



### The GW Method

Solve Dyson's equation:  $\left|-\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2+V_{\text{loc}}+\Sigma(E_n)\right|\phi_n=E_n\phi_n,$  $\Sigma(E_n) \rightarrow$  self-energy (non-Hermitian, non-local, energy-dependent operator) ▶ Perturbative expansion on the screened Coulomb interaction W First approximation  $\Sigma = iGW$ • W obtained from Inverse Dielectric Matrix  $e^{-1}$  of the system In BerkeleyGW [1]: • Epsilon code  $\rightarrow$  Compute  $\epsilon^{-1}$ Sigma code  $\rightarrow$  Compute W from  $\epsilon^{-1}$  and solve eq.1 Epsilon code: Inverse Dielectric Matrix  $\epsilon^{-1}$ Input:  $\psi_{m\mathbf{k}}$ ,  $\epsilon_{m\mathbf{k}}$ , {**q**-points}, { $\omega_i$ } L Calculate plane-waves matrix elements (FFT's):  $O(N_v N_c N_G \log N_G)$  $M^{\mathcal{G}}_{ja\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{q}) = ig\langle \psi_{j\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} ert \, e^{i(\mathbf{G}+\mathbf{q})\cdot\mathbf{r}} ert \psi_{a\mathbf{k}} ig
angle$ 2. Calculate RPA polarizability (Matrix-Multiplication):  $O(N_{\omega}N_{v}N_{c}N_{G}^{2})$  $\chi(\mathbf{q},\omega_i) = \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{q})^{\dagger} \mathbf{\Delta}_{ja\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon_{j\mathbf{k}},\epsilon_{a\mathbf{k}},\mathbf{q},\omega_i) \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{q})$  $\Delta$  diagonal matrix containing the frequency dependence 3. Dielectric matrix  $\epsilon$  and inversion:  $O(N_{\omega}N_{c}^{3})$  $\epsilon_{GG'}(\mathbf{q},\omega_i) = \delta_{GG'} - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{G})\chi_{GG'}(\mathbf{q},\omega_i)$  $\epsilon^{-1}(\mathbf{q},\omega_i) = (I - v\chi(\mathbf{q},\omega_i))^{-1}$ Parameters:  $N_v$  number of valence bands,  $N_c$  number of conduction (empty) bands,  $N_G$  PW basis set size,  $N_\omega$  number of frequencies. Static Subspace Approximation [2]: Speed-Up the Calculation of  $\epsilon^{-1}(\omega_i)$  for  $\omega_i \neq 0$ For  $\omega_i = 0$ : Standard calculation of  $\overline{\chi}(0) = v^{\frac{1}{2}} \chi(0) v^{\frac{1}{2}}$  $\chi(0) = \mathbf{M}^{\dagger} \mathbf{\Delta}_{\mathit{iak}}(0) \mathbf{M}$ Eigendecomposition  $\bar{\chi}(0) = \mathbf{C}^{0^{\dagger}} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{C}^{0}$ , define  $\mathbf{C}_{s}^{0}$  according to threshold  $t_{\text{eigen}}$  $\blacktriangleright$  Projection of **M** into the subspace spanned by  $\mathbf{C}_{s}^{0}$  $\overline{\mathsf{M}}_{\mathsf{s}}^{0} = \mathsf{M} \mathsf{v}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathsf{C}_{\mathsf{s}}^{0}$ For  $\omega_i \neq 0$ : direct computation of  $\bar{\chi}_s(\omega_i)$  $ar{\chi}_s(\omega_i) = \overline{\mathbf{M}}_s^{0^{\dagger}} \mathbf{\Delta}_{ia\mathbf{k}}(\omega_i) \overline{\mathbf{M}}_s^0$ Final evaluation of  $\epsilon^{-1}(\omega_i)$  from  $\bar{\chi}_s(\omega_i)$ Memory Execution Matrix Element  $O(N_v N_c N_G \log N_G)$  $O(N_v N_c N_G)$  $O(N_G^2)$ Polarizability  $\omega = 0$  $O(N_v N_c N_G^2)$ Eigendecomposition:  $C_c^0$  $O(N_G^3)$  $O(N_G^2)$  $\overline{\mathsf{M}}_{s}^{0}$  $O(N_v N_c N_b)$  $O(N_b N_v N_c N_G)$ Polarizability  $\omega \neq 0$  $O(N_{\omega}N_{v}N_{c}N_{b}^{2})$  $O(N_{\omega}N_{b}^{2})$ Inversion  $O(N_{\omega}N_{b}^{3})$  $O(N_{\omega}N_{b}^{2})$  $O(N_G N_b + N_\omega N_b^2)$ I/O $O(N_G N_b + N_\omega N_b^2)$ Evaluation of  $\epsilon^{-1}(\omega_i)$  $O(N_{\omega}N_G^2)$  $O(N_{\omega}N_{b}N_{G}^{2})$ 

### References

. J. Deslippe, G. Samsonidze, D. A. Strubbe, M. Jain, M. L. Cohen, and S. G. Louie, Comput. Phys. Commun. 183, 1269 (2012). M. Govoni and G. Galli, J. Chem. Theory Comput. 11, 2680 (2015) ; T.A. Pham, H.V. Nguyen, D. Rocca, and G. Galli, Phys. Rev. B 87, 155148 (2013) ; H.-V. Nguyen, T. A. Pham, D. Rocca, and G. Galli, Phys. Rev. B 85, 081101 (2012) ; H. F. Wilson, D. Lu, F. Gygi, and G. Galli, Phys. Rev. B 79, 245106 (2009) ; H. F. Wilson, F. Gygi, and G. Galli, Phys. Rev. B 78, 113303 (2008). 3. P. Umari, Geoffrey Stenuit, and Stefano Baroni, Phys. Rev. B 79, 201104-R (2009)

4. M. Del Ben, F.H. da Jornada, A. Canning, N. Wichmann, K. Raman, R. Sasanka, C. Yang, S.G. Louie and J. Deslippe, In Preparation

# Large-Scale GW Calculations on Pre-Exascale HPC Systems BerkeleyGW: Method Developments and Code Optimization

<u>M. Del Ben<sup>1</sup></u>, F.H. da Jornada<sup>1,2</sup>, A. Canning<sup>1</sup>, N. Wichmann<sup>3</sup>, K. Raman<sup>4</sup>, R. Sasanka<sup>4</sup>, C. Yang<sup>1</sup>, S.G. Louie<sup>1,2</sup> and J. Deslippe<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup>Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, <sup>2</sup>University of California at Berkeley, <sup>3</sup>CRAY, <sup>4</sup>Intel Corporation



Figure: (a) band structure as obtained without (solid blue) and with the static subspace approximation (red dotted  $t_{eig} = 0.01$ ; (b) mean absolute error between the reference and approximate results (196  $E_{QP}$  calculated); (c) percentage reduction in time to solution (red) and number of eigenvectors (blue) for the evaluation of  $\epsilon^{-1}$ 

### Single Vacancy $V_1^0$ (1000-Si Atoms Benchmark)



Approximation tested for Insulators, Semiconductors, Metals, Clusters, Slabs ▶ Direct correlation between accuracy and  $t_{eigen}$  (5-25% of the eigenstates  $\rightarrow \sim 1$  meV accuracy)

### Sigma code: Calculate $\Sigma_{lm}(\omega)$ and Solve Dyson's Equation

- . Calculate plane-waves matrix elements (FFT's):  $O(N_{\Sigma}N_nN_G \log N_G)$  $M_{nm}^{-G} = \langle \phi_n | e^{-i \mathbf{G} \cdot \mathbf{r}} | \phi_m \rangle$
- 2. For any given pair of orbital functions  $\{\phi_I, \phi_m\}$  calculate:

$$\Sigma_{lm}(E) = \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty d\omega \sum_n \sum_{GG'} M_{nl}^{-G} \frac{\epsilon_{GG'}^{-1}(\omega) \cdot v(G')}{E - E_n - \omega} M_{nm}^{-G'}$$

Matrix-Multiplication + 2D Dot-Product  $O(N_{\Sigma}N_{\omega}N_{n}N_{G}^{2})$ 

### Parallelization Strategy

 $\Sigma_{lm}(\omega)$  matrix elements distributed over Pools of processes. For each Pool:

- $N_{E} \times N_{C}$ 0123



Non-blocking cyclic communication layout

- tasks employed

 $N_G\simeq 10^5$  ;  $N_n\simeq 10^4$  ;  $N_E\simeq 10^2$ Same algorithm is used in the low-rank approximation case: matrix size  $N_G \rightarrow N_h$ 

Speed-up proportional to  $(N_G/N_b)^2$ 

Data distribution layout

Good performance achieved by using smaller pool sizes

$\Delta E^{v}$	$\Delta E^g$	$\Delta E^{c}$	$\Delta E^{\rm Si}$	#Nodes	Time (min)
).29	0.07	0.23	0.60	-	-
).41	0.27	0.46	1.15	480	73
).42	0.26	0.49	1.18	2048	157

 $G_0 W_0 =$  Full-Frequency Contour Deformation Calculations Performed on Edison@NERSC (CRAY-XC30)

 $N_{G}$   $N_{n''}$   $\blacktriangleright$  Left Matrix:  $\epsilon^{-1}(\omega)$  distributed over rows ( $N_G \times N_\omega$  combined index) ▶ Right Matrix:  $M_{nl}^{G}$  distributed over columns (FFT performed locally) ► At each cycle the matrix contraction is performed locally (ZGEMM) Ring communication restricted to contiguous MPI tasks

> ► Communication can be performed over blocks of processes:  $\blacktriangleright$   $N_{n''}$  size roughly constant independent on the ration OMP  $\times$  MPI ► Good ZGEMM performance independent on the number of MPI





Systems: Divacancy states in Silicon supercells containing 998 and 1726 atoms

### Single Pool Performance: 200 KNL Nodes



(a) Poor performance due to small Comput./Commun. ratio (different OMPxMPI ratio, no message blocking) (b) Improved performance for 64-OMPxMPI by using different processes block size (c) Different OMPxMPI ratio and process block size adjusted to give roughly constant n''.

### Strong Scaling: Individual Pool and Full Sigma



circles), (b) Full Sigma, 200-NKL nodes per Pool.

## Full Sigma: Best Performance

Number KNL Nod Number of Cores Number  $E_{qp}$  Evalu Time to solution PetaFLOP/s % Peak Performa

Sigma kernel capable to scale to full-Cori

- Sigma achieves high fraction of peak performance
- Excellent time to solution ( $\sim 100$  seconds) for systems made of thousands of atoms

### Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Center for Computational Study of Excited-State Phenomena in Energy Materials at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, which is funded by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences, Materials Sciences and Engineering Division under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231, as part of the Computational Materials Sciences Program.



- ► FLOPs per node
- Best/worst performing node
- Strong Scaling
- Time to solution
- Comparison to peak performance



	998 Si	1726 Si
les	9600	9500
	633,600	627,000
uated	48	38
(s)	160	201
	11.8	11.3
nce	47	46