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ABSTRACT

The numerical solution of the one-dimensional nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation on an unbounded domain is studied in this paper. Split local absorbing boundary (SLAB) conditions are obtained by the operator splitting method, then the original problem is reduced to an initial boundary value problem on a bounded computational domain, which can be solved by the finite difference method. Several numerical examples are provided to show the advantages and effectiveness of the given method, and some interesting collision behaviors are also observed.
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1. Introduction

The nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation (NKLGE) appears in various application areas, such as differential geometry and relativistic field theory, and it also appears in a number of other physical applications, including the propagation of fluxons in the Josephson junctions, the motion of rigid pendula attached a stretched wire, and dislocations in crystals [1,2].

The initial value problem of the one-dimensional nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation is given by the following problem:

\[ \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + f(u) = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, t > 0, \]
\[ u|_{t=0} = \varphi_0(x), u_t|_{t=0} = \varphi_1(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \]

where \( u = u(x, t) \) represents the wave displacement at position \( x \) and time \( t \), \( \varphi_0(x), \varphi_1(x) \) are initial values, and \( f(u) \) is the nonlinear force. In the well known sine-Gordon equation [19–21], the nonlinear force is given by

\[ f(u) = \sin u. \]

In the physical applications, the nonlinear force \( f(u) \) also has other forms [20–25]:

\[ f(u) = u^3 - u, \]
\[ f(u) = \sin u + \sin 2u, \]
\[ f(u) = \sinh u + \sinh 2u. \]
Eq. (1.1) is called the $\phi^4$ equation, the double sine-Gordon (DSG) equation and the double sinh-Gordon (DSHG) equation, provided \( f(u) \) is given by (1.4)–(1.6), respectively. The above nonlinear Klein–Gordon equations are Hamiltonian PDEs, and for a wide class of force \( f(u) \), it has the conserved Hamiltonian quantity (or energy) [21]

\[
H = \int \left( \frac{1}{2} u_t^2 + \frac{1}{2} u_x^2 + G(u) \right) \, dx,
\]

where \( G'(u) = f(u) \).

The essential difficulty of the numerical solution for the problem (1.1) and (1.2) involves two parts, the nonlinearity and the unboundedness of the physical domain. For the bounded domain case, there are a lot of studies on the numerical solution of the NLKGE with Dirichlet or periodic boundary condition. For example, Li and Vu–Quoc [3] studied the finite difference invariant structure of a class of algorithms for the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation and derived algorithms that preserve energy or linear momentum. Jimenez [4], Jimenez and Vazquez [5] discussed four second-order finite difference schemes for approximating the nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation with periodic boundary condition. They also observed the undesirable characteristics in some of the numerical schemes, in particular a loss of spatial symmetry and the onset of instability for large value of a parameter in the initial condition of the equation. Guo et al. [6] used the spectral and pseudo-spectral methods to solving the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation. Guo et al. [7] also investigated the numerical solution of the sine-Gordon equation with periodic boundary condition. In this paper, we will consider the NLKGE on an unbounded domain.

The artificial boundary condition (ABC) method is a powerful approach to reduce the problems on the unbounded domain to a bounded computational domain. In general, the artificial boundary conditions can be classified into implicit boundary conditions and explicit boundary conditions including global, also called nonlocal ABC, local ABC and discrete ABC [11]. For the last 30 years, many mathematicians have made great contributions on this subject, see [8–15], which makes the artificial boundary condition method for the linear partial differential equations on the unbounded domain become a well-developed method. In recent few years, there have been some new progress on the artificial boundary condition method for nonlinear partial differential equations on unbounded domain. Han et al. [16] and Xu et al. [17] use the Cole–Hopf transformation to get the exact ABCs for the viscous Burger’s equation and the deterministic KPZ equation. Zheng [18,19] use the inverse scattering approach to get the exact ABCs for the one-dimensional cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation and the sine-Gordon equation. Xu et al. [31,32] also utilize an operator splitting method to design split local absorbing boundary (SLAB) conditions for the one- and two-dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equations. The local absorbing boundary conditions were imposed on the split linear subproblem and yielded a full scheme by coupling the discretizations for the interior equation and boundary subproblems.

In this paper, we use the operator splitting method to find the split local absorbing boundary (SLAB) conditions for the nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation on the unbounded domain. Then reduce the original problem (1.1) and (1.2) to an initial boundary value problem on a bounded computational domain, which can be solved by the finite difference method. By this numerical method, we observe the soliton solutions of different kinds of nonlinear Klein–Gordon equations.

The organization of this paper is as following: in Section 2, we give a brief overview of the operator splitting method, and then discuss the split local absorbing boundary for the NLKGE, where the ABCs of the subproblem is given in detail. A finite difference scheme is given by the coupling procedure in Section 3. Some numerical examples are provided to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed scheme, especially some interesting soliton solutions of the NLKGE are observed in Section 4.

2. The split local absorbing boundary method

Operator splitting method [26,34] is a powerful method for the numerical simulation of complex physical time-dependent models, where the simultaneous effect of several different subprocess has to be considered. Mathematical models of such phenomena are usually described by time-dependent partial differential equations, which include several spatial differential operators. Each of them is corresponding to a subprocess of the physical phenomenon. Generally speaking, every subprocess is simpler than the whole spatial differential operator.

The essential idea of the operator splitting method is to decompose the considered problem into several subproblems which are easy to be handled, and then solve them successively in a small time step \( \tau \), in which the solution of one subproblem is employed as the initial condition for the next subproblem.

The operator splitting method has been widely used in many application problems, for instance, the advection–diffusion–reaction problems in air pollution modelling [27] Maxwell’s equations [28], the model of Bose–Einstein condensates [29,30] and the nonlinear Schrödinger equation [31,32].

The basic idea of split local absorbing boundary (SLAB) method is using the operator splitting method on the boundaries to construct boundary conditions. We decompose the nonlinear Klein–Gordon problem into linear and nonlinear subproblems on the artificial boundaries, which are easy to be handled, and then solve them alternatively in a small time step \( \tau \).

For Eq. (1.1), we introduce an auxiliary function \( v = u_t \), and denote the vector function \( \mathbf{U} = (u, v)^T \). Then Eq. (1.1) can be converted into a differential equation system:

\[
\mathbf{U}_t = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}_t = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ u_{xx} - f(u) \end{pmatrix}.
\]  

(2.1)
We introduce a splitting control parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the previous system (2.1) can be written in a splitting form.

$$U_t = (u, v) = \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} + \left(1 - \alpha^2\right)v \right)_{xx} \equiv L_1 U + L_2(U). \tag{2.2}$$

From time $t = t^n$ to time $t = t^{n+1}$, where $t^{n+1} = t^n + \tau$, $\tau = 0$, firstly we split the system (2.1) into a linear subproblem and a nonlinear subproblem.

$$U^n_1 = L_1 U^n \quad U^n(t_n, x) = U(t_n, x) \quad t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}], \tag{2.3}$$

$$U^n_2 = L_2(U^n) \quad U^n(t_{n,1}, x) = U^n(t_{n,1}, x) \quad t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]. \tag{2.4}$$

Then we solve the subproblems (2.3) and (2.4) step-by-step, in which the solution of one subproblem is employed as an initial condition for the alternative subproblem, and take $U(t_{n+1}, x) \approx U^n(t_{n+1}, x)$ as the approximate solution of the system (2.1). This may be realized by the solution operator that approximates combination of products of the exponential operators $e^{t_1 \Gamma}$ and $e^{t_2 \Gamma}$. By the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff theorem, we have the first-order approximation using solution operator,

$$U^{n+1} \approx e^{t_1 \Gamma} e^{t_2 \Gamma} U^n. \tag{2.5}$$

So far, the simplest idea of the operator splitting method has been described. The error of the approximation (2.5) is the first-order $O(\tau)$ induced from the noncommutativity of the operators $L_1$ and $L_2$ [33]. In general, the second-order Strang splitting is more frequently adopted in applications, for which the solution operator is approximated by,

$$U^{n+1} \approx e^{t_1 \Gamma} e^{t_2 \Gamma} e^{t_1 \Gamma} U^n. \tag{2.6}$$

In fact, the only difference between the Strang splitting method [34] and the first-order splitting method is that the first and last steps are half of the normal step $\tau$. Thus a more accurate second-order method can be implemented by a very simple way.

Next, we use the operator splitting method to obtain the split local absorbing boundary (SLAB) conditions for the NKLGE. First of all, we introduce two artificial boundaries $\Sigma_l = \{(x, t) \mid x = x_l, 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ and $\Sigma_r = \{(x, t) \mid x = x_r, 0 \leq t \leq T\}$, where $x_l, x_r$ are two constants, with $x_l < x_r$, which divide the unbounded domain $R^1 \times [0, T]$ into three parts,

$$D_l = \{(x, t) \mid -\infty \leq x \leq x_l, 0 \leq t \leq T\},$$

$$D_i = \{(x, t) \mid x_l \leq x \leq x_r, 0 \leq t \leq T\},$$

$$D_r = \{(x, t) \mid x_r \leq x \leq +\infty, 0 \leq t \leq T\}.$$

The finite sub-domain $D_i$ is the bounded computational domain. Therefore, we must find some appropriate boundary conditions on $\Sigma_l$ and $\Sigma_r$, respectively, to reduce the original initial value problem (1.1) and (1.2) into a initial boundary value problem on the domain $D_i$.

Some simple calculation shows that the equation of the linear subproblem (2.3) is equivalent to the following wave equations:

$$u_{tt} - \alpha^2 u_{xx} = 0. \tag{2.7}$$

In the problem (1.1) and (1.2), we assume the initial values $\phi_0(x), \phi_1(x)$ are constant in the exterior domain $D_l \cup D_r$. It means that no wave travels from the exterior domain into the interior domain $D_i$. So at the right artificial boundary $\Sigma_r$, we can obtain a absorbing artificial boundary condition (ABC):

$$u_t + \alpha u_x = 0, \quad \forall (x, t) \in \Sigma_r. \tag{2.8}$$

Similarly, at the artificial boundary $\Sigma_l$, we can obtain a absorbing artificial boundary condition (ABC):

$$u_t - \alpha u_x = 0, \quad \forall (x, t) \in \Sigma_l. \tag{2.9}$$

The artificial boundary conditions (2.8) and (2.9) are linear transport equations, which can be discretized by the up-wind scheme or the beam-worming scheme, thus we have first- or second-order of accuracy, respectively. Similarly, the equation of the nonlinear subproblem (2.4) is equivalent to the following equation:

$$u_t + (1 - \alpha^2)f(u) = 0 \quad x_l \leq x \leq x_r, \quad t^n \leq t \leq t^{n+1}. \tag{2.10}$$

The nonlinear Eq. (2.10) is an ordinary differential equation, which can be solved by the Runge–Kutta method or the Matlab ode-solver(ode15). Seeing that the restriction of (2.10) on the boundary $\Sigma_l$ (or $\Sigma_r$) is an initial value problem, no extra boundary condition is required.

3. The derivation of the difference scheme

In this section, we consider the coupling procedure for solving the nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation on the bounded computational domain $D_i = [x_l, x_r] \times [0, T]$. We divide the domain $D_i$ by a set of lines parallel to the $x$- and $t$-axis to form a grid, and
write \( h = (x_i - x_{i-1}) / l \) and \( \tau = T / N \) for the line spacings, where \( l \) and \( N \) are two positive integers. The crossing points \( \Omega_n^h \) are called the grid points,

\[
\Omega_n^h = \{(x_i, t_n)|x_i = x_i + ih, \ i = 0, 1, \ldots, l, \ t_n = n\tau, n = 0, 1, \ldots, N\}.
\]

Suppose \( U = \{u_i^e|0 \leq i \leq l, n \geq 0\} \) is a grid function on \( \Omega_n^h \). To get the numerical solution on the domain \( \Omega_n \), we use the central difference scheme to approximate Eq. (1.1):

\[
\frac{u_i^{n+1} - 2u_i^n + u_i^{n-1}}{\tau^2} - \frac{u_{i+1}^n - 2u_i^n + u_{i-1}^n}{h^2} + f(u_i^n) = 0,
\]

for \( i = 1, \ldots, l - 1 \), where \( u_i^n \) represents the approximation of wave function \( u(x, t) \) on the grid point \((x_i, t^n)\) with \( t^n = n\tau \), \( x_i = ih \), \( x_i = x_{i-1}, x_{i+l} = x_l \).

For each computational step, the equation system (3.1) contains \( l + 1 \) unknowns, however it only has \( l - 1 \) equations. So the scheme (3.1) is incomplete, thus two unknown values \( u_i^0 \) and \( u_i^1 \) must be provided through boundary conditions. According to the discussion in Section 2, we split Eq. (1.1) into two subproblems (2.7) and (2.10) on the grid points \((x_0, t^n)\) and \((x_l, t^n)\) in the vicinity of the boundaries, and then solve them separately, in which the solution of one subproblem is employed as an initial condition for the next subproblem by imposing two intermediate variables \( U_i^0 = (u_i^0, v_i^0)^T, i = 0, l \). For Eq. (2.10), we use the exponential operator form,

\[
U_i^0 \approx e^{ih}U_i^n, \quad i = 0, l.
\]

The second intermediate step is a linear problem, which can generate two extra equalities by discretizing the ABCs (2.8) and (2.9) with the up-wind scheme or the beam-worming scheme. Here, we take the up-wind scheme for an example,

\[
\frac{u_i^{n+1} - u_i^n}{\tau} + \alpha \frac{u_i^n - u_{i-1}^n}{h} = 0,
\]

\[
\frac{u_i^{n+1} - u_i^n}{\tau} - \alpha \frac{u_i^n - u_{i+1}^n}{h} = 0.
\]

At the \((n + 1)\)th time level, suppose \( \{u_i^k|k \leq n, 0 \leq i \leq l\} \) are given. Firstly, we solve Eqs. (3.2)–(3.4) to get the boundary term \( u_i^{n+1}, i = 0, l \) and assume \( v_i^{n+1} = v_i^* \) then solve Eq. (3.1) to get \( \{u_i^{n+1}|1 \leq i \leq l - 1\} \). Hence, we can get all the solution \( U = \{u_i^{n+1}|0 \leq i \leq l, n \geq 0\} \) step-by-step. Compare with the global ABC as mentioned above, our split local absorbing boundary (SLAB) method has great advantage for long time computation. In order to improve the accuracy of the local time-splitting procedure, a second-order Strang splitting [34] and the beam-worming scheme can be used, where we use two intermediate variables \( U_i^0 = (u_i^0, v_i^0)^T, i = 0, l \) and \( U_i^* = (u_i^*, v_i^*)^T, i = 0, l \). Here, \( U_i^0 \) is obtained from \( U_i^n \) through the half time step ordinary differential equation,

\[
U_i^0 \approx e^{ih}U_i^n, \quad i = 0, l.
\]

Suppose that \( v_i^* = v_i^*, i = 0, l \) and \( u_i^* = u_i^*, i = 0, l \) are deduced from \( u_i^0, i = 0, l \) by the beam-worming scheme:

\[
\frac{u_i^* - u_i^n}{\tau} = \alpha \frac{3u_i^n - 4u_{i-1}^n + u_{i-2}^n}{2h} + \alpha \frac{u_i^n - 2u_{i-1}^n + u_{i-2}^n}{2h} + \alpha \frac{v_i^n - 2v_{i-1}^n + v_{i-2}^n}{2h},
\]

\[
\frac{u_i^* - u_i^n}{\tau} = \alpha \frac{3u_i^n - 4u_{i+1}^n + u_{i+2}^n}{2h} + \alpha \frac{u_i^n - 2u_{i+1}^n + u_{i+2}^n}{2h} + \alpha \frac{v_i^n - 2v_{i+1}^n + v_{i+2}^n}{2h}.
\]

Finally, \( U_i^{n+1} \) can be obtained from \( U_i^* \) through another half time step ordinary differential equation,

\[
U_i^{n+1} \approx e^{ih}U_i^*, \quad i = 0, l.
\]

Thus a more accurate scheme can be obtained by coupling Eqs. (3.5)–(3.8) and the equation system (3.1).

4. Numerical tests

To test the performance and accuracy of the given split local absorbing boundary method, four different kinds of application examples for the NLKGE are provided in this section, where the second-order Strang splitting and the beam-worming scheme are used.

4.1. The sine-Gordon (sG) equation

The sine-Gordon (sG) equation is a very important nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation [19–21], which has the potential function \( G(u) = 1 - \cos(u) \) and takes the following form:

\[
\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \sin u = 0.
\]
The sine-Gordon (sG) equation has some travelling soliton solutions, also called the kink solution and anti-kink solution.

\[ u = 4 \arctan \exp \left( \pm \frac{x - ct}{\sqrt{1 - c^2}} \right) \]

where \( c \in (0, 1) \) is the moving velocity, the sign “+” corresponds to the case of kink solution, and “−” corresponds to the case of anti-kink solution. When \( t = 0 \), these solutions tend to some constants exponentially fast as \( x \) tends to infinity. For example, \( u_{\text{kink}} \to 2\pi \) as \( x \to +\infty \), and \( u_{\text{anti-kink}} \to 0 \) as \( x \to -\infty \).

First of all we consider the kink solution. Let \( c = 0 \); \( x_l = -8 \), \( x_r = 8 \) and take \( u_0(x) = u_{\text{kink}}(x, 0) \) and \( u_1(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u_{\text{kink}}(x, 0) \) as the initial data. From Fig. 1, we can see that the wave travels through the right artificial boundary, without causing dramatic reflection.

Next, we study the interaction of solitons, also called the Breather solution of the sine-Gordon equation. The sine-Gordon equation admits the kink–anti-kink solution,

\[ u_{\text{kink–anti-kink}} = 4 \arctan \left( \frac{c \sinh(\sqrt{c^2 - 1}t)}{\sqrt{c^2 - 1} \cosh(cx)} \right) \]

and the kink–kink solution,

\[ u_{\text{kink–kink}} = 4 \arctan \left( \frac{\sqrt{c^2 - 1} \sinh(cx)}{c \cosh(\sqrt{c^2 - 1}t)} \right) \]

The solitons in the kink–anti-kink solution (or the kink–kink solution) move with the same speed \( \sqrt{c^2 - 1}/c \) but in different direction. Let \( c = 2 \), \( x_l = -8 \), \( x_r = 8 \) and take \( \varphi_0(x) = u_{\text{kink–anti-kink}}(x, 0) \), \( \varphi_1(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u_{\text{kink–anti-kink}}(x, 0) \) and \( \varphi_0(x) = u_{\text{kink–kink}}(x, 0) \), \( \varphi_1(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u_{\text{kink–kink}}(x, 0) \), respectively, as the initial data. Fig. 2 shows that the given scheme not only captures the interaction of solitons, but also let the solitons travel out the computational domain without causing dramatic reflection. Finally, we design an oscillation wave problem to test the performance of the given boundary conditions. In this case, \( x_l = -8 \), \( x_r = 8 \), the initial conditions are oscillation wave:

\[ \varphi_0(x) = \sin(10x) \exp \left( -\frac{x^2}{4} \right) \], \( \varphi_1(x) = 0 \).

Fig. 3 shows that the initial oscillation wave splits into two smaller waves and spreads along the characteristic lines. When they travel out the computational domain, the reflection waves are negligible.

4.2. The \( \phi^4 \) equation

We also test the scheme for the travelling soliton wave of the \( \phi^4 \) equation [20,21], which has the potential function \( G(u) = -\frac{1}{2} m^2 u^2 + \frac{1}{4} \gamma u^4 \) and takes the following form:

\[ \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \gamma u^3 - m u = 0, \]

where the \( m \) and \( \gamma \) are two parameters. The \( \phi^4 \) equation has travelling soliton wave solutions, also called the kink and anti-kink solutions:

![Fig. 1. Kink of the sine-Gordon equation, \( h = 0.05 \), \( \tau = h/2 \).](image-url)
for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, with the velocity restricted by $c^2 < 1$. If we choose the sign “+” (“−”), the travelling soliton wave $u(x, t)$ is a kink(anti-kink) solution, i.e. it consists of a single transition region between the asymptotic values $u_{\text{kink}} = \pm 1 (u_{\text{anti-kink}} = \mp 1)$.
as $x - ct$ varies between $\pm \infty$. Again this solution is on the whole real line, and it quickly approaches its asymptotic values away from the transition region.

Similar to the construction of the soliton solution in Section 4.1, let $x_l = -8$, $x_r = 8$ and take $\varphi_1(x) = u_{kink}(x, 0)$ and $\varphi_2(x) = \frac{h}{2} u_{kink}(x, 0)$ as the initial data. The numerical solutions of $u(x,t)$ is shown in Fig. 4, with $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$, $m = 1$, $c = 0.8$ together with the step sizes $h = 0.05$ and $\tau = \frac{h}{2}$. We can see that the right artificial boundary is nearly transparent for the solitary wave propagation, since the wave travel out the computational domain without causing dramatic reflection.

4.3. The double sine-Gordon (DSG) equation

The double sine-Gordon (DSG) equation has attracted many researchers attention, because it models a variety of systems in condensed matter, quantum optics, and particle physics. Condensed matter applications include the spin dynamics of superfluid $He^3$, magnetic chains, commensurate-incommensurate phase transitions, surface structural reconstructions, and domain walls. In quantum field theory and quantum optics DSG equation applications include quark confinement and self-induced transparency, respectively, see [22, 23]. The double sine-Gordon (DSG) equation has the potential,

$$G(u) = -\frac{4}{1 + 4|\eta|} \left( \eta \cos u - \cos \frac{u}{2} \right),$$

where the parameter $\eta$ may be assigned any arbitrary real value. In this paper we will consider the range $\eta > 0$, so we introduce parameter $R$ related with $\eta$ by $\eta = \frac{1}{2} \sinh^2 R$. From the potential function $G(u)$, we get the following DSG equation:

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \frac{2}{1 + 4|\eta|} \left( 2\eta \sin u - \sin \frac{u}{2} \right) = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.1)

Eq. (4.1) has a static solution in the form of a $4\pi$ kink (anti-kink):

$$u(x,t) = 4\pi m \pm 4 \arctan \frac{\sinh \left( \frac{x-a}{\sqrt{1-c^2}} \right)}{\cosh R},$$

where the sign “+” corresponds to the case of kink, and “−” corresponds to the case of anti-kink, and $m$ is an integer. $u(x,t)$ can be interpreted as a superposition of two sG solitons, separated by the distance $2R$.

In the numerical experiment, we set $c = 0.8$, $x_l = -12$, $x_r = 12$ and take $\varphi_1(x) = u_{kink}(x, 0)$ and $\varphi_2(x) = \frac{h}{2} u_{kink}(x, 0)$ as the initial data. The numerical solutions of $u(x,t)$ is shown in Fig. 5, with $m = 0$, $R = 4$, together with the step sizes $h = 0.05$ and $\tau = \frac{h}{2}$. We can find that the profile of the initial wave consists two kinks. They travel through the right artificial boundary consecutively, without causing dramatic reflection, which shows that the boundary conditions are nearly transparent for the wave propagation.

4.4. The double sinh-Gordon (DSHG) equation

The double sinh-Gordon (DSHG) equation has been extensively studied in the classical thermodynamics. This model equation also has a double well potential $G(u) = (\zeta \cosh 2u - m)^2$, when the positive parameter $m, \zeta$ satisfy $m > \zeta$, thus there also exists the kink and anti-kink solutions. Even though it is nonintegrable, the DSHG is remarkably amenable to analysis, see[24, 25]. From the potential function $G(u)$, we get the following DSHG equation:

$$\varphi = 0.4, \varphi_2 = 0.8$$
\begin{equation}
\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + 2\zeta (\sinh 4u - 2m \sinh 2u) = 0. \tag{4.2}
\end{equation}

Eq. (4.2) possess a single kink solution and anti-kink solution as following:
\[
u(x, t) = \pm \tanh \left( \sqrt{\frac{m - \zeta}{m + \zeta}} \tanh \frac{x - ct}{\sqrt{1 - c^2}} \right), \quad \zeta = \sqrt{2(m^2 - \zeta^2)}, \quad m > \zeta.
\]
The sign “+” corresponds to the case of kink solution, and the sign “-” corresponds to the case of anti-kink solution. Eq. (4.2) can be linearized around \( u = 0 \) leading to higher energy phonons. For phonons around \( u = 0 \), the above Eq. (4.2) can be approximated by a \( \phi^4 \) equation, which shows the connection between the \( \phi^4 \) equation and the DSHG equation.
\[
\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + (8\zeta^2 - 8m\zeta)u + \frac{16}{3}(4\zeta^2 - m^2)u^3 = 0.
\]

In the numerical experiment, we set \( c = 0.5, x_l = -8, x_r = 8 \) and take \( \varphi_0(x) = u_{\text{kink}}(x, 0) \) and \( \varphi_1(x) = \frac{\zeta}{c} u_{\text{kink}}(x, 0) \) as the initial data. The numerical solutions of \( u(x, t) \) is shown in Fig. 6, with \( m = 2, \zeta = 1 \), together with the step sizes \( h = 0.05 \) and \( \tau = \frac{h}{2} \).

We can see that the kink solution travels through the right artificial boundary without causing dramatic reflection, which shows that the boundary conditions are also effective for this nonintegrable equation.

4.5. Accuracy of the SLAB method

In this section, we consider the numerical accuracy of the SLAB method for the tested problems in Sections 4.1–4.4 with exact solutions. Numerical experiments show that for these four kinds of nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation, the SLAB method
has the same accuracy. To avoid tautology, we only give the numerical results about the sG equation and the $\phi^4$ equation here.

In all the computation, we let $h = 2\tau$. To evaluate the accuracy of numerical solution, we define the $L_2$ norm of the error function as

$$E(t) = \|u_{\text{num}}(\cdot, t) - u_{\text{exa}}(\cdot, t)\|_{L_2}.$$  

(4.3)

Table 1 lists the errors for different mesh sizes and the convergence rates. Fig. 7 gives the linear least square fitting of different errors and mesh sizes in logarithm coordinates. It can be seen that our numerical scheme is second-order convergence, just as we anticipate.

Table 8 gives the result about how the SLAB method depends on the cut points $x_l$ and $x_r$. The top-left part is the evolution of the sG equation with $h = 0.05$, $\tau = \frac{1}{2}$, $x_l = -15$, $x_r = 15$, $T = 22.5$. The initial value on the top-right part shows that the wave-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mesh size</th>
<th>$L_2$ norm of the error (sG equation)</th>
<th>$L_2$ norm of the error ($\phi^4$ equation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h = \frac{1}{10}$</td>
<td>1.713E-2 ...</td>
<td>2.212E-2 ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h = \frac{1}{20}$</td>
<td>4.262E-3 4.019</td>
<td>5.532E-3 4.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h = \frac{1}{40}$</td>
<td>1.066E-3 3.996</td>
<td>1.383E-3 3.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h = \frac{1}{80}$</td>
<td>2.739E-4 3.893</td>
<td>3.459E-4 3.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h = \frac{1}{160}$</td>
<td>9.345E-5 2.930</td>
<td>8.666E-5 3.991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7. Linear least square fitting of different errors and mesh sizes, left is sG equation, right is $\phi^4$ equation. $h = \frac{1}{10}, \frac{1}{20}, \frac{1}{40}, \frac{1}{80}, \frac{1}{160}, \tau = \frac{1}{2}$.

Fig. 8. The waveform of the sG equation, $h = 0.05$, $\tau = h/2$, $T = 22.5$. 

Fig. 6.
form is constant outside the interval \([-5.5], \text{Let } L = |x_L| = |x_R| \text{ denotes the distance from the location of the artificial boundary to the center of the computational domain. During the computation process, we fix the terminal time as } T = 22.5. \text{ Initially, we set } L = 1 \text{ and every time we increase } L \text{ by 1 to compute the numerical error. Here, the error function is defined by }\]

\[
E(L) = \max_{0 \leq t \leq T; L \leq X} |u_{\text{num}}(x, t) - u_{\text{ex}}(x, t)|.
\]

**Fig. 9** shows that when the length \(L\) is bigger than 5, the SLAB method will have a very high numerical accuracy.

The choice of the splitting control parameter \(\alpha\) is quite important in the SLAB method, however how to get the \(\alpha\) in an analytic way is still open. Through numerical experiments, we find that if we choose the splitting control parameter \(0.8 < \alpha < 0.9\), the given method is nearly transparent for the wave propagation. Hence, in all of the numerical experiments in this paper, we set \(\alpha = 0.85\). **Fig. 10** shows the numerical error for different velocity of the sG equation. Here, the error function is the same as (4.3), and the wave velocities are \(c = 0.8\) and \(c = 0.4\), respectively.

The numerical schemes (3.1)–(3.4) are the standard splitting method, hence we call them SLAB1 for simplicity. Similarly, the Strong splitting methods (3.1) and (3.5)–(3.8) are called SLAB2. We compare the performance of these two methods for sG equation and \(\phi^4\) equation. **Fig. 11** shows that the SLAB2 method is second-order convergence, but when the mesh size is fine enough, the SLAB1 method can not get the second-order convergence. For the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation on the unbounded domain, Szeftel [35] adopted the paradifferential calculus approach to construct a family of absorbing boundary conditions for the semilinear wave equation. Let PDC1 and PDC2 denote the first- and second-order absorbing boundary conditions given by Szeftel. In fact, the PDC1 absorbing boundary condition is just the Neumann boundary condition. We compare the performance of the PDC1, PDC2 and SLAB2 method for the sG equation and \(\phi^4\) equation.

**Fig. 9.** The errors of different length \(L\) for the sG equation, \(h = 0.05, \tau = h/2, T = 22.5\).

**Fig. 10.** The errors of different splitting control parameter \(\alpha\) for the sG equation, \(h = 0.05, \tau = h/2, T = 12\). Left is \(c = 0.8\), right is \(c = 0.4\).
Figs. 12 and 13 show that for a large-range of wave velocity \( c \), the SLAB2 method is nearly transparent for the wave propagation, which means the SLAB2 method is robust to wave velocity \( c \). When \( c = 0.8 \) the PDC2 method is more accurate than the SLAB2 method. However, when the wave velocity is small, the PDC2 method will bring strong reflection on the artificial
boundaries. We can also see that for the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation, the Neumman (PDC1) boundary conditions will cause dramatic reflection.

5. Conclusion

The numerical solution of the one-dimensional nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation on an unbounded domain is studied in this paper. Split local absorbing boundary (SLAB) conditions are obtained by the operator splitting method, then the original initial value problem is reduced to an initial boundary value problem on a bounded computational domain. Numerical examples indicate that the given method is fast and nearly transparent for the wave propagation, but the stability and error analysis of the method is still open. This method also has the potential of generalizing to multi-dimensional nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation on the unbounded domain, which we will be our further work.
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