





High Performance Molecular Dynamics

Parallelism and Parallel algorithms

Andrew Emerson (a.emerson@cinca.it)




Agenda




1. Molecular Dynamics milestones
2. Anatomy of a serial Molecular Dynamics program
3. Concepts of Parallelism
4. Parallel algorithms and scaling limits


Molecular Dynamics milestones





- **1959: First MD simulation (Alder and Wainwright)**
 - Hard spheres at constant velocity. 500 particles on IBM-704. Simulation time >2 weeks
- **1964: First MD of a continuous potential (A. Rahman)**
 - Lennard-Jones spheres (Argon), 864 particles on a CDC3600. 50,000 timesteps > 3 weeks
- **1977: First large biomolecule (McCammon, Gelin and Karplus).**
 - Bovine Pancreatic Trypsine inhibitor. 500 atoms, 9.2ps
- **1998: First μ s simulation (Duan and Kollman)**
 - villin headpiece subdomain HP-36. Simulation time on Cray T3D/T3E ~ several months
- **2006. MD simulation of the complete satellite tobacco mosaic virus (STMV)**
 - 1 million atoms, 50ns using NAMD on 46 AMD and 128 Altix nodes
- **2006: Longest run. Folding@home (computers supplied by general public!)**
 - 500 μ s of Villin Headpiece protein (34 residues).




folding@home
equivalent to peak ~40
Pflops (Wikipedia)



Biomolecular MD Simulation – system sizes




early 1990s. Lysozyme, 40k atoms




2006. Satellite tobacco mosaic virus (STMV). 1M atoms, 50ns


2008. Ribosome. 3.2M atoms, 230ns.



2011. Chromatophore, 100M atoms (SC 2011)




Anatomy of a program



1. Read in parameters to control the simulation (e.g. run time, temperature, etc).
2. Generate or read in atomic coordinates and connectivity information. If starting from a previous run read in velocities, forces and other system data.
3. Start Main loop at time t .
 1. Compute forces between interacting atoms.
 2. Integrate forces to obtain velocities and positions at new time step $t+\Delta t$.
 3. Calculate thermodynamic properties (e.g. Temp, Pressure, etc).
 4. At intervals store configuration for trajectory and restart information.
 5. If $t <$ required time loop back to step 1.
4. Output final configuration, thermodynamic and perhaps timing data.

Simple Molecular Dynamics program for neutral atoms



```

call init
T=0
do while (T.lt.Tmax)
  call compute_forces()
  call integrate_motion()
  call save_crds()
  call sample_averages()
  T = T + DT
enddo
call save_state()
stop
end

```

```

subroutine compute_energy_forces

```

```


  Utot=0.0
  do i=1,N-1
    F(i) = 0.0
    do j=i+1,N
      rij=r(i)-r(j)
      Utot=Utot+Uij
      F(i)=F(i)+force(i,j)
    enddo
  enddo

```


```

subroutine integrate_motion
do i=1,N
  r(i)=r(i)+verlet(F(i))
  v(i)=v(i)+verlet(F(i))
enddo


```



$$U(r) = 4\epsilon_o \left(\left(\frac{\sigma_o}{r} \right)^{12} - \left(\frac{\sigma_o}{r} \right)^6 \right)$$



High Performance Molecular Dynamics



In a (serial) molecular dynamics program often 70-90% of the CPU time is spent in the calculation of the non-bonded energies and forces -> this is the first place to look when optimising or parallelising a program.


There are usually two types of long range non-bonded interactions:

1. Dispersion-type particle-particle interactions
2. Electrostatic interactions.

The dispersion interactions are normally solved with Lennard Jones (LJ) type potentials which can be truncated at short inter-particle separations.


Electrostatic interactions are commonly solved with the Particle Mesh Ewald (PME) Method or similar. (electrostatic cutoffs are too approximate)

GROMACS timings





Computing:	M-Number	M-Flops	% Flops
LJ	66460.022385	2193180.739	2.8
Coul (T)	67295.126727	2826395.323	3.6
Coul (T) [W3]	1361.881485	170235.186	0.2
Coul (T) + LJ	113027.749257	6216526.209	7.9
Coul (T) + LJ [W3]	21305.487096	2940157.219	3.7
Coul (T) + LJ [W3-W3]	67057.921884	25616126.160	32.5
Outer nonbonded loop	16258.069653	162580.697	0.2
1,4 nonbonded interactions	1814.923008	163343.071	0.2
Calc Weights	11664.933552	419937.608	0.5
Spread Q Bspline	248851.915776	497703.832	0.6
Gather F Bspline	248851.915776	1493111.495	1.9
3D-FFT	4145210.365398	33161682.923	42.1
Solve PME	819.609600	52455.014	0.1
NS-Pairs	72105.130813	1514207.747	1.9
Reset In Box	264.244768	792.734	0.0
CG-CoM	650.966640	1952.900	0.0
Angles	1587.865536	266761.410	0.3
Probers	397.158480	90949.292	0.1
Improbers	88.972464	18506.273	0.0
.....			

Optimising a serial program




- To increase the performance of the program the number of interactions $O(N^2)$ to be calculated needs to be reduced.
- Common strategies include:
 - Potential cutoffs + Neighbour lists
 - United atoms (e.g. CH_4) or coarse grain approaches (e.g. Martini) to reduce the number of interacting sites
 - Holonomic constraints (e.g. SHAKE)
 - Multiple time steps (e.g. electrostatic time step in NAMD)
 - Implicit solvents as opposed to explicit solvents (but not recommended).

cut-off and neighbour list





martini model




united atoms

implicit and explicit solvents




holonomic constraints (e.g. SHAKE) $\Delta t=1fs \rightarrow \Delta t=2fs$

Electrostatic Interactions



For complex molecules electrostatic interactions are usually calculated by assigning each atom a partial charge:




The partial charges are defined by the force-field, usually via QM calculations.

The interaction energy between two isolated charges is known (Coulomb):

$$V_{ij} = \frac{q_i q_j}{4\pi\epsilon_0 r_{ij}}$$

Problem: This is a long range interaction, varying with $\sim 1/r$. (c.f LJ, $\sim 1/r^6$) and so decays to zero slowly. The box cannot be made large enough without making the simulation impracticable. Electrostatic cutoffs on the other hand can give rise to artefacts.


Electrostatic Interactions –Ewald Sum (1921)



Solution for periodic systems first suggested by Ewald and others from their work on ionic crystals. Start with the interaction of a particle with all the other particles, including their images:


$$V = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{n}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{q_i q_j}{|\mathbf{r}_{ij} + \mathbf{n}|}$$

$$\mathbf{n} = (n_x L, n_y L, n_z L)$$



For large n the cell distribution is spherical

Electrostatic interactions – Ewald Sum




This pairwise summation converges slowly, but by assuming gaussian charge distributions around each charge it can be converted into faster converging real space (short range) and reciprocal space (long range) sums:

$$V = \text{real space sum} + \text{reciprocal space sum} + \text{constant corrections}$$

The real space term (which contains $erfc(x)$) can be calculated quite easily with standard libraries and usually a cutoff is applied (e.g. 9 Å).


Particle Mesh Ewald




The second term converges quickly in reciprocal space but is computationally expensive:

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \neq 0} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{4\pi^2 q_i q_j}{L^3 k^2} \exp\left(-\frac{k^2}{4\alpha^2}\right) \cos(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij})$$

This is an N^2 problem but by replacing the point charges by a grid-based charge distribution one can use discrete **FFT (Fast Fourier Transform)** which scales as $N \ln N$ (e.g. Particle Mesh Ewald).



Parallelising a serial program



Do we need to parallelise MD ?

Galileo

gromacs 4.6.7 1 node (16 cores)


	Core t (s)	Wall t (s)
(%)		
Time:	8060.990	504.626
1597.4		
	(ns/day)	(hour/ns)
Performance:	3.425	7.008
Finished mdrun on node 0 Fri Nov 6 15:26:07 2015		

PC:

	(ns/day)	(hour/ns)
Performance:	0.075	319.699


Even using just one node of a cluster we can get speedups of 10X, 100X or more.

Concepts and practice of Parallelism




- Even if you do not intend to write a parallel program, just use one already present, it is important to understand some of the concepts and techniques used in the preparation and execution of a parallel project.
- Hardware is moving quite quickly so it is a challenge to understand everything but useful topics include:
 - MPI and message passing
 - OpenMP and threads
 - Accelerators such as GPUs and Xeon PHIs
 - Measuring performance


Message Passing Interface (MPI)




- MPI is a standard which implements parallelism via *message passing*, i.e. providing a mechanism for communication between parallel tasks.
- Usually SPMD (**S**ingle **P**rogram **M**ultiple **D**ata) model where multiple instances of the same program are launched. When necessary they communicate by MPI calls.
- Each instance is called a *task* and is identified by its *rank* (starting from 0). Normally all the tasks are created at the beginning of the parallel execution.




MPI Communications



- MPI communications can be of various types:
 1. One-way communications.
 2. Point-to-point between two tasks.
 3. Collective calls between groups of tasks or even all of them.
- They can also be synchronous or asynchronous.
- Collective calls can be expensive, particularly when many tasks are involved.
- An efficient MPI program will minimise the time spent in communications as much as possible often by overlapping communications with calculations (*non-blocking communications*).



Using MPI




- MPI is implemented as a library which is used during compilation/linking and often also at execution.
- Different implementations may exist on a particular computer system (e.g. Intel MPI, OpenMPI, etc).
- Usually used within a launcher (e.g. mpirun, mpiexec, runjob, etc) which launches the required number of tasks.


```
module load intelmpi          # Intel MPI
mpirun -np 64 ./myprog.exe
```

- Advantages:
 - Only standard model which allows cores over multiple nodes in a cluster to be used in a parallel program.
 - Highly optimised for current architectures
- Disadvantages:
 - Complex programming model and may require high memory (program instances + buffers)


OpenMP and threads



- The OpenMP standard implements parallel programming via *threads*.
- Threads are light-weight processes, requiring fewer resources than MPI tasks. Usually created and destroyed in a fork-join process.
- Often used for “work sharing” within loops but can be used to generate tasks.
- They communicate by reading and writing program variables in shared memory.
- Advantages:
 - Less memory and *may be* faster than MPI within a shared memory node. Simpler programming model than MPI.
- Disadvantages:
 - Cannot be used between separate nodes




Using OpenMP




```

gfortran -fopenmp
myprog.c -o myprog
export OMP_NUM_THREADS=8
./myprog.exe
  
```

- But since openmp cannot be used between nodes common to use both – so called hybrid MPI/OpenMP programs (e.g. Gromacs)
- Typically use OpenMP thread within a node but MPI between nodes. Useful for minimising the number of MPI tasks. (see later)





Strong and weak scaling and parallel efficiency



- For any parallel program important to measure the performance as a function of the parallel resources used (e.g. MPI tasks, threads, physical cores, etc).
- For MD usual to measure performance in terms of ns/day and this value is reported by most MD programs. Since computer grants are based on use of physical resources (e.g. cores) makes sense to plot performance against processor cores.
- This is called *strong* scaling and by comparison with the *ideal* case indicates how well parallelised your set up is. This can be emphasised by plotting the *speedup* with respect to the smallest number of cores used (e.g. 1 core).


Strong scaling examples




Speedup R

$$R = \frac{P_N}{P_1}$$


where P =
performance (e.g.
ps/day)



Strong scaling and parallel efficiency




- Computer scientists often prefer a metric called *the parallel efficiency*.
- Less interesting for MD researchers but worth quoting for grant applications (where the reviewers may be non MD users).
- Important to do strong scaling curves before embarking on production.




$$S = 100 \times \frac{P_N}{N \times P_1}$$

Weak scaling




- This is formally as defined as “*how the solution time varies with the number of processors for a fixed problem size per processor.*”
- But usually used to know how the performance varies on increasing the input or problem size. Should be a **horizontal line** for perfect weak scaling.
- For MD this indicates how the performance varies with system size, i.e. number of atoms.
- Not often used in MD since researchers use one or only a few systems, probably with similar numbers of atoms.


Gromacs Strong Scaling on SP6



Gromacs weak scaling




Other parallel concepts



- **SIMD (Single Instruction Multiple Data) Vectorisation**
 - Special hardware in the CPU (SIMD or Vector Unit) for optimising loops. For Intel known as SSE, AVX, etc (depending on processor version)
 - Most users do not need to know about this unless compiling or writing their own code.
- **Load balancing**
 - If parallel tasks in the program finish their calculations more or less at the same time, there is good “load balancing”. If some processes have to wait for other processes then clearly the program will take longer.
- **Parallel I/O**
 - Often one task (e.g. rank 0) is given the job of reading and writing files since having many tasks accessing the same file is not safe. This task then sends the data to the other tasks.
 - For very large files and many processes may be more efficient to allow multiple access. Normally achieved by MPI-IO or specialist formats (HDF5).
 - In MD not normally used except for very large simulations (millions of atoms), e.g. in NAMD 2.10 or DL_POLY4.

Why do parallel programs stop scaling?



Regardless of algorithm, as the number of parallel tasks increase the relative time spent doing communications also increases, thus reducing the time for calculations.

Very roughly, when


$$\text{Time (communications)} > \text{Time (calculations)}$$

increasing the number of processors will not lead to an increase in performance (in fact it may start decreasing).

Of particular importance are global or *collective communications* involving groups or even all the parallel tasks and programmers tend to minimise their use.


Other factors affecting scaling may include increased I/O or memory usage.

Parallelising Molecular Dynamics




- Now we have the tools how can we parallelise an MD program?
- Need an algorithm to accelerate the most timing consuming parts of the serial program, i.e the non-bonded long ranges forces calculation.
 - Dispersion forces
 - electrostatic forces with PME
- But must minimise communications between tasks.


Atom (particle) decomposition




- One of the first algorithms implemented for parallel MD. Sometimes also called “Replicated Data” since each processor requires a copy of the entire system.
- Nowadays rarely used because of the high memory and global communications required.
- The particle decomposition option of Gromacs was removed in the latest release.



Force decomposition




- Improvement on particle decomposition, inspired by the parallel algorithms for matrices.
- Reduced memory and communication overheads but still relatively expensive at high core counts.



F_{ij} force matrix

Spatial (or domain) decomposition algorithm






Here each processor is assigned to a spatial region of the simulation box (with side $r_d > 2 * r_c$) such that it stores only a portion of the whole system. This has two components:

- The atoms which lie in that region and the forces between them.
- Atom positions and forces from neighbouring regions owned by other processors.



In order to minimise the surface with respect to the volume, and hence the communications, it is important to use regions that are as cubic as possible. In any case the communications are reduced since it is not necessary to update the whole system in local memory.

Domain decomposition




Must choose domain sides to be greater than 2xcutoff


Domain Decomposition



Simple Domain Decomposition - algorithm




1. Read in atomic coordinates (and velocities)
2. Assign atoms to domains (processors) according to x,y,z position.
3. For each domain (processor):
 1. identify interacting atoms in neighbouring domains and copy coords.
 2. calculate forces.
 3. copy partial forces of neighbour atoms back to their home domains
 4. with the forces calculate new velocities and positions.
4. Calculate thermodynamic averages (T, P,E, etc)
5. Loop back to 2 if not finished.



MPI has many commands for transferring data efficiently in a cartesian topology (such as a simulation box.)

Domain decomposition




Advantages

- Exploits *locality* of atomic interactions, minimizing communications (no All-to-All) and memory required per processor
- scalable, for large systems.
- can exploit MPI cartesian topology

Disadvantages

- needs large system, otherwise domain size too small. As no. of processors increases eventually stops scaling
- for inhomogeneous systems (liquid+vapour) load balancing problems as some procs have too few atoms.



Problem with domain decomposition occurs when density of particles is uneven or fluctuates.

Can be mitigated by “zonal” (or “neutral territory”) methods, where forces between particles i and j are not necessarily calculated on a processor where either of particles i or j resides.

GROMACS uses a zonal method called the “eighth-shell” method, with reduced communication wrt standard dd. Other methods incl “midpoint” (Desmond).

Like NAMD, Gromacs 4.x now has **Dynamic Load Balancing** which adjusts dynamically particle-processor assignment.

J. Chem. Theory Comput. C





Figure 1. A nonstaggered domain decomposition grid of $3 \times 2 \times 2$ cells. Coordinates in zones 1 to 7 are communicated to the corner cell that has its home particles in zone 0. r_c is the cutoff radius.


Hess et al., *J. Chem, Theory Comput. C*, 2007

Parallelisation of Electrostatics with Domain Decomposition and PME




PME can be parallelised with a DD scheme but 3D FFT is very inefficient for many processors (or small N) because of all-to-all global communications (e.g MPI_AlltoAll).

GROMACS and NAMD use instead a 2D decomposition of thin columns or “pencils”



In this way the first 1D part of the 3D can be done within a single processor (e.g. along z) to avoid extra communication

Does Domain Decomposition Work?




Compare

- GROMACS v 3.x and earlier with force-decomposition schemes
- GROMACS v 4.x with domain decomposition
- NAMD with domain decomposition

***Disclaimer:** There are many other differences between programs which could affect performance but parallel scaling is a good indicator of the parallelization scheme.*

Does Domain Decomposition Work?




Compare


- GROMACS v 3.x and earlier with force-decomposition schemes
- GROMACS v 4.x with domain decomposition
- NAMD with domain decomposition

Disclaimer: *There are many other differences between programs which could affect performance but parallel scaling is a good indicator of the parallelization scheme.*


Does domain decomposition work?



NAMD/Gromacs speedup




Comparison of DL_POLY(Classic) and DL_POLY 4.x




Simulation of 280K atoms of liquid argon with DL_POLY (Classic) and DL_POLY 4.03

gromacs BLG



Why do MD (programs stop scaling ?




For most parallel programs the scaling levels out when the time of communications > time needed for calculations.

For modern molecular dynamics programs this can happen when the system is too small (i.e. number of atoms too low) compared to the number of cores:


1. Limits of domain decomposition –with few particles/proc the domain size becomes too small.
2. The parallel PME calculation contains all-to-all communications (in the 3D FFT) and this cost varies as N^2 .

As a rule-of-thumb many MD simulations reach a scaling limit when there are ca. 100-200 atoms/core.

Why do MD programs stop scaling?



GROMACS BG/P scaling for SPC water (0.5M molecules)



At the scaling limit communication time presumably > calculations, but which algorithm features cause this?


Candidate features:

1. Non-bonded dispersion with DD or
2. PME for electrostatics.


For this benchmark we had to duplicate the std GROMACS benchmark d.kv12 ion channel 16 times !



GROMACS BG/P scaling for d.kv12 membrane (1.8M atoms)



Implicit and Explicit solvents



The influence of PME on parallel scaling can be tested by using implicit solvent models which model the solvent as a continuous medium instead of interacting particles, but for many biological environments (interiors of proteins or membranes) it is considered too approximate.




Figure 1. Parallel scaling of AMBER on Blue Gene. The experiment is with an implicit solvent (GB) model of 120,000 atoms (Aon benchmark).






Figure 2. Parallel scaling of AMBER on Blue Gene. The experiment is with an explicit solvent (PME) model of 290,000 atoms (Rubisco).

Life Sciences Molecular Dynamics Applications on the IBM System Blue Gene Solution: Performance Overview, http://www-03.ibm.com/systems/resources/systems_deepcomputing_pdf_lsmdabg.pdf


Implicit and Explicit solvents



Comparison of performance of implicit and explicit solvents
BLG with NAMD 2.10




NAMD 2.10
Beta-lactoglobulin
in explicit and
implicit solvents



$$G_s = \frac{1}{8\pi} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_0} - \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) \sum_{i,j}^N \frac{q_i q_j}{f_{GB}} \quad \text{Generalized Born Equation}$$

Why is parallel scaling important ?




The Bluegene and other multi-thousand core architectures represent a challenge for projects based on molecular dynamics since often a minimum scaling is required.

Computer System	Minimum Parallel Scaling	Max memory/core (Gb)
Curie	Fat Nodes 128	4
	Thin Nodes 512	4
	Hybrid 32	3
Fermi	2048 (but typically ≥ 4096)	1
SuperMUC	512 (typically ≥ 2048)	*
Hornet	2048	*
Mare Nostrum	1024	2Gb

PRACE Tier-0 parallel scaling requirements in 2013


How can I increase the parallel scaling ?



It is generally accepted that the PME method has the most influence on parallel scaling due to the global communications in the FFT but even without PME the simulations reach a performance limit. How can we mitigate this ?

1. Reduce the communications in the PME calculations. (e.g. `-npme` option of GROMACS)
2. Try exploiting threads with hybrid MPI/OpenMP .
 - OpenMP allows a finer-grain parallelism. With fewer MPI processes we can have larger domain sizes.
3. Increase the system size.
 - But not always possible if your problem size is “fixed” (i.e. because you are studying a particular molecule)
4. Design a project which uses multiple replicas of the same system.
 - Examples include replica exchange (REMD), metadynamics, ensemble simulations,..

Each system is different so important to benchmark your simulations to find the best results.



Reducing the PME cost - GROMACS

Particle-Particle (PP) and PME interactions can be decoupled so could be beneficial to assign separate nodes to PME part to reduce the communications for FFT.


GROMACS 4.x allows separate nodes to be assigned to PME calculations:

```
mpirun mdrun -npme 4 md.conf
```

Rule of thumb is PP:PME = 3:1 but **g_pme** utility allows this to be tested.


Also possible to change how the PME and PP nodes are partitioned with the **-ddorder** option of **mdrun**.

Hybrid MPI/OpenMP - Gromacs




- GROMACS v 4.6 and upwards can use OpenMP parallelization for the PME.
- OpenMP threads use less memory than MPI tasks, and by replacing MPI tasks, reduce communications.
- For Gromacs ensure that **no. of threads x no. mpi tasks = no. of physical cores**
- Because of the overheads likely to give improvements only at high core counts or with slow networks.




Gromacs (5.0.4)+plumed (1M atoms)



In this example
 OpenMP particularly
 effective at high core
 counts.
 But even here, scaling
 eventually drops.




Small, but significant improvements obtained with threaded version of NAMD 2.9



bg_size=128, ranks/node=4 (512 tasks)

<http://www.hpc.cineca.it/content/namd-benchmark>


Replica Exchange Molecular Dynamics




Replica Exchange Molecular Dynamics

- Used to prevent simulation from getting “stuck” in local minima.
- Run multiple simulations (“replicas”) at different temperatures or with varying potential parameters.
- At regular intervals the n replicas exchange coordinates and then re-continue their trajectories.
- For a BG with N cores the individual replicas need only scale up to N/n cores for efficient performance.


Other examples include metadynamics with multiple walkers, various free energy algorithms, etc..





Molecular Dynamics and accelerators



- If we cannot increase the parallelism, how can we increase performance assuming Moore's law no longer valid?
- Most of the common MD applications have GPU/CUDA-enabled versions which accelerate the calculations by off-loading the expensive, non-bonded calculations to the GPU.
- Particular effort with Amber with GPU-enabled port giving large speedups (tens of times in some cases) compared to non-accelerated codes.
- But reasonable speed-ups of 2-3x also for NAMD, GROMACS, etc.
- Sometimes maximum performance not affected significantly – main advantage is to obtain the same performance but using fewer nodes.






Molecular Dynamics and Acceleration - GROMACS




Gromacs offloads non-bonded (non PME) calculation to GPU while the main CPU does PME and bonded force calculations.
NAMD uses a similar strategy (I think)

"Accelerated" Molecular Dynamics - results



NAMD APOA1




GROMACS 4.6 DPPC




It is argued that poorly optimised un-accelerated codes give best speed-ups.

Intel Xeon PHI overview




- Intel product line based on Intel's Many Integrated Core (MIC) technology where many low, power cores (>50) are packed on a single chip.
- Currently available device (Knight's Corner or KNC) can be seen as a co-processor, in direct competition to NVIDIA GPU for HPC.
 - connection to host CPU via PCI-eXpress link.
- But unlike GPU technology is not too dissimilar from host CPU → not essential to rewrite code, in principle just re-compile (with Intel compilers). Should lead to shorter development path in most cases.
- Doesn't mean though that code does need not porting – to obtain peak performance some optimisation is needed.




Most powerful supercomputer in TOP500 (Tianhe-2) uses 48000 Xeon PHI cards.

Xeon Phi architecture (KNC)




Intel® Xeon Phi™ Coprocessor Block Diagram



- 22nm technology
- Up to 61 cores (Pentium-like), ~1.1 Ghz (dep. model)
- 352 Gb/s memory bandwidth (*fast*).
- Upto 244 threads (i.e. 4 threads/core)
- 512 bit SIMD (vector) unit
- 8-16 Gb on board memory,
- ~ 1Tflop peak performance


Includes also sensors for monitoring temperature and power consumption.

Xeon PHI software models




Three software models are supported:

1. Co-processor only (native mode): MPI ranks are solely on the Xeon PHI. App can be launched from host or co-processor.
2. Symmetric model: MPI ranks on both host and co-processor.
3. Off-load model: MPI ranks only on host which offload work (e.g. by OpenCL or OpenMP) onto co-processor.



Current MPI performance on Xeon Phi is very low so offload model + OpenMP normally recommended


Classical Molecular Dynamics and Intel Xeon PHI




- Development some way behind GPU-CUDA versions of classical MD programs (which started about 4 years ago).
- But given that there is no need to rewrite in new languages (e.g. CUDA) development path should be shorter.
- Most current Xeon PHI versions seem to be based on the off-load model to exploit CUDA developments, although AMBER also supports native-mode. No offload mode for GROMACS (so far).
- Off-loaded calculations invariably involve non-bonded dispersion interactions may also include PME, energy calculation etc.
- Intel maintains a list of “recipes” for building Xeon PHI applications (not just MD):


<https://software.intel.com/en-us/articles/namd-for-intel-xeon-phi-coprocessor>

Molecular Dynamics and Xeon PHI acceleration - Amber




Double domain decomposition strategy for offload






- For small systems a speed-up of 2-3x is possible with Intel Xeon PHIs but the speed-up isn't maintained.
- Although some tuning may be possible, large systems needed to make full use of accelerators.

**NAMD 2.10 APOA1 Benchmark
Galileo**




**NAMD 2.10 Xeon PHI performance
(Galileo)**




◆ 143K ● 143K MIC ▲ 450K ✕ 450K MIC

**NAMD 2.10 Xeon PHI Speedup
(Galileo)**



◆ 143K ■ 450K





- There are many features which affect performance but project proposals for computer time are judged mainly on the parallel scaling.
- All modern MD programs use **domain decomposition** for parallelisation.
- Parallel scaling strongly influenced by system size due to:
 1. limits of domain decomposition for non-bonded interactions
 2. all-to-all communication in FFT for electrostatics

The FFT is the more serious limitation.

- Many “normal” systems do not scale up to thousands of cores. One workaround is to use “ensemble methods” (e.g. replica exchange, metadynamics or free energy calculations).
- Most MD codes offer GPU-versions which can get good performance for fewer resources, but do not increase by orders of magnitude the maximum performances. Xeon PHI code versions starting to appear but still at an early stage.
- Memory and I/O not normally problems but become important for very large systems (e.g. >1M atoms)
- No obvious candidate for beating the scalability barrier. Some interest in the use of Fast Multipole Methods for long-range forces but still very much in the research phase.