AN AUGMENTED LAGRANGIAN PRECONDITIONER FOR THE 3D STATIONARY INCOMPRESSIBLE NAVIER–STOKES EQUATIONS AT HIGH REYNOLDS NUMBER *
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Abstract. In Benzi & Olshanskii (SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 28(6) (2006)) a preconditioner of augmented Lagrangian type was presented for the two-dimensional stationary incompressible Navier–Stokes equations that exhibits convergence almost independent of Reynolds number. The algorithm relies on a highly specialized multigrid method involving a custom prolongation operator and is tightly coupled to the use of piecewise constant finite elements for the pressure. However, the prolongation operator and velocity element used do not directly extend to three dimensions: the local solves necessary in the prolongation operator do not satisfy the inf-sup condition. In this work we generalize the preconditioner to three dimensions, proposing alternative finite elements for the velocity and prolongation operators for which the preconditioner works robustly. The solver is effective at high Reynolds number: on a three-dimensional lid-driven cavity problem with approximately one billion degrees of freedom, the average number of Krylov iterations per Newton step varies from 7 at Re = 10 to 5.5 at Re = 1000 and 9 at Re = 5000.
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1. Introduction. We consider the stationary incompressible Newtonian Navier–Stokes equations: given a bounded Lipschitz domain \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d \), \( d \in \{2,3\} \), find \((u,p) \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times Q\) such that

\begin{align*}
\tag{1.1a}
-\nu \nabla^2 u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\
\tag{1.1b}
\nabla \cdot u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\
\tag{1.1c}
u \nabla u \cdot n &= p_n \quad \text{on } \Gamma_N, \\
\tag{1.1d}
\end{align*}

where \( \nu > 0 \) is the kinematic viscosity, \( f \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \), \( n \) is the outward-facing unit normal to \( \partial \Omega \), \( \Gamma_D \) and \( \Gamma_N \) are disjoint with \( \Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_N = \partial \Omega \), and \( g \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma_D; \mathbb{R}^d) \). If \( |\Gamma_N| > 0 \), then a suitable trial space for the pressure is \( Q := L^2(\Omega) \); if \( |\Gamma_N| = 0 \), then the pressure is only defined up to an additive constant and \( Q := L^2_0(\Omega) \) is used instead. The Reynolds number, defined as \( \text{Re} = UL/\nu \), where \( U \) is the characteristic velocity and \( L \) is the characteristic length scale of the flow, is an important dimensionless number governing the nature of the flow. The Navier–Stokes equations are
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of enormous practical importance in science and industry, but are very difficult to solve, especially for large Reynolds number. The importance of these equations has motivated vast amounts of research on algorithms for their solution; for a general overview of the field, see the textbooks of Turek [73], Elman, Silvester & Wathen [30], or Brandt [15].

After Newton linearization and a suitable spatial discretization of (1.1), nonsymmetric linear systems of saddle point type must be solved:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
A & B^T \\
B & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\delta u \\
\delta p
\end{pmatrix} =
\begin{pmatrix}
b \\
0
\end{pmatrix},
\]

where \(A\) is the discrete linearized momentum operator, \(B^T\) is the discrete gradient operator, \(B\) is the discrete divergence operator, and \(\delta u\) and \(\delta p\) are the updates to the coefficients for velocity and pressure respectively. One strategy to solve these systems is to employ a monolithic multigrid iteration on the entire system with a suitable coupled relaxation method, such as the algorithms of Vanka [75] or Braess & Sarazin [14]. Vanka iteration works well for moderate Reynolds numbers [73], but the iteration counts have been observed to increase significantly once the Reynolds number becomes large [7].

An alternative approach to solving (1.2) is to build preconditioners based on block factorizations [56, 42, 6, 30, 76]. This strategy can be grounded in an insightful functional analytic framework that guides the development of solvers whose convergence is independent of parameter values and mesh size \(h\), at least in the case where (1.2) is symmetric [54]. Block Gaussian elimination reduces the problem of solving the coupled linear system to that of solving smaller separate linear systems involving the matrix \(A\) and the Schur complement \(S = -BA^{-1}B^T\). If a fast solver is available for \(A\), the main difficulty is solving linear systems involving \(S\), as this matrix is generally dense and cannot be stored explicitly for large problems. Tractable approximations \(\tilde{S}^{-1}\) to \(S^{-1}\) must be devised on a PDE-specific basis.

For the Stokes equations, the Schur complement is spectrally equivalent to the viscosity-weighted pressure mass matrix [70]. For the Navier–Stokes equations this choice yields mesh-independent convergence and is effective for very small Reynolds numbers, but the convergence deteriorates badly with Reynolds number [27, 30]. The pressure convection-diffusion (PCD) approach [44] constructs an auxiliary convection-diffusion operator on the pressure space, and hypothesizes that a certain commutator is small. This yields an approximation to the Schur complement inverse that involves the inverse of the Laplacian on the pressure space, the application of this auxiliary operator, and the inverse of the pressure mass matrix. The least-squares commutator (LSC) approach [26] is based on a similar idea, but derives the auxiliary operator algebraically. Both of these approaches perform well for moderate Reynolds numbers. Numerical experiments comparing the performance of our approach to these algorithms are provided in section 5.

In 2006, Benzi & Olshtanski proposed an augmented Lagrangian approach for controlling the Schur complement of (1.2) [58, 7, 57, 8, 31, 49]. The idea, also called grad-div stabilization, is to introduce an additional term in the equations that does not change the continuous solution, but does modify the Schur complement. The continuous form of the stabilization replaces (1.1a) with

\[
-\nu \nabla^2 u + (u \cdot \nabla) u + \nabla p - \gamma \nabla \nabla \cdot u = f \quad \text{in} \ \Omega,
\]

for \(\gamma > 0\). As \(\nabla \cdot u = 0\), the solutions of (1.3) and (1.1a) are the same. The discrete
variant of this approach replaces (1.2) with
\[
(\begin{pmatrix}
A + \gamma B^T M_p^{-1} B & B^T \\
B & 0
\end{pmatrix})
\begin{pmatrix}
\delta u \\
\delta p
\end{pmatrix} =
\begin{pmatrix}
b_0 \\
0
\end{pmatrix},
\]
where $M_p$ is the pressure mass matrix. This modified system has the same discrete solutions as (1.2), as $B \delta u = 0$. With either variant, the Schur complement inverse is well approximated by
\[
S^{-1} \approx (\nu + \gamma) M_p^{-1},
\]
where $M_p$ is the pressure mass matrix, and this approximation improves as $\gamma$ increases (section 3). In either case, we denote the discretized augmented momentum block as $A_\gamma$.

**Remark 1.1.** The continuous form of the grad-div stabilization has some further appealing characteristics. For example, it significantly improves the pressure-robustness of discretizations where the incompressibility constraint is not enforced pointwise [58, 39, 43]. It also arises in other contexts in the numerical analysis of (1.1). For example, Boffi & Lovadina [12] showed that the addition of the term $h^{-1/2} (\nabla \cdot u, \nabla \cdot v)_{L^2(\Omega)}$ to the weak form of the $[P_2]^2-P_0$ discretization of (1.1) improves its convergence order. It also arises in the iterated penalty [72, 16] and artificial compressibility [22] methods for the Stokes and Navier–Stokes equations.

The tradeoff with either variant of this approach is that developing fast solvers for $A_\gamma$ becomes significantly more difficult. The divergence operator has a large kernel (the range of the curl operator) and hence standard multigrid relaxation methods are ineffective.

A key insight of Benzi & Olshanskii was that a specialized multigrid algorithm could be built for $A_\gamma$ [7, 57] by applying the seminal work of Schöberl [64]. The algorithm combines four ingredients, each of which is crucial to the effectiveness of the method: (i) the discrete variant of the grad-div stabilization; (ii) streamline-upwind Petrov-Galerkin (SUPG) stabilization of the advective term; (iii) a multigrid relaxation that effectively treats errors in the kernel of the discrete divergence term; (iv) a specialized prolongation operator whose continuity constant is independent of the Reynolds number. This scheme exhibits outer iteration counts that grow only very slowly with Reynolds number [7]. However, it is described as difficult to implement [37, 9], and so most of the works that use grad-div stabilization and the Schur complement approximation (1.5) employ either matrix factorization as the inner solver [24, 74, 13, 38, 39] or a block-triangular approximation to $A_\gamma$ [9, 37, 8]. This block-triangular approximation decouples linear systems involving $A_\gamma$ into $d$ scalar anisotropic advection–diffusion problems, which may be solved with algebraic multigrid techniques. However, this simplicity comes at a price; the scheme is much more sensitive to the choice of $\gamma$, and its convergence deteriorates somewhat as the Reynolds number increases [9].

The main contribution of this paper is the extension of the robust multigrid scheme for the inner velocity problem arising in the augmented Lagrangian preconditioner to three dimensions. The previous work of Benzi & Olshanskii only considered the case $d = 2$. While the same general strategy applies in three dimensions, the extension is nontrivial: if the finite elements used in [64, 7] are applied in three dimensions, the prolongation operator involves the solution of ill-posed local problems. We propose appropriate finite element discretizations and matching prolongation operators that exhibit Reynolds-robust iteration counts in three dimensions.
A second contribution is the release of an open-source parallel implementation of the solver in two and three dimensions, built on Firedrake [62] and PETSc [5]. This has required substantial modifications to Firedrake, PETSc, UFL [1] and TSFC [41], as well as minor developments in FIAT [45]. The solver heavily relies on and extends the solver infrastructure developed in [46], enabling easy composition and nesting of preconditioners in PETSc and Firedrake. To express the local solves involved in the relaxation and prolongation operator, we have developed a new preconditioner in PETSc that allows for the simple expression of general additive subspace correction methods. For example, the same code that does patchwise relaxation can be used to formulate line smoothers, plane smoothers, or Vanka iteration, and we expect that it will be of substantial interest for other applications as well.

The remainder of the paper is laid out as follows. The discretization and the grad-div stabilization are described in section 2. The preconditioner is currently restricted to discretizations using piecewise constant approximations for the pressure; the reasons for this and prospects for relaxing this constraint are discussed. The augmented Lagrangian approach is explained in section 3. The multigrid cycle for the augmented momentum block is described in section 4. Numerical experiments analyzing its performance and comparing it to PCD and LSC are reported in section 5. Finally, conclusions and prospects for future improvements are given in section 6.

2. Formulation and discretization. For boundary data \( g \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma_D) \), let

\[
V_g = \{ v \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) : v|_{\Gamma_D} = g \}.
\]

The initial weak form of (1.1) is: find \((u, p) \in V_g \times Q\) such that

\[
\nu \int_\Omega \nabla u : \nabla v \, dx + \int_\Omega (u \cdot \nabla)u \, dx - \int_\Omega p \nabla \cdot v \, dx - \int_\Omega q \nabla \cdot u \, dx = \int_\Omega f \cdot v \, dx,
\]

for all \((v, q) \in V_0 \times Q\). This will be extended before discretization in two ways. The first is a consistent SUPG stabilization; it is well known that straightforward Galerkin discretizations of advection-dominated problems are oscillatory [18, 73, 60, 30]. In addition, it is widely observed that mesh-dependent SUPG stabilization is highly advantageous for multigrid smoothers on advection-dominated problems [61, 73]. The strong form of the momentum residual is given by

\[
\mathcal{L}(u, p) = -\nu \nabla \cdot \nabla u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p - f
\]

and the following term is added to the weak form:

\[
\int_\Omega \delta(u) \mathcal{L}(u, p) \cdot ((u \cdot \nabla)v) \, dx.
\]

Here \(\delta(u)\) is a weighting function that should be small in regions where the flow is well-resolved and large where stabilization is necessary. The particular form employed in this work is

\[
\delta(u) = \delta_d \left( \frac{4\|u\|^2}{h^2} + \frac{144\beta^2}{h^4} \right)^{-1/2},
\]

with \(\delta_d = 1\) in two dimensions and \(\delta_d = 1/20\) in three dimensions. To the best of our knowledge this form was first suggested in [68, eq. (3.58)]. It is important to take account of the dependence of \(\delta\) on the (unknown) solution \(u\) when taking the
derivatives required by Newton’s method; in this work, these derivatives are calculated automatically and symbolically by the Unified Form Language [1].

The second stabilization is the grad-div stabilization mentioned above. If the continuous variant is employed, the term

\[ \gamma \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot \nabla \cdot v \, dx \]

is added to the weak form, while if the discrete variant is employed, the term

\[ \gamma \int_{\Omega} (P_{Q_h} \nabla \cdot u) \nabla \cdot v \, dx \]

is added instead, where \( P_{Q_h} : L^2(\Omega) \to Q_h \) is the projection operator onto the discrete pressure space \( Q_h \). The continuous grad-div stabilization changes the discrete solution computed, whereas the discrete variant does not. As this change is beneficial, this represents a substantial advantage of the continuous approach; its effect is to penalize \( \| \nabla \cdot u_h \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \) and thereby improve the discrete enforcement of the incompressibility constraint [58, 39, 43]. Indeed, the limit of the continuously grad-div stabilized Taylor–Hood approximation of the Navier–Stokes problem converges to the (exactly divergence-free) Scott-Vogelius approximation as \( \gamma \to \infty \) [21]. Nevertheless, in this work we use the discrete variant (2.7). The reason for this is that the kernel of \( P_{Q_h} \text{div} \) is much more straightforward to characterize than the kernel of \( \text{div} \) if \( Q_h \) is chosen to be the space of piecewise constants:

\[ Q_h(\mathcal{M}) = \{ q \in L^2(\Omega) : q|_K \in \mathbb{P}_0(K) \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{M} \}, \]

where \( \mathcal{M} \) is a simplicial mesh of the domain \( \Omega \). By the divergence theorem, \( u_h \in \ker(P_{Q_h} \text{div}) \) if and only if for any \( K \in \mathcal{M}, u_h \) satisfies

\[ \int_{\partial K} u_h \cdot n \, ds = 0. \]

This characterization will be extremely useful for dealing with errors in the kernel in the multigrid relaxation, as it ensures that the kernel is spanned by basis functions with local support [17, §VI.8]. Note also that this choice of \( Q_h \) removes the dependency of \( L \) on \( p \) (as \( \nabla p \) is zero on each element), thereby eliminating any contribution to the top-right block of the linearized system to be solved.

After these stabilizations, the final discrete weak form to be solved is: find \( (u, p) \in (V_h \cap V_g) \times (Q_h \cap Q) \) such that

\[ \nu \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx + \int_{\Omega} (u \cdot \nabla)u \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \delta(u)L(u) \cdot ((u \cdot \nabla)v) \, dx \]

\[ + \gamma \int_{\Omega} (P_{Q_h} \nabla \cdot u) \nabla \cdot v \, dx - \int_{\Omega} p \nabla \cdot v \, dx - \int_{\Omega} q \nabla \cdot u \, dx = \int_{\Omega} f \cdot v \, dx, \]

for all \( (v, q) \in (V_h \cap V_0) \times (Q_h \cap Q) \), with the choice of \( V_h \) to be discussed below.

2.1. Choice of velocity space. We now turn our attention to choosing an appropriate space for the discrete velocities. Define the space \( V_h(\mathcal{M}) \) used for the velocity as

\[ V_h(\mathcal{M}) = \{ v \in H^1(\Omega) : v|_K \in \mathbb{P}_v(K) \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{M} \}, \]
for some choice of $P_v(K)$. The first condition on $P_v(K)$ is that $V_h$ must be inf-sup stable when combined with $Q_h$ for the pressure. Unfortunately, both in two and in three dimensions, the $[P_1]^d-P_0$ element combining piecewise linear functions for the velocity space together with piecewise constants for the pressure does not satisfy the inf-sup condition on general meshes. This means that the velocity space needs to be enriched, with the resulting element pairs (e.g. $[P_2]^2-P_0$ and $[P_3]^3-P_0$) exhibiting a suboptimal convergence rate.

In [7] the element pair $[P_1 \text{iso } P_2]^2-P_0$ is used, which is obtained by considering a $[P_1]^2$ element on a once refined mesh for the velocity. This element has the same number of degrees of freedom as $[P_2]^2-P_0$. Neither $[P_2]^3-P_0$ nor $[P_1 \text{iso } P_2]^3-P_0$ are inf-sup stable on a single regularly refined tetrahedron, which as we shall see in section 4.2 is crucial for the effectiveness of the preconditioner. They are missing degrees of freedom on the facets of the tetrahedra which are necessary to stabilize the jump of the pressure field.

Increasing the degree of the velocity space to piecewise cubic polynomials, i.e. choosing the element pair $[P_3]^3-P_0$, introduces additional degrees of freedom on the facets and results in a stable element pair. However, this element is extremely expensive while being suboptimal by two orders for the velocity. Alternatively, Bernardi & Raugel [10, 11] suggest enriching the piecewise linear velocity space with bubble functions on each facet. While it is only necessary to add a single bubble function for the normal component of the velocity on each facet, this adds significant complexity to the implementation as these functions are not affine equivalent; they require a Piola transform to preserve the normal orientation. This means that the basis functions associated with vertices and those associated with facets need to be pulled-back differently, complicating the implementation. For this reason we choose instead to enrich the space with facet bubbles for all three components of the velocity, obtaining the $[P_1 \oplus B^F_3]^3-P_0$ element. As can be seen in Figure 2.1, this results in an element with significantly fewer degrees of freedom than $[P_3]^3-P_0$. We also show the $[P_2 \oplus B^F_3]^3$ element in Figure 2.1; we will demonstrate in Section 4.2 that these elements satisfy a particular property that is useful in the prolongation.

![Fig. 2.1: The $P_1 \oplus B^F_3$, $P_2$, $P_2 \oplus B^F_3$ and $P_3$ elements.](image)

**Remark 2.1.** Pressure elements other than $P_0$ have been considered for the augmented Lagrangian preconditioner. Benzi & Olshanskii [7] also present results for the $[P_1 \text{iso } P_2]^2-P_1$ pair, where the pressure mass matrix solve in $P_Q_h$ is approximated by the inverse of a diagonal matrix. However, these results exhibit worse iteration growth

---

1 The bubble function on each facet is the product of the barycentric coordinates that are nonzero on that facet.
for the Picard linearization as $\nu \to 0$ than the $[P_1 \text{iso} P_2]^2 - P_0$ element.

**Remark 2.2.** Effective smoothers for partial differential equations involving the continuous term $(\nabla \cdot u, \nabla \cdot v)_{L^2(\Omega)}$ have been proposed in other contexts [2, 40]; it should be possible to extend these approaches to the two- and three-dimensional advection-dominated case considered here, and thereby enable the use of finite elements with advantageous properties such as optimal convergence rates and exact enforcement of the incompressibility constraint.

3. The augmented Lagrangian method. The Schur complement of the matrix in (1.4) is given by

$$(3.1) \quad S = -B(A + \gamma B^T M_p^{-1} B)^{-1} B^T.$$ 

From the Sherman–Morrison–Woodbury formula it follows (e.g. [4, Theorem 3.2]) that

$$(3.2) \quad S^{-1} = -(B A^{-1} B^T)^{-1} - \gamma M_p^{-1}.$$ 

From this we obtain immediately that

$$(3.3) \quad \tilde{S}^{-1} = -(\nu + \gamma) M_p^{-1}$$

is a good approximation to $S^{-1}$ as $\gamma \to \infty$ for fixed mesh size and viscosity. To understand the quality of the approximation for finite $\gamma$ as $\nu$ or $h$ change, we need to consider how $\nu M_p^{-1}$ approximates $(BA^{-1} B^T)^{-1}$.

It is well known that the eigenvalues of a matrix do not characterize the convergence of GMRES for a linear system [34]. Instead, it is necessary to bound the field-of-values of the preconditioned system [71, Theorem 3.2], [25, Corollary 6.2]. This analysis was performed by Benzi & Olshanskii [8] for both the ideal and the modified augmented Lagrangian preconditioner for the Oseen problem, using general results of Loghin & Wathen [53]. One of the key ingredients in this analysis is that the momentum operator is coercive with constant $\nu$. They use this to prove that the choice of $\gamma \sim \nu^{-1}$ results in an optimal preconditioner (assuming exact solves of the momentum block). However, it is well known [33, p. 300] that the momentum operator of the Newton linearization of (1.1) is only coercive for $\nu > \nu_0$ for some problem-dependent $\nu_0$. Fortin & Glowinski remark [31, p. 85] that this is typically a very restrictive condition: for $\nu > \nu_0$ the Stokes approximation itself is adequate. This proof strategy would therefore require significant extension to apply to the Newton linearization considered here.

In practice, Benzi & Olshanskii [7] observe that a constant choice of $\gamma$ yields mesh-independent and essentially Reynolds number independent results. As our multigrid solver for the momentum block is robust with respect to $\gamma$, we simply choose $\gamma$ large. In the experiments of section 5, we take the value $\gamma = 10^4$.

4. Solving the augmented momentum block. The key challenge with the augmented Lagrangian strategy is the solution of the augmented momentum block $A_\gamma$. The grad-div term has a large nullspace, rendering standard relaxation methods (point-block Jacobi or Gauss–Seidel) ineffective as $\nu \to 0$. In this section we explain the specialized multigrid algorithm of Benzi & Olshanskii, along with the modifications required to extend the method to three dimensions. The multigrid method has two components: a $\nu$- and $\gamma$-robust relaxation method, and a kernel-preserving prolongation operator. In subsections 4.1 and 4.2 we first consider the augmented Stokes momentum operator without the linearized advection terms, to study in the simplest
possible situation the difficulties arising with the grad-div term. We then comment on the case with advection in subsection 4.3.

To understand the properties required of the relaxation and prolongation, it suffices to consider a two-level scheme. We use the subscripts $h$ and $H$ to denote function spaces, bilinear forms, and meshes on the fine and coarse levels respectively.

### 4.1. Relaxation

The augmented Stokes momentum problem is of the form:

\[
\text{find } u \in V_{h,0} := V_h \cap V_0 \text{ such that }
\]

\[
a_h(u, v) := \nu(\nabla u, \nabla v) + \gamma(P_{Q_h} \nabla \cdot u, \nabla \cdot v) = (f, v)
\]

for all $v \in V_{h,0}$. The viscosity term is symmetric and positive definite; the discrete grad-div term is positive semidefinite. As $\nu \to 0$ or $\gamma \to \infty$ this system becomes nearly singular and standard relaxation methods such as Gauss-Seidel or Jacobi iterations perform poorly. The essential difficulty is in computing the component of the solution in the kernel

\[
N_h := \{ u \in V_{h,0} : (P_{Q_h} \nabla \cdot u, \nabla \cdot v) = 0 \forall v \in V_{h,0} \}
\]

of the grad-div term. Schöberl [65, Theorem 4.1] and Lee et al. [50, Theorem 4.2] consider subspace correction methods for this class of problem. The key result of these works is that if a subspace decomposition

\[
V_{h,0} = \sum_i V_i
\]

satisfies the kernel decomposition property

\[
N_h = \sum_i (V_i \cap N_h)
\]

then the resulting subspace correction method (a block Gauss-Seidel or Jacobi iteration) is robust with respect to $\nu$ and $\gamma$. This is why characterizing the kernel of the grad-div term is crucial, and why the discrete variant is easier to solve: the kernel $N_h$ is spanned by basis functions with local support around each vertex.

More specifically, for each vertex $v_i$ in the mesh $\mathcal{M}$, its star is the patch of elements sharing $v_i$:

\[
K_i := \bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{M} : v_i \in K}
\]

The subspace decomposition is then given by

\[
V_i := \{ \phi_j \in V_{h,0} : \text{supp}(\phi_j) \subset K_i \}.
\]

We call the resulting patchwise block relaxation method a star iteration. Note that homogeneous Dirichlet conditions are imposed on the boundary of each star patch. This relaxation method has been employed for robust multigrid methods in $H(\text{div})$ and $H(\text{curl})$ [3].

For the reader’s convenience, we briefly summarize the argument of [65, Section 4.1.2] to see why this decomposition satisfies (4.4). Observe that a discretely divergence-free vector field $u_h \in N_h$ can be suitably modified in the interior of each cell to become continuously divergence-free by solving a local Stokes problem. Denote this continuously divergence-free vector field by $\tilde{u}$ and recall that then $\tilde{u} = \nabla \times \phi$
for some vector field $\phi$. Choosing a partition of unity $\{\rho_i\}$, with $\sum_i \rho_i = 1$ and \(\text{supp}(\rho_i) \subset K_i\) we define $\phi_i = \rho_i \phi$ and obtain a decomposition
\[
\phi = \sum_i \phi_i.
\]
(4.7)

For such a partition of unity to exist, every point in the mesh has to be in the interior of at least one patch. The decomposition of the mesh into star patches is the smallest decomposition of a finite element mesh that satisfies this property. Now let $I$ be a Fortin operator based on the Scott-Zhang [67] interpolation operator using facet averaging. Note that $I$ only depends on values of $u$ on the facets of elements and hence $I\tilde{u} = u_h$. We then define $u_i = I\nabla \times \phi_i$ and conclude that
\[
\sum_i u_i = \sum_i I\nabla \times \phi_i = I\nabla \times \phi = I\tilde{u} = u_h
\]
as required.

4.2. Prolongation. The second key ingredient of the multigrid scheme is the prolongation operator that maps $V_h$ to $V_{h'}$. To get an intuition for the properties required, let $E_H : V_H \rightarrow V_h$ be the prolongation operator obtained by interpolating a function $u_H \in V_H$ at the degrees of freedom of $V_h$. The continuity of $E_H$ in the energy norm induced by the bilinear form $a_h$ defined in (4.1) is a key assumption in Schöberl’s proof of the optimality of a two-level multigrid scheme [65, Lemma 3.5]. In order for the scheme to be robust, this continuity constant must be uniform in $\nu$ and $\gamma$. Calculating, we observe that
\[
\begin{align*}
\|u_H\|^2_{a_H} &= \nu \|\nabla u_H\|^2_{L^2} + \gamma \|P_{Q_h}(\nabla \cdot u_H)\|^2_{L^2} \\
\|E_H u_H\|^2_{a_h} &= \nu \|\nabla (E_H u_H)\|^2_{L^2} + \gamma \|P_{Q_h}(\nabla \cdot (E_H u_H))\|^2_{L^2}.
\end{align*}
\]
(4.9)

The key difficulty lies in the second term of this norm. To see this, observe that for an element $u_H \in N_H$ the second term in $\|u_H\|^2_{a_H}$ vanishes, but since it does not necessarily hold that $E_H u_H \in N_h$, the corresponding term in $\|E_H u_H\|^2_{a_h}$ might be large.

To avoid this, we must modify the prolongation operator to map fields that are discretely divergence-free on the coarse grid to fields that are (nearly) discretely divergence-free on the fine grid.

To begin, we assume that there is a decomposition $Q_h = \mathcal{Q}_H \oplus \mathcal{Q}_T$ and a subspace $V_T \subset V_h$ that satisfies $V_T \subset \ker(P_{Q_h}(\nabla \cdot \cdot \cdot ))$. Schöberl proved that if the pairing $V_T - \mathcal{Q}_T$ satisfies the inf-sup condition and if
\[
\begin{align*}
(P_{Q_h}(\nabla \cdot (E_H u_H)), \tilde{q}_H)_{L^2} &= (P_{Q_h}(\nabla \cdot u_H), \tilde{q}_H)_{L^2}, &\forall u_H \in V_H, \tilde{q}_H \in \mathcal{Q}_H \\
(P_{Q_h}(\nabla \cdot u_T), \tilde{q}_H)_{L^2} &= 0, &\forall u_T \in V_T, \tilde{q}_H \in \mathcal{Q}_H
\end{align*}
\]
(4.10)
(4.11)

then the prolongation $\tilde{E}_H$ defined as
\[
\tilde{E}_H u_H = E_H u_h - w_T,
\]
(4.12)

where $w_T \in V_T$ satisfies
\[
a_h(w_T, v_T) = a_h(E_H u_H, v_T) &\forall v_T \in V_T.
\]
(4.13)
is continuous in the energy norm. The continuity constant is uniform in $\nu$ and $\gamma$. In this case, the decomposition of $Q_h$ is chosen as
\begin{align}
\tilde{Q}_H & := Q_H \\
Q_T & := \{ q_h \in Q_h : P_{Q_h}(q_h) = 0 \}
\end{align}
and we choose
\begin{equation}
V_T := \{ v_h \in V_h : v_h|_{\partial K} = 0 \ \forall K \in \mathcal{M}_H \}.
\end{equation}
The idea behind this is the following: (4.10) guarantees that prolongation preserves the flux across coarse grid facets. Then a correction term $w_T \in V_T$ that corrects the flux across the fine grid facets is subtracted. The condition (4.11) guarantees that this correction does not affect the flux across the coarse facets.

**Remark 4.1.** The definition of $V_T$ implies that the problem in (4.13) can be solved locally on each coarse grid element. This is crucial for an efficient implementation.

**Remark 4.2.** Decompositions $\tilde{Q}_H \neq Q_H$ arise in other problems, such as in Reissner–Mindlin plates [65, Section 4.2.2].

In [64, 7] the $[P_2]^2 - P_0$ element is used. For this element choice it holds that $V_H \subset V_h$ and hence (4.11) is satisfied trivially. However, in three dimensions the pairing $V_T - Q_T$ resulting from the choice $[P_2]^3 - P_0$ is not inf-sup stable. This can easily seen by counting degrees of freedom: $[P_2]^3$ only has degrees of freedom on edges and vertices. Since there are zero vertices and only one edge not entirely on the boundary of the refined coarse tetrahedron (see Figure 4.1), we have $\dim(V_T) = 3$. On the other hand, the pressure space satisfies $\dim(Q_T) = 7$ (one dimension is fixed by the nullspace). The local solve can therefore not be well-posed.

![Fig. 4.1: The uniform refinement of a coarse mesh tetrahedron yields eight fine mesh tetrahedra. Only the edge highlighted in blue does not lie entirely on the boundary of the tetrahedron.](image)

The choice $[P_3]^3 - P_0$ alleviates this problem of ill-posedness on the coarse cell and still satisfies $V_H \subset V_h$. However, as described in Section 2.1, this element is quite expensive without improving accuracy of the solution.
A much cheaper alternative is offered by the $[P_1 \oplus B^F] - P_0$ element. This does satisfy the inf-sup condition but violates $V_H \subset V_h$. The non-nestedness is demonstrated in Figure 4.2; a coarse bubble cannot be interpolated exactly by functions in $V_h$. In particular, the flux across the coarse grid faces is not preserved, hence violating (4.10). A brief calculation shows that every coarse grid bubble is interpolated by four fine grid bubbles: one with coefficient 1, the other three with coefficient 1/2. From this it follows immediately that the integral of the prolonged bubble is equal to $(1 + 3 \cdot \frac{1}{2})/4 = \frac{5}{8}$ of the integral of the coarse bubble. Hence, when using a hierarchical basis, since the piecewise linear basis functions are prolonged exactly we can obtain a prolongation that satisfies (4.10) by simply multiplying the coefficients of the fine grid bubble functions by $8/5$. After this scaling, the local correction $w_T$ is computed as described above. For a nodal basis, a change of basis to the hierarchical basis should be performed.

This modification of the prolongation operator is crucial for the solver to work with the $[P_1 \oplus B^F] - P_0$ element. We demonstrate this by showing the residual of the outer flexible GMRES iteration for the linear solve in the first Newton step at $Re = 10$ for a lid-driven cavity problem (see section 5.5 for details) in Table 4.1. Without modifying the prolongation of the facet bubbles, we observe no convergence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iteration</th>
<th>Residual with bubble scaling</th>
<th>Residual without bubble scaling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2.34 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2.04 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$4.50 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$6.79 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1.36 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1.33 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2.19 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Residual of the outer flexible GMRES solver when employing the $[P_1 \oplus B^F] - P_0$ element. It is necessary to modify the prolongation operator to achieve convergence with this element.
Lastly, we consider the $[P_2 \oplus BF^3]_3 - P_0$ element. While it is also non-nested, it turns out that the interpolation is exact on the facets of each coarse cell and hence flux preserving. To see this, observe that the cubic facet bubble function is only quadratic on the newly introduced edges of a regularly refined facet, as they are parallel to the edges of the coarse facet and therefore one of the barycentric coordinates is constant. The coarse bubble function is therefore prolonged exactly. This means that the $[P_2 \oplus BF^3]_3 - P_0$ element can be used with the Schöberl prolongation operator (4.12), without the modifications necessary for $[P_1 \oplus BF^3]_3 - P_0$ described above. However, in our preliminary numerical experiments the simpler prolongation was outweighed by the cost of the larger number of degrees of degrees of freedom, and hence we use $[P_1 \oplus BF^3]_3 - P_0$ for the numerical experiments in section 5.

Remark 4.3. Only the prolongation is modified; as in Benzi & Olshanskii [7], the natural operations are used for restriction and injection.

4.3. The advection terms. So far we have neglected the terms arising from the linearization of the advection term. Applying a Newton linearization, (4.1) becomes: find $u \in V_{h,0}$ such that

\begin{equation}
\nu(\nabla u, \nabla v) + (w \cdot \nabla u, v) + (u \cdot \nabla w, v) + \gamma(P_{Q_h} \nabla \cdot u, \nabla \cdot v) = (f, v)
\end{equation}

for all $v \in V_{h,0}$, while the Picard linearization yields: find $u \in V_{h,0}$ such that

\begin{equation}
\nu(\nabla u, \nabla v) + (w \cdot \nabla u, v) + \gamma(P_{Q_h} \nabla \cdot u, \nabla \cdot v) = (f, v)
\end{equation}

for all $v \in V_{h,0}$. The Picard linearization is easier to solve but sacrifices quadratic convergence of the nonlinear solver. Several authors have reported success with geometric multigrid for scalar analogues of (4.18) without the grad-div term, using a combination of line/plane relaxation and SUPG stabilization [61, 59, 77]. Olshanskii and Benzi [57] and Elman et al. [28] apply preconditioners built on the Picard linearization (4.18) to the Newton linearization (4.17), with good results.

Numerical experiments indicated that the additive star iteration alone was not effective as a relaxation method for (4.17). (Benzi and Olshanskii [7] used a multiplicative star iteration with multiple directional sweeps, but we wished to avoid this as its performance varies with the core count in parallel.) We investigated the multiplicative composition of additive star iterations and plane smoothers, and while this led to a successful multigrid cycle, the plane smoothers were quite expensive (involving many 2D solves) and were also difficult to parallelize on arbitrary unstructured grids where the parallel decomposition does not divide into planes. Although an undamped additive star iteration is not effective as a relaxation, by choosing a suitable damped parameter, it is possible to achieve a convergent scheme (this weighting is not necessary for the multiplicative version) [36, Lemma 12.13]. It is difficult to derive an optimal damping factor analytically, but we found that a few iterations of GMRES preconditioned by the additive star iteration was surprisingly effective as a relaxation method for (4.17), even with low viscosities. This point merits further analysis and will be considered in future work. This relaxation method also has the advantage that it is easy to parallelize, with convergence independent of the parallel decomposition.

5. Numerical results.

5.1. Algorithm details. A graphical representation of the entire algorithm is shown in Figure 5.1. We employ simple continuation in Reynolds number as a globalization device, as Newton’s method is not globally convergent. Newton’s method is globalized with the $L^2$ line search algorithm of PETSc [20].
We use flexible GMRES [63] as the outermost solver for the linearized Newton system, as we employ GMRES in the multigrid relaxation. If the pressure is only defined up to a constant, then the appropriate nullspace is passed to the Krylov solver and the solution orthogonalized against the nullspace at every iteration. The solve is done matrix-free, i.e. the entire sparse Jacobian matrix is not assembled; instead its action is computed by finite element assembly every time it is required. We use the full block factorization preconditioner

\[
P^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} I & -\tilde{A}^{-1}_\gamma B^T \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A}^{-1}_\gamma & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{S}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -B\tilde{A}^{-1}_\gamma & I \end{pmatrix}
\]

with approximate inner solves $\tilde{A}^{-1}_\gamma$ and $\tilde{S}^{-1}$ for the augmented momentum block and the Schur complement respectively. The diagonal, upper and lower triangular variants described in [56, 42] also converge well, but these took longer runtimes in preliminary experiments.

We use one F-cycle of the geometric multigrid algorithm described in section 4 as $\tilde{A}^{-1}_\gamma$. The problem on each level is constructed by rediscritization; fine grid functions, such as the current iterate in the Newton scheme, are transferred to the coarse levels via injection. On all levels except for the coarsest, the only matrices assembled are the local problems on each star patch (for the relaxation) and each coarser cell (for the prolongation). For each relaxation sweep we perform 6 (in 2D) or 10 (in 3D) GMRES iterations preconditioned by the additive star iteration; at lower Reynolds numbers this can be reduced, but we found that these expensive smoothers represented the optimal tradeoff between inner and outer work at higher Reynolds numbers. The coarsest level is assembled explicitly as a global sparse matrix and solved with the SuperLU_DIST sparse direct solver [52, 51]. For scalability, the coarse grid solve is agglomerated onto a single compute node using PETSc’s telescoping facility [55]. As all inner solvers are additive, the convergence of the solver is independent of the parallel decomposition (up to roundoff).

5.2. Software implementation. The solver proposed in the previous section is complex, and relies heavily on PETSc’s capability for the arbitrarily nested composi-
tion of solvers [19]. For the implementation of local patch solves, we have developed a new subspace correction preconditioner for PETSc that relies on the DMPlex unstructured mesh component [47, 48] for topological subspace construction and provides an extensible callback interface that allows for the very general specification of additive Schwarz methods. A detailed description of this preconditioner is in preparation.

5.3. Solver verification with the method of manufactured solutions. In order to verify the implementation and the convergence of the $[P_1 \oplus B^F_3]^{3} - P_0$ element we employ the method of manufactured solution (MMS). We start by considering the pressure and velocity field proposed in [69], which is rescaled to the $[0,2]^2$ square. This results in $u = (u_1, u_2)$ with

$$u_1(x,y) = \frac{1}{4}(x-2)^2 x^2 y (y^2 - 2)$$
$$u_2(x,y) = -\frac{1}{4}x (x^2 - 3x + 2) y^2 (y^2 - 4)$$
$$\tilde{p}(x,y) = \frac{xy(3x^4 - 15x^2 + 10x^2 y^2 - 30x(y^2 - 2) + 20(y^2 - 2))}{5\text{Re}}$$
$$-\frac{1}{128}(x-2)^4 x^2 y^2 (y^4 - 2y^2 + 8)$$
$$p(x,y) = \tilde{p} - \frac{1}{4} \int_{[0,2]^2} \tilde{p}(x,y) \, dx = \tilde{p} + \frac{1408}{33075} = \frac{8}{5\text{Re}}.$$  

As we are primarily interested in the three dimensional case, we extend the vector field into the $z$ dimension via $u(x,y,z) = (u_1(x,y), u_2(x,y), 0)$. The pressure remains the same as in two dimensions.

To demonstrate that the error convergence is independent of $\gamma$, we run the solver for values $\gamma = 1$ and $\gamma = 10^4$. Figure 5.2 shows the error between the computed velocity and pressure and their known analytical solutions for Re = 1, Re = 200 and Re = 500. Due to the DG0 discretization we expect first order convergence of the pressure. Without stabilization, we would expect second order convergence for the velocity field; however, due to the presence of the SUPG stabilization this is reduced to linear convergence for coarse meshes. Once the mesh is fine enough so that $h^{-1} \gg \text{Re}$, second order convergence is achieved.

5.4. Two-dimensional experiments. We consider two representative benchmark problems: the regularized lid-driven cavity and backward-facing step problems, fully described in [30, examples 8.1.2 and 8.1.3]. For each experiment, we fix a coarse grid and vary the number of refinements to vary the size of the problem under consideration; all refinements are used in the multigrid iteration, to ensure that the convergence does not deteriorate as more levels are employed. We employ the $[P_2]^2 - P_0$ element for all two dimensional experiments. To investigate the performance of the solver with Reynolds number, the problem is first solved for Re = 10, then Re = 100, and then in steps of 100 until Re = 10000, with the solution for the previous value of Re used as initial guess for the next. The Stokes equations are solved using a standard geometric multigrid algorithm with the pressure mass matrix as Schur complement approximation and point-block SOR as a smoother to provide the initial guess used at Re = 10. The grad-div stabilization parameter is set to $\gamma = 10^4$ in these and all subsequent experiments.

The linear solves are terminated with an absolute tolerance of $10^{-10}$ in the $\ell_2$-norm and a relative tolerance of $10^{-6}$. The nonlinear solves are terminated with an
Fig. 5.2: Convergence of the computed velocity and pressure field as the mesh is refined for a 3D lid-driven cavity test problem. We observe asymptotic second order convergence for the velocity and first order convergence for the pressure.

absolute tolerance of $10^{-8}$ and a relative tolerance of $10^{-10}$. As each outer iteration of the Krylov method does a fixed amount of work (i.e. all subproblems are solved with a fixed number of iterations, not to a specified tolerance), the solver scales well with mesh size and Reynolds number if the iteration counts remain approximately constant.

For comparison, we solve the same problems using the reference implementations of the PCD and LSC preconditioners in version 3.5 of IFISS [29]. For both of these preconditioners we use the variant that takes corrections for the boundary conditions into account and we solve the inner problems in the Schur complement approximation using an algebraic multigrid solver. We employ the hybrid strategy suggested by [30, p. 391] that uses a single sweep of ILU(0) on the finest level and two iterations of point-damped Jacobi for pre- and post-smoothing on all coarsened levels. A relative tolerance of $10^{-6}$ is set for the Krylov solver and an absolute tolerance of $10^{-8}$ for the Newton solver.

We begin by considering the regularized lid-driven cavity problem. The coarse grid used is the $16 \times 16$ grid of triangles of negative slope. The results are shown in
Table 5.1: we observe only very mild iteration growth from Re = 10 to Re = 10000 with the performance improving as more refinements are taken. Iteration counts using the PCD or LSC preconditioner are shown in Table 5.2. For both PCD and LSC they increase by approximately one and a half orders of magnitude over the same range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># refinements</th>
<th># degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Reynolds number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 × 10^4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1 × 10^4</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6 × 10^5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6 × 10^5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Average number of outer Krylov iterations per Newton step for the 2D regularized lid-driven cavity problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1/h</th>
<th># dofs</th>
<th>Reynolds number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2^4</td>
<td>8.34 × 10^2</td>
<td>22.0/21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2^5</td>
<td>3.20 × 10^3</td>
<td>23.0/22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2^6</td>
<td>1.25 × 10^4</td>
<td>24.5/22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2^7</td>
<td>4.97 × 10^4</td>
<td>25.5/21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2^8</td>
<td>1.98 × 10^5</td>
<td>26.0/23.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Average number of outer Krylov iterations per Newton step for the 2D regularized lid-driven cavity problem with PCD/LSC preconditioner. NaNF denotes failure due to NaNs occurring in the solve for the velocity block.

For the backward-facing step we observe that the performance is dependent on the resolution of the coarse grid. We consider two experiments, one starting with a coarse grid consisting of 7207 vertices and 14418 elements (labeled A) and one consisting of 28347 vertices and 56698 elements (labeled B). Both unstructured triangular meshes were generated with Gmsh [32]. For mesh A, we observe that the iteration counts for large Reynolds numbers show mesh dependence and that the solver degrades as the mesh is refined, see Table 5.3. Using the finer coarse grid B alleviates this problem. The bottom half of Table 5.3 shows that iteration counts only approximately double as we increase from Re = 10 to Re = 10000.

The results for PCD and LSC on the backwards-facing step are shown in Table 5.4. Increasing the Reynolds number for Re = 10 to Re = 2500 results a iteration growth by approximately an order of magnitude. In all cases the solver breaks down before Re = 10000.

5.5. Three-dimensional experiments. The two benchmark problems that we considered in the previous section can both be extended to three dimensions in a natural way. For the lid-driven cavity, we consider the cube Ω = [0, 2]^3 with no-slip boundary conditions on all sides apart from the top boundary {y = 2}. On the top boundary we enforce \( u(x, y, z) = (x^2(2-x)^2z^2(2-z)^2, 0, 0)^T \). The three dimensional
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### Table 5.3: Average number of outer Krylov iterations per Newton step for the 2D backward-facing step problem for two different coarse grids.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># refinements</th>
<th># degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Reynolds number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10  100  1000  2500  5000  10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coarse grid A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2.8 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>4.33  6.40  8.00  18.50  23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1.1 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>4.33  6.75  8.00  13.50  58.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$4.5 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>5.00  10.50  6.50  16.00  100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coarse grid B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1.1 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>4.00  6.25  6.50  7.00  12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$4.5 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>5.50  5.50  6.50  7.00  10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1.8 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>5.50  7.50  6.50  6.00  12.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4: Average number of outer Krylov iterations per Newton step for the 2D backwards-facing step problem with PCD/LSC preconditioner. NaNF denotes failure due to NaNs occurring in the solve for the velocity block, KF denotes failure due to the Krylov solver exceeding 5000 iterations and NF denotes failure due to the Newton solver exceeding 8 iterations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$1/h$</th>
<th># dofs</th>
<th>Reynolds number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10  100  1000  2500  5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2^4$</td>
<td>$3.94 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>23.0/29.0  32.5/47.5  NaNF/NanF  NaNF/NanF  NaNF/NanF  NaNF/NanF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2^5$</td>
<td>$1.52 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>23.5/26.0  31.0/45.0  221.3/329.0  502.0/812.5  NaNF/NanF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2^6$</td>
<td>$5.96 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>23.5/25.5  30.5/42.8  122.7/225.7  502.0/812.5  NaNF/NanF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2^7$</td>
<td>$2.36 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>23.5/25.5  30.0/40.8  85.3/161.3  282.0/529.5  NaNF/NanF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2^8$</td>
<td>$9.38 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>23.5/27.0  30.0/40.0  78.3/128.0  185.0/402.5  NaNF/NanF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The backwards-facing step is given by $\Omega = ([0, 10] \times [1, 2]) \cup ([1, 10] \times [0, 1]) \times [0, 1]$. We enforce the inflow condition $u(x, y, z) = (4(2 - y)(y - 1)z(1 - z), 0, 0)^T$ on the left boundary $\{x = 0\}$, a natural outflow condition on the right boundary $\{x = 10\}$ and no-slip boundary conditions on the remaining boundaries.

Two aspects of the solver were modified compared to the version used in two dimensions. Firstly, we observe that reducing the size of the SUPG stabilization by a factor of 1/20 improves convergence significantly. Secondly, the relative tolerance for the linear solver was relaxed to $10^{-5}$ and the absolute tolerance for the linear and the nonlinear solver was relaxed to $10^{-8}$, to save computational time. The three-dimensional experiments were both run for $P_1 \otimes B^3_f - P_0$ discretizations of up to one billion degrees of freedom on ARCHER, the UK national supercomputer. Images of the solutions are shown in Figures 5.3 and 5.4.

As for the two-dimensional case, we see only weak growth of the iteration counts with Reynolds number. For the lid-driven cavity results in Table 5.5, for the largest problem we study, iterations grow from 7 at $Re = 10$ to 9 at $Re = 5000$.

For the backwards-facing step problem we observe near constant iteration counts
Table 5.5: Average number of outer Krylov iterations per Newton step for the 3D regularized lid-driven cavity problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># refinements</th>
<th># dofs</th>
<th>Reynolds number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2.1 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1.7 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1.3 \times 10^8$</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1.1 \times 10^9$</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6: Average number of outer Krylov iterations per Newton step for the 3D backwards-facing step problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># refinements</th>
<th># dofs</th>
<th>Reynolds number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2.1 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1.7 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1.3 \times 10^8$</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^9$</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

up to Re = 2000. These numbers are shown in Table 5.6. However, at around Reynolds number 2500 to 3000, the convergence degrades and eventually stalls. This can be seen for a simulation on 48 cores in Figure 5.5. We observe that increasing the length of the domain delays the point of failure but we are not able to recover performance as robust as for the lid-driven cavity. We also found this problem is sensitive to the SUPG variant used, and that convergence can be improved by tuning this, although without any available theoretical guidance.

5.5.1. Computational performance. Having seen that the algorithmic scalability of the solver is good, with well-controlled iteration counts, we now consider the computational performance. In Figures 5.6a and 5.6b we show the weak scaling of the total time to solution over all continuation steps. The lid-driven cavity shows excellent scalability from 48 to 24576 MPI processes, with a scaling efficiency of 78%. In contrast, the performance of the solver for the backwards-facing step is not as good: the time to solution doubles from 48 to 24576 processes. We attribute this to two factors. Firstly, the mean number of Krylov iterations per nonlinear iteration increases mildly with problem size. Secondly, and of greater significance, is a load imbalance in our mesh distribution. In both problems, although the mesh has a well-balanced partition of cells, for the patch smoother to have perfect load balance the number of vertices owned by each process must also be equal. The partitioning scheme used does not take this constraint into account, and we observe that the number of patches per process varies by a factor of 4 over the partition for the largest problems. The scaling and computational performance of the code will be improved in future work.

6. Conclusions and outlook. In this paper we have extended the multigrid method of Benzi, Olshtanski and Schöberl for the augmented momentum solve arising in the augmented Lagrangian preconditioner to three dimensions. The prolongation
operator proposed by Schöberl works for the $[P_3]^3 - P_0$ and $[P_2 \oplus B^F_3]^3 - P_0$ discretizations, while a modification is required to use the cheaper $[P_1 \oplus B^F_3]^3 - P_0$ element. We have developed a new patchwise preconditioner in PETSc and implemented the resulting scheme in Firedrake. We have demonstrated iteration counts that grow very slowly with respect to the Reynolds number in both 2D and 3D for problems of up to a billion degrees of freedom. The code is freely available as open source.

However, this multigrid method is currently tightly coupled to the use of piecewise constant elements for the pressure, and the discretizations considered here do not represent the divergence-free constraint exactly, which is highly desirable [43]. The key next step is to develop a Reynolds-robust preconditioner for these discretizations, such as the Scott–Vogelius element [66], the Guzmán–Neilan modification of Bernardi–Raugel [35], or a $H(\text{div})$-conforming element [23].
Fig. 5.5: Iteration counts per Newton-step for the smallest three-dimensional backwards-facing step problem ($2.1 \times 10^6$ dofs). The iteration count increases suddenly at $\text{Re} \approx 2600$.

Fig. 5.6: Weak scaling of time to solution over all continuation steps for both 3D problems. The lid-driven cavity solves up to $\text{Re} = 5000$, the backwards-facing step to $\text{Re} = 2000$.

**Code availability.** For reproducibility, we cite archives of the exact software versions used to produce the results in this paper. All major Firedrake components have been archived on Zenodo [78]. An installation of Firedrake with components matching those used to produce the results in this paper can by obtained following the instructions at https://www.firedrakeproject.org/download.html with

```
export PETSC_CONFIGURE_OPTIONS="--download-superlu --download-superlu_dist"
python3 firedrake-install --doi 10.5281/zenodo.1436628
```
The additive Schwarz preconditioner has been incorporated into PETSc as of version 3.10. The version used in the paper is archived at [79], and is available at https://github.com/wence-/ssc/. The Navier-Stokes solver, and example files, are available at https://bitbucket.org/pefarrell/fmwns/, the version used in the paper is archived as part of [78].
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