

A REVIEW OF HIGH ORDER STRONG STABILITY PRESERVING TWO-DERIVATIVE EXPLICIT, IMPLICIT, AND IMEX METHODS

SIGAL GOTTLIEB* AND ZACHARY J. GRANT†

Abstract. High order strong stability preserving (SSP) time discretizations ensure the nonlinear non-inner-product strong stability properties of spatial discretizations suited for the stable simulation of hyperbolic PDEs. Over the past decade multiderivative time-stepping have been used for the time-evolution hyperbolic PDEs, so that the strong stability properties of these methods have become increasingly relevant. In this work we review sufficient conditions for a two-derivative multistage method to preserve the strong stability properties of spatial discretizations in a forward Euler and different conditions on the second derivative. In particular we present the SSP theory for explicit and implicit two-derivative Runge–Kutta schemes, and discuss a special condition on the second derivative under which these implicit methods may be unconditionally SSP. This condition is then used in the context of implicit-explicit (IMEX) multi-derivative Runge–Kutta schemes, where the time-step restriction is independent of the stiff term. Finally, we present the SSP theory for implicit-explicit (IMEX) multi-derivative general linear methods, and some novel second and third order methods where the time-step restriction is independent of the stiff term.

1. Overview. Strong stability preserving Runge–Kutta methods were developed by Shu in [71, 72] to preserve the nonlinear stability properties of forward Euler in any norm, semi-norm, or convex functional. This approach was further studied for Runge–Kutta, multistep, and general linear methods in [31, 32, 66, 70, 74, 75, 28, 38, 67, 37, 65, 73, 45, 47, 51, 30, 57, 39, 40, 6]. The study of the SSP properties of different time-stepping methods has been aided by its connections to contractivity theory [24, 26, 35, 36, 27, 47, 45]. SSP methods have proven useful in the solution of hyperbolic PDEs using many different spatial approaches [14, 62, 8, 22, 11, 15, 42, 8, 19, 2, 4, 9, 78, 23, 49, 3, 82, 60, 77, 12, 80, 81]. They have been widely used for many application areas [80, 61, 77, 8, 4, 19, 2, 82, 23, 3, 53, 49, 12, 60, 14, 9, 78, 15, 11, 42].

More recently, two-derivative SSP methods have become a subject of increasing interest [56, 13, 33, 55, 20, 29, 64, 63]. In this work we review two-step Runge–Kutta methods which preserve the properties of forward Euler and a selection of conditions on the second derivative. In Section 2 we review SSP theory for Runge–Kutta methods. In Section 3 we discuss the strong stability preservation theory for two derivative methods and propose three different conditions on the second derivative that each lead to SSP two-derivative Runge–Kutta methods, and present some optimal methods in each class. Finally, in Section 4 we discuss implicit-explicit (IMEX) Runge–Kutta methods with two derivatives treated implicitly, and in Section 5 we extend this approach to IMEX general linear methods. We note that while this paper is a review of the topic of SSP two derivative methods, the material in Section 5 and the related order conditions in Appendix C is new.

2. SSP methods. In numerically solving the hyperbolic conservation law

$$(1) \quad U_t + f(U)_x = 0,$$

*Mathematics Department, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, North Dartmouth, MA 02747. Email: sgottlieb@umassd.edu. SG’s research was supported in part by AFOSR Grant No. FA9550-23-1-0037, DOE Grant No. DE-SC0023164 Subaward RC114586, and Mass Dartmouth’s Marine and Undersea Technology (MUST) Research Program funded by the ONR Grant No. N00014-20-1-2849.

†Mathematics Department, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, North Dartmouth, MA 02747. Email: zgrant@umassd.edu. ZJG’s research was supported in part by DOE grant No. DE-SC0023164 Subaward RC114586.

oscillations leading to instability may occur when the exact solution develops sharp gradients or discontinuities. High order spatial discretizations that can handle discontinuities while preserving nonlinear non-inner-product stability properties, such as total variation stability or positivity, are required for the stable simulation of such problems. After discretizing in space using such a specially designed scheme (e.g. DG, TVD, WENO), we obtain the semi-discretized equation

$$(2) \quad u_t = F(u),$$

(where u is a vector of approximations to U) that has the property that the numerical solution is strongly stable when coupled with forward Euler time stepping

$$(3) \quad \|u^{n+1}\| = \|u^n + \Delta t F(u^n)\| \leq \|u^n\|, \quad 0 \leq \Delta t \leq \Delta t_{FE},$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is some norm, semi-norm, or convex functional, depending on the design of the spatial discretization.

In practice, Euler's method is not a preferred method, as it is low order and has a linear stability region that excludes the imaginary axis. Instead, we desire a higher order method that preserves the strong stability property $\|u^{n+1}\| \leq \|u^n\|$ under a (possibly modified) time-step restriction $\Delta t \leq \mathcal{C}\Delta t_{FE}$. If such a method exists for $\mathcal{C} > 0$, we call it a *strong stability preserving* (SSP) method, and we say that \mathcal{C} is the *SSP coefficient* of the method. The research in the field of SSP methods focuses on finding SSP methods of high order with largest possible \mathcal{C} .

2.1. Explicit SSP Runge–Kutta methods. In this section we will show that if a higher order Runge–Kutta method can be written as convex combinations of forward Euler steps, then any convex functional property (3) satisfied by the forward Euler scheme

$$(4) \quad u^{n+1} = u^n + \Delta t F(u^n)$$

will be *preserved* under a modified time-step restriction $\Delta t \leq \mathcal{C}\Delta t_{FE}$ [71, 72]. In this sense, the forward Euler method is the building block to constructing SSP Runge–Kutta methods. In fact, the forward Euler condition is a natural and important property of an operator F ; it has been noted [25] that it is equivalent to the circle condition which is central to the analysis of contractive functions F .

The s -stage explicit Runge–Kutta method

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} y^{(0)} &= u^n, \\ y^{(i)} &= \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \left(\alpha_{i,j} y^{(j)} + \Delta t \beta_{i,j} F(y^{(j)}) \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, s \\ u^{n+1} &= y^{(s)} \end{aligned}$$

can be rewritten as convex combination of forward Euler steps of the form (4) by factoring each stage

$$y^{(i)} = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \alpha_{i,j} \left(y^{(j)} + \Delta t \frac{\beta_{i,j}}{\alpha_{i,j}} F(y^{(j)}) \right).$$

If all the coefficients $\alpha_{i,j}$ and $\beta_{i,j}$ are non-negative, and $\alpha_{i,j}$ is zero only if its corresponding $\beta_{i,j}$ is zero, then the consistency condition $\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \alpha_{i,j} = 1$ and the forward

Euler condition (3) imply that each stage is bounded by

$$\|y^{(i)}\| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \alpha_{i,j} \left\| y^{(j)} + \Delta t \frac{\beta_{i,j}}{\alpha_{i,j}} F(y^{(j)}) \right\| \leq \|y^{(j)}\|$$

for $\frac{\beta_{i,j}}{\alpha_{i,j}} \Delta t \leq \Delta t_{FE}$. Putting this together for the entire Runge–Kutta method (5), we see that

$$(6) \quad \|u^{n+1}\| \leq \|u^n\| \quad \text{for} \quad \Delta t \leq C \Delta t_{FE} \quad \text{where} \quad C = \min_{i,j} \frac{\alpha_{i,j}}{\beta_{i,j}}.$$

(If any β is equal to zero, we consider that ratio to be infinite.)

The resulting time-step restriction is a combination of two distinct factors: (1) the term Δt_{FE} that depends on the spatial discretization, and (2) the SSP coefficient C that depends only on the time-discretization. As stated above, any method that admits such a decomposition with $C > 0$ is called a *strong stability preserving (SSP)* method.

This convex combination decomposition was used in the development of second and third order explicit SSP Runge–Kutta methods [71] and later of fourth order SSP Runge–Kutta methods [74, 45]. These methods not only guarantee the strong stability properties of any spatial discretization, given only the forward Euler condition, but also ensure that the intermediate stages in a Runge–Kutta method satisfy the strong stability property as well. The convex combination decomposition is not only a sufficient condition, it has been shown to be necessary as well [25, 26, 35, 36].

Much research on SSP methods focuses on finding high-order time discretizations with the largest allowable time-step $\Delta t \leq C \Delta t_{FE}$ by maximizing the *SSP coefficient* C of the method. In fact, a more relevant measure is the *effective SSP coefficient* $C_{eff} = \frac{C}{s}$ where the cost is relative to the number of function evaluations at each time-step – typically the number of stages s of a method. All explicit Runge–Kutta methods with positive SSP coefficient have a tight bound on the effective SSP coefficient: $C_{eff} \leq 1$ [30].

Furthermore, it has been shown that explicit Runge–Kutta methods with positive SSP coefficients suffer from an order barrier: they cannot be more than fourth-order accurate [48, 66]. These bounds and barriers on explicit SSP Runge–Kutta methods drive the study of other classes of SSP methods, such as explicit or implicit methods with multiple stages, steps, and/or derivatives. Explicit multistep SSP methods of order $p > 4$ do exist, but have severely restricted time-step requirements [30]. Explicit multistep multistage methods that are SSP and have order $p > 4$ have been developed as well [17, 7]. This review paper focuses on methods that include a second derivative terms. The analysis of explicit two-derivative Runge–Kutta methods will be discussed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2.

2.2. Implicit SSP Runge–Kutta methods. One approach to alleviating the bounds and barriers of explicit methods is to turn to implicit methods. While implicit SSP Runge–Kutta methods exist up to order $p = 6$, they suffer from a step-size restriction that is quite severe. For implicit methods the SSP coefficient is usually bounded by twice the number of stages for a Runge–Kutta method [46]. This is true for all implicit methods that have been tested: Runge–Kutta, multistep methods, and general linear methods. Although this bound on the effective SSP coefficient is twice the maximal size of the bound on the explicit method, the additional computational cost for the implicit solve far outweighs the benefits.

Once way of overcoming the bound on the SSP coefficient is by using an additional operator \tilde{F} that approximates the same spatial operator as F but satisfies a downwind first order condition

Downwind condition:

$$(7) \quad \|u - \Delta t \tilde{F}(u)\| \leq \|u\| \quad \text{for all } \Delta t \leq \Delta t_{DW},$$

instead of the usual forward Euler condition (3). Such an operator can often be defined when solving hyperbolic PDEs. By incorporating the downwind operator \tilde{F} as well as the usual operator F into an implicit Runge–Kutta method, Ketcheson and his students designed families of second order and third order methods that are unconditionally SSP [46, 34]. The second order methods [46] have coefficients that depend on r

$$\begin{aligned} y^{(1)} &= \frac{2}{r(r-2)}u^n + \frac{2}{r} \left(y^{(1)} + \frac{1}{r} \Delta t F(y^{(1)}) \right) + \frac{r^2 - 4r + 2}{r(r-2)} \left(y^{(2)} + \frac{1}{r} \Delta t \tilde{F}(y^{(2)}) \right) \\ y^{(2)} &= y^{(1)} + \frac{1}{r} \Delta t F(y^{(1)}) \\ u^{n+1} &= y^{(2)} + \frac{1}{r} \Delta t F(y^{(2)}). \end{aligned}$$

For $r > 2 + \sqrt{2}$, this family of methods is A-stable and SSP with $\mathcal{C} = r$. Since r can be chosen to be arbitrarily large, these methods can be SSP for arbitrarily large \mathcal{C} . The second and third order methods are *fully implicit* and so require the simultaneous solution of all the stages.

Inclusion of the downwind term \tilde{F} allows us to bypass the requirement that all coefficients in the scheme are non-negative. This strict requirement leads to barriers and bounds on the allowable order and SSP coefficient. Allowing negative coefficients provides added flexibility which alleviates the barriers and bounds. Similarly, another way of overcoming the bound on the SSP coefficient involves the inclusion of a second derivative and will be discussed in Sections 3.3, 4, and 5.

3. SSP two-derivative Runge–Kutta methods. Enhancing Runge–Kutta methods with additional derivatives was proposed in [79, 76], and multistage multi-derivative time integrators for ordinary differential equations were studied in [68, 69, 43, 44, 54, 58, 10]. In the last decade multistage multidervative methods were applied to the time evolution of partial differential equations [16, 1, 50, 59, 21]. In particular, for hyperbolic PDEs, adding a second derivative to Runge–Kutta methods is efficient because the computation of the Jacobian of the flux $f(u)$ in (1) is generally needed for the stable evolution of the equation; the second derivative computation \dot{F} relies on the computation of this Jacobian as well. For this reason, we limit our discussion to methods with at most two derivatives: F and \dot{F} . Two derivative Runge–Kutta methods take the form

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} y^{(i)} &= u^n + \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^s a_{ij} F(y^{(j)}) + \Delta t^2 \sum_{j=1}^s \dot{a}_{ij} \dot{F}(y^{(j)}), \quad i = 1, \dots, s \\ u^{n+1} &= u^n + \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^s b_j F(y^{(j)}) + \Delta t^2 \sum_{j=1}^s \dot{b}_j \dot{F}(y^{(j)}). \end{aligned}$$

The method can be written in matrix form

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{y} &= u^n + \Delta t \mathbf{A} F(\mathbf{y}) + \Delta t^2 \dot{\mathbf{A}} \dot{F}(\mathbf{y}) \\ u^{n+1} &= u^n + \Delta t \mathbf{b}^T F(\mathbf{y}) + \Delta t^2 \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{F}(\mathbf{y}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{A}_{ij} = a_{ij}$, $\dot{\mathbf{A}} = \dot{a}_{ij}$, and b and \dot{b} are column vectors with the elements b_j and \dot{b}_j , respectively. We give the order conditions for this method in Appendix A.

While the forward Euler condition is central to the development of SSP methods, additional conditions on the derivative allow us to devise SSP two-derivative Runge–Kutta methods. The exact form of the condition depends on the types of the problems we aim to solve: we considered (1) a condition that depends on an evolution of the second derivative; (2) a condition that mimics the explicit Taylor series method; and (3) a condition that is inspired by the implicit Taylor series method. These three conditions, and the SSP methods that arise from them, are the subject of the next subsections.

REMARK 1. *We note that for hyperbolic problems, we use a typical method-of-lines approach where the operator F is a spatial discretization of the term $U_t = -f(U)_x$ that leads to the system $u_t = F(u)$. In principal, the computation of the second derivative term \dot{F} should follow directly from the definition of F , so that $\dot{F} = F(u)_t = F_u u_t = F_u F$. However, in practice, such a computation may be expensive. Instead, we use a Lax–Wendroff type approach to compute \dot{F} . We go back to the original PDE (1), replace the time derivatives by the spatial derivatives, and discretize these in space.*

3.1. Second derivative condition. In any method-of-lines formulation (2), the spatial discretization F is designed to satisfy the *forward Euler* condition (3)

$$\text{Forward Euler condition} \quad \|u^n + \Delta t F(u^n)\| \leq \|u^n\| \quad \text{for } \Delta t \leq \Delta t_{FE},$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the desired norm, semi-norm, or convex functional. To account for the second derivative in (8), we impose a similar strong stability condition on the second derivative

Second derivative condition

$$(10) \quad \|u^n + \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^n)\| \leq \|u^n\| \quad \text{for } \Delta t \leq \Delta t_{SD} = K \Delta t_{FE}.$$

We find it useful to define the constant $K = \Delta t_{SD} / \Delta t_{FE}$ that compares the stability condition of the second derivative term to that of the forward Euler term, so that condition (10) holds for $\Delta t \leq K \Delta t_{FE}$.

The choice of second derivative condition (10) over the more natural Taylor series condition (17) was motivated by the unique two-stage two-derivative fourth order method [50, 59, 21]

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} y^{(1)} &= u^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} F(u^n) + \frac{\Delta t^2}{8} \dot{F}(u^n) \\ u^{n+1} &= u^n + \Delta t F(u^n) + \frac{\Delta t^2}{6} (\dot{F}(u^n) + 2\dot{F}(y^{(1)})). \end{aligned}$$

This method is SSP if F satisfies the forward Euler condition (4) and \dot{F} satisfies the second derivative condition (10). This is because we write each stage of (11) as a

convex combination of the building blocks in (4) and (10). The first stage can be written for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$

$$y^{(1)} = \alpha \left(u^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2\alpha} F(u^n) \right) + (1 - \alpha) \left(u^n + \frac{\Delta t^2}{8(1 - \alpha)} \dot{F}(u^n) \right),$$

where $\|y^{(1)}\| \leq \|u^n\|$ for an appropriate time-step

$$\Delta t \leq \min \left\{ 2\alpha \Delta t_{FE}, \sqrt{8(1 - \alpha)} K \Delta t_{FE} \right\}$$

dictated by (3) and (10). Similarly, for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$, $0 \leq 1 - \alpha - \beta \leq 1$, the second stage

$$\begin{aligned} u^{n+1} &= (1 - \alpha - \beta) \left(u^n + \Delta t \frac{2 - \alpha}{2(1 - \alpha - \beta)} F(u^n) \right) + \beta \left(u^n + \frac{4 - 3\alpha}{24\beta} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^n) \right) \\ &\quad + \alpha \left(y^{(1)} + \frac{\Delta t^2}{3\alpha} \dot{F}(y^{(1)}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

is SSP for an appropriate time-step.

While not every multistage multiderivative method is SSP in the sense that it preserves the properties of (4) and (10), we can use a convex decomposition approach to determine which ones are, and to find the value of Δt for which we can ensure the method satisfies the desired strong stability properties. This approach is generalized in the following theorem, which also suggests the optimal decomposition of the method.

THEOREM 1 ([13]). *Given spatial discretizations F and \dot{F} that satisfy (4) and (10), a two-derivative multistage method of the form (9) preserves the strong stability property $\|u^{n+1}\| \leq \|u^n\|$ under the time-step restriction $\Delta t \leq r \Delta t_{FE}$ for some $r > 0$, if satisfies the component-wise inequalities*

$$(12a) \quad \left(I + r\mathbf{S} + \frac{r^2}{K^2} \dot{\mathbf{S}} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{e} \geq 0$$

$$(12b) \quad r \left(I + r\mathbf{S} + \frac{r^2}{K^2} \dot{\mathbf{S}} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{S} \geq 0$$

$$(12c) \quad \frac{r^2}{K^2} \left(I + r\mathbf{S} + \frac{r^2}{K^2} \dot{\mathbf{S}} \right)^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{S}} \geq 0$$

where

$$\mathbf{S} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{0}_{s \times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\mathbf{S}} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\mathbf{A}} & \mathbf{0}_{s \times 1} \\ \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and \mathbf{e} is a vector of ones.

EXAMPLE 1. Motivating Example: *An example in which conditions (4) and (10) are satisfied and the SSP property is desired was considered in [13]. Consider the simple linear one-way wave equation*

$$U_t = U_x.$$

We can semi-discretize in space to obtain $u_t = F(u)$ where F is defined by a first-order upwind method

$$F(u^n)_j := \frac{1}{\Delta x} (u_{j+1}^n - u_j^n) \approx U_x(x_j).$$

If u is sufficiently smooth, the second derivative in time is also the second derivative in space:

$$U_{tt} = (U_x)_t = (U_t)_x = U_{xx}.$$

This convenient fact allows us to use a Lax-Wendroff type approach to define $\dot{F}(u^n)$ by a centered spatial discretization of U_{xx} , e.g.

$$\dot{F}(u^n)_j := \frac{1}{\Delta x^2} (u_{j+1}^n - 2u_j^n + u_{j-1}^n) \approx U_{xx}(x_j).$$

Both F and \dot{F} satisfy the total variation diminishing (TVD) property:

$$\|u^n + \Delta t F(u^n)\|_{TV} \leq \|u^n\|_{TV} \quad \text{for } \Delta t \leq \Delta x,$$

and

$$\left\| u^n + \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^n) \right\|_{TV} \leq \|u^n\|_{TV} \quad \text{for } \Delta t \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \Delta x.$$

In Section 3.1.2 we show how the methods that satisfy the conditions of Theorem (1) perform for these F and \dot{F} .

3.1.1. Optimal methods based on the forward Euler and second derivative conditions. In this section we present some optimal methods (in the sense of the largest \mathcal{C}) that satisfy Theorem (1) for spatial discretizations F and \dot{F} that satisfy (3) and (10).

Optimal one stage second order methods: There is a unique explicit one-stage two-derivative second order method: the Taylor series method

$$(13) \quad u^{n+1} = u^n + \Delta t F(u^n) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^n).$$

The optimal decomposition of this method, and the corresponding SSP coefficient, depend on the value of K in (10). This method can be written as a convex combination of two terms that satisfy the conditions (4) and (10):

$$u^{n+1} = (1 - \alpha) \left(u^n + \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \Delta t F(u^n) \right) + \alpha \left(u^n + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^n) \right).$$

This is SSP for $\Delta t \leq \max\{(1 - \alpha)\Delta t_{FE}, \sqrt{2\alpha}K\Delta t_{FE}\}$, so we set

$$(1 - \alpha)^2 = 2\alpha K^2 \quad \implies \quad \alpha = 1 + K^2 \pm K\sqrt{2 + K^2}$$

to obtain

$$\mathcal{C} = K\sqrt{2 + K^2} - K^2.$$

Two-stage third order methods. Optimal SSP explicit two-stage two-derivative third order methods take the form

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} u^* &= u^n + a\Delta t F(u^n) + \hat{a}\Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^n), \\ u^{n+1} &= u^n + b_1\Delta t F(u^n) + b_2\Delta t F(u^*) + \hat{b}_1\Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^n) + \hat{b}_2\Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^*). \end{aligned}$$

The optimal method has SSP coefficient $\mathcal{C} = r$ given by the smallest positive root of the polynomial

$$2K(a_0 - 2K) + 4K^3 a_0 - a_0 r + \frac{1 - a_0}{2K^2} r^2 - \frac{a_0}{6K^3} + \frac{K}{6K^3} r^3,$$

for $a_0 = \sqrt{K^2 + 2} - K$. The coefficients of the optimal method for each K depend on K and r and are given by

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \frac{1}{r}(Ka_0), & b_1 &= 1 - b_2, & b_2 &= \frac{2K^2(1 - \frac{1}{r}) + r}{Ka_0 + 2K^2} - \frac{r^2}{3K^2}, \\ \hat{a} &= \frac{1}{2}a^2, & \hat{b}_1 &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}ab_2 - \frac{1}{6a}, & \hat{b}_2 &= \frac{1}{6a} - \frac{1}{2}ab_2. \end{aligned}$$

Fourth order methods. The two-stage two-derivative fourth order method is given in (11). Although the method is unique, the optimal decomposition, and therefore the SSP coefficient, depends on K . The SSP coefficient $\mathcal{C} = r$ is given by the smallest positive root of the polynomial:

$$r^4 + 4K^2r^3 - 12K^2r^2 - 24K^4r + 24K^4.$$

Although the method can be implemented in its usual form, for analysis purposes the optimal Shu-Osher decomposition may be helpful:

$$\begin{aligned} y^{(1)} &= \left(1 - \frac{4rK^2 + r^2}{8K^2}\right)u^n + \frac{r}{2}\left(u^n + \frac{\Delta t}{r}F(u^n)\right) + \frac{r^2}{8K^2}\left(u^n + \frac{K^2}{r^2}\Delta t^2\dot{F}(u^n)\right) \\ u^{n+1} &= r\left(1 - \frac{r^2}{6K^2}\right)\left(u^n + \frac{\Delta t}{r}F(u^n)\right) + \frac{r^2(4K^2 - r^2)}{24K^4}\left(u^n + \frac{K^2}{r^2}\Delta t^2\dot{F}(u^n)\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{r^2}{3K^2}\left(y^{(1)} + \frac{K^2}{r^2}\Delta t^2\dot{F}(y^{(1)})\right). \end{aligned}$$

Increasing the number of stages to three allows for fourth-order SSP methods with a larger SSP coefficient, as described in [13]. Increasing the number of stages also allows for fifth order.

Three-stage fifth order methods. While explicit Runge–Kutta methods have an order barrier of $p = 4$ [48, 66], including a second derivative term allows us to achieve fifth order SSP methods. The optimal SSP three stage two-derivative fifth order methods were given in [13]:

$$\begin{aligned} (15) \quad y^{(1)} &= u^n + a_{21}\Delta tF(u^n) + \dot{a}_{21}\Delta t^2\dot{F}(u^n) \\ y^{(2)} &= u^n + a_{31}\Delta tF(u^n) + \dot{a}_{31}\Delta t^2\dot{F}(u^n) + \dot{a}_{32}\Delta t^2\dot{F}(y^{(1)}) \\ u^{n+1} &= u^n + \Delta tF(u^n) + \Delta t^2\left(\dot{b}_1\dot{F}(u^n) + \dot{b}_2\dot{F}(y^{(1)}) + \dot{b}_3\dot{F}(y^{(2)})\right). \end{aligned}$$

The SSP coefficient $\mathcal{C} = r$ is the largest positive root of

$$10r^2a_{21}^4 - (100K^2 + 10r^2)a_{21}^3 + (130K^2 + 3r^2)a_{21}^2 - 50K^2a_{21} + 6K^2,$$

where

$$a_{21} = \frac{K^6}{r^6} \left(-\frac{2}{K^4}r^5 + \frac{10}{K^4}r^4 + \frac{40}{K^2}r^3 - \frac{120}{K^2}r^2 - 240r + 240 \right).$$

Given K , we can find the corresponding r , and the coefficients are then given as a




FIG. 1. Comparison of the rise in total variation as a function of the CFL number for the two-stage third order SSP (14) and non-SSP method (16). On the left is the maximal per time-step rise and on the right the maximal TV rise above the initial TV.

one-parameter system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{a}_{21} &= \frac{1}{2}a_{21}^2, & a_{31} &= \frac{3/5 - a_{21}}{1 - 2a_{21}}, \\ \dot{a}_{32} &= \frac{1}{10} \left(\frac{(\frac{3}{5} - a_{21})^2}{a_{21}(1 - 2a_{21})^3} - \frac{\frac{3}{5} - a_{21}}{(1 - 2a_{21})^2} \right), & \dot{a}_{31} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\frac{3}{5} - a_{21})^2}{(1 - 2a_{21})^2} - \dot{a}_{32}, \\ \dot{b}_2 &= \frac{2a_{31} - 1}{12a_{21}(a_{31} - a_{21})}, & \dot{b}_3 &= \frac{1 - 2a_{21}}{12a_{31}(a_{31} - a_{21})}, & \dot{b}_1 &= \frac{1}{2} - \dot{b}_2 - \dot{b}_3. \end{aligned}$$

This method shows that explicit multiderivative Runge–Kutta methods break the well-known fourth order barrier for explicit SSP Runge–Kutta methods.

3.1.2. Numerical example. To demonstrate how these numerical methods perform on our motivating example, we repeat the example from [13]. We simulate the linear advection equation

$$U_t = U_x, \quad \text{on the domain } x \in [0, 1]$$

using a first order finite difference for the first derivative and a second order centered difference for the second derivative

$$F(u^n)_j := \frac{u_{j+1}^n - u_j^n}{\Delta x} \approx U_x(x_j), \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{F}(u^n)_j := \frac{u_{j+1}^n - 2u_j^n + u_{j-1}^n}{\Delta x^2} \approx U_{xx}(x_j).$$

These spatial discretizations satisfy (3) with $\Delta t_{FE} = \Delta x$, and (10) with $K = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. We use a step function initial condition

$$u_0(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \frac{1}{4} \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and periodic boundary conditions $u(0, t) = u(1, t)$.

We use a spatial step $\Delta x = \frac{1}{1600}$, and a time-step $\Delta t = \lambda \Delta x$ where we vary $0.05 \leq \lambda \leq 2$ to find the value λ_{obs} at which the total variation starts to rise. We measure the maximal rise in total variation

$$\max_{0 \leq n \leq N-1} (\|u^{n+1}\|_{TV} - \|u^n\|_{TV}),$$




FIG. 2. Comparison of the rise in total variation as a function of the CFL number for the two-stage third order SSP (14) and non-SSP method (16). On the left is the maximal per time-step rise and on the right the maximal TV rise above the initial TV.

and the rise in total variation compared to the total variation of the initial solution:

$$\max_{0 \leq n \leq N-1} (\|u^{n+1}\|_{TV} - \|u^0\|_{TV}),$$

over time-evolution of $N = 50$ time-steps using the methods in Section 3.1.1. For comparison we consider the non-SSP two stage third order method,

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} u^* &= u^n - \Delta t F(u^n) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^n), \\ u^{n+1} &= u^n - \frac{1}{3} \Delta t F(u^n) + \frac{4}{3} \Delta t F(u^*) + \frac{4}{3} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^n) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^*). \end{aligned}$$

In Figure 1 we see that that the SSP method (14) preserves the TVD behavior of the discretization up to the value $\lambda_{obs} = 1.04$, while the non-SSP method (16) does not preserve the TVD behavior at all. This graph shows that the absence of the SSP property results in the loss of the TVD property for any time-step.

Figure 2 shows the maximal rise in total variation for each CFL value $\lambda = \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x}$ for the Taylor series method, and the (14), (11), (15) methods described in Section 3.1.1, as well as a three stage fourth order optimal for $K = 1/\sqrt{2}$ presented in [13]. It is interesting to compare the observed value λ_{obs} at which the TV starts to rise to the theoretical value \mathcal{C} . For the Taylor series method, the two stage third order method, and the three stage fourth order method, the observed SSP coefficient matches exactly the theoretical value. On the other hand, the two-stage fourth order and the three-stage fifth order, both of which have the smallest SSP coefficients (both in theory and practice), have a larger observed SSP coefficient than predicted, as presented in the following table.

Method	1s2p (TS)	2s3p	2s4p	3s4p	3s5p
\mathcal{C}	0.6180	1.0400	0.6788	1.3927	0.6746
λ_{obs}	0.6180	1.0400	0.7320	1.3927	0.7136

3.2. Taylor Series Condition. In addition to being the unique one stage second order method, the Taylor series method (13) is a natural building block for multistage two-derivative methods. Indeed, many spatial discretizations in the literature

[52, 41, 18, 16] were designed to satisfy

Taylor series condition:

$$(17) \quad \|u^n + \Delta t F(u^n) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^n)\| \leq \|u^n\| \quad \text{for } \Delta t \leq \kappa \Delta t_{FE}.$$

Additionally, (17) provides more flexibility for the spatial discretization: there exist spatial discretizations that satisfy both the forward Euler condition (4) and the Taylor series condition (17) but not the second derivative condition (10). For such discretizations, the methods presented in Section 3.1 are not guaranteed to preserve the desired strong stability properties.

EXAMPLE 2. Motivating Example: *A simple case in which this added flexibility in the spatial discretization is needed is, once again, seen in the one-way wave equation*

$$U_t = U_x$$

where F is defined as before by the first-order upwind method

$$F(u^n)_j := \frac{1}{\Delta x} (u_{j+1}^n - u_j^n) \approx U_x(x_j)$$

and \dot{F} is computed by simply applying this differentiation operator twice

$$\dot{F} := \frac{1}{\Delta x^2} (u_{j+2}^n - 2u_{j+1}^n + u_j^n).$$

As noted above, the spatial discretization F satisfies the total variation diminishing (TVD) property:

$$\|u^n + \Delta t F(u^n)\|_{TV} \leq \|u^n\|_{TV} \quad \text{for } \Delta t \leq \Delta x,$$

while the Taylor series term using F and \dot{F} satisfies

$$\|u^n + \Delta t F(u^n) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^n)\|_{TV} \leq \|u^n\|_{TV} \quad \text{for } \Delta t \leq \Delta x.$$

In other words, these spatial discretizations satisfy (3) and (17) with $\kappa = 1$, in the TV semi-norm. Note, however, that Condition (10) is not satisfied by this \dot{F} , so that the methods derived in [13] will not guarantee the preservation of the TVD property of the numerical solution using F_{ex} and \dot{F} .

Once again, we wish to determine which methods can be written as convex combination of the base conditions, and to find the value of Δt for which we can ensure the method satisfies the desired strong stability properties. To decompose the schemes (9) into forward Euler and Taylor series building blocks, we stack the stages into a vector Y and

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= u^n + \Delta t \mathbf{S} F(Y) + \Delta t^2 \dot{\mathbf{S}} \dot{F}(Y) \\ &= \mathbf{R} e u^n + \mathbf{P} \left(Y + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F(Y) \right) + \mathbf{Q} \left(Y + \frac{\kappa \Delta t}{r} F(Y) + \frac{\kappa^2 \Delta t^2}{2r^2} \dot{F}(Y) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Where $R = I - \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}$. We can easily see that if all the elements of \mathbf{P} , \mathbf{Q} , and $\mathbf{R}e$ are non-negative, this methods will be a convex combination of the two base conditions. The following theorem gives the conditions under which these coefficients are non-negative.

THEOREM 2. *Given spatial discretizations F and \dot{F} that satisfy (4) and (17), a two-derivative multistage method of the form (9) preserves the strong stability property $\|u^{n+1}\| \leq \|u^n\|$ under the time-step restriction $\Delta t \leq r\Delta t_{FE}$ if it satisfies the component-wise conditions*

$$(18a) \quad \left(I + rS + \frac{2r^2}{\kappa^2} (1 - \kappa) \dot{S} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{e} \geq 0$$

$$(18b) \quad r \left(I + rS + \frac{2r^2}{\kappa^2} (1 - \kappa) \dot{S} \right)^{-1} \left(S - \frac{2r}{\kappa} \dot{S} \right) \geq 0$$

$$(18c) \quad \frac{2r^2}{\kappa^2} \left(I + rS + \frac{2r^2}{\kappa^2} (1 - \kappa) \dot{S} \right)^{-1} \dot{S} \geq 0$$

for some $r > 0$.

We showed above that the Taylor series building block is a convex combination of the forward Euler and the second derivative building blocks. Thus, any method of the form (8) that can be written as a convex combination of the forward Euler and Taylor series methods can also be written as a convex combination of the forward Euler and the second derivative building blocks. However, the converse is not true. There exist certain time discretizations, such as the two-stage fourth order method (11), that cannot be written as a convex combination of forward Euler and Taylor series methods, and therefore will not satisfy Theorem 2.

3.2.1. Optimal methods and order barriers. The family of three stage fourth order methods for $\kappa \geq 1$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} y^{(1)} &= u^n \\ y^{(2)} &= u^n + \Delta t F(y^{(1)}) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(y^{(1)}) \\ y^{(3)} &= u^n + \frac{1}{27} \Delta t \left(14F(y^{(1)}) + 4F(y^{(2)}) \right) + \frac{2}{27} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(y^{(1)}) \\ u^{n+1} &= u^n + \frac{1}{48} \Delta t \left(17F(y^{(1)}) + 4F(y^{(2)}) + 27F(y^{(3)}) \right) + \frac{1}{24} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(y^{(1)}). \end{aligned}$$

and has $\mathcal{C} = 1$.

If $\kappa \leq 1$ the optimal family of three stage fourth order methods has SSP coefficient $\mathcal{C} = \frac{2\kappa}{\kappa+1}$. This method is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} y^{(1)} &= u^n \\ y^{(2)} &= u^n + a_{21} \Delta t F(y^{(1)}) + \dot{a}_{21} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(y^{(1)}) \\ y^{(3)} &= u^n + a_{31} \Delta t F(y^{(1)}) + a_{32} \Delta t F(y^{(2)}) + \dot{a}_{31} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(y^{(1)}) \\ u^{n+1} &= u^n + b_1 \Delta t F(y^{(1)}) + b_2 \Delta t F(y^{(2)}) + b_3 \Delta t F(y^{(3)}) + \dot{b}_1 \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(y^{(1)}). \end{aligned}$$

where the coefficients depend on κ :

$$\begin{aligned} a_{21} &= \frac{\kappa+1}{2} & b_1 &= \frac{3\kappa^5 - 9\kappa^4 - 22\kappa^3 + 30\kappa^2 + 21\kappa + 11}{3(\kappa-3)^2(\kappa+1)^3} & \dot{a}_{21} &= \frac{(\kappa+1)^2}{8} \\ a_{31} &= \frac{(\kappa+1)(-\kappa^3 - 2\kappa^2 + 14\kappa + 3)}{2(\kappa+2)^3} & b_2 &= \frac{2\kappa}{3(\kappa+1)^3} & \dot{a}_{31} &= \frac{\kappa(-\kappa^2 + 2\kappa + 3)^2}{8(\kappa+2)^3} \\ a_{32} &= \frac{(\kappa+1)(\kappa-3)^2}{2(\kappa+2)^3} & b_3 &= \frac{2(\kappa+2)^3}{3(\kappa-3)^2(\kappa+1)^3} & \dot{b}_1 &= -\frac{-3\kappa^3 + 3\kappa^2 + \kappa + 1}{6(\kappa-3)(\kappa+1)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

More optimal SSP methods that use the base conditions (4) and (17), were found in [33] up to order $p = 6$. Most of these methods cannot be written in closed form so we do not replicate them here. Methods of this type have an order barrier of $p \leq 6$:

THEOREM 3. [33] *A method of the form (8) which can be decomposed into a convex combination of the base conditions (4) and (17), cannot have order $p \geq 7$.*

3.3. Negative derivative condition. The second derivative and Taylor series building blocks described in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 allow for the design of explicit SSP methods that have higher order and larger SSP coefficient than classical Runge–Kutta methods. However, similar time-step restrictions still hold for implicit two-derivative Runge–Kutta methods. This constraint is due to the non-negativity of the coefficients implied by the form of the building blocks. Recall that unconditional implicit SSP Runge–Kutta methods were enabled by including a downwind operator that allows for negative coefficients. Here we consider a negative coefficient on the derivative.

Consider the implicit Taylor series method for the ODE (2)

$$(19) \quad u^{n+1} = u^n + \Delta t F(u^{n+1}) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^{n+1}).$$

This one stage method is second order and the second derivative enters with a negative sign. Similarly, in this section we will use an implicit negative derivative condition that states that the implicit building block $u^{n+1} = u^n - \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^{n+1})$ satisfies a strong stability condition of the form $\|u^{n+1}\| \leq \|u^n\| \quad \forall \Delta t > 0$.

Negative derivative condition

$$(20) \quad u^{n+1} = u^n - \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^{n+1}) \implies \|u^{n+1}\| \leq \|u^n\| \quad \forall \Delta t > 0.$$

REMARK 2. *The more natural extension of the second derivative condition (10) is the explicit negative derivative condition*

$$\|u^n - \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^n)\| \leq \|u^n\| \quad \text{for } \Delta t \leq \Delta t_{ND}.$$

This condition is stricter than (20). In fact, we can show that this explicit negative derivative condition implies (20):

$$(21) \quad u^{n+1} = u^n - \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^{n+1})$$

$$(22) \quad (1+r)u^{n+1} = u^n + r \left(u^{n+1} - \frac{1}{r} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^{n+1}) \right)$$

Taking the norm on both sides,

$$(23) \quad \|u^{n+1}\| = \left\| \frac{1}{r+1} u^n + \frac{r}{r+1} \left(u^{n+1} - \frac{1}{r} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^{n+1}) \right) \right\|$$

$$(24) \quad \leq \frac{1}{r+1} \|u^n\| + \frac{r}{r+1} \left\| \left(u^{n+1} - \frac{1}{r} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^{n+1}) \right) \right\|$$

$$(25) \quad \leq \frac{1}{r+1} \|u^n\| + \frac{r}{r+1} \|u^{n+1}\| \quad \text{for } \Delta t \leq r \Delta t_{ND}.$$

Rearranging, we obtain

$$\|u^{n+1}\| \leq \|u^n\| \quad \text{for } \Delta t \leq r \Delta t_{ND}.$$

We can select r to be arbitrarily large, and so $\|u^{n+1}\| \leq \|u^n\|$ unconditionally.

Similarly, it is well known [38, 35, 30] that a method of the form

$$u^{n+1} = u^n + \Delta t F(u^{n+1})$$

is unconditionally SSP if the operator F satisfies a forward Euler condition of the form (3) for any $\Delta t_{FE} > 0$. The proof of this follows the same process described in the remark. In parallel to (20), we will use the less stringent condition

Backward Euler condition

$$(26) \quad u^{n+1} = u^n + \Delta t F(u^{n+1}) \implies \|u^{n+1}\| \leq \|u^n\| \quad \forall \Delta t > 0.$$

We wish to decompose the method into building blocks of the forms (26) and (20). In this case, we need the function and its derivative to *only* appear implicitly. However, previous intermediate stages that use the function and its derivative may be re-used at later stages. Thus, we use the more limited form of (8) given by

$$(27a) \quad u^{(i)} = r_i u^n + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} p_{ij} u^{(j)} + \Delta t d_{ii} G(u^{(i)}) + \Delta t^2 \dot{d}_{ii} \dot{G}(u^{(i)}), \quad i = 1, \dots, s,$$

$$(27b) \quad u^{n+1} = u^{(s)}.$$

This form ensures that any explicit terms in the method (27) enter only after they were introduced implicitly in a prior stage.

We can write (27) in matrix form:

$$(28) \quad U = \mathbf{R}e u^n + \mathbf{P}U + \Delta t \mathbf{D}G(U) + \Delta t^2 \dot{\mathbf{D}}\dot{G}(U),$$

where \mathbf{P} and $\mathbf{R} = I - \mathbf{P}$ are $s \times s$ matrices, r_i are the i th row sum of \mathbf{R} , and \mathbf{D} and $\dot{\mathbf{D}}$ are $s \times s$ diagonal matrices. The numerical solution u^{n+1} is then given by the final element of the vector U .

It is clear from the structure of (27) that as long as the coefficients r_i , p_{ij} , and d_{ii} are non-negative, and \dot{d}_{ii} are non-positive, then conditions (3) and (20) ensure that the method will be unconditionally SSP. The following theorem formalizes this observation:

THEOREM 4. [29] *Let the operators F and \dot{F} satisfy the forward Euler condition (3) and the implicit negative derivative condition (20). A method given by (28) which satisfies the conditions*

$$(29) \quad \mathbf{R}e \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{P} \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{D} \geq 0, \quad \dot{\mathbf{D}} \leq 0,$$

(where the inequalities are understood componentwise), will preserve the strong stability property

$$\|u^{n+1}\| \leq \|u^n\|$$

for any positive time-step $\Delta t > 0$.

REMARK 3. In [29] we showed that the order conditions on a method of the form (27) lead to negative coefficients for any method of order $p \geq 2$. On the other hand, the forward Euler condition (3) coupled with the second derivative condition (10) or the Taylor series condition (17) require positive coefficients on both the function and its derivative. Thus, implicit multi-derivative Runge–Kutta methods cannot be unconditionally SSP in the sense of preserving the forward Euler and one of the derivative conditions (10) or (17) above. This leads us to consider the backward derivative condition if we want an unconditional SSP method.

3.3.1. Unconditionally SSP implicit two-derivative Runge–Kutta methods up to order $p = 4$. In this section we present the methods of orders $p = 2, 3, 4$ that satisfy the conditions in Theorem 4. These unconditionally SSP methods were found in [29].

Second order: The one-stage, second order method is simply the implicit Taylor series method

$$u^{n+1} = u^n + \Delta t F(u^{n+1}) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^{n+1}).$$

Third order: A two-stage, third order unconditionally SSP implicit two-derivative Runge–Kutta method is given by

$$\begin{aligned} u^{(1)} &= u^n - \frac{1}{6} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^{(1)}) \\ u^{(2)} &= u^{(1)} + \Delta t F(u^{(2)}) - \frac{1}{3} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}(u^{(2)}) \\ u^{n+1} &= u^{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Fourth order: A five-stage, fourth order unconditionally SSP implicit two-derivative Runge–Kutta method is given by the Shu–Osher coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} \text{diag}(\mathbf{D}) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.660949255604937 \\ 0.242201390400848 \\ 1.137542996287740 \\ 0.191388711018110 \\ 0.625266691721946 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{diag}(\dot{\mathbf{D}}) = \begin{bmatrix} -0.177750705279127 \\ -0.354733903778084 \\ -0.403963513682271 \\ -0.161628266349058 \\ -0.218859021269943 \end{bmatrix}, \\ P &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.084036809261019 & 0.915963190738981 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.001511648458457 & 0 & 0.090254853867587 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{Re} &= [1, 0, 0, 0, 0.908233497673956, 0]^T. \end{aligned}$$

No methods of fifth order that satisfy the conditions in Theorem 4 were found in [29].

4. SSP theory for Two-derivative IMEX methods. The implicit negative derivative condition (20) does not always offer an attractive alternative to the second derivative and Taylor series conditions given in [13, 33], as there are some significant spatial discretizations that do not satisfy (20). However, the implicit negative derivative condition which enables unconditionally SSP schemes is of tremendous interest in several application areas where one component of the problem is stiff and which satisfies (26) and (20) [29]. These problems require treatment with an implicit-explicit (IMEX) time-stepping approach, as we describe in this section.

In this section we consider equations that have two components

$$(30) \quad u_t = F_{ex}(u) + F_{im}(u).$$

In many cases, the time-step restriction coming from the explicit evolution of one component (F_{ex}) is of a reasonable size under the forward Euler condition (3) while the second component (F_{im}) imposes a very small time-step restriction when handled explicitly, but satisfied unconditionally conditions (26) and has a derivative \dot{F}_{im} that satisfies (20). To alleviate this time-step restriction we can turn to IMEX two-derivative

methods. It seems natural to use unconditionally SSP implicit multi-derivative methods for F_{im} in combination with explicit methods for the non-stiff term F_{ex} .

EXAMPLE 3. *Our motivating example is the Bhatnagar-Gross-Krook (BGK) equation [5], a widely used kinetic model introduced to mimic the full Boltzmann equation. The BGK model is given by*

$$(31) \quad \partial_t U + v \cdot \nabla_x U = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(M - U), \quad x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $U = U(t, x, v)$ is the probability density function and M is the Maxwellian given by

$$(32) \quad M(t, x, v) = \frac{\rho(t, x)}{(2\pi T(t, x))^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{|v - w(t, x)|^2}{2T(t, x)}\right),$$

where the density ρ , bulk velocity w and temperature T are given by the moments of U :

$$\rho = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} U \, dv, \quad \rho w = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} U v \, dv, \quad \frac{1}{2}\rho dT = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} U |v - w|^2 \, dv.$$

Discretizing this equation in space so $u \approx U$, we let

$$F_{ex} = -v \cdot \nabla_x u \quad \text{and} \quad F_{im} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(M - u),$$

we observe that F_{ex} is a typical advection term which can be discretized to satisfy a condition of the form (3), while F_{im} is well-behaved under an implicit evolution of the form (26). Furthermore, it can be easily verified that

$$(33) \quad \dot{F}_{im}(u) = -F_{im}(u).$$

Assume that F_{ex} satisfies a forward Euler condition of the form (3) under the restriction $\Delta t \leq \Delta t_{FE}$, while F_{im} satisfies a backward Euler condition of the form (26). Furthermore, $\dot{F}_{im}(u)$ satisfies an implicit negative derivative condition of the form (20). Theorem (5) shows that under certain conditions a multi-derivative IMEX method

$$(34a) \quad \begin{aligned} u^{(i)} &= r_i u^n + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} p_{ij} u^{(j)} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} w_{ij} \left(u^{(j)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(u^{(j)}) \right) \\ &\quad + \Delta t d_{ii} F_{im}(u^{(i)}) + \Delta t^2 \dot{d}_{ii} \dot{F}_{im}(u^{(i)}), \quad i = 1, \dots, s, \\ u^{n+1} &= u^{(s)}. \end{aligned}$$

will be SSP under a time-step restriction of the form $\Delta t \leq \mathcal{C} \Delta t_{FE}$.

Note that as before it is convenient to write the method in its matrix form:

$$(35) \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{R} \mathbf{e} u^n + \mathbf{P} \mathbf{U} + \mathbf{W} \left(\mathbf{U} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(\mathbf{U}) \right) + \Delta t \mathbf{D} F_{im}(\mathbf{U}) + \Delta t^2 \dot{\mathbf{D}} \dot{F}_{im}(\mathbf{U}),$$

where \mathbf{P} , \mathbf{W} , and $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{W}$ are $s \times s$ matrices, r_i are the i th row sum of \mathbf{R} , \mathbf{D} and $\dot{\mathbf{D}}$ are $s \times s$ diagonal matrices, and \mathbf{e} is a vector of ones. The numerical solution u^{n+1} is then given by the final element of the vector \mathbf{U} .

The following theorem expresses the conditions under which a method of this form is SSP with a time step restriction related only to F_{ex} :

THEOREM 5. [29] Given an operator F_{ex} that satisfied condition (3) with Δt_{FE} , and operators F_{im} and \dot{F}_{im} that unconditionally satisfy (26) and (20) respectively, if the method given by (35) with $r > 0$ satisfies the component-wise conditions

$$(36) \quad \mathbf{Re} \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{P} \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{W} \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{D} \geq 0, \quad \dot{\mathbf{D}} \leq 0,$$

then it preserves the strong stability property

$$\|u^{n+1}\| \leq \|u^n\|$$

under the time-step condition

$$\Delta t \leq r \Delta t_{FE}.$$

In the following section we present a second and a third order method that satisfy the requirements of Theorem (5).

4.1. SSP IMEX multi-derivative Runge–Kutta methods. The methods in this section were found in [29]. They satisfy the form (34) and the additional condition $d_{ii} + \dot{d}_{ii} > 0$ for each stage i , which together ensure the asymptotic preserving property. Given a function F_{ex} that satisfies the forward Euler condition (3), F_{im} that satisfies the backward Euler (26), and \dot{F}_{im} that satisfies an implicit negative derivative condition (20), the following IMEX methods have an explicit part that is SSP for a time-step that depends only on F_{ex} , and an implicit part that is unconditionally SSP.

Second order method: The method

$$(37) \quad \begin{aligned} u^{(1)} &= u^n + \frac{1}{2} \Delta t F_{im}(u^{(1)}) \\ u^{(2)} &= u^{(1)} + \Delta t F_{ex}(u^{(1)}) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}_{im}(u^{(2)}) \\ u^{(3)} &= \frac{1}{2} u^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2} \left(u^{(2)} + \Delta t F_{ex}(u^{(2)}) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta t F_{im}(u^{(3)}) \\ u^{n+1} &= u^{(3)}. \end{aligned}$$

is SSP for $\Delta t \leq \Delta t_{FE}$ arising from condition (3) satisfied by F_{ex} . The implicit component does not result in any restriction on the allowable time-step.

Third order method: The six stage method given by

$$\begin{aligned}
(38) \quad u^{(1)} &= r_1 u^n + \dot{d}_{11} \frac{1}{2} \Delta t F_{im}(u^{(1)}) \\
u^{(2)} &= r_2 u^n + p_{21} u^{(1)} + w_{21} \left(u^{(1)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(u^{(1)}) \right) \\
&\quad + d_{22} \Delta t F_{im}(u^{(2)}) + \dot{d}_{22} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}_{im}(u^{(2)}) \\
u^{(3)} &= p_{32} u^{(2)} + w_{31} \left(u^{(1)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(u^{(1)}) \right) + d_{33} \Delta t F_{im}(u^{(3)}) \\
u^{(4)} &= r_4 u^n + p_{42} u^{(2)} + w_{43} \left(u^{(3)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(u^{(3)}) \right) + d_{44} \Delta t F_{im}(u^{(4)}) \\
u^{(5)} &= p_{51} u^{(1)} + p_{52} u^{(2)} + w_{51} \left(u^{(1)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(u^{(1)}) \right) \\
&\quad + w_{54} \left(u^{(4)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(u^{(4)}) \right) + d_{55} \Delta t F_{im}(u^{(5)}) + \dot{d}_{55} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}_{im}(u^{(5)}) \\
u^{(6)} &= p_{61} u^{(1)} + p_{65} u^{(5)} + w_{61} \left(u^{(1)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(u^{(1)}) \right) \\
&\quad + w_{64} \left(u^{(4)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(u^{(4)}) \right) + \dot{d}_{66} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}_{im}(u^{(6)}) \\
u^{n+1} &= u^{(6)}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
r_1 &= 1, & r_2 &= 0.688151680893388, & r_4 &= 0.583517183806433, \\
p_{21} &= 0.253395246357353, & w_{21} &= 0.058453072749259 \\
p_{32} &= 0.235733481708505, & w_{31} &= 0.764266518291495 \\
p_{42} &= 0.123961833526104, & w_{43} &= 0.292520982667463 \\
p_{51} &= 0.409037644509411, & w_{51} &= 0.173788618990251 \\
p_{52} &= 0.136123556305509, & w_{54} &= 0.281050180194829 \\
p_{61} &= 0.203353399602184, & w_{61} &= 0.016811671845949 \\
p_{65} &= 0.331204417210324, & w_{64} &= 0.448630511341543 \\
d_{22} &= 2, & \dot{d}_{11} &= -0.871358934880525 \\
d_{33} &= 0.388820513661584, & \dot{d}_{22} &= -0.856842702601821 \\
d_{44} &= 0.083529464436389, & \dot{d}_{55} &= -2 \\
d_{55} &= 1.793313488277995, & \dot{d}_{66} &= -0.205134529930013
\end{aligned}$$

is SSP for $\Delta t \leq C \Delta t_{FE}$ where $C = 0.904402174130635$ and Δt_{FE} comes from condition (3) satisfied by F_{ex} .

These methods were tested extensively in [29] where we showed that for a hyperbolic relaxation model, the Broadwell model, and the BGK kinetic equations, these methods provide the desired high order accuracy, positivity preservation, and an asymptotic preserving property.

5. Multistep multi-stage two-derivative methods. Moradi et al. [55] extended the study of SSP two derivative Runge–Kutta methods by including previous steps. They developed SSP general linear methods (GLMs) with two-derivatives by using the second derivative condition (10). In this section we extend the SSP IMEX two derivative Runge–Kutta methods (34) considered in [29] by including previous

steps. We will study the SSP properties of these IMEX two derivative GLMs using the implicit negative derivative condition (20).

A k -step s -stage two-derivative IMEX method is given by

$$(39) \quad \begin{aligned} y^{(i)} &= \sum_{\ell=1}^k r_{i\ell} u^{n+\ell-k} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} p_{ij} y^{(j)} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} w_{ij} \left(y^{(j)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(j)}) \right) \\ &\quad + \Delta t d_{ii} F_{im}(y^{(i)}) + \Delta t^2 \dot{d}_{ii} \dot{F}_{im}(y^{(i)}), \quad i = 1, \dots, s, \\ u^{n+1} &= \sum_{\ell=1}^k \gamma_{\ell} u^{n+\ell-k} + \sum_{j=1}^s q_j y^{(j)} + \sum_{j=1}^s v_j \left(y^{(j)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(j)}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

This can be written in the matrix form

$$(40) \quad Y = \mathbf{R}U + \mathbf{P}Y + \mathbf{W} \left(Y + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(Y) \right) + \Delta t \mathbf{D} F_{im}(Y) + \Delta t^2 \dot{\mathbf{D}} \dot{F}_{im}(Y),$$

$$(41) \quad u^{n+1} = \mathbf{\Gamma}U + \mathbf{Q}Y + \mathbf{V} \left(Y + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(Y) \right)$$

REMARK 4. Note that the form (34) is not equivalent to (39) with $k = 1$, due to the inclusion of additional explicit terms in the final stage of (39). Recall that in (34) we required an implicit evaluation at each stage, and set $u^{n+1} = y^{(s)}$. This was done in [29] to ensure the asymptotic preserving (AP) property holds. In this section we allow any stage to be explicit, and in particular we allow the final stage to have convex combinations of prior steps, stages, and forward Euler steps of the explicit operator F_{ex} . This additional freedom allows for larger SSP coefficients, as we will observe in Section 5.1.

THEOREM 6. Given an operator F_{ex} that satisfied condition (3) with Δt_{FE} , and operators F_{im} and \dot{F}_{im} that unconditionally satisfy (26) and (20) respectively, if the method given by (39) with $r > 0$ satisfies the component-wise conditions

$$(42) \quad \mathbf{R} \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{P} \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{W} \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{D} \geq 0, \quad \dot{\mathbf{D}} \leq 0, \quad \mathbf{\Gamma} \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{Q} \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{V} \geq 0,$$

then it preserves the strong stability property

$$\|u^{n+1}\| \leq \max \{ \|u^{n+1-k}\|, \|u^{n+2-k}\|, \dots, \|u^n\| \}$$

under the time-step condition

$$\Delta t \leq r \Delta t_{FE} = \mathcal{C} \Delta t_{FE}.$$

Proof. We assume that we begin the simulation with k starting values u^0, \dots, u^{k-1} that are well behaved. Observe that by consistency the coefficients of the first stage $\sum_{\ell=1}^k r_{1\ell} = 1$, and the conditions in the theorem require $r_{1\ell} \geq 0$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, so that

$$\left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^k r_{1\ell} u^{n+\ell-k} \right\| \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^k r_{1\ell} \|u^{n+\ell-k}\| \leq \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \|u^{n+\ell-k}\|.$$

Now consider the first stage of the method

$$y^{(1)} = \sum_{\ell=1}^k r_{1\ell} u^{n+\ell-k} + \Delta t d_{11} F_{im}(y^{(1)}) + \Delta t^2 \dot{d}_{11} \dot{F}_{im}(y^{(1)}).$$

The fact that F_{im} and \dot{F}_{im} satisfy Condition (20) allows us to conclude that to conclude that

$$\|y^{(1)}\| \leq \left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^k r_{1\ell} u^{n+\ell-k} \right\| \leq \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \|u^{n+\ell-k}\| \quad \forall \Delta t.$$

We now proceed to consider each stage in turn. At the i th stage we have already shown that the previous stages satisfy the strong stability condition

$$\|y^{(j)}\| \leq \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \|u^{n+\ell-k}\|,$$

for $j = 1, \dots, i-1$. The fact that F_{ex} satisfies the forward Euler condition (3) gives us

$$\left\| y^{(j)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(j)}) \right\| \leq \|y^{(j)}\| \quad \forall \Delta t \leq r\Delta t_{FE}.$$

Putting this together we observe that, due to the positivity of the coefficients the explicit terms at the i th term satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_{ex}^{(i)}\| &= \left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^k r_{i\ell} u^{n+\ell-k} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} p_{ij} y^{(j)} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} w_{ij} \left(y^{(j)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(j)}) \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^k r_{i\ell} \|u^{n+\ell-k}\| + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} p_{ij} \|y^{(j)}\| + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} w_{ij} \left\| \left(y^{(j)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(j)}) \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^k r_{i\ell} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} p_{ij} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} w_{ij} \right) \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \|u^{n+\ell-k}\| \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \|u^{n+\ell-k}\| \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is by the consistency conditions. Observing that $y^{(i)}$ takes the form

$$y^{(i)} = y_{ex}^{(i)} + \Delta t d_{ii} F_{im}(y^{(i)}) + \Delta t^2 \dot{d}_{ii} \dot{F}_{im}(y^{(i)})$$

and that F_{im} and \dot{F}_{im} satisfy Condition (20), we conclude that

$$y^{(i)} \leq \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \|u^{n+\ell-k}\|.$$

Finally, the positivity of the coefficients means that the the last stage consists only of a convex combination so that

$$\|u^{n+1}\| \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^k \gamma_{\ell} \|u^{n+\ell-k}\| + \sum_{j=1}^s q_j \|y^{(j)}\| + \sum_{j=1}^s v_j \left\| y^{(j)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(j)}) \right\|.$$

Once again, the fact that F_{ex} satisfies the forward Euler condition (3) gives us

$$\|u^{n+1}\| \leq \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^k \gamma_{\ell} + \sum_{j=1}^s q_j + \sum_{j=1}^s v_j \right) \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \|u^{n+\ell-k}\|,$$

for $\Delta t \leq r\Delta t_{FE}$. By the consistency conditions, these coefficients all add to one, so we obtain

$$\|u^{n+1}\| \leq \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \|u^{n+\ell-k}\|. \quad \square$$

5.1. New SSP IMEX two-derivative GLM methods.

5.1.1. Second order methods. In Section 4.1 we presented a one-step two-derivative three stage second order method (37) with $\mathcal{C} = 1$. However that method did not include explicit evaluations in the final stage because we wanted the AP property. If we allow the structure (39) we can obtain a one-step two-derivative three stage second order method with better SSP coefficient.

One-step two-derivative three stage second order method

$$\begin{aligned}
y^{(1)} &= u^n + \frac{1}{2 + \sqrt{2}} \Delta t F_{im}(y^{(1)}) - \frac{1}{2 + \sqrt{2}} \Delta t^2 \dot{F}_{im}(y^{(1)}) \\
y^{(2)} &= \left(y^{(1)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(1)}) \right) \\
y^{(3)} &= \frac{6 - \sqrt{2}}{8} y^{(1)} + \frac{2 + \sqrt{2}}{8} \left(y^{(2)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(2)}) \right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \Delta t F_{im}(y^{(3)}) \\
(43) \quad u^{n+1} &= \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} \right) y^{(3)} + \frac{2 + \sqrt{2}}{4(1 + \sqrt{2})} \left(y^{(3)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(3)}) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

preserves the SSP properties of (26) and (20) with $\mathcal{C} = (1 + \sqrt{2})/2$.

Two-step two-derivative three stage second order method

$$\begin{aligned}
y^{(1)} &= u^{n-1} \\
y^{(2)} &= \left(y^{(1)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(1)}) \right) \\
y^{(3)} &= r_{31} u^n + w_{32} \left(y^{(2)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(2)}) \right) \\
&\quad + \Delta t d_{33} F_{im}(y^{(3)}) + \Delta t^2 \dot{d}_{33} \dot{F}_{im}(y^{(3)}) \\
(44) \quad u^{n+1} &= q_3 y^{(3)} + v_2 \left(y^{(2)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(2)}) \right) + v_3 \left(y^{(3)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(3)}) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

with coefficients

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{32} &= \frac{(27 + 5\sqrt{29})^{1/3} - 2^{1/3}}{2(5 + \sqrt{29})^{1/3}}, \quad \dot{d}_{33} = -\frac{2}{v_3 + q_3}, \\
d_{33} &= \frac{10}{6} + \frac{2^{2/3}}{6} \left((9\sqrt{29} + 43)^{1/3} - (9\sqrt{29} - 43)^{1/3} \right) \\
r_{31} &= 1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} (-5 + \sqrt{29})^{1/3} - 1/(2^{2/3}(-5 + \sqrt{29})^{1/3}) \right) \\
q_3 &= \frac{20}{9} - \frac{2^{2/3}}{9} \left((727 - 135\sqrt{29})^{1/3} + (727 + 135\sqrt{29})^{1/3} \right) \\
v_2 &= \frac{1}{9} \left(7 - 2^{2/3}(81\sqrt{29} + 137)^{1/3} + 2^{2/3}(81\sqrt{29} - 137)^{1/3} \right), \\
v_3 &= 2^{2/3} \left((5 + \sqrt{29})^{1/3} - (\sqrt{29} - 5)^{1/3} \right) - 2,
\end{aligned}$$

is SSP with

$$r = \mathcal{C} = \frac{1}{3} \left(\left(\frac{1}{2}(61 + 9\sqrt{29}) \right)^{1/3} + \left(\frac{1}{2}(61 - 9\sqrt{29}) \right)^{1/3} - 1 \right) \approx 1.5468.$$

($k \geq 3$)-step two-derivative two-stage second order methods: Increasing the number of steps allows fewer stages, which means fewer implicit evaluations. Here we present a new family of two-derivative k -step two stage second order methods for $k \geq 3$. These methods have

$$r = \mathcal{C} = \frac{k-2}{k-1}$$

and take the form

$$(45) \quad \begin{aligned} y^{(1)} &= u^n - (k-1)\Delta t^2 \dot{F}_{im}(y^{(1)}) \\ y^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{k-1}u^{n-k+1} + \frac{k-2}{k-1} \left(y^{(1)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(1)}) \right) \\ &\quad + k\Delta t F_{im}(y^{(2)}) - k\Delta t^2 \dot{F}_{im}(y^{(2)}) \\ u^{n+1} &= \frac{1}{k-1}y^{(2)} + \frac{k-2}{k-1} \left(y^{(1)} + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(y^{(1)}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

5.1.2. Third order methods. A two-step, two-derivative GLM with $s = 5$ stages has $r = \mathcal{C} = 1.080445742835932$ is given by the coefficients

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0.000000000013270 & 0.403826433558741 & 0.037615230472512 \\ 0 & 0.221598110956903 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.059380532720245 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.452661697511965 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.032510664101898 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.235231740166619 & 0.000000000563127 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.536915718824635 & 0.013138165959401 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.105896638443513 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.745891224941199 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.705387726550010 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.409669470298833 & 0 & 0.000000000119198 & 0.040276644797934 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

$$\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}[0, 21.332739593864588, 0, 0.652867317315466, 14.945015954497144].$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{D}} = \text{diag}[-6.7737812489230, -72.4600167654208, 0, 0, -161.5846694139845].$$

$$\Gamma = [0, 0, 0].$$

$$\mathbf{Q} = [0.289233938741249, 0, 0, 0, 0.041812814961867].$$

$$\mathbf{V} = [0.274172259985154, 0, 0, 0.394780986311730, 0].$$

6. Conclusions. The increasing popularity of multi-stage multiderivative methods in the time-evolution of hyperbolic problems, raised interest in their strong stability properties. In this paper we review the recent work on SSP two-derivative methods. We first discuss the SSP formulation for multistage two-derivative methods presented in [13] where we require the spatial discretization to satisfy the forward Euler condition (3) and a second derivative condition of the form (10). We present the conditions under which we can ensure that an explicit SSP multistage two-derivative method preserve the strong stability properties of (3) and (10). We present optimal methods of up to order $p = 5$ and demonstrate the need for SSP time-stepping methods in simulations where the spatial discretization is specially designed, as well as the sharpness of the SSP time-step for some of these methods.

While this choice of base conditions gives more flexibility in finding SSP time stepping schemes, it limits the flexibility in the choice of the spatial discretization. For this reason, we considered in [33] an alternative SSP formulation based on the conditions (3) and (17) and investigate SSP methods that preserve their strong stability properties. These base conditions are relevant in many commonly used spatial discretizations that are designed to satisfy the Taylor series condition (17) but may not satisfy the second derivative condition (10). Explicit SSP methods which preserve the strong stability properties of (3) and (17), have a maximum obtainable order of $p = 6$, as we proved in [33]. While this approach decreases the flexibility in our choice of time discretization but it increases the flexibility in our choice of spatial discretizations. Numerical tests presented in [33] showed that this increased flexibility allowed for more efficient simulations in several cases.

We showed in [29] that the $p \geq 2$ order conditions for implicit two-derivative Runge–Kutta method lead to negative coefficients, so that requiring that the second derivative satisfy the conditions (10) or (17) which have positive coefficients results in conditional SSP. Instead, in [29] we presented a class of unconditionally SSP implicit multi-derivative Runge–Kutta schemes enabled by the backward derivative condition (20) as an alternative to the second derivative conditions given in [13, 33]. We review this SSP theory here and reproduce unconditionally SSP methods of order $p = 2, 3, 4$ for use with spatial discretizations that satisfy these conditions. This implicit negative derivative condition is extremely relevant for certain classes of problems including the Broadwell model and the BGK kinetic equation. In [29] we formulated two-derivative IMEX Runge–Kutta methods of order $p = 2$ and $p = 3$ that are SSP under a time-step restriction independent of the stiff term. These are reproduced in Section 4.1.

Finally, we extend this SSP theory for two-derivative IMEX Runge–Kutta methods based on the derivative conditions (26) and (20) to two-derivative IMEX GLMs 5, and present novel methods of orders $p = 2$ and $p = 3$ in Section 5.1. These methods have fewer stages and larger SSP coefficient than the corresponding SSP two-derivative IMEX Runge–Kutta methods, while still having no step-size restriction resulting from the implicit component. We hope that the new approach and results for SSP two-derivative IMEX GLM methods will be of significant use in the simulation of relevant problems.

Appendix A. Order Conditions. For a method of the form (9) to be of order $p = P$, the coefficients $\mathbf{A}, \dot{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{b}, \dot{\mathbf{b}}$ need to satisfy the order conditions given below. For simplicity, we define auxiliary coefficients $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{e}$ and $\dot{\mathbf{c}} = \dot{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{e}$, where \mathbf{e} is a vector of ones.

$$\begin{aligned}
p = 1 & \quad \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{e} = 1 \\
p = 2 & \quad \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{e} = \frac{1}{2} \\
p = 3 & \quad \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{c}^2 + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{3} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{c}} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{6} \\
p = 4 & \quad \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{c}^3 + 3\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c}^2 = \frac{1}{4} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c}^2 + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{1}{8} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^2 + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c}^2 = \frac{1}{12} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{c}} + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{1}{24} \\
p = 5 & \quad \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{c}^4 + 4\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c}^3 = \frac{1}{5} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c}^3 + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) = \frac{1}{10} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^2) + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c}^3 + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^2 + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{15} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{c}}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) \\
& \quad \quad + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{30} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\dot{\mathbf{c}} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{c}}^2 + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) = \frac{1}{20} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^3 + 3\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2 + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c}^3 = \frac{1}{20} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2 + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \dot{\mathbf{c}} \\
& \quad \quad + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) = \frac{1}{40} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c}^2 + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2 + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^2 + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{60} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A}^3 \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A}^2 \dot{\mathbf{c}} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \dot{\mathbf{c}} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c} \\
& \quad \quad + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{120} \\
p = 6 & \quad \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{c}^5 + 5\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c}^4 = \frac{1}{6} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c}^3 \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + 3\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c}^4 + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c}^3 \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) \\
& \quad \quad + 3\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) = \frac{1}{12} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^2) + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^2) + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c}^4 \\
& \quad \quad + 4\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) = \frac{1}{18} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^3) + 3\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^3 + 3\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2 + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c}^4 = \frac{1}{24} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^4 + 4\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^3 + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c}^4 = \frac{1}{30} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c}) + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{c}}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \\
& \quad \quad + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) = \frac{1}{36} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}}^2 \mathbf{c}^2) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}}^2 \mathbf{c}^2 + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^2) + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2) \\
& \quad \quad + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2 + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) = \frac{1}{72} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c}^3 + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^3 + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^3 + 3\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2 + 3\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2 = \frac{1}{120} \\
& \quad \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) \\
& \quad \quad + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}})) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} \\
& \quad \quad + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2 + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c}^2 \dot{\mathbf{c}} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{48}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + 2\mathbf{b}^T (\dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) \\
& \quad + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^3 + 2\mathbf{b}^T (\dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) = \frac{1}{60} \\
& \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^2) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^2) + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^2 + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^3 + 2\mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) \\
& \quad + 2\mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}}^2 \mathbf{c} + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) = \frac{1}{90} \\
& \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A}^3 \mathbf{c}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A}^3 \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) \\
& \quad + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A}^2 \dot{\mathbf{c}}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A}^2 \dot{\mathbf{c}} \\
& \quad + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c} \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{c}} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{c} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \dot{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{1}{144} \\
& \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) \\
& \quad + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T (\dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{c}} \\
& \quad + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{c}}) + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}}^2 \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}) = \frac{1}{180} \\
& \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{A}^2 (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A}^2 (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2 + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} \\
& \quad + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \dot{\mathbf{c}} + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) \\
& \quad + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2 + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \dot{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{1}{240} \\
& \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A}^3 \mathbf{c}^2 + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c}^2 + \mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}^2 + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2 + 2\mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A}^2 \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}^2 \\
& \quad + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \mathbf{A} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} + 2\mathbf{b}^T \dot{\mathbf{A}}^2 \mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{360} \\
& \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + 2\mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) \\
& \quad + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\dot{\mathbf{c}} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}) + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^T (\mathbf{c}^2 \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}) \\
& \quad + \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{c} \odot \dot{\mathbf{c}}^2) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^T \dot{\mathbf{c}}^2 = \frac{1}{24}
\end{aligned}$$

Appendix B. Order Conditions for IMEX two-derivative Runge–Kutta method. The order conditions for a method (34) are generally easier to formulate if the method is written in its Butcher form:

$$(46) \quad U = \mathbf{e}u^n + \Delta t \widehat{\mathbf{A}} F_{ex}(U) + \Delta t \mathbf{A} F_{im}(U) + \Delta t^2 \dot{\mathbf{A}} \dot{F}_{im}(U).$$

The conversion between the two formulations (35) and (46) is given by:

$$(47) \quad \widehat{\mathbf{A}} = \frac{1}{r} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}, \quad \mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{D}, \quad \dot{\mathbf{A}} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{W})^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{D}}.$$

The vectors $\widehat{\mathbf{b}}$, \mathbf{b} , and $\dot{\mathbf{b}}$ are given by the last row of $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$, \mathbf{A} , and $\dot{\mathbf{A}}$, respectively. The vectors $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{e}$, $\dot{\mathbf{c}} = \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{e}$, and $\widehat{\mathbf{c}} = \widehat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{e}$ define the time-levels at which the stages are happening; these values are known as the abscissas. The order conditions for methods of this form are:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{For } p \geq 1 & \mathbf{b}^t \mathbf{e} = 1 & \widehat{\mathbf{b}}^t \mathbf{e} = 1 \\
\text{For } p \geq 2 & \mathbf{b}^t \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^t \mathbf{e} = \frac{1}{2} & \mathbf{b}^t \widehat{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{1}{2} \\
& \widehat{\mathbf{b}}^t \mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{2} & \dot{\mathbf{b}}^t \widehat{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{1}{2} \\
\text{For } p \geq 3 & \mathbf{b}^t \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^t \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}^t \dot{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{1}{6} & \mathbf{b}^t \mathbf{A} \widehat{\mathbf{c}} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^t \widehat{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{1}{6} \\
& \mathbf{b}^t \widehat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{6} & \mathbf{b}^t \widehat{\mathbf{A}} \widehat{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{1}{6} \\
& \widehat{\mathbf{b}}^t \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^t \dot{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{1}{6} & \widehat{\mathbf{b}}^t \mathbf{A} \widehat{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{1}{6} \\
& \widehat{\mathbf{b}}^t \widehat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{6} & \widehat{\mathbf{b}}^t \widehat{\mathbf{A}} \widehat{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{1}{6} \\
& \mathbf{b}^t (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{c}) + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}}^t \mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{3} & \mathbf{b}^t (\mathbf{c} \odot \widehat{\mathbf{c}}) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}^t \widehat{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{1}{3} \\
& \mathbf{b}^t (\widehat{\mathbf{c}} \odot \widehat{\mathbf{c}}) = \frac{1}{3} & \widehat{\mathbf{b}}^t (\mathbf{c} \odot \mathbf{c}) = \frac{1}{3} \\
& \widehat{\mathbf{b}}^t (\mathbf{c} \odot \widehat{\mathbf{c}}) = \frac{1}{3} & \widehat{\mathbf{b}}^t (\widehat{\mathbf{c}} \odot \widehat{\mathbf{c}}) = \frac{1}{3}
\end{array}$$

Appendix C. Order Conditions for IMEX two-derivative GLM method.

We wrote the general linear method with k steps and s stages in a matrix-vector notation (40)

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= \mathbf{R}U + \mathbf{P}Y + \mathbf{W} \left(Y + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(Y) \right) + \Delta t \mathbf{D}F_{im}(Y) + \Delta t^2 \dot{\mathbf{D}}\dot{F}_{im}(Y), \\ u^{n+1} &= \Gamma U + \mathbf{Q}Y + \mathbf{V} \left(Y + \frac{\Delta t}{r} F_{ex}(Y) \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is more convenient to derive and present the order conditions in the form

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= \mathbf{T}U^n + \Delta t \hat{\mathbf{A}}F_{ex}(Y) + \Delta t \mathbf{A}F_{im}(Y) + \Delta t^2 \dot{\mathbf{A}}\dot{F}_{im}(Y) \\ u^{n+1} &= \theta U^n + \Delta t \hat{\mathbf{b}}F_{ex}(Y) + \Delta t \mathbf{b}F_{im}(Y) + \Delta t^2 \dot{\mathbf{b}}\dot{F}_{im}(Y). \end{aligned}$$

where the conversion between the two sets of coefficients is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{T} &= (I - \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{R}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{A}} = \frac{1}{r} (I - \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}, \\ \mathbf{A} &= (I - \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{D}, \quad \dot{\mathbf{A}} = (I - \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{W})^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{D}}, \\ \theta &= \Gamma + (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V})(I - \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{R}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{b}} = \frac{1}{r} ((\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V})(I - \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{V}), \\ \mathbf{b} &= (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V})(I - \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{D}, \quad \dot{\mathbf{b}} = (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V})(I - \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{W})^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{D}}. \end{aligned}$$

For a method to be order P it must satisfy all the order conditions $p \leq P$. The conditions up to $P = 3$ are given below, where we use the vector $\ell = [1 - k, 2 - k, \dots, 0]$.

$$\begin{aligned} p = 1 & \quad \theta \ell + \hat{\mathbf{b}}e = 1 & \quad \theta \ell + \mathbf{b}e = 1 \\ p = 2 & \quad \frac{1}{2} \theta \ell^2 + \hat{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{T}\ell + \hat{\mathbf{A}}e) = \frac{1}{2} & \quad \frac{1}{2} \theta \ell^2 + \hat{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{T}\ell + \mathbf{A}e) = \frac{1}{2} \\ & \quad \frac{1}{2} \theta \ell^2 + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{T}\ell + \hat{\mathbf{A}}e) = \frac{1}{2} & \quad \frac{1}{2} \theta \ell^2 + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{T}\ell + \mathbf{A}e) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}e = \frac{1}{2} \\ p = 3 & \quad \frac{1}{6} \theta \ell^3 + \hat{\mathbf{b}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}\ell^2 + \hat{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{T}\ell + \hat{\mathbf{A}}e) \right) = \frac{1}{6} \\ & \quad \frac{1}{6} \theta \ell^3 + \hat{\mathbf{b}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}\ell^2 + \hat{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{T}\ell + \mathbf{A}e) \right) = \frac{1}{6} \\ & \quad \frac{1}{6} \theta \ell^3 + \hat{\mathbf{b}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}\ell^2 + \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{T}\ell + \hat{\mathbf{A}}e) \right) = \frac{1}{6} \\ & \quad \frac{1}{6} \theta \ell^3 + \hat{\mathbf{b}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}\ell^2 + \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{T}\ell + \mathbf{A}e) + \dot{\mathbf{A}}e \right) = \frac{1}{6} \\ & \quad \frac{1}{6} \theta \ell^3 + \mathbf{b} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}\ell^2 + \hat{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{T}\ell + \hat{\mathbf{A}}e) \right) = \frac{1}{6} \\ & \quad \frac{1}{6} \theta \ell^3 + \mathbf{b} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}\ell^2 + \hat{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{T}\ell + \mathbf{A}e) \right) = \frac{1}{6} \\ & \quad \frac{1}{6} \theta \ell^3 + \mathbf{b} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}\ell^2 + \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{T}\ell + \hat{\mathbf{A}}e) \right) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{T}\ell + \hat{\mathbf{A}}e) = \frac{1}{6} \\ & \quad \frac{1}{6} \theta \ell^3 + \mathbf{b} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{T}\ell^2 + \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{T}\ell + \mathbf{A}e) + \dot{\mathbf{A}}e \right) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{T}\ell + \mathbf{A}e) = \frac{1}{6} \\ & \quad \frac{1}{3} \theta \ell^3 + \hat{\mathbf{b}} \left((\mathbf{T}\ell + \hat{\mathbf{A}}e) \odot (\mathbf{T}\ell + \hat{\mathbf{A}}e) \right) = \frac{1}{3} \\ & \quad \frac{1}{3} \theta \ell^3 + \hat{\mathbf{b}} \left((\mathbf{T}\ell + \hat{\mathbf{A}}e) \odot (\mathbf{T}\ell + \mathbf{A}e) \right) = \frac{1}{3} \\ & \quad \frac{1}{3} \theta \ell^3 + \hat{\mathbf{b}} \left((\mathbf{T}\ell + \mathbf{A}e) \odot (\mathbf{T}\ell + \mathbf{A}e) \right) = \frac{1}{3} \\ & \quad \frac{1}{3} \theta \ell^3 + \mathbf{b} \left((\mathbf{T}\ell + \hat{\mathbf{A}}e) \odot (\mathbf{T}\ell + \hat{\mathbf{A}}e) \right) = \frac{1}{3} \\ & \quad \frac{1}{3} \theta \ell^3 + \mathbf{b} \left((\mathbf{T}\ell + \mathbf{A}e) \odot (\mathbf{T}\ell + \hat{\mathbf{A}}e) \right) + \dot{\mathbf{b}} \left(\mathbf{T}\ell + \hat{\mathbf{A}}e \right) = \frac{1}{3} \\ & \quad \frac{1}{3} \theta \ell^3 + \mathbf{b} \left((\mathbf{T}\ell + \mathbf{A}e) \odot (\mathbf{T}\ell + \mathbf{A}e) \right) + 2\dot{\mathbf{b}} \left(\mathbf{T}\ell + \mathbf{A}e \right) = \frac{1}{3} \end{aligned}$$

REFERENCES

- [1] R. P. K. C. A. Y. J. TSAI AND S. WANG, *Two-derivative Runge–Kutta methods for PDEs using a novel discretization approach*, Numerical Algorithms, 65 (2014), pp. 687–703.
- [2] L. BAIOTTI, I. HAWKE, P. J. MONTERO, F. LOFFLER, L. REZZOLLA, N. STERGIIOULAS, J. A. FONT, AND E. SEIDEL, *Three-dimensional relativistic simulations of rotating neutron-star collapse to a Kerr black hole*, Physical Review D, 71 (2005).
- [3] J. BALBÁS AND E. TADMOR, *A central differencing simulation of the Orszag-Tang Vortex system*, IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science, 33 (2005), pp. 470–471.
- [4] E. BASSANO, *Numerical simulation of thermo-solutal-capillary migration of a dissolving drop in a cavity*, IJNMF, 41 (2003), pp. 765–788.
- [5] P. BHATNAGAR, E. GROSS, AND M. KROOK, *A model for collision processes in gases. I. Small amplitude processes in charged and neutral one-component systems*, Phys. Rev., 94 (1954), pp. 511–525.
- [6] M. BRAS, G. IZZO, AND Z. JACKIEWICZ, *A new class of strong stability preserving general linear methods*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics, 396 (2021), p. 113612.
- [7] Z. G. D. H. D. I. K. C. BRESTEN, S. GOTTLIEB AND A. NÉMETH, *Strong stability preserving multistep Runge-Kutta methods*, Mathematics of Computation, 86 (2017), pp. 747–769.
- [8] R. CAIDEN, R. P. FEDKIW, AND C. ANDERSON, *A numerical method for two-phase flow consisting of separate compressible and incompressible regions*, Journal of Computational Physics, 166 (2001), pp. 1–27.
- [9] J. CARRILLO, I. M. GAMBA, A. MAJORANA, AND C.-W. SHU, *A weno-solver for the transients of boltzmann-poisson system for semiconductor devices: performance and comparisons with monte carlo methods*, Journal of Computational Physics, 184 (2003), pp. 498–525.
- [10] R. P. K. CHAN AND A. Y. J. TSAI, *On explicit two-derivative Runge-Kutta methods*, Numerical Algorithms, 53 (2010), pp. 171–194.
- [11] L.-T. CHENG, H. LIU, AND S. OSHER, *Computational high-frequency wave propagation using the level set method, with applications to the semi-classical limit of Schrodinger equations*, Comm. Math. Sci., 1 (2003), pp. 593–621.
- [12] V. CHERUVU, R. D. NAIR, AND H. M. TURFO, *A spectral finite volume transport scheme on the cubed-sphere*, Applied Numerical Mathematics, 57 (2007), pp. 1021–1032.
- [13] A. CHRISTLIEB, S. GOTTLIEB, Z. GRANT, AND D. C. SEAL, *Explicit strong stability preserving multistage two-derivative time-stepping schemes*, Journal of Scientific Computing, 68(3) (2016), pp. 914–942.
- [14] B. COCKBURN, F. LI, AND C.-W. SHU, *Locally divergence-free discontinuous Galerkin methods for the Maxwell equations*, Journal of Computational Physics, 194 (2004), pp. 588–610.
- [15] B. COCKBURN, J. QIAN, F. REITICH, AND J. WANG, *An accurate spectral/discontinuous finite-element formulation of a phase-space-based level set approach to geometrical optics*, Journal of Computational Physics, 208 (2005), pp. 175–195.
- [16] Y. G. D. C. SEAL AND A. J. CHRISTLIEB, *High-order multidervative time integrators for hyperbolic conservation laws*, Journal of Scientific Computing, 60 (2014), pp. 101–140.
- [17] S. G. D. I. KETCHESON AND C. B. MACDONALD, *Strong stability preserving two-step Runge-Kutta methods*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 49 (2012), pp. 2618–2639.
- [18] V. DARU AND C. TENAUD, *High order one-step monotonicity-preserving schemes for unsteady compressible flow calculations*, Journal of Computational Physics, 193 (2004), pp. 563–594.
- [19] L. DEL ZANNA AND N. BUCCIANINI, *An efficient shock-capturing central-type scheme for multi-dimensional relativistic flows: I. hydrodynamics*, Astronomy and Astrophysics, 390 (2002), pp. 1177–1186.
- [20] A. DITKOWSKI, S. GOTTLIEB, AND Z. J. GRANT, *Two-derivative error inhibiting schemes and enhanced error inhibiting schemes*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 58 (2020), pp. 3197–3225.
- [21] Z. DU AND J. LI, *A hermite weno reconstruction for fourth order temporal accurate schemes based on the grp solver for hyperbolic conservation laws*, Journal of Computational Physics, 355 (2018), pp. 385–396.
- [22] D. ENRIGHT, R. FEDKIW, J. FERZIGER, AND I. MITCHELL, *A hybrid particle level set method for improved interface capturing*, Journal of Computational Physics, 183 (2002), pp. 83–116.
- [23] L.-L. FENG, C.-W. SHU, AND M. ZHANG, *A hybrid cosmological hydrodynamic/n-body code based on a weighted essentially nonoscillatory scheme*, The Astrophysical Journal, 612 (2004), pp. 1–13.
- [24] L. FERRACINA AND M. SPIJKER, *Stepsize restrictions for total-variation-boundedness in general runge-kutta procedures*, Applied Numerical Mathematics, 53 (2005), pp. 265–279.
- [25] L. FERRACINA AND M. N. SPIJKER, *Stepsize restrictions for the total-variation-diminishing*

- property in general Runge-Kutta methods, *SIAM Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 42 (2004), pp. 1073–1093.
- [26] ———, *An extension and analysis of the Shu-Osher representation of Runge-Kutta methods*, *Mathematics of Computation*, 249 (2005), pp. 201–219.
- [27] L. FERRACINA AND M. SPJKER, *Strong stability of singly-diagonally-implicit Runge-Kutta methods*, *Applied Numerical Mathematics*, (2008). to appear.
- [28] S. GOTTLIEB AND L.-A. J. GOTTLIEB, *Strong stability preserving properties of Runge-Kutta time discretization methods for linear constant coefficient operators*, *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 18 (2003), pp. 83–109.
- [29] S. GOTTLIEB, Z. J. GRANT, J. HU, AND R. SHU, *High order strong stability preserving multi-derivative implicit and imex runge-kutta methods with asymptotic preserving properties*, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 60 (2022), pp. 423–449.
- [30] S. GOTTLIEB, D. KETCHESON, AND C.-W. SHU, *Strong Stability Preserving Runge-Kutta and Multistep Time Discretizations*, World Scientific, 2011.
- [31] S. GOTTLIEB AND C.-W. SHU, *Total variation diminishing Runge-Kutta schemes*, *Mathematics of Computation*, 67 (1998), pp. 73–85.
- [32] S. GOTTLIEB, C.-W. SHU, AND E. TADMOR, *Strong stability preserving high-order time discretization methods*, *SIAM Review*, 43 (2001), pp. 89–112.
- [33] Z. GRANT, S. GOTTLIEB, AND D. SEAL, *A strong stability preserving analysis for explicit multistage two-derivative time-stepping schemes based on taylor series conditions*, *Communications on Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 1 (2019), pp. 21–59.
- [34] Y. HADJIMICHAEL, 2017.
- [35] I. HIGUERAS, *On strong stability preserving time discretization methods*, *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 21 (2004), pp. 193–223.
- [36] ———, *Representations of Runge-Kutta methods and strong stability preserving methods*, *Siam Journal On Numerical Analysis*, 43 (2005), pp. 924–948.
- [37] W. HUNSDORFER AND S. J. RUUTH, *On monotonicity and boundedness properties of linear multistep methods*, *Mathematics of Computation*, 75 (2005), pp. 655–672.
- [38] W. HUNSDORFER, S. J. RUUTH, AND R. J. SPITERI, *Monotonicity-preserving linear multistep methods*, *SIAM Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 41 (2003), pp. 605–623.
- [39] G. IZZO AND Z. JACKIEWICZ, (2015).
- [40] G. IZZO AND Z. JACKIEWICZ, *Strong stability preserving implicit-explicit transformed general linear methods*, *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 176 (2020), pp. 206–225. *Applied Scientific Computing XV: Innovative Modelling and Simulation in Sciences*.
- [41] M. D. J. QIU AND C.-W. SHU, *The discontinuous galerkin method with lax-wendroff type time discretizations*, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 194 (2005), pp. 4528–4543.
- [42] S. JIN, H. LIU, S. OSHER, AND Y.-H. R. TSAI, *Computing multivalued physical observables for the semiclassical limit of the Schrodinger equation*, *Journal of Computational Physics*, 205 (2005), pp. 222–241.
- [43] K. KASTLUNGER AND G. WANNER, *On Turan type implicit Runge-Kutta methods*, *Computing (Arch. Elektron. Rechnen)*, 9 (1972), pp. 317–325.
- [44] K. H. KASTLUNGER AND G. WANNER, *Runge Kutta processes with multiple nodes*, *Computing (Arch. Elektron. Rechnen)*, 9 (1972), pp. 9–24.
- [45] D. I. KETCHESON, *Highly efficient strong stability preserving Runge-Kutta methods with low-storage implementations*, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, (2008). to appear.
- [46] ———, *Step sizes for strong stability preserving with downwind-biased operators*, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 49 (2011), pp. 1649–1660.
- [47] D. I. KETCHESON, C. B. MACDONALD, AND S. GOTTLIEB, *Optimal implicit strong stability preserving Runge-Kutta methods*, *Applied Numerical Mathematics*. submitted.
- [48] J. F. B. M. KRAAIJEVANGER, *Contractivity of Runge-Kutta methods*, *BIT*, 31 (1991), pp. 482–528.
- [49] S. LABRUNIE, J. CARRILLO, AND P. BERTRAND, *Numerical study on hydrodynamic and quasi-neutral approximations for collisionless two-species plasmas*, *Journal of Computational Physics*, 200 (2004), pp. 267–298.
- [50] J. LI AND Z. DU, *A two-stage fourth order time-accurate discretization for lax-wendroff type flow solvers i. hyperbolic conservation laws*, *SIAM J. Sci. Computing*, 38 (2016), pp. 3046–3069.
- [51] Y. LIU, C.-W. SHU, AND M. ZHANG, *Strong stability preserving property of the deferred correction time discretization*, *Journal of Computational Mathematics*. to appear.
- [52] A. H. M. DUMBSER, O. ZANOTTI AND D. S. BALSARA, *Ader-weno finite volume schemes with space-time adaptive mesh refinement*, *Journal of Computational Physics*, 248 (2013),

- pp. 257 – 286.
- [53] A. MIGNONE, *The dynamics of radiative shock waves: linear and nonlinear evolution*, The Astrophysical Journal, 626 (2005), pp. 373–388.
 - [54] T. MITSUI, *Runge-Kutta type integration formulas including the evaluation of the second derivative. i.*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.
 - [55] A. MORADI, J. FARZI, AND A. ABDI, *Strong stability preserving second derivative general linear methods*, Journal of Scientific Computing, 81 (2019), pp. 392 – 435.
 - [56] T. NGUYEN-BA, H. NGUYEN-THU, T. GIORDANO, AND R. VAILLANCOURT, *One-step strong-stability-preserving hermite-birkhoff-taylor methods*, Scientific Journal of Riga Technical University, 45 (2010), pp. 95–104.
 - [57] H. NGUYEN-THU, T. NGUYEN-BA, AND R. VAILLANCOURT, *Strong-stability-preserving, hermite-birkhoff time-discretization based on k step methods and 8-stage explicit runge-kutta methods of order 5 and 4*, Journal of computational and applied mathematics, 263 (2014), pp. 45–58.
 - [58] H. ONO AND T. YOSHIDA, *Two-stage explicit Runge-Kutta type methods using derivatives.*, Japan J. Indust. Appl. Math., 21 (2004), pp. 61–374.
 - [59] L. PAN, K. XU, Q. LI, AND J. LI, *An efficient and accurate two-stage fourth-order gas-kinetic scheme for the euler and navier-stokes equations*, Journal of Computational Physics.
 - [60] C. PANTANO, R. DEITERDING, D. HILL, AND D. PULLIN, *A low numerical dissipation patch-based adaptive mesh refinement method for large-eddy simulation of compressible flows*, Journal of Computational Physics, 221 (2007), pp. 63–87.
 - [61] S. PATEL AND D. DRIKAKIS, *Effects of preconditioning on the accuracy and efficiency of incompressible flows*, IJNMF, 47 (2005), pp. 963–970.
 - [62] D. PENG, B. MERRIMAN, S. OSHER, H. ZHAO, AND M. KANG, *A pde-based fast local level set method*, Journal of Computational Physics, 155 (1999), pp. 410–438.
 - [63] X. QIN, Z. JIANG, AND J. YU, *Strong stability-preserving three-derivative runge-kutta methods*, Computational and Applied Mathematics, 42 (2023), p. 171.
 - [64] X. QIN, J. YU, Z. JIANG, L. HUANG, AND C. YAN, *Explicit strong stability preserving second derivative multistep methods for the euler and navier-stokes equations*, Computers & Fluids, 268 (2024), p. 106089.
 - [65] S. RUUTH, *Global optimization of explicit strong-stability-preserving Runge-Kutta methods*, Math. Comp., 75 (2006), pp. 183–207.
 - [66] S. J. RUUTH AND R. J. SPITERI, *Two barriers on strong-stability-preserving time discretization methods*, Journal of Scientific Computation, 17 (2002), pp. 211–220.
 - [67] S. J. RUUTH AND R. J. SPITERI, *High-order strong-stability-preserving Runge-Kutta methods with downwind-biased spatial discretizations*, SIAM Journal of Numerical Analysis, 42 (2004), pp. 974–996.
 - [68] H. SHINTANI, *On one-step methods utilizing the second derivative*, Hiroshima Mathematical Journal,.
 - [69] ———, *On explicit one-step methods utilizing the second derivative*, Hiroshima Mathematical Journal, 2 (1972), pp. 353–368.
 - [70] C.-W. SHU, *A survey of strong stability-preserving high-order time discretization methods*, in Collected Lectures on the Preservation of Stability under discretization, SIAM: Philadelphia, PA, 2002.
 - [71] C.-W. SHU AND S. OSHER, *Efficient implementation of essentially non-oscillatory shock-capturing schemes*, Journal of Computational Physics, 77 (1988), pp. 439–471.
 - [72] ———, *Efficient implementation of essentially non-oscillatory shock-capturing schemes*, Journal of Computational Physics, 77 (1988), p. 439–471.
 - [73] M. N. SPIJKER, *Stepsize conditions for general monotonicity in numerical initial value problems*, Siam Journal On Numerical Analysis, 45 (2007), pp. 1226–1245.
 - [74] R. J. SPITERI AND S. J. RUUTH, *A new class of optimal high-order strong-stability-preserving time discretization methods*, SIAM Journal of Numerical Analysis, 40 (2002), pp. 469–491.
 - [75] ———, *Nonlinear evolution using optimal fourth-order strong-stability-preserving Runge-Kutta methods*, Mathematics and Computers in Simulation, 62 (2003), pp. 125–135.
 - [76] D. D. STANCU AND A. H. STROUD, *Quadrature formulas with simple Gaussian nodes and multiple fixed nodes*, Math. Comp., 17 (1963), pp. 384–394.
 - [77] Y. SUN, Z. WANG, AND Y. LIU, *Spectral (finite) volume method for conservation laws on unstructured grids VI: Extension to viscous flow*, Journal of Computational Physics, 215 (2006), pp. 41–58.
 - [78] M. TANGUAY AND T. COLONIUS, *Progress in modeling and simulation of shock wave lithotripsy (sul)*, in Fifth International Symposium on cavitation (CAV2003), no. OS-2-1-010, 2003.
 - [79] P. TURÁN, *On the theory of the mechanical quadrature*, Acta Sci.Math. Szeged, 12 (1950),

- pp. 30–37.
- [80] Z. WANG AND Y. LIU, *The spectral difference method for the 2D Euler equations on unstructured grids*, in 17th AIAA Computational Fluid Dynamics Conference, AIAA, 2005.
 - [81] Z. WANG, Y. LIU, G. MAY, AND A. JAMESON, *Spectral difference method for unstructured grids II: Extension to the Euler equations*, *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 32 (2007), pp. 45–71.
 - [82] W. ZHANG AND A. I. MACFAYDEN, *RAM: A relativistic adaptive mesh refinement hydrodynamics code*, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 164 (2006), pp. 255–279.