# A Scalable, Linear-Time Dynamic Cutoff Algorithm for Molecular Dynamics

#### Paul Springer, Ahmed E. Ismail, Paolo Bientinesi

Aachen Institute for Advanced Study in Computational Engineering Science

#### ISC 2015, Frankfurt, 14.07.15





# Molecular Dynamics



$$V_C(r) = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon} \frac{Q}{r}$$
  $V_{LJ}(r) = 4\epsilon \left( \left( \frac{\sigma}{r} \right)^{12} - \left( \frac{\sigma}{r} \right)^6 \right)$ 

## Interfacial systems



## Short-range method: "cutoff"







## Interface



#### Long-range solvers

Ewald methods, based on FFT.  $O(n \log(n))$ 

#### Long-range solvers

Ewald methods, based on FFT.  $O(n \log(n))$ 



PPPM long-range solver, 1200 particles/core, IBM BG/Q.

#### Recap

- $\bullet$  Small cutoff  $\rightarrow$  accuracy loss at the interface
- $\bullet~\mbox{Large cutoff} \to \mbox{flops wasted in the bulk phase}$

#### Recap

- $\bullet$  Small cutoff  $\rightarrow$  accuracy loss at the interface
- $\bullet~\mbox{Large cutoff} \to \mbox{flops wasted in the bulk phase}$
- Idea

Cutoff chosen dynamically, according to the distance from the interface  $% \left( {{{\left[ {{T_{{\rm{c}}}} \right]}}_{{\rm{c}}}}} \right)$ 



#### Challenges & Objectives

Cutoff chosen particle by particle

- How to detect the interface?
- How to compute the distance particle-interface?

- Complexity O(n)
- Only local communication

#### Dynamic Cutoff Method

- 1. Interface detection\*
- **2.** Distance calculation + cutoff assignemnt\*
  - . (Almost) traditional short-range method
    - 3. Neighbor-list\*
    - 4. Forces
    - 5. Positions

\*: not in every iteration

#### Dynamic Cutoff Method



## 1) Interface detection

• Bin particles to 3D bins

	•										-				
ŀ														••	•
						Ŀ.									
•								ŀ .							··
• •												 			
	 •														
•															
							Γ.								

#### 1) Interface detection

- Bin particles to 3D bins
- Treat particle densities as gray values



#### 1) Interface detection

- Bin particles to 3D bins
- Treat particle densities as gray values
- Apply image segmentation

Minimization of Mumford-Shah functional; periodic boundary conditions; finite differences + filtering, local communication only



- Distance is only required close to the interface
- Interface-box distance (Fast Sweeping Method) + box-particle distance (trilinear interpolation)



- Distance is only required close to the interface
- Interface-box distance (Fast Sweeping Method) + box-particle distance (trilinear interpolation)



- Distance is only required close to the interface
- Interface-box distance (Fast Sweeping Method) + box-particle distance (trilinear interpolation)



- Distance is only required close to the interface
- Interface-box distance (Fast Sweeping Method) + box-particle distance (trilinear interpolation)



- Distance is only required close to the interface
- Interface-box distance (Fast Sweeping Method) + box-particle distance (trilinear interpolation)



- Distance is only required close to the interface
- Interface-box distance (Fast Sweeping Method) + box-particle distance (trilinear interpolation)





Initial state



Local CFSM step



Ghost Exchange



Local CFSM step



Ghost Exchange



Local CFSM step

#### Dynamic Cutoff Method





- Spatial binning. Search limited to neighboring boxes  $\Rightarrow O(N)$
- DCM  $\Rightarrow$  Newton's 3rd law not applicable anymore



- Spatial binning. Search limited to neighboring boxes  $\Rightarrow O(N)$
- DCM  $\Rightarrow$  Newton's 3rd law not applicable anymore
- Bins of size  $r_c^{max} \times r_c^{max} \times r_c^{max} \Rightarrow$  performance loss in bulk phase



- Spatial binning. Search limited to neighboring boxes  $\Rightarrow O(N)$
- DCM  $\Rightarrow$  Newton's 3rd law not applicable anymore
- Bins of size  $r_c^{max} \times r_c^{max} \times r_c^{max} \Rightarrow$  performance loss in bulk phase
- Bins of size  $r_c^{min} \times r_c^{min} \times r_c^{min} \Rightarrow$  speedups of  $\mathbf{4} \mathbf{6} \times \mathbf{1}$

#### Experiments



a) planar interface



b) non-planar interface

## Strong Scaling

Size:  $1200 \times 32768 \approx 4 \cdot 10^7$  particles



## Strong Scaling

Size:  $1200 \times 32768 \approx 4 \cdot 10^7$  particles



## Weak Scaling

#### 1200 particles per core



### Weak Scaling

#### 1200 particles per core



#### Weak Scaling

#### 1200 particles per core



#### Accuracy

#### Absolute error with respect to long-range Ewald summation



#### Accuracy vs. performance

#### How to select min/max cutoffs



### Conclusions

#### Idea

Cutoff chosen particle by particle

 $\Rightarrow$  interface detection, distance calculation

- Results
  - Nearly perfect strong and weak scalability
  - $5.5\times10^8$  particles on 458,752 cores
  - As accurate as PPPM, much more scalable than PPPM
- Future work
  - Accelerators?
  - Use DCM as short-range solver within Ewald-based solvers

### Conclusions

#### Idea

Cutoff chosen particle by particle

 $\Rightarrow$  interface detection, distance calculation

- Results
  - Nearly perfect strong and weak scalability
  - $5.5\times10^8$  particles on 458,752 cores
  - As accurate as PPPM, much more scalable than PPPM
- Future work
  - Accelerators?
  - Use DCM as short-range solver within Ewald-based solvers

# Thank you for your attention