Towards an ultra efficient kinetic scheme : High-Performance Computing

G. Dimarco¹ J. Narski² R. Loubère²

¹Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Ferrara, Italy. ²Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, Université de Toulouse 31062 Toulouse, France.

SHARK-FV Ofir 2014

G. Dimarco, J. Narski, R. Loubère Towards an ultra efficient kinetic scheme : High-Performance Computing

Motivation

Motivations

- Modeling of non equilibrium gas flows (plasma, hypersonic flow)
- Kinetic equations extremely difficult to solve numerically (7 dimensions)

FKS

- G. DIMARCO, R. LOUBÈRE, *Towards an ultra efficient kinetic scheme. Part I: basics on the BGK equation*, J. Comput. Phys., Vol. 255, 2013, pp 680-698.
- G. DIMARCO, R. LOUBÈRE, *Towards an ultra efficient kinetic scheme. Part II: the high order case*, J. Comput. Phys., Vol. 255, 2013, pp 699-719.

Goal

Parallelize FKS

Problem formulation

Boltzmann-BGK equation

$$\partial_t f + \mathbf{V} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{X}} f = \frac{1}{\tau} (M_f - f),$$

 $f = f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}, t)$ distribution od particles, τ relaxation time. Collisions modeled by relaxation towards the local thermodynamical equilibrium defined by the Maxwellian distribution

$$M_f = M_f[
ho, \mathbf{U}, T](\mathbf{V}) = rac{
ho}{(2\pi\theta)^{3/2}} \exp\left(rac{-\|\mathbf{U}-\mathbf{V}\|^2}{2 heta}
ight),$$

 $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \textit{TR}~\boldsymbol{\rho}, \mathbf{U}, \textit{T}, \textit{R}$ — density, mean velocity, temperature and gas constant

Macroscopic moments

$$\rho = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f \, d\mathbf{V}, \qquad \mathbf{U} = \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathbf{V} f \, d\mathbf{V}, \qquad \theta = \frac{1}{3\rho} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \|\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{U}\|^2 \, f \, d\mathbf{V},$$

Total energy

$$E = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \|\mathbf{V}\|^2 f \ d\mathbf{V} = \frac{1}{2} \rho \|\mathbf{U}\|^2 + \frac{3}{2} \rho \theta$$

G. Dimarco, J. Narski, R. Loubère Towards an u

Towards an ultra efficient kinetic scheme : High-Performance Computing

The limit of au ightarrow 0

If number of collisions goes to infinity, then $\tau \rightarrow 0$ and $f \rightarrow M_f$. One retrieves compressible Euler equations

$$\begin{split} &\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} + \nabla_{\mathbf{X}} \cdot (\rho \mathbf{U}) = 0, \\ &\frac{\partial(\rho \mathbf{U})}{\partial t} + \nabla_{\mathbf{X}} \cdot (\rho \mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{U} + \rho l) = 0, \\ &\frac{\partial E}{\partial t} + \nabla_{\mathbf{X}} \cdot ((E + \rho)\mathbf{U}) = 0, \\ &p = \rho\theta, \quad E = \frac{3}{2}\rho\theta + \frac{1}{2}\rho \|\mathbf{U}\|^2, \end{split}$$

where I is the identity and p the pressure given by a perfect equation of state with gas constant $\gamma = 5/3$ in 3D.

This is the fluid/macroscopic model.

Semi-Lagrangian scheme for Discrete Velocity Model (DVM) approximation of Boltzmann-BGK equation.

DVM

Let \mathcal{K} be a bounded set of N^3_{ν} multi-indices of \mathbb{N}^3 . Let \mathcal{V} be a Cartesian grid given by

$$\mathcal{V} = \{\mathbf{V}_k = k\Delta \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{W}, \ k \in \mathcal{K}\},\$$

where Δv is the grid step in the velocity space. The generic cell in the velocity space is $\omega_{k+1/2} = [\mathbf{V}_k; \mathbf{V}_{k+1}]$. We denote the discrete collision invariants on \mathcal{V} by

$$m_k = \left(1, \mathbf{V}_k, \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{V}_k\|^2\right)^t$$

Semi-Lagrangian scheme for Discrete Velocity Model (DVM) approximation of Boltzmann-BGK equation.

DVM

The continuous distribution function f is replaced by a vector

$$f_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{X},t) = \left(f_k(\mathbf{X},t)
ight)_k, \qquad f_k(\mathbf{X},t) pprox f(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{V}_k,t).$$

Fluid quantities:

$$F(\mathbf{X},t) = \sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}} m_k f_k(\mathbf{X},t) \Delta v.$$

Set of N_v^3 evolution equations

$$\partial_t f_k + \mathbf{V}_k \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{X}} f_k = \frac{1}{\tau} (\mathcal{E}_k[F] - f_k)$$

Space and time discretization

Cartesian uniform grid $\mathcal{X} = \{\mathbf{X}_j = j\Delta x + \mathbf{Y}, j \in \mathcal{J}\}, \Delta x$ is the grid step, \mathbf{Y} is a vector in \mathbb{R}^3 and \mathcal{J} is a subset of \mathbb{N}^3 . $t^{n+1} = t^n + \Delta t$, time step Δt defined by a CFL condition.

Splitting

Transport stage
$$\longrightarrow \partial_t f_k + \mathbf{V}_k \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{X}} f_k = 0,$$

Relaxation stage $\longrightarrow \partial_t f_k = \frac{1}{\tau} (\mathcal{E}_k[F] - f_k).$



Let $f_{j,k}^n$ be the pointwise approximation at discrete time t^n of the distribution f: $f_{j,k}^n = f(\mathbf{X}_j, \mathbf{V}_k, t^n)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{j,k}^n[F]$ be the equilibrium distribution approximation of $M_{j,k}^n = M_f(\mathbf{X}_j, \mathbf{V}_k, t^n)$ defined at any point \mathbf{X}_j of space at discrete time $t = t^n$. Let \overline{f}_k^n be a piecewise constant function associated with velocity \mathbf{V}_k at time t^n defined at each space cell by

$$\overline{f}_{k,j}^{n} = rac{1}{|\Omega_{j}|} \int_{\Omega_{j}} f(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{V}_{k},t^{n}) \ d\mathbf{X}$$

Exact transport during Δt :

$$\overline{f}_{k}^{*,n+1} = \overline{f}_{k}^{n} (\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{V}_{k} \Delta t), \qquad \forall \mathbf{X} \in \Omega$$

Relaxation step

$$\partial_t f_{j,k} = \frac{1}{\tau} (\mathcal{E}_{j,k}[F] - f_{j,k})$$

Initial data is given by the result of the transport step $f_{j,k}^{*,n+1} = \overline{f}_k^{*,n+1}(\mathbf{X}_j)$. Maxwellian computed using macroscopic quantities

$$F_{j}^{n+1} = F_{j}^{*,n+1} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} m_{k} f_{j,k}^{*,n+1} \Delta v$$

Preservation of macroscopic quantities: moments before $(F_j^{*,n+1})$ and after (F_i^{n+1}) unchanged. Then

$$f_{j,k}^{n+1} = \exp(-\Delta t/ au) f_{j,k}^{*,n+1} + (1-\exp(-\Delta t/ au)) \mathcal{E}_k[F_j^{n+1}],$$

New value of f^{n+1} only in the cell centers, we need f^{n+1} in whole domain for the transport step.

Relaxation step

$$\partial_t f_{j,k} = \frac{1}{\tau} (\mathcal{E}_{j,k}[F] - f_{j,k})$$

Define \mathcal{E}_k as the equilibrium function with the discontinuities located in the same positions as f_k

$$\overline{\mathcal{E}}_k^{n+1}(\mathbf{X})[F] = \mathcal{E}_{j,k}^{n+1}[F], \;\; orall \mathbf{X} \; ext{such that} \;\; \overline{f}_k^{*,n+1}(\mathbf{X}) = \overline{f}_k^{*,n+1}(\mathbf{X}_j)$$

Finally

$$\overline{f}_{k}^{n+1}(\mathbf{X}) = \overline{f}_{k}(\mathbf{X}, t^{n} + \Delta t) = \exp(-\Delta t/\tau)\overline{f}_{k}^{*}(\mathbf{X}) + (1 - \exp(-\Delta t/\tau))\overline{\mathcal{E}}_{k}^{n+1}(\mathbf{X})[F]$$

HOFKS - high order extension

Second order in time

Time splitting with Strang splitting strategy. CFL:

$$\Delta t \max_{\mathcal{K}} \frac{||\mathbf{V}_k||}{L_c} \leq 1$$

- performs well in collisionless regimes
- scheme stable for $\Delta t > CFL$
- $\bullet\,$ projection over the equilibrium of first order $\rightarrow\,$ loss of accuracy close to fluid regime

$$\overline{f}_{k}^{n+1}(\mathbf{X}) = \exp(-\Delta t/\tau)\overline{f}_{k}^{*}(\mathbf{X}) + (1 - \exp(-\Delta t/\tau))\overline{\mathcal{E}}_{k}^{n+1}(\mathbf{X})[F]$$

Solve the equilibrium part with of the distribution function with a macroscopic scheme instead of kinetic.

Moments from the transport stage are replaced by a solution of Euler equations. We use MUSCL scheme. Stability condition:

$$\Delta t < rac{1}{2}rac{\Delta x}{lpha_{\max}}$$

In the limit of $\tau \rightarrow 0$ scheme corresponds to a high order shock capturing scheme.

Second order close to the fluid limit.

Efficient implementation



Particle implementation: Initially N_{ν}^3 particles are positioned at the cell center

$$\mathbf{X}_p^0 = (\Delta x/2, \Delta y/2, \Delta z/2)^t$$

each particle has a unique constant velocity \mathbf{V}_{p} from the velocity space, $p = 1, \dots, N_{v}^{3}$. The transport of these particles during Δt follows

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{n+1} = \mathbf{X}_{p}^{n} + \Delta t \, \mathbf{V}_{p}.$$

Same set of particles in every space cell, only positions and velocities of particles in generic cell kept in memory.

Particle mass

Each particle p in cell j carries its "mass" which is updated defined at t^n thanks to the previous mass $m_{i,p}^{n-1}$ and updated moments $\rho_i^n, \mathbf{U}_i^n, \theta_i^n$ as

 $m_{j,p}^n = \exp(-\Delta t/ au)m_{j,p}^{n-1} + (1 - \exp(-\Delta t/ au))M_f[
ho_j^n, \mathbf{U}_j^n, heta_j^n](\mathbf{V}_p)$

$$=\exp(-\Delta t/\tau)m_{j,p}^{n-1}+(1-\exp(-\Delta t/\tau))\frac{(\Delta v)^{3}\rho_{j}^{n}}{(2\pi\theta_{j}^{n})^{3/2}}\exp\left(\frac{-\|\mathbf{V}_{p}-\mathbf{U}_{j}^{n}\|^{2}}{2\theta_{j}^{n}}\right)$$

Performance Computing

Because the fluid quantities are obtained through discrete summations on particles in cell *j*:

$$F_j^n = \sum_{
ho=1}^{N_v^3} m_{j,
ho}^n \, \Delta v$$

the updated fluid quantities are therefore obtained after the transport step following

$$F_{j}^{n+1} = F_{j}^{n} - \sum_{\substack{p, \ \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{p}^{n+1} \notin \Omega_{j} \\ \text{Leaving particles}}} m_{j,p}^{n} \Delta v + \sum_{\substack{p', \ \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{p'}^{n+1} \in \Omega_{j} \\ \text{Entering particles}}} m_{j-\delta,p'}^{n} \Delta v .$$
G. Dimarco, J. Narski, R. Loubère Towards an ultra efficient kinetic scheme : High

Generic algorithm

- Relaxation step. Compute masses of N_v^3 particles, store them in an array of the size $N_v^3 \times N^3$
- **②** Transport of particles. Displace N_v^3 particles, produce a list of N_{out} particles escaping the generic cell and store the δ determining the destination and provenance of associated sister particles.
- Update conservative variables Fⁿ⁺¹_i
- Opdate primitive variables

OpenMP algorithm

- Relaxation step. Compute in parallel masses of N³_v particles with, parallelization is performed on the external loop over N³_v particles.
- **2** Transport of particles. Move in parallel N_v^3 particles
- Update conservative variables. Test in a parallel loop over N³_v particles if a particle has escaped from the generic cell. If so, add a contribution to Fⁿ⁺¹_j for every space cell. Update the particle position and exchange particle mass with the associated sister particle.
- Opdate primitive variables

GPU algorithm

- Copy from CPU to GPU. Copy to the GPU memory all primitive and conservative variables.
- 2 Loop over particles
 - *Transport step* Move every particle and test if it has escaped the generic cell. If so, store the provenance of the sister cell.
 - Relaxation step Compute relaxed masses of particles for every space cell using CUDA. Store the result on GPU.
 - Update conservative variables. If the particle has escaped the generic cell, add contribution to conservative variables and assign mass to he one of the incoming sister particle.
 - Copy from GPU to CPU. Copy the resulting mass array from the GPU memory to the CPU memory.
- **Output** Update primitive variables in parallel on GPU.
- Copy from GPU to CPU. Write to the CPU memory the updated conservative variables.

Easily extendable to multi GPU architectures

HOFKS and HOFKS-OMP

Serial version implemented in C++ compiled with gcc 4.7.2 and -Ofast optimization flag

Computational server with 4 Intel(R) Xeon(TM) E5-4650 processors running at 2.7 GHz (giving a total of 32 physical cores and 64 logical) with 512GB of RAM running under Debian Wheezy

HOFKS-GPU

GPU version implemented in CUDA 5.5 and gcc 4.7.2 and -Ofast optimization flag

Computational server with dual Intel(R) Xeon(TM) E5-2650 processor running at 2.0 GHz (16 physical and 32 virtual cores) with 128GB and 2 Nvidia GTX 780 units (3GB of memory, 2304 CUDA cores at 900MHz each) running under Debian Wheezy

Decent card for gaming, not designed for professional applications (lack of memory error correction, double precision, worse copy engine than Tesla/Quadro)

Machines

CUDA architecture

- Massively parallel : 12 multiprocessors consisting of 192 CUDA cores
- Functions executed on GPU (kernels) are executed in warps involving 32 threads
- Parallelization strategy : replace every loop over space cells by a call to suitable CUDA kernel
- Slow CPU \leftrightarrow GPU memory transfer (8Gb/s at most)
- Example: $200^3 \times 15^3$ particles equals to 100Gb of data (mass vector) 25s lost on transfer from and to GPU
- Sometimes better to recompute some values than to copy them from CPU memory
- Not really possible in this case
- Possibility to use two concurent copy engine (Tesla/Quadro) : mass array of 1 particle is copied to GPU, second particle is processed by GPU and the updated masses of third particle are transfered back to CPU at the same time ⇒ time lost on transfered reduced to 0.

Parallelization test only

• $\Omega = [0, 2]^3$, ball centered at (1, 1, 1), radius r = 0.2, number of space cells $N^3 = 25, 50, 100, 200$, velocity space $[-15, 15]^3$ discretized with $N_V = 15^3$ points

• The relaxation parameter
$$au=10^{-4}$$

• Δt fixed at maximal time step

Convergence tests in

- G. DIMARCO, R. LOUBÈRE, *Towards an ultra efficient kinetic scheme. Part I: basics on the BGK equation*, J. Comput. Phys., Vol. 255, 2013, pp 680-698.
- G. DIMARCO, R. LOUBÈRE, *Towards an ultra efficient kinetic scheme. Part II: the high order case*, J. Comput. Phys., Vol. 255, 2013, pp 699-719.

Cell #	Cycle	Time	T/cycle	T/cell	Mem
$N_c \times N_v^3$	N _{cycle}	T (s)	$T_{\text{cycle}}(s)$	$T_{\rm cell}$ (s)	(GB)
$\boxed{25^3\times15^3}$	13	204s (3.5mn)	204s (3.5mn) 15.69		0.23
$= 52.7 \times 10^{6}$		6.77s	0.52	$33 imes10^{-6}$	
		6.1s	0.47	$30 imes10^{-6}$	
$50^3 imes 15^3$	25	3244s (54mn)	129.76	$1 imes 10^{-3}$	1.6
$= 421.9 \times 10^{6}$		86.6s (1.43mn)	3.46	$27.7 imes 10^{-6}$	
		46s	1.84	$14.7 imes10^{-6}$	
$100^3 imes 15^3$	50	46408s (13h)	928	$0.9 imes10^{-3}$	12
$= 3.4 imes 10^9$		1102s (18.4mn)	22.04	22.04×10^{-6}	
		486s (8.1mn)	9.7	$9.7 imes10^{-6}$	
$200^3 imes 15^3$	98	$784 imes 10^3$ s (9d)	8000	$1 imes 10^{-3}$	101
$= 27 \times 10^{9}$		17036s (4.73h)	174	$21.7 imes 10^{-6}$	
		9353s (2.6h)	95	$12 imes 10^{-6}$	

OpenMP scalability

					100000	real acceleration
# of	Time	Time/cycle	Time/cell	Speed		
cores	T (s)	T _{cycle} (s)	T _{cell} (s)	up	ļ	
1	46408	928	928×10^{-6}	1	10000	
2	23573	471	471×10^{-6}	1.96	(min)	
4	12395	248	248×10^{-6}	3.74	gung	
8	6674	133.5	133.5×10^{-6}	6.95	1000	
16	3536	70.7	70.7×10^{-6}	13.12		
32	1735	34.7	34.7×10^{-6}	26.74		
64	1102	22.04	22.04×10^{-6}	42.11		
					100	 2 5

- Smaller speed-up when no. of threads exceeds no. of physical cores
- The HOFKS is "embarrassingly parallel"

N,3

GPU scalability

SOD test again, $N = 100^3$, N_{ν} varies from 15^3 to 30^3



• Computational time grows linearly with number of particles

• 2 GPUs almost twice as fast as single GPU

Kelvin-Helmholtz instabilities

- Cubic domain $\Omega=[0,1]^3,~\textit{N}^3=200^3,~\textit{N}_{\nu}^3=10^3$
- Three layers : $\Omega_1 = \{ \mathbf{X} \in \Omega, \ 0 \le z < 0.25 \}$, $\Omega_2 = \{ \mathbf{X} \in \Omega, \ 0.25 \le z \le 0.75 \}$, and $\Omega_3 = \Omega \setminus \{ \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \}$
- Initial conditions



with $a(x, y) = 0.01 \sin(2\pi x) \sin(2\pi y)$ and $\gamma = 1.4$.

Time step : 0 CPU time : 0h



Time step : 1000 CPU time : 4h



Time step : 2000 CPU time : 8*h*



Time step : 3000 CPU time : 12h



Time step : 4000 CPU time : 16h



Time step : 5000 CPU time : 20h



Time step : 6000 CPU time : 24h



Time step : 7000 CPU time : 28h



Time step : 8000 CPU time : 32h



Time step : 9000 CPU time : 36h



Time step : 10000 CPU time : 40h



Time step : 11000 CPU time : 44h



Time step : 12000 CPU time : 48h



Time step : 13000 CPU time : 52h



Time step : 14000 CPU time : 56h



Time step : 15000 CPU time : 60h

