

# STOCHASTIC AND DETERMINISTIC MOLECULAR DYNAMICS DERIVED FROM THE TIME-INDEPENDENT SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION

ANDERS SZEPESSY

ABSTRACT. Born-Oppenheimer, Smoluchowski, Langevin, Ehrenfest and surface-hopping dynamics are shown to be accurate approximations of time-independent Schrödinger observables for a molecular system avoiding caustics, in the limit of large ratio of nuclei and electron masses, without assuming that the nuclei are localized to vanishing domains. The derivation, based on characteristics for the Schrödinger equation, bypasses the usual separation of nuclei and electron wave functions and gives a different perspective on initial and boundary conditions, the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, computation of observables, stochastic electron equilibrium states and numerical simulation in molecular dynamics modeling.

## CONTENTS

1. The Schrödinger and molecular dynamics models	2
2. Ehrenfest dynamics derived from the time-independent Schrödinger equation	5
2.1. Exact Schrödinger dynamics	5
2.2. Approximate Ehrenfest dynamics and densities	9
2.3. Comparison of two alternative Ehrenfest formulations	10
2.4. Equations for the density	12
2.5. Construction of the solution operator	14
3. The time-dependent Schrödinger equation	16
4. Surface-hopping and multiple states	16
4.1. Surface-hopping and Ehrenfest dynamics for multiple states	17
5. Computation of observables	17
6. Approximation error derived from a Hamilton-Jacobi equation	19
6.1. The Ehrenfest approximation error	19
6.2. The Born-Oppenheimer approximation	22
6.3. Stochastic Langevin and Smoluchowski molecular dynamics approximation	24
7. Construction of the solution operator	29
7.1. Spectral decomposition	30
7.2. Derivatives of the wave function	31

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 81Q20; Secondary: 82C10.

*Key words and phrases*. Ehrenfest dynamics, quantum classical molecular dynamics, surface-hopping, foundations of quantum mechanics, WKB expansion, Born-Oppenheimer approximation, Langevin equation, Smoluchowski equation, Schrödinger equation, shock wave.

7.3. Discrete spectrum	33
7.4. The Born-Oppenheimer approximation	35
References	35

## 1. THE SCHRÖDINGER AND MOLECULAR DYNAMICS MODELS

The *time-independent Schrödinger* equation

$$(1.1) \quad H(x, X)\Phi(x, X) = E\Phi(x, X),$$

models nuclei-electron systems and is obtained from minimization of the energy in the solution space of wave functions, cf. [41, 40, 3, 43, 9]. It is an eigenvalue problem for the energy  $E \in \mathbb{R}$  of the system in the solution space, described by wave functions,  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^{3J} \times \mathbb{R}^{3N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , depending on electron coordinates  $x = (x^1, \dots, x^J) \in \mathbb{R}^{3J}$ , nuclei coordinates  $X = (X^1, \dots, X^N) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ , and a Hamiltonian operator  $H(x, X)$

$$H(x, X) = V(x, X) - \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{n=1}^N \Delta_{X^n}.$$

The nuclei masses  $M$  are assumed to be large and the interaction potential  $V$ , independent of  $M$ , is in the canonical setting (neglecting relativistic and magnetic effects),

$$(1.2) \quad V(x, X) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \Delta_{x^j} + \sum_{1 \leq k < j \leq J} \frac{1}{|x^k - x^j|} \\ - \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{Z_n}{|x^j - X^n|} + \sum_{1 \leq n < m \leq N} \frac{Z_n Z_m}{|X^n - X^m|},$$

composed of the kinetic energy of the electrons, the electron-electron repulsion, the electron-nuclei attraction, and the repulsion of nuclei (with charge  $Z_n$ ), in the Hartree atomic units where the electron mass, electron charge, reduced Planck constant, and the Coulomb force constant  $(4\pi\epsilon_0)^{-1}$  all are one. The mass of the nuclei, which are much greater than one (electron mass), are the diagonal elements in the diagonal matrix  $M$ .

An essential feature of the partial differential equation (1.1) is the high computational complexity to determine the solution, in an antisymmetric/symmetric subset of the Sobolev space  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^{3(J+N)})$ . Wave functions depend also on discrete spin states

$$(1.3) \quad \Phi(x^1, \sigma_1, \dots, x^J, \sigma_J, X_1, \Sigma_1, \dots, X_N, \Sigma_N),$$

which effect the solutions space: each electron spin  $\sigma_j$  can take two different values and each nucleus can be in a finite set of spin states  $\Sigma_n$ ; the *Pauli exclusion principle* restricts the solutions space to wave functions satisfying the antisymmetry/symmetry

$$\Phi(\dots, x^j, \sigma_j, \dots, x^k, \sigma_k, \dots) = -\Phi(\dots, x^k, \sigma_k, \dots, x^j, \sigma_j, \dots) \text{ for any } 1 \leq j, k \leq J$$

and for any pair of nuclei  $n$  and  $m$ , with  $A$  nucleons and the same number of protons and neutrons,

$$\Phi(\dots, X^m, \Sigma_m, \dots, X^n, \sigma_n, \dots) = (-1)^A \Phi(\dots, X^n, \Sigma_n, \dots, X^m, \Sigma_m, \dots)$$

cf. [9]. We simplify the notation by writing  $\Phi(x, X)$  instead of the more complete (1.3), since the Hamiltonian  $H$  does not depend on the spin of each particle. The time-independent Schrödinger equation has convincing agreement with experimental results, as the basis for computational chemistry and solid state physics. An attractive property of the Schrödinger equation (1.1) is the precise definition of the Hamiltonian and the solutions space, without unknown parameters. The agreement with measurements can be further improved by including relativistic and magnetic effects, cf. [9].

In contrast to the Schrödinger equation, a *molecular dynamics* model of nuclei  $X : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ , with a given potential  $V_0 : \mathbb{R}^{3N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , can be computationally studied also for large  $N$  by solving the ordinary differential equation

$$(1.4) \quad M\ddot{X}_\tau = -\partial_X V_0(X_\tau).$$

This computational and conceptual simplification motivates the study to determine the potential and its implied accuracy by a derivation of molecular dynamics from the Schrödinger equation, as started already in the 1920's with the seminal Born-Oppenheimer approximation [6]. The purpose here is to contribute to the current understanding of such derivations, by showing improved convergence rates under new assumptions.

A useful sub step to derive molecular dynamics from the Schrödinger equation is *Ehrenfest dynamics*, for classical *ab initio* motion of the nuclei coupled to Schrödinger dynamics for the electrons,

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{aligned} M\ddot{X}_\tau^n &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3J}} \phi_\tau^*(\cdot, X_\tau) \partial_{X^n} V(\cdot, X_\tau) \phi_\tau(\cdot, X_\tau) dx \\ i\dot{\phi}_\tau &= V(\cdot, X_\tau)\phi_\tau, \end{aligned}$$

with the initial normalization  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3J}} \phi_0^*(\cdot, X_0)\phi_0(\cdot, X_0)dx = 1$ . The Ehrenfest dynamics (1.5) has been derived from the time-dependent Schrödinger equation through the self consistent field equations, see [7, 34, 44]. Equation (1.5) can be used for *ab initio* computation of molecular dynamics, cf. [34, 31]. A next step is the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, where  $X_\tau$  solves the classical *ab initio* molecular dynamics (1.4) with the potential  $V_0 : \mathbb{R}^{3N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  determined as an eigenvalue of the electron Hamiltonian  $V(\cdot, X)$  for a given nuclei position  $X$ , that is  $V(\cdot, X)\psi_0(X) = V_0(X)\psi_0(X)$ , for instance with the electron ground state  $\psi_0(X)$ . The Born-Oppenheimer approximation has been derived from the time-dependent Schrödinger equation in [24, 37].

The model (1.4) simulates dynamics at constant energy  $M|\dot{X}|^2/2 + V_0(X)$ , constant number of particles  $N$  and constant volume, i.e. the microcanonical ensemble. The alternative to simulate with constant number of particles, constant volume and constant temperature  $T$ ,

i.e. the canonical ensemble, is possible for instance with the stochastic *Langevin dynamics*

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{aligned} dX_\tau &= v_\tau d\tau \\ Mdv_\tau &= -\partial_X V_0(X_t)d\tau - Kv_t d\tau + (2TK)^{1/2}dW_\tau, \end{aligned}$$

where  $W_\tau$  is the standard Brownian process (at time  $\tau$ ) in  $\mathbb{R}^{3N}$  with independent components and  $K$  is a positive friction parameter. When the observable only depends on the nuclei positions, i.e. not on the nuclei velocities or the correlation of positions at different times, the *Smoluchowski dynamics*

$$(1.7) \quad dX_\tau = -\partial_X V_0(X_\tau) + (2T)^{1/2}dW_\tau$$

is a simplified alternative to Langevin dynamics, cf. [8].

This paper derives the Ehrenfest dynamics (1.5) and the Born-Oppenheimer approximation from the time-independent Schrödinger equation (1.1) and the main point here is to establish improved convergence rates for molecular dynamics approximations of Schrödinger observables under simple assumptions excluding so called *caustic* points, where the Jacobian determinant  $\det \partial X_t / \partial X_0$  of the Eulerian-Lagrangian transformation of  $X$ -paths vanish.

The main idea in this paper, inspired by [36, 4, 5], is to introduce the time-dependence from the classical characteristics in the Hamilton-Jacobi equation obtained by writing the time-independent eigenfunction (1.1) in WKB-form. The work [36, 4, 5] derives the time-dependent Schrödinger dynamics of an  $x$ -system,  $i\dot{\Psi} = H_1\Psi$ , from the time-independent Schrödinger equation (with the Hamiltonian  $H_1(x) + \delta H(x, X)$ ) by a classical limit for the environment variable  $X$ , as the coupling parameter  $\delta$  vanishes and the mass  $M$  tends to infinity; in particular [36, 4, 5] show that the time derivative enters through the coupling of  $\Psi$  with the classical velocity.

Here we refine the use of characteristics to study classical *ab initio* molecular dynamics, where the coupling does not vanish, and we establish error estimates for Born-Oppenheimer, Ehrenfest, surface-hopping and stochastic approximations of Schrödinger observables in the case of no caustics present. The small scale, introduced by the perturbation  $-(2M)^{-1} \sum_n \Delta_{X_n}$  of the potential  $V$ , is identified in a standard WKB eikonal equation, while its transport equation is analyzed as a time-dependent Schrödinger equation along characteristics, instead of as a usual series expansion [26, 25]. The analysis based on the characteristics for the time-independent Schrödinger equation, bypasses the usual separation of nuclei and electron wave functions in the time-dependent self consistent field equations [7, 34, 44]. The characteristic particle paths that may or may not return to the inflow domain, gives a different perspective on initial and boundary conditions, the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, and computation of observables. Section 3 shows that the Ehrenfest and surface-hopping dynamics are the same when derived from the time-independent and time-dependent Schrödinger equations.

Theorems 6.1 and 6.3 present conditions for approximation of observables based on the Schrödinger equation by observables from the Ehrenfest dynamics and the Born-Oppenheimer dynamics with error  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$  respectively  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ , using that these approximate solutions generate approximate eigenstates to the Schrödinger equation in the case of no caustics; studying this stability of the Schrödinger eigenvalue problem instead of perturbations of

solution paths avoids the complications of accumulation of error on infinite time intervals. The derivation does not assume that the nuclei are supported on small domains; in contrast, derivations based on the time-dependent self consistent field equations require nuclei to be supported on small domains. The reason that small support is not needed here comes from the combination of the characteristics and sampling from an equilibrium density, that is, for large  $M$  the nuclei paths behave classically although they may not be supported on small domains. A large nuclei system,  $N \gg M$ , is used in Remark 6.2 to motivate an assumption on perturbations of the solutions to the Schrödinger equation (1.1). The derived approximations improve the previous  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$  rate for the Ehrenfest approximation [7] and the  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/4})$  rate for the zero order Born-Oppeneheimer approximation [24]. Remark 6.4 relates the approximation results to the accuracy of symplectic numerical methods for molecular dynamics.

Section 6.3 applies the Ehrenfest approximation result to derive the Langevin and Smoluchowski dynamics from the Ehrenfest dynamics, when the electron state is randomly perturbed from its ground state and the observable depends only on the nuclei positions but not their correlation at different time. The derivation uses a classical equilibrium Gibbs-Boltzmann distribution for the electron states and an assumption of a spectral gap, showing in Theorem 6.7 that observables of Langevin and Smoluchowski dynamics accurately approximate such Schrödinger observables. The main idea in the theorem is the non-standard view of a classical Gibbs-Boltzmann equilibrium distribution of electrons states, motivated by nuclei acting as heat bath for the electrons in the Ehrenfest Hamiltonian system.

It is my hope that the ideas in this paper stimulates more research on the conditions for molecular dynamics approximation. In particular it would be desirable to

- include caustics (crossing characteristics) in the analysis, and
- have more explicit conditions for the  $L^2(dx dX)$ -bound on the  $X$ -Laplacian of the Ehrenfest electron wave function in (6.4), which is related to the stability of the Schrödinger eigenvalue problem and used in the approximation results as motivated in Remark 6.2.

## 2. EHRENFEST DYNAMICS DERIVED FROM THE TIME-INDEPENDENT SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION

**2.1. Exact Schrödinger dynamics.** Assume for simplicity that all nuclei have the same mass.<sup>1</sup> The singular perturbation  $-(2M)^{-1} \sum_n \Delta_{X_n}$  of the potential  $V$  introduces an additional small scale  $M^{-1/2}$  of high frequency oscillations, as shown by a WKB-expansion, see [38, 26, 25, 11]. We will construct solutions to (1.1) in such WKB-form

$$(2.1) \quad \Phi(x, X) = \psi(x, X) e^{iM^{1/2}\theta(X)},$$

---

<sup>1</sup>If this is not the case, change to new coordinates  $M_1^{1/2} \tilde{X}^k = M_k^{1/2} X^k$ , which transform the Hamiltonian to the form we want  $V(x, M_1^{1/2} M^{-1/2} \tilde{X}) - \frac{1}{2M_1} \sum_{n=1}^N \Delta_{\tilde{X}^n}$ .

where the wave function  $\psi$  is complex valued, the phase  $\theta$  is real valued and the factor  $M^{1/2}$  is introduced to have well defined limits of  $\psi$  and  $\theta$  as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ . The standard WKB-construction [25] is based on a series expansion in powers of  $M^{1/2}$ , we introduce instead a time-dependent Schrödinger transport equation, tailored to handle the two scales of the electron dynamics and the nuclei dynamics. In the next section we use a linear combination of such eigensolutions. The Schrödinger equation (1.1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.2) \quad 0 &= (H - E)\psi e^{iM^{1/2}\theta(X)} \\
&= \left( \left( \frac{|\partial_X \theta|^2}{2} + V - E \right) \psi \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2M} \sum_j \Delta_{X^j} \psi - \frac{i}{M^{1/2}} \sum_j (\partial_{X^j} \psi \partial_{X^j} \theta + \frac{1}{2} \psi \partial_{X^j X^j} \theta) \right) e^{iM^{1/2}\theta(X)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Introduce the complex-valued scalar product

$$v \cdot w := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3J}} v(x, \cdot)^* w(x, \cdot) dx \equiv \langle v | w \rangle$$

on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3J})$  and the notation  $X \circ Y$  for the standard scalar product on  $\mathbb{R}^{3N}$ . To find an equation for  $\theta$ , multiply (2.2) by  $\psi^*$  and integrate over  $\mathbb{R}^{3J}$ ; similarly take the complex conjugate of (2.2), multiply by  $\psi$  and integrate over  $\mathbb{R}^{3J}$ ; and finally add the two expressions to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.3) \quad 0 &= 2 \left( \frac{|\partial_X \theta|^2}{2} - E \right) \psi \cdot \psi + \underbrace{\psi \cdot V \psi + V \psi \cdot \psi}_{=2\psi \cdot V \psi} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2M} \left( \psi \cdot \left( \sum_j \Delta_{X^j} \psi \right) + \left( \sum_j \Delta_{X^j} \psi \right) \cdot \psi \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{i}{M^{1/2}} \left( \underbrace{\psi \cdot (\partial_X \psi \circ \partial_X \theta) - (\partial_X \psi \circ \partial_X \theta) \cdot \psi}_{=2i\Im(\psi \cdot (\partial_X \psi \circ \partial_X \theta))} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{i}{2M^{1/2}} \left( \underbrace{(\psi \cdot \psi - \psi \cdot \psi)}_{=0} \sum_j \partial_{X^j X^j} \theta \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The purpose of the phase function  $\theta$  is to generate an accurate approximation in the limit as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ : therefore we define  $\theta$  by the formal limit of (2.3) as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , which is the *Hamilton-Jacobi equation* (also called the *eikonal equation*)

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{|\partial_X \theta|^2}{2} = E - V_n,$$

where the function  $V_n : \mathbb{R}^{3N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is

$$V_n := \frac{\psi \cdot V \psi}{\psi \cdot \psi}.$$

Define also the *density* function  $\rho := \psi \cdot \psi$ . For the energy  $E$  chosen larger than the potential energy, that is such that  $E \geq V_n$ , the method of *characteristics*, cf. [16],

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{dX_t}{dt} &= \partial_X \theta(X_t) =: p_t, \\ \frac{dp_t}{dt} &= -\partial_X V_n(X_t), \\ \frac{dz_t}{dt} &= |p_t|^2 = 2(E - V_n(X_t)), \end{aligned}$$

yields a solution  $(X, p, z) : [0, T] \rightarrow U \times \mathbb{R}^{3N} \times \mathbb{R}$  to the eikonal equation (2.4) locally in a neighborhood  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ , for regular compatible data  $(X_0, p_0, z_0)$  given on a  $3N - 1$  dimensional "inflow"-domain  $I \subset \bar{U}$ ; here  $z_t := \theta(X_t)$ . Typically the domain  $I$  and the data  $\theta|_I$  are not given, unless it is really an inflow domain and characteristic paths do not return to  $I$ . If paths leaving from  $I$  return to  $I$ , there is an additional compatibility of data on  $I$ : we have  $z_0 = \int_0^t |p^s|^2 ds + z_t$ , where  $X_0 \in I$  and  $X_t \in I$ , so that  $z_t = \theta(X_t)$  and  $p_t = \partial_X \theta(X_t)$  are determined from  $z_0 = \theta(X_0)$  and  $p_0 = \partial_X \theta(X_0)$ , and continuing the path to subsequent hitting points  $X_{t_j} \in I$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots$  determines  $(\theta(X_{t_j}), \partial_X \theta(X_{t_j}))$  from  $(\theta(X_0), \partial_X \theta(X_0))$ . Our derivation of approximation error will use such a WKB Ansatz for the approximate Ehrenfest solution and the Born-Oppenheimer solution, but not for the exact Schrödinger solution  $\Phi$ ; the characteristics for the exact solution are therefore presented only for motivation and illustration purpose. As we shall see, the Ehrenfest and Born-Oppenheimer approximations have related (simpler) equations for its characteristics.

The work [25] proves the existence of a  $C^\infty$  solution  $\theta$  to the eikonal equation (2.4) in a neighborhood of a global minimum point of a given  $C^\infty$  non negative potential  $E - V_n : \mathbb{R}^{3N} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ ; this handles one type of caustic (i.e. crossing characteristics) where  $\partial_X \theta$  vanishes. The phase function  $\theta : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  becomes globally defined in  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{3N}$  when there is a unique characteristic path  $X_t$  going through each point in  $U$ . A globally defined wave function  $\Phi$  can be constructed from a linear combination of WKB functions also when caustics are present, using the manifold of phase-space solutions  $(X, p)$  and Fourier integral operators to relate  $X$  and  $p$  dependence, see [35] and [12]. We assume in this work that possible crossing of characteristics cause no problem, in the sense that either the characteristics do not cross or if they cross the global coupling in the Schrödinger equation (1.1) provides constraints to avoid multi valued solutions. A simple case without caustics is when the potential is such that  $\min_{X \in \mathbb{R}} (E - V_n(X)) > 0$ , in one dimension. Section 4.1 presents approximations with a linear combination of WKB functions related to so called surface hopping.

Definition (2.4) implies that  $\psi$  solves the so called *transport equation*

$$(2.6) \quad -\frac{1}{2M} \sum_j \Delta_{X^j} \psi + (V - V_n) \psi = \frac{i}{M^{1/2}} \sum_j (\partial_{X^j} \psi \partial_{X^j} \theta + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{X^j X^j} \theta \psi).$$

Time enters into the Schrödinger equation through the characteristics and the chain rule

$$\partial_X \psi \circ \partial_X \theta = \partial_X \psi \circ \frac{dX_t}{dt} = \frac{d\psi(x, X_t)}{dt},$$

cf. [36, 4, 5]. The second term in the right hand side of (2.6) can be handled by an integrating factor

$$G_t := e^{\tilde{G}_t},$$

defined along the characteristics from

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{d\tilde{G}_t}{dt} := \frac{1}{2} \sum_j \partial_{X^j X^j} \theta(X_t).$$

The integrating factor  $G_t = G(X_t)$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j \left( \partial_{X^j} \psi \partial_{X^j} \theta + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{X^j X^j} \theta \psi \right) &= \frac{d\psi}{dt} + \frac{\psi}{G_t} \frac{dG_t}{dt} \\ &= \frac{1}{G_t} \frac{d(G_t \psi)}{dt}. \end{aligned}$$

In this step our derivation differs from [36, 4, 5], which approximates the last term in (2.6),

$$\sum_j \partial_{X^j X^j} \theta \psi,$$

by zero in their case of vanishing coupling between the quantum system and the environment; here the coupling between the nuclei and electrons does not vanish. The right hand side in (2.6) becomes the time derivative  $iM^{-1/2}G^{-1} d(G\psi)/dt$  and we have derived the *time-dependent Schrödinger* equation, for the variable  $\tilde{\psi} := G\psi$ ,

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= (H - E)\Phi \\ &= \left( \left( -\frac{i}{M^{1/2}} \dot{\tilde{\psi}} + (V - V_n)\tilde{\psi} - \frac{1}{2M} \sum_j G \Delta_{X^j} (\tilde{\psi} G^{-1}) \right) G^{-1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \underbrace{\left( \frac{|\partial_X \theta|^2}{2} + V_n - E \right)}_{=0} \psi \right) e^{iM^{1/2}\theta(X)}. \end{aligned}$$

The density can be written

$$\rho = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3J}} |\psi|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3J}} |\tilde{\psi}|^2 dx / G^2$$

and therefore the second equation in (2.5) yields the nuclei dynamics

$$\ddot{X} = -\partial_X \frac{\tilde{\psi} \cdot V \tilde{\psi}}{\tilde{\psi} \cdot \tilde{\psi}}.$$

The weight function  $G_t^2$  equals the determinant of the first variation  $\partial X_t/\partial X_0$  modulo a constant:  $G_t^2/G_0^2 = \det(\partial X_t/\partial X_0)$ , using Liouville's formula or the Lagrangian-Eulerian view on the conservation of "mass" (2.18), see [35], and in one dimension  $G_t^2/G_0^2 = p_t/p_0$ .

In conclusion, we have derived the exact *Schrödinger dynamics* along the characteristics

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{i}{M^{1/2}} \dot{\tilde{\psi}} &= (V - V_n) \tilde{\psi} - \frac{1}{2M} \sum_j G \Delta_{X^j} (\tilde{\psi}/G), \\ \ddot{X} &= -\partial_X \frac{\tilde{\psi} \cdot V \tilde{\psi}}{\tilde{\psi} \cdot \tilde{\psi}}. \end{aligned}$$

In the case when no electrons are present, we have  $V = V_n$ , and this derivation is presented in [35]. The integrating factor  $G$  and its derivative  $\partial_X G$  can be determined from  $(p, \partial_X p, \partial_{XX} p)$  along the characteristics by the following characteristic equations obtained from  $X$ -differentiation of (2.4)

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \partial_{X^r} p^k &= \left[ \sum_j p^j \partial_{X^j X^r} p^k = \sum_j p^j \partial_{X^r X^k} p^j \right] \\ &= -\sum_j \partial_{X^r} p^j \partial_{X^k} p^j - \partial_{X^r X^k} V_n, \\ \frac{d}{dt} \partial_{X^r X^q} p^k &= \left[ \sum_j p^j \partial_{X^j X^r X^q} p^k = \sum_j p^j \partial_{X^r X^k X^q} p^j \right] \\ &= -\sum_j \partial_{X^r} p^j \partial_{X^k X^q} p^j - \sum_j \partial_{X^r X^q} p^j \partial_{X^k} p^j - \partial_{X^r X^k X^q} V_n, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly  $\partial_{XX} G$  can be determined from  $(p, \partial_X p, \partial_{XX} p, \partial_{XXX} p)$ .

**2.2. Approximate Ehrenfest dynamics and densities.** We define the approximating *Ehrenfest dynamics* by in (2.2) neglecting the kinetic nuclei term

$$(2.11) \quad 0 = \left( \frac{|\partial_X \hat{\theta}|^2}{2} + V - E \right) \check{\psi} - \frac{i}{M^{1/2}} \sum_j (\partial_{X^j} \check{\psi} \partial_{X^j} \hat{\theta} + \frac{1}{2} \check{\psi} \partial_{X^j X^j} \hat{\theta}),$$

and seek, as in (2.4), the approximate phase  $\hat{\theta}$  as the solution to eikonal equation

$$(2.12) \quad \frac{|\partial_X \hat{\theta}|^2}{2} = E - \hat{V}_n,$$

where

$$\hat{V}_n := \frac{\check{\psi} \cdot V \check{\psi}}{\check{\psi} \cdot \check{\psi}}.$$

Introduce its characteristics

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\hat{X}_t}{dt} &= \partial_X \hat{\theta}(X_t) =: \hat{p}_t, \\ \frac{d\hat{p}_t}{dt} &= -\partial_X \hat{V}_n(\hat{X}_t), \\ \frac{d\hat{z}_t}{dt} &= |\hat{p}_t|^2 = 2(E - \hat{V}_n(\hat{X}_t)),\end{aligned}$$

to rewrite (2.11), as in (2.8),

$$(2.13) \quad 0 = -\left(\frac{i}{M^{1/2}}\dot{\hat{\psi}} - (V - \hat{V}_n)\hat{\psi}\right)\hat{G}^{-1} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{|\partial_X \hat{\theta}|^2}{2} + \hat{V}_n - E\right)}_{=0} \check{\psi},$$

$$\ddot{\hat{X}} = -\partial_X \left(\frac{\hat{\psi} \cdot V \hat{\psi}}{\hat{\psi} \cdot \hat{\psi}}\right),$$

for  $\hat{\psi} := \hat{G}\check{\psi}$  approximating  $\check{\psi}$  and

$$(2.14) \quad \hat{G}_t := C e^{\int_0^t 2^{-1} \sum_j \partial_{X_j} \hat{p}_s^j ds}$$

as in (2.7) (where  $C$  is a positive constant for each characteristic). Using that  $\hat{\psi} \cdot \hat{\psi}$  is conserved (i.e. time-independent) in the Ehrenfest dynamics, we can normalize to  $\hat{\psi} \cdot \hat{\psi} = 1$ . Note that in the exact dynamics, the function  $\check{\psi} \cdot \check{\psi}$  is not conserved, due to the  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3J})$  non-Hermitian source term  $\frac{1}{2M} \sum_j G \Delta_{X_j} (\check{\psi}/G)$  in (2.9). We have

$$V_n = \frac{\psi \cdot V \psi}{\psi \cdot \psi} = \frac{\check{\psi} \cdot V \check{\psi}}{\check{\psi} \cdot \check{\psi}}$$

and

$$\hat{V}_n = \frac{\hat{\psi} \cdot V \hat{\psi}}{\hat{\psi} \cdot \hat{\psi}} = \hat{\psi} \cdot V \hat{\psi}.$$

**2.3. Comparison of two alternative Ehrenfest formulations.** The Ehrenfest dynamics (2.13) and (1.5) differ in

- (1) the time scales  $t$  respectively  $M^{1/2}t = \tau$ ;
- (2) the potentials  $V - \hat{V}_n$  and  $V$  in the equations for  $\hat{\psi}$  and  $\hat{\phi}$ , respectively; and
- (3) the forces  $\partial_X(\hat{\psi} \cdot V \hat{\psi})$  respectively  $\hat{\phi} \cdot \partial_X V \hat{\phi}$  in the momentum equation.

If  $\hat{\psi}$  solves (2.13), the change of variables

$$\hat{\phi} = \hat{\psi} e^{-iM^{1/2} \int_0^t \hat{\psi} \cdot V \hat{\psi}(X_s) ds}$$

and the property  $\hat{\psi} \cdot A\hat{\psi} = \hat{\phi} \cdot A\hat{\phi}$ , which holds for observables  $A$  not including the nuclei momentum  $i\partial_X$  (in particular for  $A = V$ ), imply that  $\hat{\phi}$  solves

$$(2.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{i}{M^{1/2}}\dot{\hat{\phi}} &= V\hat{\phi}, \\ \ddot{X} &= -\partial_X \left( \frac{\hat{\phi} \cdot V\hat{\phi}}{\hat{\phi} \cdot \hat{\phi}} \right) = \partial_X(\hat{\phi} \cdot V\hat{\phi}). \end{aligned}$$

There has been a discussion in the literature [7, 44] whether the forces should be computed as above in (2.15) or as in (1.5) by

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{aligned} M\ddot{X}_\tau^n &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3J}} \phi^*(\cdot, X_\tau) \partial_{X^n} V(\cdot, X_\tau) \phi(\cdot, X_\tau) dx \\ i\dot{\phi}_\tau &= V(\cdot, X_\tau)\phi_\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Equation (6.7) shows that both formulations (2.15) and (2.16, 1.5) yield accurate approximations of the Schrödinger observables, although they are not the same. The reason that both approximations are accurate is that the two different characteristic systems solve the same Hamilton-Jacobi equation, as explained below and in Section 6.

The formulation (1.5) and (2.16) has the advantage to be a closed Hamiltonian system: the variable  $(X, \varphi_r; p, \varphi_i)$ , with the definition

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi &:= \varphi_r + i\varphi_i := 2^{1/2}M^{-1/4}\phi = 2^{1/2}M^{-1/4}(\phi_r + i\phi_i), \\ \partial_{\varphi_r}\tilde{\theta} &:= \varphi_i, \end{aligned}$$

and the *Ansatz*  $\tilde{\theta} = \hat{\theta}$  imply that the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (2.12) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} H_E &:= \frac{1}{2}\partial_X\tilde{\theta} \circ \partial_X\tilde{\theta} + \phi_r \cdot V(X)\phi_r + \phi_i \cdot V(X)\phi_i \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\partial_X\tilde{\theta} \circ \partial_X\tilde{\theta} + 2^{-1}M^{1/2}\varphi_r \cdot V(X)\varphi_r + 2^{-1}M^{1/2}\varphi_i \cdot V(X)\varphi_i \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\partial_X\tilde{\theta} \circ \partial_X\tilde{\theta} + 2^{-1}M^{1/2}\varphi_r \cdot V(X)\varphi_r + 2^{-1}M^{1/2}\partial_{\varphi_r}\tilde{\theta} \cdot V(X)\partial_{\varphi_r}\tilde{\theta} \\ &= E, \end{aligned}$$

where the derivative  $\partial_{\varphi_r}\tilde{\theta}(X, \varphi_r) = \varphi_i$ , of the functional  $\tilde{\theta} : \mathbb{R}^{3N} \times L^2(dx) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , is the Gateaux derivative in  $L^2(dx)$ . Its characteristics form the Hamiltonian system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X}_t &= p_t \\ \dot{p}_t &= -\frac{M^{1/2}}{2}\varphi(t) \cdot \partial_X V(X)\varphi(t) \\ \dot{\varphi}_r(t) &= M^{1/2}V(X)\varphi_i(t) \\ \dot{\varphi}_i(t) &= -M^{1/2}V(X)\varphi_r(t), \end{aligned}$$

which is the same as the *Hamiltonian system* (2.16)

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{X}_t &= p_t \\ \dot{p}_t &= -\phi_t \cdot \partial_X V(X_t) \phi_t \\ \frac{i}{M^{1/2}} \dot{\phi}_t &= V(X_t) \phi_t. \end{aligned}$$

The Hamiltonian system yields the equation for the phase

$$\dot{\tilde{\theta}} = \partial_X \tilde{\theta} \circ \dot{X} + \partial_{\varphi_r} \tilde{\theta} \cdot \dot{\varphi}_r = p \circ p + 2\phi_i \cdot V \phi_i = 2(E - \phi_r \cdot V \phi_r),$$

since  $\tilde{\theta} = \tilde{\theta}(X, \varphi_r)$  is a function of both  $X$  and  $\varphi_r$  in this formulation, and we see that  $\tilde{\theta}$  is indeed a function of  $X$ , independent of  $x$ , so that the identification  $\hat{\theta} = \tilde{\theta}$  is possible. The important property of this Hamiltonian dynamics is that  $(X, p, \hat{\psi})$ , with

$$\hat{\psi} = \phi e^{iM^{1/2} \int_0^t \phi \cdot V \phi(s) ds},$$

solves both the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (2.12) and (2.11), written as the time-dependent Schrödinger equation (2.13).

The alternative (2.15) does not form a closed system, in the sense that the required function  $\partial_X \psi(X_t)$  is not explicitly determined along the characteristics, but can be obtained from values of  $\psi$ , in a neighborhood of  $X_t$ , by differentiation.

**2.4. Equations for the density.** We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &= \left( \frac{\rho}{\check{\psi} \cdot \check{\psi}} \right)^{1/2} \check{\psi}, \\ \check{\psi} &= \left( \frac{\hat{\rho}}{\hat{\psi} \cdot \hat{\psi}} \right)^{1/2} \hat{\psi}, \end{aligned}$$

shows that the densities  $\rho = \psi \cdot \psi$  and  $\hat{\rho} := \check{\psi} \cdot \check{\psi}$ , in addition to  $(X, p, \check{\psi})$  and  $(\hat{X}, \hat{p}, \hat{\psi})$ , are needed to determine the wave functions  $\psi$  and  $\check{\psi}$ . Equation (2.11) and the projections in (2.3) subtracted (instead of added) imply that the approximate density  $\hat{\rho}$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3J}} (\partial_{X^j} \check{\psi}^* \check{\psi} + \check{\psi}^* \partial_{X^j} \check{\psi}) dx \partial_{X^j} \hat{\theta} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3J}} \check{\psi}^* \check{\psi} dx \partial_{X^j X^j} \hat{\theta} \\ &= \sum_j \partial_{X^j} (\hat{\rho} \partial_{X^j} \hat{\theta}) \end{aligned}$$

and consequently, the density can be determined along a characteristic using (2.7)

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.18) \quad \dot{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{X}_t) &= \sum_j \partial_{\hat{X}^j} \hat{\rho}(\hat{X}_t) \dot{\hat{X}}^j \\
&= \sum_j \partial_{\hat{X}^j} \hat{\rho}(\hat{X}_t) \partial_{\hat{X}^j} \hat{\theta} \\
&= -\hat{\rho}(\hat{X}_t) \sum_j \partial_{\hat{X}^j} \hat{X}^j \\
&= -\hat{\rho}(\hat{X}_t) \operatorname{div} \hat{p} \\
&= -\hat{\rho}(\hat{X}_t) \frac{d}{dt} \log \hat{G}_t^2
\end{aligned}$$

with the solution

$$(2.19) \quad \hat{\rho}(\hat{X}_t) = \frac{C}{\hat{G}_t^2},$$

where  $C$  is a positive constant for each characteristic.

Similarly, the exact Schrödinger density satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.20) \quad \dot{\rho}(X_t) &= \sum_j \partial_{X^j} \rho(X_t) \dot{X}^j \\
&= -\rho(X_t) \frac{d}{dt} \log G_t^2 + M^{-1/2} \sum_j \Im(\psi \cdot \Delta_{X^j} \psi),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\Im w$  denotes the imaginary part of  $w$ .

Comparing (2.20) and (2.18), the difference  $\rho - \hat{\rho}$  has contributions both from  $G - \hat{G}$  and from the error term  $M^{-1/2} \sum_j \Im(\psi \cdot \Delta_{X^j} \psi)$ . In this section we indicate how the characteristics could be used to understand the difference  $\rho - \hat{\rho}$  leading to  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$  accurate Ehrenfest approximations of Schrödinger observables

$$\int g(X) \underbrace{\rho(X)}_{\Phi \cdot \Phi} dX = \int g(X) \hat{\rho}(X) dX + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}).$$

Section 6 presents a different motivation for this error estimate stated in Theorem 6.7, based on direct approximation of the Schrödinger equation (1.1) avoiding the problem of integrating the characteristics over long time.

*The  $G - \hat{G}$  error.* The difference  $G - \hat{G}$  can be understood from iterative approximations of (2.9)

$$\frac{i}{M^{1/2}} \frac{d}{dt} \hat{\psi}_{n+1} - (V - \hat{V}_n) \hat{\psi}_{n+1} = \frac{1}{2M} G_n \sum_j \Delta_{X^j} (G_n^{-1} \hat{\psi}_n)$$

with  $\hat{\psi}_0 = 0$  and  $G_n$  denoting the integrating factor (2.14), constructed from  $\hat{\psi}_n$  replacing  $\tilde{\psi}$  in the equations (2.9) for  $X$  and  $p$ . Then  $\hat{\psi}_1 = \hat{\psi}$  is the Ehrenfest approximation and formally

we have the iterations approaching the full Schrödinger solution  $\hat{\psi}_n \rightarrow \tilde{\psi}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In the special case of no electrons, there holds  $V = \hat{V}_n$ , so that  $\hat{\psi}_1$  is a real constant (solving  $i\dot{\hat{\psi}}_1 = 0$ ) and  $\hat{\psi}_2 - \hat{\psi}_1$  is imaginary with its absolute value bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ . Consequently this special Ehrenfest density satisfies

$$\hat{\rho} = G^2 = \underbrace{G^2|\psi|^2}_{=\rho} + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}),$$

since  $G_n = G$  and  $X$  do not depend on  $\tilde{\psi}$ , without electrons. In the general case with electrons, one can use the oscillatory property of the solution operator  $\tilde{\psi}_t = S_t \tilde{\psi}_0$ , as in Section 7, to deduce that  $\hat{\psi}$  and  $\tilde{\psi}$  are  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$  close in  $L^2(dx dX)$ , up to bounded time  $t$ .

*The  $M^{-1/2} \sum_j \Im(\psi \cdot \Delta_{X^j} \psi)$  error.* In Section 7.4 we show that there is a solution  $\tilde{\psi}$  which is  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$  close in  $L^2(dx)$  to an electron eigenfunction  $\psi_0$ , satisfying  $V(X, \cdot) \psi_0(X, \cdot) = \lambda_n(X) \psi_0(X, \cdot)$  for an eigenvalue  $\lambda_n(X) \in \mathbb{R}$ , and the derivative  $\Delta_X \tilde{\psi}$  is bounded independent of  $M$ . Then, the error term  $M^{-1/2} \sum_j \Im(\psi \cdot \Delta_{X^j} \psi)$ , with  $\psi = G\tilde{\psi}$ , yields a dominating term which is  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$  large, up to bounded time  $t$ . The state  $\hat{\psi}_1$  equal to a constant, in the case of no electrons, corresponds to the electron eigenfunction  $\psi_0$  in the case with electrons present.

Different characteristic paths  $\hat{X}$  may have different densities when a path does not visit the whole configuration space  $\mathbb{R}^{3N}$ . The density from the Schrödinger equation is therefore important to weight different paths.

**2.5. Construction of the solution operator.** The WKB-forms (2.1) and (2.11) are meaningful when  $\psi$  and  $\tilde{\psi}$  do not include the small scale; in our theorems we will in fact only need this property for the Ehrenfest solution  $\tilde{\psi}$  but it is helpful for the understanding to also consider the function  $\psi$  and we verify in Section 7 that both  $\partial_X \psi$  and  $\partial_X \tilde{\psi}$  are bounded independent of  $M$ , using a spectral representation. In this section we present the set-up. Section 7 also presents conditions so that  $\tilde{\psi}$  is  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$  close to an eigenvector of  $V$  in  $L^2(dx)$ . To replace  $\tilde{\psi}$  by such an electron eigenstate is called the *Born-Oppenheimer approximation*, which has been studied for the time-independent [43, 6] and the time-dependent [24, 37] Schrödinger equations by different methods.

To construct the solution operator it is convenient to include a non interacting particle, i.e. a particle without charge, in the system and assume that this particle moves with constant high speed  $dX_1^1/dt = p_1^1 \gg 1$  (or equivalently with speed one and larger mass); such a non interacting particle does clearly not effect the other particles. The additional new coordinate  $X_1^1$  is helpful in order to simply relate the time-coordinate  $t$  and  $X_1^1$ . To not change the original problem (1.1), add the corresponding kinetic energy  $(p_1^1)^2/2$  to  $E$  and write equation (2.8) in the fast time scale  $\tau = M^{1/2}t$

$$i \frac{d}{d\tau} \tilde{\psi} = (V - V_n) \tilde{\psi} - \frac{1}{2M} G \sum_j \Delta_{X^j} (G^{-1} \tilde{\psi})$$

and change to the coordinates

$$(\tau, X_0) := (\tau, X_2^1, X_3^1, X^2, \dots, X^N) \in [0, \infty) \times I \text{ instead of } (X^1, X^2, \dots, X^N) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N},$$

where  $X^j = (X_1^j, X_2^j, X_3^j) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , to obtain

$$(2.21) \quad \begin{aligned} i\dot{\tilde{\psi}} + \frac{1}{2(p_1^1)^2}\ddot{\tilde{\psi}} &= (V - V_n)\tilde{\psi} - \frac{1}{2M}G \sum_j \Delta_{X_0^j}(G^{-1}\tilde{\psi}) \\ &=: \tilde{V}\tilde{\psi}, \end{aligned}$$

using the notation  $\dot{w} = dw/d\tau$  in this section; note also that  $G$  is independent of  $X_1^1$ . We see that the operator

$$\bar{V} := G^{-1}\tilde{V}G = \underbrace{G^{-1}(V - V_n)G}_{=V-V_n} - \frac{1}{2M} \sum_j \Delta_{X_0^j}$$

is Hermitian on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3J+3N-1})$ . The solution of the eikonal equation (2.4), by the characteristics (2.5), becomes well defined in a domain  $U = [0, M^{1/2}t] \times \mathbb{R}^{3N-1}$ , in the new coordinates. Assume now the data  $(X_0, p_0, z_0)$  for  $X_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{3N-1}$  is  $(L\mathbb{Z})^{3N-1}$ -periodic, then also  $(X_\tau, p_\tau, z_\tau)$  is  $(L\mathbb{Z})^{3N-1}$ -periodic. To simplify the notation for such periodic functions, define the periodic circle

$$\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}/(L\mathbb{Z}).$$

We seek a solution  $\Phi$  of (1.1) which is  $(L\mathbb{Z})^{3(J+N)-1}$ -periodic in the  $(x, X_0)$ -variable. The Schrödinger operator  $\bar{V}_\tau$  has, for each  $\tau$ , real eigenvalues  $\{\lambda_m(\tau)\}$  with a complete set of eigenvectors  $\{p_m(x, X_0)_\tau\}$  orthogonal in the space of  $x$ -anti-symmetric functions in  $L^2(\mathbb{T}^{3J+3N-1})$ , see [3]; its proof uses that the operator  $\bar{V}_\tau + \gamma I$  generates a compact solution operator in the Hilbert space of  $x$ -anti-symmetric functions in  $L^2(\mathbb{T}^{3J+3N-1})$ , for the constant  $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$  chosen sufficiently large. The discrete spectrum and the compactness comes from Fredholm theory for compact operators and that the bilinear form  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)-1}} v \bar{V}_\tau w + \gamma v w \, dx dX_0$  is continuous and coercive on  $H^1(\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)-1})$ , see [16] and Section 7.3. We see that  $\tilde{V}$  has the same eigenvalues  $\{\lambda_m(\tau)\}$  and the eigenvectors  $\{G_\tau p_m(\tau)\}$ , orthogonal in the weighted  $L^2$ -scalar product

$$v \bullet w := \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N-1}} v \cdot w \, G^{-2} dX_0.$$

The construction and analysis of the solution operator continues in Section 7 with the four steps: spectral decomposition, derivatives of the wave function, discrete spectrum and the Born-Oppenheimer approximation.

**Remark 2.1** (Boundary conditions). The eigenvalue problem (1.1) makes sense not only in the periodic setting but also with alternative boundary conditions from interaction with an external environment. The inflow, with data given from the time-independent Schrödinger problem, and the outflow of characteristics gives a different perspective on molecular dynamics simulations and the possible initial data for the time-dependent Schrödinger equation.

### 3. THE TIME-DEPENDENT SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION

The corresponding time-dependent *Ansatz*

$$\psi(x, X, t)e^{iM^{1/2}(\theta(X,t)+Et)}$$

in the time-dependent Schrödinger equation [41]

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{i}{M^{1/2}}\dot{\Phi} = H\Phi$$

leads analogously to the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t\theta + \frac{|\partial_X\theta|^2}{2} &= E - V_n, \\ \partial_t\rho + \sum_j \partial_{X^j}(\rho\partial_{X^j}\theta) &= M^{-1/2}\sum_j \Im(\psi \cdot \Delta_{X^j}\psi), \end{aligned}$$

coupled to the Schrödinger equation along its characteristics  $X_t$

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{i}{M^{1/2}}\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{\psi}(x, X_t, t) &= (V - V_n)\tilde{\psi} - \frac{G}{2M}\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}(\tilde{\psi}G^{-1}), \\ \ddot{X} &= -\frac{\partial_X(\tilde{\psi} \cdot V\tilde{\psi})}{\tilde{\psi} \cdot \tilde{\psi}}, \end{aligned}$$

with the same equation for  $(X, p, \tilde{\psi}, \rho, z, \partial_X p, \partial_{X^j} p)$  as for the characteristics (2.4) and (2.9) in the time-independent formulation. The Ehrenfest dynamics is therefore the same when derived from the time-dependent and time-independent Schrödinger equations and the additional coordinate, introduced by a non interacting particle in the construction of the time-independent solution in Section 2.5, can be interpreted as time. A difference is that the time variable is given from the time-dependent Schrödinger equation and implies classical velocity, instead of the other way around for the time-independent formulation.

### 4. SURFACE-HOPPING AND MULTIPLE STATES

In general the eigenvalue  $E$  is degenerate with high multiplicity related to that several combinations of kinetic nuclei energy and potential energy sum to  $E$

$$-\int_{\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)}} \Phi^*(2M)^{-1}\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}\Phi dx dX + \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)}} \Phi^*V\Phi dx dX = E \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)}} \Phi^*\Phi dx dX,$$

with different excitations of kinetic nuclei energy and Born-Oppenheimer electronic eigenstates. When several such states are excited, it is useful to consider a linear combination of eigenfunctions  $\sum_{n=1}^{\bar{n}} \psi_n e^{iM^{1/2}\theta_n} =: \bar{\Phi}$ , where the individual terms solve (1.1) for the same energy  $E$ . We have

$$(4.1) \quad H\bar{\Phi} = E\bar{\Phi}$$

and the normalization  $\sum_{n=1}^{\bar{n}} \|\psi_n\|_{L^2}^2 = 1$  implies  $\|\bar{\Phi}\|_{L^2} = 1$ . Such a solution  $\bar{\Phi}$  can be interpreted as an exact *surface-hopping* model. The usual surface-hopping models make a somewhat different *Ansatz* with the  $x$ -dependence of  $\psi_n$  prescribed from a given orthonormal basis in  $L(\mathbb{T}^{3J})$  of wave functions of different energy and with explicit time-dependence, see [44, 43]. This section extends the Ehrenfest dynamics to multiple states.

**4.1. Surface-hopping and Ehrenfest dynamics for multiple states.** The characteristic  $(X_n, p_n)$ , the wave function  $\tilde{\psi}_n$ , the density  $\rho_n$  and the phase  $z_n(t) = \theta_n(X_n(t))$  determine the time-independent wave function  $\psi_n$  and the corresponding Ehrenfest approximation

$$(4.2) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\bar{n}} \hat{\psi}_n(r_n \hat{\rho}_n)^{1/2} e^{iM^{1/2} \hat{z}_n} =: \hat{\Phi}$$

yields an approximation to  $\bar{\Phi}$ ; the density of state  $n$  is now a constant multiple,  $r_n \geq 0$ , of the one-state density  $\hat{\rho}_n$  defined in (2.19), normalized to  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)}} \hat{\rho}_n dX = 1$  and  $\sum_{n=1}^{\bar{n}} r_n = 1$ . Note that by definition the Ehrenfest states  $(\hat{X}_n, \hat{\psi}_n, \hat{\rho}_n)$ ,  $n = 1, \dots, \bar{n}$ , satisfying (2.13) and (2.19), are uncoupled, in the case of no caustics points or crossing characteristics; a caustic point  $a$  is where  $1/\hat{\rho}_n(a) = 0$ . In the case of caustics and  $\bar{n}$  colliding characteristics the phases become coupled and it is necessary to have a sum of  $\bar{n}$  WKB terms for  $\hat{\Phi}$  to approximate the eigenfunction  $\bar{\Phi}$ , in (4.1), away from caustic points, see [35]. Consequently in the presence of caustics, surface-hopping approximation may improve poor approximation by Ehrenfest dynamics.

As an alternative to the usual surface-hopping methods, simulating hopping between characteristics based on empirical hopping-rules, we propose to solve the Ehrenfest characteristics (2.13) for multiple states  $n$  with (4.2) and then include the density weight in determining the outcome, in the usual probability sense of quantum mechanics, see Section 5.

## 5. COMPUTATION OF OBSERVABLES

Assume the goal is to compute an *observable*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} \bar{\Phi} \cdot A \bar{\Phi} dX$$

for a given bounded linear multiplication operator  $A = A(X)$  on  $L^2(\mathbb{T}^{3N})$  and a solution  $\bar{\Phi}$  of (4.1). We have

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} \bar{\Phi} \cdot A \bar{\Phi} dX &= \sum_{n,m} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} A(\psi_n e^{iM^{1/2} \theta_n}) \cdot \psi_m e^{iM^{1/2} \theta_m} dX \\ &= \sum_{n,m} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} A e^{iM^{1/2}(\theta_m - \theta_n)} (\psi_n \cdot \psi_m) dX. \end{aligned}$$

When there are no caustics, we can chose the eigenfunctions  $\{\psi_n e^{iM^{1/2} \theta_n} \mid n = 1, \dots, \bar{n}\}$ , for the eigenvalue  $E$  of (1.1), to be orthogonal in  $L^2(\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)})$ , by the Gram-Schmidt procedure, so that when  $A$  is constant the integrals in the right hand side of (5.1) vanish for  $n \neq m$ . The

integrand is oscillatory on the local scale  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ , for  $M^{1/2} \partial_X(\theta_n - \theta_m) \circ y \sim 1$ , and assume the phase gradient satisfies

$$|\partial_X(\theta_n - \theta_m)| \geq c$$

for some positive constant  $c$  and  $n \neq m$ . Then the integrals over  $\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)}$  of such an oscillatory function  $e^{iM^{1/2}(\theta_m - \theta_n)} \psi_n \cdot \psi_m$  with respect to a differentiable function  $A$  is small of order  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ :

$$\begin{aligned} (5.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} h(X) e^{iM^{1/2}(\theta_m - \theta_n)} dX &= -M^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} h(X) \sum_j \frac{i \partial_{X^j}(\theta_m - \theta_n)}{|\partial_X(\theta_m - \theta_n)|^2} \partial_{X^j} e^{iM^{1/2}(\theta_m - \theta_n)} dX \\ &= -M^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} \sum_j \partial_{X^j} \left( h(X) \frac{i \partial_{X^j}(\theta_m - \theta_n)}{|\partial_X(\theta_m - \theta_n)|^2} \right) e^{iM^{1/2}(\theta_m - \theta_n)} dX \\ &= \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently we have

$$(5.3) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} \bar{\Phi} \cdot A \bar{\Phi} dX = \sum_{n=1}^{\bar{n}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} A \psi_n \cdot \psi_n dX + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}),$$

in the case of multiple eigenstates,  $\bar{n} > 1$ , and

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} \bar{\Phi} \cdot A \bar{\Phi} dX = \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} A \psi_1 \cdot \psi_1 dX$$

for a single eigenstate. We will study molecular dynamics approximations of

$$(5.4) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} A \psi_n \cdot \psi_n dX = \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} A(X) \rho_n(X) dX.$$

In the case of caustics, the WKB terms may not be orthogonal and their phases may not be smooth enough to allow the integration by parts (5.2). Consequently, the reduction to a sum of densities  $\rho_n$  may not be possible and therefore Ehrenfest and Born-Oppenheimer molecular dynamics may give inaccurate approximations. An alternative could be to construct approximation of the WKB terms, as in Section 6.1, now including the phase shifts caused by caustics.

To numerically compute the integral (5.4) requires to find an approximation  $\hat{\rho}_n$  of  $\rho_n$ , using the Ehrenfest solution  $(\hat{X}_n, \hat{\psi}_n)$ , and to replace the integrals by quadrature (with a finite number of points  $X$ ). The quadrature approximation is straight forward in theory, although costly in practical computations. Regarding the inflow density  $\hat{\rho}_n|_I$  there are two situations - either the characteristics return often to the inflow domain or not. If they do not return it is reasonable to define the inflow-density  $\hat{\rho}_n|_I$  as an initial condition. If characteristics return, the dynamics can be used to estimate the return-density  $\hat{\rho}_n|_I$  as follows: assume that the

following limits exist

$$(5.5) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T A(\hat{X}_t) dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} A(\hat{X}) \hat{\rho}_n(\hat{X}) d\hat{X}$$

which bypasses the need to find  $\hat{\rho}_n|_I$  and the quadrature in the number of characteristics. A way to think about this limit is to sample the return points  $\hat{X}_t \in I$  and from these samples construct an *empirical* return-density, converging to  $\hat{\rho}_n|_I$  as the number of return iterations tends to infinity. We allow the density  $\hat{\rho}|_I$  to depend on the initial position  $\hat{X}_0$ ; the more restrictive property to have  $\hat{\rho}|_I$  constant as a function of  $\hat{X}_0$  is called *ergodicity*. For the Ehrenfest Hamiltonian dynamics (2.17), the possible densities generated by solutions from (5.5) satisfy the Liouville equation

$$\partial_t \hat{\rho} + p \partial_X \hat{\rho} - \hat{\phi} \cdot \partial_X V \hat{\phi} \partial_p \hat{\rho} - M^{1/2} V \hat{\phi}_i \cdot \partial_{\hat{\phi}_r} \hat{\rho} + M^{1/2} V \hat{\phi}_r \cdot \partial_{\hat{\phi}_i} \hat{\rho} = 0,$$

in the sense  $\hat{\rho} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\rho}_t$ , which can take the form  $\hat{\rho} = f(|p|^2/2 + \hat{\phi} \cdot V \hat{\phi})$  for some functions  $f$  as described more in Section 6.3.

## 6. APPROXIMATION ERROR DERIVED FROM A HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATION

A numerical computation of an approximation to  $\sum_n \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} \psi_n \cdot A \psi_n dX$  has the main ingredients:

- (1) to approximate the exact characteristics by Ehrenfest characteristics (2.13),
- (2) to discretize the Ehrenfest characteristics equations, and either
- (3) if  $\rho|_I$  is an inflow-density, to introduce quadrature in the number of characteristics, or
- (4) if  $\rho|_I$  is a return-density, to replace the ensemble average by a time average using the property (5.5).

This section presents a derivation of the approximation error, avoiding the second discretization step studied for instance in [8, 9, 30].

**6.1. The Ehrenfest approximation error.** This section shows that the two alternative Ehrenfest systems, written as a Hamiltonian system (1.5) or the alternative form (2.13), approximate Schrödinger observables. We see that the approximate wave function  $\hat{\Phi}$ , defined by

$$(6.1) \quad \hat{\Phi} = \hat{\rho}^{1/2} \hat{\psi} e^{iM^{1/2}\hat{\theta}},$$

where  $\hat{\psi} = \hat{\phi} e^{iM^{1/2} \int_0^t \hat{\phi} \cdot V \hat{\phi}(s) ds}$  and  $(\hat{X}, \hat{\phi})$  solves the Hamiltonian system (2.16) or the system (2.15), is an approximate solution to the Schrödinger equation (1.1)

$$(6.2) \quad (H - E)\hat{\Phi} = -\frac{1}{2M} e^{iM^{1/2}\hat{\theta}} \sum_j \Delta_{X^j} (\hat{\rho}^{1/2} \hat{\psi}),$$

since by (2.2), (2.9), (2.11) and (2.13)

$$\begin{aligned}
(H - E)\hat{\Phi} &= - \underbrace{(iM^{-1/2}\dot{\hat{\psi}} - (V - \hat{V}_n)\hat{\psi})}_{=0} \hat{\rho}^{1/2} e^{iM^{1/2}\hat{\theta}} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\left(\frac{|\partial_X \hat{\theta}|^2}{2} + \hat{\psi} \cdot V \hat{\psi} - E\right)}_{=0} \hat{\rho}^{1/2} \hat{\psi} e^{iM^{1/2}\hat{\theta}} \\
(6.3) \quad &\quad - \frac{e^{iM^{1/2}\hat{\theta}}}{2M} \sum_j \Delta_{X^j}(\hat{\rho}^{1/2}\hat{\psi}) \\
&= - \frac{1}{2M} e^{iM^{1/2}\hat{\theta}} \underbrace{\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}(\hat{\rho}^{1/2}\hat{\psi})}_{=:v}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $\hat{\Phi}$  approximates a non degenerate eigenstate  $\Phi$ , satisfying  $H\Phi = E\Phi$ , or more generally the span of  $\hat{\Phi}$  approximates the eigenspace spanned by  $\Phi$ . This section presents conditions for accurate approximation error of observables

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} g(X) \underbrace{\rho(X)}_{=\Phi \cdot \Phi} dX - \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} g(X) \underbrace{\hat{\rho}(X)}_{=\hat{\Phi} \cdot \hat{\Phi}} dX.$$

The expansion in the orthonormal eigenpairs  $\{\lambda_n, \Phi_n\}$ , satisfying  $H\Phi_n = \lambda_n \Phi_n$ ,

$$\hat{\Phi} =: \sum_n \alpha_n \Phi_n$$

yields

$$\sum_n (\lambda_n - E) \alpha_n \Phi_n = -\frac{1}{2M} v,$$

which establishes

$$(\lambda_n - E) \alpha_n = -\frac{1}{2M} \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} \Phi_n \cdot v dX}_{=: \hat{v}_n}.$$

Since  $\hat{\Phi}$  exists and solves (6.2), the right hand side satisfies

$$\hat{v}_n = 0, \quad \text{for } n \text{ such that } \lambda_n = E.$$

Use Parsevals relation to rewrite the  $L^2$ -norm of  $v$

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)})}^2 = \sum_n |\hat{v}_n|^2.$$

We have  $\hat{v}_n = 0$ , when  $\lambda_n = E$ , and let

$$|\hat{v}'_n(E)| := \sup_{0 < \delta < 1} \frac{|\hat{v}_n(E + \delta)|}{\delta},$$

which implies

$$\sum_n \frac{|\hat{v}_n(\lambda_n)|^2}{|\lambda_n - E|^2} \leq \sum_{\{n: |\lambda_n - E| < 1\}} |\hat{v}'_n(E)|^2 + \sum_n |\hat{v}_n|^2.$$

Assume that

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_n |\hat{v}_n|^2 &= \mathcal{O}(1), \\ \sum_{\{n: |\lambda_n - E| < 1\}} |\hat{v}'_n(E)|^2 &= \mathcal{O}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 6.2 motivates assumption (6.4), when the number of nuclei is large compared to  $M$ . Assumption (6.4) yields

$$(6.5) \quad 4M^2 \sum_{n: \lambda_n \neq E} |\alpha_n|^2 = \sum_n \frac{|\hat{v}_n|^2}{(\lambda_n - E)^2} = \mathcal{O}(1),$$

and we conclude that there exists an eigenstate  $\tilde{\Phi}$ , satisfying  $H\tilde{\Phi} = E\tilde{\Phi}$ , such that

$$(6.6) \quad \|\hat{\Phi} - \tilde{\Phi}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)})} = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}).$$

Assume that the approximate solution is normalized  $\|\hat{\Phi}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)})} = 1$ ; the estimate (6.6) shows that  $\hat{\Phi}$  is  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$  small in the  $L^2$  orthogonal complement of the eigenspace corresponding to the eigenvalue  $E$  of  $H$  and therefore the  $L^2$  norm of the component of  $\hat{\Phi}$  in this  $E$ -eigenspace is  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$  close to one. Consequently the same estimate (6.6) holds when both the approximate solution and the projection part are normalized  $\|\hat{\Phi}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)})} = \|\tilde{\Phi}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)})} = 1$ .

Let  $\rho := \tilde{\Phi} \cdot \tilde{\Phi}$  and  $\hat{\rho} := \hat{\Phi} \cdot \hat{\Phi}$ . We have

**Theorem 6.1.** *Assume that the bound (6.5) holds, then Ehrenfest dynamics (6.1) avoiding caustics approximates Schrödinger observables with the error bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$ :*

$$(6.7) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} g(\hat{X}) \hat{\rho}(\hat{X}) d\hat{X} = \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} g(X) \rho(X) dX + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}).$$

This derivation assumed that  $v = e^{iM^{1/2}} \sum_j \Delta_{X_j}(\hat{\rho}^{1/2} \hat{\psi})$  is bounded in  $L^2(\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)})$  and used the residual,  $v/(2M)$ , of the Ehrenfest solution  $(\hat{X}, \hat{p}, \hat{\psi})$  inserted into the time-independent Schrödinger equation (1.1) with the solution  $\tilde{\Phi}$ ; the derivation did not use the exact solution paths  $(X, p, \psi)$  obtained from the exact characteristics. The observable may include the time variable, through the position of a non interacting (non-charged) nucleus moving with given velocity, so that transport properties as e.g. the diffusion and viscosity of a liquid may be determined, cf. [21]. A case with no caustics is e.g. when  $\min_X (E - V_n(X)) > 0$  in one dimension  $N = 1$ .

**Remark 6.2.** So far we did not use that the system size is large; to motivate assumption (6.4) we will use that the number of nuclei  $N$  is large compared to  $M$ , so that  $M/N$  is negligible small. We have  $\partial_{\lambda_n} \hat{v}_n = \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} \partial_{\lambda_n} \Phi_n \cdot v dX$  and to estimate the derivative  $\partial_{\lambda_n} \Phi_n$  we make a perturbation  $\delta$  of the total energy  $\lambda_n$  and study its effect on the eigenfunction  $\Phi_n$ . When  $\lambda_n = |p|^2/2 + V_n$  is perturbed by  $\delta$ , we assume that this energy  $\delta$  is spread approximately uniformly to all nuclei as kinetic energy, so that the momentum for each particle changes only  $\mathcal{O}(\delta N^{-1})$ . The assumption that the perturbation energy is spread to kinetic energy uniformly comes with a question, why uniformly and not, for instance, all energy to one particle: we know there are many eigenstates with eigenvalue  $\lambda_n + \delta$  and we pick one special that is close to  $\Phi_n$  by making this almost uniform distribution of kinetic energy. Then the particle paths change negligible and the eigenvector  $\Phi = \psi e^{iM^{1/2}\theta}$  has almost the same path  $(X, p, \psi)$ . The phase, written as

$$\theta = 2 \int_0^t \lambda_n - V_n ds,$$

can also have negligible change by considering the perturbed phase at time  $t'$ , depending on the change from  $\lambda_n$  to  $\lambda_n + \delta$  through

$$\int_0^{t'} \lambda_n + \delta - V_n ds = \int_0^t \lambda_n - V_n ds,$$

so that the phase  $\theta$  does not change. We see that for large  $N$  the derivative  $\partial_{\lambda_n} \Phi_n$  becomes negligible small and hence  $\partial_{\lambda_n} \hat{v}_n = \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} \partial_{\lambda_n} \Phi_n \cdot v dX$  is small. Section 7.2 motivates the  $L^2$ -bound  $\|v\|_{L^2} = \sum_n |\hat{v}_n|^2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ , from derivatives of the electron wave function, using a spectral decomposition in  $L^2(dx dX)$ .

**6.2. The Born-Oppenheimer approximation.** The Born-Oppenheimer approximation leads to the standard formulation of *ab initio* molecular dynamics, in the micro-canonical ensemble with constant number of particles, volume and energy, for the nuclei positions  $\bar{X}$ ,

$$(6.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \ddot{\bar{X}} &= -\partial_X V_0 \\ V_0 &:= \frac{\psi_0 \cdot V \psi_0}{\psi_0 \cdot \psi_0}, \end{aligned}$$

by using that the electrons are in the eigenstate  $\psi_0$  with eigenvalue  $V_0$  to  $V$ . The Born-Oppenheimer dynamics approximates the Ehrenfest dynamics

$$\ddot{\bar{X}} = -\frac{\hat{\psi} \cdot \partial_X V \hat{\psi}}{\hat{\psi} \cdot \hat{\psi}}.$$

In (7.14) we show that  $\hat{\psi} = \psi_0 + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ , which yields  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$  difference between the two right hand sides. A more careful study of such approximations with stochastic initial data for  $\hat{\psi} - \psi_0$ , depending on the temperature, is in Section 6.3. Here we apply the error analysis of the previous section to the Born-Oppenheimer approximation.

The Born-Oppenheimer approximation can be analyzed similarly as the Ehrenfest dynamics by using the approximation

$$\hat{\Phi} = \bar{\rho}^{1/2} \psi_0 e^{iM^{1/2}\bar{\theta}_0},$$

satisfying

$$(6.9) \quad (H - E)\hat{\Phi} = e^{iM^{1/2}\bar{\theta}_0} \left( -M^{-1/2} i \dot{\psi}_0 \bar{\rho}^{1/2} - \frac{1}{2M} \sum_j \Delta_{X^j} (\bar{\rho}^{1/2} \psi_0) \right),$$

with the additional residual term including the bounded factor  $\dot{\psi}_0 = \partial_X \psi_0 \circ \dot{X} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ . Apply the derivation in the previous section to deduce

**Theorem 6.3.** *Assume that  $v = e^{iM^{1/2}\bar{\theta}_0} (i\dot{\psi}_0 \bar{\rho}^{1/2} - (2M)^{-1/2} \sum_j \Delta_{X^j} (\bar{\rho}^{1/2} \psi_0)) \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)})$  and suppose that (6.5) holds for this  $v$ , then the Born-Oppenheimer dynamics (6.8) (avoiding caustics) approximates, in the case (5.5), Schrödinger observables with error bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ :*

$$(6.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T g(\bar{X}_t) \frac{dt}{T} &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} g(\bar{X}) \bar{\rho}(\bar{X}) d\bar{X} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N}} g(X) \rho(X) dX + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 6.4** (Why do symplectic numerical simulations of molecular dynamics work?). The derivation of the approximation error for the Ehrenfest and Born-Oppenheimer dynamics, in Theorems 6.1 and 6.3, also allow to study perturbed systems. For instance, the perturbed Ehrenfest dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X} &= p + \partial_p H^\delta(X, p, \hat{\psi}) \\ \dot{p} &= -\hat{\psi} \cdot \partial_X V(X) \hat{\psi} - \partial_X H^\delta(X, p, \hat{\psi}) \\ iM^{-1/2} \dot{\hat{\psi}} &= (V - V_n) \hat{\psi} + (\partial_{\hat{\psi}_r} + i\partial_{\hat{\psi}_i}) H^\delta(X, p, \hat{\psi}), \end{aligned}$$

generated from a perturbed Hamiltonian  $H_E(X, p, \hat{\psi}) + H^\delta(X, p, \hat{\psi}) = E$ , with the perturbation satisfying

$$(6.11) \quad \|H^\delta\|_{L^\infty} + \|(\partial_{\hat{\psi}_r} + i\partial_{\hat{\psi}_i}) H^\delta\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3J})} \leq \delta \quad \text{for some } \delta \in (0, \infty)$$

yields through (6.3) an additional error term  $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$  to the approximation of observables in (6.7). So called symplectic numerical methods are precisely those that can be written as perturbed Hamiltonian systems, see [39], and consequently we have a method to precisely analyze their numerical error by combining an explicit construction of  $H^\delta$  with the stability condition (6.11) to obtain  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1} + \delta)$  accurate approximations. The popular Störmer-Verlet method is symplectic, first order accurate and coincides with the symplectic Euler method, for which  $H^\delta$  is explicitly constructed in [39] with  $\delta$  proportional to the time step when  $H_E$  is Lipschitz continuous.

### 6.3. Stochastic Langevin and Smoluchowski molecular dynamics approximation.

In this section we analyze a situation when the electron wave function in the Ehrenfest dynamics is perturbed from its ground state by thermal fluctuations, which will lead to molecular dynamics in the canonical ensemble with constant number of particles, volume and temperature. To determine the stochastic data for  $\phi$  requires some additional assumptions. Inspired by the study of a classical heat bath of harmonic oscillators in [45], we will sample the initial data for  $\phi$  randomly from a probability density given by an *equilibrium solution*  $f$  (satisfying  $\partial_t f = 0$ ) of the *Liouville equation*  $\partial_t f + \partial_{p_E} H_E \partial_{r_E} f - \partial_{r_E} H_E \partial_{p_E} f = 0$ , to the Ehrenfest dynamics (2.17). There are many such equilibrium solutions, e.g.  $f = h(H_E)$  for any differentiable function  $h$  and there may be equilibrium densities that are not functions of the Hamiltonian. As mentioned in Section 5, the set of densities  $\hat{\rho}$ , corresponding to the different eigenstates, forms the relevant set of equilibrium solutions  $f$ .

To find the equilibrium solution to sample  $\phi$  from, we may first consider the marginal equilibrium distribution for the nuclei in the Ehrenfest Hamiltonian system. The equilibrium distribution of the nuclei is simpler to understand than the equilibrium of electrons: in a statistical mechanics view, the marginal probability of finding the now classical nuclei with the energy  $H_E := 2^{-1}|p|^2 + \phi \cdot V(X)\phi$  (for given  $\phi$ ) is proportional to the Gibbs-Boltzmann factor  $\exp(-H_E/T)$ , where the positive parameter  $T$  is the temperature, in units of the Boltzmann constant, cf. [17], [27]. Assuming that equilibrium density is a function of the Hamiltonian, its marginal distribution therefore satisfies

$$\int h(2^{-1}|p|^2 + \phi \cdot V(X)\phi) d\phi_r d\phi_i = e^{-|p|^2/(2T)} C(X)$$

for some function  $C : \mathbb{R}^{3N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and Fourier transformation with respect to  $|p| \in \mathbb{R}$  of this equation implies the *Gibbs distribution*

$$h(H_E) = ce^{-H_E/T},$$

for a normalizing constant  $c = 1/\int \exp(-H_E/T) d\phi_r d\phi_i dX dp$ . In this perspective *the nuclei act as the heat bath for the electrons*. The work [28] considers Hamiltonian systems where the equilibrium densities are assumed to be a function of the Hamiltonian and shows that the first and second law of (reversible) thermodynamics hold (for all Hamiltonians depending on a multidimensional set of parameters) if and only if the density is the Gibbs exponential  $\exp(-H_E/T)$  (the "if" part was formulated already by Gibbs [23]); in this sense, the Gibbs distribution is more stable than other equilibrium solutions. An alternative motivation of the Gibbs distribution, based on the conclusion of this work (in a somewhat circular argument), is that the nuclei can be approximated by classical Langevin dynamics with the unique invariant density  $\exp(-|p|^2/2 - \lambda_0(X))/T$ , which is an accurate approximation of the marginal distribution of  $\exp(-H_E/T)$  when integrating over all the electron states  $\phi$ , see Lemma 6.5 and Theorem 6.7. Note that there is only one function of the Hamiltonian where the momenta  $p_j$  are independent and that is when  $f(r_E, p_E)$  is proportional to  $\exp(-H_E/T)$ .

Since the energy is conserved for the Ehrenfest dynamics –now viewed with the electrons as the primary systems coupled to the heat bath of nuclei– the probability of finding the electrons

in a certain configuration  $\phi$  is the same as finding the nuclei in a state with energy  $H_E$ , which is proportional to  $\exp(-H_E/T)$  in the canonical ensemble. This conclusion, that the probability to have an electron wave function  $\phi$  is proportional to  $\exp(-H_E/T)d\phi^r d\phi^i$  is our motivation to sample the data for  $\phi$  from the conditioned density generated by  $\exp(-\phi \cdot V(X)\phi/T)d\phi^r d\phi^i$ : since we seek data for the electrons, we use the probability distribution for  $\phi$  conditioned on  $(X, p)$ .

We compare in Remark 6.6 our model of initial data with a more standard model of initial data, having given probabilities to be in mixed states, which is not an equilibrium solution of the Ehrenfest dynamics. To sample from the Gibbs equilibrium density is standard in classical Hamiltonian statistical mechanics but it seems non standard for Ehrenfest quantum dynamics.

6.3.1. *The Constrained Stochastic Initial Data.* As in models of heat baths [19, 18] and [45] we assume that the initial data of the light particles (here the electrons) are stochastic, sampled from an equilibrium distribution of the Liouville equation. All states in this distribution correspond to pure eigenstates of the full Schrödinger operator with energy  $E$ . There are many such states and here we use the canonical ensemble where the data is in state  $\phi$  with the Gibbs-Boltzmann distribution proportional to  $\exp(-H_E/T)d\phi^r d\phi^i dp dX$ , i.e. in any state  $\phi$ , for  $\|\phi\| = 1$ , with probability weight

$$\frac{e^{-\phi \cdot V\phi/T} d\phi^r d\phi^i}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2\bar{J}}} e^{-\phi \cdot V\phi/T} d\phi^r d\phi^i}.$$

Let us now determine precise properties of this distribution generated by the Hamiltonian  $H_E$ . To reduce the complication of the constraint  $\phi \cdot \phi = 1$ , we change variables  $\phi = \tilde{\phi}/(\tilde{\phi} \cdot \tilde{\phi})^{1/2}$  and write the Hamiltonian equilibrium density as

$$(6.12) \quad \exp\left(-\left(p \circ p/2 + \lambda_0 + \frac{\tilde{\phi} \cdot (V - \lambda_0)\tilde{\phi}}{\tilde{\phi} \cdot \tilde{\phi}}\right)/T\right) d\tilde{\phi}^r d\tilde{\phi}^i dp dX.$$

Diagonalize the electron operator  $V(X^t)$  by the normalized eigenvectors and eigenvalues  $\{\bar{p}_j, \lambda_j\}$

$$\tilde{\phi} \cdot V(X^t)\tilde{\phi} = \lambda_0 + \sum_{j>0} \underbrace{(\lambda_j - \lambda_0)}_{=: \bar{\lambda}_j} |\gamma_j|^2$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\phi} &= \sum_{j \geq 0} \gamma_j \bar{p}_j, \\ (V - \lambda_0)\bar{p}_j &= \bar{\lambda}_j \bar{p}_j, \\ \bar{\lambda}_0 &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

with real and imaginary parts  $\gamma_j =: \gamma_j^r + i\gamma_j^i$ . The orthogonal transformation  $\tilde{\phi} = \sum_j \gamma_j \bar{p}_j$  shows that the probability density (6.12) is given by

$$(6.13) \quad D := \frac{\left( \prod_{j \geq 0} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_j |\gamma_j|^2 / (T \sum_{j \geq 0} |\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_j^r d\gamma_j^i \right) e^{-(p \circ p / 2 + \lambda_0(X)) / T} dp dX}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{6N}} \left( \prod_{j \geq 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_j |\gamma_j|^2 / (T \sum_{j \geq 0} |\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_j^r d\gamma_j^i \right) e^{-(p \circ p / 2 + \lambda_0(X)) / T} dp dX},$$

using that the determinant of the matrix of eigenvectors is one.

If we neglect the constraint and set  $\sum_{j \geq 0} |\gamma_j|^2 = 1$  the joint distribution density  $D$  simplifies to

$$\frac{\left( \prod_{j > 0} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_j |\gamma_j|^2 / T} d\gamma_j^r d\gamma_j^i \right) e^{-(p \circ p / 2 + \lambda_0(X)) / T} dp dX}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{6N}} \left( \prod_{j > 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_j |\gamma_j|^2 / T} d\gamma_j^r d\gamma_j^i \right) e^{-(p \circ p / 2 + \lambda_0(X)) / T} dp dX},$$

where  $\{\gamma_j^r, \gamma_j^i, j > 0\}$  are independent and each  $\gamma_j^r$  and  $\gamma_j^i$  is normally distributed with mean zero and variance  $T/\bar{\lambda}_j$ . We see in Lemma 6.5 that this approximation is accurate, provided the spectral gap condition

$$(6.14) \quad \frac{T}{\lambda_1} \ll 1, \quad \min_{X_c \in Q} \max_{\substack{X \in Q \\ Y = sX + (1-s)X_c \\ s \in [0, 1]}} \left| \sum_{j > 0} \frac{\partial_X \bar{\lambda}_j(Y) \circ (X - X_c)}{\bar{\lambda}_j(Y)} \right| =: \alpha$$

hold, where  $Q$  is the set of attained nuclei positions.

**Lemma 6.5.** *Assume the electron eigenvalues have a spectral gap around the ground state eigenvalue  $\lambda_0$ , in the sense that (6.14) holds. Then the marginal probability mass*

$$r(X) := \prod_{j \geq 0} \int_{|\gamma_j|^2 < C} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_j |\gamma_j|^2 / (T \sum_{j \geq 0} |\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_j^r d\gamma_j^i$$

satisfies

$$(6.15) \quad \left| \log \frac{r(X)}{r(X_c)} \right| \leq \alpha$$

*Proof.* We first note that  $\|\phi\|_{L^2}$  is bounded so that each component  $|\gamma_j|$  is also bounded. Each integral factor has the derivative

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_X \int_{|\gamma_n|^2 < C} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_n |\gamma_n|^2 / (T \sum_{j \geq 0} |\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_n^r d\gamma_n^i \\ &= \frac{\partial_X \bar{\lambda}_n(X)}{\bar{\lambda}_n(X)} \int_{|\gamma_n|^2 < C} \frac{\bar{\lambda}_n |\gamma_n|^2}{T \sum_{j \geq 0} |\gamma_j|^2} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_n |\gamma_n|^2 / (T \sum_{j \geq 0} |\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_n^r d\gamma_n^i \end{aligned}$$

for  $n \neq 0$  and the derivative equal to zero for  $n = 0$ , so that

$$\partial_X r(X) = r(X) \sum_{n>0} \frac{\partial_X \bar{\lambda}_n(X)}{\bar{\lambda}_n(X)} \frac{\int_{|\gamma_n|^2 < C} \frac{\bar{\lambda}_n |\gamma_n|^2}{T \sum_{j \geq 0} |\gamma_j|^2} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_n |\gamma_n|^2 / (T \sum_{j \geq 0} |\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_n^r d\gamma_n^i}{\int_{|\gamma_n|^2 < C} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_n |\gamma_n|^2 / (T \sum_{j \geq 0} |\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_n^r d\gamma_n^i}.$$

The integral in the denominator has the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{|\gamma_n|^2 < C} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_n |\gamma_n|^2 / (T \sum_{j \geq 0} |\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_n^r d\gamma_n^i \\ &= \frac{T}{\bar{\lambda}_n} \sum_{j \neq n} |\gamma_j|^2 \int_{|\hat{\gamma}_n|^2 < C' \bar{\lambda}_n / T} e^{-|\hat{\gamma}_n|^2 / (1 + \bar{\lambda}_n^{-1} T |\hat{\gamma}_n|^2)} d\hat{\gamma}_n^r d\hat{\gamma}_n^i \\ &= \frac{T}{\bar{\lambda}_n} \sum_{j \neq n} |\gamma_j|^2 \left( \int_{|\hat{\gamma}_n|^2 < \epsilon \bar{\lambda}_n / T} e^{-|\hat{\gamma}_n|^2 / (1 + \bar{\lambda}_n^{-1} T |\hat{\gamma}_n|^2)} d\hat{\gamma}_n^r d\hat{\gamma}_n^i + \mathcal{O}(\bar{\lambda}_n T^{-1} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_n \epsilon / (2T)}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

using  $\epsilon \bar{\lambda}_n / T < |\hat{\gamma}_n|^2 < C' \bar{\lambda}_n / T$  and  $T / \bar{\lambda}_n \ll 1$  in this domain; the integral over the remaining domain satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|\hat{\gamma}_n|^2 < \epsilon \bar{\lambda}_n / T} e^{-|\hat{\gamma}_n|^2} d\hat{\gamma}_n^r d\hat{\gamma}_n^i &\leq \int_{|\hat{\gamma}_n|^2 < \epsilon \bar{\lambda}_n / T} e^{-|\hat{\gamma}_n|^2 / (1 + \bar{\lambda}_n^{-1} T |\hat{\gamma}_n|^2)} d\hat{\gamma}_n^r d\hat{\gamma}_n^i \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon) \int_{|\hat{\gamma}_n|^2 < \epsilon \bar{\lambda}_n / (T(1 + \epsilon))} e^{-|\hat{\gamma}_n|^2} d\hat{\gamma}_n^r d\hat{\gamma}_n^i. \end{aligned}$$

Choose  $\epsilon = 4T \bar{\lambda}_n^{-1} \log(\bar{\lambda}_n / T)$  to obtain

$$\int_{|\gamma_n|^2 < C} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_n |\gamma_n|^2 / (T \sum_{j \geq 0} |\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_n^r d\gamma_n^i = \frac{T}{\bar{\lambda}_n} \sum_{j \neq n} |\gamma_j|^2 \left( \pi + \mathcal{O}(T \bar{\lambda}_n^{-1} \log(\bar{\lambda}_n T^{-1})) \right).$$

We have similarly

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{|\gamma_n|^2 < C} \frac{\bar{\lambda}_n |\gamma_n|^2}{T \sum_{j \geq 0} |\gamma_j|^2} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_n |\gamma_n|^2 / (T \sum_{j \geq 0} |\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_n^r d\gamma_n^i \\ &= \frac{T}{\bar{\lambda}_n} \sum_{j \neq n} |\gamma_j|^2 \left( \frac{\pi}{2} + \mathcal{O}(T \bar{\lambda}_n^{-1} \log(\bar{\lambda}_n T^{-1})) \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\left| \log \frac{r(X)}{r(X_c)} \right| = \left| \int_0^1 \frac{\partial_X r}{r} (sX_c + (1-s)X) \circ (X - X_c) ds \right| \leq \alpha.$$

□

**Remark 6.6.** *Entropy and the Standard Canonical Density Distribution.* Let  $q_j := |\gamma_j|^2$  denote the density of electron state  $j$  in the initial data  $\phi_0$ . In the usual setting of a canonical distribution there holds instead

$$(6.16) \quad q_j = e^{-\bar{\lambda}_j / T} / \sum_j e^{-\bar{\lambda}_j / T},$$

which follows from maximizing the von Neumann entropy defined by  $-\sum_j q_j \log q_j$ , with the probability and energy constraints  $\sum_j q_j = 1$  and  $\sum_j \bar{\lambda}_j q_j = \text{constant}$ , see [22]. The almost chi-square distribution (6.13) of  $\bar{\lambda}_j q_j / T = \bar{\lambda} |\gamma_j|^2 / T$  is clearly different from that and its motivation in this section – as the equilibrium solution  $\exp(-\tilde{H}_E / T)$  of the Liouville equation for the Ehrenfest Hamiltonian dynamics, viewed as a system of electrons coupled to a heat bath of classical nuclei – uses the conservation of energy from electrons and nuclei in the Ehrenfest Hamiltonian system.

6.3.2. *The stochastic molecular dynamics models.* In this subsection we consider the special case when the observable does not depend on the time variable (and the velocity). Then it is enough to determine an integral with respect to the invariant measure; there are several alternatives, cf. [8], and we focus on ensemble averages computed by stochastic Langevin and Smoluchowski dynamics. The observable in the Ehrenfest dynamics is then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} g(X) e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T} r(X) dX}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T} r(X) dX} &= \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} g(X) e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T} \frac{r(X)}{r(X_c)} dX}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T} \frac{r(X)}{r(X_c)} dX} \\ &= \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} g(X) e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T + \log \frac{r(X)}{r(X_c)}} dX}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T + \log \frac{r(X)}{r(X_c)}} dX}, \end{aligned}$$

where by Lemma 6.5

$$\frac{T}{|\lambda_0|} \left| \log \frac{r(X)}{r(X_c)} \right| = \mathcal{O}(T |\lambda_0|^{-1} \alpha),$$

which implies

$$(6.17) \quad \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} g(X) e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T} r(X) dX}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T} r(X) dX} = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} g(X) e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T} dX}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T} dX} + \mathcal{O}(T |\lambda_0|^{-1} \alpha).$$

Let  $W_t$  denote the standard Brownian process (at time  $t$ ) in  $\mathbb{R}^{3N}$  with independent components and let  $K$  be any positive parameter. The stochastic Langevin dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= p_t dt \\ dp_t &= -\partial_X \lambda_0(X_t) dt - K p_t dt + \sqrt{2TK} dW_t \end{aligned}$$

and the Smoluchowski dynamics

$$dX_s = -\partial_X \lambda_0(X_s) ds + \sqrt{2T} dW_s$$

has the unique invariant probability density

$$\frac{e^{-(p \circ p / 2 + \lambda_0(X)) / T} dp dX}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{6N}} e^{-(p \circ p / 2 + \lambda_0(X)) / T} dp dX}$$

respectively

$$\frac{e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T} dX}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T} dX},$$

cf. [8]. The hydrogen atom has eigenfunctions with a singularity proportional to  $e^{-\beta|x|}$  for some positive constant  $\beta$ . Also in the case of many electrons and one nuclei located at  $X_1 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , the electron eigenfunction  $\bar{p}_n$  are Lipschitz continuous and have a singularity proportional to  $|x_j - X_1|$ , see [20]; such eigenfunctions  $\psi$  have bounded  $\|\Delta_X \psi\|_{L^2}$  norm. If we still assume that our Ehrenfest solution satisfies the bound (6.4) and that its density is  $\hat{\rho} = e^{-H_E/T}$  the combination of (6.17) and Theorem 6.1 imply

**Theorem 6.7.** *Both the Langevin and Smoluchowski stochastic molecular dynamics approximate Schrödinger observables with error bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1} + T|\lambda_0|^{-1}\alpha)$ , provided the assumption in Theorem 6.1 holds together with the spectral gap condition (6.14).*

The ground state energy  $\lambda_0$  is an extensive variable with its value proportional to the number of particles  $N + J$ , as follows from stability of bulk matter [32]. The error term  $T\alpha|\lambda_0|^{-1}$  will then be small if  $|\partial_X \bar{\lambda}_j \circ (X - X_e)|$  is small for  $j > J_0$ , with  $J_0 \ll N + J$ , resembling free electron eigenvalues for a constant potential. The work [42] shows that Langevin dynamics, using the rank one friction and diffusion matrix

$$K = K(X) = 2M^{-1/2} \partial_X \psi_0(X) \cdot \partial_X \psi_0(X),$$

approximates Ehrenfest dynamics with accuracy  $o(M^{-1/2})$  on bounded time intervals; here  $\psi_0$  is the electron ground state satisfying  $V\psi_0 = \lambda_0\psi_0$ .

Theorem 6.7 is relevant for the central problem in statistical mechanics to show that Hamiltonian dynamics of heavy particles, coupled to a heat bath of many lighter particles with random initial data, can be approximately described by Langevin's equation, as motivated by the pioneering work [15],[29] and continued with more precise heat bath models, based on harmonic interactions, in [19, 18] [45].

## 7. CONSTRUCTION OF THE SOLUTION OPERATOR

This section continues the construction of the solution operator started in Section 2.5. It is written for the Schrödinger characteristics, but it can be directly applied to the Ehrenfest case by replacing  $\tilde{V}$  by  $V - \hat{V}_n$  (by formally taking the limit  $M \rightarrow \infty$  in the term  $(2M)^{-1}G \sum_j \Delta X_j (G^{-1}\tilde{\psi})$ ). Assume for a moment that  $\tilde{V}$  is independent of  $\tau$ . Then the solution to (2.21) can be written as a linear combination of the two exponentials

$$Ae^{i\tau\alpha_+} + Be^{i\tau\alpha_-}$$

where the two characteristic roots are

$$\alpha_{\pm} = (p_1^1)^2 \left( -1 \pm (1 - 2(p_1^1)^{-2}\tilde{V})^{1/2} \right).$$

We see that  $e^{i\tau\alpha_-}$  is a highly oscillatory solution on the fast  $\tau$ -scale with

$$\alpha_- = -2(p_1^1)^2 + \tilde{V} + \mathcal{O}(\tilde{V}^2/(p_1^1)^2),$$

while

$$(7.1) \quad \alpha_+ = -\tilde{V} + \mathcal{O}(\tilde{V}^2/(p_1^1)^2).$$

Therefore we chose initial data

$$i\dot{\tilde{\psi}}|_{\tau=0} = -\alpha_+ \tilde{\psi}|_{\tau=0}$$

to have  $B = 0$ , which eliminates the fast scale, and the limit  $p_1^1 \rightarrow \infty$  determines the solution by the Schrödinger equation

$$i\dot{\tilde{\psi}} = \tilde{V}\tilde{\psi}.$$

In the case of the Ehrenfest dynamics, this equation with  $\tilde{V}$  replaced by  $V - \hat{V}_n$  is the starting point. The next section presents an analogous construction for the slowly, in  $\tau$ , varying operator  $\tilde{V}$ .

**7.1. Spectral decomposition.** Write (2.21) as the first order system

$$\begin{aligned} i\dot{\tilde{\psi}} &= v \\ \dot{v} &= 2(p_1^1)^2 i(\tilde{V}\tilde{\psi} - v) \end{aligned}$$

which for  $\bar{\psi} := (\tilde{\psi}, v)$  takes the form

$$\dot{\bar{\psi}} = iA\bar{\psi} \quad A := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 2(p_1^1)^2 \tilde{V} & -2(p_1^1)^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the eigenvalues  $\lambda_{\pm}$ , right eigenvectors  $q_{\pm}$  and left eigenvectors  $q_{\pm}^{-1}$  of the real "matrix" operator  $A$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\pm} &:= (p_1^1)^2 \left( -1 \pm (1 - 2(p_1^1)^{-2} \tilde{V})^{1/2} \right), \\ q_+ &:= \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -\lambda_+ \end{pmatrix}, \\ q_- &:= \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda_-^{-1} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ q_+^{-1} &:= \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_+/\lambda_-} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \lambda_-^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \\ q_-^{-1} &:= \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_+/\lambda_-} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_+ \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We see that  $\lambda_+ = -\tilde{V} + \mathcal{O}((p_1^1)^{-2})$  and  $\lambda_- = -2(p_1^1)^2 + \tilde{V} + \mathcal{O}((p_1^1)^{-2})$ . The important property here is that the left eigenvector limit  $\lim_{p_1^1 \rightarrow \infty} q_+^{-1} = (1, 0)$  is constant, independent of  $\tau$ , which implies that the  $q_+$  component  $q_+^{-1} \bar{\psi} = \tilde{\psi}$  decouples: we obtain in the limit

$p_1^1 \rightarrow \infty$  the time-dependent Schrödinger equation

$$\begin{aligned}
i\dot{\tilde{\psi}}(\tau) &= i\frac{d}{d\tau}(q_+^{-1}\bar{\psi}_\tau) \\
&= iq_+^{-1}\frac{d}{d\tau}\bar{\psi}_\tau \\
&= -q_+^{-1}A_\tau\bar{\psi}_\tau \\
&= -\lambda_+(\tau)q_+^{-1}\bar{\psi}_\tau \\
&= -\lambda_+(\tau)\tilde{\psi}(\tau) \\
&= \tilde{V}_\tau\tilde{\psi}(\tau)
\end{aligned}$$

where the operator  $\tilde{V}_\tau$  depends on  $\tau$  and  $(x, X_0)$ . Define the solution operator  $S$

$$(7.2) \quad \tilde{\psi}(\tau) = S_{t,0}\tilde{\psi}(0).$$

The operator  $\tilde{V}$  can be symmetrized

$$\bar{V}_\tau := G_\tau^{-1}\tilde{V}_\tau G_\tau = (V - V_n)_\tau - \frac{1}{2M} \sum_j \Delta_{X_0^j},$$

with real eigenvalues  $\{\lambda_m\}$  and orthonormal eigenvectors  $\{p_m\}$ , satisfying

$$\bar{V}_\tau p_m(\tau) = \lambda_m(\tau)p_m(\tau).$$

Therefore  $\tilde{V}_\tau$  has the same eigenvalues and the eigenvectors  $\bar{p}_m := G_\tau p_m$ , which establishes the spectral representation

$$(7.3) \quad \tilde{V}_\tau \tilde{\psi}(\cdot, \tau, \cdot) = \sum_m \lambda_m(\tau) \tilde{\psi}(\cdot, 0, \cdot) \bullet \bar{p}_m(\tau) \bar{p}_m(\tau),$$

where the scalar product is

$$\tilde{\psi} \bullet \bar{p}_m := \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N-1}} \tilde{\psi} \cdot \bar{p}_m G_\tau^{-2} dX_0.$$

We note that the weight  $G^{-2}$  on the co-dimension one surface  $\mathbb{T}^{3N-1}$  appears precisely because the operator  $\tilde{V}$  is symmetrized by  $G$  and in the case of the Ehrenfest dynamics the weight is the density  $\hat{\rho} = G^{-2}$ . The representation (7.3) is used in the next section to establish bounds on  $\partial_{X^j}\tilde{\psi}$ .

**7.2. Derivatives of the wave function.** Differentiation of the Schrödinger equation (7.2) implies that the derivative  $\zeta := \partial_{X_0^j}\tilde{\psi}$  satisfies

$$i\dot{\zeta}_\tau = \tilde{V}_\tau \zeta_\tau + \partial_{X_0^j}\tilde{V}_\tau \tilde{\psi}(\tau),$$

which has the integral representation

$$(7.4) \quad \zeta_\tau = S_{\tau,0}\zeta_0 + \int_0^\tau S_{\tau,r}\partial_{X_0^j}\tilde{V}_r\tilde{\psi}(r) dr.$$

Assume that

$$(7.5) \quad i\dot{\omega} = \tilde{V}\omega + q,$$

that is  $\omega_\tau = S_{\tau,0}\omega_0 + \int_0^\tau S_{\tau,r}q(r) dr$ . The spectral representation (7.3) and  $\omega = \sum_m \omega_m \bar{p}_m$  imply that

$$i \sum_m \dot{\omega}_m \bar{p}_m = \sum_m \lambda_m \omega_m \bar{p}_m - i \sum_m \omega_m \dot{\bar{p}}_m + q,$$

which yields

$$(7.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega_m(\tau) &= e^{-i \int_0^\tau \lambda_m(r) dr} \omega_m(0) - \int_0^\tau e^{-i \int_s^\tau \lambda_m(r) dr} \left( \sum_j \omega_j(s) \dot{\bar{p}}_j(s) \right) \bullet \bar{p}_m(s) ds \\ &\quad - i \int_0^\tau e^{-i \int_s^\tau \lambda_m(r) dr} q_s \bullet \bar{p}_m(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

The initial assumption  $\zeta_0 = \mathcal{O}(1)$  and  $\dot{\bar{p}}_j = \partial \bar{p}_j / \partial X \circ dX / d\tau = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ , established from the bound  $\partial_X p_j = \mathcal{O}(1)$  by (2.10) and  $dX_j / dt = p_j = \mathcal{O}(1)$  by (2.5) using  $V_n = \mathcal{O}(1)$ , together with  $\tau = \mathcal{O}(M^{1/2})$  shows that the two first terms in the right hand side of (7.6) (and the first in (7.4)) leads to the bound

$$S_{\tau,0}\zeta_0 = \mathcal{O}(1).$$

To establish a similar bound on the integral in the last term in (7.6) (and the second term in (7.4)) is subtle since  $q = \partial_{X_0^j} \tilde{V}_r \tilde{\psi}(r) = \mathcal{O}(1)$  while  $\tau = \mathcal{O}(M^{1/2})$ , so that oscillatory cancellation has to be used. We will use an assumption on a continuum limit of a spectral decomposition. Let the eigenvalues  $\{\lambda_m(r) \mid m \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be in increasing order, satisfying  $\tilde{V}_r \bar{p}_m(r) = \lambda_m(r) \bar{p}_m(r)$  and define the average

$$\bar{\lambda}_m(s) := (\tau - s)^{-1} \int_s^\tau \lambda_m(r) dr.$$

We have the representation

$$(7.7) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sum_m e^{-i(\tau-s)\bar{\lambda}_m(s)} q_s \bullet \bar{p}_m(s) \bar{p}_m(\tau) \\ &= \sum_{\bar{\lambda}_k} e^{-i(\tau-s)\bar{\lambda}_k(s)} \underbrace{\sum_{m: \bar{\lambda}_m = \bar{\lambda}_k} \partial_{X_0^j} \tilde{V}_s \tilde{\psi}(s) \bullet \bar{p}_m(s) \bar{p}_m(\tau)}_{=: f_M(\bar{\lambda}_k; s)(\bar{\lambda}_{k+1} - \bar{\lambda}_k)}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 6.2 motivates that a change in the eigenvalue of order  $\delta$  perturbs each eigenstate  $\bar{p}_m$  with an amount  $\mathcal{O}(\delta N^{-1})$ , so that the sum over all eigenstates can have a change proportional to  $\delta = \bar{\lambda}_{k+1} - \bar{\lambda}_k$  as assumed in (7.7).

The large mass  $M$  implies that the eigenvalues  $\{\lambda_m\}$  almost form a continuum with

$$\Delta \bar{\lambda}_m = \bar{\lambda}_{m+1} - \bar{\lambda}_m = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}),$$

as seen by adding another non interacting particle, which yields  $(\tau - s)\Delta\bar{\lambda}_m = o(1)$ . The representation implies  $\sum_{\bar{\lambda}_m} f_M(\bar{\lambda}_m; \tau)\Delta\bar{\lambda}_m = \partial_{X_0^j}\tilde{V}_\tau\tilde{\psi}(\tau)$ . Assume that  $f_M \rightarrow f$  in  $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ , then we have the Fourier integral limit

$$(7.8) \quad \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\bar{\lambda}_m} e^{-i(\tau-s)\bar{\lambda}_m(s)} f_M(\bar{\lambda}_m)\Delta\bar{\lambda}_m = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i(\tau-s)\lambda} f(\lambda) d\lambda =: \hat{f}(\tau - s)$$

and assume that  $f$  and its second derivative are bounded in  $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ , as a function of  $\lambda$ , i.e. there is a constant  $C$  such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\partial_\lambda^2 f(\lambda)| + |f(\lambda)| d\lambda \leq C$$

then

$$\|\hat{f}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} + \|\tau^2 \hat{f}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq C$$

which implies

$$(7.9) \quad |\hat{f}(\tau)| \leq \frac{C}{1 + \tau^2}$$

so that  $\hat{f}(\tau - s)$  belongs to  $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ , as a function of  $s$ . We conclude by integration over  $s$  in (7.6) that

$$(7.10) \quad \zeta_\tau = \mathcal{O}(1).$$

Equation (2.10) for  $\partial_X p$  shows that  $\partial_X G$  also is bounded, provided  $|\partial_{X^j X^k} V_n| + |\partial_{X^j} V_n| = \mathcal{O}(1)$  and the initial data  $\partial_X p_j|_I$  is bounded. Consequently  $\partial_X \psi \cdot \partial_X \psi = \mathcal{O}(1)$  as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ . The second derivative  $\Delta_{X_0} \tilde{\psi}$  can be estimated similarly by using instead  $q = 2\partial_{X_0} \tilde{V} \partial_{X_0} \tilde{\psi} + \Delta_{X_0} V \tilde{\psi}$ .

Reduced  $L^1$ -regularity  $f \in W^{\beta,1}(\mathbb{R})$ , with  $\beta \in (0,1)$  derivatives in  $L^1$  instead of two derivatives in  $L^1$ , implies

$$|\hat{f}(\tau)| \leq \frac{C}{1 + |\tau|^\beta}$$

and  $\int_0^{M^{1/2}} |\hat{f}(\tau)| d\tau = \mathcal{O}(M^{(1-\beta)/2})$ ; also this bound shows that the WKB-Ansatz  $\psi e^{iM^{1/2}\theta}$  makes sense, since then  $|\partial_{X^j} \psi| = \mathcal{O}(M^{(1-\beta)/2}) \ll M^{1/2}$ . If  $\beta > 1$  we have  $|\partial_{X^j} \psi| = \mathcal{O}(1)$ .

**7.3. Discrete spectrum.** This section verifies that the symmetric bilinear form

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)-1}} v \bar{V}_\tau v + \gamma v^2 dx dX_0$$

is continuous and coercive on  $H^1(\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)-1})$ , which implies that the spectrum of  $\bar{V}$  is discrete by the theory of compact operators, see [16]. Let  $r := |x^j - X^n|$ . Integrate by parts, for any

$\epsilon > 0$ , to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
-\int_0^R \frac{1}{|x^j - X^n|} v^2 r^2 dr &= -\int_0^R \frac{1}{r} v^2 r^2 dr \\
&= -\int_0^R v^2 \partial_r \frac{r^2}{2} dr \\
&= \int_0^R v \partial_r v r^2 dr + \left[ \frac{v^2 r^2}{2} \right]_{r=0}^{r=R} \\
&\geq -\left( \int_0^R v^2 r^2 dr \int_0^R (\partial_r v)^2 r^2 dr \right)^{1/2} + \left[ \frac{v^2 r^2}{2} \right]_{r=0}^{r=R} \\
&\geq -\frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_0^R v^2 r^2 dr - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \int_0^R (\partial_r v)^2 r^2 dr + \left[ \frac{v^2 r^2}{2} \right]_{r=0}^{r=R}
\end{aligned}$$

and integrate the representation  $v^2(R)R = v^2(\rho)R + \int_\rho^R 2v\partial_r v R dr$  to estimate the last term

$$\begin{aligned}
v^2(R) \frac{R^2}{2} &= \int_{R/2}^R v^2(r) R dr + \int_{R/2}^R \int_\rho^R 2v\partial_r v R dr d\rho \\
&\geq \int_{R/2}^R v^2(r) R dr - \int_{R/2}^R \left( \int_\rho^R (\partial_r v)^2 r^2 R^{-1} dr \int_\rho^R v^2 R^3 r^{-2} dr \right)^{1/2} d\rho \\
&\geq \int_{R/2}^R v^2(r) R dr - \frac{\epsilon}{4} \int_{R/2}^R (\partial_r v)^2 r^2 dr - \frac{1}{4\epsilon} \int_{R/2}^R v^2 \frac{R^4}{r^4} r^2 dr
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that

$$-\int_0^R \frac{1}{|x^j - X^n|} v^2 r^2 dr \geq -\epsilon \int_0^R (\partial_r v)^2 r^2 dr - \frac{5}{\epsilon} \int_0^R v^2 \frac{R^4}{r^4} r^2 dr.$$

Similar bounds for the other interaction terms in  $V$  implies that the bilinear form is coercive

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)-1}} v \bar{V}_\tau v + \gamma v^2 dx dX_0 \geq \int_{\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)-1}} \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^J |\partial_{x^j} v|^2 + \frac{1}{4M} \sum_{n=1}^N |\partial_{X^n} v|^2 + v^2 dx dX_0,$$

for  $\gamma \geq 60(MN + J)$ . Analogous estimates show that the bilinear form is also continuous, i.e. there is a constant  $C$  such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)-1}} v \bar{V}_\tau w + \gamma v w dx dX_0 \leq C \|v\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)-1})} \|w\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)-1})}.$$

The combination of coercivity and continuity in  $H^1(\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)-1})$  implies, by the theory of compact operators, that the spectrum of  $\bar{V}$  consists of eigenvalues with orthogonal eigenvectors in  $L^2(\mathbb{T}^{3(J+N)-1})$ , see [16].

**7.4. The Born-Oppenheimer approximation.** To better understand the evolution (7.2) of  $\tilde{\psi}$ , we use the decomposition  $\tilde{\psi} = \psi_0 + \psi^\perp$ , where  $\psi_0(\tau)$  is an eigenvector of  $V_\tau$  satisfying  $V_\tau\psi_0(\tau) = \lambda_n(\tau)\psi_0(\tau)$  for an eigenvalue  $\lambda_n(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}$ . This *Ansatz* is motivated by the residual

$$(7.11) \quad R\psi_0 := i\dot{\psi}_0 - \tilde{V}\psi_0 = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$$

being small, since by (2.21)

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\psi}_0 &= \partial_X \psi_0 \dot{X} = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}) \\ \tilde{V}\psi_0 &= (V - V_n)\psi_0 + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}) = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

provided

$$(7.12) \quad \psi^\perp \cdot \psi^\perp = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}),$$

which for  $\psi_0 = \mathcal{O}(1)$  yields

$$V_n = \frac{(\psi_0 + \psi^\perp) \cdot V_\tau(\psi_0 + \psi^\perp)}{(\psi_0 + \psi^\perp) \cdot (\psi_0 + \psi^\perp)} = \lambda_n(\tau) + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}).$$

We have  $i\dot{\psi}^\perp = \tilde{V}\psi^\perp - R\psi_0$  and by (7.2)

$$(7.13) \quad \psi^\perp(\tau) = S_{\tau,0}\psi^\perp(0) - \int_0^\tau S_{\tau,s}R\psi_0(s)ds,$$

so that (7.5) can be applied with  $q = R\psi_0$  and we obtain as in (7.10)

$$(7.14) \quad \psi^\perp(\tau) = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}),$$

which also verifies that the bound (7.12) holds, if the initial data satisfies  $\psi^\perp(0) = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$  and the corresponding function

$$f_M(\bar{\lambda}_k)\Delta\lambda_k := \sum_{m: \bar{\lambda}_k = \bar{\lambda}_m} R\psi_0(s) \bullet p_m(s) p_m(\tau)$$

satisfies (7.9).

**Remark 7.1** (The Madelungen equation). An alternative to (2.6) is to instead include the coupling term  $-\frac{1}{2M} \sum_j \Delta_{X^j} \psi$  in the eikonal equation, which leads to the so called Madelungen equations [33]. Near the minima points, where  $E - V_n(X) = 0$ , the perturbation  $-\psi \cdot \frac{1}{2M} \sum_j \Delta_{X^j} \psi$  can be negative and then there is no real solution  $\partial_X \theta$  to the corresponding eikonal equation. To have a non real velocity  $\partial_X \theta$  is in our case not compatible with a classical limit and therefore we avoid the Madelungen formulation.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Barles G., Solutions de viscosité des équations de Hamilton-Jacobi, Springer-Verlag 1994.
- [2] Bardi M. and Capuzzo-Dolcetta I., Optimal Control and Viscosity Solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman Equations, Birkhäuser, 1997.
- [3] Berezin F.A. and Shubin M.A., *The Schrödinger Equation*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.
- [4] Briggs J. and Rost J.M., *On the derivation of the time-dependent equation of Schrödinger*, Foundations of Physics, **31** (2001), 693-712.

- [5] Briggs J. Boonchui S. and Khemmani S., *The derivation of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40** (2007) 1289-1302.
- [6] Born M. and Oppenheimer R., *Zur Quantentheorie die Molekeln*, Ann. Physik **84** (1927) 457-484.
- [7] Bornemann F.A., Nettesheim P. and Schütte C., *Quantum-classical molecular dynamics as an approximation to full quantum dynamics*, J. Chem. Phys, **105** (1996) 1074-1083.
- [8] Cancès E., Legoll F. and Stolz G., *Theoretical and numerical comparison of some sampling methods for molecular dynamics*, Math. Model. Num. Anal., **41** (2007) 351-389.
- [9] Cancès E., Defranceschi M., Kutzelnigg W., LeBris C. and Maday Y., *Computational Chemistry: a primer*, *Handbook of Numerical Analysis*, X, North-Holland 2003.
- [10] Cano B. and Stuart A.M. *Under-resolved simulations of heat-baths*, J. Comp. Phys. **169** (2001) 193-214.
- [11] Dimassi M. and Sjöstrand J., *Spectral Asymptotics in the Semiclassical Limit*, London Mathematical Society, Lecture Note Series 268. Cambridge University Press (1999).
- [12] Duistermaat J. J., *Fourier Integral Operators*, Courant Institute, 1973.
- [13] Dürr D., Goldstein S. and Lebowitz, J.L., *A mechanical model for the Brownian motion of a convex body*, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheori verw. Gebiete, **62** (1983) 427-448.
- [14] Dürr D., Goldstein S. and Lebowitz, J.L., *A mechanical model of Brownian motion*, Commun. Math. Phys. **78** (1981) 507-530.
- [15] Einstein A., *Über die von der molekularkinetischen Theorie der Wärme geforderte Bewegung von in ruhenden Flüssigkeiten suspendierten Teilchen*, Ann. Phys. **17** (1905) 549-560.
- [16] Evans L.C., *Partial Differential Equation*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, (1998)
- [17] Feynman R.F., *Statistical Mechanics: A Set of Lectures*, Westview Press, 1998.
- [18] Ford G. W. and Kac M., *On the quantum Langevin equation*, J. Statist. Phys. **46** (1987), 803-810.
- [19] Ford G. W., Kac M. and Mazur P., *Statistical mechanics of assemblies of coupled oscillators*, J. Mathematical Phys. **6** (1965) 504-515.
- [20] Fournais S., Hoffmann-Ostenhof M., Hoffmann-Ostenhof T. and Østergaard Sørensen T., *Analytic structure of many-body Coulombic wave functions*, arXiv:0806.1004v1, to appear in Comm. Math. Phys.
- [21] Frenkel D. and Smith B., *Understanding Molecular Simulation*, Academic Press, 2002.
- [22] Gardiner C.W., *Quantum Noise*, Springer-Verlag (1991).
- [23] Gibbs J.W., *Elementary Principles in Statistical Mechanics*, New York, Charles Scribner's sons, 1902.
- [24] Hagedorn G.A., *A time-dependent Born-Oppenheimer approximation*, Commun. Math. Phys., **77** (1980) 1-19.
- [25] Helffer B., *Semi-classical Analysis for the Schrödinger Operator and Applications*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1336 Springer Verlag 1988.
- [26] Jeffreys H., *On certain approximate solutions of linear differential equations of the second order*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society 23: 428436 (1924).
- [27] Kadanoff L., *Statistical Physics: Statistics, Dynamics and Renormalization*, World Scientific, 2000.
- [28] Kozlov V.V., *Thermodynamics of Hamiltonian systems and Gibbs distribution*, Doklady Mathematics, **61** (2000), 123-125. Translated from Doklady Akademii Nauk. **370** (2000) 325-327.
- [29] Langevin P., *On the theory of Brownian movement*, C.R.Acad. Sci. **146** 530 (1908), (translation Am. J. Phys. **65** 1079, 1997).
- [30] Le Bris C., *Computational chemistry from the perspective of numerical analysis*. Acta Numer. **14** (2005), 363-444.
- [31] Lia X., Tully J.C., Schlegel H.B. and Frisch M.J., *Ab initio Ehrenfest dynamics*, J. Chem. Phys. **123** (2005) 084106
- [32] Lieb Elliot, *The stability of matter*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **48** (1976), 553-569.
- [33] Madelung E., Z. Phys. **40** 322 (1926).

- [34] Marx D. and Hutter J., *Ab initio molecular dynamics: Theory and implementation, Modern Methods and Algorithms of Quantum Chemistry*, J.Grotendorst(Ed.), John von Neumann Institute for Computing, Jülich, NIC Series, Vol. 1, ISBN 3-00-005618-1, pp. 301-449, 2000.
- [35] Maslov V. P. and Fedoriuk M. V., *Semi-Classical Approximation in Quantum Mechanics*, D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1981.
- [36] Mott N.F., Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **27** (1931) 553.
- [37] Panati G., Spohn H. and Teufel S., *The time-dependent Born-Oppenheimer approximation*, Math. Mod. Numer. Anal. **41** (2007) 297-314.
- [38] Rayleigh, *On the Propagation of Waves through a Stratified Medium, with Special Reference to the Question of Reflection*, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) Series A, **86** (1912) 207-226.
- [39] Sandberg M., Szepessy A., *Convergence rates of symplectic Pontryagin approximations in optimal control theory*, Math. Model. Numer. Anal. 40 (2006), no. 1, 149–173.
- [40] Schiff L., *Quantum Mechanics*, McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- [41] Schrödinger E., *Collected papers on Wave Mechanics*, Blackie and Son, London (1928).
- [42] Szepessy A., *Langevin molecular dynamics derived from Ehrenfest dynamics*, preprint 2009.
- [43] Tanner D.J., *Introduction to Quantum Mechanics: A Time-dependent Perspective*, University Science Books, 2006.
- [44] Tully J.C., *Mixed quantum-classical dynamics*, Faraday Discuss., **110** (1998) 407–419.
- [45] Zwanzig R., *Nonlinear generalized Langevin equations*, J. Stat. Phys. **9** (1973) 215–220.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KUNGL. TEKNISKA HÖGSKOLAN, 100 44 STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN  
E-mail address: `szepessy@kth.se`