

# CompSci 260P: Week 7

## Greedy Algorithms

Ryuto Kitagawa

University of California, Irvine

# Before We Begin

- Greedy algorithms make *greedy* choices
  - Making optimal decisions based on local information
- Recall in Dynamic Programming, we break the problem down into making a single choice
  - Dynamic programming looks at the choice and uses recursion to find the optimal
  - Greedy algorithms instead make the optimal choice without recursion
- The burden of greedy algorithms is in the **proof!**

# Before We Begin

**Theorem 1**

Testing

- You are the manager and have  $n$  pizza orders
- Making a pizza is divided in two stages:
  - i. Preparation
  - ii. Baking
- Order  $i$  takes  $p_i$  time in prep and  $b_i$  time in baking
- Your oven is infinitely large, but you can only prep one pizza at a time
- What order should you prep the pizza such that the last pizza comes out of the oven as soon as possible?

- It is tempting to start with an algorithm, then prove it
  - However, proofs can guide our algorithms instead
- Notice this is a *permutation* problem
  - Therefore, what happens if we swap adjacent pizza orders?
- Let's look at two consecutive orders  $i$  and  $i + 1$

# Algorithmic Pizza: Solution

- Let  $s_i$  be how long it takes us to get to order  $i$ 
  - How long does pizza  $i$  and  $i + 1$  take to get out of the oven?
  - What if we were to flip it?
- How do we then use this information to find the optimal ordering?

# Algorithmic Pizza: Solution

- Consider if pizza  $i$  is prepared then pizza  $i + 1$ 
  - Pizza  $i$  comes out after:  $s_i + p_i + b_i$
  - Pizza  $i + 1$  comes out after:  $s_i + p_i + p_{i+1} + b_{i+1}$
- Consider if pizza  $i + 1$  is prepared then pizza  $i$ 
  - Pizza  $i$  comes out after:  $s_i + p_i + p_{i+1} + b_i$
  - Pizza  $i + 1$  comes out after:  $s_i + p_{i+1} + b_{i+1}$

- Let's see which pizza comes out earlier in the first configuration
  - Which is larger:  $s_i + p_i + b_i$  or  $s_i + p_i + p_{i+1} + b_{i+1}$
  - We can simplify the above by canceling like terms:  $b_i$  or  $p_{i+1} + b_{i+1}$
  - The above depends on the value of the variables, so let's consider when  $b_i < b_{i+1}$
  - Then we know that  $b_i < p_{i+1} + b_{i+1}$ , meaning pizza  $i + 1$  takes longer
  - Therefore, we take the time it takes for the longer pizza and compare it to the others



# Algorithmic Pizza: Solution

- Therefore, we compare  $s_i + p_i + p_{i+1} + b_{i+1}$  to the times for when pizza  $i + 1$  is prepared first
- Let's first compare with the time of pizza  $i$  (when pizza  $i + 1$  is prepared first)
  - $s_i + p_i + p_{i+1} + b_{i+1}$  and  $s_i + p_i + p_{i+1} + b_i$
  - Simplified for comparison we get,  $b_{i+1}$  and  $b_i$
  - So we know that preparing pizza  $i$  first takes longer in this comparison

# Algorithmic Pizza: Solution

- Now let's compare with the time of pizza  $i + 1$  (when pizza  $i + 1$  is prepared first)
  - $s_i + p_i + p_{i+1} + b_{i+1}$  and  $s_i + p_{i+1} + b_{i+1}$
  - Simplified for comparison we get,  $p_i + b_{i+1}$  and  $b_{i+1}$
  - So again, preparing pizza  $i$  first takes longer here as well
- **Conclusion:** When  $b_i < b_{i+1}$ , preparing pizza  $i$  first *always* takes longer
- The same logic follows for  $b_i > b_{i+1}$

# Interval Scheduling Approximation

- Given a set of intervals, find the largest subset of non-overlapping intervals
- Algorithm:
  - Pick the shortest interval
  - Discard any overlapping intervals
  - Repeat until we have no more intervals
- Prove this algorithm is a 2-approximation

# Interval Scheduling Approximation

- Consider the optimal solution and compare it to our own
  - What properties does the optimal solution have compared to our own?
  - The magic number to look for is 2
- What happens when the optimal solution has more intervals than the greedy
  - Consider an interval that invalidates more than 1 interval
  - Can it invalidate more than 2?
  - No, because of the middle interval!

# Interval Scheduling Approximation

- For each interval, it can overlap at most 2 optimal intervals
- Therefore, our solution is at most half of the optimal solution
- Thus making it a 2 approximation