

MLTCP: Congestion Control for DNN Training

Sudarsanan Rajasekaran Sanjoli Narang* Anton A. Zabreyko* Manya Ghobadi

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

ABSTRACT

We present MLTCP, a technique to augment today’s congestion control algorithms to accelerate DNN training jobs in shared GPU clusters. MLTCP enables the communication phases of jobs that compete for network bandwidth to interleave with each other, thereby utilizing the network efficiently. At the heart of MLTCP lies a very simple principle based on a key conceptual insight: DNN training flows should scale their congestion window size based on the number of bytes sent at each training iteration. We show that integrating this principle into today’s congestion control protocols is straightforward: by adding 30–60 lines of code to Reno, CUBIC, or DCQCN, MLTCP stabilizes flows of different jobs into an interleaved state within a few training iterations, regardless of the number of competing flows or the start time of each flow. Our experiments with popular DNN training jobs demonstrate that enabling MLTCP accelerates the average and 99th percentile training iteration time by up to 2× and 4×, respectively.

1 INTRODUCTION

The relentless pursuit of training ever-larger DNN models on shared GPU clusters makes efficient network congestion management crucial in sustaining high GPU utilization. Prior papers demonstrated that network congestion often results in longer training time [18, 57, 75]. The state-of-the-art approaches to minimize the impact of network congestion include (i) reducing the size of parameters to transmit through the network using quantization or compression techniques [6, 38, 47, 76]; (ii) using pipelining to reduce the exposed communication time by overlapping the communication period of a job with its computation phase [34, 40, 46, 55, 58, 61]; (iii) employing job scheduling and worker placement techniques that minimize network sharing by placing workers of the same job as close to each other as possible [27, 31, 39, 50, 60, 63, 78, 84, 85].

Although these techniques reduce the chances of network congestion, cross-job network contention is inevitable in large-scale shared GPU clusters. Recent work [67] demonstrated that introducing *unfairness* in congestion control has a surprising payoff that accelerates the training time of DNN jobs in shared GPU clusters. The authors manually adjusted

DCQCN [86] congestion control parameters to force a static unfair bandwidth sharing (60%-40% instead of 50%-50%) between competing DNN training jobs. After a few training iterations, this static unfairness created a desirable side-effect that nudged the communication phase of one job to *interleave* with the other, resulting in better overall network utilization and accelerating the training time of both jobs.

In contrast to pipelining [34, 40, 46, 55, 58, 61], which overlaps the compute and communication phases of the *same training job*, the goal of inter-job communication interleaving is to fit the communication phases of *different jobs* to share the network more efficiently (§2.1). We show that robust communication interleaving, while promising, has several unsolved challenges (§2.2): (i) robustness to stragglers; (ii) robustness to partially compatible jobs; (iii) robustness to circular dependencies between jobs and links.

This paper asks the following question: “*Is it possible to achieve robust inter-job communication interleaving in a completely distributed manner?*” At first blush, it appears that achieving this goal is impossible because communication interleaving is dependent on the exact traffic pattern of the jobs. How can two (or more) jobs interleave their communication patterns if they are unaware of each other’s existence? Without a centralized controller, end-hosts do not have any information about which other jobs are in the network, making it seemingly impossible to self-adjust their communication time to achieve interleaving.

We propose MLTCP, a technique to augment today’s congestion control algorithms to enable DNN training jobs to converge automatically into an interleaved state. An attractive feature of MLTCP is its simple principle based on a key conceptual insight: DNN training flows should *dynamically adjust* their aggressiveness based on the number of bytes sent. This principle applies to window-based and rate-based congestion control protocols. For instance, upon the receipt of an acknowledgment packet, window-based congestion control protocols update the congestion window, $cwnd$, as:

$$cwnd \leftarrow cwnd + additive_increase \quad (1)$$

where $additive_increase$ indicates the magnitude of congestion window increase based on the specific goals of each congestion control variant. MLTCP updates Equation 1 to:

$$cwnd \leftarrow cwnd + \mathcal{F}(bytes_ratio) \times additive_increase \quad (2)$$

* Equal contribution.




Figure 1: Inter-job communication interleaving. Figure adapted from [66, 67, 84].

where \mathcal{F} is a linear increasing function and *bytes_ratio* is the number of bytes successfully sent normalized by the total number of bytes during a training iteration (§3). Unlike traditional datacenter traffic, where accurately estimating the size of every flow is intractable [8, 25, 72], the total number of bytes in a training iteration is a predictable and consistent value throughout the lifetime of most DNN training jobs as long as the hyper-parameters remain unchanged [41, 73, 75].

The intuition behind this simple technique is that MLTCP adjusts the aggressiveness of competing flows based on the remaining bytes of the current iteration, thereby approximating the Shortest Remaining Processing Time (SRPT) policy. Given that DNN training workloads are periodic, MLTCP creates a positive *cascading effect* that separates the communication phases of competing jobs into an interleaved state after a few iterations.

To evaluate MLTCP, we build a testbed with 12 servers, each equipped with one NVIDIA A100 GPU [4] and one 50 Gbps RDMA NIC. We then augment TCP Reno [35], TCP CUBIC [28], and RoCE DCQCN [86] algorithms with MLTCP by adding 30–60 lines of code for each variant. Our experiments with 7 representative DNN models show that MLTCP stabilizes the flows into an interleaved state after ≈ 10 training iterations while improving the average and 99th percentile tail training iteration times of jobs by up to 2 \times and 4 \times , respectively, compared to default congestion control algorithms. We also show that MLTCP reduces the average number of dropped or ECN marked packets by up to 14.59 \times . Finally, we demonstrate that MLTCP flows are robust to stragglers, partially compatible jobs, and circular dependencies between jobs and flows. Our kernel patch and evaluation scripts will be available online.

2 COMMUNICATION INTERLEAVING

In this section, we first provide a background on inter-job communication interleaving (§2.1). We then identify several unsolved challenges to achieving robust communication interleaving (§2.2).

2.1 Background

Muri [84] introduced the concept of inter-job multi-resource interleaving for DNN training jobs. Muri scheduled jobs such that different resources (GPU, CPU, network, and storage) of different jobs are interleaved across the time dimension. To do so, Muri formulated the problem of resource interleaving as a k-dimensional maximum weighted matching problem and demonstrated significant improvements in job completion times. However, given the complexity of the matching problem, Muri could only consider jobs sharing the same set of GPUs, CPUs, memory, and network resources [84].

Rajasekaran et al. [66, 67] extended Muri’s footprint by focusing on the *network* as the only bottlenecked resource. They proposed interleaving the communication phases of jobs running on different GPU servers. Figure 1(a) illustrates their approach with two jobs: Job₁ (training on GPU₁ and GPU₂) and Job₂ (training on GPU₃ and GPU₄), where each GPU is located in a different server in the cluster. Figures 1(b) and (c) show the compute and communication patterns of Job₁ and Job₂ in isolation, respectively. Each job uses pipelining to overlap its compute and communication phases. However, pipelining cannot prevent network congestion when the communication phases of two jobs collide. As shown in Figure 1(d), without explicit inter-job communication interleaving, the communication phases of jobs sharing a network link will likely collide, causing congestion. Figure 1(e)




Figure 2: Circular dependency between jobs and links.

illustrates a more favorable case where the communication phases of Job₁ and Job₂ are interleaved, allowing the network link to be shared more efficiently. The compute phases are not interleaved because they are on different GPUs.

To achieve inter-job communication interleaving, [67] used an unfair congestion control algorithm by *manually* changing the parameters of DCQCN [86]. For instance, the paper showed that when two VGG19 [69] training jobs share a network link, forcing a 60%-40% bandwidth share (instead of the default 50%-50%) results in 1.23× speed up for *both* jobs compared to the default case [67]. The intuition behind this surprising result is that in fair bandwidth-sharing, the jobs communicate simultaneously, causing congestion similar to Figure 1(d). In contrast, unfair bandwidth-sharing nudges the competing jobs from synchronization and pushes them toward an interleaved state, similar to Figure 1(e).

In follow-up work, Cassini [66] used a centralized scheduler that shifts the start time of jobs to fit the compute phase of one job into the communication phase of another. Cassini consists of two parts. First, a network-aware scheduler considers job compatibility when placing jobs on the network. Second, an agent on each server continuously monitors these time shifts to ensure jobs do not deviate from their intended start times.

The following section explains that both [67] and [66] considered relatively stable conditions in testbed experiments and ignored several practical challenges to achieve robust inter-job communication interleaving. We then propose MLTCP, a straightforward change to congestion control algorithms that automatically achieves robust interleaving without manually changing the congestion control parameters or using a centralized scheduler (§3).

2.2 Challenges of Comm. Interleaving

In this section, we discuss three practical challenges to achieving robust inter-job communication interleaving in DNN




Figure 3: MLTCP high-level concept.

training clusters: (i) partially compatible jobs; (ii) stragglers; (iii) circular dependencies across links.¹

Challenge 1: Robustness to partially compatible jobs. Interleaving the communication phases of jobs that share a link requires that the compute phase of one job fit into the communication phase of the other. In other words, the jobs must be *compatible* [67]. However, given the plethora of DNN models, it is nearly impossible for all jobs sharing a network link to be perfectly compatible. Our experiments show that prior approaches [66, 67] cannot achieve speedups when the compatibility ratio is below 70% (§4.6). In particular, when partially compatible jobs share a link, prior approaches to achieve interleaving oscillate between interleaved, partially interleaved, and not interleaved states. Since these partially interleaved and not interleaved states repeat throughout the training, some of the jobs' training times become significantly worse than fair-sharing, defeating the purpose of interleaving to accelerate all jobs.

Challenge 2: Robustness to stragglers. Although several testbed experiments [43, 75, 78] have shown that the communication pattern of DNN training jobs is predictable, servers in shared clusters often experience uncorrelated latency jitters due to the presence of stragglers [9, 21, 22, 30, 71, 80, 82]. Robustness to noise becomes crucial to ensure the network maintains an interleaved state while gracefully handling these unpredictable factors without compromising the overall training time. Our experiments show that when the straggler probability is above 10%, prior approaches [66, 67] are unable to maintain interleaving and end up slowing down the 99th percentile training iteration times compared to default congestion control (§4.5).

Challenge 3: Robustness to circular dependencies across links. In practical deployments, jobs share the network with multiple jobs at different links. Consider the example shown in Figure 2(a) where Job₁ is competing with Job₂ on link l_1 , Job₂ is competing with Job₃ on link l_2 , and Job₁ is competing with Job₃ on link l_3 . This scenario creates a circular dependency across the three jobs, shown in

¹Note that Muri [84] cannot solve any of these challenges because the jobs we consider do not share the same GPUs.




Figure 4: (a) Favoring Job₁ interleaves the jobs. (b) Favoring Job₂ overlaps the jobs.

Figure 2(b). Cassini [66] cannot find the correct schedule to interleave these jobs because the affinity graph (shown in Figure 2(c)) has a loop.² Similarly, the approach proposed in [67] considers the links independently and cannot determine an unfair bandwidth sharing between these jobs on different links. In contrast, our experiments demonstrate that MLTCP flows converge to optimal interleaving even in such circular dependencies (§4.7).

3 MLTCP DESIGN

This section describes MLTCP, a congestion control feature to automatically interleave the communication phases of DNN jobs that share a network. First, we describe MLTCP’s goals and high-level design principles (§3.1). Then, we describe MLTCP’s core techniques: the job favoritism policy (§3.2) and the bandwidth aggressiveness function (§3.3). Next, we show how these techniques apply to various congestion control implementations, including window-based algorithms, such as Reno and CUBIC, as well as rate-based ones, such as DCQCN (§3.4). Finally, we discuss how MLTCP updates its parameters during the training (§3.5).

3.1 Goals and High-Level Concept

MLTCP’s goal is to stabilize flows belonging to different DNN training jobs into an interleaved state without using a centralized controller, regardless of job start times, DNN model size, parallelization strategy, or number of jobs competing for bandwidth. At the same time, MLTCP should maintain robustness to stragglers, partially compatible jobs, and circular dependencies across jobs and links.

Figure 3 illustrates MLTCP’s high-level concept when two jobs Job₁ and Job₂ share a bottleneck. Intuitively, transforming their communication patterns from a non-interleaved state to a fully interleaved state means the communication phase of one job should *slide* to the left of the figure, while the other simultaneously slides to the right until they are fully interleaved. MLTCP uses two techniques to achieve this goal. First, it selects which job should slide left by allowing it to

occupy a higher portion of the link bandwidth at every iteration until the communication patterns are interleaved. This technique is called the job favoritism policy (§3.2). Second, to achieve the effect of favoritism in a distributed manner, MLTCP introduces a novel feature that dynamically adjusts the congestion window (or rate) of flows that belong to each competing job using a scaling function called the bandwidth aggressiveness function (§3.3).

3.2 Job Favoritism Policy

DNN training jobs are periodic; hence, when two or more jobs compete for network, allocating more bandwidth to the flows that belong to one of the jobs accelerates that job’s current training iteration and, more importantly, affects the start times of its subsequent training iterations. In other words, giving more bandwidth to one of the jobs slides this job’s communication pattern to the left of the others. Eventually, this process nudges the communication phases of the jobs to separate. The question is, which job should be given higher bandwidth? In fact, the choice of the job matters!

For example, consider two DNN training jobs sharing a bottleneck link with 50 Gbps capacity, as shown in Figure 4(a). At time $t = 0$, Job₁ has a slight head start over Job₂. As a result, favoring Job₁ over Job₂ accelerates its training iterations even more and causes the communication phases to further separate in the subsequent iterations. In contrast, favoring Job₂ hurts the eventual interleaving state and leads the communication pattern of the two jobs to overlap even more, as shown in Figure 4(b).

In principle, any favoritism ordering that follows the Shortest Remaining Processing Time (SRPT) policy is valid. For instance, policies that favor jobs based on earlier iteration start time, earlier iteration finish time, smallest data remaining, or largest data sent all stabilize into an interleaved state. The intuition is that the favoritism policies that *reinforce* SRPT eventually achieve an interleaving state. However, a policy that cancels out the effect of SRPT, such as favoring jobs based on the latest iteration start time, latest iteration finish time, largest data remaining, or smallest data sent, cannot achieve interleaving. In MLTCP, we use the percentage

²Theorem 1 in Cassini [66] requires a loop-free affinity graph.

of bytes sent as our favoritism policy because it enables us to implement MLTCP in a fully distributed manner. Time-based policies require a centralized controller to compare jobs' start or finish times. An important property of MLTCP's job favoritism technique is that it provides native robustness to stragglers and partially compatible jobs because it fundamentally emulates an SRPT policy. As a result, any disturbance in communication patterns automatically triggers the sliding mechanism toward stabilizing into an interleaved state.

3.3 Bandwidth Aggressiveness Function

To realize MLTCP's favoritism policy in a distributed manner, the flow closest to completing its iteration should automatically grab a larger bandwidth share than others, helping MLTCP achieve the desired sliding effect. MLTCP achieves this goal by dynamically adjusting the congestion window (cwnd) or sending rate of flows based on a *bandwidth aggressiveness function* $\mathcal{F}(\text{bytes_ratio})$, where *bytes_ratio* is the number of bytes sent in the current iteration normalized by the total bytes ($\frac{\text{bytes_sent}}{\text{total_bytes}}$). MLTCP obtains these parameters from the TCP socket (details in §3.5).

Figure 5 provides a conceptual illustration of several potential aggressiveness functions. The x-axis represents *bytes_ratio*, and the y-axis determines the range of aggressiveness. The figure shows several function shapes. Our evaluations (§4.8) demonstrate that many aggressiveness functions can achieve MLTCP's interleaving goals as long as three requirements are satisfied: (i) the range is large enough to absorb the noise (e.g., slight variations in round-trip time (RTT) or iteration times) in the network; (ii) the derivative of the function is non-negative; (iii) all flows employ the same bandwidth aggressiveness function. Hence, to simplify the implementation, we propose a linear increasing function:

$$\mathcal{F}(\text{bytes_ratio}) = S \times \text{bytes_ratio} + I \quad (3)$$

Where S and I represent the linear function's slope and intercept, respectively. These are constant parameters tuned based on the congestion control algorithm, link rate, and noise in the system. Our evaluations suggest guidelines to select these parameters (§4.8).

MLTCP has two mechanisms for using \mathcal{F} to augment default congestion control algorithms. The first mechanism uses \mathcal{F} as a scaling factor for the cwnd increment made during the window (or rate) increase step. As a result, the flow with the most bytes sent increases its window (or rate) more aggressively, triggering MLTCP's favoritism policy and eventually interleaving the communication phases of different jobs. The second mechanism uses \mathcal{F} as a scaling factor during the multiplicative decrease step. This mechanism has a similar effect: the flow with the most bytes sent reduces its window (or rate) less aggressively, enabling it to claim a bigger share of the bandwidth even after packet loss (or




Figure 5: Potential bandwidth aggressiveness functions for adjusting the cwnd (or rate).

ECN) events. This again follows the job favoritism principle and leads to interleaving. Note that \mathcal{F} 's output is unitless.

3.4 Augmenting Reno, CUBIC, & DCQCN

This section explains how we augment Reno, CUBIC, and DCQCN algorithms with MLTCP. Following Linux's implementation, throughout this paper, we assume cwnd is expressed in packets (not bytes).

Reno additive increase. The TCP Reno algorithm uses a cumulative ack mechanism to acknowledge multiple in-flight packets with a single ack. Upon the receipt of an ack, Reno increases its congestion window as follows:

$$\text{cwnd} \leftarrow \text{cwnd} + \frac{\#\text{num_acks}}{\text{cwnd}} \quad (4)$$

MLTCP updates the above equation to:

$$\text{cwnd} \leftarrow \text{cwnd} + \mathcal{F}(\text{bytes_ratio}) \times \frac{\#\text{num_acks}}{\text{cwnd}} \quad (5)$$

Reno multiplicative decrease. With every dropped packet, TCP Reno updates its cwnd as follows:

$$\text{cwnd} \leftarrow 0.5 \times \text{cwnd} \quad (6)$$

We analyze the relationship

MLTCP updates the above equation to:

$$\text{cwnd} \leftarrow \mathcal{F}(\text{bytes_ratio}) \times 0.5 \times \text{cwnd} \quad (7)$$

CUBIC window growth. CUBIC's window growth algorithm computes the target cwnd using a cubic function based on the time gap from the last multiplicative decrease event, as shown below:

$$\text{cwnd} \leftarrow \text{CUBIC}(\text{time}) \quad (8)$$

MLTCP scales the calculated time gap by $\mathcal{F}(\text{bytes_ratio})$ before applying the cubic function:

$$\text{cwnd} \leftarrow \text{CUBIC}(\mathcal{F}(\text{bytes_ratio}) \times \text{time}) \quad (9)$$

When different MLTCP flows compete for bandwidth, a smaller $\mathcal{F}(\text{bytes_ratio})$ value has a dilation effect on the time calculation, causing less favored MLTCP-CUBIC flows

Algorithm 1 Updating MLTCP Parameters

```

1: procedure INITIALIZE:(total_bytes, INIT_COMM_GAP)
  ▶ Input Parameter total_bytes: Total bytes per iteration
  ▶ Input Parameter INIT_COMM_GAP: Minimum gap in
  communication for detecting iteration boundary
2:   bytes_ratio = 0 ▶ Current fraction of bytes sent in this iteration
3:   bytes_sent = 0 ▶ Number of successfully sent bytes
4:   prev_ack_tstamp = 0 ▶ Timestamp of the previous ack
5:   iter_gap = INIT_COMM_GAP ▶ Estimated iteration gap
6:   ▶ Maximum communication gap observed in the iteration
7:   max_gap = INIT_COMM_GAP
8:   g = 0.75; ▶ Noise tolerance in detecting iteration gap
9:   γ = 0.5; ▶ EWMA factor
10:  MTU = 1500 ▶ Maximum packet size used by the system
11: procedure UPDATE_MLTCP_PARAMS(num_acks)
  ▶ Input Parameter num_acks
12:  bytes_sent += num_acks × MTU
13:  curr_ack_tstamp = GET_REAL_TIME()
14:  curr_gap = curr_ack_tstamp − prev_ack_tstamp
15:  max_gap = MAX(max_gap, curr_gap)
16:  if curr_gap > (g × iter_gap) then
17:    ▶ Start of new training iteration
18:    ▶ Updating estimate for iter_gap
19:    iter_gap = (1 − γ) iter_gap + (γ) max_gap
20:    ▶ MLTCP state reset
21:    bytes_ratio = 0; bytes_sent = 0;
22:    max_gap = INIT_COMM_GAP
23:  else
24:    ▶ Middle of training iteration
25:    bytes_ratio = min(1,  $\frac{bytes\_sent}{total\_bytes}$ )
26:  prev_ack_tstamp = curr_ack_tstamp
27:  return

```

with smaller $\mathcal{F}(bytes_ratio)$ to increase their *cwnd* more slowly than those with higher $\mathcal{F}(bytes_ratio)$ values.

CUBIC multiplicative decrease. The multiplicative decrease step of CUBIC is similar to Reno, but instead of having a fixed value of 0.5, CUBIC specifies the multiplicative decrease factor as a parameter called β . The *cwnd* update during multiplicative decrease for CUBIC is given by:

$$cwnd \leftarrow \beta \times cwnd \quad (10)$$

MLTCP updates the multiplicative decrease factor of CUBIC similar to Reno:

$$cwnd \leftarrow \mathcal{F}(bytes_ratio) \times \beta \times cwnd \quad (11)$$

DCQCN rate increase. DCQCN is a rate-based congestion control algorithm commonly used in lossless RoCE networks [86]. It periodically increases the target rate by fixed steps R_{AI} during the additive increase stage:

$$target_rate \leftarrow target_rate + R_{AI} \quad (12)$$

MLTCP updates the above equation to:

$$target_rate \leftarrow target_rate + \mathcal{F}(bytes_ratio) \times R_{AI} \quad (13)$$

DCQCN rate decrease. DCQCN uses ECN-marked packets to detect congestion. Upon the receipt of a Congestion Notification Packet (CNP) from the receiver, the sender reduces its current rate using a multiplicative decrease factor:

$$curr_rate \leftarrow (1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}) \times curr_rate \quad (14)$$

where α is the rate reduction factor of the DCQCN algorithm. MLTCP updates the above equation to:

$$curr_rate \leftarrow \mathcal{F}(bytes_ratio) \times (1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}) \times curr_rate \quad (15)$$

MLTCP does not make any changes to any other parts of the congestion control algorithm (e.g., slow start, initial congestion window). Initially, we assumed that MLTCP must update both increase and decrease phases of congestion control algorithms to achieve interleaving. However, our evaluations show that updating only the increase or decrease phase is enough to achieve interleaving, and they both have similar gains (§4.8).

3.5 Updating MLTCP Parameters

An essential detail in MLTCP is correctly updating *bytes_ratio* = $\frac{bytes_sent}{total_bytes}$ during each iteration. There are many ways to achieve this goal. This section describes our approach.

Updating *bytes_sent*. MLTCP uses the pluggable congestion module [2, 32] to insert the UPDATE_MLTCP_PARAMS procedure, shown in Algorithm 1, as a hook into the TCP stack. This function has two essential goals: the first is to update the number of successfully sent bytes based on the acked packets, and the second is to identify iteration boundaries to reset *bytes_sent* at the start of each training iteration. UPDATE_MLTCP_PARAMS is called by the TCP stack whenever an ack packet is received. It uses the number of acks to estimate the bytes that the sender sent successfully (line 12). For training jobs with a simple on-off communication pattern (i.e., data parallel jobs), detecting the start of the communication phase is relatively straightforward: wait for a gap in the ack arrivals that is longer than a typical RTT. However, to support training jobs with more complex communication patterns with multiple peaks appearing during the same communication phase (i.e., pipeline/tensor/model parallel jobs), we use a heuristic that estimates the gaps between the communication phase of different iterations, called *iter_gap* (line 5). Our heuristic begins by keeping track of the current gap and the maximum gap between subsequent acks (lines 14 and 15, respectively). If the current gap is within an acceptable threshold of *iter_gap*, it considers the current ack as the start of a new iteration’s communication phase (line 16), updates *iter_gap* using an exponentially weighted moving average (EWMA) function (line 19), and resets MLTCP’s parameters (lines 21–22). Otherwise, it computes *bytes_ratio* based on the current *bytes_sent* (line 25).




Figure 6: Our experiment topologies.

Obtaining *total_bytes*. The total bytes in each iteration (*total_bytes*) is a constant variable that depends on the size of the DNN model, the parallelization strategy, and the communication collective. In our implementation, we pre-calculate this number and store it in a file, but an optimization of our implementation would be to automatically learn this value by measuring the total amount of data during the first few iterations. We leave this optimization to future work.

4 EVALUATION

In this section, we first describe our evaluation methodology and implementation details of MLTCP (§4.1). Then, we benchmark MLTCP’s convergence (§4.2) and report its training iteration speedup (§4.3). We then study its performance with different DNN models and parallelization strategies (§4.4). Next, we evaluate MLTCP’s robustness in the presence of stragglers (§4.5), partially compatible jobs (§4.6), and circular dependency between jobs and links (§4.7). Finally, we provide a set of guidelines for MLTCP’s parameters (§4.8).

4.1 Evaluation Methodology

Setup. We implement MLTCP as a Linux kernel module to demonstrate its convergence and gains in real-world settings. Our prototype includes 12 ASUS ESC4000A-E10 servers connected via a 64 port Tofino switch. Each server has one A100 Nvidia GPU [4] 40 GB of HBM2 memory and one 50 Gbps Mellanox ConnectX5 NIC. We experiment with both TCP and RoCEv2. For RoCE experiments, we enable DCB [3] and PFC to support a lossless fabric for RDMA. The servers run Ubuntu 20.04 LTS. Our experiments use PyTorch versions 1.13 and 1.8, CUDA version 11.7, and NCCL version 2.14.3.

Topologies. We use two topologies in our experiments. First, a single-bottleneck dumbbell topology, shown in Figure 6(a), where servers are grouped into six pairs: $\{S_1, S_2\}$, $\{S_3, S_4\}$, $\{S_5, S_6\}$, $\{S_7, S_8\}$, $\{S_9, S_{10}\}$, $\{S_{11}, S_{12}\}$. Each pair corresponds to a different DNN training job and communicates gradient updates via the bottleneck link. We change the number of active server pairs throughout the experiments. Second, we use a hierarchical topology, shown in Figure 6(b), to capture the impact of multiple bottlenecks in the network.

DNN	Batch size/GPU	Parallelization strategy	Type
VGG16 [23]	1400	Data Parallel	Vision
WideResNet101 [81]	800	Data Parallel	Vision
RoBERTa [49]	28	Data Parallel	Language
CamemBERT [53]	28	Data Parallel	Language
GPT-1 [64]	31	Data Parallel	Language
GPT-2 [65]	5-44	Data Parallel	Language
GPT-3 [15]	3	Hybrid Data/Pipeline/Model Parallel	Language

Table 1: DNN models used in our experiments.

DDN workloads. We use seven real-world DNN models: VGG16 [23], WideResNet101 [81], RoBERTa [49], CamemBERT [53], GPT-1 [64], GPT-2 [65], GPT-3 [15]. Table 1 summarizes the models and batch sizes used in our experiments. For clarity of presentation, we start all jobs at the same time. Our takeaways hold when jobs start at random times as well.

Compared schemes. We implement the following schemes in our testbed.

- **MLTCP-Reno.** We experiment with two variants of MLTCP-Reno: MLTCP-Reno-WI and MLTCP-Reno-MD, depending on whether we use MLTCP’s bandwidth aggressiveness function during the window increase or multiplicative decrease phases of the Reno algorithm. The default MLTCP-Reno corresponds to the WI version in all our experiments. The default Reno protocol cannot saturate 50 Gbps bandwidth due to kernel overheads and lack of robust zerocopy functional APIs [13, 16]. To overcome this, we create eight sockets per job on each server to parallelize the transmissions. In our experiments, we aggregate statistics across all sockets that belong to the same job. Following prior work [17] we set the RTO minimum to 1 ms. Unless otherwise specified, we use $S = 1.75$ and $I = 0.25$ for MLTCP-Reno-WI and $S = 1$ and $I = 0.5$ for MLTCP-Reno-MD.
- **MLTCP-CUBIC.** Similar to Reno, we experiment with two variants of MLTCP-CUBIC: MLTCP-CUBIC-WI and MLTCP-CUBIC-MD, depending on whether we use MLTCP’s bandwidth aggressiveness function during the window increase or multiplicative decrease phases of the CUBIC algorithm. The default MLTCP-CUBIC corresponds to the WI version in all our experiments. For CUBIC, we create four parallel sockets to saturate the link capacity. We also set the RTO minimum to 1 ms and scale the `bic_scale` parameter by 10^{10} to enable CUBIC to work on smaller RTT scales in our testbed. We use $S = 1.0$ and $I = 0.5$ for MLTCP-CUBIC-WI and $S = 0.8$ and $I = 0.8$ for MLTCP-CUBIC-MD.
- **MLQCN.** Since the DCQCN algorithm is implemented inside Mellanox NICs, we do not directly change the NIC implementation. The NICs API exposes a parameter called `rp_ai_rate` corresponding to DCQCN’s R_{AI} rate. We use a C++ program that continuously monitors the amount of data sent by reading the NIC’s hardware counter registers and




Figure 7: Reno and MLTCP-Reno performance on convergence benchmarks.




Figure 8: CUBIC and MLTCP-CUBIC performance on convergence benchmarks.

updating rp_ai_rate based on MLQCN’s algorithm. MLQCN uses $I = 0.267$ and $S = 1.067$.

- **Cassini.** We use the Cassini [66] scheduler as one of our baselines to evaluate MLTCP’s robustness. Cassini uses a centralized scheduler to determine a series of time-shift values to adjust the start time of jobs to achieve interleaving. It takes each job’s expected optimal iteration time and uses an end-host agent to enforce the time-shifts on each server.
- **Static.** We use the approach proposed in [67] as another baseline by manually setting the congestion window parameters such that the bandwidth share between the competing jobs is statically configured to be unfair. We refer to this approach as Static in our evaluations.

4.2 Convergence Benchmarks

We begin our evaluations by demonstrating MLTCP’s convergence when two GPT-2 training jobs share our dumbbell topology (Figure 6). Each job uses data-parallel training on the Book Corpus dataset [87]. We train each job for 1000 iterations (≈ 15 minutes) and compare link utilization, number of dropped (or ECN-marked) packets, and Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF) for training iteration times of MLTCP-Reno, MLTCP-CUBIC, and MLQCN with the default Reno, CUBIC, and DCQCN algorithms, respectively.

MLTCP-Reno. Figure 7(a) shows that MLTCP-Reno automatically interleaves the communication pattern of the two jobs after just six iterations. This interleaving state remains persistent for the entire duration of the experiment. In contrast, the default Reno algorithm continues to experience congestion and packet loss. Figure 7(b) plots the number of

packet drops per second for the first 200 seconds of the experiment and shows that, on average, MLTCP-Reno reduces the packet loss rate by 3.08 \times . Consequently, MLTCP accelerates the average and 99th percentile training iteration time of both jobs by 1.1 \times and 1.18 \times , respectively, as shown in Figure 7(c). Note that the two MLTCP-Reno curves overlap on top of each other.

MLTCP-CUBIC. Despite CUBIC being a different congestion control algorithm than Reno, we observe a similar behavior when we augment CUBIC with MLTCP. Figure 8(a) shows that MLTCP-CUBIC interleaves the training jobs after ten iterations. Figure 8(b) demonstrates that MLTCP-CUBIC reduces the packet loss rate by a factor of 2.25 \times compared to default CUBIC and Figure 8(c) shows that MLTCP-CUBIC accelerates the average and 99th percentile training iteration time of both jobs by 1.2 \times and 1.23 \times , respectively. Similar to MLTCP-Reno, the two MLTCP-CUBIC curves overlap.

MLQCN. The previous two experiments show MLTCP’s performance with the traditional TCP/IP stack. With RoCE, MLTCP achieves even better results, as shown in Figure 9: MLQCN jobs converge within eight iterations, experience 14.59 \times less ECN marks, and improve the average and 99th percentile iteration times by 1.34 \times by 1.47 \times , respectively. Note that in Figure 9(c), the training iteration times of both jobs overlap.

4.3 Training Iteration Time Speedup

To quantify MLTCP’s training iteration time speedup, we repeat the experiments in the previous section while increasing the number of jobs that compete on the bottleneck link.




Figure 9: DCQCN and MLQCN performance on convergence benchmarks.




Figure 10: MLTCP’s speedup as the number of jobs competing for bandwidth increases.

For each MLTCP variant, we compute its training iteration time speedup as the ratio of the training iteration time using MLTCP over the training iteration time of its congestion control counterpart. Figure 10 shows the average and 99th percentile training iteration time speedups with MLTCP-Reno plateau at 1.3× and 1.5×, respectively. In contrast, as the number of jobs increases, MLQCN’s average and tail speedups increase to 2× and 4×, respectively. This is because the default DCQCN algorithm suffers from extensive pause frames during congestion periods, which further elongates the training iteration times. As shown in Figure 9, MLQCN dramatically reduces the number of ECN-marked packets compared to DCQCN, resulting in significant gains.

4.4 Impact of DNN Model & Parallelization Strategy Diversity

We evaluate MLTCP’s performance when different DNN models with different parallelization strategies, number of servers, and job placement compete in a hierarchical topology. To do so, we follow Cassini’s snapshot trace and generate different combinations of several DNN training jobs sharing our clos topology (Figure 6(b)). We make job placement decisions based on the Cassini scheduler, which tries to place compatible jobs on network links but does not always achieve this goal. Table 2 lists the DNN model names and details of each snapshot in this experiment.

Figure 11 plots the CDF of the iteration times of all our snapshot configurations. For each snapshot, we train each job for 500 iterations and collect the training iteration times with MLQCN and DCQCN as the congestion control algorithm. The Ideal curve in the plot captures the iteration times of the same jobs when run in isolation in the cluster with the same number of workers. There are three takeaways from this experiment. First, compared to DCQCN, MLQCN improves the average and 99th percentile training iteration times by 1.33× and 1.57×, respectively. Second, MLQCN’s average and tail iteration times are within 5% and 4% of the Ideal case. Third, MLQCN achieves interleaving across various DNN models, parallelization strategies, number of workers, job placement, and compatibility scores.

4.5 Impact of Stragglers

To demonstrate MLTCP’s robustness to stragglers, we train two GPT-2 jobs sharing a bottleneck link and synthetically insert sleep commands in each server’s training code based on a uniform straggling probability. If a server decides to lag at a particular iteration, it sleeps for a period uniformly randomly chosen between 5% and 10% of the isolation iteration time, where isolation iteration time refers to the iteration time when the job is running in isolation.

In the case of Cassini, frequent straggling events break the interleaving for a few iterations, forcing the jobs to compete for bandwidth. Cassini’s end-host agent tries to overcome this by forcing the straggling server to skip an iteration, hoping that the noise in the system will be resolved in the next iteration and the jobs will return to an interleaved state. In contrast, MLQCN’s bandwidth adjustment function dynamically reacts to the straggling server to maintain the interleaving. Figure 12 shows the training iteration time speedups (normalized to default DCQCN) as the straggler probability increases. There are two takeaways from this figure. First, MLQCN’s speedup does not change dramatically in the presence of stragglers because both MLQCN and DCQCN experience the same straggler event. As a result, the relative speedup remains more or less constant. Second,

Competing jobs (batch size)	Num. servers	Parallelism	Compatibility
WideResNet101 (800)	5	data	0.88
VGG16 (1400)	5	data	
CamemBERT (28)	5	data	0.9
RoBERTa (28)	5	data	
GPT-1 (31)	4	data	1
GPT-1 (31)	4	data	
GPT-2 (15)	4	data	
GPT-3 (3)	4	hybrid	1
GPT-3 (3)	4	hybrid	

Table 2: Snapshots of jobs competing for bandwidth.




Figure 11: Impact of model diversity.




Figure 12: Impact of stragglers.






Figure 13: MLQCN’s robustness to partially compatible jobs compared with prior work.

Cassini’s tail iteration time speedup drops sharply as the straggler probability goes beyond 10%.

4.6 Impact of Partially Compatible Jobs

We now study the impact of partial compatibility on MLTCP and our Static baseline. We run two sets of experiments. First, we train two partially compatible GPT-2 jobs sharing a bottleneck link and adjust the congestion control parameters based on the suggestions in [67]. Figure 13(a) shows that when we use the Static approach, the communication phases of the jobs constantly oscillate between interleaved, partially interleaved, and not interleaved states. Since these partially interleaved and not interleaved states repeat throughout the training, Job₂’s training time becomes worse than the default DCQCN, as shown in Figure 13(b). This defeats the purpose of using Static’s unfair congestion control to accelerate both jobs. In contrast, we find that MLQCN is robust to partial compatibility and is able to partially interleave the jobs throughout the entire training.

In the second experiment, we increase to three GPT-2 training jobs sharing a bottleneck link and vary their batch sizes to sweep the training iteration time speedups across different compatibility scores between the jobs. Figure 13(c) compares the average and 99th percentile training iteration time speedups of MLQCN and Static approaches (normalized by the training time of DCQCN). There are three takeaways from this figure. First, as the compatibility score increases,

the speedup of both MLQCN and Static increases. This is because the more compatible jobs are, the better their communication patterns interleave. Second, MLQCN outperforms 99th percentile tail iteration times of Static, even when the jobs are fully compatible. MLQCN uses its aggressiveness function to dynamically adjust the sending rate, making it tolerant to small noises in the system, whereas the Static approach is unable to react to the network’s conditions. Third, when the compatibility score is below 0.7, the Static approach performs extremely poorly where the 99th percentile training iteration times are lower than the default DCQCN approach (training iteration time speedup is lower than 1).

4.7 Circular Dependency Across Links

To evaluate MLTCP’s robustness to circular dependencies between jobs and links, we experiment with the topology shown in Figure 2 using MLQCN as the congestion control algorithm while training three GPT-2 models. There are three congestion bottleneck links in this topology. Each job experiences two congestion points and competes with a different job at each point. Figure 14 shows that the communication patterns on each link l_1 , l_2 , and l_3 are interleaved such that jobs competing for bandwidth on all links occupy the maximum possible link utilization. In contrast, Cassini cannot find the correct schedule to interleave these jobs and Static cannot determine an unfair bandwidth sharing between these jobs on different links.




Figure 14: MLTCP’s robustness to circular dependency across jobs and links.

4.8 Guidelines for Choosing Parameters

Aggressiveness function. To evaluate the impact of different bandwidth aggressiveness functions \mathcal{F} on MLTCP’s performance, we experiment with three GPT-2 training jobs using MLTCP-Reno with six functions $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_6$:

- $\mathcal{F}_1 = 1.75(\text{bytes_ratio}) + 0.25$
- $\mathcal{F}_2 = 1.75(\text{bytes_ratio})^2 + 0.25$
- $\mathcal{F}_3 = 1/(-3.5(\text{bytes_ratio}) + 4)$
- $\mathcal{F}_4 = -1.75(\text{bytes_ratio})^2 + 3.5(\text{bytes_ratio}) + 0.25$
- $\mathcal{F}_5 = -1.75(\text{bytes_ratio}) + 2$
- $\mathcal{F}_6 = -1.75(\text{bytes_ratio})^2 + 2$

All these functions have the same range (0.25 – 2) but $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_4$ are increasing and \mathcal{F}_5 and \mathcal{F}_6 are decreasing. Figure 15 shows the average training iteration time of different iterations as the jobs start their training process. As shown, the iteration time of MLTCP-Reno with $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_4$ starts to decrease after ≈ 10 iterations, whereas the iteration times of MLTCP-Reno with \mathcal{F}_5 and \mathcal{F}_6 do not improve. In particular, even though different increasing functions take slightly different numbers of iterations to interleave the jobs, they eventually speed up the training iteration times as long as the function increases.

Slope and Intercept (S and I). Next, to study the impact of slope and intercept parameters on \mathcal{F} , we sweep a series of possible parameters and measure the average and 99th percentile training iteration time speedups of MLTCP-Reno over default Reno, shown in Figure 16. The color in the heatmap represents the speedup value. The heatmaps show that MLTCP-Reno is able to achieve speedups for a wide

range of slope and intercept parameters. The star marks the set of parameters with the largest speedup in this experiment.

MLTCP on window increase or multiplicative decrease? Thus far, our evaluations augment the congestion window (or rate) increase phases of Reno, CUBIC, and DC-QCN. MLTCP’s bandwidth aggressiveness function can be applied to both the increase and decrease phases. Figure 17 compares the training iteration time for two jobs running GPT-2 model and sharing a single bottleneck link in a dumbbell topology for MLTCP-Reno-WI, MLTCP-Reno-MD, MLTCP-CUBIC-WI and MLTCP-CUBIC-MD. We find that the WI or MD variants of MLTCP-Reno and MLTCP-CUBIC perform similarly for both average and tail iteration times.

5 DISCUSSION

Complex communication patterns. Algorithm 1 uses a heuristic of detecting the longest gap in communication peaks to identify iteration boundaries. MLTCP’s mechanism is not tied to detecting the exact iteration boundary of the training model; in fact, MLTCP’s approach works well even if the parameter update happens in the middle of a training iteration, as long as its close to a large compute gap and the the parameter updates take place consistently at every training iteration.

Fairness goals. Traditionally, congestion control algorithms converge to fair bandwidth sharing among competing flows. With MLTCP, flows may start with unfair bandwidth sharing and slowly converge to an interleaved state. But MLTCP is not an unfair congestion control algorithm for the entire duration of a training job. It *shifts* the granularity




Figure 15: Impact of different bandwidth aggressiveness functions on training iteration time.




Figure 16: Heatmap of MLTCP-Reno's speedup with different slopes and intercepts.




Figure 17: Window increase vs. multiplicative decrease.

of fairness from sub-RTT time scales into training iteration (many RTTs) time scales.

Priority vs. favoritism. We intentionally avoid calling MLTCP's favoritism policy as a *priority function* to avoid confusion with conventional packet priority concept. Packet priorities require switch support, and have limited priority levels. In contrast, MLTCP's favoritism is a completely distributed function implemented in congestion control with fine-grained granularity through adjusting the congestion window (or sending rate).

Interactions between MLTCP's flows and legacy flows. In our implementation, we enable MLTCP in the congestion control parameter of NCCL's FAST socket plugin [1]. Hence, only DNN flows using the NCCL library change cwnd based on MLTCP, and non-DNN training flows use the default congestion algorithm. Since MLTCP changes the aggressiveness of the congestion control, DNN jobs running MLTCP could potentially be unfair towards non-DNN flows. But MLTCP's technique can be used to address this challenge by assigning a large \mathcal{F} function (larger than DNN flows) to latency-sensitive legacy flows. As a result, flows at higher priorities can be safeguarded from the DNN traffic.

6 RELATED WORK

Our work builds on several lines of related research.

Congestion control. There is vast literature on congestion control. Many rely on feedback signals indicating congestion in the network, and reduce their sending cwnd or rate. Such protocols include drop-based [14, 26, 28, 36, 79], delay-based [12, 44, 45, 48, 54], and ECN-based [7, 86]. We adapt TCP Reno because it is the canonical congestion control algorithm, and CUBIC because it is the default in Linux. Further, we augment DCQCN because it is commonly used in machine learning training today. We believe that MLTCP can augment feedback-based protocols without significant change. Other types of congestion control include deadline-aware [74, 77], router-based [24, 42, 70], and receiver-based

[29, 56]. For deadline-based, inter-job interleaving could be implemented by adjusting the deadlines of training jobs competing on the same link. However, this requires redefining the concept of deadlines before flows converge to an interleaved state. Router-assisted approaches could also implement inter-job interleaving by enabling the router to determine the unfairness, based on when the flows started. Similarly, receiver-based protocols may delegate unfairness control to the receiver, which knows exactly how many bytes have been sent. We leave the implementation and analysis of these algorithms to future work.

Flow scheduling. There has been many workload-specific dynamic flow scheduling techniques designed for optimizing datacenter networks. Many of these focus on efficient utilization of network resources, achieving high bisection bandwidths [5, 19, 20, 37, 62] and minimizing the flow completion times [8, 11, 33]. These proposals tend to assume the scheduler has extensive knowledge about active flows in the network. In contrast, MLTCP achieves interleaving in a distributed manner without any information about flow arrivals/departures.

DNN job placement schedulers. Prior work demonstrated that generic flow schedulers are not optimal for DNN training jobs [52, 59]. As a result, there has been much work in creating schedulers for DNN training jobs. Many focused on compute-optimization in how they assign workers to jobs, and only considered the network so far as to try and schedule workers for a job close together [27, 39, 50, 60, 63, 78, 85]. MLTCP complements these schedulers by taking advantage of incidental compatibility between jobs and interleaving them.

Network-aware DNN schedulers. There are also schedulers for the network and communication strategy of the jobs. TACCL [68] and BytePS [41] develop frameworks for optimizing the collective communication algorithm. TicTac [31] optimally interleaves a job's computation with its own communication. ByteScheduler [61] optimizes the partitioning and order of tensor transmissions. Syndicate [51] proposes

breaking down communication to smaller pieces to perform joint optimization of scheduling and execution plan of collective communications. All of these approaches focus on optimizing a single job, while MLTCP further enhances these strategies by optimizing the communication interleaving over all jobs sharing links.

Multi-resource sharing. Muri [84] introduced the idea of multi-resource interleaving for DNN training. It interleaves a variety of resources together to optimize cluster utilization. However, Muri requires all jobs to share the same set of GPUs. In practice, GPU-resource sharing is not possible in large DNN training cluster. In contrast, MLTCP only considers communication interleaving and is applicable to all jobs in the cluster regardless of computation resources being used.

Benefits of unfairness in the network. Recently, there have been calls to consider new notions of fairness in the network. Zaplatel et al. [83] argue that flow completion time rather than bandwidth fairness should be the metric for fairness. Arslan et al. [10] follow a similar line of reasoning to conclude that unfairness can also lead to higher energy efficiency.

7 CONCLUSION

MLTCP is a technique to augment a family of congestion control algorithms for shared DNN training clusters. The key idea in MLTCP is to reinforce a shortest remaining processing time first policy by dynamically adjusting the congestion window (or sending rate) of flows based on the number of successfully sent bytes. We show that this straightforward change in congestion control algorithms results in automatic inter-job communication interleaving and accelerates the average and 99th percentile of training iteration times of jobs by up to 2× and 4×, respectively. This work does not raise any ethical issues.

REFERENCES

- [1] [n. d.]. NCCL Fast Socket. ([n. d.]). <https://github.com/google/nccl-fastsocket>
- [2] 2005. Pluggable congestion avoidance modules. (2005). <https://lwn.net/Articles/128681/>
- [3] 2021. Data Center Bridging eXchange (DCBX). (2021). <https://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man8/dcb-dcbx.8.html>.
- [4] 2021. NVIDIA A100 Tensor Core GPU. (2021). <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/data-center/a100/>.
- [5] Mohammad Al-Fares, Sivasankar Radhakrishnan, Barath Raghavan, Nelson Huang, and Amin Vahdat. 2010. Hedera: dynamic flow scheduling for data center networks. In *Proceedings of the 7th USENIX Conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI'10)*. USENIX Association, USA, 19.
- [6] Dan Alistarh, Demjan Grubic, Jerry Li, Ryota Tomioka, and Milan Vojnovic. 2017. QSGD: Communication-Efficient SGD via Gradient Quantization and Encoding. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett (Eds.), Vol. 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 1709–1720. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/file/6c340f25839e6acdc73414517203f5f0-Paper.pdf>
- [7] Mohammad Alizadeh, Albert Greenberg, David A. Maltz, Jitendra Padhye, Parveen Patel, Balaji Prabhakar, Sudipta Sengupta, and Murari Sridharan. 2010. Data center TCP (DCTCP). *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.* 40, 4 (aug 2010), 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1851275.1851192>
- [8] Mohammad Alizadeh, Shuang Yang, Milad Sharif, Sachin Katti, Nick McKeown, Balaji Prabhakar, and Scott Shenker. 2013. pFabric: minimal near-optimal datacenter transport. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2013 Conference on SIGCOMM (SIGCOMM '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 435–446. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2486001.2486031>
- [9] Ganesh Ananthanarayanan, Ali Ghodsi, Scott Shenker, and Ion Stoica. 2012. Why let resources idle? Aggressive Cloning of Jobs with Dolly. In *USENIX HotCloud* (usenix hotcloud ed.). <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/let-resources-idle-aggressive-cloning-jobs-dolly/>
- [10] Serhat Arslan, Sundarajan Renegathan, and Bruce Spang. 2023. Green With Envy: Unfair Congestion Control Algorithms Can Be More Energy Efficient. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks (HotNets '23)*. 8.
- [11] Wei Bai, Li Chen, Kai Chen, Dongsu Han, Chen Tian, and Hao Wang. 2017. PIAS: Practical Information-Agnostic Flow Scheduling for Commodity Data Centers. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.* 25, 4 (aug 2017), 1954–1967. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNET.2017.2669216>
- [12] Andrea Baiocchi, Angelo Castellani, and Francesco Vacirca. [n. d.]. YeAH-TCP: Yet another highspeed TCP. ([n. d.]).
- [13] Adam Belay, George Prekas, Ana Klimovic, Samuel Grossman, Christos Kozyrakis, and Edouard Bugnion. 2014. IX: A Protected Dataplane Operating System for High Throughput and Low Latency. In *11th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 14)*. USENIX Association, Broomfield, CO, 49–65. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi14/technical-sessions/presentation/belay>
- [14] L.S. Brakmo and L.L. Peterson. 1995. TCP Vegas: end to end congestion avoidance on a global Internet. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications* 13, 8 (1995), 1465–1480. <https://doi.org/10.1109/49.464716>
- [15] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. *CoRR* abs/2005.14165 (2020). arXiv:2005.14165 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.14165>
- [16] Qizhe Cai, Shubham Chaudhary, Midhul Vuppapapati, Jaehyun Hwang, and Rachit Agarwal. 2021. Understanding host network stack overheads. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGCOMM 2021 Conference (SIGCOMM '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 65–77. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3452296.3472888>
- [17] Yanpei Chen, Rean Griffith, Junda Liu, Randy H. Katz, and Anthony D. Joseph. 2009. Understanding TCP incast throughput collapse in data-center networks. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM Workshop on Research on Enterprise Networking (WREN '09)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1592681.1592693>

- [18] M. Cho, U. Finkler, M. Serrano, D. Kung, and H. Hunter. 2019. Blue-Connect: Decomposing all-reduce for deep learning on heterogeneous network hierarchy. *IBM Journal of Research and Development* 63, 6 (2019), 1:1–1:11. <https://doi.org/10.1147/JRD.2019.2947013>
- [19] Mosharaf Chowdhury and Ion Stoica. 2015. Efficient Coflow Scheduling Without Prior Knowledge. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.* 45, 4 (aug 2015), 393–406. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2829988.2787480>
- [20] Mosharaf Chowdhury, Yuan Zhong, and Ion Stoica. 2014. Efficient coflow scheduling with Varys. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.* 44, 4 (aug 2014), 443–454. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2740070.2626315>
- [21] James Cipar, Qirong Ho, Jin Kyu Kim, Seunghak Lee, Gregory R. Ganger, Garth Gibson, Kimberly Keeton, and Eric Xing. 2013. Solving the Straggler Problem with Bounded Staleness. In *14th Workshop on Hot Topics in Operating Systems (HotOS XIV)*. USENIX Association, Santa Ana Pueblo, NM. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/hotos13/session/cipar>
- [22] Eli Cortez, Anand Bonde, Alexandre Muzio, Mark Russinovich, Marcus Fontoura, and Ricardo Bianchini. 2017. Resource Central: Understanding and Predicting Workloads for Improved Resource Management in Large Cloud Platforms. In *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP '17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 153–167. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3132747.3132772>
- [23] Abhipraya Kumar Dash. [n. d.]. VGG-16 Architecture. ([n. d.]). <https://iq.opengenus.org/vgg16/>.
- [24] Nandita Dukkipati, Masayoshi Kobayashi, Rui Zhang-Shen, and Nick McKeown. 2005. Processor Sharing Flows in the Internet. In *Quality of Service – IWQoS 2005*, Hermann de Meer and Nina Bhatti (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 271–285.
- [25] Peter X. Gao, Akshay Narayan, Gautam Kumar, Rachit Agarwal, Sylvia Ratnasamy, and Scott Shenker. 2015. pHost: distributed near-optimal datacenter transport over commodity network fabric. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Conference on Emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies (CoNEXT '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 1, 12 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2716281.2836086>
- [26] M. Gerla, M.Y. Sanadidi, Ren Wang, A. Zanella, C. Casetti, and S. Mascolo. 2001. TCP Westwood: congestion window control using bandwidth estimation. In *GLOBECOM'01. IEEE Global Telecommunications Conference (Cat. No.01CH37270)*, Vol. 3. 1698–1702 vol.3. <https://doi.org/10.1109/GLOCOM.2001.965869>
- [27] Juncheng Gu, Mosharaf Chowdhury, Kang G. Shin, Yibo Zhu, Myeongjae Jeon, Junjie Qian, Hongqiang Liu, and Chuanxiong Guo. 2019. Tiresias: A GPU Cluster Manager for Distributed Deep Learning. In *16th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 19)*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 485–500. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi19/presentation/gu>
- [28] Sangtae Ha, Injong Rhee, and Lisong Xu. 2008. CUBIC: a new TCP-friendly high-speed TCP variant. *SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev.* 42, 5 (jul 2008), 64–74. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1400097.1400105>
- [29] Mark Handley, Costin Raiciu, Alexandru Agache, Andrei Voinescu, Andrew W. Moore, Gianni Antichi, and Marcin Wójcik. 2017. Researching datacenter networks and stacks for low latency and high performance. In *Proceedings of the Conference of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication (SIGCOMM '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 29–42. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3098822.3098825>
- [30] Aaron Harlap, Henggang Cui, Wei Dai, Jinliang Wei, Gregory R. Ganger, Phillip B. Gibbons, Garth A. Gibson, and Eric P. Xing. 2016. Addressing the Straggler Problem for Iterative Convergent Parallel ML. In *Proceedings of the Seventh ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing (SoCC '16)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 98–111. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2987550.2987554>
- [31] Sayed Hadi Hashemi, Sangeetha Abdu Jyothi, and Roy Campbell. 2019. TicTac: Accelerating Distributed Deep Learning with Communication Scheduling. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, A. Talwalkar, V. Smith, and M. Zaharia (Eds.), Vol. 1. 418–430. <https://proceedings.mlsys.org/paper/2019/file/84d9ee44e457ddef7f2c4f25dc8fa865-Paper.pdf>
- [32] Stephen Hemminger. 2005. TCP infrastructure split out. (2005). <http://lwn.net/Articles/128626/>
- [33] Chi-Yao Hong, Matthew Caesar, and P. Brighten Godfrey. 2012. Finishing flows quickly with preemptive scheduling. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.* 42, 4 (aug 2012), 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2377677.2377710>
- [34] Yanping Huang, Youlong Cheng, Ankur Bapna, Orhan Firat, Dehao Chen, Mia Chen, HyoukJoong Lee, Jiquan Ngiam, Quoc V Le, Yonghui Wu, and zhfeng Chen. 2019. GPipe: Efficient Training of Giant Neural Networks using Pipeline Parallelism. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett (Eds.), Vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019/file/093f65e080a295f8076b1c5722a46aa2-Paper.pdf
- [35] V. Jacobson. 1988. Congestion avoidance and control. In *Symposium Proceedings on Communications Architectures and Protocols (SIGCOMM '88)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 314–329. <https://doi.org/10.1145/52324.52356>
- [36] V. Jacobson. 1988. Congestion avoidance and control. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.* 18, 4 (aug 1988), 314–329. <https://doi.org/10.1145/52325.52356>
- [37] Akshay Jajoo, Y. Charlie Hu, and Xiaojun Lin. 2019. Your Coflow has Many Flows: Sampling them for Fun and Speed. In *2019 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 19)*. USENIX Association, Renton, WA, 833–848. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/atc19/presentation/jajoo>
- [38] Anand Jayarajan, Jinliang Wei, Garth Gibson, Alexandra Fedorova, and Gennady Pekhimenko. 2019. Priority-based Parameter Propagation for Distributed DNN Training. *CoRR* abs/1905.03960 (2019). arXiv:1905.03960 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1905.03960>
- [39] Suhas Jayaram Subramanya, Daiyaan Arfeen, Shouxu Lin, Aurick Qiao, Zhihao Jia, and Gregory R. Ganger. 2023. Sia: Heterogeneity-aware, goodput-optimized ML-cluster scheduling. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 642–657. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3600006.3613175>
- [40] Yimin Jiang, Yibo Zhu, Chang Lan, Bairen Yi, Yong Cui, and Chuanxiong Guo. 2020. A unified architecture for accelerating distributed DNN training in heterogeneous GPU/CPU clusters. In *Proceedings of the 14th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI'20)*. USENIX Association, USA, Article 26, 17 pages.
- [41] Yimin Jiang, Yibo Zhu, Chang Lan, Bairen Yi, Yong Cui, and Chuanxiong Guo. 2020. A Unified Architecture for Accelerating Distributed DNN Training in Heterogeneous GPU/CPU Clusters. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 20)*. USENIX Association, 463–479. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi20/presentation/jiang>
- [42] Dina Katabi, Mark Handley, and Charlie Rohrs. 2002. Congestion control for high bandwidth-delay product networks. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.* 32, 4 (aug 2002), 89–102. <https://doi.org/10.1145/964725.633035>
- [43] Mehrdad Khani, Manya Ghobadi, Mohammad Alizadeh, Ziyi Zhu, Madeleine Glick, Keren Bergman, Amin Vahdat, Benjamin Klenk, and Eiman Ebrahimi. 2021. SiP-ML: High-Bandwidth Optical Network Interconnects for Machine Learning Training. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGCOMM 2021 Conference (SIGCOMM '21)*. Association for

- Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 657–675. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3452296.3472900>
- [44] Gautam Kumar, Nandita Dukkipati, Keon Jang, Hassan M. G. Wassel, Xian Wu, Behnam Montazeri, Yaogong Wang, Kevin Springborn, Christopher Alfeld, Michael Ryan, David Wetherall, and Amin Vahdat. 2020. Swift: Delay is Simple and Effective for Congestion Control in the Datacenter. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication on the Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communication (SIGCOMM '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 514–528. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3387514.3406591>
- [45] Changhyun Lee, Chunjong Park, Keon Jang, Sue Moon, and Dongsu Han. 2017. DX: Latency-Based Congestion Control for Datacenters. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking* 25, 1 (2017), 335–348. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNET.2016.2587286>
- [46] Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Shiyuan Guo, Danyang Zhuo, Hao Zhang, Dawn Song, and Ion Stoica. 2021. TeraPipe: Token-Level Pipeline Parallelism for Training Large-Scale Language Models. (2021). [arXiv:cs.LG/2102.07988](https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.07988)
- [47] Yujun Lin, Song Han, Huizi Mao, Yu Wang, and William J Dally. 2017. Deep gradient compression: Reducing the communication bandwidth for distributed training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.01887* (2017).
- [48] Shao Liu, Tamer Başar, and R. Srikant. 2008. TCP-Illinois: A loss- and delay-based congestion control algorithm for high-speed networks. *Performance Evaluation* 65, 6 (2008), 417–440. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.peva.2007.12.007> Innovative Performance Evaluation Methodologies and Tools: Selected Papers from ValueTools 2006.
- [49] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. RoBERTa: A Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach. (2019). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1907.11692>
- [50] Kshiteej Mahajan, Arjun Balasubramanian, Arjun Singhvi, Shivaram Venkataraman, Aditya Akella, Amar Phanishayee, and Shuchi Chawla. 2020. Themis: Fair and Efficient GPU Cluster Scheduling. In *17th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 20)*. USENIX Association, Santa Clara, CA, 289–304. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi20/presentation/mahajan>
- [51] Kshiteej Mahajan, Ching-Hsiang Chu, Srinivas Sridharan, and Aditya Akella. 2023. Better Together: Jointly Optimizing ML Collective Scheduling and Execution Planning using SYNDICATE. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23)*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 809–824. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi23/presentation/mahajan>
- [52] Luo Mai, Chuntao Hong, and Paolo Costa. 2015. Optimizing Network Performance in Distributed Machine Learning. In *7th USENIX Workshop on Hot Topics in Cloud Computing (HotCloud 15)*. USENIX Association, Santa Clara, CA. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/hotcloud15/workshop-program/presentation/mai>
- [53] Louis Martin, Benjamin Müller, Pedro Javier Ortiz Suárez, Yoann Dupont, Laurent Romary, Éric Villemonte de la Clergerie, Djamé Seddah, and Benoît Sagot. 2019. CamemBERT: a Tasty French Language Model. *CoRR abs/2019.11.03894* (2019). [arXiv:2019.11.03894](https://arxiv.org/abs/2019.11.03894) <http://arxiv.org/abs/2019.11.03894>
- [54] Radhika Mittal, Vinh The Lam, Nandita Dukkipati, Emily Blem, Hassan Wassel, Monia Ghobadi, Amin Vahdat, Yaogong Wang, David Wetherall, and David Zats. 2015. TIMELY: RTT-based Congestion Control for the Datacenter. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.* 45, 4 (aug 2015), 537–550. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2829988.2787510>
- [55] Jayashree Mohan, Amar Phanishayee, Janardhan Kulkarni, and Vijay Chidambaram. 2022. Looking Beyond GPUs for DNN Scheduling on Multi-Tenant Clusters. In *16th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 22)*. USENIX Association, Carlsbad, CA, 579–596. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi22/presentation/mohan>
- [56] Behnam Montazeri, Yilong Li, Mohammad Alizadeh, and John Ousterhout. 2018. Homa: a receiver-driven low-latency transport protocol using network priorities. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication (SIGCOMM '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 221–235. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3230543.3230564>
- [57] Dheevatsa Mudigere, Yuchen Hao, Jianyu Huang, Zhihao Jia, Andrew Tulloch, Srinivas Sridharan, Xing Liu, Mustafa Ozdal, Jade Nie, Jongsoo Park, Liang Luo, Jie (Amy) Yang, Leon Gao, Dmytro Ivchenko, Aarti Basant, Yuxi Hu, Jiyan Yang, Ehsan K. Ardestani, Xiaodong Wang, Rakesh Komuravelli, Ching-Hsiang Chu, Serhat Yilmaz, Huayu Li, Jiyuan Qian, Zhuobo Feng, Yinbin Ma, Junjie Yang, Ellie Wen, Hong Li, Lin Yang, Chonglin Sun, Whitney Zhao, Dimitry Melts, Krishna Dhulipala, KR Kishore, Tyler Graf, Assaf Eisenman, Kiran Kumar Matam, Adi Gangidi, Guoqiang Jerry Chen, Manoj Krishnan, Avinash Nayak, Krishnakumar Nair, Bharath Muthiah, Mahmoud khorashadi, Pallab Bhattacharya, Petr Lapukhov, Maxim Naumov, Ajit Mathews, Lin Qiao, Mikhail Smelyanskiy, Bill Jia, and Vijay Rao. 2022. Software-Hardware Co-Design for Fast and Scalable Training of Deep Learning Recommendation Models. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 993–1011. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3470496.3533727>
- [58] Deepak Narayanan, Aaron Harlap, Amar Phanishayee, Vivek Seshadri, Nikhil R. Devanur, Gregory R. Ganger, Phillip B. Gibbons, and Matei Zaharia. 2019. PipeDream: Generalized Pipeline Parallelism for DNN Training. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3341301.3359646>
- [59] Rui Pan, Yiming Lei, Jialong Li, Zhiqiang Xie, Binhang Yuan, and Yiting Xia. 2022. Efficient flow scheduling in distributed deep learning training with echelon formation. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks (HotNets '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 93–100. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3563766.3564096>
- [60] Yanghua Peng, Yixin Bao, Yangrui Chen, Chuan Wu, and Chuanxiong Guo. 2018. Optimus: An Efficient Dynamic Resource Scheduler for Deep Learning Clusters. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth EuroSys Conference (EuroSys '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 3, 14 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3190508.3190517>
- [61] Yanghua Peng, Yibo Zhu, Yangrui Chen, Yixin Bao, Bairen Yi, Chang Lan, Chuan Wu, and Chuanxiong Guo. 2019. A Generic Communication Scheduler for Distributed DNN Training Acceleration. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 16–29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3341301.3359642>
- [62] Jonathan Perry, Amy Ousterhout, Hari Balakrishnan, Devavrat Shah, and Hans Fugal. 2014. Fastpass: a centralized "zero-queue" datacenter network. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM Conference on SIGCOMM (SIGCOMM '14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 307–318. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2619239.2626309>
- [63] Aurick Qiao, Sang Keun Choe, Suhas Jayaram Subramanya, Willie Neiswanger, Qirong Ho, Hao Zhang, Gregory R. Ganger, and Eric P. Xing. 2021. Pollux: Co-adaptive Cluster Scheduling for Goodput-Optimized Deep Learning. In *15th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 21)*. USENIX Association, 1–18. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi21/presentation/qiao>
- [64] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. [n. d.]. Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-Training. ([n. d.]). <https://s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/>

- openai-assets/research-covers/language-unsupervised/language_understanding_paper.pdf.
- [65] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2018. Language Models are Unsupervised Multitask Learners. (2018). <https://d4mucfpksywv.cloudfront.net/better-language-models/language-models.pdf>.
- [66] Sudarsanan Rajasekaran, Manya Ghobadi, and Aditya Akella. 2024. Cassini: Network-Aware Job Scheduling in Machine Learning Clusters. To appear in *Proceedings of 21st USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 24)* (Apr. 2024).
- [67] Sudarsanan Rajasekaran, Manya Ghobadi, Gautam Kumar, and Aditya Akella. 2022. Congestion Control in Machine Learning Clusters. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks (HotNets '22)*. 235–242.
- [68] Aashaka Shah, Vijay Chidambaram, Meghan Cowan, Saeed Maleki, Madan Musuvathi, Todd Mytkowicz, Jacob Nelson, Olli Saarikivi, and Rachee Singh. 2023. TACCL: Guiding Collective Algorithm Synthesis using Communication Sketches. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23)*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 593–612. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi23/presentation/shah>
- [69] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. 2015. Very Deep Convolutional Networks for Large-Scale Image Recognition. (2015). arXiv:cs.CV/1409.1556
- [70] Parvin Taheri, Danushka Menikkumbura, Erico Vanini, Sonia Fahmy, Patrick Eugster, and Tom Edsall. 2020. RoCC: robust congestion control for RDMA. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Emerging Networking EXperiments and Technologies (CoNEXT '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3386367.3431316>
- [71] Rashish Tandon, Qi Lei, Alexandros G. Dimakis, and Nikos Karampatziakis. 2017. Gradient Coding: Avoiding Stragglers in Distributed Learning. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research)*, Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh (Eds.), Vol. 70. PMLR, International Convention Centre, Sydney, Australia, 3368–3376. <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v70/tdandon17a.html>
- [72] Vojislav Đukić, Sangeetha Abdu Jyothi, Bojan Karlas, Muhsen Owaida, Ce Zhang, and Ankit Singla. 2019. Is advance knowledge of flow sizes a plausible assumption?. In *16th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 19)*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 565–580. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi19/presentation/dukic>
- [73] Colin Unger, Zhihao Jia, Wei Wu, Sina Lin, Mandeep Baines, Carlos Efrain Quintero Narvaez, Vinay Ramakrishnaiah, Nirmal Prajapati, Pat McCormick, Jamaludin Mohd-Yusof, Xi Luo, Dheevatsa Mudigere, Jongsoo Park, Misha Melyanskiy, and Alex Aiken. 2022. Unity: Accelerating DNN Training Through Joint Optimization of Algebraic Transformations and Parallelization. In *16th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 22)*. USENIX Association, Carlsbad, CA, 267–284. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi22/presentation/unger>
- [74] Balajee Vamanan, Jahangir Hasan, and T.N. Vijaykumar. 2012. Deadline-aware datacenter tcp (D2TCP). In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2012 Conference on Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communication (SIGCOMM '12)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 115–126. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2342356.2342388>
- [75] Weiyang Wang, Moein Khazraee, Zhizhen Zhong, Manya Ghobadi, Zhihao Jia, Dheevatsa Mudigere, Ying Zhang, and Anthony Kewitsch. 2023. TopoOpt: Co-optimizing Network Topology and Parallelization Strategy for Distributed Training Jobs. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23)*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 739–767. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi23/presentation/wang-weiyang>
- [76] Pijika Watcharapichat, Victoria Lopez Morales, Raul Castro Fernandez, and Peter Pietzuch. 2016. Ako: Decentralised Deep Learning with Partial Gradient Exchange. *SoCC '16* (2016).
- [77] Christo Wilson, Hitesh Ballani, Thomas Karagiannis, and Ant Rowtron. 2011. Better never than late: meeting deadlines in datacenter networks. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2011 Conference (SIGCOMM '11)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 50–61. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2018436.2018443>
- [78] Wencong Xiao, Romil Bhardwaj, Ramachandran Ramjee, Muthian Sivathanu, Nipun Kwatra, Zhenhua Han, Pratyush Patel, Xuan Peng, Hanyu Zhao, Quanlu Zhang, Fan Yang, and Lidong Zhou. 2018. Gandiva: Introspective Cluster Scheduling for Deep Learning. In *13th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 18)*. USENIX Association, Carlsbad, CA, 595–610. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi18/presentation/xiao>
- [79] Lisong Xu, K. Harfoush, and Injong Rhee. 2004. Binary increase congestion control (BIC) for fast long-distance networks. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2004*, Vol. 4. 2514–2524 vol.4. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFCOM.2004.1354672>
- [80] Mingran Yang, Alex Baban, Valery Kugel, Jeff Libby, Scott Mackie, Swamy Sadashivaiah Renu Kananda, Chang-Hong Wu, and Manya Ghobadi. 2022. Using trio: juniper networks’ programmable chipset - for emerging in-network applications. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2022 Conference (SIGCOMM '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 633–648. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544216.3544262>
- [81] Sergey Zagoruyko and Nikos Komodakis. 2016. Wide Residual Networks. (2016). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1605.07146>
- [82] Matei Zaharia, Andy Konwinski, Anthony D. Joseph, Randy Katz, and Ion Stoica. 2008. Improving MapReduce Performance in Heterogeneous Environments. In *Proceedings of the 8th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI'08)*. USENIX Association, Berkeley, CA, USA, 29–42.
- [83] Adrian Zaplatel and Fernando Kuipers. 2023. Slowdown as a Metric for Congestion Control Fairness. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks (HotNets '23)*. 8.
- [84] Yihao Zhao, Yuanqiang Liu, Yanghua Peng, Yibo Zhu, Xuanzhe Liu, and Xin Jin. 2022. Multi-Resource Interleaving for Deep Learning Training. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2022 Conference (SIGCOMM '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 428–440. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544216.3544224>
- [85] Pengfei Zheng, Rui Pan, Tarannum Khan, Shivaram Venkataraman, and Aditya Akella. 2023. Shockwave: Fair and Efficient Cluster Scheduling for Dynamic Adaptation in Machine Learning. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23)*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 703–723. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi23/presentation/zheng>
- [86] Yibo Zhu, Haggai Eran, Daniel Firestone, Chuanxiong Guo, Marina Lipshteyn, Yehonatan Liron, Jitendra Padhye, Shachar Raindel, Mohamad Haj Yahia, and Ming Zhang. 2015. Congestion Control for Large-Scale RDMA Deployments. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM Conference on Special Interest Group on Data Communication (SIGCOMM '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 523–536. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2785956.2787484>
- [87] Y. Zhu, R. Kiros, R. Zemel, R. Salakhutdinov, R. Urtasun, A. Torralba, and S. Fidler. 2015. Aligning Books and Movies: Towards Story-Like Visual Explanations by Watching Movies and Reading Books. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 19–27. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV.2015.248>

[//doi.org/10.1109/ICCV.2015.11](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV.2015.11)