

The cosmological simulation code GADGET-2

Volker Springel[★]

Max-Planck-Institut für Astrophysik, Karl-Schwarzschild-Straße 1, 85740 Garching bei München, Germany

Accepted 2005 September 26. Received 2005 September 25; in original form 2005 May 11

ABSTRACT

We discuss the cosmological simulation code GADGET-2, a new massively parallel TreeSPH code, capable of following a collisionless fluid with the N -body method, and an ideal gas by means of smoothed particle hydrodynamics (SPH). Our implementation of SPH manifestly conserves energy and entropy in regions free of dissipation, while allowing for fully adaptive smoothing lengths. Gravitational forces are computed with a hierarchical multipole expansion, which can optionally be applied in the form of a TreePM algorithm, where only short-range forces are computed with the ‘tree’ method while long-range forces are determined with Fourier techniques. Time integration is based on a quasi-symplectic scheme where long-range and short-range forces can be integrated with different time-steps. Individual and adaptive short-range time-steps may also be employed. The domain decomposition used in the parallelization algorithm is based on a space-filling curve, resulting in high flexibility and tree force errors that do not depend on the way the domains are cut. The code is efficient in terms of memory consumption and required communication bandwidth. It has been used to compute the first cosmological N -body simulation with more than 10^{10} dark matter particles, reaching a homogeneous spatial dynamic range of 10^5 per dimension in a three-dimensional box. It has also been used to carry out very large cosmological SPH simulations that account for radiative cooling and star formation, reaching total particle numbers of more than 250 million. We present the algorithms used by the code and discuss their accuracy and performance using a number of test problems. GADGET-2 is publicly released to the research community.

Key words: methods: numerical – galaxies: interactions – dark matter.

1 INTRODUCTION

Cosmological simulations play an ever more important role in theoretical studies of the structure formation process in the Universe. Without numerical simulations, the Λ cold dark matter (CDM) model may arguably not have developed into the leading theoretical paradigm for structure formation which it is today. This is because direct simulation is often the only available tool to compute accurate theoretical predictions in the highly non-linear regime of gravitational dynamics and hydrodynamics. This is particularly true for the hierarchical structure formation process with its inherently complex geometry and three-dimensional (3D) dynamics.

The list of important theoretical cosmological results based on simulation work is therefore quite long, including fundamental results such as the density profiles of dark matter haloes (e.g. Navarro, Frenk & White 1996), the existence and dynamics of dark matter substructure (e.g. Tormen 1997), the non-linear clustering properties of dark matter (e.g. Jenkins et al. 1998), the halo abundance (e.g. Jenkins et al. 2001), the temperature and gas profiles of clusters of galaxies (e.g. Evrard 1990), or the detailed properties of Lyman α

absorption lines in the interstellar medium (ISM; e.g. Hernquist et al. 1996). Given that many astrophysical phenomena involve a complex interplay of physical processes on a wide range of scales, it seems clear that the importance of simulation methods will continue to grow. This development is further fuelled by the rapid progress in computer technology, which makes an ever larger dynamic range accessible to simulation models. However, powerful computer hardware is only one requirement for research with numerical simulations. The other, equally important one, lies in the availability of suitable numerical algorithms and simulation codes, capable of efficiently exploiting available computers to study physical problems of interest, ideally in a highly accurate and flexible way, so that new physics can be introduced easily.

This paper is about a novel version of the simulation code GADGET, which was written and publicly released in its original form four years ago (Springel, Yoshida & White 2001a), after which it found widespread use in the research of many simulation groups. The code discussed here has principal capabilities similar to the original GADGET code. It can evolve all the systems (plus a number of additional ones) that the first version could, but it does this more accurately, and substantially faster. It is also more flexible, more memory efficient, and more easily extendible, making it

[★]E-mail: volker@mpa-garching.mpg.de

considerably more versatile. These improvements can be exploited for more advanced simulations and demonstrate that progress in algorithmic methods can be as important, or sometimes even more important, than the performance increase offered by new generations of computers.

The principal structure of GADGET-2 is that of a TreeSPH code (Hernquist & Katz 1989), where gravitational interactions are computed with a hierarchical multipole expansion, and gas dynamics is followed with smoothed particle hydrodynamics (SPH). Gas and collisionless dark matter¹ are both represented by particles in this scheme. Note that while there are a large variety of techniques for computing the gravitational field, the basic N -body method for representing a collisionless fluid is the same in all cosmological codes, so that they ultimately only differ in the errors with which they approximate the gravitational field.

Particle-mesh (PM) methods (e.g. Klypin & Shandarin 1983; White, Frenk & Davis 1983) are the fastest schemes for computing the gravitational field, but for scales below one to two mesh cells, the force is heavily suppressed; as a result, this technique is not well suited for work with high spatial resolution. The spatial resolution can be greatly increased by adding short-range direct-summation forces (Hockney & Eastwood 1981; Efsthathiou et al. 1985), or by using additional Fourier meshes adaptively placed on regions of interest (Couchman 1991). The mesh can also be adaptively refined, with the potential found in real space using relaxation methods (Kravtsov, Klypin & Khokhlov 1997; Knebe, Green & Binney 2001).

The hierarchical tree algorithms (Appel 1985; Barnes & Hut 1986, hereafter BH; Dehnen 2000) follow a different approach, and have no intrinsic resolution limit. Particularly for mass distributions with low-density contrast, they can however be substantially slower than Fourier-based methods. The recent development of TreePM hybrid methods (Xu 1995) tries to combine the best of both worlds by restricting the tree algorithm to short-range scales, while computing the long-range gravitational force by means of a PM algorithm. GADGET-2 offers this method as well.

Compared to gravity, much larger conceptual differences exist between the different hydrodynamical methods employed in current cosmological codes. Traditional ‘Eulerian’ methods discretize space and represent fluid variables on a mesh, while ‘Lagrangian’ methods discretize mass, using, for example, a set of fluid particles to model the flow. Both methods have found widespread application in cosmology. Mesh-based codes include algorithms with a fixed mesh (e.g. Cen & Ostriker 1992, 1993; Yepes et al. 1995; Pen 1998), and more recently also with adaptive meshes (e.g. Bryan & Norman 1997; Norman & Bryan 1999; Kravtsov, Klypin & Hoffman 2002; Teyssier 2002; Quilis 2004). Lagrangian codes have almost all employed SPH thus far (e.g. Evrard 1988; Hernquist & Katz 1989; Navarro & White 1993; Couchman, Thomas & Pearce 1995; Katz, Weinberg & Hernquist 1996; Serna, Alimi & Chieze 1996; Steinmetz 1996; Davé, Dubinski & Hernquist 1997; Tissera, Lambas & Abadi 1997; Owen et al. 1998; Serna, Dominguez-Tenreiro & Saiz 2003; Wadsley, Stadel & Quinn 2004), although this is not the only possibility (Gnedin 1995; Whitehurst 1995).

Mesh codes offer superior resolving power for hydrodynamical shocks, with some methods being able to capture shocks without artificial viscosity, and with very low residual numerical viscosity. However, static meshes are only poorly suited for the high dynamic range encountered in cosmology. Even for meshes as large

as 1024^3 , which is a challenge at present (e.g. Cen et al. 2003; Kang et al. 2005), individual galaxies in a cosmological volume are poorly resolved, leaving no room for resolving internal structure such as bulge and disc components. A potential solution is provided by new generations of adaptive mesh refinement (AMR) codes, which are beginning to be more widely used in cosmology (e.g. Abel, Bryan & Norman 2002; Kravtsov, Klypin & Hoffman 2002; Refregier & Teyssier 2002; Motl et al. 2004). Some drawbacks of the mesh remain however even here. For example, the dynamics is in general not Galilean-invariant, there are advection errors, and there can be spurious generation of entropy due to mixing.

In contrast, Lagrangian methods such as SPH are particularly well suited to follow the gravitational growth of structure, and to automatically increase the resolution in the central regions of galactic haloes, which are the regions of primary interest in cosmology. The accurate treatment of self-gravity of the gas in a fashion consistent with that of the dark matter is a further strength of the particle-based SPH method. Another fundamental difference with mesh-based schemes is that thermodynamic quantities advected with the flow do not mix between different fluid elements at all, unless explicitly modelled. An important disadvantage of SPH is that the method has to rely on an artificial viscosity for supplying the necessary entropy injection in shocks. The shocks are broadened over the SPH smoothing scale and not resolved as true discontinuities.

In this paper, we give a concise description of the numerical model and the novel algorithmic methods implemented in GADGET-2, which may also serve as a reference for the publicly released version of this code. In addition, we measure the code performance and accuracy for different types of problems, and discuss the results obtained for a number of test problems, focusing in particular on gas-dynamical simulations.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we summarize the set of equations the code integrates forward in time. We then discuss in Section 3 the algorithms used to compute the ‘right-hand side’ of these equations efficiently, i.e. the gravitational and hydrodynamical forces. This is followed by a discussion of the time integration scheme in Section 4, and an explanation of the parallelization strategy in Section 5. We present results for a number of test problems in Section 6, followed by a discussion of code performance in Section 7. Finally, we summarize our findings in Section 8.

2 BASIC EQUATIONS

We here briefly summarize the basic set of equations that are studied in cosmological simulations of structure formation. These describe the dynamics of a collisionless component (dark matter or stars in galaxies) and of an ideal gas (ordinary baryons, mostly hydrogen and helium), both subject to and coupled by gravity in an expanding background space. For brevity, we focus on the discretized forms of the equations, noting the simplifications that apply for non-expanding space where appropriate.

2.1 Collisionless dynamics

The continuum limit of non-interacting dark matter is described by the collisionless Boltzmann equation coupled to the Poisson equation in an expanding background Universe, the latter taken normally as a Friedman–Lemaître model. Due to the high dimensionality of this problem, these equations are best solved with the N -body method, where phase-space density is sampled with a finite number N of tracer particles.

¹ The stars in galaxies can also be well approximated as a collisionless fluid.

The dynamics of these particles is then described by the Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_i \frac{p_i^2}{2m_i a(t)^2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \frac{m_i m_j \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)}{a(t)}, \quad (1)$$

where $H = H(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_N, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N, t)$. \mathbf{x}_i are comoving coordinate vectors, and the corresponding canonical momenta are given by $\mathbf{p}_i = a^2 m_i \dot{\mathbf{x}}_i$. The explicit time dependence of the Hamiltonian arises from the evolution $a(t)$ of the scalefactor, which is given by the Friedman–Lemaître model.

If we assume periodic boundary conditions for a cube of size L^3 , the interaction potential $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ is the solution of

$$\nabla^2 \varphi(\mathbf{x}) = 4\pi G \left[-\frac{1}{L^3} + \sum_{\mathbf{n}} \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{n}L) \right], \quad (2)$$

where the sum over $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, n_3)$ extends over all integer triplets. Note that the mean density is subtracted here, so the solution corresponds to the ‘peculiar potential’, where the dynamics of the system is governed by $\nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{x}) = 4\pi G[\rho(\mathbf{x}) - \bar{\rho}]$. For our discretized particle system, we define the peculiar potential as

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i m_i \varphi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i). \quad (3)$$

The single particle density distribution function $\delta(\mathbf{x})$ is the Dirac δ -function convolved with a normalized gravitational softening kernel of comoving scale ϵ . For it, we employ the spline kernel (Monaghan & Lattanzio 1985) used in SPH and set $\delta(\mathbf{x}) = W(|\mathbf{x}|, 2.8\epsilon)$, where $W(r)$ is given by

$$W(r, h) = \frac{8}{\pi h^3} \begin{cases} 1 - 6 \left(\frac{r}{h}\right)^2 + 6 \left(\frac{r}{h}\right)^3, & 0 \leq \frac{r}{h} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ 2 \left(1 - \frac{r}{h}\right)^3, & \frac{1}{2} < \frac{r}{h} \leq 1, \\ 0, & \frac{r}{h} > 1. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

For this choice, the Newtonian potential of a point mass at zero lag in non-periodic space is $-Gm/\epsilon$, the same as for a Plummer ‘sphere’ of size ϵ .

If desired, we can simplify to Newtonian space by setting $a(t) = 1$, so that the explicit time dependence of the Hamiltonian vanishes. For vacuum boundaries, the interaction potential simplifies to the usual Newtonian form, i.e. for point masses it is given by $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = -G/|\mathbf{x}|$ modified by the softening for small separations.

Note that independent of the type of periodic conditions, a complete force computation involves a double sum, resulting in an N^2 -scaling of the computational cost. This reflects the long-range nature of gravity, where each particle interacts with every other particle, making high-accuracy solutions for the gravitational forces very expensive for large N . Fortunately, the force accuracy needed for collisionless dynamics is comparatively modest. Force errors up to ~ 1 per cent tend to only slightly increase the numerical relaxation rate without compromising results (Hernquist, Hut & Makino 1993), provided the force errors are random. This allows the use of approximative force computations using methods such as those discussed in Section 3. We note however that the situation is different for collisional N -body systems, such as star clusters. Here direct summation can be necessary to deliver the required force accuracy, a task that triggered the development of powerful custom-made computers such as GRAPE (e.g. Makino 1990; Makino et al. 2003). These systems can then also be applied to collisionless dynamics

using a direct-summation approach (e.g. Steinmetz 1996; Makino et al. 1997), or by combining them with tree or TreePM methods (Fukushige, Makino & Kawai 2005).

2.2 Hydrodynamics

SPH uses a set of discrete tracer particles to describe the state of a fluid, with continuous fluid quantities being defined by a kernel interpolation technique (Gingold & Monaghan 1977; Lucy 1977; Monaghan 1992). The particles with coordinates \mathbf{r}_i , velocities \mathbf{v}_i and masses m_i are best thought of as fluid elements that sample the gas in a Lagrangian sense. The thermodynamic state of each fluid element may be defined either in terms of its thermal energy per unit mass, u_i , or in terms of the entropy per unit mass, s_i . We prefer to use the latter as the independent thermodynamic variable evolved in SPH, for reasons discussed in full detail in Springel & Hernquist (2002). Our formulation of SPH manifestly conserves both energy and entropy even when fully adaptive smoothing lengths are used. Traditional formulations of SPH, on the other hand, can violate entropy conservation in certain situations.

We begin by noting that it is more convenient to work with an entropic function defined by $A \equiv P/\rho^\gamma$, instead of directly using the entropy s per unit mass. Because $A = A(s)$ is only a function of s for an ideal gas, we often refer to A as ‘entropy’.

Of fundamental importance for any SPH formulation is the density estimate, which GADGET-2 does in the form

$$\rho_i = \sum_{j=1}^N m_j W(|\mathbf{r}_{ij}|, h_i), \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{r}_{ij} \equiv \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j$, and $W(r, h)$ is the SPH smoothing kernel defined in equation (4).² In our ‘entropy formulation’ of SPH, the adaptive smoothing lengths h_i of each particle are defined such that their kernel volumes contain a constant mass for the estimated density, i.e. the smoothing lengths and the estimated densities obey the (implicit) equations

$$\frac{4\pi}{3} h_i^3 \rho_i = N_{\text{sph}} \bar{m}, \quad (6)$$

where N_{sph} is the typical number of smoothing neighbours, and \bar{m} is an average particle mass. Note that in many other formulations of SPH, smoothing lengths are typically chosen such that the number of particles inside the smoothing radius h_i is nearly equal to a constant value N_{sph} .

Starting from a discretized version of the fluid Lagrangian, we can show (Springel & Hernquist 2002) that the equations of motion for the SPH particles are given by

$$\frac{d\mathbf{v}_i}{dt} = - \sum_{j=1}^N m_j \left[f_i \frac{P_j}{\rho_j^2} \nabla_i W_{ij}(h_i) + f_j \frac{P_i}{\rho_i^2} \nabla_j W_{ij}(h_j) \right], \quad (7)$$

where the coefficients f_i are defined by

$$f_i = \left(1 + \frac{h_i}{3\rho_i} \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial h_i} \right)^{-1}, \quad (8)$$

and the abbreviation $W_{ij}(h) = W(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|, h)$ has been used. The particle pressures are given by $P_i = A_i \rho_i^\gamma$. Provided there are no

² We note that most of the literature on SPH defines the smoothing length such that the kernel drops to zero at a distance $2h$, and not at h as we have chosen here for consistency with Springel et al. (2001a). This is only a difference in notation without bearing on the results.

shocks and no external sources of heat, the equations above already fully define reversible fluid dynamics in SPH. The entropy A_i of each particle remains constant in such a flow.

However, flows of ideal gases can easily develop discontinuities, where entropy is generated by microphysics. Such shocks need to be captured by an artificial viscosity in SPH. To this end, GADGET-2 uses a viscous force

$$\left. \frac{d\mathbf{v}_i}{dt} \right|_{\text{visc}} = - \sum_{j=1}^N m_j \Pi_{ij} \nabla_i \bar{W}_{ij}, \quad (9)$$

where $\Pi_{ij} \geq 0$ is non-zero only when particles approach each other in physical space. The viscosity generates entropy at a rate

$$\frac{dA_i}{dt} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\gamma - 1}{\rho_i^{\gamma-1}} \sum_{j=1}^N m_j \Pi_{ij} \mathbf{v}_{ij} \cdot \nabla_i \bar{W}_{ij}, \quad (10)$$

transforming kinetic energy of gas motion irreversibly into heat. The symbol \bar{W}_{ij} is here the arithmetic average of the two kernels $W_{ij}(h_i)$ and $W_{ij}(h_j)$.

The Monaghan–Balsara form of the artificial viscosity (Monaghan & Gingold 1983; Balsara 1995) is probably the most widely employed parametrization of the viscosity in SPH codes. It takes the form

$$\Pi_{ij} = \begin{cases} (-\alpha c_{ij} \mu_{ij} + \beta \mu_{ij}^2) / \rho_{ij} & \text{if } \mathbf{v}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij} < 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

with

$$\mu_{ij} = \frac{h_{ij} \mathbf{v}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij}}{|\mathbf{r}_{ij}|^2}. \quad (12)$$

Here, h_{ij} and ρ_{ij} denote arithmetic means of the corresponding quantities for the two particles i and j , with c_{ij} giving the mean sound speed. The strength of the viscosity is regulated by the parameters α and β , with typical values in the range $\alpha \simeq 0.5$ – 1.0 and the frequent choice of $\beta = 2\alpha$.

Based on an analogy with the Riemann problem and using the notion of a signal velocity v_{ij}^{sig} between two particles, Monaghan (1997) derived a slightly modified parametrization of the viscosity, namely the Ansatz $\Pi_{ij} = -(\alpha/2) w_{ij} v_{ij}^{\text{sig}} / \rho_{ij}$. In the simplest form, the signal velocity can be estimated as

$$v_{ij}^{\text{sig}} = c_i + c_j - 3w_{ij}, \quad (13)$$

where $w_{ij} = \mathbf{v}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij} / |\mathbf{r}_{ij}|$ is the relative velocity projected on to the separation vector, provided the particles approach each other, i.e. for $\mathbf{v}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij} < 0$; otherwise we set $w_{ij} = 0$. This gives a viscosity of the form

$$\Pi_{ij} = -\frac{\alpha}{2} \frac{(c_i + c_j - 3w_{ij})w_{ij}}{\rho_{ij}}, \quad (14)$$

which is identical to equation (11) if one sets $\beta = 3/2\alpha$ and replaces w_{ij} with μ_{ij} . The main difference between the two viscosities lies therefore in the additional factor of h_{ij}/r_{ij} that μ_{ij} carries with respect to w_{ij} . In equations (11) and (12), this factor weights the viscous force towards particle pairs with small separations. In fact, after multiplying with the kernel derivative, this weighting is strong enough to make the viscous force diverge as $\propto 1/r_{ij}$ for small pair separations, unless μ_{ij} in equation (12) is softened at small separations by adding some fraction of h_{ij}^2 in the denominator, as is often done in practice.

In the equation of motion, the viscosity acts like an excess pressure $P_{\text{visc}} \simeq (1/2)\rho_{ij}^2 \Pi_{ij}$ assigned to the particles. For the new form (14) of the viscosity, this is given by

$$P_{\text{visc}} \simeq \frac{\alpha}{2} \gamma \left[\frac{w_{ij}}{c_{ij}} + \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{w_{ij}}{c_{ij}} \right)^2 \right] P_{\text{therm}}, \quad (15)$$

assuming roughly equal sound speeds and densities of the two particles for the moment. This viscous pressure depends only on a Mach-number-like quantity w/c , and not explicitly on the particle separation or smoothing length. We found that the modified viscosity (14) gives equivalent or improved results in our tests compared to the standard formulation of equation (11). In simulations with dissipation, this has the advantage that the occurrence of very large viscous accelerations is reduced, so that a more efficient and stable time integration results. For these reasons, we usually adopt the viscosity (14) in GADGET-2.

The signal-velocity approach naturally leads to a Courant-like hydrodynamical time-step of the form

$$\Delta t_i^{(\text{hyd})} = \frac{C_{\text{courant}} h_i}{\max_j (c_i + c_j - 3w_{ij})} \quad (16)$$

which is adopted by GADGET-2. The maximum is here determined with respect to all neighbours j of particle i .

Following Balsara (1995) and Steinmetz (1996), GADGET-2 also uses an additional viscosity-limiter to alleviate spurious angular momentum transport in the presence of shear flows. This is done by multiplying the viscous tensor with $(f_i + f_j)/2$, where

$$f_i = \frac{|\nabla \times \mathbf{v}_i|}{|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_i| + |\nabla \times \mathbf{v}_i|} \quad (17)$$

is a simple measure for the relative amount of shear in the flow around particle i , based on standard SPH estimates for divergence and curl (Monaghan 1992).

The above equations for the hydrodynamics were all expressed using physical coordinates and velocities. In the actual simulation code, we use comoving coordinates \mathbf{x} , comoving momenta \mathbf{p} and comoving densities as internal computational variables, which are related to physical variables in the usual way. Because we continue to use the physical entropy, adiabatic cooling due to expansion of the Universe is automatically treated accurately.

2.3 Additional physics

A number of further physical processes have already been implemented in GADGET-2, and were applied to study structure formation problems. A full discussion of this physics (which is not included in the public release of the code) is beyond the scope of this paper. However, we here give a brief overview of what has been done so far and refer the reader to the cited papers for physical results and technical details.

Radiative cooling and heating by photoionization has been implemented in GADGET-2 in a similar way as in Katz et al. (1996), i.e. the ionization balance of helium and hydrogen is computed in the presence of an externally specified time-dependent ultraviolet background under the assumption of collisional ionization equilibrium. Yoshida et al. (2003) recently added a network for the non-equilibrium treatment of the primordial chemistry of nine species, allowing cooling by molecular hydrogen to be properly followed.

Star formation and associated feedback processes have been modelled with GADGET by a number of authors using different physical approximations. Springel (2000) considered a feedback model based on a simple turbulent pressure term, while Kay (2004) studied

thermal feedback with delayed cooling. A related model was also implemented by Cox et al. (2004). Springel & Hernquist (2003a,b) implemented a subresolution multiphase model for the treatment of a star-forming ISM. Their model also accounts for energetic feedback by galactic winds, and includes a basic treatment of metal enrichment. More detailed metal enrichment models that allow for separate treatments of Type II and Type I supernovae while also properly accounting for the lifetimes of different stellar populations have been independently implemented by Tornatore et al. (2004) and Scannapieco et al. (2005). A different, more explicit approach to describe a multiphase ISM has been followed by Marri & White (2003), who introduced a hydrodynamic decoupling of cold gas and the ambient hot phase. A number of studies also used more ad hoc models of feedback in the form of pre-heating prescriptions (Springel, White & Hernquist 2001b; Tornatore et al. 2003; van den Bosch, Abel & Hernquist 2003).

A treatment of thermal conduction in hot ionized gas has been implemented by Jubelgas, Springel & Dolag (2004) and was used to study modifications of the intracluster medium of rich clusters of galaxies (Dolag et al. 2004c) caused by conduction. An SPH approximation of ideal magnetohydrodynamics has been added to GADGET-2 and was used to study deflections of ultrahigh-energy cosmic rays in the local Universe (Dolag et al. 2004b, 2005).

Di Matteo, Springel & Hernquist (2005) and Springel, Di Matteo & Hernquist (2005a) introduced a model for the growth of supermassive black holes at the centres of galaxies, and studied how energy feedback from gas accretion on to a supermassive black hole regulates quasar activity and nuclear star formation. Cuadra et al. (2005) added the ability to model stellar winds and studied the feeding of Sgr A* by the stars orbiting in the vicinity of the centre of the Galaxy.

Finally, non-standard dark matter dynamics has also been investigated with GADGET. Linder & Jenkins (2003) and Dolag et al. (2004a) independently studied dark energy cosmologies. Also, both Yoshida et al. (2000) and Davé et al. (2001) studied halo formation with self-interacting dark matter, modelled by explicitly introducing collisional terms for the dark matter particles.

3 GRAVITATIONAL ALGORITHMS

Gravity is the driving force of structure formation. Its computation thus forms the core of any cosmological code. Unfortunately, its long-range nature and the high dynamic range posed by the structure formation problem make it particularly challenging to compute the gravitational forces accurately and efficiently. In the GADGET-2 code, both the collisionless dark matter and the gaseous fluid are represented as particles, allowing the self-gravity of both components to be computed with gravitational N -body methods, which we discuss next.

3.1 The tree algorithm

The primary method that GADGET-2 uses to achieve the required spatial adaptivity is a hierarchical multipole expansion, commonly called a tree algorithm. These methods group distant particles into ever larger cells, allowing their gravity to be accounted for by means of a single multipole force. Instead of requiring $N - 1$ partial forces per particle as needed in a direct-summation approach, the gravitational force on a single particle can then be computed with just $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$ interactions.

In practice, the hierarchical grouping that forms the basis of the multipole expansion is most commonly obtained by a recursive subdivision of space. In the approach of BH, a cubical root node is used

to encompass the full mass distribution, which is repeatedly subdivided into eight daughter nodes of half the side length each, until one ends up with ‘leaf’ nodes containing single particles. Forces are then obtained by ‘walking’ the tree, i.e. starting at the root node, a decision is made whether or not the multipole expansion of the node is considered to provide an accurate enough partial force (which will in general be the case for nodes that are small and distant enough). If the answer is ‘yes’, the multipole force is used and the walk along this branch of the tree can be terminated; if it is ‘no’, the node is ‘opened’, i.e. its daughter nodes are considered in turn.

It should be noted that the final result of the tree algorithm will in general only represent an approximation to the true force. However, the error can be controlled conveniently by modifying the opening criterion for tree nodes, because higher accuracy is obtained by walking the tree to lower levels. Provided sufficient computational resources are invested, the tree force can then be made arbitrarily close to the well-specified correct force.

3.1.1 Details of the tree code

There are three important characteristics of a gravitational tree code: the type of grouping employed, the order chosen for the multipole expansion and the opening criterion used. As a grouping algorithm, we prefer the geometrical BH oct-tree instead of alternatives such as those based on nearest-neighbour pairings (Jernigan & Porter 1989) or a binary kD-tree (Stadel 2001). The oct-tree is ‘shallower’ than the binary tree, i.e. fewer internal nodes are needed for a given number N of particles. In fact, for a nearly homogeneous mass distribution, only $\approx 0.3 N$ internal nodes are needed, while for a heavily clustered mass distribution in a cosmological simulation, this number tends to increase to about $\approx 0.65 N$, which is still considerably smaller than the number of $\approx N$ required in the binary tree. This has advantages in terms of memory consumption. Also, the oct-tree avoids problems due to large aspect ratios of nodes, which helps to keep the magnitude of higher-order multipoles small. The clean geometric properties of the oct-tree make it ideal for use as a range-searching tool, a further application of the tree we need for finding SPH neighbours. Finally, the geometry of the oct-tree has a close correspondence with a space-filling Peano–Hilbert curve, a fact we exploit for our parallelization algorithm.

With respect to the multipole order, we follow a different approach from that used in GADGET-1, where an expansion including octopole moments was employed. Studies by Hernquist (1987) and Barnes & Hut (1989) indicate that the use of quadrupole moments may increase the efficiency of the tree algorithm in some situations, and Wadsley et al. (2004) even advocate hexadecapole order as an optimum choice. Higher order typically allows larger cell-opening angles (i.e. for a desired accuracy, fewer interactions need to be evaluated). This advantage is partially compensated by the increased complexity per evaluation and the higher tree construction and tree storage overhead, such that the performance as a function of multipole order forms a broad maximum, where the precise location of the optimum may depend sensitively on fine details of the software implementation of the tree algorithm.

In GADGET-2, we deliberately went back to monopole moments, because they feature a number of distinct advantages which make them very attractive compared to schemes that carry the expansions to higher order. First of all, gravitational oct-trees with monopole moments can be constructed in an extremely memory efficient way. In the first stage of our tree construction, particles are inserted one by one into the tree, with each internal node holding storage for indices of eight daughter nodes or particles. Note that for leaves

themselves, no node needs to be stored. In a second step, we compute the multipole moments recursively by walking the tree once in full. It is interesting to note that these eight indices will no longer be needed in the actual tree walk – all that is needed for each internal node is the information about which node would be the next one to look at in case the node needs to be opened, or alternatively, which is the next node in line in case the multipole moment of the node can be used. We can hence reuse the memory used for the eight indices and store in it the two indices needed for the tree walk, plus the multipole moment, which in the case of monopole moments is the mass and the centre-of-mass coordinate vector. We additionally need the node side length, which adds up to seven variables, leaving one variable still free, which we use however in our parallelization strategy. In any case, this method of constructing the tree at no time requires more than $\sim 0.65 \times 8 \times 4 \simeq 21$ bytes per particle (assuming four bytes per variable), for a fully threaded tree. This compares favourably with memory consumptions quoted by other authors, even compared with the storage optimized tree construction schemes of Dubinski et al. (2004), where the tree is only constructed for part of the volume at a given time, or with the method of Wadsley et al. (2004), where particles are bunched into groups, reducing the number of internal tree nodes by collapsing ends of trees into nodes. Note also that the memory consumption of our tree is lower than required for just storing the phase-space variables of particles, leaving aside additional variables that are typically required to control time-stepping, or to label the particles with an identifying number. In the standard version of GADGET-2, we do not quite realize this optimum because we also store the geometric centre of each tree in order to simplify the SPH neighbour search. This can in principle be omitted for purely collisionless simulations.

Very compact tree nodes as obtained above are also highly advantageous given the architecture of modern processors, which typically feature several layers of fast ‘cache’ memory as workspace. Computations which involve data that are already in cache can be carried out with close to maximum performance, but access to the comparatively slow main memory imposes large numbers of wait cycles. Small tree nodes thus help to make better use of the available memory bandwidth, which is often a primary factor limiting the sustained performance of a processor. By ordering the nodes in the main memory in a special way (see Section 5.1), we can in addition help the processor and optimize its cache utilization.

Finally, a further important advantage of monopole moments is that they allow simple dynamical tree updates that are consistent with the time integration scheme discussed in detail in Section 4. GADGET-1 already allowed dynamic tree updates, but it neglected the time variation of the quadrupole moments. This introduced a time asymmetry, which had the potential to introduce secular integration errors in certain situations. Note that particularly in simulations with radiative cooling, the dynamic range of time-steps can easily become so large that the tree construction overhead would become dominant unless such dynamic tree update methods can be used.

With respect to the cell-opening criterion, we usually employ a relative opening criterion similar to that used in GADGET-1, but adjusted to our use of monopole moments. Specifically, we consider a node of mass M and extension l at distance r for usage if

$$\frac{GM}{r^2} \left(\frac{l}{r} \right)^2 \leq \alpha |a|, \quad (18)$$

where $|a|$ is the size of the total acceleration obtained in the last time-step, and α is a tolerance parameter. This criterion tries to limit the absolute force error introduced in each particle–node interaction by comparing a rough estimate of the truncation error with the size




Figure 1. Force errors of the tree code for an isolated galaxy, consisting of a dark halo and a stellar disc. In the top panel, each line shows the fraction of particles with force errors larger than a given value. The different line styles are for different cell-opening criteria: the relative criterion is shown as solid lines and the standard BH criterion as dot-dashed lines. Both are shown for different values of the corresponding tolerance parameters, taken from the set $\{0.0005, 0.001, 0.0025, 0.005, 0.01, 0.02\}$ for α in the case of the relative criterion, and from $\{0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8\}$ in the case of the opening angle θ used in the BH criterion. In the lower panel, we compare the computational cost as a function of force accuracy. Solid lines compare the force accuracy of the 99.9 per cent percentile as a function of computational cost for the relative criterion (triangles) and the BH criterion (boxes). At the same computational cost, the relative criterion always delivers somewhat more accurate forces. The dotted lines show the corresponding comparison for the 50 per cent percentile of the force error distribution.

of the total expected force. As a result, the typical relative force error is kept roughly constant and, if needed, the opening criterion adjusts to the dynamical state of the simulation to achieve this goal; at high redshift, where peculiar accelerations largely cancel out, the average opening angles are very small, while they can become larger once matter clusters. Also, the opening angle varies with the distance of the node. The net result is an opening criterion that typically delivers higher force accuracy at a given computational cost compared to a purely geometrical criterion such as that of BH. In Fig. 1, we demonstrate this explicitly with measurements of the force accuracy in a galaxy collision simulation. Note that for the first force

computation, an estimate of the size of the force from the previous time-step is not yet available. We then use the ordinary BH opening criterion to obtain such estimates, followed by a recomputation of the forces in order to have consistent accuracy for all steps.

Salmon & Warren (1994) pointed out that tree codes can produce rather large worst-case force errors when standard opening criteria with commonly employed opening angles are used. These errors originate in situations where the distance to the nearest particle in the node becomes very small. When coming very close to or within the node, the error can even become unbounded. Our relative opening criterion (18) may suffer such errors because we may in principle encounter a situation where a particle falls inside a node while still satisfying the cell-acceptance criterion. To protect against this possibility, we impose an additional opening criterion, i.e.

$$|r_k - c_k| \leq 0.6l. \quad (19)$$

Here, $c = (c_1, c_2, c_3)$ is the geometric centre of the node, r is the particle coordinate, and the inequality applies for each coordinate axis $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ separately. We hence require that the particle lies outside a box about 20 per cent larger than the tree node. Tests have shown that this robustly protects against the occurrence of pathologically large force errors while incurring an acceptably small increase in the average cost of the tree walk.

3.1.2 Neighbour search using the tree

We also use the BH oct-tree for the search of SPH neighbours, following the range-search method of Hernquist & Katz (1989). For a given spherical search region of radius h_i around a target location r_i , we walk the tree with an opening criterion that examines whether there is any geometric overlap between the current tree node and the search region. If yes, the daughter nodes of the node are considered in turn; otherwise, the walk along this branch of the tree is immediately discarded. The tree walk is hence restricted to the region local to the target location, allowing an efficient retrieval of the desired neighbours. This use of the tree as a hierarchical search grid makes the method extremely flexible and insensitive in performance to particle clustering.

A difficulty arises for the SPH force loop, where the neighbour search depends not only on h_i , but also on properties of the target particles. We here need to find all pairs with distances $|r_i - r_j| < \max(h_i, h_j)$, including those where the distance is smaller than h_j but not smaller than h_i . We solve this issue by storing in each tree node the maximum SPH smoothing length occurring among all particles represented by the node. Note that we update these values consistently when the SPH smoothing lengths are redetermined in the first part of the SPH computation (i.e. the density loop). Using this information, it is straightforward to modify the opening criterion such that all interacting pairs in the SPH force computation are always correctly found.

Finally, a few notes on how we solve the implicit equation (6) for determining the desired SPH smoothing lengths of each particle in the first place. For simplicity, and to allow a straightforward integration into our parallel communication strategy, we find the root of this equation with a binary bisection method. Convergence is significantly accelerated by choosing a Newton-Raphson value as the next guess instead of the mid-point of the current interval. Given that we compute $\partial\rho_i/h_i$ anyway for our SPH formulation, this comes at no additional cost. Likewise, for each new time-step, we start the iteration with a new guess for h_i based on the expected change from the velocity divergence of the flow. Because we usually only require that equation (6) is solved to a few per cent accuracy,

finding and adjusting the SPH smoothing lengths are subdominant tasks in the CPU time consumption of our SPH code.

3.1.3 Periodic boundaries in the tree code

The summation over the infinite grid of particle images required for simulations with periodic boundary conditions can also be treated in the tree algorithm. GADGET-2 uses the technique proposed by Hernquist, Bouchet & Suto (1991) for this purpose. The global BH tree is only constructed for the primary mass distribution, but it is walked such that each node is periodically mapped to the closest image as seen from the coordinate under consideration. This accounts for the dominant forces of the nearest images. For each of the partial forces, the Ewald summation method can be used to complement the force exerted by the nearest image with the contribution of all other images of the fiducial infinite grid of nodes. In practice, GADGET-2 uses a 3D lookup table (in one octant of the simulation box) for the Ewald correction, as proposed by Hernquist et al. (1991).

In the first version of our code, we carried out the Ewald correction for each of the nodes visited in the primary tree walk over nearest node images, leading to roughly a doubling of the computational cost. However, the sizes of Ewald force correction terms have a very different distance dependence than the ordinary Newtonian forces of tree nodes. For nodes in the vicinity of a target particle, i.e. for separations small against the boxsize, the correction forces are negligibly small, while for separations approaching half the boxsize they become large, eventually even cancelling the Newtonian force. In principle, therefore, the Ewald correction only needs to be evaluated for distant nodes with the same opening criterion as the ordinary Newtonian force, while for nearby ones, a coarser opening angle can be chosen. In GADGET-2 we take advantage of this and carry out the Ewald corrections in a separate tree walk, taking the above considerations into account. This leads to a significant reduction of the overhead incurred by the periodic boundaries.

3.2 The TreePM method

The new version of GADGET-2 used in this study optionally allows the pure tree algorithm to be replaced by a hybrid method consisting of a synthesis of the PM method and the tree algorithm. GADGET-2's mathematical implementation of this so-called TreePM method (Xu 1995; Bode, Ostriker & Xu 2000; Bagla 2002) is similar to that of Bagla & Ray (2003). The potential of equation (3) is explicitly split in Fourier space into a long-range part and a short-range part according to $\phi_k = \phi_k^{\text{long}} + \phi_k^{\text{short}}$, where

$$\phi_k^{\text{long}} = \phi_k \exp(-k^2 r_s^2), \quad (20)$$

with r_s describing the spatial scale of the force split. This long-range potential can be computed very efficiently with mesh-based Fourier methods. Note that if r_s is chosen slightly larger than the mesh scale, force anisotropies that exist in plain PM methods can be suppressed to essentially arbitrarily small levels.

The short-range part of the potential can be solved in real space by noting that for $r_s \ll L$ the short-range part of the real-space solution of equation (3) is given by

$$\phi^{\text{short}}(\mathbf{x}) = -G \sum_i \frac{m_i}{r_i} \text{erfc}\left(\frac{r_i}{2r_s}\right). \quad (21)$$

Here, $r_i = \min(|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{n}L|)$ is defined as the smallest distance of any of the images of particle i to the point \mathbf{x} . Because the complementary error function rapidly suppresses the force for distances large compared to r_s (the force drops to about 1 per cent of its

Newtonian value for $r \simeq 4.5 r_s$), only this nearest image has any chance to contribute to the short-range force.

The short-range force corresponding to equation (21) can now be computed by the tree algorithm, except that the force law is modified by a short-range cut-off factor. However, the tree only needs to be walked in a small spatial region around each target particle, and no corrections for periodic boundary conditions are required. Together, these can result in a very substantial performance improvement. In addition, one typically gains accuracy in the long-range force, which is now basically exact, and not an approximation as in the tree method. We stress that in our approach for the TreePM method there is one global, fully threaded tree that encompasses the whole simulation volume, and that the TreePM method is applied throughout the volume in the same fashion. The force resolution is hence equal everywhere, unlike in some earlier implementations of the TreePM method (e.g. Xu 1995; Bode & Ostriker 2003). Also note that the TreePM approach maintains all of the most important advantages of the tree algorithm, namely its insensitivity to clustering, its essentially unlimited dynamic range, and its precise control about the softening scale of the gravitational force.

3.2.1 Details of the TreePM algorithm

To compute the PM part of the force, we use a clouds-in-cells (CIC) assignment (Hockney & Eastwood 1981) to construct the mass density field on to the mesh. We carry out a discrete Fourier transform of the mesh, and multiply it with the Green function for the potential in periodic boundaries, $-4\pi G/k^2$, modified with the exponential truncation of the short-range force. We then deconvolve for the CIC kernel by dividing twice with $\text{sinc}^2(k_x L/2N_g) \text{sinc}^2(k_y L/2N_g) \text{sinc}^2(k_z L/2N_g)$. One deconvolution corrects for the smoothing effect of the CIC in the mass assignment, the other for the force interpolation. After performing an inverse Fourier transform, we then obtain the gravitational potential on the mesh.

We approximate the forces on the mesh by finite differencing the potential, using the four-point differencing rule

$$\left. \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right|_{ijk} = \frac{1}{\Delta x} \left[\frac{2}{3} (\phi_{i+1,j,k} - \phi_{i-1,j,k}) - \frac{1}{12} (\phi_{i+2,j,k} - \phi_{i-2,j,k}) \right] \quad (22)$$

which offers order $\mathcal{O}(\Delta x^4)$ accuracy, where $\Delta x = L/N_{\text{mesh}}$ is the mesh spacing. It would also be possible to carry out the differentiation in Fourier space, by pulling down a factor $-ik$ and obtaining the forces directly instead of the potential. However, this would require an inverse Fourier transform separately for each coordinate, i.e. three instead of one, with little (if any) gain in accuracy compared to the four-point formula.

Finally, we interpolate the forces to the particle positions using again a CIC, for consistency. Note that the fast Fourier transforms (FFTs) required here can be efficiently carried out using real-to-complex transforms and their inverse, which saves memory and execution time compared to fully complex transforms.

In Fig. 2, we illustrate the spatial decomposition of the force and show the force error of the PM scheme. This has been computed by randomly placing a particle of unit mass in a periodic box, and then measuring the forces obtained by the simulation code for a set of randomly placed test particles. We compare the force to the theoretically expected exact force, which can be computed by Ewald summation over all periodic images, and then by multiplying with




Figure 2. Force decomposition and force error of the TreePM scheme. The top panel illustrates the size of the short-range (dot-dashed) and long-range (solid) forces as a function of distance in a periodic box. The spatial scale r_s of the split is marked with a vertical dashed line. The bottom panel compares the TreePM force with the exact force expected in a periodic box. For separations of the order of the mesh scale (marked by a vertical dotted line), maximum force errors of 1–2 per cent due to the mesh anisotropy arise, but the rms force error is well below 1 per cent even in this range, and the mean force tracks the correct result accurately. If a larger force-split scale is chosen, the residual force anisotropies can be further reduced, if desired.

the pre-factor

$$f_i = 1 - \text{erfc}\left(\frac{r}{2r_s}\right) - \frac{r}{\sqrt{\pi}r_s} \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{4r_s^2}\right), \quad (23)$$

which takes out the short-range force, exactly the part that will be supplied by the short-range tree walk. The force errors of the PM force are mainly due to mesh anisotropy, which shows up on scales around the mesh size. However, thanks to the smoothing of the short-range force and the deconvolution of the CIC kernel, the mean force is very accurate, and the rms force error due to mesh anisotropy is well below 1 per cent. Note that these force errors compare favourably to those reported by P³M codes (e.g. Efstathiou et al. 1985). Also, note that in the above formalism, the force anisotropy can be reduced further to essentially arbitrarily small levels by simply increasing r_s , at the expense of slowing down the tree part of the algorithm. Finally we remark that while Fig. 2 characterizes the magnitude of PM force errors due to a single particle, it is not yet a realistic error distribution for a real mass distribution. Here the PM force errors on the mesh scale can partially average out, while there can be additional force errors from the tree algorithm on short scales.

3.2.2 TreePM for ‘zoom’ simulations

GADGET-2 is capable of applying the PM algorithm also for non-periodic boundary conditions. Here, a sufficiently large mesh needs to be used such that the mass distribution completely fits in one octant of the mesh. The potential can then be obtained by a real-space convolution with the usual $1/r$ kernel of the potential, and this convolution can be efficiently carried out using FFTs in Fourier space. For simplicity, GADGET obtains the necessary Green function by simply Fourier transforming $1/r$ once, and storing the result in memory.

However, it should be noted that the four-point differencing of the potential requires that there are at least two correct potential values on either side of the region that is actually occupied by particles. Because the CIC assignment/interpolation involves two cells, we therefore have the following requirement for the minimum dimension N_{mesh} of the employed mesh:

$$(N_{\text{mesh}} - 5)d \geq L. \quad (24)$$

Here, L is the spatial extension of the region occupied by particles and d is the size of a mesh cell. Recall that due to the necessary zero padding, the actual dimension of the FFT that will be carried out is $(2N_{\text{mesh}})^3$.

The code is also able to use a two-level hierarchy of FFT meshes. This was designed for ‘zoom simulations’, which focus on a small region embedded in a much larger cosmological volume. Some of these simulations can feature a rather large dynamic range, being as extreme as putting much more than 99 per cent of the particles in less than 10^{-10} of the volume (Gao et al. 2005). Here, the standard TreePM algorithm is of little help because a mesh covering the full volume would have a mesh size still so large that the high-resolution region would fall into one or a few cells, so that the tree algorithm would effectively degenerate to an ordinary tree method within the high-resolution volume.

One possibility to improve upon this situation is to use a second FFT mesh that covers the high-resolution region, such that the long-range force is effectively computed in two steps. Adaptive mesh placement in the AP³M code (Couchman et al. 1995) follows a similar scheme. GADGET-2 allows the use of such a secondary mesh level and places it automatically, based on a specification of which of the particles are ‘high-resolution particles’. However, there are a number of additional technical constraints in using this method. The intermediate-scale FFT works with vacuum boundaries, i.e. the code will use zero padding and a FFT of size $(2N_{\text{mesh}})^3$ to compute it. If L_{HR} is the maximum extension of the high-resolution zone (which may not overlap with the boundaries of the box in case the base simulation is periodic), then condition (24) for the minimum high-resolution cell size applies. However, in addition, this intermediate-scale FFT must properly account for the part of the short-range force that complements the long-range FFT of the whole box, i.e. it must be able to properly account for all mass in a sphere of size R_{cut} around each of the high-resolution particles. There must hence be at least a padding region of size R_{cut} still covered by the mesh octant used for the high-resolution zone. Because of the CIC assignment, this implies the constraint $L_{\text{HR}} + 2R_{\text{cut}} \leq d_{\text{HR}}(N_{\text{mesh}} - 1)$. This limits the dynamic range one can achieve with a single additional mesh level. In fact, the high-resolution cell size must satisfy

$$d_{\text{HR}} \geq \max\left(\frac{L_{\text{HR}} + 2R_{\text{cut}}}{N_{\text{mesh}} - 1}, \frac{L_{\text{HR}}}{N_{\text{mesh}} - 5}\right). \quad (25)$$

For our typical choice of $R_{\text{cut}} = 4.5 \times r_s = 1.25 \times 4.5 \times d_{\text{LR}}$, this means that the high-resolution mesh size cannot be made smaller




Figure 3. Force decomposition and force error of the TreePM scheme in the case when two meshes are used (‘zoom simulations’). The top panel illustrates the strength of the short-range (dot-dashed), intermediate-range (thick solid) and long-range (solid) forces as a function of distance in a periodic box. The spatial scales of the two splits are marked with vertical dashed lines. The bottom panel shows the error distribution of the PM force. The outer matching region exhibits a very similar error characteristic as the inner match of tree and PM force. In both cases, for separations of the order of the fine or coarse mesh scale (dotted lines), respectively, force errors of up to 1–2 per cent arise, but the rms force error remains well below 1 per cent, and the mean force tracks the correct result accurately.

than $d_{\text{HR}} \simeq 10 d_{\text{LR}}/(N_{\text{mesh}} - 1)$, i.e. at least slightly more than 10 low-resolution mesh cells must be covered by the high-resolution mesh. Nevertheless, provided there are a very large number of particles in a quite small high-resolution region, the resulting reduction of the tree walk time can outweigh the additional cost of performing a large, zero-padded FFT for the high-resolution region.

In Fig. 3, we show the PM force error resulting for such a two-level decomposition of the PM force. We here placed a particle of unit mass randomly inside a high-resolution region of side length $1/20$ of a periodic box. We then measured the PM force accuracy of GADGET-2 by randomly placing test particles. Particles that were falling inside the high-resolution region were treated as high-resolution particles such that their PM force consists of two FFT contributions, while particles outside the box receive only the long-range FFT force. In real simulations, the long-range forces are decomposed in an analogous way. With respect to the short-range force, the tree is walked with different values for the short-range cut-off, depending on whether a particle is characterized as belonging to the high-resolution zone or not. Note however that only one global tree is constructed containing all the mass. The top panel of

Fig. 3 shows the contributions of the different force components as a function of scale, while the bottom panel gives the distribution of the PM force errors. The largest errors occur at the matching regions of the forces. For realistic particle distributions, a large number of force components contribute, further reducing the typical error due to averaging.

4 TIME INTEGRATION

4.1 Symplectic nature of the leapfrog

Hamiltonian systems are not robust in the sense that they are not structurally stable against non-Hamiltonian perturbations. Numerical approximations for the temporal evolution of a Hamiltonian system obtained from an ordinary numerical integration method (e.g. Runge–Kutta) in general introduce non-Hamiltonian perturbations, which can completely change the long-term behaviour. Unlike dissipative systems, Hamiltonian systems do not have attractors.

The Hamiltonian structure of the system can be preserved during the time integration if each step of it is formulated as a canonical transformation. Because canonical transformations leave the symplectic two-form invariant (equivalent to preserving Poincaré integral invariants, or stated differently, to preserving phase space), such an integration scheme is called symplectic (e.g. Hairer, Lubich & Wanner 2002). Note that the time evolution of a system can be viewed as a continuous canonical transformation generated by the Hamiltonian. If an integration step is the exact solution of a (partial) Hamiltonian, it represents the result of a phase-space conserving canonical transformation and is hence symplectic.

We now note that the Hamiltonian of the usual N -body problem is separable in the form

$$H = H_{\text{kin}} + H_{\text{pot}}. \quad (26)$$

In this simple case, the time-evolution operators for each of the parts H_{kin} and H_{pot} can be computed exactly. This gives rise to the following ‘drift’ and ‘kick’ operators (Quinn et al. 1997)

$$D_i(\Delta t) : \begin{cases} \mathbf{p}_i \mapsto \mathbf{p}_i \\ \mathbf{x}_i \mapsto \mathbf{x}_i + \frac{\mathbf{p}_i}{m_i} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \frac{dt}{a^2} \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

$$K_i(\Delta t) : \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_i \mapsto \mathbf{x}_i \\ \mathbf{p}_i \mapsto \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{f}_i \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \frac{dt}{a} \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

where

$$\mathbf{f}_i = - \sum_j m_i m_j \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x}_{ij})}{\partial \mathbf{x}_i}$$

is the force on particle i .

Note that both D_i and K_i are symplectic operators because they are exact solutions for arbitrary Δt for the canonical transformations generated by the corresponding Hamiltonians. A time integration scheme can now be derived by the idea of operator splitting. For example, one can try to approximate the time evolution operator $U(\Delta t)$ for an interval Δt by

$$\tilde{U}(\Delta t) = D \left(\frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) K(\Delta t) D \left(\frac{\Delta t}{2} \right), \quad (29)$$

or

$$\tilde{U}(\Delta t) = K \left(\frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) D(\Delta t) K \left(\frac{\Delta t}{2} \right), \quad (30)$$

which correspond to the well-known drift–kick–drift (DKD) and kick–drift–kick (KDK) leapfrog integrators. Both of these integration schemes are symplectic, because they are a succession of symplectic phase-space transformations. In fact, \tilde{U} generates the exact time evolution of a modified Hamiltonian \tilde{H} . Using the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff identity for expanding U and \tilde{U} , we can investigate the relation between \tilde{H} and H . Writing $\tilde{H} = H + H_{\text{err}}$, we find (Saha & Tremaine 1992)

$$H_{\text{err}} = \frac{\Delta t^2}{12} \left\{ \{H_{\text{kin}}, H_{\text{pot}}\}, H_{\text{kin}} + \frac{1}{2} H_{\text{pot}} \right\} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^4) \quad (31)$$

for the KDK leapfrog, where ‘ $\{ \}$ ’ denote Poisson brackets. Provided $H_{\text{err}} \ll H$, the evolution under \tilde{H} will be typically close to that under H . In particular, most of the Poincaré integral invariants of \tilde{H} can be expected to be close to those of H , so that the long-term evolution of \tilde{H} will remain qualitatively similar to that of H . If H is time-invariant and conserves energy, then \tilde{H} will be conserved as well. For a periodic system, this will then usually mean that the energy in the numerical solution oscillates around the true energy, but there cannot be a long-term secular trend.

We illustrate these surprising properties of the leapfrog in Fig. 4. We show the numerical integration of a Kepler problem of high eccentricity $e = 0.9$, using second-order accurate leapfrog and Runge–Kutta schemes with fixed time-step. There is no long-term drift in the orbital energy for the leapfrog result (top panel); only a small residual precession of the elliptical orbit is observed. On the other hand, the Runge–Kutta integrator, which has formally the same error per step, catastrophically fails for an equally large time-step (middle panel). Already after 50 orbits the binding energy has increased by ~ 30 per cent. If we instead employ a fourth-order Runge–Kutta scheme using the same time-step (bottom panel), the integration is only marginally more stable, giving now a decline of the binding energy by ~ 40 per cent over 200 orbits. Note however that such a higher-order integration scheme requires several force computations per time-step, making it computationally much more expensive for a single step than the leapfrog, which requires only one force evaluation per step. The underlying mathematical reason for the remarkable stability of the leapfrog integrator observed here lies in its symplectic properties.

4.2 Individual and adaptive time-steps

In cosmological simulations, we are confronted with a large dynamic range in time-scales. In high-density regions, such as at the centres of galaxies, orders of magnitude smaller time-steps are required than in low-density regions of the intergalactic medium, where a large fraction of the mass resides. Evolving all particles with the smallest required time-step hence implies a substantial waste of computational resources. An integration scheme with individual time-steps tries to cope with this situation more efficiently. The principal idea is to compute forces only for a certain group of particles in a given kick operation, with the other particles being evolved on larger time-steps and being ‘kicked’ more rarely.

Unfortunately, due to the pairwise coupling of particles, a formally symplectic integration scheme with individual time-steps is not possible, simply because the potential part of the Hamiltonian is not separable. However, we can partition the potential between two particles into a long-range part and a short-range part, as we have done in the TreePM algorithm. This leads to a separation of the Hamiltonian into

$$H = H_{\text{kin}} + H_{\text{sr}} + H_{\text{lr}}. \quad (32)$$




Figure 4. A Kepler problem of high eccentricity evolved with different simple time integration schemes, using an equal time-step in all cases. Even though the leapfrog and the second-order Runge–Kutta produce comparable errors in a single step, the long-term stability of the integration is very different. Even a computationally much more expensive fourth-order Runge–Kutta scheme, with a smaller error per step, performs dramatically worse than the leapfrog in this problem.




Figure 5. Schematic illustration of the short- and long-range time-stepping used by GADGET-2. The code always drifts the whole particle system to the next time when a force computation is required. At that time, ‘kicks’ (i.e. changes of the particle momenta) are applied based on short-range or long-range forces, or on both.

We can now easily obtain symplectic integrators as a generalization of the ordinary leapfrog schemes by ‘subcycling’ the evolution under $H_{\text{kin}} + H_{\text{sr}}$ (Duncan, Levison & Lee 1998). For example, we can consider

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{U}(\Delta t) = & K_{\text{lr}} \left(\frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) \\ & \times \left[K_{\text{sr}} \left(\frac{\Delta t}{2m} \right) D \left(\frac{\Delta t}{m} \right) K_{\text{sr}} \left(\frac{\Delta t}{2m} \right) \right]^m K_{\text{lr}} \left(\frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where m is a positive integer. This is the scheme GADGET-2 uses for integrating simulations run with the TreePM algorithm. The long-range PM force has a comparatively large time-step, which is sufficient for the slow time variation of this force. Also, we always evaluate this force for all particles. The evolution under the short-range force, however, which varies on shorter time-scales, is carried out on a power of two subdivided time-scale. Here, we optionally also allow particles to have individual time-steps, even though this perturbs the symplectic nature of the integration (see below). Note that unlike the PM algorithm, tree forces can be easily computed for a small fraction of the particles, at a computational cost that is to first order strictly proportional to the number of particles considered. This is true as long as the subfraction is not so small that tree construction overhead becomes significant. PM forces, on the other hand, are either ‘all’ or ‘nothing’. The above decomposition is hence ideally adjusted to these properties.

Note that despite the somewhat complicated appearance of equation (33), the integration scheme is still a simple alternation of drift and kick operators. In practice, the simulation code simply needs to drift the whole particle system to the next synchronization point where a force computation is necessary. There, a fraction of the particles receive a force computation and their momenta are updated accordingly, as illustrated in Fig. 5. Then the system is drifted to the next synchronization point.

As we have discussed, the integration is no longer symplectic in a formal sense when individual short-range time-steps are chosen for different particles. However, in the limit of collisionless dynamics, we can argue that the particle number is so large that particles effectively move in a collective potential, where we assume that any force between two particles is always much smaller than the total force. In this desired limit, two-body collisions become unimportant, and the motion of particles is to good approximation collisionless. We can then approximate the particles as moving quasi-independently in their collective potential, which we may describe by a global potential $\Phi(\mathbf{x}, t)$. Obviously, in this approximation the Hamiltonian separates into a sum of single particle Hamiltonians, where we have now hidden their coupling in the collective potential $\Phi(\mathbf{x}, t)$. Provided we follow the evolution of each particle accurately in this fiducial collective potential $\Phi(\mathbf{x}, t)$, the evolution of the potential itself will also be faithful, justifying the integration




Figure 6. A Kepler problem of high eccentricity integrated with leapfrog schemes using a variable time-step from step to step, based on the $\Delta t \propto 1/\sqrt{|a|}$ criterion commonly employed in cosmological simulations. As a result of the variable time-steps, the integration is no longer manifestly time reversible, and long-term secular errors develop. Interestingly, the error in the KDK variant grows four times slower than in the DKD variant, despite being of equal computational cost.

of particles with individual time-steps in an N -body system that behaves collisionlessly. While not formally being symplectic, the evolution can then be expected to reach comparable accuracy to a phase-space conserving symplectic integration.

Treating the potential as constant for the duration of a kick, each particle can be integrated by a sequence of KDK leapfrogs, which may have a different time-step from step to step. Note that changing the time-step in the leapfrog from step to step does not destroy the simplicity of the integrator, because the implied transformation is constructed from steps which are symplectic individually. However, what we find in practice is that the superior long-term stability of periodic motion is typically lost. This is because each time the time-step is changed, the error Hamiltonian appearing in equation (31) is modified. This introduces an artificial temporal dependence into the numerical Hamiltonian which is not in phase with the orbit itself because the time-step criterion usually involves information from the previous time-step. The associated time asymmetry destroys the formal time reversibility of the integration, and the phase lag of the

time-step cycle in each orbit produces a secular evolution. We illustrate this behaviour in Fig. 6 for an integration of the Kepler problem considered earlier, but this time using a leapfrog with an adaptive time-step according to $\Delta t \propto 1/\sqrt{|a|}$, where a is the acceleration of the last time-step. Interestingly, while being equivalent for a fixed time-step, the DKD and KDK leapfrogs behave quite differently in this test. For the same computational effort, the energy error grows four times as fast in the DKD scheme compared with the KDK scheme. This is simply because the effective time asymmetry in the DKD scheme is effectively twice as large. To see this, consider what determines the size of a given time-step when integrating forward or backwards in time. In the DKD scheme, the relevant acceleration that enters the time-step criterion stems from a moment that lies half a time-step before or behind the given step. As a result, there is a temporal lapse of two time-steps between forward and backwards integration. For the KDK, the same consideration leads only to a temporal asymmetry of one time-step, half as large.

The KDK scheme is hence clearly superior once we allow for individual time-steps. It is also possible to try to recover time reversibility more precisely. Hut, Makino & McMillan (1995) discuss an implicit time-step criterion that depends on both the beginning and end of the time-step, and similarly Quinn et al. (1997) discuss a binary hierarchy of trial steps that serves a similar purpose. However, these schemes are computationally impractical for large collisionless systems. However, fortunately, here the danger to build up large errors by systematic accumulation over many periodic orbits is much smaller, because the gravitational potential is highly time-dependent and the particles tend to make comparatively few orbits over a Hubble time.

In GADGET-2, a time-step criterion for collisionless particles of the form

$$\Delta t_{\text{grav}} = \min \left[\Delta t_{\text{max}}, \left(\frac{2\eta\epsilon}{|a|} \right)^{1/2} \right] \quad (34)$$

is adopted, where η is an accuracy parameter, ϵ gives the gravitational softening and a is the acceleration of the particle. The maximum allowed time-step is given by Δt_{max} , and is usually set to a small fraction of the dynamical time of the system under study. In cosmological simulations, we choose the logarithm of the expansion factor as a time integration variable, then Δt_{max} corresponds to a fixed fraction of the instantaneous Hubble time. It is possible that there are more efficient time-step criteria than equation (34) for collisionless cosmological simulations but, as Power et al. (2003) have shown, criterion (34) produces quite robust results, while other simple criteria such as those suggested by Springel et al. (2001a) have failed to show any clear advantage. We therefore adopt criterion (34) for now, but note that the time-step criterion can be easily changed in the code if desired. For SPH particles, we extend the time-step criterion by the Courant condition (16), and pick the smaller of the two. When the TreePM scheme is used, the time-step criterion (34) only applies to the short-range dynamics governed by the gravitational tree forces. The size of the long-range PM step is instead controlled by Δt_{max} . If needed, the code reduces Δt_{max} in the course of a simulation such that the particles can travel at most a small fraction of the mesh size with the rms particle velocity during one step.

In the normal integration mode of GADGET-2, we discretize the time-steps in a power of two hierarchy, where all time-steps are a power of two subdivision of a global time-step. Particles may always move to a smaller time-step, but to a larger one only every second step, when this leads to synchronization with the higher time-step

hierarchy. The level of synchronization achieved by this is beneficial for minimizing the required number of particle drifts and tree constructions. Alternatively, the code also allows a more flexible way to populate time-steps, where time-steps are discretized as integer multiples of the minimum time-step occurring among the particle set. This has the advantage of producing a more homogeneous distribution of particles across the time-line, which can simplify work-load balancing.

4.3 Time integration scheme of SPH particles

For gas particles, similar considerations apply in principle, because in the absence of viscosity, SPH can also be formulated as a Hamiltonian system. However, because shocks occur in any non-trivial flow, hydrodynamics will in practice always be irreversible; hence, the long-term integration aspects of Hamiltonian systems do not apply as prominently here. Also, in systems in hydrodynamic equilibrium the gas particles do not move, and hence do not tend to accumulate errors over many orbits as in dynamical equilibrium. However, if SPH particles are cold and rotate in a centrifugally supported disc, long-term integration aspects can become important again. So it is desirable to treat the kinematics of SPH particles in close analogy to that of the collisionless particles.

The reversible part of hydrodynamics can be described by adding the thermal energy to the Hamiltonian, i.e.

$$H_{\text{therm}} = \frac{1}{\gamma - 1} \sum_i m_i A_i \rho_i^{\gamma-1}. \quad (35)$$

Note that the SPH smoothing lengths are implicitly given by equation (6), i.e. the thermal energy depends only on the entropy per unit mass, and the particle coordinates. Hence the same considerations apply as for the collisionless leapfrog, and as long as there is no entropy production included, time integration is fully time reversible. This is actually different to mesh codes, which in non-trivial flows always produce some entropy due to mixing, even when the fluid motion should in principle be fully adiabatic. These errors arise from the advection over the mesh, and are absent in the above formulation of SPH.

5 PARALLELIZATION STRATEGIES

There are a number of different design philosophies for constructing powerful supercomputers. So-called vector machines employ particularly potent CPUs, which can simultaneously carry out computational operations on whole arrays of floating point numbers. However, not all algorithms can easily exploit the full capabilities of such vector processors. It is easier to use scalar architectures, but here large computational throughput is only achieved by the simultaneous use of a large number of processors. The goal is to let these CPUs work together on the same problem, thereby reducing the time to solution and allowing larger problem sizes. Unfortunately, the required parallelization of the application program is not an easy task in general.

On symmetric multiprocessing (SMP) computers, several scalar CPUs share the same main memory, so that time-intensive loops of a computation can be distributed easily for parallel execution on several CPUs using a technique called threading. The code for creation and destruction of threads can be generated automatically by sophisticated modern compilers, guided by hints inserted into the code in the form of compiler directives (e.g. based on the OpenMP standard). The primary advantage of this method lies in its ease of use, requiring few (if any) algorithmic changes in existing serial

code. A disadvantage is that the compiler-assisted parallelization may not always produce an optimum result and, depending on the code, sizable serial parts may remain. A more serious limitation is that this technique prevents one from using processor numbers and memory larger than available on a particular SMP computer. Also, such shared-memory SMP computers tend to be substantially more expensive than a set of single computers with comparable performance, with the price tag quickly rising the more CPUs are contained within one SMP computer.

A more radical approach to parallelization is to treat different scalar CPUs as independent computers, each of them having their own separate physical memory, and each of them running a separate instance of the application code. This approach requires extension of the program with instructions that explicitly deal with the necessary communication between the CPUs to split up the computational work and to exchange partial results. Memory is distributed in this method. In order to allow a scaling of the problem size with the total available memory, each CPU should only store a fraction of the total data of the problem in its own memory. Successful implementation of this paradigm therefore requires substantial algorithmic changes compared to serial programs and, depending on the problem, a considerably higher complexity than in corresponding serial codes may result. However, such massively parallel programs have the potential to be scalable up to very large processor number, and to exploit the combined performance of the CPUs in a close to optimum fashion. Also, such codes can be run on computers of comparatively low cost, such as clusters of ordinary PCs.

GADGET-2 follows this paradigm of a massively parallel simulation code. It contains instructions for communication using the standardized Message Passing Interface (MPI). The code itself was deliberately written using the language C (following the ANSI standard) and the open-source libraries GSL and FFTW. This results in a very high degree of portability to the full family of UNIX systems, without any reliance on special features of proprietary compilers. The parallelization algorithms of the code are flexible enough to allow its use on an arbitrary number of processors, including just one. As a result GADGET-2 can be run on a large variety of machines, ranging from a laptop to clusters of the most powerful SMP computers presently available. In the following, we describe in more detail the parallelization algorithms employed by the code.

5.1 Domain decomposition and Peano–Hilbert order

Because large cosmological simulations are often memory-bound, it is essential to decompose the full problem into parts that are suitable for distribution to individual processors. A commonly taken approach in the gravitational N -body/SPH problem is to decompose the computational volume into a set of domains, each assigned to one processor. This has often been realized with a hierarchical orthogonal bisection, with cuts chosen to approximately balance the estimated work for each domain (e.g. Dubinski 1996). However, a disadvantage of some existing implementations of this method is that the geometry of the tree eventually constructed for each domain depends on the geometry of the domains themselves. Because the tree force is only an approximation, this implies that individual particles may experience a different force error when the number of CPUs is changed, simply because this in general modifies the way the underlying domains are cut. Of course, provided the typical size of force errors is sufficiently small, this should not pose a severe problem for the final results of collisionless simulations. However, it complicates code validation, because individual particle orbits will then depend on the number of processors employed. Also, there is

the possibility of subtle correlations of force errors with domain boundaries, which could especially in the very high redshift regime show up as systematic effects.

Here we propose a new scheme for domain decomposition that guarantees a force that is independent of the processor number. It also avoids other shortcomings of the orthogonal bisection, such as high aspect ratios of domains. Our method uses a space-filling fractal, the Peano–Hilbert curve, to map 3D space on to a one-dimensional (1D) curve. The latter is then simply chopped off into pieces that define the individual domains. The idea of using a space-filling curve for the domain decomposition of a tree code was first proposed by Warren & Salmon (1993, 1995). They however used Morton ordering for the underlying curve, which produces irregularly shaped domains.

In Fig. 7, we show examples of the Peano–Hilbert curve in two and three dimensions. The Peano curve in two dimensions can be constructed recursively from its basic ‘U’-shaped form that fills a 2×2 grid, together with the rules that determine the extension of this curve on to a 4×4 grid. As can be seen in Fig. 7, these rules mean that the bar of the ‘U’ has to be replaced with two smaller copies of the underlying ‘U’, while at the two ends, rotated and mirrored copies have to be placed. By repeated application of these rules we can construct an area-filling curve for arbitrarily large grids of size $2^n \times 2^n$. In three dimensions, a basic curve defined on a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ grid can be extended in an analogous way, albeit with somewhat more complicated mapping rules, to the 3D space-filling curve shown in Fig. 7.

An interesting property of these space-filling curves is their self-similarity. Suppose we describe the Peano–Hilbert curve that fills a $2^n \times 2^n \times 2^n$ grid with a one-to-one mapping $p_n(i, j, k)$, where the value $p_n \in [0, \dots, n^3 - 1]$ of the function is the position of the cell (i, j, k) along the curve. Then we have $p_{n/2}(i/2, j/2, k/2) = p_n(i, j, k)/8$, where all divisions are to be understood as integer divisions. We can hence easily ‘contract’ a given Peano–Hilbert curve and again obtain one of lower order. This is a property we exploit in the code.

A second important property is that points that are close along the 1D Peano–Hilbert curve are in general also close in 3D space,

i.e. the mapping preserves locality. If we simply cut a space-filling Peano curve into segments of a certain length, we obtain a domain decomposition which has the property that the spatial domains are simply connected and quite ‘compact’, i.e. they tend to have small surface-to-volume ratios and low aspect ratios, a highly desirable property for reducing communication costs with neighbouring domains.

Thirdly, we note that there is a close correspondence between the spatial decomposition obtained by a hierarchical BH oct-tree, and that obtained from segmenting a Peano–Hilbert curve. For example, consider a fiducial Peano–Hilbert curve that fills a box (the root node), encompassing the whole particle set. Cutting this curve into eight equally long pieces, and then recursively cutting each segment into eight pieces again, we regenerate the spatial oct-tree structure of the corresponding BH tree. If we hence assign an arbitrary segment of the Peano–Hilbert curve to a processor, the corresponding volume is compatible with the node structure of a fiducial global BH tree covering the full volume, i.e. we effectively assign a collection of branches of this tree to each processor. Because of this property, we obtain a tree whose geometry is not affected by the parallelization method, and the results for the tree force become strictly independent of the number of processors used.

We illustrate these concepts in Fig. 8, where we show a sketch of a global BH tree and its decomposition into domains by a Peano–Hilbert curve. For simplicity, we show the situation in two dimensions. Note that the sizes of the largest nodes assigned to each processor in this way need not all be of the same size. Instead, the method can quite flexibly adjust to highly clustered particle distributions, if required.

In order to carry out the domain decomposition in practice, we first compute a Peano–Hilbert ‘key’ for each particle. This is simply the integer returned by the function p , where the coordinates of particles are mapped on to integers in the range $[0, 2^n - 1]$. The construction of the Peano–Hilbert key can be carried out with a number of fast bit-shift operations, and short lookup tables that deal with the different orientations of the fundamental figure. We typically use $n = 20$, such that the key fits into a 64-bit-long integer, giving a dynamic range of the Peano–Hilbert curve of $\sim 10^6$ per dimension. This is




Figure 7. Space-filling Peano–Hilbert curve in two (bottom) and three (top) dimensions.




Figure 8. Illustration of the relation between the BH oct-tree and a domain decomposition based on a Peano–Hilbert curve. For clarity, the sketch is drawn in two dimensions. The fiducial Peano curve associated with the simulation volume visits each cell of a regular mesh exactly once. The simulation volume is cut into domains by segmenting this curve at arbitrary intermediate points on cell boundaries. This generates a rule for distributing the particle set on to individual processors. Because the geometric structure of the BH tree is commensurable with the mesh, each mesh cell corresponds to a certain branch of a fiducial global BH tree. These branches then reside entirely on single processors. In addition, each processor constructs a ‘top-level tree’ where all nodes at higher level are represented. The missing data on other processors is marked using ‘pseudo-particles’ in this tree.

enough for all present applications but could be easily extended if needed.

In principle, we would then like to sort these keys and divide the sorted list into segments of approximately constant work-load. However, because the particle data (including the keys) are distributed, a global sort is a non-trivial operation. We solve this problem using an adaptive hashing method. Each processor first considers only its locally sorted list of keys and uses it to recursively construct a set of segments (by chopping segments into eight pieces of equal length) until each holds at most sN/N_{cpu} particles, where we usually take $s \simeq 0.1$. This operation partitions the load on each processor into a set of reasonably fine pieces, but the total number of these segments remains small, independent of the clustering state of matter. Next, a global list of all these segments is established, and segments that overlap are joined and split as needed, so that a global list of segments results. This corresponds to a BH tree where the leaf nodes hold of the order of sN/N_{cpu} particles. We can now assign one or several consecutive segments to each processor, with the divisions chosen such that an approximate work-load balance is obtained, subject to the constraint of a maximum allowed memory imbalance. The net result of this procedure is that a range of keys is assigned to each processor, which defines the domain decomposition and is now used to move the particles to their target processors, as needed. Note that unlike a global sort, the above method requires little communication.

For the particles of each individual processor, we then construct a BH tree in the usual fashion, using the full extent of the particle set as the root grid size. In addition, we insert ‘pseudo-particles’ into the tree, which represent the mass on all other processors. Each of the segments in the global domain list, which was not assigned

to the local processor, is represented by a pseudo-particle. In the tree, these serve as placeholders for branches of the tree that reside completely on a different processor. We can obtain the multipole moments of such a branch from the corresponding remote processor, and give the pseudo-particle these properties. Having inserted the pseudo-particles into each local tree therefore results in a ‘top-level tree’ that complements the tree branches generated by local particles. The local tree is complete in the sense that all internal nodes of the top-level tree have correct multipole moments, and they are independent of the domain decomposition resulting for a given processor number. However, the local tree has some nodes that consist of pseudo-particles. These nodes cannot be opened because the corresponding particle data reside on a different processor, but when encountered in the tree walk, we know precisely on which processor this information resides.

The parallel tree force computation proceeds therefore as follows. For each of its (active) local particles, a processor walks its tree in the usual way, collecting force contributions from a set of nodes, which may include top-level tree nodes and pseudo-particles. If the node represented by a pseudo-particle needs to be opened, the walk along the corresponding branch of the tree cannot be continued. In this case, the particle is flagged for export to the processor the pseudo-particle came from, and its coordinates are written into a buffer list, after which the tree walk is continued. If needed, the particle can be put several times into the buffer list, but at most once for each target processor. After all local particles have been processed, the particles in the buffer are sorted by the rank of the processor they need to be sent to. This collects all the data that need to be sent to a certain processor in a contiguous block, which can then be communicated in one operation based on a collective hypercube communication model.

The result is a list of imported particles for which the local tree is walked yet again. Unlike in the normal tree walk for local particles, all branches of the tree that do not exclusively contain local mass can be immediately discarded, because the corresponding force contributions have already been accounted for by the processor that sent the particle. Once the partial forces for all imported particles have been computed, the results are communicated back to the sending processors, using a second hypercube communication. A processor that sent out particles receives in this way force contributions for nodes that it could not open locally. Adding these contributions to the local force computed in the first step, the full force for each local particle is then obtained. The forces are independent of the number of processors used and the domain cuts that were made. In practice, numerical round-off can still introduce differences however, because the sequence of arithmetic operations that leads to a given force changes when the number of CPUs is modified.

Unlike in GADGET-1, particles are not automatically exported to other processors, and if they are, then only to those processors that hold information that is directly needed in the tree walk. Particularly in the TreePM scheme and in SPH, this leads to a drastic reduction in the required communication during the parallel force computations, an effect that is particularly important when the number of CPUs is large. Because the domains are locally compact and the tree walk is restricted to a small short-range region in SPH and TreePM, most particles will lie completely inside the local domain, requiring no information from other processors at all, and if they have to be exported, then typically only to one or a few other processors. We also remark that the above communication scheme tends to hide communication latency, because the processors can work independently on (long) lists of particles before they meet for an exchange of particles or results.

Finally, we note that we apply the Peano–Hilbert curve for a second purpose as well. Within each local domain, we order the particles in memory according to a finely resolved Peano–Hilbert curve. This is done as a pure optimization measure, designed to increase the computational speed. Because particles that are adjacent in memory after Peano–Hilbert ordering will have close spatial coordinates, they also tend to have very similar interaction lists. If the microprocessor works on them consecutively, it will hence in many cases find the required data for tree nodes already in local cache memory, which reduces wait cycles for the slower main memory. Our test results show that the Peano–Hilbert ordered particle set can result in nearly twice the performance compared to random order, even though the actual tree code that is executed is the same in both cases. The exact speed-up obtained by this trick is architecture- and problem-dependent, however.

5.2 Parallel Fourier transforms

In the TreePM algorithm, we not only need to parallelize the tree algorithm, but also the PM computations. For the Fourier transforms themselves we employ the massively parallel version of the FFTW library developed at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). The decomposition of the data is here based on slabs along one coordinate axis. The Fourier transform can then be carried out locally for the coordinate axes parallel to the slabs. However, the third dimension requires a global transpose of the data cube, a very communication intensive step which tends to be quite restrictive for the scalability of massively parallel FFTs, unless the communication bandwidth of the computer is very high. Fortunately, in most applications of interest, the cost of the FFTs is so subdominant that

even a poor scaling remains unproblematic up to relatively large processor numbers.

A more important problem lies in the slab data layout required by the FFT, which is quite different from the, to first order, ‘cubical’ domain decomposition that is ideal for the tree algorithm. Dubinski et al. (2004) and White (2002) approached this problem by choosing a slab decomposition also for the tree algorithm. While being simple, this poses severe restrictions on the combinations of mesh size and processor number that can be run efficiently. In particular, in the limit of large processor number, the slabs become very thin, so that work-load balancing can become poor. In addition, due to the large surface-to-volume ratio of the thin slabs, the memory cost of ghost layers required for the CIC assignment and interpolation schemes can become quite sizable. In fact, in the extreme case of slabs that are one mesh cell wide, one would have to store three ghost layer zones, which would then have to come from more than one processor on the ‘left’ and ‘right’.

An obvious alternative is to use different decompositions for the tree algorithm and the PM part. This is the approach GADGET-2 uses. One possibility would be to swap the data between the Peano–Hilbert decomposition, and the slab decomposition whenever a PM force computation is necessary. However, this approach has a number of drawbacks. First of all, it would require the exchange of a substantial data volume, because almost all particles and their associated data would have to be moved in the general case. Secondly, because the slab decomposition essentially enforces an equal volume decomposition, this may give rise to large particle-load imbalance in highly clustered simulations, for example in ‘zoom’ simulations. An extreme case of this problem would be encountered when FFTs with vacuum boundaries are used. Here, at least half of the slabs, and hence processors, would be completely devoid of particles if the particle set was actually swapped to the slab decomposition.

We therefore implemented a second possibility, where the particle data remains in place, i.e. in the order established for the tree algorithm. For the FFT, each processor determines by itself with which slab its local particle data overlaps. For the corresponding patch, the local particle data is then CIC-binned, and this patch is transmitted to the processor that holds the slab in the parallel FFT. In this way, the required density field for each slab is constructed from the contributions of several processors. In this scheme only the scalar density values are transmitted, which is a substantially smaller data volume than in the alternative scheme, even when the PM grid is chosen somewhat larger than the effective particle grid. After the gravitational potential has been computed, we collect in the same way the potential for a mesh that covers the local particle set. We can here pull the corresponding parts from the slabs of individual processors, including the ghost layers required around the local patch for finite differencing of the potential. Because the local domains are compact, they have a much smaller surface-to-volume ratio than the slabs, so that the memory cost of the ghost layers remains quite small. After the local patch of the potential has been assembled, it can be finite differenced and interpolated to the particle coordinates without requiring any additional communication. This method hence combines the PM computation in a quite flexible way with the tree algorithm, without putting any restriction on the allowed processor number, and avoiding, in particular, the memory- and work-load balancing issues mentioned above.

5.3 Parallel I/O

Current cosmological simulations have reached a substantial size, with particle numbers well in excess of 10^7 used quite routinely.

Time slices of such simulations can reach up to a few GByte in size, at which point it becomes very time-consuming to write or read these data sequentially on a single processor. Also, it can be impractical to store the data in a single file. GADGET-2 therefore allows simulation data to be split across several files. Each file is written or read by one processor only, with data sent to or received by a group of processors. Several of these files can be processed in parallel. This number can be either equal to the total number of files requested, or restricted to a smaller value in order to prevent a ‘flooding’ of the I/O subsystem of the operating system, which can be counterproductive. Unlike in previous versions of the code, GADGET-2 does not pose restrictions on the number of files and the number of simultaneously processed files in relation to the number of processors used.

In the largest simulation carried out with GADGET-2 thus far, a simulation with 2160^3 particles (Springel et al. 2005b), the total size of a snapshot slice was more than 300 GB. Using parallel I/O on the high-performance IBM p690 system of the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft (MPG) computing centre in Garching, these time slices could be written in slightly less than 300 s, translating in an effective disc bandwidth of $\sim 1 \text{ GB s}^{-1}$. Without parallel I/O, this would have taken a factor of $\simeq 50\text{--}60$ longer.

5.4 Miscellaneous features

We note that unlike previous versions, GADGET-2 can be run on an arbitrary number of processors, including a single processor. There is hence no longer a need for separate serial and parallel versions. Lifting the restriction for the processor numbers to be powers of two can be quite useful, particularly for loosely coupled clusters of workstations, where windows of opportunity for simulations may arise that offer ‘odd’ processor numbers for production runs.

This flexibility is achieved despite the code’s use of a communication model that operates with synchronous communication exclusively. The principal model for communication in the force computations follows a hypercube strategy. If the processor number is a power of two, say 2^p , then a full all-to-all communication cycle can be realized by $2^p - 1$ cycles, where in each cycle 2^{p-1} disjoint processor pairs are formed that exchange messages. If the processor number is not a power of two, this scheme can still be used, but the processors need to be embedded in the hypercube scheme corresponding to the next higher power of two. As a result, some of the processors will be unpaired in a subfraction of the communication cycle, lowering the overall efficiency somewhat.

GADGET-2 can also be used to set up ‘glass’ initial conditions, as suggested by White (1996). Such a particle distribution arises when a Poisson sample in an expanding periodic box is evolved with the sign of gravity reversed until residual forces have dropped to negligible values. The glass distribution then provides an alternative to a regular grid for use as an unperturbed initial mass distribution in cosmological simulations of structure formation. To speed up convergence, the code uses an ‘inverse Zel’dovich’ approximation based on the measured forces to move the particles to their estimated Lagrangian positions.

We have also added the ability to simulate gas-dynamical simulations in two dimensions, both with and without periodic boundary conditions. A further new feature in GADGET-2 is the optional use of the Hierarchical Data Format (HDF5), developed by the National Center for Supercomputing Applications (NCSA). This allows storage of snapshot files produced by GADGET-2 in a platform-independent form, simplifying data exchange with a variety of analysis software.

6 TEST PROBLEMS

Unfortunately, it is not possible to formally demonstrate the correctness of complex simulation codes such as GADGET-2. However, the reliability of a code can be studied empirically by applying it to a wide range of problems, under a broad range of values of nuisance code parameters. By comparing with known analytical solutions and other independent numerical methods, an assessment of the numerical reliability of the method can be established, which is essential for trusting the results of simulations where no analytical solutions are known (which is of course the reason to perform simulations to begin with).

We begin with a simple shock-tube test for the SPH component of GADGET-2, which has known analytical solutions. We then consider the more elaborate problem of the collapse of a cold sphere of gas under self-gravity. This 3D problem couples self-gravity and gas dynamics over a dynamic range similar to that encountered in structure formation simulations. There are no analytical solutions, but highly accurate results from 1D shock-capturing codes exist for comparison. We then move on and consider the highly dissipative collapse of an isothermal cloud of gas, the ‘standard isothermal test case’ of Boss & Bodenheimer (1979), where we carry out a resolution study that examines the reliability of the onset of fragmentation.

As a test of the accuracy of the dark matter dynamics, we consider the dark matter halo mass function and the two-point correlation function obtained for two 256^3 simulations of cosmological structure formation. Our initial conditions are the same as those used recently by Heitmann et al. (2005) in a comparison of several cosmological codes. We also use their results obtained for these different codes to compare with GADGET-2.

We then consider the formation of the ‘Santa Barbara cluster’ (Frenk et al. 1999), a realistic hydrodynamical simulation of the formation of a rich cluster of galaxies. The correct solution for this complex problem, which is directly tied to our theoretical understanding of the intracluster medium, is not known. However, results for GADGET-2 can be compared to the 12 codes examined in Frenk et al. (1999), which can serve as a broad consistency check.

Finally, we briefly consider a further hydrodynamical test problem, which involves strong shocks and vorticity generation. This is the interaction of a blast wave with a cold cloud of gas embedded at pressure equilibrium in ambient gas. This forms an advanced test of the capabilities of the SPH solver and has physical relevance for models of the ISM, for example.

6.1 Shock tube

We begin by considering a standard Sod shock-tube test, which provides a useful validation of the code’s ability to follow basic hydrodynamical phenomena. We consider an ideal gas with $\gamma = 1.4$, initially at rest, where the half-space $x < 0$ is filled with gas at unit pressure and unit density ($\rho_1 = 1$, $P_1 = 1$), while $x > 0$ is filled with low-pressure gas ($P_2 = 0.1795$) of lower density ($\rho_2 = 0.25$). These initial conditions have been frequently used as a test for SPH codes (e.g. Hernquist & Katz 1989; Rasio & Shapiro 1991; Wadsley et al. 2004). We realize the initial conditions in three dimensions using an irregular glass-like distribution of particles of equal mass, embedded in a periodic box that is longer in the x -direction than in the y - and z -directions.

In Fig. 9, we show the result obtained with GADGET-2 at time $t = 5.0$. The agreement with the analytical solution is good, with discontinuities resolved in about three interparticle separations, or equivalently two to three SPH smoothing lengths. At the contact




Figure 9. Sod shock test carried out in three dimensions. The gas is initially at rest with $\rho_1 = 1.0$, $P_1 = 1.0$ for $x < 0$, and $\rho_2 = 0.25$, $P_2 = 0.1795$ for $x > 0$. The numerical result is shown with circles (with a spacing equal to the mean particle spacing in the low-density region) and compared with the analytical result at $t = 5.0$. A shock of Mach number $M = 1.48$ develops.

discontinuity, a characteristic pressure blip is observed, and some excess entropy has been produced there as a result of the sharp discontinuity in the initial conditions, which has not been smoothed out and therefore is not represented well by SPH at $t = 0$. Note that while the shock is broadened, the post-shock temperature and density are computed very accurately.

6.2 Collapse of an adiabatic gas sphere

A considerably more demanding test problem is the adiabatic collapse of an initially cold gas cloud under its own self-gravity. Originally proposed by Evrard (1988), this problem has been considered by many authors (e.g. Hernquist & Katz 1989; Davé et al. 1997; Wadsley et al. 2004) as a test of cosmological codes. The initial conditions in natural units ($G = 1$) take the form of a spherical $\gamma = 5/3$ cloud of unit mass and unit radius, with a $\rho \propto 1/r$ density profile, and with an initial thermal energy per unit mass of $u = 0.05$. When evolved forward in time, the cloud collapses gravi-

tationally until a central bounce develops with a strong shock moving outward.

In Fig. 10 we show spherically averaged profiles of density, radial velocity and entropy of the system at time $t = 0.8$, and compare it to a 1D high-precision calculation carried out with the piece-wise parabolic method (PPM) by Steinmetz & Mueller (1993). An analytical solution is not available for this problem. We show results for two different resolutions, 1.56×10^6 and 1.95×10^5 particles; lower-resolution runs are still able to reproduce the overall solution well, although the shock becomes increasingly more broadened. We see that for sufficiently high resolution, the 3D SPH calculation reproduces the 1D PPM result reasonably well. In the region just outside the shock, we see appreciable pre-shock entropy generation. As pointed out by Wadsley et al. (2004), this arises due to the artificial viscosity which is here already triggered at some level by the strong convergence of the flow in the pre-shock region. This reduces the entropy production in the actual shock somewhat, biasing the entropy of the post-shock flow low. Note that thanks to our entropy formulation, the entropy profile is well reproduced at the outer edge of the flow, unlike the test calculation by Wadsley et al. (2004) using a traditional SPH formulation.

6.3 Isothermal collapse

Another demanding test problem that couples the evolution under self-gravity and hydrodynamics is the ‘standard isothermal test case’ introduced by Boss & Bodenheimer (1979). We consider this fragmentation calculation in the variant proposed by Burkert & Bodenheimer (1993), where a smaller initial non-axisymmetric perturbation is employed; this form of the initial conditions has been used in numerous test calculations since then. The initial state consists of a spherical cloud with sound speed $c_s = 1.66 \times 10^4 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$ and an isothermal equation of state, $P = c_s^2 \rho$. The cloud radius is $R = 5 \times 10^{16} \text{ cm}$, its mass is $M = 1 M_\odot$, and it is in solid body rotation with an angular velocity of $\omega = 7.2 \times 10^{-13} \text{ rad s}^{-1}$. The underlying constant density distribution ($\rho_0 = 3.82 \times 10^{-18} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$) is modulated with an $m = 2$ density perturbation

$$\rho(\phi) = \rho_0[1 + 0.1 \cos(2\phi)], \quad (36)$$

where ϕ is the azimuthal angle around the rotation axis. We implement the initial conditions with a sphere of particles carved out of a regular grid, where the 10 per cent density perturbation is achieved with a mass perturbation in the otherwise equal-mass particles.

This simultaneous collapse and fragmentation problem requires high spatial resolution and accuracy, both in the treatment of self-gravity and in the hydrodynamics. A particular difficulty is that only a small fraction of the simulated mass eventually becomes sufficiently self-gravitating to form fragments. As Bate & Burkert (1997) discuss, numerical results are only trustworthy if the Jeans mass is resolved during the calculation. Also, if the gravitational softening is too large, collapse may be inhibited and the forming clumps may have too large mass. In fact, Sommer-Larsen, Vedel & Hellsten (1998) show that for a finite choice of softening length, an arbitrarily large mass of gas in pressure equilibrium can be deposited in a non-singular isothermal density distribution with a radius of the order of the softening length. On the other hand, a gravitational softening much smaller than the SPH smoothing length can lead to artificial clumping of particles. The best strategy for this type of fragmentation calculation therefore appears to be to make the gravitational softening equal to the SPH softening length, an approach we use in this test calculation. While a varying gravitational softening formally changes the potential energy of the system, this energy




Figure 10. Adiabatic collapse of a gas sphere (‘Evrard’ test). At time $t = 0.8$, we show radial profiles of density, velocity and entropy for two different resolutions, in the top row for 1.56×10^6 particles, and in the bottom row for 1.95×10^5 particles. The solid lines mark the result of a 1D PPM calculation (Steinmetz & Mueller 1993), which can be taken as a quasi-exact result in this case. The 3D SPH calculations reproduce the principal features of this solution generally quite well. However, as expected, the shock is broadened, and also shows some pre-shock entropy generation. The latter effect is particularly strong in this spherically symmetric problem because of the rapid convergence of the flow in the infall region in front of the shock, which triggers the artificial viscosity. However, the post-shock properties of the flow are only mildly affected by this and show quite good agreement with the 1D PPM results.

perturbation can be neglected in the highly dissipative isothermal case we consider here. Note that once fragmentation occurs, the density rises rapidly on a free-fall time-scale, and the smallest resolved spatial scale as well as the time-step drop rapidly. This quickly causes the simulation to stall, unless the dense gas is eliminated somehow, for example by modelling star formation with sink particles (Bonnell et al. 1997).

In Fig. 11, we compare the density fields at $t = 1.24$ free-fall times in the $z = 0$ plane, orthogonal to the rotation axis, for four different numerical resolutions, ranging from 3.3×10^4 to 1.71×10^7 . At this time, an elongated bar-like structure has formed with two high-density regions at its ends. Due to a converging gas flow on to these ends, they become eventually self-gravitating and collapse to form two fragments. The onset of this collapse can be studied in Fig. 12, where we plot the maximum density reached in the simulation volume as a function of time. It can be seen that the three high-resolution computations converge reasonably well, with a small residual trend towards slightly earlier collapse times with higher resolution, something that is probably to be expected. The low-resolution run behaves qualitatively very similarly, but shows some small oscillations in the maximum density in the early phases of the collapse. Overall, our results compare favourably with those of Bate & Burkert (1997), but we are here able to reach higher resolution and are also able to reproduce more cleanly a first density maximum at $t \simeq 1.1$, which is also seen in the mesh calculations considered by Bate & Burkert (1997).

6.4 Dark matter halo mass function and clustering

Cosmological simulations of structure formation are the primary target of GADGET-2. Because the dominant mass component is dark matter, the accuracy and performance of the collisionless N -body algorithms in periodic cosmological boxes is of tantamount importance for this science application. To compare results of GADGET-2 to other codes, we make use of a recent extensive study by Heitmann et al. (2005), who systematically compared the dark matter results obtained with a number of different simulation codes and techniques. Among the codes tested was also the old public version of GADGET-1 (Springel et al. 2001b). As a useful service to the community, Heitmann et al. (2005) have made their initial conditions as well as the evolved results of their computations publicly available. We here reanalyse the dark matter mass function and the two-point autocorrelation function of their data using an independent measurement code and we compare the results with those we obtained with GADGET-2.

The simulations considered are two runs with 256^3 particles in periodic boxes of side length 64 and $256 h^{-1}$ Mpc, respectively, in an $\Omega_m = 0.314$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.686$ universe with $h = 0.71$. Further details about the initial conditions are given in Heitmann et al. (2005). We use a comoving gravitational softening length equal to $1/35$ of the mean particle spacing.

Non-linear gravitational clustering leads to the formation of gravitationally bound structures that over time build up ever more




Figure 11. Resolution study for the ‘standard isothermal collapse’ simulation. We show the gas density in a slice through the centre of the simulated volume at 1.24 free-fall times, roughly when the two perturbations at the ends of the bar-like structure become self-gravitating and undergo gravitational collapse. From the top left to the bottom row, the particle number increases from 3.3×10^4 to 1.71×10^7 by factors of 8.

massive haloes. The abundance of haloes as a function of mass and time is arguably the most important basic result of structure formation calculations. In Fig. 13, we show the differential halo mass function, computed with the standard friends-of-friends (FOF) algorithm using a linking length equal to 0.2 the mean particle spacing. The top panel compares our new GADGET-2 result for the large box at $z = 0$ with the result obtained by Heitmann et al. (2005) with GADGET-1. We obtain very good agreement over the full mass range. The bottom panel of Fig. 13 extends the comparison to the five additional codes examined by Heitmann et al. (2005): the AMR code FLASH (Fryxell et al. 2000), the parallel tree code HOT (Warren & Salmon 1995), the adaptive P³M code HYDRA (Couchman et al. 1995), the parallel PM code MC² (Habib et al., in preparation) and the tree-PM solver TPM (Bode & Ostriker 2003). We plot the relative halo abundance in each bin, normalized to the GADGET-2 result. While there is good agreement for the abundance of massive haloes

within counting statistics, systematic differences between the codes become apparent on the low-mass side. Particularly, the codes based purely on mesh-based gravity solvers, MC² and FLASH, have problems here and show a substantial deficit of small structures. It is expected that some small haloes are lost due to insufficient resolution in fixed-mesh codes, an effect that can be alleviated by using a sufficiently fine mesh, as MC² demonstrates. It is worrying however that current AMR codes have particularly severe problems in this area as well. A similar conclusion was also reached independently by O’Shea et al. (2005a) in a comparison of the AMR code ENZO (O’Shea et al. 2005b) with GADGET. As gravity is the driving force of structure formation, the novel AMR methods clearly need to keep an eye on this issue and to improve their gravity solvers when needed, otherwise part of the advantage gained by their more accurate treatment of hydrodynamics in cosmological simulations may be lost.




Figure 12. Resolution study for the ‘standard isothermal collapse’ simulation. We here compare the temporal evolution of the maximum density reached in simulations of different particle number, as indicated in the legend. Symbols give the SPH result (8×10^4 particles) of Bate & Burkert (1997), which agrees quite well with our result at comparable resolution. The small residual differences are plausibly due to differences in the employed SPH density estimator or the neighbour number.

In Fig. 14, we show a similar comparison for the two-point correlation function of the dark matter in the small $64 h^{-1}$ Mpc box, again normalized to the GADGET-2 results. As discussed in more detail by Heitmann et al. (2005), on large scales all codes agree reassuringly well, perhaps even better than might have been expected. On small scales, the mesh-based codes tend to show a deficit of clustering, consistent with the results for the mass function. Interestingly, the result obtained by Heitmann et al. (2005) for GADGET-1 shows a noticeable excess of clustering on very small scales compared to our computation with GADGET-2. This happens on rather small scales, comparable to the gravitational softening scale. This could simply be the result of a different choice of gravitational softening length, but we also believe that the GADGET-2 result is the more accurate here. As shown by Power et al. (2003), the time integrator of GADGET-1 has the property that insufficient time integration settings can lead to an increase of the central density in haloes due to secular integration errors, while for very poor time-stepping the halo density is eventually suppressed. The numerical steepening of the central density profile caused by this effect could then show up as a signature of enhanced clustering at very small scales, just as is seen here in the GADGET-1 result.

6.5 Santa Barbara cluster

In the ‘Santa Barbara cluster comparison project’ (Frenk et al. 1999), a large number of hydrodynamic cosmological simulation codes were applied to the same initial conditions, which were set up to give rise to the formation of a rich cluster of galaxies in a critical density CDM universe, simulated using adiabatic gas physics. In total, 12 codes were compared in this study, including SPH and Eulerian codes, both with fixed and adaptive meshes. Each simulation group was allowed to downsample the initial conditions in a way they considered reasonable, given also their computational resources and




Figure 13. Comparison of the differential halo mass function obtained with different simulation codes for a 256^3 Λ CDM simulation in a $256 h^{-1}$ Mpc box. The top panel compares the results from GADGET-2 (filled circles with Poisson error bars) with those obtained with the old version GADGET-1 (open circles). The bottom panel shows the relative differences with respect to GADGET-2 for a larger pool of six codes. The evolved density fields for the latter have been taken from Heitmann et al. (2005). The dashed lines indicate the size of the expected 1σ scatter due to counting statistics.

code abilities, so that the final comparison involved computations of different effective resolutions.

The overall results of this comparison were encouraging in the sense that bulk properties of the cluster agreed to within ~ 10 per cent and the gas properties were similar in most codes, although with large scatter in the inner parts of the cluster. However, there have also been some systematic differences in the results, most notably between mesh-based and SPH codes. The former showed higher temperatures and entropies in the cluster centre than the SPH codes. Also, the enclosed gas fraction within the virial radius was systematically higher for mesh codes and closer to the universal baryonic fraction, while the SPH codes only found about 90 per cent of the universal fraction in the virial radius. Since then, the Santa Barbara cluster has been repeatedly used as a test problem for cosmological codes, but the question of which is the ‘correct’ entropy profile and gas fraction in an adiabatic cluster has not been settled conclusively so far.




Figure 14. Comparison of different codes with respect to the two-point correlation of the evolved density of a 256^3 Λ CDM simulation in a $64 h^{-1}$ Mpc box. We show the relative differences with respect to GADGET-2 for the group of six codes considered by Heitmann et al. (2005). The vertical dotted line marks the gravitational softening length of $\epsilon = 10$ kpc we used for our GADGET-2 calculation. We explicitly checked that the latter is fully converged with respect to the time integration and force accuracy settings.

We have simulated the Santa Barbara cluster at three different numerical resolutions (2×256^3 , 2×128^3 and 2×64^3) with GADGET-2, in each case using a homogeneous sampling for the periodic box. Frenk et al. (1999) supplied displacement fields at a nominal resolution of 256^3 , which we directly used for our high-resolution 2×256^3 run. The initial conditions for the lower-resolution runs were constructed by applying a filter in Fourier space to eliminate modes above the corresponding Nyquist frequencies, in order to avoid aliasing of power.

In Fig. 15, we compare our results in terms of spherically averaged profiles for dark matter density, dark matter velocity dispersion, gas density, enclosed gas fraction, temperature and specific entropy. We use the original binning prescriptions of Frenk et al. (1999), and the same axis ranges for easier comparison. Our simulations converge quite well in all their properties, apart from the innermost bins (we have plotted bins if they contained at least 10 dark matter or gas particles). However, we note that we confirm the finding of Wadsley et al. (2004) that there is a merger happening right at $z = 0$; in fact, in our high-resolution 2×256^3 run, the infalling clump is just passing the centre at $z = 0$, while this occurs with a slight time offset in the other two runs. We have therefore actually plotted the results at expansion factor $a = 1.02$ in Fig. 15, where the cluster has relaxed again. The results at $z = 0$ look very similar: only the temperature, gas entropy and dark matter velocity dispersion at $r < 0.1$ show larger differences between the simulations. As Wadsley et al. (2004) point out, the effects of this unfortunate timing of the merger presumably also contribute to the scatter found in the results of Frenk et al. (1999).

Our results agree very well with the mean profiles reported in the Santa Barbara cluster comparison project. Our resolution study also suggests that GADGET-2 produces quite stable convergence for a clean set of initial conditions of different resolutions. The mass resolution has been varied by a factor of 64 and the spatial resolution per dimension by a factor of 4 in this series; this is already a significant dynamic range for 3D simulations, thereby helping to build up trust in the robustness of the results of the code.

The entropy profile of our results at small radii ($R \sim 0.1$) appears to lie somewhat above the SPH results reported in Frenk et al. (1999) for other SPH codes. This is in line with the findings of Ascasibar et al. (2003), and perhaps a consequence of the entropy-conserving formulation of SPH that we have adopted in GADGET-2. Also, the entropy profile appears to become slightly shallower at small radii, which suggests a small difference from the near power-law behaviour seen in other SPH codes (see, for example, the high-resolution result of Wadsley et al. 2004). However, this effect appears to be too small to produce the large isentropic cores seen in the mesh simulations of Frenk et al. (1999). Such a core has also been found in the new AMR code by Quilis (2004). The systematic difference between the different simulation methods therefore continues to persist. We suggest that it may be caused by entropy production due to mixing; this channel is absent in the SPH code by construction while it operates more efficiently in the mesh codes. It is presently unclear whether the SPH codes do not allow for enough mixing, or whether the mesh codes experience too much of it. Both seem possible.

Another interesting point to observe is that our SPH simulations clearly predict that the enclosed baryon fraction is well below the universal baryon fraction at the virial radius of the adiabatic cluster. It seems a solid result that our results converge at values of around 90 per cent, in clear contrast with results near ~ 100 per cent predicted by the majority of mesh codes in the study by Frenk et al. (1999). However, we note that the new AMR code ART of Kravtsov, Nagai & Vikhlinin (2005) also gives values below the universal baryon fraction, although not quite as low as the SPH codes. We can also observe a clear break in the profile at ~ 0.6 Mpc, which could not be discerned as easily in the results of Frenk et al. (1999). At this radius, the gas profile begins to notably flatten compared with the dark matter profile.

6.6 Interaction of a strong shock with a dense gas cloud

As a final hydrodynamical test problem we consider the interaction of a strong shock wave with an overdense cloud embedded at pressure equilibrium in a background gas. This can be viewed as a simple model for the interaction of a supernova blast wave with a dense cloud in the ISM. When the shock strikes the cloud, a complicated structure of multiple shocks is formed, and vortices are generated in the flow around the cloud which lead to its (partial) destruction. Aside from its physical relevance for simple models of the ISM, this makes it an interesting hydrodynamical test problem. The situation has first been studied numerically in a classic paper by Klein, McKee & Colella (1994). Recently, Poludnenko, Frank & Blackman (2002) have readdressed this problem with a high-resolution AMR code; they also extended their study to cases of multiple clouds and different density ratios and shock strengths.

As initial conditions, we adopt a planar shock wave of Mach number $M = 10$ which enters gas of unit density and unit pressure from the negative x -direction. In the frame of the ambient background gas, the shock approaches with velocity $v = 9.586$, leading to a post-shock density of $\rho' = 3.884$. We adopt a two-dimensional computational domain with periodic boundaries in the y -direction, and formally infinite extension in the x -direction. The boxsize in the y -direction is 25 length units, and the radius of the spherical cloud of overdensity 5 is $r = 3.5$. The set-up of SPH particles was realized with a glass-like particle distribution using equal-mass particles. We have first evolved the incident shock wave independently in order to eliminate transients that typically arise if it is set up as




Figure 15. Radial profiles of the Santa Barbara cluster. From top left to bottom right, we show spherically averaged profiles of dark matter density, gas density, temperature, dark matter velocity dispersion, enclosed gas fraction and specific entropy. In each case, we compare results for three different resolutions. The vertical line marks the virial radius of the cluster. The average of all codes used in the Santa Barbara cluster comparison project is indicated with open circles. The dashed line in the dark matter profile is a NFW profile with the parameters given by Frenk et al. (1999). The same profile is also shown in the gas density plot to guide the eye (scaled by the baryon to dark matter density ratio).




Figure 16. Time evolution of the interaction of a strong shock wave with a dense cloud of gas. The cloud of radius $r = 3.5$ has an initial relative overdensity of 5, and is embedded at pressure equilibrium in ambient gas of unit density and unit pressure. From the left, a shock wave with Mach number $M = 10.0$ approaches and strikes the cloud. The gas has $\gamma = 5/3$, giving the shock an incident velocity of $v = 9.586$ and a compression factor of 3.884 with respect to the background gas. Each panel shows the gas density in a region of size 62.5×25.0 , with the time indicated in the top-right corner. The computation assumed periodic boundaries at the top and bottom.

a sharp discontinuity, i.e. our incident shock is consistent with the SPH smoothing scheme.

In Fig. 16, we show density maps of the system at different times of its evolution. When the shock strikes the cloud, a complicated

structure of forward and reverse shocks develops. A detailed description of the various hydrodynamical features of the flow is given by Poludnenko et al. (2002). Two pairs of primary vortices develop in the flow around the cloud and start shredding the cloud. This can




Figure 17. Local gradients in the gas density field at time $t = 4.5$, visualized by a grey-scale image with intensity proportional to $\log(|\nabla \rho|/\rho)$. Clearly visible are the two pairs of primary and secondary vortices, as well as the stem of the backflow. The region shown has a size of 31.25×12.5 .

be seen particularly well in the ‘Schlieren’ image of Fig. 17, where we show a grey-scale map of the local density gradient. Overall, our SPH results look similar to the AMR results of Poludnenko et al. (2002), but there are also clearly some differences in detail. For example, the small ‘droplets’ of gas chopped off from the cloud still survive in the SPH calculation for a comparatively long time and are not mixed efficiently with the background material, a clear difference with the mesh-based calculations. Presumably, small-scale fluid instabilities should disperse these droplets eventually, so the coherence they show in the SPH calculation may be a sign of insufficient mixing.

7 PERFORMANCE AND SCALABILITY

The performance of a parallel simulation code is a complex function of many factors, including the type of physical problem studied, the particle and processor numbers employed, the choices made for various numerical parameters of the code (e.g. time integration settings, maximum allowed memory consumption, etc.), and finally of hardware and compiler characteristics. This makes it hard to objectively compare the performance of different codes, which should ideally be done at comparable integration accuracy for the same physical system. Given these difficulties, we restrict ourselves to a basic characterization of the performance and scaling properties of GADGET-2 without attempting to compare them in detail with other simulation codes.

7.1 Timing measurements for cosmological simulations

In Table 1, we list the total wall-clock time elapsed when running the two 256^3 dark matter simulations discussed in Section 6.4, based on the initial conditions of Heitmann et al. (2005). The measured times are for all tasks of the code, including force computations, tree construction, domain decomposition, particle drifts, etc. A detailed breakdown of the relative contributions is given in the table as well. The hardware used was an 8-CPU partition on a small cluster of Pentium-IV PCs (2.4-GHz clock speed, two CPUs per machine), using the public MPICH library for communication via gigabit ethernet.

We can see that the CPU consumption is dominated by the short-range tree computation, while the PM force is subdominant overall. The raw force speed in the short-range tree walk of these TreePM simulations (using a 384^3 mesh) reaches about 21 000 forces per second per processor. This is a high number, significantly in excess of what is reached with pure tree algorithms. In fact, the latter tend to be significantly slower for this type of simulation, typically by a factor of 4–10.

Table 1. CPU time consumption in different parts of the code for two typical 256^3 dark matter simulations. The initial conditions for the two simulations are those of Heitmann et al. (2005). We first give the total number of time-steps and the elapsed wall-clock time to evolve the simulation to $z = 0$ on eight CPUs of a Pentium-IV cluster. The total consumed time is then broken up in time spent in different parts of code, as measured by the timing routines built into GADGET-2.

Simulation boxsize (256^3)	$256 h^{-1}$ Mpc	$64 h^{-1}$ Mpc
Time-steps	2648	5794
Total wall-clock time (s)	60 600	173 700
Tree walk	52.8 per cent	41.0 per cent
Tree construction	4.6 per cent	6.4 per cent
Tree walk communication	0.9 per cent	1.6 per cent
Work-load imbalance	6.7 per cent	14.4 per cent
Domain decomposition	13.0 per cent	15.2 per cent
PM force	4.4 per cent	4.9 per cent
Particle and tree drifts	5.3 per cent	4.9 per cent
Kicks and time-stepping	1.4 per cent	1.1 per cent
Peano keys and ordering	8.0 per cent	7.8 per cent
Misc (I/O, etc.)	2.9 per cent	2.6 per cent

Most of the auxiliary tasks of the simulation code, for example particle drifting, I/O, and so on, typically require a few per cent of the total CPU. Some of these tasks are due to the parallelization strategy, namely the domain decomposition, the wait times due to work-load imbalance, and the time needed for communication itself. However, provided these contributions remain subdominant, we can still expect a significantly faster time to solution as a result of parallelization, besides the possibility to carry out larger simulations because of the availability of the combined memory of all processors.

In cosmological hydrodynamical TreePM simulations, we find that the CPU time required for the SPH computations is roughly equal to that consumed for the short-range gravitational tree forces. This is, for example, the case in the simulations of the Santa Barbara cluster discussed in Section 6.5. The cost of self-gravity is hence comparable to or larger than the cost of the hydrodynamical computations in GADGET-2. Even in simulations with dissipation, this ratio shifts only moderately towards a higher relative cost of the hydrodynamics, but of course here the total cost of a simulation increases substantially because of the much shorter dynamical times that need to be resolved.

7.2 Scalability

The problem size is an important characteristic when assessing the performance of a massively parallel simulation code. Due to the tight coupling of gravitational problems, it is in general not possible to obtain a nearly linear speed-up when a small problem is distributed on to many processors. There are several reasons that make this impossible in practice. (i) There is always some irreducible serial part of the code that does not parallelize; this overhead is fixed and hence its relative contribution to the total cost keeps becoming larger when the parallel parts are accelerated by using more processors. (ii) The more processors that are used, the less work each of them has to do, making it harder to balance the work equally among them, such that more and more time is lost to idle waiting of processors. (iii) When more processors are used, a smaller particle-load per processor results, which in turn leads to a larger communication-to-compute ratio in tightly coupled problems.




Figure 18. Diagram for the time consumption of a rather small galaxy collision simulation evolved with a different number of processors between one and eight. We show a sample of 64 time-steps in each case, each represented by a vertical bar with a width proportional to the elapsed wall-clock time during this step. Each step is additionally subdivided into different constituent parts, drawn in different shades of grey as indicated in the legend.

For all of these reasons, perfect scalability at fixed problem size can in general not be expected. In Fig. 18, we illustrate this with a rather small galaxy collision simulation, consisting of two galaxies with 30 000 collisionless particles each, distributed into a stellar disc and an extended dark matter halo. We have evolved this simulation with GADGET-2 using different processor numbers, from one to eight. The diagram in Fig. 18 shows the time consumption in different parts of the code, during 64 typical steps taken from the simulation. Each step is shown with an area proportional to the elapsed wall-clock time, and different shades of grey are used for different parts of the code within each step. In particular, black is used for the actual tree walk, while light grey marks losses of some sort or other (primarily wait times due to work-load imbalance, and communication times). We see that the relative fraction of this light grey area (at the top) relative to the total keeps growing when the number of processors is increased. In fact, the scaling is disappointing in this example, falling significantly short of perfect scaling where the total area for the 64 steps would decline as the inverse of the processor number. However, this result is not really surprising for such a small problem; when typical time-steps last only fractions of a second and the particle-load per processor is very low, the problem size is simply too small to allow good scaling with GADGET-2's massively parallel algorithms. We also see that the widths of the different steps follow

a particular pattern, stemming from the individual time-step integration scheme, where the occupancy of certain steps with 'active' particles constantly changes. The two large grey bars represent the computation of the gravitational potential for all particles, which was here carried out in regular intervals to monitor energy conservation of the code.

If a problem of larger size and higher spatial uniformity is selected, better scalability over a larger number of processors can be achieved. This is illustrated in Fig. 19, where the wall-clock time as a function of processor number for the computation of one full step of a dark matter simulation with 270^3 particles is shown. The simulation follows a Λ CDM model in a periodic box of $62.5 h^{-1}$ Mpc on a side, with $5 h^{-1}$ kpc force resolution, computed with the TreePM scheme with a 512^3 mesh. We show results both for $z = 50$ and $z = 0$ to compare the scalability for unclustered and strongly clustered particle distributions, respectively. To illustrate the dependence of the code's scalability on the communication network of the computer used, we give results for different computer architectures, namely a high-end cluster of IBM p690 computers with a very fast network, and also for 'Beowulf' clusters, consisting of commodity computers that are connected with much slower standard ethernet connections. Beside the total time, we also give the times for the PM and tree parts of the code separately. They together account for almost all of the CPU time required by the code for a full step.

On the IBM p690 cluster with the fast 'Federation Switch' communication system, scalability is essentially perfect at high redshift, and only moderately degraded by work-load imbalance losses in the tree part of the code at low redshift. On clusters of commodity workstations, the scaling of the PM part of the code is limited by the bandwidth of the communication network that connects the computers. Once the execution time of the PM part becomes communication-bound, the PM speed can actually decline for a larger number of processors, as this requires yet more communication in the parallel FFT. The tree part of the code is however less sensitive to communication times, and scales to a larger number of processors even for slow network connections. Note that in practice the code is typically run with individual and adaptive time-steps where most code steps do not involve execution of the PM part. The overall scalability of the code on clusters with slow network connections is therefore somewhat better than suggested based on the results of Fig. 19 alone. Also note that a reduction of the size of the PM mesh substantially reduces the communication requirements, which extends the scalability of the code on clusters with standard network connections, at the prize of a slightly lower speed of the tree part of the algorithm.

Arguably of more practical relevance for assessing the scaling of the code is to consider its performance when not only the processor number but, at the same time, also the problem size is increased. This is of immediate relevance for practical application of a simulation code, where one typically wants to employ large numbers of processors only for challengingly large problems, while small problem sizes are dealt with using correspondingly fewer processors. A simultaneous variation of problem size and processor number can alleviate all three of the scaling obstacles listed above. However, changing the problem size really means to change the physics of the problem, and this aspect can be easily confused with bad scaling when analysed superficially. For example, increasing the problem size of a simulation of cosmological structure formation either improves the mass resolution or the volume covered. In both cases, typically more simulation time-steps will be required to integrate the dynamics, either because of better spatial resolution, or because more massive systems of lower space-density can form. The intrinsic computational cost of a simulation therefore typically




Figure 19. Wall-clock time as a function of processor number for a full step of a 270^3 dark matter simulation, using the TreePM mode of GADGET-2 with 512^3 mesh cells. The two panels on top compare the scaling for the unclustered and strongly clustered states at $z = 50$ and $z = 0$, respectively, using an IBM p690 cluster with the fast ‘Federation Switch’ communication system. The three panels on the bottom show scaling results for various clusters of workstations, connected with different communication technologies. In all cases, solid circles show the total timings, while diamonds and triangles give the times for the tree and PM parts of the code, respectively.




Figure 20. Wall-clock times consumed by the test runs of the simulation series. An extrapolation to the size of a 2160^3 simulation suggests that it should require about 1.1×10^6 s on 1024 processors.

scales (sometimes considerably) faster than linear with the problem size.

With these caveats in mind, we show in Fig. 20 the required run times for a scaling experiment with cosmological Λ CDM dark

matter simulations, carried out with GADGET-2 on a cluster of IBM p690 systems. In our series of five simulations, we have increased the particle number from 10^6 to 10^8 , in each step by roughly a factor of $\sqrt{10}$. At the same time we also doubled the number of processors in each step. We kept the mass and spatial resolutions fixed at values of $10^9 h^{-1} M_\odot$ and $\epsilon = 5 h^{-1}$ kpc, respectively, i.e. the volume of the simulations was growing in this series. We also increased the size of the FFT mesh in lock step with the particle number. In Table 2, we list the most important simulation parameters, while in Fig. 20, we show the total wall-clock times measured for evolving each of the simulations from high redshift to $z = 0$, as a function of particle number. We note that the measurements include time spent for computing on-the-fly FOF group catalogues, two-point correlation functions, and power spectra for 64 outputs generated by the runs. However, this amounts only to a few per cent of the total CPU time.

We see that the simulation series in Fig. 20 follows a power law. For a perfect scaling, we would expect $T_{\text{wall-clock}} \propto N_{\text{part}}/N_{\text{cpu}}$, which would correspond to a power law with slope $n = 1 - \log(4) \simeq 0.4$ for the series. Instead, the actually measured slope (fitted line) is $n = 0.52$, slightly steeper. However, the perfect scaling estimate neglects factors of $\log(N_{\text{part}})$ present in various parts of the simulation algorithms (e.g. in the tree construction), and also the fact that the larger simulations do need more time-steps than the smaller simulations. In the series, the number of time-steps in fact increases by 23 per cent from S4 to S64. Overall, the scaling of the code is therefore actually quite good in this test. In fact, an extrapolation of the

Table 2. Simulations performed for the scaling test. All runs used the same mass and length resolutions of $1.03 \times 10^9 h^{-1} M_\odot$ and $5 h^{-1} \text{ kpc}$, respectively, and were started at $z_{\text{init}} = 49$. The runs used equal settings for force accuracy and time integration parameters, and all were asked to produce the same number of outputs, at which point they also carried out group finding, power spectrum estimation and two-point correlation function computation.

Name	N_{CPU}	N_{part}	N_{FFT}	$L_{\text{box}} (h^{-1} \text{ Mpc})$
S4	4	100^3	128^3	23.1
S8	8	146^3	192^3	33.8
S16	16	216^3	256^3	50.0
S32	32	318^3	384^3	73.6
S64	64	464^3	576^3	108.0




Figure 21. Total elapsed wall-clock time per particle of each test run as a function of cosmological scalefactor. The elapsed run times of each simulation have been multiplied by the processor number, and normalized by the particle number.

series to $2160^3 \simeq 1.0078 \times 10^{10}$ particles in a $500 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ box suggests that such a simulation should be possible on 1024 processors in about $1.1 \times 10^6 \text{ s}$. This simulation has in fact been realized with GADGET-2 in the first half of 2004, finishing on June 14. This ‘Millennium’ simulation by the Virgo consortium (Springel et al. 2005b) is the largest calculation carried out with GADGET-2 thus far, and it is also the largest high-resolution cosmological structure formation simulation at present, reaching a dynamic range of 10^5 everywhere in the periodic simulation box. The total wall-clock time required for the simulation on the 512 processors actually used was slightly below 350 000 h, only about 10 per cent more than expected from the above extrapolation over two orders of magnitude. This shows that GADGET-2 can scale quite well even to very large processor partitions if the problem size is sufficiently large as well.

Finally, in Fig. 21 we show the cumulative CPU time consumed for the five simulations of the series as a function of cosmological scalefactor. We have normalized the total CPU time consumption, $T_{\text{cpu}} = T_{\text{wall-clock}} \times N_{\text{cpu}}$, to the number of particles simulated, such that a measure for the computational cost per particle emerges. To first order, the required CPU time scales roughly linearly with the scalefactor, and grows to the order of a few dozen milliseconds per particle. At the time of the test run, the p690 cluster was not yet

equipped with its fast interconnection network, which led to the comparatively poorer performance of the S64 simulation as a result of the communication intensive PM part taking its toll. On current high-end hardware (which is already faster than the p690 machine), GADGET-2 reaches a total CPU cost of about 10 ms per dark matter simulation particle in realistic simulations of cosmological structure formation evolved from high redshift to the present.

7.3 Memory consumption

The standard version of GADGET-2 in TreePM mode uses 20 variables for storing each dark matter particle, i.e. 80 bytes per particle if single precision is used. For each SPH particle, an additional 21 variables (84 bytes) are occupied. For the tree, the code uses 12 variables per node, and for a secondary data structure that holds the centre-of-mass velocity and maximum SPH smoothing lengths of nodes, another four variables. For a typical clustered particle distribution, on average about ~ 0.65 nodes per particle are needed, so that the memory requirement amounts to about 42 bytes per particle. Finally, for the FFTs in the PM component, GADGET-2 needs three variables per mesh cell, but the ghost cells required around local patches increase this requirement slightly. Taking four variables per mesh cell as a conservative upper limit, we therefore need up to 16 bytes (or 32 bytes for double precision) per mesh cell for the PM computation. This can increase substantially for two-level PM computations, because we here not only have to perform zero padding but also store the Green function for the high-resolution region.

While being already reasonably memory-efficient, the standard version of GADGET-2 is not yet heavily optimized towards a lean memory footprint. This has been changed however in a special lean version of the code, where some of the code’s flexibility was sacrificed in favour of very low memory consumption. This version of the code was used for the Millennium simulation described above. The memory optimizations were necessary to fit the simulation size into the aggregated memory of 1 TB available on the supercomputer partition used. By removing explicit storage for long- and short-range accelerations, particle mass and particle type, the memory requirement per particle could be dropped to 40 bytes, despite the need to use 34-bit numbers for labelling each particle with a unique number. The tree storage could also be condensed further to about 40 bytes per particle. Because the memory for PM and tree parts of the gravitational force computation are not needed concurrently, one can hence run a simulation with a peak memory consumption of about 80 bytes per particle, provided the Fourier mesh is not chosen too large. In practice, one has to add to this some additional space for a communication buffer. Also, note that particle-load imbalance as a result of attempting to equalize the work-load among processors can lead to larger than average memory usage on individual processors.

8 DISCUSSION

In this paper, we have detailed the numerical algorithms used in the new cosmological simulation code GADGET-2, and we have presented test problems carried out with it. We have emphasized the changes made with respect to the previous public version of the code. We hope that the improvements made in speed, accuracy and flexibility will help future research with this code by allowing novel types of simulations at higher numerical resolution than accessible previously.

In terms of accuracy, the most important change of the code lies in an improved time integration scheme, which is more accurate

for Hamiltonian systems at a comparable number of integration steps, and in an ‘entropy-conserving’ formulation of SPH, which especially in simulations with radiative cooling has clear accuracy benefits. Also, large-scale gravitational forces are more accurate when the TreePM method is used, and offer reduced computational cost compared to a pure tree code.

In terms of speed, the new code has improved in essentially all of its parts thanks to a redesign of core algorithms, and a complete rewrite of essentially all parts of the simulation code. For example, the domain decomposition and tree construction have been accelerated by factors of several each. Likewise, the SPH neighbour search has been sped up, as well as the basic tree walk, despite the fact that it now has to visit many more nodes than before due to the lower order of the multipole expansion.

In terms of flexibility, the code can now be applied to more types of systems, for example to zoom simulations with a two-level TreePM approach, or to gas-dynamical simulations in two dimensions. GADGET-2 also uses considerably less memory than before, which makes it more versatile. The code can now be run on an arbitrary number of processors, and has more options for convenient I/O. Also, the code has become more modular and can be more easily extended, as evidenced by the array of advanced physical modelling already implemented in it, as discussed in Section 2.3.

In summary, we think GADGET-2 is a useful tool for simulation work that will hopefully stimulate further development of numerical codes. To promote this goal, we release GADGET-2 to the public.³ In a time of exponentially growing computer power, it remains an ongoing challenge to develop numerical codes that fully exploit this technological progress for the study of interesting astrophysical questions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author acknowledges many helpful discussions with Simon D. M. White, Lars Hernquist, Naoki Yoshida, Klaus Dolag, Liang Gao, Martin Jubelgas, Debora Sijacki, Christoph Pfrommer, Stefano Borgani, Martin White, Adrian Jenkins, Jasjeet Bagla, Matthias Steinmetz and Julio Navarro, among others. Special thanks to Matthias Steinmetz for the 1D PPM results used in Fig. 10, and to Katrin Heitmann for making the initial conditions and results of her DM test simulations publicly available.

REFERENCES

Abel T., Bryan G. L., Norman M. L., 2002, *Sci*, 295, 93
 Appel A. W., 1985, *SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comput.*, 6, 85
 Ascasibar Y., Yepes G., Müller V., Gottlöber S., 2003, *MNRAS*, 346, 731
 Bagla J. S., 2002, *J. Astrophys. Astron.*, 23, 185
 Bagla J. S., Ray S., 2003, *NewA*, 8, 665
 Balsara D. S., 1995, *J. Comput. Phys.*, 121, 357
 Barnes J., Hut P., 1986, *Nat*, 324, 446 (BH)
 Barnes J. E., Hut P., 1989, *ApJS*, 70, 389
 Bate M. R., Burkert A., 1997, *MNRAS*, 288, 1060
 Bode P., Ostriker J. P., 2003, *ApJS*, 145, 1
 Bode P., Ostriker J. P., Xu G., 2000, *ApJS*, 128, 561
 Bonnell I. A., Bate M. R., Clarke C. J., Pringle J. E., 1997, *MNRAS*, 285, 201
 Boss A. P., Bodenheimer P., 1979, *ApJ*, 234, 289

Bryan G. L., Norman M. L., 1997, in Clarke D. A., West M. J., eds, *ASP Conf. Ser. Vol. 123, Computational Astrophysics, 12th Kingston Meeting on Theoretical Astrophysics*. Astron. Soc. Pac., San Francisco, p. 363
 Burkert A., Bodenheimer P., 1993, *MNRAS*, 264, 798
 Cen R., Ostriker J. P., 1992, *ApJ*, 399, L113
 Cen R., Ostriker J. P., 1993, *ApJ*, 417, 404
 Cen R., Ostriker J. P., Prochaska J. X., Wolfe A. M., 2003, *ApJ*, 598, 741
 Couchman H. M. P., 1991, *ApJ*, 368, 23
 Couchman H. M. P., Thomas P. A., Pearce F. R., 1995, *ApJ*, 452, 797
 Cox T. J., Primack J., Jonsson P., Somerville R. S., 2004, *ApJ*, 607, L87
 Cuadra J., Nayakshin S., Springel V., Di Matteo T., 2005, *MNRAS*, 360, L55
 Davé R., Dubinski J., Hernquist L., 1997, *NewA*, 2, 277
 Davé R., Spergel D. N., Steinhardt P. J., Wandelt B. D., 2001, *ApJ*, 547, 574
 Dehnen W., 2000, *ApJ*, 536, L39
 Di Matteo T., Springel V., Hernquist L., 2005, *Nat*, 433, 604
 Dolag K., Bartelmann M., Perrotta F., Baccigalupi C., Moscardini L., Meneghetti M., Tormen G., 2004a, *A&A*, 416, 853
 Dolag K., Grasso D., Springel V., Tkachev I., 2004b, *J. Korean Astron. Soc.*, 37, 427
 Dolag K., Jubelgas M., Springel V., Borgani S., Rasia E., 2004c, *ApJ*, 606, L97
 Dolag K., Grasso D., Springel V., Tkachev I., 2005, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.*, 1, 9
 Dubinski J., 1996, *NewA*, 1, 133
 Dubinski J., Kim J., Park C., Humble R., 2004, *NewA*, 9, 111
 Duncan M. J., Levison H. F., Lee M. H., 1998, *AJ*, 116, 2067
 Efsthathiou G., Davis M., Frenk C. S., White S. D. M., 1985, *ApJS*, 57, 241
 Evrard A. E., 1988, *MNRAS*, 235, 911
 Evrard A. E., 1990, *ApJ*, 363, 349
 Frenk C. S. et al., 1999, *ApJ*, 525, 554
 Fryxell B. et al., 2000, *ApJS*, 131, 273
 Fukushige T., Makino J., Kawai A., 2005, *PASJ*, submitted (astro-ph/0504407)
 Gao L., White S. D. M., Jenkins A., Frenk C., Springel V., 2005, *MNRAS*, 363, 379
 Gingold R. A., Monaghan J. J., 1977, *MNRAS*, 181, 375
 Gnedin N. Y., 1995, *ApJS*, 97, 231
 Hairer E., Lubich C., Wanner G., 2002, *Geometric Numerical Integration*, Springer Series in Computational Mathematics. Springer, Berlin
 Heitmann K., Ricker P. M., Warren M. S., Habib S., 2005, *ApJS*, 160, 28
 Hernquist L., 1987, *ApJS*, 64, 715
 Hernquist L., Katz N., 1989, *ApJ*, 70, 419
 Hernquist L., Bouchet F. R., Suto Y., 1991, *ApJS*, 75, 231
 Hernquist L., Hut P., Makino J., 1993, *ApJ*, 402, L85
 Hernquist L., Katz N., Weinberg D. H., Miralda-Escudé J., 1996, *ApJ*, 457, L51
 Hockney R. W., Eastwood J. W., 1981, *Computer Simulation Using Particles*. McGraw-Hill, New York
 Hut P., Makino J., McMillan S., 1995, *ApJ*, 443, L93
 Jenkins A. R. et al., 1998, *ApJ*, 499, 20
 Jenkins A., Frenk C. S., White S. D. M., Colberg J. M., Cole S., Evrard A. E., Couchman H. M. P., Yoshida N., 2001, *MNRAS*, 321, 372
 Jernigan J. G., Porter D. H., 1989, *ApJS*, 71, 871
 Jubelgas M., Springel V., Dolag K., 2004, *MNRAS*, 351, 423
 Kang H., Ryu D., Cen R., Song D., 2005, *ApJ*, 620, 21
 Katz N., Weinberg D. H., Hernquist L., 1996, *ApJS*, 105, 19
 Kay S. T., 2004, *MNRAS*, 347, L13
 Klein R. I., McKee C. F., Colella P., 1994, *ApJ*, 420, 213
 Klypin A. A., Shandarin S. F., 1983, *MNRAS*, 204, 891
 Knebe A., Green A., Binney J., 2001, *MNRAS*, 325, 845
 Kravtsov A. V., Klypin A. A., Khokhlov A. M. J., 1997, *ApJS*, 111, 73
 Kravtsov A. V., Klypin A., Hoffman Y., 2002, *ApJ*, 571, 563
 Kravtsov A. V., Nagai D., Vikhlinin A. A., 2005, *ApJ*, 625, 588
 Linder E. V., Jenkins A., 2003, *MNRAS*, 346, 573
 Lucy L. B., 1977, *AJ*, 82, 1013
 Makino J., 1990, *PASJ*, 42, 717
 Makino J., Taiji M., Ebisuzaki T., Sugimoto D., 1997, *ApJ*, 480, 432

³ The website for downloading GADGET-2 is <http://www.mpa-garching.mpg.de/gadget>.

- Makino J., Fukushige T., Koga M., Namura K., 2003, *PASJ*, 55, 1163
- Marri S., White S. D. M., 2003, *MNRAS*, 345, 561
- Monaghan J. J., 1992, *ARA&A*, 30, 543
- Monaghan J. J., 1997, *J. Comput. Phys.*, 136, 298
- Monaghan J. J., Gingold R. A., 1983, *J. Comput. Phys.*, 52, 374
- Monaghan J. J., Lattanzio J. C., 1985, *A&A*, 149, 135
- Motl P. M., Burns J. O., Loken C., Norman M. L., Bryan G., 2004, *ApJ*, 606, 635
- Navarro J. F., White S. D. M., 1993, *MNRAS*, 265, 271
- Navarro J. F., Frenk C. S., White S. D. M., 1996, *ApJ*, 462, 563
- Norman M. L., Bryan G. L., 1999, in Miyama S. M., Tomisaka K., Hanawa T., eds, *ASSL Vol. 240, Numerical Astrophysics*. Kluwer Academic, Boston, MA, p. 19
- O'Shea B. W., Nagamine K., Springel V., Hernquist L., Norman M. L., 2005a, *ApJS*, 160, 1
- O'Shea B. W., Bryan G., Bordner J., Norman M., Abel T., Harkness R., Kritsuk A., 2005b, in Plewa T., Linde T., Weirs V. G., eds, *Adaptive Mesh Refinement – Theory and Applications*, Springer Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering Vol. 41. Springer, Berlin
- Owen J. M., Villumsen J. V., Shapiro P. R., Martel H., 1998, *ApJS*, 116, 155
- Pen U., 1998, *ApJS*, 115, 19
- Poludnenko A. Y., Frank A., Blackman E. G., 2002, *ApJ*, 576, 832
- Power C. et al., 2003, *MNRAS*, 338, 14
- Quilis V., 2004, *MNRAS*, 352, 1426
- Quinn T., Katz N., Stadel J., Lake G., 1997, preprint (astro-ph/9710043)
- Rasio F. A., Shapiro S. L., 1991, *ApJ*, 377, 559
- Refregier A., Teyssier R., 2002, *Phys. Rev. D*, 66(4), 043002
- Saha P., Tremaine S., 1992, *AJ*, 104, 1633
- Salmon J. K., Warren M. S., 1994, *J. Comput. Phys.*, 111, 136
- Scannapieco C., Tissera P. B., White S. D. M., Springel V., 2005, *MNRAS*, 364, 552
- Serna A., Alimi J.-M., Chieze J.-P., 1996, *ApJ*, 461, 884
- Serna A., Dominguez-Tenreiro R., Saiz A., 2003, *ApJ*, 597, 878
- Sommer-Larsen J., Vedel H., Hellsten U., 1998, *ApJ*, 500, 610
- Springel V., 2000, *MNRAS*, 312, 859
- Springel V., Hernquist L., 2002, *MNRAS*, 333, 649
- Springel V., Hernquist L., 2003a, *MNRAS*, 339, 289
- Springel V., Hernquist L., 2003b, *MNRAS*, 339, 312
- Springel V., Yoshida N., White S. D. M., 2001a, *NewA*, 6, 79
- Springel V., White M., Hernquist L., 2001b, *ApJ*, 549, 681
- Springel V., Di Matteo T., Hernquist L., 2005a, *ApJ*, 620, L79
- Springel V. et al., 2005b, *Nat*, 435, 629
- Stadel J. G., 2001, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Washington
- Steinmetz M., 1996, *MNRAS*, 278, 1005
- Steinmetz M., Mueller E., 1993, *A&A*, 268, 391
- Teyssier R., 2002, *A&A*, 385, 337
- Tissera P. B., Lambas D. G., Abadi M. G., 1997, *MNRAS*, 286, 384
- Tormen G., 1997, *MNRAS*, 290, 411
- Tornatore L., Borgani S., Springel V., Matteucci F., Menci N., Murante G., 2003, *MNRAS*, 342, 1025
- Tornatore L., Borgani S., Matteucci F., Recchi S., Tozzi P., 2004, *MNRAS*, 349, L19
- van den Bosch F. C., Abel T., Hernquist L., 2003, *MNRAS*, 346, 177
- Wadsley J. W., Stadel J., Quinn T., 2004, *NewA*, 9, 137
- Warren M. S., Salmon J. K., 1993, in *Supercomputing '93*. IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alamitos, CA, p. 12
- Warren M. S., Salmon J. K., 1995, *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, 87, 266
- White S. D. M., 1996, in Schaefer R., Silk J., Spiro M., Zinn-Justin J., eds, *Cosmology and Large-Scale Structure*. Elsevier, Amsterdam (astro-ph/9410043)
- White M., 2002, *ApJS*, 143, 241
- White S. D. M., Frenk C. S., Davis M., 1983, *ApJ*, 274, L1
- Whitehurst R., 1995, *MNRAS*, 277, 655
- Xu G., 1995, *ApJS*, 98, 355
- Yepes G., Kates R., Khokhlov A., Klypin A., 1995, in Maurogordato S., Balkowski C., Tao C., Tran Thanh Van J., eds, *Clustering in the Universe*. Editions Frontières, Gif-sur-Yvette, p. 209
- Yoshida N., Springel V., White S. D. M., Tormen G., 2000, *ApJ*, 544, L87
- Yoshida N., Abel T., Hernquist L., Sugiyama N., 2003, *ApJ*, 592, 645

This paper has been typeset from a $\text{\TeX}/\text{\LaTeX}$ file prepared by the author.