

Langevin equations and a geometric integration scheme for the overdamped limit of homogeneous rotational Brownian motion

Felix Höfling^{1,2} and Arthur V. Straube^{2,1}

¹*Freie Universität Berlin, Institute of Mathematics, Arnimallee 6, 14195 Berlin, Germany*

²*Zuse Institute Berlin, Takustraße 7, 14195 Berlin, Germany*

The translational motion of anisotropic and self-propelled colloidal particles is closely linked with the particle’s orientation and its rotational Brownian motion. In the overdamped limit, the stochastic evolution of the orientation vector follows a diffusion process on the unit sphere and is characterised by an orientation-dependent (“multiplicative”) noise. As a consequence, the corresponding Langevin equation attains different forms depending on whether Itô’s or Stratonovich’s stochastic calculus is used. We clarify that both forms are equivalent and derive them from a geometric construction of Brownian motion on the unit sphere, based on infinitesimal random rotations. Our approach suggests further a geometric integration scheme for rotational Brownian motion, which preserves the normalisation constraint of the orientation vector exactly. We show that a simple implementation of the scheme converges weakly at order 1 of the integration time step, and we outline an advanced variant of the scheme that is weakly exact for an arbitrarily large time step. The discussion is restricted to time-homogeneous rotational Brownian motion (i.e., constant rotational diffusion tensor), which is relevant for chemically anisotropic spheres such as self-propelled Janus particles.

I. INTRODUCTION

The past two decades have seen considerable advances in the synthesis and characterisation of anisotropic colloidal particles, ranging from complex shapes, e.g., ellipsoids [1, 2], clusters [3], and propellers [4], to anisotropic chemical surface coatings. An important example for the latter are so-called Janus spheres [5–10], which exhibit autonomous self-propulsion under suitable conditions and often serve as colloidal models for microswimmers. The use of such particles in experimental model systems has opened new avenues and has boosted research in the field of active matter (see, e.g., Refs. [11–13]). These successes have stimulated a large number of theoretical investigations, which have brought forth elaborate descriptions of the self-propelled motion of a single active colloid (see, e.g., Refs. [14–19]). Depending on the question at hand, hydrodynamic effects due to solvent flows can be crucial [20–23] or may be negligible. In the latter case, the active Brownian particle (ABP) model is widely used to describe the motion of active colloids [17, 24, 25]; it combines the Brownian motion of a colloidal Janus sphere with a constant propulsion velocity which randomly changes its direction. The propulsion direction is described by a unit vector \mathbf{u} which itself performs a Brownian motion on the unit sphere. Thereby, the stochastic motion of \mathbf{u} may evolve freely [5, 26, 27] or under the influence of gravity [28–33] and it becomes particularly challenging in the case of shape anisotropy [34–40]. The dynamics of active colloids becomes complex in the presence of rotation–translation coupling, e.g., due to short-time hydrodynamic friction [34, 35] or due to confinement by a harmonic potential well [41] or a substrate potential [27, 42]; in such situations, the description of the rotational dynamics is crucial for predictions on the translational motion.

Models for the rotational motion of molecules have traditionally been studied in the context of dynamic light scattering and dielectric spectroscopy [43, 44]. These models are typically based on the Fokker–Planck equation for orienta-

tional diffusion [45–47], which allows one to calculate correlation functions and, more generally, the statistics of the trajectories [38–40]. Alternatively, some form of Langevin equation is employed, which provides a description on the level of stochastic trajectories and which forms the basis of stochastic simulations. The underdamped Langevin equation is used when inertia effects are relevant [44] and, mathematically, there are no conceptual questions with this equation apart from being demanding to work with it analytically. In the context of colloidal motion, however, one would like to model the stochastic dynamics as (completely) overdamped, which requires a suitable Wiener process for the particle orientation. The corresponding Langevin equation contains a noise term that has a “multiplicative” structure [25, 27, 29, 31, 34, 35, 39, 40, 42, 44] [see below, Eqs. (7) and (9)], which brings up questions about the underlying stochastic calculus. In particular, in its Itô form, the overdamped Langevin equation [Eq. (9)] contains a drift-like term, which may appear counter-intuitive at first sight. Another example for this mathematically well-understood situation [48, 49] is given by translational diffusion near a wall characterised by a position-dependent diffusivity, which has led to a re-arising apparent controversy over decades [50–59]. We remark that the issue of multiplicative noise in rotational diffusion is entirely circumvented by modelling the particle orientation as confined to a plane, which allows one to parametrise the two-dimensional rotations by a single angle; whereas this choice is widely adopted in models of active matter it often appears to be a choice of convenience for simplicity rather than being physically well justified.

In this note, we aim to clarify some mathematical aspects of rotational Brownian motion, in particular, the different forms of the overdamped Langevin equation and how they depend on the adopted definition of the stochastic integral (Itô or Stratonovich). The equations are derived from a geometric construction of Brownian motion on the unit sphere, given as a sequence of infinitesimal random rotations. The construction suggests a geometric integration scheme for rotational Brownian motion, which (i) exactly preserves the normalisa-

tion constraint of the orientation vector and (ii) can be extended such that it is weakly exact for arbitrarily large time steps. In order to focus on the essence of the problem, we restrict the discussion to chemically anisotropic spheres (e.g., Janus spheres), thereby avoiding additional difficulties that arise from the incessant transformation of the diffusivity tensor due to the rotational motion. We refer to a Brownian motion with constant coefficients as *homogeneous in time*. Finally, we note that in the literature, a number of numerical schemes for Brownian motion of rigid bodies are described, but often justified only heuristically; this includes schemes using finite rotations [60, 61], adding a constraint force [62, 63], discretising the Stratonovich–Langevin equation [34, 64], or employing a symplectic splitting scheme of the underdamped Langevin dynamics [65]. Also the algorithm presented below (Section IV A) has already been used in previous work of one of the authors [39], without further explanation.

II. HEURISTIC DERIVATION OF THE OVERDAMPED LIMIT

A. Langevin equation of rotational Brownian motion with inertia

Let us start from classical mechanics and consider the rotational motion of a rigid body in three-dimensional space, which may be subject to a total torque $\mathbf{T}(t)$ at time t . Working in a space-fixed (or inertial) frame of reference, the body’s angular velocity $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$ obeys Euler’s equation, which is the rotational analogue of Newton’s law:

$$\mathbf{I}(t) \dot{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(t) = \mathbf{T}(t); \quad (1)$$

here, $\mathbf{I}(t)$ is the body’s moment of inertia, which depends on its instantaneous orientation in space. We consider a body-fixed axis, which is denoted by the unit vector $\mathbf{u}(t)$. Its time evolution given $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$ obeys the kinematic equation

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}(t) = \boldsymbol{\omega}(t) \times \mathbf{u}(t). \quad (2)$$

One readily verifies that this dynamics preserves the norm $|\mathbf{u}(t)| = 1$, since $d|\mathbf{u}|^2/dt = 2\mathbf{u} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{u}} = 0$.

If the particle is immersed in a fluid medium, it experiences a torque $-\zeta_R(t) \boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$ due to viscous (Stokes) friction. In general, the rotational friction coefficient $\zeta_R(t)$ is a tensor which is constant in a body-fixed frame [66], but is time-dependent in the space-fixed frame used here. Following Langevin’s and Ornstein’s approach to Brownian motion, the incessant collisions of the particle with solvent molecules are further subsumed in a random torque $\boldsymbol{\xi}(t)$ acting on the particle. Taking the collisions to be uncorrelated in a first approximation suggests to model $\boldsymbol{\xi}(t)$ as a Gaussian white noise process, which is independent of $\boldsymbol{\omega}(s)$ for $t > s$, has mean zero, and its covariance matrix is determined by the fluctuation–dissipation relation:

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\xi}(t) \rangle = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \boldsymbol{\xi}(t) \otimes \boldsymbol{\xi}(t') \rangle = 2k_B T \zeta_R(t) \delta(t - t'), \quad (3)$$

where $k_B T$ denotes the thermal energy scale and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is an ensemble average over the noise $\boldsymbol{\xi}(t)$. Taking into account the

possibility of an externally imposed torque $\mathbf{T}_{\text{ext}}(t)$, the total torque \mathbf{T} has two deterministic and one random contributions so that Eq. (1) is turned into the Euler–Langevin equation for the evolution of $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$:

$$\mathbf{I}(t) \dot{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(t) = \mathbf{T}_{\text{ext}}(t) - \zeta_R(t) \boldsymbol{\omega}(t) + \boldsymbol{\xi}(t). \quad (4)$$

This is a stochastic differential equation and since the white noise $\boldsymbol{\xi}(t)$ enters “additively” (i.e., it is not multiplied by a $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$ -dependent function), there is no ambiguity about the choice of the stochastic calculus: any (consistent) definition of the stochastic integral yields the same solution [49].

For the purpose of keeping the present discussion focussed, we will limit ourselves to spherical particles with a chemically patterned surface so that their orientation remains identifiable; colloidal Janus particles are a prominent example. In this case, the friction tensor is proportional to the unit matrix and, thus, becomes time-independent: $\zeta_R(t) = \zeta_R \mathbb{1}$. Correspondingly, the moment of inertia reduces to a constant scalar as well: $\mathbf{I}(t) = I \mathbb{1}$. If the sphere has the mass m and the radius a and is suspended in a solvent of dynamic viscosity η and density ρ , one finds $I = (2/5)ma^2$ and the solution of the Stokes flow yields $\zeta_R = 8\pi\eta a^3$.

B. Heuristic derivation of the overdamped limit

For small colloidal (passive or active) particles, inertia is typically negligibly small [67]. An exception are effects due to hydrodynamic memory, the latter manifesting themselves in algebraically decaying long-time tails of correlation functions [68–72]; however, effects due to such persistent memory are not included in the Langevin description of Brownian motion. In the absence of an external torque, one sees from Eq. (4) that the characteristic relaxation time of the angular velocity $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ is given by $\tau_1 = I/\zeta_R$. For a micron-sized sphere ($a = 10^{-3}$ mm) in water ($\eta/\rho = 1$ mm²/s), it holds $\tau_1 = \rho a^2/(15\eta) \approx 10^{-7}$ s. For times $t \gg \tau_1$, it is thus justified to neglect the inertial term $\mathbf{I}\dot{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ in Eq. (4) relative to the dissipative term $\zeta_R \boldsymbol{\omega}$, yielding

$$\zeta_R \boldsymbol{\omega}(t) = \mathbf{T}_{\text{ext}}(t) + \boldsymbol{\xi}(t). \quad (5)$$

This simple reasoning is possible since Eq. (4) is of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck type, in particular, since it is linear in $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$ and the noise $\boldsymbol{\xi}(t)$ enters additively. The same result would be obtained from the formal solution for $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$, given in integral form [49], and taking the limit $\tau_1 \rightarrow 0$.

Equation (5) states that the angular velocity $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$ is statistically equivalent to a Gaussian white noise process with a deterministic bias $\mathbf{T}_{\text{ext}}(t)$. More precisely, we may take $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$ to be a Gaussian process which satisfies

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}(t) \rangle = \mathbf{T}_{\text{ext}}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \delta\boldsymbol{\omega}(t) \otimes \delta\boldsymbol{\omega}(t') \rangle = 2D_R \mathbf{1} \delta(t - t') \quad (6)$$

upon introducing the unbiased part $\delta\boldsymbol{\omega}(t) = \boldsymbol{\omega}(t) - \mathbf{T}_{\text{ext}}(t)$ and the usual rotational diffusion constant $D_R = k_B T/\zeta_R$; from now on, $\langle \cdot \rangle$ refers to the noise average with respect to $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$. We note that $\mathbf{T}_{\text{ext}}(t)$ may depend on $\mathbf{u}(t)$, e.g., for a dipole-like alignment interaction between pairs of particles, which

gives rise to the subtle question if (and in which sense) $\omega(t)$ is independent of the orientation $\mathbf{u}(t)$.

It is now natural to interpret the kinematic equation (2) for the orientation $\mathbf{u}(t)$ as a stochastic differential equation with a random angular velocity $\omega(t)$. We repeat the equation here:

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}(t) = \omega(t) \times \mathbf{u}(t) \quad (\text{Str}), \quad (7)$$

which is one form of the overdamped Langevin equation for rotational Brownian motion of a body-fixed axis $\mathbf{u}(t)$. However, the white noise $\omega(t)$ multiplies the variable $\mathbf{u}(t)$ and the re-interpretation of Eq. (2) is yet ill-defined unless we specify the stochastic calculus [73], i.e., unless we give a meaning to the time integral $\int_0^t \omega(s) \times \mathbf{u}(s) ds$. This is a modelling decision. Recalling that $\mathbf{u}(t)$ is a unit vector, Eq. (7) describes a diffusion process on a constraining manifold, and the natural choice in this situation is to interpret the time integral as a (Fisk-)Stratonovich integral (see chap. 35 in ref. 74).

In the physics literature, the Stratonovich interpretation of Eq. (7) is often (tacitly and correctly) assumed. For the numerical integration, however, a direct application of the widespread Euler-Maruyama algorithm, which is simple and robust, would break the conservation of the norm $|\mathbf{u}(t)|$. This could be fixed *a posteriori* by rescaling $\mathbf{u}(t)$ after every integration step, but such an approach appears conceptually unsatisfying. Instead, one should use a suitable discretisation scheme for the Stratonovich integral, e.g., the stochastic Milstein algorithm; the correct implementation of such schemes, however, is more demanding [75]. A conceptually less satisfying alternative is to mix different stochastic calculi: one may cast the Stratonovich form (7) into an equivalent form that invokes the Itô integral and which is thus suitable for the Euler-Maruyama scheme [44, 49, 76]; this form includes a noise-induced term appearing as a drift [see below, Eq. (9)]. We note that all of these integration schemes preserve the normalisation of $|\mathbf{u}(t)|$ only asymptotically for a vanishing integration time step.

C. Two-dimensional case.

For motion in two dimensional space, which is widely considered in the theoretical literature on active particles, the issue of the multiplicative noise can be circumvented since the angular velocity has only a single component. Writing $\omega = (0, 0, \omega)$, the component u_z of $\mathbf{u} = (u_x, u_y, u_z)$ remains unchanged under the dynamics so that we can set $u_z = 0$ and parametrise the remaining two components $(u_x, u_y) = (\cos(\varphi), \sin(\varphi))$ in terms of the angle $\varphi \in [-\pi, \pi)$. The evolution of $\varphi(t)$ follows from Eq. (2), which reads for the first vector component: $\dot{u}_x(t) = -\omega u_y(t)$. Combining with the ordinary chain rule, $\dot{u}_x(t) = -\sin(\varphi(t)) \dot{\varphi}(t)$, yields:

$$\dot{\varphi}(t) = \omega(t). \quad (8)$$

Passing to the overdamped limit, we replace $\omega(t)$ with the white noise given in Eq. (5), which enters additively. In fact, Eq. (8) is the simplest form of a stochastic differential equation, which has an unambiguous solution with any stochastic

calculus. We conclude that $\varphi(t)$ is a Brownian motion on the one-dimensional torus $[-\pi, \pi)$, i.e., $\mathbf{u}(t)$ performs a Brownian motion on the unit circle in the xy -plane. The same result would be obtained when starting from Eq. (7) and observing that the classical (Leibniz) chain rule still applies for the Stratonovich calculus.

III. GEOMETRIC DERIVATION OF THE OVERDAMPED LANGEVIN EQUATION

For analytical and numerical work the use of Itô's calculus has certain advantages and, to this end, Eq. (7) needs to be cast into its Itô form, which reads:

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}(t) = \omega(t) \times \mathbf{u}(t) - \tau_R^{-1} \mathbf{u}(t) \quad (\text{Itô}) \quad (9)$$

with $\tau_R^{-1} := (d-1)D_R$ for motion in d -dimensional space ($d = 2, 3$). The transformation is straightforward [49], but a bit tedious due to the vector cross product on the r.h.s. of Eq. (7) and will be given below, after an alternative derivation which is based on geometric considerations. We will also show that, due to the specific rules of Itô calculus, the additional term $-\tau_R^{-1} \mathbf{u}(t)$ does not generate a drift, but is necessary to preserve the norm $|\mathbf{u}(t)|$ and to yield the orientational auto-correlation function correctly. Furthermore, the solution $\mathbf{u}(t)$ is non-anticipating with respect to the noise $\omega(t)$, i.e., the (Itô) increments of the noise, $\int_t^{t+\Delta t} \omega(s) ds$ are independent of $\mathbf{u}(s)$ for any $t \geq s$ and $\Delta t > 0$. (This central statement has no simple analogue for the Stratonovich integral.) As a consequence, the Itô-Langevin equation (9) is amenable to the straightforward Euler-Maruyama scheme for numerical integration [75]. Below, we propose a geometric integration scheme that satisfies the constraint $|\mathbf{u}(t)| = 1$ exactly for arbitrary Δt .

A. Geometric derivation of the Itô form

In the following, we adopt a geometric perspective to derive Eq. (9). For Brownian motion of the vector $\mathbf{u}(t)$ on the three-dimensional unit sphere, the evolution of $\mathbf{u}(t)$ emerges from the repeated action of infinitesimal random rotations, which are the analogue of the random displacements of planar Brownian motion. Thus, we can write:

$$\mathbf{u}(t + dt) = e^{\omega(t) dt \cdot \mathbf{J}} \mathbf{u}(t), \quad (10)$$

where $|\omega(t)| dt$ and $\omega(t)/|\omega(t)|$ are the angle and the axis of rotation at time t , respectively. The symbol $\mathbf{J} = (J_1, \dots, J_3)$ denotes the 3×3 matrices $(J_i)_{jk} = -\varepsilon_{ijk}$, given in terms of the Levi-Civita symbol. These matrices form a basis of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ such that $\omega \cdot \mathbf{J} = \omega_i J_i$ is the skew-symmetric matrix representation of the axial vector ω , where summation of repeated indices is implied; written explicitly in components $\omega = (\omega_x, \omega_y, \omega_z)$:

$$\omega \cdot \mathbf{J} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\omega_z & \omega_y \\ \omega_z & 0 & -\omega_x \\ -\omega_y & \omega_x & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (11)$$

In particular, it holds

$$\boldsymbol{\omega} \times \mathbf{v} = (\boldsymbol{\omega} \cdot \mathbf{J})\mathbf{v} \quad (12)$$

for any vectors $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ and \mathbf{v} . The ansatz (10) resembles the McKean–Gangolli injection[77] of a stochastic process, here from the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ into its Lie group $SO(3)$.

Expanding the exponential in Eq. (10) up to the order of $[\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)dt]^2$ yields, according to the rules of Itô calculus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}(t+dt) &= \left[\mathbb{1} + \boldsymbol{\omega}(t)dt \cdot \mathbf{J} + \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)dt \cdot \mathbf{J})^2 \right] \mathbf{u}(t) \\ &= \mathbf{u}(t) + \boldsymbol{\omega}(t)dt \times \mathbf{u}(t) - 2D_R \mathbf{u}(t)dt, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where we have used that

$$\begin{aligned} (\boldsymbol{\omega}dt \cdot \mathbf{J})^2 &= \sum_{ij} \omega_i \omega_j dt^2 J_i J_j \\ &= \sum_i 2D_R dt (J_i)^2 = -4D_R \mathbb{1} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Equation (13) is the same as Eq. (9), which is seen by subtracting $\mathbf{u}(t)$ from both sides of Eq. (13) and dividing it by the differential dt .

B. Discussion of the drift term

Before, we discuss the term $-\tau_R^{-1}\mathbf{u}(t)$ on the r.h.s. of Eq. (9), which appears to describe a drift. However, the term is normal to the constraining manifold and hence cannot generate a drift. Instead, it is needed to satisfy the constraint, i.e., to preserve the normalisation $|\mathbf{u}(t)| = 1$ under the dynamics of Eq. (9). In order to prove this fact, we switch to the notation of stochastic (Itô) differentials and write $d\mathbf{u}(t) = \dot{\mathbf{u}}(t)dt$; the expression $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)dt$ is the differential of a scaled (and shifted [78]) Wiener process. Then, Eq. (6) implies $\omega_i(t)dt \omega_j(t)dt = 2D_R \delta_{ij} dt$ for the Cartesian components i and j of $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$. Employing Itô's formula, substituting $d\mathbf{u}(t)$ by means of Eq. (9), and omitting the time arguments for brevity, one finds:

$$\begin{aligned} d(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}) &= 2\mathbf{u} \cdot d\mathbf{u} + d\mathbf{u} \cdot d\mathbf{u} \\ &\stackrel{(9)}{=} -2\tau_R^{-1}\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}dt + (\boldsymbol{\omega}dt \times \mathbf{u}) \cdot (\boldsymbol{\omega}dt \times \mathbf{u}) \\ &= -2\tau_R^{-1}|\mathbf{u}|^2 dt + \sum_i (\omega_i dt)^2 |\mathbf{u}|^2 \\ &\quad - \sum_{ij} \omega_i dt \omega_j dt u_i u_j \\ &= -2\tau_R^{-1}|\mathbf{u}|^2 dt + 6D_R dt |\mathbf{u}|^2 - 2D_R dt |\mathbf{u}|^2 \\ &= 2(2D_R - \tau_R^{-1})|\mathbf{u}|^2 dt. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Therefore, provided that $\tau_R^{-1} = 2D_R$, it holds $d|\mathbf{u}(t)|^2/dt = 0$ or, equivalently, $|\mathbf{u}(t)| = \text{const.}$

C. Orientational autocorrelation function

The importance of the Itô term in Eq. (9) becomes clear again when computing the autocorrelation function of the orientation, $C_1(t) := \langle \mathbf{u}(t) \cdot \mathbf{u}(0) \rangle$, which is a simple exercise in

the absence of an external torque $\mathbf{T}_{\text{ext}}(t) = 0$. Multiplication of Eq. (9) by $\mathbf{u}(0)$, integrating over time, and averaging yields

$$C_1(t) = \left\langle \int_0^t [\boldsymbol{\omega}(s) \times \mathbf{u}(s)] \cdot \mathbf{u}(0) ds \right\rangle - \tau_R^{-1} \int_0^t C(s) ds. \quad (16)$$

Recalling that $\boldsymbol{\omega}(s)$ is a white noise process [Eq. (6)] and independent of $\mathbf{u}(s)$ and $\mathbf{u}(0)$, the first term on the r.h.s. contains a properly formed Itô integral, which is zero on average. (The Stratonovich integral does not share this property.) Here, we have used that $\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}(t) \rangle = \mathbf{T}_{\text{ext}}(t) = 0$. The remaining integral equation has the expected solution

$$C_1(t) = \exp(-t/\tau_R), \quad (17)$$

which is seen, for example, by differentiating with respect to t and solving the obtained ordinary differential equation for $C_1(t)$ with $C_1(0) = |\mathbf{u}(0)|^2 = 1$.

D. Equivalence of the Itô and Stratonovich forms

It remains to show the mathematical equivalence of Eqs. (7) and (9). Generally, given a diffusion process $\mathbf{X}(t)$ in \mathbb{R}^d , which is driven by a standard Wiener process $\mathbf{W}(t)$ in \mathbb{R}^n scaled by an $d \times n$ matrix-valued coefficient function $\sigma(\mathbf{X}(t))$, the corresponding Stratonovich integral, denoted by $\circ d\mathbf{W}(t)$ as usual, is related to the Itô integral via [48, 74]

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \sigma_{ij}(\mathbf{X}(t)) \circ dW_j(t) &= \int_0^T \sigma_{ij}(\mathbf{X}(t)) dW_j(t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T [\partial_k \sigma(\mathbf{X}(t))]_{ij} \sigma_{kj}(\mathbf{X}(t)) dt, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

for some time $T > 0$ and ∂_k denoting the partial derivative w.r.t. to the component X_k . Omitting the integral signs in Eq. (18) (formally, taking a derivative w.r.t. T) yields the differential form of this relation in the common short-hand notation:

$$\sigma_{ij}(\mathbf{X}) \circ dW_j = \sigma_{ij}(\mathbf{X}) dW_j + \frac{1}{2} [\partial_k \sigma(\mathbf{X})]_{ij} \sigma_{kj}(\mathbf{X}) dt. \quad (19)$$

In order to apply it to Eq. (7), one identifies $\mathbf{X}(t)$ with $\mathbf{u}(t)$ and $d\mathbf{W}(t)$ with $(2D_R)^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\omega}(t)dt$. The noise strength $\sigma(\cdot)$ is 3×3 matrix-valued, and it is convenient to use the above matrix form of the vector product: $\sigma(\mathbf{u}) = -(2D_R)^{1/2} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{J}$, which has the derivatives $\partial_k \sigma(\mathbf{u}) = -(2D_R)^{1/2} J_k$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} [-\mathbf{u}(t) \cdot \mathbf{J}]_{ij} \circ \omega_j(t) dt &= [-\mathbf{u}(t) \cdot \mathbf{J}]_{ij} \omega_j(t) dt \\ &\quad + \frac{2D_R}{2} (-J_k)_{ij} [-\mathbf{u}(t) \cdot \mathbf{J}]_{kj} dt \\ &= \boldsymbol{\omega}(t) dt \times \mathbf{u}(t) - 2D_R \mathbf{u}(t) dt; \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

in the last step, we have simplified the last term as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (-J_k)_{ij} [-\mathbf{u}(t) \cdot \mathbf{J}]_{kj} &= (J_k)_{ij} (J_l)_{kj} u_l(t) \\ &= \varepsilon_{kij} \varepsilon_{lkj} u_l(t) = (\delta_{kl} \delta_{ik} - \delta_{ik} \delta_{il}) u_l(t) = -2u_i(t); \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

δ_{ij} is the Kronecker symbol. After division of Eq. (20) by dt , it is clear that, for $\tau_R^{-1} = 2D_R$, the r.h.s. of the Stratonovich SDE (7) corresponds to the r.h.s. of the Itô SDE (9) as claimed.

E. Two-dimensional case

The geometric derivation of Eq. (9) has a straightforward generalisation to $d = 2$ dimensions. We note that the angular velocity $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$, being an axial vector, has $n := d(d-1)/2$ components since it can be represented as a skew-symmetric $d \times d$ matrix. In particular for $d = 2$, it has only a single component ω_z (which may be chosen as the z -component in a three-dimensional embedding of the motion). Correspondingly, the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(2)$ is generated by a single matrix, e.g., $J_z = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. With this, the cross product in Eq. (12) is to be understood as

$$\boldsymbol{\omega} \times \mathbf{v} = (\boldsymbol{\omega} \cdot \mathbf{J})\mathbf{v} = \omega_z J_z \mathbf{v} \quad (22)$$

for two-dimensional vectors \mathbf{v} . The reasoning from Eqs. (10) to (13) remains unchanged except for the last step, where one has to replace $-\sum_i (J_i)^2 = 2 \cdot \mathbb{1}$ by $-(J_z)^2 = \mathbb{1}$. Hence, Eq. (9) applies also in $d = 2$ dimensions, but with $\tau_R^{-1} = D_R$.

For the proof of the equivalence of the Itô and Stratonovich forms (Section III D), the following changes apply: The noise strength $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) = -(2D_R)^{1/2} J_z \mathbf{u}$ is a 2×1 matrix with derivative $\partial_k \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) = -(2D_R)^{1/2} J_z \mathbf{e}_k$; here, \mathbf{e}_k are the Cartesian unit vectors, $(\mathbf{e}_k)_j = \delta_{kj}$. Second, the calculation in Eq. (21) is replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} (2D_R)^{-1} [\partial_k \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u})]_{ij} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u})_{kj} &= (-J_z \mathbf{e}_k)_{ij} [-J_z \mathbf{u}(t)]_{kj} \\ &= (J_z)_{ik} (J_z)_{kl} u_l(t) = [(J_z)^2 \mathbf{u}(t)]_i = -u_i(t), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where the sums run over rows $k, l \in \{1, 2\}$ and columns $j \in \{1\}$.

IV. GEOMETRIC NUMERICAL INTEGRATION SCHEME

A. Algorithm

Above, we have shown that Eq. (10) is equivalent to Eq. (9). The latter is a standard Itô stochastic differential equation and may be integrated numerically with the Euler–Maruyama scheme or some higher-order scheme [48, 75], introducing some finite integration time step Δt . However, these schemes would satisfy the constraint $|\mathbf{u}(t)| = 1$ only asymptotically, for $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$.

Alternatively, Eq. (10) suggests to implement a geometric integration scheme for Brownian motion on the unit sphere as a sequence of rotations with finite random angles, which reads for a single integration step:

$$\mathbf{u}(t + \Delta t) = e^{\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}(t) \cdot \mathbf{J}} \mathbf{u}(t) \quad (24)$$

for yet to be determined random vectors $\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}(t)$, recalling that $e^{\boldsymbol{\vartheta} \cdot \mathbf{J}}$ is a rotation matrix with axis $\mathbf{n} := \Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}(t) / |\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}(t)|$ and angle $\vartheta := |\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}(t)|$. The explicit action of this rotation on the unit vector $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(t)$ is given for $d = 3$ by Rodrigues formula,

$$\mathbf{u}(t + \Delta t) = \cos(\vartheta) \mathbf{u} - \sin(\vartheta) \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{n} + [1 - \cos(\vartheta)] (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \mathbf{n}. \quad (25)$$

It remains to specify the statistics of $\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}(t)$. Comparison of Eq. (24) and Eq. (10) yields for small time steps that

$$\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}(t) \simeq \boldsymbol{\omega}(t) \Delta t; \quad \Delta t \rightarrow 0. \quad (26)$$

With this choice, time integration of Eq. (6) suggests that $\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}(t)$ is a Gaussian vector with independent components. Clearly, the rotation of \mathbf{u} about its own axis has no effect, which also follows from setting $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{u}$ in Eq. (25). Thus, it is sufficient to choose $\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}$ in the plane perpendicular to \mathbf{u} , i.e., $\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega} = \Omega_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \Omega_2 \mathbf{e}_2$ for unit vectors $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{u})$ forming a trihedron. The random coefficients Ω_1 and Ω_2 are independent Gaussian variables with means and variances given by

$$\langle \Omega_i \rangle = \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{T}_{\text{ext}}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}[\Omega_i] = 2D_R \Delta t \quad (27)$$

for $i = 1, 2$, also including a possible external torque.

In summary, each time step of the geometric integration scheme [Eqs. (24) to (27)] consists of the following algorithm, given $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(t)$, $\mathbf{T}_{\text{ext}}(t)$, and D_R as inputs:

- (i) construct the vector $\mathbf{e}_1 \perp \mathbf{u}$ and let $\mathbf{e}_2 = \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{e}_1$,
- (ii) draw normally distributed random coefficients Ω_1 and Ω_2 satisfying Eq. (27),
- (iii) compute $\mathbf{n} = \Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega} / |\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}|$ and $\vartheta = |\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}|$ and evaluate $\sin(\vartheta)$ and $\cos(\vartheta)$,
- (iv) obtain $\mathbf{u}(t + \Delta t) = \cos(\vartheta) \mathbf{u} - \sin(\vartheta) \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{n}$.

In the last step, we have simplified Eq. (25), noting that $\mathbf{u} \perp \mathbf{n}$. Optionally, after step (iv), one may normalise the unit vector $\mathbf{u}(t + \Delta t)$ to avoid a possible drift of $|\mathbf{u}|$ after a large number of integration steps, which can result from round-off errors due to limited floating-point precision. We emphasise again that the time discretisation in this scheme preserves the normalisation exactly.

B. Estimation of the numerical error

The form of Eq. (24) admits an exact representation of the solution of the SDE (10) whereas Eq. (26) describes merely an approximation because

$$\exp(\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}_A \cdot \mathbf{J}) \exp(\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}_B \cdot \mathbf{J}) \neq \exp((\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}_A + \Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}_B) \cdot \mathbf{J}) \quad (28)$$

for $\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}_A$ and $\Delta \boldsymbol{\Omega}_B$ of subsequent integration steps. In order to estimate the discretisation error, we compare the obtained distribution of $\mathbf{u}(t + \Delta t)$ with the propagator of the dynamics of $\mathbf{u}(t)$, putting $\mathbf{T}_{\text{ext}}(t) = 0$ for simplicity. Then, the free propagator is known from the solution of the corresponding Fokker–Planck equation and, assuming that $\mathbf{u}(0)$ is sampled in equilibrium, it reads in terms of the correlation functions [43]

$$\begin{aligned} C_\ell(t) &:= \langle P_\ell(\mathbf{u}(t) \cdot \mathbf{u}(0)) \rangle \\ &= e^{-\ell(\ell+1)D_R \Delta t}, \quad \ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where $P_\ell(\cdot)$ denotes the Legendre polynomial of degree ℓ . Since $\mathbf{u}(t)$ is a Markov process, it is sufficient to consider the

first step from $t = 0$ to $t = \Delta t$. On the other hand, the numerical scheme [Eq. (25)] yields $\mathbf{u}(t) \cdot \mathbf{u}(0) = \cos(\vartheta)$ and thus

$$\widehat{C}_\ell(t) = \langle P_\ell(\cos(|\Delta\mathbf{\Omega}|)) \rangle_{\Delta\mathbf{\Omega}}, \quad (30)$$

where we have used that \mathbf{n} is orthogonal to $\mathbf{u}(0)$ and $|\mathbf{u}(0)| = 1$ and the average is taken with respect to the distribution of $\Delta\mathbf{\Omega}$ given in Eq. (27). Inserting the Gaussian distributions for Ω_1 and Ω_2 and transforming to the angle $\vartheta = (\Omega_1^2 + \Omega_2^2)^{1/2}$, one obtains

$$\widehat{C}_\ell(t) = \int_0^\infty P_\ell(\cos(\vartheta)) \frac{1}{2D_{\text{R}t}} e^{-\vartheta^2/4D_{\text{R}t}} \vartheta d\vartheta. \quad (31)$$

This integral can be expressed in terms of Dawson's F -function [79]. For our purposes, however, it suffices to expand the integrand in $\vartheta = 0$ since the distribution is sharply peaked for small $D_{\text{R}t} \ll 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{C}_\ell(t) &= \int_0^\infty \left[1 - \frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{4} \vartheta^2 + \frac{1}{24} a_2(\ell) \vartheta^4 + O(\vartheta^6) \right] \\ &\quad \times \frac{1}{4D_{\text{R}t}} e^{-\vartheta^2/4D_{\text{R}t}} d(\vartheta^2) \\ &= 1 - \ell(\ell+1)D_{\text{R}t} + \frac{4}{3} a_2(\ell)(D_{\text{R}t})^2 + O((D_{\text{R}t})^4) \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $a_2(\ell) = \ell(\ell+1)[3\ell(\ell+1) - 2]/8$. From the comparison with Eq. (29) and writing Δt again instead of t , one finds the relative numerical error of the correlation functions $C_\ell(t)$ after one integration step of length Δt :

$$\frac{\widehat{C}_\ell(\Delta t) - C_\ell(\Delta t)}{C_\ell(\Delta t)} = -\frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{3} (D_{\text{R}}\Delta t)^2 + O((D_{\text{R}}\Delta t)^3), \quad (33)$$

asymptotically as $D_{\text{R}}\Delta t \rightarrow 0$. In order to integrate $\mathbf{u}(0)$ up to time $t = N\Delta t$ one applies the one-step propagator [Eq. (24)] successively N times. Correspondingly, the relative discretisation error [Eq. (33)] adds up N times so that the overall error obeys

$$|\widehat{C}_\ell(t) - C_\ell(t)| \simeq \frac{D_{\text{R}}\Delta t}{3} \ell(\ell+1)D_{\text{R}t} e^{-\ell(\ell+1)D_{\text{R}t}} \quad (34)$$

upon $D_{\text{R}}\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, which we have verified in numerical tests. Moreover, the t -dependent factor is bounded and we can estimate the error for arbitrary times:

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} |\widehat{C}_\ell(t) - C_\ell(t)| = \frac{D_{\text{R}}\Delta t}{3e} + O((D_{\text{R}}\Delta t)^2). \quad (35)$$

One concludes that the geometric integrator shows a globally weak convergence of order 1 in the integration time step Δt .

C. A weakly exact integration scheme

A weakly exact integration scheme (i.e., one that yields the correct statistics of the solution) is obtained upon replacing Eq. (27) by the true statistics of $\Delta\mathbf{\Omega}$, which tends to a Gaussian only for $D_{\text{R}}\Delta t \ll 1$. In particular, a series representation of

the distribution of the rotation angle $\vartheta = |\Delta\mathbf{\Omega}|$, restricted to $0 \leq \vartheta \leq \pi$, follows from its angular moments [Eq. (29)]:

$$p(\vartheta) = \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \left(\ell + \frac{1}{2} \right) C_\ell(t) P_\ell(\cos(\vartheta)) \sin(\vartheta). \quad (36)$$

With this, $C_\ell(t) = \int_0^\pi P_\ell(\cos(\vartheta)) p(\vartheta) d\vartheta$ and reweighting the angle ϑ in step (iii) of the algorithm (Section IV A) such that it samples $p(\vartheta)$ yields numerical correlation functions $\widehat{C}_\ell(t)$ [Eq. (30)] which are equal to $C_\ell(t)$ for all t . A truncation of the series for $p(\vartheta)$ by keeping only terms with $\ell \leq \ell_{\text{max}}$ yields $\widehat{C}_\ell(t) = C_\ell(t)$ for $\ell \leq \ell_{\text{max}}$ and $\widehat{C}_\ell(t) = 0$ otherwise. We note that $p(\vartheta)$ is similar in shape, but different from the van-Mises-Fisher distribution, $p_{\text{vMF}}(\vartheta) \propto \exp(\cos(\vartheta)/2D_{\text{R}t}) \sin(\vartheta)$, which decays too slowly as $\vartheta \rightarrow \pi$ and would yield a larger integration error than given in Eq. (33).

Numerically, the direct sampling from the (truncated or untruncated) distribution (36) may be implemented via inverse transform sampling: $F^{-1}(Z)$ samples the density $p(\vartheta)$ if Z is a uniformly distributed random variable on the interval $[0, 1]$ and the function $F^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the (numerically pre-computed) inverse of the cumulative distribution function of ϑ , i.e., $F(\vartheta) = \int_0^\vartheta p(\vartheta') d\vartheta'$ for $\vartheta \in [0, \pi]$. Alternatively, one can imagine to start from a Gaussian distributed variable Z and to use $Z = |\Delta\mathbf{\Omega}|$ from the original step (iii) of the algorithm. An efficient implementation of this exact variant of the integration scheme is left for future research.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Brownian motion on the unit sphere is a central ingredient to models of active Brownian particles, e.g., Janus spheres, in which it describes the stochastic evolution of the propulsion direction. Here, we have constructed the corresponding overdamped stochastic process as a sequence of infinitesimal random rotations [Eq. (10)]. This construction is known as McKean–Gangolli injection [77], which transforms a stochastic process on the Lie algebra — here, $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ — into the generated Lie group — here, the rotation group $SO(3)$. Within Itô calculus, it is then straightforward to derive a stochastic differential (i.e., Langevin) equation of the process [Eq. (9)]. Transforming the equation to its equivalent form in Stratonovich calculus [Eq. (7)] yields the same equation as is obtained heuristically from the underdamped Langevin equation of rotational Brownian motion [Eqs. (2) and (4)]. In particular, the latter form is free from the apparent, noise-induced drift term present in the Itô form. We have shown that, indeed, this additional term does not generate a drift (bias) of the rotational motion; but rather, it is needed to preserve the normalisation of the orientation vector, $|\mathbf{u}(t)| = 1$, under the stochastic dynamics.

In numerical integration schemes of the overdamped Langevin equation (in either form), such as the Euler–Maruyama and Milstein schemes, the normalisation constraint is satisfied only asymptotically for vanishing time step, $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, depending on their strong order of convergence. As an alternative, we have proposed a geometric integration scheme

[Eq. (24)], which is based on finite random rotations and which satisfies the constraint exactly for any time step Δt . Combining this approach with Gaussian distributed random rotation angles yields an immediate and simple implementation of this geometric integrator (Section IV A), which we have shown to converge weakly at order 1, i.e., $O(\Delta t)$, and

which can also be combined with a deterministic bias, e.g., due to an external torque or to model circle swimmers. Moreover, we have outlined an improved algorithm that exactly generates the (free) propagator of rotational Brownian motion for an arbitrary time step Δt if an advanced sampling of the rotation angle is used [see Eq. (36)].

-
- [1] Y. Han, A. M. Alsayed, M. Nobili, J. Zhang, T. C. Lubensky, and A. G. Yodh, Brownian motion of an ellipsoid, *Science* **314**, 626 (2006).
- [2] D. Mukhija and M. J. Solomon, Translational and rotational dynamics of colloidal rods by direct visualization with confocal microscopy, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **314**, 98 (2007).
- [3] D. J. Kraft, R. Wittkowski, B. ten Hagen, K. V. Edmond, D. J. Pine, and H. Löwen, Brownian motion and the hydrodynamic friction tensor for colloidal particles of complex shape, *Phys. Rev. E* **88**, 050301 (2013).
- [4] D. Schamel, M. Pfeifer, J. G. Gibbs, B. Miksch, A. G. Mark, and P. Fischer, Chiral colloidal molecules and observation of the propeller effect, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **135**, 12353 (2013).
- [5] J. R. Howse, R. A. L. Jones, A. J. Ryan, T. Gough, R. Vafabakhsh, and R. Golestanian, Self-motile colloidal particles: From directed propulsion to random walk, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 048102 (2007).
- [6] A. Erbe, M. Zientara, L. Baraban, C. Kreidler, and P. Leiderer, Various driving mechanisms for generating motion of colloidal particles, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **20**, 404215 (2008).
- [7] J. Palacci, C. Cottin-Bizonne, C. Ybert, and L. Bocquet, Sedimentation and effective temperature of active colloidal suspensions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 088304 (2010).
- [8] T.-C. Lee, M. Alarcón-Correa, C. Miksch, K. Hahn, J. G. Gibbs, and P. Fischer, Self-propelling nanomotors in the presence of strong Brownian forces, *Nano Lett.* **14**, 2407 (2014).
- [9] I. Buttinoni, G. Volpe, F. Kümmel, G. Volpe, and C. Bechinger, Active Brownian motion tunable by light, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **24**, 284129 (2012).
- [10] G. Volpe, I. Buttinoni, D. Vogt, H.-J. Kümmerer, and C. Bechinger, Microswimmers in patterned environments, *Soft Matter* **7**, 8810 (2011).
- [11] C. Bechinger, R. Di Leonardo, H. Löwen, C. Reichhardt, G. Volpe, and G. Volpe, Active particles in complex and crowded environments, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **88**, 045006 (2016).
- [12] S. Palagi, D. P. Singh, and P. Fischer, Light-controlled micromotors and soft microrobots, *Adv. Opt. Mater.* **7**, 1900370 (2019).
- [13] J. G. Gibbs, Shape- and material-dependent self-propulsion of photocatalytic active colloids, interfacial effects, and dynamic interparticle interactions, *Langmuir* **36**, 6938 (2019).
- [14] F. Schweitzer, W. Ebeling, and B. Tilch, Complex motion of Brownian particles with energy depots, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 5044 (1998).
- [15] U. Erdmann, W. Ebeling, L. Schimansky-Geier, and F. Schweitzer, Brownian particles far from equilibrium, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **15**, 105 (2000).
- [16] M. Popescu, S. Dietrich, M. Tasinkevych, and J. Ralston, Phoretic motion of spheroidal particles due to self-generated solute gradients, *Eur. Phys. J. E* **31**, 351 (2010).
- [17] P. Romanczuk, M. Bär, W. Ebeling, B. Lindner, and L. Schimansky-Geier, Active Brownian particles, *Eur. Phys. J. Special Topics* **202**, 1 (2012).
- [18] B. Sabass and U. Seifert, Dynamics and efficiency of a self-propelled, diffusiophoretic swimmer, *J. Chem. Phys.* **136**, 064508 (2012).
- [19] P. H. Colberg and R. Kapral, Ångström-scale chemically powered motors, *EPL (Europhys. Lett.)* **106**, 30004 (2014).
- [20] C. M. Pooley, G. P. Alexander, and J. M. Yeomans, Hydrodynamic interaction between two swimmers at low Reynolds number, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 228103 (2007).
- [21] W. E. Uspal, M. N. Popescu, S. Dietrich, and M. Tasinkevych, Self-propulsion of a catalytically active particle near a planar wall: from reflection to sliding and hovering, *Soft Matter* **11**, 434 (2015).
- [22] J. Elgeti, R. G. Winkler, and G. Gompper, Physics of microswimmers—single particle motion and collective behavior: a review, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **78**, 056601 (2015).
- [23] A. Zöttl and H. Stark, Modeling active colloids: From active Brownian particles to hydrodynamic and chemical fields, *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **14**, 109 (2023).
- [24] R. Golestanian, T. B. Liverpool, and A. Ajdari, Propulsion of a molecular machine by asymmetric distribution of reaction products, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 220801 (2005).
- [25] J. Bickmann, S. Bröker, M. te Vrugt, and R. Wittkowski, Active Brownian particles in external force fields: Field-theoretical models, generalized barometric law, and programmable density patterns, *Phys. Rev. E* **108**, 044601 (2023).
- [26] B. ten Hagen, S. van Teeffelen, and H. Löwen, Brownian motion of a self-propelled particle, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **23**, 194119 (2011).
- [27] U. Choudhury, A. V. Straube, P. Fischer, J. G. Gibbs, and F. Höfling, Active colloidal propulsion over a crystalline surface, *New J. Phys.* **19**, 125010 (2017).
- [28] B. ten Hagen, F. Kümmel, R. Wittkowski, D. Takagi, H. Löwen, and C. Bechinger, Gravitaxis of asymmetric self-propelled colloidal particles, *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 4829 (2014).
- [29] K. Wolff, A. M. Hahn, and H. Stark, Sedimentation and polar order of active bottom-heavy particles, *Eur. Phys. J. E* **36**, 43 (2013).
- [30] F. Rühle, J. Blaschke, J.-T. Kuhr, and H. Stark, Gravity-induced dynamics of a squirmer microswimmer in wall proximity, *New J. Phys.* **20**, 025003 (2018).
- [31] J. Vachier and M. G. Mazza, Dynamics of sedimenting active Brownian particles, *Eur. Phys. J. E* **42**, 11 (2019).
- [32] Q. Brosseau, F. B. Usabiaga, E. Lushi, Y. Wu, L. Ristroph, M. D. Ward, M. J. Shelley, and J. Zhang, Metallic microswimmers driven up the wall by gravity, *Soft Matter* **17**, 6597 (2021).
- [33] O. Chepizhko and T. Franosch, Resonant diffusion of a gravitactic circle swimmer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 228003 (2022).
- [34] M. Makino and M. Doi, Brownian motion of a particle of general shape in newtonian fluid, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **73**, 2739 (2004); M. Doi and M. Makino, Motion of micro-particles of complex shape, *Prog. Polym. Sci.* **30**, 876 (2005).
- [35] R. Wittkowski and H. Löwen, Self-propelled Brownian spin-

- ning top: Dynamics of a biaxial swimmer at low Reynolds numbers, *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 021406 (2012).
- [36] F. Höfling, E. Frey, and T. Franosch, Enhanced diffusion of a needle in a planar array of point obstacles, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 120605 (2008).
- [37] F. Höfling, T. Munk, E. Frey, and T. Franosch, Entangled dynamics of a stiff polymer, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 060904(R) (2008).
- [38] T. Munk, F. Höfling, E. Frey, and T. Franosch, Effective Perrin theory for the anisotropic diffusion of a strongly hindered rod, *EPL (Europhys. Lett.)* **85**, 30003 (2009).
- [39] S. Leitmann, F. Höfling, and T. Franosch, Tube concept for entangled stiff fibers predicts their dynamics in space and time, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 097801 (2016); Dynamically crowded solutions of infinitely thin Brownian needles, *Phys. Rev. E* **96**, 012118 (2017).
- [40] C. Kurzthaler, S. Leitmann, and T. Franosch, Intermediate scattering function of an anisotropic active Brownian particle, *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 36702 (2016).
- [41] M. Caraglio and T. Franosch, Analytic solution of an active Brownian particle in a harmonic well, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 158001 (2022).
- [42] A. V. Straube and F. Höfling, Depinning transition of self-propelled particles (2023), [arXiv:2306.09150 \[cond-mat.soft\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.09150).
- [43] B. J. Berne and R. Pecora, *Dynamic light scattering* (Wiley, New York, 1976) chapter 6.6.
- [44] W. T. Coffey and Y. P. Kalmykov, *The Langevin equation: With Applications to Stochastic Problems in Physics, Chemistry and Electric Engineering*, 3rd ed. (World Scientific, Singapore, 2012).
- [45] F. Perrin, Mouvement brownien d'un ellipsoïde - I. Dispersion diélectrique pour des molécules ellipsoïdales, *J. Phys. Radium* **5**, 497 (1934).
- [46] W. H. Furry, Isotropic rotational Brownian motion, *Phys. Rev.* **107**, 7 (1957).
- [47] L. Dale Favro, Theory of the rotational Brownian motion of a free rigid body, *Phys. Rev.* **119**, 53 (1960).
- [48] C. Gardiner, *Stochastic Methods: A Handbook for the Natural and Social Sciences*, 4th ed. (Springer, Berlin, 2009).
- [49] B. Øksendal, *Stochastic Differential Equations: An Introduction with Applications*, 2nd ed. (Springer, Berlin, 2013).
- [50] D. Ryter, Brownian motion in inhomogeneous media and with interacting particles, *Z. Phys. B* **41**, 39 (1981).
- [51] J. M. Sancho, M. S. Miguel, and D. Dürr, Adiabatic elimination for systems of Brownian particles with nonconstant damping coefficients, *J. Stat. Phys.* **28**, 291 (1982).
- [52] A. W. C. Lau and T. C. Lubensky, State-dependent diffusion: Thermodynamic consistency and its path integral formulation, *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 011123 (2007).
- [53] G. Volpe, L. Helden, T. Brettschneider, J. Wehr, and C. Bechinger, Influence of noise on force measurements, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 170602 (2010).
- [54] I. Sokolov, Ito, Stratonovich, Hänggi and all the rest: The thermodynamics of interpretation, *Chem. Phys.* **375**, 359 (2010).
- [55] J. M. Sancho, Brownian colloidal particles: Ito, Stratonovich, or a different stochastic interpretation, *Phys. Rev. E* **84**, 062102 (2011).
- [56] G. Pesce, A. McDaniel, S. Hottovy, J. Wehr, and G. Volpe, Stratonovich-to-Itô transition in noisy systems with multiplicative feedback, *Nat. Commun.* **4**, 2733 (2013).
- [57] O. Farago and N. Grønbech-Jensen, Langevin dynamics in inhomogeneous media: Re-examining the Itô-Stratonovich dilemma, *Phys. Rev. E* **89**, 013301 (2014).
- [58] G. Volpe and J. Wehr, Effective drifts in dynamical systems with multiplicative noise: a review of recent progress, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **79**, 053901 (2016).
- [59] A. Bhattacharyay, Generalization of Stokes-Einstein relation to coordinate dependent damping and diffusivity: an apparent conflict, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **53**, 075002 (2020).
- [60] M. X. Fernandes and J. G. de la Torre, Brownian dynamics simulation of rigid particles of arbitrary shape in external fields, *Biophys. J.* **83**, 3039 (2002).
- [61] D. A. Beard and T. Schlick, Unbiased rotational moves for rigid-body dynamics, *Biophys. J.* **85**, 2973 (2003).
- [62] I. M. Ilie, W. J. Briels, and W. K. den Otter, An elementary singularity-free rotational Brownian dynamics algorithm for anisotropic particles, *J. Chem. Phys.* **142**, 114103 (2015).
- [63] Y.-G. Tao, W. K. den Otter, J. T. Padding, J. K. G. Dhont, and W. J. Briels, Brownian dynamics simulations of the self- and collective rotational diffusion coefficients of rigid long thin rods, *J. Chem. Phys.* **122**, 244903 (2005).
- [64] D. Gordon, M. Hoyles, and S.-H. Chung, Algorithm for rigid-body Brownian dynamics, *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 066703 (2009).
- [65] X. Sun, T. Lin, and J. D. Gezelter, Langevin dynamics for rigid bodies of arbitrary shape, *J. Chem. Phys.* **128**, 234107 (2008).
- [66] J. Happel and H. Brenner, *Low Reynolds Number Hydrodynamics*, 2nd ed. (Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, 1983).
- [67] A. Zöttl and H. Stark, Emergent behavior in active colloids, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **28**, 253001 (2016).
- [68] B. U. Felderhof and R. B. Jones, Diffusion in hard sphere suspensions, *Physica A* **122**, 89 (1983).
- [69] T. Franosch, M. Grimm, M. Belushkin, F. M. Mor, G. Foffi, L. Forró, and S. Jeney, Resonances arising from hydrodynamic memory in Brownian motion, *Nature* **478**, 85 (2011).
- [70] R. Huang, I. Chavez, K. M. Taute, B. Lukic, S. Jeney, M. G. Raizen, and E.-L. Florin, Direct observation of the full transition from ballistic to diffusive Brownian motion in a liquid, *Nat. Phys.* **7**, 576 (2011).
- [71] A. J. Masters and T. Keyes, Translational and rotational diffusion of an anisotropic particle in a molecular liquid: Long-time tails and Brownian limit, *J. Stat. Phys.* **39**, 215 (1985).
- [72] C. P. Lowe, D. Frenkel, and A. J. Masters, Long-time tails in angular momentum correlations, *J. Chem. Phys.* **103**, 1582 (1995).
- [73] We emphasise that we have left open this question when solving Eq. (4).
- [74] O. Kallenberg, *Foundations of Modern Probability*, 3rd ed. (Springer, 2021).
- [75] P. E. Kloeden and E. Platen, *Numerical Solution of Stochastic Differential Equations*, 3rd ed. (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010).
- [76] H. Risken, *The Fokker-Planck Equation: Methods of Solution and Applications* (Springer, Berlin, 1984).
- [77] G. S. Chirikjian, *Stochastic models, information theory, and Lie groups*, Vol. 2 (Birkhäuser, Boston, 2009).
- [78] The argument given holds also in the presence of $T_{\text{ext}}(t)$ in Eq. (6).
- [79] I. A. Stegun and M. Abramowitz, eds., *Handbook of Mathematical Functions* (Dover, New York, 1965).