

Exact algorithms for single-machine scheduling with time windows and precedence constraints

Morteza Davari¹ · Erik Demeulemeester¹ · Roel Leus² · Fabrice Talla Nobibon³

Published online: 17 April 2015
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2015

Abstract We study a single-machine scheduling problem that is a generalization of a number of problems for which computational procedures have already been published. Each job has a processing time, a release date, a due date, a deadline, and a weight representing the penalty per unit-time delay beyond the due date. The goal is to schedule all jobs such that the total weighted tardiness penalty is minimized and both the precedence constraints as well as the time windows (implied by the release dates and the deadlines) are respected. We develop a branch-and-bound algorithm that solves the problem to optimality. Computational results show that our approach is effective in solving medium-sized instances, and that it compares favorably with existing methods for special cases of the problem.

Keywords Single-machine scheduling · Branch and bound · Mixed-integer programming

1 Introduction

Scheduling problems arise in production planning (Sule 2007), in balancing processes (Shirazi et al. 1995), in telecommunication (Nemeth et al. 1997), and more generally in all situations in which scarce resources are to be allocated to jobs over time (Pinedo 2008). Depending on the application, the corresponding scheduling problem can be such that each job must be processed within a given time window, where the lower bound (*release date* or *ready time*) of this time window represents the earliest start of the execution of the job and the upper bound (*deadline*) corresponds with the latest acceptable completion time, for instance, the ultimate delivery time agreed upon with the customer (Pan and Shi 2005; Gordon et al. 1997; Xu and Parnas 1990). For some of these applications, only release dates or only deadlines are considered (Jouglet et al. 2004; Tanaka and Fujikuma 2012; Pan 2003; Posner 1985). In practice, a job often also needs to be processed before or after other jobs, e.g., due to tool or fixture restrictions or for other case-dependent technological reasons, which leads to *precedence constraints* (Potts 1985; Lawler 1978; Tanaka and Sato 2013). Finally, the contract with a client can also contain clauses that stipulate that penalties must be paid when the execution of a job is not completed before a reference date (*due date*) (Ibaraki and Nakamura 1994; Abdul-Razaq and Potts 1988; Jouglet et al. 2004; Tanaka and Fujikuma 2012; Dyer and Wolsey 1990; Talla Nobibon 2011).

In this article, we develop exact algorithms for a single-machine scheduling problem with total weighted tardiness (TWT) penalties. In the standard three-field notation introduced by Graham et al. (1979), the problem that we tackle can be denoted as $1|r_j, \delta_j, \text{prec}|\sum w_j T_j$: the execution of each job is constrained to take place within a time window, and we assume the corresponding deadline to be greater than

✉ Morteza Davari
morteza.davari@kuleuven.be

Erik Demeulemeester
erik.demeulemeester@kuleuven.be

Roel Leus
roel.leus@kuleuven.be

Fabrice Talla Nobibon
ftallanobibon@fedex.com

¹ Research Center for Operations Management, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

² ORSTAT, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

³ FedEx Express Europe, Brussels, Belgium

or equal to a due date, which is the reference for computing the tardiness of the job. The scheduling decisions are also subject to precedence constraints. In the following lines we briefly summarize the state of the art.

Abdul-Razaq et al. (1990) survey different branch-and-bound (B&B) algorithms for $1||\sum w_j T_j$. A benchmark algorithm is the B&B procedure of Potts and van Wassenhove (1985); an older reference is Held and Karp (1962), who present a dynamic programming (DP) approach. Abdul-Razaq and Potts (1988) introduce a DP-based approach to obtain tight lower bounds for the generalized version of the problem where the cost function is piecewise linear. They examine their lower bounds in a B&B algorithm and solve small instances (with at most 25 jobs) to optimality. Ibaraki and Nakamura (1994) extend their work and construct an exact method, called Successive Sublimation Dynamic Programming (SSDP), which solves medium-sized instances (with up to 50 jobs). Tanaka et al. (2009) improve the SSDP of Ibaraki and Nakamura (1994) and succeed in solving reasonably large instances (with up to 300 jobs) of $1||\sum w_j T_j$ within acceptable runtimes.

Single-machine scheduling for TWT with (possibly unequal) release dates ($1|r_j|\sum w_j T_j$) has also been studied by several authors. Akturk and Ozdemir (2000, 2001) and Jouglet et al. (2004) develop B&B algorithms that solve small instances. van den Akker et al. (2010) propose a time-indexed formulation and a method based on column generation to solve this problem with identical processing times. Tanaka and Fujikuma (2012) present an SSDP algorithm that can solve instances of $1|r_j|\sum w_j T_j$ with up to 100 jobs.

There are only few papers dealing with single-machine scheduling with deadlines and/or precedence constraints. Among these, we cite Posner (1985) and Pan (2003), who propose B&B algorithms for $1|\delta_j|\sum w_j C_j$, Pan and Shi (2005), who develop a B&B algorithm to solve $1|r_j, \delta_j|\sum w_j C_j$, Lawler (1978) and Potts (1985), who present B&B algorithms to solve $1|\text{prec}|\sum w_j C_j$, and Tang et al. (2007), who propose a hybrid backward and forward dynamic programming-based Lagrangian relaxation to compute upper and lower bounds for $1|\text{prec}|\sum w_j T_j$. Tanaka and Sato (2013) also propose an SSDP algorithm to solve a generalization of $1|\text{prec}|\sum w_j T_j$ (piecewise linear cost function). To the best of our knowledge, scheduling problems with release dates, deadlines, and precedence constraints have not yet been studied in the literature. The goal of this paper is to fill this gap and to propose efficient B&B algorithms that solve all the foregoing subproblems within limited computation times.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In Sect. 2 we provide some definitions and a formal problem statement, while Sect. 3 proposes two different integer programming formulations. In Sect. 4 we explain the branching strategies for our B&B algorithms, while the lower bounds,

the dominance rules and the initial upper bound are discussed in Sects. 5, 6 and 7, respectively. Computational results are reported and discussed in Sect. 8. We provide a summary and conclusions in Sect. 9.

2 Problem description

The jobs to be scheduled are gathered in set $N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Job i is characterized by a processing time p_i , a release date r_i , a due date d_i , a deadline δ_i , and a weight w_i which represents the cost per unit time of delay beyond d_i . Jobs can neither be processed before their release dates nor after their deadlines ($0 \leq r_i \leq \delta_i$). Precedence constraints are represented by a graph $G = (N', A)$, where $N' = N \cup \{0, n+1\}$, with 0 a dummy start job and $n+1$ a dummy end. Each arc $(i, j) \in A$ implies that job i must be executed before job j (job i is a predecessor of job j). We will assume that $G(N', A)$ is its own transitive reduction, that is, no transitive arcs are included in A . Let \mathcal{P}_i be the set of all predecessors of job i in A ($\mathcal{P}_i = \{k | (k, i) \in A\}$) and \mathcal{Q}_j the set of successors of job i ($\mathcal{Q}_j = \{k | (i, k) \in A\}$). We also define an associated graph $\hat{G} = (N', \hat{A})$ as the transitive closure of G . We assume that $\mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{Q}_{n+1} = \emptyset$, and that all jobs are successor of 0 and predecessor of $n+1$ in \hat{G} (apart from the jobs themselves).

Throughout this paper, we use the term ‘sequencing’ to refer to ordering the jobs (establishing a permutation), whereas ‘scheduling’ means that start (or end) times are determined. We denote by π an arbitrary sequence of jobs, where π_k represents the job at the k th position in that sequence. Let $\pi^{-1}(i)$ be the position of job i in π ; we only consider sequences for which $\pi^{-1}(i) < \pi^{-1}(j)$ for all $(i, j) \in A$. Value C_i is the completion time of job i . Each sequence π implies a schedule, as follows:

$$C_{\pi_i} = \begin{cases} \max\{r_{\pi_i}, C_{\pi_{i-1}}\} + p_{\pi_i} & \text{if } i > 1 \\ r_{\pi_i} + p_{\pi_i} & \text{if } i = 1. \end{cases}$$

Equivalently, the end of job i according to sequence π can also be written as $C_i(\pi)$. We denote by \mathcal{D} the set of all feasible permutations, where a permutation π is feasible ($\pi \in \mathcal{D}$) if and only if it generates a feasible schedule, which means that

$$r_{\pi_i} + p_{\pi_i} \leq C_{\pi_i} \leq \delta_{\pi_i} \quad \forall i \in N.$$

Note that the set \mathcal{D} may be empty.

The weighted tardiness associated with the job at the i th position in the sequence π is given by $W(\pi_i) = w_{\pi_i} (C_{\pi_i} - d_{\pi_i})^+$, where $x^+ = \max\{0, x\}$. A conceptual formulation of the problem P studied in this paper is the following:

Table 1 Job characteristics

Job i	p_i	r_i	d_i	δ_i	w_i
Job 1	2	3	10	14	1
Job 2	3	4	11	13	2
Job 3	4	3	8	15	3
Job 4	2	2	6	9	1




Fig. 1 Precedence graph $G(N', A)$

$$P : \min_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \text{TWT}(\pi) = \sum_{i=1}^n W(\pi_i). \tag{1}$$

This problem is at least as hard as $1||\sum w_i T_i$, which is known to be strongly NP-hard (Lawler 1977; Lenstra et al. 1977; Pinedo 2008). A stronger result is that the mere verification of the existence of a feasible schedule that respects a set of ready times and deadlines is already NP-complete (problem SS1, p. 236, Garey and Johnson 1979); we do not, however, incorporate the feasibility check as a formal part of the problem statement.

Example 1 Consider the following instance of P with $n = 4$ jobs. The processing times, release dates, due dates, deadlines, and weights of the jobs are given in Table 1. The graph representing the precedence constraints is depicted in Fig. 1, with arc set $A = \{(0, 1), (0, 4), (1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 5), (4, 5)\}$.

An optimal solution to this instance is $\pi = (4, 1, 2, 3)$, which leads to the schedule $C_1 = 6, C_2 = 9, C_3 = 13$, and $C_4 = 4$. The objective value is $w_4 \times 0 + w_1 \times 0 + w_2 \times 0 + w_3 \times (13 - 8) = 3 \times 5 = 15$.

3 Mathematical formulations

The conceptual formulation for P presented in the previous section is not linear; therefore, it cannot be used by a standard (linear) mixed-integer programming (MIP) solver. In this section, we propose an assignment formulation (ASF) and a time-indexed formulation (TIF) for the problem. These formulations are adaptations of those presented in Keha et al. (2009) and Talla Nobibon (2011).

3.1 Assignment formulation

We use binary decision variables $x_{is} \in \{0, 1\} (i \in N, s \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\})$, which identify the position of jobs in the sequence so that x_{is} is equal to 1 if job i is the s th job

processed and equal to 0 otherwise. In other words, $x_{is} = 1$ if and only if $\pi_s = i$. We also use additional continuous variables $T_i \geq 0$ representing the tardiness of job $i \in N$ and continuous variables $\tau_s \geq 0$ representing the machine idle time immediately before the execution of the s th job. The MIP formulation is given by

$$\text{ASF} : \min \sum_{i=1}^n w_i T_i \tag{2}$$

subject to

$$\sum_{s=1}^n x_{is} = 1 \quad \forall i \in N \tag{3}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n x_{is} = 1 \quad \forall s \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \tag{4}$$

$$\sum_{s=1}^n x_{is} s \leq \sum_{t=1}^n x_{jt} t - 1 \quad \forall (i, j) \in A \tag{5}$$

$$\tau_s \geq \sum_{i=1}^n x_{is} r_i - \sum_{t=1}^{s-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (x_{it} p_i) + \tau_t \right) \quad \forall s \in N \tag{6}$$

$$\sum_{t=1}^s \tau_t + \sum_{t=1}^{s-1} \sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_{it} + \sum_{i=1}^n ((p_i - \delta_i) x_{is}) \leq 0 \quad \forall s \in N \tag{7}$$

$$T_i \geq \sum_{t=1}^s \tau_t + \sum_{t=1}^{s-1} \sum_{j=1}^n p_j x_{jt} + p_i - d_i - (1 - x_{is}) M_i \quad \forall i \in N, s \in N \tag{8}$$

$$x_{is} \in \{0, 1\}, \tau_s, T_i \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in N, s \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \tag{9}$$

The objective function (2) is a reformulation of (1). The set of constraints (3) ensures that all jobs are executed. Constraints (4) check that each position in the sequence is occupied by exactly one job. The set of constraints (5) enforces the precedence restrictions. The set of equations (6) computes the idle time of the machine between the jobs in positions $s - 1$ and s , and ensures that each job is not started before its release date. In this set of constraints, $\sum_{t=1}^{s-1} (\sum_{i=1}^n (x_{it} p_i) + \tau_t)$ equals the completion time of the $(s - 1)$ th job. Constraints (7) ensure that each job is not completed after its deadline, where $\sum_{t=1}^s \tau_t + \sum_{t=1}^{s-1} \sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_{it}$ is the start time of the s th job. Constraints (8) compute the correct value of the tardiness of job i , with $M_i = \delta_i - d_i$ the maximum tardiness of job i .

A variant of ASF is obtained by replacing the set of constraints (5) by the following:

$$\sum_{s=v}^n x_{is} + \sum_{s=1}^v x_{js} \leq 1 \quad \forall (i, j) \in A, \forall v \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \tag{10}$$

We refer to this alternative formulation as ASF'. We have the following result:

Lemma 1 ASF' is stronger than ASF.

All proofs are included in the Appendix. The number of constraints in (10) is much higher than in (5). As a result, the additional computational effort needed to process this higher number of constraints might offset the improvement of a stronger bound, and we will empirically compare the performance of the two variants in Sect. 8.4.

3.2 Time-indexed formulation

Let T_S (respectively T_E) be a lower (respectively upper) bound on the time the execution of any job can be completed; we compute these values as $T_S = \min\{r_i + p_i | i \in N\}$ and $T_E = \max\{\delta_i | i \in N\}$.

The time-indexed formulation uses binary decision variables $x_{it} \in \{0, 1\}$, for $i \in N$ and $T_S \leq t \leq T_E$, where $x_{it} = 1$ if job i is completed (exactly) at time t and $x_{it} = 0$ otherwise. We also introduce the set of parameters $T_{it} = (t - d_i)^+$, representing the tardiness of job i when it finishes at time t . The time-indexed formulation is given by

$$\text{TIF} : \min \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{t=r_i+p_i}^{\delta_i} w_i T_{it} x_{it} \tag{11}$$

subject to

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s=\max\{t, r_i+p_i\}}^{\min\{\delta_i, t+p_i-1\}} x_{is} \leq 1 \quad \forall t, T_S \leq t \leq T_E \tag{12}$$

$$\sum_{t=r_i+p_i}^{\delta_i} x_{it} = 1 \quad \forall i \in N \tag{13}$$

$$\sum_{s=r_i+p_i}^{\delta_i} x_{is} s \leq \sum_{t=r_j+p_j}^{\delta_j} x_{jt} t - p_j \quad \forall (i, j) \in A \tag{14}$$

$$x_{it} \in \{0, 1\} \quad i \in N, r_i + p_i \leq t \leq \delta_i \tag{15}$$

The set of constraints (12) eliminates the parts of the solution space where the jobs overlap. The constraint set (13) ensures that all jobs are scheduled exactly once. We enforce precedence constraints in the formulation using the set of constraints (14).

Similarly as for the assignment formulation, we introduce an alternative formulation TIF' by replacing the set of constraints (14) by the following:

$$\sum_{s=t}^{\delta_i} x_{is} + \sum_{s=r_j+p_j}^{t-p_i} x_{js} \leq 1$$

$$\forall (i, j) \in A; \forall t : \max\{r_i, r_j + p_j\} + p_i \leq t \leq \min\{\delta_i, \delta_j + p_j\} \tag{16}$$




Fig. 2 The structure of a partial schedule

Lemma 2 (From Christofides et al. (1987), Artigues et al. (2007)) TIF' is stronger than TIF.

As explained for the assignment formulation, the performance of the new formulation is not necessarily better. In fact, it can be much worse than TIF, since in a time-indexed formulation the number of additional constraints is quite large (pseudo-polynomial).

4 Branching strategies

In this section we discuss two different branching strategies for our B&B algorithm. The structure of the B&B search trees is as follows: each tree consists of a finite number of nodes and branches, and at each level of the tree we make a sequencing decision for one job. Each node thus corresponds with a selection $S_P \subseteq N$ containing the already scheduled jobs and a set of unscheduled jobs $U = N \setminus S_P$. Each node also has two feasible partial sequences σ_B and σ_E of the scheduled jobs (each $i \in S_P$ appears in exactly one of these two): σ_B (respectively σ_E) denotes the partial sequence of jobs scheduled from the beginning (respectively end) of the scheduling horizon; see Fig. 2 for an illustration. All jobs that are not scheduled, belong to the set of unscheduled jobs $U = E_B \cup E_E \cup E_N$. E_B is subset of unscheduled jobs that are eligible to be scheduled immediately after the last job in σ_B , E_E is the subset of unscheduled jobs that are eligible to be scheduled immediately before the first job in σ_E , and E_N is the subset of unscheduled jobs that are not in $E_B \cup E_E$.

The root node represents an empty schedule ($S_P = \sigma_B = \sigma_E = \emptyset$). Each node branches into a number of child nodes, which each correspond with the scheduling of one particular job, called the *decision job*, as early as possible after the last job in σ_B or as late as possible before the first job in σ_E . A branch is called a *forward branch* if it schedules a job after the last job in σ_B , and is called a *backward branch* if it schedules a job before the first job in σ_E . In our branching strategies, there will be either only forward branches or only backward branches emanating from each given node. We will say that a node is of type FB (respectively BB) if all its branches are forward (respectively backward) branches.

Although scheduling jobs backward (from the end of the time horizon) often improves the tightness of lower bounds when release dates are equal (Potts and van Wassenhove 1985), it probably decreases the quality of the lower bounds in the presence of non-equal release dates; see Sect. 4.2 and 5.3

for a description of backward branching and of the lower bounds, respectively, and Sect. 8.4 for the empirical results and a discussion. Also, the efficiency of some dominance rules may decrease when we switch from forward scheduling to backward scheduling; see Sect. 6.4 for more details. We propose two B&B algorithms, each applying one of the branching strategies: BB1 corresponds with branching strategy 1 where only FB nodes are used and BB2 corresponds with branching strategy 2 where both FB and BB are created. The bounding and the dominance properties discussed in the following sections are the same in both B&B algorithms.

Let $C_{\max}(\sigma)$ be the completion time of the last job in the sequence σ . Throughout the branching procedure, we maintain two vectors of *updated release dates*, namely $\hat{r} = (\hat{r}_1, \dots, \hat{r}_n)$ and $\bar{r} = (\bar{r}_1, \dots, \bar{r}_n)$, defined as follows:

$$\hat{r}_j = \max\{r_j, C_{\max}(\sigma_B)\}$$

$$\bar{r}_j = \max\left\{\hat{r}_j, \max_{k \in \mathcal{P}_j} \{\bar{r}_k + p_k\}\right\}.$$

Let $st(\pi)$ denote the start time of the first job according to sequence π . In line with the two vectors of updated release dates, we also introduce two vectors of *updated deadlines*, namely $\hat{\delta} = (\hat{\delta}_1, \dots, \hat{\delta}_n)$ and $\bar{\delta} = (\bar{\delta}_1, \dots, \bar{\delta}_n)$, which are recursively computed as follows:

$$\hat{\delta}_j = \min\{\delta_j, st(\sigma_E)\}$$

$$\bar{\delta}_j = \min\left\{\hat{\delta}_j, \min_{k \in \mathcal{Q}_j} \{\bar{\delta}_k - p_k\}\right\}.$$

We use these updated release dates and deadlines in computing lower bounds and dominance rules. $\bar{\delta}$ and \bar{r} are more restrictive than $\hat{\delta}$ and \hat{r} in each node of the search tree ($\bar{r}_j \geq \hat{r}_j$ and $\bar{\delta}_j \leq \hat{\delta}_j$). Although being restrictive often is positive, \hat{r}_j and $\hat{\delta}_j$ are occasionally preferred over \bar{r}_j and $\bar{\delta}_j$, specifically in parts of computations related to the dominance rules discussed in Sect. 6. Further explanations of these occasions are given in Sect. 6. There are many cases in which $\bar{r}_j = \hat{r}_j$ (respectively $\bar{\delta}_j = \hat{\delta}_j$) and either of the updated release dates (respectively deadlines) can be used. In these cases, we use \hat{r}_j (respectively $\hat{\delta}_j$) because less computations are needed.

4.1 Branching strategy 1

Branching strategy 1 only uses FB nodes. The search tree is explored depth-first such that among children of a node, those with larger out-degrees (number of transitive successors) of their decision jobs in \hat{G} are visited first. As a tie-breaking rule, among children with equal out-degrees of their decision jobs, the node with lower index is visited first.

Figure 3 illustrates branching strategy 1 applied to Example 1; an asterisk ‘*’ indicates that the position has not been decided yet. Among the children of the root node, the node $(1, *, *, *)$ corresponds with the decision job (job




Fig. 3 Branching strategy 1 for Example 1 without dominance rules and without lower bounds

1) with the largest out-degree (namely 3). As a result, the node $(1, *, *, *)$ is visited first. The nodes $(2, *, *, *)$ and $(3, *, *, *)$ are not in the tree because they violate precedence constraints. Among the children of $(1, *, *, *)$, the node $(1, 2, *, *)$ is visited first because it has the decision job 2 with the largest out-degree. Among the children of $(1, 2, *, *)$, the node $(1, 2, 3, *)$ is visited first because its decision job has the largest out-degree and the smallest index. In Fig. 3, green nodes are FB nodes; no BB nodes are present. Red nodes are considered infeasible because the completion of a job (namely job 4) occurs after its deadline. The node $(1, 4, 2, 3)$ corresponds with a feasible schedule, but it is not optimal: its objective value is greater than 15, which is attained by the optimal sequence $(4, 1, 2, 3)$.

4.2 Branching strategy 2

In branching strategy 2, we try to exploit the advantages of backward scheduling whenever possible, so the search tree consists of both FB and BB nodes. If the inequality $C_{\max}(\sigma_B) < r_{\max}(U) = \max_{j \in U} \{r_j\}$ holds, then the start times of the jobs in σ_E will depend on the order in which unscheduled jobs are processed. Therefore, if the inequality $C_{\max}(\sigma_B) < r_{\max}(U)$ holds, the corresponding node is of type FB. Otherwise, the completion time of the last job in σ_E can be computed regardless of the sequencing decisions for the jobs in U , and we have a BB node. The branching is *depth-first* for both FB and BB nodes. Among the children of an FB (respectively BB) node, those with higher (respectively lower) out-degrees of their decision jobs are visited first. As a tie-breaking rule, among children with equal out-degrees, the node with lower (respectively higher) index is visited first.

Figure 4 illustrates branching strategy 2 for Example 1; green nodes are of type FB and blue nodes are of type BB. The root node is FB because $C_{\max}(\emptyset) = 0 < 4 = r_{\max}(\{1, 2, 3, 4\})$. At the node labeled $(1, *, *, *)$, the completion time $C_{\max}(1, *, *, *) = 5$ of the decision




Fig. 4 Branching strategy 2 for Example 1 without dominance rules and without lower bounds

job surpasses $r_{\max}(\{1, 2, 3, 4\}) = 4$; therefore, the end of scheduling horizon is computed ($T_E = 5 + 3 + 4 + 2 = 14$) and the node is BB. The red nodes are infeasible because the completion time of job 4 falls after its deadline.

5 Lower bounding

In this section we describe the lower bounds that are implemented in our B&B algorithm. Section 5.1 first introduces a conceptual formulation for our problem, Sect. 5.2 describes a very fast lower bounding procedure, and in Sect. 5.3 we describe several lower bounds based on Lagrangian relaxation.

5.1 Another conceptual formulation

Let variable $C_j \geq 0$ denote the completion time of job $j \in N$ and let variable $T_j \geq 0$ represent the tardiness of job j . An alternative formulation of our problem is given by

$$P : \min \sum_{j=1}^n w_j T_j \tag{17}$$

subject to

$$T_j \geq C_j - d_j \quad \forall j \in N \tag{18}$$

$$C_j \geq r_j + p_j \quad \forall j \in N \tag{19}$$

$$C_j \leq \delta_j \quad \forall j \in N \tag{20}$$

$$C_j \geq C_i + p_j \quad \forall (i, j) \in A \tag{21}$$

$$C_j \geq C_i + p_j \text{ or } C_i \geq C_j + p_i \quad \forall i, j \in N; i < j \tag{22}$$

$$T_j \geq 0 \quad \forall j \in N \tag{23}$$

$$C_j \geq 0 \quad \forall j \in N \tag{24}$$

In the above formulation, constraints (18) and (23) reflect the definition of job tardiness. Constraints (19) and (20) enforce time windows. Constraints (21) ensure that each job is scheduled after all its predecessors. Constraints (22) guarantee that

jobs do not overlap. We will use this formulation in Sect. 5.3 for producing lower bounds.

To the best of our knowledge, a lower bound procedure specifically for P has to date not been developed in the literature. Lower bounds proposed for $1|| \sum w_j T_j, 1|prec| \sum w_j C_j$ and $1|r_j| \sum w_j C_j$, however, can also function as a lower bound for P; this is shown in the following theorems. These theorems are extensions of those presented in Akturk and Ozdemir (2000).

Let I be an instance of $1|\beta| \sum w_j T_j$. We construct an instance I' of $1|| \sum w_j T_j$ by removing all constraints implied by β and an instance I'' of $1|\beta| \sum w_j C_j$ by replacing all due dates with zeros. Let $TWT^*(I)$ be the optimal objective value of I . Given any valid lower bound $lb_{I'}$ on the optimal value of I' , we have

Theorem 1 $lb_{I'} \leq TWT^*(I)$.

A job is called *early* if it finishes at or before its due date and is said to be *tardy* if it finishes after its due date. Let $C_j(S)$ be the completion time of job j in feasible solution S . For an optimal solution S^* to I , we partition N into two subsets: the set \mathcal{E} of early jobs and the set \mathcal{T} of tardy jobs. Let lb^E be a lower bound on the value $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}} w_j (d_j - C_j(S^*))$. Given any valid lower bound $\bar{lb}_{I''}$ on the optimal value of I'' , we have

Theorem 2 $\bar{lb}_{I''} - \sum_j w_j d_j + lb^E \leq TWT^*(I)$.

In the following, we remove several combinations of constraints in P to construct subproblems for which there exist polynomial-time-bounded algorithms for computing lower bounds. These bounds then directly lead to valid lower bounds for P via Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

5.2 A very fast trivial lower bound

Let P_T be the trivial subproblem of P in which constraints (18), (19), (20), and (21) are removed, which is then equivalent to $1|| \sum w_j C_j$. An optimal solution S^* to P_T (with the optimal value $OPT(S^*)$) follows sequence σ_T , which sequences jobs according to the *shortest weighted processing time* (SWPT) rule (Pinedo 2008). By Theorems 1 and 2, $LB_T = OPT(S^*) - \sum_j w_j d_j + lb^E$ is a valid lower bound for P. We compute lb^E as the summation of the earliness values when each job is scheduled at its latest possible starting time. Note that if $r_j = d_j = 0$ for all jobs j and σ_T does not violate any deadline nor precedence constraint, then σ_T is optimal to P and $OPT = LB_T$. In B&B algorithms, this situation frequently occurs when some jobs have already been scheduled.

5.3 Lagrangian relaxation-based bounds

In this section, we use Lagrangian relaxation for computing various lower bounds. Let P_0 be the subproblem of P in which constraints (19), (20), and (21) are removed. This problem is studied by Potts and van Wassenhove (1985) and is considered as our base problem. Let λ be a vector of Lagrangian multipliers. Potts and van Wassenhove (1985) obtain the following Lagrangian problem associated with P_0 :

$$LR_{P_0} : L_0(\lambda) = \min \sum_{j=1}^n (w_j - \lambda_j)T_j + \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j(C_j - d_j)$$

subject to constraints (22) – (24).

Parameter λ_j is the Lagrangian multiplier associated with job j ($0 \leq \lambda_j \leq w_j$). Potts and Van Wassenhove propose a polynomial-time algorithm to set the multipliers. Their algorithm yields a very good lower bound for P_0 ; they compute the optimal values of the multipliers in $O(n \log n)$ time, and for a given set of multipliers, the bound itself can be computed in linear time. Let λ_{PV} be the best Lagrangian multipliers computed by Potts and van Wassenhove (1985); we refer to this lower bound as $LB_0 = L_0(\lambda_{PV})$. By Theorem 1, LB_0 is also a valid bound for P . Quite a number of aspects of the definition of P are completely ignored in LB_0 ; however, in the following sections, we will examine a number of ways to strengthen LB_0 .

5.3.1 Retrieving precedence constraints

When $A \neq \emptyset$ then incorporating some or all of precedence constraints into the lower bound will improve its quality. We partition arc set A as $A = A' \cup A''$, where $G' = (N, A')$ is a two-terminal *vertex serial-parallel* (VSP) graph and $G'' = (N, A'')$. Figure 5 depicts an example of this graph decomposition. For the precise definition of VSP graphs, we refer to Valdes et al. (1982). It should be noted that there exist two types of serial-parallel graphs: VSP graphs and *edge serial-parallel* (ESP) graphs. Valdes et al. (1982) describe the link between these two types: a graph is VSP if and only if its so-called ‘line-digraph inverse’ is ESP.

We split the set of constraints (21) into two subsets, as follows:

$$C_j \geq C_i + p_j \quad \forall (i, j) \in A' \tag{25}$$

$$C_j \geq C_i + p_j \quad \forall (i, j) \in A'' \tag{26}$$

We introduce P_1 , which is a generalization of P_0 where precedence constraints are retrieved by imposing constraints (25) and (26). We create the following associated Lagrangian problem:




Fig. 5 This figure shows (a) an example graph G , (b) an associated VSP subgraph G' and (c) G''

$$LR_{P_1} : L_1(\lambda, \mu) = \min \sum_{j \in N} (w_j - \lambda_j)T_j$$

$$+ \sum_{j \in N} \lambda_j(C_j - d_j) + \sum_{j \in N} \sum_{k \in Q_j} \mu_{jk}(C_j + p_k - C_k)$$

subject to constraints (22) – (25).

Here $\lambda_j \geq 0$ is again the multiplier associated with job j and $\mu_{jk} \geq 0$ denotes the Lagrangian multiplier associated with the arc $(j, k) \in A$. We deliberately keep constraints (25) in the Lagrangian problem LR_{P_1} . The objective function can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{j \in N} (w_j - \lambda_j)T_j + \sum_{j \in N} w'_j C_j + c$$

where

$$w'_j = \lambda_j + \sum_{k \in Q_j} \mu_{jk} - \sum_{k \in P_j} \mu_{kj}$$

and

$$c = \sum_{j \in N} \sum_{k \in Q_j} \mu_{jk} p_k - \sum_{j \in N} \lambda_j d_j,$$

so it can be seen that LR_{P_1} is a total weighted-completion-times problem with serial–parallel precedence constraints, because all T_j will be set to zero and $\sum_{j \in N} (w_j - \lambda_j) T_j$ can be removed from the formulation. Lawler (1978) proposes an algorithm that solves this problem in $O(n \log n)$ time provided that a *decomposition tree* is also given for the VSP graph G' . Valdes et al. (1982) propose an $O(n + m)$ -time algorithm to construct a decomposition tree of a VSP graph, where m is the number of arcs in the graph. Calinescu et al. (2012) show that any VSP graph (directed or undirected), including G' , has at most $2n - 3$ arcs. Therefore, for any given λ and μ , the problem LR_{P_1} is solvable in $O(n \log n)$ time. From the theory of Lagrangian relaxation (see Fisher (1981)), for any choice of non-negative multipliers, $L_1(\lambda, \mu)$ provides a lower bound for P_1 . By Theorem 1, this lower bound is also valid for P . In Sect. 5.3.2, we explain how to choose appropriate values for λ and μ and Sect. 5.3.3 describes how to select a suitable VSP graph G' and how to construct a decomposition tree for G' .

5.3.2 Multiplier adjustment

We present a two-phase adjustment (TPA) procedure for the multipliers in $L_1(\lambda, \mu)$. Let λ_{TPA} and μ_{TPA} be Lagrangian multipliers adjusted by TPA; these lead to a new lower bound $LB_1 = L_1(\lambda_{TPA}, \mu_{TPA})$. The TPA procedure is heuristic, in the sense that it may not minimize L_1 in λ and μ .

In the first stage of TPA, we simply ignore precedence constraints altogether. For a feasible solution S , consider the function $g(\lambda, \mu, S)$ defined as follows:

$$g(\lambda, \mu, S) = \sum_{j \in N} (w_j - \lambda_j) T_j + \sum_{j \in N} \lambda_j (C_j - d_j) + \sum_{j \in N} \sum_{k \in Q_j} \mu_{jk} (C_j + p_k - C_k).$$


We start with the Lagrangian problem \hat{LR}_{P_1} where $\hat{L}_1(\lambda, \mu) = \min g(\lambda, \mu, S)$ subject to constraints (22)–(24), which is a relaxation of LR_{P_1} . We simply set all μ_{jk} to zero ($\mu = \mu_0 = (0, \dots, 0)$); with this choice, $\hat{L}_1(\lambda, \mu) = L_0(\lambda)$ and we set $\lambda_{TPA} = \lambda_{PV}$.

In the second stage of TPA, the multipliers μ_{jk} are adjusted assuming that $\lambda = \lambda_{TPA}$ is predefined and constant. This adjustment is an iterative heuristic; we adopt the *quick ascent direction* (QAD) algorithm proposed by van de Velde (1995). One iteration of TPA runs in $O(m + n \log n)$

Table 2 The average percentage deviation between LB_1 and LB_0 tested on Ins^L

k_{max}	n		
	20	30	40
0	11.576	8.505	6.85
5	14.579	17.454	13.493
10	15.026	18.147	14.065
20	15.207	18.419	14.344
50	15.296	18.503	14.466
100	15.310	18.508	14.495
∞	15.314	18.512	14.506

Fig. 6 The forbidden subgraph for VSP graphs



time, where $m = |A|$. We have run a number of experiments to evaluate the improvement of the lower bound as a function of the number of iterations k_{max} . For a representative dataset, Table 2 shows that the average percentage deviation of LB_1 from LB_0 significantly increases in the first iterations, whereas after about five iterations the incremental improvement becomes rather limited; more information on the choices for k_{max} follows in Sects. 5.3.3 and 8.2. The instance generation scheme is explained in Sect. 8.1.

Theorem 3 $LB_0 \leq LB_1$.

5.3.3 Finding a VSP graph

LB_1 requires a decomposition of graph G into two subgraphs $G' = (N, A')$ and $G'' = (N, A'')$, such that $A' \cup A'' = A$ and G' is a VSP graph. The more arcs we can include in A' , the tighter the lower bound. In the following, we discuss procedures to find a VSP subgraph G' with maximum number of arcs; we refer to this problem as the *maximum VSP subgraph* (MVSP) problem.

Valdes et al. (1982) state the following result:

Lemma 3 (From Valdes et al. (1982)) *A graph G is VSP if and only if its transitive closure does not contain the graph of Fig. 6 as a subgraph.*

Valdes et al. refer to the pattern in Fig. 6 as the *forbidden subgraph*. Polynomial-time exact procedures exist for finding an ESP subgraph with maximum number of nodes (see Bein et al. (1992), for instance), but to the best of our knowledge, no exact approach for MVSP has been proposed yet in the literature. McMahon and Lim (1993) suggest a heuristic traversal procedure to find and eliminate all forbidden subgraphs and, at the same time, construct a binary




Fig. 7 Modified traversal algorithm applied to the input graph in (a)

decomposition tree for the resulting VSP graph. Their procedure runs in $O(n + m)$ time. The number of arcs in a VSP graph is bounded by $2n - 3$ for an arbitrary non-VSP graph, but the maximum number of arcs for an arbitrary input graph is $O(n^2)$. We implement a slightly modified variant of the algorithm in [McMahon and Lim \(1993\)](#) to compute G' ; we select arcs for removal so that the lower bound remains reasonably tight. Simultaneously, it constructs a decomposition tree for the obtained VSP graph. The time complexity of $O(n + m)$ is maintained.

The structure of our heuristic decomposition and arc-elimination procedure is described in the following lines. The procedure constructs a decomposition tree by exploiting *parallel* and *serial node reduction* ([Lawler 1978](#)). Parallel reduction merges a job pair into one single job if both jobs have the same predecessor and successor sets. In the decomposition tree, such jobs are linked by a *P* node, which means they can be processed in parallel (see [Fig. 7b](#)). Serial reduction merges a job pair $\{i, j\}$ into one single job if arc $(i, j) \in A$, job i has only one successor and job j has only one predecessor. In the decomposition tree, such two jobs are linked by an *S* node, which means they cannot be processed in parallel (see [Fig. 7d](#)). Whenever a forbidden subgraph is recognized, the procedure removes arcs such that the forbidden subgraph is resolved (removed) and the total

number of removed arcs (including transitive and merged arcs) is approximately minimized (see [Fig. 7b, c](#)). Notice that some arcs may actually represent multiple merged arcs, so removing one arc in one iteration might imply the removal of multiple arcs simultaneously in the original network G .

The proposed algorithm is run only once, in the root node of the search tree. In each other node of the search tree, graphs G' and G'' are constructed by removing from the corresponding graphs in the parent node the arcs associated with the scheduled jobs; the resulting graphs are then the input for computing LB_1 . Notice that for each child node, both graphs G' and G'' as well as the associated decomposition tree can be constructed in $O(n)$ time.

To evaluate the impact of our arc-elimination procedure on the quality of the bounds, we examine two variations of LB_1 , namely $LB_1(VSP) = L_1(\lambda_{TPA}, \mu_{TPA})$, where all forbidden graphs in G are resolved using the arc-elimination procedure, and $LB_1(NO) = \hat{L}_1(\lambda_{TPA}, \mu_{TPA})$, in which we simply remove all arcs ($A' = \emptyset$ and $A'' = A$). Let k_{max} be the maximum number of iterations for TPA, as explained in [Sect. 5.3.2](#). [Table 3](#) demonstrates the success of our proposed algorithm in tightening the bound. The distance between the bounds is decreasing with increasing k_{max} , but in a B&B algorithm, a large value for k_{max} becomes computationally prohibitive.

Table 3 The average percentage deviation between $LB_1(VSP)$ and $LB_1(NO)$ tested on Ins^L with 40 jobs.

k_{max}	$LB_1(VSP)$	$LB_1(NO)$
0	6.850	0
1	10.515	9.057
2	12.171	11.497
3	12.896	12.538
5	13.493	13.385
10	14.344	14.020
100	14.466	14.458

Theorem 4 $LB_1(NO) \leq LB_1(VSP)$ for the same value of k_{max} .

5.3.4 Retrieving release dates and deadlines

Bound LB_1 turns out not to be very tight when release dates are rather heterogeneous. Below, we examine two means to produce a stronger bound, namely block decomposition and job splitting.

Block decomposition We follow references Pan and Shi (2005), Hariri and Potts (1983), Potts and van Wassenhove (1983) in setting up a decomposition of the job set into separate blocks: a block is a subset of jobs for which it is a dominant decision to schedule them together. We sort and renumber all jobs in non-decreasing order of their modified release dates \bar{r}_j ; as a tie-breaking criterion, we consider non-increasing order of w_j/p_j . The resulting non-delay sequence of jobs is given by $\sigma^r = (1, \dots, n)$, where a sequence is said to be ‘non-delay’ if the machine is never kept idle while some jobs are waiting to be processed (Pinedo 2008). Let $B_i = (u_i, \dots, v_i)$ be one block (in which jobs are sorted according to their new indices). The set $B = \{B_1, \dots, B_\kappa\}$ is a valid decomposition of the job set into κ blocks if the following conditions are satisfied:

- $u_1 = 1$;
- for each i, j with $1 < i \leq \kappa$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$, if $u_i = j$ then $v_{i-1} = j - 1$ and vice versa;
- for each i, j with $1 \leq i \leq \kappa$ and $u_i \leq j \leq v_i$, we have $\bar{r}_{u_i} + \sum_{s=u_i}^{j-1} p_s \geq \bar{r}_j$.

Although the sequencing of the jobs within one block is actually still open, the sequencing of the blocks is pre-determined. Given a valid set of blocks B , we compute LB_1 for each block $B_i \in B$ separately. The value LB_2 is then the sum of the bounds per block; analogously to Pan and Shi (2005), Hariri and Potts (1983), Potts and van Wassenhove (1983), LB_2 can be shown to be a lower bound for P .

We define $LB_1^* = L_1(\lambda^*, \mu^*)$, where λ^* and μ^* are optimal choices for the Lagrangian multipliers for LB_1 , and LB_2^* ,

which is computed by adding the contribution $L_1(\lambda_{B_i}^*, \mu_{B_i}^*)$ for each block B_i , where $\lambda_{B_i}^*$ and $\mu_{B_i}^*$ are the optimal choices for the multipliers for block B_i .

Theorem 5 $LB_1^* \leq LB_2^*$.

Although TPA might not find $\lambda_{B_i}^*$ and $\mu_{B_i}^*$ and thus the same result as Theorem 5 might not hold for LB_1 and LB_2 , empirical results show that LB_2 is on average far tighter than LB_1 (these results are shown in Table 8).

Job splitting It sometimes happens that the decomposition procedure fails to improve the bound (only one block is created and $LB_2 = LB_1$). Another approach is to explicitly re-introduce the release date constraints (which have been removed previously). We define problem P_2 , which is a generalization of P_1 in which the release date constraints (19) are included. The associated Lagrangian problem is

$$LR_{P_2} : L_2(\lambda, \mu) = \min \sum_{j \in N} w'_j C_j + c$$

subject to constraints (19), (22) – (24).

Contrary to LR_{P_1} , we now remove the serial-parallel precedence constraints because they render the Lagrangian problem too difficult. Problem LR_{P_2} is a total weighted-completion-times problem with release dates. This problem is known to be NP-hard (Lenstra et al. 1977), but a number of efficient polynomial algorithms, which are based on job splitting, have been proposed to compute tight lower bounds (Hariri and Potts 1983; Nessah and Kacem 2012; Belouadah et al. 1992). One of these algorithms is the SS procedure proposed by Belouadah et al. (1992), which runs in $O(n \log n)$ time and which we adopt here. Essentially, we again decompose the job set into a set of blocks B and compute $L_2(\lambda, \mu)$ for each block $B_i \in B$. The lower bound LB_2^{SSr} is again the sum of the contributions of the individual blocks. Experiments show that LB_2^{SSr} is typically tighter than LB_2 when the release dates are unequal. With equal release dates, on the other hand, normally $LB_2 \geq LB_2^{SSr}$ because LB_2 incorporates a part of the precedence graph. TPA is applied also here for multiplier updates.

We introduce P'_2 , which is a generalization of P_1 where deadline constraints are retrieved by inclusion of the constraint set (20). The associated Lagrangian problem is

$$LR_{P'_2} : L'_2(\lambda, \mu) = \min \sum_{j \in N} w'_j C_j + c$$

subject to constraints (20), (22) – (24).

$LR_{P'_2}$ is a total weighted-completion-times problem with deadlines. This problem is known to be NP-hard (Lenstra et al. 1977). Posner (1985) proposes a job-splitting lower

bounding scheme for LR_{P_2} that uses $O(n \log n)$ time; the lower bound $LB_2^{SS\delta}$ results from block decomposition and computation of $L'_2(\lambda, \mu)$ for each block. We again apply TPA for setting the multiplies.

5.3.5 Improvement by slack variables

Relaxed inequality constraints can be considered to be ‘nasty’ constraints because they decrease the quality of lower bounds. We follow [Hoogeveen and van de Velde \(1995\)](#) in exploiting the advantages of slack variables to lessen the effect of such nasty constraints to improve the quality of the lower bounds.

We introduce two non-negative vectors of slack variables: vector $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and vector $\mathbf{z} = (z_{11}, \dots, z_{1n}, \dots, z_{n1}, \dots, z_{nn})$. Consider the following sets of constraints:

$$T_j = C_j - d_j + y_j \quad \forall j \in N \quad (27)$$

$$C_j = C_i + p_j + z_{ij} \quad \forall (i, j) \in A \quad (28)$$

$$y_j, z_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall i, j \in N \quad (29)$$

Let problem P_3 be the variant of problem P_1 in which the sets of constraints (18) and (21) are replaced by the constraints (27)–(29). The Lagrangian problem associated with P_3 is

$$LR_{P_3} : L_3(\lambda, \mu) = \min \sum_{j=1}^n (w_j - \lambda_j)T_j + \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j y_j + \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k \in Q_j} \mu_{jk} z_{jk} + \sum_{j \in N} w'_j C_j + c$$

subject to constraints (22) – (25) and (29).

The values of the variables T_j, y_j and z_{jk} are zero in any optimal solution to LR_{P_3} because for $i, j \in N$ the following inequalities hold: $0 \leq \lambda_j \leq w_j$ and $\mu_{jk} \geq 0$. In an optimal solution to P_3 , however, these values might not be zero. In fact, according to the set of constraints (27), unless $C_j = d_j$, either T_j or y_j is non-zero. Also, from constraints (28), z_{jk} may not be zero when job j has at least two successors or job k has at least two predecessors in G . We introduce three problems that each carry a part of the objective function of LR_{P_3} , one of which is LR_{P_1} and the other two are the following two slack-variable (SV) problems, where Y is the set of all \mathbf{y} -vectors corresponding to feasible solutions to P_3 and Z similarly contains all \mathbf{z} -vectors.

$$P_{SV1} : SV_1(\lambda) = \min \sum_{j=1}^n (w_j - \lambda_j)T_j + \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j y_j$$

subject to constraints (22), (23), (25) and $\mathbf{y} \in Y$;

$$P_{SV2} : SV_2(\mu) = \min \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k \in Q_j} \mu_{jk} z_{jk}$$

subject to constraint $\mathbf{z} \in Z$.

Note that the term $\sum_{j=1}^n (w_j - \lambda_j)T_j$ appears in two of the problems, but it will be set to zero anyway in LR_{P_1} .

[Hoogeveen and van de Velde \(1995\)](#) propose $O(n \log n)$ -time procedures to compute valid lower bounds for P_{SV1} and P_{SV2} . Let $LB_{SV1} \geq 0$ and $LB_{SV2} \geq 0$ be lower bounds for P_{SV1} and P_{SV2} , respectively. By adding LB_{SV1} and LB_{SV2} to LB_2 , a better lower bound LB_3 for P is obtained ([Hoogeveen and van de Velde 1995](#)). The same SV problems can also be constructed for LB_2^{SSr} and $LB_2^{SS\delta}$ to lead to bounds $LB_3^{SSr} = LB_2^{SSr} + LB_{SV1} + LB_{SV2}$ and $LB_3^{SS\delta} = LB_2^{SS\delta} + LB_{SV1} + LB_{SV2}$. We have the following result:

Observation 1 $LB_2 \leq LB_3, LB_2^{SSr} \leq LB_3^{SSr}$ and $LB_2^{SS\delta} \leq LB_3^{SS\delta}$.

5.3.6 Other Lagrangian bounds

All the lower bounds introduced in this section are based on the formulation (17)–(24). Other Lagrangian relaxation-based lower bounds have also been proposed for special cases of this problem. These other bounds are mostly based on other (conceptual) formulations. For example, to achieve a lower bound, Lagrangian penalties could be added to the objective function while allowing jobs to be processed repeatedly. Many variants of such a lower bound exist ([Tanaka et al. 2009](#); [Tanaka and Fujikuma 2012](#); [Tanaka and Sato 2013](#)), but most of these variants are either too weak or too slow. Another lower bound based on Lagrangian relaxation is obtained by relaxing the capacity constraints, such that jobs are allowed to be processed in parallel in exchange for Lagrangian penalties ([Tang et al. 2007](#)).

6 Dominance properties

Our search procedure also incorporates a number of dominance rules, which will be described in this section. We will use the following additional notation. Given two partial sequences $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k)$ and $\pi' = (\pi'_1, \dots, \pi'_{k'})$, we define a merge operator as follows: $\pi|\pi' = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k, \pi'_1, \dots, \pi'_{k'})$. If π' contains only one job j then we can also write $\pi|j = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k, j)$, and similarly if $\pi = (j)$ then $j|\pi' = (j, \pi'_1, \dots, \pi'_{k'})$.

6.1 General dominance rules

We use the lower bounds proposed in Sect. 5 to prune the search tree. Let $LB(U)$ represent any of the lower bounds

described in Sect. 5, applied to the set U of unscheduled jobs, and let S_{best} be the currently best known feasible solution. Notice that $\text{TWT}(S_{\text{best}})$ is an upper bound for $\text{TWT}(S^*)$. The following dominance rule is then immediate:

Dominance rule 1 (DR₁) Consider a node associated with selection S_P . If

$$\text{TWT}(S_P) + \text{LB}(U) \geq \text{TWT}(S_{\text{best}}),$$

then the node associated with S_P can be fathomed.

As we already introduced in Sect. 4, a partial schedule can be denoted by either S_P or (σ_B, σ_E) . Multiple lower bounds can be used to fathom a node. The selection of lower bounds and the order in which they are computed obviously influences the performance of the B&B algorithm. These issues are examined in Sect. 8.2.

The subset of *active schedules* is dominant for total weighted tardiness problems (Conway et al. 1967; Pinedo 2008). A feasible schedule is called *active* if it is not possible to construct another schedule by changing the sequence of jobs such that at least one job is finishing earlier and no other job finishes later. The dominance of active schedules holds even when deadlines and precedence constraints are given.

Dominance rule 2 (DR₂) Consider a node associated with (σ_B, \emptyset) that is selected for forward branching, and let j be a job belonging to E_B . If $\bar{r}_j \geq \min_{k \in E_B} \{\bar{r}_k + p_k\}$, then the child node associated with the schedule $(\sigma_B|j, \emptyset)$ can be fathomed.

We also prune a branch whenever an obvious violation of the deadline constraints is detected. A partial schedule associated with a particular node is not always extended to a feasible schedule. Scheduling a job in one particular position may force other jobs to violate their deadline constraints, even though it does not violate its own constraints. Let \mathcal{A} be an arbitrary subset of U and let $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the set of all possible permutations of jobs in \mathcal{A} . The following theorem states when a job is scheduled in a ‘wrong position’, meaning that it will lead to a violation of deadline constraints.

Theorem 6 Consider a partial schedule (σ_B, σ_E) . If there exists any non-empty subset $\mathcal{A} \subset U$ such that the inequality $\min_{\pi \in \Pi_{\mathcal{A}}} \{C_{\max}(\sigma_B|\pi)\} > \max_{j \in \mathcal{A}} \{\bar{\delta}_j\}$ holds, then the schedule (σ_B, σ_E) is not feasible.

The problem $\min_{\pi \in \Pi_{\mathcal{A}}} \{C_{\max}(\sigma_B|\pi)\}$, which equates with $1|r_j, \delta_j, \text{prec}|C_{\max}$, is NP-hard because the mere verification of the existence of a feasible schedule is already NP-complete. We remove deadlines and create a new problem whose optimal solution is computed in $O(n^2)$ time (Lawler 1973). For computational efficiency, we use a linear-time lower bound for this new problem. This lower bound is computed as follows: $\min_{j \in \mathcal{A} \cap E_B} \{\bar{r}_j\} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}} p_j$.

Dominance rule 3 (DR₃) The node associated with (σ_B, σ_E) can be eliminated if at least one of the following conditions is satisfied:

1. if $\sigma_E = \emptyset$ and the condition of Theorem 6 is satisfied for the partial schedule (σ_B, \emptyset) ;
2. if $\sigma_E \neq \emptyset$ and $\max_{j \in U} \{\bar{\delta}_j\} < st(\sigma_E)$.

While additional precedence constraints could be added to the problem considering time windows and using constraint propagation techniques, the solution representation for our B&B algorithms and the above dominance rules (DR₂ and DR₃) are devised in such a way that any violation of these additional precedence constraints is dominated. Consider two jobs i and j with $p_i = p_j = 10$, $r_i = 0$, $r_j = 5$, $\delta_i = 20$, and $\delta_j = 30$. Using constraint propagation techniques, it could be possible to include an extra constraint that allows the processing of job j to occur only after the completion of job i . Such an additional constraint is not necessary, however, because in the above-described situation all sequences in which job j precedes job i will be automatically fathomed by DR₂ and DR₃. Moreover, increasing the density of the precedence graph in this way would also decrease the tightness of the lower bounds, which is undesirable.

6.2 Dominance rule based on two-job interchange

We describe a dominance rule based on job interchange. This dominance rule consists of two parts. The first part deals with the interchange of jobs in an FB node, whereas the second part deals with the interchange of jobs in a BB node.

6.2.1 Interchanging jobs in an FB node

In an FB node, consider jobs $j, k \in E_B$ that are not identical (they differ in at least one of their parameters). We will always assume that $\hat{r}_k < \hat{r}_j + p_j$ and $\hat{r}_j < \hat{r}_k + p_k$, because otherwise Dominance rule 2 enforces the scheduling of the job with smaller \hat{r} before the job with larger \hat{r} ; note here that $\hat{r}_j = \bar{r}_j$ and $\hat{r}_k = \bar{r}_k$ because all predecessors of jobs j and k have already been scheduled and therefore the branching decisions cover the propagation of precedence constraints. We also assume that any successor of job k is also a successor of job j ($Q_k \subset Q_j$). Consider a node of the search tree in which job k is scheduled at or after the completion of sequence σ_B . Suppose that the partial schedule associated to the current node can be extended to a feasible schedule S_1 in which job j is scheduled somewhere after job k . We define a set $\mathcal{B} = U \setminus \{j, k\}$ of jobs. We also construct a schedule S'_1 by interchanging jobs j and k , while the order of jobs belonging to \mathcal{B} remains unchanged. Figure 8 illustrates schedules S_1 and S'_1 .




Fig. 8 Schedules S_1 and S'_1

To prove that interchanging jobs j and k does not increase the total weighted tardiness, we argue that the gain of interchanging jobs j and k , which is computed as $TWT(S_1) - TWT(S'_1)$, is greater than or equal to zero, no matter when job j is scheduled. Let $st_j(S)$ denote the start time of job j in schedule S . Remember that $st(\pi)$ denotes the start time of a sequence π . Let τ_1 be the difference between the start time of job j in S_1 and the start time of k in S'_1 . If $st_k(S'_1)$ is less than $st_j(S_1)$ then τ_1 is negative, otherwise it is non-negative. By interchanging jobs j and k each job that belongs to set \mathcal{B} may be shifted either to the right or to the left. Let $\tau_2 \geq 0$ be the maximum shift to the right of the jobs belonging to set \mathcal{B} . Notice that if all jobs in \mathcal{B} are shifted to the left, then $\tau_2 = 0$. For each t as the start time of job j in S_1 , Jouglet et al. (2004) define a function $\Gamma_{jk}(t, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{jk}(t, \tau_1, \tau_2) = & w_j \max\{0, t + p_j - d_j\} \\ & - w_k \max\{0, t + \tau_1 + p_k - d_k\} \\ & + w_k \max\{0, \hat{r}_k + p_k - d_k\} \\ & - w_j \max\{0, \hat{r}_j + p_j - d_j\} - \tau_2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} w_i. \end{aligned}$$

For the subproblem of P where precedence and deadline constraints are removed, Jouglet et al. (2004) show that $\Gamma_{jk}(t, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ is a lower bound for the gain of interchanging jobs j and k when $t = st_j(S_1)$. This result can be improved by adding the gain of shifting the jobs which are tardy in both schedules S_1 and S'_1 . We introduce the set \mathcal{B}' of jobs where each job $i \in \mathcal{B}'$ is certainly a tardy job in S'_1 . Let $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_i$ be the set of transitive predecessors of job i . The following set of jobs, which is a subset of \mathcal{B}' , is used in our implementations because the order based on which the jobs in \mathcal{B} are scheduled has not yet been defined and therefore computing \mathcal{B}' is not possible

$$\left\{ i \in \mathcal{B} \mid \hat{r}_j + p_j + \sum_{l \in (\mathcal{B} \cap \hat{\mathcal{P}}_i)} p_l + p_i \geq d_i \right\}.$$

Let $\tau'_2 \geq 0$ be the minimum shift to the left of the jobs belonging to set \mathcal{B} . Note that at least one of the values τ'_2 and τ_2 equals zero. We define the function $\hat{\Gamma}_{jk}(t, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau'_2)$ as follows:

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{jk}(t, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau'_2) = \Gamma_{jk}(t, \tau_1, \tau_2) + \tau'_2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}'} w_i.$$

The values τ_2 and τ'_2 cannot be negative. Therefore, we immediately infer $\Gamma_{jk}(t, \tau_1, \tau_2) \leq \hat{\Gamma}_{jk}(t, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau'_2)$. We need the following result:

Theorem 7 $\hat{\Gamma}_{jk}(t, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau'_2)$ is a valid lower bound for the gain of interchanging jobs j and k .

In a general setting (problem P), however, job interchanges are not always feasible for every starting time t . We opt for verifying the feasibility of an interchange by ensuring that it does not cause any violation of deadlines and/or precedence constraints for all possible $t = st_j(S_1)$. Let Ψ be an upper bound for the completion time of the sequence S'_1 , computed as follows:

$$\Psi = \max \left\{ \max\{\hat{r}_j + p_j, \hat{r}_k\} + p_k, \max_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \{\hat{r}_i\} \right\} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} p_i.$$

The following theorem provides the conditions under which for every possible $t = st_j(S_1)$ interchanging jobs j and k is feasible.

Theorem 8 For each feasible schedule S_1 , an alternative feasible schedule S'_1 is created by interchanging jobs j and k , if the following conditions are satisfied:

1. $\bar{\delta}_j - p_j \leq \bar{\delta}_k - \tau_1 - p_k$ or $\Psi \leq \hat{\delta}_k$;
2. $\tau_2 = 0$ or $\Psi \leq \min_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \{\hat{\delta}_i\}$.

Jouglet et al. (2004) prove that if $w_j \geq w_k$ then the value $\Gamma_{jk}(\max\{d_j - p_j, \hat{r}_k + p_k\}, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ is the minimum gain obtained by interchanging jobs j and k for the setting where deadlines and precedence constraints are removed. We derive a more general result using the following lemma.

Lemma 4 Let $f : t \rightarrow \alpha \max\{0, t - a\} - \beta \max\{0, t - b\} + C$ be a function defined on $[u, v]$ for $a, b, C \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha, \beta, u, v \in \mathbb{R}^+$. The function f reaches a global minimum at value t^* computed as follows:

$$t^*(\alpha, \beta, a, b, u, v) = \begin{cases} \min\{\bar{u}, v\} & \text{if } \alpha \geq \beta \\ u & \text{if } \alpha < \beta, b > a, \alpha(\bar{v} - \bar{u}) \geq \beta(\bar{v} - b) \\ v & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\bar{u} = \max\{u, a\}$ and $\bar{v} = \max\{v, b\}$.

Corollary 1 below follows from Theorems 7, 8, and Lemma 4, if we choose $\alpha = w_j, \beta = w_k, a = d_j - p_j, b = d_k - \tau_1 - p_k, u = \hat{r}_k + p_k, v = \delta_j - p_j$ and

Table 4 Interchange cases

Case	$(\hat{r}_j + p_j - \hat{r}_k - p_k)$	$(p_j - p_k)$	$(\max_{i \in U} \{\hat{r}_i\} - \hat{r}_k - p_k)$	$(\hat{r}_j - \hat{r}_k)$	$(\max_{i \in U} \{\hat{r}_i\} - \hat{r}_k - p_j)$
1	≤ 0	< 0	≥ 0	–	–
2	≤ 0	< 0	< 0	≤ 0	> 0
3	≤ 0	< 0	< 0	≤ 0	≤ 0
4	≤ 0	< 0	< 0	> 0	–
5	≤ 0	≥ 0	≥ 0	–	–
6	≤ 0	≥ 0	< 0	–	–
7	> 0	< 0	–	–	–
8	> 0	≥ 0	–	–	–

$C = w_k \max\{0, \hat{r}_k + p_k - d_k\} - w_j \max\{0, \hat{r}_j + p_j - d_j\} - \tau_2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} w_i + \tau'_2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}'} w_i$. Let st_j^* be computed as follows:

$$st_j^* = t^*(w_j, w_k, d_j - p_j, d_k - \tau_1 - p_k, \hat{r}_k + p_k, \delta_j - p_j).$$

Corollary 1 $\Gamma_{jk}^*(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau'_2) = \hat{\Gamma}_{jk}(st_j^*, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau'_2)$ is the minimum gain obtained by interchanging jobs j and k , provided that for every possible $st_j(S_1)$ interchanging jobs j and k is feasible.

To compute $\Gamma_{jk}^*(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau'_2)$, the values of τ_1, τ_2 , and τ'_2 must be known. We establish an exhaustive list of cases for which τ_1, τ_2 , and τ'_2 can be computed, which is summarized in Table 4. Given a particular case, the values τ_1, τ_2 , and τ'_2 are computed as follows:

$$\tau_1 = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{Cases 1,5} \\ \max_{i \in U} \{\hat{r}_i\} - \hat{r}_k - p_k & \text{Case 2} \\ \max\{\hat{r}_j + p_j, \max_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \{\hat{r}_i\}\} - \hat{r}_k - p_k & \text{Cases 3,4,6} \\ \hat{r}_j + p_j - \hat{r}_k - p_k & \text{Cases 7,8} \end{cases}$$

$$\tau_2 = \begin{cases} p_k - p_j & \text{Case 1} \\ \max_{i \in U} \{\hat{r}_i\} - \hat{r}_k - p_j & \text{Case 2} \\ 0 & \text{Cases 3,5,6} \\ \max\{\hat{r}_j + p_j, \max_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \{\hat{r}_i\}\} - \hat{r}_k - p_j & \text{Case 4} \\ \hat{r}_j - \hat{r}_k & \text{Case 7} \\ \hat{r}_j + p_j - \hat{r}_k - p_k & \text{Case 8} \end{cases}$$

$$\tau'_2 = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{Cases 1,2,4,5,7,8} \\ \hat{r}_k - \hat{r}_j & \text{Case 3} \\ \hat{r}_k + p_k - \max\{\hat{r}_j + p_j, \max_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \{\hat{r}_i\}\} & \text{Case 6} \end{cases}$$

Following the above results, the first part of Dominance rule 4 is derived.

Dominance rule 4 (DR₄; first part) Given an FB node associated with (σ_B, \emptyset) , if there exist two non-identical jobs $j, k \in E_B$ with $\mathcal{Q}_k \cap \mathcal{Q}_j = \mathcal{Q}_k$ and the inequality $\Gamma_{jk}^*(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau'_2) > 0$ holds, then $(\sigma_B|j, \emptyset)$ dominates $(\sigma_B|k, \emptyset)$.



Fig. 9 Schedules S_2 and S'_2

6.2.2 Interchanging jobs in a BB node

Let $j, k \in E_E$ where jobs j and k are not identical. We also assume that any unscheduled predecessor of job k is also a predecessor of job j . In other words, we have $\mathcal{P}_k \cap \mathcal{P}_j \cap U = \mathcal{P}_k \cap U$. Consider a BB node of the search tree with decision job k . The partial schedule associated with the current node can be extended to a feasible schedule S_2 in which job j is scheduled before job k but after all jobs in the sequence σ_B . The set \mathcal{B} is the set of all remaining unscheduled jobs where $\mathcal{B} = U \setminus \{j, k\}$. Let schedule S'_2 be constructed by interchanging jobs j and k , while keeping the order based on which the jobs belonging to \mathcal{B} will be scheduled. Figure 9 illustrates schedules S_2 and S'_2 .

For each t as the start time of job j in S_2 , we define a function $\Delta_{jk}(t)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{jk}(t) = & w_j \max\{0, t + p_j - d_j\} \\ & - w_k \max\{0, t + p_k - d_k\} \\ & + w_k \max\{0, st(\sigma_E) - d_k\} \\ & - w_j \max\{0, st(\sigma_E) - d_j\} \\ & - \max\{0, p_k - p_j\} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} w_i. \end{aligned}$$

In a BB node, for each t as the start time of job j , $\Delta_{jk}(t)$ is a lower bound of the gain of interchanging jobs k and j , if the conditions of Theorem 9 are satisfied. Theorem 9 provides the conditions on which for every possible $t = st_j(S_1)$ interchanging jobs j and k is feasible.

Theorem 9 For each feasible schedule S_2 , a feasible schedule S'_2 can be created by interchanging jobs j and k , if the following conditions are satisfied:

1. $st(\sigma_E) \leq \hat{\delta}_j$;
2. $p_k - p_j \leq 0$ or $st(\sigma_E) - p_j \leq \min_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \hat{\delta}_i$.

Corollary 2 follows from Theorem 9 and Lemma 4, if we choose $\alpha = w_j, \beta = w_k, a = d_j - p_j, b = d_k - p_k, u = C_{\max}(\sigma_B), v = st(\sigma_E) - p_k - p_j$, and $C = w_k \max\{0, st(\sigma_E) - d_k\} - w_j \max\{0, st(\sigma_E) - d_j\} - \max\{0, p_k - p_j\} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} w_i$. Let $st_j^{*'} be computed as follows:$

$$st_j^{*'} = t^*(w_j, w_k, d_j - p_j, d_k - p_k, C_{\max}(\sigma_B) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}_j \cup U} p_i, st(\sigma_E) - p_k - p_j).$$

Corollary 2 $\Delta_{jk}^* = \Delta_{jk}(st_j^{*'})$ is the minimum gain obtained by interchanging jobs j and k , provided that for every possible $t = st_j(S_1)$ interchanging jobs j and k is feasible.

Following the above results, the second part of Dominance rule 4 is derived.

Dominance rule 4 (DR₄; second part) Given a BB node associated with (σ_B, σ_E) , if there exist two non-identical jobs $j, k \in E_E$ with $\mathcal{P}_k \cap \mathcal{P}_j \cap U = \mathcal{P}_k \cap U$ and $\Delta_{jk}^* > 0$, then $(\sigma_B, j|\sigma_E)$ dominates $(\sigma_B, k|\sigma_E)$.

6.3 Dominance rule based on job insertion

We describe a dominance rule based on job insertion. This dominance rule, similar to the dominance rule based on job interchange, consists of two parts. The first part deals with the insertion of a job in an FB node, whereas the second part deals with the insertion of a job in a BB node.

6.3.1 Inserting a job in an FB node

In an FB node, let $j, k \in E_B$ where jobs j and k are not identical. Again we assume that $\hat{r}_k < \hat{r}_j + p_j$ and $\hat{r}_j < \hat{r}_k + p_k$, otherwise Dominance rule 2 enforces scheduling the job with smaller \hat{r} before the job with larger \hat{r} (remind that $\hat{r}_j = \bar{r}_j$ and $\hat{r}_k = \bar{r}_k$ because all predecessors of jobs j and k have already been scheduled and therefore the branching decisions cover precedence constraints propagation). Consider an FB node of the search tree in which job k is scheduled after the jobs in sequence σ_B . Assume that the partial schedule associated with the current node can be extended to the feasible schedule S_1 depicted in Fig. 8. We construct a schedule S''_1 by inserting the job j before job k while keeping the order of jobs belonging to \mathcal{B} . Figure 10 illustrates the construction of the schedule S''_1 .



Fig. 10 Schedule S''_1

Let τ_3 be the maximum shift to the right of the jobs belonging to \mathcal{B} , which is computed as follows:

$$\tau_3 = \max \left\{ 0, \hat{r}_j + p_j + p_k - \max \left\{ \hat{r}_k + p_k, \min_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \{\bar{r}_i\} \right\} \right\}.$$

For each t as the start time of job j in schedule S_1 , we define a function $\Gamma'_{jk}(t, \tau_3)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma'_{jk}(t, \tau_3) = & w_j \max\{0, t + p_j - d_j\} \\ & - w_k \max\{0, \hat{r}_j + p_j + p_k - d_k\} \\ & + w_k \max\{0, \hat{r}_k + p_k - d_k\} \\ & - w_j \max\{0, \hat{r}_j + p_j - d_j\} - \tau_3 \sum_{i \in OJ} w_i. \end{aligned}$$

Job insertion, similar to job interchange, is not always feasible for every starting time t of job j . We verify feasibility of an insertion by ensuring that it does not cause any deadline and/or precedence-constraint violation for all possible $t = st_j(S_1)$. Let Ψ' be an upper bound for the completion time of the sequence S'_1 , computed as follows:

$$\Psi' = \max \left\{ \hat{r}_j + p_j + p_k, \max_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \{\hat{r}_i\} \right\} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} p_i.$$

The following theorem provides the conditions under which for every possible $t = st_j(S_1)$ inserting job j before job k is feasible.

Theorem 10 For each feasible schedule S_1 , another feasible schedule S''_1 can be created by inserting job j before job k if the following conditions hold:

1. $\hat{r}_j + p_j + p_k \leq \hat{\delta}_k$;
2. $\tau_3 = 0$ or $\Psi' \leq \min_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \{\hat{\delta}_i\}$.

Corollary 3 below follows from Theorem 10.

Corollary 3 $\Gamma_{jk}^{*'}(\tau_3) = \Gamma'_{jk}(\hat{r}_k + p_k, \tau_3) = \Gamma_{jk}(\hat{r}_k + p_k, \hat{r}_j + p_j - \hat{r}_k - p_k, \tau_3)$ is the minimum gain obtained by inserting job j before job k provided that for every possible $t = st_j(S_1)$ inserting job j before job k is feasible.

Following the above results, the first part of Dominance rule 5 is derived.

Dominance rule 5 (DR₅; first part) Consider an FB node associated with (σ_B, \emptyset) . If there exist two non-identical jobs $j, k \in E_B$ for which the inequality $\Gamma_{jk}^{*'}(\tau_3) > 0$ holds, then $(\sigma_B|j, \emptyset)$ dominates $(\sigma_B|k, \emptyset)$.




Fig. 11 Schedule S_2''

6.3.2 Inserting a job in a BB node

In a BB node, let $j, k \in E_E$ where jobs j and k are not identical. Consider a node of the search tree in which job k is scheduled before sequence σ_E . Assume that the partial schedule associated with the current node can be extended to the feasible schedule S_2 depicted in Fig. 9. We also construct a schedule S_2'' by inserting the job j to be scheduled after job k but before the jobs in the sequence σ_E and by keeping the order of jobs belonging to B . Figure 11 illustrates schedule S_2'' .

For each t , which is the start time of job j in schedule S_2 , we define the function $\Delta'_{jk}(t)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta'_{jk}(t) = & w_j \max\{0, t + p_j - d_j\} \\ & - w_k \max\{0, st(\sigma_E) - p_j - d_k\} \\ & + w_k \max\{0, st(\sigma_E) - d_k\} \\ & - w_j \max\{0, st(\sigma_E) - d_j\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to the previous results, for each feasible schedule S_2 , a feasible schedule S_2'' is constructed by inserting jobs j after job k , if $st(\sigma_E) \leq \hat{\delta}_j$. The following corollary is obtained:

Corollary 4 $\Delta'_{jk} = \Delta'_{jk}(C_{\max}(\sigma_B) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}_j \cap U} p_i)$ is the minimum gain obtained by inserting job j after job k provided that $st(\sigma_E) \leq \hat{\delta}_j$.

Following the above results, the second part of Dominance rule 5 is derived.

Dominance rule 5 (DR₅; first part) Consider a BB node associated with (σ_B, σ_E) . If there exist two non-identical jobs $j, k \in E_E$ for which the inequality $\Delta'_{jk} > 0$ holds, then $(\sigma_B, j|\sigma_E)$ dominates $(\sigma_B, k|\sigma_E)$.

6.4 Dominance rules on scheduled jobs

The dominance theorem of dynamic programming (see Jouglet et al. 2004) is another existing theorem that can be used to eliminate nodes in the search tree. It compares two partial sequences that contain identical subsets of jobs and eliminates the one having the larger total weighted tardiness. When total weighted tardiness values are the same, then only one of the sequences is kept. Let us consider two feasible partial sequences σ_1 and σ_2 (σ_2 is a feasible permutation of σ_1) of k jobs, where $k < n$. Let \mathcal{C} be the set of jobs in either

σ_1 or σ_2 . We are going to decide whether it is advantageous to replace σ_2 by σ_1 in all (partial) schedules in which σ_2 orders the last k jobs. The set of scheduled jobs and the set of unscheduled jobs are identical for both σ_1 and σ_2 . Sequence σ_1 is as good as sequence σ_2 if it fulfills one of the following conditions:

1. $C_{\max}(\sigma_1) \leq C_{\max}(\sigma_2)$ and $\text{TWT}(\sigma_1) \leq \text{TWT}(\sigma_2)$;
2. $C_{\max}(\sigma_1) > C_{\max}(\sigma_2)$ and the following inequality also holds:

$$\text{TWT}(\sigma_1) + \left(\min_{i \in U} \{\bar{r}_i^{\sigma_1}\} - \min_{i \in U} \{\bar{r}_i^{\sigma_2}\} \right) \sum_{i \in U} w_i \leq \text{TWT}(\sigma_2),$$

where $\bar{r}_i^{\sigma_1}$ is the updated release date associated with the sequence σ_1 and $\bar{r}_i^{\sigma_2}$ is the updated release date associated with the sequence σ_2 .

Jouglet et al. (2004) determine the sequences that can be replaced by a dominant permutation. They find that sequence σ_1 dominates sequence σ_2 if the following two conditions hold:

1. sequence σ_1 is as good as sequence σ_2 ;
2. sequence σ_2 is not as good as σ_1 or σ_1 has lexicographically smaller release dates than σ_2 .

Note that the second condition enforces a tie-breaking rule where a lexicographical number associated to each sequence is computed and among those sequences that are equivalent, the one with lower lexicographic number is selected. To avoid conflicts with Dominance rule 2, jobs are renumbered in non-decreasing order of their release dates r_j .

Dominance rule 6 (DR₆) If there exists a better feasible permutation of σ_B and/or a better feasible permutation of σ_E , then the node (σ_B, σ_E) is fathomed.

If $\sigma_E = \emptyset$ and there is a better feasible permutation of σ_B , then the dominance is proven similarly to Theorem 13.6 in Jouglet et al. (2004). If $\sigma_E \neq \emptyset$, then all jobs belonging to the set U will be scheduled between $C_{\max}(\sigma_B)$ and $st(\sigma_E) = C_{\max}(\sigma_B) + \sum_{j \in U} p_j$. Therefore, all permutations of σ_E start at time $st(\sigma_E)$ and if there exists at least one better feasible permutation of σ_E , then fathoming the node associated with (σ_B, σ_E) does not eliminate the optimal solution.

Dominance rule 6 where only permutations of the last k jobs are considered, is referred to as DR_6^k . Computing DR_6^k amounts to enumerating all $O(n!)$ feasible solutions, which would yield an optimal solution but is computationally prohibitive. In our B&B algorithm, we therefore choose $k < n$. There is a trade-off between the computational effort needed to compute DR_6^k and the improvement achieved by eliminating dominated nodes. Based on initial experiments (see

Table 5 Average CPU times (in s; first number) and number of unsolved instances within the time limit (between brackets, if any; out of 864) for different choices of k in BB1 run on I_{ns}

k	n			
	20	30	40	50
2	0.0043	–	–	–
3	0.0038	0.045	–	–
4	0.0039	0.039	5.157 (1)	–
5	0.0042	0.039	3.499	15.895 (15)
6	0.0043	0.041	3.130	13.358 (13)
7	0.0050	0.046	4.741 (1)	14.301 (15)
8	–	0.092	7.459 (1)	22.470 (17)

Bold values indicates the smallest (selected) number for each column

Table 5; more details on the instance generation are provided in Sect. 8.1), we observe that the algorithms perform worse when $k > 6$. We also notice that it is not efficient to use DR_6^k when $k > |U|$ because the computational effort to solve the subproblem consisting of the remaining $|U|$ jobs is less than the computational effort needed to enumerate all feasible permutations of the last k jobs. Thus, $k = \min\{|\sigma_B|, |U|, 6\}$ while scheduling forward and $k = \min\{|\sigma_E|, |U|, 6\}$ when scheduling backward.

We observe that in BB2 with unequal release dates, at certain moments during the search procedure, we switch from forward to backward branching, which forces us to start with $k = |\sigma_E| = 0$ and we thus lose a number of pruning opportunities.

7 Initial upper bound

Although for most of the instances the B&B algorithm finds a reasonably good solution (a tight upper bound) quickly, there are instances for which feasible solutions are encountered only after a large part of the search tree has been scanned. Therefore, we initialize the upper bound in the root node of the B&B algorithm using a stand-alone (heuristic) procedure, which we refer to as *time-window heuristic* (TWH).

The key idea of our TWH is to iteratively locally improve a given sequence of jobs within a varying time window (Algorithm 1); similar ideas have already been proposed in the literature (Debels and Vanhoucke 2007; Kinable et al. 2014). It starts with any given sequence (note that finding a feasible sequence might be very difficult for some instances, so we also allow infeasible sequences). Then to locally improve the solution, the algorithm constructs a number of subproblems. Each subproblem is defined by two positions: a *start* position and an *end* position. The subproblem tries to optimally resequence the jobs that are positioned between the given *start* and *end* positions in the initial sequence such

Algorithm 1 Time-window heuristic (TWH)

```

Input: a sequence  $\sigma$ 
1: for  $itr = 1$  to 2 do
2:   IMPROVE_BY_SWAP
3:    $k = 0$ 
4:   while  $k \leq 50$  do
5:     if  $k$  even then
6:        $start = 0$ 
7:     else
8:        $start = \min\{minsize, maxsize/2\}$ 
9:     end if
10:    while  $start + minsize \leq n$  do
11:       $end = \min\{start + maxsize, n\}$ 
12:       $SP \leftarrow CONST\_SP(\sigma, start, end)$ 
13:       $\sigma_{SP} \leftarrow SOLVE\_BB(SP)$ 
14:       $\sigma' \leftarrow COPYSEQ(\sigma, \sigma_{SP}, start, end)$ 
15:      if  $TWT(\sigma') < TWT(\sigma)$  then
16:         $\sigma \leftarrow \sigma'$ 
17:      end if
18:    end while
19:     $k = k + 1$ 
20:  end while
21: end for
Output:  $TWT(\sigma)$ 

```

that the completion time of the subsequence does not exceed the start time of the job in the position $end + 1$. This additional condition is fulfilled by updating the deadline of all jobs j in the subproblem to $\delta_j^{SP} = \min\{\delta_j, st_{end+1}(\sigma)\}$ and updating the release date of all jobs j in the subproblem to $r_j^{SP} = \max\{r_j, C_{start-1}(\sigma)\}$.

In TWH, the subprocedure IMPROVE_BY_SWAP is a naive local search procedure in which each pair of jobs is examined for swapping exactly once, in a steepest descent fashion. The length of the subsequence to be reoptimized is in between $minsize = 10$ and $maxsize = \min\{\max\{n/2, 10\}, 20\}$. Given a *start* and an *end* position, CONST_SP constructs the associated subproblem and SOLVE_BB solves the subproblem using the same branch-and-bound algorithms explained in this paper. A new sequence is constructed using COPYSEQ.

The input sequence for TWH is the result of a dynamic priority rule that stepwise schedules jobs (from time 0 onwards) that are eligible according to the precedence constraints (meaning that all predecessors were previously already selected) and whose release date has already been reached; if no job is eligible in this way, then the algorithm proceeds to the earliest ready time of all jobs for which all predecessors have already been scheduled. If multiple jobs are eligible, then priority is given to the one with the earliest deadline and the lowest processing time. In the computation of the eligible set of jobs the deadline constraints are ignored. Therefore, the resulting sequence might not be feasible to P. In such cases, we add a large infeasibility cost to the objective function in the hope of finding a feasible solution during TWH.

Table 6 The performance of TWH

Instance set	Total	Feas	TWH		
			Fnd	Opt	Gap
<i>Ins^L</i>					
<i>n</i> = 30	432	401	397	300	0.012
<i>n</i> = 40	432	395	392	313	0.011
<i>n</i> = 50	432	397	395	302	0.025
<i>Ins^{PAN}</i>					
<i>n</i> = 30	100	100	100	59	0.003
<i>n</i> = 40	100	100	100	72	0.001
<i>n</i> = 50	94 ^a	94	89	50	0.001
<i>Ins^{TAN}</i>					
<i>n</i> = 40	875	875	875	542	0.019
<i>n</i> = 50	875	875	875	545	0.015

^a The optimal solutions are only available for 94 instances

Table 7 Average CPU times (in s) of upper bound computation for different instance sets

<i>Ins^L</i>			<i>Ins^{PAN}</i>	<i>Ins^{TAN}</i>	
<i>n</i> = 30	<i>n</i> = 40	<i>n</i> = 50		<i>n</i> = 40	<i>n</i> = 50
0.04	0.09	0.17	0.08	0.31	0.66

The upper bound that is the output of TWH improves the runtime for those instances for which the branch-and-bound algorithm fails to find a feasible solution fast. Furthermore, this upper bound turns out to be optimal for most of the instances of P and for those instances for which the optimal solution is not found, the optimality gap is very low; see Table 6 (see Sect. 8.1 for more details on the different instance sets). To evaluate the efficiency of TWH, we have run some computational experiments, the results of which are reported in Tables 6 and 7. In Table 6, column *total* contains the total number of instances and the values in column *feas* represent the number of instances for which at least one feasible solution exists. Column *fnd* reports the number of times TWH finds a feasible solution, column *opt* counts the number of optimal solutions found, and column *gap* states the average optimality gap, averaged only for the instances for which the optimal solution was not found by TWH. The average optimality gap is computed as the average value of $((UB - OPT)/UB)$, with UB the output of TWH. Table 7 reports the average CPU times for the same subset of instances studied in Table 6. Note that the column that reports the average CPU times for *Ins^{PAN}* pertains to all instances with *n* = 30, 40, and 50.

8 Computational results

All algorithms have been implemented in VC++ 2010, while Cplex 12.3 is used to solve the MIP formulations. All compu-

tational results were obtained on a laptop Dell Latitude with 2.6 GHz Core(TM) i7-3720QM processor, 8GB of RAM, running under Windows 7.

8.1 Instance generation

To the best of our knowledge, there are no benchmark sets of instances of problem P available, and so we have generated our own set of instances, which is referred to as *Ins*. Two sets of benchmark instances for subproblems of P are also used in our experiments; these are referred to as *Ins^{TAN}* and *Ins^{PAN}* and are discussed in Sects. 8.5.1 and 8.5.2, respectively.

The set *Ins* consists of the two disjoint subsets (namely, *Ins^S* and *Ins^L*) *Ins^S* contains instances with small processing times and *Ins^L* holds instances with large processing times. The values $p_i (1 \leq i \leq n)$ are sampled from the uniform distribution $U[1, \alpha]$, where $\alpha = 10$ for *Ins^S* and $\alpha = 100$ for *Ins^L*. For each subset, we generate instances with $|N| = n = 10, 20, 30, 40,$ and 50 jobs. Release dates r_i are drawn from $U[0, \tau P]$, where $P = \sum_{i \in N} p_i$ and $\tau \in \{0.0, 0.5, 1.0\}$. Due dates d_i are generated from $U[r_i + p_i, r_i + p_i + \rho P]$ with $\rho \in \{0.05, 0.25, 0.50\}$ and weights w_i stem from $U[1, 10]$. Up to here our generation is based on the instance generation procedure of Tanaka and Fujikuma (2012). Our modifications pertain to the generation of deadlines and precedence relations among jobs. Deadlines are chosen from $U[d_i, d_i + \phi P]$ with $\phi \in \{1.00, 1.25, 1.50\}$.

The addition of precedence constraints may lead to the generation of many instances with no feasible solution. For this reason, for each instance we first construct a feasible solution without considering precedence constraints (using branch-and-bound). Next, the jobs are re-indexed according to the job order in this feasible solution. If no feasible solution exists even without precedence constraints, we use the original indices. Subsequently, a precedence graph is created using the RanGen software (Demeulemeester et al. 2003) with OS $\in \{0.00, 0.25, 0.50, 0.75\}$, where OS is the *order strength* of the graph (a measure for the density of the graph). For any instance, if a feasible solution exists without precedence constraints, then the addition of precedence constraints will never render it infeasible because RanGen only generates arcs from lower indexed to higher indexed jobs.

In conclusion, for each combination of $(\alpha, n, \tau, \rho, \phi, OS)$, four instances are generated; the total number of instances is thus $2 \times 5 \times 3 \times 3 \times 3 \times 4 \times 4 = 4320$. In all our experiments, the time limit is set to 1200 s. If an instance is not solved to guaranteed optimality, it is said to be ‘unsolved’ for the procedure. Throughout this section, we report averages computed only over the solved instances.

8.2 Lower bounds

We compare the quality of the lower bounds for the subset of instances with large processing times and *n* = 30. We set

Table 8 Average percentage gap from optimal value

	LB ₀	LB ₁	LB ₂	LB ₂ ^{SS_r}	LB ₂ ^{SS_s}	LB ₃	LB ₃ ^{SS_r}	LB ₃ ^{SS_s}	LB _{Best}
OS									
0.00	50.505	50.505	44.369	43.313	36.857	43.142	42.086	35.630	35.372
0.25	67.776	63.465	53.444	52.702	52.300	51.955	51.013	50.568	49.834
0.50	71.461	66.108	52.378	51.890	52.021	51.216	50.727	50.767	50.352
0.75	77.055	69.836	50.769	50.520	50.565	49.430	49.182	49.041	48.863
τ									
0.00	38.141	29.169	29.169	29.182	24.784	28.152	28.165	23.667	23.667
0.50	76.712	73.157	59.554	58.724	57.699	57.876	57.046	55.922	55.656
1.00	85.704	85.539	62.494	61.255	61.655	61.117	59.878	60.233	59.309
All									
–	67.161	62.911	50.638	49.950	48.268	49.275	48.586	46.824	46.425

$k_{max} = 10$ for all lower bounds. The detailed results of this comparison are reported in Table 8.

The average gap for LB_1 is less than or equal to that for LB_0 , especially when the precedence graph is dense; for $OS = 0$, on the other hand, there are no precedence constraints and LB_0 and LB_1 are essentially the same. A similar observation can be made for LB_1 and LB_2 , where the gap for LB_2 is noticeably smaller than that for LB_1 when release dates are imposed, while in the case $\tau = 0$, only one block is created and the lower bounds LB_1 and LB_2 coincide. The average gap for LB_3 is indeed smaller than that for LB_2 , as was to be expected according to Observation 1.

Although we have no theoretical result that would indicate a better performance of $LB_2^{SS_r}$ in comparison with LB_2 , the average gap for $LB_2^{SS_r}$ is less than that for LB_2 in case of non-zero release dates. When release dates are zero, however, the gap for $LB_2^{SS_r}$ is larger than or equal to that for LB_2 . In fact, when release dates are zero, only one block is created and constraints (19) can be removed from LR_{P_2} , and thus LR_{P_2} is a relaxation of LR_{P_1} . $LB_2^{SS_s}$ performs better than LB_2 and $LB_2^{SS_r}$ for most of the instances. Since $LB_2^{SS_s}$ and $LB_2^{SS_r}$ require the same computational effort, we decide not to use $LB_2^{SS_r}$ in our B&B algorithms, where enumeration of child nodes is more efficient than extra computation of a weak bound. The gap for $LB_3^{SS_r}$ is less than that for $LB_2^{SS_r}$ and a similar observation holds for $LB_3^{SS_s}$ versus $LB_2^{SS_s}$, which confirms the result in Observation 1. Again, since $LB_3^{SS_r}$ and $LB_3^{SS_s}$ are equally expensive in terms of computational effort, we decide not to use $LB_3^{SS_r}$.

In our final implementation, we will not compute all the bounds for all the nodes because this consumes too much effort. We start with computing LB_T , LB_0 , and LB_{SV1} for the unscheduled jobs. Let S_{best} be the best feasible schedule found. If the node is fathomed by DR_1 , then we backtrack; otherwise if $TWT(S_p) + \lceil LB_0 + LB_{SV1} \rceil \times 1.4 < TWT(S_{best})$ then we do not compute the remaining lower

bounds and continue branching. If the latter equality does not hold, then we anticipate that with a better bound we might still be able to fathom the node, and we compute LB_3 and/or $LB_3^{SS_s}$. For all lower bounds we choose $k_{max} = 0$ if $OS < 0.5$ and $k_{max} = 1$ otherwise.

8.3 Dominance rules

In each node of the B&B algorithm, dominance rules are tested. Based on some preliminary experiments, we find that applying the rules in the following order performs well, and we will therefore follow this order throughout the algorithm:

$$DR_2, DR_3, DR_6^2, DR_4, DR_5, DR_6^k, DR_1.$$

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the rules, we examine a number of scenarios with respect to the selection of the implemented bounds; the list of scenarios is given in Table 9. Scenario 1 includes the simplest combination of dominance rules, namely DR_2 , DR_3 , and DR_6^2 . From Scenario 2 to Scenario 4, extra rules are gradually added. In Scenario 5, all dominance rules are active except DR_4 , and in Scenario 6, only DR_5 is inactive. Scenario 7 similarly includes all dominance rules except DR_6 . Finally, in Scenario 8, all dominance rules are active.

For each of these implementations, we report the average CPU times and the average number of nodes explored in the search tree in Table 10; the results pertain to the instances of Ins with $n = 20, 30$. Scenarios 2 and 3 show the effect of DR_4 and DR_5 . In Scenario 2, DR_4 improves the performance of both algorithms, whereas in Scenario 3 DR_5 has a beneficial effect only for BB2. Scenario 4 reflects the impact of DR_6 for k jobs.

Comparing Scenario 5 to Scenario 8, we see that inclusion of DR_1 has a strong beneficial effect on both algorithms; the effect is strongest in BB2 because tighter bounds can be computed by scheduling backward. From Table 10, we learn

Table 9 The list of scenarios

Scenario	DR ₂	DR ₃	DR ₆ ²	DR ₄	DR ₅	DR ₆ ^k	DR ₁
1	✓	✓	✓	–	–	–	–
2	✓	✓	✓	✓	–	–	–
3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	–	–
4	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	–
5	✓	✓	✓	–	✓	✓	✓
6	✓	✓	✓	✓	–	✓	✓
7	✓	✓	–	✓	✓	–	✓
8	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 10 The effect of the dominance rules

Method	Scenario	n = 20		n = 30	
		CPU	Nodes	CPU	Nodes
BB1	1	0.004	12,521	–	–
	2	0.003	4310	2.956	4,388,157
	3	0.003	4279	3.547	4,382,728
	4	0.004	839	0.260	48,410
	5	0.008	1912	0.075	10,095
	6	0.003	488	0.016	3442
	7	0.772	1,044,361	–	–
	8	0.003	487	0.039	3451
BB2	1	0.003	11,698	–	–
	2	0.002	3609	1.506	2,182,869
	3	0.002	3271	1.482	1,669,982
	4	0.003	980	0.260	91,985
	5	0.004	1658	0.135	30,474
	6	0.002	490	0.055	9750
	7	0.155	239,389	–	–
	8	0.002	427	0.047	7464

‘–’ means that the implementation fails to solve many instances within the time limit

that apart from DR₂, which is always crucial in total tardiness scheduling problems, the most important dominance rule is DR₆: deactivating this rule triggers a huge increase in the average number of nodes and the average CPU times; incorporating DR₄ also has a marked effect (compare Scenarios 5 and 8). Among all dominance rules tested, DR₅ is the least important; removing DR₅ slightly increases the node count and the runtimes in BB2. In BB1, removing DR₅ even decreases the number of nodes and the runtimes; it turns out that for n > 30, however, the effect of DR₅ is also (slightly) beneficial for BB1, and so we decide to adopt Scenario 8 as the final setting in which the experiments in the following sections will be run.

As a side note, we observe that for all the foregoing dominance rules, after the root node, omitting the precedence constraints implied by sets Q_j and P_j from the updates of

Table 11 Average CPU times (in s) and number of unsolved instances within the time limit (out of 432) for the MIP formulations and the B&B algorithms run on Ins with n = 10, 20 and 30

α	Method	n		
		10	20	30
10	ASF	0.81	–	–
	ASF'	0.80	–	–
	TIF	0.43	2.02	53.47 (3)
	TIF'	0.64	2.97	88.17 (12)
	BB1	0.00	0.00	0.02
	BB2	0.00	0.00	0.03
100	ASF	0.92	–	–
	ASF'	0.95	–	–
	TIF	6.54	–	–
	TIF'	21.78	–	–
	BB1	0.00	0.00	0.06
	BB2	0.00	0.00	0.06

\bar{r}_j and $\bar{\delta}_j$ has only little effect. We will therefore not include these precedence constraints into the updated release dates and deadlines and thus avoid the additional computational overhead.

8.4 Branch-and-bound algorithms

In this section we discuss the performance of our B&B algorithms. In Table 11 we compare the performance of BB1 and BB2 with the MIP formulations discussed in Sect. 3. In this table as well as in the following, we report the average runtime and the number of unsolved instances (if there are any).

Based on Table 11, we conclude that the time-indexed formulations are far better than the assignment formulations when processing times are small. For large processing times, the performance of ASF is slightly better than TIF. Although ASF' and TIF' are tighter than their counterparts with aggregate precedence constraints, the extra computational effort needed to process the larger models increases CPU times in both TIF' and ASF'. The B&B algorithms BB1 and BB2 both clearly outperform the MIP formulations regardless of the size of the processing times. Table 12 shows the performance of BB1 and BB2 applied to the larger instances of Ins (n = 40 and 50) that cannot be solved by the MIP formulations. On average, BB1 performs better than BB2, although this does not hold for all parameter settings (more details follow below). BB1 solves all instances with 40 jobs and fails to solve around 1.5 % of the instances with 50 jobs. BB2 fails to solve one instance with 40 jobs and around 2 % of the instances with 50 jobs. We will indicate below that all these unsolved instances belong to a specific class; it is worth

Table 12 Average CPU times (in s) and number of unsolved instances within the time limit (out of 432) for BB1 and BB2 run on Ins with $n = 40$ and 50

α	Method	n	
		40	50
10	BB1	1.26	16.99 (1)
	BB2	1.65	35.73 (6)
100	BB1	5.00	14.00 (12)
	BB2	3.38 (1)	18.28 (12)

Table 13 Average CPU times (in s) and number of unsolved instances within the time limit (out of 126) for different choices of n and OS in BB1 and BB2 run on Ins

Method	n	OS			
		0	0.25	0.50	0.75
BB1	30	0.08	0.04	0.02	0.01
	40	11.85	0.55	0.10	0.02
	50	50.81 (13)	12.63	0.68	0.06
BB2	30	0.05	0.10	0.03	0.01
	40	7.37 (1)	2.37	0.32	0.03
	50	44.17 (12)	57.12 (6)	8.66	0.10

mentioning that the difficult instances are not the same for the two B&B algorithms.

The number of precedence constraints obviously affects the performance of the algorithms (Table 13). On the one hand, by adding precedence constraints, the set of feasible sequences shrinks; on the other hand, the lower bounds also become less tight. The net result of these two effects is a priori not predictable. For instance classes without release dates and deadlines ($r_j = 0$ and $\delta_j = \infty$), the quality of the lower bound is very good when OS = 0; therefore, the effect of a weaker bound due to higher OS will be more pronounced than when release dates and deadlines are also imposed.

To identify the classes of difficult instances, we focus on case $n = 50$. Table 14 shows the outcomes of the experiments for each combination of τ , ρ , and OS. According to this table, the most time-consuming class of instances is the one where release dates are neither loose nor tight ($\tau = 0.50$), due dates are loose ($\rho = 0.50$) and the set of precedence constraints is empty (OS = 0). No clear pattern can be distinguished for the algorithmic performance as a function of the tightness of the deadlines, so these results are excluded from the table. The unsolved instances are distributed differently for the two algorithms, although $\tau = 0.5$ in all and OS = 0 in most of the unsolved instances. For example, BB1 solves all instances with OS = 0.25, whereas BB2 does not solve six of these instances. Also, BB1 fails to solve two instances

Table 14 Average CPU times (in s) and number of unsolved instances within the time limit (out of 24) for different choices of τ , ρ and OS in BB1 and BB2 run on Ins with $n = 50$

Method	τ	ρ	OS				
			0	0.25	0.50	0.75	
BB1	0	0.05	0.27	0.50	0.18	0.03	
			0.25	26.84	11.89	0.51	0.05
		0.50	127.59	25.92	1.96	0.06	
			0.50	439.09 (11)	57.55	1.86	0.09
		0.5	0.05	1.60	5.16	0.44	0.05
				0.25	35.16 (2)	8.86	0.72
	0.50		1.77	0.44	0.15	0.04	
			0.25	1.14	0.50	0.16	0.05
	0.50		0.49	2.86	0.16	0.06	
			0.50	0.49	2.86	0.16	0.06
	BB2	0	0.05	0.21	1.01	0.25	0.03
				0.25	0.27	2.79	0.36
0.50			0.49	3.11	0.37	0.06	
			0.50	0.49	3.11	0.37	0.06
0.5			0.05	1.66	76.47	5.97	0.12
				0.25	77.95 (1)	158.78	17.96
		0.50	544.25 (11)	338.02 (6)	52.42	0.30	
			0.50	544.25 (11)	338.02 (6)	52.42	0.30
		1	0.05	1.75	0.43	0.15	0.06
				0.25	1.09	0.51	0.29
0.50			0.47	3.15	0.19	0.05	
			0.50	0.47	3.15	0.19	0.05

with $\rho = 0.25$, whereas this occurs for only one instance with $\rho = 0.25$ for BB2.

We will represent each class of instances by a triple (τ, ρ, OS) . As mentioned before, the hardest class of instances for both algorithms is $(0.5, 0.5, 0)$. The class $(0, 0.5, 0)$, which seems to be the third most difficult class for BB1, is very easy for BB2. Also, $(0.5, 0.5, 0.25)$, which is the second hardest class for BB2, does not require very high runtimes from BB1. We infer that BB2 is better than BB1 when release dates are equal (zero); in this case (cf. Sect. 4) stronger bounds are computed in backward scheduling. Conversely, BB1 is better than BB2 when release dates are not equal (especially when $\tau = 0.50$). With unequal release dates, backward branching cannot start from the root node but rather only after a certain number of jobs have already been scheduled. Because branching forward increases the earliest possible starting and completion times of jobs, the trivial lower bound and the Lagrangian-based lower bounds will be stronger for BB1 than those for BB2. As explained at the end of Sect. 6.4 and contrary to BB2, in BB1 k is never restarted in the computation of DR_6^k and therefore we do not lose any pruning opportunity.

8.5 Experiments for subproblems of P

In this section, we present the results of our B&B algorithms for subproblems of P that have also been studied in the earlier literature.

Table 15 Average CPU times (in s) for different choices of Pr and n in BB2 and SSDP run on Ins^{TAN}

Pr	$n = 40$		$n = 50$	
	BB2	SSDP	BB2	SSDP
0	0.04	0.04	0.26	0.06
0.005	0.49	0.35	1.83	0.71
0.01	0.61	0.51	4.98	2.05
0.02	0.80	1.67	15.79	6.40
0.05	1.48	6.01	32.11	37.13
0.10	0.57	9.71	2.64	32.78
0.20	0.09	1.67	0.18	3.61

8.5.1 A single-machine problem with precedence

$$constraints: 1|prec| \sum w_j T_j$$

One special case of P is single-machine scheduling with precedence constraints where the objective is to minimize the total weighted tardiness. From our observations in Sect. 8.4, we know that we only need to consider BB2 for this subproblem because all release dates are zero, and so we compare the performance of BB2 with the SSDP algorithm proposed by Tanaka and Sato (2013). We apply both algorithms to the benchmark instances Ins^{TAN} obtained from Tanaka and Sato (2013). For these instances, parameter Pr denotes the probability that each arc $(i, j) \in N \times N$ with $i \neq j$ is present in the precedence graph. Note that the resulting precedence graph may contain transitive arcs. In such cases, the transitive reduction is computed and used as input to BB2. Table 15 shows the computational results for our B&B algorithms and for the SSDP algorithm (which was run on the same computer). SSDP solves instances in very short runtimes when there are no precedence constraints. SSDP performs worse, however, when the precedence graph is dense, while the B&B algorithms will tend to perform better exactly in this case. To conclude this comparison, we underline the fact that our algorithms have been developed to solve the more general setting in which time windows are also imposed, whereas the instance set examined here does not contain such time windows.

8.5.2 A single-machine problem with time windows:

$$1|r_j, \delta_j| \sum w_j C_j$$

Another special case of P is the single-machine problem with time windows where the objective function is to minimize the total weighted sum of the completion times. We run our B&B algorithms on one of the instance sets provided by Pan and Shi (2005), which has been introduced as problem set (I) in which the parameters α and β define the ranges for the generation of release dates and deadlines, respectively. We refer to this

Table 16 Average CPU times (in s; first number) and number of unsolved instances within the time limit (between brackets, if any; out of 10) for different choices of n, α and β in BB1 and BB2 run on Ins^{PAN}

n	α	β	Method	
			BB1	BB2
20	0.5	1	0.006	0.005
		2	0.008	0.005
		4	0.010	0.008
		8	0.012	0.010
		16	0.012	0.010
		1	0.002	0.002
		2	0.002	0.002
		4	0.004	0.004
	1	8	0.013	0.011
		16	0.009	0.008
		1	0.026	0.022
		2	0.040	0.047
		4	0.055	0.053
		8	0.100	0.110
		16	0.105	0.107
		1	0.007	0.008
30	0.5	2	0.033	0.033
		4	0.017	0.018
		8	0.161	0.160
		16	0.092	0.087
		1	0.111	0.123
		2	0.306	0.301
		4	1.419	1.451
		8	2.512	2.477
	1	16	0.987	0.967
		1	0.014	0.012
		2	0.234	0.165
		4	0.161	0.170
		8	0.267	0.282
		16	0.867	0.875
		1	0.782	0.784
		2	3.028	3.038
50	0.5	4	11.082	11.152
		8	17.801	17.718
		16	100.041	100.253
		1	0.036	0.038
	1	2	1.660	1.638
		4	13.466 ₍₁₎	13.686 ₍₁₎
		8	71.697 ₍₂₎	72.407 ₍₂₎
		16	77.316 ₍₃₎	77.406 ₍₃₎

instance set as Ins^{PAN} . To solve these instances, we set all due dates to zero. Table 16 shows the computational results of BB1 and BB2 applied to Ins^{PAN} . Our B&B algorithms

both solve 394 out of the 400 instances to optimality within the time limit of 1200 s. Although a consistent pattern cannot be recognized, it seems that the hardest instances belong to the subsets where $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 16$. Since we do not have access to the code of Pan and Shi, direct comparisons are difficult, but overall our runtimes are of the same order of magnitude, although the most difficult instances for Pan and Shi are not the most difficult ones for our code, and vice versa.

Contrary to the discussion in Sect. 8.4, we notice that our two algorithms behave quite similarly for these instances. This can be explained as follows. First, for all members of Ins^{PAN} , release dates are non-zero, such that BB2 follows the same steps as BB1 until the release dates of all remaining jobs are less than the decision time. Second, the fact that due dates are zero makes all jobs late already in the root node and thus the scheduling of any job (even in the beginning of the schedule) has a positive contribution in the objective value. For the case where due dates are non-zero, scheduling backward is advantageous because jobs are mostly early in the beginning of the schedule, so they have zero contribution in the objective value.

9 Summary and conclusion

In this article, we have developed exact algorithms for the single-machine scheduling problem with total weighted tardiness penalties. We work with a rather general problem statement, in that both precedence constraints as well as time windows (release dates and deadlines) are part of the input; this generalizes quite a number of problems for which computational procedures have already been published. We develop a branch-and-bound algorithm that solves the problem to guaranteed optimality. Computational results show that our approach is effective in solving medium-sized instances, and that it compares favorably with two straightforward linear formulations. Our procedure was also compared with two existing methods, namely an SSDP algorithm and a B&B algorithm, for special cases of the problem. The SSDP algorithm requires only very low runtimes in the absence of precedence constraints, but it performs worse when the precedence graph is dense, which is exactly the easiest setting for our B&B algorithms.

Acknowledgments We are very grateful to professor Shunji Tanaka from Kyoto University for providing us with the benchmark instances and the code of the SSDP algorithm that were used in Sect. 8.5.1, and to professor Yunpeng Pan from South Dakota State University for sending us the instances examined in Sect. 8.5.2.

Appendix: Proofs

Proof of Lemma 1 Consider the set of constraints (10). For each $(i, j) \in A$, the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{i1} + \dots + x_{in} &\leq 1 - x_{j1} = x_{j2} + \dots + x_{jn} \\ x_{i2} + \dots + x_{in} &\leq 1 - x_{j1} - x_{j2} = x_{j3} + \dots + x_{jn} \\ &\vdots \\ x_{i(n-1)} + x_{in} &\leq 1 - x_{j1} - \dots - x_{j(n-1)} = x_{jn} \\ x_{in} &\leq 1 - x_{j1} - \dots - x_{jn} = x_{j1} + \dots + x_{jn} - 1 \end{aligned}$$

By adding the above inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x_{i1} + 2x_{i2} + 3x_{i3} + \dots + nx_{in} &\leq \\ x_{j1} + 2x_{j2} + 3x_{j3} + \dots + nx_{jn} - 1. & \end{aligned}$$

This is exactly the associated constraint in the set of constraints (5). As a result, the solution space of the LP relaxation of ASF' is included in that of ASF . To show that the inclusion is strict, consider the following fractional values for the decision variables corresponding with a couple $(i, j) \in A$: $x_{i1} = x_{i5} = 0.5$ and $x_{j4} = 1$. These values can be seen to respect the weak but not the strong formulation. \square

Proof of Theorem 1 Since $1|\sum w_j T_j$ is a relaxation of $1|\beta|\sum w_j T_j$, the optimal value of I' and any valid lower bound for this optimal value is considered as a valid lower bound for I . \square

Proof of Theorem 2 The following equality holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TWT}^*(I) &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{T}} w_j (C_j(S^*) - d_j) \\ &= \sum_{j \in N} w_j (C_j(S^*) - d_j) \\ &\quad - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}} w_j (C_j(S^*) - d_j) = \sum_{j \in N} w_j C_j(S^*) \\ &\quad - \sum_{j \in N} w_j d_j + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}} w_j (d_j - C_j(S^*)). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\bar{l}b_{I'}$ is a valid lower bound on the value $\sum_{j \in N} w_j C_j(S^*)$ and lb^E is a valid lower bound on the value $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}} w_j (d_j - C_j(S^*))$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3 We argue that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LB}_0 = L_0(\lambda_{\text{PV}}) &= \hat{L}_1(\lambda_{\text{PV}}, \mu_0) \leq \hat{L}_1(\lambda_{\text{TPA}}, \mu_{\text{TPA}}) \\ &\leq L_1(\lambda_{\text{TPA}}, \mu_{\text{TPA}}) = \text{LB}_1. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from Theorem 3 in van de Velde (1995), where it is shown that TPA generates a series of monotonically increasing lower bounds. The second inequality corresponds with Theorem 1. \square




Fig. 12 Four possible cases for the parameter combinations in the proof of Lemma 4

Proof of Theorem 4 $LB_1(NO)$ is obtained by solving LR_{P_1} with $A' = \emptyset$ and $A'' = A$, so with the same multipliers the problem associated with $LB_1(NO)$ is a relaxation of the problem associated with $LB_1(VSP)$. The multipliers are updated with TPA in both cases, and will indeed be the same for a given k_{max} , so the theorem holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 5 We introduce $g_{B_i}(\lambda, \mu, S)$ as follows:

$$g_{B_i}(\lambda, \mu, S) = \sum_{j \in B_i} (w_j - \lambda_j)T_j + \sum_{j \in B_i} \lambda_j(C_j - d_j) + \sum_{j \in B_i} \sum_{k \in Q_j} \mu_{jk}(C_j + p_k - C_k).$$

Let S_1^* be an optimal solution to LB_1^* and $S_2^* = (S_{B_1}^*, \dots, S_{B_k}^*)$ an optimal solution to LB_2^* . The following result is derived.

$$LB_1^* = g(\lambda^*, \mu^*, S_1^*) \leq g(\lambda^*, \mu^*, S_2^*) = \sum_{i=1}^k g_{B_i}(\lambda^*, \mu^*, S_{B_i}^*) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k g_{B_i}(\lambda_{B_i}^*, \mu_{B_i}^*, S_{B_i}^*) = LB_2^*.$$

\square

Proof of Theorem 6 If $\min_{\pi \in \Pi_A} \{C_{max}(\sigma_B | \pi)\}$ is greater than $\max_{j \in A} \{\bar{\delta}_j\}$ then at least one job in A cannot be sched-

uled before its deadline and the schedule (σ_B, σ_E) is not feasible. \square

Proof of Theorem 7 If $\tau'_2 = 0$, then $\Gamma_{jk}(t, \tau_1, \tau_2) = \hat{\Gamma}_{jk}(t, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau'_2)$ and the theorem holds based on [Jouglet et al. \(2004\)](#). If $\tau'_2 > 0$, all jobs in B are shifted to the left at least τ'_2 units. Also, τ_2 equals zero because no job is shifted to the right. For all jobs $i \in B'$ we have $C_i(S_1) \geq C_i(S'_1) \geq d_i$. Consequently, $\tau'_2 \sum_{i \in B'} w_i \geq 0$ is a lower bound for the gain of rescheduling jobs in B . The value $w_j \max\{0, t + p_j - d_j\} - w_j \max\{0, \hat{r}_j + p_j - d_j\}$ equals the gain of rescheduling job j and the value $w_k \max\{0, \hat{r}_k + p_k - d_k\} - w_k \max\{0, t + \tau_1 + p_k - d_k\}$ equals the gain of rescheduling job k . By adding lower bounds for rescheduling gains of all jobs in $U = B \cup \{j, k\}$, a lower bound for the gain of interchanging jobs j and k is obtained. \square

Proof of Theorem 8 We examine under which conditions the jobs belonging to the set $U = B \cup \{j, k\}$ do not violate any of their deadlines and/or precedence constraints. Precedence constraints are not violated because jobs $j, k \in E_B$ are deliberately chosen such that $Q_k \cap Q_j = Q_k$ and job j does not violate its deadline simply because $C_j(S'_1) \leq C_j(S_1) \leq \bar{\delta}_j$.

Condition 1 ensures that job k does not violate its deadline. We argue that $t = st_j(S_1) \leq \bar{\delta}_j - p_j$. If $\bar{\delta}_j - p_j \leq \bar{\delta}_k - \tau_1 - p_k$ holds, then we infer $C_k(S'_1) = t + \tau_1 + p_k \leq \bar{\delta}_k$. Also, if $\Psi \leq \hat{\delta}_k$, then all unscheduled jobs including j and k are completed at or before $\hat{\delta}_k$. Note that $\hat{\delta}_k$ is preferred over $\bar{\delta}_k$

because $\bar{\delta}_k \leq \hat{\delta}_k$, thus condition 1 is less violated, and the inequality $\Psi \leq \hat{\delta}_k$ also implies $C_k(S'_1) \leq \bar{\delta}_k$.

Condition 2 verifies that no job in \mathcal{B} violates its deadline. On the one hand, if $\tau_2 = 0$, then no job in \mathcal{B} is shifted to the right, which means $C_i(S'_1) \leq C_i(S_1) \leq \bar{\delta}_i$ for each job $i \in \mathcal{B}$. On the other hand, if $\tau_2 > 0$ and $\Psi \leq \min_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \{\hat{\delta}_i\}$, then for all jobs $i \in \mathcal{B}$ we conclude: $C_i(S'_1) \leq \Psi \leq \min_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \{\hat{\delta}_i\} \leq \hat{\delta}_i$. Again, $\hat{\delta}_i$ is preferred over $\bar{\delta}_i$ because of the same reasoning as for the preference of $\hat{\delta}_k$ over $\bar{\delta}_k$. \square

Proof Lemma 4 Let f have a global minimum at value t^* . Depending on the values of the parameters α, β, a , and b , the function f behaves differently. We discuss four possible cases for the parameter combinations to prove this lemma (see also Fig. 12). In the two first cases, we assume that $\alpha \geq \beta$. Case (a): in this case, $a \leq b$, and then f is constant on interval $[u, a]$ and is increasing on interval $[a, v]$, as shown in Fig. 12a. Case (b): $a > b$, f is constant on interval $[u, b]$, decreasing on interval $[b, a]$ and increasing on interval $[a, v]$, in line with Fig. 12b. The following results are valid for these two cases: 1- If $u \leq a \leq v$ then $t^* = a$. 2- If $a < u$, $t^* = u$ because f is always increasing on interval $[u, v]$. 3- If $a > v$, $t^* = v$ because f is always decreasing on interval $[u, v]$. We conclude that $t^* = \min\{\max\{a, u\}, v\}$ for the first two cases.

In the next two cases, we assume that $\alpha < \beta$. Case (c): $a < b$, f is constant for $[u, b]$, increasing for $[b, a]$ and decreasing for $[a, v]$, as shown in Fig. 12c. In this case, t^* equals either u or v . On the one hand, if $\alpha(b - \max\{a, u\}) \geq (\beta - \alpha)(\max\{v, b\} - b) \Rightarrow \alpha(\bar{v} - \bar{u}) \geq \beta(\bar{v} - b)$ then $f(v) \geq f(u)$ is inferred and $t^* = u$ is concluded. On the other hand, if $\alpha(\bar{v} - \bar{u}) < \beta(\bar{v} - b)$ then $t^* = v$ is concluded. Case (d): $a \geq b$, f is constant for $[u, b]$ and decreasing for $[b, v]$; see Fig. 12d. We find that t^* equals v for this case. \square

Proof of Theorem 9 and Theorem 10 Similar to the proof of Theorem 8. \square

References

Abdul-Razaq, T. S., & Potts, C. N. (1988). Dynamic programming state-space relaxation for single-machine scheduling. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 39(2), 141–152.

Abdul-Razaq, T. S., Potts, C. N., & Van Wassenhove, L. N. (1990). A survey of algorithms for the single machine total weighted tardiness scheduling problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 26, 235–253.

Akturk, M. S., & Ozdemir, D. (2000). An exact approach to minimizing total weighted tardiness with release dates. *IIE Transactions*, 32, 1091–1101.

Akturk, M. S., & Ozdemir, D. (2001). A new dominance rule to minimize total weighted tardiness with unequal release dates. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 135(2), 394–412.

Artigues, C., Demassez, S., & Neron, E. (2007). *Resource-constrained project scheduling: Models, algorithms, extensions and applications*. London: ISTE.

Bein, W., Kamburowski, J., & Stallmann, M. (1992). Optimal reduction of two-terminal directed acyclic graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 21(6), 1112–1129.

Belouadah, H., Posner, M. E., & Potts, C. N. (1992). Scheduling with release dates on a single machine to minimize total weighted completion time. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 36(3), 213–231.

Calinescu, G., Fernandes, C., Kaul, H., & Zelikovsky, A. (2012). Maximum series-parallel subgraph. *Algorithmica*, 63(1–2), 137–157.

Christofides, N., Alvarez-Valdes, R., & Tamarit, J. M. (1987). Project scheduling with resource constraints: A branch and bound approach. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 29, 262–273.

Conway, R. W., Maxwell, W. C., & Miller, L. W. (1967). *Theory of Scheduling*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Debels, D., & Vanhoucke, M. (2007). A decomposition-based genetic algorithm for the resource-constrained project-scheduling problem. *Operations Research*, 55(3), 457–469.

Demeulemeester, E., Vanhoucke, M., & Herroelen Rangen, W. (2003). A random network generator for activity-on-the-node networks. *Journal of Scheduling*, 6, 13–34.

Dyer, M. E., & Wolsey, L. A. (1990). Formulating the single machine sequencing problem with release dates as a mixed integer program. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 26(23), 255–270.

Fisher, M. L. (1981). The Lagrangian relaxation method for solving integer programming problems. *Management Science*, 27(1), 1–18.

Garey, M. R., & Johnson, D. S. (1979). *Computers and intractability: A guide to the theory of NP-completeness*. New York: W. H. Freeman.

Gordon, V., Potapneva, E., & Werner, F. (1997). Single machine scheduling with deadlines, release and due dates. *Optimization*, 42(3), 219–244.

Graham, R. L., Lawler, E. L., Lenstra, J. K., & Rinnooy Kan, A. H. G. (1979). Optimization and approximation in deterministic sequencing and scheduling: A survey. *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, 5, 287–326.

Hariiri, A. M. A., & Potts, C. N. (1983). An algorithm for single machine sequencing with release dates to minimize total weighted completion time. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 5(1), 99–109.

Held, M., & Karp, R. M. (1962). A dynamic programming approach to sequencing problems. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 10(1), 196–210.

Hoogeveen, J. A., & van de Velde, S. L. (1995). Stronger Lagrangian bounds by use of slack variables: Applications to machine scheduling problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 70, 173–190.

Ibaraki, T., & Nakamura, Y. (1994). A dynamic programming method for single machine scheduling. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 76(1), 72–82.

Jouglet, A., Baptiste, P., & Carlier, J. (2004). *Handbook of scheduling: Algorithms, models and performance analysis, chap. 13.*, Branch and bound algorithms for total weighted tardiness Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Keha, A. B., Khowala, K., & Fowler, J. W. (2009). Mixed integer programming formulations for single machine scheduling problems. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 56, 357–367.

Kinable, J., Wauters, T., & Vanden Berghe, G. (2014). The concrete delivery problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, 48, 53–68.

Lawler, E. L. (1973). Optimal sequencing of a single machine subject to precedence constraints. *Management Science*, 19(5), 544–546.

Lawler, E. L. (1977). A pseudopolynomial algorithm for sequencing jobs to minimize total tardiness. *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, 1, 331–342.

Lawler, E. L. (1978). Sequencing jobs to minimize total weighted completion time subject to precedence constraints. *Algorithmic Aspects of Combinatorics*, 2, 75–90.

Lenstra, J. K., Rinnooy Kan, A. H. G., & Brucker, P. (1977). *Studies in integer programming* (Vol. 1, pp. 343–362), Complexity

- of machine scheduling problems. *Annals of discrete mathematics* Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- McMahon, G. B., & Lim, C. J. (1993). The two-machine flow shop problem with arbitrary precedence relations. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *64*(2), 249–257.
- Nemeth, G., Lovrek, I., & Sinkovic, V. (1997). Scheduling problems in parallel systems for telecommunications. *Computing*, *58*, 199–223.
- Nessah, R., & Kacem, I. (2012). Branch-and-bound method for minimizing the weighted completion time scheduling problem on a single machine with release dates. *Computers & Operations Research*, *39*(3), 471–478.
- Pan, Y. (2003). An improved branch and bound algorithm for single machine scheduling with deadlines to minimize total weighted completion time. *Operations Research Letters*, *31*(6), 492–496.
- Pan, Y., & Shi, L. (2005). Dual constrained single machine sequencing to minimize total weighted completion time. *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, *2*(4), 344–357.
- Pinedo, M. L. (2008). *Scheduling: Theory, Algorithms, and Systems*. Berlin: Springer.
- Posner, M. E. (1985). Minimizing weighted completion times with deadlines. *Operations Research*, *33*, 562–574.
- Potts, C. N. (1985). A lagrangean based branch and bound algorithm for single machine sequencing with precedence constraints to minimize total weighted completion time. *Management Science*, *31*(10), 1300–1311.
- Potts, C. N., & Van Wassenhove, L. N. (1983). An algorithm for single machine sequencing with deadlines to minimize total weighted completion time. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *12*(4), 379–387.
- Potts, C. N., & Van Wassenhove, L. N. (1985). A branch and bound algorithm for the total weighted tardiness problem. *Operations Research*, *33*(2), 363–377.
- Shirazi, B. A., Kavi, K. M., & Hurson, A. R. (Eds.). (1995). *Scheduling and load balancing in parallel and distributed systems*. Los Alamitos: IEEE Computer Society Press.
- Sule, D. R. (2007). *Production planning and industrial scheduling: Examples, case studies and applications*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Talla Nobibon, F., & Leus, R. (2011). Exact algorithms for a generalization of the order acceptance and scheduling problem in a single-machine environment. *Computers & Operations Research*, *38*(1), 367–378.
- Tanaka, S., & Fujikuma, S. (2012). A dynamic-programming-based exact algorithm for general single-machine scheduling with machine idle time. *Journal of Scheduling*, *15*, 347–361.
- Tanaka, S., Fujikuma, S., & Araki, M. (2009). An exact algorithm for single-machine scheduling without machine idle time. *Journal of Scheduling*, *12*, 575–593.
- Tanaka, S., & Sato, S. (2013). An exact algorithm for the precedence-constrained single-machine scheduling problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *229*(2), 345–352.
- Tang, L., Xuan, H., & Liu, J. (2007). Hybrid backward and forward dynamic programming based Lagrangian relaxation for single machine scheduling. *Computers & Operations Research*, *34*(9), 2625–2636.
- Valdes, J., Tarjan, R., & Lawler, E. (1982). The recognition of series parallel digraphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, *11*(2), 298–313.
- van de Velde, S. L. (1995). Dual decomposition of a single-machine scheduling problem. *Mathematical Programming*, *69*(1–3), 413–428.
- van den Akker, J., Diepen, G., & Hoogeveen, J. (2010). Minimizing total weighted tardiness on a single machine with release dates and equal-length jobs. *Journal of Scheduling*, *13*, 561–576.
- Xu, J., & Parnas, D. (1990). Scheduling processes with release times, deadlines, precedence and exclusion relations. *IEEE Transaction on Software Engineering*, *16*(3), 360–369.