

Adaptive time step selection for Spectral Deferred Corrections

Thomas Baumann^{1,2*}, Sebastian Götschel², Thibaut Lunet², Daniel Ruprecht² and Robert Speck¹

¹Jülich Supercomputing Centre, Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, Wilhelm-Johnen-Straße, Jülich, 52428, Germany.

²Chair Computational Mathematics, Institute of Mathematics, Hamburg University of Technology, Am Schwarzenberg-Campus 3, Hamburg, 21073, Germany.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): t.baumann@fz-juelich.de;

Abstract

Spectral Deferred Corrections (SDC) is an iterative method for the numerical solution of ordinary differential equations. It works by refining the numerical solution for an initial value problem by approximately solving differential equations for the error, and can be interpreted as a preconditioned fixed-point iteration for solving the fully implicit collocation problem. We adopt techniques from embedded Runge-Kutta Methods (RKM) to SDC in order to provide a mechanism for adaptive time step size selection and thus increase computational efficiency of SDC. We propose two SDC-specific estimates of the local error that are generic and require only minimal problem specific tuning. We demonstrate a gain in efficiency over standard SDC with fixed step size, compare efficiency favorably against state-of-the-art adaptive RKM and show that due to its iterative nature, adaptive SDC can cope efficiently with silent data corruption.

Keywords: parallel-in-time, spectral deferred correction, adaptivity, resilience

1 Introduction

Spectral Deferred Corrections (SDC) were introduced by Dutt et al. [1] as a more stable variant of the classical deferred corrections approach for solving ordinary differential equations (ODEs). Deferred corrections methods iteratively refine the numerical solution for an initial value problem by approximately solving differential equations for the error.

While SDC often requires more work per time step than classical Runge-Kutta Methods (RKM) to reach a given order, it is more flexible due to the low order iterative solves, and attaining high order of accuracy is simple. For a fixed step size, SDC is also more accurate than RKM, allowing to reach the same error with fewer, larger steps. This can make SDC computationally competitive when medium to high accuracy is desired [2]. SDC has been successfully applied to complex problems that benefit from operator splitting [3–5] and problems where only low order solvers are available [6, 7].

While adaptive time step selection for SDC has already been discussed in the original SDC paper [1], it has not yet been widely explored despite its potential to improve computational efficiency. Selecting time steps in SDC based on conserved quantities has been shown to mitigate order reduction [8, 9]. An algorithm similar to what we propose here, based on comparing the high order SDC solution to a low order secondary solution, was shown to work well [6]. However, both these approaches were tailored to specific problems.

This paper adopts techniques for adaptive step size selection from explicit and diagonally implicit RKM to SDC methods. We show that well-known results carry over to SDC, in particular improved computational efficiency and resilience against soft faults. What is new in this paper is that we use generic error estimates and combine a generic step size update equation known from embedded RKM with SDC. We show for four different nonlinear problems that adaptive step size selection for SDC improves computational efficiency with little problem-specific tweaking.

SDC has gained popularity in the parallel-in-time (PinT) integration community due to its iterative and highly flexible nature [10]. SDC-based PinT algorithms have been devised in both parallel-across-the-method [11] as well as parallel-across-the-steps [12] fashion. We investigate adaptive step size selection for the parallel-across-the-steps Block Gauß-Seidel SDC algorithm and the parallel-across-the-method diagonal SDC approach. So far, there are only very few studies that explore adaptive step size selection for the Parareal PinT method [13–15] and none for SDC-flavored PinT algorithms.

Although adaptivity is typically considered a means to improve computational efficiency, it can also improve resilience of simulations against faults causing silent data corruption [16].¹ With high-performance computing systems growing ever larger, this is becoming a concern for software developers [17]. We show that, as for RKM, error estimators in SDC used in adaptive time step selection can also be used to detect changes in data due to soft faults.

¹Coincidentally, silent data corruption is also often referred to by the acronym SDC. In this article, however, SDC will always refer to spectral deferred corrections.

2 Methods and background

This section reviews the SDC algorithm, including its parallelizable variants diagonal SDC and Block Gauß-Seidel SDC. It outlines adaptive step size selection strategies known from embedded RKM and proposes two ways of applying them to SDC. Finally, an SDC variant of the Hot Rod [18] resilience strategy is presented.

2.1 Spectral Deferred Corrections

SDC methods perform numerical integration of initial value problems (IVP)

$$u_t = f(u), \quad u(t_0) = u_0, \quad (1)$$

consisting of an ODE and initial conditions, where u is the solution, f the right-hand side function, and the subscript t indicates a derivative with respect to time. For ease of notation we restrict the discussion to autonomous scalar problems, i.e. $u(t)$, u_0 , $f(u) \in \mathbb{R}$ and solve a single time step from $t_0 = 0$ to $t_1 = \Delta t$. All derivations and results shown here can be transferred to higher dimensions, albeit with a more cumbersome notation.

We recast Equation 1 in Picard form

$$u(t) = u_0 + \int_0^t f(u(s)) ds, \quad t \in [0, \Delta t]. \quad (2)$$

by integrating with respect to time. Next, the integral is approximated with a spectral quadrature rule using M collocation nodes $0 \leq \tau_m \leq 1$, $m = 1, \dots, M$, rescaled by Δt to cover the interval $[0, \Delta t]$. The aim is to obtain values of the solution at the quadrature nodes and to use polynomial interpolation to approximate the continuous solution. Using Lagrange polynomials [19]

$$l_j^\tau(t) = \frac{\prod_{i=1, i \neq j}^M (t - \tau_i)}{\prod_{i=1, i \neq j}^M (\tau_j - \tau_i)}. \quad (3)$$

to approximate the right-hand side function yields

$$f(u(t)) \approx \sum_{j=1}^M f(u(\Delta t \tau_j)) l_j^\tau(t/\Delta t). \quad (4)$$

By defining quadrature weights

$$q_{mj} = \int_0^{\tau_m} l_j^\tau(s) ds, \quad (5)$$

4 Adaptive time step selection for Spectral Deferred Corrections

we can approximate the solution at the quadrature nodes by

$$u_m := u_0 + \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^M q_{mj} f(u(\Delta t \tau_j)) \approx u(\Delta t \tau_m). \quad (6)$$

We call Equation 6 for $m = 1, \dots, M$ the collocation problem. To streamline notation, we write the collocation problem in vector form

$$\vec{u} = \vec{u}_0 + \Delta t Q F(\vec{u}), \quad (7)$$

where $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ is the quadrature matrix containing the weights q_{mj} , $F(\vec{u}) = (f(u_1), \dots, f(u_M))^T \in \mathbb{R}^M$ is a vector function for the temporal evolution, $\vec{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_M)^T \in \mathbb{R}^M$ is the vector carrying the approximate solutions at the quadrature nodes and $\vec{u}_0 = (u_0, \dots, u_0)^T \in \mathbb{R}^M$ the initial conditions.

This collocation problem corresponds to a fully implicit Runge-Kutta method. It can be solved directly, but doing so is expensive because Q is dense and the equations for the stages (Equation 6) are all coupled. Certain types of nodes, such as Gauß-Legendre, Gauß-Lobatto and Gauß-Radau can achieve super-convergence up to order $2M$ at the right boundary with only M nodes [20, Theorems 5.2, 5.3 and 5.5].

Using Picard iteration to solve the collocation problem provides a simple iterative scheme

$$\vec{u}^{k+1} = \vec{u}^k + \vec{r}^k \quad (8)$$

$$\vec{r}^k := \vec{u}_0 + \Delta t Q F(\vec{u}^k) - \vec{u}^k \quad (9)$$

where the solution in iteration k is improved by adding the residual \vec{r}^k . However, this method only converges for small Δt or (very) non-stiff ODEs. SDC preconditions Picard iterations with a low order method to achieve convergence also for large time step size.

The quadrature rule integrates the polynomial approximation exactly, i.e. $\int_0^t F(\vec{u}) \vec{l}^T(s/\Delta t) ds = \Delta t (Q F(\vec{u})) \vec{l}^T(t/\Delta t)$. Thus, if the error of the current polynomial approximation $\delta^k(t) = u(t) - \vec{u}_m^k \vec{l}^T(t/\Delta t)$ is plugged into Equation 2, we get

$$\delta^k(t) - \int_0^t \left(f \left(\vec{u}^k \vec{l}^T(s/\Delta t) + \delta^k(s) \right) - F(\vec{u}^k) \vec{l}^T(s/\Delta t) \right) ds = \vec{r}^k \vec{l}^T(t/\Delta t). \quad (10)$$

The integral is approximated by a simpler quadrature rule Q_Δ , typically referred to as preconditioner, and the resulting nonlinear system

$$\vec{\delta}^k - \Delta t Q_\Delta \left(F(\vec{u}^k + \vec{\delta}^k) - F(\vec{u}^k) \right) = \vec{r}^k. \quad (11)$$

has to be solved in each iteration. The solution is then updated by adding the correction, $\vec{u}^{k+1} = \vec{u}^k + \vec{\delta}^k$. By expanding the residual and plugging in

the refinement equation, we can eliminate the defect and simplify the SDC iteration to

$$(I_M - \Delta t Q_\Delta F) (\vec{u}^{k+1}) = \vec{u}_0 + \Delta t (Q - Q_\Delta) F (\vec{u}^k), \quad (12)$$

with I_M the $M \times M$ identity matrix.

The preconditioner Q_Δ is typically chosen to be a lower triangular matrix such that the system can be solved with forward substitution. In the context of partial differential equations with N degrees of freedom, the collocation problem is a $NM \times NM$ system and iterating K times with forward substitution allows to instead solve KM -many $N \times N$ systems. Since the algorithm proceeds from one line of the system to the next, SDC iterations are often referred to as “sweeps”.

Preconditioners and diagonal SDC

In the original derivation of SDC, implicit or explicit Euler were proposed for solving the error equations [1]. These are first order quadrature rules, integrating from node to node. This means they increase the order of accuracy by one up to the order of the underlying collocation problem, provided they converge at all. The preconditioner corresponding to implicit Euler, for example, reads:

$$Q_\Delta^{\text{IE}} = \begin{pmatrix} \tau_2 - \tau_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \tau_2 - \tau_1 & \tau_3 - \tau_2 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \dots & 0 \\ \tau_2 - \tau_1 & \tau_3 - \tau_2 & \dots & \dots & \tau_M - \tau_{M-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

Higher order preconditioners such as RKM can sometimes increase the order of accuracy by more than one with each iteration [21]. However, lack of smoothness in the error can limit gains to one order per iteration regardless of the order of the preconditioner, particularly when non-equidistant nodes are used [22].

Other interpretations of SDC do not rely on the preconditioner being consistent with an integration rule [23]. The LU preconditioner [24], where $Q_\Delta = U^T$, with $LU = Q^T$, is very effective for stiff problems. Be aware that most of these preconditioners cannot be interpreted as A-stable time marching schemes and usually pose some restrictions on the domain of convergence of the collocation problem. In the case of the LU preconditioner, a gain of exactly one order per sweep is not always observed for any given step size, see also the discussion in [25]. For this reason, we stick to the implicit Euler preconditioner for most simulations.

Another promising class of preconditioners use a diagonal Q_Δ and allow updating all nodes in parallel [11]. This is a small-scale PinT algorithm since the number of nodes is typically small, but it can be combined with other PinT algorithms that solve multiple steps concurrently. Numerical experiments suggest that best parallel efficiency is obtained when maximizing parallelism

across-the-nodes and spending the remaining computational resources on parallelizing across-the-steps [26].

Good diagonal preconditioners can be derived, for instance, by minimizing the spectral radius of the SDC iteration matrix in the stiff or non-stiff limit of the test equation. When running diagonal SDC, we use preconditioners derived in this way from [27], namely MIN-SR-NS for problems with moderate stiffness and MIN-SR-S for stiff problems. The performance of diagonal SDC variants combined with space-time parallelization is investigated in [28].

Inexact SDC iterations

Performing the implicit solves inside the SDC iteration to full accuracy often comes at no benefit to overall accuracy because the preconditioner itself is only approximate. Reducing tolerances or strict limits on the number of allowed iterations for the implicit solver can be used to avoid over-solving and to improve overall computational efficiency of SDC [29]. Optimal tolerances can be derived, but require realistic work and error models [30]. Still, efficiency can be gained even with sub-optimal tolerances when adjusting the tolerance of an inner solver based on the outer residual or when allowing only few iterations of an inner solver. Because SDC provides good initial guesses for the nonlinear solver, this can lead to very efficient schemes [29].

For simplicity, we fix the ratio of inner tolerance to outer residual based on heuristics to 1/10. Additionally, we can only employ inexactness if knowing the order after every iteration is not required because otherwise we cannot guarantee that the inner solver is accurate enough to increase the order by one.

Implicit-explicit splitting

When solving problems with stiff and non-stiff components it is possible to treat only the stiff part implicitly and the remainder explicitly. This is called implicit-explicit (IMEX) splitting and can easily be used in SDC [2, 5]. The IMEX-SDC iteration reads

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \Delta t \tilde{q}_{m+1, m+1}^I f^I)(u_{m+1}^{k+1}) &= u_0 + \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^m (\tilde{q}_{m+1, j}^I f^I + \tilde{q}_{m+1, j}^E f^E)(u_j^{k+1}) \\ &\quad - \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^{m+1} (\tilde{q}_{m+1, j}^I f^I + \tilde{q}_{m+1, j}^E f^E)(u_j^k) \\ &\quad + \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^M q_{m+1, j}(f^I + f^E)(u_j^k). \end{aligned}$$

with superscripts I and E referring to the implicit and explicit part and \tilde{q} being the entries of the preconditioners. The scheme typically has the same order of accuracy as the non-split version, although order reduction may occur [5, 31]. IMEX-SDC has been shown to outperform DIRK-based IMEX Runge-Kutta methods for incompressible flow simulations in wall-time measurements [31].

Dense output

As the solution of the collocation problem is an approximation by a polynomial of degree M , a natural continuous extension is suggested by evaluating this polynomial anywhere within the interval. We refer to this as “dense output” property of the collocation problem [32, Sect. II.6]. Keep in mind that, while the solution at the boundary is up to order $2M$ accurate for M nodes, the accuracy inside the interval is order M .

2.2 Adaptive step size selection for SDC

Adaptive selection of the time step size is useful when the rate of change of the solution is not uniform across the computational domain. We transfer well-known concepts from embedded Runge-Kutta methods [32] to SDC. First, we need to estimate the local error, which we then aim to control by choosing an appropriate step size.

The error estimation works by computing two solutions to the same initial value problem with a different order of accuracy. The difference between the solutions is a reasonable estimate of the local error of the less accurate method

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon &= \|u^{(p)} - u^{(q)}\| \\ &= \|(u^{(p)} - u^*) - (u^{(q)} - u^*)\| \\ &= \|\delta^{(p)} - \delta^{(q)}\| = \delta^{(p)} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{q+1}),\end{aligned}$$

where $u^{(p)}$, $u^{(q)}$ are the solutions obtained by integration schemes of order p and q with $q > p$, u^* marks the exact solution, δ denotes the local error with analogous meaning of the superscript and ϵ is the estimate of the local error. Once ϵ is known, an optimal step size

$$\Delta t_{\text{opt}} = \beta \Delta t \left(\frac{\epsilon_{\text{TOL}}}{\epsilon} \right)^{1/(p+1)} \quad (15)$$

can be estimated such that $\epsilon \approx \epsilon_{\text{TOL}}$. Here, ϵ_{TOL} is the user-defined tolerance for the local error and β is a safety factor, usually $\beta = 0.9$. This update equation is based on the order of accuracy p of the time-marching scheme [32, 33]. As is also common in embedded RKM, we use “local extrapolation”, meaning we advance using the higher order solution, even though we control the error of the lower order one. Crucially, we check if the local error estimate falls below the desired accuracy and we move on to the next step with Δt_{opt} only if it does. If we fail to satisfy the accuracy requirements, we recompute the current step with Δt_{opt} . While the time-scale of the problem may have changed in the next step, heuristically, Δt_{opt} often appears to be a good guess for the optimal step size for the next step as well.

Algorithm 1 SDC with Δt -adaptivity

```

 $u^0 \leftarrow u_0$ 
 $k \leftarrow 1$ 
while  $k \leq k_{\max}$  do
     $u^k \leftarrow$  SDC iteration applied to  $u^{k-1}$ 
     $k \leftarrow k + 1$ 
end while
 $\epsilon \leftarrow \|u^{k_{\max}} - u^{k_{\max}-1}\|$ 
 $\Delta t \leftarrow \beta \Delta t \left(\frac{\epsilon_{\text{TOL}}}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/k_{\max}}$ 
if  $\epsilon > \epsilon_{\text{TOL}}$  then
    Restart current step with  $u_0$ 
else
    Move on to next step with  $u^{k_{\max}}$ 
end if

```

Adaptive selection of Δt

Since the order increases by one with each SDC iteration (up the order of the underlying collocation problem), the increment can be used directly as the error estimate. While adaptivity based on the increment was already proposed in the original SDC paper [1], they employ a simpler step size update equation based only on doubling or halving. Algorithm 1 shows in pseudo-code the algorithm resulting from combining an increment based error estimation with Equation 15. Since this approach modifies only Δt but keeps the number of iterations constant, we refer to it as Δt -adaptivity. Order reduction may be observed for very stiff problems, requiring some extra care [34, 35].

Adaptive selection of Δt and k

By using the dense output property of the converged collocation problem, we can design an approach to choose both the time step Δt and the number of iterations k adaptively. For the fully converged collocation solution, the $M + 1$ values u_0, u_1, \dots, u_M define a polynomial on $[0, \Delta t]$ that provides an M -th order accurate approximation at any point $t \in [0, \Delta t]$. By removing one collocation point, we can construct an $M - 1$ -st order accurate approximation anywhere within the interval. Taking the difference thus generates an error estimate of order M .

For very large step sizes the SDC iteration may not converge with arbitrary preconditioner. To mitigate, we introduce a relative limit $\gamma = 4$ on how much the step size is allowed to increase and set $k_{\max} = 20$, so that we can return to the last step size that allowed convergence if the desired residual tolerance was not achieved after k_{\max} iterations.

Since this approach does not require a fixed k , we can simply keep iterating until convergence and thus let SDC choose the number of iterations as well as the step size. We therefore refer to this approach as Δt - k -adaptivity. Algorithm 2 sketches the algorithm in pseudo-code.

Algorithm 2 SDC with Δt - k -adaptivity

```

 $\vec{u}^0 \leftarrow \vec{u}_0$ 
 $k \leftarrow 1$ 
 $r \leftarrow \|\vec{u}_0 + \Delta t QF(\vec{u}^0) - \vec{u}^0\|$ 
 $r_{\text{prev}} \leftarrow \infty$ 
 $r_{\text{max}} \leftarrow 10^9$ 
 $\text{no\_convergence} \leftarrow \text{False}$ 
while  $r > r_{\text{tol}}$  and not  $\text{no\_convergence}$  do
   $\vec{u}^k \leftarrow$  inexact SDC iteration applied to  $\vec{u}^{k-1}$ 
   $r \leftarrow \|\vec{u}_0 + \Delta t QF(\vec{u}^k) - \vec{u}^k\|$ 
  if  $r > r_{\text{max}}$  or  $r > r_{\text{prev}}$  or  $k = k_{\text{max}}$  then
     $\text{no\_convergence} \leftarrow \text{True}$ 
  end if
   $r_{\text{prev}} \leftarrow r$ 
   $k \leftarrow k + 1$ 
end while
if  $\text{no\_convergence}$  then
   $\Delta t \leftarrow \Delta t / \gamma$ 
  Restart current step with  $u_0$ 
else
   $\{\tau^*\} \leftarrow \{\tau_i, i \neq M - 1\}$ 
   $\epsilon \leftarrow \|\sum_{i=0}^{M-2} u_i^k l_i^{\tau^*}(\tau_{M-1}) + u_M^k l_{M-1}^{\tau^*}(\tau_{M-1}) - u_{M-1}^k\|$ 
   $\Delta t \leftarrow \max\left(\gamma, \beta \left(\frac{\epsilon_{\text{TOL}}}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/M}\right) \Delta t$ 
  if  $\epsilon > \epsilon_{\text{TOL}}$  then
    Restart current step with  $u_0$ 
  else
    Move on to next step with  $u^k$ 
  end if
end if

```

Mitigating the cost of restarts

Restarting steps from scratch in Algorithms 1 and 2 is expensive but SDC offers a unique way to reduce this overhead: Using the dense output property, we can evaluate the polynomial of a restarted step at the new collocation nodes resulting from shorter step size, thus re-using the previously computed solution. Despite being not accurate enough to satisfy the prescribed tolerance, this is a good initial guess, and the SDC iteration is expected to converge in fewer iterations. This is sensible to do in the Δt - k -adaptivity strategy, but only when the collocation problem of the restarted step has converged, i.e., the SDC residual is small enough, as otherwise the solution is not a useful approximation. However, with the Δt -adaptivity strategy, a gain in efficiency is unlikely as the step size update equation will overestimate the optimal step size due to a one-time exceptionally good initial guess which the next step will not have access to.




Fig. 1 Left: Sequential SDC. Right: Block Gauß-Seidel SDC. Sequential time stepping uses the converged solution of the last step as initial conditions, whereas the parallel version receives refined initial conditions between iterations.

Advantages of Δt -and Δt - k -adaptivity over k -adaptivity

Even without local error estimation, SDC can be used adaptively with a fixed step size by simply iterating until the SDC residual is below a set tolerance. We call this approach k -adaptivity. Our newly introduced Δt - and Δt - k -adaptivity approaches have two major advantages over k -adaptivity. First, the step size is a floating point number, which can be finely adjusted, whereas the number of iterations is an integer allowing the schemes much less control. Second, the local error estimate, Equation 14, measures the error with respect to the continuous solution. By contrast, the SDC residual is only a measure of the iteration error with respect to the discrete collocation solution. While a low residual indicates that the collocation problem has been solved to high accuracy, the truncation error of the method might still be large.

2.3 Pipeline-based parallelism: Block Gauß-Seidel SDC

A relatively straightforward pipeline-based parallel-in-time variant of SDC can be constructed by solving multiple time steps simultaneously in block Gauß-Seidel fashion [36]: Instead of waiting for the previous step to converge to full accuracy before starting a new step, we begin solving a new step as soon as a single iteration has been performed on the previous step in the block and keep refining the initial conditions with the iterates from the previous step between iterations. Figure 1 illustrates both sequential SDC on the left and parallel-across-the-steps Block Gauß-Seidel SDC (GSSDC) on the right. A very similar parallel-in-time (PinT) algorithm based on pipelining more general deferred corrections, Revisionist Integral Deferred Corrections (RIDC) [37], has been shown to provide good speedup. We focus on GSSDC as it is at the heart of the large-scale PinT algorithm PFASST [12]. In contrast to Guibert et al. [36], however, we do not use any overlap between the collocation nodes of different time steps.

It has been demonstrated that the convergence order is maintained when increasing the number of steps N in a block of GSSDC [38]. In particular, it is the same as for single step SDC, which means we can employ the adaptive step size controller with no modification. However, the results will not be identical to serial SDC due to the inexactness in the initial conditions.

While we can still estimate the local error by means of the increment, its interpretation is different in the multi-step version. Within a block, we are

solving all steps with a first order accurate method, then we solve all steps with a second order accurate method and so on. This means that the increment is an estimate of the global error within the block. As the whole problem is divided into multiple blocks, we should still view this error as local in the context of the global time domain, but we need to be aware that the same local tolerance ϵ_{tol} applied to a block of multiple steps should result in smaller local errors in each step inside the block.

When the error estimate exceeds the prescribed tolerance, we have two choices for restarting: We can restart from the initial conditions of the first step in the block, or we can restart from the initial conditions of the first step in the block where the error estimate exceeds the threshold. The first is the more rigorous strategy while the second strategy is heuristic but can improve performance at a slight cost to accuracy. In the tests included here, we show only the second strategy because it performed consistently better.

2.4 Resilience

Faults in computers originate from a variety of sources such as damage to hardware components [39] or electromagnetic radiation [40]. Real-world studies suggest that faults occur multiple times per day in HPC centers [39, 41]. While the advent of the integrated circuit has led to a great increase in the reliability of electronic computation, the increasing number of components in supercomputers is cause for concern regarding the rate of faults in future systems [17]. In particular, replication, which has been successfully used in the past to deal with faults [42], may cease to work due to memory speed restrictions [43].

Silent data corruption is a particularly heinous type of fault, as it changes a simulation outcome but the result appears correct because it falls within the space of allowed results and no indication of a fault was issued by the system. Caches that are insufficiently protected by hardware error correction codes are particularly at risk. The often unknown probability of such an event undermines the reliability of the computational scientific method. Codes that can protect against such faults by providing some form of algorithm-based fault-tolerance (ABFT) are a promising approach to mitigate the risk of data corruption, see [17] for a detailed discussion on this topic.

Adaptive strategies

Adaptivity provides a promising way to achieve resilience as the estimate of the local error will reflect critical faults. Adaptive strategies can strike a good balance between computational efficiency and resilience because they usually reduce computational cost in the absence of faults instead of causing overhead.

For k -adaptivity, it has been shown that resilience in SDC can be increased by monitoring the residual and allowing continued iteration at no extra cost in the absence of faults [44]. Δt - and Δt - k -adaptivity go one step further by introducing a simple checkpoint-restart scheme to recompute inaccurate steps. As long as the soft fault does not occur in the initial conditions, we show that significant faults are corrected as efficiently as they are in embedded RKM [16].

Hot Rod detector

The Hot Rod detector [18] is a dedicated resilience strategy that we will use as a benchmark. It has been developed to boost resilience of explicit embedded RKM, specifically Cash-Karp's method [45], but can be easily extended to other methods including SDC. Instead of using the error estimate of the embedded methods for step size adaptivity, they construct a high-order error estimate by paring this with a second error estimate and compare to a threshold in order to detect silent data corruption.

This second error estimate is constructed from Taylor expansions of the solution and right-hand side functions:

$$\begin{aligned} u(t-h) &= \sum_{i=0}^n \frac{(-h)^i}{i!} u^{[i]}(t) + \mathcal{O}(h^{n+1}) \\ -hf(t-h) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(-h)^i}{(i-1)!} u^{[i]}(t) + \mathcal{O}(h^{n+1}), \end{aligned}$$

where $u^{[i]}$ denotes the i^{th} derivative of the solution with respect to time. With a weighted sum of solutions and right-hand side evaluations from previous steps, all terms in the Taylor expansions but the solution at t itself can be cancelled up to the order of the expansion. This is essentially a linear multi-step method and can be used to generate an auxiliary solution to the solution obtained by SDC. When subtracting the SDC solution of order k from an auxiliary solution with expansions to order at least $k+1$, we can generate an estimate of a multiple of the local truncation error. To arrive at the actual truncation error, we need to untangle how the truncation error of single steps is accumulated in the linear multi-step method. To this end, we linearize and assume the first step gets exact initial conditions, the initial conditions of the second step includes one times the local truncation error and so on. Keep in mind that if adaptivity is used, this must include ratios of the step sizes used in the steps in the multi-step method and the coefficients for cancelling the terms in the Taylor expansions have to be recomputed in every step.

While Hot Rod is very effective in detecting faults, it comes with a number of drawbacks. Both error estimates increase the memory footprint, in particular the one based on Taylor expansions requires to keep as many solution size objects as is the order of accuracy in memory. On top, we get computational overhead: Since the order of the two error estimates must match, we cannot use local extrapolation and must advance with the lower order solution entered in the embedded method instead of the higher order one. Furthermore, if the local truncation error varies throughout the simulation, selecting a suitable detection threshold is not straightforward, either allowing false negatives or causing false positives. The authors of Hot Rod propose a machine learning algorithm for generating tolerances based on the user's needs. We simply

employ the largest tolerance that does not cause any false positives. In particularly critical applications or especially fault-prone environments, Hot Rod might still be worthwhile.

Fault insertion methodology

In our numerical experiments, we consider only transient bitflips in the solution. While a realistic fault insertion simulation would also consider faults in instructions at the lowest level, evidence suggests that it is a sensible strategy to investigate silent data corruption, with lower level fault injection mainly increasing the probability of termination of the program by the operating system [46]. While some ABFT can recover from dying processes, for instance in the context of PFASST [47], we make no effort to handle crashes here.

3 Benchmark problems

We use one nonlinear ODE and three nonlinear PDEs as benchmarks to test the performance of our adaptive strategies. Each benchmark problem poses different challenges for numerical time-integration. All implementations are publicly available on [GitHub](#)² as part of the pySDC library [48]. Wall-clock times are measured on the JUSUF supercomputer [49] at Forschungszentrum Jülich.

3.1 Van der Pol

The van der Pol equation

$$u_{tt} - \mu(1 - u^2)u_t + u = 0, \quad (16)$$

$$u(t=0) = u_0, \quad u_t(t=0) = u'_0, \quad (17)$$

is named after a Dutch electrical engineer who used the equation to study the behavior of vacuum tubes in radios [50]. Here, μ is a parameter controlling the nonlinearity, u is the solution and the subscript t marks a derivative with respect to time. In our tests, we set $u_0 = 2$ and $u'_0 = 0$, $\mu = 5$ and solve up to $t = 11.5$. In the pySDC implementation, we introduce $v(t) = u_t(t)$, rewrite the van der Pol equation as a first order system and use a Newton scheme to solve the nonlinear systems within the SDC sweeps.

For $\mu = 0$, we recover the harmonic oscillator, but with increasing μ the problem becomes increasingly stiff. Van der Pol describes the problem with $\|\mu\| \ll 1$ as modelling free oscillations of a triode oscillator, whereas $\|\mu\| \gg 1$ models a free relaxation oscillation [51]. This is a useful test problem for adaptive step size control as the nonlinear damping introduces a second time-scale to the oscillation, see [Figure 2](#). The pattern of oscillations in the van der Pol equation is mostly determined by the μ parameter and not by the initial

²<https://github.com/Parallel-in-Time/pySDC>




Fig. 2 Solution of a van der Pol problem for $\mu = 5$ over time. The solution is oscillating on two time-scales. In order not to over-resolve the slow parts, the resolution has to be adjusted during runtime.

condition. This means, in particular, that the problem is not overly sensitive to perturbations, making it rather forgiving towards soft faults.

We use the SciPy [52] method `SOLVE_IVP` from the `INTEGRATE` package with an explicit embedded Runge-Kutta method of order 5(4) [53] with tolerances close to machine precision to obtain reference solutions.

3.2 Quench

This is a simplified model of temperature leaks in superconducting magnets provided by Erik Schnaubelt [54, Section 4.3]. Once the temperature exceeds a certain threshold, superconductivity ceases and runaway heating of the magnet sets in. This effect has led to the explosion of large magnets at the Large Hadron Collider [55].

The model consists of a one-dimensional heat equation with a nonlinear source term heating parts of the domain. For the boundary conditions, we choose Neumann-zero to treat the magnet as completely isolated from the environment, except for the leak. Due to superconductivity, the diffusivity is high, making the problem very stiff and prohibiting the use of explicit time-stepping schemes. The equation reads

$$C_V u_t - \kappa \Delta u = Q(u), \quad (18)$$

$$Q(u) = Q_{\max} \times \begin{cases} 1, & x \in (0.45, 0.55), \\ f(u), & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

$$f(u) = \begin{cases} 0, & u < T_{\text{thresh}}, \\ \frac{u - T_{\text{thresh}}}{T_{\max} - T_{\text{thresh}}}, & T_{\text{thresh}} \leq u < T_{\max}, \\ 1, & T_{\max} \leq u, \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

$$\Omega \in [0, 1], \quad (21)$$

$$u_x = 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, \quad (22)$$

$$u(t = 0) = 0, \quad (23)$$




Fig. 3 Solution of the Quench problem. Shown is the maximal temperature $T(t) = \|T(x, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ across the spatial domain over time. We see a slow heating up to about $t = 320$, after which the temperature in some parts of the domain exceeds the threshold value and a linear transition towards runaway heating is entered. Physically, this means the magnet stops being superconducting, which can have catastrophic effects in particle accelerators.

with the Laplacian Δ and parameters

$$\begin{aligned} C_V &= 1000, \\ \kappa &= 1000, \\ T_{\text{thresh}} &= 10^{-2}, \\ T_{\text{max}} &= 2 \times 10^{-2}, \\ Q_{\text{max}} &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

We solve until $t = 500$ and use a Newton scheme for implicit solves. [Figure 3](#) shows the solution over time. The behavior is fairly simple, except for the transition from superconductivity to runaway heating, which is challenging to resolve accurately.

We again rely on the SciPy method `SOLVE_IVP` to generate reference solutions, but, as the problem is very stiff, use an implicit backward differentiation formula [\[56\]](#).

3.3 Nonlinear Schrödinger

The focusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation is a wave-type equation that describes problems such as signal propagation in optical fibers [\[57\]](#). The formulation we solve can be written as

$$u_t = -i\Delta u + 2i\|u\|^2 u, \quad (24)$$

$$u(t=0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \cos(x+y)/\sqrt{2}} - 1 \right), \quad (25)$$




Fig. 4 Left: Initial condition consisting of a circle of high phase embedded in the low phase. Right: Decrease of the radius of the circle over time. The simulation is terminated at $t = 0.025$ before the circle has disappeared.

with i being the imaginary unit. We solve Equation 24 on a two-dimensional spatial domain with periodicity 2π up to $t = 1$ using fast Fourier transforms. We use implicit-explicit (IMEX) splitting to integrate the Laplacian implicitly and the nonlinear term explicitly. The global error is computed with respect to the analytic solution [58].

3.4 Allen-Cahn

The Allen-Cahn variant considered here is a two-dimensional reaction-diffusion equation with periodic boundary conditions. We choose initial conditions that cause a phase transition in the pattern of a contracting circle [59].

$$u_t = \Delta u + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} u(1 - u^2), \quad \text{on } [-0.5, 0.5]^2 \times [0, 0.025] \quad (26)$$

$$u_0(x) = \tanh\left(\frac{R_0 \|x\|}{\sqrt{2}\epsilon}\right), \quad (27)$$

$$\epsilon = 0.04, \quad (28)$$

$$R_0 = 0.25, \quad (29)$$

In the sharp interface limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the radius of the circle shrinks as $r(t) = \sqrt{R^2 - 2t}$. Figure 4 shows the initial condition. The IMEX Euler solver inside the SDC iterations is not able to resolve the front for $\Delta t > \epsilon^2$ [59]. Including a safety factor of 0.8, we limit the step size to $\Delta t \leq 0.8\epsilon^2$. Similar to our approach for the Schrödinger problem, we use IMEX splitting, integrating the Laplacian discretized with a spectral method implicitly while treating the nonlinear term explicitly. We again compute the error with respect to the SciPy method SOLVE_IVP.

Since there are no major changes in time-scale in this problem, adaptivity will have minor benefits at best. Instead, we use this benchmark to confirm that adaptivity does not add substantial overhead.

4 Numerical results

We investigate performance of the methods from [section 2](#) applied to the problems from [section 3](#) with respect to computational efficiency and resilience. We first consider SDC alone, then compare the results to RKM and investigate resilience at the end.

4.1 Computational efficiency

We demonstrate the adaptive resolution capabilities in detail for the van der Pol problem first, as it is easy to visualize. [Figure 5](#) shows the solution (upper), local error (middle) and computational work, measured in total number of required Newton iterations (lower) for the van der Pol equation. SDC with a fixed time step over-resolves significantly in many areas, delivering a local error of 10^{-11} , much smaller than the maximum local error of slightly above 10^{-7} . The adaptive variants of SDC over-resolve much less, which is reflected in the significantly lower number of required Newton iterations. Both Δt - and Δt - k -adaptive SDC perform very similarly, requiring only around 5000 instead of 15000 Newton iterations over the course of the simulation.

[Figure 6](#) shows error versus wall-clock time for the four problems from [section 3](#). For all three PDE examples, Quench, Schrödinger and Allen-Cahn, Δt - k -adaptive SDC is the most efficient variant, although Δt -adaptive SDC is very close for the Schrödinger equation. Only for the mildly stiff van der Pol ODE example is Δt -adaptive SDC slightly more efficient. This confirms that choosing both time step and number of iterations adaptively in SDC is generally a good approach.

To mitigate the cost of restarts, we use interpolation of the polynomial to obtain an initial guess after the collocation problem has converged with too large a step size in Δt - k -adaptivity, as discussed in [subsection 2.2](#). This indeed reduces the number of iterations in our numerical tests, but in the case of diagonally preconditioned SDC requires all-to-all communication, incurring additional cost. However, the number of such restarts is small for all problems under consideration, such that the overall computational cost changes only little. For problems with dynamics that lead to more restarts, on the other hand, interpolation can reduce the computational cost more significantly.

Parallel variants of SDC

[Figure 7](#) shows error against wall clock time for two serial adaptive variants of SDC, a Δt -adaptive block parallel variant of SDC, a Δt - k -adaptive variant with diagonal preconditioner and a Δt - k -adaptive combination of the latter two.

For the three PDE examples, the Δt - k -adaptive SDC with diagonal preconditioner (“parallel-across-the-method”) [27] is the most efficient variant. For the ODE example, the Δt -adaptive block parallel GSSDC variant performs best. The reason is that in the PDE case, right-hand side evaluations and implicit solves make up a larger fraction of the compute time, and these




Fig. 5 SDC for the van der Pol problem with four different strategies. The top panel shows the solution, the middle panel shows the resolution via the local error compared to a reference solution and the bottom panel shows how many Newton iterations are needed to reach the respective time, which is a good indicator of computational cost. The fixed scheme with constant k and Δt requires the most iterations and the local error varies by more than four orders of magnitude. Adaptively choosing the iteration number leads to less pronounced over-resolving of slow parts, but using Δt -adaptivity to fine-tune the step size to the problem's time-scale allows to save even more iterations without sacrificing accuracy in terms of local error. The Δt - k -adaptive scheme shows greater variability in accuracy, but maintains the same minimum accuracy at no additional cost. While it does select smaller step sizes, fewer Newton iterations are performed per step.

are performed in parallel in diagonal SDC. As Schrödinger and Allen-Cahn are solved with spectral methods, the implicit solves are relatively cheap and the parallel efficiency is not as good as for the Quench problem. Note that the serial comparison runs were also performed with diagonal preconditioners as these were found to give the best performance in our tests.

Unfortunately, combining both diagonal SDC and GSSDC does not further improve performance. The reason seems to be that the performance of GSSDC is highly sensitive to the preconditioner and that it works best with implicit




Fig. 6 Wall-clock time versus the global error relative to the magnitude of the solution. For Δt - and Δt - k -adaptivity, the tolerance for the local error is adjusted, whereas the step size controls the accuracy of the other strategies. Note that for the Quench problem in Δt -adaptivity, the global error is not necessarily reduced when choosing a smaller tolerance because the error depends sensitively on the way the transition to runaway heating is resolved. As the time-scale changes only little in Allen-Cahn, we can see that the fixed- and the Δt -adaptivity algorithm perform virtually identically with no meaningful overhead due to adaptivity.

Euler for reasons not yet well understood. Switching to a diagonal preconditioner in GSSDC significantly increases the number of iterations required which negates any performance gains from parallelization. A deeper investigation of this issue is left for future work.

4.2 Comparing efficiency against Runge-Kutta methods

After establishing that adaptive SDC is generally more efficient than SDC with fixed Δt and k , we now compare the run-times of Δt - and Δt - k -adaptive SDC against state-of-the-art embedded RKM of the same order. [Figure 8](#)




Fig. 7 Timings for parallel flavors of step size adaptive SDC. The number of processes is denoted, if larger than one, as $N=[\text{number of processes for GSSDC}] \times [\text{number of processes for diagonal SDC}]$. For van der Pol and Allen-Cahn, GSSDC gives decent parallel efficiency, whereas better parallel efficiency is observed with diagonal SDC for the other problems. For the PDEs, wall time is roughly halved when using three processes in diagonal SDC.

shows error against wall clock time for two variants of SDC against different embedded RKM for our four benchmark problems. For the van der Pol problem, we compare against Cash-Karp's method [45], an explicit pair of orders 4 and 5. For Quench, we compare against ESDIRK5(3) [60], a singly diagonally implicit, stiffly accurate pair of orders 3 and 5 with an explicit first stage. For Schrödinger and Allen-Cahn, we compare against ARK5(4) [61], an additive pair of a singly diagonally implicit stiffly accurate L-stable embedded method of orders 4 and 5 and an explicit embedded method of orders 4 and 5.

Since the van der Pol problem is only mildly stiff, SDC cannot beat the explicit CP5(4) RKM. For the three PDE examples, however, Δt - k -adaptive SDC with parallel preconditioner is always at least competitive, providing similar or better performance than RKM. Therefore, adaptive SDC is not only




Fig. 8 Comparison of embedded RKM with parallel versions of Δt - and Δt - k -adaptive SDC from Figure 7. All methods are of order 5. As the van der Pol example is not too stiff, the explicit RKM performs best. For the very stiff PDEs, on the other hand, SDC can outperform the RKM. We do not show the explicit RKM for these problems because it ran into stability issues, producing unphysical solutions or no solutions at all within a reasonable time frame relative to the implicit methods. Note that the ARK5(4) method performs very similar for Allen-Cahn as serial Δt - k -adaptivity, but the parallel version is much faster.

more efficient than standard SDC but also competitive with state-of-the-art adaptive RKM, at least for the PDE case. SDC also offers easy tuning of the order, simply by changing parameters. By contrast, ARK5(4) is the highest order additive RKM we are aware of.

4.3 Resilience

We demonstrate that adaptive SDC can boost resilience against soft faults and analyze if it can compete with a dedicated resilience strategy.




Fig. 9 Solution of van der Pol problem with bit 0 flipped in u_t . Quantities with star superscript are without fault, while the solid lines show numerical solutions with faults without any resilience strategy. Bit 0 stores the sign, which is flipped following the fault. The u component rises afterwards instead of decreasing as usual.




Fig. 10 Solution of van der Pol problem with bit 13 flipped in u_t . The legend is shared with [Figure 9](#). Bit 13 is the first bit in the mantissa, making it intermediately significant. Because of the tendency of the problem to return to its oscillatory trajectories, the solution is barely distinguishable from the fault-free solution to the naked eye during most of the interval under consideration, but the dynamics are noticeably different.

Soft faults in the van der Pol system

Before analyzing how adaptive SDC copes with faults for all problems from [section 3](#), we first provide a detailed discussion for the van der Pol equation with $\mu = 5$. We insert a fault as the dynamics transition to the fast moving part in [Figure 2](#) at $t = 5.25$ to make sure it can significantly impact the solution. Since the van der Pol equation is an ODE, we can easily try out many different combinations of inserting a fault during a run with pySDC at a specific time after an iteration. The equation has two degrees of freedom and we run SDC with $k_{\max} = 3$ iterations and $N_{\text{coll}} = 3$ collocation nodes. Since the initial conditions are treated as an additional collocation node in pySDC, we get four options for collocation nodes. Finally, we use double precision floating point numbers to store the solution with 64 bits each. In total, we get $2 \times k_{\max} \times (N_{\text{coll}} + 1) \times 64 = 1536$ possible bits we can flip. [Figure 9](#) and [Figure 10](#) shows two examples how a flipped bit can alter the solution.




Fig. 11 Recovery rate of different resilience strategies when flipping various bits while solving the van der Pol problem. The left panel shows the recovery rate across all faults that were tested, while the right panel shows only faults that can in principle be recovered. This means we exclude faults to the initial conditions in any but the last iteration and also faults that crash the code due to overflow errors in the Newton solver. For Δt -adaptivity, we also exclude faults that occur after the error has been estimated in the last iteration.

To decide whether to count a fault as recovered, we use the following heuristic: If the impact on accuracy is small compared to the discretization error, there is no need to reject the result. Therefore, we count a fault as recovered when the global error at the end of the run compared to a reference solution without faults is increased by no more than 10%.

The recovery rate for all strategies is shown in [Figure 11](#). It appears that flipping a large portion of the bits does not cause issues. We solve the problem only to limited accuracy and flipping bits in the mantissa beyond about bit 30 changes the solution only insignificantly. Another fraction of faults occurs after the last iteration but not in the last collocation node, which have no impact on the solution of the step for strategies with fixed sweep count whatsoever. This amounts to $1/k_{\max} \times N_{\text{coll}} / (N_{\text{coll}} + 1) = 25\%$ of combinations. On the other hand, we compute the residual only after inserting faults. This means that the k - and Δt - k -strategies, which rely on the residual to declare convergence, will continue iterating and propagate the fault into the solution.

However, faults in sign and exponent bits can only be recovered in about 75% of the cases with all resilience strategies. There are two reasons for this. First, the initial conditions are not replicated in memory, which means that faults to them persist after restarts. Faults that hit the initial conditions after any but the last iteration cannot be corrected and amount to $1 / (N_{\text{coll}} + 1) \times (k_{\max} - 1) / k_{\max} \approx 16\%$ of combinations. The Hot Rod detector, however, can detect faults in the initial conditions after k_{\max} iterations, as it performs one extra iteration.

Second, some faults in the exponent bits one through five cause overflow errors in the Newton solver and result in a crash. These are excluded in [Figure 11](#) (right) which shows recovery rates only for those faults that the method can theoretically recover.

We find that all strategies recover most faults that they theoretically can. However, for looser tolerances, some strategies can struggle with faults that




Fig. 12 Comparison of recovery rate from theoretically recoverable faults for all problems from [section 3](#). The Schrödinger problem uses complex128 numbers instead of the usual float64, which we show as two float64 numbers back to back. The impact of faults appears to be the same per bit regardless of whether the complex or the real part is targeted.

perturb the solution during the run insufficiently to trigger a restart, but which nevertheless affect the final solution. Also, since this is a nonlinear problem with a Newton solver, we cannot expect global convergence. Therefore, some of the faults to exponent bits that do not crash the code cannot be recovered by continued iteration.

Recovery rates for all problems

The van der Pol problem is fairly forgiving when it comes to faults and so we repeat the above analysis in less detail for all problems from [section 3](#).

For the PDE examples, there are too many possible combinations for fault insertion and so we insert 2000 faults at random positions in the solution vector, collocation nodes and SDC iterations. [Figure 12](#) shows recovery rates for theoretically recoverable faults for all of our four benchmark problems. Note that the figure for van der Pol is the same as in [Figure 11](#) (right). First we can observe that the adaptive SDC variants have much better recovery rates than SDC with fixed Δt and k . Although Δt -adaptive and k -adaptive SDC can recover almost all faults already, the Δt - k -adaptive SDC scheme provides slightly better recovery rates for the van der Pol and Quench problem and,

like Hot Rod, can recover basically all faults that are theoretically recoverable. Remember that Hot Rod introduces substantial overhead while adaptive strategies usually reduce computational cost.

In experiments not documented here, we also tested resilience of adaptive SDC for the Lorenz attractor problem which is very sensitive to faults. Indeed, the fixed strategy fails when targeted by a vast range of faults, but all other strategies can protect well. We do not show any figures of the Lorenz attractor because the problem is perhaps best solved with explicit RKM rather than with SDC.

Resilience of parallel SDC variants

The result of diagonal SDC matches identically with its serial counterpart and hence shares the same resilience characteristics. In GSSDC, on the other hand, the increment behaves differently as an error estimate as discussed in [subsection 2.3](#).

We found that the increment is essentially an estimate of the global error within the block rather than an estimate of the local error. The extrapolation based error estimate used in Hot Rod, on the other hand, is constructed from multiple steps and takes into account that these each contribute local errors. Hence, in order to compare the two estimates, we have to construct an estimate of the local error also from the increment. As there is no general way to untangle local errors from the global error, we resort to estimating the local error by subtracting two subsequent global errors. This is a rather crude approximation for the nonlinear problems discussed here.

In order to eliminate false positives in Hot Rod, we have to increase the detection threshold, thus lowering sensitivity. This allows for some intermediate faults to slip through that perturb the final solution noticeably, if the problem is sensitive to such perturbations. Note that the Hot Rod strategy is not adaptive and hence we need to choose a tolerance based on the step with the largest local error, leaving other steps less protected.

We choose the same step size for all steps in a block when using Δt - and Δt - k -adaptivity, which increases the impact of fault-induced differences in step size distribution. While in single step SDC most faults cause an increase of the global error of less than 10%, the distribution is wider in GSSDC. We found up to 50% larger global errors for some faults that triggered a restart.

5 Summary

The paper adopts concepts from adaptive embedded Runge-Kutta methods to spectral deferred corrections. We propose procedures to control the step size Δt in SDC, the iteration number k or both. Our adaptive techniques can also be used for variants of SDC that are parallelizable, either in a Gauss-Seidel "parallel-across-the-steps" fashion (GSSDC) or in a "parallel-across-the-method" way by using a diagonal preconditioner. Numerical examples demonstrate that adaptive SDC is more efficient than SDC with fixed step

size and iteration number and that adaptive parallel SDC can be competitive with embedded Runge-Kutta methods for the integration of three complex, nonlinear time-dependent PDEs.

One advantage of SDC is flexibility due its iterative nature, making it easy to include techniques like splitting. The Δt - k -adaptive algorithm, in particular, retains much of the flexibility of SDC. Preconditioners or reduced accuracy spatial solves tailored to specific problems can be used. Also, spatial adaptivity may be leveraged in unique ways [62–64].

Adaptive time stepping has been explored for revisionist integral deferred corrections (RIDC) [65], which is similar to GSSDC. However, they find that the increment is a poor choice for an error estimate, because of the accumulation of local errors from different steps in the increment. The reason why it works well for GSSDC is that instead of allowing maximal pipelining, GSSDC solves only fixed size blocks of steps at a time, each with the same step size. While sacrificing flexibility compared to RIDC, this allows us to view the accumulated errors inside the blocks as a local error of the block and enables efficient step size selection in GSSDC. More elaborate step size selection for GSSDC that allow different step sizes for each step in the blocks like in RIDC are left for future work.

We also demonstrate that adaptive SDC provides algorithm-based resilience against bitflips in the solution, similar to what has been documented for adaptive RKM. Fault tolerance based on algorithms may yield significant advantages as supercomputers continue to grow in complexity. While adaptive SDC can recover a large range of faults, we found that we are unable to recover from faults in the initial condition of a time step. These could be further protected on the application level, for instance by replication, or they could be stored in a region of memory protected by error correction codes that can detect and recover from faults, whereas all other stages of the collocation problem may be stored in unprotected regions of memory. This would use available memory more efficiently, in particular in terms of bandwidth, by avoiding the checksums that are involved in hardware error correction codes. Exploration of such more sophisticated resilience schemes is left for future work.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge computing time granted on JUSUF through the CSTMA project at Jülich Supercomputing Centre.

Funding

We thankfully acknowledge funding from the European High-Performance Computing Joint Undertaking (JU) under grant agreement No 955701. The JU receives support from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme and Belgium, France, Germany, and Switzerland. We also thankfully acknowledge funding from the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) grant 16HPC048.

Statements and declarations

All authors certify that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest or non-financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript. For instructions on how to reproduce the results shown in this paper, please consult the project section in the documentation of the pySDC code at <https://parallel-in-time.org/pySDC/projects/Resilience.html>.

References

- [1] Dutt, A., Greengard, L., Rokhlin, V.: Spectral deferred correction methods for ordinary differential equations. *BIT Numerical Mathematics* **40**(2), 241–266 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022338906936>
- [2] Ruprecht, D., Speck, R.: Spectral deferred corrections with fast-wave slow-wave splitting. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **38**(4), 2535–2557 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M1060078>
- [3] Bourlioux, A., Layton, A.T., Minion, M.L.: High-order multi-implicit spectral deferred correction methods for problems of reactive flow. *Journal of Computational Physics* **189**(2), 651–675 (2003). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9991\(03\)00251-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9991(03)00251-1)
- [4] Layton, A.T., Minion, M.L.: Conservative multi-implicit spectral deferred correction methods for reacting gas dynamics. *Journal of Computational Physics* **194**(2), 697–715 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2003.09.010>
- [5] Minion, M.L.: Semi-implicit spectral deferred correction methods for ordinary differential equations. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences* **1**(3), 471–500 (2003). <https://doi.org/10.4310/CMS.2003.v1.n3.a6>
- [6] Guo, R., Xu, Y.: High order numerical simulations for the binary fluid–surfactant system using the discontinuous Galerkin and spectral deferred correction methods. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **42**(2), 353–378 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1235405>
- [7] Feng, X., Tang, T., Yang, J.: Long time numerical simulations for phase-field problems using p -adaptive spectral deferred correction methods. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **37**(1), 271–294 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1137/130928662>
- [8] Quaife, B., Biros, G.: Adaptive time stepping for vesicle suspensions. *Journal of Computational Physics* **306**, 478–499 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2015.11.050>

- [9] Guo, R., Xu, Y.: A high order adaptive time-stepping strategy and local discontinuous Galerkin method for the modified phase field crystal equation. *Communications in Computational Physics* **24**(1), 123–151 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.4208/cicp.OA-2017-0074>
- [10] Gander, M.J.: 50 years of time parallel time integration. In: Carraro, T., Geiger, M., Körkel, S., Rannacher, R. (eds.) *Multiple Shooting and Time Domain Decomposition Methods* vol. 9, pp. 69–113. Springer, Cham (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-23321-5_3. Series Title: *Contributions in Mathematical and Computational Sciences*
- [11] Speck, R.: Parallelizing spectral deferred corrections across the method. *Computing and Visualization in Science* **19**(3), 75–83 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00791-018-0298-x>
- [12] Emmett, M., Minion, M.: Toward an efficient parallel in time method for partial differential equations. *Communications in Applied Mathematics and Computational Science* **7**(1), 105–132 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.2140/camcos.2012.7.105>
- [13] Maday, Y., Mula, O.: An adaptive parareal algorithm. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* **377**, 112915 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2020.112915>
- [14] Legoll, F., Lelièvre, T., Sharma, U.: An adaptive Parareal algorithm: Application to the simulation of molecular dynamics trajectories. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **44**(1), 146–176 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1137/21m1412979>
- [15] Kazakov, E., Efremenko, D., Zemlyakov, V., Gao, J.: A time-parallel ordinary differential equation solver with an adaptive step size: Performance assessment. In: Voevodin, V., Sobolev, S., Yakobovskiy, M., Shagaliev, R. (eds.) *Supercomputing*, pp. 3–17. Springer, Cham (2022)
- [16] Benson, A.R., Schmit, S., Schreiber, R.: Silent error detection in numerical time-stepping schemes. *The International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications* **29**(4), 403–421 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094342014532297>
- [17] Agullo, E., Altenbernd, M., Anzt, H., Bautista-Gomez, L., Benacchio, T., Bonaventura, L., Bungartz, H.-J., Chatterjee, S., Ciorba, F.M., DeBardeleben, N., Drzisga, D., Eibl, S., Engelmann, C., Gansterer, W.N., Giraud, L., Göddeke, D., Heisig, M., Jézéquel, F., Kohl, N., Li, X.S., Lion, R., Mehl, M., Mycek, P., Obersteiner, M., Quintana-Ortí, E.S., Rizzi, F., Rüde, U., Schulz, M., Fung, F., Speck, R., Stals, L., Teranishi, K., Thibault, S., Thönnies, D., Wagner, A., Wohlmuth, B.: Resiliency

- in numerical algorithm design for extreme scale simulations. *The International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications* **36**(2), 251–285 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1177/10943420211055188>
- [18] Guhur, P.-L., Zhang, H., Peterka, T., Constantinescu, E., Cappello, F.: Lightweight and accurate silent data corruption detection in ordinary differential equation solvers. In: Dutot, P.-F., Trystram, D. (eds.) *Euro-Par 2016: Parallel Processing*, pp. 644–656. Springer, Cham (2016)
- [19] Berrut, J.-P., Trefethen, L.N.: Barycentric Lagrange interpolation. *SIAM Review* **46**(3), 501–517 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0036144502417715>
- [20] Hairer, E., Wanner, G.: *Solving Ordinary Differential Equations II*. Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, vol. 14. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (1996). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-05221-7>. <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-05221-7>
- [21] Christlieb, A., Ong, B., Qiu, J.-M.: Integral deferred correction methods constructed with high order Runge–Kutta integrators. *Mathematics of Computation* **79**(270), 761–783 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-09-02276-5>
- [22] Christlieb, A., Ong, B., Qiu, J.-M.: Comments on high-order integrators embedded within integral deferred correction methods. *Communications in Applied Mathematics and Computational Science* **4**(1), 27–56 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.2140/camcos.2009.4.27>
- [23] Causley, M., Seal, D.: On the convergence of spectral deferred correction methods. *Communications in Applied Mathematics and Computational Science* **14**(1), 33–64 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.2140/camcos.2019.14.33>
- [24] Weiser, M.: Faster SDC convergence on non-equidistant grids by DIRK sweeps. *BIT Numerical Mathematics* **55**(4), 1219–1241 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10543-014-0540-y>
- [25] Kremling, G., Speck, R.: Convergence of multilevel spectral deferred corrections. *Communications in Applied Mathematics and Computational Science* **16**(2), 227–265 (2021)
- [26] Schöbel, R., Speck, R.: PFASST-ER: combining the parallel full approximation scheme in space and time with parallelization across the method. *Computing and Visualization in Science* **23**(1-4), 12 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00791-020-00330-5>
- [27] Čaklović, G., Lunet, T., Götschel, S., Ruprecht, D.: Improving parallelism across the method for spectral deferred correction (2024). in preparation

- [28] Freese, P., Götschel, S., Lunet, T., Ruprecht, D., Schreiber, M.: Parallel performance of shared memory parallel spectral deferred corrections (2024). in preparation
- [29] Speck, R., Ruprecht, D., Minion, M., Emmett, M., Krause, R.: Inexact spectral deferred corrections. In: Dickopf, T., Gander, M.J., Halpern, L., Krause, R., Pavarino, L.F. (eds.) *Domain Decomposition Methods in Science and Engineering XXII*, pp. 389–396. Springer, Cham (2016)
- [30] Weiser, M., Ghosh, S.: Theoretically optimal inexact spectral deferred correction methods. *Communications in Applied Mathematics and Computational Science* **13**(1), 53–86 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.2140/camcos.2018.13.53>
- [31] Guesmi, M., Grotteschi, M., Stiller, J.: Assessment of high-order IMEX methods for incompressible flow. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids* **95**(6), 954–978 (2023) <https://arxiv.org/abs/https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/flid.5177>. <https://doi.org/10.1002/flid.5177>
- [32] Hairer, E., Wanner, G., Nørsett, S.P.: *Solving Ordinary Differential Equations I*. Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, vol. 8. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (1993). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78862-1>
- [33] Tsitouras, C.: Runge–Kutta pairs of order 5(4) satisfying only the first column simplifying assumption. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications* **62**(2), 770–775 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2011.06.002>
- [34] Huang, J., Jia, J., Minion, M.: Accelerating the convergence of spectral deferred correction methods. *Journal of Computational Physics* **214**(2), 633–656 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2005.10.004>
- [35] Layton, A.T., Minion, M.L.: Implications of the choice of quadrature nodes for Picard integral deferred corrections methods for ordinary differential equations. *BIT Numerical Mathematics* **45**(2), 341–373 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10543-005-0016-1>
- [36] Guibert, D., Tromeur-Dervout, D.: Parallel deferred correction method for CFD problems. In: Kwon, J.H., Ecer, A., Satofuka, N., Periaux, J., Fox, P. (eds.) *Parallel Computational Fluid Dynamics 2006*, pp. 131–138. Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-044453035-6/50019-5>
- [37] Christlieb, A.J., Macdonald, C.B., Ong, B.W.: Parallel high-order integrators. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **32**(2), 818–835 (2010).

<https://doi.org/10.1137/09075740X>

- [38] Gander, M.J., Lunet, T., Ruprecht, D., Speck, R.: A unified analysis framework for iterative parallel-in-time algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **45**(5), 2275–2303 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1137/22M1487163>
- [39] Schroeder, B., Pinheiro, E., Weber, W.-D.: DRAM errors in the wild: A large-scale field study. *Commun. ACM* **54**(2), 100–107 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1897816.1897844>
- [40] Lapinsky, S.E., Easty, A.C.: Electromagnetic interference in critical care. *Journal of Critical Care* **21**(3), 267–270 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2006.03.010>
- [41] Glosli, J.N., Richards, D.F., Caspersen, K.J., Rudd, R.E., Gunnels, J.A., Streitz, F.H.: Extending stability beyond CPU millennium: A micron-scale atomistic simulation of Kelvin-Helmholtz instability. In: *Proceedings of the 2007 ACM/IEEE Conference on Supercomputing. SC '07*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1362622.1362700>. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1362622.1362700>
- [42] Guerraoui, R., Schiper, A.: Software-based replication for fault tolerance. *Computer* **30**(4), 68–74 (1997). <https://doi.org/10.1109/2.585156>
- [43] Cappello, F., Di, S., Li, S., Liang, X., Gok, A.M., Tao, D., Yoon, C.H., Wu, X.-C., Alexeev, Y., Chong, F.T.: Use cases of lossy compression for floating-point data in scientific data sets. *The International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications* **33**(6), 1201–1220 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094342019853336>
- [44] Grout, R., Kolla, H., Minion, M., Bell, J.: Achieving algorithmic resilience for temporal integration through spectral deferred corrections. *Communications in Applied Mathematics and Computational Science* **12**(1), 25–50 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.2140/camcos.2017.12.25>
- [45] Cash, J.R., Karp, A.H.: A variable order Runge-Kutta method for initial value problems with rapidly varying right-hand sides. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software* **16**(3), 201–222 (1990). <https://doi.org/10.1145/79505.79507>
- [46] Wei, J., Thomas, A., Li, G., Pattabiraman, K.: Quantifying the accuracy of high-level fault injection techniques for hardware faults. In: *2014 44th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks*, pp. 375–382 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1109/DSN.2014.2>

- [47] Speck, R., Ruprecht, D.: Toward fault-tolerant parallel-in-time integration with pfasst. *Parallel Computing* **62**, 20–37 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.parco.2016.12.001>
- [48] Speck, R.: Algorithm 997: pySDC—Prototyping spectral deferred corrections. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.* **45**(3) (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3310410>
- [49] Von St. Vieth, B.: JUSUF: Modular tier-2 supercomputing and cloud infrastructure at Jülich Supercomputing Centre. *Journal of large-scale research facilities JLSRF* **7**, 179 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.17815/jlsrf-7-179>
- [50] Van Der Pol, B.: LXXXVIII. *On “relaxation-oscillations”*. The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science **2**(11), 978–992 (1926). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14786442608564127>
- [51] van der Pol, B.: The nonlinear theory of electric oscillations. *Proceedings of the Institute of Radio Engineers* **22**(9), 1051–1086 (1934). <https://doi.org/10.1109/JRPROC.1934.226781>
- [52] Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T.E., Haberland, M., Reddy, T., Cournapeau, D., Burovski, E., Peterson, P., Weckesser, W., Bright, J., van der Walt, S.J., Brett, M., Wilson, J., Millman, K.J., Mayorov, N., Nelson, A.R.J., Jones, E., Kern, R., Larson, E., Carey, C.J., Polat, İ., Feng, Y., Moore, E.W., VanderPlas, J., Laxalde, D., Perktold, J., Cimrman, R., Henriksen, I., Quintero, E.A., Harris, C.R., Archibald, A.M., Ribeiro, A.H., Pedregosa, F., van Mulbregt, P., SciPy 1.0 Contributors: SciPy 1.0: Fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. *Nature Methods* **17**, 261–272 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2>
- [53] Dormand, J.R., Prince, P.J.: A family of embedded Runge-Kutta formulae. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* **6**(1), 19–26 (1980). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0771-050X\(80\)90013-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0771-050X(80)90013-3)
- [54] Schnaubelt, E., Wozniak, M., Schöps, S.: Thermal thin shell approximation towards finite element quench simulation. *Superconductor Science and Technology* **36**(4), 044004 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6668/acbeea>
- [55] Bajko, M., Bertinelli, F., Catalan-Lasheras, N., Claudet, S., Cruikshank, P., Dahlerup-Petersen, K., Denz, R., Fessia, P., Garion, C., Jimenez, J., Kirby, G., Lebrun, P., Le Naour, S., Mess, K.-H., Modena, M., Montabonnet, V., Nunes, R., Parma, V., Perin, A., de Rijk, G., Rijlart, A., Rossi, L., Schmidt, R., Siemko, A., Strubin, P., Tavian, L., Thiesen, H., Tock, J., Todesco, E., Veness, R., Verweij, A., Walckiers, L., Van Weelderden, R., Wolf, R., Fehér, S., Flora, R., Koratzinos, M.,

- Limon, P., Strait, J.: Report of the task force on the incident of 19th September 2008 at the LHC. Technical report, CERN, Geneva (2009). <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1168025>
- [56] Shampine, L.F., Reichelt, M.W.: The MATLAB ODE suite. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **18**(1), 1–22 (1997). <https://doi.org/10.1137/S1064827594276424>
- [57] Ablowitz, M.J., Prinari, B., Trubatch, A.D.: *Discrete and Continuous Nonlinear Schrödinger Systems*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2003). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511546709>
- [58] Aktosun, T., Demontis, F., van der Mee, C.: Exact solutions to the focusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Inverse Problems* **23**(5), 2171 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1088/0266-5611/23/5/021>
- [59] Zhang, J., Du, Q.: Numerical studies of discrete approximations to the Allen–Cahn equation in the sharp interface limit. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **31**(4), 3042–3063 (2009) <https://arxiv.org/abs/https://doi.org/10.1137/080738398>. <https://doi.org/10.1137/080738398>
- [60] Kennedy, C.A., Carpenter, M.H.: *Diagonally Implicit Runge-Kutta Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations. A Review*. National Aeronautics and Space Administration (2016). <https://ntrs.nasa.gov/api/citations/20160005923/downloads/20160005923.pdf>
- [61] Kennedy, C.A., Carpenter, M.H.: Higher-order additive Runge–Kutta schemes for ordinary differential equations. *Applied Numerical Mathematics* **136**, 183–205 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnum.2018.10.007>
- [62] Weiser, M., Scacchi, S.: Spectral deferred correction methods for adaptive electro-mechanical coupling in cardiac simulation. In: Russo, G., Capasso, V., Nicosia, G., Romano, V. (eds.) *Progress in Industrial Mathematics at ECMI 2014*, pp. 321–328. Springer, Cham (2016)
- [63] Weiser, M., Chegini, F.: Adaptive multirate integration of cardiac electrophysiology with spectral deferred correction methods. In: *CMBE22 - 7th International Conference on Computational & Mathematical Biomedical Engineering*, pp. 528–531 (2022)
- [64] Chegini, F., Steinke, T., Weiser, M.: Efficient adaptivity for simulating cardiac electrophysiology with spectral deferred correction methods. *arXiv e-prints*, 2311–07206 (2023) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.07206> [[math.NA](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.07206)]. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.07206>

- [65] Christlieb, A., Macdonald, C., Ong, B., Spiteri, R.: Revisionist integral deferred correction with adaptive step-size control. *Communications in Applied Mathematics and Computational Science* **10**(1), 1–25 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.2140/camcos.2015.10.1>