

6. DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING I

- ▶ *weighted interval scheduling*

- ▶ *knapsack problem*

Lecture slides by Kevin Wayne

Copyright © 2005 Pearson–Addison Wesley

Copyright © 2013 Kevin Wayne

<http://www.cs.princeton.edu/~wayne/kleinberg-tardos>

Algorithmic paradigms

Greedy. Build up a solution incrementally, myopically optimizing some local criterion.

Divide-and-conquer. Break up a problem into **independent** subproblems, solve each subproblem, and combine solution to subproblems to form solution to original problem.

Dynamic programming. Break up a problem into a series of **overlapping** subproblems, and build up solutions to larger and larger subproblems.

fancy name for
caching away intermediate results
in a table for later reuse



Dynamic programming history

Bellman. Pioneered the systematic study of dynamic programming in 1950s.

Etymology.

- Dynamic programming = planning over time.
- Secretary of Defense was hostile to mathematical research.
- Bellman sought an impressive name to avoid confrontation.



THE THEORY OF DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING

RICHARD BELLMAN

1. **Introduction.** Before turning to a discussion of some representative problems which will permit us to exhibit various mathematical features of the theory, let us present a brief survey of the fundamental concepts, hopes, and aspirations of dynamic programming.

To begin with, the theory was created to treat the mathematical problems arising from the study of various multi-stage decision processes, which may roughly be described in the following way: We have a physical system whose state at any time t is determined by a set of quantities which we call state parameters, or state variables. At certain times, which may be prescribed in advance, or which may be determined by the process itself, we are called upon to make decisions which will affect the state of the system. These decisions are equivalent to transformations of the state variables, the choice of a decision being identical with the choice of a transformation. The outcome of the preceding decisions is to be used to guide the choice of future ones, with the purpose of the whole process that of maximizing some function of the parameters describing the final state.

Examples of processes fitting this loose description are furnished by virtually every phase of modern life, from the planning of industrial production lines to the scheduling of patients at a medical clinic; from the determination of long-term investment programs for universities to the determination of a replacement policy for machinery in factories; from the programming of training policies for skilled and unskilled labor to the choice of optimal purchasing and inventory policies for department stores and military establishments.


Dynamic programming applications

Areas.

- Bioinformatics.
- Control theory.
- Information theory.
- Operations research.
- Computer science: theory, graphics, AI, compilers, systems,
- ...

Some famous dynamic programming algorithms.

- Unix diff for comparing two files.
- Viterbi for hidden Markov models.
- De Boor for evaluating spline curves.
- Smith-Waterman for genetic sequence alignment.
- Bellman-Ford for shortest path routing in networks.
- Cocke-Kasami-Younger for parsing context-free grammars.
- ...



6. DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING I

- ▶ *weighted interval scheduling*


- ▶ *knapsack problem*

SECTION 6.1–6.2

Weighted interval scheduling

Weighted interval scheduling problem.

- Job j starts at s_j , finishes at f_j , and has weight or value v_j .
- Two jobs compatible if they don't overlap.
- Goal: find maximum weight subset of mutually compatible jobs.




Earliest-finish-time first algorithm

Earliest finish-time first.

- Consider jobs in ascending order of finish time.
- Add job to subset if it is compatible with previously chosen jobs.

Recall. Greedy algorithm is correct if all weights are 1.

Observation. Greedy algorithm fails spectacularly for weighted version.




Weighted interval scheduling

Notation. Label jobs by finishing time: $f_1 \leq f_2 \leq \dots \leq f_n$.

Def. $p(j)$ = largest index $i < j$ such that job i is compatible with j .

Ex. $p(8) = 5, p(7) = 3, p(2) = 0$.



Dynamic programming: binary choice

Notation. $OPT(j)$ = value of optimal solution to the problem consisting of job requests $1, 2, \dots, j$.

Case 1. OPT selects job j .

- Collect profit v_j .
- Can't use incompatible jobs $\{ p(j) + 1, p(j) + 2, \dots, j - 1 \}$.
- Must include optimal solution to problem consisting of remaining compatible jobs $1, 2, \dots, p(j)$.

optimal substructure property
(proof via exchange argument)

Case 2. OPT does not select job j .

- Must include optimal solution to problem consisting of remaining compatible jobs $1, 2, \dots, j - 1$.

$$OPT(j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j=0 \\ \max \left\{ v_j + OPT(p(j)), OPT(j-1) \right\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Weighted interval scheduling: brute force



```
Input: n, s[1..n], f[1..n], v[1..n]
Sort jobs by finish time so that f[1] ≤ f[2] ≤ ... ≤ f[n].
Compute p[1], p[2], ..., p[n].
```

```
Compute-Opt(j)
if j = 0
    return 0.
else
    return max(v[j] + Compute-Opt(p[j]), Compute-Opt(j-1))
```

Weighted interval scheduling: brute force

Observation. Recursive algorithm fails spectacularly because of redundant subproblems \Rightarrow exponential algorithms.

Ex. Number of recursive calls for family of "layered" instances grows like Fibonacci sequence.



recursion tree

Weighted interval scheduling: memoization

Memoization. Cache results of each subproblem; lookup as needed.

Input: n , $s[1..n]$, $f[1..n]$, $v[1..n]$

Sort jobs by finish time so that $f[1] \leq f[2] \leq \dots \leq f[n]$.

Compute $p[1], p[2], \dots, p[n]$.

```
for j = 1 to n
    M[j] ← empty.
M[0] ← 0.
```

M-Compute-Opt(j)

```
if M[j] is empty
    M[j] ← max(v[j] + M-Compute-Opt(p[j]), M-Compute-Opt(j - 1)).
return M[j].
```

Weighted interval scheduling: running time

Claim. Memoized version of algorithm takes $O(n \log n)$ time.

- Sort by finish time: $O(n \log n)$.
- Computing $p(\cdot)$: $O(n \log n)$ via sorting by start time.
- M-COMPUTE-OPT(j): each invocation takes $O(1)$ time and either
 - (i) returns an existing value $M[j]$
 - (ii) fills in one new entry $M[j]$ and makes two recursive calls
- Progress measure $\Phi = \#$ nonempty entries of $M[]$.
 - initially $\Phi = 0$, throughout $\Phi \leq n$.
 - (ii) increases Φ by 1 \Rightarrow at most $2n$ recursive calls.
- Overall running time of M-COMPUTE-OPT(n) is $O(n)$. ▀

Remark. $O(n)$ if jobs are presorted by start and finish times.

Weighted interval scheduling: finding a solution

- Q. DP algorithm computes optimal value. How to find solution itself?
A. Make a second pass.

```
Find-Solution(j)
if j = 0
    return ∅.
else if (v[j] + M[p[j]] > M[j-1])
    return {j} ∪ Find-Solution(p[j]).  
else
    return Find-Solution(j-1).
```

Analysis. # of recursive calls $\leq n \Rightarrow O(n)$.

Weighted interval scheduling: bottom-up

Bottom-up dynamic programming. Unwind recursion.

BOTTOM-UP ($n, s_1, \dots, s_n, f_1, \dots, f_n, v_1, \dots, v_n$)


Sort jobs by finish time so that $f_1 \leq f_2 \leq \dots \leq f_n$.

Compute $p(1), p(2), \dots, p(n)$.

$M[0] \leftarrow 0$.

FOR $j = 1$ **TO** n

$M[j] \leftarrow \max \{ v_j + M[p(j)], M[j-1] \}$.



6. DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING I

- ▶ *weighted interval scheduling*
- ▶ *knapsack problem*

SECTION 6.4

Knapsack problem

- Given n objects and a "knapsack."
- Item i weighs $w_i > 0$ and has value $v_i > 0$.
- Knapsack has capacity of W .
- Goal: fill knapsack so as to maximize total value.

Ex. $\{1, 2, 5\}$ has value 35.

Ex. $\{3, 4\}$ has value 40.

Ex. $\{3, 5\}$ has value 46 (but exceeds weight limit).

i	v_i	w_i
1	1	1
2	6	2
3	18	5
4	22	6
5	28	7

knapsack instance
(weight limit $W = 11$)

Greedy by value. Repeatedly add item with maximum v_i .

Greedy by weight. Repeatedly add item with minimum w_i .

Greedy by ratio. Repeatedly add item with maximum ratio v_i / w_i .

Observation. None of greedy algorithms is optimal.

Dynamic programming: false start

Def. $OPT(i) = \max$ profit subset of items $1, \dots, i$.

Case 1. OPT does not select item i .

- OPT selects best of $\{1, 2, \dots, i-1\}$.

optimal substructure property
(proof via exchange argument)

Case 2. OPT selects item i .

- Selecting item i does not immediately imply that we will have to reject other items.
- Without knowing what other items were selected before i , we don't even know if we have enough room for i .

Conclusion. Need more subproblems!

Dynamic programming: adding a new variable

Def. $OPT(i, w) = \max$ profit subset of items $1, \dots, i$ with weight limit w .

Case 1. OPT does not select item i .

- OPT selects best of $\{1, 2, \dots, i-1\}$ using weight limit w .

Case 2. OPT selects item i .

- New weight limit $= w - w_i$.
- OPT selects best of $\{1, 2, \dots, i-1\}$ using this new weight limit.

optimal substructure property
(proof via exchange argument)

$$OPT(i, w) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = 0 \\ OPT(i-1, w) & \text{if } w_i > w \\ \max\{ OPT(i-1, w), v_i + OPT(i-1, w - w_i) \} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Knapsack problem: bottom-up

KNAPSACK ($n, W, w_1, \dots, w_n, v_1, \dots, v_n$)

FOR $w = 0$ TO W

$M[0, w] \leftarrow 0.$

FOR $i = 1$ TO n

FOR $w = 1$ TO W

IF $(w_i > w)$ $M[i, w] \leftarrow M[i-1, w].$


ELSE $M[i, w] \leftarrow \max \{ M[i-1, w], v_i + M[i-1, w - w_i] \}.$

RETURN $M[n, W].$

Knapsack problem: bottom-up demo

i	v_i	w_i
1	1	1
2	6	2
3	18	5
4	22	6
5	28	7

$$OPT(i, w) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = 0 \\ OPT(i-1, w) & \text{if } w_i > w \\ \max\{ OPT(i-1, w), v_i + OPT(i-1, w-w_i) \} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$



$OPT(i, w) = \max \text{ profit subset of items } 1, \dots, i \text{ with weight limit } w.$

Knapsack problem: running time

Theorem. There exists an algorithm to solve the knapsack problem with n items and maximum weight W in $\Theta(n W)$ time and $\Theta(n W)$ space.

Pf.

- Takes $O(1)$ time per table entry.
- There are $\Theta(n W)$ table entries.
- After computing optimal values, can trace back to find solution:
take item i in $OPT(i, w)$ iff $M[i, w] > M[i - 1, w]$. ▀

weights are integers
between 1 and W