

Hercules: Heterogeneous Requirements Congestion Control Protocol

Neta Rozen-Schiff

Amit Navon

Itzchak Pechtalt

Leon Bruckman

Abstract—Future network services present a significant challenge for network providers due to high number and high variety of co-existing requirements. Despite many advancements in network architectures and management schemes, congested network links continue to constrain the Quality of Service (QoS) for critical applications like tele-surgery and autonomous driving. A prominent, complimentary approach consists of congestion control (CC) protocols which regulate bandwidth at the endpoints before network congestion occurs. However, existing CC protocols, including recent ones, are primarily designed to handle small numbers of requirement classes, highlighting the need for a more granular and flexible congestion control solution.

In this paper we introduce Hercules, a novel CC protocol designed to handle heterogeneous requirements. Hercules is based on an online learning approach and has the capability to support any combination of requirements within an unbounded and continuous requirements space. We have implemented Hercules as a QUIC module and demonstrate, through extensive analysis and real-world experiments, that Hercules can achieve up to 3.5-fold improvement in QoS compared to state-of-the-art CC protocols.

Index Terms—Congestion Control, QoS requirements, Online learning

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the years, networks have improved significantly in terms of speed and reliability. However, even modern network architectures, such as 5G/6G networks, are facing congestion due to the escalating bandwidth requirements [1]–[3]. These requirements are driven by the rising popularity of real-time streaming applications like Augmented Reality (AR), Virtual Reality (VR), and the proliferation of IoT devices [4].

Congested networks are, by definition, limited in their ability to meet all service requirements. Among common factors like bandwidth, reliability, and latency, the highest heterogeneity is typically observed in bandwidth, ranging from 10 Kbps (e.g., for industrial automation) to 100 Mbps (e.g., for 3D video streaming) [5], [6]. Fig. 1 provides a summary of various application requirements regarding bandwidth, latency, and reliability. Applications that experience the most significant Quality of Service (QoS) degradation in congested networks are those requiring high bandwidth and low latency, such as AR, VR, and remote surgery (grouped in a blue rectangle).

In order to satisfy high QoS requirements, service providers use several approaches. These include bringing services closer to consumers through edge computing, proxies etc., enhancing in-network routing and scheduling policies based on service prioritization. Another important approach involves regulating the sending rate at the endpoints using congestion control (CC)




Figure 1: Delay, bandwidth and reliability requirements for different applications

protocols. This helps to reduce excessive network load, which could otherwise lead to delays and packet loss.

CC protocols were originally designed to achieve “fair share” bandwidth allocation, treating all applications uniformly [7]–[11]. Clearly, such protocols are sub-optimal in heterogeneous settings involving co-existing network services with different requirements.

As a result, many studies have delved into unfair bandwidth allocations. However, the existing “unfair” CC protocols have one or more of the following limitations: (i) assume perfect knowledge of the network in order to define a goal weight of each connection [12], [13] (ii) treat connections according to a limited number of priority classes [14]–[16], or (iii) specifically tailored for a single type of application, such as IoT [4], [17], [18] and video streaming [10], [19].

In this work we introduce *Hercules*, a CC protocol designed to achieve an (unfair) bandwidth allocation that satisfies any combination of heterogeneous requirements.

Our main contributions include:

- Leveraging insights from online-learning, we design Hercules, a provable CC protocol that ensure fairness based on heterogeneous requirements.
- We have implemented Hercules as a CC module for QUIC and made it publicly available [20].
- We evaluate Hercules through both theoretical analysis and real-world experiments.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND MOTIVATION

Online learning has emerged as an effective approach for bandwidth regulation, as seen in recent CC protocols like




Figure 2: Different fairness objectives

Vivace [9], [10] and its derivatives [16], [21]. These protocols continually collect feedback from the network, including loss ratio and Round-Trip-Time (RTT) data derived from ACK packets. Using this information, they estimate the current congestion level and dynamically adjust the sending rate of endpoints. Each sender autonomously operates within the protocol, making decisions about adjusting the sending rate based on a utility function, similar to a player in game theory.

The primary objectives of these protocols are twofold: (i) ensuring fairness among connections and (ii) maximizing the utilization of the network resources.

The utilization objective typically aims to achieve Pareto efficiency, representing a network state where a sender cannot increase its rate without reducing others’.

Fairness, on the other hand, is more challenging to define in scenarios with heterogeneous requirements, as discussed next.

A. Existing Fairness Definitions

Online learning CC protocols, such as Vivace [9], [10], typically employ the “fair-share” principle as their fundamental fairness principle. This principle divides bandwidth equally among competing connections. However, this definition is suboptimal for heterogeneous connections [19].

Lexicographic max-min fairness, also known as **Max-Min Fairness (MMF)**, extends the “fair-share” principle by aiming to maximize the bandwidth allocated to the most poorly treated connections [22]. Consider the connection rates as a vector, $X = \langle x_0, \dots, x_n \rangle$, whose elements are ordered from low to high, MMF is defined as the lexicographically maximal vector that can be achieved [23]. In other words, MMF vector consists of the maximums of any rate (x_i) given the values of the lower rates (x_0, \dots, x_{i-1}).

MMF achieves Pareto efficiency [21], [23] and exists as long as the number of connections is finite [24]. Recent CC protocols (such as MPCC [21]) were developed with the goal of converging to MMF. However, MMF can lead to suboptimal outcomes in scenarios involving three or more requirement levels, as demonstrated next.

B. Heterogeneous Requirements and Fairness

Given n connections with heterogeneous requirements, we denote (a_i, b_i) for each connection i , where a_i and b_i are the minimum and maximum bandwidth requirements respectively. The minimum requirement is set as the threshold below which the application will experience significant degradation in service quality. The maximum requirement is defined as




Figure 3: Different requirement penalties as functions of normalized rates, for different values of D . The normalized rate values 0 and 1 correspond to the minimum and maximum requirements respectively, and are denoted in red dashed lines.

the rate at which an application will not experience significant improvement and typically will refrain from increasing the sending rate. Note that the minimum and maximum requirements can be provided by the application or inferred using traffic classification [25], [26].

For example, consider three connections, with requirements of $r_1 = (20, 30)$ Mbps, $r_2 = (40, 60)$ Mbps and $r_3 = (60, 90)$ Mbps and a bottleneck capacity of 120Mbps. Fig. 2 illustrates the sending rates for each connection obtained using MMF along with the optimal sending rate. MMF (Fig.2a) fully utilizes the network in terms of sending rates, but still fails to meet the minimum requirements of the third connection (r_3). However, an optimal solution (Fig.2b) can utilize the network and satisfy the requirements of all connections.

Hence, to tackle the challenge of heterogeneous requirements among connections, a new fairness approach is required. This approach should take into account the specific requirements of each connection and ensure that, in congested scenarios, at least the minimum requirement of each connection is met, if possible.

III. HERCULES DESIGN OVERVIEW

We present Hercules, a CC protocol that extends the online learning approach for heterogeneous connections. We begin by defining heterogeneous fairness, then we describe Hercules’ utility function. Finally we introduce the rate control module which uses the utility function to regulate sending rates.

A. Heterogeneous Requirements Fairness

In order to maximize the satisfaction of connection requirements we extend MMF by considering the sending rates when normalized by their requirements. For each connection i with sending rate x_i we define its normalized rate by $\bar{x}_i = \frac{x_i - a_i}{b_i - a_i}$, where (a_i, b_i) are the minimum and maximum requirements of connection i respectively. Note that when the sending rate of connection i is within its minimum and maximum requirements (i.e., $x_i \in [a_i, b_i]$), its normalized rate is within 0 and 1 (i.e., $\bar{x}_i \in [0, 1]$).

Our Heterogeneous Requirements Fairness metric (HRF) is defined as the lexicographical max min vector of the normalized rates, ordered from low to high (i.e., $\langle \bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n \rangle$)




Figure 4: Hercules' extension over QUIC objects

where $\overline{x_{i-1}} \leq \overline{x_i}$ for every i). For example, considering the three connections case in Section II-B (Fig. 2b), the optimal sending rates of $\langle x_1, x_2, x_3 \rangle = \langle 20, 40, 60 \rangle$ are obtained when the lexicographical max min of the normalized sending rates $\langle \overline{x_1}, \overline{x_2}, \overline{x_3} \rangle = \langle 0, 0, 0 \rangle$ is obtained.

B. Hercules Utility Function

Hercules leverages from the rich literature on online learning and utility functions for CC [9], [10], [16]. On top of them, in order to converge to HRF, Hercules utility function also includes a "requirement penalty", denoted as $H(\overline{x_i})$, which depends on the normalized sending rate.

Inspired by the activation functions in neural networks [27], the requirement penalty uses the arctan function for scaling and is defined as follows:

$$H(\overline{x_i}) = \frac{\arctan(D \cdot (\overline{x_i} - \frac{1}{2}))}{\pi} + \frac{1}{2} \in (0, 1), \quad (1)$$

where $D \geq 1$ is a coefficient which scales the requirement penalty especially when sending rates get closer to the required rate bounds (a_i, b_i) and beyond.

Fig. 3 demonstrates different requirement penalties as functions of normalized rates, for different values of D . Rates within the requirement interval correspond to normalized rates within the interval $[0, 1]$ which is denoted in red dashed lines.

Note that higher D values imply higher penalties for connections exceeding their maximum requirement and lower penalties for connections falling below their minimum requirement. However, when D is excessively high, the penalty function becomes abrupt and approaches a step-like function numerically. This could potentially affect convergence. In Section V-B we analyze the impact of D on convergence in real experiments. Following this analysis we choose $D = 2$ as the suggested value.

Finally, Hercules utility function is defined as follows:

$$U(x_i) = (x_i)^t - x_i \cdot H(\overline{x_i}) \cdot [\beta \cdot L_i - \gamma \cdot \max\{0, \frac{d(RTT_i)}{dt}\} - \varphi \cdot \sigma(RTT_i)], \quad (2)$$

where L_i and RTT_i are the loss and RTT experience by connection i respectively¹. Note that when no latency is experienced, the utility function is much simpler: $U(x_i) = (x_i)^t$.

Theorem 3.1: In a network with n connections competing over a bottleneck, where the connections are regulated by Hercules per connection utility function (2) with per connection requirements $\{(a_i, b_i)\}_{i \in [n]}$, any equilibrium is HRF.

Due to space constraints, we provide only a brief outline of the proof. First, we show that with the absence of congestion

¹The coefficient values are $t = 0.9$, $\beta = 11.35$ (enables up to 5% random loss rate tolerance), $\gamma = 25$ and $\varphi = 750$.




Figure 5: Satisfaction ratio for the two scenarios at different network congestion conditions

rates increase and therefore congestion will occur at some point in time. Next we prove that during congestion, unsatisfied connections with lower requirements exhibit a steeper utility gradient compared to satisfied connections with higher requirements. Lastly, we conclude by establishing that there is no equilibrium in which connections with lower requirements can increase their rates at the expense of connections with higher requirements.

C. Hercules Rate-Control Module

Hercules adopts an online learning approach by dividing time into sequential update intervals. At the beginning of each interval, a connection can be in one of three states: (i) slow-start, (ii) probing, or (iii) moving.

During the **slow start** phase, the initial sending rate is determined as the minimum between a predefined rate value (configured to 5 Kbps in our evaluation) and the connection's minimum requirement. Subsequently, in each time interval, the sending rate is doubled unless either the utility function decreases or the sending rate exceeds the connection's maximum requirement. In such cases, the state transitions to probing.

In the **probing** state, we calculate the utility gradient using the current sending rate (x) . This is done by comparing the utilities achieved when sending $x + \delta x$ and $x - \delta x$, where δ is set to be a fraction (e.g., 5%) of x . The gradient determines whether the connection's rate should increase or decrease.

During **moving** state, the sending rate continues to change in the same direction as determined by the last probing decision until the utility decreases, indicating a change in gradient direction. At this point, the protocol transitions back to probing.

Theorem 3.2: In a network with n connections competing over a bottleneck, where the connections are regulated by Hercules per connection utility function (2) with per connection requirements $\{(a_i, b_i)\}_{i \in [n]}$, the sending rates converge to an equilibrium.

Due to space constraints, we provide only a sketch of the proof. First, we establish that Hercules' utility function is concave and so the system consisting of senders using the rate-control module constitutes a concave game. Then we conclude the proof since a concave game has an equilibrium point [28].

IV. IMPLEMENTATION

Hercules' implementation (available online [20]) extends QUICHE, a widely deployed C++ implementation of QUIC




Figure 6: Average throughput for all unbounded scenario at different network congestion conditions. The red dashed line denotes the connections’ requirements.

(also used in Google Chrome). As illustrated Fig. 4, Hercules’ rate control logic mainly resides in two QUICHE components: (i) the congestion control object and (ii) the session object.

Session object is responsible for managing the connection parameters. Hercules extends this object by including the minimum and maximum requirements received from the application, which are then passed on to the congestion control object. Additionally, Hercules introduces scheduled calls at regular intervals, prompting the congestion control object to calculate and update the sending rate accordingly.

Congestion control object has been extended to carry out the rate control module (as discussed in Section III-C) based on the minimum and maximum requirements received from the session object. Specifically, during each scheduled call initiated by the session object, the CC object measures the RTT and loss rate (derived from receiving ACKs), calculates the current state and utility function, and subsequently updates the new sending rates.

V. EVALUATION

We evaluate Hercules by benchmarking its performance against other state-of-the-art CC protocols, including BBR [7], CUBIC [8] and Vivace [10] across a range of network conditions. This evaluation is conducted through both laboratory simulations and real-world experiments.

The lab experiments consist a setup with a sender machine, a receiver machine, and a third machine that simulates various network conditions.

Additionally, we conducted live experiments on the Internet, spanning both Europe and the US. In Europe, we use a receiver located in London and a sender located in Frankfurt. In the US we use two AWS receivers machines, positioned in north California and north Virginia, along with two sender machines in Ohio and Oregon, respectively. All the machines run Ubuntu 20.04 OS. The network capacity was changed by running traffic control utility (the *tc* command) on the sender side, with the receiver reporting the total received bytes per second.

Due to space constraints, we present the live experiments results in the US, where the receiver is located in north California and the sender is in Oregon. Similar results were obtained in the other locations in the US, Europe, and in the lab.

The evaluation results are presented next, addressing the following challenges encountered by CC protocols: (i) satisfying heterogeneous requirements in both worst and average-case

scenarios, (ii) assessing convergence time, and (iii) evaluating fairness compared to other CC protocols.

A. Satisfying Heterogeneous Requirements

Heterogeneous Settings. Following Section I, we examine coexistence of connections with heterogeneous requirements: 10 Kbps, 100 Kbps, 1 Mbps, 10 Mbps, 100 Mbps. The maximum requirements are set at 1.5 times higher, providing a 50% margin. Due to space constraints, we concentrate on two scenarios based on the applications generating these connections:

- 1) All the applications have unbounded sending rate (which means they can exceed their maximum requirements).
- 2) All applications except one have a bounded sending rate, while one application has an unbounded sending rate.

Note that unbounded applications represent network services such as file downloads and database batch processing and synchronization. In contrast, bounded applications may consist of Zoom streaming, VoIP, IoT devices etc.

We analyzed bottlenecks with 20, 40 and 60ms RTT. Due to space constraints and consistent results across all bottlenecks, we focus on presenting the results for the 20 ms bottleneck. Considering the combined minimum and maximum requirements are 111.11 and 166.65 Mbps respectively, we evaluated Hercules’ performance under various congestion levels:

- High congestion - 95 Mbps capacity
- Medium congestion - 120 Mbps capacity
- Low congestion - 135 Mbps capacity

The sending rates for each connection are compared between Hercules to Vivace, BBR and CUBIC, across 70 trials, each lasting 30 seconds.

We define the “*satisfaction ratio*” provided by a CC protocol for a connection i in a given scenario, as the ratio between the average sending rate (in that scenario) and the minimum requirement (a_i) of that connection. Moreover, we consider the worst case (i.e., guaranteed) satisfaction ratio of a protocol as the minimum satisfaction ratio across all scenarios.

Satisfaction ratio achieved by each of the CC protocols under different network conditions is presented in Fig. 5, for both single unbounded and all unbounded connection scenarios. The findings reveal that across all network conditions, Hercules outperforms the other evaluated protocols by a factor of 1.5 and 3.5 in the single-unbounded and all-unbounded scenarios respectively.




Figure 7: Loss tolerance of the 100 Mbps requirement connection, for the unbounded scenario




Figure 8: Bottleneck saturation with varying buffer size, for 100 Mbps requirement connection, in the unbounded scenario




Figure 9: Throughput of Hercules connections

Fig.6 provides a detailed analysis of the all unbounded scenario, showing the average throughput across various congestion levels. Even during low congestion (135 Mbps) where all connections can theoretically be satisfied, the other CC protocols fall short. For instance, the 100 Mbps connection only achieves 27% of its requirement due to fair-share principles, whereas with Hercules it achieves 97% satisfaction. In medium congestion level (120 Mbps), Hercules maintains a 92% satisfaction for this connection. Furthermore, during high congestion (95 Mbps capacity), the optimal throughput reaches only 85% satisfaction, with Hercules achieving 70%.

Random loss tolerance. The satisfaction evaluation of the 100Mbps connection was extended to include scenarios with random loss. Fig. 7 illustrates the satisfaction ratio achieved in the all unbounded scenario. The results indicated that, Hercules outperformed all other evaluated protocols, especially for loss rate up to 4%. These results are consistent with those observed in the single unbounded scenario.

Buffer size tolerance. The robustness of satisfaction ratio was analyzed across a broad range of buffer sizes 0.5-5 BDP, under various network conditions (Fig. 8). The results show that in all unbounded scenario, Hercules outperform all protocols across the tested buffer sizes, even with shallow buffers. Similar results were obtained in a single unbounded scenario.

Utilization is calculated as the total sending rate across all connections divided by the network capacity. We found that




Figure 10: Hercules sending rates when network capacity changes every 60 seconds between 45, 95, 120 and 135 Mbps

BBR and CUBIC exhibit similar median utilization values across all network conditions, ranging between 94.79% (BBR) and 94.8% (CUBIC). Hercules and Vivace achieved slightly lower median utilization of 94.23% and 94.19% respectively. The results for the single unbounded scenario were similar.

B. Convergence Time

Next we examine the convergence time of Hercules in three different tests: (i) *static tests*, involving simultaneous connections, (ii) *dynamic tests*, with non simultaneous connections and (iii) *dynamic network tests*, where network conditions (specifically capacity) change during the testing phase.

Static tests include two scenarios using 95 Mbps bottleneck. The first scenario considers 10 Hercules connections, each requiring 10 Mbps and a low requirement 0.5 Mbps connection. The results (in Fig. 9a) show fast convergence with all Hercules connections approaching their requirement. Similar results are obtained when the bottleneck includes 5 different requirement levels, 10 Kbps up to 100 Mbps (Fig.9b).

Dynamic arrival test. In Fig. 9c we display Hercules' sending rates for two connections, both requiring 50 Mbps, competing over a 95 Mbps bottleneck, where one of them arrives 10 seconds after the first one. Initially, the sending rate of the first connection dominates the network utilization. Approximately




Figure 11: Requirement penalty (D) impact on convergence

5 seconds after the second connection arrives, their sending rates converge to HRF (which in this case equivalent to fair share). Comparable outcomes were observed for connections with higher requirement levels.

Dynamic network test. We further stress Hercules stability and robustness by examining its reaction to network changes. We consider connections with 5 requirement levels (ranging from 10 Kbps to 100 Mbps), with network capacity changes every 60 seconds. In addition to the previously analyzed capacity levels (95 Mbps, 120 Mbps and 135 Mbps), we also introduce 45 Mbps capacity (very high congestion). The results in Fig. 10 show that sending rates converge quickly, within a few seconds after each capacity change.

Dynamic network test with different D values. The dynamic network test was repeated to evaluate the influence of parameter D in Hercules utility function (Equation (1)) on convergence. The tests results, presented in Fig. 11 consider several D values in the range [1, 1000]. We observed that for $D = 1$, the initial convergence is slower compared to higher D values, while extremely high values of D (e.g., 100 and 1000) lead to decreased stability in Hercules, as highlighted in Section III-B. Furthermore, we found that only with $D = 2$ we could satisfy all the requirements that are feasible to satisfy, even under extreme high congestion (45 Mbps capacity).

C. Fairness with Other Protocols

We evaluate Hercules connections in comparison to other CC protocols: CUBIC, BBR, Reno and Vivace, sharing a 95 Mbps bottleneck. This evaluation includes two Hercules connections, one requiring 100 Mbps and the other 5 Mbps,




Figure 12: Throughput convergence of Hercules alongside other CC protocols in a 95 Mbps bottleneck.

alongside a single connection requiring 100 Mbps using one of the aforementioned CC protocols.

Fig.12 illustrates the sending rates over time for Hercules connections (cyan and purple lines) and a connection using one of the mentioned CC protocol (orange line). The graphs demonstrates that connections with the same bandwidth requirements converge to similar sending rates, regardless of the protocol used (whether Hercules or another). These findings remain consistent even in dynamic scenarios with non-simultaneous connections.

VI. RELATED WORK

Traditional CC protocols on the Internet focus on fair-share among all senders [7], [8], [10], [11]. Recently, there has been a growing need to address heterogeneous requirements of senders, leading to the development of new CC protocols. Many of these protocols consider only two connection classes: primary and background traffic. For primary connections, TCP CUBIC [8] is often recommended, while background connections may use Low Extra Delay Background Transport (LEDBAT) [15]. However, this approach requires prioritization decisions upfront before entering the network.

A more flexible approach prioritizes connections based on a threshold [16], allowing them to dynamically switch between two prioritization classes over time. Another strategy suggested running four distinct CC protocols simultaneously to create four priority levels or requirement levels [19]. However, this approach is tailored for specific use-case of video streaming which includes specific requirement classes.

Generalized CC protocols inspired by economic models have also emerged, aiming for a more comprehensive approach [12], [13]. In these protocols, each connection is allocated a "share" of the bandwidth. During congestion, the bandwidth allocation is based on the relative shares of each connection. However, this method doesn't directly consider application-specific requirements in its allocation process and requires perfect knowledge of the network.

VII. CONCLUSION AND FURTHER RESEARCH

In this work, we discussed and defined the desired fairness among heterogeneous connections which we named HRF. Subsequently, we introduced a new and provable CC protocol named "Hercules", designed to address heterogeneous requirements of senders in order to achieve an approximation of HRF.

Our findings indicate that Hercules outperformed the state-of-the-art protocols by providing higher satisfaction ratio across all scenarios and network conditions. Furthermore, our evaluation highlights the fast convergence among Hercules' connections and adaptability to network changes as well as robustness to random loss and shallow buffers. Additionally, Hercules exhibits fairness also when operating along side other CC protocols, though further research could improve the time needed to achieve it.

Another research direction is to use Hercules exposure to traffic content and use it to dynamically infer connection requirements.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. H. Alsharif, A. Jahid, R. Kannadasan, and M.-K. Kim, "Unleashing the potential of sixth generation (6g) wireless networks in smart energy grid management: A comprehensive review," *Energy Reports*, vol. 11, 2024.
- [2] I. Akyildiz, A. Kak, and S. Nie, "6g and beyond: The future of wireless communications systems," *IEEE Access*, vol. PP, pp. 1–1, 07 2020.
- [3] S. Khan, A. Hussain, S. Nazir, F. Khan, A. Oad, and M. D. Alshehri, "Efficient and reliable hybrid deep learning-enabled model for congestion control in 5g/6g networks," *Computer Communications*, vol. 182, 2022.
- [4] A. P., H. Vimala, and S. J., "Comprehensive review on congestion detection, alleviation, and control for iot networks," *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, vol. 221, p. 103749, 2024.
- [5] E. O'Connell, D. Moore, and T. Newe, "Challenges associated with implementing 5g in manufacturing," *Telecom*, vol. 1, pp. 48–67, 06 2020.
- [6] V. Jordán, H. Galperin, W. Peres, and M. Hilbert, "Fast-tracking the digital revolution: Broadband for latin america and the caribbean," 2023.
- [7] N. Cardwell, Y. Cheng, C. S. Gunn, S. H. Yeganeh, and V. Jacobson, "Bbr: Congestion-based congestion control," *Queue*, vol. 14, no. 5, 2016.
- [14] M. Geist and B. Jaeger, "Overview of tcp congestion control algorithms," in *Network Architectures and Services*, May 2019.
- [15] O. N. Ertugay, D. Havey, and P. Balasubramanian, "Ledbat++: Congestion control for background traffic," 2020.
- [16] T. Meng, N. Rozen-Schiff, P. B. Godfrey, and M. Schapira, "Pcc proteus: Scavenger transport and beyond," ser. SIGCOMM '20. Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, p. 615–631.
- [8] S. Ha, I. Rhee, and L. Xu, "Cubic: A new tcp-friendly high-speed tcp variant," *SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev.*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 64–74, Jul. 2008.
- [9] M. Dong, Q. Li, D. Zarchy, P. B. Godfrey, and M. Schapira, "Pcc: Re-architecting congestion control for consistent high performance," in *NSDI 15*, 2015, pp. 395–408.
- [10] M. Dong, T. Meng, D. Zarchy, E. Arslan, Y. Gilad, B. Godfrey, and M. Schapira, "Vivace: Online-learning congestion control," in *NSDI*, 2018.
- [11] V. Arun and H. Balakrishnan, "Copa: Practical delay-based congestion control for the internet," in *NSDI 18*, 2018, pp. 329–342.
- [12] L. Brown, G. Ananthanarayanan, E. Katz-Bassett, A. Krishnamurthy, S. Ratnasamy, M. Schapira, and S. Shenker, "On the future of congestion control for the public internet," ser. HotNets '20. Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, p. 30–37.
- [13] L. Popa, G. Kumar, M. Chowdhury, A. Krishnamurthy, S. Ratnasamy, and I. Stoica, "Faircloud: Sharing the network in cloud computing," *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 42, no. 4, p. 187–198, 2012.
- [17] T. Kavitha, P. Nagarajan, R. Shobana, V. Vinothini, S. Karuppanan, A. Jeyam, and A. Malar, "Data congestion control framework in wireless sensor network in iot enabled intelligent transportation system," *Measurement: Sensors*, vol. 24, p. 100563, 11 2022.
- [18] L. P. Verma and M. Kumar, "An iot based congestion control algorithm," *Internet of Things*, vol. 9, p. 100157, 2020.
- [19] N. Rozen-Schiff, A. Navon, L. Bruckman, and I. Pechtalt, "Prism based transport: How networks can boost qos for advanced video services?" in *Proceedings of the Workshop on Design, Deployment, and Evaluation of Network-Assisted Video Streaming*, ser. VisNEXT'21, 2021, p. 1–7.
- [20] I. Pechtalt, N. Rozen-Schiff, A. Navon, and L. Bruckman, "Hercules' code," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/itzcak/Hercules>
- [21] T. Gilad, N. Rozen-Schiff, P. B. Godfrey, C. Raiciu, and M. Schapira, "Mppcc: Online learning multipath transport," in *CoNEXT*, 2020.
- [22] L. Jose, S. Ibanez, M. Alizadeh, and N. McKeown, "A distributed algorithm to calculate max-min fair rates without per-flow state," *Proc. ACM Meas. Anal. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 3, no. 2, jun 2019.
- [23] W. Ogryczak, "Lexicographic max-min optimization for efficient and fair bandwidth allocation," 2007.
- [24] C. Li, T. Wan, J. Han, and W. Jiang, "Towards distributed lexicographically fair resource allocation with an indivisible constraint," *Mathematics*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2022.
- [25] N. Menezes and F. Mello, "Flow feature-based network traffic classification using machine learning," *Journal of Information Security and Cryptography (Enigma)*, vol. 8, pp. 12–16, 12 2021.
- [26] S. U. Jafri, S. Rao, V. Shrivastav, and M. Tawarmalani, "Leo: On-line ML-based traffic classification at Multi-Terabit line rate," in *21st USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 24)*. Santa Clara, CA: USENIX Association, Apr. 2024, pp. 1573–1591.
- [27] J. Lederer, "Activation functions in artificial neural networks: A systematic overview," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2101.09957, 2021.
- [28] E. Even-dar, Y. Mansour, and U. Nadav, "On the convergence of regret minimization dynamics in concave games," in *STOC '09*, 2009.