## Background & Motivation

Modern Kubernetes deployments often start with generously provisioned CPU and memory resources to ensure service reliability. However, this overprovisioning results in significant resource wastage, increasing operational costs without delivering proportional performance benefits. This inefficiency becomes particularly pronounced in microservice architectures, where each service may have distinct performance-resource relationships. Existing autoscaling strategies like HPA/VPA and static provisioning heuristics fail to capture the intricate latency behaviors under multi-axis resource reduction (CPU, memory, or both).

## Objective:

To design an intelligent, latency-constrained resource tuning strategy that dynamically reduces CPU and memory *requests* and *limits* for each service, starting from overprovisioned conditions. The reduction continues until the service latency increases by no more than a certain percentage from the baseline (measured under full resource availability).

## Experimental Scope

Your research involves four distinct Java and Go-based microservices under constant or semi-constant request load:

* Prime Verifier
* Echo
* Hash Generator
* Random Password Generator

Each service is evaluated under:

1. CPU-only reductions
2. Memory-only reductions
3. Combined CPU and memory reductions

Latency, CPU usage, and memory usage are tracked continuously during gradual reductions.

## Key Findings & Observations

1. **Resource Sensitivity Profiles**

      CPU-Sensitive Services

* Prime Verifier and Hash Generator, both implemented in Java and operating on computationally intensive tasks (e.g., number-theoretic checks or hashing operations), demonstrated *high sensitivity to CPU limit reductions*.
* As CPU limits were decreased, these services rapidly hit execution bottlenecks due to thread starvation and slower context switching.
* This led to abrupt and steep latency spikes, revealing that their runtime environments (especially the JVM) rely heavily on CPU headroom for efficient garbage collection, JIT compilation, and multithreading.
* These services exhibit "tight CPU coupling" - their performance scales linearly or super-linearly with available CPU until a critical point is reached.

Memory-Resilient Services

* Services such as Echo (in Go) and Password Generator (in Java) showed remarkable resilience to memory limit reductions - latency remained flat across multiple reduction steps.
* These applications tend to have lightweight memory footprints and rarely experience high allocation churn. In the case of Go services, garbage collection is efficient and predictable.
* Only when memory limits were aggressively reduced to within 5 - 10% of the service's actual memory usage did we begin to observe increased latency or OOM-adjacent behavior.

Combined Reductions: A Nonlinear Story

* When CPU and memory were reduced simultaneously, certain services - especially those running on the JVM - exhibited nonlinear performance degradation.
* For instance, Hash Generator began showing GC pauses and stuttering behavior even when memory usage was below limits, due to synchronized pressure on heap space and compute capacity.
* This confirms that resource reduction effects are not additive - they interact in complex ways, especially under concurrent load and runtime overheads.

1. **Latency Behavior Dynamics**

Cliff-Edge Phenomenon

* A consistent observation across all services was the emergence of latency cliffs - a phenomenon where latency remains stable through gradual reductions but suddenly increases drastically when passing a Critical Reduction Point (CRP).
* This behavior is akin to a nonlinear tipping point, often hidden in CPU scheduling, garbage collection frequency, or cache eviction behaviors.
* The cliff indicates a fragile zone where performance collapses with even a small further reduction. These zones vary per service and must be empirically discovered.

Latency-Resilient Curve

* When plotting latency against resource limits, services like Echo exhibited a flat latency-resilience curve, indicating strong tolerance to resource reduction. These services operate well below bottleneck thresholds, possibly due to I/O-bound workloads or stateless design.
* Conversely, Hash Generator showed a steep curve with an early inflection point - an indicator that its workload is highly sensitive to resource throttling, likely due to algorithmic and JVM-specific behavior (e.g., memory allocation rate, GC intervals).

1. **Resource Usage Patterns**

Underutilized Baselines

* Initially, all services were deployed with generous CPU and memory requests/limits, far exceeding actual usage under steady-state load.
* This led to resource waste, as most services maintained low utilization ratios (40–60% CPU, <50% memory).
* These baselines serve as the reference points for controlled resource reduction experiments and reveal the potential for aggressive optimization.

Buffered Memory Usage

* Especially in Go-based services (e.g., Echo), memory usage was observed to be remarkably flat even as limits were reduced.
* This is attributed to the Go runtime's adaptive memory allocator and incremental garbage collection, which maintain low residency despite reductions.
* However, once memory limits approached actual usage (~95%), even minor drops led to latency spikes or runtime warnings, indicating internal GC stress or heap resizing delays.
* Java services, in contrast, showed more volatility due to GC-induced memory churn as the heap shrinks under constrained environments.

## Research Challenges

1. **Dynamic Profiling of Critical Reduction Points (CRPs)**

* One of the core difficulties in resource optimization under latency constraints is the need to accurately identify the Critical Reduction Point (CRP) - the threshold at which further reduction in CPU or memory resources causes a nonlinear degradation in service latency or reliability.
* Why it’s challenging:
  + Nonlinearity and Variability: The location of the CRP is not fixed and may vary across deployments, workloads, time-of-day patterns, and runtime states (e.g., warmed-up vs cold JVM).
  + Service-Specific Behavior: Each service - depending on its language runtime (Java, Go), concurrency model, and workload (CPU-bound, memory-bound, I/O-bound) - has unique CRP characteristics.
  + Noise and Volatility: Identifying a CRP often requires observing trends amid transient fluctuations in latency, which can be noisy due to background GC, load bursts, or OS scheduling quirks.
  + Minimizing Disruption: Profiling must be done dynamically and in-place - we must extract sensitivity information without restarting or heavily disrupting production services.
* Effective CRP detection demands online, fine-grained telemetry combined with adaptive probing algorithms that reduce limits incrementally while continually checking SLA compliance.
* Purely static heuristics or offline benchmarks are insufficient.

1. **Latency-First Resource Optimization under Constraints**

* The objective to minimize CPU and memory usage while ensuring latency stays within a certain percentage of the original baseline is essentially a constrained multi-objective optimization problem.
* Why it’s challenging:
  + Tight SLA Coupling: Latency behaves as a hard constraint, not a soft objective. Any solution that violates the certain threshold is unacceptable - this removes flexibility in trade-offs.
  + Non-Convex Search Space: The relationship between resources and latency is non-monotonic and non-convex. Latency can remain stable for several reduction steps and then abruptly spike (the “cliff effect”).
  + No Global Optimum: The optimization landscape is service-specific and time-varying. What works for one microservice at noon may fail for another at midnight under different traffic and runtime GC state.
  + Exploration vs Exploitation Trade-Off: There’s an exploration cost in probing the limit of resource reduction - go too fast, and you crash latency; go too slow, and optimization takes too long.
* This challenge calls for advanced resource tuning strategies such as Bayesian Optimization, Reinforcement Learning, or multi-armed bandits, which can operate online, under uncertainty, and with a strict SLA constraint.

1. **Complexity of Memory-Centric Runtime Behaviors**

* Memory-related behavior is notoriously hard to model and predict due to the runtime internals of modern programming environments.
* This is especially true in garbage-collected languages like Java and Go.
* Why it’s challenging:
  + Garbage Collection (GC) Dynamics: GC latency is not linearly tied to memory allocation or usage. JVM GCs (e.g., G1, ZGC) and Go’s concurrent GC respond differently to memory pressure, and their pause times can vary based on heap fragmentation, object age, and live set size.
  + Hidden Buffers and Caches: Applications often use internal caching layers (e.g., Guava, Caffeine) and thread-local buffers, which don't always reflect in container-level memory metrics until eviction or flush.
  + Memory Overhead of Other Limits: Reducing CPU may indirectly affect memory behavior - e.g., slower CPU causes longer GC cycles, which may delay object reclamation and inflate memory pressure.
  + Out-of-Memory (OOM) Thresholds Are Soft: Services may not crash immediately when they exceed memory; they may instead exhibit degraded performance, longer GC, or even silent corruption or drops.
* A successful memory-aware tuning system must incorporate runtime-aware telemetry, possibly through language-level agents (JMX for Java, pprof for Go), and learn the interplay between GC behavior, object churn, and memory pressure over time.

## Why Latency Increases with Resource Reduction — A Deep Technical Dive

1. **Fundamental Concept: Latency = Wait Time + Execution Time**

Latency in microservices primarily arises from two components:

* Wait Time: Time spent waiting for resources (CPU, memory, I/O).
* Execution Time: Actual time spent performing the task.

Reducing CPU and memory limits/requests shifts this balance—wait times grow due to contention, and execution time increases due to throttling and lack of cache/heap space.

1. **CPU Resource Reduction → Increased Scheduling Delay**

* **Throttling:** When CPU limits are reduced below demand, the Linux CFS (Completely Fair Scheduler) throttles container processes. They are queued behind others or blocked altogether once their CPU time budget is exhausted within a cgroup.
* **Time Slicing Issues**: Containers with lower CPU shares receive fewer CPU cycles, increasing latency for each request, especially under sustained or bursty load.
* **Thread Starvation**: JVM-based services often spawn multiple threads. When fewer CPUs are available, threads must wait longer to be scheduled, delaying garbage collection (GC), logging, async I/O, and business logic.

1. **Memory Reduction → GC Pressure and Heap Starvation**

JVM Impact: Java services rely heavily on heap memory. Reducing memory limits leads to:

* Frequent GC (especially full GCs).
* Longer GC pauses due to limited memory headroom.
* Increased allocation failures, causing out-of-memory (OOM) risks or fallback to swap.

**Memory Overhead**: Kubernetes enforces hard memory limits. If a process tries to allocate beyond this, the container is terminated by the kernel OOM killer.

**Working Set Trimming**: Services may page out parts of their heap or buffer caches, increasing memory access latency.

Go services (compiled, statically typed) typically handle memory better than JVM services, hence showing resilience until close to real memory usage.

1. **Combined CPU + Memory Reduction → Compounded Nonlinear Latency**

When both limits are reduced together, latency doesn’t increase linearly—it spikes nonlinearly due to:

* **Synchronization Delays**: CPU delays slow down GC, which in turn causes heap accumulation, which then increases memory usage, pushing against the reduced memory limit.
* **Resource Coupling**: Many services co-opt CPU to manage memory (e.g., GC, buffer resizing), so limiting both removes headroom to self-recover.
* **Queue Overflows**: With reduced concurrency and memory buffers, requests may queue up internally or get dropped, increasing tail latency.

1. **Latency Cliff Phenomenon: The CRP Effect**

* There exists a Critical Reduction Point (CRP) beyond which even tiny reductions cause exponential latency growth.
* This is due to services operating near resource saturation, where adaptive optimizations fail (e.g., GC tuning, dynamic thread pools).

1. **Application-Level Effects**

* **Caching Disabled or Inefficient**: Less memory = less in-memory caching = higher latency for I/O-heavy tasks.
* **Backpressure & Retries**: Frameworks like Spring Boot or gRPC introduce backpressure and retry mechanisms when resources are constrained, adding delay.
* **Jitter & Spikes**: Non-deterministic latency arises from kernel scheduling, GC variation, and thread contention. This shows up as sudden spikes on plots during reduction events.

1. **Container Runtime & Kubernetes Enforcement**

* **cgroups v2 Enforcement**: Kubernetes applies resource constraints via cgroups. Reducing limits enforces hard throttles, not just soft hints.
* **QoS Class Demotion**: Reduced requests cause services to drop from Guaranteed to Burstable/BestEffort, making them first targets during node pressure.
* **No CPU Burst Credit**: Unlike VMs, containers don't accumulate burst credits. Once throttled, they must wait for the next cycle.

1. **Observable Trends in Our Experiments**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Pattern | Explanation |
| Latency increases immediately with CPU reduction | Because compute starvation is directly felt per request |
| Latency remains stable initially with memory reduction | Until usage nears limits—then GC stalls or OOM |
| Combined reduction causes faster latency rise than expected | Due to internal coupling of CPU + memory under high-load JVMs |
| Echo service remains stable | Because it’s compute-light and well below resource demand thresholds |
| Latency spikes align with reduction events | Confirming resource stress as the primary cause, not load |

## Solutions to Latency Increases from Resource Reductions

1. **Throttling & CPU Scheduling Delay**

* **Cause:** When CPU limits are reduced, throttling occurs and threads compete for limited CPU time.
* **Solutions**:
  + Use Vertical Pod Autoscaler (VPA) with historical CPU usage analysis to right-size CPU requests/limits.
  + Thread Affinity & Pool Optimization: Minimize thread oversubscription (especially in Java) and tune ExecutorService core threads to fit within CPU quota.
  + CPUShares + CPUQuota Tuning: Use cpu.cfs\_period\_us and cpu.cfs\_quota\_us at the cgroup level to create fairer time slices.
  + ML-Based Prediction: Train models to anticipate CPU load per request type, scaling limits before throttling hits.

1. **JVM GC Pressure and Heap Starvation**

* **Cause:** Memory limit reduction triggers frequent GC and reduces JVM efficiency.
* **Solutions**:
  + Use GC Tuning Flags (e.g., -XX:+UseG1GC, -XX:MaxRAMPercentage, -XX:+AlwaysPreTouch) to optimize GC behavior under constrained memory.
  + Enable Container Awareness: Use Java 11+ flags like -XX:+UseContainerSupport to make the JVM aware of its container limits.
  + Tune Memory Requests with Real-Time Profiling: Adjust limits based on GC pause times, not just average heap size.
  + Predictive Memory Allocation: Use a ML model trained on memory usage trends to avoid assigning limits below the service's "safe baseline".