Greedy Algorithms

A Scheduling Application: Handling Ties

Algorithms: Design and Analysis, Part II

Correctness Claim

Claim: Algorithm #2 (order jobs in nonincreasing order of ratio w_j/l_j) is always correct. [Even with ties]

New Proof Plan: Fix arbitrary input of n jobs. Let $\sigma =$ greedy schedule, let $\sigma^* =$ any other schedule.

Will show σ at least as good as $\sigma^* \Rightarrow$ Implies that greedy schedule is optimal.

Correctness Proof

Assume: [Just by renaming jobs] Greedy schedule σ is just $1, 2, 3, \ldots, n$ (and so $w_1/l_1 \geq w_2/l_2 \geq \ldots \geq w_n/l_n$).

Consider arbitrary schedule σ^*. If $\sigma^* = \sigma$, done.

Else recall $\exists$ consecutive jobs i, j in σ^* with $i > j$. (From last time)

Note: $i > j \Rightarrow w_i/l_i \leq w_j/l_j \Rightarrow w_i l_j \leq w_j l_i$.

Recall: Exchanging $i \& j$ in σ^* has net benefit of $w_j l_i - w_i l_j \geq 0$.

	more stuff		more stuff
$i > j$	j	exchange $i, j \rightarrow$	i
	i		j
	stuff		stuff
	σ^*		new schedule

Correctness Proof

Upshot: Exchanging an "adjacent inversion" like i, j only makes σ^* better, and it decreases the number of inverted pairs.

Jobs i, j with $i > j$ and i scheduled earlier

$\Rightarrow$ After at most $\binom{n}{2}$ such exchanges, can transform σ^* into σ.

$\Rightarrow$ σ at least as good as σ^*.

$\Rightarrow$ Greedy is optimal.

QED!