

Parallel Implementation of the PHOENIX Generalized Stellar Atmosphere Program. II: Wavelength Parallelization

E. Baron¹ and Peter H. Hauschildt²

ABSTRACT

We describe an important addition to the parallel implementation of our generalized NLTE stellar atmosphere and radiative transfer computer program PHOENIX. In a previous paper in this series we described data and task parallel algorithms we have developed for radiative transfer, spectral line opacity, and NLTE opacity and rate calculations. These algorithms divided the work spatially or by spectral lines, that is distributing the radial zones, individual spectral lines, or characteristic rays among different processors and employ, in addition task parallelism for logically independent functions (such as atomic and molecular line opacities). For finite, monotonic velocity fields, the radiative transfer equation is an initial value problem in wavelength, and hence each wavelength point depends upon the previous one. However, for sophisticated NLTE models of both static and moving atmospheres needed to accurately describe, e.g., novae and supernovae, the number of wavelength points is very large (200,000–300,000) and hence parallelization over wavelength can lead both to considerable speedup in calculation time and the ability to make use of the aggregate memory available on massively parallel supercomputers. Here, we describe an implementation of a pipelined design for the wavelength parallelization of PHOENIX, where the necessary data from the processor working on a previous wavelength point is sent to the processor working on the succeeding wavelength point as soon as it is known. Our implementation uses a MIMD design based on a relatively small number of standard MPI library calls and is fully portable between serial and parallel computers.

1. Introduction

Spectroscopy is one of the most important tools in all of astrophysics. It is through the use of spectroscopy that we have discovered the cosmological expansion and determined the elemental composition of the sun. Currently detailed spectroscopic analyses are used to date the age of the galaxy (Cowan et al. 1997), to determine the structure, energies, and compositions of novae (Hauschildt et al. 1995, 1996; Schwarz et al. 1997) and supernovae (Baron et al. 1995; Baron, Hauschildt, & Young 1995; Baron et al. 1996a; Nugent et al. 1995a,b, 1997) to probe the conditions at the time of galaxy formation via examining

¹Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, University of Oklahoma, 440 W. Brooks, Rm 131, Norman, OK 73019-0225; baron@mail.nhn.ou.edu

²Dept. of Physics and Astronomy & Center for Simulation Physics, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602-2451; yeti@hal.physast.uga.edu

damped Lyman alpha clouds at high redshift (cf. Prochaska & Wolfe 1997), and to confirm the reality of claims for the discovery of sub-stellar objects (Allard et al. 1997).

We have developed the spherically symmetric special relativistic non-LTE generalized radiative transfer and stellar atmosphere computer code PHOENIX (Hauschildt 1992, 1993; Hauschildt & Baron 1995; Hauschildt et al. 1995; Allard & Hauschildt 1995; Hauschildt et al. 1996; Baron et al. 1996b) which can handle very large model atoms as well as line blanketing by millions of atomic and molecular lines. This code is designed to be very flexible, it is used to compute model atmospheres and synthetic spectra for, e.g., novae, supernovae, M and brown dwarfs, O to M giants, white dwarfs and accretion disks in Active Galactic Nuclei (AGN); and it is highly portable. We include a large number of line transitions and solve the radiative transfer equation for each of them without using simple approximations (like the Sobolev approximation), and therefore the line profiles must be resolved in the co-moving (Lagrangian) frame. This requires many wavelength points (we typically use 150,000 to 300,000). Since the CPU time scales linearly with the number of wavelength points, the CPU time requirements of such a calculation are large. In addition, NLTE radiative rates for both line and continuum transitions must be calculated and stored at every spatial grid point for each transition, which requires large amounts of storage and can cause significant performance degradation if the corresponding routines are not optimally coded.

In order to take advantage of the enormous computing power and vast aggregate memory sizes of modern parallel supercomputers, both potentially allowing much faster model construction as well as more sophisticated models, we have developed a parallel version of PHOENIX. Since the code uses a modular design, we have implemented different parallelization strategies for different modules in order to maximize the total parallel speed-up of the code. In addition, our implementation allows us to change the distribution of computational work onto different nodes both via input files and dynamically during a model run, which gives a high degree of flexibility to optimize the performance for both a number of different parallel supercomputers (we are currently using IBM SP2s, SGI Origin 2000s, HP/Convex SPP-2000s, and Cray T3Es) and for different model parameters.

Since we have both large CPU and memory requirements we have developed the parallel version of the code using the MPI message passing library (Message Passing Interface Forum 1995). The single processor speed of a machine like the IBM SP2 is moderately high so that even a small number of additional processors can lead to significant speed-up. We have chosen to work with the MPI message passing interface, since it is both portable (public domain implementations of MPI are readily available cf. Gropp et al. 1996), running on dedicated parallel machines and heterogeneous workstation clusters and it is available for both distributed and shared memory architectures. For our application, the distributed memory model is in fact easier to use than a shared memory model, since then we do not have to worry about locks and synchronization, on *small* scales and, in addition, we retain full control over interprocess communication. This is especially clear once one realizes that it can be more cost-effective to avoid costly communication by executing identical code on many processing elements (or *nodes*) as long as the impact on the total CPU time is small, rather than parallelizing each individual module with the corresponding high cost of communication and loop overhead. Distributed massively parallel supercomputers also typically have more aggregate memory, which enables them to run much larger simulations than traditional serial computers. Our initial parallelization of the code (Hauschildt, Baron, & Allard 1997) was straightforward in that we distributed the computations among the different modules (task parallelism) and we were further able to sub-divide some of the

modules by utilizing data parallelism in, e.g, the radial coordinate or individual spectral lines. Thus, PHOENIX uses both task and data parallelism *at the same time* in order to optimized performance and allow larger model calculations.

2. Equations and Problem Description

The co-moving frame radiative transfer equation for spherically symmetric flows can be written as (cf. Mihalas & Mihalas 1984):

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \gamma(1 + \beta\mu)\frac{\partial I_\nu}{\partial t} + \gamma(\mu + \beta)\frac{\partial I_\nu}{\partial r} \\
 + & \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \left\{ \gamma(1 - \mu^2) \left[\frac{1 + \beta\mu}{r} \right. \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \left. - \gamma^2(\mu + \beta)\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial r} - \gamma^2(1 + \beta\mu)\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial t} \right] I_\nu \right\} \\
 - & \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \left\{ \gamma\nu \left[\frac{\beta(1 - \mu^2)}{r} + \gamma^2\mu(\mu + \beta)\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial r} \right. \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \left. + \gamma^2\mu(1 + \beta\mu)\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial t} \right] I_\nu \right\} \\
 + & \gamma \left\{ \frac{2\mu + \beta(3 - \mu^2)}{r} \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \gamma^2(1 + \mu^2 + 2\beta\mu)\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial r} + \gamma^2[2\mu + \beta(1 + \mu^2)]\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial t} \right\} I_\nu \\
 = & \eta_\nu - \chi_\nu I_\nu.
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

We set $c = 1$; β is the velocity; and $\gamma = (1 - \beta^2)^{-1/2}$ is the usual Lorentz factor. Equation 1 is a integro-differential equation, since the emissivity η_ν contains J_ν , the zeroth angular moment of I_ν :

$$\eta_\nu = \kappa_\nu S_\nu + \sigma_\nu J_\nu,$$

and

$$J_\nu = 1/2 \int_{-1}^1 d\mu I_\nu,$$

where S_ν is the source function, κ_ν is the absorption opacity, and σ_ν is the scattering opacity. With the assumption of time-independence $\frac{\partial I_\nu}{\partial t} = 0$ and a monotonic velocity field Eq. 1 becomes a boundary-value problem in the spatial coordinate and an initial value problem in the frequency or wavelength coordinate. The equation can be written in operator form as:

$$J_\nu = \Lambda_\nu S_\nu, \tag{2}$$

where Λ is the lambda-operator.

Implicit in the solution of these equations is obtaining correct expressions for the opacity and the source function, both of which depend on the level populations of the material at each spatial point. Thus, one is forced to include the auxiliary equations which include the steady state rate equations (transitions into a given level are balanced by those out of that level), the NLTE equation of state which enforces charge and mass conservation, and the radiative equilibrium equation which enforces energy conservation. These auxiliary equations of course involve the radiation field, which makes the problem highly non-linear.

2.1. Definition of terms

We define a *task* as a logical unit of code that treats an aspect of the physics of the simulation, such as radiative transfer or NLTE rate calculations. In many cases, different tasks are independent and can be executed in parallel, we call this coarse grained parallelism *task parallelism*. Within each task, the opportunity of *data parallelism* may exist, which is a fine grained parallelism, e.g., on the level of individual loops in which loop-iteration is independent.

We use the term *node* to indicate a single processing element of the parallel computer which is the smallest possible separate computational unit of the parallel computer. A node might be a single CPU (e.g., an IBM SP2 thin node) or it might be a multi-CPU SMP node (e.g., a dual Pentium Pro system that is part of a networked cluster used as a parallel machine). Each node is assumed to have local virtual memory and a means of communicating with the other nodes in the system. In addition, the node has access to a global filesystem and, possibly, a local filesystem as well. These assumptions are fulfilled by basically all of the currently available parallel supercomputer systems (with the exception of the Cray T3E which does *not* support virtual memory).

A single node can execute a number of tasks, either serial on a single CPU or in parallel, e.g., on an SMP node of a distributed shared-memory supercomputer. In addition, data parallelism can also be used across nodes, or any combination of task and data parallelism can be used simultaneously.

2.2. Task and data parallel algorithms in PHOENIX

In a previous paper (Hauschildt, Baron, & Allard 1997, Paper I) we described our method for parallelizing three separate modules: (1) The radiative transfer calculation itself, where we divide up the characteristic rays among nodes and use an `MPI_REDUCE` to send the J_ν to all the radiative transfer and NLTE rate computation tasks; (2) the line opacity which requires the calculation of about 10,000 Voigt profiles per wavelength point at each radial grid point, here we split the work amongst the processors both by radial grid point and by dividing up the individual lines to be calculated among the processors; and (3) the NLTE calculations. The NLTE calculations involve three separate parts: the calculation of the NLTE opacities, the calculation of the rates at each wavelength point, and the solution of the NLTE rate equations. In Paper I we performed all these parallelizations by distribution of the radial grid points among the different nodes or by distributing sets of spectral lines onto different nodes. In addition, to prevent communication overhead, each

task computing the NLTE rates is paired on the same node with and the corresponding task computing NLTE opacities and emissivities to reduce communication. The solution of the rate equations parallelizes trivially with the use of a diagonal rate operator.

In the latest version of our code, PHOENIX 8.1, we have incorporated the additional strategy of distributing each NLTE species (the total number of ionization stages of a particular element treated in NLTE) on separate nodes. Since different species have different numbers of levels treated in NLTE (e.g. Fe II [singly ionized iron] has 617 NLTE levels, whereas H I has 30 levels), care is needed to balance the number of levels and NLTE transitions treated among the nodes to avoid unnecessary synchronization problems.

In addition to the data parallelism discussed above, the version of PHOENIX described in paper I also uses simultaneous task parallelism by allocating different tasks to different nodes. This can result in further speed-up and better scalability but requires a careful analysis of the workload between different tasks (the workload is also a function of wavelength, e.g., different number of lines that overlap at each wavelength point) to obtain optimal load balancing.

3. Wavelength Parallelization

The division of labor outlined in the previous section requires synchronization between the radiative transfer tasks and the NLTE tasks, since the radiation field and the “approximate Λ operator” must be passed between them. In addition, our standard model calculations use 50 radial grid points and as the number of nodes increases, so too does the communication and loop overhead. We found good speedup up to about 5 nodes for a typical supernova calculation, with the speedup close to the theoretical maximum. However, for 5 nodes the communication and loop overheads begin to become significant and it is not economical to use more than 10 nodes (depending on the machine and the model calculation, it might be necessary to use more nodes to fit the data in the memory available on a single node).

Since the number of wavelength points in a calculation is very large and the CPU time scales linearly with the number of wavelength points, a further distribution of labor by wavelength points would potentially lead to large speedups and to the ability to use very large numbers of nodes available on massively parallel supercomputers. Thus, we have developed the concept of wavelength “clusters” to distribute a set of wavelength points (for the solution of the frequency dependent radiative transfer) onto a different set of nodes, see Fig. 1. In order to achieve optimal load balance and, more importantly, in order to minimize the memory requirements, each cluster works on a single wavelength point at any given time, but it may consist of a *number* of “worker” nodes where the worker nodes use parallelization methods discussed in paper I. In order to avoid communication overhead, the workers of each wavelength cluster are *symmetric*: each corresponding worker on each wavelength cluster performs identical tasks but on a different set of wavelengths for each cluster. We thus arrange the total number of nodes N in a rectangular matrix with n columns and m rows, where n is the number of clusters and m is the number of workers for each cluster, such that $N = n * m$.

This design allows us to make use of *communicator contexts*, a concept which is built into MPI. The nodes of a given wavelength cluster are assigned to a single MPI_GROUP (a

vertical column in Fig. 1) so that the m nodes of each cluster form their own `MPI_GROUP` and have their own `MPI communicator` to pass messages *within* a cluster. We use the task and data parallelism introduced in paper I within each individual cluster if the m is larger than one. In addition to the n `MPI_GROUPS` for the m workers of each of the n clusters, we also use m `MPI_GROUPS` for the n clusters with the corresponding communicators. These groups can pass messages within an individual row of Fig. 1, thus allowing the flow of information between wavelength points, this is important for the solution of the co-moving frame RTE as discussed below. The code has been designed so that the number of wavelength clusters n , the number of workers per wavelength cluster m , and the task distribution within a wavelength cluster is arbitrary and can be specified dynamically at run time.

For a static model atmosphere, all wavelengths and thus wavelength clusters are completely independent and execute in parallel with *no* communication or synchronization along the rows of Fig. 1. The basic pre- and post-processing required are illustrated in the pseudo-code in Fig. 2. However, in order to parallelize the spectrum calculations for a model atmosphere with a global velocity field, such as the expanding atmospheres of novae, supernovae or stellar winds, we need to take the mathematical character of the RTE into account. For monotonic velocity fields, the RTE is an initial value problem in wavelength (with the initial condition at the smallest wavelength for expanding atmospheres and at the largest wavelength for contracting atmospheres). This initial value problem must be discretized fully implicitly to ensure stability. In the simplest case of a first order discretization, the solution of the RTE for wavelength point i depends only on the results of the point $i - 1$. In order to parallelize the spectrum calculations, the wavelength cluster n_i computing the solution for wavelength point i must get the specific intensities from the cluster n_{i-1} computing the solution for point $i - 1$. This suggests a “pipeline” solution to the wavelength parallelization. Note that only the solution of the RTE is affected by this, the calculation of the opacities and rates remains independent between different wavelength clusters and remains fully parallelized. In this case, the wavelength parallelization works as follows: Each cluster can independently compute the opacities and start the RT calculations (hereafter called the *pre-processing phase*), it then waits until it receives the specific intensities for the previous wavelength point, then it finishes the solution of the RTE and *immediately* sends the results to the wavelength cluster calculating the next wavelength point (to minimize waiting time, this is done with non-blocking send/receives), then proceeds to calculate the rates etc. (hereafter called the *post-processing phase* and the new opacities for its *next* wavelength point and so on.

The important point in this scheme is that each wavelength cluster can execute the post-processing phase of its current wavelength point and pre-processing phase of its next wavelength point *independently and in parallel with all other clusters*. This means that the majority of the total computational work can be done in parallel, leading to a substantial reduction in wall-clock time per model. Ideal load balancing can be obtained by dynamically allocating wavelength points to wavelength clusters. This requires only primitive logic with no measurable overhead, however it requires also communication and an arbitration/synchronization process to avoid deadlocks. Typically, the number of clusters n (4-64) is much smaller than the number of wavelength points, $n_{\text{wl}} \approx 300,000$, so that at any given time the work required for each wavelength point is roughly the same for each cluster (the work changes as the number of overlapping lines changes, for example). Therefore, a simple *round robin* allocation of wavelength points to clusters (cluster i calculates wavelength points $i, n + i, 2n + i$ and so on) can be used which will result in nearly optimal performance if the condition $n \ll n_{\text{wl}}$ is fulfilled.

As an example, we consider the the simple case of 16 nodes (with one CPU each), distributed to 2 wavelength clusters with 8 worker nodes each, i.e., $n = 2$, $m = 8$. Using the round-robin scheme, clusters 1–2 are allocated to wavelength points 1–2, respectively. Within in each cluster the work is divided using the combined task and data parallelism discussed in paper I where the work topology is identical for each cluster. All clusters begin immediately by executing the various preprocessing required. Since cluster 1 begins with wavelength point 1, it sets the initial condition for the co-moving frame RT. It then solves the RTE and *immediately* sends the specific intensities off to cluster 2 (which is already working on wavelength point 2) using a non-blocking MPI send. Cluster 1 then continues to calculate the rates and various other post-processing at this wavelength point and then immediately proceeds the pre-processing phase of its next wavelength point, number 3 in this case. At the same time, cluster 2 has finished calculating the opacities at its wavelength point number 2, done the preprocessing for solving the RTE and then must wait until cluster 1 has sent it the specific intensities for the previous wavelength point. It can then solve the RTE and immediately send its specific intensities on to cluster 1. Since node 1 was busy doing post-processing for wavelength point 1 and pre-processing for wavelength point 3, it may in fact have the specific intensities from node 2 just in time when it needs them to continue with the solution of the RTE for wavelength point 3 and so minimal waiting may be required and the process proceeds in a round robin fashion. Because we employ more than one worker per wavelength cluster the combined task and data parallel method described in Hauschildt, Baron, & Allard (1997) is used within the wavelength cluster and since the workers are symmetric, the sending of data must only be done between identical workers on each wavelength cluster as depicted in Figure 1, thus minimizing the inter-cluster communication.

This scheme has some predictable properties similar to the performance results for classical serial vector machines. First, for a very small number of clusters (e.g., two), the speedup will be small because the clusters would spend a significant amount of time waiting for the results from the previous cluster (the “pipeline” has no time to fill). Second, the speedup will level off for a very large number of clusters when the clusters have to wait because some of the clusters working on previous wavelength points have not yet finished their RTE solution, thus limiting the minimum theoretical time for the spectrum calculation to roughly the time required to solve the RTE for all the wavelength points together (the “pipeline” is completely filled). This means that there is a “sweet spot” for which the speedup to number-of-wavelength-clusters ratio is optimal. This ratio can be further optimized by using the optimal number of worker nodes per cluster, thus obtaining an optimal number of total nodes. The optimum will depend on the model atmosphere parameters, the speed of each node itself and the communication speed, as well as the quality of the compilers and libraries.

The wavelength parallelization has the drawback that it does not reduce the memory requirement per node compared to runs with a single wavelength cluster. Increasing the number of worker nodes per cluster will decrease the memory requirements per node drastically, however, so that large runs can use both parallelization methods at the same time to execute large simulations on nodes with limited memory. On a shared-memory machine with distributed physical memory (such as the SGI Origin 2000), this scheme can also be used to minimize memory access latency.

4. Results of performance tests

4.1. Static atmospheres

In the case of a static model atmosphere ($\beta = 0$), Eq. 2 can be solved independently for each wavelength point because the non-coherent scattering is handled in the rate-operator formalism. This means that for static atmospheres the parallelization over wavelength is simple and involves no communication or synchronization during the spectrum calculations. For our large set of wavelengths points, this will lead to good parallel performance. This is illustrated in Fig. 3 for a NLTE model atmosphere run with parameters appropriate for the A0V star Vega ($T_{\text{eff}} = 9600$ K, $\log(g) = 4.0$, solar abundances). The model includes about 4500 NLTE levels with nearly 51000 primary NLTE lines (with with detailed Voigt profiles for nearly 39000 of them), about 320000 background LTE lines and 340000 secondary NLTE lines (dynamically selected). The calculation was performed on a grid of about 270000 wavelength points. This is a typical case of a main sequence star NLTE model. The memory requirements of this calculations are high, therefore, we had to use at least 2 worker nodes per wavelength cluster on one of the IBM SP2s that we were using for this test. This model is a static atmosphere, so that different wavelength points are independent from each other and no communication between clusters is required until the spectrum calculation is complete. Therefore, the scalability of the calculation is excellent, in particular on the SGI Origin 2000 and the IBM SP2 runs with a single worker node per wavelength cluster. Clearly, it is more effective for this model type to use the minimum number of worker nodes per wavelength cluster to minimize communication and other overheads. The overhead due to a limited number of IO nodes and limited IO bandwidth available on the production IBM SP2 we used for the tests reduces the speedup for large number of nodes when nodes start to compete for the available IO bandwidth.

Clearly, for a very small number of processors the wavelength parallelization is less effective than is the spatial parallelization. This is caused by processors competing for IO bandwidth, rather than synchronization problems. However, once the number of processors begins to increase, the wavelength parallelization clearly scales significantly better than does the spatial parallelization. Therefore, it is optimal to use the minimal number of worker nodes per wavelength cluster (defined such that the code fits completely into the memory available at each node) and use as many wavelength clusters as possible.

4.2. Expanding atmospheres

In Fig. 4 we show the performance results for a nova model atmosphere calculation ($T_{\text{eff}} = 15000$ K, $L = 200000 L_{\odot}$, $v_{\text{max}} = 2000$ km s⁻¹, solar abundances) using various configurations running on the same IBM SP2. The model includes 1775 NLTE levels with 32056 primary NLTE lines, about 1.3 million background LTE lines and about 90000 secondary NLTE lines (dynamically selected). The calculation was performed on a grid of about 175000 wavelength points. This model is somewhat smaller than our typical nova models, it was used because it is small enough to run in serial mode on the IBM SP2 that we used for the tests. The behavior of the parallel performance and scalability is essentially as expected. For a small number of nodes, the speedup obtained by using wavelength cluster is smaller than the speedup obtained by using one wavelength cluster but several worker nodes. As the number of nodes increases, it is more effective to use more wavelength

clusters than more workers. However, as the number of clusters increases over a limit (about 8 clusters in this model), the speedup remains constant if the number of clusters is increased (and the number of workers remains constant). The optimum load distribution is thus a combination of all parallelization methods, depending not only on the machine but also on the workload distribution of the model calculation itself.

For a very large supernova calculation, we examine both the scaling and performance tradeoff of spatial versus wavelength parallelization. Figure 5 presents the results of our timing tests for one iteration of a Type Ic supernova model atmosphere, with a model temperature $T_{\text{model}} = 12,000$ K (the observed luminosity is given by $L = 4\pi R^2 T_{\text{model}}^4$), characteristic velocity $v_0 = 10000$ km s⁻¹, 4666 NLTE levels, 163812 NLTE Gauss lines, 211680 LTE Gauss lines, non-homogeneous abundances, and 260630 wavelength points. This is among the largest calculations we run and hence it has the highest potential for synchronization, I/O waiting, and swapping to reduce performance. It is however, characteristic of the level of detail needed to accurately model supernovae. This calculation has also been designed to barely fit into the memory of a single node. The behavior of the speedup is very similar to the results reported for the nova test case. The fact that the turnover is at lower number of processor elements is almost certainly due to the higher I/O and memory bandwidth required by the larger calculation than the supernova represents over the nova calculation.

The “saturation point” at which the wavelength pipeline fills and no further speedup can be obtained if more wavelength clusters are used lies for the machines used here at about 5 to 8 clusters. More clusters will not lead to larger speedups, as expected. Larger speedups can be obtained by using more worker nodes per cluster, which also drastically reduces the amount of memory required on each node.

5. Summary and Conclusions

We have discussed the methods that we have implemented in PHOENIX to parallelize the calculation of wavelength dependent spectra (for both spectral synthesis and model atmosphere generation). While the algorithms are simple in the case of static stellar atmospheres, for moving atmospheres, e.g., the expanding atmospheres of novae and supernovae or stellar winds, the radiative transfer equation is coupled between different wavelengths. Therefore, we have developed a “pipelined” approach that is used in expanding atmosphere models to parallelize the spectrum calculation. Combined with the “spatial” and “line” data and task parallelization reported in paper I, this new parallelization option can dramatically increase the speed of very detailed and sophisticated NLTE and LTE stellar atmosphere calculation with PHOENIX. The parallelization has become a standard feature of the production version of PHOENIX and we are routinely using all 3 parallelization options simultaneously to calculate model atmospheres for a large variety of objects from Brown and M dwarfs to novae and supernovae on parallel supercomputers. This has drastically increased our productivity with a comparatively small time and coding investment. It also forms the basis to much larger calculations that will be required to appropriately analyze the much improved data that can be expected from future ground- and space-based observatories.

Our wavelength parallelization combines the methods described in paper I by combining a number of worker nodes (which employ the task and data parallel algorithms discussed

in paper I) into symmetric “wavelength clusters” which work on different wavelength and that communicate results (if necessary) between them. This scheme is relatively simple to implement using the MPI standard and can be used on all parallel computers, both distributed and shared-memory systems (including clusters of workstations). It has the advantage of minimizing communication and it allows us to tailor the code’s memory usage to the memory available on each individual node.

The behavior of the wavelength parallelization can be understood easily and the speedups are as expected. The parallel scalability of PHOENIX is comparable to or even better than that of many commercially available scientific applications. The potential of parallel computing for stellar atmosphere modeling is enormous, both in terms of problem size and speed to model construction. The aggregate memory and computing power of parallel supercomputers can be used to create extremely detailed models that are impossible to calculate on vector supercomputers or workstations.

Acknowledgments: We thank the referee, John Castor, for helpful comments that helped to greatly improve the manuscript. We also thank David Lowenthal for helpful discussions on parallel computing. This work was supported in part by NASA ATP grant NAG 5-3018 and LTSA grant NAG 5-3619 to the University of Georgia, and by NSF grant AST-9417242, NASA grant NAG5-3505 and an IBM SUR grant to the University of Oklahoma. Some of the calculations presented in this paper were performed on the IBM SP2 of the UGA UCNS, at the San Diego Supercomputer Center (SDSC), the Cornell Theory Center (CTC), and at the National Center for Supercomputing Applications (NCSA), with support from the National Science Foundation, and at the NERSC with support from the DoE. We thank all these institutions for a generous allocation of computer time.

References

- Allard, F., & Hauschildt, P. H. 1995, *ApJ*, 445, 433
- Allard, F., Hauschildt, P., Alexander, D. R., & Starrfield, S. 1997, *ARAA*, 36, in press
- Baron, E., Hauschildt, P. H., Branch, D., Austin, S., Garnavich, P., Ann, H. B., Wagner, R. M., Filippenko, A. V., Matheson, T., & Liebert, J. 1995, *ApJ*, 441, 170
- Baron, E., Hauschildt, P. H., & Young, T. R. 1995, *Physics Reports*, 256, 23
- Baron, E., Hauschildt, P. H., Branch, D., Kirshner, R. P., & Filippenko, A. V. 1996a, *MNRAS*, 279, 779
- Baron, E., Hauschildt, P. H., Nugent, P., & Branch, D. 1996b, *MNRAS*, 283, 297
- Cowan, J. J., McWilliam, A., Sneden, C., & Burris, D. L. 1997, *ApJ*, 480, 246
- Gropp, W., Lusk, E., Doss, N., & Skjellum, A. 1996. *MPICH Model MPI Implementation Reference Manual*. Technical report, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne
- Hauschildt, P. H. 1992, *JQSRT*, 47, 433
- Hauschildt, P. H. 1993, *JQSRT*, 50, 301
- Hauschildt, P. H., & Baron, E. 1995, *JQSRT*, 54, 987
- Hauschildt, P. H., Starrfield, S., Shore, S. N., Allard, F., & Baron, E. 1995, *ApJ*, 447, 829
- Hauschildt, P. H., Baron, E., Starrfield, S., & Allard, F. 1996, *ApJ*, 462, 386
- Hauschildt, P. H., Baron, E., & Allard, F. 1997, *ApJ*, 483, 390
- Message Passing Interface Forum 1995. *MPI: A Message-Passing Interface Standard, Version 1.1*, Knoxville, TN: Univ. of Tennessee
- Mihalas, D., & Mihalas, B. W. 1984. *Foundations of Radiation Hydrodynamics*, Oxford: Oxford University
- Nugent, P., Baron, E., Hauschildt, P., & Branch, D. 1995a, *ApJ*, 441, L33
- Nugent, P., Phillips, M., Baron, E., Branch, D., & Hauschildt, P. 1995b, *ApJ*, 455, L147
- Nugent, P., Baron, E., Branch, D., Fisher, A., & Hauschildt, P. 1997, *ApJ*, 485, in press
- Prochaska, J. X., & Wolfe, A. M. 1997, *ApJ*, 474, 140
- Schwarz, G., Hauschildt, P. H., S. Starrfield, E. B., Allard, F., Shore, S., & Sonneborn, G. 1997, *MNRAS*, 284, 669

Fig. 1.— The basic design of our parallelization method, groups of processors are divided up into wavelength clusters which will work on individual wavelength points, the wavelength clusters are further divided into worker nodes, where each worker node is assign a set of specific (e.g., spatially distributed) tasks. Our design requires that each worker node on all wavelength clusters work on exactly the same set of tasks, although additional inherently serial operations can be assigned to one particular master worker, or master wavelength cluster. This method reduces communication between clusters to its absolute minimum and allows the maximum speedup.

Fig. 2.— Pseudo-code for the global layout of PHOENIX. The processing that is required before and after the radiative transfer is indicated. Both pre- and post-processing phases can be executed in parallel and independently for all clusters.

Fig. 3.— Scalability of the static Vega model atmosphere test run as function of the number of nodes (processing elements or nodes) used. The y-axis gives the speedup obtained relative to the serial run. The different symbols show the results for different numbers of worker tasks for each wavelength cluster.

Fig. 4.— Scalability of the Nova model atmosphere test run as function of the number of nodes (processing elements or nodes) used. The y-axis gives the speedup obtained relative to the serial run. The different symbols show the results for different numbers of worker tasks for each wavelength cluster.

Fig. 5.— Scalability of the Supernova model atmosphere test run as function of the number of nodes (processing elements or nodes) used. The y-axis gives the speedup obtained relative to the serial run. The different symbols show the results for different numbers of worker tasks for each wavelength cluster.