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## Overview

(1) $\mathcal{H}$-Matrices
(2) Algebraic Clustering
(3) Algebraic Admissibility
(4) Nested Dissection
(5) Numerical Experiments

## $\mathcal{H}$-Matrices

Uniformly elliptic 2nd order PDE

$$
\operatorname{div} \alpha(x) \nabla u(x)=f(x), \quad x \in \Omega
$$

with Dirichlet/Neumann boundary conditions.
Galerkin discretisation

$$
A x=b, \quad A_{i j}=\left\langle\nabla \varphi_{i}, \alpha \nabla \varphi_{j}\right\rangle_{L^{2}(\Omega)}
$$

with basis functions

$$
\varphi_{i}: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad i \in I=\{1, \ldots, N\}
$$

Goal: Solve the system fast and robust using LU factorisation of $A$ as preconditioner.
Problem: LU factors are usually prohibitively dense.
Solution: Compute approximate LU factorisation using $\mathcal{H}$-matrices with (almost) linear complexity.

## $\mathcal{H}$-Matrices what are $\mathcal{H}$-Matrices?

A matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ of rank $\leq k$ can be represented as

$$
M=U V^{T}, \quad U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}, V \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}
$$

- $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{k})$-matrix format
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## $\mathcal{H}$-Matrices

Clustering

## Domain

Construct cluster tree using geometrical data:

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 00000000 /00000000 |  |  |  |
| 00000000 -00000000 00000000 |  |  |  |
| 00000000 00000000 00000000 000 |  |  |  |
| 00000000 ,00000000 |  |  |  |
| -0000000 0000000 |  |  |  |
| -0000000 | -0, |  |  |

## Matrix

Construct block cluster tree with admissibility condition

$$
\min (\operatorname{diam}(t), \operatorname{diam}(s)) \leq \eta \operatorname{dist}(t, s), \quad \eta>0
$$
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## $\mathcal{H}$-Matrices Matrix Structure



- $\mathcal{O}(n)$ blocks
- Small red blocks: full matrices
- All other blocks: $R(k)$-matrices


## $\mathcal{H}$-Matrices



- block-wise: exponential decay of singular values


## $\mathcal{H}$-Matrices Arithmetic

Due to hierarchical block structure, standard recursive block algorithms can be used, e.g. for multiplication:

$$
\left(\begin{array}{ll}
A_{11} & A_{12} \\
A_{21} & A_{22}
\end{array}\right) \cdot\left(\begin{array}{ll}
B_{11} & B_{12} \\
B_{21} & B_{22}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
A_{11} \cdot B_{11}+A_{12} \cdot B_{21} & A_{11} \cdot B_{12}+A_{12} \cdot B_{22} \\
A_{21} \cdot B_{11}+A_{22} \cdot B_{21} & A_{21} \cdot B_{12}+A_{22} \cdot B_{22}
\end{array}\right)
$$

## $\mathcal{H}$-Matrices Arithmetic

Due to hierarchical block structure, standard recursive block algorithms can be used, e.g. for multiplication:
$\left(\begin{array}{ll}A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22}\end{array}\right) \cdot\left(\begin{array}{ll}B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22}\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}A_{11} \cdot B_{11}+A_{12} \cdot B_{21} & A_{11} \cdot B_{12}+A_{12} \cdot B_{22} \\ A_{21} \cdot B_{11}+A_{22} \cdot B_{21} & A_{21} \cdot B_{12}+A_{22} \cdot B_{22}\end{array}\right)$
But, addition of low-rank matrices increases the rank and finally produces full-rank matrices.
To limit complexity, a truncated addition is performed using SVD:
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A_{1} B_{1}^{T}+A_{2} B_{2}^{T}=: C D^{T} \quad \rightarrow \quad U S V^{T} \quad \rightarrow \quad C^{\prime} D^{T}
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with (predefined) $\operatorname{rank}\left(C^{\prime} D^{\prime T}\right)<\operatorname{rank}\left(C D^{T}\right)$.
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## Complexity

| truncation | $\mathcal{O}(n)$ | multiplication | $\mathcal{O}\left(n \log ^{2} n\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| storage | $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ | inversion | $\mathcal{O}\left(n \log ^{2} n\right)$ |
| matrix $\times$ vector | $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ | triangular solve | $\mathcal{O}\left(n \log ^{2} n\right)$ |
| addition | $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ | LU decomposition | $\mathcal{O}\left(n \log ^{2} n\right)$ |

## $\mathcal{H}$-Matrices Summary

To solve $A x=b$ using $\mathcal{H}$-LU factorisation:
(1) construct cluster tree using geometrical data,
(2) construct block cluster tree using admissibility condition (based on geometrical data),
(3) build $\mathcal{H}$-matrix representation of $A$,
(4) perform $\mathcal{H}$-LU factorisation (with approximation due to truncated addition),
(5) solve $A x=b$ preconditioned with $\mathcal{H}$-LU approximated $A^{-1}$.

To solve $A x=b$ using $\mathcal{H}$-LU factorisation:
(1) construct cluster tree using geometrical data,
(2) construct block cluster tree using admissibility condition (based on geometrical data),
(3) build $\mathcal{H}$-matrix representation of $A$,
(4) perform $\mathcal{H}$-LU factorisation (with approximation due to truncated addition),
(5) solve $A x=b$ preconditioned with $\mathcal{H}$-LU approximated $A^{-1}$.

But what to do if no geometry information is available?

## Algebraic Clustering

## Algebraic Clustering Motivation

Consider

$$
-\Delta u=0 \quad \text { in } \Omega=[0,1]^{2}
$$

Using a uniform grid with step width $h$ and standard piecewise linear finite elements with nodal points $x_{i}, i \in I$, one obtains the stiffness matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times I}$ as
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i.e. graph corresponds to sparsity pattern of stiffness matrix.
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## Algebraic Clustering Motivation

Define distance $\operatorname{dist}_{G}(i, j)$ between nodes $i, j \in I$ as length of shortest path in $G(A)$. Then, for $i, j \in I$ we have:

$$
\left\|x_{i}-x_{j}\right\|_{2} \leq \operatorname{dist}_{G}(i, j) h
$$

i.e. distance in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ is mapped to distance in $G(A)$ :


$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\left\|x_{i}-x_{j}\right\|_{2}=\sqrt{13} h, & \operatorname{dist}_{G}(i, j)=5 \\
\left\|x_{i}-x_{k}\right\|_{2}=\sqrt{5} h, & \operatorname{dist}_{G}(i, k)=3
\end{array}
$$
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Define distance $\operatorname{dist}_{G}(i, j)$ between nodes $i, j \in I$ as length of shortest path in $G(A)$. Then, for $i, j \in I$ we have:

$$
\left\|x_{i}-x_{j}\right\|_{2} \leq \operatorname{dist}_{G}(i, j) h,
$$

i.e. distance in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ is mapped to distance in $G(A)$ :


$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\left\|x_{i}-x_{j}\right\|_{2}=\sqrt{13} h, & \operatorname{dist}_{G}(i, j)=5 \\
\left\|x_{i}-x_{k}\right\|_{2}=\sqrt{5} h, & \operatorname{dist}_{G}(i, k)=3
\end{array}
$$

In model problem: since nodes in $G(A)$ with small distance are also geometrically neighboured, one can use graph distance to cluster indices.
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Algorithm:
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## Algebraic Clustering Clustering via Breadth First Search

Algorithm:
(1) determine two nodes $i, j \in V_{A}$ with (almost) maximal distance,
(2) perform simultaneous BFS from $i$ and $j$ to construct sub clusters:

- per step, add unvisited neighbours of nodes in sub clusters
(3) recurse in sub graphs



## Algebraic Clustering Clustering via General Graph Partitioning

In graph theory, the graph partitioning problem is defined as:
Given a graph $G=(V, E)$ a partitioning $P=\left\{V_{1}, V_{2}\right\}$, with $V_{1} \cap V_{2}=\emptyset$ and $V=V_{1} \cup V_{2}$, of $V$ is sought, such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \# V_{1} \sim \# V_{2} \quad \text { and } \\
& \#\left\{(i, j) \in E: \quad i \in V_{1} \wedge j \in V_{2}\right\}=\text { min. } \quad \text { (edge-cut) }
\end{aligned}
$$

A small edge-cut corresponds to a low-rank coupling of matrix blocks.
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A small edge-cut corresponds to a low-rank coupling of matrix blocks.

Although the graph partitioning problem is NP-hard good approximation algorithms exist, e.g. multilevel or spectral methods. Furthermore, they are available in open source packages, e.g. METIS, Chaco or Scotch.

## Algebraic Admissibility

## Algebraic Admissibility Definition

To apply the standard admissibility condition
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\min (\operatorname{diam}(t), \operatorname{diam}(s)) \leq \eta \operatorname{dist}(t, s)
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for a block cluster $(t, s) \in V \times V$, one needs to define distance and diameter of clusters in a graph.
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Problem: diameter and distance in $G$ costs $\mathcal{O}\left(n^{2}\right)$.

## Algebraic Admissibility Testing

Solution: approximate cluster diameter and construct cluster surrounding ensuring admissibility.

For testing admissibility of block cluster $(t, s) \in V \times V$

- choose $i \in t$ and compute $j \in t$ with $\operatorname{dist}_{G}(i, j)=$ max,
- $\operatorname{diam}_{G}(t) \leq 2 \operatorname{dist}_{G}(i, j)=: \widetilde{\operatorname{diam}}$,
- build surrounding $\tilde{t}$ around $t$ with $\frac{1}{\eta} \widetilde{\operatorname{diam}}$ layers,

- if $\tilde{t} \cap s=\emptyset$ then $(t, s)$ is admissible.
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## Algebraic Admissibility Testing

Solution: approximate cluster diameter and construct cluster surrounding ensuring admissibility.

For testing admissibility of block cluster $(t, s) \in V \times V$

- choose $i \in t$ and compute $j \in t$ with $\operatorname{dist}_{G}(i, j)=$ max,
- $\operatorname{diam}_{G}(t) \leq 2 \operatorname{dist}_{G}(i, j)=: \widetilde{\operatorname{diam}}$,
- build surrounding $\tilde{t}$ around $t$ with $\frac{1}{\eta} \widetilde{\operatorname{diam}}$ layers,

- if $\tilde{t} \cap s=\emptyset$ then $(t, s)$ is admissible.

With usual FEM sparsity patterns, this procedure has complexity

$$
\mathcal{O}(\# t) .
$$

## Nested Dissection

## Nested Dissection Vertex Separator

In nested dissection the two constructed sub graphs of a partition have to be separated by a (minimal) vertex separator.
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## Advantages of Nested Dissection

- zero blocks do not fill up during $\mathcal{H}$-LU factorisation,
- blocks can be computed in parallel.
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A vertex separator can be obtained by computing a vertex cover of the edge-cut between both node sets in a partition.

But for $\mathcal{H}$-matrices the vertex separator has to be further partitioned to form a cluster tree.
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## Nested Dissection Cluster Tree for the Vertex Separator

A vertex separator can be obtained by computing a vertex cover of the edge-cut between both node sets in a partition.

But for $\mathcal{H}$-matrices the vertex separator has to be further partitioned to form a cluster tree.

Problem: restricting $G$ to nodes in vertex separator $\mathcal{V}$ might remove important edges, e.g.


Solution: modify previous BFS based algorithm to perform partitioning in a surrounding of the vertex separator.

## Numerical Experiments

## Numerical Experiments $\quad$ Comparison with Geom. Clustering

Solving model problem:

| $N$ | Geometric |  | Algebraic |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Time (s) | Mem (MB) | Time (s) | Mem (MB) |
| $253^{2}$ | 0.9 | 51 | 1.3 | 47 |
| $358^{2}$ | 1.9 | 86 | 2.9 | 94 |
| $511^{2}$ | 4.5 | 212 | 6.5 | 198 |
| $729^{2}$ | 9.6 | 371 | 15.0 | 402 |
| $1023^{2}$ | 20.2 | 878 | 31.6 | 819 |
| $40^{3}$ | 12.6 | 99 | 32.7 | 135 |
| $51^{3}$ | 46.9 | 300 | 97.6 | 323 |
| $64^{3}$ | 117.4 | 592 | 289.1 | 719 |
| $81^{3}$ | 269.8 | 1410 | 804.3 | 1570 |
| $102^{3}$ | 752.3 | 3020 | 1907.3 | 3370 |

Accuracy of $\mathcal{H}$-arithmetic chosen such that

$$
\left\|I-\left(L_{\mathcal{H}} U_{\mathcal{H}}\right)^{-1} A\right\|_{2} \leq 10^{-4}
$$

## Numerical Experiments $\quad$ Comparison with Direct Solvers

Solving

$$
-\Delta u+\lambda u=f \quad \text { in } \Omega=[0,1]^{2}
$$



## Numerical Experiments $\quad$ Comparison with Direct Solvers

Solving

$$
-\Delta u+\lambda u=f \quad \text { in } \Omega=[0,1]^{3}
$$



## Numerical Experiments Parallel Performance

Parallel speedup for algebraic $\mathcal{H}$-LU factorisation in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{3}$.
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