# A Geometric Frequency-Domain Wave Propagation Formulation for Fast Convergence of Iterative Solvers

Matteo Cicuttin<sup>1</sup>, Lorenzo Codecasa<sup>2</sup>, Ruben Specogna<sup>3</sup>, Francesco Trevisan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Université Paris-Est, Cermics (ENPC), F-77455 Marne-la-Vallée, France

<sup>2</sup>Dipartimento di Elettronica, Informazione e Bioingegneria, Politecnico di Milano, I-20133 Milano, Italy
<sup>3</sup>Dipartimento Politecnico di Ingegneria ed Architettura, Università di Udine, 33100 Udine, Italy

The frequency-domain wave propagation problem is notoriously difficult to solve through iterative methods because it leads to a symmetric but indefinite linear system. For this reason, direct methods are usually employed at the expense of great memory usage. Convergence of iterative methods, however, could be obtained by regularizing the wave equation. We introduce such regularization in discrete geometric approach framework on polyhedral grids. Moreover, we extend the regularization to the impedance boundary condition.

Index Terms-Convergence, discrete geometric approach (DGA), wave propagation.

## I. INTRODUCTION

THE time-harmonic wave propagation problem in the spatial domain  $\Omega$  is described by the well-known equation

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{r}} \nabla \times \mathbf{e} - \omega^2 \mu_0 \epsilon_0 \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}} \mathbf{e} = -i\omega\mu_0 \mathbf{j} \tag{1}$$

where e and j are complex vector-valued functions of the position,  $\omega$  is the angular frequency, and v and  $\epsilon$  are the symmetric positive definite material tensors. Moreover, taking the divergence of (1), it is possible to obtain the so-called continuity equation

$$-i\omega\epsilon_0\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\epsilon_r}\boldsymbol{e} = \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{j} \tag{2}$$

which relates the divergence of the electric displacement field  $d = \epsilon_0 \epsilon_r e$  with the divergence of the current *j*.

One of the possible settings to discretize (1) and (2) is the discrete geometric approach (DGA) numerical scheme [1], similar to the finite integration technique [2] but suitable also for polyhedral meshes [3]. In DGA, the domain  $\Omega$  is discretized with two polyhedral grids  $\mathcal{G}, \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ . Grid  $\mathcal{G}$  is named primal grid, while grid  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  is named dual grid and is obtained by the standard barycentric subdivision of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Discrete differential operators are then introduced on both grids. In particular, the discrete gradient G, curl C, and divergence D are, respectively, the node-edge, edge-face, and face-volume incidence matrix on the primal grid. The dual discrete differential operators are then obtained by transposing the primal ones, in particular,  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}} = \mathbf{D}^T$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C}^T$ , and  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}} = -\mathbf{G}^T$ . We finally introduce the discrete Hodge operators  $\mathbf{M}_{\nu_r}$  (primal face to dual edge),  $\mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r}$  (primal edge to dual face), and  $\mathbf{N}_{\mu_r \epsilon_r^2}^{-1}$  (dual volume to primal node), which account for material properties [1]. This setting allows to discretize (1) as

$$(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\mathbf{M}_{\nu_r}\mathbf{C} - \omega^2 \mu_0 \epsilon_0 \mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r})\mathbf{U} = -i\omega\mu_0 \tilde{\mathbf{I}}$$
(3)

Manuscript received November 19, 2016; revised February 28, 2017; accepted March 6, 2017. Date of publication March 8, 2017; date of current version May 26, 2017. Corresponding author: Matteo Cicuttin (e-mail: matteo.cicuttin@uniud.it).

Color versions of one or more of the figures in this paper are available online at http://ieeexplore.ieee.org.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TMAG.2017.2679341

where **U** and  $\tilde{\mathbf{I}}$  are the arrays of the degrees of freedom corresponding to e and j. The entries of **U** are the circulations of e on the edges  $e_i$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ 

$$U_i = \int_{e_i} \boldsymbol{e} \cdot d\boldsymbol{l} \tag{4}$$

while the entries of  $\tilde{\mathbf{I}}$  are the fluxes of j on the faces  $\tilde{f}_i$  of  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ 

$$I_i = \int_{\tilde{f}_i} \boldsymbol{j} \cdot d\boldsymbol{S}.$$
 (5)

It is well-known, however, that (3) leads to a symmetric indefinite linear system on which iterative solvers fail to converge [4]. For this reason, direct solvers are usually employed but at a great expense of memory resources. This in turn makes the solution of large scale wave propagation problems quite a challenging topic, frequently requiring approaches tailored for the specific problem [5]. In this paper, we propose a regularized formulation of (3) that could enable the convergence of iterative solvers on this type of problem. The improvement of our contribution over the existing literature [2], [6], [7] is that support for polyhedral grids is introduced and impedance boundary conditions are correctly handled.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, the formulation for problems without impedance boundary conditions is presented. In Section III, the formulation is extended to work with impedance boundary conditions. Then, some observations about preconditioning are made. Finally, the numerical results are presented.

#### II. REGULARIZED FORMULATION

By taking the discrete divergence of (3), the discrete continuity equation is obtained

$$-i\omega\epsilon_0 \mathbf{D} \mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r} \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{D} \mathbf{I}.$$
 (6)

By premultiplying both of its sides by  $-\mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{N}_{\mu_r \epsilon_r^2}^{-1} / i \omega \epsilon_0$ and by adding it to (3), the continuity equation can be exploited to enforce the divergence of the electric displacement field [6], [7].

0018-9464 © 2017 IEEE. Personal use is permitted, but republication/redistribution requires IEEE permission. See http://www.ieee.org/publications\_standards/publications/rights/index.html for more information.

By setting  $\mathbf{K} = \tilde{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{M}_{\nu_r} \mathbf{C} - \omega^2 \mu_0 \epsilon_0 \mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r}$ , the modified equation reads

$$(\mathbf{K} + \mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{N}_{\mu_r \epsilon_r^2}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{D}} \mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r}) \mathbf{U} = -\frac{1}{i\omega\epsilon_0} \mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{N}_{\mu_r \epsilon_r^2}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{D}} \tilde{\mathbf{I}} -i\omega\mu_0 \tilde{\mathbf{I}}.$$
(7)

The premultiplication is justified by the fact that for a vector field f the identity

$$\nabla \times \nabla \times f = \nabla (\nabla \cdot f) = \nabla^2 f \tag{8}$$

holds, and thus what is obtained is a discrete equation having properties similar to the Laplacian operator. This, in turn, enables the convergence of the iterative solvers, but it poses some practical problems. The first of them is that  $\mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{N}_{\mu_r \epsilon_r^2}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{D}} \mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r}$  must be constructed from the global terms  $\mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r}$ ,  $\mathbf{G}$ , and  $\mathbf{N}_{\mu_r\epsilon_r^2}^{-1}$ . Then, the term  $\mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r}\mathbf{GN}_{\mu_r\epsilon_r^2}^{-1}\mathbf{\tilde{D}}\mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r}$  has very poor sparsity: explicit computation leads to a matrix that has about ten times the number of nonzeros of (3). The poor sparsity is due to  $\mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r} \mathbf{GN}_{\mu_r \epsilon_r^2}^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{D}} \mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r}$  being the product of  $\mathbf{R}^{T} = \mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_{r}} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{N}_{\mu_{r} \epsilon_{r}^{2}}^{-1/2}$  (which has good sparsity) and its transpose. Computing the product  $\mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{R}$  and assembling it explicitly produce a fill-in sufficient to make this approach useless. Matrix-free techniques, however, allow to keep the product implicit and to keep the memory usage low. In particular, where the computation of a matrix-vector product is required inside the solver, compute it as  $\mathbf{K}\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{R}^T(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{v})$ , where **v** is the vector that has to be multiplied by the system matrix. In other words, inside the solver, it is important to first compute the matrix-vector product **Rv**; then, the resulting vector has to be multiplied by  $\mathbf{R}^T$  and, finally, summed to  $\mathbf{K}\mathbf{v}$ .

#### **III. IMPEDANCE BOUNDARY CONDITIONS**

The regularization proposed in the previous paragraph has the limitation that it cannot handle an important class of boundary conditions, namely, the *impedance boundary conditions*. If impedance boundary conditions [8] are added to (3), the new problem reads

$$(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\mathbf{M}_{\nu_r}\mathbf{C} - \omega^2 \mu_0 \epsilon_0 \mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r} + i\omega \mathbf{Y})\mathbf{U} = -i\omega\mu_0 \tilde{\mathbf{I}}$$
(9)

where  $\mathbf{Y}$  is a matrix that has nonzeros only in correspondence to the boundary edges and is computed according to [8]. Taking the divergence of this new expression leads to a different form of the discrete continuity equation, which accounts for the impedance boundary

$$\left(\tilde{\mathbf{D}}\mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_{r}} - \frac{1}{i\omega\epsilon_{0}}\tilde{\mathbf{D}}\mathbf{Y}\right)\mathbf{U} = -\frac{1}{i\omega\epsilon_{0}}\tilde{\mathbf{D}}\tilde{\mathbf{I}}.$$
 (10)

At first glance, it could appear reasonable to apply to this new equation the same approach we used with (6). However, we found that applying the same approach used for the problem without impedance boundary conditions does not lead to improved convergence of iterative solvers. In particular, conjugated orthogonal conjugated gradient (COCG) fails to converge, whereas quasi-minimal residuals (QMRs) stagnate at high values of relative residual. The technique we propose



Fig. 1. Picture of the structure used in simulations. The structure resembles a coax-waveguide transition, with the source applied to the pin inside the waveguide (TE<sub>10</sub> cutoff frequency fc = 8.33 GHz).



Fig. 2. Convergence of unpreconditioned COCG, preconditioned COCG, and unpreconditioned QMR on the problem without impedance boundary conditions. 21k elements.

to overcome this difficulty is introducing a scaling matrix  $\alpha$  and not considering Y in the premultiplication term

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}^{T} \left( \tilde{\mathbf{D}} \mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_{r}} - \frac{1}{i\omega\epsilon_{0}} \tilde{\mathbf{D}} \mathbf{Y} \right) \mathbf{U} = -\frac{1}{i\omega\epsilon_{0}} \boldsymbol{\beta}^{T} \tilde{\mathbf{D}} \tilde{\mathbf{I}}$$
(11)

where  $\boldsymbol{\beta}^T = \mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{N}_{\mu_r \epsilon_r^2}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ . The scaling matrix  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  is a diagonal matrix where all the entries are equal to one, except the entries corresponding to the nodes on the impedance boundary. Those entries are set to the value  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ . The new formulation reads

$$(\mathbf{K} + \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{P})\mathbf{U} = -i\omega\mu_0 \tilde{\mathbf{I}} - \frac{1}{i\omega\epsilon_0} \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \tilde{\mathbf{D}}\tilde{\mathbf{I}}.$$
 (12)

This new regularization has again poor sparsity, but it also leads to a nonsymmetric matrix, which require the use of appropriate solvers such as QMR. Regarding the matrix-free solver, in this last case, the matrix-vector products are computed as  $\mathbf{K}\mathbf{v} + \boldsymbol{\beta}^T(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{v})$ , where  $\mathbf{P} = (\mathbf{\tilde{D}}\mathbf{M}_{\epsilon_r} - (1/(i\omega\epsilon_0))\mathbf{\tilde{D}}\mathbf{Y})$ .

# **IV. PRECONDITIONING**

We investigated ways to precondition the solvers, and we found a very simple but effective way to precondition COCG for the solution of problem (7). By taking  $M = diag(\mathbf{K})$ , we observed that the number of iterations required for convergence is more than halved. Taking the inverse of the diagonal of the whole matrix (and thus using a simple Jacobi preconditioner) is not as efficient, since the number of iterations required to reach convergence is slightly higher. The



Fig. 3. Convergence of unpreconditioned COCG, preconditioned COCG, and unpreconditioned QMR on the problem without impedance boundary conditions, and with 181k elements.



Fig. 4. Convergence of unpreconditioned COCG, preconditioned COCG, and unpreconditioned QMR on the problem without impedance boundary conditions, and with 300k elements.

same preconditioner, unfortunately, is not effective with QMR, neither in the case with only perfect electrical conductor (PEC) and perfect magnetic conductor (PMC) boundary conditions nor in the case with impedance boundary conditions.

#### V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

The proposed regularizations were tested by simulating a structure resembling a coax to waveguide transition (Fig. 1) excited at f = 10 GHz. Simulations were made on tetrahedral grids; however, polyhedral grids are supported by method [3]. The solutions obtained were compared against the solutions computed by a direct solver on the same problem but without regularization; the difference was always comparable with the tolerance of the iterative solver. Three meshes were used: a coarser one with 21k elements, a medium one with 181k elements, and a finer one with 300k elements. The iterative solvers were implemented inside EMT, a DGA workbench



Fig. 5. Convergence of unpreconditioned COCG, preconditioned COCG, and unpreconditioned QMR on the problem with only PEC and PMC boundary conditions, and with 21k elements.



Fig. 6. Convergence of unpreconditioned COCG, preconditioned COCG, and unpreconditioned QMR on the problem with only PEC and PMC boundary conditions, and with 181k elements.

written in C++14, using the eigenlinear algebra library version 3.2.9. As a direct solver, we used Intel MKL PARDISO.

#### A. Problem With Only PEC Boundary Conditions

In the first experiment, we simulated our waveguidelike structure only in the presence of PEC boundary conditions, and we obtained the convergence behaviors shown in Figs. 2–4. In those figures, it is possible to see how COCG greatly benefits the preconditioning described in Section IV.

#### B. Problem With PEC and PMC Boundary Conditions

In the second numerical experiment, we replaced two of the six boundary conditions with a PMC condition. In Fig. 1, the PMC walls were the one in the front and the one in the back. The solvers in this case showed slower and less smooth convergence (Figs. 5–7); however, the modified regularization



Fig. 7. Convergence of unpreconditioned COCG, preconditioned COCG, and unpreconditioned QMR on the problem with only PEC and PMC boundary conditions, and with 300k elements.



Fig. 8. Convergence of QMR on problem with impedance boundary conditions. Convergence rates for all the mesh sizes are shown in the same graph.

remains equally useful. The preconditioner greatly improved the convergence of COCG also in this case.

#### C. Problem With Impedance Boundary Conditions

The problem we ran in this case had PEC boundaries everywhere, except in the rightmost wall of the waveguide (Fig. 1). When impedance boundary conditions are used, the only solver that correctly handles the (nonsymmetric) problem is QMR. We observed that, in general, impedance boundary conditions slow down the convergence significatively (Fig. 8). Moreover, we found that a good value for the scaling parameter is  $\alpha = 0.001$ .

#### D. Computational Requirements

On the 181k element mesh, solving (3) with a direct solver required about 2.9 GB of RAM, whereas solving (7) with iterative solvers required slightly less than 1 GB of RAM. On the mesh with 300k elements, 5.6 and 1.9 GB were required, respectively. Memory savings increase with increasing system sizes. On (3), it was impossible to reach convergence with iterative solvers, whereas in (7), convergence can be reached in a few hundred iterations. The presented technique allows for huge memory savings, and problems with millions of unknowns become solvable on a common laptop computer.

## VI. CONCLUSION

It is well known that simulating wave propagation in the frequency domain is a challenging problem because of the properties of the matrices that arise from the discretization. In this paper, we studied the use of regularization techniques to obtain linear systems treatable by iterative solvers. We observed that in the absence of impedance boundary conditions, introducing the regularization is effective and allows to solve huge problems on modest machines. Introducing regularization in the presence of impedance conditions, however, appears to be a far more delicate subject. The technique we proposed seems to be quite effective, but it is not optimal since it requires a user-specified parameter.

#### REFERENCES

- S. Chialina, M. Cicuttin, L. Codecasa, R. Specogna, and F. Trevisan, "Plane wave excitation for frequency domain electromagnetic problems by means of impedance boundary condition," *IEEE Trans. Magn.*, vol. 52, no. 3, Mar. 2016, Art. no. 7203504.
- [2] M. C. T. Weiland, "Discrete electromagnetism with the finite integration technique," *Prog. Electromagn. Res.*, vol. 32, pp. 65–87, 2001. [Online]. Available: http://ww.jpier.org/PIER/pier32/03.00080103.clemens.pdf
- [3] L. Codecasa, R. Specogna, and F. Trevisan, "A new set of basis functions for the discrete geometric approach," *J. Comput. Phys.*, vol. 229, no. 19, pp. 7401–7410, 2010.
- [4] O. G. Ernst and M. J. Gander, "Why it is difficult to solve helmholtz problems with classical iterative methods," *Numer. Anal. Multiscale Problems*, vol. 83, no. 10, pp. 325–363, 2012.
- [5] S. Chialina, M. Cicuttin, L. Codecasa, G. Solari, R. Specogna, and F. Trevisan, "Modeling of anechoic chambers with equivalent materials and equivalent sources," *IEEE Trans. Electromagn. Compat.*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 956–963, Aug. 2016.
- [6] W. Shin and S. Fan, "Accelerated solution of the frequency-domain Maxwell's equations by engineering the eigenvalue distribution of the operator," *Opt. Exp.*, vol. 21, no. 19, pp. 22578–22595, 2013.
- [7] S. Baumanns, M. Clemens, and S. Schöps, "Structural aspects of regularized full Maxwell electrodynamic potential formulations using FIT," in *Proc. URSI Int. Symp. Electromagn. Theory (EMTS)*, 2013, pp. 1007–1010.
- [8] L. Codecasa, R. Specogna, and F. Trevisan, "Discrete geometric formulation of admittance boundary conditions for frequency domain problems over tetrahedral dual grids," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag.*, vol. 60, no. 8, pp. 3998–4002, Aug. 2012.
- [9] R. Otin, "Regularized Maxwell equations and nodal finite elements for electromagnetic field," *Electromagnetics*, vol. 30, nos. 1–2, pp. 190–204, 2010.
- [10] H. A. van der Vorst and J. B. M. Melissen, "A Petrov-Galerkin type method for solving Axk=b, where A is symmetric complex," *IEEE Trans. Magn.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 706–708, Mar. 1990.