

# EXPONENTIAL RUNGE KUTTA TIME SEMIDISCRETIZATIONS WITH LOW REGULARITY INITIAL DATA

CLAUDIA WULFF

**ABSTRACT.** We apply exponential Runge Kutta time discretizations to semilinear evolution equations  $\frac{dU}{dt} = AU + B(U)$  posed on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Here  $A$  is normal and generates a strongly continuous semigroup, and  $B$  is assumed to be a smooth nonlinearity from  $\mathcal{Y}_\ell = D(A^\ell)$  to itself, and  $\ell \in I \subseteq [0, L]$ ,  $L \geq 0$ ,  $0, L \in I$ . In particular the semilinear wave equation and nonlinear Schrödinger equation with periodic boundary conditions or posed on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  fit into this framework. We prove convergence of order  $O(h^{\min(\ell, p)})$  for non-smooth initial data  $U^0 \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell$ , where  $\ell > 0$ , for a method of classical order  $p$ . We show in an example of an exponential Euler discretization of a linear evolution equation that our estimates are sharp, and corroborate this in numerical experiments for a semilinear wave equation. To prove our result we Galerkin truncate the semiflow and numerical method and balance the Galerkin truncation error with the error of the time discretization of the projected system. We also extend these results to exponential Rosenbrock methods.

**KEYWORDS:** Semilinear evolution equations, exponential integrator semidiscretizations in time, fractional order of convergence. exponential Rosenbrock methods.

**AMS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION:** 65J08, 65J15, 65M12, 65M15.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We analyze the convergence of exponential Runge Kutta time semidiscretizations of the semilinear evolution equation

$$\frac{dU}{dt} = AU + B(U) \tag{1.1}$$

for low regularity initial data  $U(0) = U^0$ . As in [15] we assume that (1.1) is posed on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{Y}$ ,  $A$  is a normal linear operator that generates a strongly continuous semigroup, and that  $B$  is smooth on a scale of Hilbert spaces  $\{\mathcal{Y}_\ell\}_{\ell \in I}$ ,  $I \subseteq [0, L]$ ,  $0, L \in I$ , see condition (B) below. Here  $\mathcal{Y}_\ell = D(A^\ell) \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ ,  $\ell \geq 0$ . This condition is for example satisfied for the semilinear wave equation and the nonlinear Schrödinger equation in periodic domains or the full space with smooth nonlinearities, but, for  $\ell > 0$ , poses additional restrictions in the case of other boundary conditions, see [15].

Existence of the semiflow of (1.1) is shown in [12]. We discretize (1.1) in time by a possibly implicitly defined exponential Runge Kutta method of the class considered in [1] which, as we show, is well-defined on  $\mathcal{Y}$ . At the end of the paper, in Section 7, we also study exponential Rosenbrock methods as introduced in [6].

Given a time  $T > 0$  we prove an order of convergence  $\mathcal{O}(h^\ell)$  in the  $\mathcal{Y}$  norm for the time-semidiscretization up to time  $T$  for any solution  $U(t)$  of (1.1) with a given

$\mathcal{Y}_\ell$  bound,  $\ell \in I$ , for  $0 < \ell \leq p$ . Here  $\ell > 0$  is such that  $\ell - k \in I$  for  $k = 1, \dots, [\ell]$  (the greatest integer  $\leq \ell$ ), and  $p$  is the order of the exponential integrator, i.e., the order of the integrator if  $A$  in (1.1) is a bounded operator (e.g., if  $\dim \mathcal{Y} < \infty$  so that (1.1) is an ODE). We show in an example of a linear evolution equation that this estimate is sharp (Example 6.2) and for a semilinear wave equation we demonstrate numerical evidence as well, cf. Figure 1 below.

We follow the same strategy as in [15] where we proved an order of convergence  $O(h^{\ell p/(p+1)})$  for A-stable Runge Kutta time semidiscretizations applied to semilinear evolution equations (1.1) for initial data in  $Y_\ell$ ,  $0 < \ell < p + 1$ : our approach is to apply a spectral Galerkin truncation to the evolution equation (1.1) and to estimate the error of the time discretization of the projected evolution equation in terms of the accuracy of the projection. We then balance this error with the projection error to obtain an estimate for the error of the time semi-discretization.

Related results in the literature are as follows: in [7] full order of convergence is shown for explicit exponential Runge Kutta methods (and other classes of explicit exponential integrators) in the case of sufficiently smooth solutions  $t \rightarrow U(t)$  and/or nonlinearities  $t \rightarrow B(U(t))$  and sectorial operators  $A$  under suitable order conditions. In [8] order conditions for smooth solutions of exponential Runge Kutta and exponential Rosenbrock methods are derived. In [13] the author considers the exponential Euler Rosenbrock method applied to a parabolic PDE for non-smooth initial data and proves (in general) fractional order of convergence under certain smoothness assumptions of derivatives of the nonlinearity evaluated at the continuous solution. In [4] the author studies trigonometric integrators applied to the semilinear wave equation with polynomial or analytic nonlinearity on  $S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  and proves error estimates for non-smooth initial data under some conditions on the filter functions of the method. In [11] the authors carry out a coordinate transformation on the “good” Boussinesq equation that transforms it into a semilinear PDE with bounded linear part and design exponential integrators for the transformed PDE which, due to the special structure of the PDE, yields higher convergence estimates than our results for non-smooth initial data in the original coordinates.

The order of convergence of splitting methods applied to semilinear evolution equations is studied in [9], [14], [3],c, see also references therein. In [9] a second order Strang splitting is applied to the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and convergence in the Sobolev norm  $\mathcal{H}_2$  of order 1 and in the  $\mathcal{L}_2$  norm of order 2 is shown for initial data in the Sobolev space  $\mathcal{H}_4$ . In [14] the author studies convergence of high order time splitting methods with pseudospectral space discretizations of nonlinear Schrödinger equations where the nonlinearity has the form  $B(U)U$  and obtains full order in time convergence and high order spatial convergence for smooth initial data. In her analysis she uses fractional order spaces  $\mathcal{Y}_\ell$  as we do. In [3] a Strang splitting is applied to the Vlasov-Poisson equation and full order of convergence is shown for smooth initial data. In [5] a Lie-Trotter time and Fourier space discretization is applied to the Zakharov system and convergence of order 1 in time is proved under a CFL condition.

## 2. SEMILINEAR PDES ON A SCALE OF HILBERT SPACES

In this section we list our assumptions on the semilinear evolution equation (1.1). These are the same as in [15].

We make the following assumptions on the semilinear evolution equation (1.1):

(A1)  $A$  is a normal linear operator on  $\mathcal{Y}$  that generates a strongly continuous semigroup of linear operators  $e^{tA}$  on  $\mathcal{Y}$  in the sense of [12].

We define  $\mathcal{Y}_\ell = D(A^\ell)$ ,  $\ell \geq 0$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}_0 = \mathcal{Y}$ . For  $m > 0$  we define  $\mathbb{P}_m$  to be the spectral projection of  $A$  to  $\text{spec}(A) \cap \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{C}^m(0)$ , and let  $\mathbb{Q}_m = \text{id} - \mathbb{P}_m$ . Here for a normed space  $\mathcal{X}$  we let

$$\mathcal{B}_\mathcal{X}^R(U^0) = \{U \in \mathcal{X} : \|U - U^0\|_\mathcal{X} \leq R\}.$$

We endow  $\mathcal{Y}_\ell$  with the inner product

$$\langle U_1, U_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} = \langle \mathbb{P}_1 U_1, \mathbb{P}_1 U_2 \rangle_\mathcal{Y} + \langle |A|^\ell \mathbb{Q}_1 U_1, |A|^\ell \mathbb{Q}_1 U_2 \rangle_\mathcal{Y}, \quad (2.1)$$

In the following for  $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$  let  $[\ell] = \max\{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : n \leq \ell\}$  and  $[\ell] = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : n \geq \ell\}$ . Moreover for  $R > 0$  and  $\ell \geq 0$  we abbreviate  $\mathcal{B}_\ell^R = \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell}^R(0)$ . We make the following assumption for the nonlinearity  $B(U)$  of (1.1).

(B) There exists  $L \geq 0$ ,  $I \subseteq [0, L]$ ,  $0, L \in I$ ,  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $N > [L]$ , such that  $B \in \mathcal{C}_b^{N-[\ell]}(\mathcal{B}_\ell^R; \mathcal{Y}_\ell)$  for all  $\ell \in I$  and  $R > 0$ .

Here for Banach spaces  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}$ ,  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{C}_b^k(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Z})$  the set of  $k$  times continuously differentiable functions  $F: \text{int}\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  such that  $F$  and its derivatives  $D^i F$  are bounded as maps from the interior  $\text{int}\mathcal{U}$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  to the space of  $i$ -multilinear bounded maps from  $\mathcal{X}$  to  $\mathcal{Z}$  and extend continuously to the boundary of  $\text{int}\mathcal{U}$  for  $i \leq k$ . We set  $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Z}) = \mathcal{C}_b^0(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Z})$ .

We denote the supremum of  $B: \mathcal{B}_\ell^R \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_\ell$  as  $M_\ell[R]$  and the supremum of its  $k$ th derivative as  $M_\ell^{(k)}[R]$  and set  $M'_\ell[R] = M_\ell^{(1)}[R]$ ,  $M[R] = M_0[R]$  and  $M'[R] = M'_0[R]$ . Moreover we define

$$I^- := \{\ell \in I, \ell - k \in I, k = 1, \dots, [\ell]\}. \quad (2.2)$$

We write  $\Phi^t(U^0) \equiv \Phi(U^0, t) \equiv U(t)$  for the solution of (1.1) with initial value  $U(0) = U^0 \in \mathcal{Y}$  which exists on some time interval  $[0, T]$ ,  $T > 0$  by [12]. The following theorem [15, Theorem 2.2] provides additional regularity of the semiflow  $\Phi^t$  under our assumptions.

**Theorem 2.1** (Regularity of the semiflow). *Assume (A1) and (B). Let  $R > 0$ . Then there is  $T_* > 0$  such that there exists a semiflow  $\Phi$  of (1.1) which satisfies*

$$\Phi^t \in \mathcal{C}_b^N(\mathcal{B}_0^{R/2}; \mathcal{B}_0^R) \quad (2.3a)$$

with uniform bounds in  $t \in [0, T_*]$ . Moreover if  $\ell \in I^-$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $k \leq \ell$ , then

$$\Phi(U) \in \mathcal{C}_b^k([0, T_*]; \mathcal{B}_0^R) \quad (2.3b)$$

with uniform bounds in  $U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2}$ . The bounds on  $T_*$  and  $\Phi$  depend only on  $R$ ,  $\omega$  from (2.4), and the bounds afforded by assumption (B) on balls of radius  $R$ .

Examples of PDEs satisfying assumptions (A) and (B) are the semilinear wave equation and nonlinear Schrödinger equation with periodic, Neumann and Dirichlet boundary conditions as discussed in [15].

Assumption (A1) implies that

$$\Re(\text{spec}(A)) \leq \omega, \quad \|e^{tA}\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \leq e^{\omega t}, \quad (2.4)$$

for some  $\omega \geq 0$ , see [12]. Let us decompose  $A$  as  $A_{\text{skew}} = \frac{1}{2}(A - A^*)$ ,  $A_{\text{sym}} = \frac{1}{2}(A + A^*)$ . Then  $A_{\text{skew}}$  and  $A_{\text{sym}}$  commute,  $A = A_{\text{skew}} + A_{\text{sym}}$ ,  $A_{\text{skew}}$  is a skew symmetric operator and  $A_{\text{sym}}$  is self-adjoint and its spectrum is bounded from above by (2.4):  $\text{spec}(A_{\text{sym}}) \leq \omega$ . Let  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{sym}}^\pm$  the spectral projection of  $A_{\text{sym}}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^\pm$

and  $A_{\text{sym}}^{\pm} := \mathbb{P}_{\text{sym}}^{\pm} A_{\text{sym}}$ . From now on we assume without loss of generality that  $\omega = 0$  in (2.4) by adding  $A_{\text{sym}}^+ U$  to  $B(U)$  and replacing  $A$  by  $A_{\text{skew}} + A_{\text{sym}}^-$ .

(A2)  $A$  satisfies (2.4) with  $\omega = 0$ .

### 3. EXPONENTIAL RUNGE KUTTA METHODS

As in [1] we consider numerical methods of the form

$$W = \exp(hcA)U^0 \mathbb{1} + ha(hA)B(W), \quad (3.1a)$$

$$U^1 = \exp(hA)U^0 + hb^T(hA)B(W). \quad (3.1b)$$

which are called exponential Runge Kutta methods. Here we define

$$U\mathbb{1} = \begin{pmatrix} U \\ \vdots \\ U \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{Y}^s \text{ for } U \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad W = \begin{pmatrix} W^1 \\ \vdots \\ W^s \end{pmatrix}, \quad B(W) = \begin{pmatrix} B(W^1) \\ \vdots \\ B(W^s) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.2)$$

$W^1, \dots, W^s$  are the stage vectors,  $0 \leq c_1 \leq c_2 \leq \dots \leq c_s \leq 1$  and we denote

$$(\mathbf{a}W)^i = \sum_{j=1}^s \mathbf{a}_{ij} W^j, \quad \mathbf{b}^T W = \sum_{i=1}^s \mathbf{b}_i W^i, \quad cW = \begin{pmatrix} c_1 W^1 \\ c_2 W^2 \\ \vdots \\ c_s W^s \end{pmatrix}.$$

We define

$$\|W\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s} := \max_{j=1, \dots, s} \|W^j\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell}. \quad (3.3)$$

#### Examples 3.1.

(a) For the *exponential Euler method*

$$U^1 = \exp(hA)U^0 + h\varphi_1(hA)B(U^0)$$

we have  $s = 1$ ,  $\mathbf{b}(z) = \varphi_1(z)$ ,  $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{c} = 0$  and  $\varphi_1(z) = \frac{e^z - 1}{z}$ , see e.g. [7].

(b) For the *Euler-Larson method*  $U^1 = \exp(hA)U^0 + h \exp(hA)B(U^0)$  we have  $s = 1$ ,  $\mathbf{b}(z) = \exp(z)$ ,  $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{c} = 0$ .

(c) For the *implicit Lawson-Euler method*  $U^1 = \exp(hA)U^0 + hB(U^1)$  we have  $s = 1$ ,  $\mathbf{b}(z) = 1$ ,  $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{c} = 1$ .

We assume the following:

(EXP)  $\mathbf{a} : \mathbb{C}_0^- \rightarrow \text{Mat}_{\mathbb{C}}(s, s)$ ,  $\mathbf{b} : \mathbb{C}_0^- \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^s$  and their derivatives are analytic and bounded with bounds  $M_{\mathbf{a}}^{(k)} = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}_0^-} \|\mathbf{a}^{(k)}(z)\|_{\infty}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $M_{\mathbf{a}} = M_{\mathbf{a}}^{(0)}$ ,  $M'_{\mathbf{a}} = M_{\mathbf{a}}^{(1)}$ , and  $M_{\mathbf{b}}^{(k)} = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}_0^-} \|\mathbf{b}^{(k)}(z)\|_1$ ,  $M_{\mathbf{b}}^{(0)} = M_{\mathbf{b}}$ ,  $M'_{\mathbf{b}} = M_{\mathbf{b}}^{(1)}$ .

Assumption (EXP) is true for the examples above. Note that  $\mathbf{a}(hA)$  and  $\mathbf{b}(hA)$  are well defined by functional calculus because  $A$  is a normal operator.

### 4. REGULARITY OF THE EXPONENTIAL RUNGE-KUTTA METHOD

To prove regularity of the exponential Runge-Kutta method we use the following estimate which follow from (2.1):

$$\|A^\ell\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \leq 1 \text{ for } \ell \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|U\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} \leq \|U\|_{\mathcal{Y}_n} \text{ for } 0 \leq \ell \leq n \quad (4.1)$$

We also need the following lemma:

**Lemma 4.1** (Bounds on the  $h$  derivatives of  $\mathbf{a}(hA)$  and  $\mathbf{b}(hA)$ ). *Assume (EXP), (A1) and (A2). Then for all  $\ell \geq 0$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $\ell \geq k$ ,  $h \geq 0$ ,  $W \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell^s$ ,*

$$h \mapsto \mathbf{a}(hA)W \in \mathcal{C}_b^k(\mathbb{R}_0^+; \mathcal{Y}_{\ell-k}^s), \quad h \mapsto \mathbf{b}(hA)W \in \mathcal{C}_b^k(\mathbb{R}_0^+; \mathcal{Y}_{\ell-k})$$

and

$$\|\partial_h^k(\mathbf{a}(hA))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell-k}^s} \leq M_a^{(k)}, \quad \|\partial_h^k(\mathbf{b}(hA))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell-k}} \leq M_b^{(k)}, \quad (4.2a)$$

$$\|\partial_h^k(h\mathbf{a}(hA))W\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-k}^s} \leq kM_a^{(k-1)}\|W\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-1}^s} + hM_a^{(k)}\|W\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s} \leq M_{h,a}^{(k)}\|W\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s}, \quad (4.2b)$$

$$\|\partial_h^k(h\mathbf{b}(hA))W\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-k}} \leq kM_b^{(k-1)}\|W\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-1}^s} + hM_b^{(k)}\|W\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s} \leq M_{h,b}^{(k)}\|W\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s}, \quad (4.2c)$$

with  $M_a^{(k)}$ ,  $M_b^{(k)}$  from (EXP) and  $M_{h,a}^{(k)} = kM_a^{(k-1)} + hM_a^{(k)}$ ,  $M_{h,b}^{(k)} = kM_b^{(k-1)} + hM_b^{(k)}$ .

*Proof.* We define  $\mathbb{P}_m W$  such that  $(\mathbb{P}_m W)^i = \mathbb{P}_m W^i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, s$ . The fact that  $\mathbf{a}(hA) : \mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_\ell^s$  and  $\mathbf{b}(hA) : \mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_\ell$  are bounded and strongly continuous in  $h$  follows from the smoothness of  $\mathbf{a}(hA)\mathbb{P}_m$  and  $\mathbf{b}(hA)\mathbb{P}_m$  in  $h$  which is guaranteed by assumptions (EXP), (A1) and holds for all  $m > 0$ . Moreover  $\partial_h^k \mathbf{a}(hA) = A^k \mathbf{a}^{(k)}(hA)$  and so by (4.1) we have  $\|\partial_h^k(\mathbf{a}(hA))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell-k}^s} \leq M_a^{(k)}$ . The same holds for  $\mathbf{b}(hA)$ . We have  $\partial_h(h\mathbf{a}(hA)) = \mathbf{a}(hA) + hA\mathbf{a}'(hA)$  and iteratively

$$\partial_h^k(h\mathbf{a}(hA)) = kA^{k-1}\mathbf{a}^{(k-1)}(hA) + hA^k\mathbf{a}^{(k)}(hA)$$

and so (4.2b) holds. The same applies for  $\mathbf{b}(hA)$  which proves (4.2c).  $\square$

**Theorem 4.2** (Regularity of numerical method). *Assume (A1), (A2) and (B), and apply an exponential integrator  $\Psi$  satisfying condition (EXP) to (1.1). Let  $R > 0$ . Then there is  $h_* > 0$  such that*

$$W^i(\cdot, h), \Psi(\cdot, h) \in \mathcal{C}_b^N(\mathcal{B}_0^{R/2}; \mathcal{B}_0^R) \quad (4.3a)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, s$ , with uniform bounds in  $h \in [0, h_*]$ . Moreover, for  $\ell \in I^-$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $k \leq \ell$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, s$ ,

$$W^i(U, \cdot), \Psi(U, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}_b^k([0, h_*]; \mathcal{B}_0^R) \quad (4.3b)$$

with uniform bounds in  $U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^r$ . The bounds on  $\Psi$ ,  $W$  and  $h_*$  depend only on  $R$ , the bounds from (B) for  $B$  and its derivatives on balls of radius  $R$  and the bounds of the constants of the numerical method from (EXP).

*Proof.* If the numerical method is explicit (i.e.,  $\mathbf{a}_{ij} = 0$  for  $i \leq j$ ) then we choose  $h_* > 0$  such that  $h_* \max(M_a, M_b)M[R] \leq \frac{R}{2}$  noting (3.1) and (A2). If the method is implicit, then, similarly as in [15], we compute  $W$  as fixed point of the map  $\Pi : \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}^s}^R(0) \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}^{R/2}}^R(0) \times [0, h_*] \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s$ , given by

$$\Pi(W, U, h) = \exp(hcA)\mathbb{1}U + h\mathbf{a}(hA)B(W) \quad (4.4)$$

using (3.1a). For  $U \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}^{R/2}}^R(0)$ ,  $W \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}^s}^R(0)$  we get from (3.3), (A2) and (B) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi(W, U, h)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} &\leq \|\exp(hcA)\mathbb{1}U\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} + h\|\mathbf{a}(hA)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s}M[R] \\ &\leq R/2 + hM_a M[R] \leq R \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

for  $h \in [0, h_*]$  and  $h_*$  as above. So  $\Pi$  maps  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}^s}^R(0)$  to itself. Next choose  $h_*$  such that also  $2h_*M_a M'[R] \leq 1$ . Then  $\|\mathbb{D}_W \Pi(W, U, h)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \leq hM_a M'[R] \leq 1/2$  for  $W \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}^s}^R(0)$ ,  $h \in [0, h_*]$ , and  $\Pi$  is a contraction. Moreover  $\Pi$  is continuous in  $h$  by assumption (A1) and Lemma 4.1. Therefore, by (B),  $W \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}^{R/2}}^R(0) \times$

$[0, h_*]; \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Y}^s}^R(0)$  with  $N$  derivatives in  $U$ . This proves (4.3a) and also (4.3b) in the case  $k = 0$  for  $W$ . If  $k \neq 0$  then, since  $\ell \in I^-$ , the above argument also holds if  $\mathcal{Y}$  is replaced by  $\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, k$ . Hence there is some  $h_* > 0$  such that  $W^i \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{B}_{\ell-j}^{R/2} \times [0, h_*]; \mathcal{B}_{\ell-j}^R)$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, k$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, s$ . The map  $\Pi$  from (4.4) belongs to the class of contraction mappings studied in [10, Appendix]. Hence by the results of [10, Appendix] for  $U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2}$  the  $h$  derivatives up to order  $k$  of  $W$  can then be obtained by implicit differentiation of  $\Pi(W, U, h) = W(U, h)$ . Moreover the  $h$  derivatives of  $\Psi$  can be obtained by differentiating (3.1b), using Lemma 4.1.  $\square$

## 5. GALERKIN TRUNCATION OF THE EXPONENTIAL RUNGE KUTTA METHOD

In this section we truncate the semiflow  $\Phi^t$  of (1.1) and the numerical method  $\Psi^h$  defined by (3.1) to a Galerkin subspace of  $\mathcal{Y}$  and study the truncation error. Let  $\phi_m^t(u_m^0) = u_m(t)$  be the flow of the projected evolution equation

$$\frac{du_m}{dt} = Au_m + B_m(u_m) \quad (5.1)$$

where  $B_m(U) = \mathbb{P}_m B(\mathbb{P}_m U)$ ,  $A_m = \mathbb{P}_m A$  and define  $\Phi_m^t := \phi_m^t \circ \mathbb{P}_m$ . (2.1) implies the following estimates which are crucial for our analysis: for  $\ell \geq 0$ ,  $k \geq 0$ ,  $m \geq 1$ ,

$$\|A^\ell \mathbb{P}_m U\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq m^\ell \|\mathbb{P}_m U\|_{\mathcal{Y}}, \quad \|\mathbb{P}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell+k}} \leq m^k, \quad \|\mathbb{Q}_m U\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq m^{-\ell} \|U\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell}. \quad (5.2)$$

As shown in [15] the following holds:

**Lemma 5.1** (Projection error for the semiflow). *Assume (A1), (A2) and (B) and let  $\ell > 0$ . Then Theorem 2.1 applies to the Galerkin truncated semiflow of (1.1) uniformly in  $m \geq 0$ . Moreover for fixed  $\delta > 0$  and  $T > 0$  and for all  $U^0$  with*

$$\|\Phi^t(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} \leq R, \quad t \in [0, T] \quad (5.3a)$$

there is  $m_* \geq 0$  such that for  $m \geq m_*$  we have  $\Phi_m^t(U^0) \in \mathcal{B}_0^{R+\delta}$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ , and

$$\|\Phi^t(U^0) - \Phi_m^t(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} = m^{-\ell} \text{Re}^{tM'} = \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}) \quad (5.3b)$$

for  $m \geq m_*$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ , where  $M' = M'_0[R + \delta]$ . Here  $m_*$  and the order constant depend only on  $\delta$ ,  $R$ ,  $T$ , (2.4) and the bounds afforded by (B) on balls of radius  $R + \delta$ .

Let  $\psi_m^h(u_m^0)$  be the exponential Runge-Kutta integrator  $\Psi$  applied to the projected semilinear evolution equation (5.1) and  $w_m = w_m(u_m^0, h)$  its stage vector and set  $W_m(\cdot, h) = w_m(\mathbb{P}_m \cdot, h)$ ,  $\Psi_m^h = \psi_m^h \circ \mathbb{P}_m$ . Similar to Lemma 5.1, we have the following result:

**Lemma 5.2** (Projection error of numerical method). *Assume (A1), (A2), (B), and (EXP). Let  $R > 0$ . Then there is  $h_* > 0$  such that Theorem 4.2 applies to the stage vector  $W_m$  and numerical method  $\Psi_m$  of the projected system (5.1) with uniform bounds in  $m \geq 0$ . Moreover, if  $\ell \in I$ ,  $\ell > 0$ , then for  $m \geq 0$  we get*

$$\sup_{\substack{U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2} \\ h \in [0, h_*]}} \|W(U, h) - W_m(U, h)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} = \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}) \quad (5.4a)$$

and

$$\sup_{\substack{U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2} \\ h \in [0, h_*]}} \|\Psi(U, h) - \Psi_m(U, h)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}). \quad (5.4b)$$

The bounds on  $h_*$ ,  $\Psi_m$  and  $W_m$  and the order constants depend only on  $R$ , the bounds from (B) on  $B$  and its derivatives on balls of radius  $R$  and on the bounds of the constants of the numerical method from (EXP).

*Proof.* The fact that Theorem 4.2 applies to the projected system uniformly in  $m \geq 0$  is immediate from its proof. Moreover using (3.1a) we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\|W(U, h) - W_m(U, h)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} &\leq \|\exp(chA)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \|\mathbb{Q}_m U\|_{\mathcal{Y}} + \|ha(hA)\mathbb{Q}_m B(W)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \\
&\quad + h\|\mathbf{a}(hA)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \|\mathbb{P}_m(B(W) - B(W_m))\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \\
&\leq \|\mathbb{Q}_m U\|_{\mathcal{Y}} + hM_a m^{-\ell} M_\ell[R] \\
&\quad + hM_a \|\mathbb{P}_m B(W(U, h)) - \mathbb{P}_m B(W_m(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \\
&\leq \|U\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} m^{-\ell} + hM_a m^{-\ell} M_\ell[R] \\
&\quad + hM_a M' \|W(U, h) - W_m(U, h)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s}. \tag{5.5}
\end{aligned}$$

Here  $M' = M'_0[R]$  and we used (A1), (A2), (EXP) and (5.2). Hence

$$\sup_{\substack{U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2} \\ h \in [0, h_*]}} \|W(U, h) - W_m(U, h)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \leq \frac{m^{-\ell} R/2 + h_* M_a m^{-\ell} M_\ell[R]}{1 - h_* M_a M'}$$

proving (5.4a). For the numerical method using (3.1b), Lemma 4.1, (A1), (A2) and (5.2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Psi^h(U) - \Psi_m^h(U)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} &\leq \|\exp(hA)\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \|\mathbb{Q}_m U\|_{\mathcal{Y}} + \|\mathbb{Q}_m \mathbf{b}(hA)B(W)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \\
&\quad + h\|\mathbf{b}(hA)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \|\mathbb{P}_m(B(W) - B(W_m))\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \\
&\leq \|U\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} m^{-\ell} + h\|\mathbf{b}(hA)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} m^{-\ell} M_\ell[R] \\
&\quad + h\|\mathbf{b}(hA)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} M' \|W(U) - W_m(U)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \\
&\leq \|U\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} m^{-\ell} + hM_b m^{-\ell} M_\ell[R] + hM_b M' \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used (5.4a) in the last line.  $\square$

Note that an analogous result has been obtained, for A-stable Runge-Kutta methods, in [15, Lemma 4.3].

## 6. TRAJECTORY ERROR BOUNDS FOR NON-SMOOTH DATA

In this section we prove our main result for exponential Runge-Kutta methods:

**Theorem 6.1** (Trajectory error for nonsmooth data). *Assume (A1), (A2) and (B) and apply an exponential Runge-Kutta method (3.1) subject to (EXP) to (1.1). Let  $\ell \in I^-$ ,  $\ell > 0$ , and fix  $T > 0$  and  $R > 0$ . Then there exist constants  $h_* > 0$ ,  $c_1 > 0$ ,  $c_2 > 0$  such that for every  $U^0$  with*

$$\|\Phi^t(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} \leq R, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T] \tag{6.1}$$

and for all  $h \in [0, h_*]$  we have

$$\|\Phi^{nh}(U^0) - (\Psi^h)^n(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq c_1 e^{c_2 nh} h^{\min(\ell, p)}, \tag{6.2}$$

provided that  $nh \leq T$ . The constants  $h_*$ ,  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  depend only on  $R$ ,  $T$ , the bounds from (EXP) on the numerical method and the bounds afforded by (B).

Before we prove this result we provide an example of a linear evolution equation and some numerical evidence where the estimates are sharp.

**Example 6.2.** Applying the exponential Euler method to a linear evolution equation  $\dot{U} = AU + BU$  with  $A$  skew-symmetric and  $[A, B] = 0$  gives

$$U(nh) - U^n = e^{nhA}(e^{nhB} - (\text{id} + hC(hA))^n)U^0.$$

where  $C(hA) = \varphi_1(-hA)B$ . Assume that  $\text{spec}(A) = i\mathbb{Z}$  and let  $Ae_k = ik e_k$ ,  $Be_k = \lambda_k e_k$ ,  $\|e_k\|_{\mathcal{Y}} = 1$ . Let  $h = \pi/k$ ,  $n = k$ . Then we compute that  $C(hA)e_k = -\frac{2i}{\pi}\lambda_k e_k$  and so

$$(\text{id} + hC(hA))^n e_k = (e^{-2i\lambda_k} + O(h))e_k$$

which is not close to  $e^{nhB}e_k = e^{\pi\lambda_k}e_k$ , so the global error is  $O(1)$  for  $U^0 = e_k$ . If we choose  $U = O(k^{-\ell})e_k$  then  $\|\varphi_1(-hA)U - U\|_{\mathcal{Y}} = O(khk^{-\ell}) = O(h^\ell)$  and so we get an convergence error of order  $h^\ell$ . So the estimate of Theorem 6.1 is sharp in this case.




FIGURE 1. Plot of a numerical estimate of  $q(\ell)$  against  $\ell$  for the exponential Euler method applied to the semilinear wave equation, with the prediction of Theorem 6.1 for comparison.

**Example 6.3.** In Figure 1 we display the order of convergence of the exponential Euler method (see Example 3.1) which has classical order  $p = 1$  applied to the semilinear wave equation  $u_{tt} = u_{xx} - V'(u)$ ,  $x \in [0, 2\pi]$ , with periodic boundary conditions and  $V'(u) = u - 4u^2$  for  $\ell = j/2$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, 6$ , on the integration interval  $t \in [0, 0.5]$ , using a fine spatial mesh (we use  $N = 1000$  grid points on  $[0, 2\pi]$ ). As in [15] we choose the initial values  $U^0 = (u^0, v^0) \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell$  where

$$u^0(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{N=1} \frac{c_u}{k^{\ell+1/2+\epsilon}} (\cos kx + \sin kx), \quad v^0(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{N=1} \frac{c_v}{k^{\ell+1/2+\epsilon}} (\cos kx + \sin kx).$$

Here  $c_u$  and  $c_v$  are such that  $\|U^0\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} = 1$ , with  $U^0 = (u^0, v^0)$ , and  $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$ . Approximating the order of convergence of the method numerically as in [15] we see that the numerical data confirm the theoretically predicted order of convergence  $q(\ell) = \ell$  for initial data in  $\mathcal{Y}_\ell$ ,  $\ell \leq p$  of Theorem 6.1. Note that the order of convergence does not decrease to exactly 0 at  $\ell = 0$  because we simulate a space-time discretization rather than a time semidiscretization.



To prove Theorem 6.1 we analyze the dependence on  $m$  of the local error of an exponential Runge-Kutta method (6.1) applied to the Galerkin truncated equation (5.1) for low regularity initial data under the assumptions (A1), (A2), (B) and (EXP). As in [15] for  $A$ -stable Runge-Kutta methods, by coupling  $m$  and  $h$  and balancing the Galerkin truncation error and trajectory error of the Galerkin truncated system, we prove our convergence result, Theorem 6.1.

**6.1. Some lemmas.** We first present some lemmas that will be needed in the proof. Let  $\hat{\Phi}_m^t = \Phi_m^t - e^{tA_m} \mathbb{P}_m$ , where  $A_m = \mathbb{P}_m A$ . In the following let  $[a]_+ = \max(a, 0)$  for  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Lemma 6.4** ( $m$ -dependent bounds for derivatives of  $\Phi_m$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_m$ ). *Assume (A1), (A2) and (B) and choose  $\ell \in I^-$ ,  $T > 0$  and  $R > 0$ . Then for all  $U^0$  satisfying*

$$\Phi_m^t(U^0) \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^R \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T], \quad m \geq m_*, \quad (6.3a)$$

and for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $N \geq k$ ,  $\Phi_m(U^0) \in \mathcal{C}_b^k([0, T]; \mathcal{B}_0^R)$  with  $m$  dependent bounds on the derivatives that satisfy

$$\|\partial_t^k \Phi_m^t(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{C}_b([0, T]; \mathcal{Y})} = \mathcal{O}(m^{[k-\ell]_+}) \quad (6.3b)$$

and

$$\|\partial_t^k \hat{\Phi}_m^t(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} = O(m^{[k-\ell-1]_+}) + O(tm^{[k-\ell]_+}). \quad (6.3c)$$

The order constants only depend on  $T$ ,  $R$ , (2.4) and the bounds from (B).

*Proof.* (6.3b) is shown in [15, Lemma 5.1]. To prove (6.3c) note that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \hat{\Phi}_m^t(U^0) &= A_m \Phi_m^t(U^0) + B_m(\Phi_m^t(U^0)) - A_m e^{tA_m} \mathbb{P}_m U^0 \\ &= A_m \hat{\Phi}_m^t(U^0) + B_m(\Phi_m^t(U^0)). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\partial_t^2 \hat{\Phi}_m^t(U^0) = A_m^2 \hat{\Phi}_m^t(U^0) + \frac{d}{dt} (B_m(\Phi_m^t(U^0))) + A_m B_m(\Phi_m^t(U^0))$$

and more generally

$$\partial_t^k \hat{\Phi}_m^t(U^0) = A_m^k \hat{\Phi}_m^t(U^0) + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} A_m^{k-1-j} \frac{d^j}{dt^j} (B_m(\Phi_m^t(U^0))).$$

Hence for  $U^0 \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell$  by (4.1)

$$\|\partial_t^k \hat{\Phi}_m^t(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq \|\hat{\Phi}_m^t(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left\| \frac{d^j}{dt^j} (B_m(\Phi_m^t(U^0))) \right\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{k-1-j}} \quad (6.4)$$

Moreover

$$\hat{\Phi}_m^t(U^0) = \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A_m} B_m(\Phi_m^s(U^0)) ds$$

and so by (A2) and (B)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\Phi}_m^t(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k} &\leq t \max_{s \in [0, t]} \|B_m(\Phi_m^s(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k} \leq t \max_{s \in [0, t]} m^{[k-\ell]_+} \|B_m(\Phi_m^s(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} \\ &\leq tm^{[k-\ell]_+} M_{\min(\ell, k)}[R]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

Using the Faà di Bruno formula [2] we find that for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $i \leq N$ , with  $u_m = \Phi_m^t(U^0) \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^R$ ,

$$\frac{d^i}{dt^i} (B_m(u_m)) = \sum_{1 \leq \beta \leq i} \frac{i! D_u^\beta B_m(u_m)}{j_1! \cdots j_i!} \prod_{\alpha=1}^i \left( \frac{\partial_t^\alpha u_m}{\alpha!} \right)^{j_\alpha}, \quad (6.6)$$

where  $\beta = j_1 + \cdots + j_i$  and the sum is over all  $j_\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $\alpha = 1, \dots, i$ , with  $j_1 + 2j_2 + \cdots + ij_i = i$ . Using (6.3b) and the Faa di Bruno formula we then get

$$\left\| \frac{i! D_u^\beta B_m(u_m)}{j_1! \cdots j_i!} \prod_{\alpha=1}^i \left( \frac{\partial_t^\alpha u_m}{\alpha!} \right)^{j_\alpha} \right\|_{\mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{O}(m^n)$$

with

$$n = (\lceil \ell \rceil - \ell)j_{\lceil \ell \rceil} + \cdots + (i - \ell)j_i \leq [i - \ell]_+. \quad (6.7)$$

Hence for  $N \geq i$ ,  $\ell \geq 0$

$$\left\| \frac{d^i}{dt^i} (B_m(u_m)) \right\|_{\mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{O}(m^{[i-\ell]_+}).$$

Replacing  $\mathcal{Y}$  by  $\mathcal{Y}_{k-1-j}$ ,  $\ell$  by  $\ell - (k-1-j)$  and  $i$  by  $j$  we see that for  $U \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell$

$$\left\| \frac{d^j}{dt^j} (B_m(u_m)) \right\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{k-1-j}} = \mathcal{O}(m^{[j-(\ell-(k-1-j))]_+}) = \mathcal{O}(m^{[k-\ell-1]_+}).$$

Plugging this into (6.4) and using (6.5) shows (6.3c).  $\square$

Similar to Lemma [15, Lemma 5.2] for  $A$ -stable Runge Kutta methods we have:

**Lemma 6.5** ( $m$ -dependent bounds for derivatives of  $W_m$ ). *Assume (A1), (A2) and (B), and apply an exponential Runge-Kutta method  $\Psi$  satisfying (EXP) to (1.1). Let  $R > 0$  and  $\ell \in I^-$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  with  $\ell \leq k \leq N$ . Then there is  $h_* > 0$  such that for  $m \geq 0$  and  $i = 1, \dots, s$ ,*

$$W_m^i(U, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}_b^k([0, h_*]; \mathcal{B}_0^R) \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, s \quad (6.8a)$$

with  $m$ -dependent bounds which are uniform in  $U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2}$ . Moreover

$$\sup_{\substack{U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2} \\ h \in [0, h_*]}} \|\partial_h^k W_m(U, h)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} = \mathcal{O}(m^{k-\ell}) \quad (6.8b)$$

and

$$\|\partial_h^j \mathbb{P}_m B(W_m(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} = \mathcal{O}(m^{j-\ell}) \quad (6.8c)$$

for all  $h \in [0, h_*]$ ,  $U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2}$  and  $k \geq j \geq \ell$ . The order constants in (6.8b) and (6.8c) depend only  $R$ , the bounds of the constants of the numerical method from (EXP) and the bounds from (B) for  $B$  and its derivatives on balls of radius  $R$ .

*Proof.* To prove (6.8b), differentiate (3.1a)  $k$  times in  $h$ :

$$\partial_h^k W_m = \partial_h^k (\exp(chA)) \mathbb{P}_m U \mathbb{1} + \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \partial_h^{k-j} (ha(hA) \mathbb{P}_m) \partial_h^j B(W_m). \quad (6.9)$$

By (5.2), for  $k \geq \ell$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{h \in [0, h_*]} \|\partial_h^k (\exp(chA) \mathbb{P}_m)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} &= \sup_{h \in [0, h_*]} \|\mathbf{c}^k A^k \exp(chA) \mathbb{P}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{c}^k\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \|\mathbb{P}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_k^s} = \mathcal{O}(m^{k-\ell}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

Next for  $0 \leq j \leq \ell \leq k$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_h^{k-j}(h\mathbf{a}(hA))\mathbb{P}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} &\leq \|\partial_h^{k-j}(h\mathbf{a}(hA))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{k-j}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \|\mathbb{P}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{k-j}^s} \\ &\leq M_{h,\mathbf{a}}^{(k-j)} \|\mathbb{P}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{k-j}^s} = M_{h,\mathbf{a}}^{(k-j)} m^{k-\ell}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

where we used (4.2b) (with  $k$  replaced by  $k-j$ ) and (5.2). Moreover the regularity of the stage vector on  $\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}^s$  (see Theorem 4.2 and Lemma 5.2) gives

$$W_m^i(U, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}_b^j([0, h_*]; \mathcal{B}_{\ell-j}^R), \quad (6.12)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, s$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, \lfloor \ell \rfloor$ , with bounds uniform in  $m \geq 0$  and  $U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2}$ . Using these two estimates we can obtain for the  $j$ -th term in the sum of (6.9) for  $0 \leq j \leq \ell \leq k$  and  $h \in [0, h_*]$  the following:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial_h^{k-j}(h\mathbf{a}(hA))\partial_h^j \mathbb{P}_m B(W_m(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \\ &\leq \|\partial_h^{k-j}(h\mathbf{a}(hA))\mathbb{P}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \|\partial_h^j B(W_m(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}^s} \\ &\leq M_{h,\mathbf{a}}^{(k-j)} m^{k-\ell} \|\partial_h^j B(W_m(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}^s} \leq O(m^{k-\ell}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

To estimate the  $j$ th term in the sum of (6.9) for  $j > \ell$  and hence prove (6.8b) and (6.8c) we proceed inductively for  $k = \lceil \ell \rceil, \dots, N$ . If  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$  then the start of the induction is  $k = \ell$ , and (6.8b) and (6.8c) follow from Theorem 5.2. If  $\ell \notin \mathbb{N}_0$ , then the start of the induction is  $k = \lceil \ell \rceil > \ell$ . If  $k = \lceil \ell \rceil$  then the first term in (6.9) is of order  $\mathcal{O}(m^{k-\ell})$  by (6.10), and all terms in the sum of (6.9) are  $\mathcal{O}(m^{k-\ell})$  for all  $h \in [0, h_*]$  due to (6.13) except for the last term. Hence,

$$\sup_{\substack{h \in [0, h_*] \\ U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2}}} \|\partial_h^k W_m(U, h)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \leq \mathcal{O}(m^{k-\ell}) + h_* M_{\mathbf{a}} \sup_{\substack{h \in [0, h_*] \\ U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2}}} \|\partial_h^k B(W_m(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s}. \quad (6.14)$$

The Faà di Bruno formula (6.6) gives

$$\partial_h^k B(W_m(U, h)) = \sum_{1 \leq \beta \leq k} \frac{k! D_w^\beta B_m(W_m(U, h))}{j_1! \cdots j_k!} \prod_{\alpha=1}^k \left( \frac{\partial_h^\alpha W_m(U, h)}{\alpha!} \right)^{j_\alpha} \quad (6.15)$$

where  $\beta = j_1 + \cdots + j_k$  and the sum is over all  $j_\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $\alpha = 1, \dots, k$  with  $j_1 + 2j_2 + \cdots + kj_k = k$ . All terms in the sum in (6.15) contain  $h$ -derivatives of order at most  $k-1$  and are therefore bounded independent of  $m$  except when  $\beta = j_k = 1$  and  $j_\alpha = 0$  for  $\alpha \neq k$ . Therefore

$$\sup_{\substack{h \in [0, h_*] \\ U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2}}} \|\partial_h^k B(W_m(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \leq \mathcal{O}(m^{k-\ell}) + M'_0[R] \sup_{\substack{h \in [0, h_*] \\ U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^r}} \|\partial_h^k W_m(U, h)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s}. \quad (6.16)$$

Plugging this into (6.14) gives (6.8b) for  $k = \lceil \ell \rceil$  and  $h_*$  small enough. This estimate and (6.16) also shows (6.8c) for  $k = \lceil \ell \rceil$ .

Now assume these estimates hold true for all  $\hat{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0$  with  $\ell \leq \hat{k} \leq k-1$  and let  $k \leq N$ . Then the first term in (6.9) is  $\mathcal{O}(m^{k-\ell})$  by (6.10) and by (6.13) the terms in the sum of (6.9) with  $\ell \geq j$  are  $\mathcal{O}(m^{k-\ell})$  as well. For  $k > j > \ell$  we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial_h^{k-j}(h\mathbf{a}(hA))\partial_h^j \mathbb{P}_m B(W_m(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \\ &\leq \|\partial_h^{k-j}(h\mathbf{a}(hA))\mathbb{P}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \|\partial_h^j B(W_m(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \\ &\leq M_{h,\mathbf{a}}^{(k-j)} m^{k-j} \|\partial_h^j B(W_m(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \leq O(m^{k-j}) \mathcal{O}(m^{j-\ell}) = O(m^{k-\ell}) \end{aligned} \quad (6.17)$$

where we used (6.11) and the induction hypothesis (6.8c) for  $j < k$ . Therefore under the induction hypothesis all terms in (6.9) are  $\mathcal{O}(m^{k-\ell})$  except from the last term in the sum, hence (6.14) holds true under the induction hypothesis, and so, each term in the sum of the Faà di Bruno formula (6.15) with  $j_k = 0$  is of order  $\mathcal{O}(m^n)$  in the  $\mathcal{Y}^s$  norm with  $n \leq k - \ell$  as in (6.7) (with  $i$  replaced by  $k$ ). Hence (6.16) remains valid, and from (6.14) we deduce (6.8b) and (6.8c).  $\square$

Let  $\hat{\Psi}_m = \Psi_m - e^{hA_m}$ .

**Lemma 6.6** ( $m$ -dependent bounds for derivatives of  $\hat{\Psi}_m$ ). *Assume (A1), (A2) and (B), and apply an exponential Runge-Kutta method  $\Psi$  satisfying (EXP) to (1.1). Choose  $\ell \in I^-$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  with  $\ell \leq k \leq N$ . Let  $R > 0$ . Then there is  $h_* > 0$  such that for  $m \geq 0$*

$$\Psi_m(U, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}_b^k([0, h_*]; \mathcal{B}_0^R) \quad (6.18)$$

with  $m$ -dependent bounds which are uniform in  $U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2}$ . Moreover

$$\sup_{\substack{U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2} \\ h \in [0, h_*]}} \|\partial_h^k \hat{\Psi}_m^h(U)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{O}(hm^{k-\ell}) + \mathcal{O}(m^{[k-\ell-1]_+}). \quad (6.19)$$

The order constants in (6.19) depend only  $R$ , the bounds on the numerical method from (EXP) and the bounds afforded by (B) on balls of radius  $R$ .

*Proof.* From (3.1b) we formally obtain

$$\partial_h^k \hat{\Psi}_m = \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \partial_h^{k-j} (hb^T(Ah)) \partial_h^j \mathbb{P}_m B(W_m(U, h)). \quad (6.20)$$

From (4.2c) and (5.2) we obtain for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n \geq \ell$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_h^n (hb^T(hA)) \mathbb{P}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} &\leq nM_b^{(n-1)} \|\mathbb{P}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{n-1}^s} + hM_b^{(n)} \|\mathbb{P}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_n^s} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(hm^{n-\ell}) + \mathcal{O}(m^{[n-\ell-1]_+}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

Using (6.21) (with  $n = k - j$  and  $\ell$  replaced by  $\ell - j$ ) and (6.12), we can estimate the  $j$ -th term in the sum of (6.20) for  $j \leq \ell$ ,  $j < k$ , as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial_h^{k-j} (hb^T(hA)) \partial_h^j \mathbb{P}_m B(W_m(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \\ &\leq \|\partial_h^{k-j} (hb^T(hA)) \mathbb{P}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \|\partial_h^j B(W_m(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}^s} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(hm^{k-\ell}) + \mathcal{O}(m^{[k-\ell-1]_+}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.22)$$

Using (6.21) and (6.8c) we can estimate the  $j$ -th term in the sum of (6.20) for  $k > j \geq \ell$ ,  $U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2}$ , as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial_h^{k-j} (hb^T(hA)) \partial_h^j \mathbb{P}_m B(W_m(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \\ &\leq \|\partial_h^{k-j} (hb^T(hA)) \mathbb{P}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \|\partial_h^j B(W_m(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \\ &= (\mathcal{O}(hm^{k-j}) + \mathcal{O}(m^{k-j-1})) \mathcal{O}(m^{j-\ell}) = \mathcal{O}(hm^{k-\ell}) + \mathcal{O}(m^{[k-\ell-1]_+}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.23)$$

When  $j = k$  then the second term in the estimates of (6.22) and (6.23) disappears. These estimates together with (6.20) then prove (6.19).  $\square$

**6.2. Proof of Theorem 6.1.** The proof has the same format as in [15]. To estimate the error of the time semi-discretization we first discretize in space by a Galerkin truncation and prove regularity of the solution of the truncated system. Then we estimate the error of the time discretization of the space-discretized system and couple the spatial discretization parameter  $m$  with the time step size  $h$ . Finally we prove regularity of the space-time discretization to estimate the truncation error of the time discretization.

We assume without loss of generality that  $\ell \leq p$  noting (4.1), i.e., we replace  $\ell$  by  $\min(\ell, p)$ .

*Step 1 (Regularity of solution of the Galerkin truncated system)* This step is identical to [15]. We include it for sake of completeness. We denote  $R$  from (6.1) as  $R_\Phi$  to indicate that it is a bound on  $\Phi^t(U^0)$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_m^t(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} &\leq \|\mathbb{P}_m \Phi^t(U^0) - \Phi_m^t(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} + \|\mathbb{P}_m \Phi^t(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} \\ &\leq m^\ell \|\mathbb{P}_m \Phi^t(U^0) - \Phi_m^t(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} + \|\Phi^t(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} \\ &\leq R_\Phi e^{M'_0[2R_\Phi]T} + R_\Phi =: r_\phi \end{aligned} \quad (6.24)$$

for  $U^0$  satisfying (6.1),  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $m \geq m_*$ , where  $m_* \geq 0$  is sufficiently large. Here we used (5.2) in the second estimate and Lemma 5.1 with  $\delta = R_\Phi$  and (6.1) in the final estimate.

*Step 2 (Trajectory error of the space time discretization)* Next we estimate the global error of the space time discretization, for  $jh \leq T$ ,

$$E_m^j(U^0, h) = \|\Phi_m^{jh}(U^0) - (\Psi_m^h)^j(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}}. \quad (6.25)$$

Using (6.24) for any  $U^0$  satisfying (6.1) and all  $(n+1)h \leq T$ ,  $h \in [0, h_*]$ ,  $m \geq m_*$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_m^{n+1}(U^0, h) &= \|\Phi_m^{(n+1)h}(U^0) - (\Psi_m^h)^{n+1}(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \\ &\leq \|\Phi_m^h(\Phi_m^{nh}(U^0)) - \Psi_m^h(\Phi_m^{nh}(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}} + \|\Psi_m^h(\Phi_m^{nh}(U^0)) - \Psi_m^h((\Psi_m^h)^n(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \\ &\leq \frac{h^{p+1}}{(p+1)!} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_h^{p+1} \hat{\Phi}_m^h(\Phi_m^t(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}} + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_h^{p+1} \hat{\Psi}_m^h(\Phi_m^t(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \right) \\ &\quad + \sup_{U \in \mathcal{B}_0^{2r_\phi}} \|\mathbf{D}\Psi_m^h(U)\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \cdot E_m^n(U^0, h) \end{aligned} \quad (6.26)$$

provided that

$$E_m^n(U, h) \leq r_\phi, \quad nh \leq T, h \in [0, h_*]. \quad (6.27)$$

The first term in (6.26) is  $hO(m^{p+1-\ell}) + O(m^{p-\ell})$  by Lemma 6.4, with  $R$  replaced by  $r_\phi$  and Lemma 6.6, with  $R$  replaced by  $2r_\phi$ , respectively. To bound the second term note that by Lemma 5.2 (with  $R$  replaced by  $4r_\phi$  in (4.3a)) there is  $h_* > 0$  such that  $W_h^i, \Psi_m^h \in \mathcal{C}_b^1(\mathcal{B}_0^{2r_\phi}; \mathcal{B}_0^{4r_\phi})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, s$ , for  $m \geq 0$ ,  $h \in [0, h_*]$  with uniform bounds in  $m \geq 0$ ,  $h \in [0, h_*]$ . Then, using (3.1b), (2.4), (A2) and (EXP) we get for  $h \in [0, h_*]$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{D}_U \Psi_m^h(U)\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} &\leq \|\exp(hA)\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} + h \|\mathbf{b}(hA)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} M'_0[4r_\phi] \|\mathbf{D}_U W_m(U)\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \\ &\leq 1 + h M_b M'_0[4r_\phi] \|\mathbf{D}_U W_m(U)\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} = 1 + \sigma_\Psi[2r_\phi]h \end{aligned} \quad (6.28)$$

uniformly in  $U \in \mathcal{B}_0^{2r_\phi}$ ,  $m \geq 0$ ,  $h \in [0, h_*]$  for some constant  $\sigma_\Psi[2r_\phi] > 0$ . Plugging these estimates into (6.26) gives

$$E_m^{n+1}(U^0, h) \leq \rho h^{p+1}(hm^{p+1-\ell} + m^{p-\ell}) + (1 + \sigma_\Psi h)E_m^n(U^0, h), \quad (6.29)$$

for some  $\rho > 0$ , where  $\sigma_\Psi = \sigma_\Psi[2r_\phi]$ . Hence

$$E_m^n(U, h) \leq \rho h^{p+1}(hm^{p+1-\ell} + m^{p-\ell}) \frac{(1 + \sigma_\Psi h)^n}{\sigma_\Psi h} \leq \frac{\rho}{\sigma_\Psi} h^p (hm^{p+1-\ell} + m^{p-\ell}) e^{n\sigma_\Psi h}.$$

Choosing  $m(h) = h^{-1}$  we see that for  $nh \leq T$ ,  $h \in [0, h_*]$  and  $\ell \leq p$

$$\|(\Psi_m^h)^n(U^0) - \Phi_m^{nh}(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq \frac{\rho}{\sigma_\Psi} e^{\sigma_\Psi T} h^p (2h^{\ell-p}) = Ce^{\sigma_\Psi T} h^\ell. \quad (6.30)$$

Using (6.30) we can ensure (6.27) by possibly reducing  $h_* > 0$ .

*Step 3 (Global truncation error of numerical trajectory)* We will prove that for  $m(h) = h^{-1}$ ,  $nh \leq T$ ,  $h \in [0, h_*]$ ,

$$e^n(U^0) := \|(\Psi^h)^n(U^0) - (\Psi_{m(h)}^h)^n(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}) \quad (6.31)$$

uniformly for initial data  $U^0$  satisfying (6.1). The proof is as in [15] for A stable Runge Kutta time discretizations, with the necessary adaptations: For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(n+1)h \leq T$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{n+1}(U^0) &\leq \|(\Psi^h \circ (\Psi^h)^n)(U^0) - (\Psi^h \circ (\Psi_m^h)^n)(U^0)\| + e^1((\Psi_m^h)^n)(U^0) \\ &\leq \sup_{U \in \mathcal{B}_0^{2r_\psi}} \|\mathbf{D}\Psi^h(U)\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \|e^n(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} + e^1((\Psi_m^h)^n)(U^0) \end{aligned} \quad (6.32)$$

provided that

$$\|(\Psi_m^h)^n(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq r_\psi, \quad \|e^n(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq r_\psi, \quad 0 \leq nh \leq T. \quad (6.33)$$

To obtain the first estimate of (6.33) we use that for  $m = m(h) = h^{-1}$ ,  $nh \leq T$ ,  $h \in [0, h_*]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\Psi_{m(h)}^h)^n(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} &\leq \|(\Psi_m^h)^n(U^0) - \Phi_m^{nh}(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} + \|\Phi_m^{nh}(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} \\ &\leq m^\ell \|(\Psi_m^h)^n(U^0) - \Phi_m^{nh}(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} + r_\phi \leq Ce^{\sigma_\Psi T} + r_\phi = r_\psi \end{aligned} \quad (6.34)$$

for some  $r_\psi > 0$ . Here  $r_\phi$  is as in (6.24) and we used (5.2) in the second and (6.30) in the third inequality.

To obtain the second estimate of (6.33) note that Theorem 4.2, with  $R$  replaced by  $4r_\psi$ , gives  $W^i, \Psi \in \mathcal{C}_b^1(\mathcal{B}_0^{2r_\psi}; \mathcal{B}_0^{4r_\psi})$ . Then (6.28) applies, with  $\Psi_m$  replaced by  $\Psi$ ,  $W_m$  by  $W$  and  $r_\phi$  by  $r_\psi$ , and so (6.32) for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $h \in [0, h_*]$  and  $(n+1)h \leq T$  gives

$$\|e^{n+1}(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq (1 + \sigma_\Psi h) \|e^n(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} + h\mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}), \quad (6.35)$$

where  $m = m(h) = h^{-1}$  and  $\sigma_\Psi = \sigma_\Psi[2r_\psi]$ , with order constant uniformly in all  $U^0$  satisfying (6.1), as long as the second estimate of (6.33) holds. Here we need that for  $U \in \mathbb{P}_m \mathcal{Y}$ ,

$$e^1(U) = hb^T(hA) ((\mathbb{P}_m(B(W(U, h)) - B(W_m(U, h))) + \mathbb{Q}_m B(W(U, h))), \quad (6.36)$$

so that for  $U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{r_\psi} \cap \mathbb{P}_m \mathcal{Y}$ ,  $h \in [0, h_*]$ , by (5.4a) (with  $R$  replaced by  $2r_\psi$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^1(U)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} &\leq hM_b(M'_0[2r_\psi] \|W(U, h) - W_m(U, h)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} + \|\mathbb{Q}_m B(W(U, h))\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s}) \\ &\leq hM_b(M'_0[2r_\psi] \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}) + m^{-\ell} M_\ell[2r_\psi]) = h\mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}), \end{aligned} \quad (6.37)$$

where  $m = m(h)$ .

From (6.35) we deduce for  $nh \leq T$ ,  $h \in [0, h_*]$  and all  $U^0$  satisfying (6.1) that

$$\|e^n(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq e^{\sigma_{\Psi} T} (\|e^1(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} + \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell})) = \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}), \quad (6.38)$$

with  $m = m(h)$ . Here we used that (5.4b) with  $R = 2R_{\Phi}$  implies that  $\|e^1(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell})$ . By choosing a possibly smaller  $h_*$  and thereby increasing  $m = h^{-1}$ , the second estimate of (6.33) is satisfied. This proves (6.31).

Hence, (5.3b), (6.30) and (6.31) show that

$$\|\Phi^{nh}(U^0) - (\Psi^h)^n(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq \|\Phi^t(U^0) - \Phi_m^t(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} + E_m^n(U^0, h) + e^n(U^0) = \mathcal{O}(h^{\ell})$$

for  $nh \leq T$ ,  $m(h) = h^{-1}$ ,  $h \in [0, h_*]$  and  $U^0$  satisfying (6.1).  $\square$

## 7. ERROR ESTIMATES FOR EXPONENTIAL ROSENBRACK METHODS

In this section we extend our results to exponential Rosenbrock methods. As in [6] we define an exponential Rosenbrock method as

$$W = e^{chJ(U^0)} \mathbb{1}U^0 + ha(hJ(U^0))G(W, U^0), \quad (7.1a)$$

$$U^1 = e^{hJ(U^0)}U^0 + hb^T(hJ(U^0))G(W, U^0), \quad (7.1b)$$

where

$$J(U^0) = A + DB(U^0), \quad G(U, U^0) = B(U) - DB(U^0)U.$$

Here we define  $(G(W, U^0))^i = G(W^i, U^0)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, s$ , analogously to the definition of  $B(W)$ , see (3.2). We need stronger conditions for  $\mathbf{a}(z)$  and  $\mathbf{b}(z)$  because  $J(U^0)$  might not be a normal operator, so that  $\mathbf{a}(hJ(U^0))$  and  $\mathbf{b}(hJ(U^0))$  are in general not defined under assumption (EXP). But we can define  $\exp(tJ(U^0))$  as flow map for the evolution equation  $\dot{X} = J(U^0)X$  on  $\mathcal{Y}_{\ell}$ ,  $\ell \in I$ ,  $\ell \leq N-1$ , under assumptions (A2) and (B) by [12]. We therefore modify condition (EXP) following [6]:

(EXP') For each coefficient  $\mathbf{a}_{ij} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}_i : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ ,  $i, j = 1, \dots, s$ , there is a sequence  $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $\lambda_k \geq 0$ , such that these coefficients are linear combinations of the functions  $\varphi_k(\lambda_k z)$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , with  $\varphi_k(z) := \int_0^1 e^{(1-s)z} \frac{s^{k-1}}{(k-1)!} ds$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\phi_0(z) = e^z$ .

Since  $G$  contains a derivative of  $B$  and we need the nonlinearity  $G(U, U^0)$  to be  $C^1$  on all  $\mathcal{Y}_{\ell}$ ,  $\ell \in I$ , we also need to modify condition (B) as follows:

(B') (B) holds with  $N > \lceil L \rceil + 1$ .

**Lemma 7.1** (Bound on  $e^{hJ}$  and  $\varphi_k(hJ)$ ). *Assume (A1), (A2) and (B') and let  $R > 0$ ,  $\ell \in I$ . Then for all  $U^0 \in \mathcal{B}_{\ell}^R$ ,  $h \geq 0$*

$$\|e^{hJ(U^0)}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell}} \leq e^{M'_{\ell}[R]h} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\varphi_k(hJ(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell}} \leq \varphi_k(M'_{\ell}[R]h) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

*Proof.* We have

$$e^{tJ(U^0)} = e^{tA} + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} D_U B(U^0) \exp(sJ(U^0)) ds. \quad (7.2)$$

Let  $x(t) = \|\exp(tJ(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell}}$ . Then

$$x(t) \leq 1 + \int_0^t M'_{\ell}[R]x(s) ds.$$

Hence  $x(t) \leq e^{tM'_{\ell}[R]}$ . The second estimate follows from the definition of  $\varphi_k$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.2** (Bound on  $J^j$ ). *Assume (A1), (A2) and (B') and let  $R > 0$ ,  $\ell - 1 \in I^-$ . Then for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $j \leq \ell$  and all  $U^0 \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^R$ ,  $h \geq 0$ ,*

$$\|J^j(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}} \leq \prod_{n=1}^j (1 + M'_{\ell-n}[R]), \quad (7.3a)$$

$$\|\partial_h^j \varphi_k(hJ(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}} \leq \varphi_k^{(j)}(M'_{j-\ell}[R]h) \prod_{n=1}^j (1 + M'_{\ell-n}[R]). \quad (7.3b)$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\|J^j(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}} \leq \prod_{n=1}^j \|A + DB(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell+1-n} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell-n}} \leq \prod_{n=1}^j (1 + M'_{\ell-n}[R]).$$

The integrand of  $\varphi_k^{(j)}(z) = \int_0^1 (1-s)^j e^{(1-s)z} \frac{s^{k-1}}{(k-1)!} ds$  is non-negative so that

$$\|\varphi_k^{(j)}(hJ(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}} \leq \varphi_k^{(j)}(hM'_{\ell-j}[R]).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_h^j \varphi_k(hJ(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}} &= \|\varphi_k^{(j)}(tJ(U^0))J^j(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}} \\ &\leq \varphi_k^{(j)}(hM'_{\ell-j}[R]) \|J^j(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell-j}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 7.3** (Bounds on  $h$  derivatives of  $\mathbf{a}(hJ)$  and  $\mathbf{b}(hJ)$ ). *Assume (A1), (A2), (B') and (EXP') and let  $R > 0$ ,  $\ell \in I^-$ . Then Lemma 4.1 on the  $h$  derivatives of  $\mathbf{a}(hJ(U^0))$  and  $\mathbf{b}(hJ(U^0))$  holds true for  $U^0 \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^R$  and all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  such that  $\ell \geq k$  with bounds  $M_{\mathbf{a},\ell}^{(k)}[R]$ ,  $M_{\mathbf{b},\ell}^{(k)}[R]$ ,  $M_{h,\mathbf{a},\ell}^{(k)}[R]$ ,  $M_{h,\mathbf{b},\ell}^{(k)}[R]$  that also depend on  $\ell$  and  $R$ .*

*Proof.* Using (EXP') this follows from Lemma 7.1 in the case  $k = 0$  and from (7.3b) and (4.1) in the case  $k > 0$ . □

We also need bounds on  $D_U^j e^{hJ(U)}$ ,  $\mathbf{a}(hJ(U))$  and  $\mathbf{b}(hJ(U))$ :

**Lemma 7.4** (Bounds on  $U$  derivatives of  $e^{hJ(U)}$ ,  $\mathbf{a}(hJ(U))$  and  $\mathbf{b}(hJ(U))$ ). *Assume (A1), (A2) and (B), let  $R > 0$  and  $\ell \in I$ . Then for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $j + \ell \leq N - 1$ , and all  $U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^R$ ,*

$$\|D_U^j e^{tJ(U)}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_\ell} \leq P_j(t) e^{M'_\ell[R]t} \quad (7.4)$$

where  $P_j(t)$  is a polynomial of degree  $j$  in  $t$  with  $P_j(0) = 0$  and coefficients which are polynomials in  $M_\ell^{(n)}[R]$ ,  $2 \leq n \leq j + 1$ .

These kinds of bounds also hold for  $\|D_U^j \mathbf{a}(tJ(U))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_\ell^s}$  and  $\|D_U^j \mathbf{b}(tJ(U))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_\ell^s}$ .

*Proof.* The last statement follows from (7.4) due to (EXP'). To prove (7.4), note that for  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $j + \ell \leq N - 1$ ,

$$\partial_t D_U^j e^{tJ(U)} = D_U^j \left( J(U) e^{tJ(U)} \right) = \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} D_U^{j+1-i} B(U) D_U^i e^{tJ(U)} + J(U) D_U^j e^{tJ(U)}.$$

Assume that  $D_U^i e^{tJ(U)}$  exist for  $i \leq j - 1$ . Then

$$D_U^j e^{tJ(U)} = \int_0^t e^{(t-s)J(U)} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} D_U^{j+1-i} B(U) D_U^i e^{sJ(U)} ds$$



is well defined on  $\mathcal{Y}_\ell$ . Moreover, for  $U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^R$ ,

$$\|D_U^j e^{tJ(U)}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_\ell} \leq \int_0^t e^{M'_\ell[R](t-s)} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} M_\ell^{(j+1-i)}[R] \|D_U^i e^{sJ(U)}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_\ell} ds$$

For  $j = 1$  Lemma 7.1 yields  $\|D_U e^{tJ(U)}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_\ell} \leq M_\ell^{(2)}[R] t e^{M'_\ell[R]t}$  and inductively this gives (7.4): Assume that for some  $a_{k,n}$  and all  $1 \leq n \leq j-1$

$$\|D_U^n e^{tJ(U)}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_\ell} \leq e^{M'_\ell[R]t} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{a_{k,n} t^k}{k!}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_U^j e^{tJ(U)}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_\ell} &\leq e^{M'_\ell[R]t} \int_0^t M_\ell^{(j+1)}[R] \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} M_\ell^{(j+1-i)}[R] \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{a_{k,i} s^k}{k!} ds \\ &= e^{M'_\ell t} (t M_\ell^{(j+1)}[R] \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} M_\ell^{(j+1-i)} \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{a_{k,i} t^{k+1}}{(k+1)!}) \\ &= e^{M'_\ell[R]t} (t M_\ell^{(j+1)}[R] \sum_{k=1}^j (\sum_{i=k}^{j-1} M_\ell^{(j+1-i)}[R]) \frac{a_{k,i} t^{k+1}}{(k+1)!}) \\ &= e^{M'_\ell[R]t} \sum_{k=1}^j \frac{a_{k,j} t^k}{k!} \end{aligned}$$

with  $a_{1,j} = M_\ell^{(j+1)}[R]$  and  $a_{k,j} = \sum_{i=k-1}^{j-1} M_\ell^{(j+1-i)}[R] a_{k-1,i}$  for  $k \geq 2$ .  $\square$

Due to this lemma Theorem 4.2 on the regularity of the numerical method holds true, if  $N$  is replaced by  $N-1$  in (4.3a) and (EXP'), (B') is assumed. To show that Lemma 5.2 on the projection error of the numerical method also remains true under these assumptions we need the following:

**Lemma 7.5** (Projection error of  $e^{hJ(U^0)}$ ,  $\mathbf{a}(hJ(U^0))$  and  $\mathbf{b}(hJ(U^0))$ ). *Assume (A1), (A2), (B'), (EXP') and let  $R > 0$ ,  $h_* > 0$ ,  $\ell \in I$ . Let  $J_m(U) = \mathbb{P}_m J(\mathbb{P}_m U) \mathbb{P}_m$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{hJ(U^0)} - e^{hJ_m(U^0)}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} &= \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}) \\ \|\mathbf{a}(hJ(U^0)) - \mathbf{a}(hJ_m(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} &= \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}), \\ \|\mathbf{b}(hJ(U^0)) - \mathbf{b}(hJ_m(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} &= \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}) \end{aligned}$$

with order constants uniform in for all  $U^0 \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^R$  and  $h \in [0, h_*]$ .

*Proof.* Due to (EXP') it is enough to prove the first estimate. Note that (7.2) also holds for the Galerkin truncated system

$$e^{tJ_m(U^0)} = e^{tA_m} + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} D B_m(U^0) e^{sJ_m(U^0)} ds,$$

where  $A = \mathbb{P}_m A$ , Hence with  $x(t) = \|\mathrm{e}^{tJ(U^0)} - \mathrm{e}^{tJ_m(U^0)}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}}$

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &\leq \|\mathrm{e}^{tA} - \mathrm{e}^{tA_m}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} + \int_0^t \|(\mathrm{D}B(U^0) - \mathrm{D}B_m(U^0))\mathrm{e}^{sJ(U^0)}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{d}s \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|\mathrm{D}B_m(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} x(s) \mathrm{d}s \\ &\leq \|\mathbb{Q}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} + \int_0^t \|(\mathrm{D}B(U^0) - \mathrm{D}B_m(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{e}^{sM'_\ell} \mathrm{d}s + M'_0 \int_0^t x(s) \mathrm{d}s \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 7.1 and (A2) and  $M'_n = M'_n[R]$  for  $n \in I$ . From (5.2) we know that  $\|\mathbb{Q}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} = m^{-\ell}$ . Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathrm{D}B(U^0) - \mathrm{D}B_m(U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} &\leq \|\mathbb{P}_m(\mathrm{D}B(U^0) - \mathrm{D}B(\mathbb{P}_m U^0))\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \\ &\quad + \|\mathbb{Q}_m \mathrm{D}B(U^0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \\ &\leq M'' \|\mathbb{Q}_m U^0\|_{\mathcal{Y}} + m^{-\ell} M'_\ell = m^{-\ell} (M''R + M'_\ell) \end{aligned}$$

with  $M'' = M''_0[R]$ . Hence

$$x(t) \leq m^{-\ell} + \int_0^t m^{-\ell} (M''R + M'_\ell) \mathrm{e}^{sM'_\ell} \mathrm{d}s + M'_0 \int_0^t x(s) \mathrm{d}s \quad (7.5)$$

and by Gronwall's lemma

$$\|\mathrm{e}^{tJ(U^0)} - \mathrm{e}^{tJ_m(U^0)}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} = x(t) = \left( m^{-\ell} + m^{-\ell} (M''R + M'_\ell) \frac{(\mathrm{e}^{tM'_\ell} - 1)}{M'_\ell} \right) \mathrm{e}^{tM'}.$$

□

**Lemma 7.6** (Projection error of the exponential Rosenbrock method). *Assume (A1), (A2), (B') and (EXP'). Then Lemma 5.2 remains valid.*

*Proof.* We have, with  $J = J(U^0)$ ,  $J_m = J_m(U^0) = \mathbb{P}_m J(\mathbb{P}_m U^0)$ ,

$$\mathrm{e}^{hcJ} \mathbb{1}U - \mathrm{e}^{hcJ_m} \mathbb{1}\mathbb{P}_m U = (\mathrm{e}^{hcJ} \mathbb{1}U - \mathrm{e}^{hcJ} \mathbb{1}\mathbb{P}_m U) + (\mathrm{e}^{hcJ} \mathbb{1}\mathbb{P}_m U - \mathrm{e}^{hcJ_m} \mathbb{1}\mathbb{P}_m U)$$

and so by Lemma 7.1 and Lemma 7.5 for  $U \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathrm{e}^{hcJ} \mathbb{1}U - \mathrm{e}^{hcJ_m} \mathbb{1}\mathbb{P}_m U\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} &\leq \|\mathrm{e}^{hcJ}\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \|\mathbb{Q}_m U\|_{\mathcal{Y}} + \|\mathrm{e}^{hJ} - \mathrm{e}^{hJ_m}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \|\mathbb{P}_m U\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} \\ &\leq \mathrm{e}^{hM'[R/2]} m^{-\ell} \frac{R}{2} + \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}) = \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, with  $G_m(U) = \mathbb{P}_m G(\mathbb{P}_m U)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}(hJ)G - \mathbf{a}(hJ_m)G_m &= \mathbf{a}(hJ)(G - G_m) + (\mathbf{a}(hJ) - \mathbf{a}(hJ_m))G_m \\ &= \mathbf{a}(hJ)(G - \mathbb{P}_m G) + \mathbf{a}(hA)(\mathbb{P}_m G - G_m) + (\mathbf{a}(hJ) - \mathbf{a}(hJ_m))G_m \end{aligned}$$

so that by Lemma 7.3 and Lemma 7.5 using (5.2) and that for  $U, \hat{U} \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^R$  we have  $\|G(U, \hat{U})\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell} \leq M_\ell + M'_\ell R$  (with  $M_\ell = M_\ell[R]$ ,  $M'_\ell = M'_\ell[R]$ ) we get for  $W = W(U^0)$ ,  $W_m = W_m(U^0)$ ,  $U^0 \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{R/2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{a}(hJ)G(W) - \mathbf{a}(hJ_m)G_m(W_m)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} &\leq \|\mathbf{a}(hJ)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} (M_\ell + M'_\ell R) m^{-\ell} \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{a}(hJ)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \|G(W) - G(W_m)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{a}(hJ) - \mathbf{a}(hJ_m)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} (M_\ell + M'_\ell R) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}) + M_{\mathbf{a},0}[R] \|G(W) - G(W_m)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, from  $\|D_U G(U, \hat{U})\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} = \|D_U B(U) - D_U B(\hat{U})\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \leq 2M'[R]$  for  $U, \hat{U} \in \mathcal{B}_0^R$  we get, using (7.1a) for both  $W$  and  $W_m$ , similarly as in (5.5),

$$\|W - W_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \leq \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}) + 2hM_{a,0}[R]M'_0[R]\|W - W_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s}$$

which for  $h \in [0, h_*]$  with  $h_*$  small enough shows (5.4a) for exponential Rosenbrock methods. For  $\mathbf{b}(hJ)$  we obtain in the same way that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{b}(hJ)G - \mathbf{b}(hJ_m)G_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}} &\leq \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}) + M_{b,0}[R]\|G(W) - G(W_m)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(m^{-\ell}) + 2M_{b,0}[R]M'_0[R]\|W - W_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (7.1b) for both  $\Psi$  and  $\Psi_m$  and (5.4a) for exponential Rosenbrock methods gives (5.4b) for exponential Rosenbrock methods as well.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.7** (*m dependent bounds on  $W_m$  for exponential Rosenbrock methods*). *Lemma 6.5 remains true for exponential Rosenbrock methods if (A1), (A2), (B') and (EXP') hold.*

*Proof.* We have to replace  $A$  by  $J_m = J_m(U)$  and  $B(W_m)$  by  $G = G(W_m, U)$  throughout the proof of Lemma 6.5. (6.10) becomes for  $\ell \in I^-$ ,  $k \geq \ell$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{h \in [0, h_*]} \|\partial_h^k (\exp(chJ_m)\mathbb{P}_m)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} &= \sup_{h \in [0, h_*]} \|\mathbf{c}^k J_m^k \exp(chJ_m)\mathbb{P}_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{c}^k\| \sup_{h \in [0, h_*]} \|\exp(chJ_m)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \|J_m^k\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{c}^k\| e^{\|\mathbf{c}\| M' h_*} \|J_m^{[\ell]}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\ell-[\ell]}} \|J_m^{k-[\ell]}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-[\ell]} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{O}(m^{k-\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used (7.3a) and Lemma 7.1 with  $J$  replaced by  $J_m$  noting that the proof holds true with the same bounds. Moreover we used that for  $k \geq \ell$

$$\begin{aligned} \|J_m^{k-[\ell]}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-[\ell]} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} &\leq \|J_m^{k-[\ell]-1}\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \|J_m\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{\ell-[\ell]} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{O}(m^{k-[\ell]-1})\mathcal{O}(m^{1-(\ell-[\ell])}) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(m^{k-\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

We replace the bound  $M_{h,a}^{(k-j)}$  by  $M_{h,a,k-j}^{(k-j)}[R]$  in (6.11), (6.13) and by  $M_{h,a,0}^{(k-j)}[R]$  in (6.17) and replace the bound  $M_a$  by  $M_{a,0}[R]$  in (6.14). Then (6.11) holds true with  $A$  replaced by  $J_m$  by Lemma 7.3 which also applies to  $J_m$  with the same bounds. In the analogue of (6.16) we have to replace  $M'_0[R]$  by  $2M'_0[R]$  since this is the required bound for  $DG(W_m(U, h), U)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.8** (*m dependent bounds on  $\Psi_m$  for exponential Rosenbrock methods*). *Lemma 6.6 remains true for exponential Rosenbrock methods if (A1), (A2), (B') and (EXP') hold.*

*Proof.* The proof of Lemma 6.6 remains valid if we replace  $A$  by  $J_m(U)$  and  $B(W_m(U, h))$  by  $G(W_m(U, h), U)$  throughout the proof and in (6.21) replace  $M_b^{(i)}$  by  $M_{b,i}^{(i)}[R]$ ,  $i = n-1, n$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 7.9** (*Trajectory error for nonsmooth data of exponential Rosenbrock methods*). *Theorem 6.1 remains true for exponential Rosenbrock methods under conditions (A1), (A2), (B') and (EXP').*

*Proof.* Most of the proof of Theorem 6.1 carries over. In the analogue of (6.28) we use Lemma 7.4 to obtain for  $U \in \mathcal{B}_0^{2r_\phi}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_U \Psi_m^h(U)\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} &\leq \|\exp(hJ_m)\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} + \|D_U e^{hJ_m}\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} \|U\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \\ &\quad + h \|D_U \mathbf{b}(hJ_m)\|_{\mathcal{Y}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} 2M_0 + h M_{\mathbf{b},0} M'_0 \|D_U W_m(U)\|_{\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^s} \\ &=: 1 + \sigma_\Psi[2r_\phi]h \end{aligned}$$

where constants are evaluated with radius  $R = 4r_\phi$ . In (6.36) and (6.37) we have to replace  $B(W(U, h))$  by  $G(W(U, h))$ , and in (6.37) also  $M_{\mathbf{b}}$  by  $M_{\mathbf{b},0}$  and  $M'_0$  by  $2M'_0$ .  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Andrew Sadler for preparing the code to test the accuracy of the exponential Euler method for non-smooth initial data.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] H. BERLAND, B. OWREN, B. SKAFLESTAD (2005). *B-series and order conditions for exponential integrators*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 43(4), pp. 1715–1727.
- [2] G.M. CONSTANTINE, T.H. SAVITS (1996). *A multivariate Faà di Bruno formula with applications*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 348, pp. 503–520.
- [3] L. EINKEMMER, A. OSTERMANN (2014). *Convergence analysis of Strang splitting for Vlasov-type equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 52(1), pp. 140–155.
- [4] L. GAUCKLER (2015). *Error analysis of trigonometric integrators for semilinear wave equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 53(2), pp. 1082–1106.
- [5] L. GAUCKLER (2018). *On a splitting method for the Zakharov system*, Numerische Mathematik 139(2), pp. 349–379.
- [6] M. HOCHBRUCK, A. OSTERMANN, J. SCHWEITZER (2009). *Exponential Rosenbrock-Type Methods*, SIAM Numer. Anal. 47(1), pp. 786–803.
- [7] M. HOCHBRUCK AND A. OSTERMANN (2010). *Exponential integrators*, Acta Numer. 19, pp. 209–286.
- [8] V.T. LUAN, A. OSTERMANN (2013). *Exponential B-series: the stiff case*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 51, pp. 3431–3445.
- [9] C. LUBICH (2008). *On splitting methods for Schrödinger-Poisson and cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Math. Comp. 77, pp. 2141–2153.
- [10] M. OLIVER, C. WULFF (2012). *A-stable Runge-Kutta methods for semilinear evolution equations*, J. Functional Anal. 263, pp. 1981–2023.
- [11] A. OSTERMANN, C. SU (2019). *Two exponential-type integrators for the good Boussinesq equation*. Numer. Math. 143(3), pp. 683–712.
- [12] A. PAZY (1983). *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [13] J. SCHWEITZER (2015). *The exponential Rosenbrock-Euler method for nonsmooth initial data*, Preprint.
- [14] M. THALHAMMER (2012). *Convergence analysis of high-order time-splitting pseudospectral methods for nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 50(6), pp. 3231–3258.
- [15] C. WULFF, C. EVANS (2016). *Runge-Kutta time semidiscretizations of semilinear PDEs with non-smooth data*, Numer. Math. 134(2), pp. 413–440.

(C. Wulff) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SURREY, GUILDFORD GU2 7XH, UK

*E-mail address:* c.wulff@surrey.ac.uk