

Earliest Finish Time (EFT) is a correct algorithm. How to prove it? Book proposes "Greedy Stays Athead".

Instead of trying to prove, in one shot, that the output is optimal, we instead prove, inductively, that the partial solution at the end of every iteration is optimal with respect to some criterian corresponding to what that iteration tried to optimize. How not to prove it?

"In every iteration the algorithm makes an optimal choice because it chooses the interval with the earliest finish time, which optimizer the finish time and is therefore optimal. Since the choice in each iteration is One logical error here: the proof doesn't acknowledge the distinction between what the algorithm is optimizing (earliness of finish time) and what it was asked to optimize (# of intervals). Two "greedy stays ahead" arguments. Let } 0(1), 0(2), ..., 0(K) be indices of an optimal set of interval: ordered by increasing finish time. Let Sa(1), a(2), a(2)8 be indices of the intervals that EFT chose.
Book's INDUCTION HYPOTHESIS: Fa(j) & Fo(j) \forall j. Let us assume the intervals are numbered so that F, < F2 < ... < Fn. THIS LECTURE'S INDUCTION HYPOTHESK: The number of intervals with finish time < f; chosen by our algorithm is at least as great as the # of int. with f.t. & f; in any other set non-conflicting set.

Base case j=1. There is only one such interval, so no other non-conflicting set contains more than one. Induction step. j > 1. Assume induction hypothesis

true for 1 \le i \le j - 1. ("strong induction")

Consider any non-conficating interval set.