

# Negative time splitting is stable

Dong Li <sup>\*</sup>      Chaoyu Quan <sup>†</sup>

## Abstract

For high order (than two) in time operator-splitting methods applied to dissipative systems, a folklore issue is the appearance of negative-time/backward-in-time linear evolution operators such as backward heat operators interwoven with nonlinear evolutions. The stability of such methods has remained an ensuing difficult open problem. In this work we consider a fourth order operator splitting discretization for the Allen-Cahn equation which is a prototypical high order splitting method with negative time-stepping, i.e. backward in time integration for the linear parabolic part. We introduce a new theoretical framework and prove uniform energy stability and higher Sobolev stability. This is the first strong stability result for negative time stepping operator-splitting methods.

## 1 Introduction

We consider the Allen-Cahn equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = \nu \Delta u - f(u), & (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \Omega, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where the unknown  $u = u(t, x) : [0, \infty) \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The parameter  $\nu > 0$  is called the mobility coefficient and we fix it as a constant for simplicity. The nonlinear term takes the form  $f(u) = u^3 - u = F'(u)$ , where  $F(u) = \frac{1}{4}(u^2 - 1)^2$  is the standard double well. To minimize technicality, we take the spatial domain  $\Omega$  in (1.1) as the  $2\pi$ -periodic torus  $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z} = [-\pi, \pi]$ . With some additional work our analysis can be extended to physical dimensions  $d = 2, 3$ . The system (1.1) arises as a  $L^2$ -gradient flow of a Ginzburg-Landau type energy functional  $E(u)$ , where

$$E(u) = \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{1}{2} \nu |\nabla u|^2 + F(u) \right) dx = \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{1}{2} \nu |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{1}{4} (u^2 - 1)^2 \right) dx. \quad (1.2)$$

---

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Mathematics, the Hong Kong University of Science & Technology, Clear Water Bay, Hong Kong. Email: mpdongli@gmail.com.

<sup>†</sup>SUSTech International Center for Mathematics, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen, China. Email: quancy@sustech.edu.cn.

The basic energy conservation law takes the form

$$\frac{d}{dt}E(u(t)) + \|\partial_t u\|_2^2 = \frac{d}{dt}E(u(t)) + \int_{\Omega} |\nu \Delta u - f(u)|^2 dx = 0. \quad (1.3)$$

It follows that

$$E(u(t_2)) \leq E(u(t_1)), \quad \forall 0 \leq t_1 < t_2. \quad (1.4)$$

Besides the  $L^2$ -type conservation law, there is also  $L^\infty$ -type control. Due to special form of the nonlinearity, for smooth solutions we have the maximum principle

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L_x^\infty} \leq \max\{1, \|u_0\|_{L_x^\infty}\}, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (1.5)$$

As a consequence the long-time wellposedness and regularity is not an issue for (1.1).

The objective of this work is to establish strong stability of a fourth order in time operating splitting algorithm applied to the Allen-Cahn equation (1.1). This is a part of our on-going program to develop a new theory for the rigorous analysis of stability and convergence of operator-splitting methods applied to dissipative-type problems. Due to various subtle technical obstructions, there were very few rigorous results on the analysis of the operator-splitting type algorithms for the Allen-Cahn equation, the Cahn-Hilliard equation and similar models. Prior to our recent series of works [17, 18], most existing results in the literature are conditional one way or another. To put things into perspective, we briefly review a few closely related representative works and more recent developments.

- The work of Gidey-Reddy. Gidey and Reddy considered in [24] a convective Cahn-Hilliard model of the form

$$\partial_t u - \gamma \nabla \cdot \mathbf{h}(u) + \epsilon^2 \Delta^2 u = \Delta(f(u)), \quad (1.6)$$

where  $\mathbf{h}(u) = \frac{1}{2}(u^2, u^2)$ . They adopted an operator-splitting of (1.6) into the hyperbolic part, nonlinear diffusion part and diffusion part respectively. Several conditional results concerning certain weak solutions were obtained.

- The work of Weng-Zhai-Feng. In [25], Weng, Zhai and Feng studied a viscous Cahn-Hilliard model:

$$(1 - \alpha)\partial_t u = \Delta(-\epsilon^2 \Delta u + f(u) + \alpha \partial_t u), \quad (1.7)$$

where the parameter  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . The authors employed a fast explicit Strang-type operator splitting and proved the stability and the convergence (see Theorem 1 on pp. 7 of [25]) under the assumption that  $A = \|\nabla u^{\text{num}}\|_\infty^2$ ,  $B = \|u^{\text{num}}\|_\infty^2$  stay bounded, and satisfy a technical condition  $6A + 8 - 24B > 0$ . Here  $u^{\text{num}}$  denotes the numerical solution.

- The work of Cheng-Kurganov-Qu-Tang. In [23], Cheng, Kurganov, Qu and Tang considered the Cahn-Hilliard equation

$$\partial_t u = -\nu \Delta^2 u - \Delta u + \Delta(u^3) \quad (1.8)$$

and the MBE equation

$$\partial_t \phi = -\delta \Delta^2 \phi - \nabla \cdot ((1 - |\nabla \phi|^2) \nabla \phi). \quad (1.9)$$

Concerning the Cahn-Hilliard equation, the authors considered a Strang-type splitting approximation of the form

$$u(t + \tau) \approx S_L^{(1)}\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right) S_N^{(1)}(\tau) S_L^{(1)}\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right) u(t), \quad (1.10)$$

where

$$S_L^{(1)}\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\tau(-\nu\Delta^2 - \Delta)\right); \quad (1.11)$$

and  $w = S_N^{(1)}(\tau)a$  is the nonlinear propagator

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w = \Delta(w^3), \\ w|_{t=0} = a. \end{cases} \quad (1.12)$$

Various conditional results were given in [23] but the rigorous analysis of energy stability was a long-standing open problem. This problem and several related open problems were settled in our recent proof [18].

In recent [17], we carried out the first energy-stability analysis of a first order operator-splitting approximation of the Cahn-Hilliard equation. More precisely denote  $u^{\text{CH}}$  as the exact PDE solution to the Cahn-Hilliard equation  $\partial_t u = -\nu \Delta^2 u - \Delta u + \Delta(u^3)$ . We considered a splitting approximation of the form:

$$u^{\text{CH}}(t + \tau) \approx S_L^{(2)}(\tau) S_N^{(2)}(\tau) u^{\text{CH}}(t), \quad (1.13)$$

where  $S_L^{(2)}(\tau) = \exp(-\tau\nu\Delta^2)$  and  $w = S_N^{(2)}(\tau)a$  solves

$$\frac{w - a}{\tau} = \Delta(a^3 - a). \quad (1.14)$$

We introduced a novel modified energy and rigorously proved monotonic decay of the new modified energy which is coercive in  $H^1$ -sense. Moreover we obtained uniform control of higher Sobolev regularity and rigorously justified the first order convergence of the method on any finite time interval.

In [18], we settled the difficult open problem of energy stability of the Strang-type algorithm applied to the Cahn-Hilliard equation which was introduced in the work

of Cheng, Kurganov, Qu and Tang [23]. One should note that the new theoretical framework developed in [18] is completely different from the first order case [17]. In the second-order case, for most generic data one no longer has strict energy-monotonicity at disposal and several new ideas such as dichotomy analysis, an absorbing-set approach were introduced in [18] in order to settle long time unconditional (i.e. independent of time-step or time interval) Sobolev bounds of the numerical solution.

In this work we develop further the program initiated in [17, 18] and turn to the analysis of higher order in time splitting methods. A folklore issue is that operator-splitting methods with order higher than two require negative time-stepping, i.e. backward time integration for each time step. In [33], Sheng considered dimensional splitting for the two-dimensional parabolic problem  $\partial_t u = a\partial_{xx}u + b\partial_{yy}u$ . Using semi-discretization one obtains the ODE system  $\partial_t \mathbf{u} = A\mathbf{u} + B\mathbf{u}$ , where the matrices  $A$  and  $B$  correspond to the discretization of  $a\partial_{xx}$  and  $b\partial_{yy}$  respectively. One is then naturally led to the approximation of  $\mathbf{u} = e^{t(A+B)}\mathbf{u}_0 \approx e^{\frac{1}{2}tA}e^{tB}e^{\frac{1}{2}tA}\mathbf{u}_0$ . In [33], Sheng showed that if the non-commuting matrices  $A$  and  $B$  have eigen-values in the left half of the complex-plane, and one employs the approximation

$$e^{t(A+B)} \approx \sum_{k=1}^K \gamma_k e^{\alpha_{k,1}tA} e^{\beta_{k,2}tB} \dots e^{\alpha_{k,m(k)}tA} e^{\beta_{k,m(k)}tB}, \quad (1.15)$$

$$\gamma_k > 0, \alpha_{i,k} \geq 0, \beta_{l,k} \geq 0, \quad (1.16)$$

then the highest order of a stable approximation is two even if  $K$  is chosen to be large. Put it differently, Sheng's fundamental result states that for an  $N^{\text{th}}$ -order ( $N \geq 3$ ) partitioned split-step schemes, at least one of the solution operators must be applied with negative time step, i.e. backwardly. In [34] Suzuki adopted an elegant time-ordering principle from quantum mechanics and proved a general nonexistence theorem of positive decomposition for high order splitting approximations. In [35], Goldman and Kaper strengthened these results further and showed that even with partitioned schemes, each solution operator within a convex partition must be performed with at least one negative/backward fractional time step.

For deterministic Hamiltonian-type systems, backward time stepping in general does not create instabilities and high-order operating splitting methods have shown promising effectiveness [32]. On the other hand, due to the negative time stepping, there are some arguments that higher-than-three operator splitting methods cannot be applied to parabolic equations with diffusive terms ([33, 36, 37]). As we shall explain momentarily, these concerns are not unsubstantiated and even turn up in the well-defined-ness of these algorithms.

Although rigorous analysis of these issues were not available before, recently Cervi and Spiteri [31] considered three third-order operating-splitting methods and demonstrated via extensive numerical simulations the effectiveness of higher order splitting methods for representative cardiac electrophysiology simulations. These compelling numerical evidences propel us to re-examine in detail the stability property of general negative/backward time-stepping methods in parabolic problems. Indeed, the very

purpose of this work is to break these aforementioned technical barriers and establish a new stability theory for these problems.

To set the stage and minimize technicality, we consider the Allen-Cahn equation (1.1) posed on the  $2\pi$ -periodic torus  $\mathbb{T} = [-\pi, \pi]$ . To build some intuition, let  $\tau > 0$  and consider

$$S_L(\tau) = \exp(\nu\tau\partial_{xx}), \quad (1.17)$$

and let  $w = S_N(\tau)a$  solve the equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w = w - w^3; \\ w|_{t=0} = a. \end{cases} \quad (1.18)$$

An explicit formula for  $S_N(\tau)$  is readily available, indeed it is not difficult to check that

$$S_N(\tau)a = \frac{e^{2\tau}a}{\sqrt{1 + (e^{2\tau} - 1)a^2}}. \quad (1.19)$$

Define a second-order Strang-type propagator

$$S_2^{(o)}(\tau) = S_L\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right)S_N(\tau)S_L\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right). \quad (1.20)$$

Following Yoshida [29], we consider a 4th order integrator obtained by a symmetric repetition (product) of the 2nd order integrator:

$$S_4^{(o)}(\tau) = S_2^{(o)}(x_1\tau)S_2^{(o)}(-x_0\tau)S_2^{(o)}(x_1\tau), \quad (1.21)$$

where

$$x_0 = \frac{2^{\frac{1}{3}}}{2 - 2^{\frac{1}{3}}}, \quad x_1 = \frac{1}{2 - 2^{\frac{1}{3}}}. \quad (1.22)$$

Somewhat surprisingly, we first show that the propagator  $S_4^{(o)}(\tau)$  is ill-defined if one does not introduce a judiciously chosen spectral cut-off.

**Proposition 1.1** (Ill-definedness of  $S_4^{(o)}(\tau)$  with a spectral cut-off). *The propagator  $S_4^{(o)}(\tau)$  is ill-defined in general.*

The proof of Proposition 1.1 is given in Section 2. Armed with this important observation, we are led to introduce a spectral cut-off condition for the propagators. Let  $M \geq 2$  be an integer and we shall consider the projection operator  $\Pi_M$  defined for  $f : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  via the relation

$$\Pi_M f = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{|k| \leq M} \hat{f}(k) e^{ikx}, \quad (1.23)$$

where  $\widehat{f}(k)$  denotes the Fourier coefficient of  $f$ . We introduce the following spectral cut-off condition.

**Definition** (Spectral condition). Let  $M \geq 2$  be the spectral truncation parameter. We shall say  $\tau > 0$  satisfy the spectral condition if  $\tau \leq l_0 M^{-2}$  for some  $l_0 > 0$ .

**Remark 1.1.** *This constraint in  $\tau$  is reminiscent of the CFL condition in hyperbolic problems. Here in the parabolic setting we require that the operator  $\tau \partial_{xx}$  to remain bounded when restricted to the spectral cut-off  $|k| \leq M$ .*

Let  $M \geq 2$ . We now consider the following modified propagators:

$$\begin{aligned} S^{(2)}(\tau) &= \Pi_M S_L\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right) S_N(\tau) \Pi_M S_L\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right); \\ S^{(4)}(\tau) &= S^{(2)}(x_1 \tau) S^{(2)}(-x_0 \tau) S^{(2)}(x_1 \tau). \end{aligned} \quad (1.24)$$

**Theorem 1.1** (Stability of negative-time splitting methods). *Let  $\nu > 0$ ,  $M \geq 2$  and consider the Allen-Cahn equation (1.1) on the one-dimensional  $2\pi$ -periodic torus  $\mathbb{T} = [-\pi, \pi]$ . Assume the spectral cut-off condition  $\tau \leq l_0 M^{-2}$  for some  $l_0 > 0$ . Assume the initial data  $u^0 = \Pi_M a \in H^{k_0}(\mathbb{T})$  ( $k_0 \geq 1$  is an integer). Let  $\tau > 0$  and define*

$$u^{n+1} = S^{(4)} u^n, \quad n \geq 0. \quad (1.25)$$

*There exists a constant  $\tau_* > 0$  depending only on  $l_0$ ,  $\|a\|_{H^1}$  and  $\nu$ , such that if  $0 < \tau \leq \tau_*$ , then*

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} \|u^n\|_{H^{k_0}} \leq A_1 < \infty, \quad (1.26)$$

*where  $A_1 > 0$  depends on  $(\|u^0\|_{H^{k_0}}, \nu, l_0, k_0)$ .*

**Remark 1.2.** *One can also show the fourth-order convergence of the operator splitting approximation. Namely if  $u^0 \in H^{80}(\mathbb{T})$  and let  $u$  be the exact PDE solution corresponding to initial data  $a$ . Let  $0 < \tau < \tau_*$  bet the same as in Theorem 1.1. Then for any  $T > 0$ , we have*

$$\sup_{n \geq 1, n\tau \leq T} \|u^n - u(n\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} \leq C(\tau^4 + M^{-10}), \quad (1.27)$$

*where  $C > 0$  depends on  $(\nu, l_0, \|u^0\|_{H^{80}}, T)$ . The regularity assumption on initial data can be lowered. We shall refrain from stating such a pedestrian result here and leave its justification to interested readers as exercises.*

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we set up the notation and collect some preliminary lemmas. In Section 3 we give the proof of Theorem 1.1.

## 2 Notation and preliminaries

For any two positive quantities  $X$  and  $Y$ , we shall write  $X \lesssim Y$  or  $Y \gtrsim X$  if  $X \leq CY$  for some constant  $C > 0$  whose precise value is unimportant. We shall write  $X \sim Y$  if both  $X \lesssim Y$  and  $Y \lesssim X$  hold. We write  $X \lesssim_\alpha Y$  if the constant  $C$  depends on some parameter  $\alpha$ . We shall write  $X = O(Y)$  if  $|X| \lesssim Y$  and  $X = O_\alpha(Y)$  if  $|X| \lesssim_\alpha Y$ .

We shall denote  $X \ll Y$  if  $X \leq cY$  for some sufficiently small constant  $c$ . The smallness of the constant  $c$  is usually clear from the context. The notation  $X \gg Y$  is similarly defined. Note that our use of  $\ll$  and  $\gg$  here is *different* from the usual Vinogradov notation in number theory or asymptotic analysis.

For any  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we denote  $|x| = |x|_2 = \sqrt{x_1^2 + \dots + x_d^2}$ , and  $|x|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq j \leq d} |x_j|$ . Also occasionally we use the Japanese bracket notation:  $\langle x \rangle = (1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

We denote by  $\mathbb{T}^d = [-\pi, \pi]^d = \mathbb{R}^d / 2\pi\mathbb{Z}^d$  the usual  $2\pi$ -periodic torus. For  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$  and any function  $f : x \in \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we denote the Lebesgue  $L^p$ -norm of  $f$  as

$$\|f\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} = \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} = \|f\|_p.$$

If  $(a_j)_{j \in I}$  is a sequence of complex numbers and  $I$  is the index set, we denote the discrete  $l^p$ -norm as

$$\|(a_j)_{j \in I}\|_{l_x^p(j \in I)} = \|(a_j)_{j \in I}\|_{l^p(I)} = \begin{cases} \left( \sum_{j \in I} |a_j|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, & 0 < p < \infty, \\ \sup_{j \in I} |a_j|, & p = \infty. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

For example,  $\|\hat{f}(k)\|_{l_k^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)} = \left( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\hat{f}(k)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . If  $f = (f_1, \dots, f_m)$  is a vector-valued function, we denote  $|f| = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m |f_j|^2}$ , and  $\|f\|_p = \left\| \left( \sum_{j=1}^m f_j^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p$ . We use similar convention for the corresponding discrete  $l^p$  norms for the vector-valued case.

We use the following convention for the Fourier transform pair:

$$\hat{f}(k) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f(x) e^{-ik \cdot x} dx, \quad f(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{f}(k) e^{ik \cdot x}, \quad (2.2)$$

and denote for  $0 \leq s \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\|f\|_{\dot{H}^s} = \|f\|_{\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)} = \|\ |\nabla|^s f \|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} \sim \| |k|^s \hat{f}(k) \|_{l_k^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)}, \quad (2.3a)$$

$$\|f\|_{H^s} = \sqrt{\|f\|_2^2 + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2} \sim \| \langle |k| \rangle^s \hat{f}(k) \|_{l_k^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)}. \quad (2.3b)$$

*Proof of Proposition 1.1.* To prove Proposition 1.1, it suffices for us to examine the following statement. Consider  $u = e^{\partial_{xx}} \delta_0$  where  $\delta_0$  is the periodic Dirac comb on  $\mathbb{T}$ . Let  $0 < \tau \ll 1$  and consider

$$u = w(1 + \tau w^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.4)$$

Claim:  $e^{-\epsilon_0 \partial_{xx}} w \notin L^2$  for any  $\epsilon_0 > 0$ .

Proof of Claim. Observe that the Fourier coefficients of  $u$  are all positive and

$$\widehat{u}(k) \gtrsim \tau^m \widehat{w^{2m+1}}(k). \quad (2.5)$$

Clearly the desired conclusion follows.  $\square$

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

**Lemma 3.1** (One-step  $H^k$  stability). *Let  $\nu > 0$ ,  $M \geq 2$  and assume the spectral condition  $\tau M^{-2} \leq l_0$  for some constant  $l_0 > 0$ . Suppose  $a \in H^k(\mathbb{T})$ ,  $k \geq 1$  and  $\|a\|_{H^k} \leq A_0$ . Let  $0 \leq y_1 \leq y_2 < \infty$ . There exists  $\tau_1 = \tau_1(\nu, k, y_1, y_2, A_0, l_0) > 0$  sufficiently small such that if  $0 < \tau \leq \tau_1$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_M S_L(-y_1 \tau) S_N(\tau) S_L(y_2 \tau) a\|_{H^k} &\leq e^{c_1 \tau} \|a\|_{H^k}, \\ \|\Pi_M S_L(-y_1 \tau) S_N(-\tau) S_L(y_2 \tau) a\|_{H^k} &\leq e^{c_1 \tau} \|a\|_{H^k}, \\ \|\Pi_M S_L(y_2 \tau) S_N(\tau) \Pi_M S_L(-y_1 \tau) a\|_{H^k} &\leq e^{c_1 \tau} \|a\|_{H^k}, \\ \|\Pi_M S_L(y_2 \tau) S_N(-\tau) \Pi_M S_L(-y_1 \tau) a\|_{H^k} &\leq e^{c_1 \tau} \|a\|_{H^k}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where  $c_1 > 0$  depends on  $(\nu, k, y_1, y_2, A_0, l_0)$ .

**Remark 3.1.** Define

$$T_1 a = \Pi_M S_L(-y_1 \tau) S_N(\tau) S_L(y_2 \tau); \quad (3.2)$$

$$T_2 a = \Pi_M S_L(-y_1 \tau) S_N(-\tau) S_L(y_2 \tau) a; \quad (3.3)$$

$$T_3 a = \Pi_M S_L(y_2 \tau) S_N(\tau) \Pi_M S_L(-y_1 \tau) a; \quad (3.4)$$

$$T_4 a = \Pi_M S_L(y_2 \tau) S_N(-\tau) \Pi_M S_L(-y_1 \tau) a. \quad (3.5)$$

Later we shall apply Lemma 3.1  $n$ -times. In particular we need to bound the expression

$$\| \underbrace{T_{i_1} \cdots T_{i_n}}_{n \text{ times}} a \|_{H^k}. \quad (3.6)$$

Since the constant  $c_1$  depends on the  $H^k$ -norm of the iterates, it is of importance to give uniform control of the  $H^k$ -norm. To resolve this issue, we first choose  $A_0$ ,  $\tau_1$  and  $c_1$  such that

$$\|a\|_{H^k} \leq \frac{1}{10} A_0, \quad \tau_1 = \tau_1(\nu, k, y_1, y_2, k, A_0, l_0), \quad c_1 = c_1(\nu, k, y_1, y_2, A_0, l_0). \quad (3.7)$$

We choose  $n$  such that

$$n\tau \leq \frac{1}{c_1}. \quad (3.8)$$

Clearly in the course of iteration, the  $H^k$ -norm of the iterates never exceeds  $A_0$ . In particular

$$\|T_{i_1} \cdots T_{i_n} a\|_{H^k} \leq e^{c_1 n \tau} \|a\|_{H^k} \leq e \cdot \frac{1}{10} A_0 \leq A_0. \quad (3.9)$$



*Proof of Lemma 3.1.* We begin by noting that for the ODE

$$\partial_t w = \pm w \pm w^3; \quad (3.10)$$

we have the estimate (note that  $H^k(\mathbb{T})$  is an algebra for  $k \geq 1$ )

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|w\|_{H^k} \lesssim \|w\|_{H^k} + \|w\|_{H^k}^3. \quad (3.11)$$

It follows that for  $\tau > 0$  sufficiently small,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \tau} \|S_N(\pm t)b\|_{H^k} \leq 2\|b\|_{H^k}; \quad (3.12)$$

$$\|S_N(\tau)b - b\|_{H^k} \leq \tau \cdot O(\|b\|_{H^k} + \|b\|_{H^k}^3). \quad (3.13)$$

The desired estimates then easily follows from the above using the spectral condition.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2** (Multi-step  $H^1$  stability and higher regularity). *Let  $\nu > 0$ ,  $M \geq 2$  and assume the spectral condition  $\tau M^{-2} \leq l_0$  for some constant  $l_0 > 0$ . Suppose  $a \in H^1(\mathbb{T})$  and  $\|a\|_{H^1} \leq B_1$  for some constant  $B_1 > 0$ . Define*

$$\begin{aligned} S^{(2)}(\tau) &= \Pi_M S_L\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right) S_N(\tau) \Pi_M S_L\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right); \\ S^{(4)}(\tau) &= S^{(2)}(x_1\tau) S^{(2)}(-x_0\tau) S^{(2)}(x_1\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where  $x_0 = \frac{2^{\frac{1}{3}}}{2-2^{\frac{1}{3}}} \approx 1.7$ ,  $x_1 = \frac{1}{2-2^{\frac{1}{3}}} \approx 1.35$ . For  $n \geq 1$ , define

$$u^n = S^{(4)}(\tau) u^{n-1}, \quad (3.15)$$

where  $u^0 = a$ . There exist  $c_1 = c_1(\nu, l_0, B_1) > 0$  and  $\tau_2 = \tau_2(\nu, l_0, B_1) > 0$  such that if  $0 < \tau \leq \tau_2$  (we may assume  $c_1\tau_2 \leq 0.01$ ), then

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^n\|_{H^1} &\leq e^{c_1\tau} \|u^{n-1}\|_{H^1}, \quad 1 \leq n \leq \frac{1}{c_1\tau}; \\ \sup_{1 \leq n \leq \frac{1}{c_1\tau}} \|u^n\|_{H^1} &\leq 3B_1; \\ \sup_{\frac{1}{10c_1\tau} \leq n \leq \frac{1}{c_1\tau}} \|u^n\|_{H^{s_0}} &\leq B_2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

where  $B_2 > 0$  depends on  $(\nu, l_0, B_1)$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.2.* Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} S^{(4)}(\tau) &= \Pi_M S_L\left(\frac{x_1}{2}\tau\right) S_N(x_1\tau) \Pi_M S_L\left(-\frac{x_0-x_1}{2}\tau\right) S_N(-x_0\tau) \Pi_M S_L\left(-\frac{x_0-x_1}{2}\tau\right) S_N(x_1\tau) S_L\left(\frac{x_1}{2}\tau\right) \\ &= \underbrace{\Pi_M S_L\left(\frac{x_1}{2}\tau\right) S_N(x_1\tau) S_L\left(-\frac{x_1-\epsilon_1}{2}\tau\right)}_{=:T_A} \underbrace{\Pi_M S_L\left(\frac{2x_1-x_0-\epsilon_1}{2}\tau\right) S_N(-x_0\tau) S_L\left(-\frac{x_0-x_1}{4}\tau\right)}_{=:T_B} \\ &\quad \underbrace{S_L\left(-\frac{x_0-x_1}{4}\tau\right) S_N(x_1\tau) S_L\left(\frac{x_1}{2}\tau\right)}_{=:T_C}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

where  $\epsilon_1 = 0.01$ . Clearly the operators  $T_A, T_B, T_C$  fulfill the conditions of Lemma 3.1. The  $H^1$  estimates then follow easily from the computations outlined in Remark 3.1 with some necessary adjustment of the constants.

To establish (3.16), we note that for  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\|S_N(\tau)f - f\|_{H^k} \lesssim O(\tau)\|f\|_{H^k}, \quad (3.18)$$

provided  $\tau\|f\|_{H^1}^2 \ll 1$ . We then rewrite  $S^{(4)}(\tau)f$  as

$$S^{(4)}(\tau)f = S_L((2x_1 - x_0)\tau)f + \tau\tilde{f} = S_L(\tau)f + \tau\tilde{f}, \quad (3.19)$$

where  $\|\tilde{f}\|_{H^1} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^1}$ . One can then bootstrap the higher regularity from this. We omit further details.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** *It is not difficult to check that under the assumption of uniform high Sobolev regularity, we have (below we assume  $f = \Pi_M f$ )*

$$\begin{aligned} S^{(4)}(\tau)f &= S_L(\tau)(f + \tau(f - \Pi_M(f^3))) + O(\tau^2) \\ &= \underbrace{(1 - \nu\tau\partial_{xx})^{-1}f + \tau(1 - \nu\tau\partial_{xx})^{-1}(f - \Pi_M(f^3))}_{=: \tilde{S}(\tau)f} + O(\tau^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

It follows that

$$E(S^{(4)}(\tau)f) = E(\tilde{S}(\tau)f) + O(\tau^2). \quad (3.21)$$

**Lemma 3.3** (Control of the energy flux). *Let  $\nu > 0$  and  $M \geq 2$ . Suppose  $f \in H^2(\mathbb{T})$  satisfies  $f = \Pi_M f$  and*

$$\|\nu\partial_{xx}f - \Pi_M(f^3) + f\|_2 \leq 1. \quad (3.22)$$

Then

$$\|f\|_{H^{s_0}(\mathbb{T})} \leq C_\nu^{(o)}, \quad (3.23)$$

where  $C_\nu^{(o)} > 0$  depends only on  $\nu$ . Furthermore if  $\tau \leq l_0 M^{-2}$  and  $0 < \tau \leq \tau^{(0)}(\nu, l_0)$  where  $\tau^{(0)}(\nu, l_0) > 0$  is a sufficiently small constant depending on  $(\nu, l_0)$ , then

$$E(S^{(4)}(\tau)f) \leq C_{\nu, l_0}^{(U)}, \quad (3.24)$$

where  $C_{\nu, l_0}^{(U)} > 0$  depends only on  $(\nu, l_0)$ .

*Proof.* The estimate (3.23) follows from energy estimates using (3.22). Note that the condition  $f = \Pi_M f$  is used in the identity  $\int \Pi_M(f^3)f dx = \int f^4 dx$ . The estimate (3.24) follows from (3.23) and Lemma 3.1.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4** (One-step strict energy dissipation with nontrivial energy flux). *Let  $\nu > 0$ ,  $M \geq 2$  and  $0 < \tau \leq M^{-2}l_0$ . Suppose  $f \in H^{80}(\mathbb{T})$  with  $f = \Pi_M f$  and satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nu \partial_{xx} f - \Pi_M(f^3) + f\|_2 &\geq 1, \\ \|f\|_{H^{80}(\mathbb{T})} &\leq B_0 < \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

where  $B_0 > 0$  is a given constant. There exists  $\tau_3 = \tau_3(\nu, l_0, B_0) > 0$  sufficiently small such that if  $0 < \tau \leq \tau_3$ , then

$$E(S^{(4)}(\tau)f) < E(f). \quad (3.26)$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.4.* By using Remark 3.2, it suffices for us to show

$$E(\tilde{S}(\tau)f) + c_1\tau \leq E(f), \quad (3.27)$$

for some  $c_1 > 0$ . Denote  $w = \tilde{S}(\tau)f$  and observe that

$$\frac{w - f}{\tau} = \nu \partial_{xx} w + f - \Pi_M(f^3). \quad (3.28)$$

It follows that for  $\tau > 0$  sufficiently small,

$$E(w) - E(f) + \frac{c_2}{\tau} \|w - f\|_2^2 \leq 0, \quad (3.29)$$

where  $c_2 > 0$  is a constant. Now we clearly have

$$\left(\frac{1}{\tau} - \nu \partial_{xx}\right)(w - f) = \nu \partial_{xx} f + f - \Pi_M(f^3). \quad (3.30)$$

The desired result clearly follows.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\nu > 0$ ,  $M \geq 2$  and  $0 < \tau \leq l_0 M^{-2}$ . Assume  $a \in H^1(\mathbb{T})$  and  $\|a\|_{H^1} \leq \gamma_1$ . Define  $u^0 = \Pi_M a$  and*

$$u^{n+1} = S^{(4)}(\tau)u^n, \quad n \geq 0. \quad (3.31)$$

*There exists  $\tau_* = \tau_*(\nu, l_0, \gamma_1) > 0$  sufficiently small such that if  $0 < \tau \leq \tau_*$ , then*

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \|u^n\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T})} \leq F_{\nu, l_0, \gamma_1}^{(0)}, \quad (3.32)$$

where  $F_{\nu, l_0, \gamma_1}^{(0)} > 0$  depends only on  $(\nu, l_0, \gamma_1)$ .

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Denote

$$G = 10(1 + \gamma_1 + C_{\nu, l_0}^{(U)} + C_{\nu}^{(o)}), \quad (3.33)$$

where the constants  $C_{\nu, l_0}^{(U)}$ ,  $C_{\nu}^{(o)}$  are the same as in Lemma 3.3. In the argument below we shall assume  $\tau > 0$  is sufficiently small. The needed smallness (i.e. the existence of  $\tau_*$ ) can be easily worked out by fulfilling the conditions needed in Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4.

By Lemma 3.2, we can find  $c_1 = c_1(\nu, l_0, G) > 0$  such that

$$\sup_{1 \leq n \leq \frac{c_1}{\tau}} E(u^n) \leq \frac{1}{2}G. \quad (3.34)$$

Claim: We have

$$\sup_{n \geq \frac{c_1}{\tau}} E(u^n) \leq G. \quad (3.35)$$

To prove the claim we argue by contradiction. Suppose  $n_0 \geq \frac{c_1}{\tau}$  is the first integer such that

$$E(u^{n_0}) \leq G, \quad E(u^{n_0+1}) > G. \quad (3.36)$$

By Lemma 3.3 we must have

$$\|\nu \partial_{xx} u^{n_0} - \Pi_M((u^{n_0})^3) + u^{n_0}\|_2 > 1. \quad (3.37)$$

Since  $n_0 \geq \frac{c_1}{\tau}$ , we have  $E(u^{n_0-j_0}) \leq G$  for some integer  $\frac{c_0}{10\tau} \leq j_0 \leq \frac{c_0}{10\tau} + 2$ . By using smoothing estimates we obtain

$$\|u^{n_0}\|_{H^{s_0}(\mathbb{T})} \leq C_{\nu, l_0, G}, \quad (3.38)$$

where  $C_{\nu, l_0, G} > 0$  depends on  $(\nu, l_0, G)$ . Since  $G$  depends on  $(\nu, l_0, \gamma_1)$ , we have  $C_{\nu, l_0, G}$  depends only on  $(\nu, l_0, \gamma_1)$ . By (3.37), (3.38) and Lemma 3.4, we obtain for sufficiently small  $\tau$  that

$$E(u^{n_0+1}) < E(u^{n_0}) \quad (3.39)$$

which is clearly a contradiction to (3.36). Thus we have proved the claim.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* The  $H^1$  estimate follows from Theorem 3.1. Higher order estimates follow from the smoothing estimates.  $\square$

## References

- [1] A. Baskaran, J. S. Lowengrub, C. Wang, and S. M. Wise. Convergence Analysis of a Second Order Convex Splitting Scheme for the Modified Phase Field Crystal Equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 51(2013), 2851sC2873.
- [2] J.W. Cahn, J.E. Hilliard. Free energy of a nonuniform system. I. Interfacial energy free energy, *J. Chem. Phys.* 28 (1958) 258–267.

- [3] L.Q. Chen, J. Shen. Applications of semi-implicit Fourier-spectral method to phase field equations. *Comput. Phys. Comm.*, 108 (1998), pp. 147–158.
- [4] A. Christlieb, J. Jones, K. Promislow, B. Wetton, M. Willoughby. High accuracy solutions to energy gradient flows from material science models. *J. Comput. Phys.* 257 (2014), part A, 193–215.
- [5] C.M. Elliott and A.M. Stuart. The global dynamics of discrete semilinear parabolic equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 30 (1993), pp. 1622–1663.
- [6] D. J. Eyre. Unconditionally gradient stable time marching the Cahn-Hilliard equation. *Computational and mathematical models of microstructural evolution* (San Francisco, CA, 1998), 39–46, *Mater. Res. Soc. Sympos. Proc.*, 529, MRS, Warrendale, PA, 1998.
- [7] X. Feng, T. Tang and J. Yang. Long time numerical simulations for phase-field problems using p-adaptive spectral deferred correction methods. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 37 (2015), no. 1, A271–A294.
- [8] H. Gomez and T.J.R. Hughes. Provably unconditionally stable, second-order time-accurate, mixed variational methods for phase-field models. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 230 (2011), pp. 5310-5327
- [9] Z. Guan, C. Wang and S. M. Wise, A convergent convex splitting scheme for the periodic nonlocal Cahn-Hilliard equation, *Numer. Math.*, 128 (2014), 377–406.
- [10] J. Guo, C. Wang, S. M. Wise and X. Yue, An  $H^2$  convergence of a second-order convex-splitting, finite difference scheme for the three-dimensional Cahn-Hilliard equation, *Comm. Math. Sci.*, 14 (2016), 489–515
- [11] Y. He, Y. Liu and T. Tang. On large time-stepping methods for the Cahn-Hilliard equation. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 57 (2007), 616–628.
- [12] F. Liu and J. Shen. Stabilized semi-implicit spectral deferred correction methods for Allen-Cahn and Cahn-Hilliard equations. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* 38 (2015), no. 18, 4564–4575.
- [13] D. Li, Z. Qiao and T. Tang. Characterizing the stabilization size for semi-implicit Fourier-spectral method to phase field equations, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 54 (2016), 1653–1681
- [14] D. Li, F. Wang and K. Yang. An improved gradient bound for 2D MBE. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 269(12): 11165-11171, 2020.
- [15] D. Li, T. Tang. Stability of the Semi-Implicit Method for the Cahn-Hilliard Equation with Logarithmic Potentials. *Ann. Appl. Math.*, 37 (2021), 31–60.

- [16] D. Li, C. Quan, and T. Tang. Stability analysis for the implicit-explicit discretization of the Cahn-Hilliard equation.
- [17] D. Li and C. Quan. The operator-splitting method for Cahn-Hilliard is stable. arXiv:2107.01418, 2021.
- [18] D. Li and C. Quan. On the energy stability of Strang-splitting for Cahn-Hilliard. arXiv:2107.05349, 2021.
- [19] C.B. Schönlieb and A. Bertozzi. Unconditionally stable schemes for higher order inpainting. *Commun. Math. Sci.* 9 (2011), no. 2, 413–457.
- [20] J. Shen and X. Yang. Numerical approximations of Allen-Cahn and Cahn-Hilliard equations. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. A*, 28 (2010), 1669–1691.
- [21] J. Shen, J. Xu and J. Yang. A new class of efficient and robust energy stable schemes for gradient flows. *SIAM Rev.* 61 (2019), no. 3, 474–506.
- [22] H. Song and C. Shu. Unconditional energy stability analysis of a second order implicit-explicit local discontinuous Galerkin method for the Cahn-Hilliard equation. *J. Sci. Comput.* 73 (2017), no. 2-3, 1178–1203.
- [23] Y. Cheng, A. Kurganov, Z. Qu, and T. Tang. Fast and stable explicit operator splitting methods for phase-field models. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 303:45–65, 2015.
- [24] H.H. Gidey and B.D. Reddy. Operator-splitting methods for the 2D convective Cahn-Hilliard equation. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 2019, 77(12): 3128–3153.
- [25] Z. Weng, S. Zhai and X. Feng. Analysis of the operator splitting scheme for the Cahn-Hilliard equation with a viscosity term. *Numer. Meth. for Partial Differential Equations.* 35 (2019), no. 6, 1949–1970.
- [26] C. Xu and T. Tang. Stability analysis of large time-stepping methods for epitaxial growth models. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 44 (2006), no. 4, 1759–1779.
- [27] J. Zhu, L.-Q. Chen, J. Shen, and V. Tikare. Coarsening kinetics from a variable-mobility Cahn-Hilliard equation: Application of a semi-implicit Fourier spectral method, *Phys. Rev. E* (3), 60 (1999), pp. 3564–3572.
- [28] R. I. Issa. Solution of the implicitly discretised fluid flow equations by operator-splitting. *Journal of Computational Physics* 62, no. 1 (1986): 40–65.
- [29] H. Yoshida. Construction of higher order symplectic integrators. *Physics letters A* 150, no. 5–7 (1990): 262-268.

- [30] R. I. McLachlan and G. R. W. Quispel. Splitting methods. *Acta Numerica* 11 (2002): 341–434.
- [31] J. Cervi and R. J. Spiteri. High-order operator splitting for the bidomain and monodomain models. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 40, no. 2 (2018): A769–A786.
- [32] M. Thalhammer, M. Caliarì and C. Neuhauser. High-order time-splitting Hermite and Fourier spectral methods. *J. Comput. Phys.* 228 (2009), pp. 822–832.
- [33] Q. Sheng. Solving linear partial differential equations by exponential splitting. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* 9 (1989), pp. 199–212.
- [34] M. Suzuki. General theory of fractal path integrals with applications to many-body theories and statistical physics. *J. Math. Phys.*, 32 (1991), pp. 400–407.
- [35] G. Goldman and T.J. Kaper. Nth-order operator splitting schemes and nonreversible systems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 33 (1996), pp. 349–367.
- [36] S.A. Chin. Quantum statistical calculations and symplectic corrector algorithms. *Phys. Rev. E.* 69 (2004), 046118.
- [37] *Splitting Methods in Communication, Imaging, Science and Engineering*. Sci. Comput. Springer, Cham, 2016.