

## Reviewer 1: Revision of Manuscript, “Julia for Geophysical Fluid Dynamics: Performance Comparisons between CPU, GPU, and Fortran-MPI”

The authors are grateful for the reviewers’ insightful suggestions, which have contributed to the improvement of the manuscript. The major change is that the Julia-GPU, Julia-MPI, Fortran-MPI simulations have all been retested on Perlmutter at NERSC, so that comparisons can be made directly between single-node CPU and single-node GPU. Perlmutter uses AMD EPYC 7763 CPU nodes and NVIDIA A100 GPUs, so is newer and more relevant to readers than the previous tests on Cori. We have also added more introductory material on Julia, a longer results and discussion section, weak scaling plots, and plots that directly compare full-node CPU and GPU performance.

### Major Comments:

1. The manuscript presents a shallow water model, written in the Julia programming language for CPUs and GPUs, and compares its performance to an object-oriented Python code and an established Fortran code. Since Julia is now emerging in the field of geophysical model development, and its application to unstructured-mesh PDE solvers is novel, this article is suitable for GMD. The manuscript is well written, and the model validation part is done very well. Unfortunately, the performance comparison study, which is one of the main parts of the manuscript, has major flaws. I can only recommend publication after substantial revisions are made to this part of the manuscript. Moreover, while I applaud the authors for providing code that is supposed to reproduce their results, I encountered several issues when trying to run it.

**Response:** We have revised the manuscript based on the suggestions provided, and fixed the issues with the accompanying code to ensure reproducibility.

2. This reviewer is familiar with Julia, but many potential readers won’t be. The Julia compilation model, which is the key to its performance, is first briefly described in the results section and further discussed in the optimization tips section. These descriptions are not fully correct (see the specific comments below), and could be made more clear. I think it would be a good idea to centralize this material and provide a short introduction to Julia in the methods section, emphasizing how its compilation model enables high-performance computing and how static code generation facilitates GPU computations.

**Response:** This is a good suggestion. We have added a new section 2, which is an introduction to Julia. We have also corrected the text from your specific comments below. Thank you.

3. The authors obtained very impressive speed-ups from using GPUs - up to 100,000x for the computation time. Their result that the GPU computation times for their model do not depend on problem size is very surprising and, frankly, suspicious. Looking at the provided code, the authors seem to profile their model using the Julia macros `@elapsed` and `@benchmark`. However, based on the `CUDA.jl` profiling guide<sup>1</sup>, this is not the right way to profile GPU code, which launches kernels asynchronously. The correct way is to use `CUDA.@elapsed` and add synchronization to functions profiled by `@benchmark`. Otherwise, only the cost of launching kernels will be timed and not the actual cost of computations. If this is how the GPU profiling was done, then the GPU benchmarks must be repeated and the manuscript revised based on the new results.

**Response:** Thank you for this incredibly valuable suggestion. After implementing the appropriate CUDA macros to accurately measure execution time on the GPUs, we discovered that the previous speed-up times were indeed incorrect. The rectified results, depicted in Figure 2, present a more reasonable scenario, where the scaling of the GPU closely aligns with that of a full node comprising 64 processes.

4. In general, while many speed-up numbers are provided in the paper, there is no rigorous discussion of the obtained values. These values should be put in the context of known hardware capabilities. MPAS-Ocean is a well-established code, and its performance bottlenecks are surely known. Since it is a low-order finite-volume code, most likely the main performance limiter is memory bandwidth.

The authors provided many details about the hardware they used, such as peak flops, the number of CUDA cores, and cache sizes. However, the memory bandwidth value is only provided for the RTX 8000 GPU, but not the CPU. It is also unclear whether it was measured empirically, or taken from the vendor specification. Please focus on the hardware characteristics that are relevant to the model computational performance and frame the discussion of speed-ups around these characteristics.

**Response:** Please see the new section 3.7, Hardware and Compiler Specifications. Table 1 has been added to describe the hardware, which is now a CPU node versus a GPU node of Perlmutter at NERSC.

5. While there are many ways to compare performance of heterogeneous systems, presenting comparisons of a single CPU core to a single GPU is not a valid practice. As the aim of the paper is to demonstrate the suitability of Julia for HPC, comparisons between a full CPU node and a GPU should be done, while perhaps noting their TDP values. As an MPI version of the code was created, this should be straightforward.

**Response:** After rectifying our GPU timing measurements, we proceeded to evaluate the performance of our Fortran and Julia codes on the NVIDIA TESLA A100 GPU. We compared this performance to the execution on a full CPU node consisting of 64 processes. The wall-clock times for both scenarios, illustrated in Figure 2, demonstrate remarkably similar results.

6. There is a number of possibilities to extend the performance analysis part of the paper, which, while not absolutely necessary, would significantly strengthen it. Since the number of kernels executed by each model time step is small, this presents an opportunity to use profilers to do performance analysis at the level of individual kernels. Roofline plots could be created. The scaling study could also be extended to cover weak scaling.

**Response:** We have expanded the performance analysis section of the paper to encompass weak scaling. In order to identify lines of code that are consuming excessive amount of time on the CPU, we employed line-by-line profilers and allocation trackers (as mentioned in the section on optimization tips for Julia developers).

### Specific Comments:

1. Lines 38-40: “In recent years, shallow water solvers such as Oceananigans.jl (Ramadhan et al., 2020) and ShallowWaters.jl (Klöwer et al., 2022) have been developed in Julia. These codes (...) are equipped with capabilities for running on GPUs to achieve high performance.” According to its documentation, Oceananigans.jl is not just a shallow water solver, but can solve nonhydrostatic and hydrostatic Boussinesq equations. There is no mention that ShallowWaters.jl can run on GPUs in its documentation, and its Project.toml doesn’t include any GPU packages.

**Response:** The text has been updated with this information.

2. Line 77, Equation (2a): Shouldn’t the kinetic energy term be under the gradient operator?

**Response:** Yes, we have fixed it.

3. Line 82: (2b) is referred to as the discrete momentum equation. Shouldn’t this be (2a)?

**Response:** Yes, we have fixed it.

4. Lines 278-279: “making all types and subtypes concrete rather than abstract, to minimize on-the-fly compilation”. How does making the types concrete minimize compilation? Julia performs just-in-time compilation regardless of whether the supplied arguments are concrete or abstract. The cost of abstract types is the cost of missed optimizations and additional runtime dispatch.

**Response:** Thank you for highlighting the flaw in our explanation. We have duly corrected these lines and enhanced our clarification on these points.

5. Lines 288-289: “In addition, single-precision floating point numbers (CUDA Float32 data type) calculations may execute significantly faster than Float64 (Julia Development Team).” It is true that

most customer-grade GPUs have limited double-precision capabilities. This is usually not the case for GPUs targeting the HPC market. However, if the presented code is bandwidth limited, wouldn't the maximum possible speed-up from switching to Float32 be 2x?

**Response:** The sentence mentioned above has been removed from our revised manuscript. In the updated version, we evaluate the performance of the CUDA code on the NVIDIA TESLA A100 GPU specifically designed for high-performance computing (HPC). Moreover, we employ double precision throughout our analysis, rendering the previously obtained results with single precision irrelevant.

6. Figure 3: The title mentions occupancy, but only execution times are shown. Which kernel was profiled? Are the results the same for other kernels? It would be better if the x axis ticks showed some typical block size values, such as 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, and 1024.

**Response:** The mentioned figure has been excluded from our revised manuscript. Upon properly timing the GPU computations, we realised that this particular result is neither accurate nor pertinent to our analysis.

7. Lines 330-333 and Figure 4.: Any idea why Fortran-MPI computations scale worse than Julia?

**Response:** In the revised plots using Perlmutter comparing Fortran-MPI and Julia-MPI, Fortran performance is much closer to Julia, but still a bit slower. We discussed this with performance experts at NERSC, but did not find an explanation.

8. Lines 336-347: Again, I found this discussion of the Julia compilation model not fully correct. Julia does not require variables with full type declaration to achieve fast code, since it performs aggressive type inference. The authors discuss an issue that only concerns type declarations of struct members. Moreover, the authors again seem to suggest that just-in-time compilation occurs only for Any or abstract types, which is not correct. Please revise this paragraph. As mentioned in the general remarks, some of the material regarding the compilation model should probably be presented earlier in the text.

**Response:** Thanks to the clarity of your feedback, we have made appropriate corrections to our explanation on the Julia compilation model. We have explicitly specified that the performance boost associated with concrete type definitions only apply to structs. Moreover, we have relocated the comprehensive content on the Julia compilation model to Section 2, which serves as an introductory segment on Julia.

#### Technical Comments:

1. Some words are not capitalized consistently and correctly (ssh and SSH, python and Python, Numpy and NumPy).

**Response:** Fixed.

2. Line 9 in the abstract: "The GPU-accelerated Julia code is attained a speed-up"

**Response:** Fixed.

3. spurious "is".

**Response:** Removed.

4. Line 153: pressureGradient should be sshGradient.

**Response:** Fixed.

5. I was not able to run the provided code as is. I only tried to run the optimized version. The optimized code contains typos and references to undefined variables. Some examples of the problems I encountered:

- (a) in GPU\_CPU\_performance\_comparison\_meshes.ipynb the file cuda\_time\_steppers.jl is not included, which makes CUDA tendency functions undefined.

**Response:** Fixed.

- (b) In the same file `calculate_ssh_tendency_cuda!` is used, but it is not defined in `cuda_tendencies.jl`, or anywhere else.

**Response:** Fixed.

- (c) In `calculate_normal_velocity_tendency_cuda!` there is a typo in `mpasOean.maxLevelEdgeTop`.

**Response:** Fixed.

- 6. Moreover, `maxLevelEdgeTop` is not a member of the `MPAS_Ocean_CUDA` struct. There are more issues along the same lines. Please provide a version of the optimized code that can be run.

**Response:** In our initial submission, the `MPAS_Ocean_CUDA` struct was derived from an outdated version of the code, predating our implementation of the multi-layered shallow water equations, where the relevance of `maxLevelEdgeTop` comes into play. However, we have since updated the code, ensuring that the `MPAS_Ocean_CUDA` struct now contains all the essential fields required for computation.

- 7. I had some issues with obtaining the mesh files used in this study. The readme file points to a Zenodo archive. However, the article uses meshes of size 128x128, 256x256, and 512x512. The Zenodo archive contains meshes of size 64x64, 96x96, 144x144, 216x216, and 324x324. Where can I find the mesh files used in this study?

**Response:** In our revised manuscript, we showcase the convergence of the spatial operators on the same set of meshes used for obtaining convergence of the numerical solution of the inertia gravity wave test case. They can be obtained from either

- (a) `MPAS_Ocean_Shallow_Water_Meshes_Convergence_Study/Periodic`, or
- (b) `InertiaGravityWaveMesh/ConvergenceStudyMeshes`

on the Zenodo archive.