

Hybrid next-fit algorithm for the two-dimensional rectangle bin-packing problem

Citation for published version (APA):

Frenk, J. B. G., & Galambos, G. (1986). *Hybrid next-fit algorithm for the two-dimensional rectangle bin-packing problem*. (Memorandum COSOR; Vol. 8619). Technische Universiteit Eindhoven.

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/1986

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.tue.nl/taverne

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

openaccess@tue.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

EINDHOVEN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Faculty of Mathematics and Computing Science

Memorandum COSOR 86-19

Hybrid next-fit algorithm for the two-
dimensional rectangle bin-packing problem

by

J.B.G. Frenk and G. Galambos

Eindhoven, the Netherlands

November 1986

Addresses of the authors:

J. B. G. Frenk
Faculteit der Economische Wetenschappen
Erasmus Universiteit
Postbus 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands

G. Galambos
Lehrstuhl für Angewandte Mathematik II
Universität Augsburg
Memminger Str. 6
8900 Augsburg
West Germany
(until the end of August 1985)

Kalmár Laboratory of Cybernetics
József Attila University
Árpád tér 2
6720 Szeged
Hungary

Abstract

We present a new approximation algorithm for the two-dimensional bin-packing problem. The algorithm is based on two one-dimensional bin-packing algorithms. Since the algorithm is of next-fit type it can also be used for those cases where the output is required to be on-line (e.g. if we open a new bin we have no possibility to pack elements into the earlier opened bins). We give a tight bound for its worst-case and show that this bound is a parameter of the maximal sizes of the items to be packed. Moreover, we also present a probabilistic analysis of this algorithm.

Keywords

Two-dimensional Packing, Bin-Packing, Heuristic Algorithm, Worst-Case Analysis, Probabilistic Analysis, On-line Algorithm

1. Introduction

During the last decade a wide variety of fast heuristics have been developed for the **one-dimensional bin-packing problem**. This problem can be stated as follows: We are given a list $L = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$ of n objects (or items) with sizes $s(p_i), i = 1, \dots, n$, and bins, each with a positive integer capacity of $C, (0 < s(p_i) \leq C, i = 1, \dots, n)$. What is the smallest integer m such that there is a partition $L = B_1 \cup B_2 \cup \dots \cup B_m$ satisfying $\sum_{p_i \in B_j} s(p_i) \leq C$? We usually think of each list of B_j as being the contents of a bin of capacity C , and attempt to minimize the number of bins needed for a packing of L .

It is known that the bin-packing problem belongs to the class of \mathcal{NP} -hard problems (see GAREY AND JOHNSON [1974]). So there is no efficient algorithm to solve it, unless $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{NP}$.

Therefore there were numerous heuristics developed to solve this problem. To decide on an algorithm whether it is better than another one there are different methods.

A possibility to analyse an algorithm is to examine its worst-case behavior. Since we use this method, we define the so-called **asymptotic performance ratio** which characterizes the worst-case behavior of an algorithm. For any bin packing algorithm A , let $A(L)$ denote the number of bins needs to pack L by the algorithm A , and $\text{OPT}(L)$ denotes the number of bins used by an optimal packing. Let

$$R_A(k) = \sup\left\{\frac{A(L)}{k} \mid \text{OPT}(L) = k\right\},$$

and let us define the asymptotic performance ratio R_A as the largest limit of a convergent subsequence of $R_A(k)$, i. e.

$$R_A = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} R_A(k).$$

In applications we often have a bound $0 < r \leq C$ for the size of the items of the list L . This means that for all $p_i \in L$ the size $s(p_i) \leq r$. In this case we denote the asymptotic performance ratio by $R_A(r)$.

We will now present four types of algorithms to which we will refer later. The interested readers find details in BAKER AND COFFMAN [1981], JOHNSON [1974] and JOHNSON ET AL. [1974]:

The **Next-Fit** (NF) algorithm first places the elements into the bin B_1 . Suppose that p_i is now to be packed, and let B_j be the highest indexed non-empty bin. The algorithm places p_i into B_j if it will fit (e. g. it is not allowed to pack the element into the bins $B_j, j < i$), otherwise open a new bin (B_{j+1}) placing p_i into it ($R_{\text{NF}} = 2$).

The **First-Fit** (FF) algorithm places each successive piece into the lowest indexed bin of the sequence B_1, B_2, \dots into which it will fit ($R_{\text{FF}} = 17/10$).

We note that the main difference between the above two algorithms is that according to FF it is generally possible for a piece to be packed to the left of the rightmost occupied bin, but the NF fills the bins in sequence e. g. B_1, B_2, \dots, B_{i-1} receive no further pieces after the first piece is packed in B_i .

These algorithms do not know the items in advance. If we have the possibility to order the elements before using the algorithm we would get better results. The **First-Fit Decreasing (FFD)** and the **Next-Fit Decreasing (NFD)** differ from the above ones only in the preordering the items ($R_{\text{FFD}} = 11/9$, $R_{\text{NFD}} = 1.691\dots$.)

The one-dimensional bin-packing problem is well-studied. Relatively few results have been published on the **two-dimensional rectangle bin-packing**. The problem is the following: We are given a list L of rectangles. The size of a rectangle $p \in L$ is given by an ordered pair of width and height $(w(p), h(p))$, and we are given rectangular bins with sizes W and H . We have to pack the rectangles into a minimal number of bins so that

- a) the sides of the rectangles are parallel the corresponding sides of the bins (no rotation allowed).
- b) no two rectangles in a bin overlap.

CHUNG, GAREY AND JOHNSON [1982] developed an algorithm to give an approximative solution of this problem. They called it **Hybrid-First Fit (HFF)** because the algorithm mixes the FFD and FF rules. They proved that

$$\frac{182}{90} \leq R_{\text{HFF}} \leq \frac{17}{8}.$$

A tight bound for R_{HFF} is not known. Actually, as far as we know there is no heuristic algorithm with acceptable tight bound for the two-dimensional bin packing problem. The other feature of HFF is that it has an **off-line output** in the sense that it supposes that whenever an element is to be placed all open bins can be used to pack it. But there are numerous applications where we do not have this possibility, i.e. if we pack an element in a new bin, we are lost the old ones for further packing (**on-line output**). Such problems can arise in computer science in time-dependent sequential storage allocations, in some computer network problems, packing shelves systems, filling of a cold-storage plant and so on. So in this case one can not use the above mentioned algorithm to get a fast approximative solution.

In this paper we give an algorithm with time complexity $O(n \log n)$ for the two dimensional rectangle bin-packing problem. Since this algorithm uses the results concerning the one-dimensional algorithms, see BAKER AND COFFMAN [1981] and JOHNSON [1974], it has an on-line output. We prove a tight asymptotic bound for it in section 2. Moreover, we also present in section 3 a probabilistic analysis of this algorithm, which we call **Hybrid-Next Fit (HNF)**.

2. THE HNF BOUND

First of all we present the HNF algorithm.

- Step 1: Order the rectangles p of the list in nonincreasing direction according to their heights $h(p)$.
- Step 2: Take out the first item, say p , from the list and place it in the first bin into the lower left hand corner. Let us call the rectangular area of height $h(p)$ of the bin whose left most part of width $w(p)$ is covered by p the **block** opened by p .

Step 3: Take the next rectangle of L and try to place it into the last opened block. If this is impossible then open a new block (as defined in 2.) within the current bin if this is possible. If there is no space for the new block in the current bin open a new bin with a new first block.

Step 4: If we have items unplaced then goto Step 3, else stop.

Note that without loss of generality we can assume in the sequel that the bin heights H and widths W are equal and $H = W = 1$.

Since we will examine the worst case behavior of our algorithm we have to define the asymptotic performance ratio for the two-dimensional case as well. Let r, s be integers such that

$$\text{I. } \frac{1}{r+1} < \max_{p \in L} w(p) \leq \frac{1}{r}.$$

$$\text{II. } \frac{1}{s+1} < \max_{p \in L} h(p) \leq \frac{1}{s}.$$

If

$$R_A(k, r, s) = \sup \left\{ \frac{A(L)}{k} \mid \text{OPT}(L) = k \right\},$$

then the asymptotic performance ratio is

$$R_A(r, s) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} R_A(k, r, s).$$

During the proofs of our claims - see below - we shall use sequences which came up first in number theory, but they have also been used frequently to solve different one-dimensional bin-packing problems (see BAKER AND COFFMAN [1981] and LIANG [1980]). For an integer $s \geq 1$ let

$$t_1(s) = s + 1, \quad t_{i+1}(s) = \prod_{j=1}^i t_j + 1 \quad i \geq 1.$$

We shall use two simple results concerning these sequences (see BAKER AND COFFMAN [1981])

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{t_i(s)} = \frac{2}{s+1},$$

$$\frac{2}{s+1} - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{t_i(s)} = \frac{1}{t_i(s) - 1}.$$

Our main result is a theorem concerning the asymptotic performance ratio of the HNF algorithm.

(2.1) Theorem Let L be a set (or list) of rectangles, which satisfies conditions I and II.

Let

$$\gamma_s = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{t_i(s) - 1}, \quad \gamma_s^* = \frac{s-1}{s} + \gamma_s,$$

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } r=1; \\ r, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then

$$R_{\text{HNF}}(r, s) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \gamma_s^*.$$

Proof. The proof rely on the proof which has been given for the one-dimensional case by BAKER AND COFFMANN [1980], but now we use our two -dimensional weight function.

The statement of the theorem immediately follows from the following two lemmas.

(2.2) Lemma. For any list L which satisfies the conditions I and II the following inequality is true

$$\text{HNF}(L) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \gamma_s^* \text{OPT}(L) + 8.$$

(2.3) Lemma. There is a sequence of lists L_r ($r = 1, 2, \dots$) for which each list L satisfies the conditions I and II, and

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{HNF}(L_r)}{\text{OPT}(L_r)} = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \gamma_s^*.$$

Proof. We first prove Lemma (2.2). Let us call an interval $(\frac{1}{k+1}, \frac{1}{k}]$ a γ_s -interval if $k = t_i(s) - 1$ for some i . Rectangles whose heights are in a γ_s -interval will be called γ_s -pieces. Define a weight function $W_s(p)$ as follows: for any rectangle $p \in L$, $h(p) \in (\frac{1}{k+1}, \frac{1}{k}]$, $k \geq s$,

$$W_s(p) = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} w(p) \frac{1}{k}, & \text{if } p \text{ is a } \gamma_s\text{-piece;} \\ \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} w(p) h(p) \frac{k+1}{k}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

During the proof we shall use the following, easily provable, statements concerning the weight function $W_s(p)$.

(2.4) Corollary The weight function $W_s(p)$ is a nondecreasing function for the items with equal width of p . Furthermore, it is strictly increasing, except the γ_s -intervals, where it is constant.

(2.5) Corollary The function $\frac{W_s(p)}{h(p)w(p)}$ decreases monotonically in γ_s -intervals, but it is constant in any other interval for the items with equal width.

(2.6) Corollary The weight function $W_s(p)$ is additive in vertical direction. That means, if we have a piece with sizes $h(p)$ and $w(p)$, and we divide it with a "vertical"

line (i. e. parallel to its height) into two pieces p_1, p_2 of sizes $h(p), w(p_1)$ and $h(p), w(p_2)$ then

$$W_s(p) = W_s(p_1) + W_s(p_2).$$

For a set of $Q, Q \subseteq L$ let $W_s(Q) = \sum_{p \in Q} W_s(p)$. We shall prove that the above defined weighting function has two properties.

- (1) $W_s(L) \geq \text{HNF}(L) - 8$.
- (2) $W_s(L) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \gamma_s^* \text{OPT}(L)$.

The desired result follows immediately from these two properties.

(2.7) Claim

$$W_s(L) \geq \text{HNF}(L) - 8.$$

Proof. Our proof consists of two steps. First we derive a list \bar{L} from the original list L in such a way that we disregard the fact that pieces of smaller height than the first item may occur within a block (see **Figure 2.1**).




Figure 2.1

Let \bar{L}' denote the list derived from the list \bar{L} by removing the items which have been packed into the last bin of the HNF packing of L . In the first step we prove that

$$W_s(\bar{L}) > \text{HNF}(\bar{L}) - \frac{13}{3}. \quad (2.1)$$

Let us suppose that the bin B_i belongs to the HNF packing of \bar{L}' .

Case A. Let us suppose that B_i contains exactly k_i pieces of blocks whose heights are in the interval $(\frac{1}{k_i+1}, \frac{1}{k_i}]$. If we denote the j -th block in the i -th bin by $C_{i,j}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} W_s(B_i) &\geq \frac{1}{k_i} \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \sum_{p \in C_{i,j}} w(p) \\ &= \frac{1}{k_i} \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \left[\frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} \sum_{p \in C_{i,j}} w(p) + \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} \sum_{p \in C_{i,j}} w(p) \right] \\ &> \frac{k_i-1}{k_i} + \frac{1}{k_i} \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} \sum_{p \in C_{i,1}} w(p) + \frac{1}{k_i} \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} \sum_{p \in C_{i,k_i}} w(p). \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

This expression is valid whether or not $(\frac{1}{k_i+1}, \frac{1}{k_i}]$ is a γ_s -interval. We will refer to this type of bins as **A-type bins**.

Case B. Let us suppose that B_i is not an A-type bin. In this case the bin contains at least two blocks with heights in different intervals. These bins are called **transition bins** (see BAKER AND COFFMAN [1981]).

Case B.1. Let us suppose that B_i is a transition bin and contains at least one block whose height belongs to a γ_s -interval $(\frac{1}{k_i+1}, \frac{1}{k_i}]$ ($k_i \geq s+2$). By definition of the HNF rule the cumulative height of the blocks in B_i is at least $\frac{k_i-1}{k_i}$. Let us denote the height of the block $C_{i,j}$ by $h(C_{i,j})$ ($j = 1, \dots, n_i$) and use the inequality

$$W_s(p) \geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} h(p)w(p).$$

Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} W_s(B_i) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left[\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} h(C_{i,j}) \sum_{p \in C_{i,j}} w(p) \right] \\ &\geq \sum_{j=2}^{n_i} h(C_{i,j}) + \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} h(C_{i,1}) \sum_{p \in C_{i,1}} w(p) + \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} h(C_{i,n_i}) \sum_{p \in C_{i,n_i}} w(p). \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

We will refer to this type of bins as **B1-type bins**.

Case B.2. Let us suppose that B_i is a transition bin containing no block whose height is in a γ_s -interval. We suppose again that the smallest block-height is in the interval $(\frac{1}{k_i+1}, \frac{1}{k_i}]$. Since the cumulative height of the blocks in B_i is at least $\frac{k_i-1}{k_i}$ and

$$W_s(p) \geq \frac{k_i+1}{k_i} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} h(p)w(p),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} W_s(B_i) &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left[\frac{k_i+1}{k_i} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} h(C_{i,j}) \sum_{p \in C_{i,j}} w(p) \right] \\ &> \frac{k_i+1}{k_i} \sum_{j=2}^{n_i} h(C_{i,j}) + \frac{k_i+1}{k_i} \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} h(C_{i,1}) \sum_{p \in C_{i,1}} w(p) + \\ &\quad + \frac{k_i+1}{k_i} \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} h(C_{i,n_i}) \sum_{p \in C_{i,n_i}} w(p). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

We will refer to this type of bins as **B2-type bins**.

Let i_0 be the smallest index for which B_{i_0} contains at least two blocks. Let us divide the list \bar{L}' into two parts: \bar{L}'_1 contains those elements from \bar{L}' which have been packed in bins with one block, \bar{L}'_2 contains the rest of the list.

Consider a bin B_i for which $i < i_0$. It has to be an A-type bin; moreover in that special case $s = 1$ and $k_i = 1$. So if $i < i_0$ then $W_s(B_i) = 2 \sum_{p \in B_i} w(p)$. Therefore if

we get two successive bins of this type then $W_s(B_i) + W_s(B_{i+1}) > 2$, If combine these bins for all $i < i_0$ and i_0 is even at most one bin remains , so

$$W(\bar{L}'_1) > \text{HNF}(\bar{L}'_1) - 1. \quad (2.5)$$

Now consider the case $i \geq i_0$. We recall the inequality

$$\frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} \left[\sum_{p \in C_{i+1,1}} w(p) + \sum_{p \in C_{i,n_i}} w(p) \right] > 1.$$

Introduce the following notations with the help of (2.2)-(2.4)

$$F_i = \begin{cases} \frac{k_i-1}{k_i}, & \text{if } B_i \text{ is an A-type bin;} \\ \sum_{j=2}^{n_i} h(C_{i,j}), & \text{if } B_i \text{ is a B1-type bin;} \\ \frac{k_i+1}{k_i} \sum_{j=2}^{n_i} h(C_{i,j}), & \text{if } B_i \text{ is a B2-type bin.} \end{cases}$$

$$G_i = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{k_i} \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} \sum_{p \in C_{i,1}} w(p), & \text{if } B_i \text{ is an A-type bin;} \\ \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} h(C_{i,1}) \sum_{p \in C_{i,1}} w(p), & \text{if } B_i \text{ is a B1-type bin;} \\ \frac{k_i+1}{k_i} \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} h(C_{i,1}) \sum_{p \in C_{i,1}} w(p), & \text{if } B_i \text{ is a B2-type bin.} \end{cases}$$

$$H_i = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{k_i} \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} \sum_{p \in C_{i,k_i}} w(p), & \text{if } B_i \text{ is an A-type bin;} \\ \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} h(C_{i,n_i}) \sum_{p \in C_{i,n_i}} w(p), & \text{if } B_i \text{ is a B1-type bin;} \\ \frac{k_i+1}{k_i} \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} h(C_{i,n_i}) \sum_{p \in C_{i,n_i}} w(p), & \text{if } B_i \text{ is a B2-type bin.} \end{cases}$$

Then the following inequality holds:

$$W(\bar{L}'_2) \geq \sum_{i=i_0}^{\text{HNF}(\bar{L}')} (F_i + G_i + H_i) > \sum_{i=i_0+1}^{\text{HNF}(\bar{L}')} (F_i + G_i + H_{i-1}). \quad (2.6)$$

We consider three cases for B_i .

Case 1: B_i is an A-type bin. Then whether or not B_{i-1} is an A-type bin we get

$$\begin{aligned} F_i + G_i + H_{i-1} &= \frac{k_i-1}{k_i} + \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} h(C_{i,1}) \sum_{p \in C_{i,1}} w(p) \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} h(C_{i-1,n_{i-1}}) \sum_{p \in C_{i-1,n_{i-1}}} w(p) \\ &> \frac{k_i-1}{k_i} + \frac{1}{k_i} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Case 2: B_i is a B1-type bin. Then for any type of B_{i-1} bin

$$\begin{aligned} F_i + G_i + H_{i-1} &= \sum_{j=2}^{n_i} h(C_{i,j}) + \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} h(C_{i,1}) \sum_{p \in C_{i,1}} w(p) + \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)} h(C_{i-1,n_{i-1}}) \sum_{p \in C_{i-1,n_{i-1}}} w(p) \geq \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{1}{k_i}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

So the cumulative weight of the items in a B1-type bin is at least $1 - \frac{1}{k_i}$, where k_i is that integer for which the smallest block-height of B_i is in the interval $(\frac{1}{k_i+1}, \frac{1}{k_i}]$. Since a B1-type bin is a transition bin so at most two B1-type bins may occur with blocks of heights in the same γ_s -interval. Therefore the total weight-shortfall for the B1-type bins is not greater than $2 \sum \frac{1}{k}$, where we summarize over all k for which the interval $(\frac{1}{k+1}, \frac{1}{k}]$ is a γ_s -interval. Since the function γ_s^* is a monoton decreasing function of s we get that the cumulative weight-shortfall for these bins is

$$2 \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{t_i(s) - 1} = 2(\gamma_s - \frac{1}{s}) \leq 2(\gamma_s^* - 1) < \frac{3}{2} \quad (2.9)$$

Case 3: B_i is a B2-type bin. Then

$$\begin{aligned} F_i + G_i + H_{i-1} &\geq \frac{k_i + 1}{k_i} \sum_{j=2}^{n_i} h(C_{i,j}) + \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha - 1)} \frac{k_i + 1}{k_i} h(C_{i,1}) \sum_{p \in C_{i,1}} w(p) + \\ &\quad + h(C_{i-1, n_{i-1}}) \sum_{p \in C_{i-1, n_{i-1}}} w(p) \\ &> \frac{k_i^2 - 1}{k_i^2} - \frac{k_i + 1}{k_i} (1 - \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha - 1)}) h(C_{i,1}) \sum_{p \in C_{i,1}} w(p) + \\ &\quad + h(C_{i-1, n_{i-1}}) \sum_{p \in C_{i-1, n_{i-1}}} w(p) \\ &\geq \frac{k_i^2 - 1}{k_i^2} + \frac{1}{k_i} - \frac{k_i + 1}{k_i} \frac{1}{k_{i-1}} \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{2}{k_i^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

This means that the cumulative weight of the items in B_i is at least $1 - \frac{2}{k_i^2}$, where k_i is that integer to which the smallest block-height in B_i is in the interval $(\frac{1}{k_i+1}, \frac{1}{k_i}]$. Since the smallest block-height in B_i is not greater than $\frac{1}{s+3}$, we get for the cumulative shortfall of the weights of the B2-type bins

$$\sum_{k \geq s+3} \frac{2}{k^2} \leq 2(\frac{\pi^2}{6} - \frac{49}{36}) \leq \frac{2}{3}. \quad (2.11)$$

Summing over all bins in \bar{L}'_2 we get

$$W_s(\bar{L}'_2) > \sum_{i=i_0+1}^{\text{HNF}(\bar{L}')} (F_i + G_i + H_{i-1}) > \text{HNF}(\bar{L}'_2) - \frac{13}{6}. \quad (2.11)$$

From (2.7) and (2.12)

$$W_s(\bar{L}') = W_s(\bar{L}'_1) + W_s(\bar{L}'_2) > \text{HNF}(\bar{L}') - \frac{19}{6}.$$

Since $W_s(\bar{L}) \geq W_s(\bar{L}')$ and $\text{HNF}(\bar{L}) = \text{HNF}(\bar{L}') + 1$, therefore

$$W_s(\bar{L}) > \text{HNF}(\bar{L}) - \frac{25}{6}. \quad (2.13)$$

Up to this point we ignored the fact that within a block there may occur pieces with smaller heights than the height of the block. Since the rectangles are ordered according to their heights it is easy to prove that the sum of the area above the rectangles within a block can be bounded by $h(C_{1,1})$. Since $h(C_{1,1}) \leq \frac{1}{9} \leq 1$ we get that the value of the weight-shortfall - returning to the original list - can be bounded by the cumulative weight of pieces in one bin. Using the result of the Claim (2.8) we obtain

$$W_s(\bar{L}) \leq W_s(L) + \frac{41}{12}$$

and so

$$W_s(L) > \text{HNF}(L) - 8. \quad (2.14)$$

This completes the the proof of Claim (2.7). □

(2.8) Claim *In any packing of L the cumulative weight of the items in any of the bins is at most $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \gamma_s^*$. Hence*

$$W_s(L) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \gamma_s^* \text{OPT}(L).$$

Proof. Consider a bin B in an arbitrary packing of L . Divide the bin B into bands by vertical lines along the left- and the right-hand sides of all items in it. Denote the i -th band by D_i , and its width by $w(D_i)$ (see Figure 2.2).




Figure 2.2

We prove that the cumulative weight of the items (or their segments) within a band is not greater than $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \gamma_s^* w(D_i)$. Using Corollary (2.6)

$$W_s(B) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \gamma_s^* \sum_{D_i \in B} w(D_i) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \gamma_s^*.$$

Let us consider the band D_i . First suppose that there are $s-1$ pieces with heights in the largest γ_s -interval. Their cumulative weight is $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}w(D_i)\frac{s-1}{s}$, and the occupied height by these pieces is at least $\frac{s-1}{s+1}$. So the sum of the heights of the remaining pieces is at most $1 - \frac{s-1}{s+1} = \frac{2}{s+1}$. Let q_1, \dots, q_m these pieces and $h(q_1) \geq h(q_2) \geq \dots \geq h(q_m)$. If $h(q_j)$ is in the j -th γ_s -interval $1 \leq j \leq m$ then

$$W_s(D_i) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}w(D_i)\left[\frac{s-1}{s} + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{t_j(s)-1}\right] \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\gamma_s^*w(D_i).$$

Thus assume that there is at least one q_j , whose height is not in the j -th γ_s -interval. Let k be the smallest index of the items of this type. The total weight of the largest $k-1$ pieces is

$$\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}w(D_i) \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{t_j(s)-1}.$$

The remaining height is not greater than

$$\frac{2}{s-1} - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{t_j(s)-1} = \frac{1}{t_k(s)-1}.$$

Since $h(q_k) \geq \frac{1}{t_k(s)}$ we get

$$\frac{W_s(q_l)}{h(q_l)} \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}w(D_i) \frac{t_k(s)+1}{t_k(s)}$$

for all $l \geq k$. So the cumulative weight of the pieces in the remaining part of the bin is

$$\begin{aligned} W'_s(D_i) &\leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}w(D_i) \frac{t_k(s)+1}{t_k(s)} \frac{1}{t_k(s)-1} \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}w(D_i) \left(\frac{1}{t_k(s)-1} + \frac{1}{t_{k+1}(s)-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$W_s(D_i) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}w(D_i) \left(\frac{s-1}{s} + \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{t_j(s)-1} \right) < \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\gamma_s^*w(D_i).$$

Finally let us consider the case that there are only $u \leq s-2$ pieces with heights in the first γ_s -interval. These occupy $\frac{u}{s+1}$ height in the band D_i , and their total weight is $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}w(D_i)\frac{u}{s}$. So the remaining height in the band is at most $1 - \frac{u}{s+1}$. It is clear that the height of the highest item in this part of the band is not greater than $\frac{1}{s+1}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} W_s(q_j) &\leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \frac{W_s(q_j)}{h(q_j)} \sum_{j=1}^m h(q_j) \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}w(D_i) \frac{s+2}{s+1} \left(1 - \frac{u}{s+1}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$W_s(D_i) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} w(D_i) \left[\frac{s+2}{s} + \frac{s+2}{s+1} \left(1 - \frac{s+2}{s+1} \right) \right] < \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \gamma_s^*.$$

□

We now prove the **Lemma (2.3)**. It is sufficient to construct the sequence of the lists L_r . Take the following sequence of the items for given $s \geq 1, r \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$. A list L_r consists of two types of rectangles. The widths of the rectangles of **type A** are $\frac{1}{\alpha}$, and the widths of the rectangles of **type B** are δ ($0 < \delta \leq \frac{1}{m}$, where m is a suitable multiple of $t_k(s) - 1$). The sequence of the rectangles of type A consists of $m\alpha(\alpha-1)(s-1)$ times rectangles with height $\frac{1}{s+1} + \varepsilon$ and another k rectangles of different types with heights $\frac{1}{t_i(s)} + \varepsilon, 1 \leq i \leq k$, and among them there are $m\alpha(\alpha-1)$ pieces of each of the different types. Similarly, we have $m\alpha(\alpha-1)$ pieces of the rectangles of type B bins with height $\frac{1}{s+1} + \varepsilon$ and $m\alpha$ pieces with height $\frac{1}{t_i(s)} + \varepsilon$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. It is clear that the rectangles of type A can be packed into $m(\alpha-1)$ bins, because

$$\frac{s-1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{t_i(s)} + O(\varepsilon) < 1$$

with a suitable small $\varepsilon > 0$. The pieces from the sequence of type B rectangles can be placed into one bin. Thus

$$\text{OPT}(L_r) \leq m(\alpha-1) + 1.$$

Order the elements of the list L_r according to the heights of the elements so that $\alpha-1$ pieces of type A and one piece of type B succeed each other in periodical way. Then

$$\text{HNF}(L_r) \geq m\alpha + m\alpha \sum_{i=2}^k \frac{1}{t_i(s) - 1} - (k+1).$$

The ratio is

$$\frac{\text{HNF}(L_r)}{\text{OPT}(L_r)} \geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \left[1 + \sum_{i=2}^k \frac{1}{t_i(s) - 1} - \frac{(k+1)(\alpha-1) + \alpha(1 + \sum_{i=2}^k \frac{1}{t_i(s) - 1})}{m\alpha(\alpha-1) + \alpha} \right].$$

So the right hand side of this inequality can be made as closely to $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \gamma_s^*$ as desired by appropriate choices for k, m and ε .

□

Here we give a table for the first few values of $R_{\text{HNF}}(r, s)$:

s-r	1	2	3	4	5
1	3.382	3.382	2.536	2.254	2.114
2	2.846	2.846	2.134	1.897	1.779
3	2.604	2.604	1.953	1.736	1.627
4	2.466	2.466	1.848	1.644	1.541

3. The expected solution value

In order to analyse the expected number of bins used by the HNF heuristic we approximate its performance by that of the **Sliced HNF with parameter r** (SHNF_r), (see CSIRIK ET AL. [1986]) in which items whose heights are larger than $\frac{1}{r}$ are packed according to the NFD rule, the last opened bin is completed to obtain at most $(r-1)$ blocks and any remaining items are packed in bins in blocks of size r . Contrary to the notations used in the previous section in this section the random variable $A(n)$ will denote the number of bins used by the algorithm A to pack n items. Then clearly for any realization of the item sizes $(w(p), h(p))$, $w(p) \leq 1$, $h(p) \leq 1$, we obtain

$$\text{SHNF}_r(n) \geq \text{HNF}(n), \quad r \geq 2, n \geq 1,$$

and

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \text{SHNF}_r(n) = \text{HNF}(n), \quad n \geq 1. \quad (3.1)$$

Consider now a sequence of positive random vectors $(w_i(p), h_i(p))_{i=1}^{\infty}$, bounded by 1 in each component, with $(w_i(p))_{i=1}^{\infty}$, $(h_i(p))_{i=1}^{\infty}$ independent subsequences consisting of independent and identically distributed random variables.

If $k_i(n)$ denotes the number of vectors among the first n whose second component belongs to $(\frac{1}{i+1}, \frac{1}{i}]$ and $K_r(n) = k_1(n) + k_2(n) + \dots$ then one can easily verify that

$$\text{SHNF}_r(n) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \frac{\text{NF}(k_i(n))}{i} + \frac{\text{NF}(K_r(n))}{r} + r. \quad (3.2)$$

On the other hand, if the items are packed by the HNF rule and bins containing items, whose second components are smaller than $\frac{1}{r}$ or belong to different intervals $(\frac{1}{i+1}, \frac{1}{i}]$, $1 \leq i \leq r-1$, are ignored, then we have that

$$\text{HNF} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \frac{\text{NF}(k_i(n))}{i} - r. \quad (3.3)$$

Hence by (3.2) and (3.3) we obtain for every fixed $r \geq 2$ immediately

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \frac{\text{E}(\text{NF}(k_i(n)))}{i} - r \leq \text{E}(\text{HNF}(n)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \frac{\text{E}(\text{NF}(k_i(n)))}{i} + \frac{\text{E}(\text{NF}(K_r(n)))}{r} + r. \quad (3.4)$$

Notice that for $n, m \geq 0$

$$0 \leq \text{NF}(n+m) \leq \text{NF}(n) + \text{NF}(m)$$

and so by the theory of subadditive processes (see KINGMAN [1976])

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{NF}(n)}{n} = c$$

exist a.s.. Moreover, since $NF(n) \leq n$, we get by the dominated convergence theorem

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(NF(n))}{n} = c. \quad (3.5)$$

Using the above observations (3.4) and (3.5) and the fact that $k_i(n)$, $1 \leq i \leq r-1$, resp. $K_r(n)$, are binomially distributed with parameters n , $F(\frac{1}{i}) - F(\frac{1}{i+1})$, resp. $F(\frac{1}{r})$, where F denotes the probability distribution of the height $h(p)$, we obtain by a standard argument

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(HNF(n))}{n} \leq c \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \frac{F(\frac{1}{i}) - F(\frac{1}{i+1})}{i} + \frac{c}{r} F(\frac{1}{r}) \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(HNF(n))}{n} \geq c \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \frac{F(\frac{1}{i}) - F(\frac{1}{i+1})}{i} \quad (3.7)$$

for every $r \geq 2$.

This implies, letting $r \rightarrow \infty$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(HNF(n))}{n} = c \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{F(\frac{1}{i}) - F(\frac{1}{i+1})}{i} = c \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(NFD(n))}{n} \quad (3.8)$$

where we get the last equation from CSIRIK ET AL. [1986]. Hence we have proved the following result.

(3.1) Theorem

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(HNF(n))}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(NF(n))}{n} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(NFD(n))}{n}.$$

Remark. If the item sizes $(w_i(p), h_i(p))_{i=1}^{\infty}$ are independent and uniformly distributed in the square $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(NF(n))}{n} = \frac{2}{3} \quad (\text{see ONG ET AL [1984]})$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(NFD(n))}{n} = \left(\frac{\pi^2}{6} - 1\right) \quad (\text{see CSIRIK ET AL [1986]}).$$

Hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(HNF(n))}{n} = \frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{\pi^2}{6} - 1\right)$$

and since

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(OPT(n))}{\frac{n}{4}} = 1,$$

this implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(HNF(n))}{E(OPT(n))} = \frac{8}{3} \left(\frac{\pi^2}{6} - 1\right).$$

References

- [1] B. S. Baker & E. G. Coffman [1981]: *A tight asymptotic bound for next-fit-decreasing bin packing*. SIAM J. Alg. Disc. Meth. 2 (1981), 147-152.
- [4] F. R. K. Chung & M. R. Garey & D. S. Johnson [1982]: *On packing two-dimensional bins*. SIAM Alg. Discr. Meth. 3 (1982), 66-76.
- [3] E. G. Coffman & M. R. Garey & D. S. Johnson & R. E. Tarjan, [1980]: *Performance bounds for level-oriented two-dimensional packing algorithms*. SIAM J. Computing 9 (1980), 808-826.
- [2] J. Csirik & J. B. G. Frenk & A. M. Frieze & G. Galambos, A. H. G. Rinnooy Kan, [1986]: *A probabilistic analysis of the next fit decreasing bin packing heuristic*. To appear in Operations Research Letters
- [5] M. R. Garey & D. S. Johnson [1979]: *Computer and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman San Francisco (1979).
- [6] D. S. Johnson [1974]: *Fast algorithms for bin-packing*. System Sci. 8 (1974) 272-314.
- [7] D. S. Johnson & A. Demers & J. D. Ullman & M. R. Garey & R. L. Graham [1974]: *Worst-case performance bounds for simple one-dimensional packing algorithms*. SIAM J. Computing 3 (1974) 256-278.
- [8] J. F. C. Kingman [1976]: *Subadditive Processes, Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer Verlag, 539, 168-222.
- [9] F. M. Liang [1980]: *Lower bound for on-line bin packing*. Information Proc. Lett. 10 (1980) 76-79.
- [10] H. L. Ong & M. J. Magazine & T. S. Wee [1984]: *Probabilistic analysis of bin packing heuristics*. Operations Research, 32(1984), 983-998.