

Buffer Centering for bittide Synchronization via Frame Rotation

Sanjay Lall¹

Tammo Spalink²

Abstract

Maintaining consistent time in distributed systems is a fundamental challenge. The bittide system addresses this by providing logical synchronization through a decentralized control mechanism that observes local buffer occupancies and controls the frequency of an oscillator at each node. A critical aspect of bittide’s stability and performance is ensuring that these elastic buffers operate around a desired equilibrium point, preventing data loss due to overflow or underflow. This paper introduces a novel method for centering buffer occupancies in a bittide network using a technique we term *frame rotation*. We propose a control strategy utilizing a directed spanning tree of the network graph. By adjusting the frequencies of nodes in a specific order dictated by this tree, and employing a pulsed feedback controller that targets the buffer occupancy of edges within the spanning tree, we prove that all elastic buffers in the network can be driven to their desired equilibrium. This ordered adjustment approach ensures that prior centering efforts are not disrupted, providing a robust mechanism for managing buffer occupancy in bittide synchronized systems.

1 Introduction

In distributed computing, maintaining a consistent sense of time across independent machines presents a fundamental challenge. Traditional approaches often rely on physical clock distribution or software protocols to keep local clocks aligned with wall-clock time. However, these methods can be expensive, introduce asynchrony with performance consequences, and become impractical at data-center scales. The bittide system addresses some of these limitations [11] by obviating the need for physical clock distribution or strict adherence to wall-clock time.

The core innovation of bittide lies in providing applications with a notion of time which is *logically synchronized* between nodes [4, 8, 10]. This is achieved through a decentralized control mechanism where each node adjusts its frequency based on observed communication with its neighbors, which in turn allows construction of a syn-

chronous logical clock that is unaffected by variations in the underlying physical clock frequencies. The bittide system establishes a shared logical time across the system, which may be fully disconnected from physical wall-clock time, allowing logical time-steps to vary in physical duration both over time and between nodes. However, from the perspective of applications running on the system, the behavior is identical to that of a system with a single shared physical clock. By coordinating actions using this logical time, the need to reference physical time is eliminated.

The decentralized nature of bittide’s synchronization mechanism enables the construction of large-scale systems which behave as if they are perfectly synchronized, typically very difficult or prohibitively expensive to achieve using other methods.

Unlike overlaying synchronization information onto asynchronous communication layers, which can lead to high communication overhead and limited accuracy, bittide leverages the low-level data flows inherent in serial data links for synchronization. Notably, the synchronization mechanism requires no additional communication overhead, as the continuous data exchange at the physical layer provides a direct feedback signal to the control system. This allows for accurate logical synchronization even with an underlying substrate that is only approximately synchronized. The bittide mechanism operates at Layer 1 (physical level) of the OSI network model, and synchronization occurs with each node observing only local buffer occupancy levels associated with links connecting to network neighbors.

Data is transmitted in fixed-size frames and incoming frames at each node are placed in per-link elastic buffers. A crucial aspect of the bittide mechanism is that whenever a frame is removed from the head of an elastic buffer, a new frame is sent on each outgoing link. In systems with multiple neighbors, frames are sent simultaneously on all outgoing links in discrete lockstep. The oscillator at each node drives both the processor clock and the network, ensuring that the lockstep behavior of the network induces a similar behavior in the processors.

The number of frames in each elastic buffer is measured locally at each node, and the oscillator frequencies at the nodes are adjusted. This decentralized control scheme is responsible for keeping frequencies aligned and ensuring the buffers neither overflow nor underflow.

In this paper we describe a new method for centering the buffer occupancies in a bittide network. We discuss

¹S. Lall is with the Department of Electrical Engineering at Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA, and is a Visiting Researcher at Google DeepMind. lall@stanford.edu

²Google DeepMind.

frame rotation, a method by which a controller may adjust the buffer occupancies in a bittide system. The name alludes to the balance of frames in the system being 'rotated' between nodes, taking advantage of a bittide property that total frame counts for every cyclic path in the network remain constant.

2 Notation and preliminaries

The network model for bittide used here is a directed graph \mathcal{G} with n nodes and m edges, with vertex set $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and edge set $\mathcal{E} = \{1, \dots, m\}$. We will refer to edges interchangeably either by a source destination pair $i \rightarrow j$ or by edge number $k \in \mathcal{E}$. The graph has no self loops. The incidence matrix is $B = S - D$ where $S \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is the source incidence matrix, given by

$$S_{ie} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if node } i \text{ is the source of edge } e \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is the destination incidence matrix

$$D_{ie} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if node } i \text{ is the destination of edge } e \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

For convenience, we use $\mathbf{1}$ to denote the vector of all ones. Let $E^j \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ be the matrix whose entries are all zero except for $E_{jj}^j = 1$.

We assume the graph is **strongly connected** or **irreducible**, meaning that there exists a directed path in both directions between any pair of vertices. Given the graph, suppose $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a nonnegative matrix with sparsity pattern corresponding to the adjacency, so that that $A_{ij} > 0$ if $i \rightarrow j$ is an edge, and $A_{ij} = 0$ if $i \neq j$ and $i \rightarrow j$ is not an edge. The matrix A is called irreducible if the corresponding graph is irreducible, irrespective of the entries on the diagonal.

A matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is called **Metzler** if $A_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i \neq j$, and it is called a **rate matrix** if in addition each of its rows sums to zero. If A is both Metzler and irreducible, then from the standard Perron-Frobenius theory there is an eigenvalue λ_{metzler} which is real, and which has corresponding positive left and right eigenvectors. All other eigenvalues λ satisfy $\Re(\lambda) < \lambda_{\text{metzler}}$. If A is a rate matrix, then e^A is a stochastic matrix. In particular, DB^T is a rate matrix with the sparsity of \mathcal{G} and hence it is irreducible iff \mathcal{G} is.

Let $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{E}$ be an outward directed spanning tree. Any spanning tree will do. Let the root node be $r \in \mathcal{V}$. There is a natural partial ordering on edges in \mathcal{T} induced by the tree, where two edges are defined to satisfy $f \prec g$ if there is a directed walk of non-zero length from $\text{dst}(f)$ to $\text{dst}(g)$ in the tree. The actions of our centering algorithm will follow this ordering.

3 Model

A model for the bittide system on an undirected graph, called the *abstract frame model*, is developed in [5]. That model is frame accurate, in that it predicts the precise location of every network frame in the system. For control, we make use of an approximate differential equation model based on several simplifying assumptions, including a fluid approximation, and replacement of the discrete-time control with continuous-time control; for a discussion of this approximation see [6]. Here we consider the directed graph case, which is a minor change, and build on that model. Following [9] we will simplify the dynamic model by assuming that the latencies $l_{j \rightarrow i}$ are zero. Comparison with both hardware and more detailed simulation of the abstract frame model which includes latency and individual frames have been performed in [2, 5, 9], and so we do not address that here. The model is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\theta}_i(t) &= \omega_i(t) \\ \omega_i(t) &= \omega_i^u + c_i(t) \\ \beta_{j \rightarrow i}(t) &= \theta_j(t) - \theta_i(t) + \lambda_{j \rightarrow i} \\ y_i &= \sum_{j|j \rightarrow i} (\beta_{j \rightarrow i} - \beta_{j \rightarrow i}^{\text{off}}) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here $i, j \in \mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ refer to graph vertices, and θ_i is the clock phase at node i , which evolves with frequency ω_i . This frequency is the sum of two terms, the first is ω_i^u , the *uncontrolled* frequency, which is frequency of the oscillator without any control, and the *correction*, c_i , a frequency adjustment which is chosen by the controller.

At node i there is an elastic buffer associated with each incoming link $j \rightarrow i$, which contains $\beta_{j \rightarrow i}$ frames. The controller at node i measures the sum of the occupancies of the buffers, denoted y_i . The constant $\lambda_{j \rightarrow i}$ is a property of the link, and the constant $\beta_{j \rightarrow i}^{\text{off}}$ is known and set on initialization. The base frequencies of the oscillators ω_i^u are constant but unknown. At each node i the controller measures y_i and chooses the frequency correction c_i . In practice this is sampled, but in this paper we will assume that the sampling is fast enough that the controller can be treated as continuous-time.

The fundamental dynamics of bittide are as follows. At each node i there is an oscillator of frequency ω_i , which drives the clock phase θ_i . We refer to the local clock *ticks* at node i as those times t at which $\theta_i(t)$ is an integer. Nodes are connected by network links, corresponding to the edges of the graph. At each node there is one FIFO buffer for each incoming link, and incoming data frames are stored in the buffer. With each local clock tick, a frame is removed from all of the buffers, and passed to the processor at that node. In addition, with each local tick, on each outgoing link, a new frame is sent by the processor. As a result of these dynamics, the number of frames in the buffer at node i corresponding to the link

from node j , denoted $\beta_{j \rightarrow i}$, is approximately given by (1). An explicit derivation of this is given in [5].

At each node there is a controller, which observes the occupancies of each of the buffers at that node. It uses this observation in order to set the oscillator correction c_i . The idea is that, if the oscillator at node i is slower than that of its neighbors, then it will send frames less frequently than it receives them, and its buffers will start to fill up; conversely, too fast and its buffers will drain. This motivates a controller of the form

$$c_i(t) = k \sum_{j|j \rightarrow i} (\beta_{j \rightarrow i} - \beta_{j \rightarrow i}^{\text{off}}) \quad (2)$$

Here β^{off} is the desired equilibrium point, which is usually the midpoint of the buffer. By adjusting the correction, the nodes must not only manage to ensure that all nodes tick at approximately the same frequency, but they must also ensure that all of the buffer occupancies remain close to their corresponding β^{off} . The latter is particularly important, because buffer overflow or underflow will cause running applications to lose data, and is a fatal error. The controller (2) is a proportional-plus-offset controller. We will make use of the constant term q_i in the controller to adjust the buffer equilibrium points, as discussed below.

Using the incidence matrices $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\theta}(t) &= \omega(t) \\ \omega(t) &= \omega^u + c(t) \\ \beta(t) &= B^T \theta(t) + \lambda \\ y &= D(\beta - \beta^{\text{off}}) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Following [9], we make the following assumption about the system boot, referred to as *feasibility*.

Assumption 1. *There exists some time t^0 at which the buffer occupancy $\beta(t^0) = \beta^{\text{off}}$.*

We now define for convenience the following choice of normalized coordinates.

$$\tilde{\theta}(t) = \theta(t) - \theta(t^0) \quad \tilde{\beta}(t) = \beta(t) - \beta^{\text{off}} \quad (4)$$

We will define for convenience the directed Laplacian matrix

$$Q = DB^T$$

This gives the following.

Proposition 1. *Under Assumption 1, the dynamics (3) are equivalent to the following*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{\theta}}(t) &= \omega^u + c(t) \\ \tilde{\beta}(t) &= B^T \tilde{\theta}(t) \\ y &= D \tilde{\beta}(t) \end{aligned}$$

together with the boundary condition $\tilde{\theta}(t^0) = 0$.

Properties of the Laplacian. If the graph is irreducible then the matrix Q is an irreducible rate matrix. Let $z > 0$ be its Metzler eigenvector, normalized so that $\mathbf{1}^T z = 1$. Let the eigendecomposition of Q be $QT = TD$, then we have

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda \end{bmatrix} \quad T = [\mathbf{1} \quad T_2] \quad T^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} z^T \\ V_2^T \end{bmatrix}$$

Define the matrix

$$Q^\ddagger = T \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda^{-1} \end{bmatrix} T^{-1}$$

which satisfies $QQ^\ddagger Q = Q$ and so is a generalized inverse of Q , and the associated projector $W = I - Q^\ddagger Q$. Explicitly, we have $W = \mathbf{1}z^T$. It is immediate that $WQ = QW = WQ^\ddagger = Q^\ddagger W = 0$. Further, since $W e^{Qt} = W$ we have

$$e^{Qt} = W + Q^\ddagger Q e^{Qt}$$

and so

$$e^{Qt} = \frac{d}{dt} (Wt + Q^\ddagger e^{Qt})$$

Behavior with proportional control. Previous work has considered use of proportional and proportional-integral control [5, 9]. Our approach in this paper builds on this, applying two stages of control. In the first stage, we will use proportional control, and subsequently the control will switch to a sequence of controllers which use a pulsed input. The closed-loop dynamics for $\tilde{\theta}$ become

$$\dot{\tilde{\theta}}(t) = kQ\tilde{\theta}(t) + \omega^u$$

The matrix Q is not Hurwitz, so this dynamics is not strictly stable and $\theta(t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This is expected, since θ is the clock phase and must grow without bound. Despite this, the buffer occupancy converges. We will need the solution of this system, which we state here for convenience.

Proposition 2. *Suppose $\tilde{\theta}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$ satisfy the dynamics of Proposition 1, and the controller is given by $c(t) = ky(t)$ where $k > 0$. Then*

$$\tilde{\theta}(t) = \left(Wt + k^{-1}Q^\ddagger(e^{kQt} - I) \right) \omega^u + e^{kQt} \tilde{\theta}(0)$$

and hence as $t \rightarrow \infty$ we have $\theta(t) \rightarrow \theta^{ss}$ and $\beta(t) \rightarrow \beta^{ss}$ where

$$\omega^{ss} = W\omega^u \quad \beta^{ss} = -k^{-1}B^T Q^\ddagger \omega^u$$

Proof. The proof follows from the standard variation-of-constants formula for linear dynamical systems. Note that we make use of the property that Q is Metzler to conclude

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{Qt} = W$$

along with $Q^\ddagger W = 0$ and $B^T W = 0$. ■

One important observation is that, a proportional controller will drive the system to an equilibrium point for which all nodes have the same frequency. This follows from the above expression for ω^{ss} , because $W = \mathbf{1}z^T$. Define $\bar{\omega}^{ss} = z^T \omega^u$ to be this frequency.




Figure 1: Graph used for example in §4.1

4 Control of Buffer Occupancy

The objective of the control system is to ensure that the buffer occupancies $\beta_{i \rightarrow j}$ are kept to prescribed levels. To do this, it is essential that all nodes maintain, on average, approximately the same frequency, since the buffer occupancy for edge $i \rightarrow j$ increases at a rate proportional to the difference between the frequency of node i and that of node j . If on average node i has a higher frequency than node j , then the buffer occupancy will increase without bound.

There are several approaches for achieving this. A proportional-integral controller is used in [5], and a reset controller is used in [7]. Both of these methods are effective at ensuring that buffer occupancies are kept close to β^{off} . One of the difficulties with controlling bittide is that any control scheme must be flexible enough to allow nodes to be added and removed while the system is operational. Here we present a method to allow control of buffer occupancies directly. We allow individual nodes to apply feedback control in such a way as to control the local buffer occupancies, and show that this achieves a desirable outcome for all buffer occupancies on the network.

When all nodes are at the equilibrium frequency, the critical observation is that a single node i can adjust the buffer occupancy at the elastic buffers for its incoming links. To do this, it temporarily changes its frequency ω_i , while the other nodes keep their frequencies constant. This will cause the elastic buffers at node i to drain. It can therefore set one of the elastic buffer occupancies to the midpoint, simply by increasing or decreasing its frequency for a short amount of time.

4.1 Example: triangular network

Consider the system with three nodes illustrated in Figure 1. In this system, the nodes start at frequencies ω^u and rapidly converge to a common frequency. At approximately $t \approx 400e6$, node 2 reduces its frequency, as shown in Figure 2. With this reduced frequency, the elastic buffers at node 2 start to fill, as can be seen in Figure 3. Node 2 observes the occupancy of the elastic buffer $\beta_{1 \rightarrow 2}$, and when it reaches the midpoint, it resets its frequency to the equilibrium value.

This strategy achieves the immediate goal of centering $\beta_{1 \rightarrow 2}$. By chance, it also centers the buffer occupancy of $\beta_{2 \rightarrow 1}$. In addition, the buffer occupancies of the elastic buffers associated with the other edges either incoming to node 2 or outgoing from node 2 are also affected. This

suggests that the strategy of each node simply successively centering its elastic buffers will not work, since each nodes actions will potentially de-center the changes which happened before. This can certainly happen; for example, if node 1 now increases its frequency for a short period in order to center the buffer occupancy of edge 5, this will then cause the elastic buffers of edges 1 and 4 to become de-centered again. This is shown in Figure 4, where edge 5 is controlled starting at time $t \approx 700e6$.




Figure 2: Frequency behavior as a function of time for the system in Figure 1.




Figure 3: Relative buffer occupancies for the system in Figure 1.

The simulations in this paper were performed with Calisto [3], which is a full simulation of the individual frames in a bittide network, including latency. The buffer occupancies observed in simulation match those predicted in the theory of this paper, despite the different levels of




Figure 4: Relative buffer occupancies for the system in Figure 1 after centering by both nodes 2 and node 1.

modeling fidelity.

4.2 Example: mesh

In this paper, we present an approach for solving this problem. Specifically, we show that there is an ordering in which nodes can apply corrections to the elastic buffer occupancies, and that after applying this sequence of corrections, *all* of the buffer occupancies on the graph are centered.

Our approach is as follows. First, we construct a directed spanning tree on the graph. An example is shown in Figure 5. All paths on the spanning tree lead away from the (arbitrary) root node; in this example, the root node is 2. Each edge has a corresponding elastic buffer at its destination node. The proposed control policy must satisfy the following requirement. All nodes on the network are adjusted apart from the root node. If node i is an ancestor of node j in the tree, and i is not the root, then we must adjust the frequency of node i before we adjust that of node j . This ordering is the partial ordering corresponding to the spanning tree.




Figure 5: Graph with directed spanning tree
For the example in Figure 5, one possible ordering of

edge adjustments is (3, 5, 10, 4, 13, 2, 7, 11). The resulting behavior of the elastic buffers is shown in Figure 6 where the edges are adjusted at times 500, 750, ..., 2250.




Figure 6: Relative buffer occupancies for the system in Figure 5 after centering by all nodes in sequence.

5 Formulation of the controller

In this section we state precisely the controller that we will use, and show that it has the desired outcome of reducing all buffer occupancies to the midpoint; that is $\beta = \beta^{\text{off}}$, or equivalently $\tilde{\beta} = 0$.

Definition 1. Suppose \mathcal{T} is an outward directed spanning tree with root r . Let g_1, \dots, g_{n-1} be an ordering of the edges in \mathcal{T} which is consistent with the natural ordering; that is, if $g_i \prec g_j$ then $i < j$. Let $0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n$ be given, with $t_{i+1} - t_i$ sufficiently large. Let k and k_2 be positive.

For each node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ we define the controller as follows. Given i , there is exactly one edge in \mathcal{T} which has destination i ; define j so that g_j is that edge. Then let the controller be

$$c_i(t) = \begin{cases} ky_i(t) & \text{if } t < t_1 \\ ky_i(t_1) + k_2 \text{sign}(\tilde{\beta}_{g_j}(t)) & \text{if } t_j \leq t < t_{j+1} \\ & \text{and } i \neq r \\ ky_i(t_1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

With the controller defined as above, the system is using a proportional controller $c = ky$ for the time $t < t_1$. We will make the following assumption.

Assumption 2. We assume that at time $t = t_1$ that the system has converged; that is both $\beta(t_1) = \beta^{\text{ss}}$ and $\omega(t_1) = \omega^{\text{ss}}$.

We can now look at the system behavior as a result of using this controller. First we look at the effect of a single interval.

Lemma 1. Consider the dynamics of Proposition 1. Suppose $g \in \mathcal{E}$ is an edge with destination vertex $i = \text{dst}(g)$. Suppose for $t \in [t_1, t_2]$ the controller is

$$c(t) = q + k_2 \text{sign}(\tilde{\beta}_g(t))e_i$$

where $q = (W - I)\omega^u$. Let $h = |\tilde{\beta}_g(t_1)|/k_2$ and assume $t_2 > t_1 + h$. Then

$$\tilde{\beta}(t_2) = (I + B^\top DE^g)\tilde{\beta}(t_1)$$

Proof. From the dynamics, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{\beta}}(t) &= BT^\top \dot{\theta} \\ &= B^\top(q + \omega^u + k_2 \text{sign}(\tilde{\beta}_g(t))e_i) \\ &= k_2 \text{sign}(\tilde{\beta}_g(t))e_i \end{aligned}$$

since $B^\top W = 0$. Therefore

$$\dot{\tilde{\beta}}_g(t) = -k_2 \text{sign}(\tilde{\beta}_g(t))$$

which is a scalar on-off feedback system. Hence $\tilde{\beta}_g(t_1 + h) = 0$. Let $s = \text{sign}(\tilde{\beta}_g(t_1))$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\beta}(t_2) &= \tilde{\beta}(t_1) + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \dot{\tilde{\beta}}(t) dt \\ &= \tilde{\beta}(t_1) + \int_{t_1}^{t_1+h} k_2 s B^\top e_i dt \\ &= \tilde{\beta}(t_1) + k_2 s h B^\top e_i \end{aligned}$$

Now $h k_2 s = e_g^\top \tilde{\beta}(t_1)$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\beta}(t_2) &= (I + B^\top e_i e_i^\top)\tilde{\beta}(t_1) \\ &= (I + B^\top DE^g)\tilde{\beta}(t_1) \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \blacksquare

In Lemma 1, a critical assumption is that the controller has access to q . This is possible, even though ω^u is not known by the controller, by making use of the equilibrium of the proportional controller. Specifically, a proportional controller has an equilibrium such that $ky = (W - I)\omega^u$. By applying the buffer adjustments after the system has reached equilibrium, each node i has access to ky_i , which is sufficient to apply the result.

Lemma 2. Consider the dynamics of Proposition 1 and the controller of Definition 1, and let Assumption 2 hold. Then

$$\tilde{\beta}(t_{j+1}) = (I + B^\top DE^{g_j})\tilde{\beta}(t_j)$$

and in particular

$$\tilde{\beta}_{g_j}(t_{j+1}) = 0$$

for all $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$.

Proof. Using Assumption 2, we have $\dot{\theta}(t_1) = 0$ and so $ky(t_1) = (W - I)\omega^u$. The proof then follows from applying Lemma 1 to the controller in Definition 1. \blacksquare

Lemma 2 shows that in the interval $[t_j, t_{j+1}]$, one of the elastic buffers is set to zero, and the frequency at the end of the interval is the same as it was at the start. We now consider the effect of such a step on the other elastic buffers.

Lemma 3. Assume $g \in \mathcal{E}$ is an edge. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and

$$z = (I + B^\top DE^g)x$$

Then $z_g = 0$ and for all $l \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\text{src}(l) \neq \text{dst}(g)$ and $\text{dst}(l) \neq \text{dst}(g)$ we have $z_l = x_l$.

Proof. It follows directly from the definitions that

$$(B^\top DE^g)_{ab} = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } b = g \text{ and } \text{dst}(a) = \text{dst}(g) \\ 1 & \text{if } b = g \text{ and } \text{src}(a) = \text{dst}(g) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

from which the result follows. \blacksquare

Lemma 4. Consider the dynamics of Proposition 1 and the controller of Definition 1, and let Assumption 2 hold. Then for every edge $a \in \mathcal{T}$

$$\tilde{\beta}_a(t_n) = 0$$

That is, after the controller is applied for $n - 1$ steps, the buffer occupancy of all tree edges is zero.

Proof. We have by Lemma 2 that

$$\tilde{\beta}(t_{j+1}) = (I + B^\top DE^{g_j})\tilde{\beta}(t_j)$$

By Lemma 3 we have that $\tilde{\beta}_{g_j}(t_{j+1}) = 0$ for every $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$. We claim that $\tilde{\beta}_a(t_{j+1}) = 0$ for all edges $a \preceq g_j$ for all j . The proof follows by induction. By Lemma 3 it holds at $j = 1$. Now suppose it holds at step j . We will show that it holds at step $j + 1$. We have

$$\tilde{\beta}(t_{j+2}) = (I + B^\top DE^{g_{j+1}})\tilde{\beta}(t_{j+1})$$

Now if $a \preceq g_{j+1}$ then $\text{src}(a) \neq j + 1$, since the tree must be acyclic. Also there is only one edge a such that $\text{dst}(a) = \text{dst}(g_{j+1})$, since it is an outward tree, and that edge is $a = g_{j+1}$. So by Lemma 3 we have $\tilde{\beta}_{g_{j+1}}(t_{j+2}) = 0$. All other edges a have $\tilde{\beta}_a(t_{j+2}) = \tilde{\beta}_a(t_{j+1})$ and so using the induction hypothesis this must equal zero. \blacksquare

The following result is well-known.

Theorem 1. Suppose $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is a directed graph with incidence matrix B , and suppose edges $1, \dots, n - 1$ form a spanning tree. Partition B according to

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ -\mathbf{1}^\top B_{11} & -\mathbf{1}^\top B_{12} \end{bmatrix}$$

then B_{11} is unimodular. Further

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & 0 \\ -\mathbf{1}^\top B_{11} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}$$

where $N = B_{11}^{-1} B_{12}$.

Proof. See for example Theorem 2.10 of [1]. ■

Lemma 5. Suppose $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is a directed graph with incidence matrix B , and suppose edges $\mathcal{T} = \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ form a spanning tree. Let B be the incidence matrix of the graph and suppose $y \in \text{range}(B^\top)$. If $y_i = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{T}$ then $u = 0$.

Proof. Since $y \in \text{range}(B^\top)$ we have, by Theorem 1, that there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$y = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ N^\top & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_{11}^\top & -B_{11}^\top \mathbf{1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} x$$

and hence $y = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ N^\top \end{bmatrix} z$ for some $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Now, since $y_i = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{T}$ we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \hat{y} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ N^\top \end{bmatrix} z$$

where $\hat{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{m-n+1}$. Hence $z = 0$ and $\hat{y} = 0$. ■

There are several parameters in the controller. The theoretical requirements are that k and k_2 be positive and that the time intervals $t_{i+1} - t_i$ be sufficiently large. In practice the system is not sensitive to these choices. The proportional gain k is limited in size by the sample rate in a practical implementation. Another practical consideration is that nodes do not have access to the exact time t . The controller is not dependent on the exact choice of t_i and so small inaccuracies here do not affect its behavior. Other constraints, such as the quantization in the frequency control mechanism, may also play a role but we do not analyze that here. The controller also requires determination of a spanning tree in advance, and the choice of any order consistent with the tree, which can be determined from the topology via standard algorithms before the controller is run. An additional feature of the implementation is that the controller of Definition 1 only specifies the control input up to time t_n ; after this time, the system is in a relative equilibrium and a simple proportional controller may be used.

We can now state the main result of this paper. If the controller is determined using the spanning tree and the elastic buffers of the edges on this spanning tree are centered by adjusting the frequencies of the nodes in an ordering consistent with the partial ordering according to T , then all elastic buffers will be centered. This is stated below.

Theorem 2. Consider the dynamics of Proposition 1 and the controller of Definition 1, and let Assumption 2 hold. Then

$$\tilde{\beta}(t_n) = 0$$

Proof. Lemma 4 show that $\tilde{\beta}_a(t_n) = 0$ for all a in the spanning tree. Now since $\tilde{\beta} = B^\top \tilde{\theta}$ we know that $\tilde{\beta} \in \text{range}(B^\top)$. Using Lemma 5 gives the desired result. ■

Lemma 4 shows that since the orderings proceed away from the root, no adjustment de-centers any elastic buffer on the tree preceding it. Therefore after this process, all of the elastic buffers on the tree are centered. Lemma 5 then provides the final step, showing that if the elastic buffers on a spanning tree are all centered, then every elastic buffer is centered.

6 Conclusions

This paper presents a novel approach, termed *frame rotation*, for achieving buffer centering in bittide synchronized networks.

We provide examples and analysis that show how purely local and uncoordinated buffer adjustments can shift the equilibrium and thereby de-center other buffers within the system.

To overcome this, we propose a structured control strategy predicated on the construction of a directed spanning tree of the underlying graph. We give a method which carefully orchestrates the frequency adjustments of individual nodes in an order consistent with this spanning tree, and employs a pulsed feedback mechanism to adjust the buffer occupancy of specific tree edges. We prove that this approach ensures the convergence of all elastic buffers to their desired equilibrium.

The significance of this work lies in providing a robust and theoretically grounded method for managing a critical aspect of bittide system operation. While our approach necessitates an initial coordination phase to establish the spanning tree and the processing order, the subsequent adjustments are performed locally, leveraging readily available buffer occupancy information. This methodology provides a new and reliable technique for controlling the data flows on bittide networks. Future work could explore the resilience of this approach to dynamic network changes, in particular adding and removing nodes, and investigate methods for a more adaptive or fully decentralized determination of the spanning tree and processing order.

References

- [1] R. B. Bapat. *Graphs and matrices*. Springer, 2017.
- [2] M. Bastiaan, C. Baaij, M. Izzard, F. Klein, S. Lall, and T. Spalink. bittide: Control time, not flows. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.05033>.
- [3] The Callisto simulator for bittide networks. <https://github.com/bittide/Callisto.jl>.
- [4] L. Kenwright, P. S. Roop, N. Allen, S. Lall, C. Caçaval, T. Spalink, and M. Izzard. Logical synchrony networks: A formal model for deterministic distribution. *IEEE Access*, 12:80872–80883, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.07433>.
- [5] S. Lall, C. Caçaval, M. Izzard, and T. Spalink. Modeling and control of bittide synchronization. In *Proceedings*

- of the American Control Conference, pages 5185–5192, 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.14111>.
- [6] S. Lall, C. Caşcaval, M. Izzard, and T. Spalink. Resistance distance and control performance for bittide synchronization. In *Proceedings of the European Control Conference*, pages 1850–1857, 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.05296>.
- [7] S. Lall, C. Caşcaval, M. Izzard, and T. Spalink. On buffer centering for bittide synchronization. In *International Conference on Control, Decision, and Information Technologies*, pages 2348–2353, 2023. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.11467>.
- [8] S. Lall, C. Caşcaval, M. Izzard, and T. Spalink. Logical synchrony and the bittide mechanism. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 35(11):1936–1948, Nov. 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.00144>.
- [9] S. Lall, C. Caşcaval, M. Izzard, and T. Spalink. On buffer centering for bittide synchronization. In *International Conference on Control, Decision and Information Technologies (CoDIT)*, pages 2348–2353, 2023. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.11467>.
- [10] S. Prasad. Logical synchrony plus functional processes entail observable determinacy. In *ACM-IEEE International Symposium on Formal Methods and Models for System Design*, pages 63–68, 2024.
- [11] T. Spalink. *Deterministic sharing of distributed resources*. Princeton University, 2006.