Physics Informed Neural Networks Convergence of HPC & AI domains

- Sanjay Choudhry NVIDIA

Simulations in Product Development



Saturating Performance Gains with Traditional HPC



Motivation: Evolving Platform with Mass Customization



CFD Aerodynamics Optimization: Computationally Intensive

Answer: AI powered Simulations!



Customized Developments for Audi's OpenFOAM Processes, Richard Borris, Audi AG, Oct. 2016

Al in Computational Mechanics & Sciences

AI Powered Computational Domains

Computational Mechanics	Earth Sciences	Life Sciences	Computational Physics	Computational Chemistry
Solid Mechanics	Climate Modeling	Genomics	Particle Science	Quantum Chemistry
Fluid Mechanics	Weather Modeling	Proteomics	Astrophysics	Molecular Dynamics
Electromagnetics	Ocean Modeling			
Thermal	Seismic Interpretation			
Acoustics				
Optics				
Multi-body Dynamics				
Systems				
Electrical				
Designer Materials				

Al benefits in Computational Mechanics & Sciences



Training Data

Large to Very Large

Driver

Primary

Small to Medium

Data Driven Neural Networks (DDNNs)

Automotive Aerodynamics







Comparisons of various Point Cloud based NN



Data Driven Methods

- Need to generate a lot of Simulations
- No Physics Awareness
- Not very efficient for Complex 3D Geometries/Curved Surfaces
- Interpolation/Extrapolation Errors
- + Not dependent on Physics



Physics Informed Neural Networks (PINNs)

Physics Informed Neural Nets: Architecture

A Neural Network Architecture for Computational Mechanics/Physics problems

D Point Cloud for 3D Geometries & Meshes (Fixed/Moving, Deforming, Structured & Unstructured)

Physics Driven & Physics Aware Networks (respects the governing PDEs, Multi-disciplinary)

□ Performance optimized for GPU tensor cores



Point Cloud representation of Computational Domain & Data on 3D Geometries

Shape Parameterization





Multi-View



- Good for CNNs but memory intensive for high resolution and inefficient due to unoccupied voxels.
 - Introduces quantization effects for inter- & extrapolation when using CNN, accuracy for Physics problems is questionable
 - Unable to capture fine geometry details & gradients and completely unsuitable for Physics problems

- One-to-one correspondence with analysis data format.
- Works for LIDAR based geometry or uneven density and unstructured meshes. Perfect for Physics problems
- Will require integration into CAD tools in order to regenerate uniform mesh and then invoke CNN structure
- Will retain the deficiencies of Voxel based CNNs
- Does not address legacy analysis results

✓ Point Cloud



Input: 3D Scene Point cloud

Poly Cube



Loss and Output

Physics laws present constraints -

- Governing differential equations
- Constitutive models

Loss Function

 Physics based: Conservation of Mass, Momentum & Energy, Strain Energy etc.)

$$f_{obj} = \sum_{i} w_i \left\{ \nabla \cdot \left(u_t^{\star} - \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla \hat{p}_t \right) \right\}_i^2$$



Workflow –



Discovering Hidden Physics



Hidden Physics Models in CFD:

Infer hidden quantities of interest fields from spatial-temporal visualizations of a passive scaler (e.g., dye or smoke) leveraging the underlying Physics laws (i.e., mass, momentum & energy)

Mass conservation:

$$u_x + v_y + w_z = 0.$$

Momentum conservation:

$$u_t + uu_x + vu_y + wu_z = -p_x + \operatorname{Re}^{-1}(u_{xx} + u_{yy} + u_{zz})$$

$$v_t + uv_x + vv_y + wv_z = -p_y + \operatorname{Re}^{-1}(v_{xx} + v_{yy} + v_{zz})$$

$$w_t + uw_x + vw_y + ww_z = -p_z + \operatorname{Re}^{-1}(w_{xx} + w_{yy} + w_{zz})$$

Transport:

 $c_t + uc_x + vc_y + wc_z = \text{Pec}^{-1}(c_{xx} + c_{yy} + c_{zz})$



External Flow past a Cylinder - Learnt vs. Ground Truth

CFD Simulation of an **External Flow** over a **Cylinder** with OpenFOAM –

A user error was incidentally discovered by the PINNs that presented itself as a mismatch between the Simulation & AI result !!!

Correct CFD Simulation Results with OpenFOAM (Ground Truth)

Correct Predictions



Intracranial Cerebral Aneurysm (ICA)



- 0.0e+00



ICA - Comparison between Simulation & NN



-52



Cut along X-Plane

14

-54 -52 -50

ICA - Comparison between two CFD Solvers



OpenFOAM v/s Neural Networks





20 25

15





Nektar++ v/s Neural Networks

Heat Sink

Heat Sink –

* Temperatures to not exceed the design criteria

Objectives –

- * Similar accuracy as the Solver
- * Geometry representation with Point Clouds
- * Multiple simultaneous parametrized & unparametrized geometries

Physics involved – CFD & Heat Transfer



Ansys IcePack used for Simulation (** we kindly acknowledge Ansys's support **)

Heat Sink - Conjugate Heat Transfer

$$MSE = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |d(x_i, y_i) - d_i|^2.$$

Mean Square Error

$$\begin{split} e_1 &:= uu_x + vu_y + p_x - (\nu + \nu^t)(u_{xx} + u_{yy}) - 2(\nu_x^t s^{xx} + \nu_y^t s^{xy}), \\ e_2 &:= uv_x + vv_y + p_y - (\nu + \nu^t)(v_{xx} + v_{yy}) - 2(\nu_x^t s^{xy} + \nu_y^t s^{yy}), \\ e_3 &:= u_x + v_y, \\ e^f &:= u\theta_x^f + v\theta_y^f - (\kappa^f/c_p^f + \kappa^t/c_p^f)(\theta_{xx}^f + \theta_{yy}^f) - (1/c_p^f)(\kappa_x^t \theta_x^f + \kappa_y^t \theta_y^f), \\ e^s &:= -\alpha^s(\theta_{xx}^s + \theta_{yy}^s). \end{split}$$

Loss

Point Clouds used for modeling Geometry

Heat Sink - Conjugate Heat Transfer



Conclusion

Executive Summary

Neural network for simulation workflows:

✓ Higher Performance: gains on CPU are fast approaching saturation point. Al speeds up the "time-to-insight, design, manufacture and service"

- Broader application areas: Never before imagined scientific simulations usecases are now possible with AI
- ✓ Broader user base: Increased ease-of-use and robustness in the simulation workflow will enable increased number of users with little simulation expertise