

# Stochastic Scheduling with Abandonments via Greedy Strategies

Yihua Xu

Rohan Ghuge

Sebastian Perez-Salazar

June 25, 2024

## Abstract

Motivated by applications where impatience is pervasive and service times are uncertain, we study a scheduling model where jobs may depart at an unknown point in time and service times are stochastic. Initially, we have access to a single server and  $n$  jobs with known non-negative values: these jobs have unknown stochastic service and departure times with known distributional information, which we assume to be independent. When the server is free, we can run an available job which occupies the server for an unknown amount of time, and collect its value. The objective is to maximize the expected total value obtained from jobs run on the server. Natural formulations of this problem suffer from the curse of dimensionality. In fact, this problem is NP-hard even in the deterministic case. Hence, we focus on efficiently computable approximation algorithms that can provide high expected reward compared to the optimal expected value. Towards this end, we first provide a compact linear programming (LP) relaxation that gives an upper bound on the expected value obtained by the optimal policy. Then we design a polynomial-time algorithm that is nearly a  $(1/2) \cdot (1 - 1/e)$ -approximation to the optimal LP value (so also to the optimal expected value). We next shift our focus to the case of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) service times. In this case, we show that the greedy policy that always runs the highest-valued job whenever the server is free obtains a  $1/2$ -approximation to the optimal expected value. Our approaches extend effortlessly and we demonstrate their flexibility by providing approximations to natural extensions of our problem. Finally, we evaluate our LP-based policies and the greedy policy empirically on synthetic and real datasets.

## 1 Introduction

Stochastic scheduling, a fundamental problem in Operations Research and Computer Science, deals with the allocation of resources to jobs under uncertainty. In this paper, we consider the following single-server scheduling problem: a service system receives a collection of  $n$  jobs to be run sequentially. Each job  $j$  has a service time  $s_j$  and provides a value  $v_j$  upon completion. The goal is to select a subset of jobs in order to maximize the sum of values obtained. Such scheduling decisions are often subject to constraints; for example, capacity constraints where the server can only run a fixed number of jobs due to resource limitations, or certain jobs may have time-based constraints such as specific operating hours or time windows during which service can be provided. The setting where each job must be scheduled by a fixed deadline is captured by the classic NP-hard *knapsack* problem [47]. In practice, the exact service time of a job may not be known; however, we may assume (for example, using historical data) that the probability distribution of the service time is known. This stochastic variant, termed *stochastic knapsack*, was introduced in [19], and has been extensively studied in several communities (see, for example, [9, 21]).

In many customer-facing systems, an additional challenge arises due to impatient customers. Extended wait times can lead to customers leaving the system without receiving service, driven by

factors such as dissatisfaction, or due to having access to alternative options. This can result in a loss of revenue in several settings such as healthcare, call centers, and online service platforms (see, for example, [1, 2, 4, 14], and the references therein).

Motivated by this, we study sequential stochastic scheduling problems comprising two sources of uncertainty: *jobs have a stochastic service time*, and *jobs may leave the system at a random time*. We model impatience in a *Bayesian worst-case* manner: we assume that, for each job  $j$ , we are given a distribution that represents the probability that job  $j$  stays in the system for at least  $t$  units of time. In particular, we assume:

- the service time of each job  $j$  is an *independent* random variable which is distributed according to a known probability distribution, and
- each job  $j$  *independently* stays in the system for an unknown random amount of time, following a known probability distribution.

Informally speaking, there is a single server and  $n$  jobs queue up for service. Whenever the server is free, an available job, say  $j \in [n]$ , is selected to be run, and the corresponding value  $v_j$  is obtained as reward. The server is then rendered busy for a random amount of time that corresponds to the service time of job  $j$ . In the meantime, each of the remaining jobs may depart from the system. This process repeats until there are no jobs remaining in the system. We refer to this problem as *stochastic scheduling with abandonments*, denoted as STOCSCHEDX. We believe that STOCSCHEDX is a widely applicable model. Here are two concrete applications:

*Call Centers.* A typical occurrence in call centers is customers waiting to be served. If the wait becomes too long, an impatient customer may choose to hang up. The duration a customer spends interacting with the call center is contingent on the nature of the call; for instance, opening a new account in a bank call center might require less time than a loan payment. Existing models often assume service and abandonment times are independent and identically distributed draws from exponential distributions [8, 24]. However, empirical studies [12, 41], suggest that service times and abandonment times are not necessarily exponentially distributed. Moreover, the utility of a caller can be modeled as a function of waiting cost and value of the service associated with the call [2], or by assigning a reward under some conditions; for example, if customers are served within some fixed time windows [51].

*On-Demand Service Platforms.* On-demand service platforms have experienced tremendous growth in the last few years [54]. In online platforms offering services like freelancing or task assignments (for example, TaskRabbit or UpWork), ride-hailing (Uber or Lyft) or food delivery (such as DoorDash or Meituan), service completion times can be uncertain due to factors like task complexity, provider availability, or traffic conditions. Customers may abandon requests if response is slow. Current models often assume that customer arrivals follow a Poisson process, and that service and abandonment times are exponentially distributed [55, 57]. However, this may not always be the case; for example, a recent empirical study on Meituan, a food delivery service in China, shows that a longer waiting times for service production generally increases the likelihood of abandonment, while longer delivery times do not [59]. The utility associated with a customer can be modeled in several ways; for example, we may assign a fixed price/wage rate per service unit [6, 7] or use a dynamic (system-state-contingent) rate [13].

Our model makes mild assumptions about service and departure distributions (see §1.1) and assigns a value to each job, making it a practical tool for modeling a diverse array of applications, including the ones mentioned above. In fact, STOCSCHEDX generalizes the deterministic knapsack problem: suppose that for all jobs  $j$ , the probability that job  $j$  stays in the system for  $t > T - s_j$  units of time is 0, where  $T > 0$  and  $s_j$  is the deterministic service time for job  $j$ . This is exactly a knapsack

instance with deadline  $T$ , proving that STOCSCHEDX is NP-hard. As a consequence of this, we aim to design polynomial-time algorithms with provable guarantees for the problem. A natural approach would be to study STOCSCHEDX under the competitive analysis framework [11], where we compare ourselves to a “clairvoyant” adversary who knows the random outcomes of departure and service times in advance. Unfortunately, the following example shows that an optimal algorithm (even with unbounded computational power) for STOCSCHEDX gets at most  $O(1/n)$  times the expected value obtained by a clairvoyant adversary.

**Example 1.1.** *Consider  $n$  identical jobs such that each job  $j \in [n]$  has  $v_j = 1$ , departs at time  $n$  with probability 1, and has service time uniformly in  $\{1, n\}$ . Observe that, in expectation,  $n/2$  jobs have a service time of 1, and a clairvoyant algorithm obtains expected total reward of  $n/2$ . On the other hand, any algorithm that does not know the realizations of the service times obtains expected total reward of at most 2 (in expectation, the second job that is selected has service time equal to  $n$ ).*

This motivates us to utilize a more refined benchmark, and thus, we compare our algorithm against an optimal online (non-clairvoyant) algorithm. We note that an optimal online algorithm for STOCSCHEDX can be formulated as a stochastic Markov decision process (MDP) [50], which can be computed in exponential time. So, the main question of our work is:

*Can we design polynomial time algorithms that obtain provably good expected total value compared to an optimal online algorithm for STOCSCHEDX while making mild assumptions on the service time and impatience distributions?*

Our main result lies in designing polynomial-time algorithms for STOCSCHEDX that achieve a constant-factor approximation to the online optimum. We summarize our main contributions below.

**Our Contributions:** We introduce STOCSCHEDX that captures single-server scheduling problems where job values are known, while service and departure times are unknown but follow known distributional information. By adhering to two structural properties (1): no job is run more than once, and (2) each server is busy by at most one job, we introduce a compact linear program (LP) relaxation that upper-bounds the performance of all policies. We provide an algorithm that uses the LP solution and obtains a  $1/2 \cdot (1 - 1/e) \approx 0.31$  fraction of LP objective, hence also the value of the optimal policy. This algorithm runs in polynomial time under mild assumptions over the service times. We further study STOCSCHEDX when service times are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.). In this case, we prove that the greedy policy, which selects the highest-valued available job whenever the server is free, achieves a  $1/2$ -approximation to the optimal value. We complement this result by showing that this bound is tight for this greedy policy. We demonstrate the flexibility of our approach by studying extensions of STOCSCHEDX. We consider natural constraints such as the knapsack constraint or imposing hard deadlines on the jobs. For each of these extensions, we provide similar algorithms that obtain approximation guarantees as the ones obtained for the vanilla STOCSCHEDX. Finally, we extensively evaluate our LP-based policies, as well as greedy policies on instances generated from synthetic and real-world datasets.

## 1.1 Problem Definitions

An instance  $I$  of STOCSCHEDX is given by a single server and a collection of  $n$  jobs. Each job  $j \in [n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  has a deterministic value  $v_j > 0$ , a stochastic service time  $S_j$  and a stochastic departure time  $D_j$ , each with known distributional information. We denote the set of jobs that

are still in the system at time  $t$  by  $R_t$ . We assume that all random variables (service times and departure times) are independent. We also assume that time starts at  $t = 1$ , with the server being *free*. We say that the server is *busy* when it is running a job, and say it is *free* otherwise. When the server is free, it can run a job from the set of available jobs; that is, those jobs that have not yet been run and are still in the system. Upon starting job  $j$ , the service time  $S_j$  of job  $j$  is revealed, and we obtain a reward of  $v_j$ . The server is then rendered busy for exactly  $S_j$  units of time. We assume that jobs cannot leave the system once service has begun, and preemptions are not allowed (see Figure 1 for an illustration). We use  $\bar{F}_{S_j}(t) := \Pr(S_j > t)$  to denote the tail distribution of  $S_j$ . We assume that there is  $T = T(I) < +\infty$  such that  $\bar{F}_{S_j}(T) = 0$  for all  $j \in [n]$ . For  $D_j$ , we use  $p_j(t) := \Pr(D_j \geq t)$  to denote the probability that job  $j$  remains in the system at least  $t$  units of time. We also assume that  $p_j(t) > 0$  for all  $t \geq 1$ . We note that the assumptions on  $S_j$  and  $D_j$  can be made at the expense of an arbitrarily small loss in the objective value (see Appendix A.1 and A.2 for details).




Figure 1: The figure demonstrates a sample execution. We select job  $j$  at time  $t = 1$  which gives a value  $v_j$ , and causes the system to be busy for  $S_j$  time units. Once the server is free, we select job  $j'$  from the set of available jobs and obtain (additional) value  $v_{j'}$ , and so on.

Given an instance  $I$ , a *policy*  $\Pi(I)$  is a function that dictates at each time that the server is free which available job to run in the server. Note that  $\Pi$  takes as input the time  $t$ , the available jobs  $R_t$ , and the current state of the server (free or busy). We denote by  $v(\Pi(I))$  the expected value obtained by following policy  $\Pi(I)$ . We seek a policy that solves

$$\max_{\Pi(I) \text{ policy}} v(\Pi(I)), \quad (1)$$

i.e., a policy that maximizes the expected value collected. We denote by  $\text{OPT}(I)$  the optimal policy on the instance  $I$  that solves (1). If the instance is clear from the context, we simply denote  $\Pi$  and  $\text{OPT}$  instead of  $\Pi(I)$  and  $\text{OPT}(I)$  respectively. We abuse notation and write simply  $\text{OPT}$  for  $\text{OPT}(I)$ . Even though, in theory, we can solve (1) and compute  $\text{OPT}$  (see, e.g., [50]), we seek algorithms that run efficiently and can give provably good approximations to (1).

We also consider several extensions of STOCSCHEDX that are motivated by classic scheduling problems as well as real-world applications. One extension to STOCSCHEDX adds a job-dependent *strict deadline*  $B_j \geq 1$  for each individual job  $j \in [n]$ , allowing us to differentiate between departure and deadline. Under this extension, we only collect revenue from jobs that finish running before their deadline. In another set of extension, we introduce operational knapsack constraints imposed to the server, that are independent of service and departure times. In this context, each job  $j$  is assigned a weight  $w_j \geq 0$ . The total weight of the jobs run on the server must not surpass a specified capacity  $W$ . See §3 for details.

## 1.2 Our Technical Results

Our first result is a time-indexed LP relaxation that upper bounds the expected total reward of any policy, including that of the optimal policy. We use this LP to provide simple policies with theoretical guarantees for STOCSCHEDX.

**Theorem 1.1** (Upper bound on the online optimum). *Let  $I$  be an instance of STOCSCHEDX and let  $S_j$  be bounded by  $T$  with probability 1 for all  $j \in [n]$ . Then, the optimal value of the following linear program (denoted as **LP-Sched**) with  $n^2 \cdot T$  variables and  $n \cdot (1 + T)$  constraints gives an upper bound on the online optimum.*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{maximize} && \sum_{t=1}^{nT} \sum_{j=1}^n x_{j,t} v_j && \text{(LP-Sched)} \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{t=1}^{nT} \frac{x_{j,t}}{p_j(t)} \leq 1 && \forall j \in [n] \quad \text{(a)} \\
& && \sum_{\tau \leq t} \sum_{j=1}^n x_{j,\tau} \bar{F}_{S_j}(t - \tau) \leq 1 && \forall t \in [nT] \quad \text{(b)} \\
& && x_{j,t} \geq 0 && \forall j \in [n], \forall t \in [nT]
\end{aligned}$$

For each instance  $I$ , our **(LP-Sched)** has one variable  $x_{j,t}$  per job  $j$  and time  $t$  that can be interpreted as the *the probability that the optimal policy runs job  $j$  at time  $t$* . Hence, the objective value is  $\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{t \geq 1} v_j x_{j,t}$ . **(LP-Sched)** has two types of constraints that are deduced from natural constraints that any policy for STOCSCHEDX must satisfy: (1) *no job can be run more than once*, and (2) *at any given time, the server is rendered by at most one job*. Our LP satisfies these constraints in expectation; hence, it provides a valid upper bound to the online optimum,  $v(\text{OPT})$ . We defer the details to §2.1.

Our next result demonstrates that the objective value of **(LP-Sched)** is at most a constant factor from  $v(\text{OPT})$ . We provide an algorithm that uses optimal solutions from the LP.

**Theorem 1.2** (Approximation guarantee). *There is an algorithm **ALG** that, for any instance to STOCSCHEDX, guarantees  $v(\text{ALG}) \geq (1/2) \cdot (1 - 1/e)v_{LP}$ .*

A naïve approach uses the optimal solution  $x_{j,t}^*$  to the **(LP-Sched)** as the probability to run job  $j$  at time  $t$ , hoping to obtain expected value equal to the value of the optimal solution. However, note that Constraints **(a)** and **(b)** only hold *in expectation*. So, this naïve implementation runs into two critical issues: (1) running a job at time  $t$  can decrease the chance of running a job at time  $\tau > t$ , leading to dependencies in the decisions across times, and (2) the mechanism to select one job at each time is unclear since sampling according to the  $x_{j,t}^*$  values may lead to multiple jobs being selected, while our server can run only one job at a time. We get around these challenges as follows. First, we scale down the probability that a job is available to be run using a scaling akin to simulation-based attenuation [22, 40]. The scaling guarantees that the probability that the server is free at any given time is at least  $1/2$ . To get around the other issue, we create a “consideration set” using an optimal solution to the **(LP-Sched)** and the set of available jobs. Then, from this consideration set, we greedily run the highest-valued job. This greedy step ensures that we get at least a  $(1 - 1/e)$  fraction of the value obtained by the LP at the corresponding time. Furthermore, we show that our analysis is almost tight via an instance where  $v(\text{ALG})$  is at most  $(1 - 1/\sqrt{e}) \approx 0.39$  times  $v_{LP}$ . Finally, in §2.4, we present an instance such that  $v(\text{OPT}) \leq (1 - 1/e + \varepsilon)v_{LP}$ ; hence, we cannot expect to devise an algorithm with an approximation guarantee better than  $1 - 1/e$ , at least using our LP.

The scaling factors used by **ALG** at time  $t$  require the simulation of events that happen up to time  $t - 1$ . This simulation could require exponential time to be computed accurately. However, if we assume that the service times have support in  $[0, n^k]$ , for a fixed  $k$ , our algorithm can be run in polynomial time. In short, we can use Monte-Carlo approximations [56] to estimate the

scaling factors at the expense of a small multiplicative loss in the objective. The following corollary formalizes this result; the details are presented in §2.3.

**Corollary 1.3** (Polynomial-time approximation ratio). *Assume that the support of the service times are contained in  $[0, n^k]$  for a fixed  $k$ , and denote  $v_{\max} = \max_{j \in [n]} v_j$ . Fix an  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then there is an algorithm  $\text{ALG}_\varepsilon$  that obtains an expected total reward of at least  $(1/2) \cdot (1 - 1/e - \varepsilon) \cdot v(\text{OPT})$  which runs in time  $6n^{2+k}v_{\max} \ln(2(n^{2+k}/\varepsilon))/\varepsilon^3$ .*

We obtain a better approximation guarantee when considering the special case where the service times of jobs are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.). We show that the greedy solution that runs the highest-valued job whenever the server is free obtains a  $1/2$ -approximation to the optimal policy.

**Theorem 1.4** (Greedy policy for i.i.d. service times). *The greedy policy that, from the set of available jobs, runs the one with the largest value, obtains an expected total value at least  $1/2$  times the expected total value obtained by an optimal policy for STOCSCHEDEX when the service times of the jobs are i.i.d.*

To show this result, we use coupling and charging arguments. Using a coupling argument, we ensure that the server is free at the same time steps under both, the greedy and the optimal, policies. Furthermore, via a charging argument, we show that, whenever the greedy policy runs a job, twice the value collected by the greedy policy suffices to account for the value collected by the optimal policy at the same time and one step in the future. We present the proof in Appendix C. Finally, we note that our analysis for the greedy algorithm is tight, as demonstrated by the following example.

**Example 1.2.** *Consider the following instance with  $n = 2$  jobs. We set the parameters of the jobs as follows:  $v_1 = 1 + \varepsilon$ ,  $D_1 = 2$  with probability 1;  $v_2 = 1$  and  $D_2 = 1$  with probability 1. Let  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  be 1 with probability 1. Observe that the greedy algorithm (serving the highest valued job) obtains  $(1 + \varepsilon)/(2 + \varepsilon)$  times the value obtained by an optimal policy.*

Due to the inherent simplicity and practicality of greedy solutions, it might be tempting to formulate greedy algorithms for STOCSCHEDEX. However, as the subsequent examples illustrate, these intuitive, natural greedy approaches — such as prioritizing jobs based on their value or on the ratio of value to expected service time — do not yield favorable results.

**Example 1.3.** *Consider the greedy algorithm that runs the job with the largest value. Consider the following instance of  $n$  jobs. We set the parameters of job 1 as follows:  $v_1 = 1 + \varepsilon$ ,  $D_1 = n + 1$  and  $S_1 = n$  with probability 1. For each job  $j \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ , we have  $v_j = 1$ ,  $D_j = n$  and  $S_j = 1$  with probability 1. Observe that the greedy algorithm runs job 1 at time  $t = 1$  and obtains a value of  $1 + \varepsilon$ , while the optimal solution obtains a total value of  $n + \varepsilon$  by first serving jobs  $2, \dots, n$ , and then job 1.*

**Example 1.4.** *Consider the greedy algorithm that runs the job with the largest ratio of value to expected service time. Consider the behavior of this algorithm on the following instance with  $n = 2$ . We have  $v_1 = 1 + \varepsilon$ ,  $D_1 = K + 2$  and  $S_1 = 1$  with probability 1, and  $v_2 = K$ ,  $D_2 = 1$  and  $S_2 = K$  with probability 1. The greedy algorithm runs job 1 at time  $t = 1$ , and loses out on the value of job 2 (which leaves the system at  $t = 2$ ). Thus, the greedy algorithm obtains a value of  $1 + \varepsilon$ , while the optimal solution obtains a total value of  $K + 1 + \varepsilon$ .*

Our approaches can be easily extended to tackle natural extensions of STOCSCHEDX. Our first extension includes job-dependent deadlines where no value is obtained if the job finishes after its deadline. This model generalizes the classic stochastic knapsack problem [19] by allowing jobs to leave the system. Our next extension involves introducing a knapsack constraint on the jobs that the server can run. In this case, each job  $j$  has a weight  $w_j \geq 0$ , and the cumulative weight of jobs run on the server cannot exceed a predetermined capacity  $W$ . This extension also captures a cardinality constraint when  $w_j = 1$  for all  $j \in [n]$  and  $W = k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . For each of these extensions, we propose modifications to **LP-Sched** that give valid upper bounds as in Theorem 1.1, as well as results analogous to Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3. We also demonstrate that our greedy approach offers approximations for specific subinstances of the proposed extensions. We summarize the final approximation guarantees in Table 1 and provide a detailed description of these extensions and modifications to our techniques in § 3.

Problems	Approximation Ratio (general instance)	Approximation Ratio (i.i.d. service time)
Deadline	$1/2 \cdot (1 - 1/e)$	$1/2$ (identical deadlines)
Knapsack	$1/2 \cdot (1 - 1/e) \cdot \left(1 - e^{-W^2/(2nw_{max}^2)}\right)$	$1/2 \cdot (1 - 1/e) \cdot \left(1 - e^{-W^2/(2nw_{max}^2)}\right)$
Cardinality	$1/2 \cdot (1 - 1/e) \cdot (1 - e^{-k/6})$	$1/2$

Table 1: Extensions considered and their approximation guarantees. We ignore the error introduced to make the running time polynomial time in  $n$  and  $T$ . We use  $w_{max}$  to denote  $\max_{j \in [n]} w_j$  in the knapsack sub-extension.

### 1.3 Related Work

The classic (single-machine) job scheduling problem has been extensively studied in operations research and computer science (see, for e.g., [15, 37, 46, 58]). In a traditional scheduling problem, the policy can determine the starting times of the jobs in order to construct schedules that meet certain constraints. The performance measures for such problems reflect how the resources are used; for example, minimizing the makespan [33] optimizes the overall time taken to process all the given jobs, or minimizing the total processing time [34] ensures that jobs do not spend a lot of time in the system, or optimizing for weighted completion times is important when some jobs are more critical or have higher priority than others [48]. In contrast, our objective is to maximize the expected total value derived from processing jobs. Our problem shares similarities with the *interval scheduling* problem (see surveys [36] and [44]). In the interval scheduling problem, we are given a set of jobs with specified starting times, and the goal is to design a policy such that no two jobs overlap. In this setup, the performance measures can focus on individual jobs; for example, we want to run as many jobs as possible, or maximize the total weight of the accepted jobs. The basic interval scheduling problem is conventionally addressed through interval graph coloring methodologies as illustrated in [26], however, given the stochastic nature of our setting and objective distinction, such technique can hardly transfer. Several models consider stochastic service times; for instance, see classic work [25] and [53]. Closer to our work is the work [16] which considers stochastic service times and abandonment and reach necessary and sufficient conditions for the optimality of a strict priority policy; however, their analysis is restricted to two specific classes of probability distributions.

Serving jobs with stochastic departure has also been studied extensively in the management literature [35, 49, 60], for instance, for applications to customer service where customers leave if

they become too impatient. In particular, the famous  $c\mu$  rule (which runs job with largest value of holding cost per unit time ( $c$ ) multiplying service rate( $\mu$ )) was extended to  $c\mu/\theta$  rule when an exponential patience-time distribution is introduced in [5] where  $\theta$  denotes the abandonment rate, and then further exploited in a dynamic fluid scheduling setting [39]. There is a large body of work at the intersection of queuing theory and job scheduling considering settings including service-level differentiation [29], shortest-remaining-processing-time (SRPT) scheduling policy [23], and setup costs [31]. The objective in these works is typically regret minimization. In our case, we consider approximation guarantees in nonstationary environment.

Central to our analysis for general service times is the use of LP relaxations. LP relaxations have been used extensively in job scheduling [32, 45], stochastic knapsack [10, 19, 28, 40] and other related problems [3, 17, 38]. Closer to our work is [18], where they study instances of STOCSCHEDEX where jobs depart with a geometric random time, and each job’s service time is 1. Our model extends theirs by incorporating stochastic service times and general stochastic departure process. The authors of [18] present an LP-based algorithm that guarantees a 0.7 approximation; however, this approach can only be applied when the services times are 1.

Our model exhibits parallels with online bipartite-matching as well, where the single server can be interpreted as an offline vertex, and jobs as online vertices. In contrast to the majority of scenarios where jobs arrive online (for example, [42]), we consider stochastic departures for jobs in the system. Moreover, our model resembles the setting where the offline vertex can be treated as reusable resources [22, 27, 52]. Our model also shares similarities with adaptive combinatorial optimization, in particular, the stochastic knapsack problem introduced in [20]. The study of adaptivity starts with the work of Dean et al. [19], which adopts a competitive analysis perspective. However, their work focuses on the adaptivity gap as opposed to the design of approximations. Note that fully adaptive solutions can be obtained using Markov decision processes [50].

## 1.4 Organization

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the LP relaxation and an LP-induced efficient algorithm with provable approximation guarantees for any STOCSCHEDEX instances. Section 3 presents the flexibility of our model that can readily accommodate additional constraints with minor modifications. Section 4 offers empirical validation of our policies via numerical experiments. Section 5 summarizes the paper and discusses potential future work.

# 2 The LP Relaxation and Algorithms with Provable Guarantees

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, and Corollary 1.3. Firstly, we prove that the LP relaxation (**LP-Sched**) provides an upper bound on  $v(\text{OPT})$  (see §2.1). Then, we focus on the algorithm that attains provable approximation guarantees (see §2.2). This algorithm can be adapted to run in polynomial time with minimal assumptions on the service times (see §2.3). Finally, we conclude this section by providing an upper bound on the approximation ratio under the LP relaxation (see §2.4).

## 2.1 The LP Relaxation

In this section, we provide a proof for Theorem 1.1, that is, for any instance  $I$  of STOCSCHEDEX, the optimal value of (**LP-Sched**)  $v_{LP}(I)$  is at least the value of an optimal policy  $v(\text{OPT})$ . We proceed by showing an intermediate lemma that for any instance  $I$  and policy  $\Pi$ ,  $v_{LP}(I)$  is at least the value of policy  $v(\Pi)$ .



**Lemma 2.1.** *Given any instance  $I$  of STOCSCHEDEX, and let  $\Pi$  be any policy that determines which job to run next (if any) at time  $t$  if the server is free, we have  $v_{LP}(I) \geq v(\Pi(I))$ .*

*Proof.* Given an instance  $I$  of STOCSCHEDEX and a feasible policy  $\Pi$ , let  $x_{j,t}$  denote the probability that the policy  $\Pi$  runs job  $j$  at time  $t$ . Then,  $v(\Pi) = \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^n x_{j,t} v_j$ . To finish the proof, we need to show that  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_{j,t}\}_{j \in [n], t \in [T]}$  is a feasible solution to LP (**LP-Sched**). Fix  $j \in [n]$ , and observe that for any  $t \geq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x_{j,t}}{p_j(t)} &= \Pr(\Pi \text{ runs } j \text{ at } t \mid D_j \geq t) = 1 - \Pr(\Pi \text{ does not run } j \text{ at } t \mid D_j \geq t) \\ &\leq 1 - \Pr(\Pi \text{ runs } j \text{ at some } \tau < t \mid D_j \geq t) = 1 - \sum_{\tau < t} \Pr(\Pi \text{ runs } j \text{ at } \tau \mid D_j \geq t) \\ &= 1 - \sum_{\tau < t} \Pr(\Pi \text{ runs } j \text{ at } \tau \mid D_j \geq \tau) = 1 - \sum_{\tau < t} \frac{x_{j,\tau}}{p_j(\tau)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds since  $\Pi$  can run job  $j$  only once, and the penultimate equality follows from the fact that  $\Pi$  can only make the decision at time  $\tau$  based on information up to time  $\tau$ . This implies that  $\mathbf{x}$  satisfies (a). Next, we show that  $\mathbf{x}$  also satisfies (b). Let  $\mathbb{I}_{j,t}^{\text{start}}$  be an indicator random variable that is 1 when  $\Pi$  selects job  $j$  at time  $t$  and job  $j$  is available at time  $t$ . At any given time  $t \geq 1$ , the server can either (i) start serving a new job, or (ii) continue serving a job from some prior round. In the second case, job  $j$  “blocks” time  $t$  if the server started serving it at time  $\tau$  and its service time was greater than  $(t - \tau)$ : let  $S_{j,t-\tau}$  be an indicator denoting this quantity. Formally, for any  $t \geq 1$ , we have  $\sum_{j \in [n]} \mathbb{I}_{j,t}^{\text{start}} + \sum_{\tau < t} \sum_{j \in [n]} \mathbb{I}_{j,\tau}^{\text{start}} \cdot S_{j,t-\tau} \leq 1$ . Taking expectations, noting that the service times are independent of the decisions made by  $\Pi$ , and using  $\mathbb{E}[S_{j,t-\tau}] = \Pr(S_j > t - \tau) = \bar{F}_{S_j}(t - \tau)$  gives (b). Thus,  $\mathbf{x}$  is a feasible solution for LP (**LP-Sched**), which completes the proof.  $\square$

By optimizing over  $\Pi$  we obtain Theorem 1.1.

## 2.2 Approximation Algorithm

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 1.2. To prove the theorem, we provide an algorithm, namely **ALG**, that obtains an expected value at least  $1/2 \cdot (1 - 1/e)$  fraction of  $v_{LP}$ . The significance of our result is twofold. First, it shows that  $v_{LP}$  is not arbitrarily far from  $v(\text{OPT})$  as  $v(\text{OPT})$  is always larger than  $v(\text{ALG})$ . Second, it provides a methodological way to transform feasible solutions to the LP into implementable policies with provable guarantees. We first present the algorithm and show its correctness. We then move to prove the claimed approximation guarantees. Lastly, we show that our algorithm can be made to run in polynomial time at the expense of a small multiplicative loss in the objective value.

### 2.2.1 Algorithm

At a high level, our algorithm **ALG** utilizes the optimal solution  $\mathbf{x}^*$  to (**LP-Sched**) to guide the execution of jobs when the server is available. Iteratively, for each time  $t$  when the server is free, the algorithm constructs a *consideration set*  $\mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C}^*(t)$  of jobs that have not been considered in previous times and have not departed. From this consideration set, the algorithm will choose the highest-valued job in the set  $\mathcal{C}^*$ , if any. To add jobs to the consideration set, we do the following. At time  $t$ , the algorithm computes  $f_{j,t}$  which is the *probability that ALG has not considered job  $j$  before  $t$  and the server is free at time  $t$  conditioned on  $j$  being available at time  $t$* . Hence,  $f_{j,1} = 1$  for all  $j$  and for  $t > 1$ ,  $f_{j,t}$  can be computed using only information observed up to time  $t - 1$ . Then,

when the server is free at time  $t$ , **ALG** adds job  $j$  to the consideration set for time  $t$  with probability  $x_{j,t}^*/(2 \cdot p_j(t) \cdot f_{j,t})$  if  $j$  has not departed and has not been considered before. This normalization factor allows us to avoid contentions in the analysis. We formally describe **ALG** in Algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1** **ALG**

---

- 1: **Input:** jobs  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , with value  $v_j$ ,  $f_{j,t}$  values for time  $t \geq 1$ , departure time  $p_j(\cdot)$  and service time  $\bar{F}_j(\cdot)$ .
  - 2:  $\mathbf{x}^* \leftarrow$  optimal solution (**LP-Sched**).
  - 3:  $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow [n]$ .
  - 4: **for**  $t = 1, \dots$  **do**
  - 5:     **if** server is free **then**
  - 6:          $\mathcal{C}^* \leftarrow \emptyset$ .
  - 7:         **for**  $j \in \mathcal{C}$  **do:** add  $j$  to  $\mathcal{C}^*$  w.p.  $x_{j,t}^*/(2 \cdot p_j(t) \cdot f_{j,t})$ .
  - 8:          $j_t \leftarrow \arg \max_{j \in \mathcal{C}^*} \{v_j\}$ , **run**  $j_t$ .
  - 9:     **update**  $\mathcal{C}$  by removing the job that was considered (if any) or jobs that are no longer available.
- 

Note that we need to ensure that the ratio in 7. is a valid probability. Before we move into the analysis of correctness and approximation of the algorithm, we provide some additional discussion about **ALG**. First, note that  $\{f_{j,t}\}_{j \in [n], t \geq 1}$  is part of the algorithm's input. We do this to avoid notational clutter. This can be easily modified by adding a subroutine that computes  $f_{j,t}$  at time  $t$  for each  $j$ . Our presentation is slightly more general as it allows users to choose alternative values for  $f_{j,t}$ . Let  $\mathbf{A}_{j,t}$  be the event that *job  $j$  is available at time  $t$* , then  $\Pr(\mathbf{A}_{j,t}) = \Pr(D_j \geq t) = p_j(t)$ . We also denote by  $\mathbf{SF}_t$  the event that *server is free at  $t$  when running **ALG***, and  $\mathbf{NC}_{j,t}$  the event that  *$j$  has not been considered before  $t$  by **ALG***. Then,  $f_{j,t}$ , as defined above, can be concisely written as  $f_{j,t} = \Pr(\mathbf{NC}_{j,t}, \mathbf{SF}_t \mid \mathbf{A}_{j,t})$ . Note that computing  $f_{j,t}$  may involve a sum over exponentially many terms which precludes a polynomial-time implementation of **ALG**. Instead of using the exact values of  $f_{j,t}$ , we can approximate them using Monte Carlo simulation in polynomial time at a minimal loss in the objective value; we discuss the details in §2.3. In the remaining of the section, we assume that  $f_{j,t} = \Pr(\mathbf{NC}_{j,t}, \mathbf{SF}_t \mid \mathbf{A}_{j,t})$ .

### 2.2.2 Algorithm 1 is well-defined:

Algorithm 1 is clearly well-defined once we prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.2.** *For each job  $j \in [n]$  and time  $t \geq 1$ , we have  $x_{j,t}^*/(2 \cdot p_j(t) \cdot f_{j,t}) \leq 1$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the lemma by induction in  $t$ . By definition  $f_{j,1} = 1$  for all  $j$ ; hence  $x_{j,1}^*/(2 \cdot p_j(1) \cdot f_{j,1}) \leq 1$ , using Constraint (a).

We assume, inductively, that  $x_{j,\tau}^*/(2 \cdot p_j(\tau) \cdot f_{j,\tau}) \leq 1$  for all  $\tau \leq t - 1$ . Before proving that the lemma also holds for  $t$ , we need some preliminary results. Consider the two events  $\mathbf{Run}_{j,t} = \{\mathbf{ALG} \text{ runs job } j \text{ at time } t\}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{j,t} = \{\text{job } j \text{ is in the consideration set } \mathcal{C}^* \text{ at time } t\}$ . Note that  $\mathbf{Run}_{j,t} \subseteq \mathbf{C}_{j,t}$  for any job  $j$  and time  $t \geq 1$ . Then, we have the following technical claim; which we defer its proof to Appendix B.

**Claim 2.3.** *For any  $\tau < t$ , we have that*

1. *For any job  $i \neq j$ , then  $\Pr(\mathbf{Run}_{i,\tau} \mid \mathbf{A}_{j,t}) \leq x_{i,\tau}^*/2$ , and*
2. *For any job  $j$ , then  $\Pr(\mathbf{C}_{j,\tau} \mid \mathbf{A}_{j,t}) \leq x_{j,\tau}^*/(2 \cdot p_j(\tau))$ .*

We are now ready to complete the proof of the lemma. We consider the value of  $1 - f_{j,t}$  which can be upper bounded by the probability of events in which, either (i) the server is busy at time  $t$  because of another job, or (ii) job  $j$  was considered at an earlier time  $\tau < t$ . Formally, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
1 - f_{j,t} &= \Pr(\{\exists \text{ job } i \neq j : \text{Run}_{i,\tau} \text{ and } S_i > t - \tau\} \text{ or } \{\exists \tau < t : \mathbf{C}_{j,\tau}\} \mid \mathbf{A}_{j,t}) \\
&\leq \sum_{\tau < t} \sum_{i \neq j} \Pr(\text{Run}_{i,\tau} \mid \mathbf{A}_{j,t}) \cdot \Pr(S_i > t - \tau) + \sum_{\tau < t} \Pr(\mathbf{C}_{j,\tau} \mid \mathbf{A}_{j,t}) \quad (\text{Union bound}) \\
&\leq \sum_{\tau < t} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{x_{i,\tau}^*}{2} \cdot \Pr(S_i > t - \tau) + \sum_{\tau < t} \frac{x_{j,\tau}^*}{2 \cdot p_j(\tau)} \quad (\text{Using Claim 2.3}) \\
&\leq \frac{1 - \sum_{i=1}^n x_{i,t}^*}{2} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{x_{j,t}^*}{2 \cdot p_j(t)}. \quad (\text{Constraints (a) and (b)})
\end{aligned}$$

From here, we can deduce that  $x_{j,t}^*/(2 \cdot p_j(t) \cdot f_{j,t}) \leq 1$  which finishes the proof.  $\square$

### 2.2.3 Approximation Guarantee

In this subsection, we prove that  $v(\text{ALG}) \geq (1/2) \cdot (1 - 1/e)v_{LP}$ . We proceed as follows: we compare the value collected by **ALG** against the LP at each time step  $t$ . We show that for any time  $t$ , the probability that the server is free at time  $t$  is always at least  $1/2$  (see Proposition 2.4) allowing us to run a job at time  $t$  with probability at least  $1/2$ . Secondly, we show that the highest valued job in the consideration set  $\mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C}^*(t)$  at time  $t$ , in expectation, is at least  $(1 - 1/e)$  of  $\sum_{j=1}^n v_j x_{j,t}^*$ , which is the  $t$ -th summand in the LP objective.

In the following proposition, we show that under **ALG**, the server is free at time  $t$  with probability at least  $1/2$ . The proof uses a union bound argument and we defer the details to Appendix B.

**Proposition 2.4.** *For each  $t \geq 1$ ,  $\Pr(\text{SF}_t) \geq 1/2$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* For  $t \geq 1$ , let  $X_t$  be the value of the job run at time  $t$  by **ALG**; we set  $X_t = 0$  if not job is run at time  $t$ . Then,  $v(\text{ALG}) = \sum_{t \geq 1} \mathbb{E}[X_t]$ . Hence, it is enough to show that for  $t \geq 1$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[X_t] \geq (1/2) \cdot (1 - 1/e) \sum_{j=1}^n v_j x_{j,t}^*$ .

For the rest of the analysis, we assume without loss of generality that  $v_1 \geq v_2 \geq \dots \geq v_n$ . Then,  $X_t = v_j$  if (i) the server is free at  $t$ , (ii) job  $j$  is considered at  $t$  and (iii) no job  $i < j$  is considered at  $t$ . Recall that  $\mathbf{C}_{j,t}$  refers to the event that *job  $j$  is considered by **ALG** at time  $t$*  and denote  $\bar{\mathbf{C}}_{j,t}$  as its complement. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(X_t = v_j) &= \Pr(\mathbf{C}_{j,t} \cap \{\forall i < j : \bar{\mathbf{C}}_{i,t}\} \cap \text{SF}_t) \\
&= \Pr(\text{SF}_t) \Pr(\mathbf{C}_{j,t} \cap \{\forall i < j : \bar{\mathbf{C}}_{i,t}\} \mid \text{SF}_t) \\
&= \Pr(\text{SF}_t) \Pr(\mathbf{C}_{j,t} \mid \text{SF}_t) \prod_{i < j} (1 - \Pr(\mathbf{C}_{i,t} \mid \text{SF}_t))
\end{aligned}$$

For each job  $j$ , let  $\alpha_{j,t} = \Pr(\mathbf{C}_{j,t} \mid \mathbf{SF}_t)$ . Then,  $\Pr(X_t = v_j) = \Pr(\mathbf{SF}_t)\alpha_{j,t} \prod_{i < j} (1 - \alpha_{i,t})$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{j,t} &= \Pr(\mathbf{C}_{j,t} \mid \mathbf{SF}_t, \mathbf{A}_{j,t}, \mathbf{NC}_{j,t}) \cdot \Pr(\mathbf{NC}_{j,t} \mid \mathbf{SF}_t, \mathbf{A}_{j,t}) \cdot \Pr(\mathbf{A}_{j,t}) && \text{(Conditioning on } \mathbf{A}_{j,t} \text{ and } \mathbf{NC}_{j,t}) \\
&= \frac{x_{j,t}^*}{2f_{j,t} \cdot \Pr(\mathbf{A}_{j,t})} \cdot \frac{\Pr(\mathbf{NC}_{j,t}, \mathbf{SF}_t, \mathbf{A}_{j,t})}{\Pr(\mathbf{SF}_t, \mathbf{A}_{j,t})} \cdot \Pr(\mathbf{A}_{j,t}) && \text{(Using ALG)} \\
&= \frac{x_{j,t}^*}{2f_{j,t}} \cdot \frac{\Pr(\mathbf{NC}_{j,t}, \mathbf{SF}_t, \mathbf{A}_{j,t})}{\Pr(\mathbf{A}_{j,t}) \cdot \Pr(\mathbf{SF}_t)} && \text{(Independence of } \mathbf{A}_{j,t} \text{ and } \mathbf{SF}_t) \\
&= \frac{x_{j,t}^*}{2f_{j,t}} \cdot \frac{\Pr(\mathbf{NC}_{j,t}, \mathbf{SF}_t \mid \mathbf{A}_{j,t})}{\Pr(\mathbf{SF}_t)} \\
&= \frac{x_{j,t}^*}{2\Pr(\mathbf{SF}_t)}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we use that  $f_{j,t} = \Pr(\mathbf{NC}_{j,t}, \mathbf{SF}_t \mid \mathbf{A}_{j,t})$ . Using Proposition 2.4 we can show that  $\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{j,t} \leq 1$ . Furthermore, we have the following claim. We defer its proof to Appendix E.

**Claim 2.5.** *It holds that  $\sum_{j=1}^n v_j \alpha_{j,t} \prod_{i < j} (1 - \alpha_{i,t}) \geq (1 - 1/e) \sum_{j=1}^n x_{j,t}^* \cdot v_j / (2\Pr(\mathbf{SF}_t))$ .*

Using this claim, we can conclude Theorem 1.2. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[X_t] &= \sum_{j=1}^n v_j \Pr(\mathbf{SF}_t) \alpha_{j,t} \prod_{i < j} (1 - \alpha_{i,t}) \\
&\geq \Pr(\mathbf{SF}_t) \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right) \sum_{j=1}^n v_j \frac{x_{j,t}^*}{2\Pr(\mathbf{SF}_t)} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right) \sum_{j=1}^n v_j x_{j,t}^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, summing over  $t$  gives us the desired result.  $\square$

## 2.2.4 Hard Instance on ALG

In this subsection, we show that our analysis comparing values between ALG and LP is almost tight. We provide an instance that shows that, in the worst case, ALG cannot do better than a  $1 - 1/\sqrt{e} \approx 0.393$  fraction when compared to the LP optimum.

**Proposition 2.6.** *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is an instance  $I$  such that  $v(\text{ALG}(I)) \leq (1 - 1/\sqrt{e} + \varepsilon)v_{LP}(I)$ .*

*Proof of Proposition 2.6.* We consider the following instance of STOCSCHEDEX with  $n$  identical jobs:  $v_j = 1$ ,  $D_j = 2$  with probability 1, and  $S_j = 1$  with probability 1 for all  $j \in [n]$ . Note that  $x_{j,1}^* = 1/n$ , for all  $j \in [n]$  is an optimal solution to (LP-Sched) with objective value  $v_{LP} = 1$ .<sup>1</sup>

Observe that since all jobs would depart at time 2, ALG can only collect value at time 1. At time 1, the server is free with probability 1, and both  $p_j(1)$  and  $f_{j,1}$  equal to 1 for any job  $j$ . Thus, the probability that each job  $j$  is added to the consideration set is  $1/(2n)$ , and the probability that there are at least one job added into the consideration set is  $1 - (1 - 1/(2n))^n \rightarrow 1 - 1/\sqrt{e}$ , when  $n$  large. Since ALG only runs a job and collects value 1 when the consideration set is not empty,  $v(\text{ALG}) \rightarrow 1 - 1/\sqrt{e}$ . Thus,  $v(\text{ALG})/v_{LP} \rightarrow 1 - 1/\sqrt{e}$ .  $\square$

<sup>1</sup>Note there might be different solution assignments that can achieve the same objective.

## 2.3 A Polynomial Time Implementation of Algorithm 1

In this section, we provide a proof for Corollary 1.3, that is, we can provide a polynomial-time implementation for ALG with provable performance guarantees with mild conditions on service times.

*Proof of Corollary 1.3.* Note that (LP-Sched) can be solved in polynomial time (in  $n$ ) when the service times are polynomially bounded. It is clear that when values of  $f_{j,t}$  are provided as input, Algorithm 1 can be implemented with a polynomial-time computational complexity. While we make the assumption that we have access to the exact  $\{f_{j,t}\}_{j \in [n], t \geq 1}$  in our analysis, computing exact  $f_{j,t}$  value is challenging and involve a sum over exponentially many terms. Thus, in the remaining parts of this section, we focus on getting around this issue by providing an efficient and accurate approximation for  $f_{j,t}$  values, as summarized in Lemma 2.7.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Fix an  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\{f_{j,t}\}_{j \in [n], t \geq 1}$  values can be approximated with  $6n^{2+k}v_{max} \ln(2(n^{2+k}/\varepsilon))/\varepsilon^3$  number of simulations via  $\text{ALG}_\varepsilon$ , where  $v_{max} = \max_{j \in [n]} v_j$ , and this approximation leads to an  $\varepsilon$  multiplicative loss from original approximation ratio.*

We defer the proof of Lemma 2.7 to Appendix E. At a high level, we utilize simulation and attenuation techniques as shown in [22, 40]. We iteratively simulate a modified version of ALG, and compute empirical estimates  $\hat{f}_{j,t}$ . For each job  $j$  and fixed time  $t$ , we use simulated  $\hat{f}_{j,\tau}$  information up to  $\tau = t - 1$  to retrieve empirical estimation of  $\hat{f}_{j,t}$ . Note small  $x_{j,t}^*$  values can lead to small  $f_{j,t}$  values and these tiny values do not fit in Monte-Carlo approximations scheme, thus we address this concern by setting small enough  $x_{j,t}^*$  to 0 and show that at most  $\varepsilon$  is lost from the objective (see §E.2.1). Then to further show simulated  $\hat{f}_{j,t}$  can recover an  $\varepsilon$  multiplicative loss from the original competitive ratio, we show that the *failure* event that the empirical estimate  $\hat{f}_{j,t}$  is more than  $\varepsilon$  away from  $f_{j,t}$  can be bounded. And by treating failed simulation as obtaining 0 value and otherwise follow a similar line of proof from Theorem 1.2, we conclude the proof for Lemma 2.7 (see §E.2.2).  $\square$

## 2.4 Further Discussion About LP Relaxation and Algorithm Analysis

In this subsection, we provide additional discussion about our LP relaxation and algorithm analysis. The analysis in previous subsections, imply that  $v(\text{OPT})/v_{LP} \geq (1/2) \cdot (1 - 1/e)$  for any instance to STOCSCHEDEX. The following proposition shows that this ratio is upper bounded by a term far from 1 in the worst case. In other words, this proposition allows us to quantify the quality of the bound given by our LP relaxation.

**Proposition 2.8** (Integrality gap). *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is an instance  $I$  such that  $v(\text{OPT}(I)) \leq (1 - 1/e + \varepsilon)v_{LP}(I)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $n$  be large enough and  $m < n$  large but constant. To keep the analysis simple, assume that  $m$  divides  $n$ . Consider the following instance: There are  $n$  jobs divided into  $m$  different types of jobs with each group being of size  $n/m$ . All the jobs have the same values  $v_j = 1$ . For each job  $j$  job of type  $k$ , we have

$$S_{j,k} = 2^{k-1} \text{ with probability } 1; D_{j,k} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } 1 - m/n \\ 2^{k-1} + 1 & \text{with probability } m/n \end{cases}$$

We can find a feasible solution to **(LP-Sched)** as follows. Set  $x_{1,1} = 1$ ; for all remaining jobs  $j$  from job type  $k$ , where  $k \in [m]$ , we set  $x_{j,2^{k-1}+1} = m/n$ . Thus the optimal LP solution is at least  $m + 1$ .

We now compute explicitly  $v(\text{OPT})$ . Note that by construction, a job of type  $k$  departs at time  $t = 1$  or time  $t = 2^{k-1} + 1 = S_{j,k} + 1$ . Hence, after time 1, we know exactly the jobs that departed at time 1 and the ones that remain at time  $t = S_{j,k} + 1$ . Furthermore, from each type job, we can run at most two of them. Therefore, the optimal way to run the jobs is in increasing order of their type. After running a job of type 1, at time 2, there is a job of type 1 remaining with probability  $1 - (1 - m/n)^{n/m-1}$  and for each type  $k = 2, \dots, m$  there is at least a job remaining with probability  $1 - (1 - m/n)^{n/m}$ . Hence,

$$v(\text{OPT}) = 1 + \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right)^{n/m-1}\right) + (m-1) \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right)^{n/m}\right)$$

When  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $v(\text{OPT}) \rightarrow 1 + m(1 - 1/e)$ . Thus,

$$\frac{v(\text{OPT}(I))}{v_{LP}(I)} = \frac{1 + m(1 - 1/e)}{m + 1} = 1 - \frac{1}{e} + \frac{1}{e \cdot m}$$

We conclude the proof of the theorem by making  $m$  sufficiently large.  $\square$

**Remark 2.9.** *This proposition shows that for any algorithm  $\text{ALG}'$  such that  $v(\text{ALG}') \geq \gamma v_{LP}(I)$ , we must have  $\gamma \leq 1 - 1/e$ . In other words, it poses a limit to the approximations possible using **(LP-Sched)**.*

### 3 Further Extensions

In this section, we demonstrate the flexibility of our approaches through extensions to **STOCSCHEDX** that accommodate additional constraints that are of interest in practical applications. We refer to the vanilla **STOCSCHEDX** as the **STOCSCHEDX** described in § 1. Firstly, we consider jobs with hard deadlines. Then, we consider a server with a knapsack constraint. We show how our LP and greedy approaches can be modified in each case to obtain algorithms with provable guarantees comparable to the ones obtained in the vanilla **STOCSCHEDX**.

#### 3.1 Jobs with Deadlines

Our first extension considers deadlines. In this case, we consider the same description as in the vanilla **STOCSCHEDX** but, in addition, each job has a job-dependent deadline. In this setting, a job started before its departure—that still captures impatience—but that finishes running after its deadline produces no value. Specifically, each job has an individual deadline  $B_j \geq 1$ . If job  $j$  is run at time  $t$  and has a service time  $S_j$  such that  $t + S_j \leq B_j$ , then we collect the value  $v_j$ ; otherwise, we collect 0. This extension to **STOCSCHEDX** is akin to stochastic knapsack [19, 40]. In this extension, we keep denoting by **OPT** the optimal policy and  $v(\text{OPT})$  the optimal expected value obtained. We show that several results for the vanilla **STOCSCHEDX** translate almost immediately to this version with deadline.

First, consider the following formulation (**LP-ddl**).

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{maximize} && \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^{B_j} \Pr(S_j \leq B_j - t) x_{j,t} v_j && \text{(LP-ddl)} \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{t=1}^{B_j} \frac{x_{j,t}}{p_j(t)} \leq 1 && \forall j \in [n] && \text{(ddl(a))} \\
& && \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{\tau=1}^{\min\{t, B_j\}} x_{j,\tau} \bar{F}_{S_j}(t - \tau) \leq 1 && \forall t \in [1, \max_{j \in [n]} B_j] && \text{(ddl(b))} \\
& && x_{j,t} \geq 0 && \forall j \in [n], t \in [1, B_j]
\end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $I$  be an instance of STOCSCHEDEX with job deadlines, then  $v_{LP\text{-ddl}}(I) \geq v(\text{OPT})$ , where  $v_{LP\text{-ddl}}$  is the objective value of (**LP-ddl**).*

The proof is similar to Theorem 1.1; we defer the details to Appendix D.

**Theorem 3.2** (Polynomial-time approximation with deadlines). *For any instance to STOCSCHEDEX with job-dependent deadlines and fix an  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can compute the value of the algorithm **ALG** with  $6nB_{\max}v_{\max} \ln(2(nB_{\max}/\varepsilon))/\varepsilon^3$  number of simulations, where  $B_{\max} = \max_{j \in [n]} B_j$ , and guarantee an expected reward of at least  $1/2 \cdot (1 - 1/e - \varepsilon) \cdot v(\text{OPT})$ , with mild conditions on the service times.*

*Proof.* We apply the same **ALG** in Algorithm 1. Recall that we show in Theorem 1.2 the expected value is at least  $(1/2) \cdot (1 - 1/e)$  collected by LP at each time  $t$ . Thus, by summing the time horizon up to time  $\max_{j \in [n]} B_j$ , same theoretical approximation ratio guarantee is attained. Moreover, (**LP-ddl**) can be solved in polynomial time (in  $n$ ) when the service times are polynomially bounded. By applying the reasoning detailed in the proof of Lemma 2.7 with modified time horizon  $B_{\max}$ , we can provide well-approximated  $f_{j,t}$  values as input, thereby recovering the theorem.  $\square$

For the subinstances when the service times are i.i.d. and all the jobs share the same deadline  $B_j = B$ , we can utilize the coupling argument used in the proof for the vanilla STOCSCHEDEX to obtain an approximation of  $1/2$  of the optimal value (see §C for the discussion in the vanilla STOCSCHEDEX).

**Theorem 3.3** (Approximation Ratio with Deadlines and I.I.D Service Times). *The greedy policy that runs the job  $j$  with the largest  $v_j$ , obtains an expected total value at least  $1/2$  times the expected total value obtained by an optimal policy for STOCSCHEDEX with deadlines when the service times of the jobs are i.i.d. and  $B_j = B$  for all  $j \in [n]$ .*

*Proof.* To see this, we first note that the greedy policy that runs the largest value from all available jobs does not work when jobs are associated with different hard deadlines.

**Example 3.1.** *Consider the greedy algorithm that runs the job with the largest value. Consider the following instance of 2 jobs. We set the parameters of job 1 as follows:  $v_1 = 1 + \varepsilon$ ,  $B_1 = 2$ ,  $D_1 = 2$  and  $S_1 = 2$  with probability 1. For job 2, we have  $v_2 = 1$ ,  $B_2 = K$ ,  $D_2 = 2$  and  $S_j = 2$  with probability 1. Observe that the greedy algorithm attempts to run job 1 at time  $t = 1$  yet fails to obtain a value of  $1 + \varepsilon$  because the deadline for this job falls on  $t = 2$ , and by  $t = 2$ , the second job has already departed. The optimal solution obtains a total value of 1 by first serving jobs 2.*

As previous example aptly shows, when deadlines are heterogeneous, we cannot retrieve an approximation ratio improvement. However, we can recover an  $1/2$  approximation ratio when setting all job-dependent deadlines to be identical (i.e.,  $B_j = B$  for all job  $j$ ). To see this, we use the same coupling argument from Theorem 1.4, which ensures that the server can start a new job at same time steps for both greedy and optimal policy. If we denote, in all sample paths, the last time period that we can start a new job before time  $B$  as  $t'$ , then by analysis from Theorem 1.4, the expected value gained by the greedy policy is at least half of the value using the optimal policy up to time  $t'$ . We conclude the analysis by recognizing that, under the assumption of i.i.d. service times, the probability of the final job contributing to the overall collected value remains the same regardless of the specific job chosen. Moreover, the value of the job selected by the greedy algorithm is guaranteed to be at least as high as that of the job selected by the optimal policy.  $\square$

### 3.2 Knapsack Constraint

Our second extension considers an additional constraint over the server that models operational costs. Specifically, we consider a knapsack constraint that limits the total number of jobs that can be run. For example, in manufacturing, knapsack job scheduling is utilized to allocate tasks to machines or workers in a factory, while respecting constraints such as machine capacities and working hours. We assume that each job  $j$  has a weight  $w_j \geq 0$ , and the knapsack has a capacity  $W$ . The sum of weights of jobs run into the server must respect the knapsack constraint. We call this extension STOCSCHEDEX with knapsack constraint. For simplicity, we denote by  $\text{OPT}_{kn}$  the optimal policy for the STOCSCHEDEX with knapsack constraint,  $v(\text{OPT}_{kn})$  the optimal value and  $\text{ALG}$  our algorithmic solution. Similar to the variant with deadline, we show that several of our results for the vanilla STOCSCHEDEX translate almost immediately to the STOCSCHEDEX with knapsack constraint.

First, we provide an additional constraint to **(LP-Sched)** that allows us to upper bound  $v(\text{OPT})$  by an LP. Consider the constraint

$$\sum_{t \geq 1} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j \cdot x_{j,t} \leq W \tag{c}$$

Then, if  $v_{LP-kn}$  is the optimal value of **(LP-Sched)** with the additional constraint (c), we have  $v_{LP-kn} \geq v(\text{OPT}_{kn})$ . Indeed, if we consider  $x_{j,t}$  as the *probability that  $\text{OPT}_{kn}$  runs  $j$  at  $t$* , then the right-hand side of (c) is the expected weight used by the jobs run by  $\text{OPT}_{kn}$  which is never larger than  $W$ ; hence (c) is satisfied. Constraints (a) and (b) are satisfied by  $\mathbf{x}$  by following the same proof as in Lemma 2.2; so we skip them for brevity.

**Theorem 3.4** (Polynomial-time approximation with knapsack constraints). *For any instance to STOCSCHEDEX with non-negative weights and a knapsack capacity  $W$ , fix an  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can compute the value of the algorithm  $\text{ALG}$  with  $6n^{2+k}v_{max} \ln(2(n^{2+k}/\varepsilon))/\varepsilon^3$  number of simulations and guarantee an expected reward of at least  $1/2 \cdot (1 - 1/e - \varepsilon) \cdot \left(1 - e^{-W^2/(2nw_{max}^2)}\right) \cdot v(\text{OPT})$ , where  $w_{max} = \max_{j \in [n]} w_j$ , with mild conditions on the service times.*

*Proof.* To prove Theorem 3.4, we apply  $\text{ALG}$  from Algorithm 1 which uses the optimal solution  $\mathbf{x}^*$  from **(LP-Sched)** with an additional Constraint (c). Note that analysis from Theorem 1.2 remains applicable because the approximation ratio is valid for all time  $t$ , we retain the flexibility to terminate the process at any point once the capacity  $W$  is reached. However, it is possible that the weights of jobs that we run from the  $\text{ALG}$  exceed the capacity. Thus, in the following Lemma 3.5 (where its proof is deferred to Appendix D), we bound the probability of the event that the cumulative weights of the jobs  $\text{ALG}$  runs exceed the knapsack capacity.



**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $\mathbf{E}$  be the event that the cumulative weight of jobs that **ALG** runs exceed the knapsack capacity  $W$ . Then, we have  $\Pr(\mathbf{E}) \leq \exp(-W^2/(2nw_{max}^2))$ , where  $w_{max} = \max_{j \in [n]} w_j$ .*

Let us show how this Lemma implies the result stated in Theorem 3.4. When event  $E$  happens, we treat this run as a failure and thus retrieve a value of 0, otherwise we retrieve a reward that is at least  $1/2 \cdot (1 - 1/e)$  of  $v_{LP}$  as illustrated in Theorem 1.2. Therefore, we retrieve a multiplicative loss of  $(1 - e^{-W^2/(2nw_{max}^2)})$ . Finally, we conclude the proof of the theorem by pointing out that the (**LP-Sched**) with an additional Constraint (**c**) can be solved in polynomial time and simply following the remaining reasoning from Corollary 1.3 will give a polynomial implementation with an  $\varepsilon$ -loss from the approximation ratio guarantee.  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.** *We provide more insights into the multiplicative loss term  $(1 - e^{-W^2/(2nw_{max}^2)})$  above where the term diminishes as  $W$  increases and  $w_{max}$  decreases. Given the Chernoff bound technique [30] we apply, this approximation more accurately reflects the problem characteristics especially when job weights are similar and are far away from the knapsack size. For instance, in applications like call centers, each call has a specific bounded length (see §4 for details), and agents have a fixed and comparatively large number of working hours per shift. Thus, above scenario can be formulated as a temporal knapsack problem and our approximation scheme allows managements effectively schedule workforces within the limited timeframe.*

Note that the cardinality constraint is a special case of the knapsack constraint, where at most  $k$  jobs from  $n$  jobs can be run. This constraint can be represented by assigning weights  $w_j = 1$  for all jobs  $j$  and setting the capacity  $W$  equal to  $k$ . By applying a Chernoff bound technique [43] akin to the one previously employed, we arrive at the following Corollary 3.7 (proof deferred to Appendix D).

**Corollary 3.7** (Polynomial-time approximation with cardinality constraints). *For any instance to STOCSCHEDEX with a cardinality capacity  $k$ , fix an  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can compute the value of the algorithm **ALG** with  $6n^{2+k}v_{max} \ln(2(n^{2+k}/\varepsilon))/\varepsilon^3$  number of simulations and guarantee an expected reward of at least  $1/2 \cdot (1 - 1/e - \varepsilon) \cdot (1 - e^{-k/6}) \cdot v(\text{OPT})$ , with mild conditions on the service times.*

Next, we consider the scenario where job service times are i.i.d for knapsack constraints and cardinality constraints respectively.

**Remark 3.8.** *Since we do not allow fractional solutions within the scope of job scheduling, when dealing with an additional knapsack constraints, the greedy policy, which for example simply prioritizes the value or the ratio of value per unit-weight that won't exceed the size of the knapsack, does not yield more advantageous outcomes. We illustrate by providing counterexamples D.1 and D.2. One might question whether more complex greedy policies could yield better approximations. However, we present a counterexample D.3 demonstrating that certain modified hybrid greedy-based policy that proves to be effective in general knapsack problems still fails to provide satisfactory approximations.*

Nevertheless, when all weights are uniform, the analysis presented in Theorem 1.4 remains valid. As we demonstrate that at each time step, the expected value received from the optimal policy is bounded above by twice the value obtained by the greedy policy. Consequently, even after reaching the cardinality capacity, this tighter bound of  $1/2$  persists. The summarized result is provided below.

**Theorem 3.9** (Approximation Ratio with Cardinality Constraints and i.i.d service times). *The greedy policy that runs the job with the largest value, obtains an expected total value at least 1/2 times the expected total value obtained by an optimal policy for STOCSCHEDX with Cardinality Constraints when the service times of the jobs are i.i.d.*

## 4 Computational Results

In this section, we provide a summary of computational results of our algorithms for STOCSCHEDX. We test our algorithms on two sets of instances: a synthetic dataset, and a public domain dataset from the call center of ‘Anonymous Bank’ in Israel <sup>2</sup>. We conducted all of our computational experiments using Python 3.7.6 and Gurobi 10.0.3 with a 2.4 Ghz Quad-Core Intel Core i5 processor and 8.0 GB 2.4 MHz LPDDR3 memory.

**Algorithms.** We test our simulation-based algorithm, denoted SIMALG, against a number of algorithms. To begin, recall that if the server is free at time  $t$ , SIMALG constructs a consideration set of jobs that have not been previously considered (before time  $t$ ) and are still available at time  $t$ . In particular, the algorithm adds such jobs  $j$  to the consideration set with probability  $\frac{x_{j,t}^*}{2 \cdot p_j(t) \cdot f_{j,t}}$ , and then greedily selects a job from the consideration set (see §2 for definitions of  $\mathbf{x}^*$  and  $f_{j,t}$  and §2.3 for details of the algorithm). Leveraging insights gained from our algorithm design, we develop a heuristic procedure, denoted CONSET, that only differs from SIMALG in the construction of the consideration set. Here, we construct a consideration set as follows: add job  $j$  to the consideration set with probability  $x_{j,t}^* / \left( p_j(t) \cdot \left( 1 - \sum_{\tau < t} x_{j,\tau}^* / p_j(\tau) \right) \right)$ . We note that this term represents the probability that job  $j$  is available but has not been run / selected at time  $\tau < t$ . Additionally, we also test the greedy policy that, from the set of available jobs, serves the job with the largest value. We denote this algorithm as GREEDY.

We also use the following algorithms to evaluate the performance. Ideally, we would like to compare to value of the MDP solution for a given instance; however, the state space of this MDP blows up exponentially, making it more convenient to use the optimal LP value (obtained by solving (LP-Sched)) as a benchmark. As a benchmark we also compare to an algorithm, denoted SAFE, that runs an available job  $j$  with probability  $x_{j,t}^* / \sum_{i \in R_t} x_{i,t}^*$  where  $R_t$  denotes the set of jobs that are available at time  $t$  (this heuristic was used in the work [22] in the context of matching problems). Our last algorithm is a naive randomized algorithm, denoted UR, that runs any available job uniformly at random whenever the server is free.

### 4.1 Instances

We produce two datasets to test our algorithms. First, we produce a synthetic dataset that is aimed to stress our algorithms. The second dataset is constructed from real data obtained from a small Israeli call center.

**Synthetic Data.** We test our algorithms on synthetic data generated as follows. We first set  $n \in \{5, 10, 15, \dots, 50\}$  to denote the number of jobs. Given  $n$ , we generate  $n$  probabilities,  $p_1, \dots, p_n$ , uniformly at random in  $(0.2, 1)$ . We assume that after every timestep  $t$ , job  $j$  continues to remain in the system independently with probability  $p_j$ ; that is, the departure probabilities are geometric. We set the total time to 50 and the maximum service time per job,  $s_{\max}$ , as  $n/5$  with a minimum value of 3 to ensure that it is not redundant. Each job is independently and uniformly categorized as either a *short* job or a *long* job. For short jobs, we set the service time to be 1 with probability

<sup>2</sup>Data can be accessed from <https://seelab.net.technion.ac.il/data/>.

0.9 and 2 with the remaining probability. For long jobs, we set the service time to be  $s_{\max}$  with probability 0.9 and  $s_{\max} - 1$  with the remaining probability. Furthermore, each job is assigned a value-type in {low, medium, high} with probabilities {0.2, 0.6, 0.2} respectively. A low-value (resp. medium-value and high-value) job is assigned a value uniformly in  $(1, 2)$  (resp.  $(2, 4)$  and  $(4, 8)$ ). The instances are labeled as **Syn- $n$** . For each  $n$  we generate 10 instances.

**Call Center Data.** Moreover, we use a public domain dataset from the call center of ‘Anonymous Bank’ in Israel. For our experimental setup, we utilize data originating from January 1999, which comprises 30,140 call entries, as the training dataset. The call records are primarily split into three distinct categories: ‘new’, ‘regular’, and ‘priority’, each consisting 8,723, 4,440 and 16,977 entries, respectively. To account for the different valuations that may be attached to a call type, we assume that priority calls have a value 8, regular calls have a value 2, and new calls hold a value 1. Furthermore, using 20 seconds as a reasonable unit time-step, we extract distributional information for both the (stochastic) service and the departure time. We present these as empirical point mass function distributions in Figures 5 and 6 in Appendix F, which are then used to sample instances for our computational setup. As a sanity check, we compute the standard root mean squared error (RMSE) of the learned departure and service point mass functions for January and February, and observe that the error is 0.013 and 0.006, respectively. Similar to the experimental setup on synthetic data, we label the instances as **Real- $n$** . For every value of  $n \in \{5, 10, 15, \dots, 50\}$ , we generate 10 instances based on the specified category frequency distribution and associate each customer with respective service and departure time distributions.

## 4.2 Results

For both synthetic and real datasets, we give our results for average value along with the 95% confidence interval in Figure 2 and 3 respectively (numerical values can be found in Table 3 and 4 in Appendix F). Except for the LP benchmark method which have set values, all other algorithms are simulated 100 times in order to record an averaged performance. In particular, in SIMALG, we use 100 trials to reach a good estimation for each  $f_{j,t}$ , for all  $j \in [n]$ , and all  $t \geq 1$ . A sample path of simulating  $f_{1,3}$  in dataset **Syn-10** is shown in Figure 7 in Appendix F. Additionally, we compare the runtime for all algorithms across different instances through Table 2 in synthetic datasets.




Figure 2: Algorithm values across different number of jobs in synthetic datasets. There are no overlapping lines (Lines representing SIMALG and CONSET may look overlapping, one can refer Table 3 for more precise comparison). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval.

Instance Type	LP	SIMALG-S	SIMALG-E	CONSET	SAFE	GREEDY	UR
Syn-5	0.38	7.15	0.58	0.85	1.07	0.46	0.55
Syn-10	0.39	9.60	0.96	1.29	1.63	0.83	0.92
Syn-15	0.56	20.54	1.74	2.26	2.73	1.67	1.74
Syn-20	0.85	41.68	2.89	3.75	4.22	2.67	2.72
Syn-25	1.24	76.76	4.47	5.75	6.32	3.94	3.99
Syn-30	1.77	126.88	6.22	7.98	8.79	5.23	5.32
Syn-35	2.49	199.02	8.40	10.89	12.00	6.78	6.93
Syn-40	3.38	297.87	11.03	14.48	15.88	8.70	8.85
Syn-45	4.52	432.83	14.23	18.95	20.68	10.79	11.05
Syn-50	5.94	602.15	17.90	24.15	26.06	13.36	13.77

Table 2: Average running time (in milliseconds). Running time of SIMALG is divided into two components, the first column (tagged with S) is the simulation part to retrieve  $f_{j,t}$  values, and the second column (tagged with E) is the execution part to obtain values.




Figure 3: Algorithm values across different number of jobs in real bank datasets. There are no overlapping lines. Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval.

### 4.3 Discussions

We end this section by presenting a comprehensive discussion of our results. First note that compared to the LP optimal solution, SIMALG attains a considerably high approximation ratio with consistent performances across all datasets. This empirical outcome serves to reinforce the theoretical guarantees, and solidifies the application of the simulation-based algorithm. However, SIMALG takes considerably longer running time compared to both LP-based algorithm and those not reliant on LP solutions. This elongation arises primarily due to the extra iterations needed for simulating  $f_{j,t}$  values. In situations necessitating efficient implementations, CONSET approach stands out as a notable option. This method not only leverages the structure of forming a consideration set to achieve commendable performance but also significantly diminishes runtime. Nonetheless, despite we receive good (sometimes better than SIMALG) empirical performances for methods like CONSET, SAFE or GREEDY, there are no formal theoretical guarantees to support their performance across all possible scenarios when the service times are not i.i.d.

We also note that while GREEDY algorithm performs poorly in synthetic datasets, it brings more convincing performance in real bank datasets even compared to LP-based methods. We believe this is because of the nature of the algorithm and the data. Priority calls are far more yielding candidates to run compared to its regular and new call counterparts and they all share comparable service and departure distributions, and at the same time, the solution of LP may not continue to assign much weight to priority calls in later periods of time horizons. Thus, even when the server is free and a high-valued job is available to run, LP-based algorithms do not necessarily run them as other low-valued jobs are also probable to run according to the probabilistic approach we adopt.

## 5 Final Remarks

In this work, we introduced the STOCSCHEDEX problem that models a revenue-maximizing single server job scheduling problem with jobs with unknown stochastic service and departure times that model user impatience. Since the STOCSCHEDEX is provably NP-hard, we examine heuristic approximations. We provided an extensive analysis on a time-indexed LP relaxation. We find an LP-based approximation algorithm that guarantees an expected total reward of at least  $(1/2) \cdot (1 - 1/e)$  of the expected reward of the optimal policy and provide an implementation that can be computed in polynomial time under mild conditions on the service times. This policy can flexibly extend to various settings, including jobs with deadlines and knapsack constraints. We also note, that with our LP methodology, we can only hope to get at most an approximation of  $1 - 1/e$  (see § 2.4). Breaking this factor would require a different LP relaxation or other heuristic approach. We further the theoretical results by examining the subfamily of i.i.d. service times. In this case, we show that the simple greedy solution that runs the highest valued available job guarantees an expected reward of  $1/2$  of the expected reward of the optimal policy. We empirically validate various policies derived from our LP relaxation using synthetic and real data.

Several extensions of our model to multiple servers and other combinatorial constraints over the server are captivating from a theoretical and applied perspectives. A natural extension of our model is the multiple server case. In this case, we can still use an extended version of **(LP-Sched)** to provide an upper bound on the optimal value. For example, if we use  $i$  to index the servers, we can introduce a decision variable  $x_{j,t,i}$  to represent the probability that the optimal policy runs job  $j$  at time  $t$  on server  $i$ . Using similar constraints as in **(LP-Sched)**, we can find a valid upper bound on the expected optimal value for the multiple servers setting. However, it is unclear that how to extend our algorithmic framework to multiple servers. Another natural extension is to consider job arrivals. The challenge in this case is defining a suitable arrival model. A possible arrival model is a job-dependent release times—typically used in scheduling literature. In short, if we consider release times, our LP-based analysis do not extend to this case as technical parts in Lemma 2.1 fail to hold when there is a release time. However, we note that if the service times are i.i.d., then, our greedy policy still provides an approximation of  $1/2$  for the release time settings.

## References

- [1] Zeynep Aksin, Mor Armony, and Vijay Mehrotra. The modern call center: A multi-disciplinary perspective on operations management research. *Production and operations management*, 16(6):665–688, 2007.
- [2] Zeynep Akşin, Barış Ata, Seyed Morteza Emadi, and Che-Lin Su. Structural estimation of callers’ delay sensitivity in call centers. *Management Science*, 59(12):2727–2746, 2013.
- [3] Ali Aouad and Ömer Saritaç. Dynamic stochastic matching under limited time. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 789–790, 2020.
- [4] Mor Armony, Shlomo Israelit, Avishai Mandelbaum, Yariv N Marmor, Yulia Tseytlin, and Galit B Yom-Tov. On patient flow in hospitals: A data-based queueing-science perspective. *Stochastic systems*, 5(1):146–194, 2015.
- [5] Rami Atar, Chantit Giat, and Nahum Shimkin. The  $c\mu/\theta$  rule for many-server queues with abandonment. *Operations Research*, 58(5):1427–1439, 2010.

- [6] Jiuru Bai, Kut C. So, Christopher S. Tang, Xiqun (Michael) Chen, and Hai Wang. Coordinating supply and demand on an on-demand service platform with impatient customers. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 21(3):556–570, 2019.
- [7] Siddhartha Banerjee, Carlos Riquelme, and Ramesh Johari. Pricing in ride-share platforms: A queueing-theoretic approach. *Available at SSRN 2568258*, 2015.
- [8] Achal Bassamboo, J Michael Harrison, and Assaf Zeevi. Design and control of a large call center: Asymptotic analysis of an lp-based method. *Operations Research*, 54(3):419–435, 2006.
- [9] Anand Bhargat, Ashish Goel, and Sanjeev Khanna. Improved approximation results for stochastic knapsack problems. In *Proceedings of the twenty-second annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1647–1665. SIAM, 2011.
- [10] Daniel Blado and Alejandro Toriello. Relaxation analysis for the dynamic knapsack problem with stochastic item sizes. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(1):1–30, 2019.
- [11] Allan Borodin and Ran El-Yaniv. *Online computation and competitive analysis*. cambridge university press, 2005.
- [12] Lawrence Brown, Noah Gans, Avishai Mandelbaum, Anat Sakov, Haipeng Shen, Sergey Zeltyn, and Linda Zhao. Statistical analysis of a telephone call center: A queueing-science perspective. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 100(469):36–50, 2005.
- [13] Gerard P Cachon, Kaitlin M Daniels, and Ruben Lobel. The role of surge pricing on a service platform with self-scheduling capacity. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 19(3):368–384, 2017.
- [14] Francisco Castro, Hamid Nazerzadeh, and Chiwei Yan. Matching queues with renegeing: a product form solution. *Queueing Systems*, 96(3-4):359–385, 2020.
- [15] Ceren Cebi, Enes Atac, and Ozgur Koray Sahingoz. Job shop scheduling problem and solution algorithms: a review. In *2020 11th International Conference on Computing, Communication and Networking Technologies (ICCCNT)*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2020.
- [16] Gang Chen, Jean-Philippe Gayon, and Pierre Lemaire. Stochastic scheduling with abandonment: necessary and sufficient conditions for the optimality of a strict priority policy. *Operations Research*, 71(5):1789–1793, 2023.
- [17] Natalie Collina, Nicole Immorlica, Kevin Leyton-Brown, Brendan Lucier, and Neil Newman. Dynamic weighted matching with heterogeneous arrival and departure rates. In *Web and Internet Economics: 16th International Conference, WINE 2020, Beijing, China, December 7–11, 2020, Proceedings 16*, pages 17–30. Springer, 2020.
- [18] Marek Cygan, Matthias Englert, Anupam Gupta, Marcin Mucha, and Piotr Sankowski. Catch them if you can: how to serve impatient users. In *Proceedings of the 4th conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 485–494, 2013.
- [19] Brian C Dean, Michel X Goemans, and Jan Vondrák. Approximating the stochastic knapsack problem: The benefit of adaptivity. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 33(4):945–964, 2008.
- [20] Cyrus Derman, Gerald J Lieberman, and Sheldon M Ross. A renewal decision problem. *Management Science*, 24(5):554–561, 1978.

- [21] Amol Deshpande, Lisa Hellerstein, and Devorah Kletenik. Approximation algorithms for stochastic submodular set cover with applications to boolean function evaluation and min-knapsack. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 12(3):1–28, 2016.
- [22] John P Dickerson, Karthik A Sankararaman, Aravind Srinivasan, and Pan Xu. Allocation problems in ride-sharing platforms: Online matching with offline reusable resources. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation (TEAC)*, 9(3):1–17, 2021.
- [23] Jing Dong and Rouba Ibrahim. Srpt scheduling discipline in many-server queues with impatient customers. *Management Science*, 67(12):7708–7718, 2021.
- [24] Ofer Garnett, Avishai Mandelbaum, and Martin Reiman. Designing a call center with impatient customers. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 4(3):208–227, 2002.
- [25] John C Gittins. Bandit processes and dynamic allocation indices. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 41(2):148–164, 1979.
- [26] Martin Charles Golumbic. *Algorithmic graph theory and perfect graphs*. Elsevier, 2004.
- [27] Vineet Goyal, Garud Iyengar, and Rajan Udwani. Asymptotically optimal competitive ratio for online allocation of reusable resources, 2022.
- [28] Anupam Gupta, Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, Marco Molinaro, and Ramamoorthi Ravi. Approximation algorithms for correlated knapsacks and non-martingale bandits. In *2011 IEEE 52nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 827–836. IEEE, 2011.
- [29] Itai Gurvich and Ward Whitt. Service-level differentiation in many-server service systems via queue-ratio routing. *Operations research*, 58(2):316–328, 2010.
- [30] Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *The collected works of Wassily Hoeffding*, pages 409–426, 1994.
- [31] Emmanuel Hyon and Alain Jean-Marie. Scheduling services in a queuing system with impatience and setup costs. *The Computer Journal*, 55(5):553–563, 2012.
- [32] Sungjin Im, Benjamin Moseley, and Kirk Pruhs. Stochastic scheduling of heavy-tailed jobs. In *32nd International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS 2015)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2015.
- [33] Berit Johannes. Scheduling parallel jobs to minimize the makespan. *Journal of Scheduling*, 9:433–452, 2006.
- [34] Eun-Seok Kim and Daniel Oron. Minimizing total completion time on a single machine with step improving jobs. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 66:1481–1490, 2015.
- [35] Jeunghyun Kim, Ramandeep S Randhawa, and Amy R Ward. Dynamic scheduling in a many-server, multiclass system: The role of customer impatience in large systems. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 20(2):285–301, 2018.
- [36] Antoon WJ Kolen, Jan Karel Lenstra, Christos H Papadimitriou, and Frits CR Spieksma. Interval scheduling: A survey. *Naval Research Logistics (NRL)*, 54(5):530–543, 2007.



- [37] Joseph YT Leung, Haibing Li, and Michael Pinedo. Order scheduling models: an overview. In *Multidisciplinary Scheduling: Theory and Applications: 1st International Conference, MISTA'03 Nottingham, UK, 13–15 August 2003 Selected Papers*, pages 37–53. Springer, 2005.
- [38] Zihao Li, Hao Wang, and Zhenzhen Yan. Fully online matching with stochastic arrivals and departures. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 12014–12021, 2023.
- [39] Zhenghua Long, Nahum Shimkin, Hailun Zhang, and Jiheng Zhang. Dynamic scheduling of multiclass many-server queues with abandonment: The generalized  $c\mu/h$  rule. *Operations Research*, 68(4):1218–1230, 2020.
- [40] Will Ma. Improvements and generalizations of stochastic knapsack and markovian bandits approximation algorithms. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 43(3):789–812, 2018.
- [41] Avi Mandelbaum and Sergey Zeltyn. The impact of customers’ patience on delay and abandonment: some empirically-driven experiments with the  $m/m/n+g$  queue. *OR Spectrum*, 26(3):377–411, 2004.
- [42] Aranyak Mehta. Online matching and ad allocation. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, 8(4):265–368, 2013.
- [43] Michael Mitzenmacher and Eli Upfal. *Probability and computing: Randomization and probabilistic techniques in algorithms and data analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2017.
- [44] Jatoth Mohan, Krishnanand Lanka, and A Neelakanteswara Rao. A review of dynamic job shop scheduling techniques. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 30:34–39, 2019.
- [45] Rolf H Möhring, Andreas S Schulz, and Marc Uetz. Approximation in stochastic scheduling: the power of lp-based priority policies. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 46(6):924–942, 1999.
- [46] Michael L Pinedo. *Scheduling*, volume 29. Springer, 2012.
- [47] David Pisinger and Paolo Toth. Knapsack problems. *Handbook of Combinatorial Optimization: Volume 1–3*, pages 299–428, 1998.
- [48] Chris N Potts and Luk N Van Wassenhove. An algorithm for single machine sequencing with deadlines to minimize total weighted completion time. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 12(4):379–387, 1983.
- [49] Amber L Puha and Amy R Ward. Scheduling an overloaded multiclass many-server queue with impatient customers. In *Operations research & management science in the age of analytics*, pages 189–217. INFORMS, 2019.
- [50] Martin L Puterman. *Markov decision processes: discrete stochastic dynamic programming*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- [51] Thomas R Robbins and Terry P Harrison. A stochastic programming model for scheduling call centers with global service level agreements. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 207(3):1608–1619, 2010.
- [52] Paat Rusmevichientong, Mika Sumida, and Huseyin Topaloglu. Dynamic assortment optimization for reusable products with random usage durations. *Management Science*, 66(7):2820–2844, 2020.

- [53] Shraga Shoval and Mahmoud Efatmaneshnik. A probabilistic approach to the stochastic job-shop scheduling problem. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 21:533–540, 2018.
- [54] Natasha Singh. Growth trends for on demand service platforms: retrieved from <https://www.bluelabellabs.com/blog/2020-growth-trends-for-on-demand-service-platforms>, 2020.
- [55] Terry A. Taylor. On-demand service platforms. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 20(4):704–720, 2018.
- [56] Nick T Thomopoulos. *Essentials of Monte Carlo simulation: Statistical methods for building simulation models*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [57] Guangju Wang, Hailun Zhang, and Jiheng Zhang. On-demand ride-matching in a spatial model with abandonment and cancellation. *Operations Research*, 2022.
- [58] Hegen Xiong, Shuangyuan Shi, Danni Ren, and Jinjin Hu. A survey of job shop scheduling problem: The types and models. *Computers & Operations Research*, 142:105731, 2022.
- [59] Xun Xu, Nina Yan, and Tingting Tong. Longer waiting, more cancellation? empirical evidence from an on-demand service platform. *Journal of Business Research*, 126:162–169, 2021.
- [60] Yueyang Zhong, John R Birge, and Amy Ward. Learning the scheduling policy in time-varying multiclass many server queues with abandonment. *Available at SSRN 4090021*, 2022.

## A Missing Proofs From Section 1

### A.1 Reduction to Bounded Support Service Times

In this section, we show the following proposition.

**Proposition A.1.** *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any instance  $I$  to STOCSCHEDEX, there is a policy  $\Pi$  such that  $\Pi$  only runs jobs between times 1 to  $T = T(I) < +\infty$  and  $v(\Pi, I) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)v(\text{OPT})$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the optimal policy  $\text{OPT}$  and let  $\tau$  such that  $\Pr(S_j > \tau) \leq \varepsilon/n^2$  for all  $j$ . Let  $T = n\tau$ . Let  $A = \{\exists j \in [n] : S_j > T\}$ . Then,  $\Pr(A) \leq \varepsilon/n$ . Also, let  $B = \{\text{OPT runs a job at time } > T\}$ . Then,  $\Pr(B) \leq \Pr(A) \leq \varepsilon/n$ . Let  $\Pi$  be the policy that follows  $\text{OPT}$  up to time  $T$ , and after that it does not run any job. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} v(\Pi, I) &\geq v(\text{OPT}) - v(\text{OPT} \mid B) \Pr(B) \\ &\geq v(\text{OPT}) - \varepsilon v(\text{OPT}) = (1 - \varepsilon)v(\text{OPT}) \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $v_j \leq v(\text{OPT})$  for all  $j \in [n]$ . From here, the result follows.  $\square$

### A.2 Reduction to Departure Times with Unbounded Support

In this section, we show that we can assume that  $p_j(t) > 0$  for all  $t$  by paying a small loss in the objective value. Let  $D_j$  be the departure time for job  $j$ ; hence,  $\Pr(D_j \geq t) = p_j(t)$ . For each  $j$ , let  $G_j$  be a geometric random variable with probability of success  $1 - \varepsilon$ . That is,  $\Pr(G_j = k) = \varepsilon^{k-1}(1 - \varepsilon)$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . Consider the new departure times  $D'_j = \max\{D_j, G_j\}$ . Then,

$$\Pr(D'_j \leq t) = \Pr(D_j \leq t)(1 - \varepsilon^t).$$

Thus,  $p'_j(t) := \Pr(D'_j \geq t) \geq \varepsilon^{t-1}$  for all  $t$  and  $j$ . We denote by  $v'(\text{OPT}')$  the optimal value of the CAPSTOCSCHEDEX problem when run with departure times  $D'_1, \dots, D'_n$ .

**Proposition A.2.** For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $v(\text{OPT}) \leq v'(\text{OPT}') \leq (1 + n^2\varepsilon)v(\text{OPT})$ .

*Proof.* The first inequality is direct as items remain longer in the system with the new departure times  $D'_1, \dots, D'_n$ . For the second inequality, we argue as follows. Let  $B = \{\exists j \in [n] : D_j \neq D'_j\}$  be the event where there is a departure time that differs in both problems. Then,  $\Pr(B) \leq \Pr(\exists j \in [n] : G_j \geq 2) \leq n\varepsilon$ . Let  $\Pi'$  be a policy for the problem with departure times  $D'_1, \dots, D'_n$ . Consider the policy  $\Pi$  that runs  $P'$  on the problem with the departure times  $D_1, \dots, D_n$ . Note that over the event  $\bar{B}$ ,  $\Pi$  and  $\Pi'$  collect the same expected reward. We denote by  $v_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}}(\Pi)$  the value collected by the policy  $\Pi$  when run on departure times  $D_1, \dots, D_n$ , and  $v_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}}(\Pi')$  the expected value of the policy  $\Pi'$  when run on departure times  $D'_1, \dots, D'_n$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}}(\Pi) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^n v_j \mathbb{I}_{\{\Pi \text{ runs } j\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}'} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^n v_j \mathbb{I}_{\{\Pi' \text{ runs } j\}} \mid \bar{B} \right] \Pr(\bar{B}) \\ &= v_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}'}(\Pi') - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}'} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^n v_j \mathbb{I}_{\{\Pi' \text{ runs } j\}} \mid B \right] \Pr(B) \\ &\geq v_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}'}(\Pi') - n^2\varepsilon v(\text{OPT}) \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $v_j \leq v(\text{OPT})$  for all  $j \in [n]$ . From here, the result follows.  $\square$

## B Missing Proofs From Section 2

*Proof of Claim 2.3.* For  $\tau < t$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\text{Run}_{j, \tau}) &\leq \Pr(\mathbf{C}_{j, \tau}) = \Pr(\mathbf{C}_{j, \tau} \mid \mathbf{A}_{j, \tau}) \cdot \Pr(\mathbf{A}_{j, \tau}) \\ &= \Pr(\mathbf{C}_{j, \tau} \mid \mathbf{A}_{j, \tau}, \mathbf{SF}_{\tau}, \mathbf{NC}_{j, \tau}) \cdot \Pr(\mathbf{SF}_{\tau}, \mathbf{NC}_{j, \tau} \mid \mathbf{A}_{j, \tau}) \cdot \Pr(\mathbf{A}_{j, \tau}) \\ &= \frac{x_{j, \tau}^*}{2 \cdot p_j(\tau) \cdot f_{j, \tau}} \cdot f_{j, \tau} \cdot p_j(\tau) = \frac{x_{j, \tau}^*}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

All of the steps in this analysis are valid due to the inductive hypothesis.

Now, to prove 1, by law of total probabilities, we can write

$$\Pr(\text{Run}_{i, \tau} \mid \mathbf{A}_{j, \tau}) \cdot \Pr(\mathbf{A}_{j, \tau}) + \Pr(\text{Run}_{i, \tau} \mid \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{j, \tau}) \cdot \Pr(\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{j, \tau}) = \Pr(\text{Run}_{i, \tau}) \leq \frac{x_{i, \tau}^*}{2},$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{j, \tau}$  denotes the complement of  $\mathbf{A}_{j, \tau}$ . We claim that  $\Pr(\text{Run}_{i, \tau} \mid \mathbf{A}_{j, \tau}) \leq \Pr(\text{Run}_{i, \tau} \mid \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{j, \tau})$ . To see this, observe that when  $v_i > v_j$ , the availability of  $j$  at  $\tau$  does not affect the event  $\text{Run}_{i, \tau}$ . On the other hand, if  $v_i \leq v_j$ , then there is a non-negative probability that  $\text{ALG}$  runs  $j$  at  $\tau$  (instead of  $i$ ) if  $j$  was available at  $\tau$ . In either case, we have  $\Pr(\text{Run}_{i, \tau} \mid \mathbf{A}_{j, \tau}) \leq \Pr(\text{Run}_{i, \tau} \mid \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{j, \tau})$ . So,  $\Pr(\text{Run}_{i, \tau} \mid \mathbf{A}_{j, \tau}) \leq x_{i, \tau}^*/2$  which proves 1 since conditioning  $\text{Run}_{i, \tau}$  on  $\mathbf{A}_{j, \tau}$  is the same as conditioning it on  $\mathbf{A}_{j, \tau}$  for  $\tau < t$ .

The derivation of 2 is similar to the derivation of Inequality (2); We skip it for brevity.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.4.* The result is clearly true for  $t = 1$  since the server is always free at time 1. For  $t > 1$ , we can analyze the probability that the server is busy at time  $t$ :

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \Pr(\mathbf{SF}_t) &= \Pr(\exists \tau < t, \exists j : \text{Run}_{j, \tau} \cap \{S_j > t - \tau\}) \\ &\leq \sum_{\tau < t} \sum_{j=1}^n \Pr(\text{Run}_{j, \tau}) \bar{F}_{S_j}(t - \tau) \\ &\leq \sum_{\tau < t} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{x_{j, \tau}^*}{2} \bar{F}_{S_j}(t - \tau) \leq \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from the union bound. The second inequality follows from Inequality (2). The last inequality follows from Constraint (b). Reordering terms gives us the desired result.  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 2.5.* By the assumption that  $v_1 \geq v_2 \geq \dots \geq v_n \geq 0$ , it follows that there exist values  $u_1, \dots, u_n \geq 0$  such that for all  $j \in [n]$ ,  $v_j = \sum_{\ell=j}^n u_\ell$ . Using  $X_t$  to denote the value of the highest valued available job at time  $t$ . Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathbb{E}[X_t]}{\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{j,t} v_j} &= \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{j,t} \prod_{i < j} (1 - \alpha_{i,t}) \cdot v_j}{\sum_{i=j}^n \alpha_{j,t} v_j} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{j,t} \prod_{i < j} (1 - \alpha_{i,t}) \sum_{\ell=j}^n u_\ell}{\sum_{i=j}^n \alpha_{j,t} \sum_{\ell=j}^n u_\ell} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^n u_\ell \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \alpha_{j,t} \prod_{i < j} (1 - \alpha_{i,t})}{\sum_{\ell=1}^n u_\ell \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \alpha_{j,t}} \\
&\geq \min_{\ell} \frac{u_\ell \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \alpha_{j,t} \prod_{i < j} (1 - \alpha_{i,t})}{u_\ell \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \alpha_{j,t}} \\
&= \min_{\ell} \frac{1 - \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (1 - \alpha_{i,t})}{\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \alpha_{j,t}} \\
&\geq \min_{\ell} \frac{1 - e^{-\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_{i,t}}}{\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \alpha_{j,t}} \\
&= \frac{1 - e^{-\alpha_t}}{\alpha_t} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{e}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from  $1 + x \leq e^x$  for all  $x$ , the penultimate equality follows from the fact that  $f(x) = (1 - e^{-x})/x$  is decreasing in  $[0, 1]$ , and final inequality comes from  $\alpha_t \leq 1$ . Thus, we can conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t] = \sum_{j=1}^n v_j \alpha_{j,t} \prod_{i < j} (1 - \alpha_{i,t}) \geq (1 - 1/e) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{j,t} v_j = (1 - 1/e) \sum_{j=1}^n x_{j,t}^* \cdot v_j / (2 \Pr(\mathbf{SF}_t)).$$

$\square$

## C Greedy Policies for I.I.D. Service Times

In this section, we provide the proof of Theorem 1.4. We split the proof into two steps. The first step modifies iteratively the optimal policy **OPT** to obtain a policy **ALG'** that almost follows **OPT**, but it behaves greedily. In a nutshell, if at time  $t$ , **OPT** runs a job  $j$  that is not the highest valued job, then **ALG'** runs the highest value job, say  $i^*$ , and if in some future time  $\tau > t$ , **OPT** runs  $i^*$ , then **ALG'** will *simulate* (see next subsection for details) running job  $i^*$ . The assumption that the jobs have i.i.d. service times allows us to couple the service times of job  $j$  and  $i^*$  at time  $t$ , so **ALG'** and **OPT** make decisions simultaneously. Intuitively, 2 times  $v_{i^*}$  run from **ALG'** is enough to upper bound the sum of  $v_j$  at time  $t$  and  $v_{i^*}$  at time  $\tau > t$  for **OPT**; hence, this construction shows that the expected value collected by **ALG'** is at least 1/2 of the expected value of **OPT**. In the second step, we show that the greedy algorithm that always runs the highest-valued job can only collect a value higher than **ALG'**.

In the remaining of the section, we formalize these arguments. Before providing the details, we need to introduce new definitions since the intermediate policy makes decisions based on the history of the computation. That is, the decision that **ALG'** makes at time  $t$  depends on all the decisions and outcomes observed from times  $1, \dots, t - 1$ .

## C.1 Preliminaries

In this subsection, we recast the STOCSCHEDEX problem by first defining states that keep track of the history of actions and jobs remaining in the system. Then, we define policies that make decisions based on these states. Finally, we introduce the value (or reward) collected by the policy.

The problem input are  $n$  jobs with triple  $(v_1, D_j, S_j)$  for  $j \in [n]$ . A *state*  $\sigma$  for time  $t$  is an ordered sequence of length  $t - 1$  of the form  $\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_{t-1}$ , where:

1. Each  $\sigma_\tau \in \{(R_\tau, \text{null}, \text{null}) : R_\tau \subseteq [n]\} \cup \{(R_\tau, s, \tau \rightarrow j) : j \in [n], R_\tau \subseteq [n], s \geq 1\}$ , and
2. If  $\sigma_\tau = (R_\tau, s, \tau \rightarrow j)$ , then  $\sigma_{\tau+1}, \dots, \sigma_{\min\{\tau+s-1, t-1\}}$  must be of the form  $(R, \text{null}, \text{null})$ , and
3.  $R_{t-1} \subseteq R_{t-2} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq R_1 \subseteq [n]$ . We define  $R_0 = [n]$ .

The triplet  $(R_\tau, s, \tau \rightarrow j)$  represents that at time  $\tau$ , the decision-maker runs (or simulate) job  $j$ , the service time of  $j$  is  $s$ , and the jobs that remain have not departed the system are  $R_\tau$ . The triplet  $(R_\tau, \text{null}, \text{null})$  indicates that at time  $\tau$  a previous job is still running or the decision-maker decided not to run any job. States have a natural recursive structure:  $\sigma = \sigma'(R_{t-1}, s_{t-1}, t-1 \rightarrow j_{t-1})$  or  $\sigma = \sigma'(R_{t-1}, \text{null}, \text{null})$ , depending on the last triplet of  $\sigma$ . The *initial state*  $\sigma_0$  is the empty sequence. Given a state  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{t-1}$ , we say that the state  $\sigma' = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_\tau$  is a *prefix* of  $\sigma$  for any  $\tau \leq t-1$ . Let  $\Sigma_t \subseteq \sigma$  be the set of all states for time  $t$ . Then,  $\Sigma_1 = \{\sigma_0\}$  and  $\Sigma = \bigcup_{t \geq 1} \Sigma_t$  is the set of all possible states for any time  $t \geq 1$ .

A policy is a function  $\Pi : \Sigma \rightarrow [n] \cup \{\text{null}\}$ . Given a state  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{t-1}$  for time  $t-1$ , let  $\tau_\sigma = \max\{\tau \leq t-1 : \sigma_\tau = (R_\tau, s, \tau \rightarrow j) \text{ for some } s, j\}$  the index of the last triplet  $\sigma_\tau$  in  $\sigma$  that is of the form  $(R_\tau, s, \tau \rightarrow j)$ ; we define  $\tau_\sigma = -\infty$  if  $\sigma$  has no such triplets. Then, we define  $s_\sigma$  to be the service time in the triplet  $\sigma_{\tau_\sigma}$  if  $\tau_\sigma \geq 1$ ; otherwise,  $s_\sigma = -\infty$ . The policy  $\Pi$  is *feasible* if for any state  $\sigma$  for time  $t$ , we have that the sequences of  $t$  triplets defined by

$$\sigma' = \begin{cases} \sigma(R_t, s, t \rightarrow j), & \text{if } \Pi(\sigma) = j \in [n], \text{ and } \tau_\sigma + s_\sigma \leq t \\ \sigma(R_t, \text{null}, \text{null}) & \text{if } \Pi(\sigma) = \text{null} \end{cases}$$

is a state for time  $t+1$  (i.e., it satisfies 1-3) for any subset  $R_t \subseteq R_{t-1}$  and  $s \geq 1$ . In other words, a valid policy must respect the service time of the last job run before  $t$ , if any, while also must respect the departures, if any. A state  $\sigma$  for time  $t$  is *generated by a valid policy*  $\Pi$  if  $\sigma = \sigma_0$  or  $\sigma$  can be obtained from its prefix  $\sigma'$  for time  $t-1$  by applying the policy  $\Pi$ .

Given a state  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{t-1}$  at time  $t$ , we say that *job  $j$  has been run before time  $t$  (in  $\sigma$ )* if there exists a triplet in  $\sigma$  of the form  $\sigma_\tau = (R_\tau, s_{i,\tau}, \tau \rightarrow j)$  with  $j \in R_{\tau-1}$ ; the largest  $\tau' \geq 1$  for which the prefix  $\sigma'$  up to time  $\tau'$  in  $\sigma$ , where job  $j$  has not been run before  $\tau'$ , represents the *time when  $j$  is run in  $\sigma$* . Suppose that job  $j$  is run in  $\sigma$  at time  $\tau'$ ; then, we say that any time  $\tau > \tau'$  for which  $\sigma_\tau = (R_\tau, s_{i,\tau}, \tau \rightarrow j)$  holds, represents a time when job  $j$  is *simulated*, regardless of whether  $j$  belongs to  $R_{\tau-1}$ . For a valid policy  $\Pi$  and a state  $\sigma$  for time  $t$ , we say that  $\Pi$  *runs job  $j$  at time  $t$*  if  $\Pi(\sigma) = j$ ,  $j \in R_{t-1}$ , and  $j$  has not been run before  $t$  in  $\sigma$ . If  $\Pi(\sigma) = j$  and  $j \notin R_{t-1}$  or  $j$  has been run before  $t$  in  $\sigma$ , then, we say that  $\Pi$  *simulates job  $j$  at time  $t$* .

Given a valid policy  $\Pi$  and a state  $\sigma$  for time  $t$ , we define the expected value of the  $\Pi$  starting from the state  $\sigma$  as

$$v(\sigma | \Pi) = \begin{cases} v_j \mathbb{I}_{\{j \in R_{t-1}, j \text{ has not been run in } \sigma\}} + \mathbb{E}_{S_j, R_t} [v(\sigma(R_t, S_j, t \rightarrow j))] & \text{if } \Pi(\sigma) = j \in [n] \\ \mathbb{E}_{R_t} [v(\sigma(R_t, \text{null}, \text{null}))] & \text{if } \Pi(\sigma) = \text{null} \end{cases}$$

Note that a policy can only collect a value from a job  $j$  once and for the first  $k$  jobs that runs. After that, if the policy decides to select  $j$  again, it can only simulate running the job. Given the initial state  $\sigma_0$ , we are interested in solving

$$\sup_{\substack{\Pi \text{ feasible} \\ \text{policy}}} v(\sigma_0 | \Pi).$$

This value is well-defined, as the policy that maps everything to **null** is feasible (with an expected value of 0). Additionally, the value of any policy is upper-bounded by  $\sum_{j \in [n]} v_j$ . We denote by **OPT** the feasible policy that maximizes  $v(\sigma | \Pi)$ . Note that an optimal policy will never simulate a job if it can run a job. However,

allowing this possibility is going to be useful for the next subsection when we analyze the greedy algorithm. When it is clear from the context, and to agree with the notation introduced in previous subsections, we will write  $v(\Pi)$  to refer to  $v(\sigma \mid \Pi)$ .

**Remark C.1.** Notice that we have only defined deterministic policies. Alternatively, we can define randomized policies as  $\Pi(\sigma) \in \Delta([n] \cup \text{null})$ , where  $\Delta(X) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^X : \sum_{j \in X} x_j = 1, \mathbf{x} \geq 0\}$  represents the set of distributions over a finite set  $X$ . A standard result from Markov decision process theory ensures that any randomized policy has a deterministic counterpart with the same reward. For more details, refer to [50].

## C.2 Analysis of Greedy

**The intermediate policy  $\text{ALG}'$**  We construct  $\text{ALG}'$  iteratively from  $\text{OPT}$  as follows. Let  $\text{ALG}^0 = \text{OPT}$  be the initial policy. Let  $\Sigma_t \subseteq \sigma$  be the set of all states for time  $t$ . Then,  $\Sigma_1 = \{\sigma_0\}$  and  $\Sigma = \bigcup_{t \geq 1} \Sigma_t$ . Since each  $\Sigma_t$  is countable, we can assume there is an enumeration  $\Sigma_t = \{\sigma^1, \sigma^2, \dots\}$ .

For each  $t = 1, 2, \dots$ , let  $\text{ALG}^t = \text{ALG}^{t-1}$ . Now, we iteratively modify  $\text{ALG}^t$  for each  $\sigma \in \Sigma_t$ . For each  $t' = 1, 2, \dots$ , take  $\sigma^{t'} \in \Sigma_t$  and let  $R_{t-1} \subseteq [n]$  be the set associated with the last triplet appearing in  $\sigma^{t'}$  (for  $t = 1$  we set  $R_0 = [n]$ ).

If  $R_{t-1} = \emptyset$  or  $\text{ALG}^t(\sigma^{t'}) = \text{null}$ , then we go to  $t' + 1$ . Otherwise, let  $i^*$  be the index of the highest-valued job  $v_{i^*} = \max_{i \in R_{t-1}} v_i$  and  $\text{ALG}^t(\sigma^{t'}) = j$ .

- If  $j = i^*$ , then, go to  $t + 1$ . In this case  $\text{ALG}^t$  is already behaving like greedy.
- If  $j \neq i^*$ , then, set  $\text{ALG}^t(\sigma^{t'}) = i^*$ . In this case,  $\text{ALG}^t$  will follow the greedy action. Now, for every  $\sigma' \in \bigcup_{\tau > t} \Sigma_\tau$  that has  $\sigma$  as a prefix, say  $\sigma' = \sigma \sigma_t \sigma_{t+1} \dots \sigma_{\tau-1}$ , we redefine  $\text{ALG}^t(\sigma'') = \text{ALG}^{t-1}(\sigma')$ , where  $\sigma'' = \sigma(R_t, s, t \rightarrow i^*) \sigma_{t+1} \dots \sigma_{\tau-1}$ , where  $\sigma_t = (R_t, s, t \rightarrow j)$ . In other words, after  $t$ ,  $\text{ALG}^t$  will follow  $\text{ALG}^{t-1}$  as if  $\text{ALG}^{t-1}$  had chosen  $i^*$  at time  $t$  in state  $\sigma$ .

Note that in this construction, we potentially need to examine an infinite number of states in  $\Sigma_t$ . We can overcome this challenge as follows: Let  $T \geq 1$  be the smallest value for which  $\Pr(S \geq T + 1) \leq \varepsilon/n$ , where  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then, define  $\text{OPT}'$  as the policy that follows  $\text{OPT}$  up to states for time  $T$ , and for states at time  $\tau > T$ ,  $\text{OPT}'$  only maps the state to  $\text{null}$ . It can be easily demonstrated that  $\text{OPT}'$  guarantees an expected value of at least  $(1 - \varepsilon)v(\text{OPT})$ . Now, by employing the same procedure with  $\text{OPT}'$ , we can focus on states for time  $t \leq T$  that include triplets  $(R, s, \tau \rightarrow j)$  with  $s \leq T$ . Since we can make  $\varepsilon$  arbitrarily small, the above construction holds.

**Proposition C.2.** We have  $v(\text{ALG}') \geq v(\text{OPT})/2$ .

*Proof.* For the sake of simplicity, we run the argument over  $\text{OPT}'$  that does not make any decision after time  $T$  so the construction above only generates a finite sequence of algorithms  $\text{ALG}^0, \dots, \text{ALG}^T$ , and  $\text{ALG}' = \text{ALG}^T$ . We know that up to an arbitrarily small error, the result will hold. We denote  $\text{OPT}'$  simply by  $\text{OPT}$ .

In the proof, we compare the value collected by  $\text{ALG}^t$  against  $\text{ALG}^{t-1}$  for each  $t \geq 1$ . To do this, we take a state  $\sigma$  for time  $T + 1$  that is generated by  $\text{OPT}$ . From this state, we generate a state  $\sigma^T$  that is generated by  $\text{ALG}^T$ . This process shows that the probability that  $\text{OPT}$  generates  $\sigma$  is equal to the probability that  $\text{ALG}^T$  generates  $\sigma^T$ . Furthermore, if  $v_\sigma$  denotes the value collected by jobs run in  $\sigma$  and  $v_{\sigma^T}$  the value collected by runs run in  $\sigma^T$ , then, we show that  $v_\sigma \leq 2v_{\sigma^T}$ . With these two ingredients, we conclude that twice the expected value collected by  $\text{ALG}^T = \text{ALG}'$  upper bounds the expected value of  $\text{OPT}$ . The rest of the proof is a formalization of this idea.

Let  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_T$  be a state for time  $T + 1$  generated by  $\text{OPT}$ . Let  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  be the jobs run by  $\text{OPT}$  in this state and  $\tau_1 < \dots < \tau_k$  be the times they are run. We first generate a sequence of states for time  $T + 1$  that  $\text{ALG}^t$  can generate for each  $t = 1, \dots, T$ . Let  $\sigma^0 = \sigma$ . For  $t \geq 1$ , we generate  $\sigma^t$  from  $\sigma^{t-1}$  as follows. Let  $\sigma_\tau^{t-1}$  be the  $\tau$ -th triplet in  $\sigma^{t-1}$ . Then,

- If  $\sigma_\tau^{t-1} = (R_t, \text{null}, \text{null})$ , then,  $\sigma^t = \sigma^{t-1}$  and go to  $t + 1$ .
- Otherwise, if  $\sigma_\tau^{t-1} = (R_t, s, t \rightarrow j)$ , then, let  $\text{ALG}^t(\sigma_\tau^{t-1} \dots \sigma_{t-1}^{t-1}) = j'$  and define  $\sigma^t = \sigma_1^{t-1} \dots \sigma_{t-1}^{t-1}(R_t, s, t \rightarrow j') \sigma_{t+1}^{t-1} \dots \sigma_T^{t-1}$ . That is,  $\sigma^t$  is the same as  $\sigma^{t-1}$  with the  $t$ -th triplet changed to  $(R_t, s, t \rightarrow j')$ .

With this, we have generated a sequence  $\sigma^t$  that  $\text{ALG}^t$  can generate. An inductive argument shows that the probability that the sequence  $\sigma$  is generated by  $\text{OPT}$  is the same as the probability that  $\text{ALG}^t$  generated  $\sigma^t$ . Moreover, notice that  $\text{ALG}^t$  and  $\text{ALG}^{t-1}$  make decisions different from  $\text{null}$  at the same times  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k$ .

Now, we are ready to compare the values of  $\text{ALG}^{t-1}$  and  $\text{ALG}^t$ . We do this by recording the values as in the table in Figure 4. The columns corresponds to the times where  $\text{OPT}, \text{ALG}^1, \dots, \text{ALG}^T$  make decisions, in this case,  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k$ . The rows are the values that each algorithm  $\text{ALG}^t$  collects with a minor twist. For each time  $\tau \leq t_t$ , we boost the value collected by  $\text{ALG}^t$  by a factor of 2 as Figure 4 shows. We claim that the

time	$\tau_1$	$\tau_2$	$\tau_3$	$\tau_4$	$\dots$	$\tau_k$
$\text{OPT}$	$v_{i_1}$	$v_{i_2}$	$v_{i_3}$	$v_{i_4}$	$\dots$	$v_{i_k}$
$\text{ALG}^1$	$2v_{i_1^*}$	$v_{i_2}$	0	$v_{i_4}$	$\dots$	$v_{i_k}$
$\text{ALG}^2$	$2v_{i_1^*}$	$v_{i_2}$	0	$v_{i_4}$	$\dots$	$v_{i_k}$
$\text{ALG}^3$	$2v_{i_1^*}$	$2v_{i_2^*}$	0	$v_{i_4}$	$\dots$	$v_{i_k}$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$		$\vdots$
$\text{ALG}^T$	$2v_{i_1^*}$	$2v_{i_2^*}$	0	$2v_{i_4^*}$	$\dots$	0

Figure 4: Comparison of coupled values. In this example,  $1 = t_1 < 2 < t_2$  and so  $\text{ALG}^2$  does not change the action in  $t_2$ .

sum of values in the  $t$ -th row in Figure 4 upper bounds the sum of values in the  $(t-1)$ -th row for all  $t \geq 1$ . Indeed, for  $t \geq 1$ , if  $t \neq \tau_1, \dots, \tau_k$ , then the sum of values in row  $t$  and  $t-1$  are the same. if  $t = \tau_i$ , for some  $i$ , then there are two cases:

- If  $\text{ALG}^t$  gets 0 value at time  $t$ , then,  $\text{ALG}^{t-1}$  also does. Since, every other entry in the two rows coincide, then the result follows in this case.
- If  $\text{ALG}^t$  gets a positive value  $v_{i^*}$  for some  $i^*$ , then, this value upper bounds the value obtained in the same column for row  $t-1$ . Furthermore, the additional copy induced by the factor of 2 in  $v_{i^*}$  helps pay for any future occurrence of item  $i^*$  in row  $t-1$ . Hence, also in this case the result follows.

From these two results, we obtain

$$\sum_{j \text{ run in } \sigma} v_j \Pr(\text{OPT generates } \sigma) \leq 2 \sum_{j \text{ run in } \sigma^T} v_j \Pr(\text{ALG}^T \text{ generates } \sigma^T)$$

and summing over all  $\sigma$  (which has a unique  $\sigma^T$  associated) concludes that  $v(\text{OPT}) \leq 2v(\text{ALG}^T)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition C.3.** *We have  $v(\text{ALG}_{\text{Greedy}}) \geq v(\text{ALG}^T)$ .*

*Proof.* Observe that whenever  $\text{ALG}^T$  runs a job, it does so with the highest-valued one available. Greedy does the same, but it does not miss any opportunity to run a job as  $\text{ALG}^T$  might do. Hence, the expected value collected by greedy can only be larger than the expected value collected by  $\text{ALG}^T$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

## D Missing Proofs From Section 3

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Let  $I$  be an instance of *stochastic scheduling with abandonments and deadlines*, we show the optimal value of  $(\text{LP-d dl})$ ,  $v_{\text{LP}}(I)$ , is at least the value of the optimal policy, denoted as  $v(\text{OPT})$ . Similar with the proof of Theorem 1.1, we reuse notations that  $\Pi$  represents any feasible policy,  $v(\Pi, I)$  denotes expected total value obtained by a feasible policy  $\Pi$ , and  $x_{j,t}$  stands for the probability (across all sample paths) that  $\Pi$  runs job  $j$  at time  $t$ . Thus,  $v(\Pi, I) = \sum_{t=1}^{B_j} \sum_{j=1}^n \Pr(S_j \leq B_j - t) x_{j,t} v_j$ , where an additional term of  $\Pr(S_j \leq B_j - t)$  is added since we are not allowed to collect any reward after the job deadline.

We also make necessary modifications to the constraints accordingly. Since each job  $j$  has a deadline of  $B_j$ , the summation found in Constraint **(ddl(a))** now has a temporal upper bound of  $B_j$ . As for Constraint **(ddl(b))**, note that we are only allowed to run job  $j$  up to time  $B_j$ . Therefore, at any given time  $t$ , only jobs with deadlines later than  $t$  are permitted to occupy the server busy.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.5.* We use  $\text{Con}_{j,t}$  to denote the indicator of the event that job  $j$  is considered by ALG at time  $t$ , and its value equals to 1 with probability  $x_{j,t}^*/2$ , and 0 otherwise by equation (2). Let  $\text{Con}_j$  be the indicator representing that ALG ever considers item  $j$  at any time during the process respectively.  $\text{Con}_j$  is a Bernoulli variable with value 1 with probability less than or equal to  $\sum_{t \geq 1} x_{j,t}^*/2$ . Let  $\text{Con}$  be the sum of weight of job  $j$  ( $w_j$ ) multiplying  $\text{Con}_j$  for all  $j \in [n]$ . Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Con}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j \in [n]} \text{Con}_j\right] \leq \sum_{t \geq 1} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j \cdot x_{j,t}^*/2 \leq W/2$$

where the final inequality uses Constraint **(c)**. Therefore, we apply we apply the upper tail Chernoff bound for bounded variables [30], and yield the following expression:

$$\Pr(\text{Con} > W) \leq \exp(-W^2/(2nw_{max}^2))$$

Since ALG only runs jobs if they are considered, the probability that the jobs which ALG runs have a cumulative weighted sum at least  $W$  can also be bounded by  $\exp(-W^2/(2nw_{max}^2))$ . From here, the result follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 3.7.* We use the exact same notation as the proof above for Lemma 3.5. Note that now the expected number of jobs that are considered during the whole process has a different expression:

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Con}] \leq \sum_{t \geq 1} \sum_{j=1}^n x_{j,t}^*/2 \leq k/2$$

by plugging in  $w_j = 1$  and  $W = k$  respectively. Therefore, we apply the upper tail Chernoff bound for Bernoulli variables [43], and yield the following expression:

$$\Pr(\text{Con} > k) \leq \exp(-k/6)$$

From here, we use the same reasoning from Theorem 3.4 and reach Corollary 3.7.  $\square$

**Example D.1.** Consider the greedy algorithm that runs the job with the largest value that won't exceed the size of the knapsack. Consider the following instance of 2 jobs and knapsack size  $W$ . We set the parameters of job 1 as follows:  $v_1 = w_1 = 1$ ,  $D_1 = 1$  and  $S_1 = 1$  with probability 1. For job 2, we have  $v_2 = W - 1$ ,  $w_2 = W$ ,  $D_2 = 1$  and  $S_2 = 1$  with probability 1. Observe that any algorithm can only run at most one job and the greedy algorithm runs job 1, collecting value 1. The optimal solution obtains a total value of  $W - 1$  by first running jobs 2.

**Example D.2.** Consider the greedy algorithm that runs the one with the largest value per unit-weight ( $v_j/w_j$ ) that won't exceed the size of the knapsack. Consider the following instance of  $n$  jobs and knapsack size  $W > n$ . We set the parameters of job 1 as follows:  $v_1 = 1 + \varepsilon$ ,  $w_1 = W$ ,  $D_1 = n$  and  $S_1 = 1$  with probability 1. For each job  $j \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ , we have  $v_j = 1$ ,  $w_j = 1$ ,  $D_j = n$  and  $S_j = 1$  with probability 1. Observe that the greedy algorithm can only run job 1 and collect value  $1 + \varepsilon$ . The optimal solution obtains a total value of  $n - 1$  by serving all jobs but job 1.

**Example D.3.** Consider the hybrid greedy algorithm that, from the set of available jobs that won't exceed the size of the knapsack, with probability  $1/2$  runs the job  $j$  with the largest  $v_j$  and then stop; with probability  $1/2$  runs jobs by decreasing order of value per unit-weight ( $v_j/w_j$ ). Note above policy gives a  $1/2$ -approximation for the standard knapsack problem. Consider the following instance of  $n+1$  jobs and knapsack size  $n$  (assume for simplicity,  $n$  is even). For each job  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we have  $v_j = 1 + (j - \frac{n+1}{2}) \cdot \varepsilon$ ,  $w_j = 1$ ,  $D_j = j + 1$  and  $S_j = 1$  with probability 1. We set the parameters of job  $n+1$  as follows:  $v_{n+1} = 1 + n\varepsilon/2$ ,  $w_{n+1} = n$ ,  $D_{n+1} = n$  and  $S_{n+1} = 1$  with probability 1. Note that the hybrid greedy policy with probability  $1/2$ , retrieve a value of  $v_{n+1} = 1 + n\varepsilon/2$  and stop. With remaining probability  $1/2$ , runs job  $j$  from  $\{n, \dots, n/2 + 1\}$  sequentially and stop since all other jobs have already departed, and retrieve total value of:  $n/2 + n^2\varepsilon/8$ . The optimal policy runs jobs from  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  sequentially and collect a total value of  $n$ . Thus, when  $n$  large, and  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,  $v(\text{ALG}_{\text{Hybrid Greedy}})/v(\text{OPT}) \rightarrow 1/4$ .



## E The Sampling-Based Algorithm

In this section, we complete the proof of Lemma 2.7. We illustrate the simulation process through Algorithm 2 which is a slight modification from ALG (see §E.1). We delve into the analysis onto how simulation impacts objective value and failure analysis respectively in subsequent subsections (see §E.2).

### E.1 Simulation Process

To retrieve the simulated value of  $f_{j,t}$ , denoted as  $\widehat{f}_{j,t}$ , we introduce following notations.

- **M**: Number of simulations iterations made in  $\text{ALG}_\varepsilon$ . And for ease of analysis, we set **M** to be  $2n^2Tv_{\max}\mu/\varepsilon$ , where  $T = n^k$ ,  $v_{\max} = \max_{j \in [n]} v_j$ ,  $\delta = \varepsilon/(n^2T)$ , and  $\mu = 3 \ln(2\delta^{-1})/\varepsilon^2$ .
- $\text{Count}_{j,t}$ : Out of **M** iterations, the number of occurrences of the event  $\text{ALG}_\varepsilon$  has not considered job  $j$  before time  $t$  and the server is free at time  $t$  conditioned on the event that job  $j$  is available at time  $t$ , or concisely, the event of  $\{\text{NC}_{j,t}, \text{SF}_t \mid \mathbf{A}_{j,t}\}$ .
- $\mathcal{C}'_{j,t}$ : The event that job  $j$  is considered at time  $t$ , when  $\text{ALG}_\varepsilon$  is run with input  $\left\{ \widehat{f}_{j,t'} \right\}_{j \in [n], t' \in [nT]}$ .

As discussed in Lemma 2.2, we know that  $f_{j,1} = 1$  for all  $j \in [n]$ , thus we perform the following simulation process starting from time  $t = 2$ :

- We start simulation by iterating  $\text{ALG}_\varepsilon$  with  $t = 2$  along with other standard inputs (distributional information for service and departure time, as well as job values) for a total of **M** times. And for each iteration, when job  $j$  satisfies the event  $\{\text{NC}_{j,2}, \text{SF}_2 \mid \mathbf{A}_{j,2}\}$ , we increase  $\text{Count}_{j,2}$  by 1. In the end, we retrieve the value of  $\widehat{f}_{j,2} = \text{Count}_{j,2}/\mathbf{M}$  for all  $j$ .
- We continue the same process with time  $t$  increasing by 1 each time up until time  $B$ , and use  $\left\{ \widehat{f}_{j,t'} \right\}_{j \in [n], t' \in [t-1]}$  as known information to simulate  $\left\{ \widehat{f}_{j,t} \right\}_{j \in [n]}$ .

---

#### Algorithm 2 $\text{ALG}_\varepsilon$

---

- 1: **Input:** jobs  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , with value  $v_j$ , departure time  $p_j(\cdot)$ , parameter  $c$ , time  $t$ , simulated  $\left\{ \widehat{f}_{j,t'} \right\}_{j \in [n], t' \in [t]}$
  - 2:  $\mathbf{x}^* \leftarrow$  optimal solution LP (**LP-Sched**).
  - 3:  $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow [n]$ .
  - 4: **for**  $t' = 1, \dots, t$  **do**
  - 5:     **if** server is free **then**
  - 6:          $\mathcal{C}^* \leftarrow \emptyset$ .
  - 7:         **for**  $j \in \mathcal{C}$  **do:**
  - 8:             **if**  $x_{j,t'}^* \geq \varepsilon/n^2Tv_j$  **then:** add  $j$  to  $\mathcal{C}^*$  w.p.  $x_{j,t'}^* \cdot (1 - \varepsilon)^2 / (2 \cdot p_j(t) \cdot \widehat{f}_{j,t'})$ .
  - 9:              $j_{t'} \leftarrow \arg \max_{j \in \mathcal{C}^*} \{v_j\}$ , **run**  $j_{t'}$ .
  - 10:     **update**  $\mathcal{C}$  by removing the job that was considered (if any) or jobs that are no longer available.
- 

### E.2 Analysis

#### E.2.1 Impact on Objective Value

**Claim E.1.** *Given  $\mathbf{x}^*$  the optimal solution of LP (**LP-Sched**), we can disregard tiny values of  $x_{j,t}^*$  for all  $j$  and  $t$  that are no larger than  $\varepsilon/n^2Tv_j$  as illustrated in  $\text{ALG}_\varepsilon$ , at the expense of an  $\varepsilon$ -loss in the overall objective.*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we can normalize the objective value to 1 from scaling respective  $v_i$  values. Then, the loss of the LP value can be derived:

$$\text{loss of } v_{\text{LP}} = \sum_{t \geq 1} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{I}\{x_{j,t}^* \leq \frac{\epsilon}{v_j \cdot n^2 T}\} x_{j,t}^* v_j \leq \epsilon$$

Thus, only an  $\epsilon$  fraction of the objective will be lost.  $\square$

The advantage of doing so lies in the fact that very small  $f_{j,t}$  value would not fit the Monte Carlo simulation scheme in general. Consequently, we avoid simulating these numerical values. Indeed,

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{f}_{j,t}] = f_{j,t} \geq \frac{x_{j,t}^*}{2 \cdot p_j(t)} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2n^2 T \cdot p_j(t) \cdot v_j}$$

A lower bound for  $f_{j,t}$  that we simulate is established, and thus we assume that  $\text{Count}_{j,t} \geq \mu$  in the following analysis.

## E.2.2 Failure Analysis

Notice the following scenario may happen during simulation, that is:  $\widehat{f}_{j,t}$  can be more than  $\epsilon$  away from  $f_{j,t}$ . Formally, by Chernoff bound, we retrieve the following inequality:

$$\Pr(|\widehat{f}_{j,t} - f_{j,t}| \geq \epsilon f_{j,t}) = \Pr(|\text{Count}_{j,t} - \mathbf{M} \cdot f_{j,t}| \geq \epsilon \mathbf{M} \cdot f_{j,t}) \leq \delta$$

where the last inequality applies Chernoff bound [43]. We call the above event as *failure* which could happen with  $\epsilon$  in the whole time frame  $t \in [nT]$  and across all job  $j \in [n]$  by union bound. However, assuming no failures happen, we inductively prove the following claim.

**Claim E.2.** *Given zero failure up to time  $t$ , denoted as  $\mathbf{ZF}_t$ ,  $x_{j,t}^* \cdot (1 - \epsilon)^2 / (2 \cdot p_j(t) \cdot \widehat{f}_{j,t}) \leq 1$  for all  $t \in [nT]$  and  $j \in [n]$ .*

*Proof.* Note by the set-up of  $\text{ALG}_\epsilon$ , we can find the probability of  $\mathbf{C}'_{j,t}$ :

$$\Pr[\mathbf{C}'_{j,t}] = \frac{x_{j,t}^*}{2\widehat{f}_{j,t}} \cdot f_{j,t} \cdot (1 - \epsilon)^2$$

Assuming no failures happen (i.e.  $1 - \epsilon \leq \frac{\widehat{f}_{j,t}}{f_{j,t}} \leq 1 + \epsilon$ ) up to time  $t$ , we get:

$$\frac{(1 - \epsilon)^2}{1 + \epsilon} \cdot \frac{x_{j,t}^*}{2} \leq \Pr[\mathbf{C}'_{j,t} | \mathbf{ZF}_t] \leq (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \frac{x_{j,t}^*}{2} \quad (3)$$

The process of derivation is similar to Lemma 2.2, and by inductive hypothesis that  $\Pr[\mathbf{C}'_{j,t'} | \mathbf{ZF}_{t'}] \leq (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \frac{x_{j,t'}^*}{2}$  for all  $j \in [n]$  and  $t' < t$ , we have, under zero failure,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - f_{j,t} &\leq \sum_{\tau < t} \sum_{i \neq j} \left( (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \frac{x_{i,\tau}^*}{2} \right) \cdot \Pr(S_i > t - \tau) + \sum_{\tau < t} (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \frac{x_{j,\tau}^*}{2 \cdot p_j(\tau)} \\ &\leq (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \frac{1 - \sum_{i=1}^n x_{i,t}^*}{2} + \frac{1 - \epsilon}{2} \cdot \left( 1 - \frac{x_{j,t}^*}{p_j(t)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{Claim 2.3})$$

Reordering the above inequality will give  $f_{j,t} \geq x_{j,t}^* / (2 \cdot p_j(t))$ . Thus,

$$\widehat{f}_{j,t} \geq (1 - \epsilon) f_{j,t} \geq (1 - \epsilon) \cdot x_{j,t}^* / (2 \cdot p_j(t))$$

which would guarantee the desired feasibility given no failure happens.  $\square$

Finally we connect above facts with what we want to show in Corollary 1.3.

*Proof.* Notice that following  $\text{ALG}_\varepsilon$ , the probability that job  $j$  is in the consideration set  $\mathcal{C}^*$  at time  $t$  is at least  $\frac{(1-\varepsilon)^2}{1+\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{x_{j,t}^*}{2}$  from inequality 3. Using similar technique from the proof of Theorem 1.2, we get that the expected value obtained is at least  $\left(\frac{(1-\varepsilon)^2}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \cdot 1/2 \cdot (1 - 1/e) \cdot v(\text{OPT})$ . Therefore, by treating failure (which happens  $\varepsilon$  amount of time) as a run obtaining 0 value, we recover Corollary 1.3.  $\square$

## F Additional Tables and Plots

Instance Type	LP	SIMALG	CONSET	SAFE	GREEDY	UR
Syn-5	10.93	9.78 ± 0.31	9.71 ± 0.32	10.01 ± 0.30	10.08 ± 0.34	9.29 ± 0.51
Syn-10	14.55	12.87 ± 0.53	12.72 ± 0.56	13.07 ± 0.51	13.21 ± 0.42	11.64 ± 0.65
Syn-15	17.46	15.40 ± 0.56	15.24 ± 0.59	15.70 ± 0.54	15.80 ± 0.51	13.24 ± 0.76
Syn-20	19.04	16.77 ± 0.60	16.66 ± 0.56	17.07 ± 0.56	17.00 ± 0.54	13.64 ± 0.79
Syn-25	21.27	18.57 ± 0.74	18.48 ± 0.76	19.02 ± 0.69	18.25 ± 0.67	14.44 ± 0.88
Syn-30	23.48	20.41 ± 0.88	20.30 ± 0.87	20.95 ± 0.84	19.36 ± 0.76	15.12 ± 1.00
Syn-35	24.98	21.63 ± 0.85	21.49 ± 0.85	22.25 ± 0.79	19.88 ± 0.75	15.22 ± 1.06
Syn-40	26.60	22.89 ± 0.96	22.70 ± 0.97	23.59 ± 0.91	20.57 ± 0.74	15.60 ± 1.01
Syn-45	28.17	24.14 ± 0.96	23.96 ± 0.91	24.95 ± 0.92	20.95 ± 0.76	15.89 ± 1.08
Syn-50	29.96	25.30 ± 1.00	25.10 ± 1.07	26.17 ± 0.99	21.50 ± 0.79	16.30 ± 1.17

Table 3: Algorithm Values and 95% Confidence Intervals (Synthetic Datasets). Results are rounded to retain two decimals for consistency.

Instance Type	LP	SIMALG	CONSET	SAFE	GREEDY	UR
Real-5	8.69	1.68 ± 0.27	1.64 ± 0.26	2.51 ± 0.24	3.32 ± 0.12	2.38 ± 0.26
Real-10	10.70	4.76 ± 0.68	4.68 ± 0.66	5.91 ± 0.70	6.92 ± 0.58	3.85 ± 0.80
Real-15	11.84	6.61 ± 0.79	6.59 ± 0.76	7.57 ± 0.78	8.80 ± 0.86	4.72 ± 0.93
Real-20	12.43	7.29 ± 0.80	7.08 ± 0.77	8.39 ± 0.79	9.80 ± 0.89	5.05 ± 0.89
Real-25	13.01	8.09 ± 0.85	7.90 ± 0.81	9.05 ± 0.86	10.61 ± 1.05	5.43 ± 0.95
Real-30	13.51	8.85 ± 0.98	8.65 ± 0.90	9.67 ± 0.93	11.38 ± 1.12	5.76 ± 1.04
Real-35	13.92	9.23 ± 0.94	9.00 ± 0.87	10.07 ± 0.92	11.98 ± 1.15	5.91 ± 1.01
Real-40	14.34	9.70 ± 1.03	9.45 ± 0.93	10.55 ± 1.11	12.62 ± 1.34	6.23 ± 1.14
Real-45	14.65	9.90 ± 0.98	9.70 ± 0.94	10.88 ± 1.04	13.09 ± 1.27	6.38 ± 1.13
Real-50	14.96	10.29 ± 1.09	10.10 ± 0.99	11.27 ± 1.14	13.55 ± 1.37	6.58 ± 1.11

Table 4: Algorithm Values and 95% Confidence Intervals (Real Datasets). Results are rounded to retain two decimals for consistency.




Figure 5: Service time point mass function distribution for the three categories of customers.




Figure 6: Departure time point mass function distribution for the three categories of customers.




Figure 7: Sample Path of Approximating  $f_{1,3}$