A parallel multigrid solver on a structured triangulation of a hexagonal domain DDXXI June 29, 2012

Kab Seok Kang kskang@ipp.mpg.de

High Level Support Team (HLST) Max-Planck-Institut für Plasmaphysik, EURATOM Association, Boltzmannstraße 2, D-85748 Garching, Germany



Max-Planck-Institut für Plasmaphysik EURATOM Assoziation



High Level Support Team (HLST)

- Main tasks: a support unit to ensure optimal exploitation of HPC-FF and HELIOS computers,
- Support for code development:
 - Parallelization & optimization of codes for massively parallel computers,
 - Improvement of the parallel scalability of existing codes
 - Implementation of algorithms and mathematical library routines to improve the efficiency of codes
 - Visualization of large data sets
- Members: Core team (6 persons, IPP, Garching, Germany)
 - + 4 staff (50%) in other European Fusion institutes.





- Model Problem
 - Parallelization
- Multigrid Method
 - PETSc vs own code
- Domain Decomposition method
 - BDDC
 - FETI-DP
- Scaling properties
- Conclusions



Model problem Discretization Parallelization

Model problem

 Purpose: solve the 2nd order PDE in Plasma Physics simulation codes for Tokamak experiments

K. S. Kang

- Solution is sought at each time step \rightarrow less than 0.1 sec

Tokamak experiments	ASDEX	JET	ITER	DEMO
DoF	2M	8M	32M	?

 The second order PDE (Helmholtz type) problem on a hexagonal domain with Dirichlet boundary condition

$$\begin{cases} (\mathbf{A} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} \nabla) \ \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f}, & \text{in } \Omega \\ \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}, & \text{on } \partial \Omega \end{cases}$$



Model problem Discretization Parallelization

Discretization

- Linear Finite element method or Finite volume method
- Triangulation with regular triangles
- Boundary nodes: No degree of freedom. Ghost nodes.





Model problem Discretization Parallelization

Parallelization



- Divide a regular hexagonal domain with regular triangular sub-domains
- Limited number of cores:
 - 1, 6, 24, 96, 384, ...
- Determine where the boundary

nodes of the sub-domain

are included.

- Use Fortran 90 and MPI library

(日)



Model problem Discretization Parallelization

Parallelization



Type I: 0,6,9,12,15,18,21,24, ...

- Consisted by Real (•) and

Ghost (○) nodes.

- Classify three types

of sub-domains.

- Need five steps for data

communication for

matrix-vector multiplication.



Type II: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, ...



Type III: 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 25, ...



Multigrid Method PETSc vs own code Domain Decomposition Method BDDC and FETI-DP

Multigrid Method

- Geometric multigrid method
- Well-known and well-analyzed fast solver
- The required number of iterations is fixed for many cases
- Lower levels: needs more data communication time in comparison to computing time
- Use V-cycle scheme as a solver and as a preconditioner
- Gather all data on each core for a certain lower level and solve by every core → Use MPI_Allreduce

(日)

Multigrid Method PETSc vs own code Domain Decomposition Method BDDC and FETI-DP

Implementing Multigrid Method

V-cycle Multigrid Method



Multigrid Method PETSc vs own code Domain Decomposition Method BDDC and FETI-DP

PETSc vs own code

- PETSc: Well-developed scientific library to solve
 PDE based problems
 - good for beginners of parallel programming
 - large and slow (or need to be tuned)
 - hard to optimize with structured discretization property of some specific problems
- Own code: the code can be optimized according to the properties of the structured discretization
 - hard to implement \rightarrow only expert get the benefit.



Multigrid Method PETSc vs own code Domain Decomposition Method BDDC and FETI-DP

Domain Decomposition Method

- Divide into sub-domains and solve problems only on each sub-domain \rightarrow naturally fit to distributed computers
- Overlapping (Schwarz) methods: minimally overlapping method (Block Jacobi) \rightarrow slow
- Nonoverlapping methods: Enforce the conditions on the boundaries of the sub-domains
 - good for discontinuous or many part problems



K. S. Kang Parallel multigrid method

Multigrid Method PETSc vs own code Domain Decomposition Method BDDC and FETI-DP

Two-level DDM

The condition number does not depend on the number of sub-domains.

- Balanced domain decomposition with constraints (BDDC)
 FETI-DP
- Need to solve the coarse level problem
 - \rightarrow gather data on each core and solve on every core
- Solving local problem and coarse level problem on each core
 - → Use Choleski factorization (LAPACK) for small number of DoF per core problem
 - → Need more scalable solver for large number of DoF per core problem
 - \rightarrow Working now on multigrid method

▲冊 ▶ ▲ 臣 ▶ ▲ 臣

Multigrid Method PETSc vs own code Domain Decomposition Method BDDC and FETI-DP

BDDC: Preconditioner (Dohrmann (2003))

C: the constraints, enforced between subdomains, on **corners and/or edges** $P_1 = R_l^T A_{ll}^{-1} R_l$: Solve local Dirichlet BC problem $P_2 = R^T D\Psi K_c^{-1} \Psi^T DR$ where $K_c = \sum \Psi^T A\Psi$ for $\begin{pmatrix} A & C^T \\ C & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Psi \\ \Lambda \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ R_c \end{pmatrix}$ $P_3 = R^T DQDR$ where $\begin{pmatrix} A & C^T \\ C & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Qg \\ \mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} g \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$

BDDC1. Initial static condensation correction and residual update

$$u_0=P_1r,\quad r_1=r-Au_0,$$

BDDC2. Coarse grid and substructure corrections and residual update

$$u_1 = P_2 r_1, \quad u_2 = P_3 r_1, \quad r_2 = r_1 - A(u_1 + u_2)$$

BDDC3. Final static condensation correction $u_3 = P_1 r_2$.

BDDC4. Preconditioned residual $Pr = u_0 + u_1 + u_2 + u_3$.





Multigrid Method PETSc vs own code Domain Decomposition Method BDDC and FETI-DP

FETI-DP (Farhat et el (2001))

– Imposed the continuity on the inner boundary nodes (using Lagrange multipliers B) and corners u_c

Solve
$$\begin{pmatrix} A_{rr} & A_{cr}^T & B^T \\ A_{cr} & A_{cc} & 0 \\ B & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_r \\ u_c \\ \lambda \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f_r \\ f_c \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Solve $F\lambda = d$ where

$$F = BA_{rr}^{-1}B^{T} + BA_{rr}^{-1}A_{cr}^{T}S_{cc}^{-1}A_{cr}A_{rr}^{-1}B^{T} = B\tilde{A}^{-1}B^{T}$$

$$d = BA_{rr}^{-1}f_{r} + BA_{rr}^{-1}A_{cr}^{T}S_{cc}^{-1}(f_{c} - A_{cr}A_{rr}^{-1}f_{r}) = B\tilde{A}^{-1}\tilde{f}$$

$$S_{cc} = A_{cc} - A_{cr}A_{rr}^{-1}A_{cr}^{T}$$
 (Coarser level)

- Conjugate gradient method with Dirichlet preconditioner

$$\begin{split} & u_{c} = S_{cc}^{-1}(f_{c} - A_{cr}A_{rr}^{-1}f_{r} + A_{cr}A_{rr}^{-1}B^{T}\lambda) \quad \text{(global)} \\ & u_{r} = A_{rr}^{-1}(f_{r} - A_{cr}^{T}u_{c} - B^{T}\lambda) \quad \text{(local)} \end{split}$$



Multigrid Method PETSc vs own code Domain Decomposition Method BDDC and FETI-DP

BDDC and FETI-DP

 K_c and S_{cc} : Globally defined coarse level problem

- \rightarrow K_c has large number of DoF than S_{cc},
- Four times if corners and edges used for the constraints
- The required mumber of iterations of FETI-DP and BDDC

Ratio =
$$h/H$$

h: finer level mesh size, *H*: lower level mesh size

cores	24		96		384		1536	
Ratio	FDP	BD	FDP	BD	FDP	BD	FDP	BD
1/8	12	7	15	9	16	8	17	8
1/16	14	8	18	9	19	10	20	10
1/32	17	10	22	11	23	11	24	11
1/64	20	11	24	13	26	13	27	13



HELIOS Highlights Weak scaling

HELIOS

- IFERC: The International Fusion Energy Centre is located at Rokkasho, Japan
 - EU(F4E)–Japan Broader Approach collaboration
- The Computational Simulation Centre (CSC): To exploit large-scale and high performance fusion simulations
- HELIOS: 4410 Bullx B510 Blades, 70,000 cores
 - 1.3 Pflops peak performance (No. 12 in Top500)
 - Two Intel Sandy-Bridge EP 2.7 GHz per node
 - Interconnection: Infiniband
 - Duration of project: April 1, 2012 Dec. 31, 2016



HELIOS Highlights Weak scaling

Highlights

- Multigrid method with gathering data is faster
- The matrix-vector multiplication: almost perfect weak-scaling
- For large DoF of local problem: Multigrid method has a very good (semi-)weak scaling property
- For small DoF per core problem, FETI-DP is the fastest
- Need scalable solver for FETI-DP and BDDC for large local $(A_{II} \text{ or } A_{rr})$ and coarse $(K_c \text{ or } S_{cc})$ problems

(日)

HELIOS Highlights Weak scaling

Multigrid with and without gathering



HELIOS Highlights Weak scaling

Multigrid as a solver for large problems



HELIOS Highlights Weak scaling

Multigrid, FETI-DP, and BDDC



K. S. Kang Parallel multigrid method

HELIOS Highlights Weak scaling

FETI-DP and BDDC on fixed number of cores



Conclusions

- For large DoF per core problems: Multigrid method has a very good (semi-)weak scaling property
- For small DoF per core problem: FETI-DP better than Multigrid and BDDC, but needs improvement of the scalability of the solver on the single core for large problems
- → Hybrid solver: Multigrid method with FETI-DP as a lowest solver, FETI-DP with multigrid method as local and global problem solver





- Roman Hatzky (IPP, HLST Core team leader) and all core team members

- Bruce Scott (IPP, Project coordinator)
- David Tskhakaya (University of Innsbruck, Project coordinator)

Thank you for your attention!!

