arXiv:2002.07463v1 [cs.DS] 18 Feb 2020

Coreset-based Strategies for Robust Center-type Problems

Andrea Pietracaprina
Department of Information Engineering, University of Padova, Padova, Italy
andrea.pietracaprina@unipd.it

Geppino Pucci
Department of Information Engineering, University of Padova, Padova, Italy
geppino.pucci@unipd.it

Federico Soldà
Department of Information Engineering, University of Padova, Padova, Italy
federico.solda@studenti.unipd.it

Abstract

Given a dataset V of points from some metric space, the popular k-center problem requires to identify a subset of k points (centers) in V minimizing the maximum distance of any point of V from its closest center. The *robust* formulation of the problem features a further parameter z and allows up to z points of V (outliers) to be disregarded when computing the maximum distance from the centers. In this paper, we focus on two important constrained variants of the robust k-center problem, namely, the *Robust Matroid Center* (RMC) problem, where the set of returned centers are constrained to be an independent set of a matroid of rank k built on V, and the *Robust Knapsack Center* (RKC) problem, where each element $i \in V$ is given a positive weight $w_i < 1$ and the aggregate weight of the returned centers must be at most 1. We devise coreset-based strategies for the two problems which yield efficient sequential, MapReduce, and Streaming algorithms. More specifically, for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, the algorithms return solutions featuring a $(3 + \epsilon)$-approximation ratio, which is a mere additive term ϵ away from the 3-approximations achievable by the best known polynomial-time sequential algorithms for the two problems. Moreover, the algorithms obliviously adapt to the intrinsic complexity of the dataset, captured by its doubling dimension D. For wide ranges of the parameters k, z, ϵ, D, we obtain a sequential algorithm with running time linear in $|V|$, and MapReduce/Streaming algorithms with few rounds/passes and substantially sublinear local/working memory.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Approximation algorithms analysis; Theory of computation → Facility location and clustering; Theory of computation → MapReduce algorithms

Keywords and phrases Clustering, k-center, Matroid, Knapsack, MapReduce, Streaming, Coreset

1 Introduction

Center-based clustering is a crucial primitive for data management, with application domains as diverse as recommendation systems, facility location, database search, bioinformatics, content distribution systems, and many more [13]. In general terms, given a dataset V, a distance function between pairs of points in V, and a value k, a solution for center-based clustering is a set of k representative points, called *centers*, which induce a partition of V into k subsets (clusters), each containing all points in V closest to the same center. One important formulation of center-based clustering is the *k-center* problem, where the set of centers must be chosen as a subset of V which minimizes the maximum distance of any point of V to its closest center. It is well known that k-center is NP-hard, that it admits a 2-approximation algorithm, and that for any $\epsilon > 0$ it is not $(2 - \epsilon)$-approximable unless $P = NP$ [11].

A number of natural variants of k-center have been studied in the literature. The constrained variants introduced in [9] restrict the set of returned centers to obey an additional constraint, which can be expressed either as a *matroid constraint*, that is, the set of centers must be an independent set of a given matroid system (V, I) defined on the input dataset V, or a *knapsack constraint*, where each point in V carries a weight, and the aggregate weight of the returned centers cannot exceed a certain budget. Matroid and knapsack constraints arise naturally in the context of recommendation systems or facility location. In the former context, consider for instance the case of points in the dataset belonging to different categories, where all categories should have a given quota of representatives (centers) in the returned solution, a constraint naturally expressible as a partition matroid. In the latter, "opening" a center at a given location might carry different costs, and the final solution cannot exceed a total budget.

Another variant of the original problem is motivated by the observation that the k-center objective function involves a maximum, thus the optimal solution is at risk of being severely influenced by a few "distant" points in V, called *outliers*. In fact, the presence of outliers is inherent in many datasets, since these points are often due to artifacts or errors in data collection. To cope with this issue, k-center admits the following *robust* formulation that takes into account outliers [8]: given an additional input parameter z, when computing the k-center objective function, the z points of V with the largest distances from their respective centers are disregarded in the computation of the maximum. Robust formulations of the constrained variants have been also studied, referred to as *Robust Matroid Center* (RMC) and *Robust Knapsack Center* (RKC) problems, respectively [9].

The explosive growth of data that needs to be processed in modern computing scenarios often rules out the use of traditional sequential strategies which, while efficient on small-sized datasets, often prove to be prohibitive on massive ones. It is thus of paramount importance to devise clustering strategies amenable to the typical computational frameworks employed for big data processing, such as MapReduce and Streaming [18]. *Coreset-based* strategies have recently emerged as ideal approaches for big data processing. Informally, these strategies entail the (efficient) extraction of a very succinct summary T (dubbed *coreset*) of the dataset V, so that a solution for V can be obtained by running (suitable modifications of) the best sequential algorithm on T. Coreset constructions that can be either parallelized or streamlined efficiently yield scalable and space-efficient algorithms in the big data realm. To objective of this paper is to devise novel coreset-based strategies for the RMC and RKC problems, featuring efficient sequential, MapReduce and Streaming implementations.

1.1 Previous work

Due to space constraints we only report on the works most closely related to the specific topic of this paper, and refer the interested reader to [2] and references therein for a more comprehensive overview on center-based clustering. Sequential approximation algorithms for the RMC and RKC problem are given in [9, 12, 7]. The best algorithms to date are sequential 3-approximations for both RMC [12, 7] and RKC [7]. All of these algorithms, however, do not seem immediately amenable to MapReduce or Streaming implementations. Coreset-based Streaming algorithms for RMC and RKC have been recently devised by Kale in [17]. For $\epsilon > 0$, Kale's streaming algorithms compute a coreset of size $O(k(k+z)\log(1/\epsilon)/\epsilon)$ containing a $(15+\epsilon)$-approximate solution, where z is the number of outliers and k is the rank of the matroid, for RMC, or the *maximum* cardinality of a feasible solution, for the RKC problem. The solution embedded in the coresets of [17] can be extracted using a brute-force approach. Alternatively, one of the 3-approximate sequential algorithms in [12, 7] can

be run on the coreset to yield a $(51+\epsilon)$-approximate solution. To the best of our knowledge no MapReduce algorithms for RKC and RKC have been presented in the open literature.

Coreset-based algorithms for the MapReduce and Streaming setting for the unconstrained (robust) k-center problem and related problems can be found in [19, 6, 4]. Useful techniques to deal with matroid constraints in big data scenarios have been introduced in [3, 5] in the realm of diversity maximization.

1.2 Our contribution

By leveraging ideas introduced in [3, 17], we present novel algorithms for the RMC and RKC problems which attain approximation ratios close to the best attainable ones, and feature efficient sequential implementations as well as efficient implementations in the MapReduce and Streaming settings, thus proving suitable for dealing with massive inputs. Our strategies exploit the basic k-center primitive to extract a small coreset T from the input set V, with the property that the distance between each point of V and the closest point of T is a small fraction of cost of the optimal solution. Also, T contains a good solution for the original problem on V which can be computed by assigning a suitable multiplicity to each point of T and by running the best-known sequential algorithms for RMC and RKC on T, adapted to take multiplicities into account.

More specifically, for any fixed $\epsilon \in (0,1)$, our RMC and RKC algorithms feature a $(3+\epsilon)$ approximation ratio (see Corollaries 3.5 and 4.4 for a formal statement of the results). Let z be the number of outliers and let k denote the matroid rank, in the RMC problem, and the *minimum* cardinality of an optimal solution, in the RKC problem. The time and space requirements of the algorithms are analyzed in terms of z, k, the approximation quality, captured by ϵ, and the *doubling dimension* D of the input set V, a parameter that generalizes the notion of Euclidean dimension to arbitrary metric spaces. We remark that this kind of dimensionality-aware analysis is particularly relevant in the realm of big data, and it has been employed in a variety of contexts including diversity maximization, clustering, nearest neighbour search, routing, and machine learning (see [6] and references therein).

For both problems, the sequential complexity of our algorithms is $O(|V|f(z,k,\epsilon,D))$, for a certain function $f(z,k,\epsilon,D)$, and it is thus linear for fixed values of k, z, ϵ and D. The RMC strategy admits a 2-round MapReduce implementation requiring local memory sublinear in $|V|$ (Theorem 5.1), and a 1-pass Streaming implementation with working memory size dependent only on z, k, ϵ and D (Theorem 5.3). The RKC strategy admits an R-round MapReduce implementation requiring local memory sublinear in $|V|$ (Theorem 5.2), and an R-pass Streaming implementation with working memory size dependent only on z, k, ϵ and D (Theorem 5.4), where $R = O(\log(k+z) + D\log(1/\epsilon))$. For constant $\eta \in (0,1)$, the number of rounds (resp., passes) R can be reduced to $O(1/\eta)$, at the expense of a $O(|V|^{\eta/2})$ (resp., $O(|V|^{\eta})$) increase in the local memory (resp., working memory) size. Remarkably, while the analysis of our algorithms is performed in terms of the doubling dimension D of V, the algorithms are oblivious to the value D which, in fact, would be difficult to estimate.

Our MapReduce algorithms provide the first efficient solutions to RMC and RKC in a distributed setting and attain an approximation quality that can be made arbitrarily close to that of the best sequential algorithms. Our Streaming algorithms share the same approximation quality as the MapReduce algorithms and substantially improve upon the approximations attained in [17]. Furthermore, all of our algorithms are very space efficient for a wide range of the parameter space. In particular, the working space of our RKC Streaming algorithm depends on the size of the smallest optimal solution rather than on the largest feasible solution as in [17], which might result in a considerable space-saving. Finally,

it is important to observe that in the sequential and Streaming settings, for fixed values of k, z and D, exhaustive search on the coresets yields $(1+\epsilon)$-approximate solutions to RMC and RKC with work merely linear in V.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces some key technical notions and formally defines the RMC and RKC problems. The coreset-based strategies for RMC and RKC are described and analyzed in Sections 3 and 4, respectively, while their MapReduce and Streaming implementations are discussed in Section 5. Section 6 offers some concluding remarks.

2 Preliminaries

This section introduces some key notions and basic properties that will be used throughout the paper, and defines the computational problems studied in this work.

2.1 Matroids

Let V be a ground set of elements from a metric space with distance function $d(\cdot,\cdot)$ satisfying the triangle inequality. A *matroid* [21] on V is a pair $M=(V,I)$, where I is a family of subsets of V, called *independent sets*, satisfying the following properties: (i) the empty set is independent; (ii) every subset of an independent set is independent (*hereditary property*); and (iii) if $A\in I$ and $B\in I$, and $|A|>|B|$, then there exist $x\in A\setminus B$ such that $B\cup\{x\}\in I$ (*augmentation property*). An independent set is *maximal* if it is not properly contained in another independent set. A basic property of a matroid M is that all of its maximal independent sets have the same size. The notion of maximality can be naturally extended to any subset of the ground set. Namely, for $V'\subseteq V$, an independent set $A\subseteq V'$ of maximum cardinality among all independent sets contained in V' is called a maximal independent set of V', and all maximal independent sets of V' have the same size. We let the *rank* of a subset $V'\subset V$, denoted by $rank(V')$ to be the size of a maximal independent set in V'. The rank of the matroid $rank(M)$ is then defined as $rank(V)$. An important property of the rank function is *submodularity*: for any $A,B\subseteq V$ it holds that $rank(A\cup B)+rank(A\cap B)\leq rank(A)+rank(B)$. The following lemma is an adaptation of [17, Lemma 3] and provides a useful property of matroids which will be exploited to derive the results of this paper.

▶ **Lemma 2.1** (Extended augmentation property). *Let $M=(V,I)$ be a matroid. Consider an independent set $A\in I$, a subset $V'\subseteq V$, and a maximal independent set B of V'. If there exists $y\in V'\setminus A$ such that $A\cup\{y\}\in I$, then there exists $x\in B\setminus A$ such that $A\cup\{x\}\in I$.*

Proof. Since B is maximal in in V', we have that $rank(B\cup\{y\})=rank(B)=rank((B\cup\{y\})\cap(A\cup B))$. Also, $rank((B\cup\{y\})\cup(A\cup B))\geq rank(A\cup\{y\})\geq|A|+1$, since $A\cup\{y\}\in I$. By applying the submodularity property to sets $B\cup\{y\}$ and $A\cup B$ we have the inequality

$$rank((B\cup\{y\})\cup(A\cup B))+rank((B\cup\{y\})\cap(A\cup B))\leq rank(B\cup\{y\})+rank(A\cup B),$$

which can be manipulated using the above relations to yield $rank(A\cup\{y\})\leq rank(A\cup B)$, whence $rank(A\cup B)\geq|A|+1$. So, there exists an independent set $C\subseteq A\cup B$ of $|A|+1$ elements, and the lemma follows. ◀

2.2 Definitions of the problems

The well-known *k-center problem* is defined as follows. Given a set V of points from a metric space with distance function $d(\cdot,\cdot)$, determine a subset $S\subseteq V$ of size k which minimizes

$\max_{i \in V} \min_{c \in S} d(i, c)$. For convenience, throughout the paper we will use the notation $d(i, S) = \min_{c \in S} d(i, c)$. Several variants of the k-center problem have been proposed and studied in the literature. Mostly, these variants impose additional constraints on the solution S and/or allow a given number of points to be disregarded from the computation of the maximum in the objective function. In this paper, we focus on two of these variants defined below using the same terminology adopted in [12].

▶ **Definition 2.2.** *Let $M = (V, I)$ be a matroid defined over the set of points V, and let z be an integer, with $0 \leq z < |V|$. The **Robust Matroid Center** (**RMC**) **problem** on M with parameter z, requires to determine a set $S \in I$ minimizing*

$$r(S, V, z) = \min_{X \subseteq V : |X| \geq |V| - z} \max_{i \in X} d(i, S).$$

We use the tuple $(M = (V, I), z)$ to denote an instance of RMC.

▶ **Definition 2.3.** *Let V be a set of points. Suppose that for each $j \in V$ a weight $w_j \in [0, 1]$ is given and let z be an integer, with $0 \leq z < |V|$. The **Robust Knapsack Center** (**RKC**) **problem** on V with parameter z and weights $\mathbf{w} = \{w_i : i \in V\}$, requires to determine a set $S \subseteq V$ with $\sum_{j \in S} w_j \leq 1$, minimizing*

$$r(S, V, z) = \min_{X \subseteq V : |X| \geq |V| - z} \max_{i \in X} d(i, S).$$

We use the tuple $(V, z, \mathbf{w})$ to denote an instance of RKC.

The RMC and RKC problems share the same cost function $r(S, V, z)$ but exhibit different feasible solutions for the same ground set V. Observe that $r(S, V, z)$ coincides with the $(|V| - z)$-th smallest distance of a point of V from S. In other words, the best solution is allowed to ignore the contribution of the z most distant points, which can be regarded as outliers.

The state of the art on sequential approximation algorithms for the two problems are the 3-approximation algorithms for the RMC and RKC problems presented in [7]. The coreset-based approaches developed in this paper require the solution of generalized versions of the above two problems, where each point $i \in V$ comes with a positive integer multiplicity m_i. Let $\mu_V = \sum_{i \in V} m_i$. The generalized versions of the two problems, dubbed **RMC problem with Multiplicities (RMCM problem)** and **RKC problem with Multiplicities (RKCM problem)**, respectively, allow z to vary in $[0, \mu_V)$ and modify the cost function as follows:

$$r(S, V, z) = \min_{X \subseteq V : \sum_{i \in X} m_i \geq \mu_V - z} \max_{i \in X} d(i, S).$$

Letting $\mathbf{m} = \{m_i : i \in V\}$, we use the tuples $(M = (V, I), z, \mathbf{m})$ and $(V, z, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{m})$ to denote instances of RMCM and RKCM, respectively. To the best of our knowledge, prior to this work, no algorithms had been devised to solve the RMCM and RKCM problems. However, in the rest of the subsection we describe how the sequential algorithms in [7] can be easily adapted to solve the more general RMCM and RKCM problems, featuring the same 3-approximation guarantee as in the case without multiplicities.

We start by giving the definition of *Robust $\mathcal{F}$-Supplier problem with Multiplicities*, which generalizes the Robust $\mathcal{F}$-Supplier problem of [7], and recall the definition of the auxiliary *$\mathcal{F}$-maximization under Partition Constraint* ($\mathcal{F}$-PCM) problem [7].

An instance of the Robust $\mathcal{F}$-Supplier problem with Multiplicities is a tuple $\mathcal{I} = (F, C, d, m, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ where $(F \cup C, d)$ is a metric space, m is an integer parameter, $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^F$ is a down-closed family of subsets of F, and $\mu : C \to \mathbb{N}$ is a function that associates to each point of C its multiplicity . The objective is to find $S \in \mathcal{F}$ and $T \subseteq C$ for which $\sum_{u \in T} \mu(u) \geq m$ and $\max_{u \in T} d(u, S)$ is minimized. An instance of $\mathcal{F}$-PCM is a tuple $\mathcal{I} = (F, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}, val)$, where F is a finite set, $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^F$ is a down-closed family of subsets of F, $\mathcal{P}$ is a sub-partition of F, and $val : F \to \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ is integer valued function consistent with $\mathcal{P}$ in the sense that for each $A \in \mathcal{P}$ and for each pair $f_1, f_2, \in A$, $val(f_1) = val(f_2)$. For a set $S \in \mathcal{P}$, we let $val(S) = \sum_{f \in S} val(f)$. The objective of $\mathcal{F}$-PCM problem is to compute

$$\max\{val(S) : S \in \mathcal{F} \wedge |S \cap A| \leq 1 \forall A \in \mathcal{P}\}.$$

The following theorem extends [7, Theorem 1] to encompass multiplicities.

▶ **Theorem 2.4.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an algorithm for the $\mathcal{F}$-PCM problem, and let $T_{\mathcal{A}}(\cdot)$ denote its complexity. Given an instance $\mathcal{I} = (F, C, d, m, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ of the Robust $\mathcal{F}$-Supplier problem with Multiplicities, consider the instance $\mathcal{I}' = (F, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}, val)$ of $\mathcal{F}$-PCM. Then, there is an algorithm for the Robust $\mathcal{F}$-Supplier problem with Multiplicities which returns a 3-approximate solution to $\mathcal{I}$ in time poly$(|\mathcal{I}|)T_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{I}')$.*

Proof. The proof of this theorem, follows the same reasoning of [7, Theorem 1], hence we describe here only the differences with respect to that proof.

In Algorithm 1, described in [7, Section 3.1], we substitute Line 10 with the following line:

$$val(f) \leftarrow \sum_{u \in Chld(v)} \mu(u) \; \forall f \in B_F(v, 1).$$

Next, we substitute the politope ${\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{J}}}_{cov}$ defined at the beginning of [7, Section 3.2], with the one described by the constraints below. (Note that only the first constraint is different with respect to the original ones.)

$$\sum_{v \in C} m(v) cov(v) \geq m \qquad ({\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{J}}}_{cov}.1')$$

$$cov(v) - \sum_{S \in \mathcal{F} : d(v,S) \leq 1} z_S = 0, \quad \forall v \in C \qquad ({\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{J}}}_{cov}.2)$$

$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{F}} z_S = 1 \qquad ({\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{J}}}_{cov}.3)$$

$$z_S \geq 0, \quad \forall S \in \mathcal{F} \qquad ({\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{J}}}_{cov}.4)$$

The remaining part of the proof, follows exactly the same passages as the original proof. However, we need the following modified version of [7, Claim 7], whose proof requires only straightforward adaptations to accommodate multiplicities.

▷ Claim 2.5 (Modified Claim 7 of [7]). Let $S \in \mathcal{F}$ be any feasible solution of the $\mathcal{F}$-PCM instance constructed by Algorithm 1. Then,

$$\sum_{f \in S} val(f) = \sum_{v \in R(S)} \sum_{u \in Chld(v)} \mu(u).$$

◀

Since the RMCM and RKCM problem can be seen as instantiations of the Robust $\mathcal{F}$-Supplier problem with Multiplicities, Theorem 2.4, combined with the $\mathcal{F}$-PCM algorithm from [7], allows us to derive the result stated in the following theorem.

▶ **Theorem 2.6.** *There exist* 3*-approximate polynomial-time sequential algorithms for the RMCM and RKCM problem.*

2.3 Doubling dimension

The algorithms in this paper will be analyzed in terms of the dimensionality of the ground set V as captured by the well-established notion of doubling dimension. Formally, given a point $i \in V$, let the *ball of radius r centered at i* be the subset of points of V at distance at most r from i. The *doubling dimension* of V is the smallest value D such that any balls of radius r centered at a point $i \in V$ is contained in the union of at most 2^D balls of radius $r/2$ suitably centered at points of V. The algorithms that will be presented in this paper adapt automatically to the doubling dimension D of the input dataset and attain their best performance when D is small, possibly constant. This is the case, for instance, of ground sets V whose points belong to low-dimensional Euclidean spaces, or represent nodes of mildly-expanding network topologies under shortest-path distances.

The doubling dimension D of a ground set V allows the following interesting characterization of how the radius of a k-center clustering decreases as k increases, which will be crucially exploited in this paper.

▶ **Proposition 2.7.** *Let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. Consider a set $S \subseteq V$ of size k, and let $r = \max_{i \in V} d(i,S)$. If V has doubling dimension D, there exists a set $S' \subseteq V$ of size $\leq k(1/\epsilon)^D$ such that $\max_{i \in V} d(i,S') \leq \epsilon r$.*

Proof. By repeatedly applying the definition of doubling dimension, it is easily seen that each ball of radius r around a point in S can be covered with at most $(1/\epsilon)^D$ smaller balls of radius ϵr. The centers of all of these smaller balls provide the desired set S'. ◀

3 Coreset-based strategy for the RMC problem

In this section, we present a two-phase strategy to solve the RMC problem based on the following simple high-level idea. In the first phase we extract a small *coreset* T from the ground set V, that is, a subset of V with the property that each point $j \in V$ has a suitably "close" *proxy* $p(j)$ in T. In the second phase, an approximate solution S to the RMCM problem on T is computed, where the multiplicity m_i of each $i \in T$ is defined as the number of distinct points $j \in V$ whose proxy is i. In what follows, we first determine sufficient conditions on the coreset T which guarantee that a good solution to the RMCM problem on T is also a good solution for the RMC problem on V, and then describe how such a coreset can be constructed, analyzing its size in terms of the doubling dimension of V.

Let $(M = (V,I), z)$ be an instance of the RMC problem and $r^*(M,z)$ be the cost of its optimal solution. Consider a coreset $T \subseteq V$ with proxy function $p : V \to T$, and let $m_i = |\{j \in V : p(j) = i\}|$, for every $i \in T$. Let $M_T = (T, I_T)$ denote the restriction of matroid $M = (V,I)$ to the coreset T, where for each $X \in I$, $X \cap T \in I_T$. Finally, let $(M_T, z, \mathbf{m})$ denote the RMCM instance defined by M_T, z and $\mathbf{m} = \{m_i : i \in T\}$. We have:

▶ **Lemma 3.1.** *Let $\epsilon' \in (0,1)$ be a design parameter. Suppose that the coreset T with proxy function $p : V \to T$ satisfies the following conditions:*
C1 *For each $j \in V$, $d(j, p(j)) \leq \epsilon' r^*(M,z)$;*

C2 *For each independent set $X \in I$ there exists an injective mapping $\pi_X : X \to T$ such that:*
- *$\{\pi_X(i) : i \in X\} \subseteq T$ is an independent set;*
- *for each $i \in X$, $d(i, \pi_X(i)) \leq \epsilon' r^*(M, z)$.*

Then:

P1 *There exists a solution to $(M_T = (T, I_T), z, \mathbf{m})$ of cost at most $(1 + 2\epsilon')r^*(M, z)$;*

P2 *Every solution S to $(M_T, z, \mathbf{m})$ of cost r_S is also a solution to $(M = (V, I), z)$ of cost $r_S + \epsilon' r^*(M, z)$.*

Proof. Let us first show P1. Let X_V^* be the optimal solution to the RMC instance $(M = (V, I), z)$ and let $Y = \{\pi_{X_V^*}(o) : o \in X_V^*\} \subseteq T$. We will show that Y is a $(M_T, z, \mathbf{m})$ of cost at most $(1 + 2\epsilon')r^*(M, z)$. By C2, $|Y| = |X_V^*|$ and Y is an independent set in I_T. Consider now a point $j \in V$ such that $\exists o \in X_V^*$ with $d(j, o) \leq r^*(M, z)$ and observe that there are at least $|V| - z$ such points (e.g., all nonoutliers). We have that

$$\begin{aligned} d(p(j), Y) &\leq d(p(j), \pi_{X_V^*}(o)) \\ &\leq d(p(j), j) + d(j, o) + d(o, \pi_{X_V^*}(o)) \quad \text{(by triangle inequality)} \\ &\leq \epsilon' r^*(M, z) + r^*(M, z) + \epsilon' r^*(M, z) \quad \text{(by C1 and C2)} \\ &\leq (1 + 2\epsilon')r^*(M, z). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mu_T = \sum_{i \in T} m_i$ and observe that $\mu_T = |V|$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in T : d(i,Y) \leq (1+2\epsilon')r^*(M,z)} m_i &\geq \sum_{i \in T : \exists j \in V : (i = p(j)) \wedge (d(j, X_V^*) \leq r^*(M,z))} m_i \\ &\geq |\{j \in V : d(j, X_V^*) \leq r^*(M, z)\}| \\ &\geq |V| - z, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of P1. In order to prove P2, let S be a solution to $(M_T, z, \mathbf{m})$ of cost r_S. Clearly, S is an independent set in I. Consider a generic point $i \in T$ such that $d(i, S) \leq r_S$ and let a be the point of S closest to i. Observe that the m_i points $j \in V$ with $i = p(j)$ are such that $d(j, S) \leq d(j, a) \leq d(j, i) + d(i, a) \leq \epsilon' r^*(M, z) + r_S$. Since $\sum_{i \in T : d(i,S) \leq r_S} m_i \geq \mu_T - z$, there are at least $\mu_T - z = |V| - z$ points of V that are within a distance $\epsilon' r^*(M, z) + r_S$ from S. ◀

Later in this section (see Theorem 3.4) we will show that if coreset T exhibits properties P1 and P2 stated in the above lemma, then a good solution to the (M, z) RMC instance can be obtained by running an approximation algorithm for RMCM on T. We now show how to construct a coreset T satisfying Conditions C1 and C2 of Lemma 3.1 (hence, exhibiting properties P1 and P2 by virtue of the lemma). The construction strategy is simple and, as will be discussed in Section 5, also features efficient MapReduce and Streaming implementations. As in previous works, we assume that constant-time oracles are available to compute the distance between two elements of V and to check the independence of a subset of V (see e.g., [1]). Let k be the rank of matroid M. We make the reasonable assumption that k is known to the algorithm. Also, for ease of presentation, we restrict the attention to matroids (V, I) such that $\{j\} \in I$ for every $j \in V$. This restriction can be easily removed with simple modifications to the algorithms.

In order to construct the coreset T, we first compute a β-approximate solution T_{k+z} to $(k + z)$-center on V and determine $r_{T_{k+z}} = \max_{j \in V} d(j, T_{k+z})$. In the sequential setting,

Gonzalez's algorithm [11], provides a $\beta = 2$ approximation[1] and computes T_{k+z} and $r_{T_{k+z}}$ in $O((k+z)|V|)$ time. Then, we compute a set T_τ of τ points of V such that $d(i_1, i_2) > (\epsilon'/(2\beta))r_{T_{k+z}}$, for every $i_1 \neq i_2 \in T_\tau$, and $d(j, T_\tau) \leq (\epsilon'/(2\beta))r_{T_{k+z}}$, for every $j \in V$. Hence, $r_{T_\tau} = \max_{i \in V} d(i, T_\tau) \leq (\epsilon'/(2\beta))r_{T_{k+z}}$. Clearly, the value τ will depend on $r_{T_{k+z}}$, ϵ', and β. T_τ can be computed in $O(\tau|V|)$ time by adapting the well known greedy strategy by Hochbaum and Shmoys [15], namely, by performing a linear scan of V and adding to (an initially empty) T_τ all those points $j \in V$ at distance greater than $(\epsilon'/(2\beta))r_{T_{k+z}}$ from the current T_τ. (Observe that τ is the size of the final set T_τ but the construction does not require the knowledge of τ.) Let $T_\tau = \{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_\tau\}$ and, for $1 \leq \ell \leq \tau$, define the cluster $C_\ell = \{j \in V : d(j, i_\ell) = d(j, T_\tau)\}$ (ties broken arbitrarily for points $j \in V$ equidistant from two or more points of T_τ). From each C_ℓ we extract a maximum independent set Y_ℓ and define $T = \cup_{1 \leq \ell \leq \tau} Y_\ell$. For every $1 \leq \ell \leq \tau$ and every point $j \in V \cap C_\ell$ we set the proxy $p(j) = i \in Y_\ell$, where $d(j, i) = d(j, Y_\ell)$ (ties broken arbitrarily). For each $i \in T$, its multiplicity is set to $m_i = |\{j \in V : p(j) = i\}|$. We have:

▶ **Lemma 3.2.** *The coreset T constructed by the above algorithm satisfies Conditions C1 and C2 of Lemma 3.1.*

Proof. First, we prove C1. Consider an arbitrary point $j \in V$ and suppose that j belongs to cluster C_ℓ, for some ℓ, hence $p(j)$ belongs to $Y_\ell \subseteq C_\ell$ and $d(j, p(j)) \leq 2r_{T_\tau}$. Let $\rho^*(V, k+z)$ be the cost of the optimal solution to the $(k+z)$-center problem on V. Since any solution to the $(M = (V, I), z)$ instance of RMC, augmented with the outlier points, is a solution to $(k+z)$-center on V, it is easy to see that $\rho^*(V, k+z) \leq r^*(M, z)$. Now, by using the fact that T_{k+z} is a β-approximate solution to $(k+z)$-center on V, we have

$$2r_{T_\tau} \leq 2(\epsilon'/(2\beta))r_{T_{k+z}} \leq \epsilon'\rho^*(V, k+z) \leq \epsilon' r^*(M, z),$$

thus proving C1. As for C2, we reason as follows. Consider an arbitrary independent set $X \in I$. We now show that there exists an injective mapping π_X which transforms X into an independent set contained in T, and such that, for each $1 \leq \ell \leq \tau$ and $j \in X \cap C_\ell$, $\pi_X(j) \in Y_\ell \subseteq C_\ell$ (i.e., j and $\pi_X(j)$ belong to the same cluster C_ℓ) . This will immediately imply that $d(j, \pi_X(j)) \leq 2r_{T_\tau} \leq \epsilon' r^*(M, z)$. Let $X = \{x_a : 1 \leq a \leq |X|\}$. We define the mapping π_X incrementally one element at a time. Suppose that we have fixed the mapping for the first h elements of X and assume, inductively, that $W(h) = \{\pi_X(x_a) : 1 \leq a \leq h\} \cup \{x_a : h < a \leq |X|\}$ is an independent set of size $|X|$ and that x_a and $\pi_X(x_a)$ belong to the same cluster, for $1 \leq a \leq h$. Consider now x_{h+1} and suppose that $x_{h+1} \in C_\ell$, for some ℓ. We distinguish among the following two cases:

- **Case 1.** If $x_{h+1} \in Y_\ell$, we set $\pi_X(x_{h+1}) = x_{h+1}$, hence $W(h+1) = W(h)$.
- **Case 2.** If $x_{h+1} \notin Y_\ell$, we apply the extended augmentation property stated in Lemma 2.1 with $A = W(h) \setminus \{x_{h+1}\}$, $y = x_{h+1}$, $V' = C_\ell$, and $B = Y_\ell$ to conclude that there exists a point $\pi_X(x_{h+1}) \in B \setminus A = Y_\ell \setminus (W(h) \setminus \{x_{h+1}\})$ such that $W(h+1) = (W(h) \setminus \{x_{h+1}\}) \cup \pi_X(x_{h+1})$ is an independent set.

After $|X|$ iterations of the above inductive argument, we have that the mapping π_X is completely specified and exhibits the following properties: it is inductive, $\{\pi_X(x_a) : 1 \leq a \leq |X|\}$ is independent, and, for $1 \leq a \leq |X|$, if $x_a \in C_\ell$ then also $\pi_X(x_a) \in C_\ell$, hence $d(x_a, \pi_X(x_a)) \leq \epsilon' r^*(M, z)$. This proves C2. ◀

[1] In the streaming setting, Gonzalez's algorithm cannot be used, and a slightly larger value of β will be needed

The size of coreset T can be conveniently bounded as a function of the doubling dimension of the ground set V.

▶ **Theorem 3.3.** *If V has doubling dimension D, then the coreset T obtained with the above construction has size $|T| = O(k(k+z)(4\beta/\epsilon')^D)$.*

Proof. Observe that $|T| \leq k\tau$, hence we need to bound τ. Consider the first set T_{k+z} of $k+z$ centers computed by the coreset construction algorithm. Proposition 2.7 implies that there exists a set T' of at most $h = (k+z)(4\beta/\epsilon')^D$ points such that $\max_{i \in V} d(i, T') \leq (\epsilon'/(4\beta))r_{T_{k+z}}$, hence V can be covered with h balls of radius at most $(\epsilon'/(4\beta))r_{T_{k+z}}$. It is easy to see that in the adaptation of Hochbaum and Shmoys' strategy [15] described above to construct T_τ, only one point from each such ball can be added to T_τ. Hence, $\tau = |T_\tau| \leq h$, and the theorem follows. ◀

▶ **Theorem 3.4.** *Let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and $\alpha \geq 1$. Suppose that the coreset T exhibits Properties P1 and P2 of Lemma 3.1, for $\epsilon' = \epsilon/(2\alpha+1)$. Then, an α-approximate solution S to instance $(M_T = (T, I_T), z, \mathbf{m})$ of RMCM is a $(\alpha+\epsilon)$-approximate solution to instance $(M = (V, I), z)$ of RMC.*

Proof. By Property P1 of Lemma 3.1, we know that the optimal solution to $(M_T = (T, I_T), z, \mathbf{m})$ has cost at most $(1+2\epsilon')r^*(M, z) = (1 + 2\epsilon/(2\alpha+1))r^*(M, z)$. Hence, S has cost $r_S \leq (\alpha + 2\alpha\epsilon/(2\alpha+1))r^*(M, z)$. By Property P2 of Lemma 3.1, S is also a solution to instance $(M = (V, I), z)$ of RMC with cost $r_S + \epsilon' r^*(M, z) \leq (\alpha+\epsilon)r^*(M, z)$. ◀

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorems 3.3, 3.4 and 2.6.

▶ **Corollary 3.5.** *For any fixed $\epsilon \in (0,1)$, the coreset-based strategy for the RMC problem presented above can be used to compute a $(3+\epsilon)$-approximate solution to any instance $(M = (V, I), z)$. If V has constant doubling dimension, the sequential running time is $O(|V|\text{poly}(k, z))$.*

4 Coreset-based strategy for the RKC problem

In this section we present a coreset-based strategy for the RKC problem which is similar in spirit to the one presented in the previous section for the RMC problem. Consider an instance $(V, z, \mathbf{w})$ of RKC, and let $r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w})$ denote the cost of an optimal solution. The idea is to extract a coreset T from a τ-clustering of V by picking one point per cluster so that T contains a good solution S for $(V, z, \mathbf{w})$, and then to run an approximation algorithm for the RKCM problem on T, using, for each $i \in T$, the size of its cluster as multiplicity m_i. The cost penalty introduced by seeking the solution on T rather than on the entire set V will be limited by ensuring that for each $i \in V$, the distance $d(i, T)$ is sufficiently small. The main difficulty with the above strategy is the choice of a suitable clustering granularity τ, hence we resort to testing geometrically increasing guesses for τ. Observe that in this fashion we generate a sequence of coresets, thus a sequence of RKCM instances upon which the approximation algorithm has to be run. A challenge of this approach is to devise a suitable stopping condition for detecting a good guess.

More specifically, our coreset-based strategy, dubbed RKnapCenter, works as follows. Let $\mathcal{A}_{\text{RKCM}}$ be an α-approximation algorithm for the RKCM problem, and let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ be a fixed accuracy parameter. For each value τ in a geometric progression, we run a procedure dubbed CoresetComputeAndTest, which first computes a partition of V into τ clusters $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_\tau$, induced by a solution to τ-center on V, sets coreset T to contain one point

of minimum weight from each cluster, and finally runs $\mathcal{A}_{\text{RKCM}}$ on the RKCM instance $(T, z, \mathbf{w}_T, \mathbf{m})$, where $\mathbf{w}_T$ is the restriction of $\mathbf{w}$ to T, and $\mathbf{m} = \{m_i : i \in T\}$, with m_i being the size of the cluster that i belongs to. CoresetComputeAndTest returns S, the solution computed by $\mathcal{A}_{\text{RKCM}}$, $r_1 = \max_{j \in V} d(j, T)$ and $r_2 = \min_{X \subseteq T: \sum_{i \in X} m_i \geq \mu_T - z} \max_{i \in X} d(i, S)$, where $\mu_T = \sum_{i \in T} m_i = |V|$. If $\alpha(4\alpha + 2)r_1 \leq \epsilon(r_2 - 4\alpha r_1)$, then the algorithm terminates and returns S as final solution. (See Algorithm 1 for the pseudocode.)

▶ **Lemma 4.1.** *For any $\tau \geq 1$, consider the triplet (S, r_1, r_2) returned by one execution of* CoresetComputeAndTest(τ) *within* RKnapCenter(ϵ, α). *Then:*

1. *S is a solution to the RKC instance $(V, z, \mathbf{w})$ of cost at most $2r_1 + r_2$.*
2. *$r_2 \leq \alpha(r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w}) + 4r_1)$.*

Proof. Let us prove Point 1 first. Since S is a feasible solution to $(T, z, \mathbf{w}_T, \mathbf{m})$ and $\mathbf{w}_T$ is the restriction of $\mathbf{w}_T$ of the points of T, S is also feasible for $(V, z, \mathbf{w})$. By definition of r_2, there exists a subset $X \subseteq T$ such that $\sum_{i \in X} m_i \geq |V| - z$ and $\max_{i \in X} d(i, S) \leq r_2$. Consider a point $i \in X$ and suppose that $i \in C_\ell$. Then, by the triangle inequality, $\forall j \in C_\ell$, $d(j, S) \leq d(j, i) + d(i, S) \leq 2r_1 + r_2$. Thus, the points in V at distance at most $2r_1 + r_2$ from S are at least $\sum_{\ell: C_\ell \cap X \neq \emptyset} |C_\ell| = \sum_{i \in X} m_i \geq |V| - z$.

As for Point 2, let $S_V^* \subseteq V$ be an optimal solution to $(V, z, \mathbf{w})$ and let $X = \{i \in T : (i \in C_\ell) \wedge (C_\ell \cap S_V^* \neq \emptyset)\}$. We now show that X is a feasible solution to $(T, z, \mathbf{w}_T, \mathbf{m})$ of cost at most $r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w}) + 4r_1$, hence S must have a cost of at most $\alpha(r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w}) + 4r_1)$. Observe that since T contains the points of minimum weight from each cluster, $\sum_{i \in X} w_i \leq \sum_{j \in S_V^*} w_j \leq 1$. Consider a point $j \in V$ such that $d(j, S_V^*) \leq r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w})$. Clearly there are at least $|V| - z$ such points (e.g., all nonoutliers). Let $L = \{\ell : \exists j \in C_\ell \text{ with } d(j, S_V^*) \leq r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w})\}$. Hence, $\sum_{i \in T \cap C_\ell : \ell \in L} m_i \geq |V| - z$. Consider a cluster C_ℓ with $\ell \in L$ and the point $i \in T \cap C_\ell$. Since $\ell \in L$, C_ℓ contains a point j with $d(j, S_V^*) \leq r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w})$. Let o be the point of S_V^* closest to j and suppose that o belongs to cluster $C_{\ell'}$. Letting i' be the point in $X \cap C_{\ell'}$, by the triangle inequality we have $d(i, X) \leq d(i, i') \leq d(i, j) + d(j, o) + d(o, i') \leq r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w}) + 4r_1$. This immediately implies that $\sum_{i \in T: d(i, X) \leq r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w}) + 4r_1} m_i \geq |V| - z$. ◀

The following two theorems bound, respectively, the maximum value of τ set by the do-while loop in RKnapCenter (hence, the size of the coreset from which the final solution is extracted), and the approximation ratio featured by the algorithm.

▶ **Theorem 4.2.** *Assume that a β-approximation algorithm for τ-center is used in Line 8 of* RKnapCenter(ϵ, α) *and let τ_f be the value of τ at which the algorithm stops. If V has doubling dimension D, then $\tau_f = O((k + z)(c/\epsilon)^D)$, where k is the minimum cardinality of an optimal solution to the RKC instance $(V, z, \mathbf{w})$ and $c = \beta(4\alpha + 2)(\alpha + \epsilon)$.*

Proof. Let S_V^* be the optimal solution to the RKC instance $(V, z, \mathbf{w})$ of minimum cardinality k, of cost $r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w})$. By reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we conclude that the points of S_V^* together with the at most z outliers form a solution to $(k + z)$-center on V of cost at most $r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w})$. Hence, letting $\rho^*(V, k + z)$ denote the cost of an optimal solution to $(k + z)$-center on V, we have $\rho^*(V, k + z) \leq r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w})$. Proposition 2.7 implies that for every $\tau \geq (c/\epsilon)^D(k + z)$, the cost of the optimal solution to τ-center on V is $\rho^*(V, \tau) \leq (\epsilon/c)\rho^*(V, k + z)$. Let τ_f be the smallest value of τ tested by the algorithm such that $\tau_f \geq (c/\epsilon)^D(k+z)$ (hence, $\tau_f \leq 2(c/\epsilon)^D(k+z)$) and let (S, r_1, r_2) be the triplet returned by CoresetComputeAndTest (τ_f). Observe that $r_1 \leq \beta\rho^*(V, \tau_f)$. We now show that r_1 and r_2 satisfy the stopping condition, thus proving the theorem. By Point 1 of Lemma 4.1, S is a feasible solution to the RKC instance $(V, z, \mathbf{w})$ of cost at most $2r_1 + r_2$, hence, combining

Algorithm 1: RKnapCenter(ϵ, α)

```
1  τ ← 1
2  do
3  |  (S, r1, r2) ← CoresetComputeAndTest(τ)
4  |  τ ← 2τ
5  while α(4α+2)r1 / (r2 − 4αr1) > ε;
6  return S

7  Procedure CoresetComputeAndTest(τ);
8  {C1, C2, ..., Cτ} ← τ-clustering induced by a solution Γ to τ-center on V
9  r1 ← max_{j∈V} d(j, Γ)
10 T ← ∅
11 foreach cluster Cℓ do
12 |  i ← arg min_{j∈Cℓ} wj
13 |  mi ← |Cℓ|
14 |  T ← T ∪ {i}
15 end
16 S ← A_RKCM(T, z, w_T = {wi : i ∈ T}, m = {mi : i ∈ T})
17 r2 ← min_{X⊆T: Σ_{i∈X} mi ≥ t} max_{i∈X} d(i, S)
18 return (S, r1, r2)
```

this fact with the previous observations, we have $2r_1 + r_2 \geq r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w}) \geq \rho^*(V, k + z)$. This implies that $r_1 \leq \beta\rho^*(V, \tau_f) \leq \beta(\epsilon/c)\rho^*(V, k + z) \leq \beta(\epsilon/c)(2r_1 + r_2)$. By substituting $c = \beta(4\alpha + 2)(\alpha + \epsilon)$ and applying trivial algebra, we obtain $\alpha(4\alpha + 2)r_1 \leq \epsilon(r_2 - 4\alpha r_1)$, which proves that the stopping condition is met. ◀

▶ **Theorem 4.3.** *Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let α be the approximation factor of the sequential algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{RKCM}}$ for RKCM used in Line 16 of* RKnapCenter(ϵ, α). *Then, the algorithm returns an $(\alpha + \epsilon)$-approximate solution S to the RKC instance $(V, z, \mathbf{w})$.*

Proof. When the algorithm terminates returning a solution S, it holds that $\alpha(4\alpha + 2)r_1 \leq \epsilon(r_2 - 4\alpha r_1)$. By Point 1 of Lemma 4.1, S is a solution to the RKC instance $(V, z, \mathbf{w})$ of cost at most $2r_1 + r_2 = r_2 - 4\alpha r_1 + (4\alpha + 2)r_1 \leq (r_2 - 4\alpha r_1) + (\epsilon/\alpha)(r_2 - 4\alpha r_1)$. By Point 2 of Lemma 4.1, $r_2 - 4\alpha r_1 \leq \alpha r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w})$. Hence, the solution returned has cost $2r_1 + r_2 \leq \alpha r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w}) + (\epsilon/\alpha)\alpha r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w}) \leq (\alpha + \epsilon)r^*(V, z, \mathbf{w})$. ◀

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorems 4.2, 4.3 and 2.6.

▶ **Corollary 4.4.** *For any fixed $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, the coreset-based strategy for the RKC problem presented above can be used to compute a $(3 + \epsilon)$-approximate solution to any instance $(M = (V, I), z)$. If V has constant doubling dimension, the sequential running time is $O(|V|\text{poly}(k, z))$.*

Remarks on the results of Sections 3 and 4. While the analysis of our algorithms is performed in terms of the doubling dimension D of V, the algorithms themselves are oblivious to the value D. Also, it is immediate to observe that for fixed values of k, z and D, exhaustive search on the coresets yields $(1 + \epsilon)$-approximate solutions to RMC and RKC with work merely linear in V.

5 Big Data implementations

In this section, we demonstrate how the RMC and RKC coreset-based strategies presented in Sections 3 and 4 can be efficiently implemented in the MapReduce (Subsection 5.1) and Streaming (Subsection 5.2) settings. We will refer to a generic instance $(M = (V, I), z)$ of RMC, with matroid M of rank k, and a generic instance $(V, z, \mathbf{w})$ of RKC, whose optimal solution of minimum cardinality has size k. D will denote the doubling dimension of V.

5.1 MapReduce implementations

A MapReduce (MR) algorithm executes as a sequence of *rounds* where, in a round, a multiset of key-value pairs is transformed into a new multiset of pairs by applying a given reduce function, referred to as *reducer*, independently to each subset of pairs having the same key. The model is parameterized by the total aggregate memory available to the computation, denoted with $\mathcal{M}_A$, and the maximum amount of memory locally available to each reducer, denoted with $\mathcal{M}_L$. The typical goal for a MR algorithm is to run in as few rounds as possible while keeping $\mathcal{M}_A$ (resp., $\mathcal{M}_L$) linear (resp., substantially sublinear) in the input size [10, 22].

A key feature of our coreset constructions for both the RMC and RKC problems is their *composability* [16], namely the fact that they can be applied in parallel to subsets of an arbitrary partition of V in one MapReduce round. Then, in a subsequent round a solution can be computed sequentially from the coreset T obtained as the union of the coresets extracted from each subset of the partition, using a single reducer which can fit T, whose size is much smaller than $|V|$, in its local memory.

RMC problem. A coreset T satisfying Conditions C1 and C2 of Lemma 3.1 can be constructed in one MapReduce round as follows. Partition V evenly but arbitrarily into ℓ disjoint subsets $V_1, \ldots, V_\ell$, and assign each V_q to a distinct reducer, which builds a coreset $T^{(q)}$ for V_q using the construction described in Section 3 instantiated with the $(\beta = 2)$-approximation algorithm by Gonzalez [11] to find the first $k + z$ centers. A straightforward adaptation of the proof of Lemma 3.2 shows that $T = \cup_{1 \le q \le \ell} T^{(q)}$ satisfies conditions C1 and C2. Setting $\ell = \sqrt{|V|/(k(k+z))}$ and applying Theorem 3.3, we have that $|T| = O(\sqrt{|V|k(k+z)}(8/\epsilon')^D)$. Observe that for a large range of values of k and z, the size of each V_q and the size of T are substantially sublinear in $|V|$. The following theorem is an immediate consequence of the above discussion and of the results of Section 3.

▶ **Theorem 5.1.** *Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. There exists a 2-round MapReduce algorithm that for the RMC instance $(M = (V, I), z)$ computes a $(3 + \epsilon)$-approximate solution using $\mathcal{M}_A = O(|V|)$ and $\mathcal{M}_L = O(\sqrt{|V|k(k+z)}(56/\epsilon)^D)$.*

RKC problem. By reasoning as for the RMC problem, one can easily show that each call to CoresetComputeAndTest(τ) in Algorithm RKnapCenter($\epsilon, \alpha = 3$) can be implemented in 2 MapReduce rounds with linear aggregate memory and local memory $O(\sqrt{|V|\tau})$. Thus, by the bound on the final value of τ proved in Theorem 4.2, Algorithm RKnapCenter requires $O(\log(k + z) + D \log(1/\epsilon))$ MapReduce rounds overall. Since, the round complexity is a key performance indicator for efficiency in MapReduce, we can reduce the number of rounds to $O(1/\eta)$ for any $\eta \in (0, 1)$ by substituting the progression $\tau \leftarrow 2\tau$ (Line 5 of RKnapCenter) with $\tau \leftarrow |V|^\eta \tau$, at the expense of an extra factor $|V|^{\eta/2}$ in the local memory requirement. The following theorem is an immediate consequence of the above discussion and of the results of Section 4.

▶ **Theorem 5.2.** *Let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. There exists a MapReduce algorithm that for the RKC instance $(V, z, \mathbf{w})$ computes a $(3+\epsilon)$-approximate solution with $\mathcal{M}_A = O(|V|)$, using either $O(\log(k+z) + D\log(1/\epsilon))$ rounds and local memory $\mathcal{M}_L = O(\sqrt{|V|(k+z)}(c/\epsilon)^D)$, with $c \in O(1)$, or $O(1/\eta)$ rounds with an extra factor $O(|V|^{\eta/2})$ in the local memory size, for any $\eta \in (0,1)$.*

5.2 Streaming implementations

In the streaming setting [14] the computation is performed by a single processor with a small-size working memory, and the input is provided as a continuous stream of items which is usually too large to fit in the working memory. Typically, streaming strategies aim at a single pass on the input but in some cases few additional passes may be needed. Key performance indicators are the size of the working memory and the number of passes.

RMC problem. Our streaming implementation of the coreset construction devised in Section 3 combines the scaling algorithm of [20] with ideas introduced in [17, 5]. For ease of presentation, we first describe a 2-pass implementation, and will then argue how the two passes can be merged into a single one. The first pass uses the scaling algorithm to determine the set T_{k+z} of $k+z$ centers prescribed by the construction, and an upper bound r' to $r_{T_{k+z}} = \max_{j \in V} d(j, T_{k+z})$. By the analysis in [20], we know that $r' \leq \beta\rho^*(V, k+z)$, where $\beta = 2+\delta$ for some (arbitrarily fixed) $\delta \in (0,1)$, and the working memory required by the computation is $O((k+z)(1/\delta)\log(1/\delta))$. In the second pass, we incrementally build T_τ using Hochbaum and Shmoys' strategy (which is naturally streamlined) w.r.t. $(\epsilon'/2\beta)r'$. Concurrently, for each $i \in T_\tau$ we greedily maintain the number m_i of all the points closest to i seen so far and a maximal independent set of these points. The final coreset T is the union of the $\tau = |T_\tau|$ resulting independent sets. A similar strategy was employed in [17]. At the end of the pass the final solution is computed by running the sequential 3-approximation algorithm claimed in Theorem 2.6 on the RMCM instance $(M_T = (T, I_T), z, \mathbf{m} = \{m_i : i \in T\})$, where M_T is the restriction of matroid M to the points of T. It is immediate to see that T is such that Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 hold. The working memory required by the second pass and by the whole algorithm is $O(|T|) = O(k(k+z)(4\beta/\epsilon')^D)$.

The two phases described above can be merged into one by computing T_τ, together with the multiplicities and the related independent sets, concurrently with the construction of T_{k+z}. (A similar idea was recently employed for diversity maximization in [5].) Specifically, the scaling algorithm maintains $O((1/\delta)\log(1/\delta))$ estimates of the value r', with respect to the points seen so far, and returns the tightest such estimate at the end of the pass. When a point $j \in V$ arrives, it is processed according to the scaling algorithm and, concurrently, it as also processed as prescribed by the second pass, for all available estimates of r'. At the end, the algorithm returns the coreset computed according to the best estimate. An easy argument shows that, in this fashion, we obtain the same guarantees of the 2-pass algorithm at the expense of a $O((1/\delta)\log(1/\delta))$ blow-up in the working memory space. The following theorem is an immediate consequence of the above discussion and of the results of Section 4.

▶ **Theorem 5.3.** *Let $\epsilon, \delta \in (0,1)$. There exists a 1-pass Streaming algorithm that for the RMC instance $(M = (V, I), z)$ computes a $(3+\epsilon)$-approximate solution using working memory of size $O((1/\delta)\log(1/\delta)k(k+z)(28(2+\delta)/\epsilon)^D)$.*

RKC problem. A streaming implementation of Algorithm RKnapCenter(ϵ, α) from Section 4 can be accomplished using one pass for every iteration of the do-while loop (Lines $2 \div 5$ of the algorithm). Specifically, consider an iteration of the loop for a certain value of τ. The scaling algorithm by [20] is used to compute a $\beta = (2+\delta)$-approximate solution Γ to

τ-center on V. The algorithm returns an upper bound r_1 to $\max_{j\in V} d(j,\Gamma)$ and, as noted before, $r_1 \leq \beta\rho^*(V,k+z)$. The algorithm can also be easily adapted to return, together with each point of $j \in \Gamma$, the number m_j of all points of V at distance at most r_1 from j which have been (implicitly) assigned to the cluster associated with j, and the point i_j of minimum weight among these m_j points. The sequential RKCM algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{RKCM}}$ is then run on $T = \{i_j : j \in \Gamma\}$ using m_j as multiplicity of i_j, for every j, and the original weights of the points. The required working memory is $O((1/\delta)\log(1/\delta)\tau)$. Theorems 4.2 and 4.3, and Corollary 4.4, immediately imply that using $O(\log(k+z) + D\log(1/\epsilon))$ passes and the RKCM 3-approximation algorithm claimed in Theorem 2.6 as algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{RKCM}}$, a $(3+\epsilon)$-approximate solution is finally computed, and the largest working memory required by the passes is $O((1/\delta)\log(1/\delta)(k+z)(c/\epsilon)^D)$, with $c = (2+\delta)14(3+\epsilon)$.

In order to reduce the number of passes, we can use a coarser progression for the values of τ by substituting $\tau \leftarrow 2\tau$ (Line 5 of RKnapCenter) with $\tau \leftarrow |V|^\eta\tau$, for some $\eta \in (0,1)$, as was done in the MapReduce implementation to reduce the number of rounds. In this fashion, the number of passes shrinks to $O(1/\eta)$, at the expense of an extra factor $|V|^\eta$ in the working memory requirements. The following theorem is an immediate consequence of the above discussion and of the results of Section 4.

▶ **Theorem 5.4.** *Let $\epsilon, \delta \in (0,1)$ and $c = (2+\delta)14(3+\epsilon)$. There exists a Streaming algorithm that for the RKC instance $(V,z,\mathbf{w})$ computes a $(3+\epsilon)$-approximate solution with $O(\log(k+z) + D\log(1/\epsilon))$ passes and working memory size $O((1/\delta)\log(1/\delta)(k+z)(c/\epsilon)^D)$, or $O(1/\eta)$ passes with an extra factor $O(|V|^\eta)$ in the working memory size, for any $\eta \in (0,1)$.*

6 Concluding remarks

It is not difficult to show that the techniques employed for the RMC problem can also be used to extend the algorithms presented in [4, 5] for diversity maximization under partition and transversal matroid constraints, to work for all possible matroids, also improving their space requirements. The development of 2-round/1-pass MapReduce/Streaming algorithms for the RKC problem with low memory requirements and approximation ratios close to those of the best sequential solutions, remain interesting open problems.

References

1 Z. Abbassi, V.S. Mirrokni, and M.Thakur. Diversity maximization under matroid constraints. In *Proc KDD*, pages 32–40, 2013.

2 P. Awasthi and M.F. Balcan. Center based clustering: A foundational perspective. In *Handbook of cluster analysis*. CRC Press, 2015.

3 M. Ceccarello, A. Pietracaprina, and G. Pucci. Fast coreset-based diversity maximization under matroid constraints. In *Proc. WSDM*, pages 81–89, 2018.

4 M. Ceccarello, A. Pietracaprina, and G. Pucci. Solving k-center clustering (with outliers) in mapreduce and streaming, almost as accurately as sequentially. *PVLDB*, 12(7):766–778, 2019.

5 M. Ceccarello, A. Pietracaprina, and G. Pucci. A general coreset-based approach to diversity maximization under matroid constraints. *CoRR*, abs/2002.03175, 2020. URL: `https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.03175`.

6 M. Ceccarello, A. Pietracaprina, G. Pucci, and E. Upfal. Mapreduce and streaming algorithms for diversity maximization in metric spaces of bounded doubling dimension. *PVLDB*, 10(5):469–480, 2017.

7 D. Chakrabarty and M. Negahbani. Generalized center problems with outliers. *ACM Trans. on Algorithms*, 15(3):41:1–41:14, 2019.

8 M. Charikar, S. Khuller, D.M. Mount, and G. Narasimhan. Algorithms for Facility Location Problems with Outliers. In *Proc. SODA*, pages 642–651, 2001.

9 D.Z. Chen, J. Li, H. Liang, and H. Wang. Matroid and knapsack center problems. *Algorithmica*, 75(1):27–52, 2016.

10 J. Dean and S. Ghemawat. Mapreduce: Simplified data processing on large clusters. In *Proc. OSDI*, pages 137–150, 2004.

11 T.F. Gonzalez. Clustering to Minimize the Maximum Intercluster Distance . *Theoretical Computer Science*, 38:293–306, 1985.

12 D.G. Harris, T. Pensyl, A. Srinivasan, and K. Trinh. A lottery model for center-type problems with outliers. *ACM Trans. on Algorithms*, 15(3):36:1–36:25, 2019.

13 C. Hennig, M. Meila, F. Murtagh, and R. Rocci. *Handbook of cluster analysis*. CRC Press, 2015.

14 M.Rauch Henzinger, P. Raghavan, and S. Rajagopalan. Computing on data streams. In *Proc. DIMACS Workshop on External Memory Algorithms*, pages 107–118, 1998.

15 D.S. Hochbaum and D.B. Shmoys. A best possible heuristic for the k-center problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 10(2):180–184, 1985.

16 P. Indyk, S. Mahabadi, M. Mahdian, and V.S. Mirrokni. Composable core-sets for diversity and coverage maximization. In *Proc. PODS*, pages 100–108, 2014.

17 S. Kale. Small space stream summary for matroid center. In *Proc. APPROX/RANDOM*, pages 20:1–20:22, 2019.

18 J. Leskovec, A. Rajaraman, and J.D. Ullman. *Mining of Massive Datasets, 2nd Ed*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.

19 G. Malkomes, M.J. Kusner, W. Chen, K.Q. Weinberger, and B. Moseley. Fast Distributed k-Center Clustering with Outliers on Massive Data. In *Proc. NIPS*, pages 1063–1071, 2015.

20 R.M. McCutchen and S.Khuller. Streaming algorithms for k-center clustering with outliers and with anonymity. In *Proc. APPROX-RANDOM*, pages 165–178, 2008.

21 J.G. Oxley. *Matroid Theory*. Oxford graduate texts in mathematics. Oxford University Press, 2006.

22 A. Pietracaprina, G. Pucci, M. Riondato, F. Silvestri, and E. Upfal. Space-round tradeoffs for mapreduce computations. In *Proc. ICS*, pages 235–244, 2012.