Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Commun Nonlinear Sci Numer Simulat

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/cnsns

Research paper

# Perfectly matched layer for computing the dynamics of nonlinear Schrödinger equations by pseudospectral methods. Application to rotating Bose-Einstein condensates

Xavier Antoine<sup>a</sup>, Christophe Geuzaine<sup>b</sup>, Qinglin Tang<sup>c,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Institut Elie Cartan de Lorraine, UMR CNRS 7502, Université de Lorraine, Inria Nancy-Grand Est, SPHINX Team, Vandoeuvre-lès-Nancy Cedex F-54506, France

<sup>b</sup> Université de Liège, Institut Montefiore B28, Liège B4000, Belgium

<sup>c</sup> School of Mathematics, State Key Laboratory of Hydraulics and Mountain River Engineering, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, PR China

### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 6 December 2019 Revised 17 May 2020 Accepted 11 June 2020 Available online 12 June 2020

Keywords: Nonlinear Schrödinger equation Rotating Gross-Pitaevskii equation Bose-Einstein condensate Perfectly matched layers (PML) Fourier pseudospectral method Time-splitting scheme

# ABSTRACT

In this paper, we first propose a general strategy to implement the Perfectly Matched Layer (PML) approach in the most standard numerical schemes used for simulating the dynamics of nonlinear Schrödinger equations. The methods are based on the time-splitting Bao et al. (2003)[15] or relaxation Besse (2004)[24] schemes in time, and FFT-based pseudospectral discretization method in space. A thorough numerical study is developed for linear and nonlinear problems to understand how the PML approach behaves (absorbing function and tuning parameters) for a given scheme. The extension to the rotating Gross-Pitaevskii equation is then proposed by using the rotating Lagrangian coordinates transformation method Antonelli et al. (2012), Bao et al. (2013), García-Ripoll et al. (2001)[13,16,38], some numerical simulations illustrating the strength of the proposed approach.

© 2020 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Since its first experimental creation in 1995 [3,26,34], the Bose-Einstein condensation (BEC) phenomena provides an incredible glimpse into the macroscopic quantum world and has opened a new era in atomic and molecular physics as well as in condensed matter physics. It has been extensively studied both experimentally and theoretically, and is still a very active research topic [1,2,17,25,33,37,39,42–44,48,49]. At temperatures *T* much smaller than the critical temperature  $T_c$ , the properties of a rotating BEC are well described by a macroscopic complex-valued wave function  $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)$  whose evolution is governed by the three-dimensional (3D) Gross-Pitaevskii equation (GPE). Solving the *d*-dimensional (d = 2 or 3) dimensionless GPE with *a rotation term* [11,14] leads to the following boundary-value problem: for a given initial state  $\psi_0$ , find the complex-valued wave function  $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)$  solution to

$$i\partial_t \psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 + V(\mathbf{x}, t) - \omega L_z + \beta |\psi|^2 \right] \psi(\mathbf{x}, t),$$
  

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}, t = 0) = \psi_0(\mathbf{x}), \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \qquad t \ge 0,$$
(1.1)

\* Corresponding author.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cnsns.2020.105406 1007-5704/© 2020 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.







E-mail addresses: xavier.antoine@univ-lorraine.fr (X. Antoine), cgeuzaine@uliege.be (C. Geuzaine), ginglin\_tang@scu.edu.cn (Q. Tang).

where  $\mathbf{x} := (x, y, z)$  ( := (x, y) in 2D) and t are the space and time variables, respectively. Denoting by  $\nabla$  the gradient operator,  $\nabla^2$  is then the laplacian operator, and  $V(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is a real-valued function corresponding to the potential. The constants  $\beta$ and  $\omega$  respectively represent the nonlinear interaction strength and the rotating frequency. In addition,  $L_z = i(y\partial_x - x\partial_y)$ is the z-component of the angular momentum [11,14]. When  $\omega = 0$ , the GPE is also often called the nonlinear cubic Schrödinger equation. Let us remark that many more complex models involving GPEs are widely used in the literature [11,14], including in particular nonlocal dipolar interactions or multi-components gases.

When computing the dynamics of the rotating GPE, one can use various stable and efficient schemes that are known to also respect some dynamical properties (mass/energy conservation, time invariance, dispersion relation, time reversibility,...). Here, we do not want to review all the possible methods and we rather focus on two widely used time discretization schemes, i.e. the (Strang) time-splitting [15] and relaxation [24] methods which are second-order accurate in time. We refer to [5,11,14] for more details about the most popular schemes and their properties. When computing fast rotating BEC through the GPE, quantized vorticity takes place and then highly accurate spatial discretization schemes are required to capture the dynamics of the small quantum defects. Among the available numerical methods, the most standard way [5,11,14] is to use FFT-based pseudospectral approximation schemes in cartesian coordinates. Indeed, such approximations are easy to implement, efficient and highly accurate [9–11]. In particular, they can be trivially included into time-splitting schemes by a direct integration in the Fourier domain. The implementation work for the relaxation scheme is a bit more involved, but it remains quite simple as it relies on well-known computational bricks (i.e. FFTs, Krylov subspace solvers and simple matrix-free preconditioners).

In some situations arising in BECs (as well as in many situations related to the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, e.g. in quantum optics or nonlinear wave propagation), the condensate expands. This can be the case for example when a BEC is created and then the confining potential is no longer active. In other situations related to the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, considering that the wave function propagates out of the *a priori* fixed computational domain is very standard. In these cases, one needs to use a very large computational box, leading then to extensive computational costs and memory storage limitations. An alternative approach consists in considering a fixed box and then setting suitable boundary conditions at the domain interface. According to their mathematical properties, such boundary conditions are called transparent, artificial or absorbing boundary conditions (see [4,12] for some recent reviews in quantum and relativistic mechanics). While being now widely used in practice, their implementation in a finite-difference or finite element scheme is far from being trivial. In addition, considering such boundary conditions in a FFT-based pseudospectral approximation scheme is not possible since periodic boundary conditions are already imposed at the domain boundary. An alternative is to use Perfectly Matched Layers (PMLs) as introduced in computational electromagnetism by Bérenger [19–21,47,54]. Since it is easy to implement and accurate, this method is now widely used in many areas of computational physics and engineering, e.g. acoustic [22,23,29,53,54], aeroacoustic [18], elastodynamics [27,30], fluid mechanics [31,40,41,56] or relativistic quantum mechanics [6]. Concerning the application of the PML method to linear and nonlinear Schrödinger-type equations, we refer to [4,7,12,28,35,36,46,52,57] where various developments are available in the framework of the finite-difference/finite element methods. (Let us remark that the PML method is different from the exterior complex scaling methods [32,45,52,55].) To the best of the authors' knowledge, there is no contribution until now related to the application of PMLs in the context of FFT-based methods, for both the time-splitting and relaxation schemes applied to Schrödinger equations and GPEs. The aim of this paper is to address this question, to show that this can be done without great effort and that the resulting scheme is indeed numerically efficient, accurate and that the reflection at the boundary is relatively small.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the PML formulation in cartesian coordinates for the GPE without rotating term ( $\omega = 0$  in system (1.1)). We introduce some notations and give six types of PML absorbing functions that will be tested later. In Section 3, we consider first the time discretization of the PML formulation of the GPE based on the Strang splitting scheme as well as relaxation scheme. Then, we detail how to discretize the formulation in space by the FFT-based pseudospectral approximation scheme. In Section 4, we develop a thorough numerical study of the approximation schemes. In particular, we focus on the choice of the PML absorbing function and its tuning parameters in the case of the pseudospectral schemes. The direct extension to the rotating GPE is non trivial as it is explained in Section 5 since a gradient term is involved into the GPE in system (1.1). We then propose a relatively simple solution by considering an equivalent formulation in rotating Lagrangian coordinates which extends the previous PML framework with pseudospectral approximation to the rotating simulations illustrate the efficiency and accuracy of the method. Finally, we conclude in Section 6.

## **2.** PML formulation in cartesian coordinates for the GPE without rotation ( $\omega = 0$ )

Let us assume that the initial profile  $\psi_0$  is compactly supported into a bounded domain of physical interest  $\mathcal{D}_{Phy}$  with boundary  $\Gamma_{Phy} := \partial \mathcal{D}_{Phy}$ . To solve the GPE (1.1), we consider now that the equation is set in the truncated domain  $\mathcal{D}_{Phy}$ 

$$i\partial_t \psi(\mathbf{x},t) = \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 + V(\mathbf{x},t) - \omega L_z + \beta |\psi|^2 \right] \psi(\mathbf{x},t), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{Phy}}.$$
(2.1)

Therefore, to get a complete initial boundary value problem, additional boundary conditions (BCs) are required at the domain boundary  $\Gamma_{\text{Phy}} := \partial \mathcal{D}_{\text{Phy}}$ . Most particularly, when the potential  $V(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is not trapping, then outgoing waves may emerge

and thus suitable BCs are needed to be reflection-less or non-reflecting [4,12]. Our analysis starts in this Section with the non-rotating GPE ( $\omega = 0$ ). The extension to the rotating case will be next studied in Section 5.

Let us first introduce the concept of PML [4,12] by considering the toy model for the 1D linear Schrödinger equation, i.e.

$$i\partial_t \psi(\nu, t) = -\frac{1}{2} \partial_x^2 \psi(\nu, t), \quad \nu \in \mathbb{R}.$$
(2.2)

We assume that  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Phy}} := [-L_{\nu}^*, L_{\nu}^*]$  and consider the right traveling outgoing waves only. The PML technique can be carried out by stretching the real coordinate into the complex plane [57]:

$$\tilde{\nu} = \nu + e^{i\vartheta_{\nu}} \int_{L_{\nu}^{\nu}}^{\nu} \sigma(s) ds, \qquad \sigma(s) \equiv 0 \quad \text{if } s < L_{\nu}^{*}.$$
(2.3)

Here,  $\vartheta_{\nu} \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$  is a real constant and  $\sigma(s)$  is a real-valued function called *absorbing function*. Plugging (2.3) into (2.2), we obtain the corresponding PML equation

$$i\partial_t \psi(\nu, t) + \frac{1}{2S(\nu)} \partial_\nu \left( \frac{1}{S(\nu)} \partial_\nu \psi(\nu, t) \right) = 0, \quad \nu \in \mathbb{R},$$
(2.4)

where  $S(v) = 1 + e^{i\vartheta_v}\sigma(v)$ . The constant  $\vartheta_v$  and function  $\sigma(v)$  are chosen such that  $\psi$  is damped and decays fast enough in  $v \in [L_v^*, +\infty)$ . Hence, it suffices to truncate the semi-infinite interval  $[L_v^*, +\infty)$  as a finite right PML region  $[L_v^*, L_v]$  and to impose a homogeneous Dirichlet or periodic BC on  $\psi$  at  $v = L_v$ . A similar treatment can be applied to the left semi-infinite interval  $(-\infty, -L_v^*]$ . Denote the computational domain as  $\mathcal{D} := \overline{\mathcal{D}_{PMV}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{PML} := [-L_v, L_v]$ , with  $\mathcal{D}_{PML} := [-L_v, -L_v^*] \cup [L_v^*, L_v]$ , and set  $\Gamma := \partial \mathcal{D} := \{-L_v, L_v\}$ . Then, the Schrödinger Eq. (2.2) can be approximated by the following PML equation within the domain  $\mathcal{D}$ :

$$i\partial_t \psi(\nu, t) + \frac{1}{2S(\nu)} \partial_\nu \left( \frac{1}{S(\nu)} \partial_\nu \psi(\nu, t) \right) = 0, \qquad \nu \in \mathcal{D},$$
(2.5)

$$\psi(\nu, t) = 0, \quad \nu = \pm L_{\nu}, \quad \text{or} \quad \psi(-L_{\nu}, t) = \psi(L_{\nu}, t), \qquad t > 0,$$
(2.6)

with

$$S(\nu) = \begin{cases} 1, & |\nu| < L_{\nu}^{*}, \\ 1 + e^{i\vartheta_{\nu}}\sigma(|\nu| - L_{\nu}), & L_{\nu}^{*} \le |\nu| < L_{\nu}. \end{cases}$$
(2.7)

Here,  $\vartheta_{\nu}$  is a given constant which is fixed as  $\vartheta_{\nu} = \frac{\pi}{4}$  [7,57] hereafter, and  $\sigma(\nu)$  is a given absorbing function. In this paper, we consider the following six types of absorbing functions which are well studied and successfully applied e.g. to scattering problems [22,23]

**Type 1**: 
$$\sigma_0 (\nu + \delta_\nu)^2$$
, **Type 3**:  $-\sigma_0/\nu$ , **Type 5**:  $-\sigma_0/\nu - \sigma_0/\delta_\nu$ ,  
**Type 2**:  $\sigma_0 (\nu + \delta_\nu)^3$ , **Type 4**:  $\sigma_0/\nu^2$ , **Type 6**:  $\sigma_0/\nu^2 - \sigma_0/\delta_\nu^2$ , (2.8)

with  $\delta_{\nu} = L_{\nu} - L_{\nu}^{*}$  being the thickness of the PML layer. Let us remark that  $S(\nu)$  is discontinuous at the interface  $\nu = L_{\nu}^{*}$  if the **Type 3** or **Type 4** absorbing function is chosen. We are going to compare these six types of absorbing functions and find the (range of) optimal absorbing strength  $\sigma_{0}^{\text{opt}}$  for each type of profile with different thickness  $\delta_{\nu}$  and discretization schemes for the full GPE.

Let us derive the PML equation of the GPE (2.1) with  $\omega = 0$  in cartesian coordinates. Here, we only show the 2D case, the extension to the 3D case is straightforward and is omitted for brevity. Without loss of generality, we assume that the computational domain of interest is a rectangle, i.e.,  $\mathcal{D}_{Phy} = [-L_x^*, L_x^*] \times [-L_y^*, L_y^*]$ . Analogous to the derivation of (2.5), placing a PML region  $\mathcal{D}_{PML} =: [-L_x, L_x] \times [-L_y, L_y] \setminus \overline{\mathcal{D}}_{Phy}$  surrounding  $\mathcal{D}_{Phy}$ , stretching the coordinates in both the *x*- and *y*-directions, i.e., taking the following substitutions

$$\partial_x \longrightarrow \frac{\partial_x}{S^x(x)}, \quad \partial_y \longrightarrow \frac{\partial_y}{S^y(y)},$$
(2.9)

we obtain the PML equation for the non-rotating GPE (2.1) in the computational domain  $\mathcal{D} := [-L_x, L_x] \times [-L_y, L_y] = \overline{\mathcal{D}_{Phy}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{PML}$ :

$$i\partial_t \psi = -\frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{S^x(x)} \partial_x \left( \frac{1}{S^x(x)} \partial_x \right) + \frac{1}{S^y(y)} \partial_y \left( \frac{1}{S^y(y)} \partial_y \right) \right] \psi + \left( V + \beta |\psi|^2 \right) \psi, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}, \quad t \ge 0.$$
(2.10)

The homogeneous Dirichlet or periodic BCs can then be applied at the boundary  $\Gamma := \partial D$ . To simplify the presentation, hereafter, we let  $S^{\nu}(\nu) = S(\nu)$  ( $\nu = x, y$ ), with  $S(\nu)$  reading as (2.7) and denote the linear differential operator in (2.10) as

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{S^{x}(x)} \partial_{x} \left( \frac{1}{S^{x}(x)} \partial_{x} \right) + \frac{1}{S^{y}(y)} \partial_{y} \left( \frac{1}{S^{y}(y)} \partial_{y} \right) \right].$$
(2.11)

## **3.** Discretization ( $\omega = 0$ )

In this section, we propose different approaches to discretize Eq. (2.10). To this end, we choose  $\Delta t > 0$  as the time step size and denote the discrete times by  $t_n = n\Delta t$ , for  $n \ge 0$ .

# 3.1. Time discretization

A first well-known approach to deal with the nonlinearity in the GPE (2.10) is to apply the time-splitting technique [5,14,15], i.e., one solves

$$i\partial_t \psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathcal{L}\psi(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}, \quad t_n \le t \le t_{n+1},$$
(3.1)

for the time step of length  $\Delta t$ , followed by solving

$$i \partial_t \psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \left[ V(\mathbf{x}, t) + \beta \left| \psi(\mathbf{x}, t) \right|^2 \right] \psi(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}, \quad t_n \le t \le t_{n+1},$$
(3.2)

for the same time step. Eq. (3.1) will be further discretized in the next subsection. For  $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]$ , Eq. (3.2) leaves the density  $|\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2$  invariant, i.e.,  $|\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 = |\psi(\mathbf{x}, t_n)|^2 := |\psi^n(\mathbf{x})|^2$ . Therefore, (3.2) collapses to be a linear ODE, which can be integrated analytically as

$$\psi(\mathbf{x},t) = e^{-i[\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x},t_n,t)+\beta |\psi^n(\mathbf{x})|^2(t-t_n)]}\psi(\mathbf{x},t_n), \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}, \quad t \in [t_n,t_{n+1}]$$

Here, for any  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ , function  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, a, b)$  reads

$$\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, a, b) =: \int_a^b V(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau.$$

.

Another popular approach is to use the relaxation technique introduced by Besse in [24]

$$i\delta_t^+\psi^n = \mathcal{L}\psi^{n+\frac{1}{2}} + (V^{n+\frac{1}{2}} + \varphi^{n+\frac{1}{2}})\psi^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D},$$
(3.3)

with  $\varphi^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = 2\beta |\psi^n|^2 - \varphi^{n-\frac{1}{2}}$ , for  $n \ge 0$ . Here, we set:  $\varphi^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \beta |\psi_0(\mathbf{x})|^2$ ,  $\psi^n(\mathbf{x}) = \psi(\mathbf{x}, t_n)$ ,  $\delta_t^+ \psi^n = (\psi^{n+1} - \psi^n)/\Delta t$  and  $f^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = (f^{n+1} + f^n)/2$  (f = V and  $\psi$ ). The relaxation scheme owns the important property that the resulting equation (3.3) is linear and therefore does not need any nonlinear solver unlike the standard Crank-Nicolson scheme, which greatly reduces the computational time and memory cost.

#### 3.2. Space discretization

We now introduce the Fourier Pseudospectral (FP) scheme [5,14]. To this end, periodic BCs on the boundary  $\Gamma$  must be imposed for Eq. (2.10), and hence to both (3.1) and (3.3). Let *L* and *M* be two even integer numbers. We define  $h_x = \frac{2L_x}{L}$  and  $h_y = \frac{2L_y}{M}$  as the mesh sizes in the *x*- and *y*-directions, respectively. To simplify the notations, we introduce the indices and grid points sets as well as the basis functions as

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{T}_{LM} &= \left\{ (\ell, m) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \mid 0 \le \ell \le L, \ 0 \le m \le M \right\}, \\ \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{LM} &= \left\{ (p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid -L/2 \le p \le L/2 - 1, \ -M/2 \le q \le M/2 - 1 \right\}, \\ \mathcal{G}_{xy} &= \{ (x_\ell, y_m) =: (-L_x + \ell h_x, -L_y + m h_y), \ (\ell, m) \in \mathcal{T}_{LM} \}, \\ W_{pq}(\mathbf{x}) &= e^{i\mu_p^x(x+L_x)} e^{i\mu_q^y(y+L_y)}, \quad \mu_p^x = \pi p/L_x, \ \mu_q^y = \pi q/L_y, \quad (p, q) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{LM}. \end{split}$$

Let  $f_{\ell m}^n$   $(f = \psi, \varphi, V, S^x, S^y)$  be the approximation of  $f(x_\ell, y_m, t_n)$  for  $(\ell, m) \in \mathcal{T}_{LM}$  and  $n \ge 0$ . We denote by  $\mathbf{f}^n$   $(\mathbf{f} = \boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\varphi}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{S}^x, \mathbf{S}^y, \mathbf$ 

$$\psi(x, y, t) = \sum_{p=-L/2}^{L/2-1} \sum_{q=-M/2}^{M/2-1} \widehat{\psi}_{pq}(t) W_{pq}(x, y),$$
(3.4)

where the Fourier coefficients  $\widehat{\psi}_{pq}(t)$  read as

$$\widehat{\psi}_{pq}(t) = \frac{1}{LM} \sum_{j=0}^{L-1} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \psi_{\ell m}(t) e^{-i\mu_p^x(x_\ell + L_x)} e^{-i\mu_q^y(y_m + L_y)}.$$
(3.5)

Hence, the Fourier pseudospectral discretizations of  $\partial_x \psi$  and  $\partial_y \psi$  are respectively given by: for  $(\ell, m) \in \mathcal{T}_{LM}$ .

$$\left( [\partial_x] \psi \right)_{\ell m}(t) = \sum_{p=-L/2}^{L/2-1} \sum_{q=-M/2}^{M/2-1} i \mu_p^x \, \widehat{\psi}_{pq}(t) W_{pq}(x_\ell, y_m),$$
(3.6)

X. Antoine, C. Geuzaine and Q. Tang/Commun Nonlinear Sci Numer Simulat 90 (2020) 105406

$$[0.5em] \Big( [\![\partial_y]\!] \psi \Big)_{\ell m}(t) = \sum_{p=-L/2}^{L/2-1} \sum_{q=-M/2}^{M/2-1} i \mu_q^y \, \widehat{\psi}_{pq}(t) W_{pq}(x_\ell, y_m).$$
(3.7)

Furthermore, we define the operators  $[\![\mathcal{L}]\!]$ ,  $\mathbb{S}_x^{-1}$ ,  $\mathbb{S}_y^{-1}$ ,  $\mathbb{V}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $[\![\varphi^{n+\frac{1}{2}}]\!]$  as follows

$$\llbracket \mathcal{L} \rrbracket = -\frac{1}{2} \left( \mathbb{S}_{x}^{-1} \llbracket \partial_{x} \rrbracket \left( \mathbb{S}_{x}^{-1} \llbracket \partial_{x} \rrbracket \right) + \mathbb{S}_{y}^{-1} \llbracket \partial_{y} \rrbracket \left( \mathbb{S}_{y}^{-1} \llbracket \partial_{y} \rrbracket \right) \right), \tag{3.8}$$

$$[0.5em] \left( \mathbb{S}_{x}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\psi} \right)_{\ell m} = \psi_{\ell m} / S_{\ell m}^{x}, \quad \left( \mathbb{V}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\psi} \right)_{\ell m} = \frac{1}{2} \left( V_{\ell m}^{n} + V_{\ell m}^{n+1} \right) \psi_{\ell m}, \tag{3.9}$$

$$[0.5em] \left( \mathbb{S}_{y}^{-1} \Psi \right)_{\ell m} = \psi_{\ell m} / S_{\ell m}^{y}, \quad \left( \llbracket \boldsymbol{\varphi}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} \rrbracket \boldsymbol{\psi} \right)_{\ell m} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \varphi_{\ell m}^{n+1} + \varphi_{\ell m}^{n} \right) \psi_{\ell m}.$$
(3.10)

The first scheme brings together the time-splitting and spectral methods, leading e.g. to the second-order Time-Splitting Fourier Pseudospectral method (TSFP): for  $(\ell, m) \in T_{LM}$ 

$$\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{\psi}^n \ast e^{-i\left(\mathcal{V}(t_n, t_n + \Delta t/2) + \beta \Delta t |\boldsymbol{\psi}_{LM}^n|^2/2\right)},\tag{3.11}$$

$$\left[i\frac{\mathbb{I}}{\Delta t} - \frac{1}{2}[\mathcal{L}]\right]\psi^{(2)} = \left[i\frac{\mathbb{I}}{\Delta t} + \frac{1}{2}[\mathcal{L}]\right]\psi^{(1)},\tag{3.12}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\psi}^{n+1} = \boldsymbol{\psi}^{(2)} * e^{-i\left(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}(t_n + \Delta t/2, t_{n+1}) + \beta \Delta t | \boldsymbol{\psi}^{(2)}|^2/2\right)}.$$
(3.13)

Here, we have:  $\mathcal{V}_{\ell m}(t_1, t_2) = \mathcal{V}(x_{\ell}, y_m, t_1, t_2)$ . In addition,  $(\widehat{\psi}_{LM}^n)_{pq}$  and  $(\widehat{\psi}^{(2)})_{pq}$  are the discrete Fourier series coefficients of the vectors  $\psi_{LM}^n$  and  $\psi^{(2)}$ , respectively.

The second scheme concerns the combination of the relaxation technique and spectral method, yielding the relaxation Fourier Pseudo-spectral methods (ReFP)

$$\left[i\frac{\mathbb{I}}{\Delta t} - \frac{1}{2}\llbracket\mathcal{L}\rrbracket - \frac{1}{2}\llbracket\mathcal{V}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2}\llbracket\mathcal{\phi}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\rrbracket\right]\psi^{n+1} = \left[i\frac{\mathbb{I}}{\Delta t} + \frac{1}{2}\llbracket\mathcal{L}\rrbracket + \frac{1}{2}\llbracket\mathcal{V}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{2}\llbracket\mathcal{\phi}^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\rrbracket\right]\psi^{n}.$$
(3.14)

For solving the linear systems (3.12) and (3.14), a direct solution cannot be used since all the matrix operators are related to variable coefficients PDEs, in particular because of the presence of the PML layer. An alternative approach [8–10] consists in using a preconditioned Krylov subspace iterative solver. In the present paper, we consider the GMRES [50,51], accelerated by suitable preconditioners [8–10], e.g.  $(i_{\Delta t}^{\mathbb{T}} - \frac{1}{2} [[\mathcal{L}_0]])^{-1}$ , where  $\mathcal{L}_0$  is the laplacian operator (for  $\sigma = 0$ ) in the extended domain  $\mathcal{D}$ . This operator can be trivially computed by FFT since it is a constant coefficients linear operator and can then serve as a matrix-free preconditioner to (3.14).

# 4. Numerical results ( $\omega = 0$ )

In this section, we first carry out, on a linear case and then a nonlinear case, a detailed comparison of the TSFP (3.11)–(3.13) and the ReFP (3.14) methods. We also apply the TSFP method to simulate the dynamics of a ground state that released from its trapping potential. To simplify the comparison, we only consider two-dimensional examples. The physical domain is fixed to be a square centered at the origin, i.e.  $\mathcal{D}_{Phys} = [-L, L]^2$ . Moreover, the size of the PML domain and the strength of the absorbing functions in the *x*- and *y*-directions are chosen to be identical, i.e.  $\delta_x = \delta_y = \delta$  and  $\sigma_0^x = \sigma_0^y = \sigma$  for some constants  $\delta$  and  $\sigma$ . Hence, the computational domain is  $\mathcal{D} = [-L - \delta, L + \delta]^2$ . For the two methods, we choose  $h_x = h_y = h$  and denote  $\psi_{num}^n$  as the vector consisting of the numerical solution of  $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t_n)$  on a given grid that lie in the physical domain  $\mathcal{D}_{Phys}$ . Meanwhile, we denote by  $\psi_{ref}^n$  the reference solution in  $\mathcal{D}_{Phys}$ . We define the relative  $\ell^{\infty}$ -error as

$$e_{\infty}^{\text{rel}}(t=t_n) = \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\text{num}}^n - \boldsymbol{\psi}_{\text{ref}}^n\|_{\infty}}{\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\text{ref}}^n\|_{\infty}},\tag{4.1}$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$  represents the standard  $\ell^{\infty}$ -norm on a vector space.

# 4.1. Linear case

Here, we consider a non-rotating linear case, i.e., we set  $\beta = \omega = 0$ . Moreover, the potential V and initial data  $\psi_0$  are chosen respectively as

$$V(\mathbf{x},t) = -8|\mathbf{x}|^2, \quad \psi_0(\mathbf{x}) = e^{-8|\mathbf{x}|^2}.$$
(4.2)



**Fig. 1.**  $e_{\infty}^{ee}(0.24)$  in Example 4.1 for ReFP (left) and TSFP (right) with different absorbing strengths  $\sigma$  and PML sizes  $\delta$ .

With these parameters, the linear Schrödinger equation admits the following exact solution which spreads out as the time evolves

$$\psi(\mathbf{x},t) = \frac{i}{i - 4\tanh(4t)} \exp\left\{\frac{-8|\mathbf{x}|^2 \operatorname{sech}^2(4t) + 34i|\mathbf{x}|^2 \tanh(4t)}{1 + 16\tanh^2(4t)}\right\}.$$
(4.3)

Unless stated otherwise, we fix L = 2 and  $\Delta t = 10^{-4}$ . In addition, the solution  $\psi_{\text{ref}}^n$  in (4.1) is taken as the exact solution (4.3) at the grid points at time  $t = t_n$ .

**Example 4.1.** We first compare the different kinds of absorbing functions and we determine the associated optimal absorbing strength  $\sigma$  for each type, and for ReFP and TSFP. To this end, we take  $h = \frac{1}{16}$ . Fig. 1 shows  $e_{cel}^{rel}(0.24)$  for the six types of absorbing functions with PML sizes  $\delta = 0.25$  and  $\delta = 0.5$ . From the figures, we can see that: (i) For ReFP and TSFP, all the 6 types absorbing functions are almost of the same quality. They have different "optimal" regions for  $\sigma$ , which are simply a "shift" from each other. (ii) For ReFP and TSFP, the error decays to its discretization error as  $\delta$  increases. (iii) ReFP and TSFP behave similarly for each fixed absorbing function and small parameter  $\delta$ . For a larger value of  $\delta$ , ReFP is more accurate than TSFP. The preconditioned solution of the linear systems is also very efficient through the preconditioned GMRES for the FP approaches. (iv) For the two schemes, the region of optimal  $\sigma$  are approximately the same for the types 1 and 2, types 3 and 4 and types 5 and 6, respectively. For types 1 and 2, larger values of  $\sigma$  for types 3 and 4.

**Example 4.2.** In this example, we take the same parameters as in Example 4.1. We further consider the stability region at different times. Fig. 2 shows the corresponding results for types 2, 4, 6 for  $\delta = 0.5$  for various types of absorbing functions. From this figure and additional experiments not shown here for brevity, we can see that: (i) For fixed *h* and  $\delta$ , the stability



**Fig. 2.**  $e_{\infty}^{\text{rel}}(t)$  at different times *t* and for various absorbing strengths  $\sigma$  for the PML size  $\delta = 0.5$  in Example 4.2. We report ReFP (left) and TSFP (right) with absorbing functions of types 2, 4 and 6 (from top to bottom).

of the optimal region for  $\sigma$  is not fundamentally changed for different times. (ii) For other values of  $\delta$ , the conclusion is similar. (iii) The results for types 1, 3, 5 is similar to types 2, 4, 6, respectively. (iv) ReFP has the best accuracy.

**Example 4.3.** We now consider different mesh sizes h with fixed time and PML sizes  $\delta$ . We set the mesh size to  $h = \frac{1}{16}$  and vary the absorbing strength  $\sigma$  and PML sizes  $\delta$ . Fig. 3 shows  $e_{\infty}^{\text{rel}}(0.25)$  for ReFP and TSFP with the absorbing functions of types 2, 4, 6. From this figure and additional figures not shown here, we can see that: (i) As  $\delta$  increases, the error decreases for a fixed value of  $\sigma$ . (ii) The performance of types 1, 3 and 5 are the same as those of types 2, 4 and 6, respectively. (iii) Generally, the errors of types 2, 4 and 6 are smaller than those of types 1, 3 and 5, respectively. (iv) For both ReFP and TSFP, as  $\delta$  changes, the optimal region for  $\sigma$  is shifted a lot for the absorbing functions of types 1 and 2, while for the other four types, the stability region of  $\sigma$  does not change significantly, especially when  $\delta$  is large enough. For this reason and together with comment (ii), it is preferable to use an absorbing function of type 4 or 6. Again, ReFP is more accurate than (but comparable with) TSFP.

**Example 4.4.** Here, following the last example, we consider the error with respect to different mesh sizes *h*. We fix the PML size to  $\delta = 0.25$  and vary the mesh size *h* as well as the absorbing strength  $\sigma$ . Fig. 4 illustrates  $e_{rel}^{cel}(0.25)$  for ReFP and TSFP with absorbing functions of types 2, 4, 6. From this figure and additional figures not shown here, we can see that: (i) As *h* decreases, the error for the same parameter  $\sigma$  usually decreases for both ReFP and TSFP. (ii) As *h* decreases, the stability region for  $\sigma$  enlarged significantly. (iii) However, the error is saturating for a fixed thickness  $\delta$ .

**Example 4.5.** For completeness, we show in Fig. 5 the contour plots of the relative  $L^{\infty}$ -error

$$E_{\infty}^{\text{rel}}(t=t_n,\mathbf{x}) = \frac{|\psi_{\text{num}}^n - \psi_{\text{ref}}^n|}{\|\psi_{\text{ref}}^n\|_{\infty}}$$
(4.4)

at different times  $t_n$  in the physical domain  $\mathcal{D}_{phys}$  for ReSP (the plots are very similar for TSFP). We fix the thickness to  $\delta = 0.5$  and consider the type 4 absorbing function with  $\sigma = 0.1$ . As seen in Fig. 5, the maximum relative error does not always arise at the PML interface. Indeed, the outgoing waves travel outward and are damped when crossing the interface, decay as they approach the computational boundary and are transmitted to the other side of the domain thanks to the periodic boundary conditions. They are damped again when moving inward to the PML domain. The remaining outgoing waves after the two damping processes reenter into the physical domain and cause the main errors. Hence, the location of the maximum errors depends on how the outgoing waves are reflected back into the domain and also on the discretization error inside the physical domain: (1) When the time *t* is not large enough, the remnant of the outgoing waves does not accumulate too much inside the physical domain, hence the discretization error is dominant. Therefore, the maximum error occurs inside the physical domain, not at the interface. (2) When the time *t* is large enough, the rest of the outgoing waves their adjacent grid points. Finally, let us remark that if one would include the grid points on the interface into the error computation (which is not the case here since the discretization points are not necessarily on the interface), then the results shown in the figures in the paper would not change qualitatively (but quantitatively, the errors would increase a little bit globally, i.e., all the lines in those figures would shift up a little bit).

#### 4.2. The nonlinear case

In this section, we apply the proposed methods to study the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, i.e.  $\beta \neq 0$ . Recall that from the previous section, absorbing functions of types 4 & 6 work better than other types for each method.

**Example 4.6.** We first compare the performance of the TSFP and ReFP methods for a manufactured example, setting  $\beta = -1$ . The trapping potential and initial data are chosen respectively as

$$V(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{sech}^{2}(x-t)\operatorname{sech}^{2}(y-t)\left(\cosh(2(x-t)) + \cosh(2(y-t))\right),\tag{4.5}$$

$$\psi_0(\mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{sech}(x)\operatorname{sech}(y)e^{i(x+y)}.$$
(4.6)

With these parameters, the nonlinear Schrödinger equation admits an outgoing solitary solution which can be solved analytically as

$$\psi(\mathbf{x},t) = \operatorname{sech}(x-t)\operatorname{sech}(y-t)e^{i(x+y)}.$$
(4.7)

For both methods, we choose L = 32 and  $\Delta t = 10^{-3}$ . The reference solution  $\psi_{ref}^n$  in (4.1) is taken as the exact solution (4.7) at the grid points at time  $t = t_n$ . We fix the mesh size as  $h = \frac{1}{8}$  and vary the absorbing strength  $\sigma$  as well as the size of the PML domain  $\delta$ . Fig. 6 depicts  $e_{\infty}^{rel}(31)$  for ReFP with different PML sizes  $\delta$  and absorbing functions. Fig. 7 shows  $e_{\infty}^{rel}(t)$  at different times for both methods with PML size  $\delta = 2$  and type 6 absorbing function. From these figures and other numerical experiments not reported here for conciseness, we see that: (i) The performance of the TSFP method is similar as the one of ReFP. (ii) The performances of TSFP & ReFP are similar as for the linear cases shown in the previous sections, i.e., the error decays as the PML size  $\delta$  increases. However, the optimal region of absorbing strength  $\sigma$  is different from the linear



**Fig. 3.**  $e_{\infty}^{\text{rel}}(0.25)$  vs.  $\sigma$  for TSFP (top) and ReFP (bottom) with absorbing functions of types 2, 4, 6 for  $h_x = h_y = \frac{1}{16}$  and different PML sizes  $\delta$  in Example 4.3.



**Fig. 4.**  $e_{\infty}^{\text{rel}}(0.25)$  vs.  $\sigma$  for TSFP (top) and ReFP (bottom) for the absorbing function of types 2, 4, 6, with PML size  $\delta = 0.25$ , and for different mesh sizes  $h_x = h_y = h$  in Example 4.4.



**Fig. 5.** Contour plots of the relative error in the inner physical domain  $D_{phys} = [-2, 2]^2$  for ReFP (the results are similar for TSFP) for Example 4.5. The red solid line represents the location of the PML layer. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



Fig. 6.  $e_{\infty}^{\text{rel}}(31)$  for ReFP with different PML sizes  $\delta$  and absorbing functions of type 4 & 6 in Example 4.6.

cases. (iii) Absorbing function of type 6 is more accurate than the one of type 4 in the optimal region. Moreover, the optimal region of type 4 function shifts as the PML size  $\delta$  changes. Therefore, we suggest to use the absorbing function of type 6 for the practical computations. (iv) For both types absorbing functions, usually ReFP is more accurate than TSFP (cf. Fig. 7). However, due to the nonlinearity, the preconditioner of ReFP (3.14) needs to be rebuilt at each time step, which thus is less efficient than for the TSFP (3.11)–(3.13) where the nonlinear part can be integrated explicitly. (v) Now that the acuracy of TSFP is not far from ReFP, we suggest that the TSFP method is used with the absorbing function of type 6 in practice.

**Example 4.7.** In this example, we apply the TSFP method to simulate the dynamics of the GPE with a strong nonlinearity. To this end, we choose  $\beta = 500$ ,  $\omega = 0$  and L = 16. First, we prepare the initial data by computing the corresponding ground state of the GPE with trapping potential  $V(\mathbf{x}) = |\mathbf{x}|^2/2$ . Then, we release the ground state from the trap, i.e., we set  $V(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0$  and simulate the dynamics using TSFP. Under this set-up, the ground state is expected to extend and spreads out which would cause problems wherever it is close to the computational domain if a PML technique is not applied. We fix the size of the PML region, the mesh size and discretization time step respectively as  $\delta = 2$ , h = 1/16,  $\Delta t = 10^{-3}$ . The absorbing function is chosen as the **Type 6** function with absorbing strength  $\sigma = 100$ . To compare, we also report the results obtained



**Fig. 7.**  $e_{x}^{\text{rel}}(t)$  at different times *t* for ReFP and TSFP with PML size  $\delta = 2$  and type 6 absorbing functions in Example 4.6.



**Fig. 8.** Contour plots of  $|\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2$  at different times for Example 4.7 solved by TSFP without PML (upper) and with PML (Lower). The red solid lines represents the interface of the PML region and Physical domain. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

by using TSFP without PML (i.e. set  $\sigma = 0$ ). Fig. 8 shows the contour plots of the density  $|\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2$  at different times for the TSFP method with and without PML techniques. From the figure we can see that the waves are reflected back into the physical domain leading to a nonphysical dynamics if no PML is imposed. In contrast, adding a PML region can absorb the outgoing waves well, and the dynamics of the ground state in the physical domain can be well reproduced.

# 5. Extension to rotating BECs ( $\omega \neq 0$ )

# 5.1. Direct PML formulation in cartesian coordinates

Let us consider the full GPE (2.1) with rotating term. The main difference now is that the *z*-component of the angular momentum  $-\omega L_z = -i\omega(y\partial_x - x\partial_y)$  is involved into the equation. Extending the previous PML technique in a stable way is not trivial. One possible direction could be inspired by the case of the convected Helmholtz equation (set in the frequency domain) which writes according to the pressure field *p* 

$$(1 - M^2)\partial_x^2 p + \partial_y^2 p + 2ikM\partial_x p + k^2 p = f,$$
(5.1)

in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Phys}}$ . Here,  $M = v_0/c_0$  and  $k = \tilde{\omega}/c_0$ , are the Mach number (-1 < M < 1) and the wavenumber, respectively. In addition,  $c_0$  is the sound velocity in the fluid,  $\tilde{\omega} > 0$  is the pulsation of the wave, f is a source term, and the mean velocity  $v_0$  is subsonic and uniform. Following [18], a well-suited stable PML for the duct problem (along the *x*-direction) can be introduced as

$$(1 - M^2)(\alpha(x)\partial_x + i\lambda(x))^2 p + \partial_y^2 p + 2ikM(\alpha(x)\partial_x + i\lambda(x))p + k^2 p = f,$$
(5.2)

in  $\mathcal{D}$ . The function  $\alpha := (1 + i\sigma/\tilde{\omega})^{-1}$  must satisfy  $\Re(\alpha) > 0$  and  $\Im(\alpha) < 0$ , and  $\lambda(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ . The choice of  $\lambda$  depends on the constants M and k. Extending a similar approach to the rotating GPE is not clear for many reasons: the domain is not a duct but a rectangle, the operator  $L_z$  is much more complicated since it involves a linear combination of terms  $x\partial_y$  and  $y\partial_x$  with variable dependent coefficients (i.e.  $x \otimes y$ ). For example, a direct PML approach *via* coordinate stretching leads to the following PML formulation of the rotating GPE: for  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ ,  $t \ge 0$ 

$$i\partial_t \psi = -\frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{S^x} \partial_x \left( \frac{1}{S^x} \partial_x \right) + \frac{1}{S^y} \partial_y \left( \frac{1}{S^y} \partial_y \right) \right] \psi + \left[ V + \beta |\psi|^2 \right] \psi - i\omega \left[ \frac{y \, \widehat{S^y}}{S^x} \partial_x - \frac{x \, \widehat{S^x}}{S^y} \partial_y \right] \psi, \tag{5.3}$$

with

$$\widehat{S^{\nu}} = 1 + \frac{e^{i\vartheta_{\nu}}}{\nu} \begin{cases} \int_{L_{\nu}}^{\nu} \sigma_{\nu}(s)ds, & \nu > L_{\nu}, \\ 0, & -L_{\nu} \le \nu \le L_{\nu}, \\ \int_{-L_{\nu}}^{\nu} \sigma_{\nu}(s)ds, & \nu < -L_{\nu}, \end{cases}$$
(5.4)

However, this PML approach will result in inaccurate computations (not reported here). Blow-up always arises at the interface between the PML region (i.e.  $D_{PML}$ ) and the physical domain (i.e.  $D_{Phys}$ ) for all the proposed absorbing functions and numerical schemes.

## 5.2. PML formulation in rotating Lagrangian coordinates

To get a well-posed PML formulation for the rotating GPE, we consider an alternative based on a reformulation of the initial problem into a rotating Lagrangian coordinates framework [16]. For any time  $t \ge 0$ , let  $\mathcal{R}(t)$  be the orthogonal rotational matrix

$$\mathcal{R}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\omega t) & \sin(\omega t) \\ -\sin(\omega t) & \cos(\omega t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{if } d = 2,$$
  
$$\mathcal{R}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\omega t) & \sin(\omega t) & 0 \\ -\sin(\omega t) & \cos(\omega t) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{if } d = 3.$$
(5.5)

It is easy to check that  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(t) = \mathcal{R}^{T}(t)$ , for any  $t \ge 0$  and  $\mathcal{R}(0) = I$ , where *I* is the identity matrix. For  $t \ge 0$ , we introduce the *rotating Lagrangian coordinates*  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  as [13,16,38]

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{R}^{-1}(t)\mathbf{x} = \mathcal{R}^{T}(t)\mathbf{x} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbf{x} = \mathcal{R}(t)\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}, \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d},$$
(5.6)

and we denote by  $\psi := \psi(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, t)$  the wave function in the new coordinates system

$$\widetilde{\psi}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}},t) = \psi(\mathcal{R}(t)\widetilde{\mathbf{x}},t), \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad t \ge 0.$$
(5.7)

Therefore, the rotating GPE can be rewritten as a GPE without rotation term but with a time-dependent potential

$$i\partial_t \widetilde{\psi}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}, t) = \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \widetilde{\nabla}^2 + V(\mathcal{R}(t)\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}, t) + \beta |\widetilde{\psi}|^2 \right] \widetilde{\psi}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}, t),$$
(5.8)

setting  $\widetilde{\nabla}^2 = \partial_{\widetilde{x}}^2 + \partial_{\widetilde{y}}^2$ . Now, the PML technique can be directly applied to the new GPE (5.8). All the details remain the same by just changing the symbols *x*, *y* to  $\widetilde{x}$ ,  $\widetilde{y}$ , respectively. The TSFP and ReFP proposed for the non-rotating GPE extend here. For the TSFP, the use of a numerical integration [13,16,38] is needed for evaluating the time-dependent potential. Let us remark that a different transformation was applied in [35] when dealing with cross-derivatives into the nonlinear Schrödinger equation and using a fourth-order spatial finite-difference scheme and a fourth-order additive Runge-Kutta time scheme.

## 5.3. Numerical examples

**Example 5.1.** We apply the TSFP method to simulate the dynamics of the rotating GPE with strong nonlinearity. To this end, we fix  $\beta = 10000$  and study two cases: one with rotating frequency  $\omega = 2.5$  while the other considers  $\omega = 4$ . The initial data are prepared by computing the ground states of the GPE with the same values of  $\beta \& \omega$  under the quadratic-quartic trapping potential:

$$V(x,y) = \frac{3(x^2 + y^2)^2 - 4(x^2 + y^2)}{40}.$$
(5.9)

The contour plot of the density of the ground states, and hence for the initial data  $|\psi(x, t = 0)|^2$ , for each case is illustrated in the first subfigure in Figs. 9 and 10, respectively. We then release the ground states from the trapping potential (i.e. set



**Fig. 9.** Contour plots of  $|\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2$  at different times for Example 5.1 with  $\omega = 2.5$ . The green solid lines represent the interface of PML region and "Physical domain"  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{Phy}$  in rotating Lagrange coordinates, and the black dashed lines show the physical domain  $\mathcal{D}_{Phy}$  in Cartesian coordinates. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



**Fig. 10.** Contour plots of  $|\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2$  at different times for Example 5.1 with  $\omega = 4$ . The green solid lines represent the interface of PML region and "Physical domain"  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{Phy}$  in rotating Lagrange coordinates, and the black dashed lines show the physical domain  $\mathcal{D}_{Phy}$  in Cartesian coordinates. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

 $V(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0$ ) and simulate the dynamics, which is solved by the TSFP method with absorbing function of type 6 in rotating Lagrangian coordinates. For both cases, the physical domain (in cartesian coordinates) is set to be  $\mathcal{D}_{Phys} = [-16, 16]^2$ . To recover the wave function  $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)$  in  $\mathcal{D}_{Phys}$  (which is transformed back from  $\tilde{\psi}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, t)$ ), in the rotating Lagrangian coordinates we set the "physical domain" and computational domain as  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{Phys} = [-24, 24]^2$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} = [-27, 27]^2$ , respectively. Moreover, the mesh size and time step are chosen as h = 1/16 and  $\Delta t = 10^{-3}$ . Figs. 9 ( $\omega = 2.5$ ) and 10 ( $\omega = 4$ ) show the contour plots of  $|\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2$  at different times in cartesian coordinates. From the figure, we can see clearly that the TSFP method works very

well. Due to the absence of trap, the wave function in both cases spreads out and hence all the vortices exit. Finally, nothing remains in the physical domain.

# 6. Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed and implemented in a relatively simple way the PML formulation of the rotating GPE in cartesian coordinates for the time-splitting and relaxation pseudospectral schemes. A thorough numerical study shows that the PML absorbing functions proposed in Bermúdez et al. [22], 23] are best suited in terms of accuracy and numerical stability, thanks to the tuning parameters. In addition, a high accuracy of the pseudospectral approximation scheme is observed. In the case of the rotating GPE, a Lagrangian coordinates transformation is used to rewrite the original equation in the framework of non-rotating GPEs with time-dependent potential. Following this approach, the PML formulation is directly extended to the rotating case, showing that the method remains very efficient and accurate for truncating the infinite spatial domain. Future investigations concern the extension of the PML formulations to polar coordinates and to more general GPEs, including dipolar interactions and multi-components problems.

### Credit author statement

The contributions pf the paper have been realized through a full collaboration of all authors, from the theory to the computational codes. Therefore all the authors have an equal contribution to the paper.

## **Declaration of Competing Interest**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

#### Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the support from the Inria associate team BEC2HPC (Bose-Einstein Condensates: Computation and HPC simulation). X. Antoine thanks the French National Research Agency project NABUCO grant no. ANR-17-CE40-0025. Q. Tang thanks the support of the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (YJ201807) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11971335).

#### References

- [1] Abo-Shaeer JR, Raman C, Vogels JM, Ketterle W. Observation of vortex lattices in Bose-Einsteincondensates. Science 2001;292:476-9.
- [2] Andersen JO. Theory of the weakly interacting Bose gas. Rev Mod Phys 2004;76:599–639.
- [3] Anderson MH, Ensher JR, Matthewa MR, Wieman CE, Cornell EA. Observation of Bose-Einstein condensation in a dilute atomic vapor. Science 1995;269:198–201.
- [4] Antoine X, Arnold A, Besse C, Ehrhardt M, Schaedle A. A review of transparent and artificial boundary conditions techniques for linear and nonlinear Schrödinger equations. Commun Comput Phys 2008;4(4):729–96.
- [5] Antoine X, Bao W, Besse C. Computational methods for the dynamics of the nonlinear Schrödinger/Gross-Pitaevskii equations. Comput Phys Commun 2013;184(12):2621–33.
- [6] Antoine X, Lorin E. A simple pseudospectral method for the computation of the time-dependent dirac equation with perfectly matched layers. J Comput Phys 2019;395:583-601.
- [7] Antoine X, Besse C, Klein P. Numerical solution of time-dependent nonlinear Schrödinger equations using domain truncation techniques coupled with relaxation scheme. Laser Phys 2011;21(8):1–12.
- [8] Antoine X, Duboscq R. Robust and efficient preconditioned Krylov spectral solvers for computing the ground states of fast rotating and strongly interacting Bose-Einstein condensates. J Comput Phys 2014;258:509–23.
- [9] Antoine X, Duboscq R. GPELab, a matlab toolbox to solve Gross-Pitaevskiiequations I: computation of stationary solutions. Comput Phys Commun 2014;185:2969-91.
- [10] Antoine X, Duboscq R. GPELab, a matlab toolbox to solve Gross-Pitaevskiiequations II: dynamics and stochastic simulations. Comput Phys Commun 2015;193:95–117.
- [11] Antoine X, Duboscq R. Modeling and computation of Bose-Einsteincondensates: stationary states, nucleation, dynamics, stochasticity. In: Nonlinear optical and atomic systems: at the interface of physics and mathematics. In: Book Series, 2146. Lecture Notes in Mathematics; 2015. p. 49–145.
- [12] Antoine X, Lorin E, Tang Q. A friendly review of absorbing boundary conditions and perfectly matched layers for classical and relativistic quantum waves equations. Mol Phys 2017;115(15–16):1861–79.
- [13] Antonelli P, Marahrens D, Sparber C. On the cauchy problem for nonlinear Schrödingerequations with rotation. Discrete Contin Dyn Syst A 2012;32:703–15.
- [14] Bao W, Cai Y. Mathematical theory and numerical methods for Bose-Einstein condensation. Kinetic Related Models 2013;6(1):1–135.
- [15] Bao W, Jaksch D, Markowich PA. Numerical solution of the Gross-Pitaevskii equation for Bose-Einstein condensation. J Comput Phys 2003;187(1):318–42.
- [16] Bao W, Marahrens D, Tang Q, Zhang Y. A simple and efficient numerical method for computing the dynamics of rotating Bose-Einstein condensates via rotating lagrangian coordinates. SIAM J Sci Comput 2013;35:A2671–95.
- [17] Baranov MA. Theoretical progress in many body physics of dipolar gases. Phys Rep 2008;464:71-111.
- [18] Bécache E, Dhia A-SB-b, Legendre G. Perfectly matched layers for the convected Helmholtz equation. SIAM J Numer Anal 2004;42:409–33.
- [19] Bérenger JP. A perfectly matched layer for the absorption of electromagnetic waves. J Comput Phys 1994;114(2):185–200.
- [20] Bérenger JP. Three-dimensional perfectly matched layer for the absorption of electromagnetic waves. J Comput Phys 1996;127(2):363–79.
- [21] Bérenger JP. Perfectly matched layer for the FDTD solution of wave-structure interaction problems. IEEE Trans Antennas Propag 1996;44(1):110–17.
- [22] Bermúdez A, Hervella-Nieto L, Prieto A, Rodríguez R. An exact bounded perfectly matched layer for time-harmonic scattering problems. SIAM J Sci Comput 2007;30:312–38.

- [23] Bermúdez A, Hervella-Nieto L, Prieto A, Rodríguez R. An optimal perfectly matched layer with unbounded absorbing function for time-harmonic acoustic scattering problems. J Comput Phys 2007;223:469–88.
- [24] Besse C. A relaxation scheme for the nonlinear Schrödingerequation. SIAM J Numer Anal 2004;42:934-52.
- [25] Bloch I, Dalibard J, Zwerger W. Many body physics with ultracold gases. Rev Mod Phys 2008;80:885-965.
- [26] Bradley CC, Sackett CA, Tollett JJ, Hulet RG. Evidence of Bose-Einstein condensation in an atomic gas with attractive interaction. Phys Rev Lett 1995;75:1687–90.
- [27] Chew WC, Liu QH. Perfectly matched layers for elastodynamics: a new absorbing boundary condition. J Comput Acoustics 1996;4(4):341-59.
- [28] Collino F. Perfectly matched absorbing layers for the paraxial equations. J Comput Phys 1997;131(1):164-80.
- [29] Collino F, Monk P. The perfectly matched layer in curvilinear coordinates. SIAM J Sci Comput 1998;19:2061–90.
- [30] Collino F, Tsogka C. Application of the perfectly matched absorbing layer model to the linear elastodynamic problem in anisotropic heterogeneous media. Geophysics 2001;66(1):294-307.
- [31] Colonius T. Modeling artificial boundary conditions for compressible flow. Annu Rev Fluid Mech 2004;36:315–45.
   [32] McCurdy CW, Baertschy M, Rescigno TN. Solving the three-body coulomb breakup problem using exterior complex scaling. J Phys B 2004;37(17):R137–87.
- [33] Dalfovo F. Giorgini S. Pitaevskii LP. Stringari S. Theory of Bose-Einstein condensation in trapped gases. Rev Mod Phys 1999;71:463-512.
- [34] Davis KB, Mewes MO, Andrews MR, van Druten NJ, Durfee DS, Kurn DM, et al. Bose-Einstein condensation in a gas of sodium atoms. Phys Rev Lett 1995;75:3969-73
- [35] Dohnal T. Perfectly matched layers for coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations with mixed derivatives. | Comput Phys 2009;228:8752-65.
- [36] Farrell C, Leonhardt U. The perfectly matched layer in numerical simulations of nonlinear and matter waves. J Opt B 2005;7(1):1-4.
- [37] Fetter AL, Rotating trapped Bose-Einstein condensates, Rev Mod Phys 2009:81:647–91.
- [38] García-Ripoll JJ, Pérez-García VM, Vekslerchik V. Construction of exact solution by spatial translations in inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equations. Phys Rev E 2001;64:56602.
- [39] Giorgini S, Pitaevskii LP, Stringari S. Theory of ultracold atomic fermi gases. Rev Mod Phys 2008;80:1215-74.
- [40] Hu FQ. On absorbing boundary conditions for linearized Euler equations by a perfectly matched layer. J Comput Phys 1996;129(1):201-19.
- [41] Hu FQ. A stable, perfectly matched layer for linearized Euler equations in unsplit physical variables. | Comput Phys 2001;173(2):455-80.
- [42] Leggett AJ. Bose-Einstein condensation in the alkali gases: some fundamental concepts. Rev Mod Phys 2001;73:307-56.
- [43] Lieb EH, Seiringer R. Derivation of the Gross-Pitaevskii equation for rotating Bose gases. Commun Math Phys 2006;264:505-37.
- [44] Morsch O, Oberthaler M. Dynamics of Bose-Einstein condensates in optical lattices. Rev Mod Phys 2006;78:179–215.
- [45] Muga JG, Palao JP, Navarro JP, Egusquiza IL. Complex absorbing potentials. Phys Rep-Rev Sect Phys Lett 2004;395(6):357-426.
- [46] Nissen A, Kreiss G. An optimized perfectly matched layer for the Schrödinger equation. Commun Comput Phys 2011;9(1):147-79.
- [47] Petropoulos PG. Reflectionless sponge layers as absorbing boundary conditions for the numerical solution of maxwell equations in rectangular, cylindrical and spherical coordinates. SIAM J Appl Math 2000;60:1037–58.
- [48] Pitaevskii LP, Stringari S. Bose-Einstein condensation. Oxford: Clarendon Press; 2003.
- [49] Proukakis NP, Snoke DW, Littlewood PB. Universal themes of Bose-Einstein condensation. Cambridge University Press; 2017.
- [50] Saad Y. Iterative methods for sparse linear systems. 2nd ed. SIAM; 2003.
- [51] Saad Y, Schultz MH. GMRES a generalized minimal RESidual algorithm for solving nonsymmetric linear systems. SIAM J Sci Comput 1986;7(3):856–69.
- [52] Scrinzi A, Stimming HP, Mauser NJ. On the non-equivalence of perfect matched layers and exterior complex scaling. J Comput Phys 2014;269:98–107.
- [53] Tsynkov SV. Numerical solution of problems on unbounded domains. a review. Appl Numer Math 1998;27(4):465-532.
- [54] Turkel E, Yefet A. Absorbing PML boundary layers for wave-like equations. Appl Numer Math 1998;27(4):533-57.
- [55] Weinmueller M, Weinmueller M, Rohland J, Scrinzi A. Perfect absorption in Schrödinger-like problems using non-equidistant complex grids. J Comput Phys 2017;333:199–211.
- [56] Zeng YQ, He JQ, Liu QH. The application of the perfectly matched layer in numerical modeling of wave propagation in poroelastic media. Geophysics 2001;66(4):1258–66.
- [57] Zheng C. A perfectly matched layer approach to the nonlinear Schrödinger wave equation. | Comput Phys 2007;227:537–56.