

# Approximating the 2-Machine Flow Shop Problem with Exact Delays Taking Two Values

Alexander Ageev

Sobolev Institute of Mathematics  
Novosibirsk, Russia

## Abstract

In the 2-Machine Flow Shop problem with exact delays the operations of each job are separated by a given time lag (delay). Leung et al. (2007) established that the problem is strongly NP-hard when the delays may have at most two different values. We present further results for this case: we prove that the existence of  $(1.25 - \epsilon)$ -approximation implies  $P=NP$  and present a 2-approximation algorithm.

## 1 Introduction

An instance of the 2-Machine Flow Shop problem with exact delays consists of  $n$  triples  $(a_j, l_j, b_j)$  of nonnegative integers where  $j$  is a job in the set of jobs  $J = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Each job  $j$  must be processed first on machine 1 and then on machine 2,  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  are the lengths of operations on machines 1 and 2, respectively. The operation of job  $j$  on machine 2 must start exactly  $l_j$  time units after the operation on machine 1 has been completed. The goal is to minimize makespan. In the standard three-field notation scheme the problem is written as  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j \in \{L_1, L_2\} \mid C_{\max}$ .

One of evident applications of scheduling problems with exact delays is chemistry manufacturing where there often may be an exact technological delay between the completion time of some operation and the initial time of the next operation. The problems with exact delays also arise in command-and-control applications in which a centralized commander distributes a set of orders (associated with the first operations) and must wait to receive responses (corresponding to the second operations) that do not conflict with

any other (for more extensive discussion on the subject, see [5, 9]). Condotta [4] describes an application related to booking appointments of chemotherapy treatments [4].

The approximability of  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j \in \{L_1, L_2\} \mid C_{\max}$  was studied by Ageev and Kononov in [2]. They proved that the existence of  $(1.5 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm implies  $P=NP$  and constructed a 3-approximation algorithm. They also give a 2-approximation algorithm for the cases when  $a_j \leq b_j$  and  $a_j \geq b_j$ ,  $j \in J$ . These algorithms were independently invented by Leung et al. in [8]. The case of unit processing times ( $a_j = b_j = 1$  for all  $j \in J$ ) was shown to be strongly NP-hard by Yu [10, 11]. Ageev and Baburin [1] gave a 1.5-approximation algorithm for solving this case.

In this paper we consider the case when  $l_j \in \{L_1, L_2\}$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . In the three-field notation scheme this case can be written as  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j \in \{L_1, L_2\} \mid C_{\max}$ . The problem was shown to be strongly NP-hard by Leung et al. [8].

Our results are the following: we prove that the existence of  $(1.25 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation for  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j \in \{0, L\} \mid C_{\max}$  implies  $P=NP$  and present a 2-approximation algorithm for  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j \in \{L_1, L_2\} \mid C_{\max}$ .

## 2 Inapproximability lower bound

In this section we establish the inapproximability lower bound for the case  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j \in \{0, L\} \mid C_{\max}$ , i.e., when  $L_1 = 0$ ,  $L_2 = L$ . To this end consider the following reduction from PARTITION problem.

**PARTITION**

**Instance:** Nonnegative integers  $w_1, \dots, w_m$  such that  $\sum_{k \in X} w_k = 2S$ .

**Question:** Does there exist a subset  $X \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $\sum_{k \in X} w_k = S$ ?

Consider an instance  $\mathcal{I}$  of PARTITION and construct an instance  $\mathcal{I}'$  of  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j \in \{0, L\} \mid C_{\max}$ .

Set  $J = \{1, \dots, m + 6\}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} a_k &= b_k = w_k, \quad l_k = 2R \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, m, \\ a_{m+1} &= b_{m+1} = R, \quad l_{m+1} = 0, \\ a_{m+2} &= b_{m+2} = R, \quad l_{m+2} = 2R, \\ a_{m+3} &= 0, \quad b_{m+3} = R - S, \quad l_{m+3} = 0, \\ a_{m+4} &= R - S, \quad b_{m+4} = 0, \quad l_{m+4} = 0, \\ a_{m+5} &= 0, \quad b_{m+5} = R, \quad l_{m+5} = 0, \\ a_{m+6} &= R, \quad b_{m+6} = 0, \quad l_{m+6} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where  $R > 5S$ . We will refer to the jobs in  $\{1, \dots, m\}$  as *small* and to the remaining six jobs as *big*.

**Lemma 1.** (i) If  $\sum_{k \in X} w_k = S$  for some subset  $X \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ , then there exists a feasible schedule  $\sigma$  such that  $C_{\max}(\sigma) \leq 4R + 4S$ .

(ii) If there exists a feasible schedule  $\sigma$  with  $C_{\max}(\sigma) \leq 4R + 4S$ , then  $\sum_{k \in X} w_k = S$  for some set  $X \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ .

(iii) If  $C_{\max}(\sigma) > 4R + 4S$  for any feasible schedule  $\sigma$ , then  $C_{\max}(\sigma) \geq 5R - S$ .

*Proof.* (i) Let  $X \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $\sum_{k \in X} w_k = S$ . Then  $\sum_{k \in Y} w_k = S$  where  $Y = \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus X$ .

First of all point out that the whole construction presenting a feasible schedule can be moved along the time line in both directions. So the length of the schedule is the length of the time interval between the starting time of the first operation (which is not necessarily equal to zero) and the end time of the last one.




Figure 1: Scheduling the big jobs.

To construct the required schedule arrange the big jobs in the order shown in Fig. 1. This construction has two idle intervals:  $A$  on machine 1 and  $B$  on machine 2. The interval  $A$  is between the end of the first operation of job  $m + 1$  and the beginning of the first operation of job  $m + 4$ . The interval  $B$  is between the end of the second operation of job  $m + 3$  and the beginning of the second operation of job  $m + 1$ . Both intervals have length  $S$ .

For scheduling the small jobs we use the following rule. Schedule the small jobs in  $X$  in such a way that their first operations are executed within the time interval  $A$  in non-increasing order of the lengths. Correspondingly, w.l.o.g. we may assume that  $X = \{1, 2, \dots, S\}$  and  $w_1 \leq w_2 \leq \dots \leq w_S$ .

Denote by  $A'$  the time interval between the end of the second operation of job  $m+2$  and the end of the last operation of job  $S$ . It is easy to understand (see Fig. 2) that all the second operations of jobs  $\{1, \dots, S\}$  fall within  $A'$  and the length of  $A'$  is equal to

$$\sum_{i=1}^S w_i + w_1 + (w_2 - w_1) + (w_3 - w_2) + \dots + (w_S - w_{S-1}),$$

which does not exceed  $2S$ . Now we observe that the construction is sym-




Figure 2: Scheduling the small jobs in  $X$ .

metric and schedule the jobs in  $Y$  quite similarly. Finally, we arrive at the schedule shown in Fig. 3. From the above argument its length does not exceed  $4R + 4S$ , as required.




Figure 3: The jobs in  $\{1, \dots, m\}$  are executed within the shaded intervals.

(ii) Let  $\sigma$  be a feasible schedule with  $C_{\max}(\sigma) \leq 4R + 4S$ . Observe first that in any schedule of length at most  $4R + 4S$  both operations of job  $m+1$  are executed exactly within the lag time interval of job  $m+2$ , since otherwise  $C_{\max}(\sigma) \geq 6R$ . So for these jobs we have the *initial* construction shown in Fig. 4. Denote by  $t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4$  the junction times of the operations of these jobs (see Fig. 4).




Figure 4: The initial construction.

Observe that the schedule  $\sigma$  has the following property (Q): for any small job either its execution finishes at time not earlier than  $t_1$ , or its execution starts at time not later than  $t_3$ . It follows from the fact that otherwise the length of  $\sigma$  is at least  $5R$ . Let  $X$  be the subset of small jobs such that its execution completes at time not earlier than  $t_1$ . Then  $Y = \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus X$  is the subset of small jobs whose execution starts at time not later than  $t_3$ . For definiteness assume that  $X \neq \emptyset$ . This immediately implies that job  $m+5$  starts executing at time not later than  $t_0$ . Then job  $m+3$  starts executing exactly at time  $t_1$ , since otherwise the length of  $\sigma$  is at least  $5R - S$ , which is greater than  $4R + 4S$  due to the choice of  $R$  and  $S$ . Thus the second operations of the jobs in  $X$  are executed within the interval  $[t_2 - S, S]$ . It follows that  $Y \neq \emptyset$ . Moreover, a similar argument shows that the first operations of the jobs in  $Y$  are executed within the interval  $[t_2, t_2 + S]$ . Thus we have  $\sum_{j \in X} w_j \leq S$  and  $\sum_{j \in Y} w_j \leq S$ , which implies  $\sum_{j \in X} w_j = \sum_{j \in Y} w_j = S$ , as required.

(iii) Let  $\sigma$  be a feasible schedule satisfying  $C_{\max}(\sigma) > 4R + 4S$ . We may assume that  $\sigma$  contains the initial construction and satisfies property (Q) (see (ii)), since otherwise we are done. Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be defined as in (ii). From (i) it follows that  $\sum_{j \in X} w_j \neq \sum_{j \in Y} w_j$ . W.l.o.g. we may assume that  $\sum_{j \in X} w_j > \sum_{j \in Y} w_j$ , i.e.,  $\sum_{j \in X} w_j > S$ . Then jobs  $m+3$  and  $m+5$  both start executing no later than time  $t_0$ . Since the length of the initial construction is equal to  $4R$ , the length of  $\sigma$  is at least  $4R + R - S = 5R - S$  (the shortest possible configuration is shown in Fig. 5).  $\square$

Set  $R = kS$ . Then  $5R - S = S(5k - 1)$ . On the other hand,  $4R + 4S = 4kS + 4S = S(4k + 4)$ . The fraction

$$\frac{5k - 1}{4k + 4}$$

tends to 1.25 as  $k$  tends to infinity. Thus Lemma 1 implies

**Theorem 1.** *If the problem  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j \in \{0, L\} \mid C_{\max}$  admits a  $(1.25 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm, then  $P = NP$ .*  $\square$




Figure 5: The shortest configuration for (iii).

### 3 A 2-approximation algorithm

In this section we present a simple 2-approximation algorithm for solving  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j \in \{L_1, L_2\} \mid C_{\max}$ .

We show first that the case when the delays are the same for all jobs ( $L_1 = L_2 = L$ ) is polynomially solvable. Note that any feasible schedule  $\sigma$  of an instance of  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j = L \mid C_{\max}$  can be associated with a feasible schedule  $\sigma'$  of the corresponding instance of  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j = 0 \mid C_{\max}$  and their lengths satisfy  $C_{\max}(\sigma) = C_{\max}(\sigma') + L$ . More precisely, shifting the second operations of all jobs to the left by distance  $L$  gives a feasible schedule to the problem with zero delays, and vice versa (see Fig. 6). The problem  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j = 0 \mid C_{\max}$  (all delays are equal to 0) is nothing but the 2-machine no-wait Flow Shop problem. The latter problem is known to be solvable in  $O(n \log n)$  time [6, 7, 3]. Therefore the problem  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j = L \mid C_{\max}$  is solvable in  $O(n \log n)$  time for all  $L \geq 0$ .

Let  $\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2$  be instances of  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j \mid C_{\max}$  with disjoint set of jobs  $J_1$  and  $J_2$ . Let  $\sigma_k$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , be feasible schedules of  $\mathcal{I}_k$ , respectively. Consider the instance  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j \mid C_{\max}$  formed by the union of  $J_1$  and  $J_2$ . Denote by  $\sigma_1 \oplus \sigma_2$  the schedule of  $\mathcal{I}$  obtained from  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  by *concatenation* of schedules  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$ . More precisely, the schedule  $\sigma_1 \oplus \sigma_2$  first executes the jobs in  $J_1$  according to the schedule  $\sigma_1$  and then just after completion of the last operation starts executing the jobs in  $J_2$  according to the schedule  $\sigma_2$ .

We now give a description of an approximation algorithm for  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j \in \{L_1, L_2\} \mid C_{\max}$ .

**Algorithm CONCATENATION**

Input: An instance  $\{(a_j, l_j, b_j) : j \in J\}$ ,  $l_j \in \{L_1, L_2\}$ .

Output: A feasible schedule  $\sigma$ .

1. Set  $J_k = \{j \in J : l_j = L_k, k = 1, 2\}$ . For  $k = 1, 2$  form the instances  $\mathcal{I}_k = \{(a_j, L_k, b_j) : j \in J_k\}$  of  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j = L \mid C_{\max}$ .




Figure 6: (a) A schedule with the same delay  $L$  for all jobs; (b) the corresponding schedule with delay 0 for all jobs.

2. Solve the instances  $\mathcal{I}_k$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ . Let  $\sigma_k$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , be optimal schedules of  $\mathcal{I}_k$ , respectively.

3. Set  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \oplus \sigma_2$ .

As mentioned above the time complexity of Step 2 is  $O(n \log n)$ . So the overall running time of Algorithm CONCATENATION is  $O(n \log n)$ .

The approximation bound is derived from the following easy lemmas.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $C_{\max}^*$  be the length of an optimal schedule to the instance  $\{(a_j, l_j, b_j) : j \in J\}$ ,  $l_j \in \{L_1, L_2\}$ . Then  $C_{\max}(\sigma_k) \leq C_{\max}^*$  for  $k = 1, 2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma^*$  be an optimal schedule to the instance  $\{(a_j, l_j, b_j) : j \in J\}$ ,  $l_j \in \{L_1, L_2\}$ . Let  $\sigma'$  be a schedule obtained from  $\sigma^*$  by deleting all jobs in  $J_2$ . Then

$$C_{\max}(\sigma_1) \leq C_{\max}(\sigma') \leq C_{\max}(\sigma^*) = C_{\max}^*.$$

A similar argument proves the statement for  $k = 2$ . □

**Lemma 3.**  $C_{\max}(\sigma) \leq C_{\max}(\sigma_1) + C_{\max}(\sigma_2)$ .

*Proof.* Follows from the definition of operation  $\oplus$ . □

From Lemmas 1 and 2 we have

$$C_{\max}(\sigma) \leq 2C_{\max}^*.$$

Thus we arrive at the following

**Theorem 2.** *Algorithm CONCATENATION runs in time  $O(n \log n)$  and finds a feasible schedule of  $F2 \mid \text{exact } l_j \in \{L_1, L_2\} \mid C_{\max}$  whose length is within a factor of 2 of the optimum.* □

## References

- [1] A.A. Ageev and A.E. Baburin, Approximation algorithms for UET scheduling problems with exact delays. *Oper. Res. Letters* 35(2007), 533–540.
- [2] A.A. Ageev and A.V. Kononov, Approximation algorithms for scheduling problems with exact delays. In: *Approximation and Online Algorithms: 4th International Workshop (WAOA 2006)*, Zurich, Switzerland, LNCS 4368 (2007), 1–14.
- [3] R.E. Burkard, V.G. Deineko, R. van Dal, J.A.A. van der Veen and G.J. Woeginger. Well-solvable special cases of the traveling salesman problem: A survey. *SIAM Review*, 40: 496–546, 1998.
- [4] A. Condotta, Scheduling with due dates and time lags: new theoretical results and applications. Ph.D. Thesis, 2011, The University of Leeds, School of Computing, 156 pp.
- [5] M. Elshafei, H. D. Sherali, and J.C. Smith, Radar pulse interleaving for multi-target tracking. *Naval Res. Logist.* 51 (2004), 79–94.
- [6] P.C. Gilmore and R.E. Gomory. Sequencing a one-state variable machine: a solvable case of the traveling salesman problem. *Operations Research* 12 (1964), 655–679.
- [7] P.C. Gilmore, E.L. Lawler and D.B. Shmoys. Well solved cases, in E.L. Lawler, J.K. Lenstra, A.H.G. Rinnooy Kan and D.B. Shmoys (Eds), *The Traveling Salesman Problem: A Guided Tour of Combinatorial Optimization*, Wiley, New York, pp. 87–143, 1986.
- [8] J. Y.-T. Leung, H. Li, and H. Zhao, Scheduling two-machine flow shops with exact delays. *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science* 18 (2007), 341–359.
- [9] H. D. Sherali and J. C. Smith, Interleaving two-phased jobs on a single machine, *Discrete Optimization* 2 (2005), 348–361.
- [10] W. Yu, The two-machine shop problem with delays and the one-machine total tardiness problem, Ph.D. thesis, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, 1996.
- [11] W. Yu, H. Hoogeveen, and J. K. Lenstra, Minimizing makespan in a two-machine flow shop with delays and unit-time operations is NP-hard. *J. Sched.* 7 (2004), no. 5, 333–348.