Subject: Re: Avoiding a FOR loop in calculation of SPH potential energy Posted by Jeremy Bailin on Wed, 24 Jun 2009 04:20:15 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
On Jun 23, 2:48 am, cody <codyras...@gmail.com> wrote:
> i have an SPH simulation with snapshots in time that are represented
> as structures in idl. the structures have mass, density, position etc.
> for every particle in the simulation. i'm trying to get a vector that
> represents the total potential energy at each snapshot. i have an
> outer FOR loop that loops through each snapshot file and this part is
> fine, i don't really want to change that, but i have an inner loop for
> calculating the PE that must calculate the total potential energy felt
> by each particle from every other particle without double counting. to
> do that, i just loop over a dummy variable j from 0 to the maximum
> particle ident -1 and make a sub list of particles where ident > j.
> this way, i'm not double counting and it's not n^2 time. but it's
> still way too slow for a 100k particle sim.
>
> now i'm fairly certain there's a way to speed this up considerably
> using IDL's strengths, but i'm a c++ programmer, so that's the way i
  think, can someone help me out?
>
  here's my code as it stands now:
>
  PRO exportenergy, enditer=enditer, deliter=deliter, root=root
>
> ;first get the total number of particles
> startiter = 1000
> n = (enditer - startiter)/deliter
> m=0
> G=3.93935d-7 ;SPH units
>
> arr = DBLARR(5, n)
> for i=0L,(n-1) do begin
    iter = i*deliter + startiter
>
    filename = root + '.' + STRING(iter,format='(I0)')
>
    readsdf,filename,s
>
    arr[0,i] = sdf getdouble(filename, "tpos")
>
    arr[1,i] = 0.5*total(s.mass*s.vx^2)
>
    arr[2,i] = 0.5*total(s.mass*s.vy^2)
>
    arr[3,i] = 0.5*total(s.mass*s.vz^2)
>
    :PE part starts here
>
    pn = max(s.ident)
>
    PE = 0.0
    for j=0L,pn-1 do begin
>
      sub = where(s.ident gt j)
>
      PE = PE + G*s[i].mass*total(s[sub].mass/sqrt((s[i].x-s[sub].x)^2+
```

Do you need to use direct summation? Tree potential energies aren't bad (though you need to use a smaller opening angle than for tree forces to get the same accuracy), and will reduce it to O(N log N).

-Jeremy.