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## 1 Introduction

This paper considers a scenario in which a given set of $n$ jobs must be processed on a machine subject to possible breakdowns. If a breakdown occurs, the remaining jobs (including the job currently being processed) cannot be performed and are therefore lost. On the other hand, if job $j$ is successfully completed, a revenue $r_{j}$ is gained. We denote the success probability of job $j$ as $p_{j}$. No rescheduling or reactions are possible, hence a preventive disruption management perspective is adopted (Qi et al. 2006), and the problem is to decide the job sequence before the beginning of the actual execution of the sequence, in such a way that the expected revenue is maximized. In what follows, we denote this problem as 1ERM (i.e., expected revenue maximization on a single machine). Given a sequence $\sigma$ of jobs on the machine, and denoting the $i$-th scheduled job as $\sigma(i)$, the expected revenue $E R[\sigma]$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
E R[\sigma]=p_{\sigma(1)} r_{\sigma(1)}+p_{\sigma(1)} p_{\sigma(2)} r_{\sigma(2)}+\ldots+p_{\sigma(1)} \ldots p_{\sigma(n-1)} p_{\sigma(n)} r_{\sigma(n)} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is known that 1ERM can be solved at optimality (Mitten 1960) by sequencing jobs from the greatest to the smallest $Z$-ratio:

$$
\begin{equation*}
Z_{j}=\frac{p_{j} r_{j}}{\left(1-p_{j}\right)} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here we address an extension of 1ERM in which there are $m$ (identical) machines in charge of job processing. In order to hedge against unrecoverable interruptions, we adopt the technique of duplicating work on different machines, which is a common strategy in many computing centers (Zhou et al. 2016, Benoit et al. 2013). In particular, this means that there are $m$ copies of each job, one to be executed on each machine. The revenue $r_{j}$ is gained if at least one copy of $j$ is successfully carried out, i.e., even if all copies are completed, the revenue is attained only once. When no job duplication is allowed, problems on parallel machines have been addressed in (Agnetis et al. 2017, Agnetis et al. 2009, Lee and Yu 2008).

The problem addressed here may arise when considering the execution of a set of tasks on a multi-processor environment, composed by different servers geographically distributed. In general we can assume that servers may fail, connections can be broken and outages may occur. A strategy to increase reliability is to duplicate the execution of the tasks on two or more independent servers possibly in different geographical locations so that in case of failure of a server the computation is still carried out on the other servers. In any case, the revenue is gained only once when one of the computations is over.

Specifically, we address the following problems.

Definition 1. EXPECTED REVENUE MAXIMIZATION WITH TWO MACHINES (2ERM)

- Given $n$ jobs $\{1,2, \ldots, n\}$, each having success probability $p_{j}$ and revenue $r_{j}$, and two identical machines $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$, find a sequence of the $n$ jobs on $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$ so that the expected revenue of attaining at least one copy of each job is maximized.

Definition 2. KIT AVAILABILITY MAXIMIZATION ( $m$ KAM) - Given n jobs $\{1,2, \ldots, n\}$, each having success probability $p_{j}$, and $m$ identical machines, find a sequence of the $n$ jobs on each machine so that the probability of attaining at least one copy of each job is maximized.

We discuss the problem complexity and introduce a rule based on a modified Z-ratio (2) that, given the sequence on machine $M_{1}$, allows to derive an optimal sequence for $M_{2}$. Furthermore, when the Z-ratios (2) of the jobs are all equal to 1 , the rule allows to easily build an optimal solution for 2 ERM.

## 2 The Expected Revenue Maximization Problem with two machines

We let $P=\prod_{j=1}^{n} p_{j}$ and assume that $p_{j}<1$ for all $j$ (if for some job $p_{j}=1$, such a job is obviously processed first with no consequence on the other jobs). Let us first state a result concerning the following situation. Suppose that a job sequence $\bar{\sigma}_{1}$ has been fixed on $M_{1}$, and we let $\bar{p}_{j}$ denote the cumulative probability up to job $j$ on $M_{1}$ in sequence $\bar{\sigma}_{1}$, i.e.,

$$
\bar{p}_{j}=\prod_{k: k \prec j} p_{k}
$$

Moreover, we denote by $Z_{j}^{\prime}$ the modified $Z$-ratio of job $j$, defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
Z_{j}^{\prime}=Z_{j}\left(1-\bar{p}_{j}\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The problem of finding the optimal sequence on $M_{2}$ given $\bar{\sigma}_{1}$ is solved as shown in the following lemma:

Lemma 1. If a job sequence $\bar{\sigma}_{1}$ is fixed on $M_{1}$, expected revenue is maximized sequencing the jobs on $M_{2}$ by nonincreasing values of

$$
\begin{equation*}
Z_{j}^{\prime}=Z_{j}\left(1-\bar{p}_{j}\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. The proof uses an interchange argument. Consider a sequence $\sigma_{2}$ on $M_{2}$, and let $P_{i}$ be the cumulative success probability of job $i$ in $\sigma_{2}$, i.e., $P_{i}=p_{i} \prod_{k: k \prec i} p_{k}$. (Note that $P_{i}$ includes the probability of job $i$ itself.) Given a fixed sequence $\bar{\sigma}_{1}$ on $M_{1}$ and the associated probabilities $\bar{p}_{i}$ and $\bar{p}_{j}$, assume that in $\sigma_{2}$ there are two consecutive jobs $j$ and $i$ such that $j \prec i$ and $Z_{i}^{\prime}>Z_{j}^{\prime}$. Let $\sigma_{2}^{\prime}$ be the sequence obtained swapping $i$ and $j$ in $\sigma_{2}$. The expected revenue of ( $\bar{\sigma}_{1}, \sigma_{2}^{\prime}$ ) can be expressed as

$$
E R\left(\bar{\sigma}_{1}, \sigma_{2}^{\prime}\right)=A+r_{i}\left(P_{i}+\bar{p}_{i}-P_{i} \bar{p}_{i}\right)+r_{j}\left(P_{i} p_{j}+\bar{p}_{j}-P_{i} p_{j} \bar{p}_{j}\right)+B
$$

while

$$
E R\left(\bar{\sigma}_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right)=A+r_{j}\left(P_{j}+\bar{p}_{j}-P_{j} \bar{p}_{j}\right)+r_{i}\left(P_{j} p_{i}+\bar{p}_{i}-P_{j} p_{i} \bar{p}_{i}\right)+B
$$

where $A$ and $B$ denote the contribution of jobs preceding and respectively following $i$ and $j$ on $M_{2}$ in the two schedules. Denoting with $Q$ the cumulative probability of jobs preceding $i$ and $j$ on $M_{2}$, in ( $\bar{\sigma}_{1}, \sigma_{2}^{\prime}$ ) one has $P_{i}=Q p_{i}$ and in ( $\bar{\sigma}_{1}, \sigma_{2}$ ), $P_{j}=Q p_{j}$, one has that $E R\left(\bar{\sigma}_{1}, \sigma_{2}^{\prime}\right)-E R\left(\bar{\sigma}_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right)>0$ if and only if

$$
r_{i} p_{i}-r_{i} p_{i} \bar{p}_{i}+r_{j} p_{i} p_{j}-r_{j} p_{i} p_{j} \bar{p}_{j}-\left(r_{j} p_{j}-r_{j} p_{j} \bar{p}_{j}+r_{i} p_{j} p_{i}-r_{i} p_{j} p_{i} \bar{p}_{i}\right)>0
$$

i.e.,

$$
r_{i} p_{i}\left(1-\bar{p}_{i}\right)\left(1-p_{j}\right)>r_{j} p_{j}\left(1-\bar{p}_{j}\right)\left(1-p_{i}\right),
$$

and hence

$$
Z_{i}\left(1-\bar{p}_{i}\right)>Z_{j}\left(1-\bar{p}_{j}\right),
$$

which holds since $Z_{i}^{\prime}>Z_{j}^{\prime}$. By repeatedly applying the above argument, the thesis follows.
A consequence of Lemma 1 is the following.
Lemma 2. Consider an instance of $2 E R M$ in which $Z_{j}=1$ for all jobs $j=1, \ldots, n$. Then any schedule in which the jobs are reversely sequenced on the two machines is optimal.

Regarding the computational complexity of the problem, we recall that when duplications are not allowed, the problem with 2 machines and unreliable jobs is known to be strongly NP-hard (Agnetis et. al. 2009). Concerning 2ERM, it is possible to prove the following result.

Theorem 1. 2ERM is strongly NP-hard.
The proof consists in showing that the combinatorial problem Product Partition can be polynomially reduced to 2ERM. Product Partition was proved strongly NP-hard by ( Ng et al. 2010).

## 3 The Kit Availability Maximization Problem

The following results can be established for KAM.
Theorem 2. When there are two machines and n job types (2KAM), the problem can be solved in $O(n)$.

The problem in which there are $m$ machines and only two job types (1 and 2) consists in deciding the number $x$ of machines that follow the sequence 12 , so that $m-x$ will follow the sequence 21 . The following result can be established.

Theorem 3. mKAM with two job types can be solved in $O(\log m)$.
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