

RIOT: a Stochastic-based Method for Workflow Scheduling in the Cloud

Jianfeng Chen, Tim Menzies
 Computer Science, North Carolina State University, USA
 jchen37@ncsu.edu, tim@menzies.us

Abstract—Cloud computing provides engineers or scientists a place to run complex computing tasks. Finding a workflow’s deployment configuration in a cloud environment is not easy. Traditional workflow scheduling algorithms were based on some heuristics, e.g. reliability greedy, cost greedy, cost-time balancing, etc., or more recently, the meta-heuristic methods, such as genetic algorithms. These methods are very slow and not suitable for rescheduling in dynamic cloud environment.

This paper introduces RIOT (Randomized Instance Order Types), a stochastic based method for workflow scheduling. RIOT groups the tasks in the workflow into virtual machines via a probability model and then uses an effective surrogate based method to assess large amount of potential schedulings. Experiments in dozens of study cases showed that RIOT executes tens of times faster than traditional methods while generating comparable results to other methods.

Keywords-cloud computing; workflow scheduling; multi-objective optimization

I. INTRODUCTION

Scientific workflows (a.k.a data-intensive workflow) such as those shown in Figure 1 have been widely applied in scientific research, data mining and business intelligence analysis [1]. One fundamental problem in workflow research is *workflow scheduling*, i.e. associating the appropriate computer resource to each task in the workflow.

For complex workflows, prior work used meta-heuristic optimizers (genetic algorithm, particle swarm optimization, ant colony optimization, etc. [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9]). Such meta-heuristics are often computationally




Figure 1. Examples of cloud computing workflows. Clockwise from top left: Montage, Epigenomics, Inspiral, CyberShake, Sipt. Each node is one “task” and each edge is a data flow from one task to another. Number of tasks can vary from dozens to thousands). The scheduling problem is to map these tasks to a smaller number of virtual machines, decide the ordering of tasks within one VM, and then decide what kind of machine should drive each VM.

expensive. For example, in this paper, we applied a current state-of-the-art meta-heuristic workflow scheduling algorithm (EMSC [9]) to find optimized scheduling for 20 workflows. The the total runtime for optimization was more than 10 hours (on desktop computer with 2.0GHz, 8GB memory). As a comparison, the total expected runtime for these workflows was around 9 hours. In some specific workflows, the optimized time is 14x longer than its expected runtime in Amazon AWS clouds.

Such long runtimes are problematic. Cloud computers execute in highly dynamic environments where scheduling tools need to be adaptive to changing conditions [10], [11], [12]. For example, Schad *et al.* [11] found that the runtime of a widely used benchmarks suite can vary by up to 33% even when run on supposedly identical instances within the same cloud environment. Not only CPU, but also bandwidth can be highly variable within the cloud. Schad *et al.* report that network bandwidth between the same type of EC2 instances can vary from 410KB/s to 890KB/s. Hence, even after a workflow is planned and deployed, it is important to monitor instances and repeat the scheduling process during deployment when necessary. If repeated reschedulings are too slow, then it becomes impractical to use those algorithms.

Accordingly, this paper explores methods for faster scheduling of workflows. RIOT (short for Randomized Instance Order Types) is a stochastic method that does not need to evaluate large amount of potential scheduling plans. Instead, it first applies some simple heuristics to cluster workflow before using “surrogate sampling algorithm” to find proper computing resource for each cluster of tasks. When compared to several existed tools (including a widely used heuristic method and a state-of-the-art meta-heuristic method), RIOT performs the optimization significantly (1-29x) faster than other methods. Better yet, RIOT’s faster analysis found schedules as good, or better, than those from other methods (especially for large workflows).

It is important to note that RIOT is a workflow *scheduling* algorithm rather than a workflow *prediction* algorithm. “Prediction” refers to determine the expected runtime (workload) of tasks in a workflow. There has been some recent work showing that such predictions are possible. For example, Singh *et al.* [13] created a machine learning approach for scientific workflow performance predictions; Hsu *et al.* [14] achieved 91.1% accuracy on predicting performance of the

investigated distributed systems.

But this paper is not about prediction. Rather, it is about “scheduling”; i.e. selecting virtual machines, then dividing the workflow across those machines. Due to the complexity of cloud environments, schedulers know that their decisions will only be approximately optimum (and may have to be revised once we learn more about the running system).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II formulates the workflow scheduling and discusses existed related work in this area. Section III describes our methodology. Section IV assess RIOT using dozens of real-world scientific workflows. Section V and VI further discuss RIOT. Note that a reproduction for this work is available on-line at <https://github.com/ai-se/riot>.

II. WORKFLOW SCHEDULING ON CLOUD ENVIRONMENT

A. Problem Formulation

Scientific workflows, a.k.a. data-intensive workflows typically contain many computational tasks. These tasks are commonly interconnected via data or resource dependencies. One common way to represent the dependencies is through Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) as shown in Figure 1. For a DAG $D = \langle V, E \rangle$, each task is represented as a vertex and every edge $e(i, j)$ indicates that task j must be executed after task i is finished. Mathematically, we denote


$$\begin{aligned} Pred(i) &= \{j | (j, i) \in E\} \\ Succ(i) &= \{j | (i, j) \in E\} \end{aligned}$$

Task i can start only after all tasks of $Pred(i)$ are terminated. For convenience, among all tasks, we denote T_s as the *start* task which has no predecessors; and T_e , on the other hand, as the *exit* task without any successors. In this paper, we assume that all workflows have single start task and exit task (this can be simply assured by adding dumb vertex as the head(tail) of all start(exit) tasks).

When deploying workflow into cloud environment, such as Amazon AWS services or Microsoft Azure Cloud, tasks can be executed in different virtual machines. Input/output files of tasks can be transferred via networking. Parallel executing in multiple virtual machines significantly reduced execution time of whole workflow, compared to trivial single PC execution. A deployment plan for the workflow under the specific cloud environment can be uniquely determined by following three components (see Figure 2 as an example) [9]:

- **task2VM mapping**: number of VMs should be used and what tasks should be deployed in the same VM.
- **VM types**: which type of computational resources should be assigned to the VMs.
- **secondary ordering**: ordering tasks within the same VM. Tasks inside one VM are polling in secondary ordering until one of them is ready to run.

In this work, we treat workflow as a multi-objective problem. The goal of RIOT is to minimize execution time as



task2VM mapping	VM types
$T_s, 1, 2 :: VM_a$	$VM_a, VM_c :: t2.small$
$3, 4 :: VM_b$	$VM_b :: t2.large$
$5, T_e :: VM_c$	
secondary ordering	
$T_s, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, T_e$	

Figure 2. A scheduling example that uniquely set the scheduling. In this workflow, Task $T_s, 1, 2$ are deployed in VM_a (an AWS EC2 t2.small instance). Task $3, 4$ are deployed in VM_b (an AWS EC2 t2.large instance), etc. If both task 3 and 4 are ready to run at one moment, VM_a will run task 3 first, since task 3 has higher rank.

well and the cost of hiring the virtual machines from cloud service provider.

For each task i , denote

$$ft(i) = st(i) + dur(i) \quad (1)$$

$$dur(i) = workloads(i) + filetime(i) \quad (2)$$

$$filetime(i) = \sum_{j \in Succ(i)}^{VM(i) \neq VM(j)} \frac{file(i, j)}{\min[bw(i), bw(j)]} \quad (3)$$

where $ft(i), st(i), dur(i), filetime(i)$ are finish time, start time, duration and I/O time of task i respectively. Duration of task i includes computing time of the workload as well as I/O time. $file(i, j)$ is the data flow between task i and task j . I/O speed is limited by bandwidth (bw) of VMs. Then, “execution time” is measured as *makespan*; i.e. $ft(T_e)$.

As to cost, in scientific workflows, we create a virtual machine when any task need it and terminate it only when no more future task needs it. Hence, the cost of a workflow is the sum of cost of every used virtual machine. Cost rate and charging policy may differ among providers so for this paper, we followed AWS EC2 pricing (as done by previous works [9], [15], [6]). Note that the charging unit of VM by the hour.

A multi-objective optimizer should return is the *Pareto Frontier*. Mathematically, in this problem, we define one scheduling s_i dominates another scheduling s_j iff

$$makespan(s_i) \leq makespan(s_j) \text{ and } cost(s_i) \leq cost(s_j) \quad (4)$$

All schedulings not dominated by any others form the Pareto Frontier. Engineers can inspect this frontier to find the solutions they find most useful.

B. Related Work

In the literature, there are two ways to address the above problem: *decision-support tools* and *automatic optimizers*. In these decision-support tool, the final schedules are deter-

-
- a Generate population $i = 0$ using some *initialization policy*.
 - b Evaluate all individuals in population 0.
 - c Repeat until tired or happy
 - c.1 *Cross-over*: combine elite items to make population $i + 1$;
 - c.2 *Mutation*: make small changes within population i ;
 - c.3 *Evaluate*: individuals in population i ;
 - c.4 *Selection*: choose some elite subset of population i .
-

Figure 3. Framework of Multi-objective Evolutionary Algorithms such as NSGA-II, SPEA2, MOEA/D.

mined by humans after reflecting on the information offered by the tool. For example tools like iCanCloud [16] or ElasticSim [17] has a GUI platforms where a human analyst can manually look at the effects of trying a few options.

Automatic optimizers like RIOT are different to decision-support tools in two important ways. Firstly, the final schedules are determined by automatic algorithms. Secondly, these automatic optimizers explore many more options that humans could ever manage within a decision-support tool.

Many researchers have explored a wide range of automatic optimization methods to find cloud computing schedules. One of the earliest was Topcuoglu *et al.* [2], who proposed a heuristic method, HEFT (Heterogeneous-Earliest-Finish-Time). HEFT has two phases, task prioritizing phase and processor (VM) selection phase. In task prioritizing phase, tasks were ranked by their computation as well as communication cost. In processor selection phase, tasks were assigned to the processor which was first available.

Latter as workflows become larger and larger, experiment showed that HEFT's heuristics were easily trapped into local optimal [3]. Therefore, researchers turned to meta-heuristic methods. Chen *et al.* [4] used Ant Colony Optimization (ACO) [5]. In that work, seven heuristics were applied to propose a pheromone function, such as reliability greedy, cost greedy, time/cost balance etc. Rodriguez *et al.* [6] found that particle swarm optimization (PSO) [7] outperformed ACO as well as much other prior work. At the same time, 2014, Tsai *et al.* [8] proposed HHSA (hybrid heuristic-based scheduling algorithm) framework. HHSA was an ensemble method that ran separate ACO, PSO, and other meta-heuristic algorithms, then reported the best solution found by any method.

Figure 3 shows the general framework for one type of meta-heuristic methods – multi-objectives evolutionary algorithms (MOEA). Variants of the MOEA, including SPEA2, NSGA-II and MOEA/D etc., differ in how they down-select from the general population to the frontier as defined in §II-A. Workflow researchers applied various evolutionary algorithms to solve the scheduling problem with multi-objectives. Among them, our reading of this literature is that the Zhu *et al.* [9] paper on EMSC is a comparative assessment of much of the previous work.

EMSC combined three scheduling components (as defined in §II-A) into an integer array and created unique reproduction (cross-over and mutation) operators. Zhu *et al.* showed that off-the-shelf evolutionary algorithms such as NSGA-II, SPEA2, MOEA/D could be effectively figure out optimal schedulings. The evaluation part of the Zhu *et al.* paper is every extensive and showed that EMSC achieved better schedulings than a wide range of other approaches.

Another recent work came from Wang *et al.* [18]. Wang *et al.* formulated the workflow scheduling problem using mixed integer programming. MIP was dedicated to find the *global* optimal cost under some deadline constraints. However, the runtime for MIP algorithm was quite long—they needed hours to figure out solutions for workflows with hundreds of tasks, which was similar to Zhu's EMSC framework. Therefore, their method are recommended for scheduling small or medium workflows. RIOT, on the other hand, is able to find the near-optimal scheduling for large workflows in minutes.

One frequently asked question we get about RIOT is “why not set up a deadline requirement and try to optimize the single objective—monetary cost?”. Solving single objective problems is certainly much easier than solving multi-objective problems. However, prior results [9] showed that in many times, by relaxing the deadline requirement a little bit (extend by 5%), the monetary cost may significantly reduce (by more than 30%).

III. HOW TO MAKE A RIOT

A. Overview

The design of RIOT was motivated by the following key observation: all the above methods *configured the scheduling at the task level*:

- The heuristic HEPT algorithm assigned the tasks one by one (each assignment need a traversal of all VMs);
- The meta-heuristic EMSC algorithm applied an integer bit to encode every task and performed the evolution basing on that encoding.

RIOT was designed to test the following conjecture: *better schedules can be found, faster, if we schedule at a higher level*; i.e. using group of tasks in the VMs. Hence, as described in this section:

- RIOT's B-RANK orders tasks by prior knowledge and structure of the workflow.
- RIOT's TASKGROUP sub-routine uses the concept of *critical task* (described below) to divide large amount of tasks into much fewer blocks.

Another key conjecture of RIOT is the *anchor hypothesis*. That is, when evaluating candidates, *it is sufficient to extrapolate between just a few anchor points*:

- RIOT evaluates a very small number of randomly selected candidates, which we call the *anchors*. For the anchor evaluation, RIOT uses the CloudSim workflow

Algorithm 1: Framework of RIOT

Input : DAG , directed acyclic graph representing the workflow
 $TYPES$, set of available virtual machine types
 $CloudSim$, simulator

Output : S_B , Best schedulings with balanced makespan and cost

```

1 Order  $\leftarrow$  B-RANK( $DAG$ );
2  $S \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
3 foreach  $\eta \in [0.05, 0.1, \dots, 1.0]$  do
4   Task2VM  $\leftarrow$  TASKGROUP( $DAG$ ,  $\eta$ );
5    $\{\mathcal{T}\} \leftarrow$  SURROGATEEVALUATE(Task2VM,  $TYPES$ ,  $CloudSim$ );
6   foreach  $VMTypes \in \{\mathcal{T}\}$  do
7     Add ( $Task2VM$ ,  $VMTypes$ ,  $Order$ ) to  $S$ ;
8  $S_B \leftarrow$  All non-dominated solutions within  $S$ ;
9 Evaluate schedulings in  $S_B$  by  $CloudSim$ ;
10 return  $S_B$ ;
```




Figure 4. Left: a demonstrated workflow with critical tasks highlighted; Middle& Right: probability for each tasks to deploy into new VM with different η ; $p = 0.0$ indicates that task always use existed VM, while $p = 1.0$ indicates that tasks always request new VMs.

simulator [19]. This is a very widely-used approach— as of Feb 2018, Google scholar reports that the original 2011 CloudSim paper has 2,500+ citations.

- RIOT evaluates the other candidates by extrapolating between the anchors (and we call this extrapolation SURROGATEEVALUATES).

Just to say the obvious: anchor evaluation is much faster than evaluating all candidates since only the anchors require time-consuming simulations or executions on real hardware.

Algorithm 1 shows the details of RIOT. The rest of this section discusses those details.

B. Components of RIOT

1) **B-RANK**: RIOT used the B-Rank method of HEFT [2] to sort task execution priorities on the virtual machine. When sorting tasks, the B-rank metric is distance of the activity to the end of the workflow. Let T_e be the final task of a workflow (defined in §II-A). Then

$$\begin{aligned} rank(T_e) &= 1 \\ rank(i) &= 1 + \max_{j \in Succ(i)} rank(j) \end{aligned}$$

B-rank sorts tasks in decreasing order of $rank(i)$. Then, if two tasks i, j are ready to run on the same virtual machine,

Table I
 EIGHT TYPES OF AVAILABLE EC2 VIRTUAL MACHINES (ON-DEMAND INSTANCES IN US EAST N.VIRGINIA), SORTED BY PRICE.

Type	Compute Unit	Bandwidth (MB/s)	Price(\$/hr)
m3.medium	3.75	85.2	0.067
m4.large	7.5	35.2	0.1
m3.large	7.5	85.2	0.133
m4.xlarge	15	68	0.2
m3.xlarge	15	131	0.266
m4.2xlarge	30	131	0.4
m3.2xlarge	40	131	0.532
m4.4xlarge	45	181	0.8

we select the task that is *lower* in this sort order (and ties are resolved randomly).

2) **TASKGROUP**: To map tasks into virtual machines, RIOT use TASKGROUP to cluster the tasks, and assign each cluster into one VM.

TASKGROUP defines the *critical tasks* as follows,

- It is the start task T_s , or
- It is a task whose data flow in-degree (number of edges incident to in workflow) is among the top third of all in-degrees of all tasks

Next TASKGROUP assigns each task a probability p_i as

$$p_i = \begin{cases} 1.0 & \text{task}_i \text{ is critical task} \\ \eta * \text{average}(p_j) & \text{otherwise} \\ & j \in Pred(i) \end{cases}$$

where $\eta \in [0, 1]$ is a control parameter.

With the probabilities, we can group tasks into the clusters. For each task, there is p probability to assign a new cluster. If one task does not map to new cluster, TASKGROUP map it to any one of existed clusters (if it is a critical task) or any clusters of its predecessors (if it is not a critical task).

Figure 4 demonstrates critical tasks and p assignment. As we can see, critical task separates the workflow into several “blocks”. Tasks within one block are supposed to be executed in serial, therefore, in the same cluster. p value can control this— tasks closer to end of workflow have smaller p within a block, therefore, higher probability to assign to its predecessor’s cluster.

From Figure 4, we can see that η is an parameter controlling number of clusters. Higher η implies more virtual machines might be applied in the deployment. To improve diversity (and explore more solutions), we set η as 0.05, 0.10, \dots , 1.00 to generate 20 different task-instance mappings.

3) **SURROGATEEVALUATE**: Nowadays most cloud service provider provide many predefined virtual machines such as the EC2 instances of Table I. These machines differ in computational abilities, bandwidth, and certainly, the unit rental price. After grouping the tasks into VMs, we should

find proper VM-type mappings (short for *mapping(s)* in this section). One naive assumption was that the function $f : \text{mappings} \rightarrow \text{objective}(\text{make}/\text{cost})$ is convex. If so, we can simply applied hill climbing (HC)¹. Unfortunately, with HC, results were worst than existed methods. That is, f is not convex.

Hajela [20] indicated that SA can better handle non-convex problems. Results showed that SA did perform better than HC. This approved “ f is not convex”. However, SA still under-performs existed method. Having SA results, we supposed that we should randomly explore LARGE amount of mappings and select the best ones.

SURROGATEEVALAUTE try to create large number of mappings, and assess them so that we can pick up the best mapping for each *Task2VM* clustering setting. Algorithm 2 illustrates this process.

RIOT scores candidates by extrapolating between a small number of *anchors* (i.e. a very small number of mappings with known evaluations cores (line 4-12), including n_0 random mappings plus n_T iso-mapped instances. (i.e. uni-formed type of VMs). Next we use surrogate-based method to assess other large amount of random mappings. For each vm-type mapping to be assessed, we find the nearest a_n and furthest a_f mappings in evaluated anchors; and then guess its o (makespan or cost) through following formula (equivalent to line 12)

$$\frac{\hat{o}_r - o_n}{o_f - o_n} = \frac{\text{dist}(a_n, r)}{\text{dist}(a_n, a_f)} \cos\theta \quad (5)$$

where o_f, o_n, \hat{o}_r are objectives of a_f, a_n and expected objective of r respectively; $\text{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the distance (defined next) between two vm-type mappings.

Typically the vm with higher unit rental price is equipped with better CPU, memory and bandwidth. Consequently, we can sort the *TYPES* and assign each a rank. With this, distance between two vm-type mappings X, Y is defined as

$$\text{dist}(X, Y) = \left(\sum (x_i - y_i)^\alpha \right)^{1/\alpha} \quad (6)$$

$x_i(y_i)$ is the ranking of virtual machine used for i -th cluster according to $X(Y)$. Most machine learning algorithm set $\alpha = 2$ (the Euclidean distance). In RIOT, we found that using $\alpha = 1$ (the Manhattan distance) returned similar results as Euclidean distance. As Aggarwal *et al.* [21] argues, Manhattan metric is preferred to the standard Euclidean metric when data dimension is large.

Algorithm 2 summarizes the SURROGATEEVALAUTE algorithm discussed in this section.

IV. EVALUATION

In this section we report numerical results of scheduling workflows in different structures as shown in Figure 1. Each

¹For space reasons, HC and latter mentioned SA experiments are not shown here. See <http://tiny.cc/qptery>.

Algorithm 2: Surrogate Based Evaluation

Input : *TYPES*, set of available virtual machine types
CloudSim, simulator
Output : \mathcal{T} , assessed vm-type mappings
Parameter: N , number of random vm-type mappings
 n_0 , additional anchor size ($n_0 \ll N$)

- 1 $n_T \leftarrow$ number of *TYPES*;
- 2 *Anchors* $\leftarrow n_T$ iso-mappings $\cup n_0$ random-mappings;
- 3 Evaluate all mappings in *Anchors* by *CloudSim*;
- 4 *Randoms* $\leftarrow N$ random mappings;
- 5 **foreach** $r \in$ *Randoms* **do**
- 6 $a_n \leftarrow$ mapping in *Anchors* that nearest to r ;
- 7 $a_f \leftarrow$ mapping in *Anchors* that furthest to a_n ;
- 8 **foreach** $o \in \{\text{makespan}, \text{cost}\}$ **do**
- 9 $o_n, o_f \leftarrow o(a_n), o(a_f)$;
- 10 $d_0, d_1 \leftarrow \text{dist}(a_n, r), \text{dist}(a_n, a_f)$;
- 11 $\theta \leftarrow \arccos(\frac{|\vec{a}_n \vec{r}|}{|\vec{a}_n| |\vec{r}|})$;
- 12 $\hat{o}_r \leftarrow \frac{d_0 \cos\theta}{d_1} (o_f - o_n) + o_n$;
- 13 $\{\mathcal{T}\} \leftarrow$ *Anchors* \cup *Randoms*;
- 14 **return** \mathcal{T} ;

structure scales 25 to 1000 tasks approximately (see <http://tiny.cc/wfeg> for more details). All workflows were supposed to deploy to Amazon AWS Cloud Services, with instances listed in Table I.

In this paper, we compared RIOT to two baseline schedulers. First is MOHEFT [15] (Multi-objective HEFT), a **heuristic algorithm** basing on the classic HEFT [2] method. Another is EMSC [9], a **meta-heuristic algorithm**. We ran EMSC basing on three popular MOEA, including NSGA-II, SPEA2 and MOEA/D.

We coded RIOT and two baseline tools in JAVA and ran them one the same machine (2.0GHz with 8GB memory, running in CentOS). For parameters of RIOT, by default, we set $N, n_0, n_T = \{500, 30, 8\}$ since we are using the eight types of Table I. For other baselines, we strictly follow the setups defined in their associated publications.

To test performance robustness and reduce observational error, we repeated these all studies 30 times with different random seeds. To check the statistical significance of the differences between the algorithms, we performed a statistical test using Wilcoxon test at a 5% significance level.

A. Comparing via Runtime

Table II shows the runtimes of different treatments. For convenience, we also report the *makespan* as well as speed-up of RIOT method. From this table we observe:

- Measured in relative terms, except in a very small workflow (Montage25), we note that RIOT is 1-27x faster than other approaches.
- Measured in absolute values, the general trend is that other methods can take up to 4.8 hours while RIOT is never slower than 310 seconds. That is to say, RIOT

Table II
 MEDIAN RUNTIME* AMONG 30 REPEATS IN RIOT AND OTHERS

Model	MAKE SPAN*	RIOT (t)	MO-HEFT (t_1)	EMSC-NSGAI (t_2)	EMSC-SPEA2 (t_3)	EMSC-MOEA /D (t_4)	Speedup $\frac{\min(t_i)}{t}$
M.25	31	19	6	33	34	35	0
M.50	49	9	17	62	65	65	1
M.100	113	6	55	154	157	162	9
M.1000	257	250	1.6H	2.6H	2.9H	2.8H	22
E.24	0.4H	1	4	27	28	29	4
E.46	0.6H	2	14	58	59	61	7
E.100	3.6H	5	56	153	157	164	11
E.997	5.2H	211	1.6H	2.6H	2.7H	3.0H	27
I.30	655	1	6	34	35	36	6
I.50	954	2	15	62	64	65	7
I.100	700	7	63	175	182	199	9
I.1000	0.5H	189	1.5H	2.6H	2.7H	4.8H	29
C.30	124	1	7	34	35	36	7
C.50	198	3	16	63	63	65	5
C.100	241	7	61	154	154	162	8
C.1000	0.4H	273	1.7H	3.0H	2.6H	4.8H	23
S.30	1006	1	6	34	35	35	6
S.60	1152	3	23	76	77	79	7
S.100	1133	9	62	168	169	180	6
S.1000	1.2H	302	1.4H	2.0H	2.0H	2.2H	16

Runtime* is in seconds unless otherwise stated (H=hours).

Makespan* is the median makespan of all non-dominated scheduling found by any algorithm ran in the experiment.

Model M/E/I/C/S = Montage, Epigenomics, Inspiral, CyberShake, Sipt (see Figure 1)

Table III
 MEDIAN MEASUREMENTS FOR ALL EXPERIMENTED WORKFLOWS

Model	Hypervolume						IGD						Spread				
	RIOT	MH	EN	ES	EM	RAND	RIOT	MH	EN	ES	EM	RAND	RIOT	MH	EN	ES	EM
Montage 25	79 (1)	38	82	80	70	47	4 (1)	36	2	6	10	26	83 (1)	91	92	55	71
Montage 50	82 (1)	28	86	85	74	51	4 (1)	42	6	4	10	22	76 (1)	n.a.	105	62	77
Montage 100	79 (1)	29	85	83	77	49	3 (1)	48	2	8	22	30	88 (1)	n.a.	123	81	81
Montage 1000	75 (1)	34	84	83	82	51	3 (1)	50	0	2	10	24	96 (1)	n.a.	104	55	93
Epigenomics 24	73 (1)	27	78	78	60	45	8 (1)	45	2	5	14	28	95 (1)	87	79	78	96
Epigenomics 46	67 (1)	0	68	68	62	28	6 (1)	67	5	12	17	35	79 (1)	n.a.	89	81	85
Epigenomics 100	75 (1)	6	70	69	64	35	4 (1)	62	5	3	22	31	93 (1)	87	82	56	89
Epigenomics 997	80 (1)	0	68	67	65	31	7 (1)	156	3	7	7	32	60 (1)	90	95	54	78
Inspiral 30	72 (1)	29	79	75	63	46	6 (1)	40	1	7	16	24	95 (1)	92	104	70	90
Inspiral 50	72 (1)	22	78	70	58	42	4 (1)	39	1	5	16	22	93 (1)	91	114	66	90
Inspiral 100	69 (1)	0	73	71	68	35	4 (1)	64	1	3	28	30	80 (1)	n.a.	109	79	71
Inspiral 1000	80 (1)	14	81	77	81	47	4 (1)	49	0	2	12	32	84 (1)	102	136	92	78
CyberShake 30	65 (1)	37	82	81	67	33	14 (1)	48	2	5	10	38	107 (1)	n.a.	91	42	83
CyberShake 50	67 (1)	30	78	76	53	24	11 (1)	43	2	5	16	41	108 (1)	86	98	42	81
CyberShake 100	63 (1)	19	74	72	61	13	9 (1)	55	3	5	16	55	110 (1)	95	91	51	95
CyberShake 1000	79 (1)	39	81	81	80	49	5 (1)	38	1	2	13	30	86 (1)	n.a.	119	55	85
Sipt 30	72 (1)	28	74	74	23	10	3 (1)	38	1	3	38	89	111 (1)	78	89	67	90
Sipt 60	71 (1)	23	79	79	68	40	7 (1)	49	3	6	13	32	96 (1)	85	106	85	94
Sipt 100	68 (1)	33	77	78	67	36	5 (1)	41	2	5	14	33	89 (1)	n.a.	103	85	88
Sipt 1000	68 (2)	16	77	70	75	43	5 (2)	48	1	5	8	32	94 (1)	n.a.	127	79	71

Note: all values in the table are in 10^{-2} , e.g., the median hypervolume of Montage 25 gained from RIOT is $79 * 10^{-2}$, i.e. 0.79

RAND = Random search (Sanity check)

MH = MOHEFT; EN = EMSC-NSGA-II; ES = EMSC-SPEA2; EM = EMSC-MOEA/D

Hypervolume = higher are better; IGD = lower are better; Spread = lower are better

(values) next to RIOT are IQR (interquartile range, i.e. difference between 75th and 25th percentiles) of 30 repeats of RIOT

n.a. indicates no enough frontier points to calculate spread

Bold values indicate that RIOT performed as well as or better than any of MH/EN/ES/EM (under Wilcoxon Test).

terminates in just a few seconds to minutes while other methods require minutes to hours.

- Comparing the expected makespan to optimizer runtimes, in some workflows with many tasks, such as Montage100, Montage1000, CyberShake1000, etc., previous methods were slower than the eventual runtimes (makespan); while RIOT requires just small ratio of makespans, making RIOT more suitable for re-scheduling in dynamic cloud environment.

To conclude, comparing via runtime, **RIOT finds schedulings much faster than the prior heuristic/meta-heuristic methods.**

B. Comparing via Frontier Quality

In this paper we treat workflow scheduling as a multi-objective problem. To compare the quality of returned frontier, three measures is widely applied [22] – Hypervolume, Inverted Generation Distance (IGD) and Spread. For our problem, we plot the objectives of frontiers in a 2D coordinate and have following definitions,

- *Hypervolume* is the area of space the obtained frontier dominated (top-right of the frontier curve);
- *IGD* is average Euclidean distance of each point in obtained frontier to its nearest point in the true Pareto Frontier. It is almost impossible to find the true Pareto Frontier. Following Wang *et al.*'s guidance [23], we collected non-dominated scheduling found by any algorithms in any repeats as the true frontier;
- *Spread* defines the average Euclidean distance of every pair of consecutive points in the obtained frontier. Lower spread implies better diversity.

Table III concludes the statistical measures for all workflows. In that table, **Bold** values indicate where RIOT performed as well as or better than any of MH/EN/ES/EM (under the Wilcoxon Test).

Within Table III, we observe that:

- Variants of EMSC have similar performance; EMSC outperforms the heuristic method, MOHEFT. This is consisted with EMSC's origin paper;
- Consider the IQR values²: the performance of RIOT is stable, even though it is a stochastic method;
- Measured by hypervolume, in 70% of experimented workflows, RIOT has significantly higher values than other baselines. That is, in most workflows, with monetary cost constraint, RIOT can find schedulings with less makespan, or within some deadline, RIOT can find schedulings required less cost;
- Measured by IGD, RIOT performs best in 85% workflow. In other words, RIOT's results are closer to true frontier;
- According to spread statistics, RIOT provides more diverse results in majority study cases;

²IQR = intra-quartile range = (75-25)th percentile.

- Summarizing all in Table III, there is no any algorithm always performs the best (this is one of Wolpert's *No Free Lunch* results [24]). However, RIOT performs best in majority of measurements and no bad in the remaining measures (compared to *RAND* or *MOHEFT* especially).

Summarizing above observations, **RIOT usually finds schedulings as good as anything else. This result is particularly remarkable for the large workflows.**

V. THREATS TO VALIDITY

A. Sampling Bias

While we tested RIOT on over two dozen workflows, it would be inappropriate to say that this sample covers the space of all possible workflows. As researchers, all we can do is to introduce our method, release the source code for our method and suggest that other researchers try a broader range of workflows.

B. Algorithm Bias

In this paper we compared our work to MOHEFT and EMSC. We choose MOHEFT, the multi-objective variant of HEFT, since it is one of most popular heuristic method in this area. It is simple and fast (compared to meta-heuristic methods). We choose EMSC since it is the best meta-heuristic we have explored in this area. As shown in §II-B, there are many other ways to perform workflow scheduling. For example, the MIP [18] can guarantee to get best schedule under some deadline and other constraints. Comparing to other methods is left for future work.

C. Evaluation Bias

Comparing via results Table III, we conclude that RIOT is a smart tool. Note that in some workflows, RIOT did not outperform EMSC (see three of the Sipt results of Table III). However, considering runtimes of different algorithms, EMSC might requires longer time than expected makespan. RIOT is significantly faster than other methods. Therefore, we consider RIOT as a promising tool. In future, we need to analyze why RIOT fails in some workflows.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper introduces RIOT, a novel stochastic method for workflow scheduling in the cloud.

RIOT was built to test two conjectures:

- 1) Better schedules can be found, faster, if we schedule at a higher level;
- 2) When scoring candidates it is sufficient to extrapolate between just a few anchor points.

The results shown above strongly endorse these two conjectures. When optimizing large workflows, experiments showed that about 80% of RIOT's quality indicators were as good or better than existed algorithms (MOHEFT and EMSC), but only require less than (1/29=) 3% of their optimization time. As for small or medium workflows, two

thirds of RIOT's quality indicators were as good as other methods, with RIOT 1x-30x faster.

Consequently, we recommend RIOT for configuring large workflows, since RIOT takes minutes to find schedulings that other tools need hours to find. As for smaller workflows, we still recommend researchers try RIOT first since RIOT is much faster than prior work and in the usual case, RIOT can achieve competitive results to other methods.

REFERENCES

- [1] Vöckler *et al.*, "Experiences using cloud computing for a scientific workflow application," in *Proceedings of the 2nd Intl. workshop on sci. cloud computing*. ACM, 2011, pp. 15–24.
- [2] H. Topcuoglu, S. Hariri, and M.-y. Wu, "Performance-effective and low-complexity task scheduling for heterogeneous computing," *IEEE Trans. on parallel and distributed systems*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 260–274, 2002.
- [3] M. A. Rodriguez and R. Buyya, "A taxonomy and survey on scheduling algorithms for scientific workflows in iaas cloud computing environments," *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, vol. 29, no. 8, 2017.
- [4] W.-N. Chen and J. Zhang, "An ant colony optimization approach to a grid workflow scheduling problem with various qos requirements," *IEEE Trans. on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 29–43, 2009.
- [5] M. Dorigo, M. Birattari, and T. Stutzle, "Ant colony optimization," *IEEE computational intelligence magazine*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 28–39, 2006.
- [6] M. A. Rodriguez and R. Buyya, "Deadline based resource provisioning and scheduling algorithm for scientific workflows on clouds," *IEEE Trans. on Cloud Computing*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 222–235, 2014.
- [7] Y. Shi *et al.*, "Particle swarm optimization: developments, applications and resources," in *evolutionary computation. Proceedings of Congress on*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2001, pp. 81–86.
- [8] C.-W. Tsai *et al.*, "A hyper-heuristic scheduling algorithm for cloud," *IEEE Trans. on Cloud Computing*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 236–250, 2014.
- [9] Z. Zhu *et al.*, "Evolutionary multi-objective workflow scheduling in cloud," *IEEE Trans. on parallel and distributed Systems*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 1344–1357, 2016.
- [10] M. S. Rehman and M. F. Sakr, "Initial findings for provisioning variation in cloud computing," in *Cloud Computing Technology and Science (CloudCom), 2010 IEEE Second Intl. Conference on*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 473–479.
- [11] J. Schad, J. Dittrich, and J.-A. Quiané-Ruiz, "Runtime measurements in the cloud: observing, analyzing, and reducing variance," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 3, no. 1-2, pp. 460–471, 2010.
- [12] A. Iosup, N. Yigitbasi, and D. Epema, "On the performance variability of production cloud services," in *Cluster, Cloud and Grid Computing (CCGrid), 2011 11th IEEE/ACM Intl. Sym. on*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 104–113.
- [13] A. Singh, A. Rao, S. Purawat, and I. Altintas, "A machine learning approach for modular workflow performance prediction," in *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Workflows in Support of Large-Scale Science*. ACM, 2017, p. 7.
- [14] C.-J. Hsu, R. K. Panta, M.-R. Ra, and V. W. Freeh, "Inside-out: Reliable performance prediction for distributed storage systems in the cloud," in *Reliable Distributed Systems, 2016 IEEE 35th Sym. on*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 127–136.
- [15] J. J. Durillo and R. Prodan, "Multi-objective workflow scheduling in amazon ec2," *Cluster computing*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 169–189, 2014.
- [16] A. Núñez, J. L. Vázquez-Poletti, A. C. Caminero, G. G. Castañé, J. Carretero, and I. M. Llorente, "icancloud: A flexible and scalable cloud infrastructure simulator," *Journal of Grid Computing*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 185–209, 2012.
- [17] Z. Cai, Q. Li, and X. Li, "ElasticSim: A toolkit for simulating workflows with cloud resource runtime auto-scaling and stochastic task execution times," *Journal of Grid Computing*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 257–272, 2017.
- [18] Y. Wang *et al.*, "Using integer programming for workflow scheduling in the cloud," in *Cloud Computing, 2017 IEEE 10th Intl. Conference on*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 138–146.
- [19] R. N. Calheiros *et al.*, "Cloudsim: a toolkit for modeling and simulation of cloud computing environments and evaluation of resource provisioning algorithms," *Software: Practice and experience*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 23–50, 2011.
- [20] P. Hajela, "Genetic search—an approach to the nonconvex optimization problem," *AIAA journal*, vol. 28, no. 7, pp. 1205–1210, 1990.
- [21] C. C. Aggarwal, A. Hinneburg, and D. A. Keim, "On the surprising behavior of distance metrics in high dimensional spaces," in *ICDT*, vol. 1. Springer, 2001, pp. 420–434.
- [22] R. T. Marler and J. S. Arora, "Survey of multi-objective optimization methods for engineering," *Structural and multi-disciplinary optimization*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 369–395, 2004.
- [23] S. Wang, S. Ali, T. Yue, Y. Li, and M. Liaaen, "A practical guide to select quality indicators for assessing pareto-based search algorithms in search-based software engineering," in *Software Engineering (ICSE), 2016 IEEE/ACM 38th Intl. Conference on*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 631–642.
- [24] D. H. Wolpert and W. G. Macready, "No free lunch theorems for optimization," *IEEE Trans. on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 67–82, Apr 1997.