



CHEP 2012
21-25 May 2012
New York City, NY, USA



Refactoring, reengineering and evolution: paths to Geant4 uncertainty quantification and performance improvement

Maria Grazia Pia

M. Batič, M. Begalli, M. Han, S. Hauf, G. Hoff, C. H. Kim, M. Kuster,
P. Saracco, H. Seo, G. Weidenspointner, A. Zoglauer

INFN Genova, Italy

State University of Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), Brazil

Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea

Darmstadt Tech. Univ., Germany


PUCRS, Porto Alegre, Brazil

EU XFEL GmbH, Hamburg, Germany

MPI Halbleiterlabor, Munich, Germany


Space Sciences Laboratory, UC Berkeley, USA

“The code slowly sinks from engineering to hacking”.



“Refactoring is the process of changing a software system in such a way that it does not alter the external behavior of the code yet improves its internal structure.”

“When you refactor you are improving the design of the code after it has been written.”



Reengineering “seeks to transform a legacy system into the system you would have built if you had the luxury of hindsight and could have known all the new requirements that you know today.”

“A legacy is something *valuable* that you have *inherited*.”

“With rapid development tools *and* rapid turnover in personnel, software systems can turn into legacies more quickly than you might imagine.”

evolution



1. one of a set of prescribed movements
2. a process of change in a certain direction
3. the process of working out or developing
4. the historical development of a biological group
5. the extraction of a mathematical root
6. a process in which the whole universe is a progression of interrelated phenomena



The lantern

State of the art?

State of the art
in the physics for Monte Carlo
particle transport

Quantified simulation

Focus on **physics** and **fundamental concepts**
of particle transport


Theoretical and technological challenges

Produce concrete deliverables



R&D Project

Series of **pilot projects** going on since 2008



Highlights

No time to go into details



Archival literature

State-of-the-art, quantified

Geant 4



prototype

Quantify
Geant4 physics
capabilities

**current
future**

New physics
New performance

Identify
experimental
requirements

Code
Physics

V&V

**theory
exp.
MC**


Prune
Improve
Extend

Assess the
state of the art

physics

Refactor
(Re)design

software





Smells


If it stinks, change it.

Grandma Beck, discussing child-rearing philosophy

M. Fowler, K. Beck et al.,

Refactoring: Improving the Design of Existing Code

- Duplicated Code
- Long Method
- Large Class
- Long Parameter List
- Divergent Change
- Shotgun Surgery
- Feature Envy
- Data Clumps
- Primitive Obsession
- Switch Statements
- Parallel Inheritance Hierarchies
- Lazy Class
- Speculative Generality
- Temporary Field
- Message Chains
- Middle Man
- Inappropriate Intimacy
- Alternative Classes with Different Interfaces
- Incomplete Library Class
- Data Class
- Refused Bequest



Electromagnetic smells

Coupling

σ_{tot} and final state modeling
have been decoupled in hadronic
physics design since RD44

Dependencies

on other parts of the software


“model”

Total cross section

Whether a process occurs

Final state generation

How a process occurs



One needs a geometry
(and a full scale application)
to test (verify) a cross section

Difficult to test \rightarrow no testing
often

Problem domain analysis
Improve domain decomposition



Benefits

Transparency

Ease of maintenance

Simplicity of testing for V&V

*Numera ciò che è numerabile, misura ciò che è misurabile,
e ciò che non è misurabile rendilo misurabile.*

Galileo Galilei (1564-1642)

Basic physics V&V can be performed by means of
lightweight unit tests

Exploring new models (calculations) is made easier

Quantification of accuracy is facilitated

QED \neq QCD


Distinguish genuine modeling alternatives from evolving degree of complexity

Electromagnetic processes in particle transport:

- Final state to be generated is well identified
- **Theory**, rather than **model**
- Various degrees of refinement in theoretical calculations
 - e.g. electron at rest, scattering functions, Compton profiles
- Experimental data for validation are (in general) available

Bare-bone physical functionality

Decorations on top



Shift from shopping list of alternatives

Motion of atomic electrons
Doppler broadening

Binding effects

scattering functions

Doppler profiles

Vacancy creation
Atomic relaxation

An example: Photon elastic scattering

State of the art

Form factor approximation:

non relativistic, relativistic, modified + anomalous scattering factors

2nd order S-matrix calculations

recent calculations, not yet used in Monte Carlo codes

Quantification

Statistical analysis, GoF + categorical

Differential cross sections

	Penelope 2001	Penelope 2008	EPDL	Relativ. FF	Non-Rel. FF	Modified FF	MFF ASF	RFF ASF	SM NT
ϵ	0.27	0.38	0.38	0.25	0.35	0.49	0.52	0.48	0.77
error	± 0.05	± 0.06	± 0.06	± 0.05	± 0.06	± 0.06	± 0.06	± 0.06	± 0.05

ϵ = fraction of test cases compatible with experiment, 0.01 significance

Prune

Number one in the stink parade is duplicated code

M. Fowler,
Refactoring



physics

Objective quantification of smell

Two Geant4 models, identical underlying physics content (*it used to be different*)

Efficiency w.r.t. experiment

“Livermore”	Penelope
EPDL97	EPDL97
0.38 ± 0.06	0.38 ± 0.06



Code bloat

Burden on

- Software design
- Maintenance
- User support

Unnecessary complexity

Trash and redo

Number one in the stink
parade is duplicated ~~code~~

numbers

1. Bearden & Burr (1967)
2. Carlson
3. EADL
4. Sevier
5. Tol 1978 (Shirley)
6. Tol 1996 (Larkins)
7. Williams



Atomic binding energies

Geant 4 { Carlson + Williams
EADL (Carlson
Shirley)

Source of epistemic uncertainties?

3246 IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON NUCLEAR SCIENCE, VOL. 58, NO. 6, DECEMBER 2011
Evaluation of Atomic Electron Binding Energies
for Monte Carlo Particle Transport
Maria Grazia Pia, Hee Seo, Matej Batic, Marcia Begalli, Chan Hyeong Kim, Lina Quintieri, and Paolo Saracco

23
pages



Algorithms

Popular belief

Physics model X is intrinsically slow

Baroque methods to combine it with “faster” lower precision models and limit its use to cases where one is willing to pay for higher precision


This design introduces an additional computational burden due to the effects of inheritance and the combination algorithms themselves

Truth

Physics model X is intrinsically fast

But its computationally fast physics functionality is spoiled by an inefficient sampling algorithm

Change the sampling algorithm!



- ▶ **No code smell**
- ▶ Spotted through in-depth **code review** in the course of **software validation**

The fastest algorithm

no algorithm at all

Shift modeling from algorithms to data


Merging models



Smoothing data


Guidance from
experimental data
(when available)

Electron impact ionisation cross sections



Example: LOESS local polynomial regression fitting
Beware: not optimized! Mathematical support in progress

...no silver bullet



Smoothing models (or data) that exhibit significantly different behaviour is not physically justified

← Here our understanding of the underlying physics phenomena fails

Experimental data themselves must be analyzed for inconsistencies and possible systematics

Photon elastic scattering cross section at 90°

Experimental data by Schumacher et al., Starr et al., Jackson et al., Moreh et al. etc., complete list in a forthcoming publication

How to solve this kind of problems?

Better theoretical calculations
New, dedicated experimental data

No easy solution

Data libraries

Experimentally validated
Quantified accuracy
State of the art

- PIXE (proton ionisation cross sections)
- BEB – DM (electron ionisation cross sections)
- Photon elastic
 - RTAB (Lynn Kissel) trimmed and reformatted for MC use


R&D in progress

- Interpolation algorithms
 - Smoothing techniques
 - Data management methods
- Mathematical expertise* ←

Refactoring data management

- Today's technology
 - ...keeping an eye on the new C++ Standard

- Optimal container
- Pruning data
- Splitting files
- Software design




Big refactoring


Geant4 Radioactive Decay

Well defined responsibilities and interactions






Absolute validation





Experiment: Z. W. Bell (ORNL)

Validation

New algorithm



Performance



Conclusions



A quantitatively validated, state-of-the-art Monte Carlo code is at reach

→ a tremendous challenge
an inspiring motivation

Large effort

Supported by software design

Refactoring techniques and reengineering patterns contribute to improve **computational performance** and facilitate **validation**

Physics insight is the key

