


NORGES TEKNISK-NATURVITENSKAPELIGE
UNIVERSITET

Energy-preserving Runge-Kutta methods

by

E. Celledoni, R. McLachlan, D. McLaren, B. Owren, G. Quispel, and
W. Wright

PREPRINT
NUMERICS NO. 6/2008



NORWEGIAN UNIVERSITY OF
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
TRONDHEIM, NORWAY

This report has URL
<http://www.math.ntnu.no/preprint/numerics/2008/N6-2008.pdf>
Address: Department of Mathematical Sciences, Norwegian University of Science and
Technology, N-7491 Trondheim, Norway.

Energy-preserving Runge–Kutta methods

E. Celledoni, R. McLachlan, D. McLaren, B. Owren, G. Quispel, and W. Wright

September 30, 2008

We show that while Runge–Kutta methods cannot preserve polynomial invariants in general, they can preserve polynomials that are energy invariant of canonical Hamiltonian systems.

Energy-preserving Runge–Kutta methods

E Celledoni*, Robert I McLachlan†, David I McLaren‡, Brynjulf Owren*,
G Reinout W Quispel‡, and William M Wright‡

May 7, 2008

Abstract

We show that while Runge–Kutta methods cannot preserve polynomial invariants in general, they can preserve polynomials that are the energy invariant of canonical Hamiltonian systems.

All Runge–Kutta (RK) methods preserve arbitrary linear invariants [12], and some (the symplectic) RK methods preserve arbitrary quadratic invariants [4]. However, no RK method can preserve arbitrary polynomial invariants of degree 3 or higher of arbitrary vector fields [1]; the linear system $\dot{x} = x$, $\dot{y} = y$, $\dot{z} = -2z$, with invariant xyz , provides an example. (Preservation would require $R(h)^2R(-2h) \equiv 1$, where R is the stability function of the method; but this requires $R(z) = e^z$, which is impossible [7].) This result does not rule out, however, the existence of RK methods that preserve *particular* (as opposed to arbitrary) invariants. Since the invariant does not appear in the RK method, this will require some special relationship between the invariant and the vector field. Such a relationship does exist in the case of the energy invariant of canonical Hamiltonian systems: see [3, 5] on energy-preserving B-series. In this article we show that for any polynomial Hamiltonian function, there exists an RK method of any order that preserves it.

The key is the Average Vector Field (AVF) method introduced in [8] and identified as a linear and energy-preserving method in [10]: for the differential equation

$$\dot{x} = f(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (1)$$

the AVF method is the map $x \mapsto x'$ defined by

$$\frac{x' - x}{h} = \int_0^1 f(\xi x' + (1 - \xi)x) d\xi. \quad (2)$$

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, NTNU, 7491 Trondheim, Norway

†Institute of Fundamental Sciences, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

‡Mathematics Department, La Trobe University, Bundoora, VIC 3083, Australia

Proposition 1 *The AVF method is a B-series method, is affine-covariant [9], self-adjoint, and of order 2. When*

$$f(x) = J^{-1}\nabla H(x), \quad J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad H: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (3)$$

the AVF method preserves the energy H . It is pseudo-symplectic of order 2 (but not 3) and conjugate-pseudo-symplectic of order 4 (but not 5).

Proof The existence of the B-series can be seen simply by expanding x' in a Taylor series. Alternatively, the B-series can be calculated by substituting the assumed B-series¹

$$x' = x + \sum_{t \in T} \frac{h^{|t|}}{\sigma(t)} b(t) F(t) \quad (4)$$

for x' into $f(\xi x' + (1 - \xi)x)$, evaluating the coefficients of the latter using Lemma III.1.9 of [7], and integrating term-by-term, to get

$$b(\bullet) = 1, \quad b([t_1, \dots, t_n]) = \frac{1}{n+1} b(t_1) \dots b(t_n). \quad (5)$$

That is,

$$x' = x + hf + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f'(f) + h^3 \left(\frac{1}{6}f''(f, f) + \frac{1}{4}f'(f'(f)) \right) + \dots \quad (6)$$

which can be compared to the expansion of the exact solution,

$$x(h) = x + hf + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f'(f) + h^3 \left(\frac{1}{6}f''(f, f) + \frac{1}{6}f'(f'(f)) \right) + \dots, \quad (7)$$

showing that the order is 2. All B-series methods are affine-covariant. Self-adjointness is easily checked using the change of variables $\xi' = 1 - \xi$ in (2). The change in energy in one step is (where $()^\top$ denotes transpose)

$$\begin{aligned} H(x') - H(x) &= \int_0^1 \nabla H(\xi x' + (1 - \xi)x)^\top (x' - x) d\xi \\ &= h \left(\int_0^1 \nabla H(\xi x' + (1 - \xi)x) d\xi \right)^\top \left(\int_0^1 f(\xi x' + (1 - \xi)x) d\xi \right) \\ &= h \left(\int_0^1 \nabla H(\xi x' + (1 - \xi)x) d\xi \right)^\top J^{-1} \left(\int_0^1 \nabla H(\xi x' + (1 - \xi)x) d\xi \right) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

¹See [7] for background on B-series. Here T is the set of rooted trees, $F(t)$ is the elementary differential associated with the tree t , $|t|$ is the number of vertices of t , and $\sigma(t)$ is the symmetry coefficient (number of automorphisms) of t . For example, $\mathbf{V} \in T$, $\sigma(\mathbf{V}) = 2$, and $F(\mathbf{V}) = f''(f, f)$.

Because the AVF method has order 2, it is pseudo-symplectic of order 2 (see [7] for an introduction to pseudo-symplecticity). The condition to be pseudo-symplectic of order 3 is $b(u \circ v) + b(v \circ u) - b(u)b(v) = 0$ for $u = \bullet$ and $v = \mathfrak{I}$. We have $b(\mathfrak{I}) = \frac{1}{4}$, $b(\mathfrak{V}) = \frac{1}{3}$, $b(\bullet) = 1$, and $b(\mathfrak{J}) = \frac{1}{2}$, so this condition is not satisfied. However, all B-series methods of order 2 are conjugate-pseudo-symplectic of order 3 in general and 4 if they are self-adjoint [7]. To check conjugate-pseudo-symplecticity at order 5 we calculate all 9 coefficients of the B-series at order 5 and check the 3 conditions given as Eqs. (3.7.18–20) of Scully [11] and too lengthy to reproduce here; they are not satisfied. ■

While the AVF method requires, in general, the evaluation of the integral of a function of one variable, the following can often be used to avoid this. By linearity, it extends to give the AVF for Hamiltonians that are sums of functions of 1 variable.

Proposition 2 *If $H = H(a^\top x)$ then*

$$\int_0^1 f(\xi x' + (1 - \xi)x) d\xi = J^{-1} a \frac{H(a^\top x') - H(a^\top x)}{a^\top x' - a^\top x} \quad (9)$$

Proof We have $f = J^{-1} a H'(a^\top x)$, and $\int_0^1 H'(a^\top x' \xi + a^\top x(1 - \xi)) d\xi$ can be integrated directly to give the result. ■

We now replace the integral in (2) by a quadrature to get the following

Proposition 3 *Let (b_i, c_i) , $i = 1, \dots, s$ be the weights and nodes of a quadrature rule on $[0, 1]$ that is exact on polynomials of degree $m - 1$. Let H be a polynomial of degree m . Then the s -stage Runge–Kutta method*

$$\frac{x' - x}{h} = \sum_{i=1}^s b_i f(x + hc_i) \quad (10)$$

preserves H , is consistent, mono-implicit, of order $\min(m, 2)$, and is self-adjoint when the quadrature rule is symmetric.

Gauss quadrature, for example, preserves all polynomial Hamiltonians up to degree $2s$. The B-series of methods of the form (10) take the same values as the AVF method (i.e., (5)) on trees with at most $2s - 1$ branches at each vertex. Compositions of (10) and its adjoint then give RK methods of any order that preserve the energy.²

²Proposition 3 contradicts *non-existence* results in the literature, namely Propositions 1 (a necessary condition for an RK method to preserve a generic invariant is that it be symplectic; the methods (10) are not symplectic), 3 (a necessary condition for an RK method to preserve an invariant is that the invariant satisfy a certain PDE), and 5 (an RK method cannot preserve general polynomial invariants) of [6]. These propositions are false. The error in the proofs can be seen in the final equation in the proof of Proposition

Examples are the midpoint rule (energy-preserving for quadratic Hamiltonians) and Simpson's rule

$$\frac{x' - x}{h} = \frac{1}{6}f(x) + \frac{2}{3}f\left(\frac{x + x'}{2}\right) + \frac{1}{6}f(x') \quad (12)$$

that is second-order, self-adjoint, and energy-preserving for quartic Hamiltonians. One can also regard the representation (10) as a good way to implement (2) when H is a polynomial.

Such an existence result motivates the study of energy-preserving RK methods in general.

Proposition 4 *An energy-preserving B-series must satisfy all the quadrature order conditions. No RK method is energy-preserving in general.*

Proof Consider the Hamiltonian $H = p - F(q)$ with ODEs $\dot{q} = 1$, $\dot{p} = f(q)$ where $F' = f$. The elementary differential associated with the bushy tree with n leaves is $(\delta_{n0}, f^{(n)}(q))$. All B-series methods give $q' = q + h$. Energy preservation requires $p' - F(q') = p - F(q)$ or $p' = p + \int_{t_0}^{t_0+h} f(t) dt = p + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{h^n}{n!} f^{(n-1)}(t_0)$; the terms of this Taylor series give the quadrature order conditions on the bushy trees.

Applying an RK method to this system gives $p' = p + \sum_{i=1}^s b_i f(t_0 + c_i h)$. This cannot equal $p + \int_{t_0}^{t_0+h} f(t) dt$ for all f because the quadrature rule cannot be exact on all f . (Choose an f that is zero at the quadrature nodes but has nonzero integral.) ■

The same proof shows that no B-series method that uses only a finite number of values of f and its derivatives can be energy-preserving in general. Some kind of integral, as in the AVF method (2), is required.

Proposition 5 *A Runge–Kutta method is energy-preserving for all quadratic Hamiltonians iff $R(z)R(-z) \equiv 1$.*

Proof Let the Hamiltonian be $\frac{1}{2}x^\top Hx$ and the vector field be $f = J^{-1}Hx$. The RK method yields $x' = R(hJ^{-1}H)x$,

$$H(x') = \frac{1}{2}x^\top R(hJ^{-1}H)^\top H R(hJ^{-1}H)x, \quad (13)$$

1 of [6]: in our notation,

$$H(x') - H(x) = \frac{1}{2}h^2 \sum_{i,j=1}^s M_{ij} \mathcal{B}(H)(X_i) + \mathcal{O}(h^3), \quad M_{ij} = b_i b_j - b_i a_{ij} - b_j a_{ji} \quad (11)$$

where the X_i are the stages of the RK method and $\mathcal{B}(H)$ is a certain differential polynomial in H , from which it is concluded that, unless $\mathcal{B}(H) \equiv 0$, annihilation of the $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ terms it is necessary that $M_{ij} = 0$ for all i and j . In fact this is only sufficient. The $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ terms are not independent; one can substitute $X_i = x + h \sum_{j=1}^s a_{ij} f(X_j)$, then at $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ all one gets is the necessary condition $\sum_{i,j=1}^s M_{ij} = 0$, which, on rearranging, is the condition that the method be of order 2.

and is thus energy-preserving iff $R(hJ^{-1}H)^\top HR(hJ^{-1}H) = H$ for all h and for all symmetric matrices H . We have $R(hJ^{-1}H)^\top H = R((hJ^{-1}H)^\top)H = R(-hHJ^{-1})H = HR(-hJ^{-1}H)$, which gives the result. \blacksquare

Note that self-adjointness and preservation of arbitrary quadratic invariants are sufficient but not necessary for $R(z)R(-z) \equiv 1$ to hold. The RK method with $b = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$ and $a = (0, 0; \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ has $R(z) = \frac{1+z/2}{1-z/2}$, hence $R(z)R(-z) = 1$, but is not self-adjoint. Nor does it preserve arbitrary quadratic invariants. Preservation of quadratic energies provides s conditions (of degree $2s$) on the RK coefficients, self-adjointness and preservation of arbitrary quadratic invariants provide $s(s+1)/2$ conditions (of degree 1 and 2, respectively) each.

We do not know necessary and sufficient conditions for an RK method to preserve polynomial energies of a given degree, but we conjecture that for each s and degree d , there is a $p(s, d)$ such that an RK method that is pseudo-energy-preserving up to degree p is energy-preserving. For $d = 2$ we have $p = 2s$. For cubics, consider 2-stage methods. We find that there are methods that are pseudo-energy-preserving of order 3 that are not energy-preserving, but all methods that are pseudo-energy-preserving of order 4 are energy-preserving. These satisfy 5 conditions on their 6 parameters; there is a 1-parameter family of such methods, given by (10) for 2-node quadratures exact on quadratics. Thus $p(2, 3) = 4$.

Clearly no explicit RK method can be energy-preserving, even for (nonlinear) polynomial Hamiltonians. However, one can find explicit RK methods that are pseudo-energy-preserving to low orders. At orders 1 to 4 there are 1, 1, 1, and 3 conditions to preserve energy (and be consistent). The methods

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
 0 & 0 & 0 \\
 \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 \\
 \hline
 & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{3}{4}
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{c|ccc}
 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
 \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & 0 \\
 \frac{5}{6} & -\frac{5}{48} & \frac{15}{16} & 0 \\
 \hline
 & \frac{1}{10} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{2}{5}
 \end{array}
 \tag{14}$$

are the unique minimal-stage methods that are pseudo-energy-preserving of orders 3 and 4 but no higher.

Further results on energy-preserving integrators and the structure of B-series are contained in our forthcoming article [2].

Acknowledgements. WMW acknowledges support of NZST & the ARC. RIM acknowledges the support of the Marsden Fund of the Royal Society of New Zealand. GRWQ is the recipient of an Australian Research Council Professorial Fellowship.

References

- [1] M-P Calvo, A Iserles, and A Zanna, Numerical solution of isospectral flows, *Math. Comput.* **66** (1997) 1461–1486.

- [2] E Celledoni, R I McLachlan, D I McLaren, B Owren, G R W Quispel, and W M Wright, Energy-preserving integrators and the structure of B-series, *in preparation*.
- [3] P Chartier, E Faou, and A Murua, An algebraic approach to invariant preserving integrators: The case of quadratic and Hamiltonian invariants, *Numer. Math.* **103** (2006), 575–590.
- [4] G J Cooper, Stability of Runge–Kutta methods for trajectory problems, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* **7** (1987) 1–13.
- [5] E Faou, E Hairer, and T–L Pham, Energy conservation with non-symplectic methods: examples and counter-examples, *BIT* **44** (2004) 699–709.
- [6] A Iserles and A Zanna, Preserving algebraic invariants with Runge–Kutta methods, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **125** (2000) 69–81.
- [7] E Hairer, C Lubich, and G Wanner, *Geometric Numerical Integration: Structure-Preserving Algorithms for Ordinary Differential Equations*, Springer, Berlin, 2nd ed., 2006.
- [8] R I McLachlan, G R W Quispel, and N Robidoux, Geometric integration using discrete gradients, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. A* **357** (1999), 1021–1046.
- [9] R I McLachlan, G R W Quispel, and G S Turner, Numerical integrators that preserve symmetries and reversing symmetries, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **35** (1998) 586–599.
- [10] G R W Quispel and D I McLaren, A new class of energy-preserving numerical integration methods, *J. Phys. A* **41** (2008) 045206 (7pp).
- [11] J E Scully, A search for improved numerical integration methods using rooted trees and splitting, MSc Thesis, La Trobe University, 2002.
- [12] L F Shampine, Conservation laws and the numerical solution of ODEs, *Comput. Math. Appl.* **12B** (1986) 1287–1296.