
Starjob: Dataset for LLM-Driven Job Shop Scheduling

Henrik Abgaryan¹ Tristan Cazenave^{*1} Ararat Harutyunyan^{*1}

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have shown remarkable capabilities across various domains, but their potential for solving combinatorial optimization problems remains largely unexplored. In this paper, we investigate the applicability of LLMs to the Job Shop Scheduling Problem (JSSP), a classic challenge in combinatorial optimization that requires efficient job allocation to machines to minimize makespan. To this end, we introduce Starjob, the first supervised dataset for JSSP, comprising 130k instances specifically designed for training LLMs. Leveraging this dataset, we fine-tune the LLaMA 8B 4-bit quantized model with the LoRA method to develop an end-to-end scheduling approach. Our evaluation on standard benchmarks demonstrates that the proposed LLM-based method not only surpasses traditional Priority Dispatching Rules (PDRs) but also achieves notable improvements over state-of-the-art neural approaches like L2D, with an average improvement of 15.36% on DMU and 7.85% on Taillard benchmarks. These results highlight the untapped potential of LLMs in tackling combinatorial optimization problems, paving the way for future advancements in this area.

1. Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs), despite their powerful capabilities in natural language processing, have not traditionally been associated with solving computationally intensive problems. Specifically, their applicability to NP-hard combinatorial optimization problems is often considered limited compared to other neural approaches. This perception is reinforced by the lack of examples where LLMs have successfully outperformed methods like reinforcement learning in such domains. Furthermore, LLMs are prone to “hallucinations,” where they not only fail to solve problem instances but also produce infeasible solutions. Consequently, LLMs have yet to be seriously explored (including fine-tuning) for tackling hard combinatorial problems.

In this paper, we challenge this prevailing intuition by

demonstrating that LLMs, when fine-tuned, can be effective for certain combinatorial optimization problems. We present the first fine-tuned LLM model for the Job Shop Scheduling Problem (JSSP)—and, to the best of our knowledge, for any NP-hard combinatorial problem. Our results show that for JSSP, LLMs not only generate feasible solutions but also surpass Priority Dispatch Rule (PDR) methods and outperform the earliest neural approaches that first exceeded PDR performance (e.g., L2D (Zhang et al., 2020)). These findings suggest LLMs, with refinement, could rival advanced neural methods for combinatorial optimization, paving the way for broader applications and a new computational paradigm.

The job shop scheduling problem (JSSP) optimizes the allocation of N_J jobs with varying processing times to N_M machines, targeting metrics like makespan (C_{max}) or average flow time. It has critical applications in manufacturing and services. Traditional methods, relying on mathematical programming and heuristics, often face scalability and precedence challenges. Advances in AI, such as reinforcement learning and graph neural networks, offer promising data-driven alternatives (Chaudhry & Khan, 2015)(Zhang et al., 2020)(Corsini et al., 2024). (Huang et al., 2022) examined the graph reasoning capabilities of large language models (LLMs) on tasks like connectivity, shortest paths, maximum flow, and Hamilton paths. While LLMs show promise, their performance declines on complex problems, often relying on spurious correlations. To address this, (Huang et al., 2022) introduced improved prompting strategies. (Valmeekam et al., 2022) introduce a benchmark to test for evaluating the planning/reasoning capabilities of LLMs. Recently, (Chen et al., 2024b) investigate the application of LLMs to the task of graph node classification.

Collectively, these studies underscore the growing use of LLMs for tasks involving implicit structures, while their application to scheduling problems remains unexplored. This paper is the first to utilize LLMs for end-to-end scheduling in JSSP, leveraging their ability to process and reason over complex information to tackle this challenge. To this end, we introduce the first supervised dataset Starjob designed to fine-tune LLMs specifically for the task of JSSP. Instead of traditional matrix representation format, this dataset includes natural language description of the

⁰<https://github.com/starjob42/Starjob>

JSSP problem and its solution. On two well-known JSSP benchmarks Tai(Taillard, 1993) and DMU(Demirkol et al., 1998), we show that minimal fine-tuning through RsLoRA (Kalajdziewski, 2023) on the proposed dataset enables LLM to schedule, by finding high-quality solutions, surpassing classic PDRs and exceeding other neural approaches.

The contributions of this work to the field of JSSP are multi-faceted:

- We introduce the first-ever supervised dataset Starjob containing 130,000 instances specifically designed for training LLMs in the context of JSSP
- We introduce the use of fine-tuned LLMs for end-to-end JSSP scheduling, showcasing their ability to reason over complex constraints with the Starjob dataset and RsLoRA method
- We evaluate the performance of LLM-based scheduling against four traditional PDRs and the neural method L2D, demonstrating its superior generalization on large-scale JSSP graph instances having 1000 nodes
- Our LLM-based approach enables natural language interactions with the scheduler, allowing users to inquire about specific JSSP instances and gain insights into constraints, enhancing system transparency and usability.

2. Related Work

JSSP with more than two machines is proven to be NP-hard (Garey et al., 1976). As a result, finding exact solutions for JSSP is generally infeasible, leading to the widespread use of heuristic and approximate methods for practical efficiency (Cebi et al., 2020). Traditional approaches to solving JSSP have primarily relied on search and inference techniques developed by the constraint programming community (Beck et al., 2010). These techniques effectively leverage constraints to define the relationships and limitations between jobs and resources, enabling efficient exploration of feasible solution spaces and the identification of optimal or near-optimal schedules (Nowicki & Smutnicki, 2005). A widely used heuristic method in real-world scheduling systems is the Priority Dispatching Rule (PDR) (Zahmani et al., 2015). PDRs are simple and effective, although designing an efficient PDR is time-consuming and requires extensive domain knowledge.

Recently, approaches utilizing Deep Learning and Neural Networks have gained attention for finding promising solutions to the JSSP (Bonetta et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2020; Corsini et al., 2024). These methods can be broadly categorized into supervised learning and reinforcement learning (RL). Current research in deep reinforcement learning

(DRL) is actively focused on developing advanced methods to tackle JSSP. Existing DRL methods typically represent JSSP as a Markov Decision Process (MDP) and learn a policy network based on DRL techniques(Zhang et al., 2020).

Large language models (LLMs) are now being applied to a wider range of tasks beyond language processing. In areas like robotics and planning (Huang et al., 2022). While there are currently no papers that directly address the scheduling of Job Shop Scheduling Problems (JSSP) using LLMs, some notable works explore the potential of LLMs in mathematical reasoning and programming (Chen et al., 2023; Wei et al., 2022; Ahn et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2023). Optimization using LLMs has gained significant interest in recent years, with several works exploring their capabilities across various domains (Yang et al., 2023). The ability of LLMs to understand and generate natural language has opened new possibilities for optimization tasks that were traditionally solved using derivative-based algorithms or heuristic methods(Yang et al., 2023). (Chen et al., 2023) evaluated LLMs’ performance in mathematical problem-solving and introduced ”Program of Thoughts” (PoT) prompting. Unlike Chain of Thoughts (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022), which combines reasoning and computation, PoT generates reasoning as code statements and delegates computation to an interpreter. (Ahn et al., 2024) surveys mathematical problems and datasets studied with LLMs, analyzing their strengths and weaknesses. (Frieder et al., 2024) examines LLMs’ impact on mathematicians, exploring their role in research, education, problem-solving, and proof generation, offering a balanced view of their capabilities. Recent works (Yang et al., 2023) explore LLMs as optimizers, using prompts to refine solutions iteratively. Case studies on linear reeesion and the traveling salesman problem show LLMs can produce high-quality solutions, sometimes matching heuristic algorithms in small-scale scenarios. Explorations into using LLMs for graph learning tasks have yielded notable approaches. (Huang et al., 2022) noted that LLMs exhibit some initial graph reasoning capabilities, but their performance decreases with problem complexity, (Huang et al., 2022) introduced prompting strategies to improve LLMs graph reasoning. (Valmeekam et al., 2022) developed a benchmark for assessing the planning and reasoning abilities of LLMs. More recently, (Chen et al., 2024b) examined the use of LLMs for graph node classification tasks. (Chen et al., 2024a) introduces two pipelines: LLMs-as-Enhancers, where LLMs refine textual data for Graph Neural Networks (GNNs), and LLMs-as-Predictors, where LLMs generate predictions directly from graph structures in natural language. Additionally, (Zhao et al., 2024) proposed GRAPH-TEXT, translating graphs into natural language for training-free reasoning, often matching or exceeding GNNs. These works highlight the potential of LLMs in graph-related tasks, but their application to scheduling problems remains largely

unexplored.

3. Preliminary

JSSP is formally defined as a problem involving a set of jobs J and a set of machines M . The size of the JSSP problem instance is described as $N_J \times N_M$, where N_J represents the number of jobs and N_M the number of machines. For each job $J_i \in J$, it must be processed through n_i machines (where n_i is the number of operations for job J_i) in a specified order $O_{i1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow O_{in_i}$, where each O_{ij} (for $1 \leq j \leq n_i$) represents an operation of J_i with a processing time $p_{ij} \in \mathbb{N}$. This sequence also includes a precedence constraint. Each machine can process only one job at a time, and switching jobs mid-operation is not allowed. The objective of solving a JSSP is to determine a schedule, that is, a start time S_{ij} for each operation O_{ij} , to minimize the makespan $C_{\max} = \max_{i,j} \{C_{ij} = S_{ij} + p_{ij}\}$ while meeting all constraints. The complexity of a JSSP instance can be represented as a graph with $N_J \times N_M$ nodes, where each node corresponds to an operation.

4. Dataset Generation

In order to try to solve the JSSP with LLM, we first need to represent the problem in natural language. To do that, we have to transform the matrix-based representation in standard JSSP format to a human-readable format. See the example in Listing 1.

Listing 1: Job Shop Scheduling Problem instance (ft06) (Fisher and Thompson 1963) with $N_J = 6$ and $N_M = 6$. The problem instance begins with the problem size on the first row, followed by the operations for each job. Odd columns list machines, and even columns list durations. The last row indicates the makespan (55.0).

```

6 6

2 1 0 3 1 6 3 7 5 3 4 6
1 8 2 5 4 10 5 10 0 10 3 4
2 5 3 4 5 8 0 9 1 1 4 7
1 5 0 5 2 5 3 3 4 8 5 9
2 9 1 3 4 5 5 4 0 3 3 1
1 3 3 3 5 9 0 10 4 4 2 1
    
```

55

4.1. Converting JSSP problem instance to Natural Language: Feature Generation

The approach describes the machines required for each job, providing a job-centric view of the scheduling problem.

- **Initialization:** Begins by introducing the problem, detailing the number of jobs and machines involved.
- **Problem Organization:** Enumerates jobs, specifying the sequence of the corresponding machines, and their respective durations.

Listing 1. Natural Language description of a JSSP instance of size $N_J = 3$ and $N_M = 3$

```

Optimize schedule for 3 Jobs (
denoted as J) across 3 Machines
(denoted as M) to minimize
makespan. The makespan is the
completion time of the last
operation in the schedule. Each
M can process only one J at a
time, and once started, J cannot
be interrupted.
    
```

```

J0:
M0:105 M1:29 M2:213
J1:
M0:193 M1:18 M2:213
J3:
M0:78 M1:74 M2:221
    
```

4.2. Definitions

- \mathcal{L}_p : Natural language representation of a problem instance p .
- s : A solution in natural language, detailing operation sequences, machine assignments, and timings.
- \mathcal{S}_p^f : Set of feasible solutions satisfying all JSSP constraints.
- $M(s)$: Makespan of solution s .
- Objective: Minimize $M(s)$ for feasible solutions $s \in \mathcal{S}_p^f$.

4.3. Proposed Method

1. **Fine-Tuning:** Train the LLM on problem-solution pairs (\mathcal{L}_p, s) to generate valid schedules.
2. **Inference:** Generate S candidate solutions:

$$\{s_1, \dots, s_S\} \sim \text{LLM}_\theta(\mathcal{L}_p).$$

3. **Feasibility Check:** Filter feasible solutions:

$$\mathcal{S}_p^f = \{s \mid \text{All constraints are satisfied}\}.$$

4. **Optimization:** Select the solution with the minimum makespan:

$$s^* = \arg \min_{s \in \mathcal{S}_p^f} M(s).$$

4.4. Description of Rank-Stabilized LoRA Training

Rank-Stabilized Low-Rank Adaptation (rsLoRA) (Kalajdziewski, 2023) is a method for fine-tuning large language models with low-rank adapters that remain stable even at higher ranks. It addresses the limitation in standard LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) where the scaling factor is set as $\frac{\alpha}{r}$, which often leads to gradient collapse or under-utilization of higher-rank adapters. In rsLoRA, the scaling factor is modified to

$$\gamma_r = \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{r}},$$

ensuring that the adapter outputs (and their gradients) remain well-conditioned across different ranks.

4.4.1. LOW-RANK PARAMETER DECOMPOSITION

Similar to LoRA, rsLoRA begins with the frozen pre-trained parameters of the LLM, θ_0 , and learns a low-rank update Δ_ϕ :

$$\Delta_\phi = UV^\top,$$

where $U, V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ (or equivalently B, A in some references), with a small rank $r \ll d$. The effective model parameters during fine-tuning become:

$$\theta = \theta_0 + \gamma_r \Delta_\phi,$$

where the critical *rank-stabilized* scaling factor is

$$\gamma_r = \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{r}}.$$

Only U and V (i.e. Δ_ϕ) are trained, while θ_0 remains fixed.

4.4.2. RANK-STABILIZATION VIA THE SCALING FACTOR

The main insight of rsLoRA is that setting $\gamma_r = \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{r}}$ ensures the output variance of Δ_ϕ is $\Theta(1)$ (constant order) as r grows. This prevents gradient collapse and allows higher-rank adapters to *actually* improve performance when sufficient computational resources are available. In contrast, the standard LoRA choice $\gamma_r = \frac{\alpha}{r}$ frequently under-utilizes larger ranks and leads to similar performance across different ranks.

Mathematically, Kalajdziewski et al. (Kalajdziewski, 2023) show that for infinite-rank analysis, $\gamma_r \in \Theta(r^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ is both necessary and sufficient to maintain stable updates throughout training.

4.4.3. LOSS FUNCTION FOR FINE-TUNING

Let $\{(\mathcal{L}_p^{(i)}, s^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^N$ be a dataset of problem-solution pairs. Each solution $s^{(i)}$ is tokenized as $\{w_1, \dots, w_{T_i}\}$. Using an auto-regressive language modeling objective, the negative log-likelihood (NLL) for a single example is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{NLL}}(\theta; \mathcal{L}_p^{(i)}, s^{(i)}) = - \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \log p(w_t \mid w_{<t}, \mathcal{L}_p^{(i)}; \theta).$$

Thus, the training loss summed over all samples is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{train}}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{L}_{\text{NLL}}(\theta; \mathcal{L}_p^{(i)}, s^{(i)}).$$

4.5. Zero-shot inference and Label generation

Our choice of LLM is Meta-Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct-bnb-4bit open-source model with a 128K context size. Later, we will refer to this model as Llama. The model is one of the open-source AI models developed by Meta. Llama 3.1 is an auto-regressive language model that uses an optimized transformer architecture (AI, 2024). For this study, we intentionally limited ourselves to using a single A6000 GPU and the 4-bit quantized (instead of full 32-bit) version of the model, demonstrating that our proposed dataset enables effective learning even under such constraints.

Initially, we considered performing zero-shot inference with the Llama3.1 to solve the JSSP. However, the model consistently produced general descriptions of how to solve the problem instead of actual solutions. Prompt engineering did not help. Occasionally, for very short instances (e.g 2x2, 3x2) it provided partial solutions, however, during each inference time the structure of the provided solution was different, making it hard to parse the solution.

Because the zero-shot inference results were not satisfactory, we decided to finetune the LLM using a supervised approach. This required creating a supervised dataset, which included not only the problem formulations in natural language as described in Section 4 but also the solutions. To generate feasible solutions, we employed Google’s OR-Tools. The configuration for the Google’s OR-Tools solver was set as follows:

- Maximum time allowed for the solver: 300 seconds.
- Number of search workers: 42.
- Search branching strategy: `cp_model.AUTOMATIC_SEARCH`.

We have generated approximately 130,000 random JSSP problems of various sizes ¹, ranging from 2x2 to 20x20,

¹<https://github.com/starjob42/Starjob>

with the duration of each operation between 5 and 500 units. Additionally, we included several larger examples, such as 30x15, 50x20 etc., with approximately 1,000 instances, to enhance generalizability. We created problems with asymmetric sizes also, such as 3x2 and 10x5, to enhance the model’s generalization capability. Overall, the final dataset consists of around 130,000 natural language descriptions of JSSP problems along with their feasible solutions. Since we limited the maximum allowed time for Google’s OR-Tools to 300 seconds, the optimality of solutions for problems with $N_J > 10$ and $N_M > 10$ is not guaranteed. The generated solution is converted to LLM format as described in 4

```

Listing 2. Natural Language description of the
solution of JSSP problem instance of size  $N_J = 3$ 
and  $N_M = 3$ 
Solution :
J2-M0: 0+78 -> 78, J1-M2: 0+193 ->
193, J0-M0: 78+105 -> 183,
J0-M1: 183+29 -> 212, J2-M2:
193+74 -> 267, J1-M1: 212+18
-> 230,
J1-M0: 230+213 -> 443, J2-M1:
267+221 -> 488, J0-M2: 267+213
-> 480

Maximum end completion time or
Makespan: 488
    
```

Representation in summation format aids LLM in performing computations effectively, enabling them to accurately calculate the makespan and produce feasible solutions with the minimum makespan; in contrast, our comparison with solutions generated without the summation operation often resulted in infeasible outputs.

5. Training Details

We fine-tuned Llama 3.1, an 8 billion-parameter model from Meta, utilizing a 4-bit quantized version to minimize memory usage. We used Rank-Stabilized Low-Rank Adaptation (RSLoRA) (Kalajdziewski, 2023) with a rank of $r = 64$ and $\alpha = 64$. The training required roughly 70 hours and about 30GB of GPU memory. In comparison, the dedicated Neural network such as (Zhang et al., 2020) requires 68.3 hours. We limited the context length of the model to 40k instead of the original 128k context length, to reduce memory consumption and increase the speed of fine-tuning. “Context length” refers to the maximum number of tokens (words or subwords) the model can process at once as input.

6. Evaluation

To ensure a fair comparison, we evaluated the fine-tuned LLM on two well-known benchmarks, Tai (Taillard, 1993)

and DMU (Demirkol et al., 1998), focusing on diverse problem instances. Since this is the first time an LLM has been employed for end-to-end scheduling on the JSSP problem, we compared its performance to the first neural approach, L2D (Zhang et al., 2020), which was one of the first methods that demonstrated superiority over traditional priority dispatching rules (PDRs). The PDRs included in the comparison are Shortest Processing Time (SPT), Most Work Remaining (MWKR), Most Operations Remaining (MOPNR), and the minimum ratio of Flow Due Date to Most Work Remaining (FDD/MWKR).

During inference, the context length is set to 40k to align with the configuration used during the fine-tuning phase. A sampling strategy is employed, using the default hyperparameters. Additionally, a sample size of $S = 20$ is specified, meaning that at each inference step, the model generates and returns 20 different outputs for evaluation. During both training and inference time, the model was loaded in the format *float4*. The inference process itself consumes approximately 30GB of memory on the NVIDIA A6000 GPU. The largest instance to be tested in total contains around 23000 tokens.

For faster inference, the fine-tuned model can be converted into the `llama.cpp` format (Gerganov, 2023). This conversion enables an impressive inference speed of 102.22 tokens per second, as reported in (Dai, 2024), when running on an NVIDIA RTX A6000 GPU with 48 GB of memory. Notably, the inference speed and memory usage of the LLM remain consistent across different language tasks, depending only on the token sequence length rather than the specific problem being solved. This consistency applies equally to tasks like ours (JSSP) and other tasks of similar token lengths. Consequently, the largest instance that fits within a 40,000-token context length, comprising a total of 22,224 tokens, requires approximately 217.41 seconds per sample.

6.1. Overview of JSSP Solution Parsing and Validation

Given a JSSP problem instance \mathcal{L}_p and a solution s in natural language, the feasibility check ensures that s satisfies all constraints and identifies feasible solutions \mathcal{S}_p^f . The objective is to minimize the makespan:

$$s^* = \arg \min_{s \in \mathcal{S}_p^f} M(s),$$

where $M(s)$ is the makespan of solution s .

6.1.1. VALIDATION STEPS

- 1. Parsing Inputs:** Extract jobs J_i , machines M_k , operations O_{ij} , start times S_{ij} , processing times p_{ij} , end times C_{ij} , and declared makespan C_{\max} .
- 2. Precedence Constraints:** For each job J_i , ensure op-

erations O_{ij} follow their prescribed order:

$$S_{i(j+1)} \geq C_{ij}, \quad C_{ij} = S_{ij} + p_{ij}.$$

3. **Machine Constraints:** For each machine M_k , verify no overlapping operations:

$$S_{ij} \geq C_{kl} \quad \text{or} \quad S_{kl} \geq C_{ij},$$

where O_{ij} and O_{kl} are operations assigned to M_k .

4. **Completeness and Validity:** Check that:
 - All jobs J_i and operations O_{ij} are represented.
 - Machines M_k process only one operation at a time.
 - All start and end times S_{ij}, C_{ij} are within valid bounds.

5. **Makespan Validation:** Compute:

$$C_{\max} = \max_{i,j} \{C_{ij}\},$$

and compare it with the declared makespan. If mismatched, the solution is invalid.

If all these checks pass, the solution is deemed feasible.

7. Empirical Performance Analysis

In this section, we provide an in-depth comparison of various job scheduling approaches. Since this is the first time an LLM is applied as an end-to-end scheduler for the JSSP, we compare our approach with the work presented in "Learning to Dispatch for Job Shop Scheduling via Deep Reinforcement Learning" (L2D) (Zhang et al., 2020). This comparison is fair because L2D was the first approach to use neural networks to outperform classic priority dispatching rule (PDR) methods, making it analogous to our work, which is the first to apply LLMs to JSSP. L2D's method utilizes a Graph Neural Network (GNN) with Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) (Schulman et al., 2017) and employs a size-agnostic policy network for generalization. Table 1 and Table 2 presents the performance comparison of the Llama-Finetuned model on the proposed Starjob dataset against various scheduling methods (L2D, SPT, MWKR, FDD/WKR, MOPNR) on the Tai (Taillard, 1993) and DMU (Demirkol et al., 1998) datasets, focusing on gap percentages relative to the best known solution makespan from the literature. The best solutions for Taillard's and DMU instances can be found in² and³, respectively.

The performance on each benchmark was evaluated using the *Percentage Gap* (PG), defined as:

$$PG = 100 \times \left(\frac{M_{\text{alg}}}{M_{\text{ub}}} - 1 \right),$$

where M_{alg} represents the makespan generated by the algorithm, and M_{ub} denotes the best-known makespan (or sometimes the optimal) for the instance. Lower PG values indicate better performance, as they correspond to solutions with objective values closer to the optimal or best-known makespan. Figure 1, Figure 3, and Figure 2, Figure 4 presents the performance on both Tai (Taillard, 1993) and DMU (Demirkol et al., 1998) datasets across various configurations of N_J and N_M . On Tai benchmark dataset instances with Across instances ranging from 15 jobs and 15 machines to 50 jobs and 20 machines, the fine-tuned Llama 3.1 consistently outperforms all other methods. Even on larger instances with 50 Jobs and 20 Machines (having 1000 nodes in graph representation as described in Sec. 3) Llama (24.32%) still outperforms L2D (26.40%). Average Gap: Finetuned Llama (21.69%) is significantly lower than SPT (60.57%), MWKR (55.29%), FDD/WKR (46.77%), and MOPNR (42.99%), L2D (29.54%).

On the DMU benchmark dataset with 50 Jobs and 15 Machines finetuned Llama (22.14%) again demonstrates superior performance (over 15%) against all methods including L2D(37.50 %) (Zhang et al., 2020). Finetuned Llama (22.14%) is also notably lower average gap on DMU benchmark. The *SPT* consistently exhibits the highest gap percentages, exceeding 60% for most problem instances. This is expected since *SPT*, while simple, often fails to account for job-shop constraints in complex problem settings. The *MWKR* and *FDD/WKR* heuristics, which are more sophisticated than *SPT*, perform moderately better, with gap percentages ranging between 50% and 70%. However, these heuristics are still outclassed by the machine learning-based approaches, likely due to their myopic decision-making, which does not factor in longer-term scheduling impacts. For additional detailed makspan ad gap of each instance.

8. Conclusion

We introduce Starjob, the first ever supervised dataset for training LLMs on JSSP. Our goal was to demonstrate that even with a limited setup—using a single A6000 GPU, a compact Llama 8B model, 4-bit quantisation (instead of 32-bit full precision), and the lightweight RsLoRA fine-tuning method (which updates only a subset of parameters)—LLMs can effectively tackle complex scheduling problems like JSSP. Benchmark tests (Taillard, 1993), (Demirkol et al., 1998) show that, despite these constraints, fine-tuned Llama surpasses classic and neural network methods. This work underscores the potential of LLMs in JSSP, even under resource-efficient conditions. LLMs enable interactive exploration of the JSSP, allowing users to identify constraints

²<http://optimizer.com/TA.php>

³<http://jobshop.jjvh.nl/>

Table 1. Comparison of different methods on the TAI dataset. Lower values indicate schedules closer to the optimal solution, representing better performance.

Method	15x15	20x15	20x20	30x15	30x20	50x15	50x20	Average
FDD/WKR	47.45	50.57	47.57	45.01	56.30	37.72	42.80	46.77
MOPNR	44.98	47.97	43.68	45.59	48.23	31.25	39.24	42.99
MWKR	56.74	60.65	55.60	52.61	63.93	41.90	55.62	55.29
SPT	54.64	65.24	64.11	61.61	66.03	51.37	61.00	60.57
L2D	25.95	30.03	31.60	33.02	33.62	26.15	26.40	29.54
LLM-FT-Ours	19.34*	18.00*	21.11*	21.44*	30.05*	17.57*	24.32*	21.69*

Table 2. Comparison of different methods on the DMU dataset. Lower values indicate schedules closer to the optimal solution, representing better performance.

Method	20x15	20x20	30x15	30x20	40x15	40x20	50x15	Average
FDD/WKR	53.58	52.51	54.12	60.08	50.76	55.52	37.58	52.02
MOPNR	49.17	45.18	47.14	51.97	43.23	49.22	31.73	45.38
MWKR	62.14	58.16	60.96	63.15	52.40	61.09	43.23	57.30
SPT	64.12	64.55	62.57	65.92	55.89	62.99	47.83	60.55
L2D	38.95	37.74	41.86	39.48	36.68	41.18	26.60	37.50
LLM-FT-Ours	19.90*	22.26*	22.11*	24.82*	18.44*	30.61*	16.85*	22.14*




Figure 1. Comparison of different methods on TAI(Taillard, 1993) benchmark.




Figure 2. Comparison of different methods on DMU(Demirkol et al., 1998) benchmark.

that hinder optimal solutions.

9. Limitations and Future Work

By introducing the Starjob dataset and applying LLMs, we establish a foundation for future research. Advanced sampling methods like Monte Carlo, diverse LLM architectures,

fine-tuning, and integration with reinforcement learning and graph neural networks could enhance performance. Our study demonstrates the potential of LLMs for JSSP, highlighting a promising direction for future research.




Figure 3. Comparison of different methods on TAI(Taillard, 1993) benchmark.




Figure 4. Comparison of different methods on DMU(Demirkol et al., 1998) benchmark.

References

Ahn, J., Verma, R., Lou, R., Liu, D., Zhang, R., and Yin, W. Large language models for mathematical reasoning: Progresses and challenges. In Falk, N., Papi, S.,

and Zhang, M. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*, pp. 225–237, St. Julian’s, Malta, March 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://>

- [//aclanthology.org/2024.eacl-srw.17](https://aclanthology.org/2024.eacl-srw.17).
- AI, M. Llama 3 model card, 2024. URL https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/MODEL_CARD.md. Accessed: 2024-08-10.
- Beck, J. C., Feng, T. K., and Watson, J.-P. Combining constraint programming and local search for job-shop scheduling. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 23(1): 1–14, 2010.
- Bonetta, G., Zago, D., Cancelliere, R., and Grosso, A. Job shop scheduling via deep reinforcement learning: a sequence to sequence approach. *Not Specified*, Aug 2023.
- Cebi, C., Atac, E., and Sahingoz, O. K. Job shop scheduling problem and solution algorithms: A review. In *2020 11th International Conference on Computing, Communication and Networking Technologies (ICCCNT)*, pp. 1–7, 2020. doi: 10.1109/ICCCNT49239.2020.9225581.
- Chaudhry, S. A. and Khan, S. Comparison of dispatching rules in job-shop scheduling problem using simulation: A case study. *ResearchGate*, 2015. URL https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283505822_Comparison_of_dispatching_rules_in_job-shop_Schedulingproblem_Usingsimulation_A_case_study.
- Chen, W., Ma, X., Wang, X., and Cohen, W. W. Program of thoughts prompting: Disentangling computation from reasoning for numerical reasoning tasks. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=YfZ4ZPt8zd>.
- Chen, Z., Mao, H., Li, H., Jin, W., Wen, H., Wei, X., Wang, S., Yin, D., Fan, W., Liu, H., and Tang, J. Exploring the potential of large language models (llms) in learning on graphs, 2024a.
- Chen, Z., Mao, H., Li, H., Jin, W., Wen, H., Wei, X., Wang, S., Yin, D., Fan, W., Liu, H., and Tang, J. Exploring the potential of large language models (llms) in learning on graphs, 2024b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.03393>.
- Corsini, A., Porrello, A., Calderara, S., and Dell’Amico, M. Self-labeling the job shop scheduling problem. In *Self-Labeling the Job Shop Scheduling Problem*. Arxiv, 2024.
- Dai, X. Gpu-benchmarks-on-llm-inference. <https://github.com/XiongjieDai/GPU-Benchmarks-on-LLM-Inference>, 2024.
- Demirkol, E., Mehta, S., and Uzsoy, R. Benchmarks for shop scheduling problems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 109(1):137–141, 1998.
- Frieder, S., Berner, J., Petersen, P., and Lukasiewicz, T. Large language models for mathematicians, 2024.
- Garey, M. R., Johnson, D. S., and Sethi, R. The complexity of flowshop and jobshop scheduling. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 1(2):117–129, 1976.
- Gerganov, G. llama.cpp: Llm inference in c/c++. <https://github.com/ggerganov/llama.cpp>, 2023.
- Hu, E. J., yelong shen, Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., Wang, L., and Chen, W. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=nZeVKeeFYf9>.
- Huang, W., Abbeel, P., Pathak, D., and Mordatch, I. Language models as zero-shot planners: Extracting actionable knowledge for embodied agents. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2022.
- Kalajdziewski, D. A rank stabilization scaling factor for fine-tuning with lora, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.03732>.
- Nowicki, E. and Smutnicki, C. An advanced tabu search algorithm for the job shop problem. *Journal of Scheduling*, 8(2):145–159, 2005. doi: 10.1007/s10951-005-6364-5.
- Schulman, J., Wolski, F., Dhariwal, P., Radford, A., and Klimov, O. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347, 2017.
- Taillard, E. Benchmarks for basic scheduling problems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 64(2):278–285, 1993.
- Valmeekam, K., Olmo, A., Sreedharan, S., and Kambhampati, S. Large language models still can’t plan: A benchmark for llms on planning and reasoning about change. In *NeurIPS 2022 Foundation Models for Decision Making Workshop*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=wUU-7XTL5X0>.
- Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Ichter, B., Xia, F., Chi, E. H., Le, Q. V., and Zhou, D. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Google Research, Brain Team*, 2022.
- Yang, C., Wang, X., Lu, Y., Liu, H., Le, Q. V., Zhou, D., and Chen, X. Large language models as optimizers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03409*, 2023.

Zahmani, M. H., Atmani, B., Bekrar, A., and Aissani, N. Multiple priority dispatching rules for the job shop scheduling problem. In *3rd International Conference on Control, Engineering Information Technology (CEIT'2015)*, Tlemcen, Algeria, 2015. doi: 10.1109/CEIT.2015.7232991.

Zhang, C., Song, W., Cao, Z., Zhang, J., Tan, P. S., and Xu, C. Learning to dispatch for job shop scheduling via deep reinforcement learning. In *34th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.

Zhao, J., Zhuo, L., Shen, Y., Qu, M., Liu, K., Bronstein, M. M., Zhu, Z., and Tang, J. Graphtext: Graph learning in text space, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=dbcWzalk6G>.