

# Contents

<b>I Application</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 Complex system modelization</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 Introduction . . . . .	7
1.2 Physical modelization and downsides . . . . .	7
1.2.1 Smoothed Particles Hydrodynamics . . . . .	7
1.2.2 Gravitation . . . . .	10
1.3 Test cases with SPH . . . . .	12
1.3.1 Simple tests: tree and communications . . . . .	13
1.3.2 High number of particles and specific formulation . . . . .	14
1.3.3 SPH and gravitation . . . . .	14
1.4 Conclusion . . . . .	17
<b>2 Complex simulations on hybrid architectures</b>	<b>19</b>
2.1 Introduction . . . . .	19
2.2 FleCSI . . . . .	19
2.3 Distributed SPH on multi-core architecture . . . . .	20
2.3.1 Domain decomposition . . . . .	21
2.3.2 Hierarchical trees . . . . .	24
2.3.3 Distribution strategies . . . . .	25
2.3.4 Fast Multipole Methods . . . . .	28
2.3.5 I/O . . . . .	29
2.4 Distributed SPH on hybrid architectures . . . . .	29
2.4.1 Distribution strategies . . . . .	29
2.4.2 Physics on accelerators . . . . .	30
2.5 Results . . . . .	30
2.5.1 Performances . . . . .	30
2.5.2 Simulations . . . . .	31
2.6 Conclusion . . . . .	31



# **Part I**

# **Application**



# Introduction

The first part of this thesis presented the tools needed to understand and target performances in HPC. The second part exposed our metric showing the benefit of accelerators, in this case GPUs, over classical processors in two contexts: irregular computation and irregular communication/memory behaviors. We showed that accelerators gave a real advantage on these two problems and even allowed us to push the limits of performances. We are confident that hybrid architectures will be the way to reach exascale in 2020.

In order to validate our previous results and our metric we decided to target another irregular behavior problem embedding both computation and communication/memory wall over an irregular behavior. This problem can also be considered as a *realistic, production* code as it targets current problems of domain scientists. In order to show how accelerators handle real world problems, we searched for an application fulfilling our needs. Our choice fell on the Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics problem applied to fluid and astrophysics simulation.

We targeted this problem for several reasons. We show in the first chapter the computer science implementation issues and limitations. We present the elements making this application a perfect choice for our metric. This project is also part of an exchange with the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico, USA. This laboratory is part of the U.S. Department of Energy, DoE, and groups thousands of researchers working on the most advanced nowadays problems. The Los Alamos National Laboratory, LANL, is also one of the three nuclear research facilities of the U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). In the summer of 2016, I had my first internship three months during a program called: *Co-Design Summer School*. This allowed us to discover a particular class of problems, Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics and exchange with computer scientists and domain scientists. We extrapolate after the internship and saw what this problem means in a production context and its utility for our study. It makes a perfect example of realistic problem confronting computation and communication wall with irregular behavior. In order to characterize what physicists requested for this problem, I had a second internship with the LANL in the summer of 2017 during three months.

In this part, we first present the Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics method from a physical point of view and draw a parallel with the computer science problems involved. Indeed, a huge amount of time have been spent on the understanding of the physics side to be able to do realistic simulations and thus realistic behavior. The second chapter presents a distributed SPH code working for multi-CPU and multi-GPU. This program is called FleCSPH. Starting from the framework which is the base of FleCSPH, FleCSI, we introduce the algorithm and methods needed to efficiently solve this problem on classical processor and the acceleration generated adding GPUs.



# Chapter 1

## Complex system modelization

### 1.1 Introduction

In this chapter, we give details on our choice for a generic complex system which encounters several problematics. A complex system is a problem which gathers several layers of complexity. In our case, these complexities are the physics modelization and the computer science implementation with many sub-problems like computation and communication walls with underlying high irregularity.

The problem we choose, the Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics simulation method, is described on a physical aspect. We point out the difficulties involved in the implementation on supercomputers and especially hybrid architectures. A lot of work was spent on the comprehension of the physical aspects to produce a code that met the behavior of real astrophysics simulations.

The first section is a presentation of the SPH method and the overall limitation we face. Then we describe different types of specific simulations we used as a benchmark of the application.

### 1.2 Physical modelization and downsides

We identified two main walls in our metric. The computational, the communication and the memory walls. We conducted tests on all aspects keeping the irregularity behavior as a good representative of production codes. We show how these requirements are met in the same problem with SPH and gravitation. We targeted astrophysical simulations in order to add another complexity layer in term of irregularity for both computation and communication. They require the computation of gravitation in addition to SPH on a very high number of particles. This part describes the SPH method itself and the gravitation computation based on fast multipole methods.

#### 1.2.1 Smoothed Particles Hydrodynamics

Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics (SPH) is an explicit numerical mesh-free Lagrangian method. It is used to solve hydrodynamical partial differential equations (PDEs) by discretized them into a set of fluid elements called particles. This computational method was invented for the purpose of astrophysics simulations by Monaghan, Gingold and Lucy in 1977 [Luc77, GM77]. This first SPH work conserved mass and they later proposed a method which also conserved linear and angular momenta [GM82]. The method was extended for general fluid simulations and many other fields from ballistics to oceanography. The development of new reliable, parallel and distributed tools for this method is a challenge for future HPC architectures with the upcoming Exascale systems.

The method, as illustrated in figure 1.1, computes the evolution of a group of particles representing physical quantities. Those physical quantities are either invariant or computed for




Figure 1.1: SPH kernel  $W$  and smoothing length  $h$  representation

every particle at each step regarding its neighbors in the radius of its smoothing length  $h$ . The particles in this radius are then valued according to their distance using a smoothing function  $W$ , also called a kernel. The fundamental SPH formulation computes the physical value of any quantity  $A$  of a particle  $a$  regarding its neighbors' particles  $b$  by:

$$A(\vec{r})_a \simeq \sum_b \frac{m_b}{\rho_b} A(\vec{r}_b) W(|\vec{r} - \vec{r}_b|, h) \quad (1.1)$$

On a physics aspect, this method has several advantages: it can handle deformations, low densities, vacuum and makes particle tracking easier. It also conserves mass, linear and angular momenta and energy by its construction that implies independence of the numerical resolution. Another strong benefit of using SPH is its exact advection of fluid properties. Furthermore, the particle structure of SPH easily combines with tree methods for solving Newtonian gravity through N-body simulations. As a mesh-free method, it avoids the need of grid to calculate the spatial derivatives.

However, there are cons to consider using SPH: it cannot be extended to all PDE formulations; it requires careful setup of initial distribution of particles; further, it can be difficult to resolve turbulence-dominated flows and special care must be taken when handling high gradients such as shocks and surface structure of neutron stars. Many works are exploring how to handle more cases and to push the limitations of this method [DRZR17, LSR16, RDZR16].

In this work, we are solving Lagrangian conservation equations (Euler equations) for density, energy and momentum of an ideal fluid [LL59] such that:

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = -\rho(\nabla \cdot \vec{v}), \quad \frac{du}{dt} = -\frac{P}{\rho}(\nabla \cdot \vec{v}), \quad \frac{d\vec{v}}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\rho}(\nabla P) \quad (1.2)$$

with  $\rho$  the density,  $P$  the pressure,  $u$  the internal energy and  $v$  the velocity,  $\nabla$  the nabla operator and where  $d/dt = \partial/\partial_t + \vec{v} \cdot \nabla$  which is convective derivative.

By using the volume element  $V_b = m_b/\rho_b$ , we can formulate the Newtonian SPH scheme [Ros09] such that:

$$\rho_a = \sum_b m_b W_{ab}(h_a) \quad (1.3)$$

$$\frac{du_a}{dt} = \frac{P_a}{\rho_a^2} \sum_b m_b \vec{v}_{ab} \cdot \nabla_a W_{ab} \quad (1.4)$$

$$\frac{d\vec{v}_a}{dt} = -\sum_b m_b \left( \frac{P_a}{\rho_a^2} + \frac{P_b}{\rho_b^2} \right) \nabla_a W_{ab} \quad (1.5)$$

where  $W_{ab} = W(|\vec{r}_a - \vec{r}_b|, h)$  is the smoothing kernel. The equations we would like to solve allow for emergence of discontinuities from smooth initial data. At discontinuities, the entropy increases in shocks. That dissipation occurs inside the shock-front. The SPH formulation here is inviscid so we need to handle this dissipation near shocks. There are a number of way to handle this problem, but the most widespread approach is to add artificial viscosity (or artificial dissipation) terms in SPH formulation such that:

$$\left( \frac{du_a}{dt} \right)_{art} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_b m_b \Pi_{ab} \vec{v}_{ab} \cdot \nabla_a W_{ab} \quad (1.6)$$

$$\left( \frac{d\vec{v}_a}{dt} \right)_{art} = - \sum_b m_b \Pi_{ab} \nabla_a W_{ab} \quad (1.7)$$

In general, we can express the equations for internal energy and acceleration with artificial viscosity as:

$$\frac{du_a}{dt} = \sum_b m_b \left( \frac{P_a}{\rho_a^2} + \frac{\Pi_{ab}}{2} \right) \vec{v}_{ab} \cdot \nabla_a W_{ab} \quad (1.8)$$

$$\frac{d\vec{v}_a}{dt} = - \sum_b m_b \left( \frac{P_a}{\rho_a^2} + \frac{P_b}{\rho_b^2} + \Pi_{ab} \right) \nabla_a W_{ab} \quad (1.9)$$

$\Pi_{ab}$  is the artificial viscosity tensor. As long as  $\Pi_{ab}$  is symmetric, the conservation of energy, linear and angular momentum is assured by the form of the equation and antisymmetric of the gradient of kernel with respect to the exchange of indices  $a$  and  $b$ .  $\Pi_{ab}$  may define in different ways and here we use [MG83] such as:

$$\Pi_{ab} = \begin{cases} \frac{-\alpha \bar{c}_{ab} \mu_{ab} + \beta \mu_{ab}^2}{\bar{\rho}_{ab}} & \text{for } \vec{r}_{ab} \cdot \vec{v}_{ab} < 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

$$\mu_{ab} = \frac{\bar{h}_{ab} \vec{r}_{ab} \cdot \vec{v}_{ab}}{r_{ab}^2 + \epsilon \bar{h}_{ab}^2} \quad (1.11)$$

Using the usual form  $c_s$  as  $c_s = \sqrt{\frac{\partial p}{\partial \rho}}$ . The values of  $\epsilon$ ,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  have to be set regarding the problem targeted. As an example, we used for the Sod shock tube problem:  $\epsilon = 0.01h^2$ ,  $\alpha = 1.0$  and  $\beta = 2.0$ .

There are many possibilities for the smoothing function, called the kernel. For example, the Monaghan's cubic spline kernel is given by:

$$W(\vec{r}_{ij}, h) = \frac{\sigma}{h^D} \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{3}{2}q^2 + \frac{3}{4}q^3 & \text{if } 0 \leq q \leq 1 \\ \frac{1}{4}(2-q)^3 & \text{if } 1 \leq q \leq 2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1.12)$$

where  $q = r/h$ ,  $r$  the distance between the two particles,  $D$  is the number of dimensions and  $\sigma$  is a normalization constant with the values:

$$\sigma = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{3} & \text{for 1D} \\ \frac{10}{7\pi} & \text{for 2D} \\ \frac{1}{\pi} & \text{for 3D} \end{cases} \quad (1.13)$$

In the computation of forces we need to apply the gradient of the smoothing kernel. This is, in our example, for the cubic spline kernel:

$$\vec{\nabla}_i W(\vec{r}_{ij}, h) = \frac{\sigma}{h^{D+1}} \times \begin{cases} \left( -\frac{3}{h} + \frac{9}{4h}q \right) \vec{r}_{ij}, & \text{si } 0 \leq \frac{r}{h} < 1 \\ \left( \frac{-3}{r} + \frac{3}{h} - \frac{3}{4h}q \right) \vec{r}_{ij}, & \text{si } 1 \leq \frac{r}{h} < 2 \\ 0, & \text{si } \frac{r}{h} \geq 2 \end{cases} \quad (1.14)$$




Figure 1.2: Cubic spline kernel example with  $\sigma = 1$  and  $h = 1$

Figure 1.2 is a representation of the cubic spline kernel with  $\sigma = 1$  and  $h = 1$ . The abscissa axis represents  $r$ , distance between the particles and the ordinate the value of the smoothing kernel. When the support of the function, 2 is reached the particles are ignored  $W = 0$ , represented in red on the figure.

To sum up, the SPH resolution scheme and its routines are presented on algorithm 1. The Equation of State (EOS) and the integration are problem dependent and will be define for each test case in section 1.3.

---

#### Algorithm 1 SPH loop algorithm

---

- 1: **while** not last step **do**
  - 2:   Compute density for each particle (1.3)
  - 3:   Compute pressure using EOS
  - 4:   Compute acceleration from pressure forces (1.9)
  - 5:   Compute change of internal energy for acceleration (1.8)
  - 6:   Advance particles after integration
  - 7: **end while**
- 

The main downside for the implementation of this method is the requirement for local computation on every particle. The particles have to be grouped locally to perform the computation of (1.3), (1.8) and (1.9). A communication step is needed before and after (1.3) to get the local physical data to be able to compute (1.8) and (1.9). The tree data structure allows us to perform  $O(N \log(N))$  neighbor search, but also add a domain decomposition and distribution layer.

### 1.2.2 Gravitation

We decided to simulate astrophysical events in order to target hard irregular simulation facing both the communication and computation wall in irregular behavior. This choice is also accurate since our code, FleCSPH, will be used by the LANL astrophysicists in the near future. In order to perform these simulations, the computation of gravitation/self-gravitation is required. This part presents our implementation choice and expose the main problems for HPC implementation.

For classical problems, like fluid flow, the gravitation can directly be applied on the particles with the force:

$$\vec{a}_g = m \vec{g} \quad (1.15)$$

In order to consider astrophysics problems, we need to introduce self-gravitation and gravitation. Each particle implies an action on the others based on its distance and mass. The equation of gravitation for a particle  $i$  with  $j$  other particles is:

$$\vec{f}_{ai} = \sum_j -G \frac{m_i m_j}{|\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j|^3} \vec{r}_{ij} \quad (1.16)$$

This computation involve an  $O(N^2)$  complexity and thus is not applicable directly. We applied the method called Fast Multipole Method (FMM) discussed in [BG97]. This method is perfectly adapted to a tree representation of the domain and particles.




Figure 1.3: Fast Multipole Method schematics. Particles to Multipole (P2M), Multipole to Multipole (M2M), Multipole to Particles (M2P), Multipole to Local (M2L), Local to Local (L2L) and Particles to Particles (P2P). Schematic inspired from [YB11]

This method aims to compute the gravitation up to an approximation determined by the user. Details are given in figure 1.3, from left bottom to right bottom for a group of particles. We identify three main actors in this method:

**Particles:** the bodies on which we need to compute the gravitation regarding the other particles. In figure 1.3 we separate the green particles, on which we are computing the gravitation, from the other blue particles.

**Multipoles:** the center of mass for a group of particles. In our example, they regroup the mass and barycenter of the sub-particles. There are several levels of multipoles: particles' multipole and multipoles' multipole.

**Locals:** the center of mass for the reduction on the particles concerned in this walk. They have the same behavior as the multipoles, but the information goes down to particles instead of up.

In order to compute the gravitation for a group of particles in the domain the steps are:

**Particles to Particles (P2P):** For the particles that are close, use the direct  $O(N^2)$  algorithm. This is the part that grow if the user desires more accurate results.

**Particles to Multipoles (P2M):** Gathers the data of all the sub-particles to the centers of mass, the multipoles. This is the first layer of the tree, the leaves.

**Multipoles to Multipoles (M2M):** Gathers the data of multipoles on higher level of the tree from the leaves to the root.

**Multipoles to Local (M2L):** Computes the gravitation part of all the distant multipole to the local.

**Local to Local (L2L):** Goes down in the tree and spread the component to sub-locals.

**Local to Particles (L2P):** When a leaf of the tree is reached, computes the application of the local for all sub-particles.

**Summation:** At the end of the computation for both P2P and L2P the two interactions can be summed up to compute the gravitation applied to the particles.

This scheme has to be repeat for every group of particles. The P2M-M2M steps are done just once before the FMM method for all the groups of particles. We use a criterion call Multipole Acceptance Criterion (MAC) for the choice between either P2P or M2L. In this study we used an angle between the local center of mass and the edge of distant multipole. If the angle fits

the criterion we use the current multipole, otherwise we go lower in the tree to consider smaller multipole. If the criterion never matches, we are too close and consider P2P.

For the P2P step, the classical gravitation computation is used, like presented in equation 1.16. But for the interaction with distant multipoles, we use a Taylor series.

The gravitation function of equation 1.16 can be approximate on a particle at position  $\vec{r}$  by the gravitation computed at the centroid at position  $\vec{r}_c$ :

$$\vec{f}(\vec{r}) = \vec{f}(\vec{r}_c) + \left\| \frac{\partial \vec{f}}{\partial \vec{r}} \right\| \cdot (\vec{r} - \vec{r}_c) + \frac{1}{2} (\vec{r} - \vec{r}_c)^\top \cdot \left\| \frac{\partial^2 \vec{f}}{\partial \vec{r} \partial \vec{r}} \right\| \cdot (\vec{r} - \vec{r}_c) \quad (1.17)$$

From equation 1.16 we compute the term  $\left\| \frac{\partial \vec{f}}{\partial \vec{r}} \right\|$ :

$$\frac{\partial \vec{f}}{\partial \vec{r}} = - \sum_p \frac{m_p}{|\vec{r}_c - \vec{r}_p|^3} \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{3(x_c - x_p)(x_c - x_p)}{|\vec{r}_c - \vec{r}_p|^2} & -\frac{3(y_c - y_p)(x_c - x_p)}{|\vec{r}_c - \vec{r}_p|^2} & -\frac{3(z_c - z_p)(x_c - x_p)}{|\vec{r}_c - \vec{r}_p|^2} \\ -\frac{3(x_c - x_p)(y_c - y_p)}{|\vec{r}_c - \vec{r}_p|^2} & 1 - \frac{3(y_c - y_p)(y_c - y_p)}{|\vec{r}_c - \vec{r}_p|^2} & -\frac{3(z_c - z_p)(y_c - y_p)}{|\vec{r}_c - \vec{r}_p|^2} \\ -\frac{3(x_c - x_p)(z_c - z_p)}{|\vec{r}_c - \vec{r}_p|^2} & -\frac{3(y_c - y_p)(z_c - z_p)}{|\vec{r}_c - \vec{r}_p|^2} & 1 - \frac{3(z_c - z_p)(z_c - z_p)}{|\vec{r}_c - \vec{r}_p|^2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (1.18)$$

And we propose a compact version of the matrix with:

$$\left\| \frac{\partial f^a}{\partial r^b} \right\| = - \sum_c \frac{m_c}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}_c|^3} \left[ \delta_{ab} - \frac{3 \cdot (r^a - r_c^a)(r^b - r_c^b)}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}_c|^2} \right] \quad (1.19)$$

With  $\delta_{ab}$  the Kronecker delta:

$$\delta_{ab} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a = b. \\ 0, & \text{if } a \neq b. \end{cases} \quad (1.20)$$

We note that  $a$  and  $b$  variate from 0 to 2 and  $r^0 = x$ ,  $r^1 = y$  and  $r^2 = z$  as usual sense.

For the term  $\left\| \frac{\partial^2 \vec{f}}{\partial \vec{r} \partial \vec{r}} \right\|$  we give the compact version by:

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^2 f^a}{\partial r^b \partial r^c} \right\| = - \sum_c \frac{3m_c}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}_c|^5} \left[ \frac{5(r^a - r_c^a)(r^b - r_c^b)(r^c - r_c^c)}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}_c|^2} - \left( \delta_{ab}(r^c - r_c^c) + \delta_{bc}(r^a - r_c^a) + \delta_{ac}(r^b - r_c^b) \right) \right] \quad (1.21)$$

The equations 1.19 and 1.21 are use during the M2L step. We use equation 1.17 during the tree traversal and apply the gravitation to locals and then particles in L2L and L2P.

This method imposes a lot of communications and exchanges between the processes. The particles are separate for each process in our distributed version. Indeed, as each of the processes will hold part of the particles, the multipole in M2L computation imposes to share data. The P2P computation will face issues on the edge of each sub-domain. The irregular behavior is also present for the choice of the multipole to consider during the M2L step based on the MAC criterion.

### 1.3 Test cases with SPH

The generic SPH method and the gravitation computation, either simple or with FMM, allow us to run standard example to check the physical accuracy of our code. We choose four mains examples in this purpose: the Sod shock tube, the Sedov blast wave, fluid flow simulation and astrophysical examples like binary neutron stars coalescence. We present those problems in this section and their characteristics regarding the computer science difficulties involved.





Figure 1.4: Sod shock tube with FleCSPH

Figure 1.5: Sedov Blast Wave with FleCSPH at respectively  $t = 0.01$ ,  $t = 0.03$ ,  $t = 0.06$  and  $t = 0.1$ 

### 1.3.1 Simple tests: tree and communications

#### Sod shock tube

The Sod shock tube is the test consisting of a one-dimensional Riemann problem with the following initial parameters [Sod78].

$$(\rho, v, p)_{t=0} = \begin{cases} (1.0, 0.0, 1.0) & \text{if } 0 < x \leq 0.5 \\ (0.125, 0.0, 0.1) & \text{if } 0.5 < x < 1.0 \end{cases} \quad (1.22)$$

In our code, we use the same initial data as in section 1.2.1 with ideal gas EOS such as:

$$P(\rho, u) = (\Gamma - 1)\rho u \quad (1.23)$$

where  $\Gamma$  is the adiabatic index of the gas, we set  $\Gamma = 5/3$ .

This test is used to check the physical accuracy of the code and thus the tree search itself. A simulation of our Sod shock experimentation is presented on figure 1.4 and shows physically correct results. The first difficulty of this problem is the tree repartition, the physics behind is not complicated and does not involve specific optimizations.

#### Sedov blast wave

A blast wave is the pressure and flow resulting from the deposition of a large amount of energy in a small very localized volume. There are different versions of blast wave test and we consider comparing it with the analytic solution for a point explosion as given by Sedov [Sed46], making the assumption that the atmospheric pressure relative to the pressure inside the explosion negligible. Here, we test 2D blast wave. In this simulation, we use ideal gas EOS with  $\Gamma = 5/3$  and we are assuming that the undistributed area is at rest with a pressure  $P_0 = 1.0^{-5}$ . The density is constant  $\rho_0$ , also in the pressurized region.

An example of our Sedov Blast wave experimentation is presented on figure 1.5 and shows physically correct results. This problem has the same conclusion as the Sod shock tube, his purpose is the test the tree behavior with 2 dimensions.




Figure 1.6: Different boundaries condition methods

### 1.3.2 High number of particles and specific formulation

After performing the tests regarding the physics reliability, we worked on fluid flow problem in 2D and 3D to reach high number of particles. The details can be found in [GGRC<sup>+</sup>12]. This test is based on an ideal EOS given by:

$$P = B \left[ \left( \frac{\rho}{\rho_0} \right)^\gamma - 1 \right] \quad (1.24)$$

with  $\gamma = 7$  and  $B = c_0 \rho_0 / \gamma$  being  $\rho_0 = 1000 \text{ kg.m}^{-3}$  the reference density.

#### Boundary conditions

For this experiment, realistic boundaries conditions were needed. Several methods are possible with SPH and we focused on the main ones: the repulsive wall, the mirror particles [LP91] and the dummies particles implementation [AHA12]. Those boundaries conditions implementation are presented in figure 1.6.

On our first implementation we used repulsive forces, but they imposed a lot of computation during the integration step and does not handle all the shape of boundaries easily.

For the current implementation we used the dummies particles method. This method is accurate and allows us to consider all the shape of boundaries. The wall particles are just considered as normal particles, with specific equations and their quantities are evolved during the run. The main difference is that their position does not evolve at the end of the step. They are identified in the code with a specific type, provided during the data generation.

In this fluid flow example, we were able to go up to a high number of particles with 2 or 3 dimensions. The handling of boundaries conditions added a pressure on the irregularity behavior.

### 1.3.3 SPH and gravitation

The final aim of our tests is to simulate astrophysical events. We are interested in one of the most important event recently discovered. Last year the Laser Interferometer Gravitational Wave, LIGO, detected the first gravitational wave generated by binary neutron stars merging [AAA<sup>+</sup>17b] and also more complexes event with Binary Black Holes coalescence in [AAA<sup>+</sup>17a]. We decided to conduct tests on Binary Neutron Star, BNS, coalescence. This problem represents all the aspect needed in our benchmark with the SPH method but also the self-gravitation and gravitation computation. In order to perform realistic simulations, we consider two stars that are stable. We give details on the way to generate those data and the physics of the fusion itself. A lot of work have been involved in this understanding since it is quite out of the field of the primary researches.

The generation of initial data for binary neutron star merging is quite complicated. The first step is to generate the profile of mass regarding the radius of the star. This is made using the Lane-Emden equation. As those data are generated based on a grid with a fixed smoothing

	NS <sub>1</sub>	NS <sub>2</sub>	NS <sub>3</sub>	NS <sub>4</sub>
Radius (cm)	$R = G = M = 1$	1500000	1400000	960000
K	0.636619	95598.00	83576.48	39156.94

Table 1.1: Examples of the proportionality constant  $K$  regarding the star stellar radius  $R$ 

length in our case we need to add an extra step for relaxation. We used two relaxation methods with the Roche Lobe and Darwin problems. The last step before the merging is to position the stars and add the rotation velocity.

### Solving Lane-Emden Equation

In order to consider BNS we first consider two individual stars. The star is characterized by its radius and mass but also the density repartition inside. Indeed, we have to determine the density function based on the radius. For this purpose, we used the so called Land-Emden equation.

As we consider the star as a polytropic fluid, we use the equation of Lane-Emden which is a form of the Poisson equation:

$$\frac{d^2\theta}{d\xi^2} + \frac{2}{\xi} \frac{d\theta}{d\xi} + \theta^n = 0 \quad (1.25)$$

With  $\xi$  and  $\theta$  two dimensionless variables. There are only exact solutions for a polytropic index  $n = 0.5, 1$  and  $2$ . In our work we use a polytropic index of  $1$  which can correspond to a NS simulation.

For  $n = 1$  the solution of equation 1.25 is:

$$\theta(\xi) = \frac{\sin(\xi)}{\xi} \quad (1.26)$$

We note  $\xi_1 = \pi$ , the first value of  $\xi$  with  $\theta(\xi) = 0$ .  $\theta(\xi)$  is also defined as:

$$\theta(\xi) = \left( \frac{\rho(\xi)}{\rho_c} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} = \frac{\rho(\xi)}{\rho_c} \quad (1.27)$$

With  $\rho_c$  the internal density of the star and  $\rho$  the density at a determined radius.  $\xi$  is defined as:

$$\xi = \sqrt{\frac{4\pi G}{K(n+1)}} \rho_c^{(n-1)/n} \times r = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi G}{K}} \times r = Ar \quad (\text{for } n = 1 \text{ and } A = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi G}{K}})$$

With  $K$  a proportionality constant,  $r$  the radius and  $G$  the gravitational constant.

From the previous equations we can write the stellar radius  $R$ , the total radius of the star, as:

$$R = \sqrt{\frac{K(n+1)}{4\pi G}} \rho_c^{(1-n)/2} \xi_1 = \sqrt{\frac{K}{2\pi G}} \times \xi_1 \quad (\text{for } n = 1) \quad (1.28)$$

We note that for  $n = 1$  the radius does not depend of the central density.

Here as an example, we use dimensionless units as  $G = R = M = 1$  (for the other results we use CGS with  $G = 6.674 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ g}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-2}$ ) We can compute K as:

$$K = \frac{R^2 2\pi G}{\xi_1^2} \quad (1.29)$$

Figure 1.1 give example of radius and the proportionality constant  $K$ .

Then we deduce the density function of  $r$  as :

$$\rho(\xi) = \frac{\sin(A \times r)}{A \times r} \times \rho_c \text{ with } A = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi G}{K}}$$

As we know the total Mass  $M$ , the radius  $R$  and the gravitational constant  $G$  we can compute the central density as:

$$\rho_c = \frac{MA^3}{4\pi(\sin(AR) - AR\cos(AR))}$$

Then we normalize the results to fit  $R = M = G = 1$ :  $K' = K/(R^2G)$ ,  $m'_i = m_i/M$ ,  $h'_i = h_i/R$ ,  $\vec{x}'_i = \vec{x}_i/R$

### Generating Binary Neutron Stars initial data

The initial data are based on a cubic lattice within a sphere of radius  $R$ . The density function, based on radius,  $\rho(\vec{r})$  is known using the result of the Lane-Emden equation (we use polytropic index  $n = 1$  here). The mass associate to each particle  $i$  of the total  $N$  particles:

$$m_i = \frac{\rho(\vec{r}_i)}{n_r} \text{ with } n_r = \frac{3N}{4\pi R^3}$$

The smoothing length is defined constant and the same for all particles for all the simulation:

$$h = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{3N_N}{4\pi n}}$$

Here we choose  $N_N$ , the average number of neighbors, to be 100.

### Relaxation

The last step is to perform a relaxation on the raw data. There are two methods we used: the Roche lobe and Darwin problems. In each of them we apply specific forces during a determined time for the particles to be stabilized.

**Roche lobe problem:** The Roche Lobe version is used to simulate the halo around the stars which is shaped like a tear-drop. For this Hydrostatic Equilibrium Models, we use a different equation of motion:

$$\frac{d\vec{v}_i}{dt} = \frac{\vec{F}_i^{Grav}}{m_i} + \frac{\vec{F}_i^{Hydro}}{m_i} + \vec{F}_i^{Roche} - \frac{\vec{v}_i}{t_{relax}} \quad (1.30)$$

With  $t_{relax} \leq t_{osc} \sim (G\rho)^{-1/2}$  and where  $\vec{F}_i^{Roche}$  is:

$$\vec{F}_i^{Roche} = \mu(3+q)x_i\hat{\vec{x}} + \mu q y_i\hat{\vec{y}} - \mu z_i\hat{\vec{z}}$$

With  $\mu$  to be determined (for us  $\mu = 0.069$ ) and  $q = \frac{M'}{M} = 1$  as the two polytropes have the same total mass. This is applied to each star to get the equilibrium and the simulate the tidal effect.

**Darwin problem:** This is the way we use to generate the final simulation. The equation of motion for the relaxation is now:

$$\frac{d\vec{v}_i}{dt} = \frac{\vec{F}_i^{Grav}}{m_i} + \frac{\vec{F}_i^{Hydro}}{m_i} + \vec{F}_i^{Rot} - \frac{\vec{v}_i}{t_{relax}} \quad (1.31)$$

With  $t_{relax}$  same as before and  $\vec{F}_i^{Rot}$  defined by:

$$\vec{F}_i^{Rot} = \Omega^2(x_i\hat{\vec{x}} + y_i\hat{\vec{y}}) \quad (1.32)$$

With  $\Omega = \sqrt{\frac{G(M+M')}{a^3}}$ ,  $L_z = Q_{zz}\Omega$  and  $Q_{zz} = \sum_i(x_i^2 + y_i^2)$ . At  $t = 0$  we compute the total angular moment  $L_z$  which stay constant. Using it during the relaxation we can compute  $\Omega$  as:  $\Omega = \frac{L_z}{Q_{zz}}$  just by recomputing  $Q_{zz}$ . Here the scheme is in  $N^2$  but just for the relaxation step.

For this relaxation we use two stars generated as before, applying equation of motion 1.31. Using  $a$  as the distance between the two polytropes (Here  $a = 2.9$  for  $R = 1$ ) and  $\vec{x}$  going for the center of the first to the second star and  $\vec{z}$  is like the rotation vector.

After the generation we are able to perform BNS coalescence. This provides us a code using SPH, self-gravity and gravitation.

This will be the perfect candidate to provide a benchmark for our study. First, a high computation cost with the SPH and FMM computation of hydrodynamics and gravitation. The problem size can grow accordingly to the number of particles but also their physical data like the number of neighbors. Secondly, a lot of communications for both SPH and FMM to share local particles and non-local center of mass. In completion of those two aspect, the irregularity provided by a huge number of particles moving in a 2D or 3D space at every iteration, making impossible the prediction of their position and values.

## 1.4 Conclusion

The problem we presented in this part fulfill all the objectives for our metric. The computation wall is targeted via the physics and gravitation computation. The communication wall on the other hand is central regarding the exchanges needed for SPH and the fast multipole method. This problem is also very irregular for both cases. Indeed, the particles moves at every iteration without any prediction on their new position and data. In the same time the locality imposes a very high level of irregularity to reach efficiently all the neighbors of a specific particle. This implies the usage of a tree data structure, the work of our two metrics can be applied in this context.

As the SPH method is used in a large panel of fields from astrophysics to fluid mechanic, there are numerous related works. We can cite a code developed in the LANL, 2HOT [War13] that introduced the Hashed Oct Tree structure used in our implementation. There is also GADGET-2 [Spr05], GIZMO [Hop14] and the most recent publication is GASOLINE [WKQ17] based on PKDGRAV, a specific tree+gravity implementation. Several implementations already implement GPU code and tree construction and traversal, one can cite GOTHIC [MU17], presenting gravitational tree code accelerated using the latest Fermi, Kepler and Maxwell architectures. But a lot of GPU accelerated work still focused on fluid problems and not on astrophysical problems[HKK07, CDB<sup>+</sup>11]. We also note that these implementations focus on SPH problems and does not provide a general purpose and multi-physics framework like we intent to provide through FleCSPH and FleCSI. Several other works gave us hint for the best implementation of parallel and accelerated SPH[IABT11, IOS<sup>+</sup>14]

Our implementation has not to be considered as a revolution for the SPH method itself, neither the use of accelerators. This study provides a code easy to use by domain scientists moving the complexity of distribution, load balancing and accelerator use to the back-end framework. This tool will allow us to push forward and provide different type of accelerator in the future keeping a full transparency for the user.



# Chapter 2

## Complex simulations on hybrid architectures

### 2.1 Introduction

The previous part describes the method we implement to set the last metric of our benchmark for hybrid architectures. It also presents the wall faced with smoothed particle hydrodynamics and gravitation. We showed that this application meets the communication and computation wall in an irregular behavior context. We intent to target astrophysical simulation using hybrid architectures. This distributed SPH and gravitation implementation is called FleCSPH. This is a complex application that, beside of being interesting for our purpose, need to be accurate on the physics aspect to be used by the domain scientists from LANL.

This section gives details about the FleCSPH framework. We first present FleCSI, the base project in the Los Alamos National Laboratory on which FleCSPH is based. We then give details on the implementation itself and the tools we implemented to reach a working and efficient code. We give details on the domain decomposition strategy used with Morton Ordering. The tree traversal algorithm choices are then explained.

After this presentation of the native code using multi-CPU clusters we present our strategies for a multi-GPU implementation. The last section exposes the results for both implementation and the simulations.

A lot of code already exists for SPH simulation and some are already made using hybrid architectures. The contribution of FleCSPH is, like FleCSI, to provide a transparent tool for domain scientists. Those frameworks provide a bunch of topologies and functions and will handle the load balancing and distribution for the domain scientists. This allows the computer scientists to keep track of last hardware evolution and provide efficient algorithms for them while the physicists/astrophysicists/chemists can focus on the simulation itself. In this context FleCSPH is focused on tree topologies and will be integrated in FleCSI later on.

### 2.2 FleCSI

FleCSI<sup>1</sup> [BMC16] is a compile-time configurable framework designed to support multi-physics application development. It is developed at the Los Alamos National Laboratory as part of the Los Alamos Ristra project. As such, FleCSI provides a very general set of infrastructure design patterns that can be specialized and extended to suit the needs of a broad variety of solver and data requirements. FleCSI currently supports multi-dimensional mesh topology, geometry, and adjacency information, as well as n-dimensional hashed-tree data structures, graph partitioning interfaces, and dependency closures.

---

<sup>1</sup><http://github.com/laristra/flecsi>

FleCSI introduces a functional programming model with control, execution, and data abstractions that are consistent both with MPI and with state-of-the-art, task-based runtimes such as Legion[BTSA12] and Charm++[KK93]. The abstraction layer insulates developers from the underlying runtime, while allowing support for multiple runtime systems including conventional models like asynchronous MPI.

The intent is to provide developers with a concrete set of user-friendly programming tools that can be used now, while allowing flexibility in choosing runtime implementations and optimization that can be applied to future architectures and runtimes.

FleCSI's control and execution models provide formal nomenclature for describing poorly understood concepts such as kernels and tasks. FleCSI's data model provides a low-buy-in approach that makes it an attractive option for many application projects, as developers are not locked into particular layouts or data structure representations.

FleCSI currently provides a parallel but not distributed implementation of Binary, Quad and Oct-tree topology. This implementation is based on space filling curves domain decomposition, the Morton order. The current version allows the user to specify the code main loop and the data distribution requested. The data distribution feature is not available for the tree data structure needed in our SPH code and we provide it in the FleCSPH implementation. The next step will be to incorporate it directly from FleCSPH to FleCSI as we reach a decent level of performance. As FleCSI is an on-development code the structure may change in the future and we keep track of these updates in FleCSPH.

Based on FleCSI the intent is to provide a binary, quad and oct-tree data structure and the methods to create, search and share information for it. In FleCSPH this will be dedicated, apply and tested on the SPH method. In this part we first present the domain decomposition, based on space filling curves, and the tree data structure. We describe the HDF5 files structure used for the I/O. Then we describe the distributed algorithm for the data structure over the MPI processes.

## 2.3 Distributed SPH on multi-core architecture

Before going further in the SPH implementation and our development, we need to give details on the algorithm and the work involved. The general algorithm is presented on algorithm 2

---

### Algorithm 2 SPH implementation

---

```

1: Read particles from file
2: while not last step do
3:   Generate keys for particles
4:   Load balance particles
5:   Generate local tree data structure
6:   while Physics not done do
7:     Physics: search and distributed search
8:     Update data
9:   end while
10:  Gravitation = FMM
11:  if Output step then
12:    Output data in H5part format
13:  end if
14: end while
```

---

and shows the features of SPH exposed in the previous section. In this section we present the main features of our code and the problems involved: the domain decomposition, the tree data structure and traversal and our distribution strategy. This project, in collaboration with the LANL, is named FleCSPH.




Figure 2.1: FleCSI and FleCSPH frameworks

FleCSPH<sup>2</sup> is a framework initially created as a part of FleCSI. The purpose of FleCSPH is to provide a data distribution and communications patterns to use the tree topology provided in FleCSI applied to SPH. The final purpose of FleCSPH is to complement the tree topology and provide the *colorer* to FleCSI. The distribution strategies associate to a data structure. As presented in the previous sections, SPH is a very good candidate to benchmark the binary, quad and oct tree topology. The demand is high for astrophysics simulation regarding the recent discoveries of the LIGO and the SPH method allows us to generate those simulations. Figure 2.1 presents how FleCSI and FleCSPH are integrated. FleCSPH is based on the tree topology of FleCSI and follows the same structure define in FleCSI. The ideal runtime in FleCSI is Legion but this in-development code does not allow us to do more than static data distribution. This is why we decided to work with the MPI runtime in FleCSPH. Those MPI functions can then be integrated to FleCSI to generate group of particles and labeled them, the coloring.

Figure 2.2 present the file systems of the github repository. We use the tools from Cinch<sup>4</sup> developed at LANL for the CMake and the makefile generation. It also provides the GoogleTests API for our unit tests. The FleCSPH code is currently public and available on github under the *laristra* (Los Alamos Ristra) project. The continuous integration is ensured by using Travis based on Docker and *Dockerfiles* provided in the Docker folder. In addition to Travis for the unit tests we use tools as CodeCov<sup>5</sup> for the code coverage and SonarQube<sup>6</sup> for the quality gates. In the current version we use external libraries: HDF5, H5hut and a specific library for I/O based on H5hut. Those elements are present and installed using scripts in *third-part-library* folder.

For the first implementation we present the code without considering accelerators. We intent to provide an efficient multi-CPU distributed code. The description starts with the domain decomposition strategy which is a basic element for the tree implementation. We explain the tree data structure for the construction and the search of particles along with the distribution strategy.

### 2.3.1 Domain decomposition

The number of particles can be high and represent a huge amount of data that does not fit in a single node memory. This implies the distribution of the particles over several computational nodes. As the particles moves during the simulation the static distribution is not possible and they have to be redistributed at some point in the execution. Furthermore, this distribution need to keep local particles in the same computation node to optimize the exchanges and computation itself.

A common approach is to distribute the particles over computational nodes using *space filling curves* like in [War13, Spr05, BGF<sup>+</sup>14]. It intends to assign to each particle a key which is based

<sup>2</sup><http://github.com/laristra/flecsph>

<sup>4</sup><http://github.com/laristra/cinch>

<sup>5</sup><http://codecov.io>

<sup>6</sup><http://sonarqube.org/>




Figure 2.2: FleCSPH structures and files




Figure 2.3: Morton order key generation

on its spacial coordinates, then sorting particles based on those keys keeps particles grouped locally. Many space filling curves exists: Morton, Hilbert, Peano, Moore, Gosper, etc.

This domain decomposition is used in several layers for our implementation. On one hand, to spread the particles over all the MPI processes and provide a decent load balancing regarding the number of particles. On the other hand, it is also used locally to store efficiently the particles and provide a  $O(N \log(N))$  neighbor search complexity, instead of  $O(N^2)$ , using a tree representation describe in part 2.3.2.

Several space filling curves can fit our purposes:




Figure 2.4: Morton and Hilbert space filling curves

### The Morton curves

[Mor66], or Z-Order, is the most spread method. This method can produce irregular shape domain decomposition like shown in green on figure 2.4. The main advantage is to be fast to compute, the key is made by interlacing directly the X, Y and Z bits without rotations.

### The Hilbert curves

[Sag12] are constructed by interlacing bits but also adding rotation based on the Gray code. This work is based on the Peano curves and also called Hilber-Peano. The construction is more complicated than Morton but allows a better distribution.

On figure 2.4, the Morton (left) and Hilbert (right) space-filling curves are represented in this example. The particles are distributed over 3 processes. The set of particles of the second process appears in green. As we can see there are discontinuities on the Morton case due to the Z-order "jump" over the space. This can lead to non-local particles and over-sharing of particles that will not be needed during the computation. In the Hilbert curve, the locality over the processes is conserved.

In this first implementation of FleCSPH we used the Morton ordering due to the computational cost. The next step of this work is to compare the computation time of different space filing curves.

Technically the keys are generated for each particle at each iteration because their position is expected to change over time. To be more efficient, the keys can stay the same during several steps and the final comparison can be made on the real particles positions. This increase the search time but allows less tree reconstructions.

We use 64 bits to represent the keys to avoid conflicts. The FleCSI code allows us to use a combination of memory words to reach the desired size of keys (possibly more than 64 bits) but this will cost in memory occupancy. The particle keys are generated by normalizing the space and then converting the floating-point representation to a 64 bits integer for each dimension. Then the Morton interlacing is done, and the keys are created. Unfortunately, in some arrangements, like isolated particles, or scenarios with very close particles, the keys can be either badly distributed or duplicate keys can appear. Indeed, if the distance between two particles is less than  $2^{-64} \approx 1e+20$ , in a normalized space, the key generated through the algorithm will be the same. This problem is then handle during the particle sort and then the tree generation. In both case two particles can be differentiate based on their unique ID generated at the beginning execution.




Figure 2.5: Quadtree, space and data representation

### 2.3.2 Hierarchical trees

The method we use for the tree data structure creation and research comes from Barnes-Hut trees presented in [BH86, Bar90]. By reducing the search complexity from  $O(N^2)$  for direct summation to  $O(N \log(N))$  it allows us to do very large simulations with billions of particles. It also allows the use of the tree data structure to compute gravitation using multipole methods.

We consider binary trees, for 1 dimension, quad-trees, for 2 dimensions, and oct-trees, for 3 dimensions. The construction of those trees is directly based on the domain decomposition using keys and space-filling curve presented in section 2.3.1.

As explained in the previous section, we use 64 bits keys. That gives us up to 63, 31 and 21 levels in the tree for respectively 1, 2 and 3 dimensions. As presented on figure 2.5 the first bit is used to represent the root of the tree, 1. This allows us to have up to  $2^{63}$  different keys and unique particles.

#### Tree generation

After each particle gets distributed on its final process using its space-filling curve key, we can recursively construct the tree. Each particle is added, and the branches are created recursively if there is an intersection between keys. Starting from the root of key "1" the branches are added at each level until the particles are reached. An example of a final tree is shown on figure 2.5.

#### Tree search

When all the particles have been added, the data regarding the tree nodes are computed with a bottom up approach. Summing up the mass, position called Center of Mass (COM), and the boundary box of all sub-particles of this tree node.

For the search algorithm the basic idea would be to do a tree traversal for all the particles and once we reach a particle or a node that interact with the particle smoothing length, add it for computation or in a neighbor list. Beside of being easy to implement and to use in parallel this algorithm requires a full tree traversal for every particle and will not take advantage of the particles' locality.

Our search algorithm, presented on Algorithm 3, is a two-step algorithm like in Barnes trees: First create the interaction lists and then using them on the sub-tree particles. In the first step we look down for nodes with a target sub-mass of particles  $tmass$ . Then for those branches we compute an interaction list and continue the recursive tree search. When a particle is reached, we compute the physics using the interaction list as the neighbors. The interaction list is computed using an opening-angle criterion comparing the boundary box and a user-defined angle. This way we will not need a full tree traversal for each particle but a full tree traversal for




Figure 2.6: Neighbors search using a tree traversal per particle vs a group of particle and computing an interaction list

every group of particles. On figure 2.6 we present the classical and the two steps algorithm. We see that the first method, on left, force to do one walk per particle, compute the interaction list and then apply to particles. On the left, the two-step method, only perform one tree traversal for the whole block of particles, compute the interaction list and then processed to the local computation. Indeed, this implies a check of particle distance during the computation since all the particles from the interaction list are not useful for every particle.

### 2.3.3 Distribution strategies

The previous section presented the tree data structure that can be use locally on every node. The distribution layer is added on top of it, keeping each sub-tree on the computation nodes. The current version of FleCSPH is still based on synchronous communications using the Message Passing Interface (MPI).

The main distributed algorithm is presented on algorithm 4:

#### Particle distribution

The sort step, line 5, is based on a distributed quick sort algorithm. The keys are generated using the Morton order described in part 2.3.1. As we associate a unique number to each particle we are able to sort them using the keys and, in case of collision keys, using their unique ID. This gives us a global order for the particles. Each process sends to a master node (or submaster for larger cases) a sample of its keys. We determined this size to be 256 KB of key data per process for our test cases, but it can be refined for larger simulations. Then the master determines the general ordering for all the processes and shares the pivots. Then each process locally sorts its local keys, and, in a global communication step, the particles are distributed to the process on which they belong. This algorithm gives us a good partition in term of number of particles. But some downside can be identified:

- The ordering may not be balanced in term of number of particles per processes. But by optimizing the number of data exchanged to the master can lead to better affectation.
- The load balance also depend on the number of neighbors of each particle. If a particle gets affected a poor area with large space between the particles, this can lead to bad load balancing too.

This is why we also provide another load balancing based on the particles neighbors. Depending on the user problem, the choice can be to distribute the particles on each process regarding

**Algorithm 3** Tree search algorithm

---

```

1: procedure FIND_NODES
2:   stack stk  $\leftarrow$  root
3:   while not_empty(stk) do
4:     branch b  $\leftarrow$  stk.pop()
5:     if b is leaf then
6:       for each particles p of b do
7:         apply_sub_tree(p,interaction_list(p))
8:       end for
9:     else
10:      for each child branch c of b do
11:        stk.push(c)
12:      end for
13:    end if
14:   end while
15: end procedure
16:
17: procedure APPLY_SUB_TREE(node n, node-list nl)
18:   stack stk  $\leftarrow$  n
19:   while not_empty(stk) do
20:     branch b  $\leftarrow$  stk.pop()
21:     if b is leaf then
22:       for each particles p of b do
23:         apply_physics(p,nl)
24:       end for
25:     else
26:       for each child branch c of b do
27:         stk.push(c)
28:       end for
29:     end if
30:   end while
31: end procedure
32:
33: function INTERACTION_LIST(node n)
34:   stack stk  $\leftarrow$  root
35:   node-list nl  $\leftarrow$   $\emptyset$ 
36:   while not_empty(stk) do
37:     branch b  $\leftarrow$  stk.pop()
38:     if b is leaf then
39:       for each particles p of b do
40:         if within() then
41:           nl  $\leftarrow$  nl + p
42:         end if
43:       end for
44:     else
45:       for each child branch c of b do
46:         if mac(c,angle) then
47:           nl  $\leftarrow$  nl + c
48:         else
49:           stk.push(c)
50:         end if
51:       end for
52:     end if
53:   end while
54: end function

```

---

**Algorithm 4** Main algorithm

---

```

1: procedure SPECIALIZATION_DRIVER(input data file f)
2:   Read f in parallel
3:   Set physics constant from f
4:   while iterations do
5:     Distribute the particles using distributed quick sort
6:     Compute total range
7:     Generate the local tree
8:     Share branches
9:     Compute the ghosts particles
10:    Update ghosts data
11:    PHYSICS
12:    Update ghosts data
13:    PHYSICS
14:    Distributed output to file
15:   end while
16: end procedure

```

---




Figure 2.7: Binaries tree for a 2 processes system. Exclusive, Shared and Ghosts particles resp. red, blue, green.




Figure 2.8: Particles "coloring" with local particles: exclusive, shared and distant particles useful during run: ghost particles

the number of neighbors, having the same amount of physical computation to perform on each process.

After this first step, the branches are shared between the different processes, line 8. Every of them send to its neighbors several boundaries boxes, defined by the user. Then particles from the neighbors are computed, exchanged and added in the local tree. Those particles are labeled as NON\_LOCAL particles. At this point a particle can be referenced as: EXCLUSIVE: will never be exchanged and will only be used on this process; SHARED: may be needed by another process during the computation; GHOSTS: particles information that the process need to retrieve from another process. An example is given for 2 processes on figure 2.8 and on a tree data structure on figure 2.7.

#### Exchange Shared and Ghosts particles

The previous distribution shares the particles and the general information about neighbors' particles. Then each process is able to do synchronously or asynchronously communications to gather distant particles. In the current version of FleCSPH an extra step is required to synchronously share data of the particles needed during the next tree traversal and physics part. Then after this step, the ghosts' data can be exchanged as wanted several times during the same time step.

#### 2.3.4 Fast Multipole Methods

We described in the previous chapter a method to compute gravitational interactions faster than the  $O(N^2)$  n-body algorithm, the Fast Multipole Method, FMM. This allows an approach with a precision depending of a parameter called the Multipole Acceptance Criterion, MAC. This is needed for us to target binary neutron stars simulations with high number of particles.

This approach is also based on the tree topology used for the SPH method. Three main functions are used:

- **mpi\_exchange\_cells**

share the centers of mass computed in the tree up to a determined mass. By default, the program shares the lowest COM, the leaves.

- **mpi\_compute\_fmm**

After gathering the COM this step performs the M2M computation and also isolate the particles needed for the distant P2P step.

- **mpi\_gather\_cells**

Gather The contribution of all the other processes and sum in the local branch. Then this step performs both the M2P and P2P computations. A specific P2P for distant particles is added to take in account the particles found on other processes in the M2M step.




Figure 2.9: Evolution of time regarding the multipole acceptance criterion for FMM method.

The speed of computation varies with the choose of the MAC angle. An example is given on figure 2.9. It presents the time varying with the angle. We note that bigger the angle, faster the computation time. The limit of the angle is  $\Theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$ . The loss of precision can be quantified with the evolution of linear and angular momentum. We fixed our MAC to  $\Theta = 1$ .

### 2.3.5 I/O

Regarding the high number of particles, an efficient, parallel and distributed I/O implementation is required. Several choices were available, but we wanted a solution that can be specific for our usage. The first requirement is to allow the user to work directly with the Paraview visualization tool and splash<sup>7</sup> [Pri07].

We base this first implementation on HDF5 [FCY99] file structure with H5Part and H5Hut [HAB<sup>+</sup>10]. HDF5 support MPI runtime with distributed read and write in a single or multiple file. We added the library H5hut to add normalization in the code to represent global data, steps, steps data and the particles data for each step. The I/O code was developed internally at LANL and provides a simple way to write and read the data in H5Part format. The usage of H5Hut to generate H5part data files allows us to directly read the output in Paraview without using a XDMF descriptor like requested in HDF5 format.

## 2.4 Distributed SPH on hybrid architectures

We constructed an efficient and reliable SPH code working on classical architecture clusters. In this section we present our multi-GPU implementation and compare it with our multi-CPU code. We kept the same data structure, distribution strategy and code architecture in the accelerator code. Several options are possible for the accelerator implementation, but we wanted to keep the code usable and working for the domain scientists. As the current version of FleCSI does not allow utilization of accelerator like GPU for the data structure, we decided to embed the GPU code directly on FleCSPH. We provided the same approach we studied in the Langford problem offloading part of the tree computation on the accelerators.

### 2.4.1 Distribution strategies

The FleCSPH framework provides all the tools and distribution strategies for multi-CPU and distributed computation. In order to target hybrid architectures several approaches were possible. They were identified in the previous metrics for the Langford problem. The first one is to implement the whole tree traversal and data representation on GPU. This strategy imposes several downsides especially for asynchronous communication. The data structure of FleCSI and FleCSPH does not allows the full transformation of the data structure into CUDA code and, furthermore, this would transform the framework into a problem dependent API. Even if the performances would be slightly better, the aim of this framework is to target multi-physics problems and thus general.

<sup>7</sup><http://users.monash.edu.au/~dprice/splash/>




Figure 2.10: Task resolution using GPUs

The second strategy is the one used in the Langford problem case. The smoothing length computation is a tree traversal that's lead to a group of particles and their neighbors. We decided to offload the physics computation on accelerators.

Figure 2.10 presents the distribution of tasks with the accelerator. The tree traversal itself stays on the host processor and lower part of the tree are offloaded to the accelerators. The traversal is done in parallel on the host and, when a group of particles and its neighbors list is reached, the data are transferred to the GPU for computation. With this method the GPU is fully used for regularized computation and the CPU handle the data structure. When the tree traversal is done, the CPU wait for last GPU tasks to complete and can gather the result or start another traversal leaving data on GPUs.

#### 2.4.2 Physics on accelerators

The computation of physics is also slightly different on accelerators. Indeed, the CPU send to the GPU indexes with the particles and their possible neighbors. The GPU perform a brute force computation with  $O(n^2)$  algorithm. It keeps checking if the particles received are inside the smoothing length radius. The target particle is loaded in local memory and its neighbors are stored in the local memory for a WARP based computation. The threads then iterate on the local particles and output together in global memory.

### 2.5 Results

In this part we compare the results of the multi-GPU version and the multi-CPU version of FleCSPH. We show the benefit of using hybrid architecture even on irregular problem with high communications and computations.

#### 2.5.1 Performances

The two metrics we worked on, in part II, gave us hint in order to reach performances in this simulation code. The first step was to find the best repartition between the host and device.

Figure 2.11 shows the work balancing. With the smallest distribution the CPU and GPU keep exchange data for very small amount of computation. At the opposite, if the CPU value is too high the  $O(n^2)$  part is too important. We choose the value to be configured by the user and defaulted at 7.

On figure 2.12 and figure 2.13 we find the strong scaling and scalability tests for CPU and GPU version using the empiric best depth of repartition. The time comparison with strong scaling shows us that the GPU version go faster than the CPU one with a peak of 5 times faster.




Figure 2.11: CPU-GPU tasks work balancing




Figure 2.12: CPU vs GPU time per iteration

Figure 2.13: CPU vs GPU scalability per iteration

On the other hand, the scalability graph present that the CPU version is more scalable than the GPU version. This can be explained in two ways.

### 2.5.2 Simulations

The results and tests were done on several physical and astrophysical simulations in order to check the code behavior and reliability.

The first tests, done on Sod shock tube and Sedov blast wave were presented in the previous chapter, showed perfect results.

The fluid simulation is presented on figure 2.14. In this figure we can see a 40,000 particles simulation executed on multiples node of the ROMEO supercomputer. This dam break simulation gave us the opportunity to represent the behavior of boundary conditions with a high number of particles.

In order to target a problem with both SPH and gravitation we decided to work on Astrophysics events like Binary Neutron Stars. The initial data were generated using python 3.5 to compute the position, mass and smoothing length of every particles. A first step is done for the relaxation, the particles take their location. The system relaxed then evolve following the merging equations proposed in the previous chapter.

Figure 2.15 presents the binary neutron star coalescence for 40,000 particles. The computation took 5 hours on four nodes of the supercomputer ROMEO. This simulation is done with a total of 750 outputted steps with more than 100,000 iterations.

## 2.6 Conclusion

In this section we presented a tool completing our metric. This production application dedicated to smoothed particles hydrodynamics and gravitation simulation is called FleCSPH. It allows us to target both computation and communication walls in a highly irregular context.




Figure 2.14: Fluid flow simulation, the dam break. For  $t = 0$ ,  $t = 0.4$ ,  $t = 0.8$  and  $t = 1$  seconds




Figure 2.15: Binary Neutron Stars coalescence with 40.000 particles.

We based our hybrid implementation on the knowledge from the two first metric of our benchmark. We showed the advantage of using hybrid architecture on this kind of application and this behavior can be find in many others.

It is important to notice that the GPU usage is not the best in this case. Indeed, a dedicated application for each specific SPH problem would be more efficient. The aim is to provide

a framework that can be used on a large set of cluster and architectures. Even with those limitations, the GPU was able to provide an acceleration of up to 5 times faster compare to the full-CPU computation.



# Conclusion

This part highlights our study and shows the advantages of hybrid architectures compared to classical CPU centric architectures. We showed that the GPU can handle part of the computation even in the case of computation and communication walls with irregular behavior application. We took for this last metric a simulation problem. As simulation is intrinsically linked with HPC for a lot of field this application find perfectly its place in our metric.

A huge amount of time had been spend on the comprehension and implementation of the physics itself. This was required to provide realistic test cases and show the benefit of hybrid architecture even in the most complex case. We propose simulation for classical physics problems but also complex astrophysical phenomenons like binary neutron star merging. Based on this physics knowledge and the target of completing our metric we create a dedicated distributed application.

This application is called FleCSPH and is based on the FleCSI framework developed at LANL. The intent of this project is to provide a distributed and reliable framework for multi physics purpose to domain scientists. Indeed, with the fast evolution of technologies and the complexity of new supercomputers, new tools needed to be developed. FleCSPH is a first step to reach this goal and target tree topologies. It provides a domain decomposition, a tree data structure, I/O and efficient gravitation computation.

Our hybrid version of the code is based on GPU utilization. It follows the principles we described in the second part for Langford tree structure with GPUs. A subpart of the tree traversal is dedicated to the GPUs which handle all the physics computation.

This implementation is not the best and better results can be done using exclusively GPUs for the resolution. In this case we limited the code transformation to stay in a realistic usable code for the domain scientists. The overall transformation would have create a SPH dedicated program and this is not the aim of this work, targeting realistic production applications.



# Bibliography

- [AAA<sup>+</sup>17a] Benjamin P Abbott, R Abbott, TD Abbott, F Acernese, K Ackley, C Adams, T Adams, P Addesso, RX Adhikari, VB Adya, et al. Gw170814: A three-detector observation of gravitational waves from a binary black hole coalescence. *Physical review letters*, 119(14):141101, 2017.
- [AAA<sup>+</sup>17b] Benjamin P Abbott, Rich Abbott, TD Abbott, Fausto Acernese, Kendall Ackley, Carl Adams, Thomas Adams, Paolo Addesso, RX Adhikari, VB Adya, et al. Gw170817: observation of gravitational waves from a binary neutron star inspiral. *Physical Review Letters*, 119(16):161101, 2017.
- [AHA12] S Adami, XY Hu, and NA Adams. A generalized wall boundary condition for smoothed particle hydrodynamics. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 231(21):7057–7075, 2012.
- [Bar90] Joshua E Barnes. A modified tree code: don’t laugh; it runs. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 87(1):161–170, 1990.
- [BG97] Rick Beatson and Leslie Greengard. A short course on fast multipole methods. *Wavelets, multilevel methods and elliptic PDEs*, 1:1–37, 1997.
- [BGF<sup>+</sup>14] Jeroen Bédorf, Evgenii Gaburov, Michiko S Fujii, Keigo Nitadori, Tomoaki Ishiyama, and Simon Portegies Zwart. 24.77 pflops on a gravitational tree-code to simulate the milky way galaxy with 18600 gpus. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 54–65. IEEE Press, 2014.
- [BH86] Josh Barnes and Piet Hut. A hierarchical  $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$  force-calculation algorithm. *nature*, 324(6096):446–449, 1986.
- [BMC16] Ben Bergen, Nicholas Moss, and Marc Robert Joseph Charest. Flexible computational science infrastructure. Technical report, Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), Los Alamos, NM (United States), 2016.
- [BTSA12] Michael Bauer, Sean Treichler, Elliott Slaughter, and Alex Aiken. Legion: Expressing locality and independence with logical regions. In *Proceedings of the international conference on high performance computing, networking, storage and analysis*, page 66. IEEE Computer Society Press, 2012.
- [CDB<sup>+</sup>11] Alejandro C Crespo, Jose M Dominguez, Anxo Barreiro, Moncho Gómez-Gesteira, and Benedict D Rogers. Gpus, a new tool of acceleration in cfd: efficiency and reliability on smoothed particle hydrodynamics methods. *PloS one*, 6(6):e20685, 2011.
- [DRZR17] Zili Dai, Huilong Ren, Xiaoying Zhuang, and Timon Rabczuk. Dual-support smoothed particle hydrodynamics for elastic mechanics. *International Journal of Computational Methods*, 14(04):1750039, 2017.

- [FCY99] Mike Folk, Albert Cheng, and Kim Yates. Hdf5: A file format and i/o library for high performance computing applications. In *Proceedings of Supercomputing*, volume 99, pages 5–33, 1999.
- [GGRC<sup>+</sup>12] Moncho Gomez-Gesteira, Benedict D Rogers, Alejandro JC Crespo, Robert A Dalrymple, Muthukumar Narayanaswamy, and José M Dominguez. Sphysics—development of a free-surface fluid solver—part 1: Theory and formulations. *Computers & Geosciences*, 48:289–299, 2012.
- [GM77] Robert A Gingold and Joseph J Monaghan. Smoothed particle hydrodynamics: theory and application to non-spherical stars. *Monthly notices of the royal astronomical society*, 181(3):375–389, 1977.
- [GM82] RA Gingold and JJ Monaghan. Kernel estimates as a basis for general particle methods in hydrodynamics. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 46(3):429–453, 1982.
- [HAB<sup>+</sup>10] Mark Howison, Andreas Adelmann, E Wes Bethel, Achim Gsell, Benedikt Oswald, et al. H5hut: A high-performance i/o library for particle-based simulations. In *Cluster Computing Workshops and Posters (CLUSTER WORKSHOPS), 2010 IEEE International Conference on*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2010.
- [HKK07] Takahiro Harada, Seiichi Koshizuka, and Yoichiro Kawaguchi. Smoothed particle hydrodynamics on gpus. In *Computer Graphics International*, pages 63–70. SBC Petropolis, 2007.
- [Hop14] Philip F Hopkins. Gizmo: Multi-method magneto-hydrodynamics+ gravity code. *Astrophysics Source Code Library*, 2014.
- [IABT11] Markus Ihmsen, Nadir Akinci, Markus Becker, and Matthias Teschner. A parallel sph implementation on multi-core cpus. In *Computer Graphics Forum*, volume 30, pages 99–112. Wiley Online Library, 2011.
- [IOS<sup>+</sup>14] Markus Ihmsen, Jens Orthmann, Barbara Solenthaler, Andreas Kolb, and Matthias Teschner. Sph fluids in computer graphics. 2014.
- [KK93] Laxmikant V Kale and Sanjeev Krishnan. Charm++: a portable concurrent object oriented system based on c++. In *ACM Sigplan Notices*, volume 28, pages 91–108. ACM, 1993.
- [LL59] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz. *Fluid mechanics*. 1959.
- [LP91] Larry D Libersky and AG Petschek. Smooth particle hydrodynamics with strength of materials. In *Advances in the free-Lagrange method including contributions on adaptive gridding and the smooth particle hydrodynamics method*, pages 248–257. Springer, 1991.
- [LSR16] SJ Lind, PK Stansby, and Benedict D Rogers. Incompressible–compressible flows with a transient discontinuous interface using smoothed particle hydrodynamics (sph). *Journal of Computational Physics*, 309:129–147, 2016.
- [Luc77] Leon B Lucy. A numerical approach to the testing of the fission hypothesis. *The astronomical journal*, 82:1013–1024, 1977.
- [MG83] J.J Monaghan and R.A Gingold. Shock simulation by the particle method sph. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 52(2):374 – 389, 1983.

- [Mor66] Guy M Morton. *A computer oriented geodetic data base and a new technique in file sequencing*. International Business Machines Company New York, 1966.
- [MU17] Yohei Miki and Masayuki Umemura. Gothic: Gravitational oct-tree code accelerated by hierarchical time step controlling. *New Astronomy*, 52:65–81, 2017.
- [Pri07] Daniel J Price. Splash: An interactive visualisation tool for smoothed particle hydrodynamics simulations. *Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia*, 24(3):159–173, 2007.
- [RDZR16] Huilong Ren, Zili Dai, Xiaoying Zhuang, and Timon Rabczuk. Dual-support smoothed particle hydrodynamics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.08350*, 2016.
- [Ros09] Stephan Rosswog. Astrophysical smooth particle hydrodynamics. *New Astronomy Reviews*, 53(4):78 – 104, 2009.
- [Sag12] Hans Sagan. *Space-filling curves*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [Sed46] Leonid I Sedov. Propagation of strong shock waves. *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics*, 10:241–250, 1946.
- [Sod78] Gary A Sod. A survey of several finite difference methods for systems of nonlinear hyperbolic conservation laws. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 27(1):1 – 31, 1978.
- [Spr05] Volker Springel. The cosmological simulation code gadget-2. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 364(4):1105–1134, 2005.
- [War13] Michael S Warren. 2hot: an improved parallel hashed oct-tree n-body algorithm for cosmological simulation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, page 72. ACM, 2013.
- [WKQ17] James W Wadsley, Benjamin W Keller, and Thomas R Quinn. Gasoline2: a modern smoothed particle hydrodynamics code. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 471(2):2357–2369, 2017.
- [YB11] Rio Yokota and Lorena A Barba. Treecode and fast multipole method for n-body simulation with cuda. In *GPU Computing Gems Emerald Edition*, pages 113–132. Elsevier, 2011.