

Chapter 4

Greedy Algorithms




Slides by Kevin Wayne. Copyright © 2005 Pearson-Addison Wesley. All rights reserved.

4.1 Interval Scheduling

Interval Scheduling

Interval scheduling.

- Job j starts at s_j and finishes at f_j .
- Two jobs compatible if they don't overlap.
- Goal: find maximum subset of mutually compatible jobs.



Interval Scheduling: Greedy Algorithms

Greedy template. Consider jobs in some natural order.

Take each job provided it's compatible with the ones already taken.

- [Earliest start time] Consider jobs in ascending order of s_{i} .
- [Earliest finish time] Consider jobs in ascending order of f_j .
- [Shortest interval] Consider jobs in ascending order of f_j s_j .
- [Fewest conflicts] For each job j, count the number of conflicting jobs c_j . Schedule in ascending order of c_j .

Interval Scheduling: Greedy Algorithms

Greedy template. Consider jobs in some natural order.

Take each job provided it's compatible with the ones already taken.



Interval Scheduling: Greedy Algorithm

Greedy algorithm. Consider jobs in increasing order of finish time. Take each job provided it's compatible with the ones already taken.

```
Sort jobs by finish times so that f_1 \le f_2 \le \ldots \le f_n.

set of jobs selected

A \leftarrow \phi

for j = 1 to n {

   if (job j compatible with A)

       A \leftarrow A \cup {j}

}

return A
```

Implementation. O(n log n).


- Remember job j* that was added last to A.
- Job j is compatible with A if $s_j \ge f_{j*}$.

Interval Scheduling: Analysis

Theorem. Greedy algorithm is optimal.

Pf. (by contradiction)

- Assume greedy is not optimal, and let's see what happens.
- Let i_1 , i_2 , ... i_k denote set of jobs selected by greedy.
- Let j_1 , j_2 , ... j_m denote set of jobs in the optimal solution with $i_1 = j_1$, $i_2 = j_2$, ..., $i_r = j_r$ for the largest possible value of r.




Interval Scheduling: Analysis

Theorem. Greedy algorithm is optimal.

Pf. (by contradiction)

- Assume greedy is not optimal, and let's see what happens.
- Let i_1 , i_2 , ... i_k denote set of jobs selected by greedy.
- Let j_1 , j_2 , ... j_m denote set of jobs in the optimal solution with $i_1 = j_1$, $i_2 = j_2$, ..., $i_r = j_r$ for the largest possible value of r.




4.1 Interval Partitioning

Interval Partitioning

Interval partitioning.

- Lecture j starts at s_j and finishes at f_j .
- Goal: find minimum number of classrooms to schedule all lectures so that no two occur at the same time in the same room.

Ex: This schedule uses 4 classrooms to schedule 10 lectures.




Interval Partitioning

Interval partitioning.

- Lecture j starts at s_j and finishes at f_j .
- Goal: find minimum number of classrooms to schedule all lectures so that no two occur at the same time in the same room.

Ex: This schedule uses only 3.




Interval Partitioning: Lower Bound on Optimal Solution

Def. The depth of a set of open intervals is the maximum number that contain any given time.

Key observation. Number of classrooms needed ≥ depth.

Ex: Depth of schedule below = $3 \Rightarrow$ schedule below is optimal. a, b, c all contain 9:30

Q. Does there always exist a schedule equal to depth of intervals?



Interval Partitioning: Greedy Algorithm

Greedy algorithm. Consider lectures in increasing order of start time: assign lecture to any compatible classroom.

```
Sort intervals by starting time so that s_1 \le s_2 \le \ldots \le s_n. d \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow_{number\ of\ allocated\ classrooms} for j = 1 to n \in \{1 \text{ if (lecture } j \text{ is compatible with some classroom } k) \} schedule lecture j \text{ in classroom } k \in \{1 \text{ else } k \in \{1 \text
```

Implementation. O(n log n).

- For each classroom k, maintain the finish time of the last job added.
- Keep the classrooms in a priority queue.

Interval Partitioning: Greedy Analysis

Observation. Greedy algorithm never schedules two incompatible lectures in the same classroom.

Theorem. Greedy algorithm is optimal. Pf.

- Let d = number of classrooms that the greedy algorithm allocates.
- Classroom d is opened because we needed to schedule a job, say j, that is incompatible with all d-1 other classrooms.
- These d jobs each end after s_i .
- Since we sorted by start time, all these incompatibilities are caused by lectures that start no later than s_i .
- Thus, we have d lectures overlapping at time $s_i + \epsilon$.
- Key observation \Rightarrow all schedules use \ge d classrooms. ■

4.2 Scheduling to Minimize Lateness


Scheduling to Minimizing Lateness

Minimizing lateness problem.

- Single resource processes one job at a time.
- Job j requires t_j units of processing time and is due at time d_j .
- If j starts at time s_j , it finishes at time $f_j = s_j + t_j$.
- Lateness: $\ell_j = \max \{\tilde{O}, f_j d_j \}$.
- Goal: schedule all jobs to minimize maximum lateness $L = \max \ell_j$.

Ex:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
† _j	3	2	1	4	3	2
dj	6	8	9	9	14	15



Minimizing Lateness: Greedy Algorithms

Greedy template. Consider jobs in some order.

- [Shortest processing time first] Consider jobs in ascending order of processing time t_j .
- [Earliest deadline first] Consider jobs in ascending order of deadline d_j.
- [Smallest slack] Consider jobs in ascending order of slack d_j t_j .

Minimizing Lateness: Greedy Algorithms

Greedy template. Consider jobs in some order.

• [Shortest processing time first] Consider jobs in ascending order of processing time t_j .

	1	2
† _j	1	10
dj	100	10

counterexample

• [Smallest slack] Consider jobs in ascending order of slack $d_j - t_j$.


	1	2
† _j	1	10
dj	2	10

counterexample

Minimizing Lateness: Greedy Algorithm


Greedy algorithm. Earliest deadline first.

```
Sort n jobs by deadline so that d_1 \le d_2 \le ... \le d_n
t \leftarrow 0
for j = 1 to n
Assign job j to interval [t, t + t_j]
s_j \leftarrow t, f_j \leftarrow t + t_j
t \leftarrow t + t_j
output intervals [s_j, f_j]
```



Minimizing Lateness: No Idle Time


Observation. There exists an optimal schedule with no idle time.



Observation. The greedy schedule has no idle time.

Minimizing Lateness: Inversions

Def. Given a schedule S, an inversion is a pair of jobs i and j such that: i < j but j scheduled before i.




[as before, we assume jobs are numbered so that $d_1 \le d_2 \le ... \le d_n$]

Observation. Greedy schedule has no inversions.

Observation. If a schedule (with no idle time) has an inversion, it has one with a pair of inverted jobs scheduled consecutively.

Minimizing Lateness: Inversions

Def. Given a schedule S, an inversion is a pair of jobs i and j such that: i < j but j scheduled before i.



Claim. Swapping two consecutive, inverted jobs reduces the number of inversions by one and does not increase the max lateness.

Pf. Let ℓ be the lateness before the swap, and let ℓ be it afterwards.

- $\ell'_{k} = \ell_{k}$ for all $k \neq i, j$
- $\ell'_{i} \leq \ell_{i}$
- If job j is late:

$$\ell'_{j} = f'_{j} - d_{j}$$
 (definition)
 $= f_{i} - d_{j}$ (j finishes at time f_{i})
 $\leq f_{i} - d_{i}$ ($i < j$)
 $\leq \ell_{i}$ (definition)

Minimizing Lateness: Analysis of Greedy Algorithm

Theorem. Greedy schedule S is optimal.

Pf. Define S* to be an optimal schedule that has the fewest number of inversions, and let's see what happens.

- Can assume 5* has no idle time.
- If S^* has no inversions, then $S = S^*$.
- If S* has an inversion, let i-j be an adjacent inversion.
 - swapping i and j does not increase the maximum lateness and strictly decreases the number of inversions
 - this contradicts definition of S* =