

Balsam: Automated Scheduling and Execution of Dynamic, Data-Intensive HPC Workflows

Michael A. Salim, Thomas D. Uram, J. Taylor Childers,
Prasanna Balaprakash, Venkatram Vishwanath, and Michael E. Papka
Leadership Computing Facility
Argonne National Laboratory
Lemont, IL 60439
Email: msalim@anl.gov

Abstract—We introduce the Balsam service to manage high-throughput task scheduling and execution on supercomputing systems. Balsam allows users to populate a task database with a variety of tasks ranging from simple independent tasks to dynamic multi-task workflows. With abstractions for the local resource scheduler and MPI environment, Balsam dynamically packages tasks into ensemble jobs and manages their scheduling lifecycle. The ensembles execute in a pilot “launcher” which (i) ensures concurrent, load-balanced execution of arbitrary serial and parallel programs with heterogeneous processor requirements, (ii) requires no modification of user applications, (iii) is tolerant of task-level faults and provides several options for error recovery, (iv) stores provenance data (e.g task history, error logs) in the database, (v) supports dynamic workflows, in which tasks are created or killed at runtime. Here, we present the design and Python implementation of the Balsam service and launcher. The efficacy of this system is illustrated using two case studies: hyperparameter optimization of deep neural networks, and high-throughput single-point quantum chemistry calculations. We find that the unique combination of flexible job-packing and automated scheduling with dynamic (pilot-managed) execution facilitates excellent resource utilization. The scripting overheads typically needed to manage resources and launch workflows on supercomputers are substantially reduced, accelerating workflow development and execution.

I. INTRODUCTION

The rising value of data science methods across scientific domains is causing a shift in the HPC landscape: there is a growing focus on *data-intensive* applications that produce or consume large datasets for analysis by modern machine learning or broader statistical techniques. Quite often, these data-intensive applications join a variety of simulation programs and analysis pipelines into large and dynamic workflows, comprising interdependent single- and multi-node tasks. Many instances of a given task may run concurrently in large ensembles, spanning the requisite input space to generate the target data. With exascale computing on the horizon, data-intensive and high-throughput computing workflows increasingly demand a strategy for managing the sheer number of jobs in a campaign.

Several workflow management systems (WMS) directly address this problem (Section II). Although many solutions offer a powerful framework for expressing complex workflows, **the tools for scheduling and executing workflows on supercomputers are lacking in flexibility and ease-**

of-use. Interfacing with the local resource scheduler is an important facet of supercomputing, yet even in sophisticated management solutions, the burden often lies on the user to assign workflow resources and schedule batch jobs. Automated queue submission is either rigid with respect to job queuing parameters, or it requires configuring resource management carefully on a *per-workflow* (or even *per-task*) basis. Depending on the choice of WMS, the user is also faced with one or more limitations in execution of multi-program, multi-data (MPMD) jobs. Large ensembles of parallel tasks coordinated by MPI have limited fault tolerance and can require significant source code modifications. Alternatives are usually lacking in dynamicity: tasks of varying sizes and durations cannot be launched one-after-another to optimally fill the allocated compute nodes and time.

Motivated by these difficulties, we developed the Balsam HPC service to support automated task scheduling and execution of dynamic workflows. Like other WMS with notions of provenance and a centralized database, Balsam provides command line and Python interfaces to control a task database. Users need only specify the resources needed at a task level; the scheduling process then *packages* tasks and queues them for execution in dynamically-sized ensemble jobs. These ensembles are sized to leverage a configurable scheduling policy. This is essential to high-throughput workflows in *capability* supercomputing environments, because local scheduler policies typically favor large (several hundreds of nodes) jobs and may even preclude scheduling jobs that are otherwise routine in smaller HPC clusters.

A guiding principle in the Balsam design was ease-of-use: with minimal configuration, the service provides a system-wide, multi-workflow solution for scheduling and execution of jobs. Applications require no modification to run inside Balsam. Simple command line interfaces inspired by the `conda` package manager facilitate context switching, creating, and manipulating workflows. The Python API (Section III-B2) enables efficient set-up of large job campaigns. For more complex scenarios, the Django [1] ORM underlying Balsam is accessible to users for highly expressive queries and dynamic workflow modifications.

Execution is handled by the Balsam *launcher*, a dynamic pilot application that is automatically dispatched to run in batch

job queues. Balsam workflows are naturally fault-tolerant and support massive, multi-user job campaigns and concurrency at leadership supercomputing scales. In addition to entirely pre-scheduled workloads, the launcher carries out dynamic workflows, allowing tasks to spawn additional tasks, or for tasks to be killed at runtime and replaced on-the-fly with newly available work in the Balsam database.

In the following section, we compare Balsam with a few other WMS tools in the context of the aforementioned challenges. We then provide a high-level overview of Balsam functionality and some details on the implementation, rooted in Python and the Django [1] framework. Two case studies are presented: the first describes the DeepHyper [2] package for hyperparameter optimization of deep neural networks, illustrating the coupling with Balsam’s Python API and support for dynamic task creation/killing. The second application showcases the utility of Balsam for executing a large batch of parallel quantum chemistry single-point molecular calculations.

II. RELATED WORK

The current work is an extension of the Balsam component of an HPC edge service [3] facilitating remote job submission and workflow management for High Energy Physics experimental collaborations. Balsam was designed to provide a uniform interface to HPC resource schedulers, enabling remote job submission from a centralized management service (*Argo*). Previously, Balsam jobs were received on a message queue and individually throttled into the local scheduler. Each queue submission corresponded to an independent task, and there was no support for packing tasks into ensemble jobs or dynamic workflows in Balsam. The Argo service was responsible for coordinating workflows and mediating data transfer to and from Balsam sites.

This work represents a significant overhaul of the Balsam architecture to support ensemble job packing and dynamic workflows, while de-emphasizing the facilities for remote job submission and multi-site execution. Here, we highlight a few relevant WMS tools and discuss their strengths and limitations in the context of the current work.

A. FireWorks

At a high level, the Balsam database and launcher are functionally analogous to the FireWorks (FWS) [4] infrastructure, consisting of a centralized MongoDB [5] datastore (*LaunchPad*) and clients (*FireWorkers*) that pull tasks for execution on the backend. Both FWS and Balsam leverage the database for job provenance, fault tolerance / restartability, and dynamic workflows (wherein tasks alter the database at runtime). In FWS, users can configure a *QueueLauncher* service to automate submission of a templated batch script to job queues over time. Since queue parameters are fixed in advance, this approach is suboptimal if the number or size of runnable tasks varies significantly over time. Opportunities can be missed to pack more tasks into larger ensembles as a workload grows, and these jobs are typically prioritized in

capability supercomputing systems. Alternatively, submitting jobs from a workflow on a per-task basis precludes efficient job packing and hampers throughput on systems with strict limitations on the total number of queued jobs.

The Balsam service overcomes these limitations by sizing and queueing ensemble jobs in an *elastic* fashion, matching the net demands of a user’s workload with appropriately sized queue submissions. The Balsam launcher naturally handles scheduling departures (e.g. due to faults) by dynamically assigning tasks to idle resources to maintain load balance. Another key advantage of the launcher is that arbitrary MPMD workloads, containing MPI or single-node tasks of varying sizes, are automatically run across the available nodes without user intervention or any modification of applications.

B. Swift/T and Parsl

A number of related WMS may be classified by the ability to express a workflow and its associated task graph directly *as code*. Swift [6] is a compiled dataflow language, and Swift/T programs run statements concurrently under a monolithic MPI application using the Turbine [7] and ADLB [8] runtime libraries. Parsl [9] is a Python library that uses Swift/T as an execution backend for supercomputing environments, providing Python decorators to *annotate* existing codes for asynchronous, data-parallel execution. These WMS do not have a notion of a centralized task database and are less appropriate than Balsam or FWS for long-running campaigns requiring provenance data and cross-workflow schedulability.

Some difficulties arise when Swift/T workflows include parallel MPI tasks. First, porting MPI programs to run in the Turbine environment requires nontrivial development effort: the parallel program must be restructured as a library with a callable entry function. Moreover, the tight coupling of all tasks under one MPI communicator hampers fault-tolerance. When a single task experiences a fault, all other processes in the workflow are forced to abort. There are efforts underway to improve the ease-of-use and stability of MPI programs launched within a larger MPI workflow [10]. For the time being, Balsam handles ensembles of parallel tasks by issuing a separate *mpirun* (or equivalent) command run for each task. While this approach is less scalable due to the process demands placed on the head node, fault-tolerance is significantly improved and the development overheads for MPMD workflows with Balsam are reduced to none. We emphasize that Balsam handles ensembles of thousands of single-node tasks under a single *mpirun*, and parallel tasks requiring just tens of nodes are already large enough for capability-scale ensemble jobs that don’t overload the head node. In scenarios where more than a few hundred small MPI jobs must run concurrently, it is possible to use Balsam in conjunction with methods like Cram [11] (discussed below) for finer-grained job packing.

C. Cram

Cram [11] is a tool that enables running many MPI jobs concurrently as one large application. It is not intended as a

complete WMS; instead, the Cram library is simply linked against user codes to enable running an application in ensemble mode without external services. This approach is a powerful workaround for operating system limitations on the number of concurrent MPI processes, and is interoperable with WMS like Balsam. Cram alone does not provide a complete solution for high-throughput task execution, because it is a single program parallelization scheme (SPMD), and it requires upfront definition of the tasks in a Cram job file. This static behavior also precludes running successive jobs in time; all tasks run concurrently and the ensemble takes as long as the slowest instance. Moreover, since all Cram tasks run under the same `MPI_COMM_WORLD`, if any task fails, the entire ensemble job will abort. It is conceivable to use Balsam for dynamic and fault-tolerant execution of many small Cram jobs. This approach would lessen the burden of MPI application startup on the head node through fine-grained packing at the Cram level.

III. BALSAM DESIGN AND FEATURES

Here, we interleave a discussion of Balsam internals and interfaces with a tutorial walkthrough of Balsam usage. This section describes how to define independent tasks or tasks with dependencies that form a directed acyclic graph (DAG) workflow. We will walk through available modes of job execution and/or automated scheduling, and discuss how dynamic workflows can be constructed to add, modify, or kill tasks at runtime according to user-programmed logic. Along the way, various methods to examine Balsam for provenance and performance data are illustrated.

A. Overview of Balsam Components

Balsam has three core components: the task database, launcher, and service. The **task database** is the central Balsam datastore, with a `BalsamJob` table holding one row for each task added to Balsam. Each task corresponds to a single run of a particular application and provides the necessary arguments, environment variables, and so on.¹

The Balsam **launcher** runs inside a compute resource allocation, *pulls* tasks from the database, and manages their concurrent execution. The launcher automatically determines available compute resources from the job environment and supports heterogeneous workloads of arbitrary serial and parallel programs. Each task runs in an isolated working directory; as execution proceeds, the database is updated with the task state and other provenance data. After setting up a workflow, users may invoke the `balsam launcher` command directly in an interactive shell or job script. By submitting launcher jobs to a queue, one has direct control over resource allocation and scheduling.

As an alternative to manually submitting launcher jobs, the user can choose to run the Balsam **service** as a background process to manage scheduling in an automated fashion. In this case, the service packs `BalsamJobs` into dynamically-sized

¹We use *task* to refer to a single application instance and `BalsamJob` to refer to the corresponding Python object model.




Fig. 1. Schematic view of Balsam architecture in an HPC environment. Shown in blue are the Balsam database server, service, and launcher processes. The service runs on a login node, packs `BalsamJobs` for launcher-mediated execution, and submits them through a modular scheduler interface (e.g. Cobalt `qsub`) to a local queue. When these jobs start on a designated head node, the launcher pulls `BalsamJobs` from the database and begins to dispatch tasks using a template for the local MPI implementation (e.g. `mpirun`).

requests for total compute nodes and wall time, respecting a user-defined queueing policy and attempting to maximize throughput (i.e. number of tasks finished per queued job). The job queued by the Balsam service invokes the launcher exactly as if it were submitted directly by a user. In fact, launchers are almost entirely decoupled from the service and from one another, so that it is possible to run several launcher jobs concurrently to consume work from the same database. When the service submits a launcher job, however, it tags the `BalsamJobs` intended for execution accordingly, and the launcher filters tasks by this tag in order to run its pre-designated workload. Figure 1 illustrates the three-component architecture of Balsam running inside a typical supercomputer infrastructure.

B. Workflow and Data Model

A high-throughput, data-intensive workflow typically entails managing at least thousands of tasks, executed across numerous batch jobs potentially spanning months. The `BalsamJob` database provides a stateful, persistent representation of the job campaign to facilitate scheduling and execution. Balsam leverages Django’s object-relational mapper [1] to provide a simple Python object model for the `BalsamJob`. The underlying PostgreSQL or SQLite database is entirely abstracted from users, who interact with an intuitive command-line interface or Python API to manage project databases or add and modify tasks therein.

1) *Command Line Interface*: In the absence of dependencies or data flow between tasks, Balsam provides concise command line facilities to define tasks, invoke launcher execution, or start the service to package tasks and throttle queue submission over time. This usage is illustrated in Listing 1. Here, a Balsam database is initialized and populated with 100 independent tasks from the `bash` shell. First, a new Balsam database named `my-wf` is created in the current working directory with `balsam init`. Users may create separate databases for

Listing 1 Inserting BalsamJobs from the shell

```
$ balsam init my-wf
$ source balsamactivate my-wf
$ balsam app --name=run-sim --exec=bin/sim.x
$ for i in {1..100};
do
  balsam job --name=task$i --workflow=mini \
  --application=run-sim --num-nodes=4 \
  --ranks-per-node=16 --stage-in=inbox/$i.inp;
done
```

different projects using this command, and context-switching is performed with the `source balsamactivate` command, which sets the necessary local environment variables and launches a database server process if necessary. The `balsam app` command is invoked to register an executable with the `run-sim` alias in the `ApplicationDefinition` table. Each entry references an executable or Python script located on the filesystem, along with optional pre- and post-processing scripts that can be used to create dynamic workflows (discussed in section III-D). Finally, several 4-node MPI tasks are added to the database with `balsam job`. In this example, each task runs an instance of the `run-sim` program, specifying a unique input file that will be staged into the task-local working directory, which is created by the Balsam launcher at runtime.

The `BalsamJob` table contains numerous fields to control how a task is processed. The minimum requirements, shown in Listing 1, include a name, a workflow tag for grouping related tasks, and an application referencing the task executable. The application will run with MPI when either `num-nodes` or `ranks-per-node` is set larger than 1, and there are fields to specify environment variables and command line arguments. Wall time estimates for scheduling can be provided with `wall-time-minutes`. A unique `BalsamJob` ID (UUID) is automatically generated for each task and prevents naming collisions, while serving as the primary key in the underlying database.

2) *DAG Workflows*: To define more complex workflows with data-dependencies between tasks, it is possible to use the `balsam dep <parent-id> <child-id>` command to create dependencies between parent and child tasks, which are then understood in terms of the DAG structure where vertices represent tasks and directed edges represent dependencies among them. It is often easier to express these dependencies and build workflows programatically from a Python script using the Balsam API, as illustrated in Listing 2. This Listing describes how one can programatically create a DAG. We omit several fields in this example for brevity; nevertheless, the Listing is runnable, and Balsam provides sensible default values for each missing `BalsamJob` field.

Listing 2 creates five tasks in a "diamond" workflow pattern (drawn in Figure 2). Parent job A runs the `generate` application to produce several input files for the following `simulate` stage. The parent fans out to three child jobs, B, C, and D, each of which runs a `simulate` instance on one

Listing 2 Creating a DAG workflow from the Python API

```
from balsam.launcher.dag import (
    add_job, add_dependency
)

A = add_job(name="A", application="generate")
B, C, D = [
    add_job(
        name=name,
        application="simulate",
        input_files=name+".inp"
    )
    for name in "BCD"
]

E = add_job(name="E", application="reduce",
            input_files="*.out")

for job in B,C,D:
    add_dependency(A, job)
    add_dependency(job, E)
```




Fig. 2. DAG corresponding to workflow defined in Listing 2

of the accordingly-named input files produced by A. Finally, the `reduce` application is run in task E, which depends on the `.out` files of all three `simulate` applications. The `input_files` field demonstrated here provides space-delimited filename patterns, such as `*.out`. Files matching any of the patterns flow to a child `BalsamJob` from all of its parents' working directories. This facilitates customizable dataflow from parent to child tasks. When possible, symbolic links are created in the child working directories to reduce unnecessary data movement in shared filesystems. The `input_files` option pertains only to data flow along DAG edges; there are other options like `stage_in` used in Listing 1 that enable data movement from arbitrary locations with a number of protocols (see section III-C1).

3) *Task Processing and State Flow*: The notion of `BalsamJob` state is at the heart of how workflows are processed in Balsam. The `state` field in the database tracks the status of each task, from the moment of its creation until it is finished. Each `BalsamJob` flows from one state to the

next as it undergoes transitions by the launcher, which groups tasks according to state to determine the necessary actions. The stateful, persistent representation of a workflow confers fault tolerance and allows execution across several queued batch jobs over time.

Tasks are easily listed according to state with `balsam ls`, shown in Listing 3 for the previous sample DAG workflow. Balsam records a complete `state_history` for each task as well, with timestamps marking each transition and useful log messages alongside them. For instance, applications that return a nonzero error code cause a `BalsamJob` to be advanced from `RUNNING` to `RUN_ERROR` and ultimately `FAILED` if no error-handling mechanism is defined. The error code and tail of the `stderr` stream are recorded directly in `state_history`, and a user can diagnose errors at-a-glance by running `balsam ls --state=FAILED --history` to display the logs of failed tasks.

In addition to debugging workflows, the Balsam `state_history` data captures sufficiently detailed timing information at the workflow level to gauge throughput and supercomputer resource utilization over time. Convenience functions accessible from the Python API, for instance, enable users to quickly generate a temporal profile of the distribution of jobs across different states. This is particularly useful in carrying out the sorts of efficiency analyses presented in section IV-A. A benefit of the Django ORM underlying Balsam is that power users can easily bypass the Balsam API and work directly with the underlying `BalsamJob` model to perform expressive, custom queries. For instance, “*find me all SimX jobs that took at least 256 nodes and failed, then run them again*” is as simple as:

```
BalsamJob.objects.filter(
    application="SimX", num_nodes__gte=256,
    state="FAILED"
).update(state="RESTART_READY").
```

C. Launcher

The Balsam launcher is the pilot application running on backend nodes to process tasks in the database and carry out the state flow described in the last section. Launcher instances are entirely decoupled from one another and the Balsam service, and they can be invoked manually in a hand-written batch job through the `balsam launcher` command, or scheduled automatically via the service. Many launchers can run simultaneously to consume work from the same database, potentially in batch jobs used from multiple users. The underlying relational database is leveraged to ensure consistency in multi-user scenarios with concurrent batch jobs, while providing an efficient means for storage and retrieval of millions of tasks.

The launcher is invoked in one of two modes by setting the `--job-mode` argument either to `serial` or `mpi`. In the former, only single-node tasks that use applications without MPI are permitted to run; each task application is forked on a backend compute node to run in isolation of the network. In the latter, tasks of any size are permitted, and

each application is launched independently under a separate `mpirun` (or equivalent) system command. The `serial` mode is preferable in workflows entailing hundreds of single-node tasks, because only a single MPI run process on the head node is created, bypassing the potential resource burden of numerous `mpirun` processes. In all cases, the launcher runs continuously across the allotted nodes and walltime, acquiring tasks from the database and mapping them to idle resources in order to maximize concurrency and maintain load balance. These methods are entirely flexible with respect to the type of application, permitting MPMD ensemble jobs without any modification to source code or executables. Moreover, the `mpi` launcher naturally handles tasks of mixed node counts and durations.

A key feature of all launcher modes is task-level fault tolerance, meaning that because tasks run using isolated resources, software faults in one task do not affect the launcher or other tasks running concurrently. The persistence of state in the database also provides workflow-level resilience. Launchers shutdown gracefully and mark timed-out runs upon receiving termination signals or running out of batch job walltime. Restarting a workflow is as simple as running the launcher a second time.

Finally, the launcher supports highly *dynamic* workflows. In the course of processing, `BalsamJobs` can create or kill other tasks according to runtime logic. Users may even add or kill tasks manually from an interactive shell on a separate login node. The launcher responds in near real-time, stopping killed tasks mid-execution and proceeding to fill idle resources with newly available tasks. In the following subsections, we provide some highlights of the launcher components and their implementation. The next section III-D details how dynamic workflows can be created by attaching pre- or post-processing scripts to certain applications.

1) *Transitions*: The launcher contains a `transitions` module responsible for carrying out all of the pre- and post-execution `BalsamJob` state transitions. Depending on the amount of I/O or pre/post-processing computation, the Balsam configuration allows users to specify a number of transition processes that run in parallel through the Python multiprocessing mechanism.

The transitions module carries out a variety of pre- and post-execution functions. First, the database is checked for newly created `BalsamJobs`; those without dependencies are marked `READY` for processing, while those with pending parents are marked `AWAITING_PARENTS`. The `stage_in` transition creates the `BalsamJob`-unique working path, copies in remote or local files, and ensures that for job dependencies, the requested files from all parent tasks are visible to the present child task (as described in section III-B2).

The `preprocess` and `postprocess` transitions execute user-defined preprocessing and postprocessing scripts, which are optionally attached to a particular application in the `ApplicationDefinition` entry. These scripts, typically written in Python, run in the `BalsamJob` working directory and encapsulate steps like generating input files to an applica-

Listing 3 Listing BalsamJobs from the shell

```
$ balsam ls
```

	job_id	name	workflow	application	state
d487a785-3ff1-4702-aff9-d6f1f88dd795	A	sample	sample	generate	JOB_FINISHED
94905135-b47d-439f-9561-6c16290112db	B	sample	sample	simulate	JOB_FINISHED
c04942d2-4926-4324-ad6e-b9c729d9f62b	C	sample	sample	simulate	RUNNING
19b130c3-50df-497c-a740-8c987c6b8e19	D	sample	sample	simulate	RUNNING
15df7441-4fb9-4537-af96-5f91453b7f3a	E	sample	sample	reduce	AWAITING_PARENTS

```
$
```

tion and parsing the outputs for storage or further processing. A key feature in Balsam is that these scripts run in a special, BalsamJob-aware environment that permits the calling code to get the current job and its state. We will show in III-D that this permits users to write dynamic workflows, in which a task programatically modifies the database according to its outcome.

2) *Serial Job Mode*: Some job campaigns entail a massive number of single-node jobs that make no use of MPI or HPC network resources. In this case, the `balsam launcher --job-mode=serial` command dispatches a *fork-ensemble* MPI wrapper process on the backend to handle all tasks that do not use MPI (`num_nodes` and `ranks_per_node` are equal to 1). The advantage of this job mode is that only one MPI launch command is invoked on the head node, and users can define “packable” BalsamJobs with `node_packing_count` in order to run multiple tasks concurrently inside a single node.

The serial job mode was highly optimized to minimize latency between task injection and execution in Balsam. This is particularly important to the performance of dynamic, asynchronous workflows, where new BalsamJobs are created over time and run concurrently within a single resource allocation. In Section IV-A, we highlight the use of the serial job mode to parallelize tens of thousands of single-node Tensorflow instances across 1024 nodes of the Theta leadership-class Cray XC40 system at the ALCF. The same workflow was run on the ALCF’s Cooley visualization cluster with `node_packing_count` set to 2, enabling each task to use one accelerator of the NVIDIA Tesla K80 dual-GPU card.

3) *MPI Job Mode*: The `balsam launcher --job-mode=mpi` command invokes the Balsam launcher on a head node, without any management processes running on the backend. Here, individual BalsamJobs are launched directly by issuing the appropriate `mpirun` variant for the local MPI implementation. This mode of execution is completely flexible with respect to the type of executables that may run, but it may strain the local resource manager if several hundreds or thousands of concurrent `mpirun` processes are used to run small (<10 node) parallel tasks (see discussion in Section II). Major advantages of this approach are total resource isolation between BalsamJob tasks, conferring fault-tolerance as described in the previous sections, and ease-of-use: running applications in any launch mode of Balsam requires no source code modification or

relinking of executables. The latter point is often a serious bottleneck in WMS like Swift/T, discussed in section II.

Much like the serial-mode launcher, tasks in this mode are dynamically mapped to idle nodes for concurrent execution. Eligible BalsamJobs are sorted in descending order of required nodes, so that the largest blocks of compute nodes are allocated first. This pattern follows the “first-fit descending” greedy heuristic used for automatic scheduling by the Balsam service (Section III-E). As a result, when a user opts to automate job scheduling with Balsam, the BalsamJob execution order and concurrency will approximately match the intended schedule, provided that walltime estimates are sufficiently accurate. On the other hand, the launcher naturally handles inevitable departures from the ideal schedule, and load balance is maintained, at least to first order, when tasks finish early or late, or unanticipated errors arise in the workflow.

D. Dynamic Workflows

Another advantage of the Balsam launcher’s real time task-pull behavior is that BalsamJobs can be added or killed at any time. Even during a running launcher batch job, a user can modify the database from a login shell to stop certain tasks and restart them with more promising input parameters.

The Balsam Python API, which was introduced in Section III-B2, provides a workflow-aware environment in which tasks can modify the DAG or otherwise manipulate the database during workflow execution. If a BalsamJob application is written in Python itself, the task can interface with the database while executing from the backend. A more general approach is to write Python post-processing (or pre-processing) scripts that run under the `transitions` module (Section III-C1) and manipulate the BalsamJob database based on the specific outcome of each task.

A task-aware environment is loaded upon importing the `balsam.launcher.dag` module, providing workflow authors with the BalsamJob object of the current execution context. For instance, a postprocessing script can be written to check for `RUN_TIMEOUT` or `RUN_ERROR` states, read partial outputs, and take some action (e.g. spawning new tasks) to handle these exceptional states.

An example of BalsamJob querying with the underlying Django ORM is given in Listing 4, where a snippet of code checks for `RUNNING` tasks with names containing `sim3`, and then uses `dag.kill` to terminate each task and ensure that any child nodes in the DAG are marked accordingly. This is a

Listing 4 Dynamic BalsamJob kill

```
from balsam.launcher import dag

manager = dag.BalsamJob.objects
pending = manager.filter(name__contains="sim3",
                        state="RUNNING")
for sim in pending:
    dag.kill(sim, recursive=True)
```

complete, runnable sample that could be invoked from within a BalsamJob application or processing script.

E. Balsam Service

A scientific campaign can entail millions of calculations spanning months of compute time on potentially multiple supercomputers with different job queueing policies. In this case, different batch scheduler interfaces and limitations on number of queued jobs require a cumbersome human effort to track workflow execution and enqueue new jobs. Unlike WMS with a DAG-centric view, the Balsam service can be used as a simple, global abstraction of the local job scheduler. Balsam throttles queue submission, while rounding small jobs into larger ensembles in order to leverage the local queueing policies.

Central to the service is a user-defined *queue policy*. Here, users define the names of queues to which jobs may be submitted. For each queue, a limit on the number of concurrently queued jobs is given, along with a dictionary mapping nonoverlapping node-count ranges to permitted walltime ranges. A typical entry like $(128, 255) : (0.5, 3)$ indicates that the service may submit jobs requesting between 128 and 255 nodes, and the requested walltime must lie between 30 minutes and 3 hours. This allows Balsam to make scheduling decisions within the bounds of local site policies; for instance, larger jobs are typically permitted larger walltime limits in HPC facilities to promote massively parallel applications.

Invoking `balsam service` command launches a persistent background process that runs on the user’s behalf against the active Balsam database. Jobs that are not already scheduled for launch or currently held by a launcher, and which have yet to be processed, are eligible for scheduling. Balsam uses greedy scheduling heuristics to pack many `BalsamJobs` efficiently into elastic batch jobs. Deviations from the planned schedule are handled naturally by the Balsam launcher, and this process is robust to unexpected deletion of queued jobs, requiring no user intervention.

The service employs a modular design, with a pluggable Scheduler interface allowing Balsam to interoperate with a variety of local resource managers (Cobalt, Torque, Condor, Slurm, etc...). A template of the batch job script is used to configure and invoke the launcher on the backend. There is virtually no interprocess communication between the service and launchers; instead, shared state is captured in the database. Refer to the Balsam documentation [12] for more detailed information on the job scheduling methods and design details.

IV. APPLICATIONS

Balsam has been key to the success of several applications on ALCF systems. The first of these was ATLAS event generation, for which Balsam was initially developed. Here, we describe two applications that benefit specifically from the present extensions to Balsam: the dynamic workflow model, launcher, and scheduling service. We first highlight DeepHyper, an application developed for highly-parallel hyperparameter optimizations of deep neural networks. This application leveraged the launcher to run model training and validation tasks concurrently on up to 1024 nodes of the ALCF Theta supercomputer ($\sim 25\%$ of the machine) with fault tolerance and support for externally-signalled early termination of tasks. The second application showcases the efficacy of Balsam in ensembles of MPI tasks, running a large set of *ab initio* single-point energy calculations with NWChem [13].

A. DeepHyper

We interfaced Balsam with the DeepHyper [2] package for large-scale hyperparameter searches on deep neural networks. DeepHyper is a Python framework that bridges user-defined benchmarks and hyperparameter optimization methods through a generic interface. This architecture facilitates testing arbitrary combinations of search methods and machine learning benchmarks, while serving as an extensible repository of hyperparameter tuning experiments. Here, the Balsam launcher was used as the execution engine for a variety of search experiments running on up to 1024 compute nodes of Theta [14], a leadership-class Cray XC40 system at the ALCF.

We first describe the DeepHyper-Balsam interface for training and evaluating ML model configurations. We then highlight the performance of some asynchronous search algorithms with the Balsam backend on both Theta and Cooley, a smaller visualization and analysis cluster of 126 nodes with two GPUs per node. We show that the latency between job injection and execution is short enough that Balsam poses no bottleneck to DeepHyper search at scale. DeepHyper-Balsam was applied in a comprehensive hyperparameter optimization study using 3 million Theta core-hours to-date [2].

1) *Balsam Interface*: The `DeepHyper search` subpackage contains a number of optimization modules, including random search, Bayesian optimization with surrogate models, evolutionary algorithms, and Hyperband [15]. All search methods are implemented using the `Evaluator` three function interface, shown in Listing 5. All search modules use the `add_eval_batch` method to initiate new hyperparameter evaluation tasks. This generic interface facilitates implementation of *asynchronous* methods like random search, in which new hyperparameters can be sampled as soon as one or more evaluations have completed. The corresponding method `get_finished_evals` is used to retrieve newly-finished hyperparameter configurations along with the evaluated objective values.

The `BalsamEvaluator` provides an implementation of this interface for search execution on HPC resources, insulating search method developers from MPI programming or other

Listing 5 Evaluator interface

```
class Evaluator:
    def add_eval_batch(self, XX):
        '''Submit list of new cfgs XX'''
    def get_finished_evals(self):
        '''Query for newly completed evaluations
        and return results list: [(x, y)]'''
    def await_evals(self, XX):
        '''Block until evaluations are completed
        for all cfgs in XX and return results list'''
```

Listing 6 Asynchronous model-based search with skopt:
main loop

```
for elapsed_str in timer:
    results = list(evaluator.get_finished_evals())
    if results:
        optimizer.tell(results)
        n = len(results)
        for batch in optimizer.ask(n):
            evaluator.add_eval_batch(batch)
```

parallelization concerns. This approach is also naturally fault-tolerant; because Balsam marks failed tasks accordingly in the database, DeepHyper is easily configured to either discard or assign a dummy objective value (`sys.float_info.max`) to failed hyperparameter evaluation tasks. Most importantly, the `BalsamEvaluator` implementation incurred a minimum of development overhead and made no references to any parallel programming constructs. Instead, the Django ORM was leveraged to simply insert batches of evaluation tasks and query for successful and failed evaluations. Listing 6 illustrates how concisely search algorithms can be expressed in this framework. After removing debugging and checkpointing statements, the main loop of asynchronous Bayesian model-based optimization is expressed in seven lines of Python. The optimizer object in this Listing makes use of the “ask-and-tell” `scikit-optimize` interface [16], and the evaluator is an instance of the `BalsamEvaluator`.

2) *Experimental Setup*: Balsam was installed into Anaconda environments configured for running DeepHyper on both Theta and Cooley. Theta is an 11.69 petaflops Cray XC40 based leadership-class supercomputing system at the ALCF, consisting of 4,392 nodes, each with a 64-core Intel Xeon Phi processor. Cooley is a 126 node cluster; each node has 12 CPU cores and one NVIDIA Tesla K80 dual-GPU card. The DeepHyper environment consisted of Intel Python 3.6.3, Tensorflow 1.3.1 [17], Keras 2.0.9 [18], and `scikit-optimize` 0.4 [16]. The Balsam launcher is host-aware and configured to produce the appropriate `aprun` or `mpirun` startup commands on Theta MOM nodes and Cooley head nodes, respectively. Experiments were initiated directly from hand-written Cobalt submission scripts to run the Balsam launcher. On Theta, the Balsam launcher was run in serial task mode, with one worker rank per node. Two ranks-per-node were used on Cooley, enabling concurrent evaluation of a separate model on each GPU. To quantify the impact of database backend, we compared the performance of random search with two Django backends:

PostgreSQL [19] and SQLite [20]. With PostgreSQL backend, the launcher is able to leverage transactions and reduce load on the server by batching database updates. The SQLite backend, which required a custom server implementation to serialize writes, did not utilize Django support for transactions.

3) *Scaling Tests*: We present results using the random search (RS) method of DeepHyper on two benchmarks: `rnn2` is a memory network obtained using a recurrent neural network trained on the bAbI dataset for question-and-answer systems, and `cifar10cnn` is a convolutional neural network benchmark for classifying images in the cifar10 dataset. The baseline codes for these benchmarks were obtained from the examples directory of the Keras github repository [18]. The RS method was chosen for the speed at which new hyperparameters can be sampled from a uniform distribution. By minimizing time spent in the search algorithm itself, we can clearly gauge overheads of the DeepHyper+Balsam framework and evaluate whether the system poses bottlenecks at scale.

Nine hyperparameters were scanned for `rnn2`: number of training epochs, number of hidden layers, number of units per hidden layer, activation function, batch size, dropout, optimizer type, learning rate, and RNN type; details on the hyperparameter space definition are available in a recent publication [2]. In Figure 3, we evaluate the performance of RS for this benchmark running on 1024 Theta nodes. The impact of the Django backend database is borne out in the difference between the traces corresponding to PostgreSQL and SQLite.

The top panel shows that the throughput is nearly twice as high when the PostgreSQL backend is used with Balsam, as compared with the SQLite backend. Given the median `rnn2` task runtime of 621 seconds on a single Theta node, one expects 5.80 tasks completed per node-hour in the absence of overheads due to Balsam and DeepHyper. For the PostgreSQL RS experiment, we found 5328 completed tasks in 54.31 minutes (measured from the time of initial task creation to completion of the final task), which amounts to nearly ideal efficiency at 5.75 tasks per node-hour. In fairness, this timing omits 4 minutes in the job prior to initialization of the RS and 2 minutes spent on incomplete tasks prior to walltime expiration. If the 5328 tasks are divided by the full 1024 node-hour allocation, this still amounts to 5.20 tasks completed per node-hour, or 90% efficiency. We observe that about 3 minutes of startup time elapsed in loading the Balsam launcher; this time spent in loading Python is not intrinsic to Balsam *per se*.

In 128 node experiments, Balsam overheads are so small that is little need for concern with database access patterns, and there is hardly an observable difference between PostgreSQL and SQLite backends. At 1024 nodes, however, these overheads become large enough that the SQLite backend is unable to sustain high worker utilization. The SQLite utilization curve fluctuates between 30% and 80%, which manifests in the lower throughput seen in the top panel of Figure 3. A discussion of the performance issues at scale is provided in the Appendix (Section VI).

Figure 4 demonstrates the scalability of DeepHyper+Balsam




Fig. 3. DeepHyper random search (RS) for the `rnn2` benchmark running on 1024 Theta nodes. The top panel charts the number of completed hyperparameter evaluation tasks against elapsed search time. The bottom panel plots worker utilization, which is computed as the fraction of worker nodes actively running a task at any given time. Curves drawn in blue and orange highlight Balsam performance with PostgreSQL and SQLite backends, respectively.

RS with the PostgreSQL backend up to 1024 Theta nodes. Here, as the number of nodes is increased, DeepHyper RS provides accordingly many `rnn2` configurations for concurrent, asynchronous evaluation. As expected from the preceding discussion, since worker utilization remains high even at 1024 nodes, the task throughput scales efficiently. We observed a 7.64-fold increase in throughput on scaling from 128 to 1024 nodes, amounting to 96% weak-scaling efficiency.

Finally, we show another temporal profile in Figure 5 tracking the performance of a DeepHyper+Balsam run on 64 nodes of Cooley (2 concurrent tasks per-node; one per-GPU). Results are shown for the `cifar10cnn` benchmark with an asynchronous Bayesian model-based search algorithm and SQLite backend. In the Balsam context, this search method has an identical workflow pattern to random search. The traces presented in this figure were directly obtained from the Balsam Python API; the call to `service.models.process_job_times()` infers the number of tasks in each state versus time from stored provenance data. The orange trace corresponding to `RUNNING` tasks can simply be normalized by the number of workers to obtain the worker utilization (as in Figure 3). With a significantly longer runtimes per-task and smaller number of workers than the previous example, we find the SQLite backend is sufficient to sustain 100% utilization.




Fig. 4. DeepHyper random search (RS) for the `rnn2` benchmark running on 128 to 1024 Theta nodes, using the PostgreSQL Balsam backend. The throughput, defined as number of completed `rnn2` evaluations-per-hour, is charted against compute node count. While each job was nominally 60 minutes, the number of completed evaluations is divided by the elapsed time between creation of the first task and completion of the final task, which is about 54.5 minutes in each case.




Fig. 5. DeepHyper asynchronous model-based search (using random forest) for the `cifar10cnn` benchmark running on 64 Cooley nodes, with 2 Balsam workers per node. This panel shows a characteristic workflow execution profile which can be obtained from the Balsam API `service.models.process_job_times()`. The `CREATED` trace shows the number of newly injected tasks from DeepHyper that have not been processed. The `RUNNING` curve gives the number of actively running tasks at any given time, from which worker utilization can be inferred. The `RUN_DONE` curve shows the number of completed tasks.

B. Quantum Chemistry: Potential Energy Scan

Next, we present a common workflow in materials science and computational chemistry that highlights launching of many concurrent MPI jobs. The problem is to scan a molecular structure across a range of internal coordinates and compute the electronic energy for each structure under a given model chemistry. The computed values are then assembled to construct an electronic potential energy surface (PES) for the molecule.

1) *Configuration*: For this example, we take the symmetric water molecule H_2O and sample the O–H bond length and H–O–H bond angle at 40 values for each coordinate, resulting in a total of 1600 geometries. We compute the electronic energy at the SCS-MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ level of theory using NWChem [13] version 6.6 compiled for the Theta KNL nodes. Each energy calculation was parallelized across 64 MPI ranks on 2 Theta nodes. A short Python script was used to scan the geometry and populate the Balsam database with an NWChem task for each set of coordinates. The workflow was scheduled in a single 128-node Theta job, running the launcher in `mpi` job mode.

2) *Results*: The NWChem tasks ranged from 8 to 30 seconds long, with a mean task execution time of 11 seconds. All 1600 tasks were completed in a span of 9 minutes and 56 seconds, measured from launcher startup to completion of the last task. This amounts to a throughput of about 2.7 tasks per second, *including* the overheads of a stage-in transition for copying input files to each task’s working directory, as well as the delay of the MPI launch command. In the context of typical HPC workflows, these are very short-running tasks that expose Balsam overheads. Still, Balsam does not pose a significant bottleneck here, and the overhead is expected to be negligible for more compute-intensive workloads. In fact, Balsam significantly outperforms typical recommendations for hand-written ensemble batch jobs on Theta, where only one `aprun` is launched per second.

The `BalsamJob` description was used to tag each task according to the coordinate values. A trivial Python script with the `dag` API was then used to collect the calculation outputs to assemble the water PES from all 1600 points. The outcome is shown in Figure 6, which plots a smooth 2D surface over the PES values computed at each bond length and angle value. We emphasize the ease-of-use of Balsam in this scenario; the scripts to generate the entire workflow and produce this Figure required under 60 lines of Python and minimal effort on the user’s behalf. More importantly, an existing NWChem binary was plugged into the workflow with a single `ApplicationDefinition` and no modifications whatsoever. Balsam effectively load-balanced the 1600 2-node tasks across 128 total nodes, achieving excellent throughput and storing provenance data which made PES generation trivial.

V. SUMMARY AND FUTURE WORK

Balsam’s loosely coupled service–database–launcher architecture provides a flexible, yet very accessible framework




Fig. 6. SCS-MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ potential energy surface of the water molecule in C_{2v} symmetry. The electronic energy was computed with a Balsam/NWChem workflow at each of 1600 geometries, and is plotted in atomic units against O–H bond length and H–O–H bond angle.

for managing large computational campaigns with a minimum of development or cognitive overhead. The service provides elastic scheduling of ensemble jobs, enabling users to leverage supercomputer scheduling policies to increase workflow throughput. The launcher enables efficient execution of heterogeneous workloads both concurrently and sequentially across compute allocations, with task-level fault tolerance and support for highly dynamic workflows. Detailed documentation and examples for using Balsam can be found online [12].

The benefits of automated job scheduling and ensemble-packing are useful only insofar as the runtime of tasks can be estimated with some precision. Towards this goal, we will investigate the use of automated performance models to utilize measured task runtimes for predicting the duration of pending tasks in the database. High-throughput campaigns with repetitive usage patterns can provide a wealth of actionable performance data for the Balsam service, especially if users provide the mapping from task input to features determining computational complexity. A general framework for updating application performance models and predicting runtimes with uncertainty quantification could be used to assign resources to tasks and optimize the scheduling process.

Several users have requested the ability to “co-locate” a chain of sequential tasks in the workflow, such that the tasks are grouped for execution on the same set of processors to exploit local disks or shared memory. Strategies for scheduling and execution of co-located tasks in the Balsam launcher will be explored in upcoming work. We will also continue to investigate alternative launcher execution modes, particularly for concurrent execution of many small MPI tasks, where conventional methods impose limits on scalability. A primary challenge here lies in portability across MPI implementations.

The version of Balsam described here will be reintegrated with the HPC edge service [3] for remote workflow management. The web interface for monitoring workflows will reflect the support for organizing workflows as task graphs

and should ultimately provide users with a centralized source of provenance data for an entire computational campaign.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was funded in part and used resources of the Argonne Leadership Computing Facility at Argonne National Laboratory, a DOE Office of Science User Facility supported under Contract DE-AC02-06CH11357.

The submitted manuscript has been created by UChicago Argonne, LLC, Operator of Argonne National Laboratory (“Argonne”). Argonne, a U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science laboratory, is operated under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357. The U.S. Government retains for itself, and others acting on its behalf, a paid-up nonexclusive, irrevocable worldwide license in said article to reproduce, prepare derivative works, distribute copies to the public, and perform publicly and display publicly, by or on behalf of the Government.

REFERENCES

- [1] “Django,” 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://djangoproject.com>
- [2] P. Balaprakash, M. Salim, T. Uram, V. Vishwanath, and S. Wild, “DeepHyper: Asynchronous hyperparameter search for deep neural networks,” in *HiPC 2018: 25th edition of the IEEE International Conference on High Performance Computing, Data, and Analytics*, Submitted.
- [3] J. T. Childers, T. D. Uram, D. Benjamin, T. J. LeCompte, and M. E. Papka, “An edge service for managing HPC workflows,” in *Proceedings of the Fourth International Workshop on HPC User Support Tools - HUST 17*. ACM Press, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3152493.3152557>
- [4] A. Jain, S. P. Ong, W. Chen, B. Medasani, X. Qu, M. Kocher, M. Brafman, G. Petretto, G.-M. Rignanes, G. Hautier, D. Gunter, and K. A. Persson, “FireWorks: a dynamic workflow system designed for high-throughput applications,” *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, vol. 27, no. 17, pp. 5037–5059, may 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpe.3505>
- [5] “MongoDB,” 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mongodb.com>
- [6] M. Wilde, M. Hategan, J. M. Wozniak, B. Clifford, D. S. Katz, and I. Foster, “Swift: A language for distributed parallel scripting,” *Parallel Computing*, vol. 37, no. 9, pp. 633–652, sep 2011. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.parco.2011.05.005>
- [7] W. J. M., A. T. G., M. Ketan, L. E. L., K. D. S., W. Michael, and F. I. T., “Turbine: A distributed-memory dataflow engine for high performance many-task applications,” *Fundamenta Informaticae*, vol. 128, no. 3, p. 337366, 2013. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.org/10.3233/FI-2013-949>
- [8] E. L. Lusk, S. C. Pieper, R. M. Butler, and M. T. S. Univ., “More scalability, less pain : A simple programming model and its implementation for extreme computing,” *SciDAC Rev.*, vol. 17, no. 2010, 1 2010.
- [9] Y. Babuji, A. Brizius, K. Chard, I. Foster, D. S. Katz, M. Wilde, and J. Wozniak, “Introducing parsl: A python parallel scripting library,” *Zenodo*, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://zenodo.org/record/853491>
- [10] M. Dorier, J. M. Wozniak, and R. Ross, “Supporting task-level fault-tolerance in HPC workflows by launching MPI jobs inside MPI jobs,” in *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Workflows in Support of Large-Scale Science - WORKS 17*. ACM Press, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3150994.3151001>
- [11] J. Gyllenhaal, T. Gambelin, A. Bertsch, and R. Musselman., “Enabling high job throughput for uncertainty quantification on bg/q,” in *IBM HPC Systems Scientific Computing User Group (ScicomP14)*, 2014.
- [12] “Balsam,” 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://balsam.alcf.anl.gov>
- [13] M. Valiev, E. Bylaska, N. Govind, K. Kowalski, T. Straatsma, H. V. Dam, D. Wang, J. Nieplocha, E. Apra, T. Windus, and W. de Jong, “NWChem: A comprehensive and scalable open-source solution for large scale molecular simulations,” *Computer Physics Communications*, vol. 181, no. 9, pp. 1477–1489, sep 2010. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2010.04.018>

- [14] S. Parker, V. Morozov, S. Chunduri, K. Harms, C. Knight, and K. Kumaran, “Early evaluation of the cray xc40 xeon phi system theta at argonne,” *Cray User Group 2017 proceedings*, 2017.
- [15] L. Li, K. Jamieson, G. DeSalvo, A. Rostamizadeh, and A. Talwalkar, “Hyperband: A novel bandit-based approach to hyperparameter optimization,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 18, 2016.
- [16] “Scikit-optimize,” 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://scikit-optimize.github.io>
- [17] M. Abadi, P. Barham, J. Chen, Z. Chen, A. Davis, J. Dean, M. Devin, S. Ghemawat, G. Irving, M. Isard *et al.*, “Tensorflow: A system for large-scale machine learning,” in *OSDI*, vol. 16, 2016, pp. 265–283.
- [18] F. Chollet *et al.*, “Keras,” <https://keras.io>, 2015.
- [19] “Postgresql,” 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.postgresql.org>
- [20] “Sqlite,” 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sqlite.org>

VI. APPENDIX: ARTIFACT DESCRIPTION

A. Setup and Portability

As of this writing, Balsam requires Python 3.6, `mpi4py` version 2 or newer, and PostgreSQL to be installed on the system. These prerequisites are easily satisfied on most modern platforms with a package management system (e.g. Anaconda) and freely-distributed Postgres binaries. The `balsam init` and source `balsamactivate` commands encapsulate all details of database creation and server management, requiring no configuration on the part of the user for most use cases. A default Balsam database and user configuration file are created in `.balsam` under the user’s home directory. Here, the service queuing policies and various constraints on launcher execution can be adjusted from the default values if necessary.

The modular design of Balsam allows it to run on diverse HPC platforms and computing clusters by providing the system-appropriate plug-ins. For instance, the service uses a `Scheduler` interface to query the local batch job queue and submit new launcher jobs. A number of scheduler plug-ins are provided (Cobalt, Condor, Slurm, Torque), and can be extended with minimal effort. The launcher reads a scheduler-specific job environment to determine the available compute nodes and remaining walltime; these are easily defined in the scheduler plug-in as well. Finally, MPI launch commands are rendered using a template appropriate to the MPI runtime environment (Cray aprun, OpenMPI, and MPICH, etc. . .). The user needs only specify which template is appropriate to the system, or define a template if it is not already supported.

The serial launcher job mode is only supported on platforms that support the `fork` system call. Moreover, applications built with MPI but invoked to run as serial programs can be problematic on some supercomputers, where the call to `MPI_Init()` from the backend causes an error in PMI. There is ongoing work to develop effective and portable launcher job modes that circumvent these limitations.

B. DeepHyper Experiments

The efficient task throughput of DeepHyper RS with Balsam and the PostgreSQL backend can be understood in terms of the high average worker utilization, shown in the bottom panel of Figure 3. The utilization, which can be inferred directly from the Balsam database post-run, is the fraction of workers (number of Theta nodes minus 2) executing a `BalsamJob` at a given point in time. With the PostgreSQL backend,

utilization is nearly pegged at 100%, and Balsam poses no significant bottleneck to the search workflow. Periodic drops in utilization last about one minute and occur when a large number of `rnn2` tasks with similar runtime finish together in a short interval. The following cycle occurs until utilization is restored to 100%:

- 1) all workers ranks that finished a task send a `RUN_DONE` message to the Balsam launcher master process;
- 2) the launcher batches all N of the received `RUN_DONE` messages in a 1-second window, and performs the corresponding batch database update;
- 3) the DeepHyper RS code, which queries the database for finished tasks every 2-seconds (via the `BalsamEvaluator`), receives a list of N newly-finished tasks;
- 4) the DeepHyper RS draws N new hyperparameter configurations at random and inserts this batch of N new tasks into the Balsam database, again via the `Evaluator` API;
- 5) the launcher refreshes its job cache, receiving these N new tasks. A task is sent to each idle worker until all idle workers have resumed execution of `rnn2` tasks, and utilization is restored to maximum.

When task completion is highly staggered in time, the number of finished tasks N in a given interval remains low and the fluctuations below 100% utilization are very small and short-lived. In the DeepHyper `rnn2` benchmark, however, the runtime of different hyperparameter configurations forms a strongly-peaked distribution, causing N to be large for several consecutive iterations. This effectively incurs some communication overhead between DeepHyper and Balsam *through* the shared database.

The primary reason for the observed slowdown with SQLite at scale (Figure 3) is that the standard Python adapter to the client library did not support concurrency, and we were forced to implement a serialization mechanism to intercept database updates occurring from different processes. In doing so, we sacrificed Django’s transactional support, and database updates incurred a cost proportional to the number of updated rows, which is clearly non-scalable. On the other hand, the Balsam launcher running against the PostgreSQL backend optimizes database access patterns by pooling changes in state and grouping updates into large but short-lived transactions. In this way, the number of database transactions remains small and constant with respect to increasing number of worker nodes or task throughput.

Twelve tasks in the search at 1024 nodes experienced a segmentation fault in the `fork` system call on Theta compute nodes; the workflow was unaffected by these faults. We found that setting the environment variable `MPICH_GNI_FORK_MODE=FULLCOPY` solved the issue of these sporadic faults, but caused the median `rnn2` task time to increase from 621 to 781 seconds. Specifically, the distribution of elapsed times for network *training* acquired a heavy tail, with 90th percentile training time increasing from 614 to 1787

seconds. Python module loading and `rnn2` preprocessing times were unaffected. There is ongoing dialogue with Cray to identify the cause of performance degradation and search for a better strategy to invoke `fork` in Theta ensemble jobs. In any case, Balsam provided strong task-level fault tolerance: the `BalsamJob` experiencing a fault is marked accordingly, and DeepHyper provides the next evaluation task to the worker node with minimal interruption in the workflow.