


Remap through Interpolation and Optimization (with application to multi-material ALE hydro)

MFEM Community Workshop
Portland State University,
Sep 10-11, 2025



Vladimir Tomov
B. Lazarov, C. Petra, M. Schmidt
B. Keith, D. Kim




LLNL-PRES-2007197


This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under contract DE-AC52-07NA27344. Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC

The remap problem is theoretically challenging and has high practical importance

- The remap must transfer discrete fields between computational meshes.



Advection-based remap (same topology)



Interpolation-based remap (any topology)

- Our main use case is ALE, but the usability is general.
Ex: general data transfer between codes, projecting experimental data to a mesh, etc.


Requirements:

- c1. Produce accurate and sharp fields, i.e., introduce minimal numerical diffusion.
- c2. Conserve momentum and material volume / mass / total energy.
- c3. Preserve the local min and max bounds of all remapped fields.
- c4. Maintain consistent material coupling, i.e., volume fractions must sum to one.

- Two major approaches – advection (solve PDEs) and interpolation (geometric).

Advection-based remap methods struggle to meet all requirements

- Most remap methods rely on the advection approach.
 - Solving a PDE in pseudotime, defining “physical” motion of quantities (flux form).



- [c2] Gives direct conservation of advected quantities by design.
- [c3] Bounds preservation requires nonlinear limiters.
- [c1] Sharpness requires nonlinear flux steepening (difficult).
- [c4] Material consistency requires tradeoffs (very difficult).
- The remap step is the **primary source of errors** in simulations that involve it.

The problem structure includes many local/global nonlinear constraints and coupling across materials

- Variables of the multi-material system (hydrodynamics case): material indicators, densities, internal energies (per material) & velocity.
 (η_k, ρ_k, e_k, v) , where k is material index
- [c1] Sharpness: minimize the difference between (η_k, ρ_k, e_k, v) and $(\eta_k^0, \rho_k^0, e_k^0, v^0)$.
- [c2] Conservation: linear & nonlinear equalities, global, few of them, coupled.

$$\int_{\Omega} \eta_k = \int_{\Omega^0} \eta_k^0$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \eta_k \rho_k = \int_{\Omega^0} \eta_k^0 \rho_k^0$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \sum \eta_k \rho_k v = \int_{\Omega^0} \sum \eta_k^0 \rho_k^0 v^0$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \eta_k \rho_k e_k + \frac{1}{2} \eta_k \rho_k v^2 = \int_{\Omega^0} \eta_k^0 \rho_k^0 e_k^0 + \frac{1}{2} \eta_k^0 \rho_k^0 (v^0)^2$$

- [c3] Bounds: two linear inequalities per DOF, local, uncoupled.

$$\eta_k(x)^{\min} \leq \eta_k(x) \leq \eta_k(x)^{\max}$$

$$\rho_k(x)^{\min} \leq \rho_k(x) \leq \rho_k(x)^{\max}$$

$$e_k(x)^{\min} \leq e_k(x) \leq e_k(x)^{\max}$$

$$v_c(x)^{\min} \leq v_c(x) \leq v_c(x)^{\max}$$

- [c4] Material coupling: one linear equality per DOF, local, coupled.

$$\sum_k \eta_k(x) = 1$$

We use a 2-step approach that relies on solving a constrained optimization problem


1. Get a sharp initial guess through GSLIB interpolation (no conservation).
 $(\eta_k^0, \rho_k^0, e_k^0, v^0) \rightarrow (\eta_k^*, \rho_k^*, e_k^*, v^*)$
2. Improve the guess (through optimization) to recover all physical properties.

$$\min_x (F(x) = ||x - x^*||), \text{ subject to all constraints; } x = (\eta_k, \rho_k, e_k, v)$$

- Utilize state-of-art optimization methods developed by LLNL & collaborators.
 - Interior point methods with HiOp.
 - Latent Variable Proximal Point (LVPP) method.
 - Main difference: handling bounds constraints.
- Performed as a one-step sweep (no time stepping, no intermediate stages).

Step 1: sharp and bounded initial guess is obtained through GSLIB interpolation

- Existing MFEM capability that has been tested extensively.
 - MFEM already contains a miniapp for FE interpolation performed through GSLIB.
- GSLIB can provide a map between physical point locations.
- GSLIB handles the function evaluation and the required MPI communication.
- The interpolation is sharp [c1].
 - Propagation is limited to at most one element.
- The interpolation is not conservative [c2].
- The bounds are preserved [c3].
- Material consistency is preserved [c4].



GSLIB interpolation example from MFEM


Step 2: tackle the optimization problem with HiOp's interior point methods

- Established optimization library developed by C. Petra at LLNL.
- Conservation constraints [c2] enter as Lagrange multipliers (few of them).
- Bounds constraints [c3] enter as weighted log-barriers.

$$\min_x \max_{\lambda} \left(F(x) + \lambda \left[\int_{\Omega} \eta - \int_{\Omega^0} \eta^0 \right] + \dots + \mu \sum_i \log(x_i - x_i^{\min}) + \mu \sum_i \log(x_i^{\max} - x_i) \right)$$

Equalities are admitted as $\mu \rightarrow 0$.

- Material coupling constraint [c4] is a major challenge.
 - Alternating projection / augmented Lagrangian type of methods.
(decouple the materials / solve each / combine)
Slack variables could be used to keep the solution in the admissible domain.
 - Keep all materials coupled, and rely on linear algebra-based decomposition.
How to compute the Newton step (linearization, Hessian action)?



$$\sum_k \eta_k(x) = 1$$


Step 2: tackle the optimization problem with the Latent Variable Proximal Point method

- Novel approach based on research of B. Keith.
 - Feasibility has been demonstrated simpler problems.
- Conservation constraints [c2] enter as Lagrange multipliers (few of them).
- Bounds constraints [c3] enter as entropy regularization terms.

$$\min_x \max_{\lambda} \left(F(x) + \lambda \left[\int_{\Omega} \eta - \int_{\Omega^0} \eta^0 \right] + \dots + \frac{1}{\mu} H(x) \right), \quad H(x) = \int_{\Omega} (x_i - x_i^{\min}) \log(x_i - x_i^{\min}) + \int_{\Omega} (x_i^{\max} - x_i) \log(x_i^{\max} - x_i)$$

- Form a sequence of solutions (equivalent formulation):

$$x_k = \operatorname{argmin}_x \left(F(x) + \lambda \left[\int_{\Omega} \eta - \int_{\Omega^0} \eta^0 \right] + \dots + \frac{1}{\mu} D_H(x, x_{k-1}) \right)$$




LVPP tests in MFEM: Fracture, Eikonal solver

- The trick: solve for a latent variable, eliminating [c3]: $x^* = \nabla H(x) \in (-\infty, \infty)$
- Inner Newton iteration for x_k : no bounds constraints, mass-matrix dominated.
- Outer iteration for the Lagrange multipliers λ .

- Material coupling constraint [c4]: enforced on the latent variable x^* . Any correction will be in bounds due to the transform.

$$\sum_k \eta_k(x) = 1$$




Remap of scalar L2 GridFunctions

$\min_{\eta} \|\eta - \eta^*\|_{L^2}$, subject to


$$\int_{\Omega_h} \eta = \int_{\Omega_h^0} \eta^0,$$

$$0 \leq \eta_i^{\min} \leq \eta_i \leq \eta_i^{\max} \leq 1, \quad i = 1 \dots N$$




- The initial guess η^* is obtained through interpolation in physical space (*GSLIB*). (interpolated directly at support nodes of the DOFs)
- The min and max in an element K are taken from the elements in intersects.
- Solution existence:
$$\int_{\Omega_h} \eta^{\min} dx \leq \int_{\Omega_h^0} \eta^0 dx \leq \int_{\Omega_h} \eta^{\max} dx$$


Remap of scalar L2 GridFunctions (2D result)




Initial condition




Advection solution (256 RK3)
46s, 9.8e-9 mass error




HiOp solution
1.4s, 2.5e-14 mass error



Initial condition (log)




Advection solution (log)




HiOp solution (log)


Remap of scalar L2 GridFunctions (3D result)



advection solution
mass error: 3.93e-5
time: 68s



HiOp solution
mass error: 2.35e-16
time: 1.9s




LVPP solution
mass error: 1.52e-16
time: 1.2s

Remap of a scalar smooth function: HO convergence + exact mass + correct bounds!


1. Interpolation on the final mesh.
(interpolated solution has wrong mass).
2. Bounds computation.
(interpolated solution is always in bounds).
3. Mass correction.
(optimization – fix mass, preserve bounds).

Q2 - interp		Q2 - opt				
ref	L1 error	rate	mass error	L1 error	rate	mass error
1	2.29E-02		3.10E-04	2.29E-02		6.70E-16
2	4.16E-03	2.46	4.92E-06	4.16E-03	2.46	7.20E-13
3	5.74E-04	2.86	2.13E-07	5.74E-04	2.86	5.77E-15
4	9.16E-05	2.65	4.44E-09	9.16E-05	2.65	5.98E-13
5	1.16E-05	2.98	7.71E-11	1.16E-05	2.98	1.39E-14
6	1.48E-06	2.97	1.25E-12	1.48E-06	2.97	2.04E-14

Q3 - interp		Q3 - opt				
ref	L1 error	rate	mass error	L1 error	rate	mass error
1	5.54E-03		4.19E-04	5.60E-03		8.30E-14
2	6.38E-04	3.12	1.29E-05	6.39E-04	3.13	3.33E-15
3	8.32E-05	2.94	1.22E-07	8.32E-05	2.94	2.60E-13
4	5.17E-06	4.01	3.40E-09	5.17E-06	4.01	3.33E-15
5	3.29E-07	3.97	6.07E-11	3.29E-07	3.97	6.70E-16
6	2.09E-08	3.98	1.00E-12	2.09E-08	3.98	9.68E-13




Smooth solution on the final mesh




Min and Max bounds

Remap of scalar QuadratureFunctions


- There is no advection capability to remap Q-functions directly.
(done through FE projections).
- Same interpolation / optimization method, but for the quadrature points / values.
- Intuitive control over small values / sub-element diffusion.



Initial condition



LVPP solution, zero mass error



LVPP solution (log)

Remap of the (η, ρ, e) coupled system

- Material indicator η is a Q-function.
- Material density ρ is a Q-function.
- Specific internal energy e is an L2 GridFunction.
- Don't form any product fields.
- Bounds are imposed directly on the primal (η, ρ, e) variables (simple).
- The coupling is in the *global* integrals.

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\eta, \rho, e} J(\eta, \rho, e), \\ & \int_{\Omega_h} \eta = \int_{\Omega_h^0} \eta^0, \\ & \int_{\Omega_h} \eta \rho = \int_{\Omega_h^0} \eta^0 \rho^0, \\ & \int_{\Omega_h} \eta \rho e = \int \eta^0 \rho^0 e^0, \\ & 0 \leq \eta_i^{\min} \leq \eta_i \leq \eta_i^{\max} \leq 1, \\ & e_i^{\min} \leq e_i \leq e_i^{\max}, \\ & \rho_i^{\min} \leq \rho_i \leq \rho_i^{\max}. \end{aligned}$$

Remap of the (η, ρ, e) coupled system: all requirements are satisfied on toy benchmarks


Supports indicator+density+energy coupled remap

Max sharpness through physical space interpolation

Direct Q-function remap
(no transitions to FE)
for indicators & densities

Bounds are preserved for indicators / densities / internal energies
(no product fields)

Exact conservation of volume / mass / internal energy




Sub-element diffusion for Q-functions


maximum 2 element diffusion for FE functions

Remap of the (η, ρ, e) system: preservation of constant density and energy


$$\eta \in [10^{-12}, 1]$$



$$\rho \in \{0,7\}$$



$$e \in \{0,10\}$$




Material indicator (Q-function)
* sub-element diffusion
* volume error 1e-13

Constant density (Q-function)
* constant over bool quads
* mass error 1e-12

Constant energy (FE function)
* constant over bool elements
* energy error 1e-11

- Constants are preserved exactly ($\rho = 7, e = 10$).
- Much better intuitive control of tiny volume fractions.


Remap of the (η, ρ, e) system: preservation of constant density and energy



- Matching spatial support for volume / mass /energy.
(Difficult with sharp nonlinear advection methods, especially with tiny indicators)

Remap of the (η, ρ, e) system: pressure control (control over derived fields)


- Pressure $p(\rho, e)$ is a derived (nonlinear) field controlling the physical velocity.
- Additional requirement: avoid numerical oscillations in derived fields.



Remap of the (η, ρ, e) system: pressure control (control over derived fields)

- Approach: interpolate $p_0 \rightarrow p^*$ and include it in the objective.

$$\min_{\eta, \rho, e} (J(\eta, \rho, e) + \|p - p^*\|_{L^2})$$



Remap of the full (η, ρ, e, v) coupled system.

- Material indicator η is a Q-function.
- Material density ρ is a Q-function.
- Specific energy e is an L2 GridFunction.
- Velocity v is an H1 vector GridFunction.
- Don't form any product fields.
- Bounds are imposed directly on the primal (η, ρ, e, v) variables (simple).
- The coupling is in the *global* integrals.

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\eta, \rho, e, v} J(\eta, \rho, e, v) \\ & \int_{\Omega_h} \eta = \int_{\Omega_h^0} \eta^0, \\ & \int_{\Omega_h} \eta \rho = \int_{\Omega_h^0} \eta^0 \rho^0 \\ & \int_{\Omega_h} \eta \rho v = \int \eta^0 \rho^0 v^0 \\ & \int_{\Omega_h} \eta \rho e + \frac{1}{2} \eta \rho v^2 = \int_{\Omega_h^0} \eta^0 \rho^0 e^0 + \frac{1}{2} \eta^0 \rho^0 (v^0)^2 \\ & 0 \leq \eta_i^{\min} \leq \eta_i \leq \eta_i^{\max} \leq 1, \\ & e_i^{\min} \leq e_i \leq e_i^{\max} \\ & \rho_i^{\min} \leq \rho_i \leq \rho_i^{\max} \\ & v_{i,c}^{\min} \leq v_{i,c} \leq v_{i,c}^{\max} \end{aligned}$$

Remap of the full hydro (η, ρ, e, v) system.









Volume interpolated diff: 1.6e-03
Volume optimized diff: 4.4e-15

Mass interpolated diff: 6.2e-03
Mass optimized diff: -8.9e-15

Momentum (1) interpolated diff: 1.4e-03
Momentum (1) optimized diff: 1.1e-15

Total energy interpolated diff: 1.1e-01
Total energy optimized diff: 1.9e-12

Triple Point Q3Q2, single ALE step to uniform mesh at t = 3.5:



Material Indicator

Mass


Internal Energy

Velocity Magnitude

Conclusions

- The optimization approach achieves all requirements.
- Optimization based formulations speeds up the remap process significantly.
- The artificial diffusion is decreased to a single cell.
- The optimization is scalable and easily parallelizable.
- Future work: formulations and algorithms for sum-to-one.





CASC

Center for Applied
Scientific Computing

Disclaimer

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.