

Minimizing the Number of Tardy Jobs and Maximal Tardiness on a Single Machine is NP-hard*

Klaus Heeger[†] Danny Hermelin[‡] Michael L. Pinedo[§] Dvir Shabtay[¶]

Abstract

This paper resolves a long-standing open question in bicriteria scheduling regarding the complexity of a single machine scheduling problem which combines the number of tardy jobs and the maximal tardiness criteria. We use the lexicographic approach with the maximal tardiness being the primary criterion. Accordingly, the objective is to find, among all solutions minimizing the maximal tardiness, the one which has the minimum number of tardy jobs. The complexity of this problem has been open for over thirty years, and has been known since then to be one of the most challenging open questions in multicriteria scheduling. We resolve this question by proving that the problem is strongly NP-hard. We also prove that the problem is at least weakly NP-hard when we switch roles between the two criteria (*i.e.*, when the number of tardy jobs is the primary criterion). Finally, we provide hardness results for two other approaches (constraint and a priori approaches) to deal with these two criteria.

1 Introduction

Since the early stages of classical scheduling theory, the main focus has been the optimization of a single criterion such as the makespan, maximal tardiness, total tardiness, or number of tardy jobs. However, in many practical cases, service and production organizations need to take more than a single objective into account when trying to produce an efficient schedule. For example, a production firm may want to balance its ability to meet job due dates with its ability to control the amount of work-in process held in the shop. Meeting the first objective may prioritize scheduling jobs with an early due date first, while meeting the second objective may prioritize scheduling jobs with short processing times first. As another example, consider a pizzeria that charges no money for late deliveries. Accordingly, the pizzeria owners may try to provide a delivery schedule that minimizes the number of tardy deliveries. However, such a strategy may yield an unfair solution when late deliveries have huge tardiness. In order to produce balanced delivery schedules, they may consider the maximal tardiness as an additional criterion to evaluate the quality of a delivery schedule. Given the above deficiency of traditional scheduling models, the field of multicriteria scheduling has gained a lot of attention from the late 80's on. Ever since, the literature on multicriteria scheduling has expanded considerably, with several survey papers and books published over the years [2, 6, 10, 13, 14].

Consider two different minimization objectives F_1 and F_2 for a given scheduling problem. In a typical setting there are not enough resources to compute the entire set of Pareto optimal solutions, as this set is usually quite large. Therefore, one needs a way to define which solution is the most desired in this set. There are essentially three established approaches to tackle this issue, each of which defines a different problem for a given pair of scheduling criteria F_1 and F_2 (see, e.g., [6]).

- The *lexicographic* approach: Find a solution that minimizes F_2 among all solutions that minimize F_1 . This variant is usually denoted by $1||Lex(F_1, F_2)$ in the single machine setting, where F_1 is called the *primary criterion* and F_2 is the *secondary criterion*.

*Supported by the ISF, grant No. 1070/20.

[†]Department of Industrial Engineering and Management, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva, Israel. heeger@post.bgu.ac.il.

[‡]Department of Industrial Engineering and Management, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva, Israel. hermelin@bgu.ac.il.

[§]Stern School of Business, New York University, New York City, USA. mlp5@stern.nyu.edu.

[¶]Department of Industrial Engineering and Management, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva, Israel. dvirs@bgu.ac.il.

- The *constraint* approach: Given a threshold parameter ℓ , find a solution that minimizes F_1 subject to the constraint that $F_2 \leq \ell$. In the single machine setting with no additional constraints this variant is usually denoted by $1|F_2 \leq \ell|F_1$.
- The *a priori* approach: Find a solution that minimizes $\alpha F_1 + F_2$, where α is a given constant that indicates the relative importance of criterion F_1 with respect to criterion F_2 . This variant is usually denoted by $1||\alpha F_1 + F_2$ in the single machine setting.

Note that the lexicographic approach is a special case of the a priori approach.

In this paper we consider two of the most basic and classical scheduling objectives: The first is the maximal tardiness criterion, typically denoted by T_{\max} , which measures the maximum tardiness of any job in the schedule. It is well-known that the $1||T_{\max}$ problem, the problem of minimizing T_{\max} on a single machine, is solvable in $O(n \log n)$ time by processing the jobs based on the Earliest Due Date (EDD) rule [9]. The second criterion, denoted $\sum U_j$, is the total number of tardy jobs in the schedule. The corresponding single machine $1||\sum U_j$ problem is also solvable in $O(n \log n)$ time, due to an algorithm presented by Moore in the late 60s [11]. It follows that minimizing either the maximal tardiness or the number of tardy jobs can be done in polynomial time when the scheduling is done on a single machine. However, when both criteria are considered together, the resulting bicriteria problems become much harder to analyze and solve. In fact, the computational complexity status of the problem using either the constraint, lexicographic, or a priori approach was mentioned as an open problem by several different authors.

Lee and Vairaktarakis [10] published in 1993 an influential survey on bicriteria single machine scheduling problems. They focused on the lexicographic approach, and mentioned several open problems involving either one or both of the T_{\max} and $\sum U_j$ criteria. Later on, all of these were resolved by Huo *et al.* [8, 7], apart from $1||Lex(T_{\max}, \sum U_j)$ and $1||Lex(\sum U_j, T_{\max})$ which were left open. This is summarized in [7] with the following quote:

“Despite much efforts spent on $1||Lex(T_{\max}, \sum U_j)$ and $1||Lex(\sum U_j, T_{\max})$, their complexity remain open. Although we cannot prove it, we conjecture that they are both NP-hard. It will be worthwhile to settle this issue in the future.”

The complexity status of the problem was mentioned as open also in later surveys by T’kindt and Billaut [13] and Hoogeveen [6], and also in the book on multicriteria scheduling by T’kindt and Billaut [14]. The $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell|\sum U_j$ problem is mentioned in the book on multiagent scheduling by Agnetis *et al.* [2], who write

“The complexity of this problem still stands out as one of the most prominent open issues in theoretical scheduling.”

As such, the complexity status of these problems have been established as one of the main open problems in multicriteria scheduling.

1.1 Our Results

We determine the computational complexity of single machine bicriteria scheduling involving objectives T_{\max} and $\sum U_j$ using either the constraint, lexicographic, or a priori approach, by showing that all problems are unlikely to admit polynomial-time algorithms.

Our first main result involves the constraint variant of the problem. In its decision form, the problem asks to determine whether there exists a schedule with $T_{\max} \leq \ell$ and $\sum U_j \leq k$, and we denote this problem by $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, \sum U_j \leq k|$. We prove that this problem is strongly NP-complete by a reduction from 3-PARTITION.

Theorem 1. $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, \sum U_j \leq k|$ is strongly NP-complete.

Following this, we show that there exists an easy reduction from $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, \sum U_j \leq k|$ to the $1||Lex(T_{\max}, \sum U_j)$ problem, as well an easy reduction from $1||Lex(T_{\max}, \sum U_j)$ to the $1||\alpha T_{\max} + \sum U_j$ problem. As both reductions preserve strong NP-hardness, this directly yields:

Corollary 1. $1||Lex(T_{\max}, \sum U_j)$ and $1||\alpha T_{\max} + \sum U_j$ are both strongly NP-hard.

Unfortunately, we could not find a direct reduction from $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, \sum U_j \leq k|$ to $1|Lex(\sum U_j, T_{\max})$. Thus, we are forced to design an alternative reduction for this last variant. While we cannot find such a reduction from a strong NP-hard problem, we are still able to devise a reduction from the weakly NP-complete PARTITION problem, giving us our second main result of the paper.

Theorem 2. $1|Lex(\sum U_j, T_{\max})$ is weakly NP-hard.

Thus, altogether our results resolve the complexity of all single machine bicriteria problems involving the T_{\max} and $\sum U_j$ criteria, resolving the long standing open question posed in [2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14].

1.2 Related Work

Shantikumar [12] designed a branch-and-bound procedure for $1|Lex(\sum U_j, T_{\max})$ which requires exponential time in the worst case. He also presented a polynomial-time algorithm for minimizing the maximal tardiness when the set of early jobs is given in advance. Chen and Bulfin [3] designed a branch-and-bound procedure for solving $1|Lex(T_{\max}, \sum U_j)$. By applying a set of numerical tests, they showed that their algorithm was able to solve instances of up to 40 jobs in less than one minute of computer time. Finally, Huo *et al.* [7] implemented several heuristics for $1|Lex(T_{\max}, \sum U_j)$ and tested them on instances with up to 200 jobs; their best heuristic was on average less than 1% worse than the optimal.

Huo *et al.* [7] also showed that the weighted problems $1|Lex(\max w_j T_j, \sum U_j)$ and $1|Lex(\sum U_j, \max w_j T_j)$, where each job has its own weight and one of the two criteria is to minimize the maximal weighted tardiness, are both weakly NP-hard. The results in this paper supersede both of these hardness results, as they are for the unweighted versions of these problems. The constraint problem $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell|\sum U_j$ is a special case of $1|\bar{d}_j|\sum U_j$. In this problem, each job has a due date d_j as well as an additional deadline \bar{d}_j which must be met. The goal is to minimize the number of tardy jobs while meeting all deadlines. When $\bar{d}_j = d_j + \ell$ for each job j , this problem becomes $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell|\sum U_j$. Yuan showed that $1|\bar{d}_j|\sum U_j$ is strongly NP-complete [15], and this result is superseded by our results as well.

2 Preliminaries

We use standard terminology from computer science and scheduling. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ the set of positive integers up to (and including) n . For a bijective function $f : X \rightarrow Y$, we denote its inverse by f^{-1} ; thus, we have $f^{-1}(y) = x$ if and only if $f(x) = y$.

Scheduling. We consider scheduling problems involving a set of n jobs \mathcal{J} ; where all are available at time zero to be non-preemptively processed on a single machine. Each job $J \in \mathcal{J}$ has two nonnegative parameters: its *processing time* $p(J)$ and its *due date* $d(J)$. A *schedule* is a bijection from $[n]$ to the set \mathcal{J} of jobs, where the job $J \in \mathcal{J}$ with $\sigma(i) = J$ is the i -th job to be processed on the single machine.

Given a schedule σ , the *completion time* of job J is $C_\sigma(J) := \sum_{i=1}^{\sigma^{-1}(J)} p(\sigma(i))$. We will focus on the following two objectives common in the scheduling literature: $T_\sigma(J) := \max\{0, C_\sigma(J) - d(J)\}$, which is the *tardiness* of job J ; and $U_\sigma(J)$ which is a binary tardiness indicator that equals 1 if $C_\sigma(J) > d(J)$ and 0 otherwise. If the schedule σ is clear from context, then we may also drop the subscript and just write $C(J)$, $T(J)$, or $U(J)$. If $U(J) = 1$, then we say that job J is *tardy*. Otherwise, J is an *early* job.

We study the scheduling problems arising from combining the objective total number of tardy jobs ($\sum U_j$) with the maximum tardiness $T_{\max} = \max_{J \in \mathcal{J}} T(J)$ using the lexicographic, constraint, or a priori approach as described in Section 1. We will exemplarily describe the problem resulting from the constrained approach using T_{\max} as bounded objective:

$$1|T_{\max} \leq \ell|\sum U_j$$

Input: A set \mathcal{J} of jobs with processing times $p : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and due dates $d : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and an integer $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

Question: Find a schedule σ minimizing $\sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}} U(J)$ among all schedules with $\max_{J \in \mathcal{J}} T(J) \leq \ell$.

For the constrained version, we will call a schedule *feasible* if it obeys the constraint. For example, in the context of problem $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell|\sum U_j$, a schedule is feasible if $T(J) \leq \ell$ for every job $J \in \mathcal{J}$. A schedule is *optimal* if it is feasible and, among all feasible schedules, minimizes the objective. Taking again

$1|T_{\max} \leq \ell | \sum U_j$ as an example, a schedule is optimal if $T(J) \leq \ell$ for every job $J \in \mathcal{J}$ and among all such schedules, it minimizes the number of tardy jobs. Note that the lexicographic version is a special case of the constrained version where the upper bound on the constrained objective is the minimum value of this objective over all schedules; thus, the notions of feasible and optimal schedule extend to the lexicographic case, where a schedule is feasible if it minimizes the primary objective.

Minimizing maximum tardiness for a given set of early jobs. In order to minimize the maximum tardiness, one schedules the job according to non-decreasing due date [9]. This observation can easily be extended to finding a schedule with maximum tardiness ℓ subject to the condition that a given subset $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ of jobs is early (see e.g. [5, Observation 3.2]). In order to do so, we defined a modified due date

$$\tilde{d}(J) := \begin{cases} d(J) & \text{if } J \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}} \\ d(J) + \ell & \text{if } J \notin \tilde{\mathcal{J}} \end{cases}$$

Now scheduling all jobs according to non-decreasing \tilde{d} results in a schedule with a maximum tardiness of at most ℓ and each job from $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ being early if such a schedule exists; we will call the corresponding schedule the *canonical schedule for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$* .

Observation 1. [5, Observation 3.2] *Let $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ be a subset of jobs. If there is a schedule with a total tardiness of at most ℓ where each job from $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ is early, then the canonical schedule for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ is such a schedule.*

Note that given a subset $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ of jobs, a schedule minimizing T_{\max} among all schedules where each job from $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ is early can be found using Observation 1 and binary search.

3 Strong NP-hardness

This section describes a proof for Theorem 1:

Theorem 1. $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, \sum U_j \leq k |$ is strongly NP-complete.

In order to show Theorem 1, we reduce from 3-PARTITION which is strongly NP-complete [4].

3-PARTITION

Input: A multiset of n integers a_1, \dots, a_n .

Question: Is there a partition (S_1, \dots, S_m) of $[n]$ where $n = 3m$ such that $\sum_{i \in S_j} a_i = t$ for every $j \in [m]$ where $t := \sum_{i=1}^n a_i / m$?

We will interpret $1| \sum U_j \leq k, T_{\max} \leq \ell |$ as the decision version of the constrained $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell | \sum U_j$ problem, implying that the feasibility of a schedule refers to its maximum tardiness, i.e., we call a schedule feasible if its maximum tardiness is at most ℓ . We will use throughout our construction a sufficiently large constant α defined by $\alpha = 5n^2 \cdot t$.

For ease of presentation, we partition the timeline into m *time periods*, each corresponding to a different index $j \in [m]$. Define δ to be the value

$$\delta := 4n \cdot \alpha^3 + 2 \cdot \alpha^2 + (2m + 1)t \cdot \alpha + mt.$$

The total length of each time period will be δ , where the first period starts at time $\Delta_0 = 0$. In this way, the j 'th time period starts at time Δ_{j-1} and ends at time $\Delta_j = \Delta_{j-1} + \delta$. Each period will consist of two *halves*. The length of the first half of the j 'th time period will equal

$$\delta_j^* = 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (2m - 2j + 1)t \cdot \alpha + (m - j)t.$$

In this way, the first half of the j 'th time period ends at time $\Delta_j^* = \Delta_{j-1} + \delta_j^*$, which is the time when the second half starts. Note that the length of the first and second half of each period is not exactly but only roughly half of the length of the whole period (more specifically, each half has length half of the whole period if ignoring the lower-order terms multiplied by α or α^0).

3.1 Construction

We next describe how to construct an instance of $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, \sum U_j \leq k|$ from a given instance of 3-PARTITION. The high level idea is as follows: We will construct m groups of jobs, one for each index $j \in [m]$, where the j 'th group will encode all the integers in a_1, \dots, a_n that are selected for the solution sets $S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_j$. Let $j \in [m]$. The j 'th job group will consist of the $4n$ jobs $J_{i,j}$, $\neg J_{i,j}$, $J_{i,j}^*$, and $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ where $i \in [n]$. Intuitively speaking, scheduling $J_{i,j}$ and $J_{i,j}^*$ early will correspond to the situation where $a_i \in S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_j$, while scheduling $\neg J_{i,j}$ and $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ early corresponds to the situation where $a_i \notin S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_j$. The due date of the jobs are constructed in such a way that the due date of the last early job from $\{J_{n,j}, \neg J_{n,j}\}$ will ensure that $\sum_{i \in S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_j} a_i \leq j \cdot t$, while the due date of the last early job from $\{J_{n,j}^*, \neg J_{n,j}^*\}$ will ensure that $\sum_{i \in S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_j} a_i \geq j \cdot t$. Together, accounting for all $j \in [m]$, this will ensure that the sum of integers in each S_j is exactly t .

Job construction. For each $i \in [n]$ and each $j \in [m]$, we construct four *number jobs* $J_{i,j}$, $\neg J_{i,j}$, $J_{i,j}^*$, and $\neg J_{i,j}^*$, with the following processing times and due dates:

- $p(J_{i,j}^*) = \alpha^3$ and $d(J_{i,j}^*) = \Delta_{j-1} + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2$.
- $p(\neg J_{i,j}^*) = \alpha^3 + a_i$ and $d(\neg J_{i,j}^*) = \Delta_{j-1} + (2i - 1) \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2$.
- $p(J_{i,j}) = \alpha^3 + a_i \cdot \alpha$ and $d(J_{i,j}) = \Delta_j^* + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2$.
- $p(\neg J_{i,j}) = \alpha^3$ and $d(\neg J_{i,j}) = \Delta_j^* + (2i - 1) \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2$.

Note that we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(J_{n,j-1}) &< d(\neg J_{1,j}^*) < d(J_{1,j}^*) < d(\neg J_{2,j}^*) < d(J_{2,j}^*) < \dots < d(\neg J_{n,j}^*) < d(J_{n,j}^*) \\ &< d(\neg J_{1,j}) < d(J_{1,j}) < d(\neg J_{2,j}) < d(J_{2,j}) < \dots < d(\neg J_{n,j}) < d(J_{n,j}) < d(\neg J_{1,j+1}^*). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for each $j \in [m]$, we add two *delimiter jobs* D_j^* and D_j in addition to the $4n$ jobs defined above. These jobs are used to indicate the end of the first and second halves of the j -th period. That is, time Δ_j^* and time Δ_j , respectively. The characteristics of D_j^* and D_j are defined as follows:

- $p(D_j^*) = \alpha^2 + (m - j)t \cdot \alpha$ and $d(D_j^*) = \Delta_j^*$, and
- $p(D_j) = \alpha^2 + jt \cdot \alpha$ and $d(D_j) = \Delta_j$.

We will also need to add some filler jobs for the first and last time period. We start by constructing the job F_0 with processing time and due date $p(F_0) = d(F_0) = m \cdot t \cdot \alpha$. This job will always be scheduled first in any feasible schedule for the entire $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, \sum U_j \leq k|$ instance. Furthermore, we construct n filler jobs F_1^1, \dots, F_n^1 for the first time period, and n filler jobs F_1^m, \dots, F_n^m for the last time period. These filler jobs will have the following characteristics:

- $p(F_i^1) = \alpha^3$ and due date $d(F_i^1) = d(J_{i,1}^*)$ for each $i \in [n]$ (so F_i^1 is a copy of $J_{i,1}^*$), and
- $p(F_i^m) = \alpha^3$ and $d(F_i^m) = \Delta_m + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2$ for each $i \in [n]$.

Parameters k and ℓ . We have described above all the jobs constructed for the $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, \sum U_j \leq k|$ instance. For an overview of their processing times and due dates, see Table 1. To finish our construction, we set the target number k of tardy jobs to

$$k = 2m \cdot n,$$

and the target maximum tardiness ℓ to

$$\ell = 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2.$$

Intuitively, the target maximum tardiness allows each job to be tardy by approximately half a period.

Job	Processing Time	Due Date
$J_{i,j}^*$	α^3	$\Delta_{j-1} + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2$
$\neg J_{i,j}^*$	$\alpha^3 + a_i$	$\Delta_{j-1} + (2i - 1) \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2$
D_j^*	$\alpha^2 + (m - j)t \cdot \alpha$	Δ_j^*
$J_{i,j}$	$\alpha^3 + a_i \cdot \alpha$	$\Delta_j^* + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2$
$\neg J_{i,j}$	α^3	$\Delta_j^* + (2i - 1) \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2$
D_j	$\alpha^2 + jt \cdot \alpha$	Δ_j
F_0	$mt \cdot \alpha$	$mt \cdot \alpha$
F_i^1	α^3	$d(J_{i,1}^*)$
F_i^m	α^3	$\Delta_m + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2$

Table 1: The processing times and due dates of all jobs constructed for the $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, \sum U_j \leq k|$ instance.

3.2 Job sets $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*$

To prove the correctness of our reduction we will make frequent use of the following sets of jobs: For each $j \in [m]$, we use $\mathcal{J}_j^* := \{J_{i,j}^*, \neg J_{i,j}^* : i \in [n]\}$ and $\mathcal{J}_j := \{J_{i,j}, \neg J_{i,j} : i \in [n]\}$. Next, we define $\mathcal{J}_0^* = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{J}_0 = \{F_0\} \cup \{F_i^1 : i \in [n]\}$. Then, for each $j \in [m]$, we define

$$\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^* := \mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1} \cup \mathcal{J}_j^* \cup \{D_j^*\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}_{\leq j} := \mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^* \cup \mathcal{J}_j \cup \{D_j\}.$$

Note that for $j > 0$, $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}$ contains all jobs with due dates at most Δ_j , whereas $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*$ contains all jobs with due dates at most Δ_j^* .

We first observe that all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*$ except D_j^* must be completed by the end of the j -th period, i.e., by time Δ_j , as

Observation 2.

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^* \setminus \{D_j^*\}} d(J) + \ell < \Delta_j.$$

Proof. The observation follows by easy calculations:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{J \in \mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^* \setminus \{D_j^*\}} d(J) + \ell &= d(J_{n,j}^*) + \ell \\ &= \Delta_{j-1} + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2 + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + 1.1 \cdot \alpha^2 \\ &= \Delta_{j-1} + 4n \cdot \alpha^3 + 1.2 \cdot \alpha^2 \\ &= \Delta_j - 0.8 \cdot \alpha^2 - (2m + 1)t \cdot \alpha - mt < \Delta_j. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Similarly, we observe that all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}$ except for D_j must be completed by Δ_{j+1}^* as

Observation 3.

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{J}_{\leq j} \setminus \{D_j\}} d(J) + \ell < \Delta_{j+1}^*.$$

Proof. The proof follows by calculations analogous to the proof of Observation 2:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{J \in \mathcal{J}_{\leq j} \setminus \{D_j\}} d(J) + \ell &= d(J_{n,j}) + \ell \\ &= \Delta_j^* + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2 + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + 1.1 \cdot \alpha^2 \\ &= \Delta_j^* + 4n \cdot \alpha^3 + 1.2 \cdot \alpha^2 \\ &= \Delta_{j+1}^* - 0.8 \cdot \alpha^2 - (2m - 1)t \cdot \alpha - (m - 1)t < \Delta_{j+1}^*. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

We next compare the total processing time of all jobs in $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*$ to Δ_j . This value represents, assuming that all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*$ are completed by the end of the j -th period (which is true in all feasible schedules for all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*$ except for D_j^* by Observation 2), how much processing time is left for other jobs. The resulting identity will be used frequently:

Observation 4. *For each $j \in [m]$, we have*

$$\Delta_j = p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*) + n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + 2jt \cdot \alpha.$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on j . For $j = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq 1}^*) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (p(\mathcal{J}_{i,1}^*) + p(\neg \mathcal{J}_{i,1}^*)) + p(D_1^*) + \sum_{i=1}^n p(F_i^1) + p(F_0) \\ &= 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + mt + \alpha^2 + (m-1)t \cdot \alpha + n \cdot \alpha^3 + mt \cdot \alpha \\ &= 3n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (2m-1)t \cdot \alpha + m \cdot t = \Delta_1 - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - 2t \cdot \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

For $j > 1$, note that

$$\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^* \setminus \mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}^* = \mathcal{J}_j^* \cup \mathcal{J}_{j-1} \cup \{D_j^*, D_{j-1}\}.$$

Thus, we have (using induction for the second equality)

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*) &= p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}^*) + p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^* \setminus \mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}^*) \\ &= \Delta_{j-1} - (n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + 2(j-1)t \cdot \alpha) + p(\mathcal{J}_j^*) + p(\mathcal{J}_{j-1}) + p(D_j^*) + p(D_{j-1}) \\ &= \Delta_{j-1} - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - 2(j-1)t \cdot \alpha + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + mt + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + mt \cdot \alpha \\ &\quad + \alpha^2 + (m-j)t \cdot \alpha + \alpha^2 + (j-1)t \cdot \alpha \\ &= \Delta_{j-1} + 3n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (2m-2j+1)t \cdot \alpha + mt \\ &= \Delta_j - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - 2jt \cdot \alpha. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Similarly, it will be useful to compute the difference between the end of the first half of the j 'th period and total processing time of $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}$:

Observation 5. *For each $j \in [n]$, we have*

$$\Delta_j^* = p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}) + n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (m-j)t \cdot \alpha + (m-j)t.$$

Proof. We have (using Observation 4 for the second equality)

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}) &= p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*) - (p(\mathcal{J}_j^*) + p(D_j^*)) \\ &= \Delta_j - (n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + 2jt \cdot \alpha) - (2n \cdot \alpha^3 + mt + \alpha^2 + (m-j)t \cdot \alpha) \\ &= \Delta_j - (3n \cdot \alpha^3 + 2 \cdot \alpha^2 + (m+j)t \cdot \alpha + mt) \\ &= \Delta_{j-1} + \delta - (3n \cdot \alpha^3 + 2 \cdot \alpha^2 + (m+j)t \cdot \alpha + mt) \\ &= \Delta_j^* + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + 2jt \cdot \alpha + jt - (3n \cdot \alpha^3 + 2 \cdot \alpha^2 + (m+j)t \cdot \alpha + mt) \\ &= \Delta_j^* - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - (m-j)t \cdot \alpha - (m-j) \cdot t. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

3.3 Candidate Sets

We will now consider a special kind of subsets of jobs which we will call *candidate sets*. As we will later see in Section 3.4, it suffices to consider canonical schedules for candidate sets. We start by defining a candidate set of jobs:

Definition 1. A *candidate set* is a set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ of jobs such that for each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$, exactly one of $J_{i,j}^*$ and $\neg J_{i,j}^*$, and exactly one of $J_{i,j}$ and $\neg J_{i,j}$ is contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, and every filler or delimiter job is contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$.

Whenever we will talk in the following about the canonical schedule for a candidate set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, the possible tie between F_i^1 and $J_{i,1}^*$ will always be broken in favor of $J_{i,1}^*$ i.e., if both F_i^1 and $J_{i,1}^*$ are contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, then F_i^1 will be scheduled after $J_{i,1}^*$ in the canonical schedule for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. We remark that not all candidate sets lead to feasible schedules.

Example 1. Assume that $n = 4$, $m = 2$, and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}} = \mathcal{J}_F \cup \mathcal{J}_D \cup \{J_{1,1}^*, \neg J_{2,1}^*, \neg J_{3,1}^*, J_{4,1}^*, J_{1,2}^*, J_{2,2}^*, J_{3,2}^*, J_{4,2}^*\} \cup \{J_{1,1}, \neg J_{2,1}, \neg J_{3,1}, J_{4,1}, J_{1,2}, J_{2,2}, J_{3,2}, J_{4,2}\}$$

where \mathcal{J}_F is the set of filler jobs and \mathcal{J}_D is the set of delimiter jobs. Then the candidate schedule for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ is

F_0 ,	$J_{1,1}^*$,	F_1^1 ,	$\neg J_{2,1}^*$,	F_2^1 ,	$\neg J_{3,1}^*$,	F_3^1 ,	$J_{4,1}^*$,	F_4^1 ,	D_1^*
$\neg J_{1,1}^*$,	$J_{1,1}$,	$\neg J_{2,1}$,	$J_{2,1}^*$,	$\neg J_{3,1}$,	$J_{3,1}^*$,	$\neg J_{4,1}^*$,	$J_{4,1}$,	D_1	
$\neg J_{1,1}$,	$J_{1,2}^*$,	$J_{2,2}^*$,	$J_{2,1}$,	$J_{3,2}^*$,	$J_{3,1}$,	$\neg J_{4,1}$,	$J_{4,2}^*$,	D_2^*	
$\neg J_{1,2}^*$,	$J_{1,2}$,	$\neg J_{2,2}^*$,	$J_{2,2}$,	$\neg J_{3,2}^*$,	$J_{3,2}$,	$\neg J_{4,2}^*$,	$J_{4,2}$,	D_2	
$\neg J_{1,2}$,	F_1^m ,	$\neg J_{2,2}$,	F_2^m ,	$\neg J_{3,2}$,	F_3^m ,	$\neg J_{4,2}$,	F_4^m .		

The horizontal lines separate the time periods, and each row (except for the last one) represent one half of a period.

We continue by analyzing canonical schedules for candidate sets. More precisely, we want to classify the early jobs in a canonical schedule for a candidate set and determine when the canonical schedule for a candidate set is feasible. We start characterizing which candidate sets result in a feasible schedule.

Lemma 1. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ be a candidate set. Then the canonical schedule for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ is feasible if and only if there is no $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m-1]$ such that $\neg J_{i,j+1}^*, J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ and there is no $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$ such that $\neg J_{i,j}, J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$.

Proof. First note that jobs F_0 and F_i^1 are completed by time ℓ (independent on the set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$) and thus have tardiness smaller than ℓ .

Next we will show that job $J_{i,j}^*$ for $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$ always has tardiness at most ℓ . We assume, without loss of generality, that $J_{i,j}^* \notin \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ (otherwise $J_{i,j}^*$ will be completed earlier than in the following calculation). Before $J_{i,j}^*$, all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}$ as well as $n+i$ jobs from \mathcal{J}_j^* (including $J_{i,j}^*$, and each with processing time at most $\alpha^3 + t$), D_j^* , and i jobs (each with processing time at most $p(J) \leq \alpha^3 + t \cdot \alpha$) from \mathcal{J}_j are scheduled. Thus, using Observation 5, $J_{i,j}^*$ is completed by

$$\begin{aligned} & p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}) + (n+i) \cdot (\alpha^3 + t) + \alpha^2 + (m-j)t \cdot \alpha + i \cdot (\alpha^3 + t \cdot \alpha) \\ &= \Delta_j^* - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - (m-j)t \cdot \alpha - (m-j)t + (n+2i) \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (i+m-j)t \cdot \alpha + (n+i)t \\ &= \Delta_j^* + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 + it \cdot \alpha + (n+i+j-m)t \\ &= \Delta_{j-1} + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (2m-2j+1)t \cdot \alpha + (m-j) \cdot t + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 + it \cdot \alpha + (n+i+j-m)t \\ &< \Delta_{j-1} + 2(n+i) \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2 = d(J_{i,j}^*) + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 < d(J_{i,j}^*) + \ell. \end{aligned}$$

We continue by characterizing when job $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ for $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$ has tardiness at most ℓ . We assume, without loss of generality, that $\neg J_{i,j}^* \notin \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ (otherwise $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ will be completed much earlier than in the following calculations). Before $\neg J_{i,j}^*$, all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}$ as well as $n+i$ jobs from \mathcal{J}_j^* (including $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ itself), D_j^* , and i or $i-1$ jobs from \mathcal{J}_j (depending on whether $J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$) are scheduled. We continue by showing that (under our assumption $\neg J_{i,j}^* \notin \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$) job $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ has tardiness at most ℓ if and only if $J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. If $J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, then there are only $i-1$ jobs from \mathcal{J}_j before $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ and consequently, using the analogous

calculations as for $J_{i,j}^*$ (note that the only difference to $J_{i,j}^*$ is that there are now $i-1$ instead of i jobs from \mathcal{J}_j), job $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ is completed by time

$$\Delta_{j-1} + (2n + 2i - 1) \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2 = d(\neg J_{i,j}^*) + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 < d(\neg J_{i,j}^*) + \ell.$$

If, however, $\neg J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, then there are i jobs from \mathcal{J}_j before $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ and thus $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ is not completed before (using the same calculations as for $J_{i,j}^*$)

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}) + (n+i) \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (m-j)t \cdot \alpha + i \cdot \alpha^3 \\ &= \Delta_j^* - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - (m-j)t \cdot \alpha - (m-j)t + (n+2i) \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (m-j)t \cdot \alpha \\ &= \Delta_j^* + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 - (m-j)t \\ &= \Delta_{j-1} + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (2m-2j+1)t \cdot \alpha + (m-j)t + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 - (m-j)t \\ &= d(\neg J_{i,j}^*) + (2n+1) \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.9 \cdot \alpha^2 + (2m-2j+1)t \cdot \alpha \\ &> d(\neg J_{i,j}^*) + \ell. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ has tardiness more than ℓ if and only if $J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ and $\neg J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$.

The arguments for $J_{i,j}$ and $\neg J_{i,j}$ are analogous: Before $J_{i,j}$ (assume, without loss of generality, that $\neg J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$), all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*$ as well as $n+i$ jobs from \mathcal{J}_j (including $J_{i,j}$), D_j , and i jobs from \mathcal{J}_{j+1}^* are scheduled. Thus, using Observation 4, $J_{i,j}$ is completed by time

$$\Delta_j^* + 2(n+i) \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2 < d(J_{i,j}) + \ell.$$

For job $\neg J_{i,j}$, again assume, without loss of generality, that $J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. First note that there are $i-1$ jobs from \mathcal{J}_{j+1}^* scheduled before $\neg J_{i,j}$ if $J_{i,j+1}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, and i jobs from \mathcal{J}_{j+1}^* otherwise. Analogous calculations to the case for $\neg J_{i,j}$ now show that $\neg J_{i,j}$ has tardiness at most ℓ if and only if $J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ and $\neg J_{i,j+1}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$.

We continue with job D_j^* . This job is scheduled after $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}$ and n jobs from \mathcal{J}_j^* . Thus, using Observation 5, it is completed by time

$$\Delta_j^* - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - (m-j)t \cdot \alpha - (m-j)t + n \cdot (\alpha^3 + t) + \alpha^2 + (m-j)t \cdot \alpha = \Delta_j^* + (n+j-m) \cdot t < d(D_j^*) + \ell.$$

Similarly, D_j is scheduled after $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*$ and n jobs from \mathcal{J}_j and thus (using Observation 4) completed by time

$$\Delta_j - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - 2jt \cdot \alpha + n \cdot (\alpha^3 + t \cdot \alpha) + \alpha^2 + jt \cdot \alpha = \Delta_j + (n-j)t \cdot \alpha < d(D_j) + \ell. \quad \square$$

Next, let us identify which jobs are early in the canonical schedule for a candidate set. We start with the filler jobs, which turn out to be early for every candidate set:

Lemma 2. *In the canonical schedule for any candidate set, jobs F_0 , F_i^1 , and F_i^m for $i \in [n]$ are early.*

Proof. Job F_0 is the first job and thus completed at time $p(F_0) = d(F_0)$. Until job F_i^1 , job F_0 , jobs $F_{i_0}^1$ for $i_0 \leq i$, and i number jobs are scheduled. Thus, F_i^1 is completed by time

$$p(F_0) + i \cdot p(F_i^1) + i \cdot \max_J p(J) < 2i \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2 = d(F_i^1).$$

Finally, let us consider job F_i^m . This job is completed after $\mathcal{J}_{\leq m}^*$, jobs $J_{i_0,m}$ and $\neg J_{i_0,m}$ for $i_0 \leq i$, exactly one of $J_{i_0,m}$ and $\neg J_{i_0,m}$ for $i_0 > m$, job D_m , and $F_{i_0}^m$ for $i_0 \leq i$. Thus, using Observation 4, F_i^m is completed by time

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq m}^*) + \sum_{i_0=1}^i (p(J_{i_0,m}) + p(\neg J_{i_0,m})) + \sum_{i_0=i+1}^n p(J_{i_0,m}) + p(D_m) + \sum_{i_0=1}^i p(F_{i_0}^m) \\ \leq \Delta_m - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - 2mt \cdot \alpha + (n+i) \cdot \alpha^3 + mt \cdot \alpha + \alpha^2 + mt \cdot \alpha + i \cdot \alpha^3 \\ = \Delta_m + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 < d(F_i^m). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We continue with characterizing when number jobs are early.

Lemma 3. *In the canonical schedule for a candidate set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, a number job J is early if and only if $J \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$.*

Proof. Easy calculations similar to Lemma 1 show the statement: We start with $J_{i,j}^*$, and first assume that $J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. Job $J_{i,j}^*$ is scheduled after $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}^*$, $n+i-1$ or $n+i$ jobs from \mathcal{J}_{j-1} (depending on whether $J_{i,j-1} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$), D_{j-1} , and i jobs from \mathcal{J}_j^* (including $J_{i,j}^*$). Consequently, using Observation 4, $J_{i,j}^*$ is completed by time

$$\begin{aligned} & p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}^*) + (n+i) \cdot (\alpha^3 + t \cdot \alpha) + \alpha^2 + (j-1)t \cdot \alpha + i \cdot (\alpha^3 + t) \\ &= \Delta_{j-1} - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - 2(j-1)t \cdot \alpha + (n+2i) \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (n+i+j-1)t \cdot \alpha + it \\ &= \Delta_{j-1} + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 + (n+i-j+1)t \cdot \alpha + it < d(J_{i,j}^*). \end{aligned}$$

If $J_{i,j}^* \notin \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, then $J_{i,j}^*$ is scheduled after all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}$ as well as $n+i$ jobs from \mathcal{J}_j^* (including $J_{i,j}^*$, and each with processing time at least α^3), D_j^* , and i jobs (each with processing time at least $p(J) \geq \alpha^3$) from \mathcal{J}_j . Consequently, using Observation 5, $J_{i,j}^*$ is completed not before time

$$\begin{aligned} & p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}) + (n+i) \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (m-j)t \cdot \alpha + i \cdot \alpha^3 \\ &= \Delta_j^* - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - (m-j)t \cdot \alpha - (m-j)t + (n+2i) \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (m-j)t \cdot \alpha \\ &= \Delta_j^* + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 - (m+j)t \\ &= \Delta_{j-1} + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (2m-2j+1)t \cdot \alpha + (m-j) \cdot t + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 + (m-j)t \\ &> \Delta_{j-1} + 2i \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2 = d(J_{i,j}^*). \end{aligned}$$

The calculations for $\neg J_{i,j}^*$, $J_{i,j}$ and $\neg J_{i,j}$ are analogous (using Observation 5 instead of Observation 4 for $J_{i,j}$ and $\neg J_{i,j}$). \square

We continue with identifying when a delimiter job is early in a candidate schedule:

Lemma 4. *Let σ be the canonical schedule for some candidate set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. Then D_j^* is early if and only if $\sum_{i: J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_i \geq jt$. Further, D_j is early if and only if $\sum_{i: J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_i \leq jt$.*

Proof. Up to D_j^* , the following jobs are scheduled: $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}$, $J_{i,j}^*$ if $J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ if $\neg J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, and D_j^* . Using Observation 5, the total processing time of these jobs is

$$\begin{aligned} & p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}) + \sum_{i: J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} p(J_{i,j}^*) + \sum_{i: \neg J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} p(\neg J_{i,j}^*) + p(D_j^*) \\ &= \Delta_j^* - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - (m-j)t \cdot \alpha - (m-j)t + n \cdot \alpha^3 + \sum_{i: \neg J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_i + \alpha^2 + (m-j)t \cdot \alpha \\ &= d(D_j^*) + \sum_{i: \neg J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_i - (m-j)t. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, D_j^* is early if and only if $\sum_{i: \neg J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_i \leq (m-j)t$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = mt$, this is equivalent to $\sum_{i: J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_i \geq jt$.

We now turn to the second part of the lemma. Up to D_j , the following jobs are scheduled: $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*$, $J_{i,j}$ if $J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, $\neg J_{i,j}$ if $\neg J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, and D_j . Using Observation 4, the total processing time of these jobs is

$$\begin{aligned} & p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*) + \sum_{i: J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} p(J_{i,j}) + \sum_{i: \neg J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} p(\neg J_{i,j}) + p(D_j) \\ &= \Delta_j - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - 2jt \cdot \alpha + n \cdot \alpha^3 + \sum_{i: J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_i \cdot \alpha + \alpha^2 + jt \cdot \alpha \\ &= d(D_j) + \sum_{i: J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_i \cdot \alpha - jt \cdot \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, D_j is early if and only if $\sum_{i: J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_i \leq jt$. \square

3.4 Correctness

In order to show the correctness of the reduction described in this section, the first (and hardest) part is to show that we can restrict ourselves to considering candidate schedules. This will be done in the next lemma:

Lemma 5. *If there is a feasible schedule with k tardy jobs, then there is an optimal schedule that is the canonical schedule for a candidate set.*

Before proving Lemma 5, we first show how to derive the main result in this section, namely the strong NP-hardness of $1|\sum U_j \leq k, T_{\max} \leq \ell|$:

Proof of Theorem 1. $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, U_j \leq k|$ is clearly contained in NP as an optimal schedule is a certificate. It remains to show that the problem is NP-hard. We will do so via the reduction from 3-PARTITION as described throughout this section. The reduction clearly runs in polynomial time, so it remains to show its correctness.

We start with the forward direction. So let (S_1, \dots, S_m) be a solution to the 3-PARTITION instance. Let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}} := \{J_{i,j}^*, J_{i,j} : a_i \in S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_j\} \cup \{F_0, F_i^1, F_i^m : i \in [n]\} \cup \{D_j, D_j^* : j \in [m]\},$$

and let σ be the canonical schedule for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. By Lemma 1, σ is feasible. By Lemma 2, jobs F_0 , F_i^1 , and F_i^m for $i \in [n]$ are early. By Lemma 3, we have $2nm$ early and $2nm$ tardy number jobs. By Lemma 4 and since we have a solution to 3-PARTITION, all early delimiter jobs are early. Overall, we have $k = 2mn$ tardy jobs, finishing the forward direction.

We continue with the backward direction. So let σ be a feasible schedule with at most k tardy jobs. By Lemma 5, we may assume that σ is the canonical schedule for some candidate set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. By Lemma 3, there are $2nm$ tardy number jobs. This implies that $2nm$ number jobs and all non-number jobs are early. Let $I_j^* := \{i \in [n] : J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}\}$ and $I_j := \{i \in [n] : J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}\}$. Since σ is feasible, Lemma 1 implies that whenever $J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, then also $J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ (as otherwise $\neg J_{i,j}, J_{i,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, contradicting the feasibility of σ by Lemma 1). In other words, we have $I_j^* \subseteq I_j$. Similarly, the feasibility of σ together with Lemma 1 implies that whenever $J_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, then also $J_{i,j+1}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, i.e., $I_j \subseteq I_{j+1}^*$. Because every delimiter job is early, Lemma 4 implies that $\sum_{i \in I_j^*} a_i \geq jt$ and $\sum_{i \in I_j} a_i \leq jt$. Combining the above two results, we have

$$\sum_{i \in I_j^*} a_i \geq jt \geq \sum_{i \in I_j} a_i.$$

Since $I_j^* \subseteq I_j$, this implies that $I_j^* = I_j$ and that the above inequality holds with equality. We claim that $(S_1, \dots, S_m) := (I_1^*, I_2^* \setminus I_1^*, \dots, I_m^* \setminus I_{m-1}^*)$ is a solution to the 3-PARTITION instance. First note that S_{j_0} and S_{j_1} are disjoint for $j_0 \neq j_1$ as $I_1^* = I_1 \subseteq I_2^* = I_2 \subseteq I_3^* = I_3 \subseteq \dots \subseteq I_m^* \subseteq I_m$. Further, we have

$$\sum_{i \in S_j} a_i = \sum_{i \in I_j^*} a_i - \sum_{i \in I_{j-1}^*} a_i = jt - (j-1)t = t. \quad \square$$

The rest of this section focuses on the proof of Lemma 5, i.e., that there always is an optimal canonical schedule for some candidate set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ if an optimal schedule has k early jobs. In order to show Lemma 5, we start with very coarse statements on an optimal schedule and then refine them step by step. Using Observation 1, we may assume that there is a canonical optimal schedule. We observe a very coarse structure of any canonical feasible schedule:

Lemma 6. *Any canonical feasible schedule σ satisfies that*

- for that every $j \in [m]$, jobs from \mathcal{J}_j^* and D_j^* are scheduled after every job from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}^*$ and before any job not contained in $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}$, and
- for every $j \geq 2$, jobs from \mathcal{J}_j and D_j are scheduled after every job from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}$ and before every job not contained in $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j+1}^*$.

Proof. We start with the first bullet point. Note that the maximal due date in $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}^*$ belongs to D_{j-1}^* . Thus, for each job $J \in \mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{d}_\sigma(J) &\leq d(D_{j-1}^*) + \ell \\
&= \Delta_{j-1}^* + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + 1.1 \cdot \alpha^2 \\
&= \Delta_{j-2} + \delta_{j-1}^* + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + 1.1 \cdot \alpha^2 \\
&= \Delta_{j-2} + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (2m - 2j + 3)t \cdot \alpha + (m - j + 1)t + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + 1.1 \cdot \alpha^2 \\
&= \Delta_{j-2} + 4n \cdot \alpha^3 + 2.1 \cdot \alpha^2 + (2m - 2j + 3)t \cdot \alpha + (m - j + 1)t \\
&= \Delta_{j-1} + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2 + (2 - 2j)t \cdot \alpha + (1 - j) \cdot t < d(\neg J_{i,j}^*) < d(J_{i,j}^*) < d(D_j^*).
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for any $J \notin \mathcal{J}_{\leq j}$, we have

$$\max\{\tilde{d}_\sigma(\neg J_{i,j}^*), \tilde{d}_\sigma(J_{i,j}^*), \tilde{d}_\sigma(D_j^*)\} \leq d(D_j^*) + \ell = \Delta_j^* + \ell = \Delta_j + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2 - 2jt \cdot \alpha - jt < d(J).$$

The first bullet point now follows as σ is canonical.

The proof of the second bullet point is similar to the one of the first bullet point. For each $J \in \mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{d}_\sigma(J) &\leq d(D_{j-1}) + \ell \\
&= \Delta_{j-1} + 2n \cdot \alpha^3 + 1.1 \cdot \alpha^2 \\
&= \Delta_{j-1} + \delta_j^* + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2 - (2m - 2j + 1) \cdot \alpha - (m - j)t \\
&= \Delta_j^* + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2 - (2m - 2j + 1) \cdot \alpha - (m - j)t < d(\neg J_{i,j}) < d(J_{i,j}) < d(D_j).
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for any $J \notin \mathcal{J}_{\leq j+1}^*$, we have

$$\max\{\tilde{d}_\sigma(\neg J_{i,j}), \tilde{d}_\sigma(J_{i,j}), \tilde{d}_\sigma(D_j)\} \leq d(D_j) + \ell = \Delta_j + \ell = \Delta_{j+1}^* + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2 - (2m - 2j - 1)t \cdot \alpha - (m - j - 1)t < d(J).$$

The second bullet point now follows as σ is canonical. \square

In the following, we mostly focus on the jobs with processing time at least α^3 , i.e., all jobs but the delimiter jobs and F_0 . Thus, we will call a job *large* if its processing time is at least α^3 . All other jobs are called *small*. Therefore, the set of large jobs is $\{J_{i,j}^*, \neg J_{i,j}^*, J_{i,j}, \neg J_{i,j} : i \in [n], j \in [m]\} \cup \{F_i^1, F_i^m : i \in [n]\}$. As a consequence of Lemma 6, there are strong restrictions on which large job may be scheduled in which time period:

Lemma 7. *Any canonical feasible schedule σ satisfies that the only large jobs which can be scheduled in*

- *the first half of the first period are F_i^1 for $i \in [n]$ and $\mathcal{J}_1^* \cup \mathcal{J}_1$,*
- *the first half of the j -th period for $j > 1$ are $\mathcal{J}_j^* \cup \mathcal{J}_{j-1}$, and*
- *the second half of the j -th period are $\mathcal{J}_j^* \cup \mathcal{J}_j$.*

Proof. We start with the first bullet point. By Lemma 6, for $j \geq 2$, jobs $\mathcal{J}_j^* \cup \mathcal{J}_j$ are all scheduled after all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq 1}^*$. Since $p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq 1}^*) = 3n \cdot \alpha^3 + \alpha^2 + (2m - 1)t \cdot \alpha + mt > \Delta_1^*$, this implies that all these jobs are scheduled after the first half of the first period.

We continue with the second bullet point. Let $j \geq 2$. Applying Lemma 6 for $j_0 > j$, $\mathcal{J}_{j_0}^* \cup \mathcal{J}_{j_0}$ are all scheduled after all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*$. Since $p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*) = \Delta_j - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - 2jt \cdot \alpha > \Delta_j^*$ by Observation 4, this implies that all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{j_0}^* \cup \mathcal{J}_{j_0}$ for $j_0 > j$ are scheduled after the first half of the j 'th period. Further, any large job J from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}^*$ must be completed by the end of the $(j - 1)$ 'th period by Observation 2. Consequently, the only remaining large jobs which can be scheduled in the first half of the j 'th period are $J_{i,j}^*, \neg J_{i,j}^*, J_{i,j-1}$, and $\neg J_{i,j-1}$.

Lastly, we show the third bullet point analogously to the second bullet point. Applying Lemma 6, jobs $\mathcal{J}_{j_0}^*$ for $j_0 > j + 1$ and \mathcal{J}_{j_0} for $j_0 > j$ are all scheduled after all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}$. Since $p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}) =$

$\Delta_{j+1}^* - n \cdot \alpha^3 - \alpha^2 - (m-j-1)t \cdot \alpha - (m-j-1)t > \Delta_j$ by Observation 5, this implies that all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{j_0}^*$ for $j_0 > j+1$ or \mathcal{J}_{j_0} for $j_0 > j$ are scheduled after the j 'th period. Further, any large job J from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1}$ must be completed by the end of the first half of the j 'th period by Observation 3. Consequently, the only remaining large jobs which can be scheduled in the second half of the j 'th period are $J_{i,j}^*$, $\neg J_{i,j}^*$, $J_{i,j}$, and $\neg J_{i,j}$. \square

We now bound the number of early jobs from each set \mathcal{J}_j^* or \mathcal{J}_j .

Lemma 8. *For any feasible schedule,*

- up to $2n$ jobs from $\{F_i^1, J_{i,1}^*, \neg J_{i,1}^* : i \in [n]\}$ can be completed by Δ_1^* ,
- up to n jobs from \mathcal{J}_j^* can be completed by Δ_j^* for any $j \geq 2$, and
- up to n jobs from \mathcal{J}_j can be completed by Δ_j for $j \in [m]$.

Proof. Let σ be a canonical feasible schedule. We first show the first bullet point. Note that each job from $\{F_i^1, J_{i,1}^*, \neg J_{i,1}^* : i \in [n]\}$ is large, i.e., has processing time at least α^3 . Thus, at most $2n$ jobs from $\{F_i^1, J_{i,1}^*, \neg J_{i,1}^* : i \in [n]\}$ can be completed by $\Delta_1^* < (2n+1) \cdot \alpha^3$.

We continue with the second bullet point. By Observation 3, all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1} \setminus \{D_{j-1}\}$ are completed by Δ_j^* . Thus, the total processing time of all jobs from \mathcal{J}_j^* that are completed by Δ_j^* is upper-bounded by $\Delta_j^* - p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j-1} \setminus \{D_{j-1}\}) = n \cdot \alpha^3 + 2 \cdot \alpha^2 + (m-1)t \cdot \alpha + (m-j)t < (n+1) \cdot \alpha^3$ using Observation 5 for the equality. Because each job from \mathcal{J}_j^* has a processing time of at least α^3 , this implies that at most n jobs from \mathcal{J}_j^* can be completed by Δ_j^* .

We conclude with the third bullet point which is analogous to the second bullet point. By Observation 2, all jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^* \setminus \{D_j^*\}$ are completed by time Δ_j . Thus, the total processing time of all jobs from \mathcal{J}_j which are completed by time Δ_j is upper-bounded by $\Delta_j - p(\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^* \setminus \{D_j^*\}) = n \cdot \alpha^3 + 2 \cdot \alpha^2 + (m+j)t \cdot \alpha < (n+1) \cdot \alpha^3$ using Observation 4 for the equality. Because each job from \mathcal{J}_j has processing time at least α^3 , this implies that at most n jobs from \mathcal{J}_j can be completed by time Δ_j . \square

As an easy consequence of Lemma 8, we get restrictions on the set of early jobs in an optimal solution:

Lemma 9. *For any feasible schedule with at most k tardy jobs, the set of tardy jobs looks as follows:*

- $2n$ jobs from $\{F_i^1 : i \in [n]\} \cup \mathcal{J}_1^*$ are tardy, and these tardy jobs are completed after Δ_1^* ,
- n jobs from \mathcal{J}_j^* are tardy for any $j \geq 2$, and these tardy jobs are completed after Δ_j^* , and
- n jobs from \mathcal{J}_j are tardy for $j \in [m]$, and all these tardy jobs are completed after Δ_j .

Proof. Note that each job from \mathcal{J}_j^* that is early must be completed by time Δ_j^* . Further, each job from \mathcal{J}_j that is early must be completed by time Δ_j . If F_i^1 is early, then it is completed by time $d(F_i^1) < \Delta_1^*$. Thus, Lemma 8 implies that for each $j \geq 2$, there are $2n$ tardy jobs from $\mathcal{J}_j^* \cup \mathcal{J}_j$, and there are $2n$ tardy jobs from $\mathcal{J}_1^* \cup \mathcal{J}_1 \cup \{F_i^1 : i \in [n]\}$. Since there are at most $k = 2mn$ tardy jobs overall, it follows that for each \mathcal{J}_j^* or \mathcal{J}_j with the exception of \mathcal{J}_1^* , there are exactly n tardy jobs.

The second part of each bullet point follows from Lemma 8 which imply that at most n jobs from \mathcal{J}_j^* respectively \mathcal{J}_j can be scheduled up to time Δ_j^* respectively Δ_j . \square

We can finally show Lemma 5:

Proof of Lemma 5. Let σ be an optimal schedule. By Observation 1, we may assume that σ is the canonical schedule for some set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. Since F_i^1 and $J_{i,1}^*$ have the same characteristics, we may assume, without loss of generality, that if at least one of F_i^1 and $J_{i,1}^*$ is early, then F_i^1 is early. It remains to show that $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ is a candidate set, i.e., that $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ contains every filler job, every delimiter job, and for each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$, exactly one of $J_{i,j}^*$ and $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ and exactly one of $J_{i,j}$ and $\neg J_{i,j}$. Lemma 9 together with the assumption that if one of F_i^1 and $J_{i,1}^*$ is early, then F_i^1 is early implies that $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ contains every filler and every delimiter job.

It remains to show that $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ contains for each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$, exactly one of $J_{i,j}^*$ and $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ and exactly one of $J_{i,j}$ and $\neg J_{i,j}$. We prove this by backwards induction on i . Let $i = n$, and assume towards a

contradiction that $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ contains both $J_{i,j}$ and $\neg J_{i,j}$ or both $J_{i,j}^*$ and $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ (we will handle the other case that $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ contains neither $J_{i,j}$ nor $\neg J_{i,j}$ or neither $J_{i,j}^*$ nor $\neg J_{i,j}^*$ later). If both $J_{n,j}^*, \neg J_{n,j}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ for some $j \in [m]$, then also $J_{n,j}$ and $\neg J_{n,j}$ need to be early and thus contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$: By Observation 2 and Lemma 9 and since $d(J) < \Delta_j$ for every $J \in \mathcal{J}_j$, the jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*$ and n early jobs from \mathcal{J}_j are scheduled by time Δ_j . For all jobs $J \in \mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^* \setminus \{J_{n,j}^*, \neg J_{n,j}^*\}$, it holds by Observation 2 that

$$d(J) + \ell \leq d(J_{n-1,j}^*) + \ell = d(J_{n,j}^*) - 2 \cdot \alpha^3 + \ell < \Delta_j - 2 \cdot \alpha^3.$$

Consequently, no job from $\mathcal{J}_{\leq j}^*$ is completed after $\Delta_j - 2 \cdot \alpha^3$ (note that $J_{n,j}^*$ and $\neg J_{n,j}^*$ are early and thus completed by $d(J_{n,j}^*) < \Delta_j - 2 \cdot \alpha^3$). The only two jobs from \mathcal{J}_j with due date at least $\Delta_j - 2 \cdot \alpha^3$ are $J_{n,j}$ and $\neg J_{n,j}$. Consequently, $J_{n,j}$ and $\neg J_{n,j}$ are the only candidates from \mathcal{J}_j to be completed between time $\Delta_j - 2 \cdot \alpha^3$ and Δ_j . Thus, they are completed between $\Delta_j - 2 \cdot \alpha^3$ and Δ_j , and they are early as any job from \mathcal{J}_j that is completed by Δ_j is early by Lemma 9.

Analogous arguments show that if both $J_{n,j}$ and $\neg J_{n,j}$ are contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, then both $J_{n,j+1}^*$ and $\neg J_{n,j+1}^*$ are also contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$.

However, it cannot be the case that both $J_{n,m}$ and $\neg J_{n,m}$ are contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$: As each non-number job is early by Lemma 9, $F_{i_0}^m$ is early for each $i_0 \in [n]$. Consequently, the only jobs which may be completed after time $\Delta_m + (2n - 2) \cdot \alpha^3 + 0.1 \cdot \alpha^2$ are $F_{i_0}^m$ and jobs $J_{n,m}$ or $\neg J_{n,m}$ if they are tardy. As at least two jobs must be scheduled after $\Delta_m + (2n - 2) \cdot \alpha^3$ (because the total processing time of all jobs together is $\Delta_m + 2n \cdot \alpha^3$), this implies that at least one of $J_{n,m}$ or $\neg J_{n,m}$ is tardy.

Now assume that neither $J_{n,j}^*$ nor $\neg J_{n,j}^*$ or neither $J_{n,j}$ nor $\neg J_{n,j}$ are contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. We will arrive at a contradiction in three steps, similar to the case that both $J_{n,j}^*$ and $\neg J_{n,j}^*$ are contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. First, we show that J_{n,j_0}^* and $\neg J_{n,j_0}^*$ being tardy implies that J_{n,j_0-1} and $\neg J_{n,j_0-1}$ are tardy for every $j_0 \in \{2, \dots, m\}$. Second, we show that J_{n,j_0} and $\neg J_{n,j_0}$ being tardy implies that J_{n,j_0}^* and $\neg J_{n,j_0}^*$ are tardy for every $j_0 \in [m]$. Third, we will show that both $J_{n,1}^*$ and $\neg J_{n,1}^*$ being tardy leads to a contradiction. We start with the first step by showing that the only large jobs which may be completed between time $\Delta_{j_0}^* - 2 \cdot \alpha^3$ and $\Delta_{j_0}^*$ are J_{n,j_0-1} and $\neg J_{n,j_0-1}$. As $d(J) < \Delta_{j_0}^* - 2 \cdot \alpha^3$ for every $J \in \mathcal{J}_{j_0}^* \setminus \{J_{n,j_0}^*, \neg J_{n,j_0}^*\}$, each job from $\mathcal{J}_{j_0}^*$ that is completed after $\Delta_{j_0}^* - 2 \cdot \alpha^3$ is tardy (note that J_{n,j_0}^* and $\neg J_{n,j_0}^*$ are tardy by assumption). By Lemma 9, the tardy jobs from $\mathcal{J}_{j_0}^*$ are completed after $\Delta_{j_0}^*$. By Lemma 7, this implies that only jobs from \mathcal{J}_{j_0-1} can be scheduled between $\Delta_{j_0}^* - 2 \cdot \alpha^3$ and $\Delta_{j_0}^*$. The only two jobs J from \mathcal{J}_{j_0-1} with $d(J) + \ell \geq \Delta_{j_0}^* - 2 \cdot \alpha^3$ are J_{n,j_0-1} and $\neg J_{n,j_0-1}$, implying that these two jobs are completed between $\Delta_{j_0}^* - 2 \cdot \alpha^3$ and $\Delta_{j_0}^*$ and therefore are tardy. We continue with the second step. Similar arguments show that J_{n,j_0} and $\neg J_{n,j_0}$ being tardy implies that J_{n,j_0}^* and $\neg J_{n,j_0}^*$ are tardy. We finally do the third step: Repeatedly applying the previous two steps implies $J_{n,1}^*$ and $\neg J_{n,1}^*$ are tardy. By Lemma 9, there are $2n$ early jobs from $\{J_{i,1}^*, \neg J_{i,1}^*, F_i^1 : i \in [n]\}$. Of these jobs, only $J_{n,1}^*$, $\neg J_{n,1}^*$, and F_i^1 have a due date larger than $\Delta_1^* - 2 \cdot \alpha^3$. Consequently, two of these three jobs are early. Since we assume that whenever $J_{i,1}^*$ is early, F_i^1 is also early which implies that F_n^1 and exactly one of $J_{n,1}^*$ and $\neg J_{n,1}^*$ are early.

The induction step is analogous, observing that directly before D_j^* , exactly one of $J_{i_0,j}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0,j}^*$ and exactly one of $J_{i_0,j-1}$ and $\neg J_{i_0,j-1}$ for $i_0 > i$ are scheduled and directly before D_j , exactly one of $J_{i_0,j}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0,j}^*$ and exactly one of $J_{i_0,j}$ and $\neg J_{i_0,j}$ for $i_0 > i$ are scheduled. \square

4 Lexicographically first minimizing T_{\max} and then $\sum U_j$

In this section, we show that $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, \sum U_j \leq k|$ can be reduced to the problem of first minimizing the maximum tardiness and then the number of tardy jobs:

Theorem 3. $1|Lex(T_{\max}, \sum U_j)$ is strongly NP-hard.

Proof. We reduce from $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, \sum U_j \leq k|$ which is strongly NP-hard by Theorem 1. Let $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{J} = \{J_1, \dots, J_n\}, \ell, k)$ be an instance of $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, \sum U_j \leq k|$. Let $P := \sum_{i=1}^n p(J_i)$. We assume, without loss of generality, that $\ell < P$ and $d(J) \leq P$ for every $J \in \mathcal{J}$, and that there is some schedule with maximum tardiness at most ℓ . We create a job J^* with $p(J^*) = P$ and $d(J^*) = 2P - \ell$. We claim that $\mathcal{I}' := (\mathcal{J} \cup \{J^*\}, k + 1)$ is a yes-instance of $1|Lex(T_{\max}, \sum U_j)$ if and only if \mathcal{I} is a yes-instance of $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, \sum U_j \leq k|$.

As a first step of showing the correctness of the reduction, we show that the minimal maximum tardiness for \mathcal{I}' is precisely ℓ . Let σ' be any schedule for \mathcal{I}' . If J^* is not the last job in σ' , then the last job J in σ' is completed at time $2P$ and thus has tardiness at least $2P - d(J) \geq P > \ell$. Otherwise J^* is the last job in σ' and has tardiness exactly $2P - d(J^*) = \ell$, implying that every schedule for \mathcal{I}' has maximum tardiness at least ℓ . To show that the minimum maximum tardiness is exactly ℓ , it suffices to describe a schedule with maximum tardiness ℓ . Note that taking the presumed schedule for \mathcal{I} with maximum tardiness at most ℓ and appending J^* is such a schedule.

We conclude the prove by showing correctness. We start with the forward direction. Given a solution σ to \mathcal{I} , appending J^* to σ results in a schedule for \mathcal{I}' with one more tardy job (namely J^*) and maximum tardiness ℓ .

Given a solution σ' to \mathcal{I}' , first note that any schedule minimizing T_{\max} must schedule job J^* last. Consequently, job J^* is tardy. Further, the minimal maximum tardiness of a schedule is exactly ℓ , so job J has tardiness at most ℓ for every $J \in \mathcal{J}$. Thus, $\sigma' \setminus \{J^*\}$ has maximum tardiness at most ℓ and at most k tardy jobs. \square

We will now show that the a priori version is strongly NP-hard:

Corollary 2. *For any $\alpha > 0$, $1||T_{\max} + \alpha \sum U_j$ is strongly NP-hard.*

Proof. We reduce from $1||Lex(T_{\max}, \sum U_j)$. The reduction just multiplies each due date and each processing time by $2n \cdot \lceil \alpha \rceil$. This implies that the tardiness of each job is a multiple of $2n \cdot \lceil \alpha \rceil > \alpha \sum U_j$. Consequently, any schedule minimizing $T_{\max} + \alpha \sum U_j$ also minimizes T_{\max} . \square

5 Lexicographically first minimizing $\sum U_j$ and then T_{\max}

We next prove the following theorem:

Theorem 4. *$1||Lex(\sum U_j, T_{\max})$ is weakly NP-hard.*

We will reduce from PARTITION:

PARTITION

Input: A set of n integers a_1, \dots, a_n .

Question: Is there a subset $S \subset [n]$ such that $\sum_{i \in S} a_i = t$ where $t := 0.5 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$?

Somewhat similar to Section 3, there will be four jobs J_i^* , $\neg J_i^*$, J_i , and $\neg J_i$ for each $i \in [n]$. Again, scheduling J_i^* and J_i early will encode a_i being part of the solution to PARTITION while $\neg J_i^*$ and $\neg J_i$ being early will encode a_i not being part of the solution to PARTITION. However, while in Section 3 all these jobs had roughly the same processing time, this is not true anymore; in order to prevent that scheduling e.g. J_1^* at the end allows to schedule one more early jobs, jobs J_i and $\neg J_i$ will have much larger processing times than J_i^* and $\neg J_i^*$, and the processing times will be increasing for increasing i . We add many small filler jobs F_i to ensure that J_i^* or $\neg J_i^*$ together with the filler jobs together has roughly the same size as J_i and $\neg J_i$. Since all these filler jobs have the same characteristics, we will refer to each of these jobs as F_i ; the set of all $2W/X$ filler jobs F_i will be denoted as \mathcal{F}_i . The processing times of the filler jobs will be quite small, ensuring that any schedule with minimum number of tardy jobs schedules them early. We fix sufficiently large constants $W \gg X \gg Y \gg Z \gg t$ such that W is a multiple of X ($Z = (2t + 1)$, $Y = (2t + 1) \cdot Z$, $X = n \cdot 2^{n+2} \cdot Y$, and $W = 2n^2 \cdot X$ are possible choices).

For an overview of processing times and due dates, we refer to Table 2. We set the target maximum tardiness to $\ell := n \cdot W + \sum_{i=1}^n i \cdot X + \sum_{i=1}^n 2^i \cdot Y + t \cdot Z + t$.

We now prove correctness. We start with characterizing the set of early jobs of a schedule minimizing the number of tardy jobs. We start with the early jobs completed by time D_1^* :

Lemma 10. *Any set \mathcal{J}^* of $n \cdot 2W/X + i$ early jobs completed by time D_1^* has total processing time at least $n \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X$. If the total processing time of \mathcal{J}^* is smaller than $n \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + 0.5 \cdot X$, then \mathcal{J}^* contains exactly one of $J_{i_0}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0}^*$ for each $i_0 \in [i]$ as well as each filler job F_{i_0} .*

Job	processing time	due date	multiplicity
J_i^*	$i \cdot X$	$i \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + t$	1
$\neg J_i^*$	$i \cdot X + a_i$	$(i-1) \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + t$	1
F_i	$X/2$	$i \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + t$	$2W/X$
J_i	$W + 2^i \cdot Y + a_i \cdot Z$	$D_1^* + i \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^i 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + t \cdot Z + t$	1
$\neg J_i$	$W + 2^i \cdot Y$	$D_1^* + i \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^{i-1} i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^i 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + t \cdot Z + t$	1

Table 2: Processing times and due dates where $D_1^* := n \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^n i_0 \cdot X + t$.

Proof. We first show that \mathcal{J}^* does not contain J_i and $\neg J_i$ for every $i \in [n]$. Each job has processing time at least $X/2$. Thus, if \mathcal{J}^* would contain job J_i or $\neg J_i$ which has processing time at least W , then

$$p(\mathcal{J}^*) \geq (n \cdot 2W/X) \cdot X/2 + W = (n+1) \cdot W > D_1^*,$$

a contradiction to all jobs from \mathcal{J}^* finishing until D_1^* .

We prove the statement by induction on i . For $i=1$, note that each non-filler job has processing time at least X and only J_1^* and $\neg J_1^*$ have a processing time smaller than $2 \cdot X$ while each filler job has processing time $X/2$. Thus, each set of $n \cdot 2W/X + 1$ jobs has processing time at least $n \cdot W + X$. Further, each set of $n \cdot 2W/X + 1$ early jobs containing at least two non-filler has processing time at least

$$(n \cdot 2W/X - 1) \cdot (X/2) + 2 \cdot X = n \cdot W + 1.5 \cdot X,$$

and each set of $n \cdot 2W/X + 1$ early jobs containing at least one non-filler job apart from J_1^* and $\neg J_1^*$ has processing time at least

$$(n \cdot 2W/X) \cdot (X/2) + 2 \cdot X = n \cdot W + 2 \cdot X.$$

We continue with the induction step. Let $i > 1$ and assume that the lemma holds for $i-1$. Let J^* be the longest job from \mathcal{J}^* . As there are only $n \cdot 2W/X$ filler jobs and \mathcal{J}^* contains no job from $\{J_{i_0}, \neg J_{i_0} : i_0 \in [n]\}$ by our initial observation, $|\mathcal{J}^*| > n \cdot 2W/X$ implies that $J^* = J_{i_1}^*$ or $J^* = \neg J_{i_1}^*$ for some $i_1 \in [n]$. We will now show that $i_1 \geq i$, i.e., that the longest job from \mathcal{J}^* has index at least i . So assume towards a contradiction that $i_1 < i$, i.e., all jobs from \mathcal{J}^* have index smaller than i . Since $|\mathcal{J}^*| = n \cdot 2W/X + i > n \cdot 2W/X + i_1$, this implies that there is some minimal i_2 such that $|\{(J_{i_0}^*, \neg J_{i_0}^* : i_0 \leq i_2) \cup \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{F}_{i_2}\} \cap \mathcal{J}^*| > i_2 \cdot (2W/X + 1)$. By the minimality of i_2 , we have $\{J_{i_2}^*, \neg J_{i_2}^*\} \cup \mathcal{F}_{i_2} \subset \mathcal{J}^*$. Further, due to the minimality of i_2 , we have that $p(\{(J_{i_0}^*, \neg J_{i_0}^* : i_0 < i_2) \cup \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{F}_{i_2-1}\} \cap \mathcal{J}^*) \geq (i_2 - 1) \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^{i_2-1} i_0 \cdot X$. Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p(\{(J_{i_0}^*, \neg J_{i_0}^* : i_0 \leq i_2) \cup \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{F}_{i_2}\} \cap \mathcal{J}^*) &> (i_2 - 1) \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^{i_2-1} i_0 \cdot X + W + 2 \cdot i_2 \cdot X \\ &= i_2 \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^{i_2} i_0 \cdot X + i_2 \cdot X > d(F_{i_2}), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction to all jobs from \mathcal{J}^* being early. Consequently, we have $p(J^*) \geq i \cdot X$. By induction, $\mathcal{J}^* \setminus \{J^*\}$ has a total processing time of at least $n \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^{i-1} i_0 \cdot X$. Therefore, we have

$$p(\mathcal{J}^*) = p(\mathcal{J}^* \setminus \{J^*\}) + p(J^*) \geq n \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^{i-1} i_0 \cdot X + i \cdot X = n \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X$$

and if $p(\mathcal{J}^*) < n \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + 0.5 \cdot X$, then \mathcal{J}^* contains exactly one of $J_{i_0}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0}^*$ for each $i_0 \in [i]$. \square

Using Lemma 10, we now characterize the set of schedules with minimum number of early jobs (ignoring the secondary condition of minimizing the maximum tardiness for a moment). In order to do so, we introduce EDD-schedules, a class of schedules used to solve $1||\sum w_j U_j$. An *EDD-schedule for a set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$* is a schedule

which schedules all jobs from $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ by non-decreasing order of their due dates, and then all other jobs in arbitrary order afterwards. It is a well-known fact that if there is a schedule where a set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ of jobs is early, then the EDD-schedule for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ is such a schedule (see e.g. [1]). Note that if $\ell > P$, then the canonical schedule for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ (as defined in Section 2) is an EDD-schedule for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$.

Lemma 11. *A schedule minimizes the number of tardy jobs if and only if the set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ of early jobs consists of*

- all filler jobs,
- for every $i \in [n]$, exactly one of J_i^* and $\neg J_i^*$,
- $\sum_{i \in [n]: \neg J_i^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_i \leq t$, and
- exactly n jobs from $\{J_i, \neg J_i : i \in [n]\}$ such that for each $i \in [n]$, at most i jobs from $\{J_{i_0}, \neg J_{i_0} : i_0 \in [i]\}$ are early.

Proof. We first show that for set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ fulfilling the four bullet points, the EDD-schedule σ for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ schedules every job from $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ early. We start with the filler jobs and jobs J_i^* . Until F_i or J_i^* , exactly one of $J_{i_0}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0}^*$ for $i_0 \leq i$ and \mathcal{F}_{i_0} for $i_0 \leq i$ can be scheduled. Thus, F_i or $J_i^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ is completed by time

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i_0 \in [i]: J_{i_0}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} p(J_{i_0}^*) + \sum_{i_0 \in [i]: \neg J_{i_0}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} p(\neg J_{i_0}^*) + \sum_{i_0=1}^i p(\mathcal{F}_{i_0}) &= \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0 \in [i]: \neg J_{i_0}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_{i_0} + i \cdot W \\ &\leq i \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + t = d(F_i) = d(J_i^*) \end{aligned}$$

using the third bullet point for the inequality.

We continue with job $\neg J_i^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. Until $\neg J_i^*$, exactly one of $J_{i_0}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0}^*$ for $i_0 \leq i$ and \mathcal{F}_{i_0} for $i_0 < i$ is scheduled. Thus, $\neg J_i^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ is completed by time

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i_0 \in [i]: J_{i_0}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} p(J_{i_0}^*) + \sum_{i_0 \in [i]: \neg J_{i_0}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} p(\neg J_{i_0}^*) + \sum_{i_0=1}^{i-1} p(\mathcal{F}_{i_0}) &= \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0 \in [i]: \neg J_{i_0}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_{i_0} + (i-1) \cdot W \\ &\leq (i-1) \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + t = d(\neg J_i^*) \end{aligned}$$

using again the third bullet point for the inequality.

Finally, we consider job $J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ or $\neg J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. Until J_i or $\neg J_i$, all filler jobs, exactly one of $J_{i_0}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0}^*$, and up to i jobs from $\{J_{i_0}, \neg J_{i_0} : i_0 \in [i]\}$ (by the fourth bullet point) are scheduled. Thus, the job is completed by time

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i_0=1}^n (p(\mathcal{F}_{i_0}) + p(\neg J_{i_0}^*)) + \sum_{J \in \{J_{i_0}, \neg J_{i_0} : i_0 \in [i]\} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} p(J) &= n \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^n i_0 \cdot X + 2t + \sum_{J \in \{J_{i_0}, \neg J_{i_0} : i_0 \in [i]\} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} p(J) \\ &\leq D_1^* + t + i \cdot W + i \cdot 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + \sum_{i_0: J_{i_0} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_{i_0} \cdot Z \\ &< D_1^* + i \cdot W + X. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this last term is smaller than $d(J_i)$ and $d(\neg J_i)$ except for $\neg J_1$. For $\neg J_1$, note that $\{J_{i_0} : i_0 \in [i]\} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{J}} = \emptyset$ and thus, $\neg J_1$ is completed by time $D_1^* + t + W + 2 \cdot Y < d(\neg J_1)$.

We continue with the backwards direction. We show that any schedule has at most $n \cdot (2W/X) + 2n$ early jobs, and equality only holds if the four bullet points hold. By Lemma 10, there are at most $2n \cdot W/X + n$ early jobs completed by time D_1^* . We continue by analyzing the early jobs completed after D_1^* . The only jobs with due date larger than D_1^* are $\{J_i, \neg J_i : i \in [n]\}$, all of which have processing time at least W . Since

the largest due date is $d(J_n) < D_1^* + (n+1) \cdot W$, it follows that at most n jobs completed after D_1^* are early. As there is a schedule with $2n \cdot W/X + 2n$ early jobs (as shown in the forward direction), this implies that the fourth bullet point holds.

We continue by showing the first two bullet points. Note that $D_1^* < n \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^n i_0 \cdot X + 0.5 \cdot X$. Lemma 10 then implies that all filler jobs and exactly one of J_i^* and $\neg J_i^*$ for $i \in [n]$ is early.

It remains to show the third bullet point. We may assume, without loss of generality and due to the EDD order, that the last early job from $\{J_i^*, \neg J_i^* : i \in [n]\} \cup \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{F}_n$ is F_n . Then F_n is completed by time

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i_0 \in [n]: J_{i_0}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} p(J_{i_0}^*) + \sum_{i_0 \in [n]: \neg J_{i_0}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} p(\neg J_{i_0}^*) + \sum_{i_0=1}^n p(\mathcal{F}_{i_0}) &= \sum_{i_0=1}^n i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0 \in [n]: \neg J_{i_0}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_{i_0} + n \cdot W \\ &= d(F_n) + \sum_{i_0 \in [n]: \neg J_{i_0}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_{i_0} - t. \end{aligned}$$

Because F_n is early, this implies the third bullet point. \square

Since Lemma 11 implies that the minimum number of tardy jobs is $2n$ in any schedule, we will use $k := 2n$ in the following. If we require that the maximum tardiness is at most ℓ in addition to the schedule having only k tardy jobs, then we get also structural restrictions on which jobs from $\{J_i, \neg J_i : i \in [n]\}$ are early:

Lemma 12. *Any canonical schedule with minimum number of tardy jobs and tardiness at most ℓ schedules exactly one of J_i and $\neg J_i$ for each $i \in [n]$.*

Proof. By Lemma 11, there are n early jobs from $\{J_i, \neg J_i : i \in [n]\}$. Assume towards a contradiction that the statement is not true, i.e., there exists a canonical schedule σ and some $i \in [n]$ such that neither J_i nor $\neg J_i$ or both J_i and $\neg J_i$ are early. First consider the case that there exist some i so that both J_i and $\neg J_i$ are early and there are at least $i-1$ early jobs from $\{J_{i_0}, \neg J_{i_0} : i_0 < i\}$. By Lemma 11, all filler jobs are early. Since $d(F_{i_0}) < d(\neg J_i) < d(J_i)$ for every $i_0 \in [n]$, every filler job F_{i_0} is completed before $\neg J_i$ and J_i since σ is canonical. Consequently, J_i is completed not before time

$$n \cdot W + (i-1) \cdot W + W + W = (n+i+1) \cdot W > d(J_i),$$

a contradiction to J_i being early.

We now consider the other case, for any $i \in [n]$ such that J_i and $\neg J_i$ are early, there are at most $i-2$ early jobs from $\{J_{i_0}, \neg J_{i_0} : i_0 < i\}$. Consequently, there exist some i such that both J_i and $\neg J_i$ are early and for all $i_1 > i$, exactly one of J_{i_1} and $\neg J_{i_1}$ is early. In particular, at least one of J_n and $\neg J_n$ is early (both are early if $i = n$). If J_n is early, then when J_n is completed, the following jobs are completed as well: all filler jobs, jobs $J_{i_0}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0}^*$ for $i_0 \in [n]$ (because they have tardiness at most ℓ by assumption and $d(\neg J_{i_0}^*) + \ell < d(J_{i_0}^*) + \ell < d(J_i)$), $i-2$ jobs from $\{J_{i_0}, \neg J_{i_0} : i_0 < i\}$, J_i and $\neg J_i$, and exactly one of J_{i_0} and $\neg J_{i_0}$ for $i_0 > i$. Therefore, J_n is completed not before time

$$n \cdot W + 2 \cdot \sum_{i_0=1}^n i_0 \cdot X + t + n \cdot W + 2 \cdot 2^i \cdot Y + \sum_{i_0=i+1}^n 2^{i_0} \cdot Y > d(J_n),$$

a contradiction to J_n being early. If $\neg J_n$ is early, then an analogous calculation leads to a contradiction. \square

We call a set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ fulfilling the conditions of Lemmas 11 and 12 (that is, containing every filler job and for each $i \in [n]$, exactly one of J_i^* and $\neg J_i^*$ as well as exactly one of J_i and $\neg J_i$, and fulfilling $\sum_{i: \neg J_i^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}} a_i \leq t$) a *candidate set*. By Lemma 11, we may restrict ourselves to schedules σ constructed by applying Observation 1 to a candidate set. We will further assume that ties between J_i^* and F_i will be broken in favor of J_i^* (i.e., if $\tilde{d}_\sigma(J_i^*) = \tilde{d}_\sigma(F_i)$, then J_i^* will be scheduled before F_i), and a possible tie between J_n^* and J_n will be broken in favor of J_n . Thus, given a candidate set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, the corresponding schedule looks as follows:

1. First, $i = 1$ to n , job J_i^* if $J_i^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ or $\neg J_i^*$ otherwise (i.e., $\neg J_i^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$). In both cases, \mathcal{F}_i follows.

2. Second, $i = 1$ to n , the following jobs are scheduled: If $J_i^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, then $\neg J_i^*$ is scheduled, followed by J_i if $J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ or $\neg J_i$ if $\neg J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. Otherwise (i.e., if $J_i^* \notin \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$), we first schedule J_i if $J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ or $\neg J_i$ if $\neg J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ and afterwards schedule J_i^* .
3. Third, for $i = 1$ to n , we schedule J_i if $\neg J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ or $\neg J_i$ if $J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$.

An example of the schedule for a candidate set can be found in Example 2.

Example 2. Assume that $n = 4$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{J}} = \{J_1^*, \neg J_2^*, J_3^*, \neg J_4^*\} \cup \{J_1, \neg J_2, J_3, \neg J_4\} \cup \{\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_3, \mathcal{F}_4\}$. Then the schedule for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ is

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc} J_1^*, & \mathcal{F}_1, & \neg J_2^*, & \mathcal{F}_2, & J_3^*, & \mathcal{F}_3, & \neg J_4^*, & \mathcal{F}_4, \\ \neg J_1^*, & J_1, & \neg J_2, & J_2^*, & \neg J_3^*, & J_3, & \neg J_4, & J_4^*, \\ \neg J_1, & J_2, & \neg J_3, & J_4. & & & & \end{array}$$

For a candidate set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, we define $\tilde{S}^* := \{i \in [n] : J_i^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}\}$ and $\tilde{S} := \{i \in [n] : J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}\}$.

We now want to characterize when a candidate set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ corresponds to a solution to the constructed instance of $1||Lex(\sum U_j, T_{\max})$. We first show that all filler jobs as well as jobs J_i^* or $\neg J_i^*$ from $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ are early:

Lemma 13. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ be a candidate set. Then all jobs from $J \in \mathcal{J}^* := \tilde{\mathcal{J}} \cap (\{J_i^*, \neg J_i^*\} \cup \mathcal{F}_i)$ are early.

Proof. Note that $\ell > D_1^* \geq d(J)$ for every $J \in \mathcal{J}^* := \tilde{\mathcal{J}} \cap (\{J_i^*, \neg J_i^*\} \cup \mathcal{F}_i)$. Therefore, these jobs are the first jobs in the candidate schedule σ for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, implying that they are early in σ if and only if they are early in the EDD-schedule for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ which holds by Lemma 11. \square

Next, we analyze when the remaining jobs are early, i.e., the jobs from $\tilde{\mathcal{J}} \cap \{J_i, \neg J_i : i \in [n]\}$.

Lemma 14. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ be a candidate set. Then all n jobs from $\tilde{\mathcal{J}} \cap \{J_i, \neg J_i : i \in [n]\}$ are early if and only if

- for each $i \in [n]$ with $J_i^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, we have $J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ and $\sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \leq t$, and
- for each $i \in [n]$ such that $\neg J_i, \neg J_i^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, we have $\sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \leq t$.

Proof. First consider the case that $J_i^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. By the definition of a candidate set, exactly one of J_i and $\neg J_i$ is contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. We will now show that job $\neg J_i$ will be tardy even if $\neg J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ while J_i is tardy if and only if $J_i \notin \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ and $\sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} > t$. Job J_i if $J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ or $\neg J_i$ if $\neg J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ is completed after all filler jobs, jobs $J_{i_0}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0}^*$ for $i_0 \in [i]$, exactly one of $J_{i_0}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0}^*$ for $i_0 > i$, J_{i_0} for $i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}$, and $\neg J_{i_0}$ for $i_0 \in [i] \setminus \tilde{S}$. To simplify the following equations, we assume that for each $i_0 > i$, job $\neg J_{i_0}^*$ and not $J_{i_0}^*$ is scheduled before J_i (this increases the total completion time by at most $2t < Z$). Thus, J_i or $\neg J_i$ is completed by time

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i_0=1}^n p(\mathcal{F}_{i_0}) + \sum_{i_0=1}^i \left(p(J_{i_0}^*) + p(\neg J_{i_0}^*) \right) + \sum_{i_0=i+1}^n p(\neg J_{i_0}^*) + \sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} p(J_{i_0}) + \sum_{i_0 \in [i] \setminus \tilde{S}} p(\neg J_{i_0}) \\ &= n \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^n i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + 2t + i \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^i 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + \sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \cdot Z \\ &= (n+i) \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^n i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^i 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + \sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \cdot Z + 2t \\ &= D_1^* + i \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^i 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + \sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \cdot Z + t \\ &= d(J_i) + \left(\sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} - t \right) \cdot Z \\ &= d(\neg J_i) + i \cdot X + \left(\sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} - t \right) \cdot Z. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $\neg J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, then $\neg J_i$ is tardy. If $J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, then J_i is early if and only if $\sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \leq t$.

We continue with the case $\neg J_i^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. We will show that J_i is early if and only if $J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ while $\neg J_i$ is early if and only if $\neg J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ and $\sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \leq t$. Job J_i if $J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ or $\neg J_i$ if $\neg J_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ is completed after all filler jobs, jobs $J_{i_0}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0}^*$ for $i_0 \in [i-1]$, exactly one of $J_{i_0}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0}^*$ for $i_0 \geq i$, J_{i_0} for $i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}$, and $\neg J_{i_0}$ for $i_0 \in [i] \setminus \tilde{S}$. As in the case $J_i^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, we assume that for each $i_0 \geq i$, job $\neg J_{i_0}^*$ and not $J_{i_0}^*$ is scheduled before J_i (this increases the total completion time by at most $2t < Z$). Thus, J_i or $\neg J_i$ is completed by time

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i_0=1}^n p(\mathcal{F}_{i_0}) + \sum_{i_0=1}^{i-1} \left(p(J_{i_0}^*) + p(\neg J_{i_0}^*) \right) + \sum_{i_0=i}^n p(\neg J_{i_0}^*) + \sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} p(J_{i_0}) + \sum_{i_0 \in [i] \setminus \tilde{S}} p(\neg J_{i_0}) \\
&= (n+i) \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^n i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^{i-1} i_0 \cdot X + 2t + \sum_{i_0=1}^i 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + \sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \cdot Z \\
&= D_1^* + i \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^{i-1} i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^i 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + \sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \cdot Z + t \\
&= d(J_i) - i \cdot X + \left(\sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} - t \right) \cdot Z \\
&= d(\neg J_i) + \left(\sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} - t \right) \cdot Z
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, J_i is always early while $\neg J_i$ is early if and only if $\sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \leq t$.

Since a candidate job contains exactly one of J_i and $\neg J_i$ for every $i \in [n]$, n jobs from $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ are early if and only if exactly one of J_i and $\neg J_i$ is early for every $i \in [n]$. As shown above, this is in turn equivalent to the two bullet points. \square

Finally, we analyze when the tardiness is at most ℓ .

Lemma 15. *Let $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ be a candidate set. Then the maximum tardiness is at most ℓ if and only if $J_n^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ or $\sum_{i \in \tilde{S}} a_i \leq t$.*

Proof. We make a distinction on the different jobs. First consider a job J_i^* , and assume that $J_i^* \notin \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ (otherwise J_i^* will be completed earlier than the time we compute below). Until J_i^* , the following jobs are scheduled: all filler jobs, jobs $J_{i_0}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0}^*$ for $i_0 \leq i$, exactly one of $J_{i_0}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0}^*$ for $i_0 > i$, and J_{i_0} for $i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}$, and $\neg J_{i_0}$ for $i_0 \in [i] \setminus \tilde{S}$. Consequently, J_i^* is completed by time

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i_0=1}^n p(\mathcal{F}_{i_0}) + \sum_{i_0=1}^i \left(p(J_{i_0}^*) + p(\neg J_{i_0}^*) \right) + \sum_{i_0=i+1}^n p(\neg J_{i_0}^*) + \sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} p(J_{i_0}) + \sum_{i_0 \in [i] \setminus \tilde{S}} p(\neg J_{i_0}) \\
&= n \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^n i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^n a_{i_0} + i \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^i 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + \sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \cdot Z \\
&\leq (n+i) \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^n i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^i i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^i 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + \sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \cdot Z + 2t \\
&= d(J_i^*) + n \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^n i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^i 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + \sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \cdot Z + t \\
&= d(J_i^*) + \ell - \sum_{i_0=i+1}^n 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + \left(\sum_{i_0 \in [i] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} - t \right) \cdot Z - t
\end{aligned}$$

which is smaller than $d(J_i^*) + \ell$ for $i < n$ or $\sum_{i \in \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \leq t$.

For $\neg J_i^*$, the calculations are identical to the one for J_i^* , except that neither J_i nor $\neg J_i$ is scheduled before $\neg J_i^*$ and the due date of J_i^* is by W smaller. Consequently, $\neg J_i^*$ is completed by time

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i_0=1}^n p(\mathcal{F}_{i_0}) + \sum_{i_0=1}^i \left(p(J_{i_0}^*) + p(\neg J_{i_0}^*) \right) + \sum_{i_0=i+1}^n p(\neg J_{i_0}^*) + \sum_{i_0 \in [i-1] \cap \tilde{S}} p(J_{i_0}) + \sum_{i_0 \in [i-1] \setminus \tilde{S}} p(\neg J_{i_0}) \\ &= d(\neg J_i^*) + n \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^n i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^{i-1} 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + \sum_{i_0 \in [i-1] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} \cdot Z + t \\ &= d(\neg J_i^*) + \ell - \sum_{i_0=i}^n a_{i_0} \cdot Y + \left(\sum_{i_0 \in [i-1] \cap \tilde{S}} a_{i_0} - t \right) \cdot Z - t. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\neg J_i^*$ always has tardiness smaller than ℓ .

For the filler job F_i , note that F_i is completed before J_i^* for $J_i^* \notin \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ but has the same due date. Thus, F_i has tardiness smaller than ℓ .

We continue with jobs $J_i \notin \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ or $\neg J_i \notin \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. This job is completed after all filler jobs, jobs $J_{i_0}^*$ and $\neg J_{i_0}^*$ for $i_0 \in [n]$, and $(n+i)$ jobs from $\{J_{i_0}, \neg J_{i_0} : i_0 \in [n]\}$. Consequently, the job is completed by time

$$\begin{aligned} & n \cdot W + 2 \cdot \sum_{i_0=1}^n i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^n a_{i_0} + (n+i) \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^n 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + \sum_{i_0=1}^i 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + \sum_{i_0=1}^n a_{i_0} \cdot Z \\ &= D_1^* + (n+i) \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=1}^n i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^n 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + \sum_{i_0=1}^i 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + 2t \cdot Z + t \\ &= d(\neg J_i) + n \cdot W + \sum_{i_0=i}^n i_0 \cdot X + \sum_{i_0=1}^n 2^{i_0} \cdot Y + t \cdot Z \\ &< d(\neg J_i) + \ell < d(J_i) + \ell. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, jobs J_i and $\neg J_i$ have tardiness smaller than ℓ . □

We can now show the correctness of the reduction:

Proof of Theorem 4. We start with the forward direction, so assume that there is a solution S to the PARTITION instance. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{J}} := \{J_i^*, J_i : i \in S\} \cup \{\neg J_i^*, \neg J_i : i \notin S\} \cup \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{F}_n$. By Lemmas 13 and 14, the schedule for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ has k tardy jobs. By Lemma 15, the schedule has tardiness smaller than ℓ .

We continue with the reverse direction. So assume that there is a schedule σ with k tardy jobs and tardiness at most ℓ . By Lemmas 11 and 12, we may assume that σ is the candidate schedule for some candidate set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. By Lemma 13, we have $\sum_{i \in \tilde{S}^*} a_i \geq t$. Further, we have $\sum_{i \in \tilde{S}} a_i \leq t$: If $J_n^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, then this follows from Lemma 14. Otherwise we have $J_n^* \notin \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ and the inequality follows from Lemma 15. By Lemma 15, we have $\tilde{S}^* \subseteq \tilde{S}$. Combining these statements, we get

$$t \leq \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}^*} a_i \leq \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}} a_i \leq t.$$

Consequently, we have $\tilde{S}^* = \tilde{S}$, and the inequalities hold with equality. Therefore, \tilde{S}^* is a solution to the PARTITION instance. □

6 Conclusions

In this paper we resolved one of the most fundamental problems in bicriteria scheduling which involves combining the maximal tardiness objective with the total number of tardy jobs objective. We proved that the lexicographic version of this problem (*i.e.* the $1||Lex(T_{\max}, \sum U_j)$ problem) is strongly NP-hard when

the maximal tardiness is used as the primary criterion, while it is at least weakly NP-hard when the number of tardy jobs is used as the primary criterion (*i.e.* the $1||Lex(\sum U_j, T_{\max})$ problem). We also classified the two other variants of the problem, $1|T_{\max} \leq \ell, \sum U_j \leq k|$ and $1||\alpha T_{\max} + \sum U_j$, as strongly NP-hard.

The first obvious question raised by our work is whether $1||Lex(\sum U_j, T_{\max})$ is strongly NP-hard or not. However, this is only one out of several other objectives that may be considered in future work. For example, there is lack of practical (polynomial time) approximation algorithms for solving bicriteria scheduling problems in general. It is interesting to see if one can design a polynomial time approximation scheme (PTAS) to solve our specific bicriteria problem, and if not maybe one can rule out the existence of such an algorithm. Another very interesting research direction which is still unexplored is whether we can provide FPT algorithms to hard multicriteria scheduling problems with respect to some of the more natural parameters, e.g., the number of different due dates or the number of different processing times in the instance.

References

- [1] Muminu O. Adamu and Aderemi O. Adewumi. A survey of single machine scheduling to minimize weighted number of tardy jobs. *Journal of Industrial and Management Optimization*, 10(1):219–241, 2014.
- [2] Alessandro Agnetis, Jean-Charles Billaut, Stanislaw Gawiejnowicz, Dario Pacciarelli, and Ameur Soukhal. *Multiagent Scheduling - Models and Algorithms*. Springer, 2014.
- [3] Chuen-Lung Chen and Robert L. Bulfin. Scheduling a single machine to minimize two criteria: Maximum tardiness and number of tardy jobs. *IIE Transactions*, 26:76–84, 1994.
- [4] Michael R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, 1979.
- [5] Klaus Heeger, Danny Hermelin, and Dvir Shabtay. Single machine scheduling with few deadlines. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation (IPEC 2023)*, pages 24:1–24:15, 2023.
- [6] Han Hoogeveen. Multicriteria scheduling. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 167(3):592–623, 2005.
- [7] Yumei Huo, Joseph Y.-T. Leung, and Hairong Zhao. Bi-criteria scheduling problems: Number of tardy jobs and maximum weighted tardiness. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 177(1):116–134, 2007.
- [8] Yumei Huo, Joseph Y.-T. Leung, and Hairong Zhao. Complexity of two-dual criteria scheduling problems. *Operations Research Letters*, 35:211–220, 2007.
- [9] James R. Jackson. An extension of johnson’s results on job lot scheduling. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly*, 3:201–203, 1956.
- [10] Chung-Yee Lee and George L. Vairaktarakis. *Complexity of Single Machine Hierarchical Scheduling: A Survey*, pages 269–298. World Scientific, 1993.
- [11] J. M. Moore. An n job, one machine sequencing algorithm for minimizing the number of late jobs. *Management Science*, 15:102–109, 1968.
- [12] George J. Shanthikumar. Scheduling n jobs on one machine to minimize the maximum tardiness with minimum number tardy. *Computers Operations Research*, 10:255–266, 1983.
- [13] Vincent T’kindt and Jean-Charles Billaut. Multicriteria scheduling problems: a survey. *RAIRO - Operations Research*, 35(2):143–163, 2001.
- [14] Vincent T’kindt and Jean-Charles Billaut. *Multicriteria Scheduling - Theory, Models and Algorithms (2. ed.)*. Springer, 2006.

- [15] Jinjiang Yuan. Unary NP-hardness of minimizing the number of tardy jobs with deadlines. *Journal of Scheduling*, 20(2):211–218, 2017.