An Greedy-Based Job Scheduling Algorithm in Cloud Computing
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Abstract—Nowadays, cloud computing has become a popular platform for scientific applications. Cloud computing intends to share a large number of resources such as equipments for storage and computation, and information and knowledge for scientific researches. Job scheduling algorithm is one of the most challenging theoretical issues in the cloud computing area. How to use cloud computing resources efficiently and increase user satisfaction with jobs scheduling system is one of the cloud computing service providers important goals. Some intensive researches have been done in the area of job scheduling of cloud computing. In this paper we have proposed Greedy-Based Algorithm in cloud computing. In order to prove our opinions we will process this artical as the following steps. First of all, we will classify tasks based on QoS. Then, according to the tasks categories, we will select the appropriate branch of the function and compute the justice evaluation. This will also reflects the greedy algorithm to select local optimum. Compare to other methods, it can decrease the completion time of submitted jobs and increases the user satisfaction.

Index Terms—cloud computing, job scheduling, Greedy-Based Algorithm, user satisfaction

I. INTRODUCTION

Job scheduling is one of the core and challenging issues in a cloud computing system [1]. However, traditional job scheduling systems in cloud computing only consider how to increase job scheduling efficiency or how to meet the QoS requirements for the resources users, they seldom give description which consider how to combine these above two aspects together. Several job scheduling algorithms have been proposed here as evidences in cloud computing area [2]–[9]. Most of them can be applied in the cloud environment with emphasis on efficiency [3], [4], [6]–[9]. Some of them consider the fairness of users too much to such an extent as to miss the efficiency [2], [5]. Greedy algorithm refers it always make the current best choice in solving the problem. In other words, it is not the whole optimal, but local. Greedy algorithm cannot only be overall optimal solution for all problems, but a wide range of many of the problems that he could produce one or an approximate one. In this paper, we propose the Greedy-Based Algorithm in cloud. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In sect.2, we will provide an overview of job scheduling algorithms in cloud computing and make comparisons between them accordingly. In sect.3, we are going to describe the details of algorithm proposed in this paper, which will be supported by sets of data. In sect.4, we intend to offer the descriptions of the simulation experiment and results to further prove our ideas. Finally, well reach the conclusion part with full descriptions of the core purpose of writing this paper.

II. RELATED WORKS

Job scheduling has always been a core research area and hence there are a plethora of papers related to this topic can be found in the past decade. Since the development of cloud computing requires technology about virtualization and resource allocation, job scheduling plays a vital role in it. Job scheduling in cloud and grid has an excellent history in research area. A lot of algorithm, technique and strategy have been proposed for this, which include Berger Model [2], Bagof-Tasks [3], Optimal Workflow scheduling [4], Cost-Based Multi-QoS Scheduling [5], Priority Scheduling [6], Utility-Based Scheduling [7] and lots more. [2] Shows a job scheduling algorithm based on Berger Model, the social theories of distributive justice. The algorithm for the establishment of the dual constraint supports the idea of that job scheduling. The simulation result shows that fairness of users is increased to a significant extent with low efficiency. [3] Deals with scheduling multiple applications made of collections of independent and identical tasks on a heterogeneous master-worker platform. The objective is minimizing the maximum stretch i.e. the maximum ratio between the actual time and application has spent in the system and the time. This application would have spent if executed alone. [4] Proposes an Optimal Workflow based Scheduling (OWS) algorithm to find a solution that meets the user-preferred Quality of Service (QoS) parameters. The work focuses on scheduling cloud workflows. By this way a significant improvement in
CPU utilization is achieved. In this paper, we propose the Greedy-Based Algorithm exists in cloud. The algorithm involves 3 phases. First, we classify jobs based on QoS considering the parameters of completion time and bandwidth. Second, According to the job category, we enter different algorithms branch. Finally, we judge the fairness using JEF function [2], [10], [11]. With this algorithm, a significant improvement in CPU utilization is achieved. The experimental results demonstrate that we can decrease the completion time and increases user satisfaction.

III. PROPOSED ALGORITHM

Our scheduling algorithm mainly consists of three phrases including: classification based on QoS Task-classifier, enter different algorithms branch and justice evaluation, as shown in Figure 1. We classifier jobs in the first phrase; then selected the corresponding algorithm branch; Thus we can get the final fairness evaluation by JEF function, feedback the preprocessing unit and task-classifier, and affect its next operation.

A. Task classification based on QoS

Most of these researches assume that each job has fixed types and amount of execution times. But it is not the case of the real world cloud computing. The above mention issues are highlighted in this section.

1) When users submit their job in preprocessing unit, the unit computes the attribute of different jobs and QoS, and encodes the attribute into the users job attribute vector, as following Figure 2.

2) Task-classifier, which classifies the task based on attributes, determined by preprocessing unit. For example, job can be classified into different types based on QoS (e.g. completion time, bandwidth). Then it sends jobs to different scheduler branches.

B. Greedy-Based Algorithm

For a set of jobs and the virtual machines, Greedy-Based Algorithm depends on the local optimal method to allocate resources. That is the reason why we called it Greedy-Based Algorithm based on the Greedy algorithm. A general algorithm for Greedy-Based can be sketched as following Figure 3.

C. The justice evaluation function and JEF calculations

[2] Referred to this concept and applied to the fairness of judgment in job scheduling. In our paper, we continued to quote it adding to the Greedy-Based Algorithm to increase the fairness. Please take the definition of justice evaluation function in Berger model [12] as your reference.

\[ JEF = \Theta \left( \frac{AR}{JR} \right) \]

Where \( \Theta \) denotes to constant \( 0 < \Theta \leq 1 \), \( AR \) is the actual reward, which job obtains actually, \( JR \) is the expectation reward which job expected. When JEF is zero, it achieves fairness. Others are not fair. The role of the function is to judge the outcome of the allocation resources whether fair or not.

Before evaluating the function, we first must normalize the jobs and virtual machines. Once the job scheduling has been done, the next step is to normalize the jobs and resources according to the various QoS time, bandwidth. The calculation of these parameters is specified as follows:

1) **Time Preference (TP)**: This preference indicates the purpose of choosing resources instances, that which gives the least execution time for jobs. \( TP_i \) given by Equation 1 as:

\[ TP_i = \frac{TR_i}{TR_{max} - TR_{min} + 1}, \]
0 \leq \text{timetypeLIST.size()} - 1 \quad (1)

Where \( TR_i = T_{iFin} - T_{iStart} \), \( T_{iStart} \) is the finish time of the \( i^{th} \) job, \( T_{iStart} \) is the start time of the \( i^{th} \) job, \( \text{timetypeList.size()} \) is the number of jobs preferring time, \( TR_{max} \) is time taken by slowest job, \( TR_{min} \) is time taken by fastest job, \( TR_i \) is time taken by executing \( i^{th} \) job in the job queue.

2) Bandwidth Preference (BP): This preference indicates the purpose of choosing resources instances which give the appropriate bandwidth for jobs. \( BP_i \) is given by Equation 2 as:

\[
BP_i = \frac{BR_i}{BR_{max} - BR_{min} + 1}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq \text{bwtypeLIST.size()} - 1
\]

Where \( BR_i = BW_{i\text{bwtypeList.size()}} \) is the number of jobs preferring bandwidth, \( BR_{max} \) is bandwidth taken by the greatest demand job, \( BR_{min} \) is bandwidth taken by the min demand job, \( BR_i \) is bandwidth taken by executing \( i^{th} \) job in the job queue.

3) Expectation Time Preference (ETP): This preference indicates the expectation time of job in the first type. \( ETP_i \) is given by Equation 3 as:

\[
ETP_i = \frac{ETR_i}{ETR_{max} - ETR_{min} + 1}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq \text{timetypeLIST.size()} - 1 \quad (3)
\]

Where \( ETR_i = T_{i\text{Expect.time}} \), \( ETR_i \) is the expectation time of the \( i^{th} \) job in the first type.

4) Expectation Bandwidth Preference (EBP): This preference indicates the expectation bandwidth of the \( i^{th} \) job in the second type. \( EBP_i \) is given by Equation 4 as:

\[
EBP_i = \frac{EBR_i}{EBR_{max} - EBR_{min} + 1}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq \text{bwtypeLIST.size()} - 1 \quad (4)
\]

Where \( EBR_i = BW_{i\text{Expect.BW}} \), \( EBR_i \) is the expectation bandwidth of the \( i^{th} \) job in the second type.

5) JEF function (J) and Function Result

After normalization, we start JEF function as following Equation 5 and Equation 6.

\[
J_0_i = \Theta \ln \left( TP_i/ETP_i \right), \quad 0 \leq \text{timetypeLIST.size()} - 1 \quad (5)
\]

Where \( \Theta \) denotes constant \((0 < \Theta \leq 1)\). \( J_0_i \) is the J-value of \( i^{th} \) job in the first type, \( TP_i \) is the \( i^{th} \) jobs actual time after normalization, \( ETP_i \) is the \( i^{th} \) jobs expectation time after normalization.

\[
J_{1i} = \Theta \ln \left( BP_i/EBP_i \right),
\]

Where \( \Theta \) denotes constant \((0 < \Theta \leq 1)\). \( J_{1i} \) is the J-value of \( i^{th} \) job in the second type, \( BP_i \) is the \( i^{th} \) jobs actual bandwidth after normalization, \( EBP_i \) is the \( i^{th} \) jobs expectation bandwidth after normalization. When \( J_0_i \) (\( J_{1i} \)) is zero, it achieves fairness. Others are not fair. The role of the function is to judge the outcome of the allocation resources whether or not fair. We also give feedbacks of \( J \) value to the classifier, so that it can be modified.

IV. Simulation experiment and experimental results

A. Implementation environment

We implement Greedy-Based Algorithm in the CloudSim platform [1], which aims to simulate programs. Of course, we add the algorithm presented by this paper, with overloading the bindCloudletToVM() method in DatacenterBroker class of CloudSim. Cloudlet class is also need to be extended. We add attributes for Cloudlet class, e.g. classtype, Expectationtime, ExpectationBW and related methods, such as setClasstype(), getClasstype(), setExpectationtime(), getExpectationtime(), setExpectationBW(), getExpectationBW(). We also overload the bindCloudletToVM() method in DatacenterBroker class. According to the tasks categories, we select the appropriate branch of the function. This also reflects the greedy algorithm to select local optimum.

B. Implementation Data

A group of tasks after the preprocessing unit and task classifier, with the parameters list as following Figure 4. In Figure 4, task 0-3 belong to the preference of time; task 4-7 belongs to the preference of bandwidth by classifier learned, in order to create a group of virtual machine with different performance and preference, as shown in Figure 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cloudlet-ID</th>
<th>Class-type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>File-size</th>
<th>Output-size</th>
<th>Expectation-time</th>
<th>ExpectationBW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Cloudlet parameters.

C. Experimental results

The experimental results are shown in Figure 6-9. Here you can find we compare the performance of our algorithm (Algorithm 1) with other two scheduling algorithms in the cloud environment, which named job scheduling.
algorithm based on Berger model (Algorithm 2) and job scheduling algorithm based on the optimal completion time (Algorithm 3). Algorithm 3 is implemented by using the existing scheduling strategy of CloudSim. Figure 6 shows the task execution time achieved by comparative experimental results. Overall, execution efficiency of algorithm 1 is slightly better than others.

Figure 7 shows the J Value (user satisfaction) achieved by comparative experimental results. Finally, user satisfaction of algorithm 1 is somewhat better than the others.

Figure 8 shows the first type of task achieved by comparative experimental results. It obtains good computing power.

Figure 9 shows comparison of the allocated virtual machines bandwidth for the second type of task. It obtains better fairness than algorithm 3, but slightly worse than algorithm 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VmId</th>
<th>CPU</th>
<th>Memory</th>
<th>Bandwidth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5. Virtual machine parameters.**

**Figure 6. Task execution time comparisons.**

**Figure 7. User satisfaction comparisons.**

**Figure 8. Comparison of the first class task.**

**Figure 9. Comparison of the second class task.**

V. CONCLUSIONS

User fairness and efficiency are important issues for job scheduling in cloud environments. As cloud is a business-oriented service, it must concern about both shorter completion time as well as better QoS of cloud customer. In this paper we have proposed Greedy-Based job scheduling algorithm, which can be applied in cloud environments. Result of this paper indicates that the proposed algorithm has decreased the completion time of submitted jobs and increased user satisfaction. In addition, improvement of the proposed algorithm in order to gain more fairness is considered as future work.
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