

TACOS: Topology-Aware Collective Algorithm Synthesizer for Distributed Machine Learning

William Won*, Midhilesh Elavazhagan[†], Sudarshan Srinivasan[†], Ajaya Durg[†],
Samvit Kaul[†], Swati Gupta[‡], and Tushar Krishna*

*Georgia Institute of Technology [†]Intel [‡]Massachusetts Institute of Technology

*william.won@gatech.edu, tushar@ece.gatech.edu [‡]swatig@mit.edu

[†]{midhilesh.elavazhagan, sudarshan.srinivasan, ajaya.durg, samvit.kaul}@intel.com

Abstract—The surge of artificial intelligence, specifically large language models, has led to a rapid advent towards the development of large-scale machine learning training clusters. Collective communications within these clusters tend to be heavily bandwidth-bound, necessitating techniques to optimally utilize the available network bandwidth. This puts the routing algorithm for the collective at the forefront of determining the performance. Unfortunately, communication libraries used in distributed machine learning today are limited by a fixed set of routing algorithms. This constraints collective performance within the domain of next-generation training clusters that employ intricate, heterogeneous, and asymmetric, large-scale topologies. Further, the emergence of irregular topologies attributed to runtime phenomena such as device failures serves to compound the complexity of the challenge. To this end, this paper introduces TACOS, an automated synthesizer that generates topology-aware collective algorithms for common distributed machine learning collectives across arbitrary input network topologies. TACOS was able to synthesize All-Reduce algorithm for a heterogeneous 512-NPU system in just 6.09 minutes while achieving performance improvement up to $4.27\times$ over state-of-the-art prior work. TACOS exhibits high scalability, with synthesis time scaling quadratically with the number of NPUs. In contrast to prior works’ NP-hard approaches, TACOS with 40K NPUs completes in 2.52 hours.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Artificial Intelligence (AI) boom has led to a surge in the design of specialized distributed High-performance Computing (HPC) platforms tailored for AI (often called *AI supercomputers*). Examples of such systems include Google’s Cloud TPU [1], NVIDIA’s HGX [2], Intel’s Habana [3], Cerebras’ Andromeda [4], Tesla Dojo [5], and many more. From a bird’s eye view, all these platforms include Neural Processing Units (NPUs), such as GPUs, TPUs, or ASICs, at the endpoints coupled with custom high-speed fabrics to scale the system to thousands of NPUs [6]. The need to scale is driven by enormous compute and memory demands, specifically for Large Language Models (LLMs) that cannot be provided by a single server node [7]. It is important to note, however, that different AI clusters have adopted different topologies (and technologies) to scale. Examples include hierarchical switches in NVIDIA DGX/HGX systems [8], point-to-point in Google TPU [1] and Intel Habana [3], meshes in Dojo [5], Cerebras [4], and Tensorrent [9] systems. Furthermore, almost all these systems use a mixture of different link technologies to scale (e.g., NVLink [10], XeLink [11], Infini Fabric [12], InfiniBand [13], or optical networks [1]). In summary, topologies in Machine Learning (ML) clusters

TABLE I
ALL-REDUCE ALGORITHMS AND THEIR PREFERRED TOPOLOGIES. ABBREVIATIONS DENOTE RI (RING), FC (FULLYCONNECTED), SW (SWITCH), HO (HOMOGENEOUS), AND HT (HETEROGENEOUS). HIERARCHICAL AND C-CUBE ARE MARKED WITH Δ AS THEIR PERFORMANCE IS CLOSELY TIED TO TOPOLOGY CONFIGURATIONS.

Algo.	Basic			MultiDim		Asym-metric		Any
	RI	FC	SW	Ho.	Ht.	Ho.	Ht.	Any
Ring [19]	✓							
Direct [20]		✓						
RHD [21]			✓					
DBT [22]			✓					
Hierarchical [23]	✓	✓	✓	Δ	Δ			
Themis [16]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
C-Cube [24]		Δ	Δ	Δ		Δ		
Multi-Tree [25]		✓	✓	✓		✓		
TACOS (this work)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

TABLE II
COMPARING THE CAPABILITIES OF COLLECTIVE ALGORITHM SYNTHESIZERS. TACCL IS MARKED WITH Δ AS IT REQUIRES A PRIORI HUMAN GUIDANCE AND MAKES SEVERAL ASSUMPTIONS TO MODEL NETWORK HETEROGENEITY AND CONGESTION.

Framework	Without Human Guide	Link Heterogeneity	Model Congestion	Node Asymmetry	Scale to Large Nodes
Blink [26]	✓				
SCCL [18]	✓				
TACCL [17]	Δ	Δ	Δ		
TACOS (this work)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

utilize multiple *dimensions/hierarchies*, may have **asymmetric**¹ shapes and **heterogeneous** link bandwidths. Efficiently orchestrating communication within these AI platforms remains an open and active research problem [14]–[18].

Communication within AI workloads exhibits some unique characteristics compared to traditional cloud workloads. In the latter, there can be heavy variability in the traffic pattern,² traffic volumes, and latency vs. bandwidth sensitivity. This has naturally led to a plethora of past work on dynamically managing network congestion in datacenter fabrics [27]. In contrast, both the traffic pattern and traffic volume for AI are *deterministic* once the workload has been partitioned

¹For e.g., NPUs at the center vs. edge of a 2D Mesh have different degrees.

²*Traffic Pattern* is defined in this paper to mean the set of all pairs of server nodes that communicate while the application is running.




Fig. 1. Heat map of total size of messages transferred over each link when running various All-Reduce algorithms (Direct, Recursive Halving-Doubling, (unidirectional) Ring, and TACOS-synthesized) over different network topologies (FullyConnected (FC), Ring, Mesh, and Hypercube (HC)). Each cell at $(src, dest)$ denotes a link connecting from NPU src to NPU $dest$. If there is no such link in the topology, the cell is marked black. All values are normalized across topologies by the largest message size serviced by a link. For every topology, scenarios running topology-aware collective algorithms is marked with a box, resulting in the lowest overall loads (i.e., a cooler heat map).




Fig. 2. Normalized All-Reduce algorithm bandwidth (i.e., collective size \div collective time) on 64-NPU Ring, FullyConnected (FC), Mesh, and Hypercube topologies (using link $\alpha=0.5\mu s$ and $1/\beta=50GB/s$, explained in Sec. IV-A). (Bidirectional) Ring, Recursive Halving-Doubling, and Direct algorithms are run on every topology. For Mesh and Hypercube, we also run the topology-aware collective algorithm synthesized by TACOS (Sec. IV), denoted as T. All results are normalized across topology by the lowest algorithm bandwidth. The methodology for retrieving the data is explained in Sec. V.


and mapped via sharding and replication of weights and activations [28]. However, the pattern is *collective* in nature (i.e., one-to-many and many-to-one), which introduces additional complexity of bandwidth amplification and reduction as messages traverse through the network. Message sizes in AI also tend to be extremely large, making network bandwidth the crucial metric to optimize for during AI training [29].

Given these characteristics, AI workload communication today is often routed *statically* via Collective Communication Libraries (CCLs) [30]–[33]. These libraries include a set of pre-defined routing algorithms called *topology-aware collectives*. As the name suggests, they are optimized for running on specific topologies [34]. For instance, Ring [19], Direct [35], and Recursive Halving-Doubling [21], are common baseline topology-aware collective algorithms for All-Reduce collective and guarantee congestion-free operation over a Ring, Fully-Connected and Switch-based topology, respectively. For more intricate topologies, a number of custom-designed proposals such as Hierarchical and Themis (for multi-dimensional symmetric networks) [16], [23], C-Cube (for NVIDIA DGX-1 system) [24], and MultiTree (for homogeneous networks) [25],


are introduced. Table I summarizes collective algorithms and their preferred target network topologies.

Fig. 1 presents a heat map of the overall traffic flow over each link of different physical topologies when running the suite of baseline collective algorithms. We see that except for the topology they were designed for, the basic collective algorithms introduce substantial link oversubscriptions (i.e., congestion) and undersubscriptions. This translates to suboptimal performance as Fig. 2 quantifies. Unfortunately, beyond this handful of collective routing algorithms, there are no known algorithms for arbitrary topologies. While further optimizations like Themis, C-Cube, or MultiTree may offer assistance, they are closely tied to specific topologies, making them less directly applicable to arbitrary networks and demanding significant design efforts from human experts. In practice today, CCLs typically resort to using a Ring-based collective algorithm for unknown topologies. This effectively embeds a *logical ring* snaking through the topology, which may lead to the underutilization of certain links in high radix topologies. Therefore, the goal of this work is to autonomously **synthesize** routing algorithms for collective patterns on arbitrary network topologies without human guidance or intervention.

To this end, we introduce TACOS — **Topology-Aware Collective Algorithm Synthesizer**. The architecture of TACOS is outlined in Fig. 3. When provided with a network topology and collective pattern (derived from workload and parallelization strategies), TACOS autonomously synthesizes a high-quality collective algorithm by *iteratively maximizing network bandwidth utilization* within each time span using a novel Greedy-based matching heuristic. This capability is realized by our novel approach of casting the collective algorithm synthesis into a link-chunk matching problem over a Time-expanded Network (TEN) representation, an acyclic directed graph that seamlessly integrates both spatial and temporal dimensions [36]–[38] and solving it using our novel greedy-based algorithm. Some recent efforts [17], [18], [26] have tried to solve a similar problem of collective algorithm synthesis,



(a) Current CCLs: Among predefined collective algorithms, select the best-performing algorithm by estimating collective performance by using the underlying network topology and collective pattern information.



(b) TACOS: Autonomously synthesize a topology-aware collective algorithm by repeatedly executing Greedy-based matching algorithm, which can maximize network BW utilization for a given target time period t .

Fig. 3. (a) Current CCLs execute collectives by selecting an algorithm from a set of predefined baseline collective algorithms. (b) High-level overview of the TACOS framework. Target network topology and collective pattern (derived from the AI workload and parallelization strategy) are provided as inputs. TACOS expands the network into a TEN and evaluates the collective precondition (i.e., which chunks are currently held by each NPU) for time $t=0$. Based on this information, TACOS employs a Greedy-based chunk-link matching heuristic to maximize network bandwidth utilization for the target time $t = 0$. TACOS iteratively runs this matching process for successive time spans until the postcondition is satisfied (i.e., all NPUs have received every desired chunk). This procedure yields a topology-aware collective algorithm (i.e., path of each chunk) that can be utilized by CCLs.




Fig. 4. Common collective patterns used in distributed ML.

but unfortunately, they are limited in scope to a very specific set of symmetric topologies (specifically, those of NVIDIA or Microsoft systems), do not model congestion effects, and do not scale beyond modest-scale systems (with approximately 8–80 NPUs) since they approach collective synthesis as a global optimization problem, solving which has an NP-hard complexity to the search space [39]. In contrast, TACOS can handle diverse asymmetric and heterogeneous topologies, and we demonstrate its scalability up to 40K NPUs. We compare TACOS against prior works in Table II.

Here is a summary of our contributions:

- TACOS is the first work to introduce the notion of TEN into the space of distributed ML, enabling an elegant representation of the problem and solution.
- TACOS supports a comprehensive array of arbitrary, heterogeneous and asymmetric topologies. This includes scenarios such as NPU failures or multi-tenant collectives.
- TACOS incorporates network contention effects during the synthesis process, yielding quality search results. We see $4.27\times$ speedup over the result from state-of-the-art TACCL [17] for a 64-NPU system.
- TACOS enables collective synthesis for large-scale topologies with manageable synthesis time by approaching it as a greedy-based matching problem rather than optimization. TACOS synthesized collective algorithms for a heterogeneous, multi-dimensional 512-NPU system in just 6.09 minutes. For a 40K Mesh topology, the synthesis took

2.52 hours. Notably, the synthesis time exhibits a quadratic relationship with the number of NPUs, in contrast to the NP-hard nature of previous works.

- When applied to the end-to-end training on a 256-NPU system leveraging heterogeneous 3D topology, workloads running the TACOS-synthesized algorithm shows $1.44\times$ average speedup across workloads over the baseline.
- TACOS is completely automated, without the need for any expert knowledge or human intervention.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Collective Communication Patterns

Communication has become an inevitable overhead for distributed ML systems due to the dispersion of model (and training data for training tasks) across accelerator devices, thereby necessitating synchronization of such information among NPUs [16]. Such communications can be represented in the form of collectives [20]. An illustrative representation of collective *patterns* commonly employed in distributed ML is provided in Fig. 4. In this context, the term **chunk** denotes the atomic unit for scheduling collectives across the network. Each circle depicted in Fig. 4 represents a chunk whereas each box denotes an NPU. In order to optimize network utilization, it is possible to decompose a collective into several smaller chunks [16]. Notably, in scenarios involving a synchronous NPU-to-NPU approach, the All-Reduce collective pattern emerges as the most prevalent [40].³ Logically, the All-Reduce collective can be conceptualized as two sequential stages: a Reduce-Scatter, followed by an All-Gather operation. Table III shows some of the parallelism schemes used in practice today and the corresponding collectives.

B. Topology-aware Collective Algorithms

Collective algorithms are used to route collective patterns. The network’s physical characteristics, including factors such

³The autonomous synthesis of collectives is an actively evolving domain of research. This work introduces a novel approach aimed at the synthesis of one-to-all or all-to-one collectives, including Reduce-Scatter, All-Gather, and All-Reduce. Extending TACOS to All-to-All which presents intricate challenges due to its expansive and complex search space, is a key objective of our future work.

TABLE III
COMMON MODEL AND DATA PARALLELIZATION STRATEGIES AND THEIR
REQUIRED COLLECTIVE COMMUNICATION PATTERNS.

Parallelization	Reduce-Scatter	All-Gather	All-Reduce
Data Parallelism [20]			✓
FSDP [41]	✓	✓	
ZeRO [7]	✓	✓	
Hybrid [20]	✓	✓	✓




Fig. 5. Baseline All-Reduce algorithms and their traffic patterns. In Reduce-Scatter, each arrow represents sending a chunk, which is then added to local chunks. For All-Gather, each arrow signifies forwarding a chunk to execute a multicast operation. Depending on the physical topology, each step may or may not encounter network congestion. The three algorithms operate contention-free over Ring, FullyConnected, and Switch networks, respectively.

as topology shape or link bandwidths, play a pivotal role in influencing the behavior of each network transmission. Therefore, the network topology serves as a defining factor for determining the optimal routing algorithm for a given collective pattern [21]. For instance, Ring [19], Direct [20], and Recursive Halving-Doubling [21], are different collective algorithms to run All-Reduce. The traffic patterns of baseline collective algorithms are illustrated in Fig. 5. Concurrent communications within the same communication step may experience network contentions, contingent on the physical network connectivity. For instance, executing Direct All-Reduce over a FullyConnected topology results in no network congestion. In contrast, employing the same Direct All-Reduce on a Ring topology introduces significant contention. We define a **topology-aware collective algorithm** as one that is intricately optimized alongside the underlying network topology, to achieve the highest possible collective performance [42]. CCLs [30], [31], [33] today implement a set of such collective algorithms. When executing a collective pattern, they select a collective algorithm either statically or dynamically, based on various network features such as collective chunk sizes or the underlying network topology.

III. MOTIVATION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

A. Heterogeneity and Asymmetry in ML Systems

In order to harness maximum networking performance, state-of-the-art distributed ML platforms are capitalizing on a range of network technologies, which introduce heterogeneity and asymmetry into the network topologies employed within these systems. Notable instances include wafer-scale technologies as implemented by Cerebras CS-2 [4] and Tesla Dojo [5], multi-dimensional scale-up and scale-out switches in NVIDIA DGX clusters [10], [13], and the incorporation of scale-up and Photonics technologies by Google Cloud TPU [1], [43].




Fig. 6. Network heterogeneity and asymmetry arising from homogeneous, symmetric 2D Torus topology due to (a) an NPU failure and (b) collectives running across a subset of NPUs.

Even in the context of homogeneous and symmetric networks, heterogeneity and asymmetry can arise. Example instances are visualized in Fig. 6. As demonstrated in Fig. 6(a), a single NPU failure within a given homogeneous 2D Torus topology can profoundly alter the dynamics of the underlying network, leading to network asymmetry. Device failures are reported periodically, constituting 0.25-0.5% of NPUs per week in real large-scale deployments [44]. These failures can persist in a sub-healthy state for up to several days [45], leading to a healthy state lasting only a few consecutive days at most [46].⁴ Fig. 6(b) illustrates a scenario where multiple collectives are concurrently executed over a subset of NPUs, a circumstance not uncommon due to the intricate hybrid parallelization strategies adopted by large-scale models [28], [50], [51]. Each collective operation can leverage only a subset of the available network resources, not the entire 2D Torus.

B. Importance of Topology-aware Collectives

Implementing and executing a topology-aware collective algorithm on a target system can lead to a substantial enhancement in communication performance. We conducted experiments involving Ring, Recursive Halving-Doubling, and Direct All-Reduce algorithms on Ring, FullyConnected, 2D Mesh, and 3D Hypercube configurations, each composed of 64 NPUs. For Mesh and Hypercube, we also synthesized a topology-aware collective algorithm through TACOS (explained in Sec. IV) to allude the benefit. The normalized message sizes transferred by each link is shown in Fig. 1. It is shown that topology-unaware collective algorithms create huge link oversubscriptions for some links, making most links underutilized. Topology-aware collective algorithms were able to balance the loads across links, yielding the best network resource utilization and thereby the shortest collective time. Therefore, on the Ring network, the topology-aware Ring algorithm exhibited a $16.71\times$ higher All-Reduce bandwidth than the Direct algorithm, as presented in Fig. 2. This can be attributed to the congestion experienced when executing the Direct algorithm on a Ring due to its absence of all-to-all connectivity. In contrast, on the FullyConnected topology, the Direct algorithm suffered a significant performance improvement of $31.40\times$ over the Ring algorithm. This is because the Ring algorithm breaks the All-Reduce collective into 63 phases, where each phase leverages only the Ring

⁴Various fault-tolerance techniques for distributed ML have been proposed to stabilize numerical instability and improve convergence in diverse deployment scenarios [47]–[49]. While their implications are beyond the scope of this work, TACOS can be concurrently applied with these techniques.




Fig. 7. (a) α - β model of heterogeneous, asymmetric network topology. (b) the network topology captured in TACOS representation. For example, $10.27 \mu\text{s}$ is derived by $0.5 \mu\text{s} + (1 \text{ MB} / (100 \text{ GB/s}))$.

connectivity. This significantly wastes 96.88% of the available link resources since each NPU is only communicating with 2 neighboring NPUs, even though the FullyConnected topology offers all-to-all connectivity. Lastly, with respect to the Mesh and Hypercube All-Reduce algorithm synthesized by TACOS, the topology-aware approach delivered substantial average speedup of $1.98\times$ and $2.97\times$, respectively, over the Ring algorithm. This effect is also being observed in real-world deployment scenarios. TACCL, an Integer Linear Programming (ILP) based synthesizer proposed previously, exhibited a speedup of up to $6.7\times$ over the baseline NCCL setup using the real system measurements [17]. All such compelling outcomes from these speedups underscore the imperative nature of exploring topology-aware collectives.

C. Challenge: Designing Topology-aware Collective Algorithm for Arbitrary Network Configuration

Given the importance of topology-aware collectives, designing topology-aware collective algorithms for commonly used network configurations is an active research field. This can be seen from recent proposals that have devised All-Reduce algorithms on Mesh-based [52] and DragonFly-based [53] topologies. However, there exists a multitude of popular network topologies for which no topology-aware collective algorithms exist today. Even for existing algorithms, they are often tuned today assuming homogeneous bandwidths, and thus susceptible to performance degradation from the emergence of diverse networking technologies. Furthermore, they can suffer from considerable performance degradation due to effects such as device failures or executing collectives over a subset of cluster NPUs, as illustrated in Fig. 6. In order to address such issues, fault-tolerant collective algorithms have also been proposed for certain topologies [52], [54]. Nonetheless, imposing the requirement of creating fault-resilient versions of individual collective algorithms would excessively complicate the design landscape of these algorithms.

D. Solution: Topology-aware Collective Synthesizer

To surmount the challenges inherent in manual topology-aware collective algorithm design, the development of an **autonomous synthesis framework capable of generating topology-aware collective algorithms** is imperative. Such a toolchain can alleviate the burden on human experts to manually configure the routing of each chunk, alleviate network congestions, balance latency-bandwidth trade-offs, or account




Fig. 8. (a) A topology featuring heterogeneous link cost and asymmetric shape. (b) TEN_4 expansion of the network.




Fig. 9. Ring-based All-Gather collective algorithm represented on a TEN_3 of uni-directional Ring topology of size 4. Each square represents an NPU, whereas each circle denotes the chunk.

for faulty scenarios. This becomes especially crucial as network topologies continue to be more intricate, thereby further complicating the task of optimizing collective performance. We discuss prior efforts in collective synthesis in Sec. VII.

IV. TACOS

In this section, we demonstrate our methodology to represent an arbitrary collective algorithm using a TEN and introduce the concept of link-chunk matching as a means to approach synthesizing topology-aware collectives.

A. Network Topology Representation

A network topology can be effectively described by depicting the interconnectivity among NPUs (i.e., links), along with the corresponding costs attributed to each of these connections. An illustrative exemplar of a network topology representation is presented in Fig. 7(a). To delineate link costs, we adopt the α - β model [55]. Within this model, α characterizes the latency of the link, representing the fixed cost that each communication should pay irrespective of the size of the transmitted data payload. Meanwhile, β represents the reciprocal of link bandwidth, signifying the serialization overhead per unit message size in each communication. Consequently, when transmitting a message of size n , the link communication delay is computed as $\alpha + \beta \cdot n$. We assume α is a constant value for each link, since communication delay in distributed ML is primarily influenced by β , given the typically large collective sizes [29]. NPU performance and memory bandwidth are also disregarded as collective computation requirement is marginal and multiple threads can be allocated to match the needs.⁵

⁵Such latency still be incorporated into α of each link and TACOS will reflect the affect during synthesis. Also, TACOS-synthesized collective algorithms can still benefit from collective acceleration engines or techniques [56].




Fig. 10. Greedy-based matching overview: (a) Pre/postcondition of a collective on a small TEN at time t (b) Randomly select one unsatisfied postcondition and backtrack incoming edges to identify candidate source NPUs that can provide the requested chunk (c) Randomly choose one link among candidates to make a match (d) Link-chunk matching result after iterating over all unsatisfied postconditions, maximizing network resource utilization for a given time t .

These assumptions align with those in related works of the topology-aware collective algorithm domain [16]–[18], [23].

The network configuration depicted in Fig. 7(a) represents a heterogeneous topology, featuring diverse α and β cost values associated with its links. Additionally, it qualifies as an asymmetric topology, given that NPUs may exhibit distinct degrees and shapes of connectivity. In the context of TACOS, the atomic unit of transmission is chunk. Therefore, such a network configuration is effectively captured by representing the communication cost assigned to each link, considering a given unit chunk size. This mode of representation is elucidated in Fig. 7(b), assuming a target chunk size of 1 MB.

B. Background on Time-expanded Network

We introduce the notion of Time-expanded Network (TEN) in our problem domain, which requires judicial considerations of both network topology and timing dimensions. We begin by considering a base topology graph, denoted as $G = (V, E)$, where vertices in set V correspond to NPUs, and edges in set E denote the links between these NPUs. Mathematically, a TEN's vertices are constructed by replicating the base vertices V for each time t , denoted as V_t . An edge (u_t, v_{t+k}) is established between vertex $u_t \in V_t$ and vertex $v_{t+k} \in V_{t+k}$ if and only if a packet has the capability to traverse from vertex u to vertex v within a span of time k in the base topology, i.e., if there's a link of communication cost k from NPU u to NPU v . We provide a visual example in Fig. 8. Fig. 8(a) is a three NPU topology. The three NPUs are condensed into a single vertical column within the TEN, shown in Fig. 8(b). This column is subsequently replicated over a range of time, commencing from time 0 and extending up to t , denoted as TEN_t . For instance, the depiction of Fig. 8(b) unrolls the topology up to $t = 4$, which corresponds to TEN_4 for the given network. Now moving on to the edges, note that the topology in Fig. 8(a) has three connections: $1 \rightarrow 2$, $1 \leftrightarrow 3$, and $3 \rightarrow 2$, distinguished by colors (red, green, and blue, respectively) and distinct arrow shapes. These connections are translated into directed edges flowing from left to right within the TEN, consequently interconnecting distinct timesteps, as illustrated in Fig. 8(b). A TEN facilitates an intuitive comprehension of intricate temporal and connectivity dynamics, in a single data structure, as it can be alluded in Fig. 8(b). Consider the

scenario where a chunk is dispatched from NPU 1 to NPU 2 at $t = 1$. It is intuitive from the TEN that this chunk will successfully reach its destination after 3 time steps at $t = 4$. Similarly, the TEN illustrates the absence of a direct link from NPU 2 to NPU 3, illustrating that such a transmission is impossible due to the lack of the connectivity.

C. Representing Collective Algorithms using TEN

TEN encapsulates both network topology and temporal information within a singular acyclic directed graph. As a result, TEN offers a streamlined and intuitive means of representing arbitrary collective algorithms. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to bring the notion of TEN into the realm of distributed ML and represents collective algorithm on top of it. This is shown in Fig. 9, where the (unidirectional) Ring-based All-Gather algorithm on a homogenous Ring topology is depicted using the TEN-based representation. The leftmost segment of the TEN depicts the precondition at $t = 0$ (i.e., initial chunks resident in each NPU), with the rightmost segment showing the postcondition at $t = 3$ (i.e., the chunks held by each NPU). Intermediate postconditions are omitted for space considerations. In the TEN visualization, any chunk communication occurring between two NPUs is symbolized by a chunk occupying a TEN link. We denote this **a link-chunk match has been made**. For the scenario depicted in Fig. 9, each link in the TEN structure corresponds to a matched chunk. *To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to demonstrate the use of TEN to represent ML collectives, and we believe this formulation has value beyond the specific synthesis algorithm presented in this paper.*

D. TACOS' Approach to Collective Algorithm Synthesis

The TEN-based representation of a collective algorithm enables TACOS to approach and frame the problem as a link-chunk match-making challenge, rather than viewing it as a global optimization problem that previous approaches have adopted. This approach holds a significant advantage over ILP-based synthesizers, as solving ILP poses an NP-hard problem within the search space. Given a TEN representation of a network topology, TACOS endeavors to establish mappings for individual chunks onto the TEN links. Throughout the process of synthesizing collective algorithms, TACOS strives




Fig. 11. End-to-end TACOS All-Gather synthesis for a homogeneous, asymmetric 4-NPU topology: (a) Target network topology (b) TEN expansion (shown to $t = 3$) (c) Precondition and postcondition evaluation for $t = 0$ (d)-(f) Greedy-based link-chunk matching for $t = 0$, $t = 1$, and $t = 2$, maximizing network resource utilization at each time t (g) Resulting synthesized All-Gather algorithm by TACOS, laid out over the actual topology in series of execution.

to maximize the number of successful link-chunk matches while adhering to defined constraints. This approach ensures the resultant algorithm to optimally exploit network resources, ultimately fulfilling the goal of reducing collective time and maximizing communication performance. The framework inherently addresses the impact of network congestion, as each TEN link accommodates just one chunk at any given time. It's worth noting that even though network heterogeneity and asymmetry might lead to diverse TEN configurations, the core challenge of mapping chunks onto TEN links remains consistent. This eliminates the necessity for having homogeneity or symmetry assumptions other synthesis frameworks rely on.

E. Greedy-based Matching Heuristic

TACOS resolves the link-chunk matching problem through the application of a swift yet robust and effective greedy-based matching heuristic. The utilization process of this heuristic is demonstrated in Fig. 10. The link-chunk matching problem starts with the scenario akin to the case depicted in Fig. 10(a), where the precondition and unsatisfied postcondition of each NPU at time t are initially evaluated. This allows TACOS to determine which chunks each NPU is requesting to receive. Subsequently, TACOS iterates randomly (but exhaustively) over the unsatisfied postcondition, selecting an NPU and the chunk it requires to receive. To illustrate, in Fig. 10(b), NPU 1 and chunk 3 are chosen. Subsequently, the heuristic backtracks through the TEN graph by one step, identifying a set of potential source NPUs capable of supplying the requested chunk, represented by the bold arrows in the figure. The heuristic then assesses which of the candidate source NPUs currently possess and can provide the desired chunk. In the

exemplified scenario, NPU 2 and 3 fulfill these criteria. From the pool of such candidates, a random selection is made, resulting in a successful match, as showcased in Fig. 10(c). In this instance, NPU 2 is selected to cater to chunk 3, and the corresponding TEN link (NPU 2 \rightarrow 3) becomes occupied by the established match. This sequence repeats for all unsatisfied postcondition, resulting in the outcome shown in Fig. 10(d). Through greedy matching, TACOS maximizes the number of link-chunk matchings, ensuring nearly full utilization of network resources without contentions at a given time t . The process is iteratively run, incrementing time t until the postcondition is fully satisfied. By maximizing resource utilization at each processed time t , TACOS produces high-quality collective algorithms.

The end-to-end TACOS synthesis procedure for an All-Gather collective over an asymmetric 4-NPU example is illustrated in Fig. 11. Starting with a given network topology (Fig. 11(a)), TACOS expands the network into a corresponding TEN (Fig. 11(b)) and evaluates the precondition and postcondition for the initial time $t = 0$ (Fig. 11(c)). Greedy-based matching is iteratively executed over the constructed TEN until the postcondition is fully satisfied. Fig. 11(d)-(f) illustrate how the Greedy-based matching heuristics are applied for different times $t = 0$, $t = 1$, and $t = 2$, respectively. Note that for each time t , TACOS maximizes network resource utilization by making as many link-chunk matches as possible. Fig. 11(f) especially shows the postcondition is satisfied, indicating the completion of TACOS synthesis. The resulting synthesized All-Gather algorithm is presented in Fig. 11(g).




Fig. 12. (a) Among candidate links, TACOS prioritizes lower-cost one for optimality, thus NPU 3 is chosen to provide chunk 1 instead of NPU 1. (b) When Chunk 2 arrived at NPU 2 from NPU 3 (matched at $t = 0$), a shorter link from NPU 1 had already provided Chunk 2 (matched at $t = 1$). In this scenario, the original matching from NPU 3 to 2 can be repurposed to handle other meaningful chunks that have not arrived yet (e.g., Chunk 3) instead.

F. Supporting Heterogeneous and Asymmetric Networks

The fundamentals of performing link-chunk matching over TEN remain unchanged even for networks that are heterogeneous and asymmetric, thus allowing the utilization of the greedy-based matching heuristic for such scenarios. Specifically, a slight modification is introduced to the greedy-based matching heuristic to enhance the effectiveness of the synthesized collective algorithm.

Lower-link-cost-first Matching. When conducting link-chunk matching, there can arise situations in which multiple NPUs could serve as the source for the requested chunk. Due to the heterogeneity of the network, the associated transmission costs may differ. In such instances, the TACOS employs the greedy-based matching heuristic with a priority assigned to the link with the lowest cost. This ensures that the resulting collective algorithm minimizes the overall collective time.

Chunk Replacement. On account of the network’s heterogeneity, a chunk may reach its destination through an alternate shorter path even after a link-chunk match has been established. An illustrative scenario is depicted in Figure 12(b). In this instance, a match has been established for transmitting chunk 2 from NPU 3 to NPU 2 at $t = 0$. However, during subsequent matching procedures at $t = 1$, NPU 2 received chunk 1 from NPU 1. To optimize performance, TACOS eliminates duplicated transfer and seeks alternative chunks to substitute chunk 2. In this scenario, NPU 3 sends chunk 3 instead to NPU 2 at $t = 0$, enabling NPU 2 to receive chunks 1–3 by $t = 2$. TACOS, being a design-time framework, makes all such replacement decisions during synthesis.

G. Unwinding Switch Network

A Switch topology offers versatile NPU connectivity. However, unregulated use may lead to sub-optimal performance due to network contentions or even deadlocks. To address this, we introduce a mechanism to unfold Switch networks into point-to-point connections. With fixed connectivity, TACOS can automatically synthesize high-quality collective algorithms, autonomously averting network congestion and max-




Fig. 13. (a) A Switch fabric with 4 NPUs interconnected. (b)–(d) Unwinding (a) with degrees 1 through 3.




Fig. 14. Combining collectives can be synthesized as an inverse of non-combining collectives. (a) Broadcast algorithm (b) Synthesized Reduce algorithm, an inverse of (a). Note that the time flows from right to left for this TEN.

imizing resource utilization during the synthesis process.⁶ By adopting a degree d unwinding approach for an N -NPU Switch, we establish d outgoing links originating from each NPU i , connecting to NPUs $(i + 1), (i + 2), \dots, (i + d)$. During this transition, the α cost associated with each point-to-point link remains consistent. However, due to the shared outgoing bandwidth, the bandwidth of each link diminishes by a factor of d . Fig. 13(b) illustrates a $d = 1$ unwinding of a 4-NPU Switch. In this scenario, the Switch effectively becomes a unidirectional Ring topology. Since d is set to 1, each link retains its full 120 GB/s link bandwidth. For the $d = 1$ case, an alternative configuration is offered to construct a bidirectional Ring. Scenarios encompassing $d = 2$ and $d = 3$ unwinding are depicted in Fig. 13(c) and Fig. 13(d), respectively.

H. Combining Collectives

As demonstrated in Sec. II-A, certain collectives such as Reduce-Scatter or All-Reduce fall under the category of combining collectives, where there’s a need for reduction operations among individual chunks. The synthesis of combining collectives is facilitated by their inherent relationship with the corresponding non-combining collective algorithms, operating in reverse [18], [26]. This concept is illustrated in Fig. 14. For instance, Broadcast, which represents a non-combining collective, can be synthesized by TACOS as shown in Fig. 14(a). Conversely, the Reduce algorithm, classified as a combining collective, is formulated by applying an inversion to the Broadcast algorithm, as depicted in Fig. 14(b). Analogously, the synthesis of Reduce-Scatter involves a straightforward inversion of the topology-aware All-Gather collective algorithm.

⁶It’s important to note that this Switch unwinding scheme does not entirely cover potential configurations and has room for further enhancement to offer increased flexibility. For instance, Switch connectivity could change dynamically during the TEN generation process. The development of a flexible Switch unwinding framework is a subject for future investigation.

TABLE IV
TOPOLOGIES EVALUATED IN THIS PAPER.

Topology	Heterogenous	Asymmetric
Ring (RI)		
FullyConnected (FC)		
2D Torus (2D-TR)		
3D Torus (3D-TR)		
2D Mesh (Mesh)		✓
3D Hypercube (HC)		✓
2D Switch (2D-SW)	✓	
3D Ring-FC-Switch (3D-RFS)	✓	
DragonFly (DF)	✓	✓

Lastly, the All-Reduce collective is composed by sequentially executing Reduce-Scatter followed by All-Gather.

V. METHODOLOGY

A. Baseline Collective Algorithms

TACOS synthesis time is measured by using the Intel Xeon E5-2699v3 CPU. For performance evaluations, we compare TACOS against the following baseline All-Reduce algorithms.

- **Ring.** This is the default collective algorithm explained earlier in Sec. II and the default today across almost all CCLs [30], [33]. For an N -node Ring, the algorithm requires $2N$ steps (N for Reduce-Scatter and N for All-Gather). For non-Ring physical topologies, the Ring algorithm is deployed by mapping a logical Ring over the physical topology.
- **Direct.** The Direct algorithm first performs the Reduce-Scatter and then All-Gather in one step. For a FullyConnected topology, it runs in a congestion-free manner. In other topologies, it leads to congestion due to link oversubscription (as exemplified in Fig. 1).
- **Recursive Halving-Doubling/Double Binary Tree.** We have also shown Recursive Halving-Doubling (RHD) [21] and Double Binary Tree (DBT) [22] for some scenarios, as these algorithms only runs optimally for network topologies with power-of-two number of NPUs.
- **TACCL.** TACCL [17] is a recent ILP-based approach for collective synthesis with an open-source implementation [57]. Since TACCL’s codebase provides very limited topology options, we took its ILP formulation and integrated it with our TEN representation to enable an apples-to-apples comparison against the TACOS algorithm.

B. Target Topologies

We evaluate the effectiveness of TACOS across a suite of point-to-point and Switch-based topologies. Table IV lists the topologies studied in this work to demonstrate the robustness of TACOS, covering both homogeneous and heterogeneous networks, and also both symmetric and asymmetric topologies.

C. Simulation Infrastructure

We use the ASTRA-sim2.0 distributed ML simulator [20], [35] to study the performance of the different synthesized baseline collective algorithms and corresponding impact on full workloads. ASTRA-sim2.0 already includes NCCL-validated implementations of the basic collective algorithms




Fig. 15. An All-Gather collective algorithm synthesized by TACOS over a homogeneous, 3×3 Mesh topology. Each circle represents a chunk, with its number indicating the NPU where it originated. At the end of the All-Gather, all NPUs will have a copy of all chunks.

(Ring, Direct, Recursive Halving-Doubling). It also models effects due to chunking (i.e., breaking the large collective messages into smaller chunks) and related scheduling effects in hierarchical topologies [16]. ASTRA-sim2.0 also includes a network model with support for specifying arbitrary hierarchical topologies [35] with heterogeneous link bandwidths.

Validation and Enhancements. For this work, a simulator was necessary to be able to study performance across a diverse spectrum of topologies that we studied (Table IV). We first validated ASTRA-sim’s native All-Reduce implementations over two real systems in the public cloud: 8-node NVLink based V100 GPU server on AWS and 32-node (8×4) TPU-v3 instance on Google Cloud.⁷ We observed ASTRA-sim to be 6-8% off on average, with the number getting close to 1% at large message sizes. We then extended ASTRA-sim’s system layer to simulate the custom collective routing algorithms synthesized by TACOS and TACCL, along with MultiTree and C-Cube collective algorithms. The native network model in ASTRA-sim2.0 does not model congestion as it was built to target congestion-free collectives running on their corresponding topologies. For our evaluations, we enhanced the network model with congestion support as minimizing which is the primary goal of this work.

VI. EVALUATIONS

In this section, we run various case studies to evaluate the collective performance of TACOS across diverse topologies.

⁷We plugged in link bandwidths for NVLink (25 GB/s) and TPU-v3 (80 GB/s) into ASTRA-sim. We also added a fixed delay per-hop (based on measurement) to account for link serialization and message launch overheads. These two systems use older NPU architectures, but our purpose was to validate communication, not compute.




Fig. 16. All-Reduce bandwidth of TACOS, TACCL, Ring, and Direct algorithms. 2D Switch is a 2-level Switch topology, similar to DGX. Mesh size is 5×5 (25 NPUs), DragonFly is 4×5 (20 NPUs), and 2D Switch is 8×4 (32 NPUs).




Fig. 17. The bandwidth utilization ratio of every link when running 1GB All-Reduce. Results measured by running Ring, Direct, and TACOS-synthesized algorithms on DragonFly (DF) of size 7×8 and 3D Ring-FullyConnected-Switch (3D-RFC) of size $2 \times 4 \times 8$ are shown.

A. TACOS Synthesis Result

Synthesis Result. In order to offer a visual representation of the synthesis outcomes, we commence with a small-scale application of TACOS on a homogeneous 3×3 Mesh network. The resultant synthesized algorithm is visualized in Fig. 15. Due to TACOS’ intrinsic ability to automatically model and circumvent network congestion during the synthesis process, the resulting algorithm exhibits an absence of network congestion across all links.

Link Utilization. Then, we present small-scale evaluations encompassing a variety of both homogeneous and heterogeneous networks. We synthesize topology-aware All-Reduce algorithms for three distinct systems: a Mesh network (5×5 , 25 NPUs) featuring 100 GB/s links, a DragonFly network (4×5 , 20 NPUs) with link bandwidths of [400, 200] GB/s (per dimension), and a 2D Switch network (8×4 , 32 NPUs) with link bandwidth of [300, 25] GB/s. Displayed in Fig. 16 are the TACOS-synthesized All-Reduce bandwidth (i.e., collective size \div collective time) as well as corresponding baseline performances including the TACCL configuration. Remarkably, TACOS effectively synthesizes collective algorithms for

TABLE V
NORMALIZED ALL-REDUCE COLLECTIVE TIME (AND SYNTHESIS TIME IN BRACKETS FOR TACOS AND TACCL) FOR MULTI-NODE 3D-RFS FOR 2–16 NODES (16–128 NPUs), NORMALIZED OVER TACOS.

#NPUs (#Nodes)	TACOS (ms)	TACCL (ms)	Ring	RHD	Direct	DBT
16 (2)	1 (0.63)	2.89 (790)	7.14	5.27	4.04	47.13
32 (4)	1 (8.90)	4.10 (2001)	5.10	4.42	7.86	58.35
64 (8)	1 (97.92)	4.27 (7016)	4.80	5.83	16.84	121.31
128 (16)	1 (1080)	-	4.82	9.85	36.02	294.15

both homogeneous and heterogeneous networks exhibiting distinct connectivities, yielding $2.56 \times$ average speedup over baseline methodologies. It is noteworthy that even within the scope of this small-scale search space, spanning up to 32 NPUs, TACOS already matches or surpasses the capabilities of prior optimization-based solutions. Fig. 17 represents the bandwidth utilization of all links when running 1 GB All-Reduce over a DragonFly network with 56 NPUs (7×8) and 3D Ring-FullyConnected-Switch topology with 64 NPUs ($2 \times 4 \times 8$). Topology-unaware baseline algorithms create huge link oversubscription over a few links, leaving all other links underutilized. TACOS-synthesized topology-aware collective successfully increased the overall link utilization across all links, yielding the best end-to-end collective performance.

Heterogeneous Networks. In order to show TACOS’ applicability for complex heterogeneous networks that resemble real-world training HPC clusters, we synthesized All-Reduce collective algorithm for a node adhering to the Ring-FullyConnected topology (2×4 , 8 NPUs) with link bandwidths of [200, 100] GB/s. Further scaling out the system, we extended it to encompass up to 16 nodes interconnected via switches leveraging link bandwidths of 50 GB/s, totaling up to 128 NPUs. Table V offers a comprehensive summary of these evaluations (TACCL took non-tractable synthesis time for 128 NPUs due to its inefficiency, thus not shown in the table). On average, the collective algorithm generated by TACOS showcased $5.39 \times$, $6.05 \times$, $11.78 \times$, and $99.53 \times$ speedup over the Ring, Recursive Halving-Doubling, Direct, and Double Binary Tree baselines across all configurations, respectively. Direct and Double Binary Tree baselines specifically suffered huge network underutilization since the Direct algorithm creates network congestions across the topology and the Double Binary Tree algorithm inherently experiences oversubscription over very few links near the root of the binary tree.

B. TACOS vs. Topology-aware Collectives

To assess TACOS’ effectiveness against manually-designed topology-aware collectives, we compared TACOS results with baseline Hierarchical [58] and Themis [16] algorithms over 3D Torus and 3D Hypercube with 25 GB/s links. The Hierarchical collective algorithm performs an All-Reduce operation over a multi-dimensional network by first applying Reduce-Scatter consecutively across each network dimension in sequence, followed by executing All-Gather in reverse order. Themis




Fig. 18. All-Reduce bandwidth of TACOS when compared to the Hierarchical and Themis algorithms. For Themis-preferred topology (3D Torus), TACOS and Themis showed comparable results. For Themis-unaware topology (3D Hypercube), TACOS achieved better algorithm bandwidth.




Fig. 19. Bandwidth utilization heat map for Hierarchical, Themis, and TACOS, over a 3D Hypercube. While Themis successfully mitigated link contention, TACOS achieved overall better utilization.

enhances the efficiency of this Hierarchical algorithm by allowing different chunks to execute Reduce-Scatter and All-Gather in an arbitrary manner, thereby balancing the load across each network dimension. The All-Reduce bandwidth measured are shown in Fig. 18. For Themis-preferred 3D Torus topology, TACOS synthesized a collective algorithm matching Themis performance. TACOS can synthesize the entire path each chunk takes. However, for Themis, the path each chunk is taking is fixed to specific collective algorithms and it can only decide which network dimension to traverse first. Therefore, Themis requires to split a collective into many small chunks to properly balance the loads across network dimensions and get optimized performance. Subsequently, TACOS showed better performance over Themis when both are using 4 chunks per collective, and showed equal performance when Themis is using 64 chunks per each All-Reduce. For Themis-unaware topologies (3D Hypercube), TACOS outperformed Themis (with 4 chunks per collective) by an average of $2.01\times$. Themis cannot alter the path each chunk is taking, thereby not able to mitigate link congestions when the topology-aware collective of the network dimension is not known. However, TACOS effectively mitigated network contentions by synthesizing the optimal routing and achieved the highest resource utilization, as can be seen from the link bandwidth utilization heat map in Fig. 19.

We also compared TACOS against MultiTree and C-Cube algorithms against TACOS. MultiTree synthesizes the routing algorithm by creating spanning trees growing from each NPUs. C-Cube, on the other hand, manually lays out two binary




Fig. 20. All-Reduce bandwidth of TACOS compared to MultiTree and C-Cube over their corresponding preferred and unoptimized topologies.

trees over a target topology and overlaps the reduction and broadcast phases to execute an All-Reduce. The results are summarized in Fig. 20. When compared to MultiTree over its preferred networks (2D Torus and 2D Mesh), TACOS achieved comparable performance, exhibiting an average speedup of $1.32\times$. However, since MultiTree does not account for different link costs when constructing a spanning tree, for MultiTree-unaware networks (heterogeneous 3D-RFS), TACOS achieved $3.85\times$ speedup. For C-Cube, even on its preferred network, TACOS achieved a $2.86\times$ better performance. This is attributed to the fact that C-Cube completely disables 2 out of 6 available links per each NPU to manually map two physical binary trees. However, TACOS-synthesized algorithm successfully exploits all network resources during the course of the collective. Because C-Cube requires two binary trees to be manually mapped over a given topology to function properly, naively running C-Cube over 3D Torus and 3D Hypercube, TACOS yielded $12.18\times$ speedup. In all scenarios, TACOS synthesized algorithms that either matched or outperformed existing algorithms without any human intervention or guidance, irrespective of underlying topologies. This underscores the capability of TACOS to significantly alleviate manual design efforts while maintaining comparable collective quality

C. Evaluating Scalability of TACOS

We further extended the scale of the heterogeneous 3D Ring-FullyConnected-Switch network to encompass up to 128 nodes, totaling up to 1,024 NPUs. TACOS synthesis for 256, 512, and 1K NPU clusters took 16.50 sec, 6.09 min, and 2.78 hours, respectively. Such scale of the target system significantly surpasses the previously assessed 80-NPU cluster in the TACCL evaluation [17]. Further, TACOS scales to this extent even without necessitating any a priori human expert knowledge, while encompassing network contentions and heterogeneity effects, in contrast to TACCL’s approach.

Additionally, we synthesized All-Reduce algorithms for homogeneous 2D Mesh and 3D Hypercube with a scale of




Fig. 21. Synthesis time for various-sized homogeneous 2D Mesh and 3D Hypercube using TACOS with 64 parallel threads. The synthesis time exhibited $O(n^2)$ complexity, where n is the number of NPUs.




Fig. 22. All-Reduce time of Ring and Direct algorithms over TACOS. The target network is 10×10 Mesh topology (100 NPUs).

up to 40K NPUs, using 64 parallel threads, and measured the synthesis time. The evaluation is summarized in Fig. 21. TACOS efficiently synthesized an All-Reduce algorithm for a Mesh network (40K NPUs) within just 2.52 hours and for a 3D Hypercube (27K NPUs) in 51.54 minutes. The synthesis time is measured to be $O(n^2)$, where n is the number of NPUs. This indicates that TACOS synthesis time is linear to the search space, which is the combination of links and chunks, where the number of chunks is $O(n)$ and links is $\Theta(n)$. Therefore, TACOS exhibits better scalability compared to ILP-based synthesizers, given that their optimization is NP-hard.

D. Synthesizing Large Multi-chunk Collective

As the message size of the target collective increases, each collective might be divided into multiple smaller chunks rather than a single large chunk. In an effort to spotlight such ability, we run a synthesis of an All-Reduce algorithm within a homogeneous 10×10 Mesh topology. In order to gauge the impact of collective size, we varied the number of initial chunks (each sized at 128 KB) across 1 to 64, thus effectively covering All-Reduce collectives of 25 MB to 1600 MB. The outcomes of this investigation are illustrated in Fig. 22, which depicts the normalized collective time of Ring and Direct baselines normalized over the synthesized algorithm. Notably, TACOS was able to synthesize the 1600 MB All-Reduce algorithm in 57.87 seconds. When contrasted against the baseline Ring and Direct algorithms, TACOS synthesized All-Reduce collective was $2.26\times$ and $11.00\times$ faster on average, respectively.

E. Synthesis with Asymmetry

To effectively highlight TACOS' competency in accommodating asymmetric networks, we delve into the evaluation of two synthetic scenarios elucidated in Fig. 23. The synthesis outcomes for these asymmetric scenarios are documented in Table VI. For such instances of network asymmetry, TACOS




Fig. 23. (a) 4×4 Mesh with two failures at NPU 7 and 9. (b) 6×6 Mesh running 3 sub-collectives concurrently. Broadcast source is NPU 2 and Reduce destination is NPU 17. The collective runtimes for both these scenarios are shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI
NORMALIZED COLLECTIVE RUNTIME AND SYNTHESIS TIME FOR TWO SYNTHETIC ASYMMETRIC SCENARIOS AS REPRESENTED IN FIG. 23.

Normalized Time	TACOS	Ring	Direct
NPU Failure	1.00	2.69	5.08
Sub-collectives	1.00	-	2.90

executed its synthesis process in just 3.53 ms and 3.67 ms, respectively. In addition, TACOS-synthesized algorithm achieved up to $5.08\times$ speedup.

F. Application to End-to-end ML Model Training

Lastly, in order to elucidate TACOS' implications in the context of distributed ML, we conducted an evaluation of the end-to-end training performance of GNMT [59], ResNet-50 [60] and Turing-NLG [61] models, chosen as the representative models of vision and large language models. For evaluated models which leverage data parallelism, communication becomes exposed at the end of each training iteration. This assumption aligns with the modeling of data parallel communication in a previous work in the domain [16]. We evaluate the training process of GNMT on a small, 8-node (64 NPU) heterogeneous cluster using 3D Ring-FullyConnected-Switch topology, in order to demonstrate the search quality. The normalized training time over TACOS is shown in Fig. 24. TACOS achieved $2.38\times$ speedup on average over baselines. Then, the training of ResNet-50 and Turing-NLG models was executed on a heterogeneous cluster housing 256 NPUs (across 32 nodes). Remarkably, across both ResNet-50 and Turing-NLG workloads, harnessing TACOS' synthesized collective algorithms resulted in $6.50\times$ and $1.17\times$ enhancement in end-to-end training performance over the baseline Direct and Ring collective algorithms, respectively.

VII. RELATED WORK

Collective Algorithm Representation. Some works proposed domain-specific languages for depicting collective algorithms [62], [63]. However, they are oriented towards the manual design of human-crafted collective algorithms. Other works [17], [18] use custom representations. The concept of a TEN has been leveraged in various domains related to communication or flow-based optimization. Instances include




Fig. 24. End-to-end training time of GNMT, ResNet-50, and Turing-NLG. GNMT was trained on a 64-NPU system. ResNet-50 and Turing-NLG is trained on a 256-NPU cluster. All results are normalized over the corresponding TACOS result.

vehicular traffic management [64], logistics [37], and traffic signal optimization [65]. To the best of our knowledge, this work first introduces TEN into the space of distributed ML and collectives with adequate link-chunk matching heuristics.

Collective Algorithm Design. Various works have touched the design space of collective algorithms tailored to specific network topologies. Examples include Mesh-based [52] and DragonFly-based [53] algorithms. Themis, MultiTree, and C-Cube are also examples tailored for specific target networks [16], [24], [25]. Additionally, investigations have extended into fault-tolerant collective algorithms [54]. In contrast, this study advocates for the necessity of an autonomous collective algorithm synthesizer, mitigating manual design efforts while maintaining or surpassing collective quality.

Collective Algorithm Synthesis. Table II contrasts TACOS against prior collective algorithm synthesizers. Blink [26] tackles the synthesis challenge as an optimal spanning tree construction problem. SCCL [18] employs SMT-based optimization, although its search output is confined to k -synchronous algorithms. Their evaluations only encompass up to 8 NPUs. TACCL [17] synthesizes topology-aware collective algorithms through ILP-based modeling, albeit without accounting for network congestion in pathfinding, thereby yielding sub-optimal results. Furthermore, due to the NP-hard nature of ILP, TACCL’s reach is limited to 80 NPUs and this is after being tailored to a very specific 2D topology and using user-guided synthesis hints such as network symmetry. Through link-chunk matching, TACOS achieves polynomial synthesis time while synthesizing high-quality algorithms.

Co-optimization of Collective and Network. Previous efforts have touched topology optimization for specific collective algorithms [66], [67]. Additionally, co-optimization of collectives and network topology remains an active research domain [25], [68]. Given TACOS’ ability to perform synthesis on arbitrary topologies, it can harmonize with such endeavors.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we emphasize the necessity for an autonomous synthesizer of topology-aware collective algorithms in the realm of distributed ML, capable of adapting to diverse heterogeneous and asymmetric network topologies at scale. We introduce TACOS, an innovative framework that harnesses the TEN representation and employs a greedy-based matching

heuristic to orchestrate the synthesis of topology-aware collective algorithms. TACOS accomplished the synthesis of an All-Reduce algorithm for a 40K NPU system in 2.52 hours. Furthermore, when applied to end-to-end ML model training, TACOS showcased $1.17\times$ average speedup in comparison to leveraging basic Ring collective algorithm.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. P. Jouppi, D. H. Yoon, G. Kurian, S. Li, N. Patil, J. Laudon, C. Young, and D. Patterson, “A domain-specific supercomputer for training deep neural networks,” *Commun. ACM*, vol. 63, no. 7, p. 67–78, 2020.
- [2] NVIDIA, “Nvidia h100 tensor core gpu,” <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/data-center/h100>, 2022.
- [3] Intel, “Gaudi training platform white paper,” <https://habana.ai/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Habana-Gaudi-Training-Platform-whitepaper.pdf>, 2019.
- [4] Cerebras Systems, “Cerebras Systems: Achieving industry best ai performance through a systems approach,” <https://cerebras.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Cerebras-CS-2-Whitepaper.pdf>, 2021.
- [5] T. P. Morgan, “Inside tesla’s innovative and homegrown dojo ai supercomputer,” <https://www.nextplatform.com/2022/08/23/inside-tesla-innovative-and-homegrown-dojo-ai-supercomputer>, 2022.
- [6] D. Salvator, “Acing the Test: Nvidia turbocharges generative ai training in mlperf benchmarks,” <https://blogs.nvidia.com/blog/scaling-ai-training-mlperf>, 2023.
- [7] S. Rajbhandari, J. Rasley, O. Ruwase, and Y. He, “ZeRO: memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC ’20)*, 2020.
- [8] NVIDIA, “NVIDIA DGX SuperPOD: Instant infrastructure for ai leadership,” <https://resources.nvidia.com/en-us-auto-datacenter/nvpod-superpod-wp-09>, 2020.
- [9] D. Patel, “Tenstorrent wormhole analysis - a scale out architecture for machine learning that could put nvidia on their back foot,” <https://www.semianalysis.com/p/tenstorrent-wormhole-analysis-a-scale>, 2021.
- [10] NVIDIA, “Nvidia nvlink high-speed gpu interconnect,” <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/design-visualization/nvlink-bridges>, 2022.
- [11] I. Cutress, “Analyzing Intel’s Discrete Xe-HPC Graphics Disclosure: Ponte vecchio, rambo cache, and gelato,” <https://www.anandtech.com/show/15188/analyzing-intels-discrete-xe-hpc-graphics-disclosure-ponte-vecchio>, 2019.
- [12] AMD, “Amd infinity architecture,” <https://www.amd.com/en/technologies/infinity-architecture>, 2023.
- [13] NVIDIA, “Infiniband networking solutions,” <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/networking/products/infiniband>, 2024.
- [14] A. Sapio, M. Canini, C.-Y. Ho, J. Nelson, P. Kalnis, C. Kim, A. Krishnamurthy, M. Moshref, D. Ports, and P. Richtarik, “Scaling distributed machine learning with in-network aggregation,” in *Proceedings of the 18th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI ’21)*, 2021, pp. 785–808.
- [15] Y. Li, I.-J. Liu, Y. Yuan, D. Chen, A. Schwing, and J. Huang, “Accelerating distributed reinforcement learning with in-switch computing,” in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM/IEEE 46th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA ’19)*, 2019, pp. 279–291.
- [16] S. Rashidi, W. Won, S. Srinivasan, S. Sridharan, and T. Krishna, “Themis: A network bandwidth-aware collective scheduling policy for distributed training of dl models,” in *Proceedings of the 49th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA ’22)*, 2022, p. 581–596.
- [17] A. Shah, V. Chidambaram, M. Cowan, S. Maleki, M. Musuvathi, T. Mytkowicz, J. Nelson, O. Saarikivi, and R. Singh, “TACCL: Guiding collective algorithm synthesis using communication sketches,” in *Proceedings of the 20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI ’23)*, 2023, pp. 593–612.
- [18] A. Jangda, J. Huang, G. Liu, A. H. N. Sabet, S. Maleki, Y. Miao, M. Musuvathi, T. Mytkowicz, and O. Saarikivi, “Breaking the computation and communication abstraction barrier in distributed machine learning workloads,” in *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS ’22)*, 2022, p. 402–416.

- [19] E. Chan, R. van de Geijn, W. Gropp, and R. Thakur, "Collective communication on architectures that support simultaneous communication over multiple links," in *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (PPoPP '06)*, 2006, p. 2–11.
- [20] S. Rashidi, S. Sridharan, S. Srinivasan, and T. Krishna, "ASTRA-SIM: Enabling sw/hw co-design exploration for distributed dl training platforms," in *Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS '20)*, 2020, pp. 81–92.
- [21] R. Thakur, R. Rabenseifner, and W. Gropp, "Optimization of collective communication operations in mpich," *Int. J. High Perform. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 19, no. 1, p. 49–66, 2005.
- [22] S. Jeaugey, "Massively scale your deep learning training with nccl 2.4," <https://developer.nvidia.com/blog/massively-scale-deep-learning-training-nccl-2-4>, 2019.
- [23] M. Cho, U. Finkler, M. Serrano, D. Kung, and H. Hunter, "BlueConnect: Decomposing all-reduce for deep learning on heterogeneous network hierarchy," *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, vol. 63, no. 6, pp. 1–11, 2019.
- [24] S. Cho, H. Son, and J. Kim, "Logical/physical topology-aware collective communication in deep learning training," in *Proceedings of the 2023 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA '23)*, 2023, pp. 56–68.
- [25] J. Huang, P. Majumder, S. Kim, A. Muzahid, K. H. Yum, and E. J. Kim, "Communication algorithm-architecture co-design for distributed deep learning," in *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM/IEEE 48th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA '21)*, 2021, pp. 181–194.
- [26] G. Wang, S. Venkataraman, A. Phanishayee, N. Devanur, J. Thelin, and I. Stoica, "Blink: Fast and generic collectives for distributed ml," in *Proceedings of the 2020 Machine Learning and Systems (MLSys '20)*, vol. 2, 2020, pp. 172–186.
- [27] T. Khan, S. Rashidi, S. Sridharan, P. Shurpali, A. Akella, and T. Krishna, "Impact of roce congestion control policies on distributed training of dnn," in *2022 IEEE Symposium on High-Performance Interconnects (HOTI '22)*, 2022, pp. 39–48.
- [28] R. Majumder and J. Wang, "DeepSpeed: Extreme-scale model training for everyone," <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/blog/deepspeed-extreme-scale-model-training-for-everyone>, 2020.
- [29] J. Chen, S. Li, R. Gun, J. Yuan, and T. Hoefler, "AutoDDL: Automatic distributed deep learning with asymptotically optimal communication," in *arXiv:2301.06813 [cs.DC]*, 2023.
- [30] NVIDIA, "Nvidia collective communication library (nccl)," <https://developer.nvidia.com/nccl>, 2017.
- [31] AMD, "Rccl 2.18.3 documentation," <https://rocm.docs.amd.com/projects/rccl/en/latest>, 2023.
- [32] Microsoft, "Microsoft collective communication library," <https://github.com/microsoft/msccl>, 2023.
- [33] Intel, "Intel oneapi collective communications library," <https://oneapi-src.github.io/oneCCL>, 2021.
- [34] E. Gabrielyan and R. Hersch, "Network topology aware scheduling of collective communications," in *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Telecommunications (ICT '03)*, 2003, pp. 1051–1058.
- [35] W. Won, T. Heo, S. Rashidi, S. Sridharan, S. Srinivasan, and T. Krishna, "ASTRA-sim2.0: Modeling hierarchical networks and disaggregated systems for large-model training at scale," in *Proceedings of the 2023 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS '23)*, 2023, pp. 283–294.
- [36] E. Köhler, K. Langkau, and M. Skutella, "Time-expanded graphs for flow-dependent transit times," in *Algorithms — ESA 2002*, 2002, pp. 599–611.
- [37] S. Belieres, M. Hewitt, N. Jozefowicz, and F. Semet, "A time-expanded network reduction matheuristic for the logistics service network design problem," *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, vol. 147, 2021.
- [38] A. Tafreshian, M. Abdolmaleki, N. Masoud, and H. Wang, "Proactive shuttle dispatching in large-scale dynamic dial-a-ride systems," *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, vol. 150, pp. 227–259, 2021.
- [39] A. Paulus, M. Rolínek, V. Musil, B. Amos, and G. Martius, "CombOpt-Net: Fit the right np-hard problem by learning integer programming constraints," in *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML '21)*, vol. 139, 2021, pp. 8443–8453.
- [40] B. Klenk, N. Jiang, G. Thorson, and L. Dennison, "An in-network architecture for accelerating shared-memory multiprocessor collectives," in *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM/IEEE 47th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA '20)*, 2020, pp. 996–1009.
- [41] M. Ott, S. Shleifer, M. Xu, P. Goyal, Q. Duval, and V. Caggiano, "Fully Sharded Data Parallel: faster ai training with fewer gpus," <https://engineering.fb.com/2021/07/15/open-source/fsdp>, 2021.
- [42] K. Kandalla, H. Subramoni, A. Vishnu, and D. K. Panda, "Designing topology-aware collective communication algorithms for large scale InfiniBand clusters: Case studies with scatter and gather," in *Proceedings of the 2010 IEEE International Symposium on Parallel & Distributed Processing, Workshops and Phd Forum (IPDPSW '10)*, 2010.
- [43] N. Jouppi, G. Kurian, S. Li, P. Ma, R. Nagarajan, L. Nai, N. Patil, S. Subramanian, A. Swing, B. Towles, C. Young, X. Zhou, Z. Zhou, and D. A. Patterson, "Tpu v4: An optically reconfigurable supercomputer for machine learning with hardware support for embeddings," in *Proceedings of the 50th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA '23)*, 2023.
- [44] B. Wu, L. Xia, Q. Li, K. Li, X. Chen, Y. Guo, T. Xiang, Y. Chen, and S. Li, "TRANSOM: An efficient fault-tolerant system for training llms," in *arXiv:2310.10046 [cs.DC]*, 2023.
- [45] T. He, X. Li, Z. Wang, K. Qian, J. Xu, W. Yu, and J. Zhou, "Unicron: Economizing self-healing llm training at scale," in *arXiv:2401.00134 [cs.DC]*, 2023.
- [46] Y. Wang, S. Shi, X. He, Z. Tang, X. Pan, Y. Zheng, X. Wu, A. C. Zhou, B. He, and X. Chu, "Reliable and efficient in-memory fault tolerance of large language model pretraining," in *arXiv:2310.12670 [cs.DC]*, 2023.
- [47] Y. Chen, Q. Yang, S. He, Z. Shi, J. Chen, and M. Guizani, "Ftpipehd: A fault-tolerant pipeline-parallel distributed training approach for heterogeneous edge devices," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 3200–3212, 2024.
- [48] D. Bouhata, H. Moumen, J. A. Mazari, and A. Bounceur, "Byzantine Fault Tolerance in Distributed Machine Learning: a survey," in *arXiv:2205.02572 [cs.DC]*, 2022.
- [49] I. Jang, Z. Yang, Z. Zhang, X. Jin, and M. Chowdhury, "Oobleck: Resilient distributed training of large models using pipeline templates," in *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP '23)*, 2023.
- [50] S. Singh, O. Ruwase, A. A. Awan, S. Rajbhandari, Y. He, and A. Bhatel, "A hybrid tensor-expert-data parallelism approach to optimize mixture-of-experts training," in *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Supercomputing (ICS '23)*, 2023, p. 203–214.
- [51] D. Narayanan, A. Harlap, A. Phanishayee, V. Seshadri, N. R. Devanur, G. R. Ganger, P. B. Gibbons, and M. Zaharia, "PipeDream: Generalized pipeline parallelism for dnn training," in *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP '19)*, 2019.
- [52] S. Kumar and N. Jouppi, "Highly available data parallel ml training on mesh networks," in *arXiv:2011.03605 [cs.LG]*, 2020.
- [53] J. Ma, D. Dong, C. Li, K. Wu, and L. Xiao, "PAARD: Proximity-aware all-reduce communication for dragonfly networks," in *Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE International Conference on Parallel & Distributed Processing with Applications, Big Data & Cloud Computing, Sustainable Computing & Communications, Social Computing & Networking (ISPA/BDCloud/SocialCom/SustainCom '21)*, 2021, pp. 255–262.
- [54] A. Margolin and A. Barak, "Tree-based fault-tolerant collective operations for mpi," *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, vol. 33, no. 14, p. e5826, 2021.
- [55] R. W. Hockney, "The communication challenge for MPP: Intel paragon and meiko cs-2," *Parallel Computing*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 389–398, 1994.
- [56] S. Rashidi, M. Denton, S. Sridharan, S. Srinivasan, A. Suresh, J. Nie, and T. Krishna, "Enabling compute-communication overlap in distributed deep learning training platforms," in *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM/IEEE 48th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA '21)*, 2021, pp. 540–553.
- [57] Microsoft, "TACCL: Guiding collective algorithm synthesis using communication sketches," <https://github.com/microsoft/taccl>, 2023.
- [58] W. Won, S. Rashidi, S. Srinivasan, and T. Krishna, "Exploring multi-dimensional hierarchical network topologies for efficient distributed training of trillion parameter dl models," 2021.
- [59] Y. Wu, M. Schuster, Z. Chen, Q. V. Le, M. Norouzi, W. Macherey, M. Krikun, Y. Cao, Q. Gao, K. Macherey, J. Klingner, A. Shah, M. Johnson, X. Liu, L. Kaiser, S. Gouws, Y. Kato, T. Kudo, H. Kazawa, K. Stevens, G. Kurian, N. Patil, W. Wang, C. Young, J. Smith, J. Riesa,

- A. Rudnick, O. Vinyals, G. Corrado, M. Hughes, and J. Dean, "Google's Neural Machine Translation System: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation," in arXiv:1609.08144 [cs.CL], 2016.
- [60] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in Proceedings of the 2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR '16), 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [61] C. Rosset, "Turing-NLG: A 17-billion-parameter language model by microsoft," <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/blog/turing-nlg-a-17-billion-parameter-language-model-by-microsoft>, 2020.
- [62] M. Cowan, S. Maleki, M. Musuvathi, O. Saarikivi, and Y. Xiong, "GC3: An optimizing compiler for gpu collective communication," in arXiv:2201.11840 [cs.DC], 2022.
- [63] A. Jangda, J. Huang, G. Liu, A. H. N. Sabet, S. Maleki, Y. Miao, M. Musuvathi, T. Mytkowicz, and O. Saarikivi, "Breaking the computation and communication abstraction barrier in distributed machine learning workloads," in Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS '22), 2022, p. 402–416.
- [64] M. Ferrati and L. Pallottino, "A time expanded network based algorithm for safe and efficient distributed multi-agent coordination," in Proceedings of the 52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC '13), 2013, pp. 2805–2810.
- [65] E. Köhler and M. Strehler, "Combining static and dynamic models for traffic signal optimization inherent load-dependent travel times in a cyclically time-expanded network model," Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, vol. 54, pp. 1125–1134, 2012.
- [66] T. T. Nguyen and M. Wahib, "An allreduce algorithm and network co-design for large-scale training of distributed deep learning," in Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE/ACM 21st International Symposium on Cluster, Cloud and Internet Computing (CCGrid '21), 2021, pp. 396–405.
- [67] L. Zhao, S. Pal, T. Chugh, W. Wang, J. Fantl, P. Basu, J. Khoury, and A. Krishnamurthy, "Efficient direct-connect topologies for collective communications," in arXiv:2202.03356 [cs.NI], 2023.
- [68] W. Wang, M. Khazraee, Z. Zhong, M. Ghobadi, Z. Jia, D. Mudigere, Y. Zhang, and A. Kewitsch, "TopoOpt: Co-optimizing network topology and parallelization strategy for distributed training jobs," in Proceedings of the 20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI '23), 2023, pp. 739–767.