# *Force and Energy Computation*

*Week 1 : How MD works?*



2024 Winter Molecular Simulation Seminar January 12th, 2024

> Presenter: Seonghyeon Kang Advisor: Prof. Chang Yun Son

# *Week 1 : How MD Works?*

# *Basic Principle of Molecular Dynamics*

- *1. Information of Potential Energy from Force Field*
- *2. Calculation of Potential Energy*
- *3. Computing Force, Displacement, Velocity, … from Integration Algorithm*

# *Two Kinds of Potential Energy(Brief Classification)*

- *1. Bonded Energy(Bond, Angle, Torsion, Improper)*
	- *Easy and clear to compute(Low time complexity)*
- *Short-range Interaction*

*2. Nonbonded Energy(Lennard-Jones, Electrostatic energy)*

- *Difficult to compute(High time complexity)*
- *Long-range interaction(Periodicity, Finite Size Effect)*

# *Contents*

- *1. Periodic Boundary Condition & Finite Size Effect*
- *2. Computational Algorithms for Nonbonded Energy Calculation*
	- *3. Why we use PME(Particle-Mesh-Ewald)? & Artifacts of PME*
		- *4. GPU parallelization of Nonbonded Energy Computation*

# *1. Periodic Boundary Condition(PBC) & Finite Size Effect*



*Allen, M. P., & Tildesley, D. J.*, Computer simulation of liquids. *Oxford university press.* **2017**

*Simulation Box Periodic Image/Finite Size Convention* *If we don't apply periodic images.. - Surface effect become dominant - PBC is applied to minimize it!*

*But PBC can make another artifacts - It is called Finite Size Effect - Due to the artificial external environments*

*1. Periodic Boundary Condition(PBC) & Finite Size Effect*

#### *Examples of Finite Size Effect*

*- Diffusion Coefficient(And its correction)*



*Celebi, A. T., Jamali, S. H., Bardow, A., Vlugt, T. J., & Moultos, O. A.,* Finite-size effects of diffusion coefficients computed from molecular dynamics: a review of what we have learned so far. *Mol. Sim.*, **2021**, *47*(10-11), 831-845.

*1. Periodic Boundary Condition(PBC) & Finite Size Effect*

### *Examples of Finite Size Effect*

- *- Thermal Conductivity*
- *- Solvation Energy*

*- …*

*The main reasons of these artifacts 1) Periodic images significantly affect the simulation box 2) Non-periodic nature of the real phenomenon*

*We have to set the proper size of simulation box to secure the accuracy and efficiency of computation!*



# *Bonded Energy*

- *- Easy and clear to compute*
- *- Short-range Interaction*
- *- Low time complexity*

# *Nonbonded Energy*

- *- Difficult to compute*
- *- Long-range Interaction*
- *- High time complexity*

*Van-der Walls energy(Rapidly decay, ~ r-6) - Cutoff energy*

*Electrostatic energy(Slowly decay, ~ r-1) - Cutoff unavailable - PME, PPPM, Reaction Field, FMM, …*

### *Van-der Walls energy*



8 simulation of liquids. *Oxford university press.* **2017***Allen, M. P., & Tildesley, D. J.*, Computer

# *Electrostatic Interaction*

*Direct Coulomb Summation*

 $E_{elec}=\frac{1}{2}$  $\frac{1}{2}$ .  $\overline{\mathbf{i}=\mathbf{1}}$  $\boldsymbol{N}$  $\sum$  $\overline{\mathbf{j}^{\pm}}\mathbf{i}$  $\sum_{i=1}^{N} q_i q_i$  $r_{ij}$ 

*Exact summation of all coulombic interaction The most accurate, but also the most expensive one(O(N2)) Moreover, it has low scalability to parallelize this algorithm*

*Alternative approach to make efficient algorithms* 

*Particle Mesh Ewald(PME) Method*

*Particle – Particle/Particle-Mesh(PPPM) Method*

*Reaction Field Method*

*Fast Multipole Method*

*(OpenMM utilizes sPME & Reaction Field Method)*

### *Electrostatic Interaction*

*Particle Mesh Ewald(PME) Method(Idea)*

*Sum of Coulombic energy = real space sum + reciprocal space sum*



*Stenberg, S., & Stenqvist, B*., An exact Ewald summation method in theory and practice. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A,* **2020***,124(*19*),* 3943-3946.

*Narrow distribution in real space : Broad distribution of reciprocal space Broad distribution in real space : Narrow distribution of reciprocal space*

### *Electrostatic Interaction*

#### *Particle Mesh Ewald(PME) Method(Formalism & Performance)*

 $\begin{split} E_{\text{dir}} & = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n}^{*} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \frac{q_{j}q_{j}}{|\mathbf{r}_{j}-\mathbf{r}_{i}+\mathbf{n}|}, \\ E_{\text{rec}} & = \frac{1}{2 \pi V} \sum_{\mathbf{m} \neq 0} \frac{\exp(-\pi^{2} \mathbf{m}^{2} / \beta^{2})}{\mathbf{m}^{2}} S(\mathbf{m}) S(-\mathbf{m}), \\ E_{\text{corr}} & = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in M} \frac{q_{i}q_{j}}{|\mathbf{r}_{i}-\mathbf{r}_{j}|} \frac{\$ *Direct space summation Reciprocal space summation Error correction(Self-interaction)summation*  $S(m) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i \exp(2\pi i m \cdot r_j) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i \exp[2\pi i (m_1 s_{1j} + m_2 s_{2j} + m_3 s_{3j})]$  (Structure Factor)

*Essmann, U., Perera, L., Berkowitz, M. L., Darden, T., Lee, H., & Pedersen, L. G.,* A smooth particle mesh Ewald method. *The Journal of chemical physics*, **1995**, *103*(19), 8577-8593.

#### *Time Complexity : O(NlogN) Accuracy : Medium accuracy, Depending on (Ewald splitting parameter) Scalability : High(3D Discrete Fast Fourier Transform)*

*George, A., Mondal, S., Purnaprajna, M., & Athri, P.,* Review of Electrostatic Force Calculation Methods and Their Acceleration in Molecular Dynamics Packages Using Graphics Processors*. ACS omega, 2022, 7(*37*),* 32877-32896.

### *Electrostatic Interaction*

#### *Particle Mesh Ewald(PME) Method(PME vs sPME)*

$$
S(\mathbf{m}) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} q_j \exp(2\pi i \mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} q_j \exp[2\pi i (m_1 s_{1j} + m_2 s_{2j} + m_3 s_{3j})]
$$
 (Structure Factor)  
exp $(2\pi i \mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{r})$  = exp $\left(2\pi i \frac{m_1 u_1}{K_1}\right)$  exp $\left(2\pi i \frac{m_2 u_2}{K_2}\right)$  exp $\left(2\pi i \frac{m_3 u_3}{K_3}\right)$ 

*Approximation of Structure Factor I : Lagrangian Interpolation(PME)*

$$
\exp\left(2\pi i \frac{m_{\alpha}}{K_{\alpha}} u_{\alpha}\right) \approx \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} W_2(u_{\alpha} - k) \cdot \exp\left(2\pi i \frac{m_{\alpha}}{K_{\alpha}} k\right) \qquad W_{2p}(u) = \frac{\prod_{j=-p, j\neq k}^{p-1} (u+j-k)}{\prod_{j=-p, j\neq k}^{p-1} (j-k)}
$$
  
for  $k \le u \le k+1, k=-p, -p+1, ..., p-1$ 

#### *Approximation of Structure Factor II : Cardinal B-Spline(sPME)*

$$
\exp\left(2\pi i \frac{m_i}{K_i} u_i\right) \approx b_i(m_i) \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} M_n(u_i - k) \cdot \exp\left(2\pi i \frac{m_i}{K_i} k\right) \qquad \text{Implemented in OpenMM}
$$
\n
$$
M_n(u) = \frac{u}{n-1} M_{n-1}(u) + \frac{n-u}{n-1} M_{n-1}(u-1) \qquad b_i(m_i) = \exp\left(2\pi i (n-1) m_i / K_i\right) \times \left[\sum_{k=0}^{n-2} M_n(k+1) \exp\left(2\pi i m_i k / K_i\right)\right]^{-1}
$$

*Essmann, U., Perera, L., Berkowitz, M. L., Darden, T., Lee, H., & Pedersen, L. G.,* A smooth particle mesh Ewald method. *The Journal of chemical physics*, **1995**, *103*(19), 8577-8593.

### *Electrostatic Interaction*

#### *Particle – Particle/Particle – Mesh(PPPM) Method*

*Based on Ewald sum(dividing short range/long range interaction + FFT) Short range : particle-particle & Long range : particle-mesh*

$$
\psi_s(\zeta_{ij}) = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \left( \frac{1}{r_{ij}} - \frac{1}{70a} \sum_{n=-1}^7 C_n \zeta_{ij}^n \right) \zeta_{ij} < 2 \quad \text{Short range interaction}
$$
\n
$$
\hat{\psi}(k) = \hat{\gamma} \frac{(k)^2}{\epsilon_0 k^2} \hat{\rho}(k) = \hat{G}(k)\hat{\rho}(k) \quad \text{Long range interaction}
$$
\n
$$
(48 (a)) \qquad a
$$

$$
\zeta_{ij} = \frac{2r_{ij}}{a} \ \gamma(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{40}{\pi a^4} \left( \frac{a}{2} - r \right) & r < \frac{a}{2} \\ 0 & r > \frac{a}{2} \end{cases}
$$

### *Time Complexity : O(NlogN) Accuracy : High accuracy, More than PME Scalability : Medium(Increase of long-range part make lower scalability)*

*George, A., Mondal, S., Purnaprajna, M., & Athri, P.,* Review of Electrostatic Force Calculation Methods and Their Acceleration in Molecular Dynamics Packages Using Graphics Processors*. ACS omega, <sup>2022</sup>, 7(*37*),* 32877-32896. 13

# *Electrostatic Interaction*

*Reaction Field Method(Idea)*



# *Spherical Truncation(r < r<sub>c</sub>) + Dielectric Continuum Outside*

*Explicit interaction weighting*

$$
f(r_{ij}) = \begin{cases} 1.0 & r_{ij} < r_{\rm t} \\ (r_{\rm c} - r_{ij})/(r_{\rm c} - r_{\rm t}) & r_{\rm t} \le r_{ij} \le r_{\rm c} \\ 0.0 & r_{\rm c} < r_{ij} \\ (r_{\rm t} \sim 0.95r_{\rm c}) \end{cases}
$$

*Reaction field acting on molecule i*

$$
\mathcal{E}_i = \frac{2(\epsilon_{\rm s}-1)}{2\epsilon_{\rm s}+1} \frac{1}{r_{\rm c}^3} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}} \mu_j
$$

*Allen, M. P., & Tildesley, D. J.*, Computer simulation of liquids. *Oxford university press.* **2017**

# *Electrostatic Interaction*

### *Reaction Field Method(Formalism)*

$$
\mathcal{V}^{qq} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{\substack{j, l \neq j \\ R_{IJ} < r_c}}^{N} q_i q_j \left[ \frac{1}{r_{ij}} + \left( \frac{\epsilon_s - 1}{2\epsilon_s + 1} \frac{r_{ij}^2}{r_c^3} + C \right) \right] + \mathcal{V}_{\text{Born}} + \mathcal{V}_{\text{self}}
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{V}_{\text{Born}} = -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\epsilon_s - 1}{\epsilon_s} \right) \frac{1}{r_c} \sum_{i=1}^{N} q_i \sum_{\substack{l,j \text{ s.t.} \\ R_{IJ} < r_c}}^{N} q_j \quad \mathcal{V}_{\text{self}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j \in I}^{N} q_i q_j \left( \frac{\epsilon_s - 1}{2\epsilon_s + 1} \frac{r_{ij}^2}{r_c^3} + C \right) \quad C = -\frac{1}{r_c} \left[ 1 + \frac{\epsilon_s - 1}{2\epsilon_s + 1} - \frac{\epsilon_s - 1}{\epsilon_s} \right]
$$
\nLinearized Poisson-  
Boltzmann Equation

\n
$$
B_1 = \frac{(1 - 4\epsilon_s)(1 + \kappa r_c) - 2\epsilon_s(\kappa r_c)^2}{(1 + 2\epsilon_s)(1 + \kappa r_c) + \epsilon_s(\kappa r_c)^2}
$$

*Time Complexity : O(N) Accuracy : Low accuracy Scalability : High Reaction Field Method is* 

*Implemented in OpenMM*

15 *Allen, M. P., & Tildesley, D. J.*, Computer simulation of liquids. *Oxford university press.* **2017**

### *Electrostatic Interaction*



treecode & FMM

Yokota, R., & Barba, L. A., GPU Computing Gems Emerald Edition, chapter 9: 16<br>Treecode and fast multipole method for N-body simulation with CUDA, 2011. 16

# *Electrostatic Interaction*

# *Fast Multipole Method(Formalism & Performance)*

*Potential*

$$
\phi(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-\ell}^{m=\ell} M_{\ell,m} G_{\ell,m}(\mathbf{r}) \qquad G_{\ell,m}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{(-1)^{\ell-m}(\ell-m)!}{r^{\ell+1}} \exp(im\varphi) P_{\ell,m}(\cos\theta)
$$

*Solution*

$$
M_{\ell,m} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} q_i F_{\ell,m}^*(-\mathbf{r}_i), \quad F_{\ell,m}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{(-1)^{\ell-m} r^{\ell}}{(\ell+m)!} \exp(\mathrm{i} m \varphi) P_{\ell,m}(\cos \theta).
$$

*Time Complexity : O(N), top 10 algorithms in 20th century Accuracy : Medium accuracy Scalability : High, One of the most scalable algorithm*

*FMM is Implemented in GROMACS*

*3. Why we use PME(Particle-Mesh-Ewald)? & Artifacts of PME*

### *Why we use PME nowadays?*

- *1. Low complexity(O(NlogN)) 2. Quite high accuracy 3. High scalability*
- *4. Traditionally utilized 5. Easy to parametrize*

### *Limits & Artifacts of PME*

*1. Only appliable in charge neutral system* 

*2. In non-neutral system, uniform background charge distribution to compensate the charge of the system is applied.*

*3. The background charge induces artifacts related to dielectric constant in inhomogeneous system* 

*Ex) Over-stabilization of ions in low-dielectric medium*

### *3. Why we use PME(Particle-Mesh-Ewald)? & Artifacts of PME*

### *Limits & Artifacts of PME*

*1. Only appliable in charge neutral system* 

*2. In non-neutral system, uniform background charge distribution to compensate the charge of the system is applied.*

$$
E_{elec} = E_{real} + E_{recip} + E_{back} - E_{self}
$$

$$
E_{real} = \frac{1}{2} \sum \sum_{i \neq j} q_i \phi_{real}
$$
  
\n
$$
E_{back} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{V} \rho_{back} \phi_{real} \, dr = \frac{\pi q_{tot}^2}{2V \alpha}
$$
  
\n
$$
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k} (\tilde{\rho}_{back} + \tilde{\rho}_{smooth}) \tilde{\phi}_{recip} \exp(ikr_i)
$$
  
\n
$$
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k} (\tilde{\rho}_{back} + \tilde{\rho}_{smooth}) \tilde{\phi}_{recip} \exp(ikr_i)
$$
  
\n
$$
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k} \tilde{\rho}_{smooth} \tilde{\phi}_{recip} \exp(ikr_i)
$$
  
\nInfinite sum  
\nLow convergence

*but the energy will be depend on non-physical parameter* 

 $\rho_{back}$  is constant,  $\tilde{\rho}_{back} \phi_{reciv} = 0$  for  $k \neq 0$ *Also,*  $\tilde{\rho}_{recip}\tilde{\phi}_{recip}(k=0) = \int \rho_{recip} dV = 0$ 

# *3. Why we use PME(Particle-Mesh-Ewald)? & Artifacts of PME*

### *Limits & Artifacts of PME*

*3. The background charge induces artifacts related to dielectric constant in inhomogeneous system* 

*Utilizing PME method with non-neutral system : Technically possible*

*However, constant dielectric environment gives significant artifacts for heterogeneous dielectric environment* 

*Ex) proteins solvated in water, membrane solvated in water*

*Real system : nonuniform counter charge distribution, generates electrostatic gradients PME w/ non-neutral system : No electrostatic gradient*

# *4. GPU parallelization of Nonbonded Energy Computation*

# *CPU vs GPU*





- *- Central Processing Unit*
- *- Serial cores*
- *- Low latency*
- *- Good for serial processing*
- *- Can do handful of operation at once*

- *- Graphic Processing Unit*
- *- Many cores*
- *- High throughput*
- *- Good for parallel processing*
- *- Can do thousands of operation at once*

21 *Paz, A., & Plaza, A.,* A new morphological anomaly detection algorithm for hyperspectral images and its GPU implementation. In Satellite Data Compression, Communications, and Processing VII(Vol. 8157)., *SPIE*, **2011**

# *4. GPU parallelization of Nonbonded Energy Computation GPU Acceleration*

*It is based on the principle of parallel computing*

*Scalability is the important factor to make the parallel computing better*

Table 1. Summary of Comparisons between Different Electrostatic Force Calculation Algorithms (EFC Alg.)<sup>a</sup>

<b>EFC</b> Alg.	complexity	accuracy	scalability	boundary conditions
<b>DCS</b>	$O(NO)$ 60	Highest <sup>47</sup>	Low <sup>47</sup>	NPC, PC
<b>MSM</b>	$O(N + Q)^{33}$	Medium <sup>33</sup>	High <sup>33</sup>	PC, SPC, <b>NPC</b>
$P^3$ M	$O(N \log N)$ 67	High <sup>32</sup>	Medium <sup>69,70</sup>	PC
<b>PME</b>	$O(N \log N)^{32}$	Median <sup>60,61</sup>	High <sup><math>62,63</math></sup>	PC
<b>FMM</b>	$O(N)$ 79,80	Medium <sup>77,78,82</sup>	High <sup>81</sup>	NP, PC

"NPC stands for nonperiodic conditions, PC for periodic conditions, and SPC for semiperiodic conditions.

*George, A., Mondal, S., Purnaprajna, M., & Athri, P.,* Review of Electrostatic Force Calculation Methods and Their Acceleration in Molecular Dynamics Packages Using Graphics Processors*. ACS omega, 2022, 7(*37*),* 32877-32896.

#### *Takeaways*

■ For computing energy in molecular simulation box, PBC *is applied to prevent excess surface effect in the system. Sometimes artificial environment from PBC induce artifacts of simulation*

■ Several algorithms to compute high-cost nonbonded energy were developed(Cutoff, PME, PPPM, FMM, Reaction Field).

■ Nowadays, PME is the most used algorithm for nonbonded energy calculation due to its performance. However, PME has several limitations and artifacts.

■ GPU can accelerate nonbonded computation. To utilize GPU for it, scalability of computing algorithms matters.

*Thank you for your kind attention / Q&A*

