

Smart-TCP: An Agentic AI-based Autonomous and Adaptive TCP Protocol

Yule Han, Kezhi Wang, *Senior Member, IEEE* and Kun Yang, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—The Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) relies on a state machine and deterministic arithmetic to ensure reliable connections. However, traditional protocol logic driven by hard-coded state machines struggles to meet the demands of intelligent and autonomous network architectures. Here, we adopt the agentic AI-based paradigm, driven by Large Language Models (LLMs), characterized by context perception, autonomous reasoning, and tool use. Based on this, we propose Smart-TCP, which re-imagines TCP's core control logic as an autonomous agent. Specifically, the proposed architecture employs a context aggregation mechanism to synthesize the protocol context, utilizes the LLM for autonomous logical reasoning, and invokes an Arithmetic Logic Unit (ALU) as a tool for computation. Furthermore, we establish a dual-agent interaction framework based on this architecture and implement TCP protocol interactions. Experiments demonstrate that the Smart-TCP agent excels in static prediction and error detection, achieving a 93.33% success rate in end-to-end sessions. These results strongly validate the technical feasibility of an agentic AI-based TCP protocol.

Index Terms—Agentic AI, Large Language Models, Transmission Control Protocol (TCP)

I. INTRODUCTION

The logic of the Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) is defined by its specification [1]. Its connection management is modeled as a state machine that processes events, supplemented by deterministic algorithms based on sequence numbers and windows to ensure reliable data transmission. Although this design provides a high degree of determinism, its inherent rigidity makes it difficult to meet the demands of future intelligent network architectures. To address this, we explore the agentification of protocol logic and investigate the feasibility of reframing the passive state machine as an autonomous decision-making entity.

Recent studies integrating artificial intelligence (AI) with network protocols unfold on multiple levels. For instance, Large Language Models (LLMs) are used to manage or configure the network systems that run these protocols [2], [3]. Other research leverages AI's comprehension capabilities to aid in security analysis by reverse-engineering protocol state machines (FSMs) from execution traces [4]. Similarly, earlier research focuses on optimizing specific protocol behaviors, such as data-driven congestion control methods [5], [6].

Yule Han is with the School of Information and Communication Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu 611731, China (e-mail: yulehan@std.uestc.edu.cn).

Kezhi Wang is with the Department of Computer Science, Brunel University London, UB8 3PH Uxbridge, U.K. (e-mail: kezhi.wang@brunel.ac.uk).

Kun Yang is with the School of Information and Communication Engineering and Yangtze Delta Region Research Institute, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu 611731, China, and also with the School of Intelligent Software and Engineering, Nanjing University, Suzhou 215163, China (e-mail: kyang@ieee.org).

These works expand the application of AI in networking. However, they share a common limitation: treating the protocol's core internal logic as immutable. While these methods manage, support, or analyze the protocol logic externally, no existing approach attempts to transform the logic itself into an internal agent capable of decision-making. Consequently, the protocol's internal behavior remains static.

The emergence of agentic AI provides a novel pathway. This paradigm is characterized by agents capable of autonomous reasoning, planning, and invoking tools to execute complex tasks [7]. By encapsulating the reasoning capabilities of LLMs within autonomous agents, this paradigm offers the potential to fundamentally reframe the internal logic of protocols.

Inspired by this, we apply the agentic AI paradigm to the TCP protocol and propose Smart-TCP, which reframes TCP control logic as an autonomous agent. However, explorations reveal that LLMs cannot ensure the precise 32-bit arithmetic operations for TCP sequence and acknowledgment numbers. This limitation is consistent with recent research [8]. To address this, we integrate a deterministic ALU as a specialized tool for the agent. Specifically, an LLM serves as the agent's cognitive core, handling reasoning to determine state transitions and control flags, while a deterministic ALU acts as its tool, executing calculations to ensure correctness.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose Smart-TCP, aiming to reframe TCP's core logic as an autonomous AI agent. By decoupling LLM reasoning from deterministic ALU computation, this design overcomes the arithmetic limitations of pure LLM protocol implementations.
- We establish a tool use interface based on structured JSON and high-level task instructions to enable efficient coordination between the LLM and the ALU.
- We propose a retrospective analysis method for data engineering that reconstructs stateful training samples from raw traffic using custom scripts, thereby enabling supervised fine-tuning of the autonomous agent.
- We implement and validate an end-to-end dual-agent interaction framework. Experiments demonstrate that our autonomous agents achieve a 93.33% success rate over 30 complete lifecycle sessions, outperforming the pure LLM baseline and validating the feasibility of our approach.

II. AGENT FRAMEWORK OVERVIEW

This section details the dual-agent interaction framework constructed using the Smart-TCP agent. The Smart-TCP agent primarily aims to implement TCP's core logic with an LLM while ensuring absolute arithmetic precision. Its design integrates the logical reasoning of an LLM with the computation




Fig. 1: Dual-Agent Interaction Framework based on Smart-TCP Agents

of a deterministic ALU, creating a transport agent capable of reliable TCP interactions and adaptive reasoning.

Fig. 1 illustrates this dual-agent interaction framework. It consists of two main agents, the Client Agent and the Server Agent, which work together to enable end-to-end communication. Both the client and server are implementations of the Smart-TCP agent. As shown in the internal structure of each agent, the LLM serves as the cognitive core of the protocol, and deterministic computation is separated into an independent ALU module. This design effectively combines the strengths of these two specialized components:

- **LLM:** The LLM serves as the cognitive core, responsible for making complex and adaptive protocol decisions. Its primary function is to analyze the current context, infer the correct state transition, and select the control flags.
- **ALU:** As the arithmetic engine, this deterministic unit is responsible for all high-precision 32-bit arithmetic operations. Its sole responsibility is to precisely calculate the sequence and acknowledgment numbers, ensuring absolute computational accuracy.

The dual-agent interaction framework implements the complete TCP lifecycle, as illustrated in Fig. 1. This interaction process is divided into the following three standard phases:

- **Handshake:** In this phase, the Client and Server agents perform a three-way handshake. The agents generate correct control flags and corresponding sequence and acknowledgment numbers to successfully establish the connection.
- **Data Transfer:** During this stage, the agents engage in reliable data exchange. The ALU ensures the precise update of sequence and acknowledgment numbers, guaranteeing the transmission process.
- **Termination:** In this final phase, the framework executes the four-way handshake to close the connection. The agents exchange FIN and ACK segments, ensuring that resources on both sides are correctly released.
- **Termination:** In this final phase, the framework executes the four-way handshake to close the connection. Each agent sends a FIN segment to terminate its outbound

data stream and acknowledges the peer's FIN, closing the bidirectional connection.

This agent implements these core functionalities by executing a modified operational loop. This loop is divided into the following three phases:

1) *Context Aggregation:* The agent first constructs a comprehensive view of its internal state and the environment. This view aggregates the internal state, the external received segment, and any local action into a single structured prompt, which is fed to the LLM.

2) *Reasoning and Computation:* The LLM processes this prompt to perform its core logical reasoning and determine the required response type. After making this logical decision, the LLM invokes the ALU by sending an arithmetic task request. The ALU executes precise 32-bit calculations based on the information in the state and received segment, and then returns only the arithmetic results to the LLM.

3) *Segment Assembly and State Update:* The LLM is responsible for assembling the outbound TCP Segment. It combines its own logical outputs with the deterministic results received from the ALU. The LLM updates the agent's internal state stored in the state module.

This design enables a flexible agent to effectively execute the core functionalities of TCP. It establishes a robust paradigm for intelligent network protocols by combining adaptive reasoning with precise computation.

III. AGENT IMPLEMENTATION

In this section, we detail our implementation approach, including: defining the respective tasks for the LLM and ALU, constructing the dataset, designing the data interface, and implementing the LLM fine-tuning strategy.

A. Formalization of Agent Tasks

We decompose the agent's core logic into two distinct functions: one for the reasoning core (\mathcal{L}_{LLM}) and one for the computational tool (\mathcal{L}_{ALU}).

The LLM's function, \mathcal{L}_{LLM} , acts as the cognitive core. It processes the agent's memory (internal state S), environmental perception (the received segment R), and a local action A . Based on these inputs, it determines the next internal state S' , the necessary control flags F , the payload length P_L , and the tool invocation command T_{task} to be executed by the ALU.

We formally define the LLM's cognitive process as:

$$(S', F, P_L, T_{task}) = \mathcal{L}_{LLM}(S, R, A)$$

where T_{task} represents an operation descriptor, such as *CALCULATE_ACK* or *CALCULATE_SEQ_ACK*.

The \mathcal{L}_{ALU} function performs deterministic computations. It acts as a tool, calculating the precise Sequence (Seq) and Acknowledgment (Ack) numbers based on the task T_{task} , S , and R . We formalize the ALU's execution task as:

$$(Seq, Ack) = \mathcal{L}_{ALU}(T_{task}, S, R).$$

The final output segment G constitutes the agent's action, assembled by combining the LLM's logical output (F, P_L)

and the ALU’s arithmetic output (Seq, Ack). The LLM concentrates on adaptive reasoning, while the ALU guarantees arithmetic precision. This design addresses the computational limitations that we identified in our preliminary experiments with a pure LLM-based approach.

B. Dataset Engineering

To effectively train the agent’s cognitive core, a high-quality, state-labeled dataset representing comprehensive agent experiences is required. We design a two-stage data processing workflow to construct this learning environment:

1) *Data Sourcing and Filtering*: To immerse the agent in realistic interaction environments, we source traffic from the ISCX-VPN2016 dataset [9]. We employ a 5-tuple filtering strategy to isolate distinct TCP sessions. After discarding incomplete connections, we extract 27 independent TCP flows. These flows cover the entire agent lifecycle, from the three-way handshake to the four-way termination. This dataset, totaling 16,099 packets, lays the foundation for subsequent cognitive state reconstruction.

2) *Dedicated Error Dataset*: To enhance the agent’s robustness and ability to identify protocol anomalies, we construct a dedicated error dataset of 2,000 samples. This dataset contains simulated anomalous traffic primarily categorized as order error and flag error packets. It is used to train the agent to identify protocol deviations.

3) *Retrospective State Reconstruction*: Standard network traces only record passive interaction outcomes. To enable supervised agent learning, we reconstruct the cognitive context behind each decision. We develop a custom retrospective analysis script that can reconstruct this decision context. For each segment G in the trace, the script performs a state-aware analysis of the flow history to restore the agent’s precise memory state S just before G is generated. It also identifies the perceptual input R triggering this response. Finally, the local action A is inferred directly from the content of G . This process transforms each G into a complete (*context, action*) sample pair, where the reconstructed (S, R, A) tuple constitutes the agent’s cognitive input.

We also extract ground-truth behaviors from raw trace data. These labels include not only the next state S' , control flags F , and payload length P_L , but also the tool invocation logic. We analyze TCP rules to derive the arithmetic task type T_{task} required for Seq and Ack generation. Ultimately, the reconstructed (S, R, A) serves as model input, while (S', F, P_L, T_{task}) forms the complete behavioral guide for supervised fine-tuning.

C. Agent Interfaces and Role Definition

Effective internal coordination within the Smart-TCP agent relies on specialized cognitive interfaces. These interfaces are designed to decouple the agent’s high-level logical reasoning from deterministic tool execution. This separation is achieved through the following key strategies:

1) *Structured Cognitive Input*: The agent’s cognitive input, the (S, R, A) tuple (representing memory, perception, and action), is encoded as a structured JSON object. This step ensures the core model clearly parses the complex, multi-field context, which is crucial for accurate contextual understanding and decision-making.

2) *Decoupled Decision and Tool Invocation*: The agent’s output is formulated as a JSON object containing only the products of its logical reasoning. Crucially, it outputs fields determined by protocol logic alongside a high-level tool invocation command, T_{task} . The cognitive core does not calculate the Seq or Ack values directly. Instead, it is solely responsible for identifying the correct T_{task} rule to invoke the ALU tool.

3) *Agent Role Definition via Prompting*: We employ prompt engineering to establish the LLM’s persona as an autonomous TCP inference engine. This definition steers the model to concentrate on its core competency of complex logical reasoning, thereby avoiding the distraction of arithmetic computation. This optimized interface empowers the agent to leverage its adaptive strengths while delegating deterministic tasks to computational tools.

D. Training the Cognitive Core

We employ SFT to specialize the generic LLM into a dedicated protocol agent, aligning its behavior with TCP specifications.

TABLE I: TRAINING CONFIGURATION

Parameter	Value	Parameter	Value
Model	Llama-3-8B	Grad. Accum. Steps	2
Finetuning Type	LoRA	Epochs	5
Max Seq. Len.	1024	Optimizer	AdamW
Training Precision	bf16	Learning Rate	1×10^{-4}
Batch Size	2	Loss Function	CrossEntropy

1) *Base Model and Strategy*: We select Llama3-8B as the cognitive base. To achieve parameter-efficient fine-tuning, we employ Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA), which significantly reduces the number of trainable parameters by freezing the entire pre-trained model weights.

2) *Behavioral Alignment Objectives*: We use the native BPE tokenizer to process the cognitive input (S, R, A) . The training objective is to minimize the Cross-Entropy Loss between the agent’s predictions $(S'_{pred}, F_{pred}, P_{L,pred}, T_{task,pred})$ and the ground-truth labels (S', F, P_L, T_{task}) . This objective compels the agent to accurately predict the next state, control flags, payload length, and the specific tool invocation type. Consequently, the agent learns the conditional logic of TCP and the correct strategy for using its ALU tool, without being burdened by the precise arithmetic execution itself.

All experiments are conducted on a cloud server equipped with an NVIDIA A100 GPU. The detailed training hyperparameters are configured as shown in Table I.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

A. Packet and State Prediction Accuracy

To evaluate the effectiveness of the Smart-TCP architecture, we establish three comparative baselines: the Llama3,




Fig. 2: Fine-Grained Field-Level Accuracy

Qwen2.5, and Gemma models. These baseline models utilize few-shot prompting primarily to constrain the output format. They rely on their pre-trained knowledge to deduce the protocol logic and arithmetic operations.

As shown in Fig. 2, the field-level accuracy comparison validates the Smart-TCP agent detailed in Section III. The performance disparity is particularly pronounced in arithmetic-dependent fields, which confirms the necessity of the ALU component. Specifically, while Llama3 matches Smart-TCP with 100% accuracy on the simpler *Seq* field, all baseline models underperform on the calculation-intensive *Ack* field. Llama3, Qwen2.5, and Gemma demonstrate deficiencies in arithmetic logic as their accuracies plateau around 49%, achieving values of 48.78%, 49.27%, and 49.02%, respectively. In contrast, our Smart-TCP agent maintains 100% accuracy. These results demonstrate that decoupling the arithmetic burden from the cognitive core effectively overcomes the computational bottlenecks inherent in pure LLMs.

The agent’s cognitive core, the LLM, demonstrates superior logical reasoning capabilities. It achieves 97.50% on *Flags* and 98.33% on *NewState*, consistently outperforming general-purpose baseline models. This advantage stems directly from the SFT strategy detailed in Section III-D. Unlike the baselines, which rely on limited in-context examples, the SFT process allows our agent to deeply internalize the intricate rules of the TCP state machine from the training dataset. This deep domain adaptation enables the model to capture high-dimensional logical dependencies that general-purpose models cannot grasp through prompting alone.

We use the atomic accuracy metric to evaluate the agent’s ability to generate error-free TCP segments. This metric requires simultaneous correctness across all protocol fields. Smart-TCP achieves an atomic accuracy of 97.22%. This contrasts with the baselines: Llama3 and Qwen2.5 struggle to generate fully correct packets, achieving 42.93% and 44.39% respectively, while Gemma achieves 7.35%. These results confirm the importance of combining a fine-tuned cognitive core with deterministic tools for protocol correctness.

B. Detailed Analysis of Logical Classification

Table II details classification metrics for all models on the *NewState* and *Flags* fields, utilizing precision (P) and recall (R) for a deeper analysis of model behavior. On the *NewState* task, most models perform well. Smart-TCP, Qwen2.5, and Llama3 maintain high precision and recall scores, generally

exceeding 91%. However, Gemma exhibits relatively weaker performance with a precision of 85.44%. These results indicate that high-performing LLMs possess a strong capability for learning TCP state transition logic.

TABLE II: Precision and Recall of the *NewState* and *Flags*

Method	NewState		Flags	
	P(%)	R(%)	P(%)	R(%)
Smart-TCP	97.32	97.85	98.30	98.75
Llama3	93.31	91.71	84.36	80.49
Qwen2.5	94.47	92.20	88.32	86.34
Gemma	85.44	87.75	26.36	46.57

The *Flags* task exhibits performance divergence. The Smart-TCP agent achieves the highest precision (98.30%) and recall (98.75%). While Qwen2.5 and Llama3 perform well, they experience a drop compared to the *NewState* task. Gemma’s precision drops to 26.36% and recall to 46.57%, highlighting the complexity of flag prediction.

Although general-purpose models like Qwen2.5 can approach Smart-TCP’s performance on the *NewState* task, the Smart-TCP architecture maintains exceptionally high and balanced performance across both logical tasks. This confirms its robust logical classification capabilities, particularly in scenarios requiring precise multi-field reasoning where other models struggle.

TABLE III: Confusion Matrix of TCP State Prediction

True State(%)	Predicted State(%)			
	EST	FW1	FW2	CW
EST	98.4	1.2	0.0	0.4
FW1	5.6	94.4	0.0	0.0
FW2	4.8	0.0	95.2	0.0
CW	5.3	0.0	0.0	94.7

Note: EST=ESTABLISHED, FW1=FIN_WAIT_1, FW2=FIN_WAIT_2, CW=CLOSE_WAIT.

Table III presents the detailed confusion matrix for the Smart-TCP agent. The table focuses on the four states where the agent exhibits minor misclassifications; on the remaining critical states (such as *SYN_SENT* and *SYN_RCVD*), the agent achieves 100% accuracy. The primary sources of confusion are concentrated in states where data transfer and connection closure logic intertwine. Specifically, 1.2% of *ESTABLISHED* instances are misclassified as *FIN_WAIT_1*, and 0.4% as *CLOSE_WAIT*; conversely, 5.6% of *FIN_WAIT_1*, 4.8% of *FIN_WAIT_2*, and 5.3% of *CLOSE_WAIT* instances are incorrectly classified back as *ESTABLISHED*. We attribute this specific confusion surrounding the *ESTABLISHED* state to the inherent complexity of TCP’s closure logic, where the boundary between active transmission and initiating connection termination is often blurred in specific contexts.

C. Agent Robustness Analysis

This subsection aims to evaluate the proposed agent’s robustness and error-awareness. This specifically refers to its ability to accurately identify anomalous packets that do not conform to protocol specifications.

1) *Experimental Setup*: We construct a balanced test set of 200 samples, comprising 100 order error and 100 flag error packets. We retain Qwen2.5, Llama3, and Gemma as baselines. To ensure fair evaluation, we employ few-shot prompting for these general-purpose LLMs. This technique guides the models to conform to the required output format by providing in-context examples.

TABLE IV: Protocol Error Detection Performance

Model	Overall	Recall	
	Accuracy (%)	Order Error (%)	Flag Error (%)
Smart-TCP	94.5	93.0	96.0
Llama3	28.5	35.0	22.0
Qwen2.5	51.0	63.0	39.0
Gemma	29.5	57.0	2.0

2) *Experimental Results and Analysis*: As shown in Table IV, non-fine-tuned baselines perform poorly. Qwen2.5’s accuracy of 51.0% demonstrates limited effectiveness in identifying errors. Meanwhile, Llama3 and Gemma perform significantly worse with accuracies of 28.5% and 29.5%, respectively. These results indicate that general-purpose LLMs cannot grasp the strict mathematical and logical rules of the TCP protocol through few-shot prompting alone.

The Smart-TCP agent achieves an overall accuracy of 94.50%, with recall rates exceeding 93% for order and flag errors. These results demonstrate that the agent learns to identify logical conflicts within the protocol state machine through domain-specific fine-tuning. In contrast, the failure patterns of baseline models reveal limitations. For instance, while Gemma achieves a recall of 57.00% for order errors, its flag error recall drops to 2.00%. This disparity indicates that the model fails to grasp the semantic significance of control flags. It suggests that general-purpose LLMs fail to generalize the contextual logic of the protocol.

This experiment demonstrates that few-shot prompting is inadequate for high-precision, logic-intensive tasks, such as TCP error detection. Domain-specific fine-tuning, as proposed in this paper, is a critical step for an autonomous agent to master protocol robustness.

D. End-to-End Functional Validation

Section IV-A validates the fidelity of the agent’s cognitive core in a static context. However, static accuracy does not guarantee successful dynamic interaction. To address this, we implement the dual-agent interaction framework illustrated in Fig. 1. We deploy two autonomous Smart-TCP agents to function respectively as the Client and Server, establishing a complete end-to-end connection. This experiment rigorously tests the collaborative capabilities and functional completeness of our agentic system.

1) *Test Design*: We execute 30 independent, full-lifecycle TCP sessions. These experiments cover the complete interaction sequence, including the handshake, data transfer, and termination. To replicate a realistic protocol environment, all sessions utilize high-value random Initial Sequence Numbers ($ISN \in [2^{23}, 2^{32} - 1]$). With this configuration, we assess

the end-to-end autonomous performance of the Smart-TCP agent against three general-purpose LLM baselines: Qwen2.5, Llama3, and Gemma.

TABLE V: Phase-Level and End-to-End Interaction Results

Metric	Smart-TCP	Qwen2.5	Llama3	Gemma
Handshake	100.00%	96.67%	90.00%	0.00%
Data Transfer	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Termination	93.33%	83.33%	86.67%	0.00%
Trial Accuracy	93.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

2) *Results*: Table V presents the end-to-end validation results, highlighting the performance disparity between our Smart-TCP agent and the baseline models. The Smart-TCP agent maintains consistent performance across all interaction phases, achieving a trial accuracy of 93.33% across 30 independent TCP sessions. In contrast, all baseline models fail to complete any valid sessions.

Qwen2.5 and Llama3 achieve high success rates in the logic-dominant handshake and termination phases. For instance, Qwen2.5 reaches 96.67% in the handshake phase, indicating a capability to learn TCP state transition logic. However, their performance drops to 0.00% during the data transfer phase. This phase necessitates continuous arithmetic updates to *Seq* and *Ack* numbers. This failure confirms that pure LLMs lack the arithmetic reliability required to sustain stateful data streams. Gemma fails across all phases, indicating a deficiency in managing protocol states.

This analysis confirms the rationale behind the design of the Smart-TCP agent. In a stateful protocol like TCP, partial logical correctness is insufficient; an arithmetic inconsistency during data transfer triggers a failure that invalidates the session. By decoupling arithmetic computation from logical reasoning, the agent bridges the gap between understanding the protocol and verifying packet correctness.

V. CONCLUSION

This paper explores the implementation of the TCP protocol using LLMs and proposes the Smart-TCP agent. The agent delegates deterministic computations to the ALU, freeing the cognitive core for adaptive logical reasoning. Experiments reveal the limitations of baseline models, which suffer from arithmetic inconsistencies and fail in error detection. In contrast, the Smart-TCP agent demonstrates high fidelity in static prediction and robustness in anomaly detection. Notably, in dynamic end-to-end tests, the agent achieves a 93.33% success rate, significantly exceeding all baselines. We conclude that this tool-augmented agentic paradigm, supplemented by fine-tuning, provides a robust foundation for future AI-native transport protocols.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Eddy, “Rfc 9293: Transmission control protocol (tcp),” 2022.
- [2] B. Wei, R. Jiang, R. Zhang, Y. Liu, D. Niyato, Y. Sun, Y. Lu, Y. Li, S. Mao, C. Yuen *et al.*, “Large language models for next-generation wireless network management: A survey and tutorial,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.05946*, 2025.

- [3] D. Wu, X. Wang, Y. Qiao, Z. Wang, J. Jiang, S. Cui, and F. Wang, "Netllm: Adapting large language models for networking," in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2024 Conference*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2024, p. 661678.
- [4] H. Wei, L. Chen, Z. Du, Y. Wu, H. Huang, Y. Liu, G. Cheng, F. Xu, L. Wang, and B. Mao, "Unleashing the power of llm to infer state machine from the protocol implementation," *2025 IEEE/ACM 33rd International Symposium on Quality of Service (IWQoS)*, pp. 1–10, 2024.
- [5] M. Dong, Q. Li, D. Zarchy, P. B. Godfrey, and M. Schapira, "{PCC}: Re-architecting congestion control for consistent high performance," in *12th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 15)*, 2015, pp. 395–408.
- [6] K. Winstein and H. Balakrishnan, "Tcp ex machina: Computer-generated congestion control," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 123–134, 2013.
- [7] J. Sang, J. Xiao, J. Han, J. Chen, X. Chen, S. Wei, Y. Sun, and Y. Wang, "Beyond pipelines: A survey of the paradigm shift toward model-native agentic ai," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.16720*, 2025.
- [8] T. Baeumel, J. van Genabith, and S. Ostermann, "The lookahead limitation: Why multi-operand addition is hard for llms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.19981*, 2025.
- [9] G. Draper-Gil, A. H. Lashkari, M. S. I. Mamun, and A. A. Ghorbani, "Characterization of encrypted and vpn traffic using time-related," in *Proceedings of the 2nd international conference on information systems security and privacy (ICISSP)*, 2016, pp. 407–414.