

TWO NEW FAMILIES OF FOURTH-ORDER EXPLICIT EXPONENTIAL RUNGE–KUTTA METHODS WITH FOUR STAGES FOR FIRST-ORDER DIFFERENTIAL SYSTEMS

XIANFA HU, YONGLEI FANG, AND BIN WANG

Abstract. In this paper, two new families of fourth-order explicit exponential Runge–Kutta (ERK) methods with four stages are studied for solving first-order differential systems $y'(t) + My(t) = f(y(t))$. By comparing the Taylor series of the exact solution, the order conditions of these ERK methods are derived, which are exactly identical to the order conditions of explicit Runge–Kutta methods, and these ERK methods reduce to classical Runge–Kutta methods once $M \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$. Moreover, we analyze the stability properties and the convergence of the new methods. Several numerical examples are implemented to illustrate the accuracy and efficiency of these ERK methods by comparison with standard exponential integrators.

Key Words. Exponential Runge–Kutta methods, first-order differential equations, the order conditions, and convergence

1. Introduction

Classical Runge–Kutta (RK) methods are extensively recognized by researchers and engineers for its simple idea and concise expression [5, 35, 38, 41], and standard ERK methods with the stiff-order conditions (comprise the classical order conditions) were formulated by Hochbruck et al. [22, 23, 24], which can be viewed as an extension of classical RK methods. The idea of exponential integrators is primarily concerned with the use of the variation-of-constants formula (see [24]), normally, the coefficients of exponential integrators are exponential functions of the underlying matrix in the literature, this fact means that the implementation of exponential integrators requires the evaluations of matrix exponentials and vectors. In order to reduce the computational cost, two new kinds of ERK methods up to order three were formulated in [36]. As a sequel to this work, we study two new families of fourth-order explicit ERK methods with four stages for the first-order differential system in this paper, which are termed the modified and simplified versions of fourth-order explicit ERK integrators, respectively.

In this paper, we consider the evolution equation and ordinary differential equation of the form

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} y'(t) + My(t) = f(y(t)), & t \in [t_0, t_{\text{end}}], \\ y(t_0) = y_0, \end{cases}$$

where the matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is a symmetric positive definite or skew-Hermitian. Problems of the form (1) arise frequently in a variety of applied science such as quantum mechanics, flexible mechanics, and semilinear parabolic problems.

Exponential integrators have received much attention due to its high accuracy and stability (see, e.g., [8, 21, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 34, 37, 39, 40]), and the product of a matrix exponential and a vector is effectively evaluated by the Krylov subspace method [12, 20] or a Pade approximant (see, e.g., [4, 32]). In recent years, Fang et al. [14] presented explicit pseudo two-step exponential Runge-Kutta methods for first-order differential equations, Du et al. [10, 11] considered the exponential time differencing method for semilinear parabolic problems, and Li et al. [28] formulated exponential cut-off methods for preserving maximum principle. It should be noted that ERK methods are based on the stiff-order conditions. However, as stated by Berland et al. in [3], the stiff-order conditions are relatively strict. It is true that the fourth-order explicit ERK method (9) with five stages was proposed in [22], which only satisfied the stiff-order conditions in a weak form. Here, the coefficients of our fourth-order explicit ERK methods are real constants and the study is related to the classical order conditions.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we derive the order conditions of the modified version of fourth-order explicit ERK methods. Section 3 is devoted to presenting the simplified version of explicit ERK methods of order four. The linear stability properties and the convergence of our explicit ERK methods are analyzed in Section 4. Numerical results present the accuracy and efficiency of these ERK methods when applied to the averaged system in wind-induced oscillation, the Hénon-Heiles Model, the Allen-Cahn equation, the sine-Gorden equation and the nonlinear Schrödinger equation in Section 5. The concluding remarks are included in the last section.

2. A modified version of fourth-order explicit ERK methods

The internal stages and the update of the modified version of ERK methods inherit and modify the form of classical RK methods, respectively.

Definition 2.1. ([36]) *An s -stage modified version of exponential Runge-Kutta (MVERK) method for the numerical integration (1) is defined as*

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} Y_i = y_0 + h \sum_{j=1}^s a_{ij}(-MY_j + f(Y_j)), & i = 1, \dots, s, \\ y_1 = e^{-hM}y_0 + h \sum_{i=1}^s b_i f(Y_i) + w_s(z), \end{cases}$$

where a_{ij} , b_i are real constants for $i, j = 1, \dots, s$, $Y_i \approx y(t_0 + c_i h)$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$, $w_s(z)$ is a suitable matrix-valued function of hM , and $w_s(z) \rightarrow 0$ when $M \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$.

In [36], it is clearly indicated that $w_s(z)$ is independent of the matrix exponential. In fact, the $w_s(z)$ is also related to the term $f(\cdot)$ and initial value y_0 , and MVERK methods with the same order share the same $w_s(z)$. Especially, if we consider the MVERK method with order one, then $w_s(z) = 0$. From (2), it is clear that the MVERK method can exactly integrate the first-order homogeneous linear system $y'(t) = -My(t)$, $y(0) = y_0$, which has the exact solution $y(t) = e^{-tM}y_0$.

The property of the method (2) is significant. For linear oscillatory problems, the exponential contains the full information on linear oscillations in contrast to classical numerical methods (non-exponential). The method (2) can be displayed by the following Butcher Tableau

$$(3) \quad \begin{array}{c|c|c} c & \mathbf{I} & A \\ \hline e^{-hM} & w_s(z) & b^T \end{array} = \begin{array}{c|c|ccc} c_1 & I & a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1s} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ c_s & I & a_{s1} & \cdots & a_{ss} \\ \hline e^{-hM} & w_s(z) & b_1 & \cdots & b_s \end{array}$$

with $c_i = \sum_{j=1}^s a_{ij}$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$.

In view of (2), the internal stages of the MVERK method are independent of matrix exponentials, and the update remains some properties of the matrix exponential. Once $M \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$ i.e., $y'(t) = f(y(t))$, then $e^{-hM} = I$, $w_s(z) = \mathbf{0}$, and the MVERK method reduces to a classical RK method

$$(4) \quad \begin{cases} Y_i = y_0 + h \sum_{j=1}^s a_{ij} f(Y_j), \quad i = 1, \dots, s, \\ y_1 = y_0 + h \sum_{i=1}^s b_i f(Y_i). \end{cases}$$

Therefore, MVERK methods can be considered as an extension of classical RK methods.

A numerical method is said to be of order p if the Taylor expansion of a numerical solution y_1 and the exact solution $y(t_0 + h)$ coincide up to h^p about y_0 . Under the assumption $y(t_0) = y_0$, we denote $g(t_0) = -My(t_0) + f(y(t_0))$, and the Taylor series of $y(t_0 + h)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} y(t_0 + h) &= y(t_0) + hy'(t_0) + \frac{h^2}{2!}y''(t_0) + \frac{h^3}{3!}y'''(t_0) + \frac{h^4}{4!}y^{(4)}(t_0) + \mathcal{O}(h^5) \\ &= y(t_0) + hg(t_0) + \frac{h^2}{2!}(-M + f'_y(y_0))g(t_0) + \frac{h^3}{3!}\left(M^2g(t_0) + (-M + f'_y(y(t_0)))f'_y(y(t_0))g(t_0) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - f'_y(y(t_0))Mg(t_0) + f''_{yy}(y(t_0))(g(t_0), g(t_0))\right) + \frac{h^4}{4!}\left(-M^3g(t_0) + M^2f'_y(y(t_0))g(t_0) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - Mf'_y(y(t_0))(-M + f'_y(y(t_0)))g(t_0) - Mf''_{yy}(y(t_0))(g(t_0), g(t_0)) + f'_y(y(t_0))(-M \right. \\ &\quad \left. + f'_y(y(t_0)))(-M + f'_y(y(t_0)))g(t_0) + f'_y(y(t_0))f''_{yy}(y(t_0))(g(t_0), g(t_0)) + f'''_{yyy}(y(t_0))(g(t_0), \right. \\ &\quad \left. g(t_0), g(t_0)) + 3f''_{yy}(y(t_0))((-M + f'_y(y(t_0)))g(t_0), g(t_0))\right) + \mathcal{O}(h^5). \end{aligned}$$

Before we derive the order conditions of fourth-order explicit MVERK methods with four stages, it is necessary to present the classical order conditions of RK methods:

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} \bullet & \quad b_1 + b_2 + b_3 + b_4 & = 1, \\ \downarrow & \quad b_2c_2 + b_3c_3 + b_4c_4 & = \frac{1}{2}, \\ \vee & \quad b_2c_2^2 + b_3c_3^2 + b_4c_4^2 & = \frac{1}{3}, \\ \downarrow & \quad b_3a_{32}c_2 + b_4a_{42}c_2 + b_4a_{43}c_3 & = \frac{1}{6}, \\ \vee & \quad b_2c_2^3 + b_3c_3^3 + b_4c_4^3 & = \frac{1}{4}, \\ \downarrow & \quad b_3c_3a_{32}c_2 + b_4c_4a_{42}c_2 + b_4c_4a_{43}c_3 & = \frac{1}{8}, \\ \downarrow & \quad b_3a_{32}c_2^2 + b_4a_{42}c_2^2 + b_4a_{43}c_3^2 & = \frac{1}{12}, \\ \downarrow & \quad b_4a_{43}a_{32}c_2 & = \frac{1}{24}, \end{aligned}$$

with the appropriate assumption $c_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} a_{ij}$, for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. It is very clear that the equation (5) has infinitely many solutions.

The following theorem will present the order conditions of fourth-order explicit MVERK methods with four stages are identical to (5).

Theorem 2.2. *If the coefficients of the four-stage explicit MVERK method with $w_4(z)$*

$$(6) \quad \begin{cases} Y_1 = y_0, \\ Y_2 = y_0 + ha_{21}(-MY_1 + f(Y_1)), \\ Y_3 = y_0 + h\left(a_{31}(-MY_1 + f(Y_1)) + a_{32}(-MY_2 + f(Y_2))\right), \\ Y_4 = y_0 + h\left(a_{41}(-MY_1 + f(Y_1)) + a_{42}(-MY_2 + f(Y_2)) + a_{43}(-MY_3 + f(Y_3))\right), \\ y_1 = e^{-hM}y_0 + h\left(b_1f(Y_1) + b_2f(Y_2) + b_3f(Y_3) + b_4f(Y_4)\right) + w_4(z), \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} w_4(z) = & -\frac{h^2}{2!}Mf(y_0) + \frac{h^3}{3!}(M^2f(y_0) - Mf'_y(y_0)g(y_0)) + \frac{h^4}{4!}\left(-M^3f(y_0) + M^2f'_y(y_0)g(y_0)\right. \\ & \left. - Mf''_{yy}(y_0)(g(y_0), g(y_0)) - Mf'_y(y_0)(-M + f'_y(y_0))g(y_0)\right) \end{aligned}$$

and $g(y_0) = -My_0 + f(y_0)$, satisfy the order conditions (5), then the explicit MVERK method has order four.

Proof. Under the assumption $y(t_0) = y_0$, the Taylor series of y_1 is

$$\begin{aligned}
y_1 = & (I - hM + \frac{h^2 M^2}{2!} - \frac{h^3 M^3}{3!} + \frac{h^4 M^4}{4!} + \mathcal{O}(h^5))y_0 + h \left(b_1 f(y_0) + b_2 f(y_0) + b_2 a_{21} h f'_y(y_0) g(y_0) \right. \\
& + b_2 a_{21}^2 \frac{h^2}{2!} f''_{yy}(y_0)(g(y_0), g(y_0)) + b_2 a_{21}^3 \frac{h^3}{3!} f'''_{yyy}(y_0)(g(y_0), g(y_0), g(y_0)) + b_3 f(y_0) + b_3 a_{31} h \\
& \cdot f'_y(y_0) g(y_0) + b_3 a_{32} h f'_y(y_0)(-MY_2 + f(Y_2)) + b_3 \frac{h^2}{2!} f''_{yy}(y_0)(a_{31} g(y_0) + a_{32}(-MY_2 + f(Y_2))), \\
& a_{31} g(y_0) + a_{32}(-MY_2 + f(Y_2))) + b_3 \frac{h^3}{3!} f'''_{yyy}(y_0)(a_{31} g(y_0) + a_{32}(-MY_2 + f(Y_2)), a_{31} g(y_0) \\
& + a_{32}(-MY_2 + f(Y_2)), a_{31} g(y_0) + a_{32}(-MY_2 + f(Y_2))) + b_4 f(y_0) + b_4 h f'_y(y_0)(a_{41} g(y_0) \\
& + a_{42}(-MY_2 + f(Y_2)) + a_{43}(-MY_3 + f(Y_3))) + b_4 \frac{h^2}{2!} f''_{yy}(y_0)(a_{41} g(y_0) + a_{42}(-MY_2 + f(Y_2)) \\
& + a_{43}(-MY_3 + f(Y_3)), a_{41} g(y_0) + a_{42}(-MY_2 + f(Y_2)) + a_{43}(-MY_3 + f(Y_3))) + w_4(z) \\
& + b_4 \frac{h^3}{3!} f'''_{yyy}(y_0)(a_{41} g(y_0) + a_{42}(-MY_2 + f(Y_2)) + a_{43}(-MY_3 + f(Y_3)), a_{41} g(y_0) + a_{42}(-MY_2 \\
& + f(Y_2)) + a_{43}(-MY_3 + f(Y_3)), a_{41} g(y_0) + a_{42}(-MY_2 + f(Y_2)) + a_{43}(-MY_3 + f(Y_3))) \Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting the internal stages Y_2, Y_3, Y_4 into the above formula, and combining the Taylor series of $f(Y_2), f(Y_3), f(Y_4)$ about y_0 , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
y_1 = & y_0 - hM y_0 + h(b_1 + b_2 + b_3 + b_4) f(y_0) - \frac{h^2 M g(y_0)}{2!} + h^2 (b_2 a_{21} + b_3(a_{31} + a_{32}) + b_4(a_{41} \\
& + a_{42} + a_{43})) f'_y(y_0) g(y_0) + \frac{h^3}{3!} M(M - f'_y(y_0)) g(y_0) + h^3 (b_3 a_{32} a_{21} + b_4 a_{42} a_{21} + b_4 a_{43} (a_{31} \\
& + a_{32})) f'_y(y_0) (-M + f'_y(y_0)) g(y_0) + \frac{h^3}{2!} (b_2 a_{21}^2 + b_3 (a_{31}^2 + 2a_{31} a_{32} + a_{32}^2) + b_4 (a_{41}^2 + a_{42}^2 \\
& + a_{43}^2 + 2(a_{41} a_{42} + a_{41} a_{43} + a_{42} a_{43}))) f''_{yy}(y_0)(g(y_0) g(y_0)) + \frac{h^4}{4!} (-M^3 g(y_0) + M^2 f'_y(y_0) \\
& \cdot g(y_0) - M f'_y(y_0) (-M + f'_y(y_0)) g(y_0) - M f''_{yy}(y_0)(g(y_0), g(y_0))) + h^4 (b_3 (a_{31} + a_{32}) a_{32} a_{21} \\
& + b_4 (a_{41} + a_{42} + a_{43})(a_{42} a_{21} + a_{43} (a_{31} + a_{32}))) f''_{yy}(y_0)((-M + f'_y(y_0)) g(y_0), g(y_0)) \\
& + h^4 b_4 a_{43} a_{32} a_{21} f'_y(y_0) (-M + f'_y(y_0)) (-M + f'_y(y_0)) g(y_0) + \frac{h^4}{2!} (b_3 a_{32} a_{21}^2 + b_4 a_{42} a_{21}^2 \\
& + b_4 a_{43} (a_{31}^2 + 2a_{31} a_{32} + a_{32}^2)) f'_y(y_0) f''_{yy}(y_0)(g(y_0), g(y_0)) + \frac{h^4}{3!} (b_2 a_{21}^3 + b_3 (a_{31}^3 + 3(a_{31}^2 a_{32} \\
& + a_{31} a_{32}^2) + a_{32}^3) + b_4 (a_{41}^3 + a_{42}^3 + a_{43}^3 + 3(a_{41} (a_{42}^2 + a_{43}^2) + a_{42} (a_{41}^2 + a_{43}^2) + a_{43} (a_{41}^2 + a_{42}^2)) \\
& + 6a_{41} a_{42} a_{43})) f'''_{yyy}(y_0)(g(y_0), g(y_0), g(y_0)) + \mathcal{O}(h^5).
\end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption $c_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} a_{ij}$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4$, by comparing the Taylor series of the exact solution $y(t_0 + h)$, we can verify that the explicit MVERK method with coefficients satisfying the conditions (5), has order four. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 2.3. *Third-order MVERK methods appearing in [36] use the Jacobian matrix of $f(y)$ with respect to y , and the fourth-order MVERK method (6) uses the Jacobian matrix and the Hessian matrix of $f(y)$ with respect to y at each step, however, as we known that this idea for first-order differential problems is no by means new (see, e.g., [1, 7, 13]). It can be predicted that high-order MVERK methods need to use high-order derivative of $f(y)$ with respect to y , hence our study does not involve high-order ($p \geq 5$) MVERK methods.*

The choice is that $a_{21} = \frac{1}{2}$, $a_{32} = \frac{1}{2}$, $a_{43} = 1$ and $b_1 = \frac{1}{6}$, $b_2 = \frac{2}{6}$, $b_3 = \frac{2}{6}$, $b_4 = \frac{1}{6}$, which satisfies the order conditions (5). Thus we obtain the fourth-order explicit MVERK method with four stages as follows:

$$(7) \quad \begin{cases} Y_1 = y_0, \\ Y_2 = y_0 + \frac{h}{2}(-MY_1 + f(Y_1)), \\ Y_3 = y_0 + \frac{h}{2}(-MY_2 + f(Y_2)), \\ Y_4 = y_0 + h(-MY_3 + f(Y_3)), \\ y_1 = e^{-hM}y_0 + \frac{h}{6}(f(Y_1) + 2f(Y_2) + 2f(Y_3) + f(Y_4)) + w_4(z), \end{cases}$$

the method (7) can also be expressed in the Butcher tableau

$$(8) \quad \begin{array}{c|ccc|ccc} 0 & & I & & 0 & & & & \\ \frac{1}{2} & & I & & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & & & \\ \frac{1}{2} & & I & & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & & \\ 1 & & I & & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \\ \hline e^{-hM} & w_4(z) & & & \frac{1}{6} & \frac{2}{6} & \frac{2}{6} & \frac{1}{6} & \end{array}$$

The fourth-order explicit MVERK method (7) reduces to the ‘classical Runge–Kutta method’ when $M \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$, which is especially notable. We here mention some fourth-order explicit ERK methods in the literature. Hochbruck et al. [22] proposed the five stages explicit ERK method of order four which can be indicated by the Butcher tableau

$$(9) \quad \begin{array}{c|ccccc|cc} 0 & & & & & & & & \\ \frac{1}{2} & & \frac{1}{2}\varphi_{1,2} & & & & & & \\ \frac{1}{2} & & \frac{1}{2}\varphi_{1,3} - \varphi_{2,3} & \varphi_{2,3} & & & & & \\ 1 & & \varphi_{1,4} - 2\varphi_{2,4} & \varphi_{2,4} & \varphi_{2,4} & & & & \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2}\varphi_{1,5} - 2a_{5,2} - a_{5,4} & a_{5,2} & a_{5,2} & \frac{1}{4}\varphi_{2,5} - a_{5,2} & & & & \\ \hline & \varphi_1 - 3\varphi_2 + 4\varphi_3 & 0 & 0 & -\varphi_2 + 4\varphi_3 & 4\varphi_2 - 8\varphi_3 & & & \end{array}$$

with

$$a_{5,2} = \frac{1}{2}\varphi_{2,5} - \varphi_{3,4} + \frac{1}{4}\varphi_{2,4} - \frac{1}{2}\varphi_{3,5},$$

and Krogstad [25] presented the fourth-order ERK method with four stages which can be denoted by the Butcher tableau

$$(10) \quad \begin{array}{c|ccc} 0 & & & \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2}\varphi_{1,2} & & \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2}\varphi_{1,3} - \varphi_{2,3} & \varphi_{2,3} & \\ 1 & \varphi_{1,4} - 2\varphi_{2,4} & 0 & 2\varphi_{2,4} \\ \hline & \varphi_1 - 3\varphi_2 + 4\varphi_3 & 2\varphi_2 - 4\varphi_3 & 2\varphi_2 - 4\varphi_3 \quad -\varphi_2 + 4\varphi_3 \end{array}$$

where

$$(11) \quad \varphi_{i,j} = \varphi_i(-c_j hM) = \int_0^1 e^{-(1-\tau)c_j hM} \frac{\tau^{i-1}}{(i-1)!} d\tau.$$

As claimed by Hochbruck et al. [22], the methods (9) and (10) do not satisfy the stiff-order conditions strictly, but to a weak form. The coefficients of (9) and (10) are matrix exponentials, normally, it is needed to recalculate the coefficients of them at each time step once we consider the variable stepsize technique in practice. The coefficients a_{ij} , b_i , for $i, j = 1, \dots, s$ of MVERK methods are real constants, which can greatly reduce the computational cost of matrix exponentials.

The another choice of $a_{21} = \frac{1}{3}$, $a_{31} = -\frac{1}{3}$, $a_{32} = 1$, $a_{41} = 1$, $a_{42} = -1$, $a_{43} = 1$ and $b_1 = \frac{1}{8}$, $b_2 = \frac{3}{8}$, $b_3 = \frac{3}{8}$, $b_4 = \frac{1}{8}$, which also satisfies the order conditions (5). Therefore we get another fourth-order explicit MVERK method with four stages as follows:

$$(12) \quad \begin{cases} Y_1 = y_0, \\ Y_2 = y_0 + \frac{h}{3}(-MY_1 + f(Y_1)), \\ Y_3 = y_0 - \frac{h}{3}(-MY_1 + f(Y_1)) + h(-MY_2 + f(Y_2)), \\ Y_4 = y_0 + h(-MY_1 + f(Y_1)) - h(-MY_2 + f(Y_2)) + h(-MY_3 + f(Y_3)), \\ y_1 = e^{-hM} y_0 + \frac{h}{8}(f(Y_1) + 3f(Y_2) + 3f(Y_3) + f(Y_4)) + w_4(z). \end{cases}$$

The method (12) can be expressed in the Butcher tableau

$$(13) \quad \begin{array}{c|cc|ccc} 0 & I & 0 & & & \\ \frac{1}{3} & I & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & & \\ \frac{2}{3} & I & -\frac{1}{3} & 1 & 0 & \\ 1 & I & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline e^{-hM} & w_4(z) & \frac{1}{8} & \frac{3}{8} & \frac{3}{8} & \frac{1}{8} \end{array}$$

Likewise, when $M \rightarrow 0$, the fourth-order explicit MVERK method (12) reduces to the Kutta's fourth-order method, or '3/8-Rule'.

3. A simplified version of fourth-order explicit ERK methods

Differently from MVERK methods, the internal stages and the update of the simplified version of ERK methods simultaneously preserve some properties of matrix exponentials.

Definition 3.1. ([36]) *An s -stage simplified version of exponential Runge–Kutta (SVERK) method for the numerical integration (1) is defined as*

$$(14) \quad \begin{cases} Y_i = e^{-\bar{c}_i h M} y_0 + h \sum_{j=1}^s \bar{a}_{ij} f(Y_j), \quad i = 1, \dots, s, \\ y_1 = e^{-h M} y_0 + h \sum_{i=1}^s \bar{b}_i f(Y_i) + \bar{w}_s(z), \end{cases}$$

where \bar{a}_{ij}, \bar{b}_i are real constants for $i, j = 1, \dots, s$, $Y_i \approx y(t_0 + \bar{c}_i h)$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$, $\bar{w}_s(z)$ is related to hM , and $\bar{w}_s(z) \rightarrow 0$ when $M \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$.

Similarly to $w_s(z)$, here $\bar{w}_s(z)$ is independent of the matrix exponential, and SVERK methods with the same order share the same $\bar{w}_s(z)$. Once we consider the order of SVERK methods which satisfies $p \geq 2$, then the $\bar{w}_s(z)$ is related to the term $f(\cdot)$ and initial value y_0 . In particular, when we consider the first-order SVERK method, then $\bar{w}_s(z) = 0$. It is a fact that the $\bar{w}_s(z)$ of SVERK methods is different from the $w_s(z)$ of MVERK methods when $p \geq 3$, and we have shown the difference of $\bar{w}_3(z)$ and $w_3(z)$ in [36]. In what follows, we will present the difference between $\bar{w}_4(z)$ and $w_4(z)$.

The method (14) can be displayed by the following Butcher Tableau

$$(15) \quad \begin{array}{c|c|c} \bar{c} & \mathbf{e}^{-\bar{c}hM} & \bar{A} \\ \hline e^{-hM} & \bar{w}_s(z) & \bar{b}^T \end{array} = \begin{array}{c|cc|ccc} \bar{c}_1 & e^{-\bar{c}_1 h M} & \bar{a}_{11} & \cdots & \bar{a}_{1s} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bar{c}_s & e^{-\bar{c}_s h M} & \bar{a}_{s1} & \cdots & \bar{a}_{ss} \\ \hline e^{-hM} & \bar{w}_s(z) & \bar{b}_1 & \cdots & \bar{b}_s \end{array}$$

with the suitable assumption $\bar{c}_i = \sum_{j=1}^s \bar{a}_{ij}$, $i = 1, \dots, s$. From (15), the coefficients of the SVERK method are real constants, which are different from standard ERK methods (see, e.g., [22, 23, 24]). Obviously, SVERK methods can integrate the first-order homogeneous linear system exactly, so do MVERK methods.

The following theorem will show the order conditions of fourth-order explicit SVERK methods with four stages.

Theorem 3.2. *If the coefficients of the four-stage explicit SVERK method*

$$(16) \quad \begin{cases} Y_1 = y_0, \\ Y_2 = e^{-\bar{c}_2 h M} y_0 + h \bar{a}_{21} f(Y_1), \\ Y_3 = e^{-\bar{c}_3 h M} y_0 + h(\bar{a}_{31} f(Y_1) + \bar{a}_{32} f(Y_2)), \\ Y_4 = e^{-\bar{c}_4 h M} y_0 + h(\bar{a}_{41} f(Y_1) + \bar{a}_{42} f(Y_2) + \bar{a}_{43} f(Y_3)), \\ y_1 = e^{-h M} y_0 + h(\bar{b}_1 f(Y_1) + \bar{b}_2 f(Y_2) + \bar{b}_3 f(Y_3) + \bar{b}_4 f(Y_4)) + \bar{w}_4(z), \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w}_4(z) = & -\frac{h^2}{2!} M f(y_0) + \frac{h^3}{3!} ((M - f'_y(y_0)) M f(y_0) - M f'_y(y_0) g(y_0)) + \frac{h^4}{4!} ((-M + f'_y(y_0)) \\ & \cdot M^2 f(y_0) + M^2 f'_y(y_0) g(y_0) - M f''_{yy}(y_0) (g(y_0), g(y_0)) - M f'_y(y_0) (-M + f'_y(y_0)) g(y_0) \\ & - f'_y(y_0) M f'_y(y_0) g(y_0) - f'_y(y_0) f'_y(y_0) M f(y_0) + 3 f''_{yy}(y_0) (-M f(y_0), g(y_0))), \end{aligned}$$

and $g(y_0) = -My_0 + f(y_0)$, satisfy the order conditions (5), then the explicit SVERK method has order four.

Proof. Under the assumptions $y(t_0) = y_0$ and $\bar{c}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \bar{a}_{ij}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, the Taylor series of the numerical solution y_1 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} y_1 = & (I - hM + \frac{(hM)^2}{2!} - \frac{(hM)^3}{3!} + \frac{(hM)^4}{4!} + \mathcal{O}(h^5))y_0 + h\left(\bar{b}_1 f(y_0) + \bar{b}_2 f((I - \bar{c}_2 hM \right. \\ & + \frac{(\bar{c}_2 hM)^2}{2!} - \frac{(\bar{c}_2 hM)^3}{3!} + \mathcal{O}(h^4))y_0 + h\bar{a}_{21} f(y_0) + \bar{b}_3 f((I - \bar{c}_3 hM + \frac{(\bar{c}_3 hM)^2}{2!} \\ & - \frac{(\bar{c}_3 hM)^3}{3!} + \mathcal{O}(h^4))y_0 + h\bar{a}_{31} f(y_0) + h\bar{a}_{32} f(Y_2) + \bar{b}_4 f((I - \bar{c}_4 hM + \frac{(\bar{c}_4 hM)^2}{2!} \\ & \left. - \frac{(\bar{c}_4 hM)^3}{3!} + \mathcal{O}(h^4))y_0 + h\bar{a}_{41} f(y_0) + h\bar{a}_{42} f(Y_2) + h\bar{a}_{43} f(Y_3))\right) + \bar{w}_4(z). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the internal stages Y_2, Y_3, Y_4 into the numerical solution y_1 , and expanding $f(Y_2), f(Y_3), f(Y_4)$ in a Taylor series with respect to y_0 leads to

$$\begin{aligned} y_1 = & (I - hM + \frac{(hM)^2}{2!} - \frac{(hM)^3}{3!} + \frac{(hM)^4}{4!} + \mathcal{O}(h^5))y_0 + h\bar{b}_1 f(y_0) + h\bar{b}_2 \left(f(y_0) + hf_y(y_0) \right. \\ & \cdot (-\bar{c}_2 My_0 + \bar{a}_{21} f(y_0) + \frac{h(\bar{c}_2 M)^2 y_0}{2!} - \frac{h^2(\bar{c}_2 M)^3 y_0}{3!}) + \frac{h^2}{2} f''_{yy}(y_0) (-\bar{c}_2 My_0 + \bar{a}_{21} f(y_0) \\ & + \frac{h(\bar{c}_2 M)^2 y_0}{2!}, -\bar{c}_2 My_0 + \bar{a}_{21} f(y_0) + \frac{h(\bar{c}_2 M)^2 y_0}{2!}) + \frac{h^3}{3} f'''_{yyy}(y_0) (-\bar{c}_2 My_0 + \bar{a}_{21} f(y_0), \\ & -\bar{c}_2 My_0 + \bar{a}_{21} f(y_0), -\bar{c}_2 My_0 + \bar{a}_{21} f(y_0)) \left. \right) + h\bar{b}_3 \left(f(y_0) + hf_y(y_0) (-\bar{c}_3 My_0 + \bar{a}_{31} f(y_0) \right. \\ & + \bar{a}_{32} f(Y_2) + \frac{h(\bar{c}_3 M)^2 y_0}{2!} - \frac{h^2(\bar{c}_3 M)^3 y_0}{3!}) + \frac{h^2}{2!} f''_{yy}(y_0) (-\bar{c}_3 My_0 + \bar{a}_{31} f(y_0) + \bar{a}_{32} f(Y_2) \\ & + \frac{h(\bar{c}_3 M)^2 y_0}{2!}, -\bar{c}_3 My_0 + \bar{a}_{31} + \bar{a}_{32} f(Y_2) + \frac{h(\bar{c}_3 M)^2 y_0}{2!}) + \frac{h^3}{3!} f'''_{yyy}(y_0) (-\bar{c}_3 My_0 + \bar{a}_{31} \\ & \cdot f(y_0) + \bar{a}_{32} f(Y_2), -\bar{c}_3 My_0 + \bar{a}_{31} f(y_0) + \bar{a}_{32} f(Y_2), -\bar{c}_3 My_0 + \bar{a}_{31} f(y_0) + \bar{a}_{32} f(Y_2)) \left. \right) \\ & + h\bar{b}_4 \left(f(y_0) + hf_y(y_0) (-\bar{c}_4 My_0 + \bar{a}_{41} f(y_0) + \bar{a}_{42} f(Y_2) + \bar{a}_{43} f(Y_3) + \frac{h(\bar{c}_4 M)^2 y_0}{2!} \right. \\ & - \frac{h^2(\bar{c}_4 M)^3 y_0}{3!}) + \frac{h^2}{2!} f''_{yy}(y_0) (-\bar{c}_4 My_0 + \bar{a}_{41} f(y_0) + \bar{a}_{42} f(Y_2) + \bar{a}_{43} f(Y_3) + \frac{h(\bar{c}_4 M)^2 y_0}{2!}, \\ & -\bar{c}_4 My_0 + \bar{a}_{41} f(y_0) + \bar{a}_{42} f(Y_2) + \bar{a}_{43} f(Y_3) + \frac{h(\bar{c}_4 M)^2 y_0}{2!}) \\ & + \frac{h^3}{3!} f'''_{yyy}(y_0) (-\bar{c}_4 My_0 + \bar{a}_{41} f(y_0) + \bar{a}_{42} f(Y_2) + \bar{a}_{43} f(Y_3), -\bar{c}_4 My_0 + \bar{a}_{41} f(y_0) + \bar{a}_{43} f(Y_3), \\ & \left. -\bar{c}_4 My_0 + \bar{a}_{41} f(y_0) + \bar{a}_{42} f(Y_2) + \bar{a}_{43} f(Y_3)) \right) + \bar{w}_4(z). \end{aligned}$$

To sum up, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
y_1 = & y_0 - hMy_0 + h(\bar{b}_1 + \bar{b}_2 + \bar{b}_3 + \bar{b}_4)f(y_0) - \frac{h^2Mg(y_0)}{2!} + h^2(\bar{b}_2\bar{c}_2 + \bar{b}_3\bar{c}_3 + \bar{b}_4\bar{c}_4)f'_y(y_0)g(y_0) \\
& - \frac{h^3}{3!}f'_y(y_0)Mf(y_0) + \frac{h^3}{3!}M(M - f'_y(y_0))g(y_0) + \frac{h^3}{2!}(\bar{b}_2\bar{a}_{21}^2 + \bar{b}_3\bar{c}_3^2 + \bar{b}_4\bar{c}_4^2)f''_{yy}(y_0)(g(y_0), \\
& g(y_0)) + h^3(\bar{b}_3\bar{a}_{32}\bar{a}_{21} + \bar{b}_4\bar{a}_{42}\bar{a}_{21} + \bar{b}_4\bar{a}_{43}\bar{c}_3)f'_y(y_0)(M^2y_0 + f'_y(y_0)g(y_0)) \\
& + \frac{h^4}{4!}\left(-M^3g(y_0) + M^2f'_y(y_0)g(y_0) - Mf'_y(y_0)(-M + f'_y(y_0))g(y_0) - Mf''_{yy}(y_0)(g(y_0), \right. \\
& \left. g(y_0)) - f'_y(y_0)Mf'_y(y_0)g(y_0) - f'_y(y_0)f'_y(y_0)Mf(y_0) + 3f''_{yy}(y_0)(-Mf(y_0), g(y_0))\right) \\
& + \frac{h^4}{3!}(\bar{b}_2\bar{c}_3^3\bar{b}_3\bar{c}_3^3 + \bar{b}_4\bar{c}_4^3)f'''_{yyy}(y_0)(g(y_0), g(y_0), g(y_0)) + h^4\left(\bar{b}_3\bar{c}_3\bar{a}_{32}\bar{a}_{21} + \bar{b}_4\bar{c}_4(\bar{a}_{42}\bar{a}_{21} \right. \\
& \left. + \bar{a}_{43}\bar{c}_3)\right)f''_{yy}(y_0)(M^2y_0 + f'_y(y_0)g(y_0), g(y_0)) + \frac{h^4}{2!}(\bar{b}_3\bar{a}_{32}\bar{a}_{21}^2 + \bar{b}_4\bar{a}_{42}\bar{a}_{21}^2 + \bar{b}_4\bar{a}_{43}\bar{c}_3^2) \\
& \cdot f'_y(y_0)f''_{yy}(y_0)(g(y_0), g(y_0)) + h^4\bar{b}_4\bar{a}_{43}\bar{a}_{32}\bar{a}_{21}f'_y(y_0)((M^2 + f'_y(y_0)^2)g(y_0) \\
& + f'_y(y_0)^2M^2y_0) + \mathcal{O}(h^5).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the coefficients of the four-stage explicit SVERK method (16) satisfying the order conditions (5), has order four. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 3.3. *Compared with fourth-order explicit MVERK methods, the internal stages of fourth-order explicit SVERK methods use matrix exponentials of hM to some extent, and the update also uses the Jacobian matrix and the Hessian matrix of $f(y)$ with respect to y at each step. Once we consider the high-order SVERK method, and the high-order derivative of $f(y)$ with respect to y is needed. Hence, this paper does not involve high-order ($p \geq 5$) SVERK methods, and it can be observed that the $\bar{w}_4(z)$ of (16) is more complicated than the $w_4(z)$ of (6), and our numerical experiments will support this point by comparing their consumed CPU times (in seconds).*

Taking $a_{21} = \frac{1}{2}$, $a_{32} = \frac{1}{2}$, $a_{43} = 1$ and $b_1 = \frac{1}{6}$, $b_2 = \frac{2}{6}$, $b_3 = \frac{2}{6}$, $b_4 = \frac{1}{6}$, we then obtain the fourth-order explicit SVERK method with four stages:

$$(17) \quad \begin{cases} Y_1 = y_0, \\ Y_2 = e^{-\frac{1}{2}hM}y_0 + \frac{h}{2}f(Y_1), \\ Y_3 = e^{-\frac{1}{2}hM}y_0 + \frac{h}{2}f(Y_2), \\ Y_4 = e^{-hM}y_0 + hf(Y_3), \\ y_1 = e^{-hM}y_0 + \frac{h}{6}(f(Y_1) + 2f(Y_2) + 2f(Y_3) + f(Y_4)) + \bar{w}_4(z), \end{cases}$$

with $g(y_0) = -My_0 + f(y_0)$. The method (17) can be indicated by the Butcher tableau

$$(18) \quad \begin{array}{c|cc|cc} 0 & I & 0 & & & \\ \frac{1}{2} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}hM} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & & \\ \frac{1}{2} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}hM} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \\ \hline 1 & e^{-hM} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline e^{-hM} & \bar{w}_4(z) & \frac{1}{6} & \frac{2}{6} & \frac{2}{6} & \frac{1}{6} \end{array}$$

Another option is that $a_{21} = \frac{1}{3}$, $a_{31} = -\frac{1}{3}$, $a_{32} = 1$, $a_{41} = 1$, $a_{42} = -1$, $a_{43} = 1$, $b_1 = \frac{1}{8}$, $b_2 = \frac{3}{8}$, $b_3 = \frac{3}{8}$ and $b_4 = \frac{1}{8}$. Thus, we have the following fourth-order explicit SVERK method with four stages:

$$(19) \quad \begin{cases} Y_1 = y_0, \\ Y_2 = e^{-\frac{1}{3}hM}y_0 + \frac{h}{3}f(Y_1), \\ Y_3 = e^{-\frac{2}{3}hM}y_0 - \frac{h}{3}f(Y_1) + hf(Y_2), \\ Y_4 = e^{-hM}y_0 + hf(Y_1) - hf(Y_2) + hf(Y_3), \\ y_1 = e^{-hM}y_0 + \frac{h}{8}(f(Y_1) + 3f(Y_2) + 3f(Y_3) + f(Y_4)) + \bar{w}_4(z), \end{cases}$$

which can be represented by the Butcher tableau

$$(20) \quad \begin{array}{c|cc|cc} 0 & I & 0 & & & \\ \frac{1}{3} & e^{-\frac{1}{3}hM} & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & & \\ \frac{2}{3} & e^{-\frac{2}{3}hM} & -\frac{1}{3} & 1 & 0 & \\ \hline 1 & e^{-hM} & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline e^{-hM} & \bar{w}_4(z) & \frac{1}{8} & \frac{3}{8} & \frac{3}{8} & \frac{1}{8} \end{array}$$

Once $M \rightarrow 0$, fourth-order explicit SVERK methods (17) and (19) with four stages reduce to classical fourth-order explicit RK methods.

4. Convergence analysis

It is well known that the linear stability analysis of a RK method is to apply the method to a Dalquist equation [18]. There is no doubt that we apply these exponential integrators to $y' = i\lambda y$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, which are A -stable. Based on the work of Buvoli and Minion [6], we apply these exponential methods to the partitioned Dalquist equation

$$(21) \quad y' = i\lambda_1 y + i\lambda_2 y, \quad y(t_0) = y_0, \quad \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Solving the partitioned Dalquist equation (21) by a partitioned exponential integrator, and treating the $i\lambda_1$ exponentially and the $i\lambda_2$ explicitly lead to the explicit scalar form

$$(22) \quad y_{n+1} = R(ik_1, ik_2)y_n, \quad k_1 = h\lambda_1, \quad k_2 = h\lambda_2.$$

The stability regions of fourth-order explicit ERK method (7) and (17) are respectively depicted in Fig. 1 (a) and (b). The stability region of the standard fourth-order ERK method (10) was shown in [6], and it can be observed that the stability regions of our methods are smaller than the stability region of (10).

In [36], the convergence of first-order explicit ERK methods was analyzed, however, the convergence of high-order explicit ERK methods is not discussed. The following theorem will present the convergence of fourth-order explicit SVERK methods.




FIGURE 1. (a): Stability region for the fourth-order explicit MVERK (EXMVERK41) method (7) with four stages. (b): Stability region for the fourth-order explicit SVERK (EXSVERK41) method (17) with four stages.

Assumption 4.1. Suppose that f satisfies the local Lipschitz condition in a strip along the exact solution y , i.e., there exists a real number $L > 0$ for all $t \in [t_0, t_{end}]$, such that

$$\|f(\bar{y}) - f(\hat{y})\| \leq L\|\bar{y} - \hat{y}\|, \quad \forall \hat{y}, \bar{y} \in T_y,$$

where $T_y = \{\bar{y} \in V : \min_t \|y(t) - \bar{y}\| \leq 1\}$ with the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|$.

Theorem 4.2. Under Assumption 4.1, if the four-stage explicit SVERK method with $\bar{w}_4(z)$ satisfies the order conditions (5), then the following error bound holds for $1 \leq n \leq \frac{t_{end} - t_0}{h}$:

$$\|y_n - y(t_n)\| \leq Ch^4,$$

the constant C is independent of n and h , but depends on t_{end} , $\|M\|$, $f^{(p)}(t_n)$ for $p = 0, \dots, 4$.

Proof. We rewrite the four-stage explicit SVERK method (16) as

$$(23) \quad \begin{cases} k_{n,1} = f(y_n), \\ k_{n,2} = f(e^{-\bar{c}_2 h M} y_n + h \bar{a}_{21} k_{n,1}), \\ k_{n,3} = f(e^{-\bar{c}_3 h M} y_n + h(\bar{a}_{31} k_{n,1} + \bar{a}_{32} k_{n,2})), \\ k_{n,4} = f(e^{-\bar{c}_4 h M} y_n + h(\bar{a}_{41} k_{n,1} + \bar{a}_{42} k_{n,2} + \bar{a}_{43} k_{n,3})), \\ y_{n+1} = e^{-hM} y_n + h(\bar{b}_1 k_{n,1} + \bar{b}_2 k_{n,2} + \bar{b}_3 k_{n,3} + \bar{b}_4 k_{n,4}) + \bar{w}_4(z), \end{cases}$$

and expand $y(t_n + h)$ into a Taylor series

$$(24) \quad y(t_n + h) = y(t_n) + hy'(t_n) + \frac{h^2}{2!}y''(t_n) + \frac{h^3}{3!}y'''(t_n) + \frac{h^4}{4!}y^{(4)}(t_n) + \mathcal{O}(h^5).$$

Inserting the exact solution into the numerical scheme gives

$$(25) \quad y(t_n + h) = e^{-hM} y(t_n) + h(\bar{b}_1 \bar{k}_{n,1} + \bar{b}_2 \bar{k}_{n,2} + \bar{b}_3 \bar{k}_{n,3} + \bar{b}_4 \bar{k}_{n,4}) + \hat{w}_4(z) + \delta_{n+1},$$

where

(26)

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{n+1} = & y(t_n) + hy'(t_n) + \frac{h^2}{2!}y''(t_n) + \frac{h^3}{3!}y'''(t_n) + \frac{h^4}{4!}y^{(4)}(t_n) + \mathcal{O}(h^5) - e^{-hM}y(t_n) \\ & - h(\bar{b}_1\bar{k}_{n,1} + \bar{b}_2\bar{k}_{n,2} + \bar{b}_3\bar{k}_{n,3} + \bar{b}_4\bar{k}_{n,4}) - \hat{w}_4(z), \end{aligned}$$

and $\bar{k}_{n,1}, \bar{k}_{n,2}, \bar{k}_{n,3}, \bar{k}_{n,4}$ and $\hat{w}_4(z)$ corresponding to $k_{n,1}, k_{n,2}, k_{n,3}, k_{n,4}$ and $\bar{w}_4(z)$ satisfy $y(t_n) = y_n$, respectively.

If we denote $E_{n-1,i} = k_{n-1,i} - \bar{k}_{n-1,i}$ and $e_n = y_n - y(t_n)$, then

(27)

$$\begin{aligned} E_{n-1,i} = & f(e^{-\bar{c}_i h M} y_{n-1} + h \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \bar{a}_{ij} k_{n-1,j}) - f(e^{-\bar{c}_i h M} y(t_{n-1}) + h \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \bar{a}_{ij} \bar{k}_{n-1,j}), \\ e_n = & e^{-hM} e_{n-1} + h \sum_{i=1}^4 \bar{b}_i (k_{n-1,i} - \bar{k}_{n-1,i}) + \bar{w}_4(z) - \hat{w}_4(z) - \delta_n. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the first formula of (27) that

(28)

$$E_{l,1} = f(y_l) - f(y(t_l)),$$

$$E_{l,2} = f(e^{-\bar{c}_2 h M} y_l + h \bar{a}_{21} k_{l,1}) - f(e^{-\bar{c}_2 h M} y(t_l) + h \bar{a}_{21} \bar{k}_{l,1}),$$

$$E_{l,3} = f(e^{-\bar{c}_3 h M} y_l + h \bar{a}_{31} k_{l,1} + h \bar{a}_{32} k_{l,2}) - f(e^{-\bar{c}_3 h M} y(t_l) + h \bar{a}_{31} \bar{k}_{l,1} + h \bar{a}_{32} \bar{k}_{l,2}),$$

$$\begin{aligned} E_{l,4} = & f(e^{-\bar{c}_4 h M} y_l + h \bar{a}_{41} k_{l,1} + h \bar{a}_{42} k_{l,2} + h \bar{a}_{43} k_{l,3}) - f(e^{-\bar{c}_4 h M} y(t_l) + h \bar{a}_{41} \bar{k}_{l,1} + h \bar{a}_{42} \bar{k}_{l,2} \\ & + h \bar{a}_{43} \bar{k}_{l,3}). \end{aligned}$$

The formula (28) holds for $l = 0, \dots, n-1$. Inserting the Taylor series of $\bar{k}_{l,1}, \bar{k}_{l,2}, \bar{k}_{l,3}, \bar{k}_{l,4}$ about $y(t_l)$ into (26), then δ_{l+1} satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{l+1} = & y(t_l) + hy'(t_l) + \frac{h^2}{2!}y''(t_l) + \frac{h^3}{3!}y'''(t_l) + \frac{h^4}{4!}y^{(4)}(t_l) + \mathcal{O}(h^5) - e^{-hM}y(t_l) - h(\bar{b}_1\bar{k}_{l,1} \\ & + \bar{b}_2\bar{k}_{l,2} + \bar{b}_3\bar{k}_{l,3} + \bar{b}_4\bar{k}_{l,4}) - \hat{w}_4(z) \\ = & y(t_l) + hg(t_l) + \frac{h^2}{2!}(-M + f'_y(y_l))g(t_l) + \frac{h^3}{3!} \left(M^2 g(t_l) + (-M + f'_y(y(t_l)))f'_y(y(t_l))g(t_l) \right. \\ & \left. - f'_y(y(t_l))Mg(t_l) + f''_{yy}(y(t_l))(g(t_l), g(t_l)) \right) + \frac{h^4}{4!} \left(-M^3 g(t_l) + M^2 f'_y(y(t_l))g(t_l) \right. \\ & \left. - M f'_y(y(t_l))(-M + f'_y(y(t_l)))g(t_l) - M f''_{yy}(y(t_l))(g(t_l), g(t_l)) + f'''_{yyy}(y(t_l))(g(t_l), g(t_l)), \right. \\ & \left. g(t_l) + 3f''_{yy}(y(t_l))((-M + f'_y(y(t_l)))g(t_l), g(t_l)) + f'_y(y(t_l))(-M + f'_y(y(t_l)))(-M \right. \\ & \left. + f'_y(y(t_l)))g(t_l) + f'_y(y(t_l))f''_{yy}(y(t_l))(g(t_l), g(t_l)) \right) + \mathcal{O}(h^5) \\ & - \left\{ y(t_l) - hMy(t_l) + h(\bar{b}_1 + \bar{b}_2 + \bar{b}_3 + \bar{b}_4)f(y(t_l)) - \frac{h^2 Mg(y(t_l))}{2!} + h^2(\bar{b}_2\bar{c}_2 + \bar{b}_3\bar{c}_3 \right. \\ & \left. + \bar{b}_4\bar{c}_4)f'_y(y(t_l))g(t_l) - \frac{h^3}{3!}f'_y(y(t_l))Mf(y(t_l)) + \frac{h^3}{3!}M(M - f'_y(y(t_l))g(t_l) + \frac{h^3}{2!}(\bar{b}_2\bar{c}_2^2 \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \bar{b}_3 \bar{c}_3^2 + \bar{b}_4 \bar{c}_4^2) f''_{yy}(y(t_i))(g(t_i), g(t_i)) + h^3 (\bar{b}_3 \bar{a}_{32} \bar{c}_2 + \bar{b}_4 (\bar{a}_{42} \bar{c}_2 + \bar{a}_{43} \bar{c}_3)) f'_y(y(t_i))(M^2 y(t_i) \\
& + f'_y(y(t_i))g(t_i)) + \frac{h^4}{4!} \left(-M^3 g(t_i) + M^2 f'_y(y(t_i))g(t_i) - M f''_{yy}(y(t_i))(g(t_i), g(t_i)) - M \right. \\
& \cdot f'_y(y(t_i))(-M + f'_y(y(t_i)))g(t_i) - f'_y(y(t_i))M f'_y(y(t_i))g(t_i) - f'_y(y(t_i))f'_y(y(t_i))M f(y(t_i)) \\
& + 3f''_{yy}(y(t_i))(-M f(y(t_i)), g(t_i)) \left. \right) + h^4 \bar{b}_4 \bar{a}_{43} \bar{a}_{32} \bar{a}_{21} f'_y(y(t_i))((M^2 + f'_y(y(t_i))^2)g(t_i) \\
& + f'_y(y(t_i))^2 M^2 y(t_i)) + \frac{h^4}{3!} (\bar{b}_2 \bar{c}_2^3 + \bar{b}_3 \bar{c}_3^3 + \bar{b}_4 \bar{c}_4^3) f'''_{yyy}(y(t_i))(g(t_i), g(t_i), g(t_i)) \\
& + h^4 (\bar{b}_3 \bar{c}_3 \bar{a}_{32} \bar{a}_{21} + \bar{b}_4 \bar{c}_4 \bar{a}_{42} \bar{c}_2 + \bar{b}_4 \bar{c}_4 \bar{a}_{43} \bar{c}_3) f''_{yy}(y(t_i))(M^2 y(t_i) + f'_y(y(t_i))g(t_i), g(t_i)) \\
& + \frac{h^4}{2!} (\bar{b}_3 \bar{a}_{32} \bar{c}_2^2 + \bar{b}_4 \bar{a}_{42} \bar{c}_2^2 + \bar{b}_4 \bar{a}_{43} \bar{c}_3^2) f'_y(y(t_i)) f''_{yy}(y(t_i))(g(t_i), g(t_i)) \left. \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $g(t_i) = -M y(t_i) + f(y(t_i))$. Since the coefficients of the explicit SVERK method satisfies the order conditions (5), one has

$$(29) \quad \delta_{l+1} = C_1 h^5,$$

where C_1 depends on t_{end} , $\|M\|$, $f^{(p)}(t_n)$, $p = 0, \dots, 4$, but is independent of n and h .

Taking the norm $\|\cdot\|$ for the second formula of (27) and (28) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|E_{l,1}\| \leq L \|e_l\|, \\
& \|E_{l,2}\| \leq L \|e^{-\bar{c}_2 h M} e_l + h \bar{a}_{21} (k_{l,1} - \bar{k}_{l,1})\| \leq L(1 + h |\bar{a}_{21}| L) \|e_l\|, \\
& \|E_{l,3}\| \leq L \|e^{-\bar{c}_3 h M} e_l + h \bar{a}_{31} (k_{l,1} - \bar{k}_{l,1}) + h \bar{a}_{32} (k_{l,2} - \bar{k}_{l,2})\| \\
(30) \quad & \leq L(1 + h |\bar{a}_{31}| L + h |\bar{a}_{32}| L(1 + h |\bar{a}_{21}| L)) \|e_l\| \\
& \|E_{l,4}\| \leq L \|e^{-\bar{c}_4 h M} e_l\| + L h |\bar{a}_{41}| \cdot \|E_{l,1}\| + L h |\bar{a}_{42}| \cdot \|E_{l,2}\| + L h |\bar{a}_{43}| \cdot \|E_{l,3}\| \\
& \leq L(1 + h |\bar{a}_{41}| L + h |\bar{a}_{42}| L(1 + h |\bar{a}_{21}| L) + h |\bar{a}_{43}| L(1 + h |\bar{a}_{31}| L + h |\bar{a}_{32}| L \\
& + h^2 |\bar{a}_{32}| |a_{21}| L^2)) \|e_l\|
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|e_n\| \leq \|e_{n-1}\| + h \sum_{i=1}^4 |\bar{b}_i| \cdot \|E_{n-1,i}\| + \|\bar{w}_4(z) - \hat{w}_4(z)\| + C_1 h^5,$$

According to the expressions of $\bar{w}_4(z)$ and $\hat{w}_4(z)$, one gets

$$(31) \quad \|\bar{w}_4(z) - \hat{w}_4(z)\| \leq C_2 h^2 L \|e_n\| + C_2 h^3 L \|e_n\| + C_2 h^4 L \|e_n\|,$$

where C_2 depends on $\|M\|$, $f^{(p)}(t_n)$, $p = 0, 1, 2$. It follows from (30) that

$$(32) \quad h \sum_{i=1}^4 |\bar{b}_i| \cdot \|E_{l,i}\| \leq C_3 h L \|e_l\| + C_3 h^2 L^2 \|e_l\| + C_3 h^3 L^3 \|e_l\| + C_3 h^4 L^4 \|e_l\|,$$

for $l = 0, \dots, n-1$, and the constant C_3 depends only on $a_{i,j}$ and b_i . We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(33) \quad \|e_n\| &\leq \|e_{n-1}\| + h \sum_{i=1}^4 |\bar{b}_i| \cdot \|E_{n-1,i}\| + C_2 h^2 L \|e_{n-1}\| (1 + h + h^2) + C_1 h^5 \\
&\leq \|e_1\| + \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \left(h \sum_{i=1}^4 |\bar{b}_i| \cdot \|E_{l,i}\| + C_2 h^2 L \|e_l\| (1 + h + h^2) \right) + (n-1) C_1 h^5.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting (32) into (33) leads to

$$(34) \quad \|e_n\| \leq \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} C_2 C_3 h L (1 + hL + h^2 L^2 + h^3 L^3) \|e_l\| + C_1 h^4.$$

The application of the discrete Gronwall lemma to (34) gives

$$(35) \quad \|e_n\| \leq C h^4,$$

which completes the proof. \square

The convergence of fourth-order explicit MVERK methods can be analyzed in the same way which be skipped for brevity.

5. Numerical Experiments

In this section, we conduct some numerical experiments to illustrate the accuracy and efficiency of our ERK methods. Throughout the numerical experiments, the matrix-valued φ -function of exponential integrators are evaluated by a Pade approximant (see, e.g., [32, 4]), and the standard fourth-order ERK method (9) with five stages with a small time step is employed as the reference solution. We select the following fourth-order ERK methods for comparison:

- ERK41: the fourth-order explicit ERK method (9) with five stages in [22];
- ERK42: the fourth-order explicit ERK method (10) with four stages in [25];
- MVERK41: the fourth-order explicit MVERK method (7) with four stages presented in this paper;
- MVERK42: the fourth-order explicit MVERK method (12) with four stages presented in this paper;
- SVERK41: the fourth-order explicit SVERK method (17) with four stages presented in this paper;
- SVERK42: the fourth-order explicit SVERK method (19) with four stages presented in this paper.

Problem 1. We first consider the following averaged system in wind-induced oscillation ([30])

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix}' = \begin{pmatrix} -\zeta & -\lambda \\ \lambda & -\zeta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} x_1 x_2 \\ \frac{1}{2}(x_1^2 - x_2^2) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\zeta \geq 0$ is a damping factor and λ is a detuning parameter (see, e.g., [17]). Set

$$\zeta = r \cos(\theta), \quad \lambda = r \sin(\theta), \quad r \geq 0, \quad 0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/2.$$

This system can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix}' = \begin{pmatrix} -\cos(\theta) & -\sin(\theta) \\ \sin(\theta) & -\cos(\theta) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} r x_1 - \frac{1}{2} \sin(\theta)(x_2^2 - x_1^2) - \cos(\theta) x_1 x_2 \\ r x_2 - \sin(\theta) x_1 x_2 + \frac{1}{2} \cos(\theta)(x_2^2 - x_1^2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

We integrate the conservative system over the interval $[0, 100]$ with parameters $\theta = \pi/2$, $r = 20$ and stepsizes $h = 1/2^k$ for $k = 4, \dots, 8$. Fig. 2 presents the global errors GE against the stepsizes and the CPU time in a log-log scale. It can be observe that our methods have the same accuracy with standard fourth-order explicit exponential integrators, and

the higher efficiency than standard exponential integrators supported by their less CPU times (seconds).




FIGURE 2. Results for Problem 1. (a): The log-log plots of global errors (GE) against h . (b): The log-log plots of global errors against the CPU time.

Problem 2. The Hénon-Heiles Model was used to describe the stellar motion (see, e.g., [18, 19]), which has the following identical form

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}' + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ -2x_1x_2 \\ -x_1^2 + x_2^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We select the initial values as

$$(x_1(0), x_2(0), y_1(0), y_2(0))^T = \left(\sqrt{\frac{11}{96}}, 0, 0, \frac{1}{4}\right)^T.$$

Fig. 3 presents that this problem is solved on the interval $[0, 10]$ with stepsizes $h = 1/2^k$, $k = 3, \dots, 7$ for ERK41, ERK42, SVERK41, SVERK42, MVERK41, and MVERK42.

Problem 3. We consider the Allen-Cahn equation [2, 15]

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \epsilon \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + u - u^3, & -1 < x < 1, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = 0.53x + 0.47 \sin(-1.5\pi x), & -1 \leq x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Allen and Cahn firstly introduced the equation to describe the motion of anti-phase boundaries in crystalline solids [2]. After approximating the spatial derivatives with 32-point Chebyshev spectral method, we obtain the following stiff system of first-order ordinary differential equations

$$\frac{dU}{dt} + MU = F(t, U), \quad t \in [0, t_{\text{end}}],$$

where $U(t) = (u_1(t), \dots, u_N(t))^T$, $u_i(t) \approx u(x_i, t)$, $x_i = -1 + i\Delta x$, for $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $\Delta x = 2/N$. Here, the matrix M is full and the nonlinear term is $F(t, U) = u - u^3 = (u_1 - u_1^3, \dots, u_N - u_N^3)^T$. We choose the parameters $\epsilon = 0.01$, $N = 32$ and integrate the




FIGURE 3. Results for Problem 2. (a): The log-log plots of global errors (GE) against h . (b): The log-log plots of global errors against the CPU time.

obtained stiff system over the interval $[0, 1]$. The numerical results are presented in Fig. 4 with the stepsizes $h = 1/2^k$ for $k = 8, \dots, 12$.




FIGURE 4. Results for Problem 3. (a): The log-log plots of global errors (GE) against h . (b): The log-log plots of global errors against the CPU time.

Problem 4. Consider the sine-Gorden equation with periodic boundary conditions [14, 16]

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} - \sin(u), & -1 < x < 1, t > 0, \\ u(-1, t) = u(1, t). \end{cases}$$

Discretising the spatial derivative ∂_{xx} by the second-order symmetric differences yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} U' \\ U \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & M \\ -I & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U' \\ U \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sin(U) \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in [0, t_{\text{end}}].$$

In here, $U(t) = (u_1(t), \dots, u_N(t))^T$ with $u_i(t) \approx u(x_i, t)$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, with $\Delta x = 2/N$ and $x_i = -1 + i\Delta x$, $F(t, U) = -\sin(u) = -(\sin(u_1), \dots, \sin(u_N))^T$, and

$$M = \frac{1}{\Delta x^2} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 & & & -1 \\ -1 & 2 & -1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & -1 & 2 & -1 \\ -1 & & & & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this test, we choose the initial value conditions

$$U(0) = (\pi)_{i=1}^N, \quad U'(0) = \sqrt{N} \left(0.01 + \sin\left(\frac{2\pi i}{N}\right) \right)_{i=1}^N$$

with $N = 32$, and solve the problem on the interval $[0, 1]$ with stepsizes $h = 1/2^k$, $k = 4, \dots, 8$. The global errors GE against the stepsizes and the CPU time (seconds) for ERK41, ERK42, SVERK41, SVERK42, MVERK41 and MVERK42 are respectively presented in Fig. 5 (a) and (b).




FIGURE 5. Results for Problem 4. (a): The log-log plots of global errors (GE) against h . (b): The log-log plots of global errors against the CPU time.

Problem 5. We consider the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (see [9])

$$i\psi_t + \psi_{xx} + 2|\psi|^2\psi = 0, \quad \psi(x, 0) = 0.5 + 0.025 \cos(\mu x),$$

with the periodic boundary condition $\psi(0, t) = \psi(L, t)$. Letting $L = 4\sqrt{2}\pi$ and $\mu = 2\pi/L$ and $\psi = p + iq$, we transform this equation into a pair of real-valued equations

$$\begin{aligned} p_t + q_{xx} + 2(p^2 + q^2)q &= 0, \\ q_t - p_{xx} - 2(p^2 + q^2)p &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Using the discretization on spatial variable with the pseudospectral method leads to

$$(36) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{p} \\ \mathbf{q} \end{pmatrix}' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -D_2 \\ D_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{p} \\ \mathbf{q} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} -2(\mathbf{p}^2 + \mathbf{q}^2) \cdot \mathbf{q} \\ 2(\mathbf{p}^2 + \mathbf{q}^2) \cdot \mathbf{p} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\mathbf{p} = (p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{N-1})^T$, $\mathbf{q} = (q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{N-1})^T$ and $D_2 = (D_2)_{0 \leq j, k \leq N-1}$ is the pseudospectral differential matrix defined by:

$$(D_2)_{jk} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\mu^2(-1)^{j+k+1} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\mu(x_j - x_k)/2)}, & j \neq k, \\ -\mu^2 \frac{2(N/2)^2 + 1}{6}, & j = k. \end{cases}$$

In this test, we choose $N = 48$ and solve this problem on $[0, 1]$. The global errors GE against the stepsizes and the CPU time are stated in Fig. 6 with the stepsizes $h = 1/2^k$ for $k = 4, \dots, 8$.




FIGURE 6. Results for Problem 5. (a): The log-log plots of global errors (GE) against h . (b): The log-log plots of global errors against the CPU time.

All numerical results indicate that MVERK methods and SVERK methods have the comparable accuracy and efficiency in comparison with standard exponential integrators, and the fourth-order explicit MVERK methods is more efficient than SVERK methods due to the difference of $w_4(z)$ and $\bar{w}_4(z)$.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, we present the fourth-order explicit MVERK methods and SVERK methods with four stages, and the order conditions of these ERK methods are derived, which are exactly identical to the order conditions of explicit RK methods. These ERK methods have

the favorable property, which can exactly integrate the linear system $y'(t) + My(t) = 0$. Numerical results present the comparable accuracy and the lower computational cost of our fourth-order explicit ERK methods.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (12071419).

References

- [1] C.E. Abulimen, *Exponentially fitted third derivative three-step methods for numerical integration of stiff initial value problems*, Appl. Math. Comput. 243 (2014), pp. 446–453. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2014.05.096>. MR 3244492
- [2] S.M. Allen and J.W. Cahn, *A microscopic theory for antiphase boundary motion and its application to antiphase domain coarsening*, Acta Metallurgica 27 (1979), pp. 1085–1095.
- [3] H.v. Berland, B. Owren, and B.R. Skaflestad, *B-series and order conditions for exponential integrators*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 43 (2005), pp. 1715–1727. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/040612683>. MR 2182146
- [4] H. Berland, B. Skaflestad, and W.M. Wright, *Expint—a matlab package for exponential integrators*, ACM Trans. Math. Softw. 33 (2007), 4.
- [5] J.C. Butcher, *Numerical methods for ordinary differential equations*, 2nd ed., John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 2008, Available at <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470753767>. MR 2401398
- [6] T. Buvoli and M.L. Minion, *On the stability of exponential integrators for non-diffusive equations*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 409 (2022), pp. Paper No. 114126, 17. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2022.114126>. MR 4383133
- [7] J.R. Cash, *Second derivative extended backward differentiation formulas for the numerical integration of stiff systems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 18 (1981), pp. 21–36. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/0718003>. MR 603428
- [8] E. Celledoni, D. Cohen, and B. Owren, *Symmetric exponential integrators with an application to the cubic Schrödinger equation*, Found. Comput. Math. 8 (2008), pp. 303–317. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-007-9016-7>. MR 2413146
- [9] J. Chen and M. Qin, *Multi-symplectic Fourier pseudospectral method for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal. 12 (2001), pp. 193–204. MR 1847917
- [10] Q. Du, L. Ju, X. Li, and Z. Qiao, *Maximum principle preserving exponential time differencing schemes for the nonlocal Allen-Cahn equation*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 57 (2019), pp. 875–898. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M118236X>. MR 3945242
- [11] Q. Du, L. Ju, X. Li, and Z. Qiao, *Maximum bound principles for a class of semilinear parabolic equations and exponential time-differencing schemes*, SIAM Rev. 63 (2021), pp. 317–359. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1243750>.
- [12] M. Eiermann and O.G. Ernst, *A restarted Krylov subspace method for the evaluation of matrix functions*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 44 (2006), pp. 2481–2504. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/050633846>. MR 2272603
- [13] W.H. Enright, *Second derivative multistep methods for stiff ordinary differential equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 11 (1974), pp. 321–331. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/0711029>. MR 351083
- [14] Y. Fang, X. Hu, and J. Li, *Explicit pseudo two-step exponential Runge-Kutta methods for the numerical integration of first-order differential equations*, Numer. Algorithms 86 (2021), pp. 1143–1163. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11075-020-00927-4>. MR 4211115
- [15] X. Feng, H. Song, T. Tang, and J. Yang, *Nonlinear stability of the implicit-explicit methods for the Allen-Cahn equation*, Inverse Probl. Imaging 7 (2013), pp. 679–695. Available at <https://doi.org/10.3934/ipi.2013.7.679>. MR 3105349
- [16] J.M. Franco, *New methods for oscillatory systems based on ARKN methods*, Appl. Numer. Math. 56 (2006), pp. 1040–1053. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnum.2005.09.005>. MR 2234838

- [17] J. Guckenheimer and P. Holmes, *Nonlinear oscillations, dynamical systems, and bifurcations of vector fields*, Applied Mathematical Sciences Vol. 42, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983, Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1140-2>. MR 709768
- [18] E. Hairer, C. Lubich, and G. Wanner, *Geometric numerical integration*, 2nd ed., Springer Series in Computational Mathematics Vol. 31, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006, Structure-preserving algorithms for ordinary differential equations. MR 2221614
- [19] M. Hénon and C. Heiles, *The applicability of the third integral of motion: Some numerical experiments*, *Astronom. J.* 69 (1964), pp. 73–79. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1086/109234>. MR 158746
- [20] M. Hochbruck and C. Lubich, *On Krylov subspace approximations to the matrix exponential operator*, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 34 (1997), pp. 1911–1925. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0036142995280572>. MR 1472203
- [21] M. Hochbruck, C. Lubich, and H. Selhofer, *Exponential integrators for large systems of differential equations*, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 19 (1998), pp. 1552–1574. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/S1064827595295337>. MR 1618808
- [22] M. Hochbruck and A. Ostermann, *Explicit exponential Runge-Kutta methods for semi-linear parabolic problems*, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 43 (2005), pp. 1069–1090. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/040611434>. MR 2177796
- [23] M. Hochbruck and A. Ostermann, *Exponential Runge-Kutta methods for parabolic problems*, *Appl. Numer. Math.* 53 (2005), pp. 323–339. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnum.2004.08.005>. MR 2128529
- [24] M. Hochbruck and A. Ostermann, *Exponential integrators*, *Acta Numer.* 19 (2010), pp. 209–286. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0962492910000048>. MR 2652783
- [25] S. Krogstad, *Generalized integrating factor methods for stiff PDEs*, *J. Comput. Phys.* 203 (2005), pp. 72–88. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2004.08.006>. MR 2104391
- [26] J.D. Lambert and S.T. Sigurdsson, *Multistep methods with variable matrix coefficients*, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 9 (1972), pp. 715–733. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/0709060>. MR 317548
- [27] J.D. Lawson, *Generalized Runge-Kutta processes for stable systems with large Lipschitz constants*, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 4 (1967), pp. 372–380. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/0704033>. MR 221759
- [28] B. Li, J. Yang, and Z. Zhou, *Arbitrarily high-order exponential cut-off methods for preserving maximum principle of parabolic equations*, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 42 (2020), pp. A3957–A3978. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1333456>. MR 4186541
- [29] Y. Li and X. Wu, *Exponential integrators preserving first integrals or Lyapunov functions for conservative or dissipative systems*, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 38 (2016), pp. A1876–A1895. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/15M1023257>.
- [30] R.I. McLachlan, G.R.W. Quispel, and N. Robidoux, *Unified approach to Hamiltonian systems, Poisson systems, gradient systems, and systems with Lyapunov functions or first integrals*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 81 (1998), pp. 2399–2403. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.2399>. MR 1643653
- [31] L. Mei, L. Huang, and X. Wu, *Energy-preserving continuous-stage exponential Runge-Kutta integrators for efficiently solving Hamiltonian systems*, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 44 (2022), pp. A1092–A1115. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/21M1412475>. MR 4417004
- [32] C. Moler and C. Van Loan, *Nineteen dubious ways to compute the exponential of a matrix, twenty-five years later*, *SIAM Rev.* 45 (2003), pp. 3–49. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1137/S00361445024180>. MR 1981253
- [33] S.P. Nørsett, *An A-stable modification of the Adams-Bashforth methods*, *Lecture Notes in Math.* Vol. Vol. 109, Springer, Berlin-New York, 1969, pp. 214–219. MR 267771
- [34] D.A. Pope, *An exponential method of numerical integration of ordinary differential equations*, *Comm. ACM* 6 (1963), pp. 491–493. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1145/366707.367592>. MR 153118
- [35] R. Qi, C. Zhang, and Y. Zhang, *Dissipativity of multistep Runge-Kutta methods for nonlinear Volterra delay-integro-differential equations*, *Acta Math. Appl. Sin. Engl. Ser.* 28 (2012), pp. 225–236. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10255-012-0142-x>. MR 2914368

- [36] B. Wang, X. Hu, and X. Wu, *Two new classes of exponential runge–kutta integrators for efficiently solving stiff systems or highly oscillatory problems*, International Journal of Computer Mathematics Available at <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207160.2023.2294432>.
- [37] B. Wang and X. Wu, *Exponential collocation methods for conservative or dissipative systems*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 360 (2019), pp. 99–116. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2019.04.015>. MR 3942760
- [38] W. Wang and C. Zhang, *Dissipativity of variable-stepsize Runge-Kutta methods for nonlinear functional differential equations with application to Nicholson’s blowflies models*, Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul. 97 (2021), pp. Paper No. 105723, 19. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cnsns.2021.105723>. MR 4209695
- [39] X. Wu and B. Wang, *Recent developments in structure-preserving algorithms for oscillatory differential equations*, Science Press Beijing, Beijing; Springer, Singapore, 2018, Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-9004-2>. MR 3791443
- [40] X. Wu and B. Wang, *Geometric integrators for differential equations with highly oscillatory solutions*, Springer, Singapore; Science Press Beijing, Beijing, 2021, Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-0147-7>. MR 4331421
- [41] C. Zhang and T. Qin, *The mixed Runge-Kutta methods for a class of nonlinear functional-integro-differential equations*, Appl. Math. Comput. 237 (2014), pp. 396–404. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2014.03.143>. MR 3201139

Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai, 200234, P.R.China
E-mail: zzyhxf@163.com

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Zaozhuang University, Zaozhuang, 277160, P.R.China
E-mail: ylfangmath@163.com

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Xi’an Jiaotong University, Xi’an, 710049, P.R.China
E-mail: wangbinmaths@xjtu.edu.cn