Online scheduling of unit jobs on three machines with rejection: A tight result

Leah Epstein [a,*], Hanan Zebedat-Haider [b]

[a] *Department of Mathematics, University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel*
[b] *Department of Computer Science, Sapir College, Sderot, Israel*

ABSTRACT

We design an algorithm of the best possible competitive ratio for preemptive and non-preemptive scheduling of unit size jobs with rejection on three identical machines. The algorithm does not use preemption even for the preemptive variant, and it has the interesting feature that one of its parameters is not fixed in advance, and it is defined based on the properties of the first input job having a sufficiently large rejection penalty.

© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

We deal with the problem of online scheduling with rejection of jobs of processing time 1 on three identical machines. Such jobs are called *unit jobs*. Jobs are presented to an online algorithm one by one. There is a set J of arriving jobs, where the j-th job in the input sequence is denoted by j. Each job $j \in J$ is characterized by a value $w_j \geq 0$, where w_j is the rejection penalty of j (and the processing time of j is equal to 1). For each arriving job, the algorithm decides whether it will be rejected or accepted. If it is rejected, then its rejection penalty will be added to the cost of the algorithm. If it is accepted, then it is assigned to be processed by the machines. The makespan (the last completion time) of the final schedule will be added to the cost of the algorithm at termination. Each machine can run at most one job at each time. In the non-preemptive variant, each accepted job must be assigned to run during a specific continuous time slot on one machine. In the pre-emptive variant, a job can be split between several time slots (possibly on different machines), under the restriction that the parts of one job cannot be run in parallel on different machines.

Multiprocessor scheduling with rejection was first introduced by Bartal et al. [1]. Non-preemptive and preemptive online models for minimizing the makespan plus the total rejection penalty have been studied since then [12, 8,2,3,5,6,10,11,4]. The non-preemptive scheduling problem of unit jobs without rejection is trivial even as an online problem (jobs are scheduled in a round-robin manner, and the makespan is $\lceil \frac{n}{m} \rceil$ for m machines and n jobs). In the case of preemptive scheduling, the cost of an optimal solution is $\max\{1, \frac{n}{m}\}$ [9]. For the preemptive case, the best possible competitive ratio was analyzed for all numbers of machines $m \geq 2$ by Seiden, Sgall, and Woeginger [13] (for $m = 3$ the competitive ratio is equal to $\frac{5}{4}$). In the variants with rejection (and in particular, variants with unit jobs), a suitable rejection policy is a crucial part of the algorithm, and it is often the case that the scheduling algorithm of the accepted jobs is not very advanced [1,8,2,5,7].

While the non-preemptive scheduling problem of unit jobs without rejection is simple, the same problem with

---

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: lea@math.haifa.ac.il (L. Epstein),
hnan_haider@hotmail.com (H. Zebedat-Haider).

rejection is a non-trivial problem [1,4]. Bartal et al. [1] presented a sequence of lower bounds on the optimal competitive ratio for fixed values of m, where this monotonically increasing sequence of lower bounds on the competitive ratios tends to 2 for large values of m. These lower bounds were proved using unit jobs, and they are valid for non-preemptive and preemptive algorithms. For $m = 2$, the value of this lower bound is $\phi = \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2} \approx 1.61803$, and an algorithm whose competitive ratio is ϕ (for jobs of arbitrary processing times) was also presented in [1]. For $m = 3$, the value of the lower bound of [1] is approximately $R = 1.83929$, and two algorithms whose competitive ratios are at most 2 (for $m = 3$) were designed in [1]. The precise value of R is defined as follows. First, let $z = (17 + 3\sqrt{33})^{1/3}$. We let $R = \frac{3z}{z^2 - z - 2}$, and it can be easily seen that $\frac{1}{R} = \frac{z-1}{3} - \frac{2}{3z} \approx 0.54369$. We will use a parameter $\alpha = \frac{1}{R}$ in our algorithm. In the same paper [1], the case of arbitrary values of m was studied, and tight bounds of $1 + \phi \approx 2.61803$ on the competitive ratio were given (this value is known to be tight in the overall sense, but not for specific values of m).

We studied several models for scheduling unit jobs with rejection [7,6,4]. In particular, the cases where the rejection penalties of jobs are either non-increasing or non-decreasing were analyzed completely [7]. In the case of non-decreasing penalties, there are two models, depending on whether the number of jobs is known in advance. The best possible competitive ratios for the three models and three machines are ϕ (for non-increasing penalties), and approximately 1.5133 and 1.7801 (for the case where the number of jobs is known in advance, and the case where it is not given in advance, respectively, and non-decreasing penalties). The algorithms are based on thresholds. Roughly speaking, for each index of a job there is a threshold that determines (by comparing the sum of the rejection penalty of the job and previously rejected jobs to the threshold) whether the job will be accepted.

In this paper, we present an optimal algorithm with competitive ratio approximately 1.839287, a value which matches the special case of the lower bound (for $m = 3$) that was proven by using a sequence of jobs of unit size for the general problem (arbitrary job sizes with or without preemption) of online scheduling with rejection on three identical machines [1]. The algorithm is non-preemptive, but we will show that it has the best possible competitive ratio not only for non-preemptive algorithms but also among preemptive algorithms.

2. The algorithm

In the algorithm, we will use a constant parameter α, such that $0 < \alpha < 1$. The value of α was defined earlier, and we will also state it again later. We will show that the competitive ratio of the algorithm does not exceed R, also defined earlier, and mentioned again later. Moreover, during its execution, the algorithm will define a parameter β satisfying $\alpha^2 < \beta < \alpha$ based on its input.

Our online algorithm consists of a rejection strategy and a scheduling algorithm for the accepted jobs. The scheduling algorithm simply assigns accepted jobs to machines using a round-robin policy. Thus, even in the preemptive variant, the algorithm does not use preemption. The rejection strategy for deciding which jobs are rejected and which jobs are accepted is more complicated. In particular, the threshold β that is used for such decisions in the second stage of the algorithm is defined in the first stage of the algorithm, based on the input. The *special job* will be defined as the first input job j^* such that $w_{j^*} \geq \alpha^2$ (if such a job exists), and the value of β is based on w_{j^*}. After this job arrives (and it is either rejected or scheduled), the algorithm moves to a second stage and stays there until the input is terminated. The algorithm is called *MSR3*, which is an abbreviation of MULTIPROCESSOR SCHEDULING WITH REJECTION ON THREE MACHINES.

Algorithm *MSR3*(α).

- Let $j = 1$.

Stage 1

- If the input job j exists, act as follows (and otherwise halt).
- If $w_j < \alpha^2$, then reject j, let $j = j + 1$, and go to stage 1.
- Otherwise, define $j^* = j$, that is, define j to be *the special job*.
- If $w_{j^*} < \alpha$, reject j^*, and let $\beta = \alpha - (1 - \alpha)w_{j^*}$.
- Otherwise, accept j^*, schedule it on the machine of smallest current completion time of the minimum index (that is, on machine 1, as no jobs were scheduled so far), and let $\beta = \frac{1}{3}$.
- Let $j = j + 1$, and go to stage 2.

Stage 2

- If the input job j exists, act as follows (and otherwise halt).
- If $w_j \leq \beta$, reject j.
- Otherwise, schedule it on the machine of smallest current completion time of the minimum index.
- Let $j = j + 1$ and go to stage 2.

We choose $\alpha \approx 0.54369$, which is the solution of the following equation with the variable x: $x^3 + x^2 + x = 1$. Note that $\alpha^2 \approx 0.29560$. Let $R = \alpha^2 + \alpha + 1 = \frac{1}{\alpha} \approx 1.83929$. In the case where β was not defined by the algorithm, in what follows we let $\beta = \frac{1}{3}$.

Claim 1. *We have $\alpha^2 < \beta < \alpha$, and $\beta \leq 1 - 2\alpha^2 \approx 0.40880$.*

Proof. If $\beta = \frac{1}{3}$, then the claim holds by the value of α. Otherwise, j^* exists, $w_{j^*} \geq \alpha^2$ holds by the choice of j^*, and since the algorithm defined β such that $\beta \neq \frac{1}{3}$, $w_{j^*} < \alpha$ holds as well. We find $\beta = \alpha - (1 - \alpha)w_{j^*} \leq \alpha - \alpha^2 + \alpha^3 = 1 - 2\alpha^2 \approx 0.40880$ since $w_{j^*} \geq \alpha^2$, and by the value of α. We get $\beta > \alpha^2$ as $\beta = \alpha - (1 - \alpha)w_{j^*}$ and $w_{j^*} < \alpha$. Finally, we get $\beta \leq 1 - 2\alpha^2 < \alpha$, by $\alpha^3 + \alpha = 1 - \alpha^2$ and $\alpha < 1$. □