

Article

Efficacious Analytical Technique Applied to Fractional Fornberg–Whitham Model and Two-Dimensional Fractional Population Model

Cyril D. Enyi D

Department of Mathematics, University of Hafr Al Batin, Hafar Al Batin 39524, Saudi Arabia; cyrild@uhb.edu.sa

Received: 18 September 2020; Accepted: 10 November 2020; Published: 30 November 2020



Abstract: This paper presents an efficacious analytical and numerical method for solution of fractional differential equations. This technique, here in named *q*-HATM (*q*-homotopy analysis transform method) is applied to a one-dimensional fractional Fornberg–Whitham model and a two-dimensional fractional population model emanating from biological sciences. The overwhelming agreement of our analytical solution by the *q*-HATM technique with the exact solution indeed establishes the efficacy of *q*-HATM to solve the fractional Fornberg–Whitham model and the two-dimensional fractional population model. Furthermore, comparisons by means of extensive analysis using numerics, graphs and error analysis are presented to affirm the preference of *q*-HATM technique over other methods. A variant of the *q*-HATM using symmetry can also be considered to solve these problems.

Keywords: Laplace transform; *q*-homotopy analysis transform method; Fornberg–Whitham equation; fractional biological population model; symmetry

MSC: 35Q99; 65H20; 26A33; 72B10

1. Introduction

The 17th century ushered in the discovery of calculus independently by both Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz and Isaac Newton, with the former introducing the symbol $D^n f = \frac{d^n f}{dx^n}$, meaning the *n*th derivative of a function f where *n* is a neuropolitic interval of $D^n f = \frac{d^n f}{dx^n}$. the *n*th derivative of a function f, where *n* is a nonnegative integer. L'Hôpital, out of curiosity, had asked Leibniz if *n* could be allowed to take a fractional value. This question by l'Hôpital to Leibniz was going to become a future field of mathematics to find applications in different areas of human endeavors. For more on the history of fractional calculus, see [1] and references therein. Fractional calculus indeed comprises both fractional integrals and fractional derivatives. Its numerous applications have enticed many scientists and engineers to pay more attention to it in recent years. Practical applications were found in image and signal processing [2,3], biotechnology [4], nanotechnology [5] and viscoelasticity [6]. For more applications of fractional calculus, see [7–20], and more recently, [21–40]. It is extremely difficult in general to obtain an exact solution (in terms of a handy function) for a fractional differential equation. Therefore, several analytical methods were derived in order to find approximate solutions. This, in itself, raises the challenge of always trying to get an analytical solving method which is efficient, reliable, produces better approximations and guarantees faster rate of convergence. Thus, several methods have been proposed; these are the variational iteration method (VIM), Adomian's decomposition method (ADM), the homotopy analysis method (HAM), the homotopy perturbation method (HPM), the differential transform method (DTM), the new iteration method (NIM), the least-squares



2 of 21

residual power series method (LSRPSM), the residual power series method (RPSM) and several others. In 1992, Liao [41,42] introduced the HAM to solve fractional differential equations. However, there was still a need for another method that could guarantee faster convergence and give a more accurate approximation. This led to the proposition of a modification of the HAM to *q*-HAM, which uses the axillary parameter *q* to obtain a more refined approximate solution [10]. Solutions to some nonlinear fractional differential equations were obtained using q-HAM; see [12–14,28,32,43,44]. Recently, Singh et al. [30] introduced the q-homotopy analysis transform method (q-HATM). Actually, the q-HATM was derived from the combination of the Laplace transform and the *q*-HAM. This combination is an improvement on the *q*-HAM, in that some properties of the equation under consideration are still maintained as the *q*-HATM sorts for an approximate solution in a series form. The *q*-HATM also has an added advantage as it deploys a convergence parameter \hbar , which is effectively selected to guarantee faster convergence to the solution, gives a better degree of accuracy and provides adjustment and control of convergence regions. A number of researchers have solved various nonlinear fractional differential equations by using the *q*-HATM [31,33,34,45–47]. In contrast to some other methods, *q*-HATM does not need any sort of discretization or perturbation. It also does not need polynomials like in ADM and the homotopy perturbation transform method (HPTM), nor is a Lagrange multiplier needed as in the case of the VIM. In light of the aforementioned advantages that q-HATM brings to the fore, in this work, we sort to find approximate solutions by applying the *q*-HATM first to the Fornberg–Whitham equation and secondly to a fractional biological population model in two dimensions.

In mathematical physics, the Fornberg–Whitham equation is a significant model used in investigating the qualitative behavior of wave breaking [36]. It is given as

$$\varphi_t - \varphi_{xxt} + \varphi_x = \varphi \varphi_{xxx} - \varphi \varphi_x + 3 \varphi_x \varphi_{xx}, \tag{1}$$

where $\varphi(x, t)$ is the velocity of fluid. A peaked solution to Equation (1) was derived by Fornberg and Whitham [11] and is given as $\varphi(x, t) = Ke^{\left|\frac{x}{2} - \frac{2t}{3}\right|}$, where *K* is an arbitrary constant. Considering the enormous application of fractional calculus to diverse fields of sciences, researchers recently introduced the fractional derivative to obtain the following time-fractional Fornberg–Whitham equation

$$D_t^{\alpha}\varphi - \varphi_{xxt} + \varphi_x = \varphi\varphi_{xxx} - \varphi\varphi_x + 3\varphi_x\varphi_{xx}, \quad 0 < \alpha \le 1, \quad t > 0, \tag{2}$$

where D_t^{α} represents the Caputo derivative in the variable *t* of order α . Various analytical approaches and methods have been employed by different authors in other to solve the classical Fornberg–Whitham equation (Equation (1)) (see [48,49]) and fractional Fornberg–Whitham equation (Equation (2)) (see [26,29,50–53]). Considering the simplicity in implementation, efficiency and reliability of the *q*-HATM (see [54]), we apply the *q*-HATM to solve Equation (2); then, taking advantage of the presence of a convergence parameter \hbar , we obtain a faster and more accurate approximate solution in few iterations. Our applied method outperformed existing methods that have been applied to solve Equation (2), in terms of ease of computations, faster convergence rate and more accurate approximate solution.

Secondly, we demonstrate the preference of the *q*-HATM over other methods in solving the time-fractional biological population model,

$$D_{t}^{\alpha}\varphi(x,y,t) - \varphi_{xx}^{2}(x,y,t) - \varphi_{yy}^{2}(x,y,t) - \lambda\varphi(x,y,t) = 0, \quad 0 < \alpha \le 1, \quad t > 0,$$
(3)

where D_t^{α} represents the Caputo derivative in the variable *t* of order α .

We organized the paper as follows. In Section 2, we present some basic tools needed in this work. Analysis of the *q*-HATM is given in Section 3. Application of the *q*-HATM to the fractional

Fornberg–Whitham equation is presented in Section 4. Application of the *q*-HATM to a fractional biological population model is presented in Section 5. Final remarks are stated in Section 6.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we present some basic tools that will be used hereafter.

Definition 1 (Riemann–Liouville integral). *Given a function* $\varphi \in C_m$, $m \ge -1$, the Riemann–Liouville fractional integral of order $\alpha \geq 0$ of φ is defined as [55–57]

$$\mathcal{J}^{\alpha}\varphi(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-\eta)^{\alpha-1} \varphi(\eta) d\eta, \quad \alpha, t > 0$$
(4)

where $\mathcal{J}^0 \varphi(t) = \varphi(t)$ and Γ is the known regular gamma function.

Definition 2 (Caputo derivative). *The fractional derivative of the function* φ *of order* α *, for* $n - 1 < \alpha \leq 1$ *n*, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *in the sense of Caputo is defined as* [56,57]

$$\mathcal{D}_t^{\alpha} \varphi(t) := \begin{cases} \varphi^{(n)}(t), & \alpha = n, \\ \mathcal{J}^{n-\alpha} \varphi^{(n)}(t), & n-1 < \alpha < n, \end{cases}$$
(5)

where

$$\mathcal{J}^{n-\alpha}\varphi^{(n)}(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n-\alpha)}\int_0^t (t-\eta)^{n-\alpha-1}\varphi^{(n)}(\eta)d\eta, \quad \alpha, t > 0.$$

The Caputo derivative (Equation (5)) has the following properties:

(a)
$$\mathcal{D}_t^{\alpha}(\delta_1\varphi(t) + \delta_2\varphi(t)) = \delta_1 \mathcal{D}_t^{\alpha}\varphi(t) + \delta_2 \mathcal{D}_t^{\alpha}\varphi(t), \quad \delta_1, \delta_2 \in \mathbb{R},$$

(b)
$$\mathcal{D}_t^{\alpha} \mathcal{J}^{\alpha} \varphi(t) = \varphi(t)$$

(b)
$$\mathcal{D}_t^{\alpha} \mathcal{J}^{\alpha} \varphi(t) = \varphi(t),$$

(c) $\mathcal{J}^{\alpha} \mathcal{D}_t^{\alpha} \varphi(t) = \varphi(t) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \varphi^{(k)}(t) \frac{t^k}{k!}.$

Definition 3 (Laplace transform). The Laplace transform of the Caputo fractional derivative $\mathcal{D}_t^{\alpha} \varphi(t)$ is given as [55,58]

$$\mathcal{L}_t\left[\mathcal{D}_t^{\alpha}\varphi(t)\right] = s^{\alpha}\mathcal{L}_t[\varphi(t)] - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} s^{\alpha-k-1}\varphi^{(k)}(0^+), \quad n-1 < \alpha \le n.$$
(6)

3. The q-HATM Technique

The general procedure and techniques for applying the *q*-HATM to an abstract nonlinear differential equation are presented here. Given the following abstract nonlinear time-fractional differential equation

$$\mathcal{D}_t^{\alpha}\varphi(x,t) + \mathcal{G}(\varphi(x,t)) + \mathcal{N}(\varphi(x,t)) = g(x,t), \quad n-1 < \alpha \le n,$$
(7)

where \mathcal{D}_{t}^{α} is the Caputo fractional derivative, \mathcal{G} is a linear differential operator, \mathcal{N} is a nonlinear differential operator, g is the source term and φ is the unknown function, we apply the Laplace transform in the variable t to both sides of Equation (7); keeping in mind Equation (6), we get

$$\mathcal{L}_{t}[\varphi(x,t)] - \frac{1}{s^{\alpha}} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} s^{\alpha-j-1} \varphi^{(j)}(x,0) + \frac{1}{s^{\alpha}} \mathcal{L}_{t}[\mathcal{G}(\varphi(x,t)) + \mathcal{N}(\varphi(x,t)) - g(x,t)] = 0.$$
(8)

For $0 \le q \le 1$, according to the homotopy method [41], the so-called zeroth-order deformation is given as

$$(1-q)\mathcal{L}_t(\psi(x,t;q)-\varphi_0(x,t)) = \hbar q \mathcal{H}(x,t) \mathbf{Y}[\psi(x,t;q)],$$
(9)

where

$$Y[\psi(x,t;q)] := \mathcal{L}_t[\psi(x,t;q)] - \frac{1}{s^{\alpha}} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} s^{\alpha-j-1} \psi^{(j)}(x,0;q) + \frac{1}{s^{\alpha}} \mathcal{L}_t[\mathcal{G}(\psi(x,t;q)) + \mathcal{N}(\psi(x,t;q)) - g(x,t)].$$
(10)

 $\mathcal{H}(x,t) \neq 0$ represents an auxiliary function, \hbar is an auxiliary parameter and q is an embedded parameter. It is easy to see that when q = 0 and q = 1, then from Equation (9), we can obtain, respectively,

$$\psi(x,t;0) = \varphi_0(x,t)$$
 and $\psi(x,t,q) = \varphi(x,t).$ (11)

It follows according to Equation (11) that the solution $\psi(x, t; q)$ of Equation (9) ranges from the initial guess $\varphi_0(x, t)$ to the solution $\varphi(x, t)$ of Equation (7) as q ranges from 0 to 1. Then, one chooses an appropriate \mathcal{H} such that the solution $\psi(x, t; q)$ of Equation (9) is valid on $0 \le q \le 1$. Next, with Equation (11) in mind, and the appropriate choice of \mathcal{H} , we can expand $\psi(x, t; q)$ in Taylor series [59] about q = 0 to get

$$\psi(x,t;q) = \varphi_0(x,t) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \varphi_k(x,t) q^k,$$
(12)

such that Equation (12) converges at q = 1, where

$$\varphi_k(x,t) = \frac{1}{k!} \frac{\partial^k \psi(x,t,q)}{\partial q^k} \Big|_{q=0};$$
(13)

see [41] and references therein. It follows that

$$\varphi(x,t) = \varphi_0(x,t) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \varphi_k(x,t) q^k.$$
(14)

Performing *k*-times differentiation of Equation (9) with respect to *q*, then evaluating at q = 0 and dividing through by *k*!, we get

$$\mathcal{L}_t\left[\varphi_k(x,t) - \eta_k^*\varphi_{k-1}(x,t)\right] = \hbar \mathcal{H}(x,t)\Re_k(\vec{\varphi}_{k-1}(x,t)),\tag{15}$$

where the vector $\vec{\varphi}(x, t)$ is given as

$$\vec{\varphi}(x,t) = \{\varphi_j(x,t)\}_{j=0}^k,$$

with

$$\Re_{k}(\vec{\varphi}_{k-1}(x,t)) = \mathcal{L}_{t}[\varphi_{k-1}(x,t)] - (1 - \eta_{k}^{*}) \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} s^{\alpha-j-1} \varphi^{(j)}(x,0) + \frac{1}{s^{\alpha}} \mathcal{L}_{t}[g(x,t)]\right) + \frac{1}{s^{\alpha}} \mathcal{L}_{t}[G(\varphi(x,t)) + H_{k-1}]$$
(16)

and

$$\eta_k^* := \begin{cases} 0, & k \le 1, \\ 1, & otherwise. \end{cases}$$
(17)

In Equation (16), H_k is given as

$$H_k = \frac{1}{k!} \frac{\partial^k \psi(x, t, q)}{\partial q^k} \Big|_{q=0},$$

where

$$\psi(x,t,q) = \psi_0 + q\psi_1 + q^2\psi_2 + q^3\psi_3 + \cdots$$

is the homotopy polynomial.

Application of the inverse Laplace transform to Equation (15) yields

$$\varphi_k(x,t) = \eta_k^* \varphi_{k-1}(x,t) + \hbar \mathcal{L}_t^{-1} \big[\mathcal{H}(x,t) \Re_k(\vec{\varphi}_{k-1}(x,t)) \big].$$
(18)

For the convergence analysis of the q-HATM, we present the following theorems; their proofs are given in [10,34,46].

Theorem 1 (Convergence of *q*-HATM [34,46]). Let $T : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B}$ be a nonlinear contraction mapping on a Banach space \mathcal{B} , *i.e.*, there exists 0 < K < 1 such that

$$\|\mathcal{T}(\varphi) - \mathcal{T}(\widetilde{\varphi})\| \leq K \|\varphi - \widetilde{\varphi}\|, \quad \varphi, \widetilde{\varphi} \in \mathscr{B}.$$

By the Banach's fixed point theorem [60], for any $\varphi_0, \tilde{\varphi}_0 \in \mathscr{B}$, the sequence $\{\varphi_k\}$ generated by the *q*-HATM converges to a fixed point of \mathcal{T} . Furthermore,

$$\|\varphi_i-\varphi_k\|\leq rac{K^k}{1-K}\|\varphi_1-\varphi_0\|.$$

Theorem 2 (Error analysis [10,34]). Assume that the series solution

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\varphi_k(x,t)q^k$$

given by Equation (14) converges to $\varphi(x,t)$ the solution of Equation (7) for specified values of \hbar . Suppose there exists a real number $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ such that

$$\|\varphi_{j+1}(x,t)\| \leq \varepsilon \|\varphi_j(x,t)\|, \quad \forall j.$$

If the sequence of partial sums

$$\varphi^{(N)}(x,t;q;\hbar) = \sum_{k=0}^{N} \varphi_k(x,t) q^k$$

is used as an approximation to the solution $\varphi(x,t)$ *of Equation (7), then the absolute error is bounded as follows*

$$\|\varphi(x,t)-\varphi^{(N)}(x,t;q;\hbar)\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^{N+1}}{1-\varepsilon}\|\varphi_0(x,t)\|.$$

Remark 1. A critical part of the q-HATM technique lies in the appropriate and careful choice of \hbar which guarantees faster convergence of the approximate solution to the exact solution and greatly minimizes the absolute error. A classical way to find the best \hbar is by the use of the well-known \hbar -curves. The \hbar -curve is

drawn using certain quantities of the solution versus \hbar . The best choice of the convergence control parameter \hbar is carefully made using the horizontal line test. This approach works quite well when an exact solution for a particular α value is known. However, in the case where no exact solution is known, there are different other ways to obtain a best \hbar that guarantees faster and better convergence. One method is to minimize, with respect to \hbar , the norm of the discrete residual function at each order of HAM approximation [61]. Another approach is by applying optimization method to minimize the residual of the mth-order approximate solutions, with respect to the homotopy parameter \hbar [37]. Hence, systematically, the optimal choice of \hbar that minimizes error and gives better convergence speed at every order of HAM approximation can be obtained. See also [62] (Chapter 4) and [35] for other methods to obtain \hbar .

4. Application to the Fractional Fornberg–Whitham Equation

In this section, we apply the *q*-HATM to solve the Caputo time-fractional Fornberg–Whitham equation and compare our results with those obtained from other methods. Recently, in [63], LSRPSM was used to obtain an approximate solution for the fractional Fornberg–Whitham equation. It was established that LSRPSM outperformed other methods such as RPSM and VIM in terms of accuracy and rate of convergence. We consider the following fractional Fornberg–Whitham equation:

$$D_t^{\alpha}\varphi - \varphi_{xxt} + \varphi_x = \varphi \varphi_{xxx} - \varphi \varphi_x + 3\varphi_x \varphi_{xx}, \quad 0 < \alpha \le 1, \quad t > 0, \tag{19}$$

with the initial data

$$\varphi(x,0) = \frac{4}{3}exp\left(\frac{x}{2}\right).$$
(20)

The exact solution to Equation (19) when $\alpha = 1$ is given as

$$\varphi(x,t) = \frac{4}{3}exp\left(\frac{x}{2} - \frac{2t}{3}\right).$$
(21)

We take the Laplace transform (in variable t) of Equation (19) and, keeping in mind Equation (20), we get

$$\mathcal{L}_{t}[\varphi] - \frac{1}{s}\varphi(x,0) + \frac{1}{s^{\alpha}}\frac{\partial^{2}\varphi}{\partial x^{2}}(x,0) - \frac{1}{s^{\alpha-1}}\mathcal{L}_{t}\left[\frac{\partial^{2}\varphi}{\partial x^{2}}\right] + \frac{1}{s^{\alpha}}\mathcal{L}_{t}\left[\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial x} - \varphi\frac{\partial^{3}\varphi}{\partial x^{3}} + \varphi\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial x} - 3\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial x}\frac{\partial^{2}\varphi}{\partial x^{2}}\right] = 0.$$
(22)

Taking $\psi(x, t; q)$, we define the nonlinear function

$$Y(\psi(x,t;q)) = \mathcal{L}_t[\psi] - \frac{1}{s}\psi(x,t;0) + \frac{1}{s^{\alpha}}\frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial x^2}(x,t;0) - \frac{1}{s^{\alpha-1}}\mathcal{L}_t\left[\frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial x^2}\right] \\ + \frac{1}{s^{\alpha}}\mathcal{L}_t\left[\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x} - \psi\frac{\partial^3\psi}{\partial x^3} + \psi\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x} - 3\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x}\frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial x^2}\right].$$

From Equation (15), taking $\mathcal{H} \equiv 1$, the *k*th-order deformation equation is given as

$$\mathcal{L}_t[\varphi_k - \eta_k^* \varphi_{k-1}] = \hbar \Re_k(\vec{\varphi}_{k-1}), \tag{23}$$

where

$$\Re_{k}(\vec{\varphi}_{k-1}) = \mathcal{L}_{t}\left[\varphi_{k-1}\right] - \left(1 - \eta_{k}^{*}\right) \left[\frac{4}{3s}e^{x/2} - \frac{1}{3s^{\alpha}}e^{x/2}\right] - \frac{1}{s^{\alpha-1}}\mathcal{L}_{t}\left[\frac{\partial^{2}\varphi_{k-1}}{\partial x^{2}}\right] + \frac{1}{s^{\alpha-1}}\mathcal{L}_{t}\left[\frac{\partial\varphi_{k-1}}{\partial x} - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\varphi_{j}\frac{\partial^{3}\varphi_{k-1-j}}{\partial x^{3}} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\varphi_{j}\frac{\partial\varphi_{k-1-j}}{\partial x} - 3\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\frac{\partial\varphi_{j}}{\partial x}\frac{\partial^{2}\varphi_{k-1-j}}{\partial x^{2}}\right].$$
(24)

Taking the inverse Laplace transform of Equation (23), we get

$$\varphi_k = \eta_k^* \varphi_{k-1} + \hbar \mathcal{L}_t^{-1} \left[\Re_k(\vec{\varphi}_{k-1}) \right].$$
(25)

Therefore, making use of Equations (17) and (24) in Equation (25), we obtain the following iterations for the approximate solution:

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_0(x,t) = \frac{4}{3}e^{x/2}, \\ \varphi_1(x,t) = \frac{2\hbar t^{\alpha}e^{x/2}}{3\Gamma(\alpha+1)}, \\ \varphi_2(x,t) = (1+h)\varphi_1 + \frac{\hbar t^{\alpha-1}e^{x/2}}{3\Gamma(\alpha)} - \frac{\hbar^2 t^{2\alpha-1}e^{x/2}}{6\Gamma(2\alpha)} + \frac{\hbar^2 t^{2\alpha}e^{x/2}}{3\Gamma(2\alpha+1)}. \end{cases}$$
(26)

Using Equation (26), we consider as our approximate solution the sequence of partial sums

$$\varphi^{(2)}(x,t) = \sum_{k=0}^{2} \varphi_k(x,t) q^k.$$

Thus, taking q = 1, the approximate solution $\varphi^{(2)}(x, t)$ of Equation (19) is

$$\varphi^{(2)}(x,t) = \frac{4e^{x/2}}{3} + \frac{\hbar t^{\alpha-1}e^{x/2}}{3\Gamma(\alpha)} - \frac{\hbar^2 t^{2\alpha-1}e^{x/2}}{6\Gamma(2\alpha)} + \frac{2\hbar t^{\alpha}e^{x/2}}{3\Gamma(\alpha+1)} + \frac{2\hbar(1+\hbar)t^{\alpha}e^{x/2}}{3\Gamma(\alpha+1)} + \frac{\hbar^2 t^{2\alpha}e^{x/2}}{3\Gamma(\alpha+1)}.$$
(27)

Numerical Comparison

In Table 1, we present numerical results (when $\alpha = 1$) for some values of *t* and *x*. The solutions obtained using the exact solution (Equation (25)), the *q*-HATM solution (Equation (27)) and absolute errors for the *q*-HATM and other methods (the LSRPSM [63], the RPSM [63] and the VIM [26]) are tabulated. In Table 1, "itr" means the number of iterations performed for the particular method. Table 2 shows different numerical results obtained by the *q*-HATM for different values of α ($\alpha = 0.25$, 0.5, 0.75), with x = -5, 5 and t = 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5.

Table 1. Numerical comparison when $\alpha = 1$ of the exact solution (Equation (21)), and the solutions obtained by the *q*-homotopy analysis transform method (*q*-HATM) with $\hbar = -1.28$, the least-squares residual power series method (LSRPSM) [63], the residual power series method (RPSM) [63] and the variational iteration method (VIM) [26].

x	t	$\varphi(x,t)$ Exact	$\varphi^{(2)}(x,t)$ q-HATM itr = 2	Abs Error q-HATM itr = 2	Abs Error LSRPSM [63] itr = 2	Abs Error RPSM [63] itr = 5	Abs Error VIM [26] itr = 2
	0.1	0.00840453	0.00840436	$1.70560 imes 10^{-7}$	$1.21387 imes 10^{-5}$	1.41249×10^{-4}	$1.75478 imes 10^{-2}$
-10	0.2	0.00786250	0.00786159	$9.10243 imes 10^{-7}$	$1.58400 imes 10^{-5}$	$1.58400 imes 10^{-5}$	1.71128×10^{-2}
	0.3	0.00735542	0.00735561	$1.90881 imes 10^{-7}$	$1.35139 imes 10^{-5}$	$3.77120 imes 10^{-4}$	1.66654×10^{-2}
	0.4	0.00688105	0.00688643	$5.38732 imes 10^{-6}$	$7.41498 imes 10^{-6}$	$4.74372 imes 10^{-4}$	$1.62077 imes 10^{-2}$
	0.5	0.00643727	0.00645405	$1.67882 imes 10^{-5}$	$3.47756 imes 10^{-7}$	$5.59422 imes 10^{-4}$	$1.57418 imes 10^{-2}$
	0.1	0.10238812	0.10238604	$2.07785 imes 10^{-6}$	$1.47879 imes 10^{-4}$	1.72077×10^{-3}	$2.13776 imes 10^{-1}$
$^{-5}$	0.2	0.09578480	0.09577371	$1.10890 imes 10^{-5}$	$1.92971 imes 10^{-4}$	$3.24664 imes 10^{-3}$	$2.08477 imes 10^{-1}$
	0.3	0.08960735	0.08960968	$2.32540 imes 10^{-6}$	$1.64633 imes 10^{-4}$	$4.59427 imes 10^{-3}$	$2.03026 imes 10^{-1}$
	0.4	0.08382830	0.08389393	$6.56310 imes 10^{-5}$	$9.03330 imes 10^{-5}$	$5.77904 imes 10^{-3}$	$1.97450 imes 10^{-1}$
	0.5	0.07842196	0.07862648	$2.04522 imes 10^{-4}$	$4.23654 imes 10^{-6}$	$6.81515 imes 10^{-3}$	$1.91774 imes 10^{-1}$
	0.1	2.05652035	2.05647862	$4.17347 imes 10^{-5}$	2.97023×10^{-3}	3.45626×10^{-2}	4.29380
1	0.2	1.92388916	1.92366643	2.22729×10^{-4}	3.87592×10^{-3}	$6.52104 imes 10^{-2}$	4.18737
	0.3	1.79981174	1.79985845	4.67070×10^{-5}	3.30675×10^{-3}	9.22783×10^{-2}	4.07788
	0.4	1.68373646	1.68505469	$1.31823 imes 10^{-3}$	$1.81439 imes 10^{-3}$	$1.16075 imes 10^{-1}$	3.96588
	0.5	1.57514722	1.57925515	$4.10793 imes 10^{-3}$	8.50920×10^{-5}	1.36886×10^{-1}	3.85189

Table 2. Values of the approximate solution $\varphi^{(2)}(x, t)$ by the *q*-HATM, for different values of α .

x	t	$\alpha = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.75$	
	0.1	0.05416316	0.07351917	0.09275676	
	0.2	0.06658185	0.07054802	0.08474062	
-5	0.3	0.07288553	0.06931123	0.07889088	
	0.4	0.07719428	0.06897222	0.07438139	
	0.5	0.08054278	0.06920693	0.07085670	
	0.1	8.03852633	10.91121208	13.76632402	
	0.2	9.88162297	10.47025429	12.57662352	
5	0.3	10.81717115	10.28669902	11.70844537	
	0.4	11.45664676	10.23638510	11.03917664	
	0.5	11.95360852	10.27121975	10.51606638	

Remark 2. Observe that from Equation (26), we have only performed two iterations of the q-HATM. Moreover, as could be seen from Table 1, when $\alpha = 1$, and taking $\hbar = -1.28$ (according to Figure 1), the numerical solution obtained by the q-HATM has a far-reaching match to the exact solution (with smallest absolute error) when compared to other methods presented in the table. Only in the case when t = 0.5 is the absolute error for the LSRPSM lesser than that of the q-HATM for this problem. Hence, with few iterations, our solution obtained by the q-HATM best approximates the exact solution to a high and appreciable number of significant digits. Moreover, the computations required to obtain our approximate solution $\varphi^{(2)}(x, t)$ are less strenuous compared to those of the LSRPSM [63], the RPSM [63] and the VIM [26].



Figure 1. Plots of the *q*-HATM solutions for different \hbar -values and exact solution for $\alpha = 1$.

- **Remark 3.** (*i*) Figure 2 shows the similarity in 3D plot of the exact solution and the solution by the q-HATM for $0 \le t \le 1$ and $-10 \le x \le 10$. As can also be seen from Table 1, Figure 4a confirms the closed alignment between the exact solution and the solution by the q-HATM when $\alpha = 1$.
- (ii) Figures 3 and 4b show the changes in the dynamics of the Fornberg–Whitham equation as the value of α changes. This, in essence, depicts why it is imperative to consider studying the fractional Fornberg–Whitham equation, as this will give additional information about the dynamics of the equation in real life situations.
- (iii) In Figure 5, with Remark 1 in mind, the \hbar -curve gives the convergence region of the q-HATM solution as $2 \le \hbar < 0$; then, by means of Figure 1, we make the optimal choice of $\hbar = -1.28$.



Figure 2. 3D plot of the exact solution and the *q*-HATM solution, with $\alpha = 1$, $\hbar = -1.28$.



Figure 3. 3D plot of the *q*-HATM solution with different α values and $\hbar = -1.28$.



Figure 4. (a) is the line plot of the exact and *q*-HATM solutions when $\alpha = 1$ at fixed t = 0.2 and $\hbar = -1.28$. (b) shows the effect of different values of α for fixed x = -5 and $\hbar = -1.28$.



Figure 5. \hbar -curve plots for different values of α .

Remark 4. Our attention was also drawn to methods presented in other papers—the HAM [48], NIM [51] and NDM (natural transform decomposition method) [50], which were also used to solve the fractional Fornberg–Whitham equation (Equation (2)) with different initial data $\varphi(x,0) = e^{xl^2}$. We also apply the q-HATM and compare its absolute error with those of the HAM [48], NIM [51] and NDM [50]; see Table 3 below.

Table 3. Numerical comparison when $\alpha = 1$ of the exact solution (Equation (21)) (with $\varphi(x, 0) = e^{x/2}$), and the solutions obtained by the *q*-HATM with $\hbar = -1.26$, the homotopy analysis method (HAM) [48], the new iteration method (NIM) [51] and the natural transform decomposition method (NDM) [50].

x	t	$\varphi(x,t)$ Exact	$\varphi^{(2)}(x,t)$ q-HATM itr = 2	Abs Error q-HATM itr = 2	Abs Error HAM [48] itr = 5	Abs Error NIM [51] itr = 3	Abs Error NDM [50] itr = 3
	0.1	0.00630340	0.00630348	$8.43252 imes 10^{-8}$	$1.25020 imes 10^{-4}$	$9.90107 imes 10^{-5}$	$4.86602 imes 10^{-6}$
	0.2	0.00589687	0.00589576	$1.11391 imes 10^{-6}$	$5.33187 imes 10^{-4}$	$1.84777 imes 10^{-4}$	$6.13163 imes 10^{-6}$
-10	0.3	0.00551656	0.00551478	$1.78726 imes 10^{-6}$	1.22446×10^{-3}	$2.56333 imes 10^{-4}$	4.76202×10^{-6}
	0.4	0.00516078	0.00516054	$2.44846 imes 10^{-7}$	$2.19875 imes 10^{-3}$	$3.12832 imes 10^{-4}$	1.60584×10^{-6}
	0.5	0.00482795	0.00483305	$5.09516 imes 10^{-6}$	$3.45598 imes 10^{-3}$	$3.53532 imes 10^{-4}$	$2.59733 imes 10^{-6}$
	0.1	0.07679109	0.07679212	1.02729×10^{-6}	1.52306×10^{-3}	1.20620×10^{-3}	5.92803×10^{-5}
	0.2	0.07183860	0.07182503	$1.35702 imes 10^{-5}$	$6.49555 imes 10^{-3}$	$2.25104 imes 10^{-3}$	$7.46985 imes 10^{-5}$
$^{-5}$	0.3	0.06720551	0.06718374	$2.17733 imes 10^{-5}$	$1.49169 imes 10^{-2}$	$3.12278 imes 10^{-3}$	$5.80133 imes 10^{-5}$
	0.4	0.06287123	0.06286824	$2.98283 imes 10^{-6}$	$2.67863 imes 10^{-2}$	$3.81107 imes 10^{-3}$	$1.95632 imes 10^{-5}$
	0.5	0.05881647	0.05887854	$6.20718 imes 10^{-5}$	$4.21025 imes 10^{-2}$	$4.30690 imes 10^{-3}$	$3.16419 imes 10^{-5}$
	0.1	1.54239027	1.54241090	$2.06337 imes 10^{-5}$	$3.05915 imes 10^{-2}$	$2.42271 imes 10^{-2}$	$1.19068 imes 10^{-3}$
	0.2	1.44291687	1.44264430	$2.72565 imes 10^{-4}$	1.30467×10^{-1}	$4.52134 imes 10^{-2}$	1.50036×10^{-3}
1	0.3	1.34985881	1.34942148	$4.37328 imes 10^{-4}$	$2.99615 imes 10^{-1}$	6.27227×10^{-2}	1.16523×10^{-3}
	0.4	1.26280234	1.26274243	$5.99118 imes 10^{-5}$	$5.38018 imes 10^{-1}$	$7.65474 imes 10^{-2}$	$3.92937 imes 10^{-4}$
	0.5	1.18136041	1.18260716	$1.24675 imes 10^{-3}$	$8.45651 imes 10^{-1}$	$8.65064 imes 10^{-2}$	$6.35545 imes 10^{-4}$

Following similar steps leading to Equation (25), for the case where initial data is given as $\varphi(x, 0) = e^{x/2}$, we obtain the following iterations using the *q*-HATM:

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_0(x,t) = e^{x/2} \\ \varphi_1(x,t) = \frac{\hbar t^{\alpha} e^{x/2}}{2\Gamma(\alpha+1)} \\ \varphi_2(x,t) = -\frac{\hbar^2 t^{2\alpha-1} e^{x/2}}{8\Gamma(2\alpha)} + \frac{\hbar (1+\hbar) t^{\alpha} e^{x/2}}{2\Gamma(\alpha+1)} + \frac{\hbar^2 t^{2\alpha} e^{x/2}}{4\Gamma(2\alpha+1)}. \end{cases}$$
(28)

Using Equation (28), we consider as our approximate solution the sequence of partial sums

$$\varphi^{(2)}(x,t) = \sum_{k=0}^{2} \varphi_k(x,t) q^k.$$

Thus, taking q = 1, the approximate solution $\varphi^{(2)}(x, t)$ of Equation (19) (with $\varphi(x, 0) = e^{x/2}$) is

$$\varphi^{(2)}(x,t) = e^{x/2} + \frac{\hbar t^{\alpha} e^{x/2}}{2\Gamma(\alpha+1)} - \frac{\hbar^2 t^{2\alpha-1} e^{x/2}}{8\Gamma(2\alpha)} + \frac{\hbar(1+\hbar)t^{\alpha} e^{x/2}}{2\Gamma(\alpha+1)} + \frac{\hbar^2 t^{2\alpha} e^{x/2}}{4\Gamma(2\alpha+1)}.$$
(29)

In this case, when $\varphi(x, 0) = e^{x/2}$, the exact solution to Equation (19) when $\alpha = 1$ is given as

$$\varphi(x,t) = \exp\left(\frac{x}{2} - \frac{2t}{3}\right). \tag{30}$$

This time as well, we also notice from Table 3 that the *q*-HATM solutions appears to better approximate the exact solution than the other three techniques.

5. Application to a Fractional Biological Population Model

In this section, we are concerned with applying the *q*-HATM technique to obtain an approximate solution for the following Caputo time-fractional biological population model

$$D_t^{\alpha}\varphi(x,y,t) - \varphi_{xx}^2(x,y,t) - \varphi_{yy}^2(x,y,t) - \lambda\varphi(x,y,t) = 0, \quad 0 < \alpha \le 1, \quad t > 0,$$
(31)

with the initial data

$$\varphi(x, y, 0) = \sqrt{xy}.$$
(32)

The exact solution to Equation (31) when $\alpha = 1$ is given as

$$\varphi(x, y, t) = \sqrt{xy} e^{\lambda t}.$$
(33)

We take the Laplace transform (in variable *t*) of Equation (31) and, due to Equation (32), we get

$$\mathcal{L}_t[\varphi] - \frac{1}{s}\varphi(x, y, 0) - \frac{1}{s^{\alpha}}\mathcal{L}_t\left[\frac{\partial^2 \varphi^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \varphi^2}{\partial y^2} + \lambda\varphi\right] = 0.$$
(34)

Taking $\psi(x, y, t; q)$, we define the nonlinear function

$$Y(\psi(x,y,t;q)) = \mathcal{L}_t[\psi] - \frac{1}{s}\psi(x,y,t;0) - \frac{1}{s^{\alpha}}\mathcal{L}_t\left[\frac{\partial^2\psi^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2\psi^2}{\partial y^2} + \lambda\psi\right].$$

From Equation (15), taking $\mathcal{H} \equiv 1$, the *k*th-order deformation equation is given as

$$\mathcal{L}_t[\varphi_k - \eta_k^* \varphi_{k-1}] = \hbar \Re_k(\vec{\varphi}_{k-1}), \tag{35}$$

where

$$\Re_{k}(\vec{\varphi}_{k-1}) = \mathcal{L}_{t}\left[\varphi_{k-1}\right] - \left(1 - \eta_{k}^{*}\right)\frac{1}{s}\sqrt{xy} - \frac{\lambda}{s^{\alpha}}\mathcal{L}_{t}\left[\varphi_{k-1}\right] - \frac{2}{s^{\alpha}}\mathcal{L}_{t}\left[\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\varphi_{j}\frac{\partial^{2}\varphi_{k-1-j}}{\partial x^{2}} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\frac{\partial\varphi_{j}}{\partial x}\frac{\partial\varphi_{k-1-j}}{\partial x}\right] - \frac{2}{s^{\alpha}}\mathcal{L}_{t}\left[\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\varphi_{j}\frac{\partial^{2}\varphi_{k-1-j}}{\partial y^{2}} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\frac{\partial\varphi_{j}}{\partial y}\frac{\partial\varphi_{k-1-j}}{\partial y}\right].$$
(36)

Taking the inverse Laplace transform of Equation (35), we get

$$\varphi_k = \eta_k^* \varphi_{k-1} + \hbar \mathcal{L}_t^{-1} \left[\Re_k(\vec{\varphi}_{k-1}) \right].$$
(37)

Therefore, making use of Equations (17) and (36) in Equation (37), we obtain the following iterations for the approximate solution:

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_0(x,y,t) = \sqrt{xy}, \\ \varphi_1(x,y,t) = -\frac{\lambda \hbar t^{\alpha} \sqrt{xy}}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)}, \\ \varphi_2(x,y,t) = -\frac{\hbar (1+\hbar)\lambda t^{\alpha} \sqrt{xy}}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)} + \frac{\hbar^2 \lambda^2 t^{2\alpha} \sqrt{xy}}{\Gamma(2\alpha+1)}. \end{cases}$$
(38)

Using Equation (38), we consider as our approximate solution the sequence of partial sums

$$\varphi^{(2)}(x,y,t) = \sum_{k=0}^{2} \varphi_k(x,y,t) q^k$$

Thus, taking q = 1, the approximate solution $\varphi^{(2)}(x, y, t)$ of Equation (31) is

$$\varphi^{(2)}(x,y,t) = \sqrt{xy} - \frac{\lambda\hbar t^{\alpha}\sqrt{xy}}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)} - \frac{\lambda\hbar(\hbar+1)t^{\alpha}\sqrt{xy}}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)} + \frac{\lambda^{2}\hbar^{2}t^{2\alpha}\sqrt{xy}}{\Gamma(2\alpha+1)}.$$
(39)

Numerical Comparison

We present in Table 4 the numerical results (when $\alpha = 1$) for t = 1 and some values of x and y. The solutions obtained using the exact solution (Equation (37)), the q-HATM solution (Equation (39)) and absolute errors for the q-HATM and other methods (the LSRPSM [63], the RPSM [63] and the HPM [64]) are tabulated. In Table 4, "itr" means the number of iterations performed for the particular method. In addition, Table 5 shows different numerical result obtained by the q-HATM for different values of α ($\alpha = 0.2$, 0.6, 0.9), with t = 1, x = 0.3, 1 and y = 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5.

Table 4. Numerical comparison when $\alpha = 1$ of the exact solution (Equation (21)), and the solutions obtained by the *q*-HATM with $\hbar = -1.1146$, the LSRPSM [63], the RPSM [63] and the homotopy perturbation method (HPM) [64]. We take t = 1, $\lambda = 0.5$.

x	у	$\varphi(x,y,t)$ Exact	$\varphi^{(2)}(x, y, t)$ q-HATM itr = 2	Abs Error q-HATM itr = 2	Abs Error LSRPSM [63] itr = 2	Abs Error RPSM [63] itr = 2	Abs Error HPM [64] itr = 2
	0.1	0.16487213	0.16487251	$3.7943 imes 10^{-7}$	$9.62 imes 10^{-6}$	$2.37 imes 10^{-3}$	2.3721×10^{-3}
	0.2	0.23316440	0.23316493	$5.3660 imes 10^{-7}$	$1.36 imes10^{-5}$	$3.35 imes 10^{-3}$	$3.3547 imes10^{-3}$
0.1	0.3	0.28556690	0.28556756	$6.5719 imes 10^{-7}$	$1.67 imes10^{-5}$	$4.11 imes 10^{-3}$	$4.1086 imes10^{-3}$
	0.4	0.32974425	0.32974501	$7.5886 imes 10^{-7}$	$1.92 imes 10^{-5}$	$4.74 imes10^{-3}$	$4.7443 imes10^{-3}$
	0.5	0.36866528	0.36866613	$8.4843 imes10^{-7}$	$2.15 imes 10^{-5}$	$5.30 imes 10^{-3}$	$5.3042 imes 10^{-3}$
	0.1	0.28556690	0.28556756	$6.5719 imes 10^{-7}$	$1.67 imes 10^{-5}$	$4.11 imes 10^{-3}$	$4.1086 imes10^{-3}$
	0.2	0.40385258	0.40385351	$9.2941 imes 10^{-7}$	$2.36 imes10^{-5}$	$5.81 imes 10^{-3}$	$5.8105 imes10^{-3}$
0.3	0.3	0.49461638	0.49461752	$1.1383 imes10^{-6}$	$2.89 imes10^{-5}$	$7.12 imes 10^{-3}$	$7.1164 imes10^{-3}$
	0.4	0.57113380	0.57113512	$1.3144 imes10^{-6}$	$3.33 imes10^{-5}$	$8.22 imes 10^{-3}$	$8.2173 imes 10^{-3}$
	0.5	0.63854700	0.63854847	$1.4695 imes 10^{-6}$	$3.73 imes10^{-5}$	$9.19 imes10^{-3}$	$9.1872 imes 10^{-3}$
	0.1	0.36866528	0.36866613	$8.4843 imes 10^{-7}$	$2.15 imes10^{-5}$	$5.30 imes 10^{-3}$	5.3042×10^{-3}
	0.2	0.52137144	0.52137264	$1.1999 imes 10^{-6}$	$3.04 imes10^{-5}$	$7.50 imes 10^{-3}$	$7.5013 imes 10^{-3}$
0.5	0.3	0.63854700	0.63854847	$1.4695 imes 10^{-6}$	$3.73 imes 10^{-5}$	$9.19 imes 10^{-3}$	$9.1872 imes 10^{-3}$
	0.4	0.73733057	0.73733226	$1.6969 imes 10^{-6}$	$4.30 imes10^{-5}$	$1.06 imes 10^{-2}$	1.0608×10^{-2}
	0.5	0.82436064	0.82436253	$1.8971 imes 10^{-6}$	$4.81 imes10^{-5}$	$1.19 imes 10^{-2}$	$1.1861 imes 10^{-2}$
1.0	0.1	0.52137144	0.52137264	$1.1999 imes 10^{-6}$	$3.04 imes10^{-5}$	$7.50 imes 10^{-3}$	$7.5013 imes 10^{-3}$
	0.2	0.73733057	0.73733226	$1.6969 imes 10^{-6}$	$4.30 imes10^{-5}$	$1.06 imes 10^{-2}$	1.0608×10^{-2}
	0.3	0.90304183	0.90304391	2.0782×10^{-6}	5.27×10^{-5}	$1.30 imes 10^{-2}$	1.2993×10^{-2}
	0.4	1.04274289	1.04274529	$2.3997 imes 10^{-6}$	$6.09 imes10^{-5}$	1.50×10^{-2}	1.5003×10^{-2}
	0.5	1.16582199	1.16582467	2.6830×10^{-6}	$6.80 imes 10^{-5}$	$1.68 imes 10^{-2}$	$1.6773 imes 10^{-2}$

Table 5. Values of the approximate solution $\varphi^{(2)}(x, t)$ by the *q*-HATM for different values of α , when t = 1.

x	y	$\alpha = 0.2$	$\alpha = 0.6$	$\alpha = 0.9$
	0.1	0.32691706	0.31767975	0.29415547
	0.2	0.46233054	0.44926700	0.41599866
0.3	0.3	0.56623696	0.55023746	0.50949222
	0.4	0.65383413	0.63535949	0.58831095
	0.5	0.73100878	0.71035351	0.65775163
	0.1	0.59686617	0.41012279	0.53705196
	0.2	0.84409623	0.58000121	0.75950617
1	0.3	1.03380253	0.71035351	0.93020128
	0.4	1.19373233	0.82024557	1.07410392
	0.5	1.33463332	0.91706243	1.20088469

Remark 5. Observe that from Equation (38), we have only performed two iterations of the q-HATM. Moreover, as can be seen from Table 4, when $\alpha = 1$ and taking $\hbar = -1.1146$ (according to Figure 6), $\lambda = 0.5$, t = 1, the numerical solution obtained by the q-HATM has a far-reaching match to the exact solution (with smallest absolute error) when compared to other methods presented in the table. Hence, with few iterations, our solution obtained by the q-HATM best approximates the exact solution to a high and appreciable number of significant digits. Moreover, the computations required to obtain our approximate solution $\varphi^{(2)}(x, t)$ are less strenuous compared to those of the LSRPSM [63], the RPSM [63] and the HPM [64].





Figure 6. Plots of the *q*-HATM solutions for different \hbar -values and exact solution, for $\alpha = 1$ and t = 1.

- **Remark 6.** (*i*) Figure 7 shows the similarity in 3D plot of the exact solution and the solution by the *q*-HATM for t = 1, $\lambda = 0.5$, $0 \le x \le 1$ and $0 \le y \le 1$. As can also be seen from Table 4, Figure 8 confirms the closed alignment between the exact solution and the solution by the *q*-HATM when $\alpha = 1$.
- (ii) Figures 9 and 10 shows the changes in the dynamics of the fractional biological population Equation (31) as the value of α changes. Thus, the fractional order α gives more information about the dynamics of the biological population model as it relates real life situations.
- (iii) In Figure 11, in the light of Remark 1, the \hbar -curve gives the convergence region of the q-HATM solution as $2 \le \hbar < 0$; then, by means of Figure 6, we make the optimal choice of $\hbar = -1.1146$.



Figure 7. 3D plot of the exact solution and the *q*-HATM solution, with $\alpha = 1$, $\hbar = -1.1146$, $\lambda = 0.5$, t = 1.



Figure 8. Line plot of the exact and *q*-HATM solutions with $\hbar = -1.1146$ when $\alpha = 1$, t = 1, $\lambda = 0.5$ and for fixed x = 0.5 (**left**) and fixed y = 0.7 (**right**).



Figure 9. 3D plot of the *q*-HATM solution for different α values, with $\hbar = -1.1146$, $\lambda = 0.5$, t = 1.



Figure 10. Effects of different values of α for t = 1, $\lambda = 0.5$, $\hbar = -1.1146$ and for fixed x = 0.5 (**left**) and fixed y = 0.7 (**right**).



Figure 11. \hbar -curve plots for different values of α .

6. Conclusions

In this work, we used the *q*-homotopy analysis transform method to analyze two Caputo time-fractional differential equations—the Fornberg–Whitham equation and a biological population model. By this method, we were able to obtain approximate solutions for these equations in the form of a series which was obtained from successive iterations. We were able to combine the Laplace transform and the homotopy analysis method (HAM) in an interesting way,

and obtained a satisfactory analytical solution of time-fractional nonlinear differential equations both in one space dimension and two space dimensions. Indeed, handling of the nonlinear terms by the applied method was interesting and delicate; perhaps this ensured a better approximate solution as witnessed. From Tables 1, 3 and 4, it is seen that our proposed method performed better than other methods under comparison. In addition, taking advantage of the convergence parameter \hbar , only two iterations were sufficient to obtain higher accuracy with our method as against other methods which required more iterations. Comparisons were made between the solution obtained by our proposed method and exact solution, as well as solutions obtained by other methods. This showed that our proposed method converges faster and is more accurate to solve the problems considered in this work. It does appear that our proposed method is quite promising and should be considered to solve other nonlinear differential equations of integer or fractional derivative. In future works, while applying this method, our aim will be to find a better and easier way to obtain the convergence parameter \hbar which will guarantee faster convergence and minimum error. One may also consider other methods which also improve on the homotopy series solution, such as the approximate homotopy symmetry method see [39].

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments: The author would like to appreciate the continuous support of University of Hafr Al Batin.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- 1. Debnath, L. A brief historical introduction to fractional calculus. *Int. J. Math. Educ. Sci. Technol.* 2004, 35, 487–501. [CrossRef]
- 2. Pu, Y.F. Fractional differential analysis for texture of digital image. *J. Algorithms Comput. Technol.* 2007, 3, 357–380.
- 3. Zhang, Y.; Pu, Y.F.; Hu, J.R.; Zhou, J.L. A class of fractional-order variational image in-painting models. *Appl. Math. Inf. Sci.* **2012**, *6*, 299–306.
- Kumar, D.; Seadawy, A.R.; Joardar, A.K. Modified Kudryashov method via new exact solutions for some conformable fractional differential equations arising in mathematical biology. *Chin. J. Phys.* 2018, 56, 75–85. [CrossRef]
- 5. Baleanu, D.; Guvenc, Z.B.; Machado, J.T. *New Trends in Nanotechnology and Fractional Calculus Applications;* Springer: Berlin, Germany, 2010.
- 6. Mainardi, F. Fractional Calculus and Waves in Linear Viscoelasticity; Imperial College Press: London, UK, 2010.
- 7. Agarwal, P.; Dragomir, S.S.; Jleli, M.; Samet, B. *Advances in Mathematical Inequalities and Applications*; Springer: Berlin, Germany, 2018.
- Baleanu, D.; Jajarmi, A.; Sajjadi, S.S.; Mozyrska, D. A new fractional model and optimal control of a tumor-immune surveillance with non-singular derivative operator. *Chaos Interdiscip. J. Nonlinear Sci.* 2019, 29, 083127. [CrossRef]
- 9. El-Sayed, A.A.; Agarwal, P. Numerical solution of multiterm variable order fractional differential equations via shifted Legendre polynomials. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **2019**, *42*, 3978–3991. [CrossRef]
- 10. El-Tawil, M.A.; Huseen, S.N. The Q-homotopy analysis method (QHAM). *Int. J. Appl. Math. Mech.* 2012, *8*, 51–75.
- 11. Fornberg, B.; Whitham, G.B. A numerical and theoretical study of certain nonlinear wave phenomena. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Sci.* **1978**, *298*, 373–404.
- 12. Iyiola, O.S. A numerical study of Ito equation and Sawada–Kotera equation both of time-fractional type. *Adv. Math. Sci. J.* **2013**, *2*, 71–79.
- 13. Iyiola, O.S. On the solutions of non-linear time-fractional gas dynamic equations: an analytical approach. *Int. J. Pure Appl. Math.* **2015**, *98*, 491–502. [CrossRef]

- 14. Iyiola, O.S.; Soh, M.E.; Enyi, C.D. Generalised homotopy analysis method (q-HAM) for solving foam drainage equation of time fractional type. *Math. Eng. Sci. Aerosp.* **2013**, *4*, 105.
- 15. Jain, S.; Agarwal, P.; Kilicman, A. Pathway fractional integral operator associated with 3m-parametric Mittag-Leffler functions. *Int. J. Appl. Comput. Math.* **2018**, *4*, 115. [CrossRef]
- 16. Jain, S.; Mehrez, K.; Baleanu, D.; Agarwal, P. Certain Hermite–Hadamard inequalities for logarithmically convex functions with applications. *Mathematics* **2019**, *7*, 163. [CrossRef]
- 17. Jajarmi, A.; Arshad, S.; Baleanu, D. A new fractional modelling and control strategy for the outbreak of dengue fever. *Phys. A Stat. Mech. Appl.* **2019**, 535, 122524. [CrossRef]
- 18. Jajarmi, A.; Baleanu, D.; Sajjadi, S.S.; Asad, J.H. A new feature of the fractional Euler–Lagrange equations for a coupled oscillator using a nonsingular operator approach. *Front. Phys.* **2019**, *7*, 196. [CrossRef]
- Jajarmi, A.; Ghanbari, B.; Baleanu, D. A new and efficient numerical method for the fractional modelling and optimal control of diabetes and tuberculosis co-existence. *Chaos Interdiscip. J. Nonlinear Sci.* 2019, 29, 093111. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 20. Jajarmi, A.; Yusuf, A.; Baleanu, D.; Inc, M. A new fractional HRSV model and its optimal control: A non-singular operator approach. *Phys. A Stat. Mech. Appl.* **2020**, 547, 123860. [CrossRef]
- 21. Nigmatullina, R.R.; Agarwal, P. Direct evaluation of the desired correlations: Verification on real data. *Phys. A Stat. Mech. Appl.* **2019**, *534*, 121558. [CrossRef]
- 22. Qureshi, S.; Yusuf, A. Fractional derivatives applied to MSEIR problems: Comparative study with real world data. *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* **2019**, *134*, 171. [CrossRef]
- 23. Qureshi, S.; Yusuf, A. Mathematical modeling for the impacts of deforestation on wildlife species using Caputo differential operator. *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **2019**, 126, 32–40. [CrossRef]
- 24. Rekhviashvili, S.; Pskhu, A.; Agarwal, P.; Jain, S. Application of the fractional oscillator model to describe damped vibrations. *Turk. J. Phys.* **2019**, *43*, 236–242. [CrossRef]
- 25. Ruzhansky, M.V.; Cho, Y.J.; Agarwal, P.; Area, I. *Advances in Real and Complex Analysis with Applications*; Springer: Singapore, 2017.
- 26. Sakar, M.G.; Erdogan, F.; Yildirim, A. Variational iteration method for the time-fractional Fornberg-Whitham equation. *Compt. Math. Appl.* **2012**, *63*, 1382–1388. [CrossRef]
- 27. Saoudi, K.; Agarwal, P.; Kumam, P.; Ghanmi, A.; Thounthong, P. The Nehari manifold for a boundary value problem involving Riemann–Liouville fractional derivative. *Adv. Differ. Equ.* **2018**, 2018, 263. [CrossRef]
- Senol, M.; Iyiola, O.S.; Kasmaei, H.D.; Akinyemi, L. Efficient analytical techniques for solving time-fractional nonlinear coupled Jaulent–Miodek system with energy-dependent Schrödinger potential. *Adv. Differ. Equ.* 2019, 2019, 462. [CrossRef]
- 29. Singh, J.; Kumar, D.; Kumar, S. New treatment of fractional Fornberg-Whitham equation via Laplace transform. *Ain Shams Eng. J.* **2013**, *4*, 557–562. [CrossRef]
- 30. Singh, J.; Kumar, D.; Swroop, R. Numerical solution of time and space-fractional coupled Burgers' equations via homotopy algorithm. *Alex. Eng. J.* **2016**, *55*, 1753–1763. [CrossRef]
- 31. Singh, J.; Kumar, D.; Baleanu, D.; Rathore, S. An efficient numerical algorithm for the fractional Drinfeld–Sokolov–Wilson equation. *Appl. Math. Comput.* **2018**, 335, 12–24. [CrossRef]
- 32. Soh, M.E.; Enyi, C.D.; Iyiola, O.S.; Audu, J.D. Approximate analytical solutions of strongly nonlinear fractional BBM-Burger's equations with dissipative term. *Appl. Math. Sci.* **2014**, *8*, 7715–7726. [CrossRef]
- 33. Srivastava, H.M.; Kumar, D.; Singh, J. An efficient analytical technique for fractional model of vibration equation. *Appl. Math. Model.* **2017**, *45*, 192–204. [CrossRef]
- 34. Veeresha, P.; Prakasha, D.G.; Qurashi, M.A.; Baleanu, D. A reliable technique for fractional modified Boussinesq and approximate long wave equations. *Adv. Differ. Equ.* **2019**, 2019, 253. [CrossRef]
- 35. Niu, Z.; Wang, C. A one-step optimal homotopy analysis method for nonlinear differential equations. *Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul.* **2010**, *15*, 2026–2036. [CrossRef]
- 36. Whitham, G.B. Variational methods and applications to water waves. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Sci.* **1967**, 299, 6–25.
- 37. Yabushita, K.; Yamashita, M.; Tsuboi, K. An analytic solution of projectile motion with the quadratic resistance law using the homotopy analysis method. *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.* **2007**, *40*, 8403–8416. [CrossRef]

- 38. Yıldız, T.A.; Jajarmi, A.; Yıldız, B.; Baleanu, D. New aspects of time fractional optimal control problems within operators with nonsingular kernel. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **2020**, *13*, 407–428. [CrossRef]
- 39. Yu, J.X.; Yuan, G.; Yua, L.S. Approximate homotopy symmetry method: Homotopy series solutions to the sixth-order Boussinesq equation. *Sci. China Ser. G-Phys. Mech. Astron.* **2009**, *52*, 1169–1178.
- 40. Yusuf, A.; Qureshi, S.; Shah, S.F. Mathematical analysis for an autonomous financial dynamical system via classical and modern fractional operators. *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **2020**, *132*, 109552. [CrossRef]
- 41. Liao, S.J. Homotopy analysis method and its applications in mathematics. *J. Basic Sci. Eng.* **1997**, *5*, 111–125.
- 42. Liao, S.J. Homotopy analysis method: a new analytic method for nonlinear problems. *Appl. Math. Mech.* **1998**, *19*, 957–962.
- 43. Akinyemi, L. q-homotopy analysis method for solving the seventh-order time-fractional Lax's Korteweg–de Vries and Sawada–Kotera equations. *Comput. Appl. Math.* **2019**, *38*, 191. [CrossRef]
- 44. Akinyemi, L.; Iyiola, O.S.; Akpan, U. Iterative methods for solving fourth- and sixth-order time-fractional Cahn–Hillard equation. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **2020**, *43*, 4050–4074. [CrossRef]
- 45. Kumar, D.; Agarwal, R.P.; Singh, J. A modified numerical scheme and convergence analysis for fractional model of Lienard's equation. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **2018**, *399*, 405–413. [CrossRef]
- 46. Kumar, D.; Singha, J.; Baleanu, D. A new analysis for fractional model of regularized long-wave equation arising in ion acoustic plasma waves. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **2017**, *40*, 5642–5653. [CrossRef]
- 47. Prakash, A.; Veeresha, P.; Prakasha, D.G.; Goyal, M. A homotopy technique for fractional order multi-dimensional telegraph equation via Laplace transform. *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* **2019**, *134*, 19. [CrossRef]
- Abidi, F.; Omrani, K. The homotopy analysis method for solving the Fornberg-Whitham equation and comparison with the Adomian's decomposition method. *Comp. Maths. Appl.* 2010, 59, 2743–2750. [CrossRef]
- 49. Lu, J. An analytical approach to the Fornberg-Whitham type equations by using variational iteration method. *Comp. Maths. Appl.* **2011**, *61*, 2010–2013. [CrossRef]
- 50. Alderremy, A.A.; Khan, H.; Shah, R.; Aly, S.; Baleanu, D. The analytical analysis of time-fractional Fornberg—Whitham equations. *Mathematics* **2020**, *8*, 987. [CrossRef]
- 51. Al-luhaibi, M.S. An analytical treatment to fractional Fornberg—Whitham equation. *Math Sci.* 2017, *11*, 1–6. [CrossRef]
- 52. Kumar, D.; Singh, J.; Baleanu, D. A new analysis of the Fornberg-Whitham equation pertaining to a fractional derivative with Mittag-Leffler-type kernel. *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* **2018**, *133*, 70. [CrossRef]
- Merdan, M.; Gökdoğan, A.; Yıldırım, A.; Mohyud-Din, S.T. Numerical simulation of fractional Fornberg-Whitham equation by differential transformation method. *Abstract Appl. Anal.* 2012, 2012, 965367. [CrossRef]
- 54. Akinyemi, L.; Iyiola, O.S.; Akpan, U. A reliable technique to study nonlinear time-fractional coupled Korteweg—de Vries equations. *Adv. Difference Equ.* **2020**, 2020, 169. [CrossRef]
- 55. Kilbas, A.A.; Srivastava, H.M.; Trujillo, J.J. *Theory and Applications of Fractional Differential Equations*; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2006.
- 56. Luchko, Y.F.; Srivastava, H.M. The exact solution of certain differential equations of fractional order by using operational calculus. *Comput. Math. Appl.* **1995**, *29*, 73–85. [CrossRef]
- 57. Podlubny, I. Fractional Differential Equations; Academic Press: New York, NY, USA, 1999.
- 58. Caputo, M. Elasticita e Dissipazione; Zanichelli: Bologna, Italy, 1969.
- Odibat, Z.M.; Shawagfeh, N.T. Generalized Taylor's formula. *Appl. Math. Comput.* 2007, 186, 286–293. [CrossRef]
- 60. Argyros, I.K. Convergence and Applications of Newton-Type Iterations; Springer: New York, NY, USA, 2008.
- 61. Abbasbandy, S.; Jalili, M. Determination of optimal convergence-control parameter value in homotopy analysis method. *Numer. Algor.* **2013**, *64*, 593–605. [CrossRef]
- 62. Liao, S.J. *The Homotopy Analysis Method in Nonlinear Differential Equations;* Higher Education Press: Beijing, China; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2012.

- 63. Zhang, J.; Wei, Z.; Li, L.; Zhou, C. Least-squares residual power series method for the time fractional differential equations. *Complexity* **2019**, 2019, 6159024. [CrossRef]
- 64. Liu, Y.; Li, Z.; Zhang, Y. Homotopy perturbation method to fractional biological population equation. *Diff. Calculus.* **2011**, *1*, 117–127. [CrossRef]

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



 \bigcirc 2020 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).