



**HAL**  
open science

# Normal form and long time analysis of splitting schemes for the linear Schrödinger equation.

Erwan Faou, Guillaume Dujardin

► **To cite this version:**

Erwan Faou, Guillaume Dujardin. Normal form and long time analysis of splitting schemes for the linear Schrödinger equation.. [Research Report] RR-6015, INRIA. 2006, pp.41. inria-00113480v2

**HAL Id: inria-00113480**

**<https://inria.hal.science/inria-00113480v2>**

Submitted on 13 Nov 2006

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

*Normal form and long time analysis of splitting schemes for the linear Schrödinger equation.*

Guillaume Dujardin — Erwan Faou

**N° 6015**

Novembre 2006

Thème NUM



*Rapport  
de recherche*



## Normal form and long time analysis of splitting schemes for the linear Schrödinger equation.

Guillaume Dujardin<sup>\*†</sup>, Erwan Faou<sup>‡†</sup>

Thème NUM — Systèmes numériques  
Projets IPSO

Rapport de recherche n° 6015 — Novembre 2006 — 38 pages

**Abstract:** We consider the linear Schrödinger equation on a one dimensional torus and its time-discretization by splitting methods. Assuming a non-resonance condition on the stepsize and a small size of the potential, we show that the numerical dynamics can be reduced over exponentially long time to a collection of two dimensional symplectic systems for asymptotically large modes. For the numerical solution, this implies the long time conservation of the energies associated with the double eigenvalues of the free Schrödinger operator. The method is close to standard techniques used in finite dimensional perturbation theory, but extended here to infinite dimensional operators.

**Key-words:** Splitting schemes, Schrödinger equation, perturbation theory, long-time analysis, KAM theory, symplectic integrators

\* Guillaume.Dujardin@irisa.fr

† INRIA Rennes, Campus Beaulieu, 35042 Rennes Cedex

‡ Erwan.Faou@irisa.fr

# Normal form and long time analysis of splitting schemes for the linear Schrödinger equation.

**Résumé :** We consider the linear Schrödinger equation on a one dimensional torus and its time-discretization by splitting methods. Assuming a non-resonance condition on the stepsize and a small size of the potential, we show that the numerical dynamics can be reduced over exponentially long time to a collection of two dimensional symplectic systems for asymptotically large modes. For the numerical solution, this implies the long time conservation of the energies associated with the double eigenvalues of the free Schrödinger operator. The method is close to standard techniques used in finite dimensional perturbation theory, but extended here to infinite dimensional operators.

**Mots-clés :** Splitting schemes, Schrödinger equation, perturbation theory, long-time analysis, KAM theory, symplectic integrators

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the time-discretization of the linear Schrödinger equation by splitting methods and analyze the long time behavior of the corresponding “numerical” solution. Since no approximation in space is made, the problem is infinite dimensional, and the classical theory used in the case of ordinary differential equations cannot be applied. In particular, the long time behavior of the solution cannot be understood by the use of classical backward error analysis, see [6, 9]: In the finite dimensional case, a stability argument is invoked by assuming that the numerical solution lies in a compact set of the phase space over very long time. In infinite dimension, the corresponding assumption would require the *a priori* control of the regularity of the numerical solution over long time (see [3, 8] for the case of the non linear wave equations).

In the case of splitting methods, exponential methods or standard methods for highly oscillatory equations, it is well known that for some values of the stepsize resonances appear, making the *a priori* assumption of uniform conservation of regularity irrelevant. In this work, we consider one of the simplest possible situations: The case of a splitting method applied to the linear periodic Schrödinger equation with an analytic potential in one space dimension. Moreover, we will consider the splitting scheme as a multiplicative symplectic perturbation of the free linear Schrödinger propagator, and show the quasi persistence of the conservation properties over exponentially long time with respect to the size of the potential.

Before going on, let us mention that another possible way to analyze these problems could be using modulated Fourier expansions: See [4] where the techniques used to analyze the exact solutions of non linear wave equations are clearly aimed at being applied to numerical analysis.

Let us consider the linear Schrödinger equation in one space dimension

$$i\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}(x,t) = -\frac{\partial^2\varphi}{\partial x^2}(x,t) + V(x)\varphi(x,t), \quad \text{with } \varphi(x,0) = \varphi^0(x), \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\varphi(x,t)$  is complex function depending on the space variable  $x \in \mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$  and the time  $t \geq 0$ . The potential  $V(x)$  is a real function and the function  $\varphi^0$  is the initial value at  $t = 0$ . In the following, we write  $\Delta = \partial_{xx}$  the Laplace operator in  $x$  so that the equation (1.1) reads

$$i\partial_t\varphi(t) = H\varphi(t), \quad \varphi(0) = \varphi^0, \quad \text{with } H = -\Delta + V. \quad (1.2)$$

For a given time step  $h > 0$ , we consider the approximation scheme

$$\varphi(h) \simeq \exp(ih\Delta)\exp(-ihV)\varphi(0) \quad (1.3)$$

where by definition,  $\exp(ih\Delta)\varphi$  is the solution  $\psi(t)$  at the time  $t = h$  of the equation

$$i\partial_t\psi(t) = -\Delta\psi(t), \quad \text{with } \psi(0) = \varphi, \quad (1.4)$$

and similarly  $\exp(-ihV)\varphi$  is the solution  $\psi(t)$  at the time  $t = h$  of the equation

$$i\partial_t\psi(t) = V\psi(t), \quad \text{with } \psi(0) = \varphi. \quad (1.5)$$

If the potential is smooth enough, it can be shown that the approximation (1.3) is a first order approximation of the solution of (1.1), see [10] and [2] (where the non linear case is studied). Note moreover that the propagator associated with (1.3) is  $L^2$ -unitary and so the scheme conserves the  $L^2$  norm as the exact propagator associated with (1.1) does. Splitting schemes are widely used to approximate the solution of (1.1) as they are simple to compute using fast Fourier transform: The free Schrödinger part (1.4) can be computed easily in terms of Fourier coefficients, while the solution of (1.5) is treated as an ordinary differential equation on the corresponding grid. Note also that the Lie splitting scheme (1.3) is conjugated to the Strang splitting so that the long time behavior of these two schemes are equivalent (see Remark 2.5 below).

In the finite dimensional case, the behavior of splitting methods for hamiltonian systems is now well understood, see for instance [6]. In particular, the use of the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula shows that for a sufficiently small stepsize depending on the highest eigenvalue of the problem, there exists a modified hamiltonian for the propagator (1.3). The numerical flow can thus be interpreted as the exact solution of a hamiltonian system, at least for exponentially long time with respect to the stepsize. This result holds true for the linear and the non linear case. When moreover the system is integrable, the techniques of classical perturbation theory apply, and it can be shown that the modified hamiltonian associated with a symplectic numerical method remains integrable, and that invariant tori persist over exponentially long time, see [6], Chapter X, and the classical references therein.

It is worth noticing that in infinite dimension, the persistence of invariant tori for hamiltonian PDEs is a very difficult problem even for the exact solutions, and a lot of progress have been made very recently. For the case of the non-linear Schrödinger equation, we refer to [1] and [5] for results in this direction.

In our case, though the initial equation is linear, the splitting propagator can be viewed as a non-linear function of the infinite dimensional operators  $-\Delta$  and  $V$ , and we use techniques similar to the one used in classical perturbation theory to put the propagator (1.3) under a normal form that will give information on the long time behavior of its solution.

The idea is to consider for a fixed time step  $h$  the family of propagators

$$L(\lambda) = \exp(ih\Delta) \exp(-ih\lambda V), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.6)$$

and to assume that  $V$  is analytic. For  $\lambda = 0$ , we see that  $L(0)$  is the free linear Schrödinger propagator. The corresponding solution can be written explicitly in terms of Fourier coefficients. The dynamics is periodic in time and there is no mixing between the different Fourier modes. The regularity of the initial value is preserved.

In the case of the splitting scheme (1.6) for  $\lambda \neq 0$ , we show that after a linear change of variable realized by a unitary operator satisfying exponential decay conditions on its coefficients, the propagator  $L(\lambda)$  can be put under a normal form and written as an *almost X-shaped* unitary operator, up to exponentially small terms with respect to  $\lambda$ . The coefficients of such an operator vanish, except possibly on the diagonal and the co-diagonal and for asymptotically large modes with respect to  $\lambda$ . This implies the existence of two-dimensional invariant spaces in the new variables, made of functions with zero Fourier coefficients except

possibly at the indices  $k$  and  $-k$  for a given  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . This result is valid for modes  $k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$  where  $\sigma > 0$  and for exponentially long time with respect to  $\lambda$ .

To show this result, we use the following non-resonance condition on the stepsize (see [6, 11]): there exist  $\gamma > 0$  and  $\nu > 1$  such that

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad k \neq 0, \quad \left| \frac{1 - e^{ikh}}{h} \right| \geq \gamma |k|^{-\nu}. \quad (1.7)$$

It can be shown that for a given  $h_0 > 0$  close to 0, the set of stepsizes  $h \in (0, h_0)$  that do not satisfy (1.7) has a Lebesgue measure  $\mathcal{O}(h_0^{r+1})$  for some  $r > 1$  (see [6, 11]). The precise results are given in the next section.

Using this almost X-shaped representation, we can analyze the long time behavior of the numerical solution and show that the dynamics can be reduced to two dimensional linear symplectic systems mixing the two modes  $k$  and  $-k$  for  $k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$ . This implies in particular the quasi-conservation of the regularity of the initial solution for these asymptotically large modes.

## 2 Statement of the results

In this section, we give a precise formulation of the result and its consequences for the long time behavior of the solution. We then give a sketch of proof and the major ingredients used in the recipe. We conclude this section by showing with numerical experiments the necessity of the non-resonance condition.

### 2.1 The results

For a function  $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ , the associated Fourier coefficients, for  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , are given by the formula

$$\hat{\psi}_n = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{-inx} \psi(x) dx.$$

In all this paper, we identify a function  $\psi(x)$  and its Fourier coefficients on  $\mathbb{T}$ , this means that we will write for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\psi_n$  for  $\hat{\psi}_n$  and identify the collection  $(\psi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  with the function  $\psi$  itself. We denote by  $\|\psi\| = (\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |\psi_n|^2)^{1/2}$  the  $L^2$  norm on  $\mathbb{T}$ . We also identify operators acting on  $L^2(\mathbb{T})$  with operators acting on  $l^2(\mathbb{Z})$ . Such an operator  $S$  can thus be characterized by its complex coefficients  $(S_{ij})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ . If  $\psi = (\psi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ , the product  $\varphi = S\psi$  is defined by the sequence  $\varphi = (\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of  $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  with components  $\varphi_n := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} S_{nk} \psi_k$ , provided the summation makes sense. For example, the bounded operator defined as the multiplication by  $V$  acting on  $L^2(\mathbb{T})$  is identified with the bounded operator (also denoted  $V$ ) whose coefficients are given for all  $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  by  $V_{ij} = \hat{V}_{i-j}$ .

For two operators  $A$  and  $B$ , the product  $AB$  is the operator whose coefficients are given formally by the equation

$$\forall (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2, \quad (AB)_{ij} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} A_{ik} B_{kj}. \quad (2.1)$$



For a given operator  $S = (S_{ij})_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , we denote by  $S^*$  its adjoint with coefficients

$$\forall (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2, \quad S_{ij}^* = \overline{S_{ji}}$$

where the bar denotes the complex conjugation. We say that  $S$  is symmetric if it satisfies the relation  $S = S^*$ .

For an operator  $S$  and  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , we define the analytic operator norm

$$\|S\|_\rho = \sup_{k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( e^{\rho|k-\ell|} |S_{k\ell}| \right) \quad (2.2)$$

and we set  $\mathcal{A}_\rho$  the space of  $S$  with finite norm  $\|S\|_\rho < \infty$ . The space  $\mathcal{S}_\rho$  denotes the space of symmetric operators of  $\mathcal{A}_\rho$ .

We define moreover the set of *X-shaped* operators  $\mathcal{X}_\rho$  made of the elements of  $X \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$  for which we have

$$X_{k\ell} \neq 0 \implies |k| = |\ell|.$$

We define the analytic norm for functions

$$\|\psi\|_\rho = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( e^{\rho|k|} |\psi_k| \right)$$

for a given positive number  $\rho$ , and set

$$U_\rho := \{ \psi \mid \|\psi\|_\rho < \infty \}$$

the corresponding function space<sup>1</sup>.

**Hypothesis 2.1** *We assume that there exists a function  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\rho_V > 0$  such that  $\mathcal{V}$  is analytic on a complex domain containing the closure  $\bar{\Omega}$  of  $\mathbb{T} + i(-\rho_V, \rho_V)$  and such that for all  $x \in \mathbb{T}$ ,  $V(x) = \mathcal{V}(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ . Therefore, if  $M_V$  denotes the maximum of the function  $|\mathcal{V}|$  on  $\bar{\Omega}$ , we have for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\|V^n\|_{\rho_V} \leq M_V^n$  by Cauchy estimates. In other words, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $V^n \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho_V}$  with norm bounded by  $M_V^n$ .*

For a given  $K > 0$  we define the set of indices

$$I_K = \{(k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z} \mid |k| \leq K \text{ or } |\ell| \leq K\}. \quad (2.3)$$

We then set  $\mathcal{X}_\rho^K$  the set of operators that are *almost X-shaped* in the sense where

$$X_{k\ell} \neq 0 \implies \left( |k| = |\ell| \text{ or } (k, \ell) \notin I_K \right)$$

The aim of this paper is to prove the following conjugation result for the propagator:

---

<sup>1</sup>The notation  $\|\cdot\|_\rho$  is not ambiguous: If an operator  $W$  is induced by a function, i.e. if  $W_{ij} = \hat{\psi}_{i-j}$  for  $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  and for a function  $\psi$  with Fourier coefficients  $\hat{\psi}_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then we have  $\|W\|_\rho = \|\psi\|_\rho$ .

**Theorem 2.2** *Assume that  $V$  satisfies Hypothesis 2.1 and let  $L(\lambda)$  be defined by (1.6). Assume  $\gamma > 0$  and  $\nu > 1$  are given. There exist positive constants  $\lambda_0$ ,  $\sigma$  and  $c$  depending only on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $\nu$ , such that for all stepsize  $h \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (1.7), there exist families of operators  $Q(\lambda)$  and  $\Sigma(\lambda)$  analytic in  $\lambda$  for  $|\lambda| < \lambda_0$  such that for  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ ,*

$$Q(\lambda) \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho\nu/4} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma(\lambda) \in \mathcal{X}_{\rho\nu/4}^K \quad \text{with} \quad K = \lambda^{-\sigma} \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\sigma = 1/(32(\nu + 1)) > 0$ ,

$$\|Q(\lambda) - \text{Id}\|_{\rho\nu/4} \leq \lambda^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Sigma(\lambda) - e^{ih\Delta}\|_{\rho\nu/4} \leq h\lambda^{1/2}, \quad (2.5)$$

and

$$Q(\lambda)^*Q(\lambda) = \text{Id}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma(\lambda)^*\Sigma(\lambda) = \text{Id}, \quad (2.6)$$

and such that the following relation holds:

$$Q(\lambda)L(\lambda)Q(\lambda)^* = \Sigma(\lambda) + R(\lambda). \quad (2.7)$$

Moreover, the remainder term  $R(\lambda)$  satisfies, for  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ ,

$$\|R(\lambda)\|_{\rho\nu/5} \leq \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma}). \quad (2.8)$$

Roughly speaking, the preceding result shows that after a unitary change of variables close to the identity in some analytic operator norm, the dynamics can be reduced, up to exponentially small terms, to the action of  $\Sigma(\lambda)$  which decouples into  $2 \times 2$  symplectic systems for each modes  $\pm k$ . This is valid for asymptotically large modes  $|k| \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$ . More precisely, if  $\varphi$  is a function and if  $\psi = \Sigma(\lambda)\varphi$ , we have for  $|k| \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$ ,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \psi_k \\ \psi_{-k} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_k(\lambda) & b_k(\lambda) \\ c_k(\lambda) & d_k(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_k \\ \varphi_{-k} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.9)$$

where the  $2 \times 2$  matrix in this equation is close to the diagonal matrix with entries  $e^{-ihk^2}$ , and is unitary. This implies that we have for all  $k$  such that  $|k| \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$ ,

$$|\psi_k|^2 + |\psi_{-k}|^2 = |\varphi_k|^2 + |\varphi_{-k}|^2. \quad (2.10)$$

Combining the conservation law (2.10) of  $\Sigma(\lambda)$  with the exponential estimate (2.8) will allow us to derive long time bounds for the iterates of  $L(\lambda)$ .

In the following, for a function  $\varphi$ , we use the notation

$$|\varphi|_0^2 = |\varphi_0|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, \quad |\varphi|_k^2 = |\varphi_k|^2 + |\varphi_{-k}|^2 \quad (2.11)$$

to denote the energies at the frequency  $|k|$ .

Moreover, for  $s > 0$  we introduce the norm<sup>2</sup>

$$\|\varphi\|_{s,\infty} = \sup_{k \geq 0} ((1+k)^s |\varphi|_k). \quad (2.12)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Note that  $\|\varphi\|_{s,\infty} < \infty$  implies that  $\varphi$  is in the Sobolev space  $H^{s-1/2-\varepsilon}$  for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ . If for instance  $\|\varphi\|_{s,\infty} < \infty$  for some  $s > 1/2$  then  $\varphi \in L^2$ .

Using the preceding remark and the estimates on the remainder term, we can show the following corollary, which yields long time results for the approximated solution:

**Corollary 2.3** *We use the notations of the previous Theorem. For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we set  $\varphi^n = L(\lambda)^n \varphi^0$ .*

(i) *There exists a constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $\nu$  such that for all  $h \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (1.7), all  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ ,  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$ , and  $\varphi^0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ ,*

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}, \quad \left| |\varphi^n|_k - |\varphi^0|_k \right| \leq C\lambda^{1/2} \|\varphi^0\|. \quad (2.13)$$

(ii) *Assume that  $s > 1/2$  is given, and let  $s'$  be such that  $s - s' \geq 1/2$ . Then there exists a constant  $c_s$  depending only on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\nu$  and  $s$ , such that for all  $h \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (1.7), all  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ ,  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$ , and  $\varphi^0$  such that  $\|\varphi^0\|_{s, \infty} < +\infty$ , we have*

$$\sup_{0 \leq k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}} \left( (1+k)^{s'} \left| |\varphi^n|_k - |\varphi^0|_k \right| \right) \leq c_s \lambda^{1/2} \|\varphi^0\|_{s, \infty}. \quad (2.14)$$

(iii) *For all  $\rho \in (0, \rho_V/5)$ , there exist positive constants  $\mu_0$  and  $C$  (depending only on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\nu$  and  $\rho$ ) such that for all  $h \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (1.7), all  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ ,  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$ ,  $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$  and  $\varphi^0 \in U_\rho$ ,*

$$\sup_{0 \leq k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}} \left( e^{\mu k} \left| |\varphi^n|_k - |\varphi^0|_k \right| \right) \leq C\lambda^{1/2} \|\varphi^0\|_\rho. \quad (2.15)$$

**Remark 2.4** We could also diagonalize the  $2 \times 2$  matrix in (2.9). As the eigenvalues are close to  $e^{ikh^2}$ , we could obtain this way a quasiperiodic behavior of the numerical solution in suitable coordinates, with frequencies of the form  $k^2 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{1/2})$ . However, as  $e^{ikh^2}$  is a double eigenvalue of the limit matrix, this would not imply the continuity of the transformation in terms of the small parameter  $\lambda$ . ■

**Remark 2.5** The same results hold true for the family of Strang splitting propagators

$$\exp(ih\Delta/2) \exp(-ih\lambda V) \exp(ih\Delta/2)$$

which is conjugated to the Lie splitting scheme (1.6) by the operator  $\exp(ih\Delta/2)$  that defines an isometry between all  $\mathcal{A}_\rho$  spaces. ■

**Remark 2.6** The choice of  $\rho_V/4$  and  $\rho_V/5$  in Theorem 2.2 is made for convenience in the proof, and could be replaced by any number of the type  $\rho_V - \delta$  with  $0 < \delta < \rho_V$ . This would only change the values of the constants in the statements. ■

## 2.2 Sketch of proof

The proof of Theorem 2.2 is divided into several steps. We describe here the main arguments:

**(i) Operator formal series.** We first seek the operators  $Q(\lambda)$  and  $\Sigma(\lambda)$  as formal series of the form

$$Q(\lambda) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \lambda^n Q_n \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma(\lambda) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \lambda^n \Sigma_n$$

where for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the coefficients of the operators  $Q_n$  and  $\Sigma_n$  satisfy exponential decay conditions of the form (2.2) and where the equation

$$Q(\lambda)L(\lambda)Q(\lambda)^* = \Sigma(\lambda) \tag{2.16}$$

is satisfied in the sense of formal series. Note that as  $V$  is a bounded operator, the formal series  $L(\lambda)$  is in fact a power series in  $\lambda$ .

In order to ensure the fact that  $Q(\lambda)$  and  $\Sigma(\lambda)$  are unitary operator, we introduce the "logarithm" formal series

$$S = Q^*(i\partial_\lambda Q) \quad \text{and} \quad X = \Sigma^*(i\partial_\lambda \Sigma)$$

and we will impose to the coefficients of the formal series  $S(\lambda)$  and  $X(\lambda)$  to be symmetric. Writing down the equation for the coefficients, we see that for all  $n \geq 0$ ,  $S_n$  and  $X_n$  have to satisfy an equation of the form

$$S_n - e^{ih\Delta} S_n e^{-ih\Delta} + X_n = G_n \tag{2.17}$$

where  $G_n$  is symmetric and depends on  $V$ ,  $S_p$  and  $X_p$  for  $p = 0, \dots, n-1$ . The studying of the homological equation (2.17) is thus the cornerstone for the recursive construction of the operators. The goal of the first part of Section 3 is to make explicit the recursive relations (2.17).

**(ii) Solution of the homological equation.** In the second part of Section 3, we consider the equation

$$S - e^{-ih\Delta} S e^{ih\Delta} + X = G$$

where  $G$  is a given symmetric operator. In terms of coefficients, as the Laplace operator is a diagonal operator with entries  $-k^2$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , this equation can be written

$$(1 - e^{ih(k^2 - \ell^2)})S_{k\ell} + X_{k\ell} = G_{k\ell}$$

for  $(k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ . We see that in the case where  $k^2 = \ell^2$ , this imposes the value of  $X_{k\ell}$ . This is the reason for the introduction of X-shaped operators. Moreover, a problem of small divisors may appear when  $h(k^2 - \ell^2)$  is close to a multiple of  $2\pi$ . The use of the condition (1.7) allows in principle to determine a solution

$$S_{k\ell} = \frac{1}{1 - e^{ih(k^2 - \ell^2)}} G_{k\ell}$$

for  $k^2 \neq \ell^2$ . However, (1.7) and the previous equality do not imply that  $S$  is in a space of exponentially decaying matrices  $\mathcal{A}_\rho$  for a suitable  $\rho$  if  $G$  is. This is due to possible unbounded coefficients  $k + \ell$  in the term  $|k^2 - \ell^2|$ . This is the reason for the introduction of the set of indices  $I_K$  in (2.3) and the corresponding  $I_K$ -solution of the homological equation (see Definition 3.1 below). This explains the final form of the propagator  $\Sigma(\lambda)$ .

Thanks to the non-resonance condition (1.7), we are now able to state a result for the  $I_K$ -solution of the recursive homological equations, see Proposition 3.2. In particular, we obtain the estimates (3.18) which are familiar in backward error analysis and in classical perturbation theory.

**(iii) Estimates and optimization of the constants.** Sections 4 and 5 are the most technical and show the precise estimates of the Theorem. Using  $I_K$ -solutions of the recursive homological equations, we can prove analytic estimates for the coefficients  $S_n$  and  $X_n$ : see Proposition 4.1. We obtain that for large  $n$ , these coefficients behave like

$$(K^\alpha n^\beta)^n$$

up to some constants, and for suitable positive coefficients  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . Though the series diverge, we can define for a fixed index  $N$ , the corresponding truncated series and operators  $Q^{[N]}(\lambda)$  and  $\Sigma^{[N]}(\lambda)$  that satisfy the equation (2.16) up to a remainder term  $R^{[N]}(\lambda)$  depending on  $N$ . We then use these estimates to give a bound for the remainder term, see Proposition 5.3. Roughly speaking, the remainder term is bounded in a suitable  $\mathcal{A}_\rho$  space by

$$(\lambda K^\alpha N^\beta)^N$$

for  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$  and up to some constant. We then take  $K$  and  $N$  proportional to a negative power of  $\lambda$  to obtain an exponential estimate of the form (2.8).

**(iv) Proof of Corollary 2.3.** Section 6 is devoted to the proof of this corollary. The idea is to use the almost X-shaped form of  $\Sigma(\lambda)$  and the estimate (2.8) of the remainder term  $R(\lambda)$ . We divide the phase space into the spaces  $\{\varphi | \varphi_k = 0, |k| \leq K\}$  and  $\{\varphi | \varphi_k = 0, |k| > K\}$ . If  $\pi_K$  denotes the  $L^2$ -orthogonal projection onto the latter space, the almost X-shaped structure of  $\Sigma(\lambda)$  implies that  $[\Sigma(\lambda), \pi_K] = 0$  so that these spaces are invariant by  $\Sigma(\lambda)$ . The ingredients to show the results are the following two key estimates: If for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we set  $\psi^n = Q(\lambda)\varphi^n$  we prove that for  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$  we have

$$\forall 0 \leq k \leq K, \quad |\psi^n|_k - |\psi^0|_k \leq C \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2) \|\varphi^0\|$$

for a constant  $C$  depending only on  $V$  and the parameters appearing in the non-resonant condition. This shows the extremely good conservation of the energies at a given mode  $k \leq K = \lambda^{-\sigma}$  in the "new" variables, and yields easily the estimates of the corollary for  $\psi^n$ . In order to get back to the original variables, we have to control the modes with indices greater than  $K$  by showing that for  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$ ,

$$\left| \|\pi_K \psi^n\| - \|\pi_K \psi^0\| \right| \leq C \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2) \|\varphi^0\|$$

where  $C$  does not depend on  $\lambda$ . The results are obtained by combining these two estimates, and by using the fact that for a smooth function, the term  $\|\pi_K \psi^0\|$  is small for big  $K = \lambda^{-\sigma}$ .

## 2.3 Numerical experiments

We consider the case where the potential function and the initial value are given by

$$V(x) = \frac{3}{5 - 4 \cos(x)} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi^0(x) = \frac{2}{2 - \cos(x)}.$$

We use two different stepsizes:

$$h = 0.2 \quad \text{and} \quad h = \frac{2\pi}{6^2 - 2^2} = 0.196\dots \quad (2.18)$$

The first stepsize satisfies the non-resonance condition<sup>3</sup> (1.7) while the second is obviously resonant. We use fast Fourier transformations to compute the solution of (1.3). In Figure 1, we take  $N = 2^7 + 1 = 129$  Fourier modes. We make  $10^6$  iterations, and we set  $\lambda = 0.1$ . We plot the first 5 energies  $|\varphi^n|_k$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, 4$  in logarithmic scale. We see that if the non-resonance condition is not satisfied, the conservation properties are lost.

In Figure 2, we use  $N = 2^9 + 1 = 513$  Fourier modes and plot all the energies for  $10^5$  iterations with  $\lambda = 0.01$ . We see the growth of high order modes (recall that the  $L^2$  energy is conserved).




Figure 1: Energies of the 5 first modes in logarithmic scale,  $\lambda = 0.1$ . Non-resonant stepsize (left) and resonant stepsize (right)

## 3 Formal series and homological equation

### 3.1 Operator formal series

We now start the proof of Theorem 2.2. In this Section, we consider all the operators as formal series operators in  $\lambda$ . We show rigorous estimates in the next section. Let  $A(\lambda) =$

<sup>3</sup>We thank Z. Shang who showed us this fact.




Figure 2: Energies in logarithmic scale,  $\lambda = 0.01$ . Non-resonant stepsize (left) and resonant stepsize (right)

$\sum_{n \geq 0} \lambda^n A_n$  and  $B(\lambda) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \lambda^n B_n$  be two formal series with operator coefficients  $A_n$  and  $B_n$ . The product  $A(\lambda)B(\lambda) = C(\lambda)$  is the formal series  $C(\lambda) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \lambda^n C_n$  with coefficients

$$C_n = \sum_{k=0}^n A_k B_{n-k}, \quad n \geq 0,$$

where the product between  $A_k$  and  $B_{n-k}$  is the operator product defined in (2.1). Similarly, we can define the action of the derivative in  $\lambda$  on formal series by

$$\partial_\lambda A(\lambda) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \lambda^n (n+1) A_{n+1}$$

for a formal series  $A(\lambda) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \lambda^n A_n$ .

Recall that  $L(\lambda)$  is given by (1.6). As a formal series in  $\lambda$ , we write

$$L(\lambda) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} e^{ih\Delta} (-ihV)^n.$$

We thus have the relation

$$i\partial_\lambda L(\lambda) = e^{ih\Delta} hV e^{-ih\Delta} L(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad L(0) = e^{ih\Delta}.$$

We now seek formal series  $Q(\lambda) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \lambda^n Q_n$  and  $\Sigma(\lambda) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \lambda^n \Sigma_n$  satisfying

$$Q(\lambda)L(\lambda)Q(\lambda)^* = \Sigma(\lambda) \tag{3.1}$$

such that

$$Q(\lambda)^*Q(\lambda) = \text{Id} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma(\lambda)^*\Sigma(\lambda) = \text{Id} \tag{3.2}$$

and where  $\Sigma(\lambda)$  is an X-shaped operator.

Taking the derivative  $i\partial_\lambda$  of the equation (3.1) we get

$$(i\partial_\lambda Q)LQ^* - QL(i\partial_\lambda Q)^* + hQe^{ih\Delta}Ve^{-ih\Delta}LQ^* = i\partial_\lambda\Sigma$$

whence

$$Q^*(i\partial_\lambda Q)L - L(i\partial_\lambda Q)^*Q + he^{ih\Delta}Ve^{-ih\Delta}L = Q^*(i\partial_\lambda\Sigma)Q. \quad (3.3)$$

We introduce the operators

$$S = Q^*(i\partial_\lambda Q) \quad \text{and} \quad X = \Sigma^*(i\partial_\lambda\Sigma).$$

The formal series  $Q$  and  $\Sigma$  can be reconstructed from the series  $S$  and  $X$  using the initial conditions  $Q(0) = \text{Id}$  and  $\Sigma(0) = e^{ih\Delta}$ .

Note that if the formal series  $S$  and  $X$  are symmetric,  $Q$  and  $\Sigma$  are unitary (i.e. satisfy (3.2)). Moreover, if  $X$  an X-shaped operator,  $\Sigma$  will also be X-shaped.

Assuming  $S$  is symmetric, the equation (3.3) can be written (we use  $\Sigma = QLQ^*$ )

$$SL - LS + he^{ih\Delta}Ve^{-ih\Delta}L = Q^*\Sigma XQ = LQ^*XQ$$

whence, as  $V$  and  $e^{-ih\lambda V}$  commute, and as  $L^*L = \text{Id}$ ,

$$S - L^*SL = hV - Q^*XQ. \quad (3.4)$$

Our formal series problem will hence be the following: Find formal series  $S(\lambda) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \lambda^n S_n$  and  $X(\lambda) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \lambda^n X_n$  such that for all  $n \geq 0$ ,  $S_n^* = S_n$ ,  $X_n^* = X_n$  and  $X_n$  is a X-shaped operator, satisfying the equation

$$S(\lambda) - L^*(\lambda)S(\lambda)L(\lambda) = hV - Q^*(\lambda)X(\lambda)Q(\lambda) \quad (3.5)$$

where the operator  $Q$  satisfies

$$i\partial_\lambda Q(\lambda) = Q(\lambda)S(\lambda), \quad \text{and} \quad Q(0) = \text{Id}. \quad (3.6)$$

The operator  $\Sigma$  will then be reconstructed using the formula

$$i\partial_\lambda\Sigma(\lambda) = \Sigma(\lambda)X(\lambda), \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma(0) = e^{ih\Delta}. \quad (3.7)$$

## 3.2 Coefficients

We now write the previous formal series equations in terms of the coefficients of the operator formal series. The equation (3.6) can be written: For all  $n \geq 0$ ,

$$i(n+1)Q_{n+1} = \sum_{k=0}^n Q_k S_{n-k}. \quad (3.8)$$



The equation (3.7) yields similar relations for  $\Sigma_n$  and  $X_n$ . Note that we impose  $Q_0 = I$  and  $\Sigma_0 = e^{ih\Delta}$ .

Let us write the coefficients of the equation (3.5): For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$S_n - \sum_{p+q+r=n} \frac{(ihV)^p}{p!} e^{-ih\Delta} S_q e^{ih\Delta} \frac{(-ihV)^r}{r!} = \delta_n^0 hV - \sum_{p+q+r=n} Q_p^* X_q Q_r. \quad (3.9)$$

Assuming that  $S_k$  and  $X_k$  are determined for  $k = 0, \dots, n-1$  and that they are symmetric, the equation (3.9) can be written

$$S_n - e^{-ih\Delta} S_n e^{ih\Delta} + X_n = \delta_n^0 hV + \sum_{\{p+q+r=n \mid q \neq n\}} \left( \frac{(ihV)^p}{p!} e^{-ih\Delta} S_q e^{ih\Delta} \frac{(-ihV)^r}{r!} - Q_p^* X_q Q_r \right). \quad (3.10)$$

Since the summation set is symmetric in  $r$  and  $p$ , the right-hand side of this equation is symmetric.

We thus see that for all  $n$ , we have to solve a homological equation

$$S_n - e^{-ih\Delta} S_n e^{ih\Delta} + X_n = G_n \quad (3.11)$$

where  $G_n$  is symmetric, and where we seek  $S_n$  and  $X_n$  symmetric with  $X_n$  a X-shaped operator.

Let us first consider the equation (3.10) for  $n = 0$ . We have

$$S_0 - e^{-ih\Delta} S_0 e^{ih\Delta} + X_0 = hV. \quad (3.12)$$

The operator  $\Delta$  is diagonal with entries  $-k^2$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Hence for  $(k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ , the previous equation can be written

$$(S_0)_{k\ell} (1 - e^{ih(k^2 - \ell^2)}) = hV_{k\ell} - (X_0)_{k\ell}$$

so that we can choose for  $k^2 \neq \ell^2$ , under the condition that  $h(k^2 - \ell^2)$  is not a multiple of  $2\pi$ ,

$$(S_0)_{k\ell} = \frac{1}{1 - e^{ih(k^2 - \ell^2)}} hV_{k\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad (X_0)_{k\ell} = 0 \quad (3.13)$$

so that  $X_0$  is X-shaped. For  $k^2 = \ell^2$  the previous equation degenerates, but we can take

$$(S_0)_{k\ell} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (X_0)_{k\ell} = hV_{k\ell}.$$

The previous equations define symmetric operators  $S_0$  and  $X_0$ , and  $X_0$  is X-shaped. By induction, the formal series problem of the previous subsection is then solved. However, we cannot obtain estimates in  $\mathcal{A}_\rho$ -spaces for the operators, even if  $h$  satisfies the estimate (1.7). The reason for this is that using (1.7), the equation (3.13) yields the following estimate, for  $k \neq \ell$ ,

$$|(S_0)_{k\ell}| \leq \gamma^{-1} |k^2 - \ell^2|^\nu |V_{k\ell}|$$

and the fact that  $V \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_V}$  does not implies that  $S_0 \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$  for a suitable  $\rho$ . This is due to possible unbounded coefficients  $k + \ell$ .

### 3.3 Solution of the homological equation

It is worth noticing that the above equation (3.11) is underdetermined. The previous computations motivate the introduction of the following solutions of the homological equation:

**Definition 3.1** Let  $G$  be a symmetric operator and  $K > 0$  be a real number. Assume that  $h \in (0, 1)$  satisfies (1.7). Let us consider the equation:

$$S - e^{ih\Delta} S e^{-ih\Delta} + X = G. \quad (3.14)$$

We define as  $I_K$ -solution of the homological equation (3.14) the symmetric operators  $S$  and  $X$  defined for  $(k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  by

$$\text{if } (k, \ell) \in I_K \text{ and } |k| \neq |\ell|, \quad \begin{cases} S_{k\ell} &= \frac{1}{1 - e^{ih(k^2 - \ell^2)}} G_{k\ell}, \\ X_{k\ell} &= 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

$$\text{otherwise, if } (k, \ell) \notin I_K \text{ or } |k| = |\ell|, \quad \begin{cases} S_{k\ell} &= 0, \\ X_{k\ell} &= G_{k\ell}, \end{cases} \quad (3.16)$$

where  $I_K$  is defined in (2.3). ■

With this definition, the following theorem yields the cornerstone of the solution process:

**Proposition 3.2** Let  $G \in \mathcal{S}_\rho$  for a given  $\rho > 0$ . Assume that  $h$  satisfies (1.7) with the constants  $\gamma$  and  $\nu$ . Let  $S$  and  $X$  be the  $I_K$ -solutions of the homological equation

$$S - e^{-ih\Delta} S e^{ih\Delta} + X = G \quad (3.17)$$

for a given  $K \geq 1$ . Then for all  $\delta$  such that  $0 < \delta \leq \rho$ , we have  $S \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho-\delta}$ ,  $X \in \mathcal{S}_\rho \cap \mathcal{X}_\rho^K$ , and the following estimates hold:

$$\|S\|_{\rho-\delta} \leq \frac{K^\nu}{\gamma h} \left( \frac{4\nu}{e\delta} \right)^{2\nu} \|G\|_\rho \quad \text{and} \quad \|X\|_\rho \leq \|G\|_\rho. \quad (3.18)$$

**Proof.** The fact that  $\|X\|_\rho \leq \|G\|_\rho$  is clear from (3.16).

Using (3.15) and (1.7), we have for  $(k, \ell) \in I_K$  and  $|k| \neq |\ell|$ ,

$$|S_{k\ell}| \leq \frac{1}{\gamma h} |k^2 - \ell^2|^\nu |G_{k\ell}|.$$

But for  $(k, \ell) \in I_K$ , we easily see that  $|k + \ell| \leq 2K + |k - \ell|$ . Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} |k^2 - \ell^2|^2 &\leq |k - \ell|^2 (2K + |k - \ell|)^2 \\ &\leq 2|k - \ell|^2 (4K^2 + |k - \ell|^2) \\ &\leq 8K^2 |k - \ell|^2 + 2|k - \ell|^4 \\ &\leq 16K^2 |k - \ell|^4 \end{aligned}$$

and therefore  $|k^2 - \ell^2|^\nu \leq 2^{2\nu} K^\nu |k - \ell|^{2\nu}$ . This implies that for all  $(k, \ell) \in I_K$  with  $|k| \neq |\ell|$ ,

$$|S_{k\ell}| \leq \frac{K^\nu}{\gamma h} 2^{2\nu} |k - \ell|^{2\nu} \|G\|_\rho e^{-\rho|k-\ell|}.$$

Hence, for all  $(k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ ,

$$|S_{k\ell}| e^{(\rho-\delta)|k-\ell|} \leq \frac{K^\nu}{\gamma h} 2^{2\nu} \|G\|_\rho |k - \ell|^{2\nu} e^{-\delta|k-\ell|}.$$

The fact that for all  $(k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ ,

$$|k - \ell|^{2\nu} e^{-\delta|k-\ell|} \leq \left(\frac{2\nu}{e\delta}\right)^{2\nu}$$

allows to conclude. ■

In the next section, we will consider the recursive solutions of the collection of equations (3.10) by induction on  $n$  using the  $I_K$ -solutions of the homological equation and the previous Proposition.

## 4 Estimates for the coefficients

We now give estimates for the coefficients of the formal series  $S(\lambda)$ ,  $X(\lambda)$  and  $Q(\lambda)$  given by the recursive  $I_K$ -solutions of (3.10) for a fixed  $K \geq 1$ . Recall that  $V$  is assumed to satisfy Hypothesis 2.1.

Let us first consider the operators  $S_0$  and  $X_0$  given by the  $I_K$ -solution of (3.12). Using Proposition 3.2, we have for all  $0 < \delta \leq \rho_V$

$$\|S_0\|_{\rho_V - \delta} \leq M_V \frac{K^\nu}{\gamma} \left(\frac{4\nu}{e\delta}\right)^{2\nu} \quad \text{and} \quad \|X_0\|_{\rho_V} \leq hM_V. \quad (4.1)$$

In particular, there exists a constant  $C$  depending only on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $\nu$  such that

$$\|S_0\|_{\rho_V/3} \leq K^\nu C \quad \text{and} \quad \|X_0\|_{\rho_V/3} \leq hC. \quad (4.2)$$

Moreover, since  $Q_0 = \text{Id}$ , we have that  $\|Q_0\|_{\rho_V/3} = 1$ .

The goal of this section is to prove the following result:

**Proposition 4.1** *There exist constants  $C_0 \geq 1$  and  $K_0 \geq 1$  depending only on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $\nu$  such that for all  $K \geq K_0$ , and all  $h \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (1.7), if we denote by  $(S_J)_{J \geq 0}$ ,  $(Q_J)_{J \geq 0}$  and  $(X_J)_{J \geq 0}$  the operators obtained by the iterative  $I_K$ -solutions of (3.10), we have for all  $J \geq 1$ ,*

$$\|S_J\|_{\rho_V/3} + \|Q_J\|_{\rho_V/3} \leq (C_0 K^\alpha J^\beta)^J \quad \text{and} \quad (4.3)$$

$$\|X_J\|_{\rho_V/3} \leq h (C_0 K^\alpha J^\beta)^J, \quad (4.4)$$

where  $\alpha = 2\nu$  and  $\beta = 4\nu + 3$ .

Before giving the proof of this proposition, we first give the following lemma that provides a bound for the product of two operators with exponential decay of coefficients away from the diagonal:

**Lemma 4.2** *Let  $\rho \geq 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ . Let  $A \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$  and  $B \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho+\delta}$ . Then the products  $AB$  and  $BA$  are in the space  $\mathcal{A}_\rho$  and we have the estimates*

$$\|AB\|_\rho \leq C_\delta \|A\|_\rho \|B\|_{\rho+\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \|BA\|_\rho \leq C_\delta \|A\|_\rho \|B\|_{\rho+\delta}, \quad (4.5)$$

where  $C_\delta = (1 + e^{-\delta})(1 - e^{-\delta})^{-1} > 1$ .

**Proof.** By definition, we have for  $(k, \ell, m) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$

$$|A_{k\ell}| \leq \|A\|_\rho e^{-\rho|k-\ell|} \quad \text{and} \quad |B_{\ell m}| \leq \|B\|_{\rho+\delta} e^{-(\rho+\delta)|\ell-m|}. \quad (4.6)$$

This implies that for all  $(k, m) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ ,

$$|(AB)_{km}| e^{\rho|k-m|} \leq \|A\|_\rho \|B\|_{\rho+\delta} e^{\rho|k-m|} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-\rho|k-\ell|} e^{-(\rho+\delta)|\ell-m|}.$$

The last sum can also be written after the change of index  $\ell \mapsto \ell + m$ ,

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-\rho|k-\ell-m|} e^{-\rho|\ell|} e^{-\delta|\ell|} \leq \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-\rho|k-m|} e^{+\rho|\ell|} e^{-\rho|\ell|} e^{-\delta|\ell|}$$

where we used  $|k-m| - |\ell| \leq |k-m-\ell|$  for all  $(k, m, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ . We thus have

$$\|AB\|_\rho \leq \|A\|_\rho \|B\|_{\rho+\delta} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-\delta|\ell|}$$

and we easily compute that

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-\delta|\ell|} = \frac{1 + e^{-\delta}}{1 - e^{-\delta}} \quad (4.7)$$

which yields the first inequality in (4.5). The second is proved similarly.  $\blacksquare$

**Proof of Proposition 4.1.** Let  $J \geq 1$  be a fixed integer. We set  $\delta = \rho_V(2J+1)^{-1}$  and for  $j \in \{0, \dots, J+1\}$ ,  $\rho_j = \rho_V - j\delta = (2J+1-j)\delta$ .

In the following, for all operator  $A$  and for  $j \in \{0, \dots, J+1\}$ , we set

$$\|A\|_{(j)} := \|A\|_{\rho_j}.$$

Note that if  $0 \leq j \leq k \leq J+1$ , then  $\|A\|_{(k)} \leq \|A\|_{(j)}$ . Moreover,  $\|A\|_{(0)} = \|A\|_{\rho_V}$  and

$$\|A\|_{(J+1)} = \|A\|_{\rho_V J/(2J+1)} \geq \|A\|_{\rho_V/3}.$$

The relation (4.1) and the fact that  $Q_0 = \text{Id}$  yields with the previous notations:

$$\|S_0\|_{(1)} \leq M_V \frac{K^\nu}{\gamma} \left(\frac{4\nu}{e\delta}\right)^{2\nu}, \quad \|X_0\|_{(0)} \leq hM_V \quad \text{and} \quad \|Q_0\|_{(0)} = 1.$$

We now seek recursive bounds for the norms  $\|S_j\|_{(j+1)}$ ,  $\|X_j\|_{(j)}$  and  $\|Q_j\|_{(j)}$  for  $j = 0, \dots, J$ .

The relation (3.8) and Lemma 4.2 ensure that, for  $n = 0, \dots, J-1$ , we have

$$(n+1)\|Q_{n+1}\|_{(n+1)} \leq \sum_{k=0}^n \|Q_k S_{n-k}\|_{(n+1)} \leq C_\delta \sum_{k=0}^n \|Q_k\|_{(n)} \|S_{n-k}\|_{(n+1)}.$$

Hence we get the following estimate for all  $n = 0, \dots, J-1$ :

$$\|Q_{n+1}\|_{(n+1)} \leq \frac{C_\delta}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^n \|Q_k\|_{(k)} \|S_{n-k}\|_{(n-k+1)}. \quad (4.8)$$

Let us denote, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,

$$G_n^1 = \sum_{\{p+q+r=n|q \neq n\}} \frac{(ihV)^p}{p!} e^{-ih\Delta} S_q e^{ih\Delta} \frac{(-ihV)^r}{r!}$$

$$\text{and } G_n^2 = - \sum_{\{p+q+r=n|q \neq n\}} Q_p^* X_q Q_r$$

the two members of the right-hand side of the equation (3.10). Lemma 4.2 implies that we have, for  $n = 1, \dots, J$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_n^1\|_{(n)} &\leq \sum_{\{p+q+r=n|q \neq n\}} \frac{1}{p!r!} \|(ihV)^p e^{-ih\Delta} S_q e^{ih\Delta} (-ihV)^r\|_{(n)} \\ &\leq C_\delta \sum_{\{p+q+r=n|q \neq n\}} \frac{1}{p!r!} \|(ihV)^p\|_{(n-1)} \|e^{-ih\Delta} S_q e^{ih\Delta} (-ihV)^r\|_{(n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the coefficients of the diagonal operators  $e^{\pm ih\Delta}$  are of modulus one, Lemma 4.2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_n^1\|_{(n)} &\leq C_\delta^2 \sum_{\{p+q+r=n|q \neq n\}} \frac{1}{p!r!} \|(ihV)^p\|_{(n-1)} \|S_q\|_{(n)} \|(-ihV)^r\|_{(n-1)} \\ &\leq C_\delta^2 \sum_{\{p+q+r=n|q \neq n\}} \frac{1}{p!r!} \|(ihV)^p\|_{(0)} \|S_q\|_{(q+1)} \|(-ihV)^r\|_{(0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the hypothesis on  $V$ , we obtain for all  $n = 1, \dots, J$ ,

$$\|G_n^1\|_{(n)} \leq C_\delta^2 \sum_{\{p+q+r=n|q \neq n\}} \frac{(hM_V)^{p+r}}{p!r!} \|S_q\|_{(q+1)}. \quad (4.9)$$

Similarly, for  $n = 1, \dots, J$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_n^2\|_{(n)} &\leq \sum_{\{p+q+r=n|q \neq n\}} \|Q_p^* X_q Q_r\|_{(n)} \\ &\leq 2C_\delta \|Q_n\|_{(n)} \|X_0\|_{(n-1)} \\ &\quad + C_\delta^2 \sum_{\{p+q+r=n|p,q,r \neq n\}} \|Q_p\|_{(n-1)} \|X_q\|_{(n)} \|Q_r\|_{(n-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $C_\delta > 1$ , we can write

$$\|G_n^2\|_{(n)} \leq C_\delta^2 \sum_{\{p+q+r=n|q \neq n\}} \|Q_p\|_{(p)} \|X_q\|_{(q)} \|Q_r\|_{(r)}. \quad (4.10)$$

Now using Proposition (3.2) for the  $I_K$ -solution of (3.10) we have for  $n = 1, \dots, J$ ,

$$\|S_n\|_{(n+1)} \leq \frac{K^\nu}{\gamma h} \left(\frac{4\nu}{e\delta}\right)^{2\nu} \left(\|G_n^1\|_{(n)} + \|G_n^2\|_{(n)}\right) \quad (4.11)$$

$$\text{and} \quad \|X_n\|_n \leq \|G_n^1\|_{(n)} + \|G_n^2\|_{(n)}. \quad (4.12)$$

These estimates, together with (4.8), (4.9) and (4.10) give recursive relations between the coefficients  $(\|S_j\|_{j+1})_{0 \leq j \leq J}$ ,  $(\|Q_j\|_j)_{0 \leq j \leq J}$  and  $(\|X_j\|_j)_{0 \leq j \leq J}$ .

Let us define the numbers  $(s_j)_{j \geq 0}$ ,  $(q_j)_{j \geq 0}$  and  $(x_j)_{j \geq 0}$  as follows:

$$s_0 = M_V \frac{K^\nu}{\gamma} \left(\frac{4\nu}{e\delta}\right)^{2\nu}, \quad q_0 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad x_0 = hM_V,$$

and for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , with  $\kappa = \frac{K^\nu}{\gamma h} \left(\frac{4\nu}{e\delta}\right)^{2\nu}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} s_n &= \kappa C_\delta^2 \sum_{\{p+q+r=n|q \neq n\}} \left( \frac{(hM_V)^{p+r}}{p!r!} s_q + q_p q_r x_q \right), \\ q_n &= \frac{C_\delta}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} q_k s_{n-k-1}, \\ x_n &= C_\delta^2 \sum_{\{p+q+r=n|q \neq n\}} \left( \frac{(hM_V)^{p+r}}{p!r!} s_q + q_p q_r x_q \right). \end{aligned}$$

By induction, using the equations (4.8), (4.9), (4.10) and (4.11) we have that for  $j = 0, \dots, J$ ,

$$\|S_j\|_{j+1} \leq s_j, \quad \|Q_j\|_j \leq q_j \quad \text{and} \quad \|X_j\|_j \leq x_j.$$

We then define the corresponding power series

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{s}(t) &= \sum_{n \geq 0} s_n t^n, \\ \mathfrak{q}(t) &= \sum_{n \geq 0} q_n t^n, \\ \text{and } \mathfrak{x}(t) &= \sum_{n \geq 0} x_n t^n. \end{aligned}$$

By definition of the coefficients of these series, we have the following formal identities:

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \kappa C_\delta^2 (e^{2hM_V t} - 1)) \mathfrak{s}(t) - s_0 &= \kappa C_\delta^2 \mathfrak{x}(t) (\mathfrak{q}(t)^2 - 1), \\ \mathfrak{q}'(t) &= C_\delta \mathfrak{s}(t) \mathfrak{q}(t), \\ \mathfrak{x}(t) &= \kappa^{-1} \mathfrak{s}(t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathfrak{q}'$  denotes the derivative of  $\mathfrak{q}$  with respect to  $t$ . We then derive that  $\mathfrak{q}(t)$  is solution of the following ordinary differential equation

$$\mathfrak{q}'(t) = \frac{s_0 C_\delta \mathfrak{q}(t)}{1 - C_\delta^2 (\kappa (e^{2hM_V t} - 1) + (\mathfrak{q}(t)^2 - 1))} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{q}(0) = 1. \quad (4.13)$$

The study of this equation will give us bounds on the coefficients  $q_j$ . It is clear with the previous relations that for sufficiently small  $t$ , the function  $\mathfrak{s}(t)$ ,  $\mathfrak{q}(t)$  and  $\mathfrak{x}(t)$  are analytic in  $t$ . Moreover, the following Lemma, whose proof is given in Appendix, gives a bound for the radius of convergence of the corresponding power series:

**Lemma 4.3** *Let us define*

$$K_0^\nu = \max \left( 1, \frac{\rho_V^{2(\nu-1)} \gamma}{4} \left( \frac{e}{4\nu} \right)^{2\nu} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad r^{-1} = 20hM_V \kappa C_\delta^3.$$

*For all  $K \geq K_0$  and  $h \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (1.7), the functions  $\mathfrak{x}$ ,  $\mathfrak{q}$  and  $\mathfrak{s}$  are analytic in  $(-r, r)$ , and satisfy for all  $t \in (-r, r)$  the estimates:*

$$0 < \mathfrak{s}(t) \leq \frac{5\sqrt{5}}{4} \kappa h M_V, \quad 0,8 < \mathfrak{q}(t) \leq \frac{\sqrt{5}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < \mathfrak{x}(t) \leq \frac{5\sqrt{5}}{4} h M_V.$$

**End of proof of Proposition 4.1:** Let us consider the functions  $\mathfrak{s}(z)$ ,  $\mathfrak{q}(z)$  and  $\mathfrak{x}(z)$  for complex numbers  $z$ . As the coefficients of the corresponding power series are non-negative, we have for example for all sufficiently small  $z$ ,  $|\mathfrak{s}(z)| \leq \mathfrak{s}(|z|)$  and similar inequalities for  $\mathfrak{q}(z)$  and  $\mathfrak{x}(z)$ . The previous Lemma combined with Cauchy estimates then shows that for  $j = J$ , we have

$$s_J \leq \frac{5\sqrt{5}}{4} \kappa h M_V (20hM_V \kappa C_\delta^3)^J = \frac{5\sqrt{5}}{4} 20^J C_\delta^{3J} (\kappa h M_V)^{J+1}.$$

By (4.7) and the definition of  $\delta$ , we have  $C_\delta \leq 2e^{\rho\nu} \delta^{-1}$ . The previous inequality then yields (recall that  $\kappa = \frac{K^\nu}{\gamma h} \left(\frac{4\nu}{e\delta}\right)^{2\nu}$ ):

$$s_J \leq \frac{5\sqrt{5}}{4} \left( \frac{K^\nu}{\gamma} \left( \frac{4\nu}{e\delta} \right)^{2\nu} \right)^{J+1} M_V^{J+1} 20^J 2^{3J} e^{3J\rho\nu} \delta^{-3J}$$

and we easily see that there exists a positive constant  $C$  depending on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $\nu$  such that

$$s_J \leq C^J K^{\nu(J+1)} \delta^{-2\nu(J+1)-3J}.$$

As  $\delta^{-1} = (2J+1)/\rho_V$  we can modify  $C$  to obtain

$$s_J \leq C^J K^{\nu(J+1)} (2J+1)^{(2\nu+3)J+2\nu}.$$

Now, since we have  $\|S_J\|_{\rho_V/3} \leq \|S_J\|_{(J+1)} \leq s_J$ , we obtain the result with  $\alpha = 2\nu$  and  $\beta = 4\nu + 3$  after modification of the constant  $C$  to become  $C_0$ .

The proof of the other estimates for  $\|X_J\|_{\rho_V/3}$  and  $\|Q_J\|_{\rho_V}$  can be obtained similarly from Lemma 4.3. This finishes the proof of Proposition 4.1  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 4.4** The coefficients  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  given in Proposition 4.1 are clearly not optimal. For simplicity, we did not try to optimize them, as well as the constants  $C_0$  and  $K_0$ .  $\blacksquare$

## 5 Error estimates

### 5.1 Construction of the operators

Assume that  $K \geq 1$  and  $N \geq 1$  are given. Let us define the following polynomials in  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$S^{[N]}(\lambda) = \sum_{0 \leq n \leq N} \lambda^n S_n \quad \text{and} \quad X^{[N]}(\lambda) = \sum_{0 \leq n \leq N} \lambda^n X_n \quad (5.1)$$

where the coefficients  $S_n$  and  $X_n$  are defined by the recursive  $I_K$ -solutions of (3.8)-(3.10). Proposition 4.1 shows that  $S^{[N]}(\lambda)$  and  $X^{[N]}(\lambda)$  are operators in the space  $\mathcal{S}_{\rho_V/3}$  for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . Lemma 4.2 then shows that the multiplication by  $S^{[N]}(\lambda)$  or  $X^{[N]}(\lambda)$  defines a continuous linear mapping from  $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_V/4}$  to itself.

Let us denote by  $Q^{[N]}(\lambda)$  and  $\Sigma^{[N]}(\lambda)$  the maximal solutions in  $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_V/4}$  of the following Cauchy problems

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_\lambda Q^{[N]}(\lambda) = Q^{[N]}(\lambda) S^{[N]}(\lambda), \\ Q^{[N]}(0) = \text{Id}, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_\lambda \Sigma^{[N]}(\lambda) = \Sigma^{[N]}(\lambda) X^{[N]}(\lambda), \\ \Sigma^{[N]}(0) = e^{ih\Delta}. \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

Since  $\lambda \mapsto S^{[N]}(\lambda)$  (resp.  $\lambda \mapsto X^{[N]}(\lambda)$ ) is continuous from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_V/3}$ ,  $Q^{[N]}(\lambda)$  and  $\Sigma^{[N]}(\lambda)$  are defined for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and belong to the space  $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_V/4}$ .



By construction, the spaces  $\mathcal{X}_\rho^K$  are invariant by multiplication. Combining this and Lemma 4.2 we see that the multiplication by  $X^{[N]}(\lambda)$  defines a continuous linear operator from  $\mathcal{X}_{\rho_V/4}^K$  to itself.

As  $e^{ih\Delta} \in \mathcal{X}_{\rho_V/4}^M$  and as  $\mathcal{X}_{\rho_V/4}^K$  is closed for  $\|\cdot\|_{\rho_V/4}$ , we have

$$\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \Sigma^{[N]}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{X}_{\rho_V/4}^K.$$

Since  $X^{[N]}(\lambda)$  and  $S^{[N]}(\lambda)$  are polynomial functions of  $\lambda$ ,  $\Sigma^{[N]}(\lambda)$  and  $Q^{[N]}(\lambda)$  are convergent power series in  $\lambda$  on a neighborhood of 0.

Moreover, as for all  $\lambda$  the operator  $S^{[N]}(\lambda)$  is symmetric, the function

$$\lambda \mapsto Z(\lambda) := Q^{[N]}(\lambda)^* Q^{[N]}(\lambda)$$

is solution of the following Cauchy problem in suitable  $\mathcal{A}$  spaces:

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_\lambda Z(\lambda) = [Z(\lambda), S^{[N]}(\lambda)], \\ Z(0) = \text{Id}. \end{cases}$$

This implies that for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $Z(\lambda) = \text{Id}$  and hence that  $Q^{[N]}(\lambda)$  is a unitary operator for all  $\lambda$ . A similar argument using the symmetry of  $X^{[N]}(\lambda)$  shows that  $\Sigma^{[N]}(\lambda)$  is a unitary operator.

Let us denote, for  $\lambda$  sufficiently small,

$$Q^{[N]}(\lambda) = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} Q_n^{[N]} \lambda^n \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma^{[N]}(\lambda) = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \Sigma_n^{[N]} \lambda^n$$

where for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $Q_n^{[N]}$  and  $\Sigma_n^{[N]}$  are in  $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_V/4}$  (the series are absolutely convergent in this space for  $\lambda$  sufficiently small).

For all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , we can define the following operator in a convenient  $\mathcal{A}$  space

$$R^{[N]}(\lambda) = Q^{[N]}(\lambda)L(\lambda)Q^{[N]}(\lambda)^* - \Sigma^{[N]}(\lambda). \quad (5.3)$$

Using Lemma 4.2,  $R^{[N]}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_V/5}$  and in this space,  $R^{[N]}(\lambda)$  is the sum of the following absolutely convergent power series in a neighborhood of 0:

$$R^{[N]}(\lambda) = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \lambda^n \left[ \sum_{p+q+r=n} \left( Q_p^{[N]} e^{ih\Delta} \frac{(-ih)^q}{q!} V^q (Q_r^{[N]})^* \right) - \Sigma_n^{[N]} \right]. \quad (5.4)$$

Since  $Q_0 = Q_0^{[N]} = \text{Id}$ , the relation (3.8) and the fact that  $Q^{[N]}$  is defined by (5.2) ensure that

$$\forall n \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad Q_n = Q_n^{[N]}.$$

Moreover, the operators  $(S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfy (3.10) for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  by definition. Hence we have in a suitable  $\mathcal{A}$  space,

$$S^{[N]} - L^* S^{[N]} L = hV - (Q^{[N]})^* X^{[N]} Q^{[N]} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{N+1}).$$

We deduce that

$$S^{[N]} - L^* S^{[N]} L = hV - (Q^{[N]})^* (\Sigma^{[N]})^* (i\partial_\lambda \Sigma^{[N]}) Q^{[N]} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{N+1})$$

by definition (5.2) of  $\Sigma^{[N]}$ , and the fact that this operator is unitary. Then, since  $(\Sigma^{[N]})^* = (Q^{[N]})L^*(Q^{[N]})^* - (R^{[N]})^*$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} LS^{[N]} - S^{[N]}L &= hLV - (Q^{[N]})^* (i\partial_\lambda \Sigma^{[N]}) Q^{[N]} \\ &\quad + L(Q^{[N]})^* R^{[N]} (i\partial_\lambda \Sigma^{[N]}) Q^{[N]} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{N+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $S^{[N]} = (Q^{[N]})^* (i\partial_\lambda Q^{[N]}) = (S^{[N]})^*$ , we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} L(i\partial_\lambda Q^{[N]})^* Q^{[N]} - (Q^{[N]})^* (i\partial_\lambda Q^{[N]})L &= hLV - (Q^{[N]})^* (i\partial_\lambda \Sigma^{[N]}) Q^{[N]} \\ &\quad + L(Q^{[N]})^* R^{[N]} (i\partial_\lambda \Sigma^{[N]}) Q^{[N]} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{N+1}). \end{aligned}$$

After left-multiplying this relation by  $Q^{[N]}$  and right-multiplying by  $(Q^{[N]})^*$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{[N]}L(i\partial_\lambda Q^{[N]})^* - (i\partial_\lambda Q^{[N]})L(Q^{[N]})^* \\ - hQ^{[N]}e^{ih\Delta}V e^{-ih\lambda V} (Q^{[N]})^* + i\partial_\lambda \Sigma^{[N]} &= Q^{[N]}L(Q^{[N]})^* R^{[N]} (i\partial_\lambda \Sigma^{[N]}) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{N+1}). \end{aligned}$$

This relation expresses that

$$i\partial_\lambda R^{[N]} = -Q^{[N]}L(Q^{[N]})^* R^{[N]} (i\partial_\lambda \Sigma^{[N]}) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{N+1}).$$

Noticing that  $R^{[N]}(0) = e^{ih\Delta} - e^{ih\Delta} = 0$ , we derive by induction that

$$\forall 0 \leq n \leq N+1, \quad \partial_\lambda^n R^{[N]}(0) = 0.$$

Therefore, the relation (5.4) simplifies to

$$R^{[N]}(\lambda) = \sum_{n>N+1}^{+\infty} \lambda^n \left[ \sum_{p+q+r=n} \left( Q_p^{[N]} e^{ih\Delta} \frac{(-ih)^q}{q!} V^q (Q_r^{[N]})^* \right) - \Sigma_n^{[N]} \right] \quad (5.5)$$

with absolute convergence in  $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_V/5}$ .

## 5.2 Estimate for the remainder term

We give now an estimate for the term  $R^{[N]}(\lambda)$ . We first give estimates for the coefficients of the formal series  $\Sigma^{[N]}$  and  $Q^{[N]}$ :

**Lemma 5.1** *Using the previous notations, there exists a constant  $C_1 \geq 1$  depending only on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $\nu$  such that for all  $N \geq 1$ , all  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , all  $K \geq K_0$ , and all  $h \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (1.7),*

$$\|\Sigma_n^{[N]}\|_{\rho_V/4} \leq h(C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^n \quad \text{and} \quad (5.6)$$

$$\|Q_n^{[N]}\|_{\rho_V/4} \leq (C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^n \quad (5.7)$$

where  $\alpha = 2\nu$  and  $\beta = 4\nu + 3$  are given in Proposition 4.1.

**Proof.** Since  $\Sigma_0^{[N]} = e^{ih\Delta}$ , we have  $\|\Sigma_0^{[N]}\|_{\rho_V/4} = 1$ . Moreover, since  $\Sigma_1^{[N]} = \Sigma_0^{[N]} X_0$  and we have with (4.2) that  $\|\Sigma_1^{[N]}\|_{\rho_V/4} \leq hM_V$ . Hence (5.6) holds for  $n = 1$  with a constant  $C_1$  depending only on  $V$  (notice that  $K \geq K_0 \geq 1$ ).

Assume now that (5.6) holds with some constant  $C_1$  and for all  $k \leq n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . By definition of  $\Sigma^{[N]}$  and the use Lemma 4.2 we have

$$\|\Sigma_{n+1}^{[N]}\|_{\rho_V/4} \leq \frac{C_{\rho_V/12}}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^{\min(n,N)} \|\Sigma_{n-k}^{[N]}\|_{\rho_V/4} \|X_k\|_{\rho_V/3}.$$

Using the induction hypothesis and the estimate (4.4) we thus have

$$\|\Sigma_{n+1}^{[N]}\|_{\rho_V/4} \leq \frac{C_{\rho_V/12}}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^{\min(n,N)} h(C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{n-k} h(C_0 K^\alpha k^\beta)^k.$$

If we assume that  $C_1 \geq C_0$  we thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Sigma_{n+1}^{[N]}\|_{\rho_V/4} &\leq h(C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^n \frac{hC_{\rho_V/12}}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^{\min(n,N)} \left(\frac{k}{N}\right)^{\beta k} \\ &\leq h(C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^n (hC_{\rho_V/12}) \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^{\min(n,N)} 1 \\ &\leq h(C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{n+1} \end{aligned}$$

provided that  $C_1 \geq C_{\rho_V/12}$  and since  $K \geq 1$ . This shows (5.6).

The proof of (5.7) is similar using the estimate (4.3) instead of (4.4). ■

The previous Lemma yields the following estimates:

**Proposition 5.2** *Using the previous notations, for all  $K \geq K_0$ , all  $N \geq 1$ , all  $h \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (1.7) and all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $|\lambda| \leq (2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{-1}$ , we have*

$$\|Q^{[N]}(\lambda) - \text{Id}\|_{\rho_V/4} \leq 2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta |\lambda| \quad (5.8)$$

and

$$\|\Sigma^{[N]}(\lambda) - e^{ih\Delta}\|_{\rho_V/4} \leq 2hC_1 K^\alpha N^\beta |\lambda|. \quad (5.9)$$

**Proof.** We have

$$Q^{[N]}(\lambda) - \text{Id} = \sum_{n \geq 1} \lambda^n Q_n^{[N]}.$$

This implies, using (5.7)

$$\|Q^{[N]}(\lambda) - \text{Id}\|_{\rho_V/4} \leq \sum_{n \geq 1} (|\lambda| C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^n$$

and the result follows straightforwardly. The second inequality is proved similarly.  $\blacksquare$

We now give an estimate for the remainder term itself. We use the following notation: For a function  $f$  defined in a neighborhood of 0 in  $\mathbb{R}$  and such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the derivative  $f^{(n)}(0)$  is defined, we set

$$T_N(f)(x) = f(x) - \sum_{p=0}^{\lfloor N \rfloor} x^p \frac{f^{(p)}(0)}{p!} \quad (5.10)$$

where  $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$  denotes the nearest integer towards minus infinity.

**Proposition 5.3** *Using the notations of Proposition 4.1, there exists a constant  $C_2 > 0$  depending only on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $\nu$  such that for all  $h \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (1.7), all  $N \geq 1$ , all  $K \geq K_0$  and all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $|\lambda| \leq (2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{-1}$  we have*

$$\|R^{[N]}(\lambda)\|_{\rho_V/5} \leq (C_2 |\lambda| K^{3\alpha} N^{3(\beta+1)})^N. \quad (5.11)$$

**Proof.** Using Lemma 4.2, the formula (5.5) yields for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|R^{[N]}(\lambda)\|_{\rho_V/5} \\
& \leq \sum_{n \geq N+1}^{+\infty} |\lambda|^n \left[ C_{\frac{\rho_V}{20}} \sum_{p+q+r=n} \left( \|Q_p^{[N]}\|_{\rho_V/5} \left\| \frac{(-ih)^q}{q!} V^q (Q_r^{[N]})^* \right\|_{\rho_V/4} \right) \right] \\
& \quad + \sum_{n \geq N+1}^{+\infty} |\lambda|^n \| \Sigma_n^{[N]} \|_{\rho_V/5} \\
& \leq \sum_{n \geq N+1}^{+\infty} |\lambda|^n \left[ C_{\frac{\rho_V}{20}} C_{\frac{\rho_V}{12}} \sum_{p+q+r=n} \left( \|Q_p^{[N]}\|_{\rho_V/5} \frac{h^q}{q!} \|V^q\|_{\rho_V/3} \| (Q_r^{[N]})^* \|_{\rho_V/4} \right) \right] \\
& \quad + \sum_{n \geq N+1}^{+\infty} |\lambda|^n \| \Sigma_n^{[N]} \|_{\rho_V/5}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 5.1 we thus get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|R^{[N]}(\lambda)\|_{\rho_V/5} \\
& \leq \sum_{n \geq N+1}^{+\infty} |\lambda|^n \left[ C_{\frac{\rho_V}{20}} C_{\frac{\rho_V}{12}} \sum_{p+q+r=n} \left( (C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^p \frac{h^q}{q!} M_V^q (C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^r \right) \right] \\
& \quad + h \sum_{n \geq N+1}^{+\infty} (|\lambda| C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^n.
\end{aligned}$$

For  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $|x| < (C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{-1}$ , we set

$$f(x) = (1 - C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta x)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad g(x) = e^{hM_V x}.$$

The previous inequality can then be written

$$\|R_N(\lambda)\|_{\rho_V/5} \leq C_{\frac{\rho_V}{20}} C_{\frac{\rho_V}{12}} T_N(f^2 g)(|\lambda|) + h T_N(f)(|\lambda|)$$

where  $T_N$  is defined in (5.10). Now for all  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  and all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $|x| < (C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{-1}$ , we have

$$\frac{d^p f}{dx^p}(x) = \frac{p! (C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^p}{(1 - C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta x)^{p+1}}$$

and

$$\frac{d^p (f^2)}{dx^p}(x) = \frac{(p+1)! (C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^p}{(1 - C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta x)^{p+2}},$$

and for the function  $g$ :

$$\frac{d^p g}{dx^p}(x) = (hM_V)^p e^{hM_V x}.$$

By definition of  $T_N$ , and as  $f$  and  $g$  are smooth, we have for  $|\lambda| \leq (2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{-1}$ ,

$$T_N(f^2g)(|\lambda|) \leq \frac{|\lambda|^{[N]+1}}{([N]+1)!} \sup_{|t| \leq (2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{-1}} \left| \frac{d^{[N]+1}(f^2g)}{dx^{[N]+1}}(t) \right|$$

and  $T_N(f)(|\lambda|) \leq \frac{|\lambda|^{[N]+1}}{([N]+1)!} \sup_{|t| \leq (2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{-1}} \left| \frac{d^{[N]+1}f}{dx^{[N]+1}}(t) \right|.$

As for  $|t| \leq (2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{-1}$  we have

$$\left| \frac{d^{[N]+1}f}{dx^{[N]+1}}(t) \right| = \frac{([N]+1)! (C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{[N]+1}}{(1 - C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta t)^{[N]+2}} \leq 2([N]+1)! (2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{[N]+1},$$

we derive that (notice that  $|\lambda| \leq 1/2 \leq 1$ )

$$\begin{aligned} T_N(f)(|\lambda|) &\leq 2(2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta |\lambda|)^{[N]+1} \\ &\leq (4C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{N+1} |\lambda|^N \\ &\leq (16C_1^2 K^{2\alpha} N^{2\beta})^N |\lambda|^N. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for  $|t| \leq (2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{-1}$  we have

$$\frac{d^{[N]+1}(f^2g)}{dx^{[N]+1}}(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{[N]+1} \frac{([N]+1)!}{k!([N]+1-k)!} \left( \frac{d^k f^2}{dx^k}(t) \right) \left( \frac{d^{[N]+1-k}g}{dx^{[N]+1-k}}(t) \right)$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{d^{[N]+1}(f^2g)}{dx^{[N]+1}}(t) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{[N]+1} \frac{([N]+1)!}{k!([N]+1-k)!} \left( \frac{(k+1)! (C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^k}{(1 - C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta t)^{k+2}} \right) (hM_V)^{[N]+1-k} e^{hM_V t}. \end{aligned}$$

As  $|t| \leq (2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{-1}$  and as we can always assume that  $hM_V \leq M_V \leq C_1$  with  $C_1 \geq 1$ , the right-hand side of the previous equation is bounded by

$$4e^{hM_V t} C_1^{[N]+1} ([N]+1)! \sum_{k=0}^{[N]+1} \frac{k+1}{([N]+1-k)!} (2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^k$$

and hence by

$$4\sqrt{e}(C_1)^{[N]+1} ([N]+1)! ([N]+1) \sum_{k=0}^{[N]+1} (2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^k,$$

using the fact that  $|hM_V t| \leq 1/2$ . The last factor is equal to

$$\frac{(2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{[N]+2} - 1}{2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta - 1}.$$

Since  $C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta \geq 1$ , this ratio is bounded by

$$(2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{[N]+2}.$$

This yields

$$\left| \frac{d^{[N]+1}(f^2 g)}{dx^{[N]+1}}(t) \right| \leq 4\sqrt{e}(C_1)^{[N]+1}([N]+1)!([N]+1)(2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{[N]+2}$$

and hence for  $|\lambda| \leq (2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{-1}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} T_N(f^2 g)(|\lambda|) &\leq 4\sqrt{e}|\lambda|^{[N]+1} (2C_1^2 K^\alpha ([N]+1)^{\beta+1})^{[N]+2} \\ &\leq |\lambda|^N (8eC_1^2 K^\alpha (2N)^{\beta+1})^{N+2} \\ &\leq |\lambda|^N (2^{3(\beta+4)} e^3 C_1^6 K^{3\alpha} N^{3(\beta+1)})^N. \end{aligned}$$

Collecting the previous estimates, we get (5.11) for a suitable constant  $C_2$ .  $\blacksquare$

We are now able to prove Theorem 2.2:

**Proof of Theorem 2.2.** Let  $h \in (0, 1)$  be a stepsize satisfying (1.7) and consider positive numbers  $\sigma_N$  and  $\sigma_K$  such that

$$\alpha\sigma_K + (\beta+1)\sigma_N \leq 1/4. \quad (5.12)$$

For example,  $\sigma_N = \sigma_K = 1/(8 \max(\alpha, \beta+1)) = 1/(32(\nu+1)) > 0$  is a possible choice of parameters. We make this specific choice to prove Theorem 2.2. For these parameters, we set for all  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$K = \lambda^{-\sigma_K} \quad \text{and} \quad N = 1/(2C_1)^{1/\beta} \lambda^{-\sigma_N} \quad (5.13)$$

and we define

$$Q(\lambda) = Q^{[N]}(\lambda), \quad \Sigma(\lambda) = \Sigma^{[N]}(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad R(\lambda) = R^{[N]}(\lambda).$$

Since  $\sigma_N = \sigma_K > 0$  and  $C_1$  only depends on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $\nu$ , there exists  $\lambda_0 \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $\nu$  such that for all  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ , we have  $K = \lambda^{-\sigma_K} \geq K_0$  and  $N = 1/(2C_1)^{1/\beta} \lambda^{-\sigma_N} \geq 1$ . For such a  $\lambda$ , we have

$$(2C_1 K^\alpha N^\beta)^{-1} = \lambda^{\alpha\sigma_K + \beta\sigma_N} \geq \lambda$$

since  $\alpha\sigma_K + \beta\sigma_N \leq 1$  with (5.12) and  $\lambda \leq 1$ .

Therefore, Proposition 5.2 ensures that

$$\|Q(\lambda) - \text{Id}\|_{\rho_V/4} \leq \lambda^{1-(\alpha\sigma_K + \beta\sigma_N)} \leq \lambda^{1/2}$$

and

$$\|\Sigma(\lambda) - e^{ih\Delta}\|_{\rho_V/4} \leq h\lambda^{1-(\alpha\sigma_K + \beta\sigma_N)} \leq h\lambda^{1/2}.$$

Moreover, Proposition 5.3 ensures that

$$\|R(\lambda)\|_{\rho_V/5} \leq (C_2 C_1^{-3(\beta+1)/\beta} \lambda^{1-(3\alpha\sigma_K + 3(\beta+1)\sigma_N)})^N.$$

As the exponent of  $\lambda$  in the right hand side of this inequality satisfies

$$1 - (3\alpha\sigma_K + 3(\beta + 1)\sigma_N) \geq 1/4 > 0$$

by (5.12), after a possible decrease of  $\lambda_0$  (depending only on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $\nu$  again<sup>4</sup>), we can assume that

$$\forall \lambda \in (0, \lambda_0) \quad C_2 C_1^{-3(\beta+1)/\beta} \lambda^{1-(3\alpha\sigma_K+3(\beta+1)\sigma_N)} \leq e^{-1}.$$

Therefore, we get eventually that for all  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ ,

$$\|R(\lambda)\|_{\rho_V/5} \leq e^{-N} = e^{\frac{-1}{(2C_1)^{1/\beta}} \lambda^{-\sigma_N}},$$

and this finishes the proof of the Theorem. ■

## 6 Proof of the corollary

Before starting the proof of Corollary 2.3, we give the following two lemmas:

**Lemma 6.1** *Let  $\mu > 0$ . Assume that  $R \in \mathcal{A}_\mu$ . Let  $\varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$  and let  $\psi = R\varphi$ . Then for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have*

$$|\psi_k| \leq |\psi|_{|k|} \leq \|\psi\| \leq C_\mu \|R\|_\mu \|\varphi\|$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  is the  $L^2$  norm for functions and where  $\|\cdot\|_\mu$  is the norm (2.2) for operators. Recall that the value of the constant  $C_\mu$  is given in Lemma 4.2.

**Proof.** By definition, we have for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$\psi_k = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} R_{k\ell} \varphi_\ell.$$

Hence, we have with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi\|^2 &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |R_{k\ell}| |\varphi_\ell| \right|^2 \\ &\leq \|R\|_\mu^2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-\frac{\mu}{2}|k-\ell|} |\varphi_\ell| e^{-\frac{\mu}{2}|k-\ell|} \right|^2 \\ &\leq \|R\|_\mu^2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left[ \left( \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-\mu|k-p|} \right) \left( \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-\mu|k-\ell|} |\varphi_\ell|^2 \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.7), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi\|^2 &\leq \|R\|_\mu^2 C_\mu \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |\varphi_\ell|^2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-\mu|k-\ell|} \\ &\leq \|R\|_\mu^2 C_\mu^2 \|\varphi\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>4</sup>We recall that  $C_2$  only depends on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $\nu$  by Proposition 5.3



and this yields the result using the fact that for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$|\psi_k| \leq |\psi|_{|k|} \leq \|\psi\|.$$

■

**Lemma 6.2** *Let  $\rho > 0$  and  $s \geq 0$  be real numbers. There exists a positive constant  $C$  depending only on  $\rho$  and  $s$  such that for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$  and all  $\varphi$  such that  $\|\varphi\|_{s,\infty} < \infty$ , we have*

$$\|A\varphi\|_{s,\infty} \leq C\|A\|_\rho \|\varphi\|_{s,\infty}$$

**Proof.** By definition of  $\|\cdot\|_{s,\infty}$  (see (2.12)), we have

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad |\varphi|_k \leq \|\varphi\|_{s,\infty} (1+k)^{-s}.$$

We deduce that for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\begin{aligned} |(A\varphi)_k| &\leq \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \|A\|_\rho e^{-\rho|k-\ell|} |\varphi_\ell| \\ &\leq \|A\|_\rho \|\varphi\|_{s,\infty} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-\rho|k-\ell|} (1+|\ell|)^{-s}. \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} (1+|k|)^s |(A\varphi)_k| &\leq \|A\|_\rho \|\varphi\|_{s,\infty} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-\rho|k-\ell|} \left( \frac{1+|k|}{1+|\ell|} \right)^s \\ &\leq \|A\|_\rho \|\varphi\|_{s,\infty} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-\rho|k-\ell|} \left( \frac{1+|k-\ell|+|\ell|}{1+|\ell|} \right)^s \\ &\leq \|A\|_\rho \|\varphi\|_{s,\infty} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-\rho|k-\ell|} (1+|k-\ell|)^s \end{aligned}$$

and it is clear that the last sum is finite and independent on  $k$ . ■

We now begin the proof of the Corollary 2.3. We first show (i), then (iii) and finally (ii).

**Proof of (i).** It is clear that we have for all  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\|\varphi^n\| = \|\varphi^0\|.$$

With the notations of Theorem 2.2, let  $\psi^n = Q(\lambda)\varphi^n$ . As  $Q(\lambda)$  is unitary (see (2.6)) we hence also have

$$\|\psi^n\| = \|\psi^0\| = \|\varphi^0\|.$$

Moreover, by (2.7), we have for all  $n \geq 0$ ,

$$\psi^{n+1} = (\Sigma(\lambda) + R(\lambda))\psi^n$$

Now the fact that  $\Sigma(\lambda)$  is an almost X-shaped unitary operator implies that for  $0 \leq k \leq K = \lambda^{-\sigma}$ , we have

$$|\Sigma(\lambda)\psi^n|_k = |\psi^n|_k.$$

We thus have for all  $0 \leq k \leq K$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| |\psi^{n+1}|_k - |\psi^n|_k \right| &= \left| |\psi^{n+1}|_k - |\Sigma(\lambda)\psi^n|_k \right| \\ &\leq |\psi^{n+1} - \Sigma(\lambda)\psi^n|_k \\ &\leq |R(\lambda)\psi^n|_k. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $|R(\lambda)\psi^n|_k^2 = |(R(\lambda)\psi^n)_k|^2 + |(R(\lambda)\psi^n)_{-k}|^2$ . Using lemma 6.1 with  $\mu = \rho_V/5$ , we thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| |\psi^{n+1}|_k - |\psi^n|_k \right| &\leq \sqrt{2}C_{\rho_V/5} \|R(\lambda)\|_{\rho_V/5} \|\psi^n\| \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}C_{\rho_V/5} \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma}) \|\varphi^0\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence for  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$  we have by triangle inequality,

$$\left| |\psi^n|_k - |\psi^0|_k \right| \leq \sqrt{2}C_{\rho_V/5} \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2) \|\varphi^0\|. \quad (6.1)$$

For all  $0 \leq k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$ , this inequality shows the extremely good conservation of the oscillatory energy  $|\psi^n|_k$ .

Now using the estimate (2.5) and Lemma 6.1, we get for all  $(n, k) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi^n - \psi^n|_k &= |(\text{Id} - Q(\lambda))\varphi^n|_k \\ &\leq \lambda^{1/2} \|\varphi^n\| \\ &\leq \lambda^{1/2} \|\varphi^0\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for all  $n$  and  $k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left| |\varphi^n|_k - |\varphi^0|_k \right| - \left| |\psi^n|_k - |\psi^0|_k \right| \right| &\leq \left| (|\varphi^n|_k - |\varphi^0|_k) - (|\psi^n|_k - |\psi^0|_k) \right| \\ &\leq |\varphi^n - \psi^n|_k + |\varphi^0 - \psi^0|_k \\ &\leq 2\lambda^{1/2} \|\varphi^0\|. \end{aligned}$$

We thus deduce that for all  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$  and all  $k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| |\varphi^n|_k - |\varphi^0|_k \right| &\leq \left| |\psi^n|_k - |\psi^0|_k \right| + 2\lambda^{1/2} \|\varphi^0\| \\ &\leq 2\lambda^{1/2} \|\varphi^0\| + \sqrt{2}C_{\rho_V/5} \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2) \|\varphi^0\| \end{aligned}$$

so that (2.13) is proved. ■

**Proof of (iii).** Recall that  $\lambda$  is chosen in  $(0, \lambda_0)$  and that  $K = \lambda^{-\sigma}$  with the notations of Theorem 2.2. For a function  $\varphi$ , we set

$$(\pi_K \varphi)(x) = \sum_{|k| > K} \varphi_k e^{inkx}. \quad (6.2)$$

The structure of  $\Sigma(\lambda)$  implies that  $[\pi_K, \Sigma(\lambda)] = 0$ . Hence, we have

$$\|\pi_K \Sigma(\lambda) \varphi\| = \|\pi_K \varphi\|.$$

Moreover, Theorem 2.2 ensures that  $\|R(\lambda)\|_{\rho_V/5} \leq \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma})$ , so using lemma 6.1 we have

$$\|\pi_K R(\lambda)\varphi\| \leq \|R(\lambda)\varphi\| \leq C_{\rho_V/5} \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma})\|\varphi\|.$$

Therefore, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|\pi_K \psi^{n+1}\| - \|\pi_K \psi^n\| \right| &= \left| \|\pi_K \psi^{n+1}\| - \|\pi_K \Sigma(\lambda)\psi^n\| \right| \\ &\leq \|\pi_K(\psi^{n+1} - \Sigma(\lambda)\psi^n)\| \\ &\leq \|\pi_K R(\lambda)\psi^n\| \\ &\leq C_{\rho_V/5} \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma})\|\psi^n\| \\ &\leq C_{\rho_V/5} \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma})\|\varphi^0\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have by triangle inequality for  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$ ,

$$\left| \|\pi_K \psi^n\| - \|\pi_K \psi^0\| \right| \leq C_{\rho_V/5} \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)\|\varphi^0\|. \quad (6.3)$$

Let  $\rho \in (0, \rho_V/5)$  and assume that  $\varphi^0 \in U_\rho$ . Notice that we have

$$\|\varphi^0\|^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\varphi_k^0|^2 \leq \|\varphi^0\|_\rho^2 C_{2\rho}. \quad (6.4)$$

Since  $\psi^0 = Q(\lambda)\varphi^0$ , Lemma 4.2 ensures that

$$\|\psi^0\|_\rho \leq C_{\rho_V/5-\rho} \|Q(\lambda)\|_{\rho_V/5} \|\varphi^0\|_\rho.$$

Moreover, since  $\|Q(\lambda)\|_{\rho_V/5} \leq (1 + \lambda_0^{1/2})$  by Theorem 2.2, we derive that there exists a constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $V, \gamma, \nu$ , and  $\rho$  such that

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad |\psi_k^0| \leq C \|\varphi^0\|_\rho e^{-\rho|k|}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi_K \psi^0\|^2 &\leq C^2 \|\varphi^0\|_\rho^2 \sum_{|k| > K} e^{-2\rho k} \\ &\leq C^2 \|\varphi^0\|_\rho^2 e^{-2\rho\lambda^{-\sigma}} 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-2\rho|k|}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, after a possible increase of  $C$ , we get

$$\|\pi_K \psi^0\| \leq C \|\varphi^0\|_\rho \exp(-\rho\lambda^{-\sigma}).$$

Then, using (6.3) and (6.4), we get, after another possible increase of  $C$ , for all  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$ ,

$$\|\pi_K \psi^n\| \leq C \exp(-c'\lambda^{-\sigma})\|\varphi^0\|_\rho \quad (6.5)$$

where  $c' = \min(c/2, \rho) > 0$  only depends on  $V, \gamma, \nu$ , and  $\rho$ .

Moreover, the inequality (6.1) shows that for  $0 \leq k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$  and all  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$ , we have for all  $\mu > 0$ ,

$$e^{\mu k} \left| |\psi^n|_k - |\psi^0|_k \right| \leq \sqrt{2} C_{\rho_V/5} \exp(\mu K - c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2) \|\varphi^0\|$$

so that if we set  $\mu_0 = c'/2 > 0$ , we have for  $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$ ,

$$\sup_{0 \leq k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}} \left( e^{\mu k} \left| |\psi^n|_k - |\psi^0|_k \right| \right) \leq C' \exp(-c'\lambda^{-\sigma}/2) \|\varphi^0\| \quad (6.6)$$

with  $C' = \sqrt{2} C_{\rho_V/5}$ , since  $\mu - c/2 \leq -\mu_0 = -c'/2$ .

Recall that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varphi^n = Q(\lambda)^* \psi^n$ . Using the decomposition

$$\psi^n = (\text{Id} - \pi_K) \psi^n + \pi_K \psi^n$$

we thus have

$$\varphi^n = Q(\lambda)^* (\text{Id} - \pi_K) \psi^n + Q(\lambda)^* \pi_K \psi^n$$

and therefore

$$\varphi^n - \psi^n = (Q(\lambda)^* - \text{Id})(\text{Id} - \pi_K) \psi^n + (Q(\lambda)^* - \text{Id}) \pi_K \psi^n. \quad (6.7)$$

Using Lemma 6.1 and estimate (2.5), we get for  $0 \leq k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| |\varphi^n|_k - |\psi^n|_k \right| &\leq |\varphi^n - \psi^n|_k \\ &\leq |(Q(\lambda)^* - \text{Id})(\text{Id} - \pi_K) \psi^n|_k + |(Q(\lambda)^* - \text{Id}) \pi_K \psi^n|_k \\ &\leq |(Q(\lambda)^* - \text{Id})(\text{Id} - \pi_K) \psi^n|_k + C_{\rho_V/4} \lambda^{1/2} \|\pi_K \psi^n\|. \end{aligned}$$

On one hand, we have with (6.5) that for all  $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$ , all  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$  and all  $k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$ ,

$$\|\pi_K \psi^n\| e^{+\mu k} \leq C \exp(-c'\lambda^{-\sigma}/2) \|\varphi^0\|_\rho \quad (6.8)$$

since  $\mu - c' \leq -c'/2$ .

On the other hand, with Lemma 4.2 and Theorem 2.2, we have

$$\|(Q(\lambda)^* - \text{Id})(\text{Id} - \pi_K) \psi^n\|_\mu \leq C_{\rho_V/4-\mu} \lambda^{1/2} \|(\text{Id} - \pi_K) \psi^n\|_\mu$$

and the inequalities (6.6) and (6.4) ensure that for all  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\text{Id} - \pi_K) \psi^n\|_\mu &\leq \sqrt{2} \|\psi^0\|_\mu + C' \exp(-c'\lambda^{-\sigma}/2) \|\varphi^0\| \\ &\leq C \|\varphi^0\|_\rho \end{aligned}$$

after a possible increase of  $C$  (still depending only on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\nu$  and  $\rho$ ).

As a conclusion, after another possible increase of  $C$ , we get for all  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$ , all  $k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$  and all  $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$ ,

$$\left| |\varphi^n|_k - |\psi^n|_k \right| e^{+\mu k} \leq C \lambda^{1/2} \|\varphi^0\|_\rho. \quad (6.9)$$

Eventually, we get for all  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$ , all  $k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$  and all  $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\mu k} \left| |\varphi^n|_k - |\varphi^0|_k \right| \\ & \leq e^{\mu k} \left| |\varphi^n|_k - |\psi^n|_k \right| + e^{\mu k} \left| |\psi^n|_k - |\psi^0|_k \right| + e^{\mu k} \left| |\psi^0|_k - |\varphi^0|_k \right| \\ & \leq C\lambda^{1/2} \|\varphi^0\|_\rho \end{aligned}$$

after a last increase of  $C$ , using (6.9), (6.6) and the fact that

$$\|\psi^0 - \varphi^0\|_\mu \leq \|\psi^0 - \varphi^0\|_\rho \leq C_{\rho_V/4-\rho} \|\varphi^0\|_\rho$$

by Lemma 4.2. This proves (2.15) and hence (iii).  $\blacksquare$

**Proof of (ii).** With the notations of Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.3, we assume that  $h \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (1.7),  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$  and  $s > 1/2$  are given real numbers. Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 6.2 ensure that there exists a positive constant  $c_s$  depending only on  $V, \gamma, \nu$  and  $s$  such that

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad |\psi^0|_k \leq c_s \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty} (1+k)^{-s}.$$

Note that, since  $s > 1/2$ , we have

$$\|\varphi^0\| = \left( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\varphi^0|_k^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \left( \sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}} (1+p)^{-2s} \right)^{1/2} \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty} < +\infty$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi_K \psi^0\|^2 &= \sum_{k > K} |\psi^0|_k^2 \\ &\leq c_s^2 \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty}^2 \sum_{k > K} (1+k)^{-2s} \\ &\leq c_s^2 \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty}^2 \int_{K-1}^{+\infty} (1+t)^{-2s} dt \\ &\leq c_s^2 \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty}^2 \frac{K^{-(2s-1)}}{2s-1} \\ &\leq c_s^2 \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty}^2 \frac{\lambda^{\sigma(2s-1)}}{2s-1} \end{aligned}$$

which reads

$$\|\pi_K \psi^0\| \leq c_s \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty} \lambda^{\sigma(s-1/2)}$$

after a possible increase of the constant  $c_s$ .

Another possible increase of the constant  $c_s$  allows us to write, using (6.3), that for  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi_K \psi^n\| &\leq C_{\rho_V/5} \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2) \|\varphi^0\| + \|\pi_K \psi^0\| \\ &\leq c_s \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2) \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty} + c_s \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty} \lambda^{\sigma(s-1/2)}, \end{aligned}$$

and finally

$$\|\pi_K \psi^n\| \leq c_s \lambda^{\sigma(s-1/2)} \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty}. \quad (6.10)$$

Note that  $c_s$  only depends on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\nu$  and  $s$ .

Moreover, by (6.1), we have, for  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ ,  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$  and  $0 \leq k \leq K = \lambda^{-\sigma}$ ,

$$(1+k)^s |\psi^n|_k - |\psi^0|_k \leq C \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2) (1+\lambda^{-\sigma})^s \|\varphi^0\|,$$

where  $C$  depends only on  $V$ . After a possible increase of  $c_s$ , we can assume that for all  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$  and all  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$ ,

$$\sup_{0 \leq k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}} \left( (1+k)^s |\psi^n|_k - |\psi^0|_k \right) \leq c_s \exp(-c\lambda^{-\sigma}/4) \|\varphi^0\|. \quad (6.11)$$

This implies that for all  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$  and all  $k$  such that  $0 \leq k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$ , we have after a possible increase of  $c_s$ ,

$$(1+k)^s |\psi^n|_k \leq c_s \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty}. \quad (6.12)$$

On one hand, we have with (6.10) and after another increase of the constant  $c_s$ , for all  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma})$  and all  $k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$ ,

$$\|\pi_K \psi^n\| (1+k)^{s'} \leq c_s \lambda^{\sigma(s-s'-1/2)} \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty},$$

and, since  $\lambda_0 \leq 1$ , for such  $k$  and  $n$ , we get

$$\|\pi_K \psi^n\| (1+k)^{s'} \leq c_s \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty}. \quad (6.13)$$

On the other hand, with Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 6.2, we get for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\|(Q(\lambda)^* - \text{Id})(\text{Id} - \pi_K)\psi^n\|_{s',\infty} \leq C \lambda^{1/2} \|(\text{Id} - \pi_K)\psi^n\|_{s',\infty},$$

where  $C$  depends only on  $V$  and  $s'$ . With the inequality (6.12), this yields, after a possible increase of the constant  $c_s$ , to

$$\|(Q(\lambda)^* - \text{Id})(\text{Id} - \pi_K)\psi^n\|_{s',\infty} \leq c_s \lambda^{1/2} \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty}. \quad (6.14)$$

Hence, since for all  $k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$  and all  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| |\varphi^n|_k - |\psi^n|_k \right| &\leq |\varphi^n - \psi^n|_k \\ &\leq |(Q(\lambda)^* - \text{Id})(\text{Id} - \pi_K)\psi^n|_k + |(Q(\lambda)^* - \text{Id})\pi_K \psi^n|_k, \end{aligned}$$

we derive, with (6.13) and (6.14), Lemma 6.1 and Theorem 2.2, that for such  $n$  and  $k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (1+k)^{s'} \left| |\varphi^n|_k - |\psi^n|_k \right| &\leq c_s \lambda^{1/2} \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty} + C_{\rho_V/5} \|Q(\lambda)^* - \text{Id}\|_{\rho_V/5} \|\pi_K \psi^n\| (1+k)^{s'} \\ &\leq c_s \lambda^{1/2} \|\pi_K \psi^n\|, \end{aligned}$$

after a possible increase of the constant  $c_s$ .

In addition to this last inequality and (6.11), the fact that for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$(1+k)^{s'} \left| |\varphi^0|_k - |\psi^0|_k \right| \leq c_s \lambda^{1/2} \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty}$$

which is a consequence of Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 6.2, ensures by triangle inequality, that for all  $n \leq \exp(c\lambda^{-\sigma}/2)$  and  $k \leq \lambda^{-\sigma}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (1+k)^{s'} & \left| |\varphi^n|_k - |\varphi^0|_k \right| \\ & \leq (1+k)^{s'} \left| |\varphi^n|_k - |\psi^n|_k \right| + (1+k)^{s'} \left| |\psi^n|_k - |\psi^0|_k \right| + (1+k)^{s'} \left| |\psi^0|_k - |\varphi^0|_k \right| \\ & \leq c_s \lambda^{1/2} \|\varphi^0\|_{s,\infty}, \end{aligned}$$

after a possible increase of the constant  $c_s$ , still depending only on  $V$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\nu$  and  $s$ . This proves (2.14) and hence (ii).  $\blacksquare$

## 7 Appendix

**Proof of Lemma 4.3.** We consider the differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{q}'(t) & = f(t, \mathbf{q}(t)) \\ \mathbf{q}(0) & = 1 \end{cases}$$

with

$$f(t, Y) = \frac{s_0 C_\delta Y}{1 - C_\delta^2 (\kappa (e^{2hM_V t} - 1) + (Y^2 - 1))}$$

(recall that  $s_0 = M_V \kappa h$ ). This equation has a unique analytical solution: there exists a number  $R > 0$  such that for  $t \in (-R, R)$ ,  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  expands in power series of  $t$  (see for instance [7]). We can assume that  $R$  is maximal in this sense. Let

$$T = \frac{2}{hM_V} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{1}{4\kappa C_\delta^2} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad D = \left( 1 + \frac{1}{4C_\delta^2} \right)^{1/2} - 1.$$

For  $0 \leq t \leq T$  we have  $\kappa C_\delta^2 (e^{2hM_V t} - 1) \leq \frac{1}{4}$  and if  $1 \leq Y \leq 1 + D$ , then  $C_\delta^2 (Y^2 - 1) \leq \frac{1}{4}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leq t \leq T \\ 0 \leq Y - 1 \leq D \end{cases} \implies 0 < f(t, Y) \leq 2s_0 C_\delta (D + 1). \quad (7.1)$$

This implies that  $\mathbf{q}$  is an increasing function of  $t$  as long as  $t \in (0, T)$  and  $\mathbf{q}(t) \leq D + 1$ . Notice that, for  $t \geq 0$ , we have  $0 < \mathbf{q}(t) \leq 1$ .

Moreover, the fact that  $K \geq K_0 \geq 1$  (see Lemma 4.3) implies that  $\frac{1}{\kappa} \leq 4$  and hence we have

$$T = \frac{2}{hM_V} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{1}{4\kappa C_\delta^2} \right) \geq \frac{1}{4hM_V \kappa C_\delta^2}. \quad (7.2)$$

If for all  $t \in (0, R)$ ,  $1 < \mathbf{q}(t) < 1 + D$ , we must have in view of (7.1),  $T < R$ . To the contrary, there exists  $t_D^*$  in  $(0, R)$  such that  $\mathbf{q}(t_D^*) = 1 + D$ . We can therefore choose  $t_D^* \in (0, R)$  in such a way that for all  $t \in (0, t_D^*)$ ,  $1 < \mathbf{q}(t) < 1 + D$ .

Assume that  $t_D^* \leq T$ , then

$$y(t_D^*) - y(0) = D \leq \int_0^{t_D^*} f(u, y(u)) du \leq 2s_0 C_\delta (D+1) t_D^*$$

using (7.1) Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_D^* &\geq \frac{D}{2s_0 C_\delta (D+1)} \\ &\geq \frac{(1 + \frac{1}{4C_\delta^2})^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1}{(1 + \frac{1}{4C_\delta^2})^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{1}{2\kappa h M_V C_\delta} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{16C_\delta^2 (1 + \frac{1}{4C_\delta^2})} \frac{1}{\kappa h M_V C_\delta} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4h M_V \kappa C_\delta^2} \frac{1}{5C_\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$R > t_D^* \geq \frac{1}{20h M_V \kappa C_\delta^3}. \quad (7.3)$$

To the contrary, if  $t_D^* \geq T$  then we have using (7.2)

$$R > T \geq \frac{1}{4h M_V \kappa C_\delta^2}.$$

As  $C_\delta^{-1} \leq 1$ , this implies that (7.3) holds in any case. This determines the value of  $r < R$  in the Lemma. Now as  $t \mapsto \mathbf{q}(t)$  is an increasing positive function, so is  $t \mapsto \mathbf{q}'(t) = f(t, \mathbf{q}(t))$ . With the previous notations, in any case, we have with (7.1) that for all  $t \in (-r, r)$

$$\mathbf{q}'(t) \leq \frac{\kappa h M_V C_\delta (D+1)}{1 - \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4}} \leq \sqrt{5} \kappa h M_V C_\delta.$$

We have already seen that for all  $t \in (0, r)$ ,  $1 \leq \mathbf{q}(t) \leq D+1 \leq \frac{\sqrt{5}}{2}$ . And it follows from the estimation on  $\mathbf{q}'$  that

$$\mathbf{q}(-r) = 1 - \int_{-r}^0 \mathbf{q}'(s) ds \geq 1 - r \sqrt{5} \kappa h M_V C_\delta > 0.8.$$

This proves the estimates on  $\mathbf{q}(t)$ . The estimates for  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  and  $\mathbf{s}(t)$  are then obtained straightforwardly. ■



## Acknowledgments

The authors are glad to thank François Castella, Philippe Chartier, Nicolas Lerner and Christian Lubich for their help and comments about this work.

## References

- [1] D. Bambusi, B. Grebert, *Birkhoff normal form for PDEs with tame modulus*, to appear in *Duke Math. J.*
- [2] C. Besse, B. Bidégaray, S. Descombes, *Order estimates in time of splitting methods for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 40 (2002), no. 5, 26–40.
- [3] B. Cano, *Conserved quantities of some Hamiltonian wave equations after full discretization*, *Numer. Math.* 103 (2006) 197–223.
- [4] D. Cohen, E. Hairer, C. Lubich, *Long-time analysis of nonlinearly perturbed wave equations via modulated Fourier expansions*, Preprint.
- [5] H. L. Eliasson, S. B. Kuksin, *KAM for non-linear Schroedinger equation*, Preprint (2006)
- [6] E. Hairer, C. Lubich, G. Wanner, *Geometric Numerical Integration. Structure-preserving Algorithms for Ordinary Differential Equations*. Springer, Berlin, 2002.
- [7] E. Hairer, S. P. Nørsett, G. Wanner, *Solving Ordinary Differential Equations I. Nonstiff Problems.*, Springer Series in Computational Mathematics 8, Berlin, 1993, 2nd edition.
- [8] M. Oliver, M. West, C. Wulff, *Approximate momentum conservation for spatial semi-discretizations of semilinear wave equations*, *Numer. Math.* 97 (2004), 493–535.
- [9] B. Leimkuhler, S. Reich, *Simulating Hamiltonian dynamics*. Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics, 14. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [10] T. Jahnke, C. Lubich, *Error bounds for exponential operator splittings*, *BIT* 40 (2000), 735–744.
- [11] Z. Shang *Resonant and Diophantine step sizes in computing invariant tori of Hamiltonian systems* *Nonlinearity* 13 (2000), 299–308.



---

Unité de recherche INRIA Rennes  
IRISA, Campus universitaire de Beaulieu - 35042 Rennes Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Futurs : Parc Club Orsay Université - ZAC des Vignes  
4, rue Jacques Monod - 91893 ORSAY Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Lorraine : LORIA, Technopôle de Nancy-Brabois - Campus scientifique  
615, rue du Jardin Botanique - BP 101 - 54602 Villers-lès-Nancy Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Rhône-Alpes : 655, avenue de l'Europe - 38334 Montbonnot Saint-Ismier (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Rocquencourt : Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt - BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Sophia Antipolis : 2004, route des Lucioles - BP 93 - 06902 Sophia Antipolis Cedex (France)

---

Éditeur  
INRIA - Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt, BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex (France)  
<http://www.inria.fr>  
ISSN 0249-6399