Improvement of algorithms for dynamical overlap fermions

Hideo Matsufuru for JLQCD Collaboration (with H.Fukaya, S.Hashimoto, K.Kanaya, T.Kaneko, M.Okamoto, K.Ogawa, T.Onogi, and N.Yamada)

> Lattice 2006 23–28 July 2006, Tucson, USA

Project

Dynamical simulation with overlap fermions

- New project of JLQCD Collaboration
- Main run: $16^3 \times 32$, $a \simeq 0.12$ fm (larger size is planned)
- lightest quark mass $\simeq m_s/6$
- $N_f = 2 \rightarrow$ extended to $N_f = 2 + 1$
- Fixed topology by extra Wilson fermion
 - need to examine the effect of fixing topology

Other talks at Lattice 2006

- T.Kaneko, overview of project
- S.Hashimoto, extra-Wilson fermion to fix topology
- N.Yamada, locality and choice of gauge action
- H.Fukaya, ϵ regime
- M.Okamoto, spectrum and chiral log (canceled)

New machines at KEK

Working since March 2006 Hitachi SR11000

- 2.15TFlops, 512MB memory
- 16 Power5+ \otimes 16 nodes

IBM System Blue Gene Solution

- 57.3TFlops, 5TB memory
- 1024 nodes ⊗10 racks
- $8 \times 8 \times 8$ torus network
- 2 PowerPC440 shares 4MB cache

Wilson kernel for BG:

Tuned by IBM Japan (J.Doi and H.Samukawa)

- double FPU instructions for complex arithmetics
- low level communication API

Wilson solver: \sim 24% of peak performance (on cache)





Action

 $S = S_G + S_F + S_E$

- Gauge field S_G : Iwasaki (renormalization group improved)
- Overlap fermion ($N_f = 2$): $S_F = \phi^{\dagger} [D(m)^{\dagger} D(m)]^{-1} \phi$ overlap Dirac operator

$$D(m) = \left(M_0 + \frac{m}{2}\right) + \left(M_0 - \frac{m}{2}\right)\gamma_5 \operatorname{sign}(H_W)$$

 $H_W = \gamma_5 D_W$, D_W is Wilson-Dirac operator with $-M_0$

• Extra Wilson fermion:

$$\det\left(\frac{H_W^2}{H_W^2 + \mu^2}\right) = \int \mathcal{D}\chi^{\dagger} \mathcal{D}\chi \exp[-S_E]$$

— suppresses near-zero modes of H_W

Vranas (2000), Fukaya (2006) \rightarrow S.Hashimoto's talk for details

HMC algorithm

Building blocks of accelerating HMC:

• Hasenbusch preconditioning: $S_F = S_{PF1} + S_{PF2}$ *M.Hasenbusch, Phys. Lett. B* 519 (2001) 177.

> $S_{PF1} = \phi_1^{\dagger} [D(m')^{\dagger} D(m')]^{-1} \phi_1 \quad \text{(preconditioner)}$ $S_{PF2} = \phi_2^{\dagger} \{ D(m') [D(m)^{\dagger} D(m)]^{-1} D(m')^{\dagger} \} \phi_2$

- Multi-time step: $\Delta \tau_{(PF2)} > \Delta \tau_{(PF1)} > \Delta \tau_{(G)} = \Delta \tau_{(E)}$ J.C.Sexton and D.H.Weingarten, Nucl. Phys. B 380 (1992) 665.
- Overlap solver: 5D CG/relaxed CG
- Reflection/refraction at λ_{min} = 0
 Z.Fodor, S.D.Katz and K.K.Szabo, JHEP0408 (2004) 003. – Needs monitoring of λ_{min} and inverting D[†]D
 ⇒ skipped: λ_{min} = 0 is avoided by S_E

Noisy Metropolis

Most time consuming part: solvers in molecular dynamics Cost in MD is reduced by

- assuming no near-zero mode
- fixed λ_{thrs} , $N \simeq 10 \rightarrow$ adopting 5D solver
- no eigenvalue determination

Error in MD is corrected by Noisy Metropolis: *A.D.Kennedy and J.Kuti, Phys. Rev. Lett.* 54 (1985) 2473. After usual Metropolis, accept U_{new} with $P = \min\{1, e^{-dS}\}$,

 $dS = |W^{-1}[U_{new}]W[U_{old}]\xi|^2 - |\xi|^2$

where W = D(m)/D'(m), ξ Gaussian noise vector,

- D': relaxed overlap operator used in MD
- D: accurate overlap operator

Solver algorithm (1)

Overlap Dirac operator

$$D(m) = \left(M_0 + \frac{m}{2}\right) + \left(M_0 - \frac{m}{2}\right)\gamma_5 \operatorname{sign}(H_W)$$

Zolotarev's partial fractional approximation

J. van den Eshof et al., Comp. Phys. Comm. 146 (2002) 203.

$${\rm sign}(H_W) = \frac{H_W}{\sqrt{H_W^2}} = H_W \left(p_0 + \sum_{l=1}^N \frac{p_l}{H_W^2 + q_l} \right)$$

- $(H_W^2 + q_l)^{-1}$: determined by Multishift CG simultaneously
- For smaller λ_{min} , larger N is needed for accuracy e.g. for N=10, $O(10^{-7})$ accuracy for $\lambda_{min}=0.05$ and $O(10^{-5})$ for 0.01.
- Subtraction of low modes of H_W
 → sign(λ) (λ < λ_{thrs}) is explicitly determined

Solver algorithm (2)

Overlap solver algorithms

- Nested CG
- 5-dimensional CG
- □ Nested CG algorithm
 - Outer CG for overlap operator
 - Inner CG for $(H_W^2 + q_l)^{-1}$ (l = 1, ..., N): multishift CG *A.Frommer et al., Int. J. Mod. Phys. C 6 (1995) 627.*
 - Relaxed CG: *ϵ_{in}* is relaxed as outer iteration proceeds
 N.Cundy et al., Comp. Phys. Comm. 165 (2004) 221.
 - Subtraction of low-modes of H_W applicable. \rightarrow stable against $\lambda_{min} \sim 0$
 - Cost is almost unchanged as N

Solver algorithm (3)

\Box 5-dimensional CG solver

R.G.Edwards et al., PoS LAT2005 (2006) 146.

$$M_{5} = \begin{pmatrix} H & -\sqrt{q_{2}} & & & 0 \\ -\sqrt{q_{2}} & -H & & & \sqrt{p_{2}} \\ & & H & -\sqrt{q_{1}} & 0 \\ & & -\sqrt{q_{1}} & -H & \sqrt{p_{1}} \\ \hline 0 & \sqrt{p_{2}} & 0 & \sqrt{p_{1}} & R\gamma_{5} + p_{0}H \end{pmatrix} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array} \right)$$

Schur decomposition:

$$M_5 = \tilde{L}\tilde{D}\tilde{U} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ CA^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & S \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & A^{-1}B \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$S = D - CA^{-1}B = R\gamma_5 + p_0H + H\sum_i \frac{p_i}{H^2 + q_i}$$

Solver algorithm (4)

By solving

$$M_5 \left(\begin{array}{c} \phi \\ \psi_4 \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \chi_4 \end{array} \right),$$

 $\psi_4 = S^{-1}\chi_4$ is determined.

- Preconditioning: $M_5^{(0)} = M_5[U=0]$ easily inverted
- Even-odd preconditioning (best solution).
- Cost increases linearly in N
- Subtraction of low-modes of H_W is not applicable. \rightarrow difficulty at $\lambda_{min} \sim 0$

Solver algorithm (5)

Comparison:

($a\simeq 0.12 {
m fm}, m\simeq m_s/4$, single conf.: $\lambda_{min}\simeq$ 0.006)



- Relaxed CG is factor 2 faster than standard CG
- 5D solver is 2-3 times faster than relaxed CG for N = 20
- If $\lambda \simeq 0$ does not appear, 5D solver has advantage

Effect of extra Wilson term (1)

Low-lying modes in HMC run ($a \simeq 0.125$ fm, $m \simeq m_s$)



- Extra Wilson fermion works well
- $\lambda_{thrs} \simeq 0.01$ for D(m) is reasonable choice (error is corrected by noisy Metropolis)

Effect of extra Wilson term (2)

Evolution of λ_{min} in MD ($a \simeq 0.12$ fm, $m \simeq m_s$)



- Without S_E , reflection/refraction frequently occurs
- With S_E almost no near-zero mode

 → monitoring of λ can be switched off
 If it occurs, signaled by large ΔH and rejected in Metropolis

Multi-time step

Maximum values of forces/costs of forces ($a \simeq 0.12$ fm, $m \simeq m_s$)



- Inner-most: gauge + extra Wilson
- Cost of PF2(dynamical overlap) > PF1(preconditioner)
- Example: $\frac{\Delta \tau_{(PF2)}}{\Delta \tau_{(PF1)}} = 5 \quad \frac{\Delta \tau_{(PF1)}}{\Delta \tau_{(G,E)}} = 6$

Performance

Performance on Blue Gene (512-node) $a \sim 0.12$ fm, $\mu = 0.2$, trajectory length: $\tau = 0.5$

• Step-1: With 4D (relaxed CG) solver

m_{ud}	$N_{\tau(PF2)}$	$\frac{\Delta \tau_{(PF2)}}{\Delta \tau_{(PF1)}}$	$\frac{\Delta \tau_{(PF1)}}{\Delta \tau_{(G,E)}}$	$N_{PF1,2}$	P_{acc}	time[min]
0.015	9	4	5	10	0.87	112
0.025	8	4	5	10	0.90	94
0.035	6	5	6	10	0.74	63

Step-2: less precise 5D solver in MD + noisy Metropolis
 → factor ~3 accelerated (preliminary)

m_{ud}	$N_{\tau(PF2)}$	N_{PF1}	N_{PF2}	P_{acc}	time[min]
0.035	7	10	10	0.68	22
0.035	8	10	10	0.80	26
0.035	8	6	10	0.78	23

Summary

Large scale dynamical simulation with $N_f = 2$ overlap fermions at $16^3 \times 32$, $a \simeq 0.12$ fm, $\simeq m_s/6$, with fixed topology

- topology fixing extra Wilson term works well
- 5D CG solver is faster than 4D CG, particularly for small N
- Multi-time step with Hasenbusch preconditioner
- Our present best solution: less precise 5D solver in MD + noisy Metropolis test