

Simple k -crashing Plan with a Good Approximation Ratio

Ruixi Luo

School of Intelligent Systems
Engineering, Sun Yat-Sen University
Shenzhen, China
luorx@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

Kai Jin

School of Intelligent Systems
Engineering, Sun Yat-Sen University
Shenzhen, China
cscjkk@gmail.com

Zelin Ye

School of Intelligent Systems
Engineering, Sun Yat-Sen University
Shenzhen, China
zrelay@outlook.com

ABSTRACT

In project management, a project is typically described as an activity-on-edge network (AOE network), where each activity / job is represented as an edge of some network N (which is a DAG). Some jobs must be finished before others can be started, as described by the topology structure of N . It is known that job j_i in normal speed would require b_i days to be finished after it is started. Given the network N with the associated edge lengths b_1, \dots, b_m , the duration of the project is determined, which equals the length of the critical path (namely, the longest path) of N .

To speed up the project (i.e. reduce the duration), the manager can crash a few jobs (namely, reduce the length of the corresponding edges) by investing extra resources into that job. However, the time for completing j_i has a lower bound due to technological limits – it requires at least a_i days to be completed. Moreover, it is expensive to buy resources. Given N and an integer $k \geq 1$, the k -crashing problem asks the minimum amount of resources required to speed up the project by k days. We show a simple and efficient algorithm with an approximation ratio $\frac{1}{1} + \dots + \frac{1}{k}$ for this problem.

We also study a related problem called k -LIS, in which we are given a sequence ω of numbers and we aim to find k disjoint increasing subsequence of ω with the largest total length. We show a $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ -approximation algorithm which is simple and efficient.

KEYWORDS

Project duration, Network optimization, Greedy algorithm, Maximum flow, Critical path

ACM Reference Format:

Ruixi Luo, Kai Jin, and Zelin Ye. 2024. Simple k -crashing Plan with a Good Approximation Ratio. In *Proc. of the 23rd International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2024)*, Auckland, New Zealand, May 6 – 10, 2024, IFAAMAS, 8 pages.

1 INTRODUCTION

Critical Path Method (CPM) are commonly used in network analysis and project management. A fundamental problem in CPM is to optimize the total project cost subject to a prescribed completion date [13]. The general setting is that the project manager can expedite a few jobs by investing extra resources, hence reduce the duration of the entire project and thus meet the desired completion date. Meanwhile, the extra resources spent should be as few as possible. A formal description of the problem is given in subsection 1.1. In this paper, we revisit a simple incremental algorithm for solving

this problem and prove that it has an approximation ratio $\frac{1}{1} + \dots + \frac{1}{k}$, where k denotes the amount of days the duration of the project has to be shortened (which is easily determined by the prescribed completion date and the original duration of the project).

The mentioned algorithm is based on greedy. It speeds up the project by only one day at a time, and repeats it k times. Each time it adopts the minimum cost strategy to shorten the project (by one day). This does not guarantee the minimum total cost for $k > 1$ (see an example in subsection 2.3). Nevertheless, it is a simple, efficient, and practical algorithm, which should have been applied by several engineers. Therefore, a theoretical analysis on its approximation performance seems to be important and may benefit relevant researchers and engineers. Such an analysis is not easy and is absent in literature, hence we cover it in this paper.

As a comparison, we also conduct an analysis of a similar greedy algorithm for another fundamental problem called k -LIS problem, in which we are given a sequence ω and we aim to find k disjoint increasing subsequence of ω with the largest total length. The greedy algorithm for this problem is as the following: Find the longest increasing subsequence (LIS) at one time and remove it. Repeat it for k times. However, this does not guarantee an optimum solution as well; for example, consider $\omega = (3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 1, 6, 7, 8, 9)$, $k = 2$. Nevertheless, we prove that it is a $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ -approximation algorithm. Moreover, we show that for every $k > 1$, there are cases for which the greedy solution is only 0.75 times the maximum solution.

1.1 Description of the k -crashing problem

A project is considered as an activity-on-edge network (AOE network, which is a directed acyclic graph) N , where each activity / job of the project is an edge. Some jobs must be finished before others can be started, as described by the topology structure of N .

It is known that job j_i in normal speed would take b_i days to be finished after it is started, and hence the (normal) duration of the project N , denoted by $d(N)$, is determined, which equals the length of the critical path (namely, the longest path) of N .

To speed up the project, the manager can crash a few jobs (namely, reduce the length of the corresponding edges) by investing extra resources into that job. However, the time for completing j_i has a lower bound due to technological limits - it requires at least a_i days to be completed. Following the convention, assume that the duration of a job has a linear relation with the extra resources put into this job; equivalently, there is a parameter c_i (slope), so that shortening j_i by d ($0 \leq d \leq b_i - a_i$) days costs $c_i \cdot d$ resources.

Given project N and an integer $k \geq 1$, the k -crashing problem asks the minimum cost to speed up the project by k days.

In fact, many people also care about the case of non-linear relation, especially the convex case where shortening an edge becomes

Proc. of the 23rd International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2024), N. Alechina, V. Dignum, M. Dastani, J.S. Sichman (eds.), May 6 – 10, 2024, Auckland, New Zealand. © 2024 International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (www.ifaamas.org). This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY 4.0) licence.

more difficult after a previous shortening. Delightfully, the greedy algorithm performs equally well for this convex case. Without any change, it still finds a solution with the approximation ratio $\frac{1}{1} + \dots + \frac{1}{k}$. For simplicity, we focus on the linear case throughout the paper, but our proofs are still correct for the convex case.

1.2 Related work (about k -crashing)

The first solution to the k -crashing problem was given by Fulkerson [4] and by Kelley [8] respectively in 1961. The results in these two papers are independent, yet the approaches are essentially the same, as pointed out in [10]. In both of them, the problem is first formulated into a linear program problem, whose dual problem is a minimum-cost flow problem, which can then be solved efficiently.

Later in 1977, Phillips and Dessouky [10] reported another clever approach (denoted by Algorithm PD). Similar as the greedy algorithm mentioned above, Algorithm PD also consists of k steps, and each step it locates a minimal cut in a flow network derived from the original project network. This minimal cut is then utilized to identify the jobs which should be expedite or de-expedite in order to reduce the project reduction. It is however not clear whether this algorithm can always find an optimal solution. We have a tendency to believe the correctness, yet cannot find a proof in [10].

It is noteworthy to mention that Algorithm PD shares many common logics with the greedy algorithm we considered. Both of them locates a minimal cut in some flow network and then use it to identify the set of jobs to expedite / de-expedite (there is no expedite allowed in the greedy algorithm, but there are de-expedites in Algorithm PD) in the next round. However, the constructed flow networks are different. The one in the greedy algorithm has only capacity upperbounds, whereas the one in Algorithm PD has both capacity upperbounds and lowerbounds and is thus more complex.

The greedy algorithm we considered is much simpler and easier to implement comparing to all the approaches above.

Other approaches for the problem are proposed by Siemens [13] and Goyal [6], but these are heuristic algorithms without any guarantee – approximation ratio are not proved in these papers.

Many variants of the k -crashing problem have been studied in the past decades; see [5], [1], and the references within.

1.3 Related work (about k -LIS)

The k -LIS problem is a generalization of the well-known LIS problem, most of the study about k -LIS lies on revealing the connections between LIS and Young tableau. Utilizing the Young tableau, Schensted [12] managed to compute the length of the longest increasing and decreasing subsequence of ω , which offers a way to solve the LIS problem. Greene [7] extended the result of [12] to k -LIS problem and calculates the exact result (the k increasing subsequences) of the k -LIS problem. First, it takes the largest k rows of the Young tableau of ω . Then it transform ω into a canonical form $\tilde{\omega}$. Next, it transform $\tilde{\omega}$ back to ω while modifying the largest k rows of the Young tableau accordingly. In the end, we can get the modified k rows as the optimal result of the k -LIS problem. The results of [7] are applied in some problems related to LIS; see [14] [3].

Another approach to solve the k -LIS problem is as follows. We first formulate the k -LIS problem into a minimum-cost network flow problem (which contains $O(n^2)$ arcs, where n denotes the

length of the given sequence). Basically, if some element u of ω is smaller than v of ω and u is preceding v , we build an arc from node u' to node v . By solving the flow problem, we obtain the optimum solution of the k -LIS problem. However, the time complexity of this approach is much higher comparing to the greedy algorithm.

Finding an approximation of the LIS can be solved in sublinear time [9]. See more results about LIS in a monograph [11].

2 k -CRASHING PROBLEM

Project N . Assume $N = (V, E)$ is a directed acyclic graph with a single source node s and a single sink node t (a source node refers to a node without incoming edge, and a sink node refers to a node without outgoing edges). Each edge $e_i \in E$ has three attributes (a_i, b_i, c_i) , as introduced in subsection 1.1.

Critical paths & critical edges. A path of N refers to a path of N from source s to sink t . Its length is the total length of the edges included, and the length of edge e_i equals b_i . The path of N with the longest length is called a *critical path*. The duration of N equals the length of the critical paths. There may be more than one critical paths. An edge that belongs to some critical paths is called a *critical edge*.

Accelerate plan X . Denote by $E_{b \setminus a}$ the multiset of edges of N that contains e_i with a multiplicity $b_i - a_i$. Each subset X of $E_{b \setminus a}$ (which is also a multiset) is called an *accelerate plan*, or *plan* for short. The multiplicity of e_i in X , denoted by x_i ($0 \leq x_i \leq b_i - a_i$), describes how much length j_i is shortened; i.e., j_i takes $b_i - x_i$ days when plan X is applied. The *cost* of plan X , denoted by $\text{cost}(X)$, is $\sum_i c_i x_i$.

Accelerated project $N(X)$. Define $N(X)$ as the project that is the same as N , but with b_i decreased by x_i ; in other words, $N(X)$ stands for the project optimized with plan X .

k -crashing. We say a plan X is *k -crashing*, if the duration of the project N is shortened by k when we apply plan X .

Cut of N . Suppose that V is partitioned into two subsets S, T which respectively contain s and t . Then, the set of edges from S to T is referred to as a *cut* of N . Notice that we cannot reach t from s if any cut of N is removed.

Let k_{max} be the duration of the original project N minus the duration of the accelerated project $N(E_{b \setminus a})$. Clearly, the duration of $N(X)$ is at least the duration of $N(E_{b \setminus a})$, since X is a subset of $E_{b \setminus a}$. It follows that a k -crashing plan only exists for $k \leq k_{max}$. Throughout this section, we assume that $k \leq k_{max}$.

The greedy algorithm in the following (see Algorithm 1) finds a k -crashing plan efficiently. It finds the plan incrementally – each time it reduces the duration of the project by 1.

Observe that G is an i -crashing plan of N after the i -th iteration $G \leftarrow G \cup A_i$, as the duration of $N(G)$ is reduced by 1 at each iteration. Therefore, G is a k -crashing plan at the end.

If a 1-crashing plan of $N(G)$ does not exist in the i -th iteration $i \leq k$, we determine that there is no k -crashing plan; i.e. $k > k_{max}$.

Algorithm 1 Greedy algorithm for finding a k -crashing plan.

Input: A project $N = (V, E)$.
Output: A k -crashing plan G .

$G \leftarrow \emptyset$;
for $i = 1$ to k **do**
 Find the optimum 1-crashing plan of $N(G)$, denoted by A_i ;
 $G \leftarrow G \cup A_i$; (regard as multiset union)
end for

THEOREM 2.1. Let $G = A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_k$ be the k -crashing plan found by Algorithm 1. Let OPT denote the optimal k -crashing plan. Then,

$$\text{cost}(G) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{i} \text{cost}(\text{OPT}).$$

The proof of the theorem is given in the following, which applies Lemma 2.2. This applied lemma is nontrivial and is proved below.

LEMMA 2.2. For any project N , its k -crashing plan (where $k \leq k_{\max}$) costs at least k times the cost of the optimum 1-crashing plan.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1. For convenience, let $N_i = N(A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_i)$, for $0 \leq i \leq k$. Note that $N_0 = N$ is the original project.

Fix i in $\{1, \dots, k\}$ in the following. By the algorithm, A_i is the optimum 1-crashing plan of N_{i-1} . Using Lemma 2.2, we know (1) any $(k+1-i)$ -crashing plan of N_{i-1} costs at least $(k+1-i) \cdot \text{cost}(A_i)$.

Let $Y = A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_{i-1}$ and $X = \text{OPT} \setminus Y$; hence $X \cup Y \supseteq \text{OPT}$.

Observe that $N(Y \cup X)$ saves k days comparing to N , because $Y \cup X \supseteq \text{OPT}$ is k -crashing, whereas $N(Y) = N_{i-1}$ saves $i-1$ days comparing to N . So, $N(Y \cup X)$ saves $k - (i-1)$ days comparing to $N(Y)$, which means (2) X is a $(k-i+1)$ -crashing plan of $N(Y) = N_{i-1}$. Combining (1) and (2), $\text{cost}(X) \geq (k+1-i)\text{cost}(A_i)$.

Further since $\text{cost}(X) \leq \text{cost}(\text{OPT})$ (as $X \subseteq \text{OPT}$), we obtain a relation $(k-i+1)\text{cost}(A_i) \leq \text{cost}(\text{OPT})$. Therefore,

$$\text{cost}(G) = \sum_{i=1}^k \text{cost}(A_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{k-i+1} \text{cost}(\text{OPT}).$$

□

The *critical graph* of network H , denoted by H^* , is formed by all the critical edges of H ; all the edges not critical are removed in H^* .

Before presenting the proof to the key lemma (Lemma 2.2), we shall briefly explain how do we find the optimum 1-crashing plan of some project H (e.g., the accelerated project $N(G)$ in Algorithm 1). First, compute the critical graph H^* and define the capacity of e_i in H^* by c_i if e_i in H can still be shortend (i.e., its length is more than a_i) and otherwise define the capacity of e_i in H^* to be ∞ . Then we compute the minimum $s-t$ cut of H^* (using the max-flow algorithm [2]), and this cut gives the optimum 1-crashing plan of H .

2.1 proof (part I)

PROPOSITION 2.3. A k -crashing plan X of N contains a cut of N^* .

PROOF. Because X is k -crashing, each critical path of N will be shortened in $N(X)$ and that means it contains an edge of X . Further since paths of N^* are critical paths of N (which simply follows from the definition of N^*), each path of N^* contains an edge in X .

As a consequence, after removing the edges in X that belong to N^* , we disconnect source s and sink t in N^* . Now, let S denote the vertices of N^* that can still be reached from s after the remove, and let T denote the remaining part. Observe that all edges from S to T in N^* , which forms a cut of N^* , belong to X . □

When X contains at least one cut of network H , let $\text{mincut}(H, X)$ be the minimum cut of H among all cuts of H that belong to X .

Recall that $d(H)$ is the duration of network H .

In the following, suppose X is a k -crashing plan of N . We introduce a decomposition of X which is crucial to our proof.

First, define

$$\begin{cases} N_1 & = & N, \\ X_1 & = & X, \\ C_1 & = & \text{mincut}(N_1^*, X_1). \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

(Because $X_1 = X$ is k -crashing, applying Proposition 2.3, X_1 contains at least one cut of N_1^* . It follows that C_1 is well-defined.)

Next, for $1 < i \leq k$, define

$$\begin{cases} N_i & = & N_{i-1}^*(C_{i-1}), \\ X_i & = & X_{i-1} \setminus C_{i-1}, \\ C_i & = & \text{mincut}(N_i^*, X_i). \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

See Figure 1 for an example.

PROPOSITION 2.4. For $1 < i \leq k$, it holds that

1. $d(N_i) = d(N_{i-1}) - 1$ (namely, $d(N_i) = d(N) - i + 1$).
2. X_i contains a cut of N_i^* (and thus C_i is well-defined).

PROOF. 1. Because C_{i-1} is a cut of N_{i-1}^* , set C_{i-1} is a 1-crashing plan of N_{i-1}^* , which means $d(N_{i-1}^*(C_{i-1})) \leq d(N_{i-1}^*) - 1$.

Moreover, it cannot hold that $d(N_{i-1}^*(C_{i-1})) \leq d(N_{i-1}^*) - 2$. Otherwise, cancel one edge of C_{i-1} and it still holds that $d(N_{i-1}^*(C_{i-1})) \leq d(N_{i-1}^*) - 1$, which means C_{i-1} is at least 1-crashing for N_{i-1}^* , and thus contains a cut of N_{i-1}^* (by Proposition 2.3). This contradicts the assumption that C_{i-1} is the minimum cut.

Therefore, $d(N_i) = d(N_{i-1}^*(C_{i-1})) = d(N_{i-1}^*) - 1 = d(N_{i-1}) - 1$.

2. According to Proposition 2.3, it is sufficient to prove that X_i is a 1-crashing plan to N_i .

Suppose to the opposite that X_i is not 1-crashing to N_i . There exists a path P in N_i^* that is disjoint with X_i . Observe that

- (1) The length of P in $N(X)$ is the original length of P (in N) minus the number of edges in X that fall in P .
- (2) The length of P in N_i^* is the original length of P (in N) minus the number of edges in $(C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_{i-1})$ that fall in P .
- (3) The number of edges in $(C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_{i-1})$ that fall in P equals the number of edges in X that fall in P , because $X \setminus (C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_{i-1}) = X_i$ is disjoint with P .

Together, the length of P in $N(X)$ equals the length of P in N_i^* , which equals $d(N_i^*) = d(N_i) = d(N) - i + 1 > d(N) - k$. This means X is not a k -crashing plan of N , contradicting our assumption. □

The following lemma easily implies Lemma 2.2.

LEMMA 2.5. $\text{cost}(C_i) \leq \text{cost}(C_{i+1})$ for any i ($1 \leq i < k$).

We show how to prove Lemma 2.2 in the following. The proof of Lemma 2.5 will be shown in the next subsection.




Figure 1: An example of the construction of N_i, X_i, C_i .

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.2. Suppose X is k -crashing to N . By Lemma 2.5, we know $\text{cost}(C_1) \leq \text{cost}(C_i)$ ($1 \leq i \leq k$). Further since $\bigcup_{i=1}^k C_i \subseteq X$,

$$k \cdot \text{cost}(C_1) \leq \text{cost}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^k C_i\right) \leq \text{cost}(X).$$

Because C_1 is the minimum cut of N^* that is contained in X , whereas A_1 is the minimum cut of N^* among all, $\text{cost}(A_1) \leq \text{cost}(C_1)$. To sum up, we have $k \cdot \text{cost}(A_1) \leq \text{cost}(X)$. \square

It is noteworthy to mention that $\bigcup_{i=1}^k C_i$ is not always equal to X and $\bigcup_{i=1}^k C_i$ may not be k -crashing.

2.2 proof (part II)

Assume i ($1 \leq i < k$) is fixed. In the following we prove that $\text{cost}(C_i) \leq \text{cost}(C_{i+1})$, as stated in Lemma 2.5. Some additional notation shall be introduced here. See Figure 2 and Figure 3.

Assume the cut C_i of N_i^* divides the vertices of N_i^* into two parts, U_i, W_i , where $s \in U_i$ and $t \in W_i$. The edges of N_i^* are divided into four parts: 1. S_i – the edges within U_i ; 2. T_i – the edges within W_i ; 3. C_i – the edges from U_i to W_i ; 4. RC_i – the edges from W_i to U_i .




Figure 2: Example of the definition of S_i, T_i, RC_i and C_i

PROPOSITION 2.6. (1) $C_{i+1} \cap RC_i = \emptyset$ and (2) $C_i \subseteq N_{i+1}^*$.

PROOF. (1) Consider N_i^* . Any path involving RC_i goes through C_i at least twice. Such paths are shortened by C_i by at least 2, and are thus excluded from N_{i+1} . However, C_{i+1} are edges in N_{i+1}^* and so are included in N_{i+1} . Together, $C_{i+1} \cap RC_i = \emptyset$.

(2) Suppose there is an edge $e_i \in C_i$ and $e_i \notin N_{i+1}^*$. All paths in N_i^* passing e_i will be shortened by at least 2 after expediting C_i to avoid becoming a critical path (which makes e_i critical). If the shortening of e_i is canceled, the paths can still be shortened by 1. So $C_i \setminus \{e_i\}$ still contains a cut to N_i^* , which violates the assumption that C_i is the minimum cut, contradictory. So $C_i \subseteq N_{i+1}^*$. \square

Because C_{i+1} is a subset of the edges of N_{i+1}^* , and the edges of N_{i+1}^* are also in N_i^* , we see $C_{i+1} \subseteq T_i \cup S_i \cup C_i \cup RC_i$. Further since $C_{i+1} \cap RC_i = \emptyset$ (proposition 2.6), set C_{i+1} consists of three disjoint parts:

$$\begin{cases} C_{i+1}^+ = C_{i+1} \cap T_i; \\ C_{i+1}^0 = C_{i+1} \cap C_i; \\ C_{i+1}^- = C_{i+1} \cap S_i. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Due to $C_i \subseteq N_{i+1}^*$ (proposition 2.6), set C_i consists of four disjoint parts:

$$\begin{cases} C_i^+ = C_i \cap T_{i+1} \\ C_i^0 = C_i \cap C_{i+1} \\ C_i^- = C_i \cap S_{i+1} \\ C_i^R = C_i \cap RC_{i+1} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$




Figure 3: Key notation used in the proof of Lemma 2.5.

See Figure 3 for an illustration. Note that $C_i^0 = C_{i+1}^0$.

PROPOSITION 2.7.

1. $C_{i+1}^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^+$ contains a cut of N_i^* .
2. $C_{i+1}^- \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^-$ contains a cut of N_i^* .

PROOF. To show that $C_{i+1}^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^+$ contains a cut of N_i^* , it is sufficient to prove that any path P in N_i^* goes through $C_{i+1}^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^+$.

Assume that P is disjoint with $C_i^+ \cup C_i^0$, otherwise it is trivial. We shall prove that P goes through C_{i+1}^+ .

Clearly, P goes through $C_i = C_i^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^- \cup C_i^R$, a cut of N_i^* . Therefore, P goes through $C_i^- \cup C_i^R$. See Figure 4.

Take the last edge in $C_i^- \cup C_i^R$ that P goes through; denoted by e_a with endpoint a . Denote the part of P after e_a by P^+ ($P^+ \cap C_i = \emptyset$).

We now claim that

- (1) $P^+ \subseteq T_i$.
- (2) In N_i^* , there must be a path $P^- \subseteq S_i$ from the source to e_a without passing C_i . ($P^- \cap C_i = \emptyset$)
- (3) $a \in U_{i+1}$.

Since P is disjoint with $C_i^+ \cup C_i^0$ and P^+ has gone through $C_i^- \cup C_i^R$, we obtain (1).

If (2) does not hold, then all paths in N_i^* that pass through e_a have pass through C_i already. In this case, $C_i \setminus e_a$ also contains a cut of N_i^* , which contradicts our definition of minimum cut C_i . Thus we have (2).

By the definition (3), any edge of $C_i^- \cup C_i^R$ ends at a vertex of U_{i+1} . Since a is the endpoint of $e_a \in C_i^- \cup C_i^R$, we have (3).

By (2), we can obtain a P^- from s to e_a . Concatenate P^-, e_a, P^+ , we obtain a path P' in N_i^* . Since $(P^- \cup P^+) \cap C_i = \emptyset$ and $e_a \in C_i$, P' only goes through $C_i^- \cup C_i^R$ once. So P' is only shortened by 1 and still critical after expediting C_i . Therefore, P' exists in N_{i+1}^* .

According to (3), we known that $P^+ \in P'$ starts with $a \in U_{i+1}$ and ends at the sink in W_{i+1} . Thus it must go through the cut C_{i+1} .

According to (1) and definition (3), path P^+ (which is a subset of T_i due to (1)) can only go through $C_{i+1}^+ \subseteq T_i$.

Since $P^+ \subseteq P$, we have P goes through C_{i+1}^+ . So any path P in N_i^* goes through $C_{i+1}^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^+$.

Therefore, $C_{i+1}^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^+$ contains a cut of N_i^* .




Figure 4: Construction of P' in the proof of Proposition 2.7 part 1.

To show that $C_{i+1}^- \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^-$ contains a cut of N_i^* , it is sufficient to prove that any path P in N_i^* goes through $C_{i+1}^- \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^-$.

Assume that P is disjoint with $C_i^- \cup C_i^0$, otherwise it is trivial. We shall prove that P goes through C_{i+1}^- .

Clearly, P goes through $C_i = C_i^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^- \cup C_i^R$, a cut of N_i^* . Therefore, P goes through $C_i^+ \cup C_i^R$. See Figure 5.

Take the first edge in $C_i^+ \cup C_i^R$ that P goes through; denoted by e_b with start point b . Denote the part of P before e_b by P^- ($P^- \cap C_i = \emptyset$).

We now claim that

- (1) $P^- \subseteq S_i$.
- (2) In N_i^* , there must be a path $P^+ \subseteq T_i$ from e_b to the sink without passing C_i . ($P^+ \cap C_i = \emptyset$)
- (3) $b \in W_{i+1}$.

Since P is disjoint with $C_i^- \cup C_i^0$ and P^- hasn't reach $C_i^+ \cup C_i^R$, we obtain (1).

If (2) does not hold, then all paths in N_i^* that pass through e_b will pass through C_i anyway. In this case, $C_i \setminus e_b$ also contains cut of N_i^* , which contradicts our definition of minimum cut C_i . Thus we have (2).

By the definition (3), any edge of $C_i^+ \cup C_i^R$ starts with a vertex of W_{i+1} . Since b is the start of $e_b \in C_i^+ \cup C_i^R$, we have (3).

By (2), we can obtain a P^+ from e_b to the sink. Concatenate P^-, e_b, P^+ , we obtain a path P' in N_i^* . Since $(P^- \cup P^+) \cap C_i = \emptyset$ and $e_b \in C_i$, P' only goes through $C_i^+ \cup C_i^R$ once. So P' is only shortened by 1 and still critical after expediting C_i . Therefore, P' exists in N_{i+1}^* .

According to (3), we known that $P^- \in P'$ starts from the source and ends at $b \in W_{i+1}$. Thus it must go through the cut C_{i+1} .

According to (1) and definition (3), path P^- (which is a subset of S_i due to (1)) can only go through $C_{i+1}^- \subseteq S_i$.

Since $P^- \subseteq P$, we have P goes through C_{i+1}^- . So any path P in N_i^* goes through $C_{i+1}^- \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^-$.

Therefore, $C_{i+1}^- \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^-$ contains a cut of N_i^* . \square

We are ready to prove Lemma 2.5.

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.5. According to proposition 2.7, $C_{i+1}^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^+$ and $C_{i+1}^- \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^-$ each contains a cut of N_i^* . Notice that $((C_{i+1}^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^+) \cup (C_i^- \cup C_i^0 \cup C_{i+1}^-) \cup C_i^R) = (C_i \cup C_{i+1}) \subseteq X_i$, so




Figure 5: Construction of P' in the proof of Proposition 2.7 part 2.

the mentioned two cuts are in X_i . Further since C_i is the minimum cut of N_i^* in X_i . We obtain

$$\text{cost}(C_i) = \text{cost}(C_i^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^- \cup C_i^R) \leq \text{cost}(C_{i+1}^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^+)$$

$$\text{cost}(C_i) = \text{cost}(C_i^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^- \cup C_i^R) \leq \text{cost}(C_{i+1}^- \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^-)$$

By adding the inequalities above (and note that $C_{i+1}^0 = C_i^0 = C_i \cap C_{i+1}$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\text{cost}(C_i^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^- \cup C_i^R) \\ & \leq \text{cost}(C_{i+1}^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^+) + \text{cost}(C_{i+1}^- \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^-) \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\text{cost}(C_i^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^-) + 2\text{cost}(C_i^R) \\ & \leq \text{cost}(C_{i+1}^- \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^+) + \text{cost}(C_{i+1}^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^-). \end{aligned}$$

By removing one piece of $\text{cost}(C_i^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_i^-)$ from both side,

$$\text{cost}(C_i) + \text{cost}(C_i^R) \leq \text{cost}(C_{i+1}^+ \cup C_i^0 \cup C_{i+1}^-) = \text{cost}(C_{i+1})$$

Therefore, $\text{cost}(C_i) \leq \text{cost}(C_{i+1})$. \square

Recall the ‘‘convex case’’ mentioned in subsection 1.1, in which shortening an edge becomes more and more expensive. We claim that Algorithm 1 finds a solution with the approximation ratio $\frac{1}{1} + \dots + \frac{1}{k}$ even for this convex case. Essentially, the proof does not need any change. We leave the readers to verify this by themselves. (Hint: the value of the crashing cost is only applied in Lemma 2.5, so all the other lemmas or propositions remain correct.)

2.3 Counter-example of Algorithm 1

The greedy algorithm given in Algorithm 1 does not always find an optimal k -crashing plan. Here we show an example.

The network is as shown in Figure 6 (a), and we consider $k = 2$. The critical path of this network has length 9. The unique critical path consists of jobs j_1, j_3 , and j_5 .

The greedy algorithm expedites job j_3 for one day in the first iteration; see Figure 6 (c). It further expedites jobs j_1 and j_2 for one day in the second iteration; see Figure 6 (d). The total cost is $9 + 9 + 10 = 28$.

The optimal k -crashing plan is to expedite jobs j_1 and j_5 , as shown in Figure 6 (b), which costs $10 + 10 = 20$.

3 THE k -LIS PROBLEM

Recall that the k -LIS problem aims to find k disjoint increasing subsequences among a given sequence (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) , so that the total length of the k subsequences is maximized. The following greedy algorithm can be used to find a solution for the problem.




Figure 6: An example with 5 jobs. The parameters a_i, b_i, c_i of job j_i are shown as a label $i : [a_i, b_i](c_i)$ in the graph. The source s equals 1, whereas the sink t equals 4.

Algorithm 2 Greedy algorithm for k -LIS problem

Input: A sequence of number ω .

Output: k increasing subsequences of ω .

for $i = 1$ to k **do**

 Find the longest increasing subsequence A_i of ω ;

 Output A_i and remove A_i from ω ;

end for

This algorithm does not guarantee an optimal result for $k > 1$. For example, consider $\omega = (3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 1, 6, 7, 8, 9)$, $k = 2$. We have the optimal result as $\{(3, 4, 5, 8, 9), (1, 6, 7, 8, 9)\}$ with the total length of 10. Yet the greedy algorithm finds $\{(3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9), (8, 9)\}$ with a total length of 9, which is not optimal.

3.1 A lower Bound of the Greedy Algorithm

We show that Algorithm 2 is an $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ -approximation algorithm in the following. Denote by $|\alpha|$ the length of any sequence α . Moreover, for any set \mathcal{S} of (nonoverlapping) subsequences, let $|\mathcal{S}|$ denote the total length of subsequences in \mathcal{S} .

Let L_1, \dots, L_k denote the nonoverlapping subsequences given by the optimal solution of the k -LIS problem. Assume that $|L_1| \geq \dots \geq |L_k|$ without loss of generality. Let A_1, \dots, A_k denote the nonoverlapping subsequences found by the greedy algorithm (Algorithm 2). To be clear, A_i refers to the subsequence found at the i -th step.

For any x in $\{0, \dots, k\}$, define $r_x(L_i) = L_i \setminus \{A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_x\}$, which is the remaining part of L_i after removing those elements selected in the first x rounds of the greedy algorithm.

We start with the case $k = 2$, and we first bound $\sum_{i=1}^k |r_1(L_i)|$.

$$|r_1(L_1)| + |r_1(L_2)| \geq |L_1| + |L_2| - |A_1| \quad (5)$$

PROOF OF (5). Following the definition of $r_1(L_1)$ and $r_1(L_2)$, we have

$$L_1 \cup L_2 \subseteq r_1(L_1) \cup r_1(L_2) \cup A_1,$$

and thus

$$|L_1 \cup L_2| \leq |r_1(L_1) \cup r_1(L_2) \cup A_1|.$$

Note that the left side equals $|L_1| + |L_2|$, whereas the right side equals $|r_1(L_1)| + |r_1(L_2)| + |A_1|$, because of the disjointness of L_1, L_2 and that of $r_1(L_1), r_1(L_2), A_1$. Therefore, we obtain (5). \square

Next, we point out two relations between $|A_i|$ and $|L_i|$.

$$2|A_1| \geq |L_1| + |L_2| \quad (6)$$

$$2|A_2| + |A_1| \geq |L_1| + |L_2| \quad (7)$$

Summing up (6) divided by 4 with (7) divided by 2, $|A_1| + |A_2| \geq \frac{3}{4}(|L_1| + |L_2|)$. So, Algorithm 2 is a $\frac{3}{4}$ -approximation for $k = 2$.

PROOF OF (6). $2|A_1| = |A_1| + |A_1| \geq |L_1| + |L_2|$. \square

PROOF OF (7). At the moment where the greedy algorithm is about to select A_2 (after chosen A_1), sequence $r_1(L_1)$ and $r_1(L_2)$ are both available for being selected by the greedy algorithm, hence

$$|A_2| \geq |r_1(L_1)| \text{ and } |A_2| \geq |r_1(L_2)|. \quad (8)$$

Summing them up, $2|A_2| \geq |r_1(L_1)| + |r_1(L_2)|$. Combining this with (5), we have $2|A_2| \geq |L_1| + |L_2| - |A_1|$, i.e., (7) holds. \square

We extend the above process to the case $k > 2$ in the next. Denote $\text{OPT} = \{L_1, \dots, L_k\}$, and $g_x = |A_1| + \dots + |A_x|$ for $x \leq k$.

LEMMA 3.1. For each x ($1 \leq x \leq k$),

$$\sum_{i=1}^x |r_x(L_i)| \geq |\text{OPT}| - g_x, \quad (9)$$

$$k|A_x| + g_{x-1} \geq |\text{OPT}| \quad (10)$$

Be aware that (9) extends (5), whereas (10) extends (6) and (7).

PROOF OF (9). Denote $B = \bigcup_{j=1}^x A_j$ for short in this proof. Recall that $L_i \setminus B$ is defined to be $r_x(L_i)$. Clearly, $\text{OPT} \setminus B = (L_1 \cup \dots \cup L_k) \setminus B = r_x(L_1) \cup \dots \cup r_x(L_k)$. As a corollary,

$$\text{OPT} \subseteq (\text{OPT} \setminus B) \cup B = r_x(L_1) \cup \dots \cup r_x(L_k) \cup B.$$

It follows that $|\text{OPT}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k |r_x(L_i)| + g_x$. Hence (9) holds. \square

PROOF OF (10). Similar to (8), we have

$$|A_x| \geq |r_{x-1}(L_i)| \text{ (for each } i \in \{1, \dots, k\}). \quad (11)$$

Applying (9), $g_{x-1} \geq |\text{OPT}| - \sum_{i=1}^k |r_{x-1}(L_i)|$. Together, $g_{x-1} \geq |\text{OPT}| - k|A_x|$; namely, (10) holds. \square

THEOREM 3.2. For any $k \geq 1$, it holds that

$$\frac{g_k}{|\text{OPT}|} \geq 1 - \left(\frac{k-1}{k}\right)^k > 1 - \frac{1}{e}. \quad (12)$$

PROOF. We first claim that for each x ($1 \leq x \leq k$),

$$kg_x \geq \sum_{i=0}^{x-1} \left(\frac{k-1}{k}\right)^i |\text{OPT}|. \quad (13)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} kg_k &\geq \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{k-1}{k}\right)^i |\text{OPT}| \\ &= \frac{\left(\frac{k-1}{k}\right)^k - 1}{\frac{k-1}{k} - 1} |\text{OPT}| = k \left(1 - \left(\frac{k-1}{k}\right)^k\right) |\text{OPT}|, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which implies the ratio in (12).

We prove the essential formula (13) by induction in the following.

Note that $kg_1 = k|A_1| \geq |L_1| + \dots + |L_k| = |\text{OPT}|$, whereas $\sum_{i=0}^0 \left(\frac{k-1}{k}\right)^i = 1$. So (13) holds for $x = 1$. Next, assuming that (13) holds for $x = m - 1$, we shall prove that it also holds for $x = m$.

$$\begin{aligned} kg_m &= k(|A_m| + g_{m-1}) = (k|A_m| + g_{m-1}) + \frac{k-1}{k}(kg_{m-1}) \\ &\geq |\text{OPT}| + \frac{k-1}{k} \sum_{i=0}^{m-2} \left(\frac{k-1}{k}\right)^i |\text{OPT}| \\ &= |\text{OPT}| + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{k-1}{k}\right)^i |\text{OPT}| = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{k-1}{k}\right)^i |\text{OPT}|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the formula (13) also holds for x , completing the proof. \square

3.2 Examples where $\frac{g_k}{|\text{OPT}|} \approx \frac{3}{4}$ for any $k \geq 2$

This subsection constructs an example, in which

$$\frac{g_k}{|\text{OPT}|} = \frac{1}{k^2} \lceil \frac{3}{4}k^2 \rceil \quad (15)$$

First, we define a $k \times k$ matrix M , whose rows are indexed with $1, \dots, k$ from bottom to top, and columns are indexed with $1, \dots, k$ from left to right. Each element in the i -th row has a value i .

k	\dots	k
\vdots	\ddots	\vdots
1	\dots	1

Next, build a sequence ω of length k^2 by concatenating the following diagonals of $M - (M_{1,1}), (M_{2,1}, M_{1,2}), \dots, (M_{k,1}, \dots, M_{1,k}), \dots, (M_{k,k-1}, M_{k-1,k}), (M_{k,k})$. Elements within each diagonal are enumerated from top left to bottom right; and diagonals are enumerated from left to right; e.g. $\omega = (1, 2, 1, 3, 2, 1, 3, 2, 3)$ for $k = 3$.

It is obvious that ω can be partitioned into k subsequences, each of which is a copy of $(1, \dots, k)$. This means $|\text{OPT}| = k^2$ when ω is the given input of the k -LIS problem. In the following we show that the greedy algorithm may return with $g_k = \lceil \frac{3}{4}k^2 \rceil$.

Let D_{1-k}, \dots, D_{k-1} denote the $2k - 1$ diagonals of M parallel to the minor diagonal of M ; formally, D_x ($1 - k \leq x \leq k - 1$) contains $M_{i,j}$ if $j = i + x$. We regard D_x as a sequence rather than a set — the elements are listed from bottom left to top right; e.g., $D_0 = (M_{1,1}, \dots, M_{k,k})$. In this way, each D_x is a subsequence of ω .

D_{1-k}	\dots	D_{-1}	D_0
\vdots	\ddots	\ddots	D_1
D_{-1}	D_0	\ddots	\vdots
D_0	D_1	\dots	D_{k-1}

LEMMA 3.3. *The greedy algorithm above may return the longest k diagonals among D_{1-k}, \dots, D_{k-1} as its solution (namely, it returns $A_1 = D_0, A_{2i} = D_i, A_{2i+1} = D_{-i}$), yielding a total length $\lceil \frac{3}{4}k^2 \rceil$.*

PROOF. Clearly, D_0 can be chosen as A_1 , because $|D_0| = k$.

Suppose the lemma holds for the first $2j - 1$ steps $j \geq 1$. Let $i = 2j$. Currently, the $2j - 1$ longest subdiagonals of the table have been removed, leaving 2 symmetrical triangular areas at the top left and bottom right of the table. Let T_1 denote the top left triangular area and T_2 denote the bottom right triangular area.

k	...	k	×
⋮	⋱	×	$k - j$
$j + 1$	×	⋱	⋮
×	1	...	1

Note that there are 2 subdiagonals with the length of $k - j$, one is $\{j + 1, \dots, k\}$, the other is $\{1, \dots, k - j\}$, which are the longest subdiagonals at the moment. Now we prove that there is no increasing subsequence left that is longer than $k - j$.

Suppose we pick an increasing subsequence S from $\omega_{k \times k}$, we discuss its maximum length case by case.

(i) If S starts in T_1 , it starts from a number no smaller than $j + 1$. Since we only have k numbers to form a sequence, S can only be at most $k - j$ long.

(ii) If S ends in T_2 , it ends with a number no bigger than $k - j$. Since we only have k numbers to form a sequence, S can only be at most $k - j$ long.

(iii) If S starts in T_2 and ends in T_1 , it must have two consecutive numbers $s_1 s_2$, so that s_1 is in T_2 and s_2 is in T_1 . Then, we know that for s_1 in T_2 , we have $s_1 + j$ to the left of it in $\omega_{k \times k}$. By observing the table, we know that for all possible options in T_1 , we have $s_2 > s_1 + j$. Since we only have k numbers to form a sequence, so $|S| \leq k - j$.

Therefore, for all possible increasing subsequence S , we have $|S| \leq k - j$. So we take the two subdiagonals with the length of $k - j$ as the D_{\max} for step $2j$ and $2j + 1$, and they are the longest increasing subsequences at that time.

The total length of $|A_1| + \dots + |A_k|$ can be calculated as follows.

$$\begin{cases} k + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{k-1}{2}} (k - i) = \frac{3k^2+1}{4} = \lceil \frac{3}{4}k^2 \rceil, & k \text{ is odd,} \\ k + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{k-2}{2}} (k - i) + \frac{k}{2} = \frac{3k^2}{4} = \lceil \frac{3}{4}k^2 \rceil & k \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

□

4 SUMMARY & FUTURE WORK

We have shown that simple greedy algorithms achieve pretty small approximation ratio in k -LIS and k -crashing problems. And the analysis is non-trivial.

Hopefully, the techniques developed in this paper can be used for analyzing greedy algorithms of other related problems.

We would like to end up this paper with one challenging problem: Can we prove a constant approximation ratio for Algorithm 1?

REFERENCES

- [1] Pablo Ballesteros-Pérez, Kamel Mohamed Elamrousy, and M^a Carmen González-Cruz. 2019. Non-linear time-cost trade-off models of activity crashing: Application to construction scheduling and project compression with fast-tracking. *Automation in Construction* 97 (2019), 229–240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2018.11.001>
- [2] Oliverio Cruz-Mejia and Adam N. Letchford. 2023. A survey on exact algorithms for the maximum flow and minimum-cost flow problems. *Networks* 82, 2 (2023), 167–176. <https://doi.org/10.1002/net.22169>
- [3] Patrik L Ferrari, Muhittin Mungan, and M Mert Terzi. 2022. The Preisach graph and longest increasing subsequences. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré D* (2022).
- [4] Delbert Ray Fulkerson. 1961. A Network Flow Computation for Project Cost Curves. *Management Science* 7, 2 (1961), 167–178. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2627099>
- [5] José Eduardo Vinhaes Ger and Raad Yahya Qassim. 2008. Project Acceleration via Activity Crashing, Overlapping, and Substitution. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management* 55, 4 (2008), 590–601. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2008.927786>
- [6] Suresh K. Goyal. 1996. A simple time-cost tradeoff algorithm. *Production Planning & Control* 7, 1 (1996), 104–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537289608930331>
- [7] Curtis Greene. 1974. An extension of Schensted's theorem. *Advances in Mathematics* 14, 2 (1974), 254–265.
- [8] James E. Kelley. 1961. Critical-Path Planning and Scheduling: Mathematical Basis. *Operations Research* 9, 3 (1961), 296–320. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/167563>
- [9] Michael Mitzenmacher and Saeed Seddighin. 2021. Improved sublinear time algorithm for longest increasing subsequence. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*. SIAM, 1934–1947.
- [10] Steve Phillips and Mohamed I. Dessouky. 1977. Solving the Project Time/Cost Tradeoff Problem Using the Minimal Cut Concept. *Management Science* 24, 4 (1977), 393–400. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2630261>
- [11] Dan Romik. 2015. *The surprising mathematics of longest increasing subsequences*. Number 4. Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Craig Schensted. 1961. Longest increasing and decreasing subsequences. *Canadian Journal of mathematics* 13 (1961), 179–191.
- [13] Nicolai Siemens. 1971. A Simple CPM Time-Cost Tradeoff Algorithm. *Management Science* 17, 6 (1971), B354–B363. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2629138>
- [14] Hugh Thomas and Alexander Yong. 2011. Longest increasing subsequences, Plancherel-type measure and the Hecke insertion algorithm. *Advances in Applied Mathematics* 46, 1-4 (2011), 610–642.