

Formal Abstractions for Packet Scheduling

ANSHUMAN MOHAN, Cornell University, USA

YUNHE LIU, Cornell University, USA

NATE FOSTER, Cornell University, USA

TOBIAS KAPPÉ, Open Universiteit, the Netherlands and ILLC, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

DEXTER KOZEN, Cornell University, USA

This paper studies PIFO trees from a programming language perspective. PIFO trees are a recently proposed model for programmable packet schedulers. They can express a wide range of scheduling algorithms including strict priority, weighted fair queueing, hierarchical schemes, and more. However, their semantic properties are not well understood. We formalize the syntax and semantics of PIFO trees in terms of an operational model. We also develop an alternate semantics in terms of permutations on lists of packets, prove theorems characterizing expressiveness, and develop an embedding algorithm for replicating the behavior of one with another. We present a prototype implementation of PIFO trees in OCaml and relate its behavior to a hardware switch on a variety of standard and novel scheduling algorithms.

1 INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, programmable networks have gone from a dream to reality [Foster et al. 2020]. But why do network owners want to program the network? Although there has been some “buzz” around trendy topics like self-driving networks [Liu et al. 2020] and in-network computing [Dang et al. 2015; Jin et al. 2018, 2017], the top priority for network owners is typically less flashy: they simply want to be able to build predictable networks that provide reliable service, even under uncertain operating conditions. Doing this well in practice requires not just selecting particular forwarding paths but also prioritizing certain packets over others—i.e., controlling packet scheduling—using algorithms that operate at line rate.

Today, most routers support just a few scheduling algorithms—e.g., strict priority, weighted fair queueing, etc.—which are baked into the hardware. The schedulers can be configured to some extent, but it is generally not possible to implement a completely new approach to scheduling. However, in a recent paper, Sivaraman et al. [2016b] proposed a new model for *programmable* packet schedulers based on a novel datastructure called a *push-in-first-out tree*, or *PIFO tree* for short. This relatively simple datastructure can be instantiated to realize a wide range of well-studied packet scheduling algorithms. PIFO trees can be implemented in hardware at line rate. It seems likely that PIFOs will be supported on network devices in the near future; indeed, researchers have already started to explore how the PIFO abstraction can be emulated or approximated on conventional routers [Alcoz et al. 2020].

As the name suggests, a PIFO tree is organized into a tree in which the internal nodes encode a hierarchy of past scheduling decisions, and the leaves store the actual buffered packets. Informally, to insert a packet, the PIFO tree executes a program called a *scheduling transaction* that inserts the packet into the tree at a leaf, and computes a rank for each internal node on the path back to the root. The dual process for outgoing packets uses a simple, fixed algorithm: the most favorably ranked packet in the tree is identified using a top-down traversal and removed from the tree.

Authors’ addresses: Anshuman Mohan, Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 14853-7501, USA, amohan@cs.cornell.edu; Yunhe Liu, Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 14853-7501, USA, yunhelio@cs.cornell.edu; Nate Foster, Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 14853-7501, USA, jnfoster@cs.cornell.edu; Tobias Kappé, Computer Science, Open Universiteit, Amsterdam, the Netherlands and ILLC, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands; Dexter Kozen, Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 14853-7501, USA, kozen@cs.cornell.edu.

Despite their operational simplicity, relatively little is known about the deeper semantic properties of PIFO trees, or the pragmatics of how to program them. For example, the shape of the PIFO tree may be fixed by hardware constraints. It is intuitively clear that the shape of the tree affects the kinds of scheduling algorithms that can be expressed, but we are not aware of any work that characterizes this relationship precisely, or studies how to translate scheduling algorithms written for a tree with one shape onto a tree with a different shape.

From a theoretical perspective, developing such a translation would be interesting as it would identify the conditions governing whether a given PIFO tree can be realized in hardware. It would also be useful from a practical perspective: chip designers could provision a fixed PIFO tree in advance, freeing up hardware resources for implementing the scheduling logic and other features.

This paper develops the first formal account of PIFO trees, using tools and techniques from the field of programming languages to model their semantics. We embark on a comprehensive study of PIFO trees, examining how expressiveness is affected by variations in the topology of the PIFO tree, using an elegant, alternative formulation in terms of permutations on lists of packets. Our main theoretical result is an algorithm that compiles an arbitrary PIFO tree onto a PIFO tree with regular branching. We also develop a prototype interpreter in OCaml, evaluate its behavior on a collection of representative examples, and relate it to several common scheduling algorithms as implemented on a state-of-the-art hardware switch.

This paper makes the following contributions:

- We present the first formal syntax and semantics for PIFO trees.
- We give an alternate formulation in terms of permutations on lists of packets, and we use it to characterize expressiveness of PIFO trees and to replicate the behavior of one PIFO tree on another.
- We develop a prototype interpreter for PIFO trees in OCaml, and we relate its behavior to a hardware switch on a variety of scheduling algorithms.

Overall, this work develops a first step toward higher-level abstractions for specifying scheduling algorithms, it develops accompanying compilation tools, and suggests directions for future work in the area of scheduling, both in the networking domain and beyond.

2 OVERVIEW

We start by discussing what is perhaps the most obvious model of programmable scheduling: programmable priority queues. In this model, incoming packets are ranked using a (user-defined) *scheduling transaction*, and packets are enqueued by rank. In general, the scheduling transaction that computes the rank may read and write state. To dequeue a packet, we simply remove the most favorably ranked packet (i.e., the one with the with lowest rank and, equivalently, highest priority).

Although such an approach is simple and relatively easy to implement, it is unable to express a basic feature of many packet scheduling algorithms—the ability to reorder one packet relative to another after they are enqueued—which we motivate with an example. To address this shortcoming, we then give a formal account of PIFO trees [Sivaraman et al. 2016b], which extend the simple programmable queue model and support such reordering.

2.1 Programmable priority queues

As an example, suppose incoming packets can be divided into two flows, coming to you from datacenters in Rochester and Buffalo respectively. The flows are meant to be given equal priority up to the availability of bandwidth. This last caveat is important: if one flow becomes inactive and the other stays active, then the active flow is given free rein to use the excess bandwidth until the other flow starts up again, at which point it again receives its fair share. This scheduler is said to

be *work conserving* because it always transmits *some* packet if there is a packet enqueued in its buffer and there is sufficient bandwidth available on the outgoing link.

Fortunately, the queue in your network device is programmable: it allows you to specify a *scheduling transaction*, which assigns an integer rank to each packet while updating some internal state. The packet is then inserted into a *push-in-first-out queue*, or *PIFO*,¹ which orders the packets by their rank. A different component in the network device then *POPS* the lowest ranked packet from the queue whenever the link becomes available, and transmits it.

The scenario where we aim for an equal split between **R** and **B** traffic can be implemented by judiciously assigning ranks to incoming packets such that the contents of the queue interleave between these flows whenever possible, and by maintaining the necessary state. Specifically, our aim will be to maintain a queue that has one of the following three forms at any given time:

$$B_n, \dots, B_1, (R, B)^* \qquad R_n, \dots, R_1, (R, B)^* \qquad (R, B)^*$$

Here, we write $(R, B)^*$ to stand in for a balanced (possibly zero) number of interleaved **R** and **B** packets interleaved in either order, such as **R, B, R, B** or **B, R, B, R, B, R**. In keeping with network queueing tradition, the most favorably ranked item in the queue is on the right and so the queue is read from right to left, in the order it will be dequeued.

Let us see how these three cases accept a new **R** or **B** packet. Since we just have a PIFO, our power is limited: all we can do is assign the incoming packet a rank and then *PUSH* the packet into the PIFO at that rank. The packet is inserted among the previously buffered packets without affecting the relative order of the packets that were previously enqueued. We distinguish based on the three possible shapes of the queue:

- (1) To enqueue a **B** into $B_n, \dots, B_1, (R, B)^*$, give it any rank that puts it within the list of unbalanced **B**s. Making it B_{n+1} puts it on the far left and preserves arrival order within the **B** flow. To enqueue an **R**, put it just before or just after B_1 (depending on whether the item at the head of the queue is **R** or **B**). This extends the initial (balanced) part of the queue.
- (2) To enqueue a **B** or an **R** into $R_n, \dots, R_1, (R, B)^*$, act symmetrically to the previous case.
- (3) To enqueue a **B** or an **R** into $(R, B)^*$, assign it a rank that puts it on the very left. This creates a queue of the first or second kind.

2.2 Achieving balance within flows

The solution proposed for sharing bandwidth between **R** and **B** works well thus far, but now suppose a complication arises. As it turns out, traffic from the **Rochester** node can be further divided by destination: some packets are bound for **Toronto** and some for **Pittsburgh**. Traffic to these sites also needs to be balanced equally in a 1:1 split, but *within* the share of traffic allocated to **R** packets. That is, every two packets released should (on average) contain one **R** and one **B**, and every two **R** packets released should contain one **T** and one **P**. Again, this is up to the availability of packets.

We now highlight a particular case that may arise when trying to program a scheduling transaction that adheres to these constraints, and show that the desired split cannot be achieved using a single programmable queue. Suppose **T** is initially silent, while **P** and **B** are active. In this case, our scheduler should balance **P** and **B** *evenly*: **P** gets to take up the entire share allocated to **R** traffic, of which it is a part. Under this policy, the queue might take the following form:

$$B_3, B_2, P_2, B_1, P_1$$

So far, so good: opportunities for transmission are divided evenly between **P** and **B**, up to availability of packets. But now a **Toronto**-bound packet T_1 arrives, and our scheduling transaction needs to

¹These data structures are better known as *priority queues*, with the only addendum that PIFOs are defined to break ties in *first-in-first-out (FIFO)* order. We use the term *PIFO* to preserve continuity with earlier work by [Sivaraman et al. \[2016b\]](#).




Fig. 1. A PIFO tree allows buffered packets to be reordered.

insert it somewhere in this queue. With an eye to the 1:1 split *within* the R flow, T_1 can go either before or after P_1 but it really does need to go before P_2 —after all, if this is not the case, then opportunities for R traffic are not being split evenly between T and P . This leaves us with three possible choices for inserting T_1 , which would result in one of the following queues:

$$B_3, B_2, P_2, T_1, B_1, P_1 \qquad B_3, B_2, P_2, B_1, T_1, P_1 \qquad B_3, B_2, P_2, B_1, P_1, T_1$$

However, *all* of these choices violate the 1:1 contract between R and B —note that both T and P fall under the broader R flow, so the options above all propose to send two R s in a row while an unbalanced B languishes in the back. Queues that *do* satisfy the balance requirements include

$$B_3, P_2, B_2, T_1, B_1, P_1 \qquad B_3, P_2, B_2, P_1, B_1, T_1$$

but note that these require the reordering of previously buffered packets relative to each other. Since our programmable queue model allows us to assign a rank only to the incoming packet, *it is impossible to achieve the desired behavior using a single PIFO*. Moreover, it was not obvious at the onset that the algorithm would require the reordering of previously buffered packets.

2.3 Introducing PIFO trees

Sivaraman et al. [2016b] propose a remarkably elegant solution to the problem discussed above: instead of using a single PIFO, we use a *tree* of PIFOs. The leaves of this tree correspond to flows, each of which is organized in a PIFO according to its local rules. Meanwhile, the internal nodes of the tree contain PIFOs that prioritize the opportunities for transmission *between classes of traffic*, without referring to a particular packet within those classes. This model affords us a layer of indirection, and this lets us eke out more expressiveness from the simple PIFO primitive while maintaining the flexibility of being able to program the relative priorities of each flow and subflow.

To illustrate how a PIFO tree operates, we now show how this model can be used to tackle the problem posed by the $R/B/T/P$ traffic scenario discussed above. The PIFO tree that we will use is depicted in Figure 1. Every node in this tree carries a PIFO, which we render, as before, with the most favorably ranked item on the right. An internal node orders transmission opportunities for its children by index (here, 1 and 2), while leaf nodes carry packets in their PIFOs. The tree on the left holds our original five packets, before the arrival of T_1 . We maintain the left leaf as the R leaf and the right leaf as the B leaf; we show this with colored borders.

Dequeuing a packet from the tree on the left triggers two steps. First, we dequeue an element from the PIFO in the root; in this case we obtain 1, a reference to the left child. Second, we look at that leaf, where dequeuing the PIFO returns the packet P_1 . We release this packet. In general, the pop operation recurses into a tree until it reaches a leaf, following the path guided by the references popped from the internal nodes. Repeating pop until the tree is empty yields the sequence B_3, B_2, P_2, B_1, P_1 , in accordance with the example above.

To push T_1 into the tree, we perform two steps:

- (1) Since T_1 belongs to the R flow, we insert it into the PIFO of the left leaf. To do this, we must pick a rank; as noted before, T_1 needs to go before P_2 , but either position relative to P_1 is allowed. We place T_1 after P_1 in an attempt to stay closer to arrival order.

Index	i	$i \in \mathbb{N}$
Packet	pkt	primitive
Rank	r	part of an ordered set
PIFO tree	$n ::= \text{Leaf} \{$	
	$pifo : (pkt, r) \text{ PIFO}$	holds packets ordered by r
	$\}$	
	$ \text{Internal} \{$	
	$kids : \vec{n}$	list of unique children
	$pifo : (i, r) \text{ PIFO}$	holds indices ordered by r
	$\}$	
Path	$path ::= r \mid (i, r) :: path$	
Control	$c ::= \{$	
	$state : s$	left opaque
	$st : s \rightarrow pkt \rightarrow (path, s)$	scheduling transaction
	$\}$	

Fig. 2. PIFO tree syntax.

- (2) We enqueue a **1** index (shown in orange because it was enqueued on account of a **T** packet) into the root node. We get to pick **1**'s rank before inserting it into the root PIFO; we choose a rank that maintains 1:1 harmony between the indices **1s** and **2**.

The resulting tree is on the right in Figure 1. Note how repeatedly popping elements from this tree gives the desired ordering **B**₃, **P**₂, **B**₂, **T**₁, **B**₁, **P**₁. Critically, when the **1** at the root is popped, it causes the release of **P**₂ and not **T**₁. This is because the index **1** refers to an opportunity for the left child to propose a packet, not to any individual packet enqueued there. Indeed, the packet **T**₁ has already been released by the time **1** is dequeued. The release of **T**₁ was triggered by an older **1** index.

As before, we *just* used PIFOs—at enqueue, each item was assigned a rank and inserted without affecting the relative order the older items in the PIFO—but the on-the-fly target switching that we have just seen, where an index enqueued on account of one packet may eventually lead to the release of a different packet, is elegant and powerful. This is what lets PIFO trees realize relative reordering of buffered packets despite the limitations of its relatively simplistic primitives.

2.4 Syntax and semantics

We now give a more formal definition of the syntax and semantics of PIFO trees. As mentioned, PIFO trees are trees where each node holds a PIFO. An internal node uses its PIFO to hold references to its children (in the form of integer indices), while a leaf node uses its PIFO to hold packets.

In addition, each internal node carries *kids*, a unique list of its child nodes. Fig. 2 shows this syntax formally. The indices in an internal node's PIFO refer to its *kids* list. A PIFO tree maintains the invariant that these indices are valid, i.e., range from 1 to $|kids|$. Further, there are exactly m_i occurrences of i where m_i is the total number of elements in leaves below the i^{th} child.

We model the scheduling algorithm that is run on the tree separately in a *control*. Specifically, a control contains the *state* of the algorithm as well as a *scheduling transaction* that, given a packet and state, outputs information about where the packet is to be enqueued. This information is encapsulated in a *path*, which can be seen as a list $(i_1, r_1) :: \dots :: (i_n, r_n) :: r_{n+1}$. The first n elements (i_j, r_j) contain the index i_j of the next child as well as the rank r_j at which this index should be enqueued. The last element r_{n+1} is the rank of the packet as it is enqueued in the leaf. For example, the path $(1, 10) :: (3, 5) :: 6$ should be read as the algorithm choosing to

$$\begin{array}{l}
\frac{n \in \text{Leaf} \quad \text{POP}(n.\text{pifo}) = (pkt, \text{pifo}')}{\text{pop}(n) = (pkt, \{n \text{ with } \text{pifo} = \text{pifo}'\})} \\
\\
\frac{n \in \text{Internal} \quad \text{POP}(n.\text{pifo}) = (i, \text{pifo}') \quad \text{pop}(n.\text{kids}[i]) = (pkt, \text{kid}')}{\text{pop}(n) = (pkt, \{n \text{ with } \text{pifo} = \text{pifo}'; \text{kids} = n.\text{kids}[\text{kid}'/i\})} \\
\\
\frac{n \in \text{Leaf} \quad \text{PUSH}(n.\text{pifo}, (pkt, r)) = \text{pifo}'}{\text{push}(pkt, r, n) = \{n \text{ with } \text{pifo} = \text{pifo}'\}} \\
\\
\frac{n \in \text{Internal} \quad \text{push}(pkt, \text{path}, n.\text{kids}[h]) = \text{kid}' \quad \text{PUSH}(n.\text{pifo}, (i, r)) = \text{pifo}'}{\text{push}(pkt, (i, r) :: \text{path}, n) = \{n \text{ with } \text{pifo} = \text{pifo}'; \text{kids} = n.\text{kids}[\text{kid}'/i\}}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 3. Semantics of the push and pop operations on PIFO trees.

- (1) enqueue the index 1 in the root node with rank 10; and
- (2) enqueue the index 3 in the first child of the root node with rank 5; and
- (3) enqueue the packet itself in the third child of the first child of the root node with rank 6.

We briefly introduce some notation before defining the fundamental operations of a PIFO tree. The functions `POP` and `PUSH` operate on PIFOs: `POP` extracts the lowest rank element from the PIFO, while `PUSH` inserts an element into the queue with a certain rank. We read fields of a node using dot-notation and we functionally update fields of a node using the `with` keyword. We furthermore write $list[sub/index]$ to denote the substitution of sub for the element at $index$ in the list.

The semantics of `pop`, which takes a PIFO tree as input and outputs a packet along with an updated PIFO tree, is given by the first two rules in Fig. 3. When run on a leaf, `pop` simply applies `POP` to its PIFO, returning the released packet and the functionally updated node. When `pop` is applied to an internal node, it applies `POP` to its PIFO; the returned value is an index pointing to a child node, on which we call `pop` recursively. The resulting packet is also the present node's answer, along with a PIFO reflecting the effects of popping the internal PIFO, and the altered child node.

The semantics of `push` is given by the last two rules in Fig. 3. In addition to the packet, this operation takes a path describing how the packet should be enqueued. This path is computed once for each packet by running st , the scheduling transaction held by the control. When the node is a leaf, we simply enqueue the packet into the PIFO using the given rank; we then functionally update the present node to reflect changes to its state and its PIFO. When the node is internal, we recurse by calling `push` on the appropriate child with an appropriately shortened path. If `push` succeeds on the child, an altered version of the child is returned; again, we functionally update the present node to reflect its new state, PIFO, and $kids$ list. Note that this definition of `push` implicitly assumes that the path is well-formed, i.e., it does not contain indices of children that do not exist, and it leads to a leaf node. It is the responsibility of the algorithm to ensure that this is always the case.

Remark 1. In contrast to [Sivaraman et al. \[2016b\]](#), who endow each node in the tree with a scheduling transaction, we factor out the algorithm to the control. It is not hard to see that these models are equivalent: a monolithic control can be extracted from a PIFO tree with scheduling transactions attached, while individual node-specific scheduling transactions can be recovered from the control. We also omit *scheduling transactions*, which appear in their work and others; see §7.1.

2.5 Technical Contributions

The aim of this paper is to undertake a comprehensive study of PIFO trees as a semantic model for programmable packet queues. This means that we abstract from the actual program that drives the scheduling transaction, and focus on analysing the behavior that can be effected by *any* control operating on a PIFO tree. Our main contributions, therefore, are theoretical results about the relative expressiveness of different shapes of trees, as follows:

- We formally prove that the permutations of packets affected by PIFO trees with n cannot all be accomplished by PIFO trees with m leaves when $m < n$. By extension, this means that within the class of k -ary PIFO trees, taller PIFO trees are strictly more expressive (Section 3). As a special case, we obtain a formal proof of the intuition, outlined above, that PIFO trees are strictly more expressive than plain priority queues.
- We develop the notion of *homomorphic embedding* as a tool for showing that the scheduling behavior of one PIFO tree can be replicated by another (Section 4).
- We propose a procedure that can compute homomorphic embeddings between PIFO trees, if they exist. This algorithm can be used to map a PIFO tree designed by a packet scheduler architect into a (fixed) PIFO tree implemented in hardware (Section 5).
- We implement a model of PIFO tree behavior in a simulator, as well as the algorithm from Section 5. We compare simulations of several PIFO tree-based algorithms against standard algorithms implemented on a state-of-the-art hardware switch, in addition to comparing the simulations of PIFO trees against the simulations of their embedding (Section 6).

3 PIFO TREES AS PERMUTATORS

Intuitively, it's clear that PIFO trees can be thought of as denoting permutations on packets. In particular, we can characterize their behavior in terms of scenarios where we first push a list of input packets into the PIFO tree and then completely flush the tree, obtaining a list of output packets. Here, flush is the derived operation that repeatedly invokes pop until the PIFO tree is empty. This section makes this intuition precise, and uses the resulting characterization of PIFO trees as permutators to develop a variety of expressiveness results.

In much of the rest of the paper, we will stop accounting for the *control* (i.e., the scheduling transaction and internal state). We will study the pure tree, assuming that *any* ordering of elements—i.e., that could legally result from running scheduling transactions—is possible. For the purpose of comparing expressiveness, these orderings can be thought of as being chosen by an adversary.

To lighten the notation, we define a *configuration* σ of a PIFO tree to be:

- (L) at each leaf ℓ , a queue $\ell.pifo(\sigma)$ containing zero or more stored packets, where the queue is read right to left and represents the order in which the packets will be produced if we flush the PIFO tree.
- (S) at each internal node s with k children, a queue $s.pifo(\sigma)$ containing integers in the range $1 \leq i \leq k$ with exactly m_i occurrences of i , where m_i is the total number of elements in leaves below the i^{th} child, which is read right to left to give the order that the children will be visited in a flush. In symbols,

$$\#i(s.pifo(\sigma)) = \sum_{\ell \leq s.kids[i]} |\ell.pifo(\sigma)|,$$

where

- $\#i(s.pifo(\sigma))$ denotes the number of occurrences of i in $s.pifo(\sigma)$;
- $s.kids[i]$ is the i^{th} child of s ;
- ℓ denotes a leaf;

- $|\cdot|$ gives the length of (number of elements in) a queue; and
- \leq means “descendant of or equal to”.

The *size* of a configuration σ , denoted $|\sigma|$, is the total number of elements at the leaves:

$$|\sigma| = \sum_{\ell} |\ell.pifo(\sigma)|.$$

Let $\text{Con } T$ denote the set of configurations of the PIFO tree T .

3.1 PIFO trees with n leaves

Let T be a tree with n leaves. Let $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ be an arbitrary but fixed n -element set. Consider the set of configurations of T satisfying the property:

- (A) The i^{th} leaf (in some fixed order) contains the single element a_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$.

LEMMA 3.1. *A PIFO tree with n leaves has exactly $n!$ configurations satisfying (A), and these configurations produce the $n!$ possible permutations of $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ in a flush.*

PROOF. By induction on the tree. Each leaf queue contains exactly one element, so there is exactly one configuration of the leaf and exactly one permutation that could be produced in a flush.

For the induction step, let N be an internal node with k children. Its queue contains numbers in the range $1 \leq i \leq k$ with exactly ℓ_i occurrences of i , where ℓ_i is the number of leaves below the i^{th} child. By the induction hypothesis, the i^{th} child can produce any permutation of the elements at the leaves below it, and the queue at N allows these subpermutations to be interleaved in all possible ways, so all permutations of the elements below N can be produced. Moreover, we can show that no two configurations produce the same permutation by a counting argument: By the induction hypothesis, the i^{th} child of N has exactly $\ell_i!$ configurations, and there are exactly $\binom{\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_k}{\ell_1 \ell_2 \dots \ell_k}$ possible queues at N , thus the number of configurations of the subtree rooted at N is

$$\binom{\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_k}{\ell_1 \ell_2 \dots \ell_k} \cdot \ell_1! \dots \ell_k! = (\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_k)!. \quad \square$$

3.2 Effecting permutations

Consider an arbitrary PIFO tree with n leaves and its configurations satisfying (A). Without loss of generality, assume $a_i = i$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. As shown above, the configurations satisfying (A) correspond in a one-to-one fashion with the permutations of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Let $P_\sigma : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ denote the permutation corresponding to configuration σ . So if a flush is initiated in configuration σ , the elements will appear in the order $P_\sigma(1), \dots, P_\sigma(n)$.

LEMMA 3.2. *Let σ and τ be two configurations of the same tree that satisfy (A). Then there is a sequence of n pushes followed by n pops that maps $\sigma \xrightarrow{*} \tau$.*

PROOF. We first describe an intermediate configuration φ in which the tree contains $2n$ elements. We will show how to obtain φ from σ with n pushes and τ from φ with n pops.

In φ , the i^{th} leaf queue contains two elements iX in that order, where X is a new element at the head of the queue. The value of the element X does not matter. The queue of any internal node s in φ is the concatenation of the queue of s in τ and the queue of s in σ from left to right; that is, $s.pifo(\varphi) = s.pifo(\tau) \cdot s.pifo(\sigma)$.

To produce φ from σ , we push the value X a total of n times, in the order $P_\tau(1), P_\tau(2), \dots, P_\tau(n)$. In the i^{th} push, we add X to the *head* of the queue at leaf $P_\tau(i)$; then if s_0, \dots, s_k is the sequence of nodes on the path from the root down to $P_\tau(i) = s_k$, we add each s_{j+1} to the *tail* of the queue at s_j , $0 \leq j \leq k - 1$. This configuration is φ .




Fig. 4. Effecting permutations in $2n$ steps (here, 6). From left to right are the configurations σ , φ , and τ .

Now a sequence of n calls to pop will remove all the values X at the heads of the leaf queues along with all the σ -specific indices from the internal queues. What is left is the configuration τ . Fig. 4 shows an example of this. While $\text{flush}(\sigma) = P_1, T_1, B_1$, notice that $\text{flush}(\tau) = B_1, T_1, P_1$. Recall that we write the head of the list on the right, even though this is non-standard, as it reflects the order that packets are dequeued. \square

3.3 Fewer leaves are less expressive

THEOREM 3.3. *A PIFO tree with m leaves cannot simulate a PIFO tree with $n > m$ leaves. That is, there exist permutations that the n -leaved PIFO tree can effect but the m -leaved PIFO tree cannot.*

PROOF. Let $m < n$. By the pigeonhole principle, for any configuration σ of an m -leaved tree containing the elements $1, \dots, n$, there must be at least one leaf queue containing at least two elements, say ij in that order. Then for any configuration τ of the m -leaved tree such that $\sigma \xrightarrow{*} \tau$ in which i and j have not been popped, they still occur in the same order in the same leaf queue, as there is no PIFO operation that can change the order of elements in a leaf queue. A flush from τ will produce i and j in that order, while a flush from a configuration of the n -leaved tree might produce either ij or ji . Thus not all permutations of the n elements are realizable using the m -leaved PIFO trees, as they are with n -leaved PIFO trees. \square

4 HOMOMORPHIC EMBEDDINGS AND SIMULATION

In this section, we show that tall “skinny” trees can replicate the behavior of short “fat” trees, but not vice versa. As a theoretical tool to get to this result, we will introduce the concept of *homomorphic embedding*. We will then show that if $f : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ is a homomorphic embedding, then T_2 can replicate the behavior of T_1 , but not vice versa unless the embedding is an isomorphism.

Throughout this section, we assume a certain level of familiarity with algebra, particular the concepts of a (*free*) *monoid*. Some of the concepts introduced will also be easier to understand for readers familiar with coalgebra [Rutten 2000], although that is not strictly required.

4.1 Homomorphic embedding

Let T_1 and T_2 be two PIFO trees. A map f from the nodes of T_1 to the nodes of T_2 is a *homomorphic embedding* if

- (i) f is injective
- (ii) f maps the root of T_1 to the root of T_2
- (iii) f maps leaves of T_1 to leaves of T_2
- (iv) If s and t are nodes of T_1 , then t is a descendant of s iff $f(t)$ is a descendant of $f(s)$.

It follows that if s is a node of T_1 with leaves s_1, \dots, s_k , then these nodes map to a subtree of T_2 with root $f(s)$ and leaves $f(s_1), \dots, f(s_k)$. An example is shown in Fig. 5. Moreover, the *edge* from s to s_i




Fig. 5. A homomorphic embedding.

maps to a *path* from $f(s)$ to $f(s_i)$. In Fig. 5,

$$f(1) = 11 \quad f(2) = 121 \quad f(3) = 122 \quad f(4) = 2.$$

It follows from the above that f maps a *path* in T_1 to an equivalent path in T_2 . Say the original path went from the root of T_1 to the leaf ℓ in T_1 . We map each edge of the path in T_1 using f as shown above; this gives a series of paths in T_2 . Concatenating these paths gives us the path from the root of T_2 to $f(\ell)$ in T_2 . The foot of the path (that is, the rank by which the packet is enqueued into the leaf proper) remains the same over the mapping; we will expand on how to calculate the intermediate ranks momentarily.

4.2 Operations on configurations

We extend the usual head (hd), tail (tl), and concatenation (\cdot) operations on queues to configurations. Intuitively, the concatenation of configurations σ and τ for a fixed PIFO tree, denoted $\sigma\tau$, is obtained by concatenating the corresponding queues of σ and τ at each node; $\text{hd } \sigma$ is the configuration with $|\text{hd } \sigma| = 1$ that describes a pop from σ ; $\text{tl } \sigma$ is the configuration that would remain after pop σ . Formally, for $|\sigma| > 0$, define the *head path*, $H(\sigma)$, to be the smallest set of nodes such that

- the root is in $H(\sigma)$;
- if $s \in H(\sigma)$, s is not a leaf, and $\text{hd } s.\text{pifo}(\sigma) = i$, then $s.\text{kids}[i] \in H(\sigma)$.

This is the set of nodes along the path from the root down to a leaf that would be visited in a pop initiated from configuration σ . Now we can formally define

$$\begin{aligned} s.\text{pifo}(\sigma\tau) &= s.\text{pifo}(\sigma) \cdot s.\text{pifo}(\tau) \\ s.\text{pifo}(\text{hd } \sigma) &= \begin{cases} \text{hd } s.\text{pifo}(\sigma) & \text{if } s \in H(\sigma), \\ \varepsilon & \text{if } s \notin H(\sigma) \end{cases} \\ s.\text{pifo}(\text{tl } \sigma) &= \begin{cases} \text{tl } s.\text{pifo}(\sigma) & \text{if } s \in H(\sigma), \\ s.\text{pifo}(\sigma) & \text{if } s \notin H(\sigma). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Note that if $|\sigma| > 0$, then $\text{hd } \sigma \cdot \text{tl } \sigma = \sigma$.

We can argue that $\sigma\tau$ is a valid configuration by induction. Property (L) of a configuration, which was defined at the start of this section, is easy to establish. To show property (S), for an internal

node s with k children and $1 \leq i \leq k$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\#i(s.pifo(\sigma\tau)) &= \#i(s.pifo(\sigma) \cdot s.pifo(\tau)) \\
&= \#i(s.pifo(\sigma)) + \#i(s.pifo(\tau)) \\
&= \sum_{\ell \leq s.kids[i]} |\ell.pifo(\sigma)| + \sum_{\ell \leq s.kids[i]} |\ell.pifo(\tau)| \\
&= \sum_{\ell \leq s.kids[i]} |\ell.pifo(\sigma)| + |\ell.pifo(\tau)| \\
&= \sum_{\ell \leq s.kids[i]} |\ell.pifo(\sigma\tau)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Any configuration σ with $|\sigma| = 1$ determines and is determined by its head path $H(\sigma)$ from the root down to a leaf along with the unique element stored at that leaf. If $|\sigma| = 1$, then for all nodes s in the tree we have:

$$|s.pifo(\sigma)| = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s \in H(\sigma) \\ 0 & \text{if } s \notin H(\sigma). \end{cases}$$

A configuration of size n is the concatenation of n configurations of size 1. If $|\sigma| = n$, then $\sigma = \sigma_1\sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_n$, where $\sigma_i = \text{hd}(\text{tl}^{i-1} \sigma)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. $\text{Con } T$ thus forms a free monoid (with generators $\{\sigma \mid |\sigma| = 1\}$) with concatenation as multiplication and the empty configuration as identity.

The function flush is a length-preserving monoid homomorphism from $\text{Con } T$ to the free monoid generated by the data elements. That is, if $\sigma = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_n$ with each $|\sigma_i| = 1$, then $\text{flush } \sigma = \text{flush } \sigma_1 \cdots \text{flush } \sigma_n$. The i^{th} pop would produce the single data item $\text{flush } \sigma_i$.

These observations have the following useful consequence:

LEMMA 4.1. *Let X^* denote the free monoid on generators X . The length function $|\cdot| : X^* \rightarrow (\mathbb{N}, +, 0)$ is the unique homomorphic extension of the set map $|\cdot| : X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ that assigns 1 to each element of X . Any length-preserving monoid homomorphism $h : X^* \rightarrow Y^*$ between free monoids is also a coalgebra homomorphism with respect to the destructors hd and tl . That is, if $x \in X^*$ and $|x| > 0$, then*

$$\text{hd}(h(x)) = h(\text{hd } x) \qquad \text{tl}(h(x)) = h(\text{tl } x).$$

PROOF. For any $x \in X^*$, $|x| > 0$,

$$h(x) = h(\text{hd } x \cdot \text{tl } x) = h(\text{hd } x) \cdot h(\text{tl } x).$$

Since h is length-preserving, we have $|h(\text{hd } x)| = |\text{hd } x| = 1$, thus

$$\text{hd}(h(x)) = \text{hd}(h(\text{hd } x) \cdot h(\text{tl } x)) = h(\text{hd } x)$$

$$\text{tl}(h(x)) = \text{tl}(h(\text{hd } x) \cdot h(\text{tl } x)) = h(\text{tl } x). \quad \square$$

4.3 Lifting homomorphic embeddings to configurations

Any homomorphic embedding $f : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ lifts in a natural way to a monoid homomorphism (which we also call f) from configurations σ of T_1 to configurations $f(\sigma)$ of T_2 . This will be a monoid homomorphism $f : \text{Con } T_1 \rightarrow \text{Con } T_2$, so it suffices to specify f on the generators, namely the configurations of size 1.

Given any configuration σ of T_1 with $|\sigma| = 1$, let $H(\sigma)$ be its head path. Let ℓ be the only leaf of $H(\sigma)$ and $a = \text{flush } \sigma$ be the unique data item at ℓ . As noted above, the homomorphic embedding f maps an edge (s, t) in T_1 to a path in T_2 from $f(s)$ to $f(t)$ and concatenating all these paths gives a path from the root of T_2 to the leaf $f(\ell)$. This path along with a determines a unique configuration of T_2 of size 1, which we define to be $f(\sigma)$.

Thus f is a length-preserving monoid homomorphism between two free monoids. By Lemma 4.1, this has the added consequence that f is also a coalgebra morphism with respect to the destructors hd and tl and observation map flush .

For our main simulation theorem, we will need to have a concrete description of the contents of the queues $t.\text{pifo}(f(\sigma))$ for each node t of T_2 . We distinguish between nodes of T_2 of the form $f(s)$ for some s in T_1 , which we call *anchor nodes*, and those not of this form, which we call *transit nodes*. The *anchor* of a transit node u is the lowest anchor node in the tree that is an ancestor of u (one must exist, since the root is always an anchor node). The *anchor* of an anchor node is itself.

Let us describe the queues of T_2 . For leaves ℓ of T_1 , let $f(\ell).\text{pifo}(f(\sigma)) = \ell.\text{pifo}(\sigma)$. These are the queues that contain the data elements. For internal nodes u of T_2 , we describe $u.\text{pifo}(f(\sigma))$ in two steps. Let $f(s)$ be the anchor of u , and suppose s has children s_1, \dots, s_k .

- (1) Let $u.\text{pifo}'(f(\sigma))$ be $s.\text{pifo}(\sigma)$, but delete any elements j where $f(s_j)$ is not a descendant of u .

Note that if u is an anchor node $f(s)$, then nothing is deleted, so $u.\text{pifo}'(f(\sigma)) = s.\text{pifo}(\sigma)$.

- (2) If the i^{th} element of $u.\text{pifo}'(f(\sigma))$ is j , replace j with the first step of the path from u to $f(s_j)$.

The construction, with respect to the homomorphic embedding from Fig. 5, is shown in Fig. 6. The




Fig. 6. Construction of the queues $u.\text{pifo}(f(\sigma))$ for u in T_2 .

left-hand diagram describes a subtree of T_1 consisting of an internal node s with children s_1, \dots, s_4 . The queue at s is $s.\text{pifo}(\sigma) = 3122431424$. The center and right-hand diagrams show the queues $u.\text{pifo}'(f(\sigma))$ and $u.\text{pifo}(f(\sigma))$ after the first and second step of the construction respectively.

4.4 Simulation

We are now ready to state our main *simulation theorem*, which relates the configurations of a tree T_1 to a tree T_2 , provided that T_1 can be homomorphically embedded into T_2 .

THEOREM 4.2. *Let $f : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ be a homomorphic embedding. Every PIFO operation of T_1 that transforms σ to τ can be simulated by a PIFO operation of T_2 that transforms $f(\sigma)$ to $f(\tau)$.*

PROOF. The two operations on PIFO trees are push and pop. The latter is the easier to describe, because it does not depend on the scheduling transactions. From a configuration σ , $\text{pop } \sigma$ produces the data item $\text{flush}(\text{hd } \sigma)$ and leaves the tree in configuration $\text{tl } \sigma$. If $f : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ is a homomorphic embedding, then f lifts to a monoid homomorphism $f : \text{Con } T_1 \rightarrow \text{Con } T_2$ as described in §4.3. Then for any nonempty configuration σ of T_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{flush}(\text{hd } \sigma) &= \text{flush}(f(\text{hd } \sigma)) && \text{by the definition of } f(\text{hd } \sigma) \\ &= \text{flush}(\text{hd}(f(\sigma))) && \text{by Lemma 4.1,} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{f}(\text{tl } \sigma) = \text{tl}(f(\sigma)) \quad \text{by Lemma 4.1.}$$

Thus pop maps σ to $\text{tl } \sigma$ in T_1 and $f(\sigma)$ to $f(\text{tl } \sigma)$ in T_2 and both emit the same data item $\text{flush}(\text{hd } \sigma)$.

The operation $\text{push}(a, \text{path}, \sigma)$ in T_1 inserts a data item a at some leaf ℓ of T_1 , determined by path . It also inserts child designators into the queues at each internal node along the path from the root down to ℓ , with ranks also specified by path . The scheduling transaction in T_2 will be designed to ensure that the new path for a in T_2 , denoted path' , is the image under f of the insertion path for a in T_1 , and that a will be inserted in the queue at leaf $f(\ell)$ in the same position as in ℓ .

For each node s of T_1 with children s_1, \dots, s_k , let $f(i)$ be the corresponding path from $f(s)$ to $f(s_i)$ in T_2 . For example, in Fig. 5, $f(2) = 121$. The queues $u.\text{pifo}(f(\sigma))$ in T_2 are as described in §4.3. At anchor nodes $f(s)$, the element is inserted in the queue at the same position as in $s.\text{pifo}(\sigma)$. At transit nodes on the insertion path, the new child designator is inserted in the corresponding position as described by the construction of §4.3. At transit nodes not on the insertion path, the queue is unchanged. In total, this process gives rise to the path' , to be used to insert a into T_2 .

This operation is illustrated in Fig. 7. The left-hand diagram shows a new child designator 2 (in




Fig. 7. Effect of a push into s_2 , and equivalently, $f(s_2)$. The new elements inserted are in red boldface.

red boldface) inserted in the middle of the queue $s.\text{pifo}(\sigma)$. The center and right-hand diagrams show the corresponding insertions in $u.\text{pifo}'(f(\sigma))$ and $u.\text{pifo}(f(\sigma))$, respectively, in T_2 . The new path, path' , is chosen to maintain the invariant $f(\text{push}(a, \text{path}, \sigma)) = \text{push}(a, \text{path}', f(\sigma))$. \square

An alternate approach is possible if the nodes of the target tree T_2 can be configured separately as either anchor nodes or transit nodes. In this approach, the anchor nodes have queues but the transit nodes do not. The queue of an anchor node $f(s)$ looks exactly like the queue of s , except that the child designators i are replaced by the path designators $f(i)$. On any operation, a transit node




Fig. 8. Implementation by source routing.

simply forwards down the tree. The transit node receives a path designator p from its parent, then forwards the tail of p along with the data item and its rank to the child specified by the head of p .

This technique is illustrated in Fig. 8. The elements of the queue $s.pifo(\sigma)$ in T_1 are copied over to $f(s)$ in T_2 , but with each child designator i replaced with the path designator $f(i)$. The transit nodes u and v do not contain queues, but simply forward down the tree using source routing, where the “source” in this case is $f(s)$ and the “destination” is $f(s_i)$ as specified by the path $f(i)$.

4.5 A Counterexample

A natural followup question to ask is whether the simulation property that arises from homomorphic embeddings also works the other way: if T_1 embeds in T_2 , can we simulate T_2 using T_1 ? Suppose we have a homomorphic embedding $f : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$. We will show that T_1 cannot simulate T_2 in general unless f is an isomorphism.² To this end, we need the following technical lemma.

LEMMA 4.3. *If there is a node s of T_1 such that $f(s)$ has strictly more children than s , then T_2 has strictly more leaves than T_1 .*

PROOF. Let A be a maximal antichain in T_1 (set of nodes that are incomparable with respect to the ancestor relation) containing all the children of s . By maximality, every leaf of T_1 is a descendant of some element of A . Moreover, for any node t in T_1 , the number of leaves below $f(t)$ is at least as great as the number of leaves below t , since f is injective and maps leaves to leaves. Thus the number of leaves below $\{f(t) \mid t \in A\}$ in T_2 is at least as great as the number of leaves in T_1 . Since A is an antichain, its image $\{f(t) \mid t \in A\}$ in T_2 is also, but it is not maximal: by the assumption of the lemma, there is a child u of $f(s)$ that does not contain any ancestor or descendant in $\{f(t) \mid t \in A\}$, and u must have at least one leaf below it. \square

By Lemma 4.3, if there is a node s of T_1 such that $f(s)$ has strictly more children than s , then T_2 is strictly more expressive than T_1 by Theorem 3.3. Thus we can eliminate this case and assume that no $f(s)$ has more children than s . The “trivial exception” mentioned above is when there is a node of T_2 that has exactly one child. But any such node is useless and can be elided. We therefore assume that each internal node of T_2 has at least two children.

THEOREM 4.4. *Let $f : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ be a homomorphic embedding such that T_2 contains no node with exactly one child and for all nodes s of T_1 , $f(s)$ has no more children than s . If f is not an isomorphism, then there is an operation of T_2 that cannot be simulated by T_1 .*

PROOF. It is not hard to show that under the assumptions of the theorem, if s and $f(s)$ have the same number of children for all nodes s of T_1 , then f must be an isomorphism. So if it is not, then there must be a node s with at least three children (call them t , u , and v), and $f(s)$ must have strictly fewer children. There must be at least two children of s , say u and v , such that the lowest common ancestor of $f(u)$ and $f(v)$ (call it w), is a transit node and a strict descendant of $f(s)$.

Consider a sequence of pushes to T_2 in that populates each leaf queue with exactly one packet. By Theorem 3.3, in order to simulate this, T_1 must also populate each of its leaf queues with exactly one packet. Furthermore, assume the pushes to T_2 caused packets a , b , and c to be located at leaves below $f(t)$, $f(u)$, and $f(v)$ respectively. Let T_2 now effect a permutation as described in Theorem 3.3 so that a, b, c would be output last in a flush, in that order. Pop all other packets, leaving a, b, c in queues below t, u, v respectively in T_1 , and in queues below $f(t), f(u), f(v)$ respectively in T_2 . The situation is as illustrated on the left and center of Fig. 9.

Here we have pictured a, b, c at the nodes t, u, v in T_1 and $f(t), f(u), f(v)$ in T_2 respectively, but they actually occupy leaves below the nodes pictured. Now let T_2 push a new element c' at the tail

²There is a trivial exception, which can be safely ignored. See the formal statement of Theorem 4.4.




Fig. 9. Impossibility of simulation for left two trees; the right tree is a counterexample.

of the same queue as c and corresponding child designators at the *head* of the queue of $f(s)$ and the *tail* of the queue at w . This results in the configuration illustrated on the right side of Fig. 9. The new child designators are in red boldface. A flush from this configuration will produce the string $bacc'$, that is, it has switched the order of a and b . Now T_1 must insert the child designator 3 in the queue at s , but none of the four possible placements result in the order $bacc'$. From right to left, they yield $cabc'$, $acbc'$, $abcc'$, and $abcc'$, respectively. \square

5 EMBEDDING ALGORITHMS

Now we show that it is always possible to compute an embedding from one PIFO tree to another efficiently, if it exists. To motivate this result, suppose a given router only supports a fixed configuration for PIFO trees, say a height- h binary-branching tree with 2^h leaf queues. By the expressiveness results in the preceding section, this PIFO tree can replicate the behavior of any other PIFO tree that can be homomorphically embedded into it. But to actual implement a given scheduling algorithm on the hardware, we need a kind of compiler that computes the embedding from the source PIFO tree onto the hardware PIFO tree. This section presents algorithms for such compilers.

5.1 Embedding into complete d -ary trees

We start by treating a special case, where the target of our embedding is a complete tree of fixed arity. In this case, the algorithm also has a favorable complexity.

THEOREM 5.1. *Let T_2 be a complete d -ary tree. There is an $O(n \log n)$ algorithm to determine whether a given bounded-degree PIFO tree T_1 embeds homomorphically in T_2 and to find such an embedding $f : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ if so.*

PROOF. The algorithm constructs a minimum-height embedding in a greedy bottom-up fashion reminiscent of the construction of optimal Huffman codes [Cover and Thomas 2006]. Suppose that at some intermediate stage of the algorithm, we have determined embeddings of minimum height $h(t)$ for all the children t of a node s of T_1 . To determine $h(s)$, we insert the children in a priority queue prioritized by $h(t)$. Then we repeatedly extract up to d elements of the same minimum height (say h), as many as are available; create a tree of height $h + 1$ with those elements as children; then reinsert it into the priority queue. If there is only one tree of height h , we do not need to form a tree with one child, but simply reinsert it back into the queue as a tree of height $h + 1$ (its height is still h , but we prioritize it as $h + 1$). Repeat until the queue contains only one element. It follows from an exchange argument (given below; see Kleinberg and Tardos [2005, Ch. 4]) that the single remaining tree is of the minimum height into which s embeds and can be taken to be $h(s)$. An embedding of the whole tree is therefore possible provided $h(\text{root}(T_1)) \leq \text{height}(T_2)$.

The time required to process a node s of degree d_s is $O(d_s \log d_s)$ for the maintenance of the priority queue and $O(d_s)$ for all other operations, or $O(n \log n)$ in all, where $n = |T_1|$.

Here is the exchange argument. At any stage of the algorithm, let $t_1, \dots, t_m, 1 \leq m \leq d$, be a maximal set, up to size d , of queue entries of minimum height h . Suppose the action of forming a

tree of height $h + 1$ with these children and reinserting into the queue was not the right thing to do at this point in the algorithm, and that some other action would lead to a tree T of optimal height. Assume without loss of generality that t_1 occurs deepest in T ; thus the path from the root to t_1 is the longest among the t_i . Permute the children of nodes in T so that t_1 occurs rightmost in the tree. The trees t_2, \dots, t_m can be swapped for the siblings of t_1 in T , or added as a new child to the parent of t_1 in T if t_1 has fewer than m siblings, without increasing the height of the tree. Thus the action of the algorithm was the right thing to do.

For the case $m = 1$ with more than one tree left in the queue, the argument is the same, with the observation that in any embedding, t_1 must have a sibling of greater height, therefore it does not hurt to consider t_1 to be of height $h + 1$. \square

5.2 Embedding into arbitrary trees

We now turn our attention to the more general case, where the target of embedding is an arbitrary PIFO tree. An embedding algorithm can still be achieved here, at the cost of a higher complexity.

THEOREM 5.2. *Let T_2 be an arbitrary PIFO tree. There is a polynomial-time algorithm to determine whether a given bounded-degree PIFO tree T_1 embeds homomorphically in T_2 and to find such an embedding $f : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ if so.*

PROOF. The algorithm is based on dynamic programming. One constructs a Boolean-valued table f with entries $f(s, t)$ for nodes s of T_1 and t of T_2 that determines whether there exists an embedding that maps s to t . The table is constructed inductively bottom-up. Suppose s has d children and we have determined the values of $f(u, v)$ for all children u of s and descendants v of t , and we now wish to determine $f(s, t)$. The value will be true if we can find target nodes for the children of s among the descendants of t that form an antichain with respect to the ancestor/descendant relation.

Without loss of generality, we can ignore node v' as a candidate target for a child u of s if v' has a descendant v such that $f(u, v) = \text{true}$; any embedding that maps u to v' can map u to v instead. We now form a graph with nodes (u, v) such that $f(u, v) = \text{true}$ and edges $((u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2))$ such that either $u_1 = u_2$ or v_1 and v_2 are related as ancestor/descendant or are equal. An independent set of size d in this graph gives a set of pairs (u, v) such that the first components are all the d children of s and the second components form an antichain among the descendants of t to which the first components can map. If such an independent set exists, then we can set $f(s, t)$ to true.

Let $n = |T_1|$ and $m = |T_2|$, and let d be the degree bound of T_1 . There are nm pairs s, t for which $f(s, t)$ needs to be calculated. Each pair requires an independent set calculation on a graph with dm nodes that can be solved with brute force in time $O(m^d)$, and this dominates the complexity. The total time of the algorithm is $O(nm^{d+1})$. \square

5.3 Generalizations

Here is a generalization of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 with interesting consequences for simulation. Let q_1, \dots, q_n be n strings of data items such that all data items are distinct. Let $m_i = |q_i|$. For $A \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, let

$$m(A) = \sum_{i \in A} m_i \qquad g(A) = \frac{(\sum_{i \in A} m_i)!}{\prod_{i \in A} m_i!}.$$

The number $g(A)$ is a multinomial coefficient that counts the number of possible shuffles of the strings $\{q_i \mid i \in A\}$, where a *shuffle* is a string of length $m(A)$ containing each q_i for $i \in A$ as a non-contiguous substring. Suppose a PIFO tree has n leaves ℓ_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$. Consider the class of configurations σ satisfying the property:

- (B) $\ell_i.\text{pifo}(\sigma) = q_i$, $1 \leq i \leq n$,

where $\ell_i.pifo(\sigma)$ is the queue at ℓ_i in configuration σ .

LEMMA 5.3. *Let $M = g(\{1, 2, \dots, n\})$. A PIFO tree with n leaves has exactly M configurations satisfying (B), and these configurations produce the M possible shuffles of q_1, \dots, q_n in a flush.*

PROOF. Note that a flush from any configuration produces a shuffle of the leaf queues, because the elements of each leaf queue must appear in the same order that they occur in the queue.

First we argue by induction that all shuffles can be produced. The leaf queue ℓ_i contains m_i elements, and there is exactly one configuration of the leaf and exactly one shuffle that could be produced in a flush. Here $m(\{i\}) = m_i$ and $g(\{i\}) = 1$.

For the induction step, let s be an internal node with k children. By the induction hypothesis, each child can produce any shuffle of the leaf queues below it, and the queue at s allows these strings to be shuffled in all possible ways, thus all shuffles of the leaf queues below s can be produced. Thus the number of configurations is at least the number of possible shuffles.

Conversely, we can show that no two configurations produce the same shuffle by a counting argument. By the induction hypothesis, the j^{th} child s_j of s has exactly $g(A_j)$ configurations, where $A_j = \{i \mid \ell_i \leq s_j\}$ is the set of indices of leaves ℓ_i below s_j .

The number of data elements in queues below s_j is $m(A_j)$, and this is the number of times j occurs in any queue of s . Thus the number of possible queues at s is

$$\binom{m(A_1) + m(A_2) + \dots + m(A_k)}{m(A_1) \ m(A_2) \ \dots \ m(A_k)},$$

and the number of configurations of the subtree rooted at s is the number of possible queues at s times the product of the number of configurations of the subtrees, or

$$\begin{aligned} & \binom{m(A_1) + m(A_2) + \dots + m(A_k)}{m(A_1) \ m(A_2) \ \dots \ m(A_k)} \cdot g(A_1) \cdot g(A_2) \cdot \dots \cdot g(A_k) \\ &= \frac{(\sum_{j=1}^k m(A_j))!}{\prod_{j=1}^k m(A_j)!} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{m(A_j)!}{\prod_{i \in A_j} m_i!} = \frac{(\sum_{j=1}^k m(A_j))!}{\prod_{j=1}^k \prod_{i \in A_j} m_i!} = g\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^k A_j\right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Consider an arbitrary PIFO tree with n leaves and its configurations satisfying (B). As shown above, the configurations satisfying (B) correspond in a one-to-one fashion with the shuffles of q_1, \dots, q_n . Let the permutation $P_\sigma : \{1, \dots, M\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, M\}$ denote the shuffle corresponding to configuration σ . So if a flush is initiated in configuration σ , the elements will appear in the order $P_\sigma(1), \dots, P_\sigma(M)$.

LEMMA 5.4. *Let σ and τ be two configurations satisfying (B). Then there is a sequence of M pushes followed by M pops that maps $\sigma \xrightarrow{*} \tau$.*

PROOF. We first describe an intermediate configuration φ in which the tree contains $2M$ elements. We will show below how to obtain φ from σ with M pushes. In φ , the i^{th} leaf queue contains $2m_i$ elements $q_i X^{m_i}$ in that order, where X is a new data element (the element X does not matter). The queue of the internal node s in φ contains the queue of s in τ followed by the queue of s in σ .

To produce φ from σ , we push the M X s in the order $P_\tau(1), P_\tau(2), \dots, P_\tau(M)$. In the i^{th} push, we add X to the *head* of the queue at leaf $P_\tau(i)$; then if s_0, \dots, s_k is the sequence of nodes on the path from the root down to $P_\tau(i) = s_k$, we add each s_{j+1} to the *tail* of the queue at s_j , $0 \leq j \leq k-1$. A sequence of M pops will now remove all the X s at the heads of the leaf queues, leaving the configuration τ . \square

An interesting consequence of Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4 is that if we allow arbitrary computation for the ranking (that is, the ranking mechanism is Turing complete), and dummy pushes and pops as

restructuring operations, then any n -leaf PIFO tree can simulate any other n -leaf PIFO tree. To simulate T_1 by T_2 , after every push by T_1 , let T_2 insert the same data element in the same position in the corresponding leaf queue, then restructure as necessary using dummy pushes and pops as in Lemma 5.4 to give a configuration with the same shuffle of leaf queues as T_1 .

6 IMPLEMENTATION

We have built an implementation of PIFO trees as described in §2, along with an implementation of the embedding algorithm covered in §5, in OCaml. Our implementation includes a simulator that can “run” a traffic sample of packets (in the standard PCAP format) through a PIFO tree and visualize the results as a function of push and pop time. If this paper is accepted for publication, we plan to participate in artifact evaluation and make our code freely available on GitHub.

We show that our scheduler gives expected results when programming standard scheduling algorithms. We compare the traces from our scheduler to those obtained from a state-of-the-art hardware switch and find reasonable correlation. This reinforces the idea that PIFO trees are a reasonable primitive for standard programmable scheduling. We then move beyond the capabilities of a modern switch by showing our scheduler running hierarchical algorithms as described in the paper. Finally, we show how our implementation supports the embedding of one tree into another without having to program the latter tree anew.

6.1 Preliminaries

The PIFO tree is programmed as one would expect from our presentation thus far: the user chooses the shape of the tree, specifies how the incoming packets should be partitioned into flows, and programs short programs—scheduling transactions—that are attached to nodes. The simulator takes a PCAP of incoming packets and attempts to push the packets into the tree. Using the packets’ timestamps, it paces these pushes to match the timing of the original PCAP. The simulator also requires a *line rate*, which is the frequency at which it automatically calls pop on the tree.

For ease of presentation, we have standardized a few things that are not fundamental to our implementation. All our traffic samples contain 60 packets of the same size, coming from various source addresses. We partition the traffic into flows based on these addresses.

An important subtlety is *saturation*: we need to enqueue packets quickly enough that the switch actually has some backlog of packets and therefore has to make a scheduling decision among those packets. This is easy to do in our OCaml simulator, where we have total control: we set packets to arrive at the rate of 10 packets/s and simulate a slower line rate of 4 packets/s. We also achieve saturation when running comparative experiments on the hardware switch. It is not possible to choose our rates as precisely in the real-world setting, but we achieve an ingress/egress rate ratio that is reasonably similar to that of the OCaml simulator.

The visualizations we will refer to below can be read as follows: the x-axis, read left to right, shows the time since the simulation started (in seconds); the y-axis, read top to bottom, shows packets in the order they arrive at the scheduler. Each colored horizontal bar represents a packet, and is colored based on its source address: **A**, **B**, **C**, **D**, **E**, **F**, or **G**. A horizontal bar starts at the time when the packet arrives at the scheduler and ends at the time when it is released by the scheduler, so shorter bars indicate preferential service. The bars tend to get longer with time precisely because we are saturating the scheduler. To notice trends generally, it is useful to zoom out and look at the “shadow” that a certain-colored flow casts. To focus more specifically on which packets are released when, it is useful to study the right edges of the horizontal bars.




Table 1. Standard scheduling algorithms as run against our scheduler and a programmable hardware switch.

6.2 Standard algorithms

It is worth taking a moment to convince ourselves that PIFO trees are a reasonable primitive even when running standard, non-hierarchical algorithms. These algorithms are programmable using a simple ternary tree. In each case, the root runs a straightforward scheduling transaction, and it has three leaves that run the simplest PIFO regime imaginable: first in, first out. The standard algorithms discussed below correspond to the rows of Table 1. The left-hand column of the table shows traffic samples as they run the respective algorithm through our OCaml scheduler. It is easy to see the broad goal of each algorithm being achieved.

6.2.1 FCFS. The first come, first served algorithm does nothing exciting—it simply transmits packets in the order they are received.




Table 2. HPFQ running a traffic flow. Share ratios as indicated.

6.2.2 Strict. The strict algorithm strictly prefers C to B and B to A. As with our discussion earlier in the paper, this policy is up to availability of input packets.

6.2.3 Round Robin. The round-robin algorithm seeks to alternate between flows A, B, and C.

6.2.4 WFQ. The weighted fair queue algorithm brings two new features to the table: it allows user-defined weights for each flow, so one can configure a custom ratio according to which the available capacity is shared; and it takes packet lengths into account when making scheduling decisions. Because we have kept the packets in our samples the same length, the latter feature is not demonstrated here. In the table we show a split of 10/20/30 between A/B/C.

6.2.5 The same algorithms implemented on a programmable hardware switch. As a further, albeit informal, endorsement of PIFO trees, we compare our tree-based scheduling trends to those of a modern switch. We show in the right-hand column of Table 1 the same standard algorithms as instantiated using the FIFO-based programmable scheduler exposed by our hardware switch. In each row, we show the result of the hardware switch scheduling the same traffic sample that we ran through our OCaml implementation. We visualize the results as before, and find the trends to be in agreement.

Our testbed consists of two host Linux machines connected by a hardware switch. To keep the total number of packets small enough to present here, we use a slow ingress rate of 60 kbps and an egress rate of 24 kbps, with packets of size 1 kb. Although it is untenable to visualize them here, we also conduct similar experiments with more realistic ingress and egress rates (2.5 Mbps and 1 Mbps respectively) and observe similar scheduling trends.

We point out a few oddities:

- The first few packets going into the switch spend so little time in the queue that the horizontal bars representing them do not render in our visualization.
- The switch releases packets not one by one but in batches of four. This trend does not appear in our more realistic experiments. We conjecture that this stagger is an artifact of our unrealistically slow rates: the egress thread appears to pull packets in batches.
- The arrival pattern of packets, roughly seen as the profile of the left edges of the bars, is not as regular as in our OCaml simulation. This is to be expected in a real-world experiment.

6.3 Hierarchical algorithms

Our implementation supports arbitrary PIFO trees such as the following.

6.3.1 HPFQ. Hierarchical packet fair queueing is WFQ applied at many levels, and is a more general instance of the motivating problem we discussed in §2.2. Table 2 shows HPFQ scheduling a




Table 3. Hierarchical algorithms, and compiling ternary trees to binary.

traffic sample, now with unequal splits as shown. Paying attention to the right hand side of the horizontal colored bars, we see that B gets excellent service (80/20, versus C) until the first packets from A arrive. Then B’s share decreases until it settles into a stable place. This could not have been recreated using fair scheduling without hierarchies.

6.3.2 *Different Algorithms at Different Levels.* So far we have set up trees that run one overall algorithm, even if it is expressed by programming multiple nodes. This is not necessary. For instance,

we can have two levels, one running WFQ and the other running Strict. We show this in the first row of Table 3. The traffic sample just has packets from A through E, alternating.

6.3.3 Compilation. Many of the algorithms we have presented above are based on ternary trees. We implement an embedding from ternary trees to binary trees using the techniques described in §5, and use it to run all the ternary algorithms described in Table 1 in a binary setting. We find the resultant graphs unchanged. We also embed the two-level WFQ-Strict ternary tree into a binary tree. We show in the second row of Table 3 the binary tree that was automatically constructed using the Huffman-style embedding algorithm; the transit nodes created are marked in gray. We also show a visualization of the same traffic with this binary tree. The visualizations are identical.

Perhaps our most complicated undertaking is a three-tier ternary algorithm that we automatically compile to a binary tree, again seeing no difference in the visualization. This is shown in the last two rows of the table. The traffic sample has packets from A through G, alternating.

7 RELATED WORK

We outline a class of algorithms that we have not considered in our formalization. We review other efforts in formalizing schedulers. We study other efforts in programmable packet scheduling.

7.1 Non work-conserving algorithms

In our treatment above, we have assumed a model where a scheduled packet is immediately ready to be released. That is, from the perspective of the scheduler, if the link has capacity and the scheduler has one packet, the packet will be released no matter its rank. This represents a class of scheduling algorithms that are called *work-conserving*, and it ties into the caveat of *availability* from §2.1.

Non work-conserving algorithms, also known as shaping algorithms, focus on timing. A packet will not be released until some *time* that is computed, specifically for that packet, at push. If the link has capacity and the scheduler has one packet, the scheduler will allow the link to go idle if that packet is not ready with regards to timing. To generalize: a less favorably ranked packet may be released before a more favorably ranked one if the former is ready and the latter is not.

We leave non-work conserving algorithms for future work, but provide a few pointers. Sivaraman et al. [2016b] include shaping in their PIFO tree model. Loom [Stephens et al. 2019] uses a global queue that is reserved for shaped packets, and has a procedure by which shaped packets are repeatedly inserted into the tree. Carousel [Saeed et al. 2017] only supports non work-conserving algorithms and pacing (the insertion of inter-packet gaps), but achieves impressive scalability. We plan to extend our model of PIFO trees to handle non-work-conserving scheduling algorithms in future work.

7.2 Formalizations in the domain of scheduling

Chakareski [2011] formalizes in-network packet scheduling as a constrained optimization problem expressed using Lagrange multipliers. Working in the domain of video transmission, they set up the problem somewhat differently than us. Nodes coordinate to compute the optimal rate at which other nodes—the server included—should send packets. This rate is a function of capacities, packet loss, the fidelity requested by the clients, and expected video distortion.

Dürr and Nayak [2016] map the problem of packet scheduling to the no-wait job-shop scheduling problem from operations research. They present the resultant no-wait *packet-scheduling* problem as an integer linear program, exposing the constraints under which to minimize maximum congestion.

SP-PIFOs [Alcoz et al. 2020] orchestrate a collection of FIFOs to approximate the behavior of a PIFO. This is bound to be imperfect, so the authors give a formal way to measure the number of mistakes their model makes relative to a perfect PIFO. However, follow-on work by Vass et al.

[2022] problematizes the push-up/push-down heuristic that Alcoz et al. need for their orchestration: their formal analysis reveals that the heuristic can introduce mistakes linearly up to the number of FIFOs in play. Their solution is a new heuristic called Spring that counts packets using exponentially weighted moving averages and, in some cases, achieves twofold speedup compared to SP-PIFOs.

Mittal et al. [2015], in search of a universal packet scheduler, develop a general model of packet scheduling. They formally define a *schedule* as a set of the (fixed set of) packets, the paths those packets take through the network, and the input and output times the packets enjoy. A schedule is effected by the set of scheduling algorithms that the routers along the way implement. One set of scheduling algorithms can *replay* another if, for all packets in the fixed set, it gives each packet an equal or better output time. Mittal et al. show that there is no universal set of algorithms that can replay all others, but that the classic least slack time first algorithm [Leung 1989] comes close.

7.3 Programmable scheduling

Our theoretical results expose some of the fundamental expressiveness limitations that the choice of data structure can impose, so we outline some other efforts to orchestrate FIFOs and PIFOs to eke out more expressivity. We also review work that allows higher-level programming of schedulers.

7.3.1 Orchestrating FIFOs and PIFOs. We have mentioned SP-PIFOs [Alcoz et al. 2020], which orchestrate a collection of FIFOs to approximate the behavior of a PIFO. Sharma et al. [2018] approximate WFQ on reconfigurable switches. They use a novel dequeuing scheduler called rotating strict priority; this transmits packets from multiple queues in approximate sorted order. The scheduler is constructed by grouping $2n$ FIFOs into two groups and intermittently switching the relative priority of one group versus the other. Tonic [Arashloo et al. 2020] uses a FIFO to implement the round-robin algorithm with the added notion of *credit*. It can effect a range of transport protocols while sparing the user the trouble of complex hardware programming. Zhang et al. [2021] study packet scheduling using the push-in pick-out (PIPO) datastructure. A PIPO is like a PIFO but it picks out a relatively well-ranked (not necessarily the *most* favorably ranked) packet that also satisfies some predicate. This forms a good primitive for shaping. The PIPO is an approximation of the push-in extract-out (PIEO) queue [Shrivastav 2019] which guarantees the best-ranked item.

Sivaraman et al. [2016b] orchestrate PIFOs into a tree structure. In addition to the points of divergence we have already described, Sivaraman et al. provide a hardware design targeting shared memory switches. They explain how a PIFO tree can be laid out in memory as a complete mesh and sketch a compiler from the logical tree to the theoretical hardware mesh.

7.3.2 Programming at a higher level. QtKAT [Schlesinger et al. 2015] is a variation of NetKAT [Anderson et al. 2014] that brings quality of service considerations into play. This is very hard in general but more tenable in the datacenter setting. Their work paves the way for formal analysis using network calculus and, eventually, the verification of network-wide queueing.

Arashloo et al. [2016] observe that, while is increasingly popular to offload per-packet stateful processing onto switches, this is also known to be a challenging programming problem. They present SNAP, a tool that allows a "one big switch" abstraction: users can reason at a global level and program a fictitious big switch, allowing the tool to check the program for correctness and compile it to the distributed setting. NUMFabric [Nagaraj et al. 2016] has a similar promise: the user can specify a utility maximization problem, once, and the tool calculates the allocations of bandwidth that would maximize the utility function across the distributed network.

Sivaraman et al. [2016a] allow data-plane programming as a high level "packet transaction", written Domino, a new C-like imperative language. They compile Domino code to hardware-level code written in a novel machine model that runs at line rate on programmable switches.

8 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper explored higher-level abstractions for packet scheduling. Starting with a proposal by Sivaraman et al. [2016b], we formalized the syntax and semantics of PIFO trees, developed alternate characterizations in terms of permutations on packets, established expressiveness results, and designed embedding algorithms. Our OCaml implementation simulates PIFO trees. Overall, we believe our work represents a promising first step toward developing a programming language account of scheduling algorithms—an important topic that has mostly remained in the domain of networking and systems. In the future, we are interested in further exploring the theory and practice of scheduling algorithms, including non-work conserving algorithms as well as applications to other domains, such as task scheduling.

REFERENCES

- Albert Gran Alcoz, Alexander Dietmüller, and Laurent Vanbever. 2020. SP-PIFO: Approximating Push-In First-Out Behaviors using Strict-Priority Queues. In *NSDI '20*.
- Carolyn Jane Anderson, Nate Foster, Arjun Guha, Jean-Baptiste Jeannin, Dexter Kozen, Cole Schlesinger, and David Walker. 2014. NetKAT: semantic foundations for networks. In *POPL '14*.
- Mina Tahmasbi Arashloo, Yaron Koral, Michael Greenberg, Jennifer Rexford, and David Walker. 2016. SNAP: Stateful Network-Wide Abstractions for Packet Processing. In *SIGCOMM '16*.
- Mina Tahmasbi Arashloo, Alexey Lavrov, Manya Ghobadi, Jennifer Rexford, David Walker, and David Wentzlaff. 2020. Enabling Programmable Transport Protocols in High-Speed NICs. In *NSDI '20*.
- Jacob Chakareski. 2011. In-Network Packet Scheduling and Rate Allocation: A Content Delivery Perspective. *IEEE Trans. Multimed.* (2011).
- Thomas M. Cover and Joy A. Thomas. 2006. *Elements of Information Theory* (second ed.). Wiley.
- Huyh Tu Dang, Daniele Sciascia, Marco Canini, Fernando Pedone, and Robert Soulé. 2015. NetPaxos: consensus at network speed. In *SOSR '15*.
- Frank Dürr and Naresh Ganesh Nayak. 2016. No-wait Packet Scheduling for IEEE Time-sensitive Networks (TSN). In *RTNS '16*.
- Nate Foster, Nick McKeown, Jennifer Rexford, Guru Parulkar, Larry Peterson, and Oguz Sunay. 2020. Using Deep Programmability to Put Network Owners in Control. *SIGCOMM CCR '20*.
- Xin Jin, Xiaozhou Li, Haoyu Zhang, Nate Foster, Jeongkeun Lee, Robert Soulé, Changhoon Kim, and Ion Stoica. 2018. NetChain: Scale-Free Sub-RTT Coordination. In *NSDI '18*.
- Xin Jin, Xiaozhou Li, Haoyu Zhang, Robert Soulé, Jeongkeun Lee, Nate Foster, Changhoon Kim, and Ion Stoica. 2017. NetCache: Balancing Key-Value Stores with Fast In-Network Caching. In *SOSP '17*.
- Jon Kleinberg and Éva Tardos. 2005. *Algorithm Design*. Addison-Wesley.
- Joseph Y. T. Leung. 1989. A new algorithm for scheduling periodic, real-time tasks. *Algorithmica* (1989).
- Bingzhe Liu, Ali Kheradmand, Matthew Caesar, and P. Brighten Godfrey. 2020. Towards Verified Self-Driving Infrastructure. In *HotNets '20*.
- Radhika Mittal, Rachit Agarwal, Sylvia Ratnasamy, and Scott Shenker. 2015. Universal Packet Scheduling. In *HotNets XIV*.
- Kanthi Nagaraj, Dinesh Bharadia, Hongzi Mao, Sandeep Chinchali, Mohammad Alizadeh, and Sachin Katti. 2016. NUMFabric: Fast and Flexible Bandwidth Allocation in Datacenters. In *SIGCOMM '16*.
- Jan J. M. M. Rutten. 2000. Universal coalgebra: a theory of systems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 249, 1 (2000), 3–80. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(00\)00056-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(00)00056-6)
- Ahmed Saeed, Nandita Dukkipati, Vytautas Valancius, Vinh The Lam, Carlo Contavalli, and Amin Vahdat. 2017. Carousel: Scalable Traffic Shaping at End Hosts. In *SIGCOMM '17*.
- Cole Schlesinger, Hitesh Ballani, Thomas Karagiannis, and Dimitrios Vytiniotis. 2015. *Quality of Service Abstractions for Software-defined Networks*. Technical Report. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/quality-of-service-abstractions-for-software-defined-networks/>
- Naveen Kr. Sharma, Ming Liu, Kishore Atreya, and Arvind Krishnamurthy. 2018. Approximating Fair Queueing on Reconfigurable Switches. In *NSDI '18*.
- Vishal Shrivastav. 2019. Fast, Scalable, and Programmable Packet Scheduler in Hardware. In *SIGCOMM '19*.
- Anirudh Sivaraman, Alvin Cheung, Mihai Budiu, Changhoon Kim, Mohammad Alizadeh, Hari Balakrishnan, George Varghese, Nick McKeown, and Steve Licking. 2016a. Packet Transactions: High-Level Programming for Line-Rate Switches. In *SIGCOMM '16*.

- Anirudh Sivaraman, Suvinay Subramanian, Mohammad Alizadeh, Sharad Chole, Shang-Tse Chuang, Anurag Agrawal, Hari Balakrishnan, Tom Edsall, Sachin Katti, and Nick McKeown. 2016b. Programmable Packet Scheduling at Line Rate. In *SIGCOMM '16*.
- Brent E. Stephens, Aditya Akella, and Michael M. Swift. 2019. Loom: Flexible and Efficient NIC Packet Scheduling. In *NSDI '19*.
- Balázs Vass, Csaba Sarkadi, and Gábor Rétvári. 2022. Programmable Packet Scheduling With SP-PIFO: Theory, Algorithms and Evaluation. In *INFOCOM Workshops '22*.
- Chuwen Zhang, Zhikang Chen, Haoyu Song, Ruyi Yao, Yang Xu, Yi Wang, Ji Miao, and Bin Liu. 2021. PIPO: Efficient Programmable Scheduling for Time Sensitive Networking. In *ICNP '21*.