

From Lyapunov modes to the exponents for hard disk systems

Tony Chung, Daniel Truant and Gary P. Morriss

School of Physics, University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales 2052, Australia

(Dated: February 21, 2024)

We demonstrate the preservation of the Lyapunov modes by the underlying tangent space dynamics of hard disks. This result is exact for the zero modes and correct to order ϵ for the transverse and LP modes where ϵ is linear in the mode number. For sufficiently large mode numbers the dynamics no longer preserves the mode structure. We propose a Gram-Schmidt procedure based on orthogonality with respect to the centre space that determines the values of the Lyapunov exponents for the modes. This assumes a detailed knowledge of the modes, but from that predicts the values of the exponents from the modes. Thus the modes and the exponents contain the same information.

PACS numbers: 05.45.Jn, 05.45.Pq, 02.70.Ns, 05.20.Jj

In a chaotic system, the difference between two nearby phase space trajectories, the so called Lyapunov vector, diverges exponentially in time. If one or more of the rates of divergence are positive then the dynamics of a single initial condition is unpredictable and global behavior becomes important. The statistical mechanics of chaotic many particle systems is an example of a probabilistic treatment of the global behavior of deterministic microscopic dynamics. It is believed that the probabilistic axioms of statistical mechanics can be justified by the chaotic nature of the underlying dynamics, so much effort has been devoted to finding links between macroscopic quantities, such as transport coefficients, and chaotic properties such as the Lyapunov exponents [1, 2, 3]. There have been some successes such as the conjugate pairing rule for the Lyapunov spectrum in some thermostated systems [10, 11, 12] and the fluctuation theorem [3, 14]. The stepwise structure of the Lyapunov spectrum (the full set of Lyapunov exponents for the system) is another chaotic property of many-particle systems which has been studied extensively [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 35]. Each step in the exponent spectrum is associated with delocalised wavelike structures in the corresponding Lyapunov vector, now referred to as a Lyapunov mode.

The significance of the step structure is that it appears in the Lyapunov exponents which are closest to zero, connecting them with the slowest macroscopic modes of the system. Some analytical approaches, such as random matrix theory [30, 31], kinetic theory [18, 33] and periodic orbit theory [32] have been used in an attempt to understand this phenomenon. A clue to understanding the stepwise structure of the Lyapunov spectrum and the Lyapunov modes is in the behavior of the Lyapunov vectors associated with the zero-Lyapunov exponents [21]. In each case the Lyapunov modes associated with a zero exponent are N other transformations [22] generated by the conserved quantities or time translation along the phase space trajectory. The Lyapunov modes associated with the steps in the spectrum are k -vector analogues of the zero modes and have the same basis in the funda-

mental symmetries of the system [19, 20, 21].

We consider a quasi-one-dimensional system (QOD) [16] where the two-dimensional rectangular system is so narrow that the particles remain ordered in the x -direction. We use Hard-wall boundary conditions in the x direction and Periodic boundary conditions in the y direction (the (H,P) boundary conditions). The step structure of the Lyapunov spectrum consists of one-point steps and two-point steps [16]. The one-point steps correspond to transverse modes while the two-points steps correspond to longitudinal and momentum proportional modes. The significant advantage of the QOD system is that both the exponents and the modes can be obtained to high accuracy by standard numerical schemes [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 24]. For systems with smooth interaction potentials it has proved much more difficult to get clear numerical evidence for the steps in the Lyapunov spectrum and to find modes [34, 35]. However, the same structure must exist as the dynamics is subject to the same invariances and conservation properties.

The QOD system with (H,P) boundary conditions we studied contained N hard disk particles. The complete description of the system at any time is contained in the $4N$ -dimensional phase vector $(q;p)$ where $q = q_1; \dots; q_N$ and $p = p_1; \dots; p_N$ where q_i and p_i contain the x and y coordinates and momentum of particle i . The time evolution of the phase vector through a free flight, and then collision, is given by the matrix equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix}^0 = \begin{pmatrix} I & I \\ 0 & N \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where each scripted matrix is an $N \times N$ matrix containing 2×2 submatrices, I is the identity and 0 is the zero matrix. The matrix N that changes the momenta at collisions is given by

$$N = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \\ I & : & 0 & & & & 0 \\ : & : & : & & & & : \\ 0 & : & I & n_{ij} n_{ij}^T & & n_{ij} n_{ij}^T & : \\ 0 & : & n_{ij} n_{ij}^T & I & & n_{ij} n_{ij}^T & : \\ : & : & : & : & & : & : \\ 0 & : & 0 & 0 & & 0 & I \end{pmatrix} : \quad (2)$$

Again, each element is itself a 2×2 sub-matrix. The term $n_{ij}^T = (x_{ij}; y_{ij})$ is a row vector containing the x and y components of the separation between particles i and j at collision, so that the dyadic product $n_{ij}n_{ij}^T$ is a 2×2 matrix.

We write the Lyapunov vectors as $(q; p)^T$ where q and p are N -dimensional vectors containing the 2-dimensional entries for each particle position separation q_j or momentum separation p_j . For this QOD system there are four zero-Lyapunov exponents and hence four associated Zero (Z) Lyapunov modes. The numerically observed Z modes can be written as linear combinations of elements of the basis set [21] $y = (q; 0)$, $p_y = (0; p)$, $t = (p; 0) = \frac{1}{2}p_j$ and $e = (0; p) = \frac{1}{2}p_j$ where the j^{th} element of q and p in y and p_y is given by $q_j - p_j - \frac{1}{N}$, while p is an N -dimensional vector whose j^{th} component is p_j (the momentum of particle j) and $\frac{1}{2}p_j$ is the magnitude of the total momentum.

The time evolution equations for tangent space dynamics consist of many repeats of a free-flight followed by a collision and the Gram-Schmidt procedure. The first two of these steps, the application of a free-flight matrix then a collision matrix, evolve the tangent vector in time from 0 to and can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} N & 0 & I & I \\ Q & N & 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

where

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & : & 0 & 0 & : \\ : & : & : & : & : \\ 0 & : & Q_{ij} & Q_{ij} & 0 \\ 0 & : & Q_{ij} & Q_{ij} & 0 \\ : & : & : & : & : \\ 0 & : & 0 & 0 & : \end{pmatrix} : \quad (4)$$

Each component of the matrix Q is a 2×2 sub-matrix where the only non-trivial components are those associated with the two particles that collide, i and j through Q_{ij} . Then Q_{ij} given is by

$$Q_{ij} = (n_{ij} \ p_j) I + \frac{n_{ij} p_{ij}^T}{n_{ij} \ p_j} I - \frac{p_{ij} n_{ij}^T}{n_{ij} \ p_j} : \quad (5)$$

where $p_{ij}^T = (p_{xij}; p_{yij})$ is a row vector containing the x and y components of the relative momenta at collision ($p_{ij} = p_j - p_i$). The principle property that we will exploit now is that $Q_{ij} \ p_j = 0$.

To understand the tangent vector dynamics we consider the action of the matrix N on either q or p which gives

$$N \ q = q + n_{ij} n_{ij}^T (q - q_i) X : \quad (6)$$

where X is the N -dimensional column vector with all elements equal to zero except for $X_i = 1$ and $X_j = -1$.

Note that for a QOD system $j = i + 1$, but otherwise the result is general.

Similarly, the action of the matrix Q gives

$$Q \ q = Q_{ij} (q - q_i) X \quad (7)$$

Any Lyapunov mode for which $q_i - q_j = 0$ or $p_i - p_j = 0$ exactly - such as the zero mode y - is preserved by the dynamics, while the conjugate zero mode grows linearly with time, so for example $p_y(t) = p_y + y$ [22].

The application of the dynamics on the momentum dependent Z modes gives for t that $N \ p = p^0$ and $Q \ p = 0$ so that $(p; 0) = \frac{1}{2}p_j$! $(p; 0) = \frac{1}{2}p_j$ which is t at the new time. Therefore the functional form of t is preserved exactly. The conjugate mode is linear in time $e(t) = e + t$.

The numerically observed Lyapunov modes are of four types, Z modes, transverse (T) modes, longitudinal (L) modes and momentum proportional (P) modes. The L and P are usually observed together as a combined LP mode. The T modes are given by

$$T^n = \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} q_T \\ p_T \end{pmatrix} \quad (8)$$

where q_T and p_T are of the form $q_j = \frac{0}{C_n} x_j$ where $C_n = \cos k_n x_j$.

In a transverse mode the term $(q_j - q_i)$ in equations (6) and (7), becomes $(y_j - y_i) = \frac{0}{n} \sin(k_n x_i)$ where $= k_n x_{ij} = n x_{ij} = L$. Here x_{ij} is the x-component of the distance between particles i and j at collision and L is the length of the system in the x-direction. The small parameter is linear in the mode number n . Thus the time evolution of a T modes is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} q^+ \\ p \end{pmatrix} + O(t) : \quad (9)$$

and henceforth we neglect the dependent terms. Clearly for sufficiently large the dynamics without the order term will become incorrect. We assume that below a threshold value of the dynamics in equation (9) is correct.

Further, for the LP mode, the P component is linear in the momentum, so that for example $q_i = n p_i \cos k_n x_i$ then $q_i - q_j = n (p_{ij} \cos k_n x_i - p_j \sin k_n x_i)$. As $Q_{ij} p_{ij} = 0$ the first term is zero and the result is order . The LP modes are of the form

$$LP_1^n = \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} = s_{nt} \begin{pmatrix} n \\ n \end{pmatrix}^{PC} + c_{nt} \begin{pmatrix} n \\ n \end{pmatrix}^{QL} \quad (10)$$

where s_{nt} , c_{nt} , n and n are constants [23]. The N -dimensional vector pc has components $p_j C_{nj}$, $s_{nt} = \sin !_{nt}$ and $c_{nt} = \cos !_{nt}$ (with frequency $!_n$). In the

case of (H, P) boundary conditions the LP exponents are doubly degenerate so there is a second LP mode LP_2^n with s_{nt} and c_{nt} interchanged which is orthogonal in time to LP_1^n . This result means that the LP modes also have a time evolution governed by equation (9) with a different order term and again we assume that this dynamics is correct below some threshold.

The numerically observed T modes are invariants of the dynamics and the pair of LP modes define a two-dimensional sub-space. The action of the dynamics and Gram-Schmidt procedure therefore simply results in the T mode remaining orthogonal to the centre space defined by the zero modes. This suggests that we can define an inside-out Gram-Schmidt procedure to obtain the same effect. To do this we make two assumptions: 1) that the functional forms for the T, L and P modes are known; 2) that the numerical values for the coefficients are known.

Given these assumptions we can calculate the values of the Lyapunov exponents in the step region. If we consider a T or L mode then under a free flight and collision using equation (9) the mode changes, but then the Gram-Schmidt procedure returns it to its initial direction with some scaling factor λ , as

$$\begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{coll}} \begin{pmatrix} q^+ \\ p \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{S}} \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} \quad (11)$$

The first right arrow is the action of the free flight and collision while the second right arrow is the result of the Gram-Schmidt procedure. Here we use a simplified inside-out Gram-Schmidt procedure in which we assume that the mode is already orthogonal to the centre space and then ensure orthogonality with respect to the conjugate mode.

Using the symplectic property of the system [28] the mode conjugate to $T^{(n)}$ is

$$T^{(-n)} = \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix} : \quad (12)$$

Applying the inside-out Gram-Schmidt procedure to equations (11) gives

$$\begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} q^+ \\ p \end{pmatrix} + \left(\begin{pmatrix} p \\ p \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

or two equations to solve for the scale factor λ . It is straightforward to see that as the mode is normalised $\begin{pmatrix} q \\ q^+ \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} p \\ p \end{pmatrix} = 1$ so both components of equation (13) give the same solution

$$\lambda = 1 + \frac{\left(\begin{pmatrix} p \\ p \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} \right)}{\begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} p \\ p \end{pmatrix}} \quad (14)$$

The full time evolution is infinitely many repeats of this process: free-flight, collision and Gram-Schmidt, so the Lyapunov exponent is given by

$$\lambda = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \ln \left| \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} \right|_i \quad (15)$$

TABLE I: A comparison of predicted (eqns 16, 17, 18) and numerically observed Lyapunov exponents for a 200 particle QOD system with (H, P) boundary conditions at density $\rho = 0.8$ and temperature $T = 1$. We use units where the mass and disk radius R are 1, the total energy is N and the system size is $L_y = 1.15R$ and $L_x = N = L_y$ where ρ is the density. There are small differences between the x and y projections of λ so we include both results.

n	$\frac{N}{2}$	λ_T	$N_{xx} \lambda_T$	$N_{yy} \lambda_T$	$\frac{N}{2}$	λ_{LP}
1	0.0388	0.0393	0.0599	0.0559	0.0502	0.0605
2	0.0749	0.0784	0.1169	0.1044	0.0965	0.1229
3	0.1099	0.1177	0.1507	0.1348	0.1344	0.1848
4	0.1431	0.1571	0.1753	0.1472	0.1591	0.2484
5	0.1748	0.1961	0.1693	0.1391	0.1595	0.3140
6	0.2007	0.2352	0.1855	0.1409	0.1823	0.3791

For the mode T^n , $y_j = \sum_n c_{nj}$ and $p_{yj} = \sum_n c_{nj}$ so assuming that $\sum_j c_{nj}^2 = N=2$, we have

$$\lambda_n = \frac{N}{2} \lambda_{nn} : \quad (16)$$

Similarly, we can consider the evolution of the negative mode T^{-n} and by ensuring orthogonality with respect to its conjugate mode T^n , the result will be $\lambda_n = \frac{N}{2} \lambda_{nn} = \lambda_{nn}$.

Next treat the longitudinal part of the LP mode without its explicit time dependence. Clearly this is just the same as the transverse mode and the result is

$$\lambda_n = \frac{N}{2} \lambda_{nn} : \quad (17)$$

We treat the momentum dependent part of the LP mode without its explicit time dependence and ensure orthogonality with respect to the conjugate P component. A similar argument leads to the result

$$\lambda_n = N \lambda_{nn} T : \quad (18)$$

where the temperature is given by $2N T = \sum_j p_j^2$. A gain the negative exponent is simply $\lambda_n = -\lambda_n$ for both L and P components of the mode.

In table I we compare the predicted and numerical results for the Lyapunov exponents of the first six modes of each type. The first T mode and P mode are quite accurate but the first L mode is 20% less than the numerical result. Generally the results become worse for higher order modes.

There are a number of possible sources of error. The dynamics is limited by the size of the neglected term and will be worse for larger n . Probably the most important limitation is the simplified inside-out Gram-Schmidt procedure as it assumes that the functional forms for the modes are already orthogonal to the centre space of Z modes. At any finite N this is not correct and any more exact inside-out Gram-Schmidt procedure would need to

work systematically ensuring orthogonality with all previous modes. Thus, for example, to Gram-Schmidt the 3rd mode it should be explicitly made orthogonal to the centre space, the 1st and 2nd modes and any LP modes with lower value exponents.

In conclusion, we have shown that the Lyapunov exponents for all types of modes can be calculated using an inside-out Gram-Schmidt procedure and a complete knowledge of the functional form of the modes. The simplified Gram-Schmidt procedure is only accurate for the first T and P mode components but the systematic approach suggested above may improve the accuracy but at the cost of the simplicity of the result. Thus we see that the same information that is encoded in the modes is also encoded in the values of the exponents.

In all numerical calculations of Lyapunov modes there are a set of modes which are stable below some maximum mode number n_{max} . Here we require that in the dynamics of equation (9) is less than some threshold n_{max} which we can estimate from the numerics used to generate table I. For a system of $N = 200$ disks we find that $n_{max} = 24$, and for the QOD system x_{ij} is positive and bounded by $\frac{1}{4} L_y^2 = 4 < x_{ij} < 1$. Therefore $n_{max} = 0.35x_{ij}$ which corresponds to about 8 particles per half wavelength. If the initial Lyapunov vector is mode-like for a particular n then the dynamics will preserve its mode-like character for $n < n_{max}$ and it will be unstable for $n > n_{max}$. The question of the stability or otherwise of a particular mode is a different level of stability for this system.

-
- [1] P. Gaspard, Chaos, scattering and statistical mechanics (Cambridge University press, 1998).
 - [2] J. R. Dorfman, An introduction to chaos in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics (Cambridge University press, Cambridge, 1999).
 - [3] D. J. Evans and G. P. Morriss, Statistical mechanics of nonequilibrium liquids 2nd Ed. (Cambridge University press, Cambridge, 2008).
 - [4] G. Benettin, L. Galgani, and J.-M. Strelcyn, Phys. Rev. A 14, 2338 (1976).
 - [5] G. Benettin, L. Galgani, A. Giorgilli and J.-M. Strelcyn, Meccanica 15, 9 (1980); 15, 21 (1980)
 - [6] I. Shimada and T. Nagashima, Prog. Theor. Phys. 61, 1605 (1979).
 - [7] F. Ginelli, P. Poggi, A. Turchi, H. Chate, R. Livi and A. Politi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, 130601 (2007).
 - [8] I. G. Szendro, D. Pazo, M. A. Rodriguez and J. M. Lopez,

- Phys. Rev. E 76 025202 (2007).
- [9] D. Pazo, I. G. Szendro, J. M. Lopez and M. A. Rodriguez, Phys. Rev. E 78 016209 (2008).
- [10] D. J. Evans, E. G. D. Cohen, and G. P. Morriss, Phys. Rev. A 42, 5990 (1990).
- [11] C. P. Dettmann and G. P. Morriss, Phys. Rev. E 53, R5545 (1996).
- [12] T. Taniguchi and G. P. Morriss, Phys. Rev. E 66, 066203 (2002).
- [13] D. J. Evans, E. G. D. Cohen, and G. P. Morriss, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 2401; 71, 3616 (1993).
- [14] G. Gallavotti and E. G. D. Cohen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 2694 (1995).
- [15] H. A. Posch and R. Hirschl, in Hard ball systems and the Lorentz gas, edited by D. Szasz (Springer, Berlin, 2000), p. 279.
- [16] T. Taniguchi and G. P. Morriss, Phys. Rev. E 68, 026218 (2003).
- [17] C. Forster, R. Hirschl, H. A. Posch and W. G. Hoover, Physica D 187, 294 (2004).
- [18] S. McNamara and M. Mareschal, Phys. Rev. E 64, 051103 (2001).
- [19] T. Taniguchi and G. P. Morriss, Phys. Rev. E 71, 016218 (2005).
- [20] J.-P. Eckmann, C. Forster, H. A. Posch and E. Zabey, J. Stat. Phys. 118, 813 (2005).
- [21] T. Taniguchi and G. P. Morriss, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 154101 (2005).
- [22] D. J. Robinson and G. P. Morriss, J. Stat. Phys., 131, 1 (2008).
- [23] G. P. Morriss and D. Truant, J. Stat. Mech., P02029 (2009).
- [24] H. Yang and Gunter Radons, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100 024101 (2008).
- [25] T. Taniguchi and G. P. Morriss, European Physical Journal B, 50, 305 (2006).
- [26] T. Taniguchi and G. P. Morriss, Physica A 375, 563 (2007).
- [27] L. J. Milanovic and H. A. Posch, J. Mol. Liquids, 96-97, 221 (2002).
- [28] T. Taniguchi and G. P. Morriss, Phys. Rev. E 68, 046203 (2003).
- [29] T. Taniguchi and G. P. Morriss, Phys. Rev. E 73, 036208 (2006).
- [30] J.-P. Eckmann and O. Gatz, J. Stat. Phys. 98, 775 (2000).
- [31] T. Taniguchi and G. P. Morriss, Phys. Rev. E 65, 056202 (2002).
- [32] T. Taniguchi, C. P. Dettmann, and G. P. Morriss, J. Stat. Phys. 109, 747 (2002).
- [33] A. S. de Wijn and H. van Beijeren, Phys. Rev. E 70, 016207 (2004).
- [34] C. Forster and H. A. Posch, New J. Phys. 7, 32 (2005).
- [35] H. L. Yang and G. Radons, Phys. Rev. E 71, 036211 (2005).