Mechanism Design With Predictions for Obnoxious Facility Location

Gabriel Istrate^{*}, Cosmin Bonchi^{*}

December 20, 2022

Abstract

We study *mechanism design with predictions* for the obnoxious facility location problem. We present deterministic strategyproof mechanisms that display tradeoffs between robustness and consistency on segments, squares, circles and trees. All these mechanisms are actually group strategyproof, with the exception of the case of squares, where manipulations from coalitions of two agents exist. We prove that these tradeoffs are optimal in the 1-dimensional case.

Keywords: Mechanism Design With Predictions, Robustness, Consistency

1 Introduction

The theory of algorithms with predictions [1, 2, 3] is, without a doubt, one of the most exciting recent research directions in algorithmics: when supplemented by a (correct) predictor, often based on machine learning, the newly-developed algorithms are capable of outcompeting their worst-case classical counterparts. A desirable feature of such algorithms is, of course, to perform comparably to the (worst-case) algorithms when the predictors are really bad. This requirement often results [2] in tradeoffs between two measures of algorithm performance, robustness and consistency. A significant amount of subsequent research has followed, summarized by the algorithms with predictions webpage [3].

Recently, the idea of augmenting algorithms by predictions has been adapted to the game-theoretic setting of *mechanism design* [4, 5, 6, 7]: indeed, strategyproof mechanisms often yield solutions that are only approximately optimal [8]. On the other hand, if the designer has access to a predictor for the desired outcome it could conceivably take advantage of this information by creating mechanisms that lead to an improved approximation ratio, compared to their existing (worst-case) counterparts. Tradeoffs between robustness and consistency similar to the ones from [2] apply to this setting as well. This is perhaps

^{*}University of Bucharest, email: gabrielistrate@acm.org

[†]West University of Timişoara

best exemplified by the recent results in [5]: the authors considered the classical problem of *facility location problem* in a setting with predictions. Procaccia and Tennenholtz [9] had given a 2-approximate mechanism for this problem in the setting without predictions under the utilitarian objective function, and proved it was optimal. Later on, the two-dimensional case of the problem was shown [10] to have (optimal) approximation ratio $\sqrt{2}$. Among many results, Agrawal et al. [5] gave a mechanism for the 1-dimensional case that was 2-robust and 1-consistent. In the two dimensional case they gave a mechanism with predictions parameterized by $c \in (0, 1)$ that realizes an (optimal) $(\frac{\sqrt{2c^2+2}}{1+c}, \frac{\sqrt{2c^2+2}}{1-c})$ tradeoff between robustness and consistency.

We contribute to this research direction by studying, in the setting of mechanism design with predictions, another version of facility location: the *obnoxious facility location* problem [11, 12, 13]. This is the version of facility location where the facility is, in some sense, undesirable (e.g. a garbage dump) and all agents may strive to be located as far as possible from the chosen location.

1.1 Contributions and Outline

We give deterministic mechanisms that display an identical tradeoff between consistency and robustness for obnoxious facility location on various topologies: one and two-dimensional hypercubes (Algorithm 1, Theorem 1), circles, (Algorithm 2, Theorem 2), and trees (Algorithm 3, Theorem 3). The particular case of two-dimensional hypercubes is completely new (it had not been investigated previously, even without predictions). However, in this case the mechanism that we give is strategyproof but **not** group strategyproof, being vulnerable to collusion from as little as two agents. We give indication that the displayed tradeoffs may be optimal by proving this claim for one-dimensional hypercubes (Theorem 4). We give similar results in the case of agents with dual preferences [14, 15], at the expense of replacing group strategyproofness with a weaker concept previously studied (for obnoxious facility location) in [16].

The following is an outline of the paper: In Section 2 we review relevant notations and definitions. The proofs of some of the upper-bound results follow a common strategy: in Section 4 we give a general outline of this strategy, and then present the specific details. In Section 6 we give details about the lower bounds. We briefly discuss (Section 8) related work and (Section 9) further directions and open problems.

2 Preliminaries

We will write [n] as a substitute for $\{1, 2, ..., n\}$. As usual, the expectation of a random variable Z will be denoted by E[Z].

We will be dealing with the obnoxious facility location problem. In this problem n agents are located in a metric space (X, d). The location of each agent $(p_i \text{ for agent } 1 \leq i \leq n)$ is private to the agent. We will refer to elements of X^n as location profiles. Let $\mathcal{C} = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n) \in X^n$ be the vector of (true) agent locations. The goal is to choose a single facility location $f(\mathcal{C}) \in X$, via a mechanism $f: X^n \to X^{1}$ Once the location has been chosen, each agent gains utility $u_i(f(\mathcal{C})) = d(f(\mathcal{C}), p_i)$. Our goal is to choose a location P^* to maximize obnoxious social welfare $SW(P^*, \mathcal{C}) := \sum_{i=1}^n d(P^*, p_i)$. We will denote this optimal value by $OPT(\mathcal{C})$ and use notation y^* for a point realizing it. Given mechanism f and instance C, we will use notation F(C) as a shorthand for $SW(f(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{C})$. For randomized mechanisms this changes to $F(\mathcal{C})$ for $E_{\omega \in \Omega}[SW(f(\mathcal{C}, \omega), \mathcal{C})]$. We will measure the performance of a mechanism f by the ratio $c(f) := \max_{\mathcal{C} \in X^n} \left(\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C})}{F(\mathcal{C})} \right)$. Agents may be incentivized to misreport their location in order to maximize their profit. Given location profile P and set $S \subset [n]$, define P_{-S} to be the profile obtained by eliminating elements p_i , $i \in S$, from P. Mechanism f is called *strategyproof* if for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $p'_i \neq p_i, u_i(f(p_{-i}, p'_i)) \leq u_i(f(P))$. In other words, it never pays off for agent *i* to misreport its location as p'_i . The mechanism is called *group strategyproof* iff for every $S \subset [n]$ and every location profile (P_{-S}, Q_S) , there exists an index $i \in S$ such that $u_i(f(P_{-S}, Q_S)) \leq u_i(f(P))$. In other words, agents in S cannot all gain by coordinating their deviations from their true locations.

Let $Z \subseteq X$ be a set of acceptable prediction values. A mechanism with predictions is a function $f: X^n \times Z \to X$ (or $f: X^n \times \Omega \times Z \to X$, in the randomized case). It employs a predictor $\hat{Y} \in Z$, the predicted location of the obnoxious facility, as its last argument. Denote by $\eta = d(P^*, \hat{Y})$ the prediction error. We will use the notation $c(f, \eta)$ to refer to the adaptation of c(f) to settings with prediction (\mathcal{C}, P_C) for which the condition $d(y^*, P_C) \leq \eta$ holds. That is, given $\mathcal{C} \in X^n$ and $P_{\mathcal{C}} \in Z$, use shorthand $F(\mathcal{C}, P_C) = SW(f(\mathcal{C}, P_C), \mathcal{C})$ and define

$$c(f,\eta) := \max_{\substack{\mathcal{C} \in X^n, P_{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{Z} \\ d(P_{\mathcal{C}}, y^*) \le \eta}} \left(\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C})}{F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})} \right).$$
(1)

Definition 1. Given $\gamma, \beta \geq 1$, a mechanism with predictions f is γ -robust iff $c(f, \eta) \leq \gamma$ for all η and is β -consistent if $c(f, 0) \leq \beta$.

Following [17], we will view graphs as closed, connected subsets of some Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n . They are composed of a finite number of segments called edges. We will use, in particular, *trees*. Distances between points in a tree are not computed in the ambient \mathbb{R}^n , but rather along tree paths, by summing up the (euclidian) lengths of segments forming the path. Since there is an unique path [a, b] between any two points a, b in a tree one can naturally define, for arbitrary $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ the point $\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b$ as the unique point w on this path such that $d(a, w) = \lambda d(a, b)$. In particular we will denote by $m_{a,b}$ the point $1/2 \cdot a + 1/2 \cdot b$, the *midpoint of path ab*. Vertices a, b in a tree T form a *diameter of* T if the distance d(a, b) is the largest distance between any two vertices in the tree. A vertex is called *peripheral* iff it is part of a diameter of the tree.

¹As defined the mechanism is deterministic. To model randomized mechanisms we modify the definition of f to $f: X^n \times \Omega \to X$, where Ω is a probability space.

Finally, we will refer in the sequel to *majority voting*, used to choose between two items. We will used a slightly generalized version by allowing nonintegral numbers of votes for the items.

3 Results

As in [2], our mechanisms will be parameterized by $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, which intuitively measures the "agresiveness" of relying on the predictor. Our guarantees for consistency/robustness will be functions of λ as well. When $\lambda = 1$ we will get the case of the baseline algorithm which simply returns the predicted point. In general this algorithm is 1-consistent but **not** γ -robust for any constant γ . Indeed, let P,Q be points in X that are farthest apart. Choose the n points to be all at the same location P and let the predictor predict also $P \in X$. The optimal obnoxious social welfare would be $n \cdot d(P, Q)$, corresponding to locating the facility at Q, but the bad predictor leads to an obnoxious social welfare of 0. We will plot the consistency/robustness curves against parameter $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. By the previous discussion, at $\lambda = 1 \beta(1) = 1$ and $\gamma(1) = \infty$. On the other hand at $\lambda = 0$ we expect the quantities $\beta(0)$ and $\gamma(0)$ to coincide, and be equal to the approximation ratio of the optimal strategyproof mechanism. Moreover, as we increase λ from 0 to 1 we expect the robustness $\gamma(\lambda)$ to diverge, while the consistency $\beta(\lambda)$ to tend towards 1. Our goal is to obtain explicit curves $(\beta(\lambda), \gamma(\lambda))$ that display "the best" tradeoff between robustness and consistency.

The first setting for our results is the one where $X = [0, 1]^k$, the k-dimensional hypercube. We will employ the "robust coordinatewise voting" mechanism displayed in Algorithm 1. We have:

| Algorithm 1: <i>k</i> -dimensional robust coordinatewise voting. |
|--|
| Input : $C = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), x_i \in [0, 1]^k, \lambda \in [0, 1].$ |
| Prediction: $P_{\mathcal{C}} = p_1 p_2 \dots p_k \in \{0, 1\}^k$. W.l.o.g. $P_{\mathcal{C}} = 1^k$. |
| for $i:=1$ to k |
| let $n_{1,k}$ be the number of indices i s.t. $0 \le x_{i,k} \le 1/2$. |
| let $n_{2,k}$ be the number of indices <i>i</i> s.t. $1/2 < x_{i,k} \leq 1$. |
| count $n_{1,k}$ votes for 1; count $n_{2,k}$ votes for 0. |
| count λn votes for p_i . |
| if p_i has at least as many votes as $1 - p_i$: |
| let $z_i = p_i$. |
| else |
| let $z_i = 1 - p_i$. |
| return $Z_{\mathcal{C}} := z_1 z_2 \dots z_k.$ |

Theorem 1. The robust majority mechanism in one dimension with parameter λ (see Algorithm 1) is group strategyproof, $\frac{3+\lambda}{1-\lambda}$ -robust and $\frac{3-\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ -consistent. The robust majority mechanism in **two** dimensions with parameter λ is $\frac{3+\lambda}{1-\lambda}$ -



Figure 1: (a). Consistency versus robustness. (b). Decomposition of the square into rectangles used in the case of two-dimensional hypercubes.

robust and $\frac{3-\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ -consistent (see Figure 1 (a)). It is strategyproof but **not** group strategyproof: there exists a coalition of two agents that can manipulate it.

An analogous result holds in the case of circles. We will regard a circle C as the segment [0,1] where 0 and 1 are identified. The distance between two points with coordinates $0 \le x < y \le 1$ will be the distance between the points as measured on the circle. That is: d(x,y) = min(y-x, 1+x-y). We will employ the mechanism in Algorithm 2, and prove that:

Theorem 2. The robust majority mechanism on a circle with parameter λ is group strategyproof, $\frac{3+\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ -robust and $\frac{3-\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ -consistent.

Algorithm 2: The robust majority mechanism on a circle. Input : $C = (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), \lambda \in [0, 1].$ Prediction: $P_C \in [0, 1].$ Let $S = \{x_1, ..., x_n\}.$ Let Q be the point diametrally opposed to P_C . Let n_Q be the number of points of S in $(P_C + 1/4, P_C + 3/4]$ and n_P the number of points of S in $(P_C - 1/4, P_C + 1/4].$ If $n_P \leq n_Q + \lambda n$ return point P_C else return point Q.

Finally, we propose a version of the robust majority mechanism with parameter λ for trees, displayed in Figure 3. We have:

Theorem 3. Under the hypothesis that the predicted point is always a peripherical point, the robust majority mechanism on trees with parameter λ is (also) group strategyproof, $\frac{3+\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ -robust and $\frac{3-\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ -consistent.

Remark 1. Even though the algorithm from Theorem 3 displays the same tradeoff as the ones from theorems 1 and 2, it has an important drawback, not present

Algorithm 3: The robust majority mechanism on a tree.

Input : $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \in T, \lambda \in [0, 1]$. **Prediction:** $P_{\mathcal{C}} \in T$, a vertex of T. Let $S = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$. Transform tree T to T' by making all points of Svertices, while preserving distances. Let a be the farthest vertex from $P_{\mathcal{C}}$. Let b be a vertex of T' farthest from a ($P_{\mathcal{C}}$ if possible) Let T_a be the connected component of T' determined by $m_{a,b}$ containing a, and T_b be the complement of T_a in T'. Let n_1 be the number of points of S in T_a and n_2 the number of points in T_b . If $n_1 + \lambda n \leq n_2$ return point aelse return point b.

in the other cases: the predicted point P_{C} is not necessarily among the possible outputs of the algorithm. Indeed (see Lemma 1 below) in the case of 1-d and 2-d hypercubes the distance is a convex function, hence the optimum was guaranteed a priori to be one of the points 0/1 (A, B, C, D in the two-dimensional case). On the other hand in the case of circles, we specifically designed the algorithm so that P_{C} is one of the potential outputs. To make the algorithm behave similarly to the previous algorithms, we were forced to add the condition that P_{C} is peripheral to the specification of the predictor: while the robustness bound carries on without this assumption, we don't know how to obtain the consistency bound without it.

The problem is that there are examples (see e.g. in Exercise 3.4 [18]) where the optimal point y^* need **not** be a peripheral point. In light of this fact, while it is natural to require that the prediction point P_c be a leaf of the tree, since optima are always reached at a leaf [19], it seems substantially less natural to require that P_c is peripheral. One can compute the optimum point in linear time [20]. See also [21] for a characterization of possible outputs of group strategyproof mechanisms.

The tradeoff we displayed in Theorems 1 is (at least in the one-dimensional case) optimal. Indeed, we prove:

Theorem 4. For every $0 < c \leq 2$ and $\delta > 0$, a deterministic mechanism with predictions for obnoxious facility location on a segment that always yields one of the endpoints and is (1 + c)-consistent cannot be $(1 + \frac{4}{c} - \delta)$ -robust. The mechanism in Algorithm 1 realizes the best possible tradeoff, with substitution $\lambda = \frac{2-c}{2+c}$ (i.e. $c = \frac{2(1-\lambda)}{1+\lambda}$).

3.1 The case of dual preferences

In [14] and [15] yet another twist on the obnoxious facility location was proposed: the case of *dual preferences*. Specifically, agents are of two types: those of type 1 prefer to be as close to the facility as possible, while those of type 0 still want to maximize distance to the facility. Denoting by T_1, T_0 the sets of agents of type 1, type 0, respectively, one defines the social welfare of a given choice Y as $SW(P,Y) = \sum_{i \in T_1} (1 - d(Y,x_i)) + \sum_{j \in T_0} d(Y,x_j)$. In this case, an agent *i* may misreport both its type (we will denote by y_i) and location x_i . However, it was noted that the problem is related to the obnoxious facility location as follows: define for each agent *i* its transformed location x_i^* as follows: $x_i^* = 1 - x_i$ if $y_i = 1$, $x_i^* = x_i$, otherwise. Zou and Li prove that applying the majority voting mechanism on the transformed location profile yields a group-strategyproof, 3-approximation algorithm.² One can similarly extend our Theorem 1. Interestingly enough, to obtain this we **don't** extend Algorithm 1, but need to devise a new mechanism. On the other hand we also have to give up group strategyproofness, and replace it with the following weaker concept:

Definition 2. [16] Given constant $\gamma \geq 1$, a mechanism f is called γ -group strategyproof iff for every $S \subset [n]$ and every location profile (P_{-S}, Q_S) , there exists an index $i \in S$ such that $u_i(f(P_{-S}, Q_S)) \leq \gamma \cdot u_i(f(P), p_i)$. In other words, agents in S cannot all improve their utilities by more that a multiplicative factor of γ by coordinating their deviations from their true locations.

Theorem 5. The transformed robust majority mechanism (Algorithm 4) is $\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}$ -group strategyproof, $\frac{3+\lambda}{1-\lambda}$ -robust and $\frac{3-\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ -consistent.

| Algorithm 4: Transformed Robust Majority. | |
|---|--|
| Input : $C = (x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \dots, x_n, y_n),$ | |
| $x_i \in [0, 1], y_i \in \{0, 1\}, \lambda \in [0, 1).$ | |
| Prediction: $P_{\mathcal{C}} = p_1 \in \{0, 1\}$. w.l.o.g. assume $P_{\mathcal{C}} = 1$. | |
| define transformed locations $x_i^* = x_i(1-y_i) + (1-x_i)y_i$. | |
| let n_1 be the number of indices <i>i</i> s.t. $0 \le x_i^* \le (1 - \lambda)/2$. | |
| let n_2 be the number of indices <i>i</i> s.t. $(1 - \lambda)/2 < x_i^* \leq 1$. | |
| if $n_1 > n_2$ return $Z_{\mathcal{C}} := p_1(=1)$ | |
| else return $Z_{\mathcal{C}} := 1 - p_1 (= 0).$ | |

4 Proof Idea for Theorems 1, 2 and 3

The proofs of Theorems 1, 2 and 3 proceed by first investigating group strategyproofness directly, and then **follow a similar pattern to upperbound robustness/consistency:** for an input configuration C and prediction P_C we want to upper bound the ratio $app(C, P_C) := \frac{OPT(C)}{F(C, P_C)}$ by a constant $\gamma(\lambda)$ ($\beta(\lambda)$ for consistency). To do so we will identify a "bad" configuration³ C_1 and prove

²The proof does **not** follow by reduction but needs a direct argument, since in general $1 - d(Y, x_i) \neq d(Y, x_i^*)$. However ([14], Lemma 4) $d(Y, x_i) + d(Y, x_i^*) \leq 1$.

³we emphasize C_1 will **not** necessarily be of the same type as C. That's why we will write $SW(C_1, f(C, P_C))$ instead of $F(C_1, P_C)$ in inequalities of (2).

that:

$$\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C})}{F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})} \le \frac{SW(\mathcal{C}_1, y^*)}{SW(\mathcal{C}_1, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}))} \le \frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}_1)}{SW(\mathcal{C}_1, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}))} \le \gamma(\lambda)$$
(2)

where y^* is the point realizing the optimum for configuration \mathcal{C} (we replace $\gamma(\lambda)$ by $\beta(\lambda)$ in the inequalities above in consistency proofs). The last inequality in (2) will typically follow easily by computing the optimal solutions for \mathcal{C}_1 . The second is clear by the definition of OPT. As for the first inequality, since $OPT(\mathcal{C}) \geq F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})$, we will attempt to bound the left-hand side by

$$\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C})}{F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})} \le \frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}) - (F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - SW(\mathcal{C}_1, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})))}{F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - (F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - SW(\mathcal{C}_1, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})))}$$

To make the inequality work we first need to prove that $F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - SW(\mathcal{C}_1, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})) \geq 0$. This generally follows automatically by requiring that points of \mathcal{C}_1 are translates of the corresponding points of \mathcal{C} towards the chosen location $f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})$. To make the denominator of the right-hand side less or equal to $SW(\mathcal{C}_1, y^*)$, given that $OPT(\mathcal{C}) = SW(\mathcal{C}, y^*)$, we will also need that $\Delta := F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - SW(\mathcal{C}_1, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})) - SW(\mathcal{C}, y^*) + SW(\mathcal{C}_1, y^*) \geq 0$. This inequality will be proved separately in each case. Proofs may employ triangle inequalities for the metric space in question.

5 Proof of Theorem 1

5.1 One-dimensional hypercubes (segments)

Robustness: Consider an arbitrary configuration C and without loss of generality assume that $P_{\mathcal{C}} = 1$ (if this is not the case, simply switch labels 1 and 0). Let $n = (n_1, n_2)$ be the type of C. Let y^* be the point realizing the optimum social welfare for C. Assume first that $n_1 + \lambda \cdot n \ge n_2$ (i.e. Algorithm 1 outputs $P_{\mathcal{C}}$). The above condition is equivalent to $n_2/n_1 \le \frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}$ or $n_2/n \le \frac{2}{1-\lambda}$. Define C_1 to consist of n_1 points at 0.5 and n_2 points at 1. C_1 has the same type as C, and the points in C_1 are at least as close to $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ as their counterparts in C. The social welfare of the solution of the modified majority mechanism on input C_1 is, on the other hand, $n_1/2$. So the approximation ratio will be upperbounded by

$$\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}_1)}{SW(\mathcal{C}_1, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}))} = \frac{\frac{n_1}{2} + n_2}{\frac{n_1}{2}} \le 1 + \frac{2(1+\lambda)}{1-\lambda} = \frac{3+\lambda}{1-\lambda}$$
(3)

⁴0 has social welfare $n_2 + n_1/2$, 1 has social welfare $n_1/2$.

Proving $\Delta \ge 0$: $\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i - 1| - n_1/2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y^* - x_i| +$

$$+n_1 \cdot |1/2 - y^*| + n_2 \cdot |1 - y^*| = \sum_{i:x_i \le 1/2} (1 - x_i - 1/2 + |1/2 - y^*| - |y^* - x_i|) + \sum_{i:x_i > 1/2} (|1 - x_i| + |y^* - 1| - |y^* - x_i|) \ge 0$$

by triangle inequalities $|x_i - 1/2| + |1/2 - y^*| \ge |y^* - x_i|$ and similar ones for the second sum.

In the case $n_1 + \lambda n < n_2$ (i.e. Algorithm 1 outputs 0) take C_1 to consist of n_1 points at 0 and n_2 points at 1/2.

$$\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}_1)}{SW(\mathcal{C}_1, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}))} = \frac{\frac{n_2}{2} + n_1}{\frac{n_2}{2}} < 1 + 2\frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} = \frac{3-\lambda}{1+\lambda} \le \frac{3+\lambda}{1-\lambda}$$
(4)

Proving $\Delta \ge \mathbf{0}$: $\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i - 0| - n_2/2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y^* - x_i| +$

$$\sum_{x_i \le 1/2} |0 - y^*| + \sum_{x_i > 1/2} |1/2 - y^*| = \sum_{x_i \le 1/2} (|x_i - 0| + |0 - y^*| - |x_i - y^*|) + \sum_{x_i > 1/2} (|x_i - 1/2| + |1/2 - y^*| - |x_i - y^*|) \ge 0$$

Consistency: Without loss of generality, we assume that the predicted point (which also realizes the optimum) is $P_{\mathcal{C}} = 1$. We will also assume that the mechanism 1 yields the opposite of the predicted point, otherwise the consistency ratio is 1. That is $P_{\mathcal{C}} = y^* = 1$ but $Z_{\mathcal{C}} = 0$. Given our assumptions on the predictor and algorithm, the only possible case is $n_1 + \lambda n < n_2$. We have

$$\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C})}{F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})} = \frac{\sum_{i \le n} (1 - x_i)}{\sum_{i \le n} x_i} \le \frac{2n}{n_2} - 1 < \frac{4}{1 + \lambda} - 1 = \frac{3 - \lambda}{1 + \lambda}$$
(5)

(we have used the inequality $n_2/n > \frac{1+\lambda}{2}$, which follows easily by taking $n_1 = n - n_2$, as well as $\sum_i x_i \ge n_2/2$).

Group Strategyproofness: Assume that for the truthful location profile it holds that $n_1 + \lambda \cdot n \ge n_2$ (thus Algorithm 1 returns point 1). Let $S \subset [n]$ be a set of agents. If the Algorithm also returns 1 on the modified profile then no agent has improved their utility. Therefore we will assume that agents in Scolluding leads to changing the outcome of Algorithm 1 to 0. If S contains an agent in [0, 1/2] then the utility of this agent has not improved by colluding. Therefore, the only case left is that all agents in S are in (1/2, 1]. But then reporting a different location in (1/2, 1] does not improve utility, and reporting a location in [0, 1/2] may actually decrease it. The case $n_1 + \lambda \cdot n < n_2$ is similar.

5.2 Two-dimensional hypercubes (squares)

First we note the following:

Lemma 1. For every configuration C, $max_Y(f(C, Y))$ is obtained for $y^* \in \{A, B, C, D\}$, the corners of the square in Figure 1.

Proof. A simple consequence of the fact that f is a convex function (Property 2.1, [22]). \Box

Robustness: In the two-dimensional case we will use the decomposition in Figure 1 (b). Without loss of generality we assume that $f(\mathcal{C}) = D$, otherwise we could transform the x and y coordinates separately, if needed, to make this statement true. Let n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_4 be respectively the number of points of x in each of the squares⁵. We call four-tuple $n = (n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4)$ the type of configuration \mathcal{C} .

Consider configuration C_1 consisting of n_1 points in T, n_2 points in R, n_3 points in S, n_4 points in D. Clearly C_1 has type n as well, thus $F(C_1, P_C) = (n_1 + n_3)\frac{1}{2} + n_2\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$. We claim that

$$\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}_1)}{F(\mathcal{C}_1, P_{\mathcal{C}})} = \frac{(n_1 + n_3)\sqrt{5} + (n_2 + 2n_4)\sqrt{2}}{(n_1 + n_3) + n_2\sqrt{2}} \le \frac{3+\lambda}{1-\lambda}$$
(6)

To prove this we first need to show that $OPT(\mathcal{C}_1) = SW(\mathcal{C}_1, D)$. First of all, it holds that $SW(\mathcal{C}_1, C) \leq SW(\mathcal{C}_1, B)$: points R, S are equally close to B, C, while T, D are closer to C than to B. Similarly, $SW(\mathcal{C}_1, A) \leq SW(\mathcal{C}_1, B)$. Finally $SW(\mathcal{C}_1, D) \leq SW(\mathcal{C}_1, B)$: R is equally close to B, D, while T, S, D are closer to D than to B. Since $f(\mathcal{C}_1) = D$, we have $n_1 + n_2 + \lambda n \geq n_3 + n_4$ and $n_2 + n_3 + \lambda n \geq n_1 + n_4$. In particular, we infer $n_2 + \lambda n \geq n_4$, i.e. $n_2(1 + \lambda) - n_4(1 - \lambda) \geq -\lambda(n_1 + n_3)$. The last inequality in (6) is equivalent to:

$$(n_1 + n_3)(3 + \lambda - \sqrt{5}(1 - \lambda)) + n_2(\sqrt{2}(3 + \lambda) - \sqrt{2}(1 - \lambda)) - 2\sqrt{2}n_4(1 - \lambda) \ge 0, \text{ i.e.}$$
$$(n_1 + n_3)(3 - \sqrt{5} + \lambda(1 + \sqrt{5})) + 2\sqrt{2}[n_2(1 + \lambda) - n_4(1 - \lambda)] \ge 0.$$

Since $0 \le \lambda \le 1$, it follows that $3 - \sqrt{5} + \lambda(1 + \sqrt{5} - 2\sqrt{2}) \ge 3 - \sqrt{5} - (1 + \sqrt{5} - 2\sqrt{2}) = 2(1 + \sqrt{2} > \sqrt{5}) > 0$. We infer that (7) (hence the last inequality in (6)) must be true.

 $\mathbf{Proving}\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \geq \mathbf{0} \text{:}\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} = F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - SW(\mathcal{C}_1, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})) - OPT(\mathcal{C}) +$

$$+SW(\mathcal{C}_1, y^*) = \sum_{i=1}^n d(x_i, D) - \frac{n_1 + n_3}{2} - n_2 \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} + n_1 d(T, y^*) + n_2 d(R, y^*) + n_3 d(S, y^*) + n_4 d(D, y^*)$$

⁵There is some ambiguity as to how to assign points on the boundary to a single rule. We will use the following rule: whenever we have to assign boundary points we will prefer the triangle "with lower coordinates", where coordinates are considered in the order x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k . For instance points on segment [B, R] could be counted either by n_2 or n_3 . We will assign them to n_2 since triangle BRV is "to the right of triangle BRU" with respect to first coordinate x_1 . Similarly, points on [VR) will be counted by n_3 rather than n_4 , points on segment (RS] by n_5 , rather than n_6 and so on.

We know that $y^* \in \{A, B, C, D\}$. There are four cases. We treat here the case $y^* = B$ (the other ones are similar). Hence

$$\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (d(x_i, D) - d(x_i, B)) + (n_1 + n_3) \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{2} + n_4 \sqrt{2}$$
(7)

We will break Δ into eight sums, corresponding to points x_i being in exactly one of the triangles ASR, AVR, BVR, BUR, CUR, CTR, DTR, DSR. First, if x_i is in one of AVR, BVR, BUR, CUR then $d(x_i, D)$

 $\geq d(x_i, B)$, so these four sums are nonnegative. Let us show that the remaining sum is ≥ 0 as well, proving this way that $\Delta \geq 0$.

Let us consider, for instance, the points x_i that belong to the triangle CTR. For every such x_i we have $d(x_i, D) - d(x_i, B) \ge d(T, D) - d(T, B) = \frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}$, so $d(x_i, D) - d(x_i, B) + \frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2} \ge 0$. Since the number of such points is at most n_1 and $\sqrt{5} > 1$,

$$\sum_{x_i \in CTR} (d(x_i, D) - d(x_i, B)) + n_1 \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{2} \ge 0.$$
(8)

The cases of sums corresponding to points in triangles ARS, DSR, DTR are similar. Adding all the eight inequalities proves that $\Delta \geq 0$.

i

Consistency: Again without loss of generality, we assume that the predicted point (which also realizes the optimum) is $P_{\mathcal{C}} = D$. We will also assume that the mechanism 2 yields one of A, B, C, otherwise the consistency ratio is 1. We deal here with the case where the algorithm outputs $Z_{\mathcal{C}} = B$, the others are similar. Given our assumptions on the predictor and algorithm, the only possible case is $n_1 + n_2 + \lambda n < n_3 + n_4$ and $n_2 + n_3 + \lambda n < n_1 + n_4$. So we have $n_2 + \lambda n < n_4$, i.e. $n_4(1 - \lambda) - n_2(1 + \lambda) > \lambda(n_1 + n_3)$ (**). Consider configuration \mathcal{C}_2 consisting of n_1 points at U, n_2 points at B, n_3 points at V, n_4 points at R. To prove this we first need to show that $OPT(\mathcal{C}_2) = SW(\mathcal{C}_2, D)$. First, it holds that $SW(\mathcal{C}_2, C) < SW(\mathcal{C}_2, D)$: points R, V are equally close to C, D, while U, V are closer to C than to B. Similarly, $SW(\mathcal{C}_2, A) < SW(\mathcal{C}_2, D)$. Finally $SW(\mathcal{C}_2, B) < SW(\mathcal{C}_2, D)$: R is equally close to B, D, while U, V, B are closer to D. Second, $F(\mathcal{C}_2, P_{\mathcal{C}}) = SW(\mathcal{C}_2, B)$. Thus

$$\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}_2)}{F(\mathcal{C}_2, P_{\mathcal{C}})} = \frac{(n_1 + n_3)\sqrt{5} + (n_4 + 2n_2)\sqrt{2}}{(n_1 + n_3) + n_4\sqrt{2}} < \frac{3-\lambda}{1+\lambda}$$
(9)

Indeed, the last inequality is equivalent to $(n_1 + n_3)(3 - \lambda - \sqrt{5}(1 + \lambda)) + 2\sqrt{2}[n_4(1 - \lambda) - n_2(1 + \lambda)] > 0$. Applying (**) we get

$$\begin{aligned} &(n_1+n_3)(3-\sqrt{5}-\lambda(1+\sqrt{5}))+2\sqrt{2}[n_4(1-\lambda)-n_2(1+\lambda)]>(n_1\\ &+n_3)[3-\sqrt{5}-\lambda(1+\sqrt{5}-2\sqrt{2})]\geq 2(n_1+n_3)[1-\sqrt{5}+\sqrt{2}]\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

thus proving (9) (we have used inequalities, $1 + \sqrt{5} - 2\sqrt{2} > 0$, $0 \le \lambda \le 1$ and $1 - \sqrt{5} + \sqrt{2} > 0$). To complete the proof of the consistency bound all we have

to prove is that

$$\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C})}{F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})} \le \frac{SW(\mathcal{C}_2, y^*)}{F(\mathcal{C}_2, P_{\mathcal{C}})} \le \frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}_2)}{F(\mathcal{C}_2, P_{\mathcal{C}})}$$
(10)

Similarly to the proof of robustness, to prove inequality (10) we consider quantity $\Delta_2 := F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - F(\mathcal{C}_2, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - OPT(\mathcal{C}) + SW(\mathcal{C}_2, y^*)$, and aim to prove that $\Delta_2 \geq 0$.

 $\tilde{\mathbf{Proving}} \ \boldsymbol{\Delta_2} \geq \mathbf{0}: \ \Delta_2 = F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - F(\mathcal{C}_2, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - OPT(\mathcal{C}) + SW(\mathcal{C}_2, y^*)$

$$=\sum_{i=1}^{n} d(x_i, B) - \frac{n_1 + n_3}{2} - n_4 \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d(x_i, y^*) + n_1 d(U, y^*) + n_2 d(B, y^*) + n_3 d(V, y^*) + n_4 d(R, y^*)$$

We know that $y^* \in \{A, B, C, D\}$. There are four cases. We treat here the case $y^* = D$ (the other ones are similar). Hence

$$\Delta_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (d(x_i, B) - d(x_i, D)) + (n_1 + n_3) \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{2} + n_2 \sqrt{2}$$
(11)

The proof that $\Delta_2 \geq 0$ uses the same idea of triangle decomposition as the corresponding proof for $\Delta \geq 0$.

Strategyproofness: Let $C = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n)$ be an arbitrary configuration, and without loss of generality assume that f(C) = D. Let $i \in [n]$ be an agent, and assume that by misreporting location as q_i , agents i is able to strictly improve its utility. This means that in the new profile C', $f(C') \neq f(C)$. There are two cases:

• $\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{C}') \in {\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C}}$. These two cases are symmetric and without loss of generality we can assume that $f(\mathcal{C}') = A$. This means that $n_1 + n_2 + \lambda n \ge n_3 + n_4$ and $n_2 + n_3 + \lambda n \ge n_1 + n_4$ but the corresponding inequalities for n'_1, n'_2, n'_3, n'_4 read

$$n'_1 + n'_2 + \lambda n \ge n'_3 + n'_4 \text{ but } n'_2 + n'_3 + \lambda n < n'_1 + n'_4.$$
(12)

In particular $n_2 + n_3 \ge n \frac{1-\lambda}{2}$ but $n'_2 + n'_3 < n \frac{1-\lambda}{2}$. No point whose location is in the rectangle *BUSA* gains by misreporting it (*D* is at least as far as *A*). So i does not belong to rectangle *BUSA*. But this implies $n_2 + n_3 \le n'_2 + n'_3$, a contradiction.

• $\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{C}') = \mathbf{B}$. Then $n_1 + n_2 + \lambda n \ge n_3 + n_4$ and $n_2 + n_3 + \lambda n \ge n_1 + n_4$, but $n'_1 + n'_2 + \lambda n < n'_3 + n'_4$ and $n'_2 + n'_3 + \lambda n < n'_1 + n'_4$. Hence $n_1 + n_2 \ge n \frac{1-\lambda}{2} > n'_1 + n'_2$ and $n_2 + n_3 \ge n \frac{1-\lambda}{2} > n'_2 + n'_3$.

Since misreporting a single point decreases both sums $n_2 + n_3$ and $n_1 + n_2$, we infer the fact that agent *i* is in the rectangle *BURV* and $n_1 + n_2 = n_3 + n_4$, $n_2 + n_3 = n_1 + n_4$. But this is a contradiction: no point whose true location is



Figure 2: Manipulation by a coalition of size 2.



Figure 3: (a). Configuration C_1 (b). Configuration C_2 .

in the rectangle BURV gains by misreporting its location (D is already their farthest point). So f is strategyproof.

A counterexample that shows that a coalition of two agents can manipulate Mechanism 2 is presented in Figure 2: \mathcal{C} consists of 3 agents at T, S each, one at each of R, D. Clearly $f(\mathcal{C}) = D$. On the other hand, making one agent from each of T, S misreport their location as D yields a configuration \mathcal{C}' such that $f(\mathcal{C}') = B$. Both agents benefit from misreporting.

5.3 Proof of Theorem 2

Robustness: Without loss of generality let us choose coordinates such that point $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ has coordinate 1/4.

We first deal with the case $\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{C}}) = \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{C}}$, that is $n_P \leq n_Q + \lambda n$ or, equivalently, by substituting $n_Q = n - n_P$, $n_P \leq n(1 + \lambda)/2$.

Let C_1 be the configuration consisting of n_Q points at $P_C - 1/4$, together with n_P points at P_C (Figure 3). The algorithm will output point P_C . Hence $SW(C_1, f(C, P_C)) = n_Q/4$.

Let us find $x \in [0, 1]$ such that $SW(C_1, x)$ is maximized. On each of the segments [0, 1/4], [0, 1/4], [1/2, 3/4], [3/4, 1] the objective function is a linear function in x (generally a different one from segment to segment). Hence the maximum is reached at one of the points x = 0, x = 1/4, x = 1/2, x = 3/4. These values are, respectively, $n_P/4, n_Q/4, n_P/2 + n_Q/4, n_P/4 + n_Q/2$. We infer that

 $OPT(\mathcal{C}_1) = \frac{n + max(n_P, n_Q)}{4}$, reached for $y^* = Q = 3/4$ (if $n_P \ge n_Q$) and $y^* = 1/2$ (if $n_P < n_Q$). If $n_P \le n_Q$ then the fraction $\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}_1)}{SW(\mathcal{C}_1, f(\mathcal{C}, P_C))}$ is at most 3. Otherwise it is $\frac{n_Q + 2n_P}{n_Q}$. Hence

$$\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}_1)}{SW(\mathcal{C}_1, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}))} \le max(3, 1+2\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}) = \frac{3+\lambda}{1-\lambda}$$
(13)

 $\boldsymbol{\Delta} \geq \mathbf{0}: \ \boldsymbol{\Delta} = F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - SW(\mathcal{C}_1, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})) - SW(\mathcal{C}, y^*) + SW(\mathcal{C}_1, y^*)$

$$+SW(\mathcal{C}_{1}, y^{*}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d(x_{i}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - \frac{n_{Q}}{4} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} d(x_{i}, Q) + \frac{n_{Q} + 2n_{P}}{4} = \frac{n_{P}}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (d(x_{i}, \widehat{P}) - d(x_{i}, \widehat{Q})) = \sum_{x_{i} \in [1/2, 1]} (d(x_{i}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - d(x_{i}, Q)) + \sum_{x_{i} \in [0, 1/2]} (d(x_{i}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - d(x_{i}, Q)) + n_{P}/2.$$

The first sum consists of non-negative terms only, since for $z \in [1/2, 1]$, $d(z, P_{\mathcal{C}}) \geq d(z, Q)$. For the remaining terms, when $z \in [0, 1/2]$ we claim that $d(z, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - d(z, Q) \geq -1/2$. This is obvious since $d(z, P_{\mathcal{C}}) \geq 0$ and $d(z, Q) \leq 1/2$, with equality when $z = P_{\mathcal{C}}$. Since the number of points in [0, 1/2] is n_P , $\Delta \geq 0$ follows.

The case $\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{C}}) = \mathbf{Q}$, that is $n_P > n_Q + \lambda n$ or, equivalently, $n_P(1 - \lambda) > n_Q(1 + \lambda)$, is similar: let \mathcal{C}_2 be the configuration consisting of n_P points at $P_{\mathcal{C}} + 1/4$, together with n_Q points at Q. The algorithm will output point Q, with social welfare $SW(\mathcal{C}_2, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})) = n_P/4$. A similar analysis to that of the first case yields $OPT(\mathcal{C}_2) = (n + max(n_P, n_Q))/4 = n + n_P = (2n_P + n_Q)/4$. Hence

$$\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}_2)}{SW(\mathcal{C}_2, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}))} = 2 + \frac{n_Q}{n_P} < 2 + \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} = \frac{3+\lambda}{1+\lambda} \le \frac{3+\lambda}{1-\lambda}$$
(14)

Proving $\Delta \geq 0$ follows a similar pattern to that of the first case. **Consistency:** Without loss of generality assume that $P_{\mathcal{C}} = 1/4$. If $f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) = P_{\mathcal{C}}$ then the consistency ratio is one. Assume thus that $f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) = Q$ but $OPT(\mathcal{C})$ is reached at $P_{\mathcal{C}}$. By the definition of the algorithm, the only possible case is $n_P > n_Q + \lambda n$, i.e. $\frac{n_Q}{n_P} < \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda}$. Let \mathcal{C}_1 be the configuration consisting of the n_P points of \mathcal{C} , together with n_Q points at Q. Since for every y we have d(P, y) + d(Q, y) = 1/2, it follows that the optimum social welfare of \mathcal{C}_1 is still reached at $P_{\mathcal{C}}$, and is equal to $\Sigma + n_Q/2$, where $\Sigma := \sum_{x_i \in (0,1/2)} |x_i - 1/4|$. On the other hand $SW(\mathcal{C}_1, P_{\mathcal{C}}) = \sum_{x_i \in (0,1/2)} 1/2 - |x_i - 1/4| = n_P/2 - \Sigma$. Since $\Sigma \leq n_P/4$, the approximation ratio is

$$\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}_1)}{F(\mathcal{C}_1, P_{\mathcal{C}})} = \frac{\Sigma + n_Q/2}{n_P/2 - \Sigma} \le \frac{\frac{n_P}{4} + \frac{n_Q}{2}}{\frac{n_P}{2} - \frac{n_P}{4}} = 1 + \frac{2n_Q}{n_P} \le 1 + 2\frac{1 - \lambda}{1 + \lambda} = \frac{3 - \lambda}{1 + \lambda}$$

But $OPT(\mathcal{C}) \leq OPT(\mathcal{C}_1)$ and $F(\mathcal{C}_1, P_{\mathcal{C}}) \geq F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})$. The consistency upperbound follows.

Group strategyproofness: Assume first that $n_P \leq n_Q + \lambda n$, i.e. Algorithm 2 outputs point $P_{\mathcal{C}}$. Let $S \subset [n]$ be a set of agents. If S contained a point W such that $d(W, P_{\mathcal{C}}) \geq d(W, Q)$ then W cannot increase its utility by misreporting location. So all points in S are farther to Q than to P. This means that all points in S are counted into n_P and by misreporting their location they will lead to point $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ being chosen as well. The case $n_P > n_Q + \lambda n$ is similar.

5.4 Proof of Theorem 3

First, a well-known problem in algorithms, a method to find diameters in trees, implies the fact that the algorithm is correct: if a is the farthest from $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ then P is a peripheral point: the farthest point b from a induces a diameter ab in T'. Moreover, by the definition of points a, b, we have $d(P_{\mathcal{C}}, b) \leq d(P_{\mathcal{C}}, a)$.

Group strategyproofness: This is similar to the corresponding proof in [12], and is based on the fact that points in T_a are closer to a than to b, while points in T_b are closer to b than to a.

Robustness: We first consider the case $n_1 + \lambda n > n_2$, that is the algorithm outputs point *b*. Let y^* be the optimal location for configuration C and u^* the projection of y^* on [a, b]. Consider configuration C_1 in which there are n_1 points at $m_{a,b}$ and n_2 points at *b*. $SW(C_1, y^*) = n_1 \cdot d(m_{a,b}, y^*) + n_2 \cdot d(y^*, b) \leq n_1 \cdot \frac{d(a,b)}{2} + n_2 d(a,b) < n_1 d(a,b) [\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}] = n_1 \cdot d(a,b) \cdot \frac{3+\lambda}{2(1-\lambda)}$. On the other hand $F(C_1, P_C) = n_1 \cdot d(m_{a,b}, b) + n_2 \cdot d(b, b) = n_1 \frac{d(a,b)}{2}$. So

$$\frac{SW(\mathcal{C}_1, y^*)}{F(\mathcal{C}_1, P_C)} < \frac{3+2}{1-2}$$

$$\begin{split} \Delta \geq 0 \text{:} \ \Delta &= F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) - SW(\mathcal{C}_{1}, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})) - OPT(\mathcal{C}) + SW(\mathcal{C}_{1}, y^{*}) = \\ &= \sum_{x_{i} \in \mathcal{C}} d(x_{i}, b) - n_{1}d(m_{a,b}, b) - \sum_{x_{i} \in \mathcal{C}} d(x_{i}, y^{*}) + n_{1}d(m_{a,b}, y^{*}) \\ &+ n_{2}d(b, y^{*}) = \sum_{x_{i} \in T_{a}} (d(x_{i}, b) - d(m_{a,b}, b) - d(x_{i}, w^{*}) + d(m_{a,b}, w^{*})) \\ &+ \sum_{x_{i} \in T_{b}} (d(x_{i}, b) - d(x_{i}, w^{*}) + d(b, w^{*})) = \sum_{x_{i} \in T_{a}} (d(m_{a,b}, w^{*}) + d(m_{a,b}, w^{*})) \\ &+ d(m_{a,b}, x_{i}) - d(x_{i}, w^{*})) + \sum_{x_{i} \in T_{b}} (d(x_{i}, b) + d(b, w^{*}) - d(x_{i}, w^{*}) \geq 0 \end{split}$$

by triangle inequalities.

Consider now the case $n_1 + \lambda n \leq n_2$, that is the algorithm chooses the point *a*. Consider the configuration C_2 in which there are n_1 points at *a* and n_2 points at $m_{a,b}$. $SW(C_2, y^*) = n_1 \cdot d(a, y^*) + n_2 \cdot d(y^*, m_{a,b}) \leq n_1 \cdot d(a, b) + n_2 d(a, b)/2 \leq n_2 d(a, b) [\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda}] = n_1 \cdot d(a, b) \cdot \frac{3-\lambda}{2(1+\lambda)}$. On the other hand

$$F(\mathcal{C}_{2}, P_{C}) = n_{1} \cdot d(a, a) + n_{2} \cdot d(m_{a,b}, a) = n_{2} \frac{d(a,b)}{2}.$$
 So

$$\frac{SW(\mathcal{C}_{2}, y^{*})}{F(\mathcal{C}_{2}, P_{C})} \leq \frac{3 - \lambda}{1 + \lambda} \leq \frac{3 + \lambda}{1 - \lambda}$$
(15)

$$\Delta \geq 0: \ \Delta = F(\mathcal{C}, P_{C}) - SW(\mathcal{C}_{1}, f(\mathcal{C}, P_{C})) - OPT(\mathcal{C}) + SW(\mathcal{C}_{1}, y^{*})$$

$$= \sum_{x_{i} \in \mathcal{C}} d(x_{i}, a) - n_{2}d(m_{a,b}, a) - \sum_{x_{i} \in \mathcal{C}} d(x_{i}, y^{*}) + n_{1}d(a, y^{*}) + (n_{2}d(m_{a,b}, y^{*})) = \sum_{x_{i} \in T_{a}} (d(x_{i}, a) - d(x_{i}, w^{*}) + d(a, w^{*})))$$

$$+ \sum_{x_{i} \in T_{b}} (d(x_{i}, a) - d(m_{a,b}, a) - d(x_{i}, w^{*}) + d(m_{a,b}, w^{*})) = \sum_{x_{i} \in T_{a}} d(a, w^{*}) + d(a, x_{i}) - d(x_{i}, w^{*}) + (n_{a,b}, w^{*}) + (n_{a,b}$$

by triangle inequalities.

Consistency: Assume that $P_{\mathcal{C}} = y^*$ is a peripheral point. There are two cases:

Case 1: $\mathbf{n_1} + \lambda \mathbf{n} \leq \mathbf{n_2}$. That is the algorithm outputs point *a*. We actually obtained the desired bound in the course of proving robustness (first inequality in equation (15)).

Case 1: $\mathbf{n_1} + \lambda \mathbf{n} > \mathbf{n_2}$. That is the algorithm outputs point *b*. But by the definition of the algorithm (the fact that we take $b = P_{\mathcal{C}}$ if possible) it follows that $P_{\mathcal{C}} = y^* = b$. The approximation ratio is 1.

6 Proof of Theorem 4

We will use characterization of strategyproof mechanisms from [23, 13]. They prove that strategyproof mechanisms have the following form: there exist $0 \le r < s \le 1$ and $0 \le k \le n$ s.t., if $v = \frac{r+s}{2}$ then

$$T_k^{r,s}(s_1, s_2, \dots s_n) = \begin{cases} r, & \text{if } |\{i : s_i \le v\}| \le k, \\ s, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In our cases clearly r = 0, s = 1, hence v = 1/2. We will compute next the approximation ratios for the threshold mechanism $T_k^{0,1}$ under each of the hypotheses $y^* = 0, y^* = 1$.

Clearly $OPT(\mathcal{C}) = max(\sum_{i} x_i, \sum_{i=1}^{n} (1 - x_i))$. To find the approximation ratios of $T_k^{0,1}$ we will look for configurations \mathcal{C} for which the optimum is realized at $y^* = 0$ while $T_k(\mathcal{C}) = 1$ (or viceversa).

Indeed, to realize the optimum at $y^* = 0$ while $T_k(\mathcal{C}) = 1$ we need to maximize $\sum_i x_i$ while making sure that at least k+1 points of \mathcal{C} are in [0, 1/2].

This is achieved by taking C_1 to be the configuration consisting of k+1 points at 1/2 and n-k-1 points at 1. It can be verified that the optimum for C_1 is indeed realized at $y^* = 0$, since $\sum_i x_i = k/2 + n - k = n - k/2$, while $\sum_i (1-x_i) = k/2$. So

$$\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}_1)}{T_k(\mathcal{C}_1)} = \frac{n-k/2}{k/2} = \frac{2n}{k} - 1.$$

On the other hand, to realize the optimum at $Y^* = 1$ while $T_k(\mathcal{C}) = 0$ we need to minimize $\sum_i x_i$ while making sure that at most k points of \mathcal{C} are in [0, 1/2]. Let \mathcal{C}_2 the configuration consisting of k points at 0 and n-k points at $1/2 + \epsilon$. It can be verified that for small enough $\epsilon > 0$ the optimum for \mathcal{C}_2 is indeed realized at P = 1 since $\sum_i x_i = (n-k)(1/2 + \epsilon) \approx \frac{n-k}{2}$, while $\sum_i (1-x_i) = k + (n-k)(1/2 - \epsilon) \approx (n-k)/2 + k$.

$$\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}_2)}{T_k(\mathcal{C}_2)} = \frac{(n+k)/2 - \epsilon(n-k)}{(n-k)/2 + (n-k)\epsilon} \le \frac{n+k}{n-k} = \frac{2n}{n-k} - 1.$$

In conclusion, for $k \leq n/2 T_k$ has approximation ratio $\frac{2n}{k} - 1$, while for k > n/2 T_k has approximation ratio $\frac{2n}{n-k} - 1$.

Consider now a mechanism with predictions $f: X^n \times \{0, 1\} \to \{0, 1\}$ and its restrictions f_0, f_1 to each of the cases $P_{\mathcal{C}} = 0, P_{\mathcal{C}} = 1$. Mechanisms f_0, f_1 are strategyproof. Since f is (1 + c)-consistent, for every \mathcal{C} such that $OPT(\mathcal{C}) = 0, \frac{OPT(\mathcal{C})}{SW(\mathcal{C}, f_0(\mathcal{C}))} \leq 1 + c$, and similarly, for every \mathcal{C} s.t. $OPT(\mathcal{C}) = 1, \frac{OPT(\mathcal{C})}{SW(\mathcal{C}, f_1(\mathcal{C}))} \leq 1 + c$.

By the previous discussion it follows that there exist numbers k_0, k_1 such that $f_0 \equiv T_{k_0}$ and $f_1 \equiv T_{k_1}$. Furthermore, since f is (1 + c)-consistent, we infer that $\frac{2n}{k_0} - 1 \leq 1 + c$ or, equivalently, $k_0 \geq \frac{2n}{2+c}$. Similarly, $\frac{2n}{n-k_1} - 1 \leq 1 + c$, hence $k_1 \leq n - \frac{2n}{2+c} = \frac{2cn}{2+c}$. Now let's consider the case of wrong predictions: suppose $P_{\mathcal{C}} = 0$ but, in

Now let's consider the case of wrong predictions: suppose $P_{\mathcal{C}} = 0$ but, in fact, $y^* = 1$. This means that f acts on \mathcal{C} as T_{k_0} would do. Consider again configuration \mathcal{C}_2 consisting of k_0 points at 0, the rest at $1/2 + \epsilon$. Clearly the optimum of this configuration is obtained at $y^* = 1$. On the other hand $\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}_2)}{F(\mathcal{C}_2, P_{\mathcal{C}_2})} = \frac{(n+k_0)/2 - \epsilon(n-k_0)}{(n-k_0)/2 + (n-k_0)\epsilon}$. Since $k_0 \geq \frac{2n}{2+c}$, $\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C}_2)}{F(\mathcal{C}_2, P_{\mathcal{C}_2})} \geq \frac{\frac{n}{2}(1-\epsilon) + \frac{2n}{2+c}(\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)}{\frac{n}{2}(1+2\epsilon) - \frac{2n}{2+c}(1/2+\epsilon)} = \frac{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{(\frac{1}{2+c})} + \epsilon\frac{2-c}{2+c}}{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2+c} + \epsilon\frac{c}{2+c}}$ The limit (as $\epsilon \to 0$) of the right-hand side is $\frac{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{(\frac{1}{2+c})}}{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2+c}} = \frac{4+c}{c} = 1 + \frac{4}{c}$. So for any $\delta > 0$ we can find $\epsilon > 0$ such that configuration \mathcal{C}_2 witnesses the fact that the mechanism f is **not** $(1 + \frac{4}{c} + \delta)$ -robust.

7 Proof of Theorem 5

 γ -group strategyproofness: The proof is very similar to the corresponding proof in [14] (and our own arguments for Theorem 1), and is omitted from this extended abstract. We only highlight the fact that (because the intervals we consider are $[0, \frac{1-\lambda}{2}), [1 - \lambda/2, 1]$, which have unequal lengths), for $\lambda > 0$ the mechanism cannot be group-strategyproof, otherwise it would contradict the characterization [23] of strategyproof mechanisms for agents of type 0.

Robustness: The result will follow from the following lemmas:

Lemma 2. Let C be a configuration with all agents of type 1. Then

$$\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C})}{f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})} \le \frac{3+\lambda}{1-\lambda}$$
(16)

Proof. Without loss of generality assume that $P_{\mathcal{C}} = 1$ (if this is not the case, simply switch labels 1 and 0). Let y^* be the point realizing the optimum social welfare for \mathcal{C} . y^* can be characterized as the point that maximizes $\sum_{i=1}^{n} (1 - d(x_i, y^*))$ (that is, it minimizes $\sum_{i=1}^{n} d(x_i, y^*)$). It is well-known (e.g. [9]) that y^* is the median point of configuration \mathcal{C} (any point between the two median points, if n is even). That is: let $\mathcal{C} = x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \ldots \leq x_n$. If n = 2k + 1 then $y^* = x_{k+1}$. Otherwise $y^* \in [x_k, x_{k+1}]$ and we will take $y^* = \frac{x_k + x_{k+1}}{2}$.

Assume first that $\mathbf{n_1} \leq \mathbf{n_2}$ (i.e. Algorithm 1 outputs $P_{\mathcal{C}} = 1$). Suppose first that n = 2k. Then, by condition $\mathbf{n_1} \leq \mathbf{n_2}$ it follows that there are at least k members of \mathcal{C} in the interval $[0, \frac{1+\lambda}{2}]$. So $x_k \leq \frac{1+\lambda}{2}$. For $1 \leq r \leq k$ we have:

$$\frac{u_r(y^*) + u_{n+1-r}(y^*)}{u_r(f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})) + u_{n+1-r}(f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}}))} = \frac{2 - |x_r - y^*| - |x_{n+1-r} - y^*|}{2 - x_r - x_{n+1-r}}$$
$$= \frac{2 - |x_{n+1-r} - x_r|}{2 - 2x_r - |x_{n+1-r} - x_r|} \le \frac{2 - (1 - x_r)}{2 - 2x_r - (1 - x_r)} =$$
$$= \frac{1 + x_r}{1 - x_r} \le \frac{1 + \frac{1 + \lambda}{2}}{1 - \frac{1 + \lambda}{2}} = \frac{3 + \lambda}{1 - \lambda}$$

In the previous inequalities we have used the fact that $x_r \leq y^* \leq x_{n+1-r}$, that $x_{n+1-r} - x_r \leq 1 - x_r$, that $x_r \leq \frac{1+\lambda}{2}$. In conclusion

$$u_r(y^*) + u_{n+1-r}(y^*) \le \frac{3+\lambda}{1-\lambda} \cdot (u_r(f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})) + u_{n+1-r}(f(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})))$$

Summing up all these inequalities for r = 1, ..., k we get $OPT(\mathcal{C}) \leq \frac{3+\lambda}{1-\lambda} \cdot F(\mathcal{C}, P_{\mathcal{C}})$, which is what we wanted to prove. The proof is similar for the case n = 2k + 1. In this case we sum again inequalities for i = 1, ..., k and use the fact that $x_{k+1} = y^*$, so the middle term in the sum expressing $OPT(\mathcal{C})$ is 0. We omit giving complete details.

The case $n_1 > n_2$ is dealt with similarly.

Lemma 3. Let C_1 , C_2 be two configurations with n agents s.t. all agents in C_1 are of type 1 and the transformed configurations of C, C_1 are identical. Then for any $P \in \{0,1\}$ $f(C,P) = f(C_1,P)$, while $OPT(C) \leq OPT(C_1)$. Hence $app(C, f(C,P)) \leq app(C_1, f(C_1,P))$.

Proof. The first relation follows directly from the definition of Algorithm 4. As for the second, it is enough to prove that $SW(\mathcal{C}, Y) \leq SW(\mathcal{C}_1, Y)$ for every $Y \in [0, 1]$. If $1 \leq i \leq n$ and agent *i* is of type 1 in \mathcal{C} (and in \mathcal{C}_1) then $u_i(\mathcal{C}, Y) = u_i(\mathcal{C}_1, Y)$. Otherwise, if *i* is of type 0 and location x_i in \mathcal{C} (but, of course, of type 1 in C_1) then its location in C_1 is x_i^* and $u_i(\mathcal{C}, Y) = d(x_i, Y)$, while $u_i(\mathcal{C}_1, Y) = 1 - d(x_i^*, Y)$. Since $d(x_i, Y) + d(x_i^*, Y) \leq 1$ ([14], Lemma 4) Lemma 3 follows.

Consistency: We will use again Lemma 3. To prove that the algorithm is $\frac{3-\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ consistent we only need to show that for all configurations C where all agents are of type 1, if $1 = P_C = y^*$ then $\frac{OPT(C)}{F(C,P_C)} \leq \frac{3-\lambda}{1+\lambda}$. If the algorithm outputs point P_C then the approximation ratio of the algorithm is 1. The remaining case is when the algorithm outputs the value 0. This means that $n_1 > n_2$. Furthermore, since $y^* = 1$, we must have $x_i = 1$ for all $i \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$.

Let n = 2k. Just as in the case of proving robustness $x_k \leq \frac{1-\lambda}{2}$. We have $OPT(\mathcal{C}) = (n-k) \cdot 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k x_i$. On the other hand $F(\mathcal{C}, P_C) = (n-k) \cdot 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k 1 - x_i = n + \sum_{i=1}^k x_i$. So $\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C})}{F(\mathcal{C}, P_C)} \leq \frac{n-k+k\frac{1-\lambda}{2}}{n-k\frac{1-\lambda}{2}} = \frac{3-\lambda}{1+\lambda}$.

If n = 2k + 1 then $OPT(\mathcal{C}) = n - k - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_i$, while $F(\mathcal{C}, P_C) = (n-k) \cdot 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k} 1 - x_i = n - \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_i$. So $\frac{OPT(\mathcal{C})}{F(\mathcal{C}, P_C)} < \frac{k + k \frac{1-\lambda}{2}}{2k - k \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda}} = \frac{3-\lambda}{1+\lambda}$.

8 Related Work

For lack of space we only give the briefest sketch of related work.

As mentioned in the introduction, our work is naturally related to the emerging literature on algorithms with predictions, [1, 2, 3]. In particular, the robustness/consistency model was made popular (in the context of the competitive analysis of ski-rental) by [2], and further studied in many papers. The literature on mechanism design with predictions is, on the other hand, very recent and limited, only including, to our best knowledge, references [4, 5, 6, 7].

The facility location has a long history of investigation, both in a classical (optimization) sense [22], as well as in a strategic setting (e.g. [9, 10, 11]). The classical approaches to obnoxious version of facility location have an equally long history, starting perhaps with [24], as a topic in graph theory/operations research, and including, e.g., [19, 20, 25]. The strategic approach started in [26] (journal version in [12]). Other directly relevant related references are [23, 13] that characterize stategyproof mechanisms in two overlapping but slightly settings, that both generalize obnoxious facility location, as well as [21], that characterize possible outputs of group strategyproof mechanisms. Further variations include, e.g., [27, 15, 16, 28, 29]. An interesting, alternative strategic approach based on voting, that studies a so-called *anti-Condorcet point*, and would deserve further attention is given in [30].

9 Conclusions and Open Problems

Our main contribution is showing that obnoxious facility location can be analyzed in the framework of mechanism design with predictions. A number of issues raised by our work remain open. The list of the most interesting ones includes, we believe, the following:

- 1. In the 2-d case can we give a **group-strategyproof mechanism** displaying the optimum tradeoff ?
- 2. What are the optimal tradeoffs between robustness and consistency in the case of d-dimensional hypercubes, $d \ge 3$?
- 3. Can we give an algorithm for trees that overcomes the issue(s) discussed in Remark 1 ?
- 4. What about randomized algorithms? Such bounds exist in the case without predictions. We attempted to give such bounds but failed, due to the complexity of resulting calculations.

References

- M. Mitzenmacher and S. Vassilvitskii. Algorithms with predictions. In Chapter 29 in [31], 2021.
- [2] Manish Purohit, Zoya Svitkina, and Ravi Kumar. Improving online algorithms via ml predictions. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 31, 2018.
- [3] Alexander Lindermayr and Nicole Megow. Algorithms with predictions webpage. https://algorithms-with-predictions.github.io, 2022. accessed October 2022.
- [4] Chenyang Xu and Pinyan Lu. Mechanism design with predictions. Proceedings of IJCAI'22, 2022.
- [5] Priyank Agrawal, Eric Balkanski, Vasilis Gkatzelis, Tingting Ou, and Xizhi Tan. Learning-augmented mechanism design: Leveraging predictions for facility location. *Proceedings of EC'22*, 2022.
- [6] Vasilis Gkatzelis, Kostas Kollias, Alkmini Sgouritsa, and Xizhi Tan. Improved price of anarchy via predictions. In *Proceedings of EC'22*, 2022.
- [7] Eric Balkanski, Vasilis Gkatzelis, and Xizhi Tan. Strategyproof scheduling with predictions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.04058, 2022.
- [8] Jason D Hartline. Mechanism design and approximation. Book draft. October, 2022.
- [9] Ariel D Procaccia and Moshe Tennenholtz. Approximate mechanism design without money. ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation (TEAC), 1(4):1–26, 2013.
- [10] Reshef Meir. Strategyproof facility location for three agents on a circle. In International Symposium on Algorithmic Game Theory, pages 18–33. Springer, 2019.

- [11] Haris Aziz, Hau Chan, Barton Lee, Bo Li, and Toby Walsh. Facility location problem with capacity constraints: Algorithmic and mechanism design perspectives. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelli*gence, volume 34, pages 1806–1813, 2020.
- [12] Lili Mei, Deshi Ye, and Guochuan Zhang. Mechanism design for one-facility location game with obnoxious effects on a line. *Theoretical Computer Sci*ence, 734:46–57, 2018.
- [13] Ken Ibara and Hiroshi Nagamochi. Characterizing mechanisms in obnoxious facility game. In *International conference on combinatorial optimization and applications*, pages 301–311. Springer, 2012.
- [14] Shaokun Zou and Minming Li. Facility location games with dual preference. In Proceedings of the 2015 international conference on autonomous agents and multiagent systems, pages 615–623, 2015.
- [15] Itai Feigenbaum and Jay Sethuraman. Strategyproof mechanisms for onedimensional hybrid and obnoxious facility location models. In AAAI workshop: Incentive and trust in E-communities, 2015.
- [16] Morito Oomine, Aleksandar Shurbevski, and Hiroshi Nagamochi. Parameterization of strategy-proof mechanisms in the obnoxious facility game. J. Graph Algorithms Appl., 21(3):247–263, 2017.
- [17] James Schummer and Rakesh V Vohra. Strategy-proof location on a network. Journal of Economic Theory, 104(2):405–428, 2002.
- [18] Atif Abueida, Michael Ackerman, and Choi Sul-Young. Centrality and anticentrality in trees. DIMACS Educational Module, (08-03), 2008.
- [19] Richard L Church and Robert S Garfinkel. Locating an obnoxious facility on a network. *Transportation science*, 12(2):107–118, 1978.
- [20] Shen-Sheng Ting. A linear-time algorithm for maxisum facility location on tree networks. *Transportation Science*, 18(1):76–84, 1984.
- [21] Morito Oomine and Hiroshi Nagamochi. Characterizing output locations of gsp mechanisms to obnoxious facility game in trees. *IEICE TRANSAC-TIONS on Information and Systems*, 99(3):615–623, 2016.
- [22] R. Love, J Morris, and G Wesolowsky. Facilities location: Models and methods. North Holland, 1988.
- [23] Qiaoming Han and Donglei Du. Moneyless strategy-proof mechanism on single-sinked policy domain: characterization and applications. Faculty of Business Administration, University of New Brunswick, 2012.
- [24] Bohdan Zelinka. Medians and peripherians of trees. Archivum Mathematicum, 4(2):87–95, 1968.

- [25] Arie Tamir. Obnoxious facility location on graphs. SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics, 4(4):550–567, 1991.
- [26] Deshi Ye, Lili Mei, and Yong Zhang. Strategy-proof mechanism for obnoxious facility location on a line. In *International Computing and Combinatorics Conference*, pages 45–56. Springer, 2015.
- [27] Yukun Cheng, Qiaoming Han, Wei Yu, and Guochuan Zhang. Obnoxious facility game with a bounded service range. In *International conference on* theory and applications of models of computation, pages 272–281. Springer, 2013.
- [28] Yuhei Fukui, Aleksandar Shurbevski, and Hiroshi Nagamochi. λ-group strategy-proof mechanisms for the obnoxious facility game in star networks. *IEICE TRANSACTIONS on Fundamentals of Electronics, Communica*tions and Computer Sciences, 102(9):1179–1186, 2019.
- [29] Fu Li, C Gregory Plaxton, and Vaibhav B Sinha. The obnoxious facility location game with dichotomous preferences. arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.05396, 2021.
- [30] Martine Labbé. Location of an obnoxious facility on a network: a voting approach. *Networks*, 20(2):197–207, 1990.
- [31] Tim Roughgarden. Beyond the worst-case analysis of algorithms. Cambridge University Press, 2021.