









GPU Parallelization of Spin-Tracking Simulations for the nEDM@SNS Experiment

M. Kline¹, D. Mathews², L. J. Broussard³

¹Transylvania University ²University of Kentucky ³Oak Ridge National Laboratory



Overview

- The nEDM@SNS experiment extracts the EDM from the precession of ${}^{3}He$ atoms and spin-dependent signal of neutrons capturing on ${}^{3}He$
- Spin-tracking simulations are very computationally expensive
 - We need these simulations to better understand systematic effects that can lead to a false EDM measurement
 - Need fast spin-tracking simulations for 10¹¹ events to have comparable sensitivity to expected experiment precision
 - Use Julia and CUDA to run simulations on GPU to utilize parallelization



Spin precession of neutron with gravity



Simulations on GPUs

CPU	GPU
Central Processing Unit	Graphics Processing Unit
1-64 cores	100 - 7000 cores
Linear Processing	Parallel Processing
A handful of operations very rapidly	Thousands of operations at once





Images from https://steemit.com/gridcoin/@dutch/hardware-and-project-selection-part-1-cpu-vs-gpu



Spin Precession

• Spin precession described by the Bloch equation

$$- \dot{\sigma} = \gamma_n \sigma \times B - \frac{2d_n}{\hbar} \sigma \times E$$

- Numerically integrated using 5th order Runge-Kutta method
 - Used Cash-Karp parameters
 - $\frac{dy}{dt} = f(t, y)$ - $k_i = h f(x_n + a_i h, y_n + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} b_{ij} k_j)$

$$- y_{n+1} = y_n + \sum_{i=1}^6 c_i k_i$$









Other Integration Methods

- Symplectic integration
 - More stable than Runge-Kutta over long durations
 - Used for Hamiltonian where $\mathcal{H} = T(p) + V(q)$
 - Great for UCN in gravitational/magnetic fields
 - Reflections/variable step size become problematic
 - $-\frac{dx}{dt} = f(t, v)$ and $\frac{dv}{dt} = g(t, x)$ satisfy the Hamiltonian
 - $\mathcal{H} = -\mu_n \sigma \cdot B d_n \sigma \cdot E$



- Turn RK/SI step into a matrix equation
 - The differential equation must be linear (like the Bloch equation)
 - Matrix operations are fast on GPUs
 - Adding physics (reflections, etc.) slows it down
 - Time dependence is difficult
 - Magnetic field nonuniformities cause problems



Spin precession frequency vs time with symplectic integration



Wall Interactions

- Wall reflections are difficult
 - Magically change neutron's direction in the middle of a solver step
 - To avoid errors, you have to change the step size to reach the wall exactly
- Side walls are periodic to avoid variable step size
 - Achieved with a GPU kernel
- Problem: top/bottom walls break symmetry because of gravity
- Solution: duplicate measurement cell
 - Top cell has normal gravity
 - Bottom cell has "antigravity"
- Still run into problem of wrong gravity during part of step
 - Solved by scaling velocity



Neutron oscillating between top and bottom cells



Error accumulation with and without adjusting velocity after crossing top/bottom wall



Wall Interactions

- Probability of diffuse reflections $\propto \cos \theta_i$
 - $\approx 20\%$ for normal incident angle
- Diffuse reflections must preserve detailed balance
 - For random number $y \in [0,1]$, $\theta = \cos^{-1}[(1-y)^{1/3}]$
 - Azimuthal angle ϕ can be chosen from uniform distribution in 2π
- Wall losses added with constant probability to match expected lifetime of 2000s
 - Lifetime will be experimentally determined for each measurement cell



n+³He capture and β decay

• At each step, probability of n+³He capture event is dependent on relative spin between UCN and ³He

 $- h\Gamma_3(1-\cos\theta)$

• Probability of β decay is constant

 $- h\Gamma_{\beta}$

• Γ_3 and Γ_β come from lifetimes

 $- \Gamma_3 = \frac{1}{\tau_3} = \frac{1}{500 \, s} \qquad \Gamma_\beta = \frac{1}{\tau_\beta} = \frac{1}{881.5 \, s}$

- Plot binned events vs time
- Large-scale decay caused by decrease in number of neutrons in the cell
- Zooming in shows oscillation
 - Frequency of oscillation with 3He precession signal used to determine nEDM





Simulated scintillation signal vs time



Simulated Signal Fit & Analysis

- Rate of events is
 - $-\Gamma(t) = N(t) \times \left[\Gamma_{\beta} + \Gamma_{3}(1 \cos[\omega t + \phi_{0}])\right] + \Gamma_{B}(t)$
 - $N(t) = N_0 e^{-t/\tau_{eff}}$
- Maximize log likelihood to obtain fit parameters
- $\chi^2 \approx -2 \log \Lambda$ - $\Lambda = \mathcal{L}/\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ is the maximum likelihood ratio

•
$$\log \Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{bins}} [k_i \log \left(\frac{\lambda_i}{k_i}\right) - (\lambda_i - k_i)]$$

- $\omega = (\gamma_3 \gamma_n) \frac{\omega_3}{\gamma_3} + \frac{2d_n}{\hbar} E$
- $1\sigma \approx 2.5 \times 10^{-23} e \cdot cm$



Maximum likelihood fit of simulated scintillation signal



GPU Computation Time

- Simulate \approx 15,000 particles simultaneously per GPU
- At \approx 15,000, another set of streaming multiprocessors is required for the task, causing a jump in computation time
 - Will remain approximately constant until another set is required
- Preliminary computation time per particle per iteration
 - CPU: 2 μs/CPU
 - GPU: 8 ns/GPU (with 225,000 particles)



Computation time vs number of particles simulated



Summary and Future Work

- GPUs look promising for studying computationally expensive systematic effects
- Investigating additional physics
 - Realistic B-field maps
 - Time-dependent systematics
 - Tracking of ³He particles
- Optimize GPU code to get better performance
- Compare with CUDA C
- Goal: run hybrid CPU/GPU version on Summit supercomputer





Thank You!

Questions?

This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) under the Science Undergraduate Laboratory Internship program, and by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Nuclear Physics under contract number DE-AC05-00OR2272