

Online Flexible Busy Time Scheduling on Heterogeneous Machines

Gruia Calinescu* Sami Davies† Samir Khuller‡ Shirley Zhang §

February 20, 2024

Abstract

We study the online busy time scheduling model on heterogeneous machines. In our setting, unit-length jobs arrive online with a deadline that is known to the algorithm at the job’s arrival time. An algorithm has access to machines, each with different associated capacities and costs. The goal is to schedule jobs on machines before their deadline, so that the total cost incurred by the scheduling algorithm is minimized. Relatively little is known about online busy time scheduling when machines are heterogeneous (i.e., have different costs and capacities), despite this being the most practical model for clients using cloud computing services. We make significant progress in understanding this model by designing an 8-competitive algorithm for the problem on unit-length jobs, and providing a lower bound on the competitive ratio of 2. We further prove that our lower bound is tight in the natural setting when jobs have agreeable deadlines.

1 Introduction

Busy time scheduling is an energy minimization model that is well-studied due to its applicability to cloud computing and its relationship to energy usage [KSST10, CKM14]. In this model, there are an unlimited number of *heterogeneous* machines available and n jobs arrive online, each with a deadline. A machine of *type* k , for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, has cost $c_k \geq 1$ and capacity $B_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, where the cost indicates how much the algorithm must pay each time step that the machine is executing at least one job, and the capacity dictates how many jobs the machine can execute during each time step. For job $j \in J$, we assume its release time r_j and deadline d_j are known to the algorithm when the job is released. The release time is the same time that the job “arrives” online, in the sense that the algorithm learns about the existence of the job.

We consider the setting where jobs all have unit length, and all release times and deadlines are integral. The goal is to find a non-preemptive schedule completing all jobs by their deadlines with minimum total cost. A formal definition of the problem is in Section 1.3.

Busy time scheduling is in part motivated by applications in cloud computing. Providers such as Amazon Web Services (AWS), Google Cloud, and Microsoft Azure rent virtual machines, each of which has some fixed cost and processing power. Customers are charged by how many working server hours they use, and therefore they can minimize their costs by making smart choices about which virtual machines they rent. Busy time scheduling models this setting well,

*calinescu@iit.edu. Department of Computer Science, Illinois Institute of Technology. Work performed in part while at Northwestern University.

†samidavies@berkeley.edu. Department of EECS and the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing, UC Berkeley. Supported by an NSF Computing Innovation Fellowship while at Northwestern University.

‡samir.khuller@northwestern.edu. Department of Computer Science, Northwestern University. Work supported by (IDEAL) NSF 2216970.

§szhang2@g.harvard.edu. Paulson School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University. Supported by an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship.

as it captures the difficulty that customers face in deciding whether they should greedily use cheap servers that only complete the jobs imminently due, or whether they should fork up for a more expensive server to complete additional jobs that are waiting to be processed.

One interpretation of the problem with unit-length jobs is as a model of a *shuttle scheduling* problem. Suppose passengers arrive in airport parking, not in walking distance to the terminal. Passengers arrive and tell a dispatcher when their flight is. The shuttle company has shuttles of varying sizes that incur different costs. The company needs to carry all passengers to the terminal, but would like to minimize its cost in doing so.

There has been a surge of theoretical interest in busy time scheduling over the past decade or so, with many variations on the model having been studied. Almost all of the papers are for the case of *homogeneous* machines, i.e., when machines are identical with the same costs and capacities. We discuss the different variations of busy time scheduling on homogeneous machines in Section 1.2. Much less is known about the setting when machines are heterogeneous, despite this being (arguably) the most practical setting. Most data centers consist of machines of different types, built over time, and these in general have different costs and capacities.

In the special case of interval jobs¹, there is no flexibility as to when a job is executed; each job has to instantly be scheduled upon arrival. This lack of flexibility can make the resulting cost of any schedule extremely high—for example, if single jobs arrive one after the other and we schedule them all separately, we can pay a huge cost compared to a schedule that has the flexibility to wait and bundle a group of jobs together. Ren and Tang [RT20] studied the problem of inflexible jobs with *heights*, where each job may take up non-unit space on each machine, on heterogeneous machines when the normalized cost-per-capacity rate is either monotonically increasing or decreasing as the machine capacity increases. They developed a $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm (with constant roughly 79) in the offline setting and a $\theta(\mu)$ -competitive algorithm in the online setting, for μ the max/min ratio of a job’s arrival time and deadline window length. Later, Liu and Tang [LT21] proved that one can obtain the same guarantees, but without the restrictions on the cost-per-capacity rate. They also provide matching lower bounds on the competitive ratios for both settings, as well.

We are the first to study the online setting when jobs are *flexible*, i.e., not interval, and machines are heterogeneous. However, here there is already a lower bound on the competitive ratio of $\Omega(\sqrt{\log \mu})$ [AV19]². In order to not be totally restricted by this lower bound, we must be willing to make some kind of trade-off; we choose to give up the generality of arbitrary job processing lengths and heights. By only considering unit jobs, we make the problem more tractable, while still maintaining the core theoretical difficulty of the setting. When jobs are flexible, an algorithm must make the additional decision of *when* in a job’s active interval it should be scheduled, and on heterogeneous machines, the algorithm must make the additional decision on whether to pay more to process large batches, or pay less and defer other jobs’ completions. At a high-level, the “online” and “flexible” aspects of the setting incentivize the algorithm to make decisions lazily, while the “heterogeneous” aspect punishes the algorithm for making decisions too late by forcing the algorithm to use some very expensive resource.

1.1 Our results

Several straight-forward procedures give $O(1)$ -competitive algorithms when jobs have *agreeable* deadlines, which is when if job j arrives before job j' , then the deadline of job j' cannot be before that of j . See Theorem 2 below.

The technical difficulty is in scheduling jobs that have non-agreeable deadlines. To be constant-factor competitive, our algorithm carefully tracks the types of machines that have already been used. We discuss many of the reasonable, well-studied online heuristics one might try to use for this problem and give examples that prove these heuristics have unbounded competitive ratio in Appendix A.

¹This is also called the *inflexible* setting.

²This result actually holds in the much simpler setting where jobs are inflexible and machines are homogeneous.

Our main result is the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *There is an 8-competitive algorithm for online unit-length busy time scheduling on heterogeneous machines with run-time $O(n \log n)$, for n the total number of jobs.*

Then for agreeable deadlines, we can improve our competitive ratio to 2 by using a much simpler algorithm.

Theorem 2 *If jobs have agreeable deadlines, then there is a 2-competitive algorithm for online unit-length busy time scheduling on heterogeneous machines with run-time $O(nK + n \log n)$, for n the total number of jobs and K the number of distinct machine types.*

We complement our algorithmic results by proving a lower bound on the competitive ratio.

Theorem 3 *The competitive ratio of any deterministic online algorithm for online unit-length busy time scheduling on heterogeneous machines is at least 2.*

Moreover, Theorem 3 shows that the algorithm proving Theorem 2 is tight in its competitive ratio, as our construction proving the lower bound is an agreeable instance.

1.2 Related work

Busy time scheduling on homogeneous machines Even scheduling interval jobs on homogeneous machines is *NP*-hard [WZ03]. Chang et al. [CKM14] showed that algorithms developed by Alicherry and Bhatia [AB03] and Kumar and Rudra [KR05] are 4-approximations in the offline setting for jobs of uniform heights by mapping the flexible job case to interval jobs, and then utilizing the interval job algorithms. However, for flexible (non-interval) jobs, in the offline setting a 3-approximation was also developed by Chang et al. [CKM14].

On homogeneous machines with interval jobs, Azar et al. [AV19] developed an online algorithm with tight approximation factor $\theta(\sqrt{\log \mu})$, for μ the ratio of the maximum interval window length over the minimum. Improvements are known, but these involve certain assumptions about the knowledge of the profile of jobs that have not yet arrived [BFM⁺21]. It is also worth noting that on homogeneous machines, one can find the optimal in the online or offline setting if jobs have unit length by using the algorithm by Finke et al. [FJQS08]³.

Power management and batch scheduling Much work in scheduling theory over the past several decades has focused on energy minimization or power management, and busy time scheduling is one such model [YDS95, IP05, ISG07, CCL⁺07, BKL⁺08, LWAT12]. The models that are most relevant to our study energy minimization when the machine(s) have some cost to turn on or off [CKM14, DKZ22, CW20, AIS08]. Recently, Antoniadis et al. [AGKK20] proposed the first constant-factor approximation for a long-studied energy minimization model in which awakening a sleeping machine costs L units of energy and then machines consume energy proportionally to the amount of time they are awake [DGH⁺07]. In batch scheduling problems, machines can run groups of jobs (known as batches) simultaneously. The most classic objective is throughput maximization [BNGK⁺09], though other objectives include functions of flow time and makespan [IM13], [WTFY17].

Capacitated covering problems In d -dimensional capacitated rectangle stabbing, there is a set of axis-parallel rectangles and a set of horizontal and vertical lines, both in \mathbb{R}^d , in which each line can intersect at most some number of rectangles. The goal is to find a minimum size subset of lines that intersect the rectangles. For $d > 1$, rectangle stabbing is *NP*-hard, although there do exist approximation algorithms [HM91, GIK02, ELR⁺08]. When $d = 1$, algorithms for capacitated rectangle stabbing solve the offline version of unit-length busy time scheduling on heterogeneous machines; rectangles are 1-dimensional x -axis aligned lines that correspond to jobs' arrival time, deadline intervals, and stabbers can be equipped with costs and capacities

³The algorithm with a different proof of optimality appeared previously in work by Bodlaender and Jansen [BJ95].

to correspond to a batch of jobs to be scheduled on a machine in a single time slot. This 1-dimensional rectangle stabbing problem can be solved exactly via a dynamic programming algorithm [ELR⁺08], which is based off the influential work of Baptiste [Bap06].

Capacitated versions of covering problems related to vertex cover, facility location, and other scheduling problems have also been studied [CN06, SK12, BP14, CS15]. More general frameworks have been studied in hopes of relating approximability results about covering problems to some of their capacitated versions [CGK10, BKS11, CGKS12]. Several online problems have a similar flavor to online busy time scheduling on heterogeneous machines, where an algorithm has to make a choice between different options, such as the ski-rental problem with multiple discount options [ZPX11], the parking permit problem with multiple durations [Mey05], and capacitated interval coloring [EEL09].

1.3 Preliminaries

As a warm-up, in Section 2 we discuss the agreeable deadlines setting. We provide an algorithm and show that it is 2-competitive when jobs have agreeable deadlines, proving Theorem 2. Then in Section 3, we prove a lower bound on the optimal solution’s cost in Subsection 3.2, and we prove our main result, Theorem 1, in Subsection 3.3. A lower bound of 2 on the competitive ratio of any deterministic algorithm is provided to complement these algorithmic results in Section 4.

The formal set-up and notation throughout the paper is as follows. A set of unit-length jobs arrive online, and it is denoted J with $|J| = n$. Job $j \in J$ is equipped with integral arrival r_j and deadline d_j . A machine of type $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ can execute at most $B_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ many jobs at once and costs $c_k \geq 1$ per time unit.

The labeling on the machine types is such that the capacity of the machines is increasing, i.e., $B_0 < B_1 < \dots$. Note we assume the ordering is strictly increasing, as if there were ever machines with the same capacity but different costs, one would always use the cheaper machine of the same capacity. Without loss of generality machines with larger capacity should cost more; e.g., if $c_1 \leq c_0$, then an optimal schedule could always use type 1 machines instead of type 0 machines. After these considerations, let K denote the number of remaining machine types.

A *batch* of jobs X is defined by three features: (1) $J(X)$, the set of jobs the batch contains, (2) $t(X)$, the batch’s type, which corresponds to the machine type that the jobs in $J(X)$ should be executed on, and (3) $\tau(X)$, the time at which the jobs in $J(X)$ are executed on a machine of type $t(X)$. We denote a family of batches as \mathcal{X} . A valid schedule is a partition of jobs into batches if for all X , $|J(X)| \leq B_{t(X)}$ and every $j \in J(X)$ has $r_j \leq \tau(X) \leq d_j$.

An optimal offline solution is denoted by OPT, with cost denoted by $\text{cost}(\text{OPT})$. The time horizon is denoted $[0, T]$, with time steps $\tau \in [0, T]$, where sometimes time steps have subscripts or take an argument. Continuous intervals with interval endpoints in $[0, T]$ are denoted by I , also sometimes with subscripts or taking an argument.

2 Warm-up: Agreeable Deadlines

First in Subsection 2.1, we prove a 2-competitive algorithm for the setting when jobs have agreeable deadlines. Then in Subsection 2.2, we discuss the difficulties in extending to general job deadlines.

2.1 Proof of Theorem 2

We will show that Algorithm 1 is 2-competitive when jobs have agreeable deadlines. The algorithm is simple—it collects jobs until a deadline is reached, and then it creates optimal batches for scheduling the set of all the waiting jobs.

For \mathcal{X} the set of batches, note that $\cup_{X \in \mathcal{X}} J(X)$ denotes the set of all jobs that have been executed by batches in \mathcal{X} , and $J \setminus \cup_{X \in \mathcal{X}} J(X)$ is the set of waiting jobs. For shorthand, Algorithm 1 uses the variable $W = J \setminus \cup_{X \in \mathcal{X}} J(X)$.

Algorithm 1 Greedy

Let $W \leftarrow \emptyset, \mathcal{X} \leftarrow \emptyset$.
for $\tau \leftarrow 1$ to T **do**
 \triangleright Let J' be the set of jobs with arrival time τ .
 \triangleright Update $W \leftarrow W \cup J'$.
 if $\exists j^* \in W$ with $d_{j^*} = \tau$ **then**
 $\triangleright \mathcal{X}_\tau \leftarrow \text{GetOptimalBatches}(W)$.
 \triangleright Execute all batches in \mathcal{X}_τ . // Thus completing all jobs in W
 \triangleright Update $\mathcal{X} \leftarrow \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}_\tau$.
 $\triangleright W \leftarrow \emptyset$.
 end if
end for
return A schedule \mathcal{X} . // With cost at most $2 \cdot \text{cost}(OPT)$

The subroutine $\text{GetOptimalBatches}(A)$ takes as input a set of jobs A . It first finds the lowest cost set of machines with total capacity $|A|$, then fills these machines with the jobs in A , outputting a set of new batches. It can be implemented in time $O(n \cdot K)$ using a classic dynamic program, where recall that K is the number of distinct machine types. We can initialize the optimal cost of scheduling 0 jobs to 0. After initialization, we can then optimally compute the cost of scheduling $|A|$ jobs by solving the following recurrence:

$$\text{cost}(|A|) = \min_{k \in [K]} \text{cost}(|A| - \min(B_k, |A|)) + c_k.$$

This computation can be made once before Algorithm 1 starts, then the optimal values stored in arrays can be used whenever Algorithm 1 needs them. We sort J by release times so that J' can be found in time $O(|J'|)$. This involves simply maintaining an ordered set of jobs. To store W , we use a min-heap with keys d_j , for elements $j \in W$. We do not have to go time slot by time slot, but instead use the sorted J to find the next time where $J' \neq \emptyset$ and compare this with the smallest key in W . The overall run-time is $O(nK + n \log n)$.

The following lemma crucially (though perhaps subtly) uses the agreeable deadlines structure. As in Algorithm 1, let \mathcal{X}_τ be the set of batches executed at time τ .

Lemma 4 *For each set of batches \mathcal{X}_τ executed by Algorithm 1, construct an interval I_τ starting at the earliest release time of any job carried in a batch in \mathcal{X}_τ and ending at the latest deadline of any job in a batch in \mathcal{X}_τ . At most two of these intervals overlap at any point in time.*

Proof It suffices to prove that each such interval contains at most one left endpoint of another interval. From the way the algorithm schedules all the jobs in W , we obtain that for any τ there exists at most one \mathcal{X}_τ . Assume we have \mathcal{X}_τ and $\mathcal{X}_{\tau'}$ with $\tau < \tau'$. Then the left endpoint of $I_{\tau'}$ is strictly to the right of τ , as any job released at or before τ that has not been scheduled before τ is scheduled in \mathcal{X}_τ . This also implies that the left endpoint of $I_{\tau'}$ is strictly to the right of the left endpoint of I_τ . Call two such intervals $I_\tau, I_{\tau'}$ *consecutive* if $\tau < \tau'$ and there is no τ'' with $\tau < \tau'' < \tau'$ such that the algorithm produces an $\mathcal{X}_{\tau''}$. If $I_\tau, I_{\tau'}$ are consecutive, then there is no $I_{\tau''}$ whose left endpoint is between the left endpoints of I_τ and $I_{\tau'}$.

Consider three consecutive intervals $I_{\tau_1}, I_{\tau_2}, I_{\tau_3}$. For interval I_{τ_1} , let job j_1 be a job scheduled in \mathcal{X}_{τ_1} with the earliest release time, breaking ties in favor of the job with the earliest deadline. Also for I_{τ_1} , let job j'_1 be a job scheduled in \mathcal{X}_{τ_1} with the latest deadline, breaking ties arbitrarily. Let j_2, j'_2, j_3 , and j'_3 be defined analogously for I_{τ_2} and I_{τ_3} .

We will show that the following string of inequalities holds

$$d_{j'_1} \leq d_{j_2} = \tau_2 < r_{j_3}, \tag{1}$$

which implies that I_1 and I_3 do not overlap.

We first argue that $\tau_2 = d_{j_2}$. Indeed, we must have $\tau_2 \leq d_{j_2}$ since j_2 is scheduled in \mathcal{X}_{τ_2} . On the other hand, if it were the case that $\tau_2 < d_{j_2}$, then there is some job j scheduled in \mathcal{X}_{τ_2} with deadline $d_j = \tau_2$, and jobs j and j_2 break the agreeable relation because $d_j < d_{j_2}$ and $r_j > r_{j_2}$ (by the way j_2 is selected). See Figure 1.




Figure 1: An illustration of an argument from the proof of Lemma 4, precisely why $d_{j_2} = \tau_2$: If $\tau_2 < d_{j_2}$, then one of the dashed jobs/intervals must end at τ_2 . However, the upper dashed job cannot exist since j_2 is chosen as having the earliest deadline among the jobs scheduled in \mathcal{X}_{τ_2} , while the lower dashed job cannot exist since it is not agreeable with j_2 .

The last inequality of 1 follows from the discussion in the first paragraph of the proof, with τ_2 instead τ and τ_3 instead of τ' .

The same reasoning gives that $\tau_1 < r_{j_2}$. We have that $r_{j'_1} \leq \tau_1$ since j'_1 is scheduled in \mathcal{X}_{τ_1} . Thus $r_{j'_1} < r_{j_2}$. If $d_{j'_1} > d_{j_2}$, then j'_1 and j_2 are not agreeable. Thus the first inequality of Equation (1) also holds. ■

If deadlines are not agreeable, many such intervals can overlap at any time point. In the next section, we use a more complicated interval construction to lower bound $\text{cost}(\text{OPT})$.

Proof [of Theorem 2] As in the statement of Lemma 4, construct an interval I_τ for each set of batches \mathcal{X}_τ dispatched by the Greedy algorithm, where the left endpoint of the interval corresponding to \mathcal{X}_τ is the earliest release time of any job in $\cup_{X \in \mathcal{X}_\tau} J(X)$ and the right endpoint is the latest deadline of any job in $\cup_{X \in \mathcal{X}_\tau} J(X)$. Lemma 4 implies that we can partition the intervals into two sets S_1 and S_2 of disjoint intervals. Specifically for any two consecutive, overlapping intervals, it suffices to have one such interval in S_1 and the other in S_2 . Let J_1 be the set of jobs executed by batches in \mathcal{X}_τ with $I_\tau \in S_1$, and J_2 likewise for S_2 . Let $\text{OPT}(J_i)$ denote an optimal offline schedule for J_i , for $i = 1, 2$. Then:

$$\text{cost}(\text{Greedy}) = \text{cost}(\text{OPT}(J_1)) + \text{cost}(\text{OPT}(J_2)) \leq 2 \cdot \text{cost}(\text{OPT})$$

The equality is because the intervals in S_1 are disjoint and the intervals in S_2 are disjoint, and we have sent all jobs in each interval using the lowest cost possible with `GetOptimalBatches`. ■

2.2 Difficulty in non-agreeable deadlines

Any algorithm for this problem can execute batches only when it is forced to, i.e., when the current time slot τ is the deadline of some uncompleted job j^* , as there is nothing to be gained from executing a batch before a deadline. Additionally, jobs can always be assigned to an open batch by an earliest deadline first (EDF) rule. It follows that the only remaining decision for an algorithm is what type of batch (and hence machine) should be used to execute job j^* at time τ ; note that another way to phrase this question is how many waiting jobs should be processed with j^* . We already discussed how an adversary can punish an algorithm for processing too many waiting jobs at a time slot by dispatching a huge batch of jobs soon after (as it would have been more cost efficient to execute everyone together on a machine with large capacity). On the flip side, the adversary can punish an algorithm for processing small batches by not sending any new jobs (as a large batch would have been more cost efficient here). We discuss why some simple heuristics to choose the machine type fail in Appendix A.

Agreeable deadlines were easy to handle because we can charge the cost of the Greedy algorithm to simple lower bounds on $\text{cost}(\text{OPT})$, and recall that the lower bounds were due to the nice structure of the intervals corresponding to the batches created by Greedy. For general deadlines, we are able to track a more complicated set of intervals corresponding to batches in order to decide which machine type to use at the deadline of an uncompleted job. Moreover, this complicated interval structure implies we need a more careful lower bound on $\text{cost}(\text{OPT})$. Specifically, our algorithm tracks a set of nested intervals $[r_{j^*}, \tau] = I_0 \subseteq I_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq I_k$, all with right endpoint τ , where for every $\ell \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, a batch of type ℓ was already executed in interval I_ℓ . Eventually, our method of constructing this sequence of nested intervals produces an interval I_{ℓ^*} that contains no time slot where a batch of type ℓ^* was executed. This indicates that our algorithm should create a batch of type ℓ^* at time τ .

3 Proof of Theorem 1

We prove a lower bound on $\text{cost}(\text{OPT})$ in Subsection 3.2, and then use it to analyze our algorithm that proves Theorem 1 in Subsection 3.3.

First, we begin with some additional preliminaries.

3.1 Additional preliminaries for Section 3

It will be helpful to track intervals $I \subseteq [0, T]$, and often we associate a type and a set of jobs with interval I . We let t_I denote the associated type and $J_I \subseteq J$ the associated set of jobs.

We show in the following proposition that we can assume that all machine costs are powers of 2, while losing only a factor of 2 in the competitive ratio.

Proposition 5 *With only losing a factor of 2 in the competitive ratio, we can assume in online unit-length busy time scheduling on heterogeneous machines that for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $c_k = 2^p$ for some $p \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and $c_0 = 1$.*

Proof First, if $c_0 \neq 1$, scale all of the machine costs by $1/c_0$. Note this does not effect the optimality of any schedules. For each k , let p_k be the smallest integer such that $c_k \leq 2^{p_k}$. Then take $c'_k = 2^{p_k}$ to be the new machine cost for each k . Note a schedule \mathcal{S} with machine costs c' is at most 2 times the cost of schedule \mathcal{S} with machine costs c . ■

Throughout this section, we make the following assumption with only a factor 2 loss.

Assumption 6 *For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, a machine of type k has cost $c_k = 2^k$.*

This assumption follows with only a factor 2 loss in the competitive ratio because Proposition 5 allows us to assume that all machine costs are powers of 2, and if a machine of cost 2^k is not present for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, one could just use $2^{k-k'}$ machines of cost $2^{k'}$, for k' the largest type less than k that is present.

This assumption is useful in discussing the cost-per-job of the different machine types, as seen in the following lemma.

Proposition 7 *Given Assumption 6, one can show that without loss of generality the cost-per-job is non-increasing in the machine types, i.e., $c_0/B_0 \geq c_1/B_1 \geq \dots$.*

Proof Suppose we are given machine types satisfying Assumption 6. If ever there existed k with $c_k/B_k < c_{k+1}/B_{k+1}$, then there always exists an optimal schedule that does not use any machines of type $k+1$. This is because any schedule that used machines of type $k+1$ can replace each machine of type $k+1$ with 2 machines of type k , since by Assumption 6 machine costs are factors of 2. ■

Further, Assumption 6 allows us to upper-bound K , the number of distinct machine types.

Proposition 8 *Given Assumption 6, the number of distinct machine types is bounded, with $K \leq \log n$.*




Figure 2: There are 11 jobs shown in black. The three different frames depict possible valid interval assignments for the jobs. There are four types of machines, with costs 2^k for $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and with capacities $\{2, 5, 11, 22\}$. Each interval assignment implies a different lower bound for $\text{cost}(\text{OPT})$, as in Lemma 10. We obtain better lower bounds moving from left-to-right in the frames, with bounds $2, 9/4$, and $5/2$, respectively. Note that an optimal assignment here has cost 5, with 3 batches with type 0 and 1 batch of type 1.

Proof By Assumption 6, a machine of type k has cost $c_k = 2^k$, and by Proposition 7, $c_k/B_k \geq c_{k+1}/B_{k+1}$. Substituting in for the costs and rearranging, we see that $B_{k+1} \geq 2B_k$. The batch sizes are geometrically increasing by at least a factor of 2. Since there are at most n jobs, the highest capacity machine that is relevant to the instance processes a batch of size at most n . It follows that $K \leq \log n$. \blacksquare

3.2 A lower bound on $\text{cost}(\text{OPT})$

We consider the following definition, for which Figure 2 is an accompaniment.

Definition 9 For a set of jobs J equipped with arrival times and deadlines in $[0, T]$, let an interval assignment \mathcal{A} be a family of tuples $\{(I, t_I, J_I)\}$ of a continuous interval $I \subseteq [0, T]$, a type t_I , and a set of jobs $J_I \subseteq J$. Let \mathcal{L} denote the multi-set of all intervals I with $(I, t_I, J_I) \in \mathcal{A}$ and let $I(j)$ be the interval that job j is assigned to. We define a valid interval assignment as one such that the following holds:

1. When $t_I \geq 1$, then $|J_I| = B_{t_I-1}$, and when $t_I = 0$, then $|J_I| = 1$.
2. If job j is in J_I , then $[r_j, d_j] \subseteq I$.
3. For any two intervals $I, I' \in \mathcal{L}$, if $t_I = t_{I'}$, then I and I' are disjoint.
4. Every job is assigned to at most one J_I . If a job j is not assigned to any J_I , then $I(j) = \emptyset$.

We use valid interval assignments to lower bound the cost of an optimal offline solution, as in the following lemma.

Lemma 10 For a set of jobs J equipped with arrival times and deadlines in $[0, T]$ satisfying Assumption 6 and Proposition 7, let $\mathcal{A} = \{(I, t_I, J_I)\}$ be a valid interval assignment with \mathcal{L} the multi-set of all intervals I with $(I, t_I, J_I) \in \mathcal{A}$. Then,

$$\text{cost}(\text{OPT}) \geq \frac{1}{4} \cdot \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}} 2^{t_I}.$$

Proof At a high level, we will prove this by distributing $4 \cdot \text{cost}(\text{OPT})$ credits to all jobs j for whom $I(j) \neq \emptyset$. We will do this in such a way that the sum of the credits distributed is at least $\sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}} 2^{t_I}$ and at most $4 \cdot \text{cost}(\text{OPT})$, proving the inequality in the lemma statement.




Figure 3: Distribution of credits from batch X with $k = 2$. For interval types 0, 1, and 2, X distributes $2^{t_{I(j)}}/|J_{I(j)}|$ credits per job, and there are at most $|J_{I(j)}|$ jobs in each interval type. For each job in interval types 3 and 4, X distributes $2^{k+1}/B_k$ credits, and there are at most B_k such jobs in interval types 3 and 4 combined.

Suppose that for each batch X of type k that OPT uses, we distribute credits to jobs in $J(X)$ in the following way:

- To each job j in $J(X)$ with $t_{I(j)} \leq k$ we give $2^{t_{I(j)}}/|J_{I(j)}|$ credits.
- To each job j in $J(X)$ with $t_{I(j)} > k$, we give $2^{k+1}/B_k$ credits.

Figure 3 depicts the distribution of credits.

We will first prove the following helpful claims regarding credits.

Claim 11 *When $t_{I(j)} > k$, the following holds:*

$$\frac{2^{t_{I(j)}}}{|J_{I(j)}|} \leq \frac{2^{k+1}}{B_k}.$$

Proof We observe that:

$$\frac{2^{t_{I(j)}}}{|J_{I(j)}|} = 2 \cdot \frac{2^{t_{I(j)}-1}}{B_{t_{I(j)}-1}} \leq 2 \cdot \frac{2^k}{B_k} = \frac{2^{k+1}}{B_k}$$

where the inequality is because $t_{I(j)} > k$ and we assumed (based on Proposition 7) that larger machines are more cost efficient. \blacksquare

Claim 12 *The total credits distributed by X of type k to jobs with $t_{I(j)} \leq k$ is at most 2^{k+1} .*

Proof We have required that all intervals with the same type must be disjoint, and therefore batch X can intersect at most one interval I of each type k' with $k' \leq k$. From each such interval I , $J(X)$ contains at most $|J_I|$ jobs, and so the total amount of credits awarded by X to jobs associated with I is at most $2^{k'}$. The total amount of credits awarded by X to jobs with $t_{I(j)} \leq k$ is therefore upper bounded by $1 + 2 + \dots + 2^k \leq 2^{k+1}$. \blacksquare

Claim 13 *The total credits distributed by X of type k to jobs with $t_{I(j)} > k$ is at most 2^{k+1} .*

Proof There are at most B_k jobs on batch X , and batch X distributes $2^{k+1}/B_k$ to each job with $t_{I(j)} > k$, so the total amount of credits awarded to jobs with $t_{I(j)} > k$ is upper bounded by 2^{k+1} . \blacksquare

We use these claims to prove the lemma statement. Let $\text{credit}(j)$ denote the amount of credit awarded to job j . Then

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}} 2^{t_I} = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{j \in J_I} \frac{2^{t_I}}{|J_I|} = \sum_{j: I(j) \neq \emptyset} \frac{2^{t_{I(j)}}}{|J_{I(j)}|} \leq \sum_{j: I(j) \neq \emptyset} \text{credit}(j) \leq 4 \cdot \text{cost}(\text{OPT}).$$

Algorithm 2 The main algorithm

Let $W \leftarrow \emptyset$, $\tau \leftarrow 0$, and $\mathcal{X} \leftarrow \emptyset$.

while $\tau \neq \text{NULL}$ **do**

▷ Let J' be the set of jobs with arrival time τ .

▷ Update $W \leftarrow W \cup J'$.

while $\exists j^* \in W$ with $d_{j^*} = \tau$ **do** // *If many candidates, choose j^* arbitrarily from them*

▷ Run Algorithm 3 with inputs τ , J , W , j^* , and \mathcal{X} , which outputs new batch X^* , equipped with $t(X^*)$, $J(X^*)$, $\tau(X^*)$, $\tilde{S}(X^*)$, $\tilde{I}(X^*)$.

▷ Update $\mathcal{X} \leftarrow \mathcal{X} \cup X^*$ and $W \leftarrow W \setminus J(X^*)$.

▷ $\{(\tilde{I}(X), t(X), \tilde{S}(X))\}_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \leftarrow \{(\tilde{I}(X), t(X), \tilde{S}(X))\}_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \cup \{(\tilde{I}(X^*), t(X^*), \tilde{S}(X^*))\}$.

end while

Increment $\tau \leftarrow \tau + 1$, or let $\tau = \text{NULL}$ if time has ended.

end while

Return \mathcal{X} .

Note that the first sum is over \mathcal{L} , which is a multi-set, so in particular an interval might contribute to the sum multiple times. For the first inequality, we note that every interval I must intersect some batch used by OPT, otherwise OPT would not have picked up the jobs associated with I (recall that $|J_I| > 0$). Therefore, every job j associated with an interval must receive at least $2^{t(j)}/|J_{I(j)}|$ credits (by construction and by Claim 11).

For the second inequality, we combine Claims 12 and 13 to observe that the total credits distributed by each batch X of type k sent by OPT is at most 2^{k+2} , while the cost incurred by OPT for using batch X is 2^k . Therefore, the total amount of credit awarded for all batches used by OPT will not exceed $4 \cdot \text{cost}(\text{OPT})$. This finished the proof of Lemma 10. ■

The constant of $1/4$ given by Lemma 10 is tight. See Appendix B.

3.3 Main algorithm and analysis

We use Algorithm 2 to prove Theorem 1. The algorithm scans the time horizon until we reach a time slot τ where some job j is uncompleted and has its deadline. Algorithm 2 must decide which machine type to use, and this decision is made by the subroutine in Algorithm 3. A batch $X \in \mathcal{X}$ of type $t(X)$ executed at time $\tau(X)$ completes jobs $J(X)$, which are the (at most) $B_{t(X)}$ jobs with earliest deadline who are available at $\tau(X)$ and not yet completed by that time. As before, W is the set of jobs waiting to be scheduled, i.e., $W = J \setminus \cup_{X \in \mathcal{X}} J(X)$.

Recall that in the proof of the lower bound, it was helpful to associate a type t_I and a set of jobs J_I to interval I . In the algorithm analysis, it will be helpful to associate a type $t(X)$, two sets of jobs $\tilde{S}(X)$ and $J(X)$, and an interval $\tilde{I}(X)$ to batch X . It is not surprising to see $t(X)$ as the associated type, but what might be surprising is to see two sets of associated jobs. While $J(X)$ are the jobs in batch X , $\tilde{S}(X)$ are the jobs we charge to X for our analysis, where jobs may be paying for a batch other than the one they are a part of.

Intuitively speaking, we employ a type of “pay-it-forward” philosophy. We charge the cost of one of the batches that the algorithm produces to the cost that OPT expends to execute one job in that batch (who we will refer to as the critical job) and the non-critical jobs in another batch. The *critical job* in batch X is the job $j^* \in J(X)$ with deadline at X 's execution time, i.e. $d_{j^*} = \tau(X)$; if there are many such jobs, we arbitrarily choose one to be the critical job of the batch. To determine $\tilde{S}(X)$, throughout the algorithm we will keep track of an interval associated with batch X , which we denote by $\tilde{I}(X)$. Note this is a slight abuse of notation from the lower bound section, where we let $I(j)$ denote the interval containing job j . Additionally, tracking $\tilde{S}(X)$ and $\tilde{I}(X)$ is not necessary for the algorithm (hence they are given the additional tilde in the notation), but for clarity in the analysis, we construct them in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 3 Deciding the next batch

Input: time τ , jobs J , waiting jobs W , critical job j^* with $d_{j^*} = \tau$, and batches \mathcal{X} , where every $X \in \mathcal{X}$ is equipped with $t(X)$, $J(X)$, $\tau(X)$, $\tilde{S}(X)$, $\tilde{I}(X)$.

▷ Let $k \leftarrow 0$.

▷ Let $I_0 \leftarrow [r_{j^*}, \tau]$.

while I_k contains a time slot $\tau_k := \tau(X_k)$ with $t(X_k) = k$ for some $X_k \in \mathcal{X}$ **do**

// Only the latest such τ_k is stored

▷ Let j_k be a job in $J(X_k)$ with the earliest arrival time. // Tie-break arbitrarily

▷ Let τ'_k be the arrival time of j_k .

▷ Set $I_{k+1} \leftarrow I_k \cup [\tau'_k, \tau_k]$.

▷ Increment $k \leftarrow k + 1$.

end while

Set $I^* \leftarrow I_k$ and $S^* \leftarrow \{j^*\}$.

if $k > 0$: **then**

 Add all the non-critical jobs of X_{k-1} to S^* .

end if

▷ Let J^* be the B_k ($|W|$ if $|W| < B_k$) jobs in W with earliest deadline. // Tie-break arbitrarily.

▷ Create batch X^* with type $t(X^*) \leftarrow k$, execution time $\tau(X^*) \leftarrow \tau$, and jobs $J(X^*) \leftarrow J^*$.

▷ Define $\tilde{I}(X^*) \leftarrow I^*$ and $\tilde{S}(X^*) \leftarrow S^*$.

Return X^* .

In order to use our lower bound from the previous section, we will use the batches to construct a valid interval assignment (as in Definition 9). Note that Algorithm 2 sets $t_{\tilde{I}(X)} = t(X)$ when it defines $\{(\tilde{I}(X), t(X), \tilde{S}(X))\}_{X \in \mathcal{X}}$ as an interval assignment. We prove the conditions for Definition 9 hold in Lemmas 14 and 16 and Proposition 15.

Lemma 14 *Algorithm 2 produces $\{(\tilde{I}(X), t(X), \tilde{S}(X))\}_{X \in \mathcal{X}}$ that satisfy Conditions (1) and (2) of being a valid interval assignment (Definition 9).*

Proof If $t(X) = 0$, then indeed there is only the critical job in $\tilde{S}(X)$, so $|\tilde{S}(X)| = 1$. Further, the critical job j^* completely determines the interval, with $\tilde{I}(X) = [r_{j^*}, d_{j^*}]$. Thus, Conditions (1) and (2) are satisfied when $t(X) = 0$.

Fix $t(X) = k > 0$. Batch X is dispatched at the right endpoint of $\tilde{I}(X)$, recall that this endpoint is time τ . Consider the sequence of nested intervals that the algorithm built up to construct $\tilde{I}(X)$, i.e., I_0, I_1, \dots, I_k , where now $\tilde{I}(X) = I_k$. These are indeed nested intervals, since for all $j = 0, \dots, k$, I_j contains τ_j and I_{j+1} is defined by $I_{j+1} \leftarrow I_j \cup [\tau'_j, \tau_j]$. Associated with these intervals are batches $X_0, X_1, \dots, X_{k-1} \in \mathcal{X}$ that forced interval $\tilde{I}(X)$ to be created (see Algorithm 3). Recall that τ'_ℓ is the arrival time of the earliest arriving job in $J(X_\ell)$. Since $\tau \in \tilde{I}(X)$, we have that for all $\hat{\tau} \in \tilde{I}(X)$, either $\hat{\tau} \in I_0$ or there exists some $0 < \ell < k$ such that $\hat{\tau} \in [\tau'_\ell, \tau_\ell]$.

We prove by induction on $\ell < k$ that X_ℓ is a full batch, and all jobs in $J(X_\ell)$ have deadline no later than τ .

Base case: Here, $\ell = 0$. Let j^* be the critical job of X . Note that $\tau_0 \in I_0$ and the left endpoint of I_0 is r_{j^*} . Further, since $k > 0$, job j^* is not in batch X_0 (recall that $\tau_0 \leq \tau$). Therefore, we can deduce that batch X_0 is full (because, if not, j^* would have been in batch X_0) and each job in $J(X_0)$ has deadline at latest τ due to the EDF rule.

Induction step: Fix some integer $1 \leq \ell < k$. Assume that for all $0 \leq \ell' < \ell$, $X_{\ell'}$ is filled to its capacity, and all the jobs in batch $X_{\ell'}$ have deadline no later than τ . We will show that X_ℓ is filled to its capacity, and all the jobs in batch X_ℓ have deadline no later than τ . Since X_ℓ




Figure 4: Constructing intervals. At time $\tau = d_{j^*}$, job j^* (highest bold interval) must be executed. Algorithm 3 decides which machine type to use for the next batch at τ by constructing intervals I_0, I_1, I_2, I_3 , which are indicated on the time horizon, where I_0 is the blue interval, I_1 is the union of the blue and orange intervals, I_2 is the union of the blue, orange, and pink intervals, and I_3 is the union of all colored intervals. These intervals are defined by taking the previous interval and extending it to the earliest arrival time of a job in the corresponding batch. Here Algorithm 3 decides to use a batch of type 3. Capacities of batches in this instance are $B_0 = 1, B_1 = 3, B_2 = 8, B_3 = 20$. Jobs with bold (arrival time, deadline) intervals are executed in the new batch, which can have less than B_3 jobs if these are all the jobs in the waiting list W .

exists, either $\tau_\ell \in I_0$ (in which case the reasoning from the base case applies), or there exists some $\mu < \ell$ with $\tau_\ell \in [\tau'_\mu, \tau_\mu]$. The latter case is the interesting one, so we fix such a μ .

Let job j_μ be any job arriving at time τ'_μ that is scheduled in batch X_μ at time τ_μ . Since j_μ is not in batch X_ℓ , it must be that *batch X_ℓ is full*, as j_μ was available to be sent with $\tau_\ell \in [\tau'_\mu, \tau_\mu]$. Again since batch X_ℓ was scheduled without job j_μ , the EDF rule implies that the jobs in $J(X_\ell)$ have deadlines no later than the deadline of j_μ . Thus, *all jobs in $J(X_\ell)$ have deadline no later than τ* , since $j_\mu \in J(X_\mu)$ has deadline $\leq \tau$ by the inductive hypothesis.

This completes the inductive step.

Finally, let us look at the moment that the algorithm has found an interval I_k that does not contain a time executing a batch of type k ; we can assume that $k > 0$ as we already considered the case when $k = 0$. Recall that this will be the interval associated with the new batch, i.e., the algorithm sets $\tilde{I}(X) = I_k$. Note that $[\tau'_{k-1}, \tau] \subseteq I_k$ and recall that $\tilde{S}(X)$ is the critical job of batch X plus all the non-critical jobs of batch X_{k-1} . Since batch X_{k-1} is full, $|\tilde{S}(X)| = B_{k-1}$ and so Condition (1) is satisfied. Moreover, every job in $J(X_{k-1})$ has arrival time at or after τ'_{k-1} and deadline at most τ , as proven above. The critical job of batch X also has arrival time and deadline inside I_k (since I_k contains I_0), and we conclude that Condition (2) is satisfied since $\tilde{I}(X_k) = I_k$. \blacksquare

Proposition 15 *Algorithm 2 produces batches \mathcal{X} equipped with $\{(\tilde{I}(X), t(X), \tilde{S}(X))\}_{X \in \mathcal{X}}$ which satisfy Condition (3) of being a valid interval assignment (Definition 9).*

Proof By construction, intervals of the same type cannot intersect; see the while loop condition in Algorithm 3. \blacksquare

Lemma 16 *Algorithm 2 produces batches \mathcal{X} equipped with $\{(\tilde{I}(X), t(X), \tilde{S}(X))\}_{X \in \mathcal{X}}$ which satisfy Condition (4) of being a valid interval assignment (Definition 9).*

Proof Fix a non-critical job j_k that is in $J(X_k)$. If j_k were in more than one batch, it must have ended up in batches $\tilde{S}(X)$ and $\tilde{S}(X')$, where both X and X' are of type $k+1$. But then, by

Condition (3), these corresponding intervals $\tilde{I}(X)$ and $\tilde{I}(X')$ must be disjoint. These intervals cannot be disjoint, since by Condition (2) they are both required to contain $[r_{j_k}, d_{j_k}]$. ■

Proof [of *Theorem 1*] Combining Lemmas 14 and 16 with Proposition 15, we see that Algorithm 2 schedules batches \mathcal{X} equipped with a valid interval assignment $\{(\tilde{I}(X), t(X), \tilde{S}(X))\}_{X \in \mathcal{X}}$. By Assumption 6, the costs of machines are all powers of 2, and recall we make this assumption with only a factor 2 loss in the competitive ratio. Therefore, the cost of the batches in \mathcal{X} is

$$\sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}} 2^{t(X)}.$$

Applying Lemma 10 to $\{(\tilde{I}(X), t(X), \tilde{S}(X))\}_{X \in \mathcal{X}}$, we see that for $\mathcal{L} = \{\tilde{I}(X)\}_{X \in \mathcal{X}}$:

$$\text{cost}(\text{OPT}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \cdot \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}} 2^{t_I} = \frac{1}{8} \cdot \sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}} 2^{t(X)}.$$

Note the factor of 2 in the first inequality follows from Proposition 5. Therefore, the cost of \mathcal{X} is at most $8 \cdot \text{cost}(\text{OPT})$.

The run-time of this algorithm is $O(n \log n)$. As in Algorithm 1, we sort J so that J' can be found in time $|J'|$. We use a min-heap with keys d_j , for elements $j \in W$, to store W . We use the sorted J to find the next time slot where $J' \neq \emptyset$ and compare it with the smallest key in W . Recall that $K \leq \log n$ is an upper-bound on the number of types of machines by Proposition 8. We also keep for each type $\ell \in \{0, \dots, K\}$ the time $\tau(X)$ and the earliest arrival time of a job in $J(X)$, where X is the latest batch of type ℓ . Using these, each critical job requires at most $K + 1$ iterations through the while loop of Algorithm 3 to choose the type of the batch which will contain this critical job. In time $O(\log n)$ per job, we can update the data structures. ■

4 Proof of Theorem 3

Here, we prove a lower bound of 2 for the competitive ratio of any deterministic online algorithm, assuming an all-powerful adversary. Our construction will also result in an agreeable instance, which implies that Algorithm 1 is an optimal deterministic algorithm for agreeable instances.

Proof [of *Theorem 3*]

Instance construction Suppose that there are two machine types, which we call “small” and “large”. The small machines have cost 1 and capacity 1, whereas the large machines have cost M and capacity M^3 , where M is a large even integer. We call large and small batches the corresponding batches of jobs. In this instance, the release time of every job will be odd and the deadline of every job will be even. Many jobs will have the same release time, but no two jobs will have the same deadline. The adversary’s only action will be to release groups of $M^3/2$ jobs, where those $M^3/2$ jobs arrive at some time τ and each released job has as deadline the earliest even time slot that does not already contain a job deadline (thereby adding $M^3/2$ unique deadlines to the instance). Note that this release structure will result in an agreeable instance.

At time 1, the adversary releases one group of $M^3/2$ jobs. If no large machine is used to execute any of the jobs from the first group, then no more jobs are released by the adversary. Otherwise, the adversary will release another group of $M^3/2$ jobs at the first odd time step after the algorithm uses a large machine. The adversary repeats this at most $M - 1$ more times, so that we have at most M such groups. We index the groups of jobs released by the algorithm as β_1, \dots, β_M .

We now show why this instance implies a lower bound of 2 on the competitive ratio. First, consider the case where the algorithm uses at least $2M^2$ small machines in a row in some group. These batches would incur a cost of at least $2M^2$. One valid solution across all groups of jobs would be to have instead executed all of the jobs from each group in a large batch at the first




Figure 5: An illustration for the proof of Theorem 3. Each red thick arrow represents the arrival of $M^3/2$ jobs. The short thin arrows represent the scheduling of a batch on a small machine, and the long thin arrows represent the scheduling of a batch on a large machine.

deadline of a job from each group, which would have incurred a cost of at most M^2 total. This implies a competitive ratio of at least 2.

See Figure 5 for an illustration of the rest of the proof. If an algorithm does not send $2M^2$ small batches in a row in any group, then it executes at least one large batch for every group. Note that in this case all M groups are released by the adversary. Let q_i represent the number of small batches scheduled by the algorithm between the releases of groups β_i and β_{i+1} for $i \in [M-1]$, and let q_M be the number of small batches scheduled by the algorithm after β_M was released. Then the cost incurred by the algorithm is $M^2 + \sum_{i=1}^M q_i$.

We consider two other possible solutions to this instance (see Solution 1 and Solution 2 in Figure 5). One possible solution is to schedule a large batch at the first deadline, then small batches at the next $q_2 + 1$ deadlines, then a large batch at the next deadline, then small batches at the next $q_4 + 1$ deadlines, and so on, ending with a large batch to clear away any remaining jobs. This solution is feasible as we can map any job executed by the algorithm to a batch in the solution, as follows. Any job executed in a small batch in an even group in the algorithm is also executed by a small batch in this solution. The job with the earliest deadline that is in a large batch in every even batch is also in a small batch. Every other job executed by the algorithm is in a large batch. Since the algorithm scheduled all jobs, we know this solution scheduled all jobs as well. The cost of this solution is at most $(M/2+1)M + \sum_{i=1}^{M/2} (1+q_{2i}) = (M+3)(M/2) + \sum_{i=1}^{M/2} q_{2i}$.

Another possible solution is to use small batches at the first $q_1 + 1$ deadlines, then a large batch at the next deadline, then small batches at the next $q_3 + 1$ deadlines, and so on, ending with a large batch to clear away any remaining jobs. We can again show this solution is feasible by mapping jobs carried by the algorithm to jobs carried by this solution in a similar fashion. The cost of this solution is at most $(M/2+1)M + \sum_{i=1}^{M/2} (1+q_{2i-1}) = (M+3)(M/2) + \sum_{i=1}^{M/2} q_{2i-1}$.

The sum of the costs for these two possible solutions is at most $(1+3/M)$ times the cost of the online algorithm. This then implies that the solution with the lower cost of the two is at most $(1+3/M)/2$ times the cost of the online algorithm. Letting M go to infinity completes the proof of a lower bound of 2 for the competitive ratio of any deterministic online algorithm in the all-powerful adversary model. ■

5 Conclusion and Future Directions

We study online busy-time scheduling with flexible, unit-length jobs on heterogeneous machines. For the general case, we design an 8-competitive algorithm. When jobs are guaranteed to have agreeable deadlines, a simpler algorithm is 2-competitive, which is tight with our hardness result.

In our work, we have focused on jobs that have unit processing time and have uniform resource requirement⁴, which are characteristics that could be relaxed in future work. Indeed, Ren and Tang [RT20] consider inflexible jobs with different heights, in the sense that each job takes up a different amount of space on each machine. Sarpatwar et al. [SSS23] consider preemptively scheduling flexible jobs with arbitrary processing times and heights on homogeneous machines; in the online setting, there is a $3/2$ lower bound on the competitive ratio of any online algorithm that knows a job’s characteristics at arrival time, even assuming agreeable deadlines.

Generalizing our setting to allow non-unit processing lengths or non-uniform heights introduces significant complexity into the problem. For instance, if jobs have different processing times, then we are no longer able to only schedule jobs at deadlines, and would need to reexamine our earliest deadline first heuristic. We discuss in more detail the difficulty for incorporating heights, even with agreeable deadlines. For heterogeneous machines, if jobs have unit length and agreeable deadlines but are allowed to have a resource requirement, then we can still apply our Greedy algorithm (Algorithm 1) and get a competitive ratio of 2 (the same proof works). This may not be a polynomial-time algorithm—for example, if jobs have heights and a machine can only process a set of jobs of total height at most 1 (homogeneous machines), then `GetOptimalBatches()` would have to solve a bin-packing problem. If `GetOptimalBatches()` is an α -approximation algorithm (this algorithm depends on how resource requirements are defined), we get a competitive ratio of 2α .

When deadlines are not agreeable and jobs have heights, we do not know how to extend our 8-competitive algorithm (Algorithm 2), even when jobs are unit-length. One roadblock here is that we can no longer assume that the machine with the largest capacity is the most cost-efficient, as jobs may not fit on smaller machines.

⁴In the literature, this is also known as the *height* of a job.

References

- [AB03] Mansoor Alicherry and Randeep Bhatia. Line system design and a generalized coloring problem. In *European Symposium on Algorithms*, pages 19–30. Springer, 2003.
- [AGKK20] Antonios Antoniadis, Naveen Garg, Gunjan Kumar, and Nikhil Kumar. Parallel machine scheduling to minimize energy consumption. In *Proceedings of the fourteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on discrete algorithms*, pages 2758–2769. SIAM, 2020.
- [AIS08] John Augustine, Sandy Irani, and Chaitanya Swamy. Optimal power-down strategies. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 37(5):1499–1516, 2008.
- [AV19] Yossi Azar and Danny Vainstein. Tight bounds for clairvoyant dynamic bin packing. *ACM Transactions on Parallel Computing (TOPC)*, 6(3):1–21, 2019.
- [Bap06] Philippe Baptiste. Scheduling unit tasks to minimize the number of idle periods: a polynomial time algorithm for offline dynamic power management. In *SODA*, volume 6, pages 364–367, 2006.
- [BFM⁺21] Niv Buchbinder, Yaron Fairstein, Konstantina Mellou, Ishai Menache, and Joseph Naor. Online virtual machine allocation with lifetime and load predictions. *ACM SIGMETRICS Performance Evaluation Review*, 49(1):9–10, 2021.
- [BJ95] Hans L. Bodlaender and Klaus Jansen. Restrictions of graph partition problems. part i. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 148(1):93–109, 1995.
- [BKL⁺08] Niv Buchbinder, Tracy Kimbrel, Retsef Levi, Konstantin Makarychev, and Maxim Sviridenko. Online make-to-order joint replenishment model: primal dual competitive algorithms. In *Proceedings of the nineteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 952–961, 2008.
- [BKS11] Nikhil Bansal, Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, and Barna Saha. On capacitated set cover problems. In *International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 38–49. Springer, 2011.
- [BNGK⁺09] Amotz Bar-Noy, Sudipto Guha, Yoav Katz, Joseph Naor, Baruch Schieber, and Hadas Shachnai. Throughput maximization of real-time scheduling with batching. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 5(2):1–17, 2009.
- [BP14] Nikhil Bansal and Kirk Pruhs. The geometry of scheduling. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 43(5):1684–1698, 2014.
- [CCL⁺07] Ho-Leung Chan, Wun-Tat Chan, Tak Wah Lam, Lap-Kei Lee, Kin-Sum Mak, and Prudence WH Wong. Energy efficient online deadline scheduling. In *SODA*, volume 7, pages 795–804. Citeseer, 2007.
- [CGK10] Deeparnab Chakrabarty, Elyot Grant, and Jochen Könemann. On column-restricted and priority covering integer programs. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization: 14th International Conference, IPCO 2010, Lausanne, Switzerland, June 9-11, 2010. Proceedings 14*, pages 355–368. Springer, 2010.
- [CGKS12] Timothy M Chan, Elyot Grant, Jochen Könemann, and Malcolm Sharpe. Weighted capacitated, priority, and geometric set cover via improved quasi-uniform sampling. In *Proceedings of the twenty-third annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1576–1585. SIAM, 2012.
- [CKM14] Jessica Chang, Samir Khuller, and Koyel Mukherjee. LP rounding and combinatorial algorithms for minimizing active and busy time. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM symposium on Parallelism in algorithms and architectures*, pages 118–127, 2014.
- [CN06] Julia Chuzhoy and Joseph Naor. Covering problems with hard capacities. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 36(2):498–515, 2006.
- [CS15] Tim Carnes and David B Shmoys. Primal-dual schema for capacitated covering problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 153:289–308, 2015.

- [CW20] Gruia Calinescu and Kai Wang. New approach of LP rounding algorithm for the active time problem. 2020.
- [DGH⁺07] Erik D Demaine, Mohammad Ghodsi, Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, Amin S Sayedi-Roshkhar, and Morteza Zadimoghaddam. Scheduling to minimize gaps and power consumption. In *Proceedings of the nineteenth annual ACM symposium on Parallel algorithms and architectures*, pages 46–54, 2007.
- [DKZ22] Sami Davies, Samir Khuller, and Shirley Zhang. Balancing flow time and energy consumption. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures*, pages 369–380, 2022.
- [EEL09] Leah Epstein, Thomas Erlebach, and Asaf Levin. Online capacitated interval coloring. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 23(2):822–841, 2009.
- [ELR⁺08] Guy Even, Retsef Levi, Dror Rawitz, Baruch Schieber, Shimon Shahar, and Maxim Sviridenko. Algorithms for capacitated rectangle stabbing and lot sizing with joint set-up costs. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 4(3):1–17, 2008.
- [FJQS08] Gerd Finke, Vincent Jost, Maurice Queyranne, and András Sebő. Batch processing with interval graph compatibilities between tasks. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 156(5):556–568, 2008.
- [GIK02] Daya Ram Gaur, Toshihide Ibaraki, and Ramesh Krishnamurti. Constant ratio approximation algorithms for the rectangle stabbing problem and the rectilinear partitioning problem. *Journal of Algorithms*, 43(1):138–152, 2002.
- [HM91] Refael Hassin and Nimrod Megiddo. Approximation algorithms for hitting objects with straight lines. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 30(1):29–42, 1991.
- [IM13] Sungjin Im and Benjamin Moseley. Online batch scheduling for flow objectives. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Parallelism in algorithms and architectures*, pages 102–104, 2013.
- [IP05] Sandy Irani and Kirk R Pruhs. Algorithmic problems in power management. *ACM Sigact News*, 36(2):63–76, 2005.
- [ISG07] Sandy Irani, Sandeep Shukla, and Rajesh Gupta. Algorithms for power savings. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 3(4):41–es, 2007.
- [KR05] Vijay Kumar and Atri Rudra. Approximation algorithms for wavelength assignment. In *FSTTCS 2005: Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science: 25th International Conference, Hyderabad, India, December 15-18, 2005. Proceedings 25*, pages 152–163. Springer, 2005.
- [KSST10] Rohit Khandekar, Baruch Schieber, Hadas Shachnai, and Tami Tamir. Minimizing busy time in multiple machine real-time scheduling. In *IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS 2010)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2010.
- [LT21] Mozhengfu Liu and Xueyan Tang. Analysis of busy-time scheduling on heterogeneous machines. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures*, pages 340–350, 2021.
- [LWAT12] Minghong Lin, Adam Wierman, Lachlan LH Andrew, and Eno Thereska. Dynamic right-sizing for power-proportional data centers. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 21(5):1378–1391, 2012.
- [Mey05] Adam Meyerson. The parking permit problem. In *46th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS’05)*, pages 274–282. IEEE, 2005.
- [RT20] Runtian Ren and Xueyan Tang. Busy-time scheduling on heterogeneous machines. In *2020 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*, pages 306–315, 2020.
- [SK12] Barna Saha and Samir Khuller. Set cover revisited: Hypergraph cover with hard capacities. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 762–773. Springer, 2012.
- [SSS23] Kanthi Sarpatwar, Baruch Schieber, and Hadas Shachnai. The preemptive resource allocation problem. *Journal of Scheduling*, pages 1–16, 2023.

- [WTFY17] Qian Wang, Ji Tian, Ruyan Fu, and Xiangjuan Yao. Online algorithms for scheduling on batch processing machines with interval graph compatibilities between jobs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 700:37–44, 2017.
- [WZ03] Peter Winkler and Lisa Zhang. Wavelength assignment and generalized interval graph coloring. In *Proceedings of the fourteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 830–831, 2003.
- [YDS95] Frances Yao, Alan Demers, and Scott Shenker. A scheduling model for reduced cpu energy. In *Proceedings of IEEE 36th annual foundations of computer science*, pages 374–382. IEEE, 1995.
- [ZPX11] Guiqing Zhang, Chung Keung Poon, and Yinfeng Xu. The ski-rental problem with multiple discount options. *Information Processing Letters*, 111(18):903–906, 2011.

A Discussion on Other Algorithms

We investigated several simpler algorithmic approaches for the general (non-agreeable) model, and observe that many natural algorithms do not obtain constant-factor competitive ratios. In this section, we highlight several of these algorithms and give intuition for why they fail. For each of the below examples, we assume that we have machine types $\{0, \dots, K\}$ with the capacity of each machine type ℓ being 10^ℓ and the cost of each machine ℓ being 2^ℓ . Here, K is an even integer that we will make large to obtain large competitive ratios.

Greedy Consider Algorithm 1, which schedules all jobs that are currently present at each time step where some job has a deadline. We showed in Section 2 that this algorithm works well when the input jobs have agreeable deadlines. In the general setting, the main problem with this algorithm is that it might have been better to send the majority of the jobs at or nearer to their deadlines. Suppose that at each time slot $10^{K/2}$ jobs arrive, of which one has an immediate deadline (i.e., at the next time slot) and all others have the same late deadline. Suppose $10^{K/2}$ sets of these jobs arrive. Greedy would send every job at its arrival time, in batches of $10^{K/2}$. Meanwhile, OPT could use $10^{K/2}$ batches of type 0 to send each job with an immediate deadline and one batch of cost 2^K to clear all jobs with the late deadline. Then our algorithm incurs cost $10^{K/2} \cdot 2^{K/2}$, while OPT incurs cost $10^{K/2} + 2^K$. The competitive ratio would be $\Omega(2^{K/2})$.

Most cost-efficient Another algorithm is to use the machine with the best cost-per-job scheduled (after waiting for a deadline and using EDF). The same setup used to show that Greedy can perform poorly also suffices to show that this cost-efficient algorithm performs poorly. Using the same logic, we find that the cost-efficient algorithm incurs cost $10^{K/2} \cdot 2^{K/2}$, while OPT incurs cost $10^{K/2} + 2^K$. The competitive ratio would again be $\Omega(2^{K/2})$.

Lazy Since the Greedy algorithm was sending jobs too early, one might instead try a lazy approach in which the algorithm does the following: schedule the minimum number of jobs that have an immediate deadline, until there are enough jobs to fill the largest capacity machine, at which point use the largest capacity machine. One problem with this algorithm occurs when not enough jobs arrive to fill the largest machine. Suppose that $10^{K/2}$ jobs arrive at time 1, each with a different deadline. Lazy would send each job separately on a machine of type 0, while OPT would send all jobs at the beginning on a machine of type $K/2$. Then our algorithm incurs cost $10^{K/2}$, while OPT incurs cost $2^{K/2}$. The competitive ratio would be $\Omega(5^{K/2})$.

Ramp-up We present one final simple algorithm we call the *ramp-up algorithm*. The ramp-up algorithm keeps track of an accumulated cost and always uses the largest machine type whose cost is at most the accumulated cost, or a machine of type 0 if no such machine exists. When the ramp-up algorithm clears all jobs, then it resets the accumulated cost to 0. One problem is when the algorithm keeps ramping up and clearing too soon, it fails in the manner of the Greedy algorithm.

The following example shows that the ramp-up algorithm cannot obtain a constant factor competitive ratio. Suppose that 2 jobs arrive at time 0 and groups of 10^ℓ jobs arrive at each succeeding time slot $2\ell + 1$, for $1 \leq \ell < K/2$. When $\ell = K/2$, a group of $10^{K/2} - 1$ jobs arrive. In each group, one job has an immediate deadline and the rest have the same very late deadline. Then our algorithm clears all waiting jobs in $2 + K/2$ machines for a total cost of $1 + 1 + \dots + 2^{K/2} = 2^{1+K/2}$, and resets the counter. Suppose that this set of job arrivals happens $10^{(K/2)-1}$ times. Then our algorithm would have a total cost of $10^{(K/2)-1} \cdot 2^{1+K/2}$, while a solution of total cost of $(2 + K/2) \cdot 10^{(K/2)-1} + 2^K$ exists: use batches of type 0 for the “immediate” jobs from each group, and one batch of type K to schedule all the other jobs at a very late moment. The competitive ratio would be $\Omega(2^{K/2}/K)$.

Our Algorithm 2 does “ramp up” to use bigger and bigger machines if many jobs are waiting, but manages to avoid the issue of ramping up too fast; for example, for the kind of adversary provided in the previous paragraph, Algorithm 2 only uses machines of type 0 for each group.

B Tight Example for the Lower Bound

We show that the constant of $1/4$ given by Lemma 10 is tight. Suppose we are given a set of jobs J equipped with arrival times and deadlines between $[0, T]$. Let $\{(I, t_I, J_I)\}$ be a valid interval assignment \mathcal{A} with \mathcal{L} the multi-set of all intervals I with $(I, t_I, J_I) \in \mathcal{A}$. For convenience, let

$$\sigma(\mathcal{A}) := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}} 2^{t_I}.$$

Lemma 17 *For any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an instance and a valid interval assignment \mathcal{A} such that $\text{cost}(\text{OPT}) < (\frac{1}{4} + \epsilon) \sigma$.*

Proof Let q be a large integer. Suppose that batches of type $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, q\}$ each have capacity 2^k and batches of type $k \in \{q+1, q+2, \dots\}$ each have capacity 2^{q+k} . All batches have cost 2^k .

For this example, for every I and every $j \in J_I$, $[r_j, d_j] = I$. We construct the following family of tuples. Figure 6 provides an illustration for $q = 3$. For $r \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^q\}$, and $s \in \{0, 1, \dots, q+1\}$, we construct the tuple $\tau_r^s = (I, t_I, J_I)$ where $I = [2r, 2r+1]$, $t_I = s$, and J_I is a set of “new” jobs (a set disjoint from the other sets constructed so far) of the size required by t_I . That is, if $s = 0$, then $|J_I| = 1$, and if $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, q+1\}$, then $|J_I| = 2^{s-1}$. We also have a tuple $\tau' = (I, t_I, J_I)$ where $I = [0, 2^{q+1} + 2]$, $t_I = 2q + 2$, and J_I is a set of new jobs of the required size, that is $|J_I| = 2^{3q+1}$. These are all the jobs of this instance, and this is \mathcal{A} , the family of tuples of this example.

Then

$$\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 2^q(2^0 + 2^1 + \dots + 2^{q+1}) + 2^{2q+2} = 2^q(2^{q+2} - 1) + 2^{q+2} = 2^{2q+3} - 2^q. \quad (2)$$

Now we construct a valid solution for this instance. For $r \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^q\}$, we use a batch of type $q+1$ at time $2r+1$ to schedule all the jobs assigned to τ_r^s , for all $s = 0, 1, \dots, q+1$. There are exactly $1 + 1 + 2 + 4 + \dots + 2^q = 2^{q+1}$ such jobs. We fill this batch with $2^{2q+1} - 2^{q+1}$ jobs assigned to τ' . After doing this for all $r \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^q\}$, we have scheduled all the jobs assigned to τ_r^s for all r and all s , and we have scheduled $2^q(2^{2q+1} - 2^{q+1}) = 2^{3q+1} - 2^{2q+1}$ of the jobs assigned to τ' . We use another batch of type $q+1$ to schedule the remaining 2^{2q+1} jobs that were assigned to τ' . The cost of this solution is:

$$(2^q + 1) 2^{q+1} = 2^{2q+1} + 2^{q+1}.$$

By making q large enough we finish the proof of the lemma. ■

Therefore, in order to get a competitive ratio better than 4 in the setting where the jobs have arbitrary intervals and costs powers of 2, it would be necessary to come up with a new lower bound.

type k	c_k	B_k	$ J_I $ for $t_I = k$
0	$2^0 = 1$	$2^0 = 1$	1
1	$2^1 = 2$	$2^1 = 2$	$B_{1-1} = 2^{1-1} = 1$
2	$2^2 = 4$	$2^2 = 4$	$B_{2-1} = 2^{2-1} = 2$
3	$2^3 = 8$	$2^3 = 8$	$B_{3-1} = 2^{3-1} = 4$
4	$2^4 = 16$	$2^7 = 128$	$B_{4-1} = 2^{4-1} = 8$
5	$2^5 = 32$	$2^8 = 256$	$B_{5-1} = 2^{8-1} = 128$
6	$2^6 = 64$	$2^9 = 512$	$B_{6-1} = 2^{9-1} = 256$
7	$2^7 = 128$	$2^{10} = 1024$	$B_{7-1} = 2^{10-1} = 512$
8	$2^8 = 256$	$2^{11} = 2048$	$B_{8-1} = 2^{11-1} = 1024$




Figure 6: The construction used in Lemma 17 for $q = 3$. Here a solution of cost $(2^3 + 1)2^4 = 2^7 + 2^4$ exists: the 9 vertical lines. On the other hand, $\sigma = 2^3(1 + 2 + 4 + 8 + 16) + 2^8 = 2^9 - 2^3$.