JOB SEQUENCING WITH DEADLINES

The problem is stated as below.

- There are n jobs to be processed on a machine.
- Each job i has a deadline $d_i \ge 0$ and profit $p_i \ge 0$.
- Pi is earned iff the job is completed by its deadline.
- The job is completed if it is processed on a machine for unit time.
- Only one machine is available for processing jobs.
- Only one job is processed at a time on the machine.

JOB SEQUENCING WITH DEADLINES (Contd..)

- A feasible solution is a subset of jobs J such that each job is completed by its deadline.
- An optimal solution is a feasible solution with maximum profit value.

Example: Let n = 4, $(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) = (100, 10, 15, 27)$, $(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4) = (2, 1, 2, 1)$

JOB SEQUENCING WITH DEADLINES (Contd..)

Sr.No.	Feasible	Processing	Profit value
	Solution	Sequence	
(i)	(1,2)	(2,1)	110
(ii)	(1,3)	(1,3) or $(3,1)$	115
(iii)	(1,4)	(4,1)	127 _↑ is the optimal one
(iv)	(2,3)	(2,3)	25
(v)	(3,4)	(4,3)	42
(vi)	(1)	(1)	100
(vii)	(2)	(2)	10
(viii)	(3)	(3)	15
(ix)	(4)	(4)	27

- Consider the jobs in the non increasing order of profits subject to the constraint that the resulting job sequence J is a feasible solution.
- In the example considered before, the nonincreasing profit vector is

```
(100 \ 27 \ 15 \ 10) (2 \ 1 \ 2 \ 1) p_1 \ p_4 \ p_3 \ p_2 \ d_1 \ d_4 \ d_3 \ d_2
```

```
J = \{ 1 \} \text{ is a feasible one}
J = \{ 1, 4 \} \text{ is a feasible one with processing sequence (4,1)}
J = \{ 1, 3, 4 \} \text{ is not feasible}
J = \{ 1, 2, 4 \} \text{ is not feasible}
J = \{ 1, 4 \} \text{ is optimal}
```

Theorem: Let J be a set of K jobs and

 $\sigma = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k)$ be a permutation of jobs in J such that $di_1 \le di_2 \le \dots \le di_k$.

• J is a feasible solution iff the jobs in J can be processed in the order σ without violating any deadly.

Proof:

- By definition of the feasible solution if the jobs in J can be processed in the order without violating any deadline then J is a feasible solution.
- So, we have only to prove that if J is a feasible one, then σ represents a possible order in which the jobs may be processed.

• Suppose J is a feasible solution. Then there exists $\sigma^1 = (r_1, r_2, ..., r_k)$ such that

$$d_{r_i} \ge j$$
, $1 \le j < k$

i.e.
$$d_{r1} \ge 1$$
, $d_{r2} \ge 2$, ..., $d_{rk} \ge k$.

each job requiring an unit time.

- $\sigma = (i_1, i_2, ..., i_k)$ and $\sigma^1 = (r_1, r_2, ..., r_k)$
- Assume $\sigma^1 \neq \sigma$. Then let a be the least index in which σ^1 and σ differ. i.e. a is such that $r_a \neq i_a$.
- Let $r_b = i_a$, so b > a (because for all indices j less than a $r_i = i_i$).
- In σ^1 interchange r_a and r_b .

$$\sigma = (i_1, i_2, \dots i_a \quad i_b \quad i_k) \qquad [r_b \text{ occurs before } r_a \\ & \text{ in } i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k]$$

$$\sigma^1 = (r_1, r_2, \dots r_a \quad r_b \quad \dots \quad r_k) \\ i_1 = r_1, \ i_2 = r_2, \dots i_{a-1} = r_{a-1}, \ i_a \neq r_b \text{ but } i_a = r_b$$

- We know $di_1 \le di_2 \le \dots di_a \le di_b \le \dots \le di_k$.
- Since $i_a = r_b$, $dr_b \le dr_a$ or $dr_a \ge dr_b$.
- In the feasible solution $dr_a \ge a dr_b \ge b$
- So if we interchange r_a and r_b , the resulting permutation $\sigma^{11}=(s_1, \ldots s_k)$ represents an order with the least index in which σ^{11} and σ differ is incremented by one.

- Also the jobs in σ^{11} may be processed without violating a deadline.
- Continuing in this way, σ^1 can be transformed into σ without violating any deadline.
- Hence the theorem is proved.

- Theorem2: The Greedy method obtains an optimal solution to the job sequencing problem.
- Proof: Let(p_i, d_i) 1≤i≤n define any instance of the job sequencing problem.
- Let I be the set of jobs selected by the greedy method.
- Let J be the set of jobs in an optimal solution.
- Let us assume I\neq J.

- If J C I then J cannot be optimal, because less number of jobs gives less profit which is not true for optimal solution.
- Also, I C J is ruled out by the nature of the Greedy method. (Greedy method selects jobs (i) according to maximum profit order and (ii) All jobs that can be finished before dead line are included).

- So, there exists jobs a and b such that $a \in I$, $a \notin J$, $b \in J$, $b \notin I$.
- Let a be a highest profit job such that $a \in I$, $a \notin J$.
- It follows from the greedy method that $p_a \ge p_b$ for all jobs $b \in J, b \notin I$. (If $p_b > p_a$ then the Greedy method would consider job b before job a and include it in I).

- Let S_i and S_j be feasible schedules for job sets I and J respectively.
- Let i be a job such that i∈I and i∈J.
 (i.e. i is a job that belongs to the schedules generated by the Greedy method and optimal solution).
- Let i be scheduled from t to t+1 in S_I and t^1 to t^1+1 in S_i .

- If $t < t^1$, we may interchange the job scheduled in $[t^1 \ t^1 + 1]$ in S_I with i; if no job is scheduled in $[t^1 \ t^1 + 1]$ in S_I then i is moved to that interval.
- With this, i will be scheduled at the same time in $S_{\rm I}$ and $S_{\rm I}$.
- The resulting schedule is also feasible.
- If $t^1 < t$, then a similar transformation may be made in S_i .
- In this way, we can obtain schedules S_I^1 and S_J^1 with the property that all the jobs common to I and J are scheduled at the same time.

- Consider the interval $[T_a T_a + 1]$ in S_I^{-1} in which the job <u>a</u> is scheduled.
- Let \underline{b} be the job scheduled in S_j^1 in this interval.
- As a is the highest profit job, $p_a \ge p_b$.
- Scheduling job **a** from t_a to t_a+1 in S_j^1 and discarding job b gives us a feasible schedule for job set $J^1 = J-\{b\}$ U $\{a\}$. Clearly J^1 has a profit value no less than that of J and differs from in one less job than does J.

- i.e., J¹ and I differ by m-1 jobs if J and I differ from m jobs.
- By repeatedly using the transformation, J can be transformed into I with no decrease in profit value.
- Hence I must also be optimal.

GREEDY ALGORITHM FOR JOB SEQUENSING WITH DEADLINE

```
Procedure greedy job (D, J, n)
                                                 J may be represented by
// J is the set of n jobs to be completed//
                                                  one dimensional array J (1: K)
// by their deadlines //
                                                  The deadlines are
                                            D(J(1)) \le D(J(2)) \le .. \le D(J(K))
  J \leftarrow \{1\}
                                                   To test if JU {i} is feasible,
  for I \leftarrow 2 to n do
 If all jobs in JU{i} can be completed
                                                  we insert i into J and verify
                                                 D(J\mathbb{R}) \le r  1 \le r \le k+1
by their deadlines
 then J \leftarrow JU\{I\}
end if
  repeat
 end greedy-job
```

GREEDY ALGORITHM FOR SEQUENCING UNIT TIME JOBS

```
Procedure JS(D,J,n,k)
// D(i) \ge 1, 1 \le i \le n are the deadlines //
// the jobs are ordered such that //
// p_1 \ge p_2 \ge \dots \ge p_n //
// in the optimal solution D(J(i) \ge D(J(i+1)) //
                            // 1 < i < k //
integer D(o:n), J(o:n), i, k, n, r
D(0) \leftarrow J(0) \leftarrow 0
// J(0) is a fictious job with D(0) = 0 //
K \leftarrow 1; J(1) \leftarrow 1 // job one is inserted into J //
for i ←2 to do // consider jobs in non increasing order of pi //<sub>21</sub>
```

GREEDY ALGORITHM FOR SEQUENCING UNIT TIME JOBS (Contd..)

```
// find the position of i and check feasibility of insertion //
r ← k // r and k are indices for existing job in J //
// find r such that i can be inserted after r //
while D(J(r)) > D(i) and D(i) ≠ r do
// job r can be processed after i and //
// deadline of job r is not exactly r //
r ← r-1 // consider whether job r-1 can be processed after i //
repeat
```

GREEDY ALGORITHM FOR SEQUENCING UNIT TIME JOBS (Contd..)

```
if D(J(r)) \ge d(i) and D(i) > r then
// the new job i can come after existing job r;
  insert i into J at position r+1 //
for I \leftarrow k to r+1 by -1 do
J(I+1) \leftarrow J(1) // \text{ shift jobs}(r+1) \text{ to k right by}//
//one position //
repeat
```

GREEDY ALGORITHM FOR SEQUENCING UNIT TIME JOBS (Contd..)

```
J(r+1)←i; k ←k+1

// i is inserted at position r+1 //

// and total jobs in J are increased by one //
repeat
end JS
```

COMPLEXITY ANALYSIS OF JS ALGORITHM

- Let n be the number of jobs and s be the number of jobs included in the solution.
- The loop between lines 4-15 (the for-loop) is iterated (n-1)times.
- Each iteration takes O(k) where k is the number of existing jobs.
- ... The time needed by the algorithm is O(sn) $s \le n$ so the worst case time is $O(n^2)$.

If $d_i = n - i + 1$ $1 \le i \le n$, JS takes $\theta(n^2)$ time D and J need $\theta(s)$ amount of space.

A FASTER IMPLEMENTATION OF JS

- SET UNION and FIND algorithms and using a better method to determine the feasibility of a partial solution.
- If J is a feasible subset of jobs, we can determine the processing time for each of the jobs using the following rule.

A FASTER IMPLEMENTATION OF JS (Contd..)

- If job I has not been assigned a processing time, then assign it to slot $[\alpha -1, \alpha]$ where α is the largest integer r such that $1 \le r \le d_i$ and the slot $[\alpha -1, \alpha]$ is free.
- This rule delays the processing of jobs i as much as possible, without need to move the existing jobs in order to accommodate the new job.
- If there is no α , the new job is not included.

Assignment

- Q.1)Explain job sequencing with deadline .Give one example of it.
- Q.2)Explain faster implementation of JS giving an example.