How do we make large opensource projects sustainable? (lessons learned from 25 years of deal.II)

Luca Heltai <<u>luca.heltai@sissa.it</u>>

SISSA — International School for Advanced Studies (<u>www.sissa.it</u>)

Associate professor of Numerical Analysis — SISSA mathLab (<u>mathlab.sissa.it</u>) Founder and former Director of the Master in High Performance Computing (<u>www.mhpc.it</u>) One of the principal developers of deal.II (<u>www.dealii.org</u>)









Our typical workflow

CAD Medical Image Geometry definition

Computational Mesh



Mathematical Model



 $-\nabla \cdot (\kappa \nabla u) = f$ in Ω on $\Gamma \equiv \partial \Omega$ u = g

Numerical Discretisation

Au = F

Simulation









Our typical workflow

Industry is a user of the entire framework

- Ready-made solutions
- Integration with existing tools, frameworks, inputs, etc.
- Robustness, reliability, and resilience to errors

Academia is a developer of parts of the framework

- Willing to experiment
- Need to show new methods and algorithms
- Publish or perish





The ideal (industry ready) CSE software (FEM based)

Realistic, complex geometries in 2d and 3d Multiphysics Efficient linear and non-linear solvers

> Adaptive meshes Higher order elements

Efficient multigrid solvers (algebraic and/or geometric) Scalability to thousands of processors Efficient use of current hardware

How can we make all of this happen in a single code?

From scratch it would be roughly ~100K lines of code, if not more.





Research Software in Academia

The bitter reality!

Written by graduate students

without a good overview of existing software with little software experience with little incentive to write high quality code

oftentimes also with little software experience

Typical life span of most research projects: 5/7 years



Maintained by postdocs

with little time who consider the software primarily as a tool to publish

Advised by faculty

with no time





Why are we so bad? --- I

Greg Wilson, D. A. Aruliah, C. Titus Brown, Neil P. Chue Hong, Matt Davis, Richard T. Guy, Steven H. D. Haddock, Kathryn D. Huff, Ian M. Mitchell, Mark D. Plumbley, Ben Waugh, Ethan P. White, Paul Wilson, 2014.

Best Practices for Scientific Computing. PLoS Biol 12, e1001745:

"Scientists spend an increasing amount of time building and using software. However, **most scientists are never taught how to do this efficiently**.

As a result, many are **unaware** of tools and practices that would allow them to write **more reliable and maintainable** code with less effort."





Why are we so bad? --- II

Tobias Kuipers, 2016, Why you need to know about code maintainability O'Reilly and Software Improvement Group

- On average, a good developer manages 10K lines per year
- Software that does not evolve, stops being useful (if you don't continue to update and modify an existing software system or component, it will eventually stop working)





Rughly 15% of the code needs to be updated every year to remain functional

(Updating the operating system/changing compiler, updating dependency libraries, etc. require changes in the code base!)

Every 66K lines of code require a full time developer!





We must change perspective

- 1. (re)use existing software (libraries)!
- keep the amount of code you must maintain at a minimum
 write code with *sustainability* in mind
- Use the work of others (standing on giants' shoulders)
- Do not reinvent the wheel (don't write your own non-linear solvers!)
- Make sure that your work can be useful (and therefore maintained!) also by others





We must change perspective

"User" perspective

- frameworks, rather than libraries
 - fenics
 - firedrake
 - ngsolve
- graphical user interfaces
 - low entry barrier for new users
 - high entry barrier from users to developers







- libraries, rather than frameworks
 - BLAS/LAPACK/MPI
 - PETSc/Trilinos/
 - deal.II/libmesh/dune
- command line interfaces
 - high entry barrier for new users
 - low entry barrier from users to developers

dealii.org





Bangerth, W., Heister, T., 2013. What makes computational open source software libraries successful? Comput. Sci. Disc. 6, 015010

"A common belief is that writing successful software packages is largely the result of simply 'being a good programmer' when in fact there are many other factors involved"

- community building
- improving the quality and utility of the code
- writing good documentation
- project management
- licenses
- attracting new developers...





Some numbers about deal.II

- It is truly a **Vibrant** project:
 - +3k new lines of code per month since the beginning (today: 1M lines of pure code)
 - 1000+ pages of documentation (today: 500k lines of comments)
 - An average of 5 pull requests per day, every day
 - New schools, courses, training, and video lectures (popping up every year)
 - More than 1000 people on the mailing list
 - 300+ contributors
 - 100+ downloads per month
 - 200+ publications per year since 2016 (a total of more than 2.2K publications)







Some numbers about deal.II

- It is truly a **Vibrant** project:
 - +3k new lines of code per month since the beginning (today: 1M lines of pure code)
 - 1000+ pages of documentation (today: 500k lines of comments)
 - An average of 5 pull requests per day, every day
 - New schools, courses, training, and video lectures (popping up every year)
 - More than 1000 people on the mailing list
 - 300+ contributors
 - 100+ downloads per month
 - 200+ publications per year since 2016 (a total of more than 2.2K publications)







Today: 13 Principal developers

• Daniel Arndt

Oak Ridge National Laboratory, USA

- Wolfgang Bangerth
 Colorado State University, CO, USA
- Bruno Blais

Polytechnique Montréal, Canada

- Marc Fehling
 Colorado State University, CO, USA
- Rene Gassmoeller
 University of Florida, FL, USA
- Timo Heister
 Clemson University, SC, USA
- Luca Heltai

SISSA, Trieste, Italy

Developers Emeriti

- Denis Davydov
- Ralf Hartmann

DLR, Germany

• Martin Kronbichler

University of Augsburg, Germany

• Matthias Maier

Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA

Peter Munch

University of Augsburg, Germany

• Jean-Paul Pelteret

Bruno Turcksin

Oak Ridge National Laboratory, USA

• David Wells

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

- Guido Kanschat
 Heidelberg University, Germany
- Toby D. Young

Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland































Our experience: a brief history of deal.

- Bonn, 1992: Franz-Theo Suttmeier and Guido Kanschat start playing with FE: ullet**DEAL** is born (Differential Equation Analysis Library) — 1993—2000
- Heidelberg, 1997: Guido Kanschat and Franz-Theo Suttmeier (postdocs at the time) teach **DEAL** to Wolfgang Bangerth and Ralf Hartman (diploma students)
- Heidelberg, 1997: Wolfang starts a new project (**deal.II**) for his diploma thesis (some small things taken from DiffPack)
- Heidelberg, 1998: Guido contributes with expertise, and starts contributing code to **deal.** •
- Heidelberg, 1999: Ralf used **DEAL** for his diploma, but wanted something different for his PhD (he starts working on **deal.II**)



The deal.II library is born — it goes public in 2000 (deal.II v3.0.0 124k locs)



A brief history of deal.II

- 1997: Start of project
- 2000: First public version (deal.II 3.0, 124k locs)
- 2002: <u>www.dealii.org</u> comes online (deal.II 3.4, 14 tutorials, 173k locs)
- 2004: First support for parallel computations (METIS+PETSc, 17 tutorials)
- 2005: First support for HP adaptivity
- 2006: deal.II becomes part of SPEC CPU 2006
- 2007: WB, GK, and RH win the J. H. Wilkinson Prize for Numerical Software



- 2008: Anisotropic mesh refinement
- 2009: Support for co-dimension one manifolds (deal.II 6.2, 34 examples, 400K locs)
- 2010: Distributed mesh support
- 2012: Matrix free framework
- 2017: deal.II becomes part of SPEC CPU 2017
- 2018: Particles and PIC support
- 2021: Simplex support (deal.II 9.3, 79 tutorials, 1.3M locs)
- 2023: deal.II 9.5, 86 tutorials, 1.8M locs





A graphical history of deal.II







Our cumulative knowledge



- remember ~10K lines per developer per year?
- ~100 years of one developer only working on code ~50 years of one developer only working on documentation
- If we consider all linked open-source external libraries as well, we quickly get to thousands of years!
 - No small business, research group, or single developer can ever hope to compete!





Why did I choose deal. II?

- I was a PhD student in Pavia (with prof. Daniele Boffi), starting in 2003 I liked programming, and I was given total freedom to choose my
- working tools
- I was working on fluid-structure interaction problems with nonmatching methods





No opensource tools was readily available for what I wanted to do. I needed to build something on my own.



Why did I choose deal.II?

- I stumbled upon the deal.II web page and read through the first three tutorials
- I tried compiling the library, and it compiled without issues (unlike many other libraries I had tried before)
- I worked my way through the first tutorials and I saw, used, and touched first hand, for the first time, the things that I had been told in classes



I never went back!



- First trivial commit: a small change in a header file 2004
- First major contribution: co-dimension one 2009



My start with deal.

• First meaningful contribution: interface with Function Parser library — 2005





We wanted BEM

- My first Industrial project @ SISSA: Rinave 2007—2009
 - Goal: replace an old "Panel Method" code, order zero fortran 4 + fortran 77
- I wanted to keep using deal. If for the project!





We wanted BEM

- Problem:
 - deal.II was built for dim-dimensional grids embedded in dim-dimensional space (dim=1,2,3)
 - it was not possible to work on a surface mesh, embedded in three dimensions ullet
- Our solution:
 - we modified almost every file of deal. If to add an additional template parameter to work on surface meshes
 - we made all possible mistakes that could be made!
 - it took Wolfgang several weeks of code reviewing and headaches! before the changes were finally merged







- pull requests
 - strict peer review from principal developers
 - strict feature testing



As contributors to an open-source project

• Coordinating a large project is not easy — technically

(GitHub hosting and first pull request on deal.II: 2014)

(not ourselves! we *cannot* merge our own patches)

(a pull request is not merged if some 12K tests don't pass)



- (it takes an awful lot of time!)
 - how do we help people? (mailing list, video tutorials, webinars?)
 - do we accept all contributions? (who is going to maintain it?)



As contributors to an open-source project

• Coordinating a large project is not easy — **socially** how do we convince people to invest in contributing?



 The most precious and rare thing to come about is competence • one way to keep it around is to make its products open-source we are always starving for good students/postdocs/researchers • we started forming our own!



As educators



Working with industry is not (always) easy

- different languages
- different objectives
- different timelines



As academic developers



First (personal) success: WaveBEM

- Rinave not entirely a successful industrial project OpenSHIP — first real "win-win" for us — WaveBEM was born
- OpenViewSHIP consolidate
- ... many projects later, our group mathLab@SISSA still collaborates with Fincantieri and CETENA on related topics! (UBE, Prelica, SOPHYA, UBE2, SrT, etc.)







First (personal) success: WaveBEM



Arbitrary order, locally adaptive, free surface BEM solver for unsteady and nonlinear ship-wave interactions - 2010-2015

Andrea Mola, LH, and Antonio DeSimone, A stable and adaptive semi-lagrangian potential model for unsteady and nonlinear ship-wave interactions, Engineering Analysis with Boundary Elements 37 (2013), no. 1, 128 – 143.







First (personal) success: WaveBEM















The policy of the principal developers: give back to deal.

Whatever is needed for our projects, we port to deal. If it can be useful to others

Example: Arbitrary order, locally adaptive, free surface BEM solver for unsteady and nonlinear ship-wave interactions – 2010–2015

Andrea Mola, LH, and Antonio DeSimone, A stable and adaptive semi-lagrangian potential model for unsteady and nonlinear ship-wave interactions, Engineering Analysis with Boundary Elements 37 (2013), no. 1, 128 – 143.

- 2014: OpenCASCADE (-> enables CAD geometry description to be embedded in the simulation)
- 2014: Manifold infrastructure (-> formalise how geometry and FEM should interact)
- 2017: Assimp (-> read and write several formats from computer graphics world)
- Interaction with GMSH (2004) and GMSH api (2021) (-> open-source grid generator)
- SUNDIALS (2017) (-> non-linear, ode, and dae support)
- Nanoflann (2017) (-> spacial indices, later replaced with boost::rtree and ArborX)
- boost::rtree (2018) (-> spacial indices)
- CGAL (2022) (-> computational geometry library, intersections, grid generation and improvement, etc)



•

• 2009: Co-dimension one support (-> enable the definition of geometries and FEM on triangulations embedded in higher dimensions)

Did it pay back?

- We added support for co-dimension one for **BEM**
 - Andrea Bonito and Sebastian Pauletti started using it for PDEs on surfaces (step-38, two releases later)
- Rene Gassmöller added Particles support
 - Bruno Blais and myself combined the two things into Nitsche FSI (step-70, many releases later)
- My PhD code (created with deal.II 6.0.0) runs on deal.II
 9.3 40% times faster without changes on my side

The whole is much greater than the sum of its parts!





Publications referencing deal.II

Publications per year





Known publications using deal.II. Total: 2190. (Gray bars: Incomplete data.)





Publications referencing deal.II

deal.ii Co-author Relationships



Image credit: Lorraine Hwang



Author type

- Other
- **Principal Developer**

Papers

- 20
- 40
- 60

Number of co-authorships



How do we make this sustainable?

- **Strict** version control workflow prerequisites:

 - strong enforcement of test passing (12K+ tests per PR)
 - strong enforcement of minimal indentation and documentation checks (clang-format and doxygen)
- Strict peer review
 - review starts when tests pass
 - no-one merge their own pull request
 - no-documentation = no-merge



no-test = no-merge

The little important things...

• one feature = one pull request (we have 5 PR per day/every day, on average!)





Workshops, schools, and courses

The little important things...

- We use deal. If in our courses (FEM 101 through FEM 501)
- We try to teach best programming practices
- We encourage PhD students to write
 - sustainable code
 - shareable code
 - reusable code







How do we attract new contributors?

The icing on the cake...

- Students and postdocs need recognitions for their software work
 - they become co-authors of new release papers if they contribute substantially to the library (one paper per year)
- **PIs** need recognition for their software work
 - making sustainable software must become part of evaluation criteria for promotions/grants/etc.
- right also in academia





Making good CSE software is *not* an hobby — it is a job in its own



Reproducibility

- a computational paper be accepted without the source code?)
- (example: <u>https://codeocean.com/capsule/1296846/tree/v1</u>)
- environment for software deployment, etc.



The icing on the cake...

 good science needs reproducible results and open source codes (no math paper is accepted with a "closed source theorem"! Why should

• we are starting now to get "reproducibility badges" on articles that share the codes used to reproduce the results — deterministically

• @ deal.II, we try to encourage this in all possible ways (i.e., docker images are deployed at each successful merge of deal. II — these can be used to test the library, compile online, provide controlled





Advanced Solver for Problems in Earth's ConvecTion

Martin Kronbichler, Timo Heister, and Wolfgang Bangerth. 2012. "High Accuracy Mantle Convection Simulation through Modern Numerical Methods." Geophysical Journal International 191 (1) (August 21): 12–29. doi:10.1111/ j.1365-246x.2012.05609.x. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2012.05609.x.

Timo Heister, Juliane Dannberg, Rene Gassmöller, and Wolfgang Bangerth. 2017. "High Accuracy Mantle Convection Simulation through Modern Numerical Methods – II: Realistic Models and Problems." Geophysical Journal International 210 (2) (May 9): 833–851.

Bangerth, Wolfgang, Juliane Dannberg, Menno Fraters, Rene Gassmoeller, Anne Glerum, Timo Heister, Robert Myhill, and John Naliboff. 2022. **ASPECT v2.4.0** (version v2.4.0)



Aspect















Evolution of Rift Systems and Their Fault Networks in Response to Surface Processes.

Derek Neuharth, Sascha Brune, Thilo Wrona, Anne Glerum, Jean Braun, Xiaoping Yuan. Tectonics. Volume 41, Issue3, 2022.





Matthias Maier and Martin Kronbichler ACM Transactions on Parallel Computing, 2021, Vol 8, n 3,16:1-30

Ignacio Tomas

Second-order invariant domain preserving approximation of the compressible Navier—Stokes equations Jean-Luc Guermond and Matthias Maier and Bojan Popov and Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 2021, Vol 375, n 1, 113608

Jean-Luc Guermond and Martin Kronbichler and Matthias Maier and Bojan Popov and Ignacio Tomas Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering2022, Vol 389, 114250.

https://github.com/conservation-laws/ryujin



Ryuin

Efficient parallel 3D computation of the compressible Euler equations with an invariant-domain preserving second-order finite-element scheme

On the implementation of a robust and efficient finite element-based parallel solver for the compressible Navier-stokes equations





LifeX (project iHeart)

A comprehensive and biophysically detailed comp. model of the whole human heart electromechanics M.Fedele, R.Piersanti, F.Regazzoni, M.Salvador, P.C.Africa, M.Bucelli, A.Zingaro, L.Dede', A.Quarteroni,

Modeling cardiac muscle fibers in ventricular and atrial electrophysiology simulations R.Piersanti, P.C. Africa, M.Fedele, C.Vergara, L.Dede', A.F.Corno, A.Quarteroni Journal: Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, vol. 373, p. 113468-113500 (2021)

An electromechanics-driven fluid dynamics model for the simulation of the whole human heart Zingaro, M. Bucelli, R. Piersanti, F. Regazzoni, L. Dede' and A. Quarteroni.

A geometric multiscale model for the numerical simulation of blood flow in the human left heart Zingaro, I. Fumagalli, L. Dede', M. Fedele, P.C. Africa, A.F. Corno, A. Quarteroni. Discrete and Continuous Dynamical System – Series S, 15(8), 2391-2427, 2022

A mathematical model that integrates cardiac electrophysiology, mechanics and fluid dynamics: application to the human left heart. Bucelli, M., Zingaro, A., Africa, P. C., Fumagalli, I., Dede', L., & Quarteroni, A. (2022). International Journal for Numerical Methods in Biomedical Engineering, e3678



https://gitlab.com/lifex/lifex





Pressure-volume loop



LifeX - iHeart











Time: 0.0000s



Electrical wave propagation in the heart



Lethe-CFD

Lethe: An open-source parallel high-order adaptative CFD solver for incompressible flows Bruno Blais, Lucka Barbeau, Valérie Bibeau, Simon Gauvin, Toni El Geitani, Shahab Golshan, Rajeshwari Kamble, Ghazaleh Mirakhori, Jamal Chaouki SoftwareX, 2020, Vol 12, 100579

https://github.com/lethe-cfd/lethe

Combined with Particles + step-70 (LH, Bruno Blais, Rene Gassmöller)

now Lethe-CFD supports DEM

Time: 0.00

velocity Magnitude

Time: 0.00s

Time: 0.0s

Time: 0.00

Exploiting high-contrast Stokes preconditioners to efficiently solve incompressible fluid-structure interaction problems, **M. Wichrowski**, S.Stupkiewicz, P.Krzyzanowski, **LH,** 2023, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering.

ALE - iFSI — RE = 2000 ~30 sec wall time per 0.01 time step 10k dofs/(s cores) (3D) 32k dofs/(s cores) (2D)

