

# An enhanced pinwheel algorithm for the bamboo garden trimming problem

Federico Della Croce\* <sup>†</sup>

## Abstract

In the Bamboo Garden Trimming Problem (BGT), there is a garden populated by  $n$  bamboos  $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n$  with daily growth rates  $h(1) \geq h(2) \geq \dots \geq h(n)$ . We assume that the initial heights of bamboos are zero. A gardener is in charge of the bamboos and trims them to height zero according to some schedule. The objective is to design a perpetual schedule of trimming so as to maintain the height of the bamboo garden as low as possible. We consider the so-called discrete BGT variant, where the gardener is allowed to trim only one bamboo at the end of each day. For discrete BGT, the current state-of-the-art approximation algorithm exploits the relationship between BGT and the classical Pinwheel scheduling problem and provides a solution that guarantees a 2-approximation ratio. We propose an alternative Pinwheel scheduling algorithm with approximation ratio converging to  $\frac{12}{7}$  when  $\sum_{j=1}^n h(j) \gg h(1)$ . Also, we show that the approximation ratio of the proposed algorithm never exceeds  $\frac{32000}{16947} \approx 1.888$ .

**Keywords:** Bamboo trimming, Pinwheel scheduling, Approximation.

## 1 Introduction

We consider the so-called Bamboo Garden Trimming (BGT) Problem [2, 3]. A garden  $G$  is populated by  $n$  bamboos  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  each with its own daily growth rate. It is assumed that the initial bamboos heights are zero. Every day all bamboos except the ones that are cut grow the related extra heights. The goal is to design a perpetual schedule of cuts to maintain the elevation of the bamboo garden, that is the maximum height ever reached by any of the

---

\*DIGEP, Politecnico di Torino, Italy, [federico.dellacroce@polito.it](mailto:federico.dellacroce@polito.it)

<sup>†</sup>CNR, IEIIT, Torino, Italy

bamboos, as low as possible. The problem takes its origins from perpetual testing of virtual machines in cloud systems [1]. Let denote by  $H^*$  the optimal solution value and, for any algorithm  $A$ , let denote by  $H^A$  the corresponding solution value. Approximation results are given both in [2] and [3] with one bamboo cut per day. In [3], it is shown that a simple strategy denoted *ReduceMax* that imposes to cut always the bamboo reaching the maximum height in each day has approximation ratio  $\frac{H^{ReduceMax}}{H^*} \leq \log_2 n$ . Then, the so-called pinwheel algorithm (see [4]), here denoted *PW*, is shown to have approximation ratio  $\frac{H^{PW}}{H^*} \leq 2$ . In [2] it is conjectured that  $\frac{H^{ReduceMax}}{H^*} \leq 2$  and it is shown experimentally that such limit is never exceeded. This work is connected to several pinwheel problems such as the periodic Pinwheel problem [5, 7] and the Pinwheel scheduling problem [6]. As mentioned in [2], the garden with  $n$  bamboos is an analogue of a system of  $n$  machines which have to be attended (e.g., serviced) with different frequencies.

The *BGT* problem can be expressed as follows. There are  $n$  bamboos and for each bamboo  $b_j$  the related growth is denoted by  $h(j)$ . W.l.o.g. we assume  $h(1) = 2^0 = 1 \geq \dots \geq h(n)$ . In [3], it is shown that a lower bound  $LB$  on the maximum height of a bamboo is  $\sum_{j=1}^n h(j)$ . Actually, it is straightforward to slightly extend this result as  $LB = \max\{2h(1); \sum_{j=1}^n h(j)\}$  except for the trivial case with  $n = 1$ .

Here, we look for a periodic trimming of the bamboos. More specifically, we first recall the main features of the pinwheel algorithm where each bamboo is assigned to a partition so that, typically, bamboo  $b_1$  is assigned to partition  $P_1$ , bamboos  $b_2, \dots, b_j$  are assigned to partition  $P_2$ , bamboos  $b_{j+1}, \dots, b_k$  to partition  $P_3$  and so on up to bamboo  $b_n$ . If the number of partitions that is reached is equal to  $\alpha$ , then bamboo  $b_1$  is repeatedly cut every  $\alpha$  partitions and its maximum height will be  $\alpha \times h(1)$ . If each bamboo  $b_j$  has  $h(j) = \frac{1}{2^k}$  for different integer values of  $k \geq 0$ , then it is always possible to assign bamboos to all partitions in such a way that the sum of heights of the bamboos in each partition is equal to  $h(1)$  except possibly the last partition that has sum of heights  $\leq h(1)$ .

Consider the example in Table 1 where we have  $\sum_{j=1}^n h(j) = 135/16 \approx 8.4$ . Row 1 lists the bamboos that are present, row 2 indicates the height  $h(j)$  of each bamboo  $b_j$ , row 3 indicates how bamboos are split into the partitions and row 4 indicates the bamboos heights in each partition. In this case, in all partitions, the sum of heights is equal to 1 except the last one that has height  $\frac{7}{16}$ . The bamboos trimming respects the order of the considered partitions so that partitions are repeated one after another and every time a partition is considered, then a bamboo assigned to that partition will be trimmed. Given

$b_j$	$b_1$	$b_2$	$b_3$	$b_4$	$b_5$	$b_6$	$b_7$	$b_8$	$b_9$	$b_{10}$	$b_{11}$	$b_{12}$	$b_{13}$	$b_{14}$	$b_{15}$	$b_{16}$
$h(j)$	1	1	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{16}$
$P_j$	$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_5, b_6]$	$P_6 : [b_7, b_8]$	$P_7 : [b_9, b_{10}]$	$P_8 : [b_{11}, b_{12}, b_{13}]$	$P_9 : [b_{14}, b_{15}, b_{16}]$							
$\sum_{i \in P_j} h(i)$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	$\frac{7}{16}$	

Table 1: A 16-bamboos instance with all growths  $h(j) = 2^k$  for different integer values of  $k \leq 0$

$b_j$	$b_1$	$b_2$	$b_3$	$b_4$	$b_5$	$b_6$	$b_7$	$b_8$	$b_9$	$b_{10}$	$b_{11}$	$b_{12}$	$b_{13}$	$b_{14}$	$b_{15}$	$b_{16}$
$r(j)$	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	8	16

Table 2: Relevant  $r(j)$ s for the example of Table 1

a partition  $P_i$  and a bamboo  $b_j$ , the frequency of the bamboo  $b_j$  to be trimmed in partition  $P_i$  is not smaller than the ratio  $r(j) = h(1)/h(j)$ . Indeed bamboo  $b_j$  is trimmed at most once every  $r(j)$  appearances of partition  $P_i$ .

For the considered example, the  $r(j)$ s are as indicated in Table 2 (notice that, if  $h(j) = \frac{1}{2^k}$  for some integer  $k \geq 0$ , then  $r(j) = 2^k$  always holds) while partitions and selected bamboos are iterated as indicated in Table 3 and so on (notice that for partition  $P_9$ , as  $\sum_{i \in P_9} h(i) = \frac{7}{16} < 1$ , bamboos  $b_{14}, b_{15}, b_{16}$  can be trimmed more often than necessary). Then, for the considered example, the maximum height reached (that is the solution cost) is not larger than  $\alpha \times r(j) \times h(j) = \alpha \times h(1) = 9 * 1 = 9$ .

If bamboos growths are general, hence  $h(j) \neq \frac{1}{2^k}$  holds, then  $PW$  was used in [3] by considering modified growths  $h'(j)$  determined as follows:  $h'(j) = \frac{1}{2^k}$  such that  $\frac{1}{2^{k+1}} < h(j) \leq \frac{1}{2^k}$ . The rationale of the approach is to determine for every  $h(j)$ , the closest  $\frac{1}{2^k}$  value ( $k$  integer  $\geq 0$ ) not inferior to  $h(j)$  and to set  $h'(j) = \frac{1}{2^k}$ .

To see how algorithm  $PW$  works in this case, consider, the example in Table 4 with growths  $0 < h(j) \leq 1$ , where the entries have the same meaning of Table 1 and an additional row is included presenting the corresponding  $h'(j)$  values. In this case we have  $\sum_{i=1}^n h(j) = 5.93$ . If we substitute each  $h(j)$  with the corresponding  $h'(j)$ , we can see that partitions and  $r(j)$ s are

$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_5]$	$P_6 : [b_7]$	$P_7 : [b_9]$	$P_8 : [b_{11}]$	$P_9 : [b_{14}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_6]$	$P_6 : [b_8]$	$P_7 : [b_{10}]$	$P_8 : [b_{12}]$	$P_9 : [b_{15}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_5]$	$P_6 : [b_7]$	$P_7 : [b_9]$	$P_8 : [b_{11}]$	$P_9 : [b_{14}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_6]$	$P_6 : [b_8]$	$P_7 : [b_{10}]$	$P_8 : [b_{13}]$	$P_9 : [b_{16}]$

Table 3: Relevant partitions for the example of Table 1

$b_j$	$b_1$	$b_2$	$b_3$	$b_4$	$b_5$	$b_6$	$b_7$	$b_8$	$b_9$	$b_{10}$	$b_{11}$	$b_{12}$	$b_{13}$	$b_{14}$	$b_{15}$	$b_{16}$
$h(j)$	1	0.83	0.6	0.55	0.45	0.4	0.32	0.29	0.28	0.27	0.26	0.22	0.16	0.15	0.1	0.05
$h'(j)$	1	1	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{16}$
$P_j$	$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_5, b_6]$	$P_6 : [b_7, b_8]$	$P_7 : [b_9, b_{10}]$	$P_8 : [b_{11}, b_{12}, b_{13}]$	$P_9 : [b_{14}, b_{15}, b_{16}]$							
$\sum_{i \in P_j} h'(i)$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	$\frac{7}{16}$

Table 4: A 16-bamboos instance with all growths  $0 < h(j) \leq 1$

identical to those in Table 1 and we have  $H^{PW} = \alpha \times h(1) = 9$  achieved by bamboo  $b_1$  (and also other bamboos).

As mentioned before, it is shown in [3] that  $H^{PW} \leq 2 \sum h(j) \leq 2LB \leq 2H^*$  always holds, that is  $\frac{H^{PW}}{H^*} \leq 2$ . The following Lemma shows the asymptotical tightness of that result.

**Lemma 1.** *The bound on the approximation ratio  $\rho_1 = \frac{H^{PW}}{H^*} \leq 2$  is asymptotically tight.*

*Proof.* Consider an instance with  $n+1$  bamboos ( $n$  being even), where  $h(1) = 1$ ,  $h(2) = \dots = h(n+1) = \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon$ , with  $\epsilon > 0$  and arbitrarily close to zero. We have  $H^{PW} = n+1$ , while  $LB = \max\{2h(1), \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} h(j)\} = \frac{n}{2} + 1 + n\epsilon$  and a periodic asymptotically optimal solution exists with  $b_1$  assigned to partition  $P_1$  and bamboos  $b_{2j}, b_{2j+1}$  assigned to partition  $P_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n/2$  with value  $H^* = \frac{n}{2} + 1 + (n+2)\epsilon$  which is arbitrarily close to  $LB$  for  $\epsilon$  small enough. Also, this induces an approximation ratio asymptotically converging to  $\frac{n+1}{\frac{n}{2}+1} \approx 2$  for  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

## 2 Main result

In order to compute a periodic solution providing an improved approximation ratio, we consider a different way for determining modified growths denoted here as  $h''(j)$  and propose a different algorithm  $PW''$  applied to these  $h''(j)$  values. For any given  $\frac{1}{2^{k+1}} < h(j) \leq \frac{1}{2^k}$ ,  $k \geq 0$  integer, consider exhaustively splitting the bamboos into the following four subsets  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$ ,  $S_3$ , and  $S_4$ , compute the related  $h''(j)$  values as follows and determine the relevant number of partitions  $\pi_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, 4$ ) induced by these subsets.

$S_1$  : subset of bamboos  $b_j : \frac{2}{3} < h(j) \leq 1$ ; let  $h''(j) = h(1) = 1$  and  $\pi_1 = \sum_{j \in S_1} h''(j)$ .

$S_2$  : subset of bamboos  $b_j : \frac{1}{2} < h(j) \leq \frac{2}{3}$ ; for these bamboos, consider two options (a) and (b) and relevant modified growths  $h''_a(j)$  and  $h''_b(j)$ : either set  $h''_a(j) = 1$  and  $\pi_2 = |S_2|$ , or set  $h''_b(j) = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\pi_2 = \lfloor \frac{|S_2|}{2} \rfloor$ .

$S_3$  : subset of bamboos  $b_j : h(j) \leq \frac{1}{2}$  with  $\frac{2}{3}(\frac{1}{2^k}) < h(j) \leq \frac{1}{2^k}$ ,  $k \geq 1$  integer; let  $h''(j) = \frac{1}{2^k}$  and  $\pi_3 = \lfloor \sum_{j \in S_3} h''(j) \rfloor$ .

$S_4$  : subset of bamboos  $b_j : h(j) \leq \frac{1}{2}$  with  $\frac{1}{2^{k+1}} < h(j) \leq \frac{2}{3}(\frac{1}{2^k})$ ,  $k \geq 1$  integer; let  $h''(j) = \frac{2}{3}(\frac{1}{2^k})$  and  $\pi_4 = \lfloor \sum_{j \in S_4} h''(j) \rfloor$ .

Let denote by  $sh_i$  the sum of modified growths of subset  $S_i$ , that is  $sh_i = \sum_{j \in S_i} h''(j)$ . We remark that in  $S_1$ , the  $h''(j)$  values are equal to 1 and thus integer. Then, in  $S_2$ , either all  $h''(j)$  values are equal to 1 or are equal to  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Also, in  $S_3$  each  $h''(j)$  value is multiple of  $\frac{1}{2^k}$  for some integer  $k \geq 1$  (where  $k$  may differ from one bamboo to another) and in  $S_4$  each  $h''(j)$  value is multiple of  $\frac{2}{3}(\frac{1}{2^k})$  for some integer  $k \geq 1$  (also here  $k$  may differ from one bamboo to another). Correspondingly, the rationale is that, in subset  $S_1$ ,  $sh_1$  is an integer value and induces directly an integer number of partitions  $\pi_1 = sh_1$  where to allocate the related bamboos  $b_j$  with unit modified grow  $h''(j) = 1$ . Then, consider subset  $S_2$ . If option (a) is considered all  $h''(j)$  values are equal to 1 and thus integer and  $\pi_2 = sh_2 = \sum_{j \in S_2} h''(j)$ . Else option (b) holds. In this case all  $h''(j)$  values are equal to  $\frac{1}{2}$  and all bamboos (except possibly one if the number of bamboos is odd) are allocated in pairs determining  $\pi_2 = \lfloor \frac{|S_2|}{2} \rfloor$  partitions. If the number of bamboos in  $S_2$  is odd, then  $sh_2 = \sum_{j \in S_2} h''(j)$  is fractional. Hence, the last bamboo  $b_l$  of this subset with value  $h''(l) = \frac{1}{2}$  corresponding to the mantissa of  $sh_2$  represents a remaining part of subset  $S_2$  to be assigned to some other partition. Also, in subset  $S_3$ , as all  $h''(j)$  value are multiple of  $\frac{1}{2^k}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ), it is always possible to determine  $\pi_3$  partitions where to allocate all bamboos of this subset except possibly a smaller subset of bamboos  $R_{S_3}$  with  $\sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3}} h''(j) < 1$  corresponding to the mantissa of  $sh_3$ . As an example, suppose in subset  $S_3$  we have six bamboos  $b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_6}$ , with  $h''(j_1) = h''(j_2) = h''(j_3) = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $h''(j_4) = h''(j_5) = \frac{1}{4}$  and  $h''(j_6) = \frac{1}{8}$  so that  $sh_3 = \frac{17}{8}$ . Then, we have  $\pi_3 = \lfloor \frac{17}{8} \rfloor = 2$  partitions, where to allocate bamboos  $b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_5}$  with bamboos  $b_{j_1}, b_{j_2}$  in one partition and bamboos  $b_{j_3}, b_{j_4}$  and  $b_{j_5}$  in the other partition, while  $b_{j_6} \in R_{S_3}$  represents a remaining part of subset  $S_3$  to be assigned to some other partition. A similar consideration holds for subset  $S_4$ . As all  $h''(j)$  value are multiple of  $\frac{2}{3}(\frac{1}{2^k})$  ( $k \geq 1$ ), it is always possible to determine  $\pi_4$  partitions where to allocate all bamboos of this subset except possibly a smaller subset of bamboos  $R_{S_4}$  with  $\sum_{b_j \in R_{S_4}} h''(j) < 1$  corresponding to the mantissa of  $sh_4$ . As an example, suppose in subset  $S_4$  we have nine bamboos  $b_{k_1}, \dots, b_{k_9}$ , with  $h''(k_1) = h''(k_2) = h''(k_3) = h''(k_4) = h''(k_5) = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $h''(k_6) = h''(k_7) = h''(k_8) = \frac{1}{6}$  and  $h''(k_9) = \frac{1}{12}$  so that  $sh_4 = \frac{27}{12}$ . Then, we have  $\pi_4 = \lfloor \frac{27}{12} \rfloor = 2$  partitions, where to allocate bamboos  $b_{k_1}, \dots, b_{k_9}$  with bamboos  $b_{k_1}, b_{k_2}, b_{k_3}$  in one partition and bamboos  $b_{k_4}, b_{k_5}, b_{k_6}, b_{k_7}$  in the

$b_j$	$b_1$	$b_2$	$b_3$	$b_4$	$b_5$	$b_6$	$b_{12}$	$b_{15}$	$b_{16}$	$b_7$	$b_8$	$b_9$	$b_{10}$	$b_{11}$	$b_{13}$	$b_{14}$
$h(j)$	1	0.83	0.6	0.55	0.45	0.4	0.22	0.1	0.05	0.32	0.29	0.28	0.27	0.26	0.16	0.15
$h''(j)$ ( $h''_a(j)$ for $S_5$ )	1	1	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{16}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{1}{6}$
$h''(j)$ ( $h''_b(j)$ for $S_5$ )	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{16}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{1}{6}$
$S_j, R_{S_j}$	$S_1 : [b_1, b_2]$		$S_2 : [b_3, b_4]$		$S_3 : [b_5, b_6]$		$R_{S_3} : [b_{12}, b_{15}, b_{16}]$			$S_4 : [b_7, b_8, b_9, b_{10}, b_{11}, b_{13}, b_{14}]$						
$P_j(a)$	$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_5, b_6]$	$P_6 : [b_{12}, b_{15}, b_{16}]$	$P_7 : [b_7, b_8, b_9]$			$P_8 : [b_{10}, b_{11}, b_{13}, b_{14}]$						
$\sum_{i \in P_j(a)} h''(i)$	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	$\lceil \frac{7}{16} \rceil$	[1]			[1]						
$P_j(b)$	$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3, b_4]$		$P_4 : [b_5, b_6]$	$P_5 : [b_{12}, b_{15}, b_{16}]$	$P_6 : [b_7, b_8, b_9]$			$P_7 : [b_{10}, b_{11}, b_{13}, b_{14}]$						
$\sum_{i \in P_j(b)} h''(i)$	[1]	[1]	[1]		[1]	$\lceil \frac{7}{16} \rceil$	[1]			[1]						

Table 5: The modified growths  $h''(j)$  and related entries for the 16-bamboos instance with all growths  $0 < h(j) \leq 1$

other partition, while  $b_{k_8}, b_{k_9} \in R_{S_4}$  represent a remaining part of subset  $S_4$  to be assigned to some other partition. We propose the following algorithm denoted  $PW''$  that reads in input the number  $n$  of bamboos  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  and relevant heights  $h(1), \dots, h(n)$ , and provides in output the maximum height attained by the algorithm corresponding to the minimum between  $z(a)$  and  $z(b)$  computed as indicated in the algorithm.

---

**Algorithm 1**  $PW''$

---

**Input:** BGT problem with  $n$  bamboos  $b_j$  and relevant growths  $h(j)$  with  $h(1) = 1 \geq \dots \geq h(n)$ .

Consider option (a) and compute subsets  $S_i$  as indicated above, relevant  $h''(j)$  values,  $r(j)$  values and  $\sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(a)$ ; determine subsets  $R_{S_i}$  ( $i = 2, 3, 4$ ) if non-empty and all bamboos  $b_k \in R_{S_2}, R_{S_3}, R_{S_4}$ .

Determine the number of partitions necessary to allocate all  $b_k \in R_{S_3}, R_{S_4}$ , namely compute  $\pi_R(a) = \lceil \sum_{b_j \in (R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4})} h''(j) \rceil$ .

Compute the solution value that is  $z(a) = \pi_R(a) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(a)$ .

If  $S_2$  is non empty, let denote by  $b_{j^*}$  the bamboo  $b_j$  with value  $\frac{1}{2} < h(j) \leq \frac{2}{3}$  with largest value. Repeat for option (b) the same steps above mentioned for option (a) and compute  $\pi_R(b) = \lceil \sum_{b_j \in (R_{S_2} \cup R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4})} h''(j) \rceil$ .

Correspondingly, compute the solution value that is  $z(b) = \frac{h(j^*)}{0.5}(\pi_R(b) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(b))$ , else  $z(b) = +\infty$ .

Return  $\min\{z(a), z(b)\}$ .

---

Table 5 provides the relevant  $h''(j)$  values (split into  $h''_a(j)$  and  $h''_b(j)$  for the two options of subset  $S_2$ ), the relevant subsets  $S_j, R_{S_j}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, 4$ ) and the final partitions ( $P_j(a)$  (option a) and  $P_j(b)$  (option b)) for the example of Table 4 where  $R_{S_2}$  and  $R_{S_4}$  are empty.

Thus, if option (a) is considered, partitions and selected bamboos are

$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_5]$	$P_6 : [b_{12}]$	$P_7 : [b_7]$	$P_8 : [b_{10}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_6]$	$P_6 : [b_{15}]$	$P_7 : [b_8]$	$P_8 : [b_{11}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_5]$	$P_6 : [b_{12}]$	$P_7 : [b_9]$	$P_8 : [b_{13}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_6]$	$P_6 : [b_{16}]$	$P_7 : [b_7]$	$P_8 : [b_{10}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_5]$	$P_6 : [b_{12}]$	$P_7 : [b_8]$	$P_8 : [b_{11}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_6]$	$P_6 : [b_{15}]$	$P_7 : [b_9]$	$P_8 : [b_{14}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_5]$	$P_6 : [b_{12}]$	$P_7 : [b_7]$	$P_8 : [b_{10}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_6]$	$P_6 : [b_{16}]$	$P_7 : [b_8]$	$P_8 : [b_{11}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_5]$	$P_6 : [b_{12}]$	$P_7 : [b_9]$	$P_8 : [b_{13}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_6]$	$P_6 : [b_{15}]$	$P_7 : [b_7]$	$P_8 : [b_{10}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_5]$	$P_6 : [b_{12}]$	$P_7 : [b_8]$	$P_8 : [b_{11}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_4]$	$P_5 : [b_6]$	$P_6 : [b_{16}]$	$P_7 : [b_9]$	$P_8 : [b_{14}]$

Table 6: Relevant partitions and bamboos cutting frequencies for the example of Table 5: option a

iterated as indicated in Table 2 and so on (notice that for partition  $P_6(a)$ ,

as  $\sum_{i \in P_6(a)} h''(i) = \frac{7}{16} < 1$ , bamboos  $b_{12}, b_{15}, b_{16}$  can be trimmed more often than necessary).

Alternatively, if option (b) is considered, partitions and selected bamboos are iterated as indicated in Table 2 and so on. Correspondingly, if option

(a) is considered, we have  $\alpha = 8$  and the the solution value is  $8h(1) = 8$ . Besides, if option (b) is considered, we have  $\alpha = 7$  and the solution value is  $7r(3)h(3) = 8.4$ . Hence  $H^{PW''} = 8$ .

**Proposition 1.** *If  $\sum_{j=1}^n h(j) \gg h(1)$ , then a periodic solution exists with approximation ratio  $\rho_2 = \frac{H^{PW''}}{H^*}$  converging to  $\frac{12}{7} \approx 1.714$*

*Proof.* Consider applying the above pinwheel algorithm with modified growths  $h''(j)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . As  $\sum_{j=1}^n h(j) \gg h(1)$ , then we can disregard both in the numerator and in the denominator of  $\rho_2$  the contribution given by  $b_1$  plus the bamboos  $\in R_{S_2}, R_{S_3}$  and  $R_{S_4}$  (as it increases numerator and denominator by at most a constant value). Hence, for the denominator, a lower bound is given by  $\frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \frac{3}{4}\pi_4 + \frac{\pi_2}{2}$ . Besides, the numerator is given by  $\pi_1 - 1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 + \pi_2$  if case (a) is considered and by  $\frac{4}{3}(\pi_1 - 1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 + \frac{\pi_2}{2})$  if case (b) is considered. Correspondingly, an upper bound on the approximation ratio  $\rho_2$  is given by

$$\rho_2 \leq \frac{\min\{\pi_1 - 1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 + \pi_2, \frac{4}{3}(\pi_1 - 1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 + \frac{\pi_2}{2})\}}{\frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \frac{3}{4}\pi_4 + \frac{\pi_2}{2}} \quad (1)$$

$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_5]$	$P_5 : [b_{12}]$	$P_6 : [b_7]$	$P_7 : [b_{10}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_4]$	$P_4 : [b_6]$	$P_5 : [b_{15}]$	$P_6 : [b_8]$	$P_7 : [b_{11}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_5]$	$P_5 : [b_{12}]$	$P_6 : [b_9]$	$P_7 : [b_{13}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_4]$	$P_4 : [b_6]$	$P_5 : [b_{16}]$	$P_6 : [b_7]$	$P_7 : [b_{10}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_5]$	$P_5 : [b_{12}]$	$P_6 : [b_8]$	$P_7 : [b_{11}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_4]$	$P_4 : [b_6]$	$P_5 : [b_{15}]$	$P_6 : [b_9]$	$P_7 : [b_{14}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_5]$	$P_5 : [b_{12}]$	$P_6 : [b_7]$	$P_7 : [b_{10}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_4]$	$P_4 : [b_6]$	$P_5 : [b_{16}]$	$P_6 : [b_8]$	$P_7 : [b_{11}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_5]$	$P_5 : [b_{12}]$	$P_6 : [b_9]$	$P_7 : [b_{13}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_4]$	$P_4 : [b_6]$	$P_5 : [b_{15}]$	$P_6 : [b_7]$	$P_7 : [b_{10}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_3]$	$P_4 : [b_5]$	$P_5 : [b_{12}]$	$P_6 : [b_8]$	$P_7 : [b_{11}]$
$P_1 : [b_1]$	$P_2 : [b_2]$	$P_3 : [b_4]$	$P_4 : [b_6]$	$P_5 : [b_{16}]$	$P_6 : [b_9]$	$P_7 : [b_{14}]$

Table 7: Relevant partitions and bamboos cutting frequencies for the example of Table 5: option b

that is

$$\rho_2 \leq \frac{\min\{(\pi_1 - 1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 + \pi_2), (\pi_1 - 1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 + \pi_2) + \frac{1}{3}(\pi_1 - 1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - \pi_2)\}}{\frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \frac{3}{4}\pi_4 + \frac{\pi_2}{2}} \quad (2)$$

We observe that the worst case occurs when  $\pi_4 = 0$  as the coefficient in the denominator of  $\pi_4$  is superior to that of  $\pi_1 - 1$  or  $\pi_3$ . But then, taking this observation into account and substituting  $\pi_1 - 1 + \pi_3$  with  $\alpha$  and  $\pi_2$  with  $\beta$ , we get

$$\rho_2 \leq \frac{\min\{\alpha + \beta, \frac{4}{3}(\alpha + \frac{\beta}{2})\}}{\frac{2}{3}\alpha + \frac{\beta}{2}} = \frac{\min\{\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \beta + \frac{1}{3}(\alpha - \beta)\}}{\frac{2}{3}\alpha + \frac{\beta}{2}} \quad (3)$$

where  $\rho_2$  is maximum for  $\alpha = \beta$ . Thus we get

$$\rho_2 \leq \frac{2\alpha}{\frac{2}{3}\alpha + \frac{\alpha}{2}} = \frac{2}{\frac{7}{6}} = \frac{12}{7} \quad (4)$$

□

The above proposition handles a general case with  $\sum_{j=1}^n h(j) \gg h(1)$ . If this is not the case, the following Propositions provide approximation ratios that exhaustively handle all possible other distributions of the  $h(j)$ s.

The following exhaustive cases will be considered.



1.  $|S_2| \leq \pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1$  and  $\pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1 \geq 1$  (Proposition 2).
2.  $|S_2| > \pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1$  and  $|S_2| \geq 4$ ,  $|S_2|$  even (Proposition 3).
3.  $|S_2| > \pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1$  and  $|S_2| \geq 3$ ,  $|S_2|$  odd (Proposition 4).
4.  $|S_2| = 2$  and  $\pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1 = 1$  (Proposition 5).
5.  $|S_2| = 2$  and  $\pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1 = 0$  (Proposition 6).
6.  $|S_2| = 1$  and  $\pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1 = 0$  (Proposition 7).
7.  $|S_2| = 0$  and  $\pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1 = 0$  (Proposition 8).

**Proposition 2.** *If  $|S_2| \leq \pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1$  and  $\pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1 \geq 1$  then  $\rho_2 = \frac{H^{PW''}}{H^*} \leq \frac{15}{8} = 1.875$ .*

*Proof.* If  $|S_2| \leq \pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1$ , we consider  $z(a) = \pi_R(a) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(a)$  with  $|S_2| = \pi_2$  and the ratio  $\frac{\pi_R(a) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(a)}{\sum_{j=1}^n h(j)} = \frac{h(1) + \pi_R(a) + (\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_2 + \pi_3 + \pi_4}{h(1) + \frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \frac{3}{4}\pi_4 + \frac{\pi_2}{2} + \sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}} h(j)}$ . Notice that for the same argument of Proposition 1, we observe that the worst case occurs when  $\pi_4 = 0$ . Hence,  $|S_2| \leq \pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1$  corresponds to  $\pi_2 \leq \pi_1 - 1 + \pi_3$ , that is  $\beta \leq \alpha$  (with  $\alpha \geq 1$ ). Also,  $b_1$  is allocated in one partition, all bamboos  $\in R_{S_4}$  can be allocated within a second partition, and all bamboos  $\in R_{S_3}$  in a third distinct partition. Hence,  $h(1) + \pi_R(a) \leq 3$ . Besides, if  $\sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}} h(j) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , then all bamboos  $\in R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}$  could be allocated within a unique partition inducing  $h(1) + \pi_R(a) \leq 2$ . Thus, we have  $\frac{h(1) + \pi_R(a)}{h(1) + \sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}} h(j)} \leq 2$  with the worst-case given with  $h(1) + \pi_R(a) = 3$  and  $h(1) + \sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}} h(j) = \frac{3}{2}$ . Hence, the ratio becomes  $\frac{3 + (\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_2 + \pi_4}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2}{2}}$  that is  $\frac{3 + \alpha + \beta}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}\alpha + \frac{\beta}{2}}$  and the worst case again is reached for  $\alpha = \beta$ , that is for the ratio  $\frac{3 + 2\alpha}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}\alpha + \frac{\alpha}{2}} = \frac{3 + 2\alpha}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{7}{6}\alpha}$ . This ratio is maximum for  $\alpha = 1$  that is with  $\rho_2 = \frac{3+2}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{7}{6}} = \frac{15}{8} = 1.875$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.** *If  $|S_2| > \pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1$  and  $|S_2| \geq 4$ ,  $|S_2|$  even, then  $\rho_2 = \frac{H^{PW''}}{H^*} \leq \frac{32000}{16947} \approx 1.888$ .*

*Proof.* If  $|S_2| > \pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1$  and  $|S_2| \geq 4$ ,  $|S_2|$  even, we consider  $z(b) = \frac{h(j^*)}{0.5}(\pi_R(b) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(b))$  with  $|S_2| = \pi_2$  and the ratio  $\frac{\frac{h(j^*)}{0.5}(\pi_R(b) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(b))}{\sum_{j=1}^n h(j)} \leq \frac{h(1) + \pi_R(b) + (\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3 + \pi_4 + \frac{\pi_2}{2}}{h(1) + \sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}} h(j) + \sum_{b_j \in S_2} h(j) + \frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \frac{3}{4}\pi_4}$ . With a similar analysis to

that of Proposition 2, we get  $h(1) + \pi_R(b) \leq 3$  and  $\frac{h(1) + \pi_R(b)}{h(1) + \sum_{b_j \in R_{S_2} \cup R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}} h(j)} \leq 2$  with the worst-case given with  $h(1) + \pi_R(b) = 3$  and  $h(1) + \sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}} h(j) = \frac{3}{2}$ . Also, we can deduct  $\pi_4 = 0$ .

Hence, the approximation ratio becomes

$$\rho_2 \leq \frac{\frac{h(j^*)}{0.5}(3 + (\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2}{2})}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \sum_{b_j \in S_2} h(j)} \quad (5)$$

We consider two subcases with either  $h(j^*) \leq \frac{647}{1000}$ , or  $\frac{4}{3} \leq h(j^*) > \frac{647}{1000}$ . In the first case,  $\sum_{b_j \in S_2} h(j) = \frac{\pi_2}{2}$  and expression 5 becomes

$$\rho_2 \leq \frac{\frac{649}{500}(3 + (\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2}{2})}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2}{2}} \quad (6)$$

where the worst-case occurs with  $\pi_2$  as small as possible and  $(\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3$  as large as possible, that is with  $\pi_2 = 4$  and  $(\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3 = 3$ . Correspondingly, we get  $\rho_2 \leq \frac{\frac{649}{500}(3+3+2)}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}3+2} = \frac{\frac{1298}{125}}{\frac{11}{2}} = \frac{2596}{1375} \approx 1.888$ .

In the second case, the worst-case for the ratio  $\frac{h(j^*)}{0.5}$  is  $\frac{4}{3}$ . Besides, as  $h(j^*) > \frac{649}{1000}$ , then  $\sum_{b_j \in S_2} h(j) > \frac{\pi_2 - 1}{2} + \frac{649}{1000} = \frac{\pi_2}{2} + \frac{149}{1000}$ . Hence, expression 5 becomes

$$\rho_2 \leq \frac{\frac{4}{3}(3 + (\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2}{2})}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2}{2} + \frac{149}{1000}} \quad (7)$$

Again the worst-case occurs with  $\pi_2$  as small as possible and  $(\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3$  as large as possible, that is with  $\pi_2 = 4$  and  $(\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3 = 3$ . Correspondingly, we get  $\rho_2 \leq \frac{\frac{4}{3}(3+3+2)}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}3+2+\frac{149}{1000}} = \frac{\frac{32}{3}}{\frac{5649}{1000}} = \frac{32000}{16947} \approx 1.888$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.** *If  $|S_2| > \pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1$  and  $|S_2| \geq 3$ ,  $|S_2|$  odd, then  $\rho_2 = \frac{H^{PW''}}{H^*} \leq \frac{24}{13} \approx 1.846$ .*

*Proof.* If  $|S_2|$  is odd, then  $R_{S_2}$  is composed by one bamboo  $b_l$  with  $0.5 < h_l \leq \frac{2}{3}$  and  $\pi_2 = |S_2| - 1$ . We consider the following two exhaustive subcases.

1.  $\sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}} h(j) \leq \frac{1}{4}$ . If this subcase holds, we consider  $z(b) = \frac{h(j^*)}{0.5}(\pi_R(b) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(b))$  where  $b_l$  can be assigned to a partition together with  $\sum b_j \in R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}$  and  $b(1)$  is assigned to another partition, hence

$$\frac{h(1) + \pi_R(b)}{h(1) + h(l) + \sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}} h(j)} \leq 2. \quad (8)$$

As previously, we can deduct  $\pi_4 = 0$  and  $\frac{h(j^*)}{0.5} \leq \frac{4}{3}$ . Thus,

$$H^{PW''} \leq \frac{4}{3}(2 + (\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2 - 1}{2}). \quad (9)$$

Besides,

$$H^* \geq \sum_{j=1}^n h(j) \geq h(1) + h(l) + \frac{\pi_2 - 1}{2} + \frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 \geq \frac{3}{2} + \frac{\pi_2 - 1}{2} + \frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3. \quad (10)$$

Hence, we get

$$\rho_2 \leq \frac{\frac{4}{3}(2 + (\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2 - 1}{2})}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2 - 1}{2}} \quad (11)$$

where the worst-case occurs with  $\pi_2$  as small as possible and  $(\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3$  as large as possible, that is with  $\pi_2 = 3$  and  $(\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3 = 2$ . Correspondingly, we get

$$\rho_2 \leq \frac{\frac{4}{3}(2 + 2 + 1)}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}2 + 1} = \frac{40}{23} \approx 1.739. \quad (12)$$

2.  $\sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}} h(j) > \frac{1}{4}$ . If this subcase holds, we consider  $z(b) = \frac{h(j^*)}{0.5}(\pi_R(b) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(b))$  where  $b_l$  can be assigned to a partition together with  $\sum b_j \in R_{S_4}$ ,  $b(1)$  is assigned to another partition and  $\sum b_j \in R_{S_3}$  to another further partition, hence  $\frac{h(1) + \pi_R(b)}{h(1) + h(l) + \sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}} h(j)} \leq 3$ . As previously, we can deduct  $\pi_4 = 0$  and  $\frac{h(j^*)}{0.5} \leq \frac{4}{3}$ . Thus,

$$H^{PW''} \leq \frac{4}{3}(3 + (\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2 - 1}{2}). \quad (13)$$

Besides,

$$\begin{aligned} H^* &\geq \sum_{j=1}^n h(j) \geq h(1) + h(l) + \frac{\pi_2 - 1}{2} + \frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}} h(j) > \\ &> \frac{3}{2} + \frac{\pi_2 - 1}{2} + \frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Hence, we get

$$\rho_2 < \frac{\frac{4}{3}(3 + (\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2 - 1}{2})}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2 - 1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}} \quad (15)$$

where the worst-case occurs always with  $\pi_2 = 3$  and  $(\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3 = 2$ . Correspondingly, we get

$$\rho_2 \leq \frac{\frac{4}{3}(3+2+1)}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}2 + 1 + \frac{1}{2}} = \frac{24}{13} \approx 1.846. \quad (16)$$

□

**Proposition 5.** *If  $|S_2| = 2$  and  $\pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1 = 1$  then  $\rho_2 = \frac{H^{PW''}}{H^*} \leq \frac{360}{193} \approx 1.865$ .*

*Proof.* If  $|S_2| = 2$  and  $\pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1 = 1$ , we consider two subcases depending on whether  $h(j^*) \leq \frac{11}{20}$  or  $h(j^*) > \frac{11}{20}$ . If  $h(j^*) \leq \frac{11}{20}$ , we consider  $z(b) = \frac{h(j^*)}{0.5}(\pi_R(b) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(b))$  and the relevant approximation ratio becomes

$$\rho_2 \leq \frac{\frac{11}{10}(3 + (\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2}{2})}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2}{2}} = \frac{\frac{11}{10}(3 + 1 + 1)}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3} + 1} = \frac{\frac{11}{2}}{\frac{19}{6}} = \frac{33}{19} \approx 1.737 \quad (17)$$

Alternatively,  $h(j^*) > \frac{11}{20}$  and we consider  $z(a) = \pi_R(a) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(a)$  with  $|S_2| = \pi_2$  and the relevant approximation ratio becomes

$$\rho_2 \leq \frac{3 + (\pi_1 - 1) + \pi_2 + \pi_3}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}(\pi_1 - 1) + \frac{2}{3}\pi_3 + \frac{\pi_2}{2} + \frac{1}{20}} = \frac{3 + 3}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3} + 1 + \frac{1}{20}} = \frac{6}{\frac{193}{60}} = \frac{360}{193} \approx 1.865. \quad (18)$$

□

**Proposition 6.** *If  $|S_2| = 2$  and  $\pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1 = 0$  then  $\rho_2 = \frac{H^{PW''}}{H^*} \leq \frac{100}{53} \approx 1.887$ .*

*Proof.* If  $|S_2| = 2$  and  $\pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1 = 0$ , let  $b_k, b_l \in S_2$  with  $h(k) \leq h(l)$ . We consider three main subcases.

1.  $h(k) \leq \frac{23}{40}$  and  $(\sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3}} h(j) \leq \frac{3}{8}$  or  $\sum_{b_j \in R_{S_4}} h(j) \leq \frac{1}{3}$  or  $h(l) \leq \frac{23}{40})$ .  
If this subcase holds, then bamboo  $b_k$  can be assigned to a partition together either with  $\sum b_j \in R_{S_3}$  (if  $\sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3}} h(j) \leq \frac{3}{8}$  holds) or with  $\sum b_j \in R_{S_4}$  (if  $\sum_{b_j \in R_{S_4}} h(j) \leq \frac{1}{3}$  holds) or with  $b_l$  (if  $h(l) \leq \frac{23}{40}$  holds) and the total number of partitions is  $\leq 4$  with  $H^{PW''} \leq \frac{23 \times 4}{20} = \frac{23}{5}$ . On the other hand, we have  $H^* \geq \frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{2} = \frac{5}{2}$ . Correspondingly, we get  $\rho_2 = \frac{H^{PW''}}{H^*} \leq \frac{\frac{23}{5}}{\frac{5}{2}} = \frac{46}{25} = 1.84$ .

2.  $h(k) \leq \frac{23}{40}$  and  $\sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3}} h(j) > \frac{3}{8}$  and  $\sum_{b_j \in R_{S_4}} h(j) > \frac{1}{3}$  and  $\frac{2}{3} > h(l) > \frac{23}{40}$ . If this subcase holds, then we consider the ratio  $\rho_2 \leq \frac{\pi_R(a) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(a)}{\sum_{j=1}^n h(j)}$  where  $\pi_R(a) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(a) \leq 5$  as 5 partitions are necessary at most to allocate  $b(1), b(k), b(l), \sum b_j \in R_{S_3}$  and  $\sum b_j \in R_{S_4}$ . Also,  $\sum_{j=1}^n h(j) = h(1) + h(k) + h(l) + \sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3}} h(j) + \sum_{b_j \in R_{S_4}} h(j) \geq 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{23}{40} + \frac{3}{8} + \frac{1}{3}$ . Correspondingly, we get  $\rho_2 \leq \frac{5}{1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{23}{40} + \frac{3}{8} + \frac{1}{3}} = \frac{300}{167} \approx 1.796$ .
3.  $h(k) > \frac{23}{40}$ . If this subcase holds, then we consider the ratio  $\rho_2 \leq \frac{\pi_R(a) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(a)}{\sum_{j=1}^n h(j)}$  where  $\pi_R(a) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \pi_i(a) \leq 5$ . For the denominator, we get  $\sum_{j=1}^n h(j) = h(1) + h(k) + h(l) + \sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3}} h(j) + \sum_{b_j \in R_{S_4}} h(j) \geq 1 + \frac{23}{20} + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{53}{20}$  where we assume  $\sum_{b_j \in R_{S_3} \cup R_{S_4}} h(j) \geq \frac{1}{2}$  or else four partitions only would be necessary for the numerator and a better approximation ratio would hold. Correspondingly, we get  $\rho_2 \leq \frac{5}{\frac{53}{20}} = \frac{100}{53} \approx 1.887$ .

□

**Proposition 7.** If  $|S_2| = 1$  and  $\pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1 = 0$  then  $\rho_2 = \frac{H^{PW''}}{H^*} \leq \frac{20}{11} \approx 1.818$ .

*Proof.* If  $|S_2| = 1$  and  $\pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1 = 0$ , then subset  $S_1$  is composed by bamboo  $b_1$  only,  $\sum_{j \in S_3} h(j) < \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\sum_{j \in S_4} h(j) < \frac{2}{3}$  and  $\sum_{j \in S_3 \cup S_4} h(j) < \frac{7}{6}$ . Also,  $S_2$  is composed by a single bamboo  $b_l$  with grow  $\frac{1}{2} < h(l) \leq \frac{2}{3}$ . Then, if  $\sum_{j \in S_3 \cup S_4} h(j) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , all bamboos  $\in S_3 \cup S_4$  can be allocated to a single partition and thus  $H^{PW''} = 3$  and  $\rho_2 = \frac{H^{PW''}}{H^*} \leq \frac{3}{2}$  as  $H^* \geq 2$  always holds. Alternatively,  $\sum_{j \in S_3 \cup S_4} h(j) > \frac{1}{2}$  and correspondingly  $\sum_{j=1}^n h(j) > 2$ . Then, if  $h(l) + \sum_{j \in S_3 \cup S_4} h(j) \geq \frac{6}{5}$ ,  $H^* \geq \sum_{j=1}^n h(j) \geq \frac{11}{5}$ : by allocating  $b_1$  to one partition,  $b_l$  to another partition, all bamboos  $\in S_3$  to a third partition and all bamboos  $\in S_4$  to a fourth partition, we get  $H^{PW''} = 4$  and  $\rho_2 = \frac{H^{PW''}}{H^*} \leq \frac{4}{\frac{11}{5}} = \frac{20}{11}$ . Finally, if  $2 < \sum_{j=1}^n h(j) < \frac{11}{5}$ , where  $h(l) > \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\sum_{j \in S_3 \cup S_4} h(j) > \frac{1}{2}$ , we have both  $h(l) < \frac{3}{5}$ , and  $\sum_{j \in S_3 \cup S_4} h(j) < \frac{3}{5}$ . But then, either  $\sum_{j \in S_3} h(j) < \frac{3}{10}$  or  $\sum_{j \in S_4} h(j) < \frac{3}{10}$  necessarily holds. In both cases, by allocating either all bamboos  $\in S_3$  or all bamboos  $S_4$  in the same partition of  $b_l$ , we need 3 partitions only and, as  $h(l) < \frac{3}{5}$ , we have  $H^{PW''} \leq \frac{6}{5} \cdot 3 = \frac{18}{5}$ . As  $H^* \geq \sum_{j=1}^n h(j) > 2$ , we get  $\rho_2 = \frac{H^{PW''}}{H^*} \leq \frac{\frac{18}{5}}{2} = \frac{9}{5}$ . □

**Proposition 8.** If  $|S_2| = 0$  and  $\pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1 = 0$  then  $\rho_2 = \frac{H^{PW''}}{H^*} \leq \frac{3}{2} = 1.5$ .

*Proof.* If  $|S_2| = 0$  and  $\pi_1 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 - 1 = 0$ , then subset  $S_1$  is composed by bamboo  $b_1$  only,  $\sum_{j \in S_3} h(j) < \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\sum_{j \in S_4} h(j) < \frac{2}{3}$ . Also,  $S_2$  is empty and, correspondingly,  $\sum_{j=1}^n h(j) < \frac{13}{6}$  and  $\sum_{j=2}^n h(j) < \frac{7}{6}$  as  $h(1) = 1$ . But then, by allocating all bamboos  $\in S_3$  in one partition and all bamboos  $\in S_4$  in another partition, we get  $H^{PW''} = 3$ , Correspondingly, as  $H^* \geq 2$ ,  $\rho_2 = \frac{H^{PW''}}{H^*} \leq \frac{3}{2}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** *The approximation ratio of Algorithm  $A_2$  is not superior to  $\frac{32000}{16947} \approx 1.888$ .*

*Proof.* Putting together Propositions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, the Corollary immediately holds, the worst case occurring on Proposition 3.  $\square$

### 3 Conclusions

An improved pinwheel algorithm has been proposed for the *BGT* problem reaching an approximation ratio  $\rho_2$  that in the worst-case converges to  $\frac{12}{7}$  for instances with  $\sum_{i=1}^n h(i) \gg h(1)$ . Also, it is shown that the worst case on the other instances is reached when  $\sum_{i=1}^n h(i) < 6h(1)$  with  $\rho_2 \leq \frac{32000}{16947} \approx 1.888$ . This approximation ratio is substantially due to the presence of bamboos  $b_j \in S_2$  with heights  $\frac{1}{2}h(1) < h(j) \leq \frac{2}{3}h(1)$  (inequality (4) induces  $\rho_2 \leq \frac{3}{2}$  when  $|S_2| = \beta = 0$ ) or to specific subcases where  $\sum_{i=1}^n h(i)$  is relatively small ( $\sum_{i=1}^n h(i) < 6h(1)$ ). Hence, a research direction worthy of investigation would be to find a way to compute an improved lower bound with value strictly greater than  $LB = \max\{2h(1); \sum_{j=1}^n h(j)\}$  for these subcases.

### Acknowledgement

This work was funded by the GEO-SAFE project and the EU Horizon2020 RISE programme, grant agreement No 691161.

### References

- [1] S Alshamrani, D.R. Kowalski, L. Gasieniec, “How Reduce Max Algorithm Behaves with Symptoms Appearance on Virtual Machines in Clouds”, In Proceedings of IEEE International Conference CIT/IUCC/DASC/PICOM 2015, 1703-1710, 2015.

- [2] M. D’Emidio, G. Di Stefano, A. Navarra: Priority Scheduling in Bamboo Garden Trimming Problem, Proceedings of SOFSEM 2019, 136–149, 2019.
- [3] L. Gasieniec, R. Klasing, Ch. Levcopoulos, A. Lingas, J. Min, T. Radzik, “Bamboo Garden Trimming Problem (Perpetual Maintenance of Machines with Different Attendance Urgency Factors)”, Proceedings of SOFSEM 2017, 229–240, 2017.
- [4] R. Holte, A. Mok, L. Rosier, I. Tulchinsky, D. Varvel, “The pinwheel: a real-time scheduling problem”, in II: Software Track, Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 2, 693-702, 1989.
- [5] R. Holte, L. Rosier, I. Tulchinsky, and D. Varvel. Pinwheel scheduling with two distinct numbers. Theoretical Computer Science, 100(1):105135, 1992.
- [6] T. H. Romer and L. E. Rosier. An algorithm reminiscent of euclidean-gcd for computing a function related to pinwheel scheduling. Algorithmica, 17(1):110, 1997.
- [7] S.-S. Lin and K.-J. Lin. A Pinwheel Scheduler for Three Distinct Numbers with a Tight Schedulability Bound. Algorithmica, 19(4):411426, 1997.