

Greedy Algorithms


- Interval Scheduling
- Interval Partitioning
- Scheduling to Minimize Lateness
- Coin Changing
- Fractional Knapsack

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_j .
- [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.



counterexample for earliest start time



counterexample for shortest interval




counterexample for fewest conflicts

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  $f_1 \leq f_2 \leq \dots \leq f_n$ .
```

```
    ↙ set of jobs selected  
A ←  $\phi$   
for j = 1 to n do  
    if (job j compatible with A) then  
        A ← 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 $s_j \geq f_{j^*}$.

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, \dots, i_k denote set of jobs selected by greedy.
- Let j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m denote set of jobs in the optimal solution with $i_1 = j_1, i_2 = j_2, \dots, i_r = j_r$ 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, \dots, i_k denote set of jobs selected by greedy.
- Let j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m denote set of jobs in the optimal solution with $i_1 = j_1, i_2 = j_2, \dots, i_r = j_r$ for the largest possible value of r .




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 \geq 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  $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq \dots \leq s_n$ .  
d  $\leftarrow$  0  $\leftarrow$  number of allocated classrooms  
  
for j = 1 to n do  
    if (lecture j is compatible with some classroom k) then  
        schedule lecture j in classroom k  
    else  
        allocate a new classroom d + 1  
        schedule lecture j in classroom d + 1  
        d  $\leftarrow$  d + 1  
}
```

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_j .
- Since we sorted by start time, all these incompatibilities are caused by lectures that start no later than s_j .
- Thus, we have d lectures overlapping at time $s_j + \epsilon$.
- Key observation \Rightarrow all schedules use $\geq d$ classrooms. ▪

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

Ex:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
t_j	3	2	1	4	3	2
d_j	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
t_j	1	10
d_j	100	10

counterexample

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

	1	2
t_j	1	10
d_j	2	10

counterexample

Minimizing Lateness: Greedy Algorithm

Greedy algorithm. Earliest deadline first.

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

```
 $t \leftarrow 0$ 
```


```
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. 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 $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_n$]

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:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \ell'_j &= f'_j - d_j && \text{(definition)} \\
 &= f_i - d_j && (j \text{ finishes at time } f_i) \\
 &\leq f_i - d_i && (i < j) \\
 &\leq \ell_i && \text{(definition)}
 \end{aligned}$$

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 S^* 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^* ▪

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.

Other greedy algorithms. Kruskal, Prim, Dijkstra, Huffman, ...

Coin Changing

Coin Changing

Goal. Given currency denominations: 1, 5, 10, 25, 100, devise a method to pay amount to customer using fewest number of coins.

Ex: 34¢.



Cashier's algorithm. At each iteration, add coin of the largest value that does not take us past the amount to be paid.

Ex: \$2.89.



Coin-Changing: Greedy Algorithm

Cashier's algorithm. At each iteration, add coin of the largest value that does not take us past the amount to be paid.

```
Sort coins denominations by value:  $c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_n$ .
```

```
coins selected  
S ←  $\phi$   
while (x ≠ 0) do  
  let k be largest integer such that  $c_k \leq x$   
  if (k = 0) then  
    return "no solution found"  
  x ← x -  $c_k$   
  S ← S  $\cup$  {k}  
return S
```

Q. Is cashier's algorithm optimal?

Coin-Changing: Analysis of Greedy Algorithm

Theorem. Greedy algorithm is optimal for U.S. coinage: 1, 5, 10, 25, 100.

Pf. (by induction on x)

- Consider optimal way to change $c_k \leq x < c_{k+1}$: greedy takes coin k .
- We claim that any optimal solution must also take coin k .
 - if not, it needs enough coins of type c_1, \dots, c_{k-1} to add up to x
 - table below indicates no optimal solution can do this
- Problem reduces to coin-changing $x - c_k$ cents, which, by induction, is optimally solved by greedy algorithm. ▪

k	c_k	All optimal solutions must satisfy	Max value of coins 1, 2, ..., $k-1$ in any OPT
1	1	$P \leq 4$	-
2	5	$N \leq 1$	4
3	10	$N + D \leq 2$	$4 + 5 = 9$
4	25	$Q \leq 3$	$20 + 4 = 24$
5	100	no limit	$75 + 24 = 99$


P = pennies, N = nickels, D = dimes, Q = quarters

Coin-Changing: Analysis of Greedy Algorithm

Observation. Greedy algorithm is sub-optimal for US postal denominations: 1, 10, 21, 34, 70, 100, 350, 1225, 1500.

Counterexample. 140¢.

- Greedy: 100, 34, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1.
- Optimal: 70, 70.



Fractional Knapsack

Fractional Knapsack

Input:

- Given n liquids. we have v_i liters from the i -th liquid and it is worth w_i dollars
- We have a container with capacity of W liters

Goal:

- Fill the container such that the total worth gets maximized

Fractional Knapsack: Greedy Algorithm

Greedy algorithm. Consider liquids in decreasing order of w_i / v_i . Fill the container as much as possible with the i -th liquid in this order.

```
Sort liquids by worth/volume so that  $w_1/v_1 \geq w_2/v_2 \geq \dots \geq w_n/v_n$ .  
  
for j = 1 to n do  
    if (the container has free space) then  
        pour the  $i$ -th liquid into the container as much as possible
```

Implementation. $O(n \log n)$

- Just sorting.

Fractional Knapsack: Correctness

Theorem. Greedy algorithm is optimal.

Pf.

- It is easy to see if we have two items with the same volume, we select the one which is worth more.
- As we can take any portion of any liquid, the above observation shows the correctness of the greedy algorithm.

References

References

- Section 4.1 and 4.2 of the text book "algorithm design" by Jon Kleinberg and Eva Tardos
- The original slides were prepared by Kevin Wayne. The slides are distributed by Pearson Addison-Wesley.