

**stichting
mathematisch
centrum**



AFDELING MATHEMATISCHE BESLISKUNDE
(DEPARTMENT OF OPERATIONS RESEARCH)

BW 138/81

MAART

B.J. LAGEWEG, E.L. LAWLER, J.K. LENSTRA, A.H.G. RINNOOY KAN

COMPUTER AIDED COMPLEXITY CLASSIFICATION
OF DETERMINISTIC SCHEDULING PROBLEMS

kruislaan 413 1098 SJ amsterdam

Printed at the Mathematical Centre, 413 Kruislaan, Amsterdam.

The Mathematical Centre, founded the 11-th of February 1946, is a non-profit institution aiming at the promotion of pure mathematics and its applications. It is sponsored by the Netherlands Government through the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.).

COMPUTER AIDED COMPLEXITY CLASSIFICATION OF DETERMINISTIC SCHEDULING PROBLEMS

B.J. LAGEWEG (*Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam*)

E.L. LAWLER (*University of California, Berkeley*)

J.K. LENSTRA (*Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam*)

A.H.G. RINNOOY KAN (*Erasmus University, Rotterdam*)

ABSTRACT

We present the results obtained by a computer program that has been used to maintain a record of the known complexity results for a class of 4,536 machine scheduling problems. The input of the program consists of a listing of known "easy" problems and a listing of known "hard" problems. The program employs the structure of the problem class to determine the implications of these results. The output provides a listing of essential results in the form of maximal easy and minimal hard problems as well as listings of minimal and maximal open problems, which are helpful in indicating the direction of future research. The reader is assumed to be familiar with a companion paper by the same authors, "Computer aided complexity classification of combinatorial problems" (Report BW 137, Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam, 1981). In that paper, the program is described, its application to a restricted class of 120 single-machine problems is demonstrated, and possible refinements and extensions to other research areas are suggested.

KEY WORDS & PHRASES: *machine scheduling, computational complexity, polynomial algorithm, NP-hardness, computer program*

1. INTRODUCTION

In this report, we present the results obtained by a computer program that has been used to maintain a record of the known complexity results for a class of 4,536 deterministic machine scheduling problems.

The input of the program consists of a listing of known *easy* problems, which can be solved in polynomial time, and a listing of known *hard* problems, which are NP-hard. The program systematically employs a certain *partial ordering* defined on the problem class to determine the implications of these results. The output provides a count of *easy*, *open* and *hard* problems as well as complete listings of *maximal easy*, *minimal open*, *maximal open* and *minimal hard* problems.

We assume that the reader is familiar with the contents of a companion paper [Lageweg, Lawler, Lenstra & Rinnooy Kan 1981]. In that paper, we describe the program MSPCLASS in general terms, we demonstrate its application to a restricted class of 120 single-machine scheduling problems, we discuss the benefits of this approach, and we suggest possible refinements and extensions to other research areas.

Section 2 contains a schematic definition of our class of 4,536 machine scheduling problems and Section 3 presents the state of the art as exhibited by application of the program to this class. It is our intention to publish a next edition of this report whenever newly obtained results have changed the picture significantly.

2. THE CLASS OF MACHINE SCHEDULING PROBLEMS

The class of machine scheduling problems to which the program MSPCLASS is applied is defined in this section (cf. [Graham, Lawler, Lenstra & Rinnooy Kan 1979]).

Suppose that n jobs J_j ($j = 1, \dots, n$) have to be processed on m machines M_i ($i = 1, \dots, m$). Each machine can process at most one job at a time and each job can be processed on at most one machine at a time. Various job, machine and scheduling characteristics are reflected by a three-field classification $\alpha|\beta|\gamma$, to be introduced below. Let $\circ$ denote the empty symbol.

2.1. Machine environment

The first field $\alpha = \alpha_1 \alpha_2$ specifies the machine environment.

If $\alpha_1 \in \{\circ, P, Q, R\}$, each J_j consists of a *single operation* that can be processed on *any* M_i ; the processing time of J_j on M_i is p_{ij} . The four values are characterized as follows.

- $\alpha_1 = \circ$: *Single machine*; $m = 1$; $p_{1j} = p_j$.
- $\alpha_1 = P$: *Identical parallel machines*; $p_{ij} = p_j$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$).
- $\alpha_1 = Q$: *Uniform parallel machines*; $p_{ij} = p_j/s_i$ for a given speed s_i of M_i ($i = 1, \dots, m$).
- $\alpha_1 = R$: *Unrelated parallel machines*.

If $\alpha_1 \in \{O, F, J\}$, each J_j consists of m_j operations $O_{1j}, \dots, O_{m_j j}$; O_{ij} has to be processed on a given machine μ_{ij} during p_{ij} time units. The three values are characterized as follows.

- $\alpha_1 = O$: *Open shop*; $m_j = m$; $\mu_{ij} = M_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$); the order in which the operations are executed is immaterial.
- $\alpha_1 = F$: *Flow shop*; $m_j = m$; $\mu_{ij} = M_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$); $O_{i-1,j}$ has to be completed before O_{ij} can start ($i = 2, \dots, m$).
- $\alpha_1 = J$: *Job shop*; $\mu_{i-1,j} \neq \mu_{ij}$ and $O_{i-1,j}$ has to be completed before O_{ij} can start ($i = 2, \dots, m_j$).

If $\alpha_2 \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then m is *constant* and equal to α_2 . If $\alpha_2 = \circ$, then m is *variable*.

2.2. Job characteristics

The second field $\beta \in \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_5\}$ indicates a number of job characteristics, which are defined as follows.

(1) $\beta_1 \in \{pmtn, \circ\}$.

- $\beta_1 = pmtn$: *Preemption* is allowed; the processing of any operation may be interrupted and resumed at a later time (or, if $\alpha_1 \in \{P, Q, R\}$, at the same time on a different machine) without penalty.
- $\beta_1 = \circ$: Preemption is not permitted.

(2) $\beta_2 \in \{prec, tree, \circ\}$.

- $\beta_2 = prec$: *Precedence constraints* between the jobs are given in the

form of an acyclic digraph $G = (\{1, \dots, n\}, A)$; if $(j, k) \in A$, then J_j has to be completed before J_k can start.

- $\beta_2 = \text{tree}$: G is a *rooted tree* with either indegree at most one for each vertex or outdegree at most one for each vertex.
- $\beta_2 = \circ$: G has no arcs (the jobs are *independent*).
- (3) $\beta_3 \in \{r_j, \circ\}$.
 - $\beta_3 = r_j$: Each J_j has a given nonnegative integer *release date* r_j , on which it becomes available for processing.
 - $\beta_3 = \circ$: All $r_j = 0$.
- (4) $\beta_4 \in \{d_j, \circ\}$.
 - $\beta_4 = d_j$: Each J_j has a given nonnegative integer *deadline* d_j , by which it has to be completed.
 - $\beta_4 = \circ$: All $d_j = \infty$.
- (5) $\beta_5 \in \{p_j=1, \circ\}$.
 - $\beta_5 = p_j=1$: Each operation has a *unit processing requirement*, i.e., if $\alpha_1 \in \{\circ, P, Q\}$, then all $p_j = 1$, and if $\alpha_1 \in \{R, O, F, J\}$, then all $p_{ij} = 1$.
 - $\beta_5 = \circ$: All p_j (p_{ij}) are given arbitrary nonnegative integers.

2.3. Optimality criterion

The third field γ refers to the optimality criterion chosen. Each J_j may have a given nonnegative integer *due date* $\bar{d}_j$ and/or a given integer *weight* w_j . Any schedule defines for each J_j :

- a *completion time* C_j ;
- a *lateness* $L_j = C_j - \bar{d}_j$;
- a *tardiness* $T_j = \max\{0, C_j - \bar{d}_j\}$;
- a *unit penalty* $U_j = 0$ if $C_j \leq \bar{d}_j$, $U_j = 1$ if $C_j > \bar{d}_j$.

The optimality criterion, which is to be minimized, is one of the following eight types.

- $\gamma = C_{\max}$: the *maximum completion time* $\max\{C_j\}$;
- $\gamma = L_{\max}$: the *maximum lateness* $\max\{L_j\}$;
- $\gamma = \sum C_j$: the *total completion time*;
- $\gamma = \sum w_j C_j$: the *total weighted completion time*;
- $\gamma = \sum T_j$: the *total tardiness*;

- $\gamma = \sum w_j T_j$: the total weighted tardiness;
- $\gamma = \sum U_j$: the number of late jobs;
- $\gamma = \sum w_j U_j$: the weighted number of late jobs.

2.4. Number of problems

Each eight-tuple $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 | \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5 | \gamma$ corresponds to a machine scheduling problem. Several combinations of values for the components are excluded, for the following reasons.

- Clearly, $\alpha_1 = \circ$ if and only if $\alpha_2 = 1$.
- If $\alpha_1 = R$, then $\beta_5 = \circ$, since the choice $\beta_5 = p_j=1$ leads to a problem with $\alpha_1 = P$.
- If $\gamma \in \{C_{\max}, L_{\max}\}$, then $\beta_4 = \circ$, since for the combinations $\beta_4 | \gamma$ the choices $d_j | C_{\max}$, $| L_{\max}$ and $d_j | L_{\max}$ yield equivalent problems (cf. [Lageweg, Lawler, Lenstra & Rinnooy Kan 1981]).

Further, we have decided to eliminate the choice $\beta_5 = p_j=1$ in the case that $\beta_1 = pmtn$: preemptable jobs have arbitrary processing requirements.

It is not hard to see that, under these restrictions, the class of problems defined by the above classification contains 4,536 different problem types.

2.5. Partial ordering

The program MSPCLASS employs a certain partial ordering $\rightarrow$ of the problem class, which has the property that, if $P \rightarrow P'$ for two problems P and P' , then P is *reducible* to P' . This relation is defined as follows.

Each member of our class of machine scheduling problems corresponds to a seven-tuple $(\pi_i)_{i=0}^6$, where π_i is a vertex of the digraph G_i shown in Figure 1 ($i = 0, \dots, 6$); π_0 corresponds to α , π_i to β_i ($i = 1, \dots, 5$), and π_6 to γ . There is an arc from π to π' if π' is a direct generalization of π . For two problems $P = (\pi_i)_{i=0}^6$ and $P' = (\pi'_i)_{i=0}^6$, we have $P \rightarrow P'$ if either $\pi_i = \pi'_i$ or G_i contains a directed path from π_i to π'_i , for $i = 0, \dots, 6$ (cf. [Lageweg, Lawler, Lenstra & Rinnooy Kan 1981]).




Figure 1. The graphs G_i ($i = 0, \dots, 6$).

3. THE STATE OF THE ART

The program MSPCLASS has been implemented in PASCAL on the Control Data Cyber 170-750 of the SARA Computing Centre in Amsterdam. Its application to the

class of machine scheduling problems defined in the previous section is demonstrated below.

We note that separate runs are made for two different inputs, corresponding to different assumptions about the encoding of problem instances containing numerical data. Under a standard *binary* encoding, the easy problems are solvable in *strictly polynomial* time and the hard problems are NP-hard in the *ordinary* sense. Under a *unary* encoding, the easy problems are solvable in *pseudopolynomial* time and the hard problems are NP-hard in the *strong* sense (cf. [Garey & Johnson 1978; Lenstra & Rinnooy Kan 1979]).

Moreover, the program deals separately with *nonpreemptive* and *preemptive* problems, which reflects the fact that G_1 consists of two isolated vertices. Many results for preemptive scheduling, however, follow immediately from those for nonpreemptive scheduling. For example, there is no advantage to preemption for problems with a single machine and equal release dates [McNaughton 1959] and for problems of the types $P||\sum w_j C_j$ [McNaughton 1959] and $F2||C_{\max}$ [Gonzalez & Sahni 1978].

The output of the latest runs is shown on the next pages; note that the value of the component β_1 appears in the heading of the listings and not in each individual problem type. The listings present useful additional information in the form of references to the literature where the results in question can be found, an indication of general algorithmic techniques applicable to some easy problems, the symbol # for open problems that are both minimal and maximal, and acronyms of convenient "starting problems" for transformations in the case of hard problems.

Combining the results for nonpreemptive and preemptive scheduling, we get an overview of the total numbers of easy, open and hard problems as shown in Table 1.

	binary		unary	
easy	416	(9%)	471	(10%)
open	432	(10%)	547	(12%)
hard	3688	(81%)	3518	(78%)
total	4536	(100%)	4536	(100%)

Table 1. Summary of results.

NONPREEMPTIVE SCHEDULING, BINARY ENCODING

DATE: 81:03:13

NUMBER OF PROBLEMS	MINIMAL	TOTAL	MAXIMAL
EASY		319	29
OPEN	35	310	18
HARD	42	2311	
TOTAL		2940	

MAXIMAL EASY PROBLEMS

1/PREC,RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ	LAWLER: COFFMAN GRAHAM 1972
1//SUMUJ	MOORE 1968
1/DJ/SUMCJ	SMITH 1956
1/TREE/SUMWJCJ	HORN 1972; SIDNEY 1975
1/PREC/LMAX	LAWLER 1973
1/PREC,RJ/CMAX	LAWLER 1973
P2/PREC,PJ=1/SUMCJ	GAREY 1975: COFFMAN GRAHAM 1972
P2/PREC,RJ,PJ=1/LMAX	GAREY JOHNSON 1977
P/RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJTJ	LAWLER 1964 (TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM)
P/RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJUJ	LAWLER 1964 (TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM)
P/TREE,PJ=1/CMAX	HU 1961
Q3/RJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ	LAGEWEG (DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING)
Q/DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJTJ	GRAHAM LAWLER LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1979
	(TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM)
Q/DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJUJ	GRAHAM LAWLER LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1979
	(TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM)
Q/RJ,PJ=1/CMAX	LAWLER LENSTRA
R//SUMCJ	HORN 1973; BRUNO COFFMAN SETHI 1974
O2/RJ,PJ=1/LMAX	LAWLER
O2//CMAX	GONZALEZ SAHNI 1976
O3/PJ=1/SUMUJ	LAWLER
O3/RJ,PJ=1/CMAX	LAWLER
O/PJ=1/CMAX	LENSTRA
O/PJ=1/SUMWJCJ	LENSTRA
F2/TREE,PJ=1/CMAX	LAGEWEG
F2/TREE,PJ=1/SUMCJ	LAGEWEG
F2//CMAX	JOHNSON 1954
F/RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJTJ	LAGEWEG (TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM)
F/RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJUJ	LAGEWEG (TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM)
J2/PJ=1/LMAX	BRUCKER 1981
J2/RJ,PJ=1/CMAX	BRUCKER 1981

NONPREEMPTIVE SCHEDULING, UNARY ENCODING

DATE: 81:03:13

NUMBER OF PROBLEMS	MINIMAL	TOTAL	MAXIMAL
EASY		357	32
OPEN	40	344	22
HARD	44	2239	
TOTAL		2940	

MAXIMAL EASY PROBLEMS

1/PREC,RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ	LAWLER: COFFMAN GRAHAM 1972
1//SUMTJ	LAWLER 1977
1/DJ/SUMCJ	SMITH 1956
1/TREE/SUMWJCJ	HORN 1972; SIDNEY 1975
1/PREC/LMAX	LAWLER 1973
1/PREC,RJ/CMAX	LAWLER 1973
P2/PREC,PJ=1/SUMCJ	GAREY 1975: COFFMAN GRAHAM 1972
P2/PREC,RJ,PJ=1/LMAX	GAREY JOHNSON 1977
P/RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJTJ	LAWLER 1964 (TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM)
P/RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJUJ	LAWLER 1964 (TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM)
P/TREE,PJ=1/CMAX	HU 1961
Q3/RJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ	LAGEWEG (DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING)
Q3//SUMWJCJ	LAWLER (DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING)
Q/DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJTJ	GRAHAM LAWLER LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1979
	(TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM)
Q/DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJUJ	GRAHAM LAWLER LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1979
	(TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM)
Q/RJ,PJ=1/CMAX	LAWLER LENSTRA
R3//SUMWJUJ	LAWLER (DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING)
R3/RJ/CMAX	LAWLER (DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING)
R//SUMCJ	HORN 1973; BRUNO COFFMAN SETHI 1974
O2/RJ,PJ=1/LMAX	LAWLER
O2//CMAX	GONZALEZ SAHNI 1976
O3/PJ=1/SUMWJUJ	LAWLER
O3/RJ,PJ=1/CMAX	LAWLER
O/PJ=1/CMAX	LENSTRA
O/PJ=1/SUMWJCJ	LENSTRA
F2/TREE,PJ=1/CMAX	LAGEWEG
F2/TREE,PJ=1/SUMCJ	LAGEWEG
F2//CMAX	JOHNSON 1954
F/RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJTJ	LAGEWEG (TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM)
F/RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJUJ	LAGEWEG (TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM)
J2/PJ=1/LMAX	BRUCKER 1981
J2/RJ,PJ=1/CMAX	BRUCKER 1981

NONPREEMPTIVE SCHEDULING, BINARY ENCODING (CONTINUED)

MINIMAL OPEN PROBLEMS

1/TREE,PJ=1/SUMTJ
 1//SUMTJ
 P2/TREE,DJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 P2/TREE,RJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 P3/TREE,PJ=1/LMAX
 P3/TREE,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 P3/TREE,RJ,PJ=1/CMAX
 P3/PREC,PJ=1/CMAX
 Q2/RJ,PJ=1/LMAX
 Q2/RJ,PJ=1/SUMWJCJ
 Q2/TREE,PJ=1/CMAX
 Q2/TREE,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 Q/RJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 O2/PJ=1/SUMTJ
 O2/PJ=1/SUMWJUJ
 O2/DJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 O2/DJ,PJ=1/SUMUJ
 O2/RJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 O2/RJ,PJ=1/SUMUJ
 O2/TREE,PJ=1/CMAX
 O2/TREE,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 O2//SUMCJ
 O3/RJ,PJ=1/LMAX
 O/PJ=1/LMAX
 O/RJ,PJ=1/CMAX
 F2/TREE,PJ=1/LMAX
 F2/TREE,RJ,PJ=1/CMAX
 F2/TREE,RJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 F2/PREC,PJ=1/CMAX
 F2/PREC,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 F3/TREE,PJ=1/CMAX
 F3/TREE,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 J2/PJ=1/SUMCJ
 J2/PJ=1/SUMUJ
 J2/RJ,PJ=1/LMAX

MAXIMAL OPEN PROBLEMS

1/DJ/SUMTJ
 1/TREE/SUMTJ
 Q3/TREE,RJ,PJ=1/SUMTJ
 Q3/PREC,RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 Q/RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJTJ
 Q/RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJUJ
 Q/TREE,PJ=1/CMAX
 Q/TREE,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 O3//SUMCJ
 O/RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJTJ
 O/RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJUJ
 O/TREE,PJ=1/SUMWJCJ
 O/TREE,RJ,PJ=1/SUMTJ
 O/PREC,RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 F/TREE,RJ,PJ=1/SUMTJ
 F/PREC,RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ
 J2/RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJTJ
 J2/RJ,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJUJ

NONPREEMPTIVE SCHEDULING, UNARY ENCODING (CONTINUED)

MINIMAL OPEN PROBLEMS

1/TREE, PJ=1/SUMTJ
 1/DJ/SUMTJ
 1/DJ/SUMUJ
 P2/TREE, DJ, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 P2/TREE, RJ, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 P2//SUMTJ
 P2/DJ/SUMCJ
 P2/TREE/CMAX
 P3/TREE, PJ=1/LMAX
 P3/TREE, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 P3/TREE, RJ, PJ=1/CMAX
 P3/PREC, PJ=1/CMAX
 Q2/RJ, PJ=1/LMAX
 Q2/RJ, PJ=1/SUMWJCJ
 Q2/TREE, PJ=1/CMAX
 Q2/TREE, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 Q/RJ, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 R2//SUMWJCJ
 O2/PJ=1/SUMTJ
 O2/DJ, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 O2/DJ, PJ=1/SUMUJ
 O2/RJ, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 O2/RJ, PJ=1/SUMUJ
 O2/TREE, PJ=1/CMAX
 O2/TREE, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 O2//SUMCJ
 O3/RJ, PJ=1/LMAX
 O3//CMAX
 O/PJ=1/LMAX
 O/RJ, PJ=1/CMAX
 F2/TREE, PJ=1/LMAX
 F2/TREE, RJ, PJ=1/CMAX
 F2/TREE, RJ, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 F2/PREC, PJ=1/CMAX
 F2/PREC, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 F3/TREE, PJ=1/CMAX
 F3/TREE, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 J2/PJ=1/SUMCJ
 J2/PJ=1/SUMUJ
 J2/RJ, PJ=1/LMAX

MAXIMAL OPEN PROBLEMS

1/TREE/SUMTJ
 P3/TREE/CMAX
 Q3/TREE, RJ, PJ=1/SUMTJ
 Q3/PREC, RJ, DJ, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 Q/RJ, DJ, PJ=1/SUMWJTJ
 Q/RJ, DJ, PJ=1/SUMWJUJ
 Q/TREE, PJ=1/CMAX
 Q/TREE, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 R3//SUMWJCJ
 R3/DJ/SUMTJ
 R3/DJ/SUMWJUJ
 # O3//CMAX
 O3//SUMCJ
 O/RJ, DJ, PJ=1/SUMWJTJ
 O/RJ, DJ, PJ=1/SUMWJUJ
 O/TREE, PJ=1/SUMWJCJ
 O/TREE, RJ, PJ=1/SUMTJ
 O/PREC, RJ, DJ, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 F/TREE, RJ, PJ=1/SUMTJ
 F/PREC, RJ, DJ, PJ=1/SUMCJ
 J2/RJ, DJ, PJ=1/SUMWJTJ
 J2/RJ, DJ, PJ=1/SUMWJUJ

NONPREEMPTIVE SCHEDULING, BINARY ENCODING (CONTINUED)

MINIMAL HARD PROBLEMS

1/TREE,PJ=1/SUMWJTJ	3PT	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1980
1/TREE,PJ=1/SUMUJ	S3P	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1980
1/TREE,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJCJ	3PT	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1980
1/TREE,DJ,PJ=1/SUMTJ	VC	LENSTRA
1/TREE,RJ,PJ=1/SUMWJCJ	3PT	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1980
1/PREC,PJ=1/SUMWJCJ	LA	LAWLER 1978; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1978
1/PREC,PJ=1/SUMTJ	CL	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1978
1//SUMWJTJ	3PT	LAWLER 1977; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
1//SUMWJUJ	KS	KARP 1972
1/DJ/SUMWJCJ	3PT	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
1/DJ/SUMUJ	KS	LAWLER
1/RJ/LMAX	3PT	GAREY JOHNSON 1977; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
1/RJ/SUMCJ	3PT	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
1/TREE,DJ/SUMCJ	3PT	LENSTRA
1/PREC/SUMCJ	LA	LAWLER 1978; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1978
P2/TREE,PJ=1/SUMWJCJ	3PT	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1980
P2//CMAX	PT	KARP 1972
P2//SUMWJCJ	PT	BRUNO COFFMAN SETHI 1974; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
P2/TREE/SUMCJ	3PT	SETHI 1977
P/TREE,PJ=1/LMAX	VC	BRUCKER GAREY JOHNSON 1977
P/TREE,RJ,PJ=1/CMAX	VC	BRUCKER GAREY JOHNSON 1977
P/TREE,RJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ	VC	LENSTRA: BRUCKER GAREY JOHNSON 1977
P/PREC,PJ=1/CMAX	CL	ULLMAN 1975; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1978
P/PREC,PJ=1/SUMCJ	CL	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1978
O2//LMAX	3PT	LAWLER LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1981
O2//SUMWJCJ	3PT	LENSTRA
O2/RJ/CMAX	3PT	LAWLER LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1981
O2/TREE/CMAX	3PT	LAGEWEG LENSTRA
O2/TREE/SUMCJ	3PT	LAGEWEG LENSTRA
O3//CMAX	PT	GONZALEZ SAHNI 1976
O//SUMCJ	G3C	GONZALEZ 1979
F2/TREE,PJ=1/SUMWJCJ	3PT	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1980
F2//LMAX	3PT	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
F2//SUMCJ	3PT	GAREY JOHNSON SETHI 1976
F2/RJ/CMAX	3PT	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
F2/TREE/CMAX	3PT	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
F3//CMAX	3PT	GAREY JOHNSON SETHI 1976; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
J2/TREE,PJ=1/CMAX	3PT	LENSTRA
J2/TREE,PJ=1/SUMCJ	3PT	LENSTRA
J2//CMAX	3PT	GAREY JOHNSON SETHI 1976; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
J3/PJ=1/CMAX	3PT	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1979
J3/PJ=1/SUMCJ	3PT	LENSTRA

NONPREEMPTIVE SCHEDULING, UNARY ENCODING (CONTINUED)

MINIMAL HARD PROBLEMS

1/TREE,PJ=1/SUMWJTJ	3PT LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1980
1/TREE,PJ=1/SUMUJ	S3P LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1980
1/TREE,DJ,PJ=1/SUMWJCJ	3PT LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1980
1/TREE,DJ,PJ=1/SUMTJ	VC LENSTRA
1/TREE,RJ,PJ=1/SUMWJCJ	3PT LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1980
1/PREC,PJ=1/SUMWJCJ	LA LAWLER 1978; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1978
1/PREC,PJ=1/SUMTJ	CL LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1978
1//SUMWJTJ	3PT LAWLER 1977; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
1/DJ/SUMWJCJ	3PT LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
1/RJ/LMAX	3PT GAREY JOHNSON 1977; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
1/RJ/SUMCJ	3PT LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
1/TREE,DJ/SUMCJ	3PT LENSTRA
1/PREC/SUMCJ	LA LAWLER 1978; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1978
P2/TREE,PJ=1/SUMWJCJ	3PT LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1980
P2/TREE/LMAX	3PT LENSTRA
P2/TREE/SUMCJ	3PT SETHI 1977
P2/TREE,RJ/CMAX	3PT LENSTRA
P2/PREC/CMAX	CL ULLMAN 1975; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1978
P/TREE,PJ=1/LMAX	VC BRUCKER GAREY JOHNSON 1977
P/TREE,RJ,PJ=1/CMAX	VC BRUCKER GAREY JOHNSON 1977
P/TREE,RJ,PJ=1/SUMCJ	VC LENSTRA: BRUCKER GAREY JOHNSON 1977
P/PREC,PJ=1/CMAX	CL ULLMAN 1975; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1978
P/PREC,PJ=1/SUMCJ	CL LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1978
P//CMAX	3PT GAREY JOHNSON 1975
P//SUMWJCJ	3PT LAGEWEG LENSTRA
Q2/TREE/CMAX	3PT LAGEWEG
O2//LMAX	3PT LAWLER LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1981
O2//SUMWJCJ	3PT LENSTRA
O2/RJ/CMAX	3PT LAWLER LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1981
O2/TREE/CMAX	3PT LAGEWEG LENSTRA
O2/TREE/SUMCJ	3PT LAGEWEG LENSTRA
O//CMAX	3PT LENSTRA
O//SUMCJ	G3C GONZALEZ 1979
F2/TREE,PJ=1/SUMWJCJ	3PT LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1980
F2//LMAX	3PT LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
F2//SUMCJ	3PT GAREY JOHNSON SETHI 1976
F2/RJ/CMAX	3PT LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
F2/TREE/CMAX	3PT LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
F3//CMAX	3PT GAREY JOHNSON SETHI 1976; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
J2/TREE,PJ=1/CMAX	3PT LENSTRA
J2/TREE,PJ=1/SUMCJ	3PT LENSTRA
J2//CMAX	3PT GAREY JOHNSON SETHI 1976; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977
J3/PJ=1/CMAX	3PT LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1979
J3/PJ=1/SUMCJ	3PT LENSTRA

PREEMPTIVE SCHEDULING, BINARY ENCODING

DATE: 81:03:13

NUMBER OF PROBLEMS	MINIMAL	TOTAL	MAXIMAL
EASY		97	11
OPEN	14	122	9
HARD	31	1377	
TOTAL		1596	

MAXIMAL EASY PROBLEMS

1/DJ/SUMCJ	SMITH 1956 (NO PMTN)
1/RJ/SUMCJ	BAKER 1974
1/RJ/SUMUJ	LAWLER (DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING)
1/TREE/SUMWJCJ	HORN 1972; SIDNEY 1975 (NO PMTN)
P/TREE/CMAX	MUNTZ COFFMAN 1970; GONZALEZ JOHNSON 1980
Q2/PREC,RJ/LMAX	LAWLER
Q3//SUMUJ	LAWLER 1979
Q//SUMCJ	GONZALEZ 1977
R/RJ/LMAX	LAWLER LABETOULLE 1978 (LINEAR PROGRAMMING)
O/RJ/LMAX	CHO SAHNI 1978 (LINEAR PROGRAMMING)
F2//CMAX	GONZALEZ SAHNI 1976; JOHNSON 1954 (NO PMTN)

MINIMAL OPEN PROBLEMS

1//SUMTJ
 1/RJ,DJ/SUMCJ
 P2/DJ/SUMCJ
 P2/RJ/SUMCJ
 P2/RJ/SUMUJ
 P2/TREE/SUMCJ
 P3/TREE/LMAX
 P3/TREE,RJ/CMAX
 P3/PREC/CMAX
 Q3/TREE/CMAX
 R2//SUMCJ
 R2//SUMUJ
 O2//SUMCJ
 F2//SUMCJ

MAXIMAL OPEN PROBLEMS

Q3/RJ/SUMUJ
 Q3/TREE/SUMTJ
 Q3/PREC,RJ/LMAX
 Q/TREE/CMAX
 Q/TREE/SUMCJ
 R3//SUMUJ
 R/RJ,DJ/SUMTJ
 O3/RJ,DJ/SUMTJ
 F2/RJ/SUMCJ

PREEMPTIVE SCHEDULING, UNARY ENCODING

DATE: 81:03:13

NUMBER OF PROBLEMS	MINIMAL	TOTAL	MAXIMAL
EASY		114	14
OPEN	21	203	10
HARD	27	1279	
TOTAL		1596	

MAXIMAL EASY PROBLEMS

1//SUMTJ	LAWLER 1977 (NO PMTN)
1/DJ/SUMCJ	SMITH 1956 (NO PMTN)
1/RJ/SUMCJ	BAKER 1974
1/RJ/SUMWJUJ	LAWLER (DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING)
1/TREE/SUMWJCJ	HORN 1972; SIDNEY 1975 (NO PMTN)
P3//SUMWJCJ	MCNAUGHTON 1959 (NO PMTN; DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING)
P/TREE/CMAX	MUNTZ COFFMAN 1970; GONZALEZ JOHNSON 1980
Q2/PREC,RJ/LMAX	LAWLER
Q//SUMCJ	GONZALEZ 1977
R3//SUMWJUJ	LAWLER
R/RJ/LMAX	LAWLER LABETOULLE 1978 (LINEAR PROGRAMMING)
O3//SUMWJUJ	LAWLER
O/RJ/LMAX	CHO SAHNI 1978 (LINEAR PROGRAMMING)
F2//CMAX	GONZALEZ SAHNI 1976; JOHNSON 1954 (NO PMTN)

MINIMAL OPEN PROBLEMS

1/DJ/SUMTJ
 1/DJ/SUMUJ
 1/RJ/SUMTJ
 1/RJ,DJ/SUMCJ
 1/TREE/SUMTJ
 P2//SUMTJ
 P2/DJ/SUMCJ
 P2/RJ/SUMCJ
 P2/RJ/SUMUJ
 P2/TREE/SUMCJ
 P3/TREE/LMAX
 P3/TREE,RJ/CMAX
 P3/PREC/CMAX
 P//SUMUJ
 Q2//SUMWJCJ
 Q3/TREE/CMAX
 R2//SUMCJ
 O2//SUMCJ
 O2/RJ/SUMUJ
 O//SUMUJ
 F2//SUMCJ

MAXIMAL OPEN PROBLEMS

Q3/TREE/SUMTJ
 Q3/PREC,RJ/LMAX
 Q/TREE/CMAX
 Q/TREE/SUMCJ
 R3//SUMWJCJ
 R/RJ,DJ/SUMTJ
 R/RJ,DJ/SUMWJUJ
 O3/RJ,DJ/SUMTJ
 O/RJ,DJ/SUMWJUJ
 F2/RJ/SUMCJ

PREEMPTIVE SCHEDULING, BINARY ENCODING (CONTINUED)

MINIMAL HARD PROBLEMS

1//SUMWJ TJ	3PT	LAWLER 1977; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977 (NO PMTN)
1//SUMWJUJ	KS	KARP 1972 (NO PMTN)
1/DJ/SUMWJCJ	3PT	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977 (NO PMTN)
1/DJ/SUMUJ	KS	LAWLER
1/RJ/SUMWJCJ	3PT	LABETOULLE LAWLER LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1979
1/TREE/SUMUJ	S3P	LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1980 (NO PMTN)
1/TREE,DJ/SUMCJ	3PT	LENSTRA
1/TREE,RJ/SUMCJ	3PT	LENSTRA
1/PREC/SUMCJ	LA	LAWLER 1978; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1978 (NO PMTN)
P2//SUMWJCJ	PT	MCNAUGHTON 1959; BRUNO COFFMAN SETHI 1974; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977 (NO PMTN)
P//SUMUJ	KS	LAWLER
P/TREE/LMAX	VC	LENSTRA: BRUCKER GAREY JOHNSON 1977
P/TREE,RJ/CMA	VC	LENSTRA: BRUCKER GAREY JOHNSON 1977
P/PREC/CMA	CL	ULLMAN 1976
R2/RJ/SUMUJ	KS	LAWLER
R2/TREE/CMA	3PT	LENSTRA
R2/TREE/SUMCJ	3PT	LENSTRA
O2//SUMWJCJ	3PT	LENSTRA
O2//SUMUJ	KS	LAWLER LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1981
O2/TREE/CMA	3PT	LAGEWEG LENSTRA
O2/TREE/SUMCJ	3PT	LAGEWEG LENSTRA
O//SUMCJ	G3C	GONZALEZ 1979
F2//LMAX	3PT	CHO SAHNI 1978
F2//SUMWJCJ	3PT	LENSTRA
F2/RJ/CMA	3PT	CHO SAHNI 1978
F2/TREE/CMA	3PT	LAGEWEG LENSTRA
F2/TREE/SUMCJ	3PT	LAGEWEG LENSTRA
F3//CMA	3PT	GONZALEZ SAHNI 1978
F3//SUMCJ	3PT	LENSTRA
J2//CMA	3PT	GONZALEZ SAHNI 1978
J2//SUMCJ	3PT	LENSTRA

PREEMPTIVE SCHEDULING, UNARY ENCODING (CONTINUED)

MINIMAL HARD PROBLEMS

1//SUMWJTJ	3PT LAWLER 1977; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977 (NO PMTN)
1/DJ/SUMWJCJ	3PT LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN BRUCKER 1977 (NO PMTN)
1/RJ/SUMWJCJ	3PT LABETOULLE LAWLER LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1979
1/TREE/SUMUJ	S3P LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1980 (NO PMTN)
1/TREE,DJ/SUMCJ	3PT LENSTRA
1/TREE,RJ/SUMCJ	3PT LENSTRA
1/PREC/SUMCJ	LA LAWLER 1978; LENSTRA RINNOOY KAN 1978 (NO PMTN)
P2/TREE/SUMWJCJ	3PT LENSTRA
P//SUMWJCJ	3PT MCNAUGHTON 1959: LAGEWEG LENSTRA (NO PMTN)
P/TREE/LMAX	VC LENSTRA: BRUCKER GAREY JOHNSON 1977
P/TREE,RJ/CMAX	VC LENSTRA: BRUCKER GAREY JOHNSON 1977
P/PREC/CMAX	CL ULLMAN 1976
R2/TREE/CMAX	3PT LENSTRA
R2/TREE/SUMCJ	3PT LENSTRA
O2//SUMWJCJ	3PT LENSTRA
O2/TREE/CMAX	3PT LAGEWEG LENSTRA
O2/TREE/SUMCJ	3PT LAGEWEG LENSTRA
O//SUMCJ	G3C GONZALEZ 1979
F2//LMAX	3PT CHO SAHNI 1978
F2//SUMWJCJ	3PT LENSTRA
F2/RJ/CMAX	3PT CHO SAHNI 1978
F2/TREE/CMAX	3PT LAGEWEG LENSTRA
F2/TREE/SUMCJ	3PT LAGEWEG LENSTRA
F3//CMAX	3PT GONZALEZ SAHNI 1978
F3//SUMCJ	3PT LENSTRA
J2//CMAX	3PT GONZALEZ SAHNI 1978
J2//SUMCJ	3PT LENSTRA

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was partially supported by NATO Special Research Grant 9.2.02 (SRG.7) and by NSF Grant MCS78-20054.

REFERENCES

- K.R. BAKER (1974) *Introduction to Sequencing and Scheduling*, Wiley, New York.
- P. BRUCKER (1981) An efficient optimal algorithm to minimize maximum lateness for the two-machines, unit-time, job-shop scheduling problem. Unpublished manuscript.
- P. BRUCKER, M.R. GAREY, D.S. JOHNSON (1977) Scheduling equal-length tasks under treelike precedence constraints to minimize maximum lateness. *Math. Oper. Res.* 2, 275-284.
- J. BRUNO, E.G. COFFMAN, JR., R. SETHI (1974) Scheduling independent tasks to reduce mean finishing time. *Comm. ACM* 17, 382-387.
- Y. CHO, S. SAHNI (1978) Preemptive scheduling of independent jobs with release and due times on open, flow and job shops. Technical Report 78-5, Computer Science Department, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- E.G. COFFMAN, JR., R.L. GRAHAM (1972) Optimal scheduling for two-processor systems. *Acta Inform.* 1, 200-213.
- M.R. GAREY (1975) Personal communication.
- M.R. GAREY, D.S. JOHNSON (1975) Complexity results for multiprocessor scheduling under resource constraints. *SIAM J. Comput.* 4, 397-411.
- M.R. GAREY, D.S. JOHNSON (1977) Two-processor scheduling with start-times and deadlines. *SIAM J. Comput.* 6, 416-426.
- M.R. GAREY, D.S. JOHNSON (1978) "Strong" NP-completeness results: motivation, examples and implications. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.* 25, 499-508.
- M.R. GAREY, D.S. JOHNSON, R. SETHI (1976) The complexity of flowshop and job-shop scheduling. *Math. Oper. Res.* 1, 117-129.
- T. GONZALEZ (1977) Optimal mean finish time preemptive schedules. Technical Report 220, Computer Science Department, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.
- T. GONZALEZ (1979) NP-hard shop problems. Report CS-79-35, Department of

- Computer Science, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.
- T. GONZALEZ, D.B. JOHNSON (1980) A new algorithm for preemptive scheduling of trees. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.* 27, 287-312.
- T. GONZALEZ, S. SAHNI (1976) Open shop scheduling to minimize finish time. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.* 23, 665-679.
- T. GONZALEZ, S. SAHNI (1978) Flowshop and jobshop schedules: complexity and approximation. *Oper. Res.* 26, 36-52.
- R.L. GRAHAM, E.L. LAWLER, J.K. LENSTRA, A.H.G. RINNOOY KAN (1979) Optimization and approximation in deterministic sequencing and scheduling: a survey. *Ann. Discrete Math.* 5, 287-326.
- W.A. HORN (1972) Single-machine job sequencing with treelike precedence ordering and linear delay penalties. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 23, 189-202.
- W.A. HORN (1973) Minimizing average flow time with parallel machines. *Oper. Res.* 21, 846-847.
- T.C. HU (1961) Parallel sequencing and assembly line problems. *Oper. Res.* 9, 841-848.
- S.M. JOHNSON (1954) Optimal two- and three-stage production schedules with setup times included. *Naval Res. Logist. Quart.* 1, 61-68.
- R.M. KARP (1972) Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In: R.E. MILLER, J.W. THATCHER (eds.) (1972) *Complexity of Computer Computations*, Plenum Press, New York, 85-103.
- J. LABETOULLE, E.L. LAWLER, J.K. LENSTRA, A.H.G. RINNOOY KAN (1979) Preemptive scheduling of uniform machines subject to release dates. Report BW 99, Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam.
- B.J. LAGEWEG (-) Unpublished results.
- B.J. LAGEWEG, E.L. LAWLER, J.K. LENSTRA, A.H.G. RINNOOY KAN (1981) Computer aided complexity classification of combinatorial problems. Report BW 137, Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam.
- E.L. LAWLER (1964) On scheduling problems with deferral costs. *Management Sci.* 11, 280-288.
- E.L. LAWLER (1973) Optimal sequencing of a single machine subject to precedence constraints. *Management Sci.* 19, 544-546.
- E.L. LAWLER (1977) A "pseudopolynomial" algorithm for sequencing jobs to minimize total tardiness. *Ann. Discrete Math.* 1, 331-342.
- E.L. LAWLER (1978) Sequencing jobs to minimize total weighted completion time

- subject to precedence constraints. *Ann. Discrete Math.* 2,75-90.
- E.L. LAWLER (1979) Preemptive scheduling of uniform parallel machines to minimize the weighted number of late jobs. Report BW 105, Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam.
- E.L. LAWLER (-) Unpublished results.
- E.L. LAWLER, J. LABETOULLE (1978) On preemptive scheduling of unrelated parallel processors by linear programming. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.* 25, 612-619.
- E.L. LAWLER, J.K. LENSTRA, A.H.G. RINNOOY KAN (1981) Minimizing maximum lateness in a two-machine open shop. *Math. Oper. Res.*, to appear.
- J.K. LENSTRA (-) Unpublished results.
- J.K. LENSTRA, A.H.G. RINNOOY KAN (1978) Complexity of scheduling under precedence constraints. *Oper. Res.* 26,22-35.
- J.K. LENSTRA, A.H.G. RINNOOY KAN (1979) Computational complexity of discrete optimization problems. *Ann. Discrete Math.* 4,121-140.
- J.K. LENSTRA, A.H.G. RINNOOY KAN (1980) Complexity results for scheduling chains on a single machine. *European J. Oper. Res.* 4,270-275.
- J.K. LENSTRA, A.H.G. RINNOOY KAN, P. BRUCKER (1977) Complexity of machine scheduling problems. *Ann. Discrete Math.* 1,343-362.
- R. McNAUGHTON (1959) Scheduling with deadlines and loss functions. *Management Sci.* 6,1-12.
- J.M. MOORE (1968) An n job, one machine sequencing algorithm for minimizing the number of late jobs. *Management Sci.* 15,102-109.
- R.R. MUNTZ, E.G. COFFMAN, JR. (1970) Preemptive scheduling of real-time tasks on multiprocessor systems. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.* 17,324-338.
- R. SETHI (1977) On the complexity of mean flow time scheduling. *Math. Oper. Res.* 2,320-330.
- J.B. SIDNEY (1975) Decomposition algorithms for single-machine sequencing with precedence relations and deferral costs. *Oper. Res.* 23,283-298.
- W.E. SMITH (1956) Various optimizers for single-stage production. *Naval Res. Logist. Quart.* 3,59-66.
- J.D. ULLMAN (1975) NP-Complete scheduling problems. *J. Comput. System Sci.* 10,384-393.
- J.D. ULLMAN (1976) Complexity of sequencing problems. In: E.G. COFFMAN, JR. (ed.) (1976) *Computer & Job/Shop Scheduling Theory*, Wiley, New York, 139-164.