

# Scheduling two types of jobs with minimum makespan

Song Cao<sup>[0009–0002–1760–3820]</sup> and Kai Jin<sup>[0000–0003–3720–5117]</sup>

Shenzhen Campus of Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China  
 caos6@mail2.sysu.edu.cn  
 jink8@mail.sysu.edu.cn

**Abstract.** We consider scheduling two types of jobs (A-job and B-job) to  $p$  machines and minimizing their makespan. A group of same type of jobs processed consecutively by a machine is called a batch. For machine  $v$ , processing  $x$  A-jobs in a batch takes  $k_v^A x^2$  time units for a given speed  $k_v^A$ , and processing  $x$  B-jobs in a batch takes  $k_v^B x^2$  time units for a given speed  $k_v^B$ . We give an  $O(n^2 p \log(n))$  algorithm based on dynamic programming and binary search for solving this problem, where  $n$  denotes the maximal number of A-jobs and B-jobs to be distributed to the machines. Our algorithm also fits the easier linear case where each batch of length  $x$  of A-jobs takes  $k_v^A x$  time units and each batch of length  $x$  of B-jobs takes  $k_v^B x$  time units. The running time is the same as the above case.

**Keywords:** Machine scheduling · makespan · Dynamic programming · Binary search.

## 1 Introduction

We consider scheduling two types of jobs A and B to machines and minimizing their makespan, i.e., the maximum time completing all jobs. Suppose  $n_a$  A-jobs and  $n_b$  B-jobs have to be scheduled, and can be distributed to  $p$  machines. A group of A-jobs processed consecutively by some machine is called an *A-batch*, and a group of B-jobs processed consecutively by some machine is called a *B-batch*. A batch refers to an A-batch or a B-batch. A machine processing a batch continuously will overheat over time, resulting in decreased performance. This leads to a quadratic relationship between processing time and the number of jobs in a batch. For the  $v$ -th machine, processing  $x$  A-jobs in a batch takes  $k_v^A x^2$  time units, and processing  $x$  B-jobs in a batch takes  $k_v^B x^2$  time units, where  $k_v^A, k_v^B$  are given speed. Moreover, for the  $v$ -th machine, assume that it takes  $t_v^A$  extra time units to process any A-batch (the overhead to switch the status to processing A-jobs), and  $t_v^B$  extra time units to process any B-batch (the overhead to switch the status to processing B-jobs). No empty batch is allowed, and two neighbouring batches of any machine must be of different types. Denote  $n = \max(n_a, n_b)$ .

This paper gives an  $O(n^2p \log(n))$  time algorithm for solving the above problem based on binary search. Given a parameter  $L$ , we have to determine whether there is a scheduling with makespan not exceeding  $L$  time units.

For convenience, we use a pair  $(a, b)$  to indicate the task-combination formed by  $a$  A-jobs and  $b$  B-jobs (it is always assumed that  $a \geq 0$  and  $b \geq 0$ ). Consider the set  $B$  of  $b$ , for which the machines can finish the task-combination  $(n_a, b)$  within  $L$  time units. We determine that the makespan can be smaller or equal to  $L$  time units if and only if  $n_b \in B$ . On the other hand, we prove that  $B$  is in fact an interval, which can be computed by dynamic programming that takes  $O(n^2p)$  time. This leads to our final algorithm that runs in  $O(n^2p \log(n))$  time. The major challenge for designing the algorithm lies in proving the theorem that says  $B$  is an interval, for which a lot of analysis are shown in this paper.

We also show that our algorithm can solve the linear case where each  $A$ -batch of length  $x$  takes  $k_v^A x$  time units and each  $B$ -batch of length  $x$  takes  $k_v^B x$  time units. The running time is the same as the quadratic case mentioned above.

### 1.1 Related works

Machine scheduling problem is widely studied for its practical importance. Consider scheduling jobs  $J_1, \dots, J_n$  on parallel machines  $M_1, \dots, M_m$  and minimizing the makespan. Preemption(job splitting), precedence relation and release date are not considered for each job. The processing time that machine  $M_i$  processes job  $J_j$  is denoted as  $p_{ij}$ . Classified by machine environment, when  $p_{ij} = p_j$ , it's called identical parallel machine; when  $p_{ij} = p_j/s_i$  for a given speed  $s_i$  of machine  $M_i$ , it's called uniform parallel machine; and the general case, when  $p_{ij} = p_j/s_{ij}$ , it's called unrelated parallel machine. According to the three-field classification note [1], the above three cases can be denoted as  $P||C_{max}$ ,  $Q||C_{max}$  and  $R||C_{max}$ . The problem we solve in this paper is a variation of  $R||C_{max}$ .

$R||C_{max}$  is NP-hard since its simple version  $P||C_{max}$  has been proved NP-hard [2]. Studies on these problems focus on finding polynomial  $\rho$ -approximation algorithm ( $\rho > 1$ ), that is, polynomial time algorithm which generates solution at most  $\rho$  times the optimal solution[1]. Lenstra et al.[3] proved that for  $R||C_{max}$ , the worst-case ratio for approximation is at least  $3/2$  unless  $P = NP$ . And they present a polynomial 2-approximation algorithm. Ghirardi et al.[4] provides an heuristic called Recovering Beam Search, which generates approximate solutions in  $O(n^3m)$  time.

Different variations of unrelated parallel machine problem have been studied. Consider minimizing  $L_p$  norm of unrelated machines' completion time, Alon et al.[5] provides an  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation scheme, that is, a family of algorithms  $\{A_\varepsilon\}$  ( $\varepsilon > 0$ ) such that, each  $\{A_\varepsilon\}$  is  $1 + \varepsilon$ -approximation, and its running time may depend on input and  $\varepsilon$ [1]. Azar et al. [6] provides a 2-approximation algorithm for  $p > 1$ , and  $\sqrt{2}$ -approximation for  $p = 2$ . And Kumar et al.[7] improves it with a better-than-2 approximation algorithm for all  $p \geq 1$ . Im and Li[8] consider weighted completion time with job release date. They improve a 2-approximation to 1.8786-approximation for both preemptive and non-preemptive problems. For  $R||C_{max}$ , when matrix rank formed by job processing time is small,

Bhaskara et al.[9] show that it admits an QPTAS for rank 2, and is APX-hard for rank 4. Chen et al.[10] continue this research and prove it APX-hard for rank 3. Deng et al.[11] consider a more general problem called GLB problem, where the load of each machine is a norm, and minimizes generalized makespan(also a norm). They provide a polynomial  $O(\log n)$ -approximation algorithm. Im and Li[8] give a 1.45-approximation algorithm for minimizing total weighted completion time, and a  $\sqrt{4/3}$ -approximation for minimizing  $L_2$ -norm. Bamas et al.[12] obtain a polynomial  $(2-1/n^\epsilon)$ -approximation for two-value makespan minimization, and a polynomial  $(1.75 + \epsilon)$ -approximation for the restricted assignment case.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 considers the one machine case and proves several important observations for this case. Section 3 considers the multiple machines case and gives our main algorithm.

## 2 The one machine case

Consider any fixed machine  $v$  with parameters  $k_v^A, k_v^B, t_v^A$  and  $t_v^B$ . Denote by  $f(a, b)$  the minimum time units for this machine to finish task-combination  $(a, b)$ , and denote by  $S_v$  the set of task-combinations that can be finished by machine  $v$  within  $L$  time units (where  $L$  is a bound that will be specified by a binary search in the main algorithm). Formally,  $S_v = \{(a, b) \mid f(a, b) \leq L\}$ .

A crucial property of  $S_v$  is described in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *For fixed  $a \geq 0$ , those  $b$  for which  $(a, b) \in S_v$  are consecutive.*

To prove this theorem, we need some knowledge about  $f(a, b)$  as shown below.

**Definition 1.** *For  $a \geq 0$  and  $s \geq 0$ , define  $cost^A(a, s)$  to be the minimum time units for machine  $v$  to process  $a$   $A$ -jobs in  $s$  batches (here, we allow empty batch length and hence  $cost^A(a, s)$  is well-defined even for the case  $a < s$ ). Formally,*

$$cost^A(a, s) = \min_{\substack{x_1 + \dots + x_s = a \\ x_1 \geq 0, \dots, x_s \geq 0}} \{s \cdot t_v^A + (x_1^2 + \dots + x_s^2) \cdot k_v^A\}.$$

Note that for  $s = 0$ , we have  $cost^A(0, 0) = 0$  and  $cost^A(a, 0) = \infty$  for  $a > 0$ .

Similarly, define

$$cost^B(b, s) = \min_{\substack{x_1 + \dots + x_s = b \\ x_1 \geq 0, \dots, x_s \geq 0}} \{s \cdot t_v^B + (x_1^2 + \dots + x_s^2) \cdot k_v^B\}.$$

For  $a \geq 0$  and  $s > 0$ , the following equation holds (trivial proof omitted).

$$cost^A(a, s) = s \cdot t_v^A + \left[ (a \bmod s) \left( \left\lceil \frac{a}{s} \right\rceil + 1 \right)^2 + (s - (a \bmod s)) \left\lceil \frac{a}{s} \right\rceil^2 \right] \cdot k_v^A. \quad (1)$$

According to (1), for fixed  $s \geq 1$ , function  $cost^A(a, s)$  of variable  $a$  increases on  $[0, \infty)$ . Similarly, function  $cost^B(b, s)$  of variable  $b$  increases on  $[0, \infty)$ .

**Lemma 1.**  $f(a, b) = \min_{0 \leq s \leq \min(b, a+1)} \text{cost}(a, b, s)$ , where

$$\text{cost}(a, b, s) = \text{cost}^B(b, s) + \text{mcost}^A(a, s), \quad (2)$$

and

$$\text{mcost}^A(a, s) = \min_{s' \in \{s-1, s, s+1\}, s' \geq 0} \text{cost}^A(a, s'). \quad (3)$$

Lemma 1 is not that obvious – An empty batch is allowed in the definition of  $\text{cost}^A$  and  $\text{cost}^B$ , yet **not** allowed in processing the task-combination  $(a, b)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose we want to process the task combination  $(a, b)$ . Without loss of generality, assume that we use  $s$  amount of  $B$ -batches. Obviously, (1)  $s \leq b$  (otherwise some  $B$ -batches would be empty, which is not allowed). (2)  $s \leq a + 1$  (since the number of  $A$ -batches is at least  $s - 1$  and at most  $a$ ). Together,

$$0 \leq s \leq \min(b, a + 1).$$

Under the assumption that there are  $s$  amount of  $B$ -batches and  $s \leq b$ , we know that all the  $B$ -jobs can be done in  $\text{cost}^B(b, s)$  time units. It remains to show that the minimum time units for completing  $A$ -jobs is  $\text{mcost}^A(a, s)$  time under the constraint that the number of  $A$ -batches belongs to  $\{s - 1, s, s + 1\} \cap [0, a]$ .

Plugging in the formula of  $\text{mcost}^A(a, s)$ , it reduces to proving that

$$\min_{s' \in \{s-1, s, s+1\} \cap [0, +\infty)} \text{cost}^A(a, s') = \min_{s' \in \{s-1, s, s+1\} \cap [0, a]} \text{cost}^A(a, s'). \quad (4)$$

For  $s < a$ , (4) holds as  $\{s - 1, s, s + 1\} \cap [0, +\infty) = \{s - 1, s, s + 1\} \cap [0, a]$ .

For  $s = a$ , observing that  $\text{cost}^A(a, a + 1) > \text{cost}^A(a, a)$  (due to the definition of  $\text{cost}^A$ ), the left and right sides of (4) both equal  $\min_{s' \in \{a-1, a\} \cap [0, a]} \text{cost}^A(a, s')$ .

For  $s = a + 1$ , observing that  $\text{cost}^A(a, a + 2) > \text{cost}^A(a, a)$  and  $\text{cost}^A(a, a + 1) > \text{cost}^A(a, a)$ , the two sides of (4) are equal to  $\min_{s' \in \{a\}} \text{cost}^A(a, s')$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** For  $a \geq 0$ , all the functions below are increasing functions of  $s$ :

1.  $\text{cost}^A(a, s + 1) - \text{cost}^A(a, s)$  (namely, the difference function of  $\text{cost}^A(a, s)$ );
2.  $\text{cost}^B(a, s + 1) - \text{cost}^B(a, s)$  (namely, the difference function of  $\text{cost}^B(a, s)$ );
3.  $\text{mcost}^A(a, s + 1) - \text{mcost}^A(a, s)$  (namely, the difference function of  $\text{mcost}^A(a, s)$ ).

In other words,  $\text{cost}^A(a, s)$ ,  $\text{cost}^B(a, s)$ ,  $\text{mcost}^A(a, s)$  are convex functions of  $s$ .

Due to space limit, the proof of Lemma 2 is deferred to appendix.

- Lemma 3.**
1. For fixed  $a \geq 0$  and  $b \geq 0$ , function  $\text{cost}(a, b, s + 1) - \text{cost}(a, b, s)$  of  $s$  (namely, the difference function of  $\text{cost}(a, b, s)$ ) is increasing.
  2. For fixed  $s \geq 0$  and  $a \geq 0$ , function  $\text{cost}(a, b, s)$  of  $b$  is increasing.
  3. For fixed  $s \geq 0$  and  $b \geq 0$ , function  $\text{cost}(a, b, s)$  of  $a$  is increasing.
  4. Function  $\text{cost}(x, x + 1, x + 1)$  of  $x$  is increasing.

*Proof.* 1. Recall  $cost(a, b, s) = cost^B(b, s) + mcost^A(a, s)$ . The claim on  $cost(a, b, s)$  follows from the claims on  $cost^B$  and  $mcost^A$  given in lemma 2.

2. This claim follows from the fact that the function  $cost^B(b, s)$  of variable  $b$  increases on  $[0, \infty)$  (which is stated right below (1)).

3. We need to distinguish two cases by whether  $s = 0$  or  $s > 0$ . First, suppose  $s > 0$ . It reduces to showing that  $mcost^A(a, s)$  is increasing as  $a$  grows. Recall  $mcost^A(a, s) = \min(cost^A(a, s - 1), cost^A(a, s), cost^A(a, s + 1))$ . This function is increasing because of the fact that  $cost^A(a, s - 1), cost^A(a, s), cost^A(a, s + 1)$  are all increasing functions of  $a$  (as stated right below (1)). The proof for the case  $s = 0$  is similar and easier; we leave it as an exercise for the reader.

4. Notice that  $cost(x, x + 1, x + 1) = cost^B(x + 1, x + 1) + mcost^A(x, x + 1) = cost^B(x + 1, x + 1) + cost^A(x, x) = (x + 1)(k_v^B + t_v^B) + x(k_v^A + t_v^A)$ .  $\square$

We are ready to prove Theorem 1. Suppose  $a \geq 0$  is fixed in the following.

We introduce a table  $M$  with  $n_b + 1$  rows and  $a + 2$  columns to prove Theorem 1: for  $(b, s)$  where  $0 \leq b \leq n_b$ , and  $0 \leq s \leq a + 1$ , define

$$M(b, s) = \begin{cases} [cost(a, b, s) \leq L], & s \leq b; \\ - \text{ (leave it as undefined)}, & s > b, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where  $[ \cdot ]$  denotes the Iverson bracket. See table 1 for an example. Rows in  $M$  are indexed with 0 to  $n_b$ . Columns in  $M$  are indexed with 0 to  $a + 1$ .

$\begin{matrix} s \\ b \end{matrix}$	0	1	2	3
0	<b>1</b>	-	-	-
1	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	-	-
2	0	0	<b>1</b>	-
3	0	0	<b>1</b>	0
4	0	0	0	0

**Table 1.** An example of  $M$ , where  $n_b = 4$  and  $a = 2$ .

*Proof (of Theorem 1).* Assume  $a \geq 0$  is fixed. Recall that this theorem states that  $\{b \mid f(a, b) \leq L\}$  are consecutive. Following Lemma 1,  $f(a, b) \leq L$  if and only if the  $b$ -th row in  $M$  has a 1. Hence it reduces to showing that (i) the rows in  $M$  with at least one 1 are consecutive.

We now point out two facts about table  $M(b, s)$ .

**Fact 1.** If  $M(b, s) = 1$  and  $s \leq b - 1$ , then  $M(b - 1, s) = 1$ .

*Proof.* Since  $M(b, s) = 1$ , we know  $cost(a, b, s) \leq L$ . By lemma 3.2 we know  $cost(a, b - 1, s) \leq cost(a, b, s) \leq L$ . So  $M(b - 1, s) = 1$ .  $\square$

**Fact 2.** If  $M(s, s) = 1$  and  $M(s + 1, s + 1) = 0$ , then  $M(s', s') = 0$  for  $s' > s + 1$ .

*Proof.* Since  $M(s, s) = 1$  and  $M(s + 1, s + 1) = 0$ , we know  $\text{cost}(a, s, s) \leq L < \text{cost}(a, s + 1, s + 1)$ . So,

$$\text{cost}(a, s, s) < \text{cost}(a, s + 1, s + 1). \quad (6)$$

Observe that  $\text{cost}(a, s', s') = \text{cost}^B(s', s') + m\text{cost}^A(a, s') = s't_v^B + s'k_v^B + m\text{cost}^A(a, s')$ . Following lemma 2, function  $\text{cost}(a, s', s')$  of  $s'$  is convex. Further since (6),  $\text{cost}(a, s', s')$  is strictly increasing when  $s' \geq s + 1$ . Therefore  $\text{cost}(a, s', s') > \text{cost}(a, s + 1, s + 1) > L$ , which means  $M(s', s') = 0$ .  $\square$

According to Fact 2, the 1's in the diagonal of  $M$  are consecutive. According to Fact 1, the 1's in any particular column are consecutive and the lowest 1 (if any) in that column always appears at the diagonal of  $M$ . Together, we obtain argument (i).  $\square$

## 2.1 More properties of $S_v$

For  $0 \leq a \leq n_a, 0 \leq b \leq n_b$ , define  $F^{(v)}(a, b) = [(a, b) \in S_v] = [f(a, b) \leq L]$ . Abbreviate  $F^{(v)}$  as  $F$  when  $v$  is clear. This table represents  $S_v$ . See table 2 for an illustration. Whereas Theorem 1 shows the consecutiveness of 1's within any row of  $F$ , the next theorem shows properties of  $F$  between its consecutive rows.

**Theorem 2.** For any fixed  $a \geq 0$ ,

1. If some row of  $F$  are all 0's, so is the next row of  $F$ .
2. If both row  $a$  and row  $a + 1$  contain 1, at least one of the following holds:
  - (1) there is  $b$  such that  $F(a, b) = F(a + 1, b) = 1$ .
  - (2)  $F(a, a + 1) = F(a + 1, a + 2) = 1$ .

$a \backslash b$	0	1	2	3
0	1	1	1	1
1	0	1	0	0
2	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0

**Table 2.** An example of  $F^{(v)}$ , which represents  $S_v$ .

We introduce two subregions of  $F$ . The area in which  $b \leq a + 1$  is referred to as *Area 1*. The area in which  $b \geq a + 1$  is referred to as *Area 2*.

**Lemma 4.** 1. For  $(a, b), (a + 1, b)$  in Area 1,  $F(a, b) = 0$  implies  $F(a + 1, b) = 0$ .

- 2. For  $(a, b), (a, b + 1)$  in Area 2,  $F(a, b) = 0$  implies  $F(a, b + 1) = 0$ .
- 3. If  $F(a, a + 1) = 0$ , then  $F(a + 1, a + 2) = 0$ .
- 4. If  $F(a + 1, a + 1) = 0$  and  $F(a + 1, a + 2) = 1$ , then  $F(a, a + 1) = 1$ .

*Proof.* 1. By  $F(a, b) = 0$ , we know  $cost(a, b, s) > L$  for all  $s \leq b$ . Applying lemma 3.3,  $cost(a + 1, b, s) \geq cost(a, b, s) > L$ . So  $F(a + 1, b) = 0$ .

2. By  $F(a, b) = 0$ , we know  $cost(a, b, s) > L$  for all  $s \leq a + 1$ . Applying lemma 3.2,  $cost(a, b + 1, s) \geq cost(a, b, s) > L$ . So  $F(a, b + 1) = 0$ .

3. Because  $F(a, a + 1) = 0$ , we get  $cost(a, a + 1, s) > L$  for  $s \in [0, a + 1]$ . In particular,  $cost(a, a + 1, a + 1) > L$ . Hence  $cost(a + 1, a + 2, a + 2) > L$  due to lemma 3.4. Applying Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3,  $cost(a + 1, a + 2, s) \geq cost(a, a + 1, s) > L$  for all  $s \in [0, a + 1]$ . Together,  $cost(a + 1, a + 2, s) > L$  for all  $s \in [0, a + 2]$ , which implies  $F(a + 1, a + 2) = 0$ .

4. By  $F(a + 1, a + 2) = 1$ , we know  $\min_{0 \leq s \leq a + 2} cost(a + 1, a + 2, s) \leq L$ . Because  $F(a + 1, a + 1) = 0$ , we have  $cost(a + 1, a + 1, s) > L$  for  $s \in [0, a + 1]$ . Further with Lemma 3.2, we get  $cost(a + 1, a + 2, s) > L$  for  $s \in [0, a + 1]$ .

Together, we conclude that  $cost(a + 1, a + 2, a + 2) \leq L$ .

By Lemma 3.4,  $cost(a, a + 1, a + 1) \leq cost(a + 1, a + 2, a + 2) \leq L$ . Therefore  $\min_{0 \leq s \leq a + 1} cost(a, a + 1, s) \leq L$ , which further implies that  $F(a, a + 1) = 1$ .  $\square$

*Proof (Theorem 2).* 1. Suppose row  $a$  are all 0's. By Lemma 4.1 and 4.3, we know  $F(a + 1, i) = 0$  for all  $i \leq a + 2$ . See Table 3.

$a \backslash b$	0	1	...	$a$	$a + 1$	$a + 2$	...	...	$n_b$
0									
1									
2									
...									
$a$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$a + 1$	0	0	0	0	0	0			
...									
$n_a$									

**Table 3.**

Further according to Lemma 4.2, row  $a + 1$  are all 0's.

2. If there exists  $b \leq a + 1$ , such that  $F(a + 1, b) = 1$ , we know  $F(a, b)$  and  $F(a + 1, b)$  are both in Area 1. So by Lemma 4.1 we know  $F(a, b) = 1$ .

Otherwise,  $F(a + 1, b) = 0$  for all  $b \leq a + 1$ . So there exists  $b_0 > a + 1$  such that  $F(a + 1, b_0) = 1$ . By lemma 4.2 we know  $F(a + 1, a + 2) = 1$ . So by lemma 4.4 we know  $F(a, a + 1) = 1$ .  $\square$

### 3 Multiple machines case

Below we give an  $O(n^2p \log(n))$  algorithm based on dynamic programming and binary search, and subsection 3.2 proves its running time.

#### 3.1 Algorithm

For convenience, let  $b_v(a) = \{b \geq 0 \mid f(a, b) \leq L\}$ . Given finite set  $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ , we define  $A + B = \{a + b \mid a \in A, b \in B\}$  as their *sumset*.

**Definition 2.** For  $v \geq 0$ ,  $a \geq 0$  and  $L \geq 0$ , define  $dp(v, a)$  to be the set of amount  $b$  of  $B$ -jobs, such that the first  $v$  machines can finish the task-combination  $(a, b)$  within  $L$  time units. Formally,

$$dp(v, a) = \bigcup_{\substack{x_1 + \dots + x_v = a \\ x_1 \geq 0, \dots, x_v \geq 0}} (b_1(x_1) + \dots + b_v(x_v)).$$

We can immediately get recurrence formula for  $dp(v, a)$  by enumerating the number of  $A$ -jobs finished by the last machine:

$$dp(v, a) = \bigcup_{0 \leq a' \leq a} (dp(v-1, a-a') + b_v(a')). \quad (7)$$

We obtain the answer by binary searching the smallest time units  $L$  that makes  $dp(p, n_a)$  containing  $n_b$ . The following theorem assures that  $dp(p, n_a)$  can be calculated in  $O(n^2p)$  time. The upper bound of  $L$  is  $O(n^2)$  by scheduling all jobs to one machine. Therefore the answer can be calculated in  $O(n^2p \log(n))$  time.

**Theorem 3.** Set  $dp(v, a)$  is an interval.

Suppose Theorem 3 holds. Let  $dp(v, a) = [dp(v, a).l, dp(v, a).r]$ . Theorem 1 states that  $b_v(a)$  is an interval. Let  $b_v(a) = [b_v(a).l, b_v(a).r]$ . And (7) can be simplified as:

$$\begin{aligned} dp(v, a).l &= \min_{0 \leq a' \leq a} (dp(v-1, a-a').l + b_v(a').l), \\ dp(v, a).r &= \max_{0 \leq a' \leq a} (dp(v-1, a-a').r + b_v(a').r). \end{aligned}$$

#### 3.2 Proof of theorem 3

To prove this theorem, we need some knowledge about  $dp(v, a)$  as shown below.

**Lemma 5.** For any  $v \geq 1$  and  $a \geq 0$ ,

1. If  $dp(v, a) = \emptyset$ , then  $dp(v, a + \delta) = \emptyset$  for all  $\delta > 0$ .
2. If  $dp(v, a) \neq \emptyset$  and  $dp(v, a + 1) \neq \emptyset$ , at least one of the following holds:
  - (1)  $dp(v, a) \cap dp(v, a + 1) \neq \emptyset$ .
  - (2) there exists  $b_0 \in dp(v, a)$  and  $b_0 + 1 \in dp(v, a + 1)$ .



*Proof.* 1. We prove it by induction on  $v$ . When  $v = 1$ , we have  $dp(1, a) = b_1(a)$ . Notice that Theorem 2.1 states that if  $b_v(a) = \emptyset$ , then  $b_v(a + \delta) = \emptyset$ . So the conclusion holds.

Suppose conclusion holds for  $v - 1$ . Recall that

$$dp(v, a) = \bigcup_{0 \leq a' \leq a} (dp(v-1, a-a') + b_v(a')),$$

and

$$dp(v, a + \delta) = \bigcup_{0 \leq a' \leq a + \delta} (dp(v-1, a + \delta - a') + b_v(a')).$$

Because  $dp(v, a) = \emptyset$ , we know either  $dp(v-1, a-a') = \emptyset$  or  $b_v(a') = \emptyset$  for  $a' \in [0, a]$ .

In order to prove  $dp(v, a + \delta) = \emptyset$ , we only need to prove that either  $dp(v-1, a + \delta - a') = \emptyset$  or  $b_v(a') = \emptyset$  for  $a' \in [0, a + \delta]$ .

*Case 1* ( $0 \leq a' \leq a$ ). If  $b_v(a') = \emptyset$ , conclusion holds obviously. Otherwise,  $dp(v-1, a-a') = \emptyset$ . Because  $a + \delta - a' > a - a'$ , by conclusion hypothesis we know  $dp(v-1, a + \delta - a') = \emptyset$ .

*Case 2* ( $a + 1 \leq a' \leq a + \delta$ ). If there exists  $a'' \in [0, a]$ , such that  $b_v(a'') = \emptyset$ , we know  $b_v(a') = \emptyset$  by theorem 2.1. Otherwise,  $dp(v-1, a-a'') = \emptyset$  for all  $a'' \in [0, a]$ . Let  $a'' = a$ , we have  $dp(v-1, 0) = \emptyset$ . Since  $a + \delta - a' > 0$ , by conclusion hypothesis we know  $dp(v-1, a + \delta - a') = \emptyset$ .

2. We prove it by induction on  $v$ . When  $v = 1$ , we have  $dp(1, a) = b_1(a)$ . Notice that Theorem 2.2 states that, if  $b_v(a) \neq \emptyset$  and  $b_v(a+1) \neq \emptyset$ , either  $b_v(a) \cap b_v(a+1) \neq \emptyset$  or  $a+1 \in b_v(a)$ ,  $a+2 \in b_v(a+1)$ . So the conclusion holds.

Suppose conclusion holds for  $v - 1$ . Lemma 5.1 states that non-empty  $dp(v-1, a)$  is consecutive when  $a$  changes. Theorem 2.1 states that non-empty  $b_v(a)$  is consecutive when  $a$  changes. So (7) can be written as

$$dp(v, a) = \bigcup_{a' \in [l_1, r_1] \cap [l_2, r_2]} (dp(v-1, a-a') + b_v(a')), \quad (8)$$

where  $dp(v-1, a-a') \neq \emptyset$  for all  $a' \in [l_1, r_1]$ , and  $b_v(a') \neq \emptyset$  for all  $a' \in [l_2, r_2]$ . So

$$dp(v, a+1) = \bigcup_{a' \in [l_1+1, r_1+1] \cap [l_2, r_2]} (dp(v-1, a+1-a') + b_v(a')). \quad (9)$$

*Case 1* ( $l_1 = r_1$ ). In this case

$$dp(v, a) = dp(v-1, a-l_1) + b_v(l_1),$$

and

$$dp(v, a+1) = dp(v-1, a-l_1) + b_v(l_1+1).$$

If  $b_v(l_1) \cap b_v(l_1+1) \neq \emptyset$ , we know  $dp(v, a) \cap dp(v, a+1) \neq \emptyset$ . Otherwise, according to theorem 2.2, we have  $l_1+1 \in b_v(l_1)$  and  $l_1+2 \in b_v(l_1+1)$ . Suppose  $b_0 \in dp(v-1, a-l_1)$ , then  $b_0 + l_1 + 1 \in dp(v, a)$  and  $b_0 + l_1 + 2 \in dp(v, a+1)$ .

*Case 2* ( $l_1 < r_1$ ). Notice that in this case, the intersection of  $[l_1, r_1] \cap [l_2, r_2]$  and  $[l_1 + 1, r_1 + 1] \cap [l_2, r_2]$  is non-empty. So there exists  $a'$ , such that  $dp(v-1, a-a') + b_v(a')$  and  $dp(v-1, a+1-a') + b_v(a')$  are both non-empty.

If  $dp(v-1, a-a') \cap dp(v-1, a+1-a') \neq \emptyset$ , then  $dp(v, a) \cap dp(v, a+1) \neq \emptyset$ . Otherwise, according to induction hypothesis, there exists  $b_0 \in dp(v-1, a-a')$  and  $b_0+1 \in dp(v-1, a+1-a')$ . Suppose  $b_1 \in b_v(a')$ , we know  $b_0+b_1 \in dp(v, a)$  and  $b_0+b_1+1 \in dp(v, a+1)$ .  $\square$

We can now prove Theorem 3.

*Proof (of Theorem 3).* We prove it by induction on  $v$ . When  $v = 1$ , we have  $dp(1, a) = b_1(a)$ . The conclusion holds by Theorem 1.

Suppose conclusion holds for  $v-1$ . Lemma 5.1 states that non-empty  $dp(v, a)$  is consecutive when  $a$  changes. Theorem 2.1 states that non-empty  $b_v(a)$  is consecutive when  $a$  changes. So (7) can be written as

$$dp(v, a) = \bigcup_{a' \in [l, r]} (dp(v-1, a-a') + b_v(a')),$$

where  $dp(v-1, a-a') + b_v(a') \neq \emptyset$  for all  $a' \in [l, r]$ .

To prove  $dp(v, a)$  an interval, it reduces to prove that for all  $a' \in [l, r-1]$ ,  $dp(v-1, a-a') + b_v(a') \cup dp(v-1, a-(a'+1)) + b_v(a'+1)$  is an interval. According to theorem 2.2 and lemma 5.2, there are four cases we need to discuss.

*Case 1* ( $b_v(a') \cap b_v(a'+1) \neq \emptyset$ ;

$$dp(v-1, a-a') \cap dp(v-1, a-(a'+1)) \neq \emptyset).$$

The intersection of  $dp(v-1, a-a') + b_v(a')$  and  $dp(v-1, a-(a'+1)) + b_v(a'+1)$  is non-empty. By conclusion hypothesis and theorem 1, their union is an interval.

*Case 2* ( $a'+1 \in b_v(a')$ ,  $a'+2 \in b_v(a'+1)$ ;

$$dp(v-1, a-a') \cap dp(v-1, a-(a'+1)) \neq \emptyset).$$

Suppose  $b_0 \in dp(v-1, a-a') \cap dp(v-1, a-(a'+1))$ , we have  $b_0+a'+1 \in dp(v-1, a-a') + b_v(a')$ , and  $b_0+a'+2 \in dp(v-1, a-(a'+1)) + b_v(a'+1)$ . By conclusion hypothesis and theorem 1, their union is an interval.

*Case 3* ( $b_v(a') \cap b_v(a'+1) \neq \emptyset$ ;

$$\text{there exists } b_0 \in dp(v-1, a-(a'+1)), b_0+1 \in dp(v-1, a-a')).$$

Proof is same as in case 2.

*Case 4* ( $a'+1 \in b_v(a')$ ,  $a'+2 \in b_v(a'+1)$ ;

$$\text{there exists } b_0 \in dp(v-1, a-(a'+1)), b_0+1 \in dp(v-1, a-a')).$$

Then  $b_0+a'+2 \in dp(v-1, a-a') + b_v(a')$ , and  $b_0+a'+2 \in dp(v-1, a-(a'+1)) + b_v(a'+1)$ . So their intersection is non-empty. By conclusion hypothesis and theorem 1, their union is an interval.  $\square$

### 3.3 The linear case

It's easy to know that there exists optimal solution that each machine processes several A-jobs and then several B-jobs. Therefore

$$f(a, b) = t_v^A [a > 0] + t_v^B [b > 0] + k_v^A a + k_v^B b,$$

where  $[\cdot]$  denotes the Iverson bracket. And

$$\begin{aligned} b_v(a) &= \{b \geq 0 : f(a, b) \leq L\} \\ &= \left[ 0, \frac{1}{k_v^B} (L - t_v^A [a > 0] - t_v^B [b > 0]) - \frac{k_v^A}{k_v^B} a \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Set  $b_v(a)$  is obviously an interval and satisfies Theorem 2. And  $dp(v, a)$  satisfies Theorem 3.

## References

1. Eugene L Lawler, Jan Karel Lenstra, Alexander HG Rinnooy Kan, and David B Shmoys. Sequencing and scheduling: Algorithms and complexity. *Handbooks in operations research and management science*, 4:445–522, 1993.
2. Michael R Garey and David S Johnson. “strong”np-completeness results: Motivation, examples, and implications. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 25(3):499–508, 1978.
3. Jan Karel Lenstra, David B Shmoys, and Éva Tardos. Approximation algorithms for scheduling unrelated parallel machines. *Mathematical programming*, 46:259–271, 1990.
4. Marco Ghirardi and Chris N Potts. Makespan minimization for scheduling unrelated parallel machines: A recovering beam search approach. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 165(2):457–467, 2005.
5. Noga Alon, Yossi Azar, Gerhard J Woeginger, and Tal Yadid. Approximation schemes for scheduling. In *SODA*, pages 493–500. Citeseer, 1997.
6. Yossi Azar and Amir Epstein. Convex programming for scheduling unrelated parallel machines. In *Proceedings of the thirty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 331–337, 2005.
7. VS Anil Kumar and Madhav V Marathe. Approximation algorithms for scheduling on multiple machines. In *46th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'05)*, pages 254–263. IEEE, 2005.
8. Sungjin Im and Shi Li. Better unrelated machine scheduling for weighted completion time via random offsets from non-uniform distributions. In *2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 138–147. IEEE, 2016.
9. Aditya Bhaskara, Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, Kunal Talwar, and Udi Wieder. Minimum makespan scheduling with low rank processing times. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 937–947. SIAM, 2013.
10. Lin Chen, Dániel Marx, Deshi Ye, and Guochuan Zhang. Parameterized and approximation results for scheduling with a low rank processing time matrix. In *34th Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS 2017)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2017.

11. Shichuan Deng, Jian Li, and Yuval Rabani. Generalized unrelated machine scheduling problem. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2898–2916. SIAM, 2023.
12. Étienne Bamas, Alexander Lindermayr, Nicole Megow, Lars Rohwedder, and Jens Schlöter. Santa claus meets makespan and matroids: Algorithms and reductions. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2829–2860. SIAM, 2024.

## Acknowledgement

We sincerely appreciate Ruixi Luo for his proof reading and modification advise.

## A A proof of Lemma 2

*Proof (of Lemma 2).* First we prove  $cost^A(a, s)$  is convex function of  $s$ . The proof of  $cost^B(b, s)$  is the same.

Let  $a = sq + r$ , where  $0 \leq r < s$ , we have

$$cost^A(a, s) = [r(q+1)^2 + (s-r)q^2] k_v^A + st_v^A.$$

Let  $g(s) = r(a+1)^2 + (s-r)q^2$ , it reduces to prove that  $g(s)$  is convex.

Let

$$a = sq + r, \text{ where } 0 \leq r < s, \quad (10)$$

$$a = (s+1)q' + r', \text{ where } 0 \leq r' < s+1, \quad (11)$$

$$a = (s+2)q'' + r'', \text{ where } 0 \leq r'' < s+2. \quad (12)$$

Notice that  $q \geq q' \geq q''$ .

Then let

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_s &= g(s+1) - g(s) \\ &= 2r'q' + r' + (s+1)q'^2 - 2rq - r - sq^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{s+1} &= g(s+2) - g(s+1) \\ &= 2r''q'' + r'' + (s+2)q''^2 - 2r'q' - r' - (s+1)q'^2. \end{aligned}$$

We only need to prove

$$\Delta_{s+1} \geq \Delta_s.$$

*Case 1* ( $q = q' = q''$ ). By (10), (11) and (12) we know  $r' - r = r'' - r' = -q$ . And we have

$$\Delta_s = (2q+1)(r' - r) + q^2,$$

and

$$\Delta_{s+1} = (2q+1)(r'' - r') + q^2.$$

Therefore  $\Delta_s = \Delta_{s+1}$ .

*Case 2* ( $q > q' = q''$ ).

We have

$$\Delta_s = 2r'q' + r' + (s+1)q'^2 - 2rq - r - sq^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{s+1} &= 2r''q'' + r'' + (s+2)q''^2 - 2r'q' - r' - (s+1)q'^2 \\ &= 2r''q' + r'' + q'^2 - 2r'q' - r'. \end{aligned}$$

Apply (10), (11) and (12) to the above formulas and eliminate  $r$ ,  $r'$  and  $r''$ . We have

$$\Delta_{s+1} - \Delta_s = [-sq^2 + (2a-s)q] - [-sq'^2 + (2a-s)q'].$$

Let  $h(x) = sx^2 - (2a-s)x$ , it reduces to prove that  $h(q) \leq h(q')$ .




Fig. 1.

Because  $q > q'$ , let  $q = q' + \alpha$ , where  $\alpha \geq 1$ .

Notice that  $h(x)$  is a quadratic function with axis of symmetry  $x = \frac{a}{s} - \frac{1}{2}$ . See figure 1. We consider the middle point between  $q'$  and  $q$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{q + q'}{2} &= \frac{2q - \alpha}{2} \\
 &= q - \frac{\alpha}{2} \\
 &= \lfloor \frac{a}{s} \rfloor - \frac{\alpha}{2} \\
 &\leq \frac{a}{s} - \frac{\alpha}{2} \\
 &\leq \frac{a}{s} - \frac{1}{2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $h(q) \leq h(q')$ .

*Case 3* ( $q = q' > q''$ ).

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta_s &= 2r'q' + r' + (s+1)q'^2 - 2rq - r - sq^2 \\
 &= 2(r' - r)q' + r' - r + q'^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Delta_{s+1} = 2r''q'' + r'' + (s+2)q''^2 - 2r'q' - r' - (s+1)q'^2.$$




Fig. 2.

Apply (10), (11) and (12) to the above formulas and eliminate  $r$ ,  $r'$  and  $r''$ . We have

$$\Delta_{s+1} - \Delta_s = -(s+2)q''^2 + (2a - s - 2)q'' + (s+2)q'^2 - (2a - s - 2)q'.$$

Let  $h(x) = (s+2)x^2 - (2a - s - 2)x$ , it reduces to prove that  $h(q'') \leq h(q')$ .

Because  $q' > q''$ , let  $q' = q'' + \alpha$ , where  $\alpha \geq 1$ .

Notice that  $h(x)$  is a quadratic function with axis of symmetry  $x = \frac{a}{s+2} - \frac{1}{2}$ . See figure 2. We consider the middle point between  $q'$  and  $q''$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{q' + q''}{2} &= \frac{2q'' + \alpha}{2} \\ &= q'' + \frac{\alpha}{2} \\ &= \lfloor \frac{a}{s+2} \rfloor + \frac{\alpha}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

let  $\frac{a}{s+2} + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{a}{s+2} - \beta + \frac{\alpha}{2} \\ &> \frac{a}{s+2} - 1 + \frac{1}{2} \\ &= \frac{a}{s+2} - \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $h(q'') < h(q')$ .

*Case 4* ( $q > q' > q''$ ).

Recall that

$$\Delta_s = 2r'q' + r' + (s+1)q'^2 - 2rq - r - sq^2,$$

$$\Delta_{s+1} = 2r''q'' + r'' + (s+2)q''^2 - 2r'q' - r' - (s+1)q'^2.$$

Apply (10), (11) and (12) to the above formulas and eliminate  $r$ ,  $r'$  and  $r''$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{s+1} - \Delta_s &= (s+2)q''^2 - (2a-s-2)q' - [sq^2 - (2a-s)q] - \\ &\quad [(s+2)q''^2 - (2a-s-2)q'' - (sq'^2 - (2a-s)q')]. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $h(x_1, x_2) = (s+2)x_1^2 - (2a-s-2)x_1 - sx_2^2 + (2a-s)x_2$ , it reduces to prove that  $h(q'', q') \leq h(q', q)$ .

Notice that  $h(x_1, x_2)$  is a hyperbolic paraboloid, we reduce it to its general form:

$$\begin{aligned} h(x_1, x_2) + \frac{\frac{1}{4}(2a-s-2)^2}{s+2} - \frac{\frac{1}{4}(2a-s)^2}{s} = \\ \frac{\left(x_1 - \frac{\frac{1}{2}(2a-s-2)}{s+2}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{s+2}}\right)^2} - \frac{\left(x_2 - \frac{\frac{1}{2}(2a-s)}{s}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}\right)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We can observe its saddle point  $(x_1^*, x_2^*, h^*)$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} x_1^* &= \frac{\frac{1}{2}(2a-s-2)}{s+2}, \\ x_2^* &= \frac{\frac{1}{2}(2a-s)}{s}, \\ h^* &= \frac{\frac{1}{4}(2a-s)^2}{s} - \frac{\frac{1}{4}(2a-s-2)^2}{s+2}. \end{aligned}$$

First, consider the cross section of the hyperbolic paraboloid parallel to plane  $x_1Oh$ :  $h(x_1, *)$ . Notice that it's a parabola with axis of symmetry  $x = \frac{a}{s+2} - \frac{1}{2}$ . Consider  $q'$  and  $q''$ . Same as case 3, we know  $h(q', *) \geq h(q'', *)$ .

Next, consider the cross section of the hyperbolic paraboloid parallel to plane  $x_2Oh$ :  $h(*, x_2)$ . Notice that it's a parabola with axis of symmetry  $x = \frac{a}{s} - \frac{1}{2}$ . See figure 3. Consider the middle point of  $q$  and  $q'$ .

Let  $q = q' + \alpha$ , where  $\alpha \geq 1$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{q' + q}{2} &= \frac{2q - \alpha}{2} \\ &= q - \frac{\alpha}{2} \\ &= \left\lfloor \frac{a}{s} \right\rfloor - \frac{\alpha}{2} \\ &\leq \frac{a}{s} - \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$






Fig. 3.

Therefore  $h(*, q) \geq h(*, q')$ .

By  $h(q', *) \geq h(q'', *)$  and  $h(*, q) \geq h(*, q')$ , we know

$$h(q', q) \geq h(q'', q) \geq h(q'', q').$$

At last we prove that  $mcost^A(a, s)$  is convex function of  $s$ . Recall that

$$mcost^A(a, s) = \min_{s' \in \{s-1, s, s+1\}, s' \geq 0} cost^A(a, s').$$

*Case 1* ( $cost^A(a, s)$  is increasing (or decreasing) for  $s$ ).

Then  $mcost^A(a, s) = cost^A(a, s-1)$  (or  $cost^A(a, s+1)$ ).

*Case 2* (There exists  $s_0$ , such that when  $s \leq s_0$ ,  $cost^A(a, s)$  decreases, and when  $s \geq s_0$ ,  $cost^A(a, s)$  increases).

According to case 1,  $mcost^A(a, s)$  is convex when  $s \leq s_0$  and  $s \geq s_0$ . It reduces to prove that

$$mcost^A(a, s_0) - mcost^A(a, s_0 - 1) \leq mcost^A(a, s_0 + 1) - mcost^A(a, s_0). \quad (13)$$

Notice that

$$mcost^A(a, s_0 - 1) = mcost^A(a, s_0) = mcost^A(a, s_0 + 1) = cost^A(a, s_0),$$

so the left and right side of (13) are both 0.

Therefore  $mcost^A(a, s)$  is convex.  $\square$