



Molecular Physics An International Journal at the Interface Between Chemistry and Physics

ISSN: 0026-8976 (Print) 1362-3028 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tmph20

A friendly review of absorbing boundary conditions and perfectly matched layers for classical and relativistic quantum waves equations

X. Antoine, E. Lorin & Q. Tang

To cite this article: X. Antoine, E. Lorin & Q. Tang (2017) A friendly review of absorbing boundary conditions and perfectly matched layers for classical and relativistic quantum waves equations, Molecular Physics, 115:15-16, 1861-1879, DOI: 10.1080/00268976.2017.1290834

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/00268976.2017.1290834



Published online: 01 Mar 2017.



🖉 Submit your article to this journal 🗗





則 🛛 View Crossmark data 🗹



Citing articles: 5 View citing articles 🕑

BANDRAUK



A friendly review of absorbing boundary conditions and perfectly matched layers for classical and relativistic quantum waves equations

X. Antoine ¹^a, E. Lorin^{b,c} and Q. Tang^a

^aInstitut Elie Cartan de Lorraine, Université de Lorraine, Vandoeuvre-lès-Nancy Cedex, France; ^bCentre de Recherches Mathématiques, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada; ^cSchool of Mathematics and Statistics, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada

ABSTRACT

The aim of this paper is to describe concisely the recent theoretical and numerical developments concerningabsorbing boundary conditions and perfectly matched layers for solving classical and relativistic quantum waves problems. The equations considered in this paper are the Schrödinger, Klein–Gordon and Dirac equations.



ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 7 October 2016 Accepted 18 January 2017

KEYWORDS

Classical quantum waves; relativistic quantum waves; Schrödinger equation; Klein–Gordon equation; Dirac equation; absorbing boundary conditions; perfectly matched layers; numerical schemes; simulation

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to discuss how to build and discretise absorbing boundary conditions (ABCs) and perfectly matched layers (PMLs) [1–3] to truncate an unbounded spatial computational domain, when solving partial differential equations arising in atomic, molecular and laser physics. More specifically, the equations that will be considered are the Schrödinger, Klein–Gordon and Dirac equations in their simplest form. The goal here is not to give all the technical mathematical details, but rather to give a comprehensive introduction to the topic, from both the modelling and computational points of view. For the equations above, many questions remain still open and constitute some advanced developments in mathematical analysis and computational physics.

To motivate the need to develop such theoretical analysis, we first consider an example to understand why such boundary conditions are required for a practical computation. Let us introduce the following general scalar Schrödinger system:

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t \psi + \Delta \psi + \mathbb{V}(\mathbf{x}, t)\psi = 0, & (\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d_{\mathbf{x}} \times [0; T], \\ \lim_{||\mathbf{x}|| \to \infty} \psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = 0, & t \in [0; T], \\ \psi(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \psi_0(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d_{\mathbf{x}}. \end{cases}$$
(1)

In the above system, $\psi := \psi(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the complex-valued wave function to be computed, the spatial variable is $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \ge 1$) and the time variable is t > 0, T being a maximal time of computation and $i := \sqrt{-1}$. Various possible potentials \mathbb{V} could be considered:

• $\mathbb{V}(\mathbf{x}, t) = V(\mathbf{x}, t) \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_x \times [0; T], \mathbb{R})$, the space of infinitely differentiable functions, is a real-valued potential (e.g. $V(\mathbf{x}, t) = V_c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{E}(t)$ for modelling the action of external electric field \mathbf{E} in length gauge, with an usual regularised interaction potential $V_c(\mathbf{x})$ in order to strictly satisfy the mathematical constraints; see [4] for instance in a



Figure 1. Example of the one-dimensional Schrödinger equation with a linear potential (V(x) = x): truncating the physical domain with an unsuited boundary condition generates some spurious unphysical reflections at the fictitious boundaries $x_{\ell} = -5$ and $x_r = 15$. (a) Exact reference solution. (b) Numerical solution with a Dirichlet boundary condition.

simple framework; the regularity assumption could in fact be strongly weakened in the following developments, in particular in the domain Ω),

- $\mathbb{V}(\mathbf{x}, t) = f(\psi)(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is a nonlinear potential (e.g. a cubic nonlinearity: $\mathbb{V}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \beta |u(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2$),
- or a combination of both situations: $\mathbb{V}(\mathbf{x}, t) = V(\mathbf{x}, t) + f(\psi)(\mathbf{x}, t)$.

We also assume that the initial wave function ψ_0 is compactly supported (that is ψ_0 is localised in space; some developments for non-compactly supported initial data are available in [5,6]).

For numerical considerations, the initial problem must be solved in a bounded domain Ω . If the physical phenomena is not confined within a finite domain, problems indeed arise. Let us for example consider the following one-dimensional case (d = 1): $\mathbb{V}(x) := V(x) =$ x is a linear potential and the initial wave function is a Gaussian beam $\psi_0(x) = e^{-x^2 + 10ix}$ (almost compactly supported numerically). A simple way to solve Problem (1) is to introduce a bounded spatial computational domain, e.g. $\Omega = [-5; 15]$ and to set homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions : $\psi_{|\Sigma_T} = 0$, i.e. we impose 0 on Σ_T , where the boundary Σ_T is simply defined here by $\Sigma_T \coloneqq \partial \Omega \times [0; T]$, with $\Sigma \coloneqq \partial \Omega = \{-5; 15\}$ and T =2. We report in Figure 1(a) the amplitude of the reference numerical solution $|\psi|$ as a function of time computed on a large domain (so that we do not see the perturbation of the boundary conditions) and restricted here to $\Omega_T \coloneqq \Omega \times [0; T]$, and in Figure 1(b) the numerical solution to the bounded problem on Ω_T with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions at Σ_T . Both approaches use a second-order finite-difference scheme in space and a Crank-Nicolson scheme in time [7]. As we can observe,

since the wave field ψ strikes the right boundary $x_r \approx 15$ at $T \approx 0.25$, then some numerical reflections occur. This is due to the Dirichlet boundary condition which does not mimic the property that the wave is outgoing to the computational domain, and actually acts like a 'wall'. At T = 1.4, some new reflections appear at the left point $x_{\ell} \approx -5$ and so on, the computational domain acting as a quantum wave guide structure.

From this example, it is clear that a suitable exact or approximate boundary condition must be imposed at the endpoints of the computational domain to avoid artificial reflections. We introduce a computational domain $\Omega_T :=$ $]x_\ell, x_r[\times [0; T]$ and a fictitious boundary $\Sigma_T := \partial \Omega =$ $\{x_l, x_r\} \times [0; T]$. The potential is usually a non-supported function inside Ω (that is not localised in space). The kind of boundary condition that we are looking for writes as a relation between the (Dirichlet) trace $\psi_{|\Gamma}$ and the normal derivative (Neumann) trace $\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\psi_{|\Gamma}$ of the solution at the boundary $\Sigma_T: F(\psi, \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\psi_{|\Gamma}) = 0$. In general, this relation is built in the form

$$\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\psi + i\Lambda^{+}\psi = 0, \quad \text{on } \Sigma_{T}.$$

The operator $i\Lambda^+$ is called the Dirichlet-to-Neumann (DtN) operator.

2. ABCs for the one-dimensional wave equation

To introduce step by step the ideas related to ABCs for molecular physics, let us start with the one-dimensional wave equation

$$\partial_x^2 \psi - \frac{1}{c^2} \partial_t^2 \psi = -Q \delta_{x_Q}, \qquad (2)$$

in $\mathbb{R}_x \times]0; T]$, where $\psi = \psi(x, t)$ is the wave function, *x* is the spatial coordinate and *t* is the time variable. We consider a constant sound speed *c* for the homogeneous isotropic medium \mathbb{R}_x . The source is supposed to be a point source with amplitude *Q*, located at point x_Q . The free-space solution (that is for Q = 0) of Equation (2) can be written as the sum of a left and a right travelling waves $(\psi^{\ell} \text{ and } \psi^r, \text{ respectively here})$, if we assume that the initial data ψ_0 and ψ_1 are compactly supported in a domain $\Omega \coloneqq] - x_{\ell}; x_r[\coloneqq] - R; R[(R > 0), with boundary \Sigma \coloneqq {x_{\ell}; x_r}$. More precisely, if we have

$$\begin{cases} \partial_x^2 \psi - \frac{1}{c^2} \partial_t^2 \psi = 0, (x, t) \in \Omega_T := \mathbb{R}_x \times]0; T[, \\ \psi(x, 0) = \psi_0(x), x \in \mathbb{R}_x, \\ \partial_t \psi(x, 0) = \psi_1(x), x \in \mathbb{R}_x, \end{cases}$$
(3)

under the assumption that supp $(\psi_{0,1}) \subset \Omega$, then the solution ψ can be written as $\psi(x, t) = \psi^{\ell}(x + ct) + \psi^{r}(x - ct)$. Some calculations show that we have

$$\psi(x,t) = \frac{1}{2}(\psi_0(x+ct) + \psi_0(x-ct)) + \frac{1}{2}\int_{x-ct}^{x+ct}\psi_1(u)du,$$
(4)

that is

$$\begin{cases} 2\psi^{\ell}(x) = \psi_0(x) + \int_{-\infty}^{x} \psi_1(u) du, \\ 2\psi^{r}(x) = \psi_0(x) - \int_{-\infty}^{x} \psi_1(u) du. \end{cases}$$
(5)

Let us remark that, for |x| sufficiently large, that is for all x such that |x| > L, the supports of the two wave functions $\psi^{\ell, r}$ are disjoints. This implies e.g. that for x = -L, we have $\psi(x, t) = \psi^{\ell}(x + ct)$, and so $\partial_x \psi = c^{-1} \partial_t \psi$. In a symmetrical way, we have for the right travelling wave: x = L, and $\psi(x, t) = \psi^r(x - ct)$, and so $\partial_x \psi = -c^{-1} \partial_t \psi$. By introducing the outwardly directed unit normal vector $\mathbf{n} = \pm 1$ to] - L; L[, we have the unification of the two boundary conditions

$$\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\psi + \frac{1}{c}\partial_{t}\psi = 0, \qquad (6)$$

at Σ_T . This means that, if one wants to solve numerically the initial value problem, which is a difficult task since it is set in an unbounded domain \mathbb{R}_x , we may rather consider to solve the following initial boundary value problem (IBVP): find the approximate field ψ^{a} such that

$$\begin{cases} \partial_x^2 \psi^a - \frac{1}{c^2} \partial_t^2 \psi^a = 0, (x, t) \in \Omega_T, \\ \psi^a(x, 0) = \psi_0^a(x), x \in \Omega, \\ \partial_t \psi^a(x, 0) = \psi_1^a(x), x \in \Omega, \\ \partial_n \psi^a + \frac{1}{c} \partial_t \psi^a = 0, (x, t) \in \Sigma_T, \end{cases}$$
(7)

which is set in the bounded spatial domain Ω_T . The main point here is that numerically computing ψ^a in Ω requires a finite number of grid points unlike working in \mathbb{R}_x . Furthermore, in the special case of a one-dimensional problem with constant wave speed, we can prove that we have $\psi^a = \psi_{|\Omega_T}$, which means that the restriction of the solution ψ of the initial system exactly coincides with the solution ψ^a to the bounded domain problem. Therefore, the two waves travel through the boundary Γ without being reflected back into the domain, as physically expected. For this reason, the boundary condition given by Equation (6) is said to be a transparent boundary condition (TBC). If one considers the wave operator, an interesting remark is that we get the following *exact* factorisation of the wave operator:

$$\partial_x^2 - \frac{1}{c^2}\partial_t^2 = \left(\partial_x + \frac{1}{c}\partial_t\right)\left(\partial_x - \frac{1}{c}\partial_t\right).$$
 (8)

An alternative way for designing the TBCs above is based on the Laplace transform

$$\mathscr{L}(\psi)(x,\omega) = \hat{\psi}(x,\omega) = \int_0^\infty \psi(x,t)e^{-\omega t}dt,$$

with the co-variable $\omega = \sigma + i\tau$, $\sigma > 0$ (let us remark that an approach using the Fourier transform is also possible; see Section 6). Under these notations, one gets the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{L}(\partial_t \psi)(x,\omega) &= \omega \hat{\psi}(x,\omega) - \psi(x,0), \\ \mathscr{L}(\partial_t^2 \psi)(x,\omega) &= \omega^2 \hat{\psi}(x,\omega) - \omega \psi(x,0) - \partial_t \psi(x,0). \end{aligned}$$

The initial full space problem can then be rewritten as a transmission IBVP between the bounded Neumann problem

$$\begin{cases} \left(\frac{1}{c^2}\partial_t^2 - \partial_x^2\right)\psi^{\text{int}} = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \ t > 0, \\ \partial_x\psi^{\text{int}} = \partial_x\psi^{\text{ext}}, \qquad x \in \Sigma, \ t > 0, \\ \psi^{\text{int}}(x,0) = \psi_0(x), \qquad x \in \Omega, \\ \partial_t\psi^{\text{int}}(x,0) = \psi_1(x), \qquad x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$
(9)

and the exterior Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases}
\left(\frac{1}{c^2}\partial_t^2 - \partial_x^2\right)\psi^{\text{ext}} = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_x/\overline{\Omega}, t > 0, \\
\psi^{\text{ext}}(x, t) = \psi^{\text{ext}}(x, t), \quad x = \pm L, t > 0, \quad (10) \\
\psi^{\text{ext}}(x, 0) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_x/\overline{\Omega}, \\
\partial_t \psi^{\text{ext}}(x, 0) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_x/\overline{\Omega}.
\end{cases}$$

Let us Laplace transform the first equation of system (10). Then, for $x > x_r$, one obtains the following ODE:

$$\frac{\omega^2}{c^2}\hat{\psi}^{\text{ext}} - \partial_x^2\hat{\psi}^{\text{ext}} = 0.$$
(11)

A simple computation shows that the solution writes down as the superposition of two waves travelling in opposite directions

$$\hat{\psi}^{\text{ext}}(x,\omega) = A^+(\omega)e^{\frac{\omega}{c}x} + A^-(\omega)e^{-\frac{\omega}{c}x}.$$

Since the exterior solution must have a finite energy (square-integrable function), this leads to the condition $A^+ = 0$ and to the solution (with $x_r = L$)

$$\hat{\psi}^{\text{ext}}(x,\omega) = e^{-\frac{\omega}{c}(x-x_r)} x_r(\psi^{\text{ext}}(x_r,\cdot))(\omega).$$

Then, by differentiating, by continuity and using the second equation in (9)

$$\partial_x \hat{\psi}^{\text{int}}(x,\omega)|_{x=x_r} = -\frac{\omega}{c} \hat{\psi}^{\text{int}}(x,\omega)|_{x=x_r}$$

and finally by applying the inverse Laplace transform, one obtains

$$\partial_x \psi^{\text{int}}(x,t)|_{x=L} = -\frac{1}{c} \partial_t \psi^{\text{int}}(x,t)|_{x=x_r}$$

leading to the TBC for ψ^{int} at Σ_T

$$\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\psi^{\mathrm{int}} + \frac{1}{c}\partial_{t}\psi^{\mathrm{int}} = 0, \text{ on } \Sigma_{T}.$$
 (12)

Therefore, the solution ψ^{int} exactly corresponds to ψ^{a} in system (7). This also translates the property that the factorisation (8) indeed splits the original wave operator into an outgoing and an incoming absorbing operators according to the choice of the sign \pm in front of the $c^{-1}\partial_t$ operator.

3. ABCs for one-dimensional Schrödinger equations

3.1. The free-space case

Let us now come to the case of the Schrödinger equation. We first consider the simple case of the one-dimensional Schrödinger equation in the free-space since it is a constant coefficient partial differential equation. The techniques applied to the wave operator to derive boundary conditions can still be used, but the resulting boundary conditions have some very specific differences that require more developments, in particular from the computational point of view.

Let us first introduce the formulation of the problem as coupled transmission problems

$$\begin{cases} (i\partial_t + \partial_x^2)\psi^{\text{int}} = 0, \ x \in \Omega, \ t > 0, \\ \partial_x \psi^{\text{int}} = \partial_x \psi^{\text{ext}}, \ x \in \Sigma, \ t > 0, \\ \psi^{\text{int}}(x, 0) = \psi_0(x), \ x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$
(13)

and

$$\begin{cases} (i\partial_{t} + \partial_{x}^{2})\psi^{\text{ext}} = 0, \ x \in \Omega_{\ell,r}, t > 0, \\ \psi^{\text{ext}} = \psi^{\text{int}}, \ x \in \Sigma, \ t > 0, \\ \lim_{|x| \to \infty} \psi^{\text{ext}}(x, t) = 0, \ t > 0, \\ \psi^{\text{ext}}(x, 0) = 0, \ x \in \Omega_{\ell,r}. \end{cases}$$
(14)

Now, we Laplace transform the first equation of system (14) (for example, in the right semi-infinite subdomain $\Omega_r \coloneqq]x_r; +\infty[$, setting $\Omega_\ell \coloneqq] -\infty; x_\ell[$). Then, one gets the ODE: $i\omega\hat{\psi}^{\text{ext}} + \partial_x^2\hat{\psi}^{\text{ext}} = 0$, whose solution is explicitly given by

$$\hat{\psi}^{\text{ext}}(x,\omega) = A^+(\omega)e^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{-i\omega}x}} + A^-(\omega)e^{-\frac{1}{\sqrt{-i\omega}x}},$$

where the principal determination of the square-root is such that $\Re(\sqrt[4]{\cdot}) > 0$. Since we need to find a finite mass solution, one requires that $\psi^{\text{ext}} \in L^2(\Omega_r)$, leading to A^+ = 0. We can write that

$$\hat{\psi}^{\text{ext}}(x,\omega) = e^{-\sqrt[t]{-i\omega}(x-x_r)} \mathcal{L}(\hat{\psi}^{\text{ext}}(x_r,\cdot))(\omega),$$

and by differentiating and continuity

$$\partial_x \hat{\psi}^{\text{int}}(x,\omega)|_{x=x_r} = -\sqrt[4]{-i\omega} \hat{\psi}^{\text{int}}(x,\omega)|_{x=x_r}$$
$$= -e^{-i\pi/4} \omega \frac{\hat{\psi}^{\text{int}}(x,\omega)|_{x=x_r}}{\sqrt{\omega}}$$

Now, the direct application of the inverse Laplace transform leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x \psi^{\text{int}}(x,t)|_{x=x_r} &= -e^{-i\pi/4} \partial_t \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^t \frac{\psi^{\text{int}}(x,s)|_{x=x_r}}{\sqrt{t-s}} ds \right) \\ &= -e^{-i\pi/4} \partial_t^{1/2} \psi^{\text{int}}(x_r,t), \end{aligned}$$

where $\partial_t^{1/2}$ designates the Caputo fractional derivative [8] of order 1/2. Symmetrically, the same derivation occurs at the left boundary. A unified writing of the transparent boundary condition is then

$$(\partial_{\mathbf{n}} + e^{-i\pi/4} \partial_t^{1/2}) \psi^{\text{int}} = 0, \text{ on } \Sigma_T.$$
(15)

Compared to the TBC (12) for the wave equation, there is a fundamental difference when considering (15) for the Schrödinger equation. Indeed, the BC involves a nonlocal time operator which must be discretised carefully (see Section 3.3). In practice, we are led to solving the following IBVP set in a finite spatial domain

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t \psi^{\text{int}} + \partial_x^2 \psi^{\text{int}} = 0, & (x,t) \in \Omega_T, \\ \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \psi^{\text{int}} + e^{-i\pi/4} \partial_t^{1/2} \psi^{\text{int}} = 0, & (x,t) \in \Sigma_T, \\ \psi^{\text{int}}(x,0) = \psi_0(x), & x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$
(16)

In addition, if $\psi_0 \in H^1(\Omega)$ (finite energy Sobolev space), then it can be proved [9] that there exists a unique smooth solution ψ in a well-adapted mathematical setting. Moreover, ψ satisfies the following mass inequality: $\|\psi(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\psi_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \forall t > 0$. This property can be physically interpreted as the usual mass conservation property for the full space equation: $\|\psi(t)\|_{L^2} = \|\psi_0\|_{L^2},$ $\forall t > 0$. Indeed, for the bounded domain problem (16), some mass of the solution goes out of the computational domain, which is exactly what is expected from the TBC. Let us also remark that, similarly to the wave operator, one gets the factorisation: $i\partial_t + \partial_x^2 = (\partial_x + \sqrt{-i\partial_t})(\partial_x - \sqrt{-i\partial_t})$. It can be shown that the TBC in (16) writes $(\partial_{\mathbf{n}} + \sqrt{-i\partial_t})\psi^{\text{int}} = 0$, for $(x, t) \in \Sigma_T$.

3.2. Adding a potential or/and a nonlinearity

Let us now consider the case where a potential is included into the equation. Then, if the potential $\mathbb{V}(x) = V(x)$ is general in $\Omega_{\ell,r}$ in system (1) but is time independent (in $\Omega_{\ell,r}$, \mathbb{V} can be general in the computational domain Ω , even nonsmooth), we are led to solving a variable coefficients ODE corresponding to $\partial_x^2 \hat{\psi}^{\text{ext}} + (V(x) + i\omega)\hat{\psi}^{\text{ext}} = 0$, after applying a Laplace transform. Most of the time, getting the TBC is out of reach [10]. If *V* also depends on *t*, this would lead to handle the Laplace transform of $V(x, t)\psi^{\text{ext}}$ which is a convolution. In some special cases, the TBC can still be computed. For example, for a linear potential V(x) = x, the expression of the exact operator can be made explicit [10] through the Airy functions in the Laplace domain. However, the concrete use of such boundary conditions is non-trivial. If one considers a potential $V \coloneqq V(t)$, then a change of gauge $\phi(x, t) = \psi^{\text{ext}}(x, t)e^{-i\mathcal{V}(t)}$ leads (after coming back to the interior solution ψ^{int}) to the TBC

$$\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\psi^{\mathrm{int}} + e^{-i\pi/4}e^{i\mathcal{V}(t)}\partial_{t}^{1/2}(e^{-i\mathcal{V}(t)}\psi^{\mathrm{int}}) = 0, \quad \text{on } \Sigma_{T},$$
(17)

with $\mathcal{V}(t) := I_t V$, where I_t is the integral of *V* from 0 to *t*.

Considering the general situation is much more complicate and TBCs can generally not be built. Instead, one can produce families of approximate ABCs of increasing order that minimise the reflection at the boundary. Various directions exist [10,11], but some, based on the generalisation of the point of view of the Laplace transform by *pseudo-differential operators theory and symbolical calculus* [12,13], are systematic and can be also used for many systems of partial differential equations (PDE) (in particular, for the Klein–Gordon and Dirac equations). For example, one may derive the following fourth-order ABC (see [10]):

$$\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\psi^{\mathrm{int}} + e^{-i\pi/4}e^{i\mathcal{V}}\partial_{t}^{1/2}\left(e^{-i\mathcal{V}}\psi^{\mathrm{int}}\right) + i\operatorname{sg}(\partial_{\mathbf{n}}V)\frac{\sqrt{|\partial_{\mathbf{n}}V|}}{2}e^{i\mathcal{V}}I_{t}$$

$$\left(\frac{\sqrt{|\partial_{\mathbf{n}}V|}}{2}e^{-i\mathcal{V}}\psi^{\mathrm{int}}\right) = 0,$$
(18)

on Σ_T , where sg is the sign function and $\mathcal{V}(x, t) := I_t V$. We directly see that, when *V* is *x*-independent, this ABC simplifies to (17) and is then exact as a TBC. Other kinds of ABCs can be found in the literature [10,11] for variable potentials.

Constructing TBCs for a nonlinear equation is generally impossible (see [14] for a special case). To get a nonlinear ABC for system (1) in 1D, the main idea is to use the formal substitution $V = f(\psi)(x, t)$ and $\mathcal{V} = I_t(f(\psi))(x, t)$ in the BC (18) [15–18]. Another approach, called *unified approach* and prospected in [19,20], also uses a splitting operator idea but rather to build ABCs for nonlinear Schrödinger equations. Volkov-based ABCs following similar ideas, and specifically designed for laser–molecule interaction, were also proposed in [21].

3.3. How to discretise the initial boundary-value problem

When we want to discretise one of the above IBVPs, we must carefully approximate the boundary conditions to get a stable scheme [1,9]. Indeed, if one considers for example (18) which includes all the difficulties, then we remark that the boundary condition involves

- some time convolution integrals (fractional derivatives/integration operators),
- some variable coefficients and nonlinear terms,
- and the normal derivative.

When discretising the boundary-value problem, even with a simple Dirichlet ($\psi^{\text{int}} = 0$) or Neumann ($\partial_{\mathbf{n}} \psi^{\text{int}}$ = 0) boundary condition on Σ_T , building a semi-discrete time scheme is far from being trivial. Indeed, in such a case, we often require that some physical properties remain fulfilled at the semi-discrete level: mass/energy conservation, time reversibility, gauge invariance, preservation of the dispersion relation. We refer to [22] for a complete description of the most standard and welladapted schemes (Crank-Nicolson, time-splitting, relaxation schemes, etc.). When considering an ABC, then one must take care to preserve these properties. This is not a trivial task even for the simplest case, i.e. the one-dimensional free-space linear Schrödinger equation [1,9]. To illustrate this difficulty, let us mention that when using a Crank-Nicolson scheme [1,9,22] for a uniform time step $\Delta t > 0$, the half-order time-derivative operator must be discretised, thanks to the following quadrature rule:

$$\partial_t^{1/2} f(t^n) \approx \sqrt{\frac{2}{\Delta t}} \sum_{k=0}^n \beta_{n-k} f^k,$$
 (19)

with $\beta_k = (-1)^k \alpha_k$, $\forall k \ge 0$, $(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, ...) = (1, 1, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{8}, \frac{3}{8}, ...)$, to provide an unconditionally stable scheme. The variable coefficients and nonlinear terms, as well as the normal derivative, are usually discretised consistently with the interior time and space scheme (e.g. finite difference, finite element). Let us remark that well-known Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) based pseudo-spectral approximation schemes in space [22,23] which strongly assume that the boundary conditions are periodic (or that we have a Dirichlet or Neumann boundary condition when using sine- or cosine-transform) cannot be used with an ABC. Nevertheless, we will see in Section 5 that a suitable truncation of the computational domain can be achieved using a PML approach.

The fractional nonlocal operator $\partial_t^{1/2}$ (and latter $I_t^{1/2}$, see e.g. system (21) for higher dimensional problems) can be evaluated by the suitable discrete formula given by Equation (19), but fast convolution algorithms or localised representations based on rational approximations can also be used. Concerning the fast evaluation of fractional operators, in [24,25], the authors propose an efficient evaluation algorithm by splitting the full time integral operator into a local and an history parts, leading

to a special treatment for each of the two terms. The local part, that includes the kernel singularity, is computed through an adapted quadrature formula. The history part involves an approximation through a Gaussian sum of exponentials [26,27], and then a recursive evaluation. We remark here that the development of fast evaluations of integral operators has been investigated intensively since about 30 years now with e.g. the celebrated fast multipole method by Greengard and Rokhlin [28] for longrange interactions arising in particle simulations. Concerning integral operators that arise in TBCs/ABCs, the first algorithms were studied in the case of the wave-like equation (see e.g. [29,30]) and then for Schrödinger equations [24,25,31]. Various extensions have been recently proposed to design related new fast algorithms for timefractional PDEs systems (see e.g. [32]). Let us remark here that Gaussian sum techniques are now widely used in the design of fast evaluations of nonlocal interactions (an example is given in [33]). Instead of fast algorithms for fractional operators, rational approximations of the symbol of the operators can also be used. About the contributions for the Schrödinger equation, let us mention the initial work by Di Menza [34], and then e.g. [10,35,36] for various situations (1D/2D, potential/nonlinearity). The main idea consists in introducing rational approximations (e.g. Padé rational functions) to have a local representation of the action of the fractional operator through the solution to some local auxiliary equations set on the fictitious boundary. These equations being local (meaning defined by differential operators with positive integer orders), their solution can be computed efficiently through well-adapted formulations and the use of suitable solvers.

To illustrate the accuracy of the boundary condition (18) for the truncated IBVP (1), we consider the nonlinear potential $\mathbb{V}(x, t) = 0.1x^2 - |\psi|^2$, and the initial data is taken as $\psi_0(x) = 2\operatorname{sech}(\sqrt{2}x)e^{i\frac{15}{2}x}$. We first compute the reference solution ψ^{ref} with a relaxation time scheme [16,22,37] on a very large domain, so that we do not see the effect of the boundary and plot the amplitude $|\psi^{\text{ref}}(x, t)|$ in the domain $\Omega_T =] - 10; 10[\times$ [0; 2] (see Figure 2(a)), for $\Delta t = 10^{-3}$. Then, we discretise [10] the truncated IBVP with the same semidiscrete time scheme (relaxation), setting successively as a function of time, the discrete version of the ABC (18) at three different locations: $x_r = 10$ (Figure 2(b)), x_r = 8 (Figure 2(c)) and $x_r = 6$ (Figure 2(d)). The spatial discretisation scheme is based on a linear finiteelement method [10] with $N = 4 \times 10^3$ points. As we can see, the ABC (18) yields an accurate simulation of the outgoing wave to the computational domain at x_r .



Figure 2. ABCs for the 1D Schrödinger equation (with a quadratic potential minus a nonlinear cubic term): $\mathbb{V}(x, t) = 0.1x^2 - |\psi|^2$, for $t \in [0; 2]$. The location of the ABC changes from $x_r = 10$ to $x_r = 8$ and finally $x_r = 6$ without almost affecting the solution (at least at some visible levels of accuracy since the boundary condition is not transparent). (a) Numerical reference solution. (b) Numerical approximate solution ($x_r = 8$). (d) Numerical approximate solution ($x_r = 6$).

4. ABCs for two-dimensional Schrödinger equations

4.1. The free-space case: straight boundary

The extension of ABCs to higher dimensions requires mainly the suitable integration of the effect of the boundary Σ . In the case of a straight boundary for the twodimensional case, the exact DtN operator Λ^+ can be built [1] in the form

$$\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\psi + i\Lambda^{+}(\partial_{y},\partial_{t})\psi = 0, \quad \text{on } \Sigma_{T} := \Sigma \times [0;T],$$
(20)

where **n** is the outwardly directed unit normal vector to the left half-space $\Omega := \{\mathbf{x} := (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2/x < 0\}$. The expression of Λ^+ is based on the inverse time Laplace transform, the partial Fourier transform in *y* and an extension of the factorisation formula (see e.g. [1]). The operator Λ^+ is nonlocal both in time and space and can be tricky to implement in a standard code (e.g. based on finite-difference or finite-element approximations). To simplify the situation, local approximations are usually used. For example, the following first- and second-order ABCs can be derived:

ABC₁
$$(\partial_{\mathbf{n}} + e^{-i\pi/4}\partial_t^{1/2})\psi = 0$$
, on Σ_T ,
ABC₂ $(\partial_{\mathbf{n}} + e^{-i\pi/4}\partial_t^{1/2} - e^{i\pi/4}\frac{1}{2}\Delta_{\Sigma}I_t^{1/2})\psi = 0$, on Σ_T ,
(21)

where $\Delta_{\Sigma} := \partial_{y}^{2}$ is the second-order derivative operator (called Laplace–Beltrami operator) over Σ . These boundary conditions are local in space, which is expected for deriving efficient algorithms (indeed, the associated discrete matrices are then highly sparse) but nevertheless remain nonlocal in time (yielding then to consider all the past history of the solution).

From the implementation point of view, the approach is relatively close to the one-dimensional case. The operator Δ_{Σ} could be approximated through finite-difference or finite-element methods, depending on the spatial approximation scheme in Ω .

4.2. The free-space case: curved boundary

Since the boundary conditions ABC_{1,2} defined by expressions (21) are derived in the half-space case, they can be directly applied to a rectangular domain. However, some errors may arise during the numerical simulations due to the corner reflection. Usually, additional well-adapted corner conditions must be enforced to accurately represent the wave function ψ , leading to difficult developments in mathematical and numerical analysis [38]. For practical computations, ABCs are rather preferred for smooth boundaries (e.g. a square with rounded corners, or a circle). Therefore, the ABC must take into account the fact that the fictitious boundary is curved, incorporating in particular the effects of the curvature $\kappa(s)$ (as well as its variations $\partial_s \kappa$, s being the curvilinear abscissa along Σ) and the curvilinear variations of the solution onto the surface Σ , i.e. through some terms $\partial_s \psi$, $\partial_s^2 \psi$,.... We do not give any detail here since the derivation of families of local ABCs is extremely technical and we refer to [39] for more details. For example, the following fourth-order ABC can be obtained:

$$\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\psi + e^{-i\pi/4}\partial_{t}^{1/2}\psi + \frac{\kappa}{2}\psi - e^{i\pi/4}\left(\frac{\kappa^{2}}{8} + \frac{1}{2}\Delta_{\Sigma}\right)I_{t}^{1/2}\psi + i\left(\frac{\kappa^{3}}{8} + \frac{1}{2}\partial_{s}(\kappa\partial_{s}) + \frac{\Delta_{\Sigma}\kappa}{8}\right)I_{t}\psi = 0, \text{ on}\Sigma_{T}, \quad (22)$$

where $\Delta_{\Sigma} := \partial_s^2$. Let us remark that (22) simplifies to (21) when $\kappa = 0$, i.e. for a flat interface (and then s = y). Furthermore, when Σ is a circle, many terms vanish. The implementation of such boundary conditions can be achieved again by using suitable discrete quadratures for the time operators [40] and some finite-element or finite-difference schemes in space.

4.3. Adding a potential or/and a nonlinearity

Finally, like in the one-dimensional situation, variable potentials and nonlinear terms could be incorporated into the ABC. The derivation needs a lot of technical developments [35,36]. Here, to illustrate the purpose, we write a fourth-order ABC that must be seen as the extension of (18) and (22) to the 2D potential case

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\psi + e^{-i\pi/4}e^{i\mathcal{V}}\partial_{t}^{1/2}\left(e^{-i\mathcal{V}}\psi\right) + \frac{\kappa}{2}\psi \\ &- e^{i\pi/4}e^{i\mathcal{V}}\left(\frac{\Delta_{\Sigma}}{2} + \frac{\kappa^{2}}{8} + i\partial_{s}\mathcal{V}\partial_{s} + \frac{1}{2}(i\partial_{s}^{2}\mathcal{V} - (\partial_{s}\mathcal{V})^{2})\right)I_{t}^{1/2}(e^{-i\mathcal{V}}\psi) \\ &+ ie^{i\mathcal{V}}\left(\frac{\partial_{s}(\kappa\partial_{s})}{2} + \frac{\kappa^{3}}{8} + \frac{\Delta_{\Sigma}\kappa}{8} + \frac{i\partial_{s}\kappa\partial_{s}\mathcal{V}}{2}\right)I_{t}(e^{-i\mathcal{V}}\psi) \\ &- isg(\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathcal{V})\sqrt{|\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathcal{V}|}e^{i\mathcal{V}}I_{t}(\sqrt{|\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathcal{V}|}e^{-i\mathcal{V}}\psi) = 0, \text{ on } \Sigma_{T}, \end{aligned}$$
(23)

with $V = f(\psi)(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $\mathcal{V} = I_t(f(\psi))(\mathbf{x}, t)$. The discretisation can be achieved through all the previous developments. The reader is referred to [35,36] for more details and numerical examples showing that these ABCs perform very well.

Even if ABCs can be produced for complicate equations, they are nevertheless not always so easy to implement. In addition, for Schrödinger-type equations, one of the drawbacks is that they are usually nonlocal in time. Localisation can be done but at the price of some advanced algorithmic developments. In the following section, we introduce the PML approach which is easier to implement and appears as a simple computational alternative to ABCs.

5. PMLs for Schrödinger equations

The idea of PML (sometimes also called sponge layers) has been originally introduced for electromagnetism by a French engineer J.-P. Bérenger in 1994 [41]. Since then, many developments have been directed towards the understanding and improvement of PMLs for many PDE systems arising in Physics and Engineering [3]. This methodology has some closed connections to what is commonly called 'absorbers' in the atomic physics literature and which refers to empirically designed absorbing layers [42]. Notice, however, that PML are rigorously designed and provide better absorption as analysed in [16]. In addition, they do not need to be adapted to the potential and nonlinearity, unlike complex absorbing potential (AP) approaches [43,44] (see also Section 7.3 for a comparison between the PMLs and AP approaches for the Dirac equation). For the Schrödinger equation, the developments are more recent (see e.g. [16,45] for some contributions). Basically, PMLs are designed for linear wave problems [3] (see also Section 6.3 for the closely related Klein-Gordon equation). Their application to nonlinear PDEs is direct but remains formal, without any theoretical background as for the ABCs. Nevertheless, as seen below, they perform very well for such situations and are easy to implement which makes them attractive. In particular, and unlike ABCs, they can also be easily incorporated into an existing solver based on pseudo-spectral FFT-based methods [46], opening the road to efficient time-splitting schemes.

To give a simplified but sufficiently general presentation, we consider system (1) for the 2D nonlinear case with a cubic nonlinearity and a general potential V. Let us assume that we are interested in the computation of an approximate solution inside the rectangular domain $\mathcal{D}_{Phy} =] - L_x$; $L_x[\times] - L_y$; $L_y[$. The idea of PMLs is to surround the physical domain \mathcal{D}_{Phy} by an absorbing unphysical layer: $\mathcal{D}_{PML} := (] - L_x^*; L_x^*[\times] -$



Figure 3. Surrounding the finite computational physical domain of interest \mathcal{D}_{Phy} by an absorbing layer \mathcal{D}_{PML} to damp the waves entering the layer region. The resulting complete computational domain is then $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}_{Phy} \cup \mathcal{D}_{PML}$.

 L_y^* ; L_y^* [) \ \overline{D}_{Phy} , with $L_v^* = L_v + \delta_v$ (v = x, y) (represented by the green region in Figure 3).

The objective is to artificially damp the waves entering into the layer \mathcal{D}_{PML} . To this end, one introduces the following functions:

$$S^{\nu}(\nu) = \begin{cases} 1, & |\nu| < L_{\nu}, \\ 1 + e^{i\vartheta_{\nu}}\sigma_{\nu}(|\nu| - L_{\nu}^{*}), & L_{\nu} \le \nu < L_{\nu}^{*}, \end{cases} \quad \nu = x, y,$$
(24)

where ϑ_{ν} is a constant and σ_{ν} is the so-called absorbing function. Various choices of functions ϑ_{ν} and σ_{ν} are reported in the literature (see e.g. [45,47]). Among these, the following choices are popular and work well for nonlinear Schrödinger equations: $\vartheta_{\nu} = \frac{\pi}{4}$ and $\sigma_{\nu} =$ $\sigma_0^{\nu} (\nu + \delta_{\nu})^2$, where $\delta_{\nu} = L_{\nu}^* - L_{\nu}$ is the thickness in the ν -direction of the PML layer and σ_0^{ν} is a real-valued positive constant representing the absorbing strength. Since the wave is damped into the layer, we generally are free to choose the boundary condition on the outer boundary. Usually, homogeneous Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions are set. Nevertheless, since our goal in the presentation is here to use a pseudo-spectral FFT-based approximation scheme, we impose periodic boundary conditions. With such choices, the 2D cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation with a potential V is truncated in the computational domain $\mathcal{D} :=] - L_x; L_x[\times] L_y; L_y = \overline{\mathcal{D}_{Phy}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{PML}$ and approximated by

$$i\partial_t \psi = -\frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\partial_x}{S^x(x)} \left(\frac{\partial_x}{S^x(x)} \right) + \frac{\partial_y}{S^y(y)} \left(\frac{\partial_y}{S^y(y)} \right) \right] \psi + \left[V + \beta |\psi|^2 \right] \psi, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D},$$
(25)

+periodic BC for $\mathbf{x} \in \partial \mathcal{D}, t \ge 0.$ (26)

Since system (25)–(26) is a nonlinear Schrödinger equation with variable coefficients and periodic boundary conditions, it can be solved efficiently by using FFTs incorporated into a time-splitting scheme [46]. To this end, we first apply the time-splitting approach to deal with the nonlinearity, i.e. for $\mathbf{x} \in D$, one solves

$$i \partial_t \psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = -\frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\partial_x}{S^x(x)} \left(\frac{\partial_x}{S^x(x)} \right) + \frac{\partial_y}{S^y(y)} \left(\frac{\partial_y}{S^y(y)} \right) \right] \psi(\mathbf{x}, t),$$

$$t^n \le t \le t^{n+1}, \tag{27}$$

for a time step $\Delta t > 0$, followed by solving

$$i \,\partial_t \psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \left[V(\mathbf{x}, t) + \beta \,|\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 \right] \psi(\mathbf{x}, t),$$
$$t^n \le t \le t^{n+1}, \tag{28}$$

for Δt . If $t \in [t^n, t^{n+1}]$, Equation (28) leaves $|\psi|$ invariant in t, i.e. $|\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)| = |\psi(\mathbf{x}, t^n)| := |\psi^n(\mathbf{x})|$. Higher order splitting can naturally be implemented. Therefore, (28) reduces to a linear Ordinary Differential Equation (ODE), which can be integrated analytically as

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = e^{-i\left[\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, t^n, t) + \beta \left| \psi^n(\mathbf{x}) \right|^2 (t - t^n) \right]} \psi(\mathbf{x}, t^n), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D},$$
$$t^n \le t \le t^{n+1}, \tag{29}$$

with $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, t_1, t_2) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} V(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau$. To solve Equation (27) with periodic boundary conditions by a Fourier pseudospectral method, we adapt the approach developed e.g. in [48,49] which combines FFT-based evaluations of the operator appearing in the right-hand side of Equation (27) after the semi-discretisation in time by a Crank-Nicolson scheme and the solution to implicit linear systems through a preconditioned Krylov subspace solver [50]. This approach is simple to implement since it basically uses algorithmic bricks that are well managed (even from the parallel implementation view point). The resulting scheme is second-order in time and spectrally accurate in space and appears therefore to be very efficient, robust and well-adapted to simulate problems set in infinite domains. We refer to [46] for more details and variant around this method.

To illustrate the method, we apply the resulting scheme to study the dynamics of a manufactured 2D soliton. To this end, we choose the potential and initial data respectively as $V(\mathbf{x}, t) = -\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{sech}^2(x - t)\operatorname{sech}^2(y - t)(\cosh(2(x - t)) + \cosh(2(y - t))),$



Figure 4. PML for the 2D Schrödinger equation: contour plots of $|\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2$ at times t = 0, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9. The problem consists in the dynamics of a manufactured 2D soliton.

 $\psi_0(\mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{sech}(x)\operatorname{sech}(y)e^{i(x+y)}$ and let $\beta = -1$. With these parameters, we can solve exactly the problem and get the analytical outgoing solution $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \operatorname{sech}(x - t)\operatorname{sech}(y - t)e^{i(x+y)}$. The other parameters are chosen as follows: $L_{\nu} = 8$, $\delta_{\nu} = 1$ and σ_{μ} = 80 ($\nu = x, y$). The time step and mesh size are fixed as $\Delta t = 10^{-2}$ and $h_{\nu} = 1/8$, respectively (tuning the PML parameters can sometimes be tricky). Figure 4 shows the contour plots of $|\psi|^2$ at different times. We can see that when the soliton wave enters into the PML region, it is then very well damped and no visible waves are reflected back into the physical domain. This shows that PMLs can be extremely useful when one wants to truncate an infinite domain, even when the problem is nonlinear. Let us remark that it is easy to extend the method to higher dimensions, and that circular PMLs are also available (see e.g. [46] for the Schrödinger equation).

6. ABCs/PMLs for the Klein–Gordon equation

6.1. ABCs for the field-particle Klein–Gordon equation

The time-domain Klein–Gordon equation (TDKGE) is a wave equation for which absorbing boundary layers have been extensively studied. We assume that the initial data

 ψ_0 and ψ_1 are compactly supported in a domain $\Omega :=$ $] - x_\ell; x_r[:=] - R; R[(R > 0), with boundary <math>\Sigma := \{x_\ell; x_r\}$. A strategy similar to the one used for the Schrödinger equation is then applied to a spinless relativistic particle of charge *e* and mass *m* and subject to an external *constant* electric field, written here in Coulomb gauge and denoted by (*V*, *A*) (scalar and vector potential). In this case, the TDKGE reads

$$\begin{cases} P_{\text{KG}}\psi = 0, (x, t) \in \Omega_T := \mathbb{R}_x \times]0; T[, \\ \psi(x, 0) = \psi_0(x), x \in \mathbb{R}_x \\ \partial_t \psi(x, 0) = \psi_1(x), x \in \mathbb{R}_x, \end{cases}$$
(30)

where the operator $P_{\rm KG}$ is given by

$$P_{\text{KG}} = \partial_x^2 - 1/c^2 \partial_t^2 - ieV/c^2 \partial_t - ieA \partial_x$$
$$+ e^2/c^2 V^2 - e^2 A^2 - m^2 c^2.$$

Without giving the mathematical details, one gets the following TBC by factorising P_{KG} :

$$\left(\partial_{\mathbf{n}} - \frac{1}{c}\sqrt{\partial_t^2 + ieV\partial_t - e^2V^2 + \frac{3}{4}c^2e^2A^2 + m^2c^4} - \frac{iceA}{2}\right)\psi = 0, \text{ on } \Sigma_T.$$
(31)

Now, when the external field is *not constant* and $m \neq 0$, it is no more possible to explicitly construct the exact transparent operator. However, the computation of approximate boundary conditions is possible. This step requires the introduction of mathematical tools which are beyond the scope of this paper. In addition, the introduction of a *high-frequency regime* assumption or the use of Padé's approximants is often required. For the interested reader, we refer to [51] where it can be shown that a sequence of ABCs of increasing order can be built. For not constant A_x and V, the resulting ABCs of orders k = 1, 2, 3 are given on Σ_T by

$$ABC_{1} \qquad \left(\partial_{\mathbf{n}} + \frac{1}{c}\partial_{t}\right)\psi = 0,$$

$$ABC_{2} \qquad \left(\partial_{\mathbf{n}} + \frac{1}{c}\partial_{t} + \frac{ieV}{2c} - \frac{ieA_{x}}{2}\right)\psi = 0,$$

$$ABC_{3} \qquad \left(\partial_{\mathbf{n}} + \frac{1}{c}\partial_{t} + \frac{ieV}{2c} - \frac{ieA_{x}}{2}\right)$$

$$-\frac{1}{2c}\left(-ie\partial_{t}V - ic^{2}e\partial_{x}A_{x} + e^{2}V^{2} - c^{2}e^{2}A_{x}^{2}\right)$$

$$-m^{2}c^{4} - \frac{1}{4}(e^{2}V^{2} - c^{2}e^{2}A_{x}^{2}) - \frac{i}{2}(e\partial_{x}V - ce\partial_{x}A_{x})$$

$$+\frac{i}{2}(e\partial_{t}V - ce\partial_{t}A_{x})I_{t}\psi = 0.$$
(32)

6.2. ABCs for the two-dimensional Klein–Gordon equation

We consider the two-dimensional TDKGE ($\hbar = 1$) including the electromagnetic field, that is A(x, y, t) and V(x, y, t) which, respectively, represent the vectorial and scalar potentials satisfying the Maxwell's equations. The equation writes

$$[(i\partial_t - eV(x, y, t))^2 - c^2(-i\nabla - e\mathbf{A}(x, y, t))^2 - m^2c^4]\psi = 0.$$

To simplify the presentation, we consider that the computational domain Ω is a disk of radius *R*. We rewrite the TDKGE in *polar coordinates* in Σ_r , for $r \in [0, \varepsilon)$ with $\varepsilon >$ 0 small enough, that is (the details are skipped)

$$\left(c^2\partial_r^2 - \partial_t^2 + \frac{c^2}{\chi_r^2}\partial_\theta^2 - \mu V\partial_t + O_1 + O_2 + O_3\right)\psi = 0.$$
(33)

We set above $A_x = A_r \cos(\theta) - A_\theta \sin(\theta)$, $A_y = A_r \sin(\theta) + A_\theta \cos(\theta)$ and

$$\begin{cases} O_1 := -\left(\frac{c^2}{\chi_r} + c^2 \mu A_r\right) \partial_r, & O_2 := -\frac{c^2 \mu}{\chi_r} A_\theta \partial_\theta \\ O_3 := -\mu \partial_t V - c^2 \mu \partial_r A_r - \frac{c^2 \mu}{\chi_r} A_r - \frac{c^2 \mu}{\chi_r} \partial_\theta A_\theta \\ + e^2 V^2 - c^2 e^2 \|\mathbf{A}\|^2 - m^2 c^4. \end{cases}$$

Again skipping all the technical details, ABCs for the field-particle TDKGE can be obtained on $\Sigma_T^R := C(\mathbf{0}, R) \times [0; T]$, with $C(\mathbf{0}, R)$ the circle of radius *R* and centre **0**, as

$$ABC_{1} \qquad \left(\partial_{r} + \frac{1}{c}\partial_{t}\right)\psi = 0,$$

$$ABC_{2} \qquad \left(\partial_{r} + \frac{1}{c}(\partial_{t} + \frac{ie}{2}V + \frac{1}{2c}O_{1})\right)\psi = 0,$$

$$ABC_{3} \qquad \left(\partial_{r} + \frac{1}{c}\left[\partial_{t} + \frac{ie}{2}V + \frac{1}{2c}O_{1} + \left(-\frac{c^{2}}{2\chi_{r}^{2}}\partial_{\theta}^{2} - \frac{1}{2}O_{2}\partial_{\theta} + iO_{4}\right)I_{t}\right]\right)\psi = 0,$$

where O_4 is a complicated algebraic scalar operator, which is defined in in [51, p. 282]. Notice that the first-order ABC (ABC₁) is exactly (6) in the *r*-direction.

We now consider the discretisation of the 1D TDKGE with ABCs. A second-order explicit scheme is proposed to approximate the equation defined by the corresponding operator P_{KG} in the truncated spatial domain Ω , that is for interior nodes

$$\begin{split} \psi_j^{n+1} - 2\psi_j^n + \psi_j^{n-1} &= \Delta t^2 \bigg[\frac{c^2}{\Delta x^2} (\psi_{j+1}^n - 2\psi_j^n + \psi_{j-1}^n) \\ &+ \frac{A_j^n}{2\Delta t} (\psi_j^{n+1} - \psi_j^{n-1}) \\ &+ \frac{B_j^n}{2\Delta x} (\psi_{j+1}^n - \psi_{j-1}^n) + C_j^n \psi_j^n \bigg], \end{split}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} A_{j}^{n} = -ieV(x_{j}, t_{n}), & B_{j}^{n} = -ieA_{x}(x_{j}, t_{n}), \\ C_{j}^{n} = -ie\partial_{t}V(x_{j}, t_{n}) - ic^{2}\partial_{x}A_{x}(x_{j}, t_{n}) + e^{2}V^{2}(x_{j}, t_{n}) \\ -c^{2}e^{2}A_{x}^{2}(x_{j}, t_{n}) - m^{2}c^{4}. \end{cases}$$

The initial data is a wave packet given by

$$\psi_0(x) = \frac{ck_0}{mc^2 + \sqrt{m^2c^4 + c^2k_0^2}}e^{-\frac{x^2}{4} + ik_0x},$$



Figure 5. ABCs for the 1D TDKGE: $|\psi|$ (log-scale) for ABC₁ (top), ABC₂ (middle) and ABC₃ (bottom).

with $k_0 = 10$. The external field is such that $A(t) = \cos(t)$, $V(t) = 0.1\sin(t)$ and $\hbar = m = c = 1$. The computational domain is $\Omega \coloneqq] - 10$; 10[, T = 8 and $\Delta x = \Delta t = 0.4$. The results for ABC₁, ABC₂ and ABC₃ (see Equation (32)) are presented in Figure 5 in the (*x*, *t*)-plane (log-scale). The discretisation of the time integral is based on similar ideas [51] as (19). We clearly see that increasing the order of the ABC reduces the artificial reflection at the boundary.

6.3. PMLs for the Klein–Gordon equation

We start this section by introducing the notion of PML for the linear wave equation. The beginning of this section is extracted from [52]. As for the Schrödinger equation, a thin layer surrounds the physical domain \mathcal{D}_{Phy} designed as an absorbing and reflectionless material. The construction of PMLs is based on an analytic continuation of the wave function in the complex plane, i.e. the wave function can be evaluated for complex values of x in the absorbing layer. More precisely, we set $x \rightarrow$ x + if(x) for some differentiable real-valued function f such that $f'(x) = \sigma_x(x)/\omega$, where $\sigma_x(x) > 0$ and a given frequency ω , in the PML region and zero otherwise. Then, the derivative with respect to *x* becomes $\partial_x \rightarrow 1/(1 + i\sigma_x/\omega)\partial_x$. The prefactor allows for an absorption of the wave function of frequency ω in the PML region. In the simplest 1D case, it then reads

$$\partial_t \psi = c \partial_x \phi - \sigma_x \psi, \quad \partial_t \phi = c \partial_x \psi - \sigma_x \phi,$$

where ϕ is an intermediate function.

In higher dimensions, PMLs for wave equations are established, first thanks to the Laplace transform in time and Fourier transform in the direction of propagation. Then, a modal solution/ansatz decreasing exponentially in the direction of propagation is postulated. A new set of equations adapted to the chosen ansatz is then derived in the external layer, in Laplace and Fourier variables. Finally, going back to real time and space, we get the full set of equations to solve in the PML [53]. Notice that auxiliary functions may be necessary to localise in time the PML. This concept applied in 2D [52] to the wave equation reads as follows: $\partial_t^2 \psi - c^2(\partial_x^2 + \partial_y^2)\psi = 0$. For some function σ_x and transformation $x \to 1/(1 + i\sigma_x/\omega)\partial_x$, the



Figure 6. PMLs for the 1D TDKGE: comparison between the PML and the reference solutions (left) and logarithm of the absolute error between the reference and PML solutions (right).

PML version is

$$\partial_t \psi - c \nabla \phi - \sigma_x \psi + \psi = 0,$$

with $\partial_t \phi_x = c \partial_x \psi - \sigma_x \phi_x$, $\partial_t \phi_y = c \partial_y \psi$ and $\partial_t \psi = c \sigma_x \partial_y \phi_y$.

Now, for more general wave-like equations, including the Klein–Gordon equation, of the form

$$\partial_t \psi - \nabla^2 \psi + \sum_{k\geq 0} c_k u^{2k+1} + d_k \partial_t \psi^{2k+1} = 0,$$

with $c_k \ge 0$, $d_k \ge 0$, a set of PMLs was established in [53]. This paper is a theoretical friendly as well as numerical presentation of PMLs for nonlinear wave equations.

We now test the PML approach for the equation $\partial_t^2 \psi - \partial_x^2 \psi + mc^2 \psi = 0$, with $mc^2 = 1$. In this case, we implement the PML in [53]

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 \psi - \partial_x^2 \psi + mc^2 \psi = -\sigma(x) \partial_t \psi + \sigma(x) \eta^{(2)} \\ + \alpha \sigma(x) - mc^2 \psi + \partial_x (\sigma(x) \eta^{(1)}), \\ \partial_t \eta^{(1)} + (\sigma(x) + \alpha) \eta^{(1)} + \partial_x \psi = 0, \\ \partial_t \eta^{(2)} + \alpha \eta^{(2)} + (mc^2 + \alpha^2) \psi = 0, \end{cases}$$

where σ is chosen as in [53], i.e. $\sigma(x) = 0$ in the interior zone]0; L_x [and $\sigma(x) = \sigma_x(1 - \delta_x^{-1}(x - L_x^*)^2)^8$ in the layer] L_x ; L_x^* [, where $L_x^* = L_x + \delta_x$. In this test, PMLs are implemented in] L_x ; L_x^* [and homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions are set on the left boundary x_ℓ := 0 and at $x = L_x^*$. We approximate this system by using an elementary finite-difference scheme. We take $\alpha = 1$, $L_x = 10$, $\delta_x = L_x/10$ and $\sigma_x = 50$. The initial data is taken as $\psi_0(x) = e^{-(x-L_x/2)^2}$ and the final time is T = 6. For comparison, we compute the reference solution ψ^{ref} on a large domain. The space and time steps are chosen, respectively, as $\Delta x = 4 \times 10^{-2}$ and $\Delta t = 2 \times 10^{-2}$. We first compare in real space in Figure 6 (left) the reference

and the PML solutions. Notice that the PML region is $]L_x; L_x^*[=]10; 11[$. In this Figure, a line at $x = L_x$ shows the location of the interface between the PML and the internal region. We also represent in Figure 6 (right) (in log-scale and as a function of time) the logarithm of the error between the reference and the PML solutions, i.e. $(x, t, \log |\psi^{ref}(x, t) - \psi(x, t)|)$. This clearly illustrates the absorption at the right side (for the PML) of the domain, yielding a correct numerical solution, and the artificial reflection at the left side (for the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition), resulting in a wrong numerical solution.

7. ABCs/PMLs for the Dirac equation

In this section, we propose an overview of ABCs and PMLs for the Dirac equation. In 2D, the Dirac equation which models the interaction of a quantum particle with an external field (**A**, *V*) reads $P_D \psi = 0$, with

$$P_{\rm D} := \mathbf{I}_4 \partial_t + \alpha_x (c \partial_x - i e A_x) + \alpha_y (c \partial_y - i e A_y) + i (V_c + eV) \mathbf{I}_4 - i \beta m c^2,$$

where [54,55]

- $V_c : \mathbb{R}^2_{x,y} \to \mathbb{R}$ is an interaction (Coulomb) potential.
- V : ℝ²_{x,y} × ℝ₊ → ℝ is a combination of the selfconsistent and external electric potentials.
- A: ℝ²_{x,y} × ℝ₊ → ℝ² is a combination of the electromagnetic potential generated by the particle charge and by an external potential.
- *m* is the mass of the particle, *e* their charge, *c* the speed of light.
- $\psi: \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^2_{x,y} \to \mathbb{C}^4$ is the Dirac wave function.

 the Hermitian Dirac matrices α_x, α_y, β are defined by

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0_2 & \sigma_x \\ \sigma_x & 0_2 \end{pmatrix}, & \sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \alpha_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0_2 & \sigma_y \\ \sigma_y & 0_2 \end{pmatrix}, & \sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \beta = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_2 & 0_2 \\ 0_2 & -\beta_2 \end{pmatrix}, & \beta_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \end{cases}$$

and 0₂ and **I**₂ are, respectively, the zero and identity matrices in $M_2(\mathbb{C})$. The following relations hold: $\alpha_x^2 = \alpha_y^2 = \beta^2 = I_4$ and $\{\alpha_x, \alpha_y\} = \{\alpha_x, \beta\} = \{\alpha_y, \beta\} = 0_4$.

• $\mathbf{J} = (J_x, J_y)$, with $J_x = ec(\psi, \alpha_x \psi)_{\mathbb{C}^4}$, $J_y = ec(\psi, \alpha_y \psi)_{\mathbb{C}^4}$, denotes the current density and ρ stands for the particle density which is equal to $e\sum_{i=1}^4 |\psi_i|^2$.

In the following, we assume that (**A**, *V*) is given at any time *t*. The system under consideration then reads in 2D

$$\begin{cases} P_{\rm D}\psi = \mathbf{0}, \ (x, y, t) \in \Omega_T = \mathbb{R}^2_{x, y} \times]0; \ T[, \\ \psi(x, y, 0) = \psi_0(x, y), \ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2_{x, y}. \end{cases}$$
(34)

7.1. ABCs for the one-dimensional Dirac equation

In the one-dimensional case, the Dirac equation is commonly called in mathematics a first-order hyperbolic system. Such equations are well known in fluid dynamics, mechanical engineering, as well as electromagnetism. This property is a consequence of the fact that the matri- $\cos \alpha_{x, y, z}$ (and β) are diagonalisable in \mathbb{R} . There exists an extended literature (see for instance [56]) on the derivation and approximation of boundary conditions modelling outgoing waves. Basically, the derivation of ABCs for the Dirac equation follows some very similar ideas. However, since the matrix β is not diagonalisable in the same basis as $\alpha_{x, y, z}$, even in 1D, it is only possible to derive ABCs and not TBCs. The strategy to construct ABCs for the Dirac equation is in fact mathematically equivalent to the one developed for the Klein-Gordon or Schrödinger equations. This is again nontrivial and it requires some material going beyond the scope of the present paper. We refer to [51] for the interested and mathematically inclined reader.

Let us recall that, in 1D, the Dirac equation can be written as a 2 \times 2 system

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_x \partial_x \psi - imc\beta_2 \psi - \frac{1}{c} \partial_t \psi = \mathbf{0}, (x, t) \in \Omega_T \\ := \mathbb{R}_x \times]0; T[, \\ \psi(x, 0) = \psi_0(x), x \in \mathbb{R}_x. \end{cases}$$
(35)

To explain the principle to build ABCs for the Dirac equation, we first consider the massless particle case m = 0 and no external field. Then, the Dirac equation reads $\partial_t \psi + \alpha_x \partial_x \psi = 0$, with $\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2)$, i.e.

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \psi_2 + c \partial_x \psi_1 = 0, \\ \partial_t \psi_1 + c \partial_x \psi_2 = 0. \end{cases}$$

If we introduce the two fields $\phi_1 = (\psi_1 + \psi_2)/\sqrt{2}$ and $\phi_2 = (\psi_1 - \psi_2)/\sqrt{2}$, we get a system of uncoupled transport/wave equations (first-order wave equations)

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \phi_1 + c \partial_x \phi_1 = 0, \\ \partial_t \phi_2 - c \partial_x \phi_2 = 0. \end{cases}$$
(36)

Equivalently, setting $\alpha_x = \prod_x D_x \prod_x^{-1}$, then system (36) reads $\partial_t \phi + D_x \partial_x \phi = 0$, where $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ and

$$\Pi_{x} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \ D_{x} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

At $x = x_r$ (resp. x_ℓ), we have the following TBC:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \phi^{\text{int}} + c D_x \partial_x \phi^{\text{int}} = \mathbf{0}, \ x \in \Omega, \ t > 0, \\ \phi_2^{\text{int}} = \phi_2^{\text{ext}}, \qquad x = x_r, \ t > 0, \\ \phi^{\text{int}}(x, 0) = \phi_0(x), \qquad x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\phi_0 = \Pi_x^{-1} \psi_0$. The exact solution is then reconstructed by setting $\psi^{\text{int}} = \Pi_x \phi^{\text{int}}$. Now, if $m \neq 0$, and more generally when the particle is subject to an external electric field, the derivation requires more efforts. However, from the above remark when $m \neq 0$, a first simple ABC reads at $x = x_r$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \phi^{\text{int}} + cD_x \partial_x \phi^{\text{int}} - imc^2 \Pi_x \beta_2 \phi^{\text{int}} = \mathbf{0}, \ x \in \Omega, \ t > 0, \\ \phi_2^{\text{int}} = \phi_2^{\text{ext}}, \qquad x = x_r, \ t > 0, \\ \phi^{\text{int}}(x, 0) = \phi_0(x), \qquad x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

or equivalently

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \psi^{\text{int}} + c \alpha_x \partial_x \psi^{\text{int}} - imc^2 \beta_2 \psi^{\text{int}} = \mathbf{0}, \ x \in \Omega, \ t > 0, \\ \left(\Pi_x^{-1} \psi^{\text{int}} \right)_2 = \left(\Pi_x^{-1} \psi^{\text{ext}} \right)_2, \qquad x = x_r, \ t > 0, \\ \psi^{\text{int}}(x, 0) = \psi_0(x), \qquad x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

To improve the absorption at the boundary, a finer approach is necessary, where this time Π_x will be replaced by a complex operator Π . A short overview is presented in the two-dimensional case in the next subsection.

7.2. ABCs for the two-dimensional Dirac equation

The derivation of ABCs for the Dirac equation in 2D is mathematically non-trivial, so that we will just focus here on the general ideas. Their construction is based

on a diagonalisation [51] of the Dirac operator *up to a negative-order operator* (following a diagonalisation theorem for pseudo-differential hyperbolic systems [57] that generalises the idea of factorisation). The action of the remaining operator on the solution at the boundary will be expected negligible at least for high frequencies. To simplify the presentation, we assume that the domain is a disk of radius R, $\Omega_R = C(\mathbf{0}, R)$, and we define $\Sigma_T^R :=$ $\Omega_R \times [0; T]$. The Dirac equation is then formally rewritten in *polar coordinates* (r, θ)

$$\left(\mathbf{I}_4\partial_r + L(r,\theta,t,\partial_\theta,\partial_t)\right)\psi = \mathbf{0},$$
 (37)

where $L = L_1 + L_0$ is the operator defined through

$$L_1 := \frac{1}{c} \widetilde{\alpha}_x \partial_t + \frac{1}{\chi_r} \widetilde{\alpha}_x \widetilde{\alpha}_y \partial_\theta, \quad L_0 := \frac{1}{c} \widetilde{\alpha}_x \widetilde{\beta}, \quad \chi_r := \frac{1}{R+r}$$

with the matrices

$$\widetilde{\alpha}_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-i\theta} \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ e^{i\theta} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \ \widetilde{\alpha}_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -ie^{-i\theta} \\ 0 & 0 & ie^{i\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & -ie^{-i\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ ie^{i\theta} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Finally, we set $\tilde{\beta} = i\beta mc^2 + i(eV + V_c)\mathbf{I}_4 - ie(A_r\tilde{\alpha}_x + A_\theta\tilde{\alpha}_y)$. We suppose that A_θ, A_r , *V* and V_c are independent of (t, θ) . We denote by $\mathcal{F}_{(t,\theta)}$ the Fourier transform in (t, θ) with co-variables (τ, ξ) . Then, Fourier transforming (37) leads to

$$\left(\mathbf{I}_{4}\partial_{r} + \mathcal{F}_{(t,\theta)}(L)(r,\theta,t,\xi,\tau)\right)\mathcal{F}_{t,\theta}(\psi) = \mathbf{0}.$$
 (38)

Again, if $\tilde{\alpha}_{x,y}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$ were diagonalisable in the same basis, it would be easier to impose TBCs. However, we can show that there exists a transition matrix $\mathcal{F}_{(t,\theta)}(\Pi)$ to $\mathcal{F}_{(t,\theta)}(L)$, such that one gets an almost exact operator diagonalisation: $(\partial_r + \Lambda)\phi \sim 0$, where

$$\mathcal{F}_{(t,\theta)}(\Lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{(t,\theta)}(\Lambda^{-}) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \sigma(\Lambda^{+}) \end{pmatrix} \in M_4(\mathbb{C}),$$

 Λ^+ (resp. Λ^-) representing the outgoing (resp. incoming) wave operator at the boundary. The ABCs, which simply consists of vanishing the incoming waves (inside Ω_R), are given in the following theorem.

Theorem 7.1: The zeroth- and first-order ABCs are

- zeroth-order: $\left(\Pi_0^{-1}\psi\right)_{1,2} = \mathbf{0}$ on, Σ_T^R ,
- first-order: $(\Pi_1^{-1}\psi)_{1,2}^{R} = 0$ on, Σ_T^R ,

where Π_0^{-1} and Π_1^{-1} are operators defined as

$$\Pi_0^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -e^{i\theta} & 0 & 0 & v_+ \\ 0 & -e^{-i\theta} & v_- & 0 \\ e^{i\theta} & 0 & 0 & v_- \\ 0 & e^{i\theta} & v_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$
(39)

with
$$v_{\pm} = (1 \pm \frac{ic}{\chi_r} \partial_{\theta} \partial_t^{-1})$$
, and $\Pi_1^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & B_1 \\ C_1 & D_1 \end{pmatrix}$, with
 $A_1 = -\begin{pmatrix} b_+^{-1} e^{i\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & a_-^{-1} e^{-i\theta} \end{pmatrix}$, $B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b_-^1 \\ a_+^1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$,
 $C_1 = \begin{pmatrix} b_-^{-1} e^{i\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & a_+^{-1} e^{-i\theta} \end{pmatrix}$, $D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b_+^1 \\ a_-^1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$,

setting $a_{\pm}^{1} = 1 \pm (i(V_{c} + eV) \pm ieA_{r})I_{t}, \quad a_{\pm}^{-1} = 1 \pm (i(V_{c} + eV) \mp ieA_{r})I_{t}, \quad b_{\pm}^{1} = (1 \pm (imc^{2} \pm eA_{\theta})I_{t})$ and $b_{\pm}^{-1} = (1 \pm (imc^{2} \mp eA_{\theta})I_{t}).$

7.3. Numerical discretisation and example of ABC for the Dirac equation

We propose a simple numerical illustration of the derived ABCs for the 1D Dirac equation. The quantity which is represented here is again $(t, x, \log |\psi_1(x, t)|)$ which shows the reflections at the domain boundary. We first rewrite P_D in the form

$$P_{\rm D} = i\partial_t - iA\partial_x + Bmc^2,$$

where

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} c & 0 \\ 0 & -c \end{pmatrix}, \qquad B = i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & mc^2 \\ -mc^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

As explained in Section 7.1, a simple and natural condition to impose at x_{ℓ} and x_r is $(\partial_t \pm c \partial_x)\psi_{1,2} = 0$. This boundary condition is called a transport-like boundary condition, and corresponds in fact to the zeroth-order ABC in Theorem 7.1. The initial conditions are

$$\psi_1(x,0) = e^{-\frac{k_2}{b^2} + ik_0 x},$$

$$\psi_2(x,0) = \frac{ck_0}{mc^2 + \sqrt{m^2c^4 + c^2k_0^2}}\psi_1(x,0),$$

..2

where c = 1, $k_0 = 20$, $\delta = 0.5$ and m = 1. The spatial computational domain is $]x_\ell$; $x_r[$, with $x_r = -x_\ell = 5$. The final time is T = 7 and $\Delta t = \Delta x = 1/40$ (we have 400 segments in space). The one-dimensional ABCs can be deduced from Theorem 7.1. We consider the following discretisation scheme: denoting by (ϕ_j^n, ψ_j^n) an approximation of the exact two-spinors $(\psi_1(x_j, t_n), \psi_2(x_j, t_n))$ at



Figure 7. ABCs for the 1D potential-free Dirac equation: amplitude $|\psi_1|$ (log-scale) for the zeroth-order transport-like (top) and improved first-order transport-like conditions (bottom) obtained in Theorem 7.1.

 (x_i, t_n) , for interior points, we have

$$\begin{cases} \phi_j^{n+1} = \phi_j^n + c \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} (\phi_{j+1}^n - \phi_j^n) + \Delta t m c^2 \psi_j^n, \\ \psi_j^{n+1} = \psi_j^n - c \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} (\psi_j^n - \psi_{j-1}^n) - \Delta t m c^2 \phi_j^n \end{cases}$$

At order 0, the transport condition reads at the discrete level $\phi_0^n - \psi_0^n = 0$ at the left boundary, and $\phi_N^n + \psi_N^n = 0$ at the right one. Let us remark that for the very particular interior scheme which is considered here, Dirichlet boundary conditions are equivalent to this order 0 condition (transport-like). At the next order, a time-integral is added to the boundary condition. Stability is trivially satisfied under a CFL (Courant–Friedrichs–Lewy) condition [7]. Figure 7 shows the propagation of $|\psi_1|$ by imposing the zeroth-order (top) and improved first-order (bottom) ABCs, from Theorem 7.1 in its 1D version.

7.4. PMLs for the Dirac equation

In this section, we briefly describe the application of PMLs to the Dirac equation following [58] where a detailed presentation is available. As previously mentioned, the PML approach consists in constructing an absorbing layer surrounding the physical domain, say in 3D, $\mathcal{D}_{Phy} :=] - L_x; L_x[\times] - L_y; L_y[\times] - L_z; L_z[.$ Denoting by $\Sigma(v)$ a continuous, positive and nondecreasing function (usually a quadratic function like $\sigma_0^{\nu} v^2$), which is null for negative v, the following nonlinear 3D coordinates stretching is proposed in [58]: $\eta \to \eta + i\omega^{-1}(\mu_{\eta}^{-}(\eta) + \mu_{\eta}^{+}(\eta))$, with $\mu_{\eta}^{\pm}(v) =$ $\int_{\pm L_{\eta}}^{v} \Sigma(-L_{\eta} \pm u) du$, for $\eta = x, y$ or z. By definition, the change of variable is only active in the thin layer \mathcal{D}_{Phy} surrounding the physical domain and is equivalent to the use of absorbing functions in the PML approach (the interpretation through coordinates stretching has been introduced in computational electromagnetism in [59], and is discussed in Section 6.3). Let us define $\sigma_{\eta}(v) = \Sigma(-L_{\eta})$ $(-v) + \Sigma(v - L_{\eta}), \eta = x, y \text{ or } z$. This leads to the modified



Figure 8. PML for the 2D Dirac equation: comparison between the PML and AP approaches: the PML approach is much more accurate than the complex AP approach. In addition, increasing the size of the layer improves the accuracy of the solution. Contour plots of $|\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)|$ at times t = 0, 2, 4, 6, 8 (for $\sigma_0 = 1$ and $\delta_x = \delta_y = 2$) (by courtesy of Professor Olivier Pinaud).

PML Dirac operator

$$P_{\rm D}^{\rm (PML)} = -ic \big(\alpha_x \partial_x^{\rm (PML)} + \alpha_y \partial_y^{\rm (PML)} + \alpha_z \partial_z^{\rm (PML)} \big) + mc^2 \beta + V(x) \mathbf{1}_4,$$

where

$$\partial_x^{(\mathrm{PML})}\psi = \partial_x\psi + rac{i}{2\pi}\sigma_x(x)\int_{\mathbb{R}}rac{e^{it}}{\omega - i\sigma_x(x)}\partial_x\hat{\psi}(x,\omega)d\omega$$

In [58], an accurate finite-difference discretisation of these PMLs is proposed coupled with a time-splitting approach [60,61]. Homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions are set on the outer boundary. Let us remark that an interesting research direction would be to adapt the spectral approaches with splitting scheme introduced in Section 5 and [46] for the Schrödinger equation, to the Dirac equation, again imposing periodic boundary conditions on the exterior boundary of the computational domain \mathcal{D} .

To conclude this section, we propose the comparison between the PMLs and complex AP approaches in 2D. The parameters for the Dirac equation are again $\hbar = c =$ m = 1. The approximation scheme given in [58] is a leapfrog scheme [61] which partially avoids fermion doubling and uses splitting as in [60]. The domain is] - 5; $5[^2$, T = 10, $\Delta x = \Delta y = 4 \times 10^{-2}$ and $\Delta t = \Delta x/2$. The initial data is a Gaussian: $\psi_0(\mathbf{x}) := e^{-\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_0|}{a^2}}$, with a = 0.6. The function $\Sigma(v)$ is null for $v \leq 0$ and equal to $\sigma_0 v^2$ otherwise. The absorption parameter σ_0 takes some values between 10^{-1} and 10^{1} . In the first plot of Figure 8, the abscissa represents the absorption coefficient $\sigma = \sigma_0$ and the ordinate corresponds to the $L^2(\mathcal{D}_{Phv})$ -error between the exact and approximate solutions. We consider three different sizes of the layer: $\delta_x (= \delta_y) = 2$ (diamond), $\delta_x =$ 1.5 (circle) and $\delta_x = 1$ (circle). We clearly observe that the PML approach is extremely accurate while being simple to implement and yields more accurate results than the complex AP method. In addition, we also report in Figure 8, the evolution of $|\psi|$ over the time with PMLs, where the chosen parameters are $\sigma_0 = 1$ and the layer size is $\delta_x = 2$. Again, we observe that the behaviour of the field is well reproduced.

8. Conclusion and perspectives

We presented a simplified and friendly overview of recent developments on ABCs and PMLs for PDEs arising in atomic, molecular and laser physics. The equations of interest are the Schrödinger, Klein-Gordon and Dirac equations. In addition to the main theoretical developments to understand these methods, we also provide some simulations to illustrate why they are useful and more accurate than standard empirical truncation techniques designed by physical arguments, e.g. the complex AP method. Even if many developments have now been achieved, some mathematical and numerical questions still need to be investigated. Finally, the probably most important step concerns now the use of these methods for simulations of high-dimensional realistic situations that arise in atomic and molecular physics. We expect that this paper can provide a guideline to achieve such a goal.

Acknowledgments

The authors warmly thank Professor Olivier Pinaud (Colorado State University) for discussions about PMLs for the Dirac equation and for providing the simulations from Figure 8.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

French ANR (Agence Nationale de la Recherche) grants [ANR-13-BS01-0009-01], [ANR-12-MONU-0007-02]; NSERC (Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada [Grant no.: 315846]) via the Discovery Grant program.

ORCID

X. Antoine in http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6501-7757

References

- X. Antoine, A. Arnold, C. Besse, M. Ehrhardt, and A. Schädle, Commun. Comput. Phys. 4(4), 729–796 (2008).
- [2] D. Givoli, Wave Motion **39**(4), 319–326 (2004).
- [3] T. Hagstrom, in *Topics in Computational Wave Propagation: Direct and Inverse Problems*, edited by M. Ainsworth P. Davies D. Duncan P. Martin B. Rynne (Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering, Vol. **31**, 2003. Symposium on Computational Methods for Wave Propagation in Direct Scattering, Univ Durham, Durham, England, Jul. 15–25, 2002, pp. 1–42).
- [4] J. Javanainen, J.H. Eberly, and Q. Su, Phys. Rev. A 38, 3430–3446 (1988).
- [5] M. Ehrhardt, Appl. Numer. Math. 58(5), 660–673 (2008).
- [6] V. Vaibhav, J. Comput. Phys. 230(8), 3205-3229 (2011).
- [7] J.C. Strikwerda, *Finite Difference Schemes and Partial Differential Equations*, 2nd ed. (Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2004).
- [8] A.A. Kilbas, H.M. Srivastava, and J.J. Trujillo, *Theory and Applications of Fractional Differential Equations* (Mathematics Studies, North-Holland, 2006), Vol. 204.
- [9] X. Antoine and C. Besse, J. Comput. Phys. 188(1), 157– 175 (2003).
- [10] X. Antoine, C. Besse, and P. Klein, J. Comput. Phys. 228(2), 312–335 (2009).
- [11] M. Ehrhardt and C. Zheng, J. Comput. Phys. 227(14), 6877–6894 (2008).
- [12] B. Engquist and A. Majda, Math. Comput. 31(139), 629–651 (1977).
- [13] L. Hörmander, *Linear Partial Differential Operators* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1976).
- [14] C. Zheng, J. Comput. Phys. 215(2), 552–565 (2006).
- [15] X. Antoine, C. Besse, and S. Descombes, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 43(6), 2272–2293 (2006).
- [16] X. Antoine, C. Besse, and P. Klein, Laser Phys. 21(8), 1491–1502 (2011).
- [17] X. Antoine, C. Besse, and J. Szeftel, Cubo 11(4), 29–48 (2009).
- [18] J. Szeftel, Numer. Math. **104**(1), 103–127 (2006).
- [19] J. Zhang, Z. Xu, and X. Wu, Phys. Rev. E 78(2), 2 (2008).
- [20] J. Zhang, Z. Xu, and X. Wu, Phys. Rev. E 79(4), 2 (2009).
- [21] E. Lorin, S. Chelkowski, and A.D. Bandrauk, Numer. Methods Partial Differ. Equat. 25(1), 110–136 (2009).
- [22] X. Antoine, W. Bao, and C. Besse, Comput. Phys. Commun. 184(12), 2621–2633 (2013).
- [23] W. Bao and Y. Cai, Kinet. Relat. Models 6(1), 1–135 (2013).
- [24] S. Jiang and L. Greengard, Comput. Math. Appl. 47(6–7), 955–966 (2004).

- [25] S. Jiang and L. Greengard, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. 61(2), 261–288 (2008).
- [26] G. Beylkin and L. Monzon, Appl. Comput. Harmonics Anal. 19(1), 17–48 (2005).
- [27] L. Genovese, T. Deutsch, A. Neelov, S. Goedecker, and G. Beylkin, J. Chem. Phys. 125(7), (2006).
- [28] L. Greengard and V. Rokhlin, J. Comput. Phys. 73(2), 325-348 (1987).
- [29] B. Alpert, L. Greengard, and T. Hagstrom, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 37(4), 1138–1164 (2000).
- [30] B. Alpert, L. Greengard, and T. Hagstrom, J. Comput. Phys. 180(1), 270–296 (2002).
- [31] C. Zheng, Front. Math. China 5(3), 589-606 (2010).
- [32] S. Jiang, J. Zhang, Q. Zhang, and Z. Zhang, Fast Evaluation of the Caputo Fractional Derivative and Its Applications to Fractional Diffusion Equations. arXiv:1511.03453 (2015).
- [33] X. Antoine, Q. Tang, and Y. Zhang, J. Comput. Phys. 325, 74–97 (2016).
- [34] L.D. Menza, Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim. 18(7–8), 759– 775 (1997).
- [35] X. Antoine, C. Besse, and P. Klein, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 33(2), 1008–1033 (2011).
- [36] X. Antoine, C. Besse, and P. Klein, Numer. Math. 125(2), 191–223 (2013).
- [37] C. Besse, SIAM J. Nume. Anal. 42(3), 934-952 (2004).
- [38] T. Hagstrom and T. Warburton, Wave Motion **39**(4), 327– 338 (2004).
- [39] X. Antoine and C. Besse, J. Math. Pures Appl. 80(7), 701– 738 (2001).
- [40] X. Antoine, C. Besse, and V. Mouysset, Math. Comput. 73(248), 1779–1799 (2004).
- [41] J.-P. Bérenger, J. Comput. Phys. 114(2), 185–200 (1994).
- [42] S. Chelkowski, C. Foisy, and A.D. Bandrauk, Phys. Rev. A At. Mol. Opt. Phys. 57(2), 1176–1185 (1998).
- [43] J.G. Muga, J.P. Palao, B. Navarro, and I.L. Egusquiza, Phys. Rep. Rev. Sect. Phys. Lett. **395**(6), 357–426 (2004).

- [44] A. Scrinzi, Phys. Rev. A 81(5), (2010).
- [45] C. Zheng, J. Comput. Phys. 227(1), 537–556 (2007).
- [46] X. Antoine and Q. Tang, Perfectly Matched Layers and Pseudospectral Schemes for the Dynamics of Gross-Pitaevskii Equations with Rotating Term, (2016, in preparation).
- [47] A. Bermudez, L. Hervella-Nieto, A. Prieto, and R. Rodriguez, J. Comput. Phys. 223(2), 469–488 (2007).
- [48] X. Antoine and R. Duboscq, J. Comput. Phys. 258, 509– 523 (2014).
- [49] X. Antoine and R. Duboscq, in Nonlinear Optical and Atomic Systems: At the Interface of Physics and Mathematics, edited by C. Besse J.C. Garreau (Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer, 2015), Vol. 2146, pp. 49–145.
- [50] Y. Saad and M.H. Schultz, SIAM J. Sci. Statist. Comput. 7(3), 856–869 (1986).
- [51] X. Antoine, E. Lorin, J. Sater, F. Fillion-Gourdeau, and A.D. Bandrauk, J. Comput. Phys. 277 (2014), 268–304.
- [52] S. Johnson, *Notes on Perfectly Matched layers (PMLs)*, Technical Report, MIT, 2010.
- [53] D. Appelö and G. Kreiss, Wave Motion 44(7–8), 531–548 (2007).
- [54] A.D. Bandrauk, F. Fillion-Gourdeau, and E. Lorin, J. Phys. B At. Mol. Opt. Phys. 46(15) (2013).
- [55] E. Lorin and A. Bandrauk, Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl. **12**(1), 190–202 (2011).
- [56] J.-M. Ghidaglia and F. Pascal, Eur. J. Mech. B Fluids 24(1), 1–17 (2005).
- [57] X. Antoine and H. Barucq, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 61(6), 1877–1905 (2001).
- [58] O. Pinaud, J. Comput. Phys. 289 (2015), 169-180.
- [59] W.C. Chew and W.H. Weedon, Microw. Opt. Technol. Lett. 7(13), 599–604 (1994).
- [60] F. Fillion-Gourdeau, E. Lorin, and A.D. Bandrauk, Comput. Phys. Commun. 183(7), 1403–1415 (2012).
- [61] R. Hammer, W. Pötz, and A. Arnold, J. Comput. Phys. 265, 50–70 (2014).