

N-body memory layout exploration

Oliver Geisel & Lisa Hentschke

January 30, 2021

Structure

The task

Solution Strategies


Results

Explanation

Further Approaches

The n-body simulation

- ▶ simulate the interaction of n particles
- ▶ each particle has
 - ▶ position x
 - ▶ position y
 - ▶ position z
 - ▶ velocity x
 - ▶ velocity y
 - ▶ velocity z
 - ▶ mass



<http://astro.dur.ac.uk/~nm/pubhtml/nbody/nbody.html>

Solution Strategies

- ▶ rewrite CPP-code in CUDA: implement AoS, SoA and AoSoA memory layouts
- ▶ implemented shared memory variants
- ▶ for SoA: implemented two sub-variants: B and T
 - ▶ B: compute one particle per block
 - ▶ T: compute one particle per thread
- ▶ We tested on several devices

Example on K80

16 k particles (448.000 kiB)

Benchmarks:


	Thread,	Thread_shared,	Move
AoS	56.5121ms	17.3868ms	0.036544ms
AoS	56.4797ms	17.4133ms	0.033280ms
AoS	54.9357ms	15.6404ms	0.033632ms
AoS	50.7257ms	15.6060ms	0.032544ms
AoS	50.7504ms	15.5858ms	0.032768ms
AVG:	53.8807ms	16.3264ms	0.033754ms

Benchmarks: Block,		Block_shared,	Thread,	Thread_shared,	Move
SoA	55.0906ms	21.4492ms	22.8277ms	14.2324ms	0.0110ms
SoA	54.3634ms	21.4436ms	22.8197ms	13.0962ms	0.0083ms
SoA	49.3135ms	19.3027ms	20.4029ms	12.7189ms	0.0083ms
SoA	48.4277ms	18.4641ms	18.8272ms	11.7521ms	0.0092ms
SoA	44.3154ms	17.7516ms	18.8140ms	11.7349ms	0.0092ms
AVG:	50.3021ms	19.6823ms	20.7383ms	12.7069ms	0.009184ms


Benchmarks:		Thread,	Thread_shared,	Move
AoSoA		28.2286ms	43.9762ms	0.222112ms
AoSoA		28.2296ms	43.6562ms	0.220672ms
AoSoA		28.2461ms	43.9120ms	0.221504ms
AoSoA		28.2501ms	43.8764ms	0.222688ms
AoSoA		28.2302ms	44.0284ms	0.218080ms
AVG:		28.2369ms	43.8898ms	0.221011ms

Used Profilers

► nvprof on Taurus




► Nvidia Visual Profiler version 11.2




tested on 1070; version 128k paricles on mem layout AoS; subversion T

Used Profilers

► nvprof on Taurus



► Nvidia Visual Profiler version 11.2



tested on 1070; version 128k paricles on mem layout AoS; subversion T


Compare the memory structures

We tested on K80 (Taurus), v100 (Taurus), 1070 (private, driver version 461.09), and RTX 2080 (private, driver version 641.40) respectively


Memory Layout:

- ▶ K80 - GDDR 5 with SDRAM
- ▶ v100 - HBM 2
- ▶ 1070 - GDDR 5
- ▶ RTX 2080 - GDDR 6


Compare the memory structures - on K80




Compare the memory structures - on v100




16K



32K




64K




128K


Compare the memory structures - on 1070




16K



32K




64K




128K


Compare the memory structures - on RTX 2080




16K



32K



64K



128K

Conclusion

- ▶ AoSoA can be optimized, but ...
- ▶ AoS or SoA heavily depends on architecture → just take the easier implementation

Performance of AoSoA on 16K

- ▶ has nothing to do with the mem layout
- ▶ SMs aren't fully occupied
- ▶ we configured 32 threads per block

AoS vs SoA

- ▶ performance AoS vs SoA are somewhat equally
- ▶ contrary to facts from the lecture
- ▶ K80, v100, and RTX 2080 have configurable L1 chaches
- ▶ also read-only data cache for K80 (48KiB), for 1070 (24KiB) → AoS behaves differently
- ▶ that's the reason why AoS can be better than SoA (bigger chache)
- ▶ at bigger n AoS can't catch up

What else could we try?

- ▶ use texture memory (indirectly we already do that)
- ▶ change computation (not part of the task)
- ▶ optimize AoSoA (not sure if it will be better compared to SoA)