Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/gmd-2016-146-AC2, 2016

Geoscientific Model Development Discussions
Open Access

Interactive comment on "Evaluating Lossy Data Compression on Climate Simulation Data within a Large Ensemble" *by* Allison H. Baker et al.

Allison H. Baker et al.

abaker@ucar.edu

Received and published: 17 October 2016

Thank you for your thorough review and suggestions for improvement. We address all comments and questions below.

(1) Regarding the individual analyses and methodology:

The individual analyses were indeed conducted independently by specialists in their fields. Participants were recruited in a number of ways: an open call for participation on the CESM Large Ensemble (LE) project web page; a verbal request at both the CESM-LE AGU session in 2014 and the CESM summer workshop in 2015 (and accompanying advertisements on posters at each); and direct e-mail to many scientists working with CESM data. We also approached certain individuals directly as we knew that they had expertise in complementary areas of interest that were not yet covered. All participants

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

were informed that multiple scientists were participating in the study, but all approached the question independently. We did not specify how the data should be analyzed, but asked participants to detail which ensemble members they believed to have been compressed and why. Recall that several of the analyses were not-blind, a decision that was made if we thought the particular analysis technique would provide more insight if given both the original and reconstructed data (e.g., the AMWG diagnostics package). Participants were made aware of other scientists' analyses after all feedback was received via an initial paper draft that was put together by the two lead authors.

In the revision, we updated Section 3 ("Approach") of the manuscript to include a better description of how the analyses were chosen and conducted.

(2) Regarding why these 7 analyses:

We chose these analyses for a variety of reasons, with the primary intent to give a sample of what types of post-processing analysis occur. For example, we targeted some participants based on their knowledge base (e.g., Phillipe Naveau for his expertise in extremes as we were aware of the concern over whether lossy compression would affect extremes). We also felt it necessary to include CVDP and AMWG analyses as these tools enjoy widespread use in the climate community as a first exposure to a data set. Other analyses were included simply because they were quite thorough and interesting to us. Categorizing the analyses we chose as being overall representative of what could be (or is) done with CESM as suggested is too strong, as there are too many possibilities for post-analysis of CESM simulation data. We feel that the analyses presented in the paper do give the reader a flavor for what is done and the concerns that different scientists may have when using a data set that has undergone lossy compression. The analyses also help illustrate our take-away messages in Section 6.

In the revision, we added more details about our selection process for the analysis in Section 3 (to also address reviewer comment (1)).

(3) Regarding the related works section:

In Section 2.1, we cite works that are investigating applying lossy compression to scientific data. However, as far as work particular to lossy compression of climate data, we are only aware of a few that we list below. The first two papers listed were discussed in an earlier paper by the first author (Baker et al. 2014) and certainly should have been cited again in this manuscript. As for the third, fourth, and fifth papers, we only became aware of these very recent papers after our initial submission of this manuscript. As far as a reference on the effects of lossy compression on the scientific validity of results, we are not aware of related work or comparable efforts in this area.

In the revision, we expanded the discussion in 2.1 to include the five references below. We also noted that we are unaware of any other studies that evaluate the effects of lossy compression on the scientific validity of climate simulation results.

J. Woodring, S. M. Mniszewski, C. M. Brislawn, D. E. DeMarle, and J. P. Ahrens. "Revisting wavelet compression for large-scale climate data using JPEG2000 and ensuring data precision." In D. Rogers and C. T. Silva, editors, IEEE Symposium on Large Data Analysis and Visualization (LDAV), pp. 31 - 38, 2011.

N. Hubbe, A. Wegener, J. M. Kunkel, Y. Ling, and T. Ludwig. "Evaluating lossy compression on climate data". In Proceedings of the International Supercomputing Conference (ISC '13), pp. 343-356, 2013.

M. Kuhn, Kunkel, J., and T. Ludwig."Data Compression for Climate Data." Supercomputing Frontiers and Innovations, 3 (1), pp. 75-94, June 2016.

J.D. Silver, and C.S. Zender. "Finding the Goldilocks zone: Compression-error trade-off for large gridded datasets." Geoscientific Model Development Discussions, pp. 1-13, July 2016.

C.S. Zender. " Bit Grooming: statistically accurate precision-preserving quantization with compression, evaluated in the netCDF Operators (NCO, v4.4.8+)" Geoscientific Model Development, pp. 3199-3211, September 2016.

In addition, for reference, we also added the following citations for recent lossless climate data compression work to Section 3:

X. Huang, X., Ni, Y., Chen, D., Liu, S., Fu, H. and G. Yang. "Czip: A Fast Lossless Compression Algorithm for Climate Data. International Journal of Parallel Programming." pp.1-20, 2016.

S. Liu, Huang, X., Ni, Y., Fu, H. and G. Yang, 2014. "A high performance compression method for climate data". In 2014 IEEE International Symposium on Parallel and Distributed Processing with Applications, pp. 68-77, 2014.

(4) Regarding a discussion of other lossy compression algorithms:

We did not explore using other compression algorithms in this work, as evaluating multiple state-of-the-art algorithms (and developing a methodology for such evaluations) on CESM data was the focus of the earlier work in Baker et al. 2014 entitled "A Methodology for Evaluating the Impact of Data Compression on Climate Simulation Data", which is referenced several times in this manuscript. The scope in this work is to provide a better understanding how the loss of information due to lossy compression affects the climate data from the perspective of post-processing analysis by scientists using the data (as opposed to simpler metrics common to the data compression community, e.g., root mean-squared error, peak signal-to-noise ratio, ...), and we don't believe that adding more text discussing the pros and cons of available lossy methods falls within our scope.

(5) Regarding the mixture of mathematical and visual approaches:

We agree that the analyses described are a mixture of mathematical and visual approaches. This mixture of techniques presented reflects the post-processing analysis that climate scientists perform in practice. Analysis by climate scientists often does involve an interpretation of visualized data (enabled by the CVDP or AMWG diagnostics tools, for example) that could be categorized as subjective for its dependence on the person who looks at it. In this work, our approach was to allow the participants to analyze the data relevant to their interests in the manner of their choosing. We intentionally did not dictate a methodology (as noted in Section 1).

(6) Regarding the choice of fpzip:

An earlier paper by the first author (Baker et al. 2014) found fpzip to perform the best on climate data (as noted in Section 3). We note that we have evaluated many lossy methods, both mentioned in that 2014 manuscript and since, and we have not found any that perform as well on the climate data as a whole as fpzip.

(7) Regarding: "Should we proceed with looking into lossy compression as the advantage over lossless might only be a factor of 3 and with lossless there is no further problem?":

As acknowledged by the reviewer in the statement of question (6), most climate simulations already involve loss, whether in time via the chosen output frequency (e.g., daily, monthly, etc.), in space via the chosen resolution, or when writing output to disk (converting from double to float). For that reason, the reviewer's statement "with lossless there is no further problem" is perhaps more accurately stated as "with lossless we accept the loss in precision and resolution that has already been introduced into the process". In this light, we feel that it certainly makes sense to proceed with investigating the validity of the results after applying lossy compression. In fact, because the least significant bits in the simulation do contain error, this loss may even be desirable. For example, if a factor of 3 reduction due to lossy compression could be achieved with no impact on accuracy, then decimation in time and space could be less severe, and such a tradeoff could improve rather than degrade accuracy by discarding wasteful precision in favor of higher temporal or spatial resolution. Further, we note that achieving a factor of 3 (or even 2) reduction in data volume would be welcome news to data centers such as that at NCAR that are struggling with the financial burden of large climate simulation data volumes.

(8) Regarding the extra costs in order to support lossy compression:

While the focus of this work is determining whether lossy compression negatively impacts climate science results, we recognize that potential impact on the science workflow is of interest to many. We note that the energy cost of computation is negligible compared to the cost of data movement, e.g., in an arithmetic operation, 99% of the energy is spent moving the operands to registers from memory, while 1% is spent on performing the actual computation (e.g., Kestor et al., IISWC 2013). Therefore, we expect the energy cost of compression, even if done in software, to be insignificant compared to the energy cost of writing the data uncompressed to disk, and that using compression will in fact result in a net reduction in energy usage. As detailed in (Lindstrom and Isenburg 2006) and (Lindstrom et al. 2016, doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2016.04.009), I/O time is also substantially reduced by using compression. In practice, we note that the output data from the CESM-LE project is stored in compressed NetCDF format (lossless), which to our knowledge has not negatively affected user workflows. Ideally several lossy compression techniques will be incorporated into NetCDF in the future as well (we have had such discussions with Unidata).

(9) Regarding the level of compression for each variable (Table 2):

We describe how an appropriate level of compression was chosen in Section 3, beginning on page 6 (line 16) and continuing through page 7 (line 8). Please let us know if additional details are needed beyond the provided explanation.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., doi:10.5194/gmd-2016-146, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper