

# Geometric Integrators for ODEs

Robert I McLachlan<sup>†</sup> and G Reinout W Quispel<sup>‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

<sup>‡</sup>La Trobe University, Bundoora, VIC 3083, Australia

**Abstract.** Geometric integration is the numerical integration of a differential equation, while preserving one or more of its “geometric” properties exactly, i.e. to within round-off error. Many of these geometric properties are of crucial importance in physical applications: preservation of energy, momentum, angular momentum, phase space volume, symmetries, time-reversal symmetry, symplectic structure and dissipation are examples. In this paper we present a survey of geometric numerical integration methods for ordinary differential equations. Our aim has been to make the review of use for both the novice and the more experienced practitioner interested in the new developments and directions of the past decade. To this end, the reader who is interested in reading up on detailed technicalities will be provided with numerous signposts to the relevant literature.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Geometric integration

The topic of this review is structure-preserving numerical integration methods for ordinary differential equations (ODEs)<sup>‡</sup> We will concentrate mainly on Hamiltonian equations and on methods that preserve their symplectic structure, first integrals, symmetries, or phase-space volume. We also consider Hamiltonian systems with a dissipative perturbation. More details on these topics and extensive references can be found in several recent books [44, 67, 103, 109] and survey articles [17, 18, 33, 45, 57, 69, 71, 83, 84]. Physical applications are ubiquitous, varying from celestial mechanics [62], via particle accelerators [35], to molecular dynamics [65] and many areas in between (see, e.g., applications in quantum mechanics [114] and complex systems [1]).

In recent decades the theme of structure preservation has emerged in nearly every branch of numerical analysis, most notably in numerical differential equations and numerical linear algebra. The motivations for preserving structure include

- (i) it may yield methods that are faster, simpler, more stable, and/or more accurate, as in methods for structured eigenvalue problems and for some types of ODEs;
- (ii) it may yield methods that are more robust and yield qualitatively better results than standard methods, even if the standard (quantitative) numerical errors are no smaller;
- (iii) it may suggest new types of calculations previously thought to be impossible, as in the long-time integration of Hamiltonian systems;
- (iv) it may be essential to obtain a useful (e.g. convergent) method, as in the discrete differential complexes used in electromagnetism [2, 52]; and
- (v) the development of general-purpose methods may be nearing completion, as in Runge–Kutta methods for ODEs.

Most geometric properties are not preserved by traditional numerical methods. The requirement of structure preservation necessarily restricts the choice of method and may impose a cost. In each case the costs and benefits have to be weighed. In some cases (as in some types of structured matrices and some classes of differential equations) it can be impossible to preserve the given structure [38], while in others it is unknown whether or not such a method exists ([83], §6).

These possibilities are illustrated by the two most popular geometric integrators. The *leapfrog method* [45] for the simple mechanical system  $\dot{q} = p$ ,  $\dot{p} = -\nabla V(q)$  with potential energy  $V(q)$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} q_{k+1/2} &= q_k + \frac{1}{2}\tau p_k, \\ p_{k+1} &= p_k - \tau \nabla V(q_{k+1/2}), \\ q_{k+1} &= q_{k+1/2} + \frac{1}{2}\tau p_{k+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

<sup>‡</sup> Geometric integration for *partial* differential equations is addressed by Bridges and Reich [15].

Here (and below)  $\tau$  is the time step. The leapfrog method (1) is explicit and second-order<sup>§</sup>, despite using only one evaluation of the force  $-\nabla V$  per time step (compared to two for a second-order Runge–Kutta method). It does not require the storage of any intermediate values. It is symplectic, preserving the canonical symplectic form  $\sum_i dq_i \wedge dp_i$ , and time-reversible. The total energy is not conserved, but nor does the energy error grow with time, even for time steps of the same order of magnitude as the frequencies of the system. Invariant sets such as periodic, quasiperiodic, and chaotic orbits are well-preserved in phase space. Leapfrog preserves linear and angular momentum (where applicable) up to round-off error. On the other hand, it does become unstable if the time step is too large (larger than  $T/\pi$ , where  $T$  is the shortest natural period of the system), and it does not preserve quadratic first integrals such as  $\|q\|^2$  where applicable.

The *midpoint rule* for the first-order system  $\dot{x} = f(x)$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , is given by

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \tau f\left(\frac{x_k + x_{k+1}}{2}\right). \quad (2)$$

It is implicit, and hence more expensive (uses more CPU time) than the leapfrog method. But it too is symplectic, this time for *any* Hamiltonian system with any constant symplectic or Poisson structure. It preserves any linear symmetries of the system, and is time-reversible with respect to any linear reversing symmetry of phase space. It preserves not just linear and angular momentum but any quadratic first integrals of the system. It is linearly stable for all time steps. Many more accurate or more widely applicable variants of these two methods have been developed.

On the other hand, no method can preserve energy and symplecticity in general [38]. No method is known that preserves volume in phase space and all linear symmetries [83].

The traditional problem in numerical ODEs is to compute the solution to the initial value problem  $\dot{x} = f(x)$ ,  $x(0) = x_0$ , at a fixed time  $t = k\tau$ , to within a given global error  $\|x_k - x(t)\|$ , as efficiently as possible. The class of method, its order and local error, and choice of time steps are all tailored to this end [19, 20, 46, 53]. In contrast, a typical application of a geometric integrator is to fix a (sometimes moderately large) time step and compute very long orbits, with perhaps many different initial conditions. Although the global error of each orbit is large, the phase portrait that emerges can still be close, in some sense, to the phase portrait of the differential equation. Once small global errors are abandoned, however, the convergence of each feature (e.g. energy, other first integrals, periodic and quasiperiodic orbits, phase space averages) has to be examined separately.

While the leapfrog and midpoint methods (Equations (1) and (2) respectively) are sufficient for many applications, there have been many developments since their geometric properties were discovered. Research in geometric integration has focused on three main areas: (i) Developing new types of integrators, and integrators preserving

§ The local error is  $\mathcal{O}(\tau^3)$  per time step, and the global error after integrating for a fixed time is  $\mathcal{O}(\tau^2)$ .

new structures; (ii) improving the efficiency of the integrators, by finding methods of higher order, smaller local errors, or allowing larger time steps, and by finding methods tuned for special classes of systems; and (iii) studying the behaviour of the integrators, especially their long-time dynamics and the extent to which the phase portrait of the system is preserved.

### 1.2. An illustrative example

We illustrate these themes by applying them to a venerable example, the Hénon-Heiles system. This is a Hamiltonian system with two degrees of freedom and Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H &= T(p) + V_1(q) + V_2(q), \\ T(p) &= \frac{1}{2}(p_1^2 + p_2^2), \\ V_1(q) &= \frac{1}{2}(q_1^2 + q_2^2), \\ V_2(q) &= q_1^2 q_2 - \frac{1}{3} q_2^3. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The standard geometric integrator for this system is the leapfrog method, Eq. (1). Numerous articles have illustrated the preservation of the phase portrait by the leapfrog method, the convergence of its invariant sets (e.g. quasiperiodic and chaotic) as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ , and the relative efficiency of various higher-order methods depending on the time step.

Here we take a different approach and illustrate geometric integrators as they are often used in practice. That is, rather than investigate what happens as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ , we study long runs with a relatively large time step. We will also take advantage of the special structure of (3) and use a new, highly tuned fourth order method.

We split  $H$ , not into kinetic and potential energies, but into linear ( $T(p) + V_1(q)$ ) and nonlinear ( $V_2(q)$ ) parts. The flow<sup>||</sup> of each is easily calculated, giving an explicit, second-order generalized leapfrog algorithm, Eq. (7) below (‘LF2’ in the figures). We compare this to a fourth-order (composition, i.e. leapfrog-like) method with 6 force evaluations per time step due to Blanes and Moan [14] that has been tuned for this type of splitting (see Eq. (56)) (‘LF4’), and to two non-geometric, standard algorithms: the ‘classic’ fourth-order Runge–Kutta method with fixed step size (‘RK4’), and a modern, adaptive fifth-order Runge–Kutta method, MATLAB’s `ode45` (‘RK45’). The step sizes and tolerances were adjusted so that each method used the same number of force evaluations<sup>¶</sup>. Our aim will be to show that, for this application, both geometric methods (LF2 and LF4) are better than both non-geometric ones (RK4 and RK45), and that, between the geometric integrators, LF4 is better than LF2. While the latter observation would be obvious if  $\tau$  were very small, it is non-trivial that this also remains the case for moderately large values of  $\tau$ .

Figure 1 shows the results for a **chaotic** orbit integrated to time  $t = 200$ . The global errors grow *exponentially* in time for all integrators, as expected. The time step

<sup>||</sup> the mapping in phase space defined by the exact solution of an ODE

<sup>¶</sup> The number of force or vector field evaluations is often used as a machine-independent measure of the amount of work an algorithm needs to do.

for LF4 is a moderate  $\tau = 0.1$ . The energy errors grow *linearly* for RK4 and RK45 but are *bounded* for the symplectic integrators LF2 and LF4. Despite the relatively large time step, the fourth-order method LF4 easily beats standard leapfrog LF2. (In fact, this advantage still persists even at  $\tau = 1$ .) Although we report energy and global errors, we specifically do *not* want to imply that these are directly related to the preservation of the phase portrait. Although it is necessary in a symplectic integration to check that  $\tau$  is small enough that the energy errors are bounded, this is not sufficient to ensure that the errors in any other quantity are small.

Figure 2 shows the results for a **quasiperiodic** orbit integrated to time  $t = 2000$ . The time step for LF4 is now  $\tau = 1$ , which is of the same order as the period  $2\pi$  of the harmonic oscillators in  $T(p) + V_1(q)$ . RK4 and RK45 now show a *quadratic* growth of global errors, while LF2 and LF4 show a *linear* growth.

Figure 3 shows the results for a **small-amplitude quasiperiodic** orbit integrated to time  $t = 2000$  with  $\tau = 1$ . Now the global errors of RK4 and RK45 are growing *linearly*<sup>+</sup>. Although the small amplitude helps RK4 and RK45, it helps LF2 and LF4 even more, because they capture the linear dynamics exactly and hence have global errors that vanish as  $q \rightarrow 0$ . (See also §4.2.)


The advantage of the modern method LF4 over leapfrog LF2 shown in Figs. 1, 2, and 3 would disappear if we had used instead the much cruder fourth-order method  $\varphi(z\tau)\varphi((1-2z)\tau)\varphi(z\tau)$ , where  $z = (2 - 2^{1/3})^{-1}$  and  $\varphi$  is standard leapfrog (Eq. (1)). This method, the first fourth-order symplectic integrator to be discovered [28, 110, 119] has errors 100 to 1000 times larger than LF4.

Figure 4 shows the dynamics of this small-amplitude orbit out to  $t = 20000$ . The periods of the orbit are about  $2\pi$  and 28084. Remarkably, the integrator LF4 captures this motion with a relative frequency error of about  $1.4 \times 10^{-4}$  at a time step of  $\tau = 1$ . The orbit for RK4 decays to 0, while the orbit for the adaptive method RK45 is more complex, but still bears little relation to the actual orbit; moreover, the dynamics of RK45 depends sensitively on the chosen tolerance.


Returning to the simulation of chaotic orbits, for an orbit  $x(t)$  let  $v(t)$  be a tangent vector (i.e.  $v$  obeys  $\dot{v} = f'(x)v$ ) and let  $\lambda(t)$  be the rate of expansion in the direction  $v(t)$ , i.e.  $\frac{d}{dt}\|v\| = \lambda\|v\|$  or  $\lambda = (v^T f'(x)v)/(v^T v)$ . For generic  $v(0)$ , the mean  $\bar{\lambda}$  of  $\lambda(t)$  is the largest Lyapunov exponent of the orbit.

Figure 5 shows the probability density function  $p(\lambda)$  of  $\lambda$  as calculated by LF2 for the chaotic orbit of Fig. 1 calculated for time  $t = 5 \times 10^5$ . For symplectic integrators like LF2, the finite-time estimates of the Lyapunov exponents come in exact opposite (+/-) pairs; in systems with widely varying exponents, this can lead to greater reliability in estimating them [85]. The exact value of the Lyapunov exponent  $\bar{\lambda}$  is 0.0812; an integration with  $\tau = 0.5$  (close to the largest stable value of the time step) gives  $\bar{\lambda} = 0.0724$ ; an integration with  $\tau = 0.125$  gives 0.0819. The sampling errors are about  $5 \times 10^{-4}$  in  $\bar{\lambda}$  and less than 0.04 in  $p(\lambda)$ . This illustrates the convergence of

<sup>+</sup> The second period of the orbit is very large. On the time scale shown, only the amplitudes of the harmonic oscillators drift; but this does not change their frequencies.



**Figure 1.** Advantage of newer, highly tuned geometric integrators. Global error (left) and energy error (right) for the Hénon–Heiles system with initial condition  $(q_1, q_2, p_1, p_2) = (0.25, 0.5, 0, 0)$ , which leads to a chaotic orbit that covers most of the energy surface. RK4: Classical 4th-order Runge–Kutta method. RK45: MATLAB’s `ode45`, a modern, adaptive, 5th-order Runge–Kutta method. LF2: second-order leapfrog, a symplectic integrator with one force evaluation per time step. LF4: a fourth-order symplectic integrator with 6 force evaluations per time step.




**Figure 2.** Advantage on quasiperiodic orbits. Global error (left) and energy error (right) for the Hénon–Heiles system with initial condition  $(q_1, q_2, p_1, p_2) = (0.1, 0.2, 0, 0)$ , which leads to a quasiperiodic orbit.


statistical properties of chaotic orbits. However, note that the error in these observables (up to 10% at  $\tau = 0.5$ ) is much larger than the *energy* error, which is only 0.6% at  $\tau = 0.5$ . Lyapunov exponents are almost impossible to calculate reliably with non-geometric integrators because the results are contaminated by sampling errors if  $t$  is too small and excessive dissipation if  $t$  is too large. We therefore do not present any results for  $\bar{\lambda}$  calculated by non-geometric methods.

### 1.3. Outline of the paper


In Section 2 we introduce the main types of methods used in geometric integration of ODEs: splitting and composition, Runge–Kutta and its variants, projection, variational, and multistep methods. In Section 3 we survey the main types of equations to which the methods are applied: Hamiltonian and Poisson systems, volume-preserving systems,



**Figure 3.** Advantage on nearly-integrable systems. Global error (left) and energy error (right) for the Hénon–Heiles system with initial condition  $(q_1, q_2, p_1, p_2) = (0.025, 0.05, 0, 0)$ , which leads to a small-amplitude quasiperiodic orbit.



**Figure 4.** A longer run with the initial conditions of Fig. 3. Right: a projection of the quasiperiodic orbit in phase space. Left: the slow exchange of energy between the two oscillators is only captured by the leapfrog scheme.



**Figure 5.** The probability distribution  $p(\lambda)$  of the rate of expansion  $\lambda$  of the chaotic orbit of the Hénon–Heiles system shown in Fig. 2, calculated by leapfrog (LF2) for time  $t = 5 \times 10^5$ . The results for  $\tau = 0.125$  agree with the exact value to within the sampling error.

and systems with symmetries, reversing symmetries, first integrals, and foliations. Here the properties considered are all intrinsic (i.e., coordinate-independent), geometric properties that control and characterize the dynamics of the system. Some dissipative, non-Hamiltonian types of systems are also covered. In Section 4 we specialize to consider properties that, although not intrinsic, nevertheless are numerically significant because they allow vastly more efficient methods: examples are separable or polynomial Hamiltonian systems, nearly integrable systems, and systems with multiple time scales\*. In Section 5 we cover the behaviour of geometric integrators, especially their stability, the convergence of invariant sets in phase space, and the rate of error growth of the solution or of the first integrals of the system. Section 6 surveys other computational problems: solving boundary-value and optimization problems, non-trajectory methods for analyzing dynamical systems, and the computation of Poincaré maps.

## 2. The main geometric integrators for ODEs

In this section we briefly define the main classes of numerical integrators that have been found to have useful geometric properties.

### 2.1. Splitting and composition methods

With phase space  $M$ , differential equation  $\dot{x} = f(x)$ ,  $x \in M$ , and  $f$  a vector field on  $M$ , splitting methods involve three steps: (i) choosing a set of vector fields  $f_i$  such that  $f = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i$ ; (ii) integrating either exactly or approximately each  $f_i$ ; and (iii) combining these solutions to yield an integrator for  $f$ . For example, writing the solution of the ODE  $\dot{x} = f(x)$ ,  $x(0) = x_0$  as  $x(t) = e^{tf}(x_0)$ , we might use the first-order-accurate composition method

$$e^{\tau f_1} e^{\tau f_2} \dots e^{\tau f_n} = e^{\tau f} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2). \quad (4)$$

The pieces  $f_i$  should be simpler than the original vector field  $f$ ; most commonly, they can be integrated exactly in closed form, as in Eq. (4). If so, and if the  $f_i$  lie in the same linear space of vector fields as  $f$  (e.g. of Hamiltonian vector fields, or of vector fields preserving a symmetry, reversing symmetry, first integral etc.), then the composition method (4) is explicit and preserves the appropriate geometric property automatically. For a detailed review of splitting methods, see [83].

The advantages of splitting methods are that they are usually simple to implement, explicit, and can preserve a wide variety of structures. Their disadvantages are that, except in particular special cases, the higher-order methods are relatively expensive, and that the splitting may break some particular property, such as a symmetry, that one may want to preserve.

Details specific to particular geometric properties are deferred to section 3.1; here, we discuss general aspects of composition methods. The composition (4) is only first

\* In the latter two examples, an intrinsic property emerges in an asymptotic limit.



order. The order can be increased by including more exponentials in a time step. For a splitting into two parts,  $f = f_1 + f_2$ , we have the general nonsymmetric composition

$$e^{a_m \tau f_1} e^{b_m \tau f_2} \dots e^{a_1 \tau f_1} e^{b_1 \tau f_2} e^{a_0 \tau f_1}. \quad (5)$$

By convention, we only count the evaluations of the flow of  $f_2$ , and refer to Eq. (5) as an  $m$ -stage method. The number of stages and the coefficients  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  are to be chosen to ensure that the method has some order  $p$ , i.e.  $\varphi = e^{\tau(f_1+f_2)} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^{p+1})$ . The method  $\varphi(\tau)$  is *time symmetric* if

$$\varphi(\tau)\varphi(-\tau) = 1 \quad (6)$$

for all  $\tau$ . It is easy to find time-symmetric methods, for if  $\varphi(\tau)$  is any method of order  $p$ , then  $\varphi(\frac{1}{2}\tau)\varphi^{-1}(-\frac{1}{2}\tau)$  is time-symmetric and of order at least  $p+2$  (if  $p$  is even) or at least  $p+1$  (if  $p$  is odd). In general, if  $\varphi$  is an explicit method, then  $\varphi^{-1}$  is implicit. However, if  $\varphi$  is a composition of (explicitly given) flows, then  $\varphi^{-1}$  is also explicit. Applied to the basic composition (4), this leads to the explicit “generalized leapfrog” method of order 2,

$$e^{\frac{1}{2}\tau f_1} \dots e^{\frac{1}{2}\tau f_n} e^{\frac{1}{2}\tau f_n} \dots e^{\frac{1}{2}\tau f_1}, \quad (7)$$

which is widely used in many applications. For many purposes it is the most sophisticated method needed. From the flow property  $e^{\tau f} e^{\sigma f} = e^{(\tau+\sigma)f}$ , the two central stages coalesce, and the last stage coalesces with the first stage of the next time step, so we evaluate  $2n - 2$  flows per time step, or  $2 - 2/n$  as much as the first-order method Eq. (4). Therefore there is an advantage in searching for splittings for which the number  $n$  of parts is small (say 2 or 3).

The simplest way to increase the order is to iteratively apply the following construction. If  $\varphi(\tau)$  is a time-symmetric method of order  $2k > 0$ , then the method

$$\varphi(\alpha\tau)^n \varphi(\beta\tau) \varphi(\alpha\tau)^n, \quad \alpha = (2n - (2n)^{1/(2k+1)})^{-1}, \quad \beta = 1 - 2n\alpha \quad (8)$$

is time-symmetric and has order  $2k + 2$ . This yields methods of order 4 containing 3 applications of Eq. (7) when  $n = 1$ , of order 6 containing 9 applications of Eq. (7) when  $n = 2$ , and so on [28, 110, 119]. The truncation errors of these methods tend to be rather large, however, although the order 4 methods with  $n \geq 2$  can be competitive and have some interesting properties [77]. Interestingly, the  $n = k + 1$  methods were also recommended by their discoverers [28].

A good, general purpose fourth-order method is given by (8) with  $n = 2$  and  $k = 1$ .

To get methods with fewer stages, one can use the composition

$$\varphi(a_1\tau) \dots \varphi(a_m\tau) \dots \varphi(a_1\tau) \quad (9)$$

where  $\varphi(\tau)$  is any time-symmetric method. See [108] for the best known high-order methods of this type. Methods of orders 4, 6, 8, and 10 require at least 3, 7, 15, and 31 stages (i.e., applications of  $\varphi$ ), but in practice the methods that give the smallest error for a given amount of work have even more stages.

It is also possible to consider composition methods formed from an arbitrary (usually first order and non-time-symmetric) method  $\varphi(\tau)$  and its inverse,

$$\prod_{i=1}^m \varphi^{-1}(-c_i\tau)\varphi(d_i\tau), \quad (10)$$

which is time-symmetric if  $c_i = d_{m+1-i}$  for all  $i$ . In fact, methods of class (10) are in 1–1 correspondence with methods of class (5), so a high-order method derived for two flows, such as the typical case of the flows of the kinetic and potential parts of the Hamiltonian, can be directly applied to any more general situation [75]. (A method (10) generates a method (5) by choosing  $\varphi(\tau) = e^{\tau f_2} e^{\tau f_1}$ .)

A good fourth-order method of this class, due to Blanes and Moan [14], is given by Eq. (5) together with  $m = 6$  and

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &= a_6 = 0.0792036964311957, \\ a_1 &= a_5 = 0.353172906049774, \\ a_2 &= a_4 = -0.0420650803577195, \\ a_3 &= 1 - 2(a_0 + a_1 + a_2), \\ b_1 &= b_6 = 0.209515106613362, \\ b_2 &= b_5 = -0.143851773179818, \\ b_3 &= b_4 = \frac{1}{2} - (b_1 + b_2), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

or, equivalently, by Eq. (10) together with

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 &= c_6 = 0.0792036964311957, \\ b_2 &= c_5 = 0.2228614958676077, \\ b_3 &= c_4 = 0.3246481886897062, \\ b_4 &= c_3 = 0.1096884778767498, \\ b_5 &= c_2 = -0.3667132690474257, \\ b_6 &= c_1 = 0.1303114101821663. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The coefficients of  $\tau$ , called variously  $a_i$ ,  $b_i$ ,  $c_i$ , and  $d_i$  above, cannot all be positive if the order of the method is greater than 2 [7, 105]. This can prevent the application of this kind of method to dissipative systems.

Various extensions have been considered in order to find more efficient methods. We consider the two that apply most generally here. The first is the use of a ‘‘corrector’’ (also known as processing or effective order) [6, 9, 118]. Suppose the method  $\varphi$  can be factored as

$$\varphi = \chi\psi\chi^{-1}. \quad (13)$$

Then to evaluate  $n$  time steps, we have  $\varphi^n = \chi\psi^n\chi^{-1}$ , so only the cost of  $\psi$  is relevant. The maps  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are conjugate by the map  $\chi$ , which can be regarded as a change of coordinates. Many dynamical properties of interest (to a theoretical physicist, *all* properties of interest) are invariant under changes of coordinates; in this case we can even

omit  $\chi$  entirely and simply use the method  $\psi$ . For example, calculations of Lyapunov exponents, phase space averages, partition functions, existence and periods of periodic orbits, etc., fall into this class. Initial conditions, of course, are not invariant under changes of coordinates, so applying  $\chi$  is important if one is interested in a particular initial condition, such as one determined experimentally.

The simplest example of a corrector is the following:

$$e^{\tau f_1} e^{\tau f_2} = e^{\frac{1}{2}\tau f_1} \left( e^{\frac{1}{2}\tau f_1} e^{\tau f_2} e^{\frac{1}{2}\tau f_1} \right) e^{-\frac{1}{2}\tau f_1}, \quad (14)$$

showing that the first-order method of Eq. (4) is conjugate to a second-order time-symmetric method, when  $f$  is split into  $n = 2$  pieces.

The error can be substantially reduced by the use of a corrector, with particularly marked improvement for nearly integrable systems (§4.2) and for Hamiltonian systems of kinetic plus potential type (§4.1). These improvements will typically reduce the error by 2 or 3 orders of magnitude.

The second extension uses the flows not just of the  $f_i$ , where  $f = \sum f_i$ , but also the flows of their commutators  $[f_i, f_j]$ ,  $[f_i, [f_j, f_k]]$ , etc. The simplest such method, for  $\dot{x} = f_1 + f_2$ , is given by

$$e^C e^{\frac{1}{2}\tau f_1} e^{\tau f_2 - \frac{1}{24}\tau^3 [f_2, [f_2, f_1]]} e^{\frac{1}{2}\tau f_1} e^{-C} = e^{\tau(f_1+f_2)} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^5) \quad (15)$$

where the corrector  $C$  is itself a composition approximating  $\frac{1}{24}\tau^2 [f_1, f_2]$  to within  $\mathcal{O}(\tau^4)$ . For simple mechanical systems with  $H = \frac{1}{2}\|p\|^2 + V(q)$ , this is the same as applying the leapfrog method (Eq. (1)) with the modified potential energy  $V - \frac{\tau^2}{24}\|\nabla V\|^2$ , effectively giving a fourth-order method with a single force evaluation [111].

In this review, we have only specified the coefficients of four particularly useful fourth-order methods, namely Eqs. (8), (11), (15), and (56) below. For other methods, and especially for higher-order methods, we refer the reader to the original sources [6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 22, 23, 26, 57, 70, 75, 76, 77, 95, 108].

## 2.2. Runge–Kutta-like methods

Runge–Kutta (RK) methods are defined for systems with linear phase space  $\mathbb{R}^n$  [20]. For the system

$$\dot{x} = f(x), \quad x(0) = x_0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (16)$$

the  $s$ -stage RK method with parameters  $a_{ij}$ ,  $b_i$  ( $i, j = 1, \dots, s$ ) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} X_i &= x_k + \tau \sum_{j=1}^s a_{ij} f(X_j), \\ x_{k+1} &= x_k + \tau \sum_{j=1}^s b_j f(X_j). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

RK methods are “linear”, that is, the map from vector field  $f$  to the map  $x_k \mapsto x_{k+1}$  commutes with linear changes of variable  $x \mapsto Ax$  [89]. (Alternatively, the method is independent of the basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ). This implies, for example, that all RK methods preserve

all linear symmetries of the system. They are explicit if  $a_{ij} = 0$  for  $j \geq i$ , although they cannot then be symplectic. The most useful Runge–Kutta methods in geometric integration are the Gaussian methods ([46], §II.7). They are implicit, A-stable (stable for all  $\tau$  for all linear systems with bounded solutions), have the maximum possible order for an  $s$ -stage RK method (namely  $2s$ ), preserve all quadratic first integrals of  $f$ , and are symplectic for canonical Hamiltonian systems. The 1-stage Gaussian method, usually known as the (implicit) midpoint rule, reduces to Eq. (2), and for linear systems, coincides with the well-known Crank-Nicolson method.

RK methods can be expanded in a Taylor series of the form

$$x_{k+1} = a_0 x_k + a_1 \tau f + a_2 \tau^2 f'(f) + \tau^3 (a_3 f''(f, f) + a_4 f'(f'(f))) + \dots \quad (18)$$

where each term on the right hand side is evaluated at  $x = x_k$  and the derivative  $f^{(m)}$  is a multilinear mapping from  $m$  vector fields to single vector fields. The terms in this series are called elementary differentials of  $f$  and the series Eq. (18) is called a B-series. (For a consistent method,  $a_0 = a_1 = 1$ .) There are other integration methods that also have a B-series. We call any such method a B-series method. A very general form is to generalize the right hand sides of Eq. (17) to be a sum over elementary differentials, each term of which is evaluated at each of the  $X_i$ , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} X_i &= x_k + \tau \sum_{j=1}^s a_{ij} f(X_j) + \tau^2 \sum_{j,l=1}^s a_{ijl} f'(X_j)(f(X_l)) + \dots, \\ x_{k+1} &= x_k + \tau \sum_{j=1}^s b_j f(X_j) + \tau^2 \sum_{j,l=1}^s b_{jl} f'(X_j)(f(X_l)) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Three special cases are (i) exponential integrators, in which an analytic function of the Jacobian  $f'(X_j)$  is incorporated [93]; (ii) elementary differential (EDRK) methods, in which all terms of each elementary differential are evaluated at a single  $X_i$  [95], and (iii) multiderivative (MDRK) methods, in which, in addition, only those combinations of elementary differentials that appear in the derivatives of  $x$  (i.e.  $\dot{x} = f$ ,  $\ddot{x} = f'(f)$ ,  $\ddot{\ddot{x}} = f'(f'(f)) + f''(f, f), \dots$ ) appear [46]. EDRK methods can be symplectic but MDRK methods cannot (except when one restricts to RK methods). Exponential integrators can be exact on all linear or affine systems and have been applied to stiff and highly oscillatory systems.

If we fix a basis in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , writing  $x = (x^1, \dots, x^n)$ , we can define the *partitioned* Runge–Kutta (PRK) methods, in which a different set of coefficients are used for each component of  $x$ :

$$\begin{aligned} X_i^l &= x_k^l + \tau \sum_{j=1}^s a_{ij}^l f^l(X_j), \\ x_{k+1}^l &= x_k^l + \tau \sum_{j=1}^s b_j^l f^l(X_j). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

They are not linear methods and do not have a B-series (although they can be expanded in a so-called P-series). Some PRK methods are splitting methods, but apart from

these, the most useful PRK methods in geometric integration are the Lobatto IIIA-IIIIB methods, of order  $2s - 2$  ([46], p. 550). These are symplectic for natural Hamiltonian systems and have two sets of coefficients, one for the  $q$  and one for the  $p$  variables. They also have a natural extension that is symplectic for holonomically constrained Hamiltonian systems.

### 2.3. Projection methods

Some properties can be preserved by simply taking a step of an arbitrary method and then enforcing the property. Integrals and weak integrals (invariant manifolds) can be preserved by projecting onto the desired manifold at the end of a step or steps, typically using orthogonal projection with respect to a suitable metric. For example, energy-preserving integrators have been constructed using discrete gradient methods, a form of projection [88, 92]. Although it is still used, projection is something of a last resort, as it typically destroys other properties of the method (such as symplecticity) and may not give good long-time behaviour. Reversibility (§3.6) is an exception, for  $R$ -reversibility can be imposed on the map  $\varphi$  by using  $\varphi R \varphi^{-1} R^{-1}$ , where  $R : M \rightarrow M$  is an arbitrary diffeomorphism of phase space. Since this is a composition, it can preserve group properties of  $\varphi$  such as symplecticity [89]. Symmetries are a partial exception; the composition  $\varphi S \varphi S$  is not  $S$ -equivariant, but it is closer to equivariant than  $\varphi$  is, when  $S^2 = 1$  [56].

### 2.4. Variational methods [73]

Many ODEs and PDEs of mathematical physics are derived from variational principles with natural discrete analogs. For an ODE with Lagrangian  $L(q, \dot{q})$ , one can construct an approximate discrete Lagrangian  $L_d(q_0, q_1)$  such as  $L_d(q_0, q_1) = L(q_0, (q_1 - q_0)/\tau)$  and form an integrator by requiring that the discrete action  $\sum_{i=0}^N L_d(q_i, q_{i+1})$  be stationary with respect to all variations of the  $q_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N - 1$ , with fixed end-points  $q_0$  and  $q_N$ . For regular Lagrangians, the integrator can be seen to be symplectic in a very natural way, and in fact the standard symplectic integrators such as leapfrog and the symplectic Runge–Kutta methods can be derived in this way. The advantage of the discrete Lagrangian approach is that it acts as a guide in new situations. The Newmark method, well known in computational engineering, is variational [73], a fact that allowed the determination of the (nonstandard) symplectic form it preserves; singular Lagrangians can be treated; it suggests a natural treatment of holonomic (position) and nonholonomic (velocity) constraints and of nonsmooth problems involving collisions [97]; and powerful “asynchronous” variational integrators can be constructed, which use different, even incommensurate time steps on different parts of the system [68]. In these situations variational integrators appear to be natural, and to work extremely well in practice, even if the reason for their good performance (e.g., by preserving some geometric feature) is not yet known [69].

### 2.5. Linear multistep methods [20]

These are not at first sight good candidates for geometric integrators. Defined on a linear space  $M = \mathbb{R}^n$  for  $\dot{x} = f(x)$ , a linear  $s$ -step method is

$$\sum_{j=0}^s \alpha_j x_{k+j} = \tau \sum_{j=0}^s \beta_j f(x_{k+j}). \quad (21)$$

Such methods define a map on the product space  $M^s$ , and can sometimes preserve a structure (e.g. a symplectic form) in this space. However, this will not usually give good long-time behaviour of the sequence of points  $x_k \in M$ .

Instead, one considers the so-called underlying one-step method  $\varphi : M \rightarrow M$ , which is defined so that the sequence of points  $x_k := \varphi^k(x_0)$  satisfies the multistep formula. (It always exists, at least as a formal power series in  $\tau$ .) Often the dynamics of  $\varphi$  dominates the long-term behaviour of the multistep method. Recently it has been proved [25, 43] that the underlying one-step methods for a class of time-symmetric multistep methods for second-order problems  $\ddot{x} = f(x)$  are conjugate to symplectic, which explains their near-conservation of energy over long times and their practical application in solar system dynamics.

## 3. Preservation of intrinsic properties of differential equations

### 3.1. Types of differential equations

In this section we survey first the types of differential equations that are considered in this paper, then their intrinsic properties, and finally the preservation of these properties by geometric integrators. First, Hamiltonian systems. In the most common case, a Hamiltonian system has the following form [72]:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{q} \\ \dot{p} \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{J} \nabla H(q, p), \quad (22)$$

where  $q$  and  $p \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , where the symplectic structure  $\mathcal{J}$  is given by

$$\mathcal{J} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Id \\ -Id & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

and where the Hamiltonian function  $H$  is the sum of kinetic and potential energy:

$$H(q, p) = \frac{1}{2} \|p\|_2^2 + V(q), \quad \|p\|_2^2 = \sum_i p_i^2. \quad (24)$$

More general is the case

$$\dot{x} = \mathcal{J} \nabla H(x) \quad (25)$$

where  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $\mathcal{J}$  is now allowed to be any constant skew-symmetric matrix, and  $H$  is an arbitrary (differentiable) function.

A simple example is provided by a classical particle of mass  $m$  moving in a potential  $V(q_1, q_2, q_3)$  and subject to a constant magnetic field  $b := (b_1, b_2, b_3)$ . This can be

modelled by Eq. (25), with  $x := (q_1, q_2, q_3, p_1, p_2, p_3)$ ,  $H = \frac{1}{2m}(p_1^2 + p_2^2 + p_3^2) + V(q_1, q_2, q_3)$  and

$$\mathcal{J} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Id_3 \\ -Id_3 & \hat{b} \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where } \hat{b} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -b_3 & b_2 \\ b_3 & 0 & -b_1 \\ -b_2 & b_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

In this example, as in Eq. (23), the matrix  $\mathcal{J}$  has full rank. In general, however, the determinant of  $\mathcal{J}$  in Eq. (25) may be zero. In this case, the system (25) is called a Poisson system.

More general again is the case where the Poisson structure  $\mathcal{J}$  depends on  $x$ :

$$\dot{x} = \mathcal{J}(x)\nabla H(x). \quad (27)$$

Here, in addition to being skew,  $\mathcal{J}$  must satisfy the so-called Jacobi identity:

$$\sum_{\ell} \left\{ \mathcal{J}_{i\ell} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\ell}} \mathcal{J}_{jk} + \mathcal{J}_{j\ell} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\ell}} \mathcal{J}_{ki} + \mathcal{J}_{k\ell} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\ell}} \mathcal{J}_{ij} \right\} = 0, \quad i, j, k = 1, \dots, n. \quad (28)$$

Finally, the most general case we will consider is the nonautonomous version of (27):

$$\dot{x} = \mathcal{J}(x)\nabla H(x, t). \quad (29)$$

### 3.2. Symplectic structure

Considering these systems of increasing generality (22), (25), (27), (29), we note that in all cases they preserve the symplectic two-form  $\sharp$

$$\Omega := \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{J}_{ij}^{-1}(x) dx_i \wedge dx_j \quad (30)$$

This is equivalent to saying that these equations can be derived from an underlying variational problem using Hamilton's principle. This symplectic/variational structure has many important physical and mathematical consequences, and it is therefore usually important to preserve if possible.

### 3.3. Conservation of phase-space volume

One consequence of the symplectic structure of Eqs. (22) and (25) is that these systems preserve Euclidean volume, while Eqs. (27) and (29) preserve a non-Euclidean volume, i.e., are measure preserving. For example, if the matrix  $\mathcal{J}$  in (27)–(28) is nonsingular, the system preserves the measure  $\dagger\dagger$

$$\frac{dx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_n}{\sqrt{\det \mathcal{J}(x)}}. \quad (31)$$

$\sharp$  If  $\mathcal{J}$  is singular, the form  $\Omega$  on a leaf is determined by  $\Omega(\mathcal{J}\nabla F, \mathcal{J}\nabla G) = \{F, G\}$  [72].

$\dagger\dagger$  Note that for non-singular skew  $\mathcal{J}$ ,  $\sqrt{\det \mathcal{J}(x)}$  can be expressed as a Pfaffian.

### 3.4. Conservation of energy

The next property we consider is conservation of the Hamiltonian/energy. This property is possessed by those equations above that are autonomous (i.e. by (22), (25), and (27), but in general not by (29)), as is not hard to show:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dH}{dt} &= \sum_i \frac{\partial H(x)}{\partial x_i} \frac{dx_i}{dt} \\ &= \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial H(x)}{\partial x_i} \mathcal{J}_{ij}(x) \frac{\partial H(x)}{\partial x_j} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where we have used the fact that  $\mathcal{J}$  is skew, i.e.  $\mathcal{J}_{ij} = -\mathcal{J}_{ji}$ .

### 3.5. Other first integrals

In addition to the above properties, shared by all (resp. all autonomous) Hamiltonian systems, it is not unusual for Hamiltonian systems to possess additional symmetries, foliations, or first integrals. We start by discussing first integrals, a.k.a. constants of the motion.

By definition,  $I(x)$  is a first integral of a system with Hamiltonian  $H$ , if  $\frac{dI(x)}{dt} = 0$  provided  $x(t)$  is a solution of Hamilton's eqns, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dI}{dt} &= \sum_i \frac{\partial I(x)}{\partial x_i} \frac{dx_i}{dt} \\ &= \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial I(x)}{\partial x_i} \mathcal{J}_{ij}(x) \frac{\partial H(x)}{\partial x_j} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Well known physical examples of first integrals are momentum and angular momentum. More generally, the so-called momentum map associated with certain symmetries (via Noether's theorem) is a first integral. In addition there exist many other examples of first integrals, including Casimirs (i.e.  $I$  that satisfy  $\sum_i \frac{\partial I(x)}{\partial x_i} \mathcal{J}_{ij}(x) = 0, \forall j$ ). Systems with a sufficient number of integrals to allow a solution of the system in closed form (in principle) are called (completely) integrable; some examples are the Kepler problem and the Toda chain. (For a discussion of foliations see [82].)

### 3.6. Symmetries

Symmetries occur in many physical systems. We can distinguish linear/nonlinear, continuous/discrete, and ordinary/reversing symmetries [39, 61, 98].

We start with a simple example of a linear, discrete, reversing symmetry. Note that the Hamiltonian (24) is invariant under  $p \mapsto -p$ . It is easy to see that the corresponding Eqs. (22) are invariant under  $\begin{pmatrix} p \\ t \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} -p \\ -t \end{pmatrix}$ . This is the most common form of time-reversal symmetry, and it has important physical and mathematical consequences. Common



(continuous) symmetries are invariance under translation ( $q \mapsto q + a$ ) and rotation ( $q \mapsto Rq$ ). An example of a system with a nonlinear symmetry is generated by the Hamiltonian  $H = \frac{1}{2}(p_1^2 + p_2^2)^2 + q_1^2 + 4q_2^2 + aq_1^{-2}$ . This system has an additional integral  $p_2p_1^2 + 8q_1q_2p_1 + 2(aq_1^{-2} - q_1^2)p_2$ , that (via Noether's theorem) corresponds to a nonlinear symmetry [51].

A map  $S : M \rightarrow M$  of phase space is a symmetry of  $f$  if it leaves  $f$  invariant (i.e.  $TS.f \circ S^{-1} = f$ ), while a map  $R : M \rightarrow M$  of phase space is a reversing symmetry of  $f$  if it maps  $f$  to  $-f$  (i.e.  $TR.f \circ R^{-1} = -f$ ). In general, a system may have both symmetries and reversing symmetries, and the group combining both of these is called the reversing symmetry group of the system [61].

### 3.7. Preserving symplectic structure

Symplectic structure for natural Hamiltonian systems described by Eqs. (22)–(24) can be preserved by splitting the Hamiltonian function into kinetic and potential energy, i.e., applying Eq. (5) with  $f_1 = \mathcal{J}\nabla\frac{1}{2}\|p\|_2^2$ ,  $f_2 = \mathcal{J}\nabla V(q)$ .

Each can then be integrated exactly, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\tau f_1} : q_{k+1/2} &= q_k + \tau p_k, \\ p_{k+1/2} &= p_k, \\ e^{\tau f_2} : q_{k+1} &= q_{k+1/2}, \\ p_{k+1} &= p_{k+1/2} - \tau \nabla V(q_{k+1/2}), \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Now we can use the composition (5) to obtain any desired order of accuracy (cf. §2) [119].

In general, we must split  $H$  into a sum of simpler Hamiltonians. Many simple Hamiltonians have been proposed and used [83]: quadratic Hamiltonians with linear dynamics; kinetic energies  $p^T M(q)^{-1} p$ , of which many integrable cases are known, and if nonintegrable, can be diagonalized and further split into integrable 2D systems; two body Hamiltonians such as central force problems and point vortices; monomials; the noninteracting (e.g. checkerboard) parts of lattice (e.g. quantum or semidiscrete PDE) systems with only near-neighbour interactions. A very general approach [34, 87] is to find vectors  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  such that  $a_i^T \mathcal{J} a_j = 0$  for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ . Then  $H(a_1^T x, \dots, a_n^T x)$  is integrable for any function  $H$ , and its flow is given simply by Euler's method  $x_{k+1} = x_k + \tau \mathcal{J} \nabla H(x_k)$ . Choosing suitable sets of vectors  $a_i$  then gives explicit splitting methods for any polynomial, an approach pioneered for use in accelerator physics [35].

However, for arbitrary Hamiltonians the only known symplectic methods are the symplectic Runge–Kutta methods†, i.e. methods of the form (17) that satisfy the symplecticity condition [44]

$$b_i a_{ij} + b_j a_{ji} - b_i b_j = 0, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, s. \tag{35}$$

† As well as their generalisations, the symplectic partitioned Runge–Kutta and symplectic B-series methods. Note that symplectic RK and B-series methods also preserve any constant symplectic structure for nonautonomous Hamiltonians  $H(x, t)$ .

There are no known methods that can preserve a general Poisson structure  $\mathcal{J}(x)$ . Splitting is the most practical method when it applies, the most famous example being the free rigid body, a Poisson, momentum-preserving integrator being just a sequence of planar rotations [74, 101, 65]. Methods that apply to arbitrary Hamiltonians for particular Poisson structures rely on finding either canonical coordinates or symplectic coordinates (a Poisson map from a symplectic vector space to the Poisson manifold). This can be done when  $\mathcal{J}(x)$  is linear in  $x$ , the so-called Lie-Poisson case. Such  $\mathcal{J}$  always arise from symplectic reduction of a canonical system on  $T^*G$  where  $G$  is a Lie group; a symplectic integrator for this system can reduce to a Poisson integrator [91].

### 3.8. Preserving phase-space volume

Because the preservation of phase-space volume plays an important role in many applications (e.g. in incompressible fluid flow), we here present volume-preserving methods for arbitrary divergence-free vector fields (this includes, but is more general than, Hamiltonian systems of the form (25)) [84].

We recall that, by definition, the ODE

$$\dot{x} = f(x) \tag{36}$$

is divergence-free if

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f_i(x)}{\partial x_i} = 0. \tag{37}$$

Using this, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_n(x) &= f_n(\bar{x}) + \int_{\bar{x}}^{x_n} \frac{\partial f_n(x)}{\partial x_n} dx_n \\ &= f_n(\bar{x}) - \int_{\bar{x}}^{x_n} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial f_i(x)}{\partial x_i} \right) dx_n, \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where  $\bar{x}$  is an arbitrary point which can be chosen conveniently (e.g. if possible such that  $f_n(\bar{x}) = 0$ ).

Substituting (38) in (36), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= f_1(x), \\ &\vdots \\ \dot{x}_{n-1} &= f_{n-1}(x), \\ \dot{x}_n &= f_n(\bar{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \int_{\bar{x}}^{x_n} \frac{\partial f_i(x)}{\partial x_i} dx_n. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

We now split this as the sum of  $n - 1$  vector fields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= 0 \quad i \neq j, n, \\ \dot{x}_j &= f_j(x), \\ \dot{x}_n &= f_n(\bar{x}) \delta_{j,n-1} - \int_{\bar{x}}^{x_n} \frac{\partial f_j(x)}{\partial x_j} dx_n, \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$ . Here  $\delta$  is the Kronecker delta. Note that:

- (i) Each of these  $n - 1$  vector fields is divergence-free
- (ii) We have split one big problem into  $n - 1$  small problems. But each small problem has a simpler structure than (36); each corresponds to a two-dimensional Hamiltonian system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_j &= \frac{\partial H_j}{\partial x_n}, \\ \dot{x}_n &= -\frac{\partial H_j}{\partial x_j}, \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

with Hamiltonian  $H_j = -f_n(\bar{x})\delta_{j,n-1}x_j + \int_{\bar{x}}^{x_n} f_j(x) dx_n$ , treating  $x_i$  for  $i \neq j, n$  as fixed parameters. Each of these 2D problems can either be solved exactly (if possible), or approximated with any symplectic integrator  $\psi_j$ . Even though  $\psi_j$  is not symplectic in the whole space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , it is volume-preserving. A volume-preserving integrator for  $f$  is then given by  $\psi = \psi_1\psi_2 \cdots \psi_{n-1}$ .

### 3.9. Preserving energy and other first integrals

Linear and quadratic integrals are all automatically preserved by symplectic Runge–Kutta methods. However, no other integrals can be preserved by such methods, so if the integral one wishes to preserve is e.g. cubic, one has to make the choice of whether to preserve the symplectic structure or to preserve the integral. For the latter purpose there are two main methods: discrete-gradient methods and projection methods. Each of these has its advantages and disadvantages. Here we will focus on projection methods, as they are somewhat simpler [44].

Define the integral manifold

$$M := \{x \mid g(x) = 0\}, \tag{42}$$

where

$$g(x) := I(x) - I(x_0) \tag{43}$$

and  $I : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^s$  defines  $s$  first integrals of the system. The standard projection method is now defined as follows:

- (i) Compute  $\bar{x}_{k+1} = \varphi_\tau(x_k)$  by any integration method  $\varphi_\tau$
- (ii) Project  $\bar{x}_{k+1}$  onto  $M$ , to obtain  $x_{k+1} \in M$

The projection step is usually done by minimising the Lagrange function  $\mathcal{L}(x_{k+1}, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\|x_{k+1} - \bar{x}_{k+1}\|^2 - g(x_{k+1})^\top \lambda$ , where  $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s)$  represent Lagrange multipliers. Stationarity of the Lagrange function is then given by  $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x_{k+1}} = 0$ ,  $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \lambda} = 0$ , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= \bar{x}_{k+1} + g'(x_{k+1})^\top \lambda, \\ g(x_{k+1}) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

To speed up the numerical process it is convenient to replace (44) by

$$x_{k+1} = \bar{x}_{k+1} + g'(\bar{x}_{k+1})^T \lambda, \quad (45)$$

$$g(x_{k+1}) = 0. \quad (46)$$

Since (45) is now explicit we can substitute it in (46) to obtain implicit equations for the Lagrange multipliers  $\lambda_i$ .

When a system has a large number of integrals which it is desirable to preserve it is better to see if they arise from some structural feature of the equation. If solutions are confined to lie in the orbit of a group action, each orbit is a *homogeneous space* and it is possible to make big progress using *Lie group integrators* [57].

A famous example is the Toda lattice, which can be written in the form  $\dot{L} = [A(L), L]$ , where  $L$  is a symmetric, tridiagonal matrix and  $A(L)$  is the antisymmetric, tridiagonal matrix with the same upper diagonal as  $L$ . Solutions are confined to the isospectral manifolds  $\{UL(0)U^{-1} : U \in O(n)\}$  and the eigenvalues of  $L$  are first integrals. Here the orthogonal matrices act on the symmetric matrices by conjugation.

Let  $g \cdot x$  be the action of  $g \in G$  on  $x \in M$ , where  $G$  is a Lie group and  $M$  is the phase space of the system. Write

$$\gamma(v, x) := \frac{d}{dt} \exp(tv) \cdot x|_{t=0} \quad (47)$$

so that all vector fields tangent to the orbits can be written

$$\dot{x} = \gamma(a(x), x) \quad (48)$$

for some function  $a : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ , where  $\mathfrak{g}$  is the Lie algebra of  $G$ . Classes of methods that can preserve the group orbits include Runge–Kutta–Munthe-Kaas (RKMK) integrators, Magnus methods (especially for nonautonomous linear systems), and splitting.

Instead of solving (48) directly, in RKMK methods its solution is represented as  $x(t) = \exp(y(t)) \cdot x(0)$  where now  $y(t) \in \mathfrak{g}$ . Since  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a linear space, any approximate solution for  $y$  will yield an  $x$  lying in the correct orbit. Now  $y(t)$  obeys the so-called “dexpinv” equation

$$\dot{y} = \text{dexp}_y^{-1} a(\exp(y) \cdot x(0)), \quad y(0) = 0, \quad (49)$$

which can be solved by any integrator. Here  $\text{dexp}$  is the derivative of the exponential map  $\exp : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow G$  and its inverse is given by  $\text{dexp}_y^{-1} a = a - \frac{1}{2}[y, a] + \frac{1}{6}[y, [y, a]] + \dots$  where the coefficients are the Bernoulli numbers; typically this series has to be truncated to the desired order. If an explicit third-order Runge–Kutta method is chosen as the base method, then the Lie group integrator

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 &= a(x_k), \\ k_2 &= a(\exp(\frac{1}{2}\tau k_1) \cdot x_k), \\ k_3 &= a(\exp(-\tau k_1 + 2\tau k_2) \cdot x_k), \\ l &= \tau(\frac{1}{6}k_1 + \frac{2}{3}k_2 + \frac{1}{6}k_3), \\ x_{k+1} &= \exp(l + \frac{1}{6}[l, k_1]) \cdot x_k, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

is third order and leaves  $x_{k+1}$  on the same group orbit as  $x_k$ . Many higher-order methods using as few as possible function evaluations, exponentials, and commutators have been derived [22, 23, 99]. Attention also has to be given to evaluating the exponentials exactly, or at least approximating them within  $G$ ; this can be computationally expensive.

Magnus methods can be used for linear problems  $\dot{x} = \gamma(a(t), x)$ , such as the time-dependent Schrödinger equation. Again they allow one to use evaluations, commutators, and exponentials of  $a$  to approximate  $x_{k+1}$  in the correct group orbit [12, 50, 55].

Splitting methods are more ad-hoc. One approach is to choose a basis for  $\mathfrak{g}$ , say  $v_1, \dots, v_n$ , and write  $a(x) = \sum a_i(x)v_i$ . The vector field  $\gamma(a_i(x), x)$  is tangent to the one-dimensional group orbit  $\exp(tv_j)(x)$ , hence if these are integrable, the ODE  $\dot{x} = \gamma(a_i(x), x)$  is integrable by quadratures. Splitting is preferred when it is desired to preserve some other property as well as the integrals, such as phase space volume. RKMK and Magnus methods, on the other hand, are “linear”, and hence preserve orbits of subgroups of  $G$  (as well as orbits of  $G$ ) automatically.

### 3.10. Preserving symmetries and reversing symmetries [89]

Linear and affine symmetries are automatically preserved by all Runge–Kutta methods. Linear and affine reversing symmetries are preserved by all so-called time-symmetric Runge–Kutta methods, i.e. methods of the form (17) that satisfy the time-symmetry condition

$$a_{s+1-i, s+1-j} + a_{ij} = b_j, \quad \forall i, j. \quad (51)$$

It follows that time-symmetric symplectic Runge–Kutta methods, apart from being symplectic and preserving any linear and quadratic first integrals, also automatically preserve any linear symmetries and reversing symmetries.

Starting from any numerical integration method  $x_{k+1} = \varphi_\tau(x_k)$ , a single nonlinear reversing symmetry

$$\begin{aligned} x &\mapsto R(x), \\ t &\mapsto -t, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

can be preserved by

$$x_{k+1} = R\varphi_{\frac{\tau}{2}}^{-1}R^{-1}\varphi_{\frac{\tau}{2}}(x_k), \quad (53)$$

provided  $\varphi_\tau$  commutes with  $R^2$ .

Preserving nonlinear symmetries is in general more complicated, and the reader is referred to [32, 52].

### 3.11. Dissipative systems

We will use the term “dissipative” to refer to systems in which the time derivative of a differential  $k$ -form is nonpositive. When  $k = 0$  the system has a Lyapunov function  $V(x)$  which obeys  $\dot{V} := \frac{d}{dt}V(x(t)) \leq 0$ . When  $k = 2$  the system has a symplectic form  $\omega$  which obeys  $\dot{\omega} := \frac{d}{dt}((e^{tf})^*\omega) \leq 0$ . When  $k = n$  the system has a volume form  $\mu$  which

obeys  $\dot{\mu} \leq 0$ , i.e. the system is volume-contracting. (Here the forms are evaluated on  $k$  arbitrary vectors.)

An important special case is when the  $k$ -form contracts at a constant rate, i.e.  $\dot{V} = -cV$  (in which case the foliation defined by  $\{x : V(x) = \text{const.}\}$  is preserved),  $\dot{\omega} = -c\omega$  (in which case the system is said to be conformal Hamiltonian [78]; in fact symplectic forms can only contract in this way), or  $\dot{\mu} = -c\mu$  (in which case the system is said to be conformal volume-preserving). In these cases the maps contracting the given structure actually form a group; for general contraction they only form a semigroup [85].

An example is provided by simple mechanical systems with Rayleigh dissipation. If the Hamiltonian is  $H = \frac{1}{2}p^T M(q)^{-1}p + V(q)$ , the equations of motion are

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{q} &= \nabla_p H, \\ \dot{p} &= -\nabla_q H - R(q)M(q)^{-1}p,\end{aligned}\tag{54}$$

where  $R(q)$  is positive definite. Now the energy  $H$  is a Lyapunov function, for  $\dot{H} = -\dot{q}R(q)\dot{q} \leq 0$ , and Euclidean volume  $\mu = \prod_i dq_i \wedge dp_i$  contracts, for  $\dot{\mu} = -\text{tr}(R(q)M(q)^{-1})\mu \leq 0$ . The symplectic form  $\sum dq_i \wedge dp_i$  contracts conformally if and only if  $R(q) = cM(q)$  for some constant  $c$ , as in the important and simplest case  $R(q) = cI$ ,  $M(q) = I$ .

Methods are available that preserve these properties. Doing so is particularly important when one wants to know the effect of very slow dissipation over long times. However, it is in precisely these cases that we should add the requirement that the differential form is in fact preserved when  $\dot{V}$  (resp.  $\dot{\omega}$ ,  $\dot{\mu}$ ) = 0. This will ensure both that the dissipation proceeds at the correct rate and that it vanishes if the solution tends towards a dissipation-free submanifold as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

To ensure that a Lyapunov function (or functions) decreases, one can use a form of projection combined with Runge–Kutta [41]. First, evaluate the stages of the RK method (17) applied to the original system  $\dot{x} = f(x)$ . Then, apply the *same* RK method to  $\dot{V} = \nabla V(x)^T f(x)$ . If the weights  $b_i$  of the RK method are all positive, then  $V$  will not increase. Finally, project the original RK solution for  $x_{k+1}$  to the manifold  $\{x : V(x) = V_{k+1}\}$ .

Conformal Hamiltonian systems can be integrated [78] by splitting off the dissipative part, which (without loss of generality) always has the form  $\dot{q} = 0$ ,  $\dot{p} = -cp$  and can be integrated explicitly. The non-dissipative part can be treated with any symplectic integrator.

Volume-contracting systems can also be integrated by splitting them into contracting and divergence-free parts. For example, the vector field  $g$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_1 &= f_1 + \sum_{i=2}^n \int_0^{x_1} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_i} dx_1, \\ \dot{x}_i &= 0, \quad i = 2, \dots, n,\end{aligned}\tag{55}$$

has divergence equal to  $\nabla \cdot f \leq 0$ . But for a scalar system, contractivity simply requires that solutions approach each other. Runge–Kutta methods that obey this are called

B-stable [109], which is equivalent to  $b_i \geq 0$  and  $b_i a_{ij} + b_j a_{ji} - b_i b_j \geq 0$  for all  $i, j$ . In particular, Gaussian Runge–Kutta methods are B-stable. The remainder  $f - g$  is divergence free and can be treated with any volume-preserving integrator. Volume-contractivity is only a semigroup property, however, and so the order cannot be increased beyond 2 by composition (because this would require negative time steps [7] that increase volume). Higher-order volume-contracting integrators require special techniques [42].

This leaves the cases when the system has several of these properties. These are unsolved in general, although there is some evidence that applying an integrator to (54) that would be symplectic in the absence of dissipation does provide good long-time behaviour and good tracking of the energy decay. Such methods can be constructed by splitting or by including dissipative forces in variational integrators by the Lagrange–d’Alembert principle [69].

## 4. Special Cases

The ODEs considered in Section 3 fall into natural classes defined by intrinsic, geometric properties. Their flows and integrators inherit these properties, which directly influence the nature of the dynamics of the system. In this section, by contrast, we consider properties that may not be intrinsic or influence the dynamics, but can nevertheless be usefully taken into account in integrator design. Splitting itself is an example: while writing  $f = \sum f_i$  with  $f_i$  integrable is (in a sense) intrinsic, it does not in itself influence the dynamics. We first look at special cases of splitting.

### 4.1. Simple mechanical systems

These are canonical Hamiltonian systems where the Hamiltonian has the form kinetic plus potential energy, i.e.  $H = \frac{1}{2}\|p\|^2 + V(q)$ , the norm  $\|p\|$  being induced from a metric on the configuration space; in coordinates,  $\|p\|^2 = p^T M(q)^{-1} p$ . Let  $f_2 = \mathcal{J}\nabla V$  and  $f_1 = \mathcal{J}\nabla \frac{1}{2}\|p\|^2$  be the Hamiltonian vector fields of the potential and kinetic energies, so that  $f_2$  is always integrable and  $f_1$  is integrable when the geodesics of the metric are integrable. In the simplest case,  $M(q) = I$  and the symmetrized composition (7) gives the standard leapfrog method, Eq. (1). The Lie algebra generated by  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  is far from being generic, however, and its special properties can be exploited in the design of the integrator.

First, note that  $[f_2, [f_2, f_1]] = \mathcal{J}\nabla \|\nabla V(q)\|^2$  (the Hamiltonian vector field of the function  $\|\nabla V(q)\|^2$ ) and hence  $[f_2, [f_2, f_1]]$  commutes with any other function of the coordinates only; for example,  $[f_2, [f_2, [f_2, f_1]]] \equiv 0$ . This means that  $[f_2, [f_2, [f_2, f_1]]]$  and numerous terms in the error expansion of a composition method are identically zero and that their order conditions (their coefficients expressed as polynomials in the parameters of the method, which must normally be set to zero) can be dropped. This allows methods, usually known as “Runge–Kutta–Nyström” methods, with smaller errors and often with fewer force evaluations as well. A full analysis of the Lie algebra

generated by  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  for simple mechanical systems is provided in [90].

A good fourth-order method of this class, due to Blanes and Moan [14], is given by Eq. (5) together with  $m = 7$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
a_0 &= a_7 = 0, \\
a_1 &= a_6 = 0.245298957184271, \\
a_2 &= a_5 = 0.604872665711080, \\
a_3 &= a_4 = \frac{1}{2} - (a_2 + a_3), \\
b_1 &= b_7 = 0.0829844064174052, \\
b_2 &= b_6 = 0.396309801498368, \\
b_3 &= b_5 = -0.0390563049223486, \\
b_4 &= 1 - 2(b_1 + b_2 + b_3).
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

This is the method ‘LF4’ used in Figs. 1–4. Note that, after the first step, the initial force is available from the previous time step, so only 6 force evaluations per time step are needed.

A further extension uses derivatives of the force. Because  $f_3 := [f_2, [f_2, f_1]] = \mathcal{J}\nabla(\|\nabla V(q)\|^2)$  is itself integrable, its flow can be included in the integrator. The flow of  $f_2 + \alpha f_3$  is given by

$$q(t) = q(0), \quad p(t) = p(0) - t(f_2 + \alpha(N'(f_2, f_2) + 2f_3'(Nf_2)))(q(0)), \tag{57}$$

which only involves evaluating one derivative of the force evaluated in one direction  $Nf_2$ . (Here  $N = M^{-1}$ .) This can be very cheap for some problems, e.g.  $n$ -body systems with 2-body interactions, for which it costs about the same as one force evaluation, or if the latter is dominated by expensive square root calculations, much less. For example, let  $W : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a potential such that  $V = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i,j \\ j \neq i}} W(q_i - q_j)$ ,  $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . Then

$$\sum_j \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial q_j} v_j = \sum_j W''(q_i - q_j)(v_i - v_j), \tag{58}$$

where  $W''$  is the Hessian of  $W$ .

The simplest method of this type uses a corrector to achieve order 4 with only a single force evaluation, Eq. (15) [111]. It can be extended [10, 11, 14, 26] by including more stages (this decreases the local error); going to higher order (up to 8th order methods have been found); considering near-integrable systems, described below; and including higher derivatives of the force.

This class of methods can also be used when  $f_1 = \mathcal{J}\nabla\frac{1}{2}\|p\|^2 + V_1(q)$ ,  $f_2 = \mathcal{J}\nabla V_2(q)$  (i.e.,  $V = V_1 + V_2$ ) if  $f_1$  is integrable, this being of particular advantage when  $f_2$  is simpler (e.g. smaller or slower) than  $f_1$ . The most famous example is the solar system, for which  $f_1$  contains the sun-planet and  $f_2$  the planet-planet interactions. The class can also be used on non-Hamiltonian systems of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x} &= f(x) + L(x)y, \\
\dot{y} &= g(x),
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$



where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $L(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ . For example, high-order systems  $\frac{d^k z}{dt^k} := z^{(k)} = f(z, \dot{z}, \dots, z^{(k-2)})$  have this form when written as the (divergence-free) first-order system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= x_{i+1}, & i = 0, \dots, k-2, \\ \dot{x}_{k-1} &= f(x_0, \dots, x_{k-2}), \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

where  $x_i = z^{(i)}$ .

#### 4.2. Near-integrable systems

If we are splitting  $f = f_1 + f_2$  ( $f_1$  integrable) and  $\|f_2\| \ll \|f_1\|$ , then  $f$  is near-integrable and this can be exploited in the construction of integrators. Specifically, introduce a small parameter  $\varepsilon$  and (by rescaling  $f_2$ ) let  $f = f_1 + \varepsilon f_2$ . The error of a composition method is automatically  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$  and vanishes with  $\varepsilon$ . (See Figs. 2, 3.) Splitting is superb for such nearly-integrable systems.

But, one can do even better. The error can be expanded as a double Taylor series in  $\tau$  and  $\varepsilon$ , and if  $\varepsilon \ll \tau$  then one can preferentially eliminate error terms with small powers of  $\varepsilon$ . The number of these terms is only polynomial in the order  $n$ , instead of exponential. Thus, we can beat the large cost of high-order methods in this case. For example, there is only 1 error term of each order  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon\tau^n)$  and  $\lfloor \frac{1}{2}(n-1) \rfloor$  of order  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2\tau^n)$ . One can easily build, for example, a 2 stage method of order  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2\tau^4 + \varepsilon^3\tau^3)$ , a 3 stage method of order  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2\tau^6 + \varepsilon^3\tau^4)$ , and so on [10, 63, 76].

This idea combines particularly well with the use of correctors. For *any* composition, even standard leapfrog, for all  $n$  there is a corrector that eliminates the  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon\tau^p)$  error terms for all  $1 < p < n$ . Thus, any splitting method is “really”  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$  accurate on near-integrable problems. This construction was used by Wisdom [118] to improve the accuracy of a long leapfrog integration of the solar system years after it had actually been performed! A combination of correctors and preferential elimination of error terms was also used by Laskar [64] in a solar system simulation which contributed to the 2004 Geophysical Time Scale.

#### 4.3. PDEs and Linear Parts

Consider the wave equation  $\ddot{q} = q_{xx} + f(q)$  with periodic boundary conditions in space. A pseudo-spectral spatial discretization leads to a set of ODEs of the form  $\ddot{q} = Lq + f(q)$ . Although the linear part  $\dot{q} = p$ ,  $\dot{p} = Lq$  could be split as in the standard leapfrog, it is also possible to split the system into linear and nonlinear parts, solving the linear part exactly. This is the approach traditionally used for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, for example [116]. This has the advantage of removing any stability restriction due to the splitting of the oscillators, and if the nonlinearity is small, we have the advantages discussed above for near-integrable systems. Furthermore, the highly accurate Runge–Kutta–Nyström, corrector, and multiderivative methods can also be used, and the time step can be increased using special methods for highly-oscillatory systems (§4.7).

#### 4.4. Nonautonomous systems

The usual way to treat these is to split the corresponding autonomous systems in extended phase space. In the Hamiltonian case with  $H = \frac{1}{2}\|p\|^2 + V(q, t)$ , for example, the extended phase space is  $(q, \xi, p, p_\xi)$  and the extended Hamiltonian is  $(\frac{1}{2}\|p\|^2 + p_\xi) + V(q, \xi)$ . Applying leapfrog to the indicated splitting gives

$$\begin{aligned} q_{k+1/2} &= q_k + \frac{1}{2}\tau p_k, \\ p_{k+1} &= p_k - \tau \nabla V(q_{k+1/2}, t_k + \frac{1}{2}\tau), \\ q_{k+1} &= q_k + \frac{1}{2}\tau p_{k+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

However, Blanes and Moan [13] have proposed an interesting alternative based on the Magnus expansion. To integrate the ODE  $\dot{x} = f(x, t)$  on  $[t_0, t_0 + \tau]$ , first calculate the autonomous vector fields

$$f_0 := \int_{t_0}^{t_0+\tau} f(x, t) dt, \quad f_1 := \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+\tau} (t - \frac{1}{2}\tau) t f(x, t) dt. \tag{62}$$

Then a second-order approximation of the flow of  $f$  is given by  $e^{f_0}$ , and a fourth-order approximation is given by

$$e^{\frac{1}{2}f_0 - 2f_1} e^{\frac{1}{2}f_0 + 2f_1}. \tag{63}$$

Each of these vector fields is then split and an integrator constructed by composition. This can be cost-effective because more information about the  $t$ -dependence of  $f$  is used [8].

#### 4.5. Systems with constraints

An ODE with a constraint forms a *differential-algebraic equation* (DAE), e.g.  $\dot{x} = f(x, \lambda)$ ,  $g(x) = 0$ . A great deal is known about how to integrate DAEs in general ([48] Chs. VI, VII, [4]). Here we are interested in the case when the DAE has extra structure which must also be preserved.

Consider a Hamiltonian system with configuration manifold  $Q$ , phase space  $T^*Q$  and Hamiltonian  $H : T^*Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . If the motion is subject to a holonomic (position) constraint that  $q \in M \subset Q$ , then the constrained system is again Hamiltonian, this time with phase space  $T^*M$ . The structure to be preserved is that the integrator should be a symplectic map on  $T^*M$ , expressed, however, in coordinates on the original phase space  $T^*Q$ , because often we have no good global description of  $M$ . Examples are bond length and bond angle constraints in molecular dynamics.

Suppose that we do have a second-order, time-symmetric, symplectic integrator  $\varphi : T^*Q \rightarrow T^*Q$  for the unconstrained motion, and that the constraints are specified by  $M = \{q : g(q) = 0\}$  where  $g : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ . Then the constrained equations are

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q} &= \nabla_p H, \\ \dot{p} &= -\nabla_q H - G(q)^T \lambda, \\ 0 &= g(q), \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

where  $G_{ij} = \partial g_i / \partial q^j$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$ . If the initial data  $(q_k, p_k)$  satisfy the constraints, i.e.  $g(q_k) = 0$  and  $G(q_k)p_k = 0$ , then a second-order, time-symmetric, symplectic integrator  $\psi$  is given by first calculating the new position by solving for the Lagrange multipliers  $\lambda$  in

$$(q_{k+1}, \bar{p}_{k+1}) = \varphi(q_k, p_k - G(q_k)^T \lambda), \quad g(q_{k+1}) = 0, \quad (65)$$

and then projecting the momentum to the constraint manifold by solving for the Lagrange multipliers  $\mu$  in

$$p_{k+1} = \bar{p}_{k+1} - G(q_{k+1})^T \mu, \quad G(q_{k+1})p_{k+1} = 0, \quad (66)$$

although the second step (66) can be omitted without affecting the essential behaviour of the method.

When  $H = \frac{1}{2}\|p\|^2 + V(q)$  and  $\varphi$  is given by the standard leapfrog method (1), this reduces to an integrator known as RATTLE. Although nonlinear equations have to be solved for the Lagrange multipliers  $\lambda$ , typically by iteration, the force  $\nabla V$  only needs to be evaluated once.

Since the method (65), (66) is time-symmetric, its order can be increased as desired by composition.

Another approach is to extend partitioned Runge–Kutta methods to constrained systems. The Lobatto IIIA–IIIB method [44] has order  $2s - 2$  with  $s$  stages and is time-symmetric and symplectic for systems with holonomic constraints. It is fully implicit, so a simple method like RATTLE would be preferred where possible, but if high order is needed, or if the Hamiltonian is not separable, then partitioned Runge–Kutta methods can be competitive. (Many complex mechanical systems have a nontrivial mass matrix  $M(q)$  and hence are not separable.)

The dynamics of nonholonomically constrained Hamiltonian systems is far less well understood. It is not, in general, symplectic. The Lagrange–d’Alembert principle which generates the nonholonomic equations of motion can be discretized to yield useful integrators which preserve the key geometric features of the equations, namely the constraints and reversibility [27, 80]. For example, if the Lagrangian  $\frac{1}{2}\|\dot{q}\|_2^2 - V(q)$  is subject to the nonholonomic constraint  $A(q)\dot{q} = 0$ , then one choice of discrete Lagrangian yields the nonholonomic analogue of RATTLE, namely

$$\begin{aligned} q_{k+1/2} &= q_k + \frac{1}{2}\tau v_k, \\ v_{k+1} &= v_k + \tau \left( -\nabla V(q_{k+1/2}) + A(q_{k+1/2})^T \lambda_{k+1} \right), \\ q_{k+1} &= q_{k+1/2} + \frac{1}{2}\tau v_{k+1}, \\ A(q_{k+1})v_{k+1} &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

where  $v = \dot{q}$  is the velocity. Like RATTLE, it is second order, time-symmetric, reversible, and has only one force evaluation. The reversibility appears to ensure favourable long-time energy behaviour [79].

#### 4.6. Variable time steps

In general purpose ODE software it is standard to adapt the time step during an integration so as to control the local error [46]. This becomes progressively more efficient than using a fixed time step as the diversity of regimes the orbit passes through becomes more extreme. In geometric integration, however, simply choosing the time step as some function of  $x$  (related to the force or its gradient, or to an estimate of the local error) will in general destroy any geometric properties of the integrator and hence destroy its good long-time behaviour.

Instead the idea is to adapt the system so that it *can* be integrated well using a constant time step. The adaptation must preserve the geometric properties of the system. Typically, however, the adaptation does make the system and any suitable geometric integrators more complicated.

The *Poincaré transformation* of Hamiltonian  $H$  on energy level  $E$  is  $\tilde{H} := g(x)(H - E)$ . Orbits  $\tilde{x}(\tilde{t})$  of  $\tilde{H}$  with energy 0 coincide with orbits  $x(t)$  of  $H$  and with energy  $E$ , but are followed at a different speed:  $\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}) = x(t)$  where  $dt/d\tilde{t} = g(x)$ . The monitor function  $g(x)$  is chosen to be small in regions of phase space that are difficult to integrate and the system with Hamiltonian  $\tilde{H}$  is integrated with a constant time step  $\tilde{\tau}$ , effectively reducing the time step in the difficult regions. However, even if  $H$  is separable then  $\tilde{H}$  is not, so an implicit symplectic integrator must be used for  $\tilde{H}$ . To reduce the cost, one can choose  $g(x)$  to be a smooth function that equals 1 away from the difficult regions, and choose an integrator such as two-stage Lobatto IIIA–IIIB Runge–Kutta that reduces to the leapfrog method on separable Hamiltonians. Then the calculation proceeds using standard leapfrog until the orbit enters the difficult region, when it automatically switches to the (more expensive) implicit method.

A related method has been proposed for the  $N$ -body gravitational problem [24]. The system has Hamiltonian  $H = H_1 + H_2$  where  $H_2$  is singular at collisions. The leapfrog method is applied to the splitting  $H = (H_1 + (1 - K)H_2) + KH_2$  where the monitor function  $K$  is equal to 0 near collisions, equal to 1 far away from collisions, and varies smoothly in between. Far from collisions, this reduces to standard, explicit leapfrog for  $H_1 + H_2$ . When  $K \neq 1$ , the first term  $H_1 + (1 - K)H_2$  can no longer be integrated explicitly; when this happens, its solution is evaluated numerically up to roundoff error using a standard integrator. (One could equally well use a symplectic integrator with a smaller time step.) Provided the near-collisions are rare enough, the extra cost is negligible.

There is more scope for transforming reversible systems by  $\frac{dt}{d\tilde{t}} = g(x)$ . When the original system is Hamiltonian and separable, there are reversible integrators for the transformed system [67, 47] that are either explicit or semiexplicit (require solving just a scalar nonlinear equation). Now there is essentially no cost to including adaptivity, but symplecticity has been sacrificed, raising questions about the long-time reliability of the integration. (For example, energy errors may be no longer bounded.) This method is in widespread use in molecular dynamics [67].

*Asynchronous variational integrators* [68] have been proposed in which each element (for example, each pair of particles in an  $N$ -body system) has its own time step, which can be either prescribed or determined variationally. The method looks very promising but has not yet been fully developed for ODE applications.

#### 4.7. Highly oscillatory problems

The leapfrog method for the oscillator  $\ddot{q} = \omega^2 q$  is stable only for  $\tau < 2/\omega$ . Step size restrictions like this can be a major performance bottleneck for large systems and many methods have been proposed to overcome them. Three broad classes of systems have been tackled:

- (i) the phase space coordinates can be partitioned into fast and slow variables (in molecular dynamics, the fast variables might be the positions and momenta within each molecule, and the slow variables the positions and momenta between them);
- (ii) the forces can be separated into fast and slow forces;
- (iii) a special case of (ii) in which the motion due to the fast forces can be solved exactly.

In each case the new methods allow the time step to be increased significantly, by a factor of 5 or more, while still obtaining reliable results.

The “reversible averaging” method of Leimkuhler and Reich [66] applies to problems of type (i). The fast subsystem is still integrated with a small time step, the slow variables being interpolated as needed, while the slow subsystem is integrated with a large time step, but with the force due to the fast variables being averaged along their orbit. This relies on the fast system being much faster to solve, as in molecular dynamics where it decouples into a sum of small systems. It is reversible and not symplectic, but appears to have excellent stability properties for large time steps on linear and nonlinear problems.

The “mollified impulse method” of García-Archilla, Sanz-Serna, and Skeel [37] applies to problems of type (ii). Suppose the system is described by  $H = H_f(p, q) + V_s(q)$ , where  $\|H_f''\| \gg \|V_s''\|$ . The method is the composition

$$e^{N\tau/2\mathcal{J}\nabla\bar{V}_s}(\varphi_\tau(H_f))^N e^{N\tau/2\mathcal{J}\nabla\bar{V}_s}, \quad (68)$$

where  $\varphi_\tau(H_f)$  is a time-symmetric, symplectic integrator for the fast system  $H_f$ , such as leapfrog. The expensive, slow forces  $\nabla V_s$  are only evaluated every  $N$  time steps. The mollified potential  $\bar{V}_s$  is given by  $\bar{V}_s(q) = V_s(A(q))$ , where the mollifier  $A(q)$  has the effect of averaging over the fast motion. A typical choice is  $A(q) = (2N\tau)^{-1} \int_{-N\tau}^{N\tau} q(t) dt$  where  $q(t)$  satisfies the reduced fast problem  $\dot{q} = \nabla_p H_f$ ,  $\dot{p} = -\nabla_q H_f$ ,  $q(0) = q$ ,  $p(0) = 0$ , which itself has to be integrated for  $2N\tau$  time steps using the method  $\varphi_\tau$ . This time-symmetric, symplectic method yields dramatic improvements in accuracy and stability over standard leapfrog, although some instabilities remain when the step size is in resonance with the fast frequencies.

These can best be analyzed by passing to the simplest case (iii), for which a key test problem is the system [44]

$$\ddot{q} + \Omega^2 q = -\nabla V_s(q), \quad (69)$$

where  $\Omega$  is symmetric and positive definite, so that the fast frequencies are the eigenvalues of  $\Omega$ . In this case the mollified impulse method reduces to

$$q_{k+1} - 2 \cos(\tau\Omega)q_k + q_{k-1} = -\tau^2 \psi(\tau\Omega) \nabla V_s(\phi(\tau\Omega)q_k) \quad (70)$$

with  $\psi(\xi) = \sin(\xi)/\xi$  and  $\phi(\xi) = 1$ , a method first introduced by Deuffhard [30]. In fact, the method (70) is time-symmetric, second order, and exact when  $\nabla V_s(q) = \text{const.}$  for any even functions  $\psi, \phi$  with  $\psi(0) = \phi(0) = 1$ . It is symplectic if  $\psi(\xi) = (\sin(\xi)/\xi)\phi(\xi)$ . It suffers from resonance instabilities when  $\tau\lambda$  is a multiple of  $\pi$  ( $\lambda$  an eigenvalue of  $\Omega$ ), but these can be greatly reduced by a careful choice of  $\psi$  and  $\phi$ . Dramatic improvements in accuracy and increases in the step size can be obtained compared with leapfrog. Unfortunately it appears that the requirements of symplecticity, lack of resonance instabilities, good long-time energy conservation, good long-time conservation of adiabatic invariants, and accurate slow-time-scale dynamics cannot all be achieved simultaneously [44].

*Exponential integrators* can be applied to highly oscillatory problems [40]. These are methods for  $\dot{x} = f(x)$  that incorporate entire functions of the Jacobian  $f'(x)$  or an approximation of the Jacobian. Most practically, one writes  $\dot{x} = Lx + N(x)$  and approximates  $f'(x)$  by the constant matrix  $L$ . The main strand of research seeks methods that are explicit, exact when  $N(x) = 0$ , and show good stability and high order on stiff problems (those with  $\|L\| \gg 1$ ), especially including discretizations of parabolic and hyperbolic PDEs. Enormous gains can be made compared to the common approach of simply treating the linear terms with Crank-Nicolson. See [93] for a survey of exponential integrators.

Lie group integrators based on the Magnus expansion can also be adapted to solve highly oscillatory nonautonomous linear ODEs [54].

## 5. Dynamical behaviour of geometric integrators

The main goal of geometric integration is to preserve phase portraits as well as possible. Therefore we first consider how well various invariant sets in phase space are preserved, either exactly or with a perturbation, before looking at the error growth in quantities that are not preserved.

### 5.1. Preservation of invariant sets

A useful reference for this subsection is Stuart and Humphries [109].

*5.1.1. Preservation of equilibrium points* All B-series methods and all linear multistep methods retain all equilibrium points of  $\dot{x} = f(x)$  exactly. Some B-series methods,

however, may generate additional, so-called spurious, fixed points [109]. The one-stage theta method

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \tau f(\theta x_{k+1} + (1 - \theta)x_k) \quad (71)$$

has no spurious fixed points for any  $\tau$  (for  $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$  it is the symplectic midpoint rule), and neither does the (symplectic) fourth-order Gaussian Runge–Kutta method. It has been conjectured that there are no higher-order Runge–Kutta methods without spurious fixed points.

Composition can, in general, introduce spurious fixed points. However, if we split  $f = \sum f_i$  such that  $\sum f_i(y_i) = 0 \iff f_i(y_i) = 0$  when  $y_i - y_j = \mathcal{O}(\tau)$ , then the first-order composition (5) has no spurious fixed points, and nor does the leapfrog method (1). The existence of higher-order composition methods with this property is unknown.

*5.1.2. Preservation of quasiperiodic orbits* One of the most important sources of nonlinear stability is given by the existence of invariant tori in phase space, guaranteed by the Kolmogorov–Arnold–Moser (KAM) theorems. Such theorems have been proved for Hamiltonian systems, for reversible systems, and for volume-preserving systems. This is one of the most important motivations for using integrators that preserve these geometric properties (usually a necessary condition for preservation of KAM tori).

Proofs that geometric integrators actually do preserve KAM tori seem to mainly have been given for Hamiltonian systems [44, 94, 104] and reversible systems [44]. The step size must not be resonant with the frequencies of the torus. Of course, the torus does undergo an  $\mathcal{O}(\tau^p)$  shift in its position.

Preservation of periodic orbits for Hamiltonian, reversible, and volume-preserving systems seems to have received much less attention.

*5.1.3. Preservation of integrals* This can of course be enforced if desired (see §3.5). But how do integrals fare if their preservation is not explicitly enforced?

*Energy* cannot, in general, be preserved by a symplectic integrator [38]. However, error analysis shows that energy errors can be bounded for long times (§5.2). Some other integrals can be preserved exactly: splitting methods preserve any first integral of  $f$  that is also a first integral of each  $f_i$ , where  $f = \sum f_i$ . For simple mechanical systems with  $H = \frac{1}{2}\|p\|^2 + V(q)$ , this includes any integral associated with a spatial ( $q$ ) symmetry. Thus the leapfrog method for separable systems preserves both linear and angular momentum. Quadratic integrals are preserved by any symplectic Runge–Kutta method, as mentioned before. Variational integrators can preserve integrals provided a discrete Lagrangian that preserves the associated symmetry can be found.

*5.1.4. Preservation of spectral properties and bifurcations* Of crucial importance for the dynamics near an equilibrium point are its linear eigenvalues. These eigenvalues are

generally grouped as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_i &\in \text{stable set, if } \operatorname{Re}\lambda_i < 0, \\ \lambda_i &\in \text{centre set, if } \operatorname{Re}\lambda_i = 0, \\ \lambda_i &\in \text{unstable set, if } \operatorname{Re}\lambda_i > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

A necessary condition for an equilibrium point to be stable is that its unstable set be empty. To each of the above three sets is associated a linear subspace, and these subspaces are tangent to their nonlinear generalizations, the so-called stable, centre, and unstable manifolds.

A second reason that eigenvalues are important is that bifurcations typically occur when the real part of one of the eigenvalues equals zero.

For both of these reasons, it is important to preserve the spectral properties of equilibrium points. This means that, corresponding to (72), we would like an integrator to have a fixed point with eigenvalues

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_i &\in \text{stable set, if } |\mu_i| < 1, \\ \mu_i &\in \text{centre set, if } |\mu_i| = 1, \\ \mu_i &\in \text{unstable set, if } |\mu_i| > 1. \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Time-symmetric Runge–Kutta methods that are also A-stable (such as Gaussian Runge–Kutta) have the property that if  $\lambda_i \in$  stable, centre, resp. unstable set, then  $\mu_i \in$  stable, centre, resp. unstable set, for all  $\tau$ .

Nongeometric methods will typically not have this property for any  $\tau$ .

Geometric methods will have this property for sufficiently small  $\tau$  provided that the spectrum of the equilibrium point is generic to the class of systems. The linearization of the flow will be perturbed by the integrator to a nearby matrix lying in the same class. Hence its spectrum will retain any forced or generic properties of this class: for Hamiltonian systems, the eigenvalues will come in  $\lambda, \bar{\lambda}, \lambda^{-1}, \bar{\lambda}^{-1}$  quadruplets, and, if they are elliptic and generic, will remain so. If the eigenvalues are nongeneric (e.g. double), or if the time step is too large, then the eigenvalues may change type.

Geometric methods, therefore, will undergo generic bifurcations at parameter values close to those at which the ODE bifurcates. (Nongeneric bifurcations are usually due to the presence of some other structure, such as a symmetry, which should therefore be preserved by the integrator to restore genericity.) Time-symmetric, A-stable Runge–Kutta methods do even better, for they perturb each eigenvalue by the same function, by  $\lambda_i \mapsto \mu_i := R(\tau\lambda_i)$  where  $R$  is analytic at 0. Bifurcations therefore occur at precisely the correct parameter values, and even nongeneric bifurcations with double eigenvalues are captured correctly. Only eigenvalue resonances such as  $\lambda_i/\lambda_j \in \mathbb{Z}$  are not captured correctly.

*5.1.5. Preservation of chaotic properties ([67], pp. 124–126)* By their very nature, chaotic orbits are hard (if not impossible) to compute numerically. This is due to the exponential divergence of nearby orbits in chaotic regions. In addition, the long-time



behaviour of some orbits can be extraordinarily subtle. This means that in general much care is needed and the convergence as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$  of any solution features should be carefully checked.

KAM tori can often act as a (partial) boundary between “ordered” and “chaotic” regions in phase space, and this is another reason why it is good to preserve such tori, e.g. by using symplectic integrators.

On the other hand, chaotic orbits in hyperbolic systems possess a shadowing property [59]. This property is structurally stable, and hence preserved by symplectic integrators. Reich [102] has used this property to prove that numerically computed time-averages are close to the real averages. Geometric properties of the system (esp. integrals, symplectic structure, and volume preservation) constrain the Lyapunov exponents of a chaotic orbit, hence geometric integrators that obey these constraints can give more accurate estimates of the exponents. (See Fig. 5.)

## 5.2. Error growth

Suppose the ODE  $\dot{x} = f(x)$  with solution  $x(t)$  is integrated by  $x_{k+1} = \varphi_\tau(x_k)$ ,  $x_0 = x(0)$ . The traditional objects of study in numerical analysis are the local error  $x(\tau) - x_1$  after one step and the global error  $x_k - x(t)$ , typically with  $\tau \rightarrow 0$  and the total integration time  $t = k\tau$  held fixed. For a method of order  $p$ , the local error will be  $\mathcal{O}(\tau^{p+1})$  and the global error  $\mathcal{O}((e^{Lt} - 1)\tau^p)$ , where  $L$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $f$  in the domain of integration ( $L = \max \|f'(x)\|$ ). However, in geometric integration, the step size is often held fixed (and is even quite large) while the number of steps  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . The global error bound is useless in this situation, and indeed, the global errors themselves typically would be large, especially on chaotic orbits.

If the global errors are small, then the error in any observed feature of the solution is also small. If the global errors are large, then the error in an observed feature can be small or large; the convergence of each feature has to be studied in its own right.

There are two situations, however, in which the global error of a geometric integrator can in fact be dramatically smaller than that of a standard integrator. The first case is when the system has some special structure that can be exploited to decrease the error, as in nearly integrable systems (§4.2) and systems for which the method (15) is efficient. The second case is when the solution is quasiperiodic. In a standard integrator applied to an integrable Hamiltonian system, for example, the action errors for almost all initial conditions are  $\mathcal{O}(t)$ , leading to frequency errors also being  $\mathcal{O}(t)$ ; these compound to give rise to  $\mathcal{O}(t^2)$  global errors. In a symplectic integrator the action and frequency errors are bounded on exponentially long time intervals; the orbit moves on a torus with slightly wrong frequencies, leading to  $\mathcal{O}(t)$  global errors. (See Fig. 2.) In a system with a mixture of regular and chaotic motion, one could still expect some favourable error behaviour near the regular orbits.

The integrator  $\varphi_\tau$  and the flow  $e^{\tau f}$  are both maps of phase space in the same class: symplectic, reversible, volume-preserving, etc. They are both  $\mathcal{O}(\tau)$ -close to the identity

and  $\mathcal{O}(\tau^p)$  close to each other. Any property of maps that is preserved by arbitrary small perturbations within the appropriate class will be preserved by the integrator. This includes many of the key features of the class of dynamics, such as preservation of KAM tori, genericity of bifurcations, Poincaré recurrence, and so on. However, sometimes one can say even more, using the theory of *modified equations* or *backward error analysis* [102]. This states that the integrator  $\varphi(\tau)$  is, up to a small error, close to the time- $\tau$  flow of an *autonomous* modified vector field  $\tilde{f}$  satisfying  $f - \tilde{f} = \mathcal{O}(\tau^p)$ . If  $\varphi(\tau)$  is analytic in  $\tau$  then the error  $\varphi(\tau) - e^{\tau\tilde{f}}$  is exponentially small in  $\tau$ . If  $\varphi(\tau)$  is symplectic (resp. reversible, resp. volume-preserving) then  $\tilde{f}$  is Hamiltonian (resp. reversible, resp. divergence-free). Backward error analysis can be applied both to reduce the study of maps to that of differential equations, which can be simpler, and to any case in which the dynamics of maps and flows is different.

The champion example is energy preservation. Hamiltonian systems preserve energy but symplectic maps, generically, do not. However, the modified vector field  $\tilde{f}$  is Hamiltonian and hence  $\tilde{f} = \mathcal{J}\nabla\tilde{H}$ ;  $\tilde{H}$  is called the modified Hamiltonian of  $\varphi$ . Taking care of the small error terms gives the result that there exists a time step  $\tau_0$  such that

$$\tilde{H}(x_k) = \tilde{H}(x_0) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\tau_0/2\tau}), \quad (74)$$

implying

$$H(x_k) = \tilde{H}(x_0) + \mathcal{O}(\tau^p), \quad (75)$$

for all  $|\tau| < \tau_0$  and for all  $|t| < e^{\tau_0/2\tau}$ . The energy error oscillates within fixed bounds for exponentially long times. Decreasing the time step until the energy errors are bounded is a crucial part of any symplectic integration, although it does not, of course, ensure that any other features are yet correct.

The behaviour of other first integrals that are not exactly preserved by the integrator can be difficult to determine. Numerically, both linear  $\mathcal{O}(t)$  increases in error and bounded  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  errors are observed in different cases. Bounded errors are presumably due to the presence of a modified first integral, but these have only been constructed in special cases, for example when the Hamiltonian and integral are both separable [120].

When reversible systems are integrated by reversible integrators, a variety of behaviour in first integrals can be observed. For nonsymmetric orbits, reversibility is irrelevant, and  $\mathcal{O}(t)$  error growth is to be expected. For symmetric orbits the errors are bounded for quasiperiodic orbits and  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{t})$  for ergodic orbits [79]. While this random-walk-like drift can still be an obstacle to, e.g., very long molecular dynamics simulations, it is still much better than the  $\mathcal{O}(t)$  drift of a standard integrator.

Systems with multiple time scales can possess adiabatic invariants  $J$  that obey  $|J(t) - J(0)| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$  for  $|t| < e^{c/(2\varepsilon)}$ , where  $\varepsilon \ll 1$  is the ratio of slow to fast frequencies. If the time step is small enough for backward error analysis to apply, i.e. if the fast frequencies are well resolved, then one can show that the integrator obeys  $|J(x_k) - J(x_0)| = \mathcal{O}(\tau^p) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$  also for exponentially long time intervals [102]. Even if the time step is larger than the period of the fast motion, and one is applying a

special method for such highly-oscillatory systems as in §4.7, and time step resonances are avoided, then adiabatic invariants are observed not to drift, although the magnitude of the oscillations may not be correct.

### 5.3. Stability

It might be expected that splitting methods, being nominally explicit, have only modest stability. This is not necessarily the case.

- (i) Because they are 1-step methods, they are automatically 0-stable (stable for  $\dot{x} = 0$ ), unlike multistep methods.
- (ii) If the phase space is compact, all integrators are unconditionally stable. Examples are integrators preserving the integral  $\|x\|^2$ , unitary and orthogonal integrators used in quantum mechanics, and symplectic integrators for Poisson systems with compact symplectic leaves, such as the rigid body.
- (iii) In general, most geometric integrators are only conditionally stable. One chooses a simple test problem of the relevant type with bounded solutions and computes the stability limit of various methods. For Hamiltonian systems, the test problem is usually the harmonic oscillator with  $T(p) + V(q)$  splitting. Leapfrog is stable for  $\tau < 2$  and higher-order  $m$ -stage integrators are stable for  $\tau < \tau^*$  where usually  $\tau^* \approx \pi$ . Special compositions can be found that are more stable and allow the use of a larger time step. Typically the stability limit  $\tau^*$  decreases with increasing order, while  $\tau^*/m$  increases slightly with  $m$ , where  $m$  is the number of stages.
- (iv) Some nonlinear stability can follow merely from the group property, such as existence of KAM tori in Hamiltonian, volume-preserving, or reversible systems [16, 104], preservation of invariant hypersurfaces which partition phase space, or the nonlinear stability of fixed points of Hamiltonian systems [106].
- (v) The modified Hamiltonian of symplectic integrators can confer nonlinear stability. In particular, for some splitting methods, the critical points of  $H$  do not move or change their value under the perturbation due to the integrator [81].
- (vi) Implicit geometric integrators such as symplectic RK and PRK methods can be unconditionally stable for linear systems. However, this does not always allow one to increase the time step over that of an explicit method, because the implicit equations become more expensive to solve and may not even have a solution, and because nonlinear stability for large time steps is not guaranteed [107].
- (vii) Integrators for highly oscillatory systems (§4.7) are expressly designed to allow much greater time steps and better stability [66].

## 6. Other problems in numerical ODEs

In this survey we have mostly considered the solution of initial value problems for ODEs. Other types of problems include the following.

*Boundary value problems* The geometry of boundary value problems for the various classes of systems (Hamiltonian, symmetric etc.) has received extremely little attention in the literature. The same can be said about the development and testing of geometric integrators for these problems. The close relationship between boundary and initial value problems does suggest, however, that structure preservation should be useful in much the same situations in the two cases. There are two key differences. First, boundary value problems are usually solved on fixed and moderate time intervals (partly because they become increasingly ill-conditioned as the time interval increases), so the utility of having good long-time dynamics in the integrator is decreased. Second, the balance between explicit and implicit integrators shifts markedly. For general boundary value problems, one can choose between shooting (typically with an explicit integrator) or a direct solution (typically with an implicit integrator). In the latter case, Gaussian Runge–Kutta is *already* the preferred method for boundary value problems for first-order ODEs [3]. Since it preserves so much structure as well, this appears to make it the method of choice for geometric boundary value problems, despite being implicit.

*Optimization and control problems* In optimization and control problems, and when continuing the solution of a boundary value problem with parameters, one has to repeatedly solve (sometimes approximately) a sequence of nearby systems. This further favours implicit methods, because good initial guesses, factored Jacobian matrices, etc., are known. With an implicit Runge–Kutta method one could expect to apply just one or two Newton-like updates per step. There can also be an advantage to treating the discretization and the optimization in parallel, as in the ‘Discrete Mechanics and Optimal Control’ method [58], in which both the dynamics and optimization are specified, and discretized, variationally.

*Non-trajectory methods* In the *Hybrid Monte Carlo* method [28] for the potential  $V(q)$ , a sequence of orbit segments are computed for the Hamiltonian (e.g.)  $H = \frac{1}{2}\|p\|^2 + V(q)$ , each initialized with a random value of  $p$ . As fidelity to the dynamics of  $H$  is not required for good results, there is scope for adapting the integrator. For example, in [86], explicit integrators that preserve volume, reversibility, and energy are constructed for some systems, leading to correct statistics with no rejected steps.

*Subdivision Techniques* [29] discretize the phase space itself to a set of cells, with the dynamics replaced by a Markov chain on the cells. The transition probabilities of the Markov chain are computed by a Monte Carlo method from a set of orbit segments with random initial conditions. Analysis of the Markov chain yields approximates of global quantities like invariant measures and almost invariant sets. Although the methods can be successfully applied to low-dimensional Hamiltonian systems [31], as far as we know the question of what geometric structure the Markov chain can inherit from the ODE has not yet been examined.

*Poincaré maps* The computation of Poincaré maps is often done without preserving any structure; if it is determined that the section is crossed between  $x_k$  and  $x_{k+1}$ , say, then the value  $\hat{x}$  of the map can be approximated by interpolation (often inverse Hermite interpolation is used, because the derivatives of  $x(t)$  are known from the differential equation), while the orbit calculation proceeds from  $x_{k+1}$ , so that the overall orbit calculation is given by a geometric integrator. Unfortunately, this Poincaré map does not necessarily inherit the geometric structure from the ODE, which can be important if the map is to be used, for example, in a study of bifurcation of periodic or quasiperiodic orbits. Other popular methods (such as solving  $\varphi_\tau(x_k) \in \Sigma$  for  $\tau$ , or, when the section  $\Sigma$  is defined by  $g(x) = 0$ , letting  $g(x)$  be a new dependent variable so that  $\Sigma$  can be reached in one step [112]) are not geometric either. However, some geometric approaches have been explored. First, If the section has small enough dimension, the Poincaré map can be (nonsymplectically) approximated on a grid on the section; then a (symplectic) Poincaré map can be constructed by interpolating a generating function for the map on the grid [36]. The map will be extremely fast to evaluate, but will suffer from an interpolation error. Second, in accelerator physics, the Poincaré map is known to have an elliptic fixed point, and it can be approximated by its Taylor (or Taylor–Fourier) series. A symplectic map is then constructed that has the same Taylor series up to some order [35, 115]. Third, a more conventional approach is to seek a function  $C(x)$  such that  $g(x) := \dot{C} > 0$  in the domain of interest. Under the transformed Hamiltonian  $g(x)^{-1}(H - E)$  on energy level  $E$ ,  $\dot{C} = 1$ . Hence, the section defined by  $C = \text{const.}$  can be reached with a constant step size.

## Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to W–J Beyn and Shang Zai-jiu for useful correspondence, and to David McLaren, Stephen Marsland, Dion O’Neale, Brett Ryland, Will Wright, and Philip Zhang for their comments. This work was supported by the Australian Research Council and by the Marsden Fund of the Royal Society of New Zealand.

## References

- [1] C Anteneodo and C Tsallis, Breakdown of exponential sensitivity to initial conditions: Role of the range of interactions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102** (1998), 5313–5316.
- [2] D N Arnold, Differential complexes and numerical stability, in *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. I (Beijing, 2002)*, 137–157, Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, 2002.
- [3] U M Ascher, R M M Mattheij, and R D Russell, *Numerical solution of boundary value problems for ordinary differential equations*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1995.
- [4] U M Ascher and L R Petzold, *Computer methods for ordinary differential equations and differential-algebraic equations*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1998.
- [5] E Barth, B Leimkuhler, and S Reich, A time-reversible variable-stepsize integrator for constrained dynamics, *SIAM J Sci. Comput.* **21** (1999), 1027–1044.

- [6] S Blanes, High order numerical integrators for differential equations using composition and processing of low order methods, *Appl. Numer. Math.* **37** (2001), 289–306.
- [7] S Blanes and F Casas, On the existence of positive coefficients for operator splitting schemes of order higher than two, preprint.
- [8] S Blanes and F Casas, in this issue.
- [9] S Blanes, F Casas, and J Ros, Symplectic integrators with processing: a general study, *SIAM J Sci. Comput.* **21** (2000), 711–727.
- [10] S Blanes, F Casas, and J Ros, Processing symplectic methods for near-integrable Hamiltonian systems, *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astr.* **77** (2000), 17–35.
- [11] S Blanes, F Casas, and J Ros, High-order Runge–Kutta–Nyström geometric methods with processing, *Appl. Numer. Math.* **39** (2001), 245–259.
- [12] S Blanes, F Casas, and J Ros, Improved high-order integrators based on the Magnus expansion, *BIT* **40** (2000), 434–450.
- [13] S Blanes and P C Moan, Splitting methods for non-autonomous Hamiltonian equations, *J Comput. Phys.* **170** (2001), 205–230.
- [14] S Blanes and P C Moan, Practical symplectic partitioned Runge–Kutta and Runge–Kutta–Nyström methods, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **142** (2002), 313–330.
- [15] T Bridges and S Reich, in this issue.
- [16] H W Broer, G B Huitema, and M B Sevryuk, *Quasi-periodic motions in families of dynamical systems*, Lect. Notes Math **1645**, Springer, Berlin, 1996.
- [17] C J Budd and A Iserles, Geometric integration: numerical solution of differential equations on manifolds, *R. Soc. Lond. Philos. Trans. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **357** (1999), 945–956.
- [18] C J Budd and M D Piggott, Geometric integration and its applications, in *Handbook of numerical analysis, Vol. XI*, 35–139, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2003.
- [19] J C Butcher, *The numerical analysis of ordinary differential equations*, Wiley, Chichester, 1987.
- [20] J C Butcher, *Numerical methods for ordinary differential equations*, Wiley, Chichester, 2003.
- [21] M P Calvo, A Iserles, and A Zanna, Numerical solution of isospectral flows, *Math. Comp.* **66** (1997), 1461–1486.
- [22] F Casas and B Owren, Cost-efficient Lie group integrators in the RKMK class, *BIT* **43** (2003), 723–742.
- [23] E Celledoni, A Marthinsen, and B Owren, Commutator-free Lie group methods, *Future Generation Computer Systems* **19** (2003) 341–352.
- [24] J E Chambers, A hybrid symplectic integrator that permits close encounters between massive bodies, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **304** (1999), 793–799.
- [25] P Chartier, E Faou, and A Murua, An algebraic approach to invariant preserving integrators: the case of quadratic and Hamiltonian invariants, preprint.
- [26] S A Chin and D W Kidwell, Higher-order force gradient symplectic algorithms, *Phys. Rev. E* **62** (2000), 8746–8752, Part B
- [27] J Cortes and S Martinez, Non-holonomic integrators, *Nonlinearity* **14** (2001), 1365–1392.
- [28] M Creutz and A Gocksch, Higher-order hybrid Monte Carlo algorithms, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63** (1989), 9–12.
- [29] M Dellnitz and O Junge, Set-oriented numerical methods for dynamical systems, in *Handbook of dynamical systems, Vol. 2*, pp. 221–264, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2002.
- [30] P Deuffhard, A study of extrapolation methods based on multistep schemes without parasitic solutions, *Z. angew. Math. Phys.* **30** (1979), 177–189.

- [31] P Deuffhard, M Dellnitz, O Junge, and Ch. Schütte, Computation of essential molecular dynamics by subdivision techniques. I. Basic concept, in In P Deuffhard, J Hermans, B Leimkuhler, A E Mark, S Reich, and R D Skeel, eds., *Computational Molecular Dynamics: Challenges, Methods, Ideas*, volume 4 of Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering, pp. 98–115, Springer, Berlin, 1998.
- [32] V A Dorodnitsyn, Finite difference models entirely inheriting continuous symmetry of original differential equations, *Internat. J. Modern Phys. C* **5** (1994), 723–734.
- [33] K Feng and D–L Wang, Dynamical systems and geometric construction of algorithms, in *Contemporary Mathematics* vol. 163, pp. 1–32, AMS, Providence, 1994.
- [34] K Feng and D–L Wang, Variations on a theme by Euler, *J. Comput. Math.* **16** (1998), 97–106.
- [35] E Forest, in this issue.
- [36] C Froeschle and E Lega, Global symplectic polynomial approximation of area-preserving maps, *J. Diff. Eq. Appl.* **3** (1997), 169–184.
- [37] B Garcia-Archilla, J-M Sanz-Serna, and R D Skeel, Long-time-step methods for oscillatory differential equations, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **20** (1999), 930–963.
- [38] Z Ge and J Marsden, Lie-Poisson Hamilton-Jacobi theory and Lie-Poisson integrators, *Phys. Lett. A* **133** (1998), 135–139.
- [39] M Golubitsky and I Stewart, *The symmetry perspective. From equilibrium to chaos in phase space and physical space*. Progress in Mathematics, 200. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2002.
- [40] V Grimm and M Hochbruck, Non-smooth error bounds for a family of exponential integrators applied to highly oscillatory second-order differential equations, *J. Phys. A*.
- [41] V Grimm and G R W Quispel, Geometric integration methods that preserve Lyapunov functions, *BIT*, submitted.
- [42] V Grimm and G R W Quispel, Geometric integration methods that unconditionally contract volume, submitted.
- [43] E Hairer and C Lubich, Symmetric multistep methods over long times, *Numer. Math.* **97** (2004), 699–723.
- [44] E Hairer, C Lubich, and G Wanner, *Geometric Numerical Integration: Structure-Preserving Algorithms for Ordinary Differential Equations*, Springer, Berlin, 2002.
- [45] E Hairer, C Lubich, and G Wanner, Geometric integration illustrated by the Störmer–Verlet method, *Acta Numerica* (2003), 399–450.
- [46] E Hairer, S P Nørsett, and G Wanner, *Solving ordinary differential equations. I. Nonstiff problems*, 2nd ed., Springer, Berlin, 1993.
- [47] E Hairer and G Söderlind, Explicit, time reversible, adaptive step size control, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **26** (2005), 1838–1851.
- [48] E Hairer and G Wanner, *Solving ordinary differential equations. II. Stiff and Differential-Algebraic Problems*, 2nd ed., Springer, Berlin, 1996.
- [49] D J Hardy, D I Okunbor, and R D Skeel, Symplectic variable step size integration for  $N$ -body problems, *Appl. Numer. Math.* **29** (1999), 19–30.
- [50] M Hochbruck and C Lubich, On Magnus integrators for time-dependent Schrödinger equations, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **41** (2003), no. 3, 945–963.
- [51] C R Holt, Construction of new integrable Hamiltonians in two degrees of freedom, *J. Math. Phys.* **23** (1982), 1037–1046.
- [52] P Hydon and E L Mansfield, A variational complex for difference equations, *Found. Comput. Math.* **4** (2004), 187–217.

- [53] A Iserles, *A first course in the numerical analysis of differential equations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [54] A Iserles, On the method of Neumann series for highly oscillatory equations, *BIT* **44** (2004), no. 3, 473–488.
- [55] A Iserles and S P Nørsett, On the solution of linear differential equations in Lie groups, *R. Soc. Lond. Philos. Trans. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **357** (1999), no. 1754, 983–1019.
- [56] A Iserles, R I McLachlan, and A Zanna, Approximately preserving symmetries in the numerical integration of ordinary differential equations, *Eur. J. Appl. Math.* **10** (1999), 419–445.
- [57] A Iserles, H Z Munthe-Kaas, S P Nørsett, and A Zanna, Lie group methods, *Acta Numerica* **9** (2000), 215–365.
- [58] O Junge, J E Marsden, and S Blöbaum, Discrete mechanics and optimal control, preprint.
- [59] A Katok and B Hasselblatt, *Introduction to the modern theory of dynamical systems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [60] A Kværnø and B Leimkuhler (2000), A time-reversible, regularized, switching integrator for the  $N$ -body problem, *SIAM J Sci. Comput.* **22** (2000), 1016–1035.
- [61] J S W Lamb and J A G Roberts, Time-reversal symmetry in dynamical systems: a survey, *Phys. D* **112** (1998), 1–39.
- [62] J Laskar, in this issue.
- [63] J Laskar, and P Robutel, High order symplectic integrators for perturbed Hamiltonian systems, *Celest. Mech.* **80** (2001), 39–62.
- [64] J Laskar, P Robutel, F Joutel, Gastineau, A C M Correia, and B Levrard, A long-term numerical solution for the insolation quantities of the Earth, *Astron. Astrophys.* **428** (2004), 261–285.
- [65] B Leimkuhler, in this issue.
- [66] B Leimkuhler and S Reich, A reversible averaging integrator for multiple time-scale dynamics, *J Comput. Phys.* **171** (2001), 95–114.
- [67] B Leimkuhler and S Reich, *Simulating Hamiltonian Dynamics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [68] A Lew, J E Marsden, M Ortiz, and M West, Asynchronous variational integrators, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **167** (2003), 85–146.
- [69] A Lew, J E Marsden, M Ortiz, and M West, Variational time integrators, *Int. J. Numer. Meth. Eng.* **60** (2004), 153–212.
- [70] M A López-Marcos, J M Sanz-Serna, and R D Skeel, Explicit symplectic integrators using Hessian-vector products, *SIAM J Sci. Comput.* **18** (1997), 223–238.
- [71] J E Marsden, G W Patrick, and W F Shadwick, eds., *Integration Algorithms and Classical Mechanics*, AMS, Providence, 1996.
- [72] J E Marsden and T S Ratiu, *Introduction to mechanics and symmetry*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.
- [73] J E Marsden and M West, Discrete mechanics and variational integrators, *Acta Numerica* **10** (2001), 357–514.
- [74] R I McLachlan, Explicit Lie-Poisson integration and the Euler equations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71** (1993), 3043–3046.
- [75] R I McLachlan, On the numerical integration of ordinary differential equations by symmetric composition methods, *SIAM J Sci. Comput.* **16** (1995), 151–168.
- [76] R I McLachlan, Composition methods in the presence of small parameters, *BIT* **35** (1995), 258–268.



- [77] R I McLachlan, Families of high-order composition methods, *Numer. Alg.* **31** (2002), 233–246.
- [78] R I McLachlan and M Perlmutter, Conformal Hamiltonian systems, *J Geom. Phys.* **39** (2001), 276–300.
- [79] R I McLachlan and M Perlmutter, Energy drift in reversible time integration, *J. Phys. A* **37** (2004), L593–L598.
- [80] R I McLachlan and M Perlmutter, Integrators for nonholonomic mechanical systems, *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, to appear.
- [81] R I McLachlan, M Perlmutter, and G R W Quispel, On the nonlinear stability of symplectic integrators, *BIT* **44** (2004), 99–117.
- [82] R I McLachlan, M Perlmutter, and G R W Quispel, Lie group foliate integrators, *Future Generation Computer Systems* **19** (2003) 1207–1219.
- [83] R I McLachlan and G R W Quispel, Splitting methods, *Acta Numerica* **11** (2002), 341–434.
- [84] R I McLachlan and G R W Quispel, Six Lectures on Geometric Integration, in *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* pp. 155–210, R DeVore, A Iserles, and E Süli, eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [85] R I McLachlan and G R W Quispel, What kinds of dynamics are there? Lie pseudogroups, dynamical systems, and geometric integration, *Nonlinearity* **14** (2001), 1689–1706.
- [86] R I McLachlan and G R W Quispel, Geometric integration of conservative polynomial ODEs, *Appl. Numer. Math.* **45** (2003), 411–418.
- [87] R I McLachlan and G R W Quispel, Explicit geometric integration of polynomial vector fields, *BIT* **44** (2004), 515–538.
- [88] R I McLachlan, G R W Quispel, and N Robidoux, Geometric integration using discrete gradients, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. A* **357** (1999), 1021–1046.
- [89] 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.
- [90] R I McLachlan and B N Ryland, The algebraic entropy of classical mechanics, *J. Math. Phys.* **44** (2003), 3071–3087.
- [91] R I McLachlan and C Scovel, Equivariant constrained symplectic integration, *J. Nonlinear Sci.* **5** (1995), 233–256.
- [92] D I McLaren and G R W Quispel, Integral-preserving integrators, *J. Phys. A* **37** (2004), L489–L495.
- [93] B V Minchev and W M Wright, A review of exponential integrators for first order semi-linear problems, preprint.
- [94] P C Moan, On the KAM and Nekhoroshev theorems for symplectic integrators and implications for error growth, *Nonlinearity* **17** (2004) 67–83.
- [95] P C Moan, A Murua, G R W Quispel, M Sofroniou, and G Spaletta, Symplectic elementary differential Runge–Kutta methods, preprint.
- [96] H Munthe-Kaas and A Zanna, Numerical integration of differential equations on homogeneous manifolds, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics (Rio de Janeiro, 1997)*, 305–315, F Cucker and M Shub, eds., Springer, Berlin, 1997.
- [97] A Pandolfi, C Kane, J E Marsden, and M Ortiz, Time-discretized variational formulation of nonsmooth frictional contact, *Int. J. Num. Meth. Eng.* **53** (2002), 1801–1829.
- [98] P J Olver, *Applications of Lie groups to differential equations*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.
- [99] B Owren, in this issue.
- [100] G R W Quispel, Volume-preserving integrators, *Phys. Lett. A* **206** (1995), 226–230.

- [101] S Reich, Numerical integration of the generalized Euler equations, *Tech. report 93-20, Dept. Comput. Sci., Univ. British Columbia*, 1993.
- [102] S Reich, Backward error analysis for numerical integrators, *SIAM J Numer. Anal.* **36** (1993), 1549–1570.
- [103] J–M Sanz-Serna and M P Calvo, *Numerical Hamiltonian Problems*, Chapman and Hall, London, 1994.
- [104] Z J Shang, Resonant and diophantine step sizes in computing invariant tori of Hamiltonian systems, *Nonlinearity* **13** (2000), 299–308.
- [105] Q Sheng, Solving linear partial differential equations by exponential splitting, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* **9** (1989), 199–212.
- [106] R D Skeel and K Srinivas, Nonlinear stability analysis of area-preserving integrators, *SIAM J Numer. Anal.* **38** (2000), 129–148.
- [107] J C Simo and N Tarnow, A new energy and momentum conserving algorithm for the non-linear dynamics of shells. *Int. J. Numer. Meth. Eng.* **37** (1994), 2527–2549.
- [108] M Sofroniou and G Spaletta, Derivation of symmetric composition constants for symmetric integrators, *Optimization Methods and Software* **20** (2005), 597–613.
- [109] A M Stuart and A R Humphries, *Dynamical systems and numerical analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [110] M Suzuki, Fractal decomposition of exponential operators with applications to many-body theories and Monte Carlo simulations, *Phys. Lett. A* **146** (1990), 319–323.
- [111] M Takahashi and M Imada, Monte Carlo Calculations of Quantum Systems. II Higher Order Correction, *J Phys. Soc. Japan* **53** (1984), 3765–3769.
- [112] W Tucker, Computing accurate Poincaré maps, *Phys. D* **171** (2002), 127–137.
- [113] L Verlet, Computer “experiments” on classical fluids. I Thermodynamical properties of Lennard-Jones molecules, *Phys. Rev.* **159** (1967), 98–103.
- [114] A R Walton and D E Manolopoulos, A new semiclassical initial value method for Franck-Condon spectra, *Molecular Phys.* **87** (1996), 961–978.
- [115] R L Warnock and J A Ellison, From symplectic integrator to Poincaré map: spline expansion of a map generator in Cartesian coordinates, *Appl. Numer. Math.* **29** (1999), 89–98.
- [116] J A C Weideman and B M Herbst, Split-step methods for the solution of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **23** (1986), 485–507.
- [117] J Wisdom and M Holman, Symplectic maps for the  $N$ -body problem, *Astron. J* **102** (1991), 1528–1538.
- [118] J Wisdom, M Holman, and J Touma, Symplectic correctors, in *Integration Algorithms and Classical Mechanics*, J E Marsden, G W Patrick, and W F Shadwick, eds., AMS, Providence, 1996, pp. 217–244.
- [119] H Yoshida, Construction of higher order symplectic integrators, *Phys. Lett. A* **150** (1990), 262–268.
- [120] H Yoshida, Non-existence of the modified first integral by symplectic integration methods, *Phys. Lett. A* **282** (2001), 276–283.