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OUTLINE/SUMMARY

· Overview of the project
  · Particle-in-cell method
  · OSIRIS

· Application of OSIRIS to plasma based accelerators:
  · QuickPIC simulations of positron experiments @ SLAC
  · LWFA’s in the self-modulated regime @ Livermore National Laboratory

· Higher (2 & 3) dimension simulations of LPI’s relevant to laser fusion
  · Suppression of SRS with an external magnetic field
  · Controlling LPI’s by frequency bandwidth.
  · Estimates of large scale LPI simulations (& justify the need for new numerical techniques and new algorithms and exascale supercomputers)

· Code Developments to reduce simulation time and to move toward exa-scale.
  · Quasi-3D OSIRIS for LWFA and single-speckle LPI simulations on blue waters
  · code development efforts for GPU’s and Intel PHI’s.
  · PICKSC Center @ UCLA , which provides a resource for anyone interested in learning about PIC
The particle-in-cell method treats plasma as a collection of computer particles. The interactions does not scale as $N^2$ due to the fact the particle quantities are deposited on a grids and the interactions are calculated on the grids only. Because $(\# \text{ of particles}) \gg (\# \text{ of grids})$, the timing is dominated by the particle calculations and scales as $N$ (orbit calculation + current & charge deposition).

The code spends over 90% of execution time in only 4 routines.

These routines correspond to less than 2% of the code, optimization and porting is fairly straightforward, although not always trivial.
osiris framework

- Massively Parallel, Fully Relativistic Particle-in-Cell (PIC) Code
- Visualization and Data Analysis Infrastructure
- Developed by the osiris.consortium
  ⇒ UCLA + IST

code features

- Scalability to ~ 1.6 M cores (on sequoia) and achieved sustained speed of > 2.2PetaFLOPS on Blue Waters
- SIMD hardware optimized
- Parallel I/O
- Dynamic Load Balancing
- QED module
- Particle merging
- OpenMP/MPI parallelism
- CUDA/Xeon Phi branches

Ricardo Fonseca: ricardo.fonseca@tecnico.ulisboa.pt
Frank Tsung: tsung@physics.ucla.edu
http://epp.tecnico.ulisboa.pt/
http://plasmasim.physics.ucla.edu/
Livingston Curve for Accelerators --- Why plasmas?

Plasma Wake Field Accelerator (PWFA)
A high energy electron bunch

Laser Wake Field Accelerator (LWFA, SMLWFA)
A single short-pulse of photons

The Livingston curve traces the history of electron accelerators from Lawrence’s cyclotron to present day technology.

When energies from plasma based accelerators are plotted in the same curve, it shows the exciting trend that within a few years it is will surpass conventional accelerators in terms of energy.
FACET is a new facility to provide high-energy, high peak current e⁻ & e⁺ beams for PWFA experiments at SLAC.
Two-Bunch e\(^{-}\) Driven PWFA

*M. Litos et. al, 515, 92 Nature (2014)*

And here are some figures taken from the *Nature* article, and the image which was chosen for the cover.

As I reported earlier (and the energy spectrum of the electrons are shown on the right), in the 2014 experiment, the particles started with at 20 GeV, and after 36cm of plasmas, some of the particles lost energy but the trailing bunch gained 2GeV with a very small (< 1%) energy spread, and the quantitative agreements between our simulation results and experiments are quite good.

In 2015 the experiments focus on the acceleration of positrons and I hope to talk to you about these results next year.
So what about positrons?

Positrons beams produce wakes which are very different than those produced by electron beams (because the plasma is not made of anti-matter). On top is a possible plasma based collider using plasmas. On the left is nonlinear plasma wave generated by electrons. On the right you see nonlinear plasma wave generated by positrons. And as you can see the wake structures are very different.

For an electron beam, the beam pushes away all of the nearby electrons, forming a spherical wake which is called a “bubble”. On the other hand, positrons will pull in all of the nearby electrons, forming a very different looking wake. The theory for plasma wakes due to a positron beam is not well developed and Blue Water simulations play a very important role in giving us insights to these experiments using positron beams.
Experiments produced beams with very low energy spread (as low as 1.8% to 4% and 6% in the plots shown above). In 1.3 meters, the positrons gained 3-10 GeV's, varying from shot to shot (compared to .1 GeV/meter inside a conventional accelerator).

QuickPIC simulations revealed the physics of the low energy spread seen in experiments. On the right the 2D electron density and the axial accelerating field are plotted. On the left is a snapshot from our QuickPIC simulation, showing electron phase space (lower left) and densities + accelerating field on axis + densities (upper left). QuickPIC simulation showed that, the trailing bunch flattens the wake, producing a uniform field that accelerates the trailing electrons uniformly.

*S. Corde et al, 524, 442 Nature(2015).*
Massively parallel PIC code OSIRIS used for thorough and high resolution investigation of 3D effects in the support of the laser wakefield accelerator exp. @ LLNL

TITAN current experiment @ LLNL

- The laser produces \( \sim 200 \text{ MeV} \) electrons, but it is useful in producing directional (forward-going), hard X-rays
- using the 150J and 1ps long Titan laser infrastructure available at LLNL
- 3D effects (shown below)
- This work is ongoing and we will share more results with you at next year’s BW symposium

To benchmark the experiment 3D simulations taking (30 billion grids, 1 trillion particles) up to 460 800 core-hours were required

Radiation emitted by e's

3D effects have impact on final radiation

Energy spectrum of radiation

That shows X-rays features

F.S. Tsung, Blue Waters 2016
IFE (inertial fusion energy) uses lasers to compress fusion pellets to fusion conditions. The goal of these experiments is to extract more fusion energy from the fuel than the input energy of the laser. In this case, the excitation of plasma waves via LPI (laser plasma interactions) is detrimental to the experiment in 2 ways.

- Laser light can be scattered backward toward the source and cannot reach the target.
- LPI produces hot electrons which heats the target, making it harder to compress.

The LPI problem is very challenging because it spans many orders of magnitude in lengthscale & lengthscale.

- The spatial scale spans from < 1 micron (which is the laser wavelength) to mille-meters (which is the length of the plasma).
- The temporal scale spans from a femto-second (which is the laser period) to nano-seconds (which is the duration of the fusion pulse). A typical PIC simulation spans ~10ps.
Performing a typical 1D OSIRIS Simulation Using NIF parameters

- Currently, experimentalists @ NIF can re-construct plasma conditions (such as density and temperature) using a hydro code. Using this “plasma map”, we can perform a series of 1D OSIRIS simulations, each taking ~100 CPU hours.

- 1D OSIRIS Simulations can predict:
  - Spectrum of backscattered lights (which can be compared against experiments)
  - Spectrum of energetic electrons (shown below)
  - Energy partition, i.e., how the incident laser energy is converted to
    - Transmitted light
    - Backscattered light
    - Energetic electrons

\[ I_{\text{laser}} = 2 - 8 \times 10^{14} \text{ W/cm}^2 \]
\[ \lambda_{\text{laser}} = 351 \text{ nm}, \]
\[ T_e = 2.75 \text{ keV}, \]
\[ T_i = 1 \text{ keV}, Z = 1, \]
\[ t_{\text{max}} \text{ up to } 20 \text{ ps} \]
\[ \text{Length} = 1.5 \text{ mm} \]
Density profiles from NIF hydro simulations

\[ I_0 = 4 \times 10^{14}, \text{ Green profile} \]
\[ I_0 = 8 \times 10^{14}, \text{ Red profile} \]

14 million particles
~100 CPU hours per run
~1 hr on modest size supercomputer
We have simulated stimulated Raman scattering in multi-speckle scenarios (in 2D)

• Although the SRS problem is 1D (i.e., the instability grows along the direction of laser propagation). The SRS problem in IFE is not strictly 1D -- each “beam” (right) is made up of 4 lasers, called a NIF “quad,” and each laser is not a plane wave but contains “speckles,” each one a few microns in diameter. These hotspots are problematic because you can have situations where according to linear theory, the “averaged” laser is LPI unstable only inside these “hotspots” (and the hotspots can move in time by adding colors near the carrier frequency). And the LPI’s in these hotspots can trigger activities elsewhere. The multi-speckle problem are inherently 2D and even 3D.

• We have been using OSIRIS to look at SRS in multi-speckle scenarios. In our simulations we observed the excitation of SRS in under-threshold speckles via:
  – “seeding” from backscatter light from neighboring speckles
  – “seeding” from plasma wave seeds from a neighboring speckle.
  – “inflation” where hot electrons from a neighboring speckle flatten the distribution function and reduce plasma wave damping.

• Recently experiments have shown that external magnetic fields can reduce LPI activities. This is another area of active research in our group.
Control of TPD/HFHI instability by adding $>\text{THz}$ bandwidth

One technique to “smooth” the laser profile is to add frequency bandwidth to the laser so the speckle pattern changes over time. This has the effects of smoothing the laser profile in a time-averaged sense and reduce hydrodynamical instabilities. We have begun to look at the effects of temporal bandwidths on laser plasma instabilities.

In simulations where the inverse temporal bandwidth is comparable to the growth time of the instability, simulations showed that:

1. The plasma wave activity and the interaction region is much smaller with the addition of the temporal bandwidth, and

2. most of the light is transmitted during the linear phase of the instability, which leads to more of the lights going past the quarter critical layer and reaching the fusion target. In simulations without bandwidth, only $\sim20\%$ of the light makes it to the target, and about $50\%$ of the light makes it to the target when a $3\text{THz}$ bandwidth is present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laser Profile</th>
<th>Transmitted Light</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>&lt;20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300fs, 25%DC</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300fs, 50%DC</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PIC simulations of 3D LPI’s is still a challenge, and requires exa-scale supercomputers, this will require **code developments** in both new numerical methods and new codes for new hardwares.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2D multi-speckle along NIF beam path</th>
<th>3D, 1 speckles</th>
<th>3D, multi-speckle along NIF beam path</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speckle scale</td>
<td>50 x 8</td>
<td>1 x 1 x 1</td>
<td>10 x 10 x 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (microns)</td>
<td>150 x 1500</td>
<td>9 x 9 x 120</td>
<td>28 x 28 x 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grids</td>
<td>9,000 x 134,000</td>
<td>500 x 500 x 11,000</td>
<td>1,700 x 1,700 x 80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td>300 billion</td>
<td>300 billion</td>
<td>22 trillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps</td>
<td>470,000 (15 ps)</td>
<td>540,000 (5 ps)</td>
<td>540,000 (15 ps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Usage*</td>
<td>7 TB</td>
<td>6 TB</td>
<td>1.6 PB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPU-Hours</td>
<td>8 million</td>
<td>13 million</td>
<td>1 billion (2 months on the full BW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LPI’s with a single laser speckle (and the 3D LWFA problem), the incident laser and the excited plasma waves are mostly cylindrically symmetric. We would like to take advantage of this property but lasers are not polarized in \( \hat{r} \) or \( \phi \) (but rather in \( \hat{x} \) or \( \hat{y} \)), so a simple \((r,z)\) code is insufficient.

Following Lifschitz et al., we developed the ability to model plasmas in 3D using cylindrical coordinates \((r,z,\phi)\) by introducing a Fourier decomposition in the \(\phi\) (azimuthal angle) dimension

\[
F(r, z, \phi) = \mathbb{R}\left\{ \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} F^m(r, z)e^{im\phi} \right\}
\]

\[
= F^0(r, z) + \mathbb{R}\{F^1\} \cos(\phi) - \mathbb{I}\{F^1\} \sin(\phi)
+ \mathbb{R}\{F^2\} \cos(2\phi) - \mathbb{I}\{F^2\} \sin(2\phi)
+ \cdots.
\]

The 3D field values \((E, B, J)\) are decomposed into azimuthal modes \((E^m, B^m, J^m)\), each one is a function of \((r,z)\).

This representation, and the identity:

\[
E_x = E_r \cos(\phi) + E_\phi \sin(\phi)
E_y = -E_r \sin(\phi) + E_\phi \cos(\phi)
\]

means that we can represent a linearly polarized laser with one additional mode. This decomposition enables us to study 3D physics for a variety of problems described here at a great saving (i.e., at a cost of running several 2D simulations).

We have extended this work of Lifschitz et al to enforce charge conservation in the current deposition, thereby eliminating the need to solve Poisson’s equation.
We have applied the hybrid algorithm to some of the problems described here. We have benchmarked this code against some of our published 3D results. In this case, a plasma based accelerator with a laser driver.

As shown on the right, the 2D “hybrid” code agrees very well with previous 3D simulations, recovering the wake structure and also self-trapping physics in the equivalent 3D simulations, at a saving of 1-2 orders of magnitude. (25,000 “2015” CPU hours in 3D and 1,250 hours using 2D hybrid)

In addition to new numerical methods, we are also adapting our PIC codes to new hardwares, such as GPU’s and multi-core CPU’s
On the GPU, we apply a local domain decomposition scheme based on the concept of tiles.

Particles ordered by tiles, varying from $2 \times 2$ to $16 \times 16$ grid points

On Fermi M2090:
- On each GPU, the problem is partitioned into many tiles, and the code associate a thread block with each tile and particles located in that tile

We created a new data structure for particles, partitioned among threads blocks (i.e., particles are sorted according to its tile id, and there is a local domain decomposition within the GPU), within the tile the grid and the particle data are aligned and the loops can be easily parallelized.

We created a new data structure for particles, partitioned among threads blocks:

$\text{dimension part}(\text{npmax, idimp, num\_blocks})$
Designing New Particle-in-Cell (PIC) Algorithms:

Maintaining Particle Order

Three steps:
1. Particle Push creates a list of particles which are leaving a tile
2. Using list, each thread places outgoing particles into an ordered buffer it controls
3. Using lists, each tile copies incoming particles from buffers into particle array

A “particle manager” is needed to maintain the data alignment. This is done every timestep.
- Less than a full sort, **low overhead** if particles already in correct tile
- **Essentially message-passing**, except buffer contains multiple destinations

In the end, the particle array belonging to a tile has no gaps
- Particles are moved to any existing holes created by departing particles
- If holes still remain, they are filled with particles from the end of the array
Evaluating New Particle-in-Cell (PIC) Algorithms on GPU: **Electromagnetic Case**

2-1/2D EM Benchmark with 2048x2048 grid, 150,994,944 particles, 36 particles/cell

optimal block size = 128, optimal tile size = 16x16

GPU algorithm also implemented in OpenMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CPU: Intel i7</th>
<th>GPU: Fermi M2090</th>
<th>OpenMP (12 CPUs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Push</td>
<td>66.5 ns.</td>
<td>0.426 ns.</td>
<td>5.645 ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>36.7 ns.</td>
<td>0.918 ns.</td>
<td>3.362 ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorder</td>
<td>0.4 ns.</td>
<td>0.698 ns.</td>
<td>0.056 ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Particle</td>
<td>103.6 ns.</td>
<td>2.042 ns.</td>
<td><strong>9.062 ns (11.4x speedup)</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The time reported is per particle/time step.
The total particle speedup on the Fermi M2090 was **51x** compared to 1 Intel i7 core.

Field solver takes an additional 10% on GPU, 11% on CPU.

**OK, so how about multiple CPU/GPU’s?**
Evaluating New Particle-in-Cell (PIC) Algorithms on GPU: **Electrostatic Case**

2D ES Benchmark with 2048x2048 grid, 150,994,944 particles, 36 particles/cell

optimal block size = 128, optimal tile size = 16x16. Single precision. Fermi M2090 GPU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Push (ns)</th>
<th>Deposit (ns)</th>
<th>Reorder (ns)</th>
<th>Total Particle (ns)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPU: Intel i7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 GPU</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 GPUs</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 GPUs</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>13.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The time reported is per particle/time step.

The total particle speedup on the 108 Fermi M2090s compared to 1 GPU was 77x (>70% efficient).

We feel that we can improve on the current efficiency. Currently, field solver (which uses FFT) takes an additional 5% on 1 GPU, 45% on 2 GPUs, and 73% on 108 GPUs. And we believe the efficiency should be higher for PIC codes with a finite-difference solver.

We are also working on a Intel Phi version!

here are available at the [UCLA PICKSC web-site](http://picksc.idre.ucla.edu/)
UCLA Particle-in-Cell and Kinetic Simulation Software Center (PICKSC), NSF funded center whose Goal is to provide and document parallel Particle-in-Cell (PIC) and other kinetic codes.

http://picksc.idre.ucla.edu/
github: UCLA Plasma Simulation Group (currently closed)

Planned activities
• Provide parallel skeleton codes for various PIC codes on traditional and new hardware systems.
• Provide MPI-based production PIC codes that will run on desktop computers, mid-size clusters, and the largest parallel computers in the world.
• Provide key components for constructing new parallel production PIC codes for electrostatic, electromagnetic, and other codes.
• Provide interactive codes for teaching of important and difficult plasma physics concepts
• Facilitate benchmarking of kinetic codes by the physics community, not only for performance, but also to compare the physics approximations used
• Documentation of best and worst practices for code writing, which are often unpublished and get repeatedly rediscovered.
• Provide some services for customizing software for specific purposes (based on our existing codes)

Key components and codes will be made available through standard open source licenses and as an open-source community resource, contributions from others are welcome.
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Control of TPD/HFHI instability by adding > THz bandwidth

One technique to “smooth” the laser profile is to add frequency bandwidth to the laser so the speckle pattern changes over time. This has the effects of smoothing the laser profile in a time-averaged sense and reduce hydrodynamical instabilities. We have begun to look at the effects of temporal bandwidths on laser plasma instabilities.

In simulations where the inverse temporal bandwidth is comparable to the growth time of the instability, simulations showed that:

1. The plasma wave activity and the interaction region is much smaller with the addition of the temporal bandwidth, and

2. most of the light is transmitted during the linear phase of the instability, which leads to more of the lights going past the quarter critical layer and reaching the fusion target. In simulations without bandwidth, only ~20% of the light makes it to the target, and about 50% of the light makes it to the target when a 3THz bandwidth is present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laser Profile</th>
<th>Transmitted Light</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>&lt;20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300fs, 25%DC</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300fs, 50%DC</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>