

RIBBON: Cost-Effective and QoS-Aware Deep Learning Model Inference using a Diverse Pool of Cloud Computing Instances

Baolin Li
Northeastern University

Rohan Basu Roy
Northeastern University

Tirthak Patel
Northeastern University

Vijay Gadepally
MIT Lincoln Laboratory

Karen Gettings
MIT Lincoln Laboratory

Devesh Tiwari
Northeastern University

ABSTRACT

Deep learning model inference is a key service in many businesses and scientific discovery processes. This paper introduces RIBBON, a novel deep learning inference serving system that meets two competing objectives: quality-of-service (QoS) target and cost-effectiveness. The key idea behind RIBBON is to intelligently employ a diverse set of cloud computing instances (heterogeneous instances) to meet the QoS target and maximize cost savings. RIBBON devises a Bayesian Optimization-driven strategy that helps users build the optimal set of heterogeneous instances for their model inference service needs on cloud computing platforms – and, RIBBON demonstrates its superiority over existing approaches of inference serving systems using homogeneous instance pools. RIBBON saves up to 16% of the inference service cost for different learning models including emerging deep learning recommender system models and drug-discovery enabling models.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Problem Formulation

Deep learning (DL) has been widely used in various areas of applications in recent years. The widely adopted models in areas including scientific computing [1–3], computer vision [4–6] and personalized recommendation [7–10] areas show the significance of studying these models. While model training focuses on the model accuracy and does not have strict time requirements, model inference is often conducted in real-time environments under quality-of-service (QoS) constraints. In this work, we focus on the model inference, where the models are set up to serve a continuous stream of queries submitted by the model users.

A few recent works have started to investigate and quantify the architectural performance bottleneck of various models when serving inference on different types of hardware architectures available in their data centers and platforms [9, 11–14]. *However, these works do not address the cost-effectiveness of executing inference queries on different types of hardware. As DL models are becoming more widely adopted and used, inference service providers are more likely to utilize cloud computing resources to serve their customers. Thus, cost-effectiveness is becoming a primary optimization goal along with meeting the QoS targets.* Cloud computing platforms offer a wide range of processor architectures and hence, how to properly make use of the various available resources for DL models to meet the QoS targets and minimizing the cost becomes a key challenge. This work addresses this challenge and advances the state-of-the-art by demonstrating how to serve inferences effectively under two competing objectives: QoS target and cost-effectiveness.

1.2 Contributions

This work makes the following contributions.

First, we provide evidence to demonstrate the performance and cost trade-off in serving deep learning inferences on various AWS cloud computing instances, and present a novel approach to exploit this trade-off. Our experimental characterization reveals that the performance ranking of the different cloud computing instances can be often different than their cost-effectiveness ranking, even when considering only a single model. This characteristic makes it difficult to find the optimal computing instance for serving model inferences when co-optimizing for cost and QoS together. To exploit this trade-off between cost and QoS, this work approaches the problem with a new perspective: instead of exhaustively looking for a cheaper instance to serve the model with similar or better performance than the current one, it adopts the higher-performance and lower-cost instances to create a diverse pool to serve incoming queries cooperatively.

Second, this work introduces design and implementation of a novel framework, RIBBON¹, that minimizes the cost of serving a stream of inference queries while meeting the QoS target. *The key idea behind this framework is to build a pool of diverse computing instances (e.g., a combination of different CPU and GPU instance types) to serve model inferences instead of provisioning multiple instances of the same type (a traditional homogeneous pool).* Intuitively, RIBBON’s approach of building a diverse pool is rooted in the insights obtained from our experimental study: the optimal instance type changes depending on the model architecture, QoS target, and query batch sizes. Therefore, building a pool of instance types that are of high quality in different dimensions helps us achieve better outcomes when optimizing for multiple competing objectives (QoS target and cost). However, naively building a diverse pool of multiple computing instance types may lead to worse performance and cost. RIBBON formulates this as a search-space optimization problem and designs a Bayesian Optimization (BO)-based technique to find the optimal configuration from the diverse pool of multiple computing instance types.

Finally, RIBBON’s evaluation is based on inference streams emulating production-environment behavior [7, 15–18] and different types of DL models, such as CANDLE (predicts tumor cell line response to drug pairs) and deep learning recommender system models [7, 9, 10]. Our evaluation confirms

¹RIBBON (Request Inferencing Based on Bayesian Optimization) binds together a set of diverse computing instances for serving model inference queries.

RIBBON’s effectiveness over multiple competing strategies for multiple representative deep learning models on a range of AWS cloud computing instances. In particular, we show that RIBBON can increase the cost-effectiveness by up to 16% while meeting the QoS target. RIBBON consistently outperforms competing techniques under a wide range of scenarios including different QoS targets, query characteristics, and load fluctuations.

Open-source artifact. RIBBON framework is available at: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5262865>.

1.3 Related Work

In this section, we compare RIBBON against prior works and discuss how the ideas in RIBBON advance current capabilities.

Recent works on memory-heavy models (e.g., recommendation models) have provided insights on the new challenges such workload brings on both training and inference [10, 12, 19]. DeepRecSys [7] builds a systematic approach to split and offload inference queries for higher production-scale throughput. However, none of the prior works have designed an online serving system in a multi-platform cloud environment setting, and exploited the diversity of compute instances for co-optimizing QoS target and cost-effectiveness (the core contributions of RIBBON).

Cloud providers offer a variety of configurations for cloud instances [20–23]. Traditionally, application developers provision instances based on expertise and tuning [24–29]. However, with increasing application types and cloud servers, this approach is inefficient due to its production overhead [30–33]. This led to the development of application-specific tools for optimal instance selection with the aim to maximize performance [34–40]. These approaches often rely on detailed application profiling prior to execution [20, 41–45]. In some cases, they rely on historical training data from similar applications running on similar hardware for performance optimization [46–53]. However, historical performance data is not available for the problem RIBBON is solving and such data will lose significance with an update in the application or the hardware [12, 19, 54–56]. These approaches neither consider the vast cloud-based compute and accelerator options, nor the query stream of different batch sizes to models.

Recent serverless inference frameworks such as MArk and BATCH [40, 57] cannot be directly applied to recommendation models with large embedding tables and other general large-scale models since they would not fit in limited serverless memory space, and the serverless underlying hardware is not exposed to the user, making it difficult to exploit hardware diversity. Existing automatic cloud instance suggestion frameworks [58, 59] do not explore the idea of a diverse instance pool like RIBBON. Several scheduling frameworks spawn queries among cloud instances that scale up depending on the progress of the first few tasks [60–65]. However, unlike RIBBON, they either do not deal with heterogeneous instances or assume that the queries will not change with time [66, 67]. RIBBON introduces a novel use case of Bayesian Optimization for building efficient inference service systems – expanding the surface area of what we had demonstrated previously for other use cases of Bayesian Optimization in the data center/cloud computing resource-management area (i.e., shared resource partitioning for microservices [68], shared resource management for fairness and performance [69], and performance auto-tuning [70]). None of

Table 1: Deep learning models used in this work.

Model	Description
CANDLE [71]	A large-scale fully-connected DNN model in Cancer Distributed Learning Environment (CANDLE) project [72, 73]. Predicts tumor cell line response to drug pairs.
ResNet [74]	Developed by Microsoft, a CNN model with residual operations. Widely applied in computer vision areas such as image classification, object detection.
VGG [75]	A CNN model available on DLHUB [76]. Widely applied in image recognition areas.
MT-WND [77]	Multi-Task Wide and Deep, a recommendation model. Uses multiple DNN predictors in parallel to predict multiple metrics such as click-throughput rates (CTRs), ratings. Used for YouTube video recommendation.
DIEN [78]	Deep Interest Evolution Network developed by Alibaba for recommendation. Integrates gated recurrent units (GRUs) to capture time series information. Used in e-commerce recommendation.




Figure 1: CANDLE model architecture.

these previous works exploit the diversity in hardware instances for serving cost-effective model inference queries.

2 BACKGROUND

In this section, we provide a brief background on deep learning models and the cloud computing instances used in this study.

Studied inference models. To demonstrate the effectiveness and wide application range of RIBBON, the models in Table 1 cover a wide range of deep learning applications. A description for each model is also available in the table. These models can be grouped into two major categories: the general deep neural network (DNN), convolutional neural network (CNN) models as one, and the recommendation-specific DNN and embedding table hybrid models as another.

The reason to include the CANDLE, ResNet, and VGG models is that they are very representative of the deep learning workloads in scientific research. CANDLE is a well-known cancer research project that applies deep learning techniques to biomedical studies, the model architecture is shown in Fig. 1. It combines the output feature of different DNNs to feed into a residual network for tumor’s drug response prediction. The CANDLE model size is larger than other models as it combines multiple DNNs. The residual network is also the key feature in ResNet models used in our study. ResNet and VGG are widely studied models in computer science, specifically in computer vision applications.

On the other side, MT-WND and DIEN are two representative workloads from industry personalized recommendation applications. Such applications are now consuming a large fraction of compute cycles in data centers according to the recent reports [8, 10]. Therefore, studying and evaluating RIBBON’s effectiveness on such




Figure 2: Recommendation model architecture.

Table 2: Studied AWS instances. A brief description with example application fields is provided for each category.

Category	Instance	Size	Description
General purpose	t3, m5, m5n	xlarge	t3, m5, and m5n families offer a balance of compute, memory, and network resources (powered by different processor types).
Compute optimized	c5, c5a	2xlarge	c5 and c5a family instances are suitable for compute-intensive (c) workloads, but at higher price. c5a uses AMD EPYC and c5 uses Intel Cascade Lake processor.
Memory optimized	r5, r5n	large	r5 and r5n family instances are suited for memory-intensive workloads ('r' is a codename for memory-optimized).
Accelerator (GPU)	g4dn	xlarge	g4dn family instances are GPU-based cost-effective instances – targeted for machine-learning and graphic-intensive workloads ('g' refers to graphics/GPU).

models is as important as the general DNN/CNNs. Current state-of-the-art models take a hybrid approach, which is fundamentally different in their structure and characteristics from traditional deep learning models [9]. Each input sample (e.g., a platform user and a product pair) consists of **categorical features** for the user’s past interaction with products, as well as **continuous features** for user-specific information such as age.

As shown in Fig. 2, categorical features are processed by embedding tables and continuous features are processed by DNNs, their outputs get combined and fed to a final DNN for click-through rate (CTR, probability that user clicks on the product) prediction. The size of embedding tables is typically large due to the high number of product categories (in the order of tens of GBs of memory).

Inference Service in the Cloud. To efficiently serve the model inference queries under the QoS and budget constraints, we evaluate a wide variety of Amazon’s AWS cloud computing EC2 instances. We chose AWS EC2 as a primary experimental playground because it provides a rich number of node instance types at different price points (e.g., compute-optimized, memory-optimized, accelerators, etc.). The example EC2 instances used throughout the paper are shown in Table 2.

One common characteristic of online inference service is that each query contains multiple requests, the number of requests in a query is called batch size. The batch size varies across queries to the model, and the reason is different for general deep learning models and the recommendation models. In the former case, since adaptive batching is widely applied in deep learning inference [40, 57, 79], the number of requests that are batched into a query varies over




Figure 3: Relative performance (a) and cost-effectiveness (b) of instances serving MT-WND model with batch sizes 32 and 128. X-axis represents the normalized performance and cost-effectiveness as a score between 0 and 1. The normalization point is the best performance and most cost-effective instance, respectively. “1” indicates the best performance and the most cost-effectiveness, respectively.

time. In the latter case, since a query includes multiple products that need to be ranked and recommended to the user at the same time, it also varies between different queries [7, 9, 10].

Figure of Merit. An important metric for serving DL models in the cloud is the mean service latency and tail latency (more methodological details provided in Sec. 5). We define the instance performance as its achievable throughput (queries per second, or QPS), which is the reciprocal of the mean service latency. Specifically, let the mean service latency be L_m , the QPS can be written as $\frac{1}{L_m}$. A higher performance indicates that the latency of the queries served on this instance is lower, thus more queries can be processed per unit time. When serving an online query stream, there is a Quality-of-Service (QoS) target as online service is latency-critical. The target is typically specified in terms of tail latencies. Another metric associated with serving is the price per instance, which is defined by the AWS cloud service provider.

3 OPPORTUNITY AND CHALLENGES

In this section, first we describe the trade-off between performance and cost in cloud inference environment. Then, based on these trade-offs, we show the possibility of improving a system that is already performing well by introducing a diverse instance pool. Finally, we show the new challenges that come with a diverse pool and how a RIBBON-like solution can be applied for cost-effective and QoS-aware inference service on a diverse pool of instances.

3.1 Performance and Cost Trade-off

Fig. 3 (a) shows an example of how the batch size varies the relative performance of an instance type. For the MT-WND model with batch size 32, most instances shown have similarly high performance. But when the batch size becomes 128, g4dn becomes the optimal instance, significantly outperforming other instance types. This is also an expected result as GPU’s streaming multiprocessors are more suitable for inputs with larger batch sizes.

Interestingly, the results in Fig. 3 (b) tell a different side of the story about the cost-effectiveness. The cost-effectiveness is simply defined as the number of queries that an instance can process per




Figure 4: MT-WND QoS satisfaction rate and service price for each instance configuration. The configuration (X + Y) means there are X g4dn instances and Y t3 instances used. Configurations on the right of the red vertical line satisfy the QoS requirement.

dollar spent, as shown in the following Eq. 1.

$$\text{Cost-Eff.} = \frac{\text{Perf. (query/sec)}}{\text{Price (\$/hour)}} = \frac{3600 \cdot \text{Perf.}}{\text{Price}} \text{ (query/\$)} \quad (1)$$

Even though the GPU instance g4dn has very strong performance for relatively larger batch sizes, its cost-effectiveness is the lowest among all instances shown. On the other side, the r5 and r5a instances are low on the performance of higher batch sizes, but their cost-effectiveness are consistently the highest. This is because, with the same amount of memory allocated, the memory optimized instances incur less cost than the general purpose instances and much less than compute optimized and accelerator instances. Notice that the cost-effectiveness only relates to the number of queries that an instance can serve given a budget; it does not consider whether the service satisfies the latency requirement. If there is no latency requirement, it would be optimal to serve the models with r5 or r5n instances. However, in a QoS-aware scenario, the cloud user would have to serve with g4dn just to stay within QoS requirements despite the extra cost.

3.2 Potential of Building Diverse Instance Pool

For a deployed cloud service, we assume it is already running at minimal cost on a specific instance type - reducing the number of total instances for lower cost will violate QoS. However, we ask ourselves a question: is it possible to further reduce the cost while not violating QoS? One common approach is to look for a more cost-effective instance type that also has the same or better performance so it does not violate QoS. But this is not always feasible as such instance type may not even exist. Instead, RIBBON takes an unorthodox approach – it makes use of instance types that would violate the QoS with lower performance, but also with lower cost. Based on the discussions in Sec. 3.1, we can see that the cost-effective instance could still be useful for lower batch size queries even though it greatly violates the QoS for larger batches. If we form a diverse instance pool composed of both the higher performance cost-ineffective instances and the lower performance cost-effective instances, there is an opportunity that we can lower the total serving cost while staying within the QoS.

We illustrate such improvement opportunity using a straightforward example. Fig. 4 quantifies the price and latency of serving a query stream of MT-WND model. The query inter-arrival times, batch size distributions and QoS target used in this example have been chosen to reflect production workloads [7, 15, 16] (Sec. 5). The

red vertical line indicates the QoS target, meaning at least 99% of the queries have to be within the 99th percentile tail latency target (20ms). Among all instances, the g4dn instance is the optimal type to satisfy QoS with minimum cost, no other instance can replace g4dn for a lower cost. Meeting the QoS requires at least 5 g4dn instances in total (orange triangle), as only 4 such instances would significantly violate QoS (blue circle), thus 5 g4dn is the current optimum.

To further improve the serving cost, we introduce the t3 instance type. As shown in the plot (purple star), this instance is much cheaper with limited performance: 12 t3 instance cannot satisfy the QoS, but the cost is still cheaper than 5 g4dn instances. If we use a diverse pool composed of both instance types, the serving cost can be further reduced while meeting the QoS target. The plot shows multiple heterogeneous or diverse pool configurations: (3+4), (2+4), and (4+4). We notice that the (4+4) configuration meets the QoS target, but is more expensive than the optimal homogeneous configuration (5+0). In fact, by reducing one instance of g4dn type to (3+4), our resulting configuration becomes less expensive than the (5+0) homogeneous pool configuration while meeting the QoS target. At this point, we have reached a lower serving cost by introducing the diverse pool serving. Further decreasing the g4dn instance number in the diverse pool to (2+4) will result in violation again, thus (3+4) becomes the new optimal configuration. The intuition behind diverse pool serving is that diversity increases our ability to balance the trade-offs (cost vs. performance) across query streams, instead of being one-dimensional. For example, cheaper instances can opportunistically help us reduce cost without violating the QoS when expensive instances are overloaded.

3.3 Challenges in Building a Diverse Pool

While the diverse pool can further reduce serving costs beyond heterogeneous optimum, new challenges also appear with this new technique. The general guideline on picking instance types to add to the diverse pool is to use more cost-effective instances that can satisfy a relaxed QoS target. In the example in Fig. 4, we first relax the QoS target of 20ms for about 30% to 26ms, and t3 is an instance type that can satisfy the relaxed QoS while being more cost-effective than the g4dn as shown in Fig. 3 (a). We find this degree of relaxation works well for all models during our experiments, instances selected with too much relaxation will not appear in the optimal diverse pool configuration as such instances would inevitably violate the QoS for its queries. As shown later in Sec. 5, this one-time profiling effort to form a diverse pool can also be skipped as the effective pool tend to be common for models of the same category. The real challenge is, once we have created a diverse pool, how to choose the number of each instance type such that the diverse configuration is optimal, i.e., in Fig. 4, how to quickly find the (3+4) configuration.

Finding the optimal diverse pool configuration is a non-trivial problem. Firstly, more dimensions are added to the search space as the number of each instance type represents a dimension. Due to higher dimensions, the search space becomes exponentially larger. Secondly, the interaction between the variable (a diverse pool configuration) and the corresponding QoS satisfaction rate cannot be described mathematically, resulting in “costly” evaluation for each configuration as the configuration has to be deployed to serve the




Figure 5: (a) Configurations with similar cost but significantly different QoS rate. (b) Configurations with significantly different cost but similar QoS rate.

queries to get its QoS satisfaction rate. This mathematically indescribable interaction is due to the unknown latency for each query and the randomness of query arrival and batch size. We assume no prior/offline knowledge about the latency corresponding to queries with a specific batch size is available, therefore we cannot simply map queries of certain batch sizes to certain instance types. In this work, we apply a straight-forward first-come-first-serve policy for all queries (more details in Sec. 5). Thirdly, when searching for a better configuration, there is no clear sign to follow, and the result can be counter-intuitive. As shown in Fig. 5 (a), configurations with similar cost may have significantly different QoS satisfaction rate, and in Fig. 5 (b), configurations with significantly different cost (config. 4 has almost twice the price of config. 3) may still have similar QoS satisfaction rate.

To address this challenge, RIBBON formulates this as an optimal configuration-finding optimization problem and designs a BO-based solution to find the optimal configuration with a minimum number of configuration evaluations.

4 RIBBON: THE SOLUTION

RIBBON determines the optimal heterogeneous/diverse pool configuration via search space exploration process. At the start of the exploration process, it takes the instance types and QoS target as the inputs. The goal is to determine how many instances of each instance type should be chosen (the optimal pool configuration) such that it meets the QoS targets with minimum cost. The most challenging part is *quickly* determining the number of instances for each type that leads to the optimal pool configuration – the number of evaluations for different such configurations should be small. RIBBON uses Bayesian Optimization (BO) at its core to mitigate this challenge. BO is chosen because it is a lightweight online learning model that does not require expensive training, apriori knowledge, or data. Our evaluation demonstrates that RIBBON’s BO is effective when compared against other competing search space exploration methods (Sec. 5).

Working principles of RIBBON’s BO Engine. BO is a black-box optimization method for minimizing an unknown objective function ($f(x)$) and is typically used when the sampling of the configurations is costly [80, 81] – RIBBON’s context shares this similarity. Next, we briefly describe how RIBBON uses a BO-based decision making engine at its core (Fig. 6).




Figure 6: The Bayesian Optimization approach used by RIBBON.

Initially, RIBBON’s BO engine has no knowledge of the nature and distribution of the unknown objective function ($f(x)$). BO maintains a prior belief of $f(x)$ through its surrogate model. This surrogate model serves as a proxy for the true objective function. The success of BO depends on how the surrogate model represents the true objective as the optimization proceeds. RIBBON selects Gaussian Process (GP) as its surrogate model since it is adaptive toward representing any random process and is not input- or objective-specific. This enables RIBBON to handle changing streams of requests over various cloud instances, which is critical in RIBBON’s context. Other surrogate model choices such as Tree Parzen estimators and polynomial estimators are not suitable for RIBBON because they assume conditions that are not true for RIBBON (e.g., polynomial objective function, samples can be divided into classes).

As RIBBON starts sampling configurations, it gathers the true value of $f(x)$ at those configurations (posterior). RIBBON uses this knowledge to update the value of the surrogate model at sampled configurations. The surrogate model uses its covariance kernel to extrapolate the value of $f(x)$ for configurations that are not sampled yet. This extrapolated value is a function of two factors: (1) the covariance of sampled configurations, and (2) their distance from the not-yet-sampled configurations. RIBBON chooses the Matern 5/2 covariance kernel [82, 83] for ensuring smoothness, and it also provides the capability that similar configurations will result in similar objective values, a desirable property in the context of RIBBON. Other possible choices of covariance kernels include Dot Product and Rational Quadratic assume the configurations to follow a monotonic or a particular kind of polynomial distribution of objective values – therefore, unsuitable for RIBBON.

The surrogate model of RIBBON gets updated after each sample is evaluated. The surrogate model associates a confidence value with configurations that are not sampled. It is inversely proportional to the variance of $f(x)$ for the nearby sampled configurations. RIBBON needs to intelligently sample to move toward the optimal configuration. *So, how does RIBBON decide what to sample next?*

BO has an associated *acquisition function* ($a(x)$) which helps RIBBON determine what to sample next. The acquisition function takes into account the surrogate model and the confidence of the surrogate model for configurations that are not sampled yet (higher confidence means more likelihood of the surrogate model to represent the true objective function) to decide the next best configuration to sample. RIBBON uses Expected Improvement (EI) as its acquisition function. For each unexplored configuration, EI uses its GP mean and variance as input and calculates the expected improvement over the best explored configuration. By maximizing this expected

improvement over all unexplored configurations, BO aims to sample a new configuration that provides the highest improvement over the current best.

This acquisition function is used by RIBBON to steer its way to the optimal configuration by actually sampling only a few configurations. RIBBON performs its optimization based on the exploration vs. exploitation of configuration space (exploration: exploring configurations with high uncertainty to find the value of the optimal configuration, and exploitation: exploring the vicinity of configurations where the objective function is already sampled). The acquisition function needs to maintain a balance between the two for the BO to effectively navigate through the configurations without losing the opportunity to sample better-performing ones. Since the optimization performance of RIBBON depends on the objective function $f(x)$, it is important to carefully design the objective function so that it represents the metric that RIBBON is optimizing.

How does RIBBON design an effective objective function? Recall that RIBBON jointly optimizes for two competing objectives: meeting the QoS target and minimizing the cost. Since these objectives are competing, it is critical to construct an objective that carefully captures RIBBON’s goal: minimizing the cost while meeting the QoS target. Unfortunately, this objective cannot be expressed as a typical optimization function that can be minimized or maximized, unlike traditional use cases of BO [84, 85]. To address this challenge, RIBBON constructs a new objective function.

RIBBON’s objective function is guided by the following principle: *when a configuration satisfies the query QoS, the objective function should guide the evaluation toward lower cost; when the diverse configuration does not satisfy the query QoS, the objective function should guide the evaluation towards a higher QoS satisfaction percentage.* More formally, suppose the input variable over n instance types is $x = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ where x_i indicates number of instances of type i , Eq. 2 shows the objective function designed over the two optimization aspects of RIBBON:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{R_{sat}(x)}{T_{qos}} & \text{if violates QoS,} \\ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i \cdot x_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i \cdot m_i}\right) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

$R_{sat}(x)$ is the QoS satisfaction rate achieved by the chosen configuration, constant T_{qos} is the QoS target (i.e., 99% of queries meet a latency target). Constants p_i and m_i are the unit time price and the upper bound of the number of instances for instance type i , respectively. This objective function returns a normalized output between 0 and 1, its design ensures that any configuration that satisfies the QoS is superior than a QoS violation configuration regardless of the serving price, as $0 \leq R_{sat}(x) < T_{qos}$. Maximizing the objective function guarantees the minimization of the serving cost while meeting QoS. Note that while this objective function can be evaluated at specific instance configurations when a model is run on that configuration, its general shape over the entire configuration space is unknown ($R_{sat}(x)$ cannot be known without evaluating configuration x). Therefore, RIBBON’s BO attempts to obtain the true shape of the objective function and find its maximum with as few configuration evaluations as possible.

The parameter, m_i , determines the upper bound on the search range. m_i corresponds to the maximum number of instances of a given type such that adding any more number of instances of the same type does not improve the QoS satisfaction rate. For example, when serving with u instances of a certain type, the QoS satisfaction rate is 95%, and this rate stays at 95% even when serving with $u + 1$ instances, then m_i for this type is chosen as u .

We also experimented with other objective functions (e.g., a traditional single-metric function that returns the total cost but only for configurations that satisfy QoS and minimize the returned cost), but such design did not work well. The major lesson learned from this exploration was that the objective function needs to consider both the criterion (cost and QoS) together. Secondly, the objective function needs to maintain smoothness. For a non-smooth single-metric objective function, a large portion of the search space will be flat, which cannot provide guidance for configurations with a better QoS satisfaction rate. This is why RIBBON designed Eq. 2 to increase smoothness over both QoS-satisfaction and QoS-violating regions. Furthermore, we learned that the boundary between the QoS-violating region and QoS-satisfaction region can make it difficult to optimize for the acquisition function over a sudden change, and hence a steep jump needs to be avoided.

We also considered batch size distribution in the objective function, but we noted that changing the batch size only changes the search space, the underlying BO process will still find the optimal configuration. Also, we noted that exploiting batch size distribution information risks making the optimization benefits sensitive to such parameters, which may not be always desirable.

Next, we discuss several other RIBBON-specific challenges that RIBBON needs to mitigate to make the search process more efficient.

RIBBON maintains a smooth distribution of configurations.

Recall that BO considers the outcomes of neighboring sampled configurations to determine the next configuration to sample. Specifically, BO’s underlying GP sets the surrogate model value of the not-yet-sampled configurations based on the variance of already-sampled neighboring configurations. Consequently, the surrogate model indirectly guides the acquisition function toward the optimal configuration. Therefore, it is important that the true objective values of neighboring configurations follow a smooth distribution (i.e., less variance in the objection function values). High variance makes the acquisition function repeatedly sample configurations in the vicinity of that neighborhood, losing the opportunity to explore potentially better configurations in other neighborhoods.

RIBBON employs two specific measures to solve this problem. First, we note that QoS-violating configurations are sub-optimal regardless of how close they are in meeting the QoS, but RIBBON deliberately considers their performance in the objective function (Eq. 2). This makes the objective function smoother in neighborhoods with QoS-violating configurations. In a naive design, where all QoS violating configurations simply return 0, the objective function will have a large sudden change in value between QoS violating and QoS satisfying configurations – RIBBON avoids this. (2) In individual dimensions (particular cloud instance type), RIBBON arranges the configurations in increasing order (increasing number of instances) before the BO begins to search. This guarantees a smooth distribution of configurations along each of the dimensions.




Figure 7: Effect of the rounding mechanism when varying the number of instances. For easier visualization, only one instance type is varied. The default BO behavior is shown in (a), and RIBBON’s rounding off is shown in (b).

RIBBON intelligently handles categorical variables. By default, BO is designed to handle variables that have continuous values. However, in the case of RIBBON, BO samples configurations that only have categorical values as the number of cloud instances of each type are integers [86]. To tackle this issue, RIBBON applies a rounding technique to the underlying continuous GP kernel $k(x_i, x_j)$ of BO to form a rounded off GP kernel $k'(x_i, x_j)$:

$$k'(x_i, x_j) = k(R(x_i), R(x_j)) \quad (3)$$

Here, $R(x)$ is the rounding function that rounds the variable x to its nearest integer. This ensures that the shape of the GP better matches the shape of the true objective function. Fig. 7(a) is the default BO where the true objective has a step-like behavior due to the integer categorical values of the configurations. However, the GP (determined by the GP mean) has continuous behavior. In this case the GP does not represent the true objective well. Fig. 7(b) shows how RIBBON uses the rounding mechanism on the GP, making the GP mean better represent the true objective function. The acquisition function remains consistent within the integer rounding range. In Fig. 7(a), when the next sampled configuration falls within the integer range of previously sampled configurations, the acquisition function cannot provide any useful information. In contrast, with RIBBON (Fig. 7(b)), the rounding mechanism guarantees the next sampled configuration to not fall into the same integer range of a previously sampled configuration. Therefore, it moves faster toward finding the next sample that optimizes the objective.

The above two techniques (objective function design and categorical parameter handling) make the optimization process feasible and convergent. For example, if we use a non-smooth objective function, BO’s acquisition function optimizer fails in 35% of the cases and returns invalid values. Similarly, if RIBBON drops its mechanism to handle categorical parameters carefully, it would perform repetitive sampling of configurations that fall into the same integer range of previous sampled configurations, resulting in even more total samples than exhaustive search in more than 30% of the cases. Using RIBBON’s design, we converged quickly for all our cases.

RIBBON performs active pruning to speed up the search. RIBBON uses its construction of objective function to prune the search

space beyond what a default BO can do, further reducing the number of samples needed to reach the optimal configuration.

Recall that as per RIBBON’s objective function, a QoS-meeting configuration will be judged to be sub-optimal than the previously evaluated QoS-meeting configuration if the price is higher. A higher price configuration can also violate the QoS, hence, returning a value smaller than $\frac{1}{2}$, which is sub-optimal. RIBBON actively maintains a prune set \mathbb{P} of such configurations that are unlikely to outperform the current optimal configuration. When a configuration $x_c = [c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n]$ is evaluated to violate the QoS by more than a threshold θ (e.g. 1%), any configuration $x'_c = [c'_1, c'_2, \dots, c'_n]$, where \forall integer $0 \leq i \leq n, c'_i \leq c_i$ cannot meet the QoS. Such configurations are added to the set \mathbb{P} . The set is updated after each sampling and is applied to the acquisition function as a constraint such that all the configurations in this set are avoided in the subsequent sampling. Whenever the acquisition function has the highest value for a configuration lying inside the set \mathbb{P} , RIBBON’s BO avoids sampling it and samples the next best configuration that has the highest acquisition function value among the ones not in \mathbb{P} . As the optimization process progresses, RIBBON’s BO identifies more configurations that belong to \mathbb{P} . This decreases the number of configurations to search among, and hence, the speed towards the optimal solution increases.

RIBBON promptly responds to load changes. Online service can experience fluctuations in the load. When such changes occur, RIBBON performs scaling at the instance level. RIBBON detects the load changes via performance monitoring – when the load goes up, more queries get queued in the query queue, and the QoS satisfaction rate will drop significantly due to the wait time. By monitoring the query queue size and the current QoS rate, one can determine whether the load has changed.

While previous works [40, 57] have resort to serverless functions as a means of scaling, we find that firstly, serverless functions do not guarantee the latency target for a query as the user has no information about the underlying hardware the serverless function runs on. Secondly, some workloads such as the recommendation models come with large embedding tables requiring tens of GBs of memory, general deep learning workloads can also have a large model size and large data size, which easily exceed the memory limit of serverless functions. Therefore, RIBBON performs scaling at the instance level. If the serverless function can guarantee latency targets and the workload can fit into its memory, RIBBON is still compatible with serverless as users can use RIBBON for base instance scaling and use serverless functions to deal with strong bursty workloads.

RIBBON maintains a complete record of the explored configurations in the instance space during its convergence to the optimal diverse pool. This information becomes useful when the load scales up as RIBBON will rely on the exploration record to avoid unnecessary sampling of low-QoS configurations and explore around the QoS satisfaction regions. After the scaling, the previous optimal configuration no longer satisfies the QoS target. The BO needs to restart the whole search process and find the new optimal configuration for the new load. A simple approach is to forget about the previous exploration results and restart BO from scratch. RIBBON

tries to make use of the previous exploration results to help with the new BO process instead.

In the beginning, the only explored point is the previous optimal configuration on the new load. Firstly, from the previous exploration record, RIBBON identifies the configurations that return the same or lower QoS satisfaction rate than the previous optimal. Let such configurations form a set \mathbb{S} . The intuition for collecting this set is that if the previous optimal cannot satisfy the QoS of the new load, any configuration that works as good as or worse cannot satisfy the new load QoS either. For each configuration in set \mathbb{S} , RIBBON performs the same operation introduced in pruning, and add all other configurations associated with this configuration to the pruning set \mathbb{P} .

In addition, RIBBON estimates the objective function values of the configurations in \mathbb{S} to feed to the new load BO as training data. Normally, the objective function value of an evaluation is only known after it has been evaluated by the BO process. However, since we know the configurations in \mathbb{S} cannot meet QoS for the new load just as the previous optimal, we can estimate how much it violates the QoS. From our experiment, we find that the estimation does not need to be highly accurate, as its only purpose is to convey a message to BO, which tells the BO to not evaluate configurations near the set \mathbb{S} configurations. We use a simple linear function to estimate the QoS satisfaction rate. For example, let the previous optimal configuration be A and another configuration in set \mathbb{S} as B. If A has 99.9% satisfaction rate on previous load and 33.3% rate on new load, and B has 90% satisfaction rate on the previous load, we estimate that B has 30% satisfaction rate on new load. With both pruning and estimation applied based on exploration record on the previous load, the new BO process receives a head start. The related scaling results are shown in Sec. 5.

5 METHODOLOGY AND EVALUATION

In this section, we analyze our evaluation results to understand different aspects of RIBBON, accompanied by further relevant methodological details corresponding to different evaluation focus.

5.1 Evaluated workloads

RIBBON is evaluated using the five models introduced in Sec. 2: CANDLE, ResNet50, VGG19, MT-WND, and DIEN. These models cover a wide range of DL networks: DNN, CNN, embedding tables, RNN. An important experimental methodology detail is the query arrival and batch size distribution. Our evaluation is driven by an actual trace [7] and follows the same batch size and arrival distribution as other recent works in the area which have shown these characteristics are representative of the model inferences in production workloads [15–18]. Specifically, our batch size distribution follows a heavy-tail log-normal distribution, similar to previous work [7] which confirms that heavy-tail log-normal is more representative behavior than traditional log-normal distribution. We acknowledge that the batch size distribution for CANDLE can be potentially different from other models. Therefore, for further robustness of RIBBON, we evaluated RIBBON using Gaussian distribution-based batch size because Gaussian distribution can also capture some production workload behavior [15]. Later in our evaluation and

Table 3: Cloud Computing Instance types used for different models (refer to Table 2 for AWS cloud instance code names).

Model	Homogeneous Pool	Diverse Pool
CANDLE	c5a	c5a, m5, t3
ResNet50	c5a	c5a, m5, t3
VGG19	c5a	c5a, m5, t3
MT-WND	g4dn	g4dn, c5, r5n
DIEN	g4dn	g4dn, c5, r5n




Figure 8: (a) The number of heterogeneous configurations better than the best homogeneous configuration starts saturating beyond three unique instance types in a heterogeneous configuration. (b) The cost savings from heterogeneous settings saturates after the number of unique instance types in a heterogeneous configuration goes beyond three.

analysis, our results show that RIBBON benefits are not sensitive to the choice of these parameters.

The query inter-arrival time follows a Poisson distribution, same as other works in this area [10, 15–18, 87]. Tail latency is a typical QoS target used in cloud service applications, in this paper we use the 99th percentile tail latency as default. The query tail latency targets are selected within application Service Level Agreement (SLA) range, and ensured that the highest-performance instance (g4dn in our case) can satisfy the targets (otherwise no configuration can meet QoS). For the recommendation models, Google MT-WND and Alibaba DIEN both require an SLA target of tens of milliseconds [88, 89]. Therefore, we set the MT-WND and DIEN QoS targets to be 20ms and 30ms, respectively – similar to targets chosen by previous works for these models [7]. For other models, we set the QoS target to be within 1000ms, consistent with other works [90, 91]. According to the latency for the largest query on the g4dn instance, we set the QoS targets for CANDLE, ResNet50, and VGG19 to 40ms, 400ms, and 800ms, respectively. These targets cover a wide range to demonstrate the effectiveness of RIBBON over a variety of latency targets. We confirmed that RIBBON’s benefits are not sensitive to the chosen target QoS latency and achieve similar results when the QoS targets are varied.

The query processing follows a simple first-come-first-serve (FCFS) manner, with the first arrived query going to the first available instance following the heterogeneous type order in Table 3. We note that multiple queries are served concurrently by the available pool of instances.

5.2 Cost Savings with RIBBON

To demonstrate the cost savings of diverse pool configuration of RIBBON, we compare the diverse pool against the homogeneous instance it is based on. The pool composition is shown in Table 3. We




Figure 9: Optimal heterogeneous configurations reduce cost significantly over optimal homogeneous configurations across all models.

find that the effective diverse pool for models of the same category (general DNN/CNN or recommendation) tend to be common. As in Table 3, the effective diverse pool is the same for CANDLE, ResNet50 and VGG19 models, and the same pool is used for MT-WND and DIEN models. Besides the two recommendation models in the table, we also tested on various other recommendation models in [10, 88, 92]. The diverse pool (g4dn, c5, r5n) yields similar cost saving for the other models as well (results not shown for brevity). This is because different models of the same category tend to have similar computation characteristics, thus the performance of all the instances have similar ranks even across different models.

Users who are aware of their model architecture can take advantage of this feature to quickly form a diverse pool and explore for a lower cost configuration without extensive offline knowledge about the instance performances. The cardinality of the pool is configured to be three because our empirical result (Fig. 8) shows that using more than three diverse types slows down on generating new configurations that outperform the baseline (opportunity land for RIBBON) and the top cost savings stop increasing (benefits of RIBBON) – this works in the favor of RIBBON since it reduces the search space.

Using a heterogeneous instance configuration can significantly save cost while meeting the QoS target. In Fig. 9, when using a 3-type heterogeneous instance configuration, the minimum cost to meet the QoS is lower for all models (the results show improvement over the best homogeneous configuration instance). The cost savings range from 9% (VGG19) to 16% (ResNet50).

We found that such improvements do not tend to require specifically selected instance pools as they are model-specific. In fact, similar improvements are observed for other diverse instance pools (results not shown for brevity). Further, we note that even a single-digit percent cost saving can be significant when accumulated over time. A cost improvement of a few percent would mean millions of dollars of savings in expenditure. Our results (Fig. 11) also show that RIBBON’s cost savings are not sensitive to the batch size distribution. It still provides significant cost savings even when the batch size follows a Gaussian distribution. This is primarily because of the flexibility a diverse instance pool provides. Varying the batch distribution would make particular diverse pool configurations ineffective anymore (i.e., higher cost, QoS violation), but would also make some other configurations more effective (i.e., lower cost within QoS). The RIBBON optimization framework does not make assumptions about batch size distribution. It is designed to explore the heterogeneous configuration space carefully in order to

achieve the best savings fast, regardless of where the actual optimal configuration lies.

Next, we look at how RIBBON helps find the optimal configurations most effectively when compared to other competing techniques for finding RIBBON-like configuration.

5.3 Fast Convergence to the Optimal Diverse Pool Configuration with RIBBON

Competing strategies. To evaluate the efficiency of RIBBON in finding the optimal configuration, we compare it against multiple competing online schemes that search for optimal heterogeneous pool configurations.

Random (RANDOM). This is a relatively simple strategy that evaluates different random configurations in the search space. To make it more intelligent, we do not evaluate a randomly picked configuration if a previous configuration with a higher number of instances for each type does not meet the QoS target, or a previous configuration with a lower number of instances for each type meets the QoS at a lower cost.

Hill Climbing (Hill-Climb). This scheme is designed on the hill-climbing optimization principles, widely-used for fast search space exploration [7, 93–95]. We have customized and optimized for our use case by intelligently increasing and decreasing the number of instances based on the observed QoS and cost in a multi-dimensional search space.

Response Surface Methodology (RSM). The Response Surface Methodology (RSM) [96] is an advanced technique used for exploring a certain unknown surface with a fixed number of samples. We employ an optimized 3-level 3-factor central composite face-centered design to explore the search space, since the central composite design is a widely used and one of the most promising RSM designs [97–99]. The RSM sampled configurations will be evaluated, and the scheme starts exploring around the most promising point.

RIBBON converges to cost-saving heterogeneous configurations with the least number of samples compared to all other competing strategies. In Fig. 10, the results show the number of samples required to reach a certain cost-saving given the specific instance diverse pool for each model. In order to reach a higher cost saving compared to the homogeneous configuration, more configuration samples are needed to be evaluated. To find the maximum possible cost-saving, RIBBON requires evaluating less than 40 configurations out of roughly 1000s of possible configurations in total, and for the MT-WND and DIEN models, only about 20 evaluations are needed. Compared to RIBBON, the other competing strategies require an order of magnitude more number of samples for the CANDLE model, and more than 2 to 3 times more samples for ResNet50, VGG19, MT-WND, and DIEN models.

The performance of HILL-CLIMB, RANDOM and RSM varies across models as RSM is better than HILL-CLIMB on ResNet50 and DIEN models while being close to each other on CANDLE, VGG19, and MT-WND models, meaning the central composite design sampled configurations are closer to the optimal configuration




Figure 10: RIBBON requires the fewest number of configuration samples before reaching different cost saving targets across all models.




Figure 11: RIBBON continues to provide significant cost savings over optimal homogeneous configurations even when the batch size follows a Gaussian distribution.




Figure 13: Exploration cost (as a percentage of exhaustively sampling every configuration) of finding the optimal configuration is the lowest with RIBBON, as compared to competing techniques.




Figure 12: Evaluation samples of search method on a two-dimension MT-WND model example. Red grid: QoS violation configurations (lighter the better). Green grid: QoS satisfaction configurations (darker the better). Light green triangle (5, 5): RIBBON and HILL-CLIMB starting point. Gold star (3, 4): optimal configuration. Blue circles: Explored configurations. Dark orange square: HILL-CLIMB restart point. White diamonds: RSM central composite design samples.

for ResNet50 and DIEN models; RANDOM consistently requires a lot more samples to reach optimum across most models, but RSM and HILL-CLIMB requires the same number of samples as RANDOM to reach the optimum for CANDLE, because in this case, the search space has a large number of local optima. Overall, RIBBON always consistently outperforms all other strategies to reach either an intermediate cost-saving configuration or the optimal configuration.

To dive further into why RIBBON performs better than other intelligent techniques like HILL-CLIMB and RSM, Fig. 12 shows a simplified

two-dimensional example of the configurations explored by these techniques on the MT-WND model. The two instance types in the diverse pool are g4dn and t3. RIBBON actively searches for configurations across the whole space based on its best estimation from the surrogate model. It sampled the dark red region but was able to avoid extra samples nearby, and it was able to find the optimal configuration in eight evaluations.

On the other hand, HILL-CLIMB initially climbed to a local optimum at point (4,3), sampled every possible point with a cheaper cost, then realized there is no way to go as both (3,2) and (4,1) violate QoS. It then randomly sampled a new point (dark orange) to restart, and successfully climbed to the global optimum in 13 evaluations in total. Lastly, RSM first sampled the five fixed points marked in white, and then, it started searching near the best one (5,0). However, (5,0) is already a local optimum, so it switched to (5,12) and found the global optimum from there (18 evaluations in total). This shows that the RSM sampling does not fit the search space well as the sample (2,6) is actually the closest to the optimal configuration in distance, but was not picked as a starting point due to its QoS violation. In both HILL-CLIMB and RSM, many configurations around a local optimum are evaluated before moving on, but in RIBBON, being stuck at a local optimum is not observed due to the exploration aspect of its BO engine. RIBBON’s active pruning helps it to continually identify and avoid the set of sub-optimal configurations, thus making its search process faster.

5.4 Low Exploration Cost and High Benefits with Relaxed QoS Constraints

RIBBON’s total cost of exploration evaluation is also the lowest among all strategies. It also explores QoS-violating configurations the least number of times. While RIBBON minimizes




Figure 14: Number of QoS violating configurations sampled before finding the optimal configuration is the lowest with RIBBON.

the number of configurations sampled during exploration, a desirable goal is to also minimize the total cost of exploration – although we note that running the optimal diverse pool configuration for some time after it has been achieved by any method would outweigh the cost during exploration. Nevertheless, the cost can be further lowered by exploring fewer and cheaper configurations. Fig. 13 shows the total cost to find the optimal configuration as a percentage of the cost for evaluating all available configurations exhaustively (exhaustive-search cost). For RIBBON, this exploration cost is less than 3% for all models, while for other strategies it would cost 10 to 20% of the exhaustive-search cost to find the same optimal configuration as RIBBON.

Another desirable characteristic during the exploration process is to minimize the sampling number of QoS violating configurations. During the search process, it is unavoidable to evaluate configurations that violate QoS. Even though it is a temporary process, inference service providers would still find it sub-optimal to sample configurations that violate the QoS. In Fig. 14, during the search process before finding an optimal configuration, the total number of evaluated QoS-violating configurations are compared among the competing techniques. Because RIBBON requires much fewer samples, it gets an advantage on limiting the number of QoS-violating samples. In fact, for models CANDLE, VGG19, MT-WND, and DIEN, RIBBON samples the least number of QoS-violating configurations during the exploration phase. For example, for model CANDLE, RIBBON samples 20 QoS-violating configurations, while the other three techniques sample up to 100 QoS-violating configurations. Interestingly for model ResNet50, RSM is very close to RIBBON. In this case, the optimal configuration is close to the central composite design sampled configurations. So, RSM is able to quickly converge to it from one of its initial samples.

These results also support that spawning RIBBON exploration is always recommended due to its low exploration cost (less than 3% of exhaustive search, to be recouped within a few hundred queries when steady-state is reached) and lower number of QoS violations even during the exploration. Running RIBBON provides the opportunity to avail both transient and steady-state savings.

Our results so far have focused on strict 99th percentile tail latency targets as default for all models. To better understand the effectiveness of RIBBON, we relax the QoS target since some service providers can use relaxed QoS targets for certain types of customers. We note making the QoS-target more strict (e.g., 99.9th percentile tail latency) was not possible for some models since even the most performant AWS instances are not able to reach this target.




Figure 15: RIBBON is able to improve the cost savings even further when the QoS target is relaxed to the 98th percentile tail latency.

The benefit of using a diverse pool is more significant when the QoS is relaxed. Fig. 15 shows that if the QoS is relaxed slightly to the 98th percentile tail latency (p98), the cost savings compared to homogeneous configurations become more significant. This is because a more relaxed QoS gives more freedom to use the lower performance but also lower cost instances – this opportunity is exploited by RIBBON which builds a diverse pool, but remains unexploited by homogeneous pool instances. For example, the p98 optimal configuration for the CANDLE model consists of 2 c5a, 1 m5 and 6 t3 instances. This configuration is 17% less expensive than the optimal configuration to achieve the 99th percentile tail latency (p99) QoS (6 c5a and 2 t3 instances). Thus, RIBBON is capable of achieving further gains for workloads with lower QoS requirements. Nevertheless, we chose stricter QoS requirements as default to present conservative results.

5.5 RIBBON’s Quick and QoS-friendly Adaption to Load Fluctuations

When the load level changes, RIBBON can quickly adjust to configurations that can serve the new load better, and start searching for the optimal configuration for the new load. In Fig. 16, RIBBON’s adjustment to load scale is demonstrated as time series. For each model, the x-axis represents the time as a percentage of total time to find the optimal configuration prior to the load scaling. For example, suppose it takes the CANDLE model 10 minutes to reach an optimal configuration from scratch, then after some time, the load becomes 1.5 times heavier, and a 50% time means RIBBON spends 5 minutes to reach the new optimal configuration on the new load. The load change occurs at time 0. The orange curve shows the percentage of queries that violate QoS for each configuration RIBBON explores. It should stay within 1% for the service 99th tail latency target to be satisfied. The blue curve shows the cost (\$) of each configuration normalized to the optimal configuration cost before the load changes. RIBBON’s goal is to find a point such that the orange curve is below 1% while the blue curve is the lowest. We have several observations from this figure.

First, RIBBON can quickly respond to the load change by adjusting to a more expensive and better performance configuration so that the QoS violations are reduced significantly. The queries that violate QoS experience a surge on the load change, reaching more than 95% violation (not shown in Fig. 16 as lower violation regions are more interesting). This is because the current configuration’s allowable throughput is saturated, most of the queries have to stay in the queue waiting, the accumulated queries make the queue longer and longer, resulting in violation for almost all queries. Once RIBBON detects such behavior, it resets the search




Figure 16: RIBBON quickly responds to load change with new instance configurations and starts searching for new optimal cost configuration.

space target values and based on prior knowledge, provides estimation to previously evaluated configurations on the new load, prunes away configurations that would definitely violate QoS. This process greatly helps RIBBON avoid the QoS violation region, explore the QoS satisfaction region and maneuver the diverse pool towards a lower-cost configuration. In the end, RIBBON is able to find an optimal configuration that is also around 1.5 times more expensive than the previous cost. Notice that the system does not know how much the load has changed when we apply the load change, so RIBBON does not know the new optimal cost is around 1.5 times more expensive prior to exploration.

Second, we note that once RIBBON has established an optimal configuration at a given load, the time it takes to converge to a new load optimum tends to be shorter than the previous convergence time. In Fig. 16, the time to reach the optimal cost star is less than 60% of the time needed to reach the previous optimum. This is also due to the benefit of estimation and pruning, as some configurations are considered as “already explored” before the exploration for new load actually starts, avoiding unnecessary sampling of these configurations that would greatly violate the QoS and point RIBBON to more promising regions. It is also worth noticing that after the optimal configuration is found, RIBBON tends to explore some configurations that would greatly violate the QoS again (red spikes after the star in Fig. 16). This is because RIBBON has finished exploring the more promising configurations, and starts to sample the less promising but unexplored configurations. This is also a good sign that RIBBON should stop searching and settle on the best configuration until this point. In practice, it is possible to reduce the violation spikes during exploration by monitoring the query queue. If the queue stacks beyond a limit, it means the configuration may violate QoS. The evaluation of this configuration can be terminated early to avoid more queries from violating the QoS.

6 CONCLUSION

To the best of our knowledge, RIBBON is the first work to employ the idea of using a heterogeneous pool of cloud computing instances to significantly improve the cost-effectiveness and performance-efficiency of deep learning model inferences. RIBBON finds the most-optimal instance configuration to jointly optimize two competing goals: meeting the QoS and minimizing cost. To solve this problem, RIBBON uses a BO-based exploration-exploitation approach to find the optimal instance configuration. Our evaluation confirms that RIBBON can yield up to 16% cost savings without extensive offline knowledge and can adapt to load changes quickly.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge support from NSF awards 1920020, 2124897, and 1910601, MGHPCC, and Northeastern University. This research was also sponsored by the United States Air Force Research Laboratory and the United States Air Force Artificial Intelligence Accelerator under Cooperative Agreement Number FA8750-19-2-1000. The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the United States Air Force or the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for Government purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation herein.

REFERENCES

- [1] Yujin Oh, Sangjoon Park, and Jong Chul Ye. Deep learning covid-19 features on cxr using limited training data sets. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 39(8): 2688–2700, 2020.
- [2] Kristof T Schütt, Huziel E Sauceda, P-J Kindermans, Alexandre Tkatchenko, and K-R Müller. SchNet—a deep learning architecture for molecules and materials. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 148(24):241722, 2018.
- [3] Bethany Lusch, J Nathan Kutz, and Steven L Brunton. Deep learning for universal linear embeddings of nonlinear dynamics. *Nature communications*, 9(1):1–10, 2018.
- [4] Niall O’Mahony, Sean Campbell, Anderson Carvalho, Suman Harapanahalli, Gustavo Velasco Hernandez, Lenka Krpalkova, Daniel Riordan, and Joseph Walsh. Deep learning vs. traditional computer vision. In *Science and Information Conference*, pages 128–144. Springer, 2019.
- [5] Ali Farhadi and Joseph Redmon. Yolov3: An incremental improvement. *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, cite as, 2018.
- [6] Christian Szegedy, Sergey Ioffe, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Alexander A Alemi. Inception-v4, inception-resnet and the impact of residual connections on learning. In *Thirty-first AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, 2017.
- [7] Udit Gupta, Samuel Hsia, Vikram Saraph, Xiaodong Wang, Brandon Reagen, Gu-Yeon Wei, Hsien-Hsin S Lee, David Brooks, and Carole-Jean Wu. Deeprecsys: A system for optimizing end-to-end at-scale neural recommendation inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.02772*, 2020.
- [8] Andreas Argyriou, Miguel González-Fierro, and Le Zhang. Microsoft recommenders: Best practices for production-ready recommendation systems. In *Companion Proceedings of the Web Conference 2020*, pages 50–51, 2020.
- [9] Samuel Hsia, Udit Gupta, Mark Wilkening, Carole-Jean Wu, Gu-Yeon Wei, and David Brooks. Cross-stack workload characterization of deep recommendation systems. In *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization (IISWC)*, pages 157–168. IEEE, 2020.
- [10] Udit Gupta, Carole-Jean Wu, Xiaodong Wang, Maxim Naumov, Brandon Reagen, David Brooks, Bradford Cottel, Kim Hazelwood, Mark Hempstead, Bill Jia, et al. The architectural implications of facebook’s dnn-based personalized recommendation. In *2020 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, pages 488–501. IEEE, 2020.
- [11] Norman P Jouppi, Cliff Young, Nishant Patil, David Patterson, Gaurav Agrawal, Raminder Bajwa, Sarah Bates, Suresh Bhatia, Nan Boden, Al Borchers, et al. In-datacenter performance analysis of a tensor processing unit. In *Proceedings of the 44th annual international symposium on computer architecture*, pages 1–12, 2017.
- [12] Maxim Naumov, John Kim, Dheevatsa Mudigere, Srinivas Sridharan, Xiaodong Wang, Whitney Zhao, Serhat Yilmaz, Changkyu Kim, Hector Yuen, Mustafa Ozdal, et al. Deep learning training in facebook data centers: Design of scale-up and scale-out systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.09518*, 2020.

- [13] Jongsoo Park, Maxim Naumov, Protonu Basu, Summer Deng, Aravind Kalaiah, Daya Khudia, James Law, Parth Malani, Andrey Malevich, Satish Nadathur, et al. Deep learning inference in facebook data centers: Characterization, performance optimizations and hardware implications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.09886*, 2018.
- [14] Nicholas D Lane, Sourav Bhattacharya, Petko Georgiev, Claudio Forlivesi, and Fahim Kawsar. An early resource characterization of deep learning on wearables, smartphones and internet-of-things devices. In *Proceedings of the 2015 international workshop on internet-of-things towards applications*, pages 7–12, 2015.
- [15] Jing Li, Kunal Agrawal, Sameh Elnikety, Yuxiong He, I-Ting Angelina Lee, Chenyang Lu, and Kathryn S McKinley. Work stealing for interactive services to meet target latency. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*, pages 1–13, 2016.
- [16] Yu Gan, Yanqi Zhang, Dailun Cheng, Ankitha Shetty, Priyara Rathi, Nayan Katarki, Ariana Bruno, Justin Hu, Brian Ritchken, Brendon Jackson, et al. An open-source benchmark suite for microservices and their hardware-software implications for cloud & edge systems. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, pages 3–18, 2019.
- [17] Johann Hauswald, Michael A Laurenzano, Yunqi Zhang, Cheng Li, Austin Rovinski, Arjun Khurana, Ronald G Dreslinski, Trevor Mudge, Vinicius Petrucci, Lingjia Tang, et al. Sirius: An open end-to-end voice and vision personal assistant and its implications for future warehouse scale computers. In *Proceedings of the Twentieth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, pages 223–238, 2015.
- [18] Harshad Kasture and Daniel Sanchez. Tailbench: a benchmark suite and evaluation methodology for latency-critical applications. In *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization (IISWC)*, pages 1–10. IEEE, 2016.
- [19] Dhiraj Kalamkar, Evangelos Georganas, Sudarshan Srinivasan, Jianping Chen, Mikhail Shiryaev, and Alexander Heinecke. Optimizing deep learning recommender systems training on cpu cluster architectures. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–15, 2020.
- [20] Neeraja J Yadwadkar, Bharath Hariharan, Joseph E Gonzalez, Burton Smith, and Randy H Katz. Selecting the best vm across multiple public clouds: A data-driven performance modeling approach. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Symposium on Cloud Computing*, pages 452–465, 2017.
- [21] Eli Cortez, Anand Bonde, Alexandre Muzio, Mark Russinovich, Marcus Fontoura, and Ricardo Bianchini. Resource central: Understanding and predicting workloads for improved resource management in large cloud platforms. In *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pages 153–167, 2017.
- [22] Sokol Kosta, Andrius Aucinas, Pan Hui, Richard Mortier, and Xinwen Zhang. Thinkair: Dynamic resource allocation and parallel execution in the cloud for mobile code offloading. In *2012 Proceedings IEEE Infocom*, pages 945–953. IEEE, 2012.
- [23] Xiangbo Li, Mohsen Amini Salehi, Yamini Joshi, Mahmoud K Darwich, Brad Landreneau, and Magdy Bayoumi. Performance analysis and modeling of video transcoding using heterogeneous cloud services. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 30(4):910–922, 2018.
- [24] Krzysztof Rzdadca, Pawel Findaisen, Jacek Swiderski, Przemyslaw Zych, Przemyslaw Broniek, Jarek Kusmirek, Pawel Nowak, Beata Strack, Piotr Witusowski, Steven Hand, et al. Autopilot: workload autoscaling at google. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*, pages 1–16, 2020.
- [25] Marcus Felipe Fontoura, Ricardo Gouvea Bianchini, and Girish Bablani. Predictive rightsizing for virtual machines in cloud computing systems, May 30 2019. US Patent App. 16/115,414.
- [26] Maotong Xu, Sultan Alamro, Tian Lan, and Suresh Subramaniam. Cred: Cloud right-sizing with execution deadlines and data locality. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 28(12):3389–3400, 2017.
- [27] Vojislav Dukic and Ankit Singla. Happiness index: Right-sizing the cloud’s tenant-provider interface. In *11th {USENIX} Workshop on Hot Topics in Cloud Computing (HotCloud 19)*, 2019.
- [28] Chin-Jung Hsu, Vivek Nair, Tim Menzies, and Vincent Freeh. Micky: A cheaper alternative for selecting cloud instances. In *2018 IEEE 11th International Conference on Cloud Computing (CLOUD)*, pages 409–416. IEEE, 2018.
- [29] Joel Scheuner and Philipp Leitner. Estimating cloud application performance based on micro-benchmark profiling. In *2018 IEEE 11th International Conference on Cloud Computing (CLOUD)*, pages 90–97. IEEE, 2018.
- [30] Kai Hwang, Xiaoying Bai, Yue Shi, Muyang Li, Wen-Guang Chen, and Yongwei Wu. Cloud performance modeling with benchmark evaluation of elastic scaling strategies. *IEEE Transactions on parallel and distributed systems*, 27(1):130–143, 2015.
- [31] Ang Li, Xiaowei Yang, Ming Zhang, and S Kandula. Cloudcmp: Shopping for a cloud made easy. *HotCloud*, 10:1–7, 2010.
- [32] Joel Scheuner and Philipp Leitner. A cloud benchmark suite combining micro and applications benchmarks. In *Companion of the 2018 ACM/SPEC International Conference on Performance Engineering*, pages 161–166, 2018.
- [33] Mohammad Shahrad and David Wentzlaff. Availability knob: Flexible user-defined availability in the cloud. In *Proceedings of the Seventh ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*, pages 42–56, 2016.
- [34] Andrew D Ferguson, Peter Bodik, Srikanth Kandula, Eric Boutin, and Rodrigo Fonseca. Jockey: guaranteed job latency in data parallel clusters. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM european conference on Computer Systems*, pages 99–112, 2012.
- [35] Abhishek Verma, Ludmila Cherkasova, and Roy H Campbell. Aria: automatic resource inference and allocation for mapreduce environments. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM international conference on Autonomic computing*, pages 235–244, 2011.
- [36] Shivaram Venkataraman, Zongheng Yang, Michael Franklin, Benjamin Recht, and Ion Stoica. Ernest: Efficient performance prediction for large-scale advanced analytics. In *13th {USENIX} Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation ({NSDI} 16)*, pages 363–378, 2016.
- [37] Virajith Jalaparti, Hitesh Ballani, Paolo Costa, Thomas Karagiannis, and Ant Rowstron. Bridging the tenant-provider gap in cloud services. In *Proceedings of the Third ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*, pages 1–14, 2012.
- [38] Juwei Shi, Jia Zou, Jiaheng Lu, Zhao Cao, Shiqiang Li, and Chen Wang. Mrtuner: a toolkit to enable holistic optimization for mapreduce jobs. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 7(13):1319–1330, 2014.
- [39] Yurong Jiang, Lenin Ravindranath Sivalingam, Suman Nath, and Ramesh Govindan. Webperf: Evaluating what-if scenarios for cloud-hosted web applications. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGCOMM Conference*, pages 258–271, 2016.
- [40] Chengliang Zhang, Minchen Yu, Wei Wang, and Feng Yan. Mark: Exploiting cloud services for cost-effective, slo-aware machine learning inference serving. In *2019 {USENIX} Annual Technical Conference ({USENIX} {ATC} 19)*, pages 1049–1062, 2019.
- [41] Yunjun Xu, Zachary Musgrave, Brian Noble, and Michael Bailey. Bobtail: Avoiding long tails in the cloud. In *10th {USENIX} Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation ({NSDI} 13)*, pages 329–341, 2013.
- [42] Jeongseob Ahn, Changdae Kim, Jaeung Han, Young-ri Choi, and Jaehyuk Huh. Dynamic virtual machine scheduling in clouds for architectural shared resources. In *4th {USENIX} Workshop on Hot Topics in Cloud Computing (HotCloud 12)*, 2012.
- [43] Seyedhamid Mashhadi Moghaddam, Sareh Fotuhi Piraghaj, Michael O’Sullivan, Cameron Walker, and Charles Unsworth. Energy-efficient and sla-aware virtual machine selection algorithm for dynamic resource allocation in cloud data centers. In *2018 IEEE/ACM 11th International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing (UCC)*, pages 103–113. IEEE, 2018.
- [44] Salman A Baset, Long Wang, and Chunqiang Tang. Towards an understanding of oversubscription in cloud. In *2nd {USENIX} Workshop on Hot Topics in Management of Internet, Cloud, and Enterprise Networks and Services (Hot-ICE 12)*, 2012.
- [45] Peipei Zhou, Jiayi Sheng, Cody Hao Yu, Peng Wei, Jie Wang, Di Wu, and Jason Cong. Mocha: Multinode cost optimization in heterogeneous clouds with accelerators. In *The 2021 ACM/SIGDA International Symposium on Field-Programmable Gate Arrays*, pages 273–279, 2021.
- [46] Chin-Jung Hsu, Vivek Nair, Vincent W Freeh, and Tim Menzies. Arrow: Low-level augmented bayesian optimization for finding the best cloud vm. In *2018 IEEE 38th International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS)*, pages 660–670. IEEE, 2018.
- [47] Luo Mai, Guo Li, Marcel Wagenländer, Konstantinos Fertakis, Andrei-Octavian Brabete, and Peter Pietzuch. Kungfu: Making training in distributed machine learning adaptive. In *14th {USENIX} Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation ({OSDI} 20)*, pages 937–954, 2020.
- [48] Sajib Kundu, Raju Rangaswami, Ajay Gulati, Ming Zhao, and Kaushik Dutta. Modeling virtualized applications using machine learning techniques. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM SIGPLAN/SIGOPS conference on Virtual Execution Environments*, pages 3–14, 2012.
- [49] Marcel Wagenländer, Luo Mai, Guo Li, and Peter Pietzuch. Spotnik: Designing distributed machine learning for transient cloud resources. In *12th {USENIX} Workshop on Hot Topics in Cloud Computing (HotCloud 20)*, 2020.
- [50] Changyeon Jo, Youngsu Cho, and Bernhard Egger. A machine learning approach to live migration modeling. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Symposium on Cloud Computing*, pages 351–364, 2017.
- [51] Jeff Zhang, Sameh Elnikety, Shuayb Zarar, Atul Gupta, and Siddharth Garg. Model-switching: Dealing with fluctuating workloads in machine-learning-as-a-service systems. In *12th {USENIX} Workshop on Hot Topics in Cloud Computing (HotCloud 20)*, 2020.
- [52] Ron C Chiang, Jinho Hwang, H Howie Huang, and Timothy Wood. Matrix: Achieving predictable virtual machine performance in the clouds. In *11th International Conference on Autonomic Computing ({ICAC} 14)*, pages 45–56, 2014.
- [53] Álvaro López García, Jesús Marco De Lucas, Marica Antonacci, Wolfgang Zu Castell, Mario David, Marcus Hardt, Lara Lloret Iglesias, Germán Moltó, Marcin Plociennik, Viet Tran, et al. A cloud-based framework for machine learning workloads and applications. *IEEE access*, 8:18681–18692, 2020.
- [54] Xiao Wang, Yuanyuan Zhang, Shengnan Yu, Xiwei Liu, Yong Yuan, and Fei-Yue Wang. E-learning recommendation framework based on deep learning. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC)*, pages 455–460. IEEE, 2017.

- [55] Moshe Unger, Alexander Tuzhilin, and Amit Livne. Context-aware recommendations based on deep learning frameworks. *ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems (TMIS)*, 11(2):1–15, 2020.
- [56] Hui Fang, Danning Zhang, Yiheng Shu, and Guibing Guo. Deep learning for sequential recommendation: Algorithms, influential factors, and evaluations. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, 39(1):1–42, 2020.
- [57] Ahsan Ali, Riccardo Pinciroli, Feng Yan, and Evgenia Smirni. Batch: machine learning inference serving on serverless platforms with adaptive batching. In *2020 SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC)*, pages 972–986. IEEE Computer Society, 2020.
- [58] Omid Alipourfard, Hongqiang Harry Liu, Jianshu Chen, Shivaram Venkataraman, Minlan Yu, and Ming Zhang. Cherrypick: Adaptively unearthing the best cloud configurations for big data analytics. In *14th {USENIX} Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation ({NSDI} 17)*, pages 469–482, 2017.
- [59] Yang Li, Zhenhua Han, Quanlu Zhang, Zhenhua Li, and Haisheng Tan. Automating cloud deployment for deep learning inference of real-time online services. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2020-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 1668–1677. IEEE, 2020.
- [60] Christina Delimitrou and Christos Kozyrakis. Paragon: Qos-aware scheduling for heterogeneous datacenters. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 48(4):77–88, 2013.
- [61] Christina Delimitrou and Christos Kozyrakis. Quasar: Resource-efficient and qos-aware cluster management. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 49(4):127–144, 2014.
- [62] Gingfung Yeung, Damian Borowiec, Adrian Friday, Richard Harper, and Peter Garraghan. Towards {GPU} utilization prediction for cloud deep learning. In *12th {USENIX} Workshop on Hot Topics in Cloud Computing (HotCloud 20)*, 2020.
- [63] Chengzhi Lu, Kejiang Ye, Guoyao Xu, Cheng-Zhong Xu, and Tongxin Bai. Imbalance in the cloud: An analysis on alibaba cluster trace. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pages 2884–2892. IEEE, 2017.
- [64] Yash Ukidave, Xiangyu Li, and David Kaeli. Mystic: Predictive scheduling for gpu based cloud servers using machine learning. In *2016 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*, pages 353–362. IEEE, 2016.
- [65] Jongse Park, Daewoo Lee, Bokyeong Kim, Jaehyuk Huh, and Seungryoul Maeng. Locality-aware dynamic vm reconfiguration on mapreduce clouds. In *Proceedings of the 21st international symposium on High-Performance Parallel and Distributed Computing*, pages 27–36, 2012.
- [66] Marcelo Amaral, Jordà Polo, David Carrera, Seetharami Seelam, and Malgorzata Steinder. Topology-aware gpu scheduling for learning workloads in cloud environments. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–12, 2017.
- [67] Esmail Asyabi, Azer Bestavros, Renato Mancuso, Richard West, and Erfan Sharafzadeh. Akita: A cpu scheduler for virtualized clouds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.09104*, 2020.
- [68] Tirthak Patel and Devesh Tiwari. Clite: Efficient and qos-aware co-location of multiple latency-critical jobs for warehouse scale computers. In *2020 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, pages 193–206. IEEE, 2020.
- [69] Rohan Basu Roy, Tirthak Patel, and Devesh Tiwari. Satori: Efficient and fair resource partitioning by sacrificing short-term benefits for long-term gains. In *2021 ACM/IEEE 48th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, pages 292–305. IEEE, 2021.
- [70] Rohan Basu Roy, Tirthak Patel, Vijay Gadepally, and Devesh Tiwari. Bliss: auto-tuning complex applications using a pool of diverse lightweight learning models. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, pages 1280–1295, 2021.
- [71] Fangfang Xia, Maulik Shukla, Thomas Brettin, Cristina Garcia-Cardona, Judith Cohn, Jonathan E Allen, Sergei Maslov, Susan L Holbeck, James H Doroshov, Yvonne A Ervard, et al. Predicting tumor cell line response to drug pairs with deep learning. *BMC bioinformatics*, 19(18):71–79, 2018.
- [72] Justin M Wozniak, Rajeev Jain, Prasanna Balaprakash, Jonathan Ozik, Nicholson T Collier, John Bauer, Fangfang Xia, Thomas Brettin, Rick Stevens, Jamaludin Mohd-Yusof, et al. Candle/supervisor: A workflow framework for machine learning applied to cancer research. *BMC bioinformatics*, 19(18):59–69, 2018.
- [73] Candle, 2021. URL <https://candle.cels.anl.gov/>.
- [74] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [75] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [76] Ryan Chard, Zhuozhao Li, Kyle Chard, Logan Ward, Yadu Babuji, Anna Woodard, Steven Tuecke, Ben Blaiszik, Michael J Franklin, and Ian Foster. Dlhub: Model and data serving for science. In *2019 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*, pages 283–292. IEEE, 2019.
- [77] Zhe Zhao, Lichan Hong, Li Wei, Jilin Chen, Aniruddh Nath, Shawn Andrews, Aditee Kumthekar, Maheswaran Sathiamoorthy, Xinyang Yi, and Ed Chi. Recommending what video to watch next: a multitask ranking system. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 43–51, 2019.
- [78] Guorui Zhou, Na Mou, Ying Fan, Qi Pi, Weijie Bian, Chang Zhou, Xiaoqiang Zhu, and Kun Gai. Deep interest evolution network for click-through rate prediction. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 33, pages 5941–5948, 2019.
- [79] Daniel Crankshaw, Xin Wang, Guilio Zhou, Michael J Franklin, Joseph E Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Clipper: A low-latency online prediction serving system. In *14th {USENIX} Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation ({NSDI} 17)*, pages 613–627, 2017.
- [80] Bobak Shahriari, Kevin Swersky, Ziyu Wang, Ryan P Adams, and Nando De Freitas. Taking the Human Out of the Loop: A Review of Bayesian Optimization. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104(1):148–175, 2015.
- [81] Michael A Osborne, Roman Garnett, and Stephen J Roberts. Gaussian Processes for Global Optimization. In *3rd international conference on learning and intelligent optimization (LION3)*, volume 2009, 2009.
- [82] Carl Edward Rasmussen. Gaussian processes in machine learning. In *Summer school on machine learning*, pages 63–71. Springer, 2003.
- [83] Jasper Snoek, Hugo Larochelle, and Ryan P Adams. Practical bayesian optimization of machine learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1206.2944*, 2012.
- [84] Takashi Wada and Hideitsu Hino. Bayesian optimization for multi-objective optimization and multi-point search, 2019.
- [85] Majid Abdolshah, Alistair Shilton, Santu Rana, Sunil Gupta, and Svetha Venkatesh. Multi-objective bayesian optimisation with preferences over objectives. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d’Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, pages 12235–12245. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/file/a7b7e4b27722574c611fe91476a56238-Paper.pdf>.
- [86] Eduardo C Garrido-Merchán and Daniel Hernández-Lobato. Dealing with categorical and integer-valued variables in bayesian optimization with gaussian processes. *Neurocomputing*, 380:20–35, 2020.
- [87] Vijay Janapa Reddi, Christine Cheng, David Kanter, Peter Mattson, Guenther Schmuellig, Carole-Jean Wu, Brian Anderson, Maximilien Breughe, Mark Charlebois, William Chou, et al. Mlperf inference benchmark. In *2020 ACM/IEEE 47th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, pages 446–459. IEEE, 2020.
- [88] Heng-Tze Cheng, Levent Koc, Jeremiah Harmsen, Tal Shaked, Tushar Chandra, Hrishu Aradhye, Glen Anderson, Greg Corrado, Wei Chai, Mustafa Ispir, et al. Wide & deep learning for recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 1st workshop on deep learning for recommender systems*, pages 7–10, 2016.
- [89] Guorui Zhou, Xiaoqiang Zhu, Chenru Song, Ying Fan, Han Zhu, Xiao Ma, Yanghui Yan, Junqi Jin, Han Li, and Kun Gai. Deep interest network for click-through rate prediction. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 1059–1068, 2018.
- [90] En Li, Liekang Zeng, Zhi Zhou, and Xu Chen. Edge ai: On-demand accelerating deep neural network inference via edge computing. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 19(1):447–457, 2019.
- [91] Arpan Gujarati, Sameh Elnikety, Yuxiong He, Kathryn S McKinley, and Björn B Brandenburg. Swayam: distributed autoscaling to meet slas of machine learning inference services with resource efficiency. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM/IFIP/USENIX Middleware Conference*, pages 109–120, 2017.
- [92] Xiangnan He, Lizi Liao, Hanwang Zhang, Liqiang Nie, Xia Hu, and Tat-Seng Chua. Neural collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the 26th international conference on world wide web*, pages 173–182, 2017.
- [93] Shuang Chen, Christina Delimitrou, and José F Martínez. Parties: Qos-aware resource partitioning for multiple interactive services. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, pages 107–120, 2019.
- [94] Ali Rıza Yıldız. An effective hybrid immune-hill climbing optimization approach for solving design and manufacturing optimization problems in industry. *Journal of Materials Processing Technology*, 209(6):2773–2780, 2009.
- [95] Mohammad Shehab, Ahamad Tajudin Khader, Mohammed Azmi Al-Betar, and Laith Mohammad Abualigah. Hybridizing cuckoo search algorithm with hill climbing for numerical optimization problems. In *2017 8th International conference on information technology (ICIT)*, pages 36–43. IEEE, 2017.
- [96] Nuran Bradley. *The response surface methodology*. PhD thesis, Indiana University South Bend, 2007.
- [97] M Ahmadi, F Vahabzadeh, B Bonakdarpour, E Mofarragh, and M Mehranian. Application of the central composite design and response surface methodology to the advanced treatment of olive oil processing wastewater using fenton’s peroxidation. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 123(1-3):187–195, 2005.
- [98] M Bashiri and A Farshbaf Geranmayeh. Tuning the parameters of an artificial neural network using central composite design and genetic algorithm. *Scientia Iranica*, 18(6):1600–1608, 2011.
- [99] Thiagarajan Rajmohan and Kayaroganam Palanikumar. Application of the central composite design in optimization of machining parameters in drilling hybrid metal matrix composites. *Measurement*, 46(4):1470–1481, 2013.