

COLLECTIVE SYMPLECTIC INTEGRATORS ON $S_2^N \times T^*\mathbb{R}^M$

GEIR BOGFJELLMO

ABSTRACT. A novel symplectic integrator for Hamiltonian equations on $S_2^n \times T^*\mathbb{R}^m$ is developed and studied. Partitioned Runge–Kutta methods for Hamiltonian systems on products of Hamiltonian manifolds are studied, specifically, algebraic conditions for their symplecticity are derived.

1. INTRODUCTION

When a differential equation inhibits geometrical properties, it is considered advantageous that numerical approximations to the equation inhibits the same properties. One such geometrical property is the *symplecticity* inhibited by Hamiltonian systems. In general, a *symplectic* space is a manifold M , equipped with a closed two-form ω . A differential equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}z = X(z),$$

where X is a vector field over M , is symplectic if the Lie derivative of ω ,

$$\mathcal{L}_X\omega = \text{d}i_X\omega = 0$$

Numerical approximations preserving symplecticity are known as symplectic integrators. Symplectic integrators for ordinary differential equations evolving on vector spaces have been studied by many authors, see for instance [HLW06; SC94] and the references therein.

The situation for non-flat geometries is more complicated, and usually relies on the particular geometry.

This paper studies a special case of non-flat symplectic space, the product of copies of S^2 and the canonical symplectic space $T^*\mathbb{R}^M$. This space is of special interest in spin-lattice dynamics.

2. HAMILTONIAN SYSTEMS ON $S_2^n \times T^*\mathbb{R}^m$

Hamiltonian systems evolving on $M = S_2^n \times T^*\mathbb{R}^m$ arise in e.g. spin-lattice-electron (SLE) equations. See, e.g. [MWD08; MDW12; Eri+17]. In these systems, each particle i state is given by a position $\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$, a momentum $\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and a spin $\mathbf{w}_i \in S_2$. With k particles, the total state space is thus $S_2^k \times T^*\mathbb{R}^{3k}$.

We write the state of the system $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$, where

$$\mathbf{w} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_1 \\ \mathbf{w}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{w}_k \end{bmatrix} \in S_2^k, \quad \mathbf{p} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_1 \\ \mathbf{p}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{p}_k \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{3k}, \quad \mathbf{q} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{q}_1 \\ \mathbf{q}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{q}_k \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{3k}.$$

The Hamiltonian for SLE-systems is

$$\begin{aligned}
 H(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) &= T_L(\mathbf{p}) + U_L(\mathbf{q}) + H_m(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}) \\
 (1) \quad &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\|\mathbf{p}_i\|^2}{m_i} + U_L(\mathbf{q}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n J_{ij}(\mathbf{q}) \langle \mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j \rangle
 \end{aligned}$$

where m_i is the mass of each individual particle, $U_L(\mathbf{q})$ is a potential depending on the positions \mathbf{q} , and J_{ij} determines the strength of the spin couplings, depending on the positions \mathbf{q} . Typically, $J_{ij}(\mathbf{q}) = J(\|q_i - q_j\|)$, but other functions are possible.

The resulting Hamiltonian equations are

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2) \quad \frac{d\mathbf{q}_i}{dt} &= \frac{\mathbf{p}_i}{m_i} \\
 \frac{d\mathbf{p}_i}{dt} &= -\frac{\partial U_L}{\partial \mathbf{q}_i}(\mathbf{q}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^n \frac{\partial J_{jk}(\mathbf{q})}{\partial \mathbf{q}_i} \langle \mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{w}_k \rangle \\
 \frac{d\mathbf{w}_i}{dt} &= \mathbf{w}_i \times \left[\sum_j J_{ij}(\mathbf{q}) \mathbf{w}_j \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

For the following, we define the matrix

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} m_1 \mathbf{I}_3 & & & \\ & m_2 \mathbf{I}_3 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & m_k \mathbf{I}_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

Symplectic integration of (2) has previously been obtained by splitting methods, see e.g. [OMF01]. These methods rely on a symmetric splitting where each spin is integrated individually. A disadvantage of this approach is that the spins has to be updated in sequence, limiting the possibilities of parallelization. Furthermore, the splitting methods are incapable of handling more general Hamiltonians. For instance, Perera et al. [Per+16] introduce an anisotropy term.

An alternative to the method in the present paper is the method used by Hellsvik et. al. in [Hel+18]

In this article, we suggest a novel approach for symplectic integration on $S_2^n \times T^*\mathbb{R}^m$. This approach is based on a partitioned integrator, where the positions and momenta are integrated with a standard symplectic partitioned Runge–Kutta method, and the spins are integrated with a collective symplectic integrator on S_2^n . The development of symplectic integrators on S_2^n is due to by McLachlan, Modin and Verdier [MMV14; MMV15; MMV17].

The novel integrator is implicit, as opposed to splitting-based methods.

The integrators derived in this approach can in principle handle any Hamiltonian on $S_2^n \times T^*\mathbb{R}^m$. We will, however, focus on the case where the dependence on the momentum \mathbf{p} can be split of as a quadratic kinetic term T_L .

The geometry needed for these integrators is as follows:

- (1) The symplectic manifold M is embedded into a Poisson manifold P , such that the image of M is a symplectic leaf.
- (2) P has a full realization as a canonical symplectic manifold $N \simeq T^*\mathbb{R}^d$, i.e. there exists an onto Poisson map $\psi: N \rightarrow P$.

For the integrators to be well-defined, it is necessary to extend the Hamiltonian H into a function $\bar{H}: P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. This extension is not-unique, however we will fix it to a “canonical” choice, following [MMV17]. The dynamics on the top symplectic manifold N are defined by the pulled-back Hamiltonian $\psi \circ \bar{H}$.

3. SYMPLECTIC AND POISSON STRUCTURES

To proceed, we need to define the various symplectic and Poisson structures involved.

3.1. Symplectic structure on M . Let $M = \mathbf{S} \times T^*V$, where $\mathbf{S} = S_2^n$ and $V = \mathbb{R}^m$. (In SLD $m = dn$, where d is the dimension of the lattice.)

Both (\mathbf{S}, ω^S) and (T^*V, ω^V) are symplectic manifolds with ω^V the canonical two-form and

$$\omega^S = \sum_i dA_i,$$

where A_i is the standard area form on the i th sphere.

Let ω be the product symplectic form

$$\omega = \pi_1^* \omega^V + \pi_2^* \omega^S$$

where $\pi_1: M \rightarrow T^*V$ and $\pi_2: M \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$ are the canonical projections. (M, ω) is the direct product symplectic manifold of \mathbf{S} and T^*V .

3.2. Poisson structure on P . McLachlan, Modin and Verdier [MMV17] obtained symplectic integrators on \mathbf{S} by embedding $\mathbf{S} = S_2^n$ as a symplectic leaf in the Poisson manifold \mathbb{R}^{3n} . A straightforward generalization of this is to embed $M = T^*V \times \mathbf{S}$ as a symplectic leaf in a Poisson manifold.

Let $P = T^*V \times \mathbf{R}$, where $\mathbf{R} = \mathbb{R}^{3n}$.

$(T^*V, \{\cdot, \cdot\}_V)$ is a Poisson manifold whose Poisson bracket is induced by the symplectic structure,

$$\{f, g\}_V = (\omega^V)^{-1}(df \wedge dg)$$

where $(\omega^V)^{-1}$ is the two-vector obtained by inverting the symplectic form.

The Poisson bracket on $\mathbf{R} = (\mathbb{R}^3)^n$, which we denote $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_S$, is the sum of Poisson brackets on each copy of \mathbb{R}^3 ,

$$\{f, g\}_S(\mathbf{w}) = \kappa(\mathbf{w})(df \wedge dg) = \sum_i \left\langle \mathbf{w}_i, \left[\frac{\partial f(\mathbf{w})}{\partial \mathbf{w}_i}, \frac{\partial g(\mathbf{w})}{\partial \mathbf{w}_i} \right] \right\rangle.$$

On P , we obtain a Poisson bracket by taking the sum of the brackets on each component,

$$\begin{aligned} \{f, g\}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) &= (\omega^V)^{-1}(d_{\mathbf{y}}f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) \wedge d_{\mathbf{y}}g(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w})) \\ &\quad + \kappa(\mathbf{w})(d_{\mathbf{w}}f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) \wedge d_{\mathbf{w}}g(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w})), \end{aligned}$$

for all $\mathbf{y} \in T^*V$, $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{R}$.

In the above equation, $d_{\mathbf{y}}$ and $d_{\mathbf{w}}$ denote the partial differentials, e.g.

$$d_{\mathbf{y}}f = \sum_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{y}_i} d\mathbf{y}_i.$$

Using canonical coordinates $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$, the full form of the Poisson bracket is

$$\{f, g\}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial q_i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_i} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial q_i} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^n \left\langle \mathbf{w}_j, \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{w}_j}, \frac{\partial g}{\partial \mathbf{w}_j} \right] \right\rangle.$$

Proposition 3.1. *M is a symplectic leaf in P.*

Proof. \mathbf{S} is a symplectic leaf in \mathbf{R} and T^*V is a symplectic manifold. \square

Having embedded M into P , we also need to extend vector fields on M to vector fields on P . Taking a leaf from [MMV17], we do this by letting the Hamiltonian and vector fields be constant on rays, i.e. sets of the form $\{(\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\lambda} \odot \mathbf{w}) : \boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n\} \subset P$, where $\mathbf{y} \in T^*V$, $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \odot \mathbf{w} = (\lambda_1 \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \lambda_n \mathbf{w}_n)$.

We define a projection map $\rho_1 : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$ by

$$\rho_1(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n) := \left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_1}{\|\mathbf{w}_1\|}, \dots, \frac{\mathbf{w}_n}{\|\mathbf{w}_n\|} \right),$$

and a projection map $\rho : P \rightarrow M$ by

$$\rho(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) = (\mathbf{y}, \rho_1(\mathbf{w}))$$

It is a simple exercise to show that if $H : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Hamiltonian with associated vector field, X_H , then $\bar{H} = H \circ \rho : P \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a Hamiltonian on P with associated Poisson vector field

$$X_{\bar{H}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) = X_H(\rho(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w})).$$

We call this vector field the *extension of X_H to P* .

Notice that $X_{\bar{H}}$ is tangent to every symplectic leaf, not only to M .

In particular, for the Hamiltonian of interest (1), the extended Hamiltonian takes the form

$$(3) \quad \bar{H}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = T_L(\mathbf{p}) + H_1(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q})$$

where $H_1(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}) = U_L(\mathbf{q}) + H_m(\rho_1(\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{q})$.

3.3. Realization of P .

Definition 3.2. A *realization* of a Poisson manifold $(P, \{\cdot, \cdot\})$ is a symplectic manifold (N, ω_N) together with a Poisson map $\psi : N \rightarrow P$. The realization is called *full* if it is surjective and *canonical* if $N \simeq T^*\mathbb{R}^d$ for some d .

A realization of $P = (\mathbb{R}^3)^n \times T^*V$ is obtained by using the Hopf fibration map for each copy of \mathbb{R}^3 .

Proposition 3.3. *Let $N = \mathbb{C}^{2n} \times T^*\mathbb{R}^m$, equipped with the canonical symplectic structure. We write a point in N as $(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ where*

$$\mathbf{z}_i = (z_i^1, z_i^2, \dots, z_i^n), \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2$$

and $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^m$.

Let a map $\psi : N \rightarrow P$ be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) &= (\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2), \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \\ &= (J(z_1^1, z_2^1), \dots, J(z_1^n, z_2^n), \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}), \end{aligned}$$

where $J: \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is the Hopf fibration map

$$(4) \quad J(z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 2\Re(z_1 z_2^*) \\ 2\Im(z_1 z_2^*) \\ (|z_1|^2 - |z_2|^2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

(N, ψ) is a full, canonical realization of P .

Proof. Direct products of Poisson maps are Poisson. ψ is the product of n copies of the Hopf fibration and the identity map on T^*V . Finally, the Hopf fibration is Poisson [MR99]. \square

The pull-back of the Hamiltonian (3) has the form

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{H} \circ \psi(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) &= T_L(\mathbf{p}) + H_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{q}) \\ &= T_L(\mathbf{p}) + H_1(\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{z}), \mathbf{q}) \end{aligned}$$

4. COLLECTIVE SYMPLECTIC INTEGRATORS

McLachlan, Modin and Verdier introduced *Collective symplectic integrators* for integration of Poisson systems. The main idea is to utilize a realization (N, ψ) of the Poisson manifold P and integrate the vector field of the pulled-back Hamiltonian $H \circ \psi$ on N , with a symplectic method. We will denote this vector field by $X_{H \circ \psi}$.

To obtain a symplectic integrator on P (i.e. Poisson and preserves leaves), it is necessary that the update maps of the integrator maps fibers (of ψ) to fibers, and that the preimages of leaves are preserved.

In our case $N = \mathbb{C}^{2n} \times T^*\mathbb{R}^m \simeq T^*\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times T^*\mathbb{R}^m$. We use coordinates $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ on N and assume we use a PRK method partitioned into these coordinates (i.e. each of the components $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}$ are integrated with (possibly different) RK methods.)

Lemma 4.1. *A PRK method, when applied to a lifted vector field $X_{H \circ \psi}$, maps fibers to fibers.*

Proof. The group $U(1)^{\times n}$ acts on N with the following action. Write an element in $U(1)^{\times n}$ as

$$e^{i\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (e^{i\theta_1}, e^{i\theta_2}, \dots, e^{i\theta_n})$$

where $\theta_k \in [0, 2\pi]$. The action is given by

$$e^{i\boldsymbol{\theta}} \cdot (\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = (e^{i\boldsymbol{\theta}} \odot \mathbf{z}_1, e^{i\boldsymbol{\theta}} \odot \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}).$$

This action is linear and symplectic. Furthermore, it preserves fibers and is transitive on each fiber. As the action is symplectic and preserves fibers, it is a symmetry of the lifted vector field. Since the action is also linear, and only affects one of the components, the \mathbf{z} -component, this symmetry is preserved by the partitioned Runge–Kutta method, and is also a symmetry of the update map. Since the action is transitive on each fiber, we can conclude that the update map maps fibers to fibers. \square

Lemma 4.2. *A PRK method, where the \mathbf{z} -component is integrated with a symplectic RK-method, preserves the preimages of leaves.*

Proof. The symplectic leaves in P are given by $\|\mathbf{w}_j\| = r_j$, for each j . By properties of the Hopf map (4), the preimages in N are given by

$$|z_1^j|^2 + |z_2^j|^2 = 2r_j$$

for each j , and are invariant under the flow of the lifted vector field. As quadratic invariants, depending only on \mathbf{z} , these are preserved by the PRK methods if the \mathbf{z} -method is symplectic. \square

We are almost ready to state the main theorem, except that we need a result on the symplecticity of Partitioned Runge Kutta methods with three components, where one component, \mathbf{z} , corresponds to a symplectic space, and the two remaining components, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} , correspond to Darboux coordinates of another symplectic space.

The symplecticity of such partitioned methods is interesting in its own right, and the proof of this is presented in Section 5.

Theorem 4.3. *Assume the system on N is integrated with a partitioned Runge–Kutta method, where*

- \mathbf{z} is integrated with a symplectic Runge–Kutta method.
- (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) is integrated with a symplectic partitioned Runge–Kutta method and
- The b -coefficients of the two methods above coincide.

Then the resulting integrator is symplectic. Furthermore, it descends to a symplectic method on P , and the descended method restricts to a symplectic method on M .

Proof. Sufficient conditions are that the “upstairs” integrator on M [MMV17]

- (i) is symplectic.
- (ii) maps fibers to fibers.
- (iii) preserves preimages of leaves in P .

(i) follows from Theorem 5.3 and the remarks following. (ii) is Lemma 4.1. (iii) is Lemma 4.2. \square

The method used for the numerical tests is a partitioned method where the \mathbf{z} -variable is integrated with the implicit midpoint method and the (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) -variable are integrated with the Störmer–Verlet Scheme. As the midpoint method is a one-stage method, and the Störmer–Verlet method has two stages, it is necessary to use the reducible two stage method with Butcher tableau

$$\begin{array}{c|cc} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} \\ \hline & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$$

for the \mathbf{z} -coordinate.

In the following equations describing the integrators, we will use \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} , etc. for the values before a step of the integrator, and $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}$, etc. for the values after a step of the integrator.

The partitioned integrator, applied to the Hamiltonian (5) on N can, after identifications, be written:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P} &= \mathbf{p} - \frac{h}{2} \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{Z}) \\ \mathbf{Z} &= \mathbf{z} + \frac{h}{4} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{Z}) + \frac{h}{4} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \mathbf{z}}(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}, \mathbf{Z}) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{p}} &= \mathbf{P} - \frac{h}{2} \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \mathbf{q}}(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}, \mathbf{Z}) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{q}} &= \mathbf{q} + h\mathbf{M}^{-1}\mathbf{P} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{z}} &= \mathbf{z} + \frac{h}{2} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{Z}) + \frac{h}{2} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \mathbf{z}}(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}, \mathbf{Z}).\end{aligned}$$

The \mathbf{z} -variable is integrated with the midpoint method. As shown in [MMV16], this integrator coincides with the spherical midpoint method for ray-constant vector fields (As we have here, cf.(3))

We can thus write the scheme as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P} &= \mathbf{p} - \frac{h}{2} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{W}) \\ \mathbf{W} &= \rho_1(\mathbf{w} + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{p}} &= \mathbf{P} - \frac{h}{2} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \mathbf{q}}(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}, \mathbf{W}) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{q}} &= \mathbf{q} + h\mathbf{M}^{-1}\mathbf{P} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{w}} &= \mathbf{w} + \frac{h}{2} \left[\mathbf{W}, \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{W}) + \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \mathbf{w}}(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}, \mathbf{W}) \right]\end{aligned}$$

5. NONSTANDARD SYMPLECTIC PARTITIONED RUNGE–KUTTA METHODS

For the collective integrators proposed, we integrate a Hamiltonian system where the space is partitioned into a product of two symplectic spaces. We therefore need to establish when a partitioned Runge–Kutta method is symplectic for this partitioning.¹

The conditions are not specific to our application and are here presented in a more general setting.

We first consider the case when a symplectic manifold is partitioned into N symplectic spaces, and each component is integrated with a (nonpartitioned) Runge–Kutta method.

Consider an ordinary differential equation of the form

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{dy^k}{dt} &= f^k(\mathbf{y}), \quad k = 1, \dots, N \\ y^k &\in \mathbb{R}^{n_k} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_N \end{bmatrix}$$

¹Standard symplectic PRK-methods partition into position and momentum variables

Equation (6) can be numerically integrated by a partitioned Runge–Kutta method with coefficients b_i^k, a_{ij}^k , where $k = 1, \dots, N$ and $i, j = 1, \dots, s$. When writing down the scheme, we write

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{y}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_N \end{bmatrix}$$

for the updated variables, and

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \begin{bmatrix} Y_1^k \\ \vdots \\ Y_N^k \end{bmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \dots, s$$

for the stage values.

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{y}^k &= y^k + h \sum_{i=1}^s b_i^k F_i^k & k = 1, \dots, N \\ Y_i^k &= y^k + h \sum_{j=1}^s a_{ij}^k F_j^k & k = 1, \dots, N, \quad i = 1, \dots, s \\ F_i^k &= f^k(\mathbf{Y}_i) & i = 1, \dots, s \end{aligned}$$

We are interested in which of these schemes preserve symplectic forms of the type

$$\omega = \sum_{k=1}^N \omega_k = \sum_{k=1}^N dy^k \wedge \mathbf{J}_k dy^k.$$

where each \mathbf{J}_k is a $n_k \times n_k$ skew-symmetric, nonsingular matrix

A standard application of the variational equation (see e.g. [HLW06, Chapter VI.4]) shows that for preserving symplectic forms of the above type it is sufficient that the integrator preserves all first integrals of the form

$$I(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{k=1}^N I_k(y_k) = \sum_{k=1}^N B^k(y^k, y^k),$$

where each B^k is a symmetric bilinear function.

Theorem 5.1. *If the coefficients satisfy that*

- (i) $b_i^k b_j^k = b_i^k a_{ij}^k + b_j^k a_{ji}^k$ for all i, j, k and
- (ii) $b_i^1 = b_i^2 = \dots = b_i^k$ for all i .

then the scheme preserves all invariants of the form $I(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{k=1}^N B^k(\mathbf{y}^k, \mathbf{y}^k)$.

Another way of stating the assumption in the theorem is that each of the Runge–Kutta methods is symplectic in their own right, and their b -values all have to agree.

Proof. Since I is a first integral, it holds that $\sum_k B^k(y^k, f^k(\mathbf{y})) = 0$ for all \mathbf{y} . Specifically,

$$(8) \quad \sum_k B^k(Y_i^k, F_i^k) = 0$$

Inserting (7) into

$$I(\tilde{y}) = \sum_k B^k(\tilde{y}_k, \tilde{y}_k)$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(\tilde{y}) &= \sum_k B^k \left(y^k + h \sum_i b_i^k F_i^k, y^k + h \sum_j b_j^k F_j^k \right) \\ &= I(\mathbf{y}) + h \sum_j \sum_k b_j^k B^k(y^k, F_j^k) + h \sum_i \sum_k b_i^k B^k(F_i^k, y^k) \\ &\quad + h^2 \sum_{i,j} \sum_k b_i^k b_j^k B^k(F_i^k, F_j^k) \end{aligned}$$

The trick now is to substitute $y_k = Y_i^k - h \sum_j a_{ij}^k F_j^k$ to get matching terms.

$$\begin{aligned} I(\tilde{y}) &= I(\mathbf{y}) + h \sum_j \sum_k b_j^k B^k(Y_j^k, F_j^k) + h \sum_i \sum_k b_i^k B^k(F_i^k, Y_i^k) \\ &\quad + h^2 \sum_{i,j} \sum_k (b_i^k b_j^k - b_j^k a_{ji}^k - b_i^k a_{ij}^k) B^k(F_i^k, F_j^k) \\ &= I(\mathbf{y}) + 2h \sum_i \sum_k b_i^k B^k(Y_i^k, F_i^k) \\ &\quad + h^2 \sum_{i,j} \sum_k (b_i^k b_j^k - b_j^k a_{ji}^k - b_i^k a_{ij}^k) B^k(F_i^k, F_j^k). \end{aligned}$$

We see that under the assumption $b_i^k b_j^k - b_j^k a_{ji}^k - b_i^k a_{ij}^k = 0$, the $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ term disappears. For the $\mathcal{O}(h)$ term, we see that if $b_i^k = b_i$ is constant in k , then

$$2h \sum_i \sum_k b_i^k B^k(Y_i^k, F_i^k) = 2h \sum_i b_i = \sum_k B^k(Y_i^k, F_i^k) = 0,$$

due to (8) □

Now, let equation (6) be a Hamiltonian system given by $H(y, z)$ of the form

$$(9) \quad \frac{dy^k}{dt} = \mathbf{J}_k^{-1} \frac{\partial H}{\partial y_k}$$

where \mathbf{J}_k are non-singular, skew-symmetric matrices.

Applying the above Theorem to the variational equation yields the following corollary

Corollary 5.2. *If the coefficients satisfy that*

- (i) $b_i^k b_j^k = b_i^k a_{ij}^k + b_j^k a_{ji}^k$ for all i, j, k and
- (ii) $b_i^1 = b_i^2 = \dots = b_i^N$ for all i .

Then the scheme is symplectic when applied to the system (9)

We now turn to the result actually needed in this paper, where each component is integrated with a partitioned Runge–Kutta method.

Consider a Hamiltonian system

$$(10) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{dq^k}{dt} &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial p^k} = f^k(q, p) \\ \frac{dp^k}{dt} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q^k} = g^k(q, p) \quad k = 1, \dots, N \end{aligned}$$

We integrate the system with an integrator of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{q}^k &= q^k + h \sum_{i=1}^s b_i^k F_i^k \quad k = 1, \dots, N \\ Q_i^k &= q^k + h \sum_{j=1}^s a_{ij}^k F_j^k \quad k = 1, \dots, N, \quad i = 1, \dots, s \\ F_i^k &= f^k(Q_i^k, P_i^k) \quad k = 1, \dots, N, \quad i = 1, \dots, s \\ \tilde{p}^k &= p^k + h \sum_{i=1}^s \hat{b}_i^k G_i^k \quad k = 1, \dots, N \\ P_i^k &= p^k + h \sum_{j=1}^s \hat{a}_{ij}^k G_j^k \quad k = 1, \dots, N, \quad i = 1, \dots, s \\ G_i^k &= g^k(Q_i^k, P_i^k) \quad k = 1, \dots, N, \quad i = 1, \dots, s \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 5.3. *Assume we apply the scheme (7) to the Hamiltonian system (10). If the coefficients satisfy*

- (i) $\hat{b}_i^k \hat{b}_j^k = \hat{b}_i^k a_{ij}^k + b_j^k \hat{a}_{ji}^k$ for all i, j, k ,
- (ii) $b_i^k = \hat{b}_i^k$ for all k, i and
- (iii) $b_i^1 = b_i^2 = \dots = b_i^N$ for all i .

then the integrator is symplectic.

The proof of the theorem is analogous to the proof of 5.1, and is omitted.

6. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

Numerical tests were done on a simplified version of the spin-lattice-electron equations. In this system, the position and velocity of each particle is confined to a one-dimensional space. Furthermore, we use periodic boundaries in space and only consider forces between neighbouring particles.

The total Hamiltonian is

$$H(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) = T_L(\mathbf{p}) + U_L(\mathbf{q}) + H_m(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_L(p) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{p_i^2}{2m_i}, \quad U_L(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^n U(q_{i+1} - q_i), \\ H_m(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n J(q_{i+1} - q_i) \mathbf{z}_i^\top \mathbf{z}_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

To effectuate the periodic boundary, we define $\mathbf{z}_{N+1} = \mathbf{z}_1$ and $q_{N+1} = q_1 + L$, where L is the period.




FIGURE 1. Energy behaviour over time

The intermolecular potential is the Lennart–Jones’ potential

$$U(r) = U_0 \left[\left(\frac{r_m}{r} \right)^{12} - 2 \left(\frac{r_m}{r} \right)^6 \right]$$

where r_m is the “rest distance” i.e. the distance at which U is minimal, and U_0 is a positive scalar which controls the strength of the interaction.

The magnetic force strength is a cubic function, of the same type as given by Ma, Woo and Dudarev [MWD08]

$$J(r) = J_0 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{r}{r_c} \right)^3 \cdot \Theta(r_c - r),$$

where Θ is the Heaviside step function, and r_c is a cut-off distance. J_0 is a scalar which controls the strength of the magnetic interaction.

In the numerical tests performed, the values were set to,

$$\begin{aligned} L &= N = 30 \\ m_i &= 1, \\ U_0 &= 1, & r_m &= 1, \\ J_0 &= 10, & r_c &= 1.5 \end{aligned}$$

For initial data, we set

$$q_k = k, \quad p_k = 0, \quad \mathbf{w}_k = a_k \begin{bmatrix} 0.8 \cos\left(\frac{2\pi k}{n}\right) + 0.5 \sin\left(\frac{4\pi k}{n}\right) \\ 0.8 \sin\left(\frac{2\pi k}{n}\right) + 0.5 \cos\left(\frac{4\pi k}{n}\right) \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

where a_k is chosen so that $\|\mathbf{w}_k\| = 1$.

Figure 1 shows the long term behaviour of the energy terms T_L, U_L and H_m as well as their sum H . (A constant term has been added to U_L to improve readability). The figure shows that while the energy is exchanged between the terms with an amplitude on the order of $\mathcal{O}(1)$, the variation in the sum is much smaller, on the order of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$.

The integrator was also tested with various stepsizes h from $h = \frac{1}{16}$ down to $h = 2^{-19}$ over the time interval $[0, 1]$ and the final values were compared with the




FIGURE 2. Pseudoerror as function of stepsize h

same integrator using stepsize $h = 2^{-20}$. The resulting pseudoerrors are plotted in Figure 2. The plot shows the apparent second order of the integrator.

Acknowledgements. This project has received funding from the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation grant agreement KAW 2014.0354. The author would like to thank Klas Modin and Olivier Verdier for very useful discussions and comments about collective integrators and the spherical midpoint method. Klas Modin should also be thanked for supplying the Julia code that formed the basis of the implementation used for the numerical tests.

REFERENCES

- [Eri+17] Olle Eriksson et al. *Atomistic spin dynamics: foundations and applications*. Oxford university press, 2017. ISBN: 9780198788669.
- [Hel+18] Johan Hellsvik et al. *General method for atomistic spin-lattice dynamics with first principles accuracy*. 2018. eprint: [arXiv:1804.03119](https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.03119). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.03119>.
- [HLW06] Ernst Hairer, Christian Lubich, and Gerhard Wanner. *Geometric numerical integration*. Second. Vol. 31. Springer Series in Computational Mathematics. Structure-preserving algorithms for ordinary differential equations. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006, pp. xviii+644. ISBN: 3-540-30663-3; 978-3-540-30663-4.

- [MDW12] Pui-Wai Ma, S. L. Dudarev, and C. H. Woo. “Spin-lattice-electron dynamics simulations of magnetic materials”. In: *Phys. Rev. B* 85 (18 2012), p. 184301. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.85.184301>.
- [MMV14] Robert I. McLachlan, Klas Modin, and Olivier Verdier. “Collective symplectic integrators”. In: *Nonlinearity* 27.6 (2014), pp. 1525–1542. ISSN: 0951-7715. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0951-7715/27/6/1525>.
- [MMV15] Robert I. McLachlan, Klas Modin, and Olivier Verdier. “Collective Lie-Poisson integrators on \mathbb{R}^3 ”. In: *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* 35.2 (2015), pp. 546–560. ISSN: 0272-4979. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/imanum/dru013>.
- [MMV16] Robert I. McLachlan, Klas Modin, and Olivier Verdier. “Geometry of discrete-time spin systems”. In: *J. Nonlinear Sci.* 26.5 (2016), pp. 1507–1523. ISSN: 0938-8974. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00332-016-9311-z>.
- [MMV17] Robert McLachlan, Klas Modin, and Olivier Verdier. “A minimal-variable symplectic integrator on spheres”. In: *Math. Comp.* 86.307 (2017), pp. 2325–2344. ISSN: 0025-5718. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/mcom/3153>.
- [MR99] Jerrold E. Marsden and Tudor S. Ratiu. *Introduction to mechanics and symmetry*. Second. Vol. 17. Texts in Applied Mathematics. A basic exposition of classical mechanical systems. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999, pp. xviii+582. ISBN: 0-387-98643-X. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-21792-5>.
- [MWD08] Pui-Wai Ma, C. H. Woo, and S. L. Dudarev. “Large-scale simulation of the spin-lattice dynamics in ferromagnetic iron”. In: *Phys. Rev. B* 78 (2 2008), p. 024434. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.78.024434>.
- [OMF01] I. P. Omelyan, I. M. Mryglod, and R. Folk. “Algorithm for Molecular Dynamics Simulations of Spin Liquids”. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86 (5 2001), pp. 898–901. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.898>.
- [Per+16] Dilina Perera et al. “Reinventing atomistic magnetic simulations with spin-orbit coupling”. In: *Phys. Rev. B* 93 (6 2016), p. 060402. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.93.060402>.
- [SC94] J. M. Sanz-Serna and M. P. Calvo. *Numerical Hamiltonian problems*. Vol. 7. Applied Mathematics and Mathematical Computation. Chapman & Hall, London, 1994, pp. xii+207. ISBN: 0-412-54290-0.