

Approximation algorithms for coupled task scheduling minimizing the sum of completion times

David Fischer* and Péter Györgyi†

July 4, 2022

Abstract

In this paper we consider the coupled task scheduling problem with exact delay times on a single machine with the objective of minimizing the total completion time of the jobs. We provide constant factor approximation algorithms for several variants of this problem that known to be \mathcal{NP} -hard, while also proving \mathcal{NP} -hardness for two newly introduced variants.

1 Introduction

The problem of scheduling coupled tasks with exact delays (CTP) was introduced by Shapiro [20] more than forty years ago. In this particular scheduling problem, each job has two separate tasks and a delay time. The goal is to schedule these tasks so that no tasks overlap, and the two tasks of a job are scheduled with exactly their given delay time in between them, while optimizing some objective function. This problem has several practical applications, e.g., in pulsed radar systems, where one needs to receive the reflections of the transmitted pulses after a given period of time [9, 10], in improving the performance of submarine torpedoes [21], or in chemistry [3]. Coupled task scheduling is also highly topical with regard to the Covid-19 pandemic. Most current vaccinations for this disease are to be administered at least twice for full protection, with a given delay time between the two shots depending on the employed vaccine, as recommended for example by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention [1], a United States federal agency. The process of administering these two vaccination shots to any given number of people can be modeled as a coupled task scheduling problem, by creating a job for each person, and defining the two

*Institute of Algorithms and Complexity, Hamburg University of Technology, Blohmstraße 15, 21079 Hamburg, Germany, e-mail: da.fischer@tuhh.de.

†Institute for Computer Science and Control, Eötvös Loránd Research Network, Kende Str. 13-17., 1111 Budapest, Hungary, e-mail: gyorgyi.peter@sztaki.hu.




Figure 1: An example for a feasible solution for an instance of CTP with $n = 3$. The patterns are matching for the two tasks of each job j . For simplicity, the delay time is only visualized for job 1. The total completion time of the solution is $C_1 + C_2 + C_3$.

respective vaccination shots as the two tasks of each job, with the recommended delay time in between.

Research interest in the coupled task problem is strongly increasing in recent years, see Khatami et al. [16] for a current, detailed overview of the topic. Recent work focuses mainly on optimizing the makespan [16]. These problems are generally \mathcal{NP} -hard, but efficient approximation algorithms with constant approximation factors have been developed [2, 4]. Other objective functions have virtually not been considered until recently, when Chen and Zhang [7] drew an almost full complexity picture for the problems of single-machine scheduling of coupled tasks, with the objective of minimizing the total sum of job completion times. However, they did not give any approximation algorithms for \mathcal{NP} -hard CTP variants with this particular objective function. We fill this gap by giving a number of constant factor approximation algorithms for most of these CTP variants. Additionally, we introduce some new, interesting variants, which we also prove to be \mathcal{NP} -hard, and approximate with a constant factor.

Formally, we are given a set of n jobs $\mathcal{J} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, where each job j has two tasks: a_j and b_j . We call a_j the first task, and b_j the second task of job j . In order to simplify our notations, we will denote the processing time of these tasks also by a_j and b_j ; the meaning of these notations will be clear from context. The sum $(a_j + b_j)$ is then called the total processing time of a job j . These tasks have to be scheduled on a single machine with a given delay time L_j , which means if the machine completes a_j at some time point t , then we have to schedule b_j to start exactly at $t + L_j$. Preemption is not allowed. Note that it is possible to schedule other tasks on the machine during this delay time, but the tasks cannot overlap. The starting time S_j of j is the starting time of a_j , while the completion time C_j of j is the completion time of b_j . An example of CTP is visualized in Figure 1.

We say a job is the j^{th} finishing job in a schedule if its second task is scheduled after the second tasks of exactly $j - 1$ many jobs have finished. We say a job is the j^{th} starting job in a schedule if its first task is scheduled after the first tasks of exactly $j - 1$ many jobs have been scheduled. Let C^{OPT} be the sum of completion times of an optimal solution. For a fixed optimal schedule, let $C_j^{\text{OPT}_f}$ be the completion time of the j^{th} finishing job in that schedule. Analogously, let $C_j^{\text{OPT}_s}$ be the completion time of the j^{th} starting job in that

schedule. Observe that $C^{OPT} = \sum_{j=1}^n C_j^{OPT_f} = \sum_{j=1}^n C_j^{OPT_s}$. In any proof in this work, we denote the sum of completion times of the solution produced by the currently used algorithm as C^{ALG} . In the schedule S^{ALG} created by this algorithm, S_j and C_j denote the starting time and completion time of job j , respectively.

Throughout this paper, we will use the classic $\alpha|\beta|\gamma$ notation system of Graham et al. [11], with α representing the machine environment, β representing the characteristics of the jobs, and γ representing the objective function. The notation (a_j, L_j, b_j) in the β field indicates the general CTP, where each job j consists of a pair of tasks of processing times a_j and b_j , respectively, with an exact time delay L_j between the completion time of its first task and the start time of its second task. As we also look at more restricted variants of CTP, we fix some naming conventions to easily express these restrictions in Graham notation. If in a restricted CTP environment some task of the jobs are fixed, or even constant for each job j , we denote this task without the subscript 'j', or by the constant value; e.g. CTP, where the delay time L_j is fixed to some L for all jobs j is denoted as $1|(a_j, L, b_j)| \sum C_j$. If in a restricted CTP environment, some tasks of the same job always have the same value, we denote them by p instead of their usual descriptor; e.g., CTP where the first and second task of each job j have the same processing time ($a_j = b_j, \forall j$) is denoted as $1|(p_j, L_j, p_j)| \sum C_j$. This is in line with the standard notation for the coupled task scheduling problems, as seen for example in Chen and Zhang [7].

In this paper we extend the complexity results of Chen and Zhang [7] by proving the \mathcal{NP} -hardness of $1|(1, L_j, 1)| \sum C_j$ and $1|(p_j, L, p_j)| \sum C_j$. We also give constant factor approximations for most CTP variants in a single machine environment with the sum of completion times objective function, see Figure 2. The existence of a constant factor approximation algorithm for the variants $1|(a_j, L_j, b_j)| \sum C_j$, $1|(a, L_j, b_j)| \sum C_j$, $1|(a_j, L_j, b)| \sum C_j$, and $1|(p_j, L_j, p_j)| \sum C_j$ is open (see the upper part of the figure).

This work is structured as follows. We first give a brief literature review of the topic in Section 2. We present our complexity results in Section 3. Our approximation results are stated in Section 4. There, we give detailed descriptions of our algorithms, as well as an analysis of run time and approximation factor for different problem variants, whose instances can be solved by these algorithms. Finally, we give concluding remarks and an outlook on future research in Section 5.

2 Literature review

Research on coupled task scheduling on a single machine began when Shapiro [20] proved the \mathcal{NP} -hardness of the general problem $1|(a_j, L_j, b_j)|C_{\max}$, where both tasks, as well as the delay time between them, can be different for each job, and the makespan is to be minimized.

In subsequent years, the \mathcal{NP} -hardness was also shown for more restricted variants of this problem, specifically $1|(p_j, p_j, p_j)|C_{\max}$, $1|(a_j, L, b)|C_{\max}$, and




Figure 2: Overview of our approximation results for different variants of $1|(a_j, L_j, b_j)|\sum C_j$. The variants, identified by their special constraints, are grouped into layers of equal approximation factors, with the respective theorem proving this approximation factor linked next to it. A directed edge from variant "A" to variant "B" indicates that "B" is a generalization of "A".

$1|(p, L_j, p)|C_{\max}$ by Orman and Potts [19]. Some CTP variants minimizing the makespan are \mathcal{NP} -hard even when the processing times of all jobs are fixed to 1, as shown by Yu et al. [22] for $1|(1, L_j, 1)|C_{\max}$. Condotta and Shakhlevich [8] showed \mathcal{NP} -hardness for the even more restricted variant $1|(1, L_j, 1, \pi_a)|C_{\max}$, where π_a indicates a fixed processing sequence for the first tasks of all jobs.

For most of these problems, efficient constant factor approximation algorithms have been developed. Ageev and Kononov [4] give such algorithms, as well as inapproximability bounds, for the problems $1|(a_j, L_j, b_j)|C_{\max}$, $1|(a_j, L_j, b_j, a_j \leq b_j)|C_{\max}$, $1|(a_j, L_j, b_j, a_j \geq b_j)|C_{\max}$, and $1|(p_j, L_j, p_j)|C_{\max}$. Following this work, the same authors gave an approximation algorithm for the $1|(1, L_j, 1)|C_{\max}$ problem [3]. Additionally, Ageev and Ivanov [2] give approximation algorithms and inapproximability bounds for $1|(a_j, L, b_j)|C_{\max}$, $1|(a_j, L, b_j, a_j \leq b_j)|C_{\max}$ and $1|(p_j, L, p_j)|C_{\max}$.

For other restricted variants not proven to be \mathcal{NP} -hard, polynomial-time algorithms do exist. This was shown by Orman and Potts [19] for the problems $1|(p, p, b_j)|C_{\max}$, $1|(a_j, p, p)|C_{\max}$, and $1|(p, L, p)|C_{\max}$, as well as Hwang and Lin [13] for the problem $1|(p_j, p_j, p_j), \text{fjs}|C_{\max}$, where "fjs" denotes that the sequence of jobs in the schedule is fixed.

Research interest in the topic of coupled task scheduling remained high also in the last years. Békési et al. [6] recently gave a constant factor approximation algorithm for the novel problem variant $1|(1, L_j, 1), L_j \in \{L_1, L_2\}|C_{\max}$, where there are only two different delay times in an instance; the complexity status of this problem is still unknown. Khatami and Selhipour [14] tackle the coupled task scheduling problem differently, giving upper and lower bounds on the solution through different procedures, and proposing a binary heuristic search algorithm for CTP. The same authors give optimal solutions under certain conditions, and a general heuristic, for the problem variant with fixed first tasks and delay times, but time-dependent processing times for the second tasks [15]. Bessy and Giroudeau [5] investigate CTP under parameterized complexity, where the parameter k relates to the question if k coupled tasks have a completion time before a fixed due date.

Interest is also high in scheduling coupled tasks in *flow shop* environments, denoted by $F2$ in the machine environment notation. For scheduling coupled tasks in a flow shop environment, we are given two machines instead of one, and each of the two task of one job is additionally assigned one of these two machines to be processed on. \mathcal{NP} -hardness is shown for a number of flow shop problems minimizing the makespan, e.g., for $F2|(1, L_j, 1)|C_{\max}$ by Yu et al. [22], but \mathcal{NP} -hardness is also known for variants minimizing the total completion time, e.g., $F2|(a_j, L, b_j)|\sum C_j$, as shown by Leung et al. [18]. Several flow shop problem variants minimizing the total completion time are also polynomial solvable, as proven by Leung et al. [18] and Huo et al. [12].

All of this mentioned literature only considers the objective of minimizing the makespan though, and, as Khatami et al. [16] note in their survey of CTP, “there has been no published research investigating the single-machine setting with an objective function other than the makespan, except for those in the cyclic setting.” This task is finally tackled by Chen and Zhang [7], who “draw a full complexity picture for the problems of single-machine scheduling of coupled tasks, with the objective of minimizing the total of job completion times”. They do this by either showing \mathcal{NP} -hardness, or giving polynomial-time algorithms for the most important restricted variants of CTP with the objective of minimizing the total sum of job completion times. However, they do not give any approximation algorithms for problem variants they prove to be \mathcal{NP} -hard. Recently, Kubiak [17] slightly extended these complexity results by proving \mathcal{NP} -hardness of $1|(1, L_j, 1)|\sum C_j$ and $1|(1, L_j, 1)|\sum C_j$. In the latter problem variant, the delay time between the two tasks does not have to be exactly, but at most L_j .

As in the following, we only look at CTP with the objective of minimizing the total completion times, we call this problem “CTP” from now on for simplicity reasons.

3 Complexity results

In this section we prove that $1|(1, L_j, 1)| \sum C_j$ and $1|(p_j, L, p_j)| \sum C_j$ are \mathcal{NP} -hard. We use reductions from corresponding makespan minimization problems for both results.

Theorem 1. $1|(1, L_j, 1)| \sum C_j$ is strongly \mathcal{NP} -hard.¹

Proof. We reduce the known strongly \mathcal{NP} -hard problem $1|(1, L_j, 1, \pi_a)| C_{\max}$ ([8]) to $1|(1, L_j, 1, \pi_a)| \sum C_j$. Recall that π_a fixes a scheduling sequence for the first tasks of all jobs. As $1|(1, L_j, 1)| \sum C_j$ is a generalization of $1|(1, L_j, 1, \pi_a)| \sum C_j$, this result directly implies the \mathcal{NP} -hardness of $1|(1, L_j, 1)| \sum C_j$.

Consider an instance I of $1|(1, L_j, 1, \pi_a)| C_{\max}$. We want to know if I has a solution with $C_{\max} \leq C$. We define the instance I' of $1|(1, L_j, 1, \pi_a)| \sum C_j$ as follows. There are $n + M$ jobs in I' , where M is a sufficiently large number.

- the first n jobs are the same as the jobs in I (original jobs),
- for the remaining M jobs, we have $L_j = C + 2(j - n - 1)$, $j = n + 1, \dots, n + M$ (helper jobs).

The fixed sequence of the first tasks in I' is defined as π'_a , with

- $\pi'_a := (n + M, n + M - 1, \dots, n + 1, \{\pi_a\})$.

We prove that there is a solution S for I with a makespan of at most C if and only if there is a solution for I' with a total completion time of at most

$$\beta := n(M + C) + M^2 + \frac{M(M + 1)}{2} + MC.$$

If there is such an S , then we define S' (a solution of I') from S as follows. The helper jobs are scheduled in decreasing order of their indices one after another as soon as possible, while the original jobs are scheduled in the exact same way as in S , but with their starting time increased by M each. See the first schedule of Figure 3 for an illustration. This schedule respects the order given by π'_a . Observe that the completion time of any original job in S' is at most $M + C$, while the total completion time of the helper jobs is exactly $M^2 + \frac{M(M+1)}{2} + MC$. Therefore, the total completion time of S' is at most β .

Now suppose that there is no such solution for I , i.e., the makespan C_{\max} of any solution S is at least $C + 1$. Consider an arbitrary optimal solution \hat{S} for I' . Suppose for the sake of contradiction that the total completion time of \hat{S} is at most β for any M .

¹Independent of our work, Kubiak [17] very recently proved \mathcal{NP} -hardness of $1|(1, L_j, 1)| \sum C_j$ and $1|(1, L_j, 1)| \sum C_j$. Our \mathcal{NP} -hardness result for $1|(1, L_j, 1)| \sum C_j$ is still relevant: It does not only also prove \mathcal{NP} -hardness for the more restricted $1|(1, L_j, 1, \pi_a)| \sum C_j$ variant, but also uses a wholly different reduction approach from Kubiak [17]. We reduce from a coupled-task scheduling problem with the makespan objective, instead of the Restricted Numerical Three Dimensional Matching (R3NDM) problem.




Figure 3: Above: schedule S' created from schedule S . The original jobs are white, the helper jobs are blue. Below: jobs $k+1, \dots, n+M$ in schedule \hat{S} .

Due to the fixed order of the first tasks we can assume that a_{n+M} starts at 0 in \hat{S} . Observe that the total completion time of the helper jobs is at least $M^2 + \frac{M(M+1)}{2} + MC$. The original jobs start after the first tasks of the helper jobs, i.e., after M , thus their total completion time is at least nM . If any of the original jobs completes after b_{n+M} in \hat{S} , then its completion time is larger than $2M$, and the total completion time of the jobs in \hat{S} is larger than $M^2 + \frac{M(M+1)}{2} + MC + (n+1)M > \beta$, if $M > nC$. Thus, each original job has to start before b_{n+M} .

If there is no gap among the first tasks of the helper jobs in \hat{S} , then the machine is busy with the helper jobs in $[0, M]$ and in $[M+C, 2M+C]$. Since each original job has to be completed before b_{n+M} (i.e., before $2M+C$), these jobs have to be scheduled in $[M, M+C]$. However, this is a contradiction to the makespan of S .

Therefore, in the following we suppose there is a gap between some first tasks of the helper jobs in \hat{S} . Let k , $n+1 \leq k \leq n+M-1$, be the largest index such that there is a gap before a_k . Then, the machine is busy with jobs $n+M, n+M-1, \dots, k+1$ in $[0, n+M-k]$ and in $[M+C+k-n, 2M+C]$, see the second schedule in Figure 3. Since a_k starts later than $n+M-k$, b_k starts later than $M+C+k-n$, which means it starts later than $2M+C$ to avoid intersection.

Let j be a job in $\{n+2, \dots, k\}$ whose second part b_j is scheduled after b_{n+M} . Since $L_{j-1} = L_j - 2$, and a_{j-1} has to be scheduled after a_j according to π'_a , b_{j-1} is scheduled either immediately before, or at some time after b_j . In both cases, b_{j-1} has to be scheduled after b_{n+M} to avoid intersection with b_{n+M} . This particularly implies that b_{n+1} is scheduled after b_{n+M} , i.e., $C_{n+1} \geq C_{n+M} + 1 = 2M + C + 1$.

The total completion time of jobs $n+2, \dots, n+M$ is at least $(M+C+2) + (M+C+3) + \dots + (2M+C) = (M-1)(M+C+2) + (M-1)(M-2)/2$. The total completion time of the original jobs is at least nM . Thus we have the




Figure 4: Schedule S' created from schedule S

following lower bound on the total completion time of \hat{S} :

$$\begin{aligned} & (2M + C + 1) + \left((M - 1)(M + C + 2) + \frac{(M - 1)(M - 2)}{2} \right) + (nM) \\ & = M^2 + M + CM + \frac{M^2 + M}{2} + nM > \beta, \end{aligned}$$

if $M > nC$, proving the Theorem. \square

Theorem 2. $1|(p_j, L, p_j)| \sum C_j$ is strongly \mathcal{NP} -hard.

Proof. We reduce the known strongly \mathcal{NP} -hard problem $1|(p_j, L, p_j)|C_{\max}$ ([2]) to $1|(p_j, L, p_j)| \sum C_j$. Consider an instance I of $1|(p_j, L, p_j)|C_{\max}$. We define the instance I' of $1|(p_j, L, p_j)| \sum C_j$ as follows. There are $n + M$ jobs in I' , where M is a sufficiently large number.

- the first n jobs are the same as the jobs in I (small jobs),
- for the remaining M jobs, we have $p_j = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i + nL$, $j = n + 1, \dots, n + M$ (large jobs).

We prove that there is a solution S for I with a makespan of at most C if and only if there is a solution for I' with a total completion time of at most $\beta := (n + M)C + \alpha M(M + 1)/2$, where $\alpha := 2(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i + nL) + L = a_j + L + b_j$ is the time required for scheduling a large job j . The Theorem follows from this statement.

If there is such an S , then we define S' (a solution of I') from S as follows. The small jobs start exactly at the same time as they start in S , while the large jobs start right after them as soon as possible (in arbitrary order), see Figure 4. Observe that the completion time of any small job in S' is at most C , while the total completion time of the large jobs is $MC + \alpha M(M + 1)/2$. Therefore, the total completion time of S' is at most β .

Now suppose that there is no such solution for I , i.e., the makespan C_{\max} of any solution S is at least $C + 1$. Consider an arbitrary optimal solution \hat{S} for I' . Observe that no job task can be scheduled between the first and the second task of any large job in \hat{S} , since the processing times of both tasks of any large job are bigger than L . Furthermore, no large job can precede any of the small jobs, otherwise, we would get a better schedule by moving that large job to the end of the schedule (cf., the definition of the processing times of the large jobs).

Therefore, the large jobs start right after the small jobs, i.e., after C_{\max} . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{n+M} \hat{C}_j &= \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{C}_j + MC_{\max} + \alpha M(M+1)/2 \\ &> M(C+1) + \alpha M(M+1)/2 > \beta, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows if M is larger than nC . \square

4 Approximation Results

In this section we give polynomial time approximation algorithms for most of the CTP variants. All of these variants are proven to be \mathcal{NP} -hard either by Chen and Zhang [7], or by the results of Section 3. We start this section with two useful lemmas that provide lower bounds on the optimum value of the CTP. Then, Subsection 4.2 and Subsection 4.3 consider variants with fixed processing times and with fixed delay times, respectively. Finally, Subsection 4.4 examines variants where there is a relation between the processing and the delay times of all jobs.

4.1 Lower bounds on the optimum

Recall the definitions $C_j^{OPT_f}$ and $C_j^{OPT_s}$ as the completion time of the j^{th} finishing and j^{th} starting job of a fixed optimal schedule, respectively. The next lemma is straightforward from the definition of $C_j^{OPT_f}$, since there are j jobs that complete until $C_j^{OPT_f}$ in a fixed optimal schedule.

Lemma 1. *Let the jobs be indexed in non-decreasing $a_i + b_i$ order. Then, for any optimal schedule, we have*

1. $C_j^{OPT_f} \geq \sum_{i=1}^j (a_i + b_i)$, $j = 1, \dots, n$ and
2. $C^{OPT} \geq \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^j (a_i + b_i)$.

The second lemma is analogous, and follows from the observation that there are $j-1$ first tasks that finish until the first task of the job corresponding to $C_j^{OPT_s}$ starts in a fixed optimal schedule. See Figure 5 for an illustration.

Lemma 2. *Let the jobs be indexed in non-decreasing a_i order. Then, for any optimal schedule, where j' is the j^{th} starting job, we have*

1. $C_j^{OPT_s} \geq \sum_{i=1}^j a_i + L_{j'} + b_{j'}$, $j = 1, \dots, n$ and
2. $C^{OPT} \geq \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^j a_i + \sum_{j=1}^n L_j + \sum_{j=1}^n b_j$.




Figure 5: Illustration of the bound on $C_j^{OPT_s}$.

Algorithm A

1. Sort the jobs in non-decreasing L_j order.
 2. Schedule the jobs one-by-one as soon as possible without intersection.
-

4.2 CTP with fixed processing times

In this section we assume that $a_j = a$ and $b_j = b$ for each job $j \in \mathcal{J}$.

Consider the following algorithm:

Recall that S^{ALG} denotes the schedule created by this algorithm and S_j is the starting time of job j . The precise meaning of 'as soon as possible' is the following: let $S_j := \min\{t \geq 0 : \text{the machine is idle both in } [t, t+a_j] \text{ and in } [t+a_j+L_j, t+a_j+L_j+b_j]\}$. The following lemma is straightforward:

Lemma 3. *Algorithm A has a run time of $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ and it always produces a feasible solution.*

The next lemma describes an important observation that we need in the proof of the subsequent theorem.

Lemma 4. *Suppose that $a_j = a$, $b_j = b$ ($j \in \mathcal{J}$) and $b \leq a$. When Algorithm A schedules job j ($j \in \mathcal{J}$), then a_j starts from the earliest time point t , such that the machine is idle in $[t, t+a]$.*

Proof. We prove the statement by an induction on j , it is trivial for $j = 1$. Suppose that the statement is true for some j , and consider the partial schedule S^p created by the algorithm before scheduling job $j+1$. Let t be the earliest time point such that the machine is idle in $[t, t+a]$ in S^p . We prove the lemma by showing that it is feasible to schedule job $j+1$ from t . Due to the definition of t , a_{j+1} cannot intersect with any task in S^p . We need to prove the same for b_{j+1} , which is scheduled in $[t+a+L_{j+1}, t+a+L_{j+1}+b]$.

First, observe that a_i starts before a_{i+1} for each $i \leq j$ due to the induction. This means a_1, \dots, a_j complete before t . Since $L_1, \dots, L_j \leq L_{j+1}$, we have $C_1, \dots, C_j \leq t+L_{j+1}+b \leq t+L_{j+1}+a$, where the last inequality follows from $b \leq a$. Thus, as each task in S^p completes before the start of b_{j+1} , there is no intersection. \square

Theorem 3. *Using Algorithm A, we can approximate $1|(a, L_j, b, b \leq a)| \sum C_j$ with a factor of 2.*

Proof. Due to Lemma 3, it remains to prove $C^{ALG} \leq 2C^{OPT}$.

From Lemma 4 we know that the machine is always busy just before a first task of a job is scheduled (except a_1 , which starts at time 0). This means there are at most $j-1$ idle periods before S_j , and the length of any of these periods is smaller than a . Hence, if we consider the schedule when the algorithm schedules job j , we have

$$S_j < (j-1)(a+b) + (j-1)a, \quad j \in \mathcal{J},$$

because (i) the machine is busy for at most $(j-1)(a+b)$ time in $[0, S_j]$ with tasks of the jobs $1, \dots, j-1$; and (ii) the total length of the idle periods before S_j is smaller than $(j-1)a$. Therefore, we have $C_j \leq (j-1)(a+b) + (j-1)a + a + L_j + b$ and

$$\begin{aligned} C^{ALG} &= \sum_{j=1}^n C_j \leq \frac{n(n-1)}{2}(a+b) + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}a + n(a+b) + \sum_{j=1}^n L_j \\ &\leq C^{OPT} + \frac{n(n+1)}{2}a + nb + \sum_{j=1}^n L_j \leq 2C^{OPT}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 1 and from $n(n-1)/2 + n = n(n+1)/2$, while the third follows from Lemma 2. \square

As $1|(a, L_j, b, b \leq a)| \sum C_j$, is a more general variant of $1|(p, L_j, p)| \sum C_j$, Corollary 1 directly follows.

Corollary 1. *Using Algorithm A, we can approximate $1|(p, L_j, p)| \sum C_j$ with a factor of 2.*

The following lemma describes some important attributes of S^{ALG} in the opposite case of $a \leq b$.

Lemma 5. *Suppose that $a_j = a$, $b_j = b$ ($j \in \mathcal{J}$) and $a \leq b$. Consider the schedule S^p created by Algorithm A before it schedules job j from S_j . Then,*

- (i) a_j or b_j starts right after another task (for each $j > 1$),
- (ii) the number of the gaps before S_j is at most $j-1$,
- (iii) the length of each gap in $[0, S_j]$ is at most b .

Proof. (i) immediately follows from the algorithm. We use induction on j for proving the remaining statements (ii) and (iii); they are trivial for $j=1$. Suppose that they are true for some $j \geq 1$, we then prove them for $j+1$.

Consider (ii). If a_{j+1} or b_{j+1} precede, or start right after some previously scheduled a_k , $k < j+1$, in S^p , the statement immediately follows. Otherwise, a_{j+1} or b_{j+1} precede or start right after some b_k with $k < j+1$. In the latter case, a_{j+1} either precedes, or starts right after a_k due to the non-decreasing

delay time order, from which the statement also immediately follows. In the former case (if a_{j+1} starts right after b_k), (ii) follows from the induction, since there is no gap in S^p right before a_ℓ or b_ℓ for each $\ell \leq j$ (as known from (i)). Thus, there are at most j tasks before a_{j+1} which start right after an idle period.

For proving (iii), suppose for purpose of showing contradiction that there exists a gap $[g_1, g_2]$ before b_k in S^p with a length larger than b . We know from the induction that each a_ℓ ($\ell \leq j$) completes before g_1 . In this case however, the algorithm would schedule a_{j+1} at time g_1 : there would be no intersection between neither a_{j+1} and any other task (since $a \leq b < g_2 - g_1$), nor between b_{j+1} and any other task (since a_{j+1} starts later than the previously scheduled first tasks, and $L_{j+1} \geq L_\ell$ for each $\ell \leq j$). The existence of such a gap would hence contradict the definition of the algorithm, and therefore, (iii) follows. \square

Theorem 4. *Using Algorithm A, we can approximate $1|(a, L_j, b)| \sum C_j$, with a factor of 3.*

Proof. Due to Lemma 3, it remains to prove $C^{ALG} \leq 3C^{OPT}$.

If $b \leq a$, we can approximate $1|(a, L_j, b)| \sum C_j$ with a factor of 2 (Theorem 3). Therefore, w.l.o.g, we assume in the following that $a \leq b \leq \alpha a$, for some $\alpha \geq 1$. We show that, in this case, we get an approximation factor of $1 + \frac{2\alpha}{1+\alpha}$, which is smaller than 3 for all $\alpha \geq 1$.

From Lemma 5 (ii) and (iii) we know that when the algorithm schedules job j , the total idle time of the machine in $[0, S_j]$ is at most $(j-1)b$. Due to the order of the tasks, the machine is busy in this partial schedule for at most $(a+b)(j-1)$ time in the same interval, thus we have $S_j \leq (a+b)(j-1) + b(j-1)$ and $C_j \leq (a+b)(j-1) + b(j-1) + (a+L_j+b)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} C^{ALG} &= \sum_{j=1}^n C_j \leq \sum_{j=1}^n (a+b)(j-1) + \sum_{j=1}^n b(j-1) + n(a+b) + \sum_{j=1}^n L_j \\ &= n(n-1)b + \left(\frac{n(n+1)}{2}a + nb + \sum_{j=1}^n L_j \right) \leq n(n-1)b + C^{OPT}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 2. Since $C_j^{OPT_f} \geq (a+b)j \geq (1+\alpha)aj$ by Lemma 1, we have $C^{OPT} \geq (1+\alpha)\frac{n(n+1)}{2}a$. Therefore,

$$\frac{C^{ALG}}{C^{OPT}} \leq \frac{C^{OPT} + n(n-1)\alpha a}{C^{OPT}} \leq 1 + \frac{n(n-1)\alpha a}{(1+\alpha)\frac{n(n+1)}{2}a} \leq 1 + \frac{2\alpha}{1+\alpha}.$$

\square

Theorem 5. *Using Algorithm A, we can approximate $1|(1, L_j, 1)| \sum C_j$ with a factor of 1.5.*

Proof. Due to Lemma 3, it remains to prove $C^{ALG} \leq 1.5C^{OPT}$. From Lemma 4 we know that the algorithm always schedules a_j in the first gap. Thus, the starting time of j ($j \in \mathcal{J}$) is at most $2(j-1)$, because the total processing time of the jobs $\ell < j$ is $2(j-1)$ and the other jobs start later. Therefore, $C_j \leq 2(j-1) + 2 + L_j$, and

$$\begin{aligned} C^{ALG} &\leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^n (j-1) + 2n + \sum_{j=1}^n L_j \\ &\leq C^{OPT} + \sum_{j=1}^n (j-1) + n \leq 1.5 \cdot C^{OPT}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 2, and the third from Lemma 1. \square

4.3 CTP with fixed delay times

In this section we assume $L_j = L$ for each job $j \in \mathcal{J}$. The following algorithm is based on an idea of Ageev and Ivanov [2]. Observe that both the first and the second tasks are in non-decreasing $a_j + b_j$ order in the schedule found by Algorithm B.

Algorithm B

1. Sort the jobs in non-decreasing $a_j + b_j$ order.
 2. Schedule a_1 from 0 and b_1 from $a_1 + L$. Let $s := 1$ and $j_s := 1$.
 3. For $j = 2, \dots, n$ do the following:
 - i) If it is possible to start a_j immediately after a_{j-1} without b_j intersecting any job task on the schedule, then do it and consider the next job.
 - ii) If it is possible to start b_j right after b_{j-1} without a_j intersecting any job tasks on the schedule, then do it and go to consider the next job.
 - iii) Otherwise, start a_j immediately after b_{j-1} . Let $s := s+1$ and $j_s := j$.
-

Lemma 6. *Algorithm B has a run time of $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ and always produces a feasible solution.*

Proof. The running time of Algorithm B is straightforward. Together with the observation that in step 3iii, we schedule the current job after all the other tasks, it is clear that there are no intersections in the schedule produced by the algorithm. \square

Let $B_s := \{j_s, j_s+1, \dots, j_{s+1}-1\}$ be the s^{th} block and let $H_s := C_{j_{s+1}-1} - S_{j_s}$ denote the length of B_s . The next lemma describes an important observation




Figure 6: Example for gaps in different cases.




Figure 7: Reasons of starting a new block: a_3 does not fit between a_2 and b_1 , while the total completion times of the second tasks in the second block ($b_3 + b_4$) and the gap between them is larger than L .

on the gap sizes within a block and follows from the equal delay times and some simple algebraic calculations (see Figure 6 for illustration).

Lemma 7. *If jobs j and $j+1$ are in the same block, then a_{j+1} starts immediately after a_j or b_{j+1} starts immediately after b_j . In the former case the gap between the second tasks is at most $a_{j+1} - b_j$, while in the latter case the gap between the first tasks is at most $b_j - a_{j+1}$.*

Theorem 6. *Using Algorithm B, we can approximate $1|(a_j, L, b_j)| \sum C_j$ with a factor of 3.*

Proof. Due to Lemma 6, it remains to prove $C^{ALG} \leq 3C^{OPT}$. The length of a block B_s is the sum of the following: (i) the lengths of the first tasks of the jobs in B_s , (ii) the lengths of the gaps among these tasks, (iii) L , and (iv) the length of the second task of the last job in B_s , i.e., $H_s = \sum_{i=j_s}^{j_{s+1}-1} a_i + \sum_{i=j_s}^{j_{s+1}-2} G_i + L + b_{j_{s+1}-1}$, where $G_i \geq 0$ is the length of the gap between a_i and a_{i+1} . From Lemma 7, we have $G_i \leq |b_i - a_{i+1}| \leq b_i$, thus

$$H_s \leq \sum_{i=j_s}^{j_{s+1}-1} (a_i + b_i) + L. \quad (1)$$

Observe that the algorithm starts a new block every time it cannot schedule the next job in steps 3i) and 3ii). Hence, there can be two reasons why j_{s+1} cannot be scheduled in B_s : (a) the gap between $a_{j_{s+1}-1}$ and b_{j_s} is smaller than $a_{j_{s+1}}$ or (b) the completion time of $b_{j_{s+1}-1}$ minus the starting time of b_{j_s} is larger than L , see Figure 7.

In case of (a), we have $\sum_{i=j_s+1}^{j_{s+1}} a_i + \sum_{i=j_s+1}^{j_{s+1}-1} b_i > L$, while in case of (b), we have $\sum_{i=j_s+1}^{j_{s+1}-1} a_i + \sum_{i=j_s}^{j_{s+1}-1} b_i > L$ (from Lemma 7). For each block, at least

one of the previous inequalities holds, and neither of those inequalities contains a job task used by any other inequalities of another block. Hence, summing the valid inequalities for the first $s - 1$ blocks, we have

$$(s - 1)L < \sum_{i=1}^{j_s-1} (a_i + b_i) + a_{j_s}. \quad (2)$$

Applying Equation 1 and Equation 2 for a job j in B_s , we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_j &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} H_k + \sum_{i=j_s}^j (a_i + b_i) + L \leq \sum_{i=1}^j (a_i + b_i) + sL \\ &< 2 \sum_{i=1}^j (a_i + b_i) + L \leq 3C_j^{OPT_f}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 1 and from $L < C_j^{OPT_f}$. Summing over all jobs, the Theorem follows. \square

Theorem 7. *Using Algorithm B, we can approximate $1|(p_j, L, p_j)| \sum C_j$ with a factor of 1.5.*

Proof. Due to Lemma 6, it remains to prove $C^{ALG} \leq 1.5C^{OPT}$.

Consider an arbitrary optimal solution. Note that, in the present case, the non-decreasing $a_j + b_j$ order is the same as the non-decreasing a_j order. Thus, we can use both lower bounds on the optimum described in Subsection 4.1. Also, $C_j^{OPT_f} = C_j^{OPT_s}$ follows from the fixed delay times.

Consider jobs j and $j + 1$ from the same block. From Lemma 7, and from $p_j \leq p_{j+1}$, we know that there is no gap between a_j and a_{j+1} in S^{ALG} . Thus, the length of a block B_s can be expressed as

$$H_s = \sum_{k=j_s}^{j_{s+1}-1} p_k + L + p_{j_{s+1}-1}. \quad (3)$$

Since j_s cannot be scheduled in B_{s-1} , we have

$$\sum_{k=j_{s-1}+1}^{j_s} p_k > L, \quad s \geq 2, \quad (4)$$

see Figure 8.

In the remaining part of the proof we compare C_j and $C_j^{OPT_f}$, i.e., the completion time of job j in S^{ALG} and the completion time of the j^{th} finishing (or starting) job in a fixed optimal schedule. For most j , we will prove $C_j \leq 1.5C_j^{OPT_f}$, but it is easy to give an example where this inequality does not hold true for $j = j_2$. However, with a more sophisticated analysis, we still manage to prove $C^{ALG} \leq 1.5C^{OPT}$ over all jobs.




Figure 8: Since $p_2 + p_3 + p_4 > L$, job j_4 has to be scheduled in a new block.

Let job j be a job in some block B_s , where $s \geq 2$ and $j \neq j_2$. Then the completion time C_j of j can be expressed as:

$$C_j = \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} H_i + \sum_{k=j_s}^j p_k + L + p_j.$$

Using Equation 3, we get

$$C_j < \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} \left(\sum_{k=j_i}^{j_{i+1}-1} (p_k + L + p_{j_{i+1}-1}) \right) + \sum_{k=j_s}^j p_k + L + p_j \leq \sum_{i=1}^j p_i + \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} p_{j_{i+1}-1} + sL + p_j.$$

Applying Equation 4 once for blocks B_1, \dots, B_{s-1} , we get:

$$C_j < p_1 + 2 \sum_{k=2}^{j_s} p_k + \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} p_{j_{i+1}-1} + \sum_{k=j_s+1}^{j-1} p_k + 2p_j + L.$$

Applying it again for B_1 , and then using $p_{j_2-1} \leq p_j$ (since $j > j_2$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_j &< p_1 + 3 \sum_{k=2}^{j_2} p_k + 2 \sum_{k=j_2+1}^{j_s} p_k + \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} p_{j_{i+1}-1} + \sum_{k=j_s+1}^{j-1} p_k + 2p_j \\ &\leq p_1 + 3 \sum_{k=2}^{j_2} p_k + 2 \sum_{k=j_2+1}^{j_s} p_k + \sum_{i=2}^{s-1} p_{j_{i+1}-1} + \sum_{k=j_s+1}^{j-1} p_k + 3p_j \\ &\leq 3 \sum_{k=1}^j p_k. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 1, we have $C_j < 1.5C_j^{OPT}$ and thus,

$$\sum_{j>j_2} C_j < 1.5 \sum_{j>j_2} C_j^{OPT}. \quad (5)$$

If j is in B_1 , then we have $C_j = \sum_{k=1}^j p_k + L + p_j \leq C_j^{OPT}$, where the last inequality follows from Lemma 2.

If $j = j_2$, then we have $C_{j_2} = H_1 + 2p_{j_2} + L = \sum_{k=1}^{j_2} p_k + p_{j_2-1} + p_{j_2} + 2L$ (from Equation 3) and $C_{j_2}^{OPT} \geq \sum_{k=1}^{j_2} p_k + L + p_{j_2}$ (from Lemma 2). Thus, we

have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{j_2} C_k &= (C_1 + C_{j_2}) + \sum_{k=2}^{j_2-1} C_k \\
&\leq \left(2p_1 + L + \sum_{k=1}^{j_2} p_k + p_{j_2-1} + p_{j_2} + 2L \right) + \sum_{k=2}^{j_2-1} C_j^{OPT_f} \\
&\leq 1.5 \left(C_1^{OPT_f} + C_{j_2}^{OPT_f} \right) + \sum_{k=2}^{j_2-1} C_j^{OPT_f} \leq 1.5 \sum_{k=1}^{j_2} C_j^{OPT_f}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $C^{ALG} = \sum_{j=1}^n C_j \leq 1.5 \sum_{j=1}^n C_j^{OPT_f} = 1.5C^{OPT}$ follows from the previous inequality and from Equation 5. \square

4.4 CTP with related processing and delay times

In this section we consider variants where at least one of the tasks has a processing time equal to the delay time. We first reuse Algorithm A:

Theorem 8. *Using Algorithm A, we can approximate $1|(p_j, p_j, p_j)| \sum C_j$ with a factor of 1.5.*

Proof. Due to Lemma 3, it remains to prove $C^{ALG} \leq 1.5C^{OPT}$. Observe that both first and the second tasks are in non-decreasing p_j order in S^{ALG} . It means the completion time C_j of job j is at most $3 \sum_{i=1}^j p_i$. Thus, we have $C^{ALG} = \sum_{j=1}^n C_j \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \left(3 \sum_{i=1}^j p_i \right) \leq 1.5C^{OPT}$, where the last inequality follows from Lemma 1. \square

Now, consider the following algorithm:

Algorithm C

1. Sort the jobs in non-decreasing $a_j + p_j$ order.
 2. Schedule the jobs one-by-one right after the second task of the previous job in this order.
-

Theorem 9. *Using Algorithm C, we can approximate $1|(a_j, p_j, p_j)| \sum C_j$ with a factor of 2.*

Proof. It is straightforward that Algorithm C has a run time of $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ and always produces a feasible solution. We have $C^{ALG} \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^j (a_j + 2p_j)$ from Algorithm C and $C^{OPT} \geq \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^j (a_j + p_j)$ from Lemma 1. Therefore, the Theorem follows. \square

If we modify the first step of Algorithm C so that it sorts the jobs in non-decreasing $p_j + b_j$ order, we can approximate $1|(p_j, p_j, b_j)| \sum C_j$ with factor of 2. The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 9.

Theorem 10. *We can approximate $1|(p_j, p_j, b_j)| \sum C_j$ with a factor of 2.*

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we deal with the single machine coupled task scheduling problem with the total completion time objective. This paper extends the complexity results of Chen and Zhang [7] by introducing two new \mathcal{NP} -hard variants, and provides several polynomial time constant factor approximation algorithms. To do this, we were able to modify several known concepts from makespan minimization, but some of the proofs required more sophisticated ideas. E.g., in the proof of Theorem 7, the original idea for the approximation factor only worked for jobs scheduled after a certain number of other jobs had already been processed, and a careful analysis of the approximation factor for the jobs before this cut-off was needed to get the result on hand.

Although we did manage to provide approximation algorithms for several problem variants, it is still unknown if there is a constant factor approximation algorithm for a few important cases: for the most general case; for the cases where only one of the tasks has a fixed processing time; and for the (p_j, L_j, p_j) variant. This stems from the fact that all algorithms presented in this work make use of some unique ordering of the jobs implied by the job characteristics, which does not exist in the aforementioned cases. Inapproximability results also are of interest for the problems presented in this paper, as they do exist for most CTP variants with the makespan objective [2, 4]. To our best knowledge, there are no such result for CTP with the total completion time objective. We point to these two open questions as suggestions for future research.

Acknowledgments

David Fischer was supported by DFG grant MN 59/4-1. Péter Györgyi was supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office grant no. TKP2021-NKTA-01 and by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. This research was supported by DAAD with funds of the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF). We would also like to thank Matthias Mnich from Hamburg University of Technology and Kristóf Bérczi from Eötvös Loránd University for organizing the academic exchange between the authors of this paper.

References

- [1] CDC Covid-19 vaccination timing recommendations. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/second-shot.html>. Accessed: 2022-03-15.
- [2] A. Ageev and M. Ivanov. Approximating coupled-task scheduling problems with equal exact delays. In *Discrete optimization and operations research*, volume 9869 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 259–271. 2016.
- [3] A. A. Ageev and A. E. Baburin. Approximation algorithms for uet scheduling problems with exact delays. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 35(4):533–540, 2007.
- [4] A. A. Ageev and A. V. Kononov. Approximation algorithms for scheduling problems with exact delays. In *Approximation and online algorithms*, volume 4368 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 1–14. 2006.
- [5] S. Bessy and R. Giroudeau. Parameterized complexity of a coupled-task scheduling problem. *J. Sched.*, 22(3):305–313, 2019.
- [6] J. Békési, G. Dósa, and G. Galambos. A first fit type algorithm for the coupled task scheduling problem with unit execution time and two exact delays. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 297(3):844–852, 2022.
- [7] B. Chen and X. Zhang. Scheduling coupled tasks with exact delays for minimum total job completion time. *J. Sched.*, 24(2):209–221, 2021.
- [8] A. Condotta and N. V. Shakhlevich. Scheduling coupled-operation jobs with exact time-lags. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 160(16–17):2370–2388, 2012.
- [9] M. Elshafei, H. D. Sherali, and J. C. Smith. Radar pulse interleaving for multi-target tracking. *Naval Research Logistics*, 51:72–94, 2004.
- [10] A. Farina. Multitarget interleaved tracking for phased-array radar. *IEE PROC-F*, 127:312–318(6), 1980.
- [11] R. L. Graham, E. L. Lawler, J. K. Lenstra, and A. H. G. Rinnooy Kan. Optimization and approximation in deterministic sequencing and scheduling: a survey. volume 5, pages 287–326. 1979.
- [12] Y. Huo, H. Li, and H. Zhao. Minimizing total completion time in two-machine flow shops with exact delays. *Comput. Oper. Res.*, 36(6): 2018–2030, 2009.
- [13] F. J. Hwang and B. M. T. Lin. Coupled-task scheduling on a single machine subject to a fixed-job-sequence. *Comput. Ind. Eng.*, 60(4):690—698, 2011.
- [14] M. Khatami and A. Salehipour. A binary search algorithm for the general coupled task scheduling problem. *4OR*, 19:1–19, 2021.

- [15] M. Khatami and A. Salehipour. Coupled task scheduling with time-dependent processing times. *J. Sched.*, 24:223–236, 2021.
- [16] M. Khatami, A. Salehipour, and T. Cheng. Coupled task scheduling with exact delays: Literature review and models. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 282(1): 19–39, 2020.
- [17] W. Kubiak. A note on scheduling coupled tasks for minimum total completion time. *Ann. Oper. Res.*, pages 1–4, 04 2022.
- [18] J. Y.-T. Leung, H. Li, and H. Zhao. Scheduling two-machine flow shops with exact delays. *Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 18:341–359, 2007.
- [19] A. J. Orman and C. N. Potts. On the complexity of coupled-task scheduling. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 72(1-2):141–154, 1997.
- [20] R. D. Shapiro. Scheduling coupled tasks. *Naval Res. Logist. Quart.*, 27(3): 489–498, 1980.
- [21] G. Simonin, R. Giroudeau, and J. König. Complexity and approximation for scheduling problem for a torpedo. *Comput. Ind. Eng.*, 61(2):352–356, 2011.
- [22] W. Yu, H. Hoogeveen, and J. K. Lenstra. Minimizing makespan in a two-machine flow shop with delays and unit-time operations is NP-hard. *J. Sched.*, 7(5):333–348, 2004.