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Consider the linear system: $A u=f \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$.
Given a decomposition of $\llbracket 1 ; n \rrbracket,\left(\mathcal{N}_{1}, \mathcal{N}_{2}\right)$, define:

- the restriction operator $R_{i}$ from $\llbracket 1 ; n \rrbracket$ into $\mathcal{N}_{i}$,
- $R_{i}^{T}$ as the extension by 0 from $\mathcal{N}_{i}$ into $\llbracket 1 ; n \rrbracket$.

Then solve concurrently:
$u_{1}^{m+1}=u_{1}^{m}+A_{11}^{-1} R_{1}\left(f-A u^{m}\right) \quad u_{2}^{m+1}=u_{2}^{m}+A_{22}^{-1} R_{2}\left(f-A u^{m}\right)$ where $u_{i}=R_{i} u$ and $A_{i j}:=R_{i} A R_{j}^{T}$.
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Then, $u^{m+1}=\sum_{i=1}^{N} R_{i}^{T} D_{i} u_{i}^{m+1}$.

$$
M^{-1}=\sum_{i=1}^{N} R_{i}^{T} D_{i} A_{i i}^{-1} R_{i} .
$$

## Contributions and goals

Based on algebraic results with the $p$. of $u$., we propose:
(1) a reformulation of the global matrix-vector product eliminating the need of a global ordering,
(2) a construction of a so-called "coarse operator" to enhance a simple preconditioner.

We are interested in the solution of various SPD systems, independently of:

- the discretization order,
- the contrast in the coefficients,
- the number of subdomains.
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## Using the overlap to its fullest extent

DDM methods are seldom used as standalone solvers.
Krylov methods and overlapping Schwarz methods

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{i} A u & =\sum_{j=1}^{N} R_{i} A R_{j}^{T} D_{j} R_{j} u=\sum_{j \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_{i}}} A_{i j} D_{j} R_{j} u \\
& =\sum_{j \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_{i}}} R_{i} R_{j}^{T} A_{j j} D_{j} R_{j} u . \text { local unknowns on } \Omega_{j}
\end{aligned}
$$

- no need for the global matrix, only local to neighbors mappings. $\hookrightarrow$ explicit point-to-point communications via $R_{i} R_{j}^{T}$.
- reuse of the operators from the preconditioner, $A_{i i}$.
$\mathcal{O}_{i}$ are the neighbors of $\Omega_{i}, \overline{\mathcal{O}_{i}}=\mathcal{O}_{i} \cup\{i\}$.


## Limitations of one-level methods

One-level methods don't require exchange of global information.

This hampers numerical scalability of such preconditioners.
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## Two-level preconditioners I

A common technique in the field of DDM, MG, deflation: introduce an auxiliary "coarse" problem.

Let $Z$ be a rectangular matrix. Define

$$
E:=Z^{\top} A Z .
$$

$Z$ has $\mathcal{O}(N)$ columns, hence $E$ is much smaller than $A$.
Enrich the original preconditioner, e.g. additively

$$
P^{-1}=M^{-1}+Z E^{-1} Z^{\top},
$$

c.f. (Tang et al. 2009).

## Two-level preconditioners II

The construction of $Z$ and the assembly of $E$ are challenging. Let each domain compute concurrently $\nu_{i}$ vectors $\left\{\Lambda_{i j}\right\}_{j=1}^{\nu_{i}}$. Define local dense rectangular matrices:

$$
W_{i}=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
D_{i} \Lambda_{i_{1}} & D_{i} \Lambda_{i_{2}} & \cdots & D_{i} \Lambda_{i_{\nu_{i}}}
\end{array}\right] .
$$

Then, define the global deflation matrix as:

$$
Z=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
R_{1}^{T} W_{1} & R_{2}^{T} W_{2} & \cdots & R_{N}^{T} W_{N}
\end{array}\right]
$$

## Generalized eigenvalue problems

For theoretical justification of $Z$, see (Spillane et al. 2011). Solved by ARPACK concurently:

$$
A_{i}^{N} \Lambda_{j}=\lambda_{j} D_{i} R_{i, 0}^{T} R_{i, 0} A_{i}^{N} D_{i} \Lambda_{j}
$$

where

- $A_{i}^{N}$ is the local unassembled matrix,
- $R_{i, 0}$ is the restriction from $\Omega_{i}$ to $\Omega_{i} \bigcap\left(\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{O}_{i}} \Omega_{j}\right)$.
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## Distribution of the coarse operator

How can one solve $E^{-1} z=c \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$ ?
Some constraints:
(1) E cannot be centralized on a single MPI process,
(2) $E$ cannot be distributed on all MPI processes,
(3) the solution must be computed fast and reliably.
$\Longrightarrow$ use a direct solver with a distributed matrix on few master processes (number chosen at runtime).

## Assembly for Schwarz methods

Recalling $E=Z A Z^{\top}$, it can be proven that the block $(i, j)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_{i j} & =W_{i}^{\top} A_{i j} W_{j} \\
& =W_{i}^{\top} R_{i} R_{j}^{\top} A_{i j} W_{j}
\end{aligned}
$$

(1) compute locally $T_{i}=A_{i j} W_{i}$ (csrmm),
(2) send to each neighbor, $S_{j}=R_{j} R_{i}^{T} T_{i}$,
(3) receive from each neighbor $U_{j}=R_{i} R_{j}^{T} T_{j}$,
(4) compute locally $E_{i, i}=W_{i}^{\top} T_{i}$ (gemm),
© compute locally $E_{i, j}=W_{i}^{\top} U_{j}$ (gemm).
Note: - steps 2 and 3 overlap with step 4,

- if $j \notin \mathcal{O}_{i}, R_{i} R_{j}^{T}=0$.


## Example of heterogeneous coefficients

$$
\nabla \cdot(\kappa \nabla u)=f
$$

$+B C$


## 2D geometry



## 3D geometry



## Machine used for scaling runs

## Curie Thin Nodes

- 5,040 compute nodes.
- 2 eight-core Intel Sandy Bridge@2.7 GHz per node.
- IB QDR full fat tree.
- 1.7 PFLOPs peak performance.


## PRAGE

## Strong scaling (linear elasticity)

1 subdomain/MPI process, 2 OpenMP threads/MPI process.
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## Weak scaling (scalar diffusion equation)

1 subdomain/MPI process, 2 OpenMP threads/MPI process.

$\square$ Factorization $\square$ Deflation vectors $\square$ Coarse operator $\square$ Krylov method

## Distributed global matrix

Local to global mapping $\Longrightarrow$ distribution of the global matrix à la PETSc (split row-wise).

Comparing performance of setup and solution phases between our solver against purely algebraic (+ near null space) solvers:

- GASM - one-level domain decomposition method (ANL),
- Hypre BoomerAMG - algebraic multigrid (LLNL),
- GAMG - algebraic multrigrid (ANL/LBL).


## Solution of a linear system I

Homogeneous 3D Poisson equation discretized by $\mathbb{P}_{1} \mathrm{FE}$ solved on 2,048 MPI processes, 111M d.o.f.



## Solution of a linear system II

Heterogeneous 3D linear elasticity equation discretized by $\mathbb{P}_{2} \mathrm{FE}$ solved on $2,048 \mathrm{MPI}$ processes, 127 M d.o.f.



## Final words

Limitations:

- scaling of the coarse operator in 3D beyond 10k subdomains,
- deflation vectors need elementary matrices to be computed.

Summary:

- scalable framework for building two-level preconditioners for both Schwarz or substructuring methods (FETI-1),
- easily interfacable (FEM, FVM) without a global ordering.

Outlooks:

- adaptive (re)construction/recycling of the coarse operator,
- nonlinear and saddle point problems.
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目 Tang, J., R. Nabben, C. Vuik, and Y. Erlangga (2009). "Comparison of two-level preconditioners derived from deflation, domain decomposition and multigrid methods". In: Journal of Scientific Computing 39.3, pp. 340-370.

## Solvers parameters

- Schwarz GenEO: $\nu_{i}=20$, overlap $=1$ (geometric).
- PETSc GASM: overlap $=10$ (algebraic).
- Hyper BoomerAMG: HMIS coarsening, extended "classical" interpolation, no CF-relaxation, 2 levels of aggressive coarsening.
- PETSc GAMG: 1 smoothing step, -mg_levels_ksp_type richardson -mg_levels_pc_type sor.

OpenMPI bindings for hybrid runs:
--bind-to-socket --bycore.

## Distribution of the coarse operator



Uniform distribution


Non-uniform distribution

Distribution of $E$ when built with $N=16$ using 4 masters. On the right, the number of values per master is roughly the same if the values below the diagonal are dropped (symmetric coarse operator).

## Timings for assembling the coarse operator

3D

| $N$ | $P$ | $\operatorname{dim}(E)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\left\|\mathcal{O}_{i}\right\|$ (average) |  | Memory cost of " $E^{-1} "$ |  | Time |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 256 | 4 |  | 5120 |  | 11.5 |  | 38 MB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 512 | 6 |  | 10240 |  | 12.4 |  | 78 MB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1024 | 8 | 8 | 20480 | 22528 | 13.0 | 12.0 | 156 MB | 93 MB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2048 | 12 | 12 | 40960 | 40960 | 13.8 | 12.9 | 332 MB | 138 MB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4096 | 18 | 22 | 73728 | 73728 | 14.2 | 13.7 | 434 MB | 172 MB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8192 | 64 | 48 | 131072 | 131072 | 14.7 | 14.6 | 420 MB | 11.91 s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

2D

| $N$ | $P$ | $\operatorname{dim}(E)$ |  | $\left\|\mathcal{O}_{i}\right\|$ (average) | Memory cost of " $E^{-1} "$ | Time |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 256 | 2 |  | 5376 |  | 5.5 |  | 21 MB |  |
| 512 | 4 |  | 10240 |  | 5.6 |  | 32 MB |  |
| 1024 | 10 | 8 | 20480 | 24576 | 5.7 | 5.5 | 65 MB | 57 MB |
| 2048 | 14 | 12 | 38912 | 40960 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 94 MB | 83 MB |
| 4096 | 22 | 18 | 81920 | 73728 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 99 MB | 73 MB |
| 8192 | 36 | 36 | 163840 | 122880 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 152 MB | 10.05 s |

## Strong scaling (linear elasticity)

|  | $N$ | Factorization | Deflation | Solution | \#it. | Total | \#d.o.f. |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 3D | 1024 | 177.86 s | 264.03 s | 77.41 s | 28 | 530.56 s |  |
|  | 2048 | 62.69 s | 97.29 s | 20.39 s | 23 | 186.04 s | $293.98 \cdot 10^{6}$ |
|  | 4096 | 19.64 s | 35.70 s | 9.73 s | 20 | 73.12 s |  |
|  | 8192 | 6.33 s | 22.08 s | 6.05 s | 27 | 51.76 s |  |
| 2D | 1024 | 37.01 s | 131.76 s | 34.29 s | 28 | 213.20 s |  |
|  | 2048 | 17.55 s | 53.83 s | 17.52 s | 28 | 95.10 s | $2.14 \cdot 10^{9}$ |
|  | 4096 | 6.90 s | 27.07 s | 8.64 s | 23 | 47.71 s |  |
|  | 8192 | 2.01 s | 20.78 s | 4.79 s | 23 | 34.54 s |  |

## Weak scaling (scalar diffusion equation)

|  | $N$ | Factorization | Deflation | Solution | \#it. | Total | \#d.o.f. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3D | 256 | 64.24 s | 117.74 s | 15.81 s | 13 | 200.57 s | $74.62 \cdot 10^{6}$ |
|  | 512 | 63.97 s | 112.17 s | 19.93 s | 18 | 199.41 s | $144.70 \cdot 10^{6}$ |
|  | 1024 | 63.22 s | 118.58 s | 16.18 s | 14 | 202.40 s | $288.80 \cdot 10^{6}$ |
|  | 2048 | 59.43 s | 117.59 s | 21.34 s | 17 | 205.26 s | $578.01 \cdot 10^{6}$ |
|  | 4096 | 58.14 s | 110.68 s | 27.89 s | 20 | 207.47 s | $1.15 \cdot 10^{9}$ |
|  | 8192 | 54.96 s | 116.64 s | 23.64 s | 17 | 215.15 s | $2.31 \cdot 10^{9}$ |
| 2D | 256 | 29.40 s | 111.35 s | 25.71 s | 29 | 175.85 s | $695.96 \cdot 10^{6}$ |
|  | 512 | 29.60 s | 111.52 s | 27.99 s | 28 | 179.07 s | $1.39 \cdot 10^{9}$ |
|  | 1024 | 29.43 s | 112.18 s | 33.63 s | 28 | 185.16 s | $2.79 \cdot 10^{9}$ |
|  | 2048 | 29.18 s | 112.23 s | 33.74 s | 28 | 185.20 s | $5.58 \cdot 10^{9}$ |
|  | 4096 | 29.80 s | 113.69 s | 31.02 s | 26 | 185.38 s | $11.19 \cdot 10^{9}$ |
|  | 8192 | 29.83 s | 113.81 s | 30.67 s | 25 | 187.57 s | $22.31 \cdot 10^{9}$ |

