

Efficient parallel solver for rarefied gas flow using GSIS

Yanbing Zhang, Jianan Zeng, Ruifeng Yuan, Wei Liu, Qi Li*, Lei Wu*

*Department of Mechanics and Aerospace Engineering, Southern University of Science and Technology,
Shenzhen 518055, China*

Abstract

Recently, the general synthetic iterative scheme (GSIS) has been proposed to find the steady-state solution of the Boltzmann equation in the whole range of gas rarefaction, where its fast-converging and asymptotic-preserving properties lead to the significant reduction of iteration numbers and spatial cells in the near-continuum flow regime. However, the efficiency and accuracy of GSIS has only been demonstrated in two-dimensional problems with small numbers of spatial cell and discrete velocities. Here, a large-scale parallel computing strategy is designed to extend the GSIS to three-dimensional flow problems, including the supersonic flows which are usually difficult to solve by the discrete velocity method. Since the GSIS involves the calculation of the mesoscopic kinetic equation which is defined in six-dimensional phase-space, and the macroscopic high-temperature Navier-Stokes-Fourier equations in three-dimensional physical space, the proper partition of the spatial and velocity spaces, and the allocation of CPU cores to the mesoscopic and macroscopic solvers, are the keys to improving the overall computational efficiency. These factors are systematically tested to achieve optimal performance, up to 100 billion spatial and velocity grids. For hypersonic flows around the Apollo reentry capsule, the X38-like vehicle, and the space station, our parallel solver can obtain the converged solution within one hour.

Keywords: rarefied gas dynamics, general synthetic iterative scheme, multiscale simulation, fast convergence, asymptotic preserving, high-temperature gas dynamics

1. Introduction

Due to the development in space exploration [1, 2], EUV lithography [3, 4] and vacuum systems for nuclear fusion [5], the study of rarefied (non-equilibrium) gas dynamics has become more and more important. From the theoretical perspective, these non-equilibrium flows are governed by the Boltzmann-type kinetic equations [6] that use the velocity distribution function (VDF) to describe the system state at the mesoscopic level, rather than the Navier-Stokes-Fourier (NSF) equations in the macroscopic level. From the computational

*Corresponding authors:

Email address: liq33@sustech.edu.cn; wul@sustech.edu.cn (Lei Wu)

perspective, the efficient and accurate simulation of the kinetic equation is crucial to emerging technologies in aerospace engineering, where the numerical scheme should be carefully designed as the VDF is defined in the high-dimensional phase space (e.g., for polyatomic gas, it includes the time, the three-dimensional physical space, the three-dimensional molecular velocity space, and the one-dimensional internal energy space).

The Boltzmann equation can be solved by the stochastic and deterministic methods. Historically, due to the limitation of computer memory, the Boltzmann equation is simulated by the direct simulation Monte Carlo (DSMC) method [7]. This method uses the simulation particles (each represents a huge number of real gas molecules) to mimic the free streaming and binary collisions of gas molecules. Therefore, the number of simulation particles can be kept small, but the macroscopic quantities in the steady state are obtained by a large number of statistical averaging. In simulating moderate and highly rarefied gas flows, DSMC becomes the prevailing numerical method. However, when it comes to the simulation of near-continuum flows, due to the splitting of streaming and collision, the spatial cell size and time step in DSMC simulations should be smaller than the mean free path and mean collision time of gas molecules, respectively, hence it is quite inefficient.

The discrete velocity method is the deterministic method to solve the Boltzmann equation. In addition to spatial discretization, the molecular velocity space is also discretized, by tens of thousands of discrete velocities. Thus, the computer memory requirement can be thousands times of the DSMC. However, due to its deterministic nature, the averaging process is removed, so that it can be faster than DSMC in low-speed simulations [8]. The early version of discrete velocity method also handles the streaming and collision separately, therefore suffers from the similar numerical deficiency as DSMC.

In the past decade, significant progresses have been achieved in both the deterministic and stochastic methods [9–21]. For instances, the implicit unified gas kinetic scheme (UGKS) [10–12] and the general synthetic iterative scheme (GSIS) [15, 16] are proposed and applied to challenging multiscale engineering applications. In UGKS, the analytical solution of the Bhatnagar–Gross–Krook (BGK) kinetic equation is used, so that the streaming and collision are handled simultaneously, and the limitation on the spatial cell size is relieved (the asymptotic-preserving property). In GSIS, the traditional discrete velocity method is used to solve the Boltzmann equation and its simplified kinetic model equations, together with the macroscopic synthetic equations that facilitate the fast-converging and asymptotic-preserving properties, so that steady-state solutions can be obtained within dozens of iterations in the whole range of gas rarefaction. The stochastic numerical methods worth mentioning are the Fokker-Planck solver which is based on the stochastic Langevin process so that the time step is not limited by the mean collision time [9], the unified stochastic particle method based on the BGK equation [17, 19] and the time-relaxed Monte Carlo method for the Boltzmann equation [18] where the numerical dissipation induced in the large spatial cell size is compensated by changing the collision term. More recently, the unified gas-kinetic wave-particle method (UGKWP) for the BGK-type equation [20, 21], which combines the advantages of both deterministic and stochastic methods, has been proposed to simulate large-scale three-dimensional problems.

The efficient and accurate simulation of multiscale gas flow problems lies in two factors.

The first factor is the remove or relieve of the constraints in spatial cell size and time step, and the second factor is the fast convergence to the steady-state. For the methods introduced in the last paragraph, we see that the first factor is satisfied in most schemes. However, the second is not, since most of the methods lack the global “information exchange” to enhance convergence in the whole computational domain. The synthetic equations in GSIS are designed to facilitate quick information exchange process, skipping the intermediate physical-evolving process. The rigorous mathematical analysis of GSIS shows that it processes the two properties in linear problems [22], while the numerical results show that it processes the two properties in small-scale nonlinear problems [16]. Therefore, it is of great practical meaning to extend the GSIS to solver large-scale nonlinear problems. Especially, while it is commonly recognized that the stochastic method is much more efficient than the deterministic methods for high-speed flow simulations, here we are going to show that the GSIS is able to outperform the state-of-the-art stochastic method even in high-speed multiscale flow simulations.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the high-temperature Navier-Stokes equations used in the continuum flow regime, the modified Boltzmann-Rykov equation valid from the continuum to free-molecular flow regimes, and their relations. In Section 3, the numerical procedure in solving GSIS is introduced, while in Section 4, the parallel computing strategy is proposed and the factors that affect the parallel efficiency are analyzed. In Section 5, the accuracy and efficiency of the parallel computing of GSIS are assessed in several challenging cases. Finally, conclusions are given in Section 6.

2. Governing equations

In the non-equilibrium dynamics of dilute gas, the kinetic model equations have been proposed to describe the evolution of gas VDFs; while the multi-temperature macroscopic equations are usually adopted in the near continuum regime. Without losing of generality, we consider the molecular gas with 3 translational degrees of freedom and d_r internal degrees of freedom.

2.1. High-temperature Navier-Stokes equations

When thermal non-equilibrium occurs in high-temperature gas, the multi-temperature governing equations for the molecular gas with mass density ρ , flow velocity $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$, translational temperature T_t , and internal temperature T_r are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u}) &= 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho \mathbf{u}) + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}) + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{P} &= 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho e) + \nabla \cdot (\rho e \mathbf{u}) + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{q}_t + \mathbf{q}_r) &= 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho e_r) + \nabla \cdot (\rho e_r \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{q}_r) &= \frac{d_r \rho R T - T_r}{2 Z_r \tau}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here, t is the time and $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is the spatial coordinate; $e_r = d_r R T_r / 2$ and $e = (3 R T_t + u^2) / 2 + e_r$ are the specific total and internal energies, respectively; the pressure tensor

$\mathbf{P}$ is given by $\mathbf{P} = p_t \mathbf{I} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}$, with $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ being the shear stress tensor, $p_t = \rho R T_t$ the kinetic pressure, $\mathbf{I}$ the 3×3 identity matrix, and R the gas constant; $\mathbf{q}_t$ and $\mathbf{q}_r$ are the translational and internal heat fluxes, respectively; the total temperature T is defined as the equilibrium temperature between the translational and internal modes $T = (3T_t + d_r T_r)/(3 + d_r)$. Finally, Z_r is the internal collision number, and $Z_r \tau$ characterizes how fast the internal-translational energy exchange is when compared to the mean collision time $\tau = \mu/p_t$, where μ is the shear viscosity of the gas. The power-law intermolecular potential is considered, so that the viscosity can be expressed as

$$\mu(T_t) = \mu(T_0) \left(\frac{T_t}{T_0} \right)^\omega, \quad (2)$$

with ω the viscosity index and T_0 the reference temperature.

In the continuum flow regime, i.e., when the Knudsen number (defined as the ratio of the molecular mean free path λ to the characteristic flow length L_0)

$$\text{Kn} = \frac{\lambda}{L_0} \equiv \frac{\mu(T_0)}{p_0 L} \sqrt{\frac{\pi R T_0}{2}}, \quad (3)$$

is small ($\text{Kn} < 0.001$), the constitutive relations are given by the Newton law of viscosity and the Fourier law of heat conduction:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\text{NSF}} &= -\mu \left(\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^T - \frac{2}{3} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} \mathbf{I} \right), \\ \mathbf{q}_{t,\text{NSF}} &= -\kappa_t \nabla T_t, \\ \mathbf{q}_{r,\text{NSF}} &= -\kappa_r \nabla T_r. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where κ_t and κ_r are the transitional and internal thermal conductivities, respectively, and the superscript T is the matrix transpose.

2.2. Gas kinetic equations

Kinetic model equations simplified from the Wang-Chang & Uhlenbeck equation [23] are usually adopted in numerical simulations to describe the dynamics of molecular gas in the whole range of gas rarefaction. The model equation applied in this work is initially developed by Rykov [24] and recently extended [25–27] to reflect the proper relaxations of energy and heat-flux exchanges between translational and internal modes. Two VDFs, $f_0(t, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi})$ and $f_1(t, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi})$, are used to describe the translational and internal states of gas molecules, where $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$ is the molecular velocity. The macroscopic quantities are obtained by taking moments of VDFs f_0 and f_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\rho, \rho \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \frac{3}{2} \rho R T_t, \mathbf{q}_t \right) &= \int \left(1, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{c} \mathbf{c} - \frac{c^2}{3} \mathbf{I}, \frac{c^2}{2}, \frac{c^2}{2} \mathbf{c} \right) f_0 d\boldsymbol{\xi}, \\ \left(\frac{d_r}{2} \rho R T_r, \mathbf{q}_r \right) &= \int (1, \mathbf{c}) f_1 d\boldsymbol{\xi}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{c} = \boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{u}$ is the peculiar (thermal) velocity. The pressure related to the translational motion is $p_t = \rho RT_t$, while the total pressure is $p = \rho RT$.

In the absence of an external force, the evolution of VDFs is governed by the following kinetic equations:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial f_0}{\partial t} + \boldsymbol{\xi} \cdot \nabla f_0 &= \frac{g_{0t} - f_0}{\tau} + \frac{g_{0r} - g_{0t}}{Z_r \tau}, \\ \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial t} + \boldsymbol{\xi} \cdot \nabla f_1 &= \frac{g_{1t} - f_1}{\tau} + \frac{g_{1r} - g_{1t}}{Z_r \tau},\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

where the reference distribution functions are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}g_{0t} &= \rho \left(\frac{1}{2\pi RT_t} \right)^{3/2} \exp \left(-\frac{c^2}{2RT_t} \right) \left[1 + \frac{2\mathbf{q}_t \cdot \mathbf{c}}{15RT_t p_t} \left(\frac{c^2}{2RT_t} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \right], \\ g_{0r} &= \rho \left(\frac{1}{2\pi RT} \right)^{3/2} \exp \left(-\frac{c^2}{2RT} \right) \left[1 + \frac{2\mathbf{q}_0 \cdot \mathbf{c}}{15RT p} \left(\frac{c^2}{2RT} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \right], \\ g_{1t} &= \frac{d_r}{2} RT_r g_{0t} + \left(\frac{1}{2\pi RT_t} \right)^{3/2} \frac{\mathbf{q}_r \cdot \mathbf{c}}{RT_t} \exp \left(-\frac{c^2}{2RT_t} \right), \\ g_{1r} &= \frac{d_r}{2} RT g_{0r} + \left(\frac{1}{2\pi RT} \right)^{3/2} \frac{\mathbf{q}_1 \cdot \mathbf{c}}{RT} \exp \left(-\frac{c^2}{2RT} \right),\end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

with $\mathbf{q}_0, \mathbf{q}_1$ being linear combinations of translational and internal heat fluxes [26]:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{q}_0 \\ \mathbf{q}_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (2 - 3A_{tt})Z_r + 1 & -3A_{tr}Z_r \\ -A_{rt}Z_r & -A_{rr}Z_r + 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{q}_t \\ \mathbf{q}_r \end{bmatrix},\tag{8}$$

where $\mathbf{A} = [A_{tt}, A_{tr}, A_{rt}, A_{rr}]$ is determined by the relaxation rates of heat flux.

2.3. Relation between the mesoscopic and macroscopic descriptions

Here the relation between the mesoscopic and macroscopic equations is introduced. First, Eq. (1) is obtained by taking moments of the kinetic equations (6). Note that, at this stage, the pressure tensor and heat flux are determined by the VDFs via Eq. (5) rather than (4), making the macroscopic equations valid in all flow regimes but not closed.

The Chapman-Enskog expansion method [28] is used to close the macroscopic equations at Euler and Navier-Stokes levels. The VDFs f_l ($l = 0, 1$) are expansions in the form of an infinite series of Kn, $f_l = f_l^{(0)} + \text{Kn} f_l^{(1)} + \dots$. By substituting the expansions into Eq. (6) with the assumption $Z_r \sim O(\text{Kn}^{-1})$, the zero-order distribution functions $f_l^{(0)}$ can be obtained immediately as the local equilibrium distribution functions with the temperatures T_t, T_r of respective modes:

$$f_0^{(0)} = \rho \left(\frac{1}{2\pi RT_t} \right)^{3/2} \exp \left(-\frac{c^2}{2RT_t} \right), \quad f_1^{(0)} = \frac{d_r}{2} RT_r f_0^{(0)}.\tag{9}$$

Then the zero-order pressure $\mathbf{P}^{(0)}$ and heat fluxes $\mathbf{q}_t^{(0)}, \mathbf{q}_r^{(0)}$ can be obtained by taking moments of $f_l^{(0)}$, and gives the constitutive relations at Euler approximation: $\mathbf{P}_{\text{Euler}} = \mathbf{P}^{(0)} = \rho R T_t \mathbf{I}$ and $(\mathbf{q}_{t,\text{Euler}}, \mathbf{q}_{r,\text{Euler}}) = (\mathbf{q}_t^{(0)}, \mathbf{q}_r^{(0)}) = (0, 0)$. Next, the first-order correction $f_l^{(1)}$ is solved from the equations:

$$\mathcal{D}^{(1)} f_l = -\frac{f_l^{(1)}}{\tau} + \frac{g_{lr} - f_l^{(0)}}{Z_r \tau}, \quad (10)$$

where $\mathcal{D}^{(1)} f_l$ can be explicitly evaluated by $\partial f_l^{(0)} / \partial t + \boldsymbol{\xi} \cdot \partial f_l^{(0)} / \partial \mathbf{x}$. Thus the first-order distribution functions $f_l^{(1)}$ are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} f_0^{(1)} &= \frac{g_{0r} - f_0^{(0)}}{Z_r} - \tau f_0^{(0)} \left[\left(\frac{c^2}{2RT_t} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \mathbf{c} \cdot \nabla \ln T_t + \frac{d_r}{3T_t} \left(\frac{c^2}{2RT_t} - \frac{3}{2} \right) \frac{T - T_r}{Z_r \tau} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{RT_t} \left(\mathbf{c}\mathbf{c} - \frac{1}{3}c^2\mathbf{I} \right) : \nabla \mathbf{u} \right], \\ f_1^{(1)} &= \frac{g_{1r} - f_1^{(0)}}{Z_r} - \tau f_1^{(0)} \left[\left(\frac{c^2}{2RT_t} - \frac{5}{2} \right) \mathbf{c} \cdot \nabla \ln T_t + \mathbf{c} \cdot \nabla \ln T_r \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{d_r}{3T_t} \left(\frac{c^2}{2RT_t} - \frac{3}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{T_r} \right) \frac{T - T_r}{Z_r \tau} + \frac{1}{RT_t} \left(\mathbf{c}\mathbf{c} - \frac{1}{3}c^2\mathbf{I} \right) : \nabla \mathbf{u} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Substituting the approximation $f_l^{(0)} + \text{Kn} f_l^{(1)}$ into the definitions of the pressure tensor and heat fluxes, the constitutive relations at the NSF level read,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{\text{NSF}} &= \mathbf{P}^{(0)} + \mathbf{P}^{(1)} = \rho R T_t \mathbf{I} - \mu \left(\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^T - \frac{2}{3} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} \mathbf{I} \right), \\ (\mathbf{q}_{t,\text{NSF}}, \mathbf{q}_{r,\text{NSF}}) &= (\mathbf{q}^{(0)} + \mathbf{q}_t^{(1)}, \mathbf{q}_r^{(0)} + \mathbf{q}_r^{(1)}) = -(\kappa_t \nabla T_t, \kappa_r \nabla T_r). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the shear viscosity is $\mu = \rho R T_t \tau$ and thermal conductivities κ_t, κ_r are given by,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \kappa_t \\ \kappa_r \end{bmatrix} = \frac{\mu R}{2} \begin{bmatrix} A_{tt} & A_{tr} \\ A_{rt} & A_{rr} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 5 \\ d_r \end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

It shows that each component of the heat flux is related to the corresponding temperature gradient of its own mode, due to the slow translational-internal energy relaxation.

3. General Synthetic Iterative Scheme

There are two versions of GSIS, where the difference lies in the macroscopic synthetic equations [29]: in GSIS-I [15, 22, 30] the synthetic equations include the evolution equations for the mass, momentum, energy, stress and heat flux, while in GSIS-II [16, 31] only the evolution equations for the mass, momentum and energy are considered. Therefore, the asymptotic-preserving property of GSIS-I is better, but meanwhile, the numerical solving of




Figure 1: The velocity domain is respectively discretized for a hypersonic flow at $Ma = 5$ and $AoA = 30^\circ$ with (a) 27,704 unstructured tetrahedral cells and (b) 8,166 structure-unstructured hybrid cells. Cells are refined around the stagnation and free stream velocities [32–34]. The color indicates the volume of the discretized velocity cells, which is nondimensionalized by $(RT_0)^{3/2}$.

high-order macroscopic equations is more difficult. Here we choose the GSIS-II, since the sophisticated numerical techniques in computational fluid dynamics can be directly used; indeed, anyone who can write program to solve the NSF equations can implement the GSIS-II without any difficulties.

We adopt the finite volume scheme with second order of accuracy to solve the kinetic equations and macroscopic equations. We only show the major steps here, leaving the details in Ref. [16, 31].

3.1. Unstructured velocity space discretization

In the DVM, the continuous velocity space should be discretized first. Normally, for low-speed flows, it can be discretized by the Cartesian grid, both uniformly or non-uniformly [35]. In the simulation of hypersonic flows, the velocity space is usually discretized by the unstructured mesh, see Fig. 1(a). However, a huge number of velocity grid is required. Recently, it is found that the local refinement of velocity space in front of shock wave, after shock wave and at the wall surface can effectively reduce the number of velocity discretization without affecting the integral accuracy. [32–34]. According to the 3σ and 5σ criteria of the standard normal distribution, the probability of the sample falling within the corresponding interval is 99.73% and 99.99%, respectively. In the three-dimensional example, the whole velocity space is truncated into a sphere centered at $\mathbf{U}_s = \mathbf{U}_\infty / [(\gamma + 1) Ma^2 / (2 + (\gamma - 1) Ma^2)]$ with radius $5\sqrt{RT_s}$, where $T_s = \max(T_m, T_w, T_\infty)$, $T_m = T_\infty [1 + (\gamma - 1) Ma^2 / 2]$, γ is the specific heat ratio, T_w is the wall temperature, $\mathbf{U}_\infty$ and T_∞ are the velocity and temperature of the free flow. Then the refinement discretization is performed at the centers $\mathbf{U}_\infty$ and $\mathbf{0}$ with

the lengths of $3\sqrt{RT_\infty}$ and $3\sqrt{RT_w}$, respectively. The refinement range can be a sphere or a cube, and the rest velocity domain is filled with unstructured tetrahedra, see Fig. 1(b). If the refinement range is rectangular and uniform orthogonal discrete, high-precision integration format can be used to improve the integration accuracy.

3.2. The kinetic solver

Since f_0 and f_1 share the same form, in the following they are represented by f for clarity of presentation. Given the gas information at the n -th iteration step, the discretized velocity distribution at the next intermediate (the VDFs will be further modified according to the solution of the synthetic equations) iteration step $n + 1/2$ is calculated as

$$\frac{f_i^{n+1/2} - f_i^n}{\Delta t} + \frac{1}{V_i} \sum_{j \in N(i)} \xi_n f_{ij}^{n+1/2} S_{ij} = \frac{g_i^n - f_i^{n+1/2}}{\tau_i^n}, \quad (14)$$

where

$$g = \left(1 - \frac{1}{Z_r}\right) g_t + \frac{1}{Z_r} g_r. \quad (15)$$

In the above two equations, Δt is the time step; The subscripts i, j are the indices of the control cells, and the subscript ij denotes the interface between the adjacent cells i and j , with S_{ij} and V_i being the area of interface ij and the volume of cell i , respectively. $\xi_n = \boldsymbol{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{n}$ is the molecular velocity component along normal direction $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{S}/|\mathbf{S}|$ pointing from cell i to cell j ; the sum of fluxes $\xi_n f_{ij}$ is taken over all the faces of a cell $N(i)$.

To apply a simple matrix-free implicit solving of the discretized equations, the incremental variable $\Delta f_i = f_i^{n+1/2} - f_i^n$ is introduced. Therefore, the delta-form discretized kinetic equation for Δf_i is given by:

$$\left(\frac{1}{\Delta t} + \frac{1}{\tau_i^n}\right) \Delta f_i + \frac{1}{V_i} \sum_{j \in N(i)} \xi_n \Delta f_{ij} S_{ij} = \underbrace{\frac{g_i^n - f_i^n}{\tau_i^n} - \frac{1}{V_i} \sum_{j \in N(i)} \xi_n f_{ij}^n S_{ij}}_{r_i^n}. \quad (16)$$

The interface fluxes f_{ij}^n in the right-hand-side of Eq. (16) are reconstructed using a second-order upwind scheme. Specifically, we have $f_{ij} = [\xi_n^+(f_i + \phi \nabla f_i \cdot \mathbf{x}) + \xi_n^-(f_j + \phi \nabla f_j \cdot \mathbf{x})]/2$, where $\xi_n^\pm = [1 \pm \text{sign}(\xi_n)]$ denotes the interface sign directions with respect to the cell center value, and ϕ is the Venkatakrishnan limiter. The derivative information is obtained via the least squares method. On the other hand, the increment fluxes Δf_{ij}^n in the left-hand-side of Eq. (16) are constructed using a first-order upwind scheme: $\Delta f_{ij} = (\xi_n^+ \Delta f_i + \xi_n^- \Delta f_j)/2$. Finally, Eq. (16) can be rewritten as:

$$\left(\frac{1}{\Delta t} + \frac{1}{\tau_i^n} + \frac{1}{2V_i} \sum_{j \in N(i)} \xi_n^+ \xi_n S_{ij}\right) \Delta f_i + \sum_{j \in N(i)} \left(\frac{1}{2V_i} \xi_n^- \xi_n S_{ij}\right) \Delta f_j = r_i^n, \quad (17)$$

which can be solved using the standard Lower-Upper Symmetric Gauss-Seidel (LU-SGS) technique. When Δf_i is solved, the VDF at the intermediate step is given by

$$f_i^{n+1/2} = f_i^n + \Delta f_i. \quad (18)$$

3.3. The macroscopic solver

To describe the rarefaction effects, the constitutive relation in the macroscopic equations (1) should not only contain the Newton and Fourier laws of viscosity and heat conduction, but also contain the high-order rarefaction effects. In GSIS-II, the stress and heat fluxes are constructed in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{n+1} &= \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\text{NSF}}^{n+1} + \underbrace{\int \left(\mathbf{c}\mathbf{c} - \frac{c^2}{3}\mathbf{I} \right) f_0^{n+1/2} d\mathbf{v}}_{\text{HoT}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\text{NSF}}^{n+1/2}, \\
\mathbf{q}_t^{n+1} &= \mathbf{q}_{t,\text{NSF}}^{n+1} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \int \mathbf{c}c^2 f_0^{n+1/2} d\mathbf{v}}_{\text{HoT}_{\mathbf{q}_t}} - \mathbf{q}_{t,\text{NSF}}^{n+1/2}, \\
\mathbf{q}_r^{n+1} &= \mathbf{q}_{r,\text{NSF}}^{n+1} + \underbrace{\int \mathbf{c}f_1^{n+1/2} d\mathbf{v}}_{\text{HoT}_{\mathbf{q}_r}} - \mathbf{q}_{r,\text{NSF}}^{n+1/2},
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

such that when substituting Eq. (19) into Eq. (1), the traditional NSF equations with source terms coming from the high-order constitutive relations are obtained, where variables without the superscripts are all solved in the $(n+1)$ -th step.

The discretized form of the governing equation (1) for the macroscopic properties with the backward Euler method can be written as:

$$\frac{\mathbf{W}_i^{n+1} - \mathbf{W}_i^n}{\Delta t} + \frac{1}{V_i} \sum_{j \in N(i)} \mathbf{F}_{ij}^{n+1} S_{ij} = \mathbf{Q}_i^{n+1}, \tag{20}$$

where the detailed expressions of macroscopic variables $\mathbf{W}$, the fluxes $\mathbf{F}$ including both convective and viscous parts, and the source terms $\mathbf{Q}$ are given in the appendix in [16]. Introduce the incremental variables $\Delta \mathbf{W}_i^m = \mathbf{W}_i^{m+1} - \mathbf{W}_i^m$ with m being the inner iteration index in solving macroscopic equations, Eq. (20) is converted to

$$\left[\frac{1}{\Delta t_i} - \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}}{\partial \mathbf{W}} \right)_i^m \right] \Delta \mathbf{W}_i^m + \frac{1}{V_i} \sum_{j \in N(i)} \Delta \mathbf{F}_{ij}^m S_{ij} = - \underbrace{\frac{1}{V_i} \sum_{j \in N(i)} \mathbf{F}_{ij}^m S_{ij}}_{R_i^m} + \mathbf{Q}_i^m. \tag{21}$$

The general form of the macroscopic fluxes can be expressed as $F_{ij} = F(W_L, W_R, S_{ij})$, where $W_{L,R}$ represents the reconstructed values of the left and right sides of the interface, respectively, and can be further written as $W_{L/R} = W_{i/j} + \phi \nabla W_{i/j} \cdot \mathbf{x}$. For the reconstruction of the macroscopic flux, the Rusanov scheme [36] is applied, while the gradient and the limiter are chosen to be consistent with the mesoscopic equations.

To obtain a matrix-free form, the implicit fluxes in the macroscopic system (21) are approximated by the Euler-type fluxes: $\Delta \mathbf{F}_{ij}^m = \frac{1}{2} [\Delta \mathbf{F}_i^m + \Delta \mathbf{F}_j^m + \Gamma_{ij}(\Delta \mathbf{W}_i^m - \Delta \mathbf{W}_j^m)]$, with $\Gamma_{ij} = |u_n| + c_s + \frac{2\mu}{\rho |\mathbf{n}_{ij} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i)|}$. Since the control volume satisfies the geometric conservation law, the interface fluxes through the cell accumulate to $\sum_{j \in N(i)} \mathbf{F}_i S_{ij} = 0$. While the

flux can be directly represented by the convective one $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}_c$, the flux of subscript j can be written as a matrix-free form $\Delta \mathbf{F}_j^m = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{W}_j^m + \Delta \mathbf{W}_j^m) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{W}_j^m)$. Substituting this into Eqs. (21), the implicit governing equations for macroscopic variables become

$$D_i \Delta \mathbf{W}_i^m + \frac{1}{2V_i} \sum_{j \in N(i)} (\Delta \mathbf{F}_j^m - \Gamma_{ij} \Delta \mathbf{W}_j^m) S_{ij} = \mathbf{R}_i^m, \quad (22)$$

where $D_i = \frac{1}{\Delta t_i} + \frac{1}{2V_i} \sum_{j \in N(i)} \Gamma_{ij} S_{ij} - \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}}{\partial \mathbf{W}} \right)_i^m$.

The macroscopic solver needs boundary conditions (note that in rarefied gas dynamics, the no-velocity-slip and no-temperature-jump conditions do not hold anymore). In the initial work of the GSIS for nonlinear flows [31], the macroscopic synthetic equations were solved in the inner domain, excluding four cell layers adjacent to solid walls. Thus, although the total iteration number for the kinetic solver (which is the most time-consuming part) can be greatly reduced when compared to the traditional implicit discrete velocity method, it still needs several hundreds of iterations. This problem is partially fixed in our recent paper [16], where the boundary flux is modified by the physical quantity increment of the boundary element, in a similar manner as the Roe scheme. Very recently, we further proposed a generalized macroscopic boundary treatment to achieve super-accelerated convergence in GSIS [37], where the conservative variables in the NSF solver, and the high-order constitutive relations for stress and heat flux in the kinetic solver, are used to construct the VDFs similar to that used in the Grad 13 moment method, and hence providing the boundary flux for the macroscopic solver in each step m . The velocity distribution function on both sides L, R of the interface ij is reconstructed based on macroscopic quantity information:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{0,ij}^{L,R} &= f^{eq} \left[1 + \frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{c} \mathbf{c}}{2\rho T^2} + \frac{\mathbf{q}_t \cdot \mathbf{c}}{\rho T^2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{c}^2}{5T_t} - 1 \right) \right], \\ f_{1,ij}^{L,R} &= \left(\frac{d_r}{2} T_r \right) f_{0,ij}^{L,R} \left[1 + \frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{c} \mathbf{c}}{2\rho T_t^2} + \frac{\mathbf{q}_t \cdot \mathbf{c}}{\rho T_t^2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{c}^2}{5T_t} - 1 \right) \right] + f_{0,ij}^{L,R} \frac{\mathbf{q}_r \cdot \mathbf{c}}{\rho T_t}, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where the conservative variables in the NSF solver, and the high-order constitutive relations for stress and heat flux in the kinetic solver, are used to construct the VDFs similar to that used in the Grad 13 moment method, and then the macroscopic flux at the interface ij could be obtained:

$$\mathbf{F}_{ij} = S \begin{bmatrix} \rho u_n \\ \rho \mathbf{u} u_n \\ \rho E u_n \\ \rho E_r u_n \end{bmatrix} = S \begin{bmatrix} \int_{\xi_n > 0} \xi_n f_{0,ij}^L d\xi + \int_{\xi_n < 0} \xi_n f_{0,ij}^R d\xi \\ \int_{\xi_n > 0} \xi_n f_{0,ij}^L \xi d\xi + \int_{\xi_n < 0} \xi_n f_{0,ij}^R \xi d\xi \\ \int_{\xi_n > 0} \xi_n \left(\frac{1}{2} \xi^2 f_{0,ij}^L + f_{1,ij}^L \right) d\xi + \int_{\xi_n < 0} \xi_n \left(\frac{1}{2} \xi^2 f_{0,ij}^R + f_{1,ij}^R \right) d\xi \\ \int_{\xi_n > 0} \xi_n f_{1,ij}^L d\xi + \int_{\xi_n < 0} \xi_n f_{1,ij}^R d\xi \end{bmatrix} \quad (24)$$

and hence providing the boundary flux for the macroscopic solver in each step m . Since the distribution function in Eq. (23) is an equilibrium distribution, the above macroscopic flux can be expressed and calculated explicitly. Details are presented in Ref. [37] since it involves complicated mathematics; also, the boundary condition affects only the iteration number n but not the parallel efficiency; the latter is the major focus of the present paper.

Algorithm 1 Overall flowchart of GSIS

Input: Initial macroscopic quantities $\mathbf{W}$;

Output: Macroscopic quantities $\mathbf{W}$;

- 1: Getting initial field by calculating 1000 steps of the macroscopic solver (see Algorithm 2 below) with Euler constitutive relations and 10 steps of the kinetic solver (see Algorithm 3 below) in general;
 - 2: set $steps = 0$, $error = 1$;
 - 3: **while** $steps \leq \text{MaxSteps} \parallel error \geq 1e - 6$ **do**
 - 4: $steps++$;
 - 5: Update velocity distribution function using macroscopic quantities;
 - 6: Kinetic solver evolves once, see Algorithm 3;
 - 7: Calculate the macroscopic quantities $\mathbf{W}$, high-order terms HoT_q and HoT_σ defined in Eq. (19), boundary flux F_{ij} ;
 - 8: Macroscopic solver evolves multiple ($300 \sim 400$) times, see Algorithm 2;
 - 9: Calculate $error$;
 - 10: **end while**
-

When the macroscopic conservative variables $\mathbf{W}^{n+1}$ are solved, they are used to update the VDF. That is, the non-equilibrium part is kept while the equilibrium is modified:

$$f^{n+1} = f^{n+1/2} + [f_{eq}(\mathbf{W}^{n+1}) - f_{eq}(\mathbf{W}^{n+1/2})]. \quad (25)$$

4. Parallel implementation of GSIS

To meet the requirement of solving non-equilibrium flows on complex configurations, the parallel implementation of a solver needs to be carefully designed to achieve high performance. Although the parallelism model on processors with shared memory architectures has the advantage of simplicity, the scalable performance is limited to tens of processors. Thus, the parallelism model works on distributed memory architectures using the Message Passing Interface (MPI) library is usually utilized in large-scale practical simulations.

The overview of GSIS is shown in Algorithm 1. Every single iteration step in GSIS invokes the kinetic solver once and the macroscopic solver several tens or hundreds of times. Considering the significant difference in computing time and memory requirement between the two solvers, their parallel strategies are designed separately to achieve an optimized usage of computational resources. Note that in order to increase the stability of the algorithm, pre-conditioning of the macroscopic and kinetic equations is adopted. Namely, we first run the macroscopic solver with Euler constitutive relations for 1000 steps, then the kinetic solver for 10 steps, before calling the GSIS.

4.1. Parallel computing strategy

For the macroscopic solver, a natural parallel implementation on unstructured grids uses spatial domain decomposition to partition the grids across processors, where each processor

Algorithm 2 Macroscopic solver: Spatial domain decomposition to solve macroscopic equations in parallel. The `MPI_Startall()` and `MPI_Waitall()` are non-blocking communication subroutines in MPI, which correspond to one-to-one invoking.

Input: Macroscopic quantities $\mathbf{W}$, high-order terms $\text{HoT}_{\mathbf{q}}$ and $\text{HoT}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, and boundary flux $\mathbf{F}_{ij}$ obtained from the previous iteration or the initial conditions;

Output: Macroscopic quantities $\mathbf{W}$ in the next iteration step of kinetic solver;

```

1: set  $steps = 0$ ,  $error = 1$ ,  $n = 4$ ;
2: while  $steps \leq \text{MaxSteps} \parallel error \geq 10^{-6}$  do
3:    $steps++$ ;
4:   MPI_Startall(), send data of macroscopic quantities on ghost cells between spatial
   partitions;
5:   Update boundary conditions;
6:   MPI_Waitall(), wait for data reception to complete;
7:   Interpolate the cell-centered macroscopic quantities to the interfaces and calculate
   the fluxes in each spatial subdomain;
8:   MPI_Startall(), send data of unilateral fluxes on interfaces between subdomains;
9:   Calculate cell-based source terms and time steps;
10:  MPI_Waitall(), wait for interface flux reception to complete;
11:  Calculate total fluxes on interfaces between subdomains;
12:  for  $i = 0; i < n; i++$  do
13:    MPI_Startall(), send data of increment of macroscopic quantities  $\Delta\mathbf{W}$ ;
14:    MPI_Waitall(), wait for  $\Delta\mathbf{W}$  reception to complete;
15:    LU-SGS iteration;
16:  end for
17:  Boundary flux modification;
18:  Calculate  $error$ ;
19: end while

```

performs the computations for its assigned grids. In the implicit scheme, the information communicated between processors includes the macroscopic variables and their fluxes at the interfaces between subdomains, as well as at neighboring grid cells outside each subdomain. Thus, additional layers of adjacent grid cells around a subdomain are attached to the associated processor as ghost cells (one layer of ghost cells is sufficient for the numerical schemes up to second order). Algorithm 2 shows the parallel computing strategy for solving macroscopic equations. The non-blocking version of the MPI send/receive subroutines is used to simultaneously execute the computation and MPI communication.

For the kinetic solver, the implementation of spatial domain decomposition can be the same as that for the macroscopic solver. However, the information of entire velocity grids needs to be stored on each computing core. Thus, it can easily exceed the memory limitations of a single core for hypersonic flow simulations, where a large number of discrete velocity grids are required. Besides, an enormous amount of distribution functions needs to be communicated between processors, which may lead to a significant reduction in parallel

Algorithm 3 Kinetic solver: Hybrid parallelization of spatial domain and velocity domain decomposition to calculate mesoscopic equations. The `MPI_Allreduce()` is reduction subroutine in MPI.

Input: Distribution function f from the previous iteration or the initial conditions;

Output: Macroscopic quantities $\mathbf{W}$, high order terms HoT_q and HoT_σ , boundary flux F_{ij} ;

```

1: set  $steps = 0$ ,  $error = 1$ ,  $n = 4$ ;
2: The velocity domain decomposition;
3: while  $steps \leq \text{MaxSteps} \parallel error \geq 10^{-6}$  do
4:    $steps++$ ;
5:   MPI_Startall(), send data of velocity distribution function on ghost cells between
   spatial partitions;
6:   Calculate collision terms;
7:   MPI_Waitall(), wait for data reception to complete;
8:   Interpolate the cell-centered velocity distribution function to the interfaces and calculate
   the fluxes in each spatial subdomain;
9:   MPI_Startall(), send data of unilateral fluxes on interfaces between subdomains;
10:  Calculate boundary fluxes;
11:  MPI_Waitall(), wait for interface flux reception to complete;
12:  Calculate total fluxes on interfaces between subdomains;
13:  for  $i = 0; i < n; i++$  do
14:    MPI_Startall(), send data of increment of velocity distribution functions  $\Delta f$ ;
15:    MPI_Waitall(), wait for  $\Delta f$  reception to complete;
16:    LU-SGS iteration;
17:  end for
18:  MPI_Allreduce(), calculate macroscopic quantities based on Eq. (5);
19:  Calculate  $error$ ;
20: end while

```

efficiency when the number of subdomains is large. Therefore, the velocity domain decomposition, as the second level parallelism in the kinetic solver, is also inevitably required. Note that the distribution functions on discrete velocity points are independent of each other in the calculations of streaming and collision terms, while the data dependency and information communications are required only for calculating macroscopic quantities. It is simple to implement velocity domain decomposition and achieve high-efficiency parallelism, as shown in Algorithm 3. In addition to the send/receive subroutines, the MPI reduction subroutine is also used to calculate Eq. (5).

The parallel strategy of GSIS is sketched in Fig. 2: (i) as the first level parallelism for both macroscopic and kinetic solvers, the entire spatial domain is decomposed into N_x subdomains by graph partitioning techniques to achieve optimized load balance and time cost on associated message passing across processors, e.g., see Fig. 3(c); (ii) for each spatial subdomain, the entire discrete velocity cells are uniformly distributed over N_v processors, as the second level parallelism only for the kinetic solver; (iii) In total, $N_c = N_x \times N_v$ cores,




Figure 2: Allocation and usage of the computing cores in the parallel strategy of GSIS for large-scale simulations. The processor S-m-n performs the computations for grids in the m -th spatial subdomain ($m=1,2,\dots,N_x$); for the kinetic solver, $n=1,2,\dots,N_v$ represents the second level parallelism for velocity subdomain, while for the macroscopic solver, $n=1$ is used in each spatial cell partition.

labeled as S-m-n ($m = 1, 2, \dots, N_x$, $n = 1, 2, \dots, N_v$), are required and used in the kinetic solver, while S-m-1 ($m = 1, 2, \dots, N_x$) among those are utilized in macroscopic solver with others waited.

4.2. Parallel computing efficiency

The parallel computing efficiency of the macroscopic solver, the kinetic solver, as well as the overall GSIS algorithm is assessed individually in the hypersonic flow around the re-entry capsule Apollo at $Ma = 5$, $Kn = 0.0012$, and the angle of attack $AoA = 30^\circ$. The spatial domain consisting of 372,500 hexahedral cells is illustrated in Fig. 3(a,b) with a detailed view of the mesh on the wall surface, and the velocity domain is discretized by 27,704 tetrahedral cells. The open-source graph partitioning program METIS [38] is used to facilitate spatial cell decomposition. For example, Fig. 3(c) demonstrates a partitioning with 10 subdomains indicated by different colors. All the simulations are conducted on a parallel computer with Inter(R) Core(TM) i7-9700 CPU@3.2GHz.

The parallel efficiency of the macroscopic solver for a fixed interval of 2000 iterations is tested, where the spatial partitioning number N_x changes from 1 to 480 by using $N_c = N_x \times 1$ cores. The wall clock time and corresponding parallel efficiency (based on the time cost of a serial solver with $N_x = 1$) are shown in Table 1. It is found that, although the parallel efficiency falls below 90% when N_x is larger than 20, it keeps fluctuating around 73-88% as N_x increases from 20 to 400, which is a fair performance in large-scale parallelism. Further increase of N_x leads to a significant reduction of parallel efficiency, due to the chock of message passing between processors. It is noted that $N_x = 400$ corresponds to approximate 930 spatial cells assigned to each processor, which can be regarded as a lower limit of cell number per subdomain in spatial partitioning to keep a scalable parallelism in this configuration. In other words, if the total cell number is increased, then using more than 400 spatial partitions will also have a parallel efficiency of around 80%.




Figure 3: Spatial domain of the hypersonic flow around Apollo is discretized by 372,500 hexahedral cells. (a) Global view of the simulation domain, (b) a detailed view of the meshes on the wall surface. (c) Schematic of partitioning of spatial cells with 10 subdomains indicated by different colors.

To measure the performance of the kinetic solver with the two-level parallel strategy, the computational costs are compared by (i) changing N_x and N_v with $N_c = N_x \times N_v = 1280$ fixed; (ii) changing N_c with $N_x = 320$ fixed. For the case (i), as shown in Fig. 4(a), once the total core number N_c is fixed, the high efficiency of parallelism (less wall clock time) occurs when using either a small number of spatial subdomains ($N_x \leq 10$), or a small number of velocity partitioning ($N_v = N_c/N_x = 2 \sim 8$). The reason lies in the competition in the amount of data transfer between neighboring subdomains and the communication efficiency within the associated processors, both of which reduce when N_x increases. Considering that there are $N_x \times (N_v - 1)$ cores waiting in idle for the macroscopic solver, as well as the fact that the number of spatial cells is usually much larger than that of the velocity grids in 3D flow problems, a small number of velocity partitioning will be a practical choice on a fixed number of total cores. For the case (ii), Fig. 4(b) compares the wall clock time by increasing the total core number N_c with $N_x = 320$ fixed, where the ideal computational cost is calculated based on the reference one with $N_c = 640$. It is found that a high parallel

Table 1: Wall clock time and parallel computing efficiency of the macroscopic solver with 2000 iterations in the hypersonic flow passing over Apollo. The number of spatial partitions N_x varies from 1 to 480, and the total number of cores used is $N_c = N_x \times 1$.

Partitions N_x	Wall time (s)	Actual speedup	Parallel efficiency
1	4356.96	1.00	100.00%
2	2330.98	1.87	93.46%
5	889.01	4.90	98.02%
10	436.55	9.98	99.80%
20	246.74	17.66	88.29%
80	69.37	62.81	78.51%
160	33.45	130.25	81.41%
320	17.03	255.84	79.95%
360	16.42	265.34	73.71%
400	13.78	316.18	79.04%
440	15.9	274.02	62.28%
480	16.2	268.95	56.03%

efficiency above 82% can be guaranteed when $N_c \leq 1600$ ($N_v \leq 5$ correspondingly). Further increase of N_c leads to a significantly larger portion of time cost on the message passing, and thus reduces the efficiency.

Table 2 shows the wall clock time and the corresponding parallel efficiency of the overall GSIS solver when running 20 iteration steps, each of which includes one step of kinetic solver and 400 steps of macroscopic solver. The numbers of spatial and velocity partitioning are $N_x = 160, 320, 400$ and $N_v = 2, 4$, respectively. The parallel computing efficiency is measured based on the time cost of the case with $N_x \times N_v = 160 \times 2$ (a serial solver with $N_x \times N_v = 1 \times 1$ is too time-consuming to be applied in this problem), and good performance is achieved.

Table 2: Computational time and parallel computing efficiency of GSIS with 20 iteration steps, each of which includes one step kinetic solver and 400 steps macroscopic solver. The numbers of spatial and velocity partitioning are $N_x = 160, 320, 400$ and $N_v = 2, 4$, respectively.

$N_x \times N_v$	Wall time (s)	Ideal speedup	Actual speedup	Parallel efficiency
160×2	1256.2	1	1.00	100.0%
320×2	638.3	2	1.97	98.4%
400×2	550.4	2.5	2.28	91.3%
160×4	708.6	2	1.77	88.6%
320×4	445.9	4	2.82	70.4%
400×4	405.5	5	3.10	62.0%




Figure 4: The comparison of wall clock time of the kinetic solver with 20 iterations in the hypersonic flow around Apollo by (a) changing the number of partitions N_x with a fixed number of total cores $N_c = 1280$ and (b) changing the total core number N_c with a fixed spatial partitioning number $N_x = 320$, where the ideal time cost is calculated based on the reference one with $N_c = 640$.

5. Numerical results

In this section, the parallel GSIS solver is assessed in a 2D lid-driven cavity flow and in hypersonic flows (Apollo reentry module, space vehicle like x38, and space station) with complex 3D configurations. Detailed flow fields are compared with the available data from the DSMC simulations [39] and the latest AUGKWP [21].

Nitrogen gas with rotational degrees of freedom $d_r = 2$, collision number $Z_r = 3.5$ and viscosity index $\omega = 0.74$ is employed in the following simulations, unless otherwise noted. The thermal relaxation rates are [25]: $A_{tt} = 0.786$, $A_{tr} = -0.201$, $A_{rt} = -0.059$ and $A_{rr} = 0.842$, and hence the Eucken factors (corresponding to thermal conductivities) of translational and rotational degrees of freedom are determined as $f_t = 2.365$, $f_r = 1.435$, respectively.


The convergence criterion of the simulations is that the volume-weighted relative error ε between two consecutive iterations

$$\varepsilon = \max \left(\sqrt{\frac{\sum_i (W_i^n - W_i^{n-1})^2 \Omega_i}{\sum_i (W_i^{n-1})^2 \Omega_i}} \right) \quad (26)$$


is less than 10^{-6} , where $W \in \{\rho, \mathbf{u}, T_t\}$. This criterion is used to determine the wall clock time spent in the following simulations. Nevertheless, due to the fast-converging property of GSIS [22], $\varepsilon < 10^{-4}$ is sufficient to obtain the converged solutions of critical macroscopic properties, see the results in Fig. 7 for an example.

5.1. 2D lid-driven flow in a square cavity


In order to test the acceleration effect of GSIS in low speed flow, a 2D lid-driven cavity flow is tested. The grid structure is shown in Fig. 5(a), with a square barrier of 0.3 length




(a) Spatial discretization



(b) $Kn = 0.5$



(c) $Kn = 0.05$




(d) $Kn = 0.005$


Figure 5: Comparison of density distribution in cavity under different Knudsen numbers. Background contour: DSMC; Black solid lines: GSIS.

in the center. The square cavity lid moves forward to the X-axis at a speed of 50 m/s, and all wall temperatures are set to $T_w = 273.15$ K. The simulated gas is nitrogen, the initial temperature is $T_0 = 273.15$ K, the Knudsen numbers are $Kn = 0.5, 0.05$ and 0.005 , where the side length of the square cavity is chosen as the reference length. Non-uniform structure spatial grid is used, where the thickness of the first layer mesh near the wall is 0.005, and the total number of physical space grids is 9100. The velocity space adopts the uniform orthogonal discretization, the range of the two velocity directions is $[-5\sqrt{RT_0}, 5\sqrt{RT_0}] \times [-4\sqrt{RT_0}, 4\sqrt{RT_0}]$, and the discrete number is set to 50×40 .


Figure 5 compares the density between the GSIS and DSMC under different Knudsen



(a) $Kn = 0.5$



(b) $Kn = 0.05$



(c) $Kn = 0.005$

Figure 6: Comparison of velocity distribution along the central axis of the cavity under different Knudsen numbers.

numbers. Meanwhile, the velocity profiles on the central axis in the horizontal and vertical directions of the cavity under different Knudsen numbers are compared in Fig. 6. It can be seen that the calculated results of density and velocity agree well with each other.

The simulation time of DSMC and the traditional discrete velocity method (DVM) are compared in Table 3. It can be found that the GSIS has a considerable advantage over the DSMC and traditional DVM methods in computing time in the low speed flow of small Knudsen numbers. Note that since DVM has no asymptotic preserving property, it cannot calculate the same result as DSMC and GSIS under this physical grid at $Kn = 0.005$. It is necessary to refined the grid at the wall to get the correct result.

Table 3: The computational costs for the simulations of the lid-driven flow in a square cavity. The results of DSMC are calculated by the open source software SPARTA [40] using 320 cores, while DVM and GSIS use 8 cores; CPU times = Cores $\times$ Wall times.

Kn	DSMC	DVM		GSIS	
	CPU times (h)	Steps	CPU times (h)	Steps	CPU times (h)
0.5	85	133	0.18	75	0.22
0.05	135	370	0.44	61	0.18
0.005	2491	3660	3.95	19	0.07

5.2. Hypersonic flow passing Apollo

A hypersonic flow passing Apollo at $Ma = 5$ and $AoA = 30^\circ$ is simulated for $Kn = 0.0012, 0.01, 0.1, 1$, which are defined in terms of the reference length $L_0 = 3.912$ m and temperature $T_0 = T_\infty = 142.2$ K with T_∞ being the free stream temperature. The isothermal surface with $T_w = 300$ K and fully diffuse gas-wall interaction is adopted. The simulation configuration has been presented in Section 4, and the spatial domain is discretized by 372,500 hexahedral cells as shown in Fig. 3.

The velocity domain is truncated to a sphere with radius $12.2\sqrt{RT_0}$, centered at $(0.866\sqrt{RT_0}, 0.5\sqrt{RT_0}, 0)$. Structured meshes with refinement around the stagnation and free stream velocity points are used, with centers of $(0, 0, 0)$ and $(5.12\sqrt{RT_0}, 2.96\sqrt{RT_0}, 0)$ and lengths of $5\sqrt{RT_0}$ and $3.6\sqrt{RT_0}$, respectively. The rest of the velocity space is partitioned into 8,166 tetrahedral and hexahedral cells, see Fig. 1(b). Fig. 1(a) shows that the velocity domain is truncated to a sphere centered at $(0, 0, 0)$ with radius $20\sqrt{RT_0}$. In the same way, unstructured meshes with refinement around the stagnation and free stream velocity points are used, which result in 27,704 tetrahedral cells in the velocity domain discretization. In this paper, the velocity space discretization in Fig. 1(b) is adopted, and the calculated results are consistent with those in Fig. 1(a). The computational resources required in the simulations include $N_x \times N_v = 128 \times 1$ cores and 487 GB RAM.

We first analyze how the convergence criteria (26) affect the final solution. In the previous paper [22], we have rigorously analyzed that the GSIS has the fast-convergence property, which means that the solution converges even when ϵ in Eq. (26) is large. This is indeed supported in the dimensionless macroscopic quantities along the symmetry axis in Fig. 7. In the near-continuum flow regime ($Kn = 0.0012$), in the windward region, it is seen that the solutions of density, flow velocity and translational temperature converge, when the maximum relative error is as low as $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$. In the leeward region, the solutions converge even when the maximum relative error is around $\epsilon = 10^{-3} \sim 10^{-4}$, which corresponds to only 13 iteration steps. In the transition regime ($Kn = 0.1$), the solutions can be seen converged after 34 iterations, when the maximum relative error is again around $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$.

The first row in Figure 7 compares our results of the windward side density, flow velocity and total temperature along the symmetry axis with those solved by AUGKWP [21] when $Kn = 0.0012$. The good agreement between the two methods proves the accuracy of GSIS. It should be noted that the Knudsen number in Ref. [21] is 0.001 due to a different definition. Therefore, we show the distributions of dimensionless density, local Mach number,




Figure 7: Comparison of the dimensionless macroscopic quantities along the symmetry axis (z -axis) obtained under different convergence criteria, when $Ma = 5$. (1st and 3rd rows) windward region from $(-3.0, 0, 0)$ to $(0, 0, 0)$ and (2nd and 4th rows) leeward region from $(1.8, 1.2, 0)$ to $(3.0, 1.8, 0)$. The Knudsen number in the first and last two rows are $Kn = 0.0012$ and 0.1 , respectively.

Table 4: The computational costs for the simulations of the hypersonic flow passing Apollo ($Ma = 5$) at different Knudsen numbers. The same spatial grid cells are adopted in both GSIS and AUGKWP. The total wall clock time in GSIS including those spent on initial flow field calculation (1000 steps of macroscopic Euler solver followed by 10 steps of kinetic solver) and GSIS iterations.

Kn	AUGKWP [21]		GSIS		
	Cores	Wall time (h)	Cores	Steps	Wall times (h)
1	-	-	128	50	0.48
0.1	-	-		66	0.55
0.01	-	-		47	0.36
0.0012	120	6.82		22	0.24




Figure 8: The distributions of dimensionless (a) density, (b) local Mach number, (c) translational and (d) rotational temperatures calculated by GSIS solver for the hypersonic flow passing Apollo, when $Kn = 1$ and $Ma = 5$, and $AoA = 30^\circ$.

translational and rotational temperatures calculated by the GSIS solver in Figs. 8 and 9,

when $Kn = 1$ and 0.0012 , respectively. As the Knudsen number increases, the shock thickness at the windward region increases significantly; meanwhile, the thermal non-equilibrium grows stronger and a distinguishable difference between the translational and rotational temperatures is observed.




Figure 9: The distributions of dimensionless (a) density, (b) local Mach number, (c) translational and (d) rotational temperatures calculated by GSIS solver for the hypersonic flow passing Apollo, when $Kn = 0.0012$ and $Ma = 5$, and $AoA = 30^\circ$.

Table 4 summarizes the computational costs at different Knudsen numbers, and also a comparison with that of AUGKWP [21] simulation when $Kn = 0.0012$. It is seen that the GSIS is efficient across the different degrees of rarefaction, with a converged solution found within dozens of iterations. Particularly, it shows a significant advantage in the near-continuous flow regime, which outperforms the AUGKWP solver by 26 times, in terms of the total CPU hours.

5.3. Hypersonic flow passing an X38-like space vehicle

We consider the hypersonic flow around an X38-like space vehicle at $Ma = 8$, see the back, top and side views in Ref. [41]. To make a fair comparison with the DSMC [39], we use the same gas properties as those in Ref. [39]: $\mu_{ref} = 1.7805 \times 10^{-5} \text{ Pa} \cdot \text{s}$ at $T_{ref} = 300 \text{ K}$ and viscosity index is $\omega = 0.75$. The Knudsen number, which is determined in terms of the reference length $L_0 = 0.1 \text{ m}$, free stream temperature $T_\infty = 56 \text{ K}$ and density ρ_∞ , is chosen to be 0.00443, 0.0443, 0.443, 4.33, respectively. Also, two cases with AoA = 0° and 20° are simulated for each free stream condition. There are 961,080 hexahedral cells used in the spatial discretization, see Fig. 10, and 8,002 structure-unstructured hybrid cells in the discretization of velocity space at AoA = 0° (similar to the Fig. 1(b)), and a similar velocity space with 8,531 cells at AoA = 20° . The computational resources required in the simulations include $N_x \times N_v = 512 \times 1$ cores and 1.32 TB RAM.




Figure 10: Spatial discretization of the hypersonic flow around an X38-like space vehicle, where 961,080 hexahedral cells are generated in total: (left) global view of the simulation domain, (right) meshes on the wall surface.

Figures 11 and 12 plot the distributions of dimensionless density, local Mach number, translational and rotational temperatures, when $Kn = 0.443$ and $Kn = 0.00443$, respectively. The strong and sharp shock layer can be observed in the near continuum case when $Kn = 0.00443$, while the non-equilibrium between translational and rotational temperature still significant. As the Knudsen number increases to 0.443, the bow shock in the windward region becomes much more diffuse, due to the rarefaction effects, e.g., the effective viscosity is larger.

Figure 13 compares the coefficients of aerodynamic lift and drag force calculated by GSIS and DSMC [39]. Good agreement has been obtained. It is shown that the lift coefficient is not sensitive to the degree of rarefaction, while the drag coefficient increases significantly as the Knudsen number increases.

The computational costs for the simulations by GSIS at different Knudsen numbers are listed in Table 5. For all cases, the converged solutions can be obtained within 1 hour on 512 cores, and particularly fast convergence is achieved in near-continuum flows. As




Figure 11: The distributions of dimensionless (a) density, (b) local Mach number, (c) translational and (d) rotational temperatures calculated by GSIS solver for the hypersonic flow passing an X38-like space vehicle, when $\text{Kn} = 0.443$ and $\text{Ma} = 8$, and $\text{AoA} = 20^\circ$.

a comparison, the corresponding cost by the UGKWP method [42] is also shown. The gas employed in simulations by GSIS and UGKWP is nitrogen and argon, respectively. Therefore, if the GSIS is applied to simulate the argon gas where only the translational motion is considered, the simulation time and storage will be reduced by half. Note that in UGKWP the number of spatial cells used is 246,558 for cases with $\text{Kn} = 0.00443$ and 560,593 for the others, which is less than that used in our simulations. Assuming the linear scalability of the UGKWP method when the mesh size is increased to 961,080, it can be found that the GSIS can be faster than UGKWP by about one order of magnitude, see the last column in the table.

5.4. Hypersonic flow passing a space station

Note that the altitude of the space station is usually very high, so that the Knudsen number is large, and the traditional DSMC method is very efficient. However, recently




Figure 12: The distributions of dimensionless (a) density, (b) local Mach number, (c) translational and (d) rotational temperatures calculated by GSIS solver for the hypersonic flow passing an X38-like space vehicle, when $\text{Kn} = 0.00443$ and $\text{Ma} = 8$, and $\text{AoA} = 20^\circ$.

scientists are interested in the falling and disintegration process of the out-of-control space station from outer space to earth as it reaches/exceeds its service life [43]. Therefore, as a test of the parallel performance and simulation capacity, the hypersonic flow passing a space station at $\text{Ma} = 25$ is simulated for $\text{Kn} = 0.01$, which are defined in terms of the reference length $L_0 = 0.01$ m and temperature $T_0 = T_\infty = 142.2$ K with T_∞ being the free stream temperature. The direction of the incoming flow is the positive direction of the Z axis. The isothermal surface with $T_w = 500$ K and fully diffuse gas-wall interaction is adopted. The configuration is shown in Fig. 14. The whole spatial domain is composed of tetrahedron, pentahedron, triangular prism, and hexahedron, with a total of 5,640,776 cells. The velocity domain is truncated to a sphere with diameter $42\sqrt{RT_0}$. Unstructured meshes with refinement around the stagnation and free stream velocity points are used, which result in 31,440 tetrahedral cells in the velocity domain discretization, which is similar to that in




Figure 13: Comparison of the (a) lift and (b) drag coefficients for the hypersonic flow passing an X38-like space vehicle between GSIS solutions and DSMC results [39].

Table 5: The computational costs in simulating the hypersonic flow passing an X38-like space vehicle ($Ma = 8$). The gas employed in simulations by GSIS and UGKWP is nitrogen and argon, respectively. The number of spatial cells used is 961,080 in GSIS and 560,593 (246,558 when $Kn = 0.00443$) in UGKWP [42].

Kn	AoA	UGKWP		GSIS			Speedup ratio *
		Cores	Wall time (h)	Cores	Steps	Wall time (h)	
4.43	0°	640	12.3	512	43	0.31	85.0
0.443	0°		8.22		35	0.24	73.3
0.0443	0°		15.1		46	0.33	98.0
0.00443	0°		6.58		29	0.22	145.7
4.43	20°		11.1		40	0.30	79.2
0.443	20°		8.15		37	0.26	67.1
0.0443	20°		13.6		45	0.32	91.0
0.00443	20°		6.25		38	0.28	108.7

* The speedup ratio quantifies the computational efficiency of GSIS relative to UGKWP in these cases, where the computational time costs of the two schemes are normalized by the corresponding numbers of spatial cells.

Fig. 1(a).

Figure 15 displays the dimensionless density, local Mach number, translational and rotational temperatures at $Ma = 25$ and $Kn = 0.01$. Notice that in this case there is no significant difference between the translational and rotational temperatures. The computational resources required in the simulations include $N_x \times N_v = 2304 \times 4$ cores and 21.5 TB RAM. The initial field is calculated by 4000 steps of macroscopic solver with Euler constitutive relations and 10 steps of kinetic solver. After iterating GSIS for 52 steps, the error ε reaches below 10^{-6} , and the total computational time is 52 minutes.

6. Conclusions

In summary, we have developed an efficient parallel strategy to simulate the multiscale rarefied gas flow based on the gas kinetic equations. Due to the fast-converging property of GSIS, the iteration number of the kinetic equation, which is the most time-consuming part, is reduced to within 100 in the whole range of gas rarefaction. Eventually, the GSIS, which is a deterministic solver that uses a huge number of additional memory due to the discretization of velocity space, can be faster than the adaptive UGKWP method that combines the advantages of the stochastic and deterministic methods, in the simulation of high-speed multiscale flows.

The GSIS framework is easy to implement, since the kinetic and the macroscopic equations can be solved efficiently by mature techniques in computational fluid dynamics. As a matter of fact, we believe that anyone who can write a program to solve the NSF equations can easily write the GSIS solver. Moreover, the GSIS solver is ready to be extended to time-dependent problems [29], where the two-body separation, fluid-solid interactions, and even the ablation can be incorporated. With these developments, we believe that the GSIS can become an indispensable tool in simulating large-scale three-dimensional hypersonic rarefied flows, e.g., in the simulation of the falling and disintegration process of out-of-control space stations.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (12172162) and the “Climbing Program” for Scientific and Technological Innovation in Guangdong (pdjh2023c10701). Simulations are conducted in the Center for Computational Science and Engineering at the Southern University of Science and Technology. The authors thank Prof. Kun Xu in the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology for sharing the mesh of Apollo re-entry capsule and Dr. Liyan Luo in Southern University of Science and Technology for sharing the results of DSMC in 2D lid-driven flow in a square cavity.

References

- [1] R. Votta, A. Schettino, A. Bonfiglioli, Hypersonic high altitude aerothermodynamics of a space re-entry vehicle, *Aerospace Science and Technology* 25 (1) (2013) 253–265.
- [2] M. Ivanov, S. Gimelshein, Computational hypersonic rarefied flows, *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* 30 (1) (1998) 469–505.
- [3] M. A. van de Kerkhof, D. A. Andrei M. Yakunin, M. van Kampen, R. van der Horst, V. Banine, Euv-induced hydrogen plasma: pulsed mode operation and confinement in scanner, *Journal of Micro/Nanopatterning, Materials, and Metrology* 20 (2021) 033801.
- [4] S. Teng, M. Hao, J. X. Liu, X. Bian, Y. H. Xie, K. Liu, Pollutant inhibition in an extreme ultraviolet lithography machine by dynamic gas lock, *Journal of Cleaner Production* 430 (2023) 139664.
- [5] C. Tantos, S. Waroutis, V. Hauer, C. Day, P. Innocente, 3D numerical study of natural gas dynamics in the DTT particle exhaust using the DSMC method, *Nuclear Fusion* 64 (2024) 016019.
- [6] L. Wu, *Rarefied Gas Dynamics: Kinetic Modeling and Multi-Scale Simulation*, Springer, 2022.
- [7] G. A. Bird, *Molecular Gas Dynamics and the Direct Simulation of Gas Flows*, Oxford Science Publications, Oxford University Press Inc, New York, 1994.

- [8] M. T. Ho, L. H. Zhu, L. Wu, P. Wang, Z. L. Guo, Z. H. Li, Y. H. Zhang, A multi-level parallel solver for rarefied gas flows in porous media, *Computer Physics Communications* 234 (2019) 14–25.
- [9] M. H. Gorji, P. Jenny, An efficient particle Fokker–Planck algorithm for rarefied gas flows, *Journal of Computational Physics* 262 (2014) 325–343.
- [10] Y. Zhu, C. Zhong, K. Xu, Implicit unified gas-kinetic scheme for steady state solutions in all flow regimes, *Journal of Computational Physics* 315 (2016) 16–38.
- [11] Y. Zhu, C. Zhong, K. Xu, Unified gas-kinetic scheme with multigrid convergence for rarefied flow study, *Physics of Fluids* 29 (9) (2017).
- [12] X. Xu, Y. Chen, C. Liu, Z. Li, K. Xu, Unified gas-kinetic wave-particle methods v: Diatomic molecular flow, *Journal of Computational Physics* 442 (2021) 110496.
- [13] W. Boscheri, G. Dimarco, High order finite volume schemes with IMEX time stepping for the Boltzmann model on unstructured meshes, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 387 (2021) 114180.
- [14] G. Dimarco, R. Loubère, J. Narski, T. Rey, An efficient numerical method for solving the Boltzmann equation in multidimensions, *Journal of Computational Physics* 353 (2018) 46–81.
- [15] W. Su, L. Zhu, P. Wang, Y. Zhang, L. Wu, Can we find steady-state solutions to multiscale rarefied gas flows within dozens of iterations?, *Journal of Computational Physics* 407 (2020) 109245.
- [16] J. N. Zeng, R. F. Yuan, Y. Zhang, Q. Li, L. Wu, General synthetic iterative scheme for polyatomic rarefied gas flows, *Computers and Fluids* 265 (2023) 105998.
- [17] F. Fei, J. Zhang, J. Li, Z. H. Liu, A unified stochastic particle Bhatnagar-Gross-Krook method for multiscale gas flows, *Journal of Computational Physics* 400 (2020) 108972.
- [18] F. Fei, A time-relaxed Monte Carlo method preserving the Navier-Stokes asymptotics, *Journal of Computational Physics* 486 (2023) 112128.
- [19] K. K. Feng, P. Tian, J. Zhang, F. Fei, D. S. Wen, SPARTACUS: An open-source unified stochastic particle solver for the simulation of multiscale nonequilibrium gas flows, *Computer Physics Communications* 284 (2023) 108607.
- [20] C. Liu, Y. J. Zhu, K. Xu, Unified gas-kinetic wave-particle methods I: Continuum and rarefied gas flow, *Journal of Computational Physics* 401 (2020) 108977.
- [21] Y. Wei, J. Cao, X. Ji, K. Xu, Adaptive wave-particle decomposition in ugkwp method for high-speed flow simulations, *Advances in Aerodynamics* 5 (1) (2023) 25.
- [22] W. Su, L. Zhu, L. Wu, Fast convergence and asymptotic preserving of the general synthetic iterative scheme, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 42 (1) (2020) B1517–B1544.
- [23] C. S. Wang-Chang, G. E. Uhlenbeck, *Transport Phenomena in Polyatomic Gases*, University of Michigan Engineering Research Rept. No. CM-681, 1951.
- [24] V. Rykov, A model kinetic equation for a gas with rotational degrees of freedom, *Fluid Dynamics* 10 (6) (1975) 959–966.
- [25] L. Wu, C. White, T. J. Scanlon, J. M. Reese, Y. H. Zhang, A kinetic model of the Boltzmann equation for non-vibrating polyatomic gases, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 763 (2015) 24–50.
- [26] Q. Li, J. Zeng, W. Su, L. Wu, Uncertainty quantification in rarefied dynamics of molecular gas: rate effect of thermal relaxation, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 917 (2021) A58.
- [27] Q. Li, J. N. Zeng, Z. M. Huang, L. Wu, Kinetic modelling of rarefied gas flows with radiation, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 965 (2023) A13.
- [28] S. Chapman, T. G. Cowling, *The mathematical theory of non-uniform gases: an account of the kinetic theory of viscosity, thermal conduction and diffusion in gases*, Cambridge university press, 1990.
- [29] J. N. Zeng, W. Su, L. Wu, General synthetic iterative scheme for unsteady rarefied gas flows, *Communications in Computational Physics* 34 (2023) 173–207.
- [30] W. Su, Y. Zhang, L. Wu, Multiscale simulation of molecular gas flows by the general synthetic iterative scheme, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 373 (2021) 113548.
- [31] L. Zhu, X. Pi, W. Su, Z. Li, Y. Zhang, L. Wu, General synthetic iteration scheme for nonlinear gas kinetic simulation of multi-scale rarefied gas flows, *Journal of Computational Physics* 430 (2021) 110091.
- [32] R. Yuan, Application and study of multiscale kinetic method applicable for all flow regimes, Ph.D.

- thesis, Northwestern Polytechnical University (2021).
- [33] R. Zhang, S. Liu, J. Chen, C. Zhong, C. Zhuo, A conservative implicit scheme for three-dimensional steady flows of diatomic gases in all flow regimes using unstructured meshes in the physical and velocity spaces (2023). [arXiv:2303.10846](#).
 - [34] R. Zhang, S. Liu, J. Chen, H. Jin, C. Zhuo, C. Zhong, Implicit unified gas-kinetic scheme for steady state solution of hypersonic thermodynamic non-equilibrium flows in all flow regimes, Available at SSRN 4724172.
 - [35] L. Wu, J. M. Reese, Y. H. Zhang, Solving the boltzmann equation deterministically by the fast spectral method: application to gas microflows, *J. Fluid Mech.* 746 (2014) 53–84.
 - [36] K. Mohamed, M. A. Abdelrahman, The modified Rusanov scheme for solving the ultra-relativistic Euler equations, *European Journal of Mechanics-B/Fluids* 90 (2021) 89–98.
 - [37] W. Liu, Y. Zhang, J. Zeng, L. Wu, Further acceleration of multiscale simulation of rarefied gas flow via a generalized boundary treatment, *Journal of Computational Physics* 503 (2024) 112830.
 - [38] G. Karypis, V. Kumar, A fast and high quality multilevel scheme for partitioning irregular graphs, *SIAM Journal on scientific Computing* 20 (1) (1998) 359–392.
 - [39] J. Li, D. Jiang, X. Geng, J. Chen, Kinetic comparative study on aerodynamic characteristics of hypersonic reentry vehicle from near-continuous flow to free molecular flow, *Advances in Aerodynamics* 3 (2021) 1–10.
 - [40] S. Plimpton, M. Gallis, Sparta direct simulation monte carlo (dsmc) simulator, Sandia National Laboratories, USA, see <http://sparta.sandia.gov> (2015).
 - [41] Y. Wei, Y. Zhu, K. Xu, Unified gas-kinetic wave-particle methods vii: diatomic gas with rotational and vibrational nonequilibrium (2022). [arXiv:2211.12922](#).
 - [42] W. Long, Y. Wei, K. Xu, Nonequilibrium flow simulations using unified gas-kinetic wave-particle method (2023). [arXiv:2310.05182](#).
 - [43] Z. Li, A. Peng, J. Wu, Q. Ma, X. Tang, J. Liang, Gas-kinetic unified algorithm for computable modeling of Boltzmann equation for aerothermodynamics during falling disintegration of Tiangong-type spacecraft, in: *AIP Conference Proceedings*, Vol. 2132, AIP Publishing, 2019.







Figure 14: Spatial domain discretization of the hypersonic flow around a space station, where 5,640,776 cells (composed of tetrahedron, pentahedron, triangular prism, and hexahedron) are generated in total.




(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)

Figure 15: The distributions of dimensionless (a) density, (b) local Mach number, (c) translational and (d) rotational temperatures calculated by GSIS solver for the hypersonic flow passing a space station, when $Kn = 0.01$ and $Ma = 25$.