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**ABSTRACT**

We present an update on the General-relativistic multigrid numerical (Gmunu) code, a paralleled, multi-dimensional curvilinear, general relativistic magnetohydrodynamics code with an efficient non-linear cell-centred multigrid elliptic solver, which is fully coupled with an efficient block-based adaptive mesh refinement module. To date, as described in this paper, Gmunu is able to solve the elliptic metric equations in the conformally flat condition approximation with the multigrid approach and the equations of ideal general-relativistic magnetohydrodynamics by means of high-resolution shock-capturing finite-volume method with reference metric formalised multi-dimensionally in Cartesian, cylindrical or spherical geometries. To guarantee the absence of magnetic monopoles during the evolution, we have developed an elliptical divergence cleaning method by using the multigrid solver. In this paper, we present the methodology, full evolution equations and implementation details of Gmunu and its properties and performance in some benchmarking and challenging relativistic magnetohydrodynamics problems.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Many astrophysical scenarios involving neutron stars and black holes such as core-collapse supernovae, mergers of compact objects are the most important events in gravitational wave physics or multimessenger astrophysics. In order to have a better understanding of such detected events and gain our understanding of the physics at nuclear densities in the postmerger remnant of binary neutron mergers (e.g. Rosswog (2015) and neutron star-black hole mergers (e.g. Metzger (2017)), accurate general relativistic (magneto-)hydrodynamic (GRMHD) simulations are essential.

Depending on the configuration and focus of the problems, the computational cost can be significantly reduced if some symmetries can be imposed or simulating the problems in certain geometries, e.g. core-collapse supernovae Janka et al. (2007); Burrows (2013), mergers Turolla et al. (2015); Mereghetti et al. (2015); Kaspi & Beloborodov (2017), pulsars Lorimer (2005), compact binary merger remnants Shibata & Taniguchi (2011); Faber & Rasio (2012); Baiotti & Rezzolla (2017); Duez & Zlochower (2019); Radice et al. (2020), and self-gravitating accretion disks Abramowicz & Fragile (2013). While these problems can be simulated in three-dimensional Cartesian coordinate, these systems with approximate symmetries are better captured in spherical or cylindrical coordinates due to better angular momentum conservation. Furthermore, the dimensionality of the problems and the computational cost can be reduced significantly if any symmetry can be imposed. Moreover, the simulation code is required not only to be robust in the highly relativistic region but also be able to resolve different scales accurately since most of such astrophysical systems are usually highly relativistic, include multi-time scale and multi-length scale physics. For instance, in stellar core collapse problem, the length scale could vary from the pre-supernova stellar core (thousands of kilometres) and down to a small length scale such as the turbulence in the postbounce flow (on the order of meters), and a typical time step size is of the order O (10^-6) s and one needs to evolve such systems up to 1 – 2 s for the development of a full explosion or for black hole formation Ott (2009). Thus, to numerically model these systems accurately within a reasonable time and affordable computational resources, a multi-scale, multi-dimensional, fully parallelized, support different geometries general relativistic (magneto-)hydrodynamics code is desired.

Several GRMHD codes are developed recently Porth et al. (2017); Oliviares et al. (2019); Ripperda et al. (2019); Liska et al. (2019); Mewes et al. (2020); Cipolletta et al. (2020). However, most of them are either designed for particular coordinates, or does not allow for a dynamical evolution of spacetime. In our pervious work Cheong et al. (2020), we presented an axisymmetric general relativistic hydrodynamics code Gmunu (General-relativistic multigrid numerical solver) and show that cell-centered multigrid method is an efficient and robust approach of solving the elliptic metric equations in the conformally flat condition (CFC) approximation Dimmelmeier et al. (2002); Cordero-Carrion et al. (2009). However, the previous version of Gmunu has limitations such as it has no GRMHD solver, not parallelized, not grid adaptive, supports two-dimensional spherical coordinate only. The aim of this work is to extend the capabilities of Gmunu to overcome these difficulties and enable us to apply it to...
more generic astrophysical problems. The key updates of Gmunu are the following:

- one-, two- and three- dimensional Cartesian, cylindrical and spherical coordinates are supported;
- general relativistic magnetohydrodynamics (GRMHD) solver is implemented;
- multigrid based elliptic divergence cleaning is implemented for magnetic fields divergenceless handling;
- fully parallelized with Message Passing Interface (MPI);
- block-based adaptive mesh refinement module is included.

The parallelization and the adaptive mesh refinement module of current Gmunu are provided by coupling with MPI-AMRVAC PDE toolkit (Xia et al. 2018; Keppens et al. 2020), a Message Passing Interface (MPI) based parallelized toolkit with a block-based quadtree-to-cubed sphere (2D-3D) Adaptive Mesh Refinement (AMR) module. In this paper, we present the methodology and the implementation details of the code and validate our code through some benchmarking tests.

The work is organized as follows. In section 2 we outline the formalism we used in this work. The details of the numerical settings and, the methodology, implementation of our magneto-hydrodynamics solver and our multigrid solver are presented in respectively. The code tests and results are presented in section 3. This paper ends with a discussion section in section 4. Unless explicitly stated, we work in geometrized units, for which the speed of light $c$, gravitational constant $G$, solar mass $M_\odot$, vacuum permittivity $\varepsilon_0$ and vacuum permeability $\mu_0$ are all equal to one ($c = G = M_\odot = \varepsilon_0 = \mu_0 = 1$). Greek indices, running from 0 to 3, are used for 4-quantities while the Roman indices, running from 1 to 3, are used for 3-quantities.

2 FORMULATION AND NUMERICAL METHODS

2.1 GR(M)HD in the reference-metric formalism

We use the standard ADM (Arnowitt-Deser-Misner) 3+1 formalism (Gourgoulhon (2007); Alcubierre (2008)). The metric can be written as

$$\text{d}s^2 = g_{\mu\nu} \text{d}x^\mu \text{d}x^\nu = -\alpha^2 \text{d}t^2 + \gamma_{ij} \left( \text{d}x^i + \beta^i \text{d}t \right) \left( \text{d}x^j + \beta^j \text{d}t \right)$$

where $\alpha$ is the lapse function, $\beta^i$ is the spacelike shift vector and $\gamma_{ij}$ is the spatial metric. We adopt a conformal decomposition of the spatial metric $\gamma_{ij}$ with the conformal factor $\psi$:

$$\gamma_{ij} = \psi^2 \tilde{\gamma}_{ij},$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}_{ij}$ is the conformally related metric.

The evolution equations for matter are derived from the local conservation of the rest-mass and energy-momentum and the homogeneous Faraday’s law:

$$\nabla_\mu \left( \rho u^\mu \right) = 0,$$

$$\nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0,$$

$$\nabla_\mu F^{\mu\nu} = 0,$$

where $\rho$ is the rest-mass density of the fluid, $u^\mu$ is the fluid four-velocity, $T^{\mu\nu}$ is the total energy-momentum tensor and $F^{\mu\nu}$ is the dual Faraday tensor. From Faraday tensor, we define the magnetic field four-vector (the projection of the Faraday tensor parallel to the fluid four-velocity):

$$b^\mu = \gamma F^{\mu\nu} u_\nu.$$
where $K_{ij}$ is the extrinsic curvature.

In order to solve eq. (8) with the finite volume formulation, we further express the equations in the following form:

$$\partial_t q + \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \partial_j \left[ \sqrt{g} f^j \right] = s + s_{\text{geom}},$$

where $s_{\text{geom}}$ are so-called geometrical source terms which contain the 3-Christoffel symbols $\Gamma^l_{ik}$ associated with the reference metric $\hat{g}_{ij}$. Explicitly, eq. (24) can be expressed as:

$$\partial_t (q_{D}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \partial_j \left[ \sqrt{g} (f_{D})^j \right] = 0,$$

$$\partial_t (q_{S}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \partial_j \left[ \sqrt{g} (f_{S})^j \right] = s_{S} + \Gamma^l_{ik} (f_{S})^k,$$

$$\partial_t (q_{T}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \partial_j \left[ \sqrt{g} (f_{T})^j \right] = s_{T},$$

$$\partial_t (q_{B}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \partial_j \left[ \sqrt{g} (f_{B})^j \right] = 0.$$

Note that the momentum conservation in this expression is satisfied to machine precision rather than to the level of truncation error because the geometrical source terms $s_{\text{geom}}$ are identically vanishing for the components associated with ignorable coordinates in the metric. For example, in spherical coordinates $\theta$, $\phi$, since the coordinate $\phi$ does not explicitly enter into the metric, the corresponding geometrical source term vanish for the $q_{S\phi}$ equations. Physically, unlike in the expression in Montero et al. (2014); Mewes et al. (2020) where the angular momentum is conserved to the level of truncation error due to the explicit form of the covariant derivatives, in our expression, the angular momentum conservation is numerically satisfied to machine precision since the corresponding geometrical source term is identically equal to zero.

We then discretize the volume averages of eq. (24). Using divergence theorem and some algebra, the discretized version of eq. (24) in the cell $(i,j,k)$ can be expressed as

$$d \frac{d}{dt} (q)_{i,j,k}$$

$$= \frac{1}{AV_{i,j,k}} \left( \left( (f)^{1} \Delta A^{1} \right)_{i+1/2,j,k} - \left( (f)^{1} \Delta A^{1} \right)_{i-1/2,j,k} \right) - \left( (f)^{2} \Delta A^{2} \right)_{i,j+1/2,k} - \left( (f)^{2} \Delta A^{2} \right)_{i,j-1/2,k} - \left( (f)^{3} \Delta A^{3} \right)_{i,j,k+1/2} - \left( (f)^{3} \Delta A^{3} \right)_{i,j,k-1/2} + \left( s \right)_{i,j,k} + \left( s_{\text{geom}} \right)_{i,j,k},$$

where the cell volume and volume-average are defined as

$$\Delta V = \int_{\text{cell}} \sqrt{g} dx^1 dx^2 dx^3,$$

$$\langle \bullet \rangle = \frac{1}{\Delta V} \int_{\text{cell}} \bullet \sqrt{g} dx^1 dx^2 dx^3,$$

while the surface area and surface-average is defined as

$$\Delta A^{i} = \int_{\text{surface}} \sqrt{g} dx^{i} dx^{j \neq i},$$

$$\langle \bullet \rangle^{i} = \frac{1}{\Delta A^{i}} \int_{\text{surface}} \bullet \sqrt{g} dx^{i} dx^{j \neq i}.$$

Here we note that, as the reference metric $\hat{g}_{ij}$ is time-independent, the volume-averaged 3-Christoffel symbols $\Gamma^l_{ik}$ in the geometrical source terms, cell volume $\Delta V$ and surface area $\Delta A$ are fixed once the coordinate is chosen. For completeness, we included these quantities in both cylindrical and spherical coordinates in Appendix A.

### 2.2 Divergenceless handling and elliptic divergence cleaning

The time-component of eq. (5) implies that the divergence of the magnetic field is zero, namely:

$$\nabla \cdot \vec{B} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \partial_i \left( \sqrt{g} B^i \right) = 0,$$

$$\Rightarrow \nabla_i q_{B} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \partial_i \left( \sqrt{g} q_{B} \right) = 0.$$

In practice, this condition is not satisfied if we evolve the induction equation (28) directly without any treatment due to the accumulating numerical error. As a result, non-vanishing monopoles are introduced and the code returns non-physical results. Various treatments are introduced to enforce this constraint in (GR)MHD calculations. The most common approaches recently are (i) hyperbolic divergence cleaning through a generalized Lagrange multiplier (GLM) (e.g. Porth et al. (2017)); (ii) constrained transport (CT) scheme which updates the magnetic fields while controlling the divergence-free constraint to numerical round-off accuracy (e.g. Porth et al. (2017); Olivares et al. (2019)); and (iii) evolving the vector potentials directly and compute the magnetic field by taking the curl of the vector potential (e.g. Mewes et al. (2020)). Here, we adopt a different approach, the so-called elliptic divergence cleaning, by solving Poisson’s equation and enforce the magnetic field is divergence-free:

$$\hat{\nabla}^2 \Phi = \frac{\nabla_i q_{B}^{\text{old}}}{\Delta V},$$

$$q_{B}^{\text{new}} = q_{B}^{\text{old}} - \langle \hat{\nabla} \Phi \rangle^{i}.$$

The BBIAC code Porth et al. (2017), elliptic divergence cleaning is available to be used only for the magnetic fields initialization Teu- nissen & Keppens (2019).

In the current implementation of 3μnu with elliptic divergence cleaning, the magnetic field is defined at cell centres. Whenever the conserved magnetic field $q_{B}^{\text{i}}$ is updated at each timestep, we first solve Poisson’s equation in eq. (35) through the multigrid solver (see section 2.7), then we update the magnetic field with the solution $\Phi$ as shown in eq. (36). In addition to the elliptic cleaning mentioned above, generalized Lagrange multiplier (GLM), constrained transport (CT) and the vector potential schemes are planned for 3μnu. The implementations and comparisons of these divergence-free treatments will be presented in future work. Here, we will only focus on the elliptic divergence cleaning approach as our main divergence-free treatment for evolution.

### 2.3 Characteristic speed

In relativistic magnetohydrodynamics, one has to solve a quartic equation if we wish to obtain the exact form of the characteristic wave speeds $\lambda_{x}$ (e.g. Anile (1990)). To reduce the computational cost and complexity of the implementation, instead of obtaining the exact characteristic speeds, we follow the approach presented in Gammie et al. (2003). In this approach, the upper bound $a$ for the fast wave speed is

$$a^2 = c_s^2 + c_a^2 - c_s^2 c_a^2,$$
where $c_s$ is the sound speed and $c_A$ is the Alfvén speed which can be obtained by

$$c_s^2 = \frac{b^2}{\rho + b^2} = \frac{b^2}{\rho b^2}. \quad (38)$$

The characteristic velocities can then be calculated by

$$\lambda_k^i = \alpha_k \lambda_k^i - \beta_k^i, \quad \beta_k^i = \left(1 - a^2\right) v^i \pm \sqrt{a^2 \left(1 - v^2\right) \left(1 - v^2 a^2\right) t - \left(1 - a^2 \left(v^2\right)\right)}, \quad (39)$$

$$\lambda_k^i = a K \lambda_k^i - \beta_k^i, \quad \beta_k^i = \left(1 - a^2\right) v^i \pm \sqrt{a^2 \left(1 - v^2\right) \left(1 - v^2 a^2\right) t - \left(1 - a^2 \left(v^2\right)\right)}.$$  

### 2.4 Positivity Preserving Limiter

Positivity preserving limiter was originally introduced in Hu et al. (2013) for Newtonian hydrodynamics and was successfully applied on GRMHD Radice et al. (2014); Porth et al. (2017). Here we will discuss the basic concept of positivity preserving limiter and its implementation in GRMHD. For simplicity, let us consider the evolution equation of conserved density in one-dimensional case:

$$\partial_t(u) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \partial_x \left[ \sqrt{\gamma} f(u) \right] = 0. \quad (41)$$

Note that if the positivity of $u$ is guaranteed over one first-order Euler timestep, then the positivity is also guaranteed for any strong-stability preserving Runge-Kutta (SSPRK) time integrator since the time integrator is always constructed as a convex combination of Euler steps. So, we discretized eq. (41) as the following form:

$$\frac{u^n_{i+1} - u^n_i}{\Delta t} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \left[ f_{1,1/2} A_{1,1/2} - f_{1-1/2} A_{1-1/2} \right] \quad (42)$$

$$\Rightarrow u^{n+1}_{i+1/2} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ u^n_{i+1/2} + u^n_{i} \right],$$

where

$$u^{n+1}_{i+1/2} = \left( u^n_{i+1} - 2 \Delta t \frac{\Lambda}{V_l} f_{1,1/2} A_{1,1/2} \right), \quad (43)$$

$$u^n_{i+1/2} = \left( u^n_{i} + 2 \Delta t \frac{\Lambda}{V_l} f_{1-1/2} A_{1-1/2} \right).$$

To ensure both $u^{n+1}_{i+1/2}$ and $u^n_{i+1/2}$ are positive, we modify the flux as

$$f_{1,1/2} = \theta f_{1,1/2} + (1 - \theta) f_{1-1/2}, \quad (44)$$

where $f_{1,1/2}^{HO}$ is the high-order flux of the original scheme while $f_{1,1/2}^{LF}$ is the first order Lax-Friedrichs flux and $\theta \in [0, 1]$ is the maximum value such that both $u^{n+1}_{i+1/2}$ and $u^n_{i+1/2}$ are positive. Since the Lax-Friedrichs scheme is positivity preserving, it is always possible to choose some $\theta$ such that positivity is guaranteed. In $\gamma$, we implemented this limiter to preserve the positivity of conserved density $D$ and energy density $\tau$, to preserve the positivity of density $\rho$ and pressure $p$. For multi-dimensional cases, we apply the limiter component by component.

#### 2.4.1 Implementation of positivity preserving limiter

After calculating $f_{1,1/2}^{HO}$ and $f_{1,1/2}^{LF}$, we check if the the relationship $f_{1,1/2} = f_{1,1/2}^{HO}$ needs to be modified with a small value $\epsilon$ (which is set as $10^{-16}$ in $\gamma$), i.e., we check if the following relations hold:

$$u^n_{i+1} = \left( u^n_{i+1} - 2 \Delta t \frac{\Lambda}{V_l} f_{1,1/2} A_{1,1/2} \right) > \epsilon \quad (45)$$

$$u^n_{i} = \left( u^n_{i} + 2 \Delta t \frac{\Lambda}{V_l} f_{1-1/2} A_{1-1/2} \right) > \epsilon.$$  

If above’s relations do not hold, we then work out $\theta$s by substituting (44) into (45):

$$\theta^n_{i} = \min \left( \theta^n_{i+1/2} \right), \quad \theta^n_{i} = \min \left( \max \left( \theta^n_{i}, 0 \right), 1 \right).$$

After obtaining $\theta$s for both continuity and energy equations, we pick the maximum one and substitute the resulting $\theta$ into (44) to modify the all the flux terms at that particular grid point.

### 2.5 Conserved to Primitive variables conversion

Recovery of the primitive variables $(\rho, \mathbf{v}, \tau)$ from the conservative variables $(D, S, \tau)$ in GRMHD is non-trivial, one has to solve nonlinear equations numerically. Most of the root-finding methods used in GRMHD simulations are Newton-Raphson method which works fine with analytic equations of state. However, it might return inaccurate results with tabulated equations of state because it requires the partial derivatives $\partial \tilde{D}/\partial D$ and $\partial \tilde{\tau}/\partial \tau$. In $\gamma$, two conserved to primitive variables conversions which do not require derivatives are implemented for GRHD and GRMHD respectively. For the GRHD cases, the implementation basically follows the formulation presented in Appendix C in Galeazzi et al. (2013) while for the GRMHD cases we mainly follow a recent work Kastaun et al. (2020). Although GRHD can be reduced from GRMHD by letting all magnetic field $B_i = 0$ and the recovery of primitive variables method presented in Kastaun et al. (2020) actually works well for vanishing magnetic fields, for different applications and development purposes (e.g. for the systems which have no magnetic fields, it is better to use the GRHD module to lower the computational cost), we implemented two separate modules called grhd and grmhd correspondingly. For completeness, we included the implementation details of both GRHD and GRMHD here.

#### 2.5.1 Implementation of recovery of primitive variables in GRHD

Step 1: Calculate the rescaled variables and the following useful relations which are fixed during the iterations.

$$S = \sqrt{S \times S}, \quad (47)$$

$$r = \frac{S}{D}, \quad q = \frac{\tau}{D}, \quad k = \frac{S}{\tau + D}. \quad (48)$$

Step 2: Determine the bounds of the root $z_-$ and $z_+$, where

$$z_- = \frac{k}{\sqrt{1 - k^2/4}}, \quad z_+ = \frac{k}{\sqrt{1 - k^2}}. \quad (49)$$

Step 3: In the interval $[z_-; z_+]$, solve:

$$f(z) = z - \frac{r}{h(z)}, \quad (50)$$
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where
\[ h(z) = (1 + \hat{e}(z))(1 + \hat{a}(z)), \]
\[ \hat{\rho}(z) = p(\hat{\rho}(z), \hat{e}(z)), \quad \hat{a}(z) = \frac{\hat{\rho}(z)}{\hat{\rho}(z)(1 + \hat{e}(z))}, \]
\[ \hat{\rho}(z) = \frac{D}{\hat{W}(z)}, \]
\[ \hat{e}(z) = \hat{W}(z)q - zr + \frac{z^2}{1 + \hat{W}(z)}, \]
\[ \hat{W}(z) = \sqrt{1 + z^2}. \]

In Gmunu, we numerically solve eq. (50) with the Illinois algorithm Dowell & Jarratt (1971), which is an improved version of Regula-Falsi method. Note that during the iterations, we ensure that the density \( \rho \) and the specific energy \( e \) fall within the validity region of the EOS, i.e., we evaluate the updated \( \hat{\rho} \) and \( \hat{e} \) with \( \hat{\rho} = \max(\min(\rho_{\text{max}}, \hat{\rho}), \rho_{\text{min}}) \) and \( \hat{e} = \max(\min(\epsilon_{\text{max}}(\hat{\rho}), \hat{e}), \epsilon_{\text{min}}(\hat{\rho})) \).

Step 4: With the root \( z_0 \) of eq. (50), we can then work out the primitive variables \( [\rho, e, p] \) respectively with the equations used in step 3. The velocity \( \hat{v}^i \) can be obtained with \( z \) by:
\[ \hat{v}^i(z) = \frac{S^i / D}{h(z)\hat{W}(z)}. \]

### 2.5.2 Implementation of recovery of primitive variables in GRMHD

Step 1: Calculate the rescaled variables and the following useful relations which are fixed during the iterations.
\[ q = \frac{\tau}{D}, \quad r_i = \frac{S_i}{D}, \quad \hat{p}^i = \frac{B^i}{\sqrt{D}}, \]
\[ r^2 = r^l r_i, \quad b^i = \hat{b}^i b_i, \quad \text{and} \quad b^2 r_1^2 = b^2 r^2 - (r^l b_i)^2. \]

Step 2: In the interval \( \left[ 0, h_0^{-1} \right] \), solve:
\[ f_a(\mu) = \mu \sqrt{h_0^2 + \hat{r}^2(\mu)} - 1, \]
where \( h_0 \) is the relativistic enthalpy lower bound over the entire validity region of the EOS and
\[ \hat{r}^2(\mu) = r^2 \chi^2(\mu) + \mu \chi(\mu) \left( r^l b_i \right)^2, \]
\[ \chi(\mu) = \frac{1}{1 + \mu b^2}. \]

Here the root of \( f_a \) in eq. (59) is denoted as \( \mu_+ \). Since \( f_a \) is smooth and its derivative can be expressed analytically, we numerically solve eq. (59) with Newton-Raphson method, which is usually more efficient than bracketing methods. In case the Newton-Raphson method fails to converge, we use the Illinois algorithm to solve this equation.

Step 3: In the interval \( \left( 0, \mu_+ \right] \), solve:
\[ f(\mu) = \mu - \frac{1}{\hat{v} + \mu \hat{r}^2(\mu)} \]
\[ \hat{v}(\mu) = \max(v_A(\mu), v_B(\mu)), \]
\[ v_A(\mu) = (1 + \hat{a}(\mu)) \frac{1 + \hat{e}(\mu)}{\hat{W}(\mu)}, \]
\[ v_B(\mu) = (1 + \hat{a}(\mu)) \left( 1 + \hat{e}(\mu) - \mu \hat{r}^2(\mu) \right), \]
\[ \hat{r}(\mu) = \rho \hat{\rho}(\mu), \quad \hat{e}(\mu) = \frac{\hat{\rho}(\mu)}{\hat{\rho}(\mu)(1 + \hat{e}(\mu))}, \]
\[ \hat{W}(\mu) = \frac{D}{\hat{W}(\mu)} - \hat{e}(\mu) = \hat{W}(\mu) \left( \hat{q}(\mu) - \mu \hat{r}^2(\mu) \right) + \hat{v}^2(\mu) \frac{\hat{W}^2(\mu)}{1 + \hat{W}(\mu)}, \]
\[ \hat{v}^2(\mu) = \min(\mu^2 \hat{r}^2(\mu), \hat{v}_0^2), \quad \hat{W}(\mu) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \hat{v}^2(\mu)}}, \]
\[ \hat{q}(\mu) = q - \frac{1}{2} b^2 - \frac{1}{2} \chi^2(\mu) \left( b^2 r_1^2 \right)^2. \]

\( \hat{r}^2(\mu) \) and \( \chi(\mu) \) are defined in eq. (60) and eq. (61), and the upper velocity limit square \( v_0^2 \) is defined as \( v_0^2 = r^2 / (h_0^2 + r^2) < 1 \). In Gmunu, we numerically solve eq. (62) with the Illinois algorithm. Note that during the iterations, we enforce the density \( \rho \) and the specific energy \( e \) fall within the validity region of the EOS, i.e., we evaluate the updated \( \hat{\rho} \) and \( \hat{e} \) with \( \hat{\rho} = \max(\min(\rho_{\text{max}}, \hat{\rho}), \rho_{\text{min}}) \) and \( \hat{e} = \max(\min(\epsilon_{\text{max}}(\hat{\rho}), \hat{e}), \epsilon_{\text{min}}(\hat{\rho})) \).

Step 4: With the root \( \mu_+ \) of eq. (62), we can then work out the primitive variables \( [\rho, e, p] \) respectively with the equations used in step 3. The velocity \( \hat{v}^i \) can be obtained with \( \mu \) by:
\[ \hat{v}^i(\mu) = \mu \chi(\mu) \left( r^l b_i \right) b^i. \]

### 2.6 Metric equations and Conformal flatness approximation

In this work, we adopt conformal flatness approximation and solve the Einstein field equations with xCFC scheme as in Cheong et al. (2020). For the details of CFC/ xCFC schemes and how to numerically solve the metric equations, we refer readers to Dimmelmeier et al. (2002); Cordero-Carrion et al. (2009); Bucciantini, N. & Del Zanna, L. (2011); Cheong et al. (2020). Here we briefly outline the basic equations and the formulations.

In a CFC approximation Dimmelmeier et al. (2002); Bucciantini, N. & Del Zanna, L. (2011), the three metric \( \gamma_{ij} \) is assumed to be decomposed according to
\[ \gamma_{ij} := \psi^4 f_{ij}, \]
where \( f_{ij} \) is a time-independent flat background metric and \( \psi \) is the conformal factor which is a function of space and time. In the updated implementation, we let the flat background metric \( f_{ij} \) equals the reference metric \( \gamma_{ij} \). Another assumption is the maximal slicing condition of foliations \( K = 0 \). For the matter sources, we define
\[ U = n_{\mu} n_{\nu} T^{\mu \nu} \text{ and } S^{l i} = \gamma_{l j} T^{j i}, \]
where \( T^{\mu \nu} \) is the energy-momentum tensor. In the xCFC scheme, one introduces a vector potential \( X^l \), and the metric can be solved by the following
equations:
\[ \Delta X^i + \frac{1}{3} \tilde{V}^i \left( \tilde{V}_j X^j \right) = 8\pi f^{ij} \tilde{S}^j, \]  
(72)
\[ \Delta \psi = -2\pi \tilde{U} \psi^{-1} - \frac{1}{8} f_{ij} f_{kl} \tilde{A}^{kl} \tilde{A}^{ij} \psi^{-7}, \]  
(73)
\[ \Lambda (\alpha \psi) = (\alpha \psi) \left[ 2(\tilde{U} + 2\tilde{S}) \psi^{-2} + \frac{7}{8} f_{ij} f_{kl} \tilde{A}^{kl} \tilde{A}^{ij} \psi^{-8} \right], \]  
(74)
where \( \tilde{V}_j \) and \( \tilde{A} \) are the covariant derivative and the Laplacian with respect to the flat three metric \( f_{ij} \), respectively, and \( \tilde{U} := \psi^6 U \), \( \tilde{S}_i := \psi^6 S_i \) and \( \tilde{S} := \psi^6 S = \psi^6 \gamma_{ij} S^{ij} \) are the rescaled fluid source terms. The tensor field \( \tilde{A}^{ij} \) can be approximated on the CFC approximation level by (see the Appendix of Cordero-Carrión et al. (2009)):
\[ \tilde{A}^{ij} \approx \tilde{V}^i X^j + \tilde{V}^j X^i + \frac{2}{3} \tilde{\gamma} X^k f^{ij}. \]  
(76)

Once the conformally rescaled hydrodynamical conserved variables \( \{ qD, qS, qF \} \) (for their definitions, see section 2.1) are given, the metric can be solved by the following steps:

Step 1: Solve eq. (72) for the vector potential \( X^i \) from the conserved variables \( qS_i \).
Step 2: Calculate the tensor \( \tilde{A}^{ij} \) in eq. (76) from the vector potential \( X^i \).
Step 3: Solve eq. (73) for the conformal factor \( \psi \).
Step 4: With the updated conformal factor \( \psi \), calculate the conserved variables \( \{ D, S, \tau \} \) and thus convert the conserved variables to the primitive variables \( \{ \rho, Wv^i, P \} \). Then \( \tilde{S} \) can be worked out consistently.
Step 5: Solve eq. (74) for the lapse function \( \alpha \).
Step 6: Solve eq. (75) for the shift vector \( \beta^i \).

As in Cheong et al. (2020), in the simulations of spheric-like astrophysical systems (e.g. isolated neutron star and core-collapse supernova), we set the Schwarzschild solution as the outer boundary condition. In particular, we impose the following boundary conditions:
\[ \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial r} \bigg|_{r_{\max}} = \frac{1 - \psi}{r}, \]  
(77)
\[ \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial r} \bigg|_{r_{\max}} = \frac{1 - \alpha}{r}, \]  
(78)
\[ \beta^i \bigg|_{r_{\max}} = 0, \]  
(79)
\[ X^i \bigg|_{r_{\max}} = 0. \]  
(80)

Note that due to the non-linearity of the scalar equations eq. (73) and eq. (74), instead of solving \( \psi \) and \( \alpha \) directly, we solve for its deviation, e.g. \( \delta \psi \equiv \psi - 1 \) as in Cheong et al. (2020); Bucciantini, N. & Del Zanna, L. (2011). The boundary conditions to eq. (77) that we implemented in \texttt{Gmunu} for the equation of the conformal factor \( \psi \) is
\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r \delta \psi) = 0. \]  
(81)

In spherical coordinates \( (r, \theta, \phi) \), the implementation of this Robin boundary condition eq. (81) on the cell-face is straightforward. However, this is not the case when we are working in Cartesian coordinates \( (x, y, z) \) or cylindrical coordinates \( (R, z, \varphi) \). In these particular cases, we define the outer boundary at the outer most cell-center, the boundary condition eq. (81) can then be implementated as
\[ \delta \phi + x \frac{\partial \delta \phi}{\partial x} + y \frac{\partial \delta \phi}{\partial y} + z \frac{\partial \delta \phi}{\partial z} = 0 \]  
(82)
in Cartesian coordinate \((x, y, z)\),
\[ \delta \phi + R \frac{\partial \delta \phi}{\partial R} + \varphi \frac{\partial \delta \phi}{\partial \varphi} = 0 \]  
(82)
in cylindrical coordinate \((R, z, \varphi)\).

### 2.7 Non-linear cell-centred multigrid solver

To solve the elliptical metric equations (72) - (75), as in the previous version of \texttt{Gmunu}, we use the non-linear cell-centred multigrid (CCMG) elliptic solver Cheong et al. (2020). Since the current version of \texttt{Gmunu} is developed on top of \texttt{MPI-ARMVAC 2.0} framework Xia et al. (2018); Keppens et al. (2020), it is natural to couple \texttt{Gmunu} to the existing open-source geometric multigrid library \texttt{octree-mg} Teunissen & Keppens (2019). This library is parallelized with MPI, supports coupling with quadtree/octree AMR grids and provides Dirichlet, Neumann and periodic boundary conditions.

However, the library has its limitations, e.g. polar and spherical grids are not supported, supports only simple and non-varying source terms and has no Robin boundary conditions and thus cannot be applied directly on the metric equations or on spherical polar coordinates. Although the convergence rate is reduced when using point-wise smoothers directly on spherical polar/3D-cylindrical coordinates Briggs et al. (2000), in the current implementation, we still adopt point-wise smoothers, and extend the library based on our previous implementation Cheong et al. (2020) so that the extended multigrid library can be applied to solve the elliptic metric equations on cylindrical and spherical coordinates. The extension of supporting curvilinear coordinates also benefits us when handling divergenceless constraint of the magnetic field in different geometries.

Note that the diagonal ghost cells (i.e. layers of cells around every grid blocks, which is used to contain data from neighboring blocks for parallel communication) are not passed when different processors are communicating as in Teunissen & Keppens (2019), to calculate some mixed differentiation such as \( \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x \partial y} \) in equations (72) and (75) without a large amount of communication between processors, at the block corner, we adopt the following discretization which requires not all diagonal elements:
\[ \left( \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x \partial y} \right)_{1,j,k} \approx \frac{1}{2\Delta x \Delta y} \left( f_{i+1,j-1,k} - f_{i-1,j+1,k} + f_{i+1,j,k} + f_{i-1,j,k} - 2f_{1,j,k} \right), \]  
(83)

### 3 NUMERICAL TESTS

In the remainder of this paper, we present a selection of representative test problems with our code. The tests range from special relativistic (magneto-)hydrodynamics to general relativistic (magneto-)hydrodynamics, from one to multiple dimensions and in Cartesian, cylindrical and spherical coordinates. Unless otherwise specified, all simulations reported in this paper were performed with TVDLF approximate Riemann solver, 5-th order reconstruction method MP5 and SSPRK3 for the time integration.

1 As the authors did not name their code in Teunissen & Keppens (2019), here we use the name of the git repository, \texttt{octree-mg}, as the name of the library.
3.1 Special Relativistic Hydrodynamics

3.1.1 Relativistic Shock Tubes

We follow Martí & Müller (2003) in this one-dimensional shock tube problem. In particular, we perform the simulation with Cartesian coordinates on a flat spacetime. Instead of simulating this problem with a uniform grid, we activate the block-based AMR module in this case. For instance, the computational domain covers the region $0 \leq x \leq 1$ with 16 base grid points and allows for 10 AMR levels (i.e. an effective resolution of 8192). The initial condition is given as

$$\begin{align*}
(p, p, v^3) & = \begin{cases} 
(10, 40/3, 0) & \text{if } x < 0.5, \\
(1, 0, 0) & \text{if } x > 0.5.
\end{cases}
\end{align*}$$

We consider an ideal-gas equation of state $p = (\Gamma - 1) \rho \varepsilon$ with $\Gamma = 5/3$. The upper panel of the figure 1 shows the comparison between the numerical results and the analytic solutions for the density, pressure and velocity profiles at $t = 0.4$. The figure shows that our numerical results agree with the analytic solutions. The lower panel shows the grid-level at different location of the computational domain. The grid-level is higher to provide finer resolution when the density is sharper.

3.1.2 Two-dimensional Riemann Problem

To test how Gmuu works in two-dimensional Cartesian coordinates, we picked a demanding highly relativistic two-dimensional Riemann problem Del Zanna & Bucciantini (2002). Here, we follow the modified version of this test presented in Mignone et al. (2005), in which elementary waves are introduced at every interface. The initial condition is given as

$$\begin{align*}
(p, p, v^3, v) & = \begin{cases} 
(p_1, p_1, 0, 0) & \text{if } x > 0, y > 0, \\
(0, 1, 1, 0, 99, 0) & \text{if } x < 0, y > 0, \\
(0, 5, 1, 0, 0) & \text{if } x < 0, y < 0, \\
(1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 99) & \text{if } x > 0, y < 0,
\end{cases}
\end{align*}$$

where $p_1 = 5.477875 \times 10^{-3}$, $p_1 = 2.762987 \times 10^{-3}$. Here we consider an ideal-gas equation of state $p = (\Gamma - 1) \rho \varepsilon$ with $\Gamma = 5/3$. This test is run with a uniform grid $512 \times 512$ which covers the region $[-1, 1]$ for both $x$ and $y$. Figure 2 shows the density profile at $t = 0.8$. Gmuu is able to evolve this demanding test without crashing the code.

3.1.3 Two-dimensional axisymmetric jet in cylindrical geometry

We study the propagation of a two-dimensional axisymmetric relativistic jet in cylindrical coordinates. Not only would we like to test if Gmuu works properly in cylindrical geometry, to test the code’s robustness, we simulated the model C2 in Martí et al. (1997), which contains strong relativistic shocks, instabilities and shear flows and is highly supersonic. The computational domain covers $0 \leq r \leq 15$ and $0 \leq z \leq 45$ with resolution $512 \times 1536$. Initially, the jet is configured in the region $r \leq 1$ and $z \leq 1$ with density $\rho_b = 1 \times 10^{-7}$, pressure $p_b = 1.70305 \times 10^{-3}$, the velocity along z-axis $v_z = v_b = 0.99c$ (which corresponds to a Lorentz factor $\sim 7$). Here we consider the ideal-gas equation of state with $\Gamma = 5/3$. The rest of the computational domain is filled with an ambient medium with density $\rho_m = 1$, pressure $p_m = p_b$, and zero velocity. We apply reflecting boundary conditions at the symmetric axis while the out-going boundary conditions were applied at all outer boundaries except that we keep the value unchanged inside the jet inlet $z = 0, r < 1$. In this test, we use 3-rd order reconstruction method PPM.

Figure 3 shows the density distribution of the axisymmetric jet at $t = 100$. As shown in figure 3, an expanding bow shock is formed and the Kelvin-Helmholz instability is developed. The key structures of the jet, e.g. the head location, the shape of the bow shock and the development of the Kelvin-Helmholtz instability all agree with Martí et al. (1997).
3.2 Special Relativistic Magneto-Hydrodynamics

3.2.1 Relativistic Shock Tubes

Similar to relativistic hydrodynamics, there are shock tube tests in MHD. We follow Balsara (2001) in this one-dimensional shock tube problem. In particular, we perform the simulation with Cartesian coordinates on a flat spacetime. The initial condition is given as

\[ (\rho, p, B^x, B^y) = \begin{cases} (1, 1, 0.5, 1) & \text{if } x < 0, \\ (0.125, 0.1, 0.5, -1) & \text{if } x > 0. \end{cases} \]

We consider an ideal-gas equation of state \( p = (\Gamma - 1)\rho e \) with \( \Gamma = 2.5 \).

Figure 4 compares the numerical results obtained by Gmunu (red dots) with the reference solutions (black solid lines) Balsara (2001) at \( t = 0.4 \). It illustrates the shock-capturing ability of Gmunu and the results agree with the reference results.

3.2.2 Cylindrical blast wave

The cylindrical blast wave is a well-known difficult multi-dimensional SRMHD test problem. This problem describes an expanding blast wave in a plasma with an initially uniform magnetic field. Here, we follow the parameters presented in Komissarov (1999). The initial condition of this test problem is determined with radial parameters \( r_{in} \) and \( r_{out} \). The density (and also the pressure, in the same form) profile is given by:

\[ \rho(r) = \begin{cases} \rho_{in} & \text{if } r \leq r_{in}, \\ \exp \left( \frac{(r_{out} - r) \ln \rho_{out} + (r - r_{in}) \ln \rho_{in}}{r_{out} - r_{in}} \right) & \text{if } r_{in} \leq r \leq r_{out}, \\ \rho_{out} & \text{if } r \geq r_{out}. \end{cases} \]  

where the parameters are:

\( r_{in} = 0.8, \quad r_{out} = 1.0; \)  
\( \rho_{in} = 10^{-2}, \quad \rho_{out} = 10^{-4}; \)  
\( p_{in} = 1.0, \quad p_{out} = 3 \times 10^{-5}; \)  
\( B^l = (0.1, 0, 0), \quad v^l = (0, 0, 0). \)

Here we consider the ideal-gas equation of state with \( \Gamma = 4/3 \). The computational domain covers \([-6, 6]\) for both \( x \) and \( y \) directions with the resolution \( 256 \times 256 \).

Figure 5 shows the two-dimensional profile of the magnetic field strength \( B^l B_1, B^x, B^y \) and the Lorentz factor \( W \) at \( t = 4.0 \). To compare our results with other groups (e.g. Mösta et al. (2014)) in more detail, we also plot one-dimensional slices along the \( x \)- and \( y \)-axes for the rest mass density \( \rho \), pressure \( p \), magnetic pressure \( b^3/2 \) and the Lorentz factor \( W \) at \( t = 4 \), as shown in fig. 6. In this test, the numerical results obtained by Gmunu, which agree with the reference solutions Mösta et al. (2014).

3.2.3 Loop advection

The advection of a weakly magnetized loop is a well known test to examine divergence-control technique in a MHD code. This test is performed on an uniform background with \( \rho = 1, p = 1, v^x = 0.2 \) and \( v^y = 0.1 \). The initial condition of the magnetic field \( B^l \) is given as

\[ B^l = \begin{cases} (-A_0 y/r, A_0 x/r, 0) & \text{if } r < R, \\ (0, 0, 0) & \text{if } r > R, \end{cases} \]

where \( R = 3 \) is the radius of the advecting magnetic loop, \( r = \)
\( \sqrt{x^2 + y^2} \) and \( A_0 \) is chosen to be \( 10^{-3} \). We consider an ideal-gas equation of state \( p = \rho (\Gamma - 1) \) with \( \Gamma = 4/3 \). The computational domain is set to be periodic at all boundaries and covers the region \(-1 \leq x \leq 1 \) and \(-0.5 \leq y \leq 0.5 \) with the base grid points \( n_x \times n_y = 32 \times 16 \) and allowing 5 AMR levels (i.e., an effective resolution of \( 512 \times 256 \)).

Figure 7 gives an example of the evolution of the magnetic pressure \( b^2/2 \) for the loop advection test at different times. The shape of the loop is preserved well at \( t = 10 \), where the magnetic field has translated with 1 cycle.

Figure 8 shows the evolution of the \( L_2 \)-norm of \( \nabla \cdot \vec{B} \), defined as
\[
|\nabla \cdot \vec{B}|_2 \equiv \sqrt{\frac{1}{V} \int |\nabla \cdot \vec{B}|^2 dV},
\]
which can be used to indicate the validity of the divergence-control. The \( L_2 \)-norm of \( \nabla \cdot \vec{B} \) is suppressed to lower than \( 10^{-5} \) immediately when the evolution started and is well controlled for the rest of the evolution. Overall, the elliptic divergence cleaning (see section 2.2) works well to control monopole errors for this test case.

3.3 General relativistic (magneto-)hydrodynamics in dynamical spacetime

3.3.1 Stability of a rapidly rotating neutron star

Here we study the evolution of a stable rapidly rotating neutron star with a dynamical background metric. In this test, we consider a uniformly rotating model which is constructed with the polytropic equation of state with \( \Gamma = 2 \) and \( K = 100 \) with central rest-mass density \( \rho_c = 1.28 \times 10^{-3} \) and the angular velocity \( \Omega = 2.633 \times 10^{-2} \) (in \( c = G = M_\odot = 1 \) unit), which is also known as “BU8” in the literature (Dimmelmeier et al. 2006; Cordero-Carrión et al. 2009). The initial neutron star model is generated with the open-source code XIS (Bucciantini & Del Zanna 2011; Pili et al. 2014, 2015, 2017). The computational domain covers \( 0 \leq r \leq 30, 0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/2 \) with the resolution \( n_r \times n_\theta = 640 \times 64 \). This test problem is simulated with the ideal-gas equation of state \( P = (\Gamma - 1)\rho e \) with \( \Gamma = 2 \). Long
time evolution of this model is demanding since the rotational rate is close to the mass shedding limit. While maintaining this model stably is formidable, we challenge the robustness of our code with the use of the positivity preserving limiter by setting an extremely low “atmosphere” density $\rho_{\text{atmo}} = 10^{-20}$ (which is below machine precision) and simulate the system with a 5-th order reconstruction method MP5. As in Cheong et al. (2020), in order to increase the size of the time steps in our simulations, we treat $0 < r < 0.4$ as a spherically symmetric core (i.e., only radial motions are allowed).

With the positivity preserving limiter and the robust recovery of primitive variables scheme, Gmunu evolve such demanding systems stably even with an extremely low density of “atmosphere” up to at least $t = 9$ ms without crashing the code. Figure 9 gives an example of the evolution of this rapidly rotating neutron star model BU8 at different time.

Figure 10 shows one-dimensional slices of the rapidly rotating neutron star BU8 along the $\theta = \pi/8$, $\theta = \pi/4$ and $\theta = \pi/2$ for the density $\rho$ and the rotational velocity $\sqrt{\hat{v}_\theta \hat{v}_\phi}$ respectively. The density and the velocity profiles are maintained well except that some low density “atmosphere” $\rho \sim 10^{-9}$ to $10^{-17}$ is surrounding the neutron star.

To illustrate the conservation properties, we monitor the total rest mass $M_b$ of the whole system, where the rest mass $M_b$ is given by

$$M_b = \int_{\Sigma_b} \psi^6 \rho W \sqrt{\gamma} d^3 x.$$  \hspace{1cm} (94)

The upper panel of figure 11 shows the relative variation of the rest mass $M_b$ in time. Even for such rapidly rotating neutron star BU8 with extreme configurations, Gmunu is able to maintain the profile up to 9 ms and the relative variation of the rest mass of the order $10^{-5}$.

As an another indicator for the validity of the code, the lower panel of figure 11 shows the power spectral density of the radial velocity $W v^r (t)$ at $r = 5, \theta = \pi/4$ (inside the neutron star), which agrees with the well-tested eigenmode frequencies Dimmelmeier et al. (2006).

3.3.2 Differentially rotating strongly magnetized neutron star

Here we study the evolution of a differentially rotating strongly magnetized equilibrium neutron star. As there are no similar studies in the literature except Bucciantini, N. & Del Zanna, L. (2011), we use the same equilibrium model as in Bucciantini, N. & Del Zanna, L. (2011) here. In this test, we construct an equilibrium model with a polytropic equation of state with $\Gamma = 2$ and $K = 100$ with central rest-mass density $\rho_c = 1.28 \times 10^{-3}$. The neutron star is differentially rotating with $\Omega_c = 2.575 \times 10^{-2}$, $A^2 = 70$ and is magnetized with
magnetic polytropic index \( m = 1 \) and magnetic coefficient \( K_m = 3 \). Here we note that this is a strong toroidal field, \(-5 \times 10^{17} \text{G}\) inside the neutron star, which is roughly 10% of the total internal energy. This test problem is simulated with the polytrope equation of state with \( \Gamma = 2 \) and \( K = 100 \).

We simulate this initial model in 2-dimensional cylindrical coordinate \((R, z, \varphi)\), where the computational domain covers \( 0 \leq R \leq 120 \) and \(-120 \leq z \leq 120 \), with the resolution \( n_R \times n_z = 32 \times 64 \) and allowing 5 AMR levels (i.e., an effective resolution of \( 512 \times 1024 \)). The grid refinement used in this simulation is the following: We defined a relativistic gravitational potential \( \Phi \equiv 1 - \alpha \). Since \( \Phi \) is approximately proportional to \( M/R \), \( \Phi^{-1} \) can be used as a measure of the characteristic length scale. For any \( \Phi \) larger than the maximum potential \( \Phi_{\text{max}} \) (which is set as 0.2 in this work), the block is set to be finest. While for the second finest level, the same check is performed with a new maximum potential which is half of the previous one, so on and so forth. As an example, figure 12 shows the density profile with the annotated mesh lines at \( t = 10 \text{ ms} \).

Figure 13 shows the evolution of this differentially rotating strongly magnetized equilibrium neutron star in cylindrical coordinate. The rest mass \( M_b \) is unchanged during the whole simulation (\( t = 0 \text{ ms} \) to \( t = 10 \text{ ms} \)). Figure 14 compares the initial (\( t = 0 \)) density profile, rotational velocity and the magnetic field (black solid lines) with the same quantities (red dots) at \( t = 10 \text{ ms} \). The profiles are maintained well except some slight distortions.

3.3.3 Stability of a non-rotating neutron star

We present a full 3-dimensional simulation of a spherically symmetric neutron star here. In this test, we consider a non-rotating model which is constructed with the polytropic equation of state with \( \Gamma = 2 \) and \( K = 100 \) with central rest-mass density \( \rho_c = 1.28 \times 10^{-3} \text{(in } c = G = M_0 = 1 \text{ unit}) \), which is also known as “BU0” in the literature Dimmelmeier et al. (2006); Cordero-Carrion et al. (2009). Actually, such a spherically symmetric model can be simulated in a one- or two-dimensional spherical coordinate. Nevertheless, as a demonstration, we simulate this system in 3D Cartesian coordinate without imposing any symmetries, i.e. this problem is simulated in the full 3D configuration. The computational domain covers \([-100, 100]\) for both \( x, y \) and \( z \), with the resolution \( n_x \times n_y \times n_z = 64 \times 64 \times 64 \) and allowing 4 AMR level (an effective resolution of \( 512^3 \)). The refinement setting is identical to section 3.3.2. As an example, figure 15 shows the density profile with the annotated mesh lines at \( t = 101.7 \text{ ms} \).

Figure 16 shows the evolution of the spherically symmetric neutron star BU0 in Cartesian coordinate. Gmuu is able to maintain the profile up to 100 ms and the relative variation of the rest mass of
Figure 15. The projection of density profile along $z$-axis of a spherical neutron star in Cartesian coordinates with the annotated mesh lines at $t = 101.7$ ms. The computational domain covers $[-100, 100]$ for both $x,y$ and $z$, with the resolution $n_x \times n_y \times n_z = 64 \times 64 \times 64$ and allowing 4 AMR level (an effective resolution of $512^3$).

Figure 16. Upper panel: The relative variation of the rest mass $M_b$ in time. The conservation of the rest mass $M_b$ is preserved remarkably well from $t = 0$ ms to $t = 100$ ms where the relative variation is of the order $10^{-4}$. Middle panel: The relative variation of the density $\rho_c$ in time. Lower panel: The relative variation of the lapse function $\alpha_c$ in time.

the order $10^{-4}$. Figure 17 compares the initial density profile (black solid lines) with the same quantities (red dots) at $t = 101.7$ ms. The density profile is maintained well.

3.3.4 Migration of an unstable neutron star

To see how Gmuu preform in the fully non-linear regime with significant changes and coupling in the metric and fluid variables, here we present a simulation of the migration of an unstable neutron star, which is one of the standard tests for hydrodynamical evolution coupled with dynamical spacetime in the fully non-linear regime Font et al. (2002); Bernuzzi & Hilditch (2010); Cordero-Carrión et al. (2009); Bucciantini, N. & Del Zanna, L. (2011). In this test, we consider an unstable neutron star, which lies on the unstable branch of the mass-radius curve. The neutron star is constructed with the polytropic equation of state with $\Gamma = 2$ and $K = 100$ with central rest-mass density $\rho_c = 8.00 \times 10^{-3}$ (in $c = G = M_\odot = 1$ unit), which is also known as “SU” in Cordero-Carrión et al. (2009). We simulate this initial model in 2-dimensional cylindrical coordinates $(R, z)$, where the computational domain covers $0 \leq R \leq 60$ and $-60 \leq z \leq 60$, with the resolution $n_R \times n_z = 32 \times 64$ and allowing 4 AMR level (i.e., an effective resolution of $256 \times 512$). The refinement setting is identical to section 3.3.2. We adopt the ideal-gas (gamma-law) equation of state $P = (\Gamma - 1)\rho\epsilon$ with $\Gamma = 2$ for the fluid so that we can also capture the shock heating effect.

As the star evolves and migrates to the corresponding stable configuration $\rho_c = 1.346 \times 10^{-3}$ with the same mass, the radius of the star expands to a large value. Figure 18 shows the evolution of the baryon mass $M_b$ and the central density $\rho_c$ as a function of time. The oscillations of the central density $\rho_c$ are damped since shock waves are formed at every pulsation and some kinetic energy is dissipated into thermal energy. A small amount of mass is ejected outwards from the surface of the star to the surrounding artificial low-density ($\rho_{\text{atmo}} = 10^{-14}$) “atmosphere” whenever these shock waves hit the surface of the star, and thus the total baryon mass $M_b$ decays once the shock waves hit the outer numerical boundaries. With weaker oscillation, the decay rate of the baryon mass is smaller. This dissipation effect can also be seen in the density profile, as shown in figure 19. As a result, the baryon mass and the central density of the final equilibrium stable configuration is slightly lower than the expected value.

4 CONCLUSIONS

We present the new methodology and implementation of Gmuu, a parallelized multi-scale multi-dimensional curvilinear general-relativistic magneto-hydrodynamics code with a cell-centred non-linear multigrid solver which is fully coupled with an adaptive mesh refinement module. The code has been designed to perform generic general relativistic (magneto-)hydrodynamical simulations in dy-
Gmunu is able to solve the elliptic-type metric equations in the extended conformally flat condition (xCFC) approximation to general relativity.

We have tested Gmunu with several benchmarking tests, from special-relativistic to general-relativistic (magnetohydrodynamics in one-, two- and three-dimensional Cartesian, cylindrical and spherical coordinates. These tests include (i) SR(M)HD shock tubes, SRHD Riemann test, axisymmetric jet in SRHD, cylindrical blast wave and magnetic field loop advection in SRMHD, the evolution of rapidly/differentially rotating, strongly magnetized neutron stars in GR(M)HD. In the GRMHD tests, we demonstrate that the multigrid algorithm in Gmunu is able to solve CFC metric equations in multiple dimensions and in different coordinates with or without coupling with the AMR module. In addition, the robust positivity preserving limiter and conserved-to-primitive variables conversions enable us to set the density of the “atmosphere” $\rho_{\text{atmo}}$ to the order of $O(10^{-20})$ (below machine precision) even in the evolution of a rapidly rotating or strongly magnetized neutron star with good rest mass conservation and accurate results.

In the future, we will present the implementations and comparisons of various divergence-free treatments, i.e., elliptic cleaning, generalized Lagrange multiplier (GLM), constrained transport (CT) and the vector potential schemes. Furthermore, we will implement radiation hydrodynamics for MHD also for neutrino physics. We shall also extend Gmunu to a fully-constrained scheme in exact general relativity such as the formulation of Bonazzola et al. Bonazzola et al. (2004). On the other hand, we shall include the spherical dendritic grid to avoid extremely small time step in the original spherical polar coordinates Skinner et al. (2019).
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Here we note that since the average of the 3-Christoffel symbols $\Gamma^{i}_{jk}$ which is contained in the geometrical are non-trivial when the reference metric $\hat{g}_{ij}$ is chosen to be cylindrical or spherical. Here we list out the relation we implemented in Eqs. (A1) and (A2).

### APPENDIX A: FLAT METRIC IN 3D

The cell volume $\Delta V$, cell surface $\Delta A$ and the volume-average of the 3-Christoffel symbols $\langle \hat{\Gamma}^{l}_{ik} \rangle$ which is contained in the geometrical are non-trivial when the reference metric $\hat{g}_{ij}$ is chosen to be cylindrical or spherical. Here we list out the relation we implemented in $\hat{g}_{ij}$.

#### A1 cylindrical coordinate

The line element can be expressed as: $ds^2 = dR^2 + dz^2 + R^2d\varphi^2$, with the reference metric $\hat{g}_{ij}$:

$$\hat{g}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & R^2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (A1)$$

The associated 3-Christoffel symbols $\langle \hat{\Gamma}^{l}_{ik} \rangle$ are:

$$\hat{\Gamma}^{R}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & R & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{\Gamma}^{z}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{\Gamma}^{\varphi}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (A2)$$

The geometrical source terms for the momentum equations are:

$$\hat{\Gamma}^{l}_{Rk}(f_{S_{k}}) = \hat{f}^{\alpha}_{R}(f_{S_{\alpha}}), \quad (A3)$$

$$\hat{\Gamma}^{l}_{zk}(f_{S_{k}}) = 0, \quad (A4)$$

$$\hat{\Gamma}^{l}_{\varphi k}(f_{S_{k}}) = 0. \quad (A5)$$

Here we note that since $z$ and $\varphi$ do not explicitly enter into the reference metric $\hat{g}_{ij}$, the corresponding geometrical source terms for the momentum equations $q_{S_{k}}$ are vanishing. In this formulations, the linear momentum $q_{S_{k}}$, and the angular momentum $q_{S_{\varphi}}$ are conserved to machine precision.

To work out the cell volume $\Delta V$, cell surface $\Delta A$ and the volume-average of the 3-Christoffel symbols $\langle \hat{\Gamma}^{l}_{ik} \rangle$, we define the following notations:

$$R_{\pm} \equiv R \pm \frac{1}{2}\Delta R, \quad z_{\pm} \equiv z \pm \frac{1}{2}\Delta z, \quad \varphi_{\pm} \equiv \varphi \pm \frac{1}{2}\Delta \varphi, \quad (A6)$$

where $(R, z, \varphi)$ are the location at the cell centre at some particular point while $(\Delta R, \Delta z, \Delta \varphi)$ are the corresponding grid sizes. The cell surface $\Delta A$ and the cell volume $\Delta V$ can then be expressed as:

$$\Delta A_{R} \mid_{R_{\pm}} = \left( \frac{R \pm \Delta R}{2} \right) (\Delta z) (\Delta \varphi), \quad (A7)$$

$$\Delta A_{z} \mid_{z_{\pm}} = R (\Delta R) (\Delta \varphi), \quad (A8)$$

$$\Delta A_{\varphi} \mid_{\varphi_{\pm}} = R (\Delta R) (\Delta z), \quad (A9)$$

$$\Delta V = R (\Delta R) (\Delta z) (\Delta \varphi). \quad (A10)$$

Finally, the non-vanishing volume-averaged 3-Christoffel symbols $\langle \hat{\Gamma}^{l}_{ik} \rangle$ are:

$$\langle \hat{\Gamma}^{R}_{ik} \rangle = -\frac{1}{R} \left( R^2 + \frac{1}{12} (\Delta R)^2 \right), \quad (A11)$$

$$\langle \hat{\Gamma}^{\varphi}_{ik} \rangle = \langle \hat{\Gamma}^{\varphi}_{Rk} \rangle = \frac{1}{R}. \quad (A12)$$
A2 Spherical coordinate

The line element can be expressed as: 
\[ ds^2 = dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2, \]
with the reference metric \( \hat{g}_{ij} \):

\[
\hat{g}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & r^2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & r^2 \sin^2 \theta
\end{bmatrix}.
\]  
(A13)

The associated 3-Christoffel symbols \( \bar{\Gamma}^{l}_{ik} \) are:

\[
\Gamma_{ij}^r = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -r & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -r \sin^2 \theta
\end{bmatrix},
\]  
(A14)

\[
\Gamma_{ij}^\theta = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & \frac{1}{r} & 0 \\
\frac{1}{r} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -\sin \theta \cos \theta
\end{bmatrix},
\]  
(A15)

\[
\Gamma_{ij}^\phi = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & \frac{1}{r} \\
0 & 0 & \cot \theta \\
\frac{1}{r} \cot \theta & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix},
\]  
(A16)

The geometrical source terms for the momentum equations are:

\[
\Gamma_{r kl}^l (f_{S_k}) = \Gamma_{r \theta}^r (f_{S_\theta}) + \Gamma_{r \phi}^r (f_{S_\phi}) \Gamma_{r k}^l
\]  
(A17)

\[
\Gamma_{\theta kl}^l (f_{S_k}) = \Gamma_{\theta \theta}^\theta (f_{S_\theta}) + \Gamma_{\theta \phi}^\theta (f_{S_\phi}) + \Gamma_{\phi \phi}^\theta (f_{S_\phi}) \Gamma_{\theta k}^l
\]  
(A18)

\[
\Gamma_{\phi kl}^l (f_{S_k}) = 0.
\]  
(A19)

Simularity, as in the cylindrical case, the angular momentum \( g_{S_\phi} \) are conserved to machine precision.

To work out the cell volume \( \Delta V \), cell surface \( \Delta A \) and the volume-average of the 3-Christoffel symbols \( \bar{\Gamma}^{l}_{ik} \), we define the following notations:

\[
r_\pm = r \pm \frac{1}{2} \Delta r, \quad \theta_\pm = \theta \pm \frac{1}{2} \Delta \theta, \quad \phi_\pm = \phi \pm \frac{1}{2} \Delta \phi,
\]  
(A20)

where \( r, \theta, \phi \) are the location at the cell centre at some particular point while \( \Delta \theta, \Delta \phi \) are the corresponding grid sizes. The cell surface \( \Delta A \) and the cell volume \( \Delta V \) can then be expressed as:

\[
\Delta A_r \bigg|_{r_\pm} = \left( \frac{\Delta r}{2} \right)^2 \left( 2 \sin \theta \sin \frac{\Delta \theta}{2} \right) \Delta \phi
\]  
(A21)

\[
\Delta A_\theta \bigg|_{\theta_\pm} = \left( \left( r^2 + \frac{1}{12} (\Delta r)^2 \right) \Delta r \right) \left( \sin \left( \theta \pm \frac{\Delta \theta}{2} \right) \right) \Delta \phi
\]  
(A22)

\[
\Delta A_\phi \bigg|_{\phi_\pm} = \left( \left( r^2 + \frac{1}{12} (\Delta r)^2 \right) \Delta r \right) \left( 2 \sin \theta \sin \frac{\Delta \theta}{2} \right) \Delta \phi
\]  
(A23)

\[
\Delta V = \left( \left( r^2 + \frac{1}{12} (\Delta r)^2 \right) \Delta r \right) \left( 2 \sin \theta \sin \frac{\Delta \theta}{2} \right) \Delta \phi
\]  
(A24)

Finally, the non-vanishing volume-averaged 3-Christoffel symbols \( \bar{\Gamma}^{l}_{ik} \) are:

\[
\langle \bar{\Gamma}^{r}_{r \theta} \rangle = \langle \bar{\Gamma}^{r}_{r \phi} \rangle = \langle \bar{\Gamma}^{\phi}_{r \phi} \rangle = \frac{1}{\Delta V} \left( \Delta A_r \bigg|_{r_\pm} - \Delta A_r \bigg|_{r_-} \right)
\]  
(A25)

\[
\langle \Gamma^{r}_{\theta \theta} \rangle = -\frac{1}{\Delta V} \frac{1}{4} \left( r_+^2 \Delta A_r \bigg|_{r_\pm} - r_-^2 \Delta A_r \bigg|_{r_-} \right)
\]  
(A26)

\[
\langle \Gamma^{r}_{\phi \phi} \rangle = \frac{1}{\Delta V} \left( r_\pm^2 \Delta A_r \bigg|_{r_\pm} \right) \cos \theta \sin \theta \Delta \phi
\]  
(A27)

\[
\langle \Gamma^{\phi}_{\theta \phi} \rangle = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{\Delta V} \left( \sin^2(\theta_\pm) \Delta A_\theta \bigg|_{\theta_\pm} - \sin^2(\theta_-) \Delta A_\theta \bigg|_{\theta_-} \right)
\]  
(A28)

\[
\langle \Gamma^{\phi}_{\theta \phi} \rangle = \langle \bar{\Gamma}^{\phi}_{\theta \phi} \rangle = \cot \theta
\]  
(A29)