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## Goals

## Understand that sometimes greed is good optimal!

Be able to analyze whether a greedy algorithm is optimal

- show it "stays ahead" of any other algorithm
- inductively
- lower bound the optimal solution, show that greedy achieves this bound
- exchangability and other problem structure

Problems:

- Interval scheduling
- Coin changing
- Optimal caching
- Shortest path
- Minimum spanning tree


### 4.1 Interval Scheduling

## Interval Scheduling

Interval scheduling.

- Job $j$ starts at $s_{j}$ and finishes at $f_{j}$.
- Two jobs compatible if they don't overlap.
- Goal: find maximum subset of mutually compatible jobs.



## Interval Scheduling: Greedy Algorithms

Greedy template. Consider jobs in some order. Take each job provided it's compatible with the ones already taken.

- [Earliest start time] Consider jobs in ascending order of start time $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{j}}$.
- [Earliest finish time] Consider jobs in ascending order of finish time $f_{j}$.
- [Shortest interval] Consider jobs in ascending order of interval length $f_{j}-s_{j}$.
- [Fewest conflicts] For each job, count the number of conflicting jobs $c_{j}$. Schedule in ascending order of conflicts $c_{j}$.


## Interval Scheduling: Greedy Algorithms

Greedy template. Consider jobs in some order. Take each job provided it's compatible with the ones already taken.

breaks earliest start time
breaks shortest interval
breaks fewest conflicts

## Interval Scheduling: Greedy Algorithm

Greedy algorithm. Consider jobs in increasing order of finish time. Take each job provided it's compatible with the ones already taken.

```
Sort jobs by finish times so that f}\mp@subsup{f}{1}{}\leq\mp@subsup{f}{2}{}\leq\ldots\leq\mp@subsup{f}{n}{}
    , jobs selected
A}\leftarrow
for j = 1 to n {
    if (job j compatible with A)
        A}\leftarrow\mathbf{A}\cup{j
}
return A
```

Implementation. $O(n \log n)$.

- Remember job $j^{*}$ that was added last to $A$.
- Job $j$ is compatible with $A$ if $s_{j} \geq f_{j^{*}}$.


## Interval Scheduling Example
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## Interval Scheduling Example



|  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Interval Scheduling Example
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## Interval Scheduling Example



|  |  | $B$ |  |  | $D$ | $E$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

## Interval Scheduling Example



|  |  | $B$ |  |  |  | $E$ | $F$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Interval Scheduling Example



|  |  | $B$ |  |  |  | $E$ |  | $G$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Interval Scheduling Example



|  | B |  |  | $E$ |  |  |  |  | $H$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |

## Interval Scheduling: Analysis

Theorem. Greedy algorithm is optimal.
Pf. (by contradiction)

- Assume greedy is not optimal, and let's see what happens.
- Let $i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots i_{k}$ denote set of jobs selected by greedy.
- Let $j_{1}, j_{2}, \ldots j_{m}$ denote set of jobs in the optimal solution with
$i_{1}=j_{1}, i_{2}=j_{2}, \ldots, i_{r}=j_{r}$ for the largest possible value of $r$.



## Interval Scheduling: Analysis

Theorem. Greedy algorithm is optimal.

## Pf. (by contradiction)

- Assume greedy is not optimal, and let's see what happens.
- Let $i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots i_{k}$ denote set of jobs selected by greedy.
- Let $j_{1}, j_{2}, \ldots j_{m}$ denote set of jobs in the optimal solution with
$i_{1}=j_{1}, i_{2}=j_{2}, \ldots, i_{r}=j_{r}$ for the largest possible value of $r$.

solution still feasible and optimal, but contradicts maximality of $r$.


## Coin Changing

Greed is good. Greed is right. Greed works. Greed clarifies, cuts through, and captures the essence of the evolutionary spirit.

- Gordon Gecko (Michael Douglas)



## Coin Changing

Goal. Given currency denominations: $1,5,10,25,100$, devise a method to pay amount to customer using fewest number of coins.

Ex: 344.



Cashier's algorithm. At each iteration, add coin of the largest value that does not take us past the amount to be paid.

Ex: \$2.89.


## Coin-Changing: Greedy Algorithm

Cashier's algorithm. At each iteration, add coin of the largest value that does not take us past the amount to be paid.

```
Sort coins denominations by value: c}\mp@subsup{c}{1}{}<\mp@subsup{c}{2}{}<\ldots<\mp@subsup{c}{n}{}\mathrm{ .
    , coins selected
S}\leftarrow
while (x f= 0) {
    let k be largest integer such that cock m
    if (k = 0)
        return "no solution found"
    x}\leftarrow\mathbf{x}-\mp@subsup{\mathbf{C}}{\mathbf{k}}{
    S}\leftarrowS\cup{k
}
return S
```

Q. Is cashier's algorithm optimal?

## Coin-Changing: Analysis of Greedy Algorithm

Theorem. Greed is optimal for U.S. coinage: $1,5,10,25,100$. Pf. (by induction on $x$ )

- Consider optimal way to change $c_{k} \leq x<c_{k+1}$ : greedy takes coin $k$.
- We claim that any optimal solution must also take coin $k$.
- if not, it needs enough coins of type $c_{1}, \ldots, c_{k-1}$ to add up to $x$
- table below indicates no optimal solution can do this
- Problem reduces to coin-changing $x-c_{k}$ cents, which, by induction, is optimally solved by greedy algorithm. -

| $k$ | $c_{k}$ | All optimal solutions <br> must satisfy | Max value of coins <br> $1,2, \ldots, k-1$ in any OPT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | $\mathrm{P} \leq 4$ | - |
| 2 | 5 | $\mathrm{~N} \leq 1$ | 4 |
| 3 | 10 | $\mathrm{~N}+\mathrm{D} \leq 2$ | $4+5=9$ |
| 4 | 25 | $\mathrm{Q} \leq 3$ | $20+4=24$ |
| 5 | 100 | no limit | $75+24=99$ |

## Coin-Changing: Analysis of Greedy Algorithm

Observation. Greedy algorithm is sub-optimal for US postal denominations: $1,10,21,34,70,100,350,1225$, 1500.

Counterexample. 140\$.

- Greedy: 100, 34, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1.
- Optimal: 70,70.



### 4.1 Interval Partitioning

## Interval Partitioning

Interval partitioning.

- Lecture $j$ starts at $s_{j}$ and finishes at $f_{j}$.
- Goal: find minimum number of classrooms to schedule all lectures so that no two occur at the same time in the same room.

Ex: This schedule uses 4 classrooms to schedule 10 lectures.


## Interval Partitioning

Interval partitioning.

- Lecture $j$ starts at $s_{j}$ and finishes at $f_{j}$.
- Goal: find minimum number of classrooms to schedule all lectures so that no two occur at the same time in the same room.

Ex: This schedule uses only 3.


## Interval Partitioning: Lower Bound on Optimal Solution

Def. The depth of a set of open intervals is the maximum number that contain any given time.

Key observation. Number of classrooms needed $\geq$ depth.
Ex: Depth of schedule below $=3 \Rightarrow$ schedule below is optimal.

$$
a, b, c \text { all contain 9:30 }
$$

Q. Does there always exist a schedule equal to depth of intervals?


## Interval Partitioning: Greedy Algorithm

Greedy algorithm. Consider lectures in increasing order of start time: assign lecture to any compatible classroom.

```
Sort intervals by starting time so that s}\mp@subsup{s}{1}{}\leq\mp@subsup{s}{2}{}\leq\ldots\leq\mp@subsup{s}{n}{}
d}\leftarrow0\leftarrow\mathrm{ number of allocated classrooms
for j = 1 to n {
    if (lecture j is compatible with some classroom k)
        schedule lecture j in classroom k
    else
        allocate a new classroom d + 1
        schedule lecture j in classroom d + 1
        d}\leftarrowd+
}
```

Implementation. $O(n \log n)$.

- For each classroom $k$, maintain the finish time of the last job added.
- Keep the classrooms in a priority queue.


## Interval Partitioning: Greedy Analysis

Observation. Greedy algorithm never schedules two incompatible lectures in the same classroom.

Theorem. Greedy algorithm is optimal. Pf.

- Let $d=$ number of classrooms that the greedy algorithm allocates.
- Classroom d is opened because we needed to schedule a job, say $j$, that is incompatible with all d1 other classrooms.
- Since we sorted by start time, all these incompatibilities are caused by lectures that start no later than $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{j}}$.
- Thus, we have d lectures overlapping at time $s_{j}+\varepsilon$.
- Key observation $\Rightarrow$ all schedules use $\geq d$ classrooms. .

