

Modular parametric PGD enabling online solution of partial differential equations

Angelo Pasquale^{a,b,*}, Mohammad-Javad Kazemzadeh-Parsi^b, Daniele Di Lorenzo^{a,c}, Victor Champaney^a, Amine Ammar^{b,d}, Francisco Chinesta^{a,d}

^a*ESI Group Chair @ PIMM Lab, Arts et Métiers Institute of Technology, 151 Boulevard de l'Hôpital, Paris, F-75013, France*

^b*LAMPA Lab, Arts et Métiers Institute of Technology, 2 Boulevard du Ronceray BP 93525, Angers cedex 01, 49035, France*

^c*ESI Group, 3 bis Saارين, Parc Icade, Immeuble le Seville, Rungis Cedex, 94528, France*

^d*CNRS@CREATE LTD, 1 Create Way, #08-01 CREATE Tower, Singapore, 138602, Singapore*

Abstract

In the present work, a new methodology is proposed for building surrogate parametric models of engineering systems based on modular assembly of pre-solved modules. Each module is a generic parametric solution considering parametric geometry, material and boundary conditions. By assembling these modules and satisfying continuity constraints at the interfaces, a parametric surrogate model of the full problem can be obtained. In the present paper, the PGD technique in connection with NURBS geometry representation is used to create a parametric model for each module. In this technique, the NURBS objects allow to map the governing boundary value problem from a parametric non-regular domain into a regular reference domain and the PGD is used to create a reduced model in the reference domain. In the assembly stage, an optimization problem is solved to satisfy the continuity constraints at the interfaces. The proposed procedure is based on the

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: `angelo.pasquale@ensam.eu` (Angelo Pasquale),
`javad.kazem@ensam.eu` (Mohammad-Javad Kazemzadeh-Parsi),
`daniele.di_lorenzo@ensam.eu` (Daniele Di Lorenzo), `victor.champaney@ensam.eu`
(Victor Champaney), `amine.ammar@ensam.eu` (Amine Ammar),
`francisco.chinesta@ensam.eu` (Francisco Chinesta)

offline–online paradigm: the offline stage consists of creating multiple pre-solved modules which can be afterwards assembled in almost real-time during the online stage, enabling quick evaluations of the full system response. To show the potential of the proposed approach some numerical examples in heat conduction and structural plates under bending are presented.

Keywords:

Modular parametric, Modular sub-domain, Modular sub-assembly, Parametric macro-element, NURBS-PGD

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Materials and methods	5
2.1	Multi-parametric modularization	7
2.2	Computational work-flow for online real-time simulations . . .	12
3	Results and discussion	13
3.1	Steady state heat conduction	13
3.2	First order plate deformation	17
4	Conclusions	19

1. Introduction

Within the framework of reduced-order models (ROMs), numerous intrusive and non-intrusive techniques have been developed to solve parametrized partial differential equations (pPDEs), for a large variety of engineering applications [1, 2, 3].

Usual techniques are the snapshots-based parametric ROMs (pROMs), which rely on an offline stage where the parametric space is explored computing high-fidelity solutions of the PDE for sampled combinations of parameters values, called sampling points. This stage basically consists of exploring the so-called solution manifold for extracting a reduced approximation basis.

Within the context of the reduced basis method (RBM) [4, 5, 6, 7], the online stage consists of projecting the solution of the full-order model (FOM) over the previously extracted reduced basis and solving the reduced problem.

Other approaches proceed by directly interpolating among the sampled snapshots, extracted orthogonal bases or subspaces [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. This accelerates and simplifies the procedure, at the expense of loosing accuracy since no reduced problem is solved during the online stage. In fact, in many cases, to ensure robustness with respect to parameters variations, the interpolation must be performed on the solution manifold [16, 17, 18, 19]. Otherwise, recent studies suggest new interpolation strategies, such as parametric optimal transport [20].

Another family of approaches is the one coming from the proper generalized decomposition (PGD) [21, 22], where a pPDE is solved accounting for the parameters as extra-coordinates, additionally to usual space and time coordinates. The offline stage, in this context, consists of solving a high-dimensional problem exploiting the separation of variables and defining a fixed-point based iterative algorithm. Recent studies combine the PGD-based parametric solver with NURBS-based geometrical descriptions, allowing to solve efficiently geometrically parametrized PDEs [23, 24]. As a main disadvantage, due to its intrusiveness, the PGD procedure often requires ad hoc implementations which can be difficult in case of large-scale problems or in industrial settings.

All the previously mentioned works share common issues when dealing with large and complex systems, where a single simulation can be excessively expensive computationally. Here, the curse of dimensionality is encountered since such systems often exhibit a high number of parameters, compromising a rich exploration of the parametric space.

To overcome, or at least alleviate, such drawbacks, localized model reduction methods have been proposed, where standard model reduction is combined with multiscale (MS) or domain decomposition (DD) techniques [2, 25]. The primary concept of localized model reduction is the decomposition of the computational domain in modules and the definition of local reduced models, which are coupled across interfaces.

A first example is the usage of finite element tearing and interconnecting (FETI) [26, 27, 28], where the computational domain is divided into smaller subdomains or substructures, and then interconnected using interface degrees of freedom. The compatibility is enforced efficiently regardless of the differences in meshing strategies, making the method suitable for large-scale structures composed of multiple components or materials.

In the context of RBM, one can refer to [29, 30, 31], where authors target many-parameter thermo-mechanical analyses over repeated components

systems. Moreover, in [32], the static condensation reduced basis method has recently been applied to efficiently model parametric wind turbines. The method has also been applied in [33] to model general cellular structures. In [34, 35], several ROMs based on the proper orthogonal decomposition (POD) have been proposed for fluid-dynamics and neutron diffusion problems. Other studies successfully combine domain partitioning strategies with projection-based ROMs and hyper-reduction approaches in nonlinear and chaotic fluid-dynamics settings [36, 37, 38, 39].

Recent works suggest nonlinear manifold ROMs based on modules modeling via neural-networks, sparse autoencoders and hyper-reduction [40]. Also in the framework of physics-informed neural networks, domain decomposition is introduced to tackle large-scale problems [41].

In some works, the interface coupling benefits of standard algorithms developed in the literature of DD. For instance, in [42] the Schwarz alternating method is used to enable ROM-FOM and ROM-ROM coupling in nonlinear solid mechanics. Similarly, in [43] the one-shot overlapping Schwarz approach is applied to component-based MOR of steady nonlinear PDEs. In [44, 45] the transmission problem along the interface is formulated in terms of a Lagrange multiplier representing the interface flux and solved through a dual Schur complement.

In the context of the proper generalized decomposition, subdomain approaches have been proposed in [46, 47, 48, 49]. In [46] a multi-patch NURBS-PGD approach has been developed with the aim of enabling or simplifying the PGD solution of problems defined over complex domains. In [47], the Arlequin method constructs local PGD solutions and uses Lagrange multipliers in overlapping regions to connect the local surrogates. A non-overlapping Dirichlet–Dirichlet method is instead used in [48], where the local surrogates are computed in the offline phase, while an interface problem is solved online to ensure the coupling. In [49], a DD-PGD framework is introduced for linear elliptic PDEs, utilizing an overlapping Schwarz algorithm to connect local surrogate models exhibiting parametric Dirichlet boundary conditions.

In the present work, a general component-based pMOR framework (valuable for intrusive and non-intrusive surrogates) is presented. This is based on decomposing the spatial region in non-overlapping parametric patches. Single-patch parametric solutions are built exploiting, without loss of generality, the NURBS-PGD technique (other surrogate modeling choices could be done over a patch, also snapshots-based such as PODI and sPGD [9, 10, 11]), accounting additionally for parametric boundary conditions, as well as other

parameters related to loading or physics. The full-system parametric solution is then built ensuring the equilibrium of patches across the interfaces, that could make use of any coupling procedure.

The paper is structure as follows. Section 2 is describing the overall procedure. Section 3 shows applications two benchmark problems in computational mechanics. Section 3 gives conclusive remarks and perspectives.

2. Materials and methods

Let us consider a parametric problem \mathcal{P} (i.e., a pPDE) defined over the physical space $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, with $d = 2, 3$, and involving N_p parameters collected in the vector \mathbf{p} . Moreover, problem \mathcal{P} is equipped of suitable boundary conditions on the boundary of the domain $\partial\Omega$.

For the sake of illustration, but without loss of generality, let us initially suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ (the physical coordinates are denoted with $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2)$) is decomposable in a number of non-overlapping parametric domains (three in our illustration), which can be seen as a macro-element (each part may have its own model and/or geometric parameters). This means that Ω is expressed as $\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^3 \Omega_i$ and the modules intersect only on their interface, that means $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j = \gamma_i$ or $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j = \emptyset$ based on whether or not the modules are contiguous, as illustrated in figure 1. For instance, for the illustrated example, only two interfaces γ_1 and γ_2 exist.




Figure 1: Modularisation of the parametric problem \mathcal{P} defined on domain Ω and parameter vector \mathbf{p} into a set of some pre-solved sub-problems \mathcal{P}_i defined on Ω_i considering parameter vector \mathbf{p}_i .

The initial problem \mathcal{P} involving N_p parameters is recast in terms of three sub-problems \mathcal{P}_i defined over the modules Ω_i and involving $N_{p,i} < N_p$ parameters, respectively.

Many possible methods have been discussed in the introduction to address the parametric sub-problems. This study will employ the NURBS-PGD approach, extensively detailed in our previous works, across a wide range of

engineering applications, encompassing three-dimensional problems on non-simply connected domains [23, 24, 46]. This mostly consists of two steps: (a) a NURBS-based geometry mapping from Ω to the reference square $\bar{\Omega}$ (the reference coordinates are denoted with $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \xi_2)$) and (b) the PGD-based computation of a parametric solution $u_i^h(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{p}_i)$ (and, consequently, $u_i^h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}_i)$) related to the local problem \mathcal{P}_i , characterized by the parameters collected into the vector \mathbf{p}_i . The two steps are schematically summarized in figure 2.




Figure 2: Using the NURBS-PGD technique to map the parametric modules (sub-problems) into a regular (hyper-cubic) computational space and then solving it.

A less direct task is the reconstruction of the parametric solution $u^h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ of \mathcal{P} starting from the local parametric solutions $u_i^h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}_i)$ of \mathcal{P}_i . Indeed, the parametric solutions on the different modules Ω_i must be assembled across the internal interfaces to reconstruct the response over the whole domain Ω .

The modules Ω_i have internal boundaries defined from the common interfaces as $\Gamma_1 = \gamma_1$, $\Gamma_2 = \gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$ and $\Gamma_3 = \gamma_2$, respectively. Each subproblem \mathcal{P}_i inherits from \mathcal{P} the equations and the imposed boundary conditions over $\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_i$. Moreover, each \mathcal{P}_i needs to be equipped of suitable interface conditions (or transmission conditions) over Γ_i in order to satisfy the global problem \mathcal{P} .

In the parametric context, the interface conditions must be taken into account within the parametric sub-models. Indeed, the global solution is obtained by the particularization of local solutions at parameters' values, followed by the interfaces equilibrium. To tackle this point, the PGD has the chief advantage to solve BVPs with parametric boundary conditions, treating them as problem extra-coordinates. Following this rationale, the local parametric solutions will be expressed as $u_i^h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i)$, where the vector

α_i accounts for the boundary conditions imposed over the patch Ω_i , namely the interface conditions.

As an additional remark, in case of modules sharing topology and parameters, a single parametric sub-model is built and replicated in the assembly of the full system. For instance, as shown in figure 3, the module Ω'' can be obtained from Ω' defining local frames and opportune translations, rotations and reflections. This is what occurs, for instance, in the case of Ω_1 and Ω_3 , which are modeled through a single reference module.




Figure 3: Two modules sharing topology and parameters.

All the details about the parametric modularization and assembly proposed in this work will be given in subsection 2.1.

2.1. Multi-parametric modularization

Let us consider the general case of a parametric problem \mathcal{P} rewritten in terms of P parametric sub-problems \mathcal{P}_p .

The methodology can be summarized with the following steps:

1. define the interfaces skeleton by modules decomposition;
2. identify the model parameters of each module including the parameters considering the geometry, material, model and boundary conditions;
3. assume a reduced model of the interface conditions (Neumann or Dirichlet);
4. find a parametric solution for each module, including a parametrization of the interface condition and the model/geometrical parameters;
5. impose the equilibrium among the modules to determine the global solution.

These steps will be explained in detail in the subsections here below.

Interfaces skeleton. The domain Ω is decomposed in P non-overlapping modules Ω_p and in S internal interfaces γ_s , $s = 1, \dots, S$, linking the different components and characterizing the structure skeleton Γ . This is sketched in figure 4, considering modules as squares. However, as explained previously, any complex shape can be mapped into the square using single-patch or multi-patch NURBS [24].

Let us denote with \mathcal{S}_p the set of indices associated with the internal interfaces characterizing Ω_p . This means that $\partial\Omega_p = \Gamma_p \cup \bigcup_{s \in \mathcal{S}_p} \gamma_s$, where $\Gamma_p = \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega_p$ is the external part of the boundary.

Moreover, let \mathcal{V}_s the set of indices of modules sharing the interface γ_s . That is, if $\gamma_s = \partial\Omega_l \cap \partial\Omega_m$ then $\mathcal{V}_s = \{l, m\}$. Without loss of generality, this is sketched in figure 5.




Figure 4: Large structure composed by P modules linked by S interfaces.




Figure 5: Two modules sharing the same interface γ_s .

Single part parameters. Each part composing the entire structure has its own parameters, collected into the vector \mathbf{p}_p . The parametric sub-problem \mathcal{P}_p is the restriction of the global problem \mathcal{P} to Ω_p . However, this must be equipped of suitable boundary conditions.

To this purpose, let us suppose that the kinematics at its boundary γ_s , with $s \in \mathcal{S}_p$, can be reduced to a set of coefficients collected in the vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_s$. This means that the whole skeleton reduced kinematics is obtained considering all the internal interface coefficients, that is $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_S)$.

Figure 6 shows the definition of a parametric module.




Figure 6: Parametric sub-components including parametric boundary conditions.

Part reduced model: parametric transfer function. Each sub-problem \mathcal{P}_p can be solved using the NURBS-PGD method (among other metamodelling strategies), where the parameters \mathbf{p}_p and the reduced skeleton kinematics $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ are treated as additional coordinates. The parametric transfer function allows the computation of the related thermo-mechanical fields, like the temperature/displacement contour

$$\mathbf{u}|_p = \mathbf{u}|_p(\mathbf{p}_p, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_s), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}_p. \quad (1)$$

In particular, the fluxes/forces at the interface γ_s characterizing the part Ω_p can be extracted

$$\mathbf{F}|_s^p = \mathbf{F}|_s^p(\mathbf{p}_p, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_s), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}_p.$$

Enforcing the interface equilibrium. The skeleton kinematics $\mathbf{u}|_\Gamma$ is univocally determined by its reduced representation $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$. For a new choice of parameters \mathbf{p}_p , the compatibility of interface fields must be enforced to determine the correct kinematics $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^*$. This amounts to minimize a given cost function $\mathcal{C}|_\Gamma$ which depends upon the problem at hand.

In structural mechanics, an example of cost function $\mathcal{C}|_\Gamma$ can be the sum of forces (and momentums if needed) at all the interfaces γ_s (in a thermal

problem, this can be the equilibrium of fluxes), that is

$$\sum_{s=1}^S \mathcal{C}|_{\gamma_s} = \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{p \in \mathcal{V}_s} \mathbf{F}|_s^p = \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{p \in \mathcal{V}_s} \mathbf{F}|_s^p(\mathbf{p}_p, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_s).$$

For instance, considering two modules \mathcal{P}_l and \mathcal{P}_m sharing the interface γ_s , this stage consists of determining the coefficients $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*$ minimizing the cost function \mathcal{C} at the interface γ_s . This is illustrated in figure 7.




Figure 7: Compatibility of interface between two modules.

Iterative scheme For an arbitrary choice of the skeleton kinematics $\mathbf{A}_0 = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1^0, \dots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_S^0)$, certainly the equilibrium is not satisfied at all the interfaces γ_s . Thus, we assume the existence of at least one interface violating the equilibrium, e.g. γ_s

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{V}_s} \mathbf{F}|_s^p(\mathbf{p}_p, \mathbf{A}_0) \neq \mathbf{0}.$$

In what follows the unbalanced forces at each interface will be noted \mathbf{R}_s ,

$$\mathbf{R}_s = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{V}_s} \mathbf{F}|_s^p(\mathbf{p}_p, \mathbf{A}_0), \quad \forall s = 1, \dots, S.$$

In order to equilibrate the system one should modify the skeleton kinematics, $\mathbf{A}_0 + \Delta \mathbf{A}$ (that is, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_s^0 + \Delta \boldsymbol{\alpha}_s$, $\forall s = 1, \dots, S$), in order to satisfy the equilibrium everywhere, we should enforce

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{V}_s} \mathbf{F}|_s^p(\mathbf{p}_p, \mathbf{A}_0 + \Delta \mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \forall s = 1, \dots, S$$

with

$$\mathbf{F}|_s^p(\mathbf{p}_p, \mathbf{A}_0 + \Delta \mathbf{A}) \approx \mathbf{F}|_s^p(\mathbf{p}_p, \mathbf{A}_0) + \left. \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}|_s^p(\mathbf{p}_p, \mathbf{A})}{\partial \mathbf{A}} \right|_{\mathbf{A}_0} \Delta \mathbf{A},$$

leading to the Newton-Raphson iterate

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{V}_s} \left. \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}|_s^p(\mathbf{p}_p, \mathbf{A})}{\partial \mathbf{A}} \right|_{\mathbf{A}_0} \Delta \mathbf{A} = -\mathbf{R}_s,$$

that can be assembled in a linear system

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M}_{11}(\mathbf{p}_{11}) & \mathbf{M}_{11}(\mathbf{p}_{12}) & \cdots & \mathbf{M}_{1S}(\mathbf{p}_{1S}) \\ \mathbf{M}_{21}(\mathbf{p}_{21}) & \mathbf{M}_{21}(\mathbf{p}_{22}) & \cdots & \mathbf{M}_{2S}(\mathbf{p}_{2S}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{M}_{S1}(\mathbf{p}_{S1}) & \mathbf{M}_{S1}(\mathbf{p}_{S2}) & \cdots & \mathbf{M}_{SS}(\mathbf{p}_{SS}) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta \alpha_1 \\ \Delta \alpha_2 \\ \vdots \\ \Delta \alpha_S \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{R}_1 \\ \mathbf{R}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{R}_S \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{M}_{ij} contains the contributions of interface γ_j on interface γ_i , and consequently the parameters \mathbf{p}_{ij} involved are the ones related to the part that involves interfaces γ_i and γ_j , with $\mathbf{M}_{ij} = \mathbf{0}$ if no part contains both interfaces γ_i and γ_j .

Remark. System (2) only involves few hundred of equations and consequently can be solved extremely fast. However, in case of many interfaces, its assembly requires the evaluation of the cost function and computation of the gradient (with respect to the parameters), in an iterative setting. Thus, if solved online, the real-time response in some scenarios could be compromised (this is the case for any optimization in high dimension).

A valuable route consists of solving thousands of times (offline) the system (2) for a diversity of choices of parameters $\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_P$, for computing the associated kinematics $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_P)$. For that purpose powerful regression techniques could be employed, e.g. neural networks-based deep learning.

Another valuable route could be representing the different values of \mathbf{A}_k , related to the parameter choice $\mathbf{p}_1^k, \dots, \mathbf{p}_P^k$, to check its intrinsic dimensionality, by employing for example manifold learning (such as the kPCA [50] or LLE [51], for instance) or even auto-encoders. The main interest of such a reduction is the possibility of employing regularized regressions, such as the sPGD [9, 10, 14].

Remark. The methodology requires to increase the number of parameters since the boundary conditions of single patches are parametric. However, this

does not face the curse of dimensionality contrarily to full-structure based modeling. Indeed, considering a structure composed by P modules each one involving N_p parameters, the total number of parameters in the problem is PN_p . Let us split the full problem in P sub-problems involving N_p parameters each and R additional parameters for the interface conditions. Then, the total number of parameters in each local problem is $N_p + R$. Even in the case in which $N_p + R$ is comparable with PN_p , the methodology is convenient since all local models are all built in parallel over simple geometries. In target applications involving many modules and many parameters parameters by modules $N_p + R \ll PN_p$ and $R \ll N_p$ ensuring the good scalability of the algorithm.

2.2. Computational work-flow for online real-time simulations

The global proposed workflow consists of:

1. offline stage:
 - (a) structure decomposition in a number of modules and determination of the interfaces;
 - (b) creation of a reduced model of the interface conditions: this can be achieved via an a priori parametrization; otherwise, one can compute some high-fidelity solutions of \mathcal{P} for some parameters' combinations and determine the principal modes on the skeleton composed by the interfaces;
 - (c) construction of the parametric solutions for each problem \mathcal{P}_p , for $p = 1, \dots, P$ (this step is performed efficiently in parallel);
2. online stage:
 - (a) choosing the model parameters $\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_P$;
 - (b) use the part parametric transfer function (1), $\mathbf{u}|_p = \mathbf{u}|_p(\mathbf{p}_p, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_s)$ for each module;
 - (c) find the interface parameters ensuring the global equilibrium of modules.

Remark. As previously remarked, during the offline stage, one could perform also the modules assembling by enforcing the interfaces equilibrium. This can be done for many choices of the parameters \mathbf{p} to determine the regression $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_P)$. In this case, in the online stage one can directly compute the skeleton kinematics from the already constructed vademecum $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_P)$.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Steady state heat conduction

A first example is a design problem in 2D steady state conduction. The domain is a curved corner L-shaped geometry having 6 shape parameters $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_6)$, as illustrated in figure 8. Moreover the inlet and outlet fluxes q_1 and q_2 are parametric and described by 3 coefficients, that is $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text{in}} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text{out}} = (\beta_4, \beta_5, \beta_6)$, respectively. Null flux and fixed temperature are considered as boundary conditions for the outer and inner wall, respectively. Denoting with $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text{in}}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text{out}})$ the vector collecting the parameters related to the boundary conditions, the sought parametric solution has 12 parameters and can be written as $u(x, y, \mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, therefore u is a function defined in a 14 dimensions space.




Figure 8: Steady state conduction problem set-up.

The problem is decomposed in three parametric sub-problems \mathcal{P}_i defined over Ω_i , for $i = 1, \dots, 3$, having the corresponding geometrical parameters \mathbf{p}_i . Moreover, the internal interfaces γ_1 and γ_2 are treated considering a parametric flux profile still described with 3 parameters, as shown in figure 9. For instance, the interface condition between the domain Ω_i and Ω_j is an imposed flux depending upon the parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{ij} = (\alpha_1^{ij}, \alpha_2^{ij}, \alpha_3^{ij})$.

Since problems \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_3 exhibit exactly the same parameters' dependency, they can be reduced to a single parametric problem $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ as shown in




Figure 9: Parametric patches decomposition.

figure 10, where both inlet and outlet fluxes are parametric. The angle θ_k represents the rotation of the domain to be considered for the assembly within the global system.

Letting $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = (\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{p}_2, \tilde{p}_3)$ the geometrical parameters and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ the ones related to the parametric flux, the sought solution of $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is $\tilde{u}(x, y, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ with 9 parameters. The solution u_i of \mathcal{P}_i , for $i = \{1, 3\}$, is simply the particularization of \tilde{u} at the correct parameters values, that is $u_i = \tilde{u}(x, y, \mathbf{p}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i)$, where

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{p}_1 = (a_1, c_1, b_1), \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 = (\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text{in}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{12}), \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{p}_3 = (a_3, b_3, c_3), \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_3 = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{23}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text{out}}). \end{cases}$$

In the same way, the solution of problem \mathcal{P}_2 has 2 geometrical parameters $\mathbf{p}_2 = (a_2, b_2)$ and 6 parameters for the inlet and outlet fluxes, that is $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{12}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{23}$, respectively.




Figure 10: Reference sub-problem for \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_3 .

The three parametric sub-solutions finally read

$$\begin{cases} u_1(x, y, \mathbf{p}_1, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text{in}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{12}), \\ u_2(x, y, \mathbf{p}_2, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{12}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{23}), \\ u_3(x, y, \mathbf{p}_3, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{23}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text{out}}), \end{cases}$$

and the global solution $u(x, y, \mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is obtained by assembly. To this purpose, one must ensure the geometric constraint fixing $a_1 = b_2 = c_3 = p_4$ and, for a given choice of parameters, minimize the temperature jumps at the interface, by solving

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{12}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{23}} (\|u_1 - u_2\|_{2, \gamma_1} + \|u_2 - u_3\|_{2, \gamma_2}),$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{2, \gamma_i}$ denotes the Euclidean norm at the interface γ_i .

In this example, the geometrical parameters are chosen varying in $[1, 3]$ while all the coefficients of flux profiles have range $[-100, 100]$. The meta-models \tilde{u} (i.e., u_1 and u_3) and u_2 are computed in parallel, employing the NURBS-PGD method. Each direction (space and parameters ones) is discretized in 51 nodes, yielding a total number of DOFs of 51^{11} and 51^{10} for $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ and \mathcal{P}_2 , respectively. This is possible thanks to the usage of PGD-based separated representations.

Figure 11 shows 12 snapshots of the sub-solutions for different combinations of the parameters. This can be seen as a catalog of patches which can suitably be combined in the global assembly to evaluate several designs of the curved L -shape geometry of figure 8.




Figure 11: 12 snapshots of parametric sub-solutions.




Figure 12: 6 snapshots of the assembled parametric solution.

3.2. First order plate deformation

Let us consider a thin elastic plate composed of two modules with different geometry and material properties, as shown in figure 13. The plate is clamped along one edge (homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition), while along the left and right edges a distributed out-of-plane loading is applied. The upper edge has a traction-free boundary condition (homogeneous Neumann). The mechanical problem \mathcal{P} has 17 geometric and model parameters resumed in table, with also the corresponding ranges 1.




Figure 13: Plate problem set-up.

Length	Thickness	Young Modulus	Poisson Ratio	Force
a_1, b_1, c_1, a_2, c_2	h_1, h_2	E_1, E_2	ν_1, ν_2	β_1, \dots, β_6
[0.1, 0.3]	[0.001, 0.01]	$[100, 300] \cdot 10^9$	0.2, 0.4	$[-1, -1] \cdot 10^4$

Table 1: Problem parameters and ranges.

Each out-of-plane force $F_{z,i}$, for $i = 1, 2$ is assumed depending upon 3 coefficients β_i . The two plates share the interface γ_1 whose length is determined by the parameter c_1 .

The plate is modeled through the first order Kirchhoff theory, which expresses the displacement field in terms of the middle plane kinematic variables w , θ_x and θ_y ,

$$\begin{cases} u(x, y, z) = z\theta_y(x, y) \\ v(x, y, z) = -z\theta_x(x, y) \\ w(x, y, z) = w(x, y) \end{cases}$$

where θ_x and θ_y are the angles defining the rotation of the normal vector to the middle surface and w is the vertical displacement (deflection).

Following the same procedure, problem \mathcal{P} can be split in two sub-problems which can be reduced to the same parametric module $\tilde{\Omega}$, as resumed in figure 14.




Figure 14: From modules to a reference parametric patch.

In this way, the original problem is reduced to a single problem $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ having 12 parameters, and the two particularized sub-solutions can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u}_1(x, y, z, \mathbf{p}_1, \boldsymbol{\beta}_1, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{12}), \\ \mathbf{u}_2(x, y, z, \mathbf{p}_2, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{12}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_2), \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{p}_i = (a_i, b_i, c_i, h_i, E_i, \nu_i)$ for $i = \{1, 2\}$.

Finally, the assembly is performed imposing the geometrical constraint $c_1 = b_2 = c_3$ and the minimization of the displacement jump at the interface, that is

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{12}} \|\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_{2, \gamma_1},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{2, \gamma_1}$ denotes the Euclidean norm at the interface γ_1 .

For instance, figure 15 shows the assembled solution when choosing the following parameters values

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{p}_1 = (0.3, 0.15, 0.2, 0.01, 100 \cdot 10^9, 0.3), & \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 = (7 \cdot 10^3, 7 \cdot 10^3, 7 \cdot 10^3), \\ \mathbf{p}_2 = (0.2, 0.2, 0.25, 0.01, 200 \cdot 10^9, 0.3), & \boldsymbol{\beta}_2 = (0, -7 \cdot 10^3, -7 \cdot 10^3). \end{cases}$$




Figure 15: Plate bending from different isometric views.

4. Conclusions

In this work a novel methodology to build parametric surrogates in high-dimensional problems has been proposed.

The method is based on a modularization of the domain in non-overlapping parametric modules which are treated separately and simultaneously (in the sense of parallel computing). The arising sub-solutions can be assembled in the global system by means of a suitable minimization ensuring the compatibility at the modules interfaces.

The replicability of the modules is the most appealing feature of the technique, which can be exploited for the quick design and performance evaluation. This may be useful in many industrial and large-scale applications, which are being addressed in our current research. In particular, special care is paid to the minimization step, which is fundamental to ensure a real-time response.

Declarations

Availability of data and material

Interested reader can contact authors.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author's contributions

All the authors participated in the definition of techniques and algorithms.

Acknowledgements

Authors acknowledge the support of the ESI Group through its research chair CREATE-ID at Arts et Métiers ParisTech.

This research is part of the program DesCartes and is supported by the National Research Foundation, Prime Minister's Office, Singapore under its Campus for Research Excellence and Technological Enterprise (CREATE) program.

References

- [1] P. Benner, M. Ohlberger, A. Cohen, K. Willcox, Model Reduction and Approximation, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 2017. arXiv:<https://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/1.9781611974829>, doi:10.1137/1.9781611974829. URL <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611974829>
- [2] G. Rozza, M. Hess, G. Stabile, M. Tezzele, F. Ballarin, C. Gräßle, M. Hinze, S. Volkwein, F. Chinesta, P. Ladeveze, Y. Maday, A. Patera, C. Farhat, S. Grimberg, A. Manzoni, A. Quarteroni, A. Buhr, L. Iapichino, J. Kutz, Volume 2 Snapshot-Based Methods and Algorithms, De Gruyter, 2020. doi:10.1515/9783110671490.
- [3] G. Rozza, M. Hess, G. Stabile, M. Tezzele, F. Ballarin, C. Gräßle, M. Hinze, S. Volkwein, F. Chinesta, P. Ladeveze, Y. Maday, A. Patera, C. Farhat, S. Grimberg, A. Manzoni, A. Quarteroni, A. Buhr, L. Iapichino, J. Kutz, Model Order Reduction: Volume 3: Applications, De Gruyter, 2020. doi:doi:10.1515/9783110499001.

- [4] J. S. Hesthaven, G. Rozza, B. Stamm, Certified Reduced Basis Methods for Parametrized Partial Differential Equations, SpringerBriefs in Mathematics, Springer International Publishing, 2015, the final publication is available at Springer via <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22470-1>. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-22470-1.
URL <https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-01223456>
- [5] A. Quarteroni, A. Manzoni, F. Negri, Reduced basis methods for partial differential equations: An introduction, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-15431-2.
- [6] M. Ohlberger, S. Rave, Reduced basis methods: Success, limitations and future challenges, arXiv: Numerical Analysis (2015).
- [7] K. Urban, The Reduced Basis Method in Space and Time: Challenges, Limits and Perspectives, Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 2023, pp. 1–72. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-29563-8_1.
URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-29563-8_1
- [8] D. Borzacchiello, J. V. Aguado, F. Chinesta, Non-intrusive sparse subspace learning for parametrized problems, Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering 26 (07 2017). doi:10.1007/s11831-017-9241-4.
- [9] R. Ibáñez Pinillo, E. Abisset-Chavanne, A. Ammar, D. González, E. Cueto, A. Huerta, J. Duval, F. Chinesta, A multidimensional data-driven sparse identification technique: The sparse proper generalized decomposition, Complexity 2018 (2018) 1–11. doi:10.1155/2018/5608286.
- [10] A. Sancarlos, V. Champany, E. Cueto, F. Chinesta, Regularized regressions for parametric models based on separated representations, Advanced Modeling and Simulation in Engineering Sciences 10 (03 2023). doi:10.1186/s40323-023-00240-4.
- [11] V. Champany, F. Chinesta, E. Cueto, Engineering empowered by physics-based and data-driven hybrid models: A methodological overview, International Journal of Material Forming 15 (05 2022). doi:10.1007/s12289-022-01678-4.

- [12] N. Demo, M. Tezzele, G. Rozza, A non-intrusive approach for the reconstruction of pod modal coefficients through active subspaces, *Comptes Rendus Mécanique* 347 (11) (2019) 873–881, data-Based Engineering Science and Technology. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crme.2019.11.012>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1631072119301834>
- [13] A. Pasquale, V. Champany, Y. Kim, N. Hascoët, A. Ammar, F. Chinesta, A parametric metamodel of the vehicle frontal structure accounting for material properties and strain-rate effect: application to full frontal rigid barrier crash test, *Heliyon* 8 (2022) e12397. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e12397.
- [14] A. Schmid, A. Pasquale, C. Ellersdorfer, V. Champany, M. Raffler, S. Guévelou, S. Kizio, M. Ziane, F. Feist, F. Chinesta, Pgd based meta modelling of a lithium-ion battery for real time prediction, *Frontiers in Materials (Computational Materials Science)* 10 (08 2023). doi:10.3389/fmats.2023.1245347.
- [15] A. Schmid, A. Pasquale, C. Ellersdorfer, M. Raffler, V. Champany, M. Ziane, F. Chinesta, F. Feist, Mechanical characterization of li-ion cells and the calibration of numerical models using proper generalized decomposition, *Proceedings of the ASME 2023 International Mechanical Engineering Congress and Exposition IMECE2023* (11 2023).
- [16] D. Amsallem, C. Farhat, Interpolation method for adapting reduced-order models and application to aeroelasticity, *Aiaa Journal - AIAA J* 46 (2008) 1803–1813. doi:10.2514/1.35374.
- [17] O. Friderikos, E. Baranger, M. Olive, D. Néron, On the stability of pod basis interpolation via grassmann manifolds for parametric model order reduction in hyperelasticity (2020). arXiv:2012.08851.
- [18] K. Vlachas, K. Tatsis, K. Agathos, A. R. Brink, E. Chatzi, A local basis approximation approach for nonlinear parametric model order reduction, *Journal of Sound and Vibration* 502 (2021) 116055. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsv.2021.116055>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022460X21001279>

- [19] R. Zimmermann, Manifold interpolation and model reduction (2022). [arXiv:1902.06502](https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.06502).
- [20] S. Torregrosa, V. Champaney, A. Ammar, V. Herbert, F. Chinesta, Surrogate parametric metamodel based on optimal transport, *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation* 194 (11 2021). doi:10.1016/j.matcom.2021.11.010.
- [21] F. Chinesta, A. Ammar, E. Cueto, Recent advances and new challenges in the use of the proper generalized decomposition for solving multidimensional models, *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering* 17 (2010) 327–350. doi:10.1007/s11831-010-9049-y.
- [22] F. Chinesta, R. Keunings, A. Leygue, *The Proper Generalized Decomposition for Advanced Numerical Simulations: A Primer*, 2014. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-02865-1.
- [23] M.-J. Kazemzadeh-Parsi, A. Ammar, J. Duval, F. Chinesta, Enhanced parametric shape descriptions in pgd-based space separated representations, *Advanced Modeling and Simulation in Engineering Sciences* 8 (12 2021). doi:10.1186/s40323-021-00208-2.
- [24] M.-J. Kazemzadeh-Parsi, A. Pasquale, D. Di Lorenzo, V. Champaney, A. Ammar, F. Chinesta, Nurbs-based shape parametrization enabling pgd-based space separability: Methodology and application, *Finite Elements in Analysis and Design* 227 (2023) 104022. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.finel.2023.104022>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168874X23001154>
- [25] A. Buhr, L. Iapichino, M. Ohlberger, S. Rave, F. Schindler, K. Smetana, Localized model reduction for parameterized problems (2019). [arXiv:1902.08300](https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.08300).
- [26] C. Farhat, F.-X. Roux, A method of finite element tearing and interconnecting and its parallel solution algorithm, *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* 32 (6) (1991) 1205–1227. [arXiv:https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/nme.1620320604](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/nme.1620320604), doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/nme.1620320604>.

URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/nme.1620320604>

- [27] C. Farhat, F.-X. Roux, An unconventional domain decomposition method for an efficient parallel solution of large-scale finite element systems, *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing* 13 (1) (1992) 379–396. arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1137/0913020>, doi:10.1137/0913020.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/0913020>
- [28] C. Farhat, J. Mandel, F. X. Roux, Optimal convergence properties of the feti domain decomposition method, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 115 (3) (1994) 365–385. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0045-7825\(94\)90068-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0045-7825(94)90068-X).
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S004578259490068X>
- [29] D. Huynh, D. Knezevic, A. Patera, A static condensation reduced basis element method: approximation and a posteriori error estimation, *European Series in Applied and Industrial Mathematics (ESAIM): Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis* 47 (01 2013). doi:10.1051/m2an/2012022.
- [30] L. Iapichino, A. Quarteroni, G. Rozza, Reduced basis method and domain decomposition for elliptic problems in networks and complex parametrized geometries, *Computers & Mathematics with Applications* 71 (1) (2016) 408–430. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2015.12.001>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0898122115005696>
- [31] E. Zappon, A. Manzoni, P. Gervasio, A. Quarteroni, A reduced order model for domain decompositions with non-conforming interfaces (06 2022). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2206.09618.
- [32] X. Zhao, M. H. Dao, Q. T. Le, Digital twining of an offshore wind turbine on a monopile using reduced-order modelling approach, *Renewable Energy* 206 (2023) 531–551. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2023.02.067>.

- URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960148123002112>
- [33] D. A. White, J. Kudo, K. Swartz, D. A. Tortorelli, S. Watts, A reduced order model approach for finite element analysis of cellular structures, *Finite Elements in Analysis and Design* 214 (2023) 103855. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.finel.2022.103855>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168874X22001287>
- [34] N. Iyengar, D. Rajaram, K. Decker, C. Perron, D. N. Mavris, Nonlinear Reduced Order Modeling using Domain Decomposition. arXiv:<https://arc.aiaa.org/doi/pdf/10.2514/6.2022-1250>, doi:10.2514/6.2022-1250.
URL <https://arc.aiaa.org/doi/abs/10.2514/6.2022-1250>
- [35] T. R. F. Phillips, C. E. Heaney, B. S. Tollit, P. N. Smith, C. C. Pain, Reduced-order modelling with domain decomposition applied to multi-group neutron transport, *Energies* 14 (5) (2021). doi:10.3390/en14051369.
URL <https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/14/5/1369>
- [36] D. Amsallem, M. Zahr, C. Farhat, Nonlinear model order reduction based on local reduced-order bases, *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* 92 (2012) 891–916. doi:10.1002/nme.4371.
- [37] C. Hoang, Y. Choi, K. Carlberg, Domain-decomposition least-squares petrov–galerkin (dd-lspg) nonlinear model reduction, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 384 (2021) 113997. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cma.2021.113997>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0045782521003285>
- [38] C. Huang, K. Duraisamy, C. Merkle, Component-based reduced order modeling of large-scale complex systems, *Frontiers in Physics* 10 (08 2022). doi:10.3389/fphy.2022.900064.
- [39] S. Anderson, C. White, C. Farhat, Space-local reduced-order bases for accelerating reduced-order models through sparsity, *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* 124 (7) (2023) 1646–1671.

arXiv:<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/nme.7179>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/nme.7179>.
URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/nme.7179>

- [40] A. N. Diaz, Y. Choi, M. Heinkenschloss, A fast and accurate domain-decomposition nonlinear manifold reduced order model (2023). arXiv: 2305.15163.
- [41] W. Wu, X. Feng, H. Xu, Improved deep neural networks with domain decomposition in solving partial differential equations, *Journal of Scientific Computing* 93 (09 2022). doi:10.1007/s10915-022-01980-y.
- [42] J. Barnett, I. Tezaur, A. Mota, The schwarz alternating method for the seamless coupling of nonlinear reduced order models and full order models (10 2022). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2210.12551.
- [43] A. Iollo, G. Sambataro, T. Taddei, A one-shot overlapping schwarz method for component-based model reduction: application to nonlinear elasticity, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 404 (2023) 115786. doi:10.1016/j.cma.2022.115786.
- [44] A. Castro, P. Kuberry, I. Tezaur, P. Bochev, A novel partitioned approach for reduced order model – finite element model (rom-fem) and rom-rom coupling (06 2022). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2206.04736.
- [45] A. Castro, P. Bochev, P. Kuberry, I. Tezaur, Explicit synchronous partitioned scheme for coupled reduced order models based on composite reduced bases (06 2023).
- [46] M.-J. Kazemzadeh-Parsi, A. Ammar, F. Chinesta, Domain decomposition involving subdomain separable space representations for solving parametric problems in complex geometries, *Advanced Modeling and Simulation in Engineering Sciences* 9 (12 2022). doi:10.1186/s40323-022-00216-w.
- [47] M. N. Shahul hameed, F. Bordeu, A. Leygue, F. Chinesta, Arlequin based pgd domain decomposition, *Computational Mechanics* 54 (07 2014). doi:10.1007/s00466-014-1048-7.

- [48] A. Huerta, E. Nadal Soriano, F. Chinesta, Proper generalized decomposition solutions within a domain decomposition strategy: Pgd solutions within a dd strategy, *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* 113 (11 2017). doi:10.1002/nme.5729.
- [49] M. Discacciati, B. J. Evans, M. Giacomini, An overlapping domain decomposition method for the solution of parametric elliptic problems via proper generalized decomposition, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 418 (2024) 116484. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cma.2023.116484>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0045782523006084>
- [50] B. Schölkopf, A. Smola, K.-R. Müller, Kernel principal component analysis, in: *Artificial Neural Networks—ICANN'97: 7th International Conference Lausanne, Switzerland, October 8–10, 1997 Proceedings*, Springer, 2005, pp. 583–588.
- [51] S. T. Roweis, L. K. Saul, Nonlinear dimensionality reduction by locally linear embedding, *science* 290 (5500) (2000) 2323–2326.