

Two-machine Flow Shop Scheduling Problem with a Single Server and Equal Processing Times

Shi ling¹ and Cheng xue-guang²

Abstract

We study the problem of two-machine flow-shop scheduling with a single server and equal processing times, we show that this problem is NP -hard in the strong sense.

Mathematics Subject Classification : 90B35

Keywords: two-machine, flow-shop, single server, complexity, NP -hardness

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the problem in which we have two machines M_1, M_2 , a single server M_s and n jobs J_j with equal processing times

¹ Department of Mathematics, Hubei University for Nationalities, Enshi 445000, China,
e-mail: shiling59@126.com

² School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, China,
e-mail: chengxueguang6011@msn.com

$p_{1,j} = p_{2,j} = p$ and server times $s_{1,j}, s_{2,j}$ on machine M_1 and M_2 , respectively.

The problem can be described as the $F2, S1 | p_{i,j} = p | C_{\max}$ problem.

It is well known, S.M. Johnson [1], the $F2 | C_{\max}$ problem has a maximal polynomial solvable. P. Brucker [2] shows that the $F2, S1 | p_{i,j} = p | C_{\max}$ problem is *NP*-hard in the binary sense. In this paper, we will show that this problem is *NP*-hard in the strong sense.

2 Main result

Lemma 1 [3] Consider the $F2, S1 | p_{i,j} = p | C_{\max}$ problem with processing times $p_{i,j}$ and server times $s_{i,j}$, where $i = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then

$$C(\sigma, \tau) = \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left\{ \sum_{j \leq \sigma^{-1}(k)} (s_{1, \sigma(j)} + p_{1, \sigma(j)}) + \sum_{j \geq \tau^{-1}(k)} (s_{2, \tau(j)} + p_{2, \tau(j)}) \right\} \quad (1)$$

where $\sigma^{-1}(k)$ and $\tau^{-1}(k)$ denote the positions of job k in sequence σ and τ , respectively. For a schedule S , let $I_{i,j}(S)$ ($i = 1, 2; j = 1, 2, \dots, n$) denote the total idle times of job J_j on machine M_i , we have that

$$C_{\max}(S) = \max \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n (s_{1,j} + p_{1,j}) + I_{1,j}(S), \sum_{j=1}^n (s_{2,j} + p_{2,j}) + I_{2,j}(S) \right\} \quad (2)$$

Theorem 1 The $F2, S1 | p_{i,j} = p | C_{\max}$ problem is *NP*-hard in the strong sense.

Proof. We prove that the $F2, S1 | p_{i,j} = p | C_{\max}$ problem is *NP*-hard in the strong sense through a reduction from the *3-Partition* problem [4], which is known to be *NP*-hard in the strong sense, to the $F2, S1 | p_{i,j} = p | C_{\max}$ problem.

The *3-Partition* problem is then stated as:

3-Partition : Given a set of positive integers $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{3r}\}$, and a positive integer b with:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{3r} x_j = rb, \quad b/4 < x_j < b/2, \quad \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, r \quad (3)$$

Decide whether there exists a partition of X into r disjoint 3-element subset $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_r\}$ such that

$$\sum_{j \in X_i} x_j = b \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, r) \quad (4)$$

Given any instance of the 3-Partition problem, we define the following instance of the $F2, S1|p_{i,j} = p|C_{\max}$ problem with two types of jobs:

$$(1) \text{ P-job: } s_{1,j} = x_j, p_{1,j} = b, s_{2,j} = 0, p_{2,j} = b \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, 3r)$$

$$(2) \text{ U-job: } s_{1,j} = 0, p_{1,j} = b, s_{2,j} = b, p_{2,j} = b \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, r)$$

The threshold $y = 5br + 4b$ and the corresponding decision problem are: Is there a schedule S with makespan $C(S)$ not greater than $y = 5br + 4b$?

Observe that all processing times are equal to b . To prove the theorem we show that in this constructed instance of the $F2, S1|p_{i,j} = p|C_{\max}$ problem a schedule S_0 satisfying $C_{\max}(S_0) \leq y = 5br + 4b$ exists if and only if the 3-Partition problem has a solution.

Suppose that the 3-Partition problem has a solution, and X_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, r$) are the required subsets of set X . Notice that each set X_j contains precisely elements, since $b/4 < x_j < b/2$, and $\sum_{j=1}^{3r} x_j = rb$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$.

Let σ denotes a sequence of the elements of set X for which $X_j = \{\sigma(3j-2), \sigma(3j-1), \sigma(3j)\}$, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$. The desired schedule S_0 exists and can be described as follows. No machine has intermediate idle time. Machine M_1 process the P-jobs and U-jobs in order of the sequence σ , i.e., in the sequence

$$\sigma = (P_{\sigma(1,1)}, P_{\sigma(1,2)}, P_{\sigma(1,3)}, U_{1,1}, P_{\sigma(1,4)}, P_{\sigma(1,5)}, P_{\sigma(1,6)}, U_{1,2}, \dots, P_{\sigma(1,3r-2)}, P_{\sigma(1,3r-1)}, P_{\sigma(1,3r)}, U_{1,r})$$

While machine M_2 process the P-jobs and U-jobs in the order of sequence τ ,

i.e., in the sequence

$$\tau = (U_{2,1}, P_{\sigma(2,1)}, P_{\sigma(2,2)}, P_{\sigma(2,3)}, U_{2,2}, \dots, U_{2,r}, P_{\sigma(2,3r-2)}, P_{\sigma(2,3r-1)}, P_{\sigma(2,3r)})$$

Then, these sequences σ and τ fulfills $C(\sigma, \tau) \leq y$.

Conversely, assume that this flow-shop scheduling problem has a solution σ and τ with $C(\sigma, \tau) \leq y$. By setting $\sigma(j) = j$ ($j=1,2,3$) in (1), we get for all sequences σ and τ :

$$C(\sigma, \tau) \geq (s_{1,1} + p_{1,1} + s_{1,2} + p_{1,2} + s_{1,3} + p_{1,3}) + \sum_{\lambda=1}^n (s_{2,\tau_\lambda} + p_{2,\tau_\lambda}) = 5rb + 4b = y$$

Thus, for sequences σ and τ with $C(\sigma, \tau) = y$. We may conclude that

(a) Machine M_1 process jobs in the interval $[0, 5rb]$, without idle times. In the interval $[5jb, (5j+4)b]$ ($j=0,1,\dots,r-1$), machine M_1 process P -jobs, in the interval $[4jb, 5jb]$ ($j=1,2,\dots,r$) machine M_1 process U -jobs,

(b) Machine M_2 process jobs in the interval $[4b, 5rb + 4b]$, without idle times. In the interval $[(6+5j)b, (9+5j)b]$ ($r=0,1,\dots,r-1$), machine M_2 process P -jobs, in the interval $[(4+5j)b, (6+5j)b]$ ($j=0,1,\dots,r-1$) machine M_2 process U -jobs. Now, we will prove that the $\sum_{j \in X_i} (s_{1,i} + p_{1,i}) = 4b$.

If $\sum_{j \in X_i} (s_{1,i} + p_{1,i}) \geq 4b$, then U_{21} -job cannot start processing at time $4b$, which contradicts (2).

If $\sum_{j \in X_i} (s_{1,i} + p_{1,i}) \leq 4b$, then there is idle time before machine M_1 process job $U_{1,1}$, which contradicts (1). Thus, we have $\sum_{j \in X_i} (s_{1,i} + p_{1,i}) = 4b$.

Since $p_{1,1} = p_{1,2} = p_{1,3} = b, s_{1,i} = x_i$, then

$$\sum_{j \in X_i} (s_{1,i} + p_{1,i}) = (s_{1,1} + p_{1,1} + s_{1,2} + p_{1,2} + s_{1,3} + p_{1,3}) = 3b + \sum_{j \in X_i} x_j = 4b,$$

$$\sum_{j \in X_i} x_j = b.$$

The set X_1 give a solution to the 3-Partition problem.

Analogously, we show that the remaining sets X_2, X_3, \dots, X_r separated by the jobs

$1, 2, \dots, r$ contain 3-element and fulfill $\sum_{j \in X_i} x_j = b$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$. Thus, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_r define a solution of the 3-Partition problem.

References

- [1] S.M. Johnson. Optimal two-and-three-stage production schedules with set-up times included, *Naval Res. Quart.*, **1**, (1954), 61-68.
- [2] P. Brucker, S. Knust, G.Q. Wang, et al., Complexity of results for flow-shop problems with a single server, *European J. Oper. Res.*, **165**(2), (2005), 398-407.
- [3] W.C. Yu, *The two-machine flow shop problem with delays and the one machine total tardiness problem*, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, 1996.
- [4] P.C. Gilmore and R.E. Gomory, Sequencing a one-state variable machine: A solvable case of the traveling salesman problem, *Operations Research*, **12**, (1996), 655-679.