

REPS: Recycling Entropies for Packet Spraying to Adaptively Explore Paths and Mitigate Failures

Tommaso Bonato
ETH Zürich
Microsoft

Abdul Kabbani
Microsoft

Ahmad Ghalayini
Microsoft

Mohammad Dohadwala
Microsoft

Michael Papamichael
Microsoft

Daniele De Sensi
Sapienza University of Rome

Torsten Hoefler
ETH Zürich
Microsoft

ABSTRACT

Most existing datacenter transport protocols rely on in-order packet delivery, a design choice rooted in legacy systems and simplicity. However, advancements in technology, such as RDMA, have made it feasible to relax this requirement, allowing for more effective use of modern datacenter topologies like FatTree and Dragonfly. The rise of AI/ML workloads underscores the necessity for enhanced link utilization, a challenge for single-path load balancers due to issues like ECMP collisions.

In this paper, we introduce REPS, a novel per-packet traffic load-balancing algorithm that integrates seamlessly with existing congestion control mechanisms. REPS reroutes packets around congested hotspots and unreliable or failing links with remarkable simplicity and minimal state requirements.

Our evaluation demonstrates that REPS significantly outperforms traditional packet spraying and other state-of-the-art solutions in contemporary datacenter networks, offering substantial improvements in performance and link utilization.

1 INTRODUCTION

With the recent explosion in AI/ML networks, the battle for better next-generation transport protocols has heated up with the recent release of Poseidon [29] by Google and the incoming release of Ultra Ethernet [9] by major tech players. Traditionally, AI/ML clusters have been using Infiniband and more recently Ethernet based solutions such as RoCEv2 [3] to reduce cost and offer an easier to deploy alternative.

However, existing solutions struggle to keep up with the increasingly demanding AI/ML workload where the expected load is much higher than what encountered in cloud workloads. This increased load requirement showcases even more one of the main shortcomings of existing solutions: the routing algorithm. This is because, most of the times, the expectation is that each message will be routed using a single

path to avoid out-of-order packets and reduce complexity of the load balancer. However, this results in ECMP collisions which reduce the overall performance of the whole transport layer due to queues building up and re-transmissions or PFC kicking in for lossless networks.

Moreover, a number of recent industry papers have highlighted the drastic effect of failures in both training times and economic costs [24]. This highlights the importance of designing a transport layer with a load balancing scheme capable of adapting almost instantaneously to both network failures and asymmetries in the networks.

For this reasons, we propose REPS, a simple load balancing scheme based on adaptive packet spraying. We design REPS in order to work with any congestion control scheme and transport layer as long as it is able to handle out-of-order packets which is what next generation protocols are pushing for given the inherit performance advantage.

REPS does not require any specific hardware support from switches beside ECMP which is commonly present in modern switches. If available, REPS can take advantage of packet trimming to further improve its accuracy but it is also capable of running without that.

1.1 Background and Motivation

Modern datacenters tend to use Equal Cost Multi-Path (ECMP) [17] as their default routing scheme for their switches. ECMP uses the 5-tuple header of each data packet: the protocol number, the IP addresses and the TCP or UDP source and destination port numbers. It uses such information to determine the next link to take by using a hash function. Packets that belong to the same connection will normally be routed using the same exact path from source to destination, which is the case for RoCEv2 for instance. This helps keeping the design trivial since, ignoring failures, it is extremely unlikely to receive out-of-order packets at the receiver. On the other hand, if two different connections get hashed to the same

link, there will be a ECMP collision resulting in queues building up and in more extreme cases re-transmissions.

To mitigate such issues certain protocols have proposed splitting each flow into sub-flow and then routing each sub-flow individually, usually by artificially changing the source port field. This is the case of Flowlet Switching [28], Flowcell [16] or PLB [18, 25] that attempt to provide a trade-off between low amount of re-ordering and better performance.

However, if we can design a new transport layer that can relax such out-of-orderliness requirement, then we can theoretically do such operation at the individual packet by choosing a random source port field for each packet. This is called packet spraying [12] and by its own, it is able to offer a significant performance improvement over single path algorithms or intermediate solutions such as Flowlet Switching.

Finally, we observe how we can take this one step further by adaptively spraying packets over paths. This, surprisingly, allows to achieve better results even with a perfectly symmetric network and an even bigger advantage when encountering failures.

1.2 Contribution

REPS A powerful and lightweight adaptive load balancing scheme called *Recycled Entropy Packet Spraying* (REPS, Sec.3). REPS achieves near-optimal performance at high bandwidth utilization and efficiently routes around path failures, congestion hotspots, and network asymmetries. Unlike more complex in-network load balancing solutions[10, 26], REPS does not require any switch support beyond ECMP. REPS provides a significant improvement over traditional packet spraying, both in perfectly symmetric networks and in the presence of asymmetries, whether due to differing topologies or potential failures. We demonstrate that REPS performs well regardless of the congestion control scheme used.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Congestion Signals

In this section we are going over several congestion signals that REPS can take advantage of if they are implemented in the network. At minimum we require ECN to be supported by the switches.

Delay End-to-end delay serves as a reliable indicator of congestion. Delay can be calculated by the sender through measuring the RTT, as seen in protocols like Swift [19] and TCP [7]. Alternatively, the receiver can annotate acknowledgment (ACK) packets with one-way delay information, a method used in protocols such as TIMELY [21] and DX [20]. In this context, we assume that precise delay measurements are obtained via NIC timestamping [4, 19].

ECN-marking *Explicit Congestion Notification* (ECN) allows switches to indicate congestion by setting a bit in the traffic class field of the IP header when congestion is detected. This marked packet is then returned to the sender by the receiver, prompting the sender to adjust its load balancing or its transmission rate accordingly [2, 31, 32]. Unlike time-based signals that provide detailed queuing delay information, ECN uses a single-bit mark, offering less granularity. Switches can employ various strategies for marking packets. For instance, in *Random Early Detection* (RED)[13], switches probabilistically mark packets based on queue size, with the marking probability increasing linearly between two thresholds (K_{min} and K_{max}). Although ECN was originally intended to mark packets upon enqueue[14], marking at dequeue has been shown to enable quicker response times for congestion control (CC) algorithms. This dequeue marking method is easily implemented on most existing switches [30]. For this reason, the rest of the paper assumes the use of RED with dequeue marking for ECN packets. While ECN-based CC algorithms can respond faster than those based on delay, they may struggle with incast scenarios and can be difficult to fine-tune [19]. Finally, while delay accumulates over multiple hops, ECN would be able to filter out such cases where there is not really a significant congestion happening but only a small amount of queueing over multiple hops.

Packet Losses Packet loss has long been a key indicator of severe congestion in networks [13, 22]. However, using packet losses as the sole signal for congestion detection can result in delayed responses, as losses typically indicate a point of significant congestion. Additionally, packet loss detection often relies on timeouts, which can be challenging to calibrate and may lead to unnecessary retransmissions. Having said that, timeout can still be very useful in the case of network failures, especially when having out-of-order delivery support since we can not easily rely on a packet arriving out of order to detect losses.

Packet Trimming Packet trimming is a technique where a switch removes portions of a packet, such as the payload, instead of discarding the entire packet. This method preserves crucial information, like headers, which enables the host to quickly identify and respond to congestion [8, 15, 23]. Researchers have shown that packet trimming can be implemented on switches such as Intel Tofino, Broadcom Trident 4, and NVidia Spectrum 2 by utilizing their capability to reroute packets to an alternate port when the primary egress queue is full [1]. This can be particularly helpful in detecting congestion events versus losses events, as the former would produce a trim even while the latter a timeout (excluding edge cases where even a trim would fail).

REPS utilizes ECN as its primary congestion signal to determine if a path is congested. Notably, ECN marking is performed at the egress to ensure that the most current information is captured. If packet trimming is supported, REPS leverages this feature to enhance its ability to distinguish between packets lost due to congestion and those lost due to network failures. In situations where packet trimming is not supported, REPS employs a straightforward timeout mechanism to detect packet loss within the network.

3 RECYCLED ENTROPY PACKET SPRAY (REPS)

REPS is a simple load balancer scheme that does not need any switch support besides ECMP [17]. With ECMP, each switch computes a hash function over some packet header fields to determine which path to forward the packet on. One of these fields is the *entropy* (e.g., the source port or the IPv6 Flow Label), which REPS changes on a per-packet basis.

The key idea behind REPS is very simple: we want to explore new possible paths when congestion is detected while re-using paths where there is little to no congestion. This has the immediate advantage of being both simple and lightweight since we can potentially store only the last good entropy that we have seen and which is to be reused. However, the slightly more advanced version of it uses a circular buffer of a fixed size where we save all the cached entropies.

For the first *bdp* of packets, REPS explores all possible entropies. This is necessary since initially we do not have any information about the status of the network. The receiver copies the entropies from the received packet to the ACK, thus forwarding them back to the sender. Whenever an ACK arrives, if the ACK is not ECN-marked, the entropy carried by the ACK is cached. Intuitively, because the corresponding data packet did not experience congestion, we can send other packets on the same path, and REPS will thus reuse it for subsequent packets. Otherwise, if the ACK was ECN-marked, REPS selects the next entropy. This can be further extended by defining additional policies (e.g., excluding bad entropies after some time or storing entropies in a priority queue based on their RTTs and/or ECN marking), but we do not explore this further in this initial version of this work. The circular buffer design guarantees that even when receiving back-to-back ACKs with good entropies, these can be correctly stored and used. On the sending side, if we have multiple elements in the buffer, we will always first select the oldest entropy to make sure to not get stuck on old information.

We evaluate REPS' advantages versus traditional packet spraying and ECMP in Sec. 4.2. Algorithm 1 describes the REPS pseudocode, and Fig. 1a shows an example of REPS' behavior.

Algorithm 1 REPS Pseudocode

```

1: num_entropies = 256
2: next_entropy = 0
3: cached_buffer_size = 8
4: cached_entropies = []
5: procedure REPS_ONSEND(p)
6:   if p.seqnum < bdp and not all entropies tried then
7:     p.entropy = next_entropy ++ % num_entropies
8:   else
9:     p.entropy = cached_entropies.get_earliest_entropy()
10:  end if
11: end procedure
12:
13: procedure REPS_ONRECV(p)
14:  if !p.ecn then
15:    cached_entropies.add(ack.entropy)
16:  end if
17: end procedure
18:
19: procedure GET_EARLIEST_ENTROPY
20:  if cached_entropies.is_empty() then
21:    next_entropy ++ % num_entropies
22:  else
23:    cached_entropies.get_entropy()
24:  end if
25: end procedure

```




Figure 1: Example of REPS behavior. We assume the sender already cycled over all the possible entropies and that we are using a buffer with size of one.

3.0.1 Interaction between CC and load balancing. We design REPS with the idea of it being capable of working with any transport layer that does not require in-order delivery of packets. Having said that, co-designing the congestion control protocol with the load balancer algorithm can bring several benefits. For these reasons, we optimize REPS to work with SMaRTT [5]. REPS effectively mitigates the effects of fabric congestion, such as those caused by ECMP hashing collisions, without necessitating a reduction in the congestion window size. This capability is particularly important in permutation workloads on non-oversubscribed networks, where proper traffic balancing can theoretically prevent congestion. To enable REPS to respond to such congestion, SMaRTT is designed to ignore individual ECN-marked packets unless

multiple marked packets are received. Specifically, SMaRTT maintains an exponentially weighted moving average of ECN-marked packets, updating the variable avg_wtd using the formula $avg_wtd = \alpha \cdot p.ecn + (1 - \alpha) \cdot avg_wtd$. The congestion window remains unchanged as long as $avg_wtd < 0.25$, meaning that the system does not react to congestion unless 25 percent or more of the acknowledgments indicate congestion—a threshold high enough to exclude transient load imbalances. This mechanism, referred to as *Wait to Decrease* (WTD), is illustrated in Fig. 1, which demonstrates how it significantly improves the flow completion time (FCT) for permutation workloads running on a 1,024-node non-oversubscribed fat tree network.

4 EVALUATION

Simulation Setup. We ran simulations using and extending the *htsim* packet-level network simulator [15]. Our simulations consider different fat-tree topologies with 1024 nodes and different level of oversubscription ranging from zero to 8:1. This is relevant due to the relevance of such topologies in production datacenters [27]. We configure the network with a 4 KiB MTU size, a bandwidth of 100 Gbps, and a switch traversal latency of 500 ns, reflecting the specifications of current-generation switches [6, 11]. To simplify the analysis, we assume uniform link lengths and latencies, with each link exhibiting a latency of 500 ns.

State-of-the-art Comparison. We pair REPS together with SMaRTT and compare it against packet spraying and ECMP. We use SMaRTT for all of them in order to have the same baseline regarding congestion control. We enable trimming for all the algorithms.

4.1 Non-Oversubscribed Networks

In this section we evaluate the performance of REPS in a simple setting where there is no oversubscription and no failures, meaning the network is perfectly symmetrical. Intuitively, this is the best situation for packet spraying since evenly splitting the packets across multiple links should result in the best performance. However, as we can see in Fig.2a, this is not the case as REPS still offers a 10% advantage over oblivious packet spraying. This is because of ECMP collisions that still happen with spraying. While over long period of time, each link will be evenly used, there will still be short term collisions happening that also increase the RTT of packets as seen in Fig.2b.

4.2 Oversubscribed Networks

In Fig.3a, we evaluate the performance of SMaRTT with various load balancing algorithms: REPS, ECMP[17], and oblivious packet spraying [12]. We simulate a 4 MiB permutation workload on a 8:1 oversubscribed fat tree network.




Figure 2: 4MiB permutation running on a non over-subscribed fat tree. Flow completion times and RTT distribution of different load balancing algorithms.

The results show that REPS achieves again approximately a 10% improvement in completion time over oblivious packet spraying due to its superior fairness. In contrast, per-flow ECMP results in job completion times that are 1.5 times higher than those achieved with packet spraying and REPS, primarily because of increased flow collisions (which are not depicted in the plot). However, the individual RTTs for per-flow ECMP are relatively low since SMaRTT reduces the congestion window size upon detecting congestion caused by hash collisions. Additionally, an analysis of the packet RTT distribution in Fig. 3b reveals that REPS maintains RTTs that are closer to the target with lower variability, indicating improved network utilization.




Figure 3: 4MiB permutation running on a 8:1 oversubscribed fat tree. Flow completion times and RTT distribution of different load balancing algorithms.

4.3 Failures

We now evaluate what happens in a network where some links are failing, in particular we fail a fixed number of links between the aggregation switches and core switches of the fat tree. REPS now gains a 50% advantage (Fig. 4b) over spraying because it is able to avoid more efficiently the failing links, while spraying would randomly select failing paths over time and hence increase the completion time. For ECMP, certain flows don't properly terminate as they are not able to adaptively avoid failing links.




Figure 4: 4MiB permutation running on a non over-subscribed fat tree with link failures. Flow completion times and RTT distribution of different load balancing algorithms.

5 CONCLUSION

We design REPS, a simple and resource-efficient load balancer that can be paired with different congestion control algorithms. REPS significantly improves the FCT, runtime and number of dropped packets as shown in our evaluation. REPS can drastically improve the load balancing performance compared to traditional per-flow ECMP or oblivious packet spraying at minimal complexity cost. We also show that REPS can effectively handle faults and network asymmetries. In a future version of this work we will expand REPS to be used alongside several congestion control algorithms and with different failure modes.

REFERENCES

- [1] Popa Adrian, Dumitrescu Dragos, Handley Mark, Nikolaidis Georgios, Lee Jeongkeun, and Raiciu Costin. 2022. Implementing packet trimming support in hardware. (2022). arXiv:cs.NI/2207.04967
- [2] 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>
- [3] Infiniband Trade Association. 2024. Supplement to InfiniBand Architecture Specification Volume 1 Release 1.2.1 Annex A17: RoCEv2. (2024).
- [4] Wei Bai, Shanim Sainul Abdeen, Ankit Agrawal, Krishan Kumar Attre, Paramvir Bahl, Ameya Bhagat, Gowri Bhaskara, Tanya Brokman, Lei Cao, Ahmad Cheema, Rebecca Chow, Jeff Cohen, Mahmoud Elhaddad, Vivek Ette, Igal Figlin, Daniel Firestone, Mathew George, Ilya German, Lakhmeet Ghai, Eric Green, Albert Greenberg, Manish Gupta, Randy Haagens, Matthew Hendel, Ridwan Howlader, Neetha John, Julia Johnstone, Tom Jolly, Greg Kramer, David Kruse, Ankit Kumar, Erica Lan, Ivan Lee, Avi Levy, Marina Lipshteyn, Xin Liu, Chen Liu, Guohan Lu, Yuemin Lu, Xiakun Lu, Vadim Makherovaks, Ulad Malashanka, David A. Maltz, Ilias Marinos, Rohan Mehta, Sharda Murthi, Anup Namdhari, Aaron Ogus, Jitendra Padhye, Madhav Pandya, Douglas Phillips, Adrian Power, Suraj Puri, Shachar Raindel, Jordan Rhee, Anthony Russo, Maneesh Sah, Ali Sheriff, Chris Sparacino, Ashutosh Srivastava, Weixiang Sun, Nick Swanson, Fuhou Tian, Lukasz Tomczyk, Vamsi Vadlamuri, Alec Wolman, Ying Xie, Joyce Yom, Lihua Yuan, Yanzhao Zhang, and Brian Zill. 2023. Empowering Azure Storage with RDMA. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and*

- Implementation (NSDI 23)*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 49–67. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi23/presentation/bai>
- [5] Tommaso Bonato, Abdul Kabbani, Daniele De Sensi, Rong Pan, Yanfang Le, Costin Raiciu, Mark Handley, Timo Schneider, Nils Blach, Ahmad Ghalayini, Daniel Alves, Michael Papamichael, Adrian Caulfield, and Torsten Hoefer. 2024. SMaRTT-REPS: Sender-based Marked Rapidly-adapting Trimmed & Timed Transport with Recycled Entropies. (2024). arXiv:cs.NI/2404.01630 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.01630>
- [6] Broadcom. 2024. Tomahawk 5 Switch. (2024). <https://www.broadcom.com/products/ethernet-connectivity/switching/strataxgs/bcm78900-series> (accessed 01/24).
- [7] V. Cerf and R. Kahn. 1974. A Protocol for Packet Network Intercommunication. *IEEE Transactions on Communications* 22, 5 (1974), 637–648. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCOM.1974.1092259>
- [8] Peng Cheng, Fengyuan Ren, Ran Shu, and Chuang Lin. 2014. Catch the Whole Lot in an Action: Rapid Precise Packet Loss Notification in Data Center. In *11th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 14)*. USENIX Association, Seattle, WA, 17–28. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi14/technical-sessions/presentation/cheng>
- [9] Ultra Ethernet Consortium. 2024. Ultra Ethernet. (2024). <https://ultraethernet.org/>.
- [10] Daniele De Sensi, Salvatore Di Girolamo, and Torsten Hoefer. 2019. Mitigating Network Noise on Dragonfly Networks through Application-Aware Routing. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 16, 32 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3295500.3356196>
- [11] Daniele De Sensi, Salvatore Di Girolamo, Kim H. McMahon, Duncan Roweth, and Torsten Hoefer. 2020. An In-Depth Analysis of the Slingshot Interconnect. In *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*. 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SC41405.2020.00039>
- [12] Advait Dixit, Pawan Prakash, Y. Charlie Hu, and Ramana Rao Kompella. 2013. On the impact of packet spraying in data center networks. In *2013 Proceedings IEEE INFOCOM*. 2130–2138. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFOCOM.2013.6567015>
- [13] S. Floyd and V. Jacobson. 1993. Random early detection gateways for congestion avoidance. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking* 1, 4 (1993), 397–413. <https://doi.org/10.1109/90.251892>
- [14] Sally Floyd, Dr. K. K. Ramakrishnan, and David L. Black. 2001. The Addition of Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN) to IP. RFC 3168. (Sept. 2001). <https://doi.org/10.17487/RFC3168>
- [15] Mark Handley, Costin Raiciu, Alexandru Agache, Andrei Voinescu, Andrew W. Moore, Gianni Antichi, and Marcin Wójcik. 2017. Re-Architecting 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>
- [16] Keqiang He, Eric Rozner, Kanak Agarwal, Wes Felter, John Carter, and Aditya Akella. 2015. Presto: Edge-Based Load Balancing for Fast Datacenter Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM Conference on Special Interest Group on Data Communication (SIGCOMM '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 465–478. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2785956.2787507>
- [17] C. Hopps. 2009. Analysis of an Equal-Cost Multi-Path Algorithm. RFC 2992. (Nov. 2009). <https://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2992.txt>
- [18] Abdul Kabbani, Balajee Vamanan, Jahangir Hasan, and Fabien Duchene. 2014. FlowBender: Flow-level Adaptive Routing for Improved Latency and Throughput in Datacenter Networks. In *Proceedings of the 10th*

- ACM International on Conference on Emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies (CoNEXT '14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 149–160. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2674005.2674985>
- [19] Gautam Kumar, Nandita Dukkipati, Keon Jang, Hassan Wassel, Xian Wu, Behnam Montazeri, Yaogong Wang, Kevin Springborn, Christopher Alfeld, Mike Ryan, David J. Wetherall, and Amin Vahdat. 2020. Swift: Delay is Simple and Effective for Congestion Control in the Datacenter. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/3387514.3406591>
- [20] 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>
- [21] Radhika Mittal, Terry 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. In *Sigcomm '15*.
- [22] Kathleen Nichols and Van Jacobson. 2012. Controlling Queue Delay: A modern AQM is just one piece of the solution to bufferbloat. *Queue* 10, 5 (may 2012), 20–34. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2208917.2209336>
- [23] Vladimír Olteanu, Haggai Eran, Dragos Dumitrescu, Adrian Popa, Cristi Baciu, Mark Silberstein, Georgios Nikolaidis, Mark Handley, and Costin Raiciu. 2022. An edge-queued datagram service for all datacenter traffic. In *19th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 22)*. USENIX Association, Renton, WA, 761–777. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi22/presentation/olteanu>
- [24] Kun Qian, Yongqing Xi, Jiamin Cao, Jiaqi Gao, Yichi Xu, Yu Guan, Binzhang Fu, Xuemei Shi Fangbo Zhu, Rui Miao, Chao Wang, Peng Wang, Pengcheng Zhang, Xianlong Zeng Zhiping Yao, Ennan Zhai, and Dennis Cai. 2024. Alibaba HPN: A Data Center Network for Large Language Model Training. (2024).
- [25] Mubashir Adnan Qureshi, Yuchung Cheng, Qianwen Yin, Qiaobin Fu, Gautam Kumar, Masoud Moshref, Junhua Yan, Van Jacobson, David Wetherall, and Abdul Kabbani. 2022. PLB: congestion signals are simple and effective for network load balancing. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2022 Conference (SIGCOMM '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 207–218. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544216.3544226>
- [26] José Rocher-González, Ernst Gunnar Gran, Sven-Arne Reinemo, Tor Skeie, Jesús Escudero-Sahuquillo, Pedro Javier García, and Francisco J. Quiles Flor. 2022. Adaptive Routing in InfiniBand Hardware. In *2022 22nd IEEE International Symposium on Cluster, Cloud and Internet Computing (CCGrid)*. 463–472. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CCGrid54584.2022.00056>
- [27] Arjun Singh, Joon Ong, Amit Agarwal, Glen Anderson, Ashby Armistead, Roy Bannon, Seb Boving, Gaurav Desai, Bob Felderman, Paulie Germano, Anand Kanagala, Jeff Provost, Jason Simmons, Eiichi Tanda, Jim Wanderer, Urs Hölzle, Stephen Stuart, and Amin Vahdat. 2015. Jupiter Rising: A Decade of Clos Topologies and Centralized Control in Google’s Datacenter Network. In *Sigcomm '15*.
- [28] Erico Vanini, Rong Pan, Mohammad Alizadeh, Parvin Taheri, and Tom Edsall. 2017. Let It Flow: Resilient Asymmetric Load Balancing with Flowlet Switching. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 17)*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 407–420. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi17/technical-sessions/presentation/vanini>
- [29] Weitao Wang, Masoud Moshref, Yuliang Li, Gautam Kumar, T. S. Eugene Ng, Neal Cardwell, and Nandita Dukkipati. 2023. Poseidon: An Efficient Congestion Control using Deployable INT for Data Center Networks. <https://www.usenix.org/system/files/nsdi23-wang-Weitao.pdf>
- [30] Haitao Wu, Chuanxiong Guo, Yongqiang Xiong, and Yongguang Zhang. 2012. Tuning ECN for Data Center Networks. In *ACM CoNEXT'12*. ACM. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/tuning-ecn-for-data-center-networks/>
- [31] Jin Ye, Renzhang Liu, Ziqi Xie, Luting Feng, and Sen Liu. 2019. EMPTCP: An ECN Based Approach to Detect Shared Bottleneck in MPTCP. In *2019 28th International Conference on Computer Communication and Networks (ICCCN)*. 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCN.2019.8847013>
- [32] Yibo Zhu, Yibo Zhu, Haggai Eran, Daniel Firestone, Daniel Firestone, Chuanxiong Guo, Marina Lipshteyn, Yehonatan Liron, Jitendra Padhye, Shachar Raindel, Mohamad Haj Yahia, Ming Zhang, and Jitu Padhye. 2015. Congestion Control for Large-Scale RDMA Deployments. In *SIGCOMM (sigcomm ed.)*. ACM - Association for Computing Machinery. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/congestion-control-for-large-scale-rdma-deployments/>