ОБЕСПЕЧЕНИЕ ВЫЧИСЛИТЕЛЬНЫХ СИСТЕМ, КОМПЛЕКСОВ И КОМПЬЮТЕРНЫХ СЕТЕЙ / MATHEMATICAL SOFTWARE FOR COMPUTERS, COMPLEXES AND COMPUTER NETWORKS

**DOI: https://doi.org/10.60797/itech.2025.5.4**

# EXPLORING ALGEBRAIC ANALYSIS: DEFINITIONS, INTERPRETATIONS, AND METHODOLOGIES

Review article

**Altaher A.[1,] *, Saba S.M.[2], Khaled S.M.[3], Khanin K.M.[4]**
[1] Al-Furat Al-Awsat Technical University, Babil, Iraq
[2] University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq
[3, 4] University of Sumer, Thi Qar, Iraq

* Corresponding author (dr.ammar[at]atu.edu.iq)

**Abstract**

For further than 200 times, the word algebraic analysis has been used to relate to a variety of motifs and methodologies. These connotations are still present moment. Algebraic analysis is presently defined as the study of right invertible drivers in direct spaces, generally without topology. The fact that right antitheses and original drivers are non-commutative, a field structure isn't needed, and the conception of complication isn't needed are crucial differences between algebraic analysis and functional math. This will be a fairly broad discussion, covering a variety of interpretations of the expression in algebraic analysis, piecemeal from the factual workshop that employs the expression, we will also take a quick look at its implicit meanings. In other words, the study of analysis exercising algebraic styles either fully or substantially will be appertained to as algebraic analysis.

**Keywords:** algebraic analysis, right invertible operators, vector spaces non-commutative, functional mathematics.

# ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ АЛГЕБРАИЧЕСКОГО АНАЛИЗА: ОПРЕДЕЛЕНИЯ, ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИИ И МЕТОДОЛОГИИ

Обзор

**Алтахер А.[1,] *, Саба С.М.[2], Халед С.М.[3], Ханин Х.М.[4]**
[1] Технический университет Аль-Фурат Аль-Аусат, Вавилон, Ирак
[2] Багдадский университет, Багдад, Ирак
[3, 4] Университет Шумера, Ти Кар, Ирак

* Корреспондирующий автор (dr.ammar[at]atu.edu.iq)

**Аннотация**

Более 200 раз выражение «алгебраический анализ» использовалось для обозначения самых разных концепций и методологий. Эти коннотации сохраняются и в настоящее время. Сегодня алгебраический анализ определяется как изучение обратимых справа операторов в прямых пространствах, как правило, без топологии. То, что правые антитезы и исходные элементы являются некоммутативными, не нужна структура поля, концепция усложнения не требуется, является принципиальным отличием алгебраического анализа от функциональной математики. Это будет довольно широкая дискуссия, охватывающая различные интерпретации выражения в алгебраическом анализе, частично из фактологического практикума, в котором используется это выражение, мы также кратко рассмотрим его неявные смыслы. Другими словами, алгебраическим анализом будет называться изучение анализа, использующего алгебраические стили полностью или в значительной степени.

**Ключевые слова:** алгебраический анализ, обратимые операторы, некоммутативные векторные пространства, функциональная математика.

## Introduction

There are cases when studies that are simply or substantially algebraic are appertained to as algebraic analyses. For this case, Mansion (1898) discusses only algebraic motifs in sections named Algebraic Analysis in a compendium named "M elangesmathematiques". The authors of the recent book Foundations of Algebraic Analysis, Kashiwara, Kawai, & Kimura (1986), claim that while algebraic analysis lacks a clear description, it does partake an abecedarian element in the application of algebraic ways like chorology proposition. Joseph Fels Ritt established the content of discrimination algebra (18931951). Ritt's (1932) original expression dealt with ordinary or partial discrimination equation systems that have algebraic unknowns and derivations. Although assuming canonical forms for systems has been traditional, he claims that this is an inadequate representation of universal systems. This insufficiency is caused by limitations performing from the operation of implicit function theorems, a lack of strategies to deal with downfalls that are likely to arise throughout the elimination process, and a lack of procedures to stop the preface of extraneous results. He continues by saying that these are only signs of the futility essential in similar approaches of reduction. Still, a solid proposition of algebraic elimination exists for the proposition of algebraic equation systems, encompassing the generalities of rings and ideals. Ritt's exploration aims to introduce some of the absoluteness that systems of algebraic equations enjoy to the proposition of systems of algebraic discrimination equations. (2.5) Ritt's examines functions that are meromorphic on a certain open linked set R of the complex Aeroplan in (1932). Also, a set F that satisfies the below conditions is a field (of similar functions).

$$\exists f \in F \text{ such that } f \not\equiv 0 \text{ on } R$$
$$f, g \in F \rightrightarrows f + g, f - g, fg \in F$$
$$f, g \in F \text{ and } g \not\equiv 0 \rightrightarrows, f/g \in F$$
$$f \in F \rightrightarrows \text{ its derivation } f' \in F$$

Ritt's framework presents his initial results. He later generalizes this setup to any field with characteristic zero, together with an operation called differ- initiation, denoted by a → a′ where a, a′ ∈ F. This operation is assumed to satisfy,

$$(a + b)' = a' + b', (ab)' = b' + ab' \cdot$$

Starting with this core definition of a differential field by Ritt, his entire theoretical framework is constructed. This topic most definitely fits the description of algebraic analysis. On the other hand, algebra is the focus of modern differential algebra research rather than analysis. (Rhett and his students are credited with 99 percent of the description of the topic.) There is also the theory of difference algebra. Graph theories and their development such as [1] and many examples can be provided, but these will do for the time being. Later, we'll go into more detail about a few more options. Let's focus our discussion on topics closely related to algebraic analysis to ensure we stay within the core concepts of the field. The theory of symbolic approaches in its broadest meaning will be the focus, and some related subjects will be briefly reviewed [2] and [3].

**Language Models Based on Semantic Composition**

**2.1. Composition Models**

In natural language processing, vector composition is an issue that has not gotten important attention. Tensor products dimensionality increases exponentially with the number of factors they're made of, making it extremely delicate to connect one vector to another computationally. Other styles that produce a vector with the same dimensionality as its factors by binding two vectors have been presented as a result to this issue. Most importantly, these ways work only under the presumption that the vector factors are dispersed aimlessly. For modelling languages with regular structures, this is worrisome. Considering the forenamed factors, we present a broad frame for probing vector composition. Which we formulate as a function f of two vectors.

$$u\&vh = f(u, v) \quad (1)$$

Where the composition of u and v is indicated by h. colorful models of composition crop grounded on the choice of f. Two general groups of models grounded on multiplicative and cumulative functions were delved in our former work. The most extensively used fashion for combining vectors in literature is cumulative modelling. They've been used for numerous different tasks, similar as opting a restriction modelling, essay grading, document consonance, and most specially, language modelling.

$$h_i = u_i + v_i \quad (2)$$

Vector addition keeps the complexity of the resulting representation the same as the individual ones, making it efficient for calculations. It works well with cosine similarity (and averaging). However, the idea of "averaging" words doesn't quite sit right from a language perspective. When we combine "simple pieces" of language into more complex forms, we expect to create new meanings that go beyond the individual parts. As argued by Mitchell and Lapata (2008), models based on vector addition don't seem to handle this aspect very well:

$$h_i = u_i + v_i \quad (3)$$

Instead of simply combining content from two vectors like traditional addition, this new approach, called "vector addition," carefully selects elements based on their relative importance. Each element in one vector acts as a weight, influencing the corresponding element in the other vector. This way, the resulting vector reflects the combined meaning with finer nuance, unlike traditional addition which simply merges everything together. This method is particularly useful for understanding how a verb's meaning changes depending on its subject. Additionally, we propose a "probabilistic complementarity argument" to support this model's validity. For now, let's assume that the underlying structure of these "semantic vectors" consists of "factors," which represent the relative likelihood of finding a specific context word alongside a target word compared to its overall probability in general.

$$v_i = \frac{\rho(context_i \backslash target)}{\rho(context_i)} \quad (4)$$

The distributional characteristics of a target word are represented by these vectors, which show how explosively itco-occurs with a group of environment words. The most frequent environment words, which also have the largest tentative chances, don't dominate the vectors when the total probability of each environment word is divided through. Assume target words $W_1$ and $W_2$ are represented by vectors u and v. Using the multiplicative model and the factors description, we can now combine these vectors to get:

$$h_i = v_i, u_i = \frac{\rho(c_i|w_1)}{\rho(c_i)} \frac{\rho(c_i|w_2)}{\rho(c_i)} \quad (5)$$

And by Bayes' theorem:

$$h_i = \frac{\rho(w_1|c_i)\rho(w_2|c_i)}{\rho(w_1)\rho(w_2)} \quad (6)$$

Applying the Bayes theorem once more and assuming that $W_1$ and $W_2$ are independent, $h_i$ becomes:

$$h_i \approx \frac{\rho(w_1 w_2|c_i)}{\rho(w_1 w_2)} = \frac{\rho(c_i|w_1 w_2)}{\rho(c_i)} \quad (7)$$

The expression on the right-hand side provides us with something similar to the vector components we would anticipate when our aim is the co-occurrence of $W_1$ and $W_2$, as can be seen by comparing it to (4). As a result, the combined vector hi for the multiplicative model can be seen as an approximation to a vector that represents the distributional features of the phrase $W_1W_2$. Addition creates a vector that is more similar to the representation of either $W_1$ or $W_2$, if multiplication yields a vector that resembles the representation of $W_1$ and w2. Let's say we weren't sure if the word token x belonged to $W_1$ or $W_2$. Assuming total uncertainty between them, it would make sense to represent the probability of context words around this to Ken in terms of the probabilities for $W_1$ and $W_2$ :

$$p(c_i|w_1) = \frac{1}{2}p(c_i|w_1) + \frac{1}{2}p(c_i|w_2) \tag{8}$$

Consequently, based on these probabilities, we might use a vector with the following components to represent *x*:

$$x_i = \frac{1}{2}\frac{p(c_i|w_1)}{p(c_i)} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{p(c_i|w_2)}{p(c_i)} \tag{9}$$

This is precisely how semantic composition is approached via vector averaging. Vector addition will affect in increased generality rather than increased particularity when further vectors are coupled. Alternately, the multiplicative system selects the corridor that are material to the combination and more directly captures the characteristics of their confluence. As an away, we should mention that in addition to the models we have covered then, our former work included a number of other cumulative and multiplicative models.

In addition to using, it as a birth, the cumulative model was chosen because of its enormous appeal in the literature on language modelling. In our assessment analysis, the multiplicative model that was preliminarily handed fared the stylish (i.e., prognosticating verb-subject similarity) [4].

**2.2. Language Modeling**

Calculating Chances Given a word's semantic representation (w) and its history (h), the thing of language modelling is to induce chances p(w ⎪ h), under the premise that likely words should be semantically harmonious with the history. Generally, the cosine of the angle formed by two vectors is used to determine semantic consonance:

$$sim(w,h) = \frac{w,h}{|w||h|}$$
$$w,h = \sum_i w_i h_i \tag{10}$$

where w · h represents w and h's fleck product. This measure is used by Coccaro and Jurafsky (1998) in their language modelling methodology. Unfortunately, to convert the cosine similarity into meaningful chances, they had to calculate on several ad hoc processes. The cosine measure's main excrescence is that, unlike prob capacities, which must have a sum of 1, its values do not, indeed though they fall between 0 and 1. Thus, normalization of some kind is necessary. An fresh issue is that this metric ignores the abecedarian frequency of w, which is essential for a probabilistic model. For case, although the terms" encephalon" and" brain" are nearly exchangeable and may indeed be used interchangeably in some situations, the term" brain" may nonetheless be far more probable due to its lesser frequency.

A perfect measure would yield values that add up to one and account for the underpinning probability of the constituent corridor. Our strategy involves altering the fleck product (equation (11) that serves as the foundation for the cosine measure. Given that equation (4) provides our vector factors, the fleck product is as follows:

$$w \cdot h = \sum_i \frac{p(c_i|w)}{p(c_i)}\frac{p(c_i|h)}{p(c_i)} \tag{11}$$

Which we alter to calculate the probabilities below:

$$p(w|h) = p(w)\sum_i \frac{p(c_i|w)}{p(c_i)}\frac{p(c_i|h)}{p(c_i)}p(c_i) \tag{12}$$

This expression now balances the total using the dependent probabilities of the predicted word and the context words. The fact that this is comparable to shows that this is a real probability $\sum_i p(c_i|w)p(c_i|h)$. However, since equation (13) is based on vector components and works well with the composition models described in Mitchell and Lapata, it is more practical to apply it when creating a representation of the history h. (2008). We may calculate probabilities using vectors that reflect a word and its past equation (13) [5].

We also need to capture the context of a sentence up to a specific word (let's say the nth word). To accomplish this, we merge the vector representing that word with the vector representing the history up to *n-1* words using a (multiplicative or additive) function *f*:

$$h_n = f(w_n, h_n - 1)$$
$$h_1 = w_1 \tag{13}$$

When putting equation (14) into practice, one problem that needs to be fixed is that the history vector needs to stay properly normalized. Put otherwise, the products hi $\cdot p(c_i)$ ought to be legitimate distributions over context words in and of themselves [6].

Thus, the history vector is normalized in the following manner following each vector composition:

$$h_i = \frac{\hat{h_i}}{\sum_i \hat{h_i} \cdot p(c_i)} \tag{14}$$

The language model described in equations (13) and (16) relies on vector composition. This composition requires a set of word vectors whose features are based on the probabilities predicted by equation (4). Traditionally, these features have been derived from a spatial semantic space model similar to the one used by Mitchell and Lapata (2008). However, there's no limitation on how we create these vectors. As a promising alternative, I propose representing words as distributions over topics in the LDA content model (equation 3). These distributions act as the "building blocks" of a vector "v" that captures the semantic meaning of the target word.

We restate these chances into rates of chances in a manner analogous to equation:

$$v_i = \frac{p(topic_i|target)}{p(topic_i)} \tag{15}$$

**2.3. Integrating with Other Language Models**

Semantic coherence serves as the foundation for the models described above. Because they mainly disregard word order, which n-gram models primarily take use of, they will therefore only be marginally predictive. The simplest way to include semantic data into a conventional language model is to create a weighted sum by summing two probability estimates:

$$p(w|h) = \lambda_1 p_1(w|h) + (1-\lambda)p_2(w|h) \tag{16}$$

Linear interpolation can be used to integrate structured language models and n-gram models, ensuring the production of valid probabilities. However, it works best when the combined models complement each other in terms of their strengths and limitations, and when they are equally predictive. In most cases, if one model is significantly weaker than the other, linear interpolation will result in a model of intermediate strength, which is generally worse than the better model. The weaker model may contribute some smoothing, but it is limited in its impact. To calculate semantic probabilities, the unigram probability (p(w)) and a semantic component (Δ) are multiplied together, with Δ representing the scaling factor based on the context in which it occurs, as described in equation (13) [4].

$$p(w|h) = p(w) \cdot \Delta(w,h)$$
$$\Delta(w,h) = \sum_i \frac{p(c_i|w)}{p(c_i)} \frac{p(c_i|h)}{p(c_i)} p(c_i) \tag{17}$$

By leveraging n-gram probabilities instead of unigrams, we capture the context of words and improve the accuracy of our model.

$$\hat{p}(w_n) = p(w_n|w_{n-2}^{n-1}) \cdot \Delta(w_n,h) \tag{18}$$

We normalize, $\hat{p}(w_n)$ by dividing through the total of all word probabilities in order to get a genuine probability estimate:

$$---p(w_n|w_{n-2}^{n-1},h) = \frac{\hat{p}(w_n)}{\sum_w \hat{p}(w)} x \tag{19}$$

Our approach involves combining our semantic model with an n-gram model. This allows the n-gram model to handle long-term dependencies that extend beyond its window, while the semantic model focuses on managing short-range relationships [7].

we incorporate our models with a model of structured language. However, since the models are nearly equally predictive and because linear interpolation is frequently employed when structured language models are integrated with n-grams and other information sources, we utilize it in this instance (equation (18)).

Another advantage of this method is that it lets you merge models without having to renormalize the probabilities. It would be prohibitively expensive to normalize the entire vocabulary in the structured language model [5].

**2.4. 2-Tikhonov method**

This work advances the donation of the Tikhonov system's operation to the result of complicated, unstable semi-linear algebraic equation systems. The recommended approach solves an NLP scoring scheme in a opposition discovery system using the Tikhonov system. The effectiveness of the suggested strategy in comparison to indispensable machine literacy, fuzzy, or stochastic approaches was demonstrated by the simulation results.

The primary issues with separate position problems, like the bone we've with our system, are that the unknown measure matrix lacks numerical order, and the problem is indefinite because of the small single values in the measure matrix. As a result, in order to stabilize the problem, details regarding the systems of position equations indicated in the" Answer fashion" form must be added. The" Tikhonov" system, which is the most extensively used approach for stabilizing separate position problems particularly those involving inverse problems is one way to break these equations (5).

Philips and Tikhonov came up with this system's conception virtually contemporaneously, though singly. When the morning data or supposition of unknowns is known, this approach which is regarded as an inverse way of working inverse issues from a statistical perspective – is employed. Analogous to the least places approach, the Tikhonov system operates under the supposition that the experimental error is arbitrary, the crimes' probability distribution function is normal, and their fine anticipation is zero.

As a result, the thing of this approach, like the least places system, is to find the result with the smallest residuals. still, because of the poor driver conditions, it was also insolvable to get an answer using only the leastsquares condition in the separate position equation bias. As a result, Tikhonov's system prevents the answer from going perpetuity while minimizing the residuals vector by minimizing a point of unknowns (7).

Several computer wisdom, simulation, and engineering study disciplines, including cargo identification, radiation, thermal conductivity, hemivariational inequality, time-fractional prolixity, and singular value corruption, have set up multitudinous uses for Tikhonov's ways.

Because the answers in the ill-posed equations are sensitive to crimes in the input data, indeed a slight anxiety in the input data can have a significant impact on the response. Still, in real-world operations, data always contains excrescencies like rounding, approximation, and dimension crimes that have a significant impact on the problem's result.

In regularization approaches, fresh details about the result to the problem are added in order to produce a sustainable result.

In regularization approaches, additional details about the solution to the problem are added in order to produce a sustainable solution. They hope to achieve a suitable compromise between the residual $\|A_x\text{-}b\|2$ minimizations and the constraint minimization by introducing this constraint [8]. $x_\lambda = arg\ min_x\{\| A_x - b \|_{\frac{2}{2}} + \lambda^2 \| x \|_{\frac{2}{2}} x$ where regularization is indicated by the parameter λ>0, which needs to be chosen carefully. While a little λ (corresponding to a small amount of regularization) has the opposite effect, a large λ (equivalent to a large amount of regularization) causes norm shrinking and enlarges in contrast to the remaining norm. The matrix SVD analysis yields the following expression for Tikhonov's ordered solution [9].

$$x_{reg} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\sigma_i^2+\lambda^2} \frac{u_i^T}{\sigma_i} v_i \tag{20}$$

Where $f_i = \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\sigma_i^2+\lambda^2} = 1, 2...n$ the coefficients are the filter, and we have

$$f_{i=\frac{\lambda^2}{\sigma_i^2}}^{\sigma_i^2+\lambda^2} \approx \int_{\frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda^2}}^{1} \begin{matrix} \sigma_{i \gg \lambda} \\ \sigma_i \ll \lambda \end{matrix} \tag{21}$$

All filter coefficients will be one if $\lambda=0$, and relation 4 will provide the $x_i$ solution. and in return $\lambda=\infty, x_{reg}=0$, is obtained [5].

$$x_{reg} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} fi \frac{u_i^T}{\sigma_i} v_i \tag{22}$$

Formula (2) can be simply used by the Tikhonov function achieved.

$$\| A_x - b \|_{\frac{2}{2}} + \lambda^2 \| x \|_{\frac{2}{2}} \tag{23}$$

We may determine the minimum to calculate by computing the soft and deriving from (5).

$$(A^T A + \lambda^2 I)x = A^T b \tag{24}$$

The following $A^T A$, $A^T$ b can be expressed using the right singularity vectors.

$$A^T A = v\Sigma^2 v^T = \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i \sigma_i^2 {v_i}^T, A^T b = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i \left({u_i}^T b\right) v_i \tag{25}$$

Substituting in (6) results in (7).

According to the expression $\frac{u_i^T b}{\sigma_i}$ in (4), the rate of velocity that $u_i^T$ b and

σi tends to zero in relation to one another is pivotal to understanding how the abnormal situation behaves. Our suspicion tells us that when the portions $|| u_i^T b|$ Tikhonov's regularization and other ways that exclude small single values are unfit to produce a well- organized, methodical result because tend to be zero at a vastly slower rate of σi. As a result, a significant regularization error becomes less severe. The trip in the regularization ways that define the sludge portions is represented as follows (8).

$$x_{\text{exact}} - x_{\text{reg}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{u_i^T b}{\sigma_i} v_i - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{u_i^T b}{\sigma_i} v_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (1 - f_i) \frac{u_i^T b}{\sigma_i} v_i \tag{26}$$

The correct-exact, should be applied to the separate Picard's condition criterion in order to determine the ordered result that nearly matches the exact result to the problem. The Fourier portions must meet the separate Picard demand. $|u_i^T b_b exact|$ (at least on average) tend to zero when I increase, faster than singular values $\sigma_i$ [9].

**Conclusion**

The study of analysis procedures using power series has been appertained to as algebraic analysis from ancient times. Power series were wholly algebraic to Leibniz, John Bernoulli, Euler, and Lagrange, who saw analysis as a way to apply algebra to the result of different problems. Lagrange went the farthest in trying to use mathematics, videlicet power series, as the base for analysis. It persisted into the 20th century as well as the 19th.

Still, algebraic analysis the study of emblematic ways in analysis, both emblematic and direct — has been the focus of our attention in this case. This conception differs greatly from algebraic power series. This exploration has its roots in the work of Arbogast and a many of his less well-known French mathematicians who followed him. In addition, Fourier and Cauchy employed emblematic ways, albeit in confined surrounds. They ultimately abandoned these examinations. Likewise, they didn't draw a direct line between algebra and emblematic approaches. Direct manipulation of drivers includes algebraic analysis, which is rejected as the study of right-invertible drivers. But thanks to the large and sophisticated direct algebraic ministry that serves as a frame, this proposition is far more rigorous and exact. Since she started studying algebraic analysis in the early 1960s, D. Przeworska-Rolewicz is largely responsible for the work in this field.

**Конфликт интересов**

Не указан.

**Рецензия**

Все статьи проходят рецензирование. Но рецензент или автор статьи предпочли не публиковать рецензию к этой статье в открытом доступе. Рецензия может быть предоставлена компетентным органам по запросу.

**Conflict of Interest**

None declared.

**Review**

All articles are peer-reviewed. But the reviewer or the author of the article chose not to publish a review of this article in the public domain. The review can be provided to the competent authorities upon request.

**Список литературы на английском языке / References in English**

1. Majeed S.S. Modern roman domination of corona of cycle graph with some certain graphs / S.S. Majeed, A.A. Omran, M.N. Yaqoob // International Journal of Mathematics and Computer Science. — 2022. — Vol. 17. — № 1. — P. 317–324.

2. Munshid K.S. Principally self-injective modules / K.S. Munshid, M.F. Hamid, J.R. Kider // International Journal of Mathematics and Computer Science. — 2022. — Vol. 17. — № 1. — P. 255–263.

3. Bustan W.K. Analysis and development of curriculum and teaching methods for mathematics in different educational stages in some Iraqi universities / W.K. Bustan // College of Education for Women Journal. — 2023. — Vol. 22. — № 5.

4. YaseenS.M. Department of mathematics, college of science, university of baghdad / S.M. Yaseen, Z.T. Salman // Journal of Al-Nahrain University. — 2011. — Vol. 14. — № 1. — P. 157–160.

5. Abid S.H. 3rd international conference on mathematics and applied sciences (icmas), college of education, mustansiriyah university, baghdad, iraq / S.H. Abid, A.J. Obaid, J.H. Eidi // Journal of Physics: Conference Series. — 2022. — Vol. 2322. — № 1. — P. 011001.

6. Zainab A. Linear Algebra, Class, First Mathematics, University Baghdad / A. Zainab. — College Science for Women. Department Mathematics, 2022.

7. Fiadh M.S. Applications of Differential-Difference Algebra in Discrete Calculus / M.S. Fiadh, M.A. Mohammed // Babylonian Journal of Mathematics. — 2023. — P. 11–20.

8. Kunkel P. Differential-algebraic equations: analysis and numerical solution / P. Kunkel // European Mathematical Society. — 2006. — Vol. 2.

9. Unger J. Structural analysis of differential-algebraic equation systems-theory and applications / J. Unger, A. Kröner, W. Marquardt // Computers & Chemical Engineering. — 1995. — № 19 (8). — P. 867–882.