

Approximation Algorithms for Clustering Problems with Lower Bounds and Outliers*

Sara Ahmadian[†]

Chaitanya Swamy[†]

Abstract

We consider clustering problems with *non-uniform lower bounds and outliers*, and obtain the *first approximation guarantees* for these problems. We have a set \mathcal{F} of facilities with lower bounds $\{L_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{F}}$ and a set \mathcal{D} of clients located in a common metric space $\{c(i, j)\}_{i, j \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{D}}$, and bounds k, m . A feasible solution is a pair $(S \subseteq \mathcal{F}, \sigma : \mathcal{D} \mapsto S \cup \{\text{out}\})$, where σ specifies the client assignments, such that $|S| \leq k$, $|\sigma^{-1}(i)| \geq L_i$ for all $i \in S$, and $|\sigma^{-1}(\text{out})| \leq m$. In the *lower-bounded min-sum-of-radii with outliers* (LBkSRO) problem, the objective is to minimize $\sum_{i \in S} \max_{j \in \sigma^{-1}(i)} c(i, j)$, and in the *lower-bounded k-supplier with outliers* (LBkSupO) problem, the objective is to minimize $\max_{i \in S} \max_{j \in \sigma^{-1}(i)} c(i, j)$.

We obtain an approximation factor of 12.365 for LBkSRO, which improves to 3.83 for the non-outlier version (i.e., $m = 0$). These also constitute the *first* approximation bounds for the min-sum-of-radii objective when we consider lower bounds and outliers *separately*. We apply the primal-dual method to the relaxation where we Lagrangify the $|S| \leq k$ constraint. The chief technical contribution and novelty of our algorithm is that, departing from the standard paradigm used for such constrained problems, we obtain an $O(1)$ -approximation *despite the fact that we do not obtain a Lagrangian-multiplier-preserving algorithm for the Lagrangian relaxation*. We believe that our ideas have broader applicability to other clustering problems with outliers as well.

We obtain approximation factors of 5 and 3 respectively for LBkSupO and its non-outlier version. These are the *first* approximation results for k -supplier with *non-uniform* lower bounds.

1 Introduction

Clustering is an ubiquitous problem that arises in many applications in different fields such as data mining, machine learning, image processing, and bioinformatics. Many of these problems involve finding a set S of at most k “cluster centers”, and an assignment σ mapping an underlying set \mathcal{D} of data points located in some metric space $\{c(i, j)\}$ to S , to minimize some objective function; examples include the *k-center* (minimize $\max_{j \in \mathcal{D}} c(\sigma(j), j)$) [21, 22], *k-median* (minimize $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} c(\sigma(j), j)$) [10, 23, 26, 7], and *min-sum-of-radii* (minimize $\sum_{i \in S} \max_{j: \sigma(j)=i} c(i, j)$) [16, 12] problems. Viewed from this perspective, clustering problems can often be viewed as *facility-location* problems, wherein an underlying set of clients that require service need to be assigned to facilities that provide service in a cost-effective fashion. Both clustering and facility-location problems have been extensively studied in the Computer Science and Operations Research literature; see, e.g., [28, 30] in addition to the above references.

We consider clustering problems with (non-uniform) *lower-bound requirements* on the cluster sizes, and where a bounded number of points may be designated as *outliers* and left unclustered. One motivation for considering lower bounds comes from an *anonymity* consideration. In order to achieve data privacy, [29] proposed an anonymization problem where we seek to perturb (in a specific way) some of (the attributes of)

* A preliminary version [3] appeared in the Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP), 2016.

[†]{sahmadian, cswamy}@uwaterloo.ca. Dept. of Combinatorics and Optimization, Univ. Waterloo, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1. Supported in part by NSERC grant 327620-09 and an NSERC Discovery Accelerator Supplement award.

the data points and then cluster them so that every cluster has at least L identical perturbed data points, thus making it difficult to identify the original data from the clustering. As noted in [2, 1], this anonymization problem can be abstracted as a lower-bounded clustering problem where the clustering objective captures the cost of perturbing data. Another motivation comes from a facility-location perspective, where (as in the case of *lower-bounded facility location*), the lower bounds model that it is infeasible or unprofitable to use services unless they satisfy a certain minimum demand (see, e.g., [27]). Allowing outliers enables one to handle a common woe in clustering problems, namely that data points that are quite dissimilar from any other data point can often disproportionately (and undesirably) degrade the quality of *any* clustering of the *entire* data set; instead, the outlier-version allows one to designate such data points as outliers and focus on the data points of interest.

Formally, adopting the facility-location terminology, our setup is as follows. We have a set \mathcal{F} of facilities with lower bounds $\{L_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{F}}$ and a set \mathcal{D} of clients located in a common metric space $\{c(i, j)\}_{i, j \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{D}}$, and bounds k, m . A feasible solution chooses a set $S \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ of at most k facilities, and assigns each client j to a facility $\sigma(j) \in S$, or designates j as an outlier by setting $\sigma(j) = \text{out}$ so that $|\sigma^{-1}(i)| \geq L_i$ for all $i \in S$, and $|\sigma^{-1}(\text{out})| \leq m$. We consider two clustering objectives: minimize $\sum_{i \in S} \max_{j: \sigma(j)=i} c(i, j)$, which yields the *lower-bounded min-sum-of-radii with outliers* (LBkSRO) problem, and minimize $\max_{i \in S} \max_{j: \sigma(j)=i} c(i, j)$, which yields the *lower-bounded k-supplier with outliers* (LBkSupO) problem. (k -supplier denotes the facility-location version of k -center; the latter typically has $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}$.) We refer to the non-outlier versions of the above problems (i.e., where $m = 0$) as LBkSR and LBkSup respectively.

Our contributions. We obtain the *first* results for clustering problems with *non-uniform lower bounds and outliers*. We develop various techniques for tackling these problems using which we obtain *constant-factor approximation guarantees* for LBkSRO and LBkSupO. Note that we need to ensure that none of the three types of *hard* constraints involved here—at most k clusters, non-uniform lower bounds, and at most m outliers—are violated, which is somewhat challenging.

We obtain an approximation factor of 12.365 for LBkSRO (Theorem 2.8, Section 2.2), which improves to 3.83 for the non-outlier version LBkSR (Theorem 2.7, Section 2.1). These also constitute the *first* approximation results for the min-sum-of-radii objective when we consider: (a) lower bounds (even uniform bounds) but no outliers (LBkSR); and (b) outliers but no lower bounds. Previously, an $O(1)$ -approximation was known only in the setting where there are *no lower bounds and no outliers* (i.e., $L_i = 0$ for all i , $m = 0$) [12].

For the k -supplier objective (Section 3), we obtain an approximation factor of 5 for LBkSupO (Theorem 3.2), and 3 for LBkSup (Theorem 3.1). These are the *first* approximation results for the k -supplier problem with non-uniform lower bounds. Previously, [1] obtained approximation factors of 4 and 2 respectively for LBkSupO and LBkSup for the special case of *uniform* lower bounds and when $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}$. Complementing our approximation bounds, we prove a factor-3 hardness of approximation for LBkSup (Theorem 3.3), which shows that our approximation factor of 3 is optimal for LBkSup. We also show (Appendix C) that LBkSupO is equivalent to the k -center version of the problem (where $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}$).

Our techniques. Our main technical contribution is an $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for LBkSRO (Section 2.2). Whereas for the non-outlier version LBkSR (Section 2.1), one can follow an approach similar to that of Charikar and Panigrahi [12] for the min-sum-of-radii problem without lower bounds or outliers, the presence of outliers creates substantial difficulties whose resolution requires various novel ingredients. As in [12], we view LBkSRO as a *k-ball-selection* (k -BS) problem of picking k suitable balls (see Section 2) and consider its LP-relaxation (P_2). Let OPT denote its optimal value. Following the Jain-Vazirani (JV) template for k -median [23], we move to the version where we may pick any number of balls but incur a fixed cost of z for each ball we pick. The dual LP (D_2) has α_j dual variables for the clients, which “pay” for (i, r) pairs (where (i, r) denotes the ball $\{j \in \mathcal{D} : c(i, j) \leq r\}$). For LBkSR (where $m = 0$), as observed

in [12], it is easy to adapt the JV primal-dual algorithm for facility location to handle this fixed-cost version of k -BS: we raise the α_j s of uncovered clients until all clients are covered by some fully-paid (i, r) pair (see PDAIlg). This yields a so-called *Lagrangian-multiplier-preserving* (LMP) 3-approximation algorithm: if F is the primal solution constructed, then $3 \sum_j \alpha_j$ can pay for $\text{cost}(F) + 3|F|z$; hence, by varying z , one can find two solutions F_1, F_2 for nearby values of z , and combine them to extract a low-cost k -BS-solution.

The presence of outliers in LB k SRO significantly complicates things. The natural adaptation of the primal-dual algorithm is to now stop when at least $|\mathcal{D}| - m$ clients are covered by fully-paid (i, r) pairs. But now, the dual objective involves a $-m \cdot \gamma$ term, where $\gamma = \max_j \alpha_j$, which potentially cancels the dual contribution of (some) clients that pay for the last fully-paid (i, r) pair, say f . Consequently, we *do not obtain an LMP-approximation*: if F is the primal solution we construct, we can only say that (loosely speaking) $3(\sum_j \alpha_j - m \cdot \gamma)$ pays for $\text{cost}(F \setminus f) + 3|F \setminus f|z$ (see Theorem 2.9 (ii)). In particular, this means that *even if the primal-dual algorithm returns a solution with k pairs, its cost need not be bounded*, an artifact that never arises in LB k SR (or k -median). This in turn means that by combining the two solutions F_1, F_2 found for $z_1, z_2 \approx z_1$, we only obtain a solution of cost $O(\text{OPT} + z_1)$ (see Theorem 2.14).

Dealing with the case where $z_1 = \Omega(\text{OPT})$ is technically the most involved portion of our algorithm (Section 2.2.2). We argue that in this case the solutions F_1, F_2 (may be assumed to) have a very specific structure: $|F_1| = k + 1$, and every F_2 -ball intersects at most one F_1 -ball, and vice versa. We utilize this structure to show that either we can find a good solution in a suitable neighborhood of F_1 and F_2 , or F_2 itself must be a good solution.

We remark that the above difficulties (i.e., the inability to pay for the last “facility” and the ensuing complications) also arise in the *k -median problem with outliers*. We believe that our ideas also have implications for this problem and should yield a much-improved approximation ratio for this problem. (The current approximation ratio is a large (unspecified) constant [13].)

For the k -supplier problem, LB k SupO, we leverage the notion of skeletons and pre-skeletons defined by [15] in the context of *capacitated k -supplier with outliers*, wherein facilities have capacities instead of lower bounds limiting the number of clients that can be assigned to them. Roughly speaking, a skeleton $F \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ ensures there is a low-cost solution (F, σ) . A pre-skeleton satisfies some of the properties of a skeleton. We show that if F is a pre-skeleton, then either F is a skeleton or $F \cup \{i\}$ is a pre-skeleton for some facility i . This allows one to find a sequence of facility-sets such that at least one of them is a skeleton. For a given set F , one can check if F admits a low-cost assignment σ , so this yields an $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm.

Related work. There is a wealth of literature on clustering and facility-location (FL) problems (see, e.g., [28, 30]); we limit ourselves to the work that is relevant to LB k SRO and LB k SupO.

The only prior work on clustering problems to incorporate both lower bounds *and* outliers is by Aggarwal et al. [1]. They obtain approximation ratios of 4 and 2 respectively for LB k SupO and LB k Sup with *uniform* lower bounds and when $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}$, which they consider as a means of achieving anonymity. They also consider an alternate *cellular clustering* (CellC) objective and devise an $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for lower-bounded CellC, again with uniform lower bounds, and mention that this can be extended to an $O(1)$ -approximation for lower-bounded CellC with outliers.

More work has been directed towards clustering problems that involve *either* outliers or lower bounds (but not both), and here, clustering with outliers has received more attention than lower-bounded clustering problems. Charikar et al. [11] consider (among other problems) the outlier-versions of the uncapacitated FL, k -supplier and k -median problems. They devise constant-factor approximations for the first two problems, and a bicriteria approximation for the k -median problem with outliers. They also proved a factor-3 approximation hardness result for k -supplier with outliers. This nicely complements our factor-3 hardness result for k -supplier with lower bounds but no outliers. Chen [13] obtained the first true approximation for k -median with outliers via a sophisticated combination of the primal-dual algorithm for k -median and

local search that yields a large (unspecified) $O(1)$ -approximation. As remarked earlier, the difficulties that we overcome in designing our 12.365-approximation for LB k SRO are similar in spirit to the difficulties that arise in k -median with outliers, and we believe that our techniques should also help and significantly improve the approximation ratio for this problem. Cygan and Kociumaka [15] consider the *capacitated k -supplier with outliers* problem, and devise a 25-approximation algorithm. We leverage some of their ideas in developing our algorithm for LB k SupO.

Lower-bounded clustering and FL problems remain largely unexplored and are not well understood. Besides LB k Sup (which has also been studied in Euclidean spaces [17]), another such FL problem that has been studied is *lower-bounded facility location* (LBFL) [24, 20], wherein we seek to open (any number of) facilities (which have lower bounds) and assign each client j to an open facility $\sigma(j)$ so as to minimize $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}} c(\sigma(j), j)$. Svitkina [31] obtained the first true approximation for LBFL, achieving an $O(1)$ -approximation; the $O(1)$ -factor was subsequently improved by [4]. Both results apply to LBFL with uniform lower bounds, and can be adapted to yield $O(1)$ -approximations to the k -median variant (where we may open at most k facilities).

We now discuss work related to our clustering objectives, albeit that does not consider lower bounds or outliers. Doddi et al. [16] introduced the k -clustering min-sum-of-diameters (k SD) problem, which is closely related to the k -clustering min-sum-of-radii (k SR) problem: the k SD-cost is at least the k SR-cost, and at most twice the k SR-cost. The former problem is somewhat better understood than the latter one. Whereas the k SD problem is *APX*-hard even for shortest-path metrics of unweighted graphs (it is *NP*-hard to obtain a better than 2 approximation [16]), the k SR problem is only known to be *NP*-hard for general metrics, and its complexity for shortest-path metrics of unweighted graphs is not yet settled with only a quasipolytime (exact) algorithm known [18]. On the positive side, Charikar and Panigrahi [12] devised the first (and current-best) $O(1)$ -approximation algorithms for these problems, obtaining approximation ratios of 3.504 and 7.008 for the k SR and k SD problems respectively, and Gibson et al. [18] obtain a quasi-PTAS for the k SR problem when $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}$. Various other results are known for specific metric spaces and when $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}$, such as Euclidean spaces [19, 8] and metrics with bounded aspect ratios [18, 6].

The k -supplier and k -center (i.e., k -supplier with $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}$) objectives have a rich history of study. Hochbaum and Shmoys [21, 22] obtained optimal approximation ratios of 3 and 2 for these problems respectively. Capacitated versions of k -center and k -supplier have also been studied: [25] devised a 6-approximation for uniform capacities, [14] obtained the first $O(1)$ -approximation for non-uniform capacities, and this $O(1)$ -factor was improved to 9 in [5].

Finally, our algorithm for LB k SRO leverages the template based on Lagrangian relaxation and the primal-dual method to emerge from the work of [23, 9] for the k -median problem.

2 Minimizing sum of radii with lower bounds and outliers

Recall that in the *lower-bounded min-sum-of-radii with outliers* (LB k SRO) problem, we have a facility-set \mathcal{F} and client-set \mathcal{D} located in a metric space $\{c(i, j)\}_{i, j \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{D}}$, lower bounds $\{L_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{F}}$, and bounds k and m . A feasible solution is a pair $(S \subseteq \mathcal{F}, \sigma : \mathcal{D} \mapsto S \cup \{\text{out}\})$, where $\sigma(j) \in S$ indicates that j is assigned to facility $\sigma(j)$, and $\sigma(j) = \text{out}$ designates j as an outlier, such that $|\sigma^{-1}(i)| \geq L_i$ for all $i \in S$, and $|\sigma^{-1}(\text{out})| \leq m$. The cost of such a solution is $\text{cost}(S, \sigma) := \sum_{i \in S} r_i$, where $r_i := \max_{j \in \sigma^{-1}(i)} c(i, j)$ denotes the *radius* of facility i ; the goal is to find a solution of minimum cost. We use LB k SR to denote the non-outlier version where $m = 0$.

It will be convenient to consider a relaxation of LB k SRO that we call the *k -ball-selection* (k -BS) problem, which focuses on selecting at most k balls centered at facilities of minimum total radius. More precisely, let $B(i, r) := \{j \in \mathcal{D} : c(i, j) \leq r\}$ denote the ball of clients centered at i with radius r . Let $c_{\max} = \max_{i \in \mathcal{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}} c(i, j)$. Let $\mathcal{L}_i := \{(i, r) : |B(i, r)| \geq L_i\}$, and $\mathcal{L} := \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{L}_i$. The goal in k -BS is to

find a set $F \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ with $|F| \leq k$ and $|\mathcal{D} \setminus \bigcup_{(i,r) \in F} B(i,r)| \leq m$ so that $\text{cost}(F) := \sum_{(i,r) \in F} r$ is minimized. (When formulating the LP-relaxation of the k -BS-problem, we equivalently view \mathcal{L} as containing only pairs of the form $(i, c(i, j))$ for some client j , which makes \mathcal{L} finite.) It is easy to see that any LBkSRO-solution yields a k -BS-solution of no greater cost. The key advantage of working with k -BS is that we do not explicitly consider the lower bounds (they are folded into the \mathcal{L}_i s) and we do not require the balls $B(i, r)$ for $(i, r) \in F$ to be disjoint. While a k -BS-solution F need not directly translate to a feasible LBkSRO-solution, one can show that it does yield a feasible LBkSRO-solution of cost at most $2 \cdot \text{cost}(F)$. We prove a stronger version of this statement in Lemma 2.1. In the following two sections, we utilize this relaxation to devise the *first* constant-factor approximation algorithms for for LBkSR and LBkSRO. To our knowledge, our algorithm is also the first $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for the outlier version of the min-sum-of-radii problem *without* lower bounds.

We consider an LP-relaxation for the k -BS-problem, and to round a fractional k -BS-solution to a good integral solution, we need to preclude radii that are much larger than those used by an (integral) optimal solution. We therefore “guess” the t facilities in the optimal solution with the largest radii, and their radii, where $t \geq 1$ is some constant. That is, we enumerate over all $O((|\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{D}|)^{2t})$ choices $F^O = \{(i_1, r_1), \dots, (i_t, r_t)\}$ of t (i, r) pairs from \mathcal{L} . For each such selection, we set $\mathcal{D}' = \mathcal{D} \setminus \bigcup_{(i,r) \in F^O} B(i, r)$, $\mathcal{L}' = \{(i, r) \in \mathcal{L} : r \leq \min_{(i,r) \in F^O} r\}$ and $k' = k - |F^O|$, and run our k -BS-algorithm on the modified k -BS-instance $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', c, k', m)$ to obtain a k -BS-solution F . We translate $F \cup F^O$ to an LBkSRO-solution, and return the best of these solutions. The following lemma, and the procedure described therein, is repeatedly used to bound the cost of translating $F \cup F^O$ to a feasible LBkSRO-solution. We call pairs $(i, r), (i', r') \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ *non-intersecting*, if $c(i, i') > r + r'$, and *intersecting* otherwise. Note that $B(i, r) \cap B(i', r') = \emptyset$ if (i, r) and (i', r') are non-intersecting. For a set $P \subseteq \mathcal{F} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ of pairs, define $\mu(P) := \{i \in \mathcal{F} : \exists r \text{ s.t. } (i, r) \in P\}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $F^O \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, and $\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', k'$ be as defined above. Let $F \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ be a k -BS-solution for the k -BS-instance $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', c, k', m)$. Suppose for each $i \in \mu(F)$, we have a radius $r'_i \leq \max_{r: (i,r) \in F} r$ such that the pairs in $U := \bigcup_{i \in \mu(F)} (i, r'_i)$ are non-intersecting and $U \subseteq \mathcal{L}$. Then there exists a feasible LBkSRO-solution (S, σ) with $\text{cost}(S, \sigma) \leq \text{cost}(F) + \sum_{(i,r) \in F^O} 2r$.*

Proof. Pick a maximal subset $P \subseteq F^O$ to add to U such that all pairs in $U' = U \cup P$ are non-intersecting. For each $(i, r) \in F^O \setminus P$, define $\kappa(i, r)$ to be some intersecting pair $(i', r') \in U'$. Define $S = \mu(U')$. Assign each client j to $\sigma(j) \in S$ as follows. If $j \in B(i, r)$ for some $(i, r) \in U'$, set $\sigma(j) = i$. Note that $U' \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, so this satisfies the lower bounds for all $i \in S$. Otherwise, if $j \in B(i, r)$ for some $(i, r) \in F$, set $\sigma(j) = i$. Otherwise, if $j \in B(i, r)$ for some $(i, r) \in F^O \setminus P$ and $(i', r') = \kappa(i, r)$, set $\sigma(j) = i'$. Any remaining unassigned client is not covered by the balls corresponding to pairs in $F \cup F^O$. There are at most m such clients, and we set $\sigma(j) = \text{out}$ for each such client j . Thus (S, σ) is a feasible LBkSRO-solution.

For any $i \in S$ and $j \in \sigma^{-1}(i)$ either $j \in B(i, r)$ for some $(i, r) \in F \cup U'$, or $j \in B(i', r')$ where $\kappa(i', r') = (i, r) \in U'$, in which case $c(i, j) \leq r + 2r'$. So $\text{cost}(S, \sigma) \leq \text{cost}(F) + \sum_{(i,r) \in F^O} 2r$. \square

2.1 Approximation algorithm for LBkSR

We now present our algorithm for the non-outlier version, LBkSR, which will introduce many of the ideas underlying our algorithm for LBkSRO described in Section 2.2. Let O^* denote the cost of an optimal solution to the given LBkSR instance.

As discussed above, for each selection of $(i_1, r_1), \dots, (i_t, r_t)$ of t pairs, we do the following. We set $\mathcal{D}' = \mathcal{D} \setminus \bigcup_{p=1}^t B(i_p, r_p)$, $\mathcal{L}' = \{(i, r) \in \mathcal{L} : r \leq R^* := \min_{p=1, \dots, t} r_p\}$, $k' = k - t$, and consider the k -BS-problem of picking at most k' pairs from \mathcal{L}' whose corresponding balls cover \mathcal{D}' incurring minimum cost (but our algorithm k -BSAlg will return pairs from \mathcal{L}). We consider the following natural LP-relaxation

(P₁) of this problem, and its dual (D₁).

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \sum_{(i,r) \in \mathcal{L}'} r \cdot y_{i,r} & \text{(P}_1\text{)} & \quad \max \quad & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j - k' \cdot z & \text{(D}_1\text{)} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{(i,r) \in \mathcal{L}': j \in B(i,r)} y_{i,r} \geq 1 \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{D}' & & \quad \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{j \in B(i,r) \cap \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j - z \leq r \quad \forall (i,r) \in \mathcal{L}' & \text{(2)} \\
& \sum_{(i,r) \in \mathcal{L}'} y_{i,r} \leq k' & \text{(1)} & & \alpha, z \geq 0. \\
& y \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

If (P₁) is infeasible then we discard this choice of t pairs and move on to the next selection. So we assume (P₁) is feasible in the remainder of this section. Let OPT denote the common optimal value of (P₁) and (D₁). As in the JV-algorithm for k -median, we Lagrangify constraint (1) and consider the unconstrained problem where we do not bound the number of pairs we may pick, but we incur a fixed cost z for each pair (i, r) that we pick (in addition to r). It is easy to adapt the JV primal-dual algorithm for facility location [23] to devise a simple *Lagrangian-multiplier-preserving* (LMP) 3-approximation algorithm for this problem (see PDA1g and Theorem 2.3). We use this LMP algorithm within a binary-search procedure for z to obtain two solutions F_1 and F_2 with $|F_1| \leq k < |F_2|$, and show that these can be “combined” to extract a k -BS-solution F of cost at most $3.83 \cdot OPT + O(R^*)$ (Lemma A.4). This combination step is more involved than in k -median. The main idea here is to use the F_2 solution as a guide to merge some F_1 -pairs. We cluster the F_1 pairs around the F_2 -pairs and setup a *covering-knapsack problem* whose solution determines for each F_2 -pair (i, r) , whether to “merge” the F_1 -pairs clustered around (i, r) or select all these F_1 -pairs (see step B2). Finally, we add back the pairs $(i_1, r_1), \dots, (i_t, r_t)$ selected earlier and apply Lemma 2.1 to obtain an LB k SR-solution. As required by Lemma 2.1, to aid in this translation, our k -BS-algorithm returns, along with F , a suitable radius $\text{rad}(i)$ for every facility $i \in \mu(F)$. This yields a $(3.83 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm (Theorem 2.7).

While our approach is similar to the one in [12] for the min-sum-of-radii problem *without* lower bounds (although our combination step is notably simpler), an important distinction that arises is the following. In the absence of lower bounds, the ball-selection problem k -BS is *equivalent* to the min-sum-of-radii problem, but (as noted earlier) this is no longer the case when we have lower bounds since in k -BS we do not insist that the balls we pick be disjoint. Consequently, moving from overlapping balls in a k -BS-solution to an LB k SR-solution incurs, in general, a factor-2 blowup in the cost (see Lemma 2.1). It is interesting that we are able to avoid this blowup and obtain an approximation factor that is quite close to the approximation factor (of 3.504) achieved in [12] for the min-sum-of-radii problem without lower bounds.

We now describe our algorithm in detail and proceed to analyze it. We describe a slightly simpler $(6.183 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm below (Theorem 2.2). We sketch the ideas behind the improved approximation ratio at the end of this section and defer the details to Appendix A.

Algorithm 1. Input: An LB k SR-instance $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}, \{L_i\}, \{c(i, j)\}, k)$, parameter $\epsilon > 0$.

Output: A feasible solution (S, σ) .

A1. Let $t = \min\{k, \lceil \frac{1}{\epsilon} \rceil\}$. For each set $F^O \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ with $|F^O| = t$, do the following.

A1.1. Set $\mathcal{D}' = \mathcal{D} \setminus \bigcup_{(i,r) \in F^O} B(i, r)$, $\mathcal{L}' = \{(i, r) \in \mathcal{L} : r \leq R^* = \min_{(i,r) \in F^O} r\}$, and $k' = k - t$.

A1.2. If (P₁) is infeasible, then reject this guess and move to the next set F^O . If $\mathcal{D}' \neq \emptyset$, run k -BSAlg(\mathcal{D}' , \mathcal{L}' , k' , ϵ) to obtain $(F, \{\text{rad}(i)\}_{i \in F})$; else set $(F, \text{rad}) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$.

A1.3. Apply the procedure in Lemma 2.1 taking $r'_i = \text{rad}(i)$ for all $i \in \mu(F)$ to obtain (S, σ) .

A2. Among all the solutions (S, σ) found in step A2, return the one with smallest cost.




Figure 1: An example of stars formed by F_1 and F_2 where $F_1 = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{11}\}$ and $F_2 = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_6\}$ depicted by squares and circles, respectively.

Algorithm k-BSAlg(\mathcal{D}' , \mathcal{L}' , k' , ϵ). Output: $F \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ with $|F| \leq k'$, a radius $\text{rad}(i)$ for all $i \in \mu(F)$.

B1. Binary search for z .

B1.1. Set $z_1 = 0$ and $z_2 = 2k'c_{\max}$. For $p = 1, 2$, let $(F_p, \{\text{rad}_p(i)\}, \alpha^p) \leftarrow \text{PDAIlg}(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', z_p)$, and let $k_p = |F_p|$. If $k_1 \leq k'$, stop and return $(F_1, \{\text{rad}_1(i)\})$. We prove in Theorem 2.3 that $k_2 \leq k'$; if $k_2 = k'$, stop and return $(F_2, \{\text{rad}_2(i)\})$.

B1.2. Repeat the following until $z_2 - z_1 \leq \delta_z = \frac{\epsilon \text{OPT}}{3^n}$, where $n = |F| + |\mathcal{D}|$. Set $z = \frac{z_1 + z_2}{2}$. Let $(F, \{\text{rad}(i)\}, \alpha) \leftarrow \text{PDAIlg}(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', z)$. If $|F| = k'$, stop and return $(F, \{\text{rad}(i)\})$; if $|F| > k'$, update $z_1 \leftarrow z$ and $(F_1, \text{rad}_1, \alpha^1) \leftarrow (F, \text{rad}, \alpha)$, else update $z_2 \leftarrow z$ and $(F_2, \text{rad}_2, \alpha^2) \leftarrow (F, \text{rad}, \alpha)$.

B2. Combining F_1 and F_2 . Let $\pi : F_1 \mapsto F_2$ be any map such that (i', r') and $\pi(i', r')$ intersect $\forall (i', r') \in F_1$. (This exists since every $j \in \mathcal{D}'$ is covered by $B(i, r)$ for some $(i, r) \in F_2$.) Define star $\mathcal{S}_{i,r} = \pi^{-1}(i, r)$ for all $(i, r) \in F_2$ (see Fig. 1). Solve the following *covering-knapsack LP*.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{(i,r) \in F_2} \left(x_{i,r}(2r + \sum_{(i',r') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r}} 2r') + (1 - x_{i,r}) \sum_{(i',r') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r}} r' \right) & \text{(C-P)} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{(i,r) \in F_2} (x_{i,r} + |\mathcal{S}_{i,r}|(1 - x_{i,r})) \leq k, \quad 0 \leq x_{i,r} \leq 1 \quad \forall (i,r) \in F_2. \end{aligned}$$

Let x^* be an extreme-point optimal solution to (C-P). The variable $x_{(i,r)}$ has the following interpretation. If $x_{i,r}^* = 0$, then we select all pairs in $\mathcal{S}_{i,r}$. Otherwise, if $\mathcal{S}_{i,r} \neq \emptyset$, we pick a pair in $(i', r') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r}$, and include $(i', 2r + r' + \max_{(i'', r'') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r} \setminus \{(i', r')\}} 2r'')$ in our solution. Notice that by expanding the radius of i' to $2r + r' + \max_{(i'', r'') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r} \setminus \{(i', r')\}} 2r''$, we cover all the clients in $\bigcup_{(i'', r'') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r}} B(i'', r'')$. Let F' be the resulting set of pairs.

B3. If $\text{cost}(F_2) \leq \text{cost}(F)$, return (F_2, rad_2) , else return $(F', \{\text{rad}_1(i)\}_{i \in \mu(F')}$.

Algorithm PDAIlg(\mathcal{D}' , \mathcal{L}' , z). Output: $F \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, radius $\text{rad}(i)$ for all $i \in \mu(F)$, dual solution α .

P1. Dual-ascent phase. Start with $\alpha_j = 0$ for all $j \in \mathcal{D}'$, \mathcal{D}' as the set of *active clients*, and the set T of *tight pairs* initialized to \emptyset . We repeat the following until all clients become inactive: we raise the α_j s of all active clients uniformly until constraint (2) becomes tight for some (i, r) ; we add (i, r) to T and mark all active clients in $B(i, r)$ as inactive.

P2. Pruning phase. Let T_I be a maximal subset of non-intersecting pairs in T picked by a greedy algorithm that scans pairs in T in non-increasing order of radius. Note that for each $i \in \mu(T_I)$, there is exactly one pair $(i, r) \in T_I$. We set $\text{rad}(i) = r$, and $r_i = \max \{c(i, j) : j \in B(i', r'), (i', r') \in T, r' \leq r, (i', r') \text{ intersects } (i, r) \text{ ((i', r') could be (i, r))}\}$. Let $F = \{(i, r_i)\}_{i \in \mu(T_I)}$. Return F , $\{\text{rad}(i)\}_{i \in \mu(T_I)}$, and α .

Analysis. We prove the following result.

Theorem 2.2. For any $\epsilon > 0$, *Algorithm 1* returns a feasible LBkSR-solution of cost at most $(6.1821 + O(\epsilon))O^*$ in time $n^{O(1/\epsilon)}$.

We first prove that PDAIlg is an LMP 3-approximation algorithm, i.e., its output (F, α) satisfies $\text{cost}(F) + 3|F|z \leq 3 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j$ (Theorem 2.3). Utilizing this, we analyze *k-BSAlg*, in particular, the output of the combination step B2, and argue that *k-BSAlg* returns a feasible solution of cost at most $(6.183 + O(\epsilon)) \cdot \text{OPT} + O(R^*)$ (Theorem 2.5). For the right choice of F^O , combining this with Lemma 2.1 yields Theorem 2.2.

Theorem 2.3. Suppose $\text{PDAI}(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', z)$ returns $(F, \{\text{rad}(i)\}, \alpha)$. Then

- (i) the balls corresponding to F cover \mathcal{D}' ,
- (ii) $\text{cost}(F) + 3|F|z \leq 3 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j \leq 3(\text{OPT} + k'z)$,
- (iii) $\{(i, \text{rad}(i))\}_{i \in \mu(F)} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$, is a set of non-intersecting pairs, and $\text{rad}(i) \leq r_i \leq 3R^* \forall i \in \mu(F)$,
- (iv) if $|F| \geq k'$ then $\text{cost}(F) \leq 3 \cdot \text{OPT}$; if $|F| > k'$, then $z \leq \text{OPT}$. (Hence, $k_2 \leq k'$ in step B1.1.)

Proof. We prove parts (i)—(iii) first. Note that $\{(i, \text{rad}(i))\}_{i \in \mu(F)}$ is T_I (by definition). Consider a client $j \in \mathcal{D}'$ and let (i', r') denote the pair in T that causes j to become inactive. Then there must be a pair $(i, r) \in T_I$ that intersects (i', r') such that $r \geq r'$ (we could have $(i, r) = (i', r')$). Since by definition $r_i \geq c(i, j)$, $j \in B(i, r_i)$. Also, $c(i, i') \leq r + r'$. So if j is the client that determines r_i , then $r_i = c(i, j) \leq c(i', i) + c(i, j) \leq 2r' + r \leq 3r \leq 3R^*$.

All pairs in T_I are tight and non-intersecting. So for every $i \in \mu(F)$, there must be some $j \in B(i, \text{rad}(i)) \cap \mathcal{D}'$ with $c(i, j) = \text{rad}(i)$, so $\text{rad}(i) \leq r_i$. Since $|F| = |T_I|$,

$$\text{cost}(F) + 3|F|z = \sum_{(i,r) \in T_I} (r_i + 3z) \leq \sum_{(i,r) \in T_I} (3r + 3z) = \sum_{\substack{(i,r) \in T_I \\ j \in B(i,r) \cap \mathcal{D}'}} 3\alpha_j \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} 3\alpha_j \leq 3(\text{OPT} + k'z).$$

The last inequality above follows since (α, z) is a feasible solution to (D_1) .

Rearranging the bound yields $3(|F| - k')z \leq 3 \cdot \text{OPT} - \text{cost}(F)$, so when $|F| \geq k'$, we have $\text{cost}(F) \leq 3 \cdot \text{OPT}$, and when $|F| > k'$, we have $z \leq \text{OPT}$.

Recall that in step B1.1, k_2 is the number of pairs returned by PDAI for $z = 2k'c_{\max}$. So the last statement follows since $\text{OPT} \leq k'c_{\max}$, as all balls in \mathcal{L}' have radius at most c_{\max} and any feasible solution to (P_1) satisfies $\sum_{(i,r) \in \mathcal{L}'} y_{i,r} \leq k'$. \square

Let $(F, \{\text{rad}(i)\}) = k\text{-BSAlg}(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', k')$. If $k\text{-BSAlg}$ terminates in step B1, then $\text{cost}(F) \leq 3 \cdot \text{OPT}$ due to part (ii) of Theorem 2.3, so assume otherwise. Let $a, b \geq 0$ be such that $ak_1 + bk_2 = k'$, $a + b = 1$. Let $C_1 = \text{cost}(F_1)$ and $C_2 = \text{cost}(F_2)$. Recall that $(F_1, \text{rad}_1, \alpha^1)$ and $(F_2, \text{rad}_2, \alpha^2)$ are the outputs of PDAI for z_1 and z_2 respectively.

Claim 2.4. We have $aC_1 + bC_2 \leq (3 + \epsilon)\text{OPT}$.

Proof. By part (ii) of Theorem 2.3, we have $C_1 + 3k_1z_1 \leq 3(\text{OPT} + k'z_1)$ and $C_2 + 3k_2z_2 \leq 3(\text{OPT} + k'z_2)$. Combining these, we obtain

$$aC_1 + bC_2 \leq 3\text{OPT} + 3k'(az_1 + bz_2) - 3(ak_1z_1 + bk_2z_2) \leq 3(\text{OPT} + k'z_2) - 3k'z_2 + 3ak_1\delta_z \leq (3 + \epsilon)\text{OPT}.$$

The second inequality follows since $0 \leq z_2 - z_1 \leq \delta_z$. \square

Theorem 2.5. $k\text{-BSAlg}(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', k')$ returns a feasible solution $(F, \{\text{rad}(i)\})$ with $\text{cost}(F) \leq (6.183 + O(\epsilon)) \cdot \text{OPT} + O(R^*)$ where $\{(i, \text{rad}(i))\}_{i \in \mu(F)} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$ is a set of non-intersecting pairs.

Proof. The radii $\{\text{rad}(i)\}_{i \in \mu(F)}$ are simply the radii obtained from some execution of PDAI , so $\{(i, \text{rad}(i))\}_{i \in \mu(F)} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$ and comprises non-intersecting pairs. If $k\text{-BSAlg}$ terminates in step B1, we have argued a better bound on $\text{cost}(F)$. If not, and we return F_2 , the cost incurred is C_2 .

Otherwise, we return the solution F' found in step B2. Since (C-P) has only one constraint in addition to the bound constraints $0 \leq x_{i,r} \leq 1$, the extreme-point optimal solution x^* has at most one fractional component, and if it has a fractional component, then $\sum_{(i,r) \in F_2} (x_{i,r}^* + |\mathcal{S}_{i,r}|(1 - x_{i,r}^*)) = k'$. For any $(i, r) \in F_2$ with $x_{i,r}^* \in \{0, 1\}$, the number of pairs we include is exactly $x_{i,r}^* + |\mathcal{S}_{i,r}|(1 - x_{i,r}^*)$, and the total cost of these pairs is at most the contribution to the objective function of (C-P) from the $x_{i,r}^*$ and $(1 - x_{i,r}^*)$

terms. If x^* has a fractional component $(i', r') \in F_2$, then $x_{i', r'}^* + |\mathcal{S}_{i', r'}|(1 - x_{i', r'}^*)$ is a *positive* integer. Since we include at most one pair for (i', r') , this implies that $|F'| \leq k'$. The cost of the pair we include is at most $15R^*$, since all $(i, r) \in F_1 \cup F_2$ satisfy $r \leq 3R^*$. Therefore, $\text{cost}(F') \leq \text{OPT}_{\text{C-P}} + 15R^*$. Also, $\text{OPT}_{\text{C-P}} \leq 2bC_2 + (2b + a)C_1 = 2bC_2 + (1 + b)C_1$, since setting $x_{i, r} = b$ for all $(i, r) \in F_2$ yields a feasible solution to (C-P) of this cost.

So when we terminate in step B3, we return a solution F with $\text{cost}(F) \leq \min\{C_2, 2bC_2 + (1 + b)C_1 + 15R^*\}$. The following claim (Claim 2.6) shows that $\min\{C_2, 2bC_2 + (1 + b)C_1\} \leq 2.0607(aC_1 + bC_2)$ for all $a, b \geq 0$ with $a + b = 1$. Combining this with Claim 2.4 yields the bound in the theorem. \square

Claim 2.6. $\min\{C_2, 2bC_2 + (1 + b)C_1\} \leq \left(\frac{b+1}{3b^2-2b+1}\right)(aC_1 + bC_2) \leq 2.0607(aC_1 + bC_2)$ for all $a, b \geq 0$ such that $a + b = 1$.

Proof. Since the minimum is less than any convex combination,

$$\begin{aligned} \min(C_2, 2bC_2 + bC_1 + C_1) &\leq \frac{3b^2 - b}{3b^2 - 2b + 1}C_2 + \frac{1 - b}{3b^2 - 2b + 1}(2bC_2 + bC_1 + C_1) \\ &= \frac{(1 - b)(1 + b)}{3b^2 - 2b + 1}C_1 + \frac{b^2 + b}{3b^2 - 2b + 1}C_2 = \frac{b + 1}{3b^2 - 2b + 1}((1 - b)C_1 + bC_2) \end{aligned}$$

Since $a = 1 - b$, the first inequality in the claim follows.

The expression $\frac{b+1}{3b^2-2b+1}$ is maximized at $b = -1 + \sqrt{2}$, and has value $1 + \frac{3}{2\sqrt{2}} \approx 2.0607$, which yields the second inequality in the claim. \square

Now we have all the ingredients needed for proving the main theorem of this section.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. It suffices to show that when the selection $F^O = \{(i_1, r_1), \dots, (i_t, r_t)\}$ in step A1 corresponds to the t facilities in an optimal solution with largest radii, we obtain the desired approximation bound. In this case, if $t = k$, then F^O is an optimal solution. Otherwise, $t \geq \frac{1}{\epsilon}$, so we have $R^* \leq \frac{O^*}{t} \leq \epsilon O^*$ and $\text{OPT} \leq O^* - \sum_{p=1}^t r_p$. Combining Theorem 2.5 and Lemma 2.1 then yields the theorem. \square

Improved approximation ratio. The improved approximation ratio comes from a better way of combining F_1 and F_2 in step B2. The idea is that we can ensure that the dual solutions α^1 and α^2 are component-wise quite close to each other by setting δ_z in the binary-search procedure to be sufficiently small. Thus, we may essentially assume that if $T_{1,I}, T_{2,I}$ denote the tight pairs yielding F_1, F_2 respectively, then every pair in $T_{1,I}$ intersects some pair in $T_{2,I}$, because we can augment $T_{2,I}$ to include non-intersecting pairs of $T_{1,I}$. This yields dividends when we combine solutions as in step B2, because we can now ensure that if $\pi(i', r') = (i, r)$, then the pairs of $T_{2,I}$ and $T_{1,I}$ yielding (i, r) and (i', r') respectively intersect, which yields an improved bound on $c_{i, i'}$. This yields an improved approximation of 3.83 for the combination step (Lemma A.4), and hence for the entire algorithm (Theorem 2.7); we defer the details to Appendix A.

Theorem 2.7. For any $\epsilon > 0$, our algorithm returns a feasible LBkSR-solution of cost at most $(3.83 + O(\epsilon))O^*$ in time $n^{O(1/\epsilon)}$.

2.2 Approximation algorithm for LBkSRO

We now build upon the ideas in Section 2.1 to devise an $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for the outlier version LBkSR. The high-level approach is similar to the one in Section 2.1. We again “guess” the t (i, r) pairs F^O corresponding to the facilities with largest radii in an optimal solution, and consider the modified k -BS-instance $(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', k', m)$ (where $\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', k'$ are defined as before). We design a primal-dual algorithm for the Lagrangian relaxation of the k -BS-problem where we are allowed to pick any number of pairs from

\mathcal{L}' (leaving at most m uncovered clients) incurring a fixed cost of z for each pair picked, utilize this to obtain two solutions F_1 and F_2 , and combine these to extract a low-cost solution. However, the presence of outliers introduces various difficulties both in the primal-dual algorithm and in the combination step. We consider the following LP-relaxation of the k -BS-problem and its dual (analogous to (P_1) and (D_1)).

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \sum_{(i,r) \in \mathcal{L}'} r \cdot y_{i,r} & (P_2) \quad & \max \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j - k' \cdot z - m \cdot \gamma & (D_2) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{(i,r) \in \mathcal{L}': j \in B(i,r)} y_{i,r} + w_j \geq 1 \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{D}' & & \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j \in B(i,r) \cap \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j - z \leq r \quad \forall (i,r) \in \mathcal{L}' & (3) \\
& \sum_{(i,r) \in \mathcal{L}'} y_{i,r} \leq k', \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} w_j \leq m & & \alpha_j \leq \gamma \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{D}' \\
& y, w \geq 0. & & \alpha, z, \gamma \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

As before, if (P_2) is infeasible, we reject this guess; so we assume (P_2) is feasible in the remainder of this section. Let OPT denote the optimal value of (P_2) . The natural modification of the earlier primal-dual algorithm PDA_{alg} is to now stop the dual-ascent process when the number of active clients is at most m and set $\gamma = \max_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j$. This introduces the significant complication that one may not be able to pay for the $(r+z)$ -cost of non-intersecting tight pairs selected in the pruning phase by the dual objective value $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j - m \cdot \gamma$, since clients with $\alpha_j = \gamma$ may be needed to pay for both the $r+z$ -cost of the last tight pair $f = (i_f, r_f)$ but their contribution gets canceled by the $-m \cdot \gamma$ term. This issue affects us in various guises. First, we no longer obtain an LMP-approximation for the unconstrained problem since we have to account for the $(r+z)$ -cost of f separately. Second, unlike Claim 2.4, given solutions F_1 and F_2 obtained via binary search for $z_1, z_2 \approx z_1$ respectively with $|F_2| \leq k' < |F_1|$, we now only obtain a fractional k -BS-solution of cost $O(OPT + z_1)$. While one can modify the covering-knapsack-LP based procedure in step B2 of $k\text{-BSAlg}$ to combine F_1, F_2 , this only yields a good solution when $z_1 = O(OPT)$. The chief technical difficulty is that z_1 may however be much larger than OPT . Overcoming this obstacle requires various novel ideas and is the key technical contribution of our algorithm. We design a second combination procedure that is guaranteed to return a good solution when $z_1 = \Omega(OPT)$. This requires establishing certain structural properties for F_1 and F_2 , using which we argue that one can find a good solution in the neighborhood of F_1 and F_2 .

We now detail the changes to the primal-dual algorithm and $k\text{-BSAlg}$ in Section 2.1 and analyze them to prove Theorem 2.18, which states the performance guarantee we obtain for the modified $k\text{-BSAlg}$. As before, for the right guess of F^O , combining this with Lemma 2.1 immediately yields the following result.

Theorem 2.8. *There exists a $(12.365 + O(\epsilon))$ -approximation algorithm for LBkSRO that runs in time $n^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.*

Modified primal-dual algorithm $PDA_{\text{alg}}^o(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', z)$. This is quite similar to PDA_{alg} (and we again return pairs from \mathcal{L}). We stop the dual-ascent process when there are at most m active clients. We set $\gamma = \max_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j$. Let $f = (i_f, r_f)$ be the last tight pair added to the tight-pair set T , and $B_f = B(i_f, r_f)$. We sometimes abuse notation and use (i, r) to also denote the singleton set $\{(i, r)\}$. For a set P of (i, r) pairs, define $\text{uncov}(P) := \mathcal{D}' \setminus \bigcup_{(i,r) \in P} B(i, r)$. Note that $|\text{uncov}(T \setminus f)| > m \geq |\text{uncov}(T)|$. Let Out be a set of m clients such that $\text{uncov}(T) \subseteq Out \subseteq \text{uncov}(T \setminus f)$. Note that $\alpha_j = \gamma$ for all $j \in Out$.

The pruning phase is similar to before, but we only use f if necessary. Let T_I be a maximal subset of non-intersecting pairs picked by greedily scanning pairs in $T \setminus f$ in non-increasing order of radius. For $i \in \mu(T_I)$, set $\text{rad}(i)$ to be the unique r such that $(i, r) \in T_I$, and let r_i be the smallest radius ρ such that $B(i, \rho) \supseteq B(i', r')$ for every $(i', r') \in T \setminus f$ such that $r' \leq \text{rad}(i)$ and (i', r') intersects $(i, \text{rad}(i))$. Let $F' = \{(i, r_i)\}_{i \in \mu(T_I)}$. If $\text{uncov}(F') \leq m$, set $F = F'$. If $\text{uncov}(F') > m$ and $\exists i \in \mu(F')$ such

that $c(i, i_f) \leq 2R^*$, then increase r_i so that $B(i, r_i) \supseteq B_f$ and let F be this updated F' . Otherwise, set $F = F \cup f$ and $r_{i_f} = \text{rad}(i_f) = r_f$. We return $(F, f, \text{Out}, \{\text{rad}(i)\}_{i \in \mu(F)}, \alpha, \gamma)$. The proof of Theorem 2.9 dovetails the proof of Theorem 2.3.

Theorem 2.9. *Let $(F, f, \text{Out}, \{\text{rad}(i)\}, \alpha, \gamma) = \text{PDAI}^\circ(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', z)$. Then*

- (i) $\text{uncov}(F) \leq m$,
- (ii) $\text{cost}(F \setminus f) + 3|F \setminus f|z - 3R^* \leq 3(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j - m\gamma) \leq 3(\text{OPT} + k'z)$,
- (iii) $\{(i, \text{rad}(i))\}_{i \in \mu(F)} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$, is a set of non-intersecting pairs, and $\text{rad}(i) \leq r_i \leq 3R^* \forall i \in \mu(F)$,
- (iv) if $|F \setminus f| \geq k'$ then $\text{cost}(F) \leq 3 \cdot \text{OPT} + 4R^*$, and if $|F \setminus f| > k'$ then $z \leq \text{OPT}$.

Proof. We first prove parts (i)–(iii). Let $F' = \{(i, r'_i)\}_{i \in \mu(T_I)}$ be the set of pairs obtained from the set T_I in the pruning phase. By the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 2.3, we have $r'_i \leq 3\text{rad}(i) \leq 3R^*$ for all $i \in \mu(T_I)$, and $\text{uncov}(F') \subseteq \text{uncov}(T \setminus f)$. If we return $F = F'$, then $|\text{uncov}(F)| \leq m$ by definition. If $\text{uncov}(F') > m$ and we increase the radius of some $i \in \mu(F')$ with $c(i, i_f) \leq 2R^*$, then we have $r_i \leq \max\{r'_i, 3R^*\} \leq 3R^*$ and $\text{uncov}(F) \subseteq \text{uncov}(T)$, so $|\text{uncov}(F)| \leq m$. If $f \in F$, then we again have $\text{uncov}(F) \subseteq \text{uncov}(T)$. This proves part (i).

The above argument shows that $\text{cost}(F \setminus f) \leq \sum_{i \in \mu(T_I)} 3 \cdot \text{rad}(i) + 3R^*$. All pairs in T_I are tight and non-intersecting and $|F \setminus f| = |T_I|$. Also, $\text{Out} \subseteq \text{uncov}(T \setminus f) \subseteq \text{uncov}(T_I)$. (Recall that $|\text{Out}| = m$ and $\alpha_j = \gamma$ for all $j \in \text{Out}$.) So

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cost}(F \setminus f) + 3|F \setminus f|z - 3R^* &\leq \sum_{i \in \mu(T_I)} (3 \cdot \text{rad}(i) + 3z) = \sum_{\substack{i \in \mu(T_I) \\ j \in B(i, \text{rad}(i)) \cap \mathcal{D}'}} 3\alpha_j \\ &\leq 3 \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j - \sum_{j \in \text{Out}} \alpha_j \right) = 3 \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j - m\gamma \right) \leq 3(\text{OPT} + k'z). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The last inequality follows since (α, γ, z) is a feasible solution to (D_2) . This proves part (ii).

Notice that $\{(i, \text{rad}(i))\}_{i \in \mu(F)}$ is T_I if $f \notin F$, and $T_I + f$ otherwise. In the latter case, we know that $c(i, i_f) > 2R^*$ for all $i \in \mu(T_I)$, so f does not intersect $(i, \text{rad}(i))$ for any $i \in \mu(T_I)$. Thus, all pairs in $\{(i, \text{rad}(i))\}_{i \in \mu(F)}$ are non-intersecting. The claim that $\text{rad}(i) \leq r_i$ for all $i \in \mu(F)$ follows from exactly the same argument as that in the proof of Theorem 2.3.

Part (iv) follows from part (ii) and (4). The bound on $\text{cost}(F)$ follows from part (ii) since that $\text{cost}(F) \leq \text{cost}(F \setminus f) + R^*$. Inequality (4) implies that $|F \setminus f|z \leq \sum_{i \in \mu(T_I)} (\text{rad}(i) + z) \leq \text{OPT} + k'z$, and so $z \leq \text{OPT}$ if $|F \setminus f| > k'$. \square

Modified algorithm $k\text{-BSA}^\circ(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', k', \epsilon)$. As before, we use binary search to find solutions F_1, F_2 and extract a low-cost solution from these. The only changes to step B1 are as follows. We start with $z_1 = 0$ and $z_2 = 2nk'c_{\max}$; for this z_2 , we argue below that PDAI° returns at most k' pairs. We stop when $z_2 - z_1 \leq \delta_z := \frac{\epsilon \text{OPT}}{3n2^n}$. We *do not stop* even if PDAI° returns a solution (F, \dots) with $|F| = k'$ for some $z = \frac{z_1 + z_2}{2}$, since *Theorem 2.9 is not strong enough to bound $\text{cost}(F)$ even when this happens!*. If $|F| > k'$, we update $z_1 \leftarrow z$ and the F_1 -solution; otherwise, we update $z_2 \leftarrow z$ and the F_2 -solution. Thus, we maintain that $k_1 = |F_1| > k'$, and $k_2 = |F_2| \leq k'$.

Claim 2.10. *When $z = z_2 = 2nk'c_{\max}$, PDAI° returns at most k' pairs.*

Proof. Let $(F, f, \text{out}, \{\text{rad}(i)\}_{i \in \mu(F)}, \alpha, \gamma)$ be the output of PDAI° for this z . Let T be the sight of tight pairs after the dual-ascent process. Observe that $\gamma \geq 2k'c_{\max}$, since for any tight pair $(i, r) \in T$, we have

that $n\gamma \geq \sum_{j \in B(i,r) \cap \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j \geq z$. We have $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j - m\gamma \leq OPT + k'z \leq k'c_{\max} + k'z$. On the other hand, since $\text{uncov}(T \setminus f) \setminus \text{out} \neq \emptyset$ and $\alpha_j = \gamma$ for all $j \in \text{uncov}(T \setminus f)$, we also have the lower bound

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j - m\gamma \geq \sum_{\substack{i \in \mu(F \setminus f) \\ j \in B(i, \text{rad}(i)) \cap \mathcal{D}'}} \alpha_j + \gamma \geq |F \setminus f|z + \gamma.$$

So if $|F| > k'$, we arrive at the contradiction that $\gamma \leq k'c_{\max}$. \square

The main change is in the way solutions F_1, F_2 are combined. We adapt step B2 to handle outliers (procedure \mathcal{A} in Section 2.2.1), but the key extra ingredient is that we devise an alternate combination procedure \mathcal{B} (Section 2.2.2) that returns a low-cost solution when $z_1 = \Omega(OPT)$. We return the better of the solutions output by the two procedures. We summarize these changes at the end in Algorithm $k\text{-BSAlg}^\circ(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', k', \epsilon)$ and state the approximation bound for $k\text{-BSAlg}^\circ$ (Theorem 2.18). Combining this with Lemma 2.1 (for the right selection of $t(i, r)$ pairs) immediately yields Theorem 2.8.

We require the following *continuity lemma*, which is essentially Lemma 6.6 in [12]; we include a proof in Appendix B for completeness.

Lemma 2.11. *Let $(F_p, \dots, \alpha^p, \gamma^p) = \text{PDAI}^\circ(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', z_p)$ for $p = 1, 2$, where $0 \leq z_2 - z_1 \leq \delta_z$. Then, $\|\alpha_j^1 - \alpha_j^2\|_\infty \leq 2^n \delta_z$ and $|\gamma^1 - \gamma^2| \leq 2^n \delta_z$. Thus, if (3) is tight for some $(i, r) \in \mathcal{L}'$ in one execution, then $\sum_{j \in B(i,r) \cap \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j^p \geq r + z_1 - 2^n \delta_z$ for $p = 1, 2$.*

2.2.1 Combination subroutine $\mathcal{A}((F_1, \text{rad}_1), (F_2, \text{rad}_2))$

As in step B2, we cluster the F_1 -pairs around F_2 -pairs in stars. However, unlike before, some $(i', r') \in F_1$ may remain *unclustered* and we may not pick (i', r') or some pair close to it. Since we do not cover all clients covered by F_1 , we need to cover a suitable number of clients from $\text{uncov}(F_1)$. We again setup an LP to obtain a suitable collection of pairs. Let uc_p denote $\text{uncov}(F_p)$ and $\mathcal{D}_p := \mathcal{D}' \setminus \text{uc}_p$ for $p = 1, 2$. Let $\pi : F_1 \rightarrow F_2 \cup \{\emptyset\}$ be defined as follows: for each $(i', r') \in F_1$, if (i', r') intersects some F_2 -pair, pick such an intersecting $(i, r) \in F_2$ and set $\pi(i', r') = (i, r)$; otherwise, set $\pi(i', r') = \emptyset$. In the latter case, (i', r') is unclustered, and $B(i', r') \subseteq \text{uc}_2$. Define $\mathcal{S}_{i,r} = \pi^{-1}(i, r)$ for all $(i, r) \in F_2$. Let $\mathcal{Q} = \pi^{-1}(\emptyset)$. Let $\{\text{uc}_1(i, r)\}_{(i,r) \in F_2}$ be a partition of $\text{uc}_1 \cap \mathcal{D}_2$ such that $\text{uc}_1(i, r) \subseteq \text{uc}_1 \cap B(i, r)$ for all $(i, r) \in F_2$. Similarly, let $\{\text{uc}_2(i', r')\}_{(i',r') \in F_1}$ be a partition of $\text{uc}_2 \cap \mathcal{D}_1$ such that $\text{uc}_2(i', r') \subseteq \text{uc}_2 \cap B(i', r')$ for all $(i', r') \in F_1$. We consider the following 2-dimensional covering knapsack LP.

$$\min \sum_{(i,r) \in F_2} \left(x_{i,r} (2r + \sum_{(i',r') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r}} 2r') + (1 - x_{i,r}) \sum_{(i',r') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r}} r' \right) + \sum_{(i',r') \in \mathcal{Q}} q_{i',r'} \cdot r' \quad (2\text{C-P})$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{(i,r) \in F_2} (x_{i,r} + |\mathcal{S}_{i,r}|(1 - x_{i,r})) + \sum_{(i',r') \in \mathcal{Q}} q_{i',r'} \leq k \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_{(i,r) \in F_2} (1 - x_{i,r}) |\text{uc}_1(i, r)| + \sum_{(i',r') \in \mathcal{Q}} (1 - q_{i',r'}) |\text{uc}_2(i', r')| \leq m - |\text{uc}_1 \cap \text{uc}_2| \quad (6)$$

$$0 \leq x_{i,r} \leq 1 \quad \forall (i, r) \in F_2, \quad 0 \leq q_{i',r'} \leq 1 \quad \forall (i', r') \in \mathcal{Q}.$$

The interpretation of the variable $x_{i,r}$ is similar to before. If $x_{i,r} = 0$, or $x_{i,r} = 1$, $\mathcal{S}_{i,r} \neq \emptyset$, we proceed as in step B2 (i.e., select all pairs in $\mathcal{S}_{i,r}$, or pick some $(i', r') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r}$ and expand its radius suitably). But if $x_{i,r} = 1$, $\mathcal{S}_{i,r} = \emptyset$, then we may also pick (i, r) (see Theorem 2.14). Variable $q_{i',r'}$ indicates if we pick $(i', r') \in F_1$. The number of uncovered clients in such a solution is at most $|\text{uc}_1 \cap \text{uc}_2| + (\text{LHS of (6)})$, and (6) enforces that this is at most m .

Let (x^*, q^*) be an extreme-point optimal solution to (2C-P). The number of fractional components in (x^*, q^*) is at most the number of tight constraints from (5), (6). We exploit this to round (x^*, q^*) to an integer solution (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) of good objective value (Lemma 2.13), and then use (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) to extract a good set of pairs as sketched above (Theorem 2.14). Recall that $k_1 = |F_1|$, $k_2 = |F_2|$. Let $a, b \geq 0$ be such that $ak_1 + bk_2 = k'$, $a + b = 1$. Let $C_1 = \text{cost}(F_1)$ and $C_2 = \text{cost}(F_2)$.

Lemma 2.12. *The following hold.*

- (i) $aC_1 + bC_2 \leq (3 + \epsilon)OPT + 4R^* + 3z_1$,
- (ii) $OPT_{2C-P} \leq 2bC_2 + (1 + b)C_1$.

Proof. Part (i) follows easily from part (ii) of Theorem 2.9 and since $\text{cost}(F_p) \leq \text{cost}(F_p \setminus f_p) + R^*$ for $p = 1, 2$. So we have $C_1 + 3(k_1 - 1)z_1 \leq 3(OPT + k'z_1) + 4R^*$ and $C_2 + 3(k_2 - 1)z_2 \leq 3(OPT + k'z_2) + 4R^*$. Combining these, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} aC_1 + bC_2 &\leq 3OPT + 3k'(az_1 + bz_2) - 3(ak_1z_1 + bk_2z_2) + 3(az_1 + bz_2) + 4R^* \\ &\leq 3(OPT + k'z_2) - 3k'z_2 + 3ak_1\delta_z + 3z_1 + 3b\delta_z + 4R^* \\ &\leq (3 + \epsilon)OPT + 4R^* + 3z_1. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows since $0 \leq z_2 - z_1 \leq \delta_z$.

For part (ii), we claim that setting $x_{i,r} = b$ for all $(i, r) \in F_2$, and $q_{i',r'} = a$ for all $(i', r') \in \mathcal{Q}$ yields a feasible solution to (2C-P). The LHS of (5) evaluates to $ak_1 + bk_2$, which is exactly k' . The first term on the LHS of (6) evaluates to $a \sum_{(i,r) \in F_2} |\text{uc}_1(i, r)| = a|\text{uc}_1 \cap \mathcal{D}_2| = a|\text{uc}_1 \setminus \text{uc}_2|$ since $\{\text{uc}_1(i, r)\}_{(i,r) \in F_2}$ is a partition of $\text{uc}_1 \cap \mathcal{D}_2$. Similarly, the second term on the LHS of (6) evaluates to at most $b|\text{uc}_2 \cap \mathcal{D}_1| = b|\text{uc}_2 \setminus \text{uc}_1|$. So we have

$$(\text{LHS of (6)}) + |\text{uc}_1 \cap \text{uc}_2| = a|\text{uc}_1| + b|\text{uc}_2| \leq m$$

since $|\text{uc}_1|, |\text{uc}_2| \leq m$. The objective value of this solution is $2bC_2 + 2bC_1 + (1 - b)C_1 = 2bC_2 + (1 + b)C_1$. \square

Let $\mathcal{P} = \{(i, r) \in F_2 : \mathcal{S}_{i,r} = \emptyset\}$.

Lemma 2.13. *(x^*, q^*) can be rounded to a feasible integer solution (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) to (2C-P) of objective value at most $OPT_{2C-P} + O(R^*)$.*

Proof. Let S be the set of fractional components of (x^*, q^*) . As noted earlier, $|S|$ is at most the number of tight constraints from (5), (6). Let

$$l^* := \sum_{(i,r) \in S \cap F_2} (x_{i,r}^* + |\mathcal{S}_{i,r}|(1 - x_{i,r}^*)) + \sum_{(i',r') \in S \cap \mathcal{Q}} q_{i',r'}^*$$

denote the contribution of the fractional components of (x^*, q^*) to the LHS of (5). Note that if (5) is tight, then l^* must be an integer. For a vector $v = (v_j)_{j \in I}$ where I is some index-set, let $\lceil v \rceil$ denote $(\lceil v_j \rceil)_{j \in I}$. We round (x^*, q^*) as follows.

- If $l^* \geq 2$ or $|S| \leq 1$ or $|S \cap (F_2 \setminus \mathcal{P})| \geq 1$, set $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) = \lceil (x^*, q^*) \rceil$.
- Otherwise, we set $\tilde{x}_{i,r} = x_{i,r}^*$, $\tilde{q}_{i',r'} = q_{i',r'}^*$ for all the integer-valued coordinates. We set the fractional component with larger absolute coefficient value on the LHS of (6) equal to 1 and the other fractional component to 0.

We prove that (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) is a feasible solution to (2C-P). Note that (6) holds for (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) since we always have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(i,r) \in F_2} (1 - \tilde{x}_{i,r}) |\text{uc}_1(i, r)| + \sum_{(i',r') \in \mathcal{Q}} (1 - \tilde{q}_{i',r'}) |\text{uc}_2(i', r')| \\ \leq \sum_{(i,r) \in F_2} (1 - x_{i,r}^*) |\text{uc}_1(i, r)| + \sum_{(i',r') \in \mathcal{Q}} (1 - q_{i',r'}^*) |\text{uc}_2(i', r')|. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, the contribution to the LHS of (5) from the components not in S is the same in both (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) and (x^*, q^*) . Let l denote the contribution from (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) to the LHS of (5) from the components in S . Clearly, l is an integer.

If $l^* \geq 2$, then $l = 2$. If $|S| \leq 1$, then $l = 1$. If $l^* \geq 1$, then in these cases the LHS of (5) evaluated at (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) is at most the LHS of (5) evaluated at (x^*, q^*) . If $l^* < 1$ and $|S| \leq 1$ (so $l = 1$), then since l^* is fractional, we know that (5) is not tight for (x^*, q^*) . So despite the increase in LHS of (5), we have that (5) holds for (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) . If $|S| = 2$ and $|S \cap (F_2 \setminus \mathcal{P})| \geq 1$, then we actually have $l^* > 1$ and $l = 2$. Again, since l^* is fractional, we can conclude that (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) satisfies (5) despite the increase in LHS of (5). Finally, suppose $l^* < 2$, $|S| = 2$, and $S \cap (F_2 \setminus \mathcal{P}) = \emptyset$. Then the contribution from S to the LHS of (5) is $\sum_{(i,r) \in S \cap F_2} x_{i,r} + \sum_{(i',r') \in S \cap \mathcal{Q}} q_{i',r'}$, and at most one of the components in S is set to 1 in (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) . So $l = 1$, and either $l \leq l^*$ or $l^* < 1$, and in both cases (5) holds for (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) .

To bound the objective value of (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) , notice that compared to (x^*, q^*) , the solution (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) pays extra only for the components that are rounded up. There are at most two such components, and their objective-function coefficients are bounded by $15R^*$, so the objective value of (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) is at most $\text{OPT}_{2\text{C-P}} + 30R^*$. \square

Theorem 2.14. *The integer solution (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) returned by Lemma 2.13 yields a solution $(F, \{\text{rad}(i)\}_{i \in \mu(F)})$ to the k -BS-problem with $\text{cost}(F) \leq (6.1821 + O(\epsilon))(OPT + z_1) + O(R^*)$ where $\{(i, \text{rad}(i))\}_{i \in \mu(F)} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$ is a set of non-intersecting pairs.*

Proof. Unlike in step B2 of k -BSAlg, we will not simply pick a subset of pairs of F_1 and expand their radii. We will sometimes need to pick pairs from F_2 in order to ensure that we have at most m outliers, but we need to be careful in doing so because we also need to find suitable radii for the facilities we pick so that we obtain non-intersecting pairs.

We first construct F'' as follows. If $\tilde{q}_{i',r'} = 1$, we include $(i', r') \in F''$ and set $\text{rad}(i') = \text{rad}_1(i')$. If $\tilde{x}_{i,r} = 0$, we include all pairs in $\mathcal{S}_{i,r}$ in F'' and set $\text{rad}(i') = \text{rad}_1(i')$ for all $(i', r') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r}$. If $\tilde{x}_{i,r} = 1$ and $\mathcal{S}_{i,r} \neq \emptyset$, we pick a pair in $(i', r') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r}$, and include $(i', 2r + r' + \max_{(i'', r'') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r} \setminus \{(i', r')\}} 2r'')$ in F'' . We set $\text{rad}(i') = \text{rad}_1(i')$. Now we initialize $F' = F''$ and consider all $(i, r) \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\tilde{x}_{i,r} = 1$. If (i, r) does not intersect any $(i', r') \in F''$ then we add (i, r) to F' , and set $\text{rad}(i) = \text{rad}_2(i)$. Otherwise, if (i, r) intersects some $(i', r') \in F''$, then we replace $(i', r') \in F'$ with $(i', r' + 2r)$. We have thus ensured that $\{(i, \text{rad}(i))\}_{i \in \mu(F')} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$ and consists of non-intersecting pairs. Note that in all the cases above, the total cost of the pairs we include when we process some $\tilde{q}_{i',r'}$ or $\tilde{x}_{i,r}$ term is at most the total contribution to the objective function from the $\tilde{q}_{i',r'}$ term, or the $\tilde{x}_{i,r}$ and $1 - \tilde{x}_{i,r}$ terms. Therefore, $\text{cost}(F')$ is at most the objective value of (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) . Finally, we argue that $|\text{uncov}(F')| \leq m$. We have $|\text{uncov}(F')| \leq |\text{uc}_1 \cap \text{uc}_2| + |\text{uncov}(F') \cap \mathcal{D}_1| + |\text{uncov}(F') \cap \mathcal{D}_2 \cap \text{uc}_1|$. Observe that for every client $j \in \text{uncov}(F') \cap \mathcal{D}_1$ and every $(i', r') \in F_1$ such that $j \in B(i', r')$, it must be that $(i', r') \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\tilde{q}_{i',r'} = 0$. It follows that $j \in \text{uc}_2(i', r')$ for some $(i', r') \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $\tilde{q}_{i',r'} = 0$. Therefore, $|\text{uncov}(F') \cap \mathcal{D}_1| \leq \sum_{(i',r') \in \mathcal{Q}} (1 - \tilde{q}_{i',r'}) |\text{uc}_2(i', r')|$. Similarly, for every $j \in \text{uncov}(F') \cap \mathcal{D}_2 \cap \text{uc}_1$ and every $(i, r) \in F_2$ such that $j \in B(i, r)$, we must have $(i, r) \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\tilde{x}_{i,r} = 0$; hence, $j \in \text{uc}_1(i, r)$ for some $(i, r) \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\tilde{x}_{i,r} = 0$. Therefore, $|\text{uncov}(F') \cap \mathcal{D}_2 \cap \text{uc}_1| \leq \sum_{(i,r) \in \mathcal{P}} (1 - \tilde{x}_{i,r}) |\text{uc}_1(i, r)|$. Thus, since (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) is feasible, constraint (6) implies that $|\text{uncov}(F')| \leq m$.

We return (F_2, rad_2) if $\text{cost}(F_2) \leq \text{cost}(F')$, and $(F', \{\text{rad}(i)\}_{i \in \mu(F')})$ otherwise. Combining the above bound on $\text{cost}(F')$ with part (ii) of Lemma 2.12 and Lemma 2.13, we obtain that the cost of the

solution returned is at most

$$\begin{aligned} \min\{C_2, 2bC_2 + (1+b)C_1\} + 30R^* &\leq 2.0607(aC_1 + bC_2) + 30R^* \\ &\leq 2.0607\left((3+\epsilon)OPT + 4R^* + 3z_1\right) + 30R^* \leq (6.1821 + 3\epsilon)(OPT + z_1) + 39R^*. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from Claim 2.6, and the second follows from part (i) of Lemma 2.12. \square

2.2.2 Subroutine $\mathcal{B}((F_1, f_1, Out_1, rad_1, \alpha^1, \gamma^1), (F_2, f_2, Out_2, rad_2, \alpha^2, \gamma^2))$

Subroutine \mathcal{A} in the previous section yields a low-cost solution only if $z_1 = O(OPT)$. We complement subroutine \mathcal{A} by now describing a procedure that returns a good solution when z_1 is large. We assume in this section that $z_1 > (1+\epsilon)OPT$. Then $|F_1 \setminus f_1| \leq k'$ (otherwise $z_1 \leq OPT$ by part (iv) of Theorem 2.9), so $|F_1 \setminus f_1| \leq k' < |F_1|$, which means that $k_1 = k' + 1$ and $f_1 \in F_1$. Hence, $\alpha_j^1 = \gamma^1$ for all $j \in B_{f_1} \cap \mathcal{D}'$.

First, we take care of some simple cases. If there exists $(i, r) \in F_1 \setminus f_1$ such that $|\text{uncov}(F_1 \setminus \{f_1, (i, r)\} \cup (i, r + 12R^*))| \leq m$, then set $F = F_1 \setminus \{f_1, (i, r)\} \cup (i, r + 12R^*)$. We have $\text{cost}(F) = \text{cost}(F_1 \setminus f_1) + 12R^* \leq 3 \cdot OPT + 15R^*$ (by part (ii) of Theorem 2.9). If there exist pairs $(i, r), (i', r') \in F_1$ such that $c(i, i') \leq 12R^*$, take r'' to be the minimum $\rho \geq r$ such that $B(i', r') \subseteq B(i, \rho)$ and set $F = F_1 \setminus \{(i, r), (i', r')\} \cup (i, r'')$. We have $\text{cost}(F) \leq \text{cost}(F_1 \setminus f_1) + 13R^* \leq 3 \cdot OPT + 16R^*$. In both cases, we return $(F, \{\text{rad}_1(i)\}_{i \in \mu(F)})$.

So we assume in the sequel that neither of the above apply. In particular, all pairs in F_1 are well-separated. Let $AT = \{(i, r) \in \mathcal{L}' : \sum_{j \in B(i, r) \cap \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j^1 \geq r + z_1 - 2^n \delta_z\}$ and $AD = \{j \in \mathcal{D}' : \alpha_j^1 \geq \gamma^1 - 2^n \delta_z\}$. By Lemma 2.11, AT includes the tight pairs of $\text{PDAI}g^o(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', z_p)$ for both $p = 1, 2$, and $Out_1 \cup Out_2 \subseteq AD$. Since the tight pairs T_2 used for building solution F_2 are almost tight in $(\alpha^1, \gamma^1, z_1)$, we swap them in and swap out pairs from F_1 one by one while maintaining a feasible solution. Either at some point, we will be able to remove f , which will give us a solution of size k' , or we will obtain a bound on $\text{cost}(F_2)$. The following lemma is our main tool for bounding the cost of the solution returned.

Lemma 2.15. *Let $F \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$, and let $T_F = \{(i, r'_i)\}_{i \in \mu(F)}$ where $r'_i \leq r$ for each $(i, r) \in F$. Suppose $T_F \subseteq AT$ and pairs in T_F are non-intersecting. If $|F| \geq k'$ and $|AD \setminus \bigcup_{(i, r) \in F} B(i, r)| \geq m$ then $\text{cost}(T_F) \leq (1+\epsilon)OPT$. Moreover, if $|F| > k'$ then $z_1 \leq (1+\epsilon)OPT$.*

Proof. Let Out_F be a subset of exactly m of clients from $AD \setminus \bigcup_{(i, r) \in F} B(i, r)$. Since the pairs in T_F are non-intersecting and almost tight, $\sum_{i \in \mu(F)} (r'_i + z_1) \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}' \setminus Out_F} (\alpha_j^1 + 2^n \delta_z)$, so

$$\sum_{i \in \mu(F)} (r'_i + z_1) \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} (\alpha_j^1 + 2^n \delta_z) - m(\gamma^1 - 2^n \delta_z) \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j^1 - m\gamma^1 + (m + |\mathcal{D}'|)2^n \delta_z \leq (1+\epsilon)OPT + k'z_1$$

where the last inequality follows since $(\alpha^1, \gamma^1, z_1)$ is a feasible solution to (D_2) . So $\text{cost}(T_F) \leq (1+\epsilon)OPT$ if $|T_F| = |F| \geq k'$, and $z_1 \leq (1+\epsilon)OPT$ if $|F| > k'$. \square

Define a mapping $\psi : F_2 \rightarrow F_1 \setminus f_1$ as follows. Note that any $(i, r) \in F_2$ may intersect with at most one F_1 -pair: if it intersects $(i', r'), (i'', r'') \in F_1$, then we have $c(i', i'') \leq 12R^*$. First, for each $(i, r) \in F_2$ that intersects with some $(i', r') \in F_1$, we set $\psi(i, r) = (i', r')$. Let $M \subseteq F_2$ be the F_2 -pairs mapped by ψ this way. For every $(i, r) \in F_2 \setminus M$, we arbitrarily match (i, r) with a *distinct* $(i', r') \in F_1 \setminus \psi(M)$. We claim that ψ is in fact a one-one function.

Lemma 2.16. *Every $(i, r) \in F_1 \setminus f_1$ intersects with at most one F_2 -pair.*

Proof. Suppose two pairs $(i_1, r_1), (i_2, r_2) \in F_2$ intersect with a common pair $(i, r) \in F_1 \setminus f_1$. Let $T_{1,I}$ be the tight pairs corresponding to $F_1 \setminus f_1$ obtained from (the pruning phase of) $\text{PDAIlg}^\circ(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', z_1)$. Let $(i, \text{rad}_1(i)) \in T_{1,I}$ be the tight pair corresponding to (i, r) . Let $(i_1, \text{rad}_2(i_1)), (i_2, \text{rad}_2(i_2))$ be the tight pairs corresponding to $(i_1, r_1), (i_2, r_2)$ obtained from $\text{PDAIlg}^\circ(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', z_2)$. Let $F'' = F_1 \setminus \{f_1, (i, r)\} \cup (i, r + 12R^*)$. We show that either $z_1 \leq \text{OPT}$ or $|\text{uncov}(F'')| \leq m$, both of which lead to a contradiction.

Define $F' = F_1 \setminus \{f_1, (i, r)\} \cup \{(i_1, r_1), (i_2, r_2)\}$, so $|F'| = k + 1$. Consider the set $T_{F'} = T_{1,I} \setminus \{(i, \text{rad}_1(i))\} \cup \{(i_1, \text{rad}_2(i_1)), (i_2, \text{rad}_2(i_2))\}$. Since $(i_1, \text{rad}_2(i_1))$ and $(i_2, \text{rad}_2(i_2))$ are non-intersecting and they do not intersect with any pair in $T_{1,I} \setminus (i, \text{rad}_1(i))$, the pairs in $T_{F'}$ are non-intersecting. Also, $T_{F'} \subseteq AT$. If $|AD \cap \text{uncov}(F')| = |AD \setminus \bigcup_{(i', r') \in F'} B(i', r')| \geq m$, then $z_1 \leq \text{OPT}$ by Lemma 2.15.

Otherwise, note that every client in $B(i_1, r_1) \cup B(i_2, r_2)$ is at distance at most $r + 2 \max\{r_1, r_2\} \leq r + 6R^*$ from i . So we have $\text{uncov}(F'') \subseteq \text{uncov}(F) \cup B_{f_1} \subseteq AD$ and $\text{uncov}(F'') \subseteq \text{uncov}(F')$. So $|\text{uncov}(F'')| \leq |AD \cap \text{uncov}(F')| \leq m$. \square

Let F'_2 be the pairs $(i, r) \in F_2$ such that if $(i', r') = \psi(i, r)$, then $r' < r$. Let $P = F'_2 \cap M$ and $Q = F'_2 \setminus M$. For every $(i', r') \in \psi(Q)$ and $j \in B(i', r')$, we have $j \in \text{uncov}(F_2) \subseteq AD$ (else (i', r') would lie in $\psi(M)$). Starting with $F = F_1 \setminus f_1$, we iterate over $(i, r) \in F'_2$ and do the following. Let $(i', r') = \psi(i, r)$. If $(i, r) \in P$, we update $F \leftarrow F \setminus (i', r') \cup (i, r + 2r')$ (so $B(i, r + 2r') \supseteq B(i', r')$), else we update $F \leftarrow F \setminus (i', r') \cup (i, r)$. Let $T_F = \{(i, \text{rad}_1(i))\}_{(i,r) \in F \cap F_1} \cup \{(i, \text{rad}_2(i))\}_{(i,r) \in F \setminus F_1}$. Note that $|F| = k'$ and $\text{uncov}(F) \subseteq AD$ at all times. Also, since (i, r) intersects only (i', r') , which we remove when (i, r) is added, we maintain that T_F is a collection of non-intersecting pairs and a subset of $AT \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$. This process continues until $|\text{uncov}(F)| \leq m$, or when all pairs of F'_2 are swapped in. In the former case, we argue that $\text{cost}(F)$ is small and return $(F, \{\text{rad}_1(i)\}_{(i,r) \in F \cap F_1} \cup \{\text{rad}_2(i)\}_{(i,r) \in F \setminus F_1})$. In the latter case, we show that $\text{cost}(F'_2)$, and hence $\text{cost}(F_2)$ is small, and return (F_2, rad_2) .

Lemma 2.17. (i) If the algorithm stops with $|\text{uncov}(F)| \leq m$, then $\text{cost}(F) \leq (9 + 3\epsilon)\text{OPT} + 18R^*$.

(ii) If case (i) does not apply, then $\text{cost}(F_2) \leq (3 + 3\epsilon)\text{OPT} + 9R^*$.

(iii) The pairs corresponding to the radii returned are non-intersecting and form a subset of \mathcal{L}' .

Proof. Part (iii) follows readily from the algorithm description and the discussion above. Consider part (i). Let $(i, r) \in F'_2$ be the last pair scanned by the algorithm before it terminates, and $(i', r') = \psi(i, r)$. Let F' be the set F before the last iteration. So $F' = F \setminus (i, r + 2r') \cup (i', r')$ if $(i, r) \in P$, and $F' = F \setminus (i, r) \cup (i', r')$ if $(i, r) \in Q$. Note that $r + 2r' \leq 9R^*$. Since $\text{uncov}(F') \subseteq AD$ and $|\text{uncov}(F')| > m$, by Lemma 2.15, we have $\text{cost}(T_{F'}) \leq (1 + \epsilon)\text{OPT}$. For all $(i, r) \in F_1$, we have $r \leq 3\text{rad}_1(i)$ (since $f_1 \in F_1$). For all but at most one $(i, r) \in F_2$, we have $r \leq 3\text{rad}_2(i)$ and for the one possible exception, we have $r \leq 3R^*$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cost}(F) &\leq \text{cost}(F' \cap F_1) + \text{cost}(F' \setminus F_1) + 9R^* \leq 3 \cdot \text{cost}(T_{F'}) + 3R^* + 2 \cdot \text{cost}(F_1 \setminus F') + 9R^* \\ &\leq 3(1 + \epsilon)\text{OPT} + 3R^* + 2(3 \cdot \text{OPT} + 3R^*) + 9R^* = (9 + 3\epsilon)\text{OPT} + 18R^*. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality above follows since $\text{cost}(F' \cap F_1) \leq \sum_{(i,r) \in F' \cap F_1} 3\text{rad}_1(i)$ and $\text{cost}(F' \setminus F_1) \leq \sum_{(i,r) \in F' \setminus F_1} 3\text{rad}_2(i) + 3R^* + 2\text{cost}(F_1 \setminus F')$.

For part (ii), Lemma 2.15 shows that $\text{cost}(T_F) \leq (1 + \epsilon)\text{OPT}$, and so $\text{cost}(F'_2) + \text{cost}(F_1 \setminus (f_1 \cup \psi(F'_2))) \leq 3 \cdot \text{cost}(T_F) + 3R^*$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cost}(F_2) &= \text{cost}(F'_2) + \text{cost}(F_2 \setminus F'_2) \leq \text{cost}(F'_2) + \text{cost}(\psi(F_2 \setminus F'_2)) \\ &= \text{cost}(F'_2) + \text{cost}(F_1 \setminus (f_1 \cup \psi(F'_2))) \leq 3(1 + \epsilon) \cdot \text{OPT} + 3R^* \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows by the definition of F'_2 . \square

Algorithm k -BSAlg $^\circ(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', k', \epsilon)$. Output: $F \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ with $|F| \leq k'$, a radius $\text{rad}(i)$ for all $i \in \mu(F)$.

- C1. **Binary search.** Let $(F_1, \text{rad}_1, \dots) = \text{PDAlg}^\circ(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', 0)$. If $|F_1| \leq k'$ pairs, return (F_1, rad_1) . Else perform binary-search in the range $[0, n c_{\max}]$ to find z_1, z_2 with $0 \leq z_2 - z_1 \leq \delta_z = \frac{\epsilon \cdot \text{OPT}}{3n2^n}$ such that letting $(F_p, f_p, \text{Out}_p, \text{rad}_p, \alpha^p, \gamma^p) = \text{PDAlg}(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', z_p)$ for $p = 1, 2$, we have $|F_2| \leq k' < |F_1|$.
- C2. Let $(F_A, \{\text{rad}_A(i)\}_{i \in \mu(F_A)}) = \mathcal{A}((F_1, \text{rad}_1), (F_2, \text{rad}_2))$ (Section 2.2.1). If $|F_1 \setminus f_1| > k'$, return (F_A, rad_A) .
- C3. If $\exists(i, r) \in F_1 \setminus f_1$ such that $|\text{uncov}(F_1 \setminus \{f_1, (i, r)\} \cup (i, r + 12R^*))| \leq m$, then set $F = F_1 \setminus \{f_1, (i, r)\} \cup (i, r + 12R^*)$. If $\exists(i, r), (i', r') \in F_1$ such that $c(i, i') \leq 12R^*$, let r'' be the minimum $\rho \geq r$ such that $B(i', r') \subseteq B(i, \rho)$; set $F = F_1 \setminus \{(i, r), (i', r')\} \cup (i, r'')$. If either of the above apply, return $(F, \{\text{rad}_1(i)\}_{i \in \mu(F)})$.
- C4. Let $(F_B, \{\text{rad}_B(i)\}_{i \in \mu(F_B)})$ be the output of subroutine \mathcal{B} (Section 2.2.2).
- C5. If $\text{cost}(F_A) \leq \text{cost}(F_B)$, return (F_A, rad_A) , else return (F_B, rad_B) .
-

Theorem 2.18. k -BSAlg $^\circ(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', k')$ returns a solution (F, rad) with $\text{cost}(F) \leq (12.365 + O(\epsilon)) \cdot \text{OPT} + O(R^*)$ where $\{(i, \text{rad}(i))\}_{i \in \mu(F)} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$ comprises non-intersecting pairs.

Proof. This follows essentially from Theorem 2.14 and Lemma 2.17. When $z_1 \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \text{OPT}$, Theorem 2.14 yields the above bound on $\text{cost}(F_A)$. Otherwise, if none of the cases in step C3 apply, then Lemma 2.17 bounds $\text{cost}(F_B)$. In the boundary cases, when we terminate in step C1 or C3, we have $\text{cost}(F) \leq \text{cost}(F_1 \setminus f_1) + \text{cost}(f_1) + 12R^*$, which is at most the expression in the theorem due to part (ii) of Theorem 2.9. \square

3 Minimizing the maximum radius with lower bounds and outliers

The *lower-bounded k -supplier with outliers* (LBkSupO) problem is the min max-radius version of LBkSRO. The input and the set of feasible solutions are the same as in LBkSRO: the input is an instance $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}, \{L_i\}, \{c(i, j)\}, k', m)$, and a feasible solution is $(S \subseteq \mathcal{F}, \sigma : \mathcal{D} \mapsto S \cup \{\text{out}\})$ with $|S| \leq k$, $|\sigma^{-1}(i)| \geq L_i$ for all $i \in S$, and $|\sigma^{-1}(\text{out})| \leq m$. The cost of (S, σ) is now $\max_{i \in S} \max_{j \in \sigma^{-1}(i)} c(i, j)$. The special case where $m = 0$ is called the *lower-bounded k -supplier* (LBkSup) problem, and the setting where $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{F}$ is often called the *k -center* version.

Let τ^* denote the optimal value; note that there are only polynomially many choices for τ^* . As is common in the study of min-max problems, we reduce the problem to a “graphical” instance, where given some value τ , we try to find a solution of cost $O(\tau)$ or deduce that $\tau^* > \tau$. We construct a bipartite unweighted graph $G_\tau = (V_\tau = \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{F}_\tau, E_\tau)$, where $\mathcal{F}_\tau = \{i \in \mathcal{F} : |B(i, \tau)| \geq L_i\}$, and $E_\tau = \{ij : c(i, j) \leq \tau, i \in \mathcal{F}_\tau, j \in \mathcal{D}\}$. Let $\text{dist}_\tau(i, j)$ denote the shortest-path distance in G_τ between i and j , so $c(i, j) \leq \text{dist}_\tau(i, j) \cdot \tau$. We say that an assignment $\sigma : \mathcal{D} \mapsto \mathcal{F}_\tau \cup \{\text{out}\}$ is a *distance- α assignment* if $\text{dist}_\tau(j, \sigma(j)) \leq \alpha$ for every client j with $\sigma(j) \neq \text{out}$. We call such an assignment feasible, if it yields a feasible LBkSupO-solution, and we say that G_τ is feasible if it admits a feasible distance-1 assignment. It is not hard to see that given $F \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\tau$, the problem of finding a feasible distance- α -assignment $\sigma : \mathcal{D} \mapsto F \cup \{\text{out}\}$ in G_τ (if one exists) can be solved by creating a network-flow instance with lower bounds and capacities.

Observe that an optimal solution yields a feasible distance-1 assignment in G_{τ^*} . We devise an algorithm that for every τ , either finds a feasible distance- α assignment in G_τ for some constant α , or detects that G_τ is not feasible. This immediately yields an α -approximation algorithm since the smallest τ for which the algorithm returns a feasible LBkSupO-solution must be at most τ^* . We obtain Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 via this template.

Theorem 3.1. *There is a 3-approximation algorithm for LBkSup.*

Theorem 3.2. *There is a 5-approximation algorithm for LBkSupO.*

We complement our approximation results via a simple hardness result (Theorem 3.3) showing that our approximation factor for LBkSup is tight. We also show that LBkSupO is equivalent to the k -center version (i.e., where $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}$) of the problem (Appendix C); a similar equivalence is known to hold for the *capacitated* versions of k -supplier and k -center with outliers [15].

Theorem 3.3. *It is NP-hard to approximate LBkSup within a factor better than 3, unless $P = NP$.*

Proof. The result is shown via a reduction from set cover problem. Suppose we have a set cover instance with set $\mathcal{U} = [n]$ of elements and collection $\mathcal{S} = \cup_{p=1}^{n'} \{S_p\}$ of subsets of \mathcal{U} , and we want to know if there exists k subsets of \mathcal{U} in \mathcal{S} that cover all elements of \mathcal{U} . Let j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n represent the elements and $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{n'}$ represent subsets of \mathcal{U} in \mathcal{S} . Construct an LBkSup instance \mathcal{I} with client set $\mathcal{D} = \cup_{p=1}^n \{j_p\}$, facility set $\mathcal{F} = \cup_{q=1}^{n'} \{i_q\}$, define $c(j_p, i_q)$ for $j_p \in \mathcal{D}, i_q \in \mathcal{F}$ to be 1 if $p \in S_q$, 3 otherwise, and let $L_i = 1$ for each $i \in \mathcal{F}$. Suppose there exists a collection F of k subsets in \mathcal{S} that cover all elements. First, remove any set i in F , if i does not cover an element that is not covered by $F \setminus i$. Let $\sigma : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow F$ be defined for element j to be some set in F that covers j . Since each set i in F covers at least one element that is not covered by $F \setminus i$, $|\sigma^{-1}(i)| \geq 1$, so (F, σ) is a feasible solution to \mathcal{I} with radius 1. If no collection of k subsets of \mathcal{U} in \mathcal{S} covers all elements, then there does not exist k facilities in \mathcal{F} that all elements are at distance at most 1 from them, so optimal solution of \mathcal{I} has cost at least 3. Therefore, it is NP-hard to approximate LBkSup with a factor better than 3 as otherwise the algorithm can be used to answer the decision problem. \square

Finding a distance-3 assignment for LBkSup. Consider the graph G_{τ^*} . Note that there exists an optimal center among the neighbors of each client in G . Moreover, two clients at distance at least 3 are served by two distinct centers. These insights motivate the following algorithm.

Let $N(v)$ denote the neighbors of vertex v in the given graph G_{τ} . Find a maximal subset Γ of clients with distance at least 3 from each other. If $|\Gamma| > k$ or there exists a client j with $N(j) = \emptyset$, then return G_{τ} is not feasible. For each $j \in \Gamma$, let i_j denote the center in $N(j)$ with minimum lower bound. If there exists a feasible distance-3 assignment σ of clients to $F = \cup_{j \in \Gamma} \{i_j\}$, return σ , otherwise return G_{τ} is not feasible. The following lemma yields Theorem 3.1.

Lemma 3.4. *The above algorithm finds a feasible distance-3 assignment in G_{τ} if G_{τ} is feasible.*

Proof. Let $\sigma^* : \mathcal{D} \mapsto F^*$ be a feasible distance-1 assignment in G_{τ} . So $F^* \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\tau}$ and every client has a non-empty neighbor set. Since each client in Γ has to be served by a distinct center in F^* , $|\Gamma| \leq |F^*| \leq k$. For each client $j \in \Gamma$, let $i_j^* = \sigma^*(j)$. Note that $i_j^* \in N(j)$, so $L_{i_j} \leq L_{i_j^*}$ by the choice of i_j , and every client in $\sigma^{*-1}(i_j^*)$ is at distance at most 3 from i_j .

We show that there is a feasible distance-3 assignment $\sigma : \mathcal{D} \mapsto F$. For each $j \in \Gamma$, we assign all clients in $\sigma^{*-1}(i_j^*)$ to i_j . As argued above this satisfies the lower bound of i_j . For any unassigned client j , let $j' \in \Gamma$ be a client at distance at most 2 from j (which must exist by maximality of Γ). We assign j to $i_{j'}$. \square

Finding a distance-5 assignment for LBkSupO. The main idea here is to find a set $F \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\tau}$ of at most k centers that are close to the centers in $F^* \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\tau}$ for some feasible distance-1 assignment $\sigma^* : \mathcal{D} \mapsto F^* \cup \{\text{out}\}$ in G_{τ} . The non-outlier clients of (F^*, σ^*) are close to F , so there are at least $|\mathcal{D}| - m$ clients close to F . If centers in F do not share a neighbor in G_{τ} , then clients in $N(i)$ can be assigned to i for each $i \in F$ to satisfy the lower bounds. We cannot check if F satisfies the above properties, but using an idea similar to that in [15], we will find a sequence of facility sets such that at least one of these sets will have the desired properties when G_{τ} is feasible.

Definition 3.5. Given the bipartite graph G_τ , a set $F \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ is called a *skeleton* if it satisfies the following properties.

- (a) (*Separation property*) For $i, i' \in F$, $i \neq i'$, we have $\text{dist}_\tau(i, i') \geq 6$;
- (b) There exists a feasible distance-1 assignment $\sigma^* : \mathcal{D} \mapsto F^* \cup \{\text{out}\}$ in G_τ such that
 - (*Covering property*) For all $i^* \in F^*$, $\text{dist}_\tau(i^*, F) \leq 4$, where $\text{dist}_\tau(i^*, F) = \min_{i \in F} \text{dist}_\tau(i^*, i)$.
 - (*Injection property*) There exists $f : F \mapsto F^*$ such that $\text{dist}_\tau(i, f(i)) \leq 2$ for all $i \in F$.

If F satisfies the separation and injection properties, it is called a *pre-skeleton*.

Note that if $F \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\tau$ is a skeleton or pre-skeleton, then G_τ is feasible. Suppose $F \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\tau$ is a skeleton and satisfies the properties with respect to a feasible distance-1 assignment (F^*, σ^*) . The separation property ensures that the neighbor sets of any two locations $i, i' \in F$ are disjoint. The covering property ensures that F^* is at distance at most 4 from F , so there are at least $|\mathcal{D}| - m$ clients at distance at most 5 from F . Finally, the injection and separation properties together ensure that $|F| \leq k$ since no two locations in F can be mapped to the same location in F^* . Thus, if F is a skeleton, then we can obtain a feasible distance-5 assignment $\sigma : \mathcal{D} \mapsto F \cup \{\text{out}\}$.

Lemma 3.6. Let F be a pre-skeleton in G_τ . Define $U = \{i \in \mathcal{F}_\tau : \text{dist}_\tau(i, F) \geq 6\}$ and let $i = \arg \max_{i' \in U} |N(i')|$. Then, either F is a skeleton, or $F \cup \{i\}$ is a pre-skeleton.

Proof. Suppose F is not a skeleton and $F \cup \{i\}$ is not a pre-skeleton. Let $\sigma^* : \mathcal{D} \mapsto F^* \cup \{\text{out}\}$ be a feasible distance-1 assignment in G_τ such F satisfies the injection property with respect to (F^*, σ^*) . Let $f : F \mapsto F^*$ be the mapping given by the injection property. Since $F \cup \{i\}$ is not a pre-skeleton and $\text{dist}_\tau(i, F) \geq 6$, this implies that $\text{dist}_\tau(i, F^*) > 2$, and hence, $\text{dist}_\tau(i, F^*) \geq 4$ as G_τ is bipartite. This means that all clients in $N(i)$ are outliers in (F^*, σ^*) . Moreover, since F is not a skeleton, there exists a center $i^* \in F^*$ with $\text{dist}_\tau(i^*, F) > 4$, and so $\text{dist}(i^*, F) \geq 6$. Therefore, $i^* \in U$. By the choice of i , we know that $|N(i)| \geq |N(i^*)|$. Now consider $F' = F^* \setminus \{i^*\} \cup \{i\}$, and define $\sigma' : \mathcal{D} \mapsto F' \cup \{\text{out}\}$ as follows: $\sigma'(j) = \sigma^*(j)$ for all $j \notin N(i) \cup N(i^*)$, $\sigma'(j) = i$ for all $j \in N(i)$, and $\sigma'(j) = \text{out}$ for all $j \in N(i^*)$. Note that the F covers as many clients as F^* , and so $\sigma' : \mathcal{D} \mapsto F' \cup \{\text{out}\}$ is another feasible distance-1 assignment. But this yields a contradiction since $F \cup \{i\}$ now satisfies the injection property with respect to (F', σ') as certified by the function $f' : F \rightarrow F'$ defined by $f'(s) = f(s)$ for $s \in F$, $f'(i) = i$. \square

If G_τ is feasible, then \emptyset is a pre-skeleton. A skeleton can have size at most k . So using Lemma 3.6, we can find a sequence \mathcal{F}' of at most $k + 1$ subsets of \mathcal{F}_τ by starting with \emptyset and repeatedly applying Lemma 3.6 until we either have a set of size k or the set U in Lemma 3.6 is empty. By Lemma 3.6, if G_τ is feasible then one of these sets must be a skeleton. So for each $F \in \mathcal{F}'$, we check if there exists a feasible distance-5 assignment $\sigma : \mathcal{D} \mapsto F \cup \{\text{out}\}$, and if so, return (F, σ) . Otherwise we return that G_τ is not feasible.

References

- [1] Gagan Aggarwal, Tomás Feder, Krishnaram Kenthapadi, Samir Khuller, Rina Panigrahy, Dilys Thomas, and An Zhu. Achieving anonymity via clustering. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 6(3):49, 2010.
- [2] Gagan Aggarwal, Tomás Feder, Krishnaram Kenthapadi, Rajeev Motwani, Rina Panigrahy, Dilys Thomas, and An Zhu. Approximation algorithms for k-anonymity. *Journal of Privacy Technology (JOPT)*, 2005.
- [3] Sara Ahmadian and Chaitanya Swamy. Approximation guarantees for clustering problems with lower bounds and outliers. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*, 2016.

- [4] Sara Ahmadian and Chaitanya Swamy. Improved approximation guarantees for lower-bounded facility location. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Approximation and Online Algorithms (WAOA)*, pages 257–271, 2012.
- [5] Hyung-Chan An, Aditya Bhaskara, Chandra Chekuri, Shalmoli Gupta, Vivek Madan, and Ola Svensson. Centrality of trees for capacitated k-center. *Mathematical Programming*, 154(1-2):29–53, 2015.
- [6] Babak Behsaz and Mohammad R. Salavatipour. On minimum sum of radii and diameters clustering. *Algorithmica*, 73(1):143–165, 2015.
- [7] Jarosław Byrka, Thomas Pensyl, Bartosz Rybicki, Aravind Srinivasan, and Khoa Trinh. An improved approximation for k-median, and positive correlation in budgeted optimization. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 737–756, 2015.
- [8] Vasilis Capoyleas, Günter Rote, and Gerhard Woeginger. Geometric clusterings. *Journal of Algorithms*, 12(2):341–356, 1991.
- [9] Moses Charikar and Sudipto Guha. Improved combinatorial algorithms for facility location problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 34(4):803–824, 2005.
- [10] Moses Charikar, Sudipto Guha, Éva Tardos, and David B Shmoys. A constant-factor approximation algorithm for the k-median problem. In *Proceedings of the 31st annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 1–10, 1999.
- [11] Moses Charikar, Samir Khuller, David Mount, and Giri Narasimhan. Algorithms for facility location problems with outliers. In *Proceedings of the 12th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 642–651, 2001.
- [12] Moses Charikar and Rina Panigrahy. Clustering to minimize the sum of cluster diameters. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 1–10, 2001.
- [13] Ke Chen. A constant factor approximation algorithm for k-median clustering with outliers. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 826–835, 2008.
- [14] Marek Cygan, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, and Samir Khuller. Lp rounding for k-centers with non-uniform hard capacities. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 273–282, 2012.
- [15] Marek Cygan and Tomasz Kociumaka. Constant factor approximation for capacitated k-center with outliers. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS)*, pages 251–262, 2014.
- [16] Srinivas R Doddi, Madhav V Marathe, SS Ravi, David Scot Taylor, and Peter Widmayer. Approximation algorithms for clustering to minimize the sum of diameters. In *Proceedings of the 11th Scandinavian Workshop on Algorithm Theory (SWAT)*, pages 237–250, 2000.
- [17] Alina Ene, Sarel Har-Peled, and Benjamin Raichel. Fast clustering with lower bounds: No customer too far, no shop too small. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1304.7318*, 2013.
- [18] Matt Gibson, Gaurav Kanade, Erik Krohn, Imran A Pirwani, and Kasturi Varadarajan. On metric clustering to minimize the sum of radii. *Algorithmica*, 57(3):484–498, 2010.

- [19] Matt Gibson, Gaurav Kanade, Erik Krohn, Imran A Pirwani, and Kasturi Varadarajan. On clustering to minimize the sum of radii. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 41(1):47–60, 2012.
- [20] Sudipto Guha, Adam Meyerson, and Kamesh Munagala. Hierarchical placement and network design problems. In *Proceedings of 41st Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 603–612, 2000.
- [21] Dorit S Hochbaum and David B Shmoys. A best possible heuristic for the k-center problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 10(2):180–184, 1985.
- [22] Dorit S Hochbaum and David B Shmoys. A unified approach to approximation algorithms for bottleneck problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 33(3):533–550, 1986.
- [23] Kamal Jain and Vijay V Vazirani. Approximation algorithms for metric facility location and k-median problems using the primal-dual schema and lagrangian relaxation. *Journal of the ACM*, 48(2):274–296, 2001.
- [24] David R. Karger and Maria Minkoff. Building steiner trees with incomplete global knowledge. In *Proceedings of 41st Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 613–623, 2000.
- [25] Samir Khuller and Yoram J Sussmann. The capacitated k-center problem. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 13(3):403–418, 2000.
- [26] Shi Li and Ola Svensson. Approximating k-median via pseudo-approximation. In *Proceedings of the 44th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 901–910, 2013.
- [27] Andrew Lim, Fan Wang, and Zhou Xu. A transportation problem with minimum quantity commitment. *Transportation Science*, 40(1):117–129, 2006.
- [28] Pitu B Mirchandani and Richard L Francis. *Discrete location theory*. Wiley-Interscience, 1990.
- [29] Pierangela Samarati. Protecting respondents identities in microdata release. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 13(6):1010–1027, 2001.
- [30] David B Shmoys. The design and analysis of approximation algorithms. *Trends in Optimization: American Mathematical Society Short Course, January 5-6, 2004, Phoenix, Arizona*, 61:85, 2004.
- [31] Zoya Svitkina. Lower-bounded facility location. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 6(4):69, 2010.

A Improved Approximation Ratio for LBkSR

We now describe in detail the changes to algorithm k -BSAlg and its analysis leading to Theorem 2.7. First, we set $\delta_z = \frac{\epsilon OPT}{3n2^n}$ in the binary-search procedure (step B1); note that the binary search still takes polynomial time. By Lemma 2.11 (specialized to the non-outlier setting), we have $\|\alpha^1 - \alpha^2\|_\infty \leq 2^n \delta_z$, which implies that every $(i, r) \in T_1 \cup T_2$ is almost tight with respect to (α^p, z_p) for $p = 1, 2$. To obtain the improved guarantee, we construct the mapping $\pi : F_1 \mapsto F_2$, and hence, our stars, based on whether pairs $(i', \text{rad}_1(i'))$ and $(i, \text{rad}_2(i))$ intersect for $i' \in \mu(F_1)$, $i \in \mu(F_2)$. To ensure that every $(i', r') \in F_1$ belongs to some star, we first modify F_2 and $T_{2,I}$ by including non-intersecting pairs from $T_{1,I}$ (which are almost tight in (α^2, z_2)). We consider pairs in F_1 in arbitrary order. For each $(i, r) \in F_1$, if $(i, \text{rad}_1(i))$ does not intersect any pair in $T_{2,I}$, we add $(i, \text{rad}_1(i))$ to $T_{2,I}$, add (i, r) to F_2 , and set $\text{rad}_2(i) = \text{rad}_1(i)$. We continue this process until all pairs in F_1 are scanned or $|F_2| = k'$.

Lemma A.1. *If $|F_2| = k'$ after the above process, then F_2 is a feasible k -BS solution with $\text{cost}(F_2) \leq (3 + \epsilon)OPT$, and $T_{2,I} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$ is a set of non-intersecting pairs.*

Proof. All clients in \mathcal{D}' are covered by balls corresponding to the F_2 -pairs since this holds even before any pairs are added to F_2 . It is clear that $T_{2,I} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$ and consists of non-intersecting pairs. Using Lemma 2.11, we have $\sum_{(\hat{i}, \hat{r}) \in T_{2,I}} (\hat{r} + z_1) \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j^1 + 2^n \delta_z |T_{2,I}|$, so $\sum_{(\hat{i}, \hat{r}) \in T_{2,I}} \hat{r} \leq (1 + \frac{\epsilon}{3})OPT$. For every $(i, r) \in F_2$ we have $r \leq 3\text{rad}_2(i)$, so $\text{cost}(F_2) \leq \sum_{(\hat{i}, \hat{r}) \in T_{2,I}} 3\hat{r} \leq (3 + \epsilon)OPT$. \square

So if $|F_2| = k'$ after the above preprocessing, we simply return (F_2, rad_2) . Otherwise, we combine solutions F_1 and F_2 using an LP similar to (C-P). We construct a map $\pi : F_1 \rightarrow F_2$ similar to before, but with the small modification that we set $\pi(i', r') = (i, r)$ only if $(i', \text{rad}_1(i'))$ intersects with $(i, \text{rad}_2(i))$. Due to our preprocessing, π is well-defined. As before, let $\text{star } \mathcal{S}_{i,r} = \pi^{-1}(i, r)$ for each $(i, r) \in F_2$.




Figure 2: Old combination method.
 $\mathcal{S}_{i,r} = \{(i_1, r_1), (i_2, r_2), (i_3, r_3)\}$




Figure 3: New combination method.
 $\mathcal{S}_{i,r} = \{(i_1, r_1), (i_2, r_2), (i_3, r_3)\}$

The LP again has an indicator variable $x_{i,r}$. If $x_{i,r} = 0$, we select all pairs in $\mathcal{S}_{i,r}$. Otherwise, if $\mathcal{S}_{i,r} \neq \emptyset$, we select a pair $(i', r') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r}$ and include $(i', 2\text{rad}_2(i) + \sum_{(i'', r'') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r}} 4\text{rad}_1(i''))$ in our solution; note that the corresponding ball covers all clients in $\bigcup_{(i'', r'') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r}} B(i'', r'')$. So we consider the following LP.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{(i,r) \in F_2} \left(x_{i,r} (2\text{rad}_2(i) + \sum_{(i',r') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r}} 4\text{rad}_1(i')) + (1 - x_{i,r}) \sum_{(i',r') \in \mathcal{S}_{i,r}} 3\text{rad}_1(i') \right) \quad (\text{C-P}') \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{(i,r) \in F_2} (x_{i,r} + |\mathcal{S}_{i,r}|(1 - x_{i,r})) \leq k, \quad 0 \leq x_{i,r} \leq 1 \quad \forall (i,r) \in F_2. \end{aligned}$$

Let x^* be an extreme point of (C-P'). Let F' be the pairs obtained by picking the pairs corresponding to $[x^*]$ as described above. Since x^* has at most one fractional component, it follows as before that $|F'| \leq k'$. As before, we return $(F', \{\text{rad}(i)\}_{\mu(i) \in F'})$ or $(F_2, \{\text{rad}_2(i)\})$, whichever has lower cost.

Let $C'_1 = \sum_{(i,r) \in F_1} \text{rad}_1(i)$ and $C'_2 = \sum_{(i',r') \in F_2} \text{rad}_2(i')$. The following claims are analogous to Claims 2.4 and 2.6.

Claim A.2. *We have $aC'_1 + bC'_2 \leq (1 + \frac{\epsilon}{3})OPT$.*

Proof. Using Lemma 2.11, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
aC'_1 + bC'_2 &= a \sum_{(i,r) \in F_1} \text{rad}_1(i) + b \sum_{(i,r) \in F_2} \text{rad}_2(i) \leq a \cdot \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j^1 - k_1 z_1 \right) + b \cdot \left(k_2 2^n \delta_z + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j^1 - k_2 z_2 \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} (a\alpha_j^1 + b\alpha_j^1) - (ak_1 + bk_2) \cdot z_1 + \frac{\epsilon}{3} \cdot OPT \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}'} \alpha_j^1 - k' \cdot z_1 + \frac{\epsilon}{3} \cdot OPT \leq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right) OPT. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Claim A.3. $\min\{3C'_2, 2bC'_2 + (3+b)C'_1\} \leq \frac{3(b+3)}{3b^2-2b+3}(aC'_1 + bC'_2) \leq 3.83(aC'_1 + bC'_2)$ for all $a, b \geq 0$ such that $a + b = 1$.

Proof. Since the minimum is less than any convex combination,

$$\begin{aligned}
\min(3C'_2, 2bC'_2 + bC'_1 + 3C'_1) &\leq \frac{3b^2 + b}{3b^2 - 2b + 3}(3C'_2) + \frac{-3b + 3}{3b^2 - 2b + 3}(2bC'_2 + bC'_1 + 3C'_1) \\
&= \frac{3(1-b)(b+3)}{3b^2 - 2b + 3}(C'_1) + \frac{3b(b+3)}{3b^2 - 2b + 3}C'_2 \\
&= \frac{3(b+3)}{3b^2 - 2b + 3}((1-b)C'_1 + bC'_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $a = 1 - b$, the first inequality in the claim follows. The expression $\frac{3(b+3)}{3b^2-2b+3}$ is maximized at $b = -3 + 2\sqrt{3}$, and has value $\frac{3}{8}(5 + 3\sqrt{3}) \approx 3.8235$, which yields the second inequality in the claim. \square

Lemma A.4. *The cost of the solution $(F, \{\text{rad}(i)\})$ returned by the above combination subroutine is at most $(3.83 + O(\epsilon))OPT + O(R^*)$ where $\{(i, \text{rad}(i))\}_{i \in \mu(F)} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$ is a set of non-intersecting pairs.*

Proof. First note that $\{\text{rad}(i)\}$ correspond to $\{\text{rad}_2(i)\}$ if $F = F_2$ and $\{\text{rad}(i)\} \subseteq \{\text{rad}_1(i)\}$ if $F = F'$, so in both cases it consists of non-intersecting pairs from \mathcal{L}' .

The cost of the pair included in F' corresponding to a fractional component of x^* is at most $7R^*$ as each $\text{rad}_p(i)$ is bounded by R^* for $p \in \{1, 2\}$. Since x^* has at most one fractional component, $\text{cost}(F') \leq OPT_{\text{C-P}'} + 7R^*$. Also, $OPT_{\text{C-P}'} \leq 2bC'_2 + (4b + 3a)C'_1 = 2bC'_2 + (3 + b)C'_1$, since setting $x_{i,r} = b$ for all $(i, r) \in F_2$ yields a feasible solution to (C-P') of this cost. Therefore, $\text{cost}(F) \leq \min\{3C'_2, 2bC'_2 + (b + 3)C'_1 + 7R^*\}$, which is at most $3.83(aC'_1 + bC'_2) + 7R^*$ by Claim A.3. Combining this with Claim A.2 yields the bound in the lemma. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.7. It suffices to show that when the selection $F^O = \{(i_1, r_1), \dots, (i_t, r_t)\}$ in step A1 corresponds to the t facilities in an optimal solution with largest radii, we obtain the desired approximation bound. In this case, if $t = k$, then F^O is an optimal solution; otherwise, we have $R^* \leq \frac{O^*}{t} \leq \epsilon O^*$ and $OPT \leq O^* - \sum_{p=1}^t r_p$. Combining Lemma A.4 and Lemma 2.1 then yields the theorem. \square

B Proof of Lemma 2.11

We abbreviate $\text{PDAIlg}^\circ(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{L}', z)$ to $\text{PDAIlg}^\circ(z)$. We use x^- to denote a quantity infinitesimally smaller than x . Consider the dual-ascent phase of PDAIlg° for z_1 and z_2 . First, suppose that $m = 0$. Sort clients with respect to their $\alpha_j^0 = \min(\alpha_j^1, \alpha_j^2)$ value. Let this ordering be $\alpha_1^0 \leq \alpha_2^0 \leq \dots \leq \alpha_n^0$. We prove by induction that $|\alpha_j^1 - \alpha_j^2| \leq 2^{j-1} \delta_z$.

For the base case, assume without loss of generality that $\alpha_j^0 = \alpha_j^1$, and let (i, r) be the tight pair that caused j to become inactive in $\text{PDAIlg}^\circ(z_1)$. Consider time point $t = \alpha_1^0$ in the two executions. By definition

all clients are active at time t^- in $\text{PDAI}g^\circ(z_2)$. So the contribution $\sum_{j \in B(i,r) \cap \mathcal{D}'}$ α_j of clients to the LHS of (3) at time t^- is at least as much as their contribution in $\text{PDAI}g^\circ(z_1)$ at time t^- . Therefore, we can increase α_1 by at most δ_z beyond time t in $\text{PDAI}g^\circ(z_2)$ as $z_2 - z_1 = \delta_z$.

Suppose we have shown that for all clients $j = 1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1$ (where $\ell \geq 2$), Now consider client ℓ and let (i, r) be the tight pair that makes ℓ inactive at time α_ℓ^0 in $\text{PDAI}g^\circ(z_p)$, where $p \in \{1, 2\}$. Consider time point $t = \alpha_\ell^0$ in both executions. By definition, all clients $j > \ell$ are still active at time t^- in both executions $\text{PDAI}g^\circ(z_1)$ and $\text{PDAI}g^\circ(z_2)$. (They might become inactive at time t but can not become inactive earlier.) The contribution $\sum_{j \in B(i,r) \cap \mathcal{D}'}$ α_j of clients to the LHS of (3) in the execution other than p at time t^- is at least their contribution in $\text{PDAI}g^\circ(z_p)$ at time t^- minus $\sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} 2^{j-1} \delta_z$. The values of z in the two executions differs by at most δ_z , so in the execution other than p , α_ℓ can grow beyond t by at most $(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} 2^{j-1}) \delta_z \leq 2^\ell \delta_z$.

Now if we consider a tight pair (i, r) in one of the execution, the value of *RHS* and *LHS* of $\sum_{j \in B(i,r)} \alpha_j \leq r + z$ for the other execution can differ by at most $(1 + \sum_{j=1}^n 2^{j-1}) \delta_z \leq 2^n \delta_z$.

Now consider the case where $m > 0$. Note that in this case, we can assume that we have the execution for $m = 0$, pick the first time at which there are at most m active clients, i.e., time γ in $\text{PDAI}g^\circ$, and set $\alpha_j = \gamma$ for every active client at this time point. Let $\gamma^0 = \min(\gamma^1, \gamma^2)$, suppose $\gamma^0 = \gamma_p$, where $p \in \{1, 2\}$. Note that by time $\gamma^0 + 2^n \delta_z$, all pairs that are tight in the p -th execution by time γ^0 are also tight in the other execution. So the number of active clients after this time point is at most m . Therefore $|\gamma^1 - \gamma^2| \leq 2^n \delta_z$. \square

C Equivalence of lower-bounded k -supplier with outliers and lower-bounded k -center with outliers

Let $\text{LB}k\text{CentO}$ denote the special case of $\text{LB}k\text{SupO}$ where $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}$. In this section, we show that if there exists an α -approximation for $\text{LB}k\text{CentO}$, then there exists an α -approximation for $\text{LB}k\text{SupO}$. Let $\mathcal{I} = (k, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}, c, L, m)$ be an instance of $\text{LB}k\text{SupO}$ with $N = |\mathcal{F}| + 1$ and $|\mathcal{D}| = n$. Define an instance $\mathcal{I}' = (k', \mathcal{D}', c', L', m')$ as follows: let $k' = k$ and $\mathcal{D}' = (\mathcal{D} \times \{1, 2, \dots, N\}) \cup \mathcal{F}$. Let $c'((j, p), i) = c(j, i)$ for each $j \in \mathcal{D}, p \in [N], i \in \mathcal{F}$, and let c' be the metric completion of these distances (i.e., $c'(q, q')$ is the shortest-path distance between q and q' with respect to these distances for $q, q' \in \mathcal{D}'$). Define $L'_i = NL_i$ for $i \in \mathcal{F}$ and $L'_{(j,p)} = N(n+1)$, and let $m' = N \cdot m + (N-1)$. Clearly \mathcal{I}' can be constructed from \mathcal{I} in polynomial time. The lower-bounds for $(j, p), j \in \mathcal{D}, p \in [N]$ are set so that $L'_{(j,p)} < |\mathcal{D}'|$, so (j, p) cannot be opened as a center in any feasible solution to \mathcal{I}' .

Let $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}')$ denote the value of optimal solution of \mathcal{I}' and $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I})$ denote the value of optimal solution of \mathcal{I} . We claim that $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}') \leq \text{OPT}(\mathcal{I})$. Let (F^*, σ^*) denote an optimal solution of \mathcal{I} . Let solution $(\hat{F}, \hat{\sigma})$ for \mathcal{I} be constructed as follows: let $\hat{F} = F^*$, for each $p \in [N]$, define $\sigma(q) = i$ for $q = (j, p)$ if $\sigma^*(j) = i$, and $\sigma(q) = \text{out}$ otherwise. Note that since there are at most m outliers in solution (F^*, σ^*) then there are at most $Nm + |\mathcal{F}| = Nm + (N-1)$ outliers in $(\hat{F}, \hat{\sigma})$. Clearly the radius of the opened centers is the same as before, so $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}') \leq \text{OPT}(\mathcal{I})$.

Now suppose there exists an α -approximation algorithm \mathcal{A} for $\text{LB}k\text{CentO}$ problem. Use \mathcal{A} to generate a solution $(\hat{F}, \hat{\sigma})$ for \mathcal{I}' with maximum radius R . As noted above, we have $\hat{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$. We construct a solution (\hat{F}, σ') for \mathcal{I} of maximum radius at most R using Algorithm 1.

Lemma C.1. *Solution (\hat{F}, σ') is a feasible solution to \mathcal{I} with maximum radius at most R , where σ' is the output of Algorithm 1.*

Proof. Consider any set $S \subseteq \hat{F}$. There are at least $\sum_{i \in S} NL_i$ clients in \mathcal{D}' assigned to S . Since there are at most $N-1$ facilities among \mathcal{D}' , there are at least $\frac{\sum_{i \in S} NL_i - (N-1)}{N} > \sum_{i \in S} L_i - 1$ clients at distance at most R from S . So there are at least $\sum_{i \in S} L_i$ clients in neighbor set of S in \mathcal{N} . It follows that every s - t cut

Algorithm 1 Constructing a feasible assignment σ'

- 1: Construct network $\mathcal{N} = (V, E)$ where $V = \{s, t\} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \hat{F}$ and $E = \{si : i \in \hat{F}\} \cup \{ij : i \in \hat{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}, c(i, j) \leq r\} \cup \{jt : j \in \mathcal{D}\}$.
 - 2: Set $l_{ij} = 0, u_{ij} = \infty$ for each $ij \in E, i \in \hat{F}, j \in \mathcal{D}$.
 - 3: Set $l_{si} = L_i, u_{si} = \infty$ for each $si \in E, i \in \hat{F}$.
 - 4: Set $l_{jt} = 0, u_{jt} = 1$ for each $jt \in E, j \in \mathcal{D}$.
 - 5: Let $f \leftarrow \text{max-flow}(\mathcal{N})$ respecting lower-bounds (l) and upper-bounds (u) on edges.
 - 6: **if** value of f is $\geq n - m$ **then**,
 - 7: set $\sigma'(j) = i$ if $f_{jt} = 1$ and $f_{ij} = 1$ for $i \in \hat{F}$.
 - 8: set $\sigma'(j) = \text{out}$ if $f_{jt} = 0$.
 - 9: **return** f .
 - 10: **return** $\sigma' = \emptyset$.
-

in \mathcal{N} has capacity at least $\sum_{i \in \hat{F}} L_i$, so there exists a flow f that satisfies the lower-bounds and upper-bounds on the edges.

It remains to show that value of f is at least $|\mathcal{D}| - m$. If there is an incoming edge to a client in \mathcal{N} , then a flow of 1 can be sent through j . So we want to bound the number of clients with no incoming edge in \mathcal{N} . If any copy of client j is served by some facility in the solution $(\hat{F}, \hat{\sigma})$ then j is at distance at most R from some facility in \hat{F} . Since there are at most $Nm + (N - 1)$ outliers in $(\hat{F}, \hat{\sigma})$, there are at most $\frac{Nm + (N-1)}{N} < m + 1$ clients with no incoming edge in \mathcal{N} . \square

Since algorithm \mathcal{A} is an α -approximation algorithm, we have $R \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}') \leq \alpha \text{OPT}(\mathcal{I})$.