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Context

- EDF R&D is looking for a Fast Reference Solver
- PhD Student: Salli Moustafa

- Industrial solvers:
  - diffusion approximation ($\approx$ SP1);
  - COCAGNE (SPN).

- Solution on more than $10^{11}$ degrees of freedom (DoFs) involved
  - probabilistic solvers (very long computation time);
  - deterministic solvers.

**DOMINO** (SN) is designed for this validation purpose.
DOMINO: Discrete Ordinates Method In NeutrOnics

- Deterministic, Cartesian, and 3D solver;
- 3 levels of discretization:
  - energy ($G$): multigroup formalism;
  - angle ($\vec{\Omega}$): Level Symmetric Quadrature, $N(N+2)$ directions
  - space ($x, y, z$): Diamond Differencing scheme (order 0);
- 3 nested levels of iterations:
  - power iterations + Chebychev acceleration;
  - multigroup iterations: Gauss–Seidel algorithm;
  - scattering iterations + DSA acceleration (using the SPN solver):
    → spatial sweep, which consumes most of the computation time.
The Sweep Algorithm

forall the \( o \in \text{Octants} \) do
  forall the \( c \in \text{Cells} \) do
    \( \triangleright c = (i, j, k) \)
    forall the \( d \in \text{Directions} [o] \) do
      \( \triangleright d = (\nu, \mu, \xi) \)
      \[ \epsilon_x = \frac{2\nu}{\Delta x}; \quad \epsilon_y = \frac{2\eta}{\Delta y}; \quad \epsilon_z = \frac{2\xi}{\Delta z}; \]
      \[ \psi [o][c][d] = \frac{\epsilon_x \psi_L + \epsilon_y \psi_B + \epsilon_z \psi_F + S}{\epsilon_x + \epsilon_y + \epsilon_z + \Sigma_t}; \]
      \[ \psi_R [o][c][d] = 2\psi [o][c][d] - \psi_L [o][c][d]; \]
      \[ \psi_T [o][c][d] = 2\psi [o][c][d] - \psi_B [o][c][d]; \]
      \[ \psi_{BF} [o][c][d] = 2\psi [o][c][d] - \psi_F [o][c][d]; \]
      \[ \phi [k][j][i] = \phi [k][j][i] + \psi [o][c][d] \ast \omega [d]; \]
  end
end
The Spatial Sweep (*Diamond Differencing scheme*) (1/2)

3D regular mesh with per cell, per angle, per energy group:
- 1 moment to update
- 3 incoming fluxes
- 3 outgoing fluxes
At the beginning, data are known only on the incoming faces.
The Spatial Sweep (*Diamond Differencing scheme*) (2/2)

2D example of the spatial mesh for one octant

- **processed cell**
- **ready cell**
The Spatial Sweep (*Diamond Differencing scheme*) (2/2)

2D example of the spatial mesh for one octant

... after a few steps

- **processed cell**
- **ready cell**
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Parallelization Strategies
Many opportunities for parallelism

- Each level of discretization is a potentially independent computation:
  - energy group
  - angles
  - space
- All energy groups are computed together
- All angles are considered independent → This is not true when problems have boundary conditions
- All cell updates on a front are independent
Several directions belong to the same octant:

- Vectorization of the computation
- Use of SIMD units at processor/core level
  → improve kernel performance
Spatial Parallelization
First level: granularity

Grouping cells in **MacroCells:**
- Reduces thread scheduling overhead
- Similar to exploiting BLAS 3
- Reduces overall parallelism
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Octant Parallelization
Case of Vacuum Boundary Conditions

When using vacuum boundary conditions, all octants are independent from each other.
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Octant Parallelization
Case of Vacuum Boundary Conditions

Concurrent access to a cell (or MacroCell) are protected by mutexes.
Octant Parallelization
Case of Vacuum Boundary Conditions

Concurrent access to a cell (or MacroCell) are protected by mutexes.
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Sweep Theoretical Model
We define the efficiency of the sweep algorithm as follow:

\[ \epsilon = \frac{T_{task} N_{tasks}}{(N_{tasks} + N_{idle}) \times (T_{task} + T_{comm})} \]

\[ = \frac{1}{(1 + N_{idle}/N_{tasks}) \times (1 + T_{comm}/T_{task})} \]

Objective: **Minimize** \( N_{idle} \)
For 3D block distribution

The minimal number of idle steps are those required to reach the cube center:

\[ N_{\text{idle}}^{\text{min}} = P_x + \delta_x - 2 + P_y + \delta_y - 2 + P_z + \delta_z - 2 \]

where \( \delta_u = 0 \), if \( P_u \) is even, 1 otherwise.

Objective: **Minimize the sum** \( P + Q + R \), where \( P \times Q \times R \) is the process grid.

\( \rightarrow \) Hybrid MPI-Thread implementation allows this
Hybrid Model
DOMINO on top of PARSEC
DOMINO on top of PaRSEC

Implementation

- Only one kind of task:
  - Associated to one MacroCell
  - All energy group
  - All directions included in one octant
    → 8 tasks per MacroCell
  - No dependencies from one octant to another
    → protected by mutexes

- Simple algorithm to write in JDF

- Require a data distribution:
  - Independent from the algorithm: 2D, 3D, cyclic or not, . . .
  - For now: Block-3D (Non cyclic) with a $P \times Q \times R$ grid

- Fluxes on faces are dynamically allocated/freed by the runtime
DOMINO on top of PARSEC

DOMINO JDF Representation (2D)

```c
1  CellUpdate(a, b)
2 /
3 /* Execution Space */
4  a = 0 .. ncx-1
5  b = 0 .. ncy-1
6 /* Task Locality (Owner Compute) */
7  : mcg(a, b)
8 /* Data dependencies */
9 RW X <= (a != aBeg) ? X CellUpdate(a-aInc, b) : X READ_X(b)
10  -> (a != aEnd) ? X CellUpdate(a+aInc, b)
11 RW Y <= (b != bBeg) ? Y CellUpdate(a, b-bInc) : Y READ_Y(a)
12  -> (b != bEnd) ? Y CellUpdate(a, b+bInc)
13 RW MCG <= mcg(a, b)
14  -> mcg(a, b)
15 BODY
16  {
17    solve ( MCG, X, Y, ... );
18  }
19 END

▶ aBeg, aEnd, aInc, bBeg, bEnd and bInc are octant dependent variables.
```
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Results
Scalability of the existing implementation with Intel TBB
32-core Nehalem node with two 4-way SIMD units running at 2.26 Ghz

- 2 energy groups calculation;
- S8 Level Symmetric quadrature (80 angular directions);
- spatial mesh: $120 \times 120 \times 120$ and $480 \times 480 \times 480$. 

![Graph showing scalability results]
DOMINO on top of PaRSEC

Shared Memory Results: Comparison with Intel TBB

- 1 energy group;
- mesh size: $480 \times 480 \times 480$;
- Level Symmetric S2;
- 7.9 Gflops (4.6%)
DOMINO on top of PaRSEC
Shared Memory Results: Comparison with Intel TBB

- 1 energy group;
- mesh size: $480 \times 480 \times 480$;
- *Level Symmetric* S8;
- 57.2 Gflops (33.5%)
DOMINO on top of PaRSEC

Shared Memory Results: Comparison with Intel TBB

- 1 energy group;
- mesh size: $480 \times 480 \times 480$;
- *Level Symmetric* S16;
- 92.6 Gflops (54.2%)
DOMINO on top of PaRSEC
Shared Memory Results: Comparison with Intel TBB

Test on manumanu NUMA node: 160 cores.
DOMINO on top of PaRSEC

Distributed Memory Results (Ivanoe)

- 1 energy group; mesh size: $480 \times 480 \times 480$; *Level Symmetric S16*;
DOMINO on top of PaRSEC
Distributed Memory Results (Athos)

- 1 energy group; mesh size: $480 \times 480 \times 480$; Level Symmetric S16;
DOMINO on top of PaRSEC
Distributed Memory Results (Athos)

- 1 energy group; mesh size: $120 \times 120 \times 120$; *Level Symmetric S16*;
DOMINO on top of PaRSEC

Distributed Memory Results

Execution trace for a run on 8 nodes (2, 2, 2) (Bad scheduling).
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Distributed Memory Results

Execution trace for a run on 8 nodes (2, 2, 2) (Good scheduling).
DOMINO on top of PaRSEC
Scheduling by front
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Conclusion and future works
Conclusion and Future Work

Conclusion

- Efficient implementation on top of PaRSEC
  - Less than 2 weeks to be implemented
  - Comparable to Intel TBB in shared memory
- Multi-level implementation:
  - Code vectorization (angular direction)
  - Block algorithm (MacroCells)
  - Hybrid MPI-Thread implementation

Future work

- Finish the hybrid model to get better evaluation of the performance
- Experiments on Intel Xeon Phi
Thanks !