

Efficient Coflow Scheduling in Hybrid-Switched Data Center Networks

Xin Wang[†], Hong Shen^{*,†}, Hui Tian[‡]

[†]School of Computer Science and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, China

^{*}School of Applied Sciences, Macao Polytechnic University, Macao SAR, China

[‡]School of Information and Communcation Technology, Griffith University, Australia

Abstract—To improve the application-level communication performance, scheduling of coflows, a collection of parallel flows sharing the same objective, is prevalent in modern data center networks (DCNs). Meanwhile, a hybrid-switched DCN design combining optical circuit switches (OCS) and electrical packet switches (EPS) for transmitting high-volume and low-volume traffic separately has recently received considerable research attention. Efficient scheduling of coflows on hybrid network links is crucial for reducing the overall communication time. However, because of the reconfiguration delay in the circuit switch due to the ultra-high transmission rate and the limitation of bandwidth in the packet switch, coflow scheduling becomes increasingly challenging. The existing coflow scheduling algorithms in hybrid-switched DCNs are all heuristic and provide no performance guarantees. In this work, we propose an approximation algorithm with the worst-case performance guarantee of $O(\tau)$, where τ is a factor related to system parameters and demand characteristics, for single coflow scheduling in hybrid-switched DCNs to minimize the coflow completion time (CCT). Extensive simulations based on Facebook data traces show that our algorithm outperforms the state-of-the-art schemes Solstice by $1.08\times$ and Reco-Sin by $1.42\times$ in terms of minimizing CCT.

Index Terms—coflow scheduling, optical circuit switches, electrical packet switches, hybrid networks, approximation algorithm

I. INTRODUCTION

As the emergence of data center networks (DCNs), various data parallel frameworks such as MapReduce [1], Spark [2] and Dryad [3] are gaining increasing popularity. The execution process of typical data-parallel applications usually consists of multiple consecutive stages. Each stage is dependent on a collection of parallel flows, termed *coflow* [4], and the next stage cannot begin until all flows in the current stage have completed their transmission. Hence, application-level performance largely depends on coflow completion time (CCT), i.e., the completion time of the slowest flow within a coflow, and minimizing the CCT becomes an interesting problem of great significance for improving application-level performance. It should be noted that applying the traditional network metrics, such as minimizing the flow completion time (FCT), is unable to minimize the CCT and therefore ineffective for improving the communication performance of coflows in the application. Coflow is a higher-level networking abstraction that captures a range of communication patterns observed in cluster computing applications, such as Partition-Aggregate,

Bulk Synchronous Parallel, and Shuffle. As shown in Fig. 1, the coflow abstraction accurately reflects the communication pattern during partition-aggregate communication.




Fig. 1: Coflow Abstraction in Partition-Aggregate Pattern

Based on the coflow abstraction, many coflow scheduling algorithms [5]–[10] have been designed to improve the traffic transmission efficiency in DCNs supported by conventional Electronic Packet Switches (EPS). Varys [6] proposed the smallest-effective-bottleneck-first (SEBF) and minimum-allocation-for-desired-duration (MADD) heuristic algorithms that greedily schedule coflows based on the bottleneck completion time of coflow to minimize the CCT. Barrat [7] and Stream [11] both focused on decentralized coflow scheduling. Aalo [12] utilizes Discretized Coflow-Aware Least-Attained Service (D-CLAS) to schedule coflows without prior knowledge of coflows. Additionally, several theoretical studies [8]–[10] have been proposed with the aim to minimize the total weighted CCT. While packet switches have advantages for flow transmission, such as the ability to make forwarding decisions at the packet level, their bandwidth grows too slowly to meet the demands of modern DCNs.

As a result, optical circuit switches (OCS) have become more common in contemporary DCNs to meet network bandwidth demands. Compared to traditional EPS, OCS offers much better data transfer rates and lower power consumption. However, the transmission mode of OCS limits each ingress or egress port only to establish one circuit at a time, called the *port constraint*. In addition, each circuit reconfiguration in OCS incurs a fixed time delay δ (i.e., a reconfiguration delay), typically between a few hundred microseconds and a few tens of milliseconds. Therefore, the above EPS-based scheduling algorithms cannot be directly applied to OCS, which would violate the *port constraint*, as they all provide bandwidth sharing, i.e., an ingress (egress) port may be connected to multiple

egress (ingress) ports simultaneously. Several EPS-based flow scheduling algorithms [13], [14] do not share bandwidth and are therefore suitable for OCS. However, these approaches may require frequent circuit reconfigurations. Hence, coflow scheduling in OCS still faces several difficulties.

The literature on coflow scheduling in optical circuit switches (OCS) is still limited. To our knowledge, Sunflow [15] is the first study to consider both OCS and coflow characteristics. OMCO [16] proposes a heuristic algorithm for scheduling coflow in OCS under online scenarios, but does not guarantee performance. Reco-Sin [17] is the first constant approximation algorithm for single coflow scheduling in OCS, with an approximation ratio of 2. In addition, researchers have proposed hybrid-switched DCNs which combine high-speed OCS with traditional EPS to offer higher throughput at a reduced cost, such as Helios [18] and c-Through [19]. However, these methods aim to minimize the flow completion time (FCT) rather than coflow completion time (CCT). Recently, Liu et al. [20] have provided an exciting flow scheduling heuristic algorithm (called Solstice) that minimizes the maximum flow completion time in a hybrid network. The algorithm effectively improves circuit utilization and reduces the number of configurations.

To efficiently schedule coflows in a hybrid network, we need to determine: (1) a set of circuit configurations in the OCS, i.e., what ports are connected and the connection durations; and (2) which traffic should be allocated to the packet switch. Considering the delay time between configurations, it is necessary to reduce the frequency of reconfigurations in OCS. Meanwhile, we need to coordinate traffic demand allocation among different switches in order to achieve high link utilization and reduce the total completion time (i.e., CCT) in a hybrid-switched network. In this paper, we propose a new and effective operation, called *Migrating*, which distributes as much traffic load to the packet switch and balances traffic across the packet and circuit switch. By ensuring simultaneous completion of transmission in both switches, *Migrating* can maximize link utilization over the packet switch and further reduce the CCT. This paper investigates single coflow scheduling problem in hybrid-switched DCNs, aiming at minimizing the CCT, while providing detailed theoretical analysis and proof of approximation ratio. We can summarize the contribution of this work as follows:

- We propose a new and effective operation, called *Migrating*, which can further reduce the CCT and optimizes the system performance.
- We further propose an efficient coflow scheduling algorithm to minimize the CCT and show that it achieves a performance guarantee (approximation ratio to the optimal solution) of $O(\tau)$, where τ is the demand characteristic. To our knowledge, this is the first approximation algorithm for coflow scheduling in hybrid-switched DCNs, and hence fills a research gap.
- We evaluate our method's performance using real-life traces from Facebook. Simulation results demonstrate that our method outperforms the state-of-the-art schemes

regarding the reduced number of reconfigurations and faster transmission of a single coflow.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II defines the system model and formulates the problem. Section III describes our proposed coflow scheduling algorithm in hybrid networks. Section IV provides specific theoretical analysis and approximation ratio proof. Section V presents the experimental results of our algorithm and performance comparison with the state-of-the-art works. Finally, Section VI concludes the paper.

II. MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

This section presents the system model and the formal definition of the coflow scheduling problem in a hybrid network.

A. System Model

Network Model: In data center networks (DCNs), two types of switches are typically used: optical circuit switches (OCS) and electrical packet switches (EPS). As shown in Fig. 2, the DCN is modeled as a non-blocking hybrid circuit/packet switch with N ingress ports and N egress ports, where each ingress/egress port is connected to both a circuit switch and a packet switch. In many cases, these ports are connected to Top-of-Rack (ToR) switches, with each ToR switch connecting to a group of machines. At the sender machines, flows are temporarily buffered, aggregated and organized into virtual output queues (VOQs) for each ingress port. Circuit switches can only handle one VOQ at a time per ingress port, while packet switches can handle multiple VOQs, simultaneously.




Fig. 2: A Hybrid Switch Architecture

Optical Circuit Switch: Compared with EPS, OCS is capable of higher data transfer rates and lower power consumption, which makes it suitable for high-bandwidth applications. OCS needs to establish a circuit between ingress and egress ports so that data can be transferred between them. However, OCS has a port connection restriction known as *port constraint*. Specifically, at any given time, each ingress (egress) port can only have one circuit connection to one egress (ingress) port. In addition, OCS requires the reconfiguration of a new circuit, resulting in a delay in the reconfiguration process of up to ten microseconds. Until the reconfiguration process is complete, all transmissions in the OCS may be halted, which is called *all-stop* circuit switch model and is widely used in existing works [19], [21], [22]. In addition, Sunflow [15] adopts a *not-all-stop* circuit establishment model, allowing the transmission to continue on unchanged circuits during reconfiguration and

stop only on affected ports. However, implementing a pure *not-all-stop* OCS remains challenging due to the immaturity of current manufacturing technology [17]. Therefore, in our work, we also adopt the *all-stop* model.

Electrical Packet Switch: Compared with OCS, a significant advantage of EPS is its ability to provide more flexible network connectivity without the *port constraint* of OCS. In EPS, each ingress or egress port can connect to multiple egress or ingress ports at the same time, enabling port-sharing and providing greater flexibility in network configuration. However, this flexibility requires careful management of available bandwidth to ensure that the network can satisfy the bandwidth requirements of all simultaneous connections, which is known as *bandwidth constraint*.

B. Problem Formulation

We now formally define the coflow scheduling problem for single coflow in a hybrid network fabric. The main mathematical notations used are listed in Table I.

TABLE I: Notations

Symbol	Definition
N	The number of hybrid switch ports
δ	The fixed reconfiguration delay time
r_c	The circuit link rates
r_p	The packet link rates
D	The input demand matrix ($N \times N$)
ρ	The maximum value of the sum of each row and column of D , that is the diameter of D
τ	The maximum number of non-zero elements of each row or column of D
E	The residual demand sent to packet switch ($N \times N$)
L	The number of configurations
P_l	The l -th circuit switch configuration (permutation) matrix ($N \times N$)
t_l	The time duration of P_l
T	The total completion time of traffic demand
T_{trans}	The total transmission time of traffic demand
T_{conf}	The total configuration delay time of traffic demand

We denote T_c as the total completion time (i.e., CCT) of coflow c , given by $T_c = \max(T_c^O, T_c^E)$, where T_c^O is the total completion time of the traffic demand transmitted through the circuit switch and T_c^E is the total completion time of the residual traffic demand transmitted through the packet switch. In hybrid networks, the circuit switch is primarily used for transmitting most of the traffic, and it is commonly assumed that $T_c^E \leq T_c^O$, implying that $T_c = T_c^O$. Therefore, unless otherwise specified, the total completion time of the coflow specifically refers to T_c^O , which includes the total transmission time and the total configuration delay time on the circuit switch.

Problem Definition (Single Coflow Scheduling): Given a demand matrix D of coflow, we want to compute a feasible coflow schedule in an $N \times N$ non-blocking hybrid network to reduce the number of configurations and minimize the coflow completion time (CCT).

Input (traffic demand): The communication requirements of a coflow can be represented by an $N \times N$ demand matrix D .

Each element $d_{i,j} \in D$ corresponds to the amount of data that flow $f_{i,j}$ needs to transmit from ingress port i to egress port j , where $1 \leq i, j \leq N$.

Output (Scheduling): The output of the scheduling process has two main components. The first component of the output is a circuit switch schedule, denoted as (M, P_l, t_l) , which consists of a set of configurations $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_L\}$ and the corresponding durations $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_L\}$. In the circuit switch, each configuration $P_l (1 \leq l \leq L)$ encodes the connectivity of ports as a $N \times N$ binary matrix. Specifically, $P_l^{i,j}$ is set to 1 if port i is allowed to send data to port j during this configuration. All P_l are permutation matrices, that is, they have exactly one 1 in each row and column due to the fact that the circuit switch establishes a one-to-one connection between each sender and receiver. Each configuration P_l also has a duration t_l that specifies how long the circuit switch should stay in the specific configuration. The second component of the output is the residual demand, denoted as E , which is also an $N \times N$ matrix. The elements $E_{i,j}$ in E represent the demand $D_{i,j}$ that is routed from port i to port j via the packet switch.

Objective: In a hybrid network, our scheduling objective is to minimize the total completion time for scheduling the entire traffic demand D . To achieve this goal, we need to effectively reduce the frequency of reconfigurations in OCS, and allocate the traffic demand reasonably while allowing packet switches to carry as much traffic load as possible.

The following is a formal definition of our scheduling objective, as well as two constraints related to demand satisfaction and packet switch capacity. More specifically, we define the total completion time as the sum of the time required to transfer the demand on the circuit switch (i.e., the total transmission time, T_{trans}) and the time required to wait for reconfiguration delays when switching between configurations (i.e., the total configuration time, T_{conf}). Our objective is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \min CCT &= \min (T_{trans} + T_{conf}) \\ &= \min \left(\left(\sum_{l=1}^L t_l \right) + L\delta \right). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Demand satisfaction constraint: It is required that the sum of data transferred via the packet switch and data transferred via the circuit switch must be greater than or equal to the demand between the source and destination for each ingress-egress pair in traffic demand D , i.e., covering the whole traffic demand D :

$$E + \sum_{l=1}^L r_c t_l P_l \geq D. \quad (2)$$

Packet switch capacity constraint: The data capacity that can be carried by a packet switch is constrained by the time spent on the circuit switch, as both must occur concurrently. Therefore, for each ingress i or egress j in the packet switch, the allowable amount of data is limited:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^N E_{i,j} &\leq r_p T, \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}, \\ \sum_{i=1}^N E_{i,j} &\leq r_p T, \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Since the coflow scheduling problem is known to be NP-hard [14], [15], we will propose an efficient approximation algorithm for coflow scheduling in hybrid-switched DCNs in the next section.

III. THE ALGORITHM

Birkoff-von Neumann (BvN) [23] decomposition is a traditional and classical method used to schedule coflow in optical circuit switches (OCS). However, in hybrid network environments, the basic BvN method has two main limitations: (1) it only considers the circuit switch without utilizing the necessary packet switch, and (2) it does not address the problem of minimizing the number of configurations of the OCS, and thus may result in possible delays in reconfigurations [20]. To overcome these limitations, we propose an efficient coflow scheduling algorithm specifically for hybrid networks that has a provable performance guarantee.

A. Birkoff-von Neumann Decomposition

The Birkhoff-von Neumann (BvN) decomposition (as shown in Algorithm 1) requires an input matrix D of size $N \times N$, with each element being non-negative and the sum of each row and column equaling a constant value K , that is known as a K -bistochastic matrix. According to the BvN theorem, any K -bistochastic matrix can be decomposed into a set of up to N^2 permutation matrices, whose non-negative sum of durations is K . However, finding the optimal BvN decomposition with the least permutation matrices is an NP-hard problem [24]. In fact, the demand matrix in practical applications may not naturally be K -bistochastic, but by adding artificial demands, a pre-processing method called *Stuffing* [17], [20] can transform it into one.

Algorithm 1 BvN [23] Decomposition Algorithm

Input: K -bistochastic traffic matrix D ($N \times N$); the circuit link rates r_c

Output: a circuit switch schedule: (M, P_l, t_l)

- 1: $l \leftarrow 1$
 - 2: **while** $D > 0$ **do**
 - 3: $B \leftarrow \text{BinaryMatrix}(D)$
 - 4: Interpret B as a bipartite graph of senders to receivers
 - 5: Calculate a perfect matching P_l of B
 - 6: Interpret P_l as a permutation matrix
 - 7: $t_l \leftarrow \min \{ D_{i,j} \mid P_l^{i,j} = 1 \} / r_c$
 - 8: $D \leftarrow D - r_c t_l P_l$
 - 9: $l \leftarrow l + 1$
 - 10: **end while**
 - 11: $L \leftarrow l - 1$
-

In practice, due to preemption, the BvN decomposition often generates schedules with many configurations when the demand matrix has a large ratio between its maximum and minimum non-zero elements (i.e., the matrix is highly skewed), resulting in extensive reconfigurations. The durations of these configurations are usually quite short (e.g., on the order of the reconfiguration delay δ), resulting in lower overall efficiency. The problem, however, is that the BvN decomposition must provide service for the whole traffic demand, including configurations with shorter durations that have lower efficiency. Therefore, in a hybrid network, if some demands can be transferred by a packet switch, the scheduling algorithm can focus on finding configurations that can last longer, resulting in higher efficiency.

B. Approximation Algorithm

The main challenge for coflow scheduling in hybrid networks is how to effectively reduce the frequency of reconfigurations in OCS while allowing packet switches to carry as much traffic load as possible thus minimizing the total completion time (i.e., CCT). We propose an efficient approximate algorithm for coflow scheduling in hybrid networks, as depicted in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Coflow Scheduling in Hybrid Networks

Input: the traffic demand D ($N \times N$); the circuit reconfiguration delay time δ ; the circuit and packet link rates r_c and r_p

Output: L circuit configurations and corresponding durations: P_l, t_l ; the residual demand sent to packet switch E ($N \times N$)

- 1: $D' \leftarrow \text{run Regularization and Stuffing on } D \text{ with } \delta$
 - 2: $T' \leftarrow 0$
 - 3: $\gamma \leftarrow \text{largest power of 2 smaller than } \max(D')$
 - 4: $l \leftarrow 1$
 - 5: **while** $r_p T' < \rho_{E'}$ **do**
 - 6: $P_l \leftarrow \text{Slicing}(D', \gamma)$
 - 7: **if** $P_l \neq \text{NULL}$ **then**
 - 8: $t_l \leftarrow \min \{ D'_{i,j} \mid P_l^{i,j} = 1 \} / r_c$
 - 9: $D' \leftarrow D' - r_c t_l P_l$
 - 10: $E' \leftarrow D'$
 - 11: $T' \leftarrow T' + t_l + \delta$
 - 12: $l \leftarrow l + 1$
 - 13: **else**
 - 14: $\gamma \leftarrow \gamma / 2$
 - 15: **end if**
 - 16: **end while**
 - 17: $L \leftarrow l - 1$
 - 18: $E, T \leftarrow \text{Migrating}(E', T')$
-

Algorithm 2 involves four primary operations: *Regularization* [17], *Stuffing*, *Slicing* and *Migrating*. *Regularization* (line 1) is a simple but efficient pre-processing operation that can significantly reduce the frequency of reconfigurations while minimizing the impact on circuit idle time [17]. *Stuffing* (line 1) entails adding artificial demands to the original demand

matrix D to create a K -bistochastic demand matrix D' , so that it can be decomposed by the BvN theory. *Slicing* (lines 5-16) is based on BvN and exploits the decomposability of K -bistochastic matrices to iteratively compute a long-duration scheduling plan, greedily avoiding short and inefficient configurations. Note that the residual demand E' generated by the current iteration is the input matrix D' for the next iteration. *Slicing* terminates when the residual demand matrix E' (a bistochastic matrix) in the current iteration becomes small enough to be accommodated by the packet switch, i.e., $r_p T' > \rho_{E'}$, where $\rho_{E'}$ is the diameter of the residual matrix E' generated by the current iteration. Finally, since $r_p T' > \rho_{E'}$, this means that the current residual matrix E' requires less time to be transmitted through the packet switch than the total completion time T' rather than strictly equal, allowing for further optimization. Therefore, we propose *Migrating* (line 18), a new operation that allocates more traffic load to the packet switch to generate the final residual matrix E ($\rho_E > \rho_{E'}$) and the final total completion time T ($T < T'$), ensuring that both switches complete their transmissions simultaneously (i.e., $r_p T = \rho_E$) and further optimizing overall performance.

1) *Regularization*: In practical applications, if reconfiguration delays in OCS are not negligible, coflow scheduling based on the BvN decomposition may lead to poor CCT. This is since the original BvN-based coflow scheduling often requires preemption, leading to frequent reconfigurations, whereas non-preemptive scheduling may result in long circuit idle time. *Regularization* [17] is a pre-processing technique that can be used to reduce the frequency of reconfiguration at a low cost in terms of circuit idle time. It adjusts each element $d_{i,j} \in D$ to $\left\lceil \frac{d_{i,j}}{\delta} \right\rceil \cdot \delta$, which is an integer multiple of δ (i.e., the reconfiguration delay) to obtain a new regularized matrix D^* . Since each element of the new matrix is larger than the original D , an efficient scheduling solution that satisfies the new matrix will also satisfy the original demand. We adopt the existing operation of *Regularization* [17] to handle a demand matrix of coflow, which leads to a considerably less frequent circuit reconfiguration.

2) *Stuffing*: *Stuffing* is the process of converting a regularized matrix D^* into a K -bistochastic matrix D' by adding artificial demands. QuickStuff [20] is used to perform this operation, which stuffs the non-zero elements of D' in any order. Then, it checks the zero elements and adds them if necessary until a K -bistochastic matrix is obtained. In our work, *Stuffing* does not increase the maximum row/column sum (i.e., ρ) or the maximum number of non-zero elements of each row or column (i.e., τ), which means that $\rho_{D'} = \rho_{D^*}$ and $\tau_{D'} = \tau_{D^*}$.

3) *Slicing*: After *Stuffing*, our algorithm enters its third phase, *Slicing*, which is logically equivalent to the primary iteration of BvN. We must iteratively determine the next circuit configuration and the corresponding duration. However, there is no known algorithm that can explore all possible configurations in polynomial time, so we employ a greedy approach. Our method, in contrast to BvN, selects configurations with

longer durations to compensate for the reconfiguration cost and maintain higher utilization rates. Moreover, unlike BvN, the *Slicing* process terminates once the packet switch is capable of forwarding the residual traffic demand.

In each iteration of *Slicing*, we input the current demand matrix D' , which is the residual matrix E' resulting from the previous iteration, as well as a threshold γ , and obtain a circuit configuration P_l as the output. To determine the circuit configuration, we regard the demand matrix D' as a bipartite graph between the senders and the receivers and search for a perfect matching of size N with the largest minimum element, which is known as Maximum Weighted Minimum Matching (MMWM) [20]. The minimum element of each circuit configuration determines its duration, and we start with a high threshold value γ , which is the largest power of 2 less than the largest element in D' . We attempt to find a perfect matching on the demand matrix, ignoring the values below the threshold, so that any perfect matching returned has a duration of at least γ/r_c [20]. We repeat the process with the same threshold until no more perfect matchings can be found at that threshold, and then reduce the threshold by half before the next iteration.

The *Slicing* operation ends when the packet switch has sufficient capacity to handle the residual demand, which is tracked by matrix E' . In the next iteration, the previous E' becomes the current demand matrix D' . The total time required to schedule the traffic demand is recorded by variable T' , which includes transmission time T'_{trans} and reconfiguration delay time T'_{conf} (i.e., $T' = T'_{trans} + T'_{conf}$). Once the time T' is large enough to allow the packet switch to handle the residual demand E' , i.e., $r_p T' > \rho_{E'}$, *Slicing* terminates.

4) *Migrating*: Let T' and T represent the total time at the end of *Slicing* (i.e., before *Migrating*) and the final total time after *Migrating*, respectively. When the condition $T'_{E'} = \frac{\rho_{E'}}{r_p} < T'$ (i.e., $r_p T' > \rho_{E'}$) is satisfied, where $T'_{E'}$ denotes the current completion time of the residual matrix E' , indicating that the packet switch completes the transmission early, resulting in a low link utilization for the packet switch due to the unused of time slots of $T' - T'_{E'}$. To maximize link utilization over the packet switch, we can redistribute some of the load from the circuit switch to the packet switch, ensuring they both remain active for the same duration (i.e., completing the transmission simultaneously), thus further reducing the total completion time.

Hence, when *Slicing* ends, a novel and effective operation, called *Migrating*, is performed. Specifically, we select a circuit configuration matrix P_l , and based on the position of the port connections in P_l (i.e., $P_l^{i,j} = 1$), by migrating partial data ε into the current residual matrix E' at the same position, obtain the final residual matrix E ($\tau_E \leq \tau_{E'} + 1$), so that the transmission time of E (i.e., $\frac{\rho_E}{r_p}$, where $\rho_E > \rho_{E'}$) on the packet switch is equal to the final total time T after *Migrating*. In other words, both the circuit switch and the packet switch complete the data transmission simultaneously (i.e., $r_p T = \rho_E$, $T < T'$). According to $r_p T = \rho_E$, we can calculate the ε through

$$r_c t_l > \varepsilon.$$

$$\begin{aligned} r_p (T_{trans} + T_{conf}) &= r_p \left[\left(\sum_{l=1, l \neq \bar{l}}^L t_l + \left(t_{\bar{l}} - \frac{\varepsilon}{r_c} \right) \right) + L\delta \right], \\ &= r_p \left[\left(T'_{trans} - \frac{\varepsilon}{r_c} \right) + T'_{conf} \right] = \rho_{E'} + \varepsilon \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where, $T_{trans} + T_{conf} = T$ and $\rho_{E'} + \varepsilon = \rho_E$. The duration of the selected configuration ($t_{\bar{l}}$) is reduced (i.e., $T_{trans} < T'_{trans}$), while the number of configurations remains the same (i.e., $T'_{conf} = T_{conf}$). Consequently, the final total completion time is further reduced (i.e., $T < T'$), and the system performance is optimized. In fact, we can randomly select a $P_{\bar{l}}$ as long as the corresponding duration satisfies $r_c t_{\bar{l}} > \varepsilon$.

5) *Example*: Consider the example depicted in Fig. 3 to illustrate how our algorithm operates, assuming a fixed time of delay $\delta = 2$, and packet and circuit rates of $r_p = 0.1$ and $r_c = 1$, respectively. We define the diameter of a matrix as the maximum row or column sum, denoted by ρ . The diameter of the input demand matrix D is 102 (i.e., the fifth column sum), and D is regularized to yield the matrix D^* with $\rho^* = 104$. Next, we perform *Stuffing* on D^* to obtain a new matrix D' , where the sum of each row and column is also 104 (i.e., D' is K -bistochastic with $K = 104$). The diameter before and after *Stuffing* needs to remain constant, i.e., $\rho^* = \rho'$.

During the first iteration of the algorithm, we choose $\gamma = 64$ and search for a subset of elements with values at least 64. We only find one perfect matching with a minimum value of 68, so the duration of the first configuration is $68/r_c$. We then obtain the current residual matrix E' by subtracting the demand from the current matrix D' . The current total time is then updated to $T' = 68/r_c + 1\delta = 70$. If $r_p T'$ (in this case, 7.0) is greater than the diameter of D' ($\rho' = 36$), then we can transfer the residual demand directly to the packet switch. Nonetheless, this condition is not satisfied, so we continue to perform *Slicing* with decreasing thresholds. Since our algorithm seeks for perfect matchings, it needs to consider at least N elements and ensure that the found P_m is a non-singular permutation matrix (i.e., rank is N), rather than a sub-permutation matrix (i.e., rank is less than N). When $\gamma = 32$ and $\gamma = 16$, perfect matchings cannot be obtained, therefore the threshold is reduced once again. When $\gamma = 8$, there are two perfect matchings for D' with the same minimum element of size 12. The total time is now $T' = (68 + 12 + 12)/r_c + 3\delta = 98$, and $r_p T'$ (here 9.8) is smaller than the diameter of D' ($\rho' = 12$), so the loop continues. The loop (*Slicing*) ends when the current total time is $T' = (68 + 12 + 12 + 4)/r_c + 4\delta = 104$, and $r_p T' > \rho_{E'}$ (here $10.4 > 8$). To further optimize performance, we perform *Migrating* and select a configuration matrix P_1 at random, by migrating ε (calculated by Eq (4)) data into the current residual matrix E' , obtaining the final residual matrix E such that $r_p T = \rho_E$ and $T < T'$. Finally, we need to update the duration of the configuration P_1 . In fact, we may also select P_2 , P_3 or P_4 , given that their durations satisfy

IV. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

In this section, we prove our proposed algorithm is $O(\tau)$ -approximate, where τ is a factor related to demand characteristics, which is the first approximation algorithm for single coflow scheduling in hybrid networks.

Circuit-Switched Lower Bound: For a circuit switch, to satisfy the traffic demand D , the total transmission time, T_{trans} , should be at least as much as the largest row or column sum, diameter ρ , divided by the link rate r_c . Furthermore, since the circuit switch needs to be configured at least as many times as the maximum number of non-zero elements of each row or column, denoted as τ , and each configuration incurs a penalty of δ , the total configuration time T_{conf} is at least $\tau\delta$. Therefore, in a pure circuit-switched network, we can obtain the following lower bound:

$$T_{LB}^C = \frac{\rho}{r_c} + \tau\delta. \quad (5)$$

Hybrid-Switched Lower Bound: In a hybrid switch, because it is possible to divert (small-volume) data via a packet switch, the number of needed configurations may be reduced by relaxing the value of τ from the count of non-zero elements of each row and column to either 1 or 0 [20]. As a result, we reduce the total circuit switch time from Eq. (5) to Eq. (6), which is proportional to the ratio of circuit link bandwidth r_c to total bandwidth due to the introduction of the packet switch:

$$T_{LB}^H = \left(\frac{r_c}{r_c + r_p} \right) \left(\frac{\rho}{r_c} + \delta \right). \quad (6)$$

When we analyze the performance of the scheduling algorithm, we need to consider the theoretical lower bounds of CCT, i.e., T_{LB}^C and T_{LB}^H , that indicate the optimal theoretical limits of CCT independent of the scheduling algorithms. In practice, the achievable CCT may be much larger than the lower bound. Nevertheless, we can still evaluate the algorithm's efficiency by comparing its performance with these lower bounds.

Lemma 1. *Reco-Sin is 2-approximate, i.e., $T^{Reco-Sin} < 2 \left(\frac{\rho}{r_c} + \tau\delta \right) \leq 2T^*$.*

Proof: Reco-Sin [17] is an efficient 2-approximation algorithm for coflow scheduling in circuit-switched networks. It applies *Regularization* and *Stuffing* on D with δ to obtain a new matrix D' . L is the number of configurations obtained from Reco-Sin, the transmission time is $T_{trans}^{Reco-Sin} = \sum_{l=1}^L t_l$, and the configuration time is $T_{conf}^{Reco-Sin} = L\delta$. Each element $d_{i,j} \in D$ is regularized to $d'_{i,j} = \left\lceil \frac{d_{i,j}}{\delta} \right\rceil \cdot \delta$, which is an integer multiple of δ . Therefore, the duration of each circuit configuration is at least δ , ensuring that $t_l \geq \delta$ and therefore $T_{trans}^{Reco-Sin} \geq T_{conf}^{Reco-Sin}$.

Let ρ and ρ' denote the maximum value of the sum of each row and column of D and D' , respectively, and let τ




Fig. 3: An Example Execution

represent the maximum number of non-zero elements of each row or column of D . *Regularization* increases each element in D by no more than δ , so $\rho' < \rho + \tau\delta$. In addition, we have $\frac{\rho'}{r_c} = T_{\text{trans}}^{\text{Reco-Sin}}$. Hence, we can derive that

$$T^{\text{Reco-Sin}} = T_{\text{trans}}^{\text{Reco-Sin}} + T_{\text{conf}}^{\text{Reco-Sin}} \leq 2T_{\text{trans}}^{\text{Reco-Sin}} = 2\frac{\rho'}{r_c} < 2\left(\frac{\rho + \tau\delta}{r_c}\right) < 2\left(\frac{\rho}{r_c} + \tau\delta\right) \leq 2T^*,$$

where $T^{\text{Reco-Sin}}$ is the CCT given by Reco-Sin [17], and T^* is the optimal CCT in a circuit-switched network.

This completes the proof. Details can be seen in Reco-Sin [17]. \blacksquare

Lemma 2. $T^{\text{Reco-Sin}} \geq \left(1 + \frac{r_p}{r_c}\right) T^{\text{Ours}} + (\tau_E - 1)\delta$, which is the CCT bound between Reco-Sin and our proposed algorithm.

Proof: Let E' and E represent the residual matrix at the end of *Slicing* (i.e., before *Migrating*) and the actual residual matrix to be transmitted to the packet switch after *Migrating*, respectively. Let $\rho_{E'}$ and ρ_E represent the maximum value of the sum of each row and column of E' and E , respectively. Let $\tau_{E'}$ and τ_E be the maximum number of non-zero elements

of each row or column of E' and E , respectively. Assume $T_{E'}^{\text{Reco-Sin}}$ and $T_E^{\text{Reco-Sin}}$ are the completion times of E' and E based on the algorithm Reco-Sin [17], respectively.

In reality, the performance improvement of our proposed algorithm over Reco-Sin is the result of two factors: (1) allowing the simultaneous transmission of the residual matrix on the packet switch, thereby reducing the total completion time; (2) performing the *Migrating* operation, and which increases the load on the packet switch, thereby further reducing the total completion time.

For a given coflow with demand matrix D , let $T^{\text{Reco-Sin}}$, T^{Ours} be respectively the CCT given by Reco-Sin [17] and by our proposed algorithm. If we do not perform the *Migrating* operation, then the time saved by our algorithm compared to Reco-Sin is $T_{E'}^{\text{Reco-Sin}}$, i.e., $T^{\text{Reco-Sin}} - T^{\text{Ours}} = T^{\text{Saved}} = T_{E'}^{\text{Reco-Sin}}$. According to T_{LB}^C (Eq. (5)), we can get $T^{\text{Saved}} \geq \frac{\rho_{E'}}{r_c} + \tau_{E'}\delta$. However, after *Migrating*, the current $T_E^{\text{Reco-Sin}}$ is not equal to the current T^{Saved} . Due to *Migrating* operation, we have $\rho_E = r_p T^{\text{Ours}}$ and $\tau_E \leq \tau_{E'} + 1$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} T^{\text{Reco-Sin}} - T^{\text{Ours}} &= T^{\text{Saved}} \geq \frac{\rho_E}{r_c} + \tau_{E'}\delta \\ &\geq \frac{\rho_E}{r_c} + (\tau_E - 1)\delta = \frac{r_p T^{\text{Ours}}}{r_c} + (\tau_E - 1)\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $T^{Reco-Sin} - T^{Saved} = T^{Ours}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} T^{Saved} &\geq \frac{r_p T^{Ours}}{r_c} + (\tau_E - 1) \delta \\ &\geq \frac{r_p}{r_c} (T^{Reco-Sin} - T^{Saved}) + (\tau_E - 1) \delta, \end{aligned}$$

thus,

$$\left(1 + \frac{r_p}{r_c}\right) T^{Saved} \geq \frac{r_p}{r_c} T^{Reco-Sin} + (\tau_E - 1) \delta.$$

Next, we have

$$\left(1 + \frac{r_p}{r_c}\right) (T^{Reco-Sin} - T^{Ours}) \geq \frac{r_p}{r_c} T^{Reco-Sin} + (\tau_E - 1) \delta.$$

Finally,

$$T^{Reco-Sin} \geq \left(1 + \frac{r_p}{r_c}\right) T^{Ours} + (\tau_E - 1) \delta.$$

This completes the proof. \blacksquare

Set T^{Ours} and T^* are respectively the CCT of our algorithm and optimal CCT in a hybrid-switched network. Based on the above Lemma 1 and 2, we can get Theorem 1.

Theorem 1. *Our proposed single coflow scheduling algorithm is $O(\tau)$ -approximate, i.e., $T^{Ours} \leq O(\tau)T^*$.*

Proof: For a hybrid-switched network, because T_{LB}^H (Eq. (6)) is a lower bound of CCT for any algorithm, we have $T^* \geq T_{LB}^H = \left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) \left(\frac{\rho}{r_c} + \delta\right)$.

By Lemma 1, we can get $T^{Reco-Sin} < 2 \left(\frac{\rho}{r_c} + \tau\delta\right)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) T^{Reco-Sin} &< 2 \left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) \left(\frac{\rho}{r_c} + \tau\delta\right) \\ &= 2 \left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) \left(\frac{\rho}{r_c} + \delta\right) + 2 \left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) (\tau - 1) \delta \\ &\leq 2T^* + 2 \left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) (\tau - 1) \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Further, by Lemma 2, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) \left[\left(1 + \frac{r_p}{r_c}\right) T^{Ours} + (\tau_E - 1) \delta \right] \\ &\leq \left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) T^{Reco-Sin} \leq 2T^* + 2 \left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) (\tau - 1) \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Since $1 \leq \tau_E \leq N$, hence,

$$\begin{aligned} T^{Ours} &\leq 2T^* + \left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) (2\tau - \tau_E - 1) \delta \\ &\leq 2T^* + \left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) (2\tau - 2) \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $T^* \geq \left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) \left(\frac{\rho}{r_c} + \delta\right)$, thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) (2\tau - 2) \delta}{T^*} &\leq \frac{\left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) (2\tau - 2) \delta}{\left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) \left(\frac{\rho}{r_c} + \delta\right)} \\ &= \frac{(2\tau - 2) \delta}{\left(\frac{\rho}{r_c} + \delta\right)} < \frac{(2\tau - 2) \delta}{\delta} = 2\tau - 2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) (2\tau - 2) \delta \leq (2\tau - 2) T^*.$$

Finally,

$$T^{Ours} \leq 2T^* + (2\tau - 2) T^* = 2\tau T^* = O(\tau)T^*,$$

where τ is the demand characteristic, i.e., the maximum number of non-zero elements of each row or column of the input matrix D .

This completes the proof. \blacksquare

V. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATIONS

In this section, we use the traces of Facebook [25] to test the performance of the proposed method and provide simulation results and detailed performance analysis.

A. Simulation Settings

Workload: Our workload is generated based on Facebook trace [25], which is collected from a 3000-machine, 150-rack MapReduce cluster at Facebook. This trajectory is extensively used in simulation [15], [17], it contains 526 coflows scaled down to a 150-port fabric with exact inter-arrival times. For each coflow in the Facebook trace, the sender machines, receiver machines, and the transmitted bytes at the receiver level, rather than the flow level, are provided. To generate flows, we therefore pseudo-uniformly divide the bytes from each receiver to each sender. We randomly select N machines from the trace as servers.

Evaluation Metrics: We evaluate schemes based on the Normalized Reconfiguration Frequency (Normalized RF) and the Normalized CCT.

- *Normalized RF* is defined as the number of configurations under the compared scheduler normalized by our algorithm's RF, i.e.,

$$\text{Norm.RF} = \frac{\text{Compared RF}}{\text{RF under our algorithm}}.$$

Obviously, if the *Normalized RF* is greater (smaller) than one, the benchmark algorithm generates fewer (more) configurations than the compared scheduler.

- *Normalized CCT* is defined as the CCT under the compared scheduler normalized by our algorithm's CCT, i.e.,

$$\text{Norm.CCT} = \frac{\text{Compared CCT}}{\text{CCT under our algorithm}}.$$

Intuitively, the benchmark algorithm is faster (slower) if the *Normalized CCT* is greater (smaller) than one. As a result, this

metric can measure how efficient the benchmark is compared to others.

Baseline solutions: We compare the performances of our proposed algorithm with the following baselines for single coflow scheduling in minimizing CCT.

1) *Hybrid-Switched Lower Bound:* $T_{LB}^H = \left(\frac{r_c}{r_c+r_p}\right) \left(\frac{\rho}{r_c} + \delta\right)$ is the optimal theoretical limits of CCT in hybrid-switched networks, independent of the scheduling algorithms.

2) *Basic BvN* [23]: BvN is a fundamental and classical method for scheduling coflow in optical circuit switches (OCS), which iteratively calculates the scheduling of configuration (*Slicing*) to complete the transmission.

3) *Reco-Sin* [17]: Reco-Sin is the first constant approximation algorithm for single coflow scheduling in OCS. Reco-Sin applies *Regularization* and *Stuffing* on D with δ , obtaining a doubly stochastic matrix D' , and then executes BvN decomposition (*Slicing*) on D' .

4) *Solstice* [20]: Solstice is an efficient circuit scheduling algorithm in a hybrid network that operates in two stages: *Stuffing* and *Slicing*.

B. Simulation Results

Our simulation is based on a hybrid switch with $N=10$ ports. The hybrid switch consists of a circuit switch with 100 Gbps per link capacity and a packet switch with 10 Gbps per link capacity. The value of the reconfiguration delay, δ , ranges from 20 μs to 100 μs , with a default value of 20 μs .

Essentially, a demand matrix D exhibits sparsity when the proportion of non-zero elements in the matrix is low. We measure the sparsity of a matrix with *density*, which is a value between 0 and 1. In this paper, coflows are categorized as sparse, normal, or dense based on the density of their demand matrix. We consider a matrix to be sparse when its $density \leq 0.2$, normal when $0.2 \leq density \leq 0.6$, and dense when $density \geq 0.6$. Sparse matrices can be scheduled more efficiently in circuit switches since they inherently require fewer configurations [20].

Fig. 4 depicts the reconfiguration frequency of different algorithms for various density levels, with a fixed reconfiguration time of 20 μs . In this case, we utilize the CCT of our algorithm as a normalized benchmark and show the performance of various schedulers. The density of the demand matrix can significantly affect the reconfiguration frequency of the coflow. It is observed that the reconfiguration frequency of our method is lower than Solstice [20], indicating that the *Regularization* [17] operation we incorporate to process the traffic matrix indeed results in a significantly lower circuit reconfiguration frequency. Compared to the Reco-Sin [17] for scheduling coflows in OCS, we utilize the hybrid switched network to transfer the remaining low-volume traffic to the packet switch, thereby effectively reducing the reconfiguration frequency.

As shown in Fig. 4, Solstice spends $1.25\times$, $1.17\times$ and $1.09\times$ more reconfigurations than our method, when the

demand matrix of coflow is sparse, normal and dense, respectively. Reco-Sin spends $1.25\times$, $1.33\times$ and $1.45\times$ more reconfigurations than our method, when the demand matrix of coflow is sparse, normal and dense, respectively. As the density increases, the performance gap becomes even greater. The reason for this is that the number of BvN-decomposed permutation matrices in Solstice increases as the coflow density increases, whereas the role played by *Regularization* in our method is likely to become increasingly apparent, so the performance gap increases. In addition, Basic BvN has the highest number of reconstructions due to the absence of the *Regularization* operation, considering only OCS and not utilizing EPS.




Fig. 4: Normalized RF in Different Schedulers




Fig. 5: Normalized CCT in Different Schedulers

Next, as shown in Fig. 5, we evaluate the performance of our method and different schedulers in terms of minimizing the coflow completion time (CCT). Compared to BvN and Reco-Sin, which schedule single coflow in optical circuit switches (OCS), our method allows for the simultaneous transmission of remaining traffic on packet switches, thereby reducing the total completion time (i.e., CCT). Furthermore, for Solstice (which also schedules coflows in hybrid networks), we integrate the *Regularization* process to decrease reconfiguration frequency, and propose the *Migrating* operation to further minimize the CCT and optimize system performance, thus surpassing Solstice in performance. Solstice requires $1.14\times$, $1.10\times$ and $1.08\times$ more time than our algorithm to schedule the demand matrix with sparse, normal and dense coflows, respectively. Additionally, Reco-Sin requires $1.19\times$, $1.23\times$ and $1.42\times$ more time than our algorithm to schedule the demand matrix with sparse, normal and dense coflows, respectively.

The variation of δ is an important property determined by the hardware of Optical Circuit Switching (OCS), which directly affects the CCT and indirectly changes the reconfiguration frequency. In this case, we utilize the theoretical lower bound of RF and CCT as a normalized benchmark and show the performance of various schedulers. The curves in Fig. 6 demonstrate that our proposed algorithm requires less reconfiguration time (i.e., fewer reconfigurations) to complete the same coflow compared to Reco-Sin and Solstice. A comparative analysis of Fig. 6, 8 and 10 shows that the number of reconfigurations decreases as δ increases for both our method and Reco-Sin. This observation is primarily based on the fact that the *Regularization* operation is directly related to δ . As δ increases, *Regularization* operation causes the elements of the

coflow demand matrix to become more aligned, thus reducing reconfiguration time. Note that *Regularization* operation may not be effective in reducing the number of configurations when the demand matrix is too sparse. Conversely, when δ varies, the number of reconfigurations for Solstice remains relatively constant. In fact, the variation of δ would have no significant impact on the reconfiguration frequency of Solstice.




Fig. 6: Normalized RF in Sparse Density




Fig. 7: Normalized CCT in Sparse Density




Fig. 8: Normalized RF in Normal Density




Fig. 9: Normalized CCT in Normal Density




Fig. 10: Normalized RF in Dense Density




Fig. 11: Normalized CCT in Dense Density

Fig. 7 displays the performance in terms of CCT. A comparative analysis of Fig. 7, 9 and 11 shows that, as the coflow demand matrix shifts from sparse to dense, the advantages of our method become more apparent. This is because as the demand matrix becomes more dense, the required number of configurations also increases. Furthermore, as δ increases, reconfiguration time dominates the total completion time (i.e., CCT). At this point, the advantage of our method becomes more prominent as it yields fewer reconfigurations.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we explore how to schedule single coflows more efficiently in hybrid-switched data center networks (DCNs). We incorporate an existing operation called *Regularization* [17] to handle a demand matrix of coflow, allowing circuits to be reconfigured significantly less frequently. We also introduce a new technique called *Migrating*, which further decreases the CCT and improves system performance. We then develop an efficient coflow scheduling algorithm to minimize the CCT and demonstrate that it achieves a performance guarantee (approximation ratio to the optimal solution) of $O(\tau)$, where τ is a factor related to demand characteristics. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first approximation algorithm for coflow scheduling in a hybrid-switched DCN. Extensive simulations based on real data traces show that our proposed algorithm significantly outperforms the state-of-the-art schemes in terms of reducing the number of reconfigurations and speeding up the transmission of single coflow.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is supported by Macao Polytechnic University Research Grant #CI401/DEI/2022 and Key-Area Research and Development Plan of Guangdong Province #2020B010164003. The corresponding author is Hong Shen.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Dean and S. Ghemawat, "Mapreduce: simplified data processing on large clusters," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 107–113, 2008.
- [2] M. Zaharia, M. Chowdhury, T. Das, A. Dave, J. Ma, M. McCauley, M. J. Franklin, S. Shenker, and I. Stoica, "Resilient distributed datasets: A fault-tolerant abstraction for in-memory cluster computing," in *9th {USENIX} Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation ({NSDI} 12)*, 2012, pp. 15–28.
- [3] M. Isard, M. Buidu, Y. Yu, A. Birrell, and D. Fetterly, "Dryad: distributed data-parallel programs from sequential building blocks," in *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM SIGOPS/EuroSys European Conference on Computer Systems 2007*, 2007, pp. 59–72.
- [4] M. Chowdhury and I. Stoica, "Coflow: A networking abstraction for cluster applications," in *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks*, 2012, pp. 31–36.
- [5] M. Chowdhury, M. Zaharia, J. Ma, M. I. Jordan, and I. Stoica, "Managing data transfers in computer clusters with orchestra," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 98–109, 2011.
- [6] M. Chowdhury, Y. Zhong, and I. Stoica, "Efficient coflow scheduling with varies," in *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM conference on SIGCOMM*, 2014, pp. 443–454.
- [7] F. R. Dogar, T. Karagiannis, H. Ballani, and A. Rowstron, "Decentralized task-aware scheduling for data center networks," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 431–442, 2014.
- [8] Z. Qiu, C. Stein, and Y. Zhong, "Minimizing the total weighted completion time of coflows in datacenter networks," in *Proceedings of the 27th ACM symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures*, 2015, pp. 294–303.
- [9] S. Khuller and M. Purohit, "Brief announcement: Improved approximation algorithms for scheduling co-flows," in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures*, 2016, pp. 239–240.
- [10] M. Shafiee and J. Ghaderi, "An improved bound for minimizing the total weighted completion time of coflows in datacenters," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 1674–1687, 2018.
- [11] H. Susanto, H. Jin, and K. Chen, "Stream: Decentralized opportunistic inter-coflow scheduling for datacenter networks," in *2016 IEEE 24th International Conference on Network Protocols (ICNP)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–10.

- [12] M. Chowdhury and I. Stoica, "Efficient coflow scheduling without prior knowledge," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 393–406, 2015.
- [13] S. Agarwal, S. Rajakrishnan, A. Narayan, R. Agarwal, D. Shmoys, and A. Vahdat, "Sincronia: Near-optimal network design for coflows," in *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication*, 2018, pp. 16–29.
- [14] M. Shafiee and J. Ghaderi, "An improved bound for minimizing the total weighted completion time of coflows in datacenters," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 1674–1687, 2018.
- [15] X. S. Huang, X. S. Sun, and T. E. Ng, "Sunflow: Efficient optical circuit scheduling for coflows," in *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on emerging Networking EXperiments and Technologies*, 2016, pp. 297–311.
- [16] C. Xu, H. Tan, J. Hou, C. Zhang, and X.-Y. Li, "Omco: Online multiple coflow scheduling in optical circuit switch," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [17] H. Tan, C. Zhang, C. Xu, Y. Li, Z. Han, and X.-Y. Li, "Regularization-based coflow scheduling in optical circuit switches," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 1280–1293, 2021.
- [18] N. Farrington, G. Porter, S. Radhakrishnan, H. H. Bazzaz, V. Subramanya, Y. Fainman, G. Papen, and A. Vahdat, "Helios: a hybrid electrical/optical switch architecture for modular data centers," in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2010 Conference*, 2010, pp. 339–350.
- [19] G. Wang, D. G. Andersen, M. Kaminsky, K. Papagiannaki, T. E. Ng, M. Kozuch, and M. Ryan, "c-through: Part-time optics in data centers," in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2010 Conference*, 2010, pp. 327–338.
- [20] H. Liu, M. K. Mukerjee, C. Li, N. Feltman, G. Papen, S. Savage, S. Seshan, G. M. Voelker, D. G. Andersen, M. Kaminsky *et al.*, "Scheduling techniques for hybrid circuit/packet networks," in *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Conference on Emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies*, 2015, pp. 1–13.
- [21] G. Porter, R. Strong, N. Farrington, A. Forencich, P. Chen-Sun, T. Rosing, Y. Fainman, G. Papen, and A. Vahdat, "Integrating microsecond circuit switching into the data center," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 447–458, 2013.
- [22] C.-H. Wang, T. Javidi, and G. Porter, "End-to-end scheduling for all-optical data centers," in *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 406–414.
- [23] G. Birkhoff, "Tres observaciones sobre el algebra lineal," *Univ. Nac. Tucuman, Ser. A*, vol. 5, pp. 147–154, 1946.
- [24] F. Dufossé and B. Uçar, "Notes on birkhoff–von neumann decomposition of doubly stochastic matrices," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 497, pp. 108–115, 2016.
- [25] "Facebooktrace," <https://github.com/coflow/coflow-benchmark>, 2019.