

ForestColl: Efficient Collective Communications on Heterogeneous Network Fabrics

Liangyu Zhao*
University of Washington

Saeed Maleki
Microsoft Research

Ziyue Yang
Microsoft Research

Hossein Poureza
Microsoft

Aashaka Shah
Microsoft Research

Changho Hwang
Microsoft Research

Arvind Krishnamurthy
University of Washington

Abstract

As modern DNN models grow ever larger, collective communications between the accelerators (allreduce, etc.) emerge as a significant performance bottleneck. Designing efficient communication schedules is challenging given today’s highly diverse and heterogeneous network fabrics. In this paper, we present ForestColl, a tool that generates efficient schedules for any network topology. ForestColl constructs broadcast/aggregation spanning trees as the communication schedule, achieving theoretically minimum network congestion. Its schedule generation runs in strongly polynomial time and is highly scalable. ForestColl supports any network fabrics, including both switching fabrics and direct connections, as well as any network graph structure. We evaluated ForestColl on multi-cluster AMD MI250 and NVIDIA A100 platforms. ForestColl’s schedules achieved up to 52% higher performance compared to the vendors’ own optimized communication libraries, RCCL and NCCL. ForestColl also outperforms other state-of-the-art schedule generation techniques with both up to 61% more efficient generated schedules and orders of magnitude faster schedule generation speed.

1 Introduction

Collective communication involves concurrent aggregation and distribution of data among a group of nodes. Originally used in high-performance computing (HPC) for large-scale parallel computation [14, 29, 35], it has now become an indispensable part of distributed machine learning (ML) [18, 31, 33]. With the explosive growth in model size, especially in large language models (LLMs) [20, 24, 25], both ML training [28, 33, 41] and serving [9, 26] today involve distributing the model and data among a group of nodes for parallel computation. Collective communication is crucial for these nodes to synchronize gradients and activations, and has become a performance bottleneck [26, 33, 37, 38, 41]. As a result, today’s ML hardware providers have focused significantly on

speeding up inter-node communication, delivering interconnects with hundreds of GB/s [1, 2, 22].

A key observation is that *today’s ML network topologies are highly diverse and heterogeneous*. First of all, a network may be based on switching fabrics, direct connections between accelerator nodes, or a combination of both. For example, NVIDIA DGX A100 system [2] packages 8 GPUs as one cluster and uses NVSwitch and IB switch to handle intra-cluster and inter-cluster GPU communications; Google’s TPU v4 [22] directly connects TPUs with optical/electrical links without going through any switching fabric¹; AMD MI250 platform [1] is a hybrid of direct intra-cluster connections and inter-cluster IB switches. Secondly, the bandwidths of different network components can exhibit order-of-magnitude heterogeneity. In DGX A100, the intra-cluster NVSwitch can offer 300GB/s GPU-to-GPU bandwidth, while the inter-cluster IB network can only support 25GB/s per GPU [7]. Finally, the graph structures of networks can also vary drastically. Switch networks may be structured as fat-tree [8] or dragonfly [23], while non-switch networks can be connected as torus, Kautz, or any other graph, for example.

Given the diversity and heterogeneity, existing collectives that assume a simple flat or hierarchical and homogeneous network are ill-suited for ML networks. Although these algorithms may exhibit good latency performance at small data sizes, where performance is not bottlenecked by link bandwidth, at intermediate to large data sizes, the mismatch between assumed and actual topologies leads to network imbalance and congestion. For instance, ring allreduce [18] assumes a flat network where each node communicates with the next node in the ring at equal bandwidth. When applied to clustered networks, however, ring allreduce is bottlenecked by the slower inter-cluster bandwidth and underutilizes intra-cluster bandwidth. Further, existing algorithms (e.g., ring, recursive halving/doubling, Bruck algorithm, Blue-Connect) [15, 27] assume communicating with a single peer

*The work was partially done during an internship at Microsoft Research.

¹The optical circuit switch in TPU v4 is not considered a switching fabric. It configures direct-connect circuits instead of doing packet-level switching.

can saturate a node’s bandwidth. Yet, today’s ML networks often feature multi-ported nodes with multiple communication links that these algorithms cannot fully exploit.

To address this issue, we need to design collective algorithms tailored for today’s ML network topologies. We pose the following research question: *Given network topologies having heterogeneous link bandwidths, employing an arbitrary graph structure, and may or may not be using switching fabric, how do we derive efficient collective communication schedules?*

There are several challenges that need to be overcome in developing such a method. First, traditional traffic engineering approaches like multi-commodity flow are optimizing network congestion for point-to-point traffic patterns, not the aggregation and multicast traffic in collective communications. Second, unlike optimizing point-to-point flow, where maintaining a flow conservation constraint (i.e., ensuring an equal total amount of flow entering and exiting any node) is sufficient, optimizing aggregation and multicast traffic requires deciding the exact data transmitted and its data dependency. This often results in NP-hard optimization problems. Third, switching fabric, in particular, introduces significant heterogeneity into mathematical modeling, because unlike accelerator nodes, switch nodes do not provide/consume data and is often unable to aggregate/multicast.

Our work, ForestColl, addresses these challenges by developing an algorithm that generates a *forest* of spanning trees for data aggregation and broadcast on any topology. The forest of trees, as the name suggests, features one or more trees rooted at every node. We make the following contributions:

- (i) The forest of spanning trees achieves theoretically optimal network congestion as communication schedules for reduce-scatter, allgather, and allreduce.
- (ii) ForestColl accommodates switch-based topologies by deriving equivalent switch-free logical topologies, ensuring there is no compromise in performance.
- (iii) To achieve optimality, we develop a mathematical method to derive the theoretically optimal collective communication performance on any network topology.
- (iv) Every part of ForestColl runs in strongly polynomial time, enabling it to scale to large network topologies.

We evaluated ForestColl on two popular ML platforms: a 2-cluster 32-GPU AMD MI250 testbed and a 2-cluster 16-GPU NVIDIA A100 testbed. On the AMD hardware, ForestColl achieved up to 61% and 36% higher communication performance than state-of-the-art schedule generation techniques, TACCL [32] and Blink [36]. It also outperformed AMD’s own collective communication library, RCCL [6], by up to 37% in average performance. On the A100 testbed, ForestColl’s schedules also outperformed NVIDIA’s own library, NCCL [4], by up to 52%. Furthermore, ForestColl synthesizes

	SCCL	TACCL	BFB	Blink	ForestColl
Switch-based Network	×	✓	×	×	✓
Optimal Schedule	✓	×	×	×	✓
Scalable Runtime	×	×	✓	✓	✓

Table 1: Comparison of schedule generation methods.

schedules orders of magnitude faster than its counterparts and is scalable to large network topologies with thousands of GPUs without compromising schedule performance.

2 Background & Related Work

Desired Qualities of Schedule Generation: To generate collective communication schedules for network topologies, several key qualities should be considered. First of all, the schedule generation should support heterogeneous network fabrics. While most methods have no problem supporting topologies with pure direct connections between nodes, the heterogeneity of switching fabrics poses a significant challenge. Secondly, the generated schedules should provide a performance guarantee, ideally achieving optimality within a reasonable cost model. Lastly, the schedule generation process itself should be efficient and scalable.

Limitations of Previous Work: Previous work has already proposed many methods, but they all have certain limitations (see Table 1). SCCL [13] encodes the schedule synthesis problem as a quantifier-free SMT formula and employs a theorem prover to generate optimal schedules. However, SCCL faces scalability issues due to the NP-hardness of the SMT problem, and it lacks the support for switch topologies. TACCL [32] uses a mixed integer linear program (MILP) to generate schedules and supports converting switch-based topologies into switch-free logical topologies. Still, its scalability suffers from the NP-hardness of MILP, and experiments have shown that its schedules are less performant compared to others. BFB [40] adopts a scalable polynomial-time linear program for schedule generation, but it only achieves optimality in topologies with certain symmetries and also lacks the support for switch topologies.

Step Schedule vs. Spanning Tree Schedule: The schedules generated by SCCL, TACCL, and BFB are *step schedules*, which organize communications in a sequence of steps. The steps serve to manage data dependencies, ensuring that a node sending a chunk of data at step t must have received it at a step $< t$. Optimizing such schedules requires not only balancing data chunks across links to avoid congestion but also distributing chunks across steps to ensure this balancing is possible without violating data dependencies. The discrete nature of data chunks often necessitates an NP-hard discrete optimization, such as the SMT of SCCL and MILP of TACCL. Heterogeneous networks present an even more intractable challenge for step schedules, as the bandwidth and latency differences across links further complicate the optimization.




Figure 1: Relationships between collective operations. Reduce and reduce-scatter can be constructed by reversing the communications of broadcast and allgather [14]. Reduce and broadcast are simplified single-root versions of reduce-scatter and allgather. Finally, allreduce can be performed by applying a reduce-scatter followed by an allgather or a reduce followed by a broadcast. In our exposition, we focus on allgather, while the method applies to other operations as well.

Instead, we adopt *spanning tree schedules*. The spanning trees provide natural scheduling for aggregation and broadcast, where data simply follows the trees as flows, eliminating the need for communication steps to manage data dependencies. The flow model also obviates the discrete states of data chunks, thus enabling an order-of-magnitude lower computational complexity for schedule generation.

Comparison with Blink: Among previous schedule generation methods, Blink [36] also constructs spanning trees as communication schedules. Although ForestColl employs a similar approach, our methodologies fundamentally differ. First, Blink’s spanning tree packing does not support switch topologies, which are widely used in networks for ML. Second, Blink lacks a performance guarantee for a finite number of trees, whereas ForestColl can calculate and achieve optimality with a limited set of trees. A more critical difference lies in the roots of spanning trees. Blink’s spanning trees are all rooted at a single node, whereas ForestColl’s forest has trees rooted at every node. Multi-root spanning trees not only additionally support reduce-scatter and allgather, which are widely used in distributed ML, but also offer performance advantages in allreduce, as data can be evenly aggregated and broadcast from every node without suffering communication/computation bottlenecks at a single root node.

3 Collective Scheduling Problem

Collectives can be classified into *aggregation only* (e.g., reduce, reduce-scatter), *broadcast only* (e.g., broadcast, allgather), and *aggregation plus broadcast* (e.g., allreduce). Aggregation requires *in-trees*, with edge directions flowing from leaves to the root, while broadcast requires *out-trees*, where edges flow from the root to leaves. In terms of roots, collective operations can also be categorized as *single-root* (e.g., reduce, broadcast) or *multi-root* (e.g., reduce-scatter, allgather, allreduce). Figure 1 shows the relationships between operations. While we explain ForestColl in the context of constructing allgather out-trees, it also applies to other operations.




Figure 2: Example of Spanning Out-Tree. (a) shows a 2-cluster 8-compute-node switch topology along with the allgather bottleneck network cut. The intra-cluster connections (thick lines) have 10x the bandwidth of inter-cluster ones (thin lines). (b) shows one example of ForestColl’s spanning out-trees that is rooted at compute node $c_{1,1}$.

3.1 Allgather Optimality

We model a network topology as a directed graph G , where edge capacities signify link bandwidths, and the vertex set V consists of *compute nodes* V_c (e.g., GPUs) and *switch nodes* V_s . Figure 2(a) shows an example. In allgather, each compute node has an equal shard of data that must be broadcast to all other compute nodes. We denote the total amount of data M , the number of compute nodes $|V_c| = N$, and thus the size of each shard is $\frac{M}{N}$.

In Figure 2(a), consider the cut S^* in the network. S^* contains all nodes in cluster 1: compute nodes $c_{1,1}, c_{1,2}, c_{1,3}, c_{1,4}$ and switch node w_1 . To finish an allgather, each compute node within S^* must send at least one copy of its shard across the cut to the other cluster; otherwise, $c_{2,1}, c_{2,2}, c_{2,3}, c_{2,4}$ will fail to receive the data shard. Therefore, at least $4 \cdot \frac{M}{N}$ amount of data has to exit cut S^* . Note that the total bandwidth exiting S^* is $4b$, counting all four links connecting $c_{1,*}$ to the inter-cluster switch w_0 . Thus, a lower bound for the allgather communication time in this topology is $4 \cdot \frac{M}{N} / (4b) = \frac{M}{8b}$ with $N=8$ in Figure 2(a).

The lower bound can be generalized to any topology G . Given an arbitrary network cut $S \subset V$ in G , if there is any compute node not in S (i.e., $S \not\supseteq V_c$), then at least $\frac{M}{N} |S \cap V_c|$ amount of data has to exit S . Let $B^+(S)$ denote the exiting bandwidth of S , i.e., the sum of bandwidths of links going from S to $V-S$, then $\frac{M}{N} \cdot \frac{|S \cap V_c|}{B^+(S)}$ is a lower bound for allgather communication time T_{comm} in topology G . Consider all such cuts in G , then T_{comm} satisfies

$$T_{\text{comm}} \geq \frac{M}{N} \max_{S \subset V, S \not\supseteq V_c} \frac{|S \cap V_c|}{B^+(S)}. \quad (1)$$

We call the cut or cuts S that maximize the ratio of compute nodes to exiting bandwidth, $\frac{|S \cap V_c|}{B^+(S)}$, as the *allgather bottleneck*

cut. In this work, we present ForestColl, which constructs a set of spanning out-trees whose communication time equals the right-hand side of (1). Since (1) is a lower bound of allgather time, ForestColl achieves theoretical optimality.

3.2 Spanning Trees as Allgather Schedule

Given a topology G , ForestColl generates a set of Nk spanning out-trees, with k trees rooted at each compute node. Correspondingly, a $1/k$ shard of data is broadcast along each out-tree. ForestColl determines the value of k to achieve optimality. We assume a *broadcast flow model* for out-trees: data flows fluidly from the root to other nodes along the tree, occupying an equal amount of bandwidth on each edge, and multicasts at non-leaf nodes. Collectively, each out-tree also occupies an equal amount of bandwidth, and the entire set of out-trees must adhere to each link’s bandwidth constraint.

We assume only compute nodes can multicast data and that switches don’t, as in most operational networks. Furthermore, the broadcast trees do not need to span switch nodes, as switch nodes do not consume data. Switch nodes only serve to relay compute-to-compute communications. Consequently, the spanning out-trees generated by ForestColl are defined only on compute nodes, with switch nodes merely acting as parts of the edges between compute nodes. Figure 2(b) shows an example. The spanning out-tree spans and includes only compute nodes. Switch w_0 , for example, is part of the edge $(c_{1,1}, c_{2,1})$, which occupies capacities of both links $(c_{1,1}, w_0)$ and $(w_0, c_{2,1})$ in the original topology (a).

Unlike the step schedules used by SCCL, TACCL, and BFB, the broadcast flow model we assume overlooks the latencies of sends and receives for lower computational complexity. However, these latencies, being on the order of tens of microseconds or even less, are negligible in collective communications involving intermediate to large data sizes, which are the primary focus of this paper. Communications involving small data sizes are either optimized separately in network protocols [4] or batched into larger transfers [5]. Further discussion of the broadcast flow model are in Appendix B.

4 Algorithm Design

In this section, we delve into the details of ForestColl’s algorithm. The algorithm contains three parts: *optimality binary search*, *switch node removal*, and *spanning tree construction*. Together, the algorithm solves the following problem:

Input: A symmetrical-bandwidth topology modeled as a directed graph G with integer link capacities and a vertex set V consisting of compute nodes V_c and switch nodes V_s .

Ouput: A set of spanning out-trees $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ among compute nodes, where each tree occupies an equal amount of bandwidth and collectively, they achieve optimality (1).

Note that we make two trivial assumptions about the input topology: (i) all link bandwidths are integers, and (ii) the




Figure 3: The auxiliary network for optimality binary search. (a) shows two cuts: S^* , S' , along with their exiting bandwidths. Note that S' is $V - c_{2,1}$ instead of $\{c_{2,1}\}$. (b) shows the auxiliary network that there exists a set of spanning out-trees broadcasting x bandwidth from each compute node if and only if the maxflow from s to every compute node is Nx .

network has symmetrical bandwidth, i.e., the total ingress and egress bandwidth/capacity are equal at each node.

This section introduces the high-level intuitions and steps of ForestColl’s algorithms. We provide detailed mathematical analysis in Appendix C and proofs in Appendix F.

4.1 Algorithm Overview

ForestColl starts with a binary search to compute the optimality (1) established by *allgather bottleneck cut*. Note that iterating through all cuts to find the allgather bottleneck cut is intractable due to the exponential number of possible cuts in the network. Instead, we design an auxiliary network on which we can compute maxflow to determine if a given value is \geq or $<$ than optimality, thus enabling a binary search. Knowing the optimality is crucial for deciding the number of trees per compute node (i.e., k) and the bandwidth of each tree to achieve optimality.

In a switch-free topology, after knowing the bandwidth of each tree and the number of trees, we directly apply *spanning tree packing* [10, 11, 16, 30, 34] to construct the optimal set of out-trees. In a switch topology, however, we retrofit the *edge splitting technique* [10, 17, 21] to iteratively remove switch nodes before constructing spanning trees. We replace each switch node by direct logical links between its neighboring nodes, while ensuring that (i) the resulting logical topology is equivalent to the original topology, i.e., the generated spanning out-trees in the resulting topology can be mapped back to the original without violating capacity constraints; (ii) there is no sacrifice to the optimal performance (1) in the process. Thus, by constructing spanning trees on the resulting switch-free logical topology, we also have the optimal set of out-trees for the original switch topology.

4.2 Optimality Binary Search

We now present ForestColl's binary search to compute the optimality (1) established by the allgather bottleneck cut. Let the total bandwidth of the out-trees rooted at each compute node be x . As each node simultaneously broadcasts a shard of data, the communication time $T_{\text{comm}} = \frac{M}{N} \cdot \frac{1}{x}$. Therefore, to minimize T_{comm} , we need to maximize x . The goal of the binary search is to *find the maximum x such that there exists a set of spanning out-trees broadcasting x amount of bandwidth from each compute node*. We denote the maximum such x as x^* . It turns out that as long as $x \leq x^*$, we can always determine k and construct the corresponding spanning trees. Hence, our first task is to find x^* . We show that $\frac{1}{x^*}$ is precisely the maximum ratio of compute nodes to exiting bandwidth, i.e., $\max_{S \subset V, S \not\supseteq V_c} \frac{|S \cap V_c|}{B^+(S)}$ in optimality (1). We then describe the binary search to compute x^* .

Suppose each compute node broadcasts x amount of bandwidth, then for any cut S that does not include all compute nodes, the exiting flow of S is at least $|S \cap V_c| x$. Figure 3(a) shows two such cuts: S^* and S' . S^* includes four compute nodes, resulting in an exiting flow of $4x$. S' is a cut that includes *all* compute and switch nodes except $c_{2,1}$, with an exiting flow of $7x$ to $c_{2,1}$. Suppose $x = b$ (the inter-cluster link bandwidth) so that each compute node broadcasts b amount of bandwidth. For cut S' , the exiting bandwidth $B^+(S')$ is $11b$, more than sufficient for the exiting flow $7b$. However, for cut S^* , the exiting bandwidth $B^+(S^*)$ is exactly $4b$, equal to the required amount of exiting flow. Thus, we are bottlenecked by S^* : if $x > b$, cut S^* cannot sustain the cumulative exiting flow from $c_{1,*}$ to $c_{2,*}$ anymore. Consequently, $x^* = b$ is the maximum bandwidth each compute node can simultaneously broadcast. In an arbitrary topology, as we increase x , we will always be bottlenecked by a cut like S^* . This cut is exactly the allgather bottleneck cut in optimality (1): $S^* = \arg \max_{S \subset V, S \not\supseteq V_c} \frac{|S \cap V_c|}{B^+(S)}$. Since the exiting flow saturates $B^+(S^*)$, we have $B^+(S^*) = |S^* \cap V_c| x^*$, which implies $\frac{1}{x^*} = \frac{|S^* \cap V_c|}{B^+(S^*)} = \max_{S \subset V, S \not\supseteq V_c} \frac{|S \cap V_c|}{B^+(S)}$ as desired.

Detect Overwhelmed Cut: To conduct a binary search for x^* , given a value of x , we must determine if $x \leq x^*$ or $x > x^*$, which is equivalent to determining if x overwhelms some cut in the topology. This presents a complex problem because (i) both the amount of exiting flow and the bandwidth of the cut need to be considered, e.g., S' 's bandwidth is not saturated when $x = b$ despite having a larger exiting flow than S^* ; (ii) testing every possible cut is intractable due to the exponential number of cuts in the network.

Auxiliary Network: To address the above issues, we construct an auxiliary network as in Figure 3(b). We add a source node s and connect s to every compute node with capacity x . Suppose we want to check if S^* is overwhelmed. We pick an arbitrary compute node outside of S^* , say $c_{2,2}$, and calculate

Algorithm 1: Optimality Binary Search

Input: A directed graph $G = (V_s \cup V_c, E)$

Output: $\frac{1}{x^*} = \max_{S \subset V, S \not\supseteq V_c} \frac{|S \cap V_c|}{B^+(S)}$

begin

$l \leftarrow \frac{N-1}{\min_{v \in V_c} B^-(v)}$ // a lower bound of $\frac{1}{x^*}$

$r \leftarrow N-1$ // an upper bound of $\frac{1}{x^*}$

while $r - l \geq 1/\min_{v \in V_c} B^-(v)^2$ **do**

$\frac{1}{x} \leftarrow (l+r)/2$

Add node s to G .

foreach compute node $c \in V_c$ **do**

Add an edge from s to c with capacity x .

if the maxflow from s to each $c \in V_c$ is Nx **then**

$r \leftarrow \frac{1}{x}$ // case $\frac{1}{x} \geq \frac{1}{x^*}$

else

$l \leftarrow \frac{1}{x}$ // case $\frac{1}{x} < \frac{1}{x^*}$

Find the unique fractional number $\frac{p}{q} \in [l, r]$ such that denominator $q \leq \min_{v \in V_c} B^-(v)$.

return $\frac{p}{q}$ as $\frac{1}{x^*}$

the maxflow from s to $c_{2,2}$. If no cut is overwhelmed, then $c_{2,2}$ should get all the flow that s can emit, which equals $8x$. However, if we set $x > b$, while the $4x$ amount of flow from s to $c_{2,*}$ (compute nodes outside of S^*) can directly bypass $B^+(S^*)$, the $4x$ amount of flow from s to $c_{1,*}$ (compute nodes within S^*) must pass through $B^+(S^*)$ to reach $c_{2,2}$, capped at $4b$. Thus, if $x > b$, then the maxflow from s to $c_{2,2}$ is capped at $4x+4b$, which is less than $8x$, signaling a cut between s and $c_{2,2}$ is overwhelmed. To check every cut in the network, we need to compute a maxflow from s to every compute node. If the maxflow from s to any compute node c is $< Nx$, then some cut between s and c is overwhelmed, indicating $x > x^*$; otherwise, $x \leq x^*$, and we can try a larger value of x .

Binary Search: Algorithm 1 shows ForestColl's search for $\frac{1}{x^*}$. Starting from a lower bound l and an upper bound r of $\frac{1}{x^*}$, we continuously test if the midpoint $(l+r)/2$ is \geq or $<$ than $\frac{1}{x^*}$ by computing the aforementioned maxflows, and adjust l, r accordingly. Thus, we can shrink the range $[l, r]$ small enough for us to determine $\frac{1}{x^*}$ exactly by finding the unique fractional number $\frac{p}{q}$ within $[l, r]$ with denominator q at most $\min_{v \in V_c} B^-(v)$.

Determine k : As previously mentioned, knowing the optimality x^* helps us decide the number of trees rooted at each compute node (i.e., k) and the bandwidth utilized by each tree. In the spanning tree packing and edge splitting algorithms that ForestColl will apply later, each unit of edge capacity is interpreted as the allocation of one tree instead of one unit of bandwidth. Suppose y is the bandwidth of each tree, then we need to adjust the edge capacities by dividing the bandwidth of each edge b_e by y , so that the new capacity b_e/y is the number of trees edge e can sustain. This leads to two requirements for y : (i) $k = x^*/y$ must be an

integer, and (ii) b_e/y must be an integer for all edge bandwidth b_e . In Algorithm 1, we have computed $\frac{1}{x^*} = \frac{p}{q}$. Thus, by setting $y = \gcd(q, \{b_e\}_{e \in E})/p$, we ensure that both requirements are satisfied, and k , the number of trees rooted at each compute node, is simply x^*/y . For example, the optimality of Figure 2(a) is $\frac{1}{x^*} = \frac{4}{4b} = \frac{1}{b}$ bottlenecked by S^* . We have $y = \gcd\{b, b, 10b\} = b$, so the bandwidths of edges are scaled from $\{b, 10b\}$ to $\{1, 10\}$, and $k = b/b = 1$. Figure 4(a) shows the resulting topology. A more detailed mathematical analysis of the binary search and deriving k is included in Appendix C.1.

4.3 Switch Node Removal

We introduce ForestColl’s process to iteratively replace all switch nodes with direct links between their neighboring nodes. This allows us to subsequently apply the spanning tree packing algorithm on the resulting switch-free logical topology. The process ensures two key outcomes: (i) the logical topology remains equivalent to the original one, allowing spanning tree solutions generated on the logical topology to be mapped back to the original without violating capacity constraints; (ii) there is no sacrifice to the optimal allgather performance (1), so the optimal trees generated on the logical topology are also optimal in the original when mapped back. While previous works, such as TACCL [32] and TACOS [39], have similarly proposed transforming a switch topology to a switch-free logical topology, their methods, like replacing each switch with a ring connection among its neighbors, only guarantee (i) but not (ii). In contrast, our method can ensure both equivalence and zero loss in performance.

Edge Splitting: We borrow the edge splitting technique [10, 17, 21] from graph theory. Starting with the scaled topology as in Figure 4(a), for each switch node w , we pair one capacity of an egress link (w, t) with one capacity of an ingress link (u, w) , and replace them with one capacity of a direct link (u, t) that bypasses the switch node w . Figure 4(b) shows two such examples. In both the red and blue examples, we replace the dashed ingress and egress capacities of switch node w_0 with a direct unit of capacity bypassing w_0 . By continuously doing so, we can replace all capacities to/from the switch node w_0 , eventually eliminating any link connected to/from w_0 . Consequently, we can safely remove the isolated w_0 from the topology. Note that u, t do not have to be compute nodes; they can also be switch nodes that we will remove later. By repeating this for each switch node, we achieve a switch-free topology, as shown in Figure 4(d). We can always pair an ingress capacity with an egress capacity, because we assume symmetrical bandwidth in the input network. Furthermore, the resulting logical topology remains equivalent to the original, since we only redistribute existing capacities without adding new ones. *This process effectively assigns the ingress and egress capacities of a switch to compute-to-compute flows traversing the switch.*

Algorithm 2: Switch Node Removal

Input: A directed graph $G = (V_s \cup V_c, E)$ and k .

Output: A directed graph $H = (V_c, E')$.

begin

foreach switch node $w \in V_s$ **do**

foreach egress edge $f = (w, t) \in E$ **do**

foreach ingress edge $e = (u, w) \in E$ **do**

 Compute γ , the maximum capacity we can safely replace f, e by (u, t) , as in Theorem 8.

if $\gamma = 0$ **then continue**

 Decrease f ’s and e ’s capacity by γ . Remove e if its capacity reaches 0.

 Increase the capacity of (u, t) by γ . Add the edge if $(u, t) \notin E$.

if f ’s capacity reaches 0 **then break**

 // Edge f should have 0 capacity at this point.

 Remove edge f from G .

 // Node w should be isolated at this point.

 Remove node w from G .

return the resulting G as H

Choose Ingress Link: Given an egress capacity, there are often ingress capacities from multiple ingress links that we can pair and replace. However, arbitrarily choosing an ingress link may lead to performance sacrifice. In the two examples of Figure 4(b), the exiting capacity of S^* remains unchanged after replacing capacities in the red example, while it decreases from 4 to 3 in the blue example. This corresponds to decreasing exiting bandwidth $B^+(S^*)$ from $4b$ to $3b$ in the original unscaled topology. Since S^* is an allgather bottleneck cut, any decrease in its bandwidth $B^+(S^*)$ further bottlenecks the overall performance. Therefore, when replacing capacities, we need to ensure that *we do not create a worse bottleneck cut than existing ones*. For an already bottlenecked cut, we cannot afford any decrease in the exiting bandwidth. For a non-bottleneck cut S , we can only reduce the exiting bandwidth to the point where it just becomes a bottleneck, i.e., maintaining $\frac{|S \cap V_c|}{B^+(S)} \leq \frac{|S^* \cap V_c|}{B^+(S^*)} = \frac{1}{x^*}$.

From the two examples in Figure 4(b), we can observe that replacing capacities decreases the exiting capacities of cuts that cut through both the ingress and egress links. Suppose we are replacing a certain capacity of (u, w) , (w, t) with (u, t) . If we can compute among all cuts that cut through both (u, w) , (w, t) , the minimum decrease γ in exiting capacity that would turn any cut into a bottleneck, then by replacing at most this exact amount of capacity, we are safe from creating a worse bottleneck cut. Figure 4(c) shows the auxiliary network we use to compute γ . For each compute node c , we construct an auxiliary network like Figure 4(c) and compute the maxflow from u to w . The minimum of these maxflows, subtracted by Nk , is the maximum capacity γ that we can safely replace (u, w) , (w, t) by (u, t) .

Algorithm 2 shows the pseudocode of the switch node removal process. For each switch node w and each egress




Figure 4: Figures explaining the switch node removal process. (a) is the starting topology after optimality binary search scales edge capacities from $\{b, 10b\}$ to $\{1, 10\}$. (b) contains two examples of replacing the ingress and egress capacities of a switch node with a direct capacity bypassing the switch. (c) shows an example of the auxiliary network ForestColl uses to compute the γ in Algorithm 2. (d) is the final resulting switch-free logical topology.

edge $f = (w, t)$, we pair it with each ingress edge $e = (u, w)$ and calculate γ , the maximum capacity we can safely replace f, e by (u, t) . We leave the details to compute γ in Theorem 8 in Appendix C.2. The theorem also proves that after we iterate through every ingress edge e , the capacity of f reaches 0. Because symmetrical bandwidth is assumed, after all egress edges are removed, the capacities of ingress edges also reach 0. Thus, the switch node w is isolated and can be safely removed. After doing so for every switch node w , we obtain a switch-free logical topology H that is equivalent to the original G and has the same optimal performance (1). Appendix C.2 provides more details of the algorithm.

4.4 Spanning Tree Construction

Given the switch-free logical topology like Figure 4(d), ForestColl applies the spanning out-tree packing algorithm [11, 30]. Our earlier efforts have ensured that in the logical topology, there exist k spanning out-trees rooted at each node, with respect to the scaled link capacities. With all switch nodes removed, every node is now a compute node, and the out-trees simply span all nodes in the topology. Because k can potentially be large, constructing spanning trees one by one may be intractable and not within polynomial time. It turns out that these k out-trees are often not distinct. For example, we may have a batch of $\frac{k}{2} - 1$ identical out-trees and another batch of $\frac{k}{2} + 1$ identical out-trees rooted at the same node. In the algorithm, we construct the out-trees in batches, or rather, trees with capacities. For each node v , the algorithm starts by initializing a k -capacity out-tree containing only a root node $\{v\}$. Then, it iteratively adds edges to each tree, expanding the tree until it spans all nodes in the graph. When adding an edge to an out-tree, the algorithm calculates the maximum capacity μ of the edge that can be added to the out-tree while maintaining the feasibility of constructing the remaining trees. If μ is less than the tree's capacity m , the




Figure 5: The constructed spanning out-tree. (a) shows one example of the spanning out-trees generated by applying the spanning tree packing algorithm to Figure 4(d). (b) shows the corresponding tree after mapping (a) back to the original topology.

algorithm splits the tree into two: one with capacity $m - \mu$ and another with capacity μ , adding the edge to the latter. Appendix C.3 describes the complete details of the algorithm.

Figure 5(a) shows one example of the spanning out-trees constructed by applying the algorithm to Figure 4(d). Thanks to the equivalence guarantee of logical topology, we can map the out-tree back to the original topology, resulting in the tree shown in Figure 5(b). Because we scaled the edge capacities from $\{b, 10b\}$ to $\{1, 10\}$ in §4.2, the 1 unit of capacity carried by the out-tree in Figure 5(a) corresponds to b amount of bandwidth in (b).

4.5 Fixed- k Binary Search

In §4.2, the optimality binary search automatically determines k (the number of trees rooted at each compute node) and γ (the bandwidth utilized by each tree) to achieve theoretically optimal allgather. However, the k required by optimality may be a large number. Although the runtime of




Figure 6: The auxiliary network for fixed- k binary search. (a) shows the original topology. (b) shows the auxiliary network ForestColl uses to binary search for the optimal y (the bandwidth utilized by each tree) given a fixed k (the number of trees rooted at each compute node).

Algorithm 3: Fixed- k Binary Search

Input: A directed graph $G = (V_s \cup V_c, E)$ and k , the number of trees rooted at each compute node.

Output: y^* , the maximum bandwidth utilized by each tree.

begin

$l \leftarrow \frac{(N-1)k}{\min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v)}$ // a lower bound of $\frac{1}{y^*}$

$r \leftarrow (N-1)k$ // an upper bound of $\frac{1}{y^*}$

while $r - l \geq 1/\max_{e \in E} b_e^2$ **do**

$\frac{1}{y} \leftarrow (l + r)/2$

 Add node s to G .

foreach compute node $c \in V_c$ **do**

 Add an edge from s to c with capacity k .

foreach link $e \in E$ with bandwidth b_e **do**

 Adjust the capacity of e to $\lfloor b_e/y \rfloor$.

if the maxflow from s to each $c \in V_c$ is Nk **then**

$r \leftarrow \frac{1}{y}$ // case $\frac{1}{y} \geq \frac{1}{y^*}$

else

$l \leftarrow \frac{1}{y}$ // case $\frac{1}{y} < \frac{1}{y^*}$

 Find the unique fractional number $\frac{p}{q} \in [l, r]$ such that denominator $q \leq \max_{e \in E} b_e$.

return $\frac{q}{p}$ as y^*

ForestColl does not depend on k , a large k may complicate the implementation of the schedule. In this section, we introduce a method of ForestColl to generate the most performant schedule given any fixed k . As in §4.2, this method also involves a binary search and maxflow on an auxiliary network. Given a topology like Figure 6(a), we construct an auxiliary network as (b). Unlike the auxiliary network in Figure 3(b), here we fix the capacities from s to compute nodes at k , while adjusting the capacities of links. As in §4.2, y is the bandwidth utilized by each tree. The goal of the binary search this time is to find the maximum y^* that the maxflow from s to every compute node remains Nk . Note that a link with bandwidth b_e can only support $\lfloor b_e/y \rfloor$ number of trees.

Algorithm 3 shows the pseudocode for searching y^* . The algorithm is similar to Algorithm 1 except the construction of the auxiliary network. We also shrink the search range until $\frac{1}{y^*}$ can be determined uniquely. We leave more mathematical details of fixed- k binary search in Appendix C.4. Once y^* is obtained, the link bandwidths can be adjusted to $\lfloor b_e/y^* \rfloor$, and one can simply apply the switch node removal (§4.3) and spanning tree construction (§4.4) to construct the out-trees.

The ability to generate the most performant schedule given a fixed small k greatly helps schedule implementation, especially with GPUs. When k is small, one can simply allocate an equal number of threadblocks to each tree. When k is large, however, one threadblock needs to handle multiple trees, or a weighted flow control has to be implemented at each threadblock. Thus, fixing k to a small number significantly simplifies the schedule implementation. It also turns out that a small k , while much less than what would be required for exact optimality, can still achieve performance very close to the optimal. For example, in our 2-cluster AMD MI250 topology, the theoretically optimal algorithmic bandwidth (algbw) of 354.13GB/s is attained with $k = 83$ trees rooted at each compute node. Yet, the most performant schedule with $k=2$ can already achieve 341.33GB/s theoretical algbw despite having only two trees per compute node. Therefore, in reality, if the optimality binary search gives a too large k , we opt to scan k values within a much smaller range (< 10) and pick the best k for schedule construction.

4.6 Reduce-Scatter & Allreduce

While we introduce ForestColl in the context of allgather, it can be easily adapted for other collectives as well. In contrast to allgather, where each node broadcasts a shard of data, reduce-scatter needs each node to reduce a shard of data, requiring spanning in-trees. In bidirectional networks, we can simply reverse the direction of out-trees to create in-trees for reduce-scatter schedules. In unidirectional networks, where links may be one-way, we can also construct out-trees in the transpose graph of the topology and then reverse the out-trees into in-trees as described in [40]. In both cases, the resulting reduce-scatter in-trees also achieve optimality.

Allreduce, however, poses a more complicated challenge. Allreduce involves both an aggregation stage and a broadcast stage. In the aggregation stage, data follows spanning in-trees to be aggregated on a set of root nodes and then follows out-trees to be broadcast to every node. Each root node is responsible for aggregating and broadcasting a disjoint part of the data. The set of root nodes can be any subset of the compute nodes, and the amount of data aggregated by each root node can also vary. For example, one can perform allreduce by applying a reduce-scatter followed by an allgather, treating every compute node as a root node that aggregates and broadcasts an equal shard of data. Alternatively, one can

also perform reduce+broadcast like Blink [36], where one node is chosen as the only root node to aggregate and broadcast all data. To generate the optimal allreduce schedule, we have developed a linear program detailed in Appendix E. The linear program uses decision variables to decide (i) the amount of data aggregated and broadcast by each compute node, and (ii) the bandwidth allocation of each link for the aggregation and broadcast stages. However, in all topologies we have tested so far, *the optimal allreduce generated by the linear program shows no better theoretical performance than applying ForestColl’s reduce-scatter plus allgather*. Therefore, our go-to solution for allreduce remains using ForestColl to construct the optimal reduce-scatter in-trees and allgather out-trees, and then combine them for allreduce.

4.7 Strongly Polynomial Runtime

We devoted considerable effort to ensure ForestColl runs in strongly polynomial runtime, i.e., the runtime is polynomial in the size of the topology and does not depend on the bandwidths of the links. The latter is crucial because the bandwidths can often be large numbers. Therefore, in the optimality binary search, we let each tree occupy y amount of bandwidth, which significantly streamlines tree construction. However, doing so is not enough. k , the number of out-trees rooted at each compute node, is not necessarily polynomial in the size of the topology. Consequently, constructing the out-trees one by one is still not polynomial-time in the worst case. The spanning out-tree packing algorithm [11, 30] addresses this issue by constructing the out-trees in batches, a process proven to run in strongly polynomial time. Although the original authors in [11, 30] did not explicitly mention how to compute μ in polynomial time, we independently developed an efficient approach for this computation. In addition, we also developed the computation of γ in switch removal, enabling us to determine the maximum amount of capacity that can be replaced at once, rather than splitting off edge capacity unit by unit. Collectively, these efforts ensure that the values of the bandwidths affect ForestColl’s runtime only logarithmically. Detailed proofs are in Appendix D.

5 Evaluation

We evaluated ForestColl on two popular distributed ML platforms: a 2-cluster 32-GPU AMD MI250 testbed and a 2-cluster 16-GPU NVIDIA A100 testbed. §5.1 describes our implementation of ForestColl’s schedules. §5.2 and §5.3 show the experiment results on the MI250 and the A100 testbeds, respectively. §5.4 compares TACCL and ForestColl in terms of schedule generation speed and quality at a large scale.

5.1 Schedule Implementation

Given the generated trees from ForestColl, we implemented a compiler to translate the mathematical representation into

MSCCL schedules. MSCCL [3] is an open-source library for executing custom collective communication algorithms on accelerators. Our compiler generates the communication schedules as XML files that can be directly executed by MSCCL on both AMD and NVIDIA GPUs. This enables us to run and evaluate ForestColl’s schedules on actual hardware. The XML schedules will be made public.

5.2 AMD MI250 Experiments

Testbed Setup: We evaluated ForestColl against baselines on a two-cluster AMD MI250 testbed with 32 GPUs. Figure 7(a) shows the two-cluster topology. The MI250 topology is complex, characterized by a hybrid of direct intra-cluster connections and an inter-cluster switched network. Each cluster contains 16 GPUs, each directly connected to three or four other GPUs through $7\times$ AMD Infinity Fabric links at 50GB/s. Some pairs of GPUs possess parallel links to enhance the connection speed. Each cluster also has $8\times$ InfiniBand NICs, offering 256GB/s total inter-cluster bandwidth and connected to GPUs via PCIe switches. Note that although ForestColl directly models PCIe switches and IB NICs as switch nodes in schedule generation, for simplicity, we omit these components and assume each GPU has 16GB/s bandwidth to the IB switch in Figure 7(a).

Experiment Setup: We tested allgather, reduce-scatter, and allreduce performance of ForestColl and the baselines in two settings: one involving all 32 GPUs (16+16) and another with 8 GPUs per cluster (8+8). In the 8+8 setting, we only enable GPUs 0~7 in each cluster, which corresponds to the left half of Figure 7(a). The 8+8 setting is useful for cloud providers when bin-packing ML jobs. Figure 7(b) and (c) show two examples of the trees ForestColl generated for the 16+16 and 8+8 topologies, respectively. The complete allgather schedules have such trees rooted at each GPU to broadcast data. For reduce-scatter, we simply reverse the trees to perform aggregation, and for allreduce, we perform a reduce-scatter followed by an allgather.

Baselines: We evaluated ForestColl’s schedules against TACCL, Blink, and RCCL, where RCCL [6] (ROCm Collective Communication Library) is AMD’s dedicated library optimized for AMD GPUs. Due to a runtime error in TACCL’s code, we were unable to generate its reduce-scatter and allreduce schedules, so we only compared TACCL’s allgather performance. For Blink, which lacks publicly available code, we implemented an optimal single-root spanning tree packing according to Blink’s paper. Blink’s spanning tree packing does not support switch topology. We augmented Blink with our switch removal technique to create “Blink+Switch”, which applies Blink’s tree packing to ForestColl’s switch-free logical topology. Furthermore, Blink’s tree packing is limited to single-root reduce and broadcast to perform allreduce, and it mentions that allgather can be performed as allreduce




Figure 7: 2-cluster AMD MI250 topology and examples of ForestColl’s spanning out-trees in 16+16 and 8+8 settings. In (a), black connections represent 50GB/s AMD Infinity Fabric links, while gray connections are 16GB/s links to the InfiniBand Switch. PCIe switches and IB NICs are omitted for simplicity. (b) and (c) showcase two of ForestColl’s trees rooted at the bolded GPU. The complete allgather schedules have at least one tree rooted at each GPU.

	16+16 AMD MI250										8+8 AMD MI250									
	Algbw (GB/s)					ForestColl / Baseline					Algbw (GB/s)					ForestColl / Baseline				
Allgather	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg
ForestColl	9.3	69.8	152	174	97.7	-	-	-	-	-	12.8	70.8	111	121	77.0	-	-	-	-	-
TACCL	9.73	54.4	96.5	108	65.3	1.0x	1.3x	1.6x	1.6x	1.5x	10.7	54.9	78.8	84.7	56.6	1.2x	1.3x	1.4x	1.4x	1.4x
RCCL Ring	2.98	35.2	111	165	71.1	3.1x	2.0x	1.4x	1.1x	1.4x	2.43	32.1	44.6	44.9	30.6	5.3x	2.2x	2.5x	2.7x	2.5x
Reduce-Scatter	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg
ForestColl	9.75	68.8	146	177	95.1	-	-	-	-	-	12.9	64.8	99.5	109	70.1	-	-	-	-	-
RCCL Ring	2.98	35.9	114	163	72.2	3.3x	1.9x	1.3x	1.1x	1.3x	2.34	31.7	44.9	45.0	30.6	5.5x	2.0x	2.2x	2.4x	2.3x
Allreduce	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg
ForestColl	5.26	42.3	78.3	87.4	51.3	-	-	-	-	-	7.46	39.5	57.7	61.4	40.8	-	-	-	-	-
Blink+Switch	5.12	31.6	60.5	75.4	41.2	1.0x	1.3x	1.3x	1.2x	1.2x	5.46	29.4	42.5	45.0	30.1	1.4x	1.3x	1.4x	1.4x	1.4x
RCCL Tree	4.69	33.0	67.3	86.5	45.3	1.1x	1.3x	1.2x	1.0x	1.1x	6.44	26.8	36.0	37.0	27.7	1.2x	1.5x	1.6x	1.7x	1.5x
RCCL Ring	1.55	18.3	56.7	82.9	36.3	3.4x	2.3x	1.4x	1.1x	1.4x	1.23	16.6	22.5	23.0	15.6	6.1x	2.4x	2.6x	2.7x	2.6x
RCCL Best	4.69	33.0	67.3	86.5	45.3	1.1x	1.3x	1.2x	1.0x	1.1x	6.44	26.8	36.0	37.0	27.7	1.2x	1.5x	1.6x	1.7x	1.5x

Table 2: Experiment results of running allgather, reduce-scatter, and allreduce schedules of TACCL, Blink+Switch, RCCL, and ForestColl on the 2-cluster AMD MI250 testbed. “Blink+Switch” represents Blink augmented with our switch removal technique, enabling it to support switch topology. “RCCL Best” in allreduce represents the best result from “RCCL Tree” and “RCCL Ring” at each data size. The algorithmic bandwidth (algbw) is calculated by dividing data size by schedule runtime. The table listed algbws as well as ratios of ForestColl’s algbw to that of baseline at 1MB, 16MB, 128MB, and 1GB data sizes. The average algbw is calculated as the mean of all algbws from 1MB to 1GB. Figure 8 provides visual plots of the experiment results.

without reduction, so we only evaluated Blink’s allreduce performance. Both TACCL and Blink use MSCCL in the experiments. While we can use TACCL’s code to generate MSCCL schedule XMLs, we used ForestColl’s compiler to generate Blink’s MSCCL XMLs, given both are tree-based schedules. Lastly, the final baseline RCCL offers two algorithms: tree and ring. RCCL ring works for all three collectives, while RCCL tree is only an allreduce algorithm.

16+16 Results: The left column of Figure 8 shows our experimental results in 16+16 setting. We compare schedule performance by algorithmic bandwidth (algbw), calculated by dividing data size by schedule runtime. ForestColl consistently outperforms baselines. In allgather comparison with

TACCL, ForestColl shows a 61% higher algbw at 1GB data size and an average 50% higher algbw from 1MB to 1GB. Against Blink+Switch in allreduce, ForestColl is 16% faster at 1GB and 24% faster on average. In Figure 8, allgather and reduce-scatter are generally twice as fast as allreduce, contradicting Blink’s suggestion that one should perform allgather/reduce-scatter as allreduce. While RCCL performs comparably to ForestColl at 1MB and 1GB, it lags in the mid-range. On average, ForestColl outperforms the best-performing RCCL algorithm by 37%, 32%, and 13% in allgather, reduce-scatter, and allreduce, respectively. Table 2 lists detailed performance numbers from the experiments.




Figure 8: Comparing allgather, reduce-scatter, and allreduce performance of TACCL, Blink+Switch, RCCL, and ForestColl in 16+16 and 8+8 settings on the 2-cluster AMD MI250 Testbed. The columns and rows correspond to different settings and collectives, respectively. “Blink+Switch” represents Blink augmented with our switch removal technique, enabling it to support switch topology. The algorithmic bandwidth (algbw) is calculated by dividing data size by schedule runtime. Detailed numbers of the results are listed in Table 2.

8+8 Results: In 8+8 setting, ForestColl also outperforms the baselines. The comparison between ForestColl and TACCL remains similar, with ForestColl being 43% faster at 1GB and 36% faster on average from 1MB to 1GB. Against Blink+Switch, ForestColl is 36% faster at 1GB and 35% faster on average. RCCL’s performance, however, drops significantly in 8+8 setting, with ForestColl being on average 2.52x, 2.29x, and 1.47x faster in allgather, reduce-scatter, and allreduce, respectively. At 1GB data size, ForestColl has 2.7x, 2.42x, and 1.66x higher algbws compared to RCCL’s best-performing algorithm. The drop in RCCL’s performance is due to its inability to generate schedules based on the new topology, as it is optimized for fixed topologies with full 16 GPUs per cluster. In contrast, ForestColl, TACCL, and Blink+Switch can generate new schedules for the new 8+8 topology and have relatively stable performance.

5.3 NVIDIA A100 Experiments

Testbed Setup: On a two-cluster NVIDIA A100 testbed, we evaluated ForestColl’s schedules against TACCL and NCCL, where NCCL [4] (NVIDIA Collective Communication Library) is NVIDIA’s own library optimized for NVIDIA GPUs.




Figure 9: Example of ForestColl’s spanning out-trees on 2-cluster NVIDIA A100 topology.




Figure 10: Comparing allgather, reduce-scatter, and allreduce performance of TACCL, NCCL, and ForestColl on the 2-cluster NVIDIA A100 testbed. Detailed numbers of the results are listed in Table 3.

Each cluster is equipped with 8× NVIDIA A100 GPUs, interconnected by an NVSwitch with 300GB/s intra-cluster bandwidth per GPU. Additionally, every two GPUs are connected to two InfiniBand NICs via a PCIe switch. Each NIC provides 25GB/s inter-cluster bandwidth.

Schedule Comparison: While the trees generated by ForestColl for AMD MI250 topology are not intuitive to humans, the trees for A100 topology are quite straightforward. Figure 9 shows one example of the trees generated by ForestColl. Here, the data shard follows two long paths: one within the local cluster, and one goes to the opposite cluster. The optimality binary search suggests that the bottleneck cut in the 2-cluster A100 topology is the total ingress bandwidth of a single GPU. This leads to an optimal allgather runtime of $T_{\text{comm}} = \frac{M}{16} \cdot \frac{15}{325\text{GB/s}} = \frac{M}{346.67\text{GB/s}}$, which ForestColl’s schedule guarantees. In comparison, the path of the ring algorithm, visiting GPUs one by one, has to travel through the IB switch twice, once in each direction. Excluding the most southwestern and northeastern GPUs (whose data shards only cross the IB once), the data shards of the remaining 14 GPUs need

Allgather	Algbw (GB/s)					ForestColl / Baseline				
	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg
ForestColl	13.1	92.6	201	247	130	-	-	-	-	-
TACCL	6.67	56.4	150	213	97.3	2.0x	1.6x	1.3x	1.2x	1.3x
NCCL Ring	3.17	37.6	152	187	85.8	4.1x	2.5x	1.3x	1.3x	1.5x
Reduce-Scatter	Algbw (GB/s)					ForestColl / Baseline				
	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg
ForestColl	9.24	72.5	185	247	119	-	-	-	-	-
NCCL Ring	3.17	37.5	151	190	86.0	2.9x	1.9x	1.2x	1.3x	1.4x
Allreduce	Algbw (GB/s)					ForestColl / Baseline				
	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg	1M	16M	128M	1G	Avg
ForestColl	5.75	41.4	107	122	65.0	-	-	-	-	-
NCCL Tree	4.47	34.8	71.9	96.8	48.8	1.3x	1.2x	1.5x	1.3x	1.3x
NCCL Ring	1.75	20.8	78.3	95.3	44.6	3.3x	2.0x	1.4x	1.3x	1.5x
NCCL Best	4.47	34.8	78.3	96.8	50.1	1.3x	1.2x	1.4x	1.3x	1.3x

Table 3: Experiment results of running allgather, reduce-scatter, and allreduce schedules of TACCL, NCCL, and ForestColl on the 2-cluster NVIDIA A100 testbed. “NCCL Best” in allreduce represents the best result from “NCCL Tree” and “NCCL Ring” at each data size. Figure 10 provides visual plots of the experiment results.

to travel through IB once per direction. The 16 GPUs collectively require a total $\frac{M}{16} \cdot (2 + 14 \cdot 2) / 2 = \frac{M}{16} \cdot 15$ amount of data crossing IB from each direction. Consequently, although the ring’s data path is only slightly different from that of ForestColl, the ring algorithm’s theoretical allgather runtime is at least $T_{\text{comm}} \geq \frac{M}{16} \cdot \frac{15}{8.25\text{GB/s}} = \frac{M}{213.33\text{GB/s}}$, which is 62.5% worse than $\frac{M}{346.67\text{GB/s}}$ of ForestColl.

Experiment Results: Figure 10 presents our experiment results. ForestColl leads in all three collectives by a considerable margin over the closest baseline. While TACCL’s performance improves in switch-only topology, ForestColl still outperforms it by 16% at 1GB data size and by an average of 34% for sizes from 1MB to 1GB. The lead of ForestColl over NCCL is even greater. Compared to NCCL, ForestColl achieves 32%, 30%, and 26% higher algbws at 1GB for allgather, reduce-scatter, and allreduce, respectively. On average, ForestColl is 52%, 38%, and 30% faster than NCCL for data sizes from 1MB to 1GB in allgather, reduce-scatter, and allreduce, respectively. Table 3 lists detailed performance numbers from the experiments.

5.4 Schedule Generation Comparison

In schedule generation, TACCL is the closest to ForestColl. While BFB and Blink also conduct schedule generation, they do not support switch topologies. In Figure 11, we compare TACCL and ForestColl in generating allgather schedules for multi-cluster NVIDIA A100 and AMD MI250 topologies.

TACCL employs a mixed integer linear program (MILP) to solve the schedule generation problem. Given that MILP is generally NP-hard and can take an extremely long time to solve to optimality, TACCL imposes a time limit to its MILP solver, after which the solver will stop early and return the best solution found up to that point. However, for large topologies, TACCL may not find a single solution within the time limit. In our experiments, TACCL’s time limit is set to 10^4 s for A100 topologies. For MI250 topologies, due




Figure 11: Schedule generation comparison between TACCL and ForestColl on multi-cluster NVIDIA A100 and AMD MI250 topologies. The top row compares the total time spent to generate the schedules, and the bottom row compares the theoretical algorithmic bandwidth of the generated schedules. TACCL is run with four different numbers of chunks, and the MILP solver time limit is set to 10^4 s for A100 and 3×10^4 s for MI250.

to their the increased complexity, TACCL cannot generate any schedule beyond 2-cluster 32 GPUs within 10^4 s, hence we extend the time limit to 3×10^4 s, or 8.3 hours. Figure 11 shows the schedule generation results. In A100 topologies, TACCL saturates the 10^4 s limit at four clusters with 32 GPUs, while ForestColl’s generation times are still within the sub-second range. In MI250 topologies, TACCL also exhausts the 3×10^4 s limit at four cluster 64 GPUs. In both types of topologies, ForestColl is orders of magnitude faster due to its strongly polynomial runtime. For larger topology sizes (> 128 GPUs), TACCL fails to generate any solution within the time limits. In contrast, ForestColl can generate schedules for topologies with > 1000 GPUs within the same limits. Furthermore, unlike ForestColl, which automatically determines the number of trees k , TACCL requires the number of chunks c as an input parameter. To achieve the best schedule performance, one needs a parameter sweep with TACCL, potentially prolonging the required time further.

While TACCL can stop early to generate schedules within time limits, this comes with a significant loss in schedule performance. Figure 11 compares the theoretical algorithmic bandwidths (algbw) of the generated schedules. The theoretical algbw is calculated by dividing the data size by the expected communication time, which is computed based on the congestion of links in the schedule. ForestColl is always theoretically optimal as guaranteed by our underlying theory. As for TACCL, in 16-GPU A100 topology, TACCL finishes solving the MILP to optimality, generating a schedule that matches ForestColl’s schedule in algbw. However, when TACCL has to stop early at larger topology sizes, its

schedule performance drops significantly. In MI250 topologies, TACCL’s schedules are far from optimal. This aligns with the observation in [40] that TACCL tends to generate inefficient schedules for direct-connect topologies.

6 Concluding Remarks

Collective communication has become a performance bottleneck in distributed ML. The diversity and heterogeneity of the network topologies pose significant challenges to designing efficient communication algorithms. In this paper, we proposed ForestColl, which *efficiently* generates *theoretically optimal* communication schedules for *any type* of network topology. Experiments on today’s most widely used multi-cluster ML platforms have demonstrated our significant performance improvements over both the platforms’ own optimized communication libraries and other state-of-the-art schedule generation techniques.

This work does not raise any ethical issues.

References

- [1] AMD Instinct™ Accelerators. <https://www.amd.com/en/products/accelerators/instinct.html#partner-solutions>.
- [2] DGX Platform | NVIDIA. <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/data-center/dgx-platform/>.
- [3] Microsoft Collective Communication Library (MSCCL). <https://github.com/microsoft/msccl>.
- [4] NVIDIA Collective Communication Library (NCCL). <https://github.com/NVIDIA/nccl>.
- [5] PyTorch: Distributed Data Parallel. <https://pytorch.org/docs/stable/notes/ddp.html>.
- [6] ROCm Collective Communication Library (RCCL). <https://github.com/ROCm/rccl>.
- [7] NVIDIA DGX A100 System Architecture: The Universal System for AI Infrastructure. Technical White Paper WP-10083-001_v01, NVIDIA, July 2020.
- [8] AL-FARES, M., LOUKISSAS, A., AND VAHDAT, A. A scalable, commodity data center network architecture. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2008 Conference on Data Communication* (New York, NY, USA, 2008), SIGCOMM ’08, Association for Computing Machinery, p. 63–74.
- [9] AMINABADI, R. Y., RAJBHANDARI, S., AWAN, A. A., LI, C., LI, D., ZHENG, E., RUWASE, O., SMITH, S., ZHANG, M., RASLEY, J., AND HE, Y. DeepSpeed-inference: Enabling efficient inference of transformer models at unprecedented scale. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis* (2022), SC ’22, IEEE Press.
- [10] BANG-JENSEN, J., FRANK, A., AND JACKSON, B. Preserving and increasing local edge-connectivity in mixed graphs. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 8, 2 (1995), 155–178.
- [11] BÉRCZI, K., AND FRANK, A. Packing arborescences (combinatorial optimization and discrete algorithms). *RIMS Kokyuroku Bessatsu B23* (2010), 1–31.
- [12] BERMOND, J.-C., AND FRAIGNIAUD, P. Broadcasting and NP-completeness. In *Graph Theory Notes of New York* (1992), vol. XXII, pp. 8–14.
- [13] CAI, Z., LIU, Z., MALEKI, S., MUSUVATHI, M., MYTKOWICZ, T., NELSON, J., AND SAARIKIVI, O. Synthesizing optimal collective algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming* (New York, NY, USA, 2021), PPOPP ’21, Association for Computing Machinery, p. 62–75.
- [14] CHAN, E., HEIMLICH, M., PURKAYASTHA, A., AND VAN DE GEIJN, R. Collective communication: Theory, practice, and experience: Research articles. *Concurr. Comput. : Pract. Exper.* 19, 13 (sep 2007), 1749–1783.
- [15] CHO, M., FINKLER, U., AND KUNG, D. Blueconnect: Novel hierarchical all-reduce on multi-tired network for deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 2nd SysML Conference* (2019).
- [16] EDMONDS, J. Edge-disjoint branchings. *Combinatorial algorithms* (1973), 91–96.
- [17] FRANK, A. On connectivity properties of eulerian digraphs. In *Graph Theory in Memory of G.A. Dirac*, L. D. Andersen, I. T. Jakobsen, C. Thomassen, B. Toft, and P. D. Vestergaard, Eds., vol. 41 of *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*. Elsevier, 1988, pp. 179–194.
- [18] GIBIANSKY, A. Bringing hpc techniques to deep learning. *Baidu Research, Tech. Rep.* (2017). <https://andrew.gibiansky.com/blog/machine-learning/baidu-allreduce/>.
- [19] GOLDBERG, A. V., AND TARJAN, R. E. A new approach to the maximum-flow problem. *J. ACM* 35, 4 (oct 1988), 921–940.
- [20] GOOGLE RESEARCH. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways, 2022.
- [21] JACKSON, B. Some remarks on arc-connectivity, vertex splitting, and orientation in graphs and digraphs. *Journal of Graph Theory* 12, 3

- (1988), 429–436.
- [22] JOUPPI, N., KURIAN, G., LI, S., MA, P., NAGARAJAN, R., NAI, L., PATIL, N., SUBRAMANIAN, S., SWING, A., TOWLES, B., YOUNG, C., ZHOU, X., ZHOU, Z., AND PATTERSON, D. A. Tpu v4: An optically reconfigurable super-computer for machine learning with hardware support for embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture* (New York, NY, USA, 2023), ISCA '23, Association for Computing Machinery.
- [23] KIM, J., DALLY, W. J., SCOTT, S., AND ABTS, D. Technology-driven, highly-scalable dragonfly topology. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture* (USA, 2008), ISCA '08, IEEE Computer Society, p. 77–88.
- [24] META. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, 2023.
- [25] OPENAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.
- [26] POPE, R., DOUGLAS, S., CHOWDHURY, A., DEVLIN, J., BRADBURY, J., HECK, J., XIAO, K., AGRAWAL, S., AND DEAN, J. Efficiently scaling transformer inference. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems 5* (2023).
- [27] RABENSEIFNER, R. Optimization of collective reduction operations. In *Computational Science - ICCS 2004* (Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004), M. Bubak, G. D. van Albada, P. M. A. Sloot, and J. Dongarra, Eds., Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 1–9.
- [28] RAJBHANDARI, S., RASLEY, J., RUWASE, O., AND HE, Y. Zero: Memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis* (2020), SC '20, IEEE Press.
- [29] SAAD, Y., AND SCHULTZ, M. H. Data communication in parallel architectures. *Parallel Computing* 11, 2 (1989), 131–150.
- [30] SCHRIJVER, A. Combinatorial optimization : polyhedra and efficiency, 2003.
- [31] SERGEEV, A., AND BALSIO, M. D. Horovod: fast and easy distributed deep learning in tensorflow, 2018.
- [32] SHAH, A., CHIDAMBARAM, V., COWAN, M., MALEKI, S., MUSUVATHI, M., MYTKOWICZ, T., NELSON, J., SAARIKIVI, O., AND SINGH, R. TACCL: Guiding collective algorithm synthesis using communication sketches. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23)* (Boston, MA, Apr. 2023), USENIX Association, pp. 593–612.
- [33] SHOEYBI, M., PATWARY, M., PURI, R., LEGRISLEY, P., CASPER, J., AND CATANZARO, B. Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism, 2020.
- [34] TARJAN, R. E. A good algorithm for edge-disjoint branching. *Information Processing Letters* 3, 2 (1974), 51–53.
- [35] THAKUR, R., RABENSEIFNER, R., AND GROPP, W. Optimization of collective communication operations in mpich. *The International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications* 19, 1 (2005), 49–66.
- [36] WANG, G., VENKATARAMAN, S., PHANISHAYEE, A., DEVANUR, N., THELIN, J., AND STOICA, I. Blink: Fast and generic collectives for distributed ml. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems* (2020), I. Dhillon, D. Papailiopoulos, and V. Sze, Eds., vol. 2, pp. 172–186.
- [37] WANG, W., GHOBADI, M., SHAKERI, K., ZHANG, Y., AND HASANI, N. How to build low-cost networks for large language models (without sacrificing performance)?, 2023.
- [38] WANG, W., KHAZRAEE, M., ZHONG, Z., GHOBADI, M., JIA, Z., MUDIGERE, D., ZHANG, Y., AND KEWITSCH, A. TopoOpt: Co-optimizing network topology and parallelization strategy for distributed training jobs. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23)* (Boston, MA, Apr. 2023), USENIX Association, pp. 739–767.
- [39] WON, W., ELAVAZHAGAN, M., SRINIVASAN, S., DURG, A., GUPTA, S., AND KRISHNA, T. Tacos: Topology-aware collective algorithm synthesizer for distributed training, 2023.
- [40] ZHAO, L., PAL, S., CHUGH, T., WANG, W., FANTL, J., BASU, P., KHOURY, J., AND KRISHNAMURTHY, A. Efficient direct-connect topologies for collective communications, 2023.
- [41] ZHENG, L., LI, Z., ZHANG, H., ZHUANG, Y., CHEN, Z., HUANG, Y., WANG, Y., XU, Y., ZHUO, D., XING, E. P., GONZALEZ, J. E., AND STOICA, I. Alpa: Automating inter- and Intra-Operator parallelism for distributed deep learning. In *16th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 22)* (Carlsbad, CA, July 2022), USENIX Association, pp. 559–578.

Appendix

In this appendix, we provide detailed mathematical analysis and proofs to supplement the main text. To summarize,

- §A provides a summary of notations used in the main text and appendix.
- §B justifies our adoption of broadcast flow cost model and tree-based schedule.
- §C elaborates on the mathematical details of algorithm.
- §D proves that every part of our algorithm runs in strongly polynomial time.
- §E describes a linear program to construct optimal all-reduce schedule.
- §F provides proofs of all theorems in this paper.

A Notations

To ensure rigorous mathematical reasoning, we introduce the following notations:

- $G = (V = V_s \cup V_c, E)$: the input topology as a directed graph. V_s and V_c represent the switch nodes and compute nodes, respectively.
- \vec{G}_x : the auxiliary network constructed for optimality binary search. Defined in §C.1.
- $G(\{Ub_e\})$: a graph obtained by multiplying each link bandwidth b_e of G by U . Defined in §C.1.
- G^{ef} : a graph obtained by splitting off edge e and f of G . Defined in §C.2.
- $G^* = (V_c, E^*)$: the graph after removing all switch nodes from G using edge splitting technique. Defined in §C.2.
- $\widehat{D}_{(u,w),v}, \widehat{D}_{(w,t),v}$: the auxiliary networks for edge splitting (computing γ). Defined in §C.2.
- \overline{D} : the auxiliary network for spanning tree construction (computing μ). Defined in §C.3.
- M : total size of the data across all nodes.
- N : the number of compute nodes, i.e., $N = |V_c|$.
- b_e : the bandwidth of link e .
- k : the number of out-trees rooted at each compute node.
- x : the total bandwidth of the out-trees rooted at each compute node.
- y : the bandwidth utilized by each out-tree.
- U : equal to $1/y$. Used to scale edge capacities.
- γ : the maximum capacity we can safely replace (or split off) (u, w) , (w, t) with (u, t) . Defined in Theorem 8.
- μ : the maximum capacity we can add an edge into a tree. Defined in (4) of §C.3.

- S, S^* : a cut represented as a vertex subset. S^* denotes the bottleneck cut, where $\frac{|S^* \cap V_c|}{B_G^+(S^*)} \geq \frac{|S \cap V_c|}{B_G^+(S)}$ for all $S \subset V, S \not\subseteq V_c$.
- $B_G^+(S), B_G^-(S)$: the exiting bandwidth and entering bandwidth of a vertex set S on a graph G , i.e., sum of the bandwidths of all links exiting/entering S .
- $F(x, y; G)$: the maxflow from node x to y in graph G .
- $c(A, B; G)$: the total capacity from vertex set A to B in graph G , i.e., the sum of the capacities of directed edges going from A to B .
- $\lambda(x, y; G)$: the edge connectivity from x to y in graph G . In integer-capacity graph, $\lambda(x, y; G) = F(x, y; G)$.
- $d^+(v), d^-(v)$: the in-degree and out-degree of node v . In integer-capacity graph, $d^+(v), d^-(v)$ are total ingress and egress capacity of v .
- $T_{u,i}$: the i -th out-tree rooted at node u .
- $R_{u,i}, \mathcal{V}(T_{u,i})$: the vertex set of the out-tree $T_{u,i}$.
- $\mathcal{E}(T_{u,i})$: the edge set of the out-tree $T_{u,i}$.
- $m(R_{u,i}), g(x, y)$: notations for spanning tree construction. Defined in Theorem 11.

B Broadcast Flow Model

In this work, we assume a *broadcast flow model*, in which data follows spanning out-trees to be broadcast from the roots to all nodes in the network. This model aligns with modern ML network architectures, where data transmission is implemented to break data into small chunks and send them one by one in a flow fashion. One potential pitfall is that at small data sizes (\leq MBs), the flow is too small to saturate bandwidth in the network and is bottlenecked by hop latency instead. In this work, we do not focus on minimizing hop latency, which corresponds to the height of spanning trees, since packing spanning trees with limited height has been shown to be NP-complete [12]. We argue that in collective communication of today’s ML workloads, small data sizes are relatively unimportant compared to intermediate to large data sizes for the following reasons:

- (i) In today’s ML network architectures, the communication time for small data sizes (\leq MBs) is at most tens of microseconds given hundreds of GB/s bandwidth, rendering optimization efforts for small data sizes inconsequential.
- (ii) The design of modern ML training/inferencing often features computation-communication overlap, which effectively hides the communication cost of small data sizes but not intermediate to large data sizes.
- (iii) Modern ML training frameworks also support batching small communications into a larger-size communication, such as the “bucket” in PyTorch DDP [5], further reducing the importance of small data sizes.

When performance is bottlenecked by hop latency, optimizations in network protocol and implementation (e.g., the LL protocol in NCCL [4]) are more critical than scheduling optimization, which is the primary focus of this paper. Scheduling optimization also becomes meaningless at small data sizes, because if congestion can be ignored, then any schedule with small number of hops, such as recursive halving/doubling, can be effective on any topology with all-to-all reachability. In the following section, we further discuss a dilemma in collective communication, showing that our tree-based schedule is the only approach to achieve theoretical optimal performance.

B.1 Minimality-or-Saturation Dilemma

In this section, we discuss why we need a tree-based schedule instead of an ordinary step-based schedule to achieve optimality. We show that in certain situations, tree-based schedule is *the only possible way* to achieve optimality. As shown in optimality (1), the performance of a topology is bounded by a bottleneck cut (S^*, \bar{S}^*) . Suppose we want to achieve the performance bound given by the bottleneck cut, i.e., $(M/N)|S^* \cap V_c|/B_G^+(S^*)$, then the schedule must satisfy two requirements: (a) the bandwidth of the bottleneck cut, i.e., $B_G^+(S^*)$, must be saturated at all times, and (b) only the minimum amount of data required, i.e., $(M/N)|S^* \cap V_c|$, is transmitted through the bottleneck cut.

Consider the switch topology in Figure 12a. The topology has 8 compute nodes and 3 switch nodes. The eight compute nodes are in two clusters. Each cluster has a switch v_1^s or v_2^s providing $10b$ egress/ingress bandwidth for each compute node in the cluster. The 8 compute nodes are also connected to a global switch v_0^s , providing b egress/ingress bandwidth for each compute node. It is easy to check that the bottleneck cut in this topology is a cluster cut $S^* = \{v_1^s, v_{1,1}^c, v_{1,2}^c, v_{1,3}^c, v_{1,4}^c\}$ shown in Figure 12b. The cut provides a communication time lower bound of $(M/N)(4/4b)$. In comparison, a single-compute-node cut provides a much lower communication time lower bound $(M/N)(1/11b)$.

Suppose we want to achieve the lower bound by bottleneck cut S^* . Let C be the last chunk sent through the cut to cluster 2, and suppose it is sent to $v_{2,1}^c$. The first thing to try is to saturate the bandwidth. It means that the schedule terminates right after C is sent, leaving no idle time for $B_G^+(S^*)$. Then, at least one of $v_{2,2}^c, v_{2,3}^c, v_{2,4}^c$ must get C directly from cluster 1 because they have no time to get it from $v_{2,1}^c$. This violates minimality, however, because chunk C got sent through the bottleneck cut at least twice.

Suppose we want to achieve minimality. Then, $v_{2,1}^c$ has to broadcast C to $v_{2,2}^c, v_{2,3}^c, v_{2,4}^c$ within the cluster. However, because C is the last chunk sent through the cut by assumption, the cut bandwidth $B_G^+(S^*)$ is idle during the broadcast. The saturation requirement is violated. Thus, we are in a

minimality-or-saturation dilemma that we cannot achieve both at the same time. However, we can do infinitely close by making chunk C infinitesimally small. By doing so, we transmit minimum data required, and we also make the idle time of bottleneck cut close to 0. In step-based schedule, one always needs to specify C as a fixed fraction of the total data, so it is impossible to achieve optimality in such a case. In contrast, the size of one send/recv can be arbitrarily small in tree-based schedule. Therefore, tree-based schedule is the only way to achieve optimality.

C Algorithm Design

Let $G = (V = V_s \cup V_c, E)$ be an arbitrary network topology. We will compute an allgather schedule that reaches the optimal communication time (1). We make two trivial assumptions about the topology: (a) all link bandwidths are integers and (b) G is *Eulerian*, i.e., the total egress bandwidth equals the total ingress bandwidth for any node. For (a), when bandwidths are rational numbers, one can always scale them up to become integers. For (b), we use $B_G^+(v)$ and $B_G^-(v)$ to denote the total egress and ingress bandwidth of node v respectively. Since G is Eulerian, we have $B_G^+(v) = B_G^-(v)$ for all $v \in V$ and, consequently, $B_G^+(S) = B_G^-(S)$ for any $S \subseteq V$.

In summary, the algorithm contains three parts:

- **§C.1:** Conduct a binary search to compute the optimal communication time (1). The binary search uses a network flow based oracle to test if a certain value is \geq or $<$ than the true value of optimality (1).
- **§C.2:** Transform the switch topology into a direct-connect logical topology by using *edge splitting* to remove switch nodes. The transformation is done without compromising optimal performance. This part can be skipped if the input topology is already direct-connect.
- **§C.3:** Construct spanning trees in direct-connect topology to achieve optimal performance. These spanning trees can then be mapped back to the original topology by reversing edge splitting, which determines the routing of communications between compute nodes.

The algorithm design is centered on earlier graph theoretical results on constructing edge-disjoint out-trees in directed graph [10, 11, 16, 30, 34]. A key observation leading to this algorithm is that *given a set of out-trees, there are at most U out-trees congested on any edge of G , if and only if, the set of out-trees is edge-disjoint in a multigraph topology obtained by duplicating each of G 's edges U times.*

Another core design of our algorithm relies on *edge splitting*, also a technique from graph theory [10, 17, 21]. It is used to transform the switch topology into a direct-connect topology so that one can construct compute-node-only spanning trees. Previous works such as TACCL [32] and TACOS [39] attempt to do this by “unwinding” switch topologies into




Figure 12: An 8-compute-node switch topology in 2-cluster setting. The thick links have 10x the bandwidth of the thin ones. Figure (a) shows the original switch topology. Figure (b) shows the bottleneck cut in this topology. Figure (c) shows a spanning tree rooted at $v_{1,1}^c$ with switch-node broadcast. Figure (d) shows a suboptimal way of transforming the switch topology into a direct-connect logical topology (resulting in 4x worse optimal performance).

predefined logical topologies, such as rings. However, their transformations often result in a loss of performance compared to the original switch topology. For example, the previous works may unwind all switches in Figure 12a into rings, resulting in Figure 12d. However, it makes the bottleneck cut S^* worse that the egress bandwidth of S^* becomes b instead of $4b$, causing optimality (1) being $(M/N)(4/b)$ (4x worse). In contrast, our *edge splitting* strategically removes switch nodes without sacrificing any overall performance. Our transformation generates direct-connect topology in Figure 13b, which has the same optimality as Figure 12a.

In this paper, we make extensive use of network flow between different pairs of nodes. For any flow network D , we use $F(x, y; D)$ to denote the value of maxflow from x to y in D . For disjoint A, B , let $c(A, B; D)$ be the total capacity from A to B in D . By min-cut theorem, $F(x, y; D) \leq c(A, \bar{A}; D)$ if $x \in A, y \in \bar{A}$, and there exists an x - y cut (A^*, \bar{A}^*) that $F(x, y; D) = c(A^*, \bar{A}^*; D)$.

C.1 Optimality Binary Search

In this section, we will show a way to compute the optimality (1). Let $\{b_e\}_{e \in E}$ be the link bandwidths of G . By assumption, $\{b_e\}_{e \in E}$ are in \mathbb{Z}_+ and represented as capacities of edges in G . For any $x \in \mathbb{Q}$, we define \vec{G}_x to be the flow network that (a) a source node s is added and (b) an edge (s, u) is added with capacity x for every vertex $u \in V_c$. Now, we have the following theorem:

THEOREM 1. $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_x) \geq |V_c|x$ if and only if $1/x \geq \max_{S \subset V, S \not\subseteq V_c} |S \cap V_c| / B_G^+(S)$.

The implication of Theorem 1 is that we can do a binary search to get $1/x^* = \max_{S \subset V, S \not\subseteq V_c} |S \cap V_c| / B_G^+(S)$. The following initial range is trivial

$$\frac{N-1}{\min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v)} \leq \max_{S \subset V, S \not\subseteq V_c} \frac{|S \cap V_c|}{B_G^+(S)} \leq N-1.$$

The lower bound corresponds to a partition containing all nodes except the compute node with minimum ingress bandwidth. The upper bound is due to the fact that $|S \cap V_c| \leq N-1$ and $B_G^+(S) \geq 1$. Starting with the initial range, one can then continuously test if $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_x) \geq |V_c|x$ for some midpoint x to do a binary search. To find the exact $1/x^*$, let $S^* = \arg \max_{S \subset V, S \not\subseteq V_c} |S \cap V_c| / B_G^+(S)$, then $1/x^*$ equals a fractional number with $B_G^+(S^*)$ as its denominator. Observe that $|S^* \cap V_c| \leq N-1$ and $|S^* \cap V_c| / B_G^+(S^*) \geq (N-1) / \min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v)$, so $B_G^+(S^*) \leq \min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v)$. Therefore, the denominator of $1/x^*$ is bounded by $\min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v)$. Now, we use the following proposition:

PROPOSITION 2. Given two unequal fractional numbers a/b and c/d with $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, if denominators $b, d \leq X$ for some $X \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then $|a/b - c/d| \geq 1/X^2$.

The proposition implies that if $1/x^* = a/b$ for some $b \leq \min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v)$, then any $c/d \neq 1/x^*$ with $d \leq \min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v)$ satisfies $|c/d - 1/x^*| \geq 1 / \min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v)^2$. Thus, one can run binary search until the range is smaller than $1 / \min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v)^2$. Then, $1/x^*$ can be computed exactly by finding the fractional number closest to the midpoint with a denominator not exceeding $\min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v)$. The latter can be done with the continued fraction algorithm or brute force search if $\min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v)$ is small.

At the point, we have already known the optimality of communication time given a topology G . For the remainder of this section, we will show that there exists a family of spanning trees that achieves this optimality. First of all, we have assumed that G 's links have the set of bandwidths $\{b_e\}_{e \in E}$. For the simplicity of notation, we use $G(\{c_e\})$ to denote the same topology as G but with the set of bandwidths $\{c_e\}_{e \in E}$ instead. $\vec{G}_x(\{c_e\})$ is also defined accordingly. When $\{c_e\}_{e \in E}$ are integers, we say a family of out-trees \mathcal{F} is *edge-disjoint* in $G(\{c_e\})$ if the number of trees using any edge $e \in E$ is less than or equal to c_e , i.e., $\sum_{T \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{I}[e \in T] \leq c_e$ for

all $e \in E$. The intuition behind this edge-disjointness is that *the integer capacity c_e represents the number of multiedges from the tail to the head of e .*

Now, we find $U \in \mathbb{Q}, k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $U/k = 1/x^*$ and $Ub_e \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for all $e \in E$. For simplicity of schedule, we want k to be as small as possible. The following proposition shows how to find such U, k :

PROPOSITION 3. *Given $\{b_e\}_{e \in E} \subset \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $1/x^* \in \mathbb{Q}$, let p/q be the simplest fractional representation of $1/x^*$, i.e., $p/q = 1/x^*$ and $\gcd(p, q) = 1$. Suppose $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is the smallest such that there exists $U \in \mathbb{Q}$ satisfying $U/k = 1/x^*$ and $Ub_e \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for all $e \in E$, then $U = p/\gcd(q, \{b_e\}_{e \in E})$ and $k = Ux^*$.*

In Figure 12a's example, we have $1/x^* = |S^* \cap V_c|/B_G^+(S^*) = 4/4b = 1/b$ and thus $U = 1/b, k = 1$.

Consider the digraph $G(\{Ub_e\})$. Each edge of $G(\{Ub_e\})$ has integer capacity. We will show that there exists a family of edge-disjoint out-trees $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ in $G(\{Ub_e\})$ with $T_{u,i}$ rooted at u and $\mathcal{V}(T_{u,i}) \supseteq V_c$. Here, $[k] = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $\mathcal{V}(T_{u,i})$ denotes the vertex set of $T_{u,i}$. We use the following theorem proven by Bang-Jensen et al. [10]:

THEOREM 4 (BANG-JENSEN ET AL. [10]). *Let $n \geq 1$ and $D = (V, E)$ be a digraph with a special node s . Let $T' = \{v \mid v \in V - s, d^-(v) < d^+(v)\}$. If $\lambda(s, v; D) \geq n$ for all $v \in T'$, then there is a family \mathcal{F} of edge-disjoint out-trees rooted at s such that every $v \in V$ belongs to at least $\min(n, \lambda(s, v; D))$ number of out-trees.*

Because we see integer capacity as the number of multiedges, here, the total in-degree $d^-(v)$ and out-degree $d^+(v)$ are simply the total ingress and egress capacity of v in $G(\{Ub_e\})$. $\lambda(x, y; D)$ denotes the edge-connectivity from x to y in D , i.e., $\lambda(x, y; D) = \min_{x \in A, y \in \bar{A}} c(A, \bar{A}; D)$. By min-cut theorem, $\lambda(x, y; D)$ is also equal to the maxflow from x to y . Theorem 4 leads to the following:

THEOREM 5. *Given integer-capacity digraph $D = (V_s \cup V_c, E)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a family of edge-disjoint out-trees $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ in D with $T_{u,i}$ rooted at u and $\mathcal{V}(T_{u,i}) \supseteq V_c$ if and only if $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k) \geq |V_c|k$.*

Consider the flow network $\vec{G}_k(\{Ub_e\})$. It is trivial to see that each edge in $\vec{G}_k(\{Ub_e\})$ has exactly U times the capacity as in \vec{G}_{x^*} , including the edges incident from s . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_k(\{Ub_e\})) &= U \cdot \min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_{x^*}) \\ &\geq U \cdot |V_c|x^* \\ &= |V_c|k. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 5, there exists a family of edge-disjoint out-trees $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ in $G(\{Ub_e\})$ with $T_{u,i}$ rooted at u and $\mathcal{V}(T_{u,i}) \supseteq V_c$. Observe that for any edge $e \in E$, at most Ub_e number of trees from $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ use edge e . For allgather, we make each tree broadcast $1/k$ of the root's data shard,

Algorithm 4: Remove Switch Nodes

Input: Integer-capacity Eulerian digraph $D = (V_s \cup V_c, E)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Output: Direct-connect digraph $D^* = (V_c, E^*)$ and path recovery table routing.

```

begin
  Initialize table routing
  foreach switch node  $w \in V_s$  do
    foreach egress edge  $f = (w, t) \in E$  do
      foreach ingress edge  $e = (u, w) \in E$  do
        Compute  $\gamma$  as in (2).
        if  $\gamma > 0$  then
          Decrease  $f$ 's and  $e$ 's capacity by  $\gamma$ . Remove  $e$  if
            its capacity reaches 0.
          Increase capacity of  $(u, t)$  by  $\gamma$ . Add the edge if
             $(u, t) \notin E$ .
          routing $[(u, t)][w] \leftarrow$  routing $[(u, t)][w] + \gamma$ 
          if  $f$ 's capacity reaches 0 then break
        // Edge  $f$  should have 0 capacity at this point.
        Remove edge  $f$  from  $D$ .
        // Node  $w$  should be isolated at this point.
        Remove node  $w$  from  $D$ .
  return the latest  $D$  as  $D^*$  and table routing

```

then the communication time is

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\text{comm}} &\leq \max_{e \in E} \frac{M}{Nk} \cdot \frac{Ub_e}{b_e} = \frac{M}{N} \cdot \frac{U}{k} \\ &= \frac{M}{N} \cdot \frac{1}{x^*} = \frac{M}{N} \max_{s \subset V, S \not\supseteq V_c} \frac{|S \cap V_c|}{B_G^+(S)} \end{aligned}$$

reaching the optimality (1) given topology G .

At this point, one may be tempted to construct and use $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ to perform allgather. However, because $T_{u,i}$ can be arbitrary tree in $G(\{Ub_e\})$, it may force switch nodes to broadcast like v_0^s, v_1^s in Figure 12c. In the following section, we introduce a way to remove switch nodes from $G(\{Ub_e\})$, while preserving the existence of out-trees with the same communication time. Afterward, we construct out-trees in the compute-node-only topology and map the communications back to $G(\{Ub_e\})$. Thus, we are able to construct a schedule with the same optimal performance but without switch-node broadcast.

C.2 Edge Splitting

To remove the switch nodes from $G(\{Ub_e\})$, we apply a technique called *edge splitting*. Consider a vertex w and two incident edges (u, w) , (w, t) . The operation of edge splitting is to replace (u, w) , (w, t) by a direct edge (u, t) while maintaining edge-connectivities in the graph. In our context, w is a switch node. We continuously split off one capacity of an incoming edge to w and one capacity of an outgoing edge from w until w is isolated and can be removed from the graph. Because the edge-connectivities are maintained, we are able to show that $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_k(\{Ub_e\})) \geq |V_c|k$ is maintained in the process. Thus, by Theorem 5, the existence




Figure 13: Different stages of the topology in schedule construction. Figure (a) shows the topology of $G(\{Ub_e\})$. Note that the link capacities no longer have b as a multiplier. Figure (b) shows the topology G^* after edge splitting removes all switch nodes. Figure (c) shows a spanning tree constructed in G^* . Figure (d) shows the routings in G corresponding to the spanning tree.

of spanning trees with the same optimal performance is also preserved.

We start with the following theorem from Bang-Jensen et al. [10]. The theorem was originally proven by Frank [17] and Jackson [21].

THEOREM 6 (BANG-JENSEN ET AL. [10]). *Let $D = (V + w, E)$ be a directed Eulerian graph, that is, $d^-(x) = d^+(x)$ for every node x of D . Then, for every edge $f = (w, t)$ there is an edge $e = (u, w)$ such that $\lambda(x, y; D^{ef}) = \lambda(x, y; D)$ for every $x, y \in V$, where D^{ef} is the resulting graph obtained by splitting off e and f in D .*

In our case, we are not concerned with any edge-connectivity other than from s . In other words, we allow $\lambda(x, y; D^{ef}) \neq \lambda(x, y; D)$ as long as $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) = \min_{v \in V_c} \lambda(s, v; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) \geq |V_c|k$ holds after splitting. Theorem 6 is used to derive the following theorem:

THEOREM 7. *Given integer-capacity Eulerian digraph $D = (V_s \cup V_c, E)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k) \geq |V_c|k$, for every edge $f = (w, t)$ ($w \in V_s$) there is an edge $e = (u, w)$ such that $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) \geq |V_c|k$.*

Note that here, f and e each represent one of the multi-edges (or one capacity) between w, t and u, w , respectively. Observe that edge splitting does not affect a graph being Eulerian. Thus, in $G(\{Ub_e\})$, we can iteratively replace edges $e = (u, w), f = (w, t)$ by (u, t) for each switch node $w \in V_s$, while maintaining $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_k^{ef}(\{Ub_e\})) \geq |V_c|k$. The resulting graph will have all nodes in V_s isolated. By removing V_s , we get a graph $G^* = (V_c, E^*)$ having compute nodes only. Because of Theorem 5, there exists a family of edge-disjoint out-trees in $G^* = (V_c, E^*)$ that achieves the optimal performance.

While one can split off one capacity of $(u, w), (w, t)$ at a time, this becomes inefficient if the capacities of edges are large. Here, we introduce a way to split off $(u, w), (w, t)$ by maximum capacity at once. Given edges $(u, w), (w, t) \in E$,

we construct a flow network $\widehat{D}_{(u,w),v}$ from \vec{D}_k for each $v \in V_c$ that $\widehat{D}_{(u,w),v}$ connects $(u, s), (u, t), (v, w)$ with ∞ capacity. Similarly, we construct a flow network $\widehat{D}_{(w,t),v}$ that connects $(w, s), (u, t), (v, t)$ with ∞ capacity.

THEOREM 8. *Given integer-capacity Eulerian digraph $D = (V_s \cup V_c, E)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k) \geq |V_c|k$, the maximum capacity that $e = (u, w), f = (w, t)$ can be split off with the resulting graph D^{ef} satisfying $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) \geq |V_c|k$ is*

$$\gamma = \min \left\{ c(u, w; D), c(w, t; D), \min_{v \in V_c} F(u, w; \widehat{D}_{(u,w),v}) - |V_c|k, \min_{v \in V_c} F(w, t; \widehat{D}_{(w,t),v}) - |V_c|k \right\}. \quad (2)$$

Based on Theorem 8, we are able to develop Algorithm 4. What is remarkable about Algorithm 4 is that its runtime does not depend on the capacities of the digraph. One should also note that we update a table routing while splitting. After edge splitting, we are ready to construct spanning trees that only use compute nodes for broadcast. routing is then used to convert the spanning trees back to paths in G that use switch nodes for send/receive between compute nodes.

Figure 13 gives an example of edge splitting. In Figure 13a, within each cluster $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we split off 10 capacity of $(v_{i,j}^c, v_i^s), (v_i^s, v_{i,(j \bmod 4)+1}^c)$ for $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ to form a ring topology. Across clusters, we split off 1 capacity of $(v_{i,j}^c, v_0^s), (v_0^s, v_{(i \bmod 2)+1,j}^c)$ for $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$. The resulting topology Figure 13b has compute nodes only, and the optimal communication time is still $(M/N)(4/4b)$ if bandwidth multiplier b is added. Note that for this example, in the innermost foreach loop of Algorithm 4, we adjusted the order of iterating through es to prioritize splitting off $(u, v_0^s), (v_0^s, t)$ pairs with u, t in different clusters. The adjustment is not for

Algorithm 5: Spanning Tree Construction

Input: Integer-capacity digraph $D^* = (V_c, E^*)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
Output: Spanning tree $(R_{u,i}, \mathcal{E}(R_{u,i}))$ for each $u \in V_c, i \in [n_u]$. Subgraph $(R_{u,i}, \mathcal{E}(R_{u,i}))$ s satisfy $\forall u \in V_c : \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} m(R_{u,i}) = k$ and $\forall e \in E^* : \sum \{m(R_{u,i}) \mid e \in \mathcal{E}(R_{u,i})\} \leq c(e; D^*)$.

begin
 Initialize $R_{u,1} = \{u\}, \mathcal{E}(R_{u,1}) = \emptyset, m(R_{u,1}) = k, n_u = 1$ for all $u \in V_c$.
 Initialize $g(e) = c(e; D^*)$ for all $e \in E^*$.
while there exists $R_{u,i} \neq V_c$ **do**
 while $R_{u,i} \neq V_c$ **do**
 Pick an edge (x, y) in D^* that $x \in R_{u,i}, y \notin R_{u,i}$.
 Compute μ as in (5).
if $\mu = 0$ **then continue**
if $\mu < m(R_{u,i})$ **then**
 $n_u \leftarrow n_u + 1$
 Create a new copy $R_{u,n_u} = R_{u,i}, \mathcal{E}(R_{u,n_u}) = \mathcal{E}(R_{u,i}), m(R_{u,n_u}) = m(R_{u,i}) - \mu$.
 $m(R_{u,i}) \leftarrow \mu$
 $\mathcal{E}(R_{u,i}) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}(R_{u,i}) + (x, y)$
 $R_{u,i} \leftarrow R_{u,i} + y$
 $g(x, y) \leftarrow g(x, y) - \mu$.
 Remove (x, y) if $g(x, y)$ reaches 0.

performance-related reasons, but rather to simplify routing by scheduling all intra-cluster traffic through the in-cluster switch. We successfully achieved this goal: the capacity of each f reaches 0 before we iterate to an e with u in the same cluster as t .

C.3 Spanning Tree Construction

At this point, we have a digraph $G^* = (V_c, E^*)$ with only compute nodes. In this section, we construct k out-trees from every node that span all nodes V_c in G^* . We start by showing the existence of spanning trees with the following theorem in Tarjan [34]. The theorem was originally proven by Edmonds [16].

THEOREM 9 (TARJAN [34]). *For any integer-capacity digraph $D = (V, E)$ and any sets $R_i \subseteq V, i \in [k]$, there exist k edge-disjoint spanning out-trees $T_i, i \in [k]$, rooted respectively at R_i , if and only if for every $S \neq V$,*

$$c(S, \bar{S}; D) \geq |\{i \mid R_i \subseteq S\}|. \quad (3)$$

A spanning out-tree is *rooted at R_i* if for every $v \in V - R_i$, there is exactly one directed path from a vertex in R_i to v within the acyclic subgraph of out-tree. To see there exists a family of edge-disjoint spanning out-trees $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ in G^* , observe that each $T_{u,i}$ is rooted at $R_{u,i} = \{u\}$, so $|\{(u, i) \mid R_{u,i} \subseteq S\}| = |S|k$ for any $S \subset V_c, S \neq V_c$. We show the following theorem:

THEOREM 10. *Given integer-capacity digraph $D = (V_c, E)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}, c(S, \bar{S}; D) \geq |S|k$ for all $S \subset V_c, S \neq V_c$ if and only if $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \bar{D}_k) \geq |V_c|k$.*

Since we ensured $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \bar{G}_k^*) \geq |V_c|k$, condition (3) is satisfied. Spanning tree construction essentially involves iteratively expanding each $R_{u,i} = \mathcal{V}(T_{u,i})$ from $\{u\}$ to V_c by adding edges to $T_{u,i}$, while maintaining condition (3). Tarjan [34] has proposed such an algorithm. For each $T_{u,i}$, the algorithm continuously finds an edge (x, y) with $x \in R_{u,i}, y \notin R_{u,i}$ that adding this edge to $T_{u,i}$ does not violate (3). It is proven that such an edge is guaranteed to exist. However, the runtime of the algorithm quadratically depends on the total number of spanning trees, i.e., Nk in our case. This becomes problematic when k is large, as k can get up to $\min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v) / \gcd(\{b_e\}_{e \in E})$. Fortunately, Bérczi & Frank [11] has proposed a strongly polynomial-time algorithm based on Schrijver [30]. The runtime of the algorithm does not depend on k at all. In particular, the following theorem has been shown:

THEOREM 11 (BÉRCZI & FRANK [11]). *Let $D = (V, E)$ be a digraph, $g : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ a capacity function, $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \dots, R_n\}$ a list of root-sets, $\mathcal{U} = \{U_1, \dots, U_n\}$ a set of convex sets with $R_i \subseteq U_i$, and $m : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ a demand function. There is a strongly polynomial time algorithm that finds (if there exist) $m(\mathcal{R})$ out-trees so that $m(R_i)$ of them are spanning U_i with root-set R_i and each edge $e \in E$ is contained in at most $g(e)$ out-trees.*

In our context, we start with $\mathcal{R} = \{R_u \mid u \in V_c\}$ and $R_u = \{u\}, U_u = V_c, m(R_u) = k$. We define $\mathcal{E}(R_i)$ to be the edge set of the $m(R_i)$ out-trees corresponding to R_i , so $\mathcal{E}(R_u) = \emptyset$ is initialized. Given $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \dots, R_n\}$, we pick an $R_i \neq V_c$, say R_1 . Then, we find an edge (x, y) such that $x \in R_1, y \notin R_1$ and (x, y) can be added to $\mu : 0 < \mu \leq \min\{g(x, y), m(R_1)\}$ copies of the $m(R_1)$ out-trees without violating (3). If $\mu = m(R_1)$, then we directly add (x, y) to $\mathcal{E}(R_1)$ and $R_1 = R_1 + y$. If $\mu < m(R_1)$, then we add a copy R_{n+1} of R_1 that $\mathcal{E}(R_{n+1}) = \mathcal{E}(R_1), m(R_{n+1}) = m(R_1) - \mu$. We revise $m(R_1)$ to μ , add (x, y) to $\mathcal{E}(R_1)$, and $R_1 = R_1 + y$. Finally, we update $g(x, y) = g(x, y) - \mu$. Now, given $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \dots, R_{n+1}\}$, we can apply the step repeatedly until $R_i = V_c$ for all $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$. According to Bérczi & Frank [11], μ is defined as followed:

$$\mu = \min \left\{ g(x, y), m(R_1), \min\{c(S, \bar{S}; D) - p(S; D) : x \in S, y \in \bar{S}, R_1 \not\subseteq S\} \right\} \quad (4)$$

where $p(S; D) = \sum \{m(R_i) \mid R_i \subseteq S\}$. Neither Bérczi & Frank [11] nor Schrijver [30] explicitly mentioned how to compute μ in polynomial time. Therefore, we describe a method for doing so. We construct a flow network \bar{D} such that (a) a node s_i is added for each R_i except $i = 1$, (b) connect x to each s_i with capacity $m(R_i)$, and (c) connect each s_i to every vertex in R_i with ∞ capacity. We then show the following result:

THEOREM 12. *For any edge (x, y) in D with $x \in R_1, y \notin R_1$,*

$$\mu = \min \left\{ g(x, y), m(R_1), F(x, y; \bar{D}) - \sum_{i \neq 1} m(R_i) \right\}. \quad (5)$$

Thus, μ can be calculated by computing a single maxflow from x to y in \bar{D} . The complete algorithm is described in Algorithm 5. The resulting \mathcal{R} can be indexed as $\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{u \in V_c} \{R_{u,1}, \dots, R_{u,n_u}\}$, where $R_{u,i}$ corresponds to $m(R_{u,i})$ number of identical out-trees rooted at u and specified by edge set $\mathcal{E}(R_{u,i})$. We have $\sum_{i=1}^{n_u} m(R_{u,i}) = k$ for all u . Thus, \mathcal{R} can be decomposed into $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$. However, since all spanning trees within $R_{u,i}$ are identical, the allgather schedule can simply be specified in terms of $\mathcal{E}(R_{u,i})$ and $m(R_{u,i})$.

After construction, we have edge-disjoint spanning trees $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ in G^* . Each of the edge (u, v) in $T_{u,i}$ may correspond to a path $u \rightarrow w_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow w_n \rightarrow v$ in G with w_1, \dots, w_n being switch nodes. In other words, edges in $T_{u,i}$ only specify the source and destination of send/rcv between compute nodes. Thus, one needs to use the routing in Algorithm 4 to recover the paths in G . For any edge (u, t) in G^* , $\text{routing}[(u, t)][w]$ denotes the amount of capacity from u to t that is going through $(u, w), (w, t)$. It should be noted that routing may be recursive, meaning that $(u, w), (w, t)$ may also go through some other switches. Because each capacity of (u, t) corresponds to one capacity of a path from u to t in G , the resulting schedule in G has the same performance in G^* , achieving the optimal performance (1).

In Figure 13's example, we construct a spanning tree like 13c for each of the compute node. By reversing the edge splitting with routing, the spanning tree becomes the schedule in 13d. Note that the corresponding schedule of a spanning tree in G^* is not necessarily a tree in G . For example, the schedule in 13d visits switches v_1^s, v_2^s multiple times. To obtain a complete allgather schedule with optimal communication time $(M/N)(4/4b)$, one can apply the similar schedule for each of the compute nodes in 13d.

One may be tempted to devise a way to construct spanning trees with low heights. This has numerous benefits such as lower latency at small data sizes and better convergence towards optimality. Although there is indeed potential progress to be made in this direction, constructing edge-disjoint spanning trees of minimum height has been proven to be NP-complete [12].

C.4 Fixed- k Optimality

A potential problem of our schedule is that k , the number of spanning trees per root, depends linearly on link bandwidths, potentially reaching up to $\min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v) / \gcd(\{b_e\}_{e \in E})$. Although the runtime of spanning tree construction does not depend on k , in practice, one may want to reduce k to simplify the schedule. In this section, we offer a way to construct a schedule with the best possible performance for a fixed k . We start with the following theorem:

THEOREM 13. *Given $U \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a family of out-trees $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ with $T_{u,i}$ rooted at u and $\mathcal{V}(T_{u,i}) \supseteq V_c$*

achieves $\frac{M}{Nk} \cdot U$ communication time if and only if it is edge-disjoint in $G(\{\lfloor Ub_e \rfloor\}_{e \in E})$.

To test the existence of edge disjoint $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ in $G(\{\lfloor Ub_e \rfloor\}_{e \in E})$, by Theorem 5, we can simply test whether $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_k(\{\lfloor Ub_e \rfloor\})) \geq |V_c|k$ holds. The following theorem provides a method for binary search to find the lowest communication time for the given k .

THEOREM 14. *Let $\frac{M}{Nk} \cdot U^*$ be the lowest communication time that can be achieved with k out-trees per $v \in V_c$. Then, there exists a family of edge-disjoint out-trees $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ in $G(\{\lfloor Ub_e \rfloor\}_{e \in E})$ with $T_{u,i}$ rooted at u and $\mathcal{V}(T_{u,i}) \supseteq V_c$ if and only if $U \geq U^*$.*

The initial range is:

$$\frac{(N-1)k}{\min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v)} \leq U^* \leq (N-1)k.$$

Observe that there must exist $b_e \in E$ such that $U^* b_e \in \mathbb{Z}_+$; otherwise, U^* can be further decreased. Thus, the denominator of U^* must be less than or equal to $\max_{e \in E} b_e$. Similar to optimality binary search, by Proposition 2, one can run binary search until the range is smaller than $1/\max_{e \in E} b_e^2$. Then, U^* can be determined exactly by computing the fractional number that is closest to the midpoint, while having a denominator less than or equal to $\max_{e \in E} b_e$. After having U^* , one can simply apply edge splitting and spanning tree construction to $G(\{\lfloor U^* b_e \rfloor\}_{e \in E})$ to derive the pipeline schedule. Note that $G(\{\lfloor U^* b_e \rfloor\}_{e \in E})$ is not necessarily Eulerian. If $G(\{\lfloor U^* b_e \rfloor\}_{e \in E})$ is not Eulerian, then edge splitting cannot be applied. However, in cases where G is bidirectional, $G(\{\lfloor U^* b_e \rfloor\}_{e \in E})$ is guaranteed to be Eulerian.

The following theorem gives a bound on how close $\frac{M}{Nk} \cdot U^*$ is to optimality (1):

THEOREM 15. *Let $\frac{M}{Nk} \cdot U^*$ be the lowest communication time that can be achieved with k out-trees per $v \in V_c$. Then,*

$$\frac{M}{Nk} \cdot U^* \leq \frac{M}{N} \max_{S \subset V, S \not\supseteq V_c} \frac{|S \cap V_c|}{B_G^+(S)} + \frac{M}{Nk} \cdot \frac{1}{\min_{e \in E} b_e}.$$

D Runtime Analysis

In this section, we give a runtime analysis of different parts of the algorithm. To summarize, all parts are strongly polynomial-time. Note that the runtime bounds discussed in this section could be loose in many respects. The analysis of this section serves to show that the runtime is polynomial in topology size. We leave proofs of tighter runtime bounds for future work.

Optimality Binary Search The key part of optimality binary search is to compute $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_x)$, which involves computing maxflow from s to every compute node in V_c . Assuming the use of preflow-push Algorithm [19] to solve network flow, the time complexity to compute $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_x)$ is $\mathcal{O}(N|V|^2|E|)$. Note that in practice,

one can compute the maxflow from s to each $v \in V_c$ in parallel to significantly speed up the computation. As for how many times $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_x)$ is computed, observe that the binary search terminates when range is smaller than $1/\min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v)^2$. The initial range of binary search is bounded by interval $(0, N)$, so the binary search takes at most $\lceil \log_2(N \min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v)^2) \rceil$ iterations. Because $\min_{v \in V_c} B_G^-(v) < |V| \max_{e \in E} b_e$ and $\mathcal{O}(\log b_e)$ is trivial, the total runtime complexity is $\mathcal{O}(N|V|^2|E| \log |V|)$.

Edge Splitting In Algorithm 4, while we possibly add more edges to the topology, the number of edges is loosely bounded by $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$. Thus, computing γ in Theorem 8 takes $\mathcal{O}(N|V|^4)$, and γ is computed at most $\mathcal{O}(|V_s||V|^4)$ times in the nested foreach loop. The total runtime can be loosely bounded by $\mathcal{O}(N|V_s||V|^8)$.

Spanning Tree Construction Upon completion of Algorithm 4, G^* has N vertices and hence $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$ number of edges. In Algorithm 5, μ only needs one maxflow to be computed. The runtime is thus $\mathcal{O}(N^4)$. Bérczi & Frank [11] proved that μ only needs to be computed $\mathcal{O}(mn^2)$ times, where m and n are the number of edges and vertices respectively. Thus, the runtime of Algorithm 5 can be loosely bounded by $\mathcal{O}(N^8)$.

Fixed- k Optimality The runtime of this part is similar to optimality binary search, with the exception that the binary search takes at most $\lceil \log_2(Nk \max_{e \in E} b_e^2) \rceil$ iterations instead. Since $\mathcal{O}(\log b_e)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\log k)$ are trivial, the total runtime complexity is $\mathcal{O}(N|V|^2|E| \log N)$.

E Allreduce Linear Program

Generating an Allreduce schedule is similar to generating an Allgather schedule, as we can also use spanning tree packing. For Allreduce, data flows through spanning in-trees to be reduced at root nodes and then is broadcast through spanning out-trees. One can apply the algorithm introduced in the main text to generate optimal out-trees and then reverse them for the in-trees. While this approach always yields the optimal Allreduce schedule in our work so far, theoretically, Allreduce can be further optimized from two perspectives:

- (i) Each node can be the root of a variable number of spanning trees instead of equal number in allgather.
- (ii) Congestion between spanning in-trees and out-trees may be further optimized.

In this section, we introduce a linear program designed to optimize allreduce schedules, addressing both perspectives. This linear program formulation automatically determine: for (i), the number of trees rooted at each node, and for (ii), the bandwidth allocation of each edge for the reduce in-trees and broadcast out-trees, respectively.

The linear program works by formulating maxflow and edge splitting as linear program constraints. Given a graph

G , suppose we want the maxflow from s to t in G being $\geq L$, i.e., $F(s, t; G) \geq L$. This constraint can be expressed in terms of linear program constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{u \in N_G^-(v)} f_{(u,v)}^{s,t} \geq \sum_{w \in N_G^+(v)} f_{(v,w)}^{s,t}, & \forall v \in V(G), v \notin \{s, t\} \\ & \sum_{u \in N_G^-(t)} f_{(u,t)}^{s,t} \geq \sum_{w \in N_G^+(t)} f_{(t,w)}^{s,t} + L, \\ & 0 \leq f_{(u,v)}^{s,t} \leq c_{(u,v)}. & \forall (u, v) \in E(G) \end{aligned}$$

As long as a solution exists for the set of decision variables $\{f_{(u,v)}^{s,t} \mid (u, v) \in E_G\}$, the maxflow from s to t is $\geq L$. Recall from §4.2 that our objective is to maximize x while ensuring that the maxflow from s to any $v \in V_c$ is $\geq Nx$. Here, because of (i), we assign a distinct x_v for each $v \in V_c$. Consequently, the optimization problem shifts to maximize $\sum_{v \in V_c} x_v$ without causing any $F(s, v; \vec{G}) < \sum_{v \in V_c} x_v$. The resulting allreduce communication time is

$$T_{\text{comm}} = M / \sum_{v \in V_c} x_v.$$

To optimize (ii), we introduce variables $c_{(u,v)}^{\text{RE}}$ and $c_{(u,v)}^{\text{BC}}$ to reserve the bandwidth of each link (u, v) for reduce in-trees and broadcast out-trees, respectively, with $c_{(u,v)}^{\text{RE}} + c_{(u,v)}^{\text{BC}} = b_{(u,v)}$. Thus, $c_{(u,v)}^{\text{RE}}$ s and $c_{(u,v)}^{\text{BC}}$ s induce two separate graph G s, on which we can apply the spanning tree construction to derive in-trees and out-trees, respectively. The linear program formulation is as followed:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{v \in V_c} x_v \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & F(s, t; \vec{G}) \geq \sum_{v \in V_c} x_v, & \forall t \in V_c \\ & \text{w.r.t. } 0 \leq f_{(s,v)}^{s,t} \leq x_v \text{ and } 0 \leq f_{(u,v)}^{s,t} \leq c_{(u,v)}^{\text{BC}} \\ & F(t, s; \vec{G}) \geq \sum_{v \in V_c} x_v, & \forall t \in V_c \\ & \text{w.r.t. } 0 \leq f_{(v,s)}^{t,s} \leq x_v \text{ and } 0 \leq f_{(u,v)}^{t,s} \leq c_{(u,v)}^{\text{RE}} \\ & c_{(u,v)}^{\text{RE}} + c_{(u,v)}^{\text{BC}} \leq b_{(u,v)}, & \forall (u, v) \in E_G \\ & c_{(u,v)}^{\text{RE}}, c_{(u,v)}^{\text{BC}} \geq 0, & \forall (u, v) \in E_G \\ & x_v \geq 0. & \forall v \in V_c \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Note that for reduce in-trees, we constraint the maxflow from V_c to s instead of s to V_c , and the x_v s are also capacities from $v \in V_c$ to s . The solution to LP (6) yields the optimal allreduce performance.

The linear program is sufficient for switch-free topology. In a switch topology G , similar to the algorithm in the main text, we need to convert it into a switch-free topology before applying the LP. We are unable to solve the LP and then apply edge splitting technique, as the $c_{(u,v)}^{\text{RE}}$ s and $c_{(u,v)}^{\text{BC}}$ s do not guarantee symmetrical bandwidth in the respective induced graphs. To remove switch nodes, we add a level of indirection by defining $b'_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ s for all $(\alpha, \beta) \in V_c^2$ to replace the $b_{(u,v)}$ s in LP (6). We add multi-commodity flow constraints into the LP to ensure $b'_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ commodity flow from α to β in G under the

capacities $b_{(u,v)}$ s. Thus, the linear program can automatically allocate switch bandwidth for compute-to-compute flows.

In ideal mathematics, we can obtain rational solutions for all variables to derive the in-trees and out-trees to reach optimality. However, in practice, modern LP solvers cannot guarantee rational solutions. We can only round down $x_v, c_{(u,v)}^{\text{RE}}, c_{(u,v)}^{\text{BC}}$ s to the nearest $1/k$ and construct spanning trees, assuming one wants at most $k \cdot \sum_{v \in V_c} x_v$ trees. This approach can approximate the optimal solution as k increases. Nevertheless, the optimal objective value of LP (6) provided by any solver always suggests the optimal allreduce performance, and we can use it to verify the optimality of allreduce schedule derived by using the algorithm in main text.

F Proofs

THEOREM 1. $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_x) \geq |V_c|x$ if and only if $1/x \geq \max_{S \subset V, S \not\supseteq V_c} |S \cap V_c|/B_G^+(S)$.

PROOF. \Rightarrow : Suppose $1/x < \max_{S \subset V, S \not\supseteq V_c} |S \cap V_c|/B_G^+(S)$. Let $S' \subset V, S' \not\supseteq V_c$ be the set that $1/x < |S' \cap V_c|/B_G^+(S')$. Pick arbitrary $v' \in V_c - S'$. Consider the maxflow $F(s, v'; \vec{G}_x)$ and s - v' cut (A, \bar{A}) in G that $A = S' + s$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{G}_x) &= c(S', \bar{A}; \vec{G}_x) + \sum_{u \in \bar{A} \cap V_c} c(s, u; \vec{G}_x) \\ &= B_G^+(S') + |V_c - S'|x \\ &< |S' \cap V_c|x + |V_c - S'|x \\ &= |V_c|x. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

By min-cut theorem, $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_x) \leq F(s, v'; \vec{G}_x) \leq c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{G}_x) < |V_c|x$.

\Leftarrow : Suppose $1/x \geq \max_{S \subset V, S \not\supseteq V_c} |S \cap V_c|/B_G^+(S)$. Pick arbitrary $v' \in V_c$. Let (A, \bar{A}) be an arbitrary s - v' cut and $S' = V \cap A = A - s$. It follows that $1/x \geq |S' \cap V_c|/B_G^+(S')$. Thus, following (7),

$$\begin{aligned} c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{G}_x) &= B_G^+(S') + |V_c - S'|x \\ &\geq |S' \cap V_c|x + |V_c - S'|x \\ &= |V_c|x. \end{aligned}$$

Because cut (A, \bar{A}) is arbitrary, we have $F(s, v'; \vec{G}_x) \geq |V_c|x$. Because v' is also arbitrary, $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_x) \geq |V_c|x$. \square

PROPOSITION 2. Given two unequal fractional numbers a/b and c/d with $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, if denominators $b, d \leq X$ for some $X \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then $|a/b - c/d| \geq 1/X^2$.

PROOF. Because $a/b \neq c/d$, we have $ad - bc \neq 0$. Thus,

$$\left| \frac{a}{b} - \frac{c}{d} \right| = \left| \frac{ad - bc}{bd} \right| \geq \frac{1}{bd} \geq \frac{1}{X^2}.$$

\square

PROPOSITION 3. Given $\{b_e\}_{e \in E} \subset \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $1/x^* \in \mathbb{Q}$, let p/q be the simplest fractional representation of $1/x^*$, i.e., $p/q = 1/x^*$ and $\gcd(p, q) = 1$. Suppose $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is the smallest such that there exists $U \in \mathbb{Q}$ satisfying $U/k = 1/x^*$ and $Ub_e \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for all $e \in E$, then $U = p/\gcd(q, \{b_e\}_{e \in E})$ and $k = Ux^*$.

PROOF. Since $U/k = 1/x^*$, we have $k = Ux^*$, so finding the smallest k is to find the smallest U such that (a) $Ux^* = Uq/p \in \mathbb{N}$ and (b) $Ub_e \in \mathbb{N}$ for all $e \in E$. Suppose $U = \alpha/\beta$ and $\gcd(\alpha, \beta) = 1$. Because α, β are coprime, $Ub_e \in \mathbb{N}$ implies $\beta|b_e$ for all $e \in E$. Again, because p, q are coprime, $Uq/p \in \mathbb{N}$ implies $p|\alpha$ and $\beta|q$. Thus, the smallest such α is p , and the largest such β is $\gcd(q, \{b_e\}_{e \in E})$. The proposition immediately follows. \square

THEOREM 4 (BANG-JENSEN ET AL. [10]). Let $n \geq 1$ and $D = (V, E)$ be a digraph with a special node s . Let $T' = \{v \mid v \in V - s, d^-(v) < d^+(v)\}$. If $\lambda(s, v; D) \geq n$ for all $v \in T'$, then there is a family \mathcal{F} of edge-disjoint out-trees rooted at s such that every $v \in V$ belongs to at least $\min(n, \lambda(s, v; D))$ number of out-trees.

THEOREM 5. Given integer-capacity digraph $D = (V_s \cup V_c, E)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a family of edge-disjoint out-trees $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ in D with $T_{u,i}$ rooted at u and $\mathcal{V}(T_{u,i}) \supseteq V_c$ if and only if $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k) \geq |V_c|k$.

PROOF. \Rightarrow : Pick arbitrary $v \in V_c$. Given the family of edge-disjoint out-trees $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$, we push one unit of flow from s to v along the path from u to v within tree $T_{u,i}$ for each $u \in V_c, i \in [k]$. Thus, we have constructed a flow assignment with $|V_c|k$ amount of flow. Since $v \in V_c$ is arbitrary, we have $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k) \geq |V_c|k$.

\Leftarrow : Suppose $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k) \geq |V_c|k$. It immediately implies that $\lambda(s, v; \vec{D}_k) \geq |V_c|k$ for all $v \in V_c$. Note that $T' = V_c$, so by Theorem 4, a family \mathcal{F} of edge-disjoint out-trees rooted at s exists that each $v \in V_c$ belongs to at least $|V_c|k$ of them. Since $d^+(s) = |V_c|k$ in \vec{D}_k , \mathcal{F} has exactly $|V_c|k$ edge-disjoint out-trees rooted at s and each out-tree spans V_c . In addition, for each $v \in V_c$, since $c(s, v; \vec{D}_k) = k$, there are exactly k out-trees in \mathcal{F} in which v is the only child of root s . By removing the root s from every out-tree in \mathcal{F} , we have the family of edge-disjoint out-trees $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ in D as desired. \square

THEOREM 6 (BANG-JENSEN ET AL. [10]). Let $D = (V + w, E)$ be a directed Eulerian graph, that is, $d^-(x) = d^+(x)$ for every node x of D . Then, for every edge $f = (w, t)$ there is an edge $e = (u, w)$ such that $\lambda(x, y; D^{ef}) = \lambda(x, y; D)$ for every $x, y \in V$, where D^{ef} is the resulting graph obtained by splitting off e and f in D .

THEOREM 7. Given integer-capacity Eulerian digraph $D = (V_s \cup V_c, E)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k) \geq |V_c|k$, for

every edge $f = (w, t)$ ($w \in V_s$) there is an edge $e = (u, w)$ such that $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) \geq |V_c|k$.

PROOF. Consider the flow network \vec{D}_k . We construct \vec{D}'_k by adding a k -capacity edge from each $v \in V_c$ back to s . It is trivial to see that \vec{D}'_k is Eulerian. By Theorem 6, given $f = (w, t)$, there exists an edge $e = (u, w)$ such that $\lambda(s, v; \vec{D}'_k^{ef}) = \lambda(s, v; \vec{D}_k^{ef})$ for all $v \in V_c$. Observe that adding edges from V_c to s does not affect the edge-connectivity from s to any $v \in V_c$, so for all $v \in V_c$,

$$\begin{aligned} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) &= \lambda(s, v; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) = \lambda(s, v; \vec{D}'_k^{ef}) \\ &= \lambda(s, v; \vec{D}'_k) = \lambda(s, v; \vec{D}_k) = F(s, v; \vec{D}_k). \end{aligned}$$

The theorem trivially follows. \square

THEOREM 8. Given integer-capacity Eulerian digraph $D = (V_s \cup V_c, E)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k) \geq |V_c|k$, the maximum capacity that $e = (u, w)$, $f = (w, t)$ can be split off with the resulting graph D^{ef} satisfying $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) \geq |V_c|k$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma = \min & \left\{ c(u, w; D), c(w, t; D), \right. \\ & \min_{v \in V_c} F(u, w; \widehat{D}_{(u, w), v}) - |V_c|k, \\ & \left. \min_{v \in V_c} F(w, t; \widehat{D}_{(w, t), v}) - |V_c|k \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

PROOF. First of all, one should note that for any s - v cut (A, \bar{A}) with $v \in V_c$ and $A \subset V_s \cup V_c + s$, if $s, u, t \in A \wedge v, w \in \bar{A}$, then (A, \bar{A}) has the same capacity in \vec{D}_k and $\widehat{D}_{(u, w), v}$, i.e., $c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k) = c(A, \bar{A}; \widehat{D}_{(u, w), v})$. Similarly, if $s, w \in A \wedge v, u, t \in \bar{A}$, then $c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k) = c(A, \bar{A}; \widehat{D}_{(w, t), v})$.

\geq : Suppose we split off (u, w) , (w, t) by γ times and then $F(s, v'; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) < |V_c|k$ for some $v' \in V_c$. Let (A, \bar{A}) be the min s - v' cut in \vec{D}_k^{ef} that $c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) = F(s, v'; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) < |V_c|k$. We assert that (A, \bar{A}) must cut through (u, w) and (w, t) such that either $s, u, t \in A \wedge v', w \in \bar{A}$ or $s, w \in A \wedge v', u, t \in \bar{A}$; otherwise, we have $F(s, v'; \vec{D}_k) \leq c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k) = c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) < |V_c|k$ (note that splitting off (u, w) , (w, t) adds edge (u, t)). Suppose $s, u, t \in A \wedge v', w \in \bar{A}$, then $c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k) = c(A, \bar{A}; \widehat{D}_{(u, w), v'})$. It is trivial to see that $c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k) = c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) + \gamma$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(u, w; \widehat{D}_{(u, w), v'}) &\leq c(A, \bar{A}; \widehat{D}_{(u, w), v'}) \\ &= c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k) = c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) + \gamma < |V_c|k + \gamma, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting $\gamma \leq \min_{v \in V_c} F(u, w; \widehat{D}_{(u, w), v}) - |V_c|k$. For $s, w \in A \wedge v', u, t \in \bar{A}$, one can similarly show a contradiction by looking at $F(w, t; \widehat{D}_{(w, t), v'})$.

\leq : Suppose we split off (u, w) , (w, t) by $\gamma' > \gamma$ times and the resulting graph is D^{ef} . It is trivial to see that γ' cannot be greater than $c(u, w; D)$ or $c(w, t; D)$. Suppose $\gamma' > F(u, w; \widehat{D}_{(u, w), v'}) - |V_c|k$ for some $v' \in V_c$. Consider the min u - w cut (A, \bar{A}) with $c(A, \bar{A}; \widehat{D}_{(u, w), v'}) = F(u, w; \widehat{D}_{(u, w), v'})$. Because (u, s) , (u, t) , (v', w) have ∞ capacity, we have $s, u, t \in A \wedge v', w \in \bar{A}$ and hence $c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k) = c(A, \bar{A}; \widehat{D}_{(u, w), v'})$. It is again trivial to see that $c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) = c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k) - \gamma'$ and (A, \bar{A}) being an s - v' cut in \vec{D}_k^{ef} . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} F(s, v'; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) &\leq c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k^{ef}) = c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k) - \gamma' \\ &= c(A, \bar{A}; \widehat{D}_{(u, w), v'}) - \gamma' < |V_c|k. \end{aligned}$$

One can show similar result for $\gamma' > F(w, t; \widehat{D}_{(w, t), v'}) - |V_c|k$. \square

THEOREM 9 (TARJAN [34]). For any integer-capacity digraph $D = (V, E)$ and any sets $R_i \subseteq V$, $i \in [k]$, there exist k edge-disjoint spanning out-trees T_i , $i \in [k]$, rooted respectively at R_i , if and only if for every $S \neq V$,

$$c(S, \bar{S}; D) \geq |\{i \mid R_i \subseteq S\}|. \quad (3)$$

THEOREM 10. Given integer-capacity digraph $D = (V_c, E)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $c(S, \bar{S}; D) \geq |S|k$ for all $S \subset V_c$, $S \neq V_c$ if and only if $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k) \geq |V_c|k$.

PROOF. \Rightarrow : Suppose $\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{D}_k) < |V_c|k$. Let $v' \in V_c$ be the vertex that $F(s, v'; \vec{D}_k) < |V_c|k$. By min-cut theorem, there exists an s - v' cut (A, \bar{A}) in \vec{D}_k such that $c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k) = F(s, v'; \vec{D}_k) < |V_c|k$. Let $S = V_c \cap A$, then $A = S + s$, $\bar{S} = V_c - S = V_c + s - A = \bar{A}$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} c(S, \bar{S}; D) &= c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k) - \sum_{u \in \bar{A}} c(s, u; \vec{D}_k) \\ &< |V_c|k - |V_c - S|k = |S|k. \end{aligned}$$

\Leftarrow : Suppose there exists $S \subset V_c$, $S \neq V_c$ such that $c(S, \bar{S}; D) < |S|k$. Pick arbitrary $v' \in V_c - S$. Consider s - v' cut (A, \bar{A}) such that $A = S + s$. By min-cut theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(s, v'; \vec{D}_k) &\leq c(A, \bar{A}; \vec{D}_k) = c(S, \bar{S}; D) + \sum_{u \in \bar{A}} c(s, u; \vec{D}_k) \\ &< |S|k + |V_c - S|k = |V_c|k. \end{aligned}$$

\square

THEOREM 11 (BÉRCZI & FRANK [11]). Let $D = (V, E)$ be a digraph, $g : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ a capacity function, $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \dots, R_n\}$ a list of root-sets, $\mathcal{U} = \{U_1, \dots, U_n\}$ a set of convex sets with $R_i \subseteq U_i$, and $m : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ a demand function. There is a strongly polynomial time algorithm that finds (if there exist) $m(\mathcal{R})$ out-trees so that $m(R_i)$ of them are spanning U_i with root-set R_i and each edge $e \in E$ is contained in at most $g(e)$ out-trees.

THEOREM 12. For any edge (x, y) in D with $x \in R_1, y \notin R_1$,

$$\mu = \min \left\{ g(x, y), m(R_1), F(x, y; \bar{D}) - \sum_{i \neq 1} m(R_i) \right\}. \quad (5)$$

PROOF. For simplicity of notation, let $L = \min\{c(S, \bar{S}; D) - p(S; D) : x \in S, y \in \bar{S}, R_1 \not\subseteq S\}$. We will prove (5) by showing that either $L = F(x, y; \bar{D}) - \sum_{i \neq 1} m(R_i)$ or $L \geq F(x, y; \bar{D}) - \sum_{i \neq 1} m(R_i) \geq m(R_1)$. Let $S \subset V_c$ be arbitrary that $x \in S, y \in \bar{S}, R_1 \not\subseteq S$, and let $A = S \cup \{s_i \mid R_i \subseteq S\}$. It follows that (A, \bar{A}) is an x - y cut in \bar{D} and hence

$$\begin{aligned} c(S, \bar{S}; D) - p(S; D) &= c(S, \bar{S}; D) - \sum\{m(R_i) \mid R_i \subseteq S\} \\ &= c(S, \bar{S}; D) + \sum\{m(R_i) \mid i \neq 1, R_i \not\subseteq S\} \\ &\quad - \sum_{i \neq 1} m(R_i) \\ &= c(A, \bar{A}; \bar{D}) - \sum_{i \neq 1} m(R_i) \\ &\geq F(x, y; \bar{D}) - \sum_{i \neq 1} m(R_i). \end{aligned}$$

The second equality is due to $R_1 \not\subseteq S$, so $\sum\{m(R_i) \mid R_i \subseteq S\} = \sum\{m(R_i) \mid i \neq 1, R_i \subseteq S\}$. Since S is arbitrary, we have $L \geq F(x, y; \bar{D}) - \sum_{i \neq 1} m(R_i)$.

Let (A', \bar{A}') be the min x - y cut in \bar{D} and $S' = A' \cap V_c$. We assert that for any $i \neq 1, R_i \subseteq S'$, we have $s_i \in A'$; otherwise, by moving s_i from \bar{A}' to A' , we create a cut with lower capacity, contradicting (A', \bar{A}') being min-cut. We also assert that for any $i \neq 1, R_i \not\subseteq S'$, we have $s_i \in \bar{A}'$; otherwise, there exists $v \in R_i - S'$ that ∞ edge (s_i, v) crosses (A', \bar{A}') . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &F(x, y; \bar{D}) - \sum_{i \neq 1} m(R_i) \\ &= c(A', \bar{A}'; \bar{D}) - \sum_{i \neq 1} m(R_i) \\ &= c(S', \bar{S}'; D) + \sum\{m(R_i) \mid i \neq 1, R_i \not\subseteq S'\} - \sum_{i \neq 1} m(R_i) \\ &= c(S', \bar{S}'; D) - \sum\{m(R_i) \mid i \neq 1, R_i \subseteq S'\}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Now, we consider two cases:

(a) Suppose $R_1 \not\subseteq S'$. Then, $c(S', \bar{S}'; D) - p(S'; D) \geq L$. By (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} L &\geq F(x, y; \bar{D}) - \sum_{i \neq 1} m(R_i) \\ &= c(S', \bar{S}'; D) - \sum\{m(R_i) \mid i \neq 1, R_i \subseteq S'\} \\ &= c(S', \bar{S}'; D) - p(S'; D) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $L = c(S', \bar{S}'; D) - p(S'; D) = F(x, y; \bar{D}) - \sum_{i \neq 1} m(R_i)$ and (5) holds.

(b) Suppose $R_1 \subseteq S'$. Because the existence of spanning trees is guaranteed, we have

$$c(S', \bar{S}'; D) \geq p(S'; D) = m(R_1) + \sum\{m(R_i) \mid i \neq 1, R_i \subseteq S'\}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} L &\geq F(x, y; \bar{D}) - \sum_{i \neq 1} m(R_i) \\ &= c(S', \bar{S}'; D) - \sum\{m(R_i) \mid i \neq 1, R_i \subseteq S'\} \\ &\geq m(R_1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mu = \min\{g(x, y), m(R_1)\}$ and (5) also holds. \square

THEOREM 13. Given $U \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a family of out-trees $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ with $T_{u,i}$ rooted at u and $\mathcal{V}(T_{u,i}) \supseteq V_c$ achieves $\frac{M}{Nk} \cdot U$ communication time if and only if it is edge-disjoint in $G(\{\lfloor Ub_e \rfloor\}_{e \in E})$.

PROOF. \Leftarrow : Suppose $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ is edge disjoint in $G(\{\lfloor Ub_e \rfloor\}_{e \in E})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\text{comm}} &= \frac{M}{Nk} \cdot \max_{e \in E} \frac{1}{b_e} \sum_{T \in \{T_{u,i}\}} \mathbb{I}[e \in T] \\ &\leq \frac{M}{Nk} \cdot \max_{e \in E} \frac{\lfloor Ub_e \rfloor}{b_e} \leq \frac{M}{Nk} \cdot U. \end{aligned}$$

\Rightarrow : Suppose $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ achieves $\frac{M}{Nk} \cdot U$ communication time, then

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{e \in E} \frac{1}{b_e} \sum_{T \in \{T_{u,i}\}} \mathbb{I}[e \in T] &\leq U \\ \Rightarrow \sum_{T \in \{T_{u,i}\}} \mathbb{I}[e \in T] &\leq Ub_e \quad \text{for all } e \in E. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_{T \in \{T_{u,i}\}} \mathbb{I}[e \in T]$ must be an integer, the edge-disjointness trivially follows. \square

THEOREM 14. Let $\frac{M}{Nk} \cdot U^*$ be the lowest communication time that can be achieved with k out-trees per $v \in V_c$. Then, there exists a family of edge-disjoint out-trees $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ in $G(\{\lfloor Ub_e \rfloor\}_{e \in E})$ with $T_{u,i}$ rooted at u and $\mathcal{V}(T_{u,i}) \supseteq V_c$ if and only if $U \geq U^*$.

PROOF. \Rightarrow : The existence of edge-disjoint $\{T_{u,i}\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ in $G(\{\lfloor Ub_e \rfloor\}_{e \in E})$ with $U < U^*$ simply contradicts $\frac{M}{Nk} \cdot U^*$ being the lowest communication time. \Leftarrow : Let $\{T_{u,i}^*\}_{u \in V_c, i \in [k]}$ be the family of out-trees with the lowest communication time, then by Theorem 13, it is edge-disjoint in $G(\{\lfloor Ub_e \rfloor\}_{e \in E})$ for all $U \geq U^*$. \square

THEOREM 15. Let $\frac{M}{Nk} \cdot U^*$ be the lowest communication time that can be achieved with k out-trees per $v \in V_c$. Then,

$$\frac{M}{Nk} \cdot U^* \leq \frac{M}{N} \max_{S \subset V, S \not\supseteq V_c} \frac{|S \cap V_c|}{B_G^+(S)} + \frac{M}{Nk} \cdot \frac{1}{\min_{e \in E} b_e}.$$

PROOF. Let $U = \max_{e \in E} \lceil kb_e/x^* \rceil / b_e$ where $1/x^* = \max_{S \subset V, S \not\supseteq V_c} |S \cap V_c| / B_G^+(S)$. For each edge (u, v) in $G(\lfloor Ub_e \rfloor)$,

we have

$$\begin{aligned} c(u, v; G(\lfloor Ub_e \rfloor)) &= \left\lfloor b_{(u,v)} \cdot \max_{e \in E} \frac{\lceil kb_e/x^* \rceil}{b_e} \right\rfloor \\ &\geq \left\lfloor b_{(u,v)} \cdot \frac{\lceil kb_{(u,v)}/x^* \rceil}{b_{(u,v)}} \right\rfloor = \lceil kb_{(u,v)}/x^* \rceil. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, each edge in $\vec{G}_k(\lfloor Ub_e \rfloor)$ has at least k/x^* times the capacity in \vec{G}_{x^*} , so

$$\min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_k(\lfloor Ub_e \rfloor)) \geq (k/x^*) \min_{v \in V_c} F(s, v; \vec{G}_{x^*}) \geq |V_c|k.$$

Therefore, $\frac{M}{Nk} \cdot U$ is achievable and hence $U^* \leq U$ by Theorem 14.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{U^*}{k} \Big/ \frac{1}{x^*} &\leq \frac{U}{k} \Big/ \frac{1}{x^*} = \frac{\max_{e \in E} \lceil kb_e/x^* \rceil / b_e}{k/x^*} \\ &\leq \max_{e \in E} \frac{\lceil kb_e/x^* \rceil}{kb_e/x^*} \leq 1 + \max_{e \in E} \frac{1}{kb_e/x^*} = 1 + \frac{x^*}{k \cdot \min_{e \in E} b_e}. \end{aligned}$$

The theorem trivially follows. \square