

Engineering Optimal Parallel Task Scheduling

Matthew Akram ✉

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany

Nikolai Maas ✉

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany

Peter Sanders ✉

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany

Dominik Schreiber ✉

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany

Abstract

The NP-hard scheduling problem $P||C_{\max}$ encompasses a set of tasks with known execution time which must be mapped to a set of identical machines such that the overall completion time is minimized. In this work, we improve existing techniques for optimal $P||C_{\max}$ scheduling with a combination of new theoretical insights and careful practical engineering. Most importantly, we derive techniques to prune vast portions of the search space of branch-and-bound (BnB) approaches. We also propose improved upper and lower bounding techniques which can be combined with any approach to $P||C_{\max}$. Moreover, we present new benchmarks for $P||C_{\max}$, based on diverse application data, which can shed light on aspects which prior synthetic instances fail to capture. In an extensive evaluation, we observe that our pruning techniques reduce the number of explored nodes by $90\times$ and running times by $12\times$. Compared to a state-of-the-art ILP-based approach, our approach is preferable for short running time limits and for instances with large makespans.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation \rightarrow Branch-and-bound

Keywords and phrases $P||C_{\max}$, Branch and Bound, Backtracking, Pruning Rules, Dominance Criteria, Scheduling

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs.CVIT.2016.23

arXiv:2405.15371v1 [cs.DS] 24 May 2024



© Matthew Akram and Nikolai Maas and Peter Sanders and Dominik Schreiber; licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

42nd Conference on Very Important Topics (CVIT 2016).

Editors: John Q. Open and Joan R. Access; Article No. 23; pp. 23:1–23:21



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

LIPICs Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

1 Introduction

One of the most fundamental yet still challenging load balancing problems in computer science is the problem of *unconstrained, non-preemptive task scheduling on identical parallel machines*. This problem is often denoted by its Graham notation $P||C_{\max}$ [8], where P represents identical machines running in parallel. The jobs to process are given as a set of integers, each indicating the time (or *work*) a job takes. Our objective is to minimize C_{\max} , the maximum makespan (completion time) of any machine. $P||C_{\max}$ is a strongly NP-hard problem [6] and, as such, demands either inexact solving or exponential complexity [1] in order to conquer non-trivial instances. We focus on *branch-and-bound* (BnB) schemes [3, 26], which are able to find *optimal solutions* by heuristically pruning the search space.

In this work, we advance existing techniques for optimal $P||C_{\max}$ scheduling. With the original intention of exploring efficient reductions of $P||C_{\max}$ to propositional satisfiability (SAT), we have investigated ways to constrain the search space of $P||C_{\max}$ *decision instances*. The objective of a decision instance is to decide for a particular U whether a solution with $C_{\max} \leq U$ exists. Focusing on this decision problem yields a series of interesting and powerful insights which prove especially useful for BnB based scheduling approaches.

Our contributions are the following. First and foremost, we introduce new pruning rules based on the $P||C_{\max}$ decision problem which can prune vast portions of an instance’s effective search space, especially for BnB (Section 3). Secondly, we improve existing techniques to compute lower and upper bounds for C_{\max} (Section 4). We then present an efficient implementation of our techniques within a BnB scheme (Section 5). Furthermore, we introduce a new, large benchmark set crafted from realistic and diverse application data to complement prior, purely synthetic benchmark sets. We evaluate our contributions in thorough experiments (Section 6) and observe drastic improvements. In particular, our BnB pruning techniques reduce explored nodes by two orders of magnitude, which results in substantial speedups and allows to solve 64% more instances. Compared to a state-of-the-art approach based on Integer Linear Programming (ILP) [20], our approach solves fewer instances but is significantly faster and tends to scale better to large makespans.

A small subset of preliminary results of this line of work was briefly announced in Ref. [todo: not yet published]—only covering rules R6 and R7.

2 Preliminaries

A $P||C_{\max}$ *optimization instance* (W, m) is defined by n durations $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$ of n corresponding jobs $J = \{j_1, \dots, j_n\}$ and by the number m of identical processors $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$. An instance (W, m) asks for an *assignment* $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ of jobs to machines ($1 \leq a_i \leq m$) such that the *maximum completion time* $C_{\max} := \max_i \{\sum_{k|a_k=i} w_k\}$ is minimized. By contrast, a *decision instance* (W, m, U) additionally imposes an *upper bound* U for C_{\max} and poses the question whether a feasible solution exists. Throughout this paper we assume that the jobs are sorted by duration in decreasing order (i.e., $w_1 \geq w_2 \geq \dots \geq w_n$).

A *branch-and-bound* (BnB) algorithm for $P||C_{\max}$ is a tree-like search where we extend an initially empty *partial assignment* A of jobs to processors until $|A| = n$. At each *decision level* ℓ , where $|A| = \ell$, we assign job $j_{\ell+1}$ to a processor. Each possible assignment constitutes a decision (“branch”) of the algorithm. In addition, we maintain admissible bounds on C_{\max} during the search, which allows us to exclude decisions which inevitably lead to sub-optimal solutions (“bound”). We recursively search the remaining decisions in a heuristically chosen order. For each decision level ℓ , we define the *assigned workload* of processor p_x as $C_x^\ell := \sum_{i|a_i=x} w_i$. The *least loaded* processor is the one with smallest C_x^ℓ .

2.1 Related Work

$P||C_{\max}$ has been extensively studied as it has a simple formulation and is yet difficult to solve, with many interesting aspects both in theory and practice. For a thorough summary of works on $P||C_{\max}$, we refer to the excellent related work sections by Lawrinenko et al. [16, 26] and Mrad et al. [20], covering most works up to 2017. More recent research has mostly focused on generalized problem variants with additional constraints. Since the $P||C_{\max}$ *decision* problem is equivalent to the widely-studied bin packing problem (BPP), exact algorithms for the BPP can be of interest for $P||C_{\max}$ scheduling. While a further comparison is out of scope for this work, we refer to Delorme et al. [4] for an overview of such techniques.

A simple and fast $P||C_{\max}$ approximation is provided by Graham’s *longest-processing-time-first* (LPT) strategy, which assigns jobs in decreasing order of duration to the currently least loaded processor and has an approximation ratio of $4/3$ [7]. There are also EPTAS for $P||C_{\max}$, which provide arbitrarily good approximations in theory. However, achieving approximations that substantially outperform simpler algorithms is rather difficult in practice [1].

An important technique is the identification of *upper and lower bounds* on the optimal makespan of a given $P||C_{\max}$ instance. Restricting the range of admissible makespans can greatly benefit exact solvers, especially if one of the given bounds is tight. Haouari et al. [10, 11] present state-of-the-art lower bounding techniques, as well as two lifting procedures to further improve lower bounding algorithms. They also propose the *multi-start subset sum* upper bounding technique, which is essentially a local search scheme with restarts. Dell’Amico et al. [2] introduce a scatter-search based bounding technique that gives their exact solving scheme excellent performance. Since *any* $P||C_{\max}$ scheduling approach constitutes an upper bounding technique, the overall literature on upper bounds is vast [16].

We now turn to exact solving procedures. Historically one of the first approaches, Rothkopf [23] presented in 1966 a dynamic programming approach in $O(n \cdot U^m)$. Mokotoff [19] proposes a cutting plane algorithm where valid inequalities are identified and added to an LP encoding until the respective solution is integer. Dell’Amico and Martello [3] introduced the first BnB algorithm for $P||C_{\max}$ as well as pruning rules to decrease the size of the search space. Haouari and Jemmali [11] use a different branch order to construct a novel BnB algorithm which compares favorably to the algorithm by Dell’Amico and Martello. In addition, they argue that future work should focus on instances with n/m close to 2.5, since most other instances proved easy to solve in their experiments. Dell’Amico et al. [2] present a hybrid approach with excellent performance even on large instances. It consists of a scatter search algorithm, followed by an ILP translation and a dedicated BnB scheme to solve the latter.¹ Lawrinenko [16, 26] studies the structure of solutions of the $P||C_{\max}$ problem to develop new pruning rules for a BnB algorithm. The algorithm improves performance on the instances proposed by Haouari and Jemmali, but incurs notable overhead on other instance sets. Finally, Mrad et al. [20] present a pseudo-polynomial ILP encoding of the $P||C_{\max}$ problem with great performance on the instances proposed by Haouari and Jemmali.

3 Pruning the Search Space of $P||C_{\max}$

The performance of exact solvers heavily depends on how they explore the space of possible assignments of jobs to processors. In the following, we investigate effective methods to prune the search space of a $P||C_{\max}$ instance. We begin with *pruning rules*—also known

¹ Unfortunately, a full reimplementaion of this approach was out of scope for the work at hand.

as *dominance criteria* or *symmetry breaking*—that restrict the structure of a solution while preserving at least one feasible assignment. We then show how to detect dead-ends in the search space by transferring *clause learning* techniques known from SAT solving.

3.1 Prior Pruning Rules

Dell’Amico and Martello [3] present a number of BnB pruning rules for the $P||C_{\max}$ optimization problem. For each rule we consider a partial assignment A at decision level ℓ . Remember that we always assume the jobs are sorted by duration (i.e., $w_1 \geq \dots \geq w_n$).

► **Pruning Rule 1.** *If there are multiple processors $P := \{p_x, p_y, \dots\}$ with identical loads $C_x^\ell = C_y^\ell = \dots$, then only one processor in P has to be considered when assigning $j_{\ell+1}$.*

► **Pruning Rule 2.** *If $w_\ell = w_{\ell+1}$, then only decisions with $a_{\ell+1} \leq a_\ell$ need to be considered.*

► **Pruning Rule 3.** *If three jobs remain unassigned, only two options need to be considered: (1) Assign each of the jobs to the least loaded processor respectively and (2) assign the third-to-last job to the second least loaded processor, then assign the other two jobs as in (1).*

► **Pruning Rule 4.** *If $i < m$ jobs remain unassigned, then only the i least loaded processors need to be considered for the next decision.*

These are the only rules from the literature that we use in this paper; for more rules we refer to the literature on the subject [3, 11, 16].

3.2 New Pruning Rules

In the following, we consider a *decision* problem instance (W, m, U) and a feasible partial assignment A at decision level ℓ . We first present a new rule that allows us to efficiently handle the base case where all remaining jobs share the same duration.

► **Pruning Rule 5.** *If all unassigned jobs have equal duration (i.e., $w_{\ell+1} = \dots = w_n$), then there is a valid completion of A if and only if*

$$\sum_{x=1}^m \left\lfloor \frac{U - C_x^\ell}{w_n} \right\rfloor \geq n - \ell.$$

If there is a valid completion for A , then such a completion can be obtained by iteratively assigning each remaining job to a processor p_x which satisfies $C_x^\ell + w_n \leq U$.

Intuitively, we compute the number of “slots” of size w_n left on each processor and compare it to the number of remaining jobs. The exact mapping of jobs to slots is inconsequential, thus only one assignment needs to be considered. In Appendix A, we extend this idea to *two* remaining job durations. We can also restate this rule for the $P||C_{\max}$ optimization problem as follows: If all remaining jobs have the same duration, an optimal completion can be obtained via the LPT algorithm.

Next, we provide stronger rules for breaking symmetries between processors. Assume that we already assigned $u < U$ work to a certain processor and now decide whether to assign $j_{\ell+1}$ to this processor. Given the set $J_{\ell+1} := \{j_{\ell+1}, \dots, j_n\}$ of *smaller jobs*, we define the function

$$\phi(\ell, u) := \{J' \subseteq J_{\ell+1} \mid u + \sum_{j_k \in J'} w_k \leq U\}.$$

ϕ lists all possible combinations of jobs we can assign to a processor to still have an assigned workload (on this processor) $\leq U$. With that we obtain the following pruning rules.

► **Pruning Rule 6.** *If there are multiple processors $P := \{p_x, p_y, \dots\}$ such that $\phi(\ell, C_x^\ell) = \phi(\ell, C_y^\ell) = \dots$, then only one processor in P has to be considered when assigning $j_{\ell+1}$.*

This is a generalization of R1. The reasoning behind this rule is that if two processors have equal ϕ sets for a given partial assignment, then any completion of one processor can also be used as a completion of the other.

► **Pruning Rule 7 (The Fill-Up Rule, FUR).** *If $j_{\ell+1}$ is the largest unassigned job that can still be assigned to processor p_x (i.e., $C_x^\ell + w_{\ell+1} \leq U$) and $\phi(\ell, C_x^\ell) = \phi(\ell, U - w_{\ell+1})$, then we only need to consider the decision $a_{\ell+1} = x$.*

This rule is valid since any set of jobs that can be used to complete this processor will have a total weight of at most $w_{\ell+1}$. Thus, the jobs assigned to complete this processor can always be swapped with $j_{\ell+1}$ in any completion where it is not assigned to this processor.

In addition to this, the rule enables pruning when the upper bound is updated. This is described in the following theorem.

► **Theorem 1.** *Consider the case that the FUR applies to job $j_{\ell+1}$ and processor p_x and let $A' := A \cup \{a_{\ell+1} = x\}$ be the partial assignment created by it. If an optimal completion of A' has makespan U' such that $U' > C_x^\ell + w_{\ell+1}$, then it is also an optimal completion of A .*

Proof. Assume there is a feasible completion of A for the decision instance with makespan $U' - 1$. Then A is a valid partial assignment and since $C_x^\ell + w_{\ell+1} \leq U' - 1$, the FUR is applicable to p_x . The correctness of the FUR implies that if a feasible completion exists for A , a feasible completion also exists for A' , which is a contradiction. ◀

The effectiveness of the rules that use the ϕ function highly depends on the sizes of the remaining jobs. In the following, we show that the smallest jobs can be removed from the instance in some cases, thereby enabling stronger symmetry breaking via the ϕ function.

► **Theorem 2.** *If the following inequality holds,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} w_i < m(U - w_n + 1),$$

the instance (W, m, U) is equivalent to $(W \setminus \{w_n\}, m, U)$, where the smallest job is removed.

In essence, this is an application of the pigeon-hole principle. If the inequality holds, then there is at least one processor with enough space remaining to assign w_n . Note that this theorem may apply again for the newly created instance, allowing to remove multiple jobs.

3.3 Efficient Computation

Since ϕ encompasses a combinatorial co-domain, computing it explicitly would be prohibitively expensive. Therefore, we introduce an auxiliary data structure named *range equivalency table (RET)*, which allows us to *implicitly* determine whether $\phi(\ell, C_x^\ell) = \phi(\ell, C_y^\ell)$.

Let us first highlight two interesting properties of ϕ . First, $\phi(\ell, u) \supseteq \phi(\ell, u + 1)$ for all $u < U$. This is because the sets of admissible jobs will never decrease when increasing the available processing time. Secondly, for $\ell < n$, the valid ways to assign jobs that may or may not include $j_{\ell+1}$ is equal to the union of valid ways of assigning jobs that do not include $j_{\ell+1}$, and the valid ways of assigning jobs that do:

$$\phi(\ell, u) = \phi(\ell + 1, u) \cup \{j_{\ell+1} \cup X \mid X \in \phi(\ell + 1, u + w_{\ell+1})\}. \quad (1)$$

We define the RET as an $n \times (U + 1)$ table with entries in \mathbb{N} —one row for each job and one column for each possible assigned workload. For a job j_i , an *equivalence range* is a range of workloads u, \dots, u' such that $RET[i][u] = \dots = RET[i][u']$. For such a range we assert that $\phi(i - 1, u) = \dots = \phi(i - 1, u')$. This means that, regardless of whether a processor's load is u or u' (or in between), the possible combinations of jobs from j_i onward which can still be assigned to the processor are exactly the same.

We construct the RET going from the smallest (j_n) to the largest job (j_1). For j_n , if $u + w_n \leq U$ then assigning j_n still constitutes a valid workload; $\phi(j_n, u) = \{\emptyset, \{j_n\}\}$. Otherwise, assigning no further job is the only option; $\phi(j_n, u) = \{\emptyset\}$. We thus initialize two equivalence ranges: $RET[n][u] = 1$ for $U - w_n < u \leq U$ and $RET[n][u] = 2$ for $0 \leq u \leq U - w_n$. For job j_i ($i < n$), we denote the two relevant prior entries for applying property (1) as $left(i, u) := RET[i + 1][u]$ and $right(i, u) := RET[i + 1][u + w_i]$ (with $right(i, u) := 0$ if $u + w_i > U$). Note that going from some u to $u - 1$, the equivalence range for j_i should remain unchanged if and only if both $left$ and $right$ remain unchanged. As such, we start by setting $RET[i][U] := 1$ and then proceed sequentially for $u = U - 1, U - 2, \dots, 0$:

$$RET[i][u] := \begin{cases} RET[i][u + 1], & \text{if } left(i, u) = left(i, u + 1) \\ & \wedge right(i, u) = right(i, u + 1), \\ RET[i][u + 1] + 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

► **Theorem 3.** *Given an instance (W, m, U) of the $P||C_{\max}$ decision problem, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $u, u' < U$: $RET[i][u] = RET[i][u'] \Leftrightarrow \phi(i - 1, u) = \phi(i - 1, u')$.*


Proof. By induction. For $i = n$ this property is clear. For $i < n$, we assume that Theorem 3 holds for $i + 1$. If $RET[i][u] = RET[i][u']$, then we know $RET[i + 1][u] = RET[i + 1][u']$ and $RET[i + 1][u + w_i] = RET[i + 1][u' + w_i]$. Via Theorem 3 for $i + 1$, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(i - 1, u) &= \phi(i, u) \cup \{j_i \cup x \mid x \in \phi(i, u + w_i)\} \\ &= \phi(i, u') \cup \{j_i \cup x \mid x \in \phi(i, u' + w_i)\} = \phi(i - 1, u'). \end{aligned}$$

If $RET[i][u] \neq RET[i][u']$, then either $left(i, u) \neq left(i, u')$ or $right(i, u) \neq right(i, u')$. W.l.o.g., assume $u < u'$. If $left(i, u) \neq left(i, u')$, then, via Theorem 3 for $i + 1$, $\phi(i, u) \supsetneq \phi(i, u')$. Therefore, $\phi(i - 1, u) \supsetneq \phi(i - 1, u')$ since all other elements in either set must contain j_i . The case where $right(i, u) \neq right(i, u')$ proceeds analogously. ◀

3.4 SAT-inspired Learning of Dead-ends

For our next contribution, let us examine a crucial feature of modern SAT solvers, namely the *clause learning* performed by the CDCL algorithm [18]. When a CDCL solver encounters a logical conflict during its search through the space of partial assignments, it detects a subset



■ **Figure 1** The two shown assignments are equivalent when re-ordering the machines and then focusing on the resulting silhouette (center). Numbers correspond to job indices.

of the current partial assignment that causes this conflict and derives a new clause from it that can be added to the formula. The SAT solver’s logic now ensures that the sub-space triggering the found conflict will never be revisited (except if the learned clause is discarded).

We transfer this technique to our BnB algorithm for $P||C_{\max}$. Given a partial assignment that leads to a conflict, i.e., an infeasible assignment, we ensure that we do not visit the partial assignment again. To represent the relevant information of the current partial assignment in a compact manner, we introduce the notion of *silhouettes*: Given a partial assignment A that assigns jobs j_1, \dots, j_i , we define the silhouette of A as the multiset $\{C_1^A, \dots, C_m^A\}$. It is clear that given two partial assignments with the same silhouette, one can be completed to obtain an optimal solution if and only if the other one can as well. Fig. 1 provides an illustration. In the context of the $P||C_{\max}$ decision problem, we can further generalize this notion using the ϕ function. Instead of storing the makespan of each processor at the current state, we store its current equivalence range. We define the *Generalised Silhouette (gist)* as the pair $(G, i + 1)$ where G is the multiset $\{RET[i + 1][C_1^A], \dots, RET[i + 1][C_m^A]\}$.

If two states have the same gist, then they are equivalent in the context of the $P||C_{\max}$ decision problem: If one of the two can be completed to obtain a feasible solution, then the other one can as well. We refer to our BnB algorithm which exploits this property as *Conflict Driven Silhouette Memory (CDSM)*. CDSM memorizes visited gists and prunes all decisions that would lead to a memorized gist, since an equivalent partial assignment has already been visited. In other words, CDSM needs to branch on each stored gist only once.

4 Bounding Techniques

Upper and lower bounding techniques can solve many $P||C_{\max}$ instances exactly and accelerate exact solving in many other cases [11]. We now outline our improved bounding methods.

4.1 Lower Bounds

Good lower bounds are crucial to solve “simple” instances without invoking an exact solver. Moreover, they can at times take the burden from a complete solver to “prove” that a certain decision instance is infeasible—a co-NP-complete task which can be prohibitively costly in the general case. As such, lower bounds can drastically accelerate BnB approaches.

Haouari et al. [10] show that for a given $P||C_{\max}$ instance, there are $O(n)$ easily obtainable sub-instances for which a lower bound can provide a close-to-optimal lower bound on the original instance. We refer to the original publication for the exact manner in which these instances are generated. We propose to take this method a step further by solving these sub-instances *optimally*, which yields tighter bounds on our original problem if done correctly.

Lift++. Given an instance (W, m) of the $P||C_{\max}$ problem and initial upper and lower bounds U, L , we use the procedure presented by Haouari et al. to generate sub-instances and bound them from above and below. We then attempt to optimally solve any sub-instances that might improve upon the best lower bound L on our original instance. For any sub-instance with bounds U', L' such that $U' > L$ we try to solve it exactly within a given time frame. We choose our time frame in such a way that solving each instance can be attempted within the time allocated to this bounding technique. Preliminary tests show that in practical scenarios, the number of such instances tends to be very small (0–5). These instances also tend to be very small, meaning they can be solved exactly almost all the time.

4.2 Upper Bounds

Upper bounds reduce the initial search space and thereby reduce the work that an exact solver needs to perform. It is beneficial to employ a series of upper bounding procedures of varying cost and accuracy: A cheap upper bound sometimes solves a $P||C_{\max}$ instance exactly, which allows to use more expensive techniques more sparingly.

LPT++. We propose to use a modified version of the Fill-Up Rule, which does not require the RET, for improving upper bound heuristics. Given the largest unassigned job j_i and a processor p_x with remaining space exactly w_i , we can assign j_i to p_x and maintain feasibility. The *LPT++ heuristic* for $P||C_{\max}$ decision instances then works by combining the LPT algorithm with this rule. To obtain a new upper bound, we execute LPT++ for makespans within a given initial lower and upper bound. The lowest value where LPT++ succeeds is an upper bound for the original $P||C_{\max}$ instance.

MS++. Our *MS++ heuristic* is loosely inspired by the *Multi-Subset* heuristic by Dell’Amico and Martello [3]. For each processor p_x of a $P||C_{\max}$ decision problem, we solve a *Subset-Sum-Problem* (SSP) with the remaining jobs—sequentially assigning the subset of jobs that maximises C_x while maintaining $C_x \leq U$. This can be done in pseudo-polynomial time using dynamic programming [22]. Similar to the LPT++ heuristic, we then obtain a new bound by executing the MS++ heuristic for makespans within some initial bounds.

S⁴. The *Single Start Subset-Sum* heuristic is inspired by the *Multi-Start Subset-Sum* (MSS) heuristic by Haouari and Jemali [11]. MSS starts with a random assignment. Then, it repeatedly chooses two processors at random to reschedule all of their jobs optimally on those two processors via an exact algorithm for SSP. When a local minimum is reached, MSS restarts with a new random assignment. In the S⁴ heuristic, we instead start with a high-quality assignment, and improve it similarly to MSS. To escape local minima, we use perturbations. We select a processor at random, remove $i \ll n$ of its jobs, and reschedule them randomly. This perturbation factor is gradually increased until a timeout is reached.

5 Implementation

We implemented a single BnB framework integrating all of our applicable techniques. A flow chart for the full recursive algorithm (CDSM) is given in Fig. 2.




Figure 2 BnB algorithm. Diamonds represent “if-then-else” nodes; green filled arrows represent TRUE-branches, orange non-filled arrows represent FALSE-branches. Where applicable, diamonds are labelled with the rule or the theorem enabled by the respective condition. Global fields common to all recursive calls are U and L , irrelevance index ρ , the RET, state table ST, and best solution S .

CDSM takes a partial assignment A (initially $A = \emptyset$) and accesses global variables for W , m , L , and U . In addition, we use S to represent the current best solution, whose makespan is $U + 1$ (initialized via some upper bound), and ρ for the job index where *all later jobs are eliminated* by Theorem 2. The RET as well as the *State Table* (ST), which is implemented as a hash table, are also global objects. Before calling CDSM for the first time, we pre-compute ρ and the RET (disregarding irrelevant jobs according to ρ) once. CDSM returns TRUE iff it completed A in makespan $\leq U$, in which case S is guaranteed to be an *optimal* completion of A . This invariant allows to solve the optimization problem with a single top-level call to CDSM while taking full advantage of the pruning rules for the decision problem.

Whenever a solution is found, we update U , the RET, and ρ . If ρ changes, we lazily reconstruct the RET from the bottom up, due to the newly considered jobs, until we detect that levels no longer change. Note that we also need to clear the ST in this case. If ρ does not change, it suffices to shift each entry in the RET by one to match the decrease in U . We implement this by incorporating an offset into each RET query.

For each call to CDSM with a previously unseen gist, we first check whether completing A within $[L, U)$ is clearly infeasible: We ignore processors where we can no longer insert any jobs and sum up the free space on the remaining processors. If this space is less than the sum of the remaining job weights or if updating L via the trivial lower bound [3] yields $L > U$, the instance is infeasible. Otherwise, we apply our pruning rules where possible, excluding jobs that are irrelevant according to ρ .² After applying R3, R5, or Theorem 2, recursion may be required if U is updated, since this possibly unlocks further improvements. If we apply R7 and the initial recursion succeeds, we can either apply Theorem 1 or else need to undo the FUR assignment to recurse with the new bound. In the most general case, we branch over all processors not pruned by R2, R4, or R6. We first explore the branch that assigns the job to the least loaded processor, since preliminary experiments showed this is more effective than selecting the branch based on the processor index.

6 Evaluation

We implemented our approach in Rust and used (A) an 80-core ARM Neoverse-N1 at 3 GHz with 256 GB of RAM and (B) a 64-core AMD EPYC Rome 7702P at ≤ 3.35 GHz with 1 TB of RAM. Code and data are available at <https://github.com/anon495351/pcmax>.

6.1 Benchmarks

We consider three kinds of benchmarks. First and foremost, we use three different benchmark sets from literature, which consist of randomly generated instances:

- **Lawrinenko**: 3500 benchmarks as described by Mrad and Souyah [20], originating from unpublished work by Lawrinenko, inspired by the findings of Haouari and Jemmali [11].
- **Berndt**: 3060 benchmarks generated as described by Berndt et al. [1].
- **Frangioni**: 780 benchmarks as described by Frangioni et al. [5].

Secondly, we assembled benchmarks based on real data from three application disciplines:

- **Running times**. We constructed $P||C_{\max}$ instances from running times of certain applications. We use running times from SAT Competition 2022 (in s and s/10, each with one unit of upstart time added) and parallel SAT solving [24] (in s/10), bioinformatics

² Note that most pruning rules do not interfere, with one exception. When R7 is applied to a job, this job is not eligible for R2 anymore. We implement this by simply marking the according jobs.

tool RAxML [13, 14] (in s), MapReduce applications [12] (in min), perfect hashing [17] (in μs), and queries for dynamic taxi-sharing [15] (in ms)³. In cases where we sample job sizes from a large set of values and thus n is variable, we used $n/m \in \{2, 2.5, \dots, 4.5, 5\}$.

- **Vertex degrees in a graph.** When processing graphs in distributed systems, a graph is commonly partitioned across the compute nodes, while using edge counts to approximate workload. We thus consider each vertex as a job whose size is equal to the vertex degree.
- **Clause lengths in a CNF.** An undisclosed researcher is considering distributed simplification techniques for SAT solving. Some simplification techniques can be performed for each problem clause of length > 1 (e.g., clause strengthening), and these simplifications may be load balanced according to the total literals assigned to each processor.


Thirdly, we consider *planted instances*. Given parameters (n, m, U) , we begin with an optimal scheduling of m jobs on m processors, each with duration U . We draw a pair (x, t) of processor x and time $0 \leq t < U$ uniformly at random and cut the job at this spot into two jobs. This step is repeated until there are n jobs. We then increment the duration of $\lceil r \cdot n \rceil$ random jobs, for $r \in \{0, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1\}$, and output a $P||C_{\max}$ instance with the sorted job durations. For each m , we considered job-to-processor ratios $n/m \in \{2, 2.5, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10\}$.

For our application and planted benchmarks, we construct $P||C_{\max}$ instances for numbers of processors $m \in \{3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 20, 30, 50, 100, 300, 500, 1000, 2000, 3000\}$, and we pre-filter instances where LPT combined with trivial lower bounds identifies an optimal solution.


6.2 Results

First of all, Fig. 3 shows results regarding our bounding techniques (machine A). In this discussion, we only consider instances for which we know an optimal makespan C^* (16 277 instances), which allows us to rate each found bound C by how close C/C^* is to 1. We run each bound with a 10 s timeout. In terms of lower bounds, we compare our technique Lift++

³ Even though these running times are *a priori* unknown in reality, the underlying job size distributions can still be relevant, e.g., when comparing online schedulers to an optimal offline schedule of *observed* running times [25] or when computing offline schedules based on *predicted* running times [21].



■ **Figure 3** Results of bounding experiments. Red denotes upper bounds, blue denotes lower bounds. Left: Bounding quality. Each curve represents the quotients between a technique’s found bound and the corresponding optimal makespan, sorted by their difference to 1 and normalised to the x interval $[0, 1]$. Right: Cumulative running time distributions (higher is better).



■ **Figure 4** Cumulative running times for BnB and ILP approaches, disregarding instances solved exactly by bounding. Note the log. scale in x direction. The accompanying table shows relative improvements over “Base” w.r.t. solved instances, running times, and explored nodes. VBS (“Virtual Best Solver”) depicts a virtual running time oracle combining CDSM and ILP.

to the prior lifting approach (“Lift”) [10], to SSS-bounding-strengthening (“SSS-BS”) [11], and the trivial bound by Dell’Amico and Martello [3]. Lift++ is able to improve on the prior lifting technique’s lower bounds on 8% of all instances, bounds 91.1% of instances *optimally* (83.4% for Lift), and always reports the best lower bound among all considered bounding techniques. In turn, Lift++ incurs a geometric mean slowdown of 21.7% over Lift.

In terms of upper bounds, we compare our approaches to Multi-Start-Subset-Sum [11] and LPT. MS++ provides an appealing middle ground between basic and high-quality bounding techniques in terms of time-quality tradeoff, whereas S^4 is able to further improve upon the high-quality bounds of MSS. Specifically, with MS++ providing a warm start, S^4 bounds 89.1% of instances optimally (82.6% for MSS) while also achieving a substantial geometric mean speedup of 20.6 over MSS. That being said, we acknowledge that literature on upper bounding techniques is vast whereas we only considered a small selection of techniques.


The best combination of a lower bound and an upper bound—Lift++ and S^4 —tightly bounds 13 887 out of 16 765 instances (82.8%), hence solving these instances exactly. This reinforces earlier observations that, empirically, many $P||C_{\max}$ instances are easy to solve exactly with good bounding techniques [11]. Only 8–10% of CNF, graph, and planted instances are non-trivial in this sense, whereas for running time instances this ratio varied drastically, ranging from 0% for SAT solving to 50% for taxi-sharing queries.

We compare our BnB algorithm to two competitors from literature:⁴ the ILP encoding by Mrad and Souayah [20] running on the Gurobi optimizer [9], and the BnB scheme by Haouari and Jemali [11] (reimplemented). For each problem instance, we apply all of the above bounding techniques⁵ for up to 10s and then run BnB or ILP *only if the found bounds are not yet tight* for up to 500s. Fig. 4 summarizes the performance on these instances.

We considered the following increments of our BnB algorithm: a base version which corresponds to Dell’Amico and Martello’s algorithm [3]; adding R5; adding R6 (and thus maintaining the RET); adding the FUR a.k.a. R7; adding the application of Theorem 1 (and thus maintaining irrelevance index ρ); and, finally, running full CDSM (and thus

⁴ As an additional point of reference, CDSM with Lift++/ S^4 solves 99.4% of all Berndt instances in under 11 s whereas Berndt et al.’s EPTAS reportedly takes over an hour for the majority of instances [1].

⁵ We ran these tests on machine B, leading to deviating bounds from the bounding experiments.



■ **Figure 5** Direct comparison of running times of Base vs. FUR (left), FUR vs. CDSM (center), and CDSM vs. the ILP approach (right). Note the logarithmic scale in both directions.

maintaining the ST). Let us briefly discuss the performance of each increment. First, R5 brings a significant improvement on the CNF instances, which have large numbers of equally sized small jobs (App. Tab. 2); as soon as all jobs of non-final size have been placed, the problem can be solved immediately. Note that none of the prior benchmarks from literature allow to observe this behaviour. R6 improves performance on several benchmark families; the number of explored nodes is cut in half (geom. mean factor 2.17). By far the most substantial leap in performance is achieved by the FUR. Across the 901 instances solved by both the FUR and the earlier R6 configuration, FUR results in a geometric mean speedup of 8.4 and the number of explored nodes even drops by a mean factor of 20.8. Comparing FUR to the base configuration, Fig. 5 (left) illustrates that running times often improve by several orders of magnitude. The increment enabling irrelevance rules is the only one without any clear merit. Lastly, CDSM improves performance drastically on the Lawrinenko instances—relatively small instances designed to be difficult—but incurs noticeable overhead on most other instances (Fig. 5 center) due to maintaining the ST. As such, the mean speedup from FUR to CDSM on commonly solved instances is very small (1.03). Still, CDSM is able to solve 65 additional instances and, once again, halves the number of explored nodes (mean

Family	#	#*	# solved exactly							VBS		
			Base	R5	R6	FUR	Irr.	CDSM	HJ	ILP	two	all
Berndt	3060	316	305	304	309	313	313	313	288	313	313	316
Frangioni	780	38	2	2	2	2	2	2	16	6	6	18
Lawrinenko	3500	1569	205	204	246	473	472	539	366	1558	1558	1558
SC2022	307	11	1	3	3	8	8	8	11	0	8	11
RAxML/MR	53	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
MP-hash	335	125	63	63	67	77	77	79	53	115	119	119
Taxi-share	746	403	160	160	164	189	189	189	183	233	242	257
Graph	292	31	3	4	5	8	8	6	20	6	10	25
CNF	6265	589	8	84	83	104	105	104	121	284	301	395
Planted	1064	99	17	17	17	21	21	20	37	49	49	69
Total	16765	3188	771	848	903	1202	1202	1267	1102	2571	2613	2775

■ **Table 1** Number of exactly solved instances by benchmark family. “#*” signifies the number of instances that were not solved by our bounding heuristic, i.e., the number of instances the BnB and ILP approaches were run on. The final two columns show a virtual running time oracle (VBS, Virtual Best Solver) of {CDSM, ILP} (“two”) and of all eight displayed runs (“all”).

factor 2.06). Put together, our combined improvements to the algorithm of Dell’Amico and Martello [3] increase the number of solved instances by 64%, reduce explored nodes by a factor of 89.8, and result in a mean speedup of 11.9 on instances solved by both.

As Fig. 4 indicates, the HJ algorithm is also outperformed by our approach. Still, the solved instances are orthogonal to a degree. Tab. 1 and Fig. 7 (App.) show that HJ performs poorly on Berndt, Lawrinenko, and MP-hash instances, which share a moderate number of processors (mostly ≤ 100) and small n/m (mostly ≤ 10). By contrast, HJ outperforms all others on Frangioni, SC2022, and Graph instances, which share especially long optimal makespans (see App. Tab. 3). Interestingly, HJ also outperforms CDSM on planted instances, which have makespans $\leq 3000 + \varepsilon$. We suspect that HJ’s different branching heuristics are especially useful to reconstruct the planted solutions; further analyses are needed.

Next, we compare these BnB results to the ILP approach [20], which we consider to reflect the state of the art in $P||C_{\max}$. As Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 (right) show, the ILP approach requires a significant upfront investment to generate the ILP encoding, resulting in more than two orders of magnitude of overhead over BnB for the easiest of instances. This investment does pay off after 10s, at which point the ILP approach surpasses all BnB approaches. Given the full 500s, ILP solves substantially more instances (2571 vs. 1267 for CDSM), especially on the benchmark set where it was originally evaluated (Lawrinenko) as well as MP-hash, Taxi-share, CNF, and planted instances. These families share a modest optimal makespan (few thousand). By contrast, BnB performs better on families with large optimal makespans, such as SC2022, Frangioni, and Graph. For example, CDSM found more solutions with a makespan $\geq 10\,000$ than ILP (87 vs. 71). This indicates that BnB may also be more favorable for higher resolutions of job sizes. A virtual oracle which picks the approach with lower running time from CDSM and ILP for each instance solves 42 additional instances compared to ILP and, more importantly, results in a mean speedup of 13 over ILP. An oracle based on ILP and HJ even solves 178 additional instances but only with a speedup of 6. As such, running our approach for just one second before proceeding with the more heavyweight ILP approach is already an appealing option to boost an exact $P||C_{\max}$ scheduler’s performance.

7 Conclusion

We present new pruning rules for the $P||C_{\max}$ *decision problem* and integrate these rules into an efficient BnB scheme for optimally solving the $P||C_{\max}$ *optimization problem*. Together with a lower bounding technique which clearly outperforms previous methods and multiple improvements to upper bounding techniques, this allows to solve some instances with thousands of machines and jobs within seconds. Our experimental analyses are supported by new benchmark sets crafted from diverse application data, which exhibit characteristics that synthetic benchmarks from prior $P||C_{\max}$ literature fail to capture. Although a cutting-edge commercial ILP solver still performs substantially better if given sufficient time, our prototypical implementation is the faster approach and appears to scale better to huge makespans. All in all, we clearly advanced the start of the art for BnB-based scheduling.

Our work highlights multiple options for further improvements. Our efficient base case for a single remaining job duration has proven impactful, which makes it promising to investigate techniques for extending it to multiple job durations (cf. App. A). Both RET and CDSM are powerful techniques that we believe to bear further potential for even more pruning. In addition, we aim to further optimize our implementation and explore possible parallelisations. Lastly, beyond algorithmic improvements, it might also prove insightful to investigate the differences between instance families and their effect on solvers in more detail.

References

- 1 Sebastian Berndt, Max A Deppert, Klaus Jansen, and Lars Rohwedder. Load balancing: The long road from theory to practice. In *Proc. ALENEX*, pages 104–116, 2022. doi:10.1137/1.9781611977042.9.
- 2 Mauro Dell’Amico, Manuel Iori, Silvano Martello, and Michele Monaci. Heuristic and exact algorithms for the identical parallel machine scheduling problem. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 20:333–344, 08 2008. doi:10.1287/ijoc.1070.0246.
- 3 Mauro Dell’Amico and Silvano Martello. Optimal scheduling of tasks on identical parallel processors. *INFORMS J. Computing*, 7:191–200, 05 1995. doi:10.1287/ijoc.7.2.191.
- 4 Maxence Delorme, Manuel Iori, and Silvano Martello. Bin packing and cutting stock problems: Mathematical models and exact algorithms. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 255(1):1–20, 2016. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2016.04.030>, doi:10.1016/J.EJOR.2016.04.030.
- 5 Antonio Frangioni, Emiliano Necciari, and Maria Grazia Scutella. A multi-exchange neighborhood for minimum makespan parallel machine scheduling problems. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 8:195–220, 2004.
- 6 Michael R. Garey and David S. Johnson. Strong NP-completeness results. *J. ACM*, 25(3):499–508, 1978. doi:10.1145/322077.322090.
- 7 Ronald L. Graham. Bounds on multiprocessing timing anomalies. *SIAM journal on Applied Mathematics*, 17(2):416–429, 1969.
- 8 Ronald L. Graham, E. Leighton Lawler, Jan Karel Lenstra, and AHG Rinnooy Kan. Optimization and approximation in deterministic sequencing and scheduling: a survey. In *Annals of discrete mathematics*, volume 5, pages 287–326. 1979. doi:10.1016/s0167-5060(08)70356-x.
- 9 Gurobi Optimization, LLC. Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual, 2023. URL: <https://www.gurobi.com>.
- 10 Mohamed Haouari, Anis Gharbi, and Mahdi Jemmali. Tight bounds for the identical parallel machine scheduling problem. *Int. Trans. Operational Research*, 13:529 – 548, 10 2006. doi:10.1111/j.1475-3995.2006.00562.x.
- 11 Mohamed Haouari and Mahdi Jemmali. Tight bounds for the identical parallel machine-scheduling problem: Part ii. *Int. Trans. Operational Research*, 15(1):19–34, 2008. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-3995.2007.00605.x>.
- 12 L. Demian Hesse. *Enabling Scalability: Graph Hierarchies and Fault Tolerance*. PhD thesis, Karlsruhe Institut für Technologie (KIT), 2023. 46.21.02; LK 01. doi:10.5445/IR/1000161317.
- 13 Dimitri Höhler, Wayne Pfeiffer, Vassilios Ioannidis, Heinz Stockinger, and Alexandros Stamatakis. RAxML Grove: an empirical phylogenetic tree database. *Bioinformatics*, 38(6):1741–1742, 12 2021. arXiv:<https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article-pdf/38/6/1741/49009442/btab863.pdf>, doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btab863.
- 14 Lukas Hübner, Alexey M Kozlov, Demian Hesse, Peter Sanders, and Alexandros Stamatakis. Exploring parallel MPI fault tolerance mechanisms for phylogenetic inference with RAxML-NG. *Bioinformatics*, 37(22):4056–4063, 2021. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btab399.
- 15 Moritz Laupichler and Peter Sanders. *Fast Many-to-Many Routing for Dynamic Taxi Sharing with Meeting Points*, pages 74–90. doi:10.1137/1.9781611977929.6.
- 16 Alexander Lawrinenko. *Identical parallel machine scheduling problems: structural patterns, bounding techniques and solution procedures*. PhD thesis, Friedrich-Schiller-Universität, Jena, 2017. URL: https://www.db-thueringen.de/receive/dbt_mods_00032188.
- 17 Hans-Peter Lehmann, Peter Sanders, and Stefan Walzer. Sichash - small irregular cuckoo tables for perfect hashing. In *ALENEX*, pages 176–189. SIAM, 2023. doi:10.1137/1.9781611977561.CH15.
- 18 Joao Marques-Silva, Inês Lynce, and Sharad Malik. Conflict-driven clause learning SAT solvers. In *Handbook of satisfiability*, pages 133–182. ios Press, 2021.

- 19 Ethel Mokotoff. An Exact Algorithm for the Identical Parallel Machine Scheduling Problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 152(3):758–769, 2004. Applications of Soft O.R. Methods. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377221702007269>, doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217\(02\)00726-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217(02)00726-9).
- 20 Mehdi Mrad and Nizar Souayah. An arc-flow model for the makespan minimization problem on identical parallel machines. *IEEE Access*, 6:5300–5307, 2018. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2789678.
- 21 Yanik Ngoko, Christophe Cérin, and Denis Trystram. Solving SAT in a distributed cloud: a portfolio approach. *J. Applied Mathematics and Computer Science*, 29(2):261–274, 2019. doi:10.2478/amcs-2019-0019.
- 22 David Pisinger. Linear Time Algorithms for Knapsack Problems with Bounded Weights. *Journal of Algorithms*, 33(1):1–14, 1999. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0196677499910349>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1006/jagm.1999.1034>.
- 23 Michael H. Rothkopf. Scheduling Independent Tasks on Parallel Processors. *Management Science*, 12(5):437–447, 1966. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2627826>.
- 24 Dominik Schreiber. *Scalable SAT Solving and its Application*. PhD thesis, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.5445/IR/1000165224>.
- 25 Dominik Schreiber and Peter Sanders. Scalable sat solving in the cloud. In *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing–SAT 2021: 24th International Conference, Barcelona, Spain, July 5-9, 2021, Proceedings 24*, pages 518–534. Springer, 2021.
- 26 Rico Walter and Alexander Lawrinenko. A characterization of optimal multiprocessor schedules and new dominance rules. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 40:876–900, 2020. doi:10.1007/s10878-020-00634-9.

A Pruning Rules for Two Remaining Job Durations

We can extend the idea from R5 to formulate pruning rules for two remaining job durations, thereby improving the base case even further. In the following, we consider a decision problem instance (W, m, U) and a valid partial assignment A at decision level ℓ . Note that none of these results is implemented yet, which is a topic for future work.

A.1 Dynamic Programming for Two Job Durations

We can solve the general case of two remaining job durations in polynomial time with a dynamic programming formulation. Assume that there are n_a remaining jobs with duration a and n_b remaining jobs with duration b (and no other remaining jobs). Our dynamic program maximizes the number of jobs with duration b which can still be assigned after all jobs with duration a are assigned. Note, this works for both $a > b$ or $b > a$.

► **Theorem 4.** *Let $T: [m] \times \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{-\infty\}$ be a function such that $T(x, k)$ describes the number of jobs with duration b which are assignable to the first x processors under the assumption that k jobs with duration a are already assigned to these processors. If we define*

$$t(x, k) := \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{if } C_x^\ell + k \cdot a > U \\ \left\lfloor \frac{U - C_x^\ell - k \cdot a}{b} \right\rfloor & \text{if } C_x^\ell + k \cdot a \leq U \end{cases}$$

and define T recursively as

$$T(x, k) := \begin{cases} t(x, k) & \text{if } x = 1 \\ \max_{0 \leq i \leq k} T(x-1, k-i) + t(x, i) & \text{if } x > 1 \end{cases},$$

then $T(m, n_a)$ is the maximal achievable number of still assignable jobs with duration b after all jobs with duration a are assigned.

Proof. It is sufficient to show that $T(x, k)$ is actually the maximal possible number of assignable jobs with duration b when assigning k jobs with duration a to the first x processors, or $-\infty$ if no valid assignment exists. Clearly, this is the case for $x = 1$. For larger x , this follows by induction since the maximum covers all possible cases of splitting the available jobs between the current processor and the processors with smaller index. ◀

Since the table has at most $m \cdot n_a$ entries and computing an entry needs at most n_a lookups, this theorem allows to decide in time $O(m \cdot n_a^2)$ whether a valid completion of A exists. For an actual implementation, some further improvements are possible. First, for the computation of the minimum, it suffices to consider values of i where both terms are finite (and returning $-\infty$ if no such i exists). The maximum index where the entry for processor p_x is finite is $\sum_{y=1}^x \max\{k \mid t(y, k) > -\infty\}$, thus these upper bounds can be computed via a prefix sum over the processors. Second, even the remaining entries are not all required (e.g., we need only the entry with index n_a from the last column). This allows to compute a lower bound for i in a similar way to the upper bound, but starting from the last processor.

A.2 Additional Rules for Two Job Durations

While the dynamic programming approach is a powerful tool to solve the general case, it is also comparatively expensive since the complexity is quadratic in the number of jobs. Therefore, we present some additional rules for two job durations that are much cheaper but

can still be sufficient to eliminate all branches or at least reduce the number of cases that need to be considered for the dynamic programming. In the following, we always assume $w_{\ell+1} = \dots = w_r$ and $w_{r+1} = \dots = w_n$ for some r with $\ell < r < n$.

First, we show that the condition of Rule 5, assuming all remaining jobs have equal duration, can be restated equivalently as follows for a partial assignment with depth r :

$$\sum_{x=1}^m ((U - C_x^r) \bmod w_n) \leq mU - \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \quad (2)$$

Consider a processor p_x with load C_x^r . If we assign as many of the remaining jobs as possible to p_x , the new load is $C_x^{r+k} = C_x^r + k \cdot w_n$ for the largest k satisfying $C_x^{r+k} \leq U$. The remaining space on p_x is then $U - C_x^{r+k} = (U - C_x^r) \bmod w_n$. This inevitable ‘‘gap’’ to the optimal load implies a lower bound for the *total* remaining space of any feasible completion. Specifically, a completion with makespan U is feasible if and only if the sum of all such gaps does not exceed the free space that must remain after successfully assigning all jobs.

Now, we consider a specific processor x and a feasible partial assignment $A' \supseteq A$ with depth r . Assume that at depth i , A' assigns k additional jobs with duration w_r to p_x . This means that the load is $C_x^i = C_x^\ell + k \cdot w_r$. Based on this, we define $u_x(i) := (U - C_x^i - k \cdot w_r) \bmod w_n$ as the contribution of p_x to Equation 2, where $\ell \leq i \leq r$. In addition, we define $\hat{w} := -w_r \bmod w_n$ (the smallest non-negative number satisfying the modulo relation), which allows to write the contribution as $u_x(i) = (u_x(\ell) + k \cdot \hat{w}) \bmod w_n$.

The key insight to construct additional pruning rules is the following. As a consequence of Equation 2, we do not need to consider any completion of A that is different to A' if A' already minimizes $\sum_{x=1}^m u_x(r)$. To exploit this, we define $k_x := \min\{k \mid u_x(\ell) + k \cdot \hat{w} \geq w_n\}$ as the minimum number of jobs we need to assign to reach the next ‘‘threshold’’ of u_x for a processor p_x ($k_x := \infty$ if $\hat{w} = 0$). Decreasing $\sum_{x=1}^m u_x(r)$ in comparison to $\sum_{x=1}^m u_x(\ell)$ requires that A' assigns k_x jobs of weight w_r to at least one processor. Consequently, we define the set of *active* processors as $P^\ell := \{p_x \mid C_x^\ell + k_x w_r \leq U \text{ and } k_x \leq r - \ell\}$.

► **Pruning Rule 8.** *If P^ℓ is empty and there is a feasible completion for A , then such a completion can be obtained by iteratively assigning each remaining job w_i to a processor p_x which satisfies $C_x^{i-1} + w_i \leq U$.*

If P^ℓ is empty, then $\sum_{x=1}^m u_x(r) = (r - \ell)\hat{w} + \sum_{x=1}^m u_x(\ell)$ for every possible completion of A , thus it suffices to consider a single (arbitrary) valid decision. An additional corollary of this rule is that in the dynamic programming formulation from Theorem 4, all processors which are not active can be combined into a single column.

► **Pruning Rule 9.** *If P^ℓ is non-empty and $u_x(\ell) = u_y(\ell)$ for all processors $p_x, p_y \in P^\ell$, then w.l.o.g. we only need to consider the decision $a_{\ell+1} = x$ where p_x is chosen from P^ℓ such that C_x^ℓ is minimal.*

This rule is similar to R6, but adjusted to the specific setting of two remaining job durations. The reasoning is also similar. Assigning a job with weight w_r to a processor not in P^ℓ can only increase $\sum_{x=1}^m u_x(r)$, thus it suffices to consider processors in P^ℓ . Assignments to such a processor p_y are then interchangeable with p_x due to $u_x(\ell) = u_y(\ell)$.

► **Pruning Rule 10.** *If P^ℓ is non-empty, let p_x be a processor with minimal k_x . If $k_x \hat{w} \leq w_n$, then w.l.o.g. we only need to consider the decisions $a_{\ell+1} = x, \dots, a_{\ell+k_x} = x$.*

Proof. Since assigning a job to a processor which does not reach the next multiple of w_n is always replaceable with any other valid assignment decision, we can assume that all future

23:18 Engineering Optimal Parallel Task Scheduling

jobs are assigned in batches of k_y jobs for a processor p_y . We show that, at any point after assigning the k_x jobs using this rule, the batch size k_y to reach the next threshold for either the same or another processor satisfies $k_y \geq k_x$. First, assume that $y \neq x$ and no additional job has yet been assigned to y . Then $k_y \geq k_x$ follows directly from the minimality condition of the pruning rule. Otherwise, at least one batch has been assigned to y (and it might be the case that $x = y$). Let i be the current depth. Since we can assume that all assignments happen in batches, this implies that $u_y(i) < \hat{w}$ and thus $(k_y + 1)\hat{w} > w_n$, since otherwise $u_y(i) + k_y\hat{w} < w_n$. We conclude $k_y + 1 > k_x$ and thus $k_y \geq k_x$ due to the second condition of the pruning rule. ◀

We can consider this rule as being a variant of the FUR for two job durations. In addition to the pruning, this rule also affects the dynamic programming formulation from Theorem 4. When computing the minimum for a new entry, we do not need to consider any index i where $k_x\hat{w} \leq w_n$ holds after assigning i jobs with duration w_r to processor x .

We want to remark that combining the above rules means we can forego any further branching if either w_n divides w_r or $(w_n \bmod \hat{w}) \in \{0, 1\}$. If w_n divides w_r , R8 is applicable. If \hat{w} divides w_n , R10 is always applicable. If $w_n \bmod \hat{w} = 1$, either R9 or R10 is always applicable.


B Supplementary Material

Family	Job size								
	min	p10	p25	med	geom	arith	p75	p90	max
Berndt	1	27	84	187	167.3	303.9	514	731	1000
Frangioni	1	52	94	892	583.9	2663.3	4873	9448	10000
Lawrinenko	1	38	64	92	110.7	187.7	198	545	1658
SC2022	1	2	10	129	127.8	2494.6	1288	6127	50004
Par.SAT	2	16	46	160	135.3	366.0	428	975	3097
Bio/MR	2	21	73	233	248.1	2505.5	739	1771	526875
MP-hash	340	415	439	477	513.8	551.8	535	642	16365
Taxi-share	111	314	421	691	722.0	987.0	1188	1510	60681
Graph	1	4	5	7	8.8	27.8	10	25	26068
CNF	2	2	2	3	2.9	3.3	3	5	3222
Planted	1	11	32	97	92.6	268.9	298	734	3000


■ **Table 2** Job size distributions for each benchmark family; featuring the minimum, median, geometric and arithmetic mean, maximum, and the 10th, 25th, 75th, and 90th percentile.

Family	Found optimal makespan								
	min	p10	p25	med	geom	arith	p75	p90	max
Berndt	13	59	171	453	446.7	1563.6	1213	4436	24926
Frangioni	86	471	1891	9861	11506.1	119130.8	93938	376316	1882118
Lawrinenko	90	128	158	229	280.9	406.7	322	1086	2477
SC2022	1667	9969	55546	181727	182859.6	848179.7	640124	3228482	6892847
Par.SAT	2903	3712	5206	11587	11110.3	15040.8	23017	30231	49036
Bio/MR	135	228	419	670	3461.7	195810.3	54644	281311	3033958
MP-hash	930	1307	1595	2175	2242.7	2595.1	2632	5252	16802
Taxi-share	801	1363	2064	4569	5096.1	9666.9	10847	26784	77495
Graph	5	20	62	394	544.6	10428.3	3700	27747	333332
CNF	5	33	117	840	826.5	6601.6	5641	20727	201695
Planted	100	101	301	1000	663.6	1198.6	3000	3001	3002

■ **Table 3** Distributions over optimal makespans for each family; featuring the minimum, median, geometric and arithmetic mean, maximum, and the 10th, 25th, 75th, and 90th percentile.



■ **Figure 6** Distribution over values of m and n/m for each benchmark family.



■ **Figure 7** Running times split by family (without Par.SAT since no instances were solved).