

Separating k -MEDIAN from the Supplier Version

Aditya Anand Euiwoong Lee
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Abstract

Given a metric space (V, d) along with an integer k , the k -MEDIAN problem asks to open k centers $C \subseteq V$ to minimize $\sum_{v \in V} d(v, C)$, where $d(v, C) := \min_{c \in C} d(v, c)$. While the best-known approximation ratio 2.613 holds for the more general *supplier version* where an additional set $F \subseteq V$ is given with the restriction $C \subseteq F$, the best known hardness for these two versions are $1 + 1/e \approx 1.36$ and $1 + 2/e \approx 1.73$ respectively, using the same reduction from MAXIMUM k -COVERAGE. We prove the following two results separating them.

1. We give a 1.546-parameterized approximation algorithm that runs in time $f(k)n^{O(1)}$. Since $1 + 2/e$ is proved to be the optimal approximation ratio for the supplier version in the parameterized setting, this result separates the original k -MEDIAN from the supplier version.
2. We prove a 1.416-hardness for polynomial-time algorithms assuming the Unique Games Conjecture. This is achieved via a new fine-grained hardness of MAXIMUM k -COVERAGE for small set sizes.

Our upper bound and lower bound are derived from almost the same expression, with the only difference coming from the well-known separation between the powers of LP and SDP on (hypergraph) vertex cover.

1 Introduction

k -MEDIAN is perhaps the most well-studied clustering objective in finite general metrics. Given a (semi-)metric space (V, d) along with an integer k , the goal is to open k centers $C \subseteq V$ to minimize the objective function $\sum_{v \in V} d(v, C)$, where $d(v, C) := \min_{c \in C} d(v, c)$. It has been the subject of numerous papers introducing diverse algorithmic techniques, including filtering [36, 37], metric embedding [8, 10], local search [3], primal LP rounding [12, 13], primal-dual [30], greedy with dual fitting analysis [11, 29], and bipoint rounding [9, 35]. The current best approximation ratio is slightly lower than 2.613 [18, 23], achieved by the combination of greedy search analyzed dual fitting method and bipoint rounding.

One can define a slightly more general version of k -MEDIAN by putting restrictions on which points can become centers; the input specifies a partition of V into *candidate centers* $F \subseteq V$ and *clients* $L \subseteq V$, and the goal is to choose $C \subseteq F$ with $|C| = k$ to minimize $\sum_{v \in L} d(v, C)$. Let us call this version the *supplier version* in this paper. This distinction between the original version and the supplier version is apparent in a similar clustering objective k -CENTER (where the objective function is $\max_{v \in C} d(v, C)$), whose supplier version has been called k -SUPPLIER and sometimes studied separately. k -CENTER and k -SUPPLIER admit 2 and 3 approximation algorithms respectively, which are optimal assuming $\mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$, so we know there is a strict separation between these two.

For k -MEDIAN, this distinction has not been emphasized as much. Earlier papers define k -MEDIAN as the original version [8, 10, 12, 36, 37], but most papers in this century define k -MEDIAN as the supplier version. One reason for this transformation might be the influence of techniques coming from the FACILITY LOCATION problem. As the name suggests, FACILITY LOCATION originates from the planning perspective (just like k -SUPPLIER), so it is natural to assume that V is partitioned into the set of clients L and set of potential facility sites F with opening costs $f : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and the goal is to open $C \subseteq F$ (without any restriction on $|C|$) to minimize $f(C) + \sum_{v \in L} d(v, C)$. But once we interpret k -MEDIAN in the context of geometric clustering, such a restriction seems unnecessary, and it is more natural to study the original version directly.

Then the question is: will the original version of k -MEDIAN exhibit better approximability than the supplier version, just like k -CENTER and k -SUPPLIER? Algorithmically, no such separation is known, as many of the current algorithmic techniques, including the ones giving the current best approximation ratio, rely on the connection between k -MEDIAN and FACILITY LOCATION; the best approximation ratio for k -MEDIAN still holds for the supplier version. However, these two problems show different behaviors in terms of hardness. The reduction from MAXIMUM k -COVERAGE to FACILITY LOCATION by Guha and Khuller [26], adapted to k -MEDIAN by Jain et al. [29], shows that the supplier version of k -MEDIAN is NP-hard to approximate within a factor $(1 + 2/e) \approx 1.73$. The same reduction yields only $(1 + 1/e) \approx 1.36$ for the original k -MEDIAN. This separation in the current hardness, together with the separation between k -CENTER and k -SUPPLIER, suggest that the best approximation ratio achieved by a polynomial-time algorithm for the original k -MEDIAN might be strictly smaller than that of the supplier version. Of course, formally showing such a separation requires a polynomial-time algorithm for the original version with the approximation ratio strictly less than $1 + 2/e$, which seems hard to achieve now given the big gap between the upper and lower bounds for both versions.

A relatively new direction of *parameterized approximation*, which studies algorithms running in time $f(k) \cdot n^{O(1)}$ for any computable function $f(k)$, might be a good proxy for the polynomial-time approximation. In fact, Cohen-Addad et al. [15] showed that there exists a parameterized approximation algorithm for the supplier version that guarantees a $(1 + 2/e + \epsilon)$ -approximation for any $\epsilon > 0$. Moreover, this additional running time does not seem to cross the NP-hardness boundary; assuming the Gap Exponential Time Hypothesis (Gap-ETH), they show that no FPT algorithm can achieve an approximation ratio $(1 + 2/e - \epsilon)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Many subsequent (and concurrent) papers studied parameterized approximability of many variants of k -MEDIAN and obtained improved approximation ratios over polynomial-time algorithms [1, 2, 6, 7, 17, 21, 24, 25, 28, 32, 40], but for quite a few of these problems, including k -MEDIAN and CAPACITATED k -MEDIAN, no parameterized approximation algorithm achieved a result impossible for their polynomial-time counterparts. Therefore, apart from its practical benefit when k is small, the study of parameterized approximation might yield a meaningful prediction for polynomial-time approximability.

Our main algorithmic result is the following parameterized approximation algorithm that strictly separates the original and supplier versions of k -MEDIAN. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first separation

between the original and supplier versions of any variant of k -MEDIAN.

Theorem 1.1. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is an algorithm for k -MEDIAN that runs in time $f(k, \epsilon) \cdot n^{O(1)}$ and guarantees an approximation ratio of*

$$\min_{p \in [0,1]} \max_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \left[1 + \left(1 - \frac{1-p}{d} \right)^d + \left(1 - \frac{pd + (1-p)}{d} \right)^d + \epsilon \right] \approx 1.546 + \epsilon,$$

where the optimal value is achieved with $p^* := (10^{-6}\sqrt{2})/7 \approx 0.22$ and $d^* := 3$.

Our main hardness result is the following theorem against *polynomial-time* algorithms assuming the Unique Games Conjecture (UGC) [33], improving the best known lower bound of $(1 + 1/e) \approx 1.36$ [26, 29].

Theorem 1.2. *Assuming the Unique Games Conjecture, for any $\epsilon > 0$, k -MEDIAN is NP-hard to approximate within a factor*

$$\max_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3}} \min_{p \in [0,1]} \left[1 + \left(1 - \frac{1-p}{d-1} \right)^d + \left(1 - \min\left(1, \frac{pd + (1-p)}{d-1}\right) \right)^d - \epsilon \right] \approx 1.416 - \epsilon.$$

Somewhat surprisingly, this expression almost exactly matches the algorithmic guarantee except (1) denominators being $d - 1$ instead of d (which causes the $\min(1, \cdot)$) and (2) $\max_d \min_p$ vs $\min_p \max_d$.

The difference between $d - 1$ and d comes from the well-known separation between the powers of LP and SDP on (hypergraph) vertex cover, elaborated more in the overview below. Furthermore, we show that the max-min and the min-max values of the function in Theorem 1.1 coincide (Lemma 2.8), so these two results might point towards the optimal approximability of k -MEDIAN, both for polynomial-time and parameterized algorithms.

Our hardness result proceeds via, and hence shows, more fine grained hardness for MAXIMUM k -COVERAGE. Given an instance of MAXIMUM k -COVERAGE with universe size n and a constant $d \geq 3$ so that each element appears in exactly d sets, we show that assuming the Unique Games Conjecture, it is NP-Hard to distinguish the YES-case where k sets cover all elements, and the NO-case where for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, αk sets cover at most $1 - (1 - \frac{\alpha}{d-1})^d$ fraction of the elements where $k = \frac{n}{d-1}$ (see Theorem 3.1). This is a new fine-grained version of the $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ hardness of [19] when $\alpha = 1$ for small d .

1.1 Overview

In this overview, we explain our intuition behind these two results and how they are related. For the sake of simplicity, let us ignore the arbitrarily small constant $\epsilon > 0$ in the overview.

Hardness. Our improved hardness, which eventually guided our algorithm, comes from observing the classical reduction of Guha and Khuller [26] and Jain et al. [29]. It is a reduction from the famous MAXIMUM k -COVERAGE problem; given a hypergraph $H = (V_H, E_H)$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, choose $S \subseteq V_H$ of k vertices that intersects the most number of hyperedges.¹ The classical result of Feige [19] shows that it is NP-hard to distinguish between the (YES) case where k vertices intersect all hyperedges and the (NO) case where any choice of k vertices intersect at most $(1 - 1/e) \approx 0.63$ fraction of the hyperedges.

Given a hardness instance (H, k) for MAXIMUM k -COVERAGE, the reduction to k -MEDIAN is simply to construct the vertex-hyperedge incidence graph $G = (V_G, E_G)$ where $V_G = V_H \cup E_H$ and a pair $(v, e) \in V_H \times E_H$ is in E_G if $v \in e$ in H . In the supplier version, one can simply let $F = V_H$ and $L = E_H$. Given $C \subseteq F$, for each $e \in L$, the distance $d(e, C)$ is 1 if it contains a vertex in C and at least 3 otherwise, thanks to the bipartiteness of G . Therefore, the average distance for clients in L becomes 1 in the YES case and at least $1 \cdot (1 - 1/e) + 3 \cdot (1/e) = 1 + 2/e$ in the NO case.

The same construction works for the original version without F and L with two differences. The first difference is that the objective function sums over points in V_H as well as E_H , but this can be handled by

¹Typically, it is stated in terms of the dual set system where the input is a set system, and the goal is to choose k sets whose union size is maximized.

duplicating many points for each $e \in E_H$. The bigger issue is the fact that C might contain points from E_H , which implies that $d(e, C)$ can be possibly 2 even when C does not contain a vertex from e . Therefore, the hardness factor weakens to $1 \cdot (1 - 1/e) + 2 \cdot (1/e) = 1 + 1/e$.

The natural question to ask to improve the hardness is then: how much does placing centers at E_H help cover other points in E_H ? Suppose that a solution C contains $(1-p)k$ centers from V_H and pk centers from E_H for some $p \in [0, 1]$. Compared to the solution that puts all centers in V_H , putting some centers at E_H will hurt the ability to cover points in E_H at distance 1 (i.e., for $e \in E_H$, $d(e, C) = 1$ only if there exists $v \in (C \cap e)$), but it will help covering points in E_H at distance 2 (i.e., for $e \in E_H$, $d(e, C) \leq 2$ if there exists $f \in (C \cap E_H)$ with $e \cap f \neq \emptyset$). To bound the effect of the latter, one natural and conservative observation is, when the hypergraph H has uniformity d (i.e., each $e \in E_H$ has $|e| = d$), letting $C' = (V_H \cap C) \cup (\cup_{e \in (E_H \cap C)} e)$, a hyperedge $e \in E_H$ has $d(e, C) \geq 3$ if it does not intersect C' . Since each $e \in C \cap E_H$ generates at most d new points in C' , we can easily see $|C'| \leq ((1-p) + dp)k$. Therefore, it seems we need a good hardness of approximation for MAXIMUM k -COVERAGE with small d in order to go beyond $1 + 1/e$. Quantitatively, for a d -uniform hypergraph H , the ideal hardness one can imagine is the following.

- In the YES case, $k := |V_H|/d$ vertices intersect (almost) all the hyperedges. For k -MEDIAN, there exist k centers that cover almost all points at distance 1.
- In the NO case, H is like a *random hypergraph*; for any $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, any choice of $\gamma|V_H|$ vertices intersect at most $1 - (1 - \gamma)^d$ hyperedges. In other words, for fixed γ , the best solution is essentially to pick each vertex with probability γ .

For k -MEDIAN, for any solution C with $|C \cap V_H| = (1-p)k$ and $|C \cap E_H| = pk$, we use the above guarantee twice to $(C \cap V_H)$ and C' to conclude that (1) at most a $1 - (1 - (1-p)/d)^d$ fraction of hyperedges can be covered by distance at most 1 and (2) at most $1 - (1 - (1-p+dp)/d)^d$ fraction of hyperedges can be covered by distance at most 2.

Such an ideal hardness turns out to be impossible to prove, but one can get close. For any integer $d \geq 3$, one can prove the above ideal hardness for d -uniform hypergraphs with the only difference being $k := |V_H|/d-1$ instead of $|V_H|/d$. This means that the denominator d is replaced by $d-1$ in the expressions $1 - (1 - (1-p)/d)^d$ and $1 - (1 - (1-p+dp)/d)^d$ above, which yields the hardness result of Theorem 1.2. If we had proved the ideal hardness above, then the hardness ratio would have exactly matched the algorithm of Theorem 1.1. We elaborate more about this gap in the discussion below.

Algorithms. Our algorithm follows the framework of Cohen-Addad et al. [15] for the supplier version. One can compute a *coreset* $P \subseteq V$, $|P| = O(k \log n)$ with weight function $w : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ so that for any choice of k centers, the objective function for points in V is almost the same as that for weighted points in P . Therefore, one can focus on P as the set of points. Let P_1^*, \dots, P_k^* be the partition of P with respect to the optimal clustering. For each $i \in [k]$, let $c_i^* \in V$ be the optimal center corresponding to P_i^* , and $\ell_i = \operatorname{argmin}_{\ell \in P_i^*} d(\ell, c_i^*)$ be the *leader* of P_i^* . Guessing ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k and (approximately) guessing $d(\ell_1, c_1^*), \dots, d(\ell_k, c_k^*)$ takes a parameterized time $O(k \log n)^k$. Then, for each $i \in [k]$, let C_i be the points that have distance (almost) equal to $d(\ell_i, c_i^*)$. By definition $c_i^* \in C_i$.

We solve the standard LP relaxation for k -MEDIAN, with only the additional constraint that we fractionally open exactly one center from each C_i . (A standard trick can make sure that C_i 's are disjoint.) The rounding algorithm opens exactly one center from C_i (different clusters are independent) according to LP values. Fix a point $v \in P$. A standard analysis for k -MEDIAN shows that with probability at least $1 - 1/e$, a center fractionally connected to v will open, and the expected distance from v to the closest open center conditioned on this event is at most its contribution to the LP objective. In the other event, if $v \in P_i^*$ for some $i \in [k]$, since one center $c \in C_i$ is open and

$$d(v, c) \leq d(v, c_i^*) + d(\ell_i, c_i^*) + d(\ell_i, c),$$

the fact that $d(v, c_i^*) \geq d(\ell_i, c_i^*)$ (by definition of ℓ_i) and $d(\ell_i, c_i^*) \approx d(\ell_i, c)$ (by definition of C_i) ensures that this distance is almost at most $3d(v, c_i^*)$. Combining these two events shows that the total expected distance is at most $(1 - 1/e)LP + (3/e)OPT \leq (1 + 2/e)OPT$.

In order to obtain a possibly better result over the supplier version, using the power that we can open centers anywhere, for some fixed $p \in [0, 1]$, we do the following. For each $i \in [k]$, we simply open the leader ℓ_i as a center with probability p , and with the remaining probability $(1 - p)$, open exactly one center from C_i as usual. For the analysis, let us fix $v \in P_i$ and consider its distance to the closest center in this rounding strategy. For simplicity, assume v is fractionally connected to c_1, \dots, c_d with fraction $1/d$ each, where $c_i \in C_i$ for $i \in [d]$. Let us also assume that $d(v, c_i) = 1$ for each $i \in [d]$, and $d(\ell_i, c_i) = 1$ for each $i \in [d]$. Observe that c_i opens with probability $(1-p)/d$, ℓ_i opens with probability p , and some other center in C_i opens with probability $(1-p)(d-1)/d$. If at least one $c_i, i \in [d]$ is opened, then v 's connection cost is at most 1. If at least one $\ell_i, i \in [d]$ is open, then v 's connection cost is at most 2. It follows that the probability that no center at distance 1 from v opens is exactly $(1 - (1-p)/d)^d$, and the probability that no center at distance ≤ 2 from v opens is exactly $((1-p)(d-1)/d)^d = (1 - (1-p+pd)/d)^d$. Note they exactly match the analysis for the (ideal) hardness; the first probability $(1 - (1-p)/d)^d$ corresponds to the case where we choose random $(1-p)k$ vertices in the hypergraph, and the second probability $(1 - (1-p+pd)/d)^d$ corresponds to the case where we choose random $(1-p+pd)k$ vertices due to picking pk hyperedges!

Of course, the above intuition already assumes various regularities involving the LP values and distances. We show that such regular cases are indeed the worst case in terms of approximation ratio. The analysis involves a series of factor-revealing programs that try to find the worst-case configuration for a fixed point, which reveal simplifying structural properties of the optimal configuration via rank and convexity arguments.

Discussion and Future Work. The first question from this work might be: where is the difference between d and $d - 1$ coming from, and how can we close this gap? As we saw, if we had been able to prove the “ideal” hardness, that is, the inability to distinguish a d -uniform hypergraph with vertex cover size $|V_H|/d$ and a random d -uniform hypergraph, this gap would not exist.

If we just want to *fool* the LP, since every d -uniform hypergraph admits a fractional covering of all hyperedges with a $1/d$ fraction of vertices, we believe that a random d -uniform hypergraph will exhibit such a property, giving an LP (even Sherali-Adams) gap with the exact same factor as the upper bound. Indeed, when $d = 2$, Charikar, Makarychev, and Makarychev [14] showed that even $O(n^\delta)$ -levels of Sherali-Adams cannot distinguish a random graph and a nearly-bipartite graph.

However, for d -uniform hypergraphs with small d , SDPs are expected to strictly outperform the LP, and this is evident when $d = 2$ where the LP (even Sherali-Adams) guarantees at most $3/4$ -approximation for MAXIMUM k -COVERAGE while the SDP guarantees a 0.929-approximation [38]. Our Unique Games Hardness is based on a standard way to construct an SDP gap based on pairwise independence, which is essentially from Håstad’s seminal result for MAX 3LIN and MAX 3SAT when $d = 3$ [27]. It is reasonable to expect that SDPs give a strictly better guarantee for k -MEDIAN instances constructed from (the vertex-hyperedge incidence graph of) d -uniform hypergraphs, but reducing the general k -MEDIAN instance to such a case seems a significant technical challenge as our analysis relies on simple properties of the LP.

A more fundamental limitation of our work is that the upper bound is given by parameterized algorithms and the lower bound is only against polynomial-time algorithms. The biggest open question is to prove an optimal approximability for either polynomial-time or parameterized algorithms. Currently, it might be the case that the optimal thresholds for these two classes of algorithms coincide just like the supplier version.

Improving the best polynomial-time approximation ratio for any version of k -MEDIAN has been studied intensively. Matching the $(1 + 2/e)$ -hardness for the supplier version or going below for the original version is a long-standing open problem, but we believe that giving an algorithm for the original version with the approximation ratio strictly better than the current known 2.613 [18, 23] for the supplier version is a meaningful step. Such an algorithm is likely to yield insight into how to take advantage of opening centers anywhere in the context of primal-dual or dual-fitting analysis, whereas our improved parameterized algorithm uses a primal LP rounding algorithm.

From the parameterized hardness perspective, we first remark that MAXIMUM k -COVERAGE in d -uniform hypergraphs with constant d (or even $d = f(k)$) admits a parameterized approximation scheme [5, 31]. However, there might be more sophisticated ways to understand the effect of opening centers anywhere. A better understanding of the hardness of LABEL COVER in the parameterized setting, combined with Feige’s reduction to MAXIMUM k -COVERAGE, might be a way to achieve a strictly improvement over $(1 + 1/e)$.

2 Approximation algorithm

In this section, we prove our main algorithmic result Theorem 1.1, restated below.

Theorem 1.1. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is an algorithm for k -MEDIAN that runs in time $f(k, \epsilon) \cdot n^{O(1)}$ and guarantees an approximation ratio of*

$$\min_{p \in [0, 1]} \max_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} \left[1 + \left(1 - \frac{1-p}{d} \right)^d + \left(1 - \frac{pd + (1-p)}{d} \right)^d + \epsilon \right] \approx 1.546 + \epsilon,$$

where the optimal value is achieved with $p^* := (10 - 6\sqrt{2})/7 \approx 0.22$ and $d^* := 3$.

Section 2.1 presents our algorithm. Section 2.2 introduces the setup for our analysis, which tries to understand the worst-case configuration for a fixed point via a series of factor-revealing programs. Section 2.3, Section 2.4 and Section 2.5 consider different such programs and deduce that the optimal solutions exhibit simple structures, which leads to our final bound.

2.1 Algorithm

We begin by computing a *coreset*. For any choice of centers $C \subseteq V$ and a set of weighted points $V' \subseteq V$ where point $v \in V'$ has weight w_v , let $\text{cost}(V', C)$ denote the cost of assigning the points V' to the centers C so as to minimize the total weighted connection cost. Concretely, for every assignment function $f : V' \rightarrow C$, define the cost of f as $\sum_{v \in V'} w_v d(v, f(v))$. Then $\text{cost}(V', C)$ is the minimum cost among all such assignments f .

Definition 2.1. *Given a k -MEDIAN instance (V, d, k) and $\epsilon > 0$, an ϵ -coreset V' is a set of points with a weight w_v for each $v \in V'$, so that for any choice of centers $C \subseteq V$ with $|C| = k$, $\text{cost}(V', C) \in (1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon)\text{cost}(V, C)$.*

Theorem 2.2 ([20]). *There is a polynomial time algorithm that when given a k -MEDIAN instance and $\epsilon > 0$, computes an ϵ -coreset $V' \subseteq V$ with $|V'| \leq \mathcal{O}(k \log n / \epsilon^2)$.*

We start by considering a natural LP relaxation and proceed in a similar manner to the algorithm of [16]. We first compute a coreset V' for the point set V of size $\mathcal{O}(\frac{k \log n}{\epsilon^2})$, using Theorem 2.2. It follows that for any choice of k centers $C \subseteq V$, we have $\text{cost}(V', C) \in (1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon)\text{cost}(V, C)$. Henceforth we focus on minimizing $\text{cost}(V', C)$.

For the optimal partition $\{V_1^*, V_2^*, \dots, V_k^*\}$ of V' and corresponding choice of centers $\{c_1^*, c_2^*, \dots, c_k^*\}$, we guess for each $i \in [k]$ the leaders ℓ_i , which are the points in V_i^* closest to c_i^* for each $i \in [k]$. Since the coreset guarantees $|V'| \leq \mathcal{O}(\frac{k \log n}{\epsilon^2})$, this can be accomplished in time $\mathcal{O}((\frac{k \log n}{\epsilon^2})^k)$. We also guess the distances R_i^* of the leaders ℓ_i to the corresponding center c_i^* for each $i \in [k]$, rounded down to the nearest power of $(1 + \epsilon)$. By the argument used in [16], we can assume without loss of generality that the distance between any two points of C is at least 1 and at most $n^{O(1)}$: this means there are only $\mathcal{O}(\log(\frac{n}{\epsilon}))$ choices for the distances R_i^* , which in turn means that this step can be accomplished in time $\mathcal{O}((\log(\frac{n}{\epsilon}))^k)$. It can be easily shown that $\mathcal{O}((\log(\frac{n}{\epsilon}))^k)$ and $\mathcal{O}((\frac{k \log n}{\epsilon^2})^k)$ can be bounded above by $f(k, \frac{1}{\epsilon})n^{O(1)}$ as follows. First, note that it is enough to upper bound $(\log(\frac{n}{\epsilon}))^{O(k)}$. If $k > \frac{\log \frac{n}{\epsilon}}{\log \log \frac{n}{\epsilon}}$, then this expression is upper bounded by $2^{O(k \log k)}$. Otherwise,

$k < \frac{\log \frac{n}{\epsilon}}{\log \log \frac{n}{\epsilon}}$, and we get an upper bound of $(\log \frac{n}{\epsilon})^{O\left(\frac{\log \frac{n}{\epsilon}}{\log \log \frac{n}{\epsilon}}\right)} \leq (\frac{n}{\epsilon})^{O(1)}$.

Once we guess these quantities, let C_i be the subset of V which are at distance at most $R_i^*(1 + \epsilon)$ from ℓ_i . Notice that we must have $c_i^* \in C_i$. For purely technical reasons, by adding a copy of ℓ_i in C_i , we will assume that $\ell_i \notin C_i$. Also by making copies of points, we will assume that C_1, \dots, C_ℓ are disjoint.

Consider the following natural LP relaxation for the problem.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\min & \sum_{v \in V'} w_v \sum_{c \in V} d(v, c) x_{v, c} \\
\text{s.t.} & x_{v, c} \leq y_c \quad \forall v \in V', c \in V \\
& \sum_{c \in C_i} y_c = 1 \quad \forall i \in [k] \\
& \sum_{c \in V} x_{v, c} = 1 \quad \forall v \in V' \\
& x_{v, c} = 0 \quad \forall v \in V', i \in [k], c \in C_i \text{ such that } d(v, c) < d(\ell_i, c) \quad (1)
\end{array}$$

Clearly, this LP is a relaxation as witnessed by the canonical integral solution where one can assign each point in V_i^* to (a copy of) $c_i^* \in C_i$.

We solve the LP to obtain a (fractional) optimal solution (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) for the LP - we will also assume that $x_{v, c} = y_c$ for each $c \in V$ and each point $v \in V'$ with $x_{v, c} \neq 0$. This can be accomplished using a fairly straightforward construction by “splitting centers” which we describe below. Similar constructions have been used in previous work for other related problems.

Pick a point $c \in V$ for which there is a point v such that $x_{v, c} \neq 0$ and $x_{v, c} \neq y_c$. Let $v_1, v_2 \dots v_t$ be the points v with $x_{v, c} \neq 0$, taken in non-decreasing order of $x_{v, c}$. Create $t + 1$ many copies $c_1, c_2 \dots c_{t+1}$ of the point c (with all distances from other points the same as the original point c). Set $y_{c_1} = x_{v_1, c}$. Next, set $y_{c_2} = x_{v_2, c} - x_{v_1, c}$, and so on, so that $y_{c_j} = x_{v_j, c} - x_{v_{j-1}, c}$ for all $2 \leq j \leq t$. Set $y_{c_{t+1}} = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^t y_{c_j}$. Finally, for each point v_i , $i \in [t]$, we set $x_{v_i, c_j} = y_{c_j}$ for $j \in \{1, 2 \dots i\}$. It is clear that the construction preserves feasibility and optimality, and $x_{v, c} = y_c$ whenever $x_{v, c} \neq 0$.

Our rounding algorithm is very simple: we pick a threshold $p \in [0, 1]$ to be determined later by analysis, and for each $i \in [k]$, we pick ℓ_i into C with probability p , and with remaining probability $1 - p$, we choose exactly one center c from C_i from the distribution given by the LP: more concretely, each center $t \in C_i$ is picked with probability y_t .

Algorithm 1 Rounding algorithm

Input: k -MEDIAN instance (V, d, k) with coreset V' , the sets $C_1, C_2 \dots C_k$ and leaders $\ell_1, \ell_2 \dots \ell_k$. A parameter $p \in [0, 1]$, and the optimal LP solution (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) .

Output: An approximate solution $C \subseteq V$ with $|C| = k$.

for $i \in [k]$ **do**

With probability p pick ℓ_i .

With remaining probability $1 - p$, pick exactly one center $t \in C_i$ with probability y_t .

end for

Observe that for every $i \in [k]$, the algorithm opens either a center in C_i , or the leader ℓ_i .

2.2 Analysis: Casting as factor-revealing problems

Once we decide on the centers, each point $v \in V'$ can be assigned to the closest open center. For the sake of the analysis, we consider the following specific assignment of the points to the open centers; the cost only increases by doing so. Henceforth, we fix $v \in V'$. Let $I_v \subseteq [k]$ be the set of indices i for which there is a center $c \in C_i$ with $x_{v, c} \neq 0$, and suppose $|I_v| = \ell$. For the sake of simplicity and clarity of exposition, by re-numbering indices, let us assume that $I_v = [\ell]$.

For each $i \in [\ell]$, define the *flow* to cluster i as $\mu_i = \sum_{c \in C_i} x_{v, c}$. Let s_i be the weighted average distance to a center $c \in C_i$, where center c is given weight $x_{v, c}$, so that $s_i = (\sum_{c \in C_i} x_{v, c} d(v, c)) / \mu_i$. Assume without loss of generality that $s_i \leq s_j$ whenever $i \leq j$ for $i, j \in [\ell]$. Note that s_i is the *expected* cost of assigning v to a random center $c \in C_i$ according to the probabilities $x_{v, c}$. Algorithm 2 describes our assignment algorithm.

First, we have the following lemma which shows that v will be always assigned to a relatively close center.

Lemma 2.3. *For any $j \in [\ell]$, we must have $d(v, \ell_j) \leq 2s_j$. Consequently, v will be always assigned an open center at distance at most $3s_1(1 + \epsilon)$.*

Algorithm 2 Assignment algorithm

Input: k -MEDIAN instance with coreset V' and centers C opened by Algorithm 1, a point $v \in V'$, and the set $I_v = [\ell]$.

Output: An assignment of v to a center of C .

Let A be the set of indices $i \in [\ell]$ with $s_i \leq 1.5s_1$.

Let D be the set of centers c satisfying $x_{v,c} \neq 0$, with $c \in C_i$ so that $s_i \leq 3s_1(1 + \epsilon)$ for some $i \in [\ell]$.

if $D \cap C \neq \emptyset$ **then**

Assign v to the center $c \in C_{i^*}$, where i^* is the first index with $C_{i^*} \cap D \cap C \neq \emptyset$.

else if there is a $j \in A$ such that ℓ_j is open **then**

Assign v to ℓ_{j^*} where j^* is the first index in A such that ℓ_{j^*} is open.

else

Assign v to any open center in C_1 .

end if

Proof. Fix any index $j \in [\ell]$. Let $c'_j \in C_j$ be a point in C_j which minimizes $d(v, c)$ among all points $c \in C_j$ with $x_{v,c} \neq 0$. Clearly, $d(v, c'_j) \leq s_j$. By the triangle inequality, we have $d(v, \ell_j) \leq d(v, c'_j) + d(c'_j, \ell_j)$. Since $x_{v,c'_j} \neq 0$, the LP constraint (1) ensures $d(v, c'_j) \geq d(c'_j, \ell_j)$. Thus $d(v, \ell_j) \leq 2d(v, c'_j) \leq 2s_j$.

Observe that Algorithm 1 ensures that either ℓ_j is open, or some center $c_j \in C_j$ is open. Also $d(\ell_j, c_j) \leq d(\ell_j, c'_j)(1 + \epsilon) \leq d(v, c'_j)(1 + \epsilon) \leq s_j(1 + \epsilon)$, where the first inequality follows by the definition of C_j , and the second inequality again follows from the LP constraint (1). Together, we obtain $d(v, c_j) \leq d(v, \ell_j) + d(\ell_j, c_j) \leq 2s_j + s_j(1 + \epsilon) = 3s_j(1 + \epsilon)$. Since this holds for any j , and in particular when $j = 1$, it is clear from the description of Algorithm 2 that v will be always assigned an open center at distance at most $3s_1(1 + \epsilon)$ and the result follows. \square

Let $LP(v) := \sum_{c \in V} x_{v,c} d(v, c)$ be the connection cost of v in the LP. For each case of the assignment given by Algorithm 2, let us define $cost(v)$ to be the following upper bound on $d(v, C)$:

1. Some center $c \in D$ is open. In this case, the point goes to the open center $c_{i^*} \in D \cap C_{i^*}$, where i^* is the minimum index for which there is a center open in $D \cap C_{i^*}$. Given that there is a center open in $D \cap C_{i^*}$, observe that Algorithm 1 opens each center $c \in D \cap C_{i^*}$ with probability proportional to y_c . Thus the expected connection cost is exactly s_{i^*} . Let $cost(v) = s_{i^*}$ in this case.
2. No center in D is open, but some leader ℓ_j is open, for some $j \in A$. The point v is then assigned to the leader ℓ_{j^*} , where $j^* \in A$ is the minimum index j^* so that ℓ_{j^*} is open. Using Lemma 2.3, the connection cost for v is upper bounded by $2s_{j^*}$. Let $cost(v) = 2s_{j^*}$ in this case.
3. Any other scenario. Again, using Lemma 2.3, we upper bound the cost by $3s_1(1 + \epsilon)$. Let $cost(v) = 3(1 + \epsilon)s_1$ in this case.

The rest of the section will be devoted to upper bounding the ratio $\mathbb{E}[cost(v)]/LP(v)$, which will yield Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 2.4. *For every v , the ratio $(\mathbb{E}[cost(v)]/LP(v)) \leq \alpha_{alg}(1 + O(\epsilon)) \approx 1.546(1 + O(\epsilon))$.*

As in Algorithm 2, let A be the set of indices $i \in [\ell]$ with $s_i \leq 1.5s_1$, and let B be the set of indices $i \in [\ell]$ with $s_i > 1.5s_1$. Fix the “degrees” $d_A = |A|$, $d_B = |B|$, the “flows” $\mu_A = \sum_{i \in A} \mu_i$, $\mu_B = \sum_{i \in B} \mu_i$. By our previous assumption, since $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq s_3 \dots \leq s_\ell$, it follows that $A = [|d_A|]$ and $B = [\ell \setminus |d_A|]$.

Both $\mathbb{E}[cost(v)]$ and $LP(v)$ will be entirely determined by $p, d_A, d_B, (\mu_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$, and $(s_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$. So our main question is: for a given p (that our algorithm can control), which values for $d_A, d_B, (\mu_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$, and $(s_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$ will maximize the ratio $\mathbb{E}[cost(v)]/LP(v)$?

It is simple to see that $LP(v) = \sum_{i \in [\ell]} \mu_i s_i$, while $\mathbb{E}[cost(v)]$ is a complex function of $d_A, d_B, (\mu_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$, and $(s_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$. We will show that the values for these variables maximizing the ratio $\mathbb{E}[cost(v)]/LP(v)$ must exhibit a certain structure, which finally leads to the desired upper bound. This will be achieved via a series of factor-revealing programs that maximize the ratio over a subset of variables while the others are considered fixed. The analysis is spread across Section 2.3, Section 2.4 and Section 2.5.

2.3 Simplifying distances

We will first consider such a program where $p, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_\ell, d_A, d_B$ are fixed and the variables are $(s_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$. Henceforth, we assume without loss of generality that $s_i \leq 3s_1(1 + \epsilon)$ for each $i \in [\ell]$. If this is not satisfied for some $i \in [\ell]$, then for every $c \in C_i$ with $x_{v,c} \neq 0$ such that $d(v,c) \geq 3s_1(1 + \epsilon)$, we set $d(v,c) = 3s_1(1 + \epsilon)$. First, observe that this operation can only decrease $LP(v)$. Also, notice that by the description of Algorithm 2, this change can only increase $\mathbb{E}[\text{cost}(v)]$. To see this, fix any set of centers opened by Algorithm 1. For this fixed set of open centers, $\text{cost}(v)$ changes only if some center of C_i is open, in which case Algorithm 2 may assign v to a center of C_i , which may increase $\text{cost}(v)$. It follows that the ratio $\mathbb{E}[\text{cost}(v)]/LP(v)$ does not decrease after this operation.

The following lemma shows that $\mathbb{E}[\text{cost}(v)]$ is a linear function of $(s_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$.

Lemma 2.5. $\mathbb{E}[\text{cost}(v)] = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \gamma_i s_i$ where each γ_i is a function of $p, d_A, d_B, (\mu_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$ only.

Proof. Consider some $i \in [\ell]$. The probability that Algorithm 1 decides to open ℓ_i is exactly p . With remaining probability $1 - p$, exactly one center of C_i is opened, and each center $c \in C_i$ is chosen with probability $y_c = x_{v,c}$. Thus the probability that some $c \in D \cap C_i$ is open is exactly $(1 - p) \sum_{c \in (D \cap C_i)} y_c = (1 - p) \sum_{c \in (D \cap C_i)} x_{v,c} = (1 - p) \sum_{c \in C_i} x_{v,c} = (1 - p) \mu_i$.

If a center of D is open, Algorithm 2 assigns v to an open center in $D \cap C_{i^*}$ where i^* is the first index i^* for which there is an open center in $D \cap C_{i^*}$. For each $i \in [\ell]$, $i = i^*$ if and only if for every $1 \leq i' < i$, Algorithm 1 does not choose a center in $D \cap C_{i'}$, and Algorithm 1 chooses some center in $D \cap C_i$. Since the choices made by Algorithm 1 are independent across different $i' \in [\ell]$, it follows this probability is $z_i = (\prod_{1 \leq i' < i} (1 - (1 - p) \mu_{i'})) (1 - p) \mu_i$, and hence depends only on $p, \mu_i, i \in [\ell]$. In this case, recall that we upper bound the cost by s_i .

When no center of D is open, Algorithm 2 assigns v to ℓ_{j^*} where j^* is the first index $j \in A$ for which ℓ_j is open. For any fixed $j \in [\ell]$, we claim that the probability λ_j that no center of D is open and $j = j^*$ depends only on $p, \mu_i, i \in [\ell]$ and d_A . To see this, first note that if $j \in B$, then $j \neq j^*$, since the algorithm never assigns points to ℓ_j , and hence $\lambda_j = 0$. If $j \in A$, the event that $j = j^*$ and no center of D is open happens only when for every $1 \leq j' < j$, Algorithm 1 does not choose $\ell_{j'}$ or a center of $D \cap C_{j'}$, Algorithm 1 chooses ℓ_j , and for $j < j' \leq \ell$ no center in $D \cap C_{j'}$ is opened. This probability is exactly $\lambda_j = (\prod_{1 \leq j' < j} (1 - p)(1 - \mu_{j'})) \cdot p \cdot (\prod_{j < j' \leq \ell} (1 - (1 - p) \mu_{j'}))$. In this case, recall that we upper bound the cost by $2s_j$.

Finally, if no center of D is open and no leader ℓ_j is open for $j \in A$, Algorithm 2 assigns c to an open center in C_1 . This happens with probability $\gamma = \prod_{j \in A} (1 - p)(1 - \mu_j) \prod_{j \in B} (1 - (1 - p) \mu_j)$, and the cost is upper bounded by $3(1 + \epsilon)s_1$.

Now observe that for every $j \geq 2$, the coefficient γ_j of s_j is exactly $z_j + 2\lambda_j$, and $\gamma_1 = z_1 + 2\lambda_1 + 3(1 + \epsilon)\gamma$.

This allows us to conclude that each $\gamma_i, i \in [\ell]$ is a function of p, d_A, d_B and $(\mu_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$ alone. \square

Recall that we assumed that $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq s_3 \leq \dots \leq s_{\ell=d_A+d_B}$. Then finding the worst case ratio for the point v over $(s_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$ can be cast as the following optimization problem whose variables are the distances $(s_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$, which we refer to as O :

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \gamma_i s_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu_i s_i} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & s_1 \leq s_2 \leq s_3 \leq \dots \leq s_{d_A} \leq 1.5s_1 \\ & 1.5s_1 \leq s_{d_A+1} \leq s_{d_A+2} \leq \dots \leq s_{d_A+d_B} \leq 3s_1(1 + \epsilon) \\ & s_1 > 0 \end{aligned}$$

(Note that we allow s_i for $i \in B$ to take the value exactly $1.5s_1$, which is not allowed in the definition of B . However, it only increases the optimal value.)

It is now clear that this optimization problem O (where we fix $p, d_A, d_B, (\mu_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$) is a linear program with the variables $(s_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$, for we can simply add the additional constraint $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu_i s_i = 1$ and maximize the numerator of the objective. Since any linear program on ℓ variables has an optimal solution that is an

extreme point where exactly ℓ linearly independent constraints are tight, this allows us to greatly simplify the structure of optimal solutions.

Lemma 2.6. *There is an optimal solution to O which satisfies $s_i \in \{s_1, 1.5s_1, 3s_1\}$ for each $i \in [\ell]$.*

Proof. Consider the following linear program which is equivalent to O .

$$\begin{aligned}
 \max \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \gamma_i s_i \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu_i s_i = 1 & (2) \\
 & s_1 \leq s_2 \leq s_3 \leq \dots \leq s_{d_A} \leq 1.5s_1 & (3) \\
 & 1.5s_1 \leq s_{d_A+1} \leq s_{d_A+2} \leq \dots \leq s_{d_A+d_B} \leq 3s_1(1 + \epsilon) & (4) \\
 & s_1 \geq 0 & (5)
 \end{aligned}$$

Let $(s_i^*)_{i \in [\ell]}$ be an *extreme point optimal solution* for this linear program. We claim that $s_i^* \in \{s_1, 1.5s_1, 3s_1(1 + \epsilon)\}$ for each $i \in [\ell]$. We show this as follows. First, there are a total of $\ell = d_A + d_B$ variables in the linear program. An extreme point, therefore, must be the intersection of ℓ linearly independent constraints. There are a total of $\ell + 1$ constraints captured by (3) and (4), and two more constraints (2) and (5). At an extreme point, at most 3 of these constraints may not be tight. The constraint $s_1 > 0$ cannot be tight, since it forces the objective to be zero, which is clearly not optimal. Also, every constraint in the family constraints (3) cannot be tight, similarly, every constraint in the family of constraints (4) cannot be tight, since that would imply $s_1 = 0$. It follows that exactly one constraint among the constraints (3) is not tight, and exactly one constraint among the constraints (4) is not tight. But this means that $s_i^* \in \{s_1, 1.5s_1, 3s_1(1 + \epsilon)\}$ for each $i \in [\ell]$, which proves the result. \square

2.4 Simplifying LP values and degrees

Once we know that the worst-case ratio must involve distances from $\{s_1, 1.5s_1, 3s_1(1 + \epsilon)\}$, we proceed as follows.

Without loss of generality, assume that $s_1 = 1$. Let A', B' and C' denote the set of indices $i \in [\ell]$ which have $s_i = 1, 1.5$ and $3(1 + \epsilon)$ respectively. We can now compute the worst case upper bound $\mathbb{E}[\text{cost}(v)]$ for the point v in this special case as follows. For some distance parameter ρ , let $t_\rho := \Pr[\text{cost}(v) \geq \rho]$. We say that v has a *direct connection* in a set $I' \subseteq [\ell]$ if there exists a center $c \in C_i \cap D$ for some $i \in I'$ which is open. Further we say that a leader of I' is open if there exists an $i \in I'$ such that the leader ℓ_i is open. With these definitions, we have the following observations.

Lemma 2.7. *The following equations hold.*

$$\begin{aligned}
 t_1 &= 1 \\
 t_{1.5} &= \Pr[\text{No direct connection in } A'] \\
 t_2 &= \Pr[\text{No direct connection in } A' \cup B'] \\
 t_3 &= \Pr[\text{No direct connection in } A' \cup B', \text{ but direct connection in } C'] + \\
 & \quad \Pr[\text{No direct connection in } A' \cup B' \cup C', \text{ and no leader of } A' \text{ is open}].
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The point v always pays a cost at least 1, so the “baseline” cost is 1, which is paid with probability 1. If there is no direct connection to any center in A' , then the point must clearly pay at least 1.5 (possibly using a direct connection to an open center of B'). If there is no direct connection to centers in $A' \cup B'$, the point must pay at least 2 (possibly using a connection to an open leader of A). Finally, the point can pay 3 or $3(1 + \epsilon)$ in two different ways. The first scenario is when there is no direct connection to centers in $A' \cup B'$, but a direct connection to a center of C' . Recall that Algorithm 2 always assigns a point to a center whenever a direct connection is open, therefore in this case the point gets assigned to some center of

C' at distance $3(1 + \epsilon)$. The second scenario is when there is no direct connection in $A' \cup B' \cup C'$, and no leader of A' is open. In this case the point gets connected at distance ≥ 3 (for instance it may be assigned to a leader of B'). \square

Let $cost'(v) = t_1 + 0.5t_{1.5} + 0.5t_2 + t_3$. Then it is clear that $cost'(v)(1 + \epsilon) \geq \mathbb{E}[cost(v)]$, because $cost(v)$ is always between 1 and $3(1 + \epsilon)$, and $cost'(v) = \int_{x=0}^3 \Pr[cost(v) \geq x] dx$. It remains to analyze and upper bound these probabilities. Let

$$\begin{aligned} p_{A'} &= \Pr[\text{No direct connection in } A'] \\ p_{B'} &= \Pr[\text{No direct connection in } B'] \\ p_{C'} &= \Pr[\text{No direct connection in } C'] \\ q_{A'} &= \Pr[\text{No direct connection in } A' \wedge \text{No leader open in } A']. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the above discussion and definitions we have $t_{1.5} = p_{A'}$, $t_2 = p_{A'}p_{B'}$, and $t_3 = (1 - p_{C'})p_{A'}p_{B'} + p_{C'}q_{A'}p_{B'}$, which yields

$$cost'(v) = 1 + 0.5p_{A'} + 0.5p_{A'}p_{B'} + ((1 - p_{C'})p_{A'}p_{B'} + p_{C'}q_{A'}p_{B'}).$$

For fixed $d_{A'}, \mu_{A'}, \mu_{B'}, \mu_{C'}$ (which decides $LP(v) = \mu_{A'} + 1.5\mu_{B'} + 3(1 + \epsilon)\mu_{C'}$), we seek the worst-case configurations over $(\mu_i)_{i \in [\ell]}$, $d_{B'}$ and $d_{C'}$ that maximize $cost'(v)$. Note that $p_{A'}$ (and $q_{A'}$), $p_{B'}$, $p_{C'}$ depend only on the μ_i values of A', B', C' respectively, so we can treat them separately. We can deduce the following conclusions about the worst-case configurations. Note that for any $I' \subseteq [\ell]$, $p_{I'} = \Pr[\text{no direct connection in } I'] = \prod_{i \in I'} (1 - (1 - p)\mu_i)$.

- For each of $p_{A'}$, $q_{A'}$, and $p_{B'}$, the coefficient (treating other terms as constants) in $cost'(v)$ is nonnegative, so the worst case happens when they are maximized.
- Let us first compute an upper bound on $p_{A'} = \prod_{i \in A'} (1 - (1 - p)\mu_i)$. Fix $d_{A'} = |A'|$ and $\mu_{A'} = \sum_{i \in A'} \mu_i$. By a simple application of the AM-GM inequality, it follows that $p_{A'}$ is maximized when $\mu_i = \mu_{A'}/d_{A'}$ for each $i \in A'$, and this value equals $(1 - (1 - p)\mu_{A'}/d_{A'})^{d_{A'}}$. Defining $p_{B'}$, $d_{B'}$ similarly, we derive similar expressions for upper bounds on $p_{B'}$. For $q_{A'}$, note that the event corresponding to $q_{A'}$ happens when there is no direct connection in A' and no leader open in A' : the probability of this happening is exactly $\prod_{i \in A'} (1 - p)(1 - \mu_i)$. Again using the AM-GM inequality, we can upper bound this by $(1 - p)^{d_{A'}} (1 - \mu_{A'}/d_{A'})^{d_{A'}}$.
- For fixed $\mu_{B'}$, for the worst case, since $p_{B'} = (1 - (1 - p)\mu_{B'}/d_{B'})^{d_{B'}}$ is increasing with $d_{B'}$, we can let $d_{B'} \rightarrow \infty$, which results in $e^{-(1 - p)\mu_{B'}}$. (We cannot do this for A' because of the factor $(1 - p)^{d_{A'}}$ in $q_{A'}$.)
- For $p_{C'}$, notice that the term involving $p_{C'}$ is $p_{C'}(q_{A'}p_{B'} - p_{A'}p_{B'})$, and $q_{A'} \leq p_{A'}$. Thus in order to maximize $cost'(v)$, it is beneficial to reduce $p_{C'}$ as much as possible (given $\mu_{C'}$), and hence we can set $d_{C'} = 1$, which makes $p_{C'}$ the smallest possible value $1 - (1 - p)\mu_{C'}$.

Accounting for these changes, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} t_{1.5} &\leq t'_{1.5} = \left(1 - (1 - p)\frac{\mu_{A'}}{d_{A'}}\right)^{d_{A'}} \\ t_2 &\leq t'_2 = \left(1 - (1 - p)\frac{\mu_{A'}}{d_{A'}}\right)^{d_{A'}} e^{(p-1)\mu_{B'}} \\ t_3 &\leq t'_3 = \left(1 - (1 - p)\frac{\mu_{A'}}{d_{A'}}\right)^{d_{A'}} e^{(p-1)\mu_{B'}} \mu_{C'}(1 - p) + \left((1 - p)\left(1 - \frac{\mu_{A'}}{d_{A'}}\right)\right)^{d_{A'}} e^{(p-1)\mu_{B'}} (1 - \mu_{C'}(1 - p)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we now only need to compute the min-max value $\min_p \max_{d, \mu_{A'}, \mu_{B'}, \mu_{C'}} (cost'(v)/LP(v))$ where $cost'(v) = 1 + 0.5t'_{1.5} + 0.5t'_2 + t'_3$, and the variables are $p, d_{A'}, \mu_{A'}, \mu_{B'}, \mu_{C'}$ with the constraint $\mu_{A'} + \mu_{B'} + \mu_{C'} = 1$, and $d_{A'}$ being a positive integer.

2.5 Final simplifications

In the next lemma, we show that in fact we can assume without loss of generality that $\mu_{A'} = 1$ and $\mu_{B'} = \mu_{C'} = 0$, so that this is equivalent to minimizing over p and maximizing over d the expression $g(p, d) = 1 + (1 - (1-p)/d)^d + ((1-p)(1-1/d))^d$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 2.8. $\min_p \max_{d, \mu_{A'}, \mu_{B'}, \mu_{C'}} (cost'(v)/LP(v)) = \min_p \max_d g(p, d) \leq \alpha_{alg} \approx 1.546$, where $\alpha_{alg} := g(p^*, d^*)$ with $p^* := (10-6\sqrt{2})/7 \approx 0.22$ and $d^* := 3$.

Proof. For the sake of convenience and better readability, we denote A', B', C' by A, B, C . We begin by upper bounding each term. First, observe that the function $\psi(x) = (1-ax)^b$ is convex when $1-ax > 0$ and $b \geq 1$. This can be checked easily by computing the second derivative $\psi''(x) = a^2b(b-1)(1-ax)^{b-2} > 0$. Using Jensen's inequality on the interval $[0, 1]$, this means that $(1-ax)^b \leq x((1-a)^b - 1) + 1$ whenever $x \in [0, 1]$. This means one can upper bound $(1 - (1-p)\frac{\mu_A}{d_A})^{d_A}$ by $\mu_A((1 - \frac{1-p}{d_A})^{d_A} - 1) + 1$. Similarly, the function e^{ax} is convex for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and by Jensen's inequality we have $e^{ax} \leq (e^a - 1)x + 1$. This gives $e^{(p-1)\mu_B} \leq (e^{p-1} - 1)\mu_B + 1$. Finally, we note similarly that $(1 - \frac{\mu_A}{d_A})^{d_A} \leq \mu_A((1 - \frac{1}{d_A})^{d_A} - 1) + 1$. Plugging these into the expression for $cost'(v)$, we obtain the following upper bound for $cost'(v)/LP(v)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{cost'(v)}{LP(v)} &\leq \psi(p, d_A, \mu_A, \mu_B, \mu_C) = \frac{1}{\mu_A + 1.5\mu_B + 3\mu_C} \left[1 + 0.5(1 - \mu_A + \mu_A \left(1 - \frac{1-p}{d_A}\right)^{d_A}) \right. \\ &\quad + 0.5(1 - \mu_B + e^{p-1}\mu_B)(1 - \mu_A + \mu_A \left(1 - \frac{1-p}{d_A}\right)^{d_A}) \\ &\quad + \mu_C(1-p)(1 - \mu_B + e^{p-1}\mu_B)(1 - \mu_A + \mu_A \left(1 - \frac{1-p}{d_A}\right)^{d_A}) \\ &\quad + (1 - \mu_C(1-p))(1 - \mu_B + e^{p-1}\mu_B)((1-p)^{d_A} - \mu_A(1-p)^{d_A}) \\ &\quad \left. + \left(1 - \frac{1}{d_A}\right)^{d_A} \mu_A(1-p)^{d_A} \right] \\ &=: \frac{\zeta(p, d_A, \mu_A, \mu_B, \mu_C)}{\mu_A + 1.5\mu_B + 3\mu_C} \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $g(p, d) = 1 + (1 - \frac{1-p}{d})^d + ((1-p)(1 - \frac{1}{d}))^d$ is obtained by setting $d_A = d$, $\mu_A = 1$, $\mu_B = \mu_C = 0$ in $\psi(p, d_A, \mu_A, \mu_B, \mu_C)$. Then $g(p, d)$ is a function of two variables: we prove that the min-max value $\min_p \max_d g(p, d) = \alpha_{alg}$ is where $\alpha_{alg} := g(p^*, d^*) \approx 1.546$.

Lemma 2.9. $\min_p \max_d g(p, d) = \alpha_{alg}$, and the min-max value is attained when $p = p^* = \frac{1}{7}(10 - 6\sqrt{2})$ and $d = d^* = 3$.

Proof. Let $d^* = 3$, $p^* = \frac{1}{7}(10 - 6\sqrt{2})$, and let $\alpha := g(p^*, d^*) \approx 1.546$. When $d = 3$, $g(p, d)$ is a cubic function of p which is easily shown to have a minimum value at $p = p^*$, showing that $\max_d \min_p g(p, d) \geq \alpha$.

Similarly, $g(p^*, d)$ is a function of d alone. Using the inequality $1-x \leq e^{-x}$, observe that $1 + e^{p^*-1} + \frac{1}{e}(1-p^*)^d$ is an upper bound on $g(p^*, d)$. When $d \geq 7$, this quantity is at most 1.542. Manually checking values of $g(p^*, d)$ for $d \leq 7$, the maximum is attained when $d = 3$, which implies that $\min_p \max_d g(p, d) \leq \alpha$. Since the min-max value is at least the max-min in general and we proved $\max_d \min_p g(p, d) \geq \alpha \geq \min_p \max_d g(p, d)$, both values are exactly α . \square

Next we will show that for $p = p^* = \frac{1}{7}(10 - 6\sqrt{2})$ and any choice of d_A, μ_A, μ_B, μ_C with $\mu_A + \mu_B + \mu_C = 1$, we have $\psi(p, d_A, \mu_A, \mu_B, \mu_C) \leq \alpha_{alg}$. Henceforth we fix $p = p^*$ and try to maximize $\psi(p, d_A, \mu_A, \mu_B, \mu_C)$.

First, we show that there is a maximizer of $\psi(\cdot)$ with $\mu_C = 0$. We need the following lemma for the proof.

Lemma 2.10. The functions $\zeta(p, d_A, \mu_A, 1 - \mu_A - \mu_C, \mu_C)$ and $\zeta(p, d_A, 1 - \mu_B - \mu_C, \mu_B, \mu_C)$ are both convex with respect to μ_C .

Proof. We show convexity by computing second derivatives. Consider $\frac{\partial^2 \zeta(p, d_A, \mu_A, 1 - \mu_A - \mu_C, \mu_C)}{\partial \mu_C^2}$. Since $\zeta(p, d_A, \mu_A, 1 - \mu_A - \mu_C, \mu_C)$ is a quadratic function of μ_C , the second derivative is simply twice the coefficient of μ_C^2 . Simple computation shows that this is equal to

$$2(1 - e^{p-1})(1-p) \left(1 - (1-p)^{d_A} + \mu_A \left(\left(1 - \frac{1-p}{d_A} \right)^{d_A} - 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{d_A} \right)^{d_A} (1-p)^{d_A} + (1-p)^{d_A} \right) \right)$$

. Let $a = 1-p$ and $b = \frac{1}{d_A}$. Then it is sufficient to show that $\rho(a, b, d_A) = 1 - a^{d_A} + \mu_A ((1-ab)^{d_A} - 1 - a^{d_A}(1-b)^{d_A} + a^{d_A})$ is positive. First note that $(1-ab)^{d_A} \geq (1-b)^{d_A}$. Plugging this and simplifying yields the expression

$$1 - a^{d_A} - \mu_A(1 - (1-b)^{d_A})(1 - a^{d_A}) = (1 - a^{d_A})(1 - \mu_A(1 - (1-b)^{d_A})) > 0$$

for our choices and suitable ranges of a, b, d_A .

Similarly, consider the partial derivative $\frac{\partial^2 \zeta(p, d_A, 1 - \mu_B - \mu_C, \mu_B, \mu_C)}{\partial \mu_C^2}$. Again a simple computation yields that this is equal to

$$2(1 - (1 - e^{p-1})\mu_B)(1-p) \left(1 - (1 - \frac{1-p}{d_A})^{d_A} - (1-p)^{d_A} + (1 - \frac{1}{d_A})^{d_A} (1-p)^{d_A} \right)$$

The last term is equal to $\rho(a, b, d_A) = 1 - (1-ab)^{d_A} - a^{d_A} + a^{d_A}(1-b)^{d_A}$

Observe that $\rho(0, b, d_A) = 0$, and $\rho(1, b, d_A) = 0$. We now show ρ is concave with respect to a whenever $a \in (0, 1)$. Consider $\frac{\partial^2 \rho(a, b, d_A)}{\partial a^2}$. This is equal to $-b^2 d_A (d_A - 1) (1 - ab)^{d_A - 2} - d_A (d_A - 1) a^{d_A - 2} (1 - (1 - b)^{d_A})$. Both of these terms are negative when $d_A \geq 1$, and hence ρ is indeed concave with respect to a . It follows that $\rho(a, b, d_A) > 0$ for any $a \in (0, 1)$, and hence $\zeta(p, d_A, 1 - \mu_B - \mu_C, \mu_B, \mu_C)$ is convex with respect to μ_C . \square

Observation 2.11. *The functions $\zeta(p, d_A, \mu_A, 1 - \mu_A - \mu_C, \mu_C) - \lambda(\mu_A + 1.5(1 - \mu_A - \mu_C) + 3\mu_C)$ and $\zeta(p, d_A, 1 - \mu_B - \mu_C, \mu_B, \mu_C) - \lambda(1 - \mu_B - \mu_C + 1.5\mu_B + 3\mu_C)$ are convex with respect to μ_C for any fixed $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Follows from the fact that adding a linear function to a convex function results in a convex function. \square

Lemma 2.12. *There is a maximizer for $\psi(p, d_A, \mu_A, \mu_B, \mu_C)$ where $\mu_C = 0$.*

Proof. Let λ^* be the maximum value of $\psi(p, d_A, \mu_A, \mu_B, \mu_C)$. Then we must have $\zeta(p, d_A, \mu_A, 1 - \mu_A - \mu_C, \mu_C) - \lambda^*(\mu_A + 1.5(1 - \mu_A - \mu_C) + 3\mu_C) \geq 0$ and $\zeta(p, d_A, 1 - \mu_B - \mu_C, \mu_B, \mu_C) - \lambda^*(1 - \mu_B - \mu_C + 1.5\mu_B + 3\mu_C) \geq 0$ for some choice of d_A, μ_A, μ_B, μ_C . Since $\zeta(p, d_A, \mu_A, 1 - \mu_A - \mu_C, \mu_C) - \lambda^*(\mu_A + 1.5(1 - \mu_A - \mu_C) + 3\mu_C)$ is convex with respect to μ_C , it follows that there is another point $d_A, \mu'_A, \mu'_B, \mu'_C$ which attains a higher value of $\zeta(p, d_A, \mu'_A, \mu'_B, \mu'_C) - \lambda^*(\mu'_A + 1.5\mu'_B + 3\mu'_C)$ and satisfies $\mu'_C = 0$ or $\mu'_C = 1 - \mu'_A$. Using the fact that $\zeta(p, d_A, 1 - \mu_B - \mu_C, \mu_B, \mu_C) - \lambda^*(1 - \mu_B - \mu_C + 1.5\mu_B + 3\mu_C)$ is convex with respect to μ_C , we can further obtain a triplet $(\mu''_A, \mu''_B, \mu''_C)$ that still satisfies both inequalities and further $\mu''_C = 0$ or both $\mu''_C = 1 - \mu''_B$ and $\mu''_C = 1 - \mu''_A$. These two relationships imply that either $\mu''_C = 0$, or both $\mu''_A = \mu''_B = 0$, so that $\mu''_C = 1$. However, the latter is impossible, since $\zeta(p, d_A, 0, 0, 1) = \frac{1}{3}(3 - p + p(1 - p)^d) < 1$ which is clearly less than λ^* . Hence $\mu''_C = 0$. \square

Henceforth, we concern ourself with $\psi(p, d_A, \mu_A, 1 - \mu_A, 0)$. For convenience we will use the notation $\psi(p, d, \mu)$ instead, where $d := d_A$ and $\mu := \mu_A$.

Lemma 2.13. *When $d \geq 3$ and $p = p^*$, $\frac{\partial \psi(p, d, \mu)}{\partial \mu} > 0$ for all $\mu \in (0, 1)$.*

Proof. Again, define $a = (1 - p)$ and $b = \frac{1}{d}$ and additionally define $c = e^{p-1}$. First, we evaluate $\psi(p, d, \mu)$ by plugging $\mu_C = 0$, $\mu_B = 1 - \mu$, $\mu_A = \mu$, $d_A = d$ in $\psi(p, d_A, \mu_A, \mu_B, \mu_C)$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(p, d, \mu) &= \frac{1}{1.5 - 0.5\mu} (1.5 + 0.5c + ca^d + \mu((1 - ab)^d(0.5 + 0.5c) - c + ca^d(1 - b)^d + a^d(1 - 2c)) + \\ &\quad \frac{\mu^2}{2} (1 - c)((1 - ab)^d - 1 + 2a^d((1 - b)^d - 1)) \end{aligned}$$

Now we take the partial derivative $\frac{\partial \psi(p, d, \mu)}{\partial \mu}$. First, let us write $\psi(p, d, \mu) := \frac{\psi_1(p, d, \mu)}{1.5 - 0.5\mu}$. We have

$$\frac{\partial \psi_1(p, d, \mu)}{\partial \mu} = (1 - ab)^d(0.5 + 0.5c) - c + ca^d(1 - b)^d + a^d(1 - 2c) + \mu(1 - c)((1 - ab)^d - 1 + 2a^d((1 - b)^d - 1))$$

Notice that $\frac{\partial \psi(p, d, \mu)}{\partial \mu} = \frac{1}{(1.5 - 0.5\mu)^2}((1.5 - 0.5\mu)\frac{\partial \psi_1(p, d, \mu)}{\partial \mu} + 0.5\psi_1(p, d, \mu)) := \frac{\psi_2(p, d, \mu)}{(1.5 - 0.5\mu)^2}$.

Here ψ_2 is a quadratic function of μ of the form $\lambda_1\mu^2 + \lambda_2\mu + \lambda_3$, where

$$\lambda_1 = -\frac{1}{4}(1 - c)((1 - ab)^d - 1 + 2a^d((1 - b)^d - 1))$$

$$\lambda_2 = 1.5(1 - c)((1 - ab)^d - 1 + 2a^d((1 - b)^d - 1))$$

$$\lambda_3 = 1.5((1 - ab)^d(0.5 + 0.5c) - c + ca^d(1 - b)^d + a^d(1 - 2c)) + 0.5(1.5 + 0.5c + ca^d)$$

Observe that $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\frac{\lambda_2}{-2\lambda_1} = 3$. This means that ψ_2 attains its minimum at $\mu = 3$ and is decreasing with respect to μ when $\mu \in (0, 1)$. We compute $\psi_2(p, d, 1)$.

$$\psi_2(p, d, 1) = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = (2 - 0.5c)(1 - ab)^d + (2.5 - c)a^d(1 - b)^d - a^d - \frac{1}{2}$$

Recall that $b = \frac{1}{d}$, and $0 < a, b, c < 1$. The function $(1 - k/x)^x$ is increasing when $x \geq 1$, for any $k > 0$. Since $d \geq 3$, we obtain the following lower bound on $\psi_2(p, d, 1)$.

$$\psi_2(p, d, 1) \geq \psi_2'(p, d, 1) = (2 - 0.5c)(1 - a/3)^3 + (2.5 - c)a^d(1 - 1/3)^3 - a^d - \frac{1}{2}$$

Plugging in $p = p^*$ in $\psi_2'(p, d, 1)$, this expression evaluates approximately to $0.214 - 0.395(1 - p^*)^d$. Since $d \geq 3$, this quantity is at least $\psi_2'(p^*, 3, 1) \approx 0.025 > 0$. Since $\psi_2(p^*, d, \mu)$ decreases with μ and $\psi_2(p^*, d, 1) > 0$ whenever $d \geq 3$, it follows that $\frac{\partial \psi(p^*, d, \mu)}{\partial \mu} > 0$ for every $\mu \in (0, 1)$ and $d \geq 3$. \square

Lemma 2.14. *When $d \geq 3$ and $p = p^*$, $\psi(p, d, \mu) \leq \alpha_{alg}$ for all $\mu \in (0, 1)$.*

Proof. The proof is straightforward. Since we showed in the previous lemma that $\frac{\partial \psi(p, d, \mu)}{\partial \mu} > 0$, for each $\mu \in (0, 1)$ when $p = p^*$ and $d \geq 3$, $\psi(p^*, d, \mu)$ is maximized when $\mu = 1$. When $\mu = 1$ and $p = p^*$, we have $\psi(p, d, 1) = g(p^*, d) \leq \alpha_{alg}$ from Lemma 2.9. \square

Lemma 2.15. *When $d = 1, 2$ and $p = p^*$, $\psi(p, d, \mu) \leq \alpha_{alg}$ for all $\mu \in (0, 1)$.*

Proof. The proof is by direct computation. When $d = 1$, and $p = p^*$, we obtain the function $\psi(p^*, 1, \mu) \leq \frac{(4.173 - 0.462\mu - 1.277\mu^2)}{3 - \mu}$. Finding the maximum of the right hand side is a single variable maximization problem easily solved by computing first derivatives. We obtain that the maximum is attained when $\mu \approx 0.39$, and the maximum is at most 1.46.

When $d = 2$ and $p = p^*$, similarly we obtain the function $\frac{4.02 - 0.128\mu - 0.842\mu^2}{3 - \mu}$ as an upper bound, which is maximized when $\mu \approx 0.836$ and the maximum is at most $1.537 < \alpha_{alg} \approx 1.546$. Thus the inequality holds. \square

Finally, combining all these results, we have shown that the function $\psi(p, d_A, \mu_A, \mu_B, \mu_C)$ is at most $\alpha_{alg} \approx 1.546$ when $p = p^*$, for any (valid) choice of d_A, μ_A, μ_B, μ_C . This completes the proof of Lemma 2.8. \square

3 Hardness

In this section, we prove the following hardness result for k -MEDIAN.

Theorem 1.2. *Assuming the Unique Games Conjecture, for any $\epsilon > 0$, k -MEDIAN is NP-hard to approximate within a factor*

$$\max_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3}} \min_{p \in [0, 1]} \left[1 + \left(1 - \frac{1 - p}{d - 1} \right)^d + \left(1 - \min\left(1, \frac{pd + (1 - p)}{d - 1} \right) \right)^d - \epsilon \right] \approx 1.416 - \epsilon.$$

Our result follows from the following hardness result for k -Hypergraph Vertex Cover (k -HVC), where we allow parallel hyperedges.

Theorem 3.1. *Assuming the Unique Games Conjecture, for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3}$, given a d -uniform hypergraph $H = (V, E)$, it is NP-hard to distinguish the following two cases.*

- *YES: There exists $U \subseteq V$ with $|U| = \frac{|V|}{d-1}$ that intersects at least a $(1 - \epsilon)$ fraction of hyperedges.*
- *NO: For any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, any subset $U \subseteq V$ with $\alpha|V|$ vertices intersects at most a $1 - (1 - \alpha)^d + \epsilon$ fraction of hyperedges.*

A standard reduction shows that Theorem 1.2 immediately follows from Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Given a d -uniform hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ from Theorem 3.1, we first perform the following operation.

- For each hyperedge in E , add M copies of the same hyperedge for $M = (|V||E|)^5$.
- For each triple $\{u, v, w\} \subseteq V$ that do not have a corresponding hyperedge, add a hyperedge.

This ensures that (1) $|E| \geq \omega(|V|)$ and (2) any two vertices are contained in the same hyperedge, while maintaining the claimed hardness up to an additive loss of $o(1)$. After such a transformation, our instance for k -MEDIAN is simply the vertex-hyperedge incidence graph of H with $k = \frac{|V|}{d-1}$.

In the YES case, by placing k centers at the promised set U , at least a $(1 - \epsilon - o(1))$ fraction of vertices from E have distance 1 to U , and all the other vertices have distance at most 4 from U . Therefore, the average distance to the open centers is $1 + O(\epsilon)$.

In the NO case, consider any solution U that opens $\frac{1-p}{d-1}|V|$ centers in V and $\frac{p}{d-1}|V|$ in E for some $p \in [0, 1]$. Letting $\alpha = \frac{1-p}{d-1}$ ensures that at least a $(1 - \frac{1-p}{d-1})^d - \epsilon - o(1)$ fraction of hyperedges have a distance strictly greater than one from U . Letting $\alpha = \min(1, \frac{1-p}{d-1} + d\frac{p}{d-1})$ ensures that at least a $(1 - \min(1, \frac{1-p}{d-1} + d\frac{p}{d-1}))^d - \epsilon - o(1)$ fraction of hyperedges have a distance strictly greater than two from U . Since all distances are integers, the average distance to U is at least

$$h(p, d) = 1 + \left(1 - \frac{1-p}{d-1}\right)^d + \left(1 - \min(1, \frac{1-p}{d-1} + d\frac{p}{d-1})\right)^d - O(\epsilon).$$

We thus obtain a hardness of $\max_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3}} \min_{p \in [0, 1]} h(p, d) \approx 1.416 - O(\epsilon)$ as desired. \square

3.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

It remains to prove Theorem 3.1. It follows from standard techniques to prove hardness of approximation of constraint satisfaction or covering problems assuming the Unique Games Conjecture, pioneered by O’Donnell et al. [34]. Our proof becomes particularly simple due to the use of *pairwise independence* [4, 39]. This notion has been crucially used for constraint satisfaction problems, but its use for covering problems (especially with $d > 3$) has been limited.

3.1.1 Dictatorship test

Let $d \geq 3$ be an integer and R be another positive integer. Our dictatorship test is a d -uniform hypergraph whose set of vertices is $[d-1]^R$. Let $\Omega = [d-1]$. A distribution μ on Ω^d is called *pairwise independent* if x is a random d -dimensional vector sampled from Ω , for every $i < j \in [d]$ and $t_i, t_j \in [d-1]$, $\Pr[x_i = t_i, x_j = t_j] = \frac{1}{(d-1)^2}$.

Lemma 3.2 ([22]). *For any $d \geq 3$, there exists a pairwise independent distribution μ on $[d-1]^d$ such that every $x \in [d-1]^d$ in the support has at least one $i \in [d]$ with $x_i = 1$.*

Fix the μ given by the above lemma, and for another parameter $\delta > 0$ to be determined, let μ_δ be the δ -noised version of μ on Ω^d ; after sampling v from μ , each coordinate of x is independently resampled with probability δ to a random value in Ω .

Let $\mu_\delta^{\otimes R}$ be the product distribution on $(\Omega^d)^R$ so that for every $x^1, \dots, x^d \in \Omega^R$, $\mu_\delta^{\otimes R}(x^1, \dots, x^d) = \prod_{i=1}^R \mu_\delta(x_i^1, \dots, x_i^d)$. Then the dictatorship test is a weighted d -uniform hypergraph where the weight of a d -edge is exactly the probability that it is sampled from $\mu_\delta^{\otimes R}$. It can be easily converted to an unweighted hypergraph by duplicating the same hyperedge according to its weight. (Eventually, in the Unique Games reduction, ϵ and R will be constants independent of the instance size.)

A *dictator* is to the set $\{x \in \Omega^R : x_i = 1\}$ for some $i \in [R]$. Note that every such set intersects at least a $(1 - \delta)$ fraction of hyperedges.

3.1.2 Fourier analysis preliminaries

To analyze the soundness of the test, we use the following standard tools from Gaussian bounds for correlated functions from Mossel [39]. We define the correlation between two and more correlated spaces.

Definition 3.3. *Given a distribution ν on $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$, the correlation $\rho(\Omega_1, \Omega_2; \nu)$ is defined as*

$$\rho(\Omega_1, \Omega_2; \nu) = \sup \{ \text{Cov}[f, g] : f : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, g : \Omega_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \text{Var}[f] = \text{Var}[g] = 1 \}.$$

Given a distribution μ on $\Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_d$, the correlation $\rho(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_d; \mu)$ is defined as

$$\rho(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_d; \mu) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} \rho\left(\prod_{j \neq i} \Omega_j, \Omega_i; \mu\right).$$

Since our distribution μ_δ on $\Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_d$ with $\Omega_1 = \dots = \Omega_d = [d - 1]$ is independently noised with probability δ , we have the following bound on the correlation.

Lemma 3.4 (Lemma 2.9 of [39]). $\rho(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_d; \mu_\delta) \leq 1 - \delta^d/2$.

Definition 3.5. *For any function $F : [d - 1]^R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the Efron-Stein decomposition is given by*

$$F(y) = \sum_{S \subseteq [R]} F_S(y)$$

where the functions F_S satisfy

- F_S only depends on y_S , the restriction of y to the coordinates of S .
- For all $S \not\subseteq S'$ and all $z_{S'}$, $\mathbb{E}_y[F_S(y) | y_{S'} = z_{S'}] = 0$.

Based on the Efron-Stein decomposition, we can define (low-degree) influences of a function. For a function $F : [d - 1]^R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $p \geq 1$, let $\|F\|_p := \mathbb{E}[|F(y)|^p]^{1/p}$

Definition 3.6. *For any function $F : [d - 1]^R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, its i th influence is defined as*

$$\text{Inf}_i := \sum_{S: i \in S} \|f_S\|_2^2.$$

Its i th degree- t influence is defined as

$$\text{Inf}_i^{\leq t} := \sum_{S: i \in S, |S| \leq t} \|f_S\|_2^2.$$

We crucially use the following invariance principle applied to our dictatorship test, using the fact that μ and μ_δ are pairwise independent.

Theorem 3.7 (Theorem 1.14 of [39]). *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\tau > 0$ such that the following is true. Let $F_1, \dots, F_d : [d-1]^R \rightarrow [0, 1]$. If $\max(\text{Inf}_i^{\leq t}[F_1], \dots, \text{Inf}_i^{\leq t}[F_d]) \leq \tau$ for every $i \in [R]$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x^1, \dots, x^d) \in \mu_\delta^{\otimes R}} \left[\prod_{j=1}^d F_j(x^j) \right] \geq \prod_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}[F_j(x^j)] - \epsilon.$$

Given this theorem, consider an arbitrary set of vertices $S \subseteq \Omega^R$ such that $|S| = \alpha |\Omega^R|$, and let F_1, \dots, F_d all be the reverse indicator function of S ; $F_i(x) = 1$ if $x \notin S$ and 0 otherwise. Then the fraction of the hyperedges not intersected by S is

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x^1, \dots, x^d) \in \mu_\delta^{\otimes R}} \left[\prod_{j=1}^d F_j(x^j) \right] \geq \prod_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}[F_j(x^j)] - \epsilon = (1 - \alpha)^d - \epsilon,$$

unless F_i has an influential coordinate.

3.1.3 Reduction from Unique Games

In this subsection, we introduce the reduction from the Unique Games using the dictatorship test constructed. We first introduce the Unique Games Conjecture [33], which is stated below.

Definition 3.8 (Unique Games). *An instance $\mathcal{L}(G(V \cup W, E), [R], \{\pi(v, w)\}_{(v, w) \in E})$ of Unique Games consists of a regular bipartite graph $G(V \cup W, E)$ and a set $[R]$ of labels. For each edge $(v, w) \in E$ there is a constraint specified by a permutation $\pi(v, w) : [R] \rightarrow [R]$. Given a labeling $\ell : V \cup W \rightarrow [R]$, let $\text{Val}_{\text{UG}}(\ell)$ be the fraction of edges satisfied by ℓ , where an edge $e = (v, w)$ is said to be satisfied if $\ell(v) = \pi(v, w)(\ell(w))$. Let $\text{Opt}_{\text{UG}}(\mathcal{L}) = \max_\ell(\text{Val}_{\text{UG}}(\ell))$.*

Conjecture 3.9 (Unique Games Conjecture [33]). *For any constant $\eta > 0$, there is $R = R(\eta)$ such that, for a Unique Games instance \mathcal{L} with label set $[R]$, it is NP-hard to distinguish between*

- $\text{Opt}_{\text{UG}}(\mathcal{L}) \geq 1 - \eta$.
- $\text{Opt}_{\text{UG}}(\mathcal{L}) \leq \eta$.

Given d and ϵ , fix t, τ from Theorem 3.7. Given an instance $\mathcal{L}(G(V \cup W, E), [R], \{\pi(v, w)\}_{(v, w) \in E})$ of Unique Games, we construct a weighted d -uniform hypergraph. For $y \in [d-1]^R$ and a permutation $\pi : [R] \rightarrow [R]$, let $y \circ \pi \in [d-1]^R$ be defined by $(y \circ \pi)_i = (y)_{\pi^{-1}(i)}$.

- The set of vertices $\mathcal{V} := V \times [d-1]^R$.
- The hyperedges are described by the following probabilistic procedure to sample a d -tuple of vertices, where the weight of the hyperedge is exactly the probability that it is sampled.
 - Sample $w \in W$ uniformly at random and its neighbors v_1, \dots, v_d uniformly and independently.
 - Sample $(x^1, \dots, x^d) \sim \mu_\delta^{\otimes R}$. Output the pair $((v_1, x^1 \circ \pi_{v_1, w}), \dots, (v_d, x^d \circ \pi_{v_d, w}))$.

Completeness. Suppose that $\text{Val}_{\text{UG}}(\ell) \geq 1 - \eta$ for some labeling $\ell : V \cup W \rightarrow [R]$. Consider the set of vertices $\mathcal{U} := \{(v, x) : x_{\ell(v)} = 1\}$. In the above sample procedure, the probability that ℓ satisfies all the edges $(w, v_1), \dots, (w, v_d)$ is at least $1 - d\eta$, and if that happens, the probability that the sampled hyperedge intersects with \mathcal{U} is at least $1 - \delta$. Therefore, the total fraction of hyperedge intersected by \mathcal{U} is at least $1 - d\eta - \delta$, which can be made at least $1 - \epsilon$ by choosing small enough η and δ .

Soundness. Consider any solution $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ with $|\mathcal{U}| = \alpha|\mathcal{V}|$ and suppose that it intersects at least a $1 - (1 - \alpha)^d + \epsilon$ fraction of the hyperedges.

For any $v \in V$, let $F_v : [d - 1]^R \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the reverse indicator function \mathcal{U} for v ; $F_v(x) = 0$ if $(v, x) \in \mathcal{U}$ and 1 otherwise. For each $w \in W$, let $F_w : [d - 1]^R \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be such that

$$F_w(y) := \mathbb{E}_{(v,w) \in E} [F_v(y \circ \pi_{v,w})].$$

Then the soundness of the dictatorship test shows that, for some τ and t depending only on d and ϵ , unless there exists $i \in [R]$ with $\text{Inf}_i^{\leq d}[F_w] > \tau$, the probability that a random hyperedge, in the above probabilistic procedure given w , intersects \mathcal{U} is at most $1 - \mathbb{E}[F_w]^d + \epsilon/2$.

Call w *good* if w has $i \in [R]$ with $\text{Inf}_i^{\leq d}[F_w] > \tau$. We define a labeling of the Unique Games instance as follows. First, for any good w , let $\ell(w) = i$. Let β be the fraction of good w 's. Since the fraction of the hyperedges intersected by \mathcal{U} is at most

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_w \text{bad}[1 - \mathbb{E}[F_w]^d + \epsilon/2] + \beta \leq 1 - (\mathbb{E}_w \text{bad} \mathbb{E}[F_w])^d + \epsilon/2 + \beta \\ & \leq 1 - (1 - \min(\alpha + \beta, 1))^d + \epsilon/2 + \beta \leq 1 - (1 - \alpha)^d + \epsilon/2 + (d + 1)\beta. \end{aligned}$$

(The first inequality uses the fact that $1 - (1 - x)^d$ is concave in x in $[0, 1]$.) Since this fraction is at least $1 - (1 - \alpha)^d + \epsilon$, we have $\beta > \frac{\epsilon}{4d}$.

From the representation of influences in terms of Fourier coefficients (see Definition 3.6),

$$\tau < \text{Inf}_i^{\leq d}[F_w] \leq \mathbb{E}_{(v,w) \in E} [\text{Inf}_{\pi_{v,w}(i)}^{\leq d}[F_v]]$$

and we conclude that a $\tau/2$ fraction of neighbors v of w have $\text{Inf}_{\pi_{v,w}(i)}^{\leq d}(F_v) \geq \tau/2$. We choose $\ell(v)$ uniformly from a candidate set $\{i : \text{Inf}_i^{\leq d}[F_v] \geq \tau/2\}$. (If v has no candidate, choose $\ell(v)$ arbitrarily.) Since $\sum_i \text{Inf}_i^{\leq d}[F_v] \leq d$, there are at most $O(d/\tau)$ possible i 's, so the total size of the above set is $O(\frac{d}{\tau})$.

So this labeling strategy satisfies at least $\Omega(\frac{\beta\tau}{d})$ fraction of Unique Games constraints in expectation. Taking η small enough completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

References

- [1] Marek Adamczyk, Jaroslaw Byrka, Jan Marcinkowski, Syed M Meesum, and Michal Wlodarczyk. Constant-factor fpt approximation for capacitated k-median. In *27th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2019)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019. 2
- [2] Akanksha Agrawal, Tanmay Inamdar, Saket Saurabh, and Jie Xue. Clustering what matters: optimal approximation for clustering with outliers. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 78:143–166, 2023. 2
- [3] Vijay Arya, Naveen Garg, Rohit Khandekar, Adam Meyerson, Kamesh Munagala, and Vinayaka Pandit. Local search heuristic for k-median and facility location problems. In *Proceedings of the thirty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 21–29, 2001. 2
- [4] Per Austrin and Elchanan Mossel. Approximation resistant predicates from pairwise independence. *Computational Complexity*, 18(2):249–271, 2009. 15
- [5] Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru, Robert Kleinberg, and Hooyeon Lee. Approximating low-dimensional coverage problems. In *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 161–170, 2012. 5
- [6] Sayan Bandyapadhyay, Fedor V Fomin, Petr A Golovach, Nidhi Purohit, and Kirill Simonov. Fpt approximation for fair minimum-load clustering. In *17th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation*, 2022. 2
- [7] Sayan Bandyapadhyay, William Lochet, and Saket Saurabh. Fpt constant-approximations for capacitated clustering to minimize the sum of cluster radii. In *39th International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2023)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. 2

- [8] Yair Bartal. On approximating arbitrary metrics by tree metrics. In *Proceedings of the thirtieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 161–168, 1998. [2](#)
- [9] Jarosław Byrka, Thomas Pensyl, Bartosz Rybicki, Aravind Srinivasan, and Khoa Trinh. An improved approximation for k-median and positive correlation in budgeted optimization. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 13(2):1–31, 2017. [2](#)
- [10] Moses Charikar, Chandra Chekuri, Ashish Goel, and Sudipto Guha. Rounding via trees: deterministic approximation algorithms for group steiner trees and k-median. In *Proceedings of the thirtieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 114–123, 1998. [2](#)
- [11] Moses Charikar and Sudipto Guha. Improved combinatorial algorithms for the facility location and k-median problems. In *40th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (Cat. No. 99CB37039)*, pages 378–388. IEEE, 1999. [2](#)
- [12] Moses Charikar, Sudipto Guha, Éva Tardos, and David B Shmoys. A constant-factor approximation algorithm for the k-median problem. In *Proceedings of the thirty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 1–10, 1999. [2](#)
- [13] Moses Charikar and Shi Li. A dependent lp-rounding approach for the k-median problem. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 194–205. Springer, 2012. [2](#)
- [14] Moses Charikar, Konstantin Makarychev, and Yury Makarychev. Integrality gaps for sherali-adams relaxations. In *Proceedings of the forty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 283–292, 2009. [5](#)
- [15] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Anupam Gupta, Amit Kumar, Euiwoong Lee, and Jason Li. Tight fpt approximations for k-median and k-means. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.12334*, 2019. [2](#), [4](#)
- [16] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Anupam Gupta, Amit Kumar, Euiwoong Lee, and Jason Li. Tight fpt approximations for k-median and k-means. In *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2019)*, volume 132, pages 42–1. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019. [6](#)
- [17] Vincent Cohen-Addad and Jason Li. On the fixed-parameter tractability of capacitated clustering. In *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2019)*, volume 132, pages 41–1. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019. [2](#)
- [18] Vincent Cohen-Addad Viallat, Fabrizio Grandoni, Euiwoong Lee, and Chris Schwiegelshohn. Breaching the 2 lmp approximation barrier for facility location with applications to k-median. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 940–986. SIAM, 2023. [2](#), [5](#)
- [19] Uriel Feige. A threshold of $\ln n$ for approximating set cover. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 45(4):634–652, 1998. [3](#)
- [20] Dan Feldman and Michael Langberg. A unified framework for approximating and clustering data. In *Proceedings of the forty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 569–578, 2011. [6](#)
- [21] Qilong Feng, Zhen Zhang, Ziyun Huang, Jinhui Xu, and Jianxin Wang. A unified framework of fpt approximation algorithms for clustering problems. In *31st International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC 2020)*. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2020. [2](#)
- [22] Badih Ghazi and Euiwoong Lee. Lp/sdp hierarchy lower bounds for decoding random ldpc codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(6):4423–4437, 2017. [15](#)
- [23] Kishen N Gowda, Thomas Pensyl, Aravind Srinivasan, and Khoa Trinh. Improved bi-point rounding algorithms and a golden barrier for k-median. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 987–1011. SIAM, 2023. [2](#), [5](#)

- [24] Dishant Goyal and Ragesh Jaiswal. Tight fpt approximation for socially fair clustering. *Information Processing Letters*, 182:106383, 2023. [2](#)
- [25] Dishant Goyal, Ragesh Jaiswal, and Amit Kumar. Fpt approximation for constrained metric k -median/means. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.11773*, 2020. [2](#)
- [26] Sudipto Guha and Samir Khuller. Greedy strikes back: Improved facility location algorithms. *Journal of algorithms*, 31(1):228–248, 1999. [2](#), [3](#)
- [27] Johan Håstad. Some optimal inapproximability results. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 48(4):798–859, 2001. [5](#)
- [28] Tanmay Inamdar and Kasturi Varadarajan. Capacitated sum-of-radii clustering: An fpt approximation. In *28th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2020)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. [2](#)
- [29] Kamal Jain, Mohammad Mahdian, Evangelos Markakis, Amin Saberi, and Vijay V Vazirani. Greedy facility location algorithms analyzed using dual fitting with factor-revealing lp. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 50(6):795–824, 2003. [2](#), [3](#)
- [30] Kamal Jain and Vijay V Vazirani. Approximation algorithms for metric facility location and k -median problems using the primal-dual schema and lagrangian relaxation. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 48(2):274–296, 2001. [2](#)
- [31] Pallavi Jain, Lawqueen Kanesh, Fahad Panolan, Souvik Saha, Abhishek Sahu, Saket Saurabh, and Anannya Upasana. Parameterized approximation scheme for biclique-free max k -weight sat and max coverage. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 3713–3733. SIAM, 2023. [5](#)
- [32] Ragesh Jaiswal and Amit Kumar. Clustering what matters in constrained settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00175*, 2023. [2](#)
- [33] Subhash Khot. On the power of unique 2-prover 1-round games. In *Proceedings of the thirty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 767–775, 2002. [3](#), [17](#)
- [34] Subhash Khot, Guy Kindler, Elchanan Mossel, and Ryan O’Donnell. Optimal inapproximability results for max-cut and other 2-variable csps? *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 37(1):319–357, 2007. [15](#)
- [35] Shi Li and Ola Svensson. Approximating k -median via pseudo-approximation. In *proceedings of the forty-fifth annual ACM symposium on theory of computing*, pages 901–910, 2013. [2](#)
- [36] Jyh-Han Lin and Jeffrey Scott Vitter. Approximation algorithms for geometric median problems. *Information Processing Letters*, 44(5):245–249, 1992. [2](#)
- [37] Jyh-Han Lin and Jeffrey Scott Vitter. ϵ -approximations with minimum packing constraint violation. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 771–782, 1992. [2](#)
- [38] Pasin Manurangsi. A note on max k -vertex cover: Faster fpt-as, smaller approximate kernel and improved approximation. In *2nd Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms*, 2019. [5](#)
- [39] Elchanan Mossel. Gaussian bounds for noise correlation of functions. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 19(6):1713–1756, 2010. [15](#), [16](#), [17](#)
- [40] Yicheng Xu, Rolf H Möhring, Dachuan Xu, Yong Zhang, and Yifei Zou. A constant fpt approximation algorithm for hard-capacitated k -means. *Optimization and Engineering*, 21:709–722, 2020. [2](#)