

# SplitSim: Large-Scale Simulations for Evaluating Network Systems Research

Hejing Li

Max Planck Institute for Software  
Systems  
Germany  
hejingli@mpi-sws.org

Praneeth

Balasubramanian  
BITS Pilani  
India

Marvin Meiers

Saarland University  
Germany

Jialin Li

National University of Singapore  
Singapore  
lijl@comp.nus.edu.sg

Antoine Kaufmann

Max Planck Institute for Software  
Systems  
Germany  
antoinek@mpi-sws.org

## ABSTRACT

When physical testbeds are out of reach for evaluating a networked system, we frequently turn to simulation. In today’s datacenter networks, bottlenecks are rarely at the network protocol level, but instead in end-host software or hardware components, thus current protocol-level simulations are inadequate means of evaluation. End-to-end simulations covering these components on the other hand, simply cannot achieve the required scale with feasible simulation performance and computational resources.

In this paper, we address this with SplitSim, a simulation framework for end-to-end evaluation for large-scale network and distributed systems. To this end, SplitSim builds on prior work on modular end-to-end simulations and combines this with key elements to achieve scalability. First, mixed fidelity simulations judiciously reduce detail in simulation of parts of the system where this can be tolerated, while retaining the necessary detail elsewhere. SplitSim then parallelizes bottleneck simulators by decomposing them into multiple parallel but synchronized processes. Next, SplitSim provides a profiler to help users understand simulation performance and where the bottlenecks are, so users can adjust the configuration. Finally SplitSim provides abstractions to make it easy for users to build complex large-scale simulations. Our evaluation demonstrates SplitSim in multiple large-scale case studies.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Research on large-scale network and distributed systems often faces the challenge of complete evaluation in a physical testbed. Most researchers and even many practitioners do not have access to testbeds that are large enough and/or provide the necessary flexibility, control, and hardware. For example, a new data center congestion control algorithm might require

specific configuration parameters at each network switch in the data center, or a distributed system accelerated with in-network processing requires new programmable switches deployed at specific points in the network.

In these cases we typically rely on a patchwork evaluation that combines end-to-end measurements in a small physical testbed with protocol-level simulations for evaluating at scale. However, this methodology compromises accuracy of end-to-end system behaviors at scale. The physical testbed is by necessity too small and protocol-level simulations do not model many system components, from NIC behavior, to host-interconnects, memory hierarchy, and the whole OS and application-level software stack.

We argue that *large-scale end-to-end simulation could bridge this gap*. In this paper, we take a top-down approach, starting from small-scale end-to-end simulations, we tackle the practical and fundamental challenges in scaling up.

We use existing work on modular end-to-end simulation as a starting point. Modular end-to-end simulations in SimBricks [16] combine and connect different best-of-breed simulators for different system components, and through modularity it can flexibly cover a broad range of use-cases. SimBricks scales up by running separate components as parallel processes communicating and synchronizing through efficient shared-memory message passing, and scales out with proxy components that forward messages between simulator instances across hosts. With this combination, SimBricks has been demonstrated to scale to a simulated network of 1000 single-core hosts and NICs running Memcached on Linux. While technically feasible, this simulation of 10 s of application workload required 6–20 h of simulation time, depending on configuration, on 26 machines with 96 vCPUs, for \$600-\$2000 today on ec2.

With SplitSim, we enable large-scale simulations with more reasonable cost-benefit ratios through a combination of four techniques. First, we leverage modularity to implement *mixed fidelity simulations* where some system component instances are simulated in less accurate simulators to drastically reduce CPU resources needed, while key instances remain in accurate simulators. Next, we design generic building blocks for reducing simulation time by *parallelizing bottleneck simulators by decomposing* them into multiple parallel, connected, and synchronized processes. We then introduce *lightweight synchronization and communication profiling* to inform the user about bottlenecks and resource efficiency across component simulator instances. Finally, we provide a *configuration and orchestration framework* for end-to-end simulations that simplifies specifying and running simulations by separating the configuration of the simulated system from concrete simulator instantiation choices.

In our evaluation we demonstrate that SplitSim enables evaluation of large scale systems in networks of up to 1200 hosts, while running complete OS and application stacks for key nodes. SplitSim simulations enable full end-to-end application evaluation in large networks. By combining mixed fidelity simulation with parallelization through decomposition, SplitSim can simulate 20 seconds in less than 4 hours while running on a single machine. The modular approach and flexible configuration and orchestration framework makes SplitSim suitable for a broad range of evaluation use-cases.

We plan to release SplitSim open source after publication. This work does not raise any ethical issues.

## 2 BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

### 2.1 Requirements

We argue that practical simulations for evaluating large scale systems need to satisfy the following requirements:

- **End-to-End:** Obtain full end-to-end measurements with all relevant hardware (switches, topology, NICs, server-internals, etc.) and software (application, OS, library) components.
- **Scalable:** Perform measurements in systems of realistic scale, at least 1000s of hosts.
- **Efficient:** Run simulation within feasible resource limits, in particular processor cycles.
- **Fast:** Keep simulation times manageable.
- **Flexible:** Support simulating a broad range of different system configurations.
- **Easy to Use:** Make it easy for users to configure and run simulations.

### 2.2 Existing Simulators Fall Short

In this section we overview most dominant simulation tools used in network research and explain why these are not

enough to conduct large scale end-to-end system simulation as presented in Table 1. **Discrete Event Simulator:** DES models network behavior by sequentially processing discrete events based on their timestamp. For example a packet sent by an application or transmitted to a channel, offering detailed packet-level traces and the status of the network at the certain timestamp. Established simulators like ns-3 [22] and OMNet++ [11] have garnered extensive features over decades, leading many researchers to rely on DES for evaluating proposed systems. However, due to their sequential processing nature, these simulators encounter performance bottlenecks. It often takes hours or days to simulate mere seconds. Especially when the size of the target system increases or the number of event generated. For instance a network constitute of large number of hosts or simulating a high bandwidth network, making simulating modern data center network with traditional DES particularly difficult.

Efforts spanning decades have aimed to parallelize DES for simulation acceleration [8]. ns-3 [22] supports distributing the network across multiple processes or physical hosts using MPI [19] for component synchronization and communication, enhancing scalability. Nevertheless, the overhead associated with global synchronization and message passing limits potential acceleration. In our experiments, partitioning an ns-3 simulation into 16 processes on 16 processors yielded only a 3.8x acceleration. Clean-slate simulators [9, 24, 27] are designed specifically to improve the parallelism. DONS [9] adopts a redesigned, data-oriented paradigm, optimizing cache utilization and significantly boosting simulation speed. However, they lack the extensive feature set developed over years in the field and can only simulate specific components rather than full end-to-end systems. SplitSim provides essential components for parallelizing existing simulators without requiring intrusive implementation changes, and a common interface to integrate all the component in the end-to-end system.

**Modular Simulator:** Simulators such as SimBrick [16], dist-gem5 [21], pd-gem5 [2], and SST [26] allows users to combine multiple components such as host, hardware device, and network to construct an end-to-end simulation, and run in parallel. The main issue is the simulation speed limited by the bottleneck components. The imbalanced simulation load in each component leads to poor parallel execution. SplitSim presents a framework that automatically profiles each component load and indicates the balanced decomposition.

**AI Powered Estimator:** Recent efforts have delved into emulating networks using deep neural networks to estimate user-relevant metrics such as delay and packet loss. MimicNet [30], for instance, learns performance metrics at a cluster granularity level and generates estimated packet traces.

	End-to-End	Scalability	Fidelity	Engineering Effort
AI Powered	✗	✓	✗	High
Original DES	✗	✗	✓	Low
Paralle DES	✗	✓	✓	Low
Modular Simulator	✓	✗	✓	Low
SplitSim	✓	✓	✓	Low

**Table 1: Overview of network simulators and the characteristic**

DeepQueueNet [29] refines this approach by learning device-level performance metrics, thereby enhancing packet visibility within the cluster. These estimations are derived through inferencing input data, which lends itself well to massive parallelization, enabling rapid results for large-scale networks. However, the deep neural net’s behavior is not easily interpretable, and each to model different network configurations, model has to be reconstructed, incurs significant computing and engineering effort.


### 2.3 Technical Challenges

Large-scale simulations supporting end-to-end evaluation face multiple compounding challenges.

*High resource needs for detailed simulators.* In general, more detailed simulators are slower and less resource efficient compared to less-detailed simulators. To obtain meaningful end-to-end measurements, we generally functionally and timing accurate simulators for all component types in the system, be it processor and memory subsystem, hardware devices such as NICs, and the actual network topology. As a result, end-to-end simulations of large-scale systems are prohibitively expensive.

*Simulations bottlenecked by slowest component.* Modular simulation comprising multiple synchronized components can, by construction, only proceed as fast as the slowest component in the system. Slow bottleneck simulators cause two separate problems. First, overall simulation times will be long for simulations that include even just a single slow simulator component. Second, as typical end-to-end simulation will naturally contain component simulators that simulate with different speeds, this results in faster components wasting a lot of processor cycles waiting for slower simulators.

*Hard to understand simulation performance.* To make matters worse, finding bottlenecks in simulations comprising tens to thousands of communicating and synchronized components is a challenge. Most efficient simulation synchronization mechanisms rely on polling shared memory state for




**Figure 1: SplitSim overview**

efficiency. Thus all components will commonly show 100% CPU utilization, and a regular profiler will indicate lots of time spend in the functions that poll for messages. Based on these indicators it is hard to tell if a simulator is bottlenecked or communicating heavily, especially when also combined with heavy compiler optimization. Blocking will also naturally propagate through dependent system components.

*Complex configuration and execution.* Finally, configuring and running simulations for large-scale end-to-end system is a complex task. Many instances of different simulators for different components need to be configured, connected, and then executed in a coordinated manner. The first problem is the complexity: each simulator has its own mechanism and abstractions for configuring it, and there is a substantial learning curve whenever a user looks to use a new simulator. Second, this is complicated by the fact that any non-trivial evaluation typically will need to simulate multiple different configurations of its system, and often needs to explore different simulators and simulator configurations to identify suitable configurations. Finally, once the user has chosen a system and simulation configuration, all components need to be connected together, started in the correct order respecting dependencies, outputs need to be collected, and finally all simulators need to be cleanly terminated. Even with more than a handful of components a manual approach is prohibitively complex and laborious.

## 3 DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

SplitSim combines four techniques to address these technical challenges. Figure 1 shows an overview. First, SplitSim reduces the resources needed for large scale simulations by



**Figure 2: Changing an end-to-end simulation into a mixed-fidelity simulation by simulating clients at the protocol-level in ns-3 instead using individual host and NIC simulator instances.**

enabling *mixed-fidelity simulations* (3.1), where expensive detailed simulators are replaced with faster, less resource intensive simulations in part of the system, while keeping detailed simulation in other parts. To increase simulation speed and avoid poorly utilized processor cores, SplitSim provides generic building blocks for *parallelizing bottleneck component simulators by decomposing them into parallel processes* (3.2). SplitSim helps users identify bottleneck component simulators and largely idle component simulators with a *cross-simulator synchronization and communication profiler* (3.3). Finally, SplitSim aims to streamline configuring and running a broad range of different system and simulation configurations, with *programming abstractions for configuration and communication*. (3.4).

### 3.1 Mixed-Fidelity Simulations

To reduce the computational resources necessary for large-scale end-to-end simulations, we propose mixed-fidelity simulation. The idea is basically to retain a subset of full detailed end-to-end components for part of the system, while using less resource-intensive simulations for less critical areas of the system.

*Reducing Simulation Detail in non-Critical Components.* The underlying insight is that typically full detail is not required in every component of the system. A common example is running a system as part of a larger network to evaluate the effect of other background traffic, congestion, etc. in the network; here protocol-level simulation of hosts generating this background traffic is completely sufficient. However, where detailed simulation is required and where detail can be sacrificed depends on the system and evaluation

goal. When evaluating peak system throughput for a client-server system, modelling internal client detail is not essential — as long as client requests arrive at the required rate and with the correct protocol or format, the server behavior will be the same. When evaluating end-to-end request latency, on the other hand, client internal behavior is likely to significantly affect measured latency, thus here at least the clients that measure the latency need to be simulated in full detail. For all three of these examples, instead of simulating all hosts end-to-end with detailed architectural simulators, such as qemu or gem5, we can instead simulate a specific subset of them at the protocol level, e.g. in ns-3 or OMNet++ (Figure 2). A similar approach applies to other system components, e.g. instead of running expensive RTL-level simulations for all NICs or Switches for projects that propose new hardware design, a judicious combination of RTL simulations with faster and more efficient lightweight simulation models, drastically reduces cycles needed.

*Enabling Mixed-Fidelity End-to-End Simulations.* At a technical level, SplitSim enables mixed fidelity simulations through modular composition, inherited from SimBricks. Components simulators are connected through fixed message passing interfaces, primarily Ethernet packets and PCI, and individual simulators are thus decoupled from how these messages are generated.

*New Challenges.* However, while mixed fidelity simulations can drastically reduce computational cost for large-scale simulations, configuring and running mixed fidelity simulations gives rise to or exacerbates the other three challenges. First, these simulations often result in heavy bottlenecks for simulation speed, thereby also introducing significant imbalance leading other simulators to waste cycles waiting and leaving cores idle — with most SimBricks simulations we have run, the end-host simulators (qemu or gem5) are the slowest component by a significant margin, however once we move a few hundred or thousand hosts into the ns-3 network, ns-3 slows down the whole simulation by 3–5×. In the following two subsections we discuss how SplitSim enables users to locate (3.3) and mitigate (3.2) such bottlenecks. Finally, configuring mixed-fidelity simulations and exploring different levels of detail in different system components, is particularly complicated and laborious for users. In addition to building host disk images with applications and configurations, and setting up commands for each host to run etc., a mixed fidelity simulation now also requires configuring additional simulators, e.g. ns-3, to also implement similar functionality through their abstractions. SplitSim simplifies this, in part, through the configuration and orchestration framework (3.4).

### 3.2 Parallelizing Through Decomposition

In general, parallelizing simulators is a challenging problem with different approaches for different types of simulators. These are well-studied but at least the few major relevant simulators for end-to-end simulations are either sequential (gem5) or scale poorly (ns-3, OMNeT++) [31]. Moreover, the existing parallelization approaches often require intrusive changes to simulators. In SplitSim we instead propose simpler easy-to-integrate building blocks to parallelize system simulators with modular architectures, such as ns-3, OMNeT++, and gem5.

The key idea in the SplitSim parallelization approach is to decompose these simulators at component boundaries into multiple separate processes.


We then leverage the well-defined module interfaces for connecting and synchronizing the parallel processes with SplitSim adapters that translate these interface into messages on SimBricks channels, the same channels also used to interconnect other SplitSim simulator components. Using the same mechanisms enables re-use and provides SplitSim with visibility into the simulation structure for effective orchestration and also enables use the SplitSim profiler for these newly parallel components.

#### 3.2.1 Building Blocks.

*Base adapter.* We build on SimBricks adapters in gem5, ns-3, and OMNeT, that are all implemented simply within the device abstractions of each simulator, and implement synchronization through the channel, as well as communication. Based on these, we define an abstract SplitSim base adapter for each simulator, that implements initialization and synchronization, but is not specific to a particular SimBricks channel type. This base adapter can then be used to implement multiple specific protocol adapters without needing to re-implement the common functionality. This includes adapters for the existing SimBricks protocols, but also makes it easy to implement adapters for internally connecting and synchronizing pieces of a simulator.

*Trunk adapter.* Many non-trivial partitions will require multiple connections between some pairs of processes. In principle here multiple instances of the SplitSim adapter can be used and this will just work. However, this will unnecessarily incur the synchronization overhead once for each adapter. To address this, SplitSim introduces trunk channels, that multiplex messages for multiple upper layer channels over one synchronized SimBricks channel. The implementation tags messages going across with the sub-channel identifier, for demultiplexing at the receiver.

#### 3.2.2 Examples.



**Figure 3: Parallelizing a sequential multicore architecture simulation by splitting it into parallel processes interconnected with SplitSim adapters.**

*Multi-Core gem5.* Figure 3 demonstrates how we use SplitSim adapters to parallelize multi-core simulations in gem5. Changes to gem5 are limited to 1) implementing the adapters as simulation object in gem5, and serializing the already message-based memory packet interface to messages, and 2) changing the gem5 python configuration script to only instantiate the relevant components for each process.


*Parallel ns-3 and OMNeT++.* We also implemented SplitSim parallelization for the ns-3 and OMNeT++ network simulators. Here we also instantiate different parts of the overall network topology in separate processes, and replace links going across components with SplitSim trunk link adapters. For network simulators we rely on the user to configure the partitioning and create the adapters, either manually or through our configuration framework (3.4).

### 3.3 Lightweight Profiling for Synchronization and Communication

To address the challenges in understanding simulation performance, deciding what to parallelize, consolidate, and generally find bottlenecks, SplitSim includes profiling infrastructure. The SplitSim profiler measures metrics related to SplitSim cross-simulator synchronization and communication in each component simulator. The profiler comprises two components: instrumentation in each simulator, and post-processing to aggregate the collected metrics and present them to the user.

*3.3.1 Lightweight Instrumentation.* SplitSim instruments each adapter, both for communication across simulator components and within the processes of a particular component, with lightweight metric collection and logging. First, each adapter continuously counts the number of 1) *CPU cycles blocked waiting for a synchronization message from the peer to allow the simulation to proceed*, 2) *sending data messages*





**Figure 4: Example of a generated wait-time-profile graph. Here the `net.np0` process is the immediate bottleneck, but `np1-3` are close behind, judging from their waiting numbers.**

to peer simulators, and 3) *processing incoming data messages*. Second, each simulator can be set to periodically, e.g. every 10 s, log the values of these counters for each adapter and the current time stamp counter as well as that simulator’s current simulation time.

**3.3.2 Profiler Post-Processing.** After the simulation terminates, either because it completes or because the user stops it, the profiler post processor ingests and parses these logs. As each simulator logs absolute totals for each value, we calculate the difference between a late entry towards the end and an early entry towards the beginning, dropping a configurable number of warm-up and cool-down lines. Each log entry contains both the simulation time and processor time stamp counter, thereby providing a reference for simulation time and physical system time.

**Metrics calculated.** The post processor first calculates a global metric, *simulation speed*, by dividing the difference in simulation time by the difference in time stamp counter cycles (as all simulators are synchronized, this value is the same for each simulator). For each simulator we also calculate their *efficiency* as the fraction of cycles not spent on receive, transmit, or synchronization in the SplitSim adapter. This metric is useful to determine when diminishing returns for parallelizing SplitSim simulations set in.

**Wait-Time Profile Graph.** The main output for understanding SplitSim simulation performance and for localizing bottlenecks, is the wait-time profile graph (WTPG). The WTPG contains a node for each simulator instance, and a pair of opposite directed edges for each SplitSim channel connecting two simulators. The profiler annotates each edge with

the fraction of cycles that the simulator at the source of the edge has spent waiting for synchronization messages from the destination simulator of the edge. As such, the graph visualizes “who waits for who”. Additionally, the profiler annotates each node with the total number of cycles that node spends waiting across simulators. Based on this value, we also color nodes on a spectrum from green to red, with red for nodes that spend few cycles waiting for other nodes, and green for nodes that spend many cycles waiting for other nodes. Typically, nodes that spend little time waiting, are the bottleneck simulators and will stand out in red. If in doubt, the edge labels allow users to confirm that their neighbors spend significant cycles waiting on them. Figure 4 shows an example of a WTPG for a SplitSim simulation.

### 3.4 Configuration and Orchestration

Finally, we are left with addressing the complexity of configuring and running a broad range of large-scale simulations. SplitSim addresses this with an orchestration framework. The orchestration framework aims to reduce the user configuration complexity by providing natural abstractions for separately specifying the configuration of the simulated system from the implementation choices for how to simulate the system. Finally SplitSim will apply the specified implementation choices and coordinate the execution of the simulation, including starting up each component simulator, connecting them up, collecting outputs, and, eventually, clean up after termination.

Crucially, with the SplitSim configuration abstractions, users can solve many simulation configuration tasks fully within SplitSim, without resorting to manually configuring specific simulators through their specific configuration mechanism. For such tasks, SplitSim abstractions also provide a level of portability, in fully separating system configurations from concrete simulator choices. At the same time, the SplitSim orchestration framework can easily be bypassed where necessary and users can resort to manually configuring specific simulators. The SplitSim orchestration aims to make easy tasks easy, and complex tasks possible.

**3.4.1 System Configuration Abstraction.** The goal for the SplitSim system configuration abstraction is to specify the *configuration of the simulated system* separate from concrete choices of how to simulate it. We represent the system configuration as a hierarchy of Python objects. At the root we have the `SystemConfiguration` object, that contains a list of all system components. A system component can be a host, a NIC, a switch, or a PCI or Ethernet link. Each component object carries the expected attributes. For example, a host object may specify the number of cores, memory, disk image, applications to run, IP address, etc. A link object specifies latency and bandwidth, along with its two endpoints. The

key design consideration for these abstraction is to specify system characteristics while abstracting simulation details.

Since we use Python for defining SplitSim system configurations, users can use all python language features for assembling this configuration, in particular relying on loops for instantiating repeated patterns or using functions and modules for factoring out re-usable configuration parts. For example, for the experiments in this paper we use the same parametrizable large-scale network topology across multiple of our experiments and have defined this in a common function across experiments.

**3.4.2 Implementation Choices.** After a user has assembled a system configuration in the simulation Python script, the second step is to generate one or more different concrete simulation instantiations. Users instantiate a SplitSim simulation by choosing specific simulators and translating the system configuration for the corresponding system components into configurations for these concrete simulators. We specify the resulting instantiated simulation using the existing SimBricks abstractions for describing interconnected instances of component simulators.

In general, there are many different instantiation strategies. Instead of trying to automate this inherently complex step with a one-size-fits-all approach, SplitSim instead opts for an extensible and flexible approach by merely providing library routines for common instantiation strategies. For example, one strategy we commonly use is to instantiate all hosts as separate processes for a specified host simulator, gemu or gem5, all NICs of a particular type, and simulate the whole network topology in one ns-3 process. A generalized version of this strategy instead first applies a partition function provided as a parameter to divvy up the network topology components into different partitions to run in separate ns-3 processes. For the network topology above, we have implemented a couple of different partition strategy functions that we use across the experiments in this paper.

As instantiated simulation configurations is just a regular SimBricks configuration, comprising SimBricks orchestration python objects, SplitSim users can manually modify this configuration afterwards when the need arises.

**3.4.3 Running Simulations.** Finally, to actually run SplitSim simulations, we leverage the existing SimBricks orchestration framework runtime. Since the instantiation above produces a SimBricks configuration as its output, this can directly be passed through for execution.

## 4 EVALUATION

In our evaluation we aim to answer the following questions:

- Does SplitSim enable *end-to-end* evaluation of networked systems that are hard to evaluate in physical testbeds?
- What are the resource savings from mixed-fidelity simulations?
- How much accuracy do mixed-fidelity simulations sacrifice compared to full end-to-end simulations?
- How effective is SplitSim parallelization at removing simulation bottlenecks? Is it competitive with native parallelization approaches in specific simulators?
- Is simulation speed for different parallelization strategies hard to predict and understand? Does the SplitSim profiler help?
- What user-effort is required to configure and run SplitSim simulations?


### 4.1 Methodology

Our measurements are performed on machines with double Intel Xeon Gold 6336Y CPUs for a total of 48 physical cores and 256GB RAM. For resource efficiency, we opt for the smallest simulations that substantiate each evaluation point. While SplitSim supports SimBricks proxies for distributed simulations and inherits their demonstrated scalability, by relying on mixed fidelity simulations for our evaluation we have not found the need to scale out to multiple machines.

Unless otherwise mentioned, we use the following simulation parameters. We configure up single-core hosts and gemu with instruction counting for time synchronization. Simulated hosts are configured with 4 GHz clock frequency and 1 GB of memory. For NICs we use the SimBricks i40e\_bm simulator for the Intel X710 NIC.

### 4.2 Case-Study: In-Network Processing

We start off with a case study on evaluating NetCache [12] and Pegasus [17], two distributed storage systems with in-network support. NetCache caches key-value items in programmable switches but directs writes to a single responsible replica. Pegasus instead load-balances all requests to servers but uses the switches as an in-network coherence directory to enable load-balancing writes to multiple hosts. For this, we implement the switch functionality for both systems in ns-3. In all configurations we simulate two servers and three clients connected to a single switch, and configure the client with a skewed zipf 1.8 key distribution and 70% write workload. For the protocol-level simulation, we implement both the client and server as ns-3 applications, while the mixed-fidelity simulation only uses the former. The end-to-end and mixed-fidelity simulations use the unmodified client and server Linux applications from the project repositories.




**Figure 5: Comparing NetCache and Pegasus throughput, with different simulation configurations.**

*Need for End-to-End Simulation.* First, we compare results from protocol-level ns-3 simulation to a full end-to-end simulation and a mixed-fidelity simulation. We configure all clients with the same offered load. We start by measuring system throughput, and report results in the first two groups of bars in Figure 5. This comparison shows opposite trends, the protocol-level ns-3 simulation shows NetCache outperforming Pegasus by 33%, while the end-to-end simulation shows 47% higher throughput for Pegasus. Inspection of simulation logs shows that this is because the end-to-end system is bottlenecked by server software process, which ns-3 does not model. This also shows up in latency measurements for this workload, even under saturation the request latency in ns-3 comes out to 7–8 $\mu$ s, while the end-to-end simulation measures 590–704 $\mu$ s. This demonstrates the need for end-to-end measurements.

*Benefit of Mixed-Fidelity Simulation.* However, the end-to-end simulation uses 11 cores (1 host simulator and 1 NIC simulator per server, plus ns-3 instance for network), while the protocol-level simulation only needs one core. On top of this, the end-to-end simulation also needs these cores for a complete simulation time of 1160 s, while the protocol-level simulation only needs the core for 170 s.

Given that this setup saturates the servers and measuring system throughput, we primarily need detailed simulation behavior for the servers, while client internals do not affect end-to-end performance significantly. Thus, we configure a mixed-fidelity simulation that only simulates servers with separate host and NIC simulators, while simulating clients in ns-3. As a result, this configuration needs 54% fewer cores, with 5 total, 2 host simulators and NICs for the servers plus one core for ns-3, and has a 17% lower simulation time. The rightmost group of bars in Figure 5 shows similar throughput for the mixed-fidelity simulation.

*Latency in Mixed-Fidelity Simulation.* When it comes to measuring latency, the situation is less clear cut, here client



**Figure 6: Pegasus latency CDFs for ns3 client and qemu client in two different mixed-fidelity simulations, one saturating the servers, and one with low request load.**

behavior may or may not be a significant factor. We demonstrate this in a mixed fidelity simulation that replaces one ns-3 clients above with a QEMU host and NIC simulator, and measure latencies from the ns-3 clients as well as the qemu client. We compare two different client workloads, first the one above that saturates the servers, and then a low-throughput workload that does not saturate the servers.


Figure 6 shows latency CDFs for both workloads. In Figure 6a we see that under saturation, when latencies are in the milliseconds, both ns-3 and qemu clients measure the same latency distribution, as the client contribution here is negligible. For the low-throughput workload in Figure 6b latencies are significantly lower, leading ns-3 and qemu clients to measure significantly different latency distributions.

### 4.3 Case-Study: Clock Synchronization

In our second case study, we aim to compare NTP vs PTP host clock synchronization accuracy and its effect on application performance for distributed systems that rely on clock-bounds for consistency [7, 23] in large-scale networks. We use a modified version of CockroachDB [18] that uses the dynamic clock bound from the Chrony NTP server [5] for its commit-wait period, used in prior work [10]. We configure the following end-to-end host machines: 2 CockroachDB replica servers, 4 CockroachDB clients running the social workload, and a single clock server, either NTP server or PTP grand master. Clients and server run Chrony, for PTP alongside ptp41. For the NTP configuration, we configure Chrony to synchronize to the NTP server. For the PTP configuration, we configure Chrony to use the local NIC’s PTP hardware clock (PHC) as a reference clock.

We integrate these machines into a large-scale network topology comprising 1200 hosts total, 7 qemu hosts, and 1193 background hosts simulated in NS3. The background






**Figure 7: DCTCP congestion control behavior with different marking threshold, evaluated in ns-3, a mixed-fidelity, and end-to-end simulations.**

hosts are randomized pairs of hosts performing bulk transfers. The network topology is organized as a single core switch, connected through 100 Gbps links to 4 aggregation switches, that each connect to 6 racks with a ToR and 40 machines. We extended ns-3 with a switch that implements a PTP transparent clock (TC).

In the simulation, we measure the clock accuracy bound that Chrony reports on the servers. As expected, we see that PTP, with its NIC hardware timestamping and transparent clocks in switches, improves the clock bound from 11  $\mu$ s with NTP, to 943 ns with PTP. Note that this includes a full end-to-end simulation of the PTP synchronization, with ptp4l running on Linux, using the NIC hardware receive and transmit timestamping, as well as the transparent clock switch support adding corrections for queue residence time. As reported by prior work [10, 23], this improved clock bound improves application request throughput and latency for the application relying on commit-wait to ensure consistency. We measure a 38% throughput improvement for write operations, and a 15% reduction in latency for writes. This simulation simulates 20s in 175 min and 227 min for NTP and PTP respectively.

#### 4.4 Case-Study: Congestion Control

In a final case study, we evaluate the suitability of mixed-fidelity simulations for evaluating congestion control implementations. As network bandwidths have increased and latencies decreased, host-internal behavior, such as processing time variation or other bottlenecks, increasingly affect congestion control behavior [1, 14, 20]. None of these behaviors are modelled by the common protocol-level simulations for congestion control algorithms, reducing the ability of these simulation results to predict real system behavior. Prior work [16] has demonstrated that end-to-end simulation can improve validity of the results. But as congestion control schemes, especially for data centers, typically need



**Figure 8: Simulation time for SplitSim-parallelized multi-core gem5 compared to sequential gem5.**

to be evaluated at scale, the resulting simulation resource requirements are prohibitive.


To address this, we now evaluate whether mixed-fidelity simulations can provide sufficiently accurate results relative to full end-to-end simulations. To that end, we simulate a common typical dumbbell topology with a 10G bottleneck link and two hosts on each side, performing a bulk transfer across the bottleneck link. We use dctp [3] congestion control, and evaluate the effect of different marking threshold parameter values on throughput. We compare three cases: 1) protocol-level simulation in ns-3, 2) mixed-fidelity simulation with one pair of gem5 hosts, and one pair of ns-3 hosts, and 3) full end-to-end setup with all 4 gem5 hosts. autoreffig:hybrid-dctp-dumbbell shows that the mixed-fidelity simulation behavior closely matches the end-to-end simulation, while protocol-level simulation is far off.

#### 4.5 Parallelizing Simulators with SplitSim

Next, we evaluate our SplitSim simulator parallelization approach relying on decomposition and SimBricks synchronization and communication. First, for parallelizing the sequential gem5 simulator, and then we compare SplitSim parallelization to native parallelization mechanisms in ns-3 and OMNeT++.

##### 4.5.1 Parallelizing Sequential gem5 Multi-Core Simulations.

The gem5 [4] architectural simulator is sequential. As a consequence, when simulating a multi-core machine, simulation time increases at least linearly with the number of simulated cores. Simulating larger multi-core hosts is prohibitively slow. At the same time, gem5 takes a similarly modular configuration approach based on standard component interfaces, similar to network simulators such as ns-3 or OMNeT++. Specifically, gem5 components, such as processor cores, caches, memories, or devices, connect through ports that communicate through packetized memory requests.



**Figure 9: Comparing SplitSim parallelization to native parallelization in omnet and ns-3.**


We leverage this and implement a SplitSim adapter for this interface, that forwards these messages across a SimBricks channel to a different process. This required roughly 1000 LoC of code to be added to gem5, without intrusive changes required. We then create separate gem5 configurations to simulate each processor core in parallel as a separate process, connected together through SplitSim channels. We validate through detailed simulator logs with timestamps that the parallelized multi-core simulation behaves as the original sequential simulation. Figure 8 shows drastically reduced simulation time of the parallelized simulation compared to sequential gem5. For 8 cores, we see about a 5 $\times$  speedup. The parallelized gem5 also scales well, with simulation time only increasing by a factor of 2 from 8 cores to simulating 44 cores.

**4.5.2 SplitSim vs. native parallelization in ns-3 and OMNeT++.** Next, we compare SplitSim parallelization for the ns-3 and OMNeT++ to their native MPI-based parallelization schemes. For this we leverage the SimBricks network adapters already implemented in these simulators for connecting to NIC simulators. We use the FatTree8 network configuration from DONS [9], comprising 128 simulated servers. We then evenly partition this topology into 1, 2, 16, and 32, components, once with the native synchronization mechanism and once with SplitSim. Figure 9 shows that SplitSim outperforms both ns-3 and OMNeT++ synchronization, resulting in up to 57% lower simulation times. Despite the lightweight integration into simulators, SplitSim vastly outperforms native parallelization for both simulators.

## 4.6 SplitSim Profiler

We now demonstrate the challenges in predicting simulation performance a priori, and demonstrate using the SplitSim profiler to find simulation bottlenecks.


Part.	Description
s	Whole network as one process.
ac	One process per aggregation block, plus one for the core switch.
crN	Aggregate N racks into a process, plus one for the aggregation and core switches.
rs	One process per rack, one process each per aggregation and core switch.



**Figure 10: Simulation speeds for different network partitioning strategies with qemu and gem5 hosts.**

*Complexity in Predicting Simulation Performance.* We first explore different partitioning strategies for the 1200 node network topology with background traffic from §4.3. Here we connect a pair of qemu or gem5 hosts with two Intel x710 NICs. Figure 10 shows the partitioning strategies along with their achieved simulation speeds and cores used for the whole simulation (including 4 cores for hosts and NICs). The results show that different partitioning strategies achieve significantly different simulation speeds across strategies but also with qemu compared to gem5, in some cases even with identical number of cores. Additionally, the results show that past a point adding more cores results in lower simulation speeds again.

*Profiling to Locate Bottlenecks.* Next we pick the *ac* and *cr3* partitioning strategies and examine their SplitSim profile graphs in Figure 11. Here, we run the simulations for 5 min for the most reliable results, but we found typically even 60-90 s is sufficient to record the profile to inform partitioning decisions. Profiling and post-processing to generate the graphs are fully automatic, and simply require adding the flag to enable profiling when running SplitSim, and then running the post-processing script. For compactness and readability, we simplify the graph here to only show the node color representing the fraction of cycles each simulator spends waiting for messages in the SplitSim adapters.



**Figure 11: SplitSim profile graphs for two partition strategies in Figure 10 with qemu hosts.**

High waiting cycles, shown in green, imply the simulator is not computation bound and thus not the bottleneck, while few waiting cycles, shown in red, imply a bottleneck. Figure 11a shows that for the coarse-grain ac, primary bottlenecks are the ns-3 instances with the 6 racks, rather than the ns-3 instance with the core, or the qemu or NIC instances. Thus, as expected, a much more fine-grain partition of the network into 15 processes with cr3, Figure 11b shows that here the bottleneck are starting to shift towards the two qemu instances.

#### 4.7 SplitSim Config and Orchestration

Finally, we demonstrate the flexibility and ease of use of SplitSim, by comparing the necessary effort for configuring and running some of the simulations used in our evaluation.

*SplitSim Simulations are Easy to Configure.* Even complex simulation configurations are relatively easy to configure in SplitSim. For example, the configuration for running all the clock synchronization simulations in §4.3 comprises 252 lines of Python, 195 of which are responsible for generating configuration files and commands to run for Chrony, ptp4l, and CockroachDB. The other simulation configurations in this evaluation section are more compact. Other than the initial extension to ns-3 for PTP transparent clocks in switches, no changes outside of the python configuration are required for configuring these simulations.

*Re-use of Configuration through Python.* SplitSim configurations are just Python scripts; ordinary language features such as loops, functions, and modules, can be used as meta-programming for generating configurations. We commonly

use loops to generate different structurally similar, configurations. We also abstract out common building blocks into reusable python modules. For example, the large (parametrized) background network topology used in multiple experiments is defined in a separate python module of 195 lines and is imported and used for multiple of our simulations.

*Running Simulations is Fully Automatic.* After writing a SplitSim simulation configuration, execution, is fully automatic. The SplitSim orchestration framework starts processes, wires up channels between different simulator instances, collects output, and cleanly terminates simulations.

## 5 RELATED WORK

**Discrete Event Simulator:** Discrete Event Simulators (DES) stand as the cornerstone in network systems research. [15, 25, 28]. While existing DES excel in capturing network behavior intricacies at the packet level, their sequential nature impedes scalability as simulation time fails to align with the target system’s size. Various attempts have been made to address these scalability challenges by introducing parallelism tailored to each simulator’s design. For example ns-3 [25] supports parallel simulations by distributing networks among multiple processes communicating via MPI, [19], while gem5 [4] supports concurrent execution through multiple event queues. DONS [9] builds a clean state parallel network simulator that features Data-Oriented Design. SplitSim is a generic framework providing building blocks to parallelize multiple existing simulators, and ensures efficient communication between each parallel component. At the same time, SplitSim enables end-to-end performance simulation by integrating host simulation, helps users to delve deeper into specific investigation points.

**Modular Simulator:** SimBricks [16] introduces modular full system simulation capabilities with efficient parallelization, however, its performance is constrained by the slowest component simulator. SplitSim seeks to address this bottleneck by implementing additional parallelization within each standalone simulator. pd-gem5 [2] and dist-gem5 [21] establish full networked systems simulation by combining multiple gem5 instances in parallel and synchronizing them through global barriers. SplitSim integrates various simulator types and provides a convenient orchestration framework for configuring and launching large-scale simulations. The Structural Simulation Toolkit(SST) [26] presents a modular simulator enabling users to integrate components through a common interface and execute them in parallel using MPI. Unlike SplitSim, SST lacks the capability to profile each component, identify bottlenecks, and conduct further decomposition.

**Network Performance Estimator:** Theoretical models [6, 32] serve as valuable tools for describing network

states and estimating key metrics such as throughput and latency. While they are helpful in scenarios where network behavior can be precisely articulated through equations, they lack the packet-level visibility offered by DES. Recently researchers have turned to AI-powered estimators as an alternative to traditional theoretical models [13, 29, 30]. Unlike SplitSim these estimators can not provide an end-to-end application performance and requires re-learning the model for new network configurations.

## 6 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have introduced SplitSim, a system and methodology for enabling end-to-end evaluation for large scale systems in simulation for when physical testbeds are out of reach. SplitSim uses mixed fidelity simulation to reduce resource requirements, parallelizes component simulators through decomposition to mitigate bottlenecks and increase simulation speed, streamlines configuring and profiling such simulations. In our evaluation we have shown SplitSim can simulate multiple hosts with full OS and application software stacks, NICs, as part of a large scale network of 1200 hosts, run this simulation on a single physical machine, and complete a 20s simulation run in under four hours. Finally, SplitSim drastically runs the barrier of entry for such simulations, by enabling users to configure such simulations comprising multiple different simulators etc. without needing expertise for how to configure each and every simulator.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Saksham Agarwal, Rachit Agarwal, Behnam Montazeri, Masoud Moshref, Khaled Elmeleegy, Luigi Rizzo, Marc Asher de Kruijff, Gautam Kumar, Sylvia Ratnasamy, David Culler, and Amin Vahdat. Understanding host interconnect congestion. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks, HotNets*, 2022.
- [2] Mohammad Alian, Daehoon Kim, and Nam Sung Kim. Pd-Gem5: Simulation infrastructure for parallel/distributed computer systems. *IEEE Computer Architecture Letters*, 15(1):41–44, January 2016.
- [3] Mohammad Alizadeh, Albert Greenberg, David A. Maltz, Jitendra Padhye, Parveen Patel, Balaji Prabhakar, Sudipta Sengupta, and Murari Sridharan. Data center TCP (DCTCP). In *2010 ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Data Communication, SIGCOMM*, 2010.
- [4] Nathan Binkert, Bradford Beckmann, Gabriel Black, Steven K. Reinhardt, Ali Saidi, Arkaprava Basu, Joel Hestness, Derek R. Hower, Tushar Krishna, Somayeh Sardashti, Rathijit Sen, Korey Sewell, Muhammad Shoaib, Nilay Vaish, Mark D. Hill, and David A. Wood. The Gem5 simulator. *SIGARCH Computer Architecture News*, 39(2):1–7, August 2011.
- [5] chrony project. <https://chrony-project.org/>.
- [6] Florin Ciucu and Jens Schmitt. Perspectives on network calculus: no free lunch, but still good value. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, 42(4):311–322, aug 2012.
- [7] James C. Corbett, Jeffrey Dean, Michael Epstein, Andrew Fikes, Christopher Frost, J. J. Furman, Sanjay Ghemawat, Andrey Gubarev, Christopher Heiser, Peter Hochschild, Wilson Hsieh, Sebastian Kanthak, Eugene Kogan, Hongyi Li, Alexander Lloyd, Sergey Melnik, David Mwaura, David Nagle, Sean Quinlan, Rajesh Rao, Lindsay Rolig, Yasushi Saito, Michal Szymaniak, Christopher Taylor, Ruth Wang, and Dale Woodford. Spanner: Google’s globally distributed database. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, 31(3), aug 2013.
- [8] Richard M. Fujimoto. Parallel discrete event simulation. *Commun. ACM*, 33(10):30–53, oct 1990.
- [9] Kaihui Gao, Li Chen, Dan Li, Vincent Liu, Xizheng Wang, Ran Zhang, and Lu Lu. Dons: Fast and affordable discrete event network simulation with automatic parallelization. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2023 Conference*, pages 167–181, 2023.
- [10] Jacob Gunnarsson and Fabian Lindfors. Utilizing highly synchronized clocks in distributed databases. Master’s thesis, Lund University, 2022.
- [11] INET Authors. INET framework. <https://inet.omnetpp.org/>, 2022. Retrieved Feb 2, 2022.
- [12] Xin Jin, Xiaozhou Li, Haoyu Zhang, Robert Soulé, Jeongkeun Lee, Nate Foster, Changhoon Kim, and Ion Stoica. NetCache: Balancing key-value stores with fast in-network caching. In *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP*, 2017.
- [13] Charles W. Kazer, João Sedoc, Kelvin K.W. Ng, Vincent Liu, and Lyle H. Ungar. Fast network simulation through approximation or: How blind men can describe elephants. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks, HotNets ’18*, pages 141–147, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [14] Gautam Kumar, Nandita Dukkkipati, Keon Jang, Hassan M. G. Wassel, Xian Wu, Behnam Montazeri, Yaogong Wang, Kevin Springborn, Christopher Alfeld, Michael Ryan, David Wetherall, and Amin Vahdat. Swift: Delay is simple and effective for congestion control in the data-center. In *2020 ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Data Communication, SIGCOMM*, 2020.
- [15] Bob Lantz, Brandon Heller, and Nick McKeown. A network in a laptop: Rapid prototyping for software-defined networks. In *10th ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks, HotNets*, 2010.
- [16] Hejing Li, Jialin Li, and Antoine Kaufmann. SimBricks: End-to-end network system evaluation with modular simulation. In *2022 ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Data Communication, SIGCOMM*, 2022.
- [17] Jialin Li, Jacob Nelson, Ellis Michael, Xin Jin, and Dan R. K. Ports. Pegasus: Tolerating skewed workloads in distributed storage with In-Network coherence directories. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI*, November 2020.
- [18] Fabian Lindfors and Jacob Gunnarsson. Github fabianlindfors/cockroach. <https://github.com/fabianlindfors/cockroach/>.
- [19] Message Passing Interface Forum. MPI: A message-passing interface standard. <https://www.mpi-forum.org/docs/>, June 2015. Version 3.1.
- [20] Radhika Mittal, Vinh The Lam, Nandita Dukkkipati, Emily Blem, Hassan Wassel, Monia Ghobadi, Amin Vahdat, Yaogong Wang, David Wetherall, and David Zats. TIMELY: RTT-based congestion control for the datacenter. In *2015 ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Data Communication, SIGCOMM*, 2015.
- [21] Alian Mohammad, Umur Darbaz, Gabor Dozsa, Stephan Diestelhorst, Daehoon Kim, and Nam Sung Kim. dist-gem5: Distributed simulation of computer clusters. In *2017 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software, ISPASS*, 2017.
- [22] nsnam. ns-3 | a discrete-event network simulator for internet systems. <https://www.nsnam.org/>, 2022. Retrieved Feb 2, 2022.
- [23] Oleg Obleshkov and Ahmad Byagowi. How precision time protocol is being deployed at Meta. <https://engineering.fb.com/2022/11/21/production-engineering/precision-time-protocol-at-meta/>, 2022.
- [24] Steven K. Reinhardt, Mark D. Hill, James R. Larus, Alvin R. Lebeck, James C. Lewis, and David A. Wood. The wisconsin wind tunnel: virtual prototyping of parallel computers. *SIGMETRICS Perform. Eval. Rev.*, 21(1):48–60, jun 1993.
- [25] George F Riley and Thomas R Henderson. The ns-3 network simulator. In *Modeling and tools for network simulation*, pages 15–34. Springer,

- 2010.
- [26] A. F. Rodrigues, K. S. Hemmert, B. W. Barrett, C. Kersey, R. Oldfield, M. Weston, R. Risen, J. Cook, P. Rosenfeld, E. Cooper-Balis, and B. Jacob. The structural simulation toolkit. *ACM SIGMETRICS Performance Evaluation Review*, 38(4):37–42, March 2011.
- [27] Daniel Sanchez and Christos Kozyrakis. Zsim: Fast and accurate microarchitectural simulation of thousand-core systems. *ACM SIGARCH Computer architecture news*, 41(3):475–486, 2013.
- [28] András Varga and Rudolf Hornig. An overview of the omnet++ simulation environment. In *1st International ICST Conference on Simulation Tools and Techniques for Communications, Networks and Systems*, 2010.
- [29] Qingqing Yang, Xi Peng, Li Chen, Libin Liu, Jingze Zhang, Hong Xu, Baochun Li, and Gong Zhang. Deepqueuet: Towards scalable and generalized network performance estimation with packet-level visibility. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2022 Conference*, pages 441–457, 2022.
- [30] Qizhen Zhang, Kelvin K. W. Ng, Charles Kazer, Shen Yan, João Sedoc, and Vincent Liu. Mimicnet: Fast performance estimates for data center networks with machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGCOMM 2021 Conference*, SIGCOMM '21, pages 287–304, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [31] Qizhen Zhang, Kelvin K. W. Ng, Charles Kazer, Shen Yan, João Sedoc, and Vincent Liu. MimicNet: fast performance estimates for data center networks with machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGCOMM 2021 Conference*, SIGCOMM, 2021.
- [32] Kevin Zhao, Prateesh Goyal, Mohammad Alizadeh, and Thomas E Anderson. Scalable tail latency estimation for data center networks. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23)*, pages 685–702, 2023.