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Abstract—Contemporary large-scale Partial Differential Equation (PDE) simulations usually require the solution of large and sparse linear systems. Moreover, it is often needed to solve these linear systems with different or multiple Right-Hand Sides (RHSs). In this paper, various strategies will be presented to extend the scalability of existing multigrid or domain decomposition linear solvers using appropriate recycling strategies or block methods—i.e., by treating multiple right-hand sides simultaneously.

The scalability of this work is assessed by performing simulations on up to 8,192 cores for solving linear systems arising from various physical phenomena modeled by Poisson's equation, the system of linear elasticity, or Maxwell’s equation.

This work is shipped as part of an open-source software, readily available and usable in any C/C++, Python, or Fortran code. In particular, some simulations are performed on top of a well-established library, PETSc, and it is shown how our approaches can be used to decrease time to solution down by 30%.

Index Terms—Iterative methods, distributed algorithms, Maxwell’s equation

I. INTRODUCTION

Discretizations of PDEs used to model physical phenomena typically lead to larger and larger systems that cannot be solved directly and require both 1) advanced preconditioning techniques and 2) efficient iterative methods. In recent years, a lot of efforts have been made to design highly scalable preconditioners for computational fluid dynamics [1, 2] or solid mechanics [3, 4], for example with multigrid [5] or domain decomposition [6] methods. Most of these advanced preconditioners, however, rely on basic iterative methods, such as the Generalized Minimal RESidual method [7] (GMRES) or the Preconditioned Conjugate Gradient [8] (PCG). Still, numerous new or modified iterative methods have been developed to: pipeline reductions [9], [10], avoid synchronizations [11], [12], decrease the number of iterations by means of multiple search directions [13], [14] or Krylov subspace recycling [15], [16]. Iterative methods tailored to tackle efficiently problems with multiple right-hand sides have also blossomed [17]–[19]. Finally, it can also be beneficial to couple block methods and recycling [20], [21].

The contribution of this paper is threefold, we present:

- a uniform implementation of a pseudo-block [i] and block Krylov solver based on an existing theoretical work [22],
- large-scale experiments using the aforementioned implementation on top of a well-established parallel library, PETSc [23], [24],
- a scalable solver for Maxwell’s equation with multiple right-hand sides using overlapping Schwarz methods with optimized boundary conditions [25], [26].

The paper is organized as follows. In section II, we present related work and limitations of current implementations of (pseudo-)block iterative methods with or without recycling. In section III we analyze the theoretical work presented by Parks et al. [22] in the context of high-performance computing. We also extend this study to the case of non-variable sequence of linear systems—i.e., when only right-hand sides are changing but not the linear operator itself—and to variable preconditioning, as already done theoretically [27], [28]. In section IV we use PETSc to generate large linear systems on up to 8,196 cores. We then compare our open-source implementation against existing subspace recycling strategies already implemented in the framework and we show that our approach can be used to decrease time to solution down by 30%. In section V, we investigate the potential of (pseudo-)block iterative methods over standard methods when direct solvers are used to define a preconditioner, for example in the context of domain decomposition methods. Eventually, we integrate these block methods inside a solver for Maxwell’s equation and show a relative speedup of up to 450% against more traditional solvers.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Subspace recycling

The work presented in this paper is mostly based on the Generalized Conjugate Residual method with inner Orthogonalization and Deflated Restarting method [22] (GCRO-DR), which itself is an extension of a prior work by de Sturler [29]. GCRO-DR was developed in the context of fatigue and fracture modeling via finite element analysis where it is usually required to solve a sequence of linear systems:

\[ A_i X_i = B_i \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots \]  

where the coefficient matrices \( A_i \in \mathbb{K}^{n \times n} \) and the right-hand sides \( B_i \in \mathbb{K}^{n \times p} \) might change from one index \( i \) to the next.

\[ \text{method were operations for each RHS are fused together, cf. section V-B1} \]

\[ \text{available at https://github.com/hpddm/hpddm} \]
In the original paper, each linear system is solved with a single right-hand side, i.e. \( p = 1 \). A MATLAB implementation has ever since been available to try this method, with either left or right preconditioning. A flexible variant of GCRO has then been proposed \([24]\), and eventually a flexible variant of GCRO-DR was derived \([28]\). In the latter reference, it is proved that under certain circumstances, FGCRO-DR is extended to the case of multiple right-hand sides. The notations for GMRES(\(m\)) and GCRO-DR(\(mk\)) are as follows:

- \( n \) is the size of all linear systems,
- \( p \) is the number of right-hand sides,
- \( m \) is the maximum dimension of Krylov subspaces,
- \( k \) is the dimension of recycled Krylov subspaces,
- \( V_{m+1} \) is an Arnoldi basis of \( m+1 \) blocks of dimension \( n \times p \),
- \( \overline{H}_m \) is a block Hessenberg matrix of dimension \( p \cdot (m+1) \times p \cdot m \) with blocks \( \{h_{ij}\} \) of size \( p \times p \), \( H_m \) is the restriction of \( \overline{H}_m \) to its first \( p \cdot m \) rows.

The QR decomposition of a single-column matrix—i.e., a vector—\( R_j = QR \) is unique and defined as \( Q = \frac{R_j}{\|R_j\|} \) and \( R = \|R_j\| \) (line \(1\)) and line \(24\) are the traditional way of defining the first vector of the Arnoldi basis for GMRES). The main difference between GMRES (resp. Augmented GMRES) and GCRO-DR is the solution of the eigenvalue problem line \(16\) (resp. generalized eigenvalue problem line \(33\)).

In the original paper, as well as in Belos, the left-hand side of the eigenvalue problem (line \(16\)) is defined as:

\[
H = H_m + H_m^H \begin{bmatrix} 0_{p \times (m-1) \times p \times (m-1)} & 0_{p \times p \times (m-1) \times p} \\ 0_{p \times p \times (m-1) \times p} & h_{m+1,m+1} \end{bmatrix},
\]

Since our implementation of (Block) GMRES computes the QR factorization of \( \overline{H}_m \) incrementally—i.e., \( p \) column(s) of \( Q \) and \( R \) are determined per iteration—we prefer to compute the following left-hand side, which is cheaper to evaluate:

\[
H = H_m + QR^H \begin{bmatrix} 0_{p \times (m-1) \times p \times (m-1)} & 0_{p \times p \times (m-1) \times p} \\ 0_{p \times p \times (m-1) \times p} & h_{m+1,m+1} \end{bmatrix}.
\]

The generalized eigenvalue problem (line \(33\)) may be defined with the following matrix pair:

\[
T = G_m^H G_m,
W = G_m^H \begin{bmatrix} C_k^H U_k & 0_{p \times k \times (m-k)} \\ V_{m-k+1}^H U_k & I_{p \times (m-k+1) \times p \times (m-k)} \end{bmatrix}.
\]
where the matrix $G_m$ is defined as:

$$G_m = \begin{bmatrix} D_k & E_k \\ 0_{p \cdot (m-k+1) \times p \cdot k} & H_{m-k} \end{bmatrix}.$$  

$D_k$ is a diagonal matrix whose entries are the $p \cdot k$ coefficients used to scale $U_k$ (line 31). We will see in section III-C that alternative definitions of the right-hand side matrix $W$ in eq. (3) are possible and may yield better performance.

Like in some communication-avoiding iterative methods, GCRO-DR requires the orthogonalization of $p \cdot k$ vectors at once (line 4). When it comes to subspace recycling methods or block iterative methods, Gram-Schmidt schemes are often used to perform this (37). Belos uses by default the Iterated Modified Gram-Schmidt method, but it is also possible to switch to the TSQR method, first studied in the context of CA-GMRES (47). In our implementation, we propose to use the CholQR method (48) since its efficiency has already been proved—once again in the context of CA-GMRES (49).

B. Non-variable linear systems

For some time-dependent PDEs, it is necessary to solve sequences of linear systems where the operator is the same throughout the sequence, and only the right-hand sides are varying. E.g., when solving the heat equation implicitly:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \Delta u = f, \quad (4)$$

where $f$ is a source term, or when solving the Navier–Stokes equation using projection methods (50). In fig. 1 the conditional statements line 3 and line 31 were not part of the original GCRO-DR method, but introduced afterwards (51). When GCRO-DR is called with a sequence of identical linear operators $A_{i+1} = A_i$, there is indeed no need to compute the original distributed QR decomposition (lines 4-6), and it is not mandatory to update the Arnoldi basis (line 37). The additional computations of GCRO-DR compared to GMRES after the first cycle are thus:

- the initial orthogonalization of the residual matrix (line 9) and the update of the initial guess (line 8),
- the orthogonalization w.r.t. $(I - C_k C_k^H)$ at each iteration (line 29) for generating the Arnoldi basis,
- the update of the approximate solution $X_j$ at the end of the $j$th cycle involves more work (lines 28, 29).

C. Variable preconditioning

Nonlinear or nondeterministic preconditioners are often needed, e.g., when using Krylov subspace methods as smoothers in multigrid preconditioners (52), (53). As first proposed by Parks et al. (22), and as implemented in Belos, GCRO-DR cannot handle variable preconditioning. A first flexible variant of GCRO-DR was proposed by Carvalho et al. (28). In the corresponding Technical Report (4), the authors

1: $R_0 = B_1 - A_1 X_0$
2: if $U_k$ is defined (from solving a previous system) then
3: if $A_i \neq A_{i-1}$ then
4: $[Q, R] = \text{distributed qr}(A_i U_k)$
5: $C_k = Q$
6: $U_k = U_k R^{-1}$
7: end if
8: $X_k = X_0 + U_k C_k^H R_0$
9: $R_1 = R_0 - C_k C_k^H R_0$
10: else
11: $[V_1, S_1] = \text{distributed qr}(R_0)$
12: perform $m$ steps of (Block) GMRES, thus generating $V_{m+1}$ and $[Q, R] = \text{qr}(H_m)$
13: find $Y_m$ such that $R Y_m = Q^{-1} S_1$
14: $X_k = X_0 + V_m Y_m$
15: $R_1 = B_1 - A_1 X_1$
16: end if
17: solve $H z_\lambda = \theta \Lambda z_\lambda$ \hspace{1cm} (eq. (2))
18: store the $k$ eigenvectors $z_\lambda$ associated to the smallest eigenvalues in magnitude in $P_k$
19: $[Q, R] = \text{qr}(H_m P_k)$
20: $C_k = V_{m+1} Q$
21: $U_k = V_m P_k R^{-1}$
22: $j = 1$
23: while $\text{EPS}(R_j, \varepsilon)$ do
24: $[V_k, S_k] = \text{distributed qr}(R_j)$
25: $j += 1$
26: perform $m - k$ steps of (Block) GMRES with the linear operator $(I - C_k C_k^H)A_i$, thus generating $V_{m-k}$, $[Q, R] = \text{qr}(H_{m-k})$, and $E_k = C_k A_i V_{m-k}$
27: find $Y_{m-k}$ such that $R Y_{m-k} = Q^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} S_k \\ 0_{p \cdot (m-k-1) \times p} \end{bmatrix}$
28: $Y_k = C_k^H R_{j-1} - E_k Y_{m-k}$
29: $X_j = X_{j-1} + U_k Y_k + V_{m-k} Y_{m-k}$
30: $R_j = B_1 - A_1 X_j$
31: if $A_i \neq A_{i-1}$ then
32: scale the columns of $U_k$ so that they are of unit norm
33: solve $T z_\lambda = \theta_1 W z_\lambda$ \hspace{1cm} (cf. eq. (3))
34: store the $k$ eigenvectors $z_\lambda$ associated to the smallest eigenvalues in magnitude in $P_k$
35: $[Q, R] = \text{qr}(H_m P_k)$
36: $C_k = \begin{bmatrix} C_k & V_{m-k+1} \end{bmatrix} Q$
37: $U_k = [U_k P_k \quad V_{m-k} P_k] R^{-1}$
38: end if
39: end while
40: function $\text{EPS}(R, \varepsilon)$
41: for each column $r$ of $R$ do
42: if $\|r\| > \varepsilon$ then
43: return true
44: return false
45: end function

Fig. 1. (Block) GCRO-DR as drafted by Parks et al. (22).
propose an alternative right-hand side matrix for the generalized eigenvalue problem (line 33). Instead of defining $W$ as in eq. (3a), they use:

$$
W = G_m^H V_{m+1} V_m^H = G_m^H \begin{bmatrix} I_{p \times m} & 0_{p \times p-m} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3b}
$$

We will see why this is attractive in practice in the following paragraph.

D. Cost analysis

For conciseness, no preconditioner has been mentioned in this section. However, when one is used, part of the initialization process (lines 4-6) must be adapted so that the preconditioner must be applied to the block of $p$ vectors $U_k$ (resp. $A U_k$) when using right (resp. left) preconditioning (line 3). This remark only holds when using a non-variable preconditioner.

The memory cost and the FLOP count of (Block) GCRO-DR and its flexible variant have already been studied in some of the aforementioned papers. We want to focus here on the synchronization and communication overhead introduced by these methods in the context of large-scale distributed computing. Our implementation uses the Message Passing Interface, and, as done frequently in implementations of Krylov subspace methods, we store:

- in a distributed fashion, matching the distribution of the linear systems $A_i$, all variables of the size of the system, i.e., $R_j, U_k, C_k$, and $V_k$. Persistent memory for the recycled vectors $U_k$ and $C_k$ between cycles is allocated using a singleton class.
- redundantly on each MPI process all variables of the dimension of the Krylov subspace, i.e., $\prod m, P_k, E_k$, and $Y_m$.

All additional communications in GCRO-DR are reductions that scale logarithmically with the number of processes:

- the distributed QR factorizations (line 11 and line 24) require a single reduction when using the CholQR or TSQR methods, or $k$ reductions when using the Classical Gram-Schmidt method.
- the update of the first guess (line 8) requires once again a single reduction (resp. $k$ reductions) when using the Classical (resp. Modified) Gram-Schmidt method.
- once a subspace is recycled, each (Block) GMRES cycle (line 26) requires one additional reduction per iteration in order to orthogonalize against $C_k$ each vector in the Arnoldi basis. Notwithstanding preconditioning that might require global communications, the number of reductions per GCRO-DR cycle is then $2(m - k)$ instead of $m$ for GMRES. A typical value chosen for $k$ is then $k = \frac{m}{2}$ to ensure the same number of reductions per cycle, but this is not a golden rule.
- the solution of the least square problem (line 27) must be updated with a reduction (line 28).

All other additional operations are performed redundantly on each process, using BLAS or LAPACK routines. However, the assembly of the right-hand side matrix of the generalized eigenvalue problem eq. (3) may require another reduction. Indeed, when using the original formulation of $W$ recalled eq. (3a), there are two matrix–matrix products that can be computed simultaneously and reduced once. When using the formulation eq. (3b), there is no global communication. The best choice (in terms of number of iterations) of eigenvalue problems between eq. (3a) and eq. (3b) is problem-dependent, as observed in the Technical Paper previously cited.

IV. LARGE-SCALE EXPERIMENTS

The purpose of this section is to show 1) how recycling may improve the efficiency of two toy problems, 2) that our framework may easily interact with most existing C/C++, Python, or Fortran applications. We will be using PETSc to generate our problems and to define preconditioners, that will then be passed to our implementation of GCRO-DR using callback functions. When GMRES or GCRO-DR are used as the outer iterative methods, we use the default value of PETSc of 30 to be the maximum dimension of Krylov subspaces before the methods restart.

A. Hardware and software settings

Results were obtained on Curie, a system composed of 5,040 nodes with two eight-core Intel Sandy Bridge clocked at 2.7 GHz. The interconnect is an InfiniBand QDR full fat tree and the MPI implementation exploited was BullxMPI version 1.2.9.2. All binaries and shared libraries were compiled with Intel compilers and Math Kernel Library support (for dense linear algebra computations). The latest available release of PETSc was used (version 3.7.3).

B. Poisson’s equation

This PDE may be used to model many physical phenomena, for example in computational fluid dynamics [54]. It can also be seen as the steady-state heat equation, cf. eq. (4):

$$
- \Delta u = f.
$$

Example number 32 of the PETSc distribution[7] discretizes this continuous problem using a simple two-dimensional Cartesian grid and a standard five-point stencil. This yields a linear system $A$. We slightly modified the example to generate four successive right-hand sides:

$$
f_i(x, y) = \frac{1}{\nu_i} e^{-(1-x)^2 / \nu^2} e^{-(1-y)^2 / \nu^2},
$$

where $\{\nu_i\} = \{0.1, 10, 0.001, 100\}$. The goal of the script is now to solve the sequence of four linear systems one after another, like one would have to do when solving a time-dependent problem. We will be using the Geometric Algebraic Multigrid preconditioner [24] (GAMG). It is an implementation of the smoothed aggregation multigrid method, and is shipped by default with PETSc. To make the multigrid cycles nonlinear, three iterations of GMRES are used as a smoother.

---

It is likely that there are better setup parameters, but we don’t want to focus on the performance of the preconditioner, and rather on the performance of the iterative methods (FGMRES vs. FGCRO-DR). The command line used to define the linear systems, setup the preconditioners and the iterative method is:

```
mpirun -np 8192 ./ex32 -da_grid_x 4210 -da_refine 2 -da_grid_y 4210 -ksp_rtol 1.0e-8 -pc_type gamg -pc_gamg_threshold 0.0725 -pc_gamg_square_graph 2 -ksp_type fgmres -mg_levels_ksp_type gmres -mg_levels_ksp_max_it 3
```

This generates a linear system of 280 million unknowns, for which the preconditioner is setup in 160 seconds. The matrix as well as the preconditioner are only assembled for the first right-hand side. They can be reused as is for successive solves.

We compare the Flexible GMRES method implemented in PETSc and our implementation of Flexible GCRO-DR, using a recycled subspace of dimension 10. This dimension was chosen after some preliminary experiments, but it can be set between 1 and \( m - 1 \). In fig. 2a the convergence curves of both methods are displayed. In fig. 2b the time to solution for each RHS is displayed. Overall, FGMRES (resp. FGCRO-DR) performs 124 (resp. 90) iterations. There is almost no restart in the previous experiment, thanks to the good numerical properties of the preconditioner. We will now use a slightly cheaper preconditioner, which induces a lower setup cost at the price of more iterations. The PETSc option \(-pc_gamg_threshold\)—a parameter to select edges in aggregation graphs—is adjusted accordingly:

```
mpirun -np 8192 ./ex32 -da_grid_x 4210 -da_refine 2 -da_grid_y 4210 -ksp_rtol 1.0e-8 -pc_type gamg -pc_gamg_threshold 0.076 -pc_gamg_square_graph 2 -ksp_type fgmres -mg_levels_ksp_type gmres -mg_levels_ksp_max_it 3
```

In fig. 2c the convergence curves of both methods are displayed. In fig. 2d the time to solution for each RHS is displayed. Overall, FGMRES (resp. FGCRO-DR) performs 172 (resp. 137) iterations. All these numbers are application-dependent, but it is clear that when using costly preconditioners, any decrease in number of iterations is worthwhile. An important observation that can be made looking at figs. 2b and 2d is that the cumulative solve time of FGMRES with the more robust but costlier preconditioner (blue bars in fig. 2b) is greater than the cumulative time of FGCRO-DR with the less robust but cheaper preconditioner (red bars fig. 2d). Thus, recycling can also be used to spend less time in assembling highly robust preconditioners by relaxing setup parameters—e.g., threshold criterion for multigrid preconditioners, overlap width for domain decomposition methods, or level of fill-in for incomplete factorizations.

C. The system of linear elasticity

This PDE is used in computational solid mechanics, for example to model small deformations of a rigid body. In the
FGMRES(30) [PDE on the unit cube with Q\(E\) ]

In this small inclusion, the material coefficient to define parametrically a small, moving, spherical inclusion: E as we use a set of five parameters: 

Example number 56 of the PETSc distribution

5 sequence of four varying systems—indexed by i formulation of the steady-state system of linear elasticity is: 

where \(\sigma\) is the stress tensor, and \(f\) represents body forces. Example number 56 of the PETSc distribution\[55\] discretizes this PDE on the unit cube with \(Q_i\) finite elements. To generate a sequence of four varying systems—indexed by \(i \in [1, \ldots, 4]\), we use a set of five parameters:

\[
\{s_i\} = \{30, 0.1, 20, 10\} \quad \{r_i\} = \{0.5, 0.45, 0.4, 0.35\} \\
\{x_i\} = \{0.5, 0.4, 0.4, 0.4\} \quad \{y_i\} = \{0.5, 0.5, 0.4, 0.4\} \\
\{z_i\} = \{0.5, 0.45, 0.4, 0.35\} 
\]

to define parametrically a small, moving, spherical inclusion: 

\[
\forall (x, y, z) \in [0; 1]^3, (x - x_i)^2 + (y - y_i)^2 + (z - z_i)^2 < r_i^2.
\]

In this small inclusion, the material coefficient \(E_i\) is defined as \(E_i = \frac{E}{s_i}\), E is the Young modulus everywhere but in the inclusion. Once again, we use a multigrid preconditioner, equipped with the near-nullspace of the operators made of six rigid body modes, to solve the linear systems efficiently. The command line used to define the linear systems, setup the preconditioners and the iterative method is:

```
mpirun -np 8000 ./ex56 -ne 399 -ksp_rtol 1.0e-8 
-ksp_type fgmres -pc_type gamg 
-mg_levels_ksp_type cg -mg_levels_ksp_max_it 4
```

This generates four linear systems of 283 million unknowns, for which the preconditioner must be setup for each different matrix—in average, this takes 50 seconds. We choose once again on purpose the smoother to be four iterations of CG to make the multigrid cycles nonlinear. It is unlikely to be the most efficient smoother, but it makes the use of the flexible variant of GCRO-DR (which is not implemented inside Belos) mandatory. In fig. 5a the convergence curves of FGMRES and FGCR-DR methods are displayed. In fig. 5b the time to solution for each RHS is displayed. Unlike in the previous experiment, an eigenvalue problem must be solved at each restart (lines \[33\]\[38\] in fig. 1). Likewise, it is costlier to update the initial guess (line \[8\] since a distributed QR factorization must be computed first. Overall, FGMRES (resp. FGCR-DR) performs 235 (resp. 189) iterations.

We now propose a comparison of our implementation of

Fig. 3. Performance analysis of GCRO-DR against FGMRES and Loose GMRES for solving four varying 3D linear elasticity systems of 192 million unknowns on 8,000 processors.
GCRO-DR and Loose GMRES as implemented in PETSc. Unfortunately, the flexible variant of LGMRES is not in PETSc, so we precondition the systems on the right instead:

\texttt{mpirun} -np 8000 ./ex56 -ne 399 -ksp_rtol 1.0e-8 -kap_type lgmres -kap_pc_side right -pc_type gamg -kap_lgmres_augment 10

This time, the multigrid cycles are linear since the default smoother used by PETSc is the Chebyshev iterative method. There is no need for the flexible variant of GCRO-DR. In fig. [5c] the convergence curves of LGMRES and GCRO-DR are displayed. In fig. [5b] the time to solution for each RHS is displayed. Clearly, the better numerical properties of GCRO-DR over LGMRES plays a huge role here, since GCRO-DR needs 96 fewer iterations to converge (269 LGMRES iterations vs. 173 GCRO-DR iterations).

V. LARGE-SCALE SOLVER FOR MAXWELL’S EQUATION

Maxwell’s equation describes the propagation of electromagnetic waves. Here, we consider a nonmagnetic linear isotropic medium of dielectric permittivity \( \varepsilon \) and conductivity \( \sigma \). Assuming that the fields behave periodically with respect to time, for example in the case of a time-periodic incident signal at angular frequency \( \omega \), the complex amplitude \( \mathbf{E} \) of the associated electric field \( \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \Re(\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{x})e^{-i\omega t}) \) is solution of the following second order time-harmonic Maxwell equation:

\[
\nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{E}) - \mu_0 \left( \omega^2 \varepsilon + i\omega \sigma \right) \mathbf{E} = 0,
\]

where \( \mu_0 \) is the permeability of free space.

High-order curl-conforming finite elements of \( \text{Nédélec} \) type [56] are now well-established in computational electromagnetism, thanks to their accuracy and low numerical dispersion and dissipation errors [57]. However, linear systems arising from such discretizations are ill-conditioned [58]. This, combined with the fact that the underlying PDE is indefinite, highlights the need for a robust and efficient preconditioner. Indeed, we show in fig. [4] that standard preconditioners such as the Additive Schwarz Method (ASM) or GAMG cannot solve the linear system arising from our application described in the next paragraph as rapidly as our preconditioner defined eq. [6]. Moreover, eq. [5] is solved with many right-hand sides in our application so we will know investigate the efficiency of block methods in this section. Recycling techniques presented in the previous paragraph will be also used to combine the advantages of both approaches.

A. Description of the application

Some of the computational methods described in this paper have been implemented in the context of an application in microwave imaging as part of the ANR project MEDIMAX, which aims at developing a robust and accurate inversion tool associated with the direct electromagnetic problem modeled by Maxwell’s equation in the frequency domain in highly heterogeneous media. The targeted application is medical imaging, and in particular brain imaging for stroke detection and diagnosis. By exposing head tissues to low-level microwave incident field and capturing the scattered field by an array of antennas, the estimation of the dielectric properties of the brain tissues—\( \varepsilon \) and \( \sigma \) in eq. [5]—can be approximated by solving an inverse problem and a diagnosis can be inferred.

Simulation results presented in this work have been obtained on the imaging system prototype developed by EMTensor GmbH [59]. The system is composed of 160 antennas: 5 rings of 32 open ceramic-loaded rectangular waveguides around a cylindrical metallic chamber, depicted in fig. [5a]. Each antenna can act as transmitter and receiver.

The object to be imaged is introduced into the imaging chamber. Each of the 160 antennas alternatively transmits a signal. The retrieved data then consist in the reflection and transmission coefficients measured by the 160 receiving antennas which will be used as input for the inverse problem. Each transmitting antenna corresponds to a different incident signal and thus to a different right-hand side in the discretized system. In section [V C] some numerical results for 32 RHSs, corresponding to one ring of transmitting antennas, are presented.

Let us now introduce our domain decomposition preconditioner. First, the mesh \( \mathcal{T} \) in fig. [5b] corresponding to the imaging system in fig. [5a] is generated using 18 million tetrahedra. It is then partitioned in \( N \) non-overlapping meshes \( \{\mathcal{T}_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N} \) using standard graph partitioners, cf. fig. [5c]. If \( \delta \) is a positive integer, the overlapping decomposition \( \{\mathcal{T}_i^\delta\}_{1 \leq i \leq \delta N} \) is defined recursively as follows: \( \mathcal{T}_i^\delta \) is obtained by including all elements of \( \mathcal{T}_i^{\delta-1} \) plus all adjacent elements of \( \mathcal{T}_i^{\delta-1} \). For \( \delta = 0 \), \( \mathcal{T}_i^0 = \mathcal{T}_i \). Let \( V \) be the finite element space defined on \( \mathcal{T} \), and \( \{V_i^\delta\}_{1 \leq i \leq \delta N} \), the local finite element spaces defined on \( \{\mathcal{T}_i^\delta\}_{1 \leq i \leq \delta N} \). Now consider the restrictions \( R_i \) from \( V \) to \( V_i^\delta \) and a local partition of unity \( \{D_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq \delta N} \) such that:

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{\delta N} R_j^T D_j R_j = I_{\delta N \times \delta N}.
\]

Algebraically speaking, if \( n \) is the global number of unknowns and \( \{n_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq \delta N} \) are the numbers of degrees of freedom in each
local finite element spaces, then $R_i$ is a Boolean matrix of size $n_i \times n$, and $D_i$ is a diagonal matrix of size $n_i \times n_i$, for all $1 \leq i \leq N$.

Using the partition of unity, one can define the following one-level preconditioner as an extension of the Restricted Additive Schwarz method proposed by Cai and Sarkis [60]:

$$\mathcal{M}^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} R_i^T D_i B_i^{-1} R_i,$$

where the $\{B_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ are local operators that resemble the submatrices $\{R_i A R_i^T\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$, but with more efficient transmission conditions between subdomains, e.g. [61]. What is important to notice here, is that when a direct solver is used to compute the action of $B_i^{-1}$ on multiple vectors, it can be done in a single forward elimination and backward substitution as long as the vectors are stored contiguously. In the next section, it will be shown that this can increase the performance of a direct solver tremendously, cf. fig. 6.

All operators related to the domain decomposition can be easily generated using finite element Domain-Specific Languages. We will be using FreeFem++ [62], since it has already been proven that it can enable large-scale simulations using overlapping Schwarz methods [63], but our framework interacts with other DSLs such as Feel++ [64].

### B. Block iterative methods

1) **Pseudo-block and block methods:** First introduced in the thesis of Langou [18], the notion of pseudo-block methods was formalized in the Belos package from Trilinos in 2007. The idea behind pseudo-block iterative methods is to fuse multiple operations to achieve higher arithmetic intensity, or to decrease the number of global synchronizations. For example, if one needs to perform $m$ GMRES iterations to reach convergence for each $p$ RHSs, a naive algorithm would require $m \cdot p$ dot products for evaluating the norm of each candidate vector of the Arnoldi basis. If the $p$ GMRES cycles are fused together, the required number of dot products is lowered to $m$ instead. Pseudo-block methods are designed to leverage the computational power of multicore architectures, while trying to mitigate the overhead of global synchronization by exchanging more data less often. In contrast, block methods are mathematical reformulations of standard iterative methods to handle multiple RHSs. They tend to converge faster at the cost of more computations and greater volume of data exchange.

2) **Cost analysis:** Our implementation can handle right, left, or variable preconditioning, for (pseudo-)Block GMRES and (pseudo-)Block GCRO-DR. The algorithm fig. [1] was written such that it can be used for both standard and Block GCRO-DR. In terms of memory, pseudo-block methods require $p$ times more storage. For block methods, Hessenberg matrices are $p \times p$ bigger, and Arnoldi basis and recycled subspaces are $p$ times thicker, cf. section [II-A] for the notations. This high memory cost is the reason why the restart parameter for BGMRES and BGCRO-DR is usually lesser than for standard methods. A more thorough analysis is available for the interested reader [65]. In terms of arithmetic operations and messages, the most demanding kernels are, as in any iterative method, sparse matrix–dense matrix products, i.e. $Y = AX$ and preconditioner–dense matrix operations, i.e. $V = \mathcal{M}^{-1} Y$. Traditionally, the matrix $A$ is distributed on the global MPI communicator, and computing sparse matrix–vector products requires peer-to-peer communications. It is possible to extend this communication pattern to the case of sparse matrix–dense matrix products as long as the MPI buffers are $p$ times bigger. The same goes for preconditioner–dense matrix operations. Most importantly, those two kernels are usually based on a combination of MPI data exchanges and local work. The efficiency of the local kernels usually scales fairly well with an increasing number of RHSs, because it means a higher arithmetic intensity. This especially applies to standard assembled sparse matrix operations which are almost all memory bound.

3) **Scalability of a direct solver with multiple right-hand sides:** As already mentioned, a domain decomposition...
It is interesting to note that even with only one thread ($P = 1$), we have a nice superlinear efficiency. This is likely due to the use of BLAS 3 \cite{BLAS3} instead of BLAS 2 routines, and thus, better arithmetic intensity. When using multiple threads, having multiple RHSs is sometimes the only way to achieve reasonable performance. When $P = 16$, with two RHSs ($p = 2$), PARDISO has an abysmal efficiency of 10%. However, as the number of RHSs increases, it is possible once again to reach a regime where the efficiency is superlinear (in this case, $p = 64$ is the tipping point).

We have thus displayed experimentally one of the advantages of (pseudo-)block methods when direct solvers are used in the definition of the global preconditioner. By increasing the workload, it is possible to achieve higher efficiency. This remark is also valid for sparse matrix–dense matrix products, and similar results are obtained when benchmarking, for example, the \texttt{?csrmv} routine from Intel MKL \cite{MKL}.

\section{Scaling analysis}

To assess the efficiency of our preconditioner, we will first perform a strong scaling analysis. We consider in this test case that the imaging chamber of fig. 5a is filled with an homogeneous dissipative matching solution, suited for brain imaging applications. Given a global mesh as depicted in fig. 5b, we increase the number of MPI processes to solve the linear system of 119 million double-precision complex unknowns yielded by the discretization of Maxwell’s equation using high-order edge elements of degree 2. As seen in fig. 4, even when the problem is relatively small, standard preconditioners fail to converge or converge slower than $\mathcal{M}^\text{ORAS}$. Because we use complex-valued scalars, \texttt{hypre}, and in particular its Maxwell solver AMS \cite{AMS}, cannot be used. MueLu \cite{MueLu} from
Trilinos can only solve Maxwell’s equation in eddy current formulation\(^6\) and it is not clear how it handles high-order edge elements.

Figure 7\(a\) is a plot of the time to solution, including both the setup and the solution phases, for solving the linear system on 512 up to 4,096 subdomains. The setup time does not account for the mesh partitioning and the assembly of the finite element matrices. We map one subdomain per MPI process, and use one thread per MPI process. The global unstructured mesh is partitioned using SCOTCH \cite{74}, we use a geometric overlap of two elements (\(\delta = 2\), the local solver is PARDISO from Intel MKL, and the iterative method is the Full GMRES which is stopped once the relative unpreconditioned residual is lower than \(10^{-8}\). The overall speedup is almost optimal, with a ratio of almost 7 between the time to solution using 512 and 4,096 subdomains, cf. fig. 7\(b\) for the exact figures. Since simple, yet efficient, optimized boundary conditions are used, the number of iterations slightly increases with the number of MPI processes. This explains why the fraction of the total time spent in the solve phase for the run on 4,096 subdomains (30\%) is greater than for the run on 512 subdomains (17\%).

We now report results with our solver for 32 RHSs on a more difficult test case, in order to demonstrate the efficiency of recycling and block methods. A non-dissipative plastic cylinder of diameter 12 cm is immersed in the imaging chamber and surrounded by matching liquid. The 32 RHSs correspond to the second ring (from the top) of 32 transmitting antennas. The corresponding linear system has 89 million unknowns. The results are obtained on 4,096 subdomains, this time with one subdomain and two OpenMP threads per MPI process—so we use a total of 8,192 cores on Curie. We propose eight alternatives to solve the system for all RHSs:

1) 32 consecutive solves with GMRES(50) (reference),
2) 32 consecutive solves with GCRO-DR(50, 10),
3) 1 solve with pseudo-BGMRES(50) and 32 RHSs,
4) 1 solve with BGMRES(50) and 32 RHSs,
5) 4 consecutive solves with pseudo-BGCRO-DR(50, 10) and 8 RHSs,
6) 1 solve with pseudo-BGCRO-DR(50, 10) and 32 RHSs,
7) 4 consecutive solves with BGCRO-DR(50, 10) and 8 RHSs,
8) 1 solve with BGCRO-DR(50, 10) and 32 RHSs.

Iterative methods are stopped once the relative unpreconditioned residual of each RHS is lower than \(10^{-8}\). In all cases, the system matrix is assembled once, as well as the preconditioner defined eq. \(6\). For each alternative, the preconditioner is setup only once. This step lasts 43.2\,s. In fig. 8\(a\) the speedup with respect to the naive approach—alternative 1)—is displayed. Setting up the preconditioner represents between 1.3\% and 6\% of the total time to solution (= 43.2\,s + the second column of fig. 8\(b\)). Thus, it is of paramount importance to increase the efficiency of the solution phase. Variants of (pseudo-)block methods guarantee at least a speedup of nearly 2. We notice that the best approach in terms of computation time is 7), which is a combination of recycling and block methods. It can be used to decrease the overall time to solution by 450\%. Numerically, the best approach is 8), which divides the number of iterations by an astonishing factor of 158. However, the cost of working on the complete block of 32 RHSs becomes quite high, and it is best to mix recycling techniques and smaller blocks of 8 RHSs. We currently do not use block size reduction inside block methods \cite{19, 21, 75}, but we perform rank-revealing CholQR (line 11 and line 24 in fig. 1\(a\)) for detecting breakdowns at each restart and residuals appear to be far from being colinear in our application. It is not clear to us if the cost of performing deflation at each iteration would be beneficial, since we already perform a rather low number of iterations with block methods—alternatives 4), 7), and 8).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Alternative & \(p\) & Solve & \# of it. per RHS & Speedup \\
\hline
1) & 1 & 3,078.4 & 20,068 & 627 & – \\
2) & 1 & 1,836.9 & 10,701 & 334 & 1.7 \\
3) & 32 & 1,577.9 & 653 & – & 2.0 \\
4) & 32 & 724.8 & 158 & – & 4.2 \\
5) & 8 & 1,357.8 & 1,508 & 377 & 2.3 \\
6) & 32 & 1,376.1 & 469 & – & 2.2 \\
7) & 8 & 677.6 & 524 & 131 & 4.5 \\
8) & 32 & 992.3 & 127 & – & 3.1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Timings (in seconds) of the solution phase, and speedups relative to alternative 1. The number of iterations per RHS is an average over all \(\frac{32}{p}\) solves (and thus not reported when \(p = 32\).)
}
\end{table}

\(D.\) Perspectives

The application presented here is a good illustration of the efficiency of recycling and block methods in speeding up computations arising in wave scattering and wave propagation problems, which often involve multiple right-hand sides corresponding to different angles of incident waves or different locations of excitation sources. Recycling techniques can also be applied in optimization problems, which generally consist in solving a sequence of slowly-varying linear systems, where the coefficient matrix depends on the choice of parameters. For such problems, recycling strategies can help in reducing significantly the total number of iterations over all linear systems. Incorporating these techniques in the development of an efficient inversion algorithm in the context of our application in brain imaging described in this paper is the focus of an ongoing work \cite{76}.

VI. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented various applications using recycling strategies or block methods. Large-scale experiments were obtained on 8,192 cores, using either our own application built on top of a finite element domain-specific language, or a well-established linear algebra backend: PETSc. Both of the approaches rely on our open-source framework for the solution phase. It can currently handle right, left, or
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APPENDIX

A. Abstract

This description contains the information needed to launch some experiments of the SC16 paper “Block Iterative Methods and Recycling for Improved Scalability of Linear Solvers”. More precisely, we explain how to compile and run the modified PETSc examples used in section IV. The results from section V can be reproduced using a finite element library interfaced with HPDDM, but this artifact description is not focused on that part of the paper.

B. Description

1) Check-list (artifact meta information):

- **Algorithm**: GCRO-DR with right, left, or variable preconditioning
- **Program**: C binary, C and C++ libraries
- **Compilation**: icpc version 16.0.2.181 (gcc version 4.9.1 compatibility) with the -O3 flag
- **Output**: time to solution and number of iterations
- **Experiment workflow**: install PETSc, clone HPDDM, compile the HPDDM C library, compile the modified PETSc examples, run the binaries, observe the results
- **Experiment customization**: number of MPI processes, threads, and grid points, standard parameters of Krylov methods...
- **Publicly available?**: yes

2) How delivered: HPDDM can be cloned from GitHub using the following URL: https://github.com/hpddm/hpddm. The examples taken from the PETSc distribution are in the folder examples/petsc. PETSc is available at the following URL: http://ftp.mcs.anl.gov/pub/petsc/release-snapshots/petsc-lite-3.7.3.tar.gz. Do not forget to turn off debugging and error detection if you need to compile PETSc (--with-debugging=0 --with-errorchecking=0).

C. Installation

1) clone HPDDM and enter the newly created directory

```
$ git clone https://github.com/hpddm/hpddm
$ cd hpddm
```

2) create an appropriate Makefile.inc by defining:

a) **MPICXX**, a C++ compiler wrapping an MPI implementation
b) **CXFFLAGS**, to activate C++11 support and such
c) **BLAS_LIBS**, to link with BLAS and LAPACK
d) or if you are using Intel Math Kernel Library, define **MKL_INCS** and **MKL_LIBS** instead

Here are some minimalist Makefile.inc examples, be sure to link PETSc and HPDDM with the same BLAS and MPI implementations as they are not all ABI compatible:

i. for Linux-based systems with the legacy BLAS

```
MPICXX = mpic++
CXXFLAGS = -std=c++11 -O3 -fPIC
BLAS_LIBS = -L/usr/lib -lblas -llapack
```

ii. for Linux-based systems with Intel MKL and GOMP

```
MPICXX = mpic++
CXXFLAGS = -std=c++11 -O3 -fPIC
MKL_LIBS = -lgomp -L$(MKLROOT)/lib/intel64
-lmkl_core -lmkl_intel_lp64 -lmkl_gnu_thread
MKL_INCS = -I$(MKLROOT)/include
```

iii. for macOS systems with Apple BLAS

```
MPICXX = mpic++
CXXFLAGS = -std=c++11 -O3 -fPIC
BLAS_LIBS = -framework Accelerate
```

iv. for macOS systems with Intel MKL and IOMP

```
MPICXX = mpic++
CXXFLAGS = -std=c++11 -O3 -fPIC
MKL_LIBS = -L/opt/intel/lib -L/opt/intel/mkl/lib
-llomp5 -lmkl_core -lmkl_intel_lp64 -lmkl_gnu_thread
MKL_INCS = -I/opt/intel/mkl/include
```

3) compile the C library

```
$ LIST_COMPILATION=c make lib
```

BLAS and LAPACK are needed for dense linear algebra computations but can be automatically downloaded by PETSc.

```
4) copy the modified PETSc examples into your PETSc installation

```bash
$ cp examples/petsc/ex32.c examples/petsc/ex56.c
$ (PETSC_DIR)/src/ksp/ksp/examples/tutorials
```

5) store the working directory in an environment variable and make sure that the shared library can be found, e.g., for some systems:

```bash
$ export HPDDM_DIR=`pwd`
$ export LD_LIBRARY_PATH=`pwd`/lib:
$ (PETSC_DIR)
```

Most HPDDM and PETSc options may be set via command line, so there is almost no need to recompile either the library or the binaries. In the rest of the artifact description, we will explain the most important options to set up in order to reproduce the results of the paper.

### E. Evaluation and expected result

To make sure that everything runs smoothly, here are two commands (one for each modified PETSc example) that should run on most platforms (from laptops to supercomputers):

```bash
$ cd $(PETSC_DIR)/src/ksp/ksp/examples/tutorials
$ make ex32 ex56 CFLAGS=-I$(HPDDM_DIR)/interface -L$(HPDDM_DIR)/lib -lhppdm_c
```

The output for example 32 should include the following lines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PETSc (GMRES)</th>
<th>HPDDM (GCRO-DR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 81 0.000241</td>
<td>1 64 0.005964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 65 0.000395</td>
<td>2 28 0.001851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 77 0.0003898</td>
<td>3 27 0.001860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 65 0.0003308</td>
<td>4 28 0.001987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 0.015842</td>
<td>147 0.011662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first column is the index of the linear system solved, the second column is the number of iterations needed to reach convergence, and the third column is the time to solution (excluding setup) in seconds. The last line is the sum of all rows.

The output for example 56 should include the following lines (which have the same structure as described previously):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PETSc (GMRES)</th>
<th>HPDDM (GCRO-DR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 128 0.018176</td>
<td>1 70 0.014209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 77 0.010872</td>
<td>2 60 0.014578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 98 0.0138343</td>
<td>3 79 0.018486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 106 0.014781</td>
<td>4 38 0.009564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409 0.057663</td>
<td>247 0.056851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. Experiment customization

In the paper, numerical experiments were carried out with the two previously compiled examples but with the following adjusted parameters: grid size, preconditioner type, dimension of recycled Krylov subspaces. All PETSc options were disclosed in the paper, but due to double-blind review policy, HPDDM options were omitted. Here are the exact command lines including both sets of options:

- for section IV-B

```bash
$ mpirun -np 8192 ./ex32 -ksp_rtol 1.0e-8
  -pc_type gamg -ksp_type bmpres -da_refine 2
  -mg_levels_ksp_type gmres -da_grid_y 4210
  -hpddm_gmres_restart 30 -hpddm_tol 1.0e-8
  -hpddm_variant flexible -pc_gamg_square_graph 2
  -hpddm_recycle_strategy A
  -hpddm_recycle_same_system
  -pc_gamg_threshold 0.0725
```

- for section IV-C

```bash
$ mpirun -np 8 ./ex56 -hpddm_recycle_same_system
  -ksp_pc_side right -ksp_rtol 1.0e-6
  -hpddm_recycle 10 -hpddm_krylov_method gcrodr
  -hpddm_gmres_restart 30 -da_refine 2
  -hpddm_krylov_method gcrodr
  -hpddm_gmres_restart 10
  -hpddm_recycle 10
  -hpddm_variant flexible -hpddm_recycle_strategy A
  -hpddm_gmres_restart 30
  -hpddm_gmres_restart 30 -hpddm_tol 1.0e-8
  -hpddm_recycle_same_system
  -hpddm_recycle_strategy B
  -pc_gamg_threshold 0.076
```

The list of all available PETSc (resp. HPDDM) options may be displayed by appending the option `-help` (resp. `-hpddm_help`) to the command line arguments. Alternatively, these options are also described at the following URL: [http://www.mcs.anl.gov/petsc/documentation](http://www.mcs.anl.gov/petsc/documentation) (resp. [https://github.com/hpddm/hpddm/blob/master/doc/cheatsheet.pdf](https://github.com/hpddm/hpddm/blob/master/doc/cheatsheet.pdf))

### G. Notes

For GCRO-DR, `-hpddm_recycle_strategy A` (resp. B) means solving the generalized eigenvalue problem in fig. 1 (line 33) with the right-hand side matrix $W$ defined by eq. (3a) (resp. eq. (3b)).

In the last experiment of section IV-C, we use FGCRO-DR instead of GCRO-DR with right preconditioning because this leads to less operations (at a cost of additional storage, which is typical of flexible iterative methods).