Chapter 2
Greedy Algorithms

Algorithm Theory
WS 2014/15

Fabian Kuhn

Greedy Algorithms

- No clear definition, but essentially:

In each step make the choice that looks best at the moment!

- Depending on problem, greedy algorithms can give
  - Optimal solutions
  - Close to optimal solutions
  - No (reasonable) solutions at all
- If it works, very interesting approach!
  - And we might even learn something about the structure of the problem

Goal: Improve understanding where it works (mostly by examples)

Interval Scheduling

- **Given:** Set of intervals, e.g.
  [0,10],[1,3],[1,4],[3,5],[4,7],[5,8],[5,12],[7,9],[9,12],[8,10],[11,14],[12,14]



- **Goal:** Select largest possible non-overlapping set of intervals
  - Overlap at boundary ok, i.e., [4,7] and [7,9] are non-overlapping

- **Example:** Intervals are room requests; satisfy as many as possible

Greedy Algorithms

- Several possibilities…

Choose first available interval:



Choose shortest available interval:



Greedy Algorithms

Choose available request with earliest finishing time:



R := set of all requests; S := empty set;
while R is not empty **do**
    choose $r \in R$ with smallest finishing time
    add r to S
    delete all requests from R that are not compatible with r
end   // S is the solution

Earliest Finishing Time is Optimal

S: alg. solution

- Let O be the set of intervals of an optimal solution
- Can we show that $S = O$?
  - No…



- Show that $|S| = |O|$.

Greedy Stays Ahead

- Greedy Solution:

  $$[a_1, b_1], [a_2, b_2], \dots, [a_{|S|}, b_{|S|}], \qquad \text{where } b_i \le a_{i+1}$$

- Optimal Solution:

  $$[a_1^*, b_1^*], [a_2^*, b_2^*], \dots, [a_{|O|}^*, b_{|O|}^*], \qquad \text{where } b_i^* \le a_{i+1}^*$$

- Assume that $b_i = \infty$ for $i > |S|$ and $b_i^* = \infty$ for $i > |O|$

Claim: For all $i \ge 1$, $b_i \le b_i^*$



Greedy Stays Ahead

Claim: For all $i \geq 1$, $b_i \leq b_i^*$

Proof (by induction on i):

Base: $i = 1$ $b_1 \leq b_1^*$ ✓

Step: $i-1 \to i$ I.H.: $b_{i-1} \leq b_{i-1}^*$



Interval i starts after time b_{i-1} — holds for $[a_i^*, b_i^*]$

$\Longrightarrow b_i \leq b_i^*$

□

Corollary: Earliest finishing time algorithm is optimal.

Weighted Interval Scheduling

Weighted version of the problem:

- Each interval has a weight
- Goal: Non-overlapping set with maximum total weight

Earliest finishing time greedy algorithm fails:

- Algorithm needs to look at weights
- Else, the selected sets could be the ones with smallest weight…

No simple greedy algorithm:

- We will see an algorithm using another design technique later.

Interval Partitioning

- **Schedule all intervals**: Partition intervals into as few as possible non-overlapping sets of intervals
  - Assign intervals to different resources, where each resource needs to get a non-overlapping set

- Example:
  - Intervals are requests to use some room during this time
  - Assign all requests to some room such that there are no conflicts
  - Use as few rooms as possible

- Assignment to 3 resources:



Depth

Depth of a set of intervals:

- Maximum number passing over a single point in time
- Depth of initial example is 4 (e.g., [0,10],[4,7],[5,8],[5,12]):



Lemma: Number of resources needed $\geq$ depth

Greedy Algorithm

Can we achieve a partition into "depth" non-overlapping sets?

- Would mean that the only obstacles to partitioning are local…

Algorithm: (colors)

- Assigns labels 1, … to the sets; same label → non-overlapping

1. sort intervals by starting time: $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n$
2. **for** $i = 1$ **to** n **do**
3. assign smallest possible label to I_i
   (possible label: different from conflicting intervals $I_j, j < i$)
4. **end**

Interval Partitioning Algorithm

Example:

- Labels:



- Number of labels = depth = 4

Interval Partitioning: Analysis

Theorem:

a) Let d be the depth of the given set of intervals. The algorithm assigns a label from $1, \dots, d$ to each interval.

b) Sets with the same label are non-overlapping

Proof:

- b) holds by construction
- For a):
  - All intervals $I_j, j < i$ overlapping with I_i, overlap at the beginning of I_i



  - At most $d - 1$ such intervals → some label in $\{1, \dots, d\}$ is available.

Traveling Salesperson Problem (TSP)

Input:

- Set V of n nodes (points, cities, locations, sites)
- Distance function $d: V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, i.e., $d(u, v)$: dist. from u to v
- Distances usually symmetric, asymm. distances → asymm. TSP

Solution:

- Ordering/permutation $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$ of nodes
- Length of TSP path: $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} d(v_i, v_{i+1})$
- Length of TSP tour: $d(v_n, v_1) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} d(v_i, v_{i+1})$

Goal:

- Minimize length of TSP path or TSP tour

Example



Optimal Tour:

Length: 86

Greedy Algorithm?

Length: 121

Nearest Neighbor (Greedy)

- Nearest neighbor can be arbitrarily bad, even for TSP paths



TSP Variants

- Asymmetric TSP
  - arbitrary non-negative distance/cost function
  - most general, nearest neighbor arbitrarily bad
  - NP-hard to get within any bound of optimum

- Symmetric TSP
  - arbitrary non-negative distance/cost function
  - nearest neighbor arbitrarily bad
  - NP-hard to get within any bound of optimum



- Metric TSP
  - distance function defines metric space: symmetric, non-negative, triangle inequality: $d(u,v) \leq d(u,w) + d(w,v)$ $(\forall u,v,w)$
  - possible to get close to optimum (we will later see factor $^3/_2$)
  - what about the nearest neighbor algorithm?

Metric TSP, Nearest Neighbor

Optimal TSP tour:

Nearest-Neighbor TSP tour:



Metric TSP, Nearest Neighbor

Optimal TSP tour:

Nearest-Neighbor TSP tour:

cost = 24

red edges that are assigned a green edge are called "marked"

opt tour = green edges

$\geq$ marked red edges

at least half of the red edges are marked



Metric TSP, Nearest Neighbor

Triangle Inequality:

optimal tour on remaining nodes

$\leq$

overall optimal tour



Metric TSP, Nearest Neighbor

Analysis works in phases:

- In each phase, assign each optimal edge to some greedy edge
  - Cost of greedy edge $\leq$ cost of optimal edge
- Each greedy edge gets assigned ≤ 2 optimal edges
  - At least half of the greedy edges get assigned
- At end of phase:

  Remove points for which greedy edge is assigned

  Consider optimal solution for remaining points
- **Triangle inequality:** remaining opt. solution $\leq$ overall opt. sol.

- Cost of greedy edges assigned in **each phase $\leq$ opt. cost**
- **Number of phases $\leq \log_2 n$**
  - +1 for last greedy edge in tour

Metric TSP, Nearest Neighbor

- Assume:

  NN: cost of greedy tour, OPT: cost of optimal tour

- We have shown:

$$\frac{\mathrm{NN}}{\mathrm{OPT}} \leq \underbrace{1 + \log_2 n}_{\text{approximation ratio}}$$

- Example of an **approximation algorithm**

- We will later see a $^3/_2$-approximation algorithm for metric TSP

Back to Scheduling

- Given: n requests / jobs with deadlines:



- Goal: schedule all jobs with minimum lateness L
  - Schedule: $s(i)$, $f(i)$: start and finishing times of request i
    Note: $f(i) = s(i) + t_i$

- Lateness $L := \max\left\{0, \max_i\{f(i) - d_i\}\right\}$
  - largest amount of time by which some job finishes late

- Many other natural objective functions possible…

Greedy Algorithm?

Schedule jobs in order of increasing length?

- Ignores deadlines: seems too simplistic…
- E.g.:



Schedule by increasing slack time?

- Should be concerned about slack time: $d_i - t_i$



Greedy Algorithm

Schedule by earliest deadline?

- Schedule in increasing order of d_i
- Ignores lengths of jobs: too simplistic?

- Earliest deadline is optimal!

Algorithm:

- Assume jobs are reordered such that $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \cdots \leq d_n$
- Start/finishing times:
  - First job starts at time $s(1) = 0$
  - Duration of job i is t_i: $f(i) = s(i) + t_i$
  - No gaps between jobs: $s(i+1) = f(i)$

  (idle time: gaps in a schedule → alg. gives schedule with no idle time)

Example

Jobs ordered by deadline:



Schedule:



Lateness: job 1: 0, job 2: 0, job 3: 4, job 4: 5

Basic Facts

1. There is an optimal schedule with no idle time
   – Can just schedule jobs earlier…

2. Inversion: Job i scheduled before job j if $d_i > d_j$
   Schedules with no inversions have the same maximum lateness