

### Performance 2020

# Heavy Traffic Analysis of Approximate Max–Weight Matching Algorithms for Input–Queued Switches

Yu Huang and Longbo Huang

IIIS, Tsinghua University

### Outline



- Motivation
- System Model & Problem Settings
- Main Results
- Conclusion

# **Motivation**

- High-Speed Router
- Data Center Networks

### Wireless Networks





https://www.indiamart.com/infinityentp-hapur/networkswitches.html



https://www.techiexpert.com/google-built-an-ai-to-help-keep-its-data-centers-cool/

https://community.fs.com/blog/power-over-ethernettechnology-poe-switch.html

### How to design a good policy?



# **Motivation**



### Shceduling Policy: Max–Weight Matching (MWM)

- Throughput optimal
- Good delay performance
- Heavy traffic queue length optimal

### Problem:

• High complexity of computation: O(n<sup>3</sup>)

# Consider a class of approximate MWM algorithms with lower complexity

# System Model:

- ✤ n×n switch:
  - Schedule process:

$$S = \left\{ \mathbf{S} \in \{0,1\}^{n^2} : \sum_{i=1}^n S_{ij} \le 1, \sum_{j=1}^n S_{ij} \le 1, \forall i, j \in \{1,2,\dots,n\} \right\}$$

 $\succ$  Arrival process: bounded by  $A_{max}$ , I.I.D. Mean&Var:  $oldsymbol{\lambda}, oldsymbol{\sigma}^2$ 

### Heavy Traffic Setttings:

 $\begin{array}{l} \succ \text{ Capacity Region} \\ \mathcal{C} = \operatorname{Conv}(\mathcal{S}) \\ = \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2}_+ : \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{ij} \leq 1, \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_{ij} \leq 1 \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \right\} \qquad \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \partial \mathcal{C} \quad \boxed{ \left[ \begin{array}{c} \sum_{j'=1}^n \nu_{ij'} = 1, \forall i \leq n_1 \\ \sum_{i'=1}^n \nu_{i'j} = 1, \forall j \leq n_2 \end{array} \right] \\ \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \longrightarrow \mathbf{0} \qquad \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(\boldsymbol{\epsilon})} = \boldsymbol{\nu} - \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\eta} \end{array} \right.}$ 



in1

in2

in3

# **Related Work:**

• MWM:



[Tassiulas et al, 1992], [McKeown et al, 1999], [Georgiadis et al, 2006], [Basu et al, 2019] ...

• Low–Complexity Policy:

[Tassiulas, 1998], [Keslassy et al, 2001], [Shah et al, 2002], [Giaccone et al, 2003], [Lin et al, 2006], [Ross et al, 2007], [Gupta et al, 2007], [Lin et al, 2009] ...

• Heavy Traffic:

[Eryilmaz et al, 2012], [Maguluri et al, 2016], [Wang et al, 2017], [Maguluri et al, 2018], [Zhou et al, 2020] ...

- Remark: Our work differs in
  - i. Extend the approximate MWM to an **expeted** sense
  - ii. Consider a general case: arbitrary number of ports are saturated
  - iii. Develop a novel communication efficient algorithm with good delay and throughput

### **Main Results:**



- Expected 1–APRX
- Heavy Traffic Analysis
- Communication–Efficient Algorithm: MWM–AU

# **Expected 1–APRX**



of scendule: 
$$W_{\mathbf{S}}(t) \triangleq \langle \mathbf{Q}(t), \mathbf{S} \rangle = \sum_{i,j} Q_{ij}(t) S_{ij}$$

MWM:

Weight

 $\mathbf{S}^{*}(t) \in \underset{\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{S}}{\arg \max} \langle \mathbf{Q}(t), \mathbf{S} \rangle$ 

**Expected 1–APRX:**  $\mathbb{E}\left\{W_{\pi}(t)|\mathbf{Q}(t)\right\} \geq W^{*}(t) - f\left(W^{*}(t)\right)$ 

#### Remark:

- Motivated by 1–APRX in [Shah et al, 2002]
- Containing a class of randomized policies e.g., TASS[Tassiulas, 1998], batch MWM [Ross et al, 2007]
- Expected 1–APRX achieves 100% throughput

# Heavy Traffic Results: SSC



$$\mathcal{C} \text{one} \qquad \mathcal{K}_{n_1 n_2} \triangleq \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2} : \mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} w_i \mathbf{e}^{(i)} + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \widetilde{w}_j \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}^{(j)} \\ w_i \in \mathbb{R}^+ \text{ for } 1 \le i \le n_1, \widetilde{w}_j \in \mathbb{R}^+ \text{ for } 1 \le j \le n_2 \right\}$$

**Theorem 1** For any fixed  $\beta > 0$ , and  $0 < \epsilon \le \nu'_{\min}/4(1+2\beta) \|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|$  each system with the steady state queue lengths vector satisfies:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_{\perp\mathcal{K}}^{(\epsilon)}\right\| - \beta \left\|\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_{\parallel\mathcal{K}}^{(\epsilon)}\right\|\right] \le M_{\beta}$$

Prior: e.g. [Maguluri et al, 2018]  $\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{Q}_{\perp \mathcal{K}_{n1n2}}\|^{r}\right] \leq M_{r}$  Our case:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_{\perp\mathcal{K}}^{(\epsilon)}\right\|\right]/\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{(\epsilon)}\right\|\right] < \beta$$

# Main Idea of Proof: Drift Method



**Drift function:** 

$$W(\mathbf{Q}) \triangleq \max\{\|\mathbf{Q}_{\perp \mathcal{K}}\| - \beta \|\mathbf{Q}_{\parallel \mathcal{K}}\|, 0\}$$

#### **Remark:**

- Inspired by [Wang et al, 2017]
- Drift function used for MWM, e.g., W(Q) ≜ ||Q<sub>⊥K</sub>|| [Maguluri et al, 2018] cannot work for expected 1–APRX

# Heavy Traffic Result: Upper Bound



Subspace

 $w_i \in \mathbb{R} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n_1, \widetilde{w}_j \in \mathbb{R} \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq n_2 \}$ 

**Theorem 2:** For any fixed weight vector  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2}$ , the steady state queue lengths vector satisfies:

$$\epsilon \left( \mathbb{E}[\langle \overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{(\epsilon)}, \boldsymbol{\alpha} \rangle] - \underline{(\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\| + 2n^2 \min\{n_1 + n_2, n\})} \mathbb{E}\left[ \left\| \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_{\perp S}^{(\epsilon)} \right\| \right] \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(\epsilon)})^2, \boldsymbol{\zeta} \right\rangle + B(\epsilon)$$

 $S_{n_1n_2} \triangleq \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2} : \mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \mathbf{e}^{(i)} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \widetilde{w}_j \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}^{(j)} \text{ where } \right\}$ 

#### **Remark:**

- Collapse to  $\mathcal{K}_{n_1n_2} \longrightarrow$  Collapse to  $\mathcal{S}_{n_1n_2}$
- Upper bound for weighted queue length  $\epsilon \mathbb{E}[\langle \overline{\mathbf{Q}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha} \rangle]$  is close to  $\frac{1}{2} \langle \sigma^2, \boldsymbol{\zeta} \rangle$  in the heavy-traffic limit.

### **Communication–Efficient Algorithm: MWM–AU**





**Proposition 1:**  $W_a(t) \ge W^*(t) - 2ng(W^*(t)/n)$  i.e., **MWM–AU** belongs to **expected 1–APRX** 

- Throughput optimal
- Upper bound:  $\epsilon \mathbb{E}[\langle \overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{(\epsilon)}, \boldsymbol{\alpha} \rangle] \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(\epsilon)})^2, \boldsymbol{\zeta} \right\rangle$

### Simulations





# **Simulations: Heavy Traffic**

![](_page_13_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_2.jpeg)

### **Conclusions:**

![](_page_14_Picture_1.jpeg)

### Expected 1–APRX

- I. Extend 1–APRX to an expected sense
- II. Contains a large class of low-complexity policies

### Heavy Traffic Analysis

- I. Establish a state-space collapse result
- II. Obtain an upper bound for the weighted queue length

### Communication–Efficient Algorithm : MWM–AU

- I. Significantly reduce communication frequency
- II. Achieve the same delay performance as MWM

![](_page_15_Picture_0.jpeg)

# THANK YOU!

Yu Huang IIIS, Tsinghua University E-mail: y-huang20@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn