

Advanced Reduced Order Methods and Applications in Computational Fluid Dynamics

Computational Science & Engineering

The SIAM series on Computational Science and Engineering publishes research monographs, advanced undergraduate- or graduate-level textbooks, and other volumes of interest to an interdisciplinary CS&E community of computational mathematicians, computer scientists, scientists, and engineers. The series includes introductory volumes aimed at a broad audience of mathematically motivated readers interested in understanding methods and applications within computational science and engineering, monographs reporting on the most recent developments in the field, and volumes addressed to specific groups of professionals whose work relies extensively on computational science and engineering.

SIAM created the CS&E series to support access to the rapid and far-ranging advances in computer modeling and simulation of complex problems in science and engineering, to promote the interdisciplinary culture required to meet these large-scale challenges, and to provide the means to the next generation of computational scientists and engineers.

Editor-in-Chief

Donald Estep, Simon Fraser University

Editorial Board

Ben Adcock
Simon Fraser University

Daniela Calvetti
Case Western Reserve University

Omar Ghattas
University of Texas at Austin

Chen Greif
University of British Columbia

Serkan Gugercin
Virginia Tech

Jan S. Hesthaven
Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale
de Lausanne

Johan Hoffman
KTH Royal Institute of Technology

David Keyes
Columbia University

Ralph C. Smith
North Carolina State University

Karen Willcox
University of Texas at Austin

Series Volumes

Rozza, Gianluigi, Stabile, Giovanni, and Ballarin, Francesco, *Advanced Reduced Order Methods and Applications in Computational Fluid Dynamics*

Gatto, Paolo, *Mathematical Foundations of Finite Elements and Iterative Solvers*

Adcock, Ben, Brugiapaglia, Simone, and Webster, Clayton G., *Sparse Polynomial Approximation of High-Dimensional Functions*

Hoffman, Johan, *Methods in Computational Science*

Da Veiga, Sébastien, Gamboa, Fabrice, Iooss, Bertrand, and Prieur, Clémentine, *Basics and Trends in Sensitivity Analysis: Theory and Practice in R*

Vidyasagar, M., *An Introduction to Compressed Sensing*

Antoulas, A. C., Beattie, C. A., and Gügüercin, S., *Interpolatory Methods for Model Reduction*

Sipahi, Rifat, *Mastering Frequency Domain Techniques for the Stability Analysis of LTI Time Delay Systems*

Bardsley, Johnathan M., *Computational Uncertainty Quantification for Inverse Problems*

Hesthaven, Jan S., *Numerical Methods for Conservation Laws: From Analysis to Algorithms*

Sidi, Avram, *Vector Extrapolation Methods with Applications*

Borzi, A., Ciaramella, G., and Sprengel, M., *Formulation and Numerical Solution of Quantum Control Problems*

Benner, Peter, Cohen, Albert, Ohlberger, Mario, and Willcox, Karen, editors, *Model Reduction and Approximation: Theory and Algorithms*

Kuzmin, Dmitri and Hämäläinen, Jari, *Finite Element Methods for Computational Fluid Dynamics: A Practical Guide*

Rostamian, Rouben, *Programming Projects in C for Students of Engineering, Science, and Mathematics*

Smith, Ralph C., *Uncertainty Quantification: Theory, Implementation, and Applications*

Dankowicz, Harry and Schilder, Frank, *Recipes for Continuation*

Mueller, Jennifer L. and Siltanen, Samuli, *Linear and Nonlinear Inverse Problems with Practical Applications*

Shapira, Yair, *Solving PDEs in C++: Numerical Methods in a Unified Object-Oriented Approach, Second Edition*

Borzi, Alfio and Schulz, Volker, *Computational Optimization of Systems Governed by Partial Differential Equations*

Ascher, Uri M. and Greif, Chen, *A First Course in Numerical Methods*

Layton, William, *Introduction to the Numerical Analysis of Incompressible Viscous Flows*

Ascher, Uri M., *Numerical Methods for Evolutionary Differential Equations*

Zohdi, T. I., *An Introduction to Modeling and Simulation of Particulate Flows*

Biegler, Lorenz T., Ghattas, Omar, Heinkenschloss, Matthias, Keyes, David, and van Bloemen Waanders, Bart, editors, *Real-Time PDE-Constrained Optimization*

Chen, Zhangxin, Huan, Guanren, and Ma, Yuanle, *Computational Methods for Multiphase Flows in Porous Media*

Shapira, Yair, *Solving PDEs in C++: Numerical Methods in a Unified Object-Oriented Approach*

Advanced Reduced Order Methods and Applications in Computational Fluid Dynamics

GIANLUIGI ROZZA

SISSA, International School for Advanced Studies
Trieste, Italy

GIOVANNI STABILE

SISSA, International School for Advanced Studies
Trieste, Italy

FRANCESCO BALLARIN

Catholic University of the Sacred Heart
Brescia, Italy



Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics
Philadelphia

Copyright © 2023 by the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored, or transmitted in any manner without the written permission of the publisher. For information, write to the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 3600 Market Street, 6th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19104-2688 USA.

No warranties, express or implied, are made by the publisher, authors, and their employers that the programs contained in this volume are free of error. They should not be relied on as the sole basis to solve a problem whose incorrect solution could result in injury to person or property. If the programs are employed in such a manner, it is at the user's own risk and the publisher, authors, and their employers disclaim all liability for such misuse.

Trademarked names may be used in this book without the inclusion of a trademark symbol. These names are used in an editorial context only; no infringement of trademark is intended.

<i>Publications Director</i>	Kivmars H. Bowling
<i>Executive Editor</i>	Elizabeth Greenspan
<i>Managing Editor</i>	Kelly Thomas
<i>Production Editor</i>	David Riegelhaupt
<i>Copy Editor</i>	Julia Cochrane
<i>Production Manager</i>	Donna Witzleben
<i>Production Coordinator</i>	Cally A. Shrader
<i>Compositor</i>	Cheryl Hufnagle
<i>Graphic Designer</i>	Doug Smock

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Rozza, Gianluigi, author. | Stabile, Giovanni, author. | Ballarin, Francesco, author.

Title: Advanced reduced order methods and applications in computational fluid dynamics / Gianluigi Rozza, Giovanni Stabile, Francesco Ballarin.

Description: Philadelphia, PA : Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2022. | Series: Computational science and engineering ; 27 | Includes bibliographical references and index. | Summary: "This is the first book dedicated to reduced order methods in computational fluid dynamics. The book focuses on complex parametrization of shapes for their optimization and applications. Advanced topics, such as turbulence, stability of flows, inverse problems, optimization, and flow control are included" - Provided by publisher.

Identifiers: LCCN 2022029194 (print) | LCCN 2022029195 (ebook) | ISBN 9781611977240 (paperback) | ISBN 9781611977257 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Computational fluid dynamics. | Fluid dynamics--Mathematics. | Estimation theory. | AMS: Partial differential equations. | Fluid mechanics. | Partial differential equations - Equations of mathematical physics and other areas of application - PDEs in connection with fluid mechanics.

Classification: LCC TA357.5.D37 R69 2022 (print) | LCC TA357.5.D37 (ebook) | DDC 620.1/064-dc23/eng/20220919

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022029194>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022029195>



*To our families, to our younger collaborators,
to little Petra and Clara representing the future,
and to all people who contributed to and inspired this book*

Contents

List of Contributors	xvii
List of Figures	xix
List of Tables	xxxiii
List of Algorithms	xxxv
Preface	xxxvii
1 Overview and Motivation	1
<i>Martin W. Hess, Marco Tezzele, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
1.1 Reduced Order Modeling	1
1.1.1 Intrusive Approaches	1
1.1.2 Nonintrusive Approaches	2
1.2 Basic Principles	2
1.2.1 Offline-Online Decomposition	2
1.2.2 Affine Parameter Dependency	3
1.2.3 POD and the Greedy Algorithm	3
1.2.4 Stabilization	6
1.3 More Advanced Principles	9
1.3.1 Parameter Space Reduction	9
1.3.2 Advanced Geometrical Morphing	10
1.3.3 New Deep Learning Approaches	11
1.3.4 Digital Twins	12
I Finite Element–Based ROMs	13
2 Finite Element–Based Reduced Basis Method in Computational Fluid Dynamics	15
<i>Federico Pichi, Maria Strazzullo, Francesco Ballarin, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
2.1 Introduction	15
2.2 The FEM	15
2.2.1 The Model Problem: The Poisson Equation	16
2.2.2 Galerkin Projection	17
2.2.3 A First Example in Fluid Dynamics: Stokes Equations	21
2.2.4 A Nonlinear Model: Navier–Stokes Equations	24

2.3	ROMs	26
2.3.1	RB Approximation	26
2.3.2	Model Problem: Parametrized Elliptic PDE	27
2.3.3	Space Generation: POD	29
2.3.4	Space Generation: Greedy Algorithm	30
2.3.5	Comparison between FE and RB Spaces	32
2.3.6	Model Problem: Geometrical Parametrization in Heat Transfer	35
2.3.7	Reduction of CFD Problems	37
2.3.8	Supremizer Enrichment of the Velocity Space	38
2.3.9	Extension to the Parabolic Case	41
2.4	A Posteriori Error Estimation for Certified RB Methods	44
2.4.1	Error Estimator for an Elliptic Problem	44
2.4.2	The min- θ Approach	48
2.4.3	The Successive Constraint Method	48
2.4.4	Error Estimator for Stokes Equations	51
2.4.5	Error Estimator for Parabolic Problems	52
2.5	Nonaffine and Nonlinear Problems	53
2.5.1	The EIM	55
2.5.2	Model Problem: Elliptic Problem with Gaussian Source	56
3	Certified Smagorinsky Reduced Basis Turbulence Model	59
	<i>Enrique Delgado Ávila, Francesco Ballarin, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
3.1	Introduction	59
3.2	RB Smagorinsky Turbulence Model	60
3.2.1	FE Problem	60
3.2.2	Greedy Algorithm	62
3.2.3	Approximation of the Eddy Viscosity Term	63
3.2.4	Well-Posedness Analysis	64
3.2.5	A Posteriori Error Estimator	65
3.2.6	Numerical Results for the Smagorinsky Model	66
3.3	RB VMS-Boussinesq Model	69
3.3.1	FE Problem	69
3.3.2	RB Problem	72
3.3.3	Well-Posedness Analysis	72
3.3.4	A Posteriori Error Bound Estimator	74
3.3.5	Numerical Results for the VMS-Boussinesq Model	74
3.4	Geometrical Parametrization	77
3.4.1	Problem Setting	77
3.4.2	Numerical Results	79
3.5	Conclusion	82
4	Finite Element–Based Reduced Basis Method for Optimal Flow Control	83
	<i>Maria Strazzullo, Francesco Ballarin, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
4.1	Introduction	83
4.2	Linear OCP(μ)s	84
4.2.1	ROMs for Linear OCP(μ)s	86
4.2.2	Numerical Test: Pollutant Control in the Gulf of Trieste	87
4.3	ROMs for Nonlinear OCP(μ)s	88
4.3.1	Numerical Test: Weather Prediction through Quasi-geostrophic Equations	89

4.4	ROMs for Space-Time OCP(μ)s	91
4.4.1	Numerical Test: Graetz Flow Boundary Control	93
4.5	Conclusions	95
5	Reduced Basis Approaches to Bifurcating Nonlinear Parametrized Partial Differential Equations	97
	<i>Federico Pichi, Francesco Ballarin, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
5.1	Introduction	97
5.2	Nonlinear Analysis of PDEs and Bifurcation Problems	98
5.2.1	Mathematical Formulation	98
5.2.2	An Overview of Bifurcation Theory	100
5.3	Numerical Approximation of Bifurcating Phenomena	102
5.3.1	High-Fidelity Approximation	103
5.3.2	Reduced Basis Approximation	105
5.4	Von Kármán Equations for Structural Buckling of Plates	109
5.4.1	Von Kármán Model	109
5.4.2	Weak Formulation and Its Approximation	110
5.4.3	Numerical Investigation of Buckling Phenomena	110
5.5	Gross–Pitaevskii Equations in Bose–Einstein Condensates	112
5.5.1	Gross–Pitaevskii Model	112
5.5.2	Weak Formulation and Its Approximation	112
5.5.3	Numerical Investigation of Quantum States	113
5.6	Hyperelastic Models for Bending Beams	115
5.6.1	A Continuum Mechanics Framework	116
5.6.2	Weak Formulation and Its Approximation	117
5.6.3	Numerical Investigation of Compressed Beams	117
5.7	Navier–Stokes Flow and the Coandă Effect	119
5.7.1	NS Model in a Channel	120
5.7.2	Weak Formulation and Its Approximation	120
5.7.3	Numerical Investigation of Wall-Hugging Behavior	121
6	Reduced Basis Stabilization for Convection-Dominated Problems	125
	<i>Enrique Delgado Ávila, Francesco Ballarin, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
6.1	Introduction	125
6.2	Advection–Diffusion Problem	126
6.3	Steady Stokes Equations	127
6.3.1	Stabilized FE Problem	128
6.3.2	Stabilized RB Problem	129
6.4	Steady Navier–Stokes Equations	129
6.4.1	Stabilized FE Problem	130
6.4.2	Stabilized RB Problem	130
6.5	Stabilized VMS–Smagorinsky Turbulence Model	131
6.5.1	FE Problem	131
6.5.2	RB Problem	133
6.5.3	Well-Posedness Analysis	135
6.5.4	A Posteriori Error Bound Estimator	137
6.5.5	Numerical Results	138
6.6	Conclusions	139

II	Finite Volume, Spectral Element, and Discontinuous Galerkin-Based Reduced Order Models	141
7	Finite Volume–Based Reduced Order Models for Laminar Flows	143
	<i>Matteo Zancanaro, Saddam Hijazi, Umberto Morelli, Giovanni Stabile, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
7.1	Introduction	143
7.1.1	Literature Review	143
7.2	Computational Fluid Dynamics—Laminar NSEs	144
7.2.1	Full-Order Model	144
7.2.2	Segregated Pressure-Based Solvers for the Incompressible NSEs	146
7.2.3	Nonsegregated Finite Volume–Based ROMs	150
7.2.4	Segregated Finite Volume–Based ROMs (SIMPLE-ROM)	153
7.2.5	Treatment of Nonhomogeneous Dirichlet Boundary Conditions	154
7.2.6	Offline-Online Computation of Lift and Drag Forces	156
7.3	Numerical Experiments	157
7.3.1	Lid-Driven Cavity Problem	157
7.3.2	Flow around a Circular Cylinder	160
7.3.3	Comments on the Results	164
8	Finite Volume–Based Reduced Order Models for Turbulent Flows	165
	<i>Matteo Zancanaro, Saddam Hijazi, Michele Girfoglio, Andrea Mola, Giovanni Stabile, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
8.1	Introduction	165
8.2	RANS Equations	165
8.2.1	Closure Problem and Reynolds Averaging	165
8.2.2	EVMs	167
8.3	LES	169
8.4	Hybrid Projection-Based/Data-Driven ROM for Turbulent Flows	171
8.4.1	Hybrid ROM with RBF Interpolation on the Time-Parameter Values	173
8.4.2	Hybrid ROM with RBF Interpolation on the Velocity Projection Coefficient Values	175
8.5	Turbulent ROMs Based on the Uniform-ROM and the PPE-ROM	178
8.5.1	Hybrid ROM Based on the PPE-ROM	180
8.6	Application of the H-SUP-ROM to Turbulent Problems	181
8.6.1	Steady Case	181
8.6.2	Unsteady Case	187
9	Nonintrusive Data-Driven Reduced Order Models in Computational Fluid Dynamics	203
	<i>Marco Tezzele, Nicola Demo, Giovanni Stabile, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
9.1	Introduction	203
9.2	A General Framework for Nonintrusive Parametric ROMs	204
9.2.1	Database Creation	204
9.2.2	Linear Dimensionality Reduction	204
9.2.3	Solution Manifold Approximation	206
9.2.4	Computational Considerations	207
9.3	DMD for Time-Dependent Problems	207
9.3.1	Classical DMD Algorithm	207
9.3.2	DMD Extensions	209

9.4	Applications in CFD	212
9.4.1	A ROM Pipeline for Shape Optimization Problems	212
9.4.2	Comparison between DMD and PODI for Hydroacoustics Problems	214
9.4.3	A Parametric View of DMD	217
9.5	Conclusions and Future Perspectives	222
10	Spectral Element Method–Based Model Order Reduction	223
	<i>Martin W. Hess, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
10.1	Basic Notions and Functions of the SEM	223
10.1.1	Polynomials and Quadrature Rules	223
10.1.2	Expansion Functions	225
10.2	Assembly of System Matrices	227
10.2.1	Method of Weighted Residuals	227
10.2.2	Elemental Properties	227
10.3	Reduced Order Modeling with the SEM	228
10.3.1	Examples in Computational Fluid Dynamics	229
10.3.2	Reduced Order Model	230
11	Discontinuous Galerkin-Based Reduced Order Models	233
	<i>Andrea Lario, Francesco Romor, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
11.1	Introduction	233
11.2	Nodal DGM	234
11.2.1	Mapping from Physical to Master Elements	236
11.2.2	Interface Fluxes	238
11.3	Reduced Order Methods for DGM	239
11.3.1	Offline Phase	239
11.3.2	Online Phase	241
11.4	Projection of the Governing Equations	241
11.4.1	Incompressible Navier–Stokes	241
11.4.2	Compressible Navier–Stokes	242
11.5	Test Case and Results	244
11.5.1	Incompressible Flow around a Square-Based Cylinder	244
11.5.2	Parametric Simulation of a Compressible Cavity Flow in a Duct	244
III	Advances in Reduced Order Models for Computational Fluid Dynamics	249
12	Weighted Reduced Order Methods for Uncertainty Quantification	251
	<i>Davide Torlo, Maria Strazzullo, Francesco Ballarin, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
12.1	Introduction	251
12.2	Stochastic PDEs and Discretized Approximations	252
12.3	Weighted ROMs	253
12.3.1	WRB Method	253
12.3.2	wPOD	254
12.4	Sampling Strategies	255
12.5	Applications	256
12.5.1	Averaging Uncertain Parameter Simulations for Heat Equation and Stokes Problems	256

12.5.2	Stabilization of Advection-Dominated Problems Conditioned to Parameters	259
12.5.3	wPOD for Optimal Control for Environmental Sciences	261
12.6	Conclusions	263
13	Reduced Basis, Embedded Methods, and Parametrized Level-Set Geometry	265
	<i>Efthymios N. Karatzas, Giovanni Stabile, Francesco Ballarin, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
13.1	Introduction and Overview	265
13.1.1	Heat Exchange Model Problem	265
13.1.2	Shifted Nitsche Boundary Weak Formulation	266
13.1.3	The Parametrized Thermal-Heat Exchange Model	267
13.1.4	Model Reduction Methodology	267
13.1.5	POD	268
13.1.6	The Projection Stage and ROM Generation	268
13.1.7	Numerical Experiments (Heat Exchange/SBM)	269
13.2	Parametrized Steady Stokes Equations	271
13.2.1	POD Adapted to Flows	272
13.2.2	Steady Stokes Numerical Experiments (SBM)	272
13.3	Looking for a Better ROM with CutFEM	276
13.4	ROM and a Fourth-Order Evolutionary Nonlinear System	280
13.5	Conclusions and Future Developments	282
14	Reduced Order Methods for Fluid-Structure Interaction Problems	283
	<i>Monica Nonino, Francesco Ballarin, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
14.1	Introduction	283
14.2	Dynamics of FSI Problems	284
14.2.1	The ALE Formulation	284
14.3	Approaches to FSI Problems	286
14.3.1	Partitioned Algorithms	286
14.3.2	Monolithic Algorithms	287
14.4	Partitioned RBM	287
14.4.1	Test Case: Leaflets Bending under the Influence of a Fluid	287
14.4.2	Offline Computational Phase	290
14.4.3	Online Phase	293
14.4.4	Numerical Results	295
14.5	A Monolithic RBM for a Transport-Dominated FSI Problem	296
14.5.1	The Kolmogorov n -Width	297
14.5.2	Nonlinear Model Reduction by Transport Maps	298
14.5.3	A Multiphysics Problem	299
14.5.4	Offline Phase	303
14.5.5	Online Phase	305
14.5.6	Numerical Results	308
14.5.7	Conclusions	310
15	Reduced Order Models for Bifurcating Phenomena in Fluid-Structure Interaction Problems	311
	<i>Moaad Khamlich, Federico Pichi, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
15.1	Introduction	311
15.2	Problem Formulation	312
15.2.1	Variational Formulation	313

15.2.2	Lagrange Multipliers Method	315
15.2.3	Branchwise Reduced Basis Approximation	315
15.3	Application to the Coandă Effect	317
15.3.1	Preliminaries	317
15.3.2	FSI Problem with Linear Elasticity	318
15.3.3	RBM Results	320
15.4	Model Comparison	322
IV	Further Advances, Perspectives, and Applications	325
16	Reduction in Parameter Space	327
	<i>Marco Tezzele, Francesco Romor, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
16.1	Introduction	327
16.2	AS-Based Methods	328
16.2.1	Active Subspaces	328
16.2.2	Kernel-Based Active Subspaces	329
16.2.3	Local Active Subspaces	333
16.2.4	Multifidelity Regression	334
16.2.5	Gradient-Free Extensions	336
16.3	Other Nonlinear Techniques	337
16.3.1	Nonlinear Level-Set Learning	337
16.3.2	Active Manifolds	337
16.4	Applications	338
16.4.1	Response Surface Design	338
16.4.2	Regression	338
16.4.3	Sensitivity Analysis	340
16.4.4	Optimization	340
16.4.5	Inverse Problems	341
16.4.6	Coupling with Other Reduced Order Methods	342
16.5	Conclusions	342
17	Geometrical Parametrization and Morphing Techniques with Applications	345
	<i>Andrea Mola, Nicola Demo, Marco Tezzele, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
17.1	Introduction	345
17.2	Parametrization Techniques	347
17.2.1	General Purpose Shape Parametrization Algorithms	347
17.2.2	Object-Specific Shape Parametrization Algorithms: Some Examples	351
17.3	Application to Different Geometry Specifications	356
17.3.1	Geometric Model Parametrization	356
17.3.2	Computational Domain Parametrization	361
17.3.3	The Use of RBF to Extend Boundary Deformation to Internal Grid Nodes	361
17.4	Conclusions and Future Perspectives	363
18	Reduced Order Methods for Hemodynamics Applications	365
	<i>Zakia Zainib, Pierfrancesco Siena, Michele Girfoglio, Martin W. Hess, Francesco Ballarin, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
18.1	Introduction	365

18.2	CABGs	366
18.2.1	Problem Statement	366
18.2.2	ROM	367
18.2.3	Numerical Results	367
18.3	Coandă Effect in Mitral Valves	370
18.3.1	Physical Principles	370
18.3.2	Mathematical Modeling	372
18.3.3	ROM	373
18.4	LVAD	374
18.4.1	High-Fidelity Problem	374
18.4.2	ROM	375
18.4.3	Numerical Results	375
19	Scientific Software Development and Packages for Reduced Order Models in Computational Fluid Dynamics	379
	<i>Nicola Demo, Marco Tezzele, Giovanni Stabile, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
19.1	Scientific Open-Source Software for Reduced Order Models	379
19.1.1	RBniCS	379
19.1.2	ITHACA-FV	381
19.1.3	ITHACA-SEM	381
19.1.4	ITHACA-DG	382
19.1.5	EZyRB	382
19.1.6	PyDMD	383
19.1.7	ATHENA	384
19.1.8	PyGeM	384
19.1.9	BladeX	385
19.2	Best Practices for Scientific Programming	385
19.2.1	Code Quality	386
19.2.2	Testing	387
19.2.3	Documentation	387
20	A Deep Learning Approach to Improving Reduced Order Models	389
	<i>Laura Meneghetti, Nirav Shah, Michele Girfoglio, Nicola Demo, Marco Tezzele, Andrea Lario, Giovanni Stabile, Gianluigi Rozza</i>	
20.1	Introduction	389
20.2	ANNs	390
20.3	NN Topologies	393
20.3.1	Feedforward Neural Network	393
20.3.2	Recurrent Neural Network	393
20.3.3	Convolutional Neural Network	394
20.3.4	Autoencoder	396
20.4	NNs to Improve POD-Based Models	397
20.4.1	The POD-ANN Approach	397
20.4.2	The NNsPOD Approach	399
20.5	A PINN for Solving Parametric PDEs	401
20.6	A Reduced Approach for CNNs	402
20.6.1	Reduction Strategies for CNNs	403
20.6.2	Reduced ANNs	403
20.6.3	Numerical Results	407

20.7	A Future Perspective on ROMs for Digital Twin	410
20.7.1	Introduction to Digital Twins	410
20.7.2	The Role of Modeling and Simulation in Digital Twin	410
20.7.3	ROMs for Digital Twin	411
20.7.4	Next Developments and Challenges	413
Bibliography		415
Index		461

List of Contributors

Francesco Ballarin

Department of Mathematics and Physics, Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Brescia, Italy

Enrique Delgado Ávila

Department of Differential Equations and Numerical Analysis, University of Seville, Spain

Nicola Demo

mathLab, Mathematics Area, SISSA, Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste, Italy

Michele Girfoglio

mathLab, Mathematics Area, SISSA, Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste, Italy

Martin W. Hess

mathLab, Mathematics Area, SISSA, Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste, Italy

Saddam Hijazi

Institute of Mathematics, University of Potsdam, Germany

Efthymios N. Karatzas

Department of Mathematics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Moad Khamlich

mathLab, Mathematics Area, SISSA, Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste, Italy

Andrea Lario

mathLab, Mathematics Area, SISSA, Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste, Italy

Laura Meneghetti

mathLab, Mathematics Area, SISSA, Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste, Italy

Andrea Mola

mathLab, Mathematics Area, SISSA, Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste, Italy

Umberto Morelli

Departamento de Matemática Aplicada, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain

Monica Nonino

Department of Mathematics, University of Vienna, Austria

Federico Pichi

Chair of Computational Mathematics and Simulation Science, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Switzerland

Francesco Romor

mathLab, Mathematics Area, SISSA, Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste, Italy

Gianluigi Rozza

mathLab, Mathematics Area, SISSA, Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste, Italy

Nirav Shah

mathLab, Mathematics Area, SISSA, Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste, Italy

Pierfrancesco Siena

mathLab, Mathematics Area, SISSA, Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste, Italy

Giovanni Stabile

mathLab, Mathematics Area, SISSA, Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste, Italy

Maria Strazzullo

Department of Mathematical Sciences “G.L. Lagrange”, Politecnico di Torino, Italy

Marco Tezzele

Oden Institute for Computational Engineering and Sciences, University of Texas at Austin, USA

Davide Torlo

mathLab, Mathematics Area, SISSA, Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste, Italy

Zakia Zainib

Technische Universität Dortmund, Germany

Matteo Zancanaro

mathLab, Mathematics Area, SISSA, Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste, Italy

List of Figures

2.1	Left: example of a triangulation over the unit square resulting from Listing 2.1. Right: highlighted edges for the application of boundary conditions. . . .	18
2.2	\mathbb{P}^1 and \mathbb{P}^2 element types for two- and three-dimensional cells in (a), (b) and (c), (d), respectively.	19
2.3	Basis function ϕ_j and its support highlighted in pink.	19
2.4	Solution of the system (2.10), with $F = \sin(\boldsymbol{\mu}[0]x) \cos(\boldsymbol{\mu}[1]y)$, for several values of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$. Here, x and y indicate the spatial coordinates of the spatial domain. Left: $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (2\pi, 2\pi)$. Center: $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (2\pi, \pi)$. Right: $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\pi, \pi)$	20
2.5	Flow past a cylinder: solution of the system (2.23) with a parabolic inlet on the left boundary. Velocity and pressure fields from left to right, respectively. No-slip conditions on the bottom and top walls and on the cylinder and Neumann boundary conditions on the right outflow.	23
2.6	Flow past a cylinder: solution of the system (2.25) with a parabolic inlet on the left boundary and velocity and pressure fields from left to right, respectively. No-slip conditions on the bottom and top walls and on the cylinder and Neumann boundary conditions on the right outflow. The solution is represented for several values of Re	25
2.7	Solution manifold at the discrete level represented by the snapshots.	27
2.8	Two-dimensional domain, composed of two subdomains, for the steady heat conduction problem.	28
2.9	Snapshots and basis for the thermal block problem.	33
2.10	FE (369 nonzero elements) and RB (225 nonzero elements) structures of the assembled systems, respectively left and right.	35
2.11	Left: parametric domain $\Omega_o(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. Right: reference domain Ω	36
2.12	Top: Stokes flow in deformable channels (RBniCS tutorial 12). Bottom: Backward-facing step for moderate Reynolds, Navier–Stokes equations (RBniCS tutorial 17).	41
2.13	Velocity and pressure reduced solution for the Navier–Stokes equations in the backward-facing step channel, varying the number of supremizers N_s	42
2.14	Reduced manifold $\mathcal{M}^{N,K}$ for time-dependent problem.	43
2.15	Left: RB temperature solution. Right: computational mesh for $\Omega = (-1, 1)^2$ with EIM interpolation points.	57
2.16	Convergence of the RB method for the elliptic problem with Gaussian source, with respect to the number of basis functions, for EIM (left) and RB (right). . . .	58
3.1	Domain Ω with the different boundaries identified.	67
3.2	Convergence of the EIM algorithm.	67
3.3	Convergence of the greedy algorithm (left) and the value of $\Delta_{N_{\max}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ and the exact error between the FE solution and the RB solution (right).	68

3.4	FE solution (left) and RB solution (right) for $\mu = 4521$	68
3.5	Unit square cavity domain Ω , with the different boundaries identified, for problem (3.30).	75
3.6	FE solution, velocity magnitude (top) and temperature (bottom), for $\mu = 4523$, $\mu = 55732$, and $\mu = 642639$ (left to right).	76
3.7	Error evolution for the EIM for $\mu \in [10^3, 10^5]$ (left) and $\mu \in [10^5, 10^6]$ (right).	76
3.8	Evolution of the a posteriori error bound in the greedy algorithm for $\mu \in [10^3, 10^5]$ (left) and $\mu \in [10^5, 10^6]$ (right).	77
3.9	A posteriori error bound for $N = N_{\max}$ for $\mu \in [10^3, 10^5]$ (left) and $\mu \in [10^5, 10^6]$ (right).	77
3.10	FE snapshots for $\mu_g = 0.5$ (top left), $\mu_g = 1$ (bottom left), $\mu_g = 1.5$ (middle), and $\mu_g = 2$ (right).	79
3.11	Error evolution for the EIM and for the Boussinesq VMS-Smagorinsky model with $\mu \in [10^3, 10^4] \times [0.5, 2]$	80
3.12	Evolution of the a posteriori error bound in the greedy algorithm for only the geometrical parameter (left) and for both physical and geometrical parameters (right)	80
3.13	A posteriori error bound for only the geometrical parameter (left) and for both physical and geometrical parameters (right), for $N = N_{\max}$	81
4.1	Graphical representation of the OCP(μ) pipeline.	84
4.2	Left: zoom of the mesh overlapping satellite images (Trieste harbor). Right: subdomains and boundaries. Orange: observation domain Ω_{obs} . Green: control domain Ω_u	88
4.3	Left and center: optimal FE and ROM state pollutant concentration for $\mu = (1, -1, 1)$, representing the Bora wind action. Right: averaged relative log-error for the variables.	88
4.4	Left: zoom of the mesh overlapping satellite images (Florida peninsula). Right: triangulation of the spatial domain Ω , representing the North Atlantic Ocean, from the Florida peninsula to northern Europe.	90
4.5	Top: comparison between desired state, FE and ROM solutions for $\mu = (10^{-4}, 0.073, 0.0452)$, representing the Gulf Stream. Bottom: averaged relative log-error for all the variables.	91
4.6	Domain Ω . Observation domain: $\Omega_d(\mu_3) = \Omega_3(\mu_3) \cup \Omega_4(\mu_3)$. Control domain: $\Gamma_C(\mu_3)$ (red solid line). Blue dashed line: Dirichlet boundary conditions. The reference domain Ω is given by $\mu_3 = 1$	93
4.7	Left: FE state solutions for $t = 1$ s, 2 s, 3 s for $\mu = (12.0, 2.5, 2.0)$. Right: ROM state solutions for $t = 1$ s, 2 s, 3 s for $\mu = (12.0, 2.5, 2.0)$	94
4.8	Averaged relative log-error for the variables.	94
5.1	A beam subject to a load and its buckled configuration.	100
5.2	An elastic and rectangular plate compressed along the edges parallel to the y direction.	109
5.3	Left: high-fidelity bifurcation diagram for the rectangular plate with $L = 2$. Right: high-fidelity displacements linked to the five branches at $\mu = 65$	111
5.4	Left: RB error on \mathcal{P} for the first branch. Right: RB contour error plot of the displacement u at $\mu = 65$	111
5.5	Left: RB bifurcation diagram for the multiparameter test case with infinity norm of the density as output. The black dotted line shows the critical values of μ . Right: RB error on \mathcal{P} for density in the L^2 - and H_0^1 -norms for $\tau = 0.18$	114

5.6	Left: RB density functions at $\mu = 0.8$ with $\tau \in \{0.15, 0.25\}$ for the first three branches. Right: RB bifurcation diagram for the multiparameter test case with infinity norm of the density as output. The blue dashed lines show the critical values of μ for both branching phenomena.	115
5.7	Left: error between the branches of the bifurcation diagram computed with FE and RB with EIM/DEIM in the μ - N_B plane. Right: high-fidelity and RB real part ϕ of the solution X for the 1-dark soliton stripe branch, left and right, respectively, at $\mu = 0.5$	115
5.8	Left: RB bifurcation diagrams for the SVK unforced beam. Right: high-fidelity zeroth and second mode displacement u for the SVK beam with $B = (0, 0)$ at $\mu = 0.2$	118
5.9	Left: RB bifurcation plot for SVK beam with $B = (0, -1000)$ for five random pairs $(E, \nu) \in [10^5, 10^7] \times [0.25, 0.42]$. Right: RB bifurcation plot for SVK beam with $B = (0, -1000)$ and $l \in [0.5, 1]$	119
5.10	Left: RB bifurcation diagram for tubular unforced geometries with $l \in [10, 20]$. Right: representative solutions of the three-dimensional SVK model with $l \in \{2, 20\}$	119
5.11	Domain Ω , which represents a straight channel with a narrow inlet.	120
5.12	Left: RB bifurcation diagram for the NS system. Right: velocity magnitude of the asymmetric branch varying the viscosity μ	122
5.13	Representative solutions for the NS system at $\mu = 0.5$, velocity and pressure fields, lower and middle branch, top and bottom respectively.	122
5.14	RB errors with respect to $\mu \in \mathcal{P}$ for the velocity and pressure of the asymmetric branch.	123
5.15	Eigenvalues of the state eigenproblem in the complex plane for the NSE: stable and unstable solutions, left and right panels, respectively.	123
6.1	Comparison of the stabilization with/without supremizer (left) and evolution of the error in the EIM (right).	138
6.2	Evolution of the error in the greedy algorithm (left) and a posteriori error estimator for $N = 16$, with error (right).	138
6.3	FE (left) and RB (right) solution for $\mu = 2751$	139
7.1	Sketch of a finite volume in two dimensions.	145
7.2	Sketch of the mesh for the lid-driven cavity problem together with the boundary subdivisions and boundary conditions.	157
7.3	Error analysis for the velocity field. The L^2 -norm of the relative error is plotted over time for three different models: with supremizer stabilization (USUP, continuous red line), with PPE stabilization (UPPE, dotted blue line), and without stabilization (PNOS, dashed green line). The ROMs are obtained with 10 modes for velocity, pressure, and supremizer.	158
7.4	Comparison of the velocity and pressure fields for high-fidelity (UHF, column 1; PHF, column 4), SUP-ROM (USUP, column 2; PSUP, column 5), and PPE-ROM (UPPE, column 3; PPEE, column 6). The fields are depicted for different time instants equal to $t = 0.2$ s, 0.5 s, 1 s, and 5 s, respectively, and increasing in the image from top to bottom. The ROM models are obtained with 10 modes for velocity and pressure and for the SUP-ROM only with 10 additional supremizer modes. The velocity and pressure magnitudes are shown in the image legends.	159

7.5 The figure shows a general overview of the mesh with dimension and boundaries (upper left), a table with the imposed values at the boundaries (bottom), and a zoom of the mesh near the cylinder (upper right). 160

7.6 Kinetic energy relative error in the cylinder example for $\nu = 0.005$ and $\nu = 0.005625$. The kinetic energy relative error is plotted over time for the two values of viscosity and for the two different models: with supremizer stabilization (USUP and PSUP) and PPE stabilization (UPPE and PPPE). The ROM solutions are obtained with 15 modes for velocity, 10 modes for pressure, and 12 modes for supremizers. The time window in this case is wider than the one used to generate the RB spaces ($\Delta T = 10$ s). 161

7.7 First four basis functions for velocity (first row), pressure (second row), and supremizers (third row). 161

7.8 Comparison of the velocity field for high-fidelity (UHF, first row), supremizer stabilized ROM (USUP, second row), and PPE stabilized ROM (UPPE, third row). The fields are depicted for different time instants equal to $t = 195$ s, 200 s, 230 s, and 270 s and increasing from left to right. The ROM solutions are obtained with 15 modes for velocity and 10 modes for pressure, and for the SUP-ROM only with 12 additional supremizer modes. The velocity magnitude is shown in the image legends. 162

7.9 Comparison of the pressure field for high-fidelity (PHF, first row), supremizer stabilized ROM (PSUP, second row), and PPE stabilized ROM (PPPE, third row). The fields are depicted for different time instants equal to $t = 195$ s, 200 s, 230 s, and 270 s and increasing from left to right. The ROM solutions are obtained with 15 modes for velocity and 10 modes for pressure, and for the SUP-ROM only with 12 additional supremizer modes. The pressure magnitude is shown in the image legends. 162

7.10 Error analysis for the velocity (left plot) and pressure (right plot) fields in the cylinder example with $\nu = 0.005625$. The L^2 -norm of the relative error is plotted over time for the two different models: with supremizer stabilization (USUP and PSUP, continuous red line) and PPE stabilization (UPPE and PPPE, dot-dashed blue line). The ROM solutions are obtained with 15 modes for velocity, 10 modes for pressure, and 12 modes for supremizers. 163

7.11 Error analysis for the velocity (left plot) and pressure (right plot) fields in the cylinder example with $\nu = 0.005$ and $\nu = 0.005625$. The L^2 -norm of the relative error is plotted over time for the two values of viscosity and for the two different models: with supremizer stabilization (USUP and PSUP) and PPE stabilization (UPPE and PPPE). The ROMs are obtained with 15 modes for velocity, 10 modes for pressure, and 12 modes for supremizers. The time window is in this case wider than the one used to generate the RB spaces ($\Delta T = 10$ s). 163

8.1 The computational domain used in the numerical simulations; all lengths are described in terms of the characteristic length D , which is equal to 1 m. . . . 181

8.2 Cumulative ignored eigenvalue decay. In the plot, the solid black line refers to the velocity eigenvalues, the dashed magenta line indicates the pressure eigenvalues, and the dash-dotted blue line refers to the eddy viscosity eigenvalues. . . 182

8.3 k - ϵ turbulence model case, velocity fields for the value of the parameter $U = 7.0886$ m/s: (a) shows the FOM velocity, while in (b) one can see the U-ROM velocity, and finally in (c) we have the H-SUP-ROM velocity. 183

Downloaded 05/29/23 to 90.147.23.94 . Redistribution subject to SIAM license or copyright; see https://pubs.siam.org/terms-privacy

8.4 $k-\epsilon$ turbulence model case, pressure fields for the value of the parameter $U = 7.0886$ m/s: (a) shows the FOM pressure, while in (b) one can see the U-ROM pressure, and finally in (c) we have the H-SUP-ROM pressure. 183

8.5 $k-\epsilon$ turbulence model case, eddy viscosity fields: (a) shows the FOM eddy viscosity, while in (b) one can see the U-ROM eddy viscosity, and finally in (c) we have the H-SUP-ROM eddy viscosity. 184

8.6 SST $k-\omega$ turbulence model case, velocity fields for the value of the parameter $U = 7.0886$ m/s: (a) shows the FOM velocity, while in (b) one can see the U-ROM velocity, and finally in (c) we have the H-SUP-ROM velocity. 184

8.7 SST $k-\omega$ turbulence model case, pressure fields for the value of the parameter $U = 7.0886$ m/s: (a) shows the FOM pressure, while in (b) one can see the U-ROM pressure, and finally in (c) we have the H-SUP-ROM pressure. 185

8.8 SST $k-\omega$ turbulence model case, eddy viscosity fields: (a) shows the FOM eddy viscosity, while in (b) one can see the U-ROM eddy viscosity, and finally in (c) we have the H-SUP-ROM eddy viscosity. 185

8.9 The pressure fields obtained using both $k-\epsilon$ and SST $k-\omega$ turbulence models and the H-SUP-ROM ones for the value of the parameter $U = 7.0886$ m/s. The plot is for the pressure value along the x_1 direction, keeping the value of x_2 fixed at half the maximum height. 186

8.10 The mean of the L^2 relative errors for all the online samples versus the number of modes used in the online stage. The convergence analysis is done for both H-SUP-ROM models obtained with two different turbulence models at the full-order level, which are $k-\epsilon$ and SST $k-\omega$. The errors are reported in percentages—in (a) we have the mean error of the velocity fields, while in (b) we have the mean error of the pressure fields. 186

8.11 (a) The OpenFOAM mesh used in the simulations for the unsteady case of the flow around a circular cylinder. (b) A picture of the mesh zoomed near the cylinder. 187

8.12 The lift coefficient curve for parameter sample $U_{in} = 10$ m/s. 188

8.13 Cumulative ignored eigenvalue decay. In the plot, the solid black line refers to the velocity eigenvalues, the dashed magenta line indicates the pressure eigenvalues, and the dash-dotted blue line refers to the eddy viscosity eigenvalues. 189

8.14 Velocity fields for the parameter value $U_{in} = 7.75$ m/s at $t = 2.8$ s: (a) shows the FOM velocity, while in (b) one can see the U-ROM velocity with $N_r = 14$, and finally in (c) we have the H-SUP-ROM velocity with $N_u = 20$ and $N_p = N_S = N_{\nu_t} = 10$ 191

8.15 Pressure fields for the parameter value $U_{in} = 7.75$ m/s at $t = 2.8$ s: (a) shows the FOM pressure, while in (b) one can see the U-ROM pressure with $N_r = 14$, and finally in (c) we have the H-SUP-ROM pressure with $N_u = 20$ and $N_p = N_S = N_{\nu_t} = 10$ 192

8.16 Eddy viscosity fields for the parameter value $U_{in} = 7.75$ m/s at $t = 2.8$ s: (a) shows the FOM eddy viscosity, while in (b) one can see the U-ROM eddy viscosity with $N_r = 14$, and finally in (c) we have the H-SUP-ROM eddy viscosity with $N_u = 20$ and $N_p = N_S = N_{\nu_t} = 10$ 192

8.17 The time evolution of the L^2 relative errors of the velocity-reduced approximations for both the U-ROM and the H-SUP-ROM. The curves correspond to the case run with the parameter value $U_{in} = 7.75$ m/s: (a) shows the error curve for the U-ROM, while (b) depicts the case of the H-SUP-ROM. The error values in both graphs are in percentages. 193

8.18 The time evolution of the L^2 relative errors of the pressure-reduced approximations for both the U-ROM and the H-SUP-ROM. The curves correspond to the case run with the parameter value $U_{in} = 7.75$ m/s: (a) shows the error curve for the U-ROM, while (b) depicts the case of the H-SUP-ROM. The error values in both graphs are in percentages. 193

8.19 Lift coefficient curves for the cross-validation test done for the parameter value $U_{in} = 7.75$ m/s for the time range $[0, 8]$ s; the figure shows the FOM, the U-ROM, and the H-SUP-ROM lift coefficient histories: (a) the full range is shown, and (b) the last 2 s of C_l is shown. 194

8.20 The graph of the L^2 relative errors for the lift coefficient curve versus the number of modes used in the online stage in the U-ROM and the H-SUP-ROM. The curves correspond to the case run with the parameter value $U_{in} = 7.75$ m/s. The error is computed between the lift coefficient curve obtained by the FOM solver and the one reconstructed from both the U-ROM and the H-SUP-ROM for the time range $[0, 8]$ s: (a) shows the error curve for the U-ROM, where N_r is the number of modes used in the online stage for all variables (by construction of the U-ROM, it is not possible to choose a different number of online modes for the reduced variables). (b) depicts the case of the H-SUP-ROM, where one can see the error values by varying the number of modes used for the pure velocity, with different fixed settings for the three other variables (the pressure, the supremizers, and the eddy viscosity). The error values in both graphs are in percentages. 195

8.21 The graph of the peak relative errors for the lift coefficient curves for varied values of the number of modes used in the online stage in the U-ROM and the H-SUP-ROM. The curves correspond to the case run with the parameter value $U_{in} = 7.75$ m/s. The error is computed between the peak values of the lift coefficient curve obtained by the FOM solver and the ones reconstructed from both the U-ROM and the H-SUP-ROM for the time range $[0, 8]$ s: (a) shows the error curve for the U-ROM, where N_r is the number of modes used in the online stage for all variables (by construction of the U-ROM it is not possible to choose a different number of online modes for the reduced variables). (b) depicts the case of the H-SUP-ROM. The error values in both graphs are in percentages. 196

8.22 Lift coefficient curves for the cross-validation test done for the parameter value $U_{in} = 7.75$ m/s for the time range $[0, 8]$ s. The figure shows the FOM, the SU-PPE-ROM, and the H-PPE-ROM lift coefficient histories: (a) the full range is shown, and (b) the last 2 s of C_l is shown. 197

8.23 The graph of the L^2 relative errors for the lift coefficient curve versus number of modes used in the online stage in the SU-PPE-ROM and the H-PPE-ROM. The curves correspond to the case run with the parameter value $U_{in} = 7.75$ m/s. The error is computed between the lift coefficient curve obtained by the FOM solver and the one reconstructed from both the U-ROM and the H-PPE-ROM for the time range $[0, 8]$ s: (a) shows the error curve for the SU-PPE-ROM, where N_u is the number of modes used in the online stage for both the velocity and the eddy viscosity, while N_p is the number of modes used for the pressure field. (b) depicts the case of the H-PPE-ROM, where one can see the error values varying the number of modes used for the velocity (including the lifting velocity mode) with different fixed settings for the two other variables (the pressure and the eddy viscosity). The error values in both graphs are in percentages. 198

8.24 The graph of the peak relative errors for the lift coefficient curves for varied values of the number of modes used in the online stage in the SU-PPE-ROM and the H-PPE-ROM. The curves correspond to the case run with the parameter value $U_{in} = 7.75$ m/s. The error is computed between the peak values of the lift coefficient curve obtained by the FOM solver and the ones reconstructed from both the SU-PPE-ROM and the H-PPE-ROM for the time range $[0, 8]$ s: (a) shows the error curve for the U-ROM, where N_u is the number of modes used in the online stage for both the velocity and the eddy viscosity, while N_p is the number of modes used for the pressure field. (b) depicts the case of the H-PPE-ROM. The error values in both graphs are in percentages. 199

8.25 The time evolution of the L^2 relative errors of the velocity-reduced approximations for both the SU-PPE-ROM and the H-PPE-ROM. The curves correspond to the case run with the parameter value $U_{in} = 7.75$ m/s: (a) shows the error curve for the SU-PPE-ROM. (b) depicts the case of the H-PPE-ROM. The error values in both graphs are in percentages. 199

8.26 The time evolution of the L^2 relative errors of the pressure-reduced approximations for both the SU-PPE-ROM and the H-PPE-ROM. The curves correspond to the case run with the parameter value $U_{in} = 7.75$ m/s: (a) shows the error curve for the SU-PPE-ROM. (b) depicts the case of the H-PPE-ROM. The error values in both graphs are in percentages. 200

8.27 Lift coefficient curves for the cross-validation test done for the parameter value $U_{in} = 11.75$ m/s for the time range $[0, 10]$ s. The figure shows the FOM and the H-SUP-ROM lift coefficient histories: (a) the full range is shown; (b) the last 3-s history of C_l is shown. 201

8.28 The lift coefficient curves obtained using both the $k-\epsilon$ and SST $k-\omega$ turbulence models and the H-SUP-ROM ones. The case considered is nonparametrized, with $U_{in} = 10$ m/s corresponding to $Re = 10^5$. The plot is for the time range $t \in [6, 8]$; the H-SUP-ROM achieved relative L^2 errors (over the range $t \in [0, 8]$) less than 5% in both cases. 202

9.1 First three POD modes obtained from the resolution of a parametrized Navier–Stokes problem, describing the flow past a cylinder. 206

9.2 In the left column are the eigenvalue positions with respect to the unit circle, and in the right column are the corresponding DMD modes. From top to bottom we have a stable, a convergent, and a divergent mode, corresponding to an eigenvalue on the unit circle, inside it, and outside it, respectively. 209

9.3 On the left is the initial dataset containing features at different time scales. In the middle is the DMD reconstruction, and on the right is the mrDMD reconstruction. 210

9.4 On the left is the initial dataset, in the middle is the DMD reconstruction, and on the right is the cDMD reconstruction. 211

9.5 Computational savings of cDMD with respect to the exact DMD for an increasing dimension of the snapshot matrix. 211

9.6 Representation of the computational pipeline used for the shape optimization problem. 212

9.7 Example of bulbous bow deformations using the FFD method. 213

9.8 Comparison of the average relative L^2 error of the ROM in a naval shape optimization problem as a function of the number of modes (left) and the number of snapshots used (right). 213

9.9 Flowchart of the FOM/ROM procedure. 214

9.10	Sketch of the computational domain used for the FOM. The sphere diameter is $D = 0.01$ m. Successive mesh refinement layers ($R2$, $R3$, $R4$) are performed using the cell splitting approach until the finest grid spacing $0.001D$ is reached in the region $R5$	215
9.11	Normalized singular values for streamwise velocity and pressure snapshots.	216
9.12	Isosurfaces of the DMD modes (left) at a value of -15×10^{-5} m/s versus the isosurfaces of POD modes (right) at a value of 6.5 m/s for the streamwise velocity field. Modes: 1, 2, 8, and 36.	216
9.13	Isosurfaces of the DMD modes (left) at a value of -5×10^{-4} Pa versus the isosurfaces of POD modes (right) at a value of 300 Pa for the pressure field. Modes: 1, 2, 8, and 36.	217
9.14	Relative error percentage in the Frobenius norm for velocity and pressure (top and bottom, respectively) fields, where half-sample-rate snapshots are used to train the reduced model, DMD (left) or PODI (right), for a particular truncation (r) while predicting the intermediate snapshots. Plots show only the snapshotwise prediction error, while disregarding errors in the training set, which are almost null.	217
9.15	Linear dipole (top) and nonlinear quadrupole (bottom) terms of FWH equation evaluated from LES data and compared to corresponding DMD (left) and PODI (right) reduced models at different truncation ranks (r).	218
9.16	Flowchart representing the proposed computational pipeline.	218
9.17	Sketch of the computational domain used to solve the fluid dynamics problem in its reference configuration. The left plot is a zoom on the mesh near the wing. The right picture is a schematic view of the domain with the main geometrical dimensions.	219
9.18	The temporal evolution of the lift coefficient from 1 s to 30 s for nine different parameters.	220
9.19	Airfoil shape functions with respect to the profile abscissa. The leading edge corresponds to $x = 0$. The bump functions are rescaled by a factor of 0.2 for illustrative reasons.	220
9.20	On the left is the sufficiency summary plot for the lift coefficient at times $t = 10.0, 14.0, 18.0$ s (top to bottom). On the right are the first eigenvector components at the corresponding parameters.	221
9.21	The relative error of the approximated outputs at different times. The relative error is computed on 100 test samples, using the high-fidelity lift coefficient to train the regression for $t \leq 20$ s, while for $t > 20$ s the DMD forecasted states are used for the training.	222
10.1	Full-order, steady-state solution for $\nu = 10$: velocity in the x direction (top) and y direction (bottom).	231
10.2	Full-order, steady-state solution for $\nu = 0.05$: velocity in the x direction (top) and the y direction (bottom).	232
10.3	Mean and maximum relative $L^2(\Omega)$ error in the velocity with increasing basis size.	232
11.1	Mapping from the physical to the master element.	236
11.2	Quadrangular master element with nodes.	237
11.3	Flux exchange between contiguous elements.	238
11.4	Mesh.	244
11.5	First four velocity modes for the square cylinder test case.	245

11.6	Reduced order solution for $N_u = 5$, $N_u = 8$, $N_u = 10$, and $N_u = 12$	245
11.7	Absolute error (velocity).	245
11.8	Absolute error (pressure).	245
11.9	Mesh of the domain.	246
11.10	First four modes (velocity).	246
11.11	Comparison between FOM (top) and ROM (bottom) solutions.	247
12.1	Comparison of multivariate quadrature rules with order of accuracy 15.	256
12.2	Heat transfer problem: error decay with respect to the number of reduced basis functions, comparison between weighted and not weighted algorithms and between uniform and Beta(20,10) distributed training samples. Left: POD; right: greedy algorithm.	257
12.3	Reference domain D . The reference parameter is $\mu = (1., 1.5, 1., 1.5, \mu_4)$	258
12.4	Stokes problem: error decay with respect to the number of RB functions, comparison between unweighted (left) and weighted (right) algorithms and between the Smolyak, tensor product, uniform, and Beta(75,75) distributed training samples. For the weighted algorithm, the Smolyak rule, the tensor product rule, and Beta(75,75) sampling coincide.	259
12.5	Graetz problem: error decay with respect to the number of RB functions, and comparison between weighted and unweighted algorithms and between uniform and Beta(5,3) distributed training samples. With online stabilization (left), without online stabilization (right). POD algorithm (top), greedy algorithm (bottom).	260
12.6	Graetz problem: weighted algorithms and Beta(5,3) distributed training samples. Error of stabilized and nonstabilized online with respect to the advection parameter μ . Comparison with selective online strategy. Left: POD; right: Greedy.	260
12.7	Domain D , the Gulf of Trieste. Orange: Miramare reserve D_{obs} . Pollutant spill D_u	262
12.8	Optimal control problem: error decay with respect to the number of RB functions; comparison between state variable (left) and control variable (right) with an unweighted POD algorithm between uniform, Beta(20, 5), Beta(5, 5), and Beta(75,75) distributed training samples.	263
13.1	Embedded FEM geometrical tools for (i) CutFEM and (ii) SBM.	267
13.2	(i) Parametrized geometry. (ii) Some RB components for $\mu \in [-0.5, 0.5]$ parametrized geometry. (iii) The full/reduced order solution and the absolute error ($\mu = -0.015$).	269
13.3	Heat exchange problem: (i) eigenvalue decay and (ii) mean relative errors.	270
13.4	Stokes with SBM experiment: sketch of the mesh, the embedded domain, and the parameters considered in the numerical examples.	272
13.5	Stokes system ROM-SBM POD velocity and pressure components for (i) μ_1 geometry and (ii) (μ_0, μ_1) geometry.	273
13.6	Stokes SBM: the full and the reduced solution and the absolute error for velocity and pressure for the (i) one-dimensional and (ii) two-dimensional parametrization case.	274
13.7	Stokes (SBM) parametrization: (i) μ_1 geometry, with the relative errors for velocity and pressure in (i) _a and the execution times in (i) _b ; (ii) (μ_0, μ_1) geometry, with the velocity and pressure fields with and without supremizer stabilization.	275

13.8	Shape parametrization with large deformations and a zoom into the embedded cylinder visualizing the extended solution.	277
13.9	Six classical (i) and six improved (ii) POD modes.	278
13.10	(i) Poisson system (CutFEM): eigenvalue decay and error analysis between reduced order and high-fidelity approximations with and without transport; (ii) steady Stokes (CutFEM): relative errors with and without transport.	279
13.11	Circular embedded geometry (parametrized).	280
13.12	Cahn–Hilliard (CutFEM): ROM basis results, the first six modes.	281
13.13	Results for the embedded circle geometrical parametrization $\mu = 0.4261$ and $t = [28, 36, 46, 100]dt$	281
13.14	Cahn–Hilliard (CutFEM): the FOM mass evolution with respect to time, together with its RB approximation and the conservation of mass.	282
14.1	Example: domain reference configuration $\hat{\Omega}$ (left) and domain configuration at time t , $\Omega(t)$ (right). In blue we have the fluid domain; in orange the solid domain. In green is the fluid-structure interface $\hat{\Gamma}_{FSI}$ in the reference configuration.	285
14.2	Original configuration at time t . Blue domain: the original fluid configuration $\Omega_f(t)$. Orange leaflets: the original solid configuration $\Omega_s(t)$. Γ_s^D : the part of the leaflets that does not move.	287
14.3	Domains: reference configuration $\hat{\Omega}$ (top left), parametrized reference configuration $\tilde{\Omega}(\mu_g)$ (top right), and original configuration $\Omega(t; \mu_g)$ (bottom).	295
14.4	Reduced order solid displacement $\mathbf{d}_s^N(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. Comparison of different behaviors of the material, for different values of the geometrical and physical parameters. From left to right: same leaflet length $\mu_g = 0.8$ cm and increased shear modulus ($\mu_s = 100000, 800000$); same leaflet length $\mu_g = 1$ cm and increased shear modulus ($\mu_s = 100000, 800000$); increased leaflet length ($\mu_g = 0.8, 1.0$ cm), and same shear modulus $\mu_s = 100000$	296
14.5	Physical domain (reference configuration): fluid subdomain (blue) and structure subdomain (orange). The fluid-structure interface coincides with the structure in our case; the structure has been magnified for visualization purposes.	300
14.6	Fluid pressure behavior: the solution is pictured here at times $t = 0.001$, $t = 0.005$, and $t = 0.015$. The peak of the wave is propagating into the domain, creating a transport phenomenon.	303
14.7	Vertical component of fluid displacement behavior: again the solution is pictured at times $t = 0.001$, $t = 0.005$, and $t = 0.015$. The peak of the wave is still very small at the beginning, it grows for some time, and then it starts to propagate.	304
14.8	Decay of the eigenvalues for the POD on the fluid pressure (blue line), fluid displacement (green line), and fluid velocity (magenta line).	304
14.9	Top: comparison between the rate of decay of the eigenvalues for the pressure with and without preprocessing. Bottom: retained energy as a function of the number N of POD modes.	306
14.10	Top: comparison between the rate of decay of the eigenvalues for the displacement with and without preprocessing. Bottom: retained energy as a function of the number N of POD modes.	306
14.11	Original snapshots for p_f at times $t = 0.001$, $t = 0.005$, and $t = 0.015$ (left column) and corresponding preprocessed snapshots (right column).	307

14.12	Pressure snapshots (left column) at time $t = 0.005$ (top) and final time $t = 0.015$ (bottom). Reduced order pressure simulation (right column) at time $t = 0.005$ and time $t = 0.015$. The reduced simulation was obtained with $N = 4$ basis functions for each component of the solution of the FSI problem.	309
14.13	Displacement snapshots (left column) at time $t = 0.005$ (top) and final time $t = 0.015$ (bottom). Reduced order displacement simulation (right column) at time $t = 0.005$ and time $t = 0.015$. The reduced simulation was obtained with $N = 4$ basis functions for each component of the solution of the FSI problem.	309
14.14	Analysis of the behavior of the relative error for the fluid pressure approximation. Dashed lines were obtained by employing the preprocessing procedure, continuous lines were obtained using a standard model order reduction.	309
14.15	Behavior of the mean relative error for the fluid pressure, depending on the number N of basis functions employed, with preprocessing (red) and without preprocessing (blue).	310
15.1	Reference configuration for the FSI problem.	314
15.2	Computational domain.	317
15.3	Velocity and pressure snapshots.	319
15.4	Solid's deformation snapshots: the solutions are given in a spatial frame using the \mathbf{d}_f map.	319
15.5	Global displacement ($\mathbf{d}_f, \mathbf{d}_s$) for $\mu = 2.0$.	319
15.6	Bifurcation diagram for the fluid phase.	320
15.7	Bifurcation diagram for the solid phase.	320
15.8	Retained energy.	321
15.9	Decay of the normalized eigenvalues.	321
15.10	Average reconstruction error in logarithmic scale.	321
15.11	Average projection error in logarithmic scale.	321
15.12	Relative reconstruction error with $N_{rb} = 16$.	322
15.13	Maximum displacement for the SVK and the linear models.	323
15.14	Solid's bifurcation diagram for the linear and the SVK model.	323
15.15	Comparison of the bifurcation diagram for the fluid phase for the different test cases.	323
16.1	Illustration of the inactive variable sampling strategy. Successive steps are depicted all at once. We highlight the Chebyshev center, the selection of the next sample using the hit and run method, and the polytope defined by (16.8).	329
16.2	Illustration of the design of a response surface using KAS and Gaussian process regression (GPR). The factorization through an RKHS is emphasized.	331
16.3	Illustration of the global AS direction, highlighted in orange in the left panel. On the right is the corresponding sufficient summary plot.	333
16.4	Comparison between K-means, K-medoids, and hierarchical top-down clustering using the AS-induced distance metric for the quartic example of Figure 16.3.	334
16.5	Illustrative scheme of a multifidelity regression procedure that employs AS as a low-fidelity model. The function to be approximated is the hyperbolic paraboloid from (16.16). Starting from 10 high-fidelity data points (depicted in blue and in white) we construct as a low-fidelity model a response surface which is constant along the inactive subspace.	336

16.6 NLL application two-dimensional example. On the left we have the target function against the first transformed coordinate, in the middle the loss function decay, and on the right the transformed parameter space. 337

16.7 On the y -axis: basic reproduction number R_0 of the SEIR model for the Ebola epidemic. Left: GPR on the one-dimensional AS. Middle: GPR on the one-dimensional KAS. Right: GPR on the one-dimensional active variable of the NLL method. In the plots are also represented the 200 training points used to find the reduced parameter space and build the GPRs. 339

16.8 Each one of the six plots represents the GPR on the reduced space of one out of six partitions of the parameter space found with LAS. On the y -axis is the basic reproduction number R_0 of the SEIR model for the Ebola epidemic. On the x -axis is the reduced one-dimensional AS of the relative cluster. In the plots are also represented the 200 training points scattered among all six clusters and used to find the partition of the parameter space with hierarchical top-down clustering and build the GPRs. 339

16.9 ASGA scheme. The main steps of the classical GA are depicted from top to bottom. Projections onto and from a lower-dimension AS are highlighted with yellow boxes, which are specific to ASGA. 341

17.1 Sketch of the three deformation maps which compose the FFD morphing. . . . 348

17.2 Interpolations corresponding to six different RBFs. The exact function is depicted with a red dashed line. The parameter ε is equal to the inverse of the average distance between the sampling points. 349

17.3 Interpolation error for different types of RBFs. Refer to Figure 17.2 for the actual interpolations. 349

17.4 Front view (top) and side view (bottom) of a planing hull featuring a double chine line and substantially straight walls above the chine line. 352

17.5 Vertical section of a planing hull perpendicular to its longitudinal axis. The bottom vertex of the section is the intersection of the section plane and the keel line. The intersections of the two chine lines are also visible on the bottom left side of the section. The first step of the parametrization strategy is a rigid rotation of the bottom part of the section around the keel intersection. This is combined with a rigid translation of the chine and wall surface sections needed to keep the top part of the section in contact with the displaced bottom part. . . . 353

17.6 Front view (left) and lateral view (right) of a ship propeller. In both images, one of the five propeller blades' surface is transparent, and a set of airfoil cylindrical sections is indicated in red to show how the blade surface is generated as the envelope surface of the single sections. 354

17.7 The airfoil section pitch as a function of relative radial coordinate. The plot shows both an initial pitch distribution (red continuous line) and the control points associated with its B-spline interpolation (red piecewise linear line). A new, smooth pitch radial distribution (blue continuous line) is then obtained using a displaced set of pitch control points (blue piecewise linear line). . . . 355

17.8 FFD application to the STL triangulation representing the bulbous bow of a cruise ship hull. The left panel, which represents the original bow geometry, also displays the FFD undeformed control point lattice. On the right, the visible displacement of the control point results in a deformed STL geometry. 357

17.9	Two examples of a triangulated surface of a carotid artery deformed with RBF. The original geometry is emphasized by the blue dots, while the RBF control points are depicted in red (the deformed ones) and in green (the undeformed ones).	357
17.10	A simplified two-dimensional example of the application of FFD to a NURBS curve. On the left, the procedure starts by placing an FFD lattice (red dots) on top of a NURBS curve. On the right, the displacement of the FFD control points is used to modify the position of the NURBS control points (black dots). The modified control polygon results in the morphed NURBS curve displayed on the right.	358
17.11	An application of the FFD algorithm to the NURBS surface specified by an IGES file. A front view of the DTMB-5415 navy combatant hull featuring a modified and enlarged bow is displayed on the left; the original hull surface is displayed on the right for reference.	359
17.12	A side view of the IGES geometry of the DTMB-5415 navy combatant hull shown in Figure 17.11. The top picture depicts the CAD surface of the hull, modified via FFD. The bottom picture shows the original hull surface.	359
17.13	Representation of a family of ship propellers generated with bottom-up construction. The different propellers are obtained in this case by scaling the skew angle curve. In particular, in the image an original propeller blade shape is presented along with two modifications resulting from scaling the skew curve by factors of 0.8 and 1.1, respectively.	360
17.14	Examples of computational domain deformation using FFD: the first picture (left) shows the edges of the original mesh, while the others illustrate two deformed domains.	361
17.15	The application of RBF shape parametrization to the Ahmed body and the surrounding volumetric mesh for CFD simulations. In the test illustrated, the inclination of the diagonal surface at the rear end of the Ahmed body is modified to investigate its effect on aerodynamic performance. Two configurations, including a vertical cut of the volumetric mesh, are shown in the top images. For reference, path lines of mean velocity field resulting from the corresponding unsteady RANS simulations are shown in the bottom pictures.	362
17.16	Example of computational domain deformation applied to a propeller design problem, seen at the radial plane. The blue edges refer to the original mesh, whereas the red ones show the deformed grid.	363
17.17	A sectional view of a volumetric grid deformation carried out using RBFs in a naval engineering problem. The blue lines denote the original volumetric mesh edges, while the red lines indicate the deformed configuration.	364
18.1	CABG: Boundary control magnitude (mm^2/s^2) (left) and eigenvalue reduction (right).	369
18.2	CABG: Simulation velocity \mathbf{v} : comparison between FE approximation (left) and ROM approximation (right).	369
18.3	CABG: Average error between FE and POD-Galerkin approximation of $\delta = \mathbf{v}, p, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}, q$ (top left); total error between Galerkin FE and POD-Galerkin approximations (top right); and error between FE and POD-Galerkin reduction of \mathcal{J} (bottom).	370
18.4	The horizontal velocity of a jet stream entering a channel.	371
18.5	The velocity in the channel.	371
18.6	The velocity in the channel, zoomed in to the wall attachment region.	371

18.7	The mitral valve between the left atrium and the left ventricle produces the Coandă effect.	371
18.8	Scheme for the LVAD.	374
18.9	LVAD: comparison of the FOM/ROM p (mmHg) at $PF = 3.45$ l/min.	376
18.10	LVAD: comparison of the FOM/ROM WSS (Pa) at $PF = 3.45$ l/min.	377
18.11	LVAD: comparison of the FOM/ROM \mathbf{u} (m/s) at $PF = 3.45$ l/min.	377
19.1	The logos of the ROM packages.	380
19.2	Example of EZyRB prediction on an automotive benchmark.	382
19.3	Example of PyDMD application to a toy problem.	383
19.4	Sketch of the techniques implemented in ATHENA for parameter space reduction.	384
19.5	Example of PyGeM deformation on an automotive test case.	385
19.6	Example of blade deformation using BladeX.	385
20.1	Schematic structure of an ANN.	390
20.2	The forward pass on the left calculates y as a function $f(x_1, x_2)$ using the input variables x_1 and x_2 . The right side of the figure shows the backward pass. Receiving $d\mathcal{L}/dy$, the gradient of the loss function with respect to y from above, the gradients of x_1 and x_2 on the loss function can be calculated by applying the chain rule, as shown in the figure.	392
20.3	Schematic structure of an FNN.	393
20.4	Schematic structure of an RNN.	394
20.5	Schematic structure of a CNN.	394
20.6	Illustration of a single convolutional layer.	395
20.7	Illustration of a pooling layer.	396
20.8	Schematic structure of an AE.	396
20.9	Example of POD enhancement thanks to the shifting of the snapshots. A Gaussian impulse advancing in time is a simple advection problem which shows the limitations of POD in these contexts: the singular values obtained by the decomposition of the snapshots are not able to individuate any reduced dimension (top). By shifting the snapshots, POD is able to detect the dimension needed to linearly represent the solution manifold, as highlighted by the single nonzero singular value (bottom).	400
20.10	Example of NNsPOD applied to an advection problem in a two-dimensional domain. The green lines represent the contour levels of the field, the blue ones refer to one of the snapshots of the database, and the red ones refer to the same snapshot after the shift. The plots at incremental epochs show that the network is able to self-learn the optimal transformation.	400
20.11	Example of a PINN solution for a Poisson problem with parametric forcing term. The two rows show the field of interest for two different parametric configurations, while in the columns the analytical solution, the PINN approximation, and the absolute error are sketched (from left to right).	402
20.12	Graphical representation of the reduction method proposed for an ANN.	404
20.13	Graphical representation of the VGG-16 architecture.	407
20.14	Example of a structural model in the naval engineering field. On the left is the entire hull, while on the right is a sectional view.	412
20.15	A modern cruise ship example of displacement field for the hogging loading condition.	412

List of Tables

2.1	Approximation accuracy for the ROM with respect to the number of supremizers exploited.	40
3.1	Computational time for FE solution and RB online phase, with the speedup and the relative error.	68
3.2	Computational time for FE and RB solutions, with the speedup and the error, for problem (3.30): $Ra \in [10^3, 10^5]$ (top) and $Ra \in [10^5, 10^6]$ (bottom)	78
3.3	Computational time for FE and RB solutions, with the speedup and the error, for the Boussinesq VMS-Smagorinsky model with $\mu_g \in [0.5, 2]$	81
3.4	Computational time for FE and RB solutions, with the speedup and the error, for the Boussinesq VMS-Smagorinsky model with $\mu \in [10^3, 10^4] \times [0.5, 2]$. . .	81
6.1	Computational time for FE solution and RB online phase, with the speedup and the error.	139
7.1	The table contains the cumulative eigenvalues for the lid-driven cavity test. The first, second, and third columns report the cumulative eigenvalues for the velocity, pressure, and supremizer fields, respectively. The last column contains the value of the inf-sup constant, in the supremizer stabilization case, for different numbers of supremizer modes and with a fixed number of velocity and pressure modes (10 modes for velocity and 10 modes for pressure).	158
7.2	The table contains the cumulative eigenvalues for the cylinder problem. In the first, second, and third columns are reported the cumulative eigenvalues for the velocity, pressure, and supremizer fields, respectively, as a function of the number of modes. In the last column is reported the value of the inf-sup constant for the supremizer stabilization case for different numbers of supremizer modes with a fixed number of velocity and pressure modes (15 modes for velocity and 10 modes for pressure).	161
7.3	The table contains the computational time for the supremizer (SUP) and the PPE stabilization techniques. In the cavity experiment, the SUP-ROM is obtained with 10 modes for velocity, pressure, and supremizers, while the PPE-ROM is obtained with 10 modes for pressure and supremizers. In the cylinder experiment, the SUP-ROM is obtained with 15 modes for velocity, 10 for pressure, and 12 for supremizers, while the PPE-ROM is obtained with 15 modes for velocity and 10 for pressure.	164
8.1	Offline parameter samples and the corresponding snapshot data.	190
8.2	Summary of the accuracy and the efficiency results for the ROMs considered in the problem of flow around a cylinder.	200

12.1	Tables for the selective stabilization approach. Given a certain threshold advection coefficient ε , we obtain the mean error by computing only a percentage of all the stabilization terms.	261
13.1	Heat exchange problem: relative error results.	270
13.2	Heat exchange problem: execution time, savings, and speedup.	271
13.3	Stokes (SBM): relative errors between the full-order solution and the RB solution, one-dimensional geometrical parametrization.	273
13.4	Execution time, at the reduced order level, for the case with one-dimensional geometrical parametrization.	274
13.5	Stokes SBM (μ_0, μ_1) geometry: Supremizer basis enrichment and the relative error.	276
14.1	Physical and geometrical constants and parameters for the geometrically and physically parametrized leaflets test case.	296
14.2	Problem data for the test case of a flow in a channel with deformable walls.	303
15.1	Energy retained by the first mode.	320
15.2	Values of Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio used for the test cases.	323
16.1	Parameter ranges for the Ebola model. Data taken from [167].	339
16.2	Comparison of the R^2 scores of the response surfaces for the Ebola model built with the AS, KAS, LAS, and NLL methods.	340
18.1	L^2 -norm relative errors for pressure p , WSS, and velocity components u_x, u_y , and u_z for $PF = 3.45$ l/min.	376
18.2	L^2 -norm relative errors for pressure p , WSS, and velocity components u_x, u_y , and u_z for $PF = 4.35$ l/min.	376
19.1	Summary table for all the packages.	380
20.1	Results obtained for the reduced net POD+FNN (7) trained on CIFAR10 with different structures for the FNN.	408
20.2	Results obtained with CIFAR10 dataset.	409
20.3	Results obtained with a custom dataset.	409

List of Algorithms

Algorithm 2.1	The prototype greedy algorithm	31
Algorithm 2.2	The actual greedy algorithm	31
Algorithm 2.3	The Gram–Schmidt orthonormalization	32
Algorithm 2.4	Greedy algorithm for Stokes	38
Algorithm 2.5	POD algorithm for Stokes	38
Algorithm 2.6	Greedy algorithm with supremizer enrichment for Stokes	40
Algorithm 2.7	POD algorithm with supremizer enrichment for Stokes	40
Algorithm 2.8	POD-greedy algorithm for parabolic problems	42
Algorithm 2.9	Greedy selection for \mathcal{C}_J	51
Algorithm 2.10	EIM	56
Algorithm 5.1	A pseudocode for the branchwise procedure	105
Algorithm 7.1	The SIMPLE algorithm	149
Algorithm 7.2	The PISO algorithm	150
Algorithm 7.3	The reduced order SIMPLE algorithm	153
Algorithm 12.1	(Deterministic) greedy algorithm	253
Algorithm 12.2	Weighted greedy algorithm	254
Algorithm 12.3	POD	254
Algorithm 12.4	wPOD	255
Algorithm 15.1	Branchwise reduced order reconstruction	317

Preface

Reduced order modeling is an important and fast-growing research field in computational science and engineering, motivated by several reasons, of which we mention just a few: parametric computing, repetitive computational environments, real-time computing, increasing complexity of scenarios with uncertainties, and better computational performance in optimization, control, and inverse problems. This book deals with recent developments in model order reduction in fluid dynamics, including challenging topics such as turbulence, optimal control, flow stability, aerodynamics, shape optimization, inverse problems, multiphysics, and uncertainty quantification. We present here an integrated, reduced, parametric computational framework characterized by a wide portability to be embedded in the most modern computational pipelines, including automatic learning and digital twin developments.

After this preface and an overview and motivation in Chapter 1, the first part is concerned with finite element–based reduced order modeling with a focus on laminar computational fluid dynamics (Chapter 2), then with the introduction of a simple turbulent pattern (Chapter 3), and then with the optimal flow control framework (Chapter 4). In Chapter 5, bifurcation problems are studied, while in Chapter 6 the focus is on transport-dominated problems.

The second part of the book deals with finite volume and spectral element methods and discontinuous Galerkin-based reduced order modeling. Chapters 7 and 8 deal with finite volume–based reduced order modeling in computational fluid dynamics (CFD) from laminar to turbulent flows. In Chapter 9 we deal with nonintrusive data-driven reduced order models. Chapter 10 introduces spectral element method–based reduced order modeling, while Chapter 11 deals with discontinuous Galerkin–based reduced order modeling.

The third part deals with advanced reduced order modeling in CFD. Chapter 12 deals with weighted reduced order modeling for uncertainty quantification, Chapter 13 with model order reduction for embedded methods and level-set geometries, Chapter 14 with multiphysics problems (fluid-structure interaction), and Chapter 15 with bifurcations in parametric multiphysics settings.

The fourth part is concerned with perspectives and applications. In Chapter 16 we deal with reduction in parameter space, and Chapter 17 deals with geometrical parametrization and applications. Hemodynamics applications are introduced as examples in Chapter 18. In Chapter 19 we introduce our scientific computing open-source libraries and Python tools. Last, but not least, Chapter 20 provides perspectives and current preliminary development to improve model reduction by automatic learning, concluding with the digital twin concept.

We accompany this book with our open-source software collection and worked problems, available at mathlab.sissa.it/cse-software.

We acknowledge all the chapter contributors (SISSA mathLab current members and past members) as listed in the frontmatter and at the beginning of each chapter. We acknowledge our long-lasting national and international research collaborations, without which this work would not exist.

We would like to acknowledge the support provided by SIAM, in particular by Elizabeth Greenspan, as well as by the book reviewers.

We also acknowledge our several industrial partners for inspiration, trust, and challenging ideas, since they motivated these research developments. We acknowledge Fincantieri, Danieli, Electrolux Professional, MICAD, Monte Carlo Yachts, CETENA, ie-fluids, Engys, Optimad, and Bormioli.

The book is based on preliminary lecture notes and slides used at the first Summer School on Advanced Reduced Order Methods and Applications in CFD (AROMA-CFD), held in Trieste at SISSA in July 2019; see <https://indico.sissa.it/event/34/>.

This project has been carried out during lockdowns and the pandemic spread of COVID-19, and it has represented for all of us a good way to remain optimistic about the future. This is the reason the project's "secret" name was "Decameron," based on Boccaccio's manuscript.

We acknowledge the strong support provided by the European Research Council Executive Agency through the Consolidator Grant AROMA-CFD (grant 681447), as well as FARE-X-AROMA-CFD project and PRIN project NA-FROM-PDEs by the Italian Ministry for Universities, INdAM GNCS national group, H2020 MSCA EID ROMSOC (grant 765374), H2020 MSCA RISE ARIA (grant 872442), and regional research programs supported by the European Social Fund (FSE FVG) and POR-FESR Friuli Venezia-Giulia (Regional Development European Funds).

We hope that you take some inspiration from this book and that this work will be known as the AROMA book.

Trieste, Italy, 20 April 2022

Gianluigi Rozza, Giovanni Stabile, Francesco Ballarin