An Improved Boris Algorithm for Charged Particle Dynamics in Tokamak Plasmas

Jian Wang^{*1,2}, Xiaodong Zhang¹, Lei Ye¹, and Xingyuan Xu¹

¹Institute of Plasma Physics, Hefei Institutes of Physical Science, Chinese Academy of Science, Hefei 230031, China

² University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China

Abstract

An Improved Boris algorithm for simulating charged particle motion in electromagnetic fields has been derived. It addresses the issue of inaccurate fast-scale cyclotron phase calculations in the original Boris algorithm, while still maintaining its advantage in simulating slow-scale guiding center motion, hence achieves a balance between low and high-frequency dynamics, overcoming the limitation of traditional second-order volumepreserving algorithms(VPAs) that are constrained to a single characteristic frequency. Test particle simulations indicate that, in most cases, the improved Boris algorithm achieves an exceedingly higher accuracy than conventional VPAs when simulating cases involving various frequencies of electric field within a typical Tokamak magnetic field, highlighting its superior efficacy in handling problems over a large range of characteristic frequencies.

Keywords: charged particle dynamics, volume-preserving algorithms, improved Boris algorithm, test particle simulations

1 Introduction

The accurate numerical calculations of charged particle dynamics within electromagnetic fields is essential to plasma simulations. A range of numerical integration methods have been developed, with the fourth-order Runge-Kutta method(RK4) and the Boris algorithm [1–3] being particularly representative. As a widely employed numerical method for solving differential equations, the RK4 method, despite its high accuracy of fourth-order in a single time step, experiences rapid error accumulation over extended computational durations, which eventually compromises its effectiveness in long-term simulations [4]. In contrast, although the Boris algorithm possesses relatively lower precision of

^{*}Corresponding Author. Email address: wang.jian@ipp.ac.cn

second order, it demonstrates exceptional stability in a large range of temporal scales [5–7], making it highly compatible with the multi-scale nature of plasma physics.

The success of the Boris algorithm can be attributed to its ability to preserve phase space volume [4]. Algorithms that exhibit this property are referred to as volume-preserving algorithms(VPAs), and can be conveniently represented using Lie algebra [8] or matrix notations [9]. In other words, the Boris algorithm belongs to the class of the second-order VPAs. Another second-order VPA, denoted as G_h^2 , was initially introduced in [10]. It is obtianed by simply modifying the magnetic-field-induced rotation angle of the velocity variable in the Boris algorithm, allowing it to preserve phase space volume while exhibiting different characteristics, and various actual performances of simulations from the Boris algorithm [10, 11]. Higher-order VPAs have also been proposed, showing satisfactory results in simulations of both relativistic and non-relativistic particles [11–13].

In Tokamak plasmas, the motion of charged particles is characterized by two distinct scales: the slow, low-frequency transit/bounce motion of the guiding center, and the fast, high-frequency cyclotron motion. The theoretical phase stability analysis presented in [9] indicates that, the Boris algorithm and G_h^2 are the most efficient second-order VPA for these two typical scales, respectively. This conclusion is also strongly corroborated by numerical experiments, emphasizing the importance of selecting the appropriate VPA based on the characteristic frequency of the specific problem.

Nevertheless, the conventional VPAs are inherently limited by a single characteristic frequency: the Boris algorithm, which is optimal for treating the slowscale guiding center motion, suffers from poor convergence in fast-scale cyclotron phases; conversely, G_h^2 excels in cyclotron motion, while a cumulative drift in the guiding center trajectory is observed. In this paper, we propose the development of a new algorithm by combining the above two methods in a manner that leverages the advantages of both in low-frequency and high-frequency dynamics, respectively. In numerical experiments, the new algorithm exhibits accuracy and efficiency that substantially surpass those of conventional VPAs, underscoring its significant potential and wide-ranging applicability in the study of charged particle dynamics.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II provides a detailed description of the construction of the improved Boris algorithm. In Section III, the numerical precision and efficiency of charged particle dynamics in a typical Tokamak toroidal magnetic field, with varying frequencies of electric fields, are compared using both conventional VPAs and the improved method. Finally, Sec.IV concludes the paper.

2 Construction of the Improved Boris Algorithm

This section is dedicated to the construction of the improved Boris Algorithm. The formulation is articulated through matrix notation, adhering to [9]. Before delving into the specific construction process, we provide a brief overview of the generalization of the second-order volume-preserving algorithm. The motion of charged particles in an electromagnetic field $\vec{E} = (E^x, E^y, E^z)^T$ and $\vec{B} = (B^x, B^y, B^z)^T$ is governed by the Lorentz-Newton equation

1

$$m\frac{d\vec{v}}{dt} = q(\vec{v} \times \vec{B} + \vec{E}) \tag{1.a}$$

$$\frac{d\vec{r}}{dt} = \vec{v} \tag{1.b}$$

with *m* the mass, *q* the electric charge, and $\vec{r} = (x, y, z)^T$, $\vec{v} = (v^x, v^y, v^z)^T$ the position and velocity of the charged particle under Cartesian coordinates. To facilitate the discussion, we will normalize the magnetic field \vec{B} , electric field \vec{E} , velocity variable \vec{v} , position variable \vec{r} time variable *t* by basic quantities

$$B_{ref} = B_0, v_{ref} = v_0 (2.a)$$

with B_0 the magnetic field strength on the magnetic axis, v_0 the initial velocity magnitude of the particle. And derived quantities are given by

$$E_{ref} = B_{ref}v_{ref} = B_0v_0, t_{ref} = \frac{m}{qB_{ref}} = \frac{m}{qB_0}, r_{ref} = v_{ref}t_{ref} = \frac{mv_0}{qB_0} \quad (2.b)$$

Replacing $\vec{B}, \vec{E}, \vec{v}, \vec{r}$ and t by $\frac{\vec{B}}{B_{ref}}, \frac{\vec{E}}{E_{ref}}, \frac{\vec{v}}{v_{ref}}, \frac{\vec{r}}{r_{ref}}$ and $\frac{t}{t_{ref}}$ in equations (1) yields

$$\frac{d\vec{v}}{dt} = \vec{v} \times \vec{B} + \vec{E} \tag{3.a}$$

$$\frac{d\vec{r}}{dt} = \vec{v} \tag{3.b}$$

Throughout the discourse in this section, we shall persistently utilize the above normalized form.

The generalized form of the second-order volume-preserving algorithm in matrix notation, as given in [9], is expressed as follows

$$\vec{v}_{k+1} = R_k \vec{v}_k + \frac{\Delta t}{2} (I + R_k) \vec{E}_k$$
 (4.a)

$$\vec{r}_{k+1} = \vec{r}_k + \Delta t \cdot \vec{v}_{k+1} = \vec{r}_k + \Delta t \cdot R_k \vec{v}_k + \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} (I + R_k) \vec{E}_k$$
(4.b)

Here, Δt denotes the fixed time step size. Let $t_j = j \cdot \Delta t$ denotes time grid for arbitrary j, then $\vec{v}_k = \vec{v}(t_k), \vec{r}_k = \vec{r}(t_{k+\frac{1}{2}}), \vec{B}_k = \vec{B}(\vec{r}_k, t_{k+\frac{1}{2}}), \vec{E}_k = \vec{E}(\vec{r}_k, t_{k+\frac{1}{2}})$ denotes variables at the k-th time step. And R_k is the rotation matrix, defined as follows

$$R_k = P_k \Lambda_k P_k^* \tag{4.c}$$

$$P_{k} = \frac{1}{B_{k}} \begin{bmatrix} B_{k}^{x} & \frac{-B_{k}^{x}B_{k}^{y} - B_{k}^{z}B_{k}i}{\sqrt{2((B_{k}^{x})^{2} + (B_{k}^{z})^{2})}} & \frac{B_{k}^{x}B_{k}^{y} - B_{k}^{z}B_{k}i}{\sqrt{2((B_{k}^{x})^{2} + (B_{k}^{z})^{2})}} \\ B_{k}^{y} & \frac{\sqrt{(B_{k}^{x})^{2} + (B_{k}^{z})^{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{\sqrt{(B_{k}^{x})^{2} + (B_{k}^{z})^{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ B_{k}^{z} & \frac{-B_{k}^{y}B_{k}^{z} + B_{k}^{x}B_{k}i}{\sqrt{2((B_{k}^{x})^{2} + (B_{k}^{z})^{2})}} & \frac{B_{k}^{y}B_{k}^{z} + B_{k}^{x}B_{k}i}{\sqrt{2((B_{k}^{x})^{2} + (B_{k}^{z})^{2})}} \end{bmatrix}$$
(4.d)

$$\Lambda_k = \operatorname{diag}(1, \exp(\theta_k \cdot i), \exp(-\theta_k \cdot i)) \tag{4.e}$$

where P_k is a unitary matrix, and P_k^* represents its conjugate transpose. $B_k = \sqrt{(B_k^x)^2 + (B_k^y)^2 + (B_k^z)^2}$ denotes the magnetic field strength, and θ_k is the magnetic-field-induced rotation angle of the velocity variable \vec{v}_k , which needs to satisfy the condition of consistency

$$\lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{\theta_k}{B_k \cdot \Delta t} = 1 \tag{4.f}$$

In other words, by treating θ_k as a function of the time step size Δt while simultaneously ensuring the condition of consistency (4.f), a series of second-order volume-preserving algorithms can be derived. The well-known Boris algorithm corresponds exactly to the case where $\theta_k = 2\arctan(\frac{1}{2}B_k \cdot \Delta t)$. Another valid volume-preserving algorithm, which is obtained by simply taking $\theta_k = B_k \cdot \Delta t$, has been proposed and is referred to as G_h^2 in [10] by Lie algebra and represented in exponential matrix form.

Now we are in the position to construct the improved algorithm. Theoretical phase stability analysis in [9] indicates that the two aforementioned algorithms are optimally suited for low and high frequency dynamics, respectively, within the class of second-order volume-preserving algorithms defined by Equations (4). Specifically, the Boris algorithm stands as the most effective numerical scheme for calculating slow-scale guiding center motions (low-frequency dynamics), while significant errors occur for fast-scale cyclotron motions (highfrequency dynamics). Conversely, G_h^2 exhibits the best performance for cyclotron motions, while offsets in guiding center motions are observed during long-term simulations. Thus, identifying a method that integrates the strengths of both algorithms would overcome the current algorithm's limitation to a single characteristic frequency, enabling it to effectively capture both low-frequency and high-frequency dynamics, thereby enhancing numerical accuracy and reducing computational costs. The Boris algorithm is chosen as the 'basis' due to its superiority in slow-scale motions and its stability in long-term calculations. This is also the rationale behind referring to the new method as the 'Improved Boris Algorithm'. Simultaneously, G_h^2 is utilized to provide accurate information on cyclotron motions and velocity variables, which must be periodically recalibrated to prevent trajectory deviation.

Building on the above ideas, we will now discuss the specific implementation of the new algorithm. Let $\vec{r}_{k1} = \vec{r}_{Boris}(t_{k+\frac{1}{2}})$, $\vec{v}_{k1} = \vec{v}_{Boris}(t_k)$, $\vec{r}_{k2} = \vec{r}_{G_h^2}(t_{k+\frac{1}{2}})$, and $\vec{v}_{k2} = \vec{v}_{G_h^2}(t_k)$ denote the variables calculated by the Boris algorithm and G_h^2 , respectively, while \vec{r}_k and \vec{v}_k represents the numerical results of the new algorithm at the k - th time step. It appears that we can directly derive

$$\vec{v}_k = \vec{v}_{k2} \tag{5.a}$$

$$\vec{r}_k = \vec{r}_{k1}^{GC} + \vec{r}_{k2}^C \tag{5.b}$$

Here, the superscript 'GC' and 'C' represent the guiding center and the cyclotron trajectory, respectively, as given by the following equations

$$\vec{r}^C = -\frac{\vec{v} \times \vec{B}(\vec{r}, t)}{B^2(\vec{r}, t)}$$
(5.c)

$$\vec{r}^{GC} = \vec{r} - \vec{r}^C = \vec{r} + \frac{\vec{v} \times \vec{B}(\vec{r}, t)}{B^2(\vec{r}, t)}$$
(5.d)

Equation (5.b) implies that the position variable of the new algorithm is obtained by combining the guiding center trajectory (low-frequency component) from the Boris algorithm and the cyclotron trajectory (high-frequency component) from G_h^2 , achieving the objective of leveraging the strengths of both algorithms, as discussed earlier. Meanwhile, in typical scenarios of tokamak plasmas, the cyclotron velocity of the particles is much greater than the guiding center velocity. Therefore, it is reasonable for the velocity variable to be directly given by G_h^2 , as described in Equation (5.a).

However, the position and velocity variables in both VPAs differ by half a time step to ensure second-order accuracy, resulting in $O(\Delta t)$ errors when directly using Equations (5.c) and (5.d) to compute the guiding center and cyclotron trajectories. To address this, we consider the central difference for Equation (3.a)

$$\frac{\vec{v}_{(k+1)i} - \vec{v}_{ki}}{\Delta t} = \vec{v}_{(k+\frac{1}{2})i} \times \vec{B}_{ki} + \vec{E}_{ki} + O(\Delta t^2)$$
(6)

with i = 1, 2 represent results of various VPAs. Substituting Equation (6) into Equations (5.c) and (5.d) yields

$$\vec{r}_{ki}^{C} = \frac{1}{B_{ki}^{2}} \left[\vec{E}_{ki} - \frac{\vec{v}_{(k+1)i} - \vec{v}_{ki}}{\Delta t} \right] + O(\Delta t^{2})$$
(7.a)

$$\vec{r}_{ki}^{GC} = \vec{r}_{ki} - \vec{r}_{ki}^{C} = \vec{r}_{ki} - \frac{1}{B_{ki}^2} \left[\vec{E}_{ki} - \frac{\vec{v}_{(k+1)i} - \vec{v}_{ki}}{\Delta t} \right] + O(\Delta t^2)$$
(7.b)

Thus, we obtain \vec{r}_{ki}^C and \vec{r}_{ki}^{GC} which are both positioned at $t_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$, like \vec{r}_{ki} . Both are second-order accurate, ensuring that no additional errors are introduced into the new algorithm.

As previously mentioned, it is necessary to periodically reset the results of G_h^2 to prevent trajectory offsets. In contrast, the Boris algorithm maintains accuracy over long-term simulations without deviation. Furthermore, our numerical tests have revealed that the Boris algorithm is extremely sensitive to

initial conditions. Namely, recalibrating its results (which is equivalent to essentially resetting the initial conditions) leads to highly inaccurate outcomes, whereas G_h^2 almost never encounters this issue. Thus, recalibration will only be applied to G_h^2 . For simplicity, the time interval between two consecutive recalibrations will be set as a constant.

In conclusion, the specific derivation process of the Improved Boris Algorithm is outlined below.

From the process described, it is evident that the theoretical computational cost of the Improved Boris Algorithm is the sum of the costs of the Boris algorithm and G_h^2 , which initially suggests that the algorithm is not 'improved'. However, if results at each single time step are not required, the computational processes of the Boris algorithm and G_h^2 can be parallelized, with communication occurring only when recalibrating the results of G_h^2 . This would reduce the computational time of the new algorithm to that of G_h^2 (Since G_h^2 involves calculations of trigonometric functions, while the Boris algorithm does not, making G_h^2 slightly more time-consuming in comparison). Besides, as will be demonstrated in the numerical experiments conducted in the next section, the new algorithm achieves significantly higher accuracy than both VPAs under identical conditions in the vast majority of cases.

3 Numerical Experiments

In this section, numerical experiments are performed to evaluate the accuracy and efficiency of the Improved Boris Algorithm(non-parallelized) in comparison to the Boris algorithm and G_h^2 . The algorithms are implemented in C++, and all numerical calculations are carried out in double precision with a single core of the 3.0 GHz Intel i9-13900k processor using the GCC compiler. The variables will no longer be normalized in the subsequent text. Instead, the time variables will be qualified by the gyro-frequency of an ion in a fixed magnetic field $B_0 = 1T$

$$\omega_{c0} = \frac{eB_0}{m_i} = 9.57 \times 10^7 s^{-1} \tag{8}$$

Consider the motion of a single ion in a toroidal magnetic field with magnetic field strength on the magnetic axis $B_{axis} = 2T$, major radius $R_0 = 1.67m$, minor radius a = 0.6m, and the safety factor

$$q = 2.52(\frac{r}{a})^2 - 0.16(\frac{r}{a}) + 0.86 \tag{9}$$

with $r = \sqrt{(\sqrt{x^2 + y^2} - R_0)^2 + z^2}$. These parameters can be referenced in [14]. The magnetic field in torodial coordinates (r, θ, ϕ) is expressed as $\vec{B} = B_{\theta}\vec{e}_{\theta} + B_{\phi}\vec{e}_{\phi}$ with

$$B_{\phi} = \frac{B_{axis}R_0}{R_0 + r\cos\theta}, B_{\theta} = \frac{rB_{\phi}}{qR_0}$$
(10)

Algorithm 1: Improved Boris Algorithm

Data: initial conditions of position \vec{r}_0 and velocity \vec{v}_0 , total calculation time T, fixed recalibration period ΔT , fixed time step size Δt . **Result:** numerical solutions of position $\vec{r}(T)$ and velocity $\vec{v}(T)$.

[Comment: For simplicity, it is assumed that the total calculation 1 time T is an integer multiple of the time step size Δt . Otherwise, an additional adjustment of the time step size is required at the end of the algorithm.]

2
$$t \leftarrow 0, k \leftarrow 0, t_1 \leftarrow 0;$$

- [Comment: Here, t represents the current calculation time, k3 represents the current time step and t_1 serves as the timer for recalibration.]
- 4 $\vec{v}_{01} \leftarrow \vec{v}_0, \, \vec{v}_{02} \leftarrow \vec{v}_0;$
- [Comment: Initialization of velocity variables for the Boris algorithm $\mathbf{5}$ and G_h^2 .]
- $\mathbf{6} \ \vec{r}_{01} \leftarrow \vec{r}_0 + \frac{1}{2} \vec{v}_0 \cdot \Delta t, \ \vec{r}_{02} \leftarrow \vec{r}_0 + \frac{1}{2} \vec{v}_0 \cdot \Delta t;$
- [Comment: Initialization of position variables for both VPAs. The position variables are advanced by half a time step relative to the velocity variables to ensure second-order accuracy.]

s while
$$t < T$$
 do

- Calculate $\vec{v}_{(k+1)1}$ by Equation (4.a); 9
- 10 Calculate $\vec{v}_{(k+1)2}$ by Equation (4.a);

11
$$\vec{v}_{k+1} \leftarrow \vec{v}_{(k+1)2};$$

[Comment: Update the velocity variables for both VPAs. The $\mathbf{12}$ result of the new algorithm (\vec{v}_{k+1}) is equivalent to that of $\begin{array}{c} G_h^2(\vec{v}_{(k+1)2}).]\\ \text{Calculate } \bar{r}_{k1}^{GC} \text{ by Equation (7.b);}\\ \text{Calculate } \bar{r}_{k2}^C \text{ by Equation (7.a);} \end{array}$

- $\mathbf{13}$
- 14

15
$$\vec{r}_k \leftarrow \vec{r}_{k1}^{GC} + r_{k2}^C;$$

[Comment: The position variable of the new algorithm(\vec{r}_k) is obtained by combining the guiding center trajectory from the Boris algorithm(\bar{r}_{k1}^{GC}) and the cyclotron trajectory from $G_h^2(\bar{r}_{k2}^C)$.]

17
$$\vec{r}_{(k+1)1} \leftarrow \vec{r}_{k1} + \vec{v}_{k1} \cdot \Delta t;$$

- $\vec{r}_{(k+1)2} \leftarrow \vec{r}_{k2} + \vec{v}_{k2} \cdot \Delta t;$ 18
- Comment: Update the position variables for both VPAs. 19

20
$$t_1 \leftarrow t_1 + \Delta t;$$

if $t_1 \geq \Delta T$ then $\mathbf{21}$

$$\mathbf{22} \qquad \vec{r}_{(k+1)2} \leftarrow \vec{r}_k + \vec{v}_{k+1} \cdot \Delta t$$

- $t_1 \leftarrow 0;$ $\mathbf{23}$
- end $\mathbf{24}$

 $\mathbf{25}$

 $\mathbf{16}$

[Comment: Recalibrate the result of G_h^2 by the result of the new algorithm.

- 26 $t \leftarrow t + \Delta t;$
- $k \leftarrow k + 1;$ $\mathbf{27}$

28 end

29 $\vec{r}_{k+1} \leftarrow \vec{r}_k + \frac{1}{2}\vec{v}_{k+1} \cdot \Delta t;$ **30** $\vec{r}(T) \leftarrow \vec{r}_{k+1}, \vec{v}(T) \leftarrow \vec{v}_{k+1};$ To apply the algorithms, we transform the toroidal magnetic field \vec{B} into the Cartesian coordinates (x, y, z) which is

$$B_{x} = -B_{\phi}\sin\phi - B_{\theta}\sin\theta\cos\phi = -\frac{B_{axis}R_{0}y}{x^{2} + y^{2}} - \frac{B_{axis}xz}{q(x^{2} + y^{2})}$$
(11.a)

$$B_y = B_\phi \cos\phi - B_\theta \sin\theta \sin\phi = \frac{B_{axis}R_0x}{x^2 + y^2} - \frac{B_{axis}yz}{q(x^2 + y^2)}$$
(11.b)

$$B_{z} = B_{\theta} \cos\theta = \frac{B_{axis}(\sqrt{x^{2} + y^{2}} - R_{0})}{q\sqrt{x^{2} + y^{2}}}$$
(11.c)

Next, we will consider the motion of particles in electric fields of various strengths and frequencies within the aforementioned typical Tokamak magnetic field.

3.1 Banana Orbit

The impact of the electric field is omitted in this case, i.e. $\vec{E} = (0, 0, 0)^T$. The initial velocity is $\vec{v}_0 = (0, 2 \times 10^4 m/s, 2 \times 10^5 m/s)^T$ and the initial position is $\vec{r}_0 = (R_0 + 0.25a, 0, 0)^T = (1.82m, 0, 0)^T$. Under these conditions, the projection of the particle's trajectory onto the (R, z) plane(where $R = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$) theoretically forms a closed banana orbit. All algorithms are implemented with a relatively large time step size of $\omega_{c0}\Delta t = 0.1$, and the time integration interval is $[0, T_0], \omega_{c0}T_0 = 2.54 \times 10^4$. The recalibration period of the improved Boris algorithm, ΔT , is set to $\omega_{c0}\Delta T = 50$, which remains constant throughout the secion. The numerical results of the banana orbit are shown in Figure 1. All algorithms correctly reproduce the trajectory of the trapped particle, and the results appear indistinguishable.

We now proceed to analyze the differences among the algorithms by examining the time-dependent numerical results of \vec{r} and \vec{v} over certain time intervals. Shown in Figure 2 is the time-dependent numerical results of the banana orbit by all algorithms with $\omega_{c0}\Delta t = 0.1$ in selected time intervals of an equal length of 5, compared with the "exact" solutions obtained by an extremely minuscule time step size $(\omega_{c0}\Delta t = 10^{-5})$, which is practically unattainable in actual numerical simulations, and all algorithms generate identical results in this case. Here we select the result derived by the Boris algorithm). The numerical solutions of the position variables \vec{r} in the time interval [20000, 20005] are displayed in subfigures (a), (b) and (c). It is evident that, in comparison to the "exact" solution, the numerical result obtained from the Boris algorithm exhibits a distinct phase discrepancy. In contrast, while the G_h^2 solutions aligns more closely in terms of phase, a noticeable overall shift in the particle trajectory is observed. The improved Boris algorithm yields superior results, with the numerical solution closely overlapping with the "exact" solution, as observed in the figures. This favorable outcome is consistently maintained in the numerical solutions of the velocity variables \vec{v} in the time interval [25000,25005], as shown in sub-figures (d), (e) and (f). The Boris algorithm still maintains a significant phase error. As



Figure 1: Numerical results on the (R, z) plane with initial conditions of banana orbit. The time step size is $\omega_{c0}\Delta t = 0.1$, and the time integration interval is $[0, T_0]$ with $\omega_{c0}T_0 = 2.54 \times 10^4$ which is approximately one period of the slow-scale motions (banana period). The banana orbit is correctly obtained by all algorithms.

for G_h^2 , due to the overall trajectory shift mentioned earlier, a slight inaccuracy in the magnetic field is introduced, resulting in a minor phase discrepancy.

To provide a more intuitive comparison of the accuracy of these algorithms, Figure 3 presents the global relative errors over the entire time integration interval $[0, T_0]$ of \vec{r} and \vec{v} as a function of time step size Δt . Here, the relative errors are defined by

$$\epsilon_{\vec{r}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sqrt{\frac{|\vec{r}_m^{"exact"} - \vec{r}_m^{numerical}|^2}{|\vec{r}_m^{"exact"}|^2}}$$
(12.a)

$$\epsilon_{\vec{v}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sqrt{\frac{|\vec{v}_m^{"exact"} - \vec{v}_m^{numerical}|^2}{|\vec{v}_m^{"exact"}|^2}}$$
(12.b)

with $N = \frac{T_0}{\Delta t}$ the total number of time grids. It can be observed that the convergence curves of both VPAs are remarkably smooth, with the slope of the linear region approaching 2, indicating second-order convergence rate for both algorithms, while G_h^2 converges noticeably faster than the Boris algorithm. Although the curve of the improved Boris algorithm is less smooth, its accuracy surpasses that of G_h^2 -the more accurate one of the two VPAs-by approximately one order of magnitude.

Compared in Figure 4 is the computational time τ (measured in seconds, with the average duration taken over 100 times of simulations) of the three algorithms. It should be noted that the improved Boris algorithm is not parallelized. Sub-figure (a) illustrates that, under identical computational conditions, the Boris algorithm exhibits the shortest computation time, followed by G_h^2 , with the improved Boris algorithm requiring the longest time. In sub-figure (b), the computation times of all algorithms are normalized with respect to the Boris algorithm's computation time. This normalization reveals that the computation time for G_h^2 is approximately 20% greater than that of the Boris algorithm, attributable to the need for trigonometric function calculations when computing the rotation matrix R_k in G_h^2 . In contrast, although the rotation matrix of Boris algorithm involves trigonometric functions as well, its actual computation is not necessary during the simulation process. The computation time for the non-parallelized improved Boris algorithm is approximately 1.8 to 2.0 times that of the Boris algorithm, which is slightly smaller than the combined computation times of both the Boris algorithm and G_h^2 .

Finally, the efficiency of the algorithms is evaluated by considering accuracy as a function of computational time, as illustrated in Figure 5. In this figure, points closer to the lower-left corner indicate higher efficiency. Despite the Boris algorithm possessing the shortest computational time, its efficiency remains the lowest. In contrast, the efficiency of the improved Boris algorithm markedly surpasses that of the Boris algorithm and G_h^2 , with this disparity becoming more pronounced under conditions of short computational time (i.e. large time step size).

To summarize, when solely the Tokamak magnetic field is present, the improved Boris algorithm successfully integrates the strengths of both the conven-



Figure 2: Time-dependent numerical results of the banana orbit in selected time intervals with a time step size of $\omega_{c0}\Delta t = 0.1$. (a)-(c): \vec{r} in [20000,20005]. (d)-(f): \vec{v} in [25000,25005]. The Boris algorithm(red dashed lines) and G_h^2 (blue dashed lines) introduce significant errors, while the improved Boris algorithm(green dashed lines) demonstrates much higher accuracy. As observed in the figure, its numerical solution is almost indistinguishable from the "exact" solution(black solid lines).



Figure 3: Global relative errors of \vec{r} and \vec{v} as functions of time step size Δt by all algorithms. The accuracy of the improved Boris algorithm significantly exceeds that of the other two volume-preserving algorithms.



Figure 4: Computational time of all algorithms.



Figure 5: Efficiency of all algorithms. Despite the lack of parallelization, the efficiency of the improved Boris algorithm still significantly surpasses that of the other two volume-preserving algorithms.

tional Boris algorithm and G_h^2 . Specifically, it preserves phase stability while simultaneously avoiding global trajectory displacement. Despite the absence of parallelization, which leads to a relatively longer computational time under identical conditions, the algorithm's precision and efficiency remain markedly superior to those of the traditional VPAs. In the following subsections, the induced electric field will be incorporated to assess the performance of the new algorithm in addressing wave heating problems.

3.2 Banana Orbit with high-frequency Electric Field

A high-frequency electric field on the z-axis is introduced in this section, i.e. $\vec{E} = (0, 0, E_0 cos(\omega_0 t)), E_0 = 5 \times 10^3 V/m$. Here, $\omega_0 = 1.5\omega_{c0}$ is of the same order of magnitude as the cyclotron frequency. All other computational conditions are kept consistent with those in the previous subsection. Figure 6 presents the time-dependent results for x, y, z. And the magnitude of velocity, $v = |\vec{v}|$, instead of its components, is displayed to provide a clearer evaluation of the effectiveness of wave heating. Although the numerical solution by the improved Boris algorithm is not as indistinguishable from the "exact" solution as in the case without the electric field discussed in the previous subsection, it still exhibits the closest agreement with the exact solution among the three algorithms. The cyclotron phase and guiding center motion are both effectively preserved.

The global relative error of position $\epsilon_{\vec{r}}$ is calculated by Equation (12) and presented as a function of time step size Δt in Figure 7, as well as the global relative error of velocity magnitude ϵ_v given by

$$\epsilon_v = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \frac{|v_m^{"exact"} - v_m^{"numerical"}|}{|v_m^{"exact"}|}$$
(13)



Figure 6: Time-dependent numerical results of the banana orbit with a high-frequency resonant electric field in selected time intervals. Compared to the Boris algorithm(red dashed lines) and G_h^2 (blue dashed lines), the numerical results obtained by the improved Boris algorithm(green dashed lines) remain the closest to the "exact" solution(black solid lines).



Figure 7: Global relative errors of \vec{r} and v as functions of time step size Δt by all algorithms. Under the conditions of this subsection, the advantages of the improved Boris algorithm are less pronounced; however, it continues to demonstrate a distinct superiority.

Unlike the previous subsection, the logarithmic scale is no longer employed. In this particular case, since the electric field frequency is of the same order of magnitude as the gyro-frequency, G_h^2 , which provides a more precise representation of the cyclotron motion, demonstrates a clear advantage over the two VPAs. Although the improved Boris algorithm does not exhibit the same substantial advantage as observed in the previous section, its accuracy still surpasses that of G_h^2 by over 50% in the majority of scenarios.

3.3 Transit Orbit with low-frequency Electric Field

In this subsection, the initial conditions for velocity are modified to $\vec{v}_0 = (0, 8 \times 10^4 m/s, 2 \times 10^5 m/s)$. This alteration results in a shift in the particle's trajectory from banana orbit to transit orbit, and the transit period T_1 is approximately $\omega_{c0}T_1 = 1.38 \times 10^4$. Meanwhile, a low-frequency electric field at the transit frequency, i.e. $\vec{E} = (0, 0, E_0 \cos(\omega_1 t)), E_0 = 5 \times 10^3 V/m$ with $\omega_1 = \frac{2\pi}{T_1}$, is also considered. The time integration interval is $[0, 2T_1]$.

In Figure 8, we present the numerical solutions for \vec{r} and v over extended time intervals. The results of the three components of the position variable \vec{r} in the time interval [24000,25000] are displayed respectively in sub-figures (a),(b) and (c). Even when observed over a longer time scale, the trajectory obtained with G_h^2 exhibits a marked deviation. This can be attributed to the amplification of its inherent limitations in low-frequency dynamics, due to the low-frequency resonant electric field. Meanwhile, the results of the other two algorithms essentially coincide with the "exact" solution, without any noticeable deviation. As depicted in sub-figure (d), the velocity magnitude v within [25000,27000] further indicates that G_h^2 is ineffective in managing low-frequency



Figure 8: Time-dependent numerical results of the transit orbit with a low-frequency resonant electric field in relative long selected time intervals. Compared to the other two algorithms, the numerical results by G_h^2 exhibit a notice-able deviation.

wave heating problems, while the other two algorithms perform well.

The convergence curves of the global relative errors, as shown in Figure 9(with logarithmic scaling), reveal that the Boris algorithm exhibits a distinct advantage over G_h^2 at larger time step sizes. However, due to the near-constant accuracy of the Boris algorithm for time steps larger than $10^{-2}\omega_{c0}^{-1}$, the precision of G_h^2 eventually surpasses that of the Boris algorithm at smaller time step sizes. This behavior can be attributed to the fact that, under the specific conditions of this case, the critical point at which the Boris algorithm's phase begins to converge occurs near a time step size of $10^{-2}\omega_{c0}^{-1}$. The improved Boris algorithm, however, maintains a substantial advantage: in the majority of cases, its accuracy exceeds that of the better-performing VPA by one to two orders of magnitude.



Figure 9: Global relative errors of \vec{r} and v as functions of time step size Δt by all algorithms. Under the conditions of this subsection, the advantages of the improved Boris algorithm even surpass those observed in the case without the magnetic field.

3.4 Banana Orbit with Electric Field of Various Frequencies

In order to more precisely evaluate the performance of the three methods for wave heating problems across various frequencies, this subsection adopts the initial conditions of the banana orbit, with the time integration interval set to $[0, T_0]$, a fixed time step size of $\omega_{c0}\Delta t = 0.1$, and a resonant electric field along the z-axis given by $\vec{E} = (0, 0, E_0 \cos(\omega t)), E_0 = 5 \times 10^3 V/m$. And the global relative errors of position and velocity magnitude are analyzed as functions of the frequency of the electric field ω .

In Figure 10, the low-frequency cases are illustrated, where the value of ω ranges from $10^{-4}\omega_{c0}$ to ω_{c0} , utilizing logarithmic coordinates for representation. The accuracy of the Boris algorithm remains virtually unchanged, while the accuracy of G_h^2 initially diminishes and subsequently enhances, surpassing that of the Boris algorithm near $\frac{\omega}{\omega_{c0}} \sim 10^{-2.5}$, and thereafter stabilizes at a level approximately one order of magnitude superior to the Boris algorithm. As for the improved Boris algorithm, its accuracy, even in the worst cases, merely approximates that of the Boris algorithm, while in other instances, it surpasses the superior of the two traditional VPAs by one to two orders of magnitude. It is evident that the improved Boris algorithm constitutes a more dependable option for addressing low-frequency problems.

Figure 11 shows the cases of relatively large ω with $\omega \in [\omega_{c0}, 10\omega_{c0}]$. The accuracy of the three algorithms exhibits similar behavior: all demonstrate unstable regions near $\omega \sim 2\omega_{c0}$ and $\omega \sim 4\omega_{c0}$, with minimal variation elsewhere. Within the stable regime, the improved Boris algorithm maintains the highest accuracy, followed by G_h^2 , and then the Boris algorithm, with each adjacent



(a) global relative errors of position at low characteristic frequencies

(b) global relative errors of velocity magnitude at low characteristic frequencies

Figure 10: Global relative errors of \vec{r} and v as functions of the frequency of the electric field by all algorithms, low-frequency cases.



characteristic frequencies

(a) global relative errors of position at high (b) global relative errors of velocity magnitude at high characteristic frequencies

Figure 11: Global relative errors of \vec{r} and v as functions of the frequency of the electric field by all algorithms, high-frequency cases. The two unstable regions depicted in this figure correspond to the particle's cyclotron frequency ω_c and $2\omega_c$, respectively.

pair differing by approximately one order of magnitude. In contrast, within the unstable region, the accuracy of the improved Boris algorithm deteriorates to a level comparable to that of the Boris algorithm.

For the Tokamak magnetic field considered in this paper, the cyclotron frequency on the magnetic axis is $2\omega_{c0}$. And the The initial conditions provided represent a deeply trapped particle very close to the magnetic axis, implying that its cyclotron frequency ω_c remains around $2\omega_{c0}$ throughout its motion. Consequently, it can be inferred that the unstable regions depicted in the figure are located in the vicinity of ω_c and $2\omega_c$.

In the case of $\omega \sim \omega_c$, the resonance heating effect, driven by the similarity between the electric field frequency and the cyclotron frequency, causes a substantial surge in kinetic energy and destabilizes the trajectory. Even with a relatively modest electric field strength utilized in this section, the particle velocity increases by approximately 20 times after one banana period T_0 . Even G_h^2 , the most accurate algorithm in this case, displays significant velocity errors exceeding 10%, indicating the ineffectiveness of VPAs and the improved Boris algorithm. Under such circumstances, even within a single time step, it is no longer tenable to treat the electric field as a constant, as we have done in the calculation process of the Boris algorithm and G_h^2 . The coupling between the electric field frequency and the cyclotron frequency needs to be incorporated into the single-step time advancement, which will be part of our future work. The case of $\omega \sim 2\omega_c$ represents a similar, less pronounced instability.

In general, for problems at various characteristic frequencies, as long as the traditional VPAs (especially the conventional Boris algorithm) remain valid, the improved Boris algorithm will invariably possess superior accuracy and efficiency.

4 Conclusions

This paper constructs an improved Boris algorithm that integrates the advantages of the two representative second-order volume-preserving algorithms (VPAs): the well-known conventional Boris algorithm, which is optimal for low-frequency guiding center dynamics, and G_h^2 , which is optimal for high-frequency cyclotron dynamics. The improved algorithm is also designed to be parallelizable. Through test particle simulations in a typical Tokamak magnetic field, the performance of the improved Boris algorithm is compared in detail with that of traditional VPAs. It overcomes the limitation of the second-order VPAs that can only accurately reflect either low-frequency or high-frequency motion, and demonstrates superior accuracy and efficiency across a large range of characteristic frequencies: It holds an absolute advantage in the low-frequency scenario; as for the high-frequency cases, although unfavorable results are produced near ω_c and $2\omega_c$ influenced by the failure of traditional VPAs, it maintains stability and efficacy across the remainder of the frequency range. It is anticipated that the adoption of this algorithm in large-scale, long-duration simulations will significantly enhance computational efficiency.

Still, the limitations near the cyclotron frequency of the improved Boris algorithm, and indeed the traditional volume-preserving algorithms, continue to restrict their utility in handling problems like full orbit simulations of ion cyclotron resonance heating(ICRH). A potential solution is to couple the electric and magnetic fields during the single-step time advancement, instead of treating them as separate variables. This will be part of our future work.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12205339.

References

- Jay P. Boris and Ramy A. Shanny. "Proceedings, Fourth Conference on the Numerical Simulation of Plasmas : November 2, 3, 1970, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C." In: 1971. URL: https://api. semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:107199562.
- [2] R.W. Hockney and J.W. Eastwood. Computer Simulation Using Particles. 1st ed. CRC Press, 1988. URL: https://doi.org/10.1201/ 9780367806934.
- C.K. Birdsall and A.B Langdon. Plasma Physics via Computer Simulation. 1st ed. CRC Press, 1991. URL: https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315275048.
- [4] Hong Qin et al. "Why is Boris algorithm so good?" In: *Physics of Plasmas* 20.8 (Aug. 2013), p. 084503. ISSN: 1070-664X. DOI: 10.1063/1.4818428. eprint: https://pubs.aip.org/aip/pop/article-pdf/doi/10.1063/1.4818428/16059300/084503_1_online.pdf. URL: https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4818428.
- [5] S.E Parker and C.K Birdsall. "Numerical error in electron orbits with large $\omega_{ce}\Delta t$ ". In: Journal of Computational Physics 97.1 (1991), pp. 91– 102. ISSN: 0021-9991. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9991(91) 90040-R. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/002199919190040R.
- P. H. Stoltz et al. "Efficiency of a Boris-like integration scheme with spatial stepping". In: *Phys. Rev. ST Accel. Beams* 5 (9 Sept. 2002), p. 094001. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevSTAB.5.094001. URL: https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevSTAB.5.094001.
- [7] G Penn et al. "Boris push with spatial stepping". In: Journal of Physics G: Nuclear and Particle Physics 29.8 (July 2003), p. 1719. DOI: 10.1088/0954-3899/29/8/337. URL: https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/29/8/337.

- [8] Ruili Zhang et al. "Application of Lie Algebra in Constructing Volume-Preserving Algorithms for Charged Particles Dynamics". In: Communications in Computational Physics 19.5 (2016), pp. 1397–1408. DOI: 10. 4208/cicp.scpde14.33s.
- Jian Wang et al. Phase Stability Analysis of Volume-preserving Algorithms for Accurate Single Particle Orbit Simulations in Tokamak Plasmas. 2025. arXiv: 2503.18482 [physics.plasm-ph]. URL: https://arxiv.org/ abs/2503.18482.
- [10] Yang He et al. "Volume-preserving algorithms for charged particle dynamics". In: Journal of Computational Physics 281 (2015), pp. 135-147. ISSN: 0021-9991. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2014.10. 032. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/ S0021999114007141.
- [11] Yang He et al. "Higher order volume-preserving schemes for charged particle dynamics". In: Journal of Computational Physics 305 (2016), pp. 172–184. ISSN: 0021-9991. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2015.10.032. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021999115007081.
- [12] Yang He et al. "High order volume-preserving algorithms for relativistic charged particles in general electromag- netic fields". In: *Physics of Plasmas (1994-present)* 23 (Aug. 2016). DOI: 10.1063/1.4962677.
- [13] Yulei Wang, Hong Qin, and Jian Liu. "Multi-scale full-orbit analysis on phase-space behavior of runaway electrons in tokamak fields with synchrotron radiation". In: *Physics of Plasmas* 23.6 (June 2016), p. 062505. ISSN: 1070-664X. DOI: 10.1063/1.4953608. eprint: https://pubs.aip.org/aip/pop/article-pdf/doi/10.1063/1.4953608/15907421/062505_1_online.pdf. URL: https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4953608.
- T. Görler et al. "Intercode comparison of gyrokinetic global electromagnetic modes". In: *Physics of Plasmas* 23.7 (July 2016), p. 072503. ISSN: 1070-664X. DOI: 10.1063/1.4954915. eprint: https://pubs.aip.org/aip/pop/article-pdf/doi/10.1063/1.4954915/14129468/072503_1_online.pdf. URL: https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4954915.
- [15] Christian Knapp et al. "Splitting methods for time integration of trajectories in combined electric and magnetic fields". In: *Phys. Rev. E* 92 (6 Dec. 2015), p. 063310. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevE.92.063310. URL: https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.92.063310.
- [16] Ernst Hairer, Christian Lubich, and Bin Wang. "A filtered Boris algorithm for charged-particle dynamics in a strong magnetic field". In: *Numerische Mathematik* 144.4 (Apr. 2020), pp. 787–809. ISSN: 0945-3245. DOI: 10. 1007/s00211-020-01105-3. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-020-01105-3.

- [17] Ernst Hairer and Christian Lubich. "Long-term analysis of a variational integrator for charged-particle dynamics in a strong magnetic field". In: *Numerische Mathematik* 144.3 (Mar. 2020), pp. 699–728. ISSN: 0945-3245. DOI: 10.1007/s00211-019-01093-z. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/ s00211-019-01093-z.
- [18] Ernst Hairer, Christian Lubich, and Yanyan Shi. "Large-stepsize integrators for charged-particle dynamics over multiple time scales". In: Numerische Mathematik 151.3 (July 2022), pp. 659–691. ISSN: 0945-3245. DOI: 10.1007/s00211-022-01298-9. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-022-01298-9.
- Jianyuan Xiao and Hong Qin. "Slow manifolds of classical Pauli particle enable structure-preserving geometric algorithms for guiding center dynamics". In: *Computer Physics Communications* 265 (2021), p. 107981. ISSN: 0010-4655. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2021.107981. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/ S001046552100093X.
- [20] Viktor K. Decyk, Warren B. Mori, and Fei Li. "An analytic Boris pusher for plasma simulation". In: Computer Physics Communications 282 (2023), p. 108559. ISSN: 0010-4655. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc. 2022.108559. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/ pii/S0010465522002788.