

# Reinforcement Learning for Dynamic Resource Allocation in Optical Networks: Hype or Hope?

MICHAEL DOHERTY<sup>1\*</sup>, ROBIN MATZNER<sup>1</sup>, RASOUL SADEGHI<sup>1</sup>, POLINA BAYVEL<sup>1</sup>, AND ALEJANDRA BEGHELLI<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Optical Networks Group, University College London, Torrington Place, London WC1E 7JE, United Kingdom

\*Corresponding author: michael.doherty.21@ucl.ac.uk

Compiled February 19, 2025

The application of reinforcement learning (RL) to dynamic resource allocation in optical networks has been the focus of intense research activity in recent years, with almost 100 peer-reviewed papers. We present a review of progress in the field, and identify significant gaps in benchmarking practices and reproducibility. To determine the strongest benchmark algorithms, we systematically evaluate several heuristics across diverse network topologies. We find that path count and sort criteria for path selection significantly affect the benchmark performance. We meticulously recreate the problems from five landmark papers and apply the improved benchmarks. Our comparisons demonstrate that simple heuristics consistently match or outperform the published RL solutions, often with an order of magnitude lower blocking probability. Furthermore, we present empirical lower bounds on network blocking using a novel defragmentation-based method, revealing that potential improvements over the benchmark heuristics are limited to 19–36% increased traffic load for the same blocking performance in our examples. We make our simulation framework and results publicly available to promote reproducible research and standardized evaluation <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12594495>.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1364/ao.XX.XXXXXX>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Network operators are faced with a problem: how to increase capacity for ever-increasing data traffic without increasing the price of services [1]. Advances in transmission technology have so far provided the solution by exponentially increasing the point-to-point capacity of the optical channel. However, as the throughput of the installed C+L bands approaches the nonlinearity-limited information bounds [2], costly infrastructure upgrades are required to scale capacity through spatial division multiplexing or ultra-wideband transmission [3]. Operators seek to minimize or delay the required capital expenditure and offset it with reduced operational costs. Online optimization of network resource allocation offers a path towards these aims by increasing the achievable network throughput with dynamic and automated service provisioning.

Reinforcement learning (RL) has emerged as a promising technique for dynamic resource allocation (DRA) from a range of exact solution methods, heuristic algorithms, and artificial intelligence (AI) approaches. RL solutions can approach the quality of exact methods such as integer linear programming (ILP), with an online allocation time comparable to simple heuristics [4]. In fact, many works have demonstrated RL outperforms selected heuristics across various optical network problems (see

section 3).

However, despite the many papers that investigate RL for optical networks, adoption of machine learning (ML) techniques by network operators has been limited by non-technological barriers [5]. One barrier is a lack of clear benchmarks and demonstrable benefits. Studies of resource allocation problems in optical networks often present results on specific topologies and traffic models, without fair comparison to previous results. Often results are not generalizable.

In this paper we address this barrier by providing analysis of and recommendations for benchmarking practices. We identify 5 papers that provide the best examples of benchmarking in the field and reproduce their described problems, including implementation details that significantly affect the results. By "problems", we mean the exact network topologies, traffic models, and other details pertinent to the network simulations. By recreating these problems, we demonstrate that simple heuristic algorithms outperform or equal the reported RL results in all cases. This is the first time that a thorough analysis, reproduction, and benchmarking of previous work has been carried out, and highlights deficient benchmarking standards.

We also investigate the limits of network throughput for dynamic traffic, to understand just how much additional data traffic can be supported by the network through optimized resource

allocation. We propose a heuristic-based lower bound network blocking estimation method, termed Resource-Prioritized Defragmentation (section 6). For each case of study, we apply this method over a range of traffic loads and estimate that possible improvements in network throughput at fixed blocking (0.1%) compared to the best heuristics are limited to 1-36%.

This paper aims to: 1) Establish higher standards for evaluation and reproducibility in research into RL for optical networking, 2) Encourage new research directions by highlighting the limited room for improvement over simple heuristics in widely-investigated problems.

The contributions of this work are:

1. A comprehensive survey of benchmark progress on RL approaches to DRA in optical networks.
2. A systematic study of the factors affecting heuristic algorithm performance.
3. A reproduction of experiments from five landmark papers in the field with comparisons to improved heuristic benchmarks, which shows that RL results have failed to improve on heuristics in all cases.
4. A novel empirical throughput bound estimation method is described and applied to estimate the upper bound network throughput, compared to benchmarks.
5. The release of our simulation framework, "XLRON", to promote reproducible research and enable fair comparison across different studies.

All of the code necessary to generate data and plots from this paper are available on Github: [6].

We begin with essential background on DRA problems and RL techniques in Section 2, followed by a literature review in Section 3. Section 4 presents the investigation of heuristic algorithms for benchmarking. Section 5 details the analysis of the previously published results and comparison with benchmarks. Section 6 presents new empirical bounds for network throughput, with recommendations for future research directions in Section 7.

## 2. BACKGROUND

### A. DRA problems in optical networks

#### *Motivation for dynamic operation and RL*

As discussed by Augé [7] and Pointurier [8], optical networks must operate with a margin in the resources serving the required demand, which could be reduced to increase the network throughput or reduce costs. Dynamic operation allows the allocated resources to vary temporally in response to shifting demand, reducing margins. The time constraints of dynamic operation may preclude exact solution methods, but a trained RL agent can compute an allocation in sub-second time [4].

RL is appropriate for these problems because they possess three characteristics that merit the application of AI [9]: 1) a large combinatorial search space, 2) a clear objective function for optimization, and 3) plentiful training data and/or accurate and efficient simulators for data generation.

#### *Traffic models*

Network traffic comprises a set of requests to connect source and destination nodes with fixed data rates. Traffic can be considered as either static, dynamic, or incremental.

Static traffic assumes knowledge of all traffic requests that the network must accommodate. For dynamic traffic, connection

requests are served on-demand without knowledge of future requests, and active connections expire randomly. The request arrival and expiry times are sampled from probability density functions (PDF), often assumed to be inverse exponential [10]. Incremental traffic lies between static and dynamic in stochasticity: requests are not known in advance but do not expire once allocated. Dynamic traffic is considered a paradigm for future optical networks, that have the necessary systems in place to enable real-time response to changing network conditions [11].

#### *Problem variants*

The classic optimization problem in an optical network is Routing and Wavelength Assignment (RWA) for fixed-grid networks or Routing and Spectrum Assignment (RSA) for flex-grid networks, where spectrum is divided into frequency slot units (FSU) [12]. Further degrees of freedom in the optimization are added by considering the selection of Modulation formats (RMSA), and the fiber Core or spectral transmission Band utilized by each channel in the case of multi-core or multi-band networks (RCMSA/RBMSA). Launch Power has also been considered as a parameter in the optimization objective for dynamic networks (RPMSA) [13] [14].

While most DRA problems in optical networks from the literature are concerned with point-to-point connections, some consider virtual networking tasks such as virtual optical network embedding (VONE) [15, 16] or virtual network function placement (VNF) [17]. We choose to focus on RWA/RSA/RMSA in this paper because they are the most widely studied DRA problems in the context of optical networks and they form a core sub-task of variants such as VNF or VONE.

#### *Constraints*

Three fundamental constraints govern resource allocation in optical networks:

1. Spectrum Continuity: A lightpath must use identical FSU along its entire route from source to destination, without wavelength conversion.
2. Spectrum Contiguity: FSU allocated to a connection must be adjacent, as optical signals occupy a continuous range of frequencies determined by the required data rate, and therefore baud rate and modulation format.
3. No Reconfiguration: Active lightpaths cannot be reallocated to different spectrum slots or routes, meaning allocation decisions are permanent while connections remain active.

The 'No Reconfiguration' constraint is not a physical limitation but an operational assumption that active services cannot be disrupted. Reconfiguration may sometimes be desirable, especially in flex-grid networks that may suffer from spectral fragmentation [18], and has been used in a production network by Meta Platforms Inc. to free up spectral resources [19].

#### *Solution methods*

Allocation of static traffic is a NP-hard combinatorial optimization problems [20], for which the computational complexity of finding a solution scales super-polynomially with the space of possible allocations. Exact solution methods such as Integer Linear Programming (ILP) have been formulated for static traffic [21, 22] but show limited scalability<sup>1</sup> and are infeasible for dynamic traffic without a priori knowledge of all requests.

<sup>1</sup>[22] Jaumard et al. scale their ILP formulation to 690 requests on the USNET topology (24 nodes and 86 links) with 380 FSU per link, without considering distance-adaptive modulation formats.

For dynamic traffic, any allocation decision must be taken within the constraint of the time interval between request arrivals. No standard limit has been defined for this constraint in the literature but it could be on the order of seconds, with a lower limit set by the switching time of reconfigurable optical add-drop multiplexers (currently 1ms to 100ms, depending on the switching technology [23]).

Many simple heuristic algorithms [24–28] have been proposed for these problems, with the goal to minimize resources, lightpath distances and required bandwidth. Heuristics have the advantages of fast execution time and deterministic and interpretable allocation decisions.

Machine learning approaches to DRA problems have included nature-inspired techniques like particle swarm optimization (PSO) [29] and genetic algorithms (GA) [30]. RL is advantageous over these approaches as it can compute an allocation faster [4] after an extensive training period, as explored in the next section.


## B. Reinforcement learning

RL is a framework for learning to optimize sequential decision making under uncertainty. It emerged from Bellman’s foundational work on optimal control theory in the 1950s, specifically dynamic programming and Markov Decision Processes (MDP) [31, 32]. MDPs model decision-making processes as an agent that takes actions in an environment to maximize a reward signal. The method of action selection is a mapping from states to actions termed the policy, which can be expressed in tabular form or approximated by a neural network (NN). The use of NN for function approximation is sometimes distinguished as “Deep” RL. Tabular RL has been applied to optical networks [33], but function approximation with NN is widely used [10, 27, 34–36] when the set of state-action pairs becomes infeasibly large to be tabulated [37].

The reader is referred to Sutton and Barto’s authoritative textbook [37] for details. However, to aid the discussion of RL applied to DRA problems, several terms are defined here.

RL algorithms can be classified as model-based or model-free. Model-based RL uses a model of the environment to plan future actions, but so far no works have applied this paradigm to DRA problems in optical networks. Model-free RL algorithms learn through direct interaction with the environment, without planning. Model-free algorithms can be further categorized into:

- **Action-value methods**, such as Q-learning, which learn to estimate the value of taking specific actions in different environment states. These methods were the first to be developed in RL [38, 39] and have been used for route selection in optical networks [40].
- **Policy gradient methods**, which directly optimize the policy parameters to maximize expected rewards. This is subtly different from action-value methods, which optimize an action-value function. Policy gradient methods are enhanced by using an Actor-Critic architecture, as in algorithms such as A2C [41] and PPO [42], which reduce variance in the policy gradient by using a learned value function (critic) to estimate the value of each state. Policy gradient methods have been used in many works on DRA in optical networks, such as A2C for DeepRMSA [10].



**Fig. 1.** Count of publications related to RL for resource allocation problems in optical networks. Citations for each classification category are: RWA [4, 45–57], RSA [36, 58–74], RMSA [10, 27, 33–35, 40, 75–101], Other [102–133].

## 3. LITERATURE SURVEY

There exists a considerable body of literature on RL for DRA problems in optical networks. DRA in optical networks is distinguished from similar problems in electronically linked networks by the nature of fiber optic links, which carry a set of wavelengths or FSU, defined by the ITU standards G.671 and G.694.2 [43, 44]. In this work we only consider publications related to optical networks but acknowledge the closely related literature on RL for other graph-based resource allocation problems.

### A. Survey methodology

To provide an overview of research progress on RL applied to DRA problems in optical networks, we searched to gather all relevant research papers. We performed a manual review of results from citation databases to create the final set of 97 peer-reviewed papers. Figure 1 shows the count of papers by publication year. The papers are grouped in 4 categories: ‘RWA’, ‘RSA’, ‘RMSA’, and ‘Other’. We use this set of papers for our analysis of benchmarking practices in the field, which we present in the next section with further commentary on figure 1.

### B. Review of benchmarking practices

In optical networks research, the first benchmark for RL was established by DeepRMSA [10] (discussed in detail in Section B). DeepRMSA was the first RL approach to achieve lower service blocking probability than KSP-FF, or any heuristic that considers multiple candidate paths. As a result of this breakthrough performance, and its open source codebase, the problem definition from DeepRMSA (topologies, traffic model, modulation format reach, FSU per link, etc.) became a de facto standard. Follow-up works used identical or similar problem definitions and compared to DeepRMSA on their problem [27, 35, 36, 64, 79, 88, 98, 101]. Arguably, comparing to DeepRMSA has become standard benchmarking practice.

Previous work has called for more rigorous benchmarking practices for research on RL for optical networking [4], with recommendations for comparison against other machine learning approaches such as GA and PSO, in addition to estimated bounds on network blocking or throughput. Some studies of RL

for resource allocation have restricted themselves to sufficiently small problem sizes and static traffic, to enable comparison to ILP results [4, 54, 56, 66, 86]. Although this provides a reliable bound, it is not applicable to dynamic traffic.

Benchmarking against standard heuristic algorithms, such as KSP-FF, avoids the complexity of training a rival machine learning approach, performs deterministic allocation, and can scale to large problem instances. However, it is important to choose the best performing heuristic for a particular case of study as a benchmark. Of the papers that benchmark their RL solution to KSP-FF (or other heuristics that consider multiple candidate paths) [4, 10, 27, 33–36, 55, 62, 64, 73, 76, 77, 79, 80, 83–85, 88, 91–93, 112, 120, 123], most achieve 20–30% reduction in service blocking probability compared to their best heuristic. Only 3 papers achieve a reduction greater than this: MaskRSA [34], PtrNet-RSA [36], and Terki et al [82]. Despite these impressive results, we demonstrate in Section 5 that MaskRSA and PtrNet-RSA are beaten by KSP-FF or FF-KSP by considering 50 candidate paths and ordering the paths by number of hops<sup>2</sup>.

Benchmarking is further complicated by the fast evolution of optical networking, with novel paradigms such as multi-band [89] and multi-core [87] emerging, and the wide variety of network topologies [134] and components that can be considered. The evolution of optical networks research is evidenced by growth in the ‘Other’ category of figure 1, which includes papers on RL applied to: traffic grooming [115, 120, 122, 129], defragmentation [118, 119, 121, 123], survivability or service restoration [66, 67, 104, 106, 112, 117, 135], multicast provisioning [45, 113, 125], and other problems such as transceiver parameter optimization [110, 116, 136] or launch power optimization [128]

The establishment of reliable benchmarks is made more difficult by the fragmented software environment for optical network simulations for RL. Several open source toolkits have been introduced to aid researchers and improve productivity, but none has proved sufficiently popular for it to become standard. Optical-rl-gym [107] was the first paper to attempt to introduce a new standard library for this task. This was followed by an extension to multi-band environments [114] and in 2024 was further extended to include a more sophisticated physical layer model for lightpath SNR calculations, renamed as the Optical Networking Gym [131]. Additionally, MaskRSA provides an open source simulation framework (RSA-RL) [34] and Deep-RMSA’s codebase is widely used [137]. SDONSim [132] and DREAM-ON-GYM [133] are other recent additions to the landscape of available simulation frameworks that further fragment the available options.

In summary, progress in applying RL to DRA problems in optical networks has been difficult to quantify due to several factors. First, the lack of standardized benchmarking practices has made it challenging to fairly compare different approaches. Second, while some studies have used ILP solutions as benchmarks, these are limited to small problem sizes and static traffic scenarios, making them impractical for large-scale or dynamic applications. Third, multiple competing simulation frameworks and publications without open source code, have made it difficult to ensure consistent testing conditions across different studies. Finally, the rapid evolution of optical networking technology means benchmarks must constantly evolve to remain

<sup>2</sup>We have not re-created the study of Terki et al. for benchmarking in Section 5 as it is multi-band and out of scope of this work. We hypothesise that their approach performs strongly because, similar to PtrNet-RSA, it is not limited to selecting from only K paths.

relevant.


The lack of reliable benchmarks, and the resulting difficulty in assessing progress in the field, is what motivates our investigations of heuristic benchmarks in Section 4 and their application to our reproduction of previous studies in Section 5.

### C. Selection of papers for benchmarking

On the basis of our review of benchmarking practices, we select 5 papers to reproduce and re-benchmark in section 5. We select these papers primarily because they all compare their results to “DeepRMSA”<sup>3</sup> with similar traffic models and topologies, therefore present the most consistent application of benchmarks in the field. We also select based on their impact, which we assess by qualitative and quantitative criteria. The qualitative criteria are novelty, contribution, and reputation of publication or conference. The quantitative criterion is their blocking performance relative to benchmarks. They are also among the most highly cited papers in the field, as of January 2025.

1. **DeepRMSA** [10] constructs a feature matrix to represent the available paths for the current requests and applies a NN with 5 x 128 hidden units to select from the K-shortest paths with first-fit spectrum allocation. It demonstrates service blocking probability (SBP) reduced by 20% vs. KSP-FF on the NSFNET and COST239 topologies. DeepRMSA’s impact was enhanced by its open source codebase.
2. **Reward-RMSA** [27] builds on the DeepRMSA framework and changes the reward function to incorporate fragmentation-related information. They report SBP reduced by 32% vs. multiple heuristics and 55% vs. DeepRMSA on NSFNET and COST239.
3. **GCN-RMSA** [35] is notable as the first work to use advanced NN architectures to improve performance. They use a graph convolutional network (GCN) (including recurrent neural network (RNN) as the path aggregation function) in the policy and value functions, which they claim allows improved feature extraction from the network state. Like DeepRMSA and Reward-RMSA, the policy selects from K paths with first-fit spectrum allocation. They report SBP reduced by up to 30% vs. multiple heuristics and 18% vs. DeepRMSA. on NSFNET, COST239, and USNET.
4. **MaskRSA** [34] innovated by selecting from the entire range of available slots on the K paths and using invalid action masking [?] to increase the efficiency of training. Despite the RSA in the title, the paper does consider distance-dependent modulation format (RMSA). MaskRSA presented improvements over KSP-FF on NSFNET and JPN48 topologies with over an order of magnitude lower SBP, or a 35–45% increase in the supported traffic in their cases of study. The authors of MaskRSA also contributed to open source by releasing their simulation framework, RSA-RL.
5. **PtrNet-RSA** [36], newly published in 2024. It innovates in both the problem setting and its use of pointer-nets [140]. The pointer-net is used to select the constituent nodes of the target path, thereby removing the restriction of selecting from the pre-calculated K-shortest paths. Invalid action masking is used to allow selection from all available spectral slots. Additionally, the paper considers joint optimization of the mean path SNR and the SBP through its

<sup>3</sup>We note that the training of RL solutions is highly sensitive to hyperparameters [138] and non-deterministic factors [139], therefore the comparisons that the selected papers make to re-trained DeepRMSA agents may not be robust.



**Fig. 2.** Network topologies used in our case studies from: DeepRMSA, Reward-RMSA, GCN-RMSA, MaskRSA, PtrNet-RSA [10] [27] [35] [34] [36]. We note that the USNET topology differs between GCN-RMSA and PtrNet-RSA. We show the GCN-RMSA version here. PtrNet-RSA also uses a variant of the COST239 topology.

reward function. It demonstrates SBP reduced by over an order of magnitude vs. KSP-FF and their implementation of MaskRSA on NSFNET, COST239, and USNET.

#### 4. HEURISTIC ALGORITHM BENCHMARK EVALUATION

To evaluate the results from our selected papers in section C, we must determine the best (lowest blocking probability) heuristic algorithms to use as benchmarks. In this section, we present comparisons of the heuristics listed in Table 1, evaluated on different traffic loads, topologies, and considering different numbers of candidate paths ( $K$ ). On the basis of this analysis, we select the benchmarks to apply in section 5.

We select the algorithms in Table 1 because they are commonly used as benchmarks or have been reported as superior to other heuristics.

Heuristic	Acronym	Reference
K-Shortest Paths First-Fit	KSP-FF	[24]
First-Fit K-Shortest Paths	FF-KSP	[24]
K-Shortest Paths Best-Fit	KSP-BF	[25]
Best-Fit K-Shortest Paths	BF-KSP	[25]
K-Minimum Entropy First-Fit	KME-FF	[26]
K-Congestion Aware First-Fit	KCA-FF	CA2 from [28]

**Table 1.** RMSA heuristics used for benchmarking.

Figure 2 shows the topologies used in the selected papers. We

use these topologies to analyze the performance of the heuristic algorithms and in our reproductions of the papers' problems in section 5. We make all topology data available in our open source codebase [141].

#### A. Effect of path ordering

All the heuristics in Table 1 select from the available pre-computed paths on the basis of sort criteria. The primary criterion may be a measure of the path congestion (KCA-FF), spectral fragmentation (KME-FF), or length (KSP-FF). In the event of multiple paths with equal value, a default ordering (usually ascending order of length) determines the selected path.

Usually, path length is considered as distance in km. However, we find that considering path length as number of hops (with length in km as a secondary sort criterion), significantly improves the performance of the heuristics. This has been observed previously by Baroni [142], who referred to it as Minimum Number of Hops routing (MNH). The intuitive explanation for this is that, if two paths can support the same order of modulation format, the path that comprises fewer links occupies fewer spectral resources.

We refer to these two orderings as path length in km (#km) or path length in number of hops (#hops). Our comparisons of KSP-FF for these two orderings in Section B Figure 7 evidence the reduction in blocking probability from #hops ordering. In our comparisons of heuristics in the next section, we use #hops ordering.

#### B. Simulation setup

For each heuristic and topology, we carried out three simulation scenarios to investigate the effects of varying traffic loads and values of  $K$  on the relative blocking performance of the heuristics.

##### Experiment 1 - Increasing $K$ :

**Aim:** Investigate relative performance of heuristics with increasing  $K$ . **Method:** Record service blocking probability (SBP) for each heuristic at values of  $K$  ranging from 2 to 26 at fixed traffic load. We arbitrarily select the traffic load for each topology so that the heuristics give a SBP of  $\sim 1\%$ .

##### Experiment 2 - Increasing $K$ at high to low traffic:

**Aim:** Investigate the effect of increasing  $K$  at different traffic loads. **Method:** Record SBP at  $K$  ranging from 2 to 40 for a range of traffic loads. We select the traffic loads for each topology such that they result in  $10^{-5}$  to  $10^{-1}$  SBP. To simplify the analysis and plots, we only present results for KSP-FF.

##### Experiment 3 - Increasing traffic load at $K=50$ :

**Aim:** Using the findings from Experiments 1 and 2, determine the lowest-blocking heuristic with optimized  $K$ -value across traffic loads. **Method:** Record SBP for high  $K$  ( $K=50$ ) at varying traffic loads. We select the traffic loads for each topology such that they result in a range of SBP ( $10^{-5}$  to  $10^{-1}$ ). This experiment provides evidence on which heuristic is the best overall for each topology.

The data for each heuristic in each experiment was collected from 3000 independent trials with unique random seeds. The SBP was calculated after 10,000 connection requests, with the mean and standard deviation calculated across trials. Each data point in Figures 3,4,5 therefore shows summary statistics from 30 million connection requests, which gives high confidence that our results present the true mean and standard deviation in each case.

We considered dynamic traffic with fixed mean service holding time at 10 units. We considered the same traffic model and other settings as DeepRMSA<sup>4</sup>: uniform traffic probability between each node pair, Poissonian arrival and departure statistics, uniform random selection of data rate from 25 to 100Gbps in 1Gbps intervals, and distance-dependent modulation formats from BPSK to 16QAM. We consider topologies with dual fibre links (one for each direction of propagation), 12.5GHz FSU width, and 100 FSU per fibre.

### C. Results and discussion

**Experiment 1** results in Figure 3 show different outcomes for smaller networks (NSFNET and COST239) and larger networks (USNET and JPN48). For NSFNET and COST239, KSP-FF and KME-FF are approximately equal and give the lowest blocking. Their blocking decreases to a minimum for approximately  $K=23$  and above for NSFNET and continues to decrease for  $K>26$  for COST239.

For USNET and JPN48, FF-KSP is clearly the best heuristic, with blocking reduced by half for JPN48. Blocking from FF-KSP decreases with  $K$  until  $K=26$  for USNET and continues dropping sharply for  $K>26$  for JPN48. For USNET, KSP-FF and KME-FF become competitive with FF-KSP at large  $K$ . It can be argued that FF-KSP performs better in larger networks where there are multiple roughly equivalent paths between source and destination, and dense packing of utilized wavelengths increases in relative importance to path selection.

The results from Experiment 1 indicate that KSP-FF and FF-KSP generally give the lowest blocking, depending on the network topology, and blocking decreases monotonically with increasing  $K$ . This experiment looked at a moderately high traffic load ( $\sim 1\%$  SBP), therefore experiment 2 investigates if the effect of increasing  $K$  holds at different traffic loads.

**Experiment 2** results in Figure 4 show that, regardless of the traffic load, increasing  $K$  decreases the SBP, until SBP reaches a minimum and increasing  $K$  does not decrease SBP further. Across all topologies and traffic loads tested in our experiments, we found that SBP does not decrease significantly for  $K>50$ . For very high traffic (approximately equivalent to incremental loading), the value of  $K$  beyond which SBP does not continue to decrease can be much lower.

**Experiment 3** results in Figure 5 show the variation of SBP with traffic load for each heuristic with  $K=50$ . We verified that at least 50 unique paths are possible for every node pair on our investigated topologies. We select  $K=50$  on the basis of experiments 1 and 2. These results confirm the initial findings from Experiment 1 - that KSP-FF and KME-FF are the lowest blocking for NSFNET and COST239<sup>5</sup>, while FF-KSP is better for USNET and JPN48, with an order of magnitude lower blocking probability on JPN48 compared to the next best heuristic.

In summary, we highlight the generally strong performance of the KSP-FF and FF-KSP heuristics but do not draw conclusions as to which is best in general, and encourage thorough analysis to determine the strongest heuristic benchmark for a particular problem, as we have exemplified here. We also emphasize the importance of selecting optimal path ordering for heuristics, as this can have a significant impact on performance.

<sup>4</sup>We consider the DeepRMSA problem settings in these experiments because it is used by most of the papers presented in Section 5.

<sup>5</sup>Although Figure 5 shows KME-FF gives slightly lower blocking than KSP-FF at lower traffic, we prefer KSP-FF for benchmarking purposes because of its widespread use and its greater simplicity.

We find #hops ordering is superior to #km for reduced blocking probability, as evidenced in Section 5 Figure 7.

## 5. REPRODUCTION AND BENCHMARKING OF PREVIOUS WORK

As discussed in our literature review (Section 3), it is difficult to assess progress in the field due to several factors, particularly the diversity of problem definitions and use of weak benchmarks. To address this, we exactly recreate the problem settings from five influential papers from the literature, and apply the best-performing heuristics from Section 4 in each case.

In this section, we first provide analysis of holding time truncation, an implementation detail present in the DeepRMSA codebase that significantly affects the blocking probability. We then present the results of our reproductions of the selected papers and compare to the heuristics, which show superior performance to all of the published RL solutions.

We have corresponded with the authors of all of the selected papers to clarify details of their implementation and ensure that our reproductions exactly match all the relevant details of their problems.

We use our high-performance simulation framework, XLRON [143], for all experiments. It has demonstrated 10x faster execution on CPU and over 1000x faster when parallelized on GPU compared to optical-rl-gym [130]. This is possible due to its array-based data model and use of the JAX numerical array computing framework, that enables just-in-time compilation to accelerator hardware. It also offers a complete suite of unit tests for core functionality, making it reliable, and includes all the problem definitions of the selected papers. We use it for these reasons and for its simple command-line interface, which facilitates experiment automation and reproducibility.

### A. Holding time truncation

DeepRMSA, Reward-RMSA, and GCN-RMSA use the same original DeepRMSA codebase as the basis for their experiments. This codebase includes a significant detail: the service holding time is resampled if the resulting value is more than twice the mean of the exponential probability density function (PDF). We refer to this detail as holding time truncation. In order to recreate the problems from these papers, we analyze the effect of holding time truncation.


#### A.1. Experiment setup

To understand the effect of truncation on the traffic statistics, we define an inverse exponential PDF that is normalized to have unit mean. We take  $10^6$  samples from the PDF, both with and without truncation, and calculate the mean of the resulting sample populations in both cases.


#### A.2. Results and discussion

Figure 6 compares histograms of service holding times with and without truncation. We define the bin width as 0.01 and normalize the count per bin to give a peak density of 1 without truncation. The truncated case shows a cutoff at twice the mean holding time. The vertical lines indicate the mean holding time for each case.


Holding time truncation reduces the mean by approximately 31%. This results in 31% lower traffic load. Therefore, papers that use the DeepRMSA codebase (including DeepRMSA, Reward-RMSA, and GCN-RMSA) evaluate their solutions at traffic loads 31% lower than reported. This detail is not made




**Fig. 3.** Service blocking probability (SBP) for heuristics at fixed traffic and varying numbers of candidate paths (K). The mean and standard deviation (shaded area) are calculated from 3000 trials of 10,000 traffic requests per data point. Increasing K decreases the SBP for most heuristics. KSP-FF and FF-KSP give lowest SBP, depending on topology.



**Fig. 4.** Service blocking probability (SBP) for KSP-FF at varying traffic loads and K values. The mean and standard deviation (shaded area) are calculated from 3000 trials of 10,000 traffic requests per data point. For all traffic loads, increasing K decreases SBP for KSP-FF. Improvements saturate at high K.



**Fig. 5.** Service blocking probability (SBP) for heuristics at varying traffic load for K=50. The mean and standard deviation (shaded area) are calculated from 3000 trials of 10,000 traffic requests per data point. KSP-FF is the best heuristic for NSFNET and COST239. FF-KSP is best for USNET and JPN48.



**Fig. 6.** Histogram of service holding times. The truncated distribution resamples the holding time when the sampled value exceeds  $2 \times \text{mean}$ . This reduces the mean holding time by 31% compared to the exponential distribution.

explicit in the published papers. This finding highlights the challenges in making fair comparisons between papers, and the need for transparency in research code.

## B. Reproduction of published results

Our analysis of the best performing heuristics, of holding time truncation, and our correspondence with the authors enables us to benchmark the published results from the five selected influential papers. The aim of this comparison is to determine if any of the published RL solutions achieve lower SBP than the heuristics.

### B.1. Experiment methodology

We recreate the problems from each selected paper in our own simulation framework [130]. We match the topologies (NSFNET, COST239, JPN48, USNET), mean service arrival rates, mean service holding times, data-rate or bandwidth request distributions, and uniform traffic matrices. We use the same measurement methodology as described in the respective papers to reproduce results, which is 3000 request warm-up period (to allow the network blocking probability to reach steady-state after the ‘initial transient’ [144]) followed by 10,000 requests. The SBP is calculated at the end of the episode. We run 10 independent episodes at each traffic load per problem and calculate the mean and standard deviation across trials.

We extract published results for KSP-FF and RL solutions from the papers, using textual values where available otherwise reading from charts. All published results report only a single data point for each traffic value, without any uncertainty.

We check that our results for KSP-FF with  $K=5$  (green line in Figure 7) match the published results for KSP-FF (blue line in Figure 7) within two standard deviations to ensure faithful reproduction. This comparison gives us a high degree of confidence that we have exactly recreated each problem setting.

### B.2. Results and discussion

Figure 7 shows our reproduction of results from the selected papers, with SBP against traffic load in Erlangs in each subplot. The plots are organized by paper (columns) and topology (rows). PtrNet-RSA has two columns reflecting its two test cases: networks with 40 FSU per link and 1 FSU requests, and networks

with 80 FSU per link and 1-4 FSU requests. PtrNet-RSA only considers fixed-bandwidth requests (no distance-dependent modulation format).

Each plot contains 5 datasets:

**RL:** Published results for the RL approach

**5-SP-FF<sub>published</sub>:** Published results for KSP-FF ( $K=5$ ) with paths ordered by #km

**5-SP-FF<sub>ours</sub>:** Our results for KSP-FF ( $K=5$ ) with paths ordered by #km

**5-SP-FF<sub>hops</sub>:** Our results for KSP-FF ( $K=5$ ) with paths ordered by #hops

**50-SP-FF<sub>hops</sub>:** Our results for KSP-FF ( $K=50$ ) with paths ordered by #hops

Points show mean values from our simulations, with shaded areas indicating standard deviation and lines interpolating between points. The DeepRMSA paper provides data for only one traffic load per topology. The excellent agreement between 5-SP-FF<sub>published</sub> and 5-SP-FF<sub>ours</sub> in all cases confirms that our framework accurately reproduces the published scenarios.

From Figure 7, we highlight the comparisons of ‘RL’ (red) with 5-SP-FF<sub>hops</sub> (orange), and 50-SP-FF<sub>hops</sub> (purple). 5-SP-FF<sub>hops</sub> reduces the blocking probability by up to an order of magnitude compared to RL in all cases for NSFNET, 4/5 cases for COST239 and 1/3 cases for USNET. This shows that ordering paths by #hops is sufficient to beat the RL results in these cases.

For larger topologies, considering more candidate paths ( $K>5$ ) improves the heuristic performance significantly, often by over an order of magnitude. As shown by Figure 7, 50-SP-FF<sub>hops</sub> gives the lowest SBP of all approaches in all cases, except the bottom right.

The single exception where RL outperforms 50-SP-FF<sub>hops</sub> is PtrNet-RSA-80 USNET. We consider it plausible that the pointer-net architecture is a contributing factor to this strong performance, as it is not limited to selecting from a pre-defined set of paths. However, as the published results in this case fall within one standard deviation of the mean for 50-SP-FF<sub>hops</sub>, the result could be spurious. This highlights the need for summary statistics and confidence intervals from multiple trials to be included with published results.

In summary, the results show that making minor changes (ordering paths by #hops and considering more paths) to simple heuristic algorithms is sufficient to achieve lower blocking probability than sophisticated RL solutions that have been published.


We highlight that this analysis, and the selected papers, focus on SBP as the optimization objective. In realistic scenarios, network blocking or throughput must be balanced with other metrics such as latency and cost of operation from transceiver launch power, amplifiers, and other network elements. Future research should therefore focus on problems that take a holistic approach to network operations optimization with multiple objectives [57], and incorporate sophisticated models of all physical layer effects for improved accuracy [145, 146].

All data shown in Figure 7 is provided in tabular form in Appendix A.

## 6. NETWORK BLOCKING BOUNDS

We have demonstrated in Section 5 that many influential works on RL for DRA problems in optical networks have failed to improve on a simple heuristic algorithm. The extent to which it is possible to reduce the blocking probability, and increase





**Fig. 7.** Mean SBP against traffic load. Each column is a publication and each subplot is for a topology. Error bars and shaded areas show standard deviations.  $50\text{-SP-FF}_{hops}$  exceeds or matches the  $RL$  performance for each case.

supported traffic, is an important motivating factor in any future research into this topic.

To understand the limits of blocking probability, we derive empirical lower bounds. By comparing these lower bounds to the performance of our best solution for a target SBP, we can estimate the additional traffic load that can be supported and, therefore, the maximum benefit from applying an intelligent resource allocation method such as  $RL$ .

As discussed in section 2, DRA problems in optical networks that require RSA are subject to at least three constraints: spectrum continuity, spectrum contiguity, and no reconfiguration. By relaxing any of these constraints, the optimal or near-optimal solution of the relaxed problem is a bound on the solution of the full problem. The cut-sets bound method of Cruzado et al [147, 148] relaxes the spectrum continuity constraint and uses insights from the min-cut max-flow theorem to estimate a lower bound SBP. We instead relax the constraint on reconfiguring already-established connections, a process known as defragmentation.

We couple this defragmentation with resource prioritization: sorting the active connection requests by their required resources and allocating them sequentially. The sorting of active requests in descending order of required resources was found to improve the achievable capacity to optimal or near-optimal by Baroni [142] in static RWA and later Beghelli [149] for dynamic RWA, a method they refer to as ‘reconfigurable routing’. Since our problem settings are elastic optical networks, we prefer the term defragmentation. The intuition behind this approach is to allocate larger requests first so that requests with shorter paths and

lower spectral requirements may be squeezed into remaining spectral gaps later.

### Resource-Prioritized Defragmentation

The resource-prioritized defragmentation blocking bound algorithm is outlined in Algorithm 2. It utilizes four key subroutines:

- $\text{REMOVEEXPIREDREQUESTS}(N, t)$  maintains network state by removing connections that have expired. For current time  $t$ , and request with arrival time  $t_{\text{arrival}}$  and holding time  $t_{\text{holding}}$ , the expiry condition is defined as:  $t_{\text{arrival}} + t_{\text{holding}} < t$ .
- $\text{ALLOCATEREQUEST}(N, \text{request})$  establishes a new connection subject to continuity and contiguity constraints. We use the KSP-FF or FF-KSP algorithm with  $K=50$ . We select the algorithm that produces the lowest SBP for the problem instance.
- $\text{GETACTIVEREQUESTS}(\mathcal{R}, t)$  identifies requests where  $t_{\text{arrival}} \leq t < t_{\text{arrival}} + t_{\text{holding}}$ , determining which connections require reallocation during defragmentation.
- $\text{SORTBYRESOURCE}(\text{requests})$  orders active requests by required resources (product of required spectral slots and hops of shortest path), prioritizing larger requests during reallocation to maximize the probability of finding viable configurations.

A shortcoming of our method of blocking bound estimation is its reliance on the internal  $\text{ALLOCATEREQUEST}$  heuristic. To

### Algorithm 1. Resource-Prioritized Defragmentation Blocking Bound Estimation

**Require:** Network topology  $G$ , Set of requests  $\mathcal{R}$ , Number of frequency slots per link  $F$

**Ensure:** Blocking probability  $P_b$

- 1:  $N \leftarrow \text{INITIALIZENETWORK}(G, F)$   $\triangleright$  Initialize network with empty spectrum slots
- 2:  $blocked \leftarrow 0$
- 3: **for**  $t \leftarrow 1$  to  $|\mathcal{R}|$  **do**
- 4:    $N \leftarrow \text{REMOVEEXPIREDREQUESTS}(N, t)$
- 5:    $r_t \leftarrow \text{current request from } \mathcal{R}$
- 6:    $success \leftarrow \text{ALLOCATEREQUEST}(N, r_t)$
- 7:   **if not**  $success$  **then**
- 8:      $active\_requests \leftarrow \text{GETACTIVEREQUESTS}(\mathcal{R}, t)$
- 9:      $sorted\_requests \leftarrow \text{SORTBYRESOURCE}(active\_requests)$
- 10:      $N_{temp} \leftarrow \text{INITIALIZENETWORK}(G, F)$
- 11:      $blocking \leftarrow \text{false}$
- 12:     **for**  $r \in sorted\_requests$  **do**
- 13:        $success \leftarrow \text{ALLOCATEREQUEST}(N_{temp}, r)$
- 14:       **if not**  $success$  **then**
- 15:          $blocking \leftarrow \text{true}$
- 16:         **break**
- 17:     **if not**  $blocking$  **then**
- 18:        $N \leftarrow N_{temp}$
- 19:     **else**
- 20:        $blocked \leftarrow blocked + 1$
- 21: **return**  $\frac{blocked}{|\mathcal{R}|}$

have confidence that the solution presents a true upper bound, the allocation method must be as close to optimal as possible. We therefore evaluate multiple heuristics for each case, as shown in Section 4, and select the one with lowest SBP. We find the best performing heuristic is KSP-FF<sub>hops</sub> with K=50 for most cases, except MaskRSA JPN48 which is FF-KSP.

An advantage of our method compared to cut-sets analysis is it computes an allocation that is guaranteed to be physically possible, as it relaxes the ‘No Reconfiguration’ constraint instead of the physical spectrum continuity constraint. Relaxing the ‘No Reconfiguration’ constraint makes Algorithm 1 omniscient (it has complete knowledge of requests to be allocated) rather than a strictly on-line algorithm, according to definitions from Awerbuch et al [150]. This gives Algorithm 1 a fundamental competitive advantage over on-line algorithms like KSP-FF/FF-KSP, therefore it can be considered a lower bound estimator of blocking probability.

We note that our algorithm is general and can be applied to any DRA problem in optical networks by using a strong heuristic for ALLOCATEREQUEST and defining the resource-based sort criteria appropriately.

#### A. Experiment setup

For each problem from the five selected papers, we run the best performing heuristic for a range of traffic loads that result in SBP from 0.01% to 1%. For the lowest-blocking heuristic and for Algorithm 1, we run 10 episodes of 10,000 requests with unique random seeds and calculate the mean and standard deviation of SBP across episodes. We calculate the mean and standard deviation SBP across episodes in each case.

We compare the resulting SBP from the best heuristic and from algorithm 1. We seek to estimate the additional network capacity that can be achieved at 0.1% SBP for each case of study

from the five selected papers. We select 0.1% SBP to align with previous studies of network throughput estimation by Cruzado et al [147, 148].

#### B. Results and discussion

Similar to Figure 7, each subplot in Figure 7 represents a different problem instance. DeepRMSA, Reward-RMSA, and GCN-RMSA are combined into a single set of plots since they use identical topologies and traffic models. The purple lines show the best performing heuristic in each case (KSP-FF with K=50, or FF-KSP for JPN48), with paths sorted in ascending order of number of hops. The grey lines show the resource-prioritized defragmentation bounds. At 0.1% SBP, we compare the network traffic loads that can be supported in each case, with the difference highlighted by a red horizontal line. The relative increase in network capacity is calculated as the difference between the upper bound traffic load and the heuristic traffic load, as a percentage of the heuristic load.

PtrNet-RSA-40 shows differences of 5%, 1%, and 9% across its three test cases. These relatively low values are due to the fixed width requests size of 1 FSU used in this case, which makes it equivalent to RWA and reduces the impact of fragmentation compared to RSA/RMSA.


For the Deep/Reward/GCN-RMSA, MaskRSA and PtrNet-RSA-80 cases, the difference between the supported traffic in the heuristic case and the upper bound ranges from 19% (MaskRSA JPN48) to 36% (Deep/Reward/GCN-RMSA NSFNET). These results show larger but comparable optimality gaps to those from the cut-sets method of Cruzado et al. [148], who found gaps of 5% to 16% in their cases of study. This shows that defragmentation can unlock significant network capacity, but it is unknown theoretically how close an intelligent online allocation method, such as RL, can come to this bound. This will be the subject of future research.

#### 7. CONCLUSION

Our review of the field of RL applied to DRA problems in optical networks shows that it has been the subject of significant research interest, with almost 100 peer-reviewed papers published so far. Many technical innovations from ML research, such as improved RL algorithms [41], invalid action masking [34, 36, 55], and GNNs [35, 95, 151], have been applied to the problem area and have demonstrated incremental improvements in network blocking.

However, the field has suffered from a lack of standardization in problems, unrigorous selection of benchmark algorithms, and poor practices for reproducibility. We have addressed these problems by developing a simulation framework that can recreate diverse network simulations and allow fast benchmarking of heuristic algorithms. We apply of this framework to five influential papers from the field and identify the best heuristics in all cases to be either KSP-FF or FF-KSP with K=50. We highlight the result that ordering the pre-computed shortest paths by number of hops gives significantly lower blocking probability than ordering by distance.

Our most significant findings are in the benchmarking of published RL results. By extracting the published results of KSP-FF and RL from the selected papers, and using the best heuristic benchmarks, we show that simple heuristics can exceed or match the results from RL in all cases, often with over an order of magnitude lower service blocking probability. This shows the relative performance of RL on these problems has



**Fig. 8.** Mean SBP against traffic load for the lowest-blocking heuristic in each case (KSP-FF or FF-KSP with  $K=50$ ) and the estimated bound from Algorithm 1. Each column is a publication and each subplot is for a topology. Shaded areas show standard deviations. Red lines and text indicate relative increase in supported traffic at 0.1% SBP from heuristic to bound.

been overestimated due to weak benchmarks, and highlights the need for more rigorous standards for evaluation in this area to avoid trivial results.

Finally, to ascertain the practical value of pursuing further research into these problems, we provide a method of estimating the lower bound network blocking probability, that we term Resource-Prioritized Defragmentation. Compared to the best heuristics available for each case, this method estimates the additional traffic load that can be supported on elastic networks is approximately 19% to 36%. Considering that data traffic is projected to increase at 20% annually until 2029 [152], it is an open question if the additional percentage gains in network throughput are worth pursuing with RL, or if research into network optimization with RL should focus on other objectives for which there are not yet good heuristic solutions.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) grant EP/S022139/1 - the Centre for Doctoral Training in Connected Electronic and Photonic Systems - and EPSRC Programme Grant TRANSNET EP/R035342/1. In addition, Polina Bayvel is supported through a Royal Society Research Professorship.

## REFERENCES

1. A. Lord, C. White, and A. Iqbal, "Future Optical Networks in a 10 Year Time Frame," in *2021 Optical Fiber Communications Conference and*

2. M. Shtaf, C. Antonelli, A. Mecozzi, and X. Chen, "The Information Capacity of the Fiber-Optic Channel: Bounds and prospects," in *2024 Optical Fiber Communications Conference and Exhibition (OFC)*, (2024), pp. 1–3.
3. P. J. Winzer, "The future of communications is massively parallel," *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **15**, 783 (2023).
4. N. Di Cicco, E. F. Merca, O. Karandin, O. Ayoub, S. Troia, F. Musumeci, and M. Tornatore, "On Deep Reinforcement Learning for Static Routing and Wavelength Assignment," *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Quantum Electron.* **28**, 1–12 (2022).
5. F. N. Khan, "Non-technological barriers: the last frontier towards AI-powered intelligent optical networks," *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 5995 (2024).
6. M. Doherty, "micdoh/XLRON: Reinforcement Learning for Dynamic Resource Allocation in Optical Networks: Hype or Hope?" (2024). URL: <https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.14561463> (accessed 2024-12-27).
7. J.-L. Augé, "Can we use Flexible Transponders to Reduce Margins?" in *Optical Fiber Communication Conference/National Fiber Optic Engineers Conference 2013*, (OSA, Anaheim, California, 2013), p. OTu2A.1.
8. Y. Pointurier, "Design of Low-Margin Optical Networks," *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **9**, A9 (2017).
9. D. Hassabis, "Nobel Prize Lecture," (2024). URL: <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/chemistry/2024/hassabis/lecture/> (accessed 2024-12-25).
10. X. Chen, B. Li, R. Proietti, H. Lu, Z. Zhu, and S. J. B. Yoo, "DeepRMSA: A Deep Reinforcement Learning Framework for Routing, Modulation and Spectrum Assignment in Elastic Optical Networks," *J. Light. Technol.* **37**, 4155–4163 (2019).
11. A. Lord, S. J. Savory, M. Tornatore, and A. Mitra, "Flexible Technologies to Increase Optical Network Capacity," *Proc. IEEE* **110**, 1714–1724

- (2022).
12. B. Mukherjee, I. Tomkos, M. Tornatore, P. Winzer, and Y. Zhao, eds., *Springer Handbook of Optical Networks*, Springer Handbooks (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020).
  13. D. J. Ives, P. Bayvel, and S. J. Savory, "Routing, modulation, spectrum and launch power assignment to maximize the traffic throughput of a nonlinear optical mesh network," *Photonic Netw. Commun.* **29**, 244–256 (2015).
  14. F. Arpanaei, M. R. Zefreh, J. A. Hernández, B. Shariati, J. Fischer, J. M. Rivas-Moscoso, F. Jiménez, J. P. Fernández-Palacios, and D. Larrabeiti, "Launch Power Optimization for Dynamic Elastic Optical Networks over C+L Bands," arXiv. (2023).
  15. L. Gong and Z. Zhu, "Virtual Optical Network Embedding (VONE) Over Elastic Optical Networks," *J. Light. Technol.* **32**, 450–460 (2014).
  16. M. Doherty and A. Beghelli, "Deep Reinforcement Learning for Infrastructure as a Service over Flexible Optical Networks," (IEEE, Glasgow, UK, 2023).
  17. C. Zhou, B. Zhao, J. Tao, and B. Wang, "Applications of Reinforcement Learning in Virtual Network Function Placement: A Survey," in *2022 18th International Conference on Mobility, Sensing and Networking (MSN)*, (IEEE, Guangzhou, China, 2022), pp. 871–876.
  18. O. Gerstel, M. Jinno, A. Lord, and S. B. Yoo, "Elastic optical networking: a new dawn for the optical layer?" *IEEE Commun. Mag.* **50**, s12–s20 (2012).
  19. S. Balasubramanian, V. Dangui, J. P. Eason, and S. Singh Ahuja, "Targeted Defragmentation of a Production Optical Network," in *2023 International Conference on Optical Network Design and Modeling (ONDM)*, (IEEE, Coimbra, Portugal, 2023), pp. 1–3.
  20. I. Chlamtac, A. Ganz, and G. Karmi, "Lightpath communications: an approach to high bandwidth optical WAN's," *IEEE Transactions on Commun.* **40**, 1171–1182 (1992).
  21. K. Walkowiak, P. Lechowicz, M. Klinkowski, and A. Sen, "ILP modeling of flexgrid SDM optical networks," in *2016 17th International Telecommunications Network Strategy and Planning Symposium (Networks)*, (2016), pp. 121–126.
  22. B. Jaumard, A. Mohammed, and Q. A. Nguyen, "Decomposition Models for the Routing and Slot Provisioning Problem," in *2023 International Conference on Computing, Networking and Communications (ICNC)*, (2023), pp. 659–665.
  23. Y. Goto, S. Shinada, Y. Hirota, and H. Furukawa, "LCOS-based Flexible Optical Switch for Heterogeneous SDM Fiber Networks," in *2024 24th International Conference on Transparent Optical Networks (ICTON)*, (2024), pp. 1–4.
  24. R. J. Vincent, D. J. Ives, and S. J. Savory, "Scalable Capacity Estimation for Nonlinear Elastic All-Optical Core Networks," *J. Light. Technol.* **37**, 5380–5391 (2019).
  25. F. S. Abkenar, A. Ghaffarpour Rahbar, and A. Ebrahimzadeh, "Best fit (BF): A new Spectrum Allocation mechanism in Elastic Optical Networks (EONs)," in *2016 8th International Symposium on Telecommunications (IST)*, (2016), pp. 24–29.
  26. P. Wright, M. C. Parker, and A. Lord, "Minimum- and maximum-entropy routing and spectrum assignment for flexgrid elastic optical networking [invited]," *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **7**, A66–A72 (2015).
  27. B. Tang, Y.-C. Huang, Y. Xue, and W. Zhou, "Heuristic Reward Design for Deep Reinforcement Learning-Based Routing, Modulation and Spectrum Assignment of Elastic Optical Networks," *IEEE Commun. Lett.* **26**, 2675–2679 (2022).
  28. S. J. Savory, "Congestion Aware Routing in Nonlinear Elastic Optical Networks," *IEEE Photonics Technol. Lett.* **26**, 1057–1060 (2014).
  29. A. Hassan and C. Phillips, "Chaotic Particle Swarm Optimization for Dynamic Routing and Wavelength Assignment in All-Optical WDM networks," in *2009 3rd International Conference on Signal Processing and Communication Systems*, (2009), pp. 1–7.
  30. R. S. Barpanda, A. K. Turuk, B. Sahoo, and B. Majhi, "Genetic Algorithm techniques to solve Routing and Wavelength Assignment problem in Wavelength Division Multiplexing all-optical networks," in *2011 Third International Conference on Communication Systems and Networks (COMSNETS 2011)*, (IEEE, Bangalore, 2011), pp. 1–8.
  31. R. Bellman, "The theory of dynamic programming," *Bull. Am. Math. Soc.* **60**, 503–515 (1954).
  32. R. BELLMAN, "A Markovian Decision Process," *J. Math. Mech.* **6**, 679–684 (1957). Publisher: Indiana University Mathematics Department.
  33. A. B. Terki, J. Pedro, A. Eira, A. Napoli, and N. Sambo, "Routing and Spectrum Assignment Based on Reinforcement Learning in Multi-Band Optical Networks," in *2023 International Conference on Photonics in Switching and Computing (PSC)*, (IEEE, Mantova, Italy, 2023), pp. 1–3.
  34. M. Shimoda and T. Tanaka, "Mask RSA: End-To-End Reinforcement Learning-based Routing and Spectrum Assignment in Elastic Optical Networks," in *2021 European Conference on Optical Communication (ECOC)*, (IEEE, Bordeaux, France, 2021), pp. 1–4.
  35. L. Xu, Y.-C. Huang, Y. Xue, and X. Hu, "Deep Reinforcement Learning-Based Routing and Spectrum Assignment of EONs by Exploiting GCN and RNN for Feature Extraction," *J. Light. Technol.* **40**, 4945–4955 (2022).
  36. Y. Cheng, S. Ding, Y. Shao, and C.-K. Chan, "PtrNet-RSA: A Pointer Network-based QoT-aware Routing and Spectrum Assignment Scheme in Elastic Optical Networks," *J. Light. Technol.* pp. 1–12 (2024).
  37. R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto, *Reinforcement learning: an introduction (2nd ed.)*, Adaptive computation and machine learning (MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass, 2018).
  38. C. Watkins, "Learning from Delayed Reward," Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge University (1989).
  39. R. S. Sutton, "Learning to predict by the methods of temporal differences," *Mach. Learn.* **3**, 9–44 (1988).
  40. N. B. Bryant, K. K. Chung, J. Feng, S. Harris, K. N. Umeh, and M. Aibin, "Q-Learning Based Routing in Optical Networks," in *2022 IEEE Canadian Conference on Electrical and Computer Engineering (CCECE)*, (IEEE, Halifax, NS, Canada, 2022), pp. 419–422.
  41. V. Mnih, A. P. Badia, M. Mirza, A. Graves, T. P. Lillicrap, T. Harley, D. Silver, and K. Kavukcuoglu, "Asynchronous Methods for Deep Reinforcement Learning," (2016). URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1602.01783> (accessed 2023-09-26), arXiv:1602.01783 [cs].
  42. J. Schulman, F. Wolski, P. Dhariwal, A. Radford, and O. Klimov, "Proximal Policy Optimization Algorithms," (2017). URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1707.06347> (accessed 2023-01-20), arXiv:1707.06347 [cs].
  43. International Telecommunication Union, "Spectral grids for WDM applications: CWDM wavelength grid," Recommendation G.694.2, ITU Telecommunication Standardization Sector (2002).
  44. International Telecommunication Union, "Transmission characteristics of optical components and subsystems," Recommendation G.671, ITU Telecommunication Standardization Sector (2012).
  45. P. Garcia, A. Zsigri, and A. Guitton, "A multicast reinforcement learning algorithm for WDM optical networks," in *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Telecommunications, 2003. ConTEL 2003.*, (IEEE, Zagreb, Croatia, 2003), pp. 419–426 vol.2.
  46. Y. Pointurier and F. Heidari, "Reinforcement learning based routing in all-optical networks," in *2007 Fourth International Conference on Broadband Communications, Networks and Systems (BROADNETS '07)*, (IEEE, Raleigh, NC, USA, 2007), pp. 919–921.
  47. I. Koyanagi, T. Tachibana, and K. Sugimoto, "A Reinforcement Learning-Based Lightpath Establishment for Service Differentiation in All-Optical WDM Networks," in *GLOBECOM 2009 - 2009 IEEE Global Telecommunications Conference*, (IEEE, Honolulu, Hawaii, 2009), pp. 1–6.
  48. J. Suárez-Varela, A. Mestres, J. Yu, L. Kuang, H. Feng, A. Cabellós-Aparicio, and P. Barlet-Ros, "Routing in optical transport networks with deep reinforcement learning," *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **11**, 547 (2019).
  49. R. Shiraki, Y. Mori, H. Hasegawa, and K.-i. Sato, "Dynamic Control of Transparent Optical Networks with Adaptive State-Value Assessment Enabled by Reinforcement Learning," in *2019 21st International Conference on Transparent Optical Networks (ICTON)*, (IEEE, Angers, France, 2019), pp. 1–4.
  50. R. Shiraki, Y. Mori, H. Hasegawa, and K.-i. Sato, "Reinforcement-learning-based optical-path routing and wavelength assignment with adaptation to traffic-distribution change," *IEICE Tech. Report; IEICE Tech. Rep.* **119**, 23–27 (2019). Publisher: IEICE.

51. Y.-C. Huang, J. Zhang, and S. Yu, "Self-learning Routing for Optical Networks," in *Optical Network Design and Modeling*, vol. 11616 A. Tzanakaki, M. Varvarigos, R. Muñoz, R. Nejabati, N. Yoshikane, M. Anastasopoulos, and J. Marquez-Barja, eds. (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020), pp. 467–478. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.
52. Z. Zhao, Y. Zhao, H. Ma, Y. Li, S. Rahman, D. Han, H. Zhang, and J. Zhang, "Cost-efficient routing, modulation, wavelength and port assignment using reinforcement learning in optical transport networks," *Opt. Fiber Technol.* **64**, 102571 (2021).
53. M. Freire-Hermelo, A. Lavignotte, and C. Lepers, "Dynamic Modulation Format and Wavelength Assignment in Optical Networks using Reinforcement Learning," in *OSA Advanced Photonics Congress 2021*, (Optica Publishing Group, Washington, DC, 2021), p. NeF2B.4.
54. Y. Liu, B. Chen, G. Su, M. Dai, and X. Lin, "A Waveband Routing Method in Optical Networks Based on the Deep Reinforcement Learning," in *26th Optoelectronics and Communications Conference*, (Optica Publishing Group, Hong Kong, 2021), p. JS3C.1.
55. J. W. Nevin, S. Nallaperuma, N. A. Shevchenko, Z. Shabka, G. Zervas, and S. J. Savory, "Techniques for applying reinforcement learning to routing and wavelength assignment problems in optical fiber communication networks," *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **14**, 733–748 (2022).
56. N. Di Cicco, M. Ibrahim, S. Troia, and M. Tornatore, "DeepLS: Local Search for Network Optimization based on Lightweight Deep Reinforcement Learning," *IEEE Transactions on Netw. Serv. Manag.* pp. 1–1 (2023).
57. S. Nallaperuma, Z. Gan, J. Nevin, M. Shevchenko, and S. J. Savory, "Interpreting multi-objective reinforcement learning for routing and wavelength assignment in optical networks," *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **15**, 497 (2023).
58. R. R. Reyes and T. Bauschert, "Adaptive and State-Dependent Online Resource Allocation in Dynamic Optical Networks," *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **9**, B64 (2017).
59. B. Li and Z. Zhu, "DeepCoop: Leveraging Cooperative DRL Agents to Achieve Scalable Network Automation for Multi-Domain SD-EONs," in *2020 Optical Fiber Communications Conference and Exhibition (OFC)*, (2020), pp. 1–3.
60. X. Li, Y. Zhao, Y. Li, S. Rahman, F. Wang, X. Li, and J. Zhang, "Multi-Objective Routing and Resource Allocation Based on Reinforcement Learning in Optical Transport Networks," in *Asia Communications and Photonics Conference/International Conference on Information Photonics and Optical Communications 2020 (ACP/IPOC)*, (Optica Publishing Group, Beijing, 2020), p. M4A.205.
61. R. Romero Reyes and T. Bauschert, "Towards DRL-based Routing and Spectrum Assignment in Optical Networks: Lessons to be Learned from Markov Decision Processes," in *2021 IEEE Latin-American Conference on Communications (LATINCOM)*, (IEEE, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, 2021), pp. 1–6.
62. Z. Zhao, Y. Zhao, Y. Li, S. Rahman, D. Han, and J. Zhang, "Reinforced Resource Allocation based on n-Dimensional Matrix Diagram for Multi-Modal Optical Networks," in *26th Optoelectronics and Communications Conference*, (Optica Publishing Group, Hong Kong, 2021), p. JS2A.1.
63. Y. Wang, Y. Mori, and H. Hasegawa, "Dynamic Routing and Spectrum Allocation Based on Actor-critic Learning for Multi-fiber Elastic Optical Networks," in *Photonics in Switching and Computing 2021*, (Optica Publishing Group, Washington, DC, 2021), p. W1B.3.
64. H. T. Quang, O. Houidi, J. Errea-Moreno, D. Verchère, and D. Zeghlache, "MAGC-RSA: Multi-Agent Graph Convolutional Reinforcement Learning for Distributed Routing and Spectrum Assignment in Elastic Optical Networks," *2022 Eur. Conf. on Opt. Commun. (ECOC)* pp. 1–4 (2022).
65. K. Cruzado, R. Shiraki, Y. Mori, T. Tanaka, K. Higashimori, F. Inuzuka, T. Ohara, and H. Hasegawa, "Reinforcement-Learning-based Network Design and Control with Stepwise Reward Variation and Link-Adjacency Embedding," in *2022 European Conference on Optical Communication (ECOC)*, (2022), pp. 1–4.
66. L. Zhao, S. Yin, Y. Chai, Y. Jiao, and S. Huang, "A RSA Policy with Failure Probability Based on Reinforcement Learning in Multi-band Optical Network," in *2022 20th International Conference on Optical Communications and Networks (ICOON)*, (2022), pp. 1–3.
67. Y. Jiao, S. Yin, T. Jin, L. Liu, L. Zhao, and S. Huang, "Reliability-Oriented RSA Combined with Reinforcement Learning in Elastic Optical Networks," in *2022 20th International Conference on Optical Communications and Networks (ICOON)*, (IEEE, Shenzhen, China, 2022), pp. 1–3.
68. P. Almasan, J. Suárez-Varela, K. Rusek, P. Barlet-Ros, and A. Cabellos-Aparicio, "Deep reinforcement learning meets graph neural networks: Exploring a routing optimization use case," *Comput. Commun.* **196**, 184–194 (2022).
69. G. Zhang, H. Ding, Y. Wang, L. Wang, and X. Han, "A Service Routing Optimization Algorithm for Power Communication Optical Transport Network Based on Knowledge Graph and Reinforcement Learning," in *Proceedings of 2021 International Conference on Autonomous Unmanned Systems (ICAUS 2021)*, vol. 861 M. Wu, Y. Niu, M. Gu, and J. Cheng, eds. (Springer Singapore, Singapore, 2022), pp. 1337–1346. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering.
70. S. Arce, L. A. Albertini, I. Rios, D. P. Pinto-Roa, J. Colbes, and M. Vilagra, "Reinforcement Learning applied to the Routing and Spectrum Assignment in Elastic Optical Networks," in *2022 IEEE Latin American Conference on Computational Intelligence (LA-CCL)*, (IEEE, Montevideo, Uruguay, 2022), pp. 1–6.
71. P. Sharma, S. Gupta, V. Bhatia, and S. Prakash, "Deep reinforcement learning-based routing and resource assignment in quantum key distribution-secured optical networks," *IET Quantum Commun.* **4**, 136–145 (2023).
72. X. Lin, Y.-C. Huang, H. Zhang, and J. Zhang, "A Deep-Reinforcement-Learning-based Dynamic Scheduling of Delay-Tolerant Requests in Elastic Optical Networks," in *2023 Asia Communications and Photonics Conference/2023 International Photonics and Optoelectronics Meetings (ACP/POEM)*, (2023), pp. 01–04.
73. C. Hernández-Chulde, R. Casellas, R. Martínez, R. Vilalta, and R. Muñoz, "Experimental evaluation of a latency-aware routing and spectrum assignment mechanism based on deep reinforcement learning," *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **15**, 925–937 (2023). Publisher: Optica Publishing Group.
74. J. Chen, X. Li, J. Wu, Y. Zheng, and W. Xiao, "GSADDQN: Combining GraphSAGE and reinforcement learning for routing optimization in software-defined optical transport network," *Opt. Fiber Technol.* **89**, 104059 (2024).
75. Y. Wang, Y. Mori, and H. Hasegawa, "Resource Assignment based on Core-State Value Evaluation to Handle Crosstalk and Spectrum Fragments in SDM Elastic Optical Networks," in *2020 Opto-Electronics and Communications Conference (OECC)*, (IEEE, Taipei, Taiwan, 2020), pp. 1–3.
76. C. Shi, M. Zhu, J. Gu, T. Shen, and X. Ren, "Deep-reinforced impairment-aware dynamic resource allocation in nonlinear elastic optical networks," in *26th Optoelectronics and Communications Conference*, (Optica Publishing Group, Hong Kong, 2021), p. M4A.8.
77. M. Shimoda and T. Tanaka, "Deep Reinforcement Learning-based Spectrum Assignment with Multi-metric Reward Function and Assignable Boundary Slot Mask," in *2021 Opto-Electronics and Communications Conference (OECC)*, (2021), pp. 1–3.
78. N. E. D. E. Sheikh, E. Paz, J. Pinto, and A. Beghelli, "Multi-band provisioning in dynamic elastic optical networks: a comparative study of a heuristic and a deep reinforcement learning approach," in *2021 International Conference on Optical Network Design and Modeling (ONDM)*, (2021), pp. 1–3.
79. L. Xu, Y.-C. Huang, Y. Xue, and X. Hu, "Spectrum Continuity and Contiguity Aware State Representation for Deep Reinforcement Learning-Based Routing of EONs," in *2021 IEEE 6th Optoelectronics Global Conference (OGC)*, (2021), pp. 73–76.
80. X. Chen, R. Proietti, C.-Y. Liu, and S. J. B. Yoo, "A Multi-Task-Learning-Based Transfer Deep Reinforcement Learning Design for Autonomic Optical Networks," *IEEE J. on Sel. Areas Commun.* **39**, 2878–2889 (2021).
81. M. Gonzalez, F. Condon, P. Morales, and N. Jara, "Improving Multi-

- Band Elastic Optical Networks Performance using Behavior Induction on Deep Reinforcement Learning,” in *2022 IEEE Latin-American Conference on Communications (LATINCOM)*, (IEEE, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 2022), pp. 1–6.
82. A. B. Terki, J. Pedro, A. Eira, A. Napoli, and N. Sambo, “Routing and Spectrum Assignment Assisted by Reinforcement Learning in Multi-band Optical Networks,” in *2022 European Conference on Optical Communication (ECOC)*, (2022), pp. 1–4.
  83. B. Tang, Y.-C. Huang, Y. Xue, and W. Zhou, “Deep Reinforcement Learning-Based RMSA Policy Distillation for Elastic Optical Networks,” *Mathematics*. **10**, 3293 (2022).
  84. L. Cheng and Y. Qiu, “Routing and spectrum assignment employing long short-term memory technique for elastic optical networks,” *Opt. Switch. Netw.* **45**, 100684 (2022).
  85. Y. Tu, B. Tang, and Y.-C. Huang, “Entropy-based Reward Design for Deep Reinforcement Learning-enabled Routing, Modulation and Spectrum Assignment of Elastic Optical Networks,” in *2022 Asia Communications and Photonics Conference (ACP)*, (2022), pp. 1168–1172.
  86. J. Momo Ziazet and B. Jaumard, “Deep Reinforcement Learning for Network Provisioning in Elastic Optical Networks,” in *ICC 2022 - IEEE International Conference on Communications*, (IEEE, Seoul, Korea, Republic of, 2022), pp. 4450–4455.
  87. J. Pinto-Ríos, F. Calderón, A. Leiva, G. Hermosilla, A. Beghelli, D. Bórquez-Paredes, A. Lozada, N. Jara, R. Olivares, and G. Saavedra, “Resource Allocation in Multicore Elastic Optical Networks: A Deep Reinforcement Learning Approach,” *Complexity*. **2023**, 1–13 (2023).
  88. J. Errea, D. Djon, H. Q. Tran, D. Verchere, and A. Ksentini, “Deep Reinforcement Learning-aided Fragmentation-aware RMSA Path Computation Engine for Open Disaggregated Transport Networks,” in *2023 International Conference on Optical Network Design and Modeling (ONDM)*, (IEEE, Coimbra, Portugal, 2023), pp. 1–3.
  89. A. Beghelli, P. Morales, E. Viera, N. Jara, D. Bórquez-Paredes, A. Leiva, and G. Saavedra, “Approaches to dynamic provisioning in multiband elastic optical networks,” in *2023 International Conference on Optical Network Design and Modeling (ONDM)*, (2023), pp. 1–6.
  90. T. Tanaka and M. Shimoda, “Pre- and post-processing techniques for reinforcement-learning-based routing and spectrum assignment in elastic optical networks,” *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **15**, 1019–1029 (2023). Publisher: Optica Publishing Group.
  91. L. Xu, Y.-C. Huang, Y. Xue, and X. Hu, “Hierarchical Reinforcement Learning in Multi-Domain Elastic Optical Networks to Realize Joint RMSA,” *J. Light. Technol.* **41**, 2276–2288 (2023).
  92. R. Sadeghi, B. Correia, E. London, A. Napoli, N. Costa, J. Pedro, and V. Curri, “Performance Comparison of Optical Networks Exploiting Multiple and Extended Bands and Leveraging Reinforcement Learning,” in *2023 International Conference on Optical Network Design and Modeling (ONDM)*, (2023), pp. 1–6.
  93. Y. Tang, D. Chen, M. You, and B. Xia, “A Routing and Spectrum Assignment Algorithm for Electric Power Elastic Optical Networks Based on Deep Reinforcement Learning,” in *2023 2nd Asia Power and Electrical Technology Conference (APET)*, (2023), pp. 729–733.
  94. Y. Teng, C. Natalino, H. Li, R. Yang, J. Majeed, S. Shen, P. Monti, R. Nejabati, S. Yan, and D. Simeonidou, “Deep-reinforcement-learning-based RMSCA for space division multiplexing networks with multi-core fibers [Invited Tutorial],” *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **16**, C76 (2024).
  95. Z. Xiong, Y.-C. Huang, and X. Hu, “Graph Attention Network Enhanced Deep Reinforcement Learning Framework for Routing, Modulation, and Spectrum Allocation in EONs,” in *2024 Asia Communications and Photonics Conference (ACP) and International Conference on Information Photonics and Optical Communications (IPOC)*, (IEEE, Beijing, China, 2024), pp. 1–6.
  96. Y. Teng, C. Natalino, F. Arpanaei, A. Sánchez-Macián, P. Monti, S. Yan, and D. Simeonidou, “DRL-Assisted Dynamic QoT-Aware Service Provisioning in Multi-Band Elastic Optical Networks,” (2024). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.03221> (accessed 2024-08-12), version Number: 1.
  97. E. Unzain, R. Fernandez, and D. P. Pinto-Roa, “Reinforcement Learning Based Routing, Modulation Level and Spectrum Assignment in Elastic Optical Networks,” in *2024 L Latin American Computer Conference (CLEI)*, (IEEE, Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2024), pp. 1–8.
  98. Z. Zhou, R. Gu, X. Zhang, L. Yunxuan, L. Bai, and J. Yuefeng, “Opti-DeepRoute: A Topology-Adaptive Deep Reinforcement Learning Based Service Provisioning Framework for Elastic Optical Network,” in *IEEE INFOCOM 2024 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPS)*, (IEEE, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 2024), pp. 1–2.
  99. S. Li, X. Lin, Y. Liu, G. Li, and J. Li, “OpticGAI: Generative AI-aided Deep Reinforcement Learning for Optical Networks Optimization,” in *Proceedings of the 1st SIGCOMM Workshop on Hot Topics in Optical Technologies and Applications in Networking*, (ACM, Sydney NSW Australia, 2024), pp. 1–6.
  100. J. Xie, Y. Song, Y. Zhang, S. Li, M. Zhang, and D. Wang, “Physical Layer-Aware Route and Spectrum Allocation in Optical Networks by Multi-Objective Deep Reinforcement Learning,” in *2024 Asia Communications and Photonics Conference (ACP) and International Conference on Information Photonics and Optical Communications (IPOC)*, (IEEE, Beijing, China, 2024), pp. 1–4.
  101. D. Yan, N. Feng, J. Lv, D. Ren, J. Hu, and J. Zhao, “DRL-based fragmentation- and impairment-aware resource allocation algorithm in C + L band elastic optical networks,” *Opt. Fiber Technol.* **90**, 104133 (2024).
  102. J. Boyan and M. Littman, “Packet Routing in Dynamically Changing Networks: A Reinforcement Learning Approach,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 6 J. Cowan, G. Tesauro, and J. Alsppector, eds. (Morgan-Kaufmann, 1993).
  103. H. Ma, Y. Zhao, Y. Li, W. Wang, Y. Wang, D. Wang, C. Wan, and J. Zhang, “Demonstration of Image Processing Based on Reinforcement Learning in Multi-Modal Optical Transport Networks,” in *2019 18th International Conference on Optical Communications and Networks (ICOON)*, (IEEE, Huangshan, China, 2019), pp. 1–3.
  104. Z. Zhao, Y. Zhao, D. Wang, Y. Wang, and J. Zhang, “Reinforcement-Learning-Based Multi-Failure Restoration in Optical Transport Networks,” in *2019 Asia Communications and Photonics Conference (ACP)*, (2019), pp. 1–3.
  105. X. Wang, Y.-C. Huang, J. Liu, and S. Yu, “A Subcarrier-Slot Autonomous Partition Scheme Based on Deep-Reinforcement-Learning in Elastic Optical Networks,” in *2019 Asia Communications and Photonics Conference (ACP)*, (2019), pp. 1–3.
  106. X. Luo, C. Shi, L. Wang, X. Chen, Y. Li, and T. Yang, “Leveraging double-agent-based deep reinforcement learning to global optimization of elastic optical networks with enhanced survivability,” *Opt. Express* **27**, 7896 (2019).
  107. C. Natalino and P. Monti, “The Optical RL-Gym: An open-source toolkit for applying reinforcement learning in optical networks,” in *2020 22nd International Conference on Transparent Optical Networks (ICTON)*, (2020), pp. 1–5. ISSN: 2161-2064.
  108. Q. Ma, A. Xiong, P. Yu, S. Guo, N. Xing, W. Li, L. Feng, and Q. Xue-Song, “Co-Allocation of Service Routing in SDN-driven 5G IP+Optical Smart Grid Communication Networks based on Deep Reinforcement Learning,” in *2020 International Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing (IWCMC)*, (IEEE, Limassol, Cyprus, 2020), pp. 868–873.
  109. C. Wang, N. Yoshikane, F. Balasis, and T. Tsuritani, “DeepCMS<sup>3</sup>: A Deep Reinforcement Learning Framework for Core, Mode and Spectrum Sequential Scheduling over Optical Transport Network,” in *2020 European Conference on Optical Communications (ECOC)*, (IEEE, Brussels, Belgium, 2020), pp. 1–4.
  110. R. Weixer, S. Kuhl, R. M. Morais, B. Spinnler, W. Schairer, B. Sommerkorn-Krombholz, and S. Pachnicke, “A Reinforcement Learning Framework for Parameter Optimization in Elastic Optical Networks,” in *2020 European Conference on Optical Communications (ECOC)*, (IEEE, Brussels, Belgium, 2020), pp. 1–4.
  111. H. Liu, R. Gu, Z. Li, and Y. Ji, “Multi-Agent Federated Reinforcement Learning for Privacy-enhanced Service Provision in Multi-domain Optical Network,” in *2021 Asia Communications and Photonics Conference (ACP)*, (2021), pp. 1–3.
  112. Z. Zhao, Y. Zhao, Y. Li, F. Wang, X. Li, D. Han, and J. Zhang, “Service

- restoration in multi-modal optical transport networks with reinforcement learning,” *Opt. Express* **29**, 3825 (2021).
113. X. Tian, B. Li, R. Gu, and Z. Zhu, “Reconfiguring multicast sessions in elastic optical networks adaptively with graph-aware deep reinforcement learning,” *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **13**, 253–265 (2021). Publisher: Optica Publishing Group.
  114. P. Morales, P. Franco, A. Lozada, N. Jara, F. Calderón, J. Pinto-Ríos, and A. Leiva, “Multi-band Environments for Optical Reinforcement Learning Gym for Resource Allocation in Elastic Optical Networks,” in *2021 International Conference on Optical Network Design and Modeling (ONDM)*, (2021), pp. 1–6.
  115. T. Tanaka and K. Higashimori, “Reinforcement-Learning-based Multi-layer Path Planning Framework that Designs Grooming, Route, Spectrum, and Operational Mode,” in *2022 European Conference on Optical Communication (ECOC)*, (2022), pp. 1–4.
  116. R. Koch, S. Kühn, R. M. Morais, B. Spinnler, W. Schairer, B. Sommerkorn-Krombolz, and S. Pachnicke, “Reinforcement Learning for Generalized Parameter Optimization in Elastic Optical Networks,” *J. Light. Technol.* **40**, 567–574 (2022). Publisher: Optica Publishing Group.
  117. C. Hernández-Chulde, R. Casellas, R. Martínez, R. Vilalta, and R. Muñoz, “Evaluation of Deep Reinforcement Learning for Restoration in Optical Networks,” in *2022 Optical Fiber Communications Conference and Exhibition (OFC)*, (2022), pp. 1–3.
  118. E. Etezadi, C. Natalino, R. Diaz, A. Lindgren, S. Melin, L. Wosinska, P. Monti, and M. Furdek, “DeepDefrag: A deep reinforcement learning framework for spectrum defragmentation,” in *GLOBECOM 2022 - 2022 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, (2022), pp. 3694–3699.
  119. E. Etezadi, C. Natalino, R. Diaz, A. Lindgren, S. Melin, L. Wosinska, P. Monti, and M. Furdek, “Deep reinforcement learning for proactive spectrum defragmentation in elastic optical networks,” *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **15**, E86 (2023).
  120. T. Tanaka, “Adaptive Traffic Grooming Using Reinforcement Learning in Multilayer Elastic Optical Networks,” in *2023 Optical Fiber Communications Conference and Exhibition (OFC)*, (2023), pp. 1–3.
  121. S. S. Johari, S. Taeb, N. Shahriar, S. R. Chowdhury, M. Tornatore, R. Boutaba, J. Mitra, and M. Hemmati, “DRL-Assisted Reoptimization of Network Slice Embedding on EON-Enabled Transport Networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Netw. Serv. Manag.* **20**, 800–814 (2023).
  122. J. Zhang, Z. Chen, B. Zhang, R. Wang, H. Ma, and Y. Ji, “ADMIRE: collaborative data-driven and model-driven intelligent routing engine for traffic grooming in multi-layer X-Haul networks,” *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **15**, A63–A73 (2023).
  123. Y. Fan, Y. Li, B. Zhang, L. Chen, Y. Wang, J. Guo, W. Wang, Y. Zhao, and J. Zhang, “Blocking-Driven Spectrum Defragmentation Based on Deep Reinforcement Learning in Tidal Elastic Optical Networks,” in *2023 21st International Conference on Optical Communications and Networks (ICOON)*, (2023), pp. 1–3.
  124. M. Lian, Y. Zhao, Y. Li, A. Nag, and J. Zhang, “Dynamic slicing of multidimensional resources in DCI-EON with penalty-aware deep reinforcement learning,” *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **16**, 112 (2024).
  125. X. Li and Y. Wang, “TABDeep: A two-level action branch architecture-based deep reinforcement learning for distributed sub-tree scheduling of online multicast sessions in EON,” *Comput. Networks* **243**, 110288 (2024).
  126. Y. Wang, L. Kong, M. Zhu, J. Gu, Y. Cai, and J. Zhang, “Availability-Aware and Delay-Sensitive RAN Slicing Mapping Based on Deep Reinforcement Learning in Elastic Optical Networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Netw. Serv. Manag.* pp. 1–1 (2024).
  127. S. Yin, L. Liu, M. Cai, Y. Chai, Y. Jiao, Z. Duan, Y. Li, and S. Huang, “DNN distributed inference offloading scheme based on transfer reinforcement learning in metro optical networks,” *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **16**, 852 (2024).
  128. S. Tse, X. Zhao, A. Chan, D. Tang, A. Mohan, C. Natalino, and M. Aibin, “Reinforcement Learning for Power Management in Low-margin Optical Networks,” (2024).
  129. T. Tanaka, “Reinforcement-learning-based path planning in multilayer elastic optical networks [Invited],” *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **16**, A68–A77 (2024).
  130. M. Doherty and A. Beghelli, “XLRON: Accelerated Reinforcement Learning Environments for Optical Networks,” in *2024 Optical Fiber Communications Conference and Exhibition (OFC)*, (2024), pp. 1–3.
  131. C. Natalino, T. Magalhães, F. Arpanaei, F. R. L. Lobato, J. C. W. A. Costa, J. A. Hernández, and P. Monti, “Optical Networking Gym: an open-source toolkit for resource assignment problems in optical networks,” *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **16**, G40 (2024).
  132. R. McCann, A. Rezaee, and V. M. Vokkarane, “SDONSim: An Advanced Simulation Tool for Software-Defined Elastic Optical Networks,” (2024). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.13999> (accessed 2024-12-31), version Number: 1.
  133. N. Jara, H. Pempelfort, E. Viera, J. Sanchez, G. España, and D. Borquez-Paredes, “DREAM-ON GYM: A Deep Reinforcement Learning Environment for Next-Gen Optical Networks,” in *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Simulation and Modeling Methodologies, Technologies and Applications*, (SCITEPRESS - Science and Technology Publications, Dijon, France, 2024), pp. 215–222.
  134. R. Matzner, A. Ahuja, R. Sadeghi, M. Doherty, A. Beghelli, S. J. Savory, and P. Bayvel, “Topology Bench: Systematic Graph Based Benchmarking for Core Optical Networks,” (2024). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.04160> (accessed 2024-11-29), version Number: 1.
  135. Z. Luo, S. Yin, L. Zhao, Z. Wang, W. Zhang, L. Jiang, and S. Huang, “Survivable Routing, Spectrum, Core and Band Assignment in Multi-Band Space Division Multiplexing Elastic Optical Networks,” *J. Light. Technol.* **40**, 3442–3455 (2022).
  136. R. Koch, S. Kuhl, W. Schairer, B. Spinnler, and S. Pachnicke, “High-Generalizability Reinforcement Learning Based Capacity Optimization in WDM Long-Haul Networks,” *IEEE Photonics Technol. Lett.* **34**, 891–894 (2022).
  137. X. Chen, “DeepRMSA GitHub repository,” URL: <https://github.com/xiaoliangchenUCD/DeepRMSA> (accessed 2024-01-06).
  138. L. Engstrom, A. Ilyas, S. Santurkar, D. Tsipras, F. Janoos, L. Rudolph, and A. Madry, “Implementation Matters in Deep Policy Gradients: A Case Study on PPO and TRPO,” (2020). URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.12729> (accessed 2023-07-08), arXiv:2005.12729 [cs, stat].
  139. P. Nagarajan, G. Warnell, and P. Stone, “The Impact of Nondeterminism on Reproducibility in Deep Reinforcement Learning,” in *2nd Reproducibility in Machine Learning Workshop at ICML 2018*, (Stockholm, Sweden, 2018).
  140. O. Vinyals, M. Fortunato, and N. Jaitly, “Pointer Networks,” (2015). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.03134> (accessed 2024-06-30), version Number: 2.
  141. Michael Doherty, “2024\_jocn\_xlron (Revision 75def23),” (2024). URL: [https://huggingface.co/micdoh/2024\\_JOCN\\_XLRON](https://huggingface.co/micdoh/2024_JOCN_XLRON).
  142. S. Baroni, “Routing and wavelength allocation in WDM optical networks,” Ph.D. thesis, University College London, United Kingdom (1998).
  143. M. Doherty, “XLRON: Accelerated Learning and Resource Allocation for Optical Networks,” (2023). URL: <https://github.com/micdoh/XLRON.git>.
  144. K. P. White and S. Robinson, “The problem of the initial transient (again), or why MSER works,” in *Proceedings of the 2009 INFORMS Simulation Society Research Workshop*, L. H. Lee, M. E. Kuhl, J. W. Fowler, and S. Robinson, eds. (Institute for Operations Research and the Management Sciences, Baltimore, 2009), pp. 90–95.
  145. V. Curri, “GNPy model of the physical layer for open and disaggregated optical networking [Invited],” *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* **14**, C92–C104 (2022). Publisher: Optica Publishing Group.
  146. H. Buglia, M. Jarmolovičius, A. Vasychenkova, E. Sillescu, L. Galdino, R. I. Killey, and P. Bayvel, “A Closed-Form Expression for the Gaussian Noise Model in the Presence of Inter-Channel Stimulated Raman Scattering Extended for Arbitrary Loss and Fibre Length,” *J. Light. Technol.* **41**, 3577–3586 (2023).
  147. K. Cruzado, Y. Mori, S.-C. Lin, M. Matsuura, S. Subramaniam, and H. Hasegawa, “Effective Capacity Estimation Based on Cut-Set Load Analysis in Optical Path Networks,” in *2023 International Conference on Photonics in Switching and Computing (PSC)*, (2023), pp. 1–3.
  148. K. Cruzado, Y. Mori, S.-C. Lin, M. Matsuura, S. Subramaniam, and

- H. Hasegawa, "Capacity-Bound Evaluation and Routing and Spectrum Assignment for Elastic Optical Path Networks with Distance-Adaptive Modulation," in *2024 Optical Fiber Communications Conference and Exhibition (OFC)*, (2024), pp. 1–3.
149. A. Beghelli, "Resource allocation and scalability in dynamic wavelength-routed optical networks," Ph.D. thesis, University of London (2006).
  150. B. Awerbuch, Y. Azar, and S. Plotkin, "Throughput-competitive on-line routing," in *Proceedings of 1993 IEEE 34th Annual Foundations of Computer Science*, (IEEE, Palo Alto, CA, USA, 1993), pp. 32–40.
  151. B. Li and Z. Zhu, "GNN-Based Hierarchical Deep Reinforcement Learning for NFV-Oriented Online Resource Orchestration in Elastic Optical DCIs," *J. Light. Technol.* **40**, 935–946 (2022).
  152. Ericsson AB, "Ericsson Mobility Report," Technical Report EAB-24:009018 Uen Rev C, Ericsson, Stockholm, Sweden (2024).



## A. APPENDIX: DATA FROM PREVIOUS WORKS AND OUR REPRODUCTIONS

**Table 2.** Comparison of service blocking probabilities for KSP-FF and RL solutions across various topologies and traffic loads.

Publication	Topology	$N_{slots}$	Load (Erlang)	Service blocking probability (%)					Mean improvement over RL (%)
				Published		Ours			
				RL	5-SP-FF	5-SP-FF	5-SP-FF <sub>hops</sub>	50-SP-FF <sub>hops</sub>	
DeepRMSA	NSFNET	100	250	4.00	5.10	5.00 ± 0.29	2.93 ± 0.22	2.33 ± 0.25	42
DeepRMSA	COST239	100	600	5.75	6.75	6.69 ± 0.35	3.80 ± 0.39	2.61 ± 0.36	55
Reward-RMSA	NSFNET	100	168	0.35	1.00	1.06 ± 0.11	0.10 ± 0.02	0.02 ± 0.01	94
Reward-RMSA	NSFNET	100	182	0.70	1.40	1.53 ± 0.15	0.25 ± 0.03	0.08 ± 0.03	89
Reward-RMSA	NSFNET	100	196	1.20	2.10	2.06 ± 0.12	0.48 ± 0.07	0.21 ± 0.04	83
Reward-RMSA	NSFNET	100	210	1.80	2.70	2.68 ± 0.20	0.95 ± 0.11	0.47 ± 0.05	74
GCN-RMSA	NSFNET	100	154	0.51	0.67	0.69 ± 0.08	0.03 ± 0.02	0.01 ± 0.00	98
GCN-RMSA	NSFNET	100	168	0.66	1.00	1.06 ± 0.11	0.10 ± 0.02	0.02 ± 0.01	97
GCN-RMSA	NSFNET	100	182	0.98	1.42	1.53 ± 0.15	0.25 ± 0.03	0.08 ± 0.03	92
GCN-RMSA	NSFNET	100	196	1.50	2.10	2.06 ± 0.12	0.48 ± 0.07	0.21 ± 0.04	86
GCN-RMSA	NSFNET	100	210	2.10	2.76	2.68 ± 0.20	0.95 ± 0.11	0.47 ± 0.05	78
GCN-RMSA	COST239	100	368	0.71	0.78	0.80 ± 0.08	0.07 ± 0.03	0.00 ± 0.00	100
GCN-RMSA	COST239	100	391	0.85	1.30	1.13 ± 0.12	0.17 ± 0.07	0.00 ± 0.00	100
GCN-RMSA	COST239	100	414	1.25	1.70	1.57 ± 0.13	0.28 ± 0.09	0.01 ± 0.01	100
GCN-RMSA	COST239	100	437	1.75	2.30	2.02 ± 0.13	0.46 ± 0.11	0.02 ± 0.02	99
GCN-RMSA	COST239	100	460	2.10	2.70	2.53 ± 0.21	0.73 ± 0.20	0.07 ± 0.03	97
GCN-RMSA	USNET	100	320	0.65	0.75	0.98 ± 0.10	0.25 ± 0.07	0.00 ± 0.01	100
GCN-RMSA	USNET	100	340	0.83	1.20	1.31 ± 0.16	0.42 ± 0.07	0.01 ± 0.02	99
GCN-RMSA	USNET	100	360	1.05	1.50	1.69 ± 0.12	0.73 ± 0.16	0.04 ± 0.04	96
GCN-RMSA	USNET	100	380	1.60	2.15	2.18 ± 0.19	1.05 ± 0.19	0.09 ± 0.09	94
GCN-RMSA	USNET	100	400	2.20	2.70	2.79 ± 0.24	1.53 ± 0.18	0.23 ± 0.09	90
MaskRSA	NSFNET	80	80	0.01	0.26	0.33 ± 0.06	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	100
MaskRSA	NSFNET	80	90	0.05	0.60	0.64 ± 0.07	0.01 ± 0.01	0.00 ± 0.00	100
MaskRSA	NSFNET	80	100	0.20	0.90	1.08 ± 0.10	0.08 ± 0.05	0.04 ± 0.02	80
MaskRSA	NSFNET	80	110	0.50	1.80	1.68 ± 0.11	0.25 ± 0.09	0.13 ± 0.03	74
MaskRSA	NSFNET	80	120	0.79	2.47	2.39 ± 0.14	0.60 ± 0.14	0.33 ± 0.12	58
MaskRSA	NSFNET	80	130	1.80	3.00	3.14 ± 0.22	1.35 ± 0.12	0.86 ± 0.14	52
MaskRSA	NSFNET	80	140	3.00	4.00	4.05 ± 0.21	2.26 ± 0.23	1.71 ± 0.27	43
MaskRSA	NSFNET	80	150	4.30	5.00	5.19 ± 0.28	3.43 ± 0.21	2.84 ± 0.26	34
MaskRSA	NSFNET	80	160	5.30	6.00	6.37 ± 0.26	4.65 ± 0.35	4.15 ± 0.27	22
MaskRSA	JPN48	80	120	0.05	1.60	1.92 ± 0.27	0.32 ± 0.08	0.00 ± 0.00	100
MaskRSA	JPN48	80	130	0.20	2.50	2.75 ± 0.31	0.64 ± 0.10	0.02 ± 0.01	90
MaskRSA	JPN48	80	140	0.55	3.50	3.69 ± 0.30	0.97 ± 0.14	0.04 ± 0.03	93
MaskRSA	JPN48	80	150	0.90	4.50	4.55 ± 0.32	1.41 ± 0.15	0.09 ± 0.04	90
MaskRSA	JPN48	80	160	1.60	5.00	5.40 ± 0.36	2.00 ± 0.21	0.18 ± 0.04	89

Continued on next page

Table 2 – continued from previous page

Publication	Topology	$N_{slots}$	Load (Erlang)	Service blocking probability (%)					Mean improvement over RL (%)
				Published		Ours			
				RL	5-SP-FF	5-SP-FF	5-SP-FF <sub>hops</sub>	50-SP-FF <sub>hops</sub>	
PtrNet-RSA	NSFNET	40	180	0.01	0.80	0.93 ± 0.11	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	100
PtrNet-RSA	NSFNET	40	190	0.03	1.25	1.27 ± 0.10	0.01 ± 0.01	0.00 ± 0.00	100
PtrNet-RSA	NSFNET	40	200	0.08	1.50	1.68 ± 0.10	0.02 ± 0.01	0.00 ± 0.01	100
PtrNet-RSA	NSFNET	40	210	0.19	1.90	2.06 ± 0.11	0.09 ± 0.04	0.03 ± 0.02	84
PtrNet-RSA	NSFNET	40	220	0.23	2.50	2.58 ± 0.11	0.22 ± 0.09	0.09 ± 0.05	61
PtrNet-RSA	NSFNET	40	230	0.75	2.90	3.14 ± 0.14	0.48 ± 0.12	0.26 ± 0.10	65
PtrNet-RSA	NSFNET	40	240	1.30	3.50	4.01 ± 0.22	0.90 ± 0.18	0.54 ± 0.15	58
PtrNet-RSA	COST239	40	340	0.01	2.50	3.36 ± 0.16	0.02 ± 0.02	0.00 ± 0.00	100
PtrNet-RSA	COST239	40	360	0.04	3.25	4.02 ± 0.20	0.04 ± 0.02	0.00 ± 0.00	100
PtrNet-RSA	COST239	40	380	0.12	3.80	4.72 ± 0.29	0.10 ± 0.03	0.00 ± 0.00	100
PtrNet-RSA	COST239	40	400	0.24	4.60	5.43 ± 0.36	0.25 ± 0.09	0.00 ± 0.00	100
PtrNet-RSA	COST239	40	420	0.39	5.50	6.24 ± 0.25	0.46 ± 0.12	0.00 ± 0.00	100
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	40	210	0.01	0.85	1.02 ± 0.20	0.14 ± 0.05	0.00 ± 0.00	100
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	40	220	0.08	1.40	1.46 ± 0.25	0.29 ± 0.08	0.00 ± 0.01	100
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	40	230	0.22	1.85	1.99 ± 0.31	0.46 ± 0.10	0.02 ± 0.01	91
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	40	240	0.38	2.20	2.59 ± 0.38	0.77 ± 0.18	0.08 ± 0.06	79
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	40	250	0.68	3.10	3.25 ± 0.32	1.19 ± 0.28	0.19 ± 0.09	72
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	40	260	1.10	3.60	3.87 ± 0.49	1.81 ± 0.35	0.42 ± 0.15	62
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	40	270	1.80	4.40	4.67 ± 0.50	2.39 ± 0.41	0.72 ± 0.27	60
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	40	280	2.20	4.90	5.40 ± 0.46	3.16 ± 0.48	1.25 ± 0.34	43
PtrNet-RSA	NSFNET	80	200	0.01	0.60	0.61 ± 0.09	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	100
PtrNet-RSA	NSFNET	80	210	0.03	0.80	0.83 ± 0.10	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	100
PtrNet-RSA	NSFNET	80	220	0.11	1.20	1.07 ± 0.09	0.02 ± 0.02	0.01 ± 0.02	91
PtrNet-RSA	NSFNET	80	230	0.16	1.40	1.32 ± 0.13	0.05 ± 0.03	0.02 ± 0.02	88
PtrNet-RSA	NSFNET	80	240	0.50	1.90	1.63 ± 0.15	0.11 ± 0.06	0.05 ± 0.04	90
PtrNet-RSA	COST239	80	420	0.01	2.50	2.66 ± 0.11	0.08 ± 0.03	0.00 ± 0.00	100
PtrNet-RSA	COST239	80	440	0.16	3.00	3.05 ± 0.16	0.13 ± 0.06	0.00 ± 0.00	100
PtrNet-RSA	COST239	80	460	0.65	3.50	3.52 ± 0.19	0.25 ± 0.07	0.01 ± 0.01	98
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	80	260	0.03	1.00	1.21 ± 0.18	0.46 ± 0.13	0.00 ± 0.00	100
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	80	270	0.09	1.20	1.48 ± 0.24	0.64 ± 0.18	0.16 ± 0.09	-78
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	80	280	0.15	1.40	1.78 ± 0.20	0.87 ± 0.21	0.38 ± 0.13	-153
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	80	290	0.29	1.70	2.13 ± 0.24	1.12 ± 0.24	0.54 ± 0.15	-86
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	80	300	0.52	2.20	2.46 ± 0.23	1.42 ± 0.29	0.61 ± 0.20	-33
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	80	310	0.66	2.40	2.79 ± 0.26	1.75 ± 0.32	0.88 ± 0.23	-33
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	80	320	1.00	2.80	3.18 ± 0.31	2.08 ± 0.35	1.15 ± 0.26	-15
PtrNet-RSA	USNET	80	330	1.50	3.10	3.50 ± 0.28	2.42 ± 0.31	1.46 ± 0.30	3