

# Can Evolutionary Clustering Have Theoretical Guarantees?

Chao Qian, *Senior Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—Clustering is a fundamental problem in many areas, which aims to partition a given data set into groups based on some distance measure, such that the data points in the same group are similar while that in different groups are dissimilar. Due to its importance and NP-hardness, a lot of methods have been proposed, among which evolutionary algorithms are a class of popular ones. Evolutionary clustering has found many successful applications, but all the results are empirical, lacking theoretical support. This paper fills this gap by proving that the approximation performance of the GSEMO (a simple multi-objective evolutionary algorithm) for solving the three popular formulations of clustering, i.e.,  $k$ -center,  $k$ -median and  $k$ -means, can be theoretically guaranteed. Furthermore, we prove that evolutionary clustering can have theoretical guarantees even when considering fairness, which tries to avoid algorithmic bias, and has recently been an important research topic in machine learning.

**Index Terms**—Clustering, evolutionary algorithms,  $k$ -center,  $k$ -median,  $k$ -means, fairness, theoretical guarantees.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Clustering [26] aims to partition a set of data points into clusters (groups) such that the data points in the same cluster are similar while the points in different clusters are less similar. It is a fundamental problem in exploratory data analysis, and has been widely studied in many different areas, e.g., machine learning, data mining, pattern recognition, information retrieval, and bioinformatics.

Clustering is generally NP-hard, and many techniques have been proposed to tackle it [3]. Among them, Evolutionary Algorithms (EAs) are a class of popular techniques [23], [36], which have been applied to solve various formulations of clustering, i.e., to optimize various objective functions measuring the goodness of a partition [15], [19], [20], [44]. Evolutionary clustering has found many successful applications, such as gene expression data analysis [21], [33], complex network analysis [16], and patient attendance data analysis [31], just to name a few.

Though achieving good performance in real-world applications, all the results of evolutionary clustering are empirical. To the best of our knowledge, there has been no theoretical analysis. Thus, a natural question is whether evolutionary clustering can have theoretical guarantees. That is, can we prove that for any problem instance, the objective function value of the clustering generated by EAs is upper bounded (consider minimization) by  $\alpha$  times that of the optimal clustering, where  $\alpha$  is called approximation ratio? Thus, achieving an approximation guarantee implies that the performance of the algorithm can be guaranteed even in the worst case.

In this paper, we give a positive answer by proving the approximation ratios of EAs for solving three popular formulations of clustering, i.e.,  $k$ -center,  $k$ -median, and  $k$ -means. Specifically, we consider a simple multi-objective EA (MOEA), i.e., GSEMO, which employs mutation operator only and maintains non-dominated solutions generated so far, and has been widely used in theoretical analysis of MOEAs [9], [12], [29], [37], [41].

Given a set of  $n$  points  $\mathcal{D} = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^l$ , and a metric distance function  $d : \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $k$ -center clustering [17] is to find a partition  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k$  of  $\mathcal{D}$  such that  $\max_{m \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}} \max\{d(v_i, v_j) \mid v_i, v_j \in S_m\}$  is minimized. That is, the maximum intracluster distance is to be minimized, where the intracluster distance is measured by the largest distance between two points in the cluster. We prove that the GSEMO can achieve a 2-approximation ratio after running at most  $ek^2n - ek(n-1)$  expected number of iterations.

For  $k$ -median clustering [2], we are given another set  $F$  of points, and the goal is to select a subset  $X \subseteq F$  of size  $k$  such that  $\sum_{v_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(v_i, X)$  is minimized, where  $d(v_i, X) = \min\{d(v_i, u) \mid u \in X\}$  is the distance between  $v_i$  and its closest point in  $X$ . That is, each data point in  $\mathcal{D}$  is assigned to the closest point in  $X$ , forming  $k$  clusters, and the sum of the  $k$  intracluster distances is to be minimized, where the intracluster distance is measured by the sum of the distance between each point in the cluster and the corresponding median point in  $X$ . We prove that the GSEMO can achieve a  $\frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right)$ -approximation ratio after running  $O\left(\frac{k^2|F|}{|F|-k+1} + \frac{k^2|F|^{2p}}{\epsilon} \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\min}}\right)$  expected number of iterations, where  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $p \geq 1$ ,  $d_i^{\max} = \max\{d(v_i, u) \mid u \in F\}$ , and  $d_i^{\min} = \min\{d(v_i, u) \mid u \in F\}$ .

The  $k$ -means clustering problem [25] is similar to  $k$ -median clustering, except that the points to be selected can be arbitrary (i.e.,  $F = \mathbb{R}^l$ ), and the squared Euclidean distance (which is not a metric) is used. That is, it is to select a set  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^l$  of  $k$  points such that  $\sum_{v_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(v_i, X)$  is minimized, where  $d(v_i, X) = \min\{(v_i - u) \cdot (v_i - u) \mid u \in X\}$  and  $\cdot$  denotes the dot product of two vectors. We prove that the GSEMO can achieve a  $\frac{1+\epsilon_1}{(1-\epsilon_2)^2} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right)^2$ -approximation ratio after running  $O\left(\frac{k^2|C|}{|C|-k+1} + \frac{k^2|C|^{2p}}{\epsilon_2} \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\min}}\right)$  expected number of iterations, where  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$ ,  $p \geq 1$ ,  $C$  is a candidate set of size  $O(n\epsilon_1^{-1} \log(1/\epsilon_1))$  which contains an approximately optimal solution and where we actually select the  $k$  points,  $d_i^{\max} = \max\{(v_i - u) \cdot (v_i - u) \mid u \in C\}$ , and  $d_i^{\min} = \min\{(v_i - u) \cdot (v_i - u) \mid u \in C\}$ .

Furthermore, we consider clustering under fairness, which

C. Qian is with the State Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210023, China (e-mail: qianc@lamda.nju.edu.cn)

has attracted much attention recently as optimizing only performance measures may lead to biased outputs of algorithms. In particular, we study  $k$ -median clustering under individual fairness [34], where a clustering characterized by a subset  $X \subseteq F = \mathcal{D}$  of size  $k$  is fair if for every point in  $\mathcal{D}$ , the corresponding median point (i.e., the closest point) in  $X$  is among its  $(|\mathcal{D}|/k)$ -closest neighbors. We prove that the GSEMO can achieve a  $(84, 7)$ -bicriteria approximation ratio after running  $O\left(k^2 n + k^2 n^8 \log \frac{\sum_{i=k+1}^n d_{(i)}^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} d_{(i)}^{\min}}\right)$  expected number of iterations, where  $d_{(1)}^{\max}, \dots, d_{(n)}^{\max}$  and  $d_{(1)}^{\min}, \dots, d_{(n)}^{\min}$  are permutations of  $d_1^{\max}, \dots, d_n^{\max}$  and  $d_1^{\min}, \dots, d_n^{\min}$  in ascending order, respectively,  $d_i^{\max} = \max\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D}\}$ , and  $d_i^{\min} = \min\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{\mathbf{v}_i\}\}$ .

Note that having theoretical guarantees is not an inherent nature of algorithms. Let's take Lloyd's algorithm (often called  $k$ -means algorithm) [32] as an example, which is probably the most celebrated heuristic for  $k$ -means clustering, and has been regarded as one of the top 10 algorithms in data mining [47]. Starting from  $k$  arbitrary centers, it assigns each point in  $\mathcal{D}$  to the nearest center, and recomputes each center as the centroid of those points assigned to it; this process is repeated until convergence. Though very appealing in practice due to its simplicity and efficiency, Lloyd's algorithm guarantees only a local optimum, which can be arbitrarily bad [25]. Thus, many efforts have been devoted to improving it (e.g., by using a careful seeding technique [46] or combining it with a local search strategy [28]), to achieve theoretical guarantees.

The contribution of this work is to provide theoretical justification for evolutionary clustering, rather than to show that EAs can achieve the best approximation guarantees. In fact, the 2-approximation ratio achieved by the GSEMO for  $k$ -center clustering has been optimal [17], while better approximation ratios can be achieved for the other considered clustering problems by developing other techniques, e.g.,  $(2.675 + \epsilon)$ -approximation ratio for  $k$ -median clustering by dependent rounding [6],  $(6.357 + \epsilon)$ -approximation ratio for  $k$ -means clustering by a primal-dual approach [1], and  $(7.081 + \epsilon, 3)$ -bicriteria approximation ratio for  $k$ -median clustering under individual fairness by a reduction to facility location under matroid constraint [45]. Thus, an interesting future work is to improve the approximation ratios of EAs by designing advanced strategies, especially considering that the GSEMO studied in this work is a very basic MOEA, which shares a common evolutionary structure but only uses uniform parent selection, bit-wise mutation, and survivor selection that simply keeps all non-dominated solutions generated so far.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II first introduces three popular formulations of the  $k$ -clustering problem, i.e.,  $k$ -center,  $k$ -median and  $k$ -means, as well as the GSEMO. In the following three sections, we theoretically analyze the approximation ratios of the GSEMO for  $k$ -center,  $k$ -median and  $k$ -means, respectively. Section VI then presents theoretical analysis of the GSEMO for  $k$ -median under fairness. Section VII finally concludes this paper.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we first give the formal definitions of  $k$ -center,  $k$ -median, and  $k$ -means clustering, and then introduce the GSEMO in detail.

### A. $k$ -Clustering

Let  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^+$  denote the set of reals and non-negative reals, respectively. Given a set of  $n$  data points  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}$  in  $l$ -dimensional space  $\mathbb{R}^l$ , the  $k$ -clustering problem aims to partition  $\mathcal{D}$  into  $k$  disjoint groups (each group is called a cluster) such that the points in the same group are similar while that in different groups are dissimilar. A typical way to solve this problem is to formulate an objective function measuring the goodness of a partition and then employ optimization techniques. Among the  $k$ -clustering formulations,  $k$ -center,  $k$ -median and  $k$ -means are probably the most three popular ones.

Let  $[k]$  denote the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . As presented in Definition 1, the objective function of  $k$ -center clustering to be minimized is defined as the maximum intracluster distance, where the intracluster distance of a cluster  $S_m$  is measured by  $\max_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j)$ , i.e., the largest distance between two points in  $S_m$ . Note that the distance function  $d: \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  between two points is required to be a metric, satisfying the symmetric property and triangle inequality.

**Definition 1** ( $k$ -Center Clustering [17]). *Given a set of  $n$  data points  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^l$ , a metric distance function  $d: \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ , and an integer  $k$ , to find a partition  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k$  of  $\mathcal{D}$  such that*

$$\arg \min_{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k: \text{a partition of } \mathcal{D}} \max_{m \in [k]} \max_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j). \quad (1)$$

The  $k$ -median clustering problem as presented in Definition 2 is also called facility location [2]. Each data point in  $\mathcal{D}$  corresponds to a client, and we are given another set  $F$  of points (called facilities). The goal is to open a subset  $X \subseteq F$  of  $k$  facilities such that the total service cost is minimized, where each client in  $\mathcal{D}$  is served by the nearest facility in  $X$  and the corresponding service cost is the distance between them. Let  $X = \{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_k\}$ . Thus, each facility  $\mathbf{u}_m$  in  $X$  corresponds to a cluster  $S_m = \{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D} \mid \mathbf{u}_m = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u} \in X} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u})\}$ . That is, each client in  $\mathcal{D}$  is assigned to the closest facility in  $X$  with ties broken arbitrarily.

**Definition 2** ( $k$ -Median Clustering [2]). *Given a set of  $n$  data points  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^l$ , a set  $F$  of points in  $\mathbb{R}^l$ , a metric distance function  $d: \mathcal{D} \cup F \times \mathcal{D} \cup F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ , and an integer  $k$ , to find a subset  $X \subseteq F$  of size  $k$  such that*

$$\arg \min_{X \subseteq F, |X|=k} \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X), \quad (2)$$

where  $d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) = \min\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in X\}$  is the distance between  $\mathbf{v}_i$  and its closest point in  $X$ .

As presented in Definition 3, the goal of  $k$ -means clustering is to determine a set  $X$  of  $k$  points in  $\mathbb{R}^l$ , to minimize the sum of the squared Euclidean distance from each point in  $\mathcal{D}$  to its closest point in  $X$ . Compared with  $k$ -median clustering

in Definition 2, the selected  $k$  points are not restricted to be from a given set  $F$ , and the squared Euclidean distance is used, which does not satisfy the triangle inequality, and is not a metric.

**Definition 3** ( $k$ -Means Clustering [25]). *Given a set of  $n$  data points  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^l$ , and an integer  $k$ , to find a set  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^l$  of size  $k$  such that*

$$\arg \min_{X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^l, |X|=k} \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X), \quad (3)$$

where  $d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) = \min\{(\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in X\}$  and  $\cdot$  denotes the dot product of two vectors.

All the above three formulations of  $k$ -clustering are generally NP-hard, and thus many efforts have been devoted to developing algorithms with approximation guarantees, e.g., [1], [2], [6], [17], [25]. Given a minimization problem where the objective function is denoted as  $f$ , an algorithm is said to achieve an  $\alpha$ -approximation ratio if for any instance of this problem, the output solution  $X$  of this algorithm satisfies

$$f(X) \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT},$$

where  $\alpha \geq 1$  and OPT denotes the optimal function value. The approximation ratio of an algorithm actually implies its approximation performance in the worst case. The smaller  $\alpha$ , the better the algorithm.

## B. GSEMO

To examine whether EAs can achieve approximation guarantees for  $k$ -clustering, we consider the GSEMO [29] as presented in Algorithm 1, which is used for maximizing multiple pseudo-Boolean objective functions over  $\{0, 1\}^n$  simultaneously. In multi-objective maximization  $\max(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m)$ , solutions may be incomparable due to the conflicting of objectives. The domination relationship in Definition 4 is often used for comparison.

**Definition 4** (Domination). *For two solutions  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,*

- 1)  $\mathbf{x}$  weakly dominates  $\mathbf{x}'$  (i.e.,  $\mathbf{x}$  is better than  $\mathbf{x}'$ , denoted by  $\mathbf{x} \succeq \mathbf{x}'$ ) if  $\forall i : f_i(\mathbf{x}) \geq f_i(\mathbf{x}')$ ;
- 2)  $\mathbf{x}$  dominates  $\mathbf{x}'$  (i.e.,  $\mathbf{x}$  is strictly better than  $\mathbf{x}'$ , denoted by  $\mathbf{x} \succ \mathbf{x}'$ ) if  $\mathbf{x} \succeq \mathbf{x}' \wedge \exists i : f_i(\mathbf{x}) > f_i(\mathbf{x}')$ .

Two solutions  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{x}'$  are *incomparable* if neither  $\mathbf{x} \succeq \mathbf{x}'$  nor  $\mathbf{x}' \succeq \mathbf{x}$ . A solution is *Pareto optimal* if no other solution dominates it. The collection of objective vectors of all Pareto optimal solutions is called *Pareto front*.

The GSEMO starts from the all-0s vector  $\mathbf{0}$  in line 1, and iteratively tries to improve the quality of solutions in the population  $P$  (i.e., lines 2–8). In each iteration, a parent solution  $\mathbf{x}$  is selected from  $P$  uniformly at random in line 3, and used to generate an offspring solution  $\mathbf{x}'$  by bit-wise mutation in line 4, which flips each bit of  $\mathbf{x}$  independently with probability  $1/n$ . The newly generated offspring solution  $\mathbf{x}'$  is then used to update the population  $P$  (lines 5–7). If  $\mathbf{x}'$  is not dominated by any solution in  $P$  (i.e., the condition in line 5 is satisfied), it will be added into  $P$ , and those solutions (i.e.,  $\{z \in P \mid \mathbf{x}' \succeq z\}$ ) weakly dominated by  $\mathbf{x}'$  will be

---

## Algorithm 1 GSEMO

---

**Input:**  $m$  pseudo-Boolean functions  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m$ , where  $f_i : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

**Process:**

- 1: Let  $P \leftarrow \{\mathbf{0}\}$ ;
  - 2: **repeat**
  - 3:   Choose  $\mathbf{x}$  from  $P$  uniformly at random;
  - 4:   Create  $\mathbf{x}'$  by flipping each bit of  $\mathbf{x}$  with prob.  $1/n$ ;
  - 5:   **if**  $\nexists z \in P$  such that  $z \succ \mathbf{x}'$  **then**
  - 6:      $P \leftarrow (P \setminus \{z \in P \mid \mathbf{x}' \succeq z\}) \cup \{\mathbf{x}'\}$
  - 7:   **end if**
  - 8: **until** some criterion is met
- 

deleted in line 6. By this updating procedure, the population  $P$  will maintain all the non-dominated solutions generated so far. Note that for ease of theoretical analysis (e.g., in Section III), we have slightly modified the original version of the GSEMO in [29], by using the all-0s vector  $\mathbf{0}$  as the initial solution instead of sampling it from  $\{0, 1\}^n$  uniformly at random.

To apply the GSEMO to solve the  $k$ -clustering problem, one needs to first decide a way of solution representation, i.e., how to use a Boolean vector to represent a solution of  $k$ -center,  $k$ -median or  $k$ -means; then reformulate the  $k$ -clustering problem as a bi-objective maximization problem

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n} (f_1(\mathbf{x}), f_2(\mathbf{x})); \quad (4)$$

finally run the GSEMO and select a solution from the population to output when terminated. Rephrasing a single-objective problem in a multi-objective way (i.e., multi-objectivization [27]) is a useful technique, whose effectiveness has been proved recently for EAs solving several combinatorial optimization problems, e.g., minimum spanning tree [37], covering [12], minimum cuts [38], minimum cost coverage [40], and submodular optimization [14], [41]. In the next three sections, we will show how to implement this procedure for  $k$ -center,  $k$ -median and  $k$ -means, respectively, and analyze the expected number of iterations of the GSEMO required to reach some approximation ratios for the first time. Note that our focus is the quality of the final output solution w.r.t. the original  $k$ -clustering problem, rather than the approximation of the final population to the Pareto front of the reformulated bi-objective problem.

## III. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF THE GSEMO FOR $k$ -CENTER CLUSTERING

To apply the GSEMO to solve the  $k$ -center clustering problem in Definition 1, we use a Boolean vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$  to represent a partition  $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{|\mathbf{x}|}\}$  of  $\mathcal{D}$ , where  $|\mathcal{D}| = n$ , and  $|\mathbf{x}| = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$  denotes the size of  $\mathbf{x}$ . If the  $i$ -th bit  $x_i = 1$ , the data point  $\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}$  serves as the center of a cluster; thus there are  $|\mathbf{x}|$  centers (also clusters) in total. Each point in  $\mathcal{D}$  is assigned to the closest center, forming the  $|\mathbf{x}|$  clusters  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{|\mathbf{x}|}$ . Note that by this way of solution representation, we are actually searching in a subspace of all possible partitions of  $\mathcal{D}$ , which is, however, sufficient to guarantee a good approximation ratio, as shown in Theorem 1.

We use  $X = \{\mathbf{v}_1^*, \mathbf{v}_2^*, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{|\mathbf{x}|}^*\}$  to denote the  $|\mathbf{x}|$  points corresponding to those 1-bits in  $\mathbf{x}$ , and  $\mathbf{v}_i^*$  serves as the center of  $S_i$ , i.e.,  $S_i = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{D} \mid \mathbf{v}_i^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u} \in X} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})\}$ . After determining the way of solution representation, the original problem Eq. (1) is reformulated as a bi-objective maximization problem

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^n} (f_1(\mathbf{x}), f_2(\mathbf{x})), \quad (5)$$

$$\text{where } \begin{cases} f_1(\mathbf{x}) = \min_{\mathbf{v}_i^*, \mathbf{v}_j^* \in X} d(\mathbf{v}_i^*, \mathbf{v}_j^*) - \max_{m \in [|\mathbf{x}|]} \max_{\mathbf{v} \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_m^*), \\ f_2(\mathbf{x}) = |\mathbf{x}|. \end{cases}$$

In the definition of  $f_1$ , the first term  $\min_{\mathbf{v}_i^*, \mathbf{v}_j^* \in X} d(\mathbf{v}_i^*, \mathbf{v}_j^*)$  is the minimum distance between cluster centers, characterizing the dissimilarity between clusters, while the second term  $\max_{m \in [|\mathbf{x}|]} \max_{\mathbf{v} \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_m^*)$  is the maximum distance from each point to its center, characterizing the dissimilarity within clusters. Thus, maximizing  $f_1$  will prefer high intercluster distances and low intracluster distances, which is consistent with the goal of clustering. To be well defined, we set the  $f_1$  value to  $+\infty$  for the all-0s vector  $\mathbf{0}$  and the vectors with size 1. Note that the Boolean-vector solutions with size larger than  $k$  are excluded during the optimization process of the GSEMO. When the GSEMO terminates, the Boolean-vector solution with size  $k$  (corresponding to a partition  $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k\}$  of  $\mathcal{D}$ ) in the population will be output.

Theorem 1 shows that the GSEMO can achieve a 2-approximation ratio after running at most  $ek^2n - ek(n-1)$  expected number of iterations. The 2-approximation ratio has been the optimal polynomial-time approximation ratio [17], and implies that the partition  $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k\}$  of  $\mathcal{D}$  corresponding to the Boolean-vector solution output by the GSEMO satisfies  $\max_{m \in [k]} \max_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j) \leq 2 \cdot \text{OPT}$ , where OPT denotes the optimal function value of Eq. (1). The proof is inspired by the analysis of the 2-approximation algorithm in [17], which starts from an arbitrary center, and iteratively selects the point with the maximum distance to its center as a new center, until having  $k$  centers.

**Theorem 1.** *For the  $k$ -center clustering problem in Definition 1, the expected number of iterations of the GSEMO using Eq. (5), until achieving a 2-approximation ratio, is at most  $ek^2n - ek(n-1)$ .*

*Proof.* To analyze the expected number of iterations until achieving a 2-approximation ratio, we consider

$$J_{\max} = \max\{|\mathbf{x}| \mid \mathbf{x} \in P, f_1(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0\}.$$

When  $J_{\max} = k$ , there exists one Boolean-vector solution  $\mathbf{x}$  in the population  $P$  satisfying that  $|\mathbf{x}| = k$  and

$$f_1(\mathbf{x}) = \min_{\mathbf{v}_i^*, \mathbf{v}_j^* \in X} d(\mathbf{v}_i^*, \mathbf{v}_j^*) - \max_{m \in [k]} \max_{\mathbf{v} \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_m^*) \geq 0. \quad (6)$$

As notated before,  $X = \{\mathbf{v}_1^*, \mathbf{v}_2^*, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k^*\}$  represents the  $k$  data points corresponding to those 1-bits in  $\mathbf{x}$ ; and for each  $m \in [k]$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_m^*$  serves as the center of  $S_m$ , and  $S_m = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{D} \mid \mathbf{v}_m^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u} \in X} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})\}$ . Let  $\max_{m \in [k]} \max_{\mathbf{v} \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_m^*) = h$ , and we use  $\mathbf{v}^*$  to denote the point which has the distance  $h$  to its center. As the distance function  $d$  is a metric, satisfying

the triangle inequality, we have that the distance between two points in any cluster is at most  $2h$ , implying that the objective function value, i.e.,  $\max_{m \in [k]} \max_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j)$  in Eq. (1), of the partition  $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k\}$  represented by  $\mathbf{x}$  is at most  $2h$ . That is,

$$\max_{m \in [k]} \max_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j) \leq 2h. \quad (7)$$

By Eq. (6), we have

$$\min_{\mathbf{v}_i^*, \mathbf{v}_j^* \in X} d(\mathbf{v}_i^*, \mathbf{v}_j^*) \geq \max_{m \in [k]} \max_{\mathbf{v} \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_m^*) = h.$$

Because each point is assigned to the closest center in  $X$ , we can conclude that the distance between any two points in  $X \cup \{\mathbf{v}^*\} = \{\mathbf{v}_1^*, \mathbf{v}_2^*, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k^*, \mathbf{v}^*\}$  is at least  $h$ . As  $|X \cup \{\mathbf{v}^*\}| = k + 1$ , for any partition (leading to  $k$  clusters) of  $\mathcal{D}$ , there must exist one cluster containing at least two points in  $X \cup \{\mathbf{v}^*\}$ , implying that the objective function value of the optimal partition is at least  $h$ . That is,

$$\text{OPT} \geq h. \quad (8)$$

Combining Eqs. (7) and (8) leads to

$$\max_{m \in [k]} \max_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j) \leq 2 \cdot \text{OPT},$$

that is, the desired approximation guarantee is reached. Thus, we only need to analyze the expected number of iterations until  $J_{\max} = k$ .

It can be easily observed that  $J_{\max}$  will not decrease. Let  $\mathbf{x}$  denote the solution in the population  $P$ , corresponding to  $J_{\max}$ . That is,  $f_1(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$  and  $|\mathbf{x}| = J_{\max}$ . If  $\mathbf{x}$  keeps in  $P$ ,  $J_{\max}$  obviously does not decrease. If it is deleted from  $P$  in line 6 of Algorithm 1, the newly included offspring solution  $\mathbf{x}'$  must weakly dominate  $\mathbf{x}$ , implying that  $|\mathbf{x}'| \geq |\mathbf{x}|$  and  $f_1(\mathbf{x}') \geq f_1(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ . Before analyzing the increase of  $J_{\max}$ , we first derive an upper bound on the population size  $P$ , which will be frequently used in the following analysis. According to the procedure of updating the population  $P$  in lines 5–7 of Algorithm 1, the solutions maintained in  $P$  must be incomparable. Since two solutions having the same value on one objective are comparable, the population  $P$  contains at most one solution for each value of one objective. As the Boolean-vector solutions with size larger than  $k$  are excluded,  $f_2(\mathbf{x}) = |\mathbf{x}|$  can take values  $0, 1, \dots, k$ , implying  $|P| \leq k + 1$ . To be more precise,  $|P| \leq k$ , because the all-0s vector  $\mathbf{0}$  (which has  $f_1(\mathbf{0}) = +\infty$  and  $f_2(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ ) is dominated by any solution  $\mathbf{x}$  with size 1 (which has  $f_1(\mathbf{x}) = +\infty$  and  $f_2(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ ). Next, we are to analyze the expected number of iterations required to increase  $J_{\max}$  under its different values.

Because the GSEMO starts from  $\mathbf{0}$ ,  $J_{\max} = 0$  initially. By selecting the solution  $\mathbf{0}$  in line 3 of Algorithm 1 and flipping only one 0-bit in line 4, an offspring solution  $\mathbf{x}'$  with size 1 (i.e.,  $|\mathbf{x}'| = 1$ ) will be generated. Note that  $\mathbf{x}'$  must be added into the population  $P$ , because no other solution can dominate it. As  $f_1(\mathbf{x}') = +\infty$  and  $|\mathbf{x}'| = 1$ , such a selection and mutation behavior will make  $J_{\max} = 1$ , implying that  $J_{\max}$  increases. The probability of selecting  $\mathbf{0}$  in line 3 is  $1/|P| \geq 1/k$  due to uniform selection and  $|P| \leq k$ . The probability of flipping only one 0-bit of the vector  $\mathbf{0}$  in line 4

is  $n \cdot (1/n)(1 - 1/n)^{n-1} = (1 - 1/n)^{n-1} \geq 1/e$ . Thus, when  $J_{\max} = 0$ ,  $J_{\max}$  increases in one iteration with probability at least  $1/(ek)$ , implying that the required expected number of iterations is at most  $ek$ .

When  $J_{\max} = 1$ , let  $\mathbf{x}$  denote the corresponding Boolean-vector solution in the population  $P$ , which has size 1, i.e.,  $|\mathbf{x}| = 1$ . We use  $\mathbf{v}_1^* \in \mathcal{D}$  to denote the data point corresponding to the only 1-bit of  $\mathbf{x}$ , and use  $\mathbf{v}_2^* \in \mathcal{D}$  to denote the point having the maximum distance (denoted as  $h$ ) with  $\mathbf{v}_1^*$ . By selecting the solution  $\mathbf{x}$  in line 3 of Algorithm 1 and flipping only the 0-bit corresponding to  $\mathbf{v}_2^*$  in line 4, an offspring solution  $\mathbf{x}'$  with size 2 (i.e.,  $|\mathbf{x}'| = 2$ ) will be generated, which contains two points, i.e.,  $\mathbf{v}_1^*$  and  $\mathbf{v}_2^*$ , serving as two centers and leading to two clusters  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ . To examine whether  $f_1(\mathbf{x}') \geq 0$ , we first have

$$d(\mathbf{v}_1^*, \mathbf{v}_2^*) = h. \quad (9)$$

As each point is assigned to the closest center, we have for any  $\mathbf{v} \in S_2$ ,  $d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_2^*) \leq d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_1^*)$ . Thus,

$$\max_{m \in [2]} \max_{\mathbf{v} \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_m^*) \leq \max_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_1^*) = h. \quad (10)$$

Combining Eqs. (9) and (10) leads to

$$f_1(\mathbf{x}') = d(\mathbf{v}_1^*, \mathbf{v}_2^*) - \max_{m \in [2]} \max_{\mathbf{v} \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_m^*) \geq 0.$$

Once  $\mathbf{x}'$  is generated, it will be added into the population  $P$ ; otherwise,  $\mathbf{x}'$  must be dominated by one solution in  $P$  (line 5 of Algorithm 1), and this implies that  $J_{\max}$  has already been larger than 1, contradicting  $J_{\max} = 1$ . After including  $\mathbf{x}'$  into  $P$ ,  $J_{\max} = 2$ , implying that  $J_{\max}$  increases. The probability of selecting  $\mathbf{x}$  in line 3 is  $1/|P| \geq 1/k$ , and the probability of flipping only a specific 0-bit of  $\mathbf{x}$  in line 4 is  $(1/n)(1 - 1/n)^{n-1} \geq 1/(en)$ . Thus, when  $J_{\max} = 1$ ,  $J_{\max}$  increases in one iteration with probability at least  $1/(ekn)$ , implying that the required expected number of iterations is at most  $ekn$ .

When  $J_{\max} = i \geq 2$ , we also use  $\mathbf{x}$  to denote the corresponding Boolean-vector solution in the population  $P$ , satisfying that  $f_1(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$  and  $|\mathbf{x}| = i$ . Let  $X = \{\mathbf{v}_1^*, \mathbf{v}_2^*, \dots, \mathbf{v}_i^*\}$  represent the  $i$  data points corresponding to those 1-bits in  $\mathbf{x}$ , and the corresponding partition of  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_i\}$ , where  $\forall m \in [i]$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_m^*$  serves as the center of  $S_m$ . Let  $\mathbf{v}_{i+1}^* \in \mathcal{D}$  denote the point having the maximum distance (denoted as  $h$ ) to its center, denoted as  $\mathbf{v}_j^*$ . That is,

$$d(\mathbf{v}_{i+1}^*, \mathbf{v}_j^*) = \max_{m \in [i]} \max_{\mathbf{v} \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_m^*) = h. \quad (11)$$

Similar to the analysis of  $J_{\max} = 1$ , by selecting the solution  $\mathbf{x}$  in line 3 of Algorithm 1 and flipping only the 0-bit corresponding to  $\mathbf{v}_{i+1}^*$  in line 4, an offspring solution  $\mathbf{x}'$  with size  $i+1$  (i.e.,  $|\mathbf{x}'| = i+1$ ) will be generated, which contains  $i+1$  points, i.e.,  $X' = \{\mathbf{v}_1^*, \mathbf{v}_2^*, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}^*\}$ , serving as  $i+1$  centers and leading to  $i+1$  clusters  $S'_1, S'_2, \dots, S'_{i+1}$ . Next we will show  $f_1(\mathbf{x}') \geq 0$ . By using Eq. (11) and

$$f_1(\mathbf{x}) = \min_{\mathbf{v}_p^*, \mathbf{v}_q^* \in X} d(\mathbf{v}_p^*, \mathbf{v}_q^*) - \max_{m \in [i]} \max_{\mathbf{v} \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_m^*) \geq 0,$$

we have

$$\min_{\mathbf{v}_p^*, \mathbf{v}_q^* \in X} d(\mathbf{v}_p^*, \mathbf{v}_q^*) \geq h. \quad (12)$$

As each point is assigned to the closest center, and the center of  $\mathbf{v}_{i+1}^*$  is  $\mathbf{v}_j^*$  under the partition  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_i$ , we have

$$\forall m \in [i] : d(\mathbf{v}_{i+1}^*, \mathbf{v}_m^*) \geq d(\mathbf{v}_{i+1}^*, \mathbf{v}_j^*) = h. \quad (13)$$

Combining Eqs. (12) and (13) leads to

$$\min_{\mathbf{v}_p^*, \mathbf{v}_q^* \in X'} d(\mathbf{v}_p^*, \mathbf{v}_q^*) \geq h, \quad (14)$$

where  $X' = \{\mathbf{v}_1^*, \mathbf{v}_2^*, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}^*\} = X \cup \{\mathbf{v}_{i+1}^*\}$ . Again using the fact that each data point is assigned to the closet center, we know that  $\forall m \in [i]$ ,  $S'_m \subseteq S_m$ , and each point in  $S_m \setminus S'_m$  is moved to  $S'_{m+1}$  because it is now closer to the new center  $\mathbf{v}_{i+1}^*$  than  $\mathbf{v}_m^*$ . Thus, we have

$$\max_{m \in [i+1]} \max_{\mathbf{v} \in S'_m} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_m^*) \leq \max_{m \in [i]} \max_{\mathbf{v} \in S_m} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_m^*) = h. \quad (15)$$

Combining Eqs. (14) and (15) leads to

$$f_1(\mathbf{x}') = \min_{\mathbf{v}_p^*, \mathbf{v}_q^* \in X'} d(\mathbf{v}_p^*, \mathbf{v}_q^*) - \max_{m \in [i+1]} \max_{\mathbf{v} \in S'_m} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_m^*) \geq 0.$$

After generating  $\mathbf{x}'$ , which satisfies that  $f_1(\mathbf{x}') \geq 0$  and  $|\mathbf{x}'| = i+1$ , and must be added into the population  $P$ , we have  $J_{\max} = i+1$ , implying that  $J_{\max}$  increases. As analyzed for the case of  $J_{\max} = 1$ , the probability of selecting  $\mathbf{x}$  in line 3 and flipping only a specific 0-bit of  $\mathbf{x}$  in line 4 is at least  $(1/k) \cdot (1/(en))$ . Thus, when  $J_{\max} = i$ ,  $J_{\max}$  increases in one iteration with probability at least  $1/(ekn)$ , implying that the required expected number of iterations is at most  $ekn$ .

Combining the above analyses for  $J_{\max} = 0$ ,  $J_{\max} = 1$  and  $J_{\max} = i \geq 2$ , we can conclude that the expected number of iterations until  $J_{\max} = k$  (i.e., achieving a 2-approximation ratio) is at most  $ek + ekn + ekn(k-2) = ek^2n - ek(n-1)$ .  $\square$

From the above proof, we can find that why the GSEMO is modified to start from the all-0s vector solution  $\mathbf{0}$ , which makes the initial value of  $J_{\max}$  be 0. If starting from a Boolean vector randomly selected from  $\{0, 1\}^n$ ,  $J_{\max}$  may be not well defined, and it may require a lot of time to find a Boolean-vector solution  $\mathbf{x}$  with  $f_1(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ .

#### IV. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF THE GSEMO FOR $k$ -MEDIAN CLUSTERING

The  $k$ -median clustering problem in Definition 2 is to select  $k$  data points (facilities) from  $F$  to open, such that the total service cost, measured by the sum of the distance of each data point (client) in  $\mathcal{D}$  to the nearest open facility, is minimized. To apply the GSEMO to solve  $k$ -median clustering, we use a Boolean vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{|F|}$  to represent a subset  $X$  of  $F$ , where the  $i$ -th bit  $x_i = 1$  iff the  $i$ -th facility in  $F$  belongs to  $X$ . In the following analysis, we will not distinguish  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{|F|}$  and its corresponding subset  $X \subseteq F$  for notational convenience. Then, the original problem Eq. (2) is reformulated as a bi-objective maximization problem

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{|F|}} (f_1(\mathbf{x}), f_2(\mathbf{x})), \quad (16)$$

$$\text{where } \begin{cases} f_1(\mathbf{x}) = -\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}), \\ f_2(\mathbf{x}) = |\mathbf{x}|. \end{cases}$$

Note that  $d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) = \min\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{x}\}$  is the distance between the client  $\mathbf{v}_i$  and its closest facility in  $\mathbf{x}$ . That is,

the GSEMO is to minimize the original objective function  $\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x})$  and maximize the subset size  $|\mathbf{x}|$  simultaneously. To be well defined, we set the  $f_1$  value to  $-\infty$  for the all-0s vector  $\mathbf{0}$ . The Boolean-vector solutions with size larger than  $k$  are excluded during the running of the GSEMO. When the GSEMO terminates, the Boolean-vector solution with size  $k$  in the population will be output as the final solution.

For each client  $\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}$ , let  $d_i^{\max}$  and  $d_i^{\min}$  denote the distance between  $\mathbf{v}_i$  and its farthest and closest facility, respectively. That is,  $d_i^{\max} = \max\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in F\}$  and  $d_i^{\min} = \min\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in F\}$ . Theorem 2 shows that the GSEMO can achieve a  $\frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right)$ -approximation ratio after running at most  $O\left(\frac{k^2|F|}{|F|-k+1} + \frac{k^2|F|^{2p}}{\epsilon} \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\min}}\right)$  expected number of iterations. This approximation ratio implies that the Boolean-vector solution  $\mathbf{x}$  output by the GSEMO satisfies  $\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right) \cdot \text{OPT}$ , where OPT denotes the optimal function value of Eq. (2).

The proof of Theorem 2 relies on Lemma 1, which shows that it is always possible to improve a subset  $X$  of  $F$  with size  $k$  by swapping at most  $p$  facilities (i.e., deleting at most  $p$  facilities from  $X$  and inserting the same number of new facilities into  $X$ ), until a good approximation has been achieved. This lemma is inspired from the analysis of local search in [2], which tries to repeatedly improve a subset of  $k$  facilities by dropping at most  $p$  facilities and opening the same number of new facilities.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $X$  be a subset of  $F$  with size  $k$ . If no subset  $X'$  of  $F$  with the objective value*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X') \leq \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{k}\right) \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \quad (17)$$

*can be achieved by deleting at most  $p$  points inside  $X$  and inserting the same number of points outside into  $X$ , then it holds*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \leq \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right) \cdot \text{OPT}. \quad (18)$$

where  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $p \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* In Section 3 of [2], the special case with  $\epsilon = 0$  has been proved. Their proof uses a series of multiswaps of  $X$ , where a multiswap of  $X$  deletes at most  $p$  points inside  $X$  and inserts the same number of points outside into  $X$ . Let  $Q$  denote the collection of all the sets generated by these multiswaps of  $X$ . Considering the condition of this lemma with  $\epsilon = 0$ , it holds that for each  $X' \in Q$ ,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X') - \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) > 0. \quad (19)$$

By assigning a positive real weight  $w(X')$  with each  $X' \in Q$ , the proof in [2] derives

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{X' \in Q} w(X') \cdot \left( \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X') - \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \right) \quad (20) \\ & \leq \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right) \cdot \text{OPT} - \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sum_{X' \in Q} w(X') \leq k$ . Combining Eqs. (19) and (20) leads to

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \leq \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right) \cdot \text{OPT},$$

i.e., Eq. (18) with  $\epsilon = 0$ .

We adapt their proof to the case of  $\epsilon > 0$ . According to the condition of this lemma, we now have, for each  $X' \in Q$ ,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X') - \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) > -\frac{\epsilon}{k} \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X). \quad (21)$$

Combining Eqs. (20) and (21) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right) \cdot \text{OPT} - \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \\ & \geq \sum_{X' \in Q} w(X') \cdot \left(-\frac{\epsilon}{k} \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X)\right) \\ & \geq -\epsilon \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by  $\sum_{X' \in Q} w(X') \leq k$ . Thus, Eq. (18) holds.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** *For the  $k$ -median clustering problem in Definition 2, the expected number of iterations of the GSEMO using Eq. (16), until achieving a  $\frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right)$ -approximation ratio, is at most  $O\left(\frac{k^2|F|}{|F|-k+1} + \frac{k^2|F|^{2p}}{\epsilon} \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\min}}\right)$ , where  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $p \geq 1$ ,  $d_i^{\max} = \max\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in F\}$ , and  $d_i^{\min} = \min\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in F\}$ .*

*Proof.* The optimization process is divided into two phases: (1) starts from the initial solution  $\mathbf{0}$  and finishes after finding a solution with size  $k$ ; (2) starts after phase (1) and finishes after achieving the desired approximation ratio  $\frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right)$ . We analyze the upper bound on the expected number of iterations required by each phase, respectively, and then sum them up to get an upper bound on the total expected number of iterations of the GSEMO.

For phase (1), we consider the maximum number of 1-bits of the solutions in the population  $P$ , denoted by  $J_{\max}$ . That is,  $J_{\max} = \max\{|\mathbf{x}| \mid \mathbf{x} \in P\}$ . Obviously,  $J_{\max} = k$  implies that a solution with size  $k$  has been found, i.e., the goal of phase (1) has been reached. As the GSEMO starts from the all-0s vector  $\mathbf{0}$ ,  $J_{\max}$  is initially 0. Assume that currently  $J_{\max} = i < k$ , and let  $\mathbf{x}$  be the corresponding solution, i.e.,  $|\mathbf{x}| = i$ .  $J_{\max}$  will not decrease because  $\mathbf{x}$  cannot be weakly dominated by a solution with less 1-bits. By selecting  $\mathbf{x}$  in line 3 of Algorithm 1 and flipping only one 0-bit of  $\mathbf{x}$  (i.e., adding a new facility into  $\mathbf{x}$ ) in line 4, which occur with probability  $(1/|P|) \cdot (|F| - i) \cdot (1/|F|)(1 - 1/|F|)^{|F|-1} \geq (|F| - i)/(e|P||F|)$ , a new solution  $\mathbf{x}'$  with  $|\mathbf{x}'| = i + 1$  can be generated in one iteration of the GSEMO. As analyzed in the proof of Theorem 1, the population size  $|P|$  is at most  $k + 1$ , because the second objective  $f_2$  can only take values  $0, 1, \dots, k$ , and the solutions in  $P$  are incomparable. Note that the solutions with size larger than  $k$  are excluded during the running of the GSEMO. In fact,  $|P| \leq k$ , because the all-0s solution (having

$f_1(\mathbf{0}) = -\infty$  and  $f_2(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ ) is dominated by any other solution, and will not exist in  $P$  once a solution with size larger than 0 has been generated. Thus, the probability of generating a new solution  $\mathbf{x}'$  with  $|\mathbf{x}'| = i + 1$  in one iteration is at least  $(|F| - i)/(ek|F|)$ . Because the newly generated solution  $\mathbf{x}'$  now has the largest number of 1-bits and no solution in  $P$  can dominate it, it will be included into  $P$ , making  $J_{\max} = i + 1$ . This implies that the probability of increasing  $J_{\max}$  in one iteration of the GSEMO is at least  $(|F| - i)/(ek|F|)$ . We then get that the expected number of iterations of phase (1) (i.e., to make  $J_{\max}$  reach  $k$ ) is at most

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{ek|F|}{|F| - i} \leq \frac{ek^2|F|}{|F| - k + 1}. \quad (22)$$

Note that the population  $P$  will always contain a solution with size  $k$  once generated, since it has the largest  $f_2$  value  $k$  and can be weakly dominated by only other solutions with size  $k$ .

Next, we consider phase (2). We call a solution  $\mathbf{x}$  with size  $k$  a  $(1 - \alpha)$ -approximate local optimum if

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}') > (1 - \alpha) \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x})$$

for any  $\mathbf{x}'$  with  $|\mathbf{x}'| = k$  and  $|\mathbf{x}' \setminus \mathbf{x}| \leq p$ , where  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . By Lemma 1, we know that a  $(1 - \epsilon/k)$ -approximate local optimum  $\mathbf{x}$  satisfies

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right) \cdot \text{OPT},$$

achieving the desired approximation ratio. For phase (2), we thus only need to analyze the expected number of iterations until generating a  $(1 - \epsilon/k)$ -approximate local optimum. Let  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  denote the solution with size  $k$  in the population  $P$ . We consider the  $-f_1$  value of  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ , where  $f_1 = -\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$  as in Eq. (16). It is obvious that  $-f_1(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$  will not increase, because  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  can be dominated by only other solutions with size  $k$  and larger  $f_1$  values. As long as  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  is not a  $(1 - \epsilon/k)$ -approximate local optimum, we know that a new solution  $\mathbf{x}'$  with

$$\begin{aligned} -f_1(\mathbf{x}') &= \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}') \leq \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{k}\right) \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{k}\right) \cdot (-f_1(\hat{\mathbf{x}})) \end{aligned}$$

can be generated through selecting  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  in line 3 of Algorithm 1 and flipping at most  $p$  specific 1-bits and the same number of 0-bits (i.e., deleting at most  $p$  facilities inside  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  and inserting the same number of new facilities into  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ ) in line 4, the probability of which is at least  $(1/|P|) \cdot (1/|F|^{2p})(1 - 1/|F|)^{|F|-2p} \geq 1/(ek|F|^{2p})$ , where the inequality holds by  $|P| \leq k$  and  $p \geq 1$ . Since  $|\mathbf{x}'| = k$  and  $f_1(\mathbf{x}') \geq (1 - \epsilon/k) \cdot f_1(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) > f_1(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ , no solution in  $P$  can dominate  $\mathbf{x}'$ , and it will be included into  $P$ , and replace  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ . That is,  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  now becomes  $\mathbf{x}'$ . Thus,  $-f_1(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$  can decrease by at least a factor of  $1/(1 - \epsilon/k)$  with probability at least  $1/(ek|F|^{2p})$  in each iteration. Such a decrease on  $-f_1(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$  is called a successful step. Thus, a successful step needs at most  $ek|F|^{2p}$  expected number of iterations. As  $d_i^{\max} = \max\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in F\}$  and

$d_i^{\min} = \min\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in F\}$ , we have, for any solution  $\mathbf{x}$  with size  $k$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\min} \leq -f_1(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max}, \quad (23)$$

where the inequalities hold by  $d_i^{\min} \leq d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) = \min\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{x}\} \leq d_i^{\max}$  due to  $\mathbf{x} \subseteq F$ . It can be known from Eq. (23) that until generating a  $(1 - \epsilon/k)$ -approximate local optimum, the number of successful steps is at most

$$\log_{\frac{1}{1-\epsilon/k}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\min}} = O\left(\frac{k}{\epsilon} \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\min}}\right).$$

Thus, the expected number of iterations of phase (2) is at most

$$ek|F|^{2p} \cdot O\left(\frac{k}{\epsilon} \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\min}}\right). \quad (24)$$

By combining the expected number of iterations (i.e., Eqs. (22) and (24)) in the above two phases, we can conclude that the GSEMO requires at most

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{ek^2|F|}{|F| - k + 1} + ek|F|^{2p} \cdot O\left(\frac{k}{\epsilon} \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\min}}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{k^2|F|}{|F| - k + 1} + \frac{k^2|F|^{2p}}{\epsilon} \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\min}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

iterations in expectation to achieve an approximation ratio of  $\frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right)$ . Thus, the theorem holds.  $\square$

## V. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF THE GSEMO FOR $k$ -MEANS CLUSTERING

The  $k$ -means clustering problem in Definition 3 is to determine a set  $X$  of  $k$  points (also called centers) in  $\mathbb{R}^l$ , to minimize the sum of the squared Euclidean distance from each point in  $\mathcal{D}$  to its closest center in  $X$ , i.e.,  $\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X)$ , where  $d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) = \min\{(\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in X\}$ . Though the centers can be placed anywhere, it has been proved in [35] that there is a set  $C$  of  $O(n\epsilon_1^{-l} \log(1/\epsilon_1))$  candidate centers, which contains an approximately optimal solution, as shown in Lemma 2. Note that in this section, we always use  $d(\mathbf{v}_i, X)$  to denote the squared Euclidean distance from  $\mathbf{v}_i$  to its closest center in  $X$ , i.e.,  $\min\{(\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in X\}$ ; this is different from  $d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) = \min\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in X\}$  in the last section, which considers any metric distance.

**Lemma 2** (Theorem 4.4 in [35]). *Given a set of  $n$  data points  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^l$ , a set  $C$  of size  $O(n\epsilon_1^{-l} \log(1/\epsilon_1))$  can be constructed in time  $O(n \log n + n\epsilon_1^{-l} \log(1/\epsilon_1))$ , satisfying that there is a subset  $X$  of  $C$  with size  $k$  such that*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \leq (1 + \epsilon_1) \cdot \text{OPT},$$

where  $\epsilon_1 > 0$ , and OPT denotes the optimal function value of Eq. (3).

To apply the GSEMO to solve  $k$ -means clustering, we select  $k$  centers directly from the candidate set  $C$  of size  $O(n\epsilon_1^{-l} \log(1/\epsilon_1))$ , as Lemma 2 has shown that  $C$  contains an approximately optimal solution. A subset  $X$  of  $C$  is

represented by a Boolean vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{|C|}$ , where the  $i$ -th bit  $x_i = 1$  iff the  $i$ -th center in  $C$  belongs to  $X$ . Similar to the bi-objective reformulation Eq. (16) for  $k$ -median clustering, the original  $k$ -means problem Eq. (3) is reformulated as a bi-objective maximization problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{|C|}} (f_1(\mathbf{x}), f_2(\mathbf{x})), \\ \text{where } & \begin{cases} f_1(\mathbf{x}) = -\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}), \\ f_2(\mathbf{x}) = |\mathbf{x}|. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

We also set  $f_1(\mathbf{0})$  to  $-\infty$ , and exclude the Boolean-vector solutions with size larger than  $k$  during optimization. When terminated, the GSEMO outputs the Boolean-vector solution with size  $k$  from the population.

Inspired from the analysis of local search in [25], we derive Lemma 3 which shows that it is always possible to improve a subset  $X$  of  $C$  with size  $k$  by swapping at most  $p$  centers in and out, until an approximation ratio of  $\frac{1}{(1-\epsilon_2)^2} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right)^2$  has been achieved. Note that this approximation is with respect to the objective function value (denoted as  $\text{OPT}_C$ ) of the best subset of  $C$  with size  $k$ . According to Lemma 2, we have

$$\text{OPT}_C \leq (1 + \epsilon_1) \cdot \text{OPT}, \quad (26)$$

where  $\text{OPT}$  is the optimal function value of the original problem Eq. (3).

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $X$  be a subset of  $C$  with size  $k$ . If no subset  $X'$  of  $C$  with the objective value*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X') \leq \left(1 - \left(1 + \frac{1 - \epsilon_2}{3 + 2/p}\right) \frac{\epsilon_2}{k}\right) \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X)$$

*can be achieved by deleting at most  $p$  points inside  $X$  and inserting the same number of points outside into  $X$ , then it holds*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \leq \frac{1}{(1 - \epsilon_2)^2} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right)^2 \cdot \text{OPT}_C. \quad (27)$$

where  $\epsilon_2 > 0$ ,  $p \geq 1$ , and  $\text{OPT}_C$  denotes the objective function value of the best subset of  $C$  with size  $k$ .

*Proof.* Theorem 2.2 of [25] shows the special case with  $\epsilon_2 = 0$ . Similar to the analysis for  $k$ -median clustering in [2] (which we have shown in the proof of Lemma 1), their proof also relies on a collection  $Q$  of the sets generated by performing different multiswaps of  $X$ , where each multiswap of  $X$  swaps at most  $p$  points in and out. By assigning a positive real weight  $w(X')$  with each  $X' \in Q$ , satisfying  $\sum_{X' \in Q} w(X') \leq k$ , their proof derives

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{X' \in Q} w(X') \cdot \left( \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X') - \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \right) \\ & \leq \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right) \cdot \text{OPT}_C - \left(1 - \frac{2}{\alpha} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right)\right) \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X), \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where

$$\alpha^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) / \text{OPT}_C \quad (29)$$

just denotes the approximation ratio of the subset  $X$  to  $\text{OPT}_C$ . When  $\epsilon_2 = 0$ , the condition of this lemma implies that

$$\forall X' \in Q, \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X') - \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) > 0. \quad (30)$$

Combining Eqs. (28) and (30) leads to

$$\left(1 - \frac{2}{\alpha} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right)\right) \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \leq \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right) \cdot \text{OPT}_C,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\alpha^2 - 2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) \alpha - \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right) \leq 0.$$

Thus,  $\alpha \leq 3 + 2/p$ , implying Eq. (27) with  $\epsilon_2 = 0$ .

We adapt their proof to the case of  $\epsilon_2 > 0$ . According to the condition of this lemma, Eq. (30) now changes to

$$\begin{aligned} \forall X' \in Q, \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X') - \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \\ > - \left(1 + \frac{1 - \epsilon_2}{3 + 2/p}\right) \frac{\epsilon_2}{k} \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Combining Eqs. (28) and (31) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right) \cdot \text{OPT}_C - \left(1 - \frac{2}{\alpha} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right)\right) \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \\ & \geq \sum_{X' \in Q} w(X') \cdot \left( - \left(1 + \frac{1 - \epsilon_2}{3 + 2/p}\right) \frac{\epsilon_2}{k} \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \right) \\ & \geq -\epsilon_2 \left(1 + \frac{1 - \epsilon_2}{3 + 2/p}\right) \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where the last inequality holds by  $\sum_{X' \in Q} w(X') \leq k$ . According to Eq. (29), we substitute  $\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X)$  with  $\alpha^2 \cdot \text{OPT}_C$  in Eq. (32), leading to

$$\left(1 - \frac{2}{\alpha} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) - \epsilon_2 \left(1 + \frac{1 - \epsilon_2}{3 + 2/p}\right)\right) \alpha^2 \leq \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right),$$

which is equivalent to

$$(1 - \epsilon_2) \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_2}{3 + 2/p}\right) \alpha^2 - 2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) \alpha - \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right) \leq 0.$$

Thus, we have

$$\left( (1 - \epsilon_2) \alpha - \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right) \right) \left( \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_2}{3 + 2/p}\right) \alpha + 1 \right) \leq 0,$$

implying that

$$\alpha \leq \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon_2} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right).$$

Thus, Eq. (27) holds.  $\square$

By following the proof procedure of Theorem 2, and using Lemma 3 and Eq. (26), we can prove Theorem 3, showing a  $\frac{1+\epsilon_1}{(1-\epsilon_2)^2} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right)^2$ -approximation ratio of the GSEMO for  $k$ -means clustering, i.e., the solution  $\mathbf{x}$  output by the GSEMO satisfies  $\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{1+\epsilon_1}{(1-\epsilon_2)^2} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right)^2 \cdot \text{OPT}$ .



**Theorem 3.** For the  $k$ -means clustering problem in Definition 3, the expected number of iterations of the GSEMO using Eq. (25), until achieving a  $\frac{1+\epsilon_1}{(1-\epsilon_2)^2} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right)^2$ -approximation ratio, is at most  $O\left(\frac{k^2|C|}{|C|-k+1} + \frac{k^2|C|^{2p}}{\epsilon_2} \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\min}}\right)$ , where  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0, p \geq 1$ , the set  $C$  is constructed as in Lemma 2 with  $|C| = O(n\epsilon_1^{-l} \log(1/\epsilon_1))$ ,  $d_i^{\max} = \max\{(\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in C\}$ , and  $d_i^{\min} = \min\{(\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in C\}$ .

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Theorem 2. In phase (1), the GSEMO requires at most  $\frac{ek^2|C|}{|C|-k+1}$  expected number of iterations to find a solution with size  $k$ . Note that we have replaced the notation  $F$  in the proof of Theorem 2 with  $C$  accordingly. In phase (2), to find a  $\left(1 - \left(1 + \frac{1-\epsilon_2}{3+2/p}\right) \frac{\epsilon_2}{k}\right)$ -approximate local optimum  $\mathbf{x}$ , it requires at most

$$\log \frac{1}{1 - \left(1 + \frac{1-\epsilon_2}{3+2/p}\right) \frac{\epsilon_2}{k}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\min}} = O\left(\frac{k}{\epsilon_2} \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\min}}\right)$$

successful steps, and each successful step needs at most  $ek|C|^{2p}$  expected number of iterations. According to Lemma 3 and Eq. (26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) &\leq \frac{1}{(1-\epsilon_2)^2} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right)^2 \cdot \text{OPT}_C \\ &\leq \frac{1+\epsilon_1}{(1-\epsilon_2)^2} \left(3 + \frac{2}{p}\right)^2 \cdot \text{OPT} \end{aligned}$$

i.e., the desired approximation ratio is reached. Thus, the total expected number of iterations of the GSEMO is at most

$$\frac{ek^2|C|}{|C|-k+1} + ek|C|^{2p} \cdot O\left(\frac{k}{\epsilon_2} \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\min}}\right),$$

implying that the theorem holds.  $\square$

## VI. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF THE GSEMO FOR $k$ -MEDIAN CLUSTERING UNDER FAIRNESS

As machine learning has been used increasingly in decision making tasks, the fairness of learning algorithms has become an important research topic. Due to the wide applications, clustering has also been studied from the perspective of fairness, e.g., group fairness [7] which requires all clusters to be balanced w.r.t. some protected attributes such as gender or race, and individual fairness [24] which requires all points to be treated equally, i.e., each point in  $\mathcal{D}$  has a center among its  $(|\mathcal{D}|/k)$ -closest neighbors.

To examine whether EAs can achieve theoretical guarantees for clustering under fairness, we consider  $k$ -median clustering under individual fairness [34], as presented in Definition 5. The  $k$ -median clustering problem in Definition 2 is to select a set  $X$  of  $k$  centers from  $F$ , to minimize the sum of the distance of each data point in  $\mathcal{D}$  to the nearest center in  $X$ . When considering individual fairness, the centers are selected from  $\mathcal{D}$  (i.e.,  $F = \mathcal{D}$ ), and the selected set  $X$  of  $k$  centers is required to be  $\alpha$ -fair, where  $\alpha \geq 1$ . For any  $\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}$ , let

$$B(\mathbf{v}_i, r) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D} \mid d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \leq r\}$$

denote the set of points contained by the ball of radius  $r$  centered at  $\mathbf{v}_i$ , and we use

$$r(\mathbf{v}_i) = \min\{r \mid |B(\mathbf{v}_i, r)| \geq n/k\} \quad (33)$$

to denote the minimum radius such that the ball centered at  $\mathbf{v}_i$  contains at least  $n/k$  points from  $\mathcal{D}$ . Intuitively,  $r(\mathbf{v}_i)$  is the radius which  $\mathbf{v}_i$  expects to have a center within, if the  $k$  centers are selected uniformly at random from  $\mathcal{D}$ . A set  $X$  of  $k$  centers is said to be  $\alpha$ -fair if

$$\forall \mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D} : d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \leq \alpha \cdot r(\mathbf{v}_i).$$

**Definition 5** ( $\alpha$ -Fair  $k$ -Median Clustering [34]). Given a set of  $n$  data points  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^l$ , a metric distance function  $d : \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ , an integer  $k$ , and a fairness parameter  $\alpha \geq 1$ , to find a subset  $X \subseteq \mathcal{D}$  of size  $k$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \min_{X \subseteq \mathcal{D}, |X|=k} \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \\ \text{s.t. } \forall \mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D} : d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \leq \alpha \cdot r(\mathbf{v}_i), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where  $d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) = \min\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in X\}$  is the distance between  $\mathbf{v}_i$  and its closest point in  $X$ , and  $r(\mathbf{v}_i)$  as in Eq. (33) is the minimum radius such that the ball centered at  $\mathbf{v}_i$  contains at least  $n/k$  points from  $\mathcal{D}$ .

To apply the GSEMO to solve  $\alpha$ -fair  $k$ -median clustering, a subset  $X$  of  $\mathcal{D}$  is represented by a Boolean vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , where the  $i$ -th bit  $x_i = 1$  iff the  $i$ -th point in  $\mathcal{D}$  is selected as a center, i.e.,  $\mathbf{v}_i \in X$ . In [34], it has been proved that if a set  $X$  of  $k$  centers is feasible with respect to a set  $\mathcal{B}$  of critical balls in Definition 6 (which can be computed in time  $O(n^2)$  [34]), i.e.,  $X$  has common points with each critical ball in  $\mathcal{B}$ , the fairness of  $X$  can be guaranteed, which is  $7\alpha$  as shown in Lemma 4.

**Definition 6** (critical balls, Definition 2.4 in [34]). A set  $\mathcal{B}$  of balls  $B(\mathbf{c}_1^*, \alpha r(\mathbf{c}_1^*)), B(\mathbf{c}_2^*, \alpha r(\mathbf{c}_2^*)), \dots, B(\mathbf{c}_q^*, \alpha r(\mathbf{c}_q^*))$  (where  $q \leq k$ ) are called critical if they satisfy

- 1)  $\forall \mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D} : d(\mathbf{v}_i, \{\mathbf{c}_1^*, \mathbf{c}_2^*, \dots, \mathbf{c}_q^*\}) \leq 6\alpha r(\mathbf{v}_i)$ ;
- 2)  $\forall i, j \in [q] : d(\mathbf{c}_i^*, \mathbf{c}_j^*) > 6\alpha \max\{r(\mathbf{c}_i^*), r(\mathbf{c}_j^*)\}$ .

**Lemma 4** (Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 in [34]). A set  $\mathcal{B}$  of critical balls can be computed in time  $O(n^2)$ , and if a set  $X$  of  $k$  centers is feasible with respect to  $\mathcal{B}$ , i.e., satisfies

$$\forall B \in \mathcal{B} : |B \cap X| \geq 1, \quad (35)$$

then  $X$  is  $(7\alpha)$ -fair, i.e.,

$$\forall \mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D} : d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \leq 7\alpha \cdot r(\mathbf{v}_i).$$

Inspired by this property, we reformulate the original problem Eq. (34) as a bi-objective maximization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n} (f_1(\mathbf{x}), f_2(\mathbf{x})), \text{ where} \\ \begin{cases} f_1(\mathbf{x}) = - \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max} \cdot \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{I}(B \cap \mathbf{x} = \emptyset), \\ f_2(\mathbf{x}) = |\mathbf{x}|, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where  $d_i^{\max} = \max\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D}\}$ , and  $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$  denotes the indicator function which takes 1 if  $\cdot$  is true, and 0 otherwise. That is, the GSEMO is to minimize

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max} \cdot \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{I}(B \cap \mathbf{x} = \emptyset) \quad (37)$$

and maximize the subset size  $|\mathbf{x}|$  simultaneously. Note that in Eq. (37), the second term  $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{\max} \cdot \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{I}(B \cap \mathbf{x} = \emptyset)$  enforces a solution with less violation degree w.r.t. Eq. (35) (measured by  $\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{I}(B \cap \mathbf{x} = \emptyset)$ ) to be better; the first term  $\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x})$  enforces a feasible solution w.r.t. the set  $\mathcal{B}$  of critical balls, which has a smaller value of the original objective function, to be better. We set  $f_1(\mathbf{0})$  to  $-\infty$ . As in the previous three sections, when the GSEMO is applied to solve the reformulated bi-objective problem Eq. (36), the Boolean-vector solutions with size larger than  $k$  are excluded; when the GSEMO is terminated, the Boolean-vector solution with size  $k$  in the final population will be output.

Lemma 5 shows that for a feasible set  $X$  of  $k$  centers with respect to the set  $\mathcal{B}$  of critical balls, if there are no feasible swaps of size at most 4 that decrease the objective function value by at least a factor of  $1/(1-1/(8k))$ , this set  $X$  achieves a 84-approximation ratio. That is, it is always possible to improve a feasible set of  $k$  centers by swapping at most 4 centers, until achieving a good approximation.

**Lemma 5** (Lemmas 5.3, 5.10 and 5.13 in [34]). *Let  $X$  be a subset of  $\mathcal{D}$  with size  $k$  (i.e., a set of  $k$  centers), which is feasible with respect to the set  $\mathcal{B}$  of critical balls. If no feasible subset  $X'$  of  $G$  with respect to  $\mathcal{B}$ , having the objective value*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X') \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{8k}\right) \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X), \quad (38)$$

*can be achieved by deleting at most 4 points inside  $X$  and inserting the same number of points outside into  $X$ , then it holds*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \leq 84 \cdot \text{OPT},$$

where  $\text{OPT}$  denotes the optimal function value of Eq. (34), i.e., the objective function value of an optimal  $\alpha$ -fair set of  $k$  centers.

Theorem 4 shows that the GSEMO can achieve a  $(84, 7)$ -bicriteria approximation ratio, implying that the output Boolean-vector solution  $\mathbf{x}$  satisfies that  $\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) \leq 84 \cdot \text{OPT}$ , and  $\forall \mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D} : d(\mathbf{v}_i, X) \leq 7\alpha \cdot r(\mathbf{v}_i)$ . The proof is similar to that of Theorem 2, except that after finding a solution with size  $k$  and before achieving the desired approximation ratio, it needs another phase to make the solution feasible with respect to the set  $\mathcal{B}$  of critical balls.

**Theorem 4.** *For the  $\alpha$ -fair  $k$ -median clustering problem in Definition 5, the expected number of iterations of the GSEMO using Eq. (36), until achieving a  $(84, 7)$ -bicriteria approximation ratio, is at most  $O\left(k^2 n + k^2 n^8 \log \frac{\sum_{i=k+1}^n d_{(i)}^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} d_{(i)}^{\min}}\right)$ , where  $d_{(1)}^{\max}, \dots, d_{(n)}^{\max}$  and  $d_{(1)}^{\min}, \dots, d_{(n)}^{\min}$  are permutations*

*of  $d_1^{\max}, \dots, d_n^{\max}$  and  $d_1^{\min}, \dots, d_n^{\min}$  in ascending order, respectively,  $d_i^{\max} = \max\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D}\}$ , and  $d_i^{\min} = \min\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{\mathbf{v}_i\}\}$ .*

*Proof.* We divide the optimization process into three phases: (1) starts from the initial solution  $\mathbf{0}$  and finishes after finding a solution with size  $k$ ; (2) starts after phase (1) and finishes after finding a solution with size  $k$  which is feasible with respect to the set  $\mathcal{B}$  of critical balls; (3) starts after phase (2) and finishes after achieving the desired  $(84, 7)$ -bicriteria approximation ratio. The analysis of phase (1) can be accomplished as same as that in the proof of Theorem 2, except that  $|F| = |\mathcal{D}| = n$  here. Thus, the GSEMO needs at most

$$\frac{ek^2n}{n-k+1} \quad (39)$$

expected number of iterations to find a solution with size  $k$ .

In phase (2), let  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  denote the solution with size  $k$  in the population  $P$ . Note that  $P$  will always contain a solution with size  $k$  after phase (1), since it has the largest  $f_2$  value  $k$  and can be weakly dominated by only other solutions with size  $k$ . We use  $J_{\text{vio}}$  to denote the violation degree of  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  w.r.t. Eq. (35), i.e.,

$$J_{\text{vio}} = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{I}(B \cap \hat{\mathbf{x}} = \emptyset).$$

$J_{\text{vio}}$  is at most  $q$ , because  $\mathcal{B}$  contains  $q$  critical balls, where  $q \leq k$ . When  $J_{\text{vio}} = 0$ , it implies that  $\forall B \in \mathcal{B} : B \cap \hat{\mathbf{x}} \neq \emptyset$ , i.e., Eq. (35) holds; thus,  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  is now feasible with respect to  $\mathcal{B}$ , i.e., the goal of phase (2) is reached. It is clear that  $J_{\text{vio}}$  cannot increase, because a solution with larger violation degree has a larger value of Eq. (37), i.e., a smaller  $f_1$  value. Assume that currently  $J_{\text{vio}} = i \leq q$ . This implies that  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  does not intersect with  $i$  critical balls. Let  $R$  denote the set of points contained by these  $i$  critical balls. Adding one point in  $R$  into  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  will decrease  $J_{\text{vio}}$  by 1. By the definition of critical balls, i.e., Definition 6, we know that the critical balls are disjoint, and each critical ball contains at least  $n/k$  points. Thus,  $|R| \geq in/k$ . Because  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  currently intersects with  $q-i$  critical balls, there must exist a subset  $S$  of  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  with  $|S| \geq k - (q-i)$ , such that deleting one point in  $S$  from  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  will not increase  $J_{\text{vio}}$ . Therefore, by selecting the solution  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  in line 3 of Algorithm 1; flipping one of the 1-bits corresponding to  $S$  (i.e., deleting one point in  $S$  from  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ ) and one of the 0-bits corresponding to  $R$  (i.e., adding one point in  $R$  into  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ ) while keeping the other bits unchanged in line 4 (which performs bit-wise mutation), an offspring solution  $\mathbf{x}'$  with size  $k$  will be generated, satisfying

$$\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{I}(B \cap \mathbf{x}' = \emptyset) = i - 1.$$

Compared with  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}'$  has a smaller value of Eq. (37), and thus a larger value of  $f_1$ , implying that  $\mathbf{x}'$  dominates  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{x}'$  will be added into the population  $P$  and replace  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ , implying that  $J_{\text{vio}}$  is decreased by 1. Then, we analyze the probability of the above selection and mutation behavior. Due to uniform selection, the probability of selecting the solution  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  in line 3 of Algorithm 1 is  $1/|P| \geq 1/k$ , where the inequality holds by the population size  $|P| \leq k$  which can be derived as in the

proof of Theorem 2. The probability of mutation is  $(|S|/n) \cdot (|R|/n) \cdot (1-1/n)^{n-2}$ , where the first term is the probability of flipping one of the 1-bits corresponding to  $S$ , the second term is the probability of flipping one of the 0-bits corresponding to  $R$ , and the last one is the probability of keeping the remaining  $n-2$  bits unchanged. Thus, the probability of decreasing  $J_{\text{vio}}$  in one iteration of the GSEMO is at least

$$\frac{1}{k} \cdot \frac{|S|}{n} \cdot \frac{|R|}{n} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-2} \geq \frac{i(k-q+i)}{ek^2n},$$

where the inequality holds by  $|S| \geq k - (q - i)$  and  $|R| \geq in/k$ . Because  $J_{\text{vio}} \leq q$ , the expected number of iterations of phase (2) (i.e., to make  $J_{\text{vio}} = 0$ ) is at most

$$\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{ek^2n}{i(k-q+i)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{ek^2n}{i^2} \leq 2ek^2n, \quad (40)$$

where the first inequality holds by  $q \leq k$ , and the last inequality holds by  $\sum_{i=1}^k 1/i^2 \leq 1 + \sum_{i=2}^k (1/(i-1) - 1/i) \leq 2$ .

In phase (3), the population  $P$  will always contain a feasible solution of size  $k$ , with respect to the set  $\mathcal{B}$  of critical balls, because a non-feasible solution with respect to  $\mathcal{B}$  has a larger value of Eq. (37) and thus a smaller value of  $f_1$ . Note that for a feasible solution  $\mathbf{x}$  of size  $k$ ,  $f_1(\mathbf{x})$  just equals to  $-\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x})$ , since  $\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{I}(B \cap \mathbf{x} = \emptyset) = 0$ . The analysis of this phase is similar to that of phase (2) in the proof of Theorem 2. For any feasible solution  $\mathbf{x}$  of size  $k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} -f_1(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathbf{x}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) \\ &\leq \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathbf{x}} d_i^{\max} \leq \sum_{i=k+1}^n d_{(i)}^{\max}, \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where the second equality holds because  $\mathbf{x} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$  and  $d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) = \min\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{x}\}$  is the distance between  $\mathbf{v}_i$  and its closest point in  $\mathbf{x}$ , the first inequality holds by  $d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) = \min\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{x}\} \leq \max\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D}\} = d_i^{\max}$  due to  $\mathbf{x} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ , and the last inequality holds because  $|\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathbf{x}| = n - k$  and  $d_{(1)}^{\max}, d_{(2)}^{\max}, \dots, d_{(n)}^{\max}$  is a permutation of  $d_1^{\max}, d_2^{\max}, \dots, d_n^{\max}$  in ascending order. Similarly, we can derive

$$\begin{aligned} -f_1(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathbf{x}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) \\ &\geq \sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathbf{x}} d_i^{\min} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} d_{(i)}^{\min}, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where the first inequality holds by  $d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) = \min\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{x}\} \geq \min\{d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{\mathbf{v}_i\}\} = d_i^{\min}$  due to  $\mathbf{x} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \setminus \{\mathbf{v}_i\}$ , and the last inequality holds because  $|\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathbf{x}| = n - k$  and  $d_{(1)}^{\min}, d_{(2)}^{\min}, \dots, d_{(n)}^{\min}$  is a permutation of  $d_1^{\min}, d_2^{\min}, \dots, d_n^{\min}$  in ascending order. According to Eqs. (41) and (42), we can conclude that until generating a  $(1 - 1/(8k))$ -approximate local optimum  $\mathbf{x}$ , the required number of successful steps is at most

$$\log_{\frac{1}{1-1/(8k)}} \frac{\sum_{i=k+1}^n d_{(i)}^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} d_{(i)}^{\min}} = O\left(k \log \frac{\sum_{i=k+1}^n d_{(i)}^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} d_{(i)}^{\min}}\right).$$

The  $(1 - 1/(8k))$ -approximate local optimum  $\mathbf{x}$  in Lemma 5 is with respect to a multiswap that swaps at most 4 points in and out, and thus one successful step needs at most  $ekn^8$  expected number of iterations. That is, the parameter  $p$  in the proof of Theorem 2 is 4 here. According to Lemma 5, we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}} d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) \leq 84 \cdot \text{OPT}. \quad (43)$$

Furthermore, since  $\mathbf{x}$  is feasible with respect to  $\mathcal{B}$ , we know from Lemma 4 that

$$\forall \mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D} : d(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}) \leq 7\alpha \cdot r(\mathbf{v}_i). \quad (44)$$

Eqs. (43) and (44) imply that the desired  $(84, 7)$ -bicriteria approximation ratio is reached. Thus, the expected number of iterations of phase (3) is at most

$$ekn^8 \cdot O\left(k \log \frac{\sum_{i=k+1}^n d_{(i)}^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} d_{(i)}^{\min}}\right). \quad (45)$$

By combining the expected number of iterations (i.e., Eqs. (39), (40) and (45)) in the above three phases, the GSEMO requires at most

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{ek^2n}{n-k+1} + 2ek^2n + ekn^8 \cdot O\left(k \log \frac{\sum_{i=k+1}^n d_{(i)}^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} d_{(i)}^{\min}}\right) \\ &= O\left(k^2n + k^2n^8 \log \frac{\sum_{i=k+1}^n d_{(i)}^{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} d_{(i)}^{\min}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

iterations in expectation to achieve a bicriteria approximation ratio of  $(84, 7)$ . Thus, the theorem holds.  $\square$

## VII. CONCLUSION

Clustering is an important application of EAs. Previous results are all empirical, while this paper provides theoretical justification for evolutionary clustering by proving the approximation guarantees of the GSEMO (a simple MOEA) for solving the three popular formulations of  $k$ -clustering, i.e.,  $k$ -center,  $k$ -median and  $k$ -means. We also show that the performance of evolutionary clustering can be theoretically grounded even when considering fairness, by proving the bicriteria approximation guarantee of the GSEMO for solving  $k$ -median clustering under individual fairness.

Though having achieved theoretical guarantees, the GSEMO is indeed very simple, which selects a parent solution from the population uniformly at random, uses bit-wise mutation only to generate an offspring solution, and keeps non-dominated solutions generated so far. Thus, an interesting future work is to study whether better approximation guarantees can be achieved by considering advanced components of EAs, especially noting that some practical MOEAs (e.g., MOEA/D [22], [30], NSGA-II [5], [48], and NSGA-III [11]) as well as the effectiveness of some advanced components (e.g., diversity-based parent selection [39], balanced crossover [13], heavy-tailed mutation [10], and non-elitist survivor selection [8]) have been theoretically analyzed recently. It is also interesting to theoretically analyze evolutionary clustering under more complicated situations, e.g., with outliers [4], [18]. As EAs

have been successfully applied to solve various machine learning problems [49], it is expected to provide theoretical justification for more applications, e.g., evolutionary policy search in reinforcement learning [43] and evolutionary neural architecture search [42].

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Ahmadian, A. Norouzi-Fard, O. Svensson, and J. Ward, "Better guarantees for  $k$ -means and Euclidean  $k$ -median by primal-dual algorithms," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. FOCS17–97–FOCS17–156, 2019.
- [2] V. Arya, N. Garg, R. Khandekar, A. Meyerson, K. Munagala, and V. Pandit, "Local search heuristics for  $k$ -median and facility location problems," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 544–562, 2004.
- [3] P. Berkhin, "A survey of clustering data mining techniques," in *Grouping Multidimensional Data*. Springer, 2006, pp. 25–71.
- [4] A. Bhaskara, S. Vadgama, and H. Xu, "Greedy sampling for approximate clustering in the presence of outliers," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32 (NeurIPS'19)*, Vancouver, Canada, 2019, pp. 11 146–11 155.
- [5] C. Bian and C. Qian, "Better running time of the non-dominated sorting genetic algorithm II (NSGA-II) by using stochastic tournament selection," in *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature (PPSN'22)*, Dortmund, Germany, 2022, pp. 428–441.
- [6] J. Byrka, T. Pensyl, B. Rybicki, A. Srinivasan, and K. Trinh, "An improved approximation for  $k$ -median and positive correlation in budgeted optimization," *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 1–31, 2017.
- [7] F. Chierichetti, R. Kumar, S. Lattanzi, and S. Vassilvitskii, "Fair clustering through fairlets," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30 (NeurIPS'17)*, Long Beach, CA, 2017, pp. 5029–5037.
- [8] D.-C. Dang, A. Eremeev, and P. K. Lehre, "Escaping local optima with non-elitist evolutionary algorithms," in *Proceedings of the 35th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI'21)*, Virtual, 2021, pp. 12 275–12 283.
- [9] B. Doerr, B. Kodric, and M. Voigt, "Lower bounds for the runtime of a global multi-objective evolutionary algorithm," in *Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC'13)*, Cancun, Mexico, 2013, pp. 432–439.
- [10] B. Doerr, H. P. Le, R. Makhmara, and T. D. Nguyen, "Fast genetic algorithms," in *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (GECCO'17)*, Berlin, Germany, 2017, pp. 777–784.
- [11] B. Doerr and S. Wietheger, "A mathematical runtime analysis of the non-dominated sorting genetic algorithm III (NSGA-III)," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.08202*, 2022.
- [12] T. Friedrich, J. He, N. Hebbinghaus, F. Neumann, and C. Witt, "Approximating covering problems by randomized search heuristics using multi-objective models," *Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 617–633, 2010.
- [13] T. Friedrich, T. Kötzing, A. Radhakrishnan, L. Schiller, M. Schirneck, G. Tennigkeit, and S. Wietheger, "Crossover for cardinality constrained optimization," in *Proceedings of the 24th ACM Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (GECCO)*, Boston, MA, 2022, pp. 1399–1407.
- [14] T. Friedrich and F. Neumann, "Maximizing submodular functions under matroid constraints by evolutionary algorithms," *Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 543–558, 2015.
- [15] M. Garza-Fabre, J. Handl, and J. Knowles, "An improved and more scalable evolutionary approach to multiobjective clustering," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 515–535, 2017.
- [16] M. Gong, Q. Cai, X. Chen, and L. Ma, "Complex network clustering by multiobjective discrete particle swarm optimization based on decomposition," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 82–97, 2013.
- [17] T. F. Gonzalez, "Clustering to minimize the maximum intercluster distance," *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 38, pp. 293–306, 1985.
- [18] S. Gupta, R. Kumar, K. Lu, B. Moseley, and S. Vassilvitskii, "Local search methods for  $k$ -means with outliers," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 10, no. 7, pp. 757–768, 2017.
- [19] L. O. Hall, I. B. Ozyurt, and J. C. Bezdek, "Clustering with a genetically optimized approach," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 103–112, 1999.
- [20] J. Handl and J. Knowles, "An evolutionary approach to multiobjective clustering," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 56–76, 2007.
- [21] Q. Huang, X. Huang, Z. Kong, X. Li, and D. Tao, "Bi-phase evolutionary searching for biclusters in gene expression data," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 803–814, 2018.
- [22] Z. Huang, Y. Zhou, C. Luo, and Q. Lin, "A runtime analysis of typical decomposition approaches in MOEA/D framework for many-objective optimization problems," in *Proceedings of the 30th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI'21)*, Virtual, 2021, pp. 1682–1688.
- [23] A. K. Jain, M. N. Murty, and P. J. Flynn, "Data clustering: A review," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 264–323, 1999.
- [24] C. Jung, S. Kannan, and N. Lutz, "A center in your neighborhood: Fairness in facility location," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.09041*, 2019.
- [25] T. Kanungo, D. M. Mount, N. S. Netanyahu, C. D. Piatkoe, R. Silverman, and A. Y. Wuf, "A local search approximation algorithm for  $k$ -means clustering," *Computational Geometry*, vol. 28, pp. 89–112, 2004.
- [26] L. Kaufman and P. J. Rousseeuw, *Finding Groups in Data: An Introduction to Cluster Analysis*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
- [27] J. D. Knowles, R. A. Watson, and D. W. Corne, "Reducing local optima in single-objective problems by multi-objectivization," in *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Evolutionary Multi-Criterion Optimization (EMO'01)*, Zurich, Switzerland, 2001, pp. 269–283.
- [28] S. Lattanzi and C. Sohler, "A better  $k$ -means++ algorithm via local search," in *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML'19)*, Long Beach, CA, 2019, pp. 3662–3671.
- [29] M. Laumanns, L. Thiele, and E. Zitzler, "Running time analysis of multi-objective evolutionary algorithms on pseudo-Boolean functions," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 170–182, 2004.
- [30] Y. Li, Y. Zhou, Z. Zhan, and J. Zhang, "A primary theoretical study on decomposition-based multiobjective evolutionary algorithms," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 563–576, 2016.
- [31] W. Liu, Z. Wang, X. Liu, N. Zeng, and D. Bell, "A novel particle swarm optimization approach for patient clustering from emergency departments," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 632–644, 2018.
- [32] S. Lloyd, "Least squares quantization in PCM," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 129–137, 1982.
- [33] P. C. Ma, K. C. Chan, X. Yao, and D. K. Chiu, "An evolutionary clustering algorithm for gene expression microarray data analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 296–314, 2006.
- [34] S. Mahabadi and A. Vakilian, "Individual fairness for  $k$ -clustering," in *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML'20)*, Virtual Event, 2020, pp. 6586–6596.
- [35] J. Matoušek, "On approximate geometric  $k$ -clustering," *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 61–84, 2000.
- [36] A. Mukhopadhyay, U. Maulik, and S. Bandyopadhyay, "A survey of multiobjective evolutionary clustering," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 1–46, 2015.
- [37] F. Neumann and I. Wegener, "Minimum spanning trees made easier via multi-objective optimization," *Natural Computing*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 305–319, 2006.
- [38] F. Neumann, J. Reichel, and M. Skutella, "Computing minimum cuts by randomized search heuristics," *Algorithmica*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 323–342, 2011.
- [39] E. C. Osuna, W. Gao, F. Neumann, and D. Sudholt, "Design and analysis of diversity-based parent selection schemes for speeding up evolutionary multi-objective optimisation," *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 832, pp. 123–142, 2020.
- [40] C. Qian, Y. Yu, and Z.-H. Zhou, "On constrained Boolean Pareto optimization," in *Proceedings of the 24th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI'15)*, Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2015, pp. 389–395.
- [41] C. Qian, Y. Yu, K. Tang, X. Yao, and Z.-H. Zhou, "Maximizing submodular or monotone approximately submodular functions by multi-objective evolutionary algorithms," *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 275, pp. 279–294, 2019.
- [42] E. Real, S. Moore, A. Selle, S. Saxena, Y. L. Suematsu, J. Tan, Q. V. Le, and A. Kurakin, "Large-scale evolution of image classifiers," in

- Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML'17)*, Sydney, Australia, 2017, pp. 2902–2911.
- [43] F. P. Such, V. Madhavan, E. Conti, J. Lehman, K. O. Stanley, and J. Clune, “Deep neuroevolution: Genetic algorithms are a competitive alternative for training deep neural networks for reinforcement learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.06567*, 2017.
- [44] R. Tinós, L. Zhao, F. Chicano, and D. Whitley, “NK hybrid genetic algorithm for clustering,” *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 748–761, 2018.
- [45] A. Vakilian and M. Yalciner, “Improved approximation algorithms for individually fair clustering,” in *Proceedings of The 25th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS'22)*, Virtual Event, 2022, pp. 8758–8779.
- [46] S. Vassilvitskii and D. Arthur, “*k*-means++: The advantages of careful seeding,” in *Proceedings of the 18th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA'07)*, New Orleans, LA, 2007, pp. 1027–1035.
- [47] X. Wu, V. Kumar, J. Ross Quinlan, J. Ghosh, Q. Yang, H. Motoda, G. J. McLachlan, A. Ng, B. Liu, P. S. Yu *et al.*, “Top 10 algorithms in data mining,” *Knowledge and Information Systems*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1–37, 2008.
- [48] W. Zheng, Y. Liu, and B. Doerr, “A first mathematical runtime analysis of the non-dominated sorting genetic algorithm II (NSGA-II),” in *Proceedings of the 36th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI'22)*, Virtual, 2022, pp. 10408–10415.
- [49] Z.-H. Zhou, Y. Yu, and C. Qian, *Evolutionary Learning: Advances in Theories and Algorithms*. Singapore: Springer, 2019.