4.1 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.

Greedy template. Consider jobs in some order. Take each job provided it’s compatible with the ones already taken.

- What order? Does that give best answer? Why or why not?
  Does it help to be greedy about order?
Interval Scheduling: Greedy Algorithms

Greedy template. Consider jobs in some order. Take each job provided it’s compatible with the ones already taken.

[Earliest start time] Consider jobs in ascending order of start time $s_j$.

[Earliest finish time] Consider jobs in ascending order of finish time $f_j$.

[Shortest interval] Consider jobs in ascending order of interval length $f_j - s_j$.

[Fewest conflicts] For each job, count the number of conflicting jobs $c_j$. Schedule in ascending order of conflicts $c_j$.

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 $f_1 \leq f_2 \leq \ldots \leq f_n$.

jobs selected

A ← φ

for $j = 1$ to $n$ {
    if (job $j$ compatible with A)
        A ← A ∪ {$j$}
}

return A

Implementation. $O(n \log n)$.

- Remember job $j^*$ that was added last to A.
- Job $j$ is compatible with A if $s_j \geq f_{j^*}$.
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Interval Scheduling: Correctness

**Theorem.** Greedy algorithm is optimal.

**Pf.** ("greedy stays ahead")
Let \(i_1, i_2, ..., i_k\) be jobs picked by greedy, \(j_1, j_2, ..., j_m\) those in some optimal solution. Show \(f(i_r) \leq f(j_r)\) by induction on \(r\).

**Basis:** \(i_1\) chosen to have min finish time, so \(f(i_1) \leq f(j_1)\)

**Ind:** \(f(i_r) \leq f(j_r) \leq s(j_r+1)\), so \(j_{r+1}\) is among the candidates considered by greedy when it picked \(i_r\) & it picks min finish, so \(f(i_{r+1}) \leq f(j_{r+1})\)

Similarly, \(k \geq m\), else \(j_{k+1}\) is among (nonempty) set of candidates for \(i_{k+1}\).

---

4.1 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 as Interval Graph Coloring**

Vertices = classes; edges = conflicting class pairs; different colors = different assigned rooms

Note: graph coloring is very hard in general, but graphs corresponding to interval intersections are a much simpler special case.
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 $\geq$ depth.

Ex: Depth of schedule below = 3 $\Rightarrow$ schedule below is optimal.

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 $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq \ldots \leq s_n$.

d ← 0 — number of allocated classrooms

for $j = 1$ to $n$
    if (lect $j$ is compatible with some classroom $k$, 1 ≤ $k$ ≤ $d$)
        schedule lecture $j$ in classroom $k$
    else
        allocate a new classroom $d + 1$
        schedule lecture $j$ in classroom $d + 1$
        $d ← d + 1$
```

Implementation? Run-time? Next HW?
Interval Partitioning: Alt Proof (exchange argument)

When 4th room added, room 1 was free; why not swap it in there?
(A: it conflicts with later stuff in schedule, which dominoes)
But: room 4 schedule after 11:00 is conflict-free; so is room 1 schedule, so could swap both post-11:00 schedules
Why does it help? Delays needing 4th room; repeat.

Cleaner: “Let $S^*$ be an opt sched with latest use of last room. When that room is added, all others in use, else we could swap, contradicting ‘latest’”

4.2 Scheduling to Minimize 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: $l_j = \max \{ 0, f_j - d_j \}$.
- Goal: schedule all jobs to minimize maximum lateness $L = \max l_j$.

Ex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>$t_j$</th>
<th>$d_j$</th>
<th>Lateness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 $t_j$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$j$</th>
<th>$t_j$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

counterexample

(Smallest slack) Consider jobs in ascending order of slack $d_j - t_j$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$j$</th>
<th>$d_j$</th>
<th>$t_j$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

counterexample

Minimizing Lateness: Greedy Algorithm

Greedy algorithm. Earliest deadline first.

Sort $n$ jobs by deadline so that $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \ldots \leq d_n$

$t \leftarrow 0$

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. An inversion in schedule $S$ is a pair of jobs $i$ and $j$ such that:

deadline $i < j$ but $j$ scheduled before $i$.  

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.  
(If $j, i$ aren’t consecutive, then look at the job $k$ scheduled right after $j$.  If $d_k < d_j$, then $(j,k)$ is a consecutive inversion; if not, then $(k,i)$ is an inversion, & nearer to each other - repeat.)

Observation. Swapping adjacent inversion reduces # inversions by 1 exactly.
Minimizing Lateness: Inversions

**Def.** An inversion in schedule $S$ is a pair of jobs $i$ and $j$ such that: deadline $i < j$ 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.

- $l'_{k} = l_{k}$ for all $k \neq i, j$
- $l'_{i} \leq l_{i}$
- If job $j$ is now late: $l'_{j} = f_{j} + d_{j}$ (definition) $= f_{i} + d_{j}$ (definition) $\leq f_{i} + d_{i}$ (definition) $= l_{i}$ (definition)

Minimizing Lateness: No Inversions

**Claim.** All inversion-free schedules $S$ have the same max lateness.

**Pf.** If $S$ has no inversions, then deadlines of scheduled jobs are monotonically nondecreasing, i.e., they increase (or stay the same) as we walk through the schedule from left to right.

Two such schedules can differ only in the order of jobs with the same deadlines. Within a group of jobs with the same deadline, the max lateness is the lateness of the last job in the group - order within the group doesn’t matter.

Minimizing Lateness: Correctness of Greedy Algorithm

**Theorem.** Greedy schedule $S$ is optimal

**Pf.** Let $S^*$ be an optimal schedule with the fewest number of inversions.

- Can assume $S^*$ has no idle time.
- 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 $S^*$

So, $S^*$ has no inversions. But then Lateness($S$) = Lateness($S^*$)

Greedy Analysis Strategies

**Greedy algorithm stays ahead.** Show that after each step of the greedy algorithm, its solution is at least as good as any other algorithm’s.

**Structural.** Discover a simple "structural" bound asserting that every possible solution must have a certain value. Then show that your algorithm always achieves this bound.

**Exchange argument.** Gradually transform any solution to the one found by the greedy algorithm without hurting its quality.
4.3 Optimal Caching

1. **cache**
   - Pronunciation: 'kash
   - Function: noun
   - Etymology: French, from cacher to press, hide
   - a hiding place especially for concealing and preserving provisions or implements

2. **cache**
   - Function: transitive verb
   - to place, hide, or store in a cache

- Webster’s Dictionary

---

**Optimal Offline Caching**

**Caching.**
- Cache with capacity to store $k$ items.
- Sequence of $m$ item requests $d_1, d_2, ..., d_m$.
- Cache hit: item already in cache when requested.
- Cache miss: item not already in cache when requested: must bring requested item into cache, and evict some existing item, if full.

**Goal.** Eviction schedule that minimizes number of cache misses.

**Ex:** $k = 2$, initial cache = ab, requests: a, b, c, b, c, a, a, b.

**Optimal eviction schedule:** 2 cache misses.

---

**Optimal Offline Caching: Farthest-In-Future**

**Farthest-in-future.** Evict item in the cache that is not requested until farthest in the future.

- current cache: a b c d e f
- future queries: g a b c d a b b a c d e a f a d e f g . . .

**Theorem.** [Bellady, 1960s] FF is optimal eviction schedule.

**Pf.** Algorithm and theorem are intuitive; proof is subtle.

**Motivation:** “Online” problem is typically what’s needed in practice - decide what to evict without seeing the future. How to evaluate such an alg? Fewer misses is obviously better, but how few? FF is a useful benchmark - best online alg is unknown, but it’s no better than FF, so online performance close to FF’s is the best you can hope for.