



**HAL**  
open science

# Unstructured volume-agglomeration MG : solution of the Poisson equation

Bruno Koobus, Marie-Hélène Lallemand, Alain Dervieux

► **To cite this version:**

Bruno Koobus, Marie-Hélène Lallemand, Alain Dervieux. Unstructured volume-agglomeration MG : solution of the Poisson equation. [Research Report] RR-1946, INRIA. 1993. inria-00074727

**HAL Id: inria-00074727**

**<https://inria.hal.science/inria-00074727>**

Submitted on 24 May 2006

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

*Unstructured  
Volume-Agglomeration  
MG : Solution of  
the Poisson Equation*

Bruno KOOBUS , Marie-Helene LALLEMAND and Alain DERVIEUX

**N° 1946**

Junin 1993

PROGRAMME 6

Calcul scientifique,  
modélisation  
et logiciels numériques



*R*apport  
*de recherche*

1993





# Unstructured Volume-Agglomeration MG : Solution of the Poisson Equation

Bruno KOOBUS \*, Marie-Helene LALLEMAND \*\* and  
Alain DERVIEUX\*

Programme 6 — Calcul scientifique, modélisation et logiciel numérique  
Projet Sinus

Rapport de recherche n° 1946 — Juin 1993 — 33 pages

**Abstract:** We are interested in solving second-order PDE's with Multigrid and unstructured meshes. The Multigrid strategy we present here is adapted from the generalized Finite Volume Agglomeration Multigrid algorithm we have developed recently for the solution of the Euler equations. We now focus on the Poisson's equation. A strategy is defined by introducing a correction factor for the diffusive terms and some illustrating results are given.

**Key-words:** Multigrid Methods, Finite Elements, Finite Volumes, Agglomeration, Elliptic Equation, Numerical Analysis

*(Résumé : tsvp)*

\*INRIA Sophia Antipolis, B.P. 93, 06902 Sophia-Antipolis Cedex, France

\*\*INRIA Rocquencourt, B.P. 105, 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex, France

Unité de recherche INRIA Sophia-Antipolis  
2004 route des Lucioles, BP 93, 06902 SOPHIA-ANTIPOLIS Cedex (France)  
Téléphone : (33) 93 65 77 77 – Télécopie : (33) 93 65 77 65

# **Multigrille en maillage non structure par volumes finis agglomerés : solution de l'équation de Poisson**

**Résumé :** On s'intéresse à la résolution des EDP du second ordre par Multigrille sur des maillages non structurés. L'approche Multigrille que nous présentons ici est adaptée de l'algorithme Multigrille par Volumes Finis Agglomérés développé pour résoudre les équations d'Euler. On s'intéresse à l'équation de Poisson. Une stratégie est définie en introduisant un facteur de correction pour les termes de diffusion et quelques résultats sont présentés à titre d'exemple.

**Mots-clé :** Méthodes Multigrilles, Eléments finis, Volumes Finis, Agglomération, Equation Elliptique, Analyse Numerique

## **Introduction: why unstructured volume agglomeration ?**

Some industrial needs necessitate the simulation of complex flows. By *complex*, we mean that the geometry might be complex and/or the physical phenomena might show local high variations (high gradients, shocks...).

A first problem encountered in simulating this type of flow is to define a good mesh. By *good*, we mean to get a mesh which must be well adapted to both geometry and solution. One way to reach that goal is to define a regular mesh which is then locally refined where it is needed: we then end up with a mesh which is no longer regular. Another issue is to handle unstructured meshes and this is the option we are considering in this paper.

Many methods are available for solving PDE's on a Finite-Element like mesh, but only a few of them can reach the maximal efficiency when dealing with very fine meshes. That means we are interested in low complexity algorithms like Multi-Grid (MG) solvers, and we restrict our attention to this category.

Now is the problem of constructing a series of grids (levels) in the MG context. Whereas Finite-Difference meshes induce easily defined coarser meshes, unstructured meshes set the important question on how to get coarser levels from a given arbitrary (fine) mesh. This is particularly the case for meshes obtained from mesh generators using e.g. Voronoï or advancing front techniques, or mesh adapter using e.g. local refinements. At this point, we have to notice that tree or hierarchical fully nested meshes are very useful for many simulations of physical phenomena, but are not yet so much applied to compressible CFD.

Then the common engineering question is how to define quite easily coarser meshes for solving efficiently some given flow problem on an arbitrary given (fine) mesh.

One answer is to build a sequence of unnested coarser meshes as in e.g. [1, 2, 3, 4]. This necessitates to handle a sequence of meshes instead of only one for each new computation.

Another answer is to apply some black-box linear solver such as Algebraic Multi-Grid (AMG) [5, 6] where the different (coarse) levels are automatically built using only the initial (fine) matrix information.

Our answer is an agglomeration approach that is, coarser equations are derived on coarser meshes obtained by grouping the finite volumes of the fine grid. It needs only one mesh to generate quite automatically all the coarser meshes wanted, but compared to the second above answer, the coarsening is simple and is a low storage process. It has also the advantage to define meshes which are all nested. This simplifies the way we want to define the transfer operators and also the programming.

The agglomeration approach has already been successfully applied to inviscid flow calculations [7]. It is, from our point of view, much more difficult to apply to viscous flow problems. The purpose of this paper is to show why it is difficult and to propose one device to overcome the main difficulty.

The paper is organized as the following: we first give an idea of the relation existing between the volume agglomeration technique and the algebraic equation summing, in a simplified 1-D case; the second section is devoted to the definition of a volume agglomeration method related to a variational formulation of the 2-D Poisson equation; in the third section we give some information about some less crucial options in the design of the MG scheme; at last, the fourth section illustrates our study by giving some significant numerical results and we then draw some conclusive remarks.

## 1 Algebraic agglomeration

### 1.1 A 1-D trivial example

Let us consider the following periodic problem

$$-\varepsilon u_{xx} + u_x = f \quad \text{on } [0, 1], \quad u \text{ periodic of period } 1,$$

with the following finite-difference/volume discretization

$$-\varepsilon \frac{u_{i+1} - 2u_i + u_{i-1}}{h^2} + \frac{u_i - u_{i-1}}{h} = f_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (1)$$

where  $n$  denotes the total number of discretization nodes that we suppose to be odd,  $u_i$  stands for  $u(x_i)$ ,  $x_i = ih$  is the discretization node in the interval  $[0, 1]$  which is regularly splitted with a space step  $h = 1/(n-1)$ ;  $x_0 \equiv 0$ ,  $x_{n-1} \equiv 1$  and  $x_n \equiv x_1$ . Equations (1) lead to an algebraic system with a

circulant  $(n - 1) \times (n - 1)$  tridiagonal matrix, the row of which reads as

$$\left[ -\frac{\varepsilon}{h^2} - \frac{1}{h} \quad 2\frac{\varepsilon}{h^2} + \frac{1}{h} \quad -\frac{\varepsilon}{h^2} \right] ,$$

and with a right-hand side (RHS) defined by the following  $(n - 1)$  component vector:

$$f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{n-1})^T .$$

Let us now define the new coarse discretization derived from the original one by skipping only nodes with even indices. We will denote by  $H$  the coarse space step which is twice larger than  $h$ . Now consider the new system obtained by

- ① summing line  $i = 2p - 1$  and line  $i + 1 = 2p$  ( $p = 1, \dots, (n - 1)/2$ ), and
- ② identifying both fine unknowns  $u_{2p}$  and  $u_{2p-1}$  to the new coarse unknown value denoted by  $U_p$ .

The result of this process will be called in the following the *coarsened system*.

**Remark 1.1** *Note that this process is a Galerkin process and can be interpreted algebraically as it follows: let  $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,n}$  be a  $n \times n$  square matrix and denote the set of fine indices by  $I$  (the cardinal of  $I$  is  $n$ ). Now suppose that we have a certain partition of  $I$ :  $I = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \dots \cup I_N$ ,  $N \ll n$  and that  $A$  is reordered following this partition. Then  $A$  can be written as*

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & \dots & A_{1N} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} & \dots & A_{2N} \\ \vdots & \dots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{N1} & \dots & \dots & A_{NN} \end{pmatrix} ,$$

where  $A_{LP} = (a_{i_L j_P})_{i_L \in I_L, j_P \in I_P}$ , with  $L, P = 1, \dots, N$ , is a  $N_L \times N_P$  block matrix, where  $N_L$  denotes the cardinal of the subset  $I_L$ ,  $L = 1, \dots, N$ . Now if we define the new  $N \times N$  coarse matrix  $A^C = (a_{PL}^C)_{P,L=1,\dots,N}$  derived from  $A$  by summing all entries belonging to a same block matrix  $A_{LP}$  and if we denote the resulting quantity by  $a_{LP}^C$ , we end up to the following coarse matrix

$$A^C = \mathcal{I}^T A \mathcal{I} ,$$



where the restriction operator  $\mathcal{I}^T$  is the transpose of  $\mathcal{I}$ , and  $\mathcal{I}$  is a  $n \times N$  interpolation operator with coefficients  $\omega_{jP}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $P = 1, \dots, N$  defined by

$$\omega_{jP} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j \in I_P, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now if  $u$  denotes the  $n$ -component fine unknown vector, then the coarse matrix  $A^C$  is associated with the  $N$ -component coarse unknown vector we can denote by  $U^C$ . That means that for a given  $P$ ,  $P = 1, \dots, N$ , we identify all fine variables  $u_j$ ,  $j \in I_P$  to the single coarse variable  $U_P$ . As it is algebraically written (with the transfer operators  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\mathcal{I}^T$ ), this coarsening process is of Galerkin type. Therefore, properties such as symmetry and positiveness of the original matrix  $A$  still hold for the coarse grid matrices.

## 1.2 The advection case

Let us first consider the case  $\varepsilon = 0$  (advection equation); then we get the resulting coarsened equation

$$\frac{U_p - U_{p-1}}{h} = (f_{2p-1} + f_{2p}), \quad p = 1, \dots, N - 1 \text{ with } N = (n + 1)/2.$$

Noting that the new spatial step  $H$  is twice as large as  $h$ , one can verify that the coarsened system is also a *consistent* approximation of the advection continuous equation; further, we get a finite-volume formulation that relies on the agglomeration of two neighboring cells ( $2m$  and  $2m + 1$ ,  $m = 0, \dots, (n - 2)/2$ ); this approach has been developed as the volume-agglomeration approach and has been applied to 2-D and 3-D Euler flow calculations [7].

## 1.3 The diffusion case: inconsistency

Let us now set  $\varepsilon = 1$  and drop the advection term; applying the coarsening process as previously described (summing line  $2p$  to line  $2p - 1$  and applying the identification:  $U_{p-1} \equiv u_{2(p-1)}$ ,  $U_p \equiv u_{2p-1} \equiv u_{2p}$ ,  $U_{p+1} \equiv u_{2(p+1)} \equiv u_{2p+1}$ ), we now get the following system

$$- \frac{U_{p+1} - 2U_p + U_{p-1}}{h^2} = (f_{2p-1} + f_{2p}) \quad \text{for } p = 1, \dots, N - 1.$$

We note that this system is *no more consistent* with the continuous system, a factor 2 is missing in the RHS.

Since we wish to combine diffusion and convection, any correction of this problem must be applied only to the diffusion term (and not to the RHS for example).

One evident remedy is to multiply the diffusion term by the factor 1/2; more generally, in 1-D, we suggest to apply a factor  $2^{-k}$  for the  $k$ -th coarser mesh.

## 2 The variational point of view

The above construction can be extended to the multi-dimensional case with unstructured meshes. One way is to consider a Galerkin variational formulation; we restrict our investigations to P1 approximations (continuous piecewise linear basis functions, with triangles (2-D) or tetrahedra (3-D), where the discretization nodes coincide with the vertices); for simplicity, we will only consider the 2-D context.

Let  $V_h$  be the space generated by the standard continuous piecewise linear basis functions, denoted by  $\phi_i$  which are defined by

$$\phi_i = 1 \text{ at vertex } i, 0 \text{ on any other vertex ,}$$

where  $i$  is any vertex of the triangulation not belonging to the boundary. Any function  $u$  in  $V_h$  can thus be expressed by

$$u = \sum_i u_i \phi_i .$$

Since a Galerkin principle is used, the basis functions are also the test functions. From the Poisson's problem (with Dirichlet boundary conditions)

$$-\Delta u = f , \text{ on } \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 ,$$

we derive the following system

$$\int_{\Omega} \left[ \sum_i u_i \vec{\nabla} \phi_i \cdot \vec{\nabla} \phi_j - f \phi_j \right] dv = 0 \quad \text{for any } j .$$

In order to keep the Galerkin standpoint, we decide to compress our system by replacing the above basis functions by a smaller set of functions which are linear combinations of the original ones; moreover, in order to be able to apply a finite-volume scheme in the volume-agglomeration framework, we define these new basis functions as follows:

Let  $I^f$  be the set of fine indices  $i$  and let  $n$  be its cardinal number. We

(i) define the following partition  $I^f$ :

$$I^f = \{1, \dots, i, \dots, n\} = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \dots \cup I_N ,$$

where  $N \ll n$ ;

(ii) define the new (coarse) basis functions,  $\Phi_J$ , for any subset  $I_J$ ,  $J = 1, \dots, N$  by

$$\Phi_J = \sum_{j \in I_J} \phi_j .$$

Defining the  $N$ -component coarse unknown vector  $U$  by the following identification

$$U_J \equiv u_j , \quad \forall j \in I_J , \quad J = 1, \dots, N ,$$

the new (coarsened) system to be solved is then written by

$$\int_{\Omega} \left[ \sum_{I=1, \dots, N} U_I \vec{\nabla} \Phi_I \cdot \vec{\nabla} \Phi_J - f \Phi_J \right] dv = 0 \quad \text{for all } J = 1, \dots, N .$$

In practise, the subsets  $I_J$  are built from neighboring relations; a **coarsening algorithm** straightly deduced from an efficient algorithm which has been extensively used in [7] is defined in the following process

*Each cell  $i$  is considered successively (alternately in the increasing or decreasing numbering order according to the coarse level number to be built):*

(i) *if the current cell  $i$  has already been included in a coarse zone then goto (ii);*

*else create a new coarse zone  $I$  containing the cell  $i$ , and neighboring cells  $j$  which do not already belong to another previously defined coarse zone;*

(ii) *if all the cells have been colored stop, else consider the next cell  $i$  and goto (i).*

The resulting compressed/agglomerated system is inconsistent, as shown in the 1-D case; the missing property of the coarse approximation space is the density of the basis set in the Sobolev space  $H^1$  (while density is true in  $L_2$ ).

The consequence of the inconsistency is not that a coarse grid correction will not help to reach the solution, but that low frequencies will not be damped with a reduction factor much less than one; instead, we may have a damping factor close to one, leading to a very poor convergence speed.

In order to overcome the inconsistency problem of the above agglomerated system, we introduce the following correction, which is empirically derived from simplified cases:

**Correction rule** : *In the corrected system, viscous terms are multiplied by the factor*

$$K_{\mathcal{N}} = 2(\mathcal{N} - 1)^2 / (2\mathcal{N} - 1)^2$$

*where  $\mathcal{N}$  is an approximation of the number of nodes in one direction. That is estimated as follows :*

$$\mathcal{N} = \sqrt[d]{NS}$$

*where  $d$  is the space dimension and  $NS$  the total number of coarse zones.*

We can derive the following lemma :

**Lemma 2.1** *The above correction yields a consistent coarsened approximation in the case of a cartesian mesh (orthogonal, regular) discretizing a rectangle.*

**Proof :**

We consider the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = 1 & \text{on } \Omega = ]0, 1[ \times ]0, 1[ , \\ u|_{\Gamma} = 0 & \text{with } \Gamma = \partial\Omega . \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Let  $m_i^h$  be the vertices of the triangulation discretizing  $\Omega$  defined by

$$m_i^h = (x_k^h, y_l^h) = ((k - 1)h, (l - 1)h) , \quad (3)$$

where  $(k, l) \in [1, \dots, n] \times [1, \dots, n]$  and  $i = (k - 1)n + l \in [1, \dots, n^2]$ ,  $h = 1/(n - 1)$  is the space step for both  $x$  and  $y$  directions.

Let us discretize the problem (2) by a Galerkin variational formulation with the standard continuous piecewise linear basis functions  $\phi_i$  as test functions. Then we get the following linear system

$$A^h u^h = s^h ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} s_i^h &= h^2 , \\ A_{ii}^h &= 4, \quad A_{ii-1}^h = A_{ii+1}^h = A_{ii-n}^h = A_{ii+n}^h = -1 , \quad \forall i / m_i^h \in \Omega \end{aligned}$$

Now let us consider the coarse grid made of zones  $I, I = 1, \dots, N^2$ ,  $N = n/2$  ( $n$  is supposed to be even), deduced from the fine cells  $i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n^2$ , by the previous agglomerating/coarsening algorithm. Let us write now the variational formulation of problem (2), relying on the previously defined coarse basis functions, on this coarse grid discretization of  $\Omega$ . This leads to the following linear system

$$A^C u^C = s^C ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} s_I^C &= 4 h^2 , \\ A_{II}^C &= 8, \quad A_{II-1}^C = A_{II+1}^C = A_{II-N}^C = A_{II+N}^C = -2 . \end{aligned}$$

The exact solution of this system is given by

$$u_I^C = 2 (h/H)^2 u_I^H ,$$

with  $H = 1/(N - 1)$ , and where  $u^H$  is the exact discrete solution of the classical P1 Galerkin formulation of problem (2), relying on the triangulation in which nodes  $m_I^H$  are defined similarly to (3), but where  $h$  and  $n$  are replaced by  $H$  and  $N$  respectively. The correction factor  $K_N$ , is therefore given by  $K_N = 2(N - 1)^2/(2N - 1)^2$ . q.e.d.

### 3 MG Algorithm

Due to the algebraic way of constructing the coarse grid equations (see Remark 1.1), it is clear that some of the good properties of the fine-grid matrix will also hold for all the successive coarse-grid matrices; in particular, we can derive the following lemma

**Lemma 3.1** *If the initial matrix is an M-matrix, then the resulting coarse matrices are also M-matrices.*

In particular, this is true for the discretized diffusion operator when the triangulation contains no obtuse angles (otherwise the positiveness maybe violated), and for the discretized advection operator, when using a first-order upwind discretization scheme.

Let us now define the transfer operators of the MG algorithm. Let  $N_{\max}$  be the total number of grid levels built from an initial fine grid  $G_1$ :

$$G_{N_{\max}} \subset G_{N_{\max}-1} \subset \dots \subset G_2 \subset G_1 ,$$

and let us denote by  $n_k$  the total number of control volumes of grid  $G_k$ , by  $V^k$  the space of grid functions defined on  $G_k$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, N_{\max}$ ; for two successive levels  $k$  and  $k + 1$ , we will denote by  $\tilde{I}$  the set of level- $k$  indices  $i, i \in [1, \dots, n_k]$ , defining the level- $(k + 1)$  control volume of index  $I, I \in [1, \dots, n_{k+1}]$ . We define in the following the restriction operator  $T_{k,k+1} : V^k \longrightarrow V^{k+1}$ , and the prolongation operator  $T_{k+1,k} : V^{k+1} \longrightarrow V^k$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, N_{\max} - 1$ :

- a) The **restriction operator**  $T_{k,k+1}$ , which transfers the (current fine) residual  $r_k \in V^k$  from the grid  $G_k$  made of control volumes  $\mathcal{V}_i^k, i = 1, \dots, n_k$ , to the (immediate coarser) grid  $G_{k+1}$  made of control volumes  $\mathcal{V}_I^{k+1}, I = 1, \dots, n_{k+1}$ , defines the new transferred residual  $r_{k+1} \in V^{k+1}$  by

$$r_{k+1,I} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [T_{k,k+1}(r_k)]_I = \sum_{i \in \tilde{I}} r_{k,i}$$

where  $r_{k,i}$  is the value of the fine residual  $r_k$  on cell  $\mathcal{V}_i^k, i = 1, \dots, n_k$ , and  $[T_{k,k+1}(r_k)]_I = r_{k+1,I}$  is the corresponding transferred value on zone  $\mathcal{V}_I^{k+1}, \tilde{I} \ni i, I = 1, \dots, n_{k+1}$ .

- b) The **prolongation operator**  $T_{k+1,k}$ , which transfers the level- $(k + 1)$  error function  $e_{k+1} \in V^{k+1}$  (i.e. the solution of the residual equation on the coarse level  $k + 1$ ) from grid  $G_{k+1}$  to the fine grid  $G_k$ , defines the correction to be added to the solution of the level- $k$  problem; this operator is the composition of a projection operator  $P_{k+1,k} : V^{k+1} \longrightarrow V^k$  and an averaging operator  $Q_k : V^k \longrightarrow V^k$  defined by:

- **Projection operator**  $P_{k+1,k} : V^{k+1} \longrightarrow V^k$  corresponds to the natural injection operator and is given by

$$P_{k+1,k}(e_{k+1}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e_k ,$$

where  $e_k$  is the level- $k$  grid function defined on the fine grid  $G_k$  by

$$e_{k,i} = e_{k+1,I} , \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n_k , \quad \forall I = 1, \dots, n_{k+1} , \quad \text{s.t. } \tilde{I} \ni i ,$$

where  $e_{k,i}$  and  $e_{k+1,I}$  denote respectively the value of  $e_k$  on control volume  $\mathcal{V}_i^k$  and the value of  $e_{k+1}$  on control volume  $\mathcal{V}_I^{k+1}$ .

- **Averaging operator**  $Q_k : V^k \longrightarrow V^k$  is given by

$$Q_k(e_k) = \beta \text{ave}(e_k) + (1 - \beta) e_k ,$$

with

$$[\text{ave}(e_k)]_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\text{AREA}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}^k(i) \cup \{i\}} \text{area}(\mathcal{V}_j^k) e_{k,j} ,$$

where

$$\text{AREA} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}^k(i) \cup \{i\}} \text{area}(\mathcal{V}_j^k) ,$$

$\mathcal{N}^k(i)$  is the set of level- $k$  indices  $j$ , corresponding to the control volumes  $\mathcal{V}_j^k$  neighboring  $\mathcal{V}_i^k$ , and  $\beta$  is a positive weighting coefficient between  $e_{k,i}$  and  $[\text{ave}(e_k)]_i$  that may be larger than one.

Therefore, the prolongation operator  $T_{k+1,k}$  is written by

$$T_{k+1,k}(e_{k+1}) = Q_k \circ P_{k+1,k}(e_{k+1}) .$$

It is important to notice that this prolongation operator, due to the averaging operator  $Q_k$ , smoothes the resulting interpolated error  $e_k$  on the (current) fine grid  $G_k$ .

## 4 Implementation

### The coarse grid equations storage, memory requirements

Instead of handling the matrix coefficients, we shall perform the gathering of the equations from the following integrals

$$a_{lm}^{ij} = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial \phi_i}{\partial x_l} \frac{\partial \phi_j}{\partial x_m} dv ,$$

with  $l, m = 1, \dots, d$ ,  $d$  being the space dimension, and  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $n$  being the total number of control volumes of the grid to be considered.

We shall say that to any couple of coarse zones (I,J) such that at least one  $a_{lm}^{IJ}$  is not zero, corresponds a "segment". On the fine grid, segments are edges.

On the finest grid  $G_1$ , there is no need of storing those integrals  $a_{lm}^{ij}$  and the assembling of the finest grid equation is done by segments and by elements (triangles).

On the coarse grids  $G_k$ ,  $k = 2, \dots, N_{\max}$ , the assembling of the coarse grid equations is done in two steps: we are storing all the integrals  $a_{lm}^{IJ}$ ,  $I, J = 1, \dots, n_k$ . The computations of these quantities are done by a loop over the triangles for the first coarse level  $k = 2$ , and by a loop over the level- $k$  segments for the other coarse levels  $k + 1$ ,  $k = 2, \dots, N_{\max} - 1$ . The coarse grid equations are then gathered by considering the coarse grid segments.

Therefore, the memory requirement of the multigrid process for storing the 2-D diffusive terms (storage of  $a_{lm}^{IJ}$  on the coarse grids) is given by

$$(ns + \frac{4}{3}nseg) \times \text{real numbers} \simeq 5ns \times \text{real numbers} ,$$

since  $nseg \simeq 3ns$ , where  $ns$  and  $nseg$  are respectively the number of vertices and segments of the initial (finest) mesh.

## 5 Numerical experiments

For each experiment, a solution is considered to be converged if the iterative residual  $Res(\alpha)$  reaches the tolerance  $\varepsilon_r = 10^{-6}$ ;  $Res(\alpha)$  is the iterative



residual obtained at the iteration number  $\alpha$  and is defined by

$$Res(\alpha) = \frac{\|u^\alpha - u^{\alpha-1}\|_{l^2}}{\|u^1\|_{l^2}},$$

where  $u^\alpha$  is the  $\alpha$ -th multigrid solution iterate, with  $u^0 = 0$ .

As a smoother, we use either the Gauss–Seidel iteration, or the Jacobi iteration with under–relaxation.

The value of the weighting coefficient  $\beta$  of the prolongation operator  $T_{k+1,k}$  is set to the value 1.5. This value has been chosen after a series of experiments on diffusion and advection for the three meshes that are considered in the sequel. For a V-cycle scheme with one pre- and post-smoothing on each grid, it appears that performing no smoothing in the transfer ( $\beta = 0$ ) results in very bad performance for Jacobi smoother with the uniform mesh and for both smoothers if the mesh is stretched. Giving priority to the worse performances (stretched mesh), a good compromise is to set  $\beta = 1.5$ . This value will be kept for all the results we shall present in the following.

## 5.1 Impact of the agglomeration strategy on the MG convergence

Let us consider the following 1-D problem

$$\begin{cases} - u_{xx} = 1, & \text{on } ]0, 1[ , \\ u(0) = u(1) = 0 . \end{cases}$$

We define a uniform discretization of the unit interval, resulting in a mesh with  $n = 101$  nodes. We are interested in the solution of this problem by an ideal two-grid scheme (i.e. the coarse grid equation is solved up to its full convergence) in the two following cases of agglomeration procedure:

- (i) the agglomeration procedure is the one previously defined in Section 2;
- (ii) the agglomeration procedure is modified by adding the following restriction in constructing the coarse zones:

*as soon as a new coarse zone  $I$  contains only a single fine cell  $i$ , this*

*new coarse zone is destroyed and the cell  $i$  is put into another existing coarse zone containing at least one neighbor of the cell  $i$ .*

Option (ii) was used in [7] to avoid too small coarse zones. In the more recent versions, alternating the numbering order while grouping cells is sufficient to avoid very small coarse zones (that is, zones reduced to a single fine zone). The smoother used in our ideal 2-G algorithm is the classical point Gauss-Seidel relaxation.

The mean reduction factor  $\mu$  of the residual and the number of ideal 2-G cycles needed to reach the convergence level of  $10^{-6}$  are given in Table 1 for the previous agglomeration procedures (i) and (ii). If  $\alpha_{\text{conv}}$  denotes the total number of ideal 2-G cycles leading to convergence, then  $\mu$  is defined by

$$\mu = \alpha_{\text{conv}} \sqrt{\text{Res}(\alpha_{\text{conv}})} .$$

These notations will be kept in all the numerical tests that follow.

	agglomeration (i)	agglomeration (ii)
$\mu$	0.275	0.389
$\alpha_{\text{conv}}$	12	16

Table 1: Ideal 2-Grid convergence factors.

One can notice that the results are much better in the case of agglomeration (i). This is the option we keep in the sequel.

## 5.2 2-D advection-diffusion equation: some numerical experiments

Let us consider now the problem  $-\varepsilon \Delta u + \text{div}(\mathbf{V} u) = 1$  with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. We propose to solve this problem with a V-cycle MG scheme where two iterations of the basic iterative method (one pre- and post-smoothing) are done on each level at each cycle. For most of the following numerical experiments, this number of smoothing sweeps per level corresponds with the optimal CPU time.

The convergence of the MG scheme is studied for three types of meshes:

- a) a structured uniform fine mesh,

- b) an unstructured fine mesh,
- c) a stretched structured fine mesh.

**a) Structured uniform fine mesh**

The calculations are done on a uniform square mesh with  $41 \times 41$  nodes (see Figure 1). The number of grids used is 5 and the finite-volume partitions of the different grids are sketched in Figure 2.

The multigrid convergence factors for several values of  $\varepsilon$  and  $\mathbf{V}$  are given in Tables 2 and 3. In Table 2, the under-relaxation parameter  $\omega$  of Jacobi smoother is set to the value 0.8. Indeed, with this value of  $\omega$ , Jacobi has the best smoothing properties for the Laplacian problem.

	MG-Jacobi ( $\omega = 0.8$ )	MG-Gauss-Seidel
$\mu$	0.364	0.300
$\alpha_{\text{conv}}$	15	13

Table 2:  $\varepsilon = 1$  ,  $\mathbf{V} = (0, 0)^T$ .

For the same convergence level, a single-grid Gauss-Seidel solver leads to  $\alpha_{\text{conv}} = 2213$ , and a single-grid Jacobi solver (with under-relaxation parameter  $\omega = 0.8$ ) leads to  $\alpha_{\text{conv}} = 5521$ .

	$\varepsilon = 1$	$\varepsilon = 10^{-1}$	$\varepsilon = 10^{-3}$
$\mu$	0.306	0.234	0.117
$\alpha_{\text{conv}}$	13	11	8

Table 3:  $\mathbf{V} = (1, 0)^T$  , MG - Gauss-Seidel.




Figure 1: The  $41 \times 41$  triangulation of the 2-D unit square.




Figure 2: The finite-volume partition grids  $G_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, 5$ .

Notice that for the Poisson equation (Table 2), the mean reduction factor is better with Gauss-Seidel as a smoother; indeed, it is wellknown that Gauss-Seidel has better smoothing properties than Jacobi (even used with an optimal relaxation parameter), when applied to the Poisson's equation, but the difference is not so big with this regular (and not very fine) mesh. Table 3 shows that the mean reduction factor of the residual becomes much smaller when the convection part dominates the diffusion part. This can be explained by the fact that, with these specific mesh and  $\mathbf{V}$ , Gauss-Seidel tends to become a direct solver when  $\varepsilon$  is small compared to the mesh size.

If the cost of the transfers is neglected, the arithmetic complexity of one V-cycle, where two smoothing sweeps of Jacobi (one pre- and post-smoothing) are done on each level, can be evaluated as about four sweeps of Jacobi on the finest grid [11]. If the matrix coefficients are not stored, the computation for assembling a flux with Gauss-Seidel is twice as important as with Jacobi. Therefore, the calculation cost of the RHS of the linear system to be solved on a coarse grid  $G_k$ ,  $k = 2, \dots, N_{\max}$ , is about half a sweep of Gauss-Seidel on the grid  $G_{k-1}$ . The arithmetic complexity of one V-cycle with two Gauss-Seidel iterations on each level (one pre- and post-smoothing) can then be evaluated as about 10/3 sweeps of Gauss-Seidel on the finest grid. Consequently, the relative efficiency (in terms of arithmetic complexity) between the single-grid scheme (1G) and the multigrid scheme (MG) for the Poisson equation (Table 2) is given by:

$$\frac{1G_{(GS)}}{MG_{(GS)}} = 51.1$$

$$\frac{1G_{(J)}}{MG_{(J)}} = 92.0$$

where GS (resp. J) stands for Gauss-Seidel (resp. Jacobi). Note the significant gain in arithmetic complexity obtained by the MG scheme.

### **b) Unstructured fine mesh**

A NACA0012 airfoil mesh involving 3114 nodes (see Figure 3) is now used for the same model equation. Six grids (depicted in Figure 4) are used to define the V-cycle scheme. Convergence results are given in Table 4 and Table 5.




Figure 3: The NACA0012 airfoil triangulation with 3114 nodes.




Figure 4: The NACA0012 airfoil finite-volume partition grids  $G_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, 6$ .



	MG-Jacobi ( $\omega = 0.8$ )	MG-Gauss-Seidel
$\mu$	0.690	0.496
$\alpha_{\text{conv}}$	39	21

Table 4:  $\varepsilon = 1$  ,  $\mathbf{V} = (0, 0)^T$ .

For the same convergence level, a single-grid Gauss-Seidel solver leads to  $\alpha_{\text{conv}} = 3007$ , whereas a single-grid Jacobi solver (with a relaxation parameter  $\omega = 0.8$ ) leads to  $\alpha_{\text{conv}} = 7395$ .

	$\varepsilon = 1$	$\varepsilon = 10^{-1}$	$\varepsilon = 10^{-3}$
$\mu$	0.422	0.402	0.399
$\alpha_{\text{conv}}$	17	17	17

Table 5:  $\mathbf{V} = (1, 0)^T$  , MG - Gauss-Seidel.

One can notice that the gain in the convergence rate obtained by Gauss-Seidel v.s. Jacobi (Table 4) is more important in this example than in the previous unit square example. We can also observe that the mean reduction factor  $\mu$  improves only slightly when the diffusion is decreasing (Table 5). The relative efficiency between the single-grid scheme and the multigrid one for the Poisson equation (Table 4) is given by:

$$\frac{1G_{(\text{GS})}}{\text{MG}_{(\text{GS})}} = 43.0$$

$$\frac{1G_{(\text{J})}}{\text{MG}_{(\text{J})}} = 47.4$$

Notice again the improvement of the MG complexity.

### c) Stretched structured fine mesh

We present now calculations on a  $41 \times 41$  square stretched mesh in which the maximal ratio between the length of two orthogonal sides of the flattest

elements is one hundred (see Figure 5). Five grids are used for the experiments (see Figure 6).

Results about multigrid convergence are given by Table 6 for the Poisson equation  $-\Delta u = 1$  with Dirichlet boundary conditions.

	MG-Jacobi ( $\omega = 0.8$ )	MG-Gauss-Seidel
$\mu$	0.925	0.842
$\alpha_{\text{conv}}$	178	82

Table 6:  $\varepsilon = 1$  ,  $\mathbf{V} = (0, 0)^T$ .

For the same convergence level, a single-grid Gauss-Seidel solver leads to  $\alpha_{\text{conv}} = 1440$ , whereas a single-grid Jacobi solver ( $\omega = 0.8$ ) leads to  $\alpha_{\text{conv}} = 3597$ .

We point out that the convergence rate is much slower than the one gotten in the case of uniform meshes. This is essentially due to the fact that standard solvers such as Gauss-Seidel and especially Jacobi are not very efficient smoothers in the case of meshes having “very flat” cells. As an illustration, we show in Figure 7 the dependency of the mean reduction factor versus the number of smoothing sweeps (Gauss-Seidel relaxations) done on the fine level at each MG-cycle for an ideal two-grid scheme. The behaviour of the convergence history let us deduce that a better smoother would improve a lot our existing MG-method in the case of stretched meshes; indeed, increasing the number of Gauss-Seidel relaxations on the fine level up to a moderate number of relaxation sweeps, results in a corresponding acceleration of convergence to be compared with the 1400 Gauss-Seidel iterations required on the fine grid for the same convergence level. The same behaviour is observed with a five-grid V-cycle scheme (see Figure 8).

Moreover, we obtain the following relative efficiency between the single-grid scheme and the multigrid scheme for each of the two smoothers Gauss-Seidel and Jacobi:

$$\frac{1G_{(\text{GS})}}{\text{MG}_{(\text{GS})}} = 5.3$$




Figure 5: The stretched  $41 \times 41$  triangulation of the 2-D unit square.




Figure 6: The finite-volume partition grids  $G_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, 5$ .




Figure 7: Ideal 2-G convergence factor as a function of number of fine smoothing sweeps (pre- and post-smoothings).




Figure 8: 5-G V-cycle convergence factor as a function of number of smoothing sweeps (pre- and post-smoothings) done on each level.

$$\frac{1G_{(J)}}{MG_{(J)}} = 5.1$$

Notice that the efficiency of the multigrid scheme compared to the single-grid one is much less important than in the previous cases a) and b).

Another point to emphasize is that in all the above experiments the convergence factors were observed to be approximately level independent.

Notice finally (see Table 6) that the number of V-cycles is divided by a factor greater than two when Gauss-Seidel is used as a smoother instead of Jacobi.

## Conclusion

Solving the Poisson equation in 2-D is not a big challenge nor our ultimate goal; our motivation was to find a method extending to viscous flows a MG algorithm which was already successfully applied to inviscid flows [7] on unstructured meshes.

We found an important theoretical difficulty related to the inter-level inconsistency, that remains unsolved; however, the trick that we applied seems to be efficient in the different practical examples that we have considered. Systems on very irregular but non-stretched meshes are solved within 20 cycles; convergence results obtained in the case of stretched meshes appeared to depend more on the efficiency of the smoother, rather than on the quality of the resulting coarse systems. The efficient treatment of stretched meshes is a classical challenge, in particular for the definition of good and robust MG schemes. Another remedy that comes in mind is to define a more sophisticated agglomerating process which would respect, at least geometrically, the scaling of the mesh size.

Extensions to other types of elements and 3-D problems seem to be reasonably possible.

The global evaluation we can make from these preliminary studies is, from our opinion, positive and promising with respect to further extensions to the calculations of viscous compressible flows. For that program, several methods can be exploited, such as implicit solvers for Navier-Stokes [8, 9], and MG relaxation methods for Euler [10], although those methods are already developed in the context of multiple triangulations.

## References

- [1] PERAIRE J., PEIRO J. and MORGAN K., “A 3-D Finite Element Multigrid Solver for the Euler Equations”, *AIAA paper*, **92-0449**, 1992.
- [2] MAVRIPLIS D. and JAMESON A., “Multigrid solution of the two-dimensional Euler equations on unstructured meshes”, *AIAA paper*, **87-0350**, January 1987.
- [3] LECLERCQ M.-P. and STOUFFLET B., “Characteristic Multigrid Method, Application to solve the Euler equations with unstructured and unnested grids”, *International Conference on Hypersonic Problems, Uppsala*, 1989.
- [4] GUILLARD H., “Node-nested multigrid”, *INRIA Research Report*, in preparation.
- [5] BRANDT A., MCCORMICK S. and RUGE J., “Algebraic multigrid (AMG) for sparse matrix equations”, *Sparsity and its applications*, D.J. Evans (ed), Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- [6] RUGE J., MCCORMICK S. and LALLEMAND M.-H., “AMG for the Euler equations”, *DRET Report*, 1989.
- [7] LALLEMAND M.-H., STEVE H. and DERVIEUX A., “Unstructured multigriding by volume agglomerating: current status”, *Computers & Fluids vol. 21, 3*, pp. 397-433, 1992.
- [8] FEZOU L., LANTERI S., LARROUTUROU B. et OLIVIER C., “Résolution numérique des équations de Navier-Stokes pour un fluide compressible en maillage triangulaire”, *Rapport de Recherche INRIA 1033*, 1989.
- [9] OLIVIER C. and LARROUTUROU B., “On the numerical approximation of the  $k-\varepsilon$  turbulence model for two dimensional compressible flows”, *INRIA Research Report 1526*, 1991.
- [10] MORANO E., GUILLARD H., DERVIEUX A., LECLERCQ M.-P. and STOUFFLET B., “Faster relaxations for non-structured MG with Voronoï coarsening”, *Computational Fluid Dynamics '92, Proceedings of the*



*First European Computational Fluid Dynamics Conference, Brussels, 7-11 September 1992*, Ch. Hirsch (ed.), 1992.

- [11] LALLEMAND M.-H., “Schémas décentrés multigrilles pour la résolution des équations d’Euler en éléments finis”, *Thesis, University of Marseille*, 1988.



Unité de recherche INRIA Lorraine, Technôpole de Nancy-Brabois, Campus scientifique,  
615 rue de Jardin Botanique, BP 101, 54600 VILLERS LÈS NANCY  
Unité de recherche INRIA Rennes, IRISA, Campus universitaire de Beaulieu, 35042 RENNES Cedex  
Unité de recherche INRIA Rhône-Alpes, 46 avenue Félix Viallet, 38031 GRENOBLE Cedex 1  
Unité de recherche INRIA Rocquencourt, Domaine de Voluceau, Rocquencourt, BP 105, 78153 LE CHESNAY Cedex  
Unité de recherche INRIA Sophia-Antipolis, 2004 route des Lucioles, BP 93, 06902 SOPHIA-ANTIPOLIS Cedex

---

Éditeur

INRIA, Domaine de Voluceau, Rocquencourt, BP 105, 78153 LE CHESNAY Cedex (France)

ISSN 0249-6399