



Algorithms: Design  
and Analysis, Part II

# Greedy Algorithms

---

A Scheduling Application:  
The Algorithm

# Intuition for Algorithm

Recall: Want to  $\min \sum_{j=1}^n w_j$ .

Goal: Devise correct greedy algorithm.

Question:

1. With equal lengths, schedule larger or smaller-weight jobs earlier?
2. With equal weights, schedule shorter or longer jobs earlier?

A) Larger/shorter

C) Larger/longer

B) Smaller/shorter

D) Smaller/longer

# Resolving Conflicting Advice

**Question:** What if  $w_i > w_j$  but  $l_i > l_j$ ?

**Idea:** Assign “scores” to jobs that are:

- increasing in weight
- decreasing in length

**Guess (1):** Order jobs by decreasing value of  $w_j - l_j$ .

**Guess (2):** Order  $w_j/l_j$ .

# Breaking a Greedy Algorithm

To distinguish (1) & (2): Find example where the two algorithms produce different outputs. (At least one will be incorrect.)

Example:

$$l_1 = 5, w_1 = 3 \text{ (longer ratio)}$$

$$l_1 = 2, w_1 = 1 \text{ (larger difference)}$$

Question: What is the sum of weighted completion times of algorithms (1) & (2) respectively?

A) 22 and 23      C) 17 and 17

B) 23 and 22      D) 17 and 11

$$\text{Alg\#1: } \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \#2 & \#1 \\ \hline \end{array} \rightarrow 1 \cdot 2 + 3 \cdot 7 = 23$$

$$\text{Alg\#2: } \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \#1 & \#2 \\ \hline \end{array} \rightarrow 3 \cdot 5 + 1 \cdot 7 = 22$$

# The Story So Far

**So:** Alg#1 not (always) correct.

**Claim:** Alg#2 (order by decreasing ratio  $w_j/l_j$ 's) is always correct.  
[not obvious! - proof coming up next]

**Running time:**  $O(n \log n)$ . [just need to sort]