

A $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for preemptive weighted flow time on a single machine

Lars Rohwedder*

Andreas Wiese†

Abstract

Weighted flow time is a fundamental and very well-studied objective function in scheduling. In this paper, we study the setting of a single machine with preemptions. The input consists of a set of jobs, characterized by their processing times, release times, and weights and we want to compute a (possibly preemptive) schedule for them. The objective is to minimize the sum of the weighted flow times of the jobs, where the flow time of a job is the time between its release date and its completion time.

It had been a long-standing open problem to find a polynomial time $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for this setting. In a recent break-through result, Batra, Garg, and Kumar (FOCS 2018) found such an algorithm if the input data are polynomially bounded integers, and Feige, Kulkarni, and Li (SODA 2019) presented a black-box reduction to this setting. The resulting approximation ratio is a (not explicitly stated) constant which is at least 10.000. In this paper we improve this ratio to $2 + \varepsilon$. The algorithm by Batra, Garg, and Kumar (FOCS 2018) reduces the problem to DEMAND MULTICUT ON TREES and solves the resulting instances via LP-rounding and a dynamic program. Instead, we first reduce the problem to a (different) geometric problem while losing only a factor $1 + \varepsilon$, and then solve its resulting instances up to a factor of $2 + \varepsilon$ by a dynamic program. In particular, our reduction ensures certain structural properties, thanks to which we do not need LP-rounding methods.

We believe that our result makes substantial progress towards finding a PTAS for weighted flow time on a single machine.

*EPFL, Switzerland, lars.rohwedder@epfl.ch, supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation project 200021-184656

†Universidad de Chile, Chile, awiese@dii.uchile.cl, partially supported by the ANID Fondecyt Regular grant 1200173.

1 Introduction

Weighted flow time is a fundamental and well studied objective in the scheduling literature, e.g., [BGK18, FKL19, BP04, BP03, BP14, KTW99, AT18, CK02, CKZ01]. We are given a set of jobs J where each job $j \in J$ is characterized by a release time $r_j \in \mathbb{N}$, a processing time $p_j \in \mathbb{N}$, and a weight $w_j \in \mathbb{N}$. In a computed schedule, the flowtime F_j of a job j is the difference between its completion time and its release date r_j . The goal is to minimize $\sum_{j \in J} w_j F_j$.

In this paper, we study the setting of a single machines in which we allow to preempt jobs (and resume them later). Note that without preemptions the problem cannot even be approximated with a factor of $O(n^{1/2-\varepsilon})$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ [KTW99]. It is known by the work of Chekuri and Khanna [CK02] that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in quasi-polynomial time (QPTAS), assuming quasi-polynomially bounded input data. In contrast to this, it had been a long-standing important open problem whether a constant factor approximation can be computed in *polynomial* time [SW99]. In a breakthrough result, Batra, Garg, and Kumar [BGK18] presented such an algorithm with pseudopolynomial running time. While for many scheduling problems one can assume the input data to be polynomially bounded via straight-forward rounding of the input etc., this is not the case for weighted flow time. However, Feige, Kulkarni, and Li [FKL19] gave a non-trivial black-box reduction to this setting which completely settles the mentioned long-standing open question (and also yields a QPTAS for arbitrary input data).

The algorithm in [BGK18] first reduces a given problem instance to a clean graph problem, the DEMAND MULTICUT PROBLEM ON TREES. This reduction loses a factor of 32 in the approximation ratio. Then, the authors present an approximation algorithm for the resulting instance of DEMAND MULTICUT. To this end, they split it into two subinstances and solve the first one by rounding a linear program (LP) and the second one with a dynamic program (DP). Their approximation ratio for the first subinstance is $24 + 8\beta$ where $\beta = O(1)$ is the approximation ratio of an algorithm by Chan, Grant, Könemann, and Sharpe [CGKS12] (which is invoked as a subroutine); the constant β is not explicitly stated in [CGKS12]. The DP for the second subinstance crucially exploits the hierarchical structure given by the tree. Its approximation ratio is a constant which is not explicitly stated in [BGK18], but is at least 512. Hence, the overall approximation ratio is at least $32 \cdot (536 + 8\beta) \geq 10.000$. While one could try to optimize this constant, it is not clear how to avoid to lose substantial factors in several parts of the algorithm, e.g., the factor 32 in the reduction to DEMAND MULTICUT, further constant factors when solving the two subinstances mentioned above, and also the dependence on β .

1.1 Our contribution

In this paper, we present a polynomial time $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for weighted flow time on a single machine. We first reduce the problem to a geometric problem (rather than DEMAND MULTICUT). Then we solve the resulting instance of this problem by a dynamic program. Our reduction is almost loss-less, i.e., it loses only a factor of $1 + \varepsilon$, and our DP has an approximation ratio of only $2 + \varepsilon$ which leads to an approximation ratio of $2 + \varepsilon$ overall.

In our geometric problem, the input consists of a set of non-overlapping axis-parallel rectangles of unit height and a set of rays that are all vertical and oriented downwards, see Figure 1. Each rectangle has a cost and a capacity, each ray has a demand. The goal is to select rectangles of minimum total cost such that for each ray, the total capacity of the selected rectangles intersecting it is at least the demand of the ray. For technical reasons there are some local dependencies between rectangles, that is, some rectangles can only be selected when another rectangle of the same size directly to its left is selected as well.

In the instances obtained by our reduction, the rectangles are arranged in a hierarchical structure given




Figure 1: An instance of the geometric problem to which we reduce weighted flow time. The rays are depicted in red and the hierarchical decomposition is visualized in green. The hatched rectangles form an example solution. The capacities and costs of the rectangles and the demands of the rays are not depicted, and neither the mentioned local dependencies between some adjacent rectangles of the same sizes.

by a hierarchical decomposition of the x -axis. More precisely, the projection of each rectangle to the x -axis coincides with a cell of this hierarchical decomposition. Moreover, when we traverse each ray from its respective initial point on, the widths of the rectangles hit by the ray are monotone (non-increasing). This hierarchical structure is crucial for our dynamic program (similarly to the tree-structure in [BGK18]). In particular, we manage to obtain this important structure while losing only a factor of $1 + \varepsilon$ in the reduction.

Importantly, in contrast to [BGK18] we can solve our instances of this geometric problem by dynamic programming only, and do not require the LP rounding algorithm from [CGKS12] or a similar procedure (with additional constant factor losses). The intuitive reason is that, translated to our geometric visualization, the instances of DEMAND MULTICUT described in [BGK18] introduce vertical line segments, rather than rays, and the algorithm in [BGK18] needs LP-rounding for a certain type of (intuitively short) line segments, which we can completely avoid. In our DP, we translate some ideas from [BGK18] to our geometric problem. However, our routine is significantly more involved than the DP in [BGK18] due to the higher complexity of our geometric problem (compared to DEMAND MULTICUT ON TREES), and since it is designed to optimize the approximation ratio of $2 + \varepsilon$ incurred by it.

Our algorithm has pseudo-polynomial running time. With the black-box reduction in [FKL19, Section 4] we turn it into a polynomial time algorithm, while losing only a factor of $1 + \varepsilon$.

Theorem 1. *There is a polynomial time $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for the problem of minimizing weighted flow time on a single machine in the preemptive setting.*

We believe that our result is a crucial step forward in the search of a PTAS for weighted flow time on a single machine. In particular, a possible approach for constructing a PTAS could be to use our reduction to the geometric problem above and develop a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for the resulting instances.

1.2 Other related work

Prior to the results in [BGK18, FKL19], Bansal and Pruhs [BP14] presented a $O(\log \log P)$ -approximation algorithm for weighted flow time (we denote by P and W the ratios between the largest and smallest processing times and weights in the input, respectively), and even more general for the General Scheduling problem in which each job incurs a cost, depending on its completion time, and this cost is given by a job-dependent cost function. They reduce this problem to a geometric covering problem (which, however, is substantially different from the geometric problem that we reduce to). For the special cases where $w_j = 1/p_j$ for each job j (i.e. the stretch metric) or if $P = O(1)$ there is a PTAS known [CK02, BMR04]. The best complexity result for weighted flow time on a single machine with preemption is strong NP-hardness [LKB77], which leaves open whether a PTAS exists for the problem.

Weighted flow time has been studied in the online setting. Bansal and Dhamdhere [BD07] presented a $O(\log W)$ -competitive algorithm and a semi-online $O(\log nP)$ -competitive algorithm. Also, Chekuri, Khanna, and Zhu [CKZ01] gave a semi-online $O(\log^2 P)$ -approximation algorithm. These results were improved by Azar and Touitou [AT18] who gave a $\min(\log W, \log P, \log D)$ -competitive algorithm, where D is the ratios of the largest and smallest job densities, being defined as w_j/p_j for each job j . On the other hand, there can be no online $O(1)$ -competitive algorithm, due to a result by Bansal and Chan [BC09]. However, if the online algorithm is given machines of speed $1 + \varepsilon$ then $O(1)$ -competitive algorithms exist, as shown by Bansal and Pruhs [BP03, BP04].

2 Reduction to geometric problem

We start with some standard transformations to simplify the instance of weighted flow time. We assume w.l.o.g. that $1/\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\min_j r_j = 0$. Moreover, we can assume that $\max_j r_j \leq \sum_j p_j$, since otherwise we can split the given instance into independent subinstances. Recall that P is defined as the ratio $\max_j p_j / \min_j p_j$. By scaling the input values and rounding, we can also assume that $\min_j p_j = 1$, $\max_j p_j = P$, and $1 \leq w_j \leq O_\varepsilon(n^2 P)$ for each job j , while losing only a factor of $1 + \varepsilon$ in the approximation ratio and increasing P by only polynomial factors (see Appendix A.1 for details). We define $T := \max_j r_j + \sum_j p_j \leq 2nP$. Hence, we can assume w.l.o.g. that each job finishes within $[0, T]$.

Then the problem is modeled by the following integer program that we denote by (IP). Intuitively, for each job $j \in J$ and each time $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we introduce a variable $x_{j,t}$ such that $x_{j,t} = 1$ if in the corresponding solution job j has not yet finished by time t . For each interval $[s, t]$ we introduce a constraint modeling that among the jobs released during $[s, t]$, only jobs with a total processing time of $t - s$ can complete during $[s, t]$ (which is clearly a necessary condition for feasibility).

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \min \sum_{j \in J} \sum_{t \geq r_j} w_j x_{j,t} \\
 & \sum_{\substack{j \in J \\ s \leq r_j \leq t}} x_{j,t} \cdot p_j \geq \sum_{\substack{j \in J \\ s \leq r_j \leq t}} p_j - (t - s) & \forall s \leq t \leq T \\
 & x_{j,t} \geq x_{j,t+1} & \forall j \in J, t > r_j \\
 & x_{j,t} \in \{0, 1\} & \forall j \in J, t \in \{r_j, \dots, T\}
 \end{aligned}$$

Given a feasible schedule, one can easily obtain a feasible solution to (IP) with the same cost following the intuition for the variables $x_{j,t}$ above. Also, one can show that any feasible solution to (IP) can be translated to a feasible schedule with the same cost.




Figure 2: Geometric visualization of (IP). The rays are depicted in red. The hatched rectangles form an example solution. The capacities and costs of the rectangles and the demands of the rays are not depicted

Theorem 2 ([BGK18]). *Suppose that $\{x_{j,t}\}_{j,t}$ is a feasible solution to (IP). Then, there is a schedule for which the total weighted flow-time is equal to the cost of the solution $\{x_{j,t}\}_{j,t}$.*

One interpretation of (IP) is that for each job j there are segments $[r_j, r_j + 1), [r_j + 1, r_j + 2), \dots, [T - 1, T)$, and we need to select a prefix of these segments (modeled by the variables $x_{j,t}$ and the constraints $x_{j,t} \geq x_{j,t+1}$ for each t). If we select a segment $[t-1, t)$ for a job j (i.e., $x_{j,t} = 1$), then this helps us to satisfy the constraint for each interval $[s, t]$ with $s \leq r_j$. Figure 2 provides a visualization of these constraints: we first sort the jobs non-decreasingly by their release dates, breaking ties arbitrarily. Denote by \prec the obtained (fixed) order of the jobs and suppose that the jobs are labeled $1, \dots, n$ according to \prec . For each job j and each variable $x_{j,t}$ we introduce a square $[t-1, t) \times [j, j+1)$. For each interval $I = [s, t]$ we define $j(I)$ to be the job j with minimum r_j such that $s \leq r_j$; we introduce a vertical ray $L(I) := \{t - \frac{1}{2}\} \times [j(I) + \frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ corresponding to I . Then one can show easily that $L(I)$ intersects the square of a variable $x_{j,t}$ if and only if the variable $x_{j,t}$ appears in the left-hand side of the constraint corresponding to I . Hence, intuitively, the capacity of the square for a variable $x_{j,t}$ is p_j , the demand of a ray $L(I)$ is the right-hand side of the constraint in (IP) corresponding to I , i.e., $\sum_{j \in J: s \leq r_j \leq t} p_j - (t - s)$, and our goal is to select squares such that each ray $L(I)$ intersects with selected squares whose total capacity are at least the demand of $L(I)$.

It is not clear how to approximate (IP) directly in polynomial time and how to make use of the visualization above for this. Therefore, we will give a randomized reduction of (IP) to a different (and in particular more structured) integer program (IP2) with the following relation.

1. Any solution for (IP) can be transformed into a solution for (IP2) such that the objective value increases at most by a factor $1 + O(\varepsilon)$ in expectation.
2. Any solution for (IP2) can be transformed into a solution for (IP) with the same objective value.

In particular, in (IP2) we will define rectangles for each job j which intuitively result from merging certain sets of adjacent squares of j . Moreover, these rectangles will be aligned with a hierarchical grid which will help us later to compute a cheap solution to (IP2) by a dynamic program.

Hierarchical grid. Our hierarchical grid has $O_\varepsilon(\log T) = O_\varepsilon(\log nP)$ levels. Each grid cell C of some level ℓ corresponds to some interval $[t_1, t_2)$ with $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{N}$. We define $\text{beg}(C) := t_1$, $\text{end}(C) := t_2$, and $\text{len}(C) := t_2 - t_1$. Each cell C has $K := (2/\varepsilon)^{1/\varepsilon}$ children cells of level $\ell + 1$, unless ℓ is the maximum level ℓ_{\max} of the hierarchy in which case C does not have any children cells. There will be exactly one grid cell of level 0. The grid is parametrized by two random variables $\text{off}_x, \text{off}_y$. Intuitively, we give the

grid a horizontal shift with some random offset off_x . Also, we choose the size of the unique cell of level 0 randomly via an offset off_y .

Formally, we define ℓ_{\max} to be the minimal value k such that $K^{k-2} \geq T$ which will ensure that later the grid cells C of level ℓ_{\max} satisfy that $\text{len}(C) \in [1, K)$. We choose both $\text{off}_y \in \{(2/\varepsilon)^0, (2/\varepsilon)^1, \dots, (2/\varepsilon)^{1/\varepsilon-1}\}$ and $\text{off}_x \in \{-K^{\ell_{\max}-1} + 1, -K^{\ell_{\max}-1} + 2, \dots, 0\}$ uniformly at random. We define that the unique grid cell of level 0 corresponds to the interval $[\text{off}_x, \text{off}_x + \text{off}_y K^{\ell_{\max}})$ which contains $[0, T)$ (since $T \leq K^{\ell_{\max}-2} \leq K^{\ell_{\max}} - K^{\ell_{\max}-1} \leq \text{off}_y K^{\ell_{\max}} + \text{off}_x$). Thus, we can assume w.l.o.g. that no job is processed outside $[\text{off}_x, \text{off}_x + \text{off}_y K^{\ell_{\max}})$. Inductively, for each grid cell C with $\text{len}(C) \geq K \cdot \text{off}_y$ of some level ℓ , we introduce K child grid cells of level $\ell + 1$, one for each interval

$$\left[\text{beg}(C) + \frac{i}{K} \text{len}(C), \text{beg}(C) + \frac{i+1}{K} \text{len}(C) \right), \quad i = 0, \dots, K-1.$$

By construction, the interval of each grid cell of level ℓ has length $\text{off}_y \cdot K^{\ell_{\max}-\ell}$. Denote by \mathcal{C} the set of all grid cells (of all levels). For each $C \in \mathcal{C}$, denote by $\ell(C)$ its level. It follows that $\ell_{\max} = \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \ell(C)$.

Segments of jobs. For each job j we want to define a set of $O_\varepsilon(\log nP)$ segments $\text{Seg}(j)$ which form a partition of $[r_j, T)$, see Figure 3. We will associate each segment $S \in \text{Seg}(j)$ with some grid cell $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $S \subseteq C$ and denote by $\text{Seg}(j, C)$ the segments in $\text{Seg}(j)$ associated with C . We will ensure that all segments in $\text{Seg}(j, C)$ are aligned with the grid cells of level $\ell(C) + 2$ and in particular all have the same size. We will also ensure that for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$, the union of the segments in $\text{Seg}(j, C)$ forms an interval that is *right-aligned with C* , i.e., it holds that $\bigcup_{S \in \text{Seg}(j, C)} S = [s, \text{end}(C))$ for some $s \in C$.

Formally, consider a job j . We construct a sequence of cells $C_{\ell_{\max}}, C_{\ell_{\max}-1}, \dots, C_0$ in levels $\ell_{\max}, \ell_{\max}-1, \dots, 0$ such that the union of these cells contains $[r_j, T)$. The cells are chosen as follows. Cell $C_{\ell_{\max}}$ is identical to the cell of level ℓ_{\max} that contains r_j . Suppose we have chosen cells $C_{\ell_{\max}}, \dots, C_k$. Then we define C_{k-1} as the cell of level $k-1$ that contains $\text{end}(C_k)$ (see Figure 3); observe that this implies $\text{end}(C_k) < \text{end}(C_{k-1})$. For each $k \in \{\ell_{\max}-1, \dots, 1\}$ consider the interval $[\text{end}(C_{k+1}), \text{end}(C_k))$, and $[r_j, \text{end}(C_{\ell_{\max}}))$ for $k = \ell_{\max}$. The length of this interval must be an integer multiple of $\text{len}(C_{k+1})$, or 1 if $k = \ell_{\max}$. We subdivide this interval into segments of length $\text{len}(C_{k+2})$ each if $k \leq \ell_{\max}-2$, and of length 1 each if $k > \ell_{\max}-2$. We define that these segments form the set $\text{Seg}(j, C_k)$. It follows by construction that each of them coincides with a cell of level $k+2$ if $k \leq \ell_{\max}-2$, and otherwise has length 1.

For each job j we define $\text{Seg}(j) := \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \text{Seg}(j, C)$. In the following lemma, we will prove some properties of these segments. For this, for each job j let F_j^* denote the flowtime of j in OPT and let C_j^* denote the cell such that $\text{Seg}(j, C_j^*)$ contains a segment S with $r_j + F_j^* - 1 \in S$. We will use this notation in the (technical) fifth property below that will be crucial later to prove that the reduction to (IP2) loses only a factor $1 + O(\varepsilon)$. The last point states intuitively that the segments of a job are coarser if the job is released earlier, see also Figure 3.

Lemma 3. *For each job $j \in J$ the segments $\text{Seg}(j)$ and $\{\text{Seg}(j, C)\}_{C \in \mathcal{C}}$ have the following properties:*

1. $\text{Seg}(j)$ forms a partition of $[r_j, T)$,
2. for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and each $S \in \text{Seg}(j, C)$ it holds that $S \subseteq C$ and $S = C'$ for some cell C' of level $\ell(C) + 2$ if $\ell(C) \leq \ell_{\max} - 2$, and $S = [t, t+1)$ for some $t \in \mathbb{N}$ if $\ell(C) > \ell_{\max} - 2$,
3. for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ the interval $\bigcup_{S \in \text{Seg}(j, C)} S$ is right-aligned with C , $|\text{Seg}(j, C)| \leq K^2$, and all segments in $\text{Seg}(j, C)$ have the same size,

4. for two segments $S \in \text{Seg}(j, C)$, $S' \in \text{Seg}(j, C')$ where S lies on the left of S' and $C \neq C'$, it holds that $\text{len}(S') = \text{len}(S) = 1$ or $\text{len}(S') = \text{len}(S) \cdot K^i$ for some integer $i \geq 1$, and
5. with probability at least $1 - O(\varepsilon)$ we have that $F_j^* \geq \text{len}(C_j^*)/(\varepsilon K)$.

Moreover, for two jobs j, j' with $r_j \leq r_{j'}$ it holds that for each segment $S' \in \text{Seg}(j')$ there is a segment $S \in \text{Seg}(j)$ with $S' \subseteq S$.

Proof. By construction the first four properties follow immediately. The non-trivial property we need to show is the fifth. First we will show that probability at least $1 - 3\varepsilon$ it holds that

$$F_j^* \notin [\varepsilon/2 \cdot \text{off}_y K^k, 2/\varepsilon \cdot \text{off}_y K^k] \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (1)$$

Note that if (1) is not true for k then F_j^* and $\text{off}_y K^k$ differ by a factor of at most $2/\varepsilon$. In other words, it suffices to show that with the mentioned probability we have

$$|\log_{2/\varepsilon} F_j^* - \log_{2/\varepsilon}(\text{off}_y K^k)| > 1 \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Notice that $\log_{2/\varepsilon}(\text{off}_y K^k) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence, the statement above is implied by

$$\begin{aligned} \lfloor \log_{2/\varepsilon} F_j^* \rfloor &\neq \log_{2/\varepsilon}(\text{off}_y) + k/\varepsilon - 1, \\ \lfloor \log_{2/\varepsilon} F_j^* \rfloor &\neq \log_{2/\varepsilon}(\text{off}_y) + k/\varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \\ \lfloor \log_{2/\varepsilon} F_j^* \rfloor &\neq \log_{2/\varepsilon}(\text{off}_y) + k/\varepsilon + 1 \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \lfloor \log_{2/\varepsilon} F_j^* \rfloor &\not\equiv \log_{2/\varepsilon}(\text{off}_y) - 1 \pmod{1/\varepsilon}, \\ \lfloor \log_{2/\varepsilon} F_j^* \rfloor &\not\equiv \log_{2/\varepsilon}(\text{off}_y) \pmod{1/\varepsilon}, \text{ and} \\ \lfloor \log_{2/\varepsilon} F_j^* \rfloor &\not\equiv \log_{2/\varepsilon}(\text{off}_y) + 1 \pmod{1/\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

The distribution of $\log_{2/\varepsilon}(\text{off}_y)$ is uniform over $\{0, \dots, 1/\varepsilon - 1\}$. Hence (1) holds with probability at least $1 - 3\varepsilon$. We condition on the event above which implies that there is some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $2/\varepsilon \cdot \text{off}_y K^{k-1} < F_j^* < \varepsilon/2 \cdot \text{off}_y K^k$. Because of $F_j^* \geq 1 \geq \text{off}_y/K$ it must hold that $\text{off}_y K^k \geq 2/\varepsilon$ and $k \geq 0$. Moreover, since $F_j^* \leq r_j + F_j^* \leq T \leq \text{off}_y K^{\ell_{\max}-2}$ we have that $k < \ell_{\max} - 1$.

Let $C_{\ell_{\max}}, \dots, C_0$ be the cells constructed in the definition of $\text{Seg}(j)$. Recall that off_x is chosen uniformly at random from $\{-K^{\ell_{\max}-1} + 1, \dots, 0\}$. The number $K^{\ell_{\max}-1}$ is an integer multiple of $\text{off}_y K^k$. Thus, the distribution of $\text{off}_x \pmod{\text{off}_y K^k}$ is uniform. With probability at least $1 - 2\varepsilon$ we have

$$r_j \not\equiv \text{off}_x, \text{off}_x - 1, \dots, \text{off}_x - \varepsilon \text{off}_y K^k \pmod{\text{off}_y K^k},$$

which means the grid cells are aligned such that r_j lies inside a cell C of level $\ell_{\max} - k$, that is, $\text{len}(C) = \text{off}_y K^k$, and $r_j < \text{end}(C) - \varepsilon \text{len}(C)$. Together with (*) this event has a probability of at least $1 - 5\varepsilon$. We now prove that the event implies $C = C_j^*$, which finishes the proof since

$$F_j^* > 2/\varepsilon \cdot \text{off}_y K^{k-1} \geq \text{len}(C)/(\varepsilon K).$$

First, we prove that $C = C_{\ell_{\max}-k}$. If $k = 0$, this follows from $r_j \in C$. Otherwise, it follows from

$$\text{beg}(C) \leq r_j \leq \text{end}(C_{\ell_{\max}-k+1})$$




Figure 3: Example cell and segment construction with $K = 3$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{end}(C_{\ell_{\max}-k+1}) &\leq r_j + \sum_{i=\ell_{\max}-k+1}^{\ell_{\max}} \text{len}(C_i) = r_j + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \text{off}_y K^i < r_j + 2\text{off}_y K^{k-1} \\ &< \text{end}(C) - \varepsilon \text{off}_y K^k + 2\text{off}_y K^{k-1} = \text{end}(C). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, $C = C_j^*$ since

$$r_j + F_j^* - 1 < r_j + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{off}_y K^k \leq \text{end}(C) - \varepsilon \cdot \text{off}_y K^k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{off}_y K^k < \text{end}(C)$$

and for $k \geq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_j + F_j^* - 1 &> r_j + \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \text{off}_y K^{k-1} - 1 > r_j + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \text{off}_y K^i - 1 \\ &> r_j + \sum_{i=\ell_{\max}-k+1}^{\ell_{\max}} \text{len}(C_i) \geq \text{end}(C_{\ell_{\max}-k+1}) \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Based on the segments in the sets $\text{Seg}(j, C)$ we define (IP2) where we introduce a variable $y_{j,S}$ for each job j and each segment $S \in \text{Seg}(j)$. This variable $y_{j,S}$ models whether we select the segment S for job j which implies that we allow job j to finish after time $\text{end}(S)$ (and are willing to pay for this). This is similar to the variables $x_{j,t}$ in (IP). Like in (IP), we have a constraint for each interval $[s, t]$. For each set $\text{Seg}(j, C)$ we define that the first segment $S \in \text{Seg}(j, C)$ has cost $c_{j,S} = w_j(\text{end}(S) - r_j)$ and each other segment $S' \in \text{Seg}(j, C)$ has cost $c_{j,S'} = w_j \text{len}(S')$. Moreover, we require that from each set $\text{Seg}(j, C)$ a prefix of its segments is selected. Thus, intuitively, if we select the first segment S of a set $\text{Seg}(j, C)$ then we pay the full price for not processing job j until $\text{end}(S)$, and for each other segments $S' \in \text{Seg}(j, C)$ we pay the

price for delaying j by $\text{len}(S')$ more.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min \sum_{j \in J} \sum_{S \in \text{Seg}(j)} c_{j,S} y_{j,S} \\
& \sum_{\substack{j \in J \\ s \leq r_j \leq t}} \sum_{\substack{S \in \text{Seg}(j) \\ t \in S}} y_{j,S} \cdot p_j \geq \sum_{\substack{j \in J \\ s \leq r_j \leq t}} p_j - (t - s) & \forall s \leq t \leq T \\
& y_{j,S} \geq y_{j,S'} & \forall j \in J, C \in \mathcal{C} \forall S, S' \in \text{Seg}(j, C) \\
& & \text{with } \text{end}(S) < \text{end}(S') \\
& y_{j,S} \in \{0, 1\} & \forall j \in J \forall S \in \text{Seg}(j)
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

We prove now that by reducing (IP) to (IP2) we lose only a factor of $1 + O(\varepsilon)$ in expectation. We define $\text{OPT}^{(\text{IP})}$ and $\text{OPT}^{(\text{IP2})}$ to be the costs of the optimal solutions to (IP) and (IP2), respectively. Note that $\text{OPT}^{(\text{IP2})}$ depends on off_x and off_y .

Lemma 4. *For all possible values for the offsets $\text{off}_x, \text{off}_y$ it holds that $\text{OPT}^{(\text{IP})} \leq \text{OPT}^{(\text{IP2})}$.*

Proof. Consider some solution for (IP2). Let j be a job and let $S \in \text{Seg}(j)$ be the rightmost segment S with $y_{j,S} = 1$, i.e., the segment with maximal $\text{end}(S)$ such that $y_{j,S} = 1$. In (IP) we set $x_{j,t} = 1$ for each $t < \text{end}(S)$ and $x_{j,t} = 0$ for each $t \geq \text{end}(S)$. This forms a feasible solution of at most the same cost: For feasibility consider the covering constraint in (IP) and (IP2) for some fixed $s \leq t \leq T$. As the right-hand side is equal in both integer programs, it suffices to show that the left-hand side of (IP) is at least as big as that in (IP2), that is,

$$\sum_{\substack{j \in J \\ s \leq r_j \leq t}} x_{j,t} \cdot p_j \geq \sum_{\substack{j \in J \\ s \leq r_j \leq t}} \sum_{\substack{S \in \text{Seg}(j) \\ t \in S}} y_{j,S} \cdot p_j \tag{3}$$

The elements of the sums in (3) correspond to jobs. For each job j with $s \leq r_j \leq t$ the left sum contains p_j if $x_{j,t} = 1$ and 0, otherwise. The right sum contains p_j , if $y_{j,S^{(t)}} = 1$ for the segment $S^{(t)} \in \text{Seg}(j)$ that contains t and 0, otherwise. By definition of $x_{j,t}$, however, we know that if $y_{j,S^{(t)}} = 1$, then $x_{j,t} = 1$ as well. Hence, (3) follows.

For the cost of the solution we will consider each job independently, that is, we show that for each job j it holds that

$$\sum_{t > r_j} w_j x_{j,t} \leq \sum_{S \in \text{Seg}(j)} c_{j,S} y_{j,S}.$$

Let C be the largest cell such that $y_{j,S} = 1$ for some $S \in \text{Seg}(j, C)$ and let $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k \in \text{Seg}(j, C)$ be the maximal prefix of segments with $y_{j,S_i} = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. By definition of $x_{j,t}$ we know that $x_{j,t} = 1$ if and only if $t < \text{end}(S_k)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{S \in \text{Seg}(j)} c_{j,S} y_{j,S} & \geq \sum_{i=1}^k c_{j,S_i} = w_j(\text{end}(S_1) - r_j) + \sum_{i=2}^k w_j \text{len}(S_i) \\
& = w_j(\text{end}(S_1) - r_j) + \sum_{i=2}^k w_j(\text{end}(S_i) - \text{end}(S_{i-1})) \\
& = w_j(\text{end}(S_k) - r_j) = \sum_{t \geq r_j} w_j x_{j,t} \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we prove that in expectation $\text{OPT}^{(\text{IP2})}$ is not much more expensive than $\text{OPT}^{(\text{IP})}$. Given an optimal solution to (IP), we define a solution to (IP2) which incurs for each job j a cost of at most $(1 + O(\varepsilon))F_j^*w_j$ if the fifth condition of Lemma 3 is satisfied for j (which happens with probability $1 - O(\varepsilon)$). On the other hand, we show that even if this condition is *not* satisfied for j , then the cost of j in (IP2) is at most $O(F_j^*w_j)$, which yields a cost of at most $(1 + O(\varepsilon))F_j^*w_j$ in expectation. Taking the sum over all jobs j yields the following lemma.

Lemma 5. *It holds that $\mathbb{E} \left[\text{OPT}^{(\text{IP2})} \right] \leq (1 + O(\varepsilon))\text{OPT}^{(\text{IP})}$.*

Proof. Let F_j^* denote the flow time in an optimal solution for (IP), that is, the optimal solution is defined with $x_{j,t} = 1$ if and only if $t < r_j + F_j^*$. For each job j and we set $y_{j,S} = 1$ for all segments $S \in \text{Seg}(j)$ that intersect with $[r_j, r_j + F_j^*)$ and $y_{j,S} = 0$, otherwise.

For feasibility consider the covering constraint in (IP) and (IP2) for some fixed $s \leq t \leq T$. As the right-hand side is equal in both integer programs, it suffices to show that the left-hand side of (IP2) is at least as big as that in (IP), that is,

$$\sum_{\substack{j \in J \\ s \leq r_j \leq t}} x_{j,t} \cdot p_j \leq \sum_{\substack{j \in J \\ s \leq r_j \leq t}} \sum_{\substack{S \in \text{Seg}(j) \\ t \in S}} y_{j,S} \cdot p_j \quad (4)$$

Let $j \in J$ with $s \leq r_j \leq t$. We argue that if $x_{j,t} = 1$ then also $y_{j,S^{(t)}} = 1$ for the segment $S^{(t)} \in \text{Seg}(j)$ with $t \in S^{(t)}$. Indeed, this follows from the definition of $y_{j,S}$, since $S^{(t)}$ intersects with $[r_j, r_j + F_j^*)$ (both contain t). Thus (4) holds.

For the cost of the solution we consider each job individually, that is, we show that $\sum_{S \in \text{Seg}(j)} c_{j,S} y_{j,S}$ is at most $(1 + O(\varepsilon))w_j F_j^*$ in expectation. More precisely, we first argue that it never exceeds $O(w_j F_j^*)$; then we show that with probability $1 - O(\varepsilon)$ it does not exceed $(1 + O(\varepsilon))w_j F_j^*$. To this end, we fix a job j .

Let $C_{\ell_{\max}}, \dots, C_0$ be the sequence of cells in the construction of $\text{Seg}(j)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $C_k = C_j^*$, that is, there is a segment $S^* \in \text{Seg}(j, C_k)$ with $r_j + F_j^* - 1 \in S^*$. Observe that the costs of segments are chosen in a way that for each $C_i, i > k$, we have

$$\sum_{S \in \text{Seg}(j, C_i)} c_{j,S} y_{j,S} = \sum_{S \in \text{Seg}(j, C_i)} c_{j,S} = w_j(\text{end}(C_i) - r_j).$$

Further, for cell C_k we have

$$\sum_{S \in \text{Seg}(j, C_k)} c_{j,S} y_{j,S} = w_j(\text{end}(S^*) - r_j) \leq w_j F_j^* + w_j \text{len}(S^*). \quad (5)$$

We first bound (5) by $2w_j F_j^*$. If $k \in \{\ell_{\max}, \ell_{\max} - 1\}$ then this holds trivially, because $\text{len}(S^*) = 1 \leq F_j^*$. Otherwise, we have that $F_j^* \geq \text{len}(C_k)/K^2 = \text{len}(S^*)$. The first inequality holds because $[\text{end}(C_{k+2}), \text{end}(C_{k+1})]$ is contained in $[r_j, r_j + F_j^*)$ and its length is an integer multiple of $\text{len}(C_{k+2}) =$

$\text{off}_y K^{\ell_{\max}-(k+2)} = \text{len}(C_k)/K^2$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{S \in \text{Seg}(j)} c_{j,S} y_{j,S} &= w_j(\text{end}(S^*) - r_j) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell_{\max}} w_j(\text{end}(C_i) - r_j) \\ &\leq 2w_j(\text{end}(S^*) - r_j) + \sum_{i=k+2}^{\ell_{\max}} w_j(\text{end}(C_i) - r_j) \\ &\leq 4w_j F_j^* + \sum_{i=k+2}^{\ell_{\max}} w_j \sum_{\ell=i}^{\ell_{\max}} \text{len}(C_\ell) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=k+2}^{\ell_{\max}} w_j \sum_{\ell=i}^{\ell_{\max}} \text{len}(C_\ell) &= \sum_{i=k+2}^{\ell_{\max}} w_j \sum_{\ell=i}^{\ell_{\max}} \text{off}_y K^{\ell_{\max}-\ell} \\ &\leq 2\text{off}_y \sum_{i=k+2}^{\ell_{\max}} w_j K^{\ell_{\max}-i} \leq 4w_j \text{off}_y K^{\ell_{\max}-(k+2)} \leq 4w_j F_j^*. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that for all $\text{off}_y, \text{off}_x$ it holds that

$$\sum_{S \in \text{Seg}(j)} c_{j,S} y_{j,S} \leq 8w_j F_j^*.$$

It remains to prove that with probability $1 - O(\varepsilon)$ the selected segments have cost at most $(1 + O(\varepsilon))w_j F_j^*$. To this end, assume we are in the case of Lemma 3:5. In other words, $F_j^* \geq \text{len}(C_k)/(\varepsilon K)$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{S \in \text{Seg}(j)} c_{j,S} y_{j,S} &= w_j(\text{end}(S^*) - r_j) + w_j \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell_{\max}} (\text{end}(C_i) - r_j) \\ &\leq w_j F_j^* + w_j \text{len}(S^*) + w_j \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell_{\max}} \sum_{\ell=i}^{\ell_{\max}} \text{len}(C_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, $\text{len}(S^*) = \text{len}(C_k)/K^2 \leq \varepsilon F_j^*/K \leq \varepsilon F_j^*$ and

$$\begin{aligned} w_j \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell_{\max}} \sum_{\ell=i}^{\ell_{\max}} \text{len}(C_\ell) &= w_j \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell_{\max}} \sum_{\ell=i}^{\ell_{\max}} \text{off}_y K^{\ell_{\max}-\ell} \leq 2w_j \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell_{\max}} \text{off}_y K^{\ell_{\max}-i} \\ &\leq 4w_j \text{off}_y K^{\ell_{\max}-(k+1)} = 4w_j \text{len}(C_k)/K \leq 4\varepsilon w_j F_j^*. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Note that Lemma 5 implies that there exist values for $\text{off}_y, \text{off}_x$ such that $\text{OPT}^{(\text{IP}^2)} \leq (1+O(\varepsilon))\text{OPT}^{(\text{IP})}$; since the number of combinations for $\text{off}_y, \text{off}_x$ is bounded by $O_\varepsilon(T)$ we simply guess these values.




Figure 4: Geometric visualization of (IP2). The rays are depicted in red and the hierarchical decomposition is visualized in green. The hatched rectangles form an example solution. The line between adjacent rectangles is interrupted, if they belong to the same set $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$, i.e., these are the sets of which a solution needs to select a prefix. The capacities and costs of the rectangles and the demands of the rays are not depicted.

2.1 Geometric visualization

We now visualize (IP2) in a similar way as (IP) before (see Figure 4). Again, we assume that the jobs are labeled $1, \dots, n$ according to \prec . For each job j and each segment $S \in \text{Seg}(j)$ we introduce a rectangle $R(j, S) = [\text{beg}(S), \text{end}(S)) \times [j, j+1)$. For each job j and each cell $C \in \mathcal{C}$ we define $\mathcal{R}(j, C) := \{R(j, S) \mid S \in \text{Seg}(j, C)\}$, for each cell C let $\mathcal{R}(C) := \bigcup_j \mathcal{R}(j, C)$, and additionally we define $\mathcal{R} := \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{R}(C)$. For each interval $I = [s, t]$ we define $j(I)$ to be the job j with minimum r_j such that $s \leq r_j$; we introduce a vertical ray $L(I) := \{t + \frac{1}{2}\} \times [j(I) + \frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ corresponding to I . Then $L(I)$ intersects a rectangle $R(j, S)$ if and only if the variable $y_{j,S}$ appears in the left-hand side of the constraint corresponding to I .

Lemma 6. *Let $I = [s, t]$. The ray $L(I)$ intersects a rectangle $R(j, S)$ corresponding to a segment S if and only if $s \leq r_j \leq t$ and $t \in S$.*

Proof. Suppose that $L(I)$ and $R(j, S)$ intersect. Then $\text{beg}(S) \leq t + \frac{1}{2} < \text{end}(S)$ and $r_{j(I)} \leq r_j$. Note that $s \leq r_{j(I)}$ and hence $s \leq r_j$. Also, $t + \frac{1}{2} \geq \text{beg}(S) \geq r_j$ holds. On the other hand, assume that $s \leq r_j \leq t$ and $t \in S$. Then $j(I) \prec j$ and thus $[j(I) + \frac{1}{2}, \infty) \cap [j, j+1) \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, $L(I)$ and $R(j, S)$ intersect. \square

For each ray $L(I)$ corresponding to an interval $I = [s, t]$ we define a demand of $d(I) := \sum_{j \in J: s \leq r_j \leq t} p_j - (t - s)$ (which is the right-hand side of the constraint corresponding to I in (IP2)). For each rectangle $R = R(j, S)$ we define a capacity $p_R := p_j$ and a cost $c_R := c_{j,S}$. This yields a geometric covering problem in which our goal is to select rectangles (respecting the prefix constraints (2)) of minimum total cost such that each ray $L(I)$ intersects selected rectangles with a total capacity of at least $d(I)$.

We will solve this problem approximately with a dynamic program. In our DP, we will take advantage of the hierarchical structure induced by the cells \mathcal{C} . To this end, note that for a cell C with two children cells $C_1, C_2 \subseteq C$, the rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(C_1)$ and $\mathcal{R}(C_2)$ are independent, in the sense that if a ray $L(I)$ intersects a rectangle in $\mathcal{R}(C_1)$ then it does not intersect any rectangle in $\mathcal{R}(C_2)$ and vice versa.

3 Computing an approximate solution

Assume that we are given the cells \mathcal{C} and the rectangles \mathcal{R} as defined above. We want to compute a set $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ of small total cost that represents a feasible solution to (IP2), i.e., such that if we set $y_{j,S} := 1$ for each rectangle $R(j, S) \in \mathcal{R}'$ then we satisfy (IP2).

The cells \mathcal{C} induce a tree $G = (V, E)$ as follows. For each cell $C \in \mathcal{C}$ we introduce a vertex v_C in V . We connect two vertices $v_C, v_{C'}$ by an edge $\{v_C, v_{C'}\}$ if C is the parent cell of C' in the hierarchy, i.e., if $C' \subseteq C$ and C is of level ℓ and C' is of level $\ell + 1$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. We define that the root of G is the vertex that corresponds to the unique cell of level 0.

Let \mathcal{Q} denote the set of all paths in G for which one of the endpoints is the root of G . For convenience, for a path $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ we write $C \in Q$ if $v_C \in Q$ (i.e., abusing notation we also interpret Q as a set of cells). For each path $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ we define $\mathcal{R}(Q) := \cup_{C \in Q} \mathcal{R}(C)$, i.e., all rectangles assigned to cells on Q . Let \mathcal{I} denote the set of all intervals $I = [s, t]$ with $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$. For each interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$ we define $\mathcal{R}(I)$ as a set of all rectangles $R(j, S)$ such that $R(j, S)$ and $L(I)$ intersect.

Lemma 7. *For each interval $I = [s, t] \in \mathcal{I}$ there is a path $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\mathcal{R}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 6 the set $\mathcal{R}(I)$ contains exactly those rectangles $R(j, S)$ where $s \leq r_j \leq t$ and $t \in S$. Let $C_0, C_1, \dots, C_{\ell_{\max}}$ be the cells of level $0, 1, \dots, \ell_{\max}$ that contain t . Note that for each level there is exactly one such cell and $v_{C_{i+1}}$ must be the child of v_{C_i} for each i . This is precisely the path Q such that $\mathcal{R}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$: Let $R(j, S) \in \mathcal{R}(I)$. Then $t \in S$. This means the cell C which S is assigned to must also contain t (since $S \subseteq C$). Hence C is in the path Q and $R(j, S) \in \mathcal{R}(C) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$. \square

Next, we define a framework for approximating our problem by a dynamic program; in [BGK18] a similar framework was implicitly used. We will define a global solution $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ and for each path $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ a subset $\mathcal{R}'_Q \subseteq \mathcal{R}' \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)$. We will ensure that for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and each interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$ with $\mathcal{R}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$ the rectangles in \mathcal{R}'_Q are sufficient to satisfy the demand of $L(I)$. Also, we want the subsets $\{\mathcal{R}'_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ to be consistent in the sense that for two paths $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $Q \supseteq Q'$ (i.e., Q is an extension of Q'), the set \mathcal{R}'_Q can contain only those rectangles from cells in Q' that are contained in $\mathcal{R}'_{Q'}$ (but possibly \mathcal{R}'_Q does not contain all of them). Moreover, we want that for each set \mathcal{R}'_Q there are only polynomially many candidates. Therefore, we will require for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ that $\mathcal{R}'_Q \in \chi_Q$ for a family of sets χ_Q that we can compute in time $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$, and hence in particular $|\chi_Q| \leq (nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$. These properties will be useful for our dynamic program later.

Formally, we require $(\mathcal{R}', \{\mathcal{R}'_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}})$ to be a consistent solution as defined below. For any set of rectangles $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ we define $p(\mathcal{R}') := \sum_{R(j,S) \in \mathcal{R}'} p(j, S)$ and $c(\mathcal{R}') := \sum_{R(j,S) \in \mathcal{R}'} c(j, S)$.

Definition 8. Let $\{\chi_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ be a family with $\chi_Q \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$ for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Let $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ and $\{\mathcal{R}'_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ with $\mathcal{R}'_Q \in \chi_Q$ for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. We say that $(\mathcal{R}', \{\mathcal{R}'_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}})$ forms a *consistent solution* for $\{\chi_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ if

1. $\mathcal{R}'_Q \subseteq \mathcal{R}'$ for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$,
2. for each $I \in \mathcal{I}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $\mathcal{R}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$, we have that \mathcal{R}'_Q covers I , i.e., $p(\mathcal{R}'_Q \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq d(I)$,
3. for any two paths $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $Q \supseteq Q'$ we have that $\mathcal{R}'_Q \cap \mathcal{R}(Q') \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_{Q'}$.

We define $c(\mathcal{R}')$ to be the *cost* of $(\mathcal{R}', \{\mathcal{R}'_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}})$.

It should be noted that by Definition 8 the rectangles in \mathcal{R}' form a feasible solution. This follows from the first and second property and Lemma 7: For every interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$ there is a $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $\mathcal{R}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$. By the second property we have $p(\mathcal{R}'_Q \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq d(I)$ and since $\mathcal{R}'_Q \subseteq \mathcal{R}'$ we also have $p(\mathcal{R}' \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq d(I)$. We can compute the cheapest consistent solution for a given family $\{\chi_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ with an easy dynamic program.

Lemma 9. *Given a family $\{\chi_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$, we can compute the cheapest consistent solution for $\{\chi_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ in time $(|\mathcal{I}| \cdot |\mathcal{Q}| \cdot \max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |\chi_Q|)^{O(1)}$.*

Proof. We build a dynamic programming table that contains an entry for each pair (v, S') , where v is a vertex and $S' \in \chi_Q$ for Q which we define to be the path from the root to v . This entry stores a set of rectangles $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \bigcup_{Q': Q' \supseteq Q} \mathcal{R}(Q')$, that is, \mathcal{S} contains rectangles that belong to cells that are either descendants of v or on the path from v to the root. The set \mathcal{S} is chosen such that $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{R}(Q) = S'$ and $p(\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq d(I)$ for every $Q' \supseteq Q$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}$ with $\mathcal{R}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$. If there is no such \mathcal{S} then a special symbol indicates that the choice of S' is infeasible, that is, the value \mathcal{R}'_Q in a consistent solution cannot be S' .

We fill the table starting with the leaves and then compute each inner node's entries using the previously computed children's entries. Suppose that v is a leaf and let Q be the path from the root to v . We check for each $S' \in \chi_Q$ whether for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$ with $\mathcal{R}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$ it holds that $p(S' \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq d(I)$. If so, we store S' in the entry for (v, S') . Otherwise, we insert a special symbol indicating that the choice is infeasible.

Now let v be an inner node and let again Q be the path from root to v . Let $S' \in \chi_Q$. In the following we describe how to compute the table entry for (v, S') . Let u_1, \dots, u_K be the children of v and Q_1, \dots, Q_K the extension of Q to each child. For each $i = 1, \dots, K$ let $S'_i \in \chi_{Q_i}$ be the set S'_i with

$$S'_i \cap \mathcal{R}(Q) \subseteq S' \tag{6}$$

for which the set \mathcal{S}_i stored in (u_i, S'_i) minimizes $c(\mathcal{S}_i \setminus \mathcal{R}(Q))$. If for some i no such S'_i exists, then we determine that the choice S' is infeasible. Otherwise, we insert for (v, S') the entry

$$\mathcal{S} = S' \cup \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{S}_K.$$

Eventually, this dynamic program will compute various solutions for the root r , namely one solution \mathcal{S} for each $S' \in \chi_{\{r\}}$. As an overall solution \mathcal{S}^* we output the solution \mathcal{S} that minimizes $c(\mathcal{S})$. We define $\{\mathcal{S}^*_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ by memoization: Recall that $\mathcal{S}^* = S' \cup \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{S}_K$ where $S' \in \chi_{\{r\}}$, \mathcal{S}_i is the entry for (u_i, S'_i) , u_i is the i 'th child of r , and $S'_i \in \chi_{\{r, u_i\}}$. We set $\mathcal{S}^*_{\{r\}} = S'$. Likewise, we set $\mathcal{S}^*_{\{r, u_i\}} = \mathcal{S}_i$. Each \mathcal{S}_i is derived from selections at the children of u_i . In the same way we recursively define \mathcal{S}^*_Q on each path Q . Indeed, $(\mathcal{S}^*, \{\mathcal{S}^*_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}})$ forms a consistent solution:

Let $Q = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots, v_k\} \in \mathcal{Q}$ where v_1 is the root. For all $i \leq k$ let $Q^{(\leq i)} = \{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$. By construction we have that $\mathcal{S}^*_{Q^{(\leq i)}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}^*_{Q^{(\leq i-1)}}$. In particular,

$$\mathcal{S}^*_{Q^{(\leq k)}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}^*_{Q^{(\leq k-1)}} \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{S}^*_{Q^{(\leq 1)}} = \mathcal{S}^*.$$

This proves (1) of Definition 8. Moreover, by Equation (6) the dynamic program ensures that

$$\mathcal{S}_{Q^{(\leq k)}}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(Q^{(\leq k-1)}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{Q^{(\leq k-1)}}^*.$$

It follows for all $i < k$ that

$$\mathcal{S}_{Q^{(\leq k)}}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(Q^{(\leq i)}) = (\mathcal{S}_{Q^{(\leq k)}}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(Q^{(\leq k-1)})) \cap \mathcal{R}(Q^{(\leq i)}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{Q^{(\leq k-1)}}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(Q^{(\leq i)}).$$

Iterating this argument we obtain

$$\mathcal{S}_{Q^{(\leq k)}}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(Q^{(\leq i)}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{Q^{(\leq i)}}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(Q^{(\leq i)}) = \mathcal{S}_{Q^{(\leq i)}}^*.$$

and thus (3) of Definition 8 holds. Finally, we prove (2) of Definition 8. To this end let $I \in \mathcal{I}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $\mathcal{R}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$. We need to show that $p(\mathcal{S}_Q^* \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq d(I)$. Let $Q' \supseteq Q$ be any extension of Q ending in a leaf. Then also $\mathcal{R}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q')$. The way we define the dynamic program on leafs it holds that $p(\mathcal{S}_{Q'}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq d(I)$. Moreover, since we already showed (3) it follows that $\mathcal{S}_{Q'}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(Q) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_Q^*$. Hence,

$$p(\mathcal{S}_Q^* \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq p((\mathcal{S}_{Q'}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) = p(\mathcal{S}_{Q'}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq d(I).$$

It remains to check that this dynamic program indeed computes the cheapest consistent solution. To this end let $(\mathcal{R}', \{\mathcal{R}'_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}})$ be the cheapest consistent solution. We show inductively that for each path Q from the root to a vertex v the entry \mathcal{S} computed for (v, \mathcal{R}'_Q) satisfies $c(\mathcal{S}) \leq c(\bigcup_{Q' \supseteq Q} \mathcal{R}'_{Q'})$. It follows that \mathcal{S}^* is of minimal cost, because $c(\mathcal{S}^*)$ is at most the cost of the entry computed for $(r, \mathcal{R}'_{\{r\}})$ which is at most

$$c\left(\bigcup_{Q \supseteq \{r\}} \mathcal{R}'_Q\right) = c\left(\bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{R}'_Q\right) \leq c(\mathcal{R}').$$

If v is a leaf the claim is satisfied by definition, since the entry of the dynamic table is $\mathcal{R}'_Q = \bigcup_{Q' \supseteq Q} \mathcal{R}'_{Q'}$. Now assume that v is not a leaf. Let—as in the definition of the dynamic program— u_1, \dots, u_K be the children of v and Q_1, \dots, Q_K the extensions of Q to each child. Let $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_i$ be the entry computed for $(u_i, \mathcal{R}'_{Q_i})$, $i = 1, \dots, K$. By induction hypothesis we have for each $i = 1, \dots, K$ that $c(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_i) \leq c(\bigcup_{Q' \supseteq Q_i} \mathcal{R}'_{Q'})$. Since the rectangle sets in both sides contain the same rectangles from $\mathcal{R}(Q)$, namely $\mathcal{R}'_{Q_i} \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)$, we also have

$$c(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_i \setminus \mathcal{R}(Q)) \leq c\left(\bigcup_{Q' \supseteq Q_i} \mathcal{R}'_{Q'} \setminus \mathcal{R}(Q)\right).$$

The rectangles at entry (v, \mathcal{R}'_Q) were chosen as $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}'_Q \cup \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{S}_K$ where \mathcal{S}_i minimizes $c(\mathcal{S}_i \setminus \mathcal{R}(Q))$ over all entries \mathcal{S}_i at (u_i, \mathcal{S}'_i) with $\mathcal{S}'_i \in \chi_{Q_i}$ and $\mathcal{S}'_i \cap \mathcal{R}(Q) \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_{Q_i}$. Since $\mathcal{R}'_{Q_i} \cap \mathcal{R}(Q) \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_{Q_i}$ by property (3) of Definition 8, $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_i$ is among these candidates and in particular $c(\mathcal{S}_i \setminus \mathcal{R}(Q)) \leq c(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_i \setminus \mathcal{R}(Q))$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} c(\mathcal{S}) &\leq c(\mathcal{R}'_Q \cup \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{S}_K) \\ &\leq c(\mathcal{R}'_Q) + c\left(\bigcup_{Q' \supseteq Q_1} \mathcal{R}'_{Q'} \setminus \mathcal{R}(Q)\right) + \dots + c\left(\bigcup_{Q' \supseteq Q_K} \mathcal{R}'_{Q'} \setminus \mathcal{R}(Q)\right) \leq c\left(\bigcup_{Q' \supseteq Q} \mathcal{R}'_{Q'}\right). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof that $(\mathcal{S}^*, \{\mathcal{S}_Q^*\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}})$ is a consistent solution of minimal cost.

The claimed running time follows because there are $|\mathcal{Q}| \max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |\chi_Q|$ entries in the dynamic table, computing each leaf's entry requires $O(|\mathcal{I}| \cdot \max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |\chi_Q|)$ operations, and computing each inner vertex's entry requires $O(K \max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |\chi_Q|) \leq |\mathcal{Q}| \max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |\chi_Q|$ operations. \square

The hard part is to show that in polynomial time we can compute a polynomial size family $\{\chi_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ that admits a consistent solution of small cost. We will prove the following lemma in Section 4 and Section 5.

Lemma 10. *In time $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ we can compute a family $\{\chi_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ with $\max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |\chi_Q| \leq (nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ for which there exists a consistent solution of cost at most $(2 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}^{(\text{IP}^2)}$.*

Then Lemmas 9 and 10 yield a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm with a running time of $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$. The black-box reduction in [FKL19, Section 4] then implies our main result.

Theorem 11. *There exists a polynomial time $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for weighted flow time on a single machine when preemptions are allowed.*

4 Quasi-polynomial size consistent solution

In this section, we prove a weaker variant of Lemma 10 which already introduces several of our key techniques and leads to a quasi-polynomial $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation. More precisely, in this section we relax the condition in Lemma 10 on the size of each set χ_Q with $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ to $|\chi_Q| \leq (nP)^{O_\varepsilon(\log^2(nP))}$ and also the running time to $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(\log^2(nP))}$.

For each rectangle R we define a *density* ρ_R which approximately describes its cost-efficiency c_R/p_R . Instead of using this ratio directly, we define $\rho_R := (1 + \varepsilon)^k$ for the value $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $(1 + \varepsilon)^k \leq c_R/p_R < (1 + \varepsilon)^{k+1}$. In this way, ρ_R differs from c_R/p_R only by a small factor of $1 + \varepsilon$, but we ensure that there are only $O_\varepsilon(\log nP)$ different densities overall. Recall that we defined the set $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ for combinations of a job j and cell $C \in \mathcal{C}$ (which contains all rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(C)$ corresponding to j). By construction, almost all of these rectangles have the same cost c_R , apart from the leftmost rectangle in $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ whose cost might be higher. Thus, we can describe the densities of the rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ by only two values that we denote by $\rho_{j,C}, \rho'_{j,C}$. Formally, let $R, R' \in \mathcal{R}(j, C)$ be the leftmost and second leftmost rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$, respectively. We define $\rho_{j,C} := \rho_R$ and $\rho'_{j,C} := \rho_{R'}$; in case that $|\mathcal{R}(j, C)| \leq 1$ we define $\rho'_{j,C} := \infty$ and if $|\mathcal{R}(j, C)| = 0$ we define also $\rho_{j,C} := \infty$. Using these values $\rho_{j,C}$ and $\rho'_{j,C}$ we classify the sets $\{\mathcal{R}(j, C)\}_{j \in J, C \in \mathcal{C}}$ into types.

Definition 12. For a job j and a cell C with $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ we say that $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ is of *type* $\tau = (\rho, \rho', s)$ if $|\mathcal{R}(j, C)| = s$, $\rho_{j,C} = \rho$, and $\rho'_{j,C} = \rho'$.

It turns out that there are only $O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ different types $\tau = (\rho, \rho', s)$ arising in the input, since in each set $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ the costs of the leftmost and second leftmost rectangles differ only by a factor $O_\varepsilon(1)$, all rectangles have the same capacity, and $s = O_\varepsilon(1)$.

Lemma 13. *There are at most $O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ different types τ for which there exists a set $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ of type τ . Moreover, for each ρ there are only $O_\varepsilon(1)$ many pairs ρ', s for which there is a set $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ of type $\tau = (\rho, \rho', s)$.*

Proof. Consider a type $\tau = (\rho, \rho', s)$ for which there exists a set $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ of type τ . By Property 3 of Lemma 3 we have that $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, K^2\}$. Moreover, the costs of different rectangles within the same set $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ can only differ by a factor of K^2 : Recall, the rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ (and their costs) are derived from segments $\mathcal{S}(j, C)$. Let $S \in \text{Seg}(j, C)$. If S is not the leftmost segment in $\text{Seg}(j, C)$, then $c_S = w_j \text{len}(S) \leq w_j \text{len}(C)$ and $\text{len}(S)$ is either $\text{len}(C)/K^2$ or 1. The latter applies if $\ell(C) \in \{\ell_{\max}, \ell_{\max} - 1\}$ and therefore $\text{len}(C) \leq \text{off}_y K \leq K^2$. In both cases we can bound the cost of the rectangle from below by

$c_S \geq w_j \text{len}(C) \geq w_j \text{len}(C)/K^2$. Now suppose that S is the leftmost segment. Then $c_S = w_j(\text{end}(S) - r_j)$. Since this is at least $w_j \text{len}(S)$, the lower bound holds as before. Finally, notice that

$$\text{end}(S) - r_j \leq \text{len}(S) + \text{beg}(C) - r_j \leq \text{len}(S) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{len}(C)/K^i \leq \text{len}(S) + \text{len}(C) \cdot 2/K \leq \text{len}(C).$$

It follows that $c_S \leq w_j \text{len}(C)$. Hence, each rectangle in $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ has a cost between $w_j \text{len}(C)/K^2$ and $w_j \text{len}(C)$. This implies that $\rho/(K^2(1 + \varepsilon)) \leq \rho' \leq (1 + \varepsilon)K^2\rho$. The number of powers of $(1 + \varepsilon)$ in $[\rho/(K^2(1 + \varepsilon)), (1 + \varepsilon)K^2\rho]$ is only

$$O(\log_{1+\varepsilon}((1 + \varepsilon)^2 K^4)) \leq O_\varepsilon(1).$$

Hence for a fixed ρ , there are only $K^2 \cdot O_\varepsilon(1) = O_\varepsilon(1)$ types. We will show that $1/((1 + \varepsilon)P) \leq \rho \leq O_\varepsilon(n^3 P^2)$. The number of powers of $(1 + \varepsilon)$ in $[1/P, O_\varepsilon(n^3 P^2)]$ is

$$O(\log_{1+\varepsilon}(O_\varepsilon((1 + \varepsilon)n^3 P^3))) \leq O_\varepsilon(\log(nP)).$$

Therefore there are only $O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ possibilities for ρ and consequently $O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ relevant types overall.

Let us now prove the claimed bounds for ρ . Let R be the rectangle corresponding to ρ . Recall that the capacity p_R is bounded by P . Moreover, the cost c_R is defined as $w_j(t_2 - t_1)$ for some interval $[t_1, t_2]$. The right border t_2 is bounded by

$$\text{off}_x + \text{off}_y K^{\ell_{\max}} \leq 2K^{\ell_{\max}+1} \leq K^3 T \leq 2K^3 (\max_j r_j + \sum_j p_j) \leq 4K^3 \sum_j p_j \leq 4K^3 nP \leq O_\varepsilon(nP).$$

Recall by preprocessing we have $1 \leq w_j \leq O_\varepsilon(n^2 P)$. Hence $1 \leq c_R \leq O_\varepsilon(n^3 P^2)$. This means that

$$\rho \geq 1/(1 + \varepsilon) \cdot c_R/p_R \geq 1/(1 + \varepsilon) \cdot 1/P.$$

On the other hand

$$\rho \leq c_R/p_R \leq c_R \leq O_\varepsilon(n^3 P^2). \quad \square$$

Let $\mathcal{R}^* \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ be the rectangles corresponding to OPT^{IP2} . We define quantities that describe how much of its budget the solution \mathcal{R}^* spends within each cell C for sets $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ of each type $\tau = (\rho, \rho', s)$, and how much of this amount it spends on jobs for which it buys exactly the first s' rectangles, for each $s' \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Formally, for each cell C , each type $\tau = (\rho, \rho', s)$, and each $s' \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ let $\mathcal{R}^*(C, \tau, s')$ be the set of all rectangles $R \in \mathcal{R}^*$ for which there is a job j such that $R \in \mathcal{R}(j, C)$ and \mathcal{R}^* contains exactly the first s' rectangles from $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$. We define $B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s') := \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}^*(C, \tau, s')} c_R$.

We define now our solution \mathcal{R}' . For a cell C and a type τ the solution $\bigcup_{s'} \mathcal{R}^*(C, \tau, s')$ can be very complicated. Instead, we construct an algorithm GreedySelect which, intuitively, computes a simple solution of total cost at most $(2 + \varepsilon) \sum_{s'} B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')$ that covers as much of each ray $L(I)$ as the rectangles in $\bigcup_{s'} \mathcal{R}^*(C, \tau, s')$. For computing it, we need to know only $\{B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')\}_{s'}$. Then \mathcal{R}' will consist of the union of all these simple solutions for all cells $C \in \mathcal{Q}$ and types τ and for each path $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ we will simply define $\mathcal{R}'_Q := \mathcal{R}' \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)$. Then there are only $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(\log^2(nP))}$ options for \mathcal{R}'_Q since it depends only on the $O_\varepsilon(\log^2(nP))$ budgets $\{B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')\}_{C, s': C \in Q}$.

Procedure GreedySelect. Formally, the input of GreedySelect consists of a cell C , a type $\tau = (\rho, \rho', s)$, and for each $s' \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ a budget $B(s')$ (for the purpose of this section we can think this value as $B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')$). It selects rectangles of total cost at most $(2 + \varepsilon) \sum_{s'} B(s')$ from the sets in $\{\mathcal{R}(j, C)\}_j$ that are of type τ . We will denote by $\text{GreedySelect}(C, \tau, \{(B(s')\}_{s'})$ the computed rectangles.

Note that for two jobs j, j' for which $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ and $\mathcal{R}(j', C)$ are of the same type τ , the rectangles in these two sets look identical, up to a vertical shift (and they might have different costs). We first define a fractional solution greedily. For each job j for which $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ is of type τ and each $r \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ we define a value $x_{j,r}$ which denotes the fractional extent to which we select the r -th rectangle in $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$. Initially, we define $x_{j,r} = 0$ for each such variable. For each $s' = s, s-1, \dots, 1$ we start a phase in which we consider the jobs for which there is a $\tilde{s} \geq s'$ such that buying the first \tilde{s} rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ costs at most $B(\tilde{s})$. Observe that through the phases more and more jobs satisfy this condition and hence if a job is available in one phase then it will also be available in all future phases. We sort the corresponding jobs decreasingly by \prec (so in particular non-increasingly by their release dates) and we consider them in this order. Note that in our graphical visualization this orders the jobs from bottom to top. When we consider a job j , for all $r \leq s'$ we increase $x_{j,r}$ simultaneously by the same amount until either $x_{j,r} = 1$ for each such r or we paid exactly $(1 + \varepsilon)B_{s'}$ in this phase (fractionally). Hence, the fractional cost is $(1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{s'} B(s')$ by construction.

We chose our ordering for the jobs since our rays are vertical and downwards oriented and, hence, if a rectangle is located further down, it intersects with more rays whose demands it helps to satisfy. In particular, here we crucially exploit that for each interval I the corresponding object $L(I)$ is a vertical ray, rather than e.g., a line segment. Using this, we will show that if $B(s') \geq B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')$ for each s' then our fractional solution $\{x_{j,r}\}_{j,r}$ covers as much from each ray $I \in \mathcal{I}$ as the rectangles in $\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(C)$ of type τ . In the output of GreedySelect we select for each job j and each $r \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ the r -th rectangle in $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ if $x_{j,r} > 0$, i.e., intuitively we round up each variable $x_{j,r}$ with $x_{j,r} > 0$. We will show that for each r there is at most one job j such that $0 < x_{j,r} < 1$ and hence we pay additionally at most $\sum_{s'} B(s')$ due to the rounding.

Lemma 14. *Suppose that for each s' it holds that $B(s') \geq B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')$. Then for each interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$ it holds that $p(\text{GreedySelect}(C, \tau, \{(B(s')\}_{s'}) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq p(\bigcup_{s'} \mathcal{R}^*(C, \tau, s') \cap \mathcal{R}(I))$ and additionally $c(\text{GreedySelect}(C, \tau, \{(B(s')\}_{s'})) \leq (2 + \varepsilon) \sum_{s'} B(s')$.*

Proof. First, we claim that already the fractional solution covers as much from each $I \in \mathcal{I}$ as \mathcal{R}^* . To this end, let $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $L(I)$ intersects the r -th rectangle of each job of type τ in $\mathcal{R}(C)$. We want to show that the fractional solution covers $L(I)$ at least as much as \mathcal{R}^* .

We say that a job j is of *kind* k if k is the largest value k' such that buying the first k' rectangles of $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ costs at most $B(k')$ and one of the first k' rectangles of $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ intersects $L(I)$. Observe that some jobs are of no kind at all, however, such segments are not selected in \mathcal{R}^* (since $B(s') \geq B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')$ for each s') or do not intersect $L(I)$. In other words, it suffices to show that GreedySelect covers $L(I)$ at least as much as \mathcal{R}^* with rectangles that are of some kind k . Intuitively, if j is of kind k then k is the earliest round in which we might have selected rectangles of $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$.

Let \hat{s}' be the minimal value s' such that after iteration s' (which refers to the value of s' in this iteration; recall that these values decrease through the iterations) the algorithm has selected (possibly partially in previous iterations) the first $s' \geq r$ rectangles of all jobs of kind $k \geq s'$. Regarding rectangles of kinds k with $r \leq k < \hat{s}'$, we know that in each iteration $k < \hat{s}'$ GreedySelect spends by a factor of $1 + \varepsilon$ more budget than \mathcal{R}^* (since $B(k) \geq B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, k)$). Since we consider rectangles R of the same type τ , their ratios c_R/p_R can only differ by a factor of $(1 + \varepsilon)$. In particular, the rectangles of all kinds $k < \hat{s}'$ selected by the algorithm have a total (fractional) size that is at least as large as the corresponding rectangles in

\mathcal{R}^* . Also, we sort the corresponding jobs decreasingly by \prec and the rays $L(I)$ are vertical and downward oriented. This implies that $p(\text{GreedySelect}(C, \tau, \{(B(s'))_{s'}\} \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq p(\bigcup_{s'} \mathcal{R}^*(C, \tau, s') \cap \mathcal{R}(I))$ for each $I \in \mathcal{I}$.

By construction, the cost of the fractional solution is at most $(1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{s'} B(s')$. We argue that the cost increases by at most another $\sum_{s'} B(s')$ when we round up the fractional solution. To this end, we claim that in the fractional solution for each kind k and each $r \leq k$ there can be at most one job j of kind k such that for its r -th rectangle it holds that $0 < x_{j,r} < 1$. The claim is clearly true before the first iteration. Suppose that it is true after the iteration that corresponds to some value k' . Suppose that in the next iteration corresponding to $k' - 1$ a value $x_{j,r}$ is increased such that before $x_{j,r} = 0$. Let k be the kind of the corresponding job j . Assume by contradiction that there is some other variable $x_{j',r}$ with $0 < x_{j',r} < 1$ corresponding to some other job j' of kind k . If $j \prec j'$ then the algorithm would have increased $x_{j',r}$ instead of $x_{j,r}$ in this iteration $k' - 1$. If $j' \prec j$ then in the previous iteration in which $x_{j',r}$ was increased, it would have increased $x_{j,r}$ instead. Also, note that if a job j is of kind k then always $x_{j,r} = 0$ for each $r > k$.

When we round up the fractional solution, then for each kind k and each $r \leq k$ we round up at most one variable $x_{j,r}$ for a job j of kind k . The total cost of rounding up all these rectangles for this kind k is bounded by $B(k)$. Hence, the total cost of rounding up is bounded by $\sum_{s'} B(s')$ which yields a total cost of $(1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{s'} B(s') + \sum_{s'} B(s')$ as claimed. \square

Definition of consistent solution. As mentioned above, we define the set of all rectangles \mathcal{R}' in our solution by $\mathcal{R}' := \bigcup_C \bigcup_\tau \text{GreedySelect}(C, \tau, \{B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')\}_{s'})$. For each path $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ we define $\mathcal{R}'_Q := \mathcal{R}' \cap \bigcup_{C \in Q} \mathcal{R}(C)$ and observe that \mathcal{R}'_Q can be computed with GreedySelect once we know all $O_\varepsilon(\log^2(nP))$ budgets $\{B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')\}_{\tau, s', C: C \in Q}$. Each of them is an integer, bounded by $O_\varepsilon(nT \cdot \max_j w_j) \leq O_\varepsilon(n^4 P^2)$, which yields only $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(\log^2(nP))}$ possibilities overall. We define χ_Q to contain each of these possibilities. This proves Lemma 10 if we relax the condition on the size of each set χ_Q to $|\chi_Q| \leq (nP)^{O_\varepsilon(\log^2(nP))}$ and allow a running time of $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(\log^2(nP))}$.

5 Polynomial size consistent solution

In this section we prove Lemma 10 (without any relaxations of its statement). We start by defining the solution \mathcal{R}' and the sets $\{\mathcal{R}'_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$. Afterwards, we define the family $\{\chi_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$.

In the approach in Section 4 we guessed the values $\{B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')\}_{C, \tau, s'}$ and recovered an approximate solution using only them. For a path Q it seems unlikely to be able to guess all $O_\varepsilon(\log^2(nP))$ values $B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')$ corresponding to cells $C \in Q$ (or sufficiently strong approximate variants of them) in polynomial time. However, consider the values $\{B^{\text{opt}}(C)\}_{C \in \mathcal{C}}$, where $B^{\text{opt}}(C) = \sum_{\tau, s'} B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')$. Note that for each path $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ only the $O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ values in $\{B^{\text{opt}}(C)\}_{C \in Q}$ are relevant. Our first step is to construct suitable substitutes for these quantities that can be guessed efficiently. Whenever we say that we “guess a value x in time $O(f(n))$ ” for some function f we mean that in time $O(f(n))$ we can compute a set (which hence has size $O(f(n))$) that contains x . In the proof of the following lemma we use smoothing techniques due to [BGK18].

Lemma 15. *There are values $\{B^{\text{round}}(C)\}_{C \in \mathcal{C}}$ with the following properties*

- $B^{\text{round}}(C) \geq B^{\text{opt}}(C)$ for all C ,
- $\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B^{\text{round}}(C) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B^{\text{opt}}(C)$,

- for each path $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ we can guess in time $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ all values $\{B^{\text{round}}(C)\}_{C \in Q}$.

Proof. We set

$$B'(C) = B^{\text{opt}}(C) + \sum_{C': v_{C'} \text{ is ancestor of } v_C} B^{\text{opt}}(C') \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{K}\right)^{\text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'})}.$$

Then for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ we set $B^{\text{round}}(C) = (1 + \varepsilon)^k$ where $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $(1 + \varepsilon)^{k-1} < B'(C) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^k$. By the construction it is obvious that $B^{\text{round}}(C) \geq B^{\text{opt}}(C)$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Moreover, note that each cell C has at most K^i descendants C' with $\text{dist}(C, C') = i$. Hence

$$\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B'(C) \leq \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B^{\text{opt}}(C) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} K^i \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{K}\right)^i \leq \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B^{\text{opt}}(C) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^i \leq (1 + 2\varepsilon) \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B^{\text{opt}}(C).$$

Finally,

$$\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B^{\text{round}}(C) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B'(C) \leq (1 + 4\varepsilon) \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B^{\text{opt}}(C).$$

Let $\{C_1, \dots, C_k\} = Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ with C_1 being the root. Guessing $B^{\text{round}}(C_i)$ is equivalent to guessing $\lceil \log_{1+\varepsilon}(B'(C_i)) \rceil$. Notice that we have $B'(C_i) \geq \varepsilon B'(C_{i-1})$ for all $i = 2, \dots, k$. It follows that

$$\log_{1+\varepsilon}(B'(C_i)) \geq \log_{1+\varepsilon}(B'(C_{i-1})) + \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\varepsilon) \geq \log_{1+\varepsilon}(B'(C_{i-1})) - O_\varepsilon(1).$$

In other words, we want to guess values $q_1, \dots, q_k = O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ with $k = O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ such that for some $c \leq O_\varepsilon(1)$ it holds that $q_i > q_{i-1} - c$ for all i . By transforming $p_i = q_i + i \cdot c$ we obtain the problem of guessing values $p_1, \dots, p_k = O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ with $k = O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ such that $p_i > p_{i-1}$. This can be done in time $2^{O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))} = (nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$: We guess for all values $v \in \{1, 2, \dots, O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))\}$ whether $p_i = v$ for some i . After guessing, the first such v must be p_1 , the second must be p_2 , etc., because $p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_k$. Hence the values of p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k are fully determined. \square

Informally speaking, by this lemma we can assume that our algorithm knows all values $\{B^{\text{round}}(C)\}_{C \in \mathcal{Q}}$ when we consider a path Q .

Next, we divide all rectangles into small and large according to their cost compared to the total budget $B^{\text{round}}(C)$ of their cell C . Let $\delta > 0$ be a constant (depending only on ε) to be defined later. Consider a cell C and a job j with $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \neq \emptyset$. We say that j is *large* for C if for the leftmost rectangle $R \in \mathcal{R}(j, C)$ it holds that $c_R > \delta \cdot B^{\text{round}}(C)$, and j is *small* for C if $c_R \leq \delta \cdot B^{\text{round}}(C)$. We define $\mathcal{R}_{\text{large}} := \bigcup_C \bigcup_{j: j \text{ is large for } C} \mathcal{R}(j, C)$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{small}} := \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}$. Note that since the leftmost rectangle is always the most expensive one, for every small job j , all rectangles $R \in \mathcal{R}(j, C)$ satisfy $c_R \leq \delta B^{\text{round}}(C)$.

Intuitively, we will prove Lemma 10 separately for $\mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}$ and argue afterwards that this yields the complete proof of Lemma 10. More precisely, for these sets we will provide families $\{\chi_{\text{large}, Q}\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$, $\{\chi_{\text{small}, Q}\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ for which there exist consistent solutions that dominate \mathcal{R}^* on $\mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}, \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}$ according to the next definition.

Definition 16. Let $\mathcal{R}_{\text{subset}} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ and let $\{\chi_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ be a family with $\chi_Q \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{R}(Q)}$ for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. We say $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ is a *solution* for $\{\chi_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ that dominates \mathcal{R}^* on $\mathcal{R}_{\text{subset}}$ if

1. $\mathcal{R}'_Q \subseteq \mathcal{R}'$ for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$,
2. for each $I \in \mathcal{I}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $\mathcal{R}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$, we have that $\mathcal{R}'_Q \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{subset}}$ covers as much of I as $\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{subset}}$, i.e., $p(\mathcal{R}'_Q \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{subset}} \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq p(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{subset}} \cap \mathcal{R}(I))$,

3. for any two paths $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $Q \supseteq Q'$ we have that $\mathcal{R}'_Q \cap \mathcal{R}(Q') \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_{Q'}$.

We define $c(\mathcal{R}')$ to be the *cost* of $(\mathcal{R}', \{\mathcal{R}'_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}})$.

Notice that in the definition of the cost, we do not take the intersection with $\mathcal{R}_{\text{subset}}$. The reason is intuitively that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}$ are not known upfront, since they depend on the unknown values $\{B^{\text{round}}(C)\}_{C \in \mathcal{C}}$. Hence, when we select a set \mathcal{R}'_Q then we need to pay for all its rectangles and cannot, e.g., take the intersection with $\mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}$ or $\mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}$. We will prove the following two lemmas in Sections 5.1 and 5.2.

Lemma 17. *In time $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ we can compute a family $\{\chi_{\text{small},Q}\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ with $\max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |\chi_{\text{small},Q}| \leq (nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ for which there exists a consistent solution $(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}, \{\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q}\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}})$ that dominates \mathcal{R}^* on $\mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}$ and has cost at most $(2 + O(\varepsilon)) \cdot c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}) + O(K^8\delta + \varepsilon) \cdot c(\mathcal{R}^*)$.*

Lemma 18. *In time $(nP)^{O_{\varepsilon,\delta}(1)}$ we can compute a family $\{\chi_{\text{large},Q}\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ with $\max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |\chi_{\text{large},Q}| \leq (nP)^{O_{\varepsilon,\delta}(1)}$ for which there exists a consistent solution $(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}, \{\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large},Q}\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}})$ that dominates \mathcal{R}^* on $\mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}$ and has cost at most $2 \cdot c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}) + O(\varepsilon) \cdot c(\mathcal{R}^*)$.*

Together these lemmas imply Lemma 10.

Proof of Lemma 10. We define $\delta := \varepsilon/K^8$. We first compute the families $\{\chi_{\text{large},Q}\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$, $\{\chi_{\text{small},Q}\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ in time $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ according to Lemmas 18 and 17. For each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ we define that χ_Q contains the set $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large},Q} \cup \mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q}$ for each combination of a set $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large},Q} \in \chi_{\text{large},Q}$ and a set $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q} \in \chi_{\text{small},Q}$. Then $|\chi_Q| \leq (nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ as required. Then Lemmas 18 and 17 imply that for $\{\chi_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ there exists a consistent solution of cost at most $(2 + O(\varepsilon))c(\mathcal{R}^*) = (2 + O(\varepsilon))\text{OPT}^{(\text{IP}^2)}$. \square

5.1 Consistent solution for small rectangles

This section is dedicated to proving Lemma 17. Recall that in the quasi-polynomial construction, for defining a set \mathcal{R}'_Q we guessed the $O_\varepsilon(\log^2(nP))$ values $\{B^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')\}_{C, \tau, s': C \in Q}$. Since in this section we focus on small rectangles, let $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')$ denote the budgets that \mathcal{R}^* spends on buying the first s' rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(C)$ of type τ . In our polynomial time procedure we want to guess only $O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ of them for each path Q . The strategy for this is to increase the budgets slightly. Intuitively, in each cell C we want to spend more budget than \mathcal{R}^* on rectangles from sets $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ with good densities $\rho_{j,C}, \rho'_{j,C}$ and hence select more such rectangles. It will turn out that these additional rectangles cover as much of each line segment $L(I)$ as the rectangles from sets $\mathcal{R}(j', C')$ with *bad* cost-efficiencies $\rho_{j',C'}, \rho'_{j',C'}$ where $v_{C'}$ is an ancestor of v_C . Therefore, in \mathcal{R}'_Q we do not need rectangles from the sets $\mathcal{R}(C', \tau, s')$ for of types τ with such bad cost-efficiencies. Thus we do not need to guess the corresponding budget $\{B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C', \tau, s')\}_{s'}$ when we define \mathcal{R}'_Q . Additionally, for each cell C the selection of very efficient rectangles will simplify drastically. Namely, we select all rectangles that have a very low density ρ until some given budget is exhausted. Thus, for the types τ corresponding to these low densities we do need to guess all corresponding budgets $\{B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C', \tau, s')\}_{s'}$ but only one single value that describes the total budget used for all of them. We remark that a similar strategy was used in [BGK18].

To this end, for each cell C we define an additional budget $B^{\text{add}}(C)$. Intuitively, each cell C donates a budget of $\varepsilon \cdot B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C)$ to its descendent cells and the received amount of each descendent cell drops exponentially. From these donations, each cell C receives an additional budget of

$$B^{\text{add}}(C) := \sum_{C': v_{C'} \text{ is ancestor of } v_C} B^{\text{round}}(C') \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{K}\right)^{\text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'})}, \quad (7)$$

where $\text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'})$ is the distance of v_C and $v_{C'}$. In fact, we used a similar procedure in the proof of Lemma 15.

Lemma 19. *We have that $\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B^{\text{add}}(C) \leq 2\varepsilon \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B^{\text{round}}(C)$.*

Proof. Notice that each cell C has at most K^i descendants C' with $\text{dist}(C, C') = i$. Hence

$$\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B^{\text{add}}(C) \leq \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B^{\text{round}}(C) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} K^i \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{K}\right)^i \leq \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B^{\text{round}}(C) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^i \leq 2\varepsilon \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} B^{\text{round}}(C). \quad \square$$

For each cell C we partition $B^{\text{add}}(C)$ equally among the pairs $s, s' \in \{1, \dots, K^2\}$ with $s' \leq s$. To this end, we define $B^{\text{add}}(C, s, s') := B^{\text{add}}(C)/K^4$ for each such pair s, s' .

We sort the density pairs (ρ, ρ') lexicographically and we write $(\rho, \rho') <_L (\hat{\rho}, \hat{\rho}')$ if (ρ, ρ') is lexicographically smaller than $(\hat{\rho}, \hat{\rho}')$. Our strategy is to define a *critical density pair* $\gamma(C, s, s')$ for each cell $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and each pairs of values $s, s' \in \{1, \dots, K^2\}$ with $s' \leq s$. In our solution $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$, intuitively for each cell $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and each value $s \in \{1, \dots, K^2\}$ select rectangles as follows:

1. for each $s' \leq s$ and each type $\tau = (\rho, \rho', s)$ with $(\rho, \rho') <_L \gamma(C, s, s')$ we select the first s' rectangles from *each* set $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ of type τ such that j is small for C ; one can imagine that we have infinite budget for these types τ and these values of s' when we run GreedySelect,
2. all other rectangles of each type $\tau = (\rho, \rho', s)$ are selected with GreedySelect and budgets $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')$; one special case is the type $\tau = (\rho, \rho', s)$ with $(\rho, \rho') = \gamma(C, s, s')$ for each value s' , where we use an increased budget of $B^{\text{round}}(C, \tau, s') + B^{\text{add}}(C, s, s')$ in order to select some additional rectangles of relatively good densities.

Note that for the selections due to step 1, for a cell C we need to know only the $O_\varepsilon(1)$ values $\gamma(C, s, s')$. We will ensure that for a given path $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ we can guess these values for each cell $C \in Q$ in time $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$. For selecting rectangles due to step 2, we need to know the budgets $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')$. We will not guess them exactly, but sufficiently good estimates that we will denote by $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, \tau, s')$. For a path $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ these can be up to $O_\varepsilon(\log^2(nP))$ values which is too much. Therefore, when we define \mathcal{R}'_Q we omit the rectangles of some types τ in some cells $C \in Q$. More precisely, we will make sure that in total there are only $O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ combinations of a cell $C \in Q$ and a type τ for which we add rectangles to \mathcal{R}'_Q in step 2. Intuitively, these omitted rectangles will be compensated by additional rectangles with relatively good densities that we select when we use the additional budget of $B^{\text{add}}(C, s, s')$ above. We will ensure that we can guess the $O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ needed values $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, \tau, s')$ in time $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$. Note that we can guess the needed values $B^{\text{add}}(C, s, s')$ easily by Lemma 15 and (7).

5.1.1 Definition of critical density pairs

For defining the critical density pairs $\gamma(C, s, s')$, we define a procedure GreedyIncrease. Given a cell C , a value s , the budgets $\{B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s')\}_{\rho, \rho', s'}$, and the additional budgets $B^{\text{add}}(C, s, s')$, GreedyIncrease sorts the density pairs (ρ, ρ') in lexicographically increasing order. For each of these pairs (ρ, ρ') it runs a slight variation of GreedySelect in order to select rectangles of type (ρ, ρ', s) . To this end, we define a procedure GreedySelectSmall($C, B^{\text{round}}(C), \tau, \{B_S(s')\}_{s'}$): this procedure first identifies all jobs j that are small for C according to the given value $B^{\text{round}}(C)$, and then on them it runs GreedySelect($C, \tau, \{B_S(s')\}_{s'}$) as defined in Section 4.

In the iteration for the density pair (ρ, ρ') we call GreedySelectSmall as follows: for each $s' \leq s$ let $\hat{B}_{s'}$ denote the total cost spent on buying exactly the first s' rectangles of jobs. For each $s' \leq s$,

1. if $\hat{B}_{s'} < B^{\text{add}}(C, s, s') + \sum_{(\hat{\rho}, \hat{\rho}') <_L (\rho, \rho')} B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\hat{\rho}, \hat{\rho}', s), s')$ (i.e., in this case we have not spent much more than \mathcal{R}^* on buying the first s' rectangles of the jobs of densities $(\hat{\rho}, \hat{\rho}') <_L (\rho, \rho')$) then we define $B(s') := B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') + B^{\text{add}}(C, s, s')$,
2. if $\hat{B}_{s'} \geq B^{\text{add}}(C, s, s') + \sum_{(\hat{\rho}, \hat{\rho}') <_L (\rho, \rho')} B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\hat{\rho}, \hat{\rho}', s), s')$ then we define $B(s') := B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s')$.

Then we call GreedySelectSmall($C, B^{\text{round}}(C), (\rho, \rho', s), \{B_{s'}\}_{s'}$). For each $s' \leq s$ we define $\gamma(C, s, s')$ to be the lexicographically largest density pair (ρ, ρ') such that case 1 applies for s' for type (ρ, ρ', s) ; in the corner case that case 2 never applies we set $\gamma(C, s, s') = (\infty, \infty)$. Note that in the iteration of each type (ρ, ρ', s) with $(\rho, \rho') \leq_L \gamma(C, s, s')$ case 1 applies for s' , and in the iteration of each type (ρ, ρ', s) with $(\rho, \rho') >_L \gamma(C, s, s')$ case 2 applies for s' .

Now an important observation is that in the calls to GreedySelectSmall we could change the value of $B(s')$ from $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') + B^{\text{add}}(C, s, s')$ to ∞ if $(\rho, \rho') <_L \gamma(C, s, s')$ without affecting the returned rectangles. Using this idea it will turn out that we do not require to know the respective value $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s')$ in those cases. As we still need to guess some of the remaining values, we will define a guessing scheme for density pairs $(\rho, \rho') \geq_L \gamma(C, s, s')$. More precisely, instead of a value $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')$ we will use an estimate $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, \tau, s')$ which we will guess, using the following lemma.

Lemma 20. *Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Define $\Gamma(C) = \{\gamma(C, s, s') : s, s'\}$. There are values $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, \tau, s')$ for each τ , and s' with the following properties*

- for each C, τ, s' it holds that $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, \tau, s') \geq B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')$,
- for each C, s, s' and each $(\rho_0, \rho'_0) \in \Gamma(C)$ it holds that

$$\sum_{(\rho, \rho') \geq_L (\rho_0, \rho'_0)} B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{K^4} B^{\text{round}}(C) + (1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{(\rho, \rho') \geq_L (\rho_0, \rho'_0)} B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s'),$$

- given $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C)$, $(\rho_0, \rho'_0) \in \Gamma(C)$, and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we can guess the values $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s')$ for the first ℓ many (with respect to lexicographic order) density pairs (ρ, ρ') satisfying $(\rho, \rho') \geq_L (\rho_0, \rho'_0)$ in time $2^{O_\varepsilon(\ell)}$.

Proof. Let $(\rho^{(1)}, \rho'^{(1)}), (\rho^{(2)}, \rho'^{(2)}), \dots, (\rho^{(m-1)}, \rho'^{(m-1)})$ be the density pairs in $\Gamma(C)$ in lexicographically increasing order. Moreover, let $(\rho^{(0)}, \rho'^{(0)}) = (-\infty, -\infty)$ and $(\rho^{(m)}, \rho'^{(m)}) = (\infty, \infty)$. Intuitively we will prove the lemma independently on each set of density pairs that for some given h contains all densities (ρ, ρ') with $(\rho^{(h)}, \rho'^{(h)}) \leq_L (\rho, \rho') <_L (\rho^{(h+1)}, \rho'^{(h+1)})$.

More precisely, for each h we will prove that there are values $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s')$ for all s, s' and (ρ, ρ') with $(\rho^{(h)}, \rho'^{(h)}) \leq_L (\rho, \rho') <_L (\rho^{(h+1)}, \rho'^{(h+1)})$ such that:

1. for each s, s' and (ρ, ρ') , with $(\rho^{(h)}, \rho'^{(h)}) \leq_L (\rho, \rho') <_L (\rho^{(h+1)}, \rho'^{(h+1)})$ it holds that

$$B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') \geq B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s'),$$

2. for each s, s' it holds that

$$\sum_{(\rho^{(h)}, \rho'^{(h)}) \leq_L (\rho, \rho') <_L (\rho^{(h+1)}, \rho'^{(h+1)})} B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{K^8} B^{\text{round}}(C) + (1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{(\rho^{(h)}, \rho'^{(h)}) \leq_L (\rho, \rho') <_L (\rho^{(h+1)}, \rho'^{(h+1)})} B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s'),$$

3. given $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C)$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we can guess the values $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s')$ for the first ℓ many (with respect to lexicographic order) density pairs (ρ, ρ') satisfying $(\rho^{(h)}, \rho'^{(h)}) \leq_L (\rho, \rho') <_L (\rho^{(h+1)}, \rho'^{(h+1)})$ in time $2^{O_\varepsilon(\ell)}$.

In the last property we assume that the ℓ -th density pair is still lexicographically smaller than $(\rho^{(h+1)}, \rho'^{(h+1)})$. Using $|\Gamma(C)| \leq K^4$ it is not hard to see that the claim above implies the lemma.

Fix some h . Let $(\rho_0, \rho'_0), (\rho_1, \rho'_1), \dots, (\rho_k, \rho'_k)$ denote the density pairs (ρ, ρ') with $(\rho^{(h)}, \rho'^{(h)}) \leq_L (\rho, \rho') <_L (\rho^{(h+1)}, \rho'^{(h+1)})$ in lexicographically increasing order starting with $(\rho_0, \rho'_0) = (\rho^{(h)}, \rho'^{(h)})$. For each $i = 0, \dots, k$ we set

$$B'(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s') = \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{4K^8}\right)^{i+1} B^{\text{round}}(C) + \sum_{j=0}^i \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right)^{i-j} B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s').$$

Moreover, define $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s') = (1 + \varepsilon/4)^k$ where $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with

$$(1 + \varepsilon/4)^{k-1} < B'(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s') \leq (1 + \varepsilon/4)^k.$$

Clearly $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s') \geq B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s')$ for all i . Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^k B'(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s') &\leq B^{\text{round}}(C) \sum_{i=0}^k \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{4K^8}\right)^{i+1} + \sum_{i=0}^k B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s') \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right)^j \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2K^8} B^{\text{round}}(C) + (1 + \varepsilon/2) \sum_{i=0}^k B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s'). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^k B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s') &\leq (1 + \varepsilon/4) \sum_{i=0}^k B'(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s') \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{K^8} B^{\text{round}}(C) + (1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{i=0}^k B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s'). \end{aligned}$$

Guessing the first ℓ values of $B^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s')$ is equivalent to guessing the first ℓ values of

$$\lfloor \log_{1+\varepsilon/4}(B'(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s')) \rfloor.$$

Notice that

$$B'(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s') \leq \varepsilon/4 \cdot B^{\text{round}}(C) + B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s') \leq (1 + \varepsilon/4)B^{\text{round}}(C)$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ and $B'(C, (\rho_0, \rho'_0, s), s') \geq \varepsilon/(4K^4) \cdot B^{\text{round}}(C)$. Moreover, from the definition of B' it follows easily that $B'(C, (\rho_{i+1}, \rho'_{i+1}, s), s') \geq \varepsilon B'(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s')$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k-1$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \lfloor \log_{1+\varepsilon/4}(B'(C, (\rho_{i+1}, \rho'_{i+1}, s), s')) \rfloor &\geq \lfloor \log_{1+\varepsilon/4}(B'(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s')) + \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\varepsilon) \rfloor \\ &\geq \lfloor \log_{1+\varepsilon/4}(B'(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s')) \rfloor - O_\varepsilon(1). \end{aligned}$$

Define $q_i := \lfloor \log_{1+\varepsilon/4}(B'(C, (\rho_i, \rho'_i, s), s')) \rfloor$ for each i . Then there exists some $c = O_\varepsilon(1)$ such that $q_{i+1} > q_i - c$ for each i . Moreover, $q_1 \geq \log(B^{\text{round}}(C)) - O_\varepsilon(1)$ and $q_i \leq \log(B^{\text{round}}(C)) + O_\varepsilon(1) \leq q_1 + O_\varepsilon(1)$ for each i . Guessing each q_i is equivalent to guessing q_1 and each $p_i := q_i - q_1 + c \cdot i$. The former can be done in time $O_\varepsilon(1)$. For the latter observe that $p_{i+1} > p_i$ and $0 \leq p_i \leq O_\varepsilon(\ell)$ for each i . Therefore, we can guess all values p_i in time $2^{O_\varepsilon(\ell)}$ as follows. First, we guess in time $2^{O_\varepsilon(\ell)}$ which values in $\{0, \dots, O_\varepsilon(\ell)\}$ are attained by some p_i . The values of p_1, p_2, \dots, p_ℓ are then fully defined then: the first value that is attained must be p_1 , the second p_2 , etc. Then the values $\{p_i\}_i$ imply the values $B^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s')$. \square

Our strategy now is the following: we define a solution $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$ with a procedure that is very similar to GreedyIncrease above. The main difference is that we use the values $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, \tau, s')$ instead of the values $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')$. Then, for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ we define a solution $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}, Q}$ for which we first guess the values $B^{\text{round}}(C)$ and $\gamma(C, s, s')$ for each $C \in Q$ and then define a value ℓ_C for each cell $C \in Q$ such that $\sum_{C \in Q} \ell(C) \leq O_\varepsilon(\log nP)$. Then we will guess each value $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, \tau, s')$ for each cell $C \in Q$, each s, s' , and the first ℓ_C types $\tau = (\rho, \rho', s)$ (i.e., the ℓ_C lexicographically smallest types) with $(\rho, \rho') \geq_L \gamma(C, s, s')$. For these types we add rectangles to $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}, Q}$ via GreedySelectSmall. Due to Lemma 20 we can guess all needed quantities in time $\prod_{C \in Q} 2^{O_\varepsilon(\ell_C)} \leq (nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$.

5.1.2 Definition of solution $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$

We now define the solution $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$ based on the values $B^{\text{round}}(C)$, $\gamma(C, s, s')$, and $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, \tau, s')$ defined above. We will produce a solution similar to the one returned by GreedyIncrease; the main difference being that we will use the budgets $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, \tau, s')$ instead of the budgets $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, \tau, s')$. Recall that in GreedyIncrease, for a value s , a density pair (ρ, ρ') , and a value s' with $(\rho, \rho') <_L \gamma(C, s, s')$, we could change the budget $B(s')$ to ∞ without affecting the returned rectangles.

Formally, for each cell C , each s , and each density pair (ρ, ρ') and we add to $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$ the rectangles returned by GreedySelectSmall($C, B^{\text{round}}(C), (\rho, \rho', s), B(s')$) where

$$B(s') = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } (\rho, \rho') <_L \gamma(C, s, s'), \\ B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') + B^{\text{add}}(C, s, s') & \text{if } (\rho, \rho') = \gamma(C, s, s'), \\ B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') & \text{if } (\rho, \rho') >_L \gamma(C, s, s'). \end{cases}$$

Lemma 21. *It holds that $c(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}) \leq (2 + O(\varepsilon))c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}) + O(K^8\delta + \varepsilon)c(\mathcal{R}^*)$.*

Proof. For a cell C , all s, s' , and all $(\rho, \rho') <_L \gamma(C, s, s')$ we define $B^{\text{actual}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s')$ as the cost of rectangles in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$ which belong to some $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ of density pair (ρ, ρ') , with $|\mathcal{R}(j, C)| = s$, and of which

exactly the first s' rectangles are selected. By the definition of $\gamma(C, s, s')$ we have that

$$\sum_{(\rho, \rho') <_L \gamma(C, s, s')} B^{\text{actual}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') < \sum_{(\rho, \rho') <_L \gamma(C, s, s')} B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') + B^{\text{add}}(C, s, s')$$

for all C, s, s' . Moreover, from the definition of GreedySelectSmall, one can observe easily that changing the value $B(s')$ from ∞ to $B^{\text{actual}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s')$ does not change the outcome in the construction of $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$: If it did, then the call to GreedySelectSmall with the original parameters would have spent more than $B^{\text{actual}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s')$, a contradiction. We can therefore calculate the cost of $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$ as if it was defined with these modified parameters. By an easy modification of Lemma 14 one can show that the cost for each C, τ , and s that GreedySelectSmall spends is at most

$$\min\left\{(1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{s'} B_S(s') + K^4 \delta B^{\text{round}}(C), (2 + \varepsilon) \sum_{s'} B(s')\right\},$$

where $B(s')$ are the budgets passed to GreedySelectSmall, since the fractional solution computed by GreedySelectSmall has a cost of $(1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{s'} B(s')$ and afterwards we round up at most K^4 variables corresponding to at most K^2 small jobs, which incurs an additional cost of at most $K^4 \delta B^{\text{round}}(C)$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} c(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}) &\leq \sum_{C, s, s'} \left(\sum_{(\rho, \rho') <_L \gamma(C, s, s')} B^{\text{actual}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') \right. \\ &\quad + (1 + \varepsilon)(B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\gamma(C, s, s'), s), s') + B^{\text{add}}(C, s, s')) + K^4 \delta B^{\text{round}}(C) \\ &\quad \left. + (2 + \varepsilon) \sum_{(\rho, \rho') >_L \gamma(C, s, s')} B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{C, s, s'} \left(\sum_{(\rho, \rho') <_L \gamma(C, s, s')} B^{\text{actual}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') \right. \\ &\quad + (2 + \varepsilon) \sum_{(\rho, \rho') \geq_L \gamma(C, s, s')} B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') \\ &\quad \left. + (1 + \varepsilon)B^{\text{add}}(C, s, s') + K^4 \delta B^{\text{round}}(C) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{C, s, s'} \left(\sum_{(\rho, \rho') <_L \gamma(C, s, s')} B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') \right. \\ &\quad + (1 + \varepsilon)(2 + \varepsilon) \sum_{(\rho, \rho') \geq_L \gamma(C, s, s')} B_{\text{small}}^{\text{opt}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s') \\ &\quad \left. + (2 + \varepsilon)B^{\text{add}}(C, s, s') + (K^4 \delta + \varepsilon/K^4)B^{\text{round}}(C) \right) \\ &\leq (2 + 4\varepsilon)c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}) + 2\varepsilon(2 + \varepsilon) \sum_C B^{\text{round}}(C) + (K^4 \delta + \varepsilon/K^4) \sum_{C, s, s'} B^{\text{round}}(C) \\ &\leq (2 + 4\varepsilon)c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}) + (K^8 \delta + 6\varepsilon) \sum_C B^{\text{round}}(C) \\ &\leq (2 + 4\varepsilon)c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}) + (K^8 \delta + 6\varepsilon)(1 + \varepsilon)c(\mathcal{R}^*) \\ &\leq (2 + O(\varepsilon))c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}) + O(K^8 \delta + \varepsilon)c(\mathcal{R}^*). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

5.1.3 Definition of solutions $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q}$

We now define the solutions $\{\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q}\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$. Let $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Let C_1, C_2, \dots, C_ℓ be the cells in Q ordered by increasing distance from the root. Intuitively, the set $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q}$ contains all rectangles in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}} \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)$ that we will use in order to satisfy the demand of intervals $I = [s, t]$ such that $t \in C_\ell$. Note that then $t \in C$ for each $C \in Q$. The trick is that $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q}$ does not necessarily need to contain all segments in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}} \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)$ (thanks to the additional budgets $B^{\text{add}}(C)$ from which we selected additional rectangles with relatively good cost-efficiencies) but potentially only a subset for which there will be only few options. In this way, we will ensure that $|\chi_Q| \leq (nP)^{O(1)}$.

We start with the rectangles in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}} \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)$ and omit some of them in the following. Consider some cell $C \in Q$, which is not one of the two bottom-most cells, i.e., $C \notin \{C_\ell, C_{\ell-1}\}$. For each s we define $r(s, C, Q) \leq s$ such that for any set $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ with $|\mathcal{R}(j, C)| = s$ the $r(s, C, Q)$ -th rectangle intersects with C_ℓ ; we define $r(s, C, Q) = 0$ if no rectangle in $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ intersects with C_ℓ . Observe that this is the same value for each such set $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ and this set can contain only one rectangle that intersects with C_ℓ .

Consider a job j . Assume that $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$ contains exactly the first s' rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$. If $s' < r(s, C, Q)$ then we omit all rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$; if $s' \geq r(s, C, Q)$ then we omit all but the first $r(s, C, Q)$ rectangles from $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$. We do this for each job j .

Next, we will omit rectangles of high densities under certain circumstances; intuitively, because they have become obsolete due to other rectangles that we selected additionally with the additional budgets $B^{\text{add}}(C)$. For every C_j with $j < \ell - 1$ we define $\sigma^-(C_j, Q)$ as the lexicographically minimal density pair $\gamma(C_j, s, r(s, C, Q))$ over all s with $r(s, C, Q) \neq 0$. Consider some C_i that is an ancestor of C_j , i.e., $i < j$. Recall that $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$ has spent an additional budget of $B^{\text{add}}(C_j)/K^4$ compared to the optimal solution on rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(C_j)$ of densities $(\rho, \rho') \leq_L \sigma^-(C_j, Q)$. This can be used to compensate for omitting all rectangles in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}} \cap \mathcal{R}(C_i)$ of density $(\rho, \rho') \geq_L (K^7/\varepsilon)^{j-i} \sigma^-(C_j, Q)$ (multiplication component-wise). Therefore, we define $H = (1 + \varepsilon)^k$ where

$$(1 + \varepsilon)^k \leq K^7/\varepsilon < (1 + \varepsilon)^{k+1}$$

and let $\sigma^+(C_i, Q)$ be the lexicographically minimal density pair $H^{j-i} \sigma^-(C_j, Q)$ over all $j \in \{i+1, i+2, \dots, \ell-2\}$. We omit from $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$ all rectangles in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}} \cap \mathcal{R}(C_i)$ of density $(\rho, \rho') \geq_L \sigma^+(C_i, Q)$.

We define that $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q}$ contains all rectangles in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$ that are not omitted by the rules above. We apply the construction above for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. We will argue that this fulfills the three properties of Definition 16 on the small rectangles $\mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}$. The first and third property are fulfilled by construction. The latter holds since if $Q \supseteq Q'$ then $\sigma^+(C, Q) \leq_L \sigma^+(C, Q')$ for each $C \in Q'$ as in Q there are more values $\sigma^-(C_j, Q)$ that can affect $\sigma^+(C, Q)$.

Proposition 22. *For each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ it holds that $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q} \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$. Also, for any two paths $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $Q \supseteq Q'$ we have that $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q} \cap \mathcal{R}(Q') \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q'}$.*

In the next lemma we show that also the second property holds.

Lemma 23. *Let $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}$ with $\mathcal{R}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$. Then*

$$p(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q} \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}} \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq d(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}} \cap \mathcal{R}(I)).$$

Proof. Consider the solution $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$ and let $C \in Q$. We have by Lemma 14 (with straightforward adaption to GreedySelectSmall) for each type τ that

$$p(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}} \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}(C, \tau) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq p(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}(C, \tau) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)),$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}(C, \tau)$ are the small rectangles of type τ in $\mathcal{R}(C)$. In particular, if we sum over all types, the solution $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$ covers $L(I)$ at least as much as $\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}$. If $L(I)$ fully traverses C (the ray begins above C) we have, in fact, a slightly stronger relation. Let $(\rho^-, \rho'^-) = \sigma^-(C, Q)$. If $\rho^- < \infty$ then there is some s such that in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}}$ we payed an extra budget of $B^{\text{add}}(C, s, r(s, C, Q)) = B^{\text{add}}(C)/K^4$ compared to $\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}$ for buying the first $r(s, C, Q)$ rectangles of some jobs j with $|\mathcal{R}(j, C)| = s$ that have density at most (ρ^-, ρ'^-) . These jobs cover at least volume of

$$\frac{1}{s'\rho^-} \cdot \frac{B^{\text{add}}(C)}{K^4} \geq \frac{1}{K^6\rho^-} B^{\text{add}}(C).$$

If $\rho^- = \infty$ then we interpret the term as 0. Hence it still holds. Thus

$$p(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}} \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}(C) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq p(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}(C) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) + \frac{B^{\text{add}}(C)}{K^6\rho^-}.$$

On the other hand, when we compare for a cell C_i the rectangles $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q} \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}(C_i) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)$ and $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small}} \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{small}}(C_i) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)$ we have removed rectangles of the densities greater than $\sigma^+(C_i, Q)$. If $\sigma^+(C_i, Q) = (\infty, \infty)$, nothing is removed and we cover enough of $L(I)$. Hence assume otherwise. By definition of $\sigma^+(C_i, Q)$ we know that there is a cell C_j , $i < j < \ell - 1$ with $\sigma^+(C_i, Q) = H^{j-i}\sigma^-(C_j, Q)$, where $H \geq K^7/\varepsilon$. Let $(\rho^+, \rho'^+) = \sigma^+(C_i, Q)$. Notice that $B^{\text{add}}(C_j)/K^4 \geq \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} (\varepsilon/K)^{j-k}/K^4 \cdot B^{\text{round}}(C_k)$. We will charge the deleted rectangles in C_i against the summand for $k = i$ in the sum above. In cell C_j we cover an additional volume of

$$\frac{(\varepsilon/K)^{j-i}}{K^6\rho^-} B^{\text{round}}(C_i) \geq \frac{(\varepsilon/K)^{j-i}}{K^6(K^7/\varepsilon)^{i-j}\rho^+} B^{\text{round}}(C_i) \geq \frac{1}{\rho^+} B^{\text{round}}(C_i).$$

The right-hand side is an upper bound for the volume that has been deleted. Thus, the deleted volume is less than the added volume. Notice that we can assume $L(I)$ fully traverses C_j . If it does not, then $L(I)$ does not hit C_i and the deleted volume in C_i is irrelevant. Since all deleted rectangles are higher than those added, the ray $L(I)$ is still covered. \square

5.1.4 Definition of families $\{\chi_{\text{small},Q}\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$

Let $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$; we want to define the set $\chi_{\text{small},Q}$. Recall that we want to ensure that $|\chi_{\text{small},Q}| \leq (nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$. We argue that for $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q}$ there are at most $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ options and we define $\chi_{\text{small},Q}$ to be the family of sets that contains each of these possible options. Let C_1, C_2, \dots, C_ℓ be the cells in Q from root to bottom. We will argue that $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q}$ is completely defined once we know

1. the budget $B^{\text{round}}(C)$ for each cell $C \in Q$ (which imply $B^{\text{add}}(C)$ for each cell $C \in Q$),
2. for each $i < \ell - 1$ whether $\sigma^+(C_i, Q) \geq \sigma^-(C_i, Q)$ and if so the values of $\sigma^+(C_i, Q)$ and $\sigma^-(C_i, Q)$,
3. for each $i < \ell - 1$, and s, s' with $s' \geq r(s, C_i, Q)$
 - (a) whether (i) $\gamma(C_i, s, s') < \sigma^-(C_i, Q)$, (ii) $\gamma(C_i, s, s') > \sigma^+(C_i, Q)$, or (iii) $\sigma^-(C_i, Q) \leq \gamma(C_i, s, s') \leq \sigma^+(C_i, Q)$,
 - (b) the budgets $B^{\text{round}}_{\text{small}}(C_i, (\rho, \rho', s), s')$ for all $\sigma^-(C_i, Q) \leq_L (\rho, \rho') <_L \sigma^+(C_i, Q)$,
 - (c) in case of (iii) also the density pair $\gamma(C_i, s, s')$,
4. the density pair $\gamma(C_i, s, s')$ and budgets $B^{\text{round}}_{\text{small}}(C_i, (\rho, \rho', s), s')$ for $i \in \{\ell - 1, \ell\}$, s, s' , and $(\rho, \rho') \geq_L \gamma(C_i, s, s')$.

Reconstructing $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q}$. We assume we are given the information above and argue that this suffices to reconstruct $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q}$. For cells C_ℓ and $C_{\ell-1}$ we know all parameters passed to GreedySelectSmall when constructing the rectangles of the solution, hence these are easy. Now let C_i be a cell with $i < \ell - 1$. Let (ρ, ρ') be a density pair that is lexicographically smaller than $\sigma^-(C_i, Q)$ and let j be a small job with this density pair and $s = |\mathcal{R}(j, C)|$. Then we know that $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q}$ selects exactly the first $r(s, C, Q)$ rectangles of $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ (provided that $r(s, C, Q) \neq 0$). On the other hand, for density pairs (ρ, ρ') that are lexicographically bigger than $\sigma^+(C_i, Q)$ we know that $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{small},Q}$ does not select any rectangles. Hence, we can focus on the density pairs (ρ, ρ') with $\sigma^-(C_i, Q) \leq (\rho, \rho') \leq \sigma^+(C_i, Q)$. For such densities we again know all parameters that are passed to GreedySelect when constructing the rectangles of the solution.

Guessing relevant quantities. Let us now argue why the mentioned values can be guessed efficiently. By Lemma 15 we can guess in time $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ all values in $\{B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C)\}_{C \in Q}$. In time $O_\varepsilon(\log^{O_\varepsilon(1)}(nP))$ we can guess the values $\gamma(C_i, s, s')$ for $i \in \{\ell - 1, \ell\}$ and all s, s' . Notice that $\gamma(C_i, s, s') \in \Gamma(C_i)$ and $\sigma^-(C_i, Q) \in \Gamma(C_i)$ for all C_i, s, s' . Here $\Gamma(C_i)$ is defined as in Lemma 20, namely

$$\Gamma(C_i) = \{\gamma(C_i, s, s') : s, s'\}.$$

In particular, by Lemma 20 we can guess in time $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ the budgets $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C_i, (\rho, \rho', s), s')$ for $i \in \{\ell - 1, \ell\}$, s, s' , and $(\rho, \rho') \geq_L \gamma(C_i, s, s')$. Next, we will guess the values $\{\sigma^+(C_i, Q)\}_{i=1}^{\ell-2}$. Here observe that for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell - 3$

$$\sigma^+(C_i, Q) \leq_L H \cdot \sigma^+(C_{i+1}, Q),$$

where $H \leq (1 + \varepsilon)K^7/\varepsilon \leq O_\varepsilon(1)$. This is because $\sigma^+(C_{i+1}, Q)$ is defined as the lexicographic minimum density pair $H^{j-(i+1)}\sigma^-(C_j, Q)$ over all $j \in \{i + 2, i + 3, \dots, \ell - 2\}$. Let C_j be the cell that achieves the minimum. Then it follows that $\sigma^+(C_i, Q) \leq_L H^{j-i} \cdot \sigma^-(C_j, Q) = H \cdot \sigma^+(C_{i+1}, Q)$. This enables us to guess all values $\sigma^+(C_i, Q)$ efficiently.

Lemma 24. *In time $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ we can guess all values $\{\sigma^+(C_i, Q)\}_{i=1}^{\ell-2}$.*

Proof. Let $(\rho_i, \rho'_i) = \sigma^+(C_i, Q)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell - 2$. It suffices to guess all values $\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_{\ell-2}$: By Lemma 13 we know that given these values there are only $O_\varepsilon(1)$ possible values for each ρ'_i . Hence all these values can be guessed in $2^{O_\varepsilon(\ell-2)} = (nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ time. To guess the values ρ_i , we exploit that $\rho_{i+1} \geq \varepsilon/K^7 \cdot \rho_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell - 3$. In other words, $\log_{1+\varepsilon}(\rho_{i+1}) \geq \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\rho_i) + \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\varepsilon/K^7)$. Our task is to guess some non-negative integers $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{\ell-2} \leq O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ such that $\ell - 2 \leq O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ and there is some $c = O_\varepsilon(1)$ with $q_{i+1} > q_i - c$ for all i . By transforming to $p_i = q_i + i \cdot c$ we get the equivalent problem of guessing values $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{\ell-2} \leq O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ such that $\ell - 2 \leq O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ and $p_{i+1} > p_i$ for all i . This can be done in time $2^{O_\varepsilon(nP)} = (nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$: We guess for each $v \in \{0, 1, \dots, O_\varepsilon(nP)\}$ whether there is some i with $p_i = v$. After this the values $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{\ell-2}$ are fully defined. The first such value must be p_1 , the second p_2 , etc. \square

Now consider the values $\sigma^-(C, Q)$. Since these are only $O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$ many, we can guess in time $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ which of them satisfy $\sigma^-(C, Q) \geq_L \sigma^+(C, Q)$. For such cells C we do not need to guess any budgets $B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s')$. On the other hand, consider some C_i where $\sigma^-(C_i, Q)$ does not satisfy the inequality above. Then it holds that

$$\sigma^+(C_i, Q) >_L \sigma^-(C_i, Q) \geq_L \frac{1}{H} \sigma^+(C_{i-1}, Q).$$

Intuitively, it is easy to guess $\sigma^-(C_i, Q)$ unless $\sigma^+(C_i, Q)$ is much larger than $\sigma^+(C_{i-1}, Q)$. Although this is possible, it cannot happen often as shown by the following lemma.

Lemma 25. For each $i = 1, \dots, \ell - 2$ let ℓ_{C_i} be the number of pairs (ρ, ρ') with

$$\sigma^+(C_{i+1}, Q) >_L (\rho, \rho') \geq_L \frac{1}{H} \sigma^+(C_i, Q).$$

Then $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell-2} \ell_{C_i} \leq O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$.

Proof. Let $(\rho_i, \rho'_i) = \sigma^+(C_i, Q)$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell - 2$. Since $H \leq O_\varepsilon(1)$ the number of values ρ with $\rho_{i+1} \geq \rho \geq H^{-1}\rho_i$ is at most $O_\varepsilon(\max\{0, \log(\rho_{i+1}/(H^{-1}\rho_i))\}) = O_\varepsilon(\max\{0, \log(\rho_{i+1}/\rho_i)\})$. By Lemma 13 we have that the number of density pairs (ρ, ρ') such that $\rho_{i+1} \geq \rho \geq \varepsilon/K^7 \cdot \rho_i$ is also at most $O_\varepsilon(\max\{0, \log(\rho_{i+1}/\rho_i)\})$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \ell_{C_i} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} O_\varepsilon \left(\max \left\{ 0, \log \frac{\rho_{i+1}}{\rho_i} \right\} \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} O_\varepsilon \left(\log \frac{\rho_{i+1}}{\rho_i} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} O_\varepsilon \left(\min \left\{ 0, \log \frac{\rho_{i+1}}{\rho_i} \right\} \right) \\ &\leq O_\varepsilon(\ell) + O_\varepsilon \left(\log \frac{\rho_\ell}{\rho_1} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} O_\varepsilon \left(\max \left\{ 0, \log \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_{i+1}} \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $O_\varepsilon(\ell) \leq O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$, $O_\varepsilon(\log(\rho_\ell/\rho_1)) \geq O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$, and $\rho_{i+1} \geq \varepsilon/K^7 \cdot \rho_i$ for all i . It follows that $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \ell_{C_i} \leq O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))$. \square

Lemma 26. In time $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ we can guess all values $\{\sigma^-(C_i, Q)\}_{i=1}^{\ell-2}$ for which $\sigma^-(C, Q) <_L \sigma^+(C, Q)$.

Proof. By Lemma 25 there are only ℓ_C candidates for $\sigma^-(C, Q)$ for each $C \in Q$. Hence we guess each of them in time ℓ_C yielding an overall time of

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\ell-2} \ell_{C_i} \leq \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-2} 2^{\ell_{C_i}} \leq 2^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell-2} \ell_{C_i}} \leq 2^{O_\varepsilon(\log(nP))} \leq (nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}. \quad \square$$

Regarding the budgets $\{B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s')\}_{s'}$, there are only $K^4 \sum_{C \in Q} \ell_C \leq O_\varepsilon(\log nP)$ combinations of a cell C , a pair (ρ, ρ') such that $\sigma^-(C, Q) \leq_L (\rho, \rho') <_L \sigma^+(C, Q)$, and values s, s' . Therefore, for all these combinations the budgets $\{B_{\text{small}}^{\text{round}}(C, (\rho, \rho', s), s')\}_{s'}$ can be guessed in time $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ by Lemma 20. This completes the proof of Lemma 17.

5.2 Consistent solution for large rectangles

In this section we prove Lemma 18. Observe that for each cell C there can be at most $1/\delta$ jobs that are large for C and such that $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}^* \neq \emptyset$. In particular, for a path $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ there can be at most $|Q|/\delta \leq O_\varepsilon((\log nP)/\delta)$ jobs that are large for a cell $C \in Q$ and such that $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}^* \neq \emptyset$.

First, for each cell C we define $B_{\text{large}}^{\text{opt}}(C) := \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(C) \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}} c_R$ and we define $B_{\text{large}}^{\text{round}}(C)$ to be the smallest multiple of $\varepsilon \cdot B_{\text{large}}^{\text{round}}(C)$ that is larger than $B_{\text{large}}^{\text{opt}}(C)$. Our strategy is to define a solution $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}$ that for each cell C spends at most $2 \cdot B_{\text{large}}^{\text{opt}}(C)$ on rectangles of jobs that are large for C . Then, for each path $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ we define a solution $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q} \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}$.

Type groups. First, we form groups of job types. We say that two types $(\rho, \rho', s), (\bar{\rho}, \bar{\rho}', \bar{s})$ are in the same group if $\rho/\rho' = \bar{\rho}/\bar{\rho}'$ and $s = \bar{s}$. The intuition is that jobs of the same type behave similarly w.r.t. ρ and ρ' ; therefore, we will consider the jobs of each group separately. This is possible since there are only constantly many groups.

Lemma 27. *There are at most $O_\varepsilon(1)$ different groups.*

Proof. Consider a job j , a cell C , and a set of rectangles $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ of a type (ρ, ρ', s) . Assume that S is the segment corresponding to the first rectangle $R \in \mathcal{R}(j, C)$, and assume that S' is the segment corresponding to the second rectangle $R' \in \mathcal{R}(j, C)$. Then it holds that $c_R = w_j(\text{end}(S) - r_j)$ and $c_{R'} = w_j(\text{end}(S') - \text{beg}(S'))$.

We first note that since $|\text{Seg}(j, C)| \leq K^2$ (see Lemma 3), it holds that $s \in \{1, \dots, K^2\}$ and hence there are only $K^2 = O_\varepsilon(1)$ options for s . We claim that for ρ/ρ' there are also only $O_\varepsilon(1)$ options. Let $C(\ell_{\max}), C(\ell_{\max} - 1), \dots, C(k) = C$ be the cells in the construction of $\text{Seg}(j)$ (see Section 2). Then it holds that $\text{beg}(S) - r_j \leq \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell_{\max}} \text{len}(C(i)) \leq \text{len}(C(k))$ since the widths of the cells are geometrically increasing. Hence, $\text{end}(S) - r_j \leq 2 \cdot \text{len}(C)$. On the other hand, the segment corresponding to R' equals the grid cell C' of some level $\ell(C) + 2$ (see Lemma 3) and thus $\text{end}(S') - \text{beg}(S') = \text{len}(C)K^2$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\rho}{\rho'} = \frac{c_R}{c_{R'}} = \frac{\text{end}(S) - r_j}{\text{end}(S') - \text{beg}(S')} \leq \frac{2\text{len}(C)}{\text{len}(C)/K^2} = 2K^2 = O_\varepsilon(1). \quad \square$$

We say that a set $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ is *in group g* if j is of a type τ in group g .

5.2.1 Definition of $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}$

Let C be a cell. We want to define $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(C)$ and to this end, we consider separately each group g and define which rectangles we select from the sets $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ of group g . Let $k(C, g) =: k \leq 1/\delta$ denote the number of jobs of group g for which there is at least one rectangle contained in $\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}(C)$. Denote by j_1, \dots, j_k the corresponding jobs. For each job $j \in \{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$ denote by $s'(j)$ the number of its rectangles that are contained in \mathcal{R}^* . For each $k' \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we define a budget $B_{\text{large}, g, k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$ which intuitively (over-)estimates the part of $B_{\text{large}}^{\text{round}}(C)$ that is used for the rectangles of job $j_{k'}$. Formally, we define that $B_{\text{large}, g, k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$ is the smallest integral multiple of $\varepsilon\delta \cdot B_{\text{large}}^{\text{round}}(C)$ that is at least as large as $c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(C, j_{k'}))$. Note that therefore $\sum_{k'=1}^k B_{\text{large}, g, k'}^{\text{round}}(C) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)B_{\text{large}}^{\text{round}}(C)$.

Later, when we define the families $\{\chi_{\text{large}, Q}\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$, we will not be able to guess the jobs $\{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$ directly, not even their exact processing times $\{p_{j_1}, \dots, p_{j_k}\}$. However, intuitively we will be able to guess $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -estimates of their processing times. To this end, we define $\bar{p}_j := (1 + \varepsilon)^h$ for each job j where

$$(1 + \varepsilon)^h \leq p_j < (1 + \varepsilon)^{h+1}$$

and our goal later will be to guess the values $\{\bar{p}_{j_1}, \dots, \bar{p}_{j_k}\}$. Then, for each value k' we know that \mathcal{R}^* selects the first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles of some job j with $\bar{p}_j = \bar{p}_{j_{k'}}$ and these rectangles cost at most $B_{\text{large}, g, k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$ in total (and we can afford to spend $B_{\text{large}, g, k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$). Unfortunately, it is not clear how to find this job j . In particular, there can be two candidate jobs j, j' such that $j \prec j'$ and hence the rectangles of j potentially intersect with fewer rays than the rectangles of j' , but on the other hand $p_j > p_{j'}$. Even though $p_j \leq (1 + \varepsilon)p_{j'}$, the difference $p_j - p_{j'}$ might be critical for whether a ray is completely covered or not. Therefore, it is not clear which job we should select, j or j' . A similar situation can occur with $\omega(1)$ jobs, rather than only j and j' .

To remedy this issue, our strategy is that for each k' we find *two* jobs with processing time at least $\bar{p}_{j_{k'}}$ and for which selecting the first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles costs at most $B_{\text{large},g,k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$ each. In this way, we pay at most $2 \cdot B_{\text{large},g,k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$ for the rectangles of these two jobs and we will ensure that together they cover as much as the rectangles of $j_{k'}$ in \mathcal{R}^* . More precisely, observe that for any two jobs $j^{(1)}, j^{(2)}$ with $\bar{p}_{j^{(1)}} = \bar{p}_{j^{(2)}} = \bar{p}_{j_{k'}}$ it holds that $p_{j^{(1)}} + p_{j^{(2)}} \geq \frac{2}{1+\varepsilon} p_{j_{k'}}$. In fact, $\frac{2}{1+\varepsilon} p_{j_{k'}}$ is by a constant factor larger than $p_{j_{k'}}$ (so we cover substantially more) which will be crucial later in order to argue that we can omit some of the large rectangles when we define the sets \mathcal{R}'_Q , i.e., an omitted rectangle $R \in \mathcal{R}(Q)$ is included in \mathcal{R}' but not in \mathcal{R}'_Q .

Unfortunately, it might be that we do not find two such jobs $j^{(1)}, j^{(2)}$ for a job $j_{k'} \in \{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$. For example, this happens if $j_{k'}$ is the job with largest processing time for which the first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles cost at most $B_{\text{large},g,k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$ and for any other job j it holds that $\bar{p}_j < \bar{p}_{j_{k'}}$. Our strategy is to guess such a job $j_{k'}$ directly. To this end, for each $k' \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we consider the k jobs j with maximum processing time in group g with $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \neq \emptyset$ such that buying the first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles of j costs at most $B_{\text{large},g,k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$. Let $J_{\text{high},g,k'}(C)$ denote the corresponding jobs for k' , and let $J_{\text{high},g}(C) := \bigcup_{k' \in \{1, \dots, k\}} J_{\text{high},g,k'}(C)$. Note that $|J_{\text{high},g}(C)| \leq k^2 \leq 1/\delta^2$. If a job $j_{k'}$ is contained in $J_{\text{high},g}(C)$ then we select the first $s'(j_{k'})$ of its rectangles, i.e., add them to $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}$. We call j *easy*. Later, we can guess the easy jobs in time $2^{1/\delta^2}$ since they are all contained in $J_{\text{high},g}(C)$. If a job $j \in \{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$ is not easy then we call j *hard*. Denote by $J_{\text{easy},g}(C)$ and $J_{\text{hard},g}(C)$ the easy and hard jobs in $\{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$, respectively.

Hard jobs. We describe now which rectangles we select in order to cover as much as the rectangles of the hard jobs in $\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(C)$. To this end, we partition the jobs in $\{j_1, \dots, j_k\} \cap J_{\text{hard},g}(C)$ according to the values $\bar{p}_{j_1}, \dots, \bar{p}_{j_k}$, i.e., in each set of the partition each job j has the same value \bar{p}_j . Let $J' = \{j'_1, \dots, j'_{|J'|}\} \subseteq \{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$ be a set of this partition. Assume that these jobs are ordered non-increasingly according to \prec , i.e., $j'_{k'+1} \prec j'_{k'}$ for each k' . In particular, note that the rectangles of $j'_{k'}$ are further down than the rectangles of $j'_{k'+1}$ for each k' . We consider the jobs in J' in this order. Consider a job $j_{k'} \in J'$. We define two jobs $j^{(1)}, j^{(2)}$ such that $j^{(1)}$ and $j^{(2)}$ are the two maximal jobs j according to \prec (i.e., $j \prec j^{(1)}$ and $j \prec j^{(2)}$ for any candidate job j with $j \neq j^{(1)}$ and $j \neq j^{(2)}$) with the properties that

- $\bar{p}_j = \bar{p}_{j_{k'}}$,
- j is in group g and $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \neq \emptyset$,
- buying the first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles of j costs at most $B_{\text{large},g,k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$,
- j is smaller according to \prec than the last job $\hat{j} \notin J_{\text{high},g}(C)$ with $\bar{p}_j = \bar{p}_{\hat{j}}$ from which we have selected rectangles before (in the first iteration this condition does not apply; in particular \hat{j} is not defined yet).

If we find two such jobs $j^{(1)}, j^{(2)}$ then one can show that together their respective first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles cover as much as the first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles of $j_{k'}$. More formally, for job j and each ℓ let $\mathcal{R}_\ell(j, C) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(j, C)$ denote the first ℓ rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$; then for each interval I one can show that

$$d\left(\left(\mathcal{R}_{s'(j_{k'})}(j^{(1)}, C) \cup \mathcal{R}_{s'(j_{k'})}(j^{(2)}, C)\right) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)\right) \geq d\left(\mathcal{R}_{s'(j_{k'})}(j_{k'}, C) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)\right).$$

Intuitively, we would like to select the respective first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles of $j^{(1)}$ and $j^{(2)}$ (i.e., add them to $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}$) and continue with the next job in J' . However, it might be that $j = j^{(1)}$ and $j^{(2)} \in J'$. Then we cannot use the rectangles from $j^{(2)}$ to argue later that we cover strictly more than $\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(C)$ (which

will be crucial later), because some rectangles from $j^{(2)}$ are already included in \mathcal{R}^* . Instead, if $j_{k'} = j^{(1)}$ then we do not select rectangles from $j^{(2)}$ (to avoid the case that $j^{(2)} \in J'$) but instead select rectangles from some job $\tilde{j} \in J_{\text{high},g}(C) \setminus J_{\text{easy},g}(C)$ from which we have not yet selected any rectangle. In particular, then $\tilde{j} \notin J'$ and the mentioned problem does not occur.

Formally, we distinguish the two cases

- $j_{k'} \neq j^{(1)}$: we select the first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles from $j^{(1)}$ and $j^{(2)}$. Then potentially $j_{k'} = j^{(2)}$ but we will ensure that $j^{(1)} \neq j \neq j^{(2)}$ for each job $j \in \{j_{k'+1}, \dots, j_k\}$,
- $j_{k'} = j^{(1)}$: we select the first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles from $j^{(1)}$ and additionally the first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles from the job in $\tilde{j} \in J_{\text{high},g} \setminus J_{\text{easy},g}(C)$ with largest processing time among all jobs in $J_{\text{high},g} \setminus J_{\text{easy},g}(C)$ for which buying the first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles costs at most $B_{\text{large},g,k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$ and from which we have not selected any rectangle so far. Using that $|J_{\text{high},g,k'}| = k$ (if $|J_{\text{high},g,k'}| < k$ then $j_{k'}$ would not be hard), one can show that we always find such a job \tilde{j} .

We will show that $j^{(1)}$ is always defined since $j_{k'}$ itself will always be a candidate. The job $j^{(2)}$ might not be defined though; however, then the second case applies and thus our procedure is well-defined.

We repeat the procedure above for each set of the partition according to the values $\bar{p}_{j_1}, \dots, \bar{p}_{j_k}$ which completes the our treatment of group g . Let $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}(C) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}(C)$ denote the set of all rectangles selected by this procedure for the cell C . We do this procedure for each cell $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and finally define $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}} := \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}(C)$.

Lemma 28. *It holds that $c(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}) \leq 2c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}) + 3\varepsilon \cdot c(\mathcal{R}^*)$.*

Proof. Consider a cell C and a group g . Let $J(g)$ denote the set of all jobs j such that $\mathcal{R}(C, j)$ is in group g . Let $J^*(g) := \{j_1, \dots, j_k\} \subseteq J(g)$ be the jobs from $J(g)$ for which $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}^* \neq \emptyset$. For each job $j_{k'} \in \{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$ we bought the first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles of two jobs for which buying the first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles costs at most $B_{\text{large},g,k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$. This yields a total cost of at most $2 \sum_{k'=1}^k B_{\text{large},g,k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$. For each $k' \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we have that $B_{\text{large},g,k'}^{\text{round}}(C) \leq c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(C, j_{k'})) + \varepsilon\delta \cdot B_{\text{large}}^{\text{round}}(C)$. Across all groups, there can be at most $1/\delta$ jobs j that are large for C and which satisfy $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}^* \neq \emptyset$. Thus, if we define $B_{\text{large},g,j_{k'}}^{\text{round}}(C)$ to be the value $B_{\text{large},g,k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$ that corresponds to the job $j_{k'}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
c(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(C)) &\leq \sum_g \sum_{j_{k'} \in J^*(g)} 2 \cdot B_{\text{large},g,j_{k'}}^{\text{round}}(C) \\
&\leq \sum_g \sum_{j_{k'} \in J^*(g)} 2 \left(c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(C, j_{k'})) + \varepsilon\delta \cdot B_{\text{large}}^{\text{round}}(C) \right) \\
&\leq 2c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(C)) + 2\varepsilon \cdot B_{\text{large}}^{\text{round}}(C).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
c(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}) &= \sum_C c(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(C)) \\
&\leq \sum_C \left(2c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(C)) + 2\varepsilon \cdot B_{\text{large}}^{\text{round}}(C) \right) \\
&\leq 2c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}) + 2\varepsilon \sum_C B_{\text{large}}^{\text{round}}(C) \\
&\leq 2c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}) + 2(1 + \varepsilon)\varepsilon \sum_C B^{\text{round}}(C) \\
&\leq 2c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}) + 2(1 + \varepsilon)^2 \varepsilon c(\mathcal{R}^*). \\
&\leq 2c(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}) + 3\varepsilon c(\mathcal{R}^*).
\end{aligned}$$

□

5.2.2 Definition of the sets $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large},Q}$

We define now the sets $\left\{ \mathcal{R}'_{\text{large},Q} \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$ with $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large},Q} \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}$ for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Let $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Let $v_{\tilde{C}}$ be the bottom-most vertex of Q and let $v_{\tilde{C}'}$ be its parent vertex; hence, \tilde{C} and \tilde{C}' are their associated cells. The set $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large},Q}$ will contain all rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(Q) \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}$ that we will use in order to satisfy the demand of intervals $I = [s, t)$ such that $t \in \tilde{C}$. One might think that those are the rectangles in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)$. However, $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large},Q}$ will not necessarily contain *all* rectangles in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)$ but potentially only a *subset*. We will ensure that for this subset there will be only few options, which will ensure that $|\chi_Q| \leq (nP)^{O(1)}$.

Consider a cell $C \in Q$ and a group g . First, for each job $j \in J_{\text{easy},g}(C)$ we add to $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large},Q}$ all rectangles in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(j, C)$. Intuitively, regarding the hard jobs, for each hard jobs j with $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}^* \neq \emptyset$ we selected rectangles from *two* jobs $j^{(1)}, j^{(2)}$. Therefore, for each interval I we selected rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(I)$ with larger total capacity than \mathcal{R}^* . Therefore, when we define $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large},Q}$ we can omit some of the rectangles in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)$. We will ensure that for the remaining rectangles there are only few options.

For each cell $C \in Q$ and each job j with $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ we add the rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}$ to $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large},Q}$ only if the pair (C, \bar{p}_j) is *relevant*. Formally, for each pair (C, \bar{p}) where $C \in Q$ and \bar{p} is a power of $1 + \varepsilon$, we say that the pair (C, \bar{p}) is *irrelevant* if

1. there is no hard job j with $\bar{p}_j = \bar{p}$ for which $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}^*$ contains a rectangle $R(j, S')$ with $\tilde{C} \subseteq S'$
or
2. if there is a hard job $j' \in J_{\text{hard},g}(C')$ for some cell $C' \in Q \setminus \{\tilde{C}, \tilde{C}'\}$ such that
 - $v_{C'}$ is a descendant of v_C ,
 - $\bar{p} \leq \bar{p}_{j'} \cdot \delta \cdot \varepsilon^{\text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'})}$, and
 - \mathcal{R}^* contains a rectangle $R(j', S')$ such that $\tilde{C} \subseteq S'$.

Otherwise, we say that (C, \bar{p}) is *relevant*.

Note that if (C, \bar{p}) is irrelevant because of condition 2., then for the mentioned (hard) job j' we considered *two* jobs $(j^{(1)})$ and additionally $j^{(2)}$ or \tilde{j} whose total processing time is at least $2p_j/(1 + \varepsilon)$, and we added to $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}$ the rectangle $R(j^{(1)}, S')$ and additionally $R(j^{(2)}, S')$ or $R(\tilde{j}, S')$. Hence, these

rectangles together cover more than $R(j', S')$ (essentially at least twice as much) and this additional coverage compensates for all rectangles in \mathcal{R}^* corresponding to the pair (C, \bar{p}) (which is irrelevant due to j'). Note that for each irrelevant pair (C, \bar{p}) there can be at most $1/\delta$ corresponding sets $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ with $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}^* \neq \emptyset$. For each relevant pair (C, \bar{p}) we add to $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q}$ all rectangles in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}$ that belong to a set $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ with $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}} \neq \emptyset$ and $\bar{p} = \bar{p}_j$.

By construction, it follows that $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q} \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}$. Also, with the above intuition, we can prove that $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q}$ covers as much from each interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$ with $\mathcal{R}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$ as the large rectangles in \mathcal{R}^* .

Lemma 29. *For each $I \in \mathcal{I}$ with $\mathcal{R}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$ we have $p(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q} \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq p(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(I))$.*

Proof. First, we observe that for each cell $C \in Q$ and each group g , the set $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q}$ contains all rectangles in $\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(Q)$ that correspond to (easy) jobs in $J_{\text{easy}, g}(C)$.

Consider a cell $C \in Q$, a group g and a (hard) job $j \in J_{\text{hard}, g}(C)$ with $\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(j, C) \neq \emptyset$. Recall that when we defined $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}$, at some point we considered this cell C and the group g . We considered the corresponding hard jobs $\{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$. We had one iteration for each job $j_{k'} \in \{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$ and in one of these iterations $j_{k'} = j$. Then we defined the jobs $j^{(1)}, j^{(2)}, \tilde{j}$ and added the first $s'(j_{k'})$ rectangles of either both $j^{(1)}$ and $j^{(2)}$, or of both $j^{(1)}$ and \tilde{j} . In the former case we define $J(j) := \{j^{(1)}, j^{(2)}\}$, in the latter case we define $J(j) := \{j^{(1)}, \tilde{j}\}$. Also, in case that $C' \notin \{\tilde{C}, \tilde{C}'\}$, there might be some rectangles in $\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}}$ that are irrelevant due to j , in which case we define $\mathcal{R}^{\text{ir}}(j)$ to be all of these rectangles, i.e., all rectangles $R \in \mathcal{R}(j', C')$ for some job j' and a cell C' such that v_C is a descendant of $v_{C'}$, $\bar{p}_{j'} \leq \bar{p}_j \cdot \varepsilon \delta \cdot \varepsilon^{\text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'})}$, and \mathcal{R}^* contains a rectangle $R(j, S)$ such that $\tilde{C} \subseteq S$.

Let $I \in \mathcal{I}$ with $\mathcal{R}(I) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Q)$. We want to show that

$$p(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q} \cap \bigcup_{j' \in J(j)} \mathcal{R}(j', C) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \geq p((\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cup \mathcal{R}^{\text{ir}}(j)) \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(I)). \quad (8)$$

We distinguish two cases. First consider the case that $J(j) := \{j^{(1)}, j^{(2)}\}$. Recall that $\bar{p}_{j^{(1)}} = \bar{p}_{j^{(2)}} = \bar{p}_j$. Also, $j^{(1)}$ and $j^{(2)}$ are chosen maximally according to \prec (i.e., with largest release dates). Also, in this case $j^{(1)} \neq j$. The following part of the definition of $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}$ is important now: whenever $j_{k'} = j_{k'}^{(1)}$ (where we define $j_{k'}^{(1)}$ and $j_{k'}^{(2)}$ to be the respective jobs $j^{(1)}$ and $j^{(2)}$ in the iteration k') for some k' then we selected rectangles from $j_{k'}^{(1)}$ and rectangles from \tilde{j} . Also, $j_{k'}^{(1)}$ and $j_{k'}^{(2)}$ are smaller according to \prec than the last job $\hat{j} \notin J_{\text{high}, g}(C)$ with $\bar{p}_j = \bar{p}_{\hat{j}}$ from which we had selected rectangles before. Therefore, for the jobs $j, j^{(1)}$, and $j^{(2)}$ we know that $j \prec j^{(1)}$ and $j \preceq j^{(2)}$ and hence the rectangles of $j^{(1)}$ are further down in our visualization than the rectangles of j . The same is true for $j^{(2)}$, unless $j = j^{(2)}$. Also, the rectangles of $j^{(1)}$ and $j^{(2)}$ are further down in our visualization than any rectangle in $\mathcal{R}^{\text{ir}}(j)$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} p_{j^{(1)}} + p_{j^{(2)}} &\geq \frac{2}{1 + \varepsilon} p_j \\ &\geq p_j + \sum_{C \in Q: v_{C'} \text{ is descendent of } v_C} \bar{p}_j \cdot 2\varepsilon^{\text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'})} \\ &\geq p_j + \sum_{C \in Q: v_{C'} \text{ is descendent of } v_C} \sum_{j: \mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}^* \neq \emptyset} \bar{p}_j \cdot 2\delta \cdot \varepsilon^{\text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'})} \\ &\geq p_j + p(\mathcal{R}^{\text{ir}}(j) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \end{aligned}$$

which implies that our selected rectangles from $j^{(1)}$ and $j^{(2)}$ satisfy as much demand from I as the rectangles from j' in \mathcal{R}^* and the rectangles in $\mathcal{R}^{\text{ir}}(j) \cap \mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(I)$. Thus, inequality 8 holds in this case.

Now assume that $J(j) := \{j^{(1)}, \tilde{j}\}$. In this case $j^{(1)} = j$. Also, all rectangles from \tilde{j} are further down in our visualization than any rectangle in $\mathcal{R}^{\text{ir}}(j)$. Similarly as above, we calculate that

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{\tilde{j}} &\geq \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon} p_j \\
&\geq \sum_{C \in Q: v_{C'} \text{ is descendent of } v_C} \bar{p}_j \cdot 2^{\varepsilon \text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'})} \\
&\geq \sum_{C \in Q: v_{C'} \text{ is descendent of } v_C} \sum_{j: \mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}^* \neq \emptyset} \bar{p}_j \cdot \delta \cdot 2^{\varepsilon \text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'})} \\
&\geq p(\mathcal{R}^{\text{ir}}(j) \cap \mathcal{R}(I))
\end{aligned}$$

and thus inequality 8 holds also in this case. We complete the proof by calculating

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q} \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) &\geq \sum_{j, C: j \text{ is easy}} p(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q} \cap \mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j, C: j \text{ is hard or } \mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}^* = \emptyset} p(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q} \cap \mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \\
&\geq \sum_{j, C: j \text{ is easy}} p(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j, C: j \text{ is hard}} p(\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q} \cap \bigcup_{j' \in J(j)} \mathcal{R}(j', C) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \\
&\geq \sum_{j, C: j \text{ is easy}} p(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j, C: j \text{ is hard and } (C, \bar{p}_j) \text{ is relevant}} p(\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cup \mathcal{R}^{\text{ir}}(j) \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(I)) \\
&\geq p(\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(I)).
\end{aligned}$$

□

In order to satisfy the properties of Lemma 18, we need to prove the third property of Definition 16.

Lemma 30. *For any two paths $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $Q \supseteq Q'$ we have that $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q} \cap \mathcal{R}(Q') \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q'}$.*

Proof. This follows from the definition of irrelevant pairs. If a pair (C, \bar{p}) with $C \in Q'$ is *irrelevant* when we defined $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q'}$, then it is also irrelevant when we defined $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q}$. Therefore, when a pair (C, \bar{p}) is relevant when we defined $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q}$, it is also relevant when we defined $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q'}$, and hence $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q} \cap \mathcal{R}(Q') \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q'}$. □

5.2.3 Definition of the families $\{\chi_{\text{large}, Q}\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$

Let $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$; we want to define the set $\chi_{\text{large}, Q}$ such that $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q} \in \chi_{\text{large}, Q}$. We will argue that for $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q}$ there are at most $(nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ options and we define $\chi_{\text{large}, Q}$ to be the family of sets that contains each of these possible options. From the definition of $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q}$ it follows that $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}, Q}$ is completely defined once we know for each cell $C \in Q$ and for each group g

- the number $k(C, g) = k \leq 1/\delta$ of jobs of group g for which at least one rectangle is contained in $\mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{large}} \cap \mathcal{R}(C)$; denote by j_1, \dots, j_k these jobs,
- the budget $B_{\text{large},g,k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$ for each $k' \in \{1, \dots, k\}$,
- the value $s'(j) \leq K = O_\varepsilon(1)$ for each job $j \in \{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$,
- the set $J_{\text{easy},g}(C)$,
- for each job $j \in J_{\text{easy},g}(C)$ the number of rectangles from $\mathcal{R}(j, C)$ that are contained in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large},Q}$,
- the value $\bar{p}_{j_{k'}}$ for each $k' \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $(C, \bar{p}_{j_{k'}})$ is relevant,
- the order of the jobs j_1, \dots, j_k according to \prec ,
- for each job $j_{k'}$ whether $j^{(1)} = j_{k'}$ for the job $j^{(1)}$ that is defined in the iteration of $j_{k'}$ in the construction of $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large}}$.

Consider a cell $C \in Q$ and a group g . We first guess $B^{\text{round}}(C)$ using Lemma 15. Then we can guess $k(C, g)$ in time $1/\delta$. Then, we can guess the budgets $B_{\text{large},g,k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$ in time $O_{\varepsilon,\delta}(1)$ since there are only $1/\delta$ values to guess, we know $B^{\text{round}}(C)$, and each of the budgets $B_{\text{large},g,k'}^{\text{round}}(C)$ is an integral multiple of $\varepsilon\delta \cdot B_{\text{large}}^{\text{round}}(C)$. Also, we can guess $\{s'(j_{k'})\}_{k'}$ in time $K/\delta = O_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)$. This yields the set $J_{\text{high},g}(C)$. Since $J_{\text{easy},g}(C) \subseteq J_{\text{high},g}(C)$ and $|J_{\text{high},g}(C)| \leq 2k(C, g) \leq 2/\delta$, we can guess $J_{\text{easy},g}(C)$ in time $2^{2/\delta}$. Also, we can guess in time $O_{\varepsilon,\delta}(1)$ the rectangles of each job $j \in J_{\text{easy},g}(C)$ that are contained in $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{large},Q}$. Also, in time $(1/\delta)! = O_\delta(1)$ we can guess the ordering of the jobs j_1, \dots, j_k according to \prec . For each job $j_{k'} \in \{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$ there are only two options for whether $j^{(1)} = j_{k'}$ in the iteration corresponding to $j_{k'}$, and thus we can guess this for all these k jobs in time $2^k \leq 2^{1/\delta} = O_\delta(1)$. Since there are $O_\varepsilon(\log nP)$ cells $C \in Q$ and $O_\varepsilon(1)$ groups g , this yields $O_{\varepsilon,\delta}(1)^{O_{\varepsilon,\delta}(\log(nP))} = (nP)^{O_{\varepsilon,\delta}(1)}$ possible guesses overall.

It remains to argue that we can guess also the values $\bar{p}_{j_{k'}}$ in time $(nP)^{O_{\varepsilon,\delta}(1)}$. The intuition is that there are only $O_{\varepsilon,\delta}(\log nP)$ relevant pairs (C, \bar{p}) and they admit a certain structure that allows us to guess them in time $(nP)^{O_{\varepsilon,\delta}(1)}$.

Lemma 31. *In time $(nP)^{O_{\varepsilon,\delta}(1)}$ we can guess all relevant pairs (C, \bar{p}) with $C \in Q$.*

Proof. As defined previously, let $v_{\tilde{C}}$ be the bottom-most vertex of Q and let $v_{\tilde{C}'}$ be its parent vertex. There are $O_\varepsilon(\log nP)$ pairs of the form (\tilde{C}, \bar{p}) or (\tilde{C}', \bar{p}) and we can guess in time $2^{O_\varepsilon(\log nP)} = (nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ which of them are relevant.

Let us consider the cells $C \in Q$ with $\tilde{C} \neq C \neq \tilde{C}'$, let $Q' \subseteq Q$ denote the set of all these cells. We group the relevant pairs (C, \bar{p}) with $C \in Q'$ into groups \mathcal{G}_ℓ where for each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ we define

$$\mathcal{G}_\ell := \{(C, \bar{p}) \mid C \in Q' \wedge \bar{p} = (1 + \varepsilon)^{\ell + \text{dist}(v_{\tilde{C}}, v_C)} \cdot \lfloor \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\varepsilon\delta) \rfloor\}.$$

Now each set \mathcal{G}_ℓ can contain at most one relevant pair (C, \bar{p}) : assume by contradiction that \mathcal{G}_ℓ contains two relevant pairs $(C, \bar{p}), (C', \bar{p}')$. Assume w.l.o.g. that v_C is closer to $v_{\tilde{C}}$ than $v_{C'}$. Then there is a hard job j with $\bar{p}_j = \bar{p}$ such that $\mathcal{R}(j, C) \cap \mathcal{R}^* \neq \emptyset$. In particular,

$$\bar{p} = (1 + \varepsilon)^{\ell + \text{dist}(v_{\tilde{C}}, v_C)} \cdot \lfloor \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\varepsilon\delta) \rfloor$$

and

$$\bar{p}' = (1 + \varepsilon)^{\ell + \text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'}) \cdot \lfloor \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\varepsilon\delta) \rfloor}$$

which implies that

$$\bar{p}' = \bar{p}_j \cdot (1 + \varepsilon)^{\text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'}) \cdot \lfloor \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\varepsilon\delta) \rfloor} \leq \bar{p}_j \cdot (\varepsilon\delta)^{\text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'})} \leq \bar{p}_j \cdot \delta \cdot \varepsilon^{\text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'})}$$

and hence (C', \bar{p}') is irrelevant.

Also, observe that there are only $O_\varepsilon(\log nP)$ values ℓ such that \mathcal{G}_ℓ contains a relevant pair. It remains to show that we can guess these relevant pairs efficiently. First, we guess in time $2^{O_\varepsilon(\log nP)} = (nP)^{O_\varepsilon(1)}$ for which cells C there exists a relevant pair (C, \bar{p}) for some value \bar{p} .

Let C^* denote the topmost cell in Q . We order the relevant pairs (C, \bar{p}) non-increasingly according to $\text{dist}(v_C, v_{C^*})$, breaking ties by ordering them increasingly by their values \bar{p} . For each pair $(C, (1 + \varepsilon)^\ell)$ we introduce the value $\alpha_{(C, (1+\varepsilon)^\ell)} := \ell + \text{dist}(v_{C^*}, v_C) \cdot \lfloor \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\varepsilon\delta) \rfloor$. We claim that in our ordering of the relevant pairs $(C, (1 + \varepsilon)^\ell)$ the values $\alpha_{(C, (1+\varepsilon)^\ell)}$ are strictly increasing. Indeed, consider two pairs $(C, \bar{p}), (C', \bar{p}')$ that are adjacent in this ordering such that (C, \bar{p}) appears directly before (C', \bar{p}') . If $C = C'$ then $\bar{p} < \bar{p}'$ and hence $\alpha_{(C, \bar{p})} < \alpha_{(C', \bar{p}')}$. Suppose now that $C \neq C'$. Assume by contradiction that $\alpha_{(C, \bar{p})} \geq \alpha_{(C', \bar{p}')}$. Assume that $\bar{p} = (1 + \varepsilon)^\ell$ and $\bar{p}' = (1 + \varepsilon)^{\ell'}$ and let j and j' be the hard jobs corresponding to the pairs (C, \bar{p}) and (C', \bar{p}') , respectively. Then

$$\alpha_{(C, \bar{p})} = \ell + \text{dist}(v_{C^*}, v_C) \cdot \lfloor \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\varepsilon\delta) \rfloor \geq \ell' + \text{dist}(v_{C^*}, v_{C'}) \cdot \lfloor \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\varepsilon\delta) \rfloor = \alpha_{(C', \bar{p}')}$$

which implies that

$$\ell + \text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'}) \cdot \lfloor \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\varepsilon\delta) \rfloor \geq \ell'$$

and therefore

$$\bar{p}_j \cdot \delta \cdot \varepsilon^{\text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'})} \geq \bar{p}_j \cdot (\varepsilon\delta)^{\text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'})} \geq (1 + \varepsilon)^{\ell + \text{dist}(v_C, v_{C'}) \cdot \lfloor \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\varepsilon\delta) \rfloor} \geq (1 + \varepsilon)^{\ell'} = \bar{p}_{j'}.$$

This implies that the job j makes the pair (C', \bar{p}') irrelevant which is a contradiction.

Since the $\alpha_{(C, \bar{p})}$ are increasing and can attain only $O_{\varepsilon, \delta}(\log(nP))$ different values, we can guess in time $2^{O_{\varepsilon, \delta}(\log nP)} = (nP)^{O_{\varepsilon, \delta}(1)}$ which of these possible values are attained by some $\alpha_{(C, \bar{p})}$ (however, this does not tell us the corresponding pairs (C, \bar{p}) since a value $\alpha_{(C, \bar{p})}$ might belong to more than one pair (C, \bar{p})). Then, since $|Q'| = O_{\varepsilon, \delta}(\log(nP))$ and the values $\alpha_{(C, \bar{p})}$ are ordered according to their cells, we guess in time $2^{O_{\varepsilon, \delta}(\log nP)} = (nP)^{O_{\varepsilon, \delta}(1)}$ which of these attained values corresponds to which cell C . One way to do this is to guess a bit-string with $O_{\varepsilon, \delta}(\log(nP))$ bits, which describes in unary the number of relevant pairs for each cell $C \in Q'$, with the 0-bits being the separators between these values for the different cells $C \in Q'$. Once we know each value $\alpha_{(C, \bar{p})}$ and its corresponding cell C , we can deduce the corresponding pair (C, \bar{p}) and hence we know all relevant pairs.

Overall, there are $(nP)^{O_{\varepsilon, \delta}(1)}$ possible guesses in total. \square

Once we know all relevant pairs, we can guess in time $O_{\varepsilon, \delta}(1)$ per relevant pair (C, \bar{p}) for which group g there is a job $j_{k'}$ with $\bar{p}_{j_{k'}} = \bar{p}$ and the corresponding value k' , which yields $O_{\varepsilon, \delta}(1)^{O_{\varepsilon, \delta}(\log(nP))} = (nP)^{O_{\varepsilon, \delta}(1)}$ possible guesses overall.

We define that $\chi_{\text{large}, Q}$ contains the resulting set of large tasks for each of the possible guesses for the above values. This completes the proof of Lemma 18.

References

- [AT18] Yossi Azar and Noam Touitou. Improved online algorithm for weighted flow time. In *2018 IEEE 59th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 427–437. IEEE, 2018.
- [BC09] Nikhil Bansal and Ho-Leung Chan. Weighted flow time does not admit $o(1)$ -competitive algorithms. In *Proceedings of the twentieth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 1238–1244. SIAM, 2009.
- [BD07] Nikhil Bansal and Kedar Dhamdhere. Minimizing weighted flow time. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 3(4):39–es, 2007.
- [BGK18] Jatin Batra, Naveen Garg, and Amit Kumar. Constant factor approximation algorithm for weighted flow time on a single machine in pseudo-polynomial time. In Mikkel Thorup, editor, *59th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2018, Paris, France, October 7-9, 2018*, pages 778–789. IEEE Computer Society, 2018.
- [BMR04] Michael A. Bender, S. Muthukrishnan, and Rajmohan Rajaraman. Approximation algorithms for average stretch scheduling. *J. Sched.*, 7(3):195–222, 2004.
- [BP03] Nikhil Bansal and Kirk Pruhs. Server scheduling in the l_p norm: a rising tide lifts all boat. In Lawrence L. Larmore and Michel X. Goemans, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, June 9-11, 2003, San Diego, CA, USA*, pages 242–250. ACM, 2003.
- [BP04] Nikhil Bansal and Kirk Pruhs. Server scheduling in the weighted l_p norm. In Martin Farach-Colton, editor, *LATIN 2004: Theoretical Informatics, 6th Latin American Symposium, Buenos Aires, Argentina, April 5-8, 2004, Proceedings*, volume 2976 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 434–443. Springer, 2004.
- [BP14] Nikhil Bansal and Kirk Pruhs. The geometry of scheduling. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 43(5):1684–1698, 2014.
- [CGKS12] Timothy M. Chan, Elyot Grant, Jochen Könemann, and Malcolm Sharpe. Weighted capacitated, priority, and geometric set cover via improved quasi-uniform sampling. In Yuval Rabani, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2012, Kyoto, Japan, January 17-19, 2012*, pages 1576–1585. SIAM, 2012.
- [CK02] Chandra Chekuri and Sanjeev Khanna. Approximation schemes for preemptive weighted flow time. In John H. Reif, editor, *Proceedings on 34th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 19-21, 2002, Montréal, Québec, Canada*, pages 297–305. ACM, 2002.
- [CKZ01] Chandra Chekuri, Sanjeev Khanna, and An Zhu. Algorithms for minimizing weighted flow time. In *Proceedings of the thirty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 84–93, 2001.
- [FKL19] Uriel Feige, Janardhan Kulkarni, and Shi Li. A polynomial time constant approximation for minimizing total weighted flow-time. In Timothy M. Chan, editor, *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2019, San Diego, California, USA, January 6-9, 2019*, pages 1585–1595. SIAM, 2019.

- [KTW99] Hans Kellerer, Thomas Tautenhahn, and Gerhard J. Woeginger. Approximability and nonapproximability results for minimizing total flow time on a single machine. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 28(4):1155–1166, 1999.
- [LKB77] Jan Karel Lenstra, AHG Rinnooy Kan, and Peter Brucker. Complexity of machine scheduling problems. In *Annals of discrete mathematics*, volume 1, pages 343–362. Elsevier, 1977.
- [SW99] Petra Schuurman and Gerhard J Woeginger. Polynomial time approximation algorithms for machine scheduling: Ten open problems. *Journal of Scheduling*, 2(5):203–213, 1999.

A Omitted proofs

A.1 Simplification of input instance

First we establish that $P = \max_j p_j / \min_j p_j = \max_j p_j$: We scale all values p_j and r_j by the same factor so that $\min_j p_j = n^2 \cdot 2/\varepsilon$. This preserves the approximation rate of a solution (if it is scaled accordingly), but the values p_j and r_j are no longer integers. Hence, we round all these values to the next integer. A solution for the non-rounded values can be transformed to a solution for the rounded values by delaying each jobs completion time by at most $n^2 + 1$ (n^2 for rounding p_j and 1 for rounding r_j). Since the optimum is at least $\sum_j w_j p_j \geq \sum_j w_j n^2 \cdot 2/\varepsilon$, this increases the optimum by at most a factor of $(1 + \varepsilon)$. Then we create a dummy job with processing time 1 and negligible weight to ensure that $\min_j p_j = 1$ and hence $P = \max_j p_j$. This transformation increases P only by a polynomial factor.

To obtain bounded weights we scale each w_j by the same factor such that $\max_j w_j = 4/\varepsilon^2 \cdot n^2 P$. This transformation preserves the approximation rate of a solution. Now remove all jobs j with $w_j < 1/\varepsilon$, round each remaining w_j to the next integer (increasing the optimum by a factor at most $(1 + \varepsilon)$), and solve the remaining instance. Note that the optimum is at least $\max_j w_j$ and all jobs are finished before T . We now schedule all jobs that were previously arbitrarily in the interval $[T, 2T]$. The cost of these jobs is at most $n \cdot 1/\varepsilon \cdot 2T \leq 1/\varepsilon \cdot 4n^2 P \leq \varepsilon \max_j w_j$ and thus negligible.