

Dependent rounding with strong negative-correlation, and scheduling on unrelated machines to minimize completion time*

David G. Harris[†]

May 20, 2024

Abstract

We describe a new dependent-rounding algorithmic framework for bipartite graphs. Given a fractional assignment \vec{x} of values to edges of graph $G = (U \cup V, E)$, the algorithms return an integral solution \vec{X} such that each right-node $v \in V$ has at most one neighboring edge f with $X_f = 1$, and where the variables X_e also satisfy broad nonpositive-correlation properties. In particular, for any edges e_1, e_2 sharing a left-node $u \in U$, the variables X_{e_1}, X_{e_2} have strong negative-correlation properties, i.e. the expectation of $X_{e_1}X_{e_2}$ is significantly below $x_{e_1}x_{e_2}$.

This algorithm is based on generating negatively-correlated Exponential random variables and using them for a rounding method inspired by a contention-resolution scheme of Im & Shadloo (2020). Our algorithm gives stronger and much more flexible negative correlation properties.

Dependent rounding schemes with negative correlation properties have been used for approximation algorithms for job-scheduling on unrelated machines to minimize weighted completion times (Bansal, Srinivasan, & Svensson (2021), Im & Shadloo (2020), Im & Li (2023)). Using our new dependent-rounding algorithm, among other improvements, we obtain a 1.398-approximation for this problem. This significantly improves over the prior 1.45-approximation ratio of Im & Li (2023).

1 Introduction

Many discrete optimization algorithms are based on the following framework: we start by solving some relaxation of the problem instance (e.g., a linear program), obtaining a fractional solution $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. We then want to convert it into an integral solution $\vec{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$, with probabilistic properties related to \vec{x} , while also satisfying any needed hard combinatorial constraints for the problem. This general framework often goes by the name *dependent rounding*, since in general the combinatorial constraints will necessarily induce dependencies among the variables X_i .

Some forms of dependent rounding are highly tailored to specific algorithmic problems, while others are very general. These frequently appear in clustering problems, for instance, where there is a hard constraint that every data item must be mapped to a cluster-center; see for example [6, 3]. It also appears in a number of job-scheduling problems [5], where there is a hard constraint that every job must be assigned to some processing node.

One particularly important property is that the variables X_i should satisfy *nonpositive-correlation* properties; namely, for certain subsets $L \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, we should have

$$\mathbb{E}[\prod_{i \in L} X_i] \leq \prod_{i \in L} \mathbb{E}[X_i] = \prod_{i \in L} x_i \quad (1)$$

For example, this property leads to Chernoff-type concentration bounds. Depending on the combinatorial constraints, such an inequality may only be satisfied for certain limited choices of subset L . Note that independent rounding would certainly satisfy this property for all sets L .

*This is an extended version of a paper appearing in the Proc. 35th annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2024). It includes more details about the numerical analysis and some slightly more precise calculations to optimize the approximation ratio.

[†]University of Maryland. Email: davidgharris29@gmail.com

One powerful setting for dependent rounding is the *bipartite rounding* algorithm of [5]. Namely, we have a bipartite graph $G = (U \cup V, E)$, where each edge e has an associated weight $y_e \in [0, 1]$. The goal is to generate random variables $Y \in \{0, 1\}^E$ which match the fractional variables in expectation, while also satisfying certain nonpositive-correlation conditions. In the original algorithm of [5], which has found numerous applications in optimization problems, the algorithm guaranteed a limited case of Eq. (1): namely, it held for any edge set L which was a subset of the neighborhood of any vertex.

For some combinatorial problems, nonpositive-correlation is not enough; we need to get *strong negative correlation*. Namely, for certain edge sets L , we want a stronger bound of the form

$$\mathbb{E}[\prod_{i \in L} X_i] \leq (1 - \phi) \cdot \prod_{i \in L} x_i \quad (2)$$

for some parameter $\phi \gg 0$; the precise value of ϕ may depend on the set L and/or the values x_i .

One particularly interesting application comes from *job scheduling on unrelated machines to minimize completion time*. We will discuss this problem in more detail later, but for now let us provide a brief summary. We have a set of machines \mathcal{M} and a set of jobs \mathcal{J} , where each job $j \in \mathcal{J}$ has a given processing time on each machine $i \in \mathcal{M}$. We want to minimize the objective function $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} w_j C_j$, where C_j is the completion time of j on its chosen machine and w_j is a weight function. A long series of approximation algorithms have been developed for this problem, often based on sophisticated convex relaxations and dependent-rounding algorithms; most recently, [9] achieved a 1.45-approximation factor.

The aim of this paper is to obtain a more unified and general picture of bipartite dependent rounding with strong negative correlation. This algorithm, along with some other improvements, leads to a 1.398-approximation algorithm for the above machine-scheduling problem, which improves over the algorithm of [9] while also being simpler and more generic.

1.1 Definitions and results for the bipartite-rounding setting

For combinatorial assignment problems, such as machine-scheduling, it can be useful to abstract to a setting of dependent rounding for *bipartite graphs*. Here, we are given a simple bipartite graph $G = (U \cup V, E)$. We call U and V left-nodes and right-nodes respectively. For any vertex $w \in U \cup V$ we define $\Gamma(w)$ to be the edges incident to w .

We suppose we are also given a fractional vector $\vec{x} \in [0, 1]^E$ with $\sum_{e \in \Gamma(v)} x_e \leq 1$ for all right-nodes $v \in V$. Our goal is to generate rounded random variables $\vec{X} \in \{0, 1\}^E$ which match the fractional variables, while also achieving nonpositive-correlation among certain subset of values X_e .

In Sections 2 and 3, we develop a general rounding algorithm based on negatively correlated Exponential random variables. These sections are completely self-contained and do not involve machine-scheduling in any way. We do this in two stages. First, we give a general method of generating Exponential random variables with certain types of negative correlation. Next, we use this in a simple contention-resolution scheme for the bipartite rounding, which takes as input a “rate” vector $\vec{\rho} \in [0, 1]^E$ satisfying $\sum_{e \in \Gamma(u)} \rho_e \leq 1$ for all left-nodes u . This vector $\vec{\rho}$ is not necessarily related to \vec{x} ; it can be carefully chosen to obtain different “shapes” of negative correlation.

For edges $e = (u, v), e' = (u', v')$, let us define symmetric relation $e \sim e'$ if (i) $u \neq u', v' \neq v$ and (ii) either $(u, v') \in E$ or $(u', v) \in E$. Equivalently, $e \sim e'$ if e, e' have distance exactly two in the line graph of G . We say a set of edges $L \subseteq E$ is *stable* if there is no pair $e, e' \in L$ with $e \sim e'$.

We get the following result:

Theorem 1. *The algorithm DEPRound satisfies the following rounding properties (A1) — (A4):*

- (A1) *For each right-node $v \in V$, we have $\sum_{e \in \Gamma(v)} X_e \leq 1$ with probability one.*
- (A2) *For each edge e there holds $\mathbb{E}[X_e] = x_e$*
- (A3) *For any stable edge-set $L \subseteq E$, there holds $\mathbb{E}[\prod_{e \in L} X_e] \leq \prod_{e \in L} x_e$*
- (A4) *For any pair of edges $e_1 = (u, v_1), e_2 = (u, v_2)$ which share a common left-node and which have $\rho_{e_1}, \rho_{e_2} \in (0, 1)$, we have $\mathbb{E}[X_{e_1} X_{e_2}] \leq (1 - \phi_{e_1, e_2}) \cdot x_{e_1} x_{e_2}$, where we define the anti-correlation parameter $\phi_{e_1, e_2} \in (0, 1)$ by:*

$$\phi_{e_1, e_2} = \frac{((1 - \rho_{e_1})^{1-1/x_{e_1}} - 1)((1 - \rho_{e_2})^{1-1/x_{e_2}} - 1)}{(1 - \rho_{e_1})^{1-1/x_{e_1}} (1 - \rho_{e_2})^{1-1/x_{e_2}} + \rho_{e_1} + \rho_{e_2} - 1}$$

These guarantees are extremely general, but hard to interpret. We can make it more concrete in two ways. First, instead of considering stable edge sets, we can consider a setting where each left-node has some “blocks” of edges; edges within a block should satisfy strong negative correlation and edges incident to a left-node should satisfy nonpositive-correlation [1, 2, 8]. By transforming each block in the graph to a new separate left-node, we can get the following corollary:

Corollary 2. *Let G be a complete bipartite graph where each left-node $u \in U$ has a partition of its edges into blocks $B_{u,1}, \dots, B_{u,\ell_u}$, with a given vector $\vec{\rho} \in [0, 1]^E$ such that $\sum_{e \in B_{u,i}} \rho_e \leq 1$ for all left-nodes u and blocks i . Then algorithm DEPROUND can be used to round the variables \vec{x} into $\vec{X} \in \{0, 1\}^E$ to satisfy the following properties (A1), (A2), (A3'), (A4') as follows:*

(A1) *For each right-node $v \in V$, we have $\sum_{e \in \Gamma(v)} X_e \leq 1$ with probability one.*

(A2) *For each edge e there holds $\mathbb{E}[X_e] = x_e$*

(A3') *For any left-node u and edge-set $L \subseteq \Gamma(u)$, there holds $\mathbb{E}[\prod_{e \in L} X_e] \leq \prod_{e \in L} x_e$*

(A4') *For any pair of edges e_1, e_2 which are in some common block $B_{u,i}$ and which have $\rho_{e_1}, \rho_{e_2} \in (0, 1)$, we have $\mathbb{E}[X_{e_1} X_{e_2}] \leq (1 - \phi_{e_1, e_2}) \cdot x_{e_1} x_{e_2}$, where ϕ_{e_1, e_2} is defined as in Theorem 1.*

There is also a question of choosing the parameter ρ . Intuitively, ρ_e controls how much anti-correlation e should have with other edges. We emphasize that there is no single optimal choice, and our scheduling algorithm will use this flexibility in a somewhat subtle way. However, there are a few natural parameterizations, as given in the following result:

Corollary 3. *Let ϕ_{e_1, e_2} be the anti-correlation parameter of Theorem 1.*

For a left-node u , let $\lambda_u = \sum_{e \in \Gamma(u)} x_e$. If we set $\rho_e = 1 - e^{-x_e/\lambda_u}$ for all $e \in \Gamma(u)$, then¹

$$\phi_{e_1, e_2} \geq \frac{1 + e^{1/\lambda_u} - e^{x_{e_1}/\lambda_u} - e^{x_{e_2}/\lambda_u}}{1 + e^{1/\lambda_u}}$$

Moreover, if $\lambda_u \leq 3/4$ and we set $\rho_e = x_e/\lambda_u$ for all $e \in \Gamma(u)$, then

$$\phi_{e_1, e_2} \geq \frac{e^{1/\lambda_u} - 1}{e^{1/\lambda_u} + 1} - 0.57(x_{e_1} + x_{e_2}) \max\{0, \lambda_u - 0.45\}$$

The first result strictly generalizes the result of [8] (which only considered the setting with $\lambda_u = 1$). The second result can be much stronger quantitatively, and also has a simpler algebraic formula. We emphasize that the dependent rounding algorithm, and its analysis, is completely self-contained and does not depend on the machine-scheduling setting. Because of its generality, it may be applicable to other combinatorial optimization problems.

1.2 Machine-scheduling on unrelated machines

This problem is denoted $R \parallel \sum_j w_j C_j$ in the common nomenclature for machine scheduling. Here, we have a set of machines \mathcal{M} and set of jobs \mathcal{J} , where each job j has a weight w_j and has a separate processing time $p_j^{(i)}$ on each machine i . Our goal is to assign the jobs to the machines in order, so as to minimize the overall weighted completion time $\sum_j w_j C_j$, where C_j is the sum of $p_{j'}^{(i)}$ over all jobs assigned on machine i up to and including j .

On a single machine, there is a simple greedy heuristic for this problem: jobs should be scheduled in non-increasing order of the ratio $\sigma_j = w_j/p_j$, which is known as the *Smith ratio* [16]. For multiple machines, it is an intriguing and long-studied APX-hard problem [7]. It has attracted attention, in part, because it leads to sophisticated convex programming relaxations and rounding algorithms. Since the 2000's, there were a series of 1.5-approximation algorithms based on various non-trivial fractional relaxations [13, 15, 14].

As shown in [1], going beyond this 1.5-approximation ratio demands much more involved algorithms: some of the main convex relaxations have integrality gap 1.5, and furthermore rounding strategies which treat each job independently, as had been used in all previous algorithms, are inherently limited to approximation ratio 1.5. In a breakthrough, [1] achieved a $1.5 - \varepsilon$ approximation factor for some minuscule constant $\varepsilon > 0$. Since then, the approximation ratio has been

¹Here and throughout we write $e = 2.718\dots$ Note that we use a slightly different font to distinguish the constant e from an edge e in a graph.

further improved [11, 8, 9]; most recently, [9] gave a 1.45-approximation (see also [12] for a faster implementation of that algorithm).

These newer algorithms can all be described in the same general framework. First, they solve an appropriate relaxation, giving fractional assignments $x_j^{(i)}$ (with perhaps some additional information). Second, they group the jobs on each machine, forming “clusters” of jobs with similar processing times. Finally, they apply some form of dependent rounding with strong negative correlation properties within each cluster to convert this into an integral assignment.

There are two main types of relaxations for the first step. The work [1] used a semidefinite-programming (SDP) relaxation. The works [11, 8, 9] used a relaxation based on a time-indexed LP. It is not clear which of these relaxations is better, for example, is faster to solve, has a better approximation algorithm, or has a smaller integrality gap. We note that the time-indexed LP may be able to accommodate some other variants of the problem, such as having “release times” for each job, which do not seem possible for the SDP relaxation.

There have also been many different types of rounding algorithms used. The work [1] used a method based on a random walk in a polytope, which was also used as a black-box subroutine by [11]. This rounding method was subsequently improved in [2]. The work [8] developed a very different rounding algorithm based on contention resolution of Poisson processes. Finally, [9] used a specialized rounding algorithm closely tied to the time-indexed LP structure; it borrows some features from both the random-walk and contention-resolution algorithms.

Our new algorithm will also fit into this framework, where we use the SDP as a starting point and we use our algorithm DEPRound for the rounding. We show the following:

Theorem 4. *There is a randomized approximation algorithm for Scheduling on Unrelated Machines to Minimize Weighted Completion Time with approximation ratio 1.398.*

In particular, the SDP relaxation has integrality gap at most 1.398.

This is the first improvement to the integrality gap for the SDP relaxation since the original work [1]; all later improvements have been based on the time-indexed LP. It is interesting now to determine which fractional relaxation has a better gap.

To explain our improvement, we note that it is relatively straightforward to handle a scenario with many jobs of small mass and similar processing times. The difficulty lies in grouping disparate items together. This typically results in “ragged” clusters and, what is worse, the “leftover clusters” for each processing-time class. A large part of our improvement is technical, coming from tracking the contributions of leftover clusters more carefully. There are two algorithmic ideas to highlight.

First, the DEPRound algorithm is much more flexible for rounding: its negative correlation guarantees scale with the size of each cluster or even the individual items, and are not determined by worst-case bounds on maximum cluster size. The parameter ρ available in DEPRound allows us to put less “anti-correlation strength” on the later jobs within a cluster. This makes the clusters act in a significantly more uniform way irrespective of their total mass. In particular, we no longer need to deal separately with jobs which have “large” mass on a given machine.

Second, we use a random shift before quantizing the items by processing time, which ensures that items are more evenly distributed within each class. This technique was also used in [8, 9], but had not been analyzed in the context of the SDP relaxation.

2 Negatively-correlated Exponential random variables

Before we consider bipartite rounding, we derive a more basic result in probability theory: how to generate Exponential random variables with strong negative correlations. The analysis depends heavily on properties of *negatively-associated* (NA) random variables [10]. Formally, we say that random variables X_1, \dots, X_k are NA if for any disjoint subsets $A_1, A_2 \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$ and any increasing functions f_1, f_2 , there holds

$$\mathbb{E}[f_1(X_i : i \in A_1)f_2(X_j : j \in A_2)] \leq \mathbb{E}[f_1(X_i : i \in A_1)]\mathbb{E}[f_2(X_j : j \in A_2)] \quad (3)$$

We quote a few useful facts about such variables from [10, 17].

Theorem 5. *1. If X_1, \dots, X_k are NA, then $\mathbb{E}[X_1 \cdots X_k] \leq \mathbb{E}[X_1] \cdots \mathbb{E}[X_k]$.*

2. If X_1, \dots, X_k are zero-one random variables with $X_1 + \cdots + X_k \leq 1$, then X_1, \dots, X_k are NA.

3. If $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}'$ are collections of NA random variables, and the joint distribution of \mathcal{X} is independent from that \mathcal{X}' , then $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}'$ are NA.
4. If X_1, \dots, X_k are NA random variables and f_1, \dots, f_ℓ are functions defined on disjoint subsets of $\{1, \dots, k\}$, such that all f_1, \dots, f_ℓ are monotonically non-increasing or all f_1, \dots, f_ℓ are monotonically non-decreasing, then random variables $f_i(\vec{X}) : i = 1, \dots, \ell$ are NA. In particular, $\mathbb{E}[f_1(\vec{X}) \cdots f_\ell(\vec{X})] \leq \mathbb{E}[f_1(\vec{X})] \cdots \mathbb{E}[f_\ell(\vec{X})]$.

We describe our algorithm to generate correlated unit Exponential random variables Z_1, \dots, Z_n . It takes as input a vector $\vec{\rho} \in [0, 1]^n$ with $\sum_i \rho_i \leq 1$, which will determine the covariances.

Algorithm 1: CORRELATEDEXPONENTIAL($\vec{\rho}$)

```

1 Set  $X \leftarrow$  MULTIVARIATEGEOMETRIC( $\vec{\rho}$ ).
2 for  $i \in [n]$  do
3   if  $\rho_i \in (0, 1)$  then
4     Set  $\alpha_i = -\log(1 - \rho_i)$ 
5     Draw random variable  $S_i \in [0, 1]$  with probability density function  $\alpha_i e^{-\alpha_i s} / \rho_i$ 
6     Set  $Z_i = \alpha_i(X_i + S_i)$ 
7   else
8     Draw  $Z_i$  as an independent Exponential random variable with rate 1
9 Return  $Z$ 

```

The density function at Line 5 is valid in that $\int_{s=0}^1 \alpha_i e^{-\alpha_i s} / \rho_i ds = \frac{1}{\rho_i}(1 - e^{-\alpha_i}) = 1$. Recall that a multivariate Geometric random variable (X_1, \dots, X_n) is obtained by running an infinite sequence of experiments, where each j^{th} experiment takes on value i with probability ρ_i , and setting X_i to be the number of trials before first seeing i . Its marginal distribution X_i is Geometric with rate ρ_i .

The algorithm can be implemented to run in randomized polynomial time via standard sampling procedures. We now analyze its probabilistic properties.

Proposition 6. *Each random variable Z_i has an Exponential distribution with rate 1, i.e. it has probability density function $e^{-z} : z \in [0, \infty)$.*

Proof. It is clear if $\rho_i \in \{0, 1\}$, so suppose $\rho_i \in (0, 1)$ and consider random variable $L = X_i + S_i$. We claim that L has an Exponential distribution with rate α_i . For, consider some $z \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, where $z = j + s$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, s \in [0, 1)$. Since X_i is Geometric with rate ρ_i , the probability density function for L at z is given by

$$\rho_i(1 - \rho_i)^j \cdot \frac{\alpha_i e^{-\alpha_i s}}{\rho_i} = (e^{-\alpha_i})^j \cdot \alpha_i e^{-\alpha_i s} = e^{-\alpha_i(j+s)} \cdot \alpha_i = \alpha_i \cdot e^{-\alpha_i z}$$

which is precisely the pdf of a rate- α_i Exponential random variable. Since rescaling Exponential random variables changes their rate, the variable Z_i is Exponential with rate 1. \square

Proposition 7. *The random variables Z_1, \dots, Z_n are NA.*

Proof. It is convenient to add a dummy element 0 with $\rho_0 = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i$. We first claim that random variables X_1, \dots, X_n are NA. To see this, observe that X_1, \dots, X_n can be viewed in terms of the following infinite sequence of random variables: for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, draw variable $F_j \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ with $\Pr(F_j = i) = \rho_i$ for all i, j . Then set $X_i = \min\{j : F_j = i\}$ for each i .

Now let $B_{i,j}$ be the indicator random variable for the event $F_j = i$. For each j , the values $B_{i,j}$ are zero-one random variables which sum to one. Hence, for fixed j they are NA. Since there is no interaction between the different indices j , all random variables $B_{i,j}$ are NA. Furthermore, each X_i is a monotone-down function of the values $B_{i,j}$. Hence, all variables X_i are NA.

The S_i variables are clearly NA since they are independent. Each variable Z_i for $\rho_i \in (0, 1)$ is an increasing function of the random variables S_i, X_i . Hence, these Z variables are also NA. The Z_i variables with $\rho_i \in \{0, 1\}$ are NA since they independent of all other variables. \square

The crucial property is that the variables Z_i have significant negative correlation (depending on shape parameter $\vec{\rho}$). Specifically, we have the following:

Lemma 8. For any indices i_1, i_2 with $\rho_{i_1}, \rho_{i_2} \in (0, 1)$, and any values $q_1, q_2 \in (-\infty, 1)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{q_1 Z_{i_1} + q_2 Z_{i_2}}] = \frac{1}{(1 - q_1)(1 - q_2)} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{((1 - \rho_{i_1})^{q_1} - 1)((1 - \rho_{i_2})^{q_2} - 1)}{(1 - \rho_{i_1})^{q_1}(1 - \rho_{i_2})^{q_2} + \rho_{i_1} + \rho_{i_2} - 1} \right)$$

Proof. Suppose without loss of generality that $i_1 = 1, i_2 = 2$. For $i = 1, 2$ define parameter $\theta_i = \alpha_i q_i = -q_i \log(1 - \rho_i)$ and random variable $L_i = X_i + S_i$. We calculate:

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{q_1 Z_1 + q_2 Z_2}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta_1 L_1 + \theta_2 L_2}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta_1 S_1 + \theta_2 S_2} \cdot e^{\theta_1 X_1 + \theta_2 X_2}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta_1 S_1}] \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta_2 S_2}] \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta_1 X_1 + \theta_2 X_2}]$$

where the last equality holds since the variables S_1, S_2 are independent of X .

We will calculate these term by term. For $i = 1, 2$ we have:

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta_i S_i}] = \frac{\alpha_i}{\rho_i} \int_{s=0}^1 e^{-\alpha_i s + \theta_i s} ds = \frac{\alpha_i(1 - e^{\theta_i - \alpha_i})}{\rho_i(\alpha_i - \theta_i)}$$

We calculate the joint distribution of X_1, X_2 as:

$$\Pr(X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2) = \begin{cases} (1 - \rho_1 - \rho_2)^{x_1} \rho_1 (1 - \rho_2)^{x_2 - x_1 - 1} \rho_2 & \text{for } 0 \leq x_1 < x_2 \\ (1 - \rho_1 - \rho_2)^{x_2} \rho_2 (1 - \rho_1)^{x_1 - x_2 - 1} \rho_1 & \text{for } 0 \leq x_2 < x_1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

So we can sum over pairs x_1, x_2 to get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta_1 X_1 + \theta_2 X_2}] &= \sum_{0 \leq x_1 < x_2} (1 - \rho_1 - \rho_2)^{x_1} \rho_1 (1 - \rho_2)^{x_2 - x_1 - 1} \rho_2 e^{\theta_1 X_1 + \theta_2 X_2} \\ &\quad + \sum_{0 \leq x_2 < x_1} (1 - \rho_1 - \rho_2)^{x_2} \rho_2 (1 - \rho_1)^{x_1 - x_2 - 1} \rho_1 e^{\theta_1 X_1 + \theta_2 X_2} \\ &= \frac{\rho_1 \rho_2}{1 - e^{\theta_1 + \theta_2} (1 - \rho_1 - \rho_2)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{e^{-\theta_1} + \rho_1 - 1} + \frac{1}{e^{-\theta_2} + \rho_2 - 1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

The result then follows by multiplying the formulas for $\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta_1 X_1 + \theta_2 X_2}], \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta_1 S_1}], \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta_2 S_2}]$ and substituting for $\alpha_i = -\log(1 - \rho_i), \theta_i = -q_i \log(1 - \rho_i)$. \square

3 Bipartite dependent rounding algorithm

We consider here a variant of a rounding algorithm from [8], which was in turn inspired by an earlier ‘‘fair sharing’’ algorithm of [4]. For motivation, consider the following natural rounding procedure: each edge e draws an Exponential random Z_e variable with rate x_e . Then, for each right-node v , we set $X_f = 1$ for the edge $f = \operatorname{argmin}_{e \in \Gamma(u)} X_e$. It is easy to see that this is equivalent to independent rounding, and in particular we have $\Pr(X_e = 1) = x_e$.

Instead of generating the variables Z_e independently, we will use our algorithm CORRELATED-EXPONENTIAL. This creates the desired negative correlation in the bipartite rounding.

In describing our algorithm, we will assume that our original fraction solution \vec{x} satisfies

$$\forall e \in E \quad x_e \in (0, 1), \quad \text{and} \quad \forall v \in V \quad \sum_{e \in \Gamma(v)} x_e = 1$$

These conditions can be assumed without loss of generality by removing edges with $x_e \in \{0, 1\}$, and by adding dummy edges for each right-node.

Algorithm 2: DEPRound($\vec{\rho}, \vec{x}$)

- 1 **for** each left-node u **do**
 - 2 $\left[\right.$ Call $\vec{Z}^{(u)} \leftarrow \text{CORRELATEDEXPONENTIAL}(\vec{\rho}^{(u)})$ for vector $\langle \rho^u(v) = \rho_{(u,v)} : v \in \Gamma(u) \rangle$
 - 3 Combine all vectors $\vec{Z}^{(u)}$ into a single vector $Z \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{|E|}$ with $Z_{(u,v)} = Z_v^{(u)}$ for all u, v .
 - 4 **for** each right-node v **do**
 - 5 $\left[\right.$ Choose neighbor $e = \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \Gamma(v)} Z_f / x_f$.
 - 6 Set $X_e = 1$ and $X_{e'} = 0$ for all other neighbors $e' \in \Gamma(v) \setminus \{e\}$
 - 7 **return** vector \vec{X}
-

From properties of CORRELATEDEXPONENTIAL, the following properties immediately hold:

Proposition 9. Suppose that $\vec{\rho} \in [0, 1]^{|E|}$ satisfies $\sum_{e \in \Gamma(u)} \rho_e = 1$ for all left-nodes u . Then **DEPBOUND** can be implemented in polynomial time with the following properties:

- Each variable Z_e has the Exponential distribution with rate 1.
- The random variables $Z_e : e \in E$ are NA.
- For a right-node v , all random variables $Z_e : e \in \Gamma(v)$ are independent.

For an edge-set L , let us write Z_L for the vector of random variables $(Z_e : e \in L)$. At this point, we can immediately show property (A2):

Proposition 10. For any edge e there holds $\Pr(X_e = 1) = x_e$.

Proof. The random variables $Z_f : f \in \Gamma(v)$ are independent unit-rate Exponentials. So random variables $Z_f/x_f : f \in \Gamma(v)$ are independent Exponentials with rates x_f respectively, and $\sum_{f \in \Gamma(v)} x_f = 1$. It is a well-known standard fact that, for independent Exponential random variables Y_1, \dots, Y_ℓ with rates $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell$, there holds $\Pr(Y_i = \min\{Y_1, \dots, Y_\ell\}) = \frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_\ell}$. \square

We next turn to show properties (A3) and (A4). For this, we have the following key lemma:

Lemma 11. Let $L \subseteq E$ be a stable edge-set. If we reveal the random variables Z_L , then we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in L} X_e \mid Z_L \right] \leq \prod_{e \in L} e^{(1-1/x_e) \cdot Z_e}$$

Proof. We assume that all right-nodes of edges in L are distinct, as otherwise $\prod_{e \in L} X_e = 0$ with probability one.

Define L' to be the set of edges outside L which share a right-node with an edge in L , that is, the set of edges of the form $f = (u, v) \notin L$ where $(u', v) \in L$. Let W, W' denote the set of left-nodes of edges of L, L' respectively. We claim that W, W' are disjoint. For, suppose $u \in W \cap W'$. So there edges $(u, v) \in L, (u, v') \in L'$; by definition of L' , there must be a corresponding edge $(u', v') \in L$. Since G is a simple graph, necessarily $u \neq u'$. Also $v \neq v'$ since edges in L have distinct right-nodes. Thus $(u, v) \sim (u', v')$, contradicting that L is a stable set.

Suppose that we condition on all random variables corresponding to the nodes in W , in particular, we reveal all values Z_L . The random variables corresponding to nodes in W' have their original unconditioned probability distributions. We now have

$$\Pr \left(\bigwedge_{e \in L} X_e = 1 \right) = \Pr \left(\bigwedge_{(u,v) \in L} Z_{(u,v)}/x_{(u,v)} = \min_{f \in \Gamma(v)} Z_f/x_f \right)$$

where, here and in the remainder of the proof, we omit the conditioning on W for brevity.

Each event $Z_{(u,v)}/x_{(u,v)} = \min_{f \in \Gamma(v)} Z_f/x_f$ is an increasing function of random variables $Z_{\Gamma(v) \setminus L}$. These sets $\Gamma(v) \setminus L$ are disjoint since the right-endpoints of edges in L are all distinct. Since random variables $Z_{L'}$ are NA, Theorem 5 yields

$$\Pr \left(\bigwedge_{(u,v) \in L} Z_{(u,v)}/x_{u,v} = \min_{f \in \Gamma(v)} Z_f/x_f \right) \leq \prod_{(u,v) \in L} \Pr \left(Z_{(u,v)}/x_{(u,v)} = \min_{f \in \Gamma(v)} Z_f/x_f \right)$$

For any edge $e = (u, v) \in L$, the variables $Z_f : f \in \Gamma(v) \setminus \{e\}$ are independent unit-rate Exponentials. By standard facts about Exponential random variables, this implies that $Z' := \min_{f \in \Gamma(v) \setminus \{e\}} Z_f/x_f$ is an Exponential random variable with rate $\sum_{f \in \Gamma(v) \setminus \{e\}} x_f = 1 - x_e$. The probability that $Z' > Z_e/x_e$ is precisely $e^{-(1-x_e) \cdot Z_e/x_e} = e^{(1-1/x_e)Z_e}$. \square

Proposition 12. Property (A3) holds.

Proof. Consider a stable edge set $L \subseteq E$, and let \mathcal{E} denote the event that $X_e = 1$ for all $e \in L$. By iterated expectations with respect to random variable Z_L and Lemma 11, we have

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{E}_{Z_L} [\Pr(\mathcal{E} \mid Z_L)] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in L} e^{(1-1/x_e)Z_e} \right]$$

Each term $e^{(1-1/x_e)Z_e}$ in this product is a decreasing function of random variable Z_e . Since the variables Z_L are NA, Theorem 5 gives:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{e \in L} e^{(1-1/x_e)Z_e}\right] \leq \prod_{e \in L} \mathbb{E}[e^{(1-1/x_e)Z_e}]$$

Here, for an edge e , we have $\mathbb{E}[e^{(1-1/x_e)Z_e}] = \int_{z=0}^{\infty} e^{-z} \cdot e^{(1-1/x_e)z} dz = x_e$. \square

Theorem 13. *For any edges $e_1 = (u, v_1), e_2 = (u, v_2)$ with the same left-node u and $\rho_{e_1}, \rho_{e_2} \in [0, 1)$, there holds*

$$\mathbb{E}[X_1 X_2] \leq x_1 x_2 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{((1 - \rho_1)^{1-1/x_1} - 1)((1 - \rho_2)^{1-1/x_2} - 1)}{(1 - \rho_1)^{1-1/x_1}(1 - \rho_2)^{1-1/x_2} + \rho_1 + \rho_2 - 1}\right)$$

where we write $X_i = X_{e_i}, x_i = x_{e_i}, \rho_i = \rho_{e_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$ for brevity.

Proof. Let $Z_i = Z_{e_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$. By Lemma 11 applied to stable-set $L = \{e_1, e_2\}$ we have:

$$\mathbb{E}[X_1 X_2 \mid Z_1, Z_2] \leq e^{(1-1/x_1)Z_1 + (1-1/x_2)Z_2}$$

Observe that values Z_1, Z_2 are simultaneously generated by $\text{CORRELATEDEXPONENTIAL}(\vec{\rho}^{(u)})$. By applying Lemma 8 with $q_1 = 1 - 1/x_1, q_2 = 1 - 1/x_2$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{(1-1/x_1)Z_1 + (1-1/x_2)Z_2}] = x_1 x_2 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{((1 - \rho_1)^{1-1/x_1} - 1)((1 - \rho_2)^{1-1/x_2} - 1)}{(1 - \rho_1)^{1-1/x_1}(1 - \rho_2)^{1-1/x_2} + \rho_1 + \rho_2 - 1}\right). \quad \square$$

There is not any clear optimal choice of vector $\vec{\rho}$. However, there is one attractive option which leads to a particularly strong and algebraically simple formulation of property (A4):

Lemma 14. *Suppose that for edges $e_1 = (u, v_1), e_2 = (u, v_2)$ with the same left-node u we set $\rho_{e_i} = x_{e_i} t$ for some parameter $t \geq 4/3$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[X_1 X_2] \leq x_1 x_2 \left(1 - \frac{e^t - 1}{e^t + 1} + 0.57(x_1 + x_2) \max\{0, 1/t - 0.45\}\right)$$

where we write $X_i = X_{e_i}, x_i = x_{e_i}$ for brevity.

The proof of Lemma 14 involves significant numerical analysis; we defer it to Appendix A. In the scheduling algorithm, *most* edges will set $\rho_e \propto x_e$, and use the bound in Lemma 14. However, a few edges will use a different value of ρ_e . This is a good illustration of the flexibility of the bipartite dependent-rounding scheme.

Another nice choice, which can work for more general graphs, is the following:

Proposition 15. *Suppose that for edges $e_1 = (u, v_1), e_2 = (u, v_2)$ with the same left-node u we set $\rho_{e_i} = 1 - e^{-x_{e_i} t} \leq x_{e_i} t$ for some parameter $t > 0$. Then we have:*

$$\mathbb{E}[X_1 X_2] \leq x_1 x_2 \cdot \frac{(e^t - 1)(e^{x_1 t} + e^{x_2 t})}{e^{2t} - e^{x_1 t} - e^{x_2 t} + e^{(x_1 + x_2)t}} \leq x_1 x_2 \cdot \frac{e^{x_1 t} + e^{x_2 t}}{1 + e^t}$$

where we write $X_i = X_{e_i}, x_i = x_{e_i}$ for brevity.

Proof. The result is obvious is either x_1 or x_2 is equal to zero, and so we may suppose that $\rho_{e_1}, \rho_{e_2} \in (0, 1)$ strictly. Let $\eta = e^t$. Now, for a given vertex u and edges $e_1 = (u, v_1), e_2 = (u, v_2)$ with the same left-node u , Theorem 13 with some algebraic simplifications gives

$$\mathbb{E}[X_1 X_2] \leq x_1 x_2 \cdot \frac{(1 - \rho_1)^{1-1/x_1} + (1 - \rho_2)^{1-1/x_2} + \rho_1 + \rho_2 - 2}{(1 - \rho_1)^{1-1/x_1}(1 - \rho_2)^{1-1/x_2} + \rho_1 + \rho_2 - 1} = x_1 x_2 \frac{(\eta - 1)(\eta^{x_1} + \eta^{x_2})}{\eta^2 - \eta^{x_1} - \eta^{x_2} + \eta^{x_1 + x_2}}$$

Furthermore, we can observe that

$$\frac{(\eta - 1)(\eta^{x_1} + \eta^{x_2})}{\eta^2 - \eta^{x_1} - \eta^{x_2} + \eta^{x_1 + x_2}} = \frac{(\eta - 1)(\eta^{x_1} + \eta^{x_2})}{(\eta^{x_1} - 1)(\eta^{x_2} - 1) + (\eta^2 - 1)} \leq \frac{(\eta - 1)(\eta^{x_1} + \eta^{x_2})}{(\eta^2 - 1)} = \frac{\eta^{x_1} + \eta^{x_2}}{\eta + 1}. \quad \square$$

4 Scheduling to minimize completion time

Our general algorithm can be summarized as follows:

- Solve the SDP relaxation, obtaining estimates $x_{j,j'}^{(i)}$ for each machine i and pair of jobs j, j' .
Roughly speaking, $x_{j,j'}^{(i)}$ represents the fractional extent to which jobs j, j' are simultaneously scheduled on machine i . The case with $j = j'$ plays an especially important role, in which case we write simply $x_j^{(i)}$.
- Based on the fractional solution \vec{x} , partition the jobs on each machine i into clusters $\mathcal{C}_1^{(i)}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_t^{(i)}$.
- Run DEPRound to obtain rounded variables $X_j^{(i)} \in \{0, 1\}$, with $\sum_i X_j^{(i)} = 1$ for all jobs j .
Job j is assigned to the machine i with $X_j^{(i)} = 1$.
- Schedule jobs assigned to each machine i in non-increasing order of Smith ratio $\sigma_j^{(i)} = w_j/p_j^{(i)}$.

We will not modify the first or last steps in any way; they are discussed in more detail in Section 4.1 next. The difference is how we implement the second step and third steps (partitioning and rounding the jobs). Specifically, given a fractional solution x , we form our clusters as follows:

Algorithm 3: Clustering the jobs

```

1 Define parameters  $\pi = 3.9, \theta = 0.555, \tau = 0.604$ .
2 Draw a random variable  $P_{\text{offset}}$  uniformly at random from  $[0, 1]$ .
3 for each machine  $i$  do
4   Partition the jobs into processing time classes  $\mathcal{P}_k^{(i)} = \{j : P_{\text{offset}} + \frac{\log p_j^{(i)}}{\log \pi} \in [k, k+1)\}$ .
5   for each class  $\mathcal{P}_k^{(i)}$  do
6     Initialize cluster index  $\ell = 1$  and set  $\mathcal{C}_{k,1}^{(i)} = \emptyset$ .
7     Sort the jobs in  $\mathcal{P}_k^{(i)}$  in non-increasing order of Smith ratio as  $j_1, j_2, \dots, j_s$ .
8     for  $t = 1, \dots, s$  and each job  $j = j_t$  do
9       Set  $\tilde{\rho}_j^{(i)} = \min\{x_j^{(i)}, \tau - \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}} x_{j'}^{(i)}\}$ 
10      Update  $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^{(i)} \leftarrow \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^{(i)} \cup \{j_t\}$ .
11      if  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}} x_j^{(i)} \geq \theta$  then
12        Update  $\ell \leftarrow \ell + 1$  and initialize the new cluster  $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^{(i)} = \emptyset$ 
13      For each cluster  $k, \ell$  and every job  $j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}$  set  $\rho_j^{(i)} = \frac{\tilde{\rho}_j^{(i)}}{\sum_{j' \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}} \tilde{\rho}_{j'}^{(i)}}$ .
14  Run DEPRound( $\rho, x$ ) to convert the fractional solution  $x$  into an integral solution  $X$ .
```

So each machine has a single “open” cluster for each processing-time quantization class at a time. If, after adding the job to the open cluster, the cluster size becomes at least θ , then we close it and open a new one. The correlation parameter $\rho_j^{(i)}$ is usually chosen to be proportional to $x_j^{(i)}$; the one exception is that the final job that closes out a cluster may need to choose a smaller parameter $\rho_j^{(i)}$. We say a job j is *truncated* on a machine i if $\tilde{\rho}_j^{(i)} < x_j^{(i)}$.

Note that, in our rounding algorithm, we only use the diagonal terms $x_j^{(i)}$ of the SDP relaxation; the “cross-terms” $x_{j,j'}^{(i)}$ appear only for the analysis. We also remark that, unlike prior algorithms, there is no special handling for “large” jobs (jobs with large mass $x_j^{(i)}$). For sake of notational convenience, we will suppose throughout that $x_j^{(i)} \in (0, 1)$ strictly for all i, j .

Proposition 16. *Algorithm DEPRound can be used to round the fractional solution x to an integral solution X , where for any machine i and distinct jobs j, j' , it satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[X_j^{(i)}] = x_j^{(i)}, \quad \mathbb{E}[X_j^{(i)} X_{j'}^{(i)}] \leq x_j^{(i)} x_{j'}^{(i)}$$

and for any machine i and any cluster k, ℓ and distinct jobs $j, j' \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}$, it has

$$\mathbb{E}[X_j^{(i)} X_{j'}^{(i)}] \leq (1 - \phi_{j,j'}^{(i)}) \cdot x_j^{(i)} x_{j'}^{(i)} \quad \text{for } \phi_{j,j'}^{(i)} := \frac{((1 - \rho_j^{(i)})^{1-1/x_j^{(i)}} - 1)((1 - \rho_{j'}^{(i)})^{1-1/x_{j'}^{(i)}} - 1)}{(1 - \rho_j^{(i)})^{1-1/x_j^{(i)}} (1 - \rho_{j'}^{(i)})^{1-1/x_{j'}^{(i)}} + \rho_j^{(i)} + \rho_{j'}^{(i)} - 1}$$

Proof. Apply Corollary 2 to the graph with left-vertices \mathcal{M} and right-vertices \mathcal{J} and blocks $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}$, with $x_e = x_j^{(i)}, \rho_e = \rho_j^{(i)}, X_j^{(i)} = X_e$ for each edge $e = (i, j)$. Note that $\sum_{e \in \Gamma(j)} x_e = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}} \rho_e = 1$.

By Property (A1), every job is assigned to exactly one machine. By Property (A2), we have $\mathbb{E}[X_j^{(i)}] = x_j^{(i)}$. By Property (A3'), every pair of jobs j, j' on a machine i has $\mathbb{E}[X_j^{(i)} X_{j'}^{(i)}] \leq x_j^{(i)} x_{j'}^{(i)}$. By Property (A4'), every pair of jobs j, j' in a cluster $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}$ has $\mathbb{E}[X_j^{(i)} X_{j'}^{(i)}] \leq (1 - \phi_{j,j'}^{(i)}) x_j^{(i)} x_{j'}^{(i)}$. \square

For each class $\mathcal{P}_k^{(i)}$ and each job $j \in \mathcal{P}_k^{(i)}$, we define

$$P_k = \pi^{k - P_{\text{offset}}}, \quad H_j^{(i)} = p_j^{(i)} / P_k.$$

Note that $H_j^{(i)} \in [1, \pi]$ for all j . The key property we exploit is that each random value $\log_\pi H_j^{(i)}$ is uniformly distributed in $[0, 1]$. The following observation is what we use for calculations:

Observation 17. For any job j and any function $\Psi : [1, \pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\Psi(H_j)] = \frac{1}{\log \pi} \int_{h=1}^{\pi} \frac{\Psi(h)}{h} dh$$

4.1 The SDP relaxation

Here, we provide a brief summary of the SDP relaxation and its properties. See [1] for a more detailed description.

For a *single* machine, there is a simple heuristic to minimize weighted completion time: namely, jobs should be ordered in non-increasing order of their Smith ratio $\sigma_j^{(i)}$. To simplify notation, let us suppose that all the ratios $\sigma_j^{(i)}$ are distinct. (This can be achieved without loss of generality by adding infinitesimal noise to each $p_j^{(i)}$.) Thus, the overall weighted completion time would be

$$\sum_{\substack{j, j' \text{ assigned to machine } i \\ \sigma_{j'}^{(i)} \leq \sigma_j^{(i)}}} w_j p_{j'}^{(i)}$$

For each machine i , let us further define a symmetric $(|\mathcal{J}| + 1) \times (|\mathcal{J}| + 1)$ matrix $\mathbf{X}^{(i)}$ as follows: we set $\mathbf{X}_{0,0}^{(i)} = 1$, we set $\mathbf{X}_{0,j}^{(i)} = \mathbf{X}_{j,0}^{(i)} = x_j^{(i)}$, and we set $\mathbf{X}_{j,j'}^{(i)} = x_{j,j'}^{(i)}$ for all pairs of jobs j, j' . This motivates the following semidefinite-programming (SDP) relaxation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} w_j \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{J} : \sigma_{j'}^{(i)} \leq \sigma_j^{(i)}} p_{j'}^{(i)} x_{j,j'}^{(i)} \\ & \text{subject to} && x_{j,j'}^{(i)} \in [0, 1] \quad \text{for all } j, j' \\ & && \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} x_j^{(i)} = 1 \quad \text{for all } j \\ & && \text{each matrix } \mathbf{X}^{(i)} \text{ is symmetric and positive-semidefinite} \end{aligned}$$

As described in [1], this relaxation can be solved in polynomial time. Furthermore, given an integral solution $X_j^{(i)} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{J}}$, there is a corresponding SDP solution defined by $x_{j,j'}^{(i)} = X_j^{(i)} X_{j'}^{(i)}$; note then that $\mathbf{X}^{(i)} = (1, x_1^{(i)}, \dots, x_n^{(i)}) \times (1, x_1^{(i)}, \dots, x_n^{(i)})^\top$, which is an outer product and hence positive-semidefinite. Our goal is to convert the fractional assignments $x_j^{(i)}$ into integral assignments $X_j^{(i)}$. We quote the following key results of [1] concerning the semidefinite program.

Theorem 18 ([1]). *For any machine i^* , suppose the jobs are sorted $1, \dots, n$ in non-increasing order of Smith ratio $\sigma_j^{(i^*)}$ along with a dummy job $n+1$ with $w_{n+1} = \sigma_{n+1}^{(i^*)} = 0$. Then the completion time on machine i^* is*

$$\sum_{j^*=1}^n (\sigma_{j^*}^{(i^*)} - \sigma_{j^*+1}^{(i^*)}) Z^{(i^*, j^*)}$$

while the contribution to the SDP objective function corresponding to machine i^* is given by

$$\sum_{j^*=1}^n (\sigma_{j^*}^{(i^*)} - \sigma_{j^*+1}^{(i^*)}) \text{LB}^{(i^*, j^*)}$$

where for each job j^* we define

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{(i^*, j^*)} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{j^*} X_j^{(i^*)} (p_j^{(i^*)})^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{j^*} \sum_{j'=1}^{j^*} X_j^{(i^*)} X_{j'}^{(i^*)} p_j^{(i^*)} p_{j'}^{(i^*)} \right) \\ \text{LB}^{(i^*, j^*)} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{j^*} x_j^{(i^*)} (p_j^{(i^*)})^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{j^*} \sum_{j'=1}^{j^*} x_{j,j'}^{(i^*)} p_j^{(i^*)} p_{j'}^{(i^*)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 19. *If $\mathbb{E}[Z^{(i^*, j^*)}] \leq \eta \cdot \text{LB}^{(i^*, j^*)}$ for all machines i^* and jobs j^* , then the resulting schedule is an η -approximation in expectation, and the SDP has integrality gap at most η .*

4.2 Focusing on a single machine and job.

The main consequence of Corollary 19 is that we can focus on a single machine i^* and single job j^* and ignore all the job weights. For the remainder of the analysis, we suppose i^*, j^* are fixed, and we omit all superscripts (i^*, j^*) , for example we write X_j instead of $X_j^{(i^*)}$.

We define \mathcal{J}^* to be the set of jobs j with $\sigma_j \geq \sigma_{j^*}$. As a point of notation, any sum of the form \sum_j should be taken to range over $j \in \mathcal{J}^*$ unless stated otherwise. Likewise, in a sum of the form $\sum_{j,j'}$, we view j, j' as an ordered pair of jobs in \mathcal{J}^* ; there are separate summands for j, j' and for j', j and we also allow $j = j'$.

For each class \mathcal{P}_k we define $\mathcal{P}_k^* = \mathcal{P}_k \cap \mathcal{J}^*$ and for each cluster $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}$, we define $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^* = \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell} \cap \mathcal{J}^*$. Within each class \mathcal{P}_k , the final opened cluster $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*$ after processing job j^* is called the *leftover cluster* for k , and denoted by $\mathcal{C}_{k,\text{left}}^* = \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*$.

With these conventions, we can write $Z = Z^{(i^*, j^*)}$ and $\text{LB} = \text{LB}^{(i^*, j^*)}$ more compactly as:

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_j X_j p_j^2 + \sum_{j,j'} X_j X_{j'} p_j p_{j'} \right) = \sum_j X_j p_j^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,j':j' \neq j} X_j X_{j'} p_j p_{j'} \\ \text{LB} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_j x_j p_j^2 + \sum_{j,j'} x_{j,j'} p_j p_{j'} \right) = \sum_j x_j p_j^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,j':j' \neq j} x_{j,j'} p_j p_{j'} \end{aligned}$$

Following [1], we further define two important quantities for measuring the approximation ratio.

$$L = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}^*} x_j p_j, \quad Q = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}^*} x_j p_j^2$$

Theorem 20. *For any vector $y \in [0, 1]^{\mathcal{J}^*}$ there holds*

$$\text{LB} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(Q + \sum_j y_j x_j p_j^2 + \left(L - \sum_j (1 - \sqrt{1 - y_j}) \cdot x_j p_j \right)^2 \right)$$

Proof. Define $z_j = \sqrt{1 - y_j}$. We decompose the expression for LB as:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_j x_j p_j^2 + \sum_{j,j'} x_{j,j'} p_j p_{j'} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_j x_j p_j^2 + \sum_{j,j'} (1 - z_j z_{j'}) x_{j,j'} p_j p_{j'} + \sum_{j,j'} x_{j,j'} z_j z_{j'} p_j p_{j'} \right) \quad (4)$$

The sum $\sum_{j,j'}(1-z_j z_{j'})x_{j,j'}p_j p_{j'}$ can be lower-bounded by only including the terms with $j = j'$, which contribute $\sum_j(1-z_j^2)x_j p_j^2 = \sum_j y_j x_j p_j^2$.

For the sum $\sum_{j,j'} x_{j,j'} z_j z_{j'} p_j p_{j'}$, let $\mu = \sum_j z_j x_j p_j = L - \sum_j(1 - \sqrt{1-y_j})x_j p_j$. Define a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{J}|+1}$ by setting $v_0 = -\mu$, $v_j = z_j p_j$ for $j \in \mathcal{J}^*$, and $v_j = 0$ for $j \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{J}^*$. The SDP relaxation ensures that $v^\top \mathbf{X} v \geq 0$. We calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} v^\top \mathbf{X} v &= \mathbf{X}_{0,0} v_0^2 + 2 \sum_j \mathbf{X}_{0,j} v_j v_0 + \sum_{j,j'} \mathbf{X}_{j,j'} v_j v_{j'} \\ &= \mu^2 - 2 \sum_j x_j z_j p_j \mu + \sum_{j,j'} x_{j,j'} z_j z_{j'} p_j p_{j'} = -\mu^2 + \sum_{j,j'} x_{j,j'} z_j z_{j'} p_j p_{j'} \end{aligned}$$

So $\sum_{j,j'} x_{j,j'} z_j z_{j'} p_j p_{j'} \geq \mu^2$. Substituting into Eq. (4) gives:

$$\text{LB} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(Q + \sum_j y_j x_j p_j^2 + \left(L - \sum_j (1 - \sqrt{1-y_j}) x_j p_j \right)^2 \right). \quad \square$$

We remark that Theorem 20 was shown in [1] for an integral vector $y \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{J}^*}$, but we will need the slightly generalized result for our analysis.

Corollary 21 ([1]). *There holds $\text{LB} \geq \max\{Q, \frac{1}{2}(Q + L^2)\}$.*

Proof. Apply Theorem 20 with respectively vectors $y = \vec{1}$ and $y = \vec{0}$. □

At this point, we can give a simple explanation of how the algorithm achieves a 1.5-approximation where we only assume *nonpositive* correlation among the variable X_j . To get a better approximation ratio we need to show there is strong negative correlation among them.

Proposition 22 (assuming nonpositive correlation only). *There holds $\mathbb{E}[Z] \leq 3/2 \cdot \text{LB}$.*

Proof. For any jobs j, j' we have $\mathbb{E}[X_j] = x_j$ and $\mathbb{E}[X_j X_{j'}] \leq x_j x_{j'}$. So

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] \leq \sum_j p_j^2 x_j + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,j':j' \neq j} p_j p_{j'} x_j x_{j'} = \sum_j p_j^2 (x_j - x_j^2/2) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j',j} p_j p_{j'} x_j x_{j'} \leq Q + \frac{1}{2} L^2$$

On the other hand, Corollary 21 gives

$$\text{LB} \geq \max\{Q, \frac{1}{2}(Q + L^2)\} \geq \frac{1}{3}Q + \frac{2}{3}(\frac{1}{2}(Q + L^2)) = \frac{2}{3}Q + \frac{1}{3}L^2. \quad \square$$

5 Determining the approximation ratio

We now begin the computation for the approximation ratio. The analysis has three main steps. First, we compute an upper bound on the expected value of the solution returned by the rounding algorithm. Second, we compute a lower bound on the objective function of the relaxation. Finally, we combine these two estimates.

We will introduce parameters $\kappa, \beta, \delta, \gamma$ to bound various internal functions, along with related numerical constants c_0, \dots, c_6 . All calculations are carried out using exact arithmetic in the Mathematica computer algebra system; some specific calculation details are deferred to Appendix B. We emphasize that these parameters are not used directly in the algorithm itself.

5.1 The algorithm upper-bound

As a starting point, we have the following identity:

Lemma 23. *If we condition on random variable P_{offset} , then the expectation over the procedure `DEPROUND` satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[Z \mid P_{\text{offset}}] \leq Q + \frac{L^2}{2} - \sum_{k,\ell} P_k^2 B_{k,\ell}$$

where for each cluster k, ℓ we define the “bonus term”

$$B_{k,\ell} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*} x_j^2 H_j^2 + \sum_{j,j' \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*: j \neq j'} \phi_{j,j'} x_j x_{j'} H_j H_{j'} \right)$$

where recall that

$$\phi_{j,j'} = \frac{((1 - \rho_j)^{1-1/x_j} - 1)((1 - \rho_{j'})^{1-1/x_{j'}} - 1)}{(1 - \rho_j)^{1-1/x_j} (1 - \rho_{j'})^{1-1/x_{j'}} + \rho_j + \rho_{j'} - 1}$$

Proof. All calculations in this proof are conditioned on P_{offset} . We have:

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_j p_j^2 X_j + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j' \neq j} p_j p_{j'} X_j X_{j'} \right]$$

Here $\mathbb{E}[X_j] = x_j$, and for any pair j, j' , we have $\mathbb{E}[X_j X_{j'}] \leq x_j x_{j'}$. Also, for any cluster k, ℓ and distinct jobs $j, j' \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*$, we have $\mathbb{E}[X_j X_{j'}] \leq (1 - \phi_{j,j'}) x_j x_{j'}$ by Proposition 16. So:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z] &\leq \sum_j p_j^2 x_j + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,j':j \neq j'} p_j p_{j'} x_j x_{j'} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,\ell} \sum_{j,j' \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*: j \neq j'} \phi_{j,j'} x_j x_{j'} p_j p_{j'} \\ &= \sum_j p_j^2 (x_j - x_j^2/2) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j',j} p_j p_{j'} x_j x_{j'} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,\ell} \sum_{j,j' \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*: j \neq j'} \phi_{j,j'} x_j x_{j'} p_j p_{j'} \\ &= Q + \frac{L^2}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,\ell} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*} p_j^2 x_j^2 + \sum_{j,j' \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*: j \neq j'} \phi_{j,j'} x_j x_{j'} p_j p_{j'} \right) \end{aligned}$$

It remains to observe that, for any cluster k, ℓ and job $j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*$, we have $p_j = H_j P_k$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*} p_j^2 x_j^2 + \sum_{j,j' \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*: j \neq j'} \phi_{j,j'} x_j x_{j'} p_j p_{j'} &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*} (P_k^2 H_j^2) x_j^2 + \sum_{j,j' \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*: j \neq j'} \phi_{j,j'} x_j x_{j'} (P_k H_j) (P_k H_{j'}) \\ &= P_k^2 \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*} x_j^2 H_j^2 + \sum_{j,j' \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*: j \neq j'} \phi_{j,j'} x_j x_{j'} H_j H_{j'} \right) = 2P_k^2 B_{k,\ell}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The main focus of the analysis is to show that $B_{k,\ell}$ is large on average. For intuition, keep in mind the extremal case when all the untruncated jobs have infinitesimal mass (i.e. $x_j^2 \approx 0$). In this case, the jobs in each cluster $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*$ have $\phi_{j,j'} = \frac{e^{1/\lambda} - 1}{e^{1/\lambda} + 1}$ where $\lambda = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*} \tilde{\rho}_{i,j}$. The truncated job (if any) requires some special analysis. We also need to show that non-infinitesimal mass can only increase the value $B_{k,\ell}$.

Lemma 24. For a cluster k, ℓ , let \mathcal{U} be the set of untruncated jobs in $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*$ and define parameters λ, a, r, s as follows:

$$\lambda = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*} \tilde{\rho}_j, \quad a = \frac{e^{1/\lambda} - 1}{e^{1/\lambda} + 1}, \quad r = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} x_j, \quad s = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} x_j H_j$$

There holds:

$$\sum_{j,j' \in \mathcal{U}: j \neq j'} \phi_{j,j'} x_j x_{j'} H_j H_{j'} \geq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} x_j H_j (a - c_0 x_j) (s - x_j) \quad \text{for constant } c_0 := 0.17556$$

Proof. Each untruncated job j has $\rho_j = \tilde{\rho}_j / \lambda = x_j / \lambda$ where $\lambda \leq \tau \leq 3/4$. By Lemma 14, any pair $j, j' \in \mathcal{U}$ has $\phi_{j,j'} \geq a - b(x_j + x_{j'})$ for $b = 0.57 \max\{0, \lambda - 0.45\} \leq 0.57(\tau - 0.45) = c_0/2$. So:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j,j' \in \mathcal{U}: j \neq j'} \phi_{j,j'} x_j x_{j'} H_j H_{j'} &\geq \sum_{j,j' \in \mathcal{U}: j \neq j'} (a - c_0/2 \cdot (x_j + x_{j'})) x_j x_{j'} H_j H_{j'} \\ &= \sum_{j,j' \in \mathcal{U}: j \neq j'} (a - c_0 x_j) x_j x_{j'} H_j H_{j'} \quad (\text{by symmetry}) \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} x_j H_j (a - c_0 x_j) (-x_j H_j + \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{U}} x_{j'} H_{j'}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} x_j H_j (a - c_0 x_j) (-x_j H_j + s) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since $a \geq \frac{e^{1/\tau} - 1}{e^{1/\tau} + 1} \geq 0.68$ and $H_j \geq 1$, we have $(a - c_0 x_j)(s - x_j H_j) \geq (a - c_0 x_j)(s - x_j)$. \square

Lemma 25. For a cluster k, ℓ , define parameters λ, a, r, s as in Lemma 24.

If $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*$ has no truncated jobs, then $B_{k,\ell} \geq s/2 \cdot \min_{x \in [0,r]} (x + (a - c_0x)(s - x))$.

If $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*$ has a truncated job j_{tr} , then define $y = x_{j_{\text{tr}}}$, $d = x_{j_{\text{tr}}} H_{j_{\text{tr}}}$ and we have:

$$B_{k,\ell} \geq d^2/2 + s/2 \cdot \min_{x \in [0,r]} \left(x + (a - c_0x)(s - x) + \frac{2d((1 - x/\tau)^{1-1/x} - 1)((r/\tau)^{1-1/y} - 1)}{(1 - x/\tau)^{1-1/x}(r/\tau)^{1-1/y} - (r - x)/\tau} \right)$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{T} denote the set of truncated jobs in $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*$; note that $|\mathcal{T}| \leq 1$. By Lemma 24, can decompose $B_{k,\ell}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 2B_{k,\ell} &= \sum_{j_{\text{tr}} \in \mathcal{T}} x_{j_{\text{tr}}}^2 H_{j_{\text{tr}}}^2 + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} x_j^2 H_j^2 + \sum_{j, j' \in \mathcal{U}: j \neq j'} \phi_{j,j'} x_j x_{j'} H_j H_{j'} + 2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}, j_{\text{tr}} \in \mathcal{T}} \phi_{j,j_{\text{tr}}} x_j x_{j_{\text{tr}}} H_j H_{j_{\text{tr}}} \\ &\geq \sum_{j_{\text{tr}} \in \mathcal{T}} x_{j_{\text{tr}}}^2 H_{j_{\text{tr}}}^2 + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} x_j H_j \left(x_j + (a - c_0x_j)(s - x_j) \right) + 2 \sum_{j_{\text{tr}} \in \mathcal{T}} \phi_{j,j_{\text{tr}}} x_j x_{j_{\text{tr}}} H_j H_{j_{\text{tr}}} \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{T} = \emptyset$, then $2B_{k,\ell} \geq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} x_j H_j (x_j + (a - c_0x_j)(s - x_j))$. Furthermore, $x_j \in [0, r]$, so we lower-bound this in turn by:

$$2B_{k,\ell} \geq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} x_j H_j \min_{x \in [0,r]} (x + (a - c_0x)(s - x)) = s \min_{x \in [0,r]} (x + (a - c_0x)(s - x))$$

as desired. Next, if $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*$ has a truncated job j_{tr} with $\rho_{j_{\text{tr}}} = 1 - r/\tau$, then for any job $j \in \mathcal{U}$ we have

$$\phi_{j,j_{\text{tr}}} = \frac{((1 - x_j/\tau)^{1-1/x_j} - 1)((r/\tau)^{1-1/y} - 1)}{(1 - x_j/\tau)^{1-1/x_j}(r/\tau)^{1-1/y} - (r - x_j)/\tau}.$$

and we get:

$$2B_{k,\ell} \geq d^2 + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} x_j H_j \left(x_j + (a - c_0x_j)(s - x_j) \right) + \frac{2d((1 - x_j/\tau)^{1-1/x_j} - 1)((r/\tau)^{1-1/y} - 1)}{(1 - x_j/\tau)^{1-1/x_j}(r/\tau)^{1-1/y} - (r - x_j)/\tau}$$

and the result follows again since $x_j \in [0, r]$. \square

There is one additional complication in the analysis. To take advantage of stochastic processing-time classes, we need a bound for the bonus term accounting for every job j *individually*, irrespective of how it is clustered with others. We handle this via the following additional approximation:

Proposition 26. Define parameter $\kappa = 0.744$. For a non-leftover cluster $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*$, we have

$$B_{k,\ell} \geq c_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*} x_j (H_j - \kappa) \quad \text{for constant } c_1 := 0.591909.$$

Proof. Let λ, a, r, s be as in Lemma 24, and define $V = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*} x_j (H_j - \kappa)$.

If $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*$ has no truncated job, then $\lambda = r \in [\theta, \tau]$ and $V = s - \kappa r$. So $a = \frac{e^{1/r} - 1}{e^{1/r} + 1}$ and Lemma 25 gives

$$\frac{B_{k,\ell}}{V} \geq \min_{\substack{r \in [\theta, \tau], x \in [0, r] \\ s \in [r, \pi r]}} \frac{s(x + (\frac{e^{1/r} - 1}{e^{1/r} + 1} - c_0x)(s - x))}{2(s - \kappa r)}$$

and, as we show in Appendix B, this is at least c_1 .

If $\mathcal{C}_{k,\ell}^*$ has a truncated job j_{tr} , then let $y = x_{j_{\text{tr}}} \geq \tau - r$ and $d = x_{j_{\text{tr}}} H_{j_{\text{tr}}}$. So $V = s + d - \kappa(r + y)$ and $\lambda = \tau$ and $a = \frac{e^{1/\tau} - 1}{e^{1/\tau} + 1}$. Lemma 25 gives:

$$\frac{B_{k,\ell}}{V} \geq \min_{\substack{r \in [0, \theta], x \in [0, r] \\ y \in [\tau - r, 1] \\ s \in [r, \pi r], d \in [y, \pi y]}} \frac{d^2 + s(x + (\frac{e^{1/\tau} - 1}{e^{1/\tau} + 1} - c_0x)(s - x) + 2d \frac{((1 - x/\tau)^{1-1/x} - 1)((r/\tau)^{1-1/y} - 1)}{(1 - x/\tau)^{1-1/x}(r/\tau)^{1-1/y} - (r - x)/\tau})}{2(s + d - \kappa(r + y))}$$

We show in Appendix B this is at least $0.5921116 \geq c_1$. \square

The non-leftover clusters are considered the “baseline” value. We also need to show how the leftover bonus value changes compared to this baseline.

Proposition 27. *For a leftover cluster $C_{k,\ell}^* = C_{k,\ell}^*$, define*

$$R_k = \sum_{j \in C_{k,\ell}^*} x_j, \quad S_k = \sum_{j \in C_{k,\ell}^*} x_j H_j, \quad T_k = \frac{S_k}{R_k}$$

Then $R_k \in [0, \theta]$, $T_k \in [1, \pi]$ and $B_{k,\ell} \geq R_k \cdot \min\{c_1(T_k - \kappa), c_2 R_k T_k^2\}$ for constant $c_2 := 0.33965$. (If $R_k = 0$, we may set T_k to an arbitrary value in $[1, \pi]$ and the result still holds.)

Proof. The cluster $C_{k,\ell}^*$ has no truncated jobs and has $R_k \in [0, \theta]$, as otherwise it would be closed after adding its final job. In the language of Lemma 24, we have $r = R_k$, $s = S_k = R_k T_k$, and $a \geq \frac{e^{1/\tau} - 1}{e^{1/\tau} + 1} \approx 0.67930078 \geq 2c_2 = 0.6793$.

Lemma 25 gives $B_{k,\ell} \geq s/2 \cdot \min_{x \in [0, r]}(x + (2c_2 - c_0 x)(s - x))$. Thus, removing a common factor of r and letting $t = T_k$, it suffices to show that

$$t/2 \cdot (x + (2c_2 - c_0 x)(rt - x)) \geq \min\{c_1(t - \kappa), c_2 r t^2\}.$$

This is an algebraic inequality which can be verified to hold for $r \in [0, \theta]$, $t \in [1, \pi]$, $x \in [0, r]$. \square

We thus can get the following upper bound for the algorithm performance.

Lemma 28. *Define function f and related random variable D by:*

$$f(r, t) = \max\{0, c_1(t - \kappa) - c_2 r t^2\}, \quad D = \sum_k P_k^2 R_k f(R_k, T_k),$$

We have

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] \leq \mathbb{E}[D] + c_3 Q + L^2/2 \quad \text{for constant } c_3 := 0.8277532$$

Proof. By Proposition 27, each leftover cluster $C_{k,\ell}^* = C_{k,\ell}^*$ has

$$B_{k,\ell} \geq R_k \min\{c_1(T_k - \kappa), c_2 R_k T_k^2\} = -R_k f(R_k, T_k) + c_1 \sum_{j \in C_{k,\ell}^*} x_j (H_j - \kappa).$$

Putting this together with Proposition 27, we can sum over all clusters in a class \mathcal{P}_k^* to get:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell} B_{k,\ell} &\geq (-R_k f(R_k, T_k) + c_1 \sum_{j \in C_{k,\ell}^*} x_j (H_j - \kappa)) + \sum_{\text{non-leftover } C_{k,\ell}^*} c_1 \sum_{j \in C_{k,\ell}^*} x_j (H_j - \kappa) \\ &= -R_k f(R_k, T_k) + c_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_k^*} x_j (H_j - \kappa) \end{aligned}$$

Summing over all classes, and noting that $P_k = p_j/H_j$ for $j \in \mathcal{P}_k^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k,\ell} P_k^2 B_{k,\ell} &\geq \sum_k (-P_k^2 R_k f(R_k, T_k)) + c_1 \sum_k P_k^2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_k^*} x_j (H_j - \kappa) \\ &= -D + c_1 \sum_k \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_k^*} x_j (H_j - \kappa) p_j^2 / H_j^2 = -D + c_1 \sum_j x_j p_j^2 (H_j - \kappa) / H_j^2 \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 23 gives $\mathbb{E}[Z \mid P_{\text{offset}}] \leq Q + L^2/2 - \sum_{k,\ell} P_k^2 B_{k,\ell}$. So we have shown at this point that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z \mid P_{\text{offset}}] \leq Q + L^2/2 + D + c_1 \sum_j x_j p_j^2 (H_j - \kappa) / H_j^2 \quad (5)$$

We now integrate over random variable P_{offset} ; by Observation 17, for any job j we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(H_j - \kappa)/H_j^2] = \frac{1}{\log \pi} \int_{h=1}^{\pi} \frac{h - \kappa}{h^3} dh = \frac{\kappa - 2\pi + 2\pi^2 - \kappa\pi^2}{2\pi^2 \log \pi}$$

So, in expectation, the term $\sum_j x_j p_j^2 (H_j - \kappa) / H_j^2$ contributes $\sum_j x_j p_j^2 \cdot \frac{\kappa - 2\pi + 2\pi^2 - \kappa\pi^2}{2\pi^2 \log \pi}$, and thus

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] \leq (1 - c_1 \cdot \frac{\kappa - 2\pi + 2\pi^2 - \kappa\pi^2}{2\pi^2 \log \pi}) Q + L^2/2 + D.$$

Direct numerical calculation shows that $1 - c_1 \cdot \frac{\kappa - 2\pi + 2\pi^2 - \kappa\pi^2}{2\pi^2 \log \pi} \leq c_3$. \square

5.2 The algorithm lower-bound

For this section, we will choose a parameter $\beta := 1.935$, and we define related functions g, g_k by

$$g(r, t, h) = h \cdot \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{\beta(h - \kappa)f(r, t)}{h^2(t - \kappa)}}\right), \quad g_k(h) = g(R_k, T_k, h)$$

In analyzing functions $f(r, t)$ and $g(r, t, h)$, we implicitly assume throughout that $r \in [0, \theta]$ and $t, h \in [1, \pi]$. It can be checked that in this region $\frac{\beta(h - \kappa)f(r, t)}{h^2(t - \kappa)} \leq 1$, so g is well-defined. Likewise, it can be checked that, for any r, t , the map $h \mapsto g(r, t, h)$ is non-decreasing and concave-down.

Lemma 29. *We have*

$$\text{LB} \geq \frac{1}{2}(Q + \beta D + (L - A)^2) \quad \text{for random variable } A = \sum_k P_k \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k, \text{left}}^*} x_j g_k(H_j)$$

Proof. Define vector $y \in [0, 1]^{\mathcal{J}^*}$ as follows: for a job $j \in \mathcal{C}_{k, \text{left}}^*$, we set

$$y_j = \frac{\beta(H_j - \kappa)f(R_k, T_k)}{H_j^2(T_k - \kappa)} \in [0, 1];$$

note that $1 - \sqrt{1 - y_j} = g_k(H_j)/H_j$. For all other jobs j we set $y_j = 0$. By Theorem 20, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \cdot \text{LB} &\geq Q + \sum_k \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k, \text{left}}^*} \frac{\beta f(R_k, T_k)(H_j - \kappa)}{H_j^2(T_k - \kappa)} \cdot x_j p_j^2 + \left(L - \sum_k \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k, \text{left}}^*} x_j p_j \cdot g_k(H_j)/H_j\right)^2 \\ &= Q + \beta \sum_k P_k^2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k, \text{left}}^*} x_j \frac{f(R_k, T_k)(H_j - \kappa)}{T_k - \kappa} + \left(L - \sum_k P_k \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k, \text{left}}^*} g_k(H_j) x_j\right)^2 \\ &= Q + \beta D + (L - A)^2. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We turn to bounding the random variable A . This is quite involved and requires a number of intermediate calculations.

Proposition 30. *Define parameter $\delta := 1.3$. We have*

$$A^2 \leq \sum_k P_k^2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_k} x_j g_k(H_j) \left(c_4 + R_k \cdot \frac{T_k + \delta}{H_j + \delta} \cdot g_k(H_j)\right) \quad \text{for constant } c_4 := 0.035898.$$

Proof. For each class \mathcal{P}_k , define $A_k = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k, \text{left}}^*} x_j g_k(H_j)$. We expand the sum A^2 as:

$$A^2 = \left(\sum_k P_k A_k\right)^2 = \sum_k P_k A_k (P_k A_k + 2 \sum_{\ell < k} P_\ell A_\ell) = \sum_k P_k^2 (A_k^2 + 2A_k \sum_{\ell < k} \pi^{\ell - k} A_\ell)$$

Since $g_\ell(h)$ is a concave-down function, Jensen's inequality gives

$$A_\ell \leq \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{\ell, \text{left}}^*} x_j\right) \cdot g_\ell\left(\frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{\ell, \text{left}}^*} x_j H_j}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{\ell, \text{left}}^*} x_j}\right) = R_\ell \cdot g(R_\ell, T_\ell, T_\ell)$$

Furthermore, since $g(r, t, h)$ is an algebraic function, we can use standard algorithms to calculate

$$c_4 \geq \max_{r \in [0, \theta], t \in [1, \pi]} \frac{2rg(r, t, t)}{\pi - 1}$$

So $A_\ell \leq c_4 \cdot \frac{\pi - 1}{2}$ for each ℓ ; by the geometric series formula, we thus get:

$$A^2 \leq \sum_k P_k^2 (A_k^2 + 2A_k \sum_{\ell < k} (c_4 \cdot \frac{\pi - 1}{2}) \pi^{\ell - k}) = \sum_k P_k^2 (A_k^2 + c_4 A_k)$$

To bound the term A_k^2 , we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} A_k^2 &= \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\text{left}}^*} \sqrt{x_j(H_j + \delta)} \cdot \frac{g_k(H_j)\sqrt{x_j}}{\sqrt{H_j + \delta}} \right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\text{left}}^*} x_j(H_j + \delta) \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\text{left}}^*} \frac{g_k(H_j)^2 x_j}{H_j + \delta} \right) \\ &= R_k(T_k + \delta) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\text{left}}^*} \frac{x_j g_k(H_j)^2}{H_j + \delta}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 31. *Define parameter $\gamma := 0.00547$. There holds*

$$\mathbb{E}[A^2] \leq \gamma \mathbb{E}[D] + c_5 Q \quad \text{for constant } c_5 := 0.004562$$

Proof. Note that any class \mathcal{P}_k^* has $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\text{left}}^*} x_j \cdot \frac{H_j + \delta}{T_k + \delta} = R_k$. Combining the decomposition in Proposition 30 with the formula $D = \sum_k P_k^2 R_k f(R_k, T_k)$, we have:

$$A^2 - \gamma D \leq \sum_k P_k^2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\text{left}}^*} x_j \left(g_k(H_j) \left(c_4 + \frac{R_k(T_k + \delta) g_k(H_j)}{H_j + \delta} \right) - \gamma f(R_k, T_k) \frac{H_j + \delta}{T_k + \delta} \right) \quad (6)$$

Accordingly, let us define function $F : [1, \pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$F(h) = \max_{r \in [0, \theta], t \in [1, \pi]} g(r, t, h) \left(c_4 + \frac{r g(r, t, h)(t + \delta)}{h + \delta} \right) - \frac{\gamma f(r, t)(h + \delta)}{t + \delta}$$

Since $R_k \in [0, \theta], T_k \in [1, \pi]$, Eq. (6) implies that

$$A^2 \leq \gamma D + \sum_k P_k^2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\text{left}}^*} x_j F(H_j) = \gamma D + \sum_k \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k,\text{left}}^*} x_j p_j^2 F(H_j) / H_j^2 \quad (7)$$

Note that $f(0, 0) = g(0, 0, h) = 0$ for all h , and so values $r = t = 0$ witness that $F(h) \geq 0$. We can further get an upper bound by summing over all jobs (not just the leftover jobs):

$$A^2 \leq \gamma D + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}^*} x_j p_j^2 F(H_j) / H_j^2$$

At this point, we take expectations over random variable P_{offset} , getting

$$\mathbb{E}[A^2] \leq \gamma \mathbb{E}[D] + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}^*} x_j p_j^2 \mathbb{E}[F(H_j) / H_j^2]$$

By Observation 17, each item j has $\mathbb{E}[F(H_j) / H_j^2] = \frac{1}{\log \pi} \int_{h=1}^{\pi} F(h) / h^3 dh$, giving us

$$\mathbb{E}[A^2] \leq \gamma \mathbb{E}[D] + \left(\frac{1}{\log \pi} \int_{h=1}^{\pi} \frac{F(h)}{h^3} dh \right) Q$$

We show in Appendix B that $c_5 \geq \frac{1}{\log \pi} \int_{h=1}^{\pi} \frac{F(h)}{h^3} dh$, which yields the claimed result. \square

5.3 Marrying the upper and lower bounds

At this point, we have an upper bound which depends on quantities Q, D, L , and we have a lower bound which depends on quantities Q, D, L, A . We now can combine these two estimates; critically, we boil down the statistics Q, D into the single parameter:

$$q = Q + \mathbb{E}[D] / c_3$$

With this definition, we can rephrase Lemma 28 as stating simply that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] \leq c_3 q + 1/2 \cdot L^2$$

We next derive a lower bound in terms of q as well.

Proposition 32. *There holds $\mathbb{E}[(L - A)^2] \geq \max\{0, L - c_6 \sqrt{q}\}^2$ for constant $c_6 := 0.0676$.*

Proof. From Lemma 31, we have $\mathbb{E}[A^2] \leq \gamma \mathbb{E}[D] + c_5 Q = q \cdot \frac{\gamma \mathbb{E}[D] + c_5 Q}{\mathbb{E}[D]/c_3 + Q} \leq q \cdot \max\{\frac{\gamma}{1/c_3}, \frac{c_5}{1}\}$; it can be checked numerically that $\max\{c_5, \gamma c_3\} \leq c_6^2$. Now consider random variable $U = A^2$. The function $u \mapsto (L - \sqrt{u})^2$ is concave-up, so by Jensen's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}[(L - A)^2] = \mathbb{E}[(L - \sqrt{U})^2] \geq (L - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[U]})^2$$

Finally, the bound $\mathbb{E}[U] \leq c_6^2 q$ implies that $(L - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[U]})^2 \geq \max\{0, L - c_6 \sqrt{q}\}^2$. \square

Proposition 33. *We have*

$$\text{LB} \geq \frac{\beta c_3 q + \max\{0, L - c_6 \sqrt{q}\}^2}{\beta c_3 + 1}.$$

Proof. By Corollary 21, we have $\text{LB} \geq Q$. By Lemma 29, we have $\text{LB} \geq \frac{1}{2}(Q + \beta D + (L - A)^2)$. We can take a convex combination of these two lower bounds to get:

$$\text{LB} \geq \alpha Q + (1 - \alpha) \cdot \frac{1}{2}(Q + \beta D + (L - A)^2) \quad \text{for } \alpha = \frac{\beta c_3 - 1}{\beta c_3 + 1} \approx 0.23.$$

Taking expectations over P_{offset} and rearranging, we get:

$$\text{LB} \geq Q \cdot \frac{1 + \alpha}{2} + \frac{(1 - \alpha)\beta}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}[D] + \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}[(L - A)^2] = \frac{\beta c_3 q + \mathbb{E}[(L - A)^2]}{\beta c_3 + 1}.$$

By Proposition 32, we have $\mathbb{E}[(L - A)^2] \geq \max\{0, L - c_6 \sqrt{q}\}^2$. \square

Proposition 34. *The approximation ratio, and the SDP integrality gap, are at most 1.398.*

Proof. By Corollary 19, we need to bound the ratio $\mathbb{E}[Z]/\text{LB}$. Let $v = \sqrt{q}/L$. From Proposition 33, we have:

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[Z]}{\text{LB}} \leq \frac{(\beta c_3 + 1)(c_3 q + L^2/2)}{\beta c_3 q + \max\{0, L - c_6 \sqrt{q}\}^2} = \frac{(\beta c_3 + 1)(c_3 v^2 + 1/2)}{\beta c_3 v^2 + \max\{0, 1 - c_6 v\}^2}.$$

This is an algebraic function of v ; its maximum value, over any $v \geq 0$, is at most 1.39798. \square

6 Acknowledgments

We thank Aravind Srinivasan for clarifications about the paper [2], Nikhil Bansal for clarifications about the paper [1], and Shi Li for discussions and explanations regarding the time-indexed LP.

A Proof of Lemma 14

We begin with a few preliminary calculations.

Proposition 35. *For $t \geq 4/3$ and $x \in [0, 1/t]$, we have $(1 - xt)^{1-1/x} \geq e^t(1 + x(t^2/2 - t))$.*

Proof. Consider the function $f(x) = (1 - xt)^{1-1/x}$ and let $z = t^2/2 - t$. Here $e^t(1 + xz)$ is simply the first-order Taylor expansion of f around $x = 0$. Thus, it suffices to show that $f''(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in [0, 1/t]$. If we denote $y = 1 - tx \in [0, 1]$, we calculate:

$$f''(x) = \frac{t^3 y^{-(1-y+t)/(1-y)}}{(1-y)^4} \left(t(1-y + \log y)^2 - (1-y)(1-y^2 + 2y \log y) \right)$$

Since $t \geq 4/3$, it thus suffices to show that $4/3 \cdot (1-y + \log y)^2 - (1-y)(1-y^2 + 2y \log y) \geq 0$ holds for $y \in [0, 1]$. This is a one-variable inequality which can be shown via straightforward calculus. \square

Observation 36. *For real numbers a_1, a_2, a'_1, a'_2, b with $a_1 \geq a'_1 \geq 1, a_2 \geq a'_2 \geq 1$ and $b \geq 0$, there holds $\frac{(a_1-1)(a_2-1)}{a_1 a_2 + b} \geq \frac{(a'_1-1)(a'_2-1)}{a'_1 a'_2 + b}$.*

Proof. It can shown mechanically e.g via decidability of first-order theory of real-closed fields. \square

We are now ready to show Lemma 14. Rephrasing Theorem 13, we want to show that:

$$\frac{((1-x_1t)^{1-1/x_1}-1)((1-x_2t)^{1-1/x_2}-1)}{(1-x_1t)^{1-1/x_1}(1-x_2t)^{1-1/x_2}+x_1t+x_2t-1} \geq \frac{e^t-1}{e^t+1} - 0.57(x_1+x_2) \max\{0, 1/t-0.45\}$$

Let $z = t^2/2 - t$. By combining Proposition 35 and Observation 36, we get

$$\frac{((1-x_1t)^{1-1/x_1}-1)((1-x_2t)^{1-1/x_2}-1)}{(1-x_1t)^{1-1/x_1}(1-x_2t)^{1-1/x_2}+x_1t+x_2t-1} \geq \frac{(e^t(1+zx_1)-1)(e^t(1+zx_2)-1)}{e^{2t}(1+zx_1)(1+zx_2)+x_1t+x_2t-1}$$

Let $d = x_1 + x_2$, $a = \frac{e^t-1}{e^t+1}$, $b = 0.57 \max\{0, 1/t-0.45\}$; to show Lemma 14, it thus suffices to show that

$$(e^t(1+zx_1)-1)(e^t(1+zx_2)-1) - (a-bd)(e^{2t}(1+zx_1)(1+zx_2)+dt-1) \geq 0 \quad (8)$$

We can rearrange the LHS of Eq. (8) as:

$$z^2x_1x_2e^{2t}(1-a+bd) + bd(e^{2t}-1+d(t+ze^{2t})) + ad(ze^t-t)$$

Since $d \in [0, 1/t]$ and $a \leq 1$, it suffices to show:

$$b(e^{2t}-1+\max\{0, 1+ze^{2t}/t\}) + a(ze^t-t) \geq 0 \quad (9)$$

where here a, b, z are all functions of the single variable t . For $t \geq 2.22$, this is immediate since $ze^t - t \geq 0$. We can divide the remaining search region $[4/3, 2.22]$ into strips of width $\varepsilon = 1/2000$. Within each strip, we use interval arithmetic in Mathematica to bound the LHS of Eq. (9). Over all regions, it is at least $0.0057 > 0$.

B Numerical analysis

Recall that we have the following values for the relevant parameters:

$\pi = 3.9$	$c_0 = 0.17556$
$\theta = 0.555$	$c_1 = 0.591909$
$\tau = 0.604$	$c_2 = 0.33965$
$\beta = 1.935$	$c_3 = 0.8277532$
$\delta = 1.3$	$c_4 = 0.035898$
$\gamma = 0.00547$	$c_5 = 0.004562$
$\kappa = 0.744$	$c_6 = 0.0676$

B.1 Calculation of c_1

Let us first calculate the value

$$c'_1 := \min_{\substack{r \in [\theta, \tau] \\ s \in [r, \pi r], x \in [0, r]}} \frac{s \cdot (x + (\frac{e^{1/r}-1}{e^{1/r}+1} - c_0x)(s-x))}{2(s-\kappa r)} \quad (10)$$

Define $t = s/r$. First, if $s \leq 4/3$, then $x + (\frac{e^{1/r}-1}{e^{1/r}+1} - c_0x)(s-x)$ is an increasing function of x . So we can lower-bound it in this range by its value at $x = 0$, namely:

$$\frac{s^2 \cdot \frac{e^{1/r}-1}{e^{1/r}+1}}{2(s-\kappa r)} = \frac{r(e^{1/r}-1)}{2e^{1/r}+2} \cdot \frac{t^2}{t-\kappa} \geq \frac{\theta(e^{1/\theta}-1)}{2e^{1/\theta}+2} \cdot 4\kappa \approx 0.591909465..$$

where the second inequality comes from straightforward calculus.

Next, we consider the case where $s \geq 4/3$. Since $r \leq \tau$, we can estimate:

$$\frac{s(x + (\frac{e^{1/r}-1}{e^{1/r}+1} - c_0x)(s-x))}{2(s-\kappa)r} \geq \frac{s(x + (\frac{e^{1/\tau}-1}{e^{1/\tau}+1} - c_0x)(s-x))}{2(s-\kappa r)} \quad (11)$$

Since the RHS of Eq. (11) is an algebraic function of r, s, x , it can be checked automatically that its minimum value is 0.6561... over the domain $r \in [\theta, \tau]$, $s \in [\max\{r, 4/3\}, \pi r]$, $x \in [0, r]$. Putting the two cases together, we have shown that $c'_1 \geq 0.591909465...$

We next turn to calculating the value

$$c''_1 := \min_{\substack{r \in [0, \theta], x \in [0, r] \\ y \in [\tau - r, 1], s \in [r, \pi r] \\ d \in [y, \pi y]}} \frac{d^2 + s \left(x + \left(\frac{e^{1/\tau} - 1}{e^{1/\tau} + 1} - c_0 x \right) (s - x) + \frac{2d((1-x/\tau)^{1-1/x} - 1)((r/\tau)^{1-1/y} - 1)}{(1-x/\tau)^{1-1/x}(r/\tau)^{1-1/y} - (r-x)/\tau} \right)}{2(s + d - \kappa(r + y))} \quad (12)$$

From Proposition 35, we note the following bound:

$$(1 - x/\tau)^{1-1/x} \geq e^{1/\tau} (1 - zx) \quad \text{for } z = \tau^{-1} - \tau^{-2}/2 \approx 0.285$$

We will divide the search region for r, y into boxes $[r_{\min}, r_{\max}] \times [y_{\min}, y_{\max}]$ of width $\varepsilon = 1/1000$. Within a given box (and subject to all other constraints on the variables), we can approximate:

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - x/\tau)^{1-1/x} &\geq u_0(1 - zx) \\ (r/\tau)^{1-1/y} &\geq (r_{\max}/\tau)^{1-1/y_{\max}} \geq u_1 \\ (r - x)/\tau &\geq (r_{\min} - x)/\tau \\ \frac{e^{1/\tau} - 1}{e^{1/\tau} + 1} &\geq u_2 \end{aligned}$$

for u_0, u_1, u_2 rational numbers within 10^{-7} of $e^{1/\tau}$, $(r_{\max}/\tau)^{1-1/y_{\max}}$, $\frac{e^{1/\tau} - 1}{e^{1/\tau} + 1}$ respectively. By Observation 36 and these other approximations, we can lower-bound the expression in Eq. (12) by:

$$\frac{d^2 + s \left(x + (u_2 - c_0 x)(s - x) + \frac{2d(u_0(1-zx) - 1)(u_1 - 1)}{u_0(1-zx)u_1 - (r_{\min} - x)/\tau} \right)}{2(s + d - \kappa(r_{\min} + y_{\min}))} \quad (13)$$

which is an algebraic function of x, s, d and now no longer depends upon r or y . For each such box, we use Mathematica algorithms to minimize over s, d, x subject to constraints $s \in [r_{\min}, \pi r_{\max}]$, $d \in [y_{\min}, \pi y_{\max}]$, $x \in [0, r_{\max}]$. With $\varepsilon = 1/1000$, we calculate a lower bound of $c'_1 \geq 0.5921116$.

B.2 Calculation of c_5

Recall the functions f, g, F defined as

$$\begin{aligned} f(r, t) &= \max\{0, c_1(t - \kappa) - c_2 r t^2\}, & g(r, t, h) &= h \cdot \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{\beta(h - \kappa)f(r, t)}{h^2(t - \kappa)}} \right) \\ F(h) &= \max_{\substack{r \in [0, \theta] \\ t \in [1, \pi]}} g(r, t, h) \left(c_4 + \frac{r(t + \delta)g(r, t, h)}{h + \delta} \right) - \frac{\gamma(h + \delta)f(r, t)}{t + \delta} \end{aligned}$$

Since $g(r, t, h)$ is a non-decreasing function of h , we can get an upper bound within a region $h \in [h_{\min}, h_{\max}]$ by:

$$F(h) \leq F^{\max}[h_{\min}, h_{\max}] := \max_{r \in \mathbb{R}, t \in [1, \pi]} g(r, t, h_{\max}) \left(c_4 + \frac{r(t + \delta)g(r, t, h_{\max})}{h_{\min} + \delta} \right) - (h_{\min} + \delta) \frac{\gamma f(r, t)}{t + \delta}$$

This can be evaluated easily by Mathematica for given h_{\min}, h_{\max} . Note that the constraint $r \in [0, \theta]$ has been relaxed to $r \in \mathbb{R}$; this is necessary for Mathematica to compute the optimization efficiently. To handle the overall integral $\int_{h=1}^{\pi} F(h)/h^3 dh$, we divide the integration region $[1, \pi]$ into strips of width $\varepsilon = 10^{-3}$, and estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{h=1}^{\pi} \frac{F(h)}{h^3} dh &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{\lceil (\pi-1)/\varepsilon \rceil - 1} \int_{h=1+i\varepsilon}^{1+(i+1)\varepsilon} \frac{F^{\max}[1+i\varepsilon, 1+(i+1)\varepsilon] dh}{h^3} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{\lceil (\pi-1)/\varepsilon \rceil - 1} F^{\max}[1+i\varepsilon, 1+(i+1)\varepsilon] \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2(i\varepsilon + 1)^2} - \frac{1}{2((i+1)\varepsilon + 1)^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

which is calculated to be at most c_5 .

References

- [1] N. Bansal, A. Srinivasan, and O. Svensson. Lift-and-round to improve weighted completion time on unrelated machines. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 50(3), pp. 138-159 (2021)
- [2] A. Baveja, X. Qu, A. Srinivasan. Approximating weighted completion time via stronger negative correlation. *Journal of Scheduling* (2023)
- [3] M. Charikar, S. Li. A dependent LP-rounding approach for the k -median problem. *Proc. 39th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP)*, pp. 194-205 (2012)
- [4] U. Feige, J. Vondrák. Approximation algorithms for allocation problems: Improving the factor of $1 - 1/e$. *Proc. 47th annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pp. 667-676 (2006)
- [5] R. Gandhi, S. Khuller, S. Parthasarathy, A. Srinivasan. Dependent rounding and its applications to approximation algorithms. *Journal of the ACM* 53(3), pp. 324-360 (2006)
- [6] D. Harris, T. Pensyl, A. Srinivasan, K. Trinh. Dependent randomized rounding for clustering and partition systems with knapsack constraints. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23(1), pp. 3494-3534 (2022).
- [7] H. Hoogeveen, P. Schuurman, G. J. Woeginger. Non-approximability results for scheduling problems with minsum criteria. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 13(2), pp. 157–168 (2001)
- [8] S. Im, M. Shadloo. Weighted completion time minimization for unrelated machines via iterative fair contention resolution. *Proc. 14th annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pp. 2790-2809 (2020)
- [9] S. Im, S. Li. Improved approximations for unrelated machine scheduling. *Proc. 2023 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pp. 2917-2946 (2023)
- [10] K. Joag-Dev, F. Proschan. Negative association of random variables with applications. *Annals of Statistics* 11(1), pp. 286-295 (1983)
- [11] S. Li. Scheduling to minimize total weighted completion time via time-indexed linear programming relaxations. *SIAM Journal on Computing* 49(4), pp. 409-440 (2020)
- [12] S. Li. Nearly-linear time LP solvers and rounding algorithms for scheduling problems. *Proc. 50th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP)*, Article #86 (2023)
- [13] A. Schulz, M. Skutella. Scheduling unrelated machines by randomized rounding. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 15(4), pp. 450–469 (2002)
- [14] J. Sethuraman and M. Squillante. Optimal scheduling of multiclass parallel machines. *Proc. 10th ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pp. 963-964 (1999)
- [15] M. Skutella. Convex quadratic and semidefinite programming relaxations in scheduling. *Journal of the ACM* 48(2), pp. 206–242 (2001)
- [16] W. E. Smith, Various optimizers for single-stage production. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly* 3(1-2), pp. 59-66 (1956).
- [17] D. Wajc. Negative association: definitions, properties, and applications. Manuscript, available from <https://goo.gl/j2ekqM> (2017)