

A modified Cayley transform for SU(3)

Kevin Schäfers^{a,*}, Michael Peardon^b, Michael Günther^a

^a*Institute of Mathematical Modelling, Analysis and Computational Mathematics (IMACM), Chair of Applied and Computational Mathematics, Bergische Universität Wuppertal, Gaußstraße 20, Wuppertal, 42119, Germany*

^b*School of Mathematics, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland*

Abstract

We propose a modification to the Cayley transform that defines a suitable local parameterization for the special unitary group SU(3). The new mapping is used to construct splitting methods for separable Hamiltonian systems whose phase space is the cotangent bundle of SU(3) or, more general, SU(3)^N, $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Special attention is given to the hybrid Monte Carlo algorithm for gauge field generation in lattice quantum chromodynamics. We show that the use of the modified Cayley transform instead of the matrix exponential neither affects the time-reversibility nor the volume-preservation of the splitting method. Furthermore, the advantages and disadvantages of the Cayley-based algorithms are discussed and illustrated in pure gauge field simulations.

Keywords: Geometric integration, Differential equations on Lie groups, Splitting methods, Cayley transform, Hybrid Monte Carlo, Lattice quantum chromodynamics

2020 MSC: 81V05, 65P10, 65L05, 65L20 37N20

1. Introduction

The Hybrid Monte Carlo (HMC) algorithm [1] is a frequent choice for gauge field generation in lattice quantum chromodynamics (QCD). In the molecular dynamics step of the HMC algorithm, Hamiltonian equations of motion have to be solved using a volume-preserving and time-reversible numerical integration scheme in order to satisfy the detailed balance condition, ensuring that the equilibrium distribution of the Markov chain can be reached [2]. Moreover, the differential equation for the link variables is of Lie-type, i.e. the exact solution to this equation evolves on a Lie group manifold, in particular the links are elements of the special unitary group SU(3). In order to avoid non-physical numerical approximations, we demand that the numerical scheme satisfies the closure property, i.e. it yields numerical approximations situated on the Lie group manifold. Due to the separability of the Hamiltonian, splitting methods [3] provide a tool to solve the equations of motion explicitly while preserving the time-reversibility, symplecticity, as well as the closure property of the exact flow. By computing the exact flows of the respective subsystems, the matrix exponential $\exp(A) := \sum_{k \geq 0} A^k/k!$ maps elements of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ into the Lie group SU(3). In the context of Lie group integrators, the exponential map is a natural choice as a local parameterization $\Psi: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$. An alternative local parameterization for quadratic Lie groups of the form

$$\mathcal{G} = \{Y \in \text{GL}(n) \mid Y^\dagger J Y = J\}, \quad J \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \text{ const.}, \quad (1.1)$$

is given by the Cayley transform [4–9]

$$\text{cay}(\Omega) = (I - \Omega)^{-1}(I + \Omega). \quad (1.2)$$

The Cayley transform is also feasible for the special unitary group SU(2). Recently, the Cayley transform has been applied successfully for simulation in an SU(2) Yang-Mills theory using the HMC algorithm [10], resulting in a

*Corresponding author.

Email addresses: schaefers@math.uni-wuppertal.de (Kevin Schäfers), mjp@maths.tcd.ie (Michael Peardon), guenther@math.uni-wuppertal.de (Michael Günther)

significantly more efficient computational process. Unfortunately, the Cayley transform does not define a local parameterization for $SU(3)$. This paper contributes in providing a modification to the Cayley transform that defines a local parameterization for the special unitary group $SU(3)$ and investigates its use in lattice QCD.

In Section 2, we will briefly explain why the Cayley transform is a suitable local parameterization for $SU(2)$, but not for $SU(3)$ anymore. Then, in Section 3, we introduce a modified Cayley transform that defines a local parameterization from $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ into $SU(3)$. In Section 4, we consider splitting methods for lattice QCD simulations and then show how to use the modified Cayley transform inside these methods. Here, we show that the usage of the modified Cayley transform does not affect the time-reversibility and volume-preservation. Moreover, we will investigate the convergence order of the resulting integrators. The proposed integrators are tested by simulating lattice gauge fields and compared to integrators based on the exponential map in Section 5. The paper closes by some concluding remarks and outlook for future research.

2. The Cayley Transform and the Special Unitary Group

The Cayley transform (1.2) defines a local parameterization for quadratic Lie groups of the form (1.1), i.e. it maps elements from the Lie algebra

$$\mathfrak{g} = \{\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid J\Omega + \Omega^\dagger J = 0\}$$

into \mathcal{G} . Furthermore, it is a local diffeomorphism near $\Omega = 0$ [9, Lemma IV.8.7]. Prominent examples of quadratic Lie groups are the orthogonal group $O(n)$ and the unitary group $U(n)$. The special orthogonal group $SO(n)$ and the special unitary group $SU(n)$ are not of the form (1.1). The Cayley transform also defines a mapping from $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ into $SO(n)$. Since the eigenvalues of any skew-symmetric matrix $\Omega \in \mathfrak{so}(n)$ are purely imaginary and complex eigenvalues of real-valued matrices occur in complex conjugate pairs, it can be shown that

$$\det((I - \Omega)^{-1}(I + \Omega)) = 1 \quad \forall \Omega \in \mathfrak{so}(n),$$

i.e. $\text{cay}(\Omega) \in SO(n) \forall \Omega \in \mathfrak{so}(n)$. In case of complex-valued matrices, this does not work anymore since the eigenvalues are not necessarily occurring in complex conjugate pairs. Whereas this is still true for the special case $n = 2$, the situation changes for $n = 3$.

Theorem 2.1 (Cayley transform for $SU(2)$). *The Cayley transform (1.2) maps elements from the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ into the Lie group $SU(2)$.*

Proof. Based on the Pauli matrices

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

one can express any matrix $\Omega \in \mathfrak{su}(2)$ as $\Omega = \sum_{j=1}^3 c_j i \sigma_j$ with coefficients $c_j \in \mathbb{R}$. Its eigenvalues are given by

$$\lambda_1 := \sqrt{-c_1^2 - c_2^2 - c_3^2}, \quad \lambda_2 := -\lambda_1,$$

and thus are purely imaginary and complex conjugate to each other. Consequently, it holds

$$\det(\text{cay}(\Omega)) = \det((I - \Omega)^{-1}) \cdot \det(I + \Omega) = \frac{(1 + \lambda_1)(1 + \lambda_2)}{(1 - \lambda_1)(1 - \lambda_2)} = \frac{(1 + \lambda_1)(1 - \lambda_1)}{(1 - \lambda_1)(1 + \lambda_1)} = 1,$$

i.e. $\text{cay}(\Omega) \in SU(2) \forall \Omega \in \mathfrak{su}(2)$. □

Theorem 2.2 (Cayley transform for $SU(3)$). *The Cayley transform (1.2) maps elements from the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ into the Lie group $U(3)$, but not necessarily into $SU(3)$.*

Proof. Since the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ is a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{u}(3)$ and $U(3)$ is of the form (1.1), the Cayley transform definitely maps elements from $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ into $U(3)$. It remains to show that the Cayley transform does not necessarily map into the subgroup $SU(3)$. Any matrix $\Omega \in \mathfrak{su}(3)$ can be represented by $\Omega = \sum_{j=1}^8 c_j i\lambda_j$ with real-valued coefficients c_j and λ_j the Gell-Mann matrices (see Appendix A). Applying the Cayley transform to the basis element $i\lambda_8$ yields

$$\text{cay}(i\lambda_8) = \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, -\frac{1}{2} - i\frac{4\sqrt{3}}{7}\right)$$

with $\det(\text{cay}(i\lambda_8)) = \frac{13}{14} + i\frac{3\sqrt{3}}{14} \neq 1$, concluding the proof. \square

3. Modified Cayley Transform for $SU(3)$

Consider a matrix $M \in \mathbb{C}^{3 \times 3}$. Then, the Cayley–Hamilton theorem implies

$$M^3 - \text{tr}(M)M^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\text{tr}(M)^2 - \text{tr}(M^2))M - \det(M)I = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

Taking the trace of this matrix expression yields

$$\det(M) = \frac{1}{3}\text{tr}(M^3) - \frac{1}{3}\text{tr}(M)\text{tr}(M^2) + \frac{1}{6}\text{tr}(M)^3 - \frac{1}{6}\text{tr}(M)\text{tr}(M^2) = \frac{1}{3}\text{tr}(M^3) - \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(M)\text{tr}(M^2) + \frac{1}{6}\text{tr}(M)^3. \quad (3.2)$$

For $M = I + \Omega$ with Ω being traceless, (3.2) simplifies to

$$\det(I + \Omega) = \frac{1}{3}\text{tr}\left((I + \Omega)^3\right) - \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(I + \Omega)\text{tr}\left((I + \Omega)^2\right) + \frac{1}{6}\text{tr}(\Omega)^3 = 1 - \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(\Omega^2) + \frac{1}{3}\text{tr}(\Omega^3) = 1 - \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(\Omega^2) + \det(\Omega), \quad (3.3)$$

where we applied (3.1) to the traceless matrix Ω in the last step.

Lemma 3.1. *If $\Omega \in \mathbb{C}^{3 \times 3}$ is a traceless and anti-Hermitian matrix, then for any angle $\theta \in (-\pi, \pi]$, the matrix*

$$U(\Omega) = \left(I - e^{-i\theta}\Omega\right)^{-1} \left(I + e^{i\theta}\Omega\right) \quad (3.4)$$

obeys $U(\Omega)^\dagger U(\Omega) = I$ and thus is an element of the Lie group $U(3)$.

Proof. By using the commutativity of the matrices and that $\Omega^\dagger = -\Omega$ holds, we obtain

$$U(\Omega)^\dagger U(\Omega) = \left(I + e^{i\theta}\Omega\right)^\dagger \left(I - e^{-i\theta}\Omega\right)^{-\dagger} \left(I - e^{-i\theta}\Omega\right)^{-1} \left(I + e^{i\theta}\Omega\right) = \left(I - e^{-i\theta}\Omega\right) \left(I + e^{i\theta}\Omega\right)^{-1} \left(I - e^{-i\theta}\Omega\right)^{-1} \left(I + e^{i\theta}\Omega\right) = I. \quad \square$$

Remark 3.2. *For $\theta = 0$, (3.4) reduces to the traditional Cayley transform since $e^{-i\theta}|_{\theta=0} = e^{i\theta}|_{\theta=0} = 1$.*

In a next step, we will determine the angle θ so that $\det(U(\Omega)) = 1$, i.e. the transformation (3.4) maps elements $\Omega \in \mathfrak{su}(3)$ into $SU(3)$.

Lemma 3.3. Consider the matrix U given by (3.4) and $\Omega \in \mathfrak{su}(3)$. It holds

$$\det(U(\Omega)) = 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \det\left(I + e^{i\theta}\Omega\right) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof. With $\det(U(\Omega)) = \det\left(I + e^{i\theta}\Omega\right) / \det\left(I - e^{-i\theta}\Omega\right)$, it holds

$$\det(U(\Omega)) = 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \det\left(I + e^{i\theta}\Omega\right) = \det\left(I - e^{-i\theta}\Omega\right).$$

By applying (3.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \det\left(e^{i\theta}\Omega\right) - \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\left(e^{2i\theta}\Omega^2\right) &= 1 + \det\left(-e^{-i\theta}\Omega\right) - \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\left(e^{-2i\theta}\Omega^2\right) \\ \Leftrightarrow e^{3i\theta}\det(\Omega) - \frac{e^{2i\theta}}{2}\text{tr}(\Omega^2) &= -e^{-3i\theta}\det(\Omega) - \frac{e^{-2i\theta}}{2}\text{tr}(\Omega^2). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Euler's formula then yields

$$\cos(3\theta) \det(\Omega) - \frac{1}{2}i \sin(2\theta) \operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2) = -\cos(3\theta) \det(\Omega) + \frac{1}{2}i \sin(2\theta) \operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2).$$

Since the determinant of $\Omega \in \mathfrak{su}(3)$ is purely imaginary and $\operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2) \in \mathbb{R}$, we can rewrite the expression and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} i \cos(3\theta) \Im(\det(\Omega)) - \frac{1}{2}i \sin(2\theta) \operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2) &= -i \cos(3\theta) \Im(\det(\Omega)) + \frac{1}{2}i \sin(2\theta) \operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2) \\ \Leftrightarrow \cos(3\theta) \Im(\det(\Omega)) - \frac{1}{2} \sin(2\theta) \operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2) &= -\cos(3\theta) \Im(\det(\Omega)) + \frac{1}{2} \sin(2\theta) \operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2). \end{aligned}$$

The left-hand side and the right-hand side coincide with the imaginary part of $\det(I + e^{i\theta}\Omega)$ and $\det(I - e^{-i\theta}\Omega)$, respectively. Since $\Im(\det(I + e^{i\theta}\Omega)) = -\Im(\det(I - e^{-i\theta}\Omega))$, the only solution is given by

$$\Im(\det(I + e^{i\theta}\Omega)) = 0 = \Im(\det(I - e^{-i\theta}\Omega)),$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Theorem 3.4. *The angle*

$$\theta(\Omega) := \sin^{-1} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma(\Omega)^{-1} \mp \sqrt{\gamma(\Omega)^{-2} + 1} \right) \right),$$

with $\gamma(\Omega) := 4\Im(\det(\Omega))/\operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2)$, ensures $\det(U(\Omega)) = 1$.

Proof. Applying (3.3) and Euler's formula yields

$$\det(I + e^{i\theta}\Omega) = 1 + e^{3i\theta} \det(\Omega) - \frac{1}{2}e^{2i\theta} \operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2) = 1 + (\cos(3\theta) + i \sin(3\theta)) \det(\Omega) - \frac{1}{2}(\cos(2\theta) + i \sin(2\theta)) \operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2).$$

According to Lemma 3.3, we demand $\Im(\det(I + e^{i\theta}\Omega)) = 0$, i.e.,

$$0 = \cos(3\theta) \Im(\det(\Omega)) - \frac{1}{2} \sin(2\theta) \operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2) \Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{2} \sin(2\theta) \operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2) = \cos(3\theta) \Im(\det(\Omega)).$$

Using the double- and triple-angle formula results in an equivalent expression which is given by

$$\sin(\theta) \cos(\theta) \operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2) = \cos(\theta) (1 - 4 \sin^2(\theta)) \Im(\det(\Omega)).$$

This gives the trivial result $\cos(\theta) = 0$, for which $U = I \in \mathrm{SU}(3)$, as well as a non-trivial constraint

$$\sin(\theta) \operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2) = (1 - 4 \sin^2(\theta)) \Im(\det(\Omega)).$$

For $\Im(\det(\Omega)) = 0$, $\sin(\theta) = 0$ solves this equation. For $\Im(\det(\Omega)) \neq 0$, we obtain

$$\sin(\theta) \operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2) = (1 - 4 \sin^2(\theta)) \Im(\det(\Omega)) \Leftrightarrow \sin^2(\theta) + \frac{\operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2)}{4\Im(\det(\Omega))} \sin(\theta) - \frac{1}{4} = 0.$$

Solving this equation for $\sin(\theta)$ yields

$$\sin(\theta) = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2)}{4\Im(\det(\Omega))} \mp \sqrt{\left(\frac{\operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2)}{4\Im(\det(\Omega))} \right)^2 + 1} \right).$$

By introducing the parameter $\gamma(\Omega) := 4\Im(\det(\Omega))/\operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2)$, the angle θ is given by

$$\theta(\Omega) = \sin^{-1} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma(\Omega)^{-1} \mp \sqrt{\gamma(\Omega)^{-2} + 1} \right) \right). \quad \square$$




Figure 3.1: The modified Cayley phase

Due to the quadratic equation for $\sin(\theta)$, there are two solutions in general. They are depicted in Figure 3.1. One branch (shown in red) diverges at $\gamma = 0$ and for small values does not give a real phase (denoted by the black dashed lines). If we exclude this branch, the phase is single-valued, differentiable for all γ and bounded such that $\sin(\theta) \in (-1/2, 1/2)$ (shown in blue). The functional form of the remaining branch is given by

$$\sin(\theta) = \begin{cases} 0, & \gamma(\Omega) = 0, \\ -\frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma(\Omega)^{-1} - \sqrt{\gamma(\Omega)^{-2} + 1} \right), & \gamma(\Omega) > 0, \\ -\frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma(\Omega)^{-1} + \sqrt{\gamma(\Omega)^{-2} + 1} \right), & \gamma(\Omega) < 0. \end{cases}$$

By applying \sin^{-1} on both sides and choosing the branch $\theta \in (-\pi/6, \pi/6)$, we have $U(-\Omega) = U(\Omega)^\dagger$ as the following lemma shows.

Lemma 3.5. *Taking the angle $\theta \in (-\pi/6, \pi/6)$ ensures $\theta(-\Omega) = -\theta(\Omega)$, which in turn makes sure that the crucial property $U(-\Omega) = U(\Omega)^\dagger$ holds.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $\gamma(\Omega) > 0$. Then, $\gamma(-\Omega) = -\gamma(\Omega) < 0$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(-\Omega) &= \sin^{-1} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(-\gamma(\Omega)^{-1} + \sqrt{\gamma(\Omega)^{-2} + 1} \right) \right) = \sin^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma(\Omega)^{-1} - \sqrt{\gamma(\Omega)^{-2} + 1} \right) \right) \\ &= -\sin^{-1} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma(\Omega)^{-1} - \sqrt{\gamma(\Omega)^{-2} + 1} \right) \right) = -\theta(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it holds

$$U(-\Omega) = (I + e^{i\theta(\Omega)}\Omega)^{-1}(I - e^{-i\theta(\Omega)}\Omega),$$

which is identical to

$$U(\Omega)^\dagger = (I - e^{-i\theta(\Omega)}\Omega)(I + e^{i\theta(\Omega)}\Omega)^{-1},$$

due to the commutativity of the matrices. □

Based on these results, we are now able to define the modified Cayley transform for $SU(3)$.

Definition 3.6 (Modified Cayley transform for SU(3)). *Let $\Omega \in \mathfrak{su}(3)$. With*

$$\theta(\Omega) := \begin{cases} 0, & \gamma(\Omega) = 0, \\ \sin^{-1} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma(\Omega)^{-1} - \sqrt{\gamma(\Omega)^{-2} + 1} \right) \right), & \gamma(\Omega) > 0, \\ \sin^{-1} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma(\Omega)^{-1} + \sqrt{\gamma(\Omega)^{-2} + 1} \right) \right), & \gamma(\Omega) < 0, \end{cases}$$

and $\gamma(\Omega) := 4\Im(\det(\Omega))/\text{tr}(\Omega^2)$ so that $\theta(\Omega) \in (-\pi/6, \pi/6)$, the modified Cayley transform

$$\widehat{\text{cay}}(\Omega) := \left(I - e^{-i\theta(\Omega)} \Omega \right)^{-1} \left(I + e^{i\theta(\Omega)} \Omega \right), \quad (3.5)$$

maps elements from $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ into SU(3). Moreover, it is a local diffeomorphism near $\Omega = 0$.

The modified Cayley transform (3.5) provides an alternative local parameterization for numerical integration on the special unitary group SU(3). Next, we will investigate the use of the modified Cayley transform inside splitting methods to solve the Hamiltonian equations of motion occurring in the molecular dynamics step of the HMC algorithm for lattice QCD computations in SU(3).

4. Lattice QCD Simulations using the Modified Cayley Transform

In this section, we focus on lattice QCD simulations on a d -dimensional lattice of size $V = T \times L^{d-1}$ where one considers the separable Hamiltonian system

$$H([P], [U]) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,\mu} \text{tr}(P_{x,\mu}^2) + S([U]), \quad (4.1)$$

with kinetic energy $\langle P, P \rangle / 2$ and $S([U])$ denoting the potential energy/action term. Here, the links $U_{x,\mu}$, connecting the sites x and $x + a\hat{\mu}$, are elements of the special unitary group SU(3), and the scaled momenta $iP_{x,\mu}$ are elements of the associated Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(3)$. One can express the Lie algebra elements as $iP_{x,\mu} = p_{x,\mu}^i T_i$ where we choose normalized generators $T_i := \sqrt{-a/2} i \lambda_i$ with λ_i the Gell-Mann matrices (A.1) and a the lattice spacing. The generators are linked to the Lie group elements via the right-invariant differential operator e_i whose action on $U_{x,\mu}$ is defined by $e_i(U_{x,\mu}) = -T_i U_{x,\mu}$. Consequently, the equations of motion read

$$i\dot{P}_{x,\mu} = \left\{ -e_i(S([U])) T_i \right\}_{x,\mu}, \quad (4.2a)$$

$$\dot{U}_{x,\mu} = -iP_{x,\mu} U_{x,\mu}. \quad (4.2b)$$

Since the Hamiltonian (4.1) is separable, splitting methods [3] provide a tool to efficiently integrate the equations of motion (4.2) while preserving the time-reversibility, symplecticity, as well as the closure property of the exact flow.

4.1. Splitting Methods

Splitting methods are a framework for efficiently solving systems initial-value problems of ordinary differential equations (ODEs)

$$\dot{y} = f(y), \quad y(t_0) = y_0,$$

by splitting the system into (in general $N \in \mathbb{N}$) subsystems

$$\dot{y} = f^{(i)}(y), \quad \sum_{i=1}^N f^{(i)}(y) = f(y),$$

that are easier to solve than the overall system. Ideally, one is able to compute the exact flows $\varphi_t^{(i)}(y_0)$ to the respective subsystems $\dot{y} = f^{(i)}(y)$, $y(t_0) = y_0$. Splitting methods then compute a numerical approximation to the overall ODE system by composing evaluations of the exact flows to the respective subsystems. For $N = 2$, one step of a splitting method with step size h reads

$$\Phi_h(y_0) = \varphi_{b_s h}^{[2]} \circ \varphi_{a_s h}^{[1]} \circ \varphi_{b_{s-1} h}^{[2]} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{a_2 h}^{[1]} \circ \varphi_{b_1 h}^{[2]} \circ \varphi_{a_1 h}^{[1]}(y_0),$$

where the weights $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R}$ have to satisfy the order-1 conditions $\sum_i a_i = \sum_i b_i = 1$ for convergence, and the symmetry conditions $a_i = a_{s+1-i}, b_i = b_{s+1-i}$ to obtain a time-reversible scheme.

In lattice QCD, where the Hamiltonian (4.1) is separable, i.e. it takes the form $H(p, q) = T(p) + V(q)$, we consider the two-way partitioned system

$$\begin{pmatrix} i\dot{P}_{x,\mu} \\ \dot{U}_{x,\mu} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -iP_{x,\mu}U_{x,\mu} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \{-e_i(S([U]))T^i\}_{x,\mu} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The exact flows of the two subsystems can be computed analytically and are given by

$$\varphi_t^{(1)}([P], [U]) = \begin{pmatrix} iP_{x,\mu} \\ \exp(-tiP_{x,\mu})U_{x,\mu} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.3a)$$

and

$$\varphi_t^{(2)}([P], [U]) = \begin{pmatrix} P_{x,\mu} - t\{e_i(S([U]))T^i\}_{x,\mu} \\ U_{x,\mu} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.3b)$$

respectively. Note that the momentum update (4.3b) can be regarded as an forward Euler step of step size t applied to the first subsystem. Similarly, one can regard the link update (4.3a) as one time step of the Munthe-Kaas approach [11] based on the forward Euler method, usually known as the *Lie-Euler method*.

Example 4.1 (Lie-Euler method for $SU(3)$). *Consider the ODE of Lie-type*

$$\dot{Y}(t) = A(t) \cdot Y(t), \quad Y(t_0) = Y_0 \in SU(3),$$

with $A(t) \in \mathfrak{su}(3) \forall t$. Moreover, let $\Psi : \mathfrak{su}(3) \rightarrow SU(3)$ denote a local parameterization. Then, a numerical approximation $Y_1 \approx Y(t_1)$ at time point $t_1 = t_0 + h$ is obtained by

$$Y_1 = \Psi \left(h d\Psi_{\Omega}^{-1}(A(t_0)) \Big|_{\Omega=0} \right) Y_0. \quad (4.4)$$

For $\Psi = \exp$, the update becomes

$$Y_1 = \exp(hA(t_0)) Y_0.$$

Using another local parameterization in (4.4) provides an order-1 approximation to the exact flow (4.3a) and, depending on the particular parameterization, may result in a more efficient computational process. In [10], this idea has been applied successfully for $SU(2)$ using the Cayley transform (1.2), resulting in a faster computational process for the Störmer–Verlet scheme [10]. We will adapt this idea for $SU(3)$ using the modified Cayley transform (3.5).

4.2. Splitting Methods based on the Modified Cayley Transform

Replacing the matrix exponential in the exact flow (4.3a) by the modified Cayley transform (3.5) results in a numerical approximation to the exact flow of convergence order $p = 1$, as it can be regarded as the application of a Lie-Euler step (4.4) with $\Psi = \widetilde{\text{cay}}$. For this purpose, we need to compute $d\widetilde{\text{cay}}_{\Omega}^{-1}(A)$ at $\Omega = 0$.

Theorem 4.2. *The derivative of $\widetilde{\text{cay}}(\Omega)$ at $\Omega = 0$ is given by*

$$\left(\frac{d}{d\Omega} \widetilde{\text{cay}}(\Omega) \right) A \Big|_{\Omega=0} = d\widetilde{\text{cay}}_{\Omega=0}(A) = 2A.$$

Consequently, its inverse is given by

$$d\widetilde{\text{cay}}_{\Omega=0}^{-1}(A) = \frac{1}{2}A.$$

Proof. Applying Leibniz rule, followed by the usual rules of calculus, yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{d}{d\Omega} \widetilde{\text{cay}}(\Omega) \right) A &= \left(\frac{d}{d\Omega} (I - e^{-i\theta(\Omega)} \Omega)^{-1} \right) A (I + e^{i\theta(\Omega)} \Omega) + (I - e^{-i\theta(\Omega)} \Omega)^{-1} \left(\frac{d}{d\Omega} (I + e^{i\theta(\Omega)} \Omega) \right) A, \\ &= (I - e^{-i\theta(\Omega)} \Omega)^{-1} \left[\left(\frac{d}{d\Omega} (I - e^{-i\theta(\Omega)} \Omega) \right) A + \left(\frac{d}{d\Omega} (I + e^{i\theta(\Omega)} \Omega) \right) A \widetilde{\text{cay}}(\Omega)^{-1} \right] \widetilde{\text{cay}}(\Omega), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$d\widetilde{\text{cay}}_{\Omega}(A) = (I - e^{-i\theta(\Omega)} \Omega)^{-1} \left[\left(\frac{d}{d\Omega} (I - e^{-i\theta(\Omega)} \Omega) \right) A + \left(\frac{d}{d\Omega} (I + e^{i\theta(\Omega)} \Omega) \right) A \widetilde{\text{cay}}(\Omega)^{-1} \right].$$

By applying the chain rule and inserting $\Omega = 0$, we immediately get

$$\left(\frac{d}{d\Omega} (I - e^{-i\theta(\Omega)} \Omega) \right) A \Big|_{\Omega=0} = \left(\frac{d}{d\Omega} (I + e^{i\theta(\Omega)} \Omega) \right) A \Big|_{\Omega=0} = A,$$

and with $\widetilde{\text{cay}}(0) = I$ finally

$$d\widetilde{\text{cay}}_{\Omega}(A) = 2A.$$

Hence, its inverse is given by

$$d\widetilde{\text{cay}}_{\Omega}^{-1}(A) = \frac{1}{2}A,$$

proving the statements of the theorem. \square

Remark 4.3. It holds $d\text{cay}_{\Omega=0}^{-1}(A) = d\widetilde{\text{cay}}_{\Omega=0}^{-1}(A) = A/2$.

Based on Theorem 4.2, the Lie-Euler step (4.4) with $\Psi = \widetilde{\text{cay}}$ becomes

$$Y_1 = \widetilde{\text{cay}}\left(\frac{h}{2}A(t_0)\right)Y_0. \quad (4.5)$$

To clarify the use of the numerical approximation (4.5) instead of the exact flow (4.3a), we will denote a link update with the modified Cayley transform with $\phi_{a,h}^{(1)}$ in the definition of the splitting methods instead of $\varphi_{a,h}^{(1)}$.

Theorem 4.4. Replacing the exact flow (4.3a) by the Lie-Euler step (4.5) affects neither the time-reversibility nor the volume-preservation of the splitting method.

Proof. Since the momentum updates (4.3b) remain unchanged, we only have to investigate the approximated link updates (4.3a) using (4.5).

Time-reversibility. To prove the time-reversibility of the Lie-Euler step (4.5), denoted by $\phi_h^{(1)}$, we have to show that

$$\rho \circ \phi_h^{(1)} \circ \rho \circ \phi_h^{(1)}(A_0, Y_0) = (A_0, Y_0),$$

with $\rho(A_0, Y_0) = (-A_0, Y_0)$ changing the sign of momenta. A straight-forward application of $\phi_h^{(1)}$, followed by applying ρ yields $(-A_0, \widetilde{\text{cay}}(\frac{h}{2}A_0)Y_0)$. Again applying $\phi_h^{(1)}$ and using the identity $\widetilde{\text{cay}}(A)\widetilde{\text{cay}}(-A) = I$ results in $(-A_0, Y_0)$. A final application of ρ yields the initial values (A_0, Y_0) again, showing the time-reversibility of the link update.

Volume-preservation. For volume-preservation of the link update $\phi_h^{(1)}$, we have to show that

$$\det \left| \frac{\partial \Phi_h^{(1)}(A_0, Y_0)}{\partial (A_0, Y_0)} \right| = 1.$$

The Jacobian reads

$$\frac{\partial \phi_h^{(1)}(A_0, Y_0)}{\partial (A_0, Y_0)} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ d\widetilde{\text{cay}}_{A_0}(Y_0)\widetilde{\text{cay}}(A_0) & \widetilde{\text{cay}}(A_0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\widetilde{\text{cay}} : \mathfrak{su}(3) \rightarrow \text{SU}(3)$, it holds $\det(\widetilde{\text{cay}}(A_0)) = 1$ and thus also the overall Jacobian has determinant 1, proving the volume-preservation. \square

4.3. Examples

In this section, we will present common splitting methods used in lattice QCD simulations and discuss which splitting methods still work with the desired order of convergence when replacing the matrix exponential by the modified Cayley transform (3.5).

4.3.1. Splitting Methods of Convergence Order two

Since the Lie-Euler step (4.4) with $\Psi = \widetilde{\text{cay}}$ is a convergent numerical scheme, all symmetric splitting methods are at least of convergence order two. Consequently, the convergence order of all splitting methods of order $p = 2$ will not be affected by using the modified Cayley transform (3.5) instead of the matrix exponential.

Example 4.5 (Störmer–Verlet method [12]). *The Cayley-version of the Störmer–Verlet algorithm in velocity version reads*

$$\Phi_h = \varphi_{h/2}^{[2]} \circ \phi_h^{[1]} \circ \varphi_{h/2}^{[2]}.$$

Analogously, the position version reads

$$\Phi_h = \phi_{h/2}^{[1]} \circ \varphi_h^{[2]} \circ \phi_{h/2}^{[1]}.$$

By using more stages per time step, more efficient integrators can be derived.

Example 4.6 (Second-order minimum norm (2MN) scheme [13]). *Let*

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{(2\sqrt{326} + 36)^{1/3}}{12} + \frac{1}{6(2\sqrt{326} + 36)^{1/3}} \approx 0.1932.$$

Then, the velocity version of the five-stage decomposition reads

$$\Phi_h = \varphi_{\lambda h}^{[2]} \circ \phi_{h/2}^{[1]} \circ \varphi_{(1-2\lambda)h}^{[2]} \circ \phi_{h/2}^{[1]} \circ \varphi_{\lambda h}^{[2]}. \quad (4.6)$$

Similarly, one obtains for the position-like algorithm

$$\Phi_h = \phi_{\lambda h}^{[1]} \circ \varphi_{h/2}^{[2]} \circ \phi_{(1-2\lambda)h}^{[1]} \circ \varphi_{h/2}^{[2]} \circ \phi_{\lambda h}^{[1]}. \quad (4.7)$$

Remark 4.7 (Optimality of 2MN). *The free parameter λ has been derived in order to minimize the norm of the principal error term for $\Psi = \text{exp}$. Since the principal error term changes due to the usage of $\widetilde{\text{cay}}$, this value is not optimal anymore.*

4.3.2. Splitting Methods of Higher Order

There exist many different approaches to derive splitting methods of order $p > 2$, for example, direct decomposition algorithms [13], force-gradient integrators [13, 14] as well as their Hessian-free versions [15–17], and composition schemes [18–21]. The derivation of direct decomposition algorithms and force-gradient integrators are assuming that the flows of the subsystems are computed exactly. In general, since the Lie-Euler step (4.5) is convergent of order $p = 1$, an order reduction will appear if the splitting method is of order $p > 2$ ($p = 2$ still works due to symmetry). Composition schemes, however, still allow for deriving splitting methods of arbitrarily high convergence order while using the modified Cayley transform (3.5) instead of the matrix exponential. Consider a splitting method Φ_h of order p , for example, one of those from the previous section. Then, the composition method

$$\Gamma_h = \Phi_{\gamma_r h} \circ \dots \circ \Phi_{\gamma_1 h}$$

has convergence order $p + 2$, if the following conditions are satisfied.

$$\sum_i^r \gamma_i = 1, \quad (\text{full time step}), \quad (4.8a)$$

$$\sum_i^r \gamma_i^{p+1} = 0, \quad (\text{vanishing leading error term}), \quad (4.8b)$$

$$\gamma_{r+1-i} = \gamma_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \quad (\text{symmetry}). \quad (4.8c)$$

Example 4.8 (Yoshida’s triple-jump [21]). *The smallest value of r that allows for a real solution of (4.8) is $r = 3$. The unique solution is given by*

$$\gamma_1 = \gamma_3 = 1/(2 - 2^{1/(p+1)}), \quad \gamma_2 = 1 - 2\gamma_1. \quad (4.9)$$

The investigations done in [13] show that the weights (4.9) do not result in efficient composition schemes. By increasing r , one is able to obtain more efficient composition schemes, for example via the following composition technique.

Example 4.9 (Suzuki’s fractals). *For $r = 5$, the best solution of (4.8) is given by*

$$\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma_4 = \gamma_5 = 1/(4 - 4^{1/(p+1)}), \quad \gamma_3 = 1 - 4\gamma_1. \quad (4.10)$$

Starting from a splitting method based on the modified Cayley transform (3.5), e.g. the five-stage algorithm (4.6), Yoshida’s triple-jump (4.9) and Suzuki’s fractals (4.10) are the most promising techniques to obtain splitting methods of order $p = 4$. One could apply these composition techniques iteratively up to the desired convergence order. However, the number of applications of the underlying splitting method grows drastically. If one aims for splitting methods of order $p \geq 6$, advanced composition techniques [18] allow for deriving composition schemes of higher order with less stages. The special case of starting with a base scheme of order $p = 2$ has been investigated in [19].

Example 4.10 (6th order advanced composition (AC6) [19]). *Starting from a base method of order two, $r = 7$ applications of the base scheme with weights*

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 = \gamma_7 &= 0.78451361047755726382, & \gamma_2 = \gamma_6 &= 0.23557321335935813368, \\ \gamma_3 = \gamma_5 &= -1.1776799841788710069, & \gamma_4 &= 1.3151863206839112189, \end{aligned}$$

are necessary to obtain a composition scheme Γ_h of convergence order six.

For more advanced composition schemes up to order $p = 10$, we refer to [19].

Remark 4.11. *In lattice QCD, one frequently works with the traceless and Hermitian momenta $P_{x,\mu}$ rather than the Lie algebra elements $iP_{x,\mu}$. Let $P_{x,\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ be traceless and Hermitian. With*

$$\theta(P_{x,\mu}) = \begin{cases} \pi/2, & \gamma(P_{x,\mu}) = 0, \\ \cos^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma(P_{x,\mu})^{-1} - \sqrt{\gamma(P_{x,\mu})^{-2} + 1} \right) \right), & \gamma(P_{x,\mu}) > 0, \\ \cos^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma(P_{x,\mu})^{-1} + \sqrt{\gamma(P_{x,\mu})^{-2} + 1} \right) \right), & \gamma(P_{x,\mu}) < 0, \end{cases}$$

and $\gamma(P_{x,\mu}) = 4 \det(P_{x,\mu}) / \text{tr}(P_{x,\mu}^2)$ so that $\theta(P_{x,\mu}) \in (\pi/3, 2\pi/3)$, the mapping

$$\left(I + e^{-i\theta(P_{x,\mu})} P_{x,\mu} \right)^{-1} \left(I + e^{i\theta(P_{x,\mu})} P_{x,\mu} \right)$$

maps $P_{x,\mu}$ into the special unitary group $\text{SU}(3)$.

5. Numerical Results

For the numerical tests, we consider a similar setting as in [10] where the Cayley transform has been investigated for simulations in an $\text{SU}(2)$ Yang-Mills theory using the HMC algorithm. We consider pure gauge field simulations in lattice QCD on a two-dimensional lattice of size $V = 32 \times 32$ with lattice spacing $a = 1$. Here, the Hamiltonian takes the form (4.1) with $S([U])$ denoting the Wilson gauge action. For the gauge coupling, we choose $\beta = 2.0$. In a first simulation, we computed 1000 trajectories of length $\tau = 2.0$ for varying step sizes h and all integrators introduced in Section 4 with $\Psi = \overline{\text{cay}}$. The results are depicted in Figure 5.1, confirming the theoretical findings on the convergence order of the Cayley-based integrators. On this small lattice, second-order algorithms turn out to be the most efficient ones [22]. Hence we focus on a comparison of Cayley-based integrators of second order and commonly used decomposition algorithms based on the matrix exponential. In HMC, one is interested in good energy conservation, ensuring a high acceptance rate in the Metropolis step, while minimizing the computational cost. Here, the choice of the integrator in the molecular dynamics step plays a crucial role. The optimal acceptance




Figure 5.1: Variance of ΔH vs. step size h for different decomposition algorithms using the modified Cayley transform $\Psi = \widetilde{\text{cay}}$. For an integrator of order p , the variance $\sigma^2(\Delta H)$ scales with order $2p$. Whereas the order of second-order integrators and composition schemes (blue lines) remains unchanged, higher-order direct decomposition algorithms and force-gradient integrators are affected by an order reduction (orange lines). For all composition techniques, the velocity version of the Störmer-Verlet method has been used as the underlying base scheme.

rate for an integrator of order $p = 2$ is $\langle P_{\text{acc}} \rangle_{\text{opt}} = \exp(-1/2) \approx 61\%$ [23]. For log-normal distributed ΔH , the expected acceptance rate can be determined based on the (empirical) variance $\sigma^2(\Delta H)$ and is given by $\langle P_{\text{acc}} \rangle = \text{erfc}(\sqrt{\sigma^2(\Delta H)}/8)$ with erfc the complementary error function. The computational cost of the numerical integration scheme is governed by the number n_f of force evaluations. Furthermore, the evaluation cost of the exponential map (using the analytical formula derived in [24]) and the modified Cayley transform are almost identical in our Matlab implementation.¹ We thus aim at minimizing the total number of force evaluations per unit trajectory n_f/τ while achieving the optimal acceptance rate of 61%. For this purpose, we start from a thermalized configuration and compute 1000 trajectories of varying trajectory length τ and step size $h = \tau/2$. In Figure 5.2, the variance $\sigma^2(\Delta H)$ is depicted for different values of n_f/τ . The horizontal line indicates the optimal acceptance rate of 61%. Similarly, Figure 5.3 shows the acceptance rate vs. n_f/τ . Both figures indicate that the five-stage decomposition algorithm (4.7) is the most efficient splitting method among all integrators under investigation. This coincides with the investigations made in [22]. Furthermore, the results emphasize that the use of second-order decomposition algorithms with $\Psi = \widetilde{\text{cay}}$ results in a more efficient computational process. Especially for the most efficient integrator (4.7) we are able to see significant differences in the acceptance rate.

For smaller step sizes, the exponential-based integrators become better than their Cayley-based counterparts. This is not surprising since the use of the modified Cayley transform introduces an additional error source by approximating the exact flow (4.3a). Despite the additional error source, the Cayley-versions perform better for acceptance rates close to $\langle P_{\text{acc}} \rangle_{\text{opt}} = 61\%$, i.e. in the domain of interest. In this region, the decomposition algorithms are close to the border of their stability domain. Using Neumann series, one can expand the modified Cayley transform in (4.5) and gets

$$\widetilde{\text{cay}}(\frac{h}{2}A) = (I - \frac{h}{2}e^{-i\theta}A)^{-1}(I + \frac{h}{2}e^{i\theta}A) = I + \frac{h}{2}2 \cos(\theta)A + \frac{h^2}{4}(1 + e^{-2i\theta})A^2 + \mathcal{O}(h^3).$$

Since $|\cos(\theta)| \leq 1$ and $|e^{-2i\theta}| = 1$, the modified Cayley transform shows a damping behavior in the leading terms compared to the matrix exponential

$$\exp(hA) = I + hA + \frac{h^2}{2}A^2 + \mathcal{O}(h^3).$$

The numerical results give evidence that the damping of the modified Cayley transform has a stabilizing effect that results in higher acceptance rates in the HMC algorithm. All in all, the numerical results emphasize that the use of the modified Cayley transform as the local parameterization is beneficial for second-order integrators.

¹In [10], the Störmer-Verlet method using the Cayley transform was ≈ 4.5 times faster than the version based on the matrix exponential. In this work, however, the matrix exponential has been computed via the significantly slower matrix decomposition method described in [25].




Figure 5.2: Variance of ΔH vs. number of force evaluations per unit trajectory n_f/τ for second-order Cayley-based integrators (blue lines) and a selection of commonly used decomposition algorithms using the matrix exponential (orange lines).




Figure 5.3: Acceptance rate vs. number of force evaluations per unit trajectory n_f/τ for second-order Cayley-based integrators (blue markers) and a selection of commonly used decomposition algorithms using the matrix exponential (orange markers).

6. Conclusion and Outlook

In this paper, we proposed a modification to the Cayley transform that defines a local parameterization for the special unitary group $SU(3)$. We discussed how to use the modified Cayley transform instead of the matrix exponential inside splitting methods and proved that the replacement does affect neither the time-reversibility nor the volume-preservation of the splitting method. For composition schemes, the convergence order is not affected by the modified Cayley transform, allowing for the derivation of splitting methods of arbitrarily high convergence order that are based on the modified Cayley transform. More advanced decomposition algorithms and force-gradient integrators of order $p > 2$ suffer from an order reduction. Numerical results highlight that the modified Cayley transform allows for the derivation of more efficient decomposition algorithms of convergence order two.

A direct decomposition method and force-gradient integrators [13] keep their convergence order if the exact flow of the link update (4.3a) is approximated using a Lie group method of the same convergence order, e.g. based on the Munthe-Kaas approach [11]. The modified Cayley transform is known, however one would then need a formula for the auxiliary ODE

$$\dot{\Omega} = d\widetilde{\text{cay}}_{\Omega}^{-1}(A),$$

also in the case $\Omega \neq 0$. Since the angle $\theta(\Omega)$ depends on Ω , the derivative is more complicated to derive than for the traditional Cayley transform (1.2).

In a next step, we plan to implement the modified Cayley transform in the openQCD code [26] and will test Cayley-based integrators in large scale lattice QCD simulations.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) research unit FOR5269 "Future methods for studying confined gluons in QCD" and by the STRONG-2020 project, funded by the European Community Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement 824093.

Appendix A. Gell-Mann matrices

A basis of traceless and Hermitian matrices $A \in \mathbb{C}^{3 \times 3}$ is given by the Gell-Mann matrices, which are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_4 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \lambda_5 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_6 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_7 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_8 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Consequently, the matrices $i\lambda_j$, $j = 1, \dots, 8$, build a basis of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(3)$.

Appendix B. Fourth-order decomposition algorithms

Composition techniques should be used for the construction of algorithms of extremely high orders only, where the derivation via direct decomposition results in an unresolvable numerical problem [13]. We therefore highlight two fourth-order decomposition algorithms of order $p = 4$ with coefficients derived in [13] and that are frequently used in lattice QCD simulations.

Fourth-order minimum norm (4MN) scheme. By minimizing the norm of the leading error coefficients, the most efficient non-gradient algorithm of order $p = 4$ is given by the eleven-stage decomposition

$$\Phi_h = \varphi_{b_1 h}^{[2]} \circ \varphi_{a_2 h}^{[1]} \circ \varphi_{b_2 h}^{[2]} \circ \varphi_{a_3 h}^{[1]} \circ \varphi_{(1/2-b_1-b_2)h}^{[2]} \circ \varphi_{(1-2(a_2+a_3))h}^{[1]} \circ \varphi_{(1/2-b_1-b_2)h}^{[2]} \circ \varphi_{a_3 h}^{[1]} \circ \varphi_{b_2 h}^{[2]} \circ \varphi_{a_2 h}^{[1]} \circ \varphi_{b_1 h}^{[2]}$$

with parameters

$$a_2 = 0.253978510841060, \quad a_3 = -0.032302867652700, \quad b_1 = 0.083983152628767, \quad b_2 = 0.682236533571909.$$

Hessian-free force-gradient integrator (BADAB) [15, 16]. The Hessian-free variant of the most efficient force-gradient integrator with five stages reads

$$\Phi_h = \varphi_{h/6}^{[2]} \circ \varphi_{h/2}^{[1]} \circ \tilde{\varphi}_{2h/3}^{[2]} \circ \varphi_{h/2}^{[1]} \circ \varphi_{h/6}^{[2]},$$

where $\tilde{\varphi}$ denotes an approximated force-gradient step including a temporary link update. For details, we refer to [16].

For both methods, replacing the matrix exponential by the modified Cayley transform, i.e. approximating the link updates by a Lie-Euler step (4.5) with $\Psi = \widehat{\text{cay}}$, results in algorithms that are convergent of order two only.

References

- [1] S. Duane, A. Kennedy, B. J. Pendleton, D. Roweth, Hybrid Monte Carlo, *Phys. Lett. B* 195 (2) (1987) 216–222. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(87)91197-X.
- [2] F. Knechtli, M. Günther, M. Peardon, Lattice quantum chromodynamics: practical essentials, SpringerBriefs in Physics, Springer Dordrecht, 2017. doi:10.1007/978-94-024-0999-4.
- [3] R. I. McLachlan, G. R. W. Quispel, Splitting methods, *Acta Numer.* 11 (2002) 341–434. doi:10.1017/S0962492902000053.
- [4] F. Diele, L. Lopez, R. Peluso, The Cayley transform in the numerical solution of unitary differential systems, *Advances in Computational Mathematics* 8 (4) (1998) 317 – 334. doi:10.1023/A:1018908700358.
- [5] F. Diele, L. Lopez, T. Politi, One step semi-explicit methods based on the Cayley transform for solving isospectral flows, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* 89 (2) (1998) 219–223. doi:10.1016/S0377-0427(97)00236-7.
- [6] L. Lopez, T. Politi, Applications of the Cayley approach in the numerical solution of matrix differential systems on quadratic groups, *Applied Numerical Mathematics* 36 (1) (2001) 35–55. doi:10.1016/S0168-9274(99)00049-5.
- [7] A. Iserles, On Cayley-transform methods for the discretization of Lie-group equations, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 1 (2) (2001) 129 – 160. doi:10.1007/s102080010003.
- [8] A. Marthinsen, B. Owren, Quadrature methods based on the Cayley transform, *Applied Numerical Mathematics* 39 (3) (2001) 403–413, themes in Geometric Integration. doi:10.1016/S0168-9274(01)00087-3.
- [9] E. Hairer, C. Lubich, G. Wanner, Geometric numerical integration: structure-preserving algorithms for ordinary differential equations, 2nd Edition, Vol. 31 of Springer Ser. Comput. Math., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006. doi:10.1007/3-540-30666-8.
- [10] M. Wandelt, M. Günther, M. Muniz, Geometric integration on Lie groups using the Cayley transform with focus on lattice QCD, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 387 (2021) 112495. doi:10.1016/j.cam.2019.112495.
- [11] H. Munthe-Kaas, Runge-Kutta methods on Lie groups, *BIT* 38 (1) (1998) 92–111. doi:10.1007/BF02510919.
- [12] E. Hairer, C. Lubich, G. Wanner, Geometric numerical integration illustrated by the Störmer–Verlet method, *Acta Numer.* 12 (2003) 399–450. doi:10.1017/S0962492902000144.
- [13] I. Omelyan, I. Mryglod, R. Folk, Symplectic analytically integrable decomposition algorithms: classification, derivation, and application to molecular dynamics, quantum and celestial mechanics simulations, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 151 (3) (2003) 272–314. doi:10.1016/S0010-4655(02)00754-3.
- [14] A. D. Kennedy, M. A. Clark, P. J. Silva, Force gradient integrators, *PoS LATTICE2009* (2010). doi:10.22323/1.091.0021.
- [15] H. Yin, R. D. Mawhinney, Improving DWF simulations: the force gradient integrator and the Möbius accelerated DWF solver, *PoS LATTICE2011* (2012). doi:10.22323/1.139.0051.
- [16] K. Schäfers, J. Finkenrath, M. Günther, F. Knechtli, Hessian-free force-gradient integrators (2024). arXiv:2403.10370.
- [17] D. Shcherbakov, M. Ehrhardt, J. Finkenrath, M. Günther, F. Knechtli, M. Peardon, Adapted nested force-gradient integrators: The Schwinger model case, *Commun. Comput. Phys.* 21 (4) (2017) 1141–1153. doi:10.4208/cicp.OA-2016-0048.
- [18] I. P. Omelyan, I. M. Mryglod, R. Folk, Construction of high-order force-gradient algorithms for integration of motion in classical and quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. E* 66 (2002) 026701. doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.66.026701.
- [19] W. Kahan, R.-C. Li, Composition constants for raising the orders of unconventional schemes for ordinary differential equations, *Math. Comp.* 66 (219) (1997) 1089–1099. doi:10.1090/S0025-5718-97-00873-9.
- [20] M. Suzuki, Fractal decomposition of exponential operators with applications to many-body theories and Monte Carlo simulations, *Phys. Lett. A* 146 (6) (1990) 319–323. doi:10.1016/0375-9601(90)90962-N.
- [21] H. Yoshida, Construction of higher order symplectic integrators, *Phys. Lett. A* 150 (5-7) (1990) 262–268. doi:10.1016/0375-9601(90)90092-3.
- [22] T. Takaishi, P. de Forcrand, Testing and tuning symplectic integrators for the hybrid Monte Carlo algorithm in lattice QCD, *Phys. Rev. E* 73 (2006) 036706. doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.73.036706.
- [23] T. Takaishi, Choice of integrator in the hybrid Monte Carlo algorithm, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 133 (1) (2000) 6–17. doi:10.1016/S0010-4655(00)00161-2.
- [24] N. Kaiser, Solving the matrix exponential function for the Lie groups SU(3), SU(4) and Sp(2), *Eur. Phys. J. A* 58 (9) (2022) 170. doi:10.1140/epja/s10050-022-00816-5.
- [25] C. Moler, C. Van Loan, Nineteen dubious ways to compute the exponential of a matrix, twenty-five years later, *SIAM Review* 45 (1) (2003) 3–49. doi:10.1137/S00361445024180.
- [26] M. Lüscher, S. Schaefer, J. Bulava, I. Campos, A. Rago, L. Del Debbio, L. Giusti, B. Leder, F. Palombi, openQCD v2.4 (2022). URL <https://luischer.web.cern.ch/luischer/openQCD/>