

Improved LP-based Approximations for Facility Location with Hard Capacities

Mong-Jen Kao

Department of Computer Science,
National Yang-Ming Chiao-Tung University, Taiwan.
Email: mjkao@nycu.edu.tw

Abstract

The Capacitated Facility Location (CFL), a long-standing classic problem with intriguing approximability and literature dated back to the 90s, is considered. Following the open question posted in [Williamson and Shmoys, 2011] and the notable work due to [An et al., FOCS 2014], we present an LP-based approximation algorithm with a guarantee of $(10 + \sqrt{67})/2 \approx 9.0927$, a significant improvement upon the previous LP-based ratio of 288 due to An et al. in 2014. Our contribution for this part is a simple and elegant rounding algorithm that brings clear insights for the MFN relaxation and the CFL problem.

For CFL with cardinality facility cost (CFL-CFC), we present an LP-based 4-approximation algorithm, which improves upon the decades-old ratio of 5 due to Levi et al. that ages up since 2004. Prior to our work, it was not clear whether or not LP-based methods can be used to provide a guarantee better than 5 for the CFL problem, even for restricted versions of this problem, for which natural LPs are already known to have small integrality gaps. Our rounding algorithm provides the first affirmative answer on the case with cardinality facility cost.

1 Introduction

We consider the facility location problem with hard capacities (CFL), a long-standing problem with intriguing unsettled approximability and literature dated back to the 90s. In this problem, we are given a set \mathcal{F} of facilities, a set \mathcal{D} of clients, and a distance metric c defined over $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{D}$. Each $i \in \mathcal{F}$ is associated with an open cost o_i and a capacity u_i , which is the number of clients it can serve when opened up. The cost of serving a client j using a facility i equals the distance between them. The goal is to determine a set of facilities to open up and an assignment of the clients to the opened facilities that respects their capacity limits so as to minimize that the total cost.

The CFL problem was first considered by Shmoys, Tardos, and Aardal in [16]. For facilities with uniform capacities, Koropolu et al. [10] showed that the local search heuristic proposed by Kuehn and Hamburger [11] yields a constant factor approximation. Chudak and Williamson [7] improved the analysis of Korupolu et al. [10] and obtained a $(6, 5)$ -approximation, i.e., a solution whose cost is bounded by 6 times the facility cost plus 5 times the service cost of an optimal solution. Aggarwal et al. [2] introduced the idea of taking suitable linear combinations of inequalities which captures the local optimality and obtained a 3-approximation.

For facilities with non-uniform capacities, i.e., the general CFL problem, Pal et al. [15] presented a $(9, 5)$ -approximation based on local search algorithm. The ratio was improved by Mahdian and Pal [14] to an $(8, 7)$ -approximation. Zhang et al. [18] introduced the idea of multi-exchange local operations and further improved the ratio to $(6, 5)$. The algorithm was later modified by Bansal et al. [5] to achieve a 5-approximation, which is the best ratio known for the CFL problem.

In contrast to the rich LP-based toolboxes developed for the uncapacitated facility location problem (UFL), the fact that no LP-based algorithms with constant approximation guarantee were known for CFL was intriguing and surprising. In fact, devising an LP-based approximation with constant guarantee for CFL was listed as one of ten open problems in the textbook on approximation algorithm due to Williamson and Shmoys [17]. This problem was resolved by the notable work of An, Singh, and Svensson [4], in which a strong multi-commodity flow network (MFN) relaxation with constant integrality gap is presented. The approximation guarantee obtained in this work, however, is in the order of 288, and it remains an open problem to devise a better LP-based guarantee for CFL or a better integrality gap for the MFN relaxation.

In the pursuit of settling down the approximability of CFL, an important variation between the general problem and the case with uniform capacities is when we have cardinality-type facility costs (CFL-CFC), i.e., uniform facility cost for which $o_i = 1$ for all $i \in \mathcal{F}$. This was studied by Levi, Shmoys, and Swamy [12], in which an LP-based 5-approximation was presented. Interestingly, the ratio of 5 remained to be the best known ratio for the next 17 years since 2004.

The hard capacitated problems have drawn a wide attention in the past two decades, with new understandings and techniques blossomed. While some of these problems are shown to share the same approximability with their uncapacitated versions [6, 9], many of others appear to be of greater difficulty to deal with [3, 4, 8, 13]. One primary reason for this phenomenon is that, the hard capacity constraint renders most of existing techniques, in particular, LP-based techniques developed for the uncapacitated versions, not directly applicable in ensuring the feasibility, and complicated constructions with compromise are often made to deliver a solid guarantee. The existing LP-based result for the CFL problem [4] is one of such examples. With the usage of reassignable partial assignments, the MFN relaxation provides a way to handle the CFL problem with a bounded integrality gap. The right rounding methodology for this category of problems, however, appears to be yet to be found, be it the CFL problem, or its restricted variations.

1.1 Our Contribution

Following the open question posted by Williamson and Shmoys [17] and the notable work due to An et al. [4], we present a simple and elegant rounding-based approximation algorithms with a significantly improved LP-based guarantee for the CFL problem. Our result for CFL is the following theorem.

Theorem 1. There is an LP-based algorithm for CFL that produces a $(10 + \sqrt{67})/2 \approx 9.0927$ -approximation in polynomial-time.

This significantly improves upon the previous ratio of 288 due to An et al. [4] in 2014. Our algorithm is built on an iterative rounding scheme for the MFN relaxation that combines several new insights and novel ideas with a couple of techniques developed in the past [1, 4, 12]. In addition, it has the characteristic of being simple and elegant in that no sophisticated construction is involved. We believe that such simplicity is essential and beneficial in the further development of this problem.

In addition to the general CFL problem, we present an improved approximation algorithm for CFL with cardinality facility cost (CFL-CFC). Our result for this part is the following theorem.

Theorem 2. There is a rounding-based algorithm for CFL-CFC that produces a 4-approximation in polynomial-time.

This result yields an improvement upon the decades-old ratio of 5 due to Levi et al. [5] that ages up for 17 years since 2004. Prior to this work, it was not even clear whether LP-based methods can be used to provide a guarantee better than 5 for the CFL problem, even for restricted versions of this problem, for which simple natural LPs are already known to have small integrality gaps. Our result provides the first affirmative answer on the case with cardinality facility cost.

The algorithm we propose for CFL-CFC is a delicate coordination of a two-staged iterative clustering scheme which incorporates a set of novel ideas with techniques developed in the past for both facility location and capacitated covering problems [6, 9, 12]. We believe that, the rounding techniques we develop in this work are of independent interests and will lead to further insights and progress for related problems.

Overview of Algorithms and Techniques. The core part of our results can be seen as rounding procedures that handles small instances incurred in the LP relaxations, i.e., the rounding decisions for the small facilities and the assignments made to them. As was illustrated implicitly by An et al. in [4], the true power of the MFN relaxation lies in its ability to remove the large facilities from consideration, using the assignments made to them as the extra price. As a result, what remains is the rounding problem for a relaxation of the small instance.

Our procedures aim at fractionally serving the clients while making sure that the rounded facilities are reasonably sparsely-loaded by the assignments, so that a small final round-up on the assignments can be made to guarantee the feasibility. The sparsity of the small facilities is guaranteed by default. In our algorithm, we make the observation that, with proper construction, the large facilities are also sparsely-loaded by the flow sent to them, and a reasonable final rounding blow-up of $1/(1 - \alpha)$ can be made when necessary. This characteristic is distinguishable to [4], in which the small instance is created by showing that, there exists a feasible flow that sends a firm fraction of $1/2$ demand from each client of interests to the small facilities.

Our rounding procedure for the small facilities builds around the idea due to Abraham et al. [1] and prior works developed for uncapacitated facility location. In each iteration, the facility with the

least *per-unit-flow-rerouting-cost* is selected to be rounded, and all the flow along with the facility value in the vicinity is rerouted simultaneously and proportionally to the selected facility.

To bound the extra rerouting cost incurred during the rounding process, one essential element is to guarantee a low assignment radius for each client. In [1, 4], this is done by applying the so-called filtering technique, which is basically to apply the Markov’s inequality to cut-off long-range assignments followed by unconditional round-up. This inevitably creates a tremendous blowup in the final guarantee. In our algorithm, we rebalance the instance in each iteration with a carefully designed LP and use the primal-dual schema in an implicit way to obtain an exact pricing on the cost, which in turn bounds the assignment radius tightly for each client that gets reassigned. The LP we design also enables, in a subtle yet crucial way, our rounding algorithm to evenly balance the facility cost and the assignment cost we spend in each iteration.

Our rounding algorithm for CFL-CFC is a delicate coordination between rounding procedures for the large and the small facilities. In contrast to our previous result, the large facilities can be tightly-loaded by the assignments made in the natural LP solutions. Hence, they do not allow a final round-up of the assignments in general.

To overcome this issue, we introduce the concept of *client redistribution*: When the residue demand of a client drops below a target threshold, we discard the client and redistribute part of it to the large facilities in the vicinity, defined by the LP solution, to form the so-called “*outlier clients*.” The outlier clients participate in the rounding process after created and act as normal clients except for that, there is no threshold for them to be discarded, and we guarantee that they will be fully-assigned for the final feasibility. Moreover, the way the outlier clients are created also guarantees that, the resulting assignment cost does not increase too much.

The concept of client redistribution resolves the assignment of the clients. However, when an outlier client is inevitably selected to form a cluster, we are no longer able to guarantee the overall rounding cost of the facilities, since the total facility value can be arbitrarily small, rendering the rounding error unbounded. To prevent this undesirable situation, we formulate the rounding decisions for the *outlier clusters* as another instance of CFL-CFC, in which the large facilities act as the clients and the small facilities act as the normal facilities. We use a carefully designed matching-yielding assignment LP, followed by an *unconditional rounding* scheme, for this instance.

To bound the cost incurred, we deploy a technique, which was originally developed for the capacitated covering problems [6, 9], to show that, basic feasible solutions of this simple LP corresponds naturally to a matching from the non-integral facilities to the large facilities at which the outlier clients reside. Hence the rounding cost of these small facilities can be bounded.

Organization of this paper. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In the rest of this section we introduce the MFN relaxation for the CFL problem. We present our approximation algorithm for CFL in Section 2 and our approximation algorithm for CFC-CFC in Section 3.

The additional content is organized as follows. We establish the approximation guarantee for CFL in Section 4, page 11, and the guarantee for CFC-CFC in Section 5, page 22.

1.2 Preliminaries

In the CFL problem, we are given a set \mathcal{F} of facilities, a set \mathcal{D} of clients, and a distance metric c defined over $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{D}$. Each $i \in \mathcal{F}$ is associated with an open cost o_i and a capacity u_i , which is the number of clients it can serve when opened up. A feasible solution for CFL consists of a multiplicity function $y: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and an assignment function $x: \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that the

following conditions are met: (a) $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} x_{i,j} \geq 1$, for each $j \in \mathcal{D}$. (b) $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x_{i,j} \leq u_i \cdot y_i$, for each $i \in \mathcal{F}$. (c) $x_{i,j} \leq y_i$, for each $i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}$. The cost of a solution (x, y) is defined to be $\psi(x, y) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} o_i \cdot y_i + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}$. Given an instance $\Psi = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{o}, \mathbf{u})$ of CFL, the goal of this problem is to compute an integral solution (x, y) such that $\psi(x, y)$ is minimized.




Figure 1: The construction of $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(x, y, g)$ and the corresponding LP constraints.

The MFN relaxation. As natural LP formulations for CFL are known to have an unbounded integrality gap even for simple settings, An, Singh, and Svensson [4] introduced a strong LP relaxation based on multicommodity flow networks (MFN). The idea is to impose Knapsack-cover type constraints, formulated as reassignable *partial assignments* given as free in each qualifying test.

Definition 1 (Partial Assignments). A partial assignment g is a function $g: \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. The partial assignment g is said to be valid if (i) $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} g_{i,j} \leq 1$, for each $j \in \mathcal{D}$, and (ii) $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} g_{i,j} \leq u_i$, for each $i \in \mathcal{F}$.

Given a candidate fractional solution (x, y) and a valid partial assignment g , the multi-commodity flow network with respect to (x, y, g) , denoted $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(x, y, g)$ and to be defined in the following, gives a qualifying test on the validity of the candidate solution (x, y) .

Definition 2 (Multi-commodity Flow Network). For a valid partial assignment g and a candidate solution (x, y) , $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(x, y, g)$ is a multicommodity flow network defined as follows.

- Each client $j \in \mathcal{D}$ corresponds to two nodes j^s and j^t in the network and is associated with a commodity j with source-sink pair (j^s, j^t) and demand $r_j^{(g)} := 1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} g_{i,j}$.
- Each facility $i \in \mathcal{F}$ corresponds to two nodes i and i^t that are connected by an arc (i, i^t) of capacity $u_i^{(g)} := y_i \cdot \left(u_i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} g_{i,j} \right)$.
- For each $j \in \mathcal{D}$ and each $i \in \mathcal{F}$, there is an arc (j^s, i) of capacity $x_{i,j}$, an arc (i, j^s) of capacity $g_{i,j}$, and an arc (i^t, j^t) of capacity $r_j^{(g)} \cdot y_i$.

See also Figure 1 for an illustration on the construction of $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(x, y, g)$ and the corresponding constraints. For any $i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}$, let $P_{(x,y)}^{(g)}(i, j)$ to denote the set of paths in $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(x, y, g)$ for commodity j to sink via i^t . The superscript (g) and the subscript (x, y) is omitted when there is no confusion in the context. Let $P := \cup_{i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}} P(i, j)$ to denote the set of all possible paths.

Lemma 3 (An, Singh, Svensson [4]). Given an instance $\Psi = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{o}, \mathbf{u})$ of CFL, the constraints defined by

$$\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(x, y) := \left\{ \mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(x, y, g) \text{ feasible} : \forall \text{ valid } g \right\}$$

is a valid relaxation for integral solutions on Ψ . Furthermore, the separation problem for the feasibility of $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(x, y, g)$ for any valid g can be answered in weakly polynomial-time, and a basic feasible flow can be obtained.

On the need for facility-saturating partial assignments. To illustrate to what extent the MFN relaxation can constraint the fractional solutions to yield a bounded integrality gap for the CFL problem, let us consider the following example.

Suppose that there are two facilities and $n + 1$ clients, where $o_1 = 0, o_2 = 1, u_1 = u_2 = n$, and $c_{i,j} = 0$ for all i, j . Then, for any $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$, making an ϵn amount of partial assignments to facility 1 in the MFN relaxation, e.g., setting $g_{1,j} = \epsilon n / (n + 1)$, only guarantees that $y_2 \geq 1 / ((1 - \epsilon)n + 1)$. Hence, when partial assignments are needed to eliminate the low-cost facilities, saturating them with partial assignments is necessary. The way how the clients are partially assigned, however, does not appear to affect the resulting integrality gap.

2 LP-based Approximation for CFL

In this section we describe our approximation algorithm for CFL and establish Theorem 1. The algorithm applies the Ellipsoid framework used in [4], which aims to either round candidate solutions with the claimed approximation guarantee or to assert the infeasibility of the solution.

For completeness, we briefly sketch the framework. Then we describe our construction for obtaining a sparsely-loading flow and the more interesting part of the iterative rounding process.

The Outer Framework. The framework starts by guessing the optimal cost using standard binary search. For each guess, say γ , the Ellipsoid algorithm is applied on LP-(1). For each separation problem incurred during the Ellipsoid algorithm, we apply Theorem 4, which is stated below, for either a separating hyperplane or an integral solution with the claimed approximation guarantee.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(x, y), && \text{LP-(1)} \\ & \psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \gamma, \\ & \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^{\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{D}}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^{\mathcal{F}}. \end{aligned}$$

When an integral solution is successfully rounded, or when the Ellipsoid algorithm concludes the infeasibility of the guess γ , the framework continues to the next iteration of the binary search process until the desired precision is attained. It suffices to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4. Given a candidate solution (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) for LP-(MFN) and a target parameter α with $0 < \alpha \leq 1/3$, we can compute in polynomial-time either (i) a separating hyperplane for (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) and LP-(MFN), or (ii) an integral solution $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$, rounded from (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) , for Ψ with

$$\psi(x^*, y^*) \leq \max \left\{ \frac{3}{2\alpha}, \frac{7 - 4\alpha}{(1 - \alpha)^2} \right\} \times \psi(x, y).$$

Note that, the particular choice of $\alpha := (10 - \sqrt{67})/11$ completes the statement of Theorem 1. In the rest of this section, we describe our rounding algorithm that establishes the statement of Theorem 4. We provide the analysis and finish the proof in Section 4, page 11.

Initial Classification. Classify the facilities as follows. Let $I := \{i \in \mathcal{F} : 0 < y_i < \alpha\}$ and $U := \{i \in \mathcal{F} : y_i \geq \alpha\}$. The facilities in U are further classified into two categories. Let

$$U^{(>)} := \left\{ i \in U : \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x_{i,j} > (1 - \alpha) \cdot u_i \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad U^{(\leq)} := U \setminus U^{(>)}.$$

Provided that the facilities in U are to be rounded up in the approximate solution, we know that the assignments to $U^{(\leq)}$ are ready to be rounded up by a factor of $1/(1 - \alpha)$. We refer the facilities in $U^{(\leq)}$ to as *sparsely-loaded* by the assignments made in \mathbf{x} .

Obtaining an Initial Sparsely-Loading Flow. Consider the bipartite graph $G = (\mathcal{D}, U^{(>)}, E)$, where there exists an edge (j, i) in E with edge capacity $x_{i,j}/(1 - \alpha)$ for each $j \in \mathcal{D}$ and $i \in U^{(>)}$. Solve LP-(2) for an optimal \mathbf{h} for the maximum b-matching problem on G .

For any $j \in \mathcal{D}$, the client j is said to be partially-assigned if $\sum_{i \in U^{(>)}} h_{i,j} < 1$ and fully-assigned otherwise. We say that a path P in G is an *augmenting path* if the following holds.

- P starts at a partially-assigned client $j \in \mathcal{D}$.
- For each $(j', i') \in P$ with $j' \in \mathcal{D}, i' \in U^{(>)}$, we have $h_{i',j'} < x_{i',j'}/(1 - \alpha)$.
- For each $(i', j') \in P$ with $i' \in U^{(>)}, j' \in \mathcal{D}$, we have $h_{i',j'} > 0$.

$$\begin{array}{l} \max \sum_{i \in U^{(>)}, j \in \mathcal{D}} h_{i,j} \quad \text{LP-(2)} \\ \sum_{i \in U^{(>)}} h_{i,j} \leq 1, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{D}, \\ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} h_{i,j} \leq u_i, \quad \forall i \in U^{(>)}, \\ 0 \leq \mathbf{h} \leq \mathbf{x}/(1 - \alpha). \end{array}$$

Intuitively, an augmenting path is a way to increasing the assignment of a partially-assigned client j without altering the optimality of \mathbf{h} . We say that a facility $i \in U^{(>)}$ is tightly-occupied if it is reachable in G from a partially-assigned client via an augmenting path.

Let $U^{(\phi)}$ denote the set of all tightly-occupied facilities. For each $i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}$, define

$$g_{i,j} := \begin{cases} h_{i,j}, & \text{if } i \in U^{(\phi)}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad y'_i := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i \in U, \\ y_i, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Apply Lemma 3 for either a basic feasible flow \mathbf{f} or a separating hyperplane for $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}', \mathbf{g})$. If a separating hyperplane is found, the algorithm reports it and terminates.

Iterative Rounding for the Small Facilities. In the following we describe our iterative rounding process for the small facilities in I using the information computed in the previous stage.

During the rounding process, the algorithm maintains a parameter tuple $\Psi' = (I', D', \mathbf{r}')$ which corresponding to the remaining instance to be processed. Initially, $I' := I$,

$$\mathbf{r}' := \sum_{i \in I, p \in P(i,j)} f_p, \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathcal{D}, \quad \text{and} \quad D' := \left\{ j \in \mathcal{D} : r'_j > \alpha \cdot r_j^{(g)} \right\},$$

where $r_j^{(g)} = 1 - \sum_{i \in U^{(\phi)}} g_{i,j}$ is the total demand of j . The rounding algorithm updates the tuple Ψ' in iterations until D' becomes empty.

	$\min \sum_{i \in I'} o_i \cdot y_i + \sum_{i \in I', j \in D'} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}$	LP-(M)
s.t.	$\sum_{i \in I'} x_{i,j} \geq r'_j, \quad \forall j \in D',$	(2.a)
	$\sum_{j \in D'} x_{i,j} \leq u_i \cdot y_i, \quad \forall i \in I',$	(2.b)
	$x_{i,j} \leq \frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha} \cdot r_j^{(g)} \cdot y_i, \quad \forall i \in I, j \in D',$	(2.c)
	$y_i \leq \frac{1-\alpha}{2}, \quad \forall i \in I',$	(2.d)
	$x_{i,j} \geq 0, y_i \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in I', j \in D'.$	(2.e)

In each iteration, the algorithm solves LP-(M) on the current tuple Ψ' for an optimal (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) . Depending on the status of \bar{y} , the algorithm selects a facility $i \in I'$ to form a cluster and defines the scaling factor $\sigma_k^{(i)}$ and $\sigma_{k,j}^{(i)}$ for all $k \in I'$ and $j \in D'$.

- If $\bar{y}_i = (1 - \alpha)/2$ for some $i \in I'$, then the algorithm picks such an i with $\bar{y}_i = (1 - \alpha)/2$ from I' and sets $\sigma_k^{(i)} = \sigma_{k,j}^{(i)} = 0$ for all $k \in I' \setminus \{i\}$ and $j \in D'$.
- If $\bar{y}_i < (1 - \alpha)/2$ for all $i \in I'$, then the algorithm selects among the facilities $i \in I'$ with $\bar{y}_i > 0$ the particular i with the minimum $\theta(i)$, where $\theta(i)$ is defined as

$$\theta(i) := \frac{1}{\sum_{j \in D'} \bar{x}_{i,j}} \cdot \left(3 \cdot o_i \cdot \bar{y}_i + 2 \cdot \sum_{j \in D'} c_{i,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j} \right).$$

Intuitively, the selected facility i has the lowest per-unit-assignment rerouting cost, and any other facility in I' can afford the rerouting cost within the cluster centered at i .

For each $j \in D'$, define

$$\delta_j^{(i)} := \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\bar{y}_i} - 1 \right) \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j}$$

to be the amount of assignments to be gathered from the vicinity of facility i to i via commodity j . For each $k \in I' \setminus \{i\}$, define the fraction of k , to be sent to i , as

$$\sigma_k^{(i)} := \frac{1}{\sum_{\ell \in D'} \bar{x}_{k,\ell}} \cdot \sum_{j \in D'} \sigma_{k,j}^{(i)}, \quad \text{where } \sigma_{k,j}^{(i)} := \frac{\bar{x}_{k,j}}{\sum_{\ell \in I' \setminus \{i\}} \bar{x}_{\ell,j}} \cdot \delta_j^{(i)}$$

is the amount of assignments to be sent via commodity j . Note that, from the definition it follows that $\sum_{k \in I' \setminus \{i\}} \sigma_{k,j}^{(i)} = \delta_j^{(i)}$, and the amount to be gathered via j can be fulfilled.

For consistency, also define $\sigma_i^{(i)} = 1$ and $\sigma_{i,j}^{(i)} = \bar{x}_{i,j}$ for all $j \in D'$.

The algorithm updates the parameter tuple Ψ' as follows.

- For each $j \in D'$, the algorithm decreases r'_j by $\sum_{k \in I'} \sigma_k^{(i)} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}$.
- The algorithm removes i from I' and all $j \in D'$ with $r'_j < \alpha \cdot r_j^{(g)}$ from D' .

Then the algorithm proceeds to the next iteration until D' becomes empty.

Final Output. When D' becomes empty, define

$$y_i^* := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i \in U \cup (I \setminus I'), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The algorithm solves the min-cost assignment problem on \mathcal{D} and $\mathcal{F}^* := \{i \in \mathcal{F} : y_i^* = 1\}$ for an optimal integral assignment \mathbf{x}^* and outputs $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ as the approximate solution.

This completes the description for our rounding algorithm.

We provide the analysis and establish the statements of Theorem 4 in Section 4, page 11.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}^*, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j} && \text{LP-(3)} \\ & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}^*} x_{i,j} \geq 1, && \forall j \in \mathcal{D}, \\ & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x_{i,j} \leq u_i, && \forall i \in \mathcal{F}^*, \\ & \mathbf{x} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

3 4-Approximation for CFL-CFC

Let $\Psi = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{u})$ be an instance of CFL-CFC. In this section, we describe our algorithm that establishes the statement of Theorem 2. We begin with the following natural LP relaxation.

$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} y_i + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j} && \text{LP-(N)} \\ & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} x_{i,j} \geq 1, && \forall j \in \mathcal{D}, \\ & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x_{i,j} \leq u_i \cdot y_i, && \forall i \in \mathcal{F}, \\ & 0 \leq x_{i,j} \leq y_i, && \forall i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}, \\ & 0 \leq y_i \leq 1, && \forall i \in \mathcal{F}. \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_j - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \eta_i && \text{LP-(DN)} \\ & \alpha_j \leq \beta_i + \Gamma_{i,j} + c_{i,j}, && \forall i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}, \\ & u_i \cdot \beta_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} \Gamma_{i,j} \leq 1 + \eta_i, && \forall i \in \mathcal{F}, \\ & \alpha_j, \beta_i, \Gamma_{i,j}, \eta_i \geq 0, && \forall i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}. \end{aligned}$
---	--

We use the following notion of *vicinity* with respect to any assignment function of interests, say, \mathbf{x} . For any $A \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ and any $j \in \mathcal{D}$, we use $N_{(A,x)}(j) := \{i \in A : x_{i,j} > 0\}$ to denote the set of facilities in A to which j is assigned to in \mathbf{x} . Similarly, for any $B \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ and any $i \in \mathcal{F}$, we use $N_{(B,x)}(i) := \{j \in B : x_{i,j} > 0\}$ to denote the set of clients in B that is assigned to i in \mathbf{x} .

Let $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')$, $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta})$ be optimal solutions for LP-(N) and its dual LP-(DN) on Ψ . In the rest of this section, we describe our rounding algorithm for $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')$.

Initial Classification. Let $I := \{i \in \mathcal{F} : 0 < y'_i < \frac{1}{2}\}$ and $U := \{i \in \mathcal{F} : y'_i \geq \frac{1}{2}\}$. The clients in \mathcal{D} are divided into three categories, namely, those that are served merely by I , those that are served jointly by I and U , and those that are served merely by U . Let

$$J^{(I)} := \left\{ j \in \mathcal{D} : x'_{i,j} = 0 \text{ for all } i \in U \right\}, \quad J^{(\leftrightarrow)} := \left\{ j \in \mathcal{D} : \min \left(\max_{i \in I} x'_{i,j}, \max_{i \in U} x'_{i,j} \right) > 0 \right\},$$

and $J^{(U)} := \mathcal{D} \setminus (J^{(I)} \cup J^{(\leftrightarrow)})$ denote the clients in the three categories, respectively.

The Rounding Process. Let F' and D' be the set of facilities and the set of clients remained to be processed, and x^* be the rounded assignment function our algorithm will maintain during the process. Initially, $F' := I$ and $D' := J^{(I)} \cup J^{(\leftrightarrow)}$, and $x^* := 0$.

The rounding algorithm consists of two stages. In the first stage, it proceeds in iterations to form clusters. In each of such iterations, the algorithm checks if $\sum_{i \in F'} x'_{i,j} \geq 1/2$ holds for all $j \in D'$. If not, the algorithm makes it so by repeatedly removing small clients from $D' \cap J^{(\leftrightarrow)}$ and redistributing their demand to facilities in U to form a set of *outlier clients*. We use H to denote the set of outlier clients created in this step and $H' \subseteq H$ to denote those that are created but not yet processed by the rounding algorithm. Initially $H := \emptyset$ and $H' := \emptyset$.

When $\sum_{i \in F'} x'_{i,j} \geq 1/2$ holds for all $j \in D'$, a cluster centered at a client is formed and possibly rounded, depending on whether or not the client forming the cluster is outlier, and the corresponding parts of the cluster are removed from F' , D' , and H' , respectively. The cluster forming process repeats until $D' \cup H'$ becomes empty.

In the second stage, the algorithm handles the rounding decisions for the remaining clusters centered at the outlier clients, using a carefully-designed assignment LP and an unconditional rounding scheme, to form an integral multiplicity function. In the following we describe the three components of our rounding algorithm in details.

Creating the Outlier Clients. When $\sum_{i \in F'} x'_{i,j} < 1/2$ for some $j \in J^{(\leftrightarrow)} \cap D'$, the algorithm discards j and relocates part of the remaining demand to facilities in $N_{(U,x')}(j)$ to form outlier clients in a way as if the demand were originated from these facilities, as illustrated in Figure 2.

Let $r'_j := \min\{\sum_{i \in F'} x'_{i,j}, \sum_{i \in U} x'_{i,j}\}$ be the amount of residue demand of j to be redistributed. For each $w \in N_{(U,x')}(j)$, we create a client j_w at the facility w with demand

$$d_{j_w} := \frac{r'_j}{\sum_{i \in U} x'_{i,j}} \cdot x'_{w,j} \quad \text{and set } x'_{i,j_w} := \frac{d_{j_w}}{\sum_{k \in F'} x'_{k,j}} \cdot x'_{i,j}$$

for each $i \in N_{(F',x')}(j)$. See also Figure 2 for an illustration. We add j_w to both H and H' and set $\alpha_{j_w} := \alpha_j + c_{w,j}$.

After the outlier client j_w is created for each $w \in N_{(U,x')}(j)$, the algorithm removes j from D' and set $x'_{i,j}$ to be zero for all $i \in F'$. Note that, by construction, we have

$$\sum_{w \in N_{(U,x')}(j)} d_{j_w} = r'_j \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k \in N_{(F',x')}(j)} x'_{k,j_w} = d_{j_w}.$$

Hence, the designated residue demand of j is fully redistributed and each j_w is fully-assigned.

Forming Clusters and Rounding. When $\sum_{i \in F'} x'_{i,j} \geq 1/2$ holds for all $j \in D'$, the algorithm selects a client $j \in D' \cup H'$ that minimizes α_j to form a cluster. Depending on the set to which j belongs, the algorithm proceeds differently.

- If $j \in H'$, then a cluster centered at j with satellite facilities in $N_{(F',x')}(j)$ is formed. We use $B(j) := N_{(F',x')}(j)$ to denote the set of satellite facilities at this moment. The algorithm then removes j from H' and $B(j)$ from F' . The rounding problem for this cluster is handled later in the second phase of the algorithm.
- If $j \in D'$, the algorithm further selects a facility $i \in N_{(F',x')}(j)$ with the maximum u_i . The algorithm relocates the assignments and facility values from the facilities in $N_{(F',x')}(j)$ to i as follows. Let

$$\delta_i := \left(\frac{1}{2} - y'_i \right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sum_{k \in N_{(F',x')}(j) \setminus \{i\}} y'_k}$$




Figure 2: Construction of the outlier clients.

be the factor to relocate for each facility in $N_{(F',x')}(j) \setminus \{i\}$.

For each facility $\ell \in N_{(F',x')}(j) \setminus \{i\}$, the algorithm scales down y'_ℓ by $(1 - \delta_i)$. For each $k \in N_{(D' \cup H', x')}(l)$, the algorithm further scales down $x'_{\ell,k}$ by $(1 - \delta_i)$ and increases $x^*_{i,k}$ by the same amount $x'_{\ell,k}$ has decreased in this step.

The algorithm increases $x^*_{i,k}$ by $x'_{i,k}$ for each $k \in D'$ and then removes i from F' .

When the above updates are done, for each client $k \in J^{(I)} \cap D'$ with $\sum_{i \in F'} x'_{i,k} < 1/2$, the algorithm removes k from D' and sets $x'_{i,k}$ to be zero for all $i \in F'$. Then the algorithm proceeds to the next iteration until $D' \cup H'$ becomes empty.

Rounding the Outlier Clusters. When the cluster-forming process ends and $D' \cup H'$ becomes empty, the algorithm proceeds to processes the rounding decisions left for the outlier clusters, i.e., clusters centered at outlier clients in H .

We formulate the rounding problem as another instance of CFL-CFC with facility set $G := \bigcup_{j \in H} B(j)$ and client set U as follows.

Each $w \in U$ is associated with a demand d_w , defined as

$$d_w := \sum_{\substack{k \in H, \\ k \text{ located at } w}} \sum_{i \in B(k), \ell \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} t'_\ell \cdot x'_{i,\ell},$$

where the scaling factor t'_ℓ is defined as

$$t'_\ell := \frac{1}{\sum_{k \in I} x^*_{k,\ell} + \sum_{k \in G} x'_{k,\ell}} \cdot \left(1 - \sum_{i \in U} x'_{i,\ell} - r'_\ell \right)$$

if $\ell \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\sum_{k \in I} x^*_{k,\ell} + \sum_{k \in G} x'_{k,\ell} > 0$, and $t'_\ell := 1$ otherwise.

Intuitively, in the above definition, for each $w \in U$, we consider all the outlier clusters centered at clients located at w and collect the demand of these clusters to be the demand of w , and t'_ℓ is the factor for which the assignments made for the client ℓ in these clusters should be scaled up in order to amend the amount lost in the previous stage.

We formulate the above instance with a carefully designed assignment LP, denoted LP-(O). The algorithm solves LP-(O) for a *basic optimal solution* $(\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{y}'')$.

LP-(O)	
\min	$\sum_{i \in G} y_i + \sum_{i \in G, j \in U} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}$
$\sum_{i \in G} x_{i,j} = d_j,$	$\forall j \in U,$
$\sum_{j \in U} x_{i,j} \leq u_i \cdot y_i,$	$\forall i \in G,$
$y_i \leq 1,$	$\forall i \in G,$
$x_{i,j}, y_i \geq 0,$	$\forall i \in G, j \in U.$

Final Output. Define the integral multiplicity function

$$y_i^* := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i \in I \setminus F', \\ \lceil y_i'' \rceil, & \text{if } i \in G, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The algorithm solves the min-cost assignment problem on \mathcal{D} and $\mathcal{F}^* := \{i \in \mathcal{F} : y_i^* = 1\}$ for an optimal integral assignment \mathbf{x}^\dagger , and outputs $(\mathbf{x}^\dagger, \mathbf{y}^*)$ as the approximation solution.

We have the following theorem. We provide the proof in Section 5, page 22.

Theorem 5. Let Ψ be an instance of CFL-CFC and $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')$ be optimal for LP-(N) on Ψ . The rounding algorithm computes in polynomial time a feasible integral solution $(\mathbf{x}^\dagger, \mathbf{y}^*)$ for Ψ with $\psi(\mathbf{x}^\dagger, \mathbf{y}^*) \leq 4 \cdot \psi(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')$.

4 Proof of Theorem 4.

It suffices to prove the following two statements.

1. The rounding algorithm is well-defined and terminates in polynomial time.
2. Provided that $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}', \mathbf{g})$ is feasible, the feasible region of the min-cost assignment problem on \mathcal{D} and F^* is non-empty, and $\psi(x^*, y^*) \leq \max \left\{ \frac{3}{2\alpha}, \frac{7-4\alpha}{(1-\alpha)^2} \right\} \times \psi(x, y)$.

We prove the first statement in Section 4.1. To prove the second statement, we define an assignment \mathbf{x}''' such that $(\mathbf{x}''', \mathbf{y}^*)$ is feasible for the min-cost assignment problem on \mathcal{D} and F^* with the claimed approximation guarantee.

This is done as follows. In Section 4.2 and Section 4.3, we define the assignment functions \mathbf{x}' and \mathbf{x}'' for the assignments made to U and $F^* \cap I$ separately and derive corresponding properties. In Section 4.4, we define the overall assignment \mathbf{x}''' and show that $(\mathbf{x}''', \mathbf{y}^*)$ forms a feasible solution for the input instance Ψ . We bound the cost incurred by $(\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{y}^*|_{F^* \cap I})$ in Section 4.5 and prove in Section 4.6 that $(\mathbf{x}''', \mathbf{y}^*)$ satisfies the claimed approximation guarantee. This completes the proof since \mathbf{x}^* is the optimal min-cost assignment between \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{F}^* .

Notations to use in the proof. To keep the notation precise, for each $i \in F^* \cap I$ that is selected in the second stage, we refer to the particular iteration for which facility i is selected and removed from I' as the i^{th} -iteration. Let $\Psi^{(i)} = (I'^{(i)}, D'^{(i)}, \mathbf{r}'^{(i)})$ denote the parameter tuple the algorithm maintains in the beginning of the i^{th} -iteration. We use $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(i)})$ to denote the optimal solution computed for LP-(M) on $\Psi^{(i)}$.

We use $\Psi^{(0)} = (I'^{(0)}, D'^{(0)}, \mathbf{r}'^{(0)})$ to denote the initial tuple the algorithm constructs in the beginning of the second stage. We refer to $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(0)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(0)})$ the solution to be defined in Section 4.1 for LP-(M) on the initial parameter tuple $\Psi^{(0)}$.

4.1 The feasibility of the algorithm

Consider the first stage of the algorithm. Since $\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{y}'$, we have $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{g}) \subseteq \mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}', \mathbf{g})$. Hence, should the algorithm outputs a separating hyperplane in the first stage, it must separate (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) from $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{g})$ as well.

In the following, we assume that $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}', \mathbf{g})$ is feasible and prove that the iterative rounding process is well-defined and runs in polynomial time. Since \mathbf{f} is a basic solution, the number of paths with nonzero flow in \mathbf{f} is polynomial in \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{D} . Hence, $\mathbf{r}'^{(0)}$ can be computed in polynomial time. The following lemma, which is proved by verifying the corresponding constraints and the fact that $0 < \alpha \leq 1/3$, shows that the feasible region of LP-(M) on $\Psi^{(0)}$ is nonempty.

Lemma 6. The solution $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(0)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(0)})$ defined by

$$\bar{x}_{i,j}^{(0)} := \sum_{p \in P(i,j)} f_p \quad \text{for all } i \in I'^{(0)}, j \in D'^{(0)} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{y}_i^{(0)} := \frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha} \cdot y_i \quad \text{for all } i \in I'^{(0)}$$

is feasible for LP-(M) on the initial parameter tuple $\Psi^{(0)}$.

Proof. We prove this lemma by verifying the constraints of LP-(M) separately.

- Constraint (2.a) follows directly from the definition of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{r}'^{(0)}$, since for each $j \in D^{(0)}$,

$$\sum_{i \in I^{(0)}} \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(0)} = \sum_{i \in I, p \in P(i,j)} f_p = r_j'^{(0)}.$$

- For Constraint (2.b), consider any $i \in I^{(0)}$. Since \mathbf{f} is feasible for $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}', \mathbf{g})$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in D^{(0)}} \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(0)} = \sum_{j \in D^{(0)}, p \in P(i,j)} f_p \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}, p \in P(i,j)} f_p \leq u_i^{(g)} \cdot y_i.$$

Since $i \in I^{(0)} = I$, we have $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} g_{i,j} = 0$ by the way \mathbf{g} is defined and hence $u_i^{(g)} = u_i$. Since $(1 - \alpha)/(2\alpha)$ is strictly decreasing for $\alpha > 0$ and since $0 < \alpha \leq 1/3$, it follows that

$$\bar{y}_i^{(0)} := \frac{1 - \alpha}{2\alpha} \cdot y_i \geq \frac{1 - 1/3}{2/3} \cdot y_i = y_i.$$

Combining the above, we obtain $\sum_{j \in D^{(0)}} \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(0)} \leq u_i \cdot \bar{y}_i^{(0)}$.

- For Constraint (2.c), consider any $i \in I^{(0)}$ and any $j \in D^{(0)}$. Since \mathbf{f} is feasible for $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}', \mathbf{g})$, apply the definitions of $\bar{y}_i^{(0)}$ and $r_j'^{(0)}$ and we have

$$\bar{x}_{i,j}^{(0)} = \sum_{p \in P(i,j)} f_p \leq r_j^{(g)} \cdot y_i = \frac{2\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \cdot r_j'^{(0)} \cdot \bar{y}_i^{(0)}.$$

- For Constraint (2.d), consider any $i \in I^{(0)}$. Since $y_i < \alpha$ by definition, it follows that

$$\bar{y}_i^{(0)} = \frac{1 - \alpha}{2\alpha} \cdot y_i \leq \frac{1 - \alpha}{2}.$$

This proves the lemma. □

Consider the i^{th} -iteration for any $i \in F^* \cap I$. Suppose that LP-(M) on $\Psi^{(i)}$ is feasible, and recall that $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(i)})$ is the optimal solution computed for LP-(M) on $\Psi^{(i)}$. The following lemma shows that the scale-down operation is well-defined.

Lemma 7. For any $i \in F^* \cap I$ with $y_i'^{(i)} < (1 - \alpha)/2$, the following holds.

- For any $j \in D^{(i)}$,

$$0 \leq \delta_j^{(i)} \leq \sum_{\ell \in I^{(i)} \setminus \{i\}} \bar{x}_{\ell,j}^{(i)}.$$

- For any $k \in I^{(i)} \setminus \{i\}$, we have $0 \leq \sigma_k^{(i)} \leq 1$.

Proof. Consider any $j \in D^{(i)}$. Since $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(i)})$ is feasible for LP-(M) on $\Psi^{(i)}$, we have $\bar{y}_i^{(i)} \leq (1 - \alpha)/2$, which implies that $(1 - \alpha)/(2 \cdot \bar{y}_i^{(i)}) \geq 1$. Hence

$$\delta_j^{(i)} := \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\bar{y}_i^{(i)}} - 1 \right) \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)} \geq 0.$$

On the other hand, applying constraint (2.c) and then constraint (2.a), we have

$$\delta_j^{(i)} := \frac{1-\alpha}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\bar{y}_i^{(i)}} \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)} - \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)} \leq \alpha \cdot r_j^{(g)} - \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)} \leq r_j^{(i)} - \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)} = \sum_{\ell \in I'^{(i)} \setminus \{i\}} \bar{x}_{\ell,j}^{(i)},$$

where in the second last inequality we apply the fact that $r_j^{(i)} \geq \alpha \cdot r_j^{(g)}$ holds for all $j \in D'^{(i)}$ by the design of the algorithm. This proves the first part of this lemma.

For the second part, consider any $k \in I'^{(i)} \setminus \{i\}$. By the conclusion of the first part, for any $j \in D'^{(i)}$, we have

$$\sigma_{k,j}^{(i)} := \frac{\delta_j^{(i)}}{\sum_{\ell \in I'^{(i)} \setminus \{i\}} \bar{x}_{\ell,j}^{(i)}} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} \leq \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_k^{(i)} := \frac{1}{\sum_{\ell \in D'^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}} \cdot \sum_{j \in D'^{(i)}} \sigma_{k,j}^{(i)} \leq 1.$$

□

Let $\Psi''^{(i)} = (I''^{(i)}, D''^{(i)}, \mathbf{r}''^{(i)})$ denote the updated tuple the algorithm maintains at the end of the i^{th} -iteration. The following lemma, which is proved by verifying the corresponding constraints, shows that the feasible region of LP-(M) on $\Psi''^{(i)}$ remains nonempty. This shows that the iterative rounding process is well-defined.

Lemma 8. For any $i \in F^* \cap I$, the solution $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}''^{(i)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}''^{(i)})$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}_{i,j}''^{(i)} &:= \left(1 - \sigma_k^{(i)}\right) \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)}, \quad \text{for any } k \in I''^{(i)}, j \in D''^{(i)}, \\ \bar{y}_k''^{(i)} &:= \left(1 - \sigma_k^{(i)}\right) \cdot \bar{y}_k^{(i)} \quad \text{for any } k \in I''^{(i)}, \end{aligned}$$

is feasible for LP-(M) on the updated tuple $\Psi''^{(i)}$.

Proof. We prove this lemma by verifying the constraints in LP-(M). First, by Lemma 7, we know that $0 \leq \sigma_k^{(i)} \leq 1$ holds for all $k \in I''^{(i)}$, and $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}''^{(i)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}''^{(i)})$ is nonnegative.

- Consider the constraint (2.a) for any $j \in D''^{(i)}$ and observe that it is obtained by subtracting $\sum_{k \in I'^{(i)}} \sigma_k^{(i)} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)}$ from both sides of the same constraint w.r.t. the original tuple $\Psi^{(i)}$. Hence the constraint remains valid.
- Consider the constraint (2.b) for any $k \in I''^{(i)}$. Observe that it is obtained by first multiplying the factor $(1 - \sigma_k^{(i)})$ to both sides of the same constraint w.r.t. $\Psi^{(i)}$, followed by subtracting from the L.H.S. $\sum_{j \in D'^{(i)} \setminus D''^{(i)}} (1 - \sigma_k^{(i)}) \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)}$. Hence the resulting inequality remains valid.

For the constraint (2.c) for any $k \in I''^{(i)}$ and $j \in D''^{(i)}$, observe that it is obtained by multiplying $(1 - \sigma_k^{(i)})$ to both sides of the same constraint w.r.t. $\Psi^{(i)}$ and remains valid.

- For the constraint (2.d), consider any $k \in I''^{(i)}$ and observe that

$$\bar{y}_k''^{(i)} = \left(1 - \sigma_k^{(i)}\right) \cdot \bar{y}_k^{(i)} \leq \bar{y}_k^{(i)} \leq \frac{1-\alpha}{2}.$$

This proves the lemma. □

Lemma 6, Lemma 7, and Lemma 8 prove the feasibility of the iterative rounding process. Since exactly one facility is removed from I' in each iteration, the process repeats for at most $|I|$ iterations before I' becomes empty. Moreover, since the tuple remains feasible during all the iterations, it follows from the constraint (2.c) of LP-(M) that, when I' becomes empty, D' must also be empty. Hence, the iterative process terminates in polynomial time.

4.2 The assignment function x' to U

For notational brevity, let $D^{(\phi)}$ denote the set of clients that are fully-assigned by \mathbf{h} and unreachable from any partially-assigned clients. For any $i \in U$, $j \in \mathcal{D}$, define the assignment $x'_{i,j}$ as

$$x'_{i,j} := \begin{cases} g_{i,j}, & \text{if } i \in U^{(\phi)}, \\ h_{i,j}, & \text{if } i \in U^{(>)} \setminus U^{(\phi)}, j \in D^{(\phi)}, \\ \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{p \in P(i,j)} f_p, & \text{if } i \in U^{(>)} \setminus U^{(\phi)}, j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus D^{(\phi)}, \\ \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{p \in P(i,j)} f_p, & \text{if } i \in U^{(\leq)}. \end{cases}$$

Intuitively, in the above definition, we keep the partial assignments made in \mathbf{g} and the flow sent in \mathbf{f} to U , except for those originated from $D^{(\phi)}$ and those sent to sink in $U^{(>)} \setminus U^{(\phi)}$ via $D^{(\phi)}$.

The following proposition shows that, in the flow \mathbf{f} , for any $i \in \mathcal{F}$ and $j \in D^{(\phi)}$, the arc (j^s, i) carries only flow originated from the commodity j .

Proposition 9. For any $j \in D^{(\phi)}$, $i \in \mathcal{F}$, and any $p \in P$ with $(j^s, i) \in p$, we have $f_p > 0$ implies that $p \in \bigcup_{i' \in \mathcal{F}} P(i', j)$, that is, $f_p > 0$ only when p is a path for commodity j .

Proof. By the definition of \mathbf{g} , we have $g_{k,j} = 0$ for all $k \in \mathcal{F}$ since $j \in D^{(\phi)}$. Hence, p must start from j^s and is thereby a path for commodity j . \square

The following lemma shows that the facilities in $U \setminus U^{(\phi)}$ are reasonably sparsely-loaded in that, extra amount of assignments can be accommodated when the assignments from $\mathcal{D} \setminus D^{(\phi)}$ are scaled up by a factor of $1/(1-\alpha)$.

Lemma 10. For any $i \in U \setminus U^{(\phi)}$, we have $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x'_{i,j} \leq u_i$.

Proof. Consider the category to which i belongs. We have the following two cases.

- $i \in U^{(>)} \setminus U^{(\phi)}$.

Since i is not tightly-occupied, it follows by the optimality of \mathbf{h} that,

$$h_{i,j} = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \cdot x_{i,j} \quad \text{holds for any } j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus D^{(\phi)}, \quad (3)$$

since any $j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus D^{(\phi)}$ is either partially-assigned, or fully-assigned but reachable from a partially-assigned client. By the construction of \mathbf{x}' , we have

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x'_{i,j} = \sum_{j \in D^{(\phi)}} h_{i,j} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus D^{(\phi)}, p \in P(i,j)} f_p.$$

By Proposition 9, flow originated from $\mathcal{D} \setminus D^{(\phi)}$ must sink via some client in $\mathcal{D} \setminus D^{(\phi)}$. Hence, by the feasibility of \mathbf{f} for $\mathbf{MFN}_{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{g})$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus D^{(\phi)}, p \in P(i,j)} f_p \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}, p \in P, (j^s, i) \in p} f_p \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus D^{(\phi)}} x_{i,j}.$$

Combining the above with (3), we obtain

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x'_{i,j} \leq \sum_{j \in D^{(\phi)}} h_{i,j} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus D^{(\phi)}} x_{i,j} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} h_{i,j} \leq u_i,$$

where the last inequality follows from the feasibility of \mathbf{h} .

- $i \in U(\leq)$.

By the construction of \mathbf{x}' and the feasibility of \mathbf{f} for $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{g})$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x'_{i,j} = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}, p \in P(i,j)} f_p \leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x_{i,j} \leq u_i,$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of $U(\leq)$.

This completes the proof of this lemma. \square

4.3 The rounded assignment \mathbf{x}'' to $F^* \cap I$

Recall that, for any $i \in F^* \cap I$, we use $\Psi^{(i)} = (I^{(i)}, D^{(i)}, \mathbf{r}^{(i)})$ to denote the parameter tuple the algorithm maintains in the beginning of the i^{th} -iteration and $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(i)})$ to denote the optimal solution computed for LP-(M) on $\Psi^{(i)}$.

For any $i \in F^* \cap I$ and $k \in I^{(i)}$, define the reassignment function from k to i as

$$z''_{i,k} := \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \sigma_{k,j}^{(i)} = \sigma_k^{(i)} \cdot \sum_{\ell \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}.$$

Intuitively, $z''_{i,k}$ is the amount of assignment that gets reassigned from k to i in the i^{th} -iteration of the rounding process. For any $i \in F^* \cap I$, $j \in \mathcal{D}$, define the rounded assignment function

$$x''_{i,j} := \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} \frac{\bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)}}{\sum_{\ell \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}} \cdot z''_{i,k}.$$

We note that, in the definition we scale up the reassignment by $1/(1-\alpha)$. Furthermore, by definition $x''_{i,j} > 0$ only when $j \in D^{(i)}$. The following lemma shows that, for each $j \in \mathcal{D}$, the demand originally assigned to I is reassigned by \mathbf{x}'' to facilities in $F^* \cap I$.

Lemma 11. For any $j \in \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$\sum_{i \in F^* \cap I} x''_{i,j} \geq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \cdot \left(r_j^{(0)} - \alpha \cdot r_j^{(g)} \right).$$

Proof. By the way \mathbf{z}'' is defined, all the assignment reduced in the process due to the scale-down operation is reassigned by \mathbf{z}'' to facilities in $F^* \cap I$. For any $j \in \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$(1-\alpha) \cdot \sum_{i \in F^* \cap I} x''_{i,j} = \sum_{i \in F^* \cap I} \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} \frac{\bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)}}{\sum_{\ell \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}} \cdot z''_{i,k} = \sum_{i \in F^* \cap I} \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} \sigma_k^{(i)} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)},$$

where in the last equality we apply the definition of \mathbf{z} .

Since the algorithm removes a client j from D' only when its residue assignment to I' drops below $\alpha \cdot r_j^{(g)}$, and since the algorithm repeats until D' becomes empty, it follows that

$$\sum_{i \in F^* \cap I} \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} \sigma_k^{(i)} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} \geq r_j^{(0)} - \alpha \cdot r_j^{(g)}.$$

This proves the lemma. \square

The following lemma shows that, the facilities in $F^* \cap I$ can accommodate the rounded assignments given by \mathbf{x}'' .

Lemma 12. For any $i \in F^* \cap I$, we have $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x''_{i,j} \leq u_i$.

Proof. By the definition of \mathbf{x}'' and \mathbf{z}'' , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \alpha) \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x''_{i,j} &= (1 - \alpha) \cdot \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} x''_{i,j} = \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} \frac{\bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)}}{\sum_{\ell \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}} \cdot z''_{i,k} \\ &= \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} \frac{\bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)}}{\sum_{\ell \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}} \cdot \sum_{\ell \in D^{(i)}} \sigma_{k,\ell}^{(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

Apply the definition of $\sigma_{k,\ell}^{(i)}$ for i and any $k \in I^{(i)} \setminus \{i\}$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \alpha) \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x''_{i,j} &= \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \frac{\bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)}}{\sum_{\ell \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{i,\ell}^{(i)}} \cdot \sum_{\ell \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{i,\ell}^{(i)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \sum_{k \in I^{(i)} \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)}}{\sum_{\ell \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}} \cdot \sum_{\ell \in D^{(i)}} \frac{\bar{x}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}}{\sum_{m \in I^{(i)} \setminus \{i\}} \bar{x}_{m,\ell}^{(i)}} \cdot \delta_\ell^{(i)} \\ &= \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)} + \sum_{k \in I^{(i)} \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{\ell \in D^{(i)}} \frac{\bar{x}_{k,\ell}^{(i)}}{\sum_{m \in I^{(i)} \setminus \{i\}} \bar{x}_{m,\ell}^{(i)}} \cdot \delta_\ell^{(i)} \\ &= \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)} + \sum_{\ell \in D^{(i)}} \delta_\ell^{(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

Further applying the definition of $\delta_\ell^{(i)}$ for any $\ell \in D^{(i)}$, we obtain

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x''_{i,j} = \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \cdot \frac{1}{\bar{y}_i^{(i)}} \cdot \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)} \leq u_i,$$

where the last inequality follows from (2.b) and the fact that $\alpha \leq 1/2$. □

4.4 The overall assignment \mathbf{x}''' and the feasibility

For any $i \in \mathcal{F}^*$ and $j \in \mathcal{D}$, define the overall assignment $x'''_{i,j}$ as

$$x'''_{i,j} := \begin{cases} x'_{i,j}, & \text{if } i \in U, \\ x''_{i,j}, & \text{if } i \in F^* \cap I, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The following lemma shows that the feasible region of the min-cost assignment problem on \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{F}^* is nonempty, and proves the feasibility of our rounding algorithm.

Lemma 13. $(\mathbf{x}''', \mathbf{y}^*)$ is feasible for Ψ , i.e.,

$$\forall j \in \mathcal{D}: \sum_{i \in F^*} x'''_{i,j} \geq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \forall i \in F^*: \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x'''_{i,j} \leq u_i.$$

Proof. Depending on the category to which j belongs, consider the following two cases.

- $j \in D^{(\phi)}$, i.e., j is fully-assigned by \mathbf{h} to facilities in $U^{(>)}$ and unreachable from any partially-assigned client via augmenting paths. It follows that $h_{i,j} = 0$ for all $i \in U^{(\phi)}$, and

$$\sum_{i \in F^*} x'''_{i,j} \geq \sum_{i \in U^{(>)} \setminus U^{(\phi)}} x'_{i,j} = \sum_{i \in U^{(>)} \setminus U^{(\phi)}} h_{i,j} = 1.$$

- $j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus D^{(\phi)}$, i.e., j is either partially-assigned, or fully-assigned but reachable from partially-assigned clients via augmenting paths. By the definition of \mathbf{x}''' , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in F^*} x'''_{i,j} &= \sum_{i \in U^{(\phi)}} x'_{i,j} + \sum_{i \in U \setminus U^{(\phi)}} x'_{i,j} + \sum_{i \in F^* \cap I} x''_{i,j} \\ &= \sum_{i \in U^{(\phi)}} g_{i,j} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{i \in U \setminus U^{(\phi)}, p \in P(i,j)} f_p + \sum_{i \in F^* \cap I} x''_{i,j}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 11 and the definition of $r_j^{(0)}$, the above becomes

$$\sum_{i \in F^*} x'''_{i,j} \geq \sum_{i \in U^{(\phi)}} g_{i,j} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in U \setminus U^{(\phi)}, p \in P(i,j)} f_p + \sum_{i \in I, p \in P(i,j)} f_p - \alpha \cdot r_j^{(g)} \right).$$

Since $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} g_{i,j} = u_i$ for all $i \in U^{(\phi)}$, it follows that $\sum_{i \in U^{(\phi)}, p \in P(i,j)} f_p = 0$ and

$$\sum_{i \in U \setminus U^{(\phi)}, p \in P(i,j)} f_p + \sum_{i \in I, p \in P(i,j)} f_p - \alpha \cdot r_j^{(g)} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}, p \in P(i,j)} f_p - \alpha \cdot r_j^{(g)} \geq (1-\alpha) \cdot r_j^{(g)}$$

by the constraint (1.a) in $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}', \mathbf{g})$. Hence, we obtain

$$\sum_{i \in F^*} x'''_{i,j} \geq \sum_{i \in U^{(\phi)}} g_{i,j} + r_j^{(g)} = 1.$$

This proves the first half of this lemma. For the second half, by Lemma 10 and Lemma 12, it remains to consider the case for which $i \in U^{(\phi)}$. In this case, i is fully-matched by \mathbf{h} , and we have $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x'''_{i,j} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} g_{i,j} = u_i$. This proves the second half of this lemma. \square

4.5 The cost incurred by $F^* \cap I$

Recall that $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(0)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(0)})$ is the solution defined in Section 4.1 for the initial tuple $\Psi^{(0)}$. In this section, we prove that

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{y}^* |_{F^* \cap I}) \leq \frac{3}{1-\alpha} \cdot \psi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(0)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(0)}).$$

For any $i \in F^* \cap I$, consider the dual LP of LP-(M) on $\Psi^{(i)}$, which is given below as LP-(DM). Let $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(i)})$ be an optimal solution for LP-(DM). It follows that $\bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)} > 0$ implies that $\lambda_j^{(i)} \geq c_{i,j}$. The following lemma establishes the equivalence between the cost incurred by a non-extremal facility and the amount of dual values it receives.

$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{j \in D'} r'_j \cdot \lambda_j - \sum_{i \in F'} \frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 - \alpha) \cdot \eta_i && \text{LP-(DM)} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \lambda_j \leq \beta_i + \Gamma_{i,j} + c_{i,j}, && \forall i \in F', j \in D', \quad (4.a) \\ & u_i \cdot \beta_i + \frac{2\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \cdot \sum_{j \in D'} r_j \cdot \Gamma_{i,j} \leq o_i + \eta_i, && \forall i \in F', \quad (4.b) \\ & \lambda_j, \beta_i, \Gamma_{i,j}, \eta_i \geq 0, && \forall i \in F', j \in D'. \end{aligned}$
--

Lemma 14. For any $i \in F^* \cap I$ and any $k \in I^{(i)}$ with $0 < \bar{y}_k^{(i)} < (1 - \alpha)/2$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \lambda_j^{(i)} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} = o_k \cdot \bar{y}_k^{(i)} + \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} c_{k,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)}.$$

Proof. This lemma follows from the complementary slackness conditions between $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(i)})$ and $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(i)})$. Since $\bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} > 0$ implies that the corresponding dual inequality (4.a) must hold with equality, we have

$$\sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \lambda_j^{(i)} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} = \beta_k^{(i)} \cdot \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} + \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \Gamma_{k,j}^{(i)} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} + \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} c_{k,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)}.$$

Similarly, $\beta_k^{(i)} > 0$ and $\Gamma_{k,j}^{(i)} > 0$ imply that the corresponding inequalities (2.b) and (2.c) hold with equality. Hence the above equality becomes

$$\beta_k^{(i)} \cdot u_k \cdot \bar{y}_k^{(i)} + \frac{2\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} r_j^{(g)} \cdot \bar{y}_k^{(i)} \cdot \Gamma_{k,j}^{(i)} + \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} c_{k,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)}.$$

The assumption that $\bar{y}_k^{(i)} > 0$ and $\bar{y}_k^{(i)} < (1 - \alpha)/2$ imply that the corresponding inequality (4.b) holds with equality and the dual variable $\eta_k^{(i)}$ must be zero. The above equality becomes

$$\bar{y}_k^{(i)} \cdot \left(u_k \cdot \beta_k^{(i)} + \frac{2\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} r_j^{(g)} \cdot \Gamma_{k,j}^{(i)} \right) + \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} c_{k,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} = o_k \cdot \bar{y}_k^{(i)} + \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} c_{k,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)},$$

and this lemma is proved. □

The following lemma bounds the facility cost plus the total rerouting cost incurred by each individual cluster $i \in F^* \cap I$.

Lemma 15. For any $i \in F^* \cap I$, we have

$$(1 - \alpha) \cdot o_i + \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} c_{i,k} \cdot z''_{i,k} \leq \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} \sigma_k^{(i)} \cdot \left(3 \cdot o_k \cdot \bar{y}_k^{(i)} + 2 \cdot \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} c_{k,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} \right).$$

Proof. If $\bar{y}_i^{(i)} = (1 - \alpha)/2$, then the statement of this lemma holds trivially. In the following we assume the nontrivial case for which $0 < \bar{y}_i^{(i)} < (1 - \alpha)/2$.

By the definition of \mathbf{z}'' and the triangle inequality, we have

$$\sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} c_{i,k} \cdot z''_{i,k} = \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} c_{i,k} \cdot \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \sigma_{k,j}^{(i)} \leq \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}, k \in I^{(i)}} (c_{i,j} + c_{k,j}) \cdot \sigma_{k,j}^{(i)}. \quad (5)$$

By the definition of $\sigma_{k,j}^{(i)}$, we know that $\sigma_{k,j}^{(i)} > 0$ implies that $\bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} > 0$, which further implies that $c_{k,j} \leq \lambda_j^{(i)}$. Hence, Inequality (5) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} c_{i,k} \cdot z''_{i,k} &\leq \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}, k \in I^{(i)}} \left(c_{i,j} + \lambda_j^{(j)} \right) \cdot \frac{\bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)}}{\sum_{\ell \in I^{(i)} \setminus \{i\}} \bar{x}_{\ell,j}^{(i)}} \cdot \delta_j^{(i)} \\ &= \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \left(c_{i,j} + \lambda_j^{(j)} \right) \cdot \delta_j^{(i)} \leq \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\bar{y}_i^{(i)}} \cdot \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \left(c_{i,j} + \lambda_j^{(j)} \right) \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where in the last inequality we apply the definition of $\delta_j^{(i)}$.

By Lemma 14 and Inequality (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \alpha) \cdot o_i + \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} c_{i,k} \cdot z''_{i,k} &= \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\bar{y}_i^{(i)}} \cdot \left(3 \cdot o_i \cdot \bar{y}_i^{(i)} + 2 \cdot \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} c_{i,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\bar{y}_i^{(i)}} \cdot \theta^{(i)}(i) \cdot \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(i)}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\theta^{(i)}$ refers to the θ function defined in the i^{th} -iteration. By the definitions of $\sigma_k^{(i)}$ and $\sigma_{k,j}^{(i)}$ for any $k \in I^{(i)} \setminus \{i\}$ and $j \in D^{(i)}$, we have

$$\sum_{\ell \in D^{(i)}} \sigma_k^{(i)} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,\ell}^{(i)} = \sum_{\ell \in D^{(i)}} \sigma_{k,\ell}^{(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\ell \in I' \setminus \{i\}} \sigma_{\ell,j}^{(i)} = \delta_j^{(i)}.$$

Hence, we have

$$\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\bar{y}_i^{(i)}} \cdot \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} x_{i,j}^{\dagger(i)} = \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \left(\delta_j^{(i)} + \sigma_{i,j}^{(i)} \right) = \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}, k \in I^{(i)}} \sigma_{k,j}^{(i)} = \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}, j \in D^{(i)}} \sigma_k^{(i)} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)}. \quad (8)$$

Moreover, by the design of the algorithm, we have $\theta^{(i)}(i) \leq \theta^{(i)}(k)$ for any $k \in I^{(i)}$. Combining this property with Inequalities (7) and (8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \alpha) \cdot o_i + \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} c_{i,k} \cdot z''_{i,k} &\leq \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} \sigma_k^{(i)} \cdot \theta^{(i)}(k) \cdot \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} \\ &= \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} \sigma_k^{(i)} \cdot \left(3 \cdot o_k \cdot \bar{y}_k^{(i)} + 2 \cdot \sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} c_{k,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

by applying the definition of $\theta^{(i)}(k)$ for all $k \in I^{(i)}$ with $\sum_{j \in D^{(i)}} \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} > 0$. \square

By Lemma 6, Lemma 8, and Lemma 15, we obtain the following lemma which establishes the overall guarantee for our iterative rounding process.

Lemma 16. We have

$$\sum_{i \in F^* \cap I} \left(o_i + \sum_{j \in D'(i)} c_{i,j} \cdot x''_{i,j} \right) \leq \frac{3}{1-\alpha} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in I} o_i \cdot \bar{y}_i^{(0)} + \sum_{i \in I, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(0)} \right). \quad (10)$$

Proof. Recall that, for any $i \in F^* \cap I$, we use $\Psi''^{(i)} = (I''^{(i)}, D''^{(i)}, \mathbf{r}''^{(i)})$ to denote the updated parameter tuple the algorithm maintains at the end of the i^{th} -iteration. Let $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}''^{(i)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}''^{(i)})$ be an optimal solution for LP-(M) on $\Psi''^{(i)}$. By Lemma 8, we have

$$\sum_{k \in I''^{(i)}} o_k \cdot \bar{y}_k''^{(i)} + \sum_{\substack{k \in I''^{(i)}, \\ j \in D''^{(i)}}} c_{k,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}''^{(i)} \leq \sum_{k \in I''^{(i)}} \left(1 - \sigma_k^{(i)} \right) \cdot \left(o_k \cdot \bar{y}_k^{(i)} + \sum_{j \in D''^{(i)}} c_{k,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} \right).$$

Combining the above with Lemma 15 and apply the fact that $I''^{(i)} = I^{(i)} \setminus \{i\}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left((1-\alpha) \cdot o_i + \sum_{j \in D'(i)} c_{i,j} \cdot x''_{i,j} \right) + 3 \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in I''^{(i)}} o_i \cdot \bar{y}_i''^{(i)} + \sum_{i \in I''^{(i)}, j \in D''^{(i)}} c_{i,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j}''^{(i)} \right) \\ & \leq 3 \cdot \sum_{k \in I^{(i)}} \left(o_k \cdot \bar{y}_k^{(i)} + \sum_{j \in D'(i)} c_{k,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{k,j}^{(i)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Inequality (11) shows that, the total cost incurred by i can be bounded within three times the difference between the optimal values of the successive iterations. Taking the summation over $i \in F^* \cap I$ and applying Inequality (11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in F^* \cap I} \left((1-\alpha) \cdot o_i + \sum_{j \in D'(i)} c_{i,j} \cdot x''_{i,j} \right) & \leq 3 \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in I} o_i \cdot \bar{y}_i''^{(0)} + \sum_{i \in I, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j}''^{(0)} \right) \\ & \leq 3 \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in I} o_i \cdot \bar{y}_i^{(0)} + \sum_{i \in I, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(0)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we use $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}''^{(0)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}''^{(0)})$ to denote an optimal solution for LP-(M) on the initial parameter tuple $\Psi^{(0)}$ and the fact from Lemma 6 that $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(0)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(0)})$ is a feasible solution for LP-(M) on $\Psi^{(0)}$. Multiplying the above by $1/(1-\alpha)$ completes the proof of this lemma. \square

4.6 The overall guarantee

In this section we establish the guarantee for the solution $\psi(\mathbf{x}''', \mathbf{y}^*)$. Recall that (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) is the initial candidate solution we have for $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{g})$ and $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(0)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(0)})$ is the solution defined in Lemma 6 for LP-(M) on the initial tuple $\Psi^{(0)}$. Apply Lemma 16 and the definition of $\bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(0)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\mathbf{x}''', \mathbf{y}^*) & = \sum_{i \in F^*} o_i + \sum_{i \in F^*, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x'''_{i,j} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot \sum_{i \in U} o_i \cdot y_i + \frac{3}{2\alpha} \cdot \sum_{i \in I} o_i \cdot y'_i + \sum_{i \in U} c_{i,j} \cdot x'_{i,j} + \frac{3}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{i \in I, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(0)}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The following lemma, which is proved by considering the contribution of each individual edge in the flow paths, bounds the assignment cost in the R.H.S. of (12).

Lemma 17. We have

$$\sum_{i \in U, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x'_{i,j} + \frac{3}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{i \in I, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(0)} \leq \frac{7-4\alpha}{(1-\alpha)^2} \cdot \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}.$$

Proof. For any $i \in U, j \in \mathcal{D}$ and any $p \in P(i, j)$, define the length of path p as

$$|p| := \sum_{\substack{i' \in \mathcal{F}, j' \in \mathcal{D}, \\ (j'^s, i') \in p}} c_{i',j'} + \sum_{\substack{i' \in \mathcal{F}, j' \in \mathcal{D}, \\ (i', j'^s) \in p}} c_{i',j'}.$$

By triangle inequality we have $c_{i,j} \leq |p|$. Applying the definition for \mathbf{x}' and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(0)}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in U, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x'_{i,j} + \frac{3}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{i \in I, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot \bar{x}_{i,j}^{(0)} &\leq \sum_{\substack{i \in U^{(\phi)}, \\ j \in \mathcal{D}}} c_{i,j} \cdot g_{i,j} + \sum_{\substack{i \in U^{(>)} \setminus U^{(\phi)}, \\ j \in \mathcal{D}^{(\phi)}}} c_{i,j} \cdot h_{i,j} \\ &+ \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{\substack{i \in U^{(>)} \setminus U^{(\phi)}, \\ j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}^{(\phi)}, \\ p \in P(i,j)}} |p| \cdot f'_p + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{\substack{i \in U^{(\leq)}, \\ j \in \mathcal{D}, \\ p \in P(i,j)}} |p| \cdot f_p + \frac{3}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{\substack{i \in I, j \in \mathcal{D}, \\ p \in P(i,j)}} |p| \cdot f_p. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

To bound the R.H.S. of (13), we consider each of the items and the total amount of flow these items has accounted for along the two edges (j^s, i) and (i, j^s) for each $i \in \mathcal{F}$ and $j \in \mathcal{D}$. To be precise, we rewrite the R.H.S. of (13) as

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}} \left(a_{i,j}^{(\Rightarrow)} + b_{i,j}^{(\Leftarrow)} \right),$$

where $a_{i,j}^{(\Rightarrow)}$ and $b_{i,j}^{(\Leftarrow)}$ denote the total amount of flow the items in the R.H.S. of (13) have accounted for along the two edges (j^s, i) and (i, j^s) , respectively.

In the following, we bound $a_{i,j}^{(\Rightarrow)}$ and $b_{i,j}^{(\Leftarrow)}$ for each $i \in \mathcal{F}$ and $j \in \mathcal{D}$ separately. Depending on the categories to which i and j belong, we have the following three cases.

- $i \in U^{(\phi)}$ is tightly-occupied.

In this case, we have

$$a_{i,j}^{(\Rightarrow)} \leq \frac{3}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{\substack{p \in P, \\ (j^s, i) \in p}} c_{i,j} \cdot f_p \leq \frac{3}{1-\alpha} \cdot c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j} \quad \text{and}$$

$$b_{i,j}^{(\Leftarrow)} \leq c_{i,j} \cdot g_{i,j} + \frac{3}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{\substack{p \in P, \\ (i, j^s) \in p}} c_{i,j} \cdot f_p \leq \left(1 + \frac{3}{1-\alpha} \right) \cdot c_{i,j} \cdot g_{i,j}$$

by constraints (1.b) and (1.c) in $\mathbf{MFN}_\Psi(x, y', g)$. Since $g_{i,j} \leq x_{i,j}/(1-\alpha)$, we obtain

$$a_{i,j}^{(\Rightarrow)} + b_{i,j}^{(\Leftarrow)} \leq \frac{7-4\alpha}{(1-\alpha)^2} \cdot c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}.$$

- $i \in U^{(>)} \setminus U^{(\phi)}$, $j \in D^{(\phi)}$. In this case, we have $b_{i,j}^{(\Leftarrow)} = 0$. By Proposition 9, none of commodities in $\mathcal{D} \setminus D^{(\phi)}$ has sent nonzero flow through the edge (j^s, i) , i.e.,

$$\sum_{\substack{i' \in \mathcal{F}, j' \in \mathcal{D} \setminus D^{(\phi)}, \\ p \in P(i', j') \text{ s.t. } (j^s, i) \in p}} f_p = 0. \quad \text{Hence, } a_{i,j}^{(\Rightarrow)} + b_{i,j}^{(\Leftarrow)} \leq c_{i,j} \cdot h_{i,j} \leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \cdot c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}.$$

- For the remaining cases, i.e., $j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus D^{(\phi)}$ or $i \in \mathcal{F} \setminus U^{(>)}$. We have $b_{i,j}^{(\Leftarrow)} = 0$ and by a similar argument,

$$a_{i,j}^{(\Rightarrow)} + b_{i,j}^{(\Leftarrow)} \leq \frac{3}{1-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{\substack{p \in P, \\ (j^s, i) \in p}} c_{i,j} \cdot f_p \leq \frac{3}{1-\alpha} \cdot c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}.$$

In all cases, $a_{i,j}^{(\Rightarrow)} + b_{i,j}^{(\Leftarrow)}$ is upper-bounded by $\frac{7-4\alpha}{(1-\alpha)^2} \cdot c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}$. This proves the lemma. \square

Combining (12) with Lemma 17, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\mathbf{x}''', \mathbf{y}^*) &\leq \frac{3}{2\alpha} \cdot \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \alpha_i \cdot y_i + \frac{7-4\alpha}{(1-\alpha)^2} \cdot \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{3}{2\alpha}, \frac{7-4\alpha}{(1-\alpha)^2} \right\} \cdot \psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof for Theorem 4.

5 Proof of Theorem 5.

We outline the proof as follows. In Section 5.1, we show that the rounding algorithm is well-defined and terminates in polynomial time. We define in the same section the rounded assignment function \mathbf{x}° and shows that $(\mathbf{x}^\circ, \mathbf{y}^*)$ is feasible for LP-(N) on Ψ . This shows that the min-cost assignment problem for $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{F}^*)$ is feasible, and hence the integral assignment \mathbf{x}^\dagger can be computed. In Section 5.2, we establish the 4-approximation guarantee for $(\mathbf{x}^\circ, \mathbf{y}^*)$. This completes the proof for Theorem 5 since \mathbf{x}^\dagger is the optimal solution for the min-cost assignment problem on $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{F}^*)$.

Notations to use in the proof. In the following, we define notations and notions that help describe our rounding process with precision in the analysis. As the notations can be subtle, we refer the readers to kindly check the definitions to prevent notational ambiguity in the proof.

Consider the cluster-forming process. Let $\mathcal{C}_{D'}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{H'}$ denote the sets of clusters centered at the non-outlier clients and outlier clients, respectively. For each $q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}$, we use $j(q)$ to denote the center client of q and $i(q)$ denote the facility that is selected to be rounded up in the iteration when q is formed. Let $F_{D'}^* := \{ i(q) : q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'} \}$ denote the set of facilities rounded up for the clusters in $\mathcal{C}_{D'}$. Note that, $F_{D'}^*$ and G are disjoint by the algorithm design. Furthermore, the set of satellite facilities $B(j)$ for each $j \in H$ forms a partition of G .

For each $q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}$, we use $D^{(q)}$, $F^{(q)}$, $H^{(q)}$, $H'^{(q)}$, $\mathbf{x}'^{(q)}$, and $\mathbf{y}'^{(q)}$ to denote the set D' , the set F' , the sets H , the set H' , the assignment \mathbf{x}' , and the multiplicity \mathbf{y}' the algorithm maintains at the moment when the cluster q was formed. We use $B(q)$ to denote the set of satellite facilities at that moment, i.e., $B(q) := N_{(F^{(q)}, \mathbf{x}'^{(q)})}(j(q))$.

For each outlier client $j \in H$, we use $w(j)$ to denote the facility in U at which j is located. We use $p(j)$ to denote the specific parent client in $J^{(\leftrightarrow)}$ from which j is created. On the contrary, for any $j \in J^{(\leftrightarrow)}$, we use $H(j)$ to denote the set of outlier clients that are created from j . For each $w \in U$, we use $H(w)$ to denote the set of outlier clients located at w .

To prevent ambiguity on the usage of $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')$, we will specifically use $(\mathbf{x}'^{(0)}, \mathbf{y}'^{(0)})$ to denote the initial solution the algorithm has for Ψ . For outlier clients $j \in H$ and any $i \in \mathcal{F}$, we use $x'_{i,j}$ to denote the assignment made for j to i at the moment when j is created. We additionally use $\mathbf{x}'^{(\text{II})}$ and $\mathbf{y}'^{(\text{II})}$ to denote the assignment \mathbf{x}' and the multiplicity \mathbf{y}' the algorithm maintains when it enters the second phase.

5.1 The Feasibility

In Section 5.1.1 we show that the first stage of the rounding process is well-defined and terminates in polynomial time. In Section 5.1.2 we consider the second stage of the process and show that the feasible region of LP-(O) is nonempty. We define the intermediate assignment \mathbf{x}° and prove the feasibility of $(\mathbf{x}^\circ, \mathbf{y}^*)$ for LP-(N) on Ψ in Section 5.1.3.

5.1.1 The first stage of the rounding process

We show that the first stage of our rounding process is well-defined and terminates in polynomial time. Consider any particular moment in the first stage, and let $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')$, F' , D' , and H' denote the parameters the algorithm maintains at that moment.

Consider the capacity constraints for facilities in F' and the third constraint from LP-(N) for facilities in F' and clients in $D' \cup H'$, listed as follows.

$$\sum_{j \in D' \cup H'} x'_{i,j} \leq u_i \cdot y'_i, \quad \forall i \in F'. \quad (\text{MN-2})$$

$$x'_{i,j} \leq y'_i, \quad \forall i \in F', j \in D' \cup H'. \quad (\text{MN-3})$$

It is clear that (MN-2) and (MN-3) hold in the beginning of the rounding process, since initially $F' := I$, $D' := J^{(I)} \cup J^{(\leftrightarrow)}$, $H' := \emptyset$, and $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}') := (\mathbf{x}'^{(0)}, \mathbf{y}'^{(0)})$ is feasible for LP-(N).

The following two lemmas establish that, the processes of creating outlier clients and cluster-forming do not render the validity of (MN-2) and (MN-3).

Lemma 18. The process of creating outlier clients does not render (MN-2) nor (MN-3) invalid.

Proof. Consider the process of creating outlier clients from a client, say, $j \in J^{(\leftrightarrow)} \cap D'$. By the algorithm design, this happens when $\sum_{i \in F'} x'_{i,j} < 1/2$.

For each $i \in N_{(F', \mathbf{x}')} (j)$, consider the assignments the algorithm has made from $H(j)$ to i after $H(j)$ is created. The total amount of assignment i receives from $H(j)$ is

$$\sum_{\ell \in H(j)} x'_{i,\ell} := \sum_{\ell \in H(j)} d_\ell \cdot \frac{x'_{i,j}}{\sum_{k \in F'} x'_{k,j}} = \frac{x'_{i,j}}{\sum_{k \in F'} x'_{k,j}} \cdot \sum_{\ell \in H(j)} r'_j \cdot \frac{x'_{w(\ell),j}}{\sum_{w \in U} x'_{w,j}},$$

where in the above we apply the definition of $x'_{i,\ell}{}^{(0)}$ and d_ℓ for any $\ell \in H(j)$. By the definition of r'_j , we have $r'_j \leq \sum_{k \in F'} x'_{k,j}$. Hence, the above becomes

$$\sum_{\ell \in H(j)} x'_{i,\ell}{}^{(0)} \leq x'_{i,j} \cdot \sum_{\ell \in H(j)} \frac{x'_{w(\ell),j}}{\sum_{w \in U} x'_{w,j}} = x'_{i,j}, \quad (14)$$

where in the last equality we apply the fact that $\sum_{\ell \in H(j)} x'_{w(\ell),j} = \sum_{w \in U} x'_{w,j}$. Since the algorithm resets $x_{i,j}$ to be zero after $H(j)$ is created, it follows from (14) that (MN-2) still holds after $H(j)$ is created and the new assignments to i are made.

The argument for (MN-3) follows analogously. For any $\ell \in H(j)$, by the above equations, we have $x'_{i,\ell}{}^{(0)} \leq \sum_{k \in H(j)} x'_{i,k}{}^{(0)} \leq x'_{i,j}$. Hence (MN-3) holds for any $i \in N_{(F',x')}(j)$ and any $\ell \in H(j)$. \square

Lemma 19. We have $0 < \delta_{i(q)} \leq 1$ for any $q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}$. Furthermore, the scaled-down operation the algorithm performs when rounding cluster q does not render (MN-2) nor (MN-3) invalid.

Proof. Consider any $q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}$. We will show that, provided that constraints (MN-2) and (MN-3) are valid in the beginning of the iteration for which q is formed, we have

- $0 < \delta_{i(q)} \leq 1$, and
- the rounding process for q does not render (MN-2) and (MN-3) invalid.

Note that this proves the lemma.

Since $i(q) \in F^{(q)}$, we know that $y'_{i(q)}{}^{(q)} < 1/2$. Furthermore, since $j(q)$ is selected as the center client and since $j(q) \in D^{(q)}$ by assumption, it follows that $\sum_{i \in F^{(q)}} x'_{i,j(q)}{}^{(q)} \geq 1/2$. This implies that

$$\sum_{i \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}} y'_{i(q)}{}^{(q)} \geq \sum_{i \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}} x'_{i,j(q)}{}^{(q)} \geq \frac{1}{2} - x'_{i(q),j(q)}{}^{(q)} \geq \frac{1}{2} - y'_{i(q)}{}^{(q)} > 0,$$

where in the first and the last inequalities we apply constraint (MN-3) for $i \in B(q)$ and $j(q)$. This shows that

$$\delta_{i(q)} := \left(\frac{1}{2} - y'_{i(q)}{}^{(q)} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sum_{i \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}} y'_{i(q)}{}^{(q)}} > 0.$$

On the contrary, by (MN-3) we have $\sum_{i \in B(q)} y'_{i(q)}{}^{(q)} \geq \sum_{i \in B(q)} x'_{i,j(q)}{}^{(q)} \geq 1/2$. This implies that $1/2 - y'_{i(q)}{}^{(q)} \leq \sum_{i \in B(q) \setminus \{i\}} y'_{i(q)}{}^{(q)}$ and $\delta_{i(q)} \leq 1$.

To see that constraints (MN-2) and (MN-3) remain valid at the end of this iteration, observe that for each $i \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}$ and any $j \in D^{(q)}$, both $x'_{i,j}{}^{(q)}$ and $y'_{i(q)}{}^{(q)}$ are scaled down simultaneously by the constant $(1 - \delta_{i(q)})$. This completes the proof of this lemma. \square

By Lemma 18 and Lemma 19, we obtain the following.

Corollary 20. (MN-2) and (MN-3) hold throughout the first stage of the rounding process.

It follows that, at any particular moment in the first stage,

$$\sum_{i \in F'} x'_{i,j} \leq \sum_{i \in F'} y'_i \quad \text{holds for any } j \in D' \cup H'. \quad (15)$$

By the design of the algorithm, we know that at least one facility is removed from F' after each iteration in the first phase. Therefore, the rounding process repeats for at most $|I|$ iterations before F' becomes empty. By (15), this implies that $\sum_{i \in F'} x'_{i,j} = 0$ for all $j \in D' \cup H'$, and $D' \cup H'$ will become empty in at most $|H|$ iterations after that. This shows that the rounding algorithm terminates in polynomial time.

The following lemma, which shows that the rounded facility is sparsely-loaded by the rerouted assignments, is straightforward to verify.

Lemma 21. We have $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} x^*_{i(q),j} \leq u_{i(q)}/2$ for any $q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}$.

Proof. Consider any $q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}$. By the design of the algorithm and the fact that constraint (MN-3) holds throughout the process, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} x^*_{i(q),j} &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} x'_{i(q),j} + \sum_{i \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} \delta_{i(q)} \cdot x'_{i,j} \\ &\leq u_{i(q)} \cdot y'_{i(q)} + \sum_{i \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}} \delta_{i(q)} \cdot u_i \cdot y'_i \\ &\leq u_{i(q)} \cdot y'_{i(q)} + u_{i(q)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} - y'_{i(q)} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot u_{i(q)}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the third inequality we use apply fact that $u_{i(q)} \geq u_i$ for all $i \in B(q)$ by the way $i(q)$ is selected and the definition of $\delta_{i(q)}$. \square

5.1.2 The second stage of the rounding process

In this section, we consider the second stage of the rounding process and the clusters in $\mathcal{C}_{H'}$. The following lemma summarizes the status of the facilities and the clients.

Lemma 22. When the algorithm enters the second stage, the following holds.

- For any $i \in G$, $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} x'_{i,j} \leq u_i \cdot y'_i$.
- For any $j \in J^{(I)}$, $\sum_{i \in I} x^*_{i,j} + \sum_{i \in G} x'_{i,j} > 1/2$.
- For any $j \in J^{(\leftrightarrow)}$, $\sum_{i \in I} x^*_{i,j} + \sum_{i \in G} x'_{i,j} + \sum_{i \in U} x'_{i,j} > 1/2$.
- For any $j \in H$, $\sum_{i \in F^*_{D'}} x^*_{i,j} + \sum_{i \in G} x'_{i,j} = \sum_{i \in I} x'_{i,j}$.

Proof. The first statement of this lemma follows directly from Corollary 20 and the definition of $(\mathbf{x}'^{(I)}, \mathbf{y}'^{(I)})$. The remaining of this lemma follows from the way how the algorithm handles the residue demand of each client. Consider the moment for which each $j \in J^{(I)} \cup J^{(\leftrightarrow)} \cup H$ is removed from consideration in the first phase, and the fact that $G := \bigcup_{j \in H} B(j)$.

For $j \in J^{(I)} \cup J^{(\leftrightarrow)}$, it is removed when $\sum_{i \in F'} x'_{i,j} < 1/2$. It follows that the assignments rerouted to clusters in $\mathcal{C}_{D'}$, the assignments taken into clusters in $\mathcal{C}_{H'}$, and possibly the original assignments to facilities in U , account for at least $1/2$.

For $j \in H$, it is removed when selected as the center of a cluster, possibly an empty cluster. When this happens, all of the remaining assignments for j are taken into this cluster. \square

Lemma 22 leads to the following corollary on the scaling factor t'_j for all $j \in \mathcal{D}$.

Corollary 23. $0 \leq t'_j \leq 2$ for all $j \in \mathcal{D}$.

Proof. It suffices to prove the statement for $j \in \mathcal{D}$ with $\sum_{i \in I} x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} x_{i,j}'^{(\text{II})} > 0$.

Since $\sum_{i \in I} x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} x_{i,j}'^{(\text{II})} > 0$ implies that $j \in J^{(I)} \cup J^{(\leftrightarrow)}$, by the definition of r'_j , we have

$$1 - \sum_{i \in U} x_{i,j}'^{(0)} - r'_j \geq 1 - \sum_{i \in U} x_{i,j}'^{(0)} - \sum_{i \in I} x_{i,j}'^{(0)} \geq 0, \text{ which implies that } t'_j > 0.$$

In the following we show that $t'_j \leq 2$. Since $j \in J^{(I)} \cup J^{(\leftrightarrow)}$, it suffices to prove the statement for the following three cases.

- If $j \in J^{(I)}$, then $t'_j < 2$ directly from the conclusion of Lemma 22 since

$$\sum_{i \in I} x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} x_{i,j}'^{(\text{II})} > 1/2 \quad \text{and} \quad (1 - \sum_{i \in U} x_{i,j}'^{(0)} - r'_j) \leq 1.$$

- If $j \in J^{(\leftrightarrow)}$ and $r'_j \neq \sum_{i \in U} x_{i,j}'^{(0)}$, then all of the residue demand of j has been redistributed as outlier clients when j is to be removed from D' . It follows that

$$1 - \sum_{i \in U} x_{i,j}'^{(0)} - r'_j = \sum_{i \in I} x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} x_{i,j}'^{(\text{II})} \quad \text{and} \quad t'_j = 1.$$

- If $j \in J^{(\leftrightarrow)}$ and $r'_j := \sum_{i \in U} x_{i,j}'^{(0)}$, then by the conclusion of Lemma 22 we have $\sum_{i \in I} x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} x_{i,j}'^{(\text{II})} + \sum_{i \in U} x_{i,j}'^{(0)} > 1/2$, which implies that

$$1 - \sum_{i \in U} x_{i,j}'^{(0)} - r'_j = 1 - 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in U} x_{i,j}'^{(0)} < 2 \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in I} x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} x_{i,j}'^{(\text{II})} \right)$$

and $t'_j < 2$.

In all cases we have $t'_\ell \leq 2$. □

The bundled assignment \mathbf{g} for LP-(O). For any $w \in U$ and $i \in G$ such that $i \in B(k)$ for some $k \in H(w)$, i.e., i belongs to the clusters centered at some $k \in H(w)$, define the bundled assignment $g_{i,w}$ as

$$g_{i,w} := \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} t'_\ell \cdot x_{i,\ell}'^{(\text{II})}.$$

Intuitively, $g_{i,w}$ is the total amount of scaled assignments i has when the algorithm enters the second stage. The following lemma shows that the feasible region of LP-(O) is nonempty, and the basic optimal solution $(\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{y}'')$ exists.

Lemma 24. $(\mathbf{g}, 2\mathbf{y}'^{(\text{II})})$ is feasible for LP-(O).

Proof. We prove by verifying the constraints of LP-(O). Also refer to Figure 3 for the numbering of the constraints.

min	$\sum_{i \in G} y_i + \sum_{i \in G, j \in U} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}$	LP-(O)
s.t.	$\sum_{i \in G} x_{i,j} = d_j,$	$\forall j \in U,$ (O-1)
	$\sum_{j \in U} x_{i,j} \leq u_i \cdot y_i,$	$\forall i \in G,$ (O-2)
	$y_i \leq 1,$	$\forall i \in G,$ (O-3)
	$x_{i,j} \geq 0, y_i \geq 0,$	$\forall i \in G, j \in U.$ (O-4)

Figure 3: (Restate) The assignment LP for the outlier clusters in \mathcal{C}_H .

- Consider the constraint (O-1).

For any $w \in U$, apply the definition of \mathbf{g} and the definition of d_w , we have

$$\sum_{i \in G} g_{i,w} = \sum_{k \in H(w), i' \in B(k)} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} t'_\ell \cdot x'_{i',\ell}{}^{(\text{II})} = d_w.$$

- Consider the constraint (O-3).

For any $i \in G$, we have $y_i'^{(\text{II})} \leq y_i'^{(0)} \leq 1/2$ since $G \subseteq I$, and $2 \cdot y_i'^{(\text{II})} \leq 1$.

- Consider the constraint (O-2).

For any $i \in G$, let $k \in H$ be the outlier client such that $i \in B(k)$. Applying the definition of \mathbf{g} and Corollary 23, we have

$$\sum_{w \in U} g_{i,w} = g_{i,w(k)} = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} t'_\ell \cdot x'_{i,\ell}{}^{(\text{II})} \leq \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} 2 \cdot x'_{i,\ell}{}^{(\text{II})} \leq 2 \cdot u_i \cdot y_i'^{(\text{II})},$$

where in the last inequality we apply the conclusion of Corollary 20 which states that constraint (MN-2) holds for i when i is removed from F' in the first stage of the rounding process.

This proves the lemma. □

The unbundled assignment \mathbf{h} from \mathbf{x}'' . Consider the basic optimal solution $(\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{y}'')$ for LP-(O). In the following, we unbundle the assignment \mathbf{x}'' as assignment function h for the original clients in $\mathcal{D} \cup H$.

For each $i \in G$ and $j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H$, define the unbundled assignment $h_{i,j}$ as

$$h_{i,j} := \sum_{w \in U} x''_{i,w} \cdot \frac{1}{d_w} \cdot \sum_{k \in H(w), i' \in B(k)} t'_j \cdot x'_{i',j}{}^{(\text{II})}.$$

Intuitively, in h we redistribute the assignment \mathbf{x}'' back for the original clients in $\mathcal{D} \cup H$ proportionally. It follows that for any $j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in G} h_{i,j} &= \sum_{i \in G, w \in U} x''_{i,w} \cdot \frac{1}{d_w} \cdot \sum_{k \in H(w), i' \in B(k)} t'_j \cdot x'^{(II)}_{i',j} \\ &= \sum_{w \in U} \sum_{k \in H(w), i' \in B(k)} t'_j \cdot x'^{(II)}_{i',j} = \sum_{i \in G} t'_j \cdot x'_{i,j}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where in the second equality we apply the first constraint of LP-(O) and in the last equality we use the fact that the set of satellite facilities for each $j \in H$ forms a partition of G .

5.1.3 The Rounded Assignment

Provided the above, the intermediate assignment \mathbf{x}° for each $j \in \mathcal{D}$ is defined as

$$x^\circ_{i,j} := \begin{cases} x'^{(0)}_{i,j}, & \text{if } i \in U, \\ t'_j \cdot x^*_{i,j} + \sum_{k \in H(j)} x^*_{i,k}, & \text{if } i \in F_{D'}^*, \\ h_{i,j} + \sum_{k \in H(j)} h_{i,k}, & \text{if } i \in G, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Intuitively, the assignment of each $j \in \mathcal{D}$ in \mathbf{x}° consists of its original assignments to U and the rounded assignments for clients in $\{j\} \cup H(j)$ to facilities in $F_{D'}^* \cup G$.

The following lemma, which asserts the feasibility of \mathbf{x}° , is straightforward to verify.

Lemma 25. $(\mathbf{x}^\circ, \mathbf{y}^*)$ is feasible for LP-(N) on the input instance Ψ .

Proof. Since \mathbf{y}^* is already integral and takes values only from $\{0, 1\}$, it suffices to show that \mathbf{x}° fully-assigns each $j \in \mathcal{D}$ and respects the capacity constraints given by \mathbf{y}^* .

For the latter part, since \mathbf{x}° keeps the assignments of \mathcal{D} to U unchanged, it suffices to examine the assignments to $F_{D'}^* \cup G$. By the definition of \mathbf{x}° , Corollary 23, and Lemma 21, for any $i \in F_{D'}^*$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x^\circ_{i,j} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} t'_j \cdot x^*_{i,j} + \sum_{j \in H} x^*_{i,j} \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} 2 \cdot x^*_{i,j} \leq u_i = u_i \cdot y_i^*.$$

Similarly, for any $i \in G$, applying the definition of \mathbf{x}° and \mathbf{h} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x^\circ_{i,j} &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} h_{i,j} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} \sum_{w \in U} x''_{i,w} \cdot \frac{1}{d_w} \cdot \sum_{k \in H(w), i' \in B(k)} t'_j \cdot x'^{(II)}_{i',j} \\ &= \sum_{w \in U} x''_{i,w} \cdot \frac{1}{d_w} \cdot \sum_{k \in H(w), i' \in B(k)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} t'_j \cdot x'^{(II)}_{i',j} = \sum_{w \in U} x''_{i,w} \leq u_i \cdot y''_i, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second last equality we apply the definition of d_w for any $w \in U$ and in the last inequality we use the fact that $(\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{y}'')$ is feasible for LP-(O).

Next, we show that \mathbf{x}° fully-assigns each $j \in \mathcal{D}$. It suffices to prove for the clients in $J^{(I)} \cup J^{(\leftrightarrow)}$. For the former case, for any $j \in J^{(I)}$, we have $\sum_{i \in U} x'_{i,j}{}^{(0)} = 0$ and $H(j) = \emptyset$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hence, } \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} x_{i,j}^\circ &= \sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*} t'_j \cdot x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} h_{i,j} \\ &= \sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*} t'_j \cdot x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} t'_j \cdot x'_{i,j}{}^{(\text{II})} = t'_j \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*} x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} x'_{i,j}{}^{(\text{II})} \right) = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we apply Equality (16), and in the last equality we apply the definition of t'_j with the fact that $\sum_{i \in U} x'_{i,j}{}^{(0)} = r'_j = 0$.

For $j \in J^{(\leftrightarrow)}$, we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} x_{i,j}^\circ = \sum_{i \in U} x'_{i,j}{}^{(0)} + \sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*} \left(t'_j \cdot x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{k \in H(j)} x_{i,k}^* \right) + \sum_{i \in G} \left(h_{i,j} + \sum_{k \in H(j)} h_{i,k} \right) \quad (17)$$

Applying Equality (16) and the definition of t'_k for $k \in H(j)$, we have

$$\sum_{i \in G} \left(h_{i,j} + \sum_{k \in H(j)} h_{i,k} \right) = \sum_{i \in G} t'_j \cdot x'_{i,j}{}^{(\text{II})} + \sum_{k \in H(j), i \in G} x'_{i,k}{}^{(\text{II})} \quad (18)$$

Combining (17) and (18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} x_{i,j}^\circ &= \sum_{i \in U} x'_{i,j}{}^{(0)} + \sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*} t'_j \cdot x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} t'_j \cdot x'_{i,j}{}^{(\text{II})} + \sum_{k \in H(j)} \left(\sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*} x_{i,k}^* + \sum_{i \in G} x'_{i,k}{}^{(\text{II})} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i \in U} x'_{i,j}{}^{(0)} + \sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*} t'_j \cdot x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} t'_j \cdot x'_{i,j}{}^{(\text{II})} + \sum_{k \in H(j)} \sum_{i \in I} x'_{i,k}{}^{(0)}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where in the last equality we apply the conclusion of Lemma 22. By the construction of outlier clients, each $k \in H(j)$ is fully-assigned to facilities in I by \mathbf{x}' . Hence, we have $\sum_{i \in I} x'_{i,k}{}^{(0)} = d_k$ for each $k \in H(j)$. Further applying the definition of d_k , we have

$$\sum_{k \in H(j)} \sum_{i \in I} x'_{i,k}{}^{(0)} = \sum_{k \in H(j)} d_k = \sum_{k \in H(j)} r'_j \cdot \frac{x'_{w(k),j}{}^{(0)}}{\sum_{i \in U} x'_{i,j}{}^{(0)}} = r'_j, \quad (20)$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that exactly one outlier client is created for each $i \in U$ with $x'_{i,j}{}^{(0)} > 0$. Combining (19) and (20) and applying the definition of t'_j , we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} x_{i,j}^\circ = \sum_{i \in U} x'_{i,j}{}^{(0)} + \sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*} t'_j \cdot x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} t'_j \cdot x'_{i,j}{}^{(\text{II})} + r'_j = 1.$$

This completes the proof of this lemma. \square

5.2 Approximation Guarantee

In the following we establish the 4-approximation guarantee for $(\mathbf{x}^\circ, \mathbf{y}^*)$. We consider the cost incurred by clusters in $\mathcal{C}_{H'}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{D'}$ separately in Section 5.2.1 and Section 5.2.2. In Section 5.2.3 we establish the overall guarantee.

Recall that we use $p(j)$ for $j \in H$ to denote the client in \mathcal{D} from which j is created. In the following, we extend the definition and define $p(k) := k$ for any $k \in \mathcal{D}$ for brevity.

Moreover, for any assignment \mathbf{x} of interest, we will use $\mathbf{x}|_{A,B}$ to denote the assignments made in \mathbf{x} between $A \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ and $B \subseteq \mathcal{D} \cup H$. Similarly, for any multiplicity function \mathbf{y} of interest, we will use $\mathbf{y}|_A$ to denote the multiplicity of facilities in $A \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ in \mathbf{y} .

5.2.1 The clusters in $\mathcal{C}_{H'}$

The following lemma, which regards the assignment radius of the outlier clients in H , follows directly from the algorithm design and triangle inequality.

Lemma 26. For any $j \in H$ and $i \in G$ such that $x'_{i,j}{}^{(\text{II})} > 0$, we have $c_{i,j} \leq \alpha_j$.

Proof. By the algorithm design, the outlier client j is created and assigned to i in $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$ only when $x'_{i,p(j)}{}^{(0)} > 0$. This implies that $c_{i,p(j)} \leq \alpha_{p(j)}$ by complementary slackness condition. By triangle inequality and the definition of α_j , it follows that

$$c_{i,j} = c_{i,w(j)} \leq c_{w(j),p(j)} + c_{i,p(j)} \leq c_{w(j),p(j)} + \alpha_{p(j)} = \alpha_j.$$

□

In the following lemma, we bound the overall assignment cost in $\mathbf{x}^\circ|_{G,\mathcal{D}}$ in terms of that in \mathbf{x}'' and $\mathbf{x}'^{(\text{II})}|_{G,\mathcal{D} \cup H}$. The proof follows from the way the clusters in $\mathcal{C}_{H'}$ are formed and the way the assignments are bundled.

Lemma 27.

$$\sum_{i \in G, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x^\circ_{i,j} \leq \sum_{i \in G, j \in U} c_{i,j} \cdot x''_{i,j} + \sum_{i \in G} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} t'_j \cdot (c_{i,p(j)} + \alpha_j) \cdot x'_{i,j}{}^{(\text{II})}.$$

Proof. By the definition of \mathbf{x}° and \mathbf{h} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in G, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x^\circ_{i,j} &= \sum_{i \in G, j \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{k \in \{j\} \cup H(j)} c_{i,j} \cdot h_{i,k} = \sum_{i \in G} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} c_{i,p(j)} \cdot h_{i,j} \\ &= \sum_{i \in G} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} c_{i,p(j)} \cdot \sum_{w \in U} x''_{i,w} \cdot \frac{1}{d_w} \cdot \sum_{k \in H(w), i' \in B(k)} t'_j \cdot x'_{i',j}{}^{(\text{II})}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

By triangle inequality, for any $i \in G$, $j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H$, $w \in U$, $k \in H(w)$, and $i' \in B(k)$ such that $x'_{i',j}{}^{(\text{II})} > 0$, we have

$$c_{i,p(j)} \leq c_{i,w} + c'_{i,w} + c'_{i',p(j)} \leq c_{i,w} + \alpha_k + c'_{i',p(j)},$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 26 and the fact that $i' \in B(k)$ implies that $x'_{i',k}{}^{(\text{II})} > 0$. See also Figure 4 for an illustration.




Figure 4: An illustration on the bundled assignment from $w \in U$ to $i \in G$ and unbundled assignments for $k \in H(w)$, $i' \in B(k)$ such that $x'_{i',j}{}^{(\text{II})} > 0$.

Applying the above inequality on (21) with proper rearrangement, we obtain the following upper-bound for $\sum_{i \in G, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}^\circ$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i \in G, w \in U} c_{i,w} \cdot x''_{i,w} \cdot \frac{1}{d_w} \cdot \sum_{k \in H(w), i' \in B(k)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} t'_j \cdot x'_{i',j}{}^{(\text{II})} \\ & + \sum_{i \in G, w \in U} x''_{i,w} \cdot \frac{1}{d_w} \cdot \sum_{k \in H(w), i' \in B(k)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} (c_{i',p(j)} + \alpha_k) \cdot t'_j \cdot x'_{i',j}{}^{(\text{II})}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the definition of d_w on the former item and the fact that $\sum_{i \in G} x''_{i,w} = d_w$ on the latter item, the above becomes

$$\sum_{i \in G, w \in U} c_{i,w} \cdot x''_{i,w} + \sum_{w \in U} \sum_{k \in H(w), i' \in B(k)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} (c_{i',p(j)} + \alpha_k) \cdot t'_j \cdot x'_{i',j}{}^{(\text{II})}.$$

By the design of the algorithm, for any $w \in U$, $k \in H(w)$, $i' \in B(k)$, and for any $j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H$ with $x'_{i',j}{}^{(\text{II})} > 0$, we have $\alpha_k \leq \alpha_j$, since k is selected as cluster center because of having the smallest α value. Therefore, the above is further upper-bounded by

$$\sum_{i \in G, w \in U} c_{i,w} \cdot x''_{i,w} + \sum_{w \in U} \sum_{k \in H(w), i' \in B(k)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} (c_{i',p(j)} + \alpha_j) \cdot t'_j \cdot x'_{i',j}{}^{(\text{II})}.$$

Applying the fact that the satellite facilities of clusters in $\mathcal{C}_{H'}$ forms a partition of G , the above is exactly

$$\sum_{i \in G, j \in U} c_{i,j} \cdot x''_{i,j} + \sum_{i \in G} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} t'_j \cdot (c_{i,p(j)} + \alpha_j) \cdot x'_{i,j}{}^{(\text{II})}.$$

□

The following two lemmas bound the overall cost incurred by $\mathbf{y}^*|_G$ and \mathbf{x}'' by the cost of $\mathbf{y}'^{(\text{II})}|_G$, $\mathbf{y}'^{(0)}|_U$, and $\mathbf{x}'^{(\text{II})}|_{G, \mathcal{D} \cup H}$.

Lemma 28. We have

$$\sum_{i \in G} \lceil y_i'' \rceil + \sum_{i \in G, j \in U} c_{i,j} \cdot x''_{i,j} \leq 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in G} y_i'^{(\text{II})} + |L| + \sum_{i \in G} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} t'_j \cdot \alpha_j \cdot x'_{i,j}{}^{(\text{II})},$$

where $L := \{ i \in G : 0 < y_i'' < 1 \}$.

Proof. Since $(\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{y}'')$ is optimal for LP-(O), by Lemma 24, the cost of $(\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{y}'')$ is no more than that of $(\mathbf{g}|_{G,U}, 2\mathbf{y}'|_G)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in G} y_i'' + \sum_{i \in G, j \in U} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}'' &\leq 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in G} y_i^{(\text{II})} + \sum_{i \in G, j \in U} c_{i,j} \cdot g_{i,j} \\ &= 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in G} y_i^{(\text{II})} + \sum_{\substack{i \in G, w \in U, \\ i \in B(k) \text{ for some } k \in H(w)}} c_{i,w} \cdot \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} t'_\ell \cdot x_{i,\ell}^{(\text{II})}. \end{aligned}$$

By the algorithm setting and Lemma 26, for any $i \in G$ and $w \in U$ such that $i \in B(k)$ for some $k \in H(w)$, i.e., facility i belongs to some cluster centered at some $k \in H(w)$, we have $c_{i,w} \leq \alpha_k \leq \alpha_\ell$, for any $\ell \in \mathcal{D} \cup H$ with $x_{i,\ell}^{(\text{II})} > 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in G} y_i'' + \sum_{i \in G, j \in U} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}'' &\leq 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in G} y_i^{(\text{II})} + \sum_{\substack{i \in G, w \in U, \\ i \in B(k) \text{ for some } k \in H(w)}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} t'_\ell \cdot \alpha_\ell \cdot x_{i,\ell}^{(\text{II})} \\ &= 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in G} y_i^{(\text{II})} + \sum_{i \in G, j \in \mathcal{D} \cup H} t'_j \cdot \alpha_j \cdot x_{i,j}^{(\text{II})}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that the set of satellite facilities of clusters in $\mathcal{C}_{H'}$ forms a partition of G . Applying the definition of L completes the proof of this lemma. \square

The following lemma follows from the fact that $(\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{y}'')$ is a basic solution for LP-(O).

Lemma 29.

$$|L| \leq |U|, \quad \text{where } L := \left\{ i \in G : 0 < y_i'' < 1 \right\}.$$

Proof. Consider the set of constraints in LP-(O) that hold with equality at $(\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{y}'')$, for which we denote by $\mathcal{E}^{(=)}$ in the following. Let M_3 and M_4 denote the set of constraints in $\mathcal{E}^{(=)}$ of the types (O-3) and (O-4), respectively. Formally,

$$M_3 := \left\{ i : \boxed{y_i \leq 1} \in \mathcal{E}^{(=)} \right\}$$

and

$$M_4 := \left\{ (i, j) : \boxed{x_{i,j} \geq 0} \in \mathcal{E}^{(=)} \right\} \cup \left\{ i : \boxed{y_i \geq 0} \in \mathcal{E}^{(=)} \right\}.$$

Let X be the number of variables in LP-(O). Since $(\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{y}'')$ is a basic solution for LP-(O), it follows that, the coefficient matrix of $\mathcal{E}^{(=)}$ is of full-rank, i.e., has rank X . Since M_3 and M_4 are linearly independent, there exists a subset $\mathcal{E}' \subseteq \mathcal{E}^{(=)}$ of linearly independent constraints such that $M_3 \cup M_4 \subseteq \mathcal{E}'$ and $|\mathcal{E}'| = X$.

Let $\mathcal{E}'' := \mathcal{E}' \setminus (M_3 \cup M_4)$ and modify the constraints in \mathcal{E}'' by setting the variable y_i to be 1 for all $i \in M_3$. Similarly, modify \mathcal{E}'' by setting $x_{i,j}$ to be zero for all $(i, j) \in M_4$ and y_i to be zero for all $i \in M_4$. By doing so, we removed equally many constraints and variables from \mathcal{E}' . Since M_3 and M_4 are linearly independent, it follows that

$$\text{rank}(\mathcal{E}'') = \text{rank}(\mathcal{E}') - |M_3 \cup M_4|,$$

and the coefficient matrix of \mathcal{E}'' is still of full-rank.

$$\text{Let } M_1 := \left\{ j : \boxed{\sum_{i \in G} x_{i,j} = d_j} \right\} \text{ and } M_2 := \left\{ i : \boxed{\sum_{j \in U} x_{i,j} \leq u_i \cdot y_i} \in \mathcal{E}'' \right\}.$$

Also let $H := \left\{ (i, j) : x''_{i,j} \neq 0 \right\}$. It follows by the above setting that, $L \cup H$ corresponds exactly to the set of variables in \mathcal{E}'' . Since the coefficient matrix of \mathcal{E}'' has full rank, the pivot in each row of the matrix defines a one-to-one mapping $\phi: L \cup H \rightarrow M_1 \cup M_2$ between the variables and the constraints.

Consider each $i \in L$. Since the variable y_i appears exactly in one constraint in M_2 , the mapping must map y_i to the constraint it corresponds to, i.e., $\phi(i) = i$. Since the constraint i corresponds to in M_2 contributes one rank, it is non-degenerated and contains at least one variable in H . Let $x_{i,j}$ be one such variable. Since $x_{i,j}$ appears in exactly two constraints, i.e., in the one i corresponds to in M_2 and the one j corresponds to in M_1 , and since $\phi(i) = i$, it follows that $\phi((i, j)) = j$. Since the mapping ϕ is one-to-one, j cannot be mapped to by other pairs.

Applying the above argument for each $i \in L$ results in a set consisting of distinct clients j from U with the same cardinality. This shows that $|L| \leq |U|$. \square

Applying Lemma 27, Lemma 28, Lemma 29, and the fact that $y_i^{(0)} \geq 1/2$ for all $i \in U$, we obtain the following bound for the cost incurred by $(\mathbf{x}^\circ|_{G, \mathcal{D}}, \mathbf{y}^*|_G)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in G} y_i^* + \sum_{i \in G, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}^\circ &\leq 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in G} y_i'^{(\text{II})} + \sum_{i \in G, j \in H} t'_j \cdot (c_{i,p(j)} + 2 \cdot \alpha_j) \cdot x_{i,j}'^{(\text{II})} \\ &\quad + 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in U} y_i^{(0)} + \sum_{i \in G, j \in \mathcal{D}} t'_j \cdot (c_{i,j} + 2 \cdot \alpha_j) \cdot x_{i,j}'^{(\text{II})} \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in G} y_i'^{(\text{II})} + \sum_{i \in G, j \in H} (c_{i,p(j)} + 2 \cdot \alpha_j) \cdot x_{i,j}'^{(\text{II})} \\ &\quad + 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in U} y_i^{(0)} + \sum_{i \in G, j \in \mathcal{D}} (2 \cdot c_{i,j} + 2 \cdot t'_j \cdot \alpha_j) \cdot x_{i,j}'^{(\text{II})}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where in the last inequality we apply Corollary 23 the fact that $t'_j \leq 2$ for all $j \in \mathcal{D}$ and the definition that $t'_j = 1$ for all $j \in H$.

5.2.2 The clusters in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{D}'}$

Consider the cost incurred by the clusters in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{D}'}$. The following lemma bounds the cost incurred by the rounding process for each individual cluster q in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{D}'}$.

Lemma 30. For any $q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(i)} \quad & y_{i(q)}^* \leq 2y_{i(q)}^{\prime(q)} + 2\delta_{i(q)} \cdot \sum_{k \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}} y_k^{\prime(q)}, \quad \text{and} \\
\text{(ii)} \quad & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i(q),j} \cdot x_{i(q),j}^\circ \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot c_{i(q),j} \cdot x_{i(q),j}^{\prime(q)} + \sum_{j \in H} c_{i(q),p(j)} \cdot x_{i(q),j}^{\prime(q)} \\
& + \delta_{i(q)} \cdot \sum_{k \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot c_{k,j} \cdot x_{k,j}^{\prime(q)} + \sum_{j \in H} c_{k,p(j)} \cdot x_{k,j}^{\prime(q)} \right) \\
& + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot t'_j \cdot \alpha_j \cdot x_{i(q),j}^* + \sum_{j \in H} 2 \cdot \alpha_j \cdot x_{i(q),j}^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The lemma follows directly from the rounding process for clusters in $\mathcal{C}_{D'}$. Consider the iteration for which q is formed and ready to be rounded. By the algorithm design, the total facility value that has been removed from F' due to the rounding process for q is

$$y_{i(q)}^{\prime(q)} + \delta_{i(q)} \cdot \sum_{k \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}} y_k^{\prime(q)} = \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot y_{i(q)}^*,$$

where in the first equality we apply the definition of $\delta_{i(q)}$. Attributing the cost of $y_{i(q)}^*$ to the facility value that is removed from F' due to cluster q proves the first part of this lemma.

For the second part, by the definition of \mathbf{x}° and the way how the algorithm reroutes the assignments from facilities in $B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}$ to $i(q)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i(q),j} \cdot x_{i(q),j}^\circ &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i(q),j} \cdot \left(t'_j \cdot x_{i(q),j}^* + \sum_{\ell \in H(j)} x_{i(q),\ell}^* \right) \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i(q),j} \cdot t'_j \cdot x_{i(q),j}^{\prime(q)} + \sum_{\ell \in H} c_{i(q),p(\ell)} \cdot x_{i(q),\ell}^{\prime(q)} \\
&+ \delta_{i(q)} \cdot \sum_{k \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i(q),j} \cdot t'_j \cdot x_{k,j}^{\prime(q)} + \sum_{\ell \in H} c_{i(q),p(\ell)} \cdot x_{k,\ell}^{\prime(q)} \right). \quad (23)
\end{aligned}$$

By the algorithm setting, for any $k \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}$ and any $\ell \in H$ with $x_{k,\ell}^{\prime(q)} > 0$, we have

$$c_{i(q),p(\ell)} \leq c_{k,p(\ell)} + c_{k,j(q)} + c_{i(q),j(q)} \leq c_{k,p(\ell)} + 2\alpha_{j(q)} \leq c_{k,p(\ell)} + 2\alpha_\ell,$$

where in the second inequality we apply the fact that $i(q)$ and k are in $B(q)$, which implies that $x_{i(q),j(q)}^{\prime(q)} > 0$, $x_{k,j(q)}^{\prime(q)} > 0$, and $\max(c_{i(q),j(q)}, c_{k,j(q)}) \leq \alpha_{j(q)}$ by complementary slackness, and in the last inequality we apply the assumption that $x_{k,\ell}^{\prime(q)} > 0$, which implies that $\ell \in H^{(q)}$ and $\alpha_{j(q)} \leq \alpha_\ell$ by the way $j(q)$ is selected. By a similar argument, we have $c_{i(q),j} \leq c_{k,j} + 2\alpha_j$ for any $k \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}$ and any $j \in \mathcal{D}$ with $x_{k,j}^{\prime(q)} > 0$.

By the above conclusion, Corollary 23, and the way the assignment \mathbf{x}^* is formed during the rounding process, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{i(q)} \cdot \sum_{k \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i(q),j} \cdot t'_j \cdot x'_{k,j} &\leq \delta_{i(q)} \cdot \sum_{k \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}, j \in \mathcal{D}} (c_{k,j} + 2 \cdot \alpha_j) \cdot t'_j \cdot x'_{k,j} \\ &\leq \delta_{i(q)} \cdot \sum_{k \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}, j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot c_{k,j} \cdot x'_{k,j} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot t'_j \cdot \alpha_j \cdot x^*_{i(q),j}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{i(q)} \cdot \sum_{k \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}, \ell \in H} c_{i(q),p(\ell)} \cdot x'_{k,\ell} \\ \leq \delta_{i(q)} \cdot \sum_{k \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}, \ell \in H} c_{k,p(\ell)} \cdot x'_{k,\ell} + \sum_{\ell \in H} 2 \cdot \alpha_\ell \cdot x^*_{i(q),\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two inequalities with (23) and further applying Corollary 23, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i(q),j} \cdot x^{\circ}_{i(q),j} &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot c_{i(q),j} \cdot x'_{i(q),j} + \sum_{\ell \in H} c_{i(q),p(\ell)} \cdot x'_{i(q),\ell} \\ &\quad + \delta_{i(q)} \cdot \sum_{k \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot c_{k,j} \cdot x'_{k,j} + \sum_{\ell \in H} c_{k,p(\ell)} \cdot x'_{k,\ell} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot t'_j \cdot \alpha_j \cdot x^*_{i(q),j} + \sum_{\ell \in H} 2 \cdot \alpha_\ell \cdot x^*_{i(q),\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

□

The following lemma, which bounds the cost incurred by $\mathbf{x}^\circ|_{F_{D'}^*, \mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathbf{y}^*|_{F_{D'}^*}$, is obtained by taking summation on the cost given in Lemma 30 over all clusters in $\mathcal{C}_{D'}$.

Lemma 31.

$$(i) \quad \sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*} y_i^* \leq 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in I \setminus G} y_i'^{(0)} + 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in G} \left(y_i'^{(0)} - y_i'^{(\text{II})} \right). \quad (24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (ii) \quad \sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}^\circ &\leq \sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*, j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot t'_j \cdot \alpha_j \cdot x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*, j \in H} 2 \cdot \alpha_j \cdot x_{i,j}^* \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in G, j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot c_{i,j} \cdot \left(x_{i,j}'^{(0)} - \sum_{\ell \in H(j)} x_{i,\ell}'^{(0)} - x_{i,j}'^{(\text{II})} \right) + \sum_{i \in G, j \in H} c_{i,p(j)} \cdot \left(x_{i,j}'^{(0)} - x_{i,j}'^{(\text{II})} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in I \setminus G, j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot c_{i,j} \cdot \left(x_{i,j}'^{(0)} - \sum_{\ell \in H(j)} x_{i,\ell}'^{(0)} \right) + \sum_{i \in I \setminus G, j \in H} c_{i,p(j)} \cdot x_{i,j}'^{(0)}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Proof. Consider the first part of Lemma 30. We have

$$\sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*} y_i^* = \sum_{q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}} y_{i(q)}^* \leq \sum_{q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}} \left(2y_{i(q)}'^{(q)} + 2\delta_{i(q)} \cdot \sum_{k \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}} y_k'^{(q)} \right). \quad (26)$$

By the design of the scaled-down operation for rounding each $q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}$, we know that, for each $k \in I \cap D^{(q)}$, the facility value $y_k^{(q)}$ decreases exactly by $\delta_{i(q)} \cdot y_k^{(q)}$ if $k \neq i(q)$ and $y_k^{(q)}$ otherwise. Hence, by summing up the RHS of (26) in a backward manner, we obtain

$$\sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*} y_i^* \leq 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in I \setminus G} y_i^{(0)} + 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in G} \left(y_i^{(0)} - y_i^{(\text{II})} \right).$$

The second part of this lemma follows from an analogous argument. By the second part of Lemma 30, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}^\circ &= \sum_{q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i(q),j} \cdot x_{i(q),j}^\circ \\ &\leq \sum_{q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot c_{i(q),j} \cdot x_{i(q),j}^{(q)} + \sum_{j \in H} c_{i(q),p(j)} \cdot x_{i(q),j}^{(q)} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}} \delta_{i(q)} \cdot \sum_{k \in B(q) \setminus \{i(q)\}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot c_{k,j} \cdot x_{k,j}^{(q)} + \sum_{j \in H} c_{k,p(j)} \cdot x_{k,j}^{(q)} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot t'_j \cdot \alpha_j \cdot x_{i(q),j}^* + \sum_{j \in H} 2 \cdot \alpha_j \cdot x_{i(q),j}^* \right). \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

For the last item in (27), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot t'_j \cdot \alpha_j \cdot x_{i(q),j}^* + \sum_{j \in H} 2 \cdot \alpha_j \cdot x_{i(q),j}^* \right) \\ = \sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*, j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot t'_j \cdot \alpha_j \cdot x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in F_{D'}^*, j \in H} 2 \cdot \alpha_j \cdot x_{i,j}^* \end{aligned}$$

by definition. For the remaining items in the RHS of (27), we apply the same argument and charge the cost to the assignment values decreased due to the scaled-down operation when rounding each $q \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}$. Hence, the remaining items can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in G, j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot c_{i,j} \cdot \left(x_{i,j}^{(0)} - \sum_{\ell \in H(j)} x_{i,\ell}^{(0)} - x_{i,j}^{(\text{II})} \right) + \sum_{i \in G, j \in H} c_{i,p(j)} \cdot \left(x_{i,j}^{(0)} - x_{i,j}^{(\text{II})} \right) \\ + \sum_{i \in I \setminus G, j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot c_{i,j} \cdot \left(x_{i,j}^{(0)} - \sum_{\ell \in H(j)} x_{i,\ell}^{(0)} \right) + \sum_{i \in I \setminus G, j \in H} c_{i,p(j)} \cdot x_{i,j}^{(0)}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. \square

5.2.3 The overall guarantee

Combining Inequality (22), Inequality (24), and Inequality (25) with proper rearrangement of the items, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(\mathbf{x}^\circ, \mathbf{y}^*) &= \psi(\mathbf{x}^\circ|_{U, \mathcal{D}}, \mathbf{y}^*|_U) + \psi(\mathbf{x}^\circ|_{F_{\mathcal{D}'}^*, \mathcal{D}}, \mathbf{y}^*|_{F_{\mathcal{D}'}^*}) + \psi(\mathbf{x}^\circ|_{G, \mathcal{D}}, \mathbf{y}^*|_G) \\
&\leq 4 \cdot \sum_{i \in U} y_i^{(0)} + 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in I} y_i^{(0)} + \sum_{i \in U, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}^{(0)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i \in I, j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot c_{i,j} \cdot \left(x_{i,j}^{(0)} - \sum_{\ell \in H(j)} x_{i,\ell}^{(0)} \right) + \sum_{i \in I, j \in H} c_{i,p(j)} \cdot x_{i,j}^{(0)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot t'_j \cdot \alpha_j \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in F_{\mathcal{D}'}^*} x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} x_{i,j}^{(\text{II})} \right) + \sum_{j \in H} 2 \cdot \alpha_j \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in F_{\mathcal{D}'}^*} x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} x_{i,j}^{(\text{II})} \right). \tag{28}
\end{aligned}$$

Consider the item $\sum_{i \in I, j \in H} c_{i,p(j)} \cdot x_{i,j}^{(0)}$ in (28). We have

$$\sum_{i \in I, j \in H} c_{i,p(j)} \cdot x_{i,j}^{(0)} = \sum_{i \in I, j \in \mathcal{D}, \ell \in H(j)} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,\ell}^{(0)}. \tag{29}$$

Consider the last two items in (28). Applying the definition of t'_j for each $j \in \mathcal{D}$ with $\sum_{i \in F_{\mathcal{D}'}^*} x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} x_{i,j}^{(\text{II})} > 0$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot t'_j \cdot \alpha_j \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in F_{\mathcal{D}'}^*} x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} x_{i,j}^{(\text{II})} \right) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot \alpha_j \cdot \left(1 - \sum_{i \in U} x_{i,j}^{(0)} - r'_j \right). \tag{30}$$

By the algorithm design, we have $\alpha_j = \alpha_{p(j)} + c_{w(j),p(j)}$ for any $j \in H$. Further applying the fact that the demand d_j of any outlier client $j \in H$ is fully-assigned when created and remains fully-assigned during the rounding process, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j \in H} 2 \cdot \alpha_j \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in F_{\mathcal{D}'}^*} x_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i \in G} x_{i,j}^{(\text{II})} \right) = \sum_{j \in H} 2 \cdot (\alpha_{p(j)} + c_{w(j),p(j)}) \cdot d_j \\
&\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot \alpha_j \cdot r'_j + \sum_{j \in H} 2 \cdot c_{w(j),p(j)} \cdot x_{w(j),p(j)}^{(0)} \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot \alpha_j \cdot r'_j + 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in U, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}^{(0)}, \tag{31}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second last inequality we use the fact that

$$\sum_{k \in H(j)} \alpha_{p(j)} \cdot d_k = \alpha_j \cdot \sum_{k \in H(j)} d_k = \alpha_j \cdot \sum_{k \in H(j)} r'_j \cdot \frac{x_{w(j),p(j)}^{(0)}}{\sum_{i \in U} x_{i,p(j)}^{(0)}} = \alpha_j \cdot r'_j$$

for all $j \in \mathcal{D}$ and the fact that $d_j \leq x_{w(j),p(j)}^{(0)}$ for any $j \in H$ by the definition of d_j .

Combining Equality (29), Equality (30), Inequality (31) with Inequality (28), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\mathbf{x}^\circ, \mathbf{y}^*) &\leq 4 \cdot \sum_{i \in U} y_i^{(0)} + 3 \cdot \sum_{i \in U, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}^{(0)} \\ &\quad + 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in I} y_i^{(0)} + 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in I, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}^{(0)} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} 2 \cdot \left(1 - \sum_{i \in U} x_{i,j}^{(0)} \right) \cdot \alpha_j. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

min	$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} y_i + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}$		LP-(N)
s.t.	$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} x_{i,j} \geq 1,$	$\forall j \in \mathcal{D}$	(N-1)
	$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x_{i,j} \leq u_i \cdot y_i,$	$\forall i \in \mathcal{F}$	(N-2)
	$0 \leq x_{i,j} \leq y_i,$	$\forall i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}$	(N-3)
	$0 \leq y_i \leq 1,$	$\forall i \in \mathcal{F}.$	(N-4)
max	$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_j - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \eta_i$		LP-(DN)
s.t.	$\alpha_j \leq \beta_i + \Gamma_{i,j} + c_{i,j},$	$\forall i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D},$	(D-1)
	$u_i \cdot \beta_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} \Gamma_{i,j} \leq 1 + \eta_i,$	$\forall i \in \mathcal{F},$	(D-2)
	$\alpha_j, \beta_i, \Gamma_{i,j}, \eta_i \geq 0,$	$\forall i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}.$	(D-3)

Figure 5: (Restate for further reference) The natural LP formulations for CFL-CFC.

The following lemma follows from complementary slackness between $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')$ and $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta})$, and the fact that $0 < y_i^{(0)} < 1$ for all $i \in I$.

Lemma 32.

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} \left(1 - \sum_{i \in U} x_{i,j}^{(0)} \right) \cdot \alpha_j \leq \sum_{i \in I} y_i^{(0)} + \sum_{i \in I, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}^{(0)}.$$

Proof. Consider any $i \in I$ and the cost incurred. From the fact that $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')$ and $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta})$ are optimal primal and dual solutions for LP-(N) and LP-(DN), by complementary slackness conditions, we have

$$y_i' + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}' = y_i' \cdot \left(u_i \cdot \beta_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} \Gamma_{i,j} \right) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j}'$$

since $y_i' > 0$ implies that constraint (D-2) is tight, and $y_i' < 1$ implies that the dual variable η_i must be zero. By the fact that $\beta_i > 0$ implies that constraint (N-2) is tight and $\Gamma_{i,j} > 0$ implies that

constraint (N-3) is tight, the above becomes

$$\beta_i \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} x'_{i,j} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} \Gamma_{i,j} \cdot x'_{i,j} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x'_{i,j}.$$

Finally, applying the fact that $x'_{i,j} > 0$ implies that constraint (D-1) is tight, we obtain

$$y'_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x'_{i,j} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_j \cdot x'_{i,j}.$$

Taking summation over all facilities in I , we obtain

$$\sum_{i \in I} y'_i + \sum_{i \in I, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x'_{i,j} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}, i \in I} \alpha_j \cdot x'_{i,j} \geq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} \left(1 - \sum_{i \in U} x'_{i,j} \right) \cdot \alpha_j.$$

where in the last equality we apply constraint (N-1) for each $j \in \mathcal{D}$. □

Applying Lemma 32 on Inequality (32), we obtain

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}^\circ, \mathbf{y}^*) \leq 4 \cdot \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} y_i^{(0)} + 4 \cdot \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}} c_{i,j} \cdot x'_{i,j}^{(0)},$$

and Theorem 5 is proved.

References

- [1] Zoë Abrams, Kamesh Munagala, and Serge Plotkin. On the integrality gap of capacitated facility location. Technical Report CMU-CS-02-199, Carnegie Mellon University, 2002.
- [2] Ankit Aggarwal, Anand Louis, Manisha Bansal, Naveen Garg, Neelima Gupta, Shubham Gupta, and Surabhi Jain. A 3-approximation algorithm for the facility location problem with uniform capacities. *Math. Program.*, 141(1-2):527–547, 2013.
- [3] Hyung-Chan An, Aditya Bhaskara, Chandra Chekuri, Shalmoli Gupta, Vivek Madan, and Ola Svensson. Centrality of trees for capacitated k -center. *Math. Program.*, 154(1-2):29–53, 2015.
- [4] Hyung-Chan An, Mohit Singh, and Ola Svensson. Lp-based algorithms for capacitated facility location. In *55th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2014, Philadelphia, PA, USA, October 18-21, 2014*, pages 256–265. IEEE Computer Society, 2014.
- [5] Manisha Bansal, Naveen Garg, and Neelima Gupta. A 5-approximation for capacitated facility location. In Leah Epstein and Paolo Ferragina, editors, *Algorithms - ESA 2012 - 20th Annual European Symposium, Ljubljana, Slovenia, September 10-12, 2012. Proceedings*, volume 7501 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 133–144. Springer, 2012.
- [6] Wang Chi Cheung, Michel X. Goemans, and Sam Chiu-wai Wong. Improved algorithms for vertex cover with hard capacities on multigraphs and hypergraphs. In Chandra Chekuri, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014, Portland, Oregon, USA, January 5-7, 2014*, pages 1714–1726. SIAM, 2014.

- [7] Fabián A. Chudak and David P. Williamson. Improved approximation algorithms for capacitated facility location problems. In *Proceedings of the 7th International IPCO Conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 99–113, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1999. Springer-Verlag.
- [8] Marek Cygan, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, and Samir Khuller. LP rounding for k -centers with non-uniform hard capacities. In *53rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2012, New Brunswick, NJ, USA, October 20-23, 2012*, pages 273–282, 2012.
- [9] Mong-Jen Kao. Iterative partial rounding for vertex cover with hard capacities. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '17*, pages 2638–2653, USA, 2017. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [10] Madhukar R. Korupolu, C. Greg Plaxton, and Rajmohan Rajaraman. Analysis of a local search heuristic for facility location problems. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '98*, pages 1–10, USA, 1998. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [11] A.A. Kuehn and M.J. Hamburger. A heuristic program for locating warehouses. *Manage. Sci.*, 9(4):643–666, July 1963.
- [12] Retsef Levi, David B. Shmoys, and Chaitanya Swamy. Lp-based approximation algorithms for capacitated facility location. In George L. Nemhauser and Daniel Bienstock, editors, *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization (IPCO) 2004*, volume 3064 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 206–218. Springer, 2004.
- [13] Shi Li. On uniform capacitated k -median beyond the natural LP relaxation. In Piotr Indyk, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, January 4-6, 2015*, pages 696–707. SIAM, 2015.
- [14] Mohammad Mahdian and Martin Pál. Universal facility location. In Giuseppe Di Battista and Uri Zwick, editors, *Algorithms - ESA 2003, 11th Annual European Symposium, Budapest, Hungary, September 16-19, 2003, Proceedings*, volume 2832 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 409–421. Springer, 2003.
- [15] M. Pál, É. Tardos, and T. Wexler. Facility location with nonuniform hard capacities. In *Proceedings of the 42nd IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS '01*, page 329, USA, 2001. IEEE Computer Society.
- [16] David B. Shmoys, Éva Tardos, and Karen Aardal. Approximation algorithms for facility location problems (extended abstract). In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '97*, pages 265–274, New York, NY, USA, 1997. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [17] David P. Williamson and David B. Shmoys. *The Design of Approximation Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, USA, 1st edition, 2011.
- [18] Jiawei Zhang, Bo Chen, and Yinyu Ye. A multi-exchange local search algorithm for the capacitated facility location problem: (extended abstract). In George L. Nemhauser and Daniel Bienstock, editors, *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization, 10th International IPCO Conference, New York, NY, USA, June 7-11, 2004, Proceedings*, volume 3064 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 219–233. Springer, 2004.