Scheduling of independent dedicated multiprocessor tasks *

Evripidis Bampis[1] **, Massimiliano Caramia[2] ***, Jiří Fiala[3†], Aleksei V. Fishkin[4 ‡], and Antonio Iovanella[5 §]

[1] LaMI, CNRS-UMR 8042, Univerité d'Evry, Boulevard Mitterrand, 91025 Evry Cedex, France. bampis@lami.univ-evry.fr

[2] Istituto per le Applicazioni del Calcolo "M. Picone" - CNR Viale del Policlinico, 137 - 00161 Roma - Italy. caramia@iac.rm.cnr.it

[3] DIMATIA and ITI, Charles University, Malostranské nám. 2/25, 118 00, Prague, Czech Republic. fiala@kam.mff.cuni.cz

[4] Institut für Informatik und Praktische Mathematik, Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel, Olshausenstrasse 40, 24 098 Kiel, Germany. avf@informatik.uni-kiel.de

[5] Dipartimento di Informatica, Sistemi e Produzione, University of Rome "Tor Vergata", Via del Politecnico, 1 - 00133 Rome, Italy. iovanella@disp.uniroma2.it

Abstract. We study the off and on-line versions of the well known problem of scheduling a set of n independent multiprocessor tasks with prespecified processor allocations on a set of identical processors in order to minimize the makespan. Recently, in [12], it has been proven that in the case when all tasks have unit processing time the problem cannot be approximated within a factor of $m^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}$, neither for some $\varepsilon > 0$, unless P= NP; nor for any $\varepsilon > 0$, unless NP=ZPP. For this special case we give a simple algorithm based on the classical first-fit technique. We analyze the algorithm for both tasks *arrive over time* and tasks *arrive over list* on-line scheduling versions, and show that its competitive ratio is bounded by

* Supported by the bilateral French-German project PROCOPE,

** Research supported by EU APPOL II project IST-2001-32007.

*** Research supported by CNR project CNRG007FC1.

† Research supported by EU ARACNE project HPRN-CT-1999-00112, GAČR project 201/99/0242, and by MECR project LN00A056.

‡ Supported by Graduiertenkolleg 357 "Effiziente Algorithmen und Mehrskalenmethoden".

§ Research supported by CNR project CNRG007FC1.

$2\sqrt{m}$ and $2\sqrt{m}+1$, respectively. Here we also use some preliminary results on (vertex) coloring of k-tuple graphs. For the case of arbitrary processing times, we show that any algorithm which uses the first-fit technique cannot be better than m competitive. Then, by using our split-round technique, we give a $3\sqrt{m}$-approximation algorithm for the off-line version of the problem. Finally, by using some ideas from [20], we adapt the algorithm to the on-line case, in the paradigm of *tasks arriving over time* in which the existence of a task is unknown until its release date, and show that its competitive ratio is bounded by $6\sqrt{m}$. Due to the conducted experimental results, we conclude that our algorithms can perform well in practice.

1 Introduction

Optical networks employing wavelength division multiplexing (WDM) are now a viable technology for implementing a next-generation network infrastructure that will support a diverse set of existing, emerging, and future applications [13]. WDM technology initially was deployed in point-to-point links in *wide* area or *metropolitan* area distances [23]. However, the work on WDM *local area* networks[1] has also been currently under way, see e.g. [16, 18].

The main future of broadcast WDM local area networks is the so-called *one-to-many transmission* or *multicasting* ability [1]. That is, a transmission by a *node* in such a network on a given channel (wavelength) is received by *all* nodes listening on that channel at that point in time (see [21] for a detailed survey on WDM networks). Since two or more nodes may want to send *data packets* to the same destination node, coordination among nodes that wish to communicate with each other is required. Many *protocols* for coordinating *multicast* data transmissions have been proposed in the literature (see [22] for a survey). The approaches used range from sending a different copy of each data packet to each one of the corresponding destinations (*unicast service*), to transmitting a single copy of the data packet to all the destinations at once (*multicast service with no fanout splitting*).

Due to the relation to the later approach, there has been recently a renewed interest to the model of scheduling *dedicated* tasks in the *on-line* context. In this framework, nodes correspond to *processors* and multi-destination data packets to *dedicated tasks*. The goal, minimizing the overall

[1] These networks are known as *single-hop* WDM networks [19].

transmission time, i.e. the time needed to send all data packets out, corresponds to the schedule *makespan* of dedicated tasks.

In this paper we also address the dedicated variant of the *multiprocessor* tasks scheduling problem (see [8] for a survey on some main results). Formally, we are given a set of n tasks $T = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and a set of m processors $M = \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$. Each task $j \in T$ has a processing time p_j, a release date r_j and a prespecified set of processors $fix_j \subseteq M$. Preemptions are not allowed. Each processor can work on at most one task at a time, each task must be processed simultaneously by all processors of fix_j. The objective is to minimize the *makespan* $C_{\max} = \max_j C_j$, where C_j denotes the completion time of task j.

We call fix_j the *type* and $|fix_j|$ the *size* of job $j \in T$, and use $\Delta_{\max}$ to denote $\max_j |fix_j|$ and $r_{\max}$ to denote $\max_j r_j$. To refer to the several variants of the above scheduling problem, we use the standard notation scheme by Graham at al. [15]. For example, $P|\, fix_j, r_j|C_{\max}$ denotes the above problem itself in the *off-line* case[2]; $P|\, on\text{-}line,\, fix_j, p = 1|C_{\max}$ denotes the on-line variant where all $p_j = 1$ and the tasks *arrive over list* [3]; and $P|\, on\text{-}line,\, fix_j, r_j|C_{\max}$ denotes the on-line variant where all p_j are arbitrary and the tasks *arrive over time*[4].

Known results and our contribution. Variants of the multiprocessor tasks scheduling problem have been studied, but the previous research has mainly focused on the off-line case. Hoogeveen et al. [17] showed that already the three-processor problem $P3\,|\, fix_j|\, C_{\max}$ is strongly NP-hard, and proved that even if all tasks have unit processing times, there exists no polynomial approximation algorithm for $P\,|\, fix_j, p_j = 1|\, C_{\max}$ with performance ratio smaller than $\frac{4}{3}$, unless P=NP. However, in the same work it was shown that if the number of processors m is fixed, i.e. $Pm|\, fix_j, p_j = 1|\, C_{\max}$, then the problem is solvable in polynomial time. Later, Amoura et al. [2] proposed a polynomial time approximation scheme (PTAS) for problem

[2] In *off-line* scheduling, the scheduler has full information of the problem instance. In contrast, in *on-line* scheduling, information about the problem instance is made available during the course of scheduling.

[3] The tasks of T are ordered in some list (sequence) and presented one by one to the scheduler according to this list. The existence of a job is not known until all its predecessors in the list have already been scheduled.

[4] The tasks j of T arrive at their release dates r_j. The tasks can be started at a time bigger than or equal to their release dates, and at any point of time, the scheduler only has knowledge of the released tasks.

$Pm|\,\mathit{fix}_j|\,C_{\max}$, and Bampis & Kononov [3] extended this result to a PTAS for $Pm|\,\mathit{fix}_j, r_j|C_{\max}$. A $\frac{7}{6}$-approximation algorithm for $P3|\,\mathit{fix}_j|C_{\max}$, which is due to Goemans [14], still remains the best low time complexity approximation algorithm. Recently, Fishkin et al. [12] extended the negative results presented in [17]. It has been proven that $P\,|\,\mathit{fix}_j, p_j = 1|\,C_{\max}$ cannot be approximated within a factor of $m^{1/2-\varepsilon}$, neither for some $\varepsilon > 0$, unless P=NP; nor for any $\varepsilon > 0$, unless NP=ZPP.

In the on-line context, there are several results known for the *parallel* variant of the multiprocessor tasks scheduling problem, see e.g. [10, 9, 5]. Up to our best knowledge, no on-line algorithms with guaranteed competitive ratio are known for the dedicated variant of the multiprocessor model, considered in this paper. Although some algorithms have been recently proposed in the literature, their performances are not evaluated analytically, but by using simulations [7, 6].

In this paper we present several results, important from both theoretical and practical point of view. First, we deal with the problems where tasks have unit processing times. Using the so-called *first-fit* technique, we give an on-line algorithm for $P|\,\mathit{on\text{-}line}, fix_j, p_j = 1|C_{\max}$, which is k-competitive if the maximum task size $\Delta_{\max}$ is bounded by some constant k. It is interesting to point out that our analysis is based on a transformation of our scheduling problem to the classical (vertex) coloring problem of a particular class of graphs, the intersection graphs of k-tuples. We propose simple extensions of this algorithm to a $2\sqrt{m}$-competitive algorithm for $P\,|\,\mathit{on\text{-}line}, \mathit{fix}_j, p_j = 1|\,C_{\max}$ and $(2\sqrt{m}+1)$-competitive algorithm for $P\,|\,\mathit{on\text{-}line}, \mathit{fix}_j, p_j = 1, r_j|\,C_{\max}$. Clearly, the $2\sqrt{m}$-competitive algorithm and the first-fit algorithm are complementary. For instance, if $k = 2$ then the first-fit algorithm is better. From another side, whenever $k = m$ the first algorithm outperforms the second one.

Next, we switch to the general problem with arbitrary processing times. We show that any on-line algorithm which schedules tasks arriving over list and leaves no unnecessary idles cannot be better than m-competitive. In some sense, this leaves no hope for contracting any good on-line algorithm based on the first-fit technique. However, using our *split-round* technique, we obtain an off-line $3\sqrt{m}$-approximation algorithm for $P\,|\,\mathit{fix}_j|\,C_{\max}$. Then, by using the so-called *active-passive-bins* scheduling technique by Shmoys, Wein & Williamson [20], we give a $6\sqrt{m}$-competitive algorithm for $P\,|\,\mathit{on\text{-}line}, \mathit{fix}_j, r_j|\,C_{\max}$ in which the existence of a task is unknown until its release date.

Finally, we have conducted some experiments based on random generated instances with $m = 20$ processors; $n = 50, 100$ and 200 tasks; $\Delta_{\max} = 4$, 6, 8, 12 maximum size; $r_{\max} = 6$, 18 and 30 maximum release date. Analyzing the results we observed that our algorithms work much better than it can be expected. For all cases, the output makespan exceeded the lower bound, which is also heuristically obtained, by at most a factor of 3.5, though $\sqrt{20} \approx 4.47$. Furthermore, we have found that all the algorithms have low running time, that is a very important factor for real world applications.

Last notes. We say that an algorithm A is a *ρ-approximation* algorithm for all problem instances it outputs a schedule with the makespan at most $\rho \cdot OPT$, where OPT is the makespan of the optimal schedule. If A is an on-line ρ-approximation algorithm, then we say that it is a *ρ-competitive* algorithm or A is *ρ-competitive*. (We may also that ρ is the approximation and/or competitive ratio of A.) Here, the *competitiveness* of an on-line algorithm is evaluated with respect to an off-line optimal algorithm, and hence it indicates the loss associated with not having complete information of the problem instance. Both approximation algorithms and on-line algorithms are assumed to run in polynomial time.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we give some preliminary results. In Section 3.1, we deal with the unit processing times case, and in Section 3.2 with the general case of arbitrary processing times. However, due to space limitation, here we omit the experimental results leaving them to the full version of the paper.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we discuss some general techniques and lemmas that apply throughout our paper. We transform our scheduling problem to the classical (vertex) coloring problem. Then, we use some standard methods from the graph theory to obtain related results. The properties we prove in this section pertain to the case of unit processing times, but the ideas will be used in modified form for arbitrary processing times as well.

2.1 Coloring of the Conflict Graph

Given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, a *clique* of G is a set of mutually adjacent vertices. A maximum clique is, naturally, a clique whose number

of vertices is at least as large as that for any other clique in the graph. If the vertices have *weights* then a maximum *weighted clique* is a clique with the largest possible sum of vertex weights.

A *(vertex) coloring* of $G = (V, E)$ is an assignment of a *color* to each vertex in V. It is required that the colors on the pair of vertices incident to any edge be different. A minimum coloring of a graph is a coloring that uses as few different colors as possible.

Clique and coloring problems are very closely related. It is straightforward to see that the size of the maximum clique of G is a lower bound on the minimum number of labels needed to color a graph.

Recall our scheduling problem. We are given a task set $T = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, processor set $M = \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, and for each task $j \in T$ a processing time p_j, release date r_j, and type $\mathit{fix}_j \subseteq M$. The goal is to find a schedule that minimizes the makespan $C_{\max} = \max_j C_j$.

Consider the case when all $r_j = 0$ and $p_j = 1$. Then, our scheduling problem can be modeled as clique and coloring problems. It involves forming the so-called *conflict* graph G_T with vertices representing the tasks of T. An edge connects two *incompatible* tasks j and i iff $\mathit{fix}_j \cup \mathit{fix}_j \neq \emptyset$. The maximum clique problem is then to find as large a set of pairwise incompatible task as possible. The minimum coloring problem is to assign a color to each task so that every incompatible pair is assigned different colors. Accordingly, having a coloring of the conflict graph G_T one can find a schedule for the tasks of T with the makespan at most the number of colors, and vice versa, having a schedule one can find a coloring with the number of colors at most the schedule makespan. Thus, the maximum clique number of G_T, denoted $\omega(G_T)$, is a lower bound on the schedule makespan of the tasks of T.

Unfortunately, there is no such a simple transformation for the case when all $r_j = 0$, but all p_j are arbitrary. However, we can add a weight p_j to each vertex j of the conflict graph G_T and deal with the maximum weighted clique problem. In this framework, the sum of vertex weights in a maximum weighted clique of G_T, denoted $\omega_p(G_T)$, is a lower bound on the schedule makespan of the tasks of T. (We use this fact only in the last section.)

Consider the case when the maximum task size $\Delta_{\max}$ is bounded by some constant, say k. Then, the conflict graph G_T gets a very specific structure, becoming a *k-tuple graph*. More formally it can be defined as follows. Let X be a finite set. A *k-tuple* of X is a set having k (or less) elements of X. A graph $G = (V, E)$ is a *k-tuple graph* if there exists a set X such that each node of V corresponds to a k-tuple of X and there is an edge in E

between any two vertices iff the intersection of the corresponding k-tuples is not empty. (Notice that several vertices can correspond to a single k-tuple.)

Different variants of the graph (vertex) coloring problem have been studied. It is widely known that in the case of general graphs the coloring problem is strongly NP-hard, and there is no ρ-approximation algorithm with $\rho = n^{1/7-\varepsilon}$ unless P=NP, where n is the number of vertices of the graph [4]. However, for restricted graph classes, there can exist either polynomial time exact or approximation algorithms, as well as on-line coloring algorithms (see [11] for a survey on on-line coloring).

For a graph $G = (V, E)$, an on-line coloring algorithm colors the vertices in V one vertex at a time in the externally determined order $v_1 \prec \cdots \prec v_n$, and at the time a color is irrevocably assigned to v_t, the algorithm sees the vertices adjacent to v_t only among $v_1, \ldots, v_{t-1}$. In the following we use a very simple variant of an on-line coloring algorithm:

First Fit Coloring (FFC): Select vertices v from V in an arbitrary order while coloring with an initial sequence of colors $1, 2, \ldots$. Assign the vertex v the least color that has not already been assigned to any vertex adjacent to v.

Lemma 1. *For a k-tuple graph G, the number of labels used by the algorithm* FFC *is at most $k \cdot w(G)$, where $w(G)$ is the maximum clique number of G.*

Proof. Let X be a finite set and $G = (V, E)$ be a k-tuple graph with the corresponding k-tuples of X. Let $\{a_1, \ldots, a_k\}$ be the k-tuple of X corresponding to a vertex v. Observe that the neighborhood $N(v) = \{u \in V \mid (u, v) \in E\}$ can be split into at most k sets forming disjoint cliques. Each set of vertices in $N(v)$ whose corresponding k-tuples of X contain a common element, is a clique. Thus, we select elements from $\{a_1, \ldots, a_k\}$ one by one, extracting the corresponding cliques from $N(v)$. These cliques are disjoint and cover $N(v)$. Hence, $|N(v)| \leq k \cdot (\omega(G) - 1)$ and FFC cannot use more than $k \cdot \omega(G)$ colors on G. □

3 Scheduling of Dedicated Tasks

In this section we consider the on-line version of the dedicated scheduling problem. In the first part we start from the simplest case of unit processing times. In the last part we consider the general case with arbitrary processing times.

3.1 Unit Processing Times

Consider the case when all $p_j = 1$. Then, we can give the following simple algorithm:

> First Fit Scheduling (FFS):
> Schedule the tasks of T by starting the task j at the earliest interval $[t, t+1)$ in which the processors of fix_j are not busy.

By using the result of Lemma 1 we have:

Lemma 2. *If the maximum task size $\Delta_{\max}$ is bounded by some constant k, then the algorithm* FFS *is k-competitive for $P \,|\, \text{on-line}, fix_j, p_j = 1 | C_{\max}$.*

Proof. First consider the case when the tasks of T arrive over-list. Let OPT be the optimum makespan for $P \,|\, fix_j, p_j = 1 | C_{\max}$. Let G_T be the corresponding conflict graph of task set T. One can see that FFC working on G_T cannot outperform FFS working on T, in the worst case analysis. (Each interval $[t, t+1)$ corresponds to color t, the makespan corresponds to the number of colors, and vice versa.) Thus, since $w(G_T)$ is a lower bound on OPT, by Lemma 1 the makespan of the output schedule by FFS is at most $k \cdot OPT$. □

The above lemma does not guarantee a good performance of FFS on instances with $\Delta_{\max} = m$. However, we can modify the algorithm as follows:

> First Fit Scheduling+ (FFS+):
> Schedule the tasks of T by starting the task j at the earliest interval $[t, t+1)$, $t \geq r_j$ in which the processors of fix_j are not busy and there is no task in $[t, t+1)$
>
> – of size greater than $\sqrt{m}$ if $|fix_j| \leq \sqrt{m}$, and
> – of size at most $\sqrt{m}$ if $|fix_j| > \sqrt{m}$.

Less formally, the output schedule can be split into two parts — the first part includes the intervals during which the tasks have size at most $\sqrt{m}$, call these intervals "red" colored, and the second part includes the intervals during which the processed tasks have a size greater than $\sqrt{m}$, call these intervals "blue" colored. Accordingly, one can think in terms of assigning the tasks, depending on their sizes, to blue or red intervals.

Lemma 3. *The algorithm* FFS+ *is $2\sqrt{m}$-competitive for $P \,|\, \text{on-line}, fix_j, p_j = 1 | C_{\max}$ and is $(2\sqrt{m}+1)$-competitive for $P \,|\, \text{on-line}, fix_j, p_j = 1, r_j | C_{\max}$.*

Proof. First consider the case where the tasks of T arrive over-list. Let $T^+ := \{j \in T : |fix_j| > \sqrt{m}\}$ and $T^- := \{j \in T : |fix_j| \leq \sqrt{m}\}$. Also, let OPT denote the optimal makespan for $P \,|\, fix_j, p_j = 1 |\, C_{\max}$. Then, by Lemma 2 the "red" part of the output schedule corresponding to T^- has a makespan at most $\sqrt{m}OPT$. Regarding the "blue" part of the output schedule corresponding to T^+ observe the following: At least one task appears in each "blue" interval, and since for each $j \in T^+ : |fix_j| > \sqrt{m}$, one may additionally place at most $(m - \sqrt{m})/\sqrt{m} = \sqrt{m} - 1$ tasks in each "blue" interval. Hence, the blue part has a makespan at most $(\sqrt{m} - 1)OPT + OPT$. Combining the two bounds we get that the output makespan is at most $2\sqrt{m}\,OPT$.

Now consider the case where the tasks of T arrive over-time. Let OPT' denote the optimal makespan for $P \,|\, fix_j, p_j = 1, r_j |\, C_{\max}$. Then, it is clear that the release date $r_j \leq OPT'$ for each task $j \in T$. Furthermore, by the above observation we can estimate the completion time of each task $j \in T$ as follows:

$$C_j \leq r_j + 2\sqrt{m}\,OPT \leq OPT' + 2\sqrt{m}\,OPT' \leq (2\sqrt{m} + 1)OPT'.$$

This completes the proof. □

3.2 Arbitrary Processing Times

Now we consider the general case when all p_j are arbitrary. First we analyze the first-fit technique, and then we go to our split-round technique, presenting the main results of this paper.

First-Fit Technique. Consider m tasks $T_1, T_2 \ldots, T_m$ with processing times $p_k = 1 + \frac{k}{m}\varepsilon$ and types $fix_k = \{k\}$ $(k = 1, \ldots, m)$, and, in addition, $m - 1$ tasks $T_{m+1}, T_{m+2}, \ldots, T_{2m-1}$ with the same type $fix_k = \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and processing time $p_k = \frac{\varepsilon}{m-1}$ $(k = m + 1, \ldots, 2m - 1)$.

If all these $2m - 1$ tasks arrive in the order $1, (m + 1), 2, (m + 2), \ldots, i, (m + i), \ldots, (m - 1), (2m - 1), m$, then any deterministic on-line algorithm which leaves no unnecessary idles produces a schedule of makespan greater than $m + 2\varepsilon$, while an optimal schedule has a makespan equal to $1 + 2\varepsilon$. (See Figure 1). Thus, m is a lower bound on the competitive ratio of any on-line algorithm which uses the first-fit technique.

We define $P(T) = \sum_{j \in T} p_j$ to be the total processing time of tasks of T, and $L(T) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j \in T} p_j |fix_j|$ to be the average load of T. Then, it holds



Fig. 1. The output and optimal schedules

that

$$P(T) \leq m \cdot L(T) \qquad \text{and} \qquad L(T) \leq OPT \leq \max_{j \in T} r_j + P(T),$$

where OPT is the minimum makespan for T.

Consider the following algorithm:

GENERAL FIRST FIT SCHEDULING (GFFS): Schedule the tasks of T by starting the task j at the earliest time $t \geq r_j$ such that the processors of fix_j are not busy in interval $[t, t + p_j)$.

Sure, the above algorithm uses the first-fit technique and cannot be better than m-competitive. However, it cannot be much worse than that as well.

Lemma 4. *The algorithm* GFFS *is m-competitive for $P \,|\, \text{on-line}, fix_j \,|\, C_{\max}$ and $(m+1)$-competitive for $P \,|\, \text{on-line}, fix_j, r_j \,|\, C_{\max}$.*

Proof. First consider the case where the tasks of T arrive over-list. Let OPT be the minimal makespan for $P \,|\, fix_j \,|\, C_{\max}$. Let C denote the makespan of the schedule found by GFFS working on T. Since for each task $j \in T$ the release date $r_j = 0$ and the algorithm GFFS uses the first-fit technique, $P(T)$ is an upper bound on C. Hence, it holds that

$$C \leq P(T) \leq m \cdot L(T) \leq m \cdot OPT,$$

i.e. the output schedule's makespan is at most $m \cdot OPT$.

We complete by using the arguments in the proof of Lemma 3. □

Split-Round Technique. Let us consider the following off-line algorithm for problem $P \,|\, fix_j \,|\, C_{\max}$.

SPLIT ROUND SCHEDULING (SRS):
Form $T^+ := \{j \in T : |fix_j| > \sqrt{m}\}$ and $T^- := \{j \in T : |fix_j| \leq \sqrt{m}\}$.

1. Apply GFFS to tasks $j \in T^+$ ordered in an arbitrary way.
2. For each task $j \in T^-$ round p_j to the smallest power of two, say $[p_j]$ [a].
3. Apply GFFS to tasks $j \in T^-$ ordered by non-increasing $[p_j]$'s.

[a] Here $[p_j] = 2^a \geq p_j$ and $2^{a-1} < p_j$.

We can state the following result

Theorem 1. *The algorithm* SRS *is a* $3\sqrt{m}$*-approximation algorithm for problem* $P \,|\, fix_j \,|\, C_{\max}$.

Proof. Let OPT be the minimum makespan for $P \,|\, fix_j \,|\, C_{\max}$. Let C^+ be the makespan of the schedule found by GFFS while working on the tasks of T^+ ordered arbitrary (Step 1), and C^- be the makespan of the schedule found by GFFS while working on the rounded tasks $j \in T^-$ ordered by non-increasing $[p_j]$'s (Steps 2 and 3).

Since for each task $j \in T^+$ the size $|fix_j| > \sqrt{m}$, it holds that

$$L(T^+) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j \in T^+} p_j |fix_j| \geq \frac{\sqrt{m}}{m} \sum_{j \in T^+} p_j = \frac{P(T^+)}{\sqrt{m}}.$$

Thus,

$$C^+ \leq P(T^+) \leq \sqrt{m}\, L(T^+) \leq \sqrt{m}\, OPT.$$

Regarding the tasks of T^- observe the following. First, by applying the rounding procedure we lose at most a factor of 2 in the objective function. Hence, the new minimal makespan, say OPT', is at most $2\,OPT$. Second, the processing time of the tasks of T^- are powers of 2, and GFFS schedules tasks $j \in T^-$ in non-increasing order of $[p_j]$. Hence, a task, say k, is "blocked" by an already scheduled task, say s, if and only if $s : fix_k \cap fix_s \neq \emptyset$. (See Figure 2 for an illustration. Notice that if processing times are not powers of 2 we cannot guarantee this property, that is a base element of our analysis.)

Consider the schedule found by GFFS while working on the rounded tasks $j \in T^-$ ordered by non-increasing $[p_j]$'s. Let k be a task such that



Fig. 2. Schedules for non-rounded and rounded tasks

$C^- = C_k$. Accordingly, $S_k = C_k - p_k = C^- - p_k$ is the starting time of task k. Then, by the above observation and by the fact that GFFS uses the first-fit technique, we can find a sequence $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_q$ of tasks in T^- such that at each moment $t \in [0, S_k)$ for exactly one task $s(t) \in \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_q\}$ it holds that $\mathit{fix}_{s(t)} \cap \mathit{fix}_k \neq \emptyset$. (See Figure 3). Hence,

$$S_k = \sum_{i=1}^{q} p_{s_i} \qquad \text{and} \qquad C^- = p_k + \sum_{i=1}^{q} p_{s_i}.$$



Fig. 3. A task k and a sequence s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, s_5

Since the size $|\mathit{fix}_k| \leq \sqrt{m}$ and each task s_i, $i = 1, \ldots, q$ requires at least one of the processors in τ_k, the makespan of any schedule for tasks $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_q$ and k is at least:

$$L' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \left(p_k + \sum_{i=1}^{q} p_{s_i} \right) = \frac{C^-}{\sqrt{m}}.$$

Furthermore, since these tasks belong to $T^- \subseteq T$ it also holds that $L' \leq OPT' \leq 2OPT$. Hence, we get

$$C^+ + C^- \leq \sqrt{m}\,OPT + 2\sqrt{m}\,OPT \leq 3\sqrt{m}\,OPT,$$

i.e. the makespan of the output schedule by SRS is at most $3\sqrt{m}\,OPT$. □

We are ready to present the following main algorithm:

SPLIT-ROUND SCHEDULING+ (SRS+):

1. At each moment we consider two bins, one of which is *active* and the other one is *passive*.
2. At the first release date, collect the tasks into the active bin.
3. Schedule the tasks of the active bin by SRS while collecting the tasks being released into the passive bin.
4. At each moment when SRS has no task to schedule, exchange the activities of bins.

Here we call the following result by Shmoys, Wein & Williamson in [20]: "Let A be a polynomial-time scheduling algorithm that works in an environment in which each job to scheduled is available at time 0 and which always produces a schedule of length at most ρC^*. For the analogous environment in which the existence of a job is unknown until its release date, there exists another polynomial-time algorithm A' that works in this more general setting and produces a schedule of length at most $2\rho C^*$". In fact, SRS is similar to the algorithm constructed, and we can give the following result

Theorem 2. SRS+ *is* $6\sqrt{m}$*-competitive for* $P \,|\, \text{on-line}, \text{fix}_j, r_j \,|\, C_{\max}$ *in which the existence of a task is unknown until its release date.*

Acknowledgment

We thank to Maxim Sviridenko for giving us useful comments and ideas.

References

1. M. Ammar, G. Polyzos, and S. Tripathi (Eds.). Special issue on network support for multipoint communication. *IEEE Journal Selected Areas in Communications*, 15, 1997.

2. A. K. Amoura, E. Bampis, C. Kenyon, and Y. Manoussakis. Scheduling independent multiprocessor tasks. In *Proceedings 5th European Symposium on Algorithms*, LNCS 1284, pages 1–12. Springer Verlag, 1997.
3. E. Bampis and A. Kononov. On the approximability of scheduling multiprocessor tasks with time dependent processing and processor requirements. In *Proceedings 15th International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium*, San Francisco, 2001.
4. M. Bellare, O. Goldreich, and M. Sudan. Free bits, PCPs, and nonapproximability — towards tight results. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 27:804–915, 1998.
5. S. Bischof and E.W. Mayr. On-line scheduling of parallel jobs with runtime restrictions. In *Proceedings 9th Annual International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, LNCS 1533, pages 119–129. Springer Verlag, 1998.
6. M. Caramia, P. Dell'Olmo, and A. Iovanella. Lower bound algorithms for multiprocessor task scheduling with ready times, 2001. Personal communications.
7. M. Caramia, P. Dell'Olmo, and A. Iovanella. On-line algorithms for multiprocessor task scheduling with ready times, 2001. Personal communications.
8. M. Drozdowski. Scheduling multiprocessor tasks - an overview. *European Journal on Operations Research*, pages 215–230, 1996.
9. A. Feldmann, M.-Y. Kao, J. Sgall, and S.H. Teng. Optimal online scheduling of parallel tasks with dependencies. In *Proceedings 25th ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, pages 642–651, 1993.
10. A. Feldmann, J. Sgall, and S-H. Teng. Dynamic scheduling on parallel machines. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 130:49–72, 1994.
11. A. Fiat and G. J. Woeginger, editors. *Online algorithms. The state of the art.* LNCS 1442. Springer Verlag, 1998.
12. A. V. Fishkin, K. Jansen, and L. Porkolab. On minimizing average weighted completion time of multiprocessor tasks with release dates. In *Proceedings 28th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming*, LNCS 2076, pages 875–886, Crete, 2001. Springer Verlag.
13. O. Gerstel, B. Li, A. McGuire, G. N. Rouskas, K. Sivalingam, and Z. Zhang (Eds.). Special issue on protocols and architectures for next generations optical wdm networks. *IEEE Journal Selected Areas in Communications*, 18, October 2000.
14. M. X. Goemans. An approximation algorithm for scheduling on three dedicated processors. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 61:49–59, 1995.
15. R. L. Graham, E. L. Lawler, J. K. Lenstra, and A. H. G. Rinnooy Kan. Optimization and approximation in deterministic scheduling: A survey. *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, pages 287–326, 1979.
16. The NGI Helious project: Regional Testbed Optical Access Network For IP Multicast and Differentiated Services. http://projects.anr.mcnc.org/Helios/, 2000.

17. J. A. Hoogeveen, S. L. Van de Velde, and B. Veltman. Complexity of scheduling multiprocessor tasks with prespecified processor allocations. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 55:259–272, 1994.
18. M. Kuznetsov, N. Froberg, S. Henion, H. Rao, J. Korn, K. Rauschenbach, E. Modiano, and V. Chan. A next-generation optical regional access networks. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 38:66 – 72, January 2000.
19. B. Mukherjee. Wdm-based local lightwave networks Part I: Single-hop systems. *IEEE Network Magazine*, pages 12–27, 1992.
20. D.B. Shmoys, J. Wein, and D.P. Williamson. Scheduling parallel machines on-line. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 24:1313–1331, 1995.
21. K. M. Sivalingam and S. Subramaniam, editors. *Optical WDM networks: Principles and practice*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.
22. D. Thaker and G. N. Rouskas. Multi-destination communication in broadcast WDM networks: A survey. Technical Report 2000-08, North Caroline State University, 2000.
23. R. E. Wagner, R. C. Alferness, A. A. M. Saleh, and M. S. Goodman. MONET: Multiwavelength Optical Networking. *Journal of Lightwave Technology*, 14:1349, June 1996.