



A Job Shop Assignment Problem with Queuing Costs

Bell, D.E.

IIASA Working Paper

WP-74-009

1974



Bell, D.E. (1974) A Job Shop Assignment Problem with Queuing Costs. IIASA Working Paper. WP-74-009 Copyright © 1974 by the author(s). <http://pure.iiasa.ac.at/162/>

Working Papers on work of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis receive only limited review. Views or opinions expressed herein do not necessarily represent those of the Institute, its National Member Organizations, or other organizations supporting the work. All rights reserved. Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage. All copies must bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. For other purposes, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, permission must be sought by contacting repository@iiasa.ac.at

A JOB SHOP ASSIGNMENT PROBLEM
WITH QUEUING COSTS

D. E. Bell

March 1974

WP-74-9

Working Papers are not intended for distribution outside of IIASA, and are solely for discussion and information purposes. The views expressed are those of the author, and do not necessarily reflect those of IIASA.

A Job Shop Assignment Problem with Queuing Costs

David E. Bell*

1. The Problem

Consider an assignment problem in which jobs are to be assigned to machines in such a way as to minimize the total cost of manufacture. In addition, there is, for each job, a queuing cost which is proportional to the time spent before completion. Each job takes a unit length of time to be completed once work is started on it by a machine.

It will be shown that this problem may be formulated as a linear program whose optimal solution will be integral.

For example, with four jobs ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) and two machines ($s = 1, 2$) with a fixed service cost of i times s plus a unit charge per period waited before completion, the optimal arrangement is to assign job 1 to machine 2 and the remainder to machine 1. This gives a total cost of

$$(1.2 + 1) + (2.1 + 3.1 + 4.1 + 1 + 2 + 3) = 18$$

2. The Formulation

Let r_i^s be the cost of processing job i on machine s . Let $x_{is} = 1$ if job i is assigned to machine s and 0 otherwise. Let $y_{ks} = 1$ if machine s has k jobs assigned to it and 0 otherwise.

*Carlos Winkler supplied the neat proof of the theorem. This problem was suggested by Aleksandr Butrimenko.

The following integer program models the situation

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{i,s} r_i^s x_{is} + \sum_{s,k} \frac{k(k+1)}{2} y_{ks} \\ & \sum_s x_{is} = 1 \quad \text{for each } i \\ & \sum_k y_{ks} = 1 \quad \text{for each } s \\ & \sum_k k y_{ks} = \sum_i x_{is} \quad \text{for each } s \quad . \\ & y_{ks} \geq 0 \quad x_{is} \geq 0 \\ & x_{is} \text{ integer} \end{aligned}$$

Note that it is not necessary to enforce the integrality of the y variables as y_{ks} will be integral if $\sum_i x_{is}$ is integral, because of the form of the objective function. Note too*, that if the y 's are integral in the optimal solution, then so will the x 's be integral because for fixed integral y 's, the problem is just an assignment problem, which is known to solve in integers.

Lemma In the optimal solution to the problem

$$\sum_i x_{is} \text{ integer} \Rightarrow y_{ks} \text{ integer for all } k$$

and all y_{ks} integer \Rightarrow whole solution is integral.

Theorem The optimal solution to the linear program (assumed to be an extreme point) is integral.

*Observation by George Dantzig

Proof The lemma only leaves the case where at least one $\sum_i x_{is}$ is not integral. It will be shown that such an optimal solution is not extreme. Suppose that

$$0 < x_{is}^* < 1$$

in the optimal solution. Hence there exists some j for which $0 < x_{ij}^* < 1$ for the same i . Suppose first that $\sum_p x_{pj}^*$ is not integral. Then we may find an $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$k_1 < \sum_p x_{ps}^* \pm \epsilon < k_1 + 1$$

$$k_2 < \sum_p x_{pj}^* \pm \epsilon < k_2 + 1$$

Associated with the three solutions (x_{ij}, x_{is}) , $(x_{ij}^* + \epsilon, x_{is}^* - \epsilon)$ and $(x_{ij}^* - \epsilon, x_{is}^* + \epsilon)$ are the solutions $(y_{k_1s}^*, y_{k_1+1,s}^*, y_{k_2j}^*, y_{k_2+1,j}^*)$, $(y_{k_1s}^* + \epsilon, y_{k_1+1,s}^* - \epsilon, y_{k_2j}^* - \epsilon, y_{k_2+1,j}^* + \epsilon)$ and $(y_{k_1s}^* - \epsilon, y_{k_1+1,s}^* + \epsilon, y_{k_2j}^* + \epsilon, y_{k_2+1,j}^* - \epsilon)$.

The important point is that only these variables are affected. All three solutions are feasible and the optimal solution is a linear combination of the other two. Hence, the optimal solution is not extreme. Now the case when $\sum_p x_{pj}^*$ is integral must be considered. In this case, since x_{ij}^* is not integral, x_{aj}^* must be non integral for some $a \neq i$. Hence, x_{at}^* is not integral for some

$t \neq j$. If $t = s$, then the solution

$$(x_{is}^* + \epsilon, x_{ij}^* - \epsilon, x_{aj}^* + \epsilon, x_{as}^* - \epsilon)$$

is feasible without affecting the y 's. The same argument about non-extremeness then applies. If $\sum_p x_{pt}^*$ is integral, the system is repeated. If it is not integral, then the first argument still applies. In summary, the argument is just that of the assignment problem proof, except that the y variables may be affected. Since these respond linearly to changes in the x variables, all is well. //

As empirical evidence of the truth of the theorem, two problems having 21 jobs and 6 machines solved in integers.