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Abstract

In this paper, we propose new and accurate finite difference methods to discretize the $d$-dimensional ($d \geq 1$) tempered fractional Laplacian and apply them to study the tempered effects on the solution of the fractional problems. Our finite difference methods have an accuracy of $O(h^\varepsilon)$, for $u \in C^{0,\alpha+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if $\alpha < 1$ (or $u \in C^{1,\alpha-1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if $\alpha \geq 1$) with $\varepsilon > 0$, suggesting the minimum consistency conditions. This accuracy can be improved to $O(h^{2})$, for $u \in C^{2,\alpha+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if $\alpha < 1$ (or $u \in C^{3,\alpha-1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if $\alpha \geq 1$). Numerical results confirm our analytical conclusions and provide further insights of our methods in solving the tempered fractional Poisson problem. It suggests that to achieve the second order of accuracy, our methods only require the solution $u \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 2)$. Moreover, if the solution $u \in C^{p,s}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $p, s \in [0, 1]$, our methods have the accuracy of $O(h^{p+s})$ in solving the tempered Poisson problem. Compared to other existing methods, our methods have better accuracy and are simpler to implement. Since our methods yield a multilevel Toeplitz stiffness matrix, one can design fast algorithms via the fast Fourier transform for efficient simulations. Finally, we apply them together with fast algorithms to study the tempered effects on the solutions of various tempered fractional PDEs, including nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Allen–Cahn equation, and Gray–Scott equations.
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1 Introduction

The anomalous diffusion of Lévy motion, in contrast to the normal diffusion of Brownian motion, has gained a lot of attention in the last couple of decades. Recently, it was found that the anomalous and normal diffusion can coexist, and the transition from anomalous to normal diffusion was observed in many fields, ranging from biology [15], finance [5,6], turbulence [9], to geophysics [22,27]. To model such transition phenomena, several approaches were proposed in the literature, such as truncating a stable Lévy process [18,21], adding a high-order power law factor [25], including a nonlinear friction term [8], and exponentially tempering a stable Lévy process [7,24]. In tempered models, a damping term is introduced to exponentially temper the power-law decay jumps in the Lévy process. Hence, they can capture the transition phenomena of anomalous diffusion in the early time and then the normal diffusion in the later time. It shows that exponential tempering offers many technical advantages and has become very popular in many applications [2,7,22,24,27]. However, the current mathematical and numerical studies of the tempered models still remain limited. In this study, we propose efficient and accurate finite difference methods to discretize the $d$-dimensional ($d \geq 1$) tempered fractional Laplacian.
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Over $\mathbb{R}^d$ (for $d = 1, 2, 3$), the tempered fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ is defined in hypersingular integral form:\cite{2, 22, 26, 28}:

\[ (-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x) = c_{d, \alpha, \lambda} \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{e^{\lambda |x-y|} |x-y|^{d+\alpha}} \, dy, \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 2), \lambda \geq 0, \]

(1.1)\{7\}

where P.V. stands for the principal value, and $|x-y|$ denotes the Euclidean distance between points $x$ and $y$. The normalization constant $c_{d, \alpha, \lambda}$ is defined as:

\[
c_{d, \alpha, \lambda} = \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{\pi^d}} \begin{cases} 2^{\alpha} \Gamma \left( \frac{d + \alpha}{2} \right) / \Gamma \left( 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \right), & \text{if } \lambda = 0 \text{ or } \alpha = 1, \\
\Gamma \left( \frac{d}{2} \right) / \Gamma(-\alpha), & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

with $\Gamma(\cdot)$ being the Gamma function. From a probabilistic point of view, the tempered fractional Laplacian represents an infinitesimal generator of a tempered symmetric $\alpha$-stable Lévy process \cite{2, 22, 24}. It shows that the tempered $\alpha$-stable Lévy process can approximate a traditional $\alpha$-stable Lévy process over a short distance, while over a long distance it behaves like Brownian motion \cite{22, 24}. Hence, the tempered fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ couples normal and anomalous diffusion in a seamless way. In the special case of $\lambda = 0$, the tempered fractional Laplacian \eqref{1.1} collapses to the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, which has been extensively studied (see \cite{1, 10, 13, 14} and references therein). Note that many other tempered fractional derivatives exist in the literature, such as the tempered Riemann–Liouville derivatives \cite{2, 7}, tempered Caputo derivatives \cite{20}, and tempered Riesz derivatives. In this study, we focus on the tempered integral fractional Laplacian as defined in \eqref{1.1}.

In contrast to the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, numerical methods for the tempered fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ still remain very limited. In one-dimensional (i.e., $d = 1$) cases, a finite difference collocation method is presented in \cite{28} to solve the tempered fractional Poisson equation, while later a Riesz basis Galerkin method is proposed in \cite{29}. Recently, a finite difference method based on the bilinear interpolation is proposed in \cite{26} to discretize the two-dimensional (i.e., $d = 2$) tempered fractional Laplacian \eqref{1.1}. To the best of our knowledge, finite difference methods for the tempered integral fractional Laplacian are still limited to one- and two-dimensional cases \cite{26, 28}, and these existing methods have the limitation of the $\alpha$-dependent accuracy, e.g., $\mathcal{O}(h^{2-\alpha})$, with $h$ a small mesh size. Furthermore, numerical methods for discretizing the three-dimensional (i.e., $d = 3$) tempered integral fractional Laplacian \eqref{1.1} are still missing in the literature.

In this paper, we present accurate finite difference methods to discretize the general $d$-dimensional ($d \geq 1$) tempered fractional Laplacian \eqref{1.1} and apply them to study the tempered effects on the solutions of the fractional problems. In contrast to other existing methods, our method has the same discretization framework for any $d$-dimensional ($d \geq 1$) tempered fractional Laplacian, and thus not only numerical schemes but also error analysis can be carried out in similar manner. If $\lambda = 0$, the proposed methods reduce to the finite difference schemes in \cite{10, 13} for the fractional Laplacian, consistent with the analytical properties of the tempered fractional Laplacian in \eqref{1.1}.

Our analytical results can be divided into two parts: (i) In the case of $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, if $u \in C^{0, \alpha+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\varepsilon > 0$, our methods have the accuracy of $\mathcal{O}(h^\varepsilon)$, suggesting a minimum consistent condition. This implies that the accuracy is $\mathcal{O}(h^{1-\alpha})$ for $u \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, i.e., choosing $\varepsilon = 1 - \alpha$. If $u \in C^{2, \alpha+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, our method achieves the optimal accuracy of $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$. (ii) In the case of $\alpha \in [1, 2)$, they have the accuracy of $\mathcal{O}(h^\varepsilon)$ for $u \in C^{1, \alpha-1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, suggesting that to obtain the same accuracy the smoothness requirement is higher for $\alpha \geq 1$. It also implies that our methods have an accuracy of $\mathcal{O}(h^{2-\alpha})$ for $u \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For $u \in C^{3, \alpha-1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, our method achieves the optimal accuracy of $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$. Extensive numerical experiments are carried out to verify our analytical results.
and provide more insights of our methods. Additionally, we numerically investigate the accuracy of our method in solving the tempered fractional Poisson problem. It shows that our method has the second order of accuracy, if the solution \( u \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) for any \( \alpha \in (0, 2) \). Due to the uniform framework in any dimension, our methods are simple to implement and generalize. Moreover, our methods lead to a multilevel Toeplitz stiffness matrix, enabling one to develop fast algorithms for efficient matrix-vector products via the fast Fourier transform. To further test their performance, we apply our methods to study the tempered effects in various problems, including the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Allen–Cahn equations, and Gray–Scott equations. Numerical studies show that the tempered fractional Laplacian presents the properties of both classical and fractional Laplacian.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we first introduce the general framework of our finite difference methods and then present the detailed schemes for the one-, two-, and three-dimensional tempered fractional Laplacian \(-\Delta + \lambda)^\frac{\alpha}{2}\). In Section 3 we carry out numerical analysis to study the local truncation errors of our methods. In Section 4 numerical experiments are presented to test the accuracy of our methods in discretizing the tempered fractional Laplacian and in solving the corresponding Poisson problems. Various tempered fractional problems, including the nonlinear Schrödinger equations, Allen–Cahn equation, and Gray–Scott equations, are presented in Section 5 to compare and understand the tempered effects on the solutions of these problems. Finally, we make conclusions in Section 6.

2 Finite difference methods

The main numerical challenges in discretizing the tempered fractional Laplacian \(-\Delta + \lambda)^\frac{\alpha}{2}\) are from its nonlocality and strong singular kernel function. As mentioned previously, the existing numerical methods are limited to the one- and two-dimensional cases \([26, 28]\), and no reports can be found for three-dimensional tempered fractional Laplacian. Moreover, these methods have an \(\alpha\)-dependent (i.e., rate of \(2 - \alpha\)) accuracy. In this section, we propose a new and accurate finite difference method for any \(d\)-dimensional \((d \geq 1)\) tempered fractional Laplacian \((1.1)\). In contrast to other existing methods, our finite difference methods share the same framework for any dimension \(d \geq 1\) and can achieve the second order of accuracy for any \(\alpha \in (0, 2)\).

Recently, a finite difference method is proposed to discretize the fractional Laplacian \(-\Delta)^\frac{\alpha}{2}\) \([10, 13]\), of which the main idea is to reformulate the hypersingular integral in the fractional Laplacian as a weighted integral of a central difference quotient. Noticing the tempered fractional Laplacian \(-\Delta + \lambda)^\frac{\alpha}{2}\) originates from smoothly damping the fractional Laplacian, we propose a finite difference method based on the damped weighted integral. Let \(\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d\) be a bounded domain, and \(\Omega^c = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega\) denotes its complement. Here, we consider the tempered fractional Laplacian \((1.1)\) on the domain \(\Omega\) with extended homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions on \(\Omega^c\).

Let \(\xi^{(i)} = |x_i - y_i|\) for \(1 \leq i \leq d\), and define a new vector \(\xi = (\xi^{(1)}, \xi^{(2)}, \ldots, \xi^{(d)})\). For an integer \(M > 0\), we denote the index sets

\[ x_M = \{(m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_d) \mid 0 \leq m_i \leq M, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d\}, \quad x_M = x_M \setminus (0, 0, \ldots, 0). \]

Then, the tempered fractional Laplacian \((1.1)\) can be reformulated as:

\[
(-\Delta + \lambda)^\frac{\alpha}{2} u(x) = -c_d^{\alpha, \lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d_+} \left( \sum_{m \in x_M} u(x + (-1)^m \circ \xi) - 2^d u(x) \right) \left( e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{-(d+\alpha)} \right) d\xi, \quad (2.1) \]

where \(\mathbb{R}^d_+ = (0, \infty)^d\), the vector \((-1)^m = ((-1)^{m_1}, (-1)^{m_2}, \ldots, (-1)^{m_d})\), and \(a \circ b\) represents the Hadamard product of \(a\) and \(b\). We then use the weighed trapezoidal rules to approximate the
For this end, we introduce a splitting parameter $\gamma \in (\alpha, 2]$ and define the function
\[
\varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{|\xi|^\gamma} \left( \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} u(x + (-1)^m \circ \xi) - 2^d u(x) \right).
\] (2.2) \(2\)

Thus, the tempered fractional Laplacian in (2.1) can be written as a weighted integral of the central difference quotient $\varphi_{d,\gamma}$, i.e.,

\[
(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} u(x) = -c_d^{\alpha,\lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi) w_{\lambda,\gamma}(\xi) d\xi, \quad \text{with} \quad w_{\lambda,\gamma} = e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{-(d+\alpha)}.
\] (2.3) \(3\)

In other words, we split the strong singular kernel function in (2.1) into two weak singular ones, i.e., $|\xi|^{-(d+\alpha)}$ in the weight $w_{\lambda,\gamma}$. We remark that retaining the damping term $e^{-\lambda|\xi|}$ in the weight function $w_{\lambda,\gamma}$ is crucially important in determining the accuracy of finite difference methods for the tempered fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}$. Our studies show that excluding the damping term from the weight function not only introduce difficulties in error analysis but also lead to significantly low accuracy; see more discussion in Remark 2.1. Moreover, the choice of the splitting parameter $\gamma$ is important in determining the accuracy of our method, which will be addressed in Section 3.

Let the $d$-dimensional domain $\Omega = (a_1, b_1) \times \cdots \times (a_d, b_d)$. Choose $L = \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |b_i - a_i|$ and an integer $N > 0$. We then define the grid points $\xi_k = (\xi^{(1)}_k, \xi^{(2)}_k, \ldots, \xi^{(d)}_k)$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_N$, with $\xi^{(i)}_k = k_i h$ for $0 \leq k_i \leq N$ and the mesh size $h = L/N$. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{N-1}$, define the element

\[I_k = [k_1 h, (k_1 + 1) h] \times [k_2 h, (k_2 + 1) h] \times \cdots \times [k_d h, (k_d + 1) h].\]

Then, the tempered fractional Laplacian in (2.3) is rewritten as:

\[
(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} u(x) = -c_d^{\alpha,\lambda} \left( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{N-1}} \int_{I_k} \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi) w_{\lambda,\gamma}(\xi) d\xi + \int_{D_d} \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi) w_{\lambda,\gamma}(\xi) d\xi \right),
\] (2.4) \(4\)

where $D_d = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus (0, L)^d$. The extended homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions imply that for any $x \in \Omega$ and $\xi \in D_d$ (equivalently, at least one of $\xi^{(i)} \geq L$), the point $(x + (-1)^m \circ \xi) \in \Omega^c$ for $m \in \mathbb{Z}_1$. Therefore, we obtain $u(x + (-1)^m \circ \xi) = 0$ for $x \in \Omega$ and $\xi \in D_d$, and simplify $\varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi) = -2^d |\xi|^{-(d+\alpha)} u(x)$. Hence, the integral over $D_d$ in (2.4) reduces to:

\[
\int_{D_d} \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi) w_{\lambda,\gamma}(\xi) d\xi = -2^d u(x) \int_{D_d} e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{-(d+\alpha)} d\xi,
\] (2.5) \(5\)

that is, no approximation is needed for the second part of (2.4).

For the integrals over element $I_k$, we divide our discussion into two parts. For $|k| \neq 0$ (i.e., $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{N-1}$), the direct application of the $d$-dimensional weighted trapezoidal rules to the integral over $I_k$ leads to:

\[
\int_{I_k} \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi) w_{\lambda,\gamma}(\xi) d\xi \approx 2^{-d} \left( \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_1} \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi_{k+n}) \right) \int_{I_k} e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{-(d+\alpha)} d\xi.
\] (2.6) \(6\)

For $|k| = 0$, due to the strong singularity at $\xi = 0$, special care should be taken to ensure the accuracy of the method. Using the weighted trapezoidal rule, we get

\[
\int_{I_0} \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi) w_{\lambda,\gamma}(\xi) d\xi \approx 2^{-d} \left( \lim_{\xi \to 0} \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi) + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_1} \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi_n) \right) \int_{I_0} e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{-(d+\alpha)} d\xi.
\] (2.7) \(7\)
The limit in (2.7) depends on the choice of the splitting parameter \( \gamma \in (\alpha, 2] \). Assuming that this limit exists, we then divide our discussion into two cases. If choosing \( \gamma = 2 \), we approximate the limit as:

\[
\lim_{\xi \to 0} \varphi_{d,2}(x, \xi) \approx \left( \frac{2^d}{d} - 1 \right) \sum_{n=1}^{2^d} \varphi_{d,2}(x, \xi_n) - \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_1, |n| \neq 1} \varphi_{d,2}(x, \xi_n).
\]

(2.8) \[?\]

If choosing any \( \gamma \in (\alpha, 2) \), we get

\[
\lim_{\xi \to 0} \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi) = \lim_{\xi \to 0} (\varphi_{d,2}(x, \xi)|\xi|^{2-\gamma}) = 0.
\]

(2.9) \[?\]

Substituting (2.8)–(2.9) into (2.7), we obtain the approximation of the integral over \( \gamma \)

\[
\int_{I_0} \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi) w_{\lambda,\gamma}(\xi) d\xi \approx 2^{-d} \left( \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_1} c_n^\gamma \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi_n) \right) \int_{I_0} e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{\gamma-(d+\alpha)} d\xi, \quad (2.10) \[?\]

where \( c_n^\gamma = 1 \) for any \( n \in \mathbb{Z}_1 \), if \( \gamma \in (\alpha, 2) \); if \( \gamma = 2 \), \( c_n^\gamma = 2^d/d \) for \( |n| = 1 \), and \( c_n^\gamma = 0 \) for \( |n| \neq 1 \).

Combining (2.4)–(2.6) and (2.10) and rearranging the terms, we obtain the following approximation to the \( d \)-dimensional tempered fractional Laplacian \( (-\Delta + \lambda)^2 \) as:

\[
(-\Delta + \lambda)^2_{h,\gamma} u(x) = -\frac{c_{d,\lambda}}{2^d} \left[ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{R}_{N-1}} \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi_k) \int_{I_k} e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{\gamma-(d+\alpha)} d\xi 
\right.
\]
\[
+ \left[ \frac{\gamma}{2} \right] \left( \left( \frac{2^d}{d} - 1 \right) \sum_{|k|=1} \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi_k) - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_1, |k| \neq 1} \varphi_{d,\gamma}(x, \xi_k) \right) \int_{I_0} e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{\gamma-(d+\alpha)} d\xi 
\]
\[
- 4^d u(x) \int_{D_d} e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{-(d+\alpha)} d\xi \right], \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega,
\]

(2.11) \[?\]

where we denote

\[
T_k = \left( \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_1} I_{k-n} \right) \cap (0, L)^d, \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{Z}_{N-1}
\]

as the collection of elements associating with the point \( \xi_k \), i.e., elements that have \( \xi_k \) as a vertex.

Note that one key idea that distinguishes our method from other existing finite difference methods is to split the kernel function \( e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{-(d+\alpha)} \) and approximate the tempered integral fractional Laplacian by the weighted trapezoidal rules. Here, how to choose the splitting parameter \( \gamma \) and where to include the damping term \( e^{-\lambda|\xi|} \) play a crucial role in determining the accuracy of the resulting finite difference methods; see more discussion on choice of \( \gamma \) in Remark 3.1

**Remark 2.1** (Effect of the damping term). *Even though the damping term \( e^{-\lambda|\xi|} \) contributes no numerical challenges, in rewriting the tempered fractional Laplacian [2.1] whether including the damping term in the central difference quotient or in the weight function plays a crucial role in determining the accuracy of the resulting method. Here, we emphasize that the damping term \( e^{-\lambda|\xi|} \) must be included in the weight function as written in (2.3) and then eventually retained in the integral to obtain the optimal accuracy for all \( \alpha \in (0, 2) \).

To show it, we compare in Figure 4 numerical errors of the methods obtained by, respectively, including and excluding the damping term from the weighted function. For the function under consideration, Fig. 4(a) and (c) show that including the damping term in the weight function leads
Figure 1: Comparison of numerical errors in approximating \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u\), showing that it is important to include the term \(e^{-\lambda|\xi|}\) in the weight function, where \(u = (1 - x^2)^{3+\frac{\alpha}{2}}\), \(\lambda = 0.5\) and \(\gamma = 2\).

(a) & (c): Including \(e^{-\lambda|\xi|}\) in the weight as in (2.3); (b) & (d): excluding \(e^{-\lambda|\xi|}\) from the weight.

To the second order of accuracy, independent of the parameter \(\alpha\) and dimension \(d\). By contrast, excluding the damping term from the weight function yields a method with an \(\alpha\)-dependent accuracy; see Fig. 1 (b) and (d). Furthermore, for the same parameters the numerical errors in Fig. 1 (b) and (d) are much larger than those in Fig. 1 (a) and (c).

From the approximation (2.11) and the definition of \(\varphi_{d,\gamma}\) in (2.2), we can obtain the finite difference schemes of the tempered integral fractional Laplacian \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\). Without loss of generality, we assume that \(N_x = N\), and choose \(N_y\) and \(N_z\) be the smallest integer such that \(a_2 + N_y h \geq b_2\) and \(a_3 + N_z h \geq b_3\). Define the grid points \(x_i = a_1 + ih\) for \(0 \leq i \leq N_x\), \(y_j = a_2 + jh\) for \(0 \leq j \leq N_y\), and \(z_k = a_3 + kh\) for \(0 \leq k \leq N_z\). For the convenience of the reader, we will summarize the finite difference scheme for \(d = 1, 2\) and 3 in Sections 2.1–2.3 respectively.

### 2.1 One-dimensional cases

In one-dimensional (i.e., \(d = 1\)) case, the scheme (2.11) at point \(x = x_i\) becomes

\[
(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x_i) = -c_1^{(\alpha,\lambda)} \left( \frac{\gamma}{2} \right) \varphi_{1,\gamma}(x_i, \xi_1) \int_0^{\xi_1} e^{-\lambda \xi \gamma - (1+\alpha)} d\xi \\
+ \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \varphi_{1,\gamma}(x_i, \xi_k) \int_{\xi_{k-1}}^{\xi_{k+1}} e^{-\lambda \xi \gamma - (1+\alpha)} d\xi - 4u(x_i) \int_L e^{-\lambda \xi \gamma - (1+\alpha)} d\xi. \tag{2.12}
\]
for \(1 \leq i \leq N_x - 1\). Also, the central difference quotient in (2.2) becomes

\[
\varphi_{1,\gamma}(x, \xi) = \frac{u(x - \xi) - 2u(x) + u(x + \xi)}{\xi^\gamma},
\]

(2.13) \{7\}

which can be viewed as a (weighted) central difference approximation to the 1D classical Laplacian \(\partial_{xx}\). In the special case of \(\gamma = 2\), it reduces to the three-point central difference scheme to \(\partial_{xx}\).

Denote \(u_i = u(x_i)\). Substituting \(\varphi_{1,\gamma}(x_i, \xi)\) into (2.12) and after simple calculations, we obtain the finite difference approximation to the 1D tempered integral fractional Laplacian \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\) as:

\[
(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} u_i = -c_{1,\gamma} \lambda (a_0 u_i + \sum_{m=0}^{i-1} a_m u_{i-m} + \sum_{m=0}^{N_x-1-i} a_m u_{i+m}), \quad 1 \leq i \leq N_x - 1. \tag{2.14} \{8\}
\]

Due to the nonlocality of the operator \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\), its discretized approximation at point \(x_i\) depends on all points in the domain \(\Omega\). The coefficients in (2.14) depend on the choice of the splitting parameter \(\gamma\), and they are given by

\[
a_m = \begin{cases} 
-2\lambda^\gamma \Gamma(-\alpha, \lambda L) - 2 \sum_{n=1}^{N_x} a_n, & \text{if } m = 0, \\
\frac{\lambda^{-\nu}}{2h^\gamma} \left(2\Gamma(\nu) - \bar{\Gamma}(\nu, 2\lambda h) - \bar{\Gamma}(\nu, \lambda h)\right), & \text{if } m = 1 \text{ and } \gamma = 2, \\
\frac{\lambda^{-\nu}}{2m^\gamma h^\gamma} \left(\bar{\Gamma}(\nu, (m-1)\lambda h) - \bar{\Gamma}(\nu, (m+1)\lambda h)\right), & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases}
\]

(2.15) \{9\}

where \(\nu = \gamma - \alpha\), and \(\bar{\Gamma}(a, b)\) represents the upper incomplete Gamma function, i.e.,

\[
\bar{\Gamma}(a, b) = \int_b^\infty t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt.
\]

It is easy to see that \(\bar{\Gamma}(a, 0) = \Gamma(a)\). If \(\lambda = 0\), the scheme (2.14) reduces to the finite difference method for the one-dimensional fractional Laplacian \((-\Delta)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\) in [10, 11].

Denote the vector \(\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \cdots, u_{N_x-1})^T\). We can write the scheme (2.14) into matrix-vector form \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \mathbf{u} = A_1 \mathbf{u}\), where the matrix

\[
A_1 = \begin{pmatrix}
a_0 & a_1 & \cdots & a_{N_x-3} & a_{N_x-2} \\
a_1 & a_0 & a_1 & \cdots & a_{N_x-3} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
a_{N_x-3} & \cdots & a_1 & a_0 & a_1 \\
a_{N_x-2} & \cdots & a_{N_x-3} & \cdots & a_1 & a_0
\end{pmatrix}_{(N_x-1) \times (N_x-1)}
\]

It is easy to see that \(A_1\) is positive definite symmetric Toeplitz matrix. Due to its symmetric structure, the matrix-vector multiplication \(A_1 \mathbf{u}\) can be efficiently computed by the one-dimensional fast Fourier transform (FFT) with computational cost of \(\mathcal{O}(N_x - 1) \log(N_x - 1)\) and memory storage of \(\mathcal{O}(N_x - 1)\).

### 2.2 Two-dimensional cases

In two-dimensional (i.e., \(d = 2\) ) cases, we denote \(u_{ij} = u(x_i, y_j)\). Setting \(d = 2\) in (2.11) and noticing the definition of \(\varphi_{2,\gamma}\) in (2.2), we obtain the finite difference approximation to the 2D
tempered integral fractional Laplacian \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\) as:

\[
(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u_{ij} = -c_2^{\alpha,\lambda} \left[ a_{00} u_{ij} + \sum_{m=0}^{i-1} \left( \sum_{n=0}^{j-1} a_{mn} u_{(i-m)(j-n)} + \sum_{n=1}^{N_y-1-j} a_{mn} u_{(i-m)(j+n)} \right) \right] \\
+ \sum_{m=0}^{N_x-1-i} \left( \sum_{n=0}^{j-1} a_{mn} u_{(i+m)(j-n)} + \sum_{n=1}^{N_y-1-j} a_{mn} u_{(i+m)(j+n)} \right), \tag{2.16}
\]

for \(1 \leq i \leq N_x - 1\) and \(1 \leq j \leq N_y - 1\). Similar to the 1D cases, the coefficients in (2.16) depend on the choice of the splitting parameter \(\gamma\), i.e.,

\[
a_{mn} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{2^{\sigma(m,n)}}{4(|\xi_{mn}|)^{\gamma}} \left( \int_{T_{mn}} e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{\gamma-(2+\alpha)} d\xi + \bar{c}_{mn} \left[ \frac{\gamma}{2} \right] \int_{I_{mn}} e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{\gamma-(2+\alpha)} d\xi \right), & \text{if } m + n > 0, \\
-2 \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} (a_{i0} + a_{0i}) - 4 \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} a_{ij} - 4 \int_{D_2} e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{\gamma-(2+\alpha)} d\xi d\eta, & \text{if } m = n = 0.
\end{cases}
\]

where \(\sigma(m,n)\) denotes the number of zeros of \(m\) and \(n\), and the constant \(\bar{c}_{01} = \bar{c}_{10} = -\bar{c}_{11} = 1\), and \(\bar{c}_{mn} \equiv 0\) for other \(m, n > 0\). Recall that the integer \(N = \max\{N_x, N_y\}\).

Denote the vector \(u_{x,j} = (u_{1,j}, u_{2,j}, \ldots, u_{N_x-1,j})\) for \(1 \leq j \leq N_y - 1\), and the block vector \(u = (u_{x,1}, u_{x,2}, \ldots, u_{x,N_y-1})^T\). We can write the scheme (2.16) into matrix-vector form \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u = A_2 u\). The matrix \(A_2\) is a symmetric block Toeplitz matrix, defined as

\[
A_2 = \begin{pmatrix}
A_{x,0} & A_{x,1} & \cdots & A_{x,N_y-3} & A_{x,N_y-2} \\
A_{x,1} & A_{x,0} & A_{x,1} & \cdots & A_{x,N_y-3} \\
& \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
A_{x,N_y-3} & \cdots & A_{x,1} & A_{x,0} & A_{x,1} \\
A_{x,N_y-2} & \cdots & A_{x,1} & A_{x,0} & A_{x,1}
\end{pmatrix}_{M \times M}, \tag{2.17}
\]

with \(M = (N_x-1)(N_y-1)\) being the total number of unknowns, and each block \(A_{x,j}\) (for \(0 \leq j \leq N_y - 2\)) is a symmetric Toeplitz matrix, defined as

\[
A_{x,j} = \begin{pmatrix}
a_{00} & a_{1j} & \cdots & a_{(N_x-3)j} & a_{(N_x-2)j} \\
a_{1j} & a_{00} & a_{1j} & \cdots & a_{(N_x-3)j} \\
& \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
a_{(N_x-3)j} & \cdots & a_{1j} & a_{00} & a_{1j} \\
a_{(N_x-2)j} & a_{(N_x-3)j} & \cdots & a_{1j} & a_{00}
\end{pmatrix}_{(N_x-1) \times (N_x-1)}.
\]

It is easy to see that \(A_2\) is a block-Toeplitz-Toeplitz-block matrix. Hence, the matrix-vector multiplication \(A_2 u\) can be computed efficiently via the two-dimensional FFT.

### 2.3 Three-dimensional cases

In three-dimensional (i.e., \(d = 3\)) cases, we denote \(u_{ijk} = u(x_i, y_j, z_k)\). Setting \(d = 3\) in (2.11) and substituting \(\varphi_{3,\gamma}\) into it, we obtain the finite difference approximation to the 3D tempered integral

\[
\]
fractional Laplacian \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\gamma\over 2}\) as:

\[
(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\gamma\over 2}u_{ijk} = -c_3^{\lambda} \left[ a_{000} u_{ijk} + \sum_{p=0,1} \left( \sum_{m \in S_i^p} a_{m00} u_{i+(1-p)m} jk + \sum_{n \in S_j^p} a_{0n0} u_{j+(1-p)n} k \right) \\
+ \sum_{s \in S_k^p} a_{0s0} u_{jk+(1-p)s} \right] + \sum_{p,q=0,1} \left( \sum_{m \in S_i^p} a_{m0s} u_{i+(1-p)m} j[k+(1-q)s] + \sum_{n \in S_j^p} a_{mn0} u_{i+(1-p)m} [j+(1-q)n] k \right) \\
+ \frac{1}{p,q,r=0} \sum_{s \in S_k^p} \sum_{m \in S_i^p} \sum_{n \in S_j^p} a_{mns} u_{i+(1-p)m} [j+(1-q)n] k \right],
\]

for \(1 \leq i \leq N_x - 1, 1 \leq j \leq N_y - 1, \) and \(1 \leq k \leq N_z - 1, \) where the index sets

\[
\begin{align*}
S_i^p &= \{ l \mid l \in \mathbb{N}, \ 1 \leq i + (1-p)l \leq N_x - 1 \}, \\
S_j^p &= \{ l \mid l \in \mathbb{N}, \ 1 \leq j + (1-p)l \leq N_y - 1 \}, \\
S_k^p &= \{ l \mid l \in \mathbb{N}, \ 1 \leq k + (1-p)l \leq N_z - 1 \},
\end{align*}
\]

The coefficients \(a_{mns}\) depend on the splitting parameter \(\gamma\).

\[
a_{mns} = \begin{cases} 
-2 \sum_{i=1}^N (a_{i00} + a_{0i0} + a_{00i}) - 4 \sum_{i,j=1}^N (a_{0ij} + a_{0ij} + a_{ij0}) \\
-8 \sum_{i,j,k=1}^N a_{ijk} - 8 \int_{D_3} e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{-(3+\alpha)} d\xi, & \text{if } m = n = s = 0, \\
2\sigma(m,n,s) \left( \int_{T_{mns}} e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{\gamma-(3+\alpha)} d\xi - \bar{c}_{mns} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{-\lambda|\xi|} |\xi|^{\gamma-(3+\alpha)} d\xi, & \text{otherwise,}
\end{cases}
\]

where \(\sigma(m,n,s)\) denotes the number zeros of \(m, n,\) and \(s,\) and \(N = \max\{N_x, N_y, N_z\}\). For \(m, n, s \leq 1\), the constant \(\bar{c}_{mns} = -3^{\alpha}\) if \(\sigma(m,n,s) = 2; \bar{c}_{mns} = 1\) if \(\sigma(m,n,s) = 0\) or \(1\). In other cases, i.e., if one of \(m, n, s > 1\), \(\bar{c}_{mns} = 0\).

Denote the vector \(u_{x,y,k} = (u_{x,y,k}, \ldots, u_{x,y,N_z-1,k})\), the block vector \(u_{x,y,k} = (u_{x,y,1,k}, \ldots, u_{x,y,N_z-1,k})\), and then \(u = (u_{x,y,1,1}, \ldots, u_{x,y,N_z-1,1})^T\). Then, the matrix-vector form of (2.18) is given by \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\gamma\over 2}u = A_3u\), where \(A_3\) is the matrix

\[
A_3 = \begin{pmatrix}
A_{x,y,0} & A_{x,y,1} & \cdots & A_{x,y,N_z-3} & A_{x,y,N_z-2} \\
A_{x,y,1} & A_{x,y,0} & A_{x,y,1} & \cdots & A_{x,y,N_z-3} \\
& \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
A_{x,y,N_z-3} & \cdots & A_{x,y,1} & A_{x,y,0} & A_{x,y,1} \\
A_{x,y,N_z-2} & A_{x,y,N_z-3} & \cdots & A_{x,y,1} & A_{x,y,0}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

For \(k = 0, 1, \ldots, N_z - 2\), the block matrix

\[
A_{x,y,k} = \begin{pmatrix}
A_{x,0,k} & A_{x,1,k} & \cdots & A_{x,N_z-3,k} & A_{x,N_z-2,k} \\
A_{x,1,k} & A_{x,0,k} & A_{x,1,k} & \cdots & A_{x,N_z-3,k} \\
& \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
A_{x,N_z-3,k} & \cdots & A_{x,1,k} & A_{x,0,k} & A_{x,1,k} \\
A_{x,N_z-2,k} & A_{x,N_z-3,k} & \cdots & A_{x,1,k} & A_{x,0,k}
\end{pmatrix},
\]

For \(k = 0, 1, \ldots, N_z - 2\).
with each block

$$A_{x,j,k} = \begin{pmatrix}
    a_{0jk} & a_{1jk} & \cdots & a_{(N_x-3)jk} & a_{(N_x-2)jk} \\
    a_{1jk} & a_{0jk} & \cdots & a_{(N_x-3)jk} & a_{(N_x-2)jk} \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
    a_{(N_x-3)jk} & \cdots & a_{1jk} & a_{0jk} & a_{1jk} \\
    a_{(N_x-2)jk} & a_{(N_x-3)jk} & \cdots & a_{1jk} & a_{0jk}
\end{pmatrix},$$

for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, N_y - 2$, and $k = 0, 1, \ldots, N_z - 2$. Similarly, the matrix-vector product can be efficiently computed via the three-dimensional FFT.

**Remark 2.2** (Relation to classical finite difference schemes). As $\alpha \to 2^-$ and $\lambda \to 0^+$, if $\gamma = 2$ is chosen, our finite difference schemes (2.14), (2.16) and (2.18) collapse to the central difference scheme of the classical Laplacian $-\Delta$.

### 3 Error analysis

In this section, we study the local truncation errors of our finite difference methods in discretizing the tempered fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. The main technique used in our proof is the extension of the weighted Montgomery identity. The weighted Montgomery identity was first presented in [16], playing an important role in the study of weighted integrals. Without loss of generality, we will provide the detailed error estimates for the one-dimensional cases. Our error analysis can be generalized to two and three dimensions by following similar lines.

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq s \leq 1$, we denote $C^{k,s}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as the space that consists of all functions $u : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ with continuous derivatives of order less or equal to $k$, and their $k$-th (partial) derivatives are uniformly Hölder continuous with exponent $s$. Let $w : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a non-negative integrable function. Define the function

$$\Theta^{(m)}_{[a, b]}(x) = \int_a^x w(\xi) \frac{(x - \xi)^m}{m!} d\xi + \int_b^x w(\xi) \frac{(\xi - x)^m}{m!} d\xi, \quad x \in [a, b], \quad (3.1)$$

for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, which can be viewed as an extension of the generalized Peano kernel function. It is easy to show that for any $m \in \mathbb{N},$

$$|\Theta^{(m)}_{[a, b]}(x)| \leq C(b - a)^m \int_a^b |w(\xi)| d\xi, \quad x \in [a, b]. \quad (3.2)$$

For the convenience of the reader, we will review the extension of weighted Montgomery identity in the following lemma, which was originally presented in [10].

**Lemma 3.1** (Extension of the weighted Montgomery identity [10]). Let $w, f : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ be integrable functions. If the derivative $f^{(n)}$ exists and integrable for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\int_a^b \left( 2f(x) - f(a) - f(b) \right) w(x) dx = (-1)^n \int_a^b \Theta^{(n-1)}_{[a, b]}(x)f^{(n)}(x) dx + \sum_{k=2}^n (-1)^{k-1} \left( \Theta^{(k-1)}_{[a, b]}(b)f^{(k-1)}(b) - \Theta^{(k-1)}_{[a, b]}(a)f^{(k-1)}(a) \right).$$

If $w \equiv 1$, Lemma 3.1 gives the error estimates of the conventional trapezoidal rule. Next, we will present some often used properties of the central difference quotient $\varphi_{1, \gamma}$. For notational simplicity, we will omit $x$ and let $\varphi_{1, \gamma}(\xi) = \varphi_{1, \gamma}(x, \xi)$ in the following, and also denote $\varphi_n^{(n)}(\xi) = \partial_\xi^n \varphi_{1, \gamma}(x, \xi)$. 


Lemma 3.2. Let $0 < s \leq 1$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

(i) If $u \in C^{m,s}(\mathbb{R})$ for $m = 0, 1$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that $|\varphi_{1,0}(\xi)| \leq C \xi^{s+m}$.

(ii) If $u \in C^{1,s}(\mathbb{R})$, then the derivative $\varphi'_{1,\gamma}$ exists. Moreover, there is a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$|\varphi'_{1,\gamma}(\xi)| \leq C \xi^{s-\gamma}, \quad \text{for any } \gamma \in (\alpha, 2].$$

(iii) If $u \in C^{m,s}(\mathbb{R})$ for $m = 2, 3$, the derivatives $\varphi'_{1,2}, \varphi''_{1,2}$ exist. Moreover, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$|\varphi'_{1,2}(\xi)| \leq C \xi^{s-(3-m)}, \quad |\varphi''_{1,2}(\xi)| \leq C \xi^{s-(4-m)}.$$  \hfill (3.3)

The proof of the above properties can be done by directly applying Taylor’s theorem. In the following, we will present our main error estimate results in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha \in [1, 2)$, respectively. For $x \in \Omega$, let’s define the local truncation error as:

$$e^h_{\alpha,\gamma}(x) = (-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x) - (-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} h_{\alpha,\gamma} u(x).$$  \hfill (3.4)

Theorem 3.1 (Error estimates for $0 < \alpha < 1$). Let $(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} h_{\alpha,\gamma}$ be the finite difference approximation of the tempered integral fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, with $h$ a small mesh size. Suppose that $u$ has finite support on the domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1 - \alpha$, there exists a positive constant $C$ independent of $h$, such that

(i) if $u \in C^{0,\alpha + \varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\gamma \in (\alpha, 2]$, the local truncation error satisfies $\|e^h_{\alpha,\gamma}(x)\|_\infty \leq Ch^\varepsilon$.

(ii) if $u \in C^{2,\alpha + \varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\gamma = 2$, the local truncation error satisfies $\|e^h_{\alpha,2}(x)\|_\infty \leq Ch^2$.

Proof. As mentioned previously, we will focus on the proof for $d = 1$ in the following. From (2.4)–(2.6) and (2.10) with $d = 1$, we obtain the error function $e^h_{\alpha,\gamma}$ as

$$e^h_{\alpha,\gamma}(x) = -c_{1,\alpha}^{\alpha-\gamma}(\int_0^{\xi_1} (2\varphi_{1,\gamma}(\xi) - c_{1,\gamma} \varphi_{1,\gamma}(\xi_1)) w_{\lambda,\gamma}(\xi) d\xi$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} (2\varphi_{1,\gamma}(\xi) - \varphi_{1,\gamma}(\xi_1) - \varphi_{1,\gamma}(\xi_1)) w_{\lambda,\gamma}(\xi) d\xi = -c_{1,\alpha}^{\alpha-\gamma}(I + II),$$  \hfill (3.5)

where constant $c_{1,\gamma}$ is defined after (2.10), i.e., $c_{1,\gamma} = 1$ for $\gamma \neq 2$, and $c_{1,\gamma} = 2$ for $\gamma = 2$. We will then prove Cases (i) and (ii) separately.

Case (i) (For $u \in C^{0,\alpha + \varepsilon}(\mathbb{R})$): First, we rewrite $\varphi_{1,\gamma}(\xi) = \xi^{-\gamma} \varphi_{1,0}(\xi)$. Using the triangle inequality and Lemma 3.2 (i) with $m = 0$ and $s = \alpha + \varepsilon$, we obtain

$$|I| = \left| \int_0^h (2\varphi_{1,0}(\xi)\xi^{-(1+\alpha)} - c_{1,\gamma} \varphi_{1,0}(\xi_1)\xi^{-\gamma} \xi^{-(1+\alpha)} e^{-\lambda\xi} d\xi \right|$$

$$\leq C \left( \int_0^h |\varphi_{1,0}(\xi)|\xi^{-(1+\alpha)} d\xi + h^{-\gamma} \int_0^h |\varphi_{1,0}(\xi)|\xi^{-\gamma} (1+\alpha) d\xi \right)$$

$$\leq C \left( \int_0^h \xi^{\varepsilon-1} d\xi + h^{\alpha + \varepsilon - \gamma} \int_0^h \xi^{\varepsilon} (1+\alpha) d\xi \right) \leq Ch^\varepsilon.$$  \hfill (3.6)
For term $II$, we first add and subtract $(\varphi_{1,0}(\xi_i) + \varphi_{1,0}(\xi_{i+1}))\xi^{-(1+\alpha)}e^{-\lambda \xi}$ and then use the triangle inequality, Taylor’s theorem, and Lemma 3.2 (i) with $m = 0$ and $s = a + \varepsilon$, to obtain

$$|II| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} |2\varphi_{1,0}(\xi) - \varphi_{1,0}(\xi_i) - \varphi_{1,0}(\xi_{i+1})|\xi^{-(1+\alpha)}d\xi$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \sum_{m=0,1} |\xi - \xi_{i+m}^-| |\varphi_{1,0}(\xi_{i+m})|\xi^{-(1+\alpha)}d\xi$$

$$\leq C \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \sum_{m=0,1} \left( |u(x - \xi) - u(x - \xi_{i+m})| + |u(x + \xi) - u(x + \xi_{i+m})| \right) \xi^{-(1+\alpha)}d\xi \right)$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} h \left( \max_{\theta \in [\xi_i, \xi]} \eta^{-(\gamma + 1)} + \max_{\xi \in [\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}]} \xi^{-(\gamma + 1)} \right) |\xi_{i+m}|^{\alpha + \varepsilon} \xi^{-(1+\alpha)}d\xi$$

$$\leq C \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} h^{\alpha + \varepsilon} \xi^{-(1+\alpha)}d\xi + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} h(\xi^{-(\gamma + 1)}) (\xi^{\alpha + \varepsilon}) (\xi^{-(1+\alpha)}) d\xi \right)$$

$$= C \left( h^{\alpha + \varepsilon} \int_0^L \xi^{-(1+\alpha)}d\xi + h \int_0^L \xi^{-2}\xi^{-\alpha}d\xi \right) \leq Ch^{\varepsilon}, \quad (3.7)$$

where we use the fact that for $i \geq 1$, if $\xi \in [\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}]$, then $\xi_{i+1} \leq 2\xi_i \leq 2\xi$. Combining (3.6) with (3.7) leads to $\|e_{\alpha, \gamma}(x)\|_{\infty} \leq Ch^{\varepsilon}$ immediately.

Case (ii) (For $u \in C^{2, \alpha + \varepsilon}(\mathbb{R})$): Set $\gamma = 2$ and then $w_{\lambda, 2} = e^{-\lambda \xi} \xi^{1-\alpha}$ in (3.5). Using the extension of weighted Montgomery identity in Lemma 3.1 with $n = 2$, we get the error function (3.4) as:

$$e_{\alpha, 2}(x) = -\frac{c_1^{\alpha, \lambda}}{2} \left( 2 \int_{0}^{\xi_1} \left( \varphi_{1,2}(\xi) - \varphi_{1,2}(\xi_1) \right) e^{-\lambda \xi} \xi^{1-\alpha}d\xi + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \Theta_{[\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}]}^{(1)}(\xi) \varphi_{1,2}''(\xi) d\xi \right.$$

$$- \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \Theta_{[\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}]}^{(1)}(\xi_{i+1}) \varphi'_{1,2}(\xi_{i+1}) - \Theta_{[\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}]}^{(1)}(\xi_i) \varphi'_{1,2}(\xi_i) \right) \right) = -\frac{c_1^{\alpha, \lambda}}{2} (\tilde{I} + \tilde{II} + \tilde{III}). \quad (3.8)$$

By Taylor’s theorem and Lemma 3.2 (iii) with $m = 2$ and $s = \alpha + \varepsilon$, we obtain

$$|\tilde{I}| = 2 \left| \int_0^h \left( \int_h^\xi \varphi_{1,2}'(\xi) d\xi \right) e^{-\lambda \xi} \xi^{1-\alpha}d\xi \right| \leq C \int_0^h \left( \int_0^h |\varphi_{1,2}'(\xi)| d\xi \right) \xi^{1-\alpha}d\xi \leq C(\int_0^h \xi^{\alpha + \varepsilon - 1} d\xi) \left( \int_0^h \xi^{1-\alpha}d\xi \right) \leq Ch^{2+\varepsilon}. \quad (3.9)$$

For term $\tilde{II}$, using the triangle inequality, the property (3.2), and Lemma 3.2 (iii) with $m = 2$
and \( s = \alpha + \varepsilon \), we obtain

\[
|\tilde{I}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \left| \Theta^{(1)}_{[\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}]}(\xi) \right| \varphi''_{1,2}(\xi) d\xi \leq C \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( h \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} e^{-\lambda \xi} \xi^{1-\alpha} d\xi \right) \left( \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \xi^{\alpha+\varepsilon-2} d\xi \right)
\]

\[
\leq Ch \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \xi^{1-\alpha} d\xi \right) \left( \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \xi^{\alpha+\varepsilon-2} d\xi \right)
\]

\[
\leq Ch \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \xi^{-\alpha} d\xi \right) \left( \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \xi^{\alpha+\varepsilon-1} d\xi \right)
\]

\[
\leq Ch^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \xi^{\varepsilon-1} d\xi \leq Ch^2,
\]

(3.10) \{7\}

where the third inequality is obtained by using the same property as in obtaining (3.7), and the second inequality from the end is by the Chebyshev integral inequality.

Rewrite term \( III \) as

\[
III = -\sum_{i=2}^{N-1} \left( \Theta^{(1)}_{[\xi_{i-1}, \xi_i]}(\xi_i) - \Theta^{(1)}_{[\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}]}(\xi_i) \right) \varphi'_{1,2}(\xi_i) + \Theta^{(1)}_{[\xi_{i-1}, \xi_i]}(\xi_i) \varphi'_{1,2}(\xi_i) - \Theta^{(1)}_{[\xi_n, \xi_{i+1}]}(\xi_{i+1}) \varphi'_{1,2}(\xi_{i+1})
\]

\[= \tilde{III}_1 + \tilde{III}_2 + \tilde{III}_3. \]

To estimate term \( \tilde{III}_1 \), we define an auxiliary function

\[
G(\xi) = \int_{\xi}^{\xi_i} e^{-\lambda \xi} \xi^{1-\alpha}(\xi - \xi) d\xi.
\]

Noticing the definitions of \( \Theta \) and \( G \), and by Taylor’s theorem, we then obtain

\[
\left| \Theta^{(1)}_{[\xi_{i-1}, \xi_i]}(\xi_i) - \Theta^{(1)}_{[\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}]}(\xi_i) \right| = \left| G(\xi_i) - G(\xi_{i+1}) \right| \leq Ch^3 \max_{\xi \in [\xi_{i-1}, \xi_{i+1}]} |G'''(\xi)| \leq Ch^3 \xi_i^{-\alpha},
\]

(3.11) \{7\}

where we use the fact that \( G(\xi_i) = G'(\xi_i) = 0 \) and \( \max_{\xi \in [\xi_{i-1}, \xi_{i+1}]} |G'''(\xi)| \leq C \xi_i^{-\alpha} \). Using the triangle inequality, Lemma \[3.2\] (iii) with \( m = 2 \) and \( s = \alpha + \varepsilon \), and (3.11), we obtain

\[
|\tilde{III}_1| \leq \sum_{i=2}^{N-1} \left| \Theta^{(1)}_{[\xi_{i-1}, \xi_i]}(\xi_i) - \Theta^{(1)}_{[\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}]}(\xi_i) \right| \varphi'_{1,2}(\xi_i) \|
\]

\[
\leq Ch^3 \sum_{i=2}^{N-1} \xi_i^{-\alpha} \xi_i^{\alpha+\varepsilon-1} \leq Ch^2 \int_{h}^{L} \xi^{\varepsilon-1} d\xi \leq Ch^{2+\varepsilon}.
\]

(3.12) \{7\}

Using Lemma \[3.2\] (iii) with \( m = 2 \) and \( s = \alpha + \varepsilon \) and the property \[3.2\] to term \( \tilde{I}I_2 \), we obtain

\[
|\tilde{III}_2| = \left| \varphi'_{1,2}(\xi_i) \right| \left| \Theta^{(1)}_{[\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}]}(\xi_i) \right| \leq Ch^{\alpha+\varepsilon} \left( h \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} e^{-\lambda \xi} \xi^{1-\alpha} d\xi \right)
\]

\[
\leq Ch^{\alpha+\varepsilon} \left( \xi_{i+1}^{2-\alpha} - \xi_i^{2-\alpha} \right) \leq Ch^{2+\varepsilon}.
\]

(3.13) \{7\}

Following similar lines and using Taylor’s theorem, we get

\[
|\tilde{III}_3| = \left| \varphi'_{1,2}(\xi_N) \right| \left| \Theta^{(1)}_{[\xi_{N-1}, \xi_N]}(\xi_N) \right| \leq C \xi_N^{\alpha+\varepsilon} \left( h \int_{\xi_{N-1}}^{\xi_N} e^{-\lambda \xi} \xi^{1-\alpha} d\xi \right)
\]

\[
\leq Ch \xi_N^{\alpha+\varepsilon} \left( \xi_N^{2-\alpha} - \xi_{N-1}^{2-\alpha} \right) \leq Ch^2.
\]

(3.14) \{7\}
Combining (3.12)–(3.14), we obtain $|III| \leq Ch^2$. Hence, the error bounds in Case (ii) is obtained by combining the estimates on terms $I$, $II$ and $III$.

Theorem 3.1 indicates that for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, our methods are consistent if $u \in C^{0,\alpha+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with small $\varepsilon > 0$, independent of the splitting parameter $\gamma$. On the other hand, if choosing $\gamma = 2$ and $u \in C^{2,\alpha+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, they have the second order of accuracy uniformly for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. The above conclusions hold for any dimension $d \geq 1$ and $\lambda \geq 0$. Note that for $\lambda = 0$, Theorem 3.1(ii) improves the results in [10] for the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^{ \frac{\alpha}{2} }$ and provides a much sharper conditions for the second order of accuracy.

**Theorem 3.2 (Error estimates for $1 \leq \alpha < 2$).** Let $(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}_{h,\gamma}$ be the finite difference approximation of the tempered integral fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, with $h$ a small mesh size. Suppose that $u$ has finite support on the domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For $0 < \varepsilon \leq 2 - \alpha$, there exists a positive constant $C$ independent of $h$, such that

(i) If $u \in C^{1,\alpha-1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\gamma \in (\alpha, 2]$, the local truncation error satisfies $\|e_{\alpha,\gamma}(x)\|_\infty \leq Ch^\varepsilon$.

(ii) If $u \in C^{3,\alpha-1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\gamma = 2$, the local truncation error satisfies $\|e_{\alpha,2}(x)\|_\infty \leq Ch^2$.

*Proof.* Again, we will focus on the proof for $d = 1$ and divide our discussion into two parts.

**Case (i) (For $u \in C^{1,\alpha-1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R})$):** Using Lemma 3.1 with $n = 1$ to the error function (3.5), we get

$$e_{\alpha,\gamma}^h(x) = -c_1^{\alpha,\lambda} \left( \int_0^{\xi_1} \left( 2\varphi_{1,\gamma}(\xi) - c_1^\gamma \varphi_{1,\gamma}(\xi_1) \right) w_{\lambda,\gamma}(\xi) d\xi - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \Theta_{[\xi_i,\xi_{i+1}]}^{(0)}(\xi) \varphi'_{1,\gamma}(\xi) d\xi \right) = -c_1^{\alpha,\lambda} (I + II).$$

(3.15)

For term $I$, we use the triangle inequality and then Lemma 3.2 (i) with $m = 1$ and $s = \alpha - 1 + \varepsilon$ to obtain

$$|I| = \left| \int_0^h \left( 2\varphi_{1,0}(\xi)\xi^{-(1+\alpha)} - c_1^\gamma \varphi_{1,0}(\xi_1)\xi_1^{-\gamma}\xi^{-(1+\alpha)} \right) e^{-\lambda\xi} d\xi \right|$$

$$\leq C \left( \int_0^h |\varphi_{1,0}(\xi)|\xi^{-(1+\alpha)} d\xi + \int_0^h |\varphi_{1,0}(\xi_1)|\xi_1^{-\gamma}\xi^{-(1+\alpha)} d\xi \right)$$

$$\leq C \left( \int_0^h \xi^{\alpha+\varepsilon-\gamma}(1+\alpha) d\xi + h^{\alpha+\varepsilon-\gamma} \int_0^h \xi^{\gamma-(1+\alpha)} d\xi \right) \leq Ch^\varepsilon.$$

(3.16)

By the triangle inequality, Chebyshev integral inequality, and Lemma 3.2 (ii) with $s = \alpha - 1 + \varepsilon$, we obtain the term $II$:

$$|II| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} |\Theta_{[\xi_i,\xi_{i+1}]}^{(0)}(\xi)||\varphi'_{1,\gamma}(\xi)| d\xi \leq C \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \xi^{\gamma-(1+\alpha)} d\xi \right) \left( \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \xi^{\alpha+\varepsilon-1-\gamma} d\xi \right)$$

$$\leq Ch \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \xi^{\varepsilon-2} d\xi \leq Ch^\varepsilon.$$

(3.17)

Combining (3.15) with (3.16) and (3.17) yields the error estimate in Case (i).
Case (ii) (For \( u \in C^{3,\alpha-1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}) \)): Starting from the error function in (3.8), we can obtain the same estimates for terms \( I \) and \( III \), where instead Lemma 3.2 (iii) with \( m = 3 \) and \( s = \alpha + \varepsilon - 1 \) is used. While for term \( \tilde{II} \), we can directly apply the Chebyshev integral inequality since \( \alpha \geq 1 \), i.e., using the triangle inequality, the property (3.2), Lemma 3.2 (iii) with \( m = 3 \) and \( s = \alpha + \varepsilon - 1 \), and Chebyshev integral inequality, to obtain

\[
|\tilde{II}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} |\Theta_{[\xi_i,\xi_{i+1}]}^{(1)}(\xi)| |\varphi''_{1,2}(\xi)| d\xi \leq C \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( h \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} e^{-\lambda \xi^{1-\alpha}} d\xi \right) \left( \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \xi^{\alpha+\varepsilon-2} d\xi \right)
\leq Ch \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \xi^{1-\alpha} d\xi \right) \left( \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \xi^{\alpha+\varepsilon-2} d\xi \right)
\leq Ch^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\xi_i}^{\xi_{i+1}} \xi^{\varepsilon-1} d\xi \leq Ch^2. \quad (3.18) \{

Hence, Case (ii) is proved immediately.

Theorem 3.2 gives the counterpart to Theorem 3.1 for \( \alpha \geq 1 \). Comparing Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, it shows that to obtain the same error estimates, the smoothness requirements of function \( u \) is higher, if \( \alpha \geq 1 \).

Corollary 3.1. Suppose that \( u \in C^{[\alpha],1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) has finite support on the domain \( \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \). For any \( \gamma \in (\alpha, 2] \), the local truncation errors satisfies \( \|e_{\alpha,\gamma}(x)\|_{\infty} \leq Ch^{1+[\alpha]-\alpha} \).

The above results can be easily obtained from Theorems 3.1 (i) and 3.2 (i) by choosing \( \varepsilon = 1 + [\alpha] - \alpha \). In the special case of \( \alpha = 1 \), our method has the first order of accuracy for \( u \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \).

Remark 3.1 (Effect of splitting parameter \( \gamma \)). Theorems 3.1 (ii) and 3.2 (ii) show that the splitting parameter \( \gamma \) plays an important role in obtaining the second order of accuracy.

(a) In one-dimensional (\( d = 1 \)) cases, there are two optimal choices of \( \gamma \) that lead to the second order of accuracy: (i) \( \gamma = 2 \) for any \( \alpha \in (0, 2) \) and \( \lambda \geq 0 \); (ii) \( \gamma = 1 + \alpha \) for \( \alpha \in (0, 1] \) or \( \lambda = 0 \); see illustration in Figure 2.

(b) In high-dimensional (\( d > 1 \)) cases, \( \gamma = 2 \) is the only optimal choice that leads to the second order of accuracy; see illustration in Figure 3. This reflects the difference between 1D and high-dimensional tempered fractional Laplacian.

(c) For other choices of \( \gamma \in (\alpha, 2) \) but not mentioned in (a) and (b), our numerical simulations show that our finite difference methods yield an \( \alpha \)-dependent accuracy, i.e., \( O(h^{2-\alpha}) \).
4 Numerical accuracy

In this section, we test the accuracy of our methods not only in discretizing the tempered integral fractional Laplacian \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u\) but also in solving the corresponding Poisson problems. As discussed previously, the splitting parameter \(\gamma = 2\) is an optimal choice for any \(d \geq 1\). Therefore, unless otherwise stated we will use \(\gamma = 2\) in all numerical simulations.

4.1 Accuracy in discretizing \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\)

In Remarks 2.1 and 3.1, we have briefly discussed the accuracy of our methods under different conditions. Next, we will carry out further studies to understand the performance of our methods in discretizing the tempered fractional Laplacian \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\). Here, we will focus on the errors \(\|e_h^{1,2}\|_\infty\) and \(\|e_h^{1,2}\|_2\) with the error function \(e_h^{1,2}\) defined in (3.4). The analytical solution of \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u\) remains unknown for \(\lambda \neq 0\). Thus, we will use the numerical solutions with very fine mesh size, i.e., \(h = 1/4096\), as the “exact” solutions.

Example 1 (Cases for \(\alpha < 1\)). We consider the function

\[ u(x, y) = [(1 - x^2)_+ (1 - y^2)_+]^p, \quad p \in \mathbb{R}, \]  

i.e., \(u = [(1 - x^2)(1 - y^2)]^p\) for \((x, y) \in (-1, 1)^2\), otherwise \(u = 0\) if \((x, y) \notin (-1, 1)^2\). To verify our analytical results in Theorem 3.1, we present in Figure 4 numerical errors \(\|e_h^{1,2}\|_\infty\) and \(\|e_h^{1,2}\|_2\) for various \(p\), where the damping parameter \(\lambda = 0.5\).

In Fig. 4 (a) and (b), we choose \(p = 1\), i.e., \(u \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^2)\), or equivalently, \(u \in C^{0,\alpha + \varepsilon}\) with \(\varepsilon = 1 - \alpha\) for \(\alpha < 1\). It shows that numerical errors increase with the value of \(\alpha\), and the accuracy in \(\infty\)-norm is \(O(h^{1-\alpha})\), which confirms our conclusion in Theorem 3.1 (i). Additionally, we find that the accuracy in 2-norm is \(O(h^{2-\alpha})\), 1/2-order higher than that of the \(\infty\)-norm. On the other hand, Fig. 4 (c) and (d) shows the numerical errors for \(u\) in (4.1) with \(p = 2 + \alpha + \varepsilon\), i.e., \(u \in C^{2,\alpha + \varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^2)\), where \(\varepsilon = 0.05\). It is clear that our method has the second order of accuracy in both \(\infty\) and 2-norm, independent of the parameters \(\alpha\) and \(\lambda\). Moreover, our extensive simulations show that numerical errors are more sensitive to the power \(\alpha\), but almost the same for different damping parameter \(\lambda\).

Theorem 3.1 predicts the accuracy of our methods for \(u \in C^{0,\alpha + \varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)\) and \(u \in C^{2,\alpha + \varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d)\). Next, we want to numerically explore their accuracy under the condition of \(u \in C^{1,\alpha + \delta}(\mathbb{R}^d)\) with
Figure 4: Numerical errors in discretizing the operator \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\) with \(\lambda = 0.5\), where \(u\) is defined in (4.1) with \(p = 2\) ((a) and (b)) and \(p = 2 + \alpha + \varepsilon\) and \(\varepsilon = 0.05\) ((c) and (d)).

\[-\alpha \leq \delta \leq 1 - \alpha.\] To this end, we consider the function defined in (4.1) with \(p = \lceil \alpha \rceil + \alpha + \delta\), where \(\lceil \cdot \rceil\) denotes the ceiling function. Figure 5 shows the accuracy rate of our methods for

\[
\delta = -\alpha/2, 0.1\text{ and }1 - \alpha.\] It shows that our methods have the accuracy of \(O(h^{1+\delta})\) in \(\infty\)-norm, if \(u \in C^{1,\alpha+3}(\mathbb{R}^2)\). In the case of \(\delta = -\frac{\alpha}{2}\), the accuracy is \(O(h^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}})\), consistent with the theoretical results in [10, Theorem 3.1] for the fractional Laplacian \((-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\), i.e., \(\lambda = 0\). Moreover, Fig. 5 (b) shows that the accuracy rate in 2-norm is \(O(h^{\min\{\frac{\alpha}{2}-\alpha,2\}})\). Even though the results in Fig. 5 are for two-dimensional cases, our extensive studies suggest that the above observations also hold for both one and three dimensions.
Example 2 (Cases with $\alpha \geq 1$). Again, we consider the function $u$ in (4.1) and carry out the corresponding studies for $\alpha \geq 1$. Figure 6 shows the numerical errors for $\lambda = 0.5$, where $p = 2$ in (a) and (b) and $p = 2 + \alpha + \varepsilon$ with $\varepsilon = 0.05$ in (c) and (d). From Fig. 6 (a) and (c), we find that for $p = 2$, i.e., $u \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, our method has an accuracy of $O(h^{2-\alpha})$ in $\infty$-norm, confirming our analytical results in Theorem 3.2 (i) with $\varepsilon = 2 - \alpha$. Moreover, the accuracy in 2-norm is $\frac{1}{2}$-order higher, i.e., $O(h^{\frac{3}{2}-\alpha})$. Similar to the case of $\alpha < 1$, the larger the value of $\alpha$, the bigger the numerical errors. On the other hand, Fig. 6 (c) and (d) not only verify our conclusions in Theorem 3.2 (ii) but also suggest that the accuracy of our method in 2-norm is also $O(h^2)$.

4.2 Accuracy in solving the Poisson problem

In the following, we test the performance of our finite difference methods in solving the tempered fractional Poisson equation of the form:

$$(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u = f(x), \quad x \in (-1, 1)^d, \quad (4.2)$$

$$u(x) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus (-1, 1)^d. \quad (4.3)$$

Our extensive studies show that the same conclusions can be obtained from solving the $d$-dimensional ($d \geq 1$) Poisson problem (4.2)–(4.3). For the purpose of brevity, we will thus focus on the examples with $d = 2$, and different cases are studied in Examples 3–5. Here, the numerical errors are computed as $\|e_u\|_p = \|u - u_h\|_p$, where $u$ and $u_h$ denote the exact and numerical solutions of (4.2)–(4.3), respectively.
Example 3. We consider a benchmark example in [26, Example 3] and solve the problem (4.2)–(4.3) with the exact solution

\[ u(x) = [(1 - x^2)(1 - y^2)]^2, \quad x \in (-1, 1)^2. \]  

(4.4) \{7\}

It is easy to see that the solution (4.4) satisfies \( u \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \). In practice, the function \( f \) in (4.2) is prepared numerically with a fine mesh size \( h = 2^{-12} \), i.e., computing \( f = (-\Delta + \lambda)^{\alpha/2}u \) with \( u \) defined in (4.4). In Table 1, we present the numerical errors \( \|e_u\|_\infty \) and \( \|e_u\|_2 \) for various \( \alpha \), where \( \lambda = 0.5 \). It shows that even though the solution satisfies \( u \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \), our method can achieve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
<th>( h )</th>
<th>1/16</th>
<th>1/32</th>
<th>1/64</th>
<th>1/128</th>
<th>1/256</th>
<th>1/512</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>( |e_u|_\infty )</td>
<td>6.117E-4</td>
<td>1.498E-4</td>
<td>3.699E-5</td>
<td>9.176E-6</td>
<td>2.278E-6</td>
<td>5.613E-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>2.0295</td>
<td>2.0179</td>
<td>2.0114</td>
<td>2.0103</td>
<td>2.0024</td>
<td>2.0155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( |e_u|_2 )</td>
<td>4.642E-4</td>
<td>1.141E-4</td>
<td>2.842E-5</td>
<td>7.106E-6</td>
<td>1.774E-6</td>
<td>4.387E-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>2.0249</td>
<td>2.0046</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.0024</td>
<td>2.0155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>( |e_u|_\infty )</td>
<td>1.001E-3</td>
<td>2.389E-4</td>
<td>5.785E-5</td>
<td>1.414E-5</td>
<td>3.471E-6</td>
<td>8.487E-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>2.0661</td>
<td>2.0462</td>
<td>2.0328</td>
<td>2.0261</td>
<td>2.0217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( |e_u|_2 )</td>
<td>7.961E-4</td>
<td>1.864E-4</td>
<td>4.522E-5</td>
<td>1.117E-5</td>
<td>2.774E-6</td>
<td>6.852E-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>2.0945</td>
<td>2.0434</td>
<td>2.0179</td>
<td>2.0092</td>
<td>2.0172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>( |e_u|_\infty )</td>
<td>1.669E-3</td>
<td>3.893E-4</td>
<td>9.177E-5</td>
<td>2.184E-5</td>
<td>5.229E-6</td>
<td>1.250E-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>2.1004</td>
<td>2.0848</td>
<td>2.0714</td>
<td>2.0622</td>
<td>2.0645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( |e_u|_2 )</td>
<td>1.506E-3</td>
<td>3.361E-4</td>
<td>7.660E-5</td>
<td>1.783E-5</td>
<td>4.218E-6</td>
<td>1.004E-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>2.1642</td>
<td>2.1332</td>
<td>2.1032</td>
<td>2.0794</td>
<td>2.0705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>( |e_u|_\infty )</td>
<td>2.501E-3</td>
<td>5.953E-4</td>
<td>1.421E-4</td>
<td>3.399E-5</td>
<td>8.161E-6</td>
<td>1.971E-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>2.0706</td>
<td>2.0672</td>
<td>2.0632</td>
<td>2.0583</td>
<td>2.0499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( |e_u|_2 )</td>
<td>2.475E-3</td>
<td>5.774E-4</td>
<td>1.350E-4</td>
<td>3.167E-5</td>
<td>8.363E-6</td>
<td>1.773E-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>2.0995</td>
<td>2.0965</td>
<td>2.0918</td>
<td>2.0853</td>
<td>2.0740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Numerical errors in solving the 2D Poisson problem (4.2)–(4.3) with \( \lambda = 0.5 \), where \( f \) is chosen such that the exact solution is \( u(x) = (1 - x^2)(1 - y^2)^2 \).

The second order of accuracy uniformly for any \( \alpha \in (0, 2) \). In other words, to obtain the second order of accuracy, the regularity that required on the solution of the tempered fractional Poisson problem is much lower than that required in discretizing the operator \((-\Delta + \lambda)^{\alpha/2}\) in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2. This observation is consistent with the central difference scheme for the classical Laplace operator. Additionally, Figure 7 compares the numerical errors for different \( \lambda \), where \( \alpha = 0.5 \) and 1.5. It shows that for small \( \alpha \), the smaller the parameter \( \lambda \), the less the numerical errors, and the numerical errors for \( \lambda = 0 \) is minimized. However, numerical errors become insensitive to \( \lambda \) as \( \alpha \) increases.

Moreover, we compare our errors in Table 1 with those in [26, Table 8] to further study the performance of our methods. We find that: (i) The method in [26] yields an accuracy of \( O(h^{2-\alpha}) \). In contrast, our method has an accuracy of \( O(h^2) \), uniformly for any \( \alpha \in (0, 2) \). (ii) Moreover, for fixed \( \alpha \), \( \lambda \) and \( h \), the numerical errors of our method is much smaller than those obtained in [26, Table 8]. For example, when \( \alpha = 1.5 \), \( \lambda = 0.5 \), and \( h = 1/256 \), the \( \infty \)-norm error of our method is \( \|e_u\|_\infty = 5.229E-6 \), while it is \( \|e_u\|_\infty = 5.1048E-2 \) from the method in [26, Table 8]. As we discussed in Remark 2.1, including of the damping term \( e^{-\lambda|\xi|} \) in the weighted function is crucial in the design of an accurate finite difference method for the tempered fractional Laplacian. The above comparisons further confirm our conclusions in Remark 2.1.
Figure 7: Comparison of numerical errors $\|e_u\|_\infty$ in solving the 2D problem (4.2)–(4.3) with exact solution $u = (1 - x^2)^2(1 - y^2)^2$.

From the above results and our extensive studies, we conclude that to obtain the second order of accuracy in solving the fractional Poisson problem, our method requires the solution to satisfy $u \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In the following, we will test the performance of our method in solving the Poisson problem (4.2)–(4.3), when its solution has lower regularity than that in Example 3.

**Example 4.** We solve the problem (4.2)–(4.3) with the exact solution

$$u(x) = (1 - x^2)(1 - y^2), \quad x \in (-1, 1)^2,$$

i.e., the solution $u \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. The right hand side function $f$ is computed in the same manner as that in Example 3. Table 2 shows the numerical errors $\|e_u\|_\infty$ and $\|e_u\|_2$ for various $\alpha$, where $\lambda = 0.5$. From it, we find that the accuracy of our method in $\infty$-norm is $O(h)$, independent of the values of $\alpha$ and $\lambda$. The accuracy rate in 2-norm is higher – the smaller the value of $\alpha$, the higher the accuracy rate in 2-norm. As $\alpha \to 2^-$, the accuracy in 2-norm is $O(h)$. From Table 2 and our extensive simulations, we find that if the solution satisfies $u \in C^{0,s}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, our method has the accuracy in $\infty$-norm $O(h^s)$ in solving the fractional Poisson problem.

**Example 5.** We solve the problem (4.2)–(4.3) with $f = 1$. In this case, the regularity of the solution is much lower. So far, the exact solution of this problem remains unknown for any $\lambda > 0$. Table 3 shows the numerical errors $\|e_u\|_\infty$ and $\|e_u\|_2$ for various $\alpha$, where $\lambda = 0.5$. Even though the regularity of solutions in this case is much lower than those in Examples 3–4, our method provides solution with a reasonable accuracy. It shows that the accuracy in $\infty$-norm is $O(h^{\lambda/2})$ for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, while $O(h^{\min\{1,1/2+\lambda/2\}})$ in 2-norm, that is, the 2-norm errors for $\alpha \geq 1$ are uniformly $O(h)$. Figure 8 presents the $\|e_u\|_\infty$ for various $\lambda$, where $\alpha = 0.5$ and 1.5. From it, we find that the smaller the value of $\lambda$, the smaller the numerical errors, in contrast to the observations in Fig. 7(b) for smooth solutions.

### 5 Applications to tempered fractional PDEs

In this section, we apply our finite difference methods to solve problems with the tempered fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, so as to study the effects of the fractional power $\alpha$ and damping constant $\lambda$ on their solutions. In all of the following applications, our finite difference methods are used for the spatial discretization. For temporal discretization, the split-step method is used for the fractional nonlinear Schrödinger equation [4,12,17], while the Crank–Nicolson method is used for
Table 2: Numerical errors in solving the 2D Poisson problem (4.2)–(4.3) with $\lambda = 0.5$, where $f$ is chosen such that the exact solution is $u(x) = (1 - x^2)(1 - y^2)$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$h$</th>
<th>$1/16$</th>
<th>$1/32$</th>
<th>$1/64$</th>
<th>$1/128$</th>
<th>$1/256$</th>
<th>$1/512$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e|_\infty$</td>
<td>2.692E-3</td>
<td>1.284E-3</td>
<td>6.072E-4</td>
<td>2.881E-4</td>
<td>1.376E-4</td>
<td>6.569E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>1.0677</td>
<td>1.0806</td>
<td>1.0753</td>
<td>1.0661</td>
<td>1.0669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e|_2$</td>
<td>2.732E-3</td>
<td>1.020E-3</td>
<td>3.622E-4</td>
<td>1.248E-4</td>
<td>4.225E-5</td>
<td>1.406E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>1.4213</td>
<td>1.4939</td>
<td>1.5368</td>
<td>1.5631</td>
<td>1.5870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e|_\infty$</td>
<td>2.688E-3</td>
<td>1.370E-3</td>
<td>6.836E-4</td>
<td>3.387E-4</td>
<td>1.673E-4</td>
<td>8.197E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>0.9722</td>
<td>1.0032</td>
<td>1.0131</td>
<td>1.0171</td>
<td>1.0296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e|_2$</td>
<td>3.188E-3</td>
<td>1.367E-3</td>
<td>5.546E-4</td>
<td>2.162E-4</td>
<td>8.210E-5</td>
<td>4.765E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>1.2188</td>
<td>1.3045</td>
<td>1.3591</td>
<td>1.3968</td>
<td>1.4331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e|_\infty$</td>
<td>2.005E-3</td>
<td>1.058E-3</td>
<td>5.403E-4</td>
<td>2.721E-4</td>
<td>1.359E-4</td>
<td>6.698E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>0.9226</td>
<td>0.9689</td>
<td>0.9899</td>
<td>1.0018</td>
<td>1.0203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e|_2$</td>
<td>2.824E-3</td>
<td>1.370E-3</td>
<td>5.546E-4</td>
<td>2.162E-4</td>
<td>8.210E-5</td>
<td>4.765E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>1.2188</td>
<td>1.3045</td>
<td>1.3591</td>
<td>1.3968</td>
<td>1.4331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e|_\infty$</td>
<td>8.247E-4</td>
<td>4.620E-4</td>
<td>2.467E-4</td>
<td>1.272E-4</td>
<td>6.444E-5</td>
<td>3.202E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>0.8558</td>
<td>0.9054</td>
<td>0.9557</td>
<td>0.9809</td>
<td>1.0088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e|_2$</td>
<td>1.315E-3</td>
<td>7.216E-4</td>
<td>3.718E-4</td>
<td>1.840E-4</td>
<td>8.870E-5</td>
<td>4.167E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>0.8660</td>
<td>0.9568</td>
<td>1.0144</td>
<td>1.0531</td>
<td>1.0897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Numerical errors in solving the 2D Poisson problem (4.2)–(4.3) with $\lambda = 0.5$ and $f = 1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$h$</th>
<th>$1/16$</th>
<th>$1/32$</th>
<th>$1/64$</th>
<th>$1/128$</th>
<th>$1/256$</th>
<th>$1/512$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e_u|_\infty$</td>
<td>1.737E-1</td>
<td>1.312E-1</td>
<td>1.013E-1</td>
<td>7.987E-2</td>
<td>6.401E-2</td>
<td>5.196E-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>0.4948</td>
<td>0.3724</td>
<td>0.3434</td>
<td>0.3195</td>
<td>0.3008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e_u|_2$</td>
<td>1.935E-1</td>
<td>1.110E-1</td>
<td>6.248E-2</td>
<td>3.488E-2</td>
<td>1.944E-2</td>
<td>1.086E-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>0.8016</td>
<td>0.8289</td>
<td>0.8412</td>
<td>0.8436</td>
<td>0.8396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e_u|_\infty$</td>
<td>2.634E-2</td>
<td>1.798E-2</td>
<td>1.238E-2</td>
<td>8.593E-3</td>
<td>6.000E-3</td>
<td>4.209E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>0.5509</td>
<td>0.5381</td>
<td>0.5269</td>
<td>0.5181</td>
<td>0.5117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e_u|_2$</td>
<td>3.380E-2</td>
<td>1.875E-2</td>
<td>1.014E-2</td>
<td>5.392E-3</td>
<td>2.836E-3</td>
<td>1.481E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>0.8504</td>
<td>0.8868</td>
<td>0.9109</td>
<td>0.9269</td>
<td>0.9377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e_u|_\infty$</td>
<td>1.440E-2</td>
<td>8.549E-3</td>
<td>5.073E-3</td>
<td>3.009E-3</td>
<td>1.786E-3</td>
<td>1.060E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>0.7518</td>
<td>0.7529</td>
<td>0.7533</td>
<td>0.7528</td>
<td>0.7521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e_u|_2$</td>
<td>2.319E-2</td>
<td>1.240E-2</td>
<td>6.498E-3</td>
<td>3.353E-3</td>
<td>1.712E-3</td>
<td>8.683E-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>0.9027</td>
<td>0.9326</td>
<td>0.9545</td>
<td>0.9696</td>
<td>0.9797</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e_u|_\infty$</td>
<td>2.917E-3</td>
<td>1.560E-3</td>
<td>8.433E-4</td>
<td>4.545E-4</td>
<td>2.442E-4</td>
<td>1.310E-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>0.9030</td>
<td>0.8874</td>
<td>0.8917</td>
<td>0.8961</td>
<td>0.8985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$|e_u|_2$</td>
<td>5.271E-3</td>
<td>2.711E-3</td>
<td>1.390E-3</td>
<td>7.080E-4</td>
<td>3.584E-4</td>
<td>1.806E-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.r.</td>
<td>0.9590</td>
<td>0.9637</td>
<td>0.9735</td>
<td>0.9824</td>
<td>0.9888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the fractional Allen–Cahn equation and fractional Gray–Scott system. In practice, fast algorithms via the fast Fourier transform (FFT) are used for efficient computations, and at each time step the computational costs are $O(M \log M)$ with $M$ the number of spatial unknowns.
Figure 8: Comparison of numerical errors $\|e_u\|_\infty$ in solving the 2D problem (4.2)–(4.3) with $f = 1$.

5.1 Fractional nonlinear Schrödinger equation

The fractional Schrödinger equation plays an important role in the study of the fractional quantum mechanics [11, 19]. Consider the following one-dimensional tempered fractional nonlinear Schrödinger (NLS) equation:

$$i\partial_t u(x, t) = \frac{1}{2}(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\alpha/2} u + \beta|u|^2 u,$$

(5.1)

where $u$ is the complex-valued wave function, and $i = \sqrt{-1}$ is the imaginary unit. The parameter $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ represents the strength of nonlinear interactions, where the interactions are repulsive (defocusing) for $\beta > 0$, or attractive (or focusing) for $\beta < 0$. Here, we are interested in the interaction of two bright solitons in the focusing NLS. The initial condition is chosen as

$$u(x, 0) = a_1\text{sech}(a_1(x - x_0)) e^{iv_1x} + a_2\text{sech}(a_2(x + x_0)) e^{iv_2x}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

(5.2)

where $a_k$ and $v_k$ denote the amplitude and velocity of the $k$-th (for $k = 1, 2$) soliton, respectively. Initially, we take $x_0 = 6$ such that the two bright solitons are well-separated. In our simulations, we consider a large enough computational domain $[-30, 30]$ and impose the extended homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. We choose $N_x = 2^{13}$ and the time step $\tau = 0.0001$.

Figure 9 shows the interaction of two bright solitons for various $\alpha$ and $\lambda$. In the classical NLS, the two bright solitons travel towards each other and collide at the center of the domain (i.e., $x = 0$), and after collision they separate completely and recover their initial profile [3]. By contrast, the dynamics in the fractional NLS crucially depends on the values of $\alpha$ and $\lambda$. For $\alpha$ close to 2 (e.g. $\alpha = 1.99$), the interaction of the two solitons is similar to that in the classical NLS, however, it becomes more complicated as $\alpha$ decreases. Denote $t_{col}$ as the time when the two solitons collide. We find that for fixed $\lambda$, the smaller the fractional power $\alpha$, the longer the collision time $t_{col}$. While for fixed $\alpha$, the larger the damping constant $\lambda$, the longer the collision time $t_{col}$. In contrast to the classical cases, the waves constantly radiate towards the boundary during the dynamics, which is caught by our method clearly. More studies should be carried out to understand the dynamics of solitons in the tempered fractional NLS, which is beyond the scope of this study.

5.2 Fractional Allen–Cahn equation

Consider the two-dimensional tempered fractional Allen–Cahn equation of the form:

$$\partial_t u(x, t) = -(-\Delta + \lambda)^{\alpha} u - \frac{1}{\varepsilon^\alpha} u(u^2 - 1), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0,$$

(5.3)

$$u(x, t) = -1, \quad x \in \Omega^c, \quad t \geq 0,$$

(5.4)
Figure 9: Interaction of two bright solitons in the fractional nonlinear Schrödinger equation with 
\( x_0 = 6, a_1 = a_2 = 2, v_1 = -v_2 = -2 \) in (5.2) and \( \beta = -1 \). Top: \( \lambda = 0 \); bottom: \( \lambda = 0.5 \).

where the domain \( \Omega = (0, 1)^2 \), and the constant \( \varepsilon > 0 \) describes the diffuse interface width. In the special case with \( \lambda = 0 \) and \( \alpha \to 2^- \), the problem (5.3)–(5.4) reduces to the well-known classical Allen–Cahn equation, which is one of the most popular phase field models and has been widely applied in materials science and fluid dynamics. Here, we study the coalescence of two “kissing” bubbles, a benchmark problem in the phase field models. We take the initial condition as

\[
    u(x, 0) = 1 - \tanh\left(\frac{|x - x_1| - 0.12}{\varepsilon}\right) - \tanh\left(\frac{|x - x_2| - 0.12}{\varepsilon}\right), \quad x \in \Omega
\]

with \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) denoting the initial center of the two bubbles, which are chosen such that the two bubbles are initially osculating or “kissing”. Note that the boundary condition in (5.4) is nonzero constant. Letting \( \bar{u} = u + 1 \), we can rewrite the problem (5.3) as an equation of \( \bar{u} \) with the extended homogeneous boundary conditions, so that our method can be directly applied.

Figures 10–11 show the dynamics of the two bubbles in the 2D tempered fractional Allen-Cahn equation with \( \varepsilon = 0.03 \), for various \( \alpha \) and \( \lambda \). Initially, the two bubbles are centered at \( x_1 = (0.4, 0.4) \) and \( x_2 = (0.6, 0.6) \), respectively. In our simulations, we choose the mesh size \( h = 1/1024 \) and the time step \( \tau = 0.0005 \). It is well known that in the classical Allen–Cahn equation, the two bubbles first coalesce into one bubble, and then this newly formed bubble shrinks and eventually disappear. In Fig. 10 with fixed \( \lambda = 0.2 \), we find that the dynamics of the two bubbles are similar to the behaviors in the classical Allen–Cahn equation. With \( \alpha \) decreasing, the merging and shrinking of the bubbles becomes much slower (cf. Fig. 10 for \( \alpha = 1.9 \) and 1). When further reducing \( \alpha \) (e.g., \( \alpha = 1 \)), the two bubbles never merge completely.

In Fig. 11 with fixed \( \alpha = 1.8 \), the effects of the damping term on the dynamics of two bubbles are studied for various \( \lambda \). It shows that including the tempered term \( e^{-\lambda |x-y|} \) reduces the long-range interactions in the fractional Laplacian, so as to slow down the evolution of two bubbles. Moreover, the larger the parameter \( \lambda \), the slower the evolution, and consequently it takes much longer time for the bubbles to vanish for a larger \( \lambda \).
5.3 Fractional Gray–Scott equations

Consider the tempered fractional Gray–Scott equations of the following form:

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_t &= -\kappa_1 (-\Delta + \lambda)^\frac{\alpha}{2} u - u v^2 + a(1 - u), \\
    v_t &= -\kappa_2 (-\Delta + \lambda)^\frac{\alpha}{2} v + u v^2 - (a + b)v. 
\end{align*}
\]

where \(u\) and \(v\) denote the concentration of two species, respectively, \(\kappa_1\) and \(\kappa_2\) are diffusion coefficients, \(a\) is the feed rate, and \(b\) is the depletion rate. Let the domain \(\Omega = (0, 2.5)^d\). The system (5.5)–(5.6) admits a trivial solution: \((u, v) = (0, 0)\). We choose the initial condition as the trivial solution \((u, v) = (1, 0)\) with a perturbation at this center of the domain, i.e., \((u, v) = (0.5, 0.25)\) for \(x \in [1.201, 1.299]^2\) in 2D and \(x \in [1.152, 1.348]^3\) in 3D. The boundary conditions of (5.5)–(5.6) are set as

\[
    u(x, t) = 1, \quad v(x, t) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega^c, \quad t \geq 0. 
\]

The parameters in (5.5)–(5.6) are set as \(\kappa_1 = 2 \times 10^{-5}, \kappa_2 = 10^{-5}, a = 0.04,\) and \(b = 0.065\).

Figures 12 and 13 illustrate the pattern formation in the 2D tempered fractional Gray–Scott equation for various \(\alpha\) and \(\lambda\). In our simulations, we choose \(N_x = N_y = 1024\), and time step \(\tau = 0.5\). It shows that the pattern starts to develop from the initial perturbation area, and if \(\lambda\) is small, it quickly propagates to the boundary of the domain. In the classical Gray–Scott equation, a spot pattern was observed for this parameter regime (referred to as pattern-\(\lambda\) in [23]). By contrast, the pattern formation in the fractional cases is more exotic, which significantly depends on the parameter \(\alpha\) and \(\lambda\).
Figure 11: Dynamics of the two kissing bubbles in the two-dimensional tempered fractional Allen–Cahn equation with $\varepsilon = 0.03$ and $\alpha = 1.8$. From top to bottom: $\lambda = 0, 0.5, 5$.

In Fig. 12 with fixed $\alpha = 1.8$, a mixed pattern of spots and stripes is observed in the steady state of $\lambda = 0$. As $\lambda$ increases, the diffusion becomes slow, and the stripes quickly reduce. If $\lambda$ is large enough, a pattern of spots is observed similar to the classical cases, but the structure is much finer due to the fractional dynamics. In Fig. 13, we focus on the effects of the superdiffusion power $\alpha$ by fixing $\lambda = 5$. For a larger $\alpha$ (e.g. $\alpha = 1.9$), a spot pattern is formed. It is similar to the classical case in [23], but due to the fractional power, the scale is much smaller. With decreasing of $\alpha$, a pattern of mixed spots and stripes appears. The smaller the values of $\alpha$, the more the stripes in the final pattern, the finer the structure. These simulations show the effectiveness of our finite difference method in the study of the pattern formation even with fine structures.

Next, we further demonstrate the effectiveness of our method by applying it to study the pattern formation in the 3D tempered fractional Gray–Scott equations. To the best of our knowledge, so far no numerical results can be found in the literature on the fractional PDEs with the 3D tempered fractional Laplacian (1.1), due to the considerable numerical challenges in discretizing the operator. Figure 14 shows the isosurface plots of the component $u$ at different time $t$, where $\alpha = 1.9$ and $a = 0.4$. For a better resolution, only the region of $[0.9, 1.6]^3$ is displayed. It shows that the 3D fractional Gray-Scott model exhibits more exotic patterns than the 2D cases. Comparing to the 2D cases, the computations of the 3D system become more challenging, however, our method and fast algorithms can ensure both the accuracy and efficiency of the simulations.
Figure 12: Pattern formation in the two-dimensional tempered fractional Gray–Scott system for $\alpha = 1.8$ and $\lambda = 0, 0.1, 10, 20$ (from top to bottom).

6 Conclusions

We proposed simple and accurate finite difference methods to discretize the $d$-dimensional ($d \geq 1$) tempered fractional Laplacian and provided detailed numerical analysis to study their local truncation errors. Our analysis not only provides a sharp consistency conditions of our methods but also indicates the accuracy of our methods under various smoothness conditions of function $u$. We showed that the accuracy of our methods can be improved to $O(h^2)$, independent of the fractional power $\alpha$ and damping constant $\lambda$. Comparing to other existing methods, our method can achieve higher accuracy with low regularity requirements, and they are simpler to implement. The multilevel Toeplitz stiffness matrix enables us to develop fast algorithms for the efficient matrix-vector products with computational complexity of order $O(M \log M)$ and memory storage $O(M)$ with $M$ the total number of unknowns in space.

Extensive numerical examples were provided to verify our analytical results. We also numerically studied the accuracy of our method in solving the tempered fractional Poisson problem. We found that to achieve the second order of accuracy, our methods only require the solution $u \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$. Moreover, extensive numerical simulations showed that if the solution
Figure 13: Pattern formation in the Gray–Scott system for $\lambda = 5$ and $\alpha = 1.95, 1.8, 1.7$ (from top to bottom).

Figure 14: Isosurface plots of $u = -0.5$ in the 3D fractional Gray–Scott equation with $\alpha = 1.9$ and $\lambda = 0$.

$u \in C^{p,s}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $0 \leq p, s \leq 1$, our methods have the accuracy of $O(h^{p+s})$ in solving the tempered Poisson problem. Finally, the tempered effects were studied in the fractional nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Allen–Cahn equation, and Gray–Scott system. For example, the pattern formation in the tempered fractional Gray–Scott equation reveals the features of both classical and fractional Laplacian. More studies will be carried out in the future to further understand the coupling effects of the normal and anomalous diffusion in the tempered fractional problems.
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