

# Universal Algorithms for Clustering Problems

Arun Ganesh \*

Bruce M. Maggs †

Debmalya Panigrahi ‡

## Abstract

This paper presents *universal* algorithms for clustering problems, including the widely studied  $k$ -median,  $k$ -means, and  $k$ -center objectives. The input is a metric space containing all *potential* client locations. The algorithm must select  $k$  cluster centers such that they are a good solution for *any* subset of clients that actually realize. Specifically, we aim for low *regret*, defined as the maximum over all subsets of the difference between the cost of the algorithm's solution and that of an optimal solution. A universal algorithm's solution  $\text{SOL}$  for a clustering problem is said to be an  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximation if for all subsets of clients  $C'$ , it satisfies  $\text{SOL}(C') \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(C') + \beta \cdot \text{MR}$ , where  $\text{OPT}(C')$  is the cost of the optimal solution for clients  $C'$  and  $\text{MR}$  is the minimum regret achievable by any solution.

Our main results are universal algorithms for the standard clustering objectives of  $k$ -median,  $k$ -means, and  $k$ -center that achieve  $(O(1), O(1))$ -approximations. These results are obtained via a novel framework for universal algorithms using linear programming (LP) relaxations. These results generalize to other  $\ell_p$ -objectives and the setting where some subset of the clients are *fixed*. We also give hardness results showing that  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximation is NP-hard if  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$  is at most a certain constant, even for the widely studied special case of Euclidean metric spaces. This shows that in some sense,  $(O(1), O(1))$ -approximation is the strongest type of guarantee obtainable for universal clustering.

---

\*Department of Computer Science, UC Berkeley. Email: arunganesh@berkeley.edu

†Department of Computer Science, Duke University and Emerald Innovations. Email: bmm@cs.duke.edu

‡Department of Computer Science, Duke University. Email: debmalya@cs.duke.edu

# 1 Introduction

In *universal*<sup>1</sup> approximation (e.g., [9, 10, 12, 22, 26, 31, 36, 49, 50]), the algorithm is presented with a set of *potential* input points and must produce a solution. After seeing the solution, an adversary selects some subset of the points as the actual *realization* of the input, and the cost of the solution is based on this realization. The goal of a universal algorithm is to obtain a solution that is near-optimal for *every* possible input realization. For example, suppose that a network-based-service provider can afford to deploy servers at  $k$  locations around the world and hopes to minimize latency between clients and servers. The service provider does not know in advance which clients will request service, but knows where clients are located. A universal solution provides guarantees on the quality of the solution regardless of which clients ultimately request service. As another example, suppose that a program committee chair wishes to invite  $k$  people to serve on the committee. The chair knows the areas of expertise of each person who is qualified to serve. Based on past iterations of the conference, the chair also knows about many possible topics that might be addressed by submissions. The chair could use a universal algorithm to select a committee that will cover the topics well, regardless of the topics of the papers that are submitted. The situation also arises in targeting advertising campaigns to client demographics. Suppose a campaign can spend for  $k$  advertisements, each targeted to a specific client type. While the entire set of client types that are potentially interested in a new product is known, the exact subset of clients that will watch the ads, or eventually purchase the product, is unknown to the advertiser. How does the advertiser target her  $k$  advertisements to address the interests of any realized subset of clients?

Motivated by these sorts of applications, this paper presents the first universal algorithms for clustering problems, including the classic  $k$ -median,  $k$ -means, and  $k$ -center problems. The input to these algorithms is a metric space containing all locations of *clients* and *cluster centers*. The algorithm must select  $k$  cluster centers such that this is a good solution for *any* subset of clients that actually realize.

It is tempting to imagine that, in general, for some large enough value of  $\alpha$ , one can find a solution SOL such that for all realizations (i.e., subsets of clients)  $C'$ ,  $\text{SOL}(C') \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(C')$ , where  $\text{SOL}(C')$  denotes SOL's cost in realization  $C'$  and  $\text{OPT}(C')$  denotes the optimal cost in realization  $C'$ . But this turns out to be impossible for many problems, including the clustering problems we study, and indeed this difficulty may have limited the study of universal algorithms. For example, suppose that the input for the  $k$ -median problem is a uniform metric on  $k + 1$  points, each with a cluster center and client. In this case, for any solution SOL with  $k$  cluster centers, there is some realization  $C'$  consisting of a single client that is not co-located with any of the  $k$  cluster centers in SOL. Then,  $\text{SOL}(C') > 0$  but  $\text{OPT}(C') = 0$ . Since it is not possible to provide a strict approximation guarantee for every realization, we instead seek to minimize the *regret*, defined as the maximum difference between the cost of the algorithm's solution and the optimal cost across all realizations. The solution that minimizes regret is called the *minimum regret solution*, or MRS for short, and its regret is termed *minimum regret* or MR. More formally,  $\text{MR} = \min_{\text{SOL}} \max_{C'} [\text{SOL}(C') - \text{OPT}(C')]$ . We now seek a solution SOL that achieves, for all input realizations  $C'$ ,  $\text{SOL}(C') - \text{OPT}(C') \leq \text{MR}$ , i.e.,  $\text{SOL}(C') \leq \text{OPT}(C') + \text{MR}$ . But, obtaining such a solution turns out to be **NP**-hard for many problems, and one has to settle for an approximation:  $\text{SOL}(C') \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(C') + \beta \cdot \text{MR}$ . The algorithm is then called an  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate universal algorithm for the problem. Note that in the aforementioned example with  $k + 1$  points, any solution must pay MR (the distance between any two points) in some realization where  $\text{OPT}(C') = 0$  and only one client appears (in which case paying MR might sound avoidable or undesirable). This example demonstrates that stricter notions of regret and approximation than  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximation are infeasible in general, suggesting that  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximation is the least relaxed guarantee possible for

---

<sup>1</sup>In the context of clustering, universal facility location sometimes refers to facility location where facility costs scale with the number of clients assigned to them. This problem is unrelated to the notion of universal algorithms studied in this paper.

universal clustering.

## 1.1 Problem Definitions and Results

We are now ready to formally define our problems and state our results. In all the clustering problems that we consider in this paper, the input is a metric space on all the potential client locations  $C$  and cluster centers  $F$ .<sup>23</sup> Let  $c_{ij}$  denote the metric distance between points  $i$  and  $j$ . The solution produced by the algorithm comprises  $k$  cluster centers in  $F$ ; let us denote this set by  $\text{SOL}$ . Now, suppose a subset of clients  $C' \subseteq C$  realizes in the actual input. Then, the cost of each client  $j \in C'$  is given as the distance from the client to its closest cluster center, i.e.,  $\text{COST}(j, \text{SOL}) = \min_{i \in \text{SOL}} c_{ij}$ . The clustering problems differ in how these costs are combined into the overall minimization objective. The respective objectives are given below:

- **$k$ -median** (e.g., [17, 34, 6, 44, 13]): *sum* of client costs, i.e.,  $\text{SOL}(C') = \sum_{j \in C'} \text{COST}(j, \text{SOL})$ .
- **$k$ -center** (e.g., [32, 21, 33, 40, 47]): *maximum* client cost, i.e.,  $\text{SOL}(C') = \max_{j \in C'} \text{COST}(j, \text{SOL})$ .
- **$k$ -means** (e.g., [45, 37, 43, 30, 1]):  $\ell_2$ -*norm* of client costs, i.e.,  $\text{SOL}(C') = \sqrt{\sum_{j \in C'} \text{COST}(j, \text{SOL})^2}$ .

We also consider  $\ell_p$ -**clustering** (e.g., [30]) which generalizes all these individual clustering objectives. In  $\ell_p$ -clustering, the objective is the  $\ell_p$ -norm of the client costs for a given value  $p \geq 1$ , i.e.,

$$\text{SOL}(C') = \left( \sum_{j \in C'} \text{COST}(j, \text{SOL})^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

Note that  $k$ -median and  $k$ -means are special cases of  $\ell_p$ -clustering for  $p = 1$  and  $p = 2$  respectively.  $k$ -center can also be defined in the  $\ell_p$ -clustering framework as the limit of the objective for  $p \rightarrow \infty$ ; moreover, it is well-known that  $\ell_p$ -norms only differ by constants for  $p > \log n$  (see Appendix A), thereby allowing the  $k$ -center objective to be approximated within a constant by  $\ell_p$ -clustering for  $p = \log n$ .

Our main result is to obtain  $(O(1), O(1))$ -approximate universal algorithms for  $k$ -median,  $k$ -center, and  $k$ -means. We also generalize these results to the  $\ell_p$ -clustering problem.

**Theorem 1.** *There are  $(O(1), O(1))$ -approximate universal algorithms for the  $k$ -median,  $k$ -means, and  $k$ -center problems. More generally, there are  $(O(p), O(p^2))$ -approximate universal algorithms for  $\ell_p$ -clustering problems, for any  $p \geq 1$ .*

**Remark:** The bound for  $k$ -means is by setting  $p = 2$  in  $\ell_p$ -clustering. For  $k$ -median and  $k$ -center, we use separate algorithms to obtain improved bounds than those provided by the  $\ell_p$ -clustering result. This is particularly noteworthy for  $k$ -center where  $\ell_p$ -clustering only gives poly-logarithmic approximation.

<sup>2</sup>We only consider finite  $C$  in this paper. If  $C$  is infinite (e.g.  $C = \mathbb{R}^d$ ), then the minimum regret will usually also be infinite. If one restricts to realizations where, say, at most  $m$  clients appear, it suffices to consider realizations that place  $m$  clients at one of finitely many points, letting us reduce to universal  $k$ -center with finite  $C$ .

<sup>3</sup>The special case where  $F = C$  has also been studied in the clustering literature, e.g., in [32, 17], although the more common setting (as in our work) is to not make this assumption. Of course, all results (including ours) without this assumption also apply to the special case. If  $F = C$ , the constants in our bounds improve, but the results are qualitatively the same. We note that some sources refer to the  $k$ -center problem when  $F \neq C$  as the  $k$ -supplier problem instead, and use  $k$ -center to refer exclusively to the case where  $F = C$ .

**Universal Clustering with Fixed Clients.** We also consider a more general setting where some of the clients are *fixed*, i.e., are there in any realization, but the remaining clients may or may not realize as in the previous case. (Of course, if no client is fixed, we get back the previous setting as a special case.) This more general model is inspired by settings where a set of clients is already present but the remaining clients are mere predictions. This surprisingly creates new technical challenges, that we overcome to get:

**Theorem 2.** *There are  $(O(1), O(1))$ -approximate universal algorithms for the  $k$ -median,  $k$ -means, and  $k$ -center problems with fixed clients. More generally, there are  $(O(p^2), O(p^2))$ -approximate universal algorithms for  $\ell_p$ -clustering problems, for any  $p \geq 1$ .*

**Hardness Results.** Next, we study the limits of approximation for universal clustering. In particular, we show that the universal clustering problems for all the objectives considered in this paper are **NP**-hard in a rather strong sense. Specifically, we show that both  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are separately bounded away from 1, *irrespective of the value of the other parameter*, showing the necessity of both  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in our approximation bounds. Similar lower bounds continue to hold for universal clustering in Euclidean metrics, even when PTASes are known in the offline (non-universal) setting [5, 41, 43, 47, 1].

**Theorem 3.** *In universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering for any  $p \geq 1$ , obtaining  $\alpha < 3$  or  $\beta < 2$  is **NP**-hard. Even for Euclidean metrics, obtaining  $\alpha < 1.8$  or  $\beta \leq 1$  is **NP**-hard. The lower bounds on  $\alpha$  (resp.,  $\beta$ ) are independent of the value of  $\beta$  (resp.,  $\alpha$ ).*

Interestingly, our lower bounds rely on realizations where sometimes as few as one client appears. This suggests that e.g. redefining regret to be some function of the number of clients that appear (rather than just their cost) cannot subvert these lower bounds.

## 1.2 Techniques

Before discussing our techniques, we discuss why standard approximations for clustering problems are insufficient. It is known that the *optimal* solution for the realization that includes all clients gives a  $(1, 2)$ -approximation for universal  $k$ -median (this is a corollary of a more general result in [38]; we do not know if their analysis can be extended to e.g.  $k$ -means), giving universal algorithms for “easy” cases of  $k$ -median such as tree metrics. But, the clustering problems we consider in this paper are **NP**-hard in general; so, the best we can hope for in polynomial time is to obtain optimal *fractional* solutions, or *approximate* integer solutions. Unfortunately, the proof of [38] does not generalize to *any* regret guarantee for the optimal *fractional* solution. Furthermore, for all problems considered in this paper, even  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate (integer) solutions for the “all clients” instance are not guaranteed to be  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximations for any finite  $\alpha, \beta$  (see the example in Appendix B). These observations fundamentally distinguish universal approximations for **NP**-hard problems like the clustering problems in this paper from those in **P**, and require us to develop new techniques for universal approximations.

In this paper, we develop a general framework for universal approximation based on linear programming (LP) relaxations that forms the basis of our results on  $k$ -median,  $k$ -means, and  $k$ -center (Theorem 1) as well as the extension to universal clustering with fixed clients (Theorem 2).

The first step in our framework is to write an LP relaxation of the regret minimization problem. In this formulation, we introduce a new regret variable that we seek to minimize and is constrained to be at least the difference between the (fractional) solution obtained by the LP and the optimal integer solution *for every realizable instance*. Abstractly, if the LP relaxation of the optimization problem is given by  $\min\{\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$ ,

then the new *regret minimization* LP<sup>4</sup> is given by

$$\min\{\mathbf{r} : \mathbf{x} \in P; \mathbf{c}(I) \cdot \mathbf{x} \leq \text{OPT}(I) + \mathbf{r}, \forall I\}.$$

Here,  $I$  ranges over all realizable instances of the problem. Hence, the LP is exponential in size, and we need to invoke the ellipsoid method via a separation oracle to obtain an optimal fractional solution. We first note that the constraints  $\mathbf{x} \in P$  can be handled using a separation oracle for the optimization problem itself. So, our focus is on designing a separation oracle for the new set of constraints  $\mathbf{c}(I) \cdot \mathbf{x} \leq \text{OPT}(I) + \mathbf{r}$ ,  $\forall I$ . This amounts to determining the regret of a fixed solution given by  $\mathbf{x}$ , which unfortunately, is **NP**-hard for our clustering problems. So, we settle for designing an approximate separation oracle, i.e., approximating the regret of a given solution. For  $k$ -median, we reduce this to a submodular maximization problem subject to a cardinality constraint, which can then be (approximately) solved via standard greedy algorithms. For  $k$ -means, and more generally  $\ell_p$ -clustering, the situation is more complex. Similarly to  $k$ -median, maximizing regret for a fixed solution can be reduced to a set of submodular maximization problems, but deriving the functional value for a given set now requires solving the **NP**-hard knapsack problem. We overcome this difficulty by showing that we can use *fractional* knapsack solutions as surrogates for the optimal integer knapsack solution in this reduction, thereby restoring polynomial running time of the submodular maximization oracle. Finally, in the presence of fixed clients, we need to run the submodular maximization algorithm over a set of combinatorial objects called *independence systems*. In this case, the resulting separation oracle only gives a bicriteria guarantee, i.e., the solutions it considers feasible are only guaranteed to satisfy  $\forall I : \mathbf{c}(I) \cdot \mathbf{x} \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(I) + \beta \cdot \mathbf{r}$  for constants  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . Note that the bi-criteria guarantee suffices for our purposes since these constants are absorbed in the overall approximation bounds.

The next step in our framework is to round these fractional solutions to integer solutions for the regret minimization LP. Typically, in clustering problems such as  $k$ -median, LP rounding algorithms give *average* guarantees, i.e., although the overall objective in the integer solution is bounded against that of the fractional solution, individual connection costs of clients are not (deterministically) preserved in the rounding. But, average guarantees are too weak for our purpose: in a realized instance, an adversary may only select the clients whose connection costs increase by a large factor in the rounding thereby causing a large regret. Ideally, we would like to ensure that the connection cost of *every* individual client is preserved up to a constant in the rounding. However, this may be impossible in general, i.e., no integer solution might satisfy this requirement. Consider a uniform metric over  $k + 1$  points. One fractional solution is to make  $\frac{k}{k+1}$  fraction of each point a cluster center. Then, each client has connection cost  $\frac{1}{k+1}$  in the fractional solution since it needs to connect  $\frac{1}{k+1}$  fraction to a remote point. However, in any integer solution, since there are only  $k$  cluster centers but  $k + 1$  points overall, there is one client that has connection cost of 1, which is  $k + 1$  times its fractional connection cost.

To overcome this difficulty, we allow for a uniform *additive* increase in the connection cost of every client. We show that such a rounding also preserves the regret guarantee of our fractional solution within constant factors. The clustering problem we now solve has a modified objective: for every client, the distance to the closest cluster center is now discounted by the additive allowance, with the caveat that the connection cost is 0 if this difference is negative. This variant is a generalization of a problem appearing in [25], and we call it clustering *with discounts* (e.g., for  $k$ -median, we call this problem  *$k$ -median with discounts*.) Our main tool in the rounding then becomes an approximation algorithm to clustering problems with discounts. For  $k$ -median, we use a Lagrangian relaxation of this problem to the classic facility location

---

<sup>4</sup>For problems like  $k$ -means with non-linear objectives, the constraint  $\mathbf{c}(I) \cdot \mathbf{x} \leq \text{OPT}(I) + \mathbf{r}$  cannot be replaced with a constraint that is simultaneously linear in  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}$ . However, for a fixed value of  $\mathbf{r}$ , the corresponding non-linear constraints still give a convex feasible region, and so the techniques we discuss in this section can still be used.

problem to design such an approximation. For  $k$ -means and  $\ell_p$ -clustering, the same general concept applies, but we need an additional ingredient called a *virtual* solution that acts as a surrogate between the regret of the (rounded) integer solution and that of the fractional solution obtained above. For  $k$ -center, we give a purely combinatorial (greedy) algorithm.

### 1.3 Related Work

For all previous universal algorithms, the approximation factor corresponds to our parameter  $\alpha$ , i.e., these algorithms are  $(\alpha, 0)$ -approximate. The notion of regret was not considered. As we have explained, however, it is not possible to obtain such results for universal clustering. Furthermore, it may be possible to trade-off some of the large values of  $\alpha$  in the results below, e.g.,  $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$  for set cover, by allowing  $\beta > 0$ .

Universal algorithms have been of large interest in part because of their applications as online algorithms where all the computation is performed ahead of time. Much of the work on universal algorithms has focused on TSP. For Euclidean TSP in the plane, Platzman and Bartholdi [49] gave an  $O(\log n)$ -approximate universal algorithm. Hajiaghayi *et al.* [31] generalized this result to an  $O(\log^2 n)$ -approximation for minor-free metrics, and Schalekamp and Shmoys [50] gave an  $O(\log n)$ -approximation for tree metrics. For arbitrary metrics, Jia *et al.* [35] presented an  $O(\log^4 n / \log \log n)$ -approximation, which improves to an  $O(\log n)$ -approximation for doubling metrics. The approximation factor for arbitrary metrics was improved to  $O(\log^2 n)$  by Gupta *et al.* [26]. It is also known that these logarithmic bounds are essentially tight for universal TSP [9, 31, 22, 10]. For the metric Steiner tree problem, Jia *et al.* [35] adapted their own TSP algorithm to provide an  $O(\log^4 n / \log \log n)$ -approximate universal algorithm, which is also tight up to the exponent of the log [2, 35, 10]. Busch *et al.* [12] present an  $O(2^{\sqrt{\log n}})$ -approximation for universal Steiner tree on general graphs and an  $O(\text{polylog}(n))$ -approximation for minor-free graphs. Finally, for universal (weighted) set cover, Jia *et al.* [35] (see also [23]) provide an  $O(\sqrt{n \log n})$ -approximate universal algorithm and an almost matching lower bound.

The problem of minimizing regret has been studied in the context of robust optimization. The robust 1-median problem was introduced for tree metrics by Kouvelis and Yu in [42] and several faster algorithms and for general metrics were developed in the following years (e.g. see [8]). For robust  $k$ -center, Averbakh and Berman [8] gave a reduction to a linear number of ordinary  $k$ -center problems, and thus for classes of instances where the ordinary  $k$ -center problem is polynomial time solvable (e.g., instances with constant  $k$  or on tree metrics) this problem is also polynomial time solvable [7]. A different notion of robust algorithms is one where a set  $S$  of possible scenarios is provided as part of the input to the problem. This model was originally considered for network design problems (see the survey by Chekuri [18]). Anthony *et al.* [3] gave an  $O(\log n + \log |S|)$ -approximation algorithm for solving  $k$ -median and a variety of related problems in this model (see also [11]) on an  $n$ -point metric space. However, note that  $|S|$  can be exponential in  $|C|$  in general.

Another popular model for uncertainty is two-stage optimization (e.g., [52, 51, 53, 19, 20, 39, 27, 28, 29, 16]). Here, the first stage presents a set of realizable instances (or a distribution over them) and the second stage chooses one of those realizations. The algorithm is free to make choices at either stage but those choices come at a higher cost in the second stage when it has more information about the input. Because of the different costs, results in this model have no bearing on our setting.

**Roadmap.** We present the constant approximation algorithms (Theorem 1) for universal  $k$ -median,  $\ell_p$ -clustering ( $k$ -means is a special case), and  $k$ -center in Sections 2, 3, and 4 respectively. In describing these algorithms, we defer the clustering with discounts algorithms used in the rounding to Appendix C. We also give the extensions to universal clustering with fixed clients for  $k$ -median,  $k$ -means/ $\ell_p$ -clustering, and  $k$ -center (Theorem 2) in Sections 5, 6, and 7. Finally, the hardness results for general metrics and for Euclidean metrics (Theorem 3) appear in Sections 8 and 9 respectively.

## 2 Universal $k$ -Median

In this section, we prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 4.** *There exists a  $(27, 49)$ -approximate universal algorithm for the  $k$ -median problem.*

We follow the recipe described in Section 1.2. Namely, the algorithm has two components. The first component is a separation oracle for the regret minimization LP based on submodular maximization, which we define below.

**Submodular Maximization with Cardinality Constraints.** A (non-negative) function  $f : 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+$  is said to be *submodular* if for all  $S \subseteq T \subseteq E$  and  $x \in E$ , we have  $f(T \cup \{x\}) - f(T) \leq f(S \cup \{x\}) - f(S)$ . It is said to be *monotone* if for all  $S \subseteq T \subseteq E$ , we have  $f(T) \geq f(S)$ . The following theorem for maximizing monotone submodular functions subject to a cardinality constraint is well-known.

**Theorem 5** (Fisher *et al.* [48]). *For the problem of finding  $S \subseteq E$  that maximizes a monotone submodular function  $f : 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+$ , the natural greedy algorithm that starts with  $S = \emptyset$  and repeatedly adds  $x \in E$  that maximizes  $f(S \cup \{x\})$  until  $|S| = k$ , is a  $\frac{e}{e-1} \approx 1.58$ -approximation.*

We give the reduction from the separation oracle to submodular maximization in Section 2.1, and then employ the above theorem. The second component of our framework is a rounding algorithm that employs the  $k$ -median with discounts problem, which we define below.

**$k$ -median with Discounts.** In the  $k$ -median with discounts problem, we are given a  $k$ -median instance, but where each client  $j$  has an additional (non-negative) parameter  $r_j$  called its *discount*. Just as in the  $k$ -median problem, our goal is to place  $k$  cluster centers that minimize the total connection costs of all clients. But, the connection cost for client  $j$  can now be discounted by up to  $r_j$ , i.e., client  $j$  with connection cost  $c_j$  contributes  $(c_j - r_j)^+ := \max\{0, c_j - r_j\}$  to the objective of the solution.

Let OPT be the cost of an optimal solution to the  $k$ -median with discounts problem. We say an algorithm ALG that outputs a solution with connection cost  $c_j$  for client  $j$  is a  $(\gamma, \sigma)$ -approximation if:

$$\sum_{j \in C} (c_j - \gamma \cdot r_j)^+ \leq \sigma \cdot \text{OPT}.$$

That is, a  $(\gamma, \sigma)$ -approximate algorithm outputs a solution whose objective function when computed using discounts  $\gamma \cdot r_j$  for all  $j$  is at most  $\sigma$  times the optimal objective using discounts  $r_j$ . In the case where all  $r_j$  are equal, [25] gave a  $(9, 6)$ -approximation algorithm for this problem based on the classic primal-dual algorithm for  $k$ -median. The following lemma generalizes their result to the setting where the  $r_j$  may differ:

**Lemma 6.** *There exists a (deterministic) polynomial-time  $(9, 6)$ -approximation algorithm for the  $k$ -median with discounts problem.*

We give details of the algorithm and the proof of this lemma in Appendix C. We note that when all  $r_j$  are equal, the constants in [25] can be improved (see e.g. [15]); we do not know of any similar improvement when the  $r_j$  may differ. In Section 2.2, we give the reduction from rounding the fractional solution for universal  $k$ -median to the  $k$ -median with discounts problem, and then employ the above lemma.

## 2.1 Universal $k$ -median: Fractional Algorithm

The standard  $k$ -median polytope (see e.g., [34]) is given by:

$$P = \{(x, y) : \sum_i x_i \leq k; \forall i, j : y_{ij} \leq x_i; \forall j : \sum_i y_{ij} \geq 1; \forall i, j : x_i, y_{ij} \in [0, 1]\}.$$

Here,  $x_i$  represents whether point  $i$  is chosen as a cluster center, and  $y_{ij}$  represents whether client  $j$  connects to  $i$  as its cluster center. Now, consider the following LP formulation for minimizing regret  $r$ :

$$\min\{r : (x, y) \in P; \forall C' \subseteq C : \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_i c_{ij} y_{ij} - \text{OPT}(C') \leq r\}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\text{OPT}(C')$  is the cost of the (integral) optimal solution in realization  $C'$ . Note that the new constraints:  $\forall C' \subseteq C : \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_i c_{ij} y_{ij} - \text{OPT}(C') \leq r$  (we call it the regret constraint set) require that the regret is at most  $r$  in all realizations.

In order to solve LP (1), we need a separation oracle for the regret constraint set. Note that there are exponentially many constraints corresponding to realizations  $C'$ ; moreover, even for a single realization  $C'$ , computing  $\text{OPT}(C')$  is **NP**-hard. So, we resort to designing an *approximate* separation oracle. Fix some fractional solution  $(x, y, r)$ . Overloading notation, let  $S(C')$  denote the cost of the solution with cluster centers  $S$  in realization  $C'$ . By definition,  $\text{OPT}(C') = \min_{S \subseteq F, |S|=k} S(C')$ . Then designing a separation oracle for the regret constraint set is equivalent to determining if the following inequality holds:

$$\max_{C' \subseteq C} \max_{S \subseteq F, |S|=k} \left[ \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_i c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C') \right] \leq r.$$

We flip the order of the two maximizations, and define  $f_y(S)$  as follows:

$$f_y(S) = \max_{C' \subseteq C} \left[ \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_i c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C') \right].$$

Then designing a separation oracle is equivalent to maximizing  $f_y(S)$  for  $S \subseteq F$  subject to  $|S| = k$ . The rest of the proof consists of showing that this function is monotone and submodular, and efficiently computable.

**Lemma 7.** *Fix  $y$ . Then,  $f_y(S)$  is a monotone submodular function in  $S$ . Moreover,  $f_y(S)$  is efficiently computable for a fixed  $S$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $d(j, S) := \min_{i' \in S} c_{i'j}$  denote the distance from client  $j$  to the nearest cluster center in  $S$ . If  $S = \emptyset$ , we say  $d(j, S) := \infty$ . The value of  $C'$  that defines  $f_y(S)$  is the set of all clients closer to  $S$  than to the fractional solution  $y$ , i.e.,  $\sum_i c_{ij} y_{ij} > \min_{i' \in S} c_{i'j}$ . This immediately establishes efficient computability of  $f_y(S)$ . Moreover, we can equivalently write  $f_y(S)$  as follows:

$$f_y(S) = \sum_{j \in C} \left( \sum_i c_{ij} y_{ij} - d(j, S) \right)^+.$$

A sum of monotone submodular functions is a monotone submodular function, so it suffices to show that for all clients  $j$ , the new function  $g_{y,j}(S) := (\sum_i c_{ij} y_{ij} - d(j, S))^+$  is monotone submodular.

- $g_{y,j}$  is *monotone*: for  $S \subseteq T$ ,  $d(j, T) \leq d(j, S)$ , and thus  $(\sum_i c_{ij} y_{ij} - d(j, S))^+ \leq (\sum_i c_{ij} y_{ij} - d(j, T))^+$ .



- $g_{y,j}$  is submodular if:

$$\forall S \subseteq T \subseteq F, \forall x \in F : g_{y,j}(S \cup \{x\}) - g_{y,j}(S) \geq g_{y,j}(T \cup \{x\}) - g_{y,j}(T)$$

Fix  $S$ ,  $T$ , and  $x$ . Assume  $g_{y,j}(T \cup \{x\}) - g_{y,j}(T)$  is positive (if it is zero, by monotonicity the above inequality trivially holds). This implies that  $x$  is closer to client  $j$  than any cluster center in  $T$  (and hence  $S$  too), i.e.,  $d(j,x) \leq d(j,T) \leq d(j,S)$ . Thus,  $d(j,x) = d(j,S \cup \{x\}) = d(j,T \cup \{x\})$  which implies that  $g_{y,j}(S \cup \{x\}) = g_{y,j}(T \cup \{x\})$ . Then we just need to show that  $g_{y,j}(S) \leq g_{y,j}(T)$ , but this holds by monotonicity.  $\square$

By standard results (see e.g., GLS [24]), we get an  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate fractional solution for universal  $k$ -median via the ellipsoid method if we have an approximate separation oracle for LP (1) that given a fractional solution  $(x, y, r)$  does either of the following:

- Declares  $(x, y, r)$  feasible, in which case  $(x, y)$  has cost at most  $\alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(\mathbf{I}) + \beta \cdot r$  in all realizations, or
- Outputs an inequality violated by  $(x, y, r)$  in LP (1).

The approximate separation oracle does the following for the regret constraint set (all other constraints can be checked exactly): Given a solution  $(x, y, r)$ , find an  $\frac{e-1}{e}$ -approximate maximizer  $S$  of  $f_y$  via Lemma 7 and Theorem 5. Let  $C'$  be the set of clients closer to  $S$  than the fractional solution  $y$  (i.e., the realization that maximizes  $f_y(S)$ ). If  $f_y(S) > r$ , the separation oracle returns the violated inequality  $\sum_{j \in C'} \sum_i c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C') \leq r$ ; else, it declares the solution feasible. Whenever the actual regret of  $(x, y)$  is at least  $\frac{e}{e-1} \cdot r$ , this oracle will find  $S$  such that  $f_y(S) > r$  and output a violated inequality. Hence, we get the following lemma:

**Lemma 8.** *There exists a deterministic algorithm that in polynomial time computes a fractional  $\frac{e}{e-1} \approx 1.58$ -approximate solution for LP (1) representing the universal  $k$ -median problem.*

## 2.2 Universal $k$ -Median: Rounding Algorithm

Let  $\text{FRAC}$  denote the  $\frac{e}{e-1}$ -approximate fractional solution to the universal  $k$ -median problem provided by Lemma 8. We will use the following property of  $k$ -median, shown by Archer *et al.* [4].

**Lemma 9** ([4]). *The integrality gap of the natural LP relaxation of the  $k$ -median problem is at most 3.*

Lemmas 8 and 9 imply that for any set of clients  $C'$ ,

$$\frac{1}{3} \cdot \text{OPT}(C') \leq \text{FRAC}(C') \leq \text{OPT}(C') + \frac{e}{e-1} \cdot \text{MR}. \quad (2)$$

Our overall goal is to obtain a solution  $\text{SOL}$  that minimizes  $\max_{C' \subseteq C} [\text{SOL}(C') - \text{OPT}(C')]$ . But, instead of optimizing over the exponentially many different  $\text{OPT}(C')$  solutions, we use the surrogate  $3 \cdot \text{FRAC}(C')$  which has the advantage of being defined by a fixed solution  $\text{FRAC}$ , but still 3-approximates  $\text{OPT}(C')$  by Eq. 2. This suggests minimizing the following objective instead:  $\max_{C'} [\text{SOL}(C') - 3 \cdot \text{FRAC}(C')]$ . For a given solution  $\text{SOL}$ , the set of clients  $C'$  that maximizes the new expression are the clients whose connection costs in  $\text{SOL}$  (denoted  $c_j$ ) exceeds 3 times their cost in  $\text{FRAC}$  (denoted  $f_j$ ):

$$\max_{C'} [\text{SOL}(C') - 3 \cdot \text{FRAC}(C')] = \sum_{j \in C} (c_j - 3f_j)^+.$$

But, minimizing this objective is precisely the aim of the  $k$ -median with discounts problem, where the discount for client  $j$  is  $3f_j$ . This allows us to invoke Lemma 6 for the  $k$ -median with discounts problem.

Thus, our overall algorithm is as follows. First, use Lemma 8 to find a fractional solution  $\text{FRAC} = (x, y, r)$ . Let  $f_j := \sum_i c_{ij}y_{ij}$  be the connection cost of client  $j$  in  $\text{FRAC}$ . Then, construct a  $k$ -median with discounts instance where client  $j$  has discount  $3f_j$ , and use Lemma 6 on this instance to obtain the final solution to the universal  $k$ -median problem.

We now complete the proof of Theorem 4 using the above lemmas.

*Proof of Theorem 4.* Let  $m_j$  be the connection cost of MRS to client  $j$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MR} &= \max_{C' \subseteq C} [\text{MRS}(C') - \text{OPT}(C')] \geq \max_{C' \subseteq C} [\text{MRS}(C') - 3 \cdot \text{FRAC}(C')] \quad (\text{by Eq. (2)}) \\ &= \sum_{j \in C: m_j > 3f_j} (m_j - 3f_j) = \sum_{j \in C} (m_j - 3f_j)^+. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\text{MR}$  upper bounds the optimal objective in the  $k$ -median with discounts instance that we construct. Let  $c_j$  be the connection cost of client  $j$  in the solution output by the algorithm. Then by Lemma 6 we get that:

$$\sum_{j \in C} (c_j - 27f_j)^+ \leq 6 \cdot \sum_{j \in C} (m_j - 3f_j)^+ \leq 6 \cdot \text{MR}. \quad (3)$$

As a consequence, we have:

$$\forall C' \subseteq C: \sum_{j \in C'} c_j = \sum_{j \in C'} [27f_j + (c_j - 27f_j)] \leq \sum_{j \in C'} 27f_j + \sum_{j \in C'} (c_j - 27f_j)^+ \leq 27 \cdot \text{FRAC}(C') + 6 \cdot \text{MR},$$

where the last step uses the definition of  $f_j$  and Eq. (3). Now, using the bound on  $\text{FRAC}(C')$  from Eq. (2) in the inequality above, we have the desired bound on the cost of the algorithm:

$$\forall C' \subseteq C: \sum_{j \in C'} c_j \leq 27 \cdot \text{FRAC}(C') + 6 \cdot \text{MR} \leq 27 \left[ \text{OPT}(C') + \frac{e}{e-1} \cdot \text{MR} \right] + 6 \cdot \text{MR} \leq 27 \cdot \text{OPT}(C') + 49 \cdot \text{MR}. \quad \square$$

### 3 Universal $\ell_p$ -Clustering and Universal $k$ -means

In this section, we give universal algorithms for  $\ell_p$ -clustering with the following guarantee:

**Theorem 10.** *For all  $p \geq 1$ , there exists a  $(54p, 103p^2)$ -approximate universal algorithm for the  $\ell_p$ -clustering problem.*

As a corollary, we obtain the following result for universal  $k$ -means ( $p = 2$ ).

**Corollary 11.** *There exists a  $(108, 412)$ -approximate universal algorithm for the  $k$ -means problem.*

Before describing further details of the universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering algorithm, we note a rather unusual feature of the universal clustering framework. Typically, in standard  $\ell_p$ -clustering, the algorithms effectively optimize the  $\ell_p^p$  objective (e.g., sum of squared distances for  $k$ -means) because these are equivalent in the following sense: an  $\alpha$ -approximation for the  $\ell_p$  objective is equivalent to an  $\alpha^p$ -approximation for the  $\ell_p^p$  objective. But, this equivalence fails in the setting of universal algorithms for reasons that we discuss below. Indeed, we first give a universal  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering algorithm, which is a simple extension of the  $k$ -median algorithm, and then give universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering algorithms, which turns out to be much more challenging.

### 3.1 Universal $\ell_p^p$ -Clustering

As in universal  $k$ -median, we can write an LP formulation for universal  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering, i.e. clustering with the objective  $\text{SOL}(C') = \sum_{j \in C'} \text{COST}(j, \text{SOL})^p$ :

$$\min\{r : (x, y) \in P; \forall C' \subseteq C : \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_i c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - \text{OPT}(C') \leq r\}, \quad (4)$$

where  $P$  is still the  $k$ -median polytope defined in Section 2.1.

The main difficulty is that the  $\ell_p^p$  distances no longer form a metric, i.e., do not satisfy triangle inequality. Nevertheless, the distances still have a metric connection, that they are the  $p$ th power of metric distances. We show that this connection is sufficient to prove the following result:

**Theorem 12.** *For all  $p \geq 1$ , there exists a  $(27^p, 27^p \cdot \frac{e}{e-1} + \frac{2}{3} \cdot 9^p)$ -approximate algorithm for the universal  $\ell_p^p$  clustering problem.*

As in universal  $k$ -median, a key component in proving Theorem 12 is a rounding algorithm that employs a bi-criteria approximation to the  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts problem. Indeed, this result will also be useful in the next subsection, when we consider the universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering problem. So, we formally define  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts problem below and state our result for it.

**$\ell_p^p$ -clustering with Discounts.** In this problem, are given a  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering instance, but where each client  $j$  has an additional (non-negative) parameter  $r_j$  called its *discount*. Our goal is to place  $k$  cluster centers that minimize the total connection costs of all clients. But, the connection cost for client  $j$  can now be discounted by up to  $r_j^p$ , i.e., client  $j$  with connection cost  $c_j$  contributes  $(c_j^p - r_j^p)^+ := \max\{0, c_j^p - r_j^p\}$  to the objective of the solution. (Note that the  $k$ -median with discounts problem that we described in the previous section is a special case of this problem for  $p = 1$ .)

Let  $\text{OPT}$  be the cost of an optimal solution to the  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts problem. We say an algorithm  $\text{ALG}$  that outputs a solution with connection cost  $c_j$  for client  $j$  is a  $(\gamma^p, \sigma)$ -approximation<sup>5</sup> if:

$$\sum_{j \in C} (c_j^p - \gamma^p \cdot r_j^p)^+ \leq \sigma \cdot \text{OPT}.$$

That is, a  $(\gamma^p, \sigma)$ -approximate algorithm outputs a solution whose objective function computed using discounts  $\gamma \cdot r_j$  for all  $j$  is at most  $\sigma$  times the optimal objective using discounts  $r_j$ . We give the following result about the  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts problem (see Appendix C for details):

**Lemma 13.** *There exists a (deterministic) polynomial-time  $(9^p, \frac{2}{3} \cdot 9^p)$ -approximation algorithm for the  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts problem.*

We now employ this lemma in obtaining Theorem 12. Recall that the universal  $k$ -median result in the previous section had three main ingredients:

- Lemma 8 to obtain an  $\frac{e}{e-1}$ -approximate fractional solution. This continues to hold for the  $\ell_p^p$  objective, since Lemma 8 does not use any metric property.
- An upper bound of 3 on the integrality gap of the natural LP relaxation of  $k$ -median from [4]. The same result now gives an upper bound of  $3^p$  on the integrality gap of  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering.

<sup>5</sup>We refer to this as a  $(\gamma^p, \sigma)$ -approximation instead of a  $(\gamma, \sigma)$ -approximation to emphasize the difference between the scaling factor for discounts  $\gamma$  and the loss in approximation factor  $\gamma^p$ .

- Lemma 6 to obtain an approximation guarantee for the  $k$ -median with discounts problem. This is where the metric property of the connection costs in the  $k$ -median problem was being used. Nevertheless, Lemma 13 above gives a generalization of Lemma 6 to the  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts problem.

Theorem 12 now follows from these three observations using exactly the same steps as Theorem 4 in the previous section; we omit these steps for brevity.  $\square$

The rest of this section is dedicated to the universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering problem. As for  $k$ -median, we have two stages, the fractional algorithm and the rounding algorithm, that we present in the next two subsections.

### 3.2 Universal $\ell_p$ -Clustering: Fractional Algorithm

Let us start by describing the fractional relaxation of the universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering problem<sup>6</sup> (again,  $P$  is the  $k$ -median polytope defined as in Section 2.1):

$$\min\{r : (x, y) \in P; \forall C' \subseteq C : \left( \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_i c_{ij}^p y_{ij} \right)^{1/p} - \text{OPT}(C') \leq r\}, \quad (5)$$

As described earlier, when minimizing regret, the  $\ell_p$  and  $\ell_p^p$  objectives are no longer equivalent. For instance, recall that one of the key steps in Lemma 8 was to establish the submodularity of the function  $f_y(S)$  denoting the maximum regret caused by any realization when comparing two given solutions: a fractional solution  $y$  and an integer solution  $S$ . Indeed, the worst case realization had a simple structure: choose all clients that have a smaller connection cost for  $S$  than for  $y$ . This observation continues to hold for the  $\ell_p^p$  objective because of the linearity of  $f_y(S)$  as a function of the realized clients once  $y$  and  $S$  are fixed. But, the  $\ell_p$  objective is not linear even after fixing the solutions, and as a consequence, we lose both the simple structure of the maximizing realization as well as the submodularity of the overall function  $f_y(S)$ . For instance, consider two clients: one at distances 1 and 0, and another at distances  $1 + \varepsilon$  and 1, from  $y$  and  $S$  respectively. Using the  $\ell_p$  objective, the regret with both clients is  $(2 + \varepsilon)^{1/p} - 1$ , whereas with just the first client the regret is 1, which is larger for  $p \geq 2$ .

The above observation results in two related difficulties: first, that  $f_y(S)$  is not submodular and hence standard submodular maximization techniques do not apply, but also that given  $y$  and  $S$ , we cannot even compute the function  $f_y(S)$  efficiently. To overcome this difficulty, we further refine the function  $f_y(S)$  to a collection of functions  $f_{y,Y}(S)$  by also fixing the cost of the fractional solution  $y$  to at most a given value  $Y$ . As we will soon see, this allows us to relate the  $\ell_p$  objective to the  $\ell_p^p$  objective, but under an additional “knapsack”-like packing constraint. It is still not immediate that  $f_{y,Y}$  is efficiently computable because of the knapsack constraint that we have introduced. Our second observation is that relaxing the (**NP**-hard) integer knapsack problem to the corresponding (poly-time) *fractional* knapsack problem does not affect the optimal value of  $f_{y,Y}(S)$  (i.e., allowing fractional clients does not increase  $y$ ’s regret), while making the function efficiently computable. As a bonus, the relaxation to fractional knapsack also restores submodularity of the function, allowing us to use standard maximization tools as earlier. We describe these steps in detail below.

To relate the regret in the  $\ell_p$  and  $\ell_p^p$  objectives, let  $\text{FRAC}_p^q(C')$  and  $S_p^q(C')$  denote the  $\ell_p$  objective to the  $q$ th power for  $y$  and  $S$  respectively in realization  $C'$  (and let  $\text{FRAC}_p(C'), S_p(C')$  denote the corresponding  $\ell_p$  objectives). Assume that  $y$ ’s regret against  $S$  is non-zero. Then:

<sup>6</sup>The constraints are not simultaneously linear in  $y$  and  $r$ , although fixing  $r$ , we can write these constraints as  $\sum_{j \in C'} \sum_i c_{ij}^p y_{ij} \leq (\text{OPT}(C') + r)^p$ , which is linear in  $y$ . In turn, to solve this program we bisection search over  $r$ , using the ellipsoid method to determine if there is a feasible point for each fixed  $r$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{C' \subseteq C} [\text{FRAC}_p(C') - S_p(C')] &= \max_{C' \subseteq C} \left[ \frac{\text{FRAC}_p^p(C') - S_p^p(C')}{\sum_{q=0}^{p-1} \text{FRAC}_p^q(C') S_p^{p-1-q}(C')} \right] \\
&\simeq_p \max_{C' \subseteq C} \left[ \frac{\text{FRAC}_p^p(C') - S_p^p(C')}{\text{FRAC}_p^{p-1}(C')} \right] \\
&= \max_Y \max_{C' \subseteq C: \text{FRAC}_p^p(C') \leq Y} \left[ \frac{\text{FRAC}_p^p(C') - S_p^p(C')}{Y^{1-1/p}} \right] \\
&= \max_Y \left[ \frac{\max_{C' \subseteq C, \text{FRAC}_p^p(C') \leq Y} [\text{FRAC}_p^p(C') - S_p^p(C')]}{Y^{1-1/p}} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The  $\simeq_p$  denotes equality to within a factor of  $p$ , and uses the fact that if the regret is non-zero, then for every  $C'$  such that  $\text{FRAC}_p(C') > S_p(C')$  (one of which is always the maximizer of all expressions in this equation), every term in the sum in the denominator is upper bounded by  $\text{FRAC}_p^{p-1}(C')$ .

We would like to argue that the denominator,

$$\max\{\text{FRAC}_p^p(C') - S_p^p(C') : C' \subseteq C, \text{FRAC}_p^p(C') \leq Y\},$$

is a submodular function of  $S$ . If we did this, then we could find an adversary and realization of clients that (approximately) maximizes the regret of  $y$  by iterating over all (discretized) values of  $Y$ . But, as described above, it is easier to work with its fractional analog because of the knapsack constraint:

$$f_{y,Y}(S) := \max\{\text{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}) - S_p^p(\mathbf{I}) : \mathbf{I} \in [0, 1]^C, \text{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}) \leq Y\}.$$

Here,  $\text{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}) := \sum_{j \in C} d_j \cdot \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij}$  and  $S_p^p(\mathbf{I}) := \sum_{j \in C} d_j \cdot \min_{i \in S} c_{ij}^p$  are the natural extensions of the  $\ell_p^p$  objective to fractional clients. The next lemma shows that allowing fractional clients does not affect the maximum regret:

**Lemma 14.** *For any two solutions  $y, S$ , there exists a global maximum of  $\text{FRAC}_p(\mathbf{I}) - S_p(\mathbf{I})$  over  $\mathbf{I} \in [0, 1]^C$  where all the clients are integral, i.e.,  $\mathbf{I} \in \{0, 1\}^C$ . Therefore,*

$$\max_{\mathbf{I} \in [0, 1]^C} [\text{FRAC}_p(\mathbf{I}) - S_p(\mathbf{I})] = \max_{C' \subseteq C} [\text{FRAC}_p(C') - S_p(C')].$$

We remark that unlike for the  $\ell_p^p$  objective, integrality of the maximizer is not immediate for the  $\ell_p$  objective because the regret of  $y$  compared to  $S$  is not a linear function of  $\mathbf{I}$ .

*Proof.* We will show that the derivative of  $\text{FRAC}_p(\mathbf{I}) - S_p(\mathbf{I})$  when  $\text{FRAC}_p(\mathbf{I}) > S_p(\mathbf{I})$  with respect to a fixed  $d_j$  is either always positive or always negative for  $d_j \in (0, 1)$ , or negative while  $0 < d_j < d'$  and then positive afterwards. This gives that any  $\mathbf{I}$  with a fractional coordinate where  $\text{FRAC}_p(\mathbf{I}) > S_p(\mathbf{I})$  (which is necessary for a fractional  $\mathbf{I}$  to be a global maximum but not the integral all-zeroes vector) cannot be a local maximum, giving the lemma.

To show this property of the derivative, letting  $\mathbf{I}_{-j}$  denote  $\mathbf{I}$  with  $d_j = 0$ , we have  $\text{FRAC}_p(\mathbf{I}) - S_p(\mathbf{I}) = (\text{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}_{-j}) + c_1 d_j)^{1/p} - (S_p^p(\mathbf{I}_{-j}) + c_2 d_j)^{1/p}$  where  $c_1, c_2$  are the  $\ell_p^p$  distance from  $j$  to  $\text{FRAC}, S$  respectively. For positive  $d_j$ , the derivative with respect to  $d_j$  is well-defined and equals

$$\frac{1}{p} \left( \frac{c_1}{(\text{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}_{-j}) + c_1 d_j)^{1-1/p}} - \frac{c_2}{(S_p^p(\mathbf{I}_{-j}) + c_2 d_j)^{1-1/p}} \right).$$

The derivative is positive if the following inequality holds:

$$\frac{S_p^p(\mathbf{I}_{-j}) + c_2 d_j}{\text{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}_{-j}) + c_1 d_j} > \left(\frac{c_2}{c_1}\right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}.$$

We first focus on the case where  $c_1 > c_2$ . The left-hand side starts at  $S_p^p(\mathbf{I}_{-j})/\text{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}_{-j})$  and monotonically and asymptotically approaches  $c_2/c_1$  as  $d_j$  increases. This implies that either it is always at least  $c_2/c_1$  or it is increasing and approaching  $c_2/c_1$ , i.e. at least  $(c_2/c_1)^{p/(p-1)}$  for  $d_j > 0$  or less than  $(c_2/c_1)^{p/(p-1)}$  for all  $d_j < d'$  for some  $d'$  and then greater than  $(c_2/c_1)^{p/(p-1)}$  for all  $d_j > d'$  (here, we are using the fact that  $c_1 > c_2$  and so  $(c_2/c_1)^{p/(p-1)} < c_2/c_1$ ). In turn, the desired property of the derivative holds.

In the case where  $c_1 \leq c_2$ , at any optimum  $S_p^p(\mathbf{I}_{-j}) + c_2 d_j < \text{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}_{-j}) + c_1 d_j$  (otherwise  $\text{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}) < S_p^p(\mathbf{I})$  and so  $\mathbf{I}$  cannot be a maximum because the all zeroes vector achieves a better objective) and so the derivative is always negative in this case as desired.  $\square$

It turns out that relaxing to fractional clients not only helps in efficient computability of the function  $f_{y,Y}(S)$ , but also simplifies the proof of submodularity of the function.

**Lemma 15.** *The function  $f_{y,Y}(S)$  as defined above is submodular.*

*Proof of Lemma 15.* Fix a universal clustering instance, fractional solution  $y$ , and value  $Y$ . Consider any  $S \subseteq T \subseteq F$  and  $x \in F$ .  $f_{y,Y}(T \cup \{x\}) - f_{y,Y}(T) \leq f_{y,Y}(S \cup \{x\}) - f_{y,Y}(S)$ .  $f_{y,Y}(S)$  is the optimum of a fractional knapsack instance where each client is an item with value equal to the difference between its contribution to  $\text{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}) - S_p^p(\mathbf{I})$  and weight equal to its contribution to  $\text{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I})$ , with the knapsack having total weight  $Y$ . For simplicity we can assume there is a dummy item with value 0 and weight  $Y$  in the knapsack instance as well (a value 0 item cannot affect the optimum). Note that the weights are fixed for any  $S$ , and the values increase monotonically with  $S$ . We will refer to the latter fact as *monotonicity of values*. The optimum of a fractional knapsack instance is given by sorting the items in decreasing ratio of value to weight, and taking the (fractional) prefix of the items sorted this way that has total weight  $Y$ . We will refer to this fact as the *prefix property*. We will show that we can construct a fractional knapsack solution that when using cluster centers  $S \cup \{x\}$  has value at least  $f_{y,Y}(S) + f_{y,Y}(T \cup \{x\}) - f_{y,Y}(T)$ , proving the lemma. For brevity, we will refer to fractions of clients which may be in the knapsack as if they were integral clients.

Consider  $f_{y,Y}(T \cup \{x\}) - f_{y,Y}(T)$ . We can split this difference into four cases:

1. A client in the optimal knapsack for  $S$ ,  $T$ , and  $T \cup \{x\}$ .
2. A client in the optimal knapsack for  $S$  and  $T \cup \{x\}$  but not for  $T$ .
3. A client in the optimal knapsack for  $T$  and  $T \cup \{x\}$  but not for  $S$ .
4. A client in the optimal knapsack for  $T \cup \{x\}$  but not for  $S$  or  $T$ .

In every case, the client's value must have increased (otherwise, it cannot contribute to the difference in cases 1 and 3, or it must also be in  $T$ 's knapsack in cases 2 and 4), i.e.  $x$  is the closest cluster center to the client in  $T \cup \{x\}$  (and thus  $S \cup \{x\}$ ). Let  $w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4$  be the total weight of clients in each case. The total weight of clients in  $T$ 's knapsack but not  $T \cup \{x\}$  is  $w_2 + w_4$ . We will refer to these clients as replaced clients. The increase in value due to cases 2 and 4 can be thought of as replacing the replaced clients with

case 2 and 4 clients. In particular, we will think of the case 2 clients as replacing the replaced clients of weight  $w_2$  with the smallest total value for  $T$ , and the case 4 clients as replacing the remaining replaced clients (i.e. those with the largest total value for  $T$ ).

Without loss of generality, we assume there are no case 1 clients. By the prefix property, any of the knapsack instances for  $S, T, T \cup \{x\}$  (and also  $S \cup \{x\}$  by monotonicity of values and the prefix property) has optimal value equal to the total value of case 1 clients plus the optimal value of a smaller knapsack instance with total weight  $Y - w_1$  and all clients except case 1 clients available. The value of case 1 clients for  $S \cup \{x\}$  and  $T \cup \{x\}$  is the same (since the values are determined by  $x$ ), and can only be smaller for  $S$  than  $T$  by monotonicity of values. In turn, we just need to construct a knapsack for  $S \cup \{x\}$  for the smaller instance with no case 1 clients whose value is at least that of  $S$  plus the contribution to  $f_{y,Y}(T \cup \{x\}) - f_{y,Y}(T)$  from cases 2-4.

To build the desired knapsack for  $S \cup \{x\}$ , we start with the knapsack for  $S$ . The case 2 clients in  $S$ 's knapsack by the prefix property have less value for  $S$  than for  $T$  by monotonicity of values. By the prefix property, for  $T$  the case 2 clients have less value than the replaced clients of total weight  $w_2$  with the smallest total value for  $T$  (since the former are not in the optimal knapsack for  $T$ , and the latter are). So, the increase in value of the case 2 clients in  $S$ 's knapsack is at least the contribution to  $f_{y,Y}(T \cup \{x\}) - f_{y,Y}(T)$  due to replacing clients in  $T$ 's knapsack with case 2 clients.

To account for the case 4 clients, we take the clients in  $S$ 's knapsack which are not case 2 clients with weight  $w_4$  and the least total value for  $T$ , and replace them with the case 4 clients. These clients are among the clients of total weight  $w_2 + w_4$  with the lowest value-to-weight ratios (for  $T$ ) in  $S$ 's knapsack (they aren't necessarily the clients of total weight  $w_4$  with the lowest value-to-weight ratios, because we chose not to include case 2 clients in this set). On the other hand, the replaced clients in  $T$ 's knapsack all have value-to-weight ratios for  $T$  greater than at least  $w_2$  weight of other clients in  $T$ 's knapsack (those replaced by the case 2 clients). So by monotonicity of values and the prefix property, the clients we replace in  $S$ 's knapsack with case 4 clients have lower value for  $S$  than the clients being replaced by case 4 clients do for  $T$ , and so we increase the value of our knapsack by more than the contribution to  $f_{y,Y}(T \cup \{x\}) - f_{y,Y}(T)$  due to case 4 clients.

Lastly, we take any clients in  $S$ 's knapsack which are not in  $T$ 's knapsack or case 2 or case 4 clients with total weight  $w_3$  and replace them with the case 3 clients. Since these clients are not in  $T$ 's knapsack, their value for  $T$  (and thus their value for  $S$  by monotonicity of values) is less than the case 3 clients' value for  $T$  by the prefix property. In turn, this replacement increases the value of our knapsack by more than the contribution to  $f_{y,Y}(T \cup \{x\}) - f_{y,Y}(T)$  due to case 3 clients.  $\square$

This lemma allows us to now give an approximate separation oracle for fractional solutions of universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering by trying all guesses for  $Y$  ( $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE in Figure 1).

One complication of using the above as a separation oracle in the ellipsoid algorithm is that it outputs linear constraints whereas the actual constraints in the fractional relaxation given in (5) are non-linear. So, we need some additional work to show that violation of the linear constraints output by  $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE also implies violation of the non-linear constraints in (5). We give these details in Appendix ?? and prove the next lemma.

**Lemma 16.** *For any  $p \geq 1, \varepsilon > 0$  there exists an algorithm which finds a  $(\frac{e}{e-1} \cdot p + \varepsilon)$ -approximation to the LP for the universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering problem.*

*Proof.* The algorithm is to use the ellipsoid method with  $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE as the separation oracle. We note that  $f_{y,Y}(S)$  can be evaluated in polynomial time by computing optimal fractional knapsacks as discussed in the proof of Lemma 15. In addition, there are polynomially values of  $Y$  that are iterated over, since

$\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE( $(x, y, r), F, C$ ):

**Input:** Fractional solution  $(x, y, r)$ , set of cluster centers  $F$ , set of all clients  $C$

```

1: if Any constraint in (5) except the regret constraint set is violated then
2:   return the violated constraint
3: end if
4:  $c_{\min} \leftarrow \min_{i \in F, j \in C} c_{ij}^p, c_{\max} \leftarrow \sum_{j \in C} \max_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p$ 
5: for  $Y \in \{c_{\min}, c_{\min}(1 + \varepsilon'), c_{\min}(1 + \varepsilon')^2, \dots, c_{\min}(1 + \varepsilon')^{\lceil \log_{1+\varepsilon'} c_{\max}/c_{\min} \rceil}\}$  do
6:    $S \leftarrow \frac{e-1}{e}$ -maximizer of  $f_{y,Y}$  subject to  $|S| \leq k$  via Theorem 5
7:    $\mathbf{I}' \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{I} \in [0,1]^C: \sum_{j \in C} d_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} \leq Y} \sum_{j \in C} d_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - \sum_{j \in C} d_j \min_{i \in S} c_{ij}^p$ 
8:   if  $\frac{1}{pY^{1-1/p}} \left[ \sum_{j \in C} d'_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - \sum_{j \in C} d'_j \min_{i \in S} c_{ij}^p \right] > r$  then
9:     return  $\frac{1}{pY^{1-1/p}} \left[ \sum_{j \in C} d'_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - \sum_{j \in C} d'_j \min_{i \in S} c_{ij}^p \right] \leq r$ 
10:  end if
11: end for
12: return "Feasible"

```

Figure 1: Separation Oracle for  $\ell_p$ -Clustering

$\lceil \log_{1+\varepsilon'} c_{\max}/c_{\min} \rceil$  is  $O(p \log n / \varepsilon')$  times the number of bits needed to describe the largest value of  $c_{ij}$ . So each call to  $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE takes polynomial time.

By Lemma 14 and the observation that  $\operatorname{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}) - S_p^p(\mathbf{I}) \leq p \cdot \operatorname{FRAC}_p^{p-1}(\mathbf{I})(\operatorname{FRAC}_p(\mathbf{I}) - S_p(\mathbf{I}))$  if  $\operatorname{FRAC}_p(\mathbf{I}) - S_p(\mathbf{I}) > 0$ , we get that  $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE cannot output a violated inequality if the input solution is feasible to Eq. (5). So we just need to show that if  $\operatorname{FRAC}_p(C') - S_p(C') \geq (\frac{e-1}{e} p + \varepsilon)r$  for some  $S, C'$ ,  $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE outputs a violated inequality, i.e. does not output "Feasible". Let  $Y'$  be the smallest value of  $Y$  iterated over by  $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE that is at least  $\operatorname{FRAC}_p^p(C')$ , and  $S'$  the  $\frac{e-1}{e}$ -maximizer of  $f_{y,Y'}$  found by  $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE. We have for the  $\mathbf{I}'$  found on Line 7 of  $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{p(Y')^{1-1/p}} \left[ \operatorname{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}') - S_p^p(\mathbf{I}') \right] &\stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \frac{e-1}{pe(Y')^{1-1/p}} \max_{S, \mathbf{I}: \operatorname{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}) \leq Y'} \left[ \operatorname{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}') - S_p^p(\mathbf{I}') \right] \geq \\
\frac{e-1}{pe(Y')^{1-1/p}} \max_{S, \mathbf{I}: \operatorname{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}) \leq \operatorname{FRAC}_p^p(C')} \left[ \operatorname{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}) - S_p^p(\mathbf{I}) \right] &\geq \frac{e-1}{pe(Y')^{1-1/p}} \left[ \operatorname{FRAC}_p^p(C') - S_p^p(C') \right] \geq \\
\frac{e-1}{pe(1+\varepsilon')} \frac{\operatorname{FRAC}_p^p(C') - S_p^p(C')}{\operatorname{FRAC}_p^{p-1}(C')} &= \frac{e-1}{pe(1+\varepsilon')} \left[ \operatorname{FRAC}_p(C') - S_p(C') \right] > r.
\end{aligned}$$

In (i), we use the fact that for a fixed  $S$ ,  $\max_{\mathbf{I}: \operatorname{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}) \leq Y} \left[ \operatorname{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}') - S_p^p(\mathbf{I}') \right]$  is the solution to a fractional knapsack problem with weight  $Y$ , and that decreasing the weight allowed in a fractional knapsack instance can only reduce the optimum. For the last inequality to hold, we just need to choose  $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon \frac{(e-1)}{pe}$  in  $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE for the desired  $\varepsilon$ . This shows that for  $Y'$ ,  $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE will output a violated inequality as desired.  $\square$

### 3.3 Universal $\ell_p$ -Clustering: Rounding Algorithm

At a high level, we use the same strategy for rounding the fractional  $\ell_p$ -clustering solution as we did with  $k$ -median. Namely, we solve a discounted version of the problem where the discount for each client is equal



to the (scaled) cost of the client in the fractional solution. However, if we apply this directly to the  $\ell_p$  objective, we run into several problems. In particular, the linear discounts are incompatible with the non-linear objective defined over the clients. A more promising idea is to use these discounts on the  $\ell_p^p$  objective, which in fact is defined as a linear combination over the individual client's objectives. But, for this to work, we will first need to relate the regret bound in the  $\ell_p^p$  objective to that in the  $\ell_p$  objective. This is clearly not true in general, i.e., for all realizations. However, we show that the realization that maximizes the regret of an algorithm ALG against a fixed solution SOL in both objectives is the same under the following ‘‘farness’’ condition: *for every client, either ALG’s connection is smaller than SOL’s or it is at least  $p$  times as large as SOL’s*. Given any solution SOL, it is easy to define a *virtual* solution  $\widetilde{\text{SOL}}$  whose individual connection costs are bounded by  $p$  times that in SOL, and  $\widetilde{\text{SOL}}$  satisfies the farness condition. This allows us to relate the regret of ALG against  $\widetilde{\text{SOL}}$  (and thus against  $p$  times SOL) in the  $\ell_p^p$  objective to its regret in the  $\ell_p$  objective.

We first state the technical lemma relating the  $\ell_p^p$  and  $\ell_p$  objectives under the farness condition. The proof of this lemma appears in Appendix ???. Informally, this lemma says that if we want to choose a realization maximizing the regret of ALG against SOL in (an approximation of) the  $\ell_p$ -objective, we should always include a client whose distance to ALG exceeds their distance to SOL by a factor larger than  $p$ . This contrasts (and limits) the example given at the beginning of this section, where we showed that including clients whose distance to ALG exceeds the distance to SOL by a smaller factor can actually reduce the regret of ALG against SOL. In turn, if *all* clients are closer to SOL are closer by a factor of  $p$ , then the realization that maximizes regret in the  $\ell_p$ -objective is also the realization that maximizes regret in the  $\ell_p^p$ -objective.

**Lemma 17.** *Suppose ALG and SOL are two solutions to an  $\ell_p$ -clustering instance, such that there is a subset of clients  $C^*$  with the following property: for every client in  $C^*$ , the connection cost in ALG is greater than  $p$  times the connection cost in SOL, while for every client not in  $C^*$ , the connection cost in SOL is at least the connection cost in ALG. Then,  $C^*$  maximizes the following function:*

$$f(C') := \begin{cases} \frac{\text{ALG}_p^p(C') - \text{SOL}_p^p(C')}{\text{ALG}_p^{p-1}(C')} & \text{ALG}_p^p(C') > 0 \\ 0 & \text{ALG}_p^p(C') = 0 \end{cases}$$

Intuitively, this lemma connects the  $\ell_p$  and  $\ell_p^p$  objectives as this subset of clients  $C^*$  will also be the set that maximizes the  $\ell_p^p$  regret of ALG vs SOL, and  $f(C')$  is (within a factor of  $p$ ) equal to the  $\ell_p$  regret. We use this lemma along with the  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts approximation in Lemma 13 to design the rounding algorithm for universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering. As in the rounding algorithm for universal  $k$ -median, let SOL denote a (virtual) solution whose connection costs are 3 times that of the fractional solution FRAC for all clients. The rounding algorithm solves an  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts instance, where the discounts are 2 times SOL’s connection costs. (Recall that in  $k$ -median, the discount was equal to SOL’s connection cost. Now, we need the additional factor of 2 for technical reasons.) Let ALG be the solution output by the algorithm of Lemma 13 for this problem. We prove the following bound for ALG (the full proof of this lemma is given in Appendix ???; here, we present a sketch with the main ideas):

**Lemma 18.** *There exists an algorithm which given any  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate fractional solution FRAC for  $\ell_p$ -clustering, outputs a  $(54p\alpha, 54p\beta + 18p^{1/p})$ -approximate integral solution.*

*Proof.* Let SOL denote a (virtual) solution whose connection costs are 3 times that of the fractional solution FRAC for all clients. The rounding algorithm solves an  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts instance, where the discounts are 2 times SOL’s connection costs. Let ALG be the solution output by the algorithm of Lemma 13 for this problem. We also consider an additional virtual solution  $\widetilde{\text{SOL}}$ , whose connection costs are defined as follows: For clients  $j$  such that ALG’s connection cost is greater than 18 times SOL’s but less than  $18p$  times

SOL's, we multiply SOL's connection costs by  $p$  to obtain connection costs in  $\widetilde{\text{SOL}}$ . For all other clients, the connection cost in  $\widetilde{\text{SOL}}$  is the same as that in SOL. Now, ALG and  $18 \cdot \widetilde{\text{SOL}}$  satisfy the condition in Lemma 17 and  $18 \cdot \widetilde{\text{SOL}}$  is a  $(54p\alpha, 54p\beta)$ -approximation.

Our goal in the rest of the proof is to bound the regret of ALG against (a constant times)  $\widetilde{\text{SOL}}$  by (a constant times) the minimum regret MR. Let us denote this regret:

$$\text{REG} := \max_{C' \subseteq C} [\text{ALG}_p(C') - 18 \cdot \widetilde{\text{SOL}}_p(C')].$$

Note that if  $\text{REG} = 0$  (it can't be negative), then for all realizations  $C'$ ,  $\text{ALG}_p(C') \leq 18 \cdot \widetilde{\text{SOL}}_p(C')$ . In that case, the lemma follows immediately. So, we assume that  $\text{REG} > 0$ .

Let  $C_1 = \text{argmax}_{C' \subseteq C} [\text{ALG}_p(C') - 18 \cdot \widetilde{\text{SOL}}_p(C')]$ , i.e., the realization defining REG that maximizes the regret for the  $\ell_p$  objective. We need to relate REG to the regret in the  $\ell_p^p$ -objective for us to use the approximation guarantees of  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts from Lemma 13. Lemma 17 gives us this relation, since it tells us that  $C_1$  is exactly the set of clients for which ALG's closest cluster center is at a distance of more than 18 times that of  $\widetilde{\text{SOL}}$ 's closest cluster center. But, this means that  $C_1$  also maximizes the regret for the  $\ell_p^p$  objective, i.e.,  $C_1 = \text{argmax}_{C'} [\text{ALG}_p^p(C') - 18^p \cdot \widetilde{\text{SOL}}_p^p(C')]$ . Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{REG} &= \frac{\max_{C' \subseteq C} [\text{ALG}_p^p(C') - 18^p \cdot \widetilde{\text{SOL}}_p^p(C')]}{\sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \text{ALG}_p^j(C_1) \cdot (18 \cdot \widetilde{\text{SOL}}_p(C_1))^{p-1-j}} \leq \frac{\max_{C' \subseteq C} [\text{ALG}_p^p(C') - 18^p \cdot \widetilde{\text{SOL}}_p^p(C')]}{\text{ALG}_p^{p-1}(C_1)} \\ &\leq \frac{\max_{C' \subseteq C} [\text{ALG}_p^p(C') - 18^p \cdot \text{SOL}_p^p(C')]}{\text{ALG}_p^{p-1}(C_1)}, \text{ since connection costs in } \widetilde{\text{SOL}} \text{ are at least those in SOL.} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the numerator in this last expression is exactly the value of the objective for the  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts problem from Lemma 13. Using this lemma, we can now bound the numerator by the optimum for this problem, which in turn is bounded by the objective produced by the minimum regret solution MRS for the  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts instance:

$$\text{REG} \leq \frac{\max_{C' \subseteq C} [\text{ALG}_p^p(C') - 18^p \cdot \text{SOL}_p^p(C')]}{\text{ALG}_p^{p-1}(C_1)} \leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot 9^p \cdot \frac{\max_{C' \subseteq C} [\text{MRS}_p^p(C') - 2^p \cdot \text{SOL}_p^p(C')]}{\text{ALG}_p^{p-1}(C_1)}. \quad (6)$$

First, we bound the numerator in the above expression. Let  $C_2 := \text{argmax}_{C' \subseteq C} [\text{MRS}_p^p(C') - 2^p \cdot \text{SOL}_p^p(C')]$  be the realization that maximizes this term. We now relate this term to MR (the first step is by factorization and the second step holds because  $2 \cdot \text{SOL} = 6 \cdot \text{FRAC}$  exceeds the optimal integer solution by to the upper bound of 3 on the integrality gap [4]):

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{C'} [\text{MRS}_p^p(C') - 2^p \cdot \text{SOL}_p^p(C')] &= (\text{MRS}_p(C_2) - 2 \cdot \text{SOL}_p(C_2)) \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \text{MRS}_p^j(C_2) \cdot (2 \cdot \text{SOL}_p(C_2))^{p-1-j} \\ &\leq \text{MR} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \text{MRS}_p^j(C_2) \cdot (2 \cdot \text{SOL}_p(C_2))^{p-1-j}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the above bound in Eq. (6), we get:

$$\text{REG} \leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot 9^p \cdot \text{MR} \cdot \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \text{MRS}_p^j(C_2) \cdot (2 \cdot \text{SOL}_p(C_2))^{p-1-j}}{\text{ALG}_p^{p-1}(C_1)}. \quad (7)$$

In the rest of proof, we obtain a bound on the last term in Eq. (7). We consider two cases. If  $\text{ALG}_p(C_1) \geq 9p^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \text{MRS}_p(C_2)$  (intuitively, the denominator is large compared to the numerator), then:

$$\frac{\sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \text{MRS}_p^j(C_2) 2^{p-1-j} \text{SOL}_p^{p-1-j}(C_2)}{\text{ALG}_p^{p-1}(C_1)} \leq p \cdot \frac{\text{MRS}_p^{p-1}(C_2)}{\text{ALG}_p^{p-1}(C_1)} \leq p \cdot (9p^{\frac{1}{p}})^{-p+1} = 9^{-p+1} p^{1/p},$$

The first step uses the fact that  $\text{MRS}_p(C_2) \geq 2\text{SOL}_p(C_2)$ , so the largest term in the sum is  $\text{MRS}_p^{p-1}(C_2)$ . Combined with Eq. (7) this  $\text{REG} \leq 6p^{1/p} \cdot \text{MR}$ , giving the lemma statement.

If  $\text{ALG}_p(C_1) < 9p^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \text{MRS}_p(C_2)$ , then we cannot hope to meaningfully bound Eq (7). In this case, however,  $\text{REG}$  is also bounded by  $\text{MRS}_p(C_2)$ , which we will eventually bound by  $\text{MR}$ . More formally, by our assumption that  $\text{REG} > 0$ ,  $\text{MRS}_p^p(C_2) - 2^p \cdot \text{SOL}_p^p(C_2) > 0$  and we have  $2\text{SOL}_p(C_2) \leq \text{MRS}_p(C_2) \leq \text{SOL}_p(C_2) + \text{MR}$ . The first inequality is by our assumption that  $\text{MRS}_p^p(C_2) - 2^p \cdot \text{SOL}_p^p(C_2) > 0$ , the second inequality is by definition of  $\text{MRS}, \text{MR}$  and the fact that  $\text{SOL}(C_2)$  upper bounds  $\text{OPT}(C_2)$ . In turn,  $\text{SOL}_p(C_2) \leq \text{MR}$  which gives  $\text{MRS}_p(C_2) \leq 2\text{MR}$  and thus  $\text{REG} \leq \text{ALG}_p(C_1) \leq 18p^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \text{MR}$ . We note that for all  $p \geq 1$ ,  $p^{1/p} \leq e^{1/e} \leq 1.5$ .  $\square$

We note that the final step requires using discounts equal to twice  $\text{SOL}$ 's connection costs instead of just  $\text{SOL}$ 's connection costs. If we did the latter, we would have started with the inequality  $\text{SOL}_p(C_2) \leq \text{MRS}_p(C_2) \leq \text{SOL}_p(C_2) + \text{MR}$  instead, which does not give us any useful bound on  $\text{SOL}(C_2)$  or  $\text{MRS}(C_2)$  in terms of just  $\text{MR}$ . We also note that we chose not to optimize the constants in the final result of Lemma 18 in favor of simplifying the presentation.

Theorem 10 now follows by using the values of  $(\alpha, \beta)$  from Lemma 16 (and a sufficiently small choice of the error parameter  $\epsilon$ ) in the statement of Lemma 18 above.

## 4 Universal $k$ -Center

In the previous section, we gave universal algorithms for general  $\ell_p$ -clustering problems. Recall that the  $k$ -center objective, defined as the maximum distance of a client from its closest cluster center, can also be interpreted as the  $\ell_\infty$ -objective in the  $\ell_p$ -clustering framework. Moreover, it is well known that for any  $n$ -dimensional vector, its  $\ell_{\log n}$  and  $\ell_\infty$  norms differ only a constant factor (see Fact 41 in Appendix ??). Therefore, choosing  $p = \log n$  in Theorem 12 gives poly-logarithmic approximation bounds for the universal  $k$ -center problem. In this section, we give direct techniques that improve these bounds to constants:

**Theorem 19.** *There exists a (3,3)-approximate algorithm for the universal  $k$ -center problem.*

First, note that for every client  $j$ , its distance to the closest cluster center in the minimum regret solution  $\text{MRS}$  is at most  $\text{MR}_j := \min_{i \in F} c_{ij} + \text{MR}$ ; otherwise, in the realization with only client  $j$ ,  $\text{MRS}$  would have regret  $> \text{MR}$ . We first design an algorithm  $\text{ALG}$  that 3-approximates these distances  $\text{MR}_j$ , i.e., for every client  $j$ , its distance to the closest cluster center in  $\text{ALG}$  is at most  $3\text{MR}_j$ . Indeed, this algorithm satisfies a more general property: given *any* value  $r$ , it produces a set of cluster centers such that every client  $j$  is at a distance  $\leq 3r_j$  from its closest cluster center, where  $r_j := \min_{i \in F} c_{ij} + r$ . Moreover, if  $r \geq \text{MR}$ , then the number of cluster centers selected by  $\text{ALG}$  is at most  $k$  (for smaller values of  $r$ ,  $\text{ALG}$  might select more than  $k$  cluster centers).

Our algorithm  $\text{ALG}$  is a natural greedy algorithm. We order clients  $j$  in increasing order of  $r_j$ , and if a client  $j$  does not have a cluster center within distance  $\alpha 3r_j$  in the current solution, then we add its closest cluster center in  $F$  to the solution.

**Lemma 20.** *Given a value  $r$ , the greedy algorithm ALG selects cluster centers that satisfy the following properties:*

- *every client  $j$  is within a distance of  $3r_j = 3(\min_{i \in F} c_{ij} + r)$  from their closest cluster center.*
- *If  $r \geq \text{MR}$ , then ALG does not select more than  $k$  cluster centers, i.e., the solution produced by ALG is feasible for the  $k$ -center problem.*

*Proof.* The first property follows from the definition of ALG.

To show that ALG does not pick more than  $k$  cluster centers, we map the cluster center  $i$  added in ALG by some client  $j$  to its closest cluster center  $i'$  in MRS. Now, we claim that no two cluster centers  $i_1, i_2$  in ALG can be mapped to the same cluster center  $i'$  in MRS. Clearly, this proves the lemma since MRS has only  $k$  cluster centers.




Figure 2: Two clients  $j_1, j_2$  that are distance at most  $r_{j_1}, r_{j_2}$  respectively from the same cluster center  $i'$  in MRS cannot cause ALG to add two different cluster centers  $i_1, i_2$ .

Suppose  $i_1, i_2$  are two cluster centers in ALG mapped to the same cluster center  $i'$  in MRS. Assume without loss of generality that  $i_1$  was added to ALG before  $i_2$ . Let  $j_1, j_2$  be the clients that caused  $i_1, i_2$  to be added; since  $i_2$  was added later, we have  $r_{j_1} \leq r_{j_2}$ . The distance from  $j_2$  to  $i_1$  is at most the length of the path  $(j_2, i', j_1, i_1)$  (see Fig. 2), which is at most  $2r_{j_2} + r_{j_1} \leq 3r_{j_2}$ . But, in this case  $j_2$  would not have added a new cluster center  $i_2$ , thus arriving at a contradiction.  $\square$

We now use the above lemma to prove Theorem 19.

*Proof of Theorem 19.* In any realization  $C' \subseteq C$ , the optimal value of the  $k$ -center objective is  $\text{OPT}(C') \geq \max_{j \in C'} \min_{i \in F} c_{ij}$ , whereas the solution produced by the algorithm ALG given above has objective value at most  $3(\max_{j \in C'} \min_{i \in F} c_{ij} + r)$ . So, ALG's solution costs at most  $3 \cdot \text{OPT}(C') + 3 \cdot r$  for all realizations  $C' \subseteq C$ . So, if we were able to choose  $r = \text{MR}$ , we would prove the theorem. But, we do not know the value of MR (in fact, this is **NP-hard**). Instead, we increase the value of  $r$  continuously until ALG produces a solution with at most  $k$  clients. By Lemma 20, we are guaranteed that this will happen for some  $r \leq \text{MR}$ , which then proves the theorem.

Our final observation is that this algorithm can be implemented in polynomial time, since there are only polynomially many possibilities for the  $k$ -center objective across all realizations (namely, the set of all cluster center to client distances) and thus polynomially many possible values for MR (the set of all differences between all possible solution costs). So, we only need to run ALG for these values of  $r$  in increasing order.  $\square$

We note that the greedy algorithm described above can be viewed as an extension of the  $k$ -center algorithm in [33] to a  $(3,3)$ -approximation for the “ $k$ -center with discounts” problem, where the discounts are the minimum distances  $\min_{i \in F} c_{ij}$ .

## 5 Universal $k$ -Median with Fixed Clients

In this section, we extend the techniques from Section 2 to prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 21.** *If there exists a deterministic polynomial time  $\gamma$ -approximation algorithm for the  $k$ -median problem, then for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a  $(54\gamma + \varepsilon, 60)$ -approximate universal algorithm for the universal  $k$ -median problem with fixed clients.*

By using the derandomized version of the  $(2.732 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm of Li and Svensson [44] for the  $k$ -median problem, and appropriate choice of both  $\varepsilon$  parameters, we obtain the following corollary from Theorem 21.

**Corollary 22.** *For every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $(148 + \varepsilon, 60)$ -approximate universal algorithm for the  $k$ -median problem with fixed clients.*

Our high level strategy comprises two steps. In Section 5.2, we show how to find a good fractional solution by approximately solving a linear program. In Section 5.3, we then round the fractional solution in a manner that preserves its regret guarantee within constant factors. As discussed in Section 1.1, for simplicity our algorithm’s description and analysis will avoid the notion of demands and instead equivalently view the input as specifying a set of fixed and unfixed clients, of which multiple might exist at the same location.

### 5.1 Preliminaries

In addition to the preliminaries of Section 2, we will use the following tools:

**Submodular Maximization over Independence Systems.** An *independence system* comprises a ground set  $E$  and a set of subsets (called *independent sets*)  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$  with the property that if  $A \subseteq B$  and  $B \in \mathcal{I}$  then  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  (the *subset closed* property). An independent set  $S$  in  $\mathcal{I}$  is *maximal* if there does not exist  $S' \supset S$  such that  $S' \in \mathcal{I}$ . Note that one can define an independence system by specifying the set of maximal independent sets  $\mathcal{I}'$  only, since the subset closed property implies  $\mathcal{I}$  is simply all subsets of sets in  $\mathcal{I}'$ . An independence system is a *1-independence system* (or *1-system* in short) if all maximal independent sets are of the same size. The following result on maximizing submodular functions over 1-independence systems follows from a more general result given implicitly in [48] and more formally in [14].

**Theorem 23.** *There exists a polynomial time algorithm that given a 1-independence system  $(E, \mathcal{I})$  and a non-negative monotone submodular function  $f : 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  defined over it, finds a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -maximizer of  $f$ , i.e. finds  $S' \in \mathcal{I}$  such that  $f(S') \geq \frac{1}{2} \max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S)$ .*

The algorithm in the above theorem is the natural greedy algorithm, which starts with  $S' = \emptyset$  and repeatedly adds to  $S'$  the element  $u$  that maximizes  $f(S' \cup \{u\})$  while maintaining that  $S' \cup \{u\}$  is in  $\mathcal{I}$ , until no such addition is possible.

**Incremental  $\ell_p$ -Clustering.** We will also use the *incremental  $\ell_p$ -clustering* problem which is defined as follows: Given an  $\ell_p$ -clustering instance and a subset of the cluster centers  $S$  (the “existing” cluster centers), find the minimum cost solution to the  $\ell_p$ -clustering instance with the additional constraint that the solution must contain all cluster centers in  $S$ . When  $S = \emptyset$ , this is just the standard  $\ell_p$ -clustering problem, and this problem is equivalent to the standard  $\ell_p$ -clustering problem by the following lemma:

**Lemma 24.** *If there exists a  $\gamma$ -approximation algorithm for the  $\ell_p$ -clustering problem, there exists a  $\gamma$ -approximation for the incremental  $\ell_p$ -clustering problem.*

*Proof of Lemma 24.* The  $\gamma$ -approximation for incremental  $\ell_p$ -clustering is as follows: Given an instance  $I$  of incremental  $\ell_p$ -clustering with clients  $C$  and existing cluster centers  $S$ , create a  $\ell_p$ -clustering instance  $I'$  which has the same cluster centers and clients as the  $\ell_p$ -clustering instance except that at the location of every cluster center in  $S$ , we add a client with demand  $\gamma|C|^{1/p} \max_{i,j} c_{ij} + 1$ .

Let  $T^*$  be the solution that is a superset of  $S$  of size  $k$  that achieves the lowest cost of all such supersets in instance  $I$ . Let  $T$  be the output of running a  $\gamma$ -approximation algorithm for  $\ell_p$ -clustering on  $I'$ . Then we wish to show  $T$  is a superset of  $S$  and has cost at most  $\gamma$  times the cost of  $T^*$  in instance  $I$ .

Any solution that buys all cluster centers in  $S$  has the same cost in  $I$  and  $I'$ . Then we claim it suffices to show that  $T$  is a superset of  $S$ . If  $T$  is a superset of  $S$ , then since both  $T$  and  $T^*$  are supersets of  $S$  and since  $T$  is a  $\gamma$ -approximation in instance  $I'$ , its cost in  $I'$  is at most  $\gamma$  times the cost of  $T^*$  in  $I'$ . This in turn implies  $T$  has cost at most  $\gamma$  times the cost of  $T^*$  in  $I$ , giving the Lemma.

Assume without loss of generality no two cluster centers are distance 0 away from each other. To show that  $T$  is a superset of  $S$ , note that in instance  $I'$  any solution that does not buy a superset of  $S$  is thus at least distance 1 from the location of some cluster center in  $S$  and thus pays cost at least  $\gamma|C|^{1/p} \max_{i,j} c_{ij} + 1$  due to one of the added clients. On the other hand, any solution that is a superset of  $S$  is distance 0 from all the added clients and thus only has to pay connection costs on clients in  $C$ , which in turn means it has cost at most  $|C|^{1/p} \max_{i,j} c_{ij}$ . Since  $T$  is the output of a  $\gamma$ -approximation algorithm,  $T$  thus has cost at most  $\gamma|C|^{1/p} \max_{i,j} c_{ij}$ , which means  $T$  must be a superset of  $S$ .  $\square$

## 5.2 Obtaining a Fractional Solution for Universal $k$ -Median with Fixed Clients

Let  $C_f \subseteq C$  denote the set of fixed clients and for any realization of clients  $C'$  satisfying  $C_f \subseteq C' \subseteq C$ , let  $\text{OPT}(C')$  denote the cost of the optimal solution for  $C'$ . The universal  $k$ -median LP is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min r && (r \text{ denotes maximum regret across all demand realizations}) \\
\text{s.t.} & \sum_{i \in F} x_i \leq k && (x_i \text{ is the indicator variable for opening cluster center } i) \\
& \forall i \in F, j \in C: y_{ij} \leq x_i && (y_{ij} \text{ is the indicator variable for cluster center } i \text{ serving client } j \text{ if it realizes}) \\
& \forall j \in C: \sum_{i \in F} y_{ij} \geq 1 \\
& \forall C_f \subseteq C' \subseteq C: \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} - \text{OPT}(C') \leq r && (8) \\
& \forall i \in F, j \in C: x_i, y_{ij} \in [0, 1]
\end{aligned}$$

Note that Eq. (8) and the objective function distinguish this LP from the standard  $k$ -median LP. We call Eq. (8) the *regret constraint set*. For a fixed fractional solution  $x, y, r$ , our goal is to approximately separate the regret constraint set, since all other constraints can be separated exactly. In the rest of this subsection, we describe our approximate separation oracle and give its analysis.

Let  $S(C')$  denote the cost of the solution  $S \subseteq F$  in realization  $C'$  (that is,  $S(C') = \sum_{j \in C'} \min_{i \in S} c_{ij}$ ). Since  $\text{OPT}(C') = \min_{S: S \subseteq F, |S|=k} S(C')$ , separating the regret constraint set exactly is equivalent to deciding if the following holds:

$$\forall S: S \subseteq F, |S| = k: \max_{C': C_f \subseteq C' \subseteq C} \left[ \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C') \right] \leq r. \quad (9)$$

By splitting the terms  $\sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij}$  and  $S(C')$  into terms for  $C_f$  and  $C' \setminus C_f$ , we can rewrite Eq. (9) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{C_f \subseteq C' \subseteq C, S \subseteq F, |S|=k} \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C') \leq r \\
\forall S \subseteq F, |S|=k : & \max_{C_f \subseteq C' \subseteq C} \sum_{j \in C'} \left[ \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C') \right] \leq r \\
\forall S \subseteq F, |S|=k : & \max_{C_f \subseteq C' \subseteq C} \sum_{j \in C' \setminus C_f} \left[ \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} + \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C' \setminus C_f) - S(C_f) \right] \leq r \\
\forall S \subseteq F, |S|=k : & \max_{C_f \subseteq C' \subseteq C} \left[ \sum_{j \in C' \setminus C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C' \setminus C_f) \right] \leq S(C_f) - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} + r \\
\forall S \subseteq F, |S|=k : & \max_{C^* \subseteq C \setminus C_f} \left[ \sum_{j \in C^*} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C^*) \right] \leq S(C_f) - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} + r
\end{aligned}$$

For fractional solution  $y$ , let

$$f_y(S) = \max_{C^*: C^* \subseteq C \setminus C_f} \left[ \sum_{j \in C^*} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C^*) \right]. \quad (10)$$

Note that we can compute  $f_y(S)$  for any  $S$  easily since the maximizing value of  $C^*$  is the set of clients  $j$  for which  $S$  has connection cost less than  $\sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij}$ . We already know  $f_y(S)$  is not submodular. But, the term  $S(C_f)$  is not fixed with respect to  $S$ , so maximizing  $f_y(S)$  is not enough to separate Eq. (8). To overcome this difficulty, for every possible cost  $M$  on the fixed clients, we replace  $S(C_f)$  with  $M$  and only maximize over solutions  $S$  for which  $S(C_f) \leq M$  (for convenience, we will call any solution  $S$  for which  $S(C_f) \leq M$  an *M-cheap* solution):

$$\forall M \in \left\{ 0, 1, \dots, |C_f| \max_{i,j} c_{ij} \right\} : \max_{S: S \subseteq F, |S|=k, S(C_f) \leq M} f_y(S) \leq M - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} + r. \quad (11)$$

Note that this set of inequalities is equivalent to Eq. (8), but it has the advantage that the left-hand side is approximately maximizable and the right-hand side is fixed. Hence, these inequalities can be approximately separated. However, there are exponentially many inequalities; so, for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we relax to the following polynomially large set of inequalities:

$$\forall M \in \left\{ 0, 1, 1 + \varepsilon, \dots, (1 + \varepsilon)^{\lceil \log_{1+\varepsilon}(|C_f| \max_{i,j} c_{ij}) \rceil + 1} \right\} : \max_{S: S \subseteq F, |S|=k, S(C_f) \leq M} f_y(S) \leq M - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} + r. \quad (12)$$

Separating inequality Eq. (12) for a fixed  $M$  corresponds to submodular maximization of  $f_y(S)$ , but now subject to the constraints  $|S| = k$  and  $S(C_f) \leq M$  as opposed to just  $|S| = k$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}_M$  be the set of all  $S \subseteq F$  such that  $|S| = k$  and  $S(C_f) \leq M$ . Since  $f_y(S)$  is monotone, maximizing  $f_y(S)$  over  $\mathcal{S}_M$  is equivalent to maximizing  $f_y(S)$  over the independence system  $(F, \mathcal{S}_M)$  with maximal independent sets  $\mathcal{S}_M$ .

Then all that is needed to approximately separate Eq. (12) corresponding to a fixed  $M$  is an oracle for deciding membership in  $(F, \mathcal{S}_M)$ . Recall that  $S \subseteq F$  is in  $(F, \mathcal{S}_M)$  if there exists a set  $S' \supseteq S$  such that  $|S'| = k$  and  $S'(C_f) \leq M$ . But, even deciding membership of the empty set in  $(F, \mathcal{S}_M)$  requires one to solve a  $k$ -median instance on the fixed clients, which is in general NP-hard. More generally, we are required to solve an instance of the incremental  $k$ -median problem (see Section 5.1) with existing cluster centers in  $S$ .

While exactly solving incremental  $k$ -median is NP-hard, we have a constant approximation algorithm for it (call it  $A$ ), by Lemma 24. So, we could define a new system  $(F, \mathcal{S}'_M)$  that contains a set  $S \subseteq F$  if the output of  $A$  for the incremental  $k$ -median instance with existing cluster centers  $S$  has cost at most  $M$ . But,  $(F, \mathcal{S}'_M)$  may no longer be a 1-system, or even an independence system. To restore the subset closed property, the membership oracle needs to ensure that: (a) if a subset  $S' \subseteq S$  is determined to not be in  $(F, \mathcal{S}'_M)$ , then  $S$  is not either, and (b) if a superset  $S' \supseteq S$  is determined to be in  $(F, \mathcal{S}'_M)$ , then so is  $S$ .

GREEDYMAX( $(x, y, r), F, C_f, C, M, T_0, f$ ):  
**Input:** Fractional solution  $(x, y, r)$ , set of cluster centers  $F$ , set of fixed clients  $C_f$ , set of all clients  $C$ , value  $M$ ,  $M$ -cheap solution  $T_0$ , submodular objective  $f : 2^F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$

- 1:  $S_0 \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2:  $F_0 \leftarrow F$
- 3: **for**  $l$  from 1 to  $k$  **do**
- 4:     **for** Each cluster center  $i$  in  $F_{l-1} \setminus S_{l-1}$  **do**
- 5:         **if**  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\} \subseteq T_0$  and  $T_0$  is  $M$ -cheap **then**
- 6:              $T_{l,i} \leftarrow T_0$
- 7:         **else**
- 8:             **if** For some  $l', i', S_{l-1} \cup \{i\} \subseteq T_{l',i'}$  and  $T_{l',i'}$  is  $M$ -cheap **then**
- 9:                  $T_{l,i} \leftarrow T_{l',i'}$
- 10:             **else**
- 11:                  $T_{l,i} \leftarrow$  Output of  $\gamma$ -approximation algorithm on incremental  $\ell_p$ -clustering instance with cluster centers  $F_{l-1}$ , existing cluster centers  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  and clients  $C_f$ .
- 12:             **end if**
- 13:         **end if**
- 14:     **end for**
- 15:      $F_l \leftarrow F_{l-1}$
- 16:     **for** Each cluster center  $i$  in  $F_l \setminus S_{l-1}$  **do**
- 17:         **if**  $i$  does not appear in any  $T_{l',i'}$  that is  $M$ -cheap **then**
- 18:              $F_l \leftarrow F_l \setminus \{i\}$
- 19:         **end if**
- 20:     **end for**
- 21:      $S_l \leftarrow S_{l-1} \cup \{\operatorname{argmax}_{i \in F_l \setminus S_{l-1}} f(S_{l-1} \cup \{i\})\}$
- 22: **end for**
- 23: **return**  $S_k$

Figure 3: Modified Greedy Submodular Maximization Algorithm

We now give the modified greedy maximization algorithm GREEDYMAX that we use to try to separate one of the inequalities in Eq. (12), which uses a built-in membership oracle that ensures the above properties hold. Pseudocode is given in Figure 3, and we informally describe it here. GREEDYMAX initializes  $S_0 = \emptyset$ ,  $F_0 = F$ , and starts with a  $M$ -cheap  $k$ -median solution  $T_0$  (generated by running a  $\gamma$ -approximation on the  $k$ -median instance involving only fixed clients  $C_f$ ). In iteration  $l$ , GREEDYMAX starts with a partial solution  $S_{l-1}$  with  $l-1$  cluster centers, and it is considering adding cluster centers in  $F_{l-1}$  to  $S_{l-1}$ . For each cluster center  $i$  in  $F_{l-1}$ , GREEDYMAX generates some  $k$ -median solution  $T_{l,i}$  containing  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  to determine if  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  is in the independence system. If a previously generated solution,  $T_0$  or  $T_{l',i'}$  for any  $l', i'$ , contains  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  and is  $M$ -cheap, then  $T_{l,i}$  is set to this solution. Otherwise, GREEDYMAX runs the



incremental  $k$ -median approximation algorithm on the instance with existing cluster centers in  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$ , the only cluster centers in the instance are  $F_{l-1}$ , and the client set is  $C_f$ . It sets  $T_{l,i}$  to the solution generated by the approximation algorithm.

After generating the set of solutions  $\{T_{l,i}\}_{i \in F_{l-1}}$ , if one of these solutions contains  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  and is  $M$ -cheap, then GREEDYMAX concludes that  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  is in the independence system. This, combined with the fact that these solutions may be copied from previous iterations ensures property (b) holds (as the  $M$ -cheap solutions generated by GREEDYMAX are implicitly considered to be in the independence system). Otherwise, since GREEDYMAX was unable to find an  $M$ -cheap superset of  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$ , it considers  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  to not be in the independence system. In accordance with these beliefs, GREEDYMAX initializes  $F_l$  as a copy of  $F_{l-1}$ , and then removes any  $i$  such that it did not find an  $M$ -cheap superset of  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  from  $F_l$  and thus from future consideration, ensuring property (a) holds. It then greedily adds to  $S_{l-1}$  the  $i$  in  $F_l$  that maximizes  $f_y(S_{l-1} \cup \{i\})$  as defined before to create a new partial solution  $S_l$ . After the  $k$ th iteration, GREEDYMAX outputs the solution  $S_k$ .

SEPORACLE( $(x, y, r), F, C_f, C$ ):

**Input:** A fractional solution  $x, y, r$ , set of cluster centers  $F$ , set of fixed clients  $C_f$ , set of all clients  $C$

- 1: **if** Any constraint in the universal  $k$ -median LP except the regret constraint set is violated **then return** the violated constraint
- 2: **end if**
- 3:  $T_0 \leftarrow$  output of  $\gamma$ -approximation algorithm  $A$  for  $k$ -median run on instance with cluster centers  $F$ , clients  $C_f$
- 4: **for**  $M \in \{0, 1, 1 + \varepsilon, (1 + \varepsilon)^2, \dots, (1 + \varepsilon)^{\lceil \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\gamma|C_f| \max_{i,j} c_{ij}) \rceil + 1}\}$  such that  $T_0$  is  $M$ -cheap **do**
- 5:      $S' \leftarrow$  GREEDYMAX( $(x, y, r), F, C_f, C, M, T_0, f_y$ )
- 6:      $C' \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{C^* \subseteq C \setminus C_f} [\sum_{j \in C^*} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} - S'(C^*)]$
- 7:     **if**  $\sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C') > M - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} + r$  **then**
- 8:         **return**  $\sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C') \leq M - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} + r$
- 9:     **end if**
- 10: **end for**
- 11: **return** “Feasible”

Figure 4: Approximate Separation Oracle for Universal  $k$ -Median

Our approximate separation oracle, SEPORACLE, can then use GREEDYMAX as a subroutine. Pseudocode is given in Figure 4, and we give an informal description of the algorithm here. SEPORACLE checks all constraints except the regret constraint set, and then outputs any violated constraints it finds. If none are found, it then runs a  $k$ -median approximation algorithm on the instance containing only the fixed clients to generate a solution  $T_0$ . For each  $M$  that is 0 or a power of  $1 + \varepsilon$  (as in Eq. (12)), if  $T_0$  is  $M$ -cheap, it then invokes GREEDYMAX for this value of  $M$  (otherwise, GREEDYMAX will consider the corresponding independence system to be empty, so there is no point in running it), passing  $T_0$  to GREEDYMAX. It then checks the inequality  $\sum_{j \in C'} \sum_i c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C') \leq M - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_i c_{ij} y_{ij} + r$  for the solution  $S$  outputted by GREEDYMAX, and outputs this inequality if it is violated.

This completes the intuition behind and description of the separation oracle. We now move on to its analysis. First, we show that GREEDYMAX always finds a valid solution.

**Lemma 25.** GREEDYMAX always outputs a set  $S_k$  of size  $k$  when called by SEPORACLE.

*Proof.* Note that GREEDYMAX is only invoked if  $T_0$  is  $M$ -cheap. This implies some  $T_{1,i}$  is  $M$ -cheap since

some  $T_{1,i}$  will be initialized to  $T_0$ . Then, it suffices to show that in the  $l$ th iteration, there is some  $i$  that can be added to  $S_l$ . If this is true, it implies  $S_k$  is of size  $k$  since  $k$  elements are added across all  $k$  iterations.

This is true in iteration 1 because some  $T_{1,i}$  is  $M$ -cheap and thus any element of  $T_{1,i}$  is in  $F_1$  and can be added. Assume this is inductively true in iteration  $l$ , i.e.  $i$  is added to  $S_l$  in iteration  $l$  because  $i$  is in some  $M$ -cheap  $T_{l,i'}$ . Since  $T_{l,i'}$  is  $M$ -cheap, no element of  $T_{l,i'}$  is deleted from  $F_l$ . Then in iteration  $l+1$ , for all  $i''$  in  $T_{l,i'} \setminus S_l$  (a set of size  $k-l$ , i.e. non-empty),  $T_{l+1,i''}$  can be initialized to  $T_{l,i'}$ . Then all such  $i''$  can be added to  $S_{l+1}$  because all such  $i''$  satisfy that  $T_{l+1,i''}$  is  $M$ -cheap and thus are in  $F_{l+1}$ . By induction, in all iterations, there is some  $i$  that can be added to  $S_l$ , giving the Lemma.  $\square$

Then, the following lemma asserts that GREEDYMAX is indeed performing greedy submodular maximization over some 1-system.

**Lemma 26.** *Fix any run of GREEDYMAX. Consider the values of  $S_l, T_{l,i}, F_l$  for all  $l, i$  (defined as in Figure 3) at the end of this run. Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the set containing  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  for each  $l, i \notin F_l, i \notin S_{l-1}$ . Let  $(F, \mathcal{S})$  be the independence system for which the set of maximal independent sets  $\mathcal{S}_{max}$  consists of all size  $k$  subsets  $S$  of  $F$  such that no subset of  $S$  is in  $\mathcal{B}$ , and  $S$  is  $M$ -cheap. Then the following properties hold:*

1. *For any  $l$  and any  $i \notin F_l$ ,  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  is not in  $\mathcal{S}$*
2. *For any  $l$  and any  $i \in F_l$ ,  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$*
3.  *$(F, \mathcal{S})$  is a 1-system*

*Proof.* **Property 1:** This property is immediate from the definition of  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Property 2:** Fix any  $l, i \in F_l$ . We want to show that  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$ . Since  $i \in F_l$ , there exists some  $T_{l,i'}$  such that  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  is a subset of  $T_{l,i'}$  and  $T_{l,i'}$  is  $M$ -cheap (otherwise,  $i$  would have been deleted from  $F_l$ ). If we can show  $T_{l,i'}$  is in  $\mathcal{S}_{max}$  then we immediately get that  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Suppose not. Since  $T_{l,i'}$  is  $M$ -cheap, this must be because some subset of  $T_{l,i'}$  is of the form  $S_{l'-1} \cup \{i''\}$  for  $i'' \notin F_{l'}, i'' \notin S_{l'-1}$ . In particular, consider the smallest value  $l'$  for which this is true, i.e. let  $l'$  be the iteration in which  $i''$  was deleted from  $F_{l'}$ .

If  $l' < l$ , since  $i''$  was deleted from  $F_{l'}$ ,  $i''$  cannot appear in any  $M$ -cheap solution containing  $S_{l'-1}$  generated by the incremental  $k$ -median approximation algorithm before the end of iteration  $l'$  (otherwise,  $T_{l',i''}$  could be initialized to this solution, preventing  $i''$  from being deleted). Since  $i''$  is not in  $F_{l'}$  (and thus not in  $F_{l'+1} \dots F_l$ ), in iterations  $l'+1$  to  $l$  the approximation algorithm is not allowed to use  $i''$ . So no  $M$ -cheap solution is ever generated by the approximation algorithm which is a superset of  $S_{l'-1} \cup \{i''\}$ . But  $T_{l,i'}$  is a  $M$ -cheap superset of  $S_{l'-1} \cup \{i''\}$  which must have been generated by the approximation algorithm at some point, a contradiction.

Thus we can assume  $l' \geq l$ . However, recall that  $T_{l,i'}$  is an  $M$ -cheap solution containing  $S_{l'} \cup \{i''\}$ . If  $l' = l$ , this prevents  $i''$  from being deleted in iteration  $l'$ , giving a contradiction. If  $l' > l$  then  $T_{l',i''}$  can be initialized to a  $M$ -cheap superset of  $S_{l'} \cup \{i''\}$ , since  $T_{l,i'}$  is such a superset. This also prevents  $i''$  from being deleted in iteration  $l''$ , giving a contradiction.

In all cases assuming  $T_{l,i'}$  is not in  $\mathcal{S}_{max}$  leads to a contradiction, so  $T_{l,i'}$  is in  $\mathcal{S}_{max}$  and thus  $S_{l-1} \cup \{i\}$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Property 3:**  $\mathcal{S}$  is defined so that all maximal independent sets are of size  $k$ , giving the property.  $\square$

**Corollary 27.** *Any run of GREEDYMAX outputs an  $M$ -cheap,  $\frac{1}{2}$ -maximizer of  $f_y(S)$  over the system  $(F, \mathcal{S})$  as defined in Lemma 26.*

*Proof.* Properties 1 and 2 in Lemma 26 imply that at each step, GREEDYMAX adds the element to its current solution that maximizes the objective  $f_y(S)$  while maintaining that the current solution is in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Thus GREEDYMAX is exactly the greedy algorithm in Theorem 23 for maximizing a monotone submodular objective over an independence system. By Lemma 25, GREEDYMAX always finds a maximal independent set, and the definition of  $\mathcal{S}$  guarantees that this maximal independent set is  $M$ -cheap. Lemma 7 gives that  $f_y(S)$  is a monotone submodular function of  $S$ . Then, Property 3 combined with Theorem 23 implies the solution output by GREEDYMAX is a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -maximizer.  $\square$

Of course, maximizing over an arbitrary 1-system is of little use. In particular, we would like to show that the 1-system Lemma 26 shows we are maximizing over approximates the 1-system of subsets of solutions whose cost on the fixed clients is at most  $M$ . The next lemma shows that while all such solutions may not be in this 1-system, all solutions that are  $\frac{M}{\gamma}$ -cheap are.

**Lemma 28.** *In any run of GREEDYMAX, let  $\mathcal{S}$  be defined as in Lemma 26. For the value  $M$  passed to GREEDYMAX in this run and any solution  $S$  which is  $\frac{M}{\gamma}$ -cheap,  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix any such  $S$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be defined as in Lemma 26. For any element  $B$  of  $\mathcal{B}$ , it must be the case that running a  $\gamma$ -approximation on the incremental  $k$ -median instance with existing cluster centers  $B$  produced a solution with cost greater than  $M$ . This implies that for any  $B$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ , the incremental  $k$ -median instance with existing cluster centers  $B$  has optimal solution with cost greater than  $\frac{M}{\gamma}$ . However, for any subset  $S'$  of  $S$ , the optimal solution to the incremental  $k$ -median instance with existing cluster centers  $S'$  has cost at most  $\frac{M}{\gamma}$  since  $S$  is a feasible solution to this instance which is  $\frac{M}{\gamma}$ -cheap. Thus no subset of  $S$  is in  $\mathcal{B}$ , and hence  $S$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$ .  $\square$

Lastly, we show that SEPORACLE never incorrectly outputs that a point is infeasible, i.e., that the region SEPORACLE considers feasible strictly contains the region that is actually feasible in the universal  $k$ -median LP.

**Lemma 29.** *If  $x, y, r$  is feasible for the universal  $k$ -median LP, SEPORACLE outputs “Feasible”.*

*Proof.* SEPORACLE can exactly check all constraints besides the regret constraint set, so assume that if SEPORACLE outputs that  $x, y, r$  is not feasible, it outputs that  $\sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C') \leq M - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} + r$  is violated for some  $M, S$ . In particular, it only outputs that this constraint is violated if it actually is violated. If this constraint is violated, then since by Corollary 27  $S$  is  $M$ -cheap:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} - S(C') &> M - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} + r \\ \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} + \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} &> S(C') + M + r \\ \sum_{j \in C' \cup C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij} &> S(C') + M + r \\ &\geq S(C') + S(C_f) + r = S(C' \cup C_f) + r \geq \text{OPT}(C' \cup C_f) + r \end{aligned}$$

Which implies the point  $x, y, r$  is not feasible for the universal  $k$ -median LP.  $\square$

We now have all the tools to prove our overall claim:

**Lemma 30.** *If there exists a deterministic polynomial-time  $\gamma$ -approximation algorithm for the  $k$ -median problem, then for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a deterministic algorithm that outputs a  $(2\gamma(1 + \varepsilon), 2)$ -approximate fractional solution to the universal  $k$ -median problem in polynomial time.*

*Proof.* We use the ellipsoid method where SEPORACLE is used as the separation oracle. By Lemma 29 since the minimum regret solution is a feasible solution to the universal  $k$ -median LP, it is also considered feasible by SEPORACLE. Then, the solution  $x^*, y^*, r^*$  output by the ellipsoid method satisfies  $r^* \leq \text{MR}$ .

Suppose the ellipsoid method outputs  $x^*, y^*, r^*$  such that  $x^*, y^*$  are not a  $(2\gamma(1 + \varepsilon), 2)$ -approximate solution. This means there exists  $S, C_f \subseteq C' \subseteq C$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij}^* &> 2\gamma(1 + \varepsilon)S(C') + 2 \cdot \text{MR} \\ \sum_{j \in C' \setminus C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij}^* - S(C' \setminus C_f) &> 2\gamma(1 + \varepsilon)S(C_f) + (2\gamma(1 + \varepsilon) - 1)S(C' \setminus C_f) - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij}^* + 2 \cdot \text{MR} \\ &\geq 2 \left[ \gamma(1 + \varepsilon)S(C_f) - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij}^* + \text{MR} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for the value of  $M$  in the set  $\{0, 1, 1 + \varepsilon, (1 + \varepsilon)^2, \dots, (1 + \varepsilon)^{\lceil \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\gamma|C_f| \max_{i,j} c_{ij}) \rceil + 1}\}$  contained in the interval  $[\gamma S(C_f), \gamma(1 + \varepsilon)S(C_f)]$ , we have

$$\sum_{j \in C' \setminus C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij}^* - S(C' \setminus C_f) \geq 2 \left[ M - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij}^* + \text{MR} \right] \geq 2 \left[ M - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij}^* + r^* \right], \text{ since } r^* \leq \text{MR}.$$

Then, consider the iteration in SEPORACLE where it runs GREEDYMAX for this value of  $M$ . Since  $M \geq \gamma S(C_f)$ ,  $S$  is  $\frac{M}{\gamma}$ -cheap. Thus by Lemma 28,  $S$  is part of the independence system  $\mathcal{S}$  specified in Lemma 26 which GREEDYMAX finds a maximizer for in this iteration, and thus the maximum of the objective in this independence system is at least  $2[M - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij}^* + r^*]$ . By Corollary 27, SEPORACLE thus finds some  $S', C'' \subseteq C \setminus C_f$  such that  $S'$  is  $M$ -cheap and for which  $\sum_{j \in C''} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij}^* - S'(C'')$  is at least  $M - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij} y_{ij}^* + r^*$ . But this means SEPORACLE will output that  $x^*, y^*, r^*$  is infeasible, which means the ellipsoid algorithm cannot output this solution, a contradiction.  $\square$

### 5.3 Rounding the Fractional Solution for Universal $k$ -Median with Fixed Clients

*Proof of Theorem 21.* The algorithm is as follows: Use the algorithm of Lemma 30 with error parameter  $\frac{\varepsilon}{54\gamma}$  to find a  $(2\gamma(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{54\gamma}), 2)$ -approximate fractional solution. Let  $f_j$  be the connection cost of this fractional solution for client  $j$ . Construct a  $k$ -median with discounts instance with the same clients  $C$  and cluster centers  $F$  where client  $j$  has discount 0 if it was originally a fixed client, and discount  $3f_j$  if it was originally a unfixed client. The solution to this instance given by Lemma 6 is the solution for the universal  $k$ -median instance.

Again using the integrality gap upper bound of 3 for  $k$ -median, we have:

$$\text{MR} = \max_{C'} [\text{MRS}(C') - \text{OPT}(C')] \geq \max_{C'} \left[ \text{MRS}(C') - 3 \sum_{j \in C'} f_j \right] = \sum_{j \in C_f} (m_j - 3f_j) + \sum_{j \in C \setminus C_f} (m_j - 3f_j)^+. \quad (13)$$

The cost of the minimum regret solution in the  $k$ -median with discounts instance is given by:

$$\sum_{j \in C_f} m_j + \sum_{j \in C \setminus C_f} (m_j - 3f_j)^+ = \sum_{j \in C_f} 3f_j + \sum_{j \in C_f} (m_j - 3f_j) + \sum_{j \in C \setminus C_f} (m_j - 3f_j)^+ \leq \sum_{j \in C_f} 3f_j + \text{MR}, \text{ by Eq. (13)}. \quad (14)$$

Let  $c_j$  be the connection cost of the algorithm's solution for client  $j$ . Lemma 6 and Eq. (14) give:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in C_f} c_j + \sum_{j \in C \setminus C_f} (c_j - 9 \cdot 3f_j)^+ &\leq 6 \left[ \sum_{j \in C_f} 3f_j + \text{MR} \right] \\ \sum_{j \in C_f} c_j + \sum_{j \in C \setminus C_f} (c_j - 27f_j)^+ &\leq \sum_{j \in C_f} 18f_j + 6 \cdot \text{MR} \quad (15) \\ \implies \max_{C'} \left[ \sum_{j \in C'} c_j - 27 \sum_{j \in C'} f_j \right] &= \sum_{j \in C_f} (c_j - 27f_j) + \sum_{j \in C \setminus C_f} (c_j - 27f_j)^+ \leq 6 \cdot \text{MR}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 30 then gives that for any valid  $C'$ :

$$\text{FRAC}(C') = \sum_{j \in C'} f_j \leq 2\gamma \left( 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{54\gamma} \right) \cdot \text{OPT}(C') + 2 \cdot \text{MR}. \quad (16)$$

Using Eq. (15) and (16), we can then conclude that

$$\forall C_f \subseteq C' \subseteq C : \sum_{j \in C'} c_j \leq 27 \sum_{j \in C'} f_j + 6 \cdot \text{MR} \leq (54\gamma + \varepsilon) \cdot \text{OPT}(C') + 60 \cdot \text{MR}. \quad \square$$

## 6 Universal $\ell_p$ -Clustering with Fixed Clients

In this section, we give the following theorem:

**Theorem 31.** *For all  $p \geq 1$ , if there exists a  $\gamma$ -approximation for  $\ell_p$ -clustering, then for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a  $(54p\gamma \cdot 2^{1/p} + \varepsilon, 108p^2 + 6p^{1/p} + \varepsilon)$ -approximate universal algorithm for  $\ell_p$ -clustering with fixed clients.*

In particular, we get from known results [1, 30]:

- A  $(162p^2 \cdot 2^{1/p} + \varepsilon, 108p^2 + 18p^{1/p} + \varepsilon)$ -approximate universal algorithm for  $\ell_p$ -clustering with fixed clients for all  $\varepsilon > 0, p \geq 1$ .
- A (459, 458)-approximate universal algorithm for  $k$ -means with fixed clients.

The algorithm for universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering with fixed clients follows by combining techniques from  $\ell_p$ -clustering and  $k$ -median with fixed clients.

### 6.1 Finding a Fractional Solution

We reuse the subroutine GREEDYMAX to do submodular maximization over an independence system whose bases are  $M$ -cheap solutions (that is, solutions with  $\ell_p$ -objective at most  $M$  on only the fixed clients), and use the submodular function  $f_{y,Y}$  with varying choices of  $Y$  as we did for  $\ell_p$ -clustering. We can extend Lemma 14 as follows:

**Lemma 32.** *For any two solutions  $y, S$ , if the global maximum of  $\text{FRAC}_p(\mathbf{I}) - S_p(\mathbf{I})$  over  $1^{C_f} \times [0, 1]^{C \setminus C_f}$  is positive, then there is a maximizer that is in  $1^{C_f} \times \{0, 1\}^{C \setminus C_f}$ , i.e.*

$$\max_{\mathbf{I} \in 1^{C_f} \times [0, 1]^{C \setminus C_f}} [\text{FRAC}_p(\mathbf{I}) - S_p(\mathbf{I})] = \max_{C_s \subseteq C' \subseteq C} [\text{FRAC}_p(C') - S_p(C')].$$

The proof follows exactly the same way as Lemma 14. In that proof, the property we use of having no fixed clients is that if the global maximum is not the all zeroes vector, then it is positive and so  $\text{FRAC}_p(\mathbf{I}) > S_p(\mathbf{I})$ . In the statement of Lemma 32, we just assume positivity instead. This shows that it is still fine to output separating hyperplanes based on fractional realizations of clients in the presence of fixed clients. The only time it is maybe not fine is in a fractional realization where if the “regret” of  $\text{FRAC}$  is negative, but in this case we will not output a separating hyperplane anyway.

**FIXED- $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE** $((x, y, r), F, C_f, C)$ :

**Input:** A fractional solution  $x, y, r$ , set of cluster centers  $F$ , set of fixed clients  $C_f$ , set of all clients  $C$

- 1: **if** Any constraint in the universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering LP except the regret constraint set is violated **then** **return** the violated constraint
- 2: **end if**
- 3:  $T_0 \leftarrow$  output of  $\gamma$ -approximation algorithm  $A$  for  $\ell_p$ -clustering run on instance with cluster centers  $F$ , clients  $C_f$
- 4:  $c_{\min} \leftarrow \min_{i \in F, j \in C \setminus C_f} c_{ij}^p, c_{\max} \leftarrow \sum_{j \in C \setminus C_f} \max_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p$
- 5:  $Y_f \leftarrow \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij}$
- 6: **for**  $M \in \{0, 1, 1 + \varepsilon, (1 + \varepsilon)^2, \dots, (1 + \varepsilon)^{\lceil \log_{1+\varepsilon}(\gamma |C_f|^{1/p} \max_{i,j} c_{ij}) \rceil + 1}\}$  such that  $T_0$  is  $M$ -cheap **do**
- 7:     **for**  $Y \in \{0, c_{\min}, c_{\min}(1 + \varepsilon'), c_{\min}(1 + \varepsilon')^2, \dots, c_{\min}(1 + \varepsilon')^{\lceil \log_{1+\varepsilon'} c_{\max}/c_{\min} \rceil}\}$  **do**
- 8:          $S' \leftarrow \text{GREEDYMAX}((x, y, r), F, C_f, C, M, T_0, f_{y,Y})$
- 9:          $\mathbf{I}' \leftarrow \text{argmax}_{\mathbf{I} \in [0,1]^{C \setminus C_f} : \sum_{j \in C \setminus C_f} d_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} \leq Y} \sum_{j \in C \setminus C_f} d_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - \sum_{j \in C \setminus C_f} d_j \min_{i \in S} c_{ij}^p$
- 10:         **if**  $\frac{1}{p(Y_f + Y)^{1-1/p}} \left[ \sum_{j \in C} d'_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - \sum_{j \in C} d'_j \min_{i \in S} c_{ij}^p \right] > r$  **then**
- 11:             **return**  $\frac{1}{p(Y_f + Y)^{1-1/p}} \left[ \sum_{j \in C} d'_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - \sum_{j \in C} d'_j \min_{i \in S} c_{ij}^p \right] \leq r$
- 12:         **end if**
- 13:     **end for**
- 14: **end for**
- 15: **return** “Feasible”

Figure 5: Approximate Separation Oracle for Universal  $\ell_p$ -Clustering with Fixed Clients.  $\text{GREEDYMAX}$  is the same algorithm as presented in Figure 3 for  $k$ -median.

**Lemma 33.** *If there exists a  $\gamma$ -approximation for  $\ell_p$ -clustering, then for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\alpha = 2^{1/p} \gamma(1 + \varepsilon)$ ,  $\beta = 2p(1 + \varepsilon)$  there exists an algorithm that outputs an  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate universal fractional solution for  $\ell_p$ -clustering with fixed clients.*

*Proof.* If  $\text{FIXED-}\ell_p\text{-SEPORACLE}$  ever outputs an inequality in the regret constraint set, for the corresponding  $Y_f, Y, \mathbf{I}', S$ , let  $\text{FRAC}_p^q(\mathbf{I}), \text{SOL}_p^q(\mathbf{I})$  denote the  $\ell_p^q$  costs of the fractional solution and  $S$  as before. Then we have by definition of  $Y_f$  and the constraint that  $\sum_{j \in C} d_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} \leq Y$ :

$$r < \frac{1}{p(Y_f + Y)^{1-1/p}} \left[ \sum_{j \in C} d'_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - \sum_{j \in C} d'_j \min_{i \in S} c_{ij}^p \right] \leq$$

$$\frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \text{FRAC}_p^j(\mathbf{I}') \text{SOL}_p^{p-1-j}(\mathbf{I}')} \left[ \text{FRAC}_p^p(\mathbf{I}') - \text{SOL}_p^p(\mathbf{I}') \right] = \text{FRAC}_p(\mathbf{I}') - \text{SOL}_p(\mathbf{I}').$$

The second inequality uses that FIXED- $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE only outputs an inequality in the regret constraint set such that  $\text{FRAC}_p(\mathbf{I}') > \text{SOL}_p(\mathbf{I}')$ . We then have by Lemma 32 that for any feasible fractional solution, the inequality output by FIXED- $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE is satisfied.

Now, suppose there exists some  $\mathbf{I}, \text{SOL}$  such that  $\text{FRAC}_p(\mathbf{I}) > \alpha \text{SOL}_p(\mathbf{I}) + \beta r$  (for  $r \geq 0$ ). Consider the values of  $Y, M$  iterated over by FIXED- $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE such that  $\sum_{j \in C \setminus C_f} d_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} \leq Y \leq (1 + \varepsilon)(\sum_{j \in C \setminus C_f} d_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij})$  and  $\gamma \text{SOL}_p(C_f) \leq M \leq \gamma(1 + \varepsilon) \text{SOL}_p(C_f)$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} \right)^{1/p} > \alpha \text{SOL}_p(C') + \beta r \\ & \left( \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} \right)^{1/p} - \alpha \text{SOL}_p(C') > \beta r \\ & \frac{\sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - \alpha^p \text{SOL}_p^p(C')}{\left( \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} \right)^{1-1/p}} > \beta r \tag{i} \\ & \frac{(1 + \varepsilon) \left( \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - \alpha^p \text{SOL}_p^p(C') \right)}{(Y_f + Y)^{1-1/p}} > \beta r \tag{ii} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - \alpha^p \text{SOL}_p^p(C') > \frac{\beta r (Y_f + Y)^{1-1/p}}{1 + \varepsilon} \\ & \sum_{j \in C' \setminus C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - \alpha^p \text{SOL}_p^p(C' \setminus C_f) > \frac{\beta r (Y_f + Y)^{1-1/p}}{1 + \varepsilon} + \alpha^p \text{SOL}_p^p(C_f) - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} \\ & \sum_{j \in C' \setminus C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - \alpha^p \text{SOL}_p^p(C' \setminus C_f) > \frac{\beta r (Y_f + Y)^{1-1/p}}{1 + \varepsilon} + \alpha^p \left( \frac{M}{\gamma(1 + \varepsilon)} \right)^p - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij}. \tag{iii} \end{aligned}$$

(i) follows from the fact that  $\text{SOL}_p(C') > \sum_{j \in C'} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij}$  if  $a > b$ . (ii) follows from definitions of  $Y_f, Y$ . (iii) follows from the choice of  $M$ . Let  $\mathbf{I}'_{C'}$  denote the vector whose  $j$ th element is  $\mathbf{I}'_j$  if  $j \in C'$  and 0 otherwise. By the analysis in Section 21, since SOL is  $M/\gamma$ -cheap it is in the independence system that GREEDYMAX finds a  $1/2$ -maximizer for. That is, GREEDYMAX outputs some  $S$  and FIXED- $\ell_p$ -ORACLE finds some  $\mathbf{I}'$  such that  $S$  is  $M$ -cheap,  $\sum_{j \in C \setminus C_f} d_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} \leq Y$ , and such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j \in C' \setminus C_f} d'_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - \alpha^p S_p^p(\mathbf{I}'_{C' \setminus C_f}) &> \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\beta r (Y_f + Y)^{1-1/p}}{1 + \varepsilon} + \alpha^p \left( \frac{M}{\gamma(1 + \varepsilon)} \right)^p - \sum_{j \in C_f} \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} \right] \\
\sum_{j \in C' \setminus C_f} d'_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - S_p^p(\mathbf{I}'_{C' \setminus C_f}) &> \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\beta r (Y_f + Y)^{1-1/p}}{1 + \varepsilon} + \alpha^p \left( \frac{S_p(C_f)}{\gamma(1 + \varepsilon)} \right)^p \right] - \sum_{j \in C_f} d'_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} \quad (iv) \\
\sum_{j \in C' \setminus C_f} d'_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - S_p^p(\mathbf{I}'_{C' \setminus C_f}) &> \frac{\beta r (Y_f + Y)^{1-1/p}}{2(1 + \varepsilon)} + S_p^p(C_f) - \sum_{j \in C_f} d'_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} \quad (v) \\
\sum_{j \in C'} d'_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - S_p^p(\mathbf{I}') &> \frac{\beta r (Y_f + Y)^{1-1/p}}{2(1 + \varepsilon)} \\
\frac{\sum_{j \in C'} d'_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - S_p^p(\mathbf{I}')}{p(Y_f + Y)^{1-1/p}} &> \frac{\beta r}{2p(1 + \varepsilon)} \\
\frac{\sum_{j \in C'} d'_j \sum_{i \in F} c_{ij}^p y_{ij} - S_p^p(\mathbf{I}')}{p(Y_f + Y)^{1-1/p}} &> r. \quad (vi)
\end{aligned}$$

(iv) follows the  $M$ -cheapness of  $S$ . (v) follows from the choice of  $\alpha$ . (vi) follows from the choice of  $\beta$ . So, FIXED- $\ell_p$ -SEPORACLE outputs an inequality as desired.  $\square$

## 6.2 Rounding the Fractional Solution

Again, we show how to generalize the approach for rounding fractional solutions for  $k$ -median with fixed clients to round fractional solutions for  $\ell_p$  clustering with fixed clients. We extend Lemma 17 as follows:

**Lemma 34.** *Suppose ALG and SOL are two (possibly virtual) solutions to an  $\ell_p$ -clustering instance with fixed clients  $C_f$ , such that there is a subset of clients  $C^* \subset (C \setminus C_f)$  such that for every client in  $C^*$  ALG's connection cost is greater than  $p$  times SOL's connection cost, and for every client in  $C \setminus C_f \setminus C^*$ , SOL's connection cost is at least ALG's connection cost. Then*

$$f(C') := \begin{cases} \frac{\text{ALG}_p^p(C') - \text{SOL}_p^p(C')}{\text{ALG}_p^{p-1}(C')} & \text{ALG}_p^p(C') > 0 \\ 0 & \text{ALG}_p^p(C') = 0 \end{cases}$$

is maximized by  $C_f \cup C^*$ .

The proof follows exactly as that of Lemma 17.

**Lemma 35.** *There exists an algorithm that given any  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate universal fractional solution for  $\ell_p$ -clustering with fixed clients, outputs a  $(54p\alpha, 54p\beta + 18p^{1/p})$ -approximate universal integral solution.*

*Proof.* Let SOL be the virtual solution whose connection costs are 3 times the fractional solution's for all clients. The algorithm is to solve the  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts instance using Lemma 13 where the discounts are 0 for fixed clients and 2 times SOL's connection costs for the remaining clients. Note that using these discounts, the  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts objective equals  $\max_{C_f \subseteq C' \subseteq C} [\text{ALG}_p^p(C') - 2^p \cdot \text{SOL}_p^p(C' \setminus C_f)]$  instead of  $\max_{C_f \subseteq C' \subseteq C} [\text{ALG}_p^p(C') - 2^p \cdot \text{SOL}_p^p(C')]$ . Let ALG be the output solution. We will again bound ALG's cost against the virtual solution  $\widetilde{\text{SOL}}$  whose connection costs are SOL's connection costs times  $p$  for



non-fixed clients  $j$  such that ALG's connection cost to  $j$  is at least 18 times SOL's but less than  $18p$  times  $18 \cdot \text{SOL}$ 's, and the same as SOL's for the remaining clients.

We use  $\max_{C'}$  to denote  $\max_{C_f \subseteq C' \subseteq C}$ . If  $\max_{C'} [\text{ALG}_p(C') - 18\widetilde{\text{SOL}}(C')] \leq 0$  then ALG's cost is always bounded by 18 times  $\widetilde{\text{SOL}}$ 's cost and we are done. So assume  $\max_{C'} [\text{ALG}_p(C') - 18\widetilde{\text{SOL}}_p(C')] > 0$ . Let  $C_1 = \text{argmax}_{C'} [\text{ALG}_p(C') - 18\widetilde{\text{SOL}}_p(C')]$  and  $C_2 = \text{argmax}_{C'} [\text{MRS}_p^p(C') - 2^p \cdot \text{SOL}_p^p(C')]$ . Like in the proof of Lemma 18, via Lemma 34 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{C'} [\text{ALG}_p(C') - 18\widetilde{\text{SOL}}_p(C')] &= \frac{\max_{C'} [\text{ALG}_p^p(C') - 18^p \text{SOL}_p^p(C')]}{\text{ALG}_p^{p-1}(C_1)} = \\ &\frac{\max_{C'} [\text{ALG}_p^p(C') - 18^p \text{SOL}_p^p(C' \setminus C_f)] - 18^p \text{SOL}_p^p(C_f)}{\text{ALG}_p^{p-1}(C_1)} \leq \\ &\frac{2}{3} \cdot 9^p \frac{\max_{C'} [\text{MRS}_p^p(C') - 2^p \text{SOL}_p^p(C' \setminus C_f)] - 18^p \text{SOL}_p^p(C_f)}{\text{ALG}_p^{p-1}(C_1)} \leq \\ &\frac{2}{3} \cdot 9^p \frac{\max_{C'} [\text{MRS}_p^p(C') - 2^p \text{SOL}_p^p(C')]}{\text{ALG}_p^{p-1}(C_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the same analysis as in Lemma 18 we can upper bound this final quantity by  $18p^{1/p} \cdot \text{MR}$ , proving the lemma.  $\square$

Theorem 31 follows from Lemmas 33 and 35.

## 7 Universal $k$ -Center with Fixed Clients

In this section, we discuss how to extend the proof of Theorem 19 to prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 36.** *There exists a  $(9,3)$ -approximate algorithm for universal  $k$ -center with fixed clients.*

*Proof.* To extend the proof of Theorem 19 to the case where fixed clients are present, let  $\text{APX}(C')$  denote the cost of a 3-approximation to the  $k$ -center problem with client set  $C'$ ; it is well known how to compute  $\text{APX}(C')$  in polynomial time [33]. A solution with regret  $r$  must be within distance  $r_j := \text{APX}(C_s \cup \{j\}) + r$  of client  $j$ , otherwise in realization  $C_s \cup \{j\}$  the solution has regret larger than  $r$  due to client  $j$ . The same algorithm as in the proof of Theorem 19 using this definition of  $r_j$  finds ALG within distance  $3r_j = 3 \cdot \text{APX}(C_s \cup \{j\}) + 3 \cdot \text{MR} \leq 9 \cdot \text{OPT}(C_s \cup \{j\}) + 3\text{MR}$  of client  $j$ .  $\text{OPT}(C') \geq \text{OPT}(C_s \cup \{j\})$  for any realization  $C'$  and any client  $j \in C'$ , so this solution is a  $(9,3)$ -approximation.  $\square$

## 8 Hardness of Universal Clustering for General Metrics

In this section we give some hardness results to help contextualize the algorithmic results. Much like the hardness results for  $k$ -median, all our reductions are based on the NP-hardness of approximating set cover (or equivalently, dominating set) due to the natural relation between the two types of problems. We state our hardness results in terms of  $\ell_p$ -clustering. Setting  $p = 1$  gives hardness results for  $k$ -median, and setting  $p = \infty$  (and using the convention  $1/\infty = 0$  in the proofs as needed) gives hardness results for  $k$ -center.

## 8.1 Hardness of Approximating $\alpha$

**Theorem 37.** *For all  $p \geq 1$ , finding an  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate solution for universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering where  $\alpha < 3$  is NP-hard.*

*Proof.* We will show that given a deterministic  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate algorithm where  $\alpha < 3$ , we can design an algorithm (using the  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate algorithm as a subroutine) that solves the set cover problem (i.e. finds a set cover of size  $k$  if one exists) giving the lemma by NP-hardness of set cover. The algorithm is as follows: Given an instance of set cover, construct the following instance of universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering:

- For each element, there is a corresponding client in the universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering instance.
- For each set  $S$ , there is a cluster center which is distance 1 from the clients corresponding to elements in  $S$  and 3 from other all clients.

Then, we just run the universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering algorithm on this instance, and output the sets corresponding to cluster centers this algorithm buys.

Assume for the rest of the proof that a set cover of size  $k$  exists. Then the corresponding  $k$  cluster centers are as close as possible to every client, and are always an optimal solution. This gives that  $\text{MR} = 0$  for this universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering instance.

Now, suppose by contradiction that this algorithm does not solve the set cover problem. That is, for some set cover instance we run an  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate algorithm where  $\alpha < 3$  on the produced  $\ell_p$ -clustering instance, and it produces a solution  $\text{ALG}$  that does not choose cluster centers corresponding to a set cover. This means it is distance 3 from some client  $j$ . For realization  $C' = \{j\}$ , we have by the definition of  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximation:

$$\text{ALG}(C') \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(C') + \beta \cdot \text{MR} \implies 3 \leq \alpha \cdot 1 + \beta \cdot 0 = \alpha$$

Which is a contradiction, giving the lemma. □

Note that for e.g.  $k$ -median, we can classically get an approximation ratio of less than 3. So this theorem shows that the universal version of the problem is harder, even if we are willing to use arbitrary large  $\beta$ .

## 8.2 Hardness of Approximating $\beta$

We give the following result on the hardness of universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering.

**Theorem 38.** *For all  $p \geq 1$ , finding an  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate solution for universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering where  $\beta < 2$  is NP-hard.*

*Proof.* We will show that given a deterministic  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate algorithm where  $\beta < 2$ , we can design an algorithm (using the  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate algorithm as a subroutine) that solves the dominating set problem (i.e. outputs at most  $k$  vertices which are a dominating set of size  $k$  if a dominating set of size  $k$  exists) giving the lemma by NP-hardness of dominating set. The algorithm is as follows: Given an instance of dominating set  $G = (V, E)$ , construct the following instance of universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering:

- For each vertex  $v \in V$ , there is a corresponding  $k$ -clique of clients in the universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering instance.
- For each  $(u, v) \in E$ , connect all clients in  $u$ 's corresponding clique to all those in  $v$ 's.

- Impose the shortest path metric on the clients, where all edges are length 1.

Then, we just run the universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering algorithm on this instance, and output the set of vertices corresponding to cluster centers this algorithm buys.

Assume for the rest of the proof that a dominating set of size  $k$  exists in the dominating set instance. Then, a dominating set of size  $k$  also exists in the constructed universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering instance (where the cliques this set resides in correspond to the vertices in the dominating set in the original instance). Thus, there is a solution to the universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering instance that covers all clients at distance at most 1.

We will first show this dominating set solution is a minimum regret solution. Given a dominating set solution, note that in any realization of the demands, OPT can cover  $k$  locations at distance 0, and must cover the rest of the clients at distance at least 1. Thus, to maximize the regret of a dominating set solution, we pick any  $k$  clients covered at distance 1 by the dominating set, and choose the realization including only these clients.

Now, consider any solution which is not a dominating set. For such a solution, there is some  $k$ -clique covered at distance 2. We can make such a solution incur regret  $2k^{1/p}$  by including all  $k$  clients in this clique, with the optimal solution being to buy all cluster centers in this clique at cost 0. Thus, the dominating set solution is a minimum regret solution, and  $MR = k^{1/p}$ .

Now consider any  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximation algorithm and suppose this algorithm when run on the reduced dominating set instance does not produce a dominating set solution while one exists. Consider the realization  $C'$  including only the clients in some  $k$ -clique covered at distance 2. By definition of  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximation we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ALG}(C') &\leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(C') + \beta \cdot \text{MR} \\ 2k^{1/p} &\leq 0 + \beta k^{1/p} \\ 2 &\leq \beta \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

If  $\beta < 2$ , this is a contradiction, i.e. the algorithm will always output a dominating set of size  $k$  if one exists. Thus an  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximation algorithm where  $\beta < 2$  can be used to solve the dominating set problem, proving the theorem.  $\square$

## 9 Hardness of Universal Clustering for Euclidean Metrics

### 9.1 Hardness of Approximating $\alpha$

We can consider the special case of  $\ell_p$ -clustering where the cluster center and client locations are all points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and the metric is a  $\ell_q$ -norm in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . One might hope that e.g. for  $d = 2$ ,  $\alpha = 1 + \varepsilon$  is achievable since for the classic Euclidean  $k$ -median problem, a PTAS exists [5]. We show that there is still a lower bound on  $\alpha$  even for  $\ell_p$ -clustering in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

**Theorem 39.** *For all  $p \geq 1$ , finding an  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate solution for universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  using the  $\ell_q$ -norm where  $\alpha < \frac{1+\sqrt{7}}{2}$  for  $q = 2$  or  $\alpha < 2$  for  $q = 1, \infty$  is NP-hard.*

*Proof.* The hardness is via reduction from the discrete  $k$ -center problem in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Section 3 of [46] shows how to reduce an instance of planar 3-SAT (which is NP-hard) to an instance of Euclidean  $k$ -center in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  using the  $\ell_q$  norm as the metric such that:

- For every client, the distance to the nearest cluster center is 1.

- There exists a  $k$ -cluster center solution which is distance 1 from all clients if the planar 3-SAT instance is satisfiable, and none exists if the instance is unsatisfiable.
- Any solution that is strictly less than distance  $\alpha - \varepsilon$  away from all clients can be converted in polynomial time to a solution within distance 1 of all clients for  $\alpha = \frac{1+\sqrt{7}}{2}$  if  $q = 2$ ,  $\alpha = 2$  if  $q = 1, \infty$ .

We note that [46]’s reduction is actually to the “continuous” version of the problem where every point in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  can be chosen as a cluster center, including the points clients are located at. That is, if we use this reduction without modification then the first property is not actually true (since the minimum distance is 0). However, in the proof of correctness for this construction [46] shows that (both for the optimal solution and any algorithmic solution) it suffices to only consider cluster centers located at the centers of a set of  $\ell_p$  discs of radius 1 chosen such that every client lies on at least one of these discs and no client is contained within any of these discs. So, taking this reduction and then restricting the choice of cluster centers to the centers of these discs, we retrieve an instance with the desired properties.

Now, consider the corresponding instance as a universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering instance. Like in the proof of Theorem 37, if the planar 3-SAT instance reduced from is satisfiable, there exists a clustering solution that is as close as possible to every client, i.e. has regret 0. So  $\text{MR} = 0$ . Thus, an  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate clustering solution is within distance  $\alpha$  of every client (in the realization where only client  $j$  appears,  $\text{OPT}$  is 1 so an  $\alpha$ -approximate solution must be within distance  $\alpha$  of this client). In turn, using the properties of the reduced clustering instance, an  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximation where  $\alpha$  is less than the lower bound given in [46] can be converted into an algorithm that solves planar 3-SAT.  $\square$

## 9.2 Hardness of Approximating $\beta$

We can also show that  $\beta = 1$  is NP-hard in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  using a similar reduction:

**Theorem 40.** *For all  $p \geq 1$ , finding an  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximate solution for universal  $\ell_p$ -clustering in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  using the  $\ell_q$ -norm where  $\beta = 1$  for  $q = 1, 2, \infty$  is NP-hard.*

*Proof.* We again use a reduction from planar 3-SAT due to [46]. This time, we use the reductions in Section 4 of [46] for simplicity, which has the properties that:

- Every client is distance 0 from a co-located cluster center, and the distance to the second-closest cluster center is 1.
- There exists a  $k$ -cluster center solution which is distance 1 from all but  $k$  clients and distance 0 from  $k$  clients (the ones at the cluster centers) if the planar 3-SAT instance is satisfiable, and none exists if the instance is unsatisfiable.

Consider any instance reduced from a satisfiable planar 3-SAT instance. The solution in the resulting instance  $\text{SOL}^*$  with the second property above has regret  $k^{1/p}$  (and in fact, this is  $\text{MR}$ ): by the first property above, no solution can be less than distance 1 away from any clients other than the  $k$  clients co-located with its cluster centers. In turn, the regret of the  $\text{SOL}^*$  against any adversarial  $\text{SOL}$  is maximized by the realization  $C'$  only including the clients co-located with the  $k$  cluster centers in the  $\text{SOL}$ . We then get  $\text{SOL}^*(C') - \text{SOL}(C') = k^{1/p} - 0 = k^{1/p}$ .

Now consider an arbitrary  $(\alpha, 1)$ -approximate universal solution  $\text{ALG}$  in this instance. Consider any set of  $k$  clients  $C'$  not co-located with  $\text{ALG}$ ’s cluster centers.  $\text{OPT}(C') = 0$ , so we get  $\text{ALG}(C') \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(C') + \text{MR} = \text{MR} \leq k^{1/p}$ .  $\text{ALG}$  is distance at least 1 from all clients in  $C'$  by construction, so this only holds if  $\text{ALG}$

is distance 1 from all clients in  $C'$ . This gives that ALG is distance 1 from all but  $k$  clients (those co-located with cluster centers in ALG), and distance 0 from the remaining clients. In turn, ALG satisfies the property of a solution corresponding to a satisfying assignment to the planar 3-SAT instance. This shows that an  $(\alpha, 1)$ -approximate universal solution to  $\ell_p$ -clustering in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  can be used to solve planar 3-SAT.  $\square$

## 10 Future Directions

In this paper, we gave the first universal algorithms for clustering problems:  $k$ -median,  $k$ -means, and  $k$ -center (and their generalization to  $\ell_p$ -clustering). While we achieve constant approximation guarantees for these problems, the actual constants are orders of magnitude larger than the best (non-universal) approximations known for these problems. In part to ensure clarity of presentation, we did not attempt to optimize these constants. But it is unlikely that our techniques will lead to *small* constants for the  $k$ -median and  $k$ -means problems (although, interestingly, we got small constants for  $k$ -center). On the other hand, we show that in general it is **NP**-hard to find an  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximation algorithm for a universal clustering problem where  $\alpha$  matches the approximation factor for the standard clustering problem. Therefore, it is not entirely clear what one should expect: *are there universal algorithms for clustering with approximation factors of the same order as the classical (non-universal) bounds?*

One possible approach to improving the constants is considering algorithms that use more than  $k$  cluster centers. For example, our  $(9^p, \frac{2}{3} \cdot 9^p)$ -approximation for  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts can easily be improved to an  $(3^p, 3^p)$ -approximation if it is allowed to use  $2k - 1$  cluster centers. This immediately improves all constants in the paper. For example, our  $(27, 49)$ -approximation for universal  $k$ -median becomes a  $(9, 18)$ -approximation if it is allowed to use  $2k - 1$  cluster centers. Unfortunately, our lower bounds on  $\alpha, \beta$  apply even if the algorithm is allowed to use  $(1 - \varepsilon)k \ln n$  cluster centers, but it is an interesting problem to show that e.g. using  $(1 + \varepsilon)k \ln n$  cluster centers allows one to beat either bound.

Another open research direction pertains to Euclidean clustering. Here, we showed that in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for  $d \geq 2$ ,  $\alpha$  needs to be bounded away from 1, which is in stark contrast to non-universal clustering problems that admit PTASes in constant-dimension Euclidean space. But, for  $d = 1$ , i.e., for universal clustering on a line, the picture is not as clear. On a line, the lower bounds on  $\alpha$  are no longer valid, which brings forth the possibility of (non-bicriteria) approximations of regret. Indeed, it is known that there is 2-approximation for universal  $k$ -median on a line [38], and even better, an *optimal* algorithm for universal  $k$ -center on a line [7]. This raises the natural question: *can we design a PTAS for the universal  $k$ -median problem on a line?*

## References

- [1] S. Ahmadian, A. Norouzi-Fard, O. Svensson, and J. Ward. Better guarantees for  $k$ -means and Euclidean  $k$ -median by primal-dual algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computing*, pages 61–72, Oct. 2017.
- [2] N. Alon and Y. Azar. On-line steiner trees in the Euclidean plane. In *Proceedings of the 8th Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*, pages 337–343, 1992.
- [3] B. Anthony, V. Goyal, A. Gupta, and V. Nagarajan. A plant location guide for the unsure: Approximation algorithms for min-max location problems. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 35(1):79–101, Feb. 2010.
- [4] A. Archer, R. Rajagopalan, and D. B. Shmoys. Lagrangian relaxation for the  $k$ -median problem: New insights and continuity properties. In G. Di Battista and U. Zwick, editors, *Algorithms - ESA 2003*:

- 11th Annual European Symposium, Budapest, Hungary, September 16-19, 2003. Proceedings*, pages 31–42. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003.
- [5] S. Arora, P. Raghavan, and S. Rao. Approximation schemes for Euclidean k-medians and related problems. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '98, pages 106–113, New York, NY, USA, 1998. ACM.
- [6] V. Arya, N. Garg, R. Khandekar, A. Meyerson, K. Munagala, and V. Pandit. Local search heuristic for k-median and facility location problems. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '01, pages 21–29, New York, NY, USA, 2001. ACM.
- [7] I. Averbakh and O. Berman. Minimax regret p-center location on a network with demand uncertainty. *Location Science*, 5(4):247 – 254, 1997.
- [8] I. Averbakh and O. Berman. Minimax regret median location on a network under uncertainty. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 12(2):104–110, 2000.
- [9] D. Bertsimas and M. Grigni. Worst-case examples for the spacefilling curve heuristic for the Euclidean traveling salesman problem. *Operations Research Letter*, 8(5):241–244, Oct. 1989.
- [10] A. Bhargat, D. Chakrabarty, and S. Khanna. Optimal lower bounds for universal and differentially private Steiner trees and TSPs. In L. A. Goldberg, K. Jansen, R. Ravi, and J. D. P. Rolim, editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 75–86, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [11] S. Bhattacharya, P. Chalermsook, K. Mehlhorn, and A. Neumann. New approximability results for the robust k-median problem. In *Proceedings of the 14th Scandinavian Workshop on Algorithm Theory*, pages 51–60, July 1994.
- [12] C. Busch, C. Dutta, J. Radhakrishnan, R. Rajaraman, and S. Srivathsan. Split and join: Strong partitions and universal Steiner trees for graphs. In *53rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2012, New Brunswick, NJ, USA, October 20-23, 2012*, pages 81–90, 2012.
- [13] J. Byrka, F. Grandoni, T. Rothvoß, and L. Sanità. Steiner tree approximation via iterative randomized rounding. *J. ACM*, 60(1):6:1–6:33, 2013.
- [14] G. Calinescu, C. Chekuri, M. Pál, and J. Vondrák. Maximizing a monotone submodular function subject to a matroid constraint. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 40(6):1740–1766, Dec. 2011.
- [15] D. Chakrabarty and C. Swamy. Approximation algorithms for minimum norm and ordered optimization problems. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2019, page 126–137, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [16] M. Charikar, C. Chekuri, and M. Pál. Sampling bounds for stochastic optimization. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Workshop on Approximation, Randomization and Combinatorial Optimization Problems, and Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Randomization and Computation: Algorithms and Techniques*, APPROX'05/RANDOM'05, pages 257–269, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. Springer-Verlag.

- [17] M. Charikar, S. Guha, E. Tardos, and D. B. Shmoys. A constant-factor approximation algorithm for the k-median problem (extended abstract). In *Proceedings of the Thirty-first Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '99, pages 1–10, New York, NY, USA, 1999. ACM.
- [18] C. Chekuri. Routing and network design with robustness to changing or uncertain traffic demands. *SIGACT News*, 38(3):106–129, 2007.
- [19] K. Dhamdhere, V. Goyal, R. Ravi, and M. Singh. How to pay, come what may: Approximation algorithms for demand-robust covering problems. In *46th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2005), 23-25 October 2005, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, Proceedings*, pages 367–378, 2005.
- [20] U. Feige, K. Jain, M. Mahdian, and V. S. Mirrokni. Robust combinatorial optimization with exponential scenarios. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization, 12th International IPCO Conference, Ithaca, NY, USA, June 25-27, 2007, Proceedings*, pages 439–453, 2007.
- [21] T. F. Gonzalez. Clustering to minimize the maximum intercluster distance. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 38:293–306, 1985.
- [22] I. Gorodezky, R. D. Kleinberg, D. B. Shmoys, and G. Spencer. Improved lower bounds for the universal and a priori TSP. In M. Serna, R. Shaltiel, K. Jansen, and J. Rolim, editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 178–191, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [23] F. Grandoni, A. Gupta, S. Leonardi, P. Miettinen, P. Sankowski, and M. Singh. Set covering with our eyes closed. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, Oct. 2008.
- [24] M. Grötschel, L. Lovász, and A. Schrijver. The ellipsoid method and its consequences in combinatorial optimization. *Combinatorica*, 1(2):169–197, 1981.
- [25] S. Guha and K. Munagala. Exceeding expectations and clustering uncertain data. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems*, PODS '09, page 269–278, New York, NY, USA, 2009. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [26] A. Gupta, M. T. Hajiaghayi, and H. Räcke. Oblivious network design. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithm*, SODA '06, pages 970–979, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2006. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [27] A. Gupta, V. Nagarajan, and R. Ravi. Thresholded covering algorithms for robust and max-min optimization. *Math. Program.*, 146(1-2):583–615, 2014.
- [28] A. Gupta, V. Nagarajan, and R. Ravi. Robust and maxmin optimization under matroid and knapsack uncertainty sets. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 12(1):10:1–10:21, 2016.
- [29] A. Gupta, M. Pál, R. Ravi, and A. Sinha. Boosted sampling: Approximation algorithms for stochastic optimization. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '04, pages 417–426, New York, NY, USA, 2004. ACM.
- [30] A. Gupta and K. Tangwongsan. Simpler analyses of local search algorithms for facility location. *ArXiv*, abs/0809.2554, 2008.

- [31] M. T. Hajiaghayi, R. Kleinberg, and T. Leighton. Improved lower and upper bounds for universal TSP in planar metrics. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 649–658, 2006.
- [32] D. S. Hochbaum and D. B. Shmoys. A best possible heuristic for the k-center problem. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 10(2):180–184, May 1985.
- [33] D. S. Hochbaum and D. B. Shmoys. A unified approach to approximation algorithms for bottleneck problems. *J. ACM*, 33(3):533–550, May 1986.
- [34] K. Jain and V. V. Vazirani. Approximation algorithms for metric facility location and k-median problems using the primal-dual schema and lagrangian relaxation. *J. ACM*, 48(2):274–296, Mar. 2001.
- [35] L. Jia, G. Lin, G. Noubir, R. Rajaraman, and R. Sundaram. Universal algorithms for TSP, Steiner tree, and set cover. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2005.
- [36] L. Jia, G. Noubir, R. Rajaraman, and R. Sundaram. GIST: Group-independent spanning tree for data aggregation in dense sensor networks. In P. B. Gibbons, T. Abdelzaher, J. Aspnes, and R. Rao, editors, *Distributed Computing in Sensor Systems*, pages 282–304, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [37] T. Kanungo, D. M. Mount, N. S. Netanyahu, C. D. Piatko, R. Silverman, and A. Y. Wu. A local search approximation algorithm for k-means clustering. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*, SCG '02, pages 10–18, New York, NY, USA, 2002. ACM.
- [38] A. Kasperski and P. Zielinski. On the existence of an FPTAS for minmax regret combinatorial optimization problems with interval data. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 35:525–532, 2007.
- [39] R. Khandekar, G. Kortsarz, V. S. Mirrokni, and M. R. Salavatipour. Two-stage robust network design with exponential scenarios. *Algorithmica*, 65(2):391–408, 2013.
- [40] S. Khuller and Y. J. Sussmann. The capacitated k-center problem. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 13(3):403–418, 2000.
- [41] S. G. Kolliopoulos and S. Rao. A nearly linear-time approximation scheme for the Euclidean k-median problem. In J. Nešetřil, editor, *Algorithms - ESA' 99*, pages 378–389, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1999. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [42] P. Kouvelis and G. Yu. *Robust 1-Median Location Problems: Dynamic Aspects and Uncertainty*, pages 193–240. Springer US, Boston, MA, 1997.
- [43] A. Kumar, Y. Sabharwal, and S. Sen. A simple linear time  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for k-means clustering in any dimensions. In *Proceedings of the 45th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 454–462, 2004.
- [44] S. Li and O. Svensson. Approximating k-median via pseudo-approximation. In *Proceedings of the Forty-fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 901–910, 2013.
- [45] S. P. Lloyd. Least squares quantization in pcm. *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, 28:129–136, 1982.
- [46] S. G. Mentzer. Approximability of metric clustering problems. Unpublished manuscript, Mar. 2016.



- [47] V. Nagarajan, B. Schieber, and H. Shachnai. The Euclidean k-supplier problem. In M. Goemans and J. Correa, editors, *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 290–301, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [48] G. L. Nemhauser, L. A. Wolsey, and M. L. Fisher. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—i. *Mathematical Programming*, 14(1):265–294, 1978.
- [49] L. K. Platzman and J. J. Bartholdi, III. Spacefilling curves and the planar travelling salesman problem. *J. ACM*, 36(4):719–737, Oct. 1989.
- [50] F. Schalekamp and D. B. Shmoys. Algorithms for the universal and a priori TSP. *Operations Research Letters*, 36(1):1–3, 2008.
- [51] D. B. Shmoys and C. Swamy. An approximation scheme for stochastic linear programming and its application to stochastic integer programs. *J. ACM*, 53(6):978–1012, Nov. 2006.
- [52] C. Swamy and D. B. Shmoys. Approximation algorithms for 2-stage stochastic optimization problems. *SIGACT News*, 37(1):33–46, 2006.
- [53] C. Swamy and D. B. Shmoys. Sampling-based approximation algorithms for multistage stochastic optimization. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 41(4):975–1004, 2012.

## A Relations Between Vector Norms

For completeness, we give a proof of the following well known fact that relates vector  $\ell_p$  norms.

**Fact 41.** For any  $1 \leq p \leq q$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we have

$$\|x\|_q \leq \|x\|_p \leq n^{1/p-1/q} \|x\|_q.$$

*Proof.* For all  $p$ , repeatedly applying Minkowski’s inequality we have:

$$\|x\|_p = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x|^p \right)^{1/p} \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |x|^p \right)^{1/p} + |x_n| \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} |x|^p \right)^{1/p} + |x_{n-1}| + |x_n| \leq \dots \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| = \|x\|_1.$$

Then we bound  $\|x\|_q$  by  $\|x\|_p$  as follows:

$$\|x\|_q = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x|^q \right)^{1/q} = \left( \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (|x|^p)^{q/p} \right)^{p/q} \right)^{1/p} \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x|^p \right)^{1/p} = \|x\|_p.$$

The inequality is by applying  $\|x'\|_{q/p} \leq \|x'\|_1$  to the vector  $x'$  with entries  $x'_i = |x_i|^p$ . To bound  $\|x\|_p$  by  $\|x\|_q$ , we invoke Holder’s inequality as follows:

$$\|x\|_p^p = \sum_{i=1}^n |x|^p = \sum_{i=1}^n |x|^p \cdot 1 \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (|x|^p)^{q/p} \right)^{p/q} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n 1^{q/(q-p)} \right)^{1-p/q} = \|x\|_q^p \cdot n^{1-p/q}.$$

Taking the  $p$ th root of this inequality gives the desired bound.  $\square$

The limiting behavior as  $q \rightarrow \infty$  shows that  $\|x\|_\infty \leq \|x\|_{c \log n} \leq n^{1/c \log n} \|x\|_\infty = 2^{1/c} \|x\|_\infty$ , i.e. that the  $\ell_\infty$ -norm and  $\ell_p$ -norm for  $p = \Omega(\log n)$  are within a constant factor.

## B Approximations for All-Clients Instances are not Universal

In this section, we demonstrate that even  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate (integer) solutions for the “all clients” instance for clustering problems are not guaranteed to be  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximations for any finite  $\alpha, \beta$ . This is in sharp contrast to the optimal (integer) solution, which is known to be a  $(1, 2)$ -approximation for a broad range of problems including the clustering problems considered in this paper [38].

Consider an instance of universal 1-median with clients  $c_1, c_2$  and cluster centers  $f_1, f_2$ . Both the cluster centers are at distance 1 from  $c_1$ , and at distances 0 and  $\varepsilon$  respectively from  $c_2$  (see Figure 6).  $f_2$  is a  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution for the realization containing both clients. In this instance, MR is 0 and so  $f_2$  is not an  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximation for any finite  $\alpha, \beta$  due to the realization containing only  $c_2$ . The same example can be used for the  $\ell_p$ -clustering objective for all  $p \geq 1$  since  $f_2$  has approximation factor  $(1 + \varepsilon^p)^{1/p} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)$  when all clients are present. In the case of  $k$ -center,  $f_2$  is an optimal solution when all clients are present.




Figure 6: Example where a  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation for all clients has no  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -approximation guarantee, for any  $\ell_p$ -clustering objective including  $k$ -center.

## C Algorithms for $k$ -Median and $\ell_p^p$ -Clustering with Discounts

In this section, we prove Lemma 13 which states that there exists a  $(9^p, \frac{2}{3} \cdot 9^p)$ -approximation algorithm for the  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts problem. As a corollary, by setting  $p = 1$ , we will obtain Lemma 6 which states that there exists a  $(9, 6)$ -approximation algorithm for the  $k$ -median with discounts problem. To prove Lemma 13, we will first use a technique due to Jain and Vazirani [34] to design a Lagrangian-preserving approximation for the  $\ell_p^p$ -facility location with discounts problem.  $\ell_p^p$ -facility location with discounts (FLD) is the same as  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts, except rather than being restricted to buying  $k$  cluster centers, each cluster center has a cost  $f_i$  associated with buying it (discounts and cluster centers costs are not connected in any way).

## C.1 Algorithm for $\ell_p^p$ -Facility Location with Discounts

Since FLD is a special case of non-metric facility location, we can consider the standard linear programming primal-dual formulation for the latter. The primal program is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min && \sum_{i \in F} f_i x_i + \sum_{i \in F, j \in C} (c_{ij}^p - r_j^p)^+ y_{ij} \\
\text{s.t. } & \forall j \in C : && \sum_{i \in F} y_{ij} \geq 1 \\
& \forall i \in F, j \in C : && y_{ij} \leq x_i \\
& \forall i \in F : && x_i \geq 0 \\
& \forall i \in F, j \in C : && y_{ij} \geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

The dual program is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max && \sum_{j \in C} a_j \\
\text{s.t. } & \forall i \in F, j \in C : && a_j - (c_{ij}^p - r_j^p)^+ \leq b_{ij} \\
& \forall i \in F : && \sum_{j \in C} b_{ij} \leq f_i \\
& \forall j \in C : && a_j \geq 0 \\
& \forall i \in F, j \in C : && b_{ij} \geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

We design a primal-dual algorithm for the FLD problem. This FLD algorithm operates in two phases. In both programs, all variables start out as 0.

In the first phase, we generate a dual solution. For each client  $j$  define a “time” variable  $t_j$  which is initialized to 0. We grow the dual variables as follows: we increase the  $t_j$  uniformly. We grow the  $a_j$  such that for any  $j$ , at all times  $a_j = (t_j - r_j^p)^+$  (or equivalently, all  $a_j$  start at 0, and we increase all  $a_j$  at a uniform rate, but we only start growing  $a_j$  at time  $r_j^p$ ). Each  $b_{ij}$  is set to the minimum feasible value, i.e.  $(a_j - (c_{ij}^p - r_j^p)^+)^+$ . If the constraint  $\sum_{j \in C} b_{ij} \leq f_i$  is tight, we stop increasing all  $t_j, a_j$  for which  $b_{ij} = a_j - (c_{ij}^p - r_j^p)^+$ , i.e., for the clients  $j$  that contributed to increasing the value  $\sum_{j \in C} b_{ij}$  (we say these clients put weight on this cluster center). We continue this process until all  $t_j$  stop growing. Note that at any time the dual solution grown is always feasible.

In the second phase, consider a graph induced on the cluster centers whose constraints are tight, where we place an edge between cluster centers  $i, i'$  if there exists some client  $j$  that put weight on both cluster centers. Find a maximal independent set  $S$  of this graph and output this set of cluster centers. Let  $\pi$  be a map from clients to cluster centers such that  $\pi(j)$  is the cluster center which made  $t_j$  stop increasing in the first phase of the algorithm. If  $\pi(j) \in S$ , connect  $j$  to cluster center  $\pi(j)$ , otherwise connect  $j$  to one of  $\pi(j)$ 's neighbors in the graph arbitrarily.

We can equivalently think of the algorithm as generating an integral primal solution where  $x_i = 1$  for all  $i \in S$  and  $x_i = 0$  otherwise, and  $y_{ij} = 1$  if  $j$  is connected to  $i$  and is  $y_{ij} = 0$  otherwise. Based again on the technique of [34], we can show the following Lemma holds:

**Lemma 42.** *Let  $x, y$  be the primal solution and  $a, b$  be the dual solution generated by the above FLD algorithm.  $x, y$  satisfies*

$$\sum_{j \in C} \sum_{i \in F} (c_{ij}^p - 3^p r_j^p)^+ y_{ij} + 3^p \sum_{i \in F} f_i x_i \leq 3^p \sum_{j \in C} a_j$$

*Proof.* Let  $C^{(1)}$  be the set of clients in  $j$  such that  $\pi(j) \in S$  and  $C^{(2)} = C \setminus C^{(1)}$ . For any  $i \in S$ , let  $C_i$  be the set of all clients  $j$  such that  $\pi(j) = i$ . Note that:

$$\sum_{j \in C_i} a_j = \sum_{j \in C_i} [b_{ij} + (c_{ij}^p - r_j^p)^+] = \sum_{j \in C_i} (c_{ij}^p - r_j^p)^+ + f_i$$

No client in  $C^{(1)}$  contributes to the sum  $\sum_{i \in F} b_{ij}$  for multiple  $i$  in  $S$  (because  $S$  is an independent set). This gives us:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j \in C^{(1)}} \sum_{i \in F} (c_{ij}^p - 3^p r_j^p)^+ y_{ij} + \sum_{i \in F} f_i x_i &\leq \sum_{j \in C^{(1)}} \sum_{i \in F} (c_{ij}^p - r_j^p)^+ y_{ij} + \sum_{i \in F} f_i x_i \\
&= \sum_{i \in S} [f_i + \sum_{j \in C_i} (c_{ij}^p - r_j^p)^+] \\
&= \sum_{i \in S} \sum_{j \in C_i} a_j \\
&= \sum_{j \in C^{(1)}} a_j. \tag{18}
\end{aligned}$$

For each client  $j$  in  $C^{(2)}$ ,  $j$  is connected to one of  $\pi(j)$ 's neighbors  $i$ . Since  $\pi(j)$  and  $i$  are neighbors, there is some client  $j'$  that put weight on both  $\pi(j)$  and  $i$ . Since  $j'$  put weight on  $\pi(j)$  and thus  $\pi(j)$  going tight would have stopped  $t_{j'}$  from increasing,  $t_{j'}$  stopped increasing before or when  $\pi(j)$  went tight, which was when  $t_j$  stopped growing. Since all  $t_j$  start growing at the same time and grow uniformly,  $t_{j'} \leq t_j$ . Since  $j$  put weight on  $\pi(j)$ , we know  $a_j - (c_{\pi(j)j} - r_j^p)^+ > 0$  and thus  $(t_j - r_j^p)^+ - (c_{\pi(j)j} - r_j^p)^+ > 0$ , implying  $t_j \geq c_{\pi(j)j}^p$ . Similarly,  $t_{j'} \geq c_{ij'}^p, c_{\pi(j)j'}^p$ . Triangle inequality gives  $c_{ij} \leq c_{ij'} + c_{\pi(j)j'} + c_{\pi(j)j} \leq 3t_{j'}^{1/p}$ . Then, we get:

$$\sum_{j \in C^{(2)}} \sum_{i \in F} (c_{ij}^p - 3^p r_j^p)^+ y_{ij} \leq \sum_{j \in C^{(2)}} (3^p t_j - 3^p r_j^p)^+ = 3^p \sum_{j \in C^{(2)}} (t_j - r_j^p)^+ = 3^p \sum_{j \in C^{(2)}} a_j \tag{19}$$

Adding  $3^p$  times Eq. (18) to Eq. (19) gives the Lemma.  $\square$

## C.2 Algorithm for $\ell_p^p$ -Clustering with Discounts

We now move on to finding an algorithm for  $\ell_p^p$ -clustering with discounts. We can represent the problem as a primal/dual linear program pair as follows. The primal program is:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min && \sum_{i \in F, j \in C} (c_{ij}^p - r_j^p)^+ y_{ij} \\
\text{s.t. } &\forall j \in C: && \sum_{i \in F} y_{ij} \geq 1 \\
&\forall i \in F, j \in C: && y_{ij} \leq x_i \\
&&& \sum_{i \in F} x_i \leq k \\
&\forall i \in F: && x_i \geq 0 \\
&\forall i \in F, j \in C: && y_{ij} \geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

The dual program is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max && \sum_{j \in C} a_j - kz \\
\text{s.t. } &\forall i \in F, j \in C: && a_j - (c_{ij}^p - r_j^p)^+ \leq b_{ij} \\
&\forall i \in F: && \sum_{j \in C} b_{ij} \leq z \\
&\forall j \in C: && a_j \geq 0 \\
&\forall i \in F, j \in C: && b_{ij} \geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

We now describe the algorithm we will use to prove Lemma 13, which uses the FLD algorithm from Section C.1 as a subroutine. By taking our  $\ell_p$ -clustering with discounts instance and assigning all cluster

centers the same cost  $z$ , we can produce a FLD instance. When  $z = 0$ , the FLD algorithm will either buy more than  $k$  cluster centers, or find a set of at most  $k$  cluster centers, in which case we can output that set. When  $z = |C| \max_{i,j} c_{ij}$ , the FLD algorithm will buy only 1 cluster center. Thus, for any  $\varepsilon$  such that  $\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} = n^{O(1)}$ , via bisection search using polynomially many runs of this algorithm we can find a value of  $z$  such that this algorithm buys a set of cluster centers  $S_1$  of size  $k_1 \geq k$  when cluster centers cost  $z$  and a set of cluster centers  $S_2$  of size  $k_2 \leq k$  cluster centers when cluster centers cost  $z + \varepsilon$  (the bisection search starts with the range  $[0, |C| \max_{i,j} c_{ij}]$  and in each iteration, determines how many cluster centers are bought when  $z$  is the midpoint value in its current range. It then recurses on the half  $[a, b]$  of its current range which maintains the invariant that when  $z = a$ , at least  $k$  cluster centers are bought and when  $z = b$ , at most  $k$  cluster centers are bought).

If either  $k_1 = k$  or  $k_2 = k$ , we output the corresponding cluster center set. Otherwise, we will randomly choose a solution which is roughly a combination of  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  (we will describe how to derandomize this process as is required to prove Lemma 6 later). Let  $\rho$  be the solution in  $[0, 1]$  to  $\rho k_1 + (1 - \rho)k_2 = k$ , i.e.  $\rho = \frac{k - k_2}{k_1 - k_2}$ . Construct a set  $S'_1$  that consists of the closest cluster center in  $S_1$  to each cluster center in  $S_2$ . If the size of  $S'_1$  is less than  $k_2$ , add arbitrary cluster centers from  $S_1 \setminus S'_1$  to  $S'_1$  until its size is  $k_2$ . Then, with probability  $\rho$ , let  $S^* = S'_1$ , otherwise let  $S^* = S_2$ . Then, sample a uniformly random subset of  $k - k_2$  elements from  $S_1 \setminus S'_1$  and add them to  $S^*$ . Then output  $S^*$  (note that  $S_1 \setminus S'_1$  is of size  $k_1 - k_2$  so every element in  $S_1 \setminus S'_1$  has probability  $\rho$  of being chosen).

*Proof of Lemma 13.* Note that if the FLD algorithm ever outputs a solution which buys exactly  $k$  cluster centers, then by Lemma 42 we get that for the LP solution  $x, y$  encoding this solution and a dual solution  $a$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in C} \sum_{i \in F} (c_{ij}^p - 3^p r_j^p)^+ y_{ij} + 3^p \sum_{i \in F} f_i x_i &\leq 3^p \sum_{j \in C} a_j \\ \sum_{j \in C} \sum_{i \in F} (c_{ij}^p - 3^p r_j^p)^+ y_{ij} + 3^p k z &\leq 3^p \sum_{j \in C} a_j \\ \sum_{j \in C} \sum_{i \in F} (c_{ij}^p - 3^p r_j^p)^+ y_{ij} &\leq 3^p [\sum_{j \in C} a_j - k z] \end{aligned}$$

Which by duality means that this solution is also a  $(3^p, 3^p)$ -approximation for the  $\ell_p$ -clustering with discounts instance.

If bisection search never finds a solution with exactly  $k$  cluster centers, but instead a pair of solutions  $S_1, S_2$  where  $|S_1| > k, |S_2| < k$ , the idea is that the algorithm constructs a "bi-point" fractional solution from these solutions (i.e. constructs a fractional solution that is just a convex combination of the two integral solutions) and then rounds it.

Consider the primal/dual solutions  $x^{(1)}, y^{(1)}, a^{(1)}$  and  $x^{(2)}, y^{(2)}, a^{(2)}$  corresponding to  $S_1, S_2$ . By Lemma 42 we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in C} \sum_{i \in F} (c_{ij}^p - 3^p r_j^p)^+ y_{ij}^{(1)} + 3^p k_1 z &\leq 3^p \sum_{j \in C} a_j^{(1)} \\ \sum_{j \in C} \sum_{i \in F} (c_{ij}^p - 3^p r_j^p)^+ y_{ij}^{(2)} + 3^p k_2 (z + \varepsilon) &\leq 3^p \sum_{j \in C} a_j^{(2)} \end{aligned}$$

By combining the two inequalities and choosing  $\varepsilon$  appropriately we can get that:

$$\sum_{j \in C} \sum_{i \in F} (c_{ij}^p - 3^p r_j^p)^+ (\rho y_{ij}^{(1)} + (1 - \rho) y_{ij}^{(2)}) \leq (3^p + \varepsilon') [\sum_{j \in C} (\rho a_j^{(1)} + (1 - \rho) a_j^{(2)}) - k z]$$

For an  $\varepsilon'$  we will fix later.

Note that  $\rho(x^{(1)}, y^{(1)}, a^{(1)}) + (1 - \rho)(x^{(2)}, y^{(2)}, a^{(2)})$  and  $z$  form a feasible (fractional) primal/dual solution pair for the  $\ell_p$ -clustering with discounts problem, and by the above inequality the primal solution is a  $(3^p, 3^p + \varepsilon')$ -approximation.

Then, we round the convex combination of the two solutions as described above. Let  $c_j$  be the connection cost of client  $j$  in the rounded solution, and  $c_j^{(1)}, c_j^{(2)}$  the connection cost of client  $j$  in solutions  $S_1, S_2$ . Then since  $(3^p + \varepsilon')(2 \cdot 3^{p-1} - \varepsilon') < \frac{2}{3} \cdot 9^p$  for  $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$  to prove the lemma it suffices to show that for each client  $j$  the expected contribution to the objective using discount  $9r_j$  for client  $j$  is at most  $2 \cdot 3^{p-1} - \varepsilon'$  times the contribution of client  $j$  to the primal solution's objective using discount  $3r_j$ . That is:

$$\mathbb{E}[(c_j^p - 9^p r_j^p)^+] \leq (2 \cdot 3^{p-1} - \varepsilon')[\rho(c_j^{(1)p} - 3^p r_j^p)^+ + (1 - \rho)(c_j^{(2)p} - 3^p r_j^p)^+]$$

Suppose client  $j$ 's nearest cluster center in  $S_1$  is in  $S_1'$ . Then with probability  $\rho$ ,  $j$  is connected to that cluster center at connection cost  $c_j^{(1)}$ , and with probability  $1 - \rho$  it is connected to the nearest cluster center in  $S_2$  at connection cost  $c_j^{(2)}$ . Then:

$$\mathbb{E}[(c_j^p - 9^p r_j^p)^+] \leq \mathbb{E}[(c_j^p - 3^p r_j^p)^+] = \rho(c_j^{(1)p} - 3^p r_j^p)^+ + (1 - \rho)(c_j^{(2)p} - 3^p r_j^p)^+$$

Suppose client  $j$ 's nearest cluster center in  $S_1$  (call it  $i_1$ ) is not in  $S_1'$ . Note that each cluster center in  $S_1 \setminus S_1'$  has probability  $\rho$  of being opened. Thus with probability  $\rho$ , we can upper bound  $c_j$  by the distance from  $j$  to  $i_1$ . If this does not happen, let  $i_2$  be  $j$ 's nearest cluster center in  $S_2$  and  $i_1'$  be the cluster center nearest to  $i_2$  in  $S_1$ . One of  $i_1', i_2$  must be opened, so we can bound  $j$ 's connection cost by its connection cost to whichever is opened. Then one of three cases occurs:

- With probability  $\rho$ ,  $j$ 's nearest cluster center in  $S_1$  is opened. Then  $c_j$  is at most the distance from  $j$  to  $i_1$ , i.e.  $c_j^{(1)}$ .
- With probability  $(1 - \rho)\rho$ ,  $j$ 's nearest cluster center in  $S_1$  is not opened and  $S_1'$  is opened.  $c_j$  is at most the distance from  $j$  to  $i_1'$ . Since  $i_1'$  is the cluster center closest to  $i_2$  in  $S_1$ , the distance from  $i_1'$  to  $i_2$  is at most the distance from  $i_1$  to  $i_2$ , which is at most  $c_j^{(1)} + c_j^{(2)}$ . Then by triangle inequality, the distance from  $j$  to  $i_1'$  is at most  $c_j^{(1)} + 2c_j^{(2)}$ . Using the AMGM inequality, we get  $c_{i_1'}^p \leq 3^{p-1}(c_j^{(1)p} + 2c_j^{(2)p})$ .
- With probability  $(1 - \rho)^2$ ,  $j$ 's nearest cluster center in  $S_1$  is not opened and  $S_2$  is opened.  $c_j$  is at most the distance from  $j$  to  $i_2$ , i.e.  $c_j^{(2)}$ .

Then we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(c_j - 9^p r_j^p)^+] \\ & \leq \rho(c_j^{(1)p} - 9^p r_j^p)^+ + (1 - \rho)^2(c_j^{(2)p} - 9^p r_j^p)^+ + (1 - \rho)\rho(3^{p-1}(c_j^{(1)} + 2c_j^{(2)}) - 9^p r_j^p)^+ \\ & = \rho(c_j^{(1)p} - 9^p r_j^p)^+ + (1 - \rho)^2(c_j^{(2)p} - 9^p r_j^p)^+ + 3^{p-1}(1 - \rho)\rho(c_j^{(1)} + 2c_j^{(2)} - 3 \cdot 3^p r_j^p)^+ \\ & \leq \rho(c_j^{(1)} - 3^p r_j^p)^+ + (1 - \rho)^2(c_j^{(2)} - 3^p r_j^p)^+ + 3^{p-1}(1 - \rho)\rho(c_j^{(1)} - 3^p r_j^p)^+ + 2 \cdot 3^{p-1}(1 - \rho)\rho(c_j^{(2)} - 3^p r_j^p)^+ \\ & = (3^{p-1}(1 - \rho) + 1)[\rho(c_j^{(1)} - 3^p r_j^p)^+] + (2 \cdot 3^{p-1}\rho + 1 - \rho)[(1 - \rho)(c_j^{(2)} - 3^p r_j^p)^+] \\ & \leq (2 \cdot 3^{p-1} - \min\{\rho, 1 - \rho\})[\rho(c_j^{(1)} - 3^p r_j^p)^+] + (1 - \rho)(c_j^{(2)} - 3^p r_j^p)^+ \\ & \leq (2 \cdot 3^{p-1} - \varepsilon')[\rho(c_j^{(1)} - 3^p r_j^p)^+] + (1 - \rho)(c_j^{(2)} - 3^p r_j^p)^+. \end{aligned}$$

Where the last step is given by choosing  $\varepsilon'$  to be at most  $\frac{1}{|F|}$ , since  $p = \frac{k-k_2}{k_1-k_2}$  and  $1 \leq k_2 < k < k_1 \leq |F|$  and thus  $\rho$  and  $1 - \rho$  are both at least  $\frac{1}{|F|}$ . This gives the lemma, except that the algorithm is randomized. However, the randomized rounding scheme can easily be derandomized: first, we choose  $S^*$  to be whichever of  $S'_1, S_2$  has a lower expected objective. Then, to choose the remaining  $k - k_2$  cluster centers to add to  $S^*$ , we add cluster centers by one by one. When we have  $c$  cluster centers left to add to  $S^*$ , we add the cluster center  $i$  from  $S_1 \setminus S'_1$  that minimizes the expected objective achieved by  $S^* \cup \{i\}$  and  $c - 1$  random cluster centers from  $(S_1 \setminus S'_1) \setminus (S^* \cup \{i\})$ . Each step of the derandomization cannot increase the expected objective, so the derandomized algorithm achieves the guarantee of Lemma 13.  $\square$

Again, we note that Lemma 6 is obtained as a corollary of Lemma 13, where we set  $p = 1$ .