

ALMOST CONSERVATION OF THE HARMONIC ACTIONS FOR FULLY DISCRETIZED NONLINEAR KLEIN–GORDON EQUATIONS AT LOW REGULARITY

CHARBELLA ABOU KHALIL AND JOACKIM BERNIER

ABSTRACT. Close to the origin, the nonlinear Klein–Gordon equations on the circle are nearly integrable Hamiltonian systems which have infinitely many almost conserved quantities called harmonic actions or super-actions. We prove that, at low regularity and with a CFL number of size 1, this property is preserved if we discretize the nonlinear Klein–Gordon equations with the symplectic mollified impulse methods. This extends previous results of D. Cohen, E. Hairer and C. Lubich to non-smooth solutions.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Hamiltonian formalism	8
3. Backward error analysis	15
4. Birkhoff normal form	22
5. Dynamical consequences	26
Appendix A. Appendix	31
References	32

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Context and motivation.** We consider the *nonlinear Klein–Gordon* equations on the torus $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ (i.e. on the segment $[0, 2\pi]$ with periodic boundary conditions)

$$(KG) \quad \partial_t^2 q - \partial_x^2 q + \rho q + g(q) = 0$$

where $q = q(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}$ with $(x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$, $\rho > 0$ is a parameter called *mass* and $g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ is a smooth real function having a zero of order 2 at 0, i.e. satisfying $g(0) = g'(0) = 0$.

They are some *Hamiltonian partial differential equations*. Indeed, setting, as usual,

$$p := \partial_t q,$$

the nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation (KG) rewrites

$$\partial_t \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \partial_x^2 - \rho & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ g(q) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \nabla H(q, p)$$

with

$$H(q, p) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{2} (p^2 + (\partial_x q)^2 + \rho q^2) + G(q) \frac{dx}{2\pi}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 65P10, 65P40, 37K55, 35B34.

Key words and phrases. Splitting methods, backward error analysis, Birkhoff normal form, low regularity.

where $G \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ is the primitive of g vanishing at the origin and $\nabla = (\nabla_q, \nabla_p)$ denotes the standard gradient for the L^2 scalar product. Note that the Hamiltonian H is a constant of the motion of (KG).

We are interested in the dynamics of the *small solutions* of (KG). In this regime, (KG) is a nearly integrable Hamiltonian system. Indeed, since $g(0) = g'(0)$, in the Fourier variables

$$q_k := \int_{\mathbb{T}} q(x) e^{-ikx} \frac{dx}{2\pi}, \quad p_k := \int_{\mathbb{T}} p(x) e^{-ikx} \frac{dx}{2\pi}, \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{Z},$$

for small solutions, (KG) is a perturbation of the linear integrable system

$$(1) \quad \partial_t \begin{pmatrix} q_k \\ p_k \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -\omega_k^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} q_k \\ p_k \end{pmatrix}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}$$

of frequencies

$$\omega_k := \sqrt{k^2 + \rho}.$$

This linear equation (1) has infinitely many constants of the motion. Among all of them, we expect, from perturbation theory in the finite dimensional setting (and in particular Birkhoff normal forms; see [21]), that, for typical values of the mass ρ , the *harmonic actions* (also called *super-actions*)

$$J_k(p, q) := \omega_k^{-1} |p_k|^2 + \omega_k |q_k|^2$$

are almost preserved, for very long times, by the flow of (KG).

More precisely, we consider solutions of (KG) generated by initial data

$$(q(0), p(0)) = (q^{(0)}, p^{(0)})$$

of size $\varepsilon \ll 1$ in a Sobolev space $H^{s+1/2}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}) \times H^{s-1/2}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$ for some $s > 0$, i.e.

$$\varepsilon = \|q^{(0)}, p^{(0)}\|_{H^{s+1/2} \times H^{s-1/2}} \ll 1.$$

The Sobolev spaces H^s are defined by

$$H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{K}) := \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{K}) \mid \|u\|_{H^s}^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle k \rangle^{2s} |u_k|^2 < \infty\}, \quad \mathbb{K} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$$

where the numbers $u_k := (2\pi)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}} u(x) e^{-ikx} dx$ denote the Fourier coefficients of u .

The nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation (KG) is locally well-posed in $H^{s+1/2}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}) \times H^{s-1/2}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$ for any $s > 0$. As a consequence, by a simple homogeneity argument, it can be proven that before times of order ε^{-1} , the nonlinear effects are neglectible with respect to the linear ones¹, and so that the harmonic actions are almost preserved, i.e.

$$t \ll \varepsilon^{-1} \implies \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle k \rangle^{2s+1} |J_k(p(t), q(t)) - J_k(p(0), q(0))| \ll \varepsilon^2 \sim \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle k \rangle^{2s} J_k(p(0), q(0)).$$

In this setting, the problem is then to prove the almost preservation of the harmonic actions for non trivial times, i.e. for times much larger than ε^{-1} . In high regularity, this problem has been solved by Bambusi [3], Bambusi–Grébert [4] and Cohen–Hairer–Lubich [13]. They proved, for typical values of the mass ρ , the almost preservation of the harmonic actions for times of order ε^{-r} , for any r arbitrarily large, provided that the initial datum is of size $\varepsilon \ll 1$ in $H^{s+1/2} \times H^{s-1/2}$ with s large enough with respect to r . More precisely, they proved that for all $r \geq 1$, there exists $s_0(r) \geq 1$ such

¹i.e. the solution of the nonlinear equation remains close to the solution of the linear one

that for almost all $\rho > 0$, provided that $s \geq s_0(r)$ and $\varepsilon = \|q^{(0)}, p^{(0)}\|_{H^{s+1/2} \times H^{s-1/2}} \lesssim_{r,s,\rho} 1$, the associated solution to (KG) satisfies

$$(2) \quad t \leq \varepsilon^{-r} \implies \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle k \rangle^{2s+1} |J_k(p(t), q(t)) - J_k(p(0), q(0))| \lesssim_{r,s,\rho} \varepsilon^3.$$

As discussed in [13], in these proofs, $s_0(r)$ is very large even for quite small values of r . Also in these proofs, $s_0(r)$ goes to $+\infty$ as r goes to $+\infty$ (at least like r^2). The smoothness assumption $s \geq s_0(r)$, where $s_0(r)$ goes to $+\infty$ as r goes to $+\infty$, is crucial in the proofs of this result in order to deal with the singularities generated by the small divisors.

In a series of papers [13, 20, 12], D. Cohen, E. Hairer and C. Lubich proved that this almost conservation property survives to some full discretizations given by some standard symplectic integrators with CFL number of order 1 (described just below). Moreover, they included the results of some numerical simulations suggesting that, surprisingly, even in low regularity, the harmonic actions are almost preserved (or, in other words, that $s_0(r)$ should be small and should not depend on r). Motivated by these numerical observations, the second author and B. Grébert, introduced, in [6], new small divisors estimates (recalled in Section 5.2) and a new partial Birkhoff normal form to prove the almost preservation of the *low* harmonic actions at low regularity (in the energy space). More precisely, they proved that for all $r \geq 1$, there exists $\beta_r \geq 1$ such that for almost all $\rho > 0$, provided that $s = 1/2$ and $\varepsilon = \|q^{(0)}, p^{(0)}\|_{H^1 \times L^2} \lesssim_{r,\rho} 1$, the associated solution to (KG) satisfies

$$(3) \quad t \leq \varepsilon^{-r} \implies \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, |J_k(p(t), q(t)) - J_k(p(0), q(0))| \lesssim_{r,\rho} \langle k \rangle^{\beta_r} \varepsilon^3.$$

The smoothness assumption $s \geq s_0(r)$ is removed but, due to the growing factor $\langle k \rangle^{\beta_r}$, we only control the variation of the low harmonic actions.

The main result of this paper consists in proving that this almost preservation property at low regularity survives to the full discretizations considered by Cohen, Hairer and Lubich in [12]. However, contrary to [12], our proof does not rely on modulated Fourier expansions but on backward error analysis and Birkhoff normal form (we refer to subsection 1.4 for discussions about the proof).

1.2. Discretization. We consider the same discretization as D. Cohen, E. Hairer and C. Lubich in [12]. However, to ensure that this paper is self-contained, we recall it.

Semi-discretization. With respect to the space variable, we consider the standard pseudo-spectral discretization (with aliasing). The unknowns $q(t), p(t) : \mathbb{T}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are real-valued functions on the discretized torus, \mathbb{T}_K , with K equidistant points

$$\mathbb{T}_K := \frac{2\pi}{K}(\mathbb{Z}/K\mathbb{Z}).$$

We define the discrete Fourier coefficients of any complex-valued function $u : \mathbb{T}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ on the discrete torus by

$$u_k = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_K} u(x) e^{-ikx}, \quad k \in \mathcal{N}_K := [-K/2, K/2) \cap \mathbb{Z}.$$

Note that the inverse Fourier transform formula ensures that for all $x \in \mathbb{T}_K$

$$(4) \quad u(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_K} u_k e^{ikx}.$$

As a consequence, we identify $\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ with the space of the complex-valued functions on \mathbb{T}_K . Moreover, the formula (4) also allows to identify the functions on the discrete torus \mathbb{T}_K with trigonometric

polynomials on \mathbb{T} whose Fourier coefficients are in \mathcal{N}_K . This identification provides a definition of ∂_x as an operator acting on $\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ by the formula

$$\forall u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}, \forall k \in \mathcal{N}_K, (\partial_x u)_k := iku_k.$$

We recall that the discrete Fourier transform and the pseudo spectral interpolation are isometries in the sense that² for all complex-valued functions $u, v \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ on the discrete torus \mathbb{T}_K ,

$$(5) \quad (u, v)_{L^2} := \Re \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_K} u_k \bar{v}_k = \frac{1}{K} \Re \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_K} u(x) \overline{v(x)} = \Re \int_{\mathbb{T}} u(x) \overline{v(x)} \frac{dx}{2\pi}.$$

As a consequence, the semi-discretized nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation writes as the continuous one, i.e.

$$(KG_{\text{sd}}) \quad \partial_t \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \partial_x^2 - \rho & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ g(q) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The only difference is that now $p, q : \mathbb{T}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are real-valued functions on the discrete torus \mathbb{T}_K . Moreover, the semi-discretized Klein–Gordon equation (KG_{sd}) is also a Hamiltonian system. Indeed, it rewrites

$$\partial_t \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \nabla H^K(q, p)$$

where $\nabla = (\nabla_q, \nabla_p)$, ∇_q, ∇_p are the partial gradients for the L^2 scalar product and

$$H^K(q, p) := T^K(q, p) + W^K(q)$$

with

$$(6) \quad T^K(q, p) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{2} (p^2 + (\partial_x q)^2 + \rho q^2) \frac{dx}{2\pi} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_K} \omega_k J_k(q, p).$$

and

$$(7) \quad W^K(q) := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_K} G(q(x)).$$

For readability of notations, from now, we drop the discretization exponent K throughout the article.

Full discretization. For the time discretization, as in [12], we consider a *symplectic mollified impulse method*. These methods have been introduced in [17]. They are Strang splitting methods with mollifiers. To present the method, we have to introduce the Fourier multiplier $\Lambda = \sqrt{-\partial_x^2 + \rho}$, naturally defined by

$$\forall u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}, \forall k \in \mathcal{N}_K, (\Lambda u)_k := \omega_k u_k.$$

In this paper, we consider the following full discretization of the Klein–Gordon equation

$$(KG_{\text{fd}}) \quad \begin{cases} q^{n+1} = \cos(h\Lambda)q^n + h \operatorname{sinc}(h\Lambda)p^n - \frac{h^2}{2} \operatorname{sinc}(h\Lambda)\phi(h\Lambda)g(\phi(h\Lambda)q^n) \\ p^{n+1} = -\Lambda \sin(h\Lambda)q^n + \cos(h\Lambda)p^n - \frac{h}{2} \phi(h\Lambda) (\cos(h\Lambda)g(\phi(h\Lambda)q^n) + g(\phi(h\Lambda)q^{n+1})) \end{cases}$$

where $h > 0$ is the *time step*, $q^n, p^n : \mathbb{T}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are real-valued functions on the discrete torus \mathbb{T}_K , $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is an integer such that (q^n, p^n) is designed to be an approximation of $(q(hn), p(hn))$, $\operatorname{sinc}(X) = \sin(X)/X$ is the usual cardinal sine function, and $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R})$ is a smooth bounded

²these formula are also true for the Hermitian scalar product (i.e. without the real part), but only the real scalar product is useful in this paper.

real-valued function satisfying $\phi(0) = 1$. We consider the function ϕ as given once and for all, we do not try to track the dependencies of the parameters with respect to ϕ .

This method also rewrites as the following 2-steps method

$$q^{n+1} - 2 \cos(h\Lambda)q^n + q^{n-1} = -h^2 \phi(h\Lambda) \operatorname{sinc}(h\Lambda) g(\phi(h\Lambda)q^n).$$

It is also very useful, both for the understanding of the method and its analysis, to notice that it is a Strang splitting with a mollifier. Indeed, tedious but direct calculations show that $(\mathbf{KG}_{\text{fd}})$ rewrites

$$(q^{n+1}, p^{n+1}) = \Phi_{\text{num}}^h(q^n, p^n)$$

with the numerical flow Φ_{num}^h given by the Strang splitting

$$\Phi_{\text{num}}^h := \Phi_V^{h/2} \circ \Phi_T^h \circ \Phi_V^{h/2},$$

where Φ_V, Φ_T denote respectively the flows of the Hamiltonian equations

$$(8) \quad \partial_t \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \nabla T(q, p) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_t \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \nabla V(q, p)$$

and V is a mollified version of W defined by

$$(9) \quad V(q, p) = W(\phi(h\Lambda)q).$$

Note that thanks to this formulation as splitting method, it is clear that the numerical flow of $(\mathbf{KG}_{\text{fd}})$ is symplectic.

1.3. Main result. Now, we are in position to state the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *For all $r \geq 1$, there exists $\beta_r \geq 1$, such that for almost all $\rho > 0$, all $\delta > 0$, all $K \geq 1$ and all $h > 0$ satisfying*

$$(10) \quad (r+2)h\omega_{K/2} \leq 2\pi - \delta,$$

there exists $\varepsilon_0(r, \rho) > 0$ depending only on r and ρ such that if $(q^n, p^n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a sequence of real-valued functions on \mathbb{T}_K solution of the fully discretized nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation $(\mathbf{KG}_{\text{fd}})$ and whose initial datum is small enough in the energy space $H^1 \times L^2$, i.e.

$$\varepsilon := \|q^0\|_{H^1} + \|p^0\|_{L^2} \leq \varepsilon_0(r, \rho)$$

then the low harmonic actions are almost preserved for times of order ε^{-r} , i.e.

$$nh \leq \varepsilon^{-r} \implies \forall k \in \mathcal{N}_K, |J_k(q^n, p^n) - J_k(q^0, p^0)| \lesssim_{\delta, r} \langle k \rangle^{\beta_r} \varepsilon^3.$$

This result partially explains the observations of D. Cohen, E. Hairer and C. Lubich in [13, 20, 12]. Indeed, the smoothness assumption has been removed, the initial data only have to be small in $H^1 \times L^2$ which is a regularity lower than the one they consider in their simulations. Theorem 1.1 only ensures the almost global preservation of the low harmonic actions. Nevertheless, in their simulations, they observe that the high harmonic actions seem also almost preserved. This last phenomena is not explained by Theorem 1.1.

Comments about the CFL condition (10). The CFL condition (10) imposes a constraint on the numerical parameters h, K which is uniform with respect to the size ε of the initial datum. This allows to approximate solutions of (\mathbf{KG}) with arbitrary precision, i.e. the condition (10) allows h to go to 0 and K to $+\infty$ (contrary, for example, to the conditions introduced in [16]). Recalling that $\omega_k \sim \langle k \rangle$, we note that this is a CFL of transport type (i.e. linear in K and h) and so that it

is not too costly. It allows to deal with the resonances generated by the time discretization of the equation. More precisely, it provides a uniform upper bound on non trivial quantities of the form

$$(11) \quad \left(1 - e^{ih(\pm\omega_{k_1} \pm \dots \pm \omega_{k_m})}\right)^{-1}$$

with $m \leq r + 2$ and $k_1, \dots, k_m \in \mathcal{N}_K$. These quantities are related to the problem of the resonant time steps and seems unavoidable in the analysis of the dynamics of discretized equations (see e.g. [14, 21]).

The CFL condition (10) is not related to the low regularity issues. It also appears in the almost conservation of the Hamiltonian or the almost conservations of some harmonic actions in high regularity (see [15, 14, 18]). As in [18], we could generalize it a little by imposing directly an upper bound on (11) by a negative small power of ε . When the CFL condition is violated, up to a genericity assumption on h , this is almost equivalent to imposing an upper bound on K by a small negative power of ε . As explained in [18], up to such a generalization, the CFL condition (10) covers the same kind of regimes as the non resonances conditions of Cohen–Hairer–Lubich in [12] (but is simpler).

Comments about the choice of the numerical method. Since we were motivated by the numerical observations in [13, 20, 12], we chose to focus on the same numerical methods. With a few more notations and technicalities, the results could be extended to general splitting methods. Actually, for simplicity, we prove the result for the numerical flow associated with the Lie splitting

$$\Phi_{\text{num}}^h = \Phi_V^h \circ \Phi_T^h,$$

and then we use that the Strang splitting is conjugated to the Lie one. It seems to us that only two properties of the method are really crucial in our proof. The first one is that the numerical flow is symplectic. The second one, more technical, is that the modified frequencies (given by the backward error analysis) satisfy the strong non-resonance conditions introduced in [6] (and recalled in Proposition 4.4). Here this second property is ensured by the pseudo-spectral semi-discretization (which ensure that semi-discretized frequencies are a subset of the original ones) and the fact that the linear part of the semi-discretized equation is solved exactly by the numerical flow, i.e.

$$d\Phi_{\text{num}}^h(0) = d\Phi_H^h(0) = \exp\left(h \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \partial_x^2 - \rho & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right).$$

The mollified impulse method is probably not the most accurate method to approximate solutions to (KG) in the energy space $H^1 \times L^2$. Indeed, classical numerical methods tend to suffer order reduction when applied to nonlinear dispersive equations at low regularity. A lot of progress have been made in recent years in analyzing these phenomena and developing new methods to avoid them (see e.g. [23, 27, 10, 26, 2, 25, 24, 22]). In any case, Theorem 1.1 allows to consider initial data smoother than $H^1 \times L^2$ (e.g. in $H^2 \times H^1$) and so to avoid order reduction issues.

Comments about the choice of the equation. We focused on (KG) for simplicity to be in the same setting as Cohen–Hairer–Lubich in [13, 20, 12]. Nevertheless, the result and the proof are robust, and we expect that they could be applied to other models. At the continuous level (i.e. without any discretization), results similar to Theorem 1.1, at low regularity, have also been proven for nonlinear Schrödinger equations in dimension $d \leq 2$ [6, 9], for the nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation on the sphere in [8] and for the Gross-Pitaevskii equation on \mathbb{R} in [1]. The main limitation is that, for the moment, to prove that the non-resonance conditions are satisfied, we have to consider models for which the frequencies converge to the integer, i.e.

$$(12) \quad \inf_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |n - \omega_k| \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

On the numerical analysis side, for discretized equations, almost preservation of the super-actions at high regularity and/or almost preservation of the Hamiltonian have also been proven for other semi-linear models (including nonlinear Schrödinger equations; see e.g. [5, 11, 19, 18, 15, 14, 16]).

Comments about the regularity condition. In order to control the variation of the super-actions for very long times, we have to be able to prove that the norm of the solution remains of order ε (or at least ε^α with $\alpha > 1/2$) for very long times. In high regularity (i.e. $s \gg 1$), this is usually done by a bootstrap argument because the estimate (2) on the variation of the super-actions implies the almost preservation of the $H^{s+1/2} \times H^{s-1/2}$ norm of the solution, i.e. $\|q(t), p(t)\|_{H^{s+1/2} \times H^{s-1/2}}$ remains of size ε for times of order ε^{-r} (see e.g. [4, 13]).

Unfortunately, in low regularity, we only have a very weak control of the high super-actions (due to the factor β_r in (3)). The estimate (3), only provides a control of a Sobolev norm of index much smaller than the one of the norm in which we control the size of the initial data. In other words, it is an estimate with a loss of derivatives. It is too weak for a bootstrap. As a consequence, we need an *a priori estimate* on the norm of the solution. That is why we consider small initial data in the energy space $H^1 \times L^2$ in order to exploit the preservation of the Hamiltonian to ensure that the solution remains small in this space.

We could also use other conserved quantities (like the Gibbs measure, or the mass for nonlinear Schrödinger equations; see [9]) to get a priori estimates. Unfortunately, in general, there exists very few conserved quantities and they only control low regularly Sobolev norms (which, as explained in [8, 9], generates many technical obstructions).

1.4. Discussions about the proof. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is divided into three main steps. First, in Section 3, we perform the *backward error analysis* of the method. More precisely, inspired by [14, 15, 5], we construct, for any $r \geq 1$ arbitrary large but given, a modified Hamiltonian H_h associated to a modified semi-discretized equation whose flow at time h is an approximation of order ε^{r+2} of the numerical flow (see Theorem 3.4). It is at this step that, to avoid resonant time steps, we impose the CFL condition (10). At this step, the regularity plays no role, we consider initial data of size ε in $H^{s+1/2} \times H^{s-1/2}$ with $s \geq 1/2$ (but $s > 0$ suffices).

As a corollary, we deduce the almost preservation of the modified Hamiltonian for times of order ε^{-r} (see Proposition 5.3 and Corollary 5.4) and so that the numerical solution (q^n, p^n) remains of size ε in $H^1 \times L^2$ on this time scale (see Corollary 5.4).

Then, in Section 4, we present an abstract theorem allowing to put the Hamiltonian H_h in (partial) Birkhoff normal form. In other words, we perform a canonical change of variable, close to the identity, to remove all the terms of H_h which do not commute (or almost do not commute) with the linear part of the equation (given by T).

Finally, in Section 5, we use the non-resonance conditions of [6] and the change of variable given by the Birkhoff normal form to construct some modified super-actions which are almost preserved by the flow generated by H_h and so, thanks to the backward error analysis, by the numerical flow.

It seems to us that this approach is robust and could be applied to other models and numerical methods. The main limitation comes from the small divisor estimates which impose that the eigenvalues of the linear part converge to the integers (see (12)).

The approach developed in this paper could also provide an alternative proof of the result in high regularity of [12] (only the dynamical consequence of the Birkhoff normal form theorem in Section 5 should be replaced by the classical one in high regularity (as in [3] or [4] for example)).

1.5. **Notations.** • We write $x \lesssim_p y$ if there exists a constant C depending on p such that $x \leq Cy$ for $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. We write $x \sim_p y$ if $x \lesssim_p y$ and $y \lesssim_p x$.
 • For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the Japanese bracket is denoted by $\langle k \rangle := \sqrt{1 + k^2}$.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank E. Faou and B. Grébert for enthusiastic discussions about this work. During the preparation of this work the authors benefited from the support of the Centre Henri Lebesgue ANR-11-LABX-0020-0 and were partially supported by the ANR project KEN ANR-22-CE40-0016. J.B. was also supported by the region "Pays de la Loire" through the project "MasCan".

2. HAMILTONIAN FORMALISM

2.1. **Complex variables and associated functional setting.** In the introduction, we have presented the problem and the result in the natural variables (q, p) . Nevertheless, it is much more convenient for the analysis to work in the complex variables $u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$. They are the variables diagonalizing the linear part of (KG_{sd}) and are defined by

$$u := \Lambda^{1/2}q + i\Lambda^{-1/2}p.$$

In this subsection, we reformulate the equation and rewrite the main quantities with respect to these variables.

The harmonic actions. In these variables, the harmonic actions rewrite

$$(13) \quad J_k(u) = \frac{|u_k|^2 + |u_{-k}|^2}{2} \quad \text{if } |k| < K/2$$

and $J_{-K/2} = |u_{-K/2}|^2$ if K is even. Indeed, if $|k| < K/2$, since q, p are real-valued, we have

$$p_k = \overline{p_{-k}}, \quad q_k = \overline{q_{-k}}$$

and $p_{-K/2}, q_{-K/2} \in \mathbb{R}$ if K is even. It follows that if $|k| < K/2$,

$$\overline{u_{-k}} = \omega_k^{1/2} q_k - i\omega_k^{-1/2} p_k,$$

and so

$$q_k = \frac{u_k + \overline{u_{-k}}}{2\omega_k^{1/2}} \quad \text{and} \quad p_k = \frac{u_k - \overline{u_{-k}}}{2i\omega_k^{-1/2}}.$$

As a consequence, recalling that by definition $J_k(p, q) := \omega_k^{-1}|p_k|^2 + \omega_k|q_k|^2$, we get (13) just by applying the parallelogram law.

The Sobolev norms. We note that

$$\|q, p\|_{H^{s+1/2} \times H^{s-1/2}}^2 \sim_\rho \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_K} \langle k \rangle^{2s} J_k(q, p) \sim \|u\|_{H^s}^2.$$

As a consequence, in Theorem 1.1, we are going to consider solutions of size ε in $H^{1/2}$.

The semi-discretized equation. The semi discretized nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation rewrites

$$i\partial_t u = \Lambda u + \Lambda^{-1/2}g(\Lambda^{-1/2}\mathfrak{R}u) = \nabla H(u)$$

with $H = T + W$ where the quadratic part of the Hamiltonian T and its nonlinear part W (defined respectively by (6) and (7)) rewrite

$$T(u) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_k} \omega_k |u_k|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad W(u) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_K} G(\mathfrak{R}u(x)).$$

The gradient ∇ is one associated with the real scalar product L^2 on $\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ defined in (5). It is convenient to note that, as usual, for any smooth real-valued function P on $\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$, we have

$$\nabla P(u) = 2\partial_{\overline{u_k}}P(u) \quad \text{where} \quad \partial_{\overline{u_k}} := \partial_{\Re u_k} + i\partial_{\Im u_k}.$$

The fully discretized equation. The fully discretized nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation rewrites naturally

$$(14) \quad u^{n+1} = \Phi_{\text{num}}^h(u^n)$$

where, as previously, $\Phi_{\text{num}}^h := \Phi_V^{h/2} \circ \Phi_T^h \circ \Phi_V^{h/2}$ and Φ_V, Φ_T are the flows of the equations

$$i\partial_t u = \nabla T(u) = \Lambda u \quad \text{and} \quad i\partial_t u = \nabla V(u) = \Lambda^{-1/2}\phi(h\Lambda)g(\Lambda^{-1/2}\phi(h\Lambda)\Re u)$$

with

$$(15) \quad V(u) = W(\Lambda^{-1/2}\phi(h\Lambda)\Re u).$$

Poisson bracket and symplectic maps. We equip naturally $\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ of the symplectic form $(i\cdot, \cdot)_{L^2}$ where the real scalar product L^2 is given by (5). It provides canonical notions of symplectic map and of Poisson bracket, the definitions of which we recall.

Definition 2.1 (Poisson bracket). *Being given two smooth functions $P, \chi : \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, their Poisson bracket is defined by*

$$\{P, \chi\}(u) := (i\nabla P(u), \nabla \chi(u))_{L^2}.$$

Remark 2.2. *As usual, it satisfies the identity*

$$(16) \quad \{P, \chi\}(u) = 2i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_K} (\partial_{\overline{u_k}}P(u)\partial_{u_k}\chi(u) - \partial_{u_k}P(u)\partial_{\overline{u_k}}\chi(u)).$$

where $\partial_{u_k} := \partial_{\Re u_k} - i\partial_{\Im u_k}$.

Definition 2.3 (Adjoin representation ad). *Being given two smooth functions $P, \chi : \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we set*

$$\text{ad}_\chi P := \{\chi, P\}.$$

Definition 2.4 (Symplectic Map). *Consider an open set \mathcal{C} of $\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ and a C^1 map $\tau : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$. We say that τ is a symplectic map if*

$$\forall u \in \mathcal{C}, \forall v, w \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}, \quad (iv, w)_{L^2} = (id\tau(u)(v), d\tau(u)(w))_{L^2}.$$

2.2. Class of Hamiltonian functions. To perform the backward error analysis and to put the system in Birkhoff normal form, we are going to transform many Hamiltonians and, in particular, their Taylor expansions. To be able to prove sharp estimates on these Taylor expansions, we define some spaces of polynomials on $\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$, and we describe their main properties.

Definition 2.5 (Momentum $\mathcal{M}(j, \sigma)$). *Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$ be given. For a collection of indices $j = (j_1, \dots, j_{r+2}) \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+2}$ and of signs $\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+2}$, we define the momentum $\mathcal{M}(j, \sigma)$ by the following formula*

$$\mathcal{M}(j, \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^{r+2} \sigma_i j_i.$$

Definition 2.6. (Class \mathcal{H}^{r+2}) Being given $r \geq 0$, we denote by \mathcal{H}^{r+2} the set of real-valued homogeneous polynomials of degree $r+2$, defined on $\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$, of the form

$$P(u) = \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+2} \\ \sigma \in \{-1,1\}^{r+2}}} P_j^\sigma u_{j_1}^{\sigma_1} \cdots u_{j_{r+2}}^{\sigma_{r+2}}$$

where $u_k^1 := u_k, u_k^{-1} := \overline{u_k}$ and $(P_j^\sigma)_{j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+2}}$ is a sequence of complex numbers satisfying:

- the reality condition

$$P_j^{-\sigma} = \overline{P_j^\sigma}$$

- the momentum condition³

$$(17) \quad P_j^\sigma \neq 0 \implies \mathcal{M}(j, \sigma) \equiv 0(K).$$

- the symmetry condition

$$\forall \phi \in \mathcal{S}_{r+2}, \quad P_{j_1, \dots, j_{r+2}}^{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{r+2}} = P_{j_{\phi_1}, \dots, j_{\phi_{r+2}}}^{\sigma_{\phi_1}, \dots, \sigma_{\phi_{r+2}}},$$

\mathcal{S}_{r+2} denoting the group of the permutations of $\{1, \dots, r+2\}$.

Note that thanks to the symmetry condition, the coefficients P_j^σ are uniquely determined by the polynomial function P .

We endow this space of polynomials with the following norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$.

Definition 2.7. (Norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$) Let $r \geq 0$ and $P \in \mathcal{H}^{r+2}$. We introduce the norm

$$\|P\|_{\mathcal{H}} := \sup_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+2} \\ \sigma \in \{-1,1\}^{r+2}}} |P_j^\sigma| \langle j_1 \rangle^{1/2} \cdots \langle j_{r+2} \rangle^{1/2}.$$

Important examples of polynomials in these spaces are those of the Taylor expansion of $V \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}; \mathbb{R})$, defined by (15), in $u = 0$.

Lemma 2.8. For all $n \geq 1$, we have that

$$(18) \quad P_n := u \mapsto \frac{1}{(n+2)!} d^{n+2} V(0)(u, \dots, u) \in \mathcal{H}^{n+2}$$

is uniformly bounded with respect to h and K , i.e.

$$\|P_n\|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim_{n,\rho} 1.$$

Proof. By definition of V , we have that

$$P_n(u) = \frac{c_n}{K} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_K} (v(x))^{n+2} \quad \text{where} \quad v = \Lambda^{-1/2} \phi(h\Lambda) \Re u$$

and $c_n = ((n+2)!)^{-1} G^{(n+2)}(0)$. Thanks to the Fourier inversion formula, it follows that

$$P_n(u) = c_n \sum_{j_1 + \dots + j_{n+2} \equiv 0(K)} v_{j_1} \cdots v_{j_{n+2}}.$$

Finally using that by definition for $j \in \mathcal{N}_K$

$$v_j = \omega_j^{-1/2} \phi(h\omega_j) \frac{u_j + \overline{u_j}}{2} = 2^{-1} \omega_j^{-1/2} \phi(h\omega_j) (u_j + \overline{u_{-j}}),$$

³ $\mathcal{M}(j, \sigma) \equiv 0(K)$ means that $\mathcal{M}(j, \sigma) \in K\mathbb{Z}$.

(where $u_{K/2} = u_{-K/2}$ if K is even), we get

$$P_n(u) = 2^{-n-2} c_n \sum_{\sigma \in \{-1,1\}^{n+2}} \sum_{\mathcal{M}(j,\sigma) \equiv 0(K)} \omega_{j_1}^{-1/2} \phi(h\omega_{j_1}) u_{j_1}^{\sigma_1} \cdots \omega_{j_{n+2}}^{-1/2} \phi(h\omega_{j_{n+2}}) u_{j_{n+2}}^{\sigma_{n+2}},$$

i.e.

$$(P_n)_j^\sigma = 2^{-n-2} c_n \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}(j,\sigma) \equiv 0(K)} \omega_{j_1}^{-1/2} \phi(h\omega_{j_1}) \cdots \omega_{j_{n+2}}^{-1/2} \phi(h\omega_{j_{n+2}}).$$

□

2.3. Vector field and Poisson bracket estimates. Before proving vector field estimates for the Hamiltonians in \mathcal{H}^{r+2} , we give a technical lemma useful to deal with aliasing error terms.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $r \geq 0$. For all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^*$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+1}$, $\sigma \in \{-1,1\}^{r+1}$ and $k \in \mathcal{N}_K$ satisfying $j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \cdots \leq j_{r+1}$ and $mK = \sigma_1 j_1 + \cdots + \sigma_{r+1} j_{r+1} - k$, we have that*

$$\langle K \rangle \leq 2(r+1) \langle j_{r+1} \rangle.$$

Proof. Since we assume that $j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \cdots \leq j_{r+1}$, then we have

$$|m| |K| = |mK| = |\sigma_1 j_1 + \cdots + \sigma_{r+1} j_{r+1} - k| \leq |k| + (r+1) |j_{r+1}| \leq \frac{|K|}{2} + (r+1) |j_{r+1}|$$

and so, since $|m| \geq 1$, as expected,

$$\frac{|K|}{2} \leq (|m| - \frac{1}{2}) |K| \leq (r+1) |j_{r+1}|.$$

□

Now we turn to the estimate on the gradient provided by the \mathcal{H} -norm.

Proposition 2.10. *There exists $C > 1$ such that for all $r \geq 0$, $s \geq 1/2$ and $P \in \mathcal{H}^{r+2}$, the gradient of P is a smooth function from $\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ to $\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ enjoying the bound*

$$\forall u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}, \quad \|\nabla P(u)\|_{H^s} \lesssim_s C^r \|P\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|u\|_{H^s}^{r+1}.$$

Proof. By the definitions of the gradient, the \mathcal{H} -norm and the symmetry condition, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla P(u)\|_{H^s}^2 &\leq 4(r+2)^2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_K} \langle k \rangle^{2s} \left[\sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+1} \\ \sigma \in \{-1,1\}^{r+1} \\ \mathcal{M}(j,k,\sigma,-1) \equiv 0(K)}} \left| P_{j,k}^{\sigma,-1} \right| \left| u_{j_1}^{\sigma_1} \right| \cdots \left| u_{j_{r+1}}^{\sigma_{r+1}} \right| \right]^2 \\ &\leq 4(r+2)^2 \|P\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_K} \left[\sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+1} \\ \sigma \in \{-1,1\}^{r+1} \\ \mathcal{M}(j,k,\sigma,-1) \equiv 0(K)}} \langle k \rangle^s \prod_{i=1}^{r+1} \langle j_i \rangle^{-1/2} |u_{j_i}| \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+1}$, $\sigma \in \{-1,1\}^{r+1}$ satisfy $\mathcal{M}(j,k,\sigma,-1) \equiv 0(K)$, then there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\sigma_1 j_1 + \cdots + \sigma_{r+1} j_{r+1} - k = mK.$$

Now, since $|m| \leq r/2$ and applying Lemma 2.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle k \rangle^s &= \langle \sigma_1 j_1 + \cdots + \sigma_{r+1} j_{r+1} - mK \rangle^s \\
&\leq \left[(r+1) \max_{n=1, \dots, r+1} \langle j_n \rangle + \langle mK \rangle \right]^s \\
&\leq 2^{(s-1)_+} \left[(r+1)^s \max_{n=1, \dots, r+1} \langle j_n \rangle^s + \frac{r^s}{2^s} \mathbb{1}_{m \neq 0} \langle K \rangle^s \right] \\
&\leq 2^{(s-1)_+} \left[(r+1)^s \max_{n=1, \dots, r+1} \langle j_n \rangle^s + r^s (r+1)^s \max_{n=1, \dots, r+1} \langle j_n \rangle^s \right] \\
&\leq 2^{(s-1)_+} (r+1)^s (1+r^s) \max_{n=1, \dots, r+1} \langle j_n \rangle^s
\end{aligned}$$

where $(s-1)_+ := \max(0, s-1)$. Then, replacing back, we get that

$$\|\nabla P(u)\|_{H^s}^2 \lesssim_s c^r \|P\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_K} \left[\sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+1} \\ \sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+1} \\ \mathcal{M}(j, k, \sigma, -1) \equiv 0(K)}} \max_{n=1, \dots, r+1} \langle j_n \rangle^s \prod_{i=1}^{r+1} \langle j_i \rangle^{-1/2} |u_{j_i}| \right]^2$$

for some constant $c > 1$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+1} \\ \sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+1} \\ \mathcal{M}(j, k, \sigma, -1) \equiv 0(K)}} \max_{n=1, \dots, r+1} \langle j_n \rangle^s \prod_{i=1}^{r+1} \langle j_i \rangle^{-1/2} |u_{j_i}| &\leq \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+1} \\ \sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+1} \\ \mathcal{M}(j, k, \sigma, -1) \equiv 0(K)}} \langle j_1 \rangle^{s-1/2} |u_{j_1}| \prod_{i=2}^{r+1} \langle j_i \rangle^{-1/2} |u_{j_i}| + \cdots \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+1} \\ \sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+1} \\ \mathcal{M}(j, k, \sigma, -1) \equiv 0(K)}} \langle j_{r+1} \rangle^{s-1/2} |u_{j_{r+1}}| \prod_{i=1}^r \langle j_i \rangle^{-1/2} |u_{j_i}|.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, after re-indexing, there exists a constant $C > 1$ such that

$$\|\nabla P(u)\|_{H^s}^2 \lesssim_s C^r \|P\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_K} \left[\sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+1} \\ \sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+1} \\ \mathcal{M}(j, k, \sigma, -1) \equiv 0(K)}} \langle j_{r+1} \rangle^{s-1/2} |u_{j_{r+1}}| \prod_{i=1}^r \langle j_i \rangle^{-1/2} |u_{j_i}| \right]^2.$$

Using Young's convolution inequality $\ell^2 * \ell^1 * \ell^1 * \cdots * \ell^1 \hookrightarrow \ell^2$, we have

$$\|\nabla P(u)\|_{H^s}^2 \lesssim_s C^r \|P\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \|\langle \cdot \rangle^{s-1/2} u\|_{\ell^2}^2 \|\langle \cdot \rangle^{-1/2} u\|_{\ell^1}^{2r} \lesssim_s C^r \|P\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^2 \|\langle \cdot \rangle^{-1/2} u\|_{\ell^1}^{2r}.$$

Then, by Cauchy-Schwarz and since $s \geq 1/2$, we deduce the needed result. \square

Since we deal with polynomials, we deduce by multi-linearity the following estimate (note that this is also a quite direct corollary of the proof of Proposition 2.10).

Corollary 2.11. *There exists $C > 1$ such that for all $r \geq 0, s \geq 1/2$ and $P \in \mathcal{H}^{r+2}$, we have*

$$\forall u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}, \quad \|\mathrm{d}\nabla P(u)\|_{H^s} \lesssim_s C^r \|P\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|u\|_{H^s}^r.$$

Since $(\nabla P(u), u)_{L^2} = (r+2)P(u)$, we also deduce the following estimate as corollary.

Corollary 2.12. *There exists $C > 1$ such that for all $r \geq 0$ and $P \in \mathcal{H}^{r+2}$, P is a smooth function from $\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ to \mathbb{R} enjoying the bound*

$$\forall u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}, \quad |P(u)| \lesssim C^r \|P\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|u\|_{H^{1/2}}^{r+2}.$$

We shall prove after this that the spaces of Hamiltonians are stable by the Poisson brackets.

Proposition 2.13. *Let $P \in \mathcal{H}^{r+2}$ and $\chi \in \mathcal{H}^{r'+2}$ with $r, r' \geq 0$. Then, there exists a Hamiltonian $N \in \mathcal{H}^{r+r'+2}$ such that*

$$\forall u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}, \quad \{P, \chi\}(u) = N(u)$$

and

$$\|\{P, \chi\}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 4(r+2)(r'+2) \|P\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|\chi\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Proof. Let $u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$. We express the Hamiltonians as

$$P(u) = \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+2} \\ \sigma \in \{-1,1\}^{r+2} \\ \mathcal{M}(j,\sigma) \equiv 0(K)}} P_j^\sigma u_{j_1}^{\sigma_1} \cdots u_{j_{r+2}}^{\sigma_{r+2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \chi(u) = \sum_{\substack{j' \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r'+2} \\ \sigma' \in \{-1,1\}^{r'+2} \\ \mathcal{M}(j',\sigma') \equiv 0(K)}} \chi_{j'}^{\sigma'} u_{j'_1}^{\sigma'_1} \cdots u_{j'_{r'+2}}^{\sigma'_{r'+2}}.$$

By Definition 2.1 and the symmetry condition satisfied by the coefficients of P and χ

$$\begin{aligned} & \{P, \chi\}(u) \\ &= 2i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_K} (\partial_{\overline{u}_k} P(u) \partial_{u_k} \chi(u) - \partial_{u_k} P(u) \partial_{\overline{u}_k} \chi(u)) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{(j,j') \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+r'+2} \\ (\sigma,\sigma') \in \{-1,1\}^{r+r'+2}}} 2i(r+2)(r'+2) \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_K} \left(P_{j,k}^{\sigma,-1} \chi_{j',k}^{\sigma',1} - P_{j,k}^{\sigma,1} \chi_{j',k}^{\sigma',-1} \right) u_{j_1}^{\sigma_1} \cdots u_{j_{r+1}}^{\sigma_{r+1}} u_{j'_1}^{\sigma'_1} \cdots u_{j'_{r'+1}}^{\sigma'_{r'+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We set

$$M_{j''}^{\sigma''} := 2i(r+2)(r'+2) \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_K} \left(P_{j,k}^{\sigma,-1} \chi_{j',k}^{\sigma',1} - P_{j,k}^{\sigma,1} \chi_{j',k}^{\sigma',-1} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad N_{j''}^{\sigma''} = \frac{1}{(r''+2)!} \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{r''+2}} M_{j'' \circ \phi}^{\sigma'' \circ \phi}$$

where $j'' := (j, j')$, $\sigma'' := (\sigma, \sigma')$ and $r'' := r + r'$. Then we get

$$\{P, \chi\}(u) = \sum_{\substack{j'' \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r''+2} \\ \sigma'' \in \{-1,1\}^{r''+2}}} N_{j''}^{\sigma''} u_{j''_1}^{\sigma''_1} \cdots u_{j''_{r''+2}}^{\sigma''_{r''+2}} = N(u).$$

Note that we can interchange the order of summation since we are dealing with finite sums. Moreover, we can obviously see that $N(u)$ defines a homogeneous polynomial of degree $r'' + 2$ (i.e. $N \in \mathcal{H}^{r''+2}$ where both the symmetry and reality conditions of $N_{j''}^{\sigma''}$ are a direct consequence of those satisfied by P_j^σ and $\chi_{j'}^{\sigma'}$). We have to check the zero momentum condition (17). Indeed, if $M_{j''}^{\sigma''} \neq 0$ then there exists $k \in \mathcal{N}_K$ such that $P_{j,k}^{\sigma,-1} \chi_{j',k}^{\sigma',1} \neq 0$ or $P_{j,k}^{\sigma,1} \chi_{j',k}^{\sigma',-1} \neq 0$. As a consequence since P and χ satisfy the zero momentum condition, there exists $\ell = \pm k$ such that

$$j_1 \sigma_1 + \cdots + j_{r+1} \sigma_{r+1} - \ell \equiv 0(K) \quad \text{and} \quad j'_1 \sigma'_1 + \cdots + j'_{r'+1} \sigma'_{r'+1} + \ell \equiv 0(K),$$

and so

$$j_1 \sigma_1 + \cdots + j_{r+1} \sigma_{r+1} + j'_1 \sigma'_1 + \cdots + j'_{r'+1} \sigma'_{r'+1} \equiv 0(K).$$

Then, we note that thanks to the zero momentum condition (17), there exists at most one $k \in \mathcal{N}_K$ such that $P_{j,k}^{\sigma,-1} \chi_{j',k}^{\sigma',1} \neq 0$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\{P, \chi\}\|_{\mathcal{H}} &= \sup_{\substack{(j,j') \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r''+2} \\ (\sigma,\sigma') \in \{-1,1\}^{r''+2}}} \left| M_{j''}^{\sigma''} \right| \langle j_1 \rangle^{1/2} \cdots \langle j_{r+1} \rangle^{1/2} \langle j'_1 \rangle^{1/2} \cdots \langle j'_{r'+1} \rangle^{1/2} \\ &\leq 4(r+2)(r'+2) \|P\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|\chi\|_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2.14. *Let $r \geq 0, s > 0, P \in \mathcal{H}^{r+2}$ and $Z \in \mathcal{H}^2$ be a quadratic Hamiltonian of the form $Z(u) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_K} \lambda_j |u_j|^2$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$. Then for all $j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{r+2}$ and all $\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+2}$, we have*

$$\{P, Z\}_j^\sigma = -2i(\sigma_1 \lambda_{j_1} + \cdots + \sigma_{r+2} \lambda_{j_{r+2}}) P_j^\sigma$$

Proof. This is a direct consequence of the formula (16) for the Poisson bracket and the symmetry of the coefficients of P . □

2.4. Flows. To perform the backward error analysis of the method and to put the modified equation in Birkhoff normal form, we are going to consider many auxiliary flows. In the following proposition, we prove their existence and their basic estimates.

Proposition 2.15. *Let $r \geq 1, s \geq 1/2, C > 0, \gamma \in (0, 1), \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}_K}, Z : \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a quadratic Hamiltonian of the form*

$$Z(u) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_K} \lambda_j |u_j|^2$$

and $\chi = \chi_1 + \cdots + \chi_r$ be a polynomial of degree smaller than or equal to $r+2$ such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $\chi_i \in \mathcal{H}^{i+2}$ satisfies $\|\chi_i\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C\gamma^{-i}$. Then there exists $\varepsilon_1 \gtrsim_{C,s,r} \gamma$ such that if $u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ satisfies $\|u\|_{H^s} \leq 2\varepsilon_1$ then the flow of the equation

$$(19) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t v = \nabla(Z + \chi)(v) \\ v(0) = u \end{cases}$$

exists for $|t| \leq 1$ and satisfies for all $t \in [-1, 1]$

$$(20) \quad \|v(t) - \Phi_Z^t(u)\|_{H^s} \leq \left(\frac{\|u\|_{H^s}}{2\varepsilon_1} \right) \|u\|_{H^s}$$

where the flow of Z is an isometry on H^s satisfying $(\Phi_Z^t u)_k = e^{-it\lambda_k} u_k$ for all $k \in \mathcal{N}_K$. Moreover, denoting by $\Phi_{Z+\chi}$ the flow of (19), we have, for all $t \in [-1, 1]$, all $w \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ and all $u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ satisfying $\|u\|_{H^s} \leq 2\varepsilon_1$

$$(21) \quad \|\mathrm{d}\Phi_{Z+\chi}^t(u)(w)\|_{H^s} \lesssim_{C,r,s} \|w\|_{H^s}.$$

Proof. By applying the Duhamel formula, we have

$$v(t) - \Phi_Z^t(u) = \int_0^t \Phi_Z^{t-\tau} \nabla \chi(v(\tau)) \mathrm{d}\tau.$$

Since $\Phi_Z^{t-\tau}$ is an isometry, applying the vector field estimate of Proposition 2.10, it comes

$$(22) \quad \|v(t) - \Phi_Z^t(u)\|_{H^s} \leq K_{r,s,C} |t| \max_{\tau \in [0,t]} \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \gamma^{-i} \|v(\tau)\|_{H^s}^{i+1}.$$

where $K_{r,s,C} > 1$ is a constant depending only on r, s and C . We set $\varepsilon_1 := (9K_{r,s,C})^{-1}\gamma$. We note that if $\|u\|_{H^s} \leq 2\varepsilon_1$ and

$$\sup_{|\tau| \leq |t|} \|v(\tau) - \Phi_Z^t(u)\|_{H^s} \leq \left(\frac{\|u\|_{H^s}}{2\varepsilon_1} \right) \|u\|_{H^s}$$

then $\|v(\tau)\|_{H^s} \leq 2\|u\|_{H^s}$ and by (22),

$$\|v(t) - \Phi_Z^t(u)\|_{H^s} \leq |t| \left(\frac{\|u\|_{H^s}}{3\varepsilon_1} \right) \|u\|_{H^s} < \left(\frac{\|u\|_{H^s}}{2\varepsilon_1} \right) \|u\|_{H^s}.$$

whenever $|t| \leq 1$. It follows by a basic bootstrap argument that $v(t)$ exists for $|t| \leq 1$ and satisfies (20).

It only remains to prove (21). First, by taking the derivative of the equation and recalling that ∇Z is linear, we have

$$i\partial_t z(t) = d\nabla(Z + \chi)(v(t))(z(t)) = \nabla Z(z(t)) + A_t(z(t)).$$

where we have set $z(t) := d\Phi_{Z+\chi}^t(u)(w)$ and $A_t = d\nabla\chi(v(t))$. Therefore, setting $y(t) = \Phi_Z^{-t}z(t)$, it comes

$$i\partial_t y = B_t y \quad \text{where} \quad B_t = \Phi_Z^{-t} A_t \Phi_Z^t.$$

Now, recalling that Φ_Z^t is an isometry on H^s and the bound on A_t given by Corollary 2.11, it comes

$$\|B_t\|_{H^s \rightarrow H^s} \lesssim_{C,r,s} \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \gamma^{-i} \|v(\tau)\|_{H^s}^i \lesssim_{C,r,s} 1.$$

Therefore, we directly conclude the proof by applying the Grönwall inequality. \square

3. BACKWARD ERROR ANALYSIS

In this section, we fix $r \geq 0$, the mass $\rho > 0$, $\delta \in (0, \pi)$ and we assume that the numerical parameters h, K satisfy the CFL condition (10), i.e.

$$(r+2)h\omega_{K/2} \leq 2\pi - \delta.$$

We denote by $P = P_1 + \dots + P_r$ the Taylor expansion of V (defined by (15)) up to order $r+2$ as defined by equation (18) in Lemma 2.8.

3.1. The cohomological equations. For reasons that will become clear later (see in particular Proposition 3.6 and equation (33)), we set $B_0 = hT$ and we consider the system of cohomological equations

$$(23) \quad \varphi(\text{ad}_{hT})\partial_t B_n = P_n - \underbrace{\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{1}{(k+1)!} \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \sum_{\substack{0 < i_1 + \dots + i_k = n-m \\ 0 \leq i_1, \dots, i_k \leq r}} \text{ad}_{B_{i_1}} \cdots \text{ad}_{B_{i_k}} \partial_t B_m}_{:=K_n} \quad \overbrace{\quad \quad \quad}^{:=K_{n,k}}$$

with initial condition $B_n(0) = 0$ and where $n \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $t \in [0, h]$, the unknowns B_n are homogeneous polynomials of degree $n+2$ depending polynomially on t (i.e. $t \mapsto B_n(t) \in \mathcal{H}^{n+2}$ is a polynomial) and $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ denotes the function defined by

$$\varphi(X) := \frac{e^X - 1}{X}.$$

We note that the system of cohomological equations (23) is actually *triangular* because for $n \leq r$, K_n only depends on B_1, \dots, B_{n-1} .

First, to ensure that the system (23) makes sense, we have to prove that, the polynomials B_1, \dots, B_r being given, the sum defining K_n converges and defines a polynomial with respect to u and t .

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $t \mapsto B_i(t) \in \mathcal{H}^{i+2}$ is a polynomial of degree smaller than or equal to i vanishing in $t = 0$. Then for all $n \geq 1$, the sum defining K_n in (23) converges⁴ and defines a polynomial $t \mapsto K_n(t) \in \mathcal{H}^{n+2}$ of degree smaller than or equal to n . Moreover, for all $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$ we have the estimates*

$$(24) \quad \|K_{n,k}(t)\|_{L^\infty(0,h;\mathcal{H}^{n+2})} \lesssim t C^k (n+2)^{k+1} (r+2)^k \left(1 + \sup_{1 \leq a \leq \min(n-1,r)} \|\partial_t B_a\|_{L^\infty(0,h;\mathcal{H}^{a+2})}\right)^n$$

and

$$(25) \quad \|K_n(t)\|_{L^\infty(0,h;\mathcal{H}^{n+2})} \lesssim t C^{nr} \left(1 + \sup_{1 \leq a \leq \min(n-1,r)} \|\partial_t B_a\|_{L^\infty(0,h;\mathcal{H}^{a+2})}\right)^n$$

where $C > 0$ is a numerical constant.

Proof. First, we note that thanks to Proposition 2.13, the finite sum $K_{n,k}$ defines a polynomial $t \mapsto K_{n,k}(t) \in \mathcal{H}^{n+2}$ of degree $n+2$ with respect to u and of degree smaller than or equal to n with respect to t . Such polynomials live in a finite dimensional space, so it suffices to prove the absolute convergence of the series defining K_n in $L^\infty(0,h;\mathcal{H}^{n+2})$ to ensure that $t \mapsto K_n(t) \in \mathcal{H}^{n+2}$ is a well-defined polynomial of degree smaller than or equal to n .

We fix $t \in [0, h]$. We set $\|B_0\|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}} := 2^{-1} h \omega_{K/2}$ and $\|B_i(t)\|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}} := \|B_i(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ if $i \geq 1$. Omitting many t to lighten the notations and applying Proposition 2.13 and Lemma 2.14 to estimate the Poisson brackets, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|K_{n,k}\|_{\mathcal{H}} &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} 4^k (n+2)^k (r+2)^k \sum_{\substack{0 < i_1 + \dots + i_k = n-m \\ 0 \leq i_1, \dots, i_k \leq r}} \|B_{i_1}\|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}} \cdots \|B_{i_k}\|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}} \|\partial_t B_m\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} 4^k (n+2)^k (r+2)^k \sum_{p=2}^k \frac{k!}{p!(k-p)!} \|B_0\|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}}^{k-p} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{\substack{0 < i_1 + \dots + i_p = n-m \\ 1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_p \leq r}} \|B_{i_1}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \cdots \|B_{i_p}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|\partial_t B_m\|_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then observing that, since $1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_p$, we have $p \leq n - m \leq n$ and since the polynomials B_i vanish in $t = 0$, they satisfy

$$\|B_i(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq t \|\partial_t B_i(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|\partial_t B_i(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

we deduce that $\|K_{n,k}\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is bounded by

$$\sum_{m=1}^{n-1} 4^k (n+2)^k (r+2)^k \sum_{p=2}^k \frac{k! t}{p!(k-p)!} \|B_0\|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}}^{k-p} 2^{2n} \left(1 + \sup_{1 \leq a \leq \min(n-1,r)} \|\partial_t B_a\|_{L^\infty(0,h;\mathcal{H}^{a+2})}\right)^n.$$

⁴in the space of polynomials of t of degree $\leq n$ and taking values in \mathcal{H}^{n+2}

Then using the binomial formula and that, thanks to the CFL condition (10), we have that $\|B_0\|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim \pi$, we get, as expected, a numerical constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|K_{n,k}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim t C^k (n+2)^{k+1} (r+2)^k \left(1 + \sup_{1 \leq a \leq \min(n-1,r)} \|\partial_t B_a\|_{L^\infty(0,h;\mathcal{H}^{a+2})}\right)^n.$$

By definition of the exponential, the estimate (25) follows directly. \square

Then, we have to invert the operator $\varphi(\text{ad}_{hT})$ uniformly with respect to h and K .

Lemma 3.2. *For all $n \leq r$, the operator $\varphi(\text{ad}_{hT}) : \mathcal{H}^{n+2} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{n+2}$ is invertible and for all $Q \in \mathcal{H}^{n+2}$, we have the bound*

$$(26) \quad \|(\varphi(\text{ad}_{hT}))^{-1}Q\|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim_\delta 1.$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.14, we know that

$$(\varphi(\text{ad}_{hT})Q)_j^\sigma = \varphi(-i\Omega_{j,\sigma})Q_j^\sigma$$

where $\Omega_{j,\sigma} = \sigma_1\omega_{j_1} + \dots + \sigma_{n+2}\omega_{j_{n+2}}$. Observing that thanks to the CFL condition (10),

$$|\varphi(-i\Omega_{j,\sigma})| \gtrsim_\delta 1,$$

we deduce directly that $\varphi(\text{ad}_{hT})$ is invertible and satisfies (26). \square

Finally, since the system (23) is triangular, we deduce the following proposition of the two previous lemmas and Lemma 2.8 for the uniform bounds on P .

Proposition 3.3. *There exists a unique sequence B_1, \dots, B_r of polynomials solving the system (23) such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $t \mapsto B_i(t) \in \mathcal{H}^{i+2}$ is a polynomial of degree smaller than or equal to i vanishing in $t = 0$. Moreover, we have the bound (uniform with respect to the numerical parameters)*

$$\sup_{1 \leq i \leq r} \|\partial_t B_i\|_{L^\infty(0,h;\mathcal{H}^{i+2})} \lesssim_{g,\delta,r,\rho} 1.$$

3.2. The modified Hamiltonian. We define the modified Hamiltonian $H_h : \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(27) \quad H_h := h^{-1}B(h) \quad \text{where} \quad B = B_0 + \dots + B_r,$$

the polynomials B_n being those given by Proposition 3.3 solving the system of cohomological equations (23). We aim at proving the following theorem.

Theorem 3.4. *For all $s \geq 1/2$, there exists $\varepsilon_0 \gtrsim_{r,s,\rho,\delta} 1$, such that for all $u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ satisfying $\varepsilon := \|u\|_{H^s} \leq \varepsilon_0$, we have*

$$(28) \quad \|(\Phi_P^h \circ \Phi_T^h - \Phi_{H_h}^h)(u)\|_{H^s} \lesssim_{r,s,\rho,\delta} h^2 \varepsilon^{r+2}.$$

Remark 3.5. $\Phi_{H_h}^h$ denotes the Hamiltonian flow of H_h at time h , i.e. the flow at times h of the equation $i\partial_t u = \nabla H_h(u)$. Its existence for times smaller than or equal to h is ensured by the uniform estimates of Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 2.15.

Before proving Theorem 3.4, we rewrite, in the following proposition, the cohomological equation (23), in a more integrated form. It is one of the key points of the proof of Theorem 3.4.

Proposition 3.6. *Setting, for all $t \in [0, h]$,*

$$(29) \quad Q_t := \int_0^1 (\partial_t B(t)) \circ \Phi_{B(t)}^{-\nu} d\nu,$$

there exists $\varepsilon_0 \gtrsim_{r,\rho,\delta} 1$ such that, on $B_{H^{1/2}}(0, \varepsilon_0) \cap \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$, we have

$$(30) \quad Q_t = P + \sum_{n>r} K_n(t).$$

Remark 3.7. • As previously, $\Phi_{B(t)}^\varsigma$ denotes the (autonomous) Hamiltonian flow of $B(t)$ at time ς , i.e. the flow at time ς of $i\partial_\tau u = (\nabla B(t))(u)$. Its existence is ensured by the same arguments as those ensuring the existence of $\Phi_{H_h}^h$.

• The uniform convergence of the series (30) is ensured by the bound (25) on K_n given by Lemma 3.1 and by the pointwise estimate given by Corollary 2.12.

Proof of Proposition 3.6. Let $u \in B_{H^{1/2}}(0, \varepsilon_0) \cap \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ where ε_0 will be chosen later small enough with respect to r, ρ and δ . First, we note that by definition of the flow and the Poisson bracket, we have

$$\partial_\nu(\partial_t B(t)) \circ \Phi_{B(t)}^{-\nu}(u) = \{B(t), \partial_t B(t)\} \circ \Phi_{B(t)}^{-\nu}(u).$$

By iterating this relation, we deduce the following Taylor expansion for all $q > r$

$$(\partial_t B(t)) \circ \Phi_{B(t)}^{-\nu}(u) = \sum_{k=0}^q \frac{\nu^k}{k!} \text{ad}_{B(t)}^k \partial_t B(t)(u) + R_{q,\nu}(u)$$

where

$$R_{q,\nu}(u) = \int_0^\nu \frac{(\nu - \varsigma)^q}{q!} \text{ad}_{B(t)}^{q+1} \partial_t B(t) \circ \Phi_{B(t)}^{-\varsigma}(u) d\varsigma.$$

Integrating this expansion, we get that

$$Q_t(u) = \sum_{k=0}^q \frac{1}{(k+1)!} \text{ad}_{B(t)}^k \partial_t B(t)(u) + \int_0^1 R_{q,\nu}(u) d\nu.$$

Expanding the main factor of the sum, we have

$$(31) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{ad}_B^k \partial_t B &= \sum_{\ell=1}^r \sum_{0 \leq i_1, \dots, i_k \leq r} \text{ad}_{B_{i_1}} \cdots \text{ad}_{B_{i_k}} \partial_t B_\ell \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \sum_{i_1 + \dots + i_k = m} \text{ad}_{B_{i_1}} \cdots \text{ad}_{B_{i_k}} \partial_t B_{n-m} \\ &=: \sum_{n \geq 1} K_{n,k} + \sum_{n=1}^r \text{ad}_{B_0}^k \partial_t B_n. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that, since B solves the cohomological equation (23), we have⁵

$$\begin{aligned} Q_t &= \sum_{n=1}^r \varphi(\text{ad}_{B_0}) \partial_t B_n + \sum_{n \geq 1} K_n - \sum_{k>q} \sum_{n=1}^r \frac{\text{ad}_{B_0}^k}{(k+1)!} \partial_t B_n - \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{k>q} \frac{K_{n,k}}{(k+1)!} + \int_0^1 R_{q,\nu} d\nu \\ &= P + \sum_{n>r} K_n - \sum_{k>q} \sum_{n=1}^r \frac{\text{ad}_{hT}^k}{(k+1)!} \partial_t B_n - \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{k>q} \frac{K_{n,k}}{(k+1)!} + \int_0^1 R_{q,\nu} d\nu \end{aligned}$$

Finally it only remains to prove that the three remainder terms go to 0 as q goes to $+\infty$. This point is usually never justified (see [14, 15]). It does not require any new ideas or fundamental estimates,

⁵on $B_{H^{1/2}}(0, \varepsilon_0) \cap \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ with ε_0 small enough to ensure that the series converge.

but it is quite heavy. We therefore only briefly describe what could be done⁶. For the first one, the operator ad_{hT} being diagonal (see Lemma 2.14), it is obvious. For the second one, using the bound (24) of Lemma 3.1 and the pointwise estimate of Corollary 2.12, there exists constant a $C \lesssim_{r,\delta,\rho} 1$ such that

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{k > q} \frac{|K_{n,k}(u)|}{(k+1)!} \lesssim \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{k > q} \frac{1}{(k+1)!} C^{n+k} (n+2)^{k+1} (r+2)^{k+1} \varepsilon_0^{n+2}.$$

To prove that it goes to 0 as q goes to $+\infty$, it suffices to note that, provided that ε is small enough, it is the remainder term of a convergent series :

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{1}{(k+1)!} C^{n+k+3} (n+2)^{k+1} (r+2)^{k+1} \varepsilon_0^{n+2} \leq \sum_{n \geq 1} (e^{C(r+2)})^{n+2} C^{n+2} \varepsilon_0^{n+2} < \infty.$$

Finally, for the last term associated with $R_{q,\nu}$, we have to replace $\text{ad}_{B(t)}^{q+1} \partial_t B(t)$ by its expansion given by (31) and to use that, thanks to Proposition 2.15, $\|\Phi_{B(t)}^{-\zeta}(u)\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq 2\varepsilon_0$. Then we conclude using estimates similar to the ones used for the other terms. \square

Thanks to this proposition, we are in position to prove Theorem 3.4.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. We are going to prove the following estimate

$$(32) \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq h} \|v(t)\|_{H^s} \lesssim_{r,s,\rho,\delta} h^2 \varepsilon^{r+2} \quad \text{where} \quad v(t) = (\Phi_P^t \circ \Phi_T^h - \Phi_{B(t)}^1)(u).$$

Note that, since $\Phi_{H_h}^h = \Phi_{hH_h}^1 = \Phi_{B(h)}^1$, (32) is stronger than (28).

Then, we note that, by Lemma A.1 of the Appendix, we have⁷

$$(33) \quad \partial_t \Phi_{B(t)}^1 = -i(\nabla Q_t) \circ \Phi_{B(t)}^1$$

where Q_t is defined by (29). Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|v(t)\|_{H^s} &\leq \int_0^t \|\partial_t v(\tau)\|_{H^s} d\tau \\ &\leq \int_0^t \|\nabla Q_\tau \circ \Phi_{B(\tau)}^1(u) - \nabla P \circ \Phi_P^\tau \circ \Phi_T^h(u)\|_{H^s} d\tau \\ &\leq \int_0^t \underbrace{\|\nabla P \circ \Phi_{B(\tau)}^1(u) - \nabla P \circ \Phi_P^\tau \circ \Phi_T^h(u)\|_{H^s}}_{=: E_1} + \underbrace{\|\nabla(Q_\tau - P) \circ \Phi_{B(\tau)}^1(u)\|_{H^s}}_{=: E_2} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Estimate of E_1 : Using the uniform bounds on B proven in Proposition 3.3 to apply Proposition 2.15, we deduce that, provided that ε_0 is chosen small enough, we have

$$(34) \quad \|\Phi_{B(\tau)}^1(u)\|_{H^s} \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

Similarly, using the uniform bounds of Lemma 2.8 on the homogeneous polynomials P_n and applying Proposition 2.15, we deduce that⁸

$$\|\Phi_P^\tau \circ \Phi_T^h(u)\|_{H^s} \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

⁶Note that we could also use some analyticity arguments but they require to be a little bit cautious due to the complex conjugations in the vector fields.

⁷the formula begin local, the assumption of finite support is not restrictive. It is only used to get global solutions and so to avoid discussions about the time of existence of the solutions.

⁸recall that Φ_T^h is an isometry on H^s .

Using these bounds to apply the mean value inequality with Corollary 2.11, we get that, provided that ε_0 is small enough

$$E_1 \leq \|v(\tau)\|_{H^s}.$$

Estimate of E_2 : First, by Proposition 3.6, we have

$$\nabla(Q_\tau - P) = \sum_{n>r} \nabla K_n.$$

Then by applying the vector field estimate given by Proposition 2.10 with the uniform estimate on K_n given by Lemma 3.1 and the estimate (34) on $\|\Phi_{B(\tau)}^1(u)\|_{H^s}$, we get that

$$\|\nabla(Q_\tau - P)(u)\|_{H^s} \leq \sum_{n>r} \|\nabla K_n(\tau, u)\|_{H^s} \lesssim_{r,s,\delta,\rho} \tau \sum_{n>r} C^n \varepsilon^{n+1}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant depending on r, s, δ, ρ . It follows that provided that ε_0 is small enough, we have

$$E_2 \lesssim_{r,s,\delta,\rho} \tau \varepsilon^{r+2}.$$

Conclusion : Putting the estimates on E_1 and E_2 together, we have proven that

$$\|v(t)\|_{H^s} \lesssim_{r,s,\delta,\rho} \int_0^t \|v(\tau)\|_{H^s} d\tau + h^2 \varepsilon^{r+2}.$$

By applying the Grönwall inequality, we deduce that, as expected, v satisfies the estimate (32). \square

3.3. Backward error analysis. In the previous subsection, in Theorem 3.4, we performed the backward error analysis of the Lie splitting method in the particular case where the nonlinearity g is polynomial. We could extend this result to the non polynomial case by adding $V - P$ to H_h . Nevertheless, it would generate some technicalities that are not useful in order to prove the almost global preservation of the harmonic actions (i.e. Theorem 1.1). The point is that, actually, to prove Theorem 1.1, the only important point is to have an approximation of the numerical flow by an Hamiltonian flow up to an error term of order $h \varepsilon^{r+2}$ (i.e. the exponent 2 on h^2 in (28) is not necessary for us). As a consequence, we prove, in the following proposition, that the modified Hamiltonian H_h provides directly such an approximation.

Proposition 3.8. *For all $s \geq 1/2$, there exists $\varepsilon_0 \gtrsim_{r,s,\rho,\delta} 1$ such that for all $u \in \mathbb{C}^{N_K}$ satisfying $\varepsilon := \|u\|_{H^s} \leq \varepsilon_0$, we have*

$$(35) \quad \|(\Phi_V^h \circ \Phi_T^h - \Phi_{H_h}^h)(u)\|_{H^s} \lesssim_{r,s,\rho,\delta} h \varepsilon^{r+2}.$$

Before proving Proposition 3.8, we prove some technical useful lemmas.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\nu > 1/2$ and $\psi \in H^\nu(\mathbb{Z})$. There exists $C_\nu > 0$ such that*

$$\|\psi^K\|_{H^\nu} \leq C_\nu \|\psi\|_{H^\nu},$$

where $\psi^K = \psi|_{\mathbb{T}_K}$ denotes the restriction of ψ on the discrete torus \mathbb{T}_K .

Proof. We write $\psi(x) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi_j e^{ijx}$ in the Fourier basis and consider the collocation points $x_k = 2\pi k/K \in \mathbb{T}_K$ on the grid. Applying a change of variable $j = \ell + aK$, we get

$$\psi(x_k) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi_j e^{2\pi i \frac{j}{K} k} = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_K} \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi_{\ell+aK} e^{2\pi i \frac{\ell}{K} k} = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_K} \left(\sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi_{\ell+aK} \right) e^{i\ell x_k} = \psi^K(x_k).$$

It implies that the Fourier coefficients of ψ^K are

$$\psi_\ell^K = \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi_{\ell+aK}.$$

Thus, taking the norm and applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\|\psi^K\|_{H^\nu(\mathbb{T}_K)}^2 = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}_K} \langle \ell \rangle^{2\nu} \left| \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi_{\ell+aK} \right|^2 \leq \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}_K} \left(\sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle \ell \rangle^{2\nu} \langle a \rangle^{2\nu} |\psi_{\ell+aK}|^2 \right) \left(\sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{\langle a \rangle^{2\nu}} \right)$$

Moreover, if $a \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\ell \in \mathcal{N}_K \setminus \{0\}$, since $|\ell| \leq K/2$, we note that

$$\langle \ell \rangle^2 \langle a \rangle^2 \leq 4\ell^2 a^2 \leq K^2 a^2 \leq 2(|a| - 1/2)K^2 \leq 2(\ell + aK)^2 \leq 2\langle \ell + aK \rangle^2.$$

We note that this last estimate holds trivially if $a = 0$ or $\ell = 0$. Hence, since $\nu > 1/2$, there exists $C_\nu > 0$ such that

$$\|\psi^K\|_{H^\nu}^2 \leq C_\nu^2 \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}_K} \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle \ell + aK \rangle^{2\nu} |\psi_{\ell+aK}|^2 = C_\nu^2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle j \rangle^{2\nu} |\psi_j|^2 = C_\nu^2 \|\psi\|_{H^\nu}^2.$$

□

Corollary 3.10. *For all $s > 0$ and all $u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ satisfying $\|u\|_{H^s} \leq 1$, we have*

$$\|\nabla(V - P)(u)\|_{H^s} \lesssim_{s,r,\rho} \|u\|_{H^s}^{r+2}$$

Proof. First, we set $\tilde{q} = \Lambda^{-1/2} \phi(h\Lambda) \mathfrak{R}u$. As a consequence, P being the Taylor expansion of V at order $r + 2$, we have

$$(36) \quad \nabla(V - P)(u) = \Lambda^{-1/2} \phi(h\Lambda) g^{(\geq r+2)}(\tilde{q})$$

where $g^{(\geq r+2)}$ is the remainder term of the Taylor expansion of g at order $r + 1$ at the origin, i.e.

$$g(y) =: \sum_{n=0}^{r+1} \frac{y^n}{n!} \partial_y^n g(0) + g^{(\geq r+2)}(y).$$

Now, we have to be cautious. As discussed in Subsection 1.2, we identified functions on the discrete torus \mathbb{T}_K with functions on the continuous torus \mathbb{T} . Nevertheless, in this proof it is dangerous and it is better to distinguish them. Indeed, in (36), \tilde{q} is considered as a function on \mathbb{T}_K and $\Psi^K := g^{(\geq r+2)}(\tilde{q})$ is simply defined by composition, i.e.

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{T}_K, \quad \psi^K(x) = g^{(\geq r+2)}(\tilde{q}(x)).$$

However, denoting by $\check{q} : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the interpolation of \tilde{q} to the continuous torus \mathbb{T} , i.e.

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{T}, \quad \check{q}(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_K} \tilde{q}_k e^{ikx},$$

we also define a function $\psi : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by composition,

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{T}, \quad \psi(x) = g^{(\geq r+2)}(\check{q}(x)).$$

The point is that, ψ^K is the restriction of ψ to the grid, i.e. $\psi^K = \psi|_{\mathbb{T}_K}$, but, a priori, the Fourier coefficients of ψ are not supported on \mathcal{N}_K so we cannot identify it with a function on the discrete torus.

Anyway, by applying Lemma 3.9, to ψ and ψ^K , we get that

$$\|\nabla(V - P)(u)\|_{H^{s+1}} \lesssim_\rho \|\psi^K\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \lesssim_{\rho,s} \|\psi\|_{H^{s+1/2}}.$$

It only remains to control ψ . First, we note that by construction

$$\|\check{q}\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \lesssim_{\rho} \|u\|_{H^s}.$$

So, since by assumption $\|u\|_{H^s} \leq 1$ and $s > 0$, we have

$$\|\check{q}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim_s \|\check{q}\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \lesssim_{\rho, s} 1.$$

Since, moreover, $g^{(\geq r+2)}$ is a smooth function of order $r+2$ in 0, it follows⁹ that as expected

$$\|\psi\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \lesssim_{s, r, \rho} \|\check{q}\|_{H^{s+1/2}}^{r+2} \lesssim_{s, r, \rho} \|u\|_{H^s}^{r+2}.$$

□

Now, we are in position to prove Proposition 3.8.

Proof of Proposition 3.8. For simplicity, here we use a special property of the nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation and the splitting method. We could do a more general proof but it would be more technical. Indeed, here, we have

$$\Phi_V^h = \Phi_{V-P}^h \circ \Phi_P^h \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{V-P}^h = \text{Id} - ih\nabla(V-P).$$

To prove these properties, it suffices to note that in the variables (q, p) , P and V depend only on q and so that q is a constant of the motion of their flows (see equation (8) for more explicit expressions).

Thus applying the triangular inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\Phi_V^h \circ \Phi_T^h - \Phi_{H_h}^h)(u)\|_{H^s} &\leq \|(\Phi_V^h \circ \Phi_T^h - \Phi_P^h \circ \Phi_T^h)(u)\|_{H^s} + \|(\Phi_P^h \circ \Phi_T^h - \Phi_{H_h}^h)(u)\|_{H^s} \\ &= h \underbrace{\|\nabla(V-P)(\Phi_P^h \circ \Phi_T^h(u))\|_{H^s}}_{=: E_1} + \underbrace{\|(\Phi_P^h \circ \Phi_T^h - \Phi_{H_h}^h)(u)\|_{H^s}}_{=: E_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.4 provides a control of E_2 by $h^2\varepsilon^{r+2}$, so it suffices to focus on E_1 . Recalling that Φ_T^h is an isometry of H^s and applying Proposition 2.15 to estimate Φ_P^h with the uniform estimates on P proven in Lemma 2.8, we deduce that, provided that ε_0 is small enough,

$$\|\Phi_P^h \circ \Phi_T^h(u)\|_{H^s} \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

Therefore, it follows of Corollary 3.10 that, as expected, provided that ε_0 is small enough,

$$E_1 \lesssim_{r, s, \delta} \varepsilon^{r+2}.$$

□

4. BIRKHOFF NORMAL FORM

In the previous section, we have proven that the numerical flow of the Lie splitting is equal, up to arbitrary high order error terms, to the flow of a modified Hamiltonian H_h . This Hamiltonian looks like the one of the semi-discretized equation (KG_{sd}). They are both nonlinear perturbations of the quadratic integrable Hamiltonian T . The aim in this section is to design a symplectic change of variable close to the identity such that in the new variable the nonlinear perturbation almost commute with T . It is a convenient way to average, up to arbitrarily high orders, the perturbative terms by the flow of T while preserving the geometrical structure of the equation.

⁹here we use the basic fact that, if $s > 1/2$, $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ is a Banach algebra and if $u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$ and if $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ is a smooth compactly supported function then $f(u) \in H^s$.

In this section $K \geq 1$ is a fixed integer. We are going to prove estimate uniform with respect to K . We do not need to consider the time-step h . Before stating the main result of this section, we introduce some standard definitions. First, we define the modulus of resonance.

Definition 4.1. (*resonance modulus $\Omega_{j,\sigma}$*) For all $n \geq 1$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{n+2}$, $\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^{n+2}$, we set

$$\Omega_{j,\sigma} := \sigma_1 \omega_{j_1} + \cdots + \sigma_{n+2} \omega_{j_{n+2}}$$

where $\omega_k = \sqrt{k^2 + \rho}$ are the frequencies of (KG).

Then we define a projection associated with terms we remove thanks to the change of variable.

Definition 4.2. (*γ -resonant Hamiltonian and associated projection Π_γ*) Let $K \geq 1$, $\gamma > 0$, $n \geq 1$ and $\Pi_\gamma Q$. We define $\Pi_\gamma Q$ by

$$\forall j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{n+2}, \forall \sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^{n+2}, \quad (\Pi_\gamma Q)_j^\sigma = \mathbb{1}_{|\Omega_{j,\sigma}| \geq \gamma} Q_j^\sigma.$$

If $\Pi_\gamma Q = 0$, we say that Q is γ -resonant.

4.1. The Birkhoff normal form theorem. Now, we present the Birkhoff normal form theorem we use in this paper.

Theorem 4.3. Let $r \geq 1, s \geq 1/2, \gamma \in (0, 1), C > 0$ and $Y = Y_1 + \cdots + Y_r$ be a polynomial such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $Y_i \in \mathcal{H}^{i+2}$ and satisfies $\|Y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C\gamma^{-i+1}$.

There exist

- a polynomial $\chi = \chi_1 + \cdots + \chi_r$ such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $\chi_i \in \mathcal{H}^{i+2}$ satisfies $\|\chi_i\|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim_{i,C} \gamma^{-i}$,
- a polynomial $Q = Q_1 + \cdots + Q_r$ such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $Q_i \in \mathcal{H}^{i+2}$ is γ -resonant and satisfies $\|Q_i\|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim_{i,C} \gamma^{-i+1}$,
- a constant $\varepsilon_2 \gtrsim_{r,C,r} \gamma$ satisfying $\varepsilon_2 \leq \varepsilon_1$ where $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ is the constant given¹⁰ by Proposition 2.15 to ensure the existence of Φ_χ^{-1} ,

such that for all $u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ satisfying $\|u\|_{H^s} \leq 2\varepsilon_2$, we have

$$(37) \quad \left(T + \sum_{i=1}^r Y_i \right) \circ \Phi_\chi^{-1}(u) = (T + Q + R)(u)$$

where the remainder term $R : \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K} \cap B_{H^s}(0, 2\varepsilon_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function satisfying

$$\|\nabla R(u)\|_{H^s} \lesssim_{r,s,C} \gamma^{-r} \|u\|_{H^s}^{r+2}.$$

Proof. This kind of Birkhoff normal form theorem is by now standard for Hamiltonian PDEs, we refer for example the reader to Theorem 2.15 in [7] and Theorem 2.12 in [9]. Moreover its proof is similar to the one we did to perform the backward error analysis of the Lie splitting in the previous section. Nevertheless, for completeness, we recall the scheme of the proof.

First, we set $\mathcal{H} = T + Y_1 + \cdots + Y_r$ and, as we did in the proof of Proposition 3.6, we perform the Taylor expansion of $\mathcal{H} \circ \Phi_\chi^{-1}$ where χ is an unknown polynomial that will be determined later. We get that

$$\mathcal{H} \circ \Phi_\chi^{-1} = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{1}{k!} \text{ad}_\chi^k \mathcal{H}.$$

Expanding \mathcal{H} and χ , we get that

$$\mathcal{H} \circ \Phi_\chi^{-1} = T + \sum_{\ell \geq 1} Q_\ell$$

¹⁰applied with $Z = 0$.

where $Q_\ell \in \mathcal{H}^{\ell+2}$ is the homogeneous polynomial defined by¹¹

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\ell &= \sum_{m_1+\dots+m_k=\ell} \frac{1}{k!} \text{ad}_{\chi_{m_1}} \cdots \text{ad}_{\chi_{m_k}} T + \sum_{i+m_1+\dots+m_k=\ell} \frac{1}{k!} \text{ad}_{\chi_{m_1}} \cdots \text{ad}_{\chi_{m_k}} Y_i \\ &= \{\chi_\ell, T\} + \underbrace{\sum_{\substack{m_1+\dots+m_k=\ell \\ k \geq 2}} \frac{1}{k!} \text{ad}_{\chi_{m_1}} \cdots \text{ad}_{\chi_{m_k}} T + \sum_{i+m_1+\dots+m_k=\ell} \frac{1}{k!} \text{ad}_{\chi_{m_1}} \cdots \text{ad}_{\chi_{m_k}} Y_i}_{:=F_\ell} \end{aligned}$$

and the implicit convention that $\chi_\ell = 0$ if $\ell > r$.

To get the decomposition, it suffices to set

$$R = \sum_{\ell > r} F_\ell$$

and to require that for all $\ell \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $\Pi_\gamma Q_\ell = 0$. Unfortunately, it provides a system of equations which is underdetermined with respect to χ . So we impose extra conditions on χ . Thus, the set of cohomological equations we consider writes

$$(38) \quad \forall \ell \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \quad \Pi_\gamma Q_\ell = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_\gamma \chi_\ell = \chi_\ell.$$

which is equivalent to

$$(39) \quad \forall \ell \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \quad \{\chi_\ell, T\} = -\Pi_\gamma F_\ell$$

with the extra condition that $\Pi_0 \chi = \chi$.

This system of equations is very similar to the one we studied to perform the backward error analysis (i.e. (23)). On the one hand it is triangular because F_ℓ depends only on $(\chi_k)_{k < \ell}$. On the other hand the implicit part of the equation is associated with an operator which is diagonal and so easy to invert. More precisely, thanks to Lemma 2.14, (39) rewrites in coordinates

$$(40) \quad (\chi_\ell)_j^\sigma = \begin{cases} \frac{(F_\ell)_j^\sigma}{i\Omega_{j,\sigma}} & \text{if } |\Omega_{j,\sigma}| \geq \gamma, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore, we design the polynomials χ_1, \dots, χ_r solving the system (39) by a direct induction.

Then the main point is to prove by induction that for all $\ell \geq 1$

$$(41) \quad \|F_\ell\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq M_{(r+1) \wedge \ell}^\ell \gamma^{-\ell+1}$$

where $(r+1) \wedge \ell = \min(r+1, \ell)$ and M_1, \dots, M_{r+1} is an increasing sequence of constants satisfying $C \leq M_1$. Note that by construction of Q_ℓ , we have

$$Q_\ell = (\text{Id} - \Pi_\gamma) F_\ell, \quad \text{and so} \quad \|Q_\ell\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|F_\ell\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Similarly, note that, by construction of χ_ℓ (see (40)), we have $\|\chi_\ell\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \gamma^{-1} \|F_\ell\|_{\mathcal{H}}$. As a consequence, it suffices to prove the bound (41) to get the expected estimates on χ , Q and R (by applying the vector field estimate of Proposition 2.10).

The proof of (41) is similar to the one we did in Subsection 3.1 to control the K_n but is simpler because the sums defining F_ℓ are finite (contrary to those defining K_ℓ). One difference is that, since

¹¹note that k is implicitly a summation index in these sums.

in this section we do not assume any CFL condition, to estimate $\text{ad}_{\chi_{m_1}} \cdots \text{ad}_{\chi_{m_k}} T$, we use that χ solves the cohomological equation (39) and so that

$$\text{ad}_{\chi_{m_1}} \cdots \text{ad}_{\chi_{m_k}} T = -\text{ad}_{\chi_{m_1}} \cdots \text{ad}_{\chi_{m_{k-1}}} \Pi_\gamma F_\ell.$$

We assume by induction that (41) holds for $\ell < n$, and we recall that $\|\chi_\ell\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \gamma^{-1} \|F_\ell\|_{\mathcal{H}}$. Then, thanks to the Poisson bracket estimate of Proposition 2.13, we get that¹²

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_n\|_{\mathcal{H}} &\leq 2\gamma^{-n+1} \sum_{m_1+\cdots+m_{k+1}=n} \frac{1}{k!} (n+2)^k (n \wedge r + 2)^k M_{(n-1)\wedge r}^{k+1} \\ &\leq 2^{n+1} \gamma^{-n+1} \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{1}{k!} (n+2)^k (n \wedge r + 2)^k M_{(n-1)\wedge r}^{k+1} \\ &= 2^{n+1} \gamma^{-n+1} M_{(n-1)\wedge r} (e^{M_{(n-1)\wedge r} (n \wedge r + 2)})^{n+2} \\ &\leq \gamma^{-n+1} (2e^{M_{(n-1)\wedge r} (n \wedge r + 2)})^{4n} \end{aligned}$$

which conclude the heredity by setting for $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $M_{j+1} = (2e^{M_j(j+3)})^4$ (and $M_1 = C$). \square

4.2. Non-resonance conditions. In order to deduce dynamical corollaries of the Birkhoff normal form theorem, we need non resonance conditions.

Proposition 4.4 (Lemma 2.5 of [6]). *There exists an increasing sequence of nonnegative exponents $(\alpha_{r_*}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{N}^*}$ such that for almost all $\rho > 0$, all $r_* \geq 1$, all $\ell \in (\mathbb{Z}^*)^{r_*}$ there exists a constant $C_{\ell, \rho} \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}^{r_*}$ with $j_1 < \dots < j_{r_*}$, we have*

$$(42) \quad |\ell_1 \omega_{j_1} + \dots + \ell_{r_*} \omega_{j_{r_*}}| > C_{\ell, \rho} \langle j_1 \rangle^{-\alpha_{r_*}}$$

where $\omega_j = \sqrt{j^2 + \rho}$ are the frequencies of the Klein–Gordon equation.

Remark 4.5. *When ρ belongs to the full measure set given by Proposition 4.4, we say that the frequencies are strongly non-resonant.*

The non resonance condition (42) has been recently introduced by the second author and B. Grébert in [6]. It is well suited to deal with non-smooth solutions. It is stronger than the classical non resonance condition (used to deal with smooth solutions), which only require a polynomial control of the small divisors by the third largest index (i.e. $\langle j_1 \rangle^{-\alpha_{r_*}}$ is replaced by $\langle j_{r_*-2} \rangle^{-\alpha_{r_*}}$ in (42); see e.g. [3]). It is to prove that the frequencies are strongly non-resonant that we use that the frequencies converge to the integer (i.e. (12)).

We will use the non-resonance condition in the following way.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\rho > 0$ belong to the full measure set given by Proposition 4.4. Let $r \geq 1$, $k \in \mathcal{N}_K$ and set*

$$\gamma = \kappa_r \langle k \rangle^{-\alpha_r} \quad \text{with} \quad \kappa = \min_{r_* \leq r} \min_{|\ell_1| + \dots + |\ell_{r_*}| \leq r} C_{\ell, \rho}.$$

If $Q \in \mathcal{H}^{n+2}$ for some $n \leq r$ is a γ -resonant polynomial (i.e. $\Pi_\gamma Q = 0$) then Q commutes with the super-action J_k , i.e.

$$\{J_k, Q\} = 0.$$

¹²These estimates are simple but very rough (they produce huge constants). For refined estimates producing more reasonable constants, we refer for example to [7].

Proof. We set for all $b \in \mathcal{N}_K$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_K^{n+2}$ and $\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^{n+2}$

$$m_b(j, \sigma) := \sum_{a=1}^{n+2} \sigma_a \mathbb{1}_{|j_a|=|b|}.$$

We note that with these notations (since ω is even)

$$(43) \quad \Omega_{j, \sigma} = \sum_{\substack{b \in \mathcal{N}_K \\ b \leq 0}} \omega_b m_b(j, \sigma) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\substack{b \in \mathcal{N}_K \\ b \leq 0}} |m_b(j, \sigma)| \leq r.$$

Then, we note that, thanks to Lemma 2.14, the coefficients of $\{J_k, Q\}$ are

$$(44) \quad \{J_k, Q\}_j^\sigma = -i Q_j^\sigma m_k(j, \sigma).$$

Recalling that $\Omega_{j, \sigma}$ writes (43), if $m_k(j, \sigma) \neq 0$ then the term associated with the index $b = k$ is non zero and so, thanks to the non resonance condition (42), it implies that

$$|\Omega_{j, \sigma}| > \kappa \langle k \rangle^{-\alpha r^*} \geq \kappa \langle k \rangle^{-\alpha r} = \gamma.$$

But since Q is γ -resonant it implies that $Q_j^\sigma = 0$. In other words, we have proven that $m_k(j, \sigma) \neq 0$ implies $Q_j^\sigma = 0$. As a consequence of (44), it means that $\{J_k, Q\} = 0$. \square

5. DYNAMICAL CONSEQUENCES

In this section, we aim at proving the almost preservation of the harmonic actions (i.e. Theorem 1.1). As in Section 3, we fix $r \geq 1$, $\rho > 0$, $\delta \in (0, \pi)$ and we assume that the numerical parameters h, K satisfy the CFL condition (10), i.e.

$$(r+2) h \omega_{K/2} \leq 2\pi - \delta.$$

We also fix an arbitrary constant $\Upsilon > 1$. We are going to prove the almost preservation of the super-actions whenever $nh \leq \Upsilon \|u^0\|_{H^{1/2}}^{-r}$. It is useful to introduce such a constant because we have to prove that the super-actions are preserved whenever $nh \leq (\|p^0\|_{L^2} + \|q^0\|_{H^1})^{-r}$ and we only have $\|p^0\|_{L^2} + \|q^0\|_{H^1} \sim_\rho \|u^0\|_{H^{1/2}}$ (i.e. instead of and equality).

From subsection 5.2, we will add a genericity assumption on the mass ρ (i.e. we will assume later that ρ belongs to the full measure set given by Proposition 4.4).

As in the introduction, we denote by Φ_{num}^h the numerical flow of the mollified impulse method, i.e.

$$\Phi_{\text{num}}^h := \Phi_V^{h/2} \circ \Phi_T^h \circ \Phi_V^{h/2}.$$

We denote by $P = P_1 + \dots + P_r$ the Taylor expansion of V (defined by (15)) up to order $r+2$ as defined by equation (18) in Lemma 2.8. We denote by H_h the modified Hamiltonian that we constructed explicitly in Section 3 and that is defined by (27).

5.1. Almost conservation of the energy and stability of the zero solution in the energy space. In this subsection we prove that the modified Hamiltonian H_h is almost preserved by the numerical flow and that numerical solutions initially of size ε in $H^{1/2}$ remain of size ε for times of order ε^{-r} .

We begin with two technical lemmas proving basic estimates on the modified Hamiltonian H_h .

Lemma 5.1. *There exist $\Lambda_\rho > 1$ depending only on ρ and $\varepsilon_4 \gtrsim_{r, \rho, \delta} 1$ such that for all $u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ satisfying $\|u\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq \varepsilon_4$, we have*

$$(45) \quad \Lambda_\rho^{-1} \|u\|_{H^{1/2}}^2 \leq H_h(u) \leq \Lambda_\rho \|u\|_{H^{1/2}}^2.$$

Proof. We note that there exists $\Lambda_\rho > 1$ such that for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$2(\Lambda_\rho)^{-1}\langle j \rangle \leq \omega_j \leq \frac{1}{2}\Lambda_\rho\langle j \rangle.$$

It follows of the definition of T that for all $u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$,

$$2(\Lambda_\rho)^{-1}\|u\|_{H^{1/2}}^2 \leq T(u) \leq \frac{1}{2}\Lambda_\rho\|u\|_{H^{1/2}}^2.$$

Then, recalling that $H_h = T + h^{-1}B(h)$, we have

$$(46) \quad T(u) - h^{-1}(B(h))(u) \leq |H_h(u)| \leq T(u) + h^{-1}(B(h))(u).$$

Finally, applying the pointwise estimate of Corollary 2.12 with the uniform estimates on $B(h)$ given by Proposition 3.3, we get that, provided that $\|u\|_{H^{1/2}}$ is small enough,

$$|(B(h))(u)| \lesssim_{r,\rho,\delta} \|u\|_{H^{1/2}}^3.$$

Plugging this last estimate in (46), we get, as expected, provided that $\|u\|_{H^{1/2}}$ is small enough, the estimate (45). \square

Lemma 5.2. *For all $C > 0$ and all $u, v \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ satisfying $\|u\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq C$, we have*

$$|dH_h(u)(v)| \lesssim_{C,\rho,r,\delta} \|u\|_{H^{1/2}} \|v\|_{H^{1/2}}.$$

Proof. Recalling that $H_h = T + h^{-1}B(h)$, we have

$$|dH_h(u)(v)| \leq |dT(u)(v)| + h^{-1}|d(B(h))(u)(v)|.$$

On the one hand, recalling that $\omega_k = \sqrt{k^2 + \rho}$, by Cauchy–Schwarz we have

$$|dT(u)(v)| = \Re \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_k} \omega_k u_k \bar{v}_k \lesssim_\rho \|u\|_{H^{1/2}} \|v\|_{H^{1/2}}.$$

On the other hand, applying the vector field estimates of Proposition 2.10 to the polynomials $B_n(h)$ enjoying the uniform bounds given by Proposition 3.3, we get that

$$|d(B(h))(u)(v)| = |(\nabla(B(h))(u), v)_{L^2}| \leq \|\nabla(B(h))(u)\|_{H^{1/2}} \|v\|_{H^{1/2}} \lesssim_{C,\rho,r,\delta} h \|u\|_{H^{1/2}}^2 \|v\|_{H^{1/2}}. \quad \square$$

First, we deduce of the backward error analysis that while the numerical solution remains of size ε in $H^{1/2}$, the modified Hamiltonian H_h is almost preserved by the numerical flow.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $C > 1$. There exists $\varepsilon_3 \gtrsim_{r,\rho,\delta,C} 1$ such that if $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_3$, $T_\varepsilon \leq \Upsilon \varepsilon^{-r}$ and $(u^n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a solution of the fully discretized nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation (i.e. for all $n \geq 0$, $u^n \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ satisfies $u^{n+1} = \Phi_{\text{num}}^h(u^n)$) which remains of size $C\varepsilon$ in $H^{1/2}$ for times smaller than or equal to T_ε , i.e. such that*

$$(47) \quad nh \leq T_\varepsilon \implies \|u^n\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq C\varepsilon$$

then $(H_h(u^n))_{n \geq 0}$ is almost constant in the sense that

$$nh \leq T_\varepsilon \implies |H_h(u^n) - H_h(u^0)| \lesssim_{C,r,\rho,\delta,\Upsilon} \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. The proof is divided in 2 steps. First, we reduce the problem to the case where the numerical flow is given by the Lie splitting. Then, we prove the result for the Lie splitting.

Step 1 : reduction to the Lie splitting. First, we use that the Strang splitting is conjugated to the Lie one. More precisely, we set

$$v^n = \Phi_V^{h/2}(u^n).$$

It follows that the time evolution of v is given by the Lie splitting, i.e.

$$v^{n+1} = \Phi_V^{h/2} \circ \Phi_V^{h/2} \circ \Phi_T^h \circ \Phi_V^{h/2}(u^n) = \Phi_V^h \circ \Phi_T^h(v^n).$$

Moreover, v^n is close to u^n . Indeed, as explained in the proof of Proposition 3.8, we have

$$\Phi_V^{h/2} = \text{Id} - \frac{h}{2}i\nabla V,$$

and so using the estimate on ∇V proved in Lemma 3.10¹³, we have

$$(48) \quad \|u^n - v^n\|_{H^{1/2}} = \frac{h}{2}\|\nabla V(u^n)\|_{H^{1/2}} \lesssim_\rho h\varepsilon^2$$

whenever $nh \leq T_\varepsilon$. It follows that, provided that ε_3 is small enough,

$$nh \leq T_\varepsilon \implies \|v^n\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq 2C\varepsilon.$$

Therefore, applying the mean value inequality thank to the uniform estimate of Lemma 5.2, we deduce that, whenever $nh \leq T_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} |H_h(u^n) - H_h(u^0)| &\leq |H_h(v^n) - H_h(v^0)| + |H_h(v^n) - H_h(u^n)| + |H_h(v^0) - H_h(u^0)| \\ &\lesssim_{\rho,r,C} |H_h(v^n) - H_h(v^0)| + h\varepsilon^3. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, to conclude, it suffices to prove that $|H_h(v^n) - H_h(v^0)| \lesssim_{\rho,r,C} \varepsilon^3$.

Step 2 : Proof for the Lie splitting. Let $n \geq 1$ be such that $nh \leq T_\varepsilon$. Since H_h is a constant of the motion of Φ_{H_h} , we have

$$H_h(v^n) - H_h(v^{n-1}) = H_h(\Phi_V^h \circ \Phi_T^h(v^{n-1})) - H_h(\Phi_{H_h}^h(v^{n-1})).$$

Therefore, applying the mean value inequality thanks to the uniform estimate of Lemma 5.2, we get that

$$|H_h(v^n) - H_h(v^{n-1})| \lesssim_{C,\rho,r,\delta} \varepsilon \|\Phi_V^h \circ \Phi_T^h(v^{n-1}) - \Phi_{H_h}^h(v^{n-1})\|_{H^{1/2}}.$$

Thus, applying the backward error analysis estimate given by Proposition 3.8, provided that ε_3 is small enough, we have

$$|H_h(v^n) - H_h(v^{n-1})| \lesssim_{C,\rho,r,\delta} h\varepsilon^{r+3}.$$

This estimate being uniform in n , it follows that

$$|H_h(v^n) - H_h(v^0)| \leq \sum_{k=1}^n |H_h(v^k) - H_h(v^{k-1})| \lesssim_{C,\rho,r,\delta} nh\varepsilon^{r+3}.$$

We conclude by using that $nh \leq T_\varepsilon \leq \Upsilon\varepsilon^{-r}$. □

As a corollary, we deduce that the numerical solutions remains of size ε for times of order ε^{-r} .

Corollary 5.4. *There exist $\Lambda_\rho > 1$ depending only on ρ and $\varepsilon_5 \gtrsim_{r,\rho,\delta,\Upsilon} 1$ such that if $(u^n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a solution of the fully discretized nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation, i.e.*

$$\forall n \geq 0, u^n \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K} \quad \text{and} \quad u^{n+1} = \Phi_{\text{num}}^h(u^n),$$

such that $\|u^0\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq \varepsilon_5$, then while $nh \leq \Upsilon\varepsilon^{-r}$, it satisfies

$$\|u^n\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq 2\Lambda_\rho \|u^0\|_{H^{1/2}}.$$

¹³in the special case $r = 0$

Proof. We define Λ_ρ as the constant given by Lemma 5.1, we set $\varepsilon = \|u^0\|_{H^{1/2}}$ and we proceed by induction on n . More precisely, we assume that

$$\forall m < n, \quad \|u^m\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq 4\Lambda_\rho\varepsilon.$$

Then, proceeding as in the proof of Proposition 5.3, we get that, provided that ε_5 is small enough,

$$\|u^n\|_{H^{1/2}} - \|u^{n-1}\|_{H^{1/2}} \lesssim_\rho h\varepsilon^2$$

and so that

$$\|u^n\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq 3\Lambda_\rho\varepsilon.$$

Then applying Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 5.3 with $C = 3\Lambda_\rho$ and $T_\varepsilon = nh$, provided that ε_5 is small enough we have, as expected,

$$\|u^n\|_{H^{1/2}}^2 \leq \Lambda_\rho H_h(u^n) \leq \Lambda_\rho H_h(u^0) + \Lambda_\rho (H_h(u^n) - H_h(u^0)) \leq \Lambda_\rho^2 \varepsilon^2 + C_{\rho,r,\delta,\Upsilon} \varepsilon^3 \leq (2\Lambda_\rho\varepsilon)^2$$

where $C_{\rho,r,\delta,\Upsilon}$ is a constant depending only on ρ, r, Υ and δ . □

5.2. Almost preservation of the harmonic actions. In this subsection, we prove Theorem 1.1.

Step 1 : Setting and reduction to the Lie splitting. From now, we assume moreover that the mass $\rho > 0$ belongs to the set of full measure set given by Proposition 4.4 ensuring that the Klein–Gordon frequencies are strongly non-resonant. We consider a solution $(u_n)_{n \geq 0}$ to the fully discretized nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation, i.e. for all $n \geq 0$, $u^n \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{N}_K}$ and $u^{n+1} = \Phi_{\text{num}}^h(u^n)$, whose initial datum u^0 is of size ε is $H^{1/2}$, i.e. $\varepsilon = \|u^0\|_{H^{1/2}}$.

As a consequence of Corollary 5.4, we know that, provided that ε is small enough, we have

$$\|u^n\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq 2\Lambda_\rho\varepsilon \quad \text{whenever} \quad nh \leq \Upsilon\varepsilon^{-r}.$$

As in the proof of Proposition 5.3, in order to consider the Lie splitting instead of the Strang one, we set, for all $n \geq 0$,

$$v^n = \Phi_V^{h/2}(u^n),$$

and we recall that

$$v^{n+1} = \Phi_V^h \circ \Phi_T^h(v^n).$$

Moreover, recalling (48), provided that ε is small enough, we have

$$\|u^n - v^n\|_{H^{1/2}} \lesssim_\rho \varepsilon^2 \quad \text{whenever} \quad nh \leq \Upsilon\varepsilon^{-r}.$$

It follows that, provided that ε is small enough, while $nh \leq \Upsilon\varepsilon^{-r}$, we have

$$\|v^n\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq 3\Lambda_\rho\varepsilon$$

and for all $k \in \mathcal{N}_K$,

$$|J_k(u^n) - J_k(u^0)| \lesssim_\rho |J_k(v^n) - J_k(v^0)| + \varepsilon^3.$$

As a consequence, it suffices to prove the existence of a constant β_r depending only on r such that

$$(49) \quad |J_k(v^n) - J_k(v^0)| \lesssim_{\rho,\delta,r} \langle k \rangle^{\beta_r} \varepsilon^3.$$

Step 2 : An upper bound on k . From now, we fix $k \in \mathcal{N}_K$ and, as in Lemma 4.6, we set

$$\gamma := \kappa \langle k \rangle^{-\alpha_r} \quad \text{with} \quad \kappa := \min_{r_* \leq r} \min_{|\ell_1| + \dots + |\ell_{r_*}| \leq r} C_{\ell,\rho}$$

where $C_{\ell,\rho}$ and α_r are the constants given by the fact that ρ is non resonant (see by Proposition 4.4). In order to apply the change of variable given by the Birkhoff normal form theorem, it is

convenient to have the extra assumption that $\gamma \geq \varepsilon^{1/2}$. So let us prove now that the case $\gamma < \varepsilon^{1/2}$ is quite obvious. Indeed, if $\gamma < \varepsilon^{1/2}$ then

$$\varepsilon^{-1} \leq \gamma^{-2} = \kappa^{-2} \langle k \rangle^{2\alpha_r}$$

and so while $nh \leq \Upsilon \varepsilon^{-r}$, we have

$$|J_k(v^n) - J_k(v^0)| \leq \|v^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \|v^0\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 18\Lambda_\rho^2 \varepsilon^2 \leq (18\Lambda_\rho^2 \kappa^{-2}) \langle k \rangle^{2\alpha_r} \varepsilon^3.$$

As a consequence, from now, we assume without loss of generality that

$$(50) \quad \gamma \geq \varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

Step 3 : Application of the Birkhoff normal form theorem. We apply Theorem 4.3 with $s = 1/2$, $Y = h^{-1}B(h)$ and $C > 0$ the constant given by the uniform estimate of Proposition 3.3. We get the Hamiltonians Q, R, χ satisfying the estimates given in the statement of the Birkhoff normal form theorem. We set, when $nh \leq \Upsilon \varepsilon^{-r}$,

$$z^n := \Phi_\chi^{-1}(v^n).$$

Note that, by Proposition 2.15, thanks to the lower bound (50), this definition makes sense, provided that ε is small enough (we proved that the flow of $-\chi$ at time 1 exists on a ball of radius proportional to γ). Then, using that, by Proposition 2.15, Φ_χ^{-1} is close to the identity, we have

$$\|z^n - v^n\|_{H^{1/2}} \lesssim_{\rho,r,\delta} \delta^{-1} \varepsilon^2 \sim_{\rho,r,\delta} \langle k \rangle^{\alpha_r} \varepsilon^2.$$

As a consequence, while $nh \leq \Upsilon \varepsilon^{-r}$, we have

$$\|z^n\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq 4\Lambda_\rho \varepsilon$$

and

$$|J_k(v^n) - J_k(v^0)| \lesssim_{\rho,r,\delta} |J_k(z^n) - J_k(z^0)| + \langle k \rangle^{\alpha_r} \varepsilon^3.$$

Thus, to conclude (i.e. to prove (49)), it suffices to prove the existence of a constant β_r depending only on r such that

$$(51) \quad |J_k(z^n) - J_k(z^0)| \lesssim_{\rho,\delta,r} \langle k \rangle^{\beta_r} \varepsilon^3.$$

Step 4 : Conclusion. Now, we fix $n \geq 0$ such that $(n+1)h \leq \Upsilon \varepsilon^{-r}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |J_k(z^{n+1}) - J_k(z^n)| &= |J_k \circ \Phi_\chi^{-1}(\Phi_V^h \circ \Phi_T^h(v^n)) - J_k(z^n)| \\ &\leq \underbrace{|J_k \circ \Phi_\chi^{-1}(\Phi_V^h \circ \Phi_T^h(v^n)) - J_k \circ \Phi_\chi^{-1}(\Phi_{H_h}^h(v^n))|}_{=: E_{\text{back}}} + \underbrace{|J_k \circ \Phi_\chi^{-1}(\Phi_{H_h}^h(v^n)) - J_k(z^n)|}_{=: E_{\text{BNF}}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, by the mean value inequality (using the bound (21) on $d\Phi_\chi^{-1}$ given by Proposition 2.15), provided that ε is small enough, we have

$$|E_{\text{back}}| \lesssim_{r,\rho,\delta} \varepsilon \|\Phi_V^h \circ \Phi_T^h(v^n) - \Phi_{H_h}^h(v^n)\|_{H^{1/2}}.$$

and so, applying the backward error analysis estimate of Proposition 3.8, we get

$$|E_{\text{back}}| \lesssim_{\delta,\rho,r} h \varepsilon^{r+3}.$$

On the other hand, since Φ_χ^{-1} is symplectic¹⁴, we have

$$\Phi_\chi^{-1}(\Phi_{H_h}^h(v^n)) = \Phi_{H_h \circ \Phi_\chi^{-1}}^h(z^n).$$

¹⁴because it is an Hamiltonian flow.

It follows that

$$E_{\text{BNF}} = \int_0^h \partial_t J_k(\Phi_{H_h \circ \Phi_\chi^1}^t(z^n)) dt = \int_0^h \{H_h \circ \Phi_\chi^1, J_k\} \circ \Phi_{H_h \circ \Phi_\chi^1}^t(z^n) dt.$$

Recalling that, by the Birkhoff normal form theorem,

$$H_h \circ \Phi_\chi^1 = T + Q_1 + \cdots + Q_r + R$$

where the polynomials Q_1, \dots, Q_r are γ -resonant, by Lemma 4.6, thanks to the non-resonance condition and by definition of γ , we have¹⁵

$$\{H_h \circ \Phi_\chi^1, J_k\} = \{R, J_k\}.$$

Therefore, using the estimate on ∇R given by Theorem 4.3 and estimating $\Phi_{H_h \circ \Phi_\chi^1}^t(z^n)$ by Proposition 2.15, provided that ε is small enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |E_{\text{BNF}}| &\leq \int_0^h \|\Phi_{H_h \circ \Phi_\chi^1}^t(z^n)\|_{H^{1/2}} \|\nabla R(\Phi_{H_h \circ \Phi_\chi^1}^t(z^n))\|_{H^{1/2}} dt \\ &\lesssim_{r,\rho,\delta} h \gamma^{-r} \varepsilon^{r+3} \sim_{r,\rho,\delta} h \langle k \rangle^{r\alpha_r} \varepsilon^{r+3}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, summing the error terms E_{back} and E_{BNF} , we get (51), i.e. if $nh \leq \Upsilon \varepsilon^{-r}$ then

$$|J_k(z^n) - J_k(z^0)| \lesssim_{\delta,\rho,r} nh \langle k \rangle^{r\alpha_r} \varepsilon^{r+3} \lesssim_{\delta,\rho,r,\Upsilon} \langle k \rangle^{r\alpha_r} \varepsilon^3.$$

APPENDIX A. APPENDIX

We prove a general formula about Hamiltonian systems depending on a parameter. This basic formula is well known (e.g. it is used in [14, 15]) but we did not find any complete proof in the literature.

Lemma A.1. *Let $n \geq 1$, $J \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$ be a skew symmetric invertible matrix, $Q_\alpha \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n}; \mathbb{R})$ be a family of smooth, compactly supported, real-valued functions indexed by $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $(\alpha, x) \mapsto Q_\alpha(x) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$. Denoting by Φ_{Q_α} the Hamiltonian flow¹⁶ of Q_α (i.e. the flow of the equation $y' = J\nabla Q_\alpha(y)$), for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$(52) \quad \partial_\alpha \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^t = \left(J\nabla \int_0^t \partial_\alpha Q_\alpha \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^{-\tau} d\tau \right) \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^t.$$

Proof. For any $H \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n}; \mathbb{R})$, we define the differential operator $\text{ad}_H := J\nabla H \cdot \nabla$ acting on $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n}; \mathbb{R})$. For any $P \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n}; \mathbb{R})$, any $t, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$P_\alpha(t) := e^{t\text{ad}_{Q_\alpha}} P := P \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^t.$$

Note that $(t, \alpha) \mapsto P_\alpha(t)$ is a smooth function. These notations make sense because P_α is solution of the transport equation

$$\partial_t P_\alpha = \text{ad}_{Q_\alpha} P_\alpha.$$

By taking the derivative of this equation with respect to α , one gets

$$\partial_t \partial_\alpha P_\alpha = \text{ad}_{\partial_\alpha Q_\alpha} P_\alpha + \text{ad}_{Q_\alpha} \partial_\alpha P_\alpha.$$

Then, by applying the Duhamel formula, one gets

$$(53) \quad \partial_\alpha P_\alpha(t) = e^{t\text{ad}_{Q_\alpha}} \int_0^t e^{-\tau\text{ad}_{Q_\alpha}} \text{ad}_{\partial_\alpha Q_\alpha} P_\alpha(\tau) d\tau.$$

¹⁵the fact that $\{T, J_k\} = 0$ is a just direct calculation.

¹⁶note that since Q_α is finitely supported, this flow is globally well defined.

Moreover, Φ_{Q_α} being symplectic, we have

$$J\nabla[(\partial_\alpha Q_\alpha) \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^{-\tau}] = J(d\Phi_{Q_\alpha}^{-\tau})^*[\nabla(\partial_\alpha Q_\alpha)] \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^{-\tau} = (d\Phi_{Q_\alpha}^{-\tau})^{-1} J[\nabla(\partial_\alpha Q_\alpha)] \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^{-\tau}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\tau \text{ad}_{Q_\alpha}} \text{ad}_{\partial_\alpha Q_\alpha} P_\alpha(\tau) &= (\text{ad}_{\partial_\alpha Q_\alpha}(P \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^\tau)) \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^{-\tau} \\ &= (J\nabla \partial_\alpha Q_\alpha \cdot \nabla(P \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^\tau)) \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^{-\tau} \\ &= J[\nabla(\partial_\alpha Q_\alpha)] \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^{-\tau} \cdot (d\Phi_{Q_\alpha}^{-\tau})^{-*} \nabla P \\ &= J\nabla[(\partial_\alpha Q_\alpha) \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^{-\tau}] \cdot \nabla P. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this relation in (53), we get

$$\partial_\alpha(P \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^t) = \left[J\nabla \int_0^t (\partial_\alpha Q_\alpha) \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^{-\tau} d\tau \cdot \nabla P \right] \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^t.$$

Now, in the particular case where P is a linear form, i.e. $P(x) = z \cdot x$ for some $z \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, this last formula gives

$$z \cdot \partial_\alpha \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^t = \left[J\nabla \int_0^t (\partial_\alpha Q_\alpha) \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^{-\tau} d\tau \right] \circ \Phi_{Q_\alpha}^t \cdot z.$$

This relation holding for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, by duality, we have proven (52). □

REFERENCES

- [1] C. ABOU KHALIL, *Birkhoff normal form in low regularity for the nonlinear quantum harmonic oscillator*, [arXiv:2211.13076](#), (2022).
- [2] Y. ALAMA BRONSARD, *A symmetric low-regularity integrator for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, drad093, 2023
- [3] D. BAMBUSI, *Birkhoff Normal Form for Some Nonlinear PDEs*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* (2003) 234: 253.
- [4] D. BAMBUSI, B. GRÉBERT, *Birkhoff normal form for partial differential equations with tame modulus*, *Duke Math. J.* 135 (2006), no. 3, 507–567.
- [5] D. BAMBUSI, E. FAOU, B. GRÉBERT, *Existence and stability of ground states for fully discrete approximations of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, *Numer. Math.* 123 (2013), pp. 461–492
- [6] J. BERNIER, B. GRÉBERT, *Birkhoff normal forms for Hamiltonian PDEs in their energy space*, *Journal de l’Ecole polytechnique — Mathématiques*, Tome 9 (2022), pp. 681–745.
- [7] J. BERNIER, B. GRÉBERT, *Almost global existence for some nonlinear Schrödinger equations on \mathbb{T}^d in low regularity*, [arXiv:2203.05799](#), to appear in *Annales de l’Institut Fourier* (2022)
- [8] J. BERNIER, B. GRÉBERT, G. RIVIÈRE, *Dynamics of nonlinear Klein-Gordon equations in low regularity on \mathbb{S}^2* , *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 40 (2023), no. 5, pp. 1009–1049.
- [9] J. BERNIER, B. GRÉBERT, AND T. ROBERT, *Dynamics of quintic nonlinear Schrödinger equations in $H^{2/5+}(\mathbb{T})$* , [arXiv:2305.05236](#), (2023)
- [10] Y. BRUNED, K. SCHRATZ, *Resonance based schemes for dispersive equations via decorated trees*, *Forum of Mathematics, Pi*, Volume 10, 2022, e2.
- [11] B. CANO, *Conserved quantities of some Hamiltonian wave equations after full discretization*, *Numer. Math.* **103**, 197–223 (2006)
- [12] D. COHEN, E. HAIRER, C. LUBICH, *Conservation of energy, momentum and actions in numerical discretizations of non-linear wave equations*, *Numer. Math.*, 110, 113–143 (2008).
- [13] D. COHEN, E. HAIRER, C. LUBICH, *Long-Time Analysis of Nonlinearly Perturbed Wave Equations Via Modulated Fourier Expansions*, *Arch Rational Mech Anal*, 187, 341–368 (2008).
- [14] E. FAOU, *Geometric numerical integration and Schrödinger equations*, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2012
- [15] E. FAOU, B. GRÉBERT, *Hamiltonian interpolation of splitting approximations for nonlinear PDEs*, *Found. Comput. Math.* **11**, 381–415 (2011)

- [16] E. FAOU, B. GRÉBERT, E. PATUREL, *Birkhoff normal form for splitting methods applied to semilinear Hamiltonian PDEs. I. Finite-dimensional discretization*, *Numer. Math.* **114**, 429-458 (2010)
- [17] B. GARCÍA-ARCHILLA, J. M. SANZ-SERNA, R. D. SKEEL, *Long-Time-Step Methods for Oscillatory Differential Equations*, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 1998 20:3, 930-963
- [18] L. GAUCKLER, *Numerical long-time energy conservation for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* **37**, 2067-2090 (2017)
- [19] L. GAUCKLER, C. LUBICH, *Splitting Integrators for Nonlinear Schrödinger Equations Over Long Times*, *Found Comput Math* **10**, 275–302 (2010).
- [20] E. HAIRER, C. LUBICH, *Spectral semi-discretisations of weakly non-linear wave equations over long times*, *Found. Comput. Math.* **8**, 319-334 (2008)
- [21] E. HAIRER, C. LUBICH, G. WANNER, *Geometric numerical integration*. (Springer, Heidelberg, 2010), Structure-preserving algorithms for ordinary differential equations, Reprint of the second (2006) edition
- [22] G. MAIERHOFER, K. SCHRATZ, *Bridging the gap: symplecticity and low regularity in Runge-Kutta resonance-based schemes*, [arXiv:2205.05024](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.05024) (2023)
- [23] B. LI, K. SCHRATZ, F. ZIVCOVICH, *A second-order low-regularity correction of Lie splitting for the semilinear Klein-Gordon equation*, *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* **57**, 899-919 (2023)
- [24] A. OSTERMANN, F. ROUSSET, K. SCHRATZ, *Fourier integrator for periodic NLS: low regularity estimates via discrete Bourgain spaces*, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, **25** (2023), no. 10, pp. 3913–3952
- [25] A. OSTERMANN, K. SCHRATZ, *Low regularity exponential-type integrators for semilinear Schrödinger equations*, *Found Comput Math*, **18**, 731–755 (2018).
- [26] F. ROUSSET, K. SCHRATZ, *A general framework of low-regularity integrators*, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **59**, 3, 1735-1768, 2021.
- [27] Y. WANG, X. ZHAO, *A symmetric low-regularity integrator for nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation*, *Math. Comp.*, **91** (2022), 2215-2245

NANTES UNIVERSITÉ, CNRS, LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES JEAN LERAY, LMJL, F-44000 NANTES, FRANCE

Email address: Charbella.AbouKhalil@univ-nantes.fr

NANTES UNIVERSITÉ, CNRS, LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES JEAN LERAY, LMJL, F-44000 NANTES, FRANCE

Email address: joackim.bernier@univ-nantes.fr