# OPENQCD ON GPU

**Antonio Rago** Quantum Theory Center, University of Southern Denmark





work done in collaboration with **Stefan Schaefer**







### Why openQCD?



**[JHEP0712:011,2007] Domain Decomposition in HMC (2003-2004) Deflated DD HMC in 2007**



- Module Development:
	- Create a comprehensive set of C++/CUDA modules mapping the CPU (relevant) functions to GPU. Ensure these modules accurately reproduce the functionality of openQCD on the GPU.
- Data Structure Translation:
	- Maintain consistent and coherent translation between GPU and CPU data structures. Ensure seamless data flow and compatibility (of fields).
- Function Naming Conventions:
	- Adopt a clear and consistent naming convention. Example: dfl\_subspace in CPU becomes dfl\_subspace\_gpu in GPU.
- GPU only:
	- Implement all the computational part of inversion cycle on the GPU. Future Goals: Extend this to include HMC and SMD processes.

## Develop C++/CUDA modules to replicate openQCD functions on the GPU





- Redesigned Data Structures: Allow full memory coalesced access in GPU data structures and memory access.
- Code Readability:

Prioritised code readability and usability. Avoided optimising non-critical routines (e.g., not all data structures have full memory coalescence).

- CUDA Grid Mapping: Mapped CUDA grid of blocks to geometrical blocks for efficient computation.
	- Block Reductions: Implemented block reductions using CUB library for optimised performance.
- Database Duplication: Duplicated the openQCD database for GPU use. field status is propagated between CPU and GPU databases.
- Quadruple Precision Reduction: Implemented quadruple precision reduction to ensure computational accuracy.
- Random Number Generation: Integrated directly on the GPU robust random number generation for simulations.
- Validation:
	- Guaranteed at field level for each openQCD test

### A pragmatic approach



![](_page_4_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Picture_62.jpeg)

Legend:

 $X = Self$ X = SetT<br>SYS = Connection traversing PCIe as well as the SMP interconnect between NUMA nodes (e.g., QPI/UPI)<br>NODE = Connection traversing PCIe as well as the interconnect between PCIe Host Bridges within a NUMA node<br>PHB =

NIC Legend:

NIC0: mlx5\_0  $NIC1: mlx5_1$ NIC2:  $mlx5_2$ NIC3:  $mlx5_3$ 

### The test ground

#### **Hardware Configuration of the JUWELS Booster Module**

#### • 936 compute nodes

- 2x AMD EPYC Rome 7402 CPU, 2x 24 cores, 2.8 GHz
- Simultaneous Multithreading
- 512 GB DDR4, 3200 MHz
- 4x NVIDIA A100 GPU, 40 GB HBM2e
- 4x InfiniBand HDR (Connect-X6)
- o Diskless

![](_page_5_Figure_15.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Picture_16.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Figure_1.jpeg)

### A first test: weak scaling  $D_W$  for a local 24<sup>4</sup>

- No un-coalesced access
- EO memory arrangement for every field
- We opted for a index computation "in flight", no lookup tables. Block sizes defined a compile time
- Can achieve 1Tflops per A100 card

![](_page_6_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_1.jpeg)

### A first test: weak scaling  $D_W$  for a local 24<sup>4</sup>

- Centralised the MPI communications and support locking and non locking strategy at compile time.
- MPI is often erratic: non-locking comms over p-threads
- Topology awareness guarantees a sensible speedup thanks to NVlink

![](_page_7_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_64.jpeg)

## A first test: weak scaling  $D_W$  for a local 24<sup>4</sup>

![](_page_8_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_4.jpeg)

## A first test: weak scaling  $D_W$  for a local  $48 \times 24^3$

![](_page_9_Picture_57.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_3.jpeg)

- SAP and Deflation are two inverters that take advantage of locality and mode coherence.
- Our strategy has been to focus on an efficient porting of the two routines.
	- block geometry allowing seamless use of different block sizes
	- Shared memory within the sap blocks
	- Block reduction through cubs thanks to the binding of the block indices to the CUDA grid

![](_page_10_Figure_6.jpeg)

- ✓ SAP seems to be a pretty well tuned routine, with small communication overhead.
- ✓ On the lightest point the computational cost is equally shared between the SAP and the little-GCR.
- Kernel fusion could improve the little-GCR but the overall performance is not going to change drastically.

![](_page_11_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_96.jpeg)

#### 64 Juwels booster nodes

- git & Continuous integration
- Code coverage

![](_page_12_Picture_19.jpeg)

### Modern coding standards

![](_page_12_Picture_20.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_5.jpeg)

Already implemented:

- Open Boundary Conditions
- **Exponential Csw**
- Independent/automatic single kernel tuning
- **D** Second stage hmc/smd (although gauge and c<sub>sw</sub> forces gauge already implemented)
- ✓ SAP / DFL / GCR
- ✓ Only PBC (Periodic Boundary Conditions):
- ✓ Random Number Generator
- ✓ Quadruple Precision in Reductions
- ✓ AMD/HIP porting works and passes initial checks.

#### What is missing

### Project status

![](_page_13_Picture_14.jpeg)

Testing and Release Strategy:

- Conduct initial testing phase with a selected group of colleagues and collaborators
- Identify and fix any preliminary bugs
- Gather feedback on usability and performances
- Ensure stability and reliability before broader release

Second Stage: Public release

- Release the code to the public with an appropriate license upon initial publication
- Provide detailed documentation and user guides
- Include comprehensive results from testing and performance evaluations

### Future plans and code release

![](_page_14_Picture_16.jpeg)