Discrete Optimization: A sample of Problems

Ngày 27 tháng 10 năm 2011

Discrete or Combinatorial Optimization deals mainly with problems where we have to choose an optimal solution from a finite (or sometimes countable) number of possibilities.

Discrete or Combinatorial Optimization deals mainly with problems where we have to choose an optimal solution from a finite (or sometimes countable) number of possibilities.

In this short introduction we shall visit a sample of Discrete Optimization problems, step through the thinking process of developing a solution and completely solve one problem. Let us start with a short list of problems.

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

Discrete or Combinatorial Optimization deals mainly with problems where we have to choose an optimal solution from a finite (or sometimes countable) number of possibilities.

In this short introduction we shall visit a sample of Discrete Optimization problems, step through the thinking process of developing a solution and completely solve one problem. Let us start with a short list of problems.

Example

You have a collection of 10000 objects. Each object has a "value" v_n (say 44,500 VND).

Discrete or Combinatorial Optimization deals mainly with problems where we have to choose an optimal solution from a finite (or sometimes countable) number of possibilities.

In this short introduction we shall visit a sample of Discrete Optimization problems, step through the thinking process of developing a solution and completely solve one problem. Let us start with a short list of problems.

Example

You have a collection of 10000 objects. Each object has a "value" v_n (say 44,500 VND).

Can you find a subset of objects whose total value is 2,000,000,000 VND?

Discrete or Combinatorial Optimization deals mainly with problems where we have to choose an optimal solution from a finite (or sometimes countable) number of possibilities.

In this short introduction we shall visit a sample of Discrete Optimization problems, step through the thinking process of developing a solution and completely solve one problem. Let us start with a short list of problems.

Example

You have a collection of 10000 objects. Each object has a "value" v_n (say 44,500 VND).

- Can you find a subset of objects whose total value is 2,000,000,000 VND?
- Can you partition the collection into two sub collections of equal value?

Both problems are very simple and easy to understand.

Both problems are very simple and easy to understand.

Both problems are very simple and easy to understand. Both seem to have a very "simple" mathematical solution: Try all possibilities.

.

Both problems are very simple and easy to understand. Both seem to have a very "simple" mathematical solution: Try all possibilities.

The solutions are not practical even with the fastest computers.

Remark

This situation is typical of many discrete optimization problems. The number of options from which an optimal solution to be chosen is way to big.

Both problems are very simple and easy to understand. Both seem to have a very "simple" mathematical solution: Try all possibilities.

The solutions are not practical even with the fastest computers.

Remark

This situation is typical of many discrete optimization problems. The number of options from which an optimal solution to be chosen is way to big.

Both problems are very simple and easy to understand. Both seem to have a very "simple" mathematical solution: Try all possibilities.

The solutions are not practical even with the fastest computers.

Remark

This situation is typical of many discrete optimization problems. The number of options from which an optimal solution to be chosen is way to big.

For instance, both problems can be solved by testing all possible subsets of objects.

Both problems are very simple and easy to understand. Both seem to have a very "simple" mathematical solution: Try all possibilities.

The solutions are not practical even with the fastest computers.

Remark

This situation is typical of many discrete optimization problems. The number of options from which an optimal solution to be chosen is way to big.

For instance, both problems can be solved by testing all possible subsets of objects.

There are "only" 2¹⁰⁰⁰⁰ subsets... :-(

Question (Scheduling to minimize lateness)

A single resource is available to process jobs (for instance a printer in an office, a big crane in a building site, etc.). n jobs are to be processed by the resource. Once a job starts, it cannot be interrupted. Processing jobs starts at time 0. Each job has a deadline d_i and processing time p_i . We need to schedule the jobs so that the lateness ($f_i - d_i$), the difference between the finishing time and deadline will be minimized.

Question (Scheduling to minimize lateness)

A single resource is available to process jobs (for instance a printer in an office, a big crane in a building site, etc.). n jobs are to be processed by the resource. Once a job starts, it cannot be interrupted. Processing jobs starts at time 0. Each job has a deadline d_i and processing time p_i . We need to schedule the jobs so that the lateness ($f_i - d_i$), the difference between the finishing time and deadline will be minimized.

Question (Scheduling to minimize the number of late jobs)

We can have different objectives for the same problem. For instance, we wish to schedule the same jobs so that the number of late jobs will be minimized.

Solution candidates

Discussion

Solution candidates

Discussion

The solution to both problems looks mathematically simple:

Generate all possible orderings (permutations) of the jobs.

- Generate all possible orderings (permutations) of the jobs.
- For each ordering calculate the maximum lateness (or the number of late jobs).

- Generate all possible orderings (permutations) of the jobs.
- For each ordering calculate the maximum lateness (or the number of late jobs).
- Note that it is very easy to write a program that will calculate these number very fast.

- Generate all possible orderings (permutations) of the jobs.
- For each ordering calculate the maximum lateness (or the number of late jobs).
- Note that it is very easy to write a program that will calculate these number very fast.
- Select the optimal ordering.

- Generate all possible orderings (permutations) of the jobs.
- For each ordering calculate the maximum lateness (or the number of late jobs).
- Note that it is very easy to write a program that will calculate these number very fast.
- Select the optimal ordering.
- So what is the problem?

- Generate all possible orderings (permutations) of the jobs.
- For each ordering calculate the maximum lateness (or the number of late jobs).
- Note that it is very easy to write a program that will calculate these number very fast.
- Select the optimal ordering.
- So what is the problem?
- There are "only" n! permutations to consider!

The solution to both problems looks mathematically simple:

- Generate all possible orderings (permutations) of the jobs.
- For each ordering calculate the maximum lateness (or the number of late jobs).
- Note that it is very easy to write a program that will calculate these number very fast.
- Select the optimal ordering.
- So what is the problem?
- There are "only" n! permutations to consider!
- If n = 100 then there are only 100! possibilities and 100! is so huge, it does not have a name in any language. It is "only" 158-digits long.

Can we try to suggest a solution to the minimum lateness problem?

How about scheduling the jobs in order of increasing processing time ?

4 D b 4 A b

Can we try to suggest a solution to the minimum lateness problem?

How about scheduling the jobs in order of increasing processing time ?

4 D b 4 A b

Can we try to suggest a solution to the minimum lateness problem?

How about scheduling the jobs in order of increasing processing time ? The idea: get rid of the short jobs first.

A D b 4 A b

Can we try to suggest a solution to the minimum lateness problem?

How about scheduling the jobs in order of increasing processing time ? The idea: get rid of the short jobs first.

Won't work! Consider 2 jobs:

 $J_1(p_1 = 100, \ d_1 = 1000)$ $J_2(p_2 = 500, \ d_2 = 500).$

イロト イヨト イラト イラト

Can we try to suggest a solution to the minimum lateness problem?

How about scheduling the jobs in order of increasing processing time ? The idea: get rid of the short jobs first.

Won't work! Consider 2 jobs:

$$J_1(p_1 = 100, d_1 = 1000)$$
 $J_2(p_2 = 500, d_2 = 500).$

In this schedule J_2 will finish at time 600 or 100 minutes late.

Can we try to suggest a solution to the minimum lateness problem?

How about scheduling the jobs in order of increasing processing time ? The idea: get rid of the short jobs first.

Won't work! Consider 2 jobs:

$$J_1(p_1 = 100, d_1 = 1000)$$
 $J_2(p_2 = 500, d_2 = 500).$

In this schedule J_2 will finish at time 600 or 100 minutes late.

On the other hand, if we schedule J_2 first it will finish on time at time 500 and J_1 will finish at time 600 with no lateness.

Can we try to suggest a solution to the minimum lateness problem?

How about scheduling the jobs in order of increasing processing time ? The idea: get rid of the short jobs first.

Won't work! Consider 2 jobs:

$$J_1(p_1 = 100, d_1 = 1000)$$
 $J_2(p_2 = 500, d_2 = 500).$

In this schedule J_2 will finish at time 600 or 100 minutes late.

On the other hand, if we schedule J_2 first it will finish on time at time 500 and J_1 will finish at time 600 with no lateness.

Seems like the problem is that we ignore the finish time.

How about scheduling by the shortest difference $d_i - p_i$, these are the jobs that look to have less time to wait. This schedule does consider all data.

How about scheduling by the shortest difference $d_i - p_i$, these are the jobs that look to have less time to wait. This schedule does consider all data.

Discussion

Once again we can show that this rule fails.

• = • •

How about scheduling by the shortest difference $d_i - p_i$, these are the jobs that look to have less time to wait. This schedule does consider all data.

Discussion

Once again we can show that this rule fails.

• = • •

How about scheduling by the shortest difference $d_i - p_i$, these are the jobs that look to have less time to wait. This schedule does consider all data.

Discussion

Once again we can show that this rule fails. To do this we need to show an example where this rule fails to produce the smallest lateness.

How about scheduling by the shortest difference $d_i - p_i$, these are the jobs that look to have less time to wait. This schedule does consider all data.

Discussion

Once again we can show that this rule fails.

To do this we need to show an example where this rule fails to produce the smallest lateness.

Assume that $J_1(p_1 = 100, d_1 = 100)$, $J_2(p_2 = 5, d_2 = 10)$.

The suggested schedule will schedule J_1 first causing J_2 to finish at time 110, 100 minutes delay. On the other hand if we schedule J_2 first J_1 will finish at time 105 with a delay of only 5 minutes.

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

- 3

There is a somewhat surprising schedule that minimizes the lateness. The surprise is that it ignores the processing time.

Theorem

Performing the jobs by increasing deadline will produce the minimal lateness.

In other words, by presorting the jobs by their deadline d_i we get the optimal schedule. Clearly this can be easily accomplished very fast even for millions of jobs!
<ロ> <四> <ヨ> <ヨ>

æ

• Let $J_1 J_2 \ldots J_n$ be a schedule.

イロン イロン イヨン イヨン

.

- Let $J_1 J_2 \ldots J_n$ be a schedule.
- Por this schedule we have:

$$f_m = \sum_{i=1}^m p_i$$

イロン イロン イヨン イヨン

э

- Let $J_1 J_2 \ldots J_n$ be a schedule.
- Por this schedule we have:

$$f_m = \sum_{i=1}^m p_i$$

Solution Assume that for some index k, $d_k > d_{k+1}$. (An inversion in the permutation).

- Let $J_1 J_2 \ldots J_n$ be a schedule.
- Por this schedule we have:

$$f_m = \sum_{i=1}^m p_i$$

- Solution Assume that for some index k, $d_k > d_{k+1}$. (An inversion in the permutation).
- Let us compare the lateness of this schedule with the schedule: $J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_{k-1}, j_{k+1}, J_k \ldots, J_n$.

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 >

- Let $J_1 J_2 \ldots J_n$ be a schedule.
- Por this schedule we have:

$$f_m = \sum_{i=1}^m p_i$$

- Solution Assume that for some index k, $d_k > d_{k+1}$. (An inversion in the permutation).
- Let us compare the lateness of this schedule with the schedule: $J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_{k-1}, j_{k+1}, J_k \ldots, J_n$.
- Solution is easy to see that $f_i d_i$ remains the same for all jobs different from J_k and J_{k+1} .

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 >

• Let us denote the finishing time for this schedule by g_i .

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Let us denote the finishing time for this schedule by g_i.
We have:

$$g_{k+1} - d_{k+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} p_i + p_{k+1} - d_{k+1} < \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} p_i - d_{k+1} = f_{k+1} - d_{k+1}$$

Similarly:

$$g_k - d_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} p_i - d_k = f_{k+1} - d_k < f_{k+1} - d_{k+1}$$

since $d_{k+1} < d_k$.

イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト

э

Let us denote the finishing time for this schedule by g_i.
We have:

$$g_{k+1} - d_{k+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} p_i + p_{k+1} - d_{k+1} < \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} p_i - d_{k+1} = f_{k+1} - d_{k+1}$$

Similarly:

$$g_k - d_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} p_i - d_k = f_{k+1} - d_k < f_{k+1} - d_{k+1}$$

since $d_{k+1} < d_k$.

So This means that all delays remain the same except for g_k , g_{k+1} which are smaller than the delay $f_{k+1} - d_{k+1}$ which can only decrease the largest delay.

Let us denote the finishing time for this schedule by g_i.
 We have:

$$g_{k+1} - d_{k+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} p_i + p_{k+1} - d_{k+1} < \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} p_i - d_{k+1} = f_{k+1} - d_{k+1}$$

Similarly:

$$g_k - d_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} p_i - d_k = f_{k+1} - d_k < f_{k+1} - d_{k+1}$$

since $d_{k+1} < d_k$.

- So This means that all delays remain the same except for g_k , g_{k+1} which are smaller than the delay $f_{k+1} d_{k+1}$ which can only decrease the largest delay.
- By the exchange, we removed one inversion in the permutation. Thus by removing all inversions we can only reduce latenesses.

We shall try to explore this problem and try to come up with an optimal solution.

• First step: Does the previous algorithm produce an optimal schedule?

We shall try to explore this problem and try to come up with an optimal solution.

- First step: Does the previous algorithm produce an optimal schedule?
 - If no, produce a counter example.

We shall try to explore this problem and try to come up with an optimal solution.

- First step: Does the previous algorithm produce an optimal schedule?
 - If no, produce a counter example.
 - If yes, can you prove it?

We shall try to explore this problem and try to come up with an optimal solution.

- First step: Does the previous algorithm produce an optimal schedule?
 - If no, produce a counter example.
 - If yes, can you prove it?
- Iry another algorithm, any suggestion?

We shall try to explore this problem and try to come up with an optimal solution.

- First step: Does the previous algorithm produce an optimal schedule?
 - If no, produce a counter example.
 - If yes, can you prove it?
- Iry another algorithm, any suggestion?
- What is the best schedule for the following 8 jobs:

 $J_1(15,20), J_3(20,40), J_4(20,60), J_5(10,30),$

 $J_6(30,70), J_2(5,20), J_7(15,50), J_8(40,80).$

We shall try to explore this problem and try to come up with an optimal solution.

- First step: Does the previous algorithm produce an optimal schedule?
 - If no, produce a counter example.
 - If yes, can you prove it?
- Iry another algorithm, any suggestion?
- What is the best schedule for the following 8 jobs:

 $J_1(15,20), J_3(20,40), J_4(20,60), J_5(10,30), J_6(30,70), J_2(5,20), J_7(15,50), J_8(40,80).$

What can we learn from this example?

We shall try to explore this problem and try to come up with an optimal solution.

- First step: Does the previous algorithm produce an optimal schedule?
 - If no, produce a counter example.
 - If yes, can you prove it?
- Iry another algorithm, any suggestion?
- What is the best schedule for the following 8 jobs:

 $J_1(15,20),\ J_3(20,40),\ J_4(20,60),\ J_5(10,30),$

 $J_6(30,70),\ J_2(5,20),\ J_7(15,50),\ J_8(40,80).$

- What can we learn from this example?
- Any suggestion? A heuristic?



イロト イヨト イヨト イヨト



• Sort the jobs in increasing finishing time.



- Sort the jobs in increasing finishing time.
- If there is more than one job with the same finishing time select first the one with the shorter processing time.

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 >



- Sort the jobs in increasing finishing time.
- If there is more than one job with the same finishing time select first the one with the shorter processing time.
- Run through your sorted list. If a job is going to be late, remove it from the list.

- Sort the jobs in increasing finishing time.
- If there is more than one job with the same finishing time select first the one with the shorter processing time.
- Run through your sorted list. If a job is going to be late, remove it from the list.
- It is a heuristic. If correct, we need a proof.

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 >

- Sort the jobs in increasing finishing time.
- If there is more than one job with the same finishing time select first the one with the shorter processing time.
- Run through your sorted list. If a job is going to be late, remove it from the list.
- 2 This is a heuristic. If correct, we need a proof.
- If not, we need a counter example.

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 >

- Sort the jobs in increasing finishing time.
- If there is more than one job with the same finishing time select first the one with the shorter processing time.
- Run through your sorted list. If a job is going to be late, remove it from the list.
- 2 This is a heuristic. If correct, we need a proof.
- If not, we need a counter example.
- Lets check what this heuristic does for the 8 jobs sample:

- Lets try the following:
 - Sort the jobs in increasing finishing time.
 - If there is more than one job with the same finishing time select first the one with the shorter processing time.
 - Run through your sorted list. If a job is going to be late, remove it from the list.
- It is a heuristic. If correct, we need a proof.
- If not, we need a counter example.
- Lets check what this heuristic does for the 8 jobs sample:
- It is easy to see that this is not a correct solution.

- Sort the jobs in increasing finishing time.
- If there is more than one job with the same finishing time select first the one with the shorter processing time.
- Run through your sorted list. If a job is going to be late, remove it from the list.
- It is a heuristic. If correct, we need a proof.
- If not, we need a counter example.
- Lets check what this heuristic does for the 8 jobs sample:
- It is easy to see that this is not a correct solution.
- Solution Let the first job be: $J_1(2000, 2000)$ and let $J_k(20, 2010), k = 1, ..., 100.$

- Lets try the following:
 - Sort the jobs in increasing finishing time.
 - If there is more than one job with the same finishing time select first the one with the shorter processing time.
 - Run through your sorted list. If a job is going to be late, remove it from the list.
- This is a heuristic. If correct, we need a proof.
- If not, we need a counter example.
- Lets check what this heuristic does for the 8 jobs sample:
- It is easy to see that this is not a correct solution.
- Solution Let the first job be: $J_1(2000, 2000)$ and let $J_k(20, 2010), k = 1, ..., 100.$
- **O** The algorithm will schedule J_1 and there will be 100 late jobs.

イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト 二日

- Lets try the following:
 - Sort the jobs in increasing finishing time.
 - If there is more than one job with the same finishing time select first the one with the shorter processing time.
 - Run through your sorted list. If a job is going to be late, remove it from the list.
- It is a heuristic. If correct, we need a proof.
- If not, we need a counter example.
- Lets check what this heuristic does for the 8 jobs sample:
- It is easy to see that this is not a correct solution.
- Solution Let the first job be: $J_1(2000, 2000)$ and let $J_k(20, 2010), k = 1, ..., 100.$
- ② The algorithm will schedule J_1 and there will be 100 late jobs.
- On the other hand, we can finish on time 50 jobs and have only 51 late jobs.

イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト 二日

Current list = jobs sorted by processing time.

A B F A B F

э

Current list = jobs sorted by processing time.

Select the first job.

э

Current list = jobs sorted by processing time.

Select the first job.

Remove from the list all jobs that cannot be completed on time to form the new current list.

Current list = jobs sorted by processing time.

Select the first job.

Remove from the list all jobs that cannot be completed on time to form the new current list.

We shall address this algorithm in assignment No. 9.

You decide to build your own xe may. You carefully study plans, tools needed. You come up with a list of 20 different tools that you will need. You also figure out that there will be 500 steps to complete the job. Unfortunately you do not have the tools. But Mr. Nguyen is renting tools. Every time you check out a tool, you have to pay Mr. Nguyen 20,000 VND. Unfortunately he has an irritating policy: he will not allow you to check out more than 5 tools at a time. this means that if you have 5 tools and you need another tool, you'll have to choose one of your current tools, return it and check out the tool you need.

You decide to build your own xe may. You carefully study plans, tools needed. You come up with a list of 20 different tools that you will need. You also figure out that there will be 500 steps to complete the job. Unfortunately you do not have the tools. But Mr. Nguyen is renting tools. Every time you check out a tool, you have to pay Mr. Nguyen 20,000 VND. Unfortunately he has an irritating policy: he will not allow you to check out more than 5 tools at a time. this means that if you have 5 tools and you need another tool, you'll have to choose one of your current tools, return it and check out the tool you need.

You carefully look over your plan, redesign each step, make sure that in each step you will not need more than 5 tools. You ilst the tools.

Now you are facing another problem. Design which tools to exchange every time you need a tool you do not have. Your goal of course is to minimize the amount of money you'll have to spend renting the tools.

4 D K 4 B K 4 B K 4 B K

Now you are facing another problem. Design which tools to exchange every time you need a tool you do not have. Your goal of course is to minimize the amount of money you'll have to spend renting the tools.

For example, how much will you have to pay Mr. Nguyen for renting out the following list of tools (that will only manage to finish $\frac{1}{5}$ of the job):

11, 5, 4, 12, 15, 8, 8, 16, 3, 1, 2, 6, 1, 1, 19, 7, 15, 6, 19, 9, 5, 6, 18, 15, 14, 16, 18, 20, 9, 16, 5, 6, 14, 16, 13, 4, 4, 6, 17, 4, 7, 11, 19, 18, 5, 2, 8, 7, 20, 14, 17, 17, 4, 15, 2, 4, 9, 17, 19, 5, 4, 14, 9, 18, 19, 2, 20, 15, 7, 19, 11, 12, 1, 9, 16, 3, 1, 4, 14, 7, 18, 12, 7, 17, 1, 6, 3, 17, 10, 17, 7, 6, 9, 15, 16, 8, 9, 13, 9, 19

イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト 二日
Now you are facing another problem. Design which tools to exchange every time you need a tool you do not have. Your goal of course is to minimize the amount of money you'll have to spend renting the tools.

For example, how much will you have to pay Mr. Nguyen for renting out the following list of tools (that will only manage to finish $\frac{1}{5}$ of the job):

11, 5, 4, 12, 15, 8, 8, 16, 3, 1, 2, 6, 1, 1, 19, 7, 15, 6, 19, 9, 5, 6, 18, 15, 14, 16, 18, 20, 9, 16, 5, 6, 14, 16, 13, 4, 4, 6, 17, 4, 7, 11, 19, 18, 5, 2, 8, 7, 20, 14, 17, 17, 4, 15, 2, 4, 9, 17, 19, 5, 4, 14, 9, 18, 19, 2, 20, 15, 7, 19, 11, 12, 1, 9, 16, 3, 1, 4, 14, 7, 18, 12, 7, 17, 1, 6, 3, 17, 10, 17, 7, 6, 9, 15, 16, 8, 9, 13, 9, 19

For instance, in the first stage you rent tools number $\{11, 5, 4, 12, 15\}$. Then you need to rent tool number 8. Which of the current 5 tools are you going to return?

イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト 二日

There seem to be some reasonable options. For instance, we can remove the tool least frequently needed in the future.

There seem to be some reasonable options. For instance, we can remove the tool least frequently needed in the future.

It is also possible that there is no single algorithm that will produce the optimal solution for every input.

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

There seem to be some reasonable options. For instance, we can remove the tool least frequently needed in the future.

It is also possible that there is no single algorithm that will produce the optimal solution for every input.

In the 1960's L. Belady suggetsed the following procedure:

Evict the tool that will be needed the furthest away in the future.

Surprisingly, this strategy will produce an optimal schedule for any given sequence.

We saw a sample of problems, experienced the thinking process that led us to a complete solution of one problem.

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 >

We saw a sample of problems, experienced the thinking process that led us to a complete solution of one problem.

A solution to another problem left as an exercise.

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 >

We saw a sample of problems, experienced the thinking process that led us to a complete solution of one problem.

A solution to another problem left as an exercise.

And we are still pondering about building our own xe-may.

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

We saw a sample of problems, experienced the thinking process that led us to a complete solution of one problem.

A solution to another problem left as an exercise.

And we are still pondering about building our own xe-may.

Time permitting, we will study more discrete optimization problems in this class.