

Multigrid - raiders of the lost algorithm at exascale

S. Baccas ^{1,2}, A. Belozerov ³, E. Müller ³, D. Nikolaenko ², T. Weinzierl ¹

¹ Dept. of Computer Science, Durham University, ² Dept. of Advanced Research Computing, Durham University, ³ Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, University of Bath December 7, 2023 **Research Questions & Project Goals**



- How can exascale systems exploit the high arithmetic intensity of high-order DG while minimising time-to-solution?
- Can mathematically optimal MG deliver optimal performance at exascale?
- Can expensive assembly be overcome?
- Can we deliver MG as toolbox from which developers can pick and assemble their MG within their code base? (mature, holistic MG solvers do exist already)
- Can we integrate MG into our demonstrators such that we can do larger time steps (IMEX) or solve constraints more accurately?

PROJECT GOALS

- 1. Combine ExaHyPE's higher-order discretisation with MG
- 2. Pair MG with spatial and temporal adaptive discretisations
- 3. Balance pros and cons of algebraic vs. geometric and matrix-free vs. matrix-based MG
- 4. Simulation of binary black holes

Multigrid

Why multigrid?

- ► Optimal scaling: Cost ∝ number of unknowns crucial for exascale
- Parallelisation well studied
- Compatible with local mesh refinement
- Supports high-order finite elements (p-refinement)
- Adapted to (Interior Penalty) DG [Bastian, Blatt, Scheichl (2012)] and Hybridisable DG [Cockburn, Dubois, Gopalakrishnan, Tan (2014)]



Challenges

- Coupling with space-time discretisation in ADER-DG, local timestepping
- Fast, matrix-free implementation [Bastian, Müller, Müthing, Piatkowski (2019)]
- Reputation of being difficult to implement (but is it?)



Challenges

- Methodological Challenges
 - Assembly expensive
 - Interplay MG-DG (hybridisation)
 - Higher order in time (ADER-DG)
 - Increase concurrency (additive/asynchronous) → new MG ingredients
- Science Challenges
 - Simulate binary black holes (CCZ4)
 - Switch to implicit/explicit time stepping
 - ightarrow \rightarrow larger time steps
 - ► → accurate constraints
 - \blacktriangleright \rightarrow alternative models of gravity
- Software Challenges
 - Integrate into existing code bases
 - ▶ Pick n select rather than adopt to 3rd party code → open source toolbox



Current Progress



Developed flexible Python - Peano interface for DG matrix assembly from weak forms:



- \Rightarrow Interior Penalty DG, Hybridisable DG, ...
- Recreate Poisson equation solver with conforming FE* and DG discretisations
 - Aim to tackle Mixed/Hybrid DG next, as these are known to be compatible with Multigrid
- Instrumented Peano with PETSc backend
 - Allows us to use out-of-the-box solvers for validation
- Implemented matrix-free conforming FE Poisson solvers, with aim to develop this further

^{*}lowest order, piecewise linear continuous finite elements



- Develop HDG with out-of-the-box solver to establish baseline
- Develop matrix-free formulations alongside
- Once hybridised DG methods are working with PETSc solver and with own matrix-free methods, begin to introduce multigrid, using previous results as a baseline
- Introduce ADER-DG for space-time discretisation

References



- Betteridge, J., Gibson, T.H., Graham, I.G. and Müller, E.H., 2021. <u>Multigrid</u> preconditioners for the hybridised discontinuous Galerkin discretisation of the shallow water equations. Journal of Computational Physics
- Cockburn, B., Dubois, O., Gopalakrishnan, J. and Tan, S., 2014. <u>Multigrid for an HDG method</u>. IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis
- Bastian, P., Müller, E.H., Müthing, S. and Piatkowski, M., 2019. <u>Matrix-free</u> <u>multigrid block-preconditioners for higher order discontinuous Galerkin</u> <u>discretisations.</u> Journal of Computational Physics, 394, pp.417-439.
- Bastian, P., Blatt, M. and Scheichl, R., 2012. <u>Algebraic multigrid for discontinuous</u> <u>Galerkin discretizations of heterogeneous elliptic problems.</u> Numerical Linear <u>Algebra with Applications</u>, 19(2), pp.367-388.