

# Deterministic metric 1-median selection with very few queries <sup>\*</sup>

Ching-Lueh Chang<sup>†</sup>

January 6, 2022

## Abstract

Given an  $n$ -point metric space  $(M, d)$ , METRIC 1-MEDIAN asks for a point  $p \in M$  minimizing  $\sum_{x \in M} d(p, x)$ . We show that for each computable function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$  satisfying  $f(n) = \omega(1)$ , METRIC 1-MEDIAN has a deterministic,  $o(n)$ -query,  $o(f(n) \cdot \log n)$ -approximation and nonadaptive algorithm. Previously, no deterministic  $o(n)$ -query  $o(n)$ -approximation algorithms are known for METRIC 1-MEDIAN. On the negative side, we prove each deterministic  $O(n)$ -query algorithm for METRIC 1-MEDIAN to be not  $(\delta \log n)$ -approximate for a sufficiently small constant  $\delta > 0$ . We also refute the existence of deterministic  $o(n)$ -query  $O(\log n)$ -approximation algorithms.

**Keywords:** metric space; 1-median; median selection; query complexity; sublinear algorithm; sublinear computation

## 1 Introduction

An  $n$ -point metric space  $(M, d)$  is a size- $n$  set  $M$  endowed with a distance function  $d: M \times M \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that

- $d(x, y) = 0$  if and only if  $x = y$ ,

---

<sup>\*</sup>Part of this paper appears in *Proceedings of the 27th International Computing and Combinatorics Conference (COCOON 2021)*.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Yuan Ze University, Taoyuan, Taiwan. clchang@saturn.yzu.edu.tw

- $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ , and
- $d(x, y) + d(y, z) \geq d(x, z)$  (triangle inequality)

for all  $x, y, z \in M$  [16]. METRIC 1-MEDIAN asks for a point  $p \in M$  minimizing  $\sum_{x \in M} d(p, x)$ . Clearly, it has a brute-force  $O(n^2)$ -time algorithm. Furthermore, it generalizes the classical median selection [6] and can be generalized further to metric  $k$ -median clustering. In social network analysis, METRIC 1-MEDIAN asks for an actor with the maximum closeness centrality [17]. For all  $\beta \geq 1$ , a  $\beta$ -approximate 1-median of  $(M, d)$  is a point  $p \in M$  satisfying  $\sum_{y \in M} d(p, y) \leq \beta \cdot \min_{q \in M} \sum_{y \in M} d(q, y)$ . By convention, a  $\beta$ -approximation algorithm for METRIC 1-MEDIAN must output a  $\beta$ -approximate 1-median of  $(M, d)$ . A query inspects  $d(x, y)$  for some  $x, y \in M$ . An algorithm is nonadaptive if its  $i$ th query  $(x_i, y_i) \in M^2$  is independent of the answers to the first  $i - 1$  queries, for all  $i > 1$ . Write  $d_G$  for the distance function induced by an undirected graph  $G$ .

Indyk [11, 12] gives a Monte Carlo  $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ -time  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for METRIC 1-MEDIAN, where  $\epsilon > 0$ . His time complexity is optimal w.r.t.  $n$ . When restricted to  $\mathbb{R}^D$ , METRIC 1-MEDIAN has a Monte Carlo  $O(D \cdot \exp(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)))$ -time  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm [14]. The more general  $k$ -median clustering in metric spaces has streaming approximation algorithms [10], requires  $\Omega(nk)$  time for  $O(1)$ -approximations [15] and is inapproximable to within  $(1 + 2/e - \Omega(1))$  unless  $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{DTIME}(n^{O(\log \log n)})$  [13]. For  $\mathbb{R}^D$  and graph metrics, a well-studied problem is to find the average distance from a query point to a finite set of points [1, 8, 9].

Deterministic  $\omega(n)$ -query computation is almost completely understood for METRIC 1-MEDIAN: For all constants  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , the best approximation ratio achievable by deterministic  $o(n^2)$ -query and  $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$ -query algorithms is 4 and  $2\lceil 1/\epsilon \rceil$ , respectively [2, 4, 18]. The same holds with “query” replaced by “time” and regardless of whether the algorithms can be adaptive [2, 4]. In contrast, we study the largely unknown deterministic  $O(n)$ - or  $o(n)$ -query computation. An  $o(n)$ -query algorithm enjoys the strength of ignoring a  $1 - o(1)$  fraction of points.

It is folklore that every point is an  $(n - 1)$ -approximate 1-median. Surprisingly, this is the current best upper bound for deterministic  $o(n)$ -query algorithms. In particular, no deterministic  $o(n)$ -query  $o(n)$ -approximation algorithms are known for METRIC 1-MEDIAN. Instead, we give a deterministic,  $o(n)$ -query,  $o(f(n) \cdot \log n)$ -approximation and nonadaptive algorithm for each computable function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$  satisfying  $f(n) = \omega(1)$ . So, e.g., METRIC

1-MEDIAN has a deterministic  $o(n)$ -query  $o(\alpha(n) \cdot \log n)$ -approximation algorithm for the very slowly growing inverse Ackermann function  $\alpha(\cdot)$ . Our main technical discovery is that a  $\beta$ -approximate 1-median of  $(S, d|_{S \times S})$  (where  $d|_{S \times S}$  denotes  $d$  restricted to  $S \times S$ ) is an  $O(\beta n/|S|)$ -approximate 1-median of  $(M, d)$ , for all  $\emptyset \subsetneq S \subseteq M$  and  $\beta \geq 1$ . When  $S \subseteq M$  is a uniformly random set of a sufficiently large size, an approximate solution to metric  $k$ -median clustering for  $(S, d|_{S \times S})$  is a good one for  $(M, d)$  with high probability [7]. But our discovery is for *any*  $S$  and is new.

Chang [3] shows that METRIC 1-MEDIAN has a deterministic,  $O(\exp(O(1/\epsilon))) \cdot n \log n$ -time,  $O(\exp(O(1/\epsilon)) \cdot n)$ -query,  $(\epsilon \log n)$ -approximation and nonadaptive algorithm, for all  $\epsilon > 0$ . So deterministic  $O(n)$ -query algorithms can be  $(\epsilon \log n)$ -approximate for each  $\epsilon > 0$ . Currently, the best lower bound against deterministic  $O(n)$ -query algorithms is that they cannot be  $O(1)$ -approximate [4]. So there is a huge gap between Chang's [3] approximation ratio of  $\epsilon \log n$  and the current best lower bound. We close the gap by showing each deterministic  $O(n)$ -query algorithm for METRIC 1-MEDIAN to be not  $(\delta \log n)$ -approximate for a sufficiently small constant  $\delta > 0$  (depending on the algorithm). Our approach, sketched below, adversarially answers the queries of a deterministic  $O(n)$ -query algorithm Alg:

- (I) Start with the complete graph on  $M$ .
- (II) Mark all edges in an  $O(1)$ -regular expander graph as permanent.
- (III) Repeat the following:
  - (1) Upon receiving a query  $(a, b) \in M^2$ , find a shortest  $a$ - $b$  path  $P$  and answer by the length of  $P$ .
  - (2) Mark all edges of  $P$  as permanent.
  - (3) For each vertex  $v$  incident to too many permanent edges, remove all non-permanent edges incident to  $v$ .

Intuitively, item (III3) keeps degrees small, thus forcing the output of Alg to have a large average distance to other points. Because item (III1) answers a query by the length of  $P$ , items (III2)–(III3) must preserve all edge of  $P$  (by marking them as permanent and not removing them) for the consistency in answering future queries. Items (I) and (III1)–(III3) follow Chang's [4] paradigm. To prove a lower bound against Alg, we shall make the output of Alg a lot worse than a 1-median, presumably by identifying or planting a

vertex with a sufficiently small average distance to other points. However, Chang fails in this respect. We overcome his problem by item (II), which allows a vertex to have an  $O(1)$  average distance to other vertices.

An extension of our lower bound forbids each deterministic  $o(n)$ -query algorithm for METRIC 1-MEDIAN to be  $o(f(n) \cdot \log n)$ -approximate for some computable function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$  satisfying  $f(n) = \omega(1)$ . In particular, deterministic  $o(n)$ -query  $O(\log n)$ -approximation algorithms do not exist. Previously, the best lower bound against deterministic  $o(n)$ -query algorithms  $A$  is folklore and forbids  $A$  to be  $h_A(n)$ -approximate for some  $h_A(n) = \omega(1)$ .<sup>1</sup> So previous works do not yet refute the existence of deterministic  $o(n)$ -query  $O(\alpha(n))$ -approximation algorithms, where  $\alpha(\cdot)$  is the very slowly growing inverse Ackermann function.

Chang [5]’s adversarial method shows that METRIC 1-MEDIAN has no deterministic  $O(n)$ -query  $o(\log n)$ -approximation algorithms that make each point involve in  $O(1)$  queries to  $d$ . But his adversary is rather naïve and does not seem to yield any unconditional lower bound such as ours.

## 2 Upper bound

Take an  $n$ -point metric space  $(M, d)$  and  $\emptyset \subsetneq S \subseteq M$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} x^* &\equiv \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in M} \sum_{y \in M} d(x, y), \\ x_S^* &\equiv \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in S} \sum_{y \in S} d(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

to be a 1-median of  $(M, d)$  and  $(S, d|_{S \times S})$ , respectively, breaking ties arbitrarily. Furthermore, pick  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  independently and uniformly at random from  $S$ . So

$$\bar{r}_S \equiv E[d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})]$$

is the average distance in  $(S, d|_{S \times S})$ .

**Lemma 1.**

$$\sum_{y \in S} d(x^*, y) \geq \frac{|S| \bar{r}_S}{2}.$$

---

<sup>1</sup>For a sketch of proof, answer all queries of  $A$  by 1 and put all points not involved in the queries to be extremely close to one another but extremely far away from  $A$ ’s output and from the points involved in the queries.

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{y \in S} d(x^*, y) &= |S| \cdot E[d(x^*, \mathbf{u})] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \cdot (|S| \cdot E[d(x^*, \mathbf{u})] + |S| \cdot E[d(x^*, \mathbf{v})]) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot |S| \cdot E[d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})].
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 2.**

$$\sum_{y \in S} d(x_S^*, y) \leq |S| \bar{r}_S.$$

*Proof.* By the optimality of  $x_S^*$ ,

$$\sum_{y \in S} d(x_S^*, y) \leq E \left[ \sum_{y \in S} d(\mathbf{u}, y) \right].$$

Clearly,

$$E \left[ \sum_{y \in S} d(\mathbf{u}, y) \right] = |S| \cdot E[d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})].$$

□

For all  $x'_S \in S$ ,

$$\sum_{y \in M} d(x'_S, y) \leq \sum_{y \in M} (d(x'_S, x^*) + d(x^*, y)) = n \cdot d(x'_S, x^*) + \sum_{y \in M} d(x^*, y). \quad (1)$$

The next two lemmas constitute our main discovery.

**Lemma 3.** For all  $x'_S \in S$  and  $\beta \geq 1$  satisfying  $\sum_{y \in S} d(x'_S, y) \leq \beta \cdot \sum_{y \in S} d(x_S^*, y)$  and  $d(x'_S, x^*) \leq 2\beta \bar{r}_S$ ,  $x'_S$  is an  $O(\beta n/|S|)$ -approximate 1-median of  $(M, d)$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 1,

$$n \cdot d(x'_S, x^*) \leq n \cdot d(x'_S, x^*) \cdot \frac{2}{|S| \bar{r}_S} \cdot \sum_{y \in S} d(x^*, y). \quad (2)$$

As  $d(x'_S, x^*) \leq 2\beta\bar{r}_S$  and  $S \subseteq M$ ,

$$\sum_{y \in M} d(x'_S, y) \leq O\left(\frac{\beta n}{|S|}\right) \cdot \sum_{y \in M} d(x^*, y)$$

by equations (1)–(2). □

**Lemma 4.** *For all  $x'_S \in S$  and  $\beta \geq 1$  satisfying  $\sum_{y \in S} d(x'_S, y) \leq \beta \cdot \sum_{y \in S} d(x^*, y)$  and  $d(x'_S, x^*) > 2\beta\bar{r}_S$ ,  $x'_S$  is an  $O(n/|S|)$ -approximate 1-median of  $(M, d)$ .*

*Proof.* By the triangle inequality,

$$\sum_{y \in S} d(x^*, y) \geq \sum_{y \in S} (d(x'_S, x^*) - d(x'_S, y)) = |S| \cdot d(x'_S, x^*) - \sum_{y \in S} d(x'_S, y). \quad (3)$$

Furthermore,

$$\sum_{y \in S} d(x'_S, y) \leq \beta \cdot \sum_{y \in S} d(x^*, y) \stackrel{\text{Lemma 2}}{\leq} \beta |S| \bar{r}_S. \quad (4)$$

As  $d(x'_S, x^*) > 2\beta\bar{r}_S$ ,

$$\sum_{y \in S} d(x^*, y) \stackrel{(3)-(4)}{\geq} |S| \cdot d(x'_S, x^*) - \beta |S| \bar{r}_S > \frac{|S|}{2} \cdot d(x'_S, x^*).$$

So

$$n \cdot d(x'_S, x^*) = \frac{2n}{|S|} \cdot \frac{|S|}{2} \cdot d(x'_S, x^*) < \frac{2n}{|S|} \cdot \sum_{y \in S} d(x^*, y).$$

This and equation (1) imply

$$\sum_{y \in M} d(x'_S, y) \leq O\left(\frac{n}{|S|}\right) \cdot \sum_{y \in M} d(x^*, y).$$

□

Lemmas 3–4 imply the following.

**Lemma 5.** *For all  $\beta \geq 1$ , every  $\beta$ -approximate 1-median of  $(S, d|_{S \times S})$  is an  $O(\beta n/|S|)$ -approximate 1-median of  $(M, d)$ .*

The following theorem is due to Chang [3].

**Theorem 6** ([3]). *For all constants  $\epsilon > 0$ , METRIC 1-MEDIAN has a deterministic,  $O(\exp(O(1/\epsilon)) \cdot n \log n)$ -time,  $(\exp(O(1/\epsilon)) \cdot n)$ -query,  $O(\epsilon \cdot \log n)$ -approximation and nonadaptive algorithm.*

Below is our main theorem.

**Theorem 7.** *For each computable function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$  satisfying  $f(n) = \omega(1)$ , METRIC 1-MEDIAN has a deterministic,  $o(n)$ -query,  $o(f(n) \cdot \log n)$ -approximation and nonadaptive algorithm.*

*Proof.* Take any  $S \subseteq M$  of size  $\Theta(n/\sqrt{f(n)})$ . Applying Theorem 6 to  $(S, d|_{S \times S})$ , an  $O(\log |S|)$ -approximate 1-median  $x'_S$  of  $(S, d|_{S \times S})$  can be found deterministically and nonadaptively with  $O(|S|)$  queries. By Lemma 5 (with  $\beta = O(\log |S|)$ ),  $x'_S$  is an  $O((\log |S|) \cdot n/|S|)$ -approximate 1-median of  $(M, d)$ .  $\square$

Taking a very slowly growing  $f(\cdot)$  (e.g., the iterated logarithm or the inverse Ackermann function), Theorem 7 allows deterministic  $o(n)$ -query algorithms to be very close to being  $O(\log n)$ -approximate.

### 3 Lower bound

Fix any deterministic  $q$ -query algorithm **Alg**, where  $q = q(n) = O(n)$ . Then take a constant  $C > 2d + 4q/n$ , where  $d = O(1)$  is such that  $d$ -regular expander graphs exist. By padding, assume the number of **Alg**'s queries to be exactly  $q$ . Adversary **Adv** in Fig. 1 answers the queries of **Alg**. All graphs are assumed to be undirected.

As a remark, whenever an edge of a graph is marked as permanent, that edge is considered to be permanent in all graphs. For example, an edge of  $G^{\text{exp}}$  marked as permanent in line 3 of **Adv** is considered to be permanent in lines 11–13, even though the latter processes  $G^{(i)}$  rather than  $G^{\text{exp}}$ . Similarly, although an edge marked as permanent by line 8 comes from  $G^{(i-1)}$  by line 6, it is considered to be permanent in lines 11–13 as well.

**Lemma 8.** *For all  $0 \leq i \leq q$ ,  $G^{\text{exp}}$  is a subgraph of  $G^{(i)}$ .*

- 1: Let  $G^{(0)}$  be the complete graph on  $M$ ;
- 2: Pick a  $d$ -regular expander graph  $G^{\text{exp}}$  on  $M$ , where  $d = O(1)$ ;
- 3: Mark all edges of  $G^{\text{exp}}$  as permanent;
- 4: **for**  $i = 1$  up to  $q$  **do**
- 5:   Receive the  $i$ th query, denoted by  $(a_i, b_i) \in M^2$ ;
- 6:   Pick a shortest  $a_i$ - $b_i$  path  $P_i$  in  $G^{(i-1)}$ ;
- 7:   Answer the  $i$ th query by the length of  $P_i$ ;
- 8:   Mark all edges of  $P_i$  as permanent;
- 9:    $G^{(i)} \leftarrow G^{(i-1)}$ ;
- 10: **for each**  $v \in M$  **do**
- 11:   **if**  $v$  is incident to more than  $C$  permanent edges **then**
- 12:     Remove from  $G^{(i)}$  all non-permanent edges incident to  $v$ ;
- 13:   **end if**
- 14: **end for**
- 15: **end for**

Figure 1: Adversary Adv for answering the queries of Alg

*Proof.* By line 1,  $G^{\text{exp}}$  is a subgraph of  $G^{(0)}$ . Assume as induction hypothesis that  $G^{\text{exp}}$  is a subgraph of  $G^{(i-1)}$ . By line 3 and the induction hypothesis, all edges of  $G^{\text{exp}}$  are permanent edges of  $G^{(i-1)}$ . By lines 9–14, all permanent edges of  $G^{(i-1)}$  are in  $G^{(i)}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 9** (Implicit in [4]). *For all  $1 \leq i \leq q$ , Adv’s answer to the  $i$ th query of Alg equals  $d_{G^{(q)}}(a_i, b_i)$ .*

*Proof (included for completeness).* Let  $\text{ans}_i$  be Adv’s answer to the  $i$ th query. By lines 6–7,  $\text{ans}_i = d_{G^{(i-1)}}(a_i, b_i)$ .<sup>2</sup> By lines 9–14,  $G^{(q)}$  is a subgraph of  $G^{(i-1)}$ , implying  $d_{G^{(i-1)}}(a_i, b_i) \leq d_{G^{(q)}}(a_i, b_i)$ . In summary,  $\text{ans}_i \leq d_{G^{(q)}}(a_i, b_i)$ .

By line 7,  $\text{ans}_i$  is the length of  $P_i$ . As  $P_i$  is in  $G^{(i-1)}$  by line 6, all edges of  $P_i$  are permanent edges of  $G^{(i)}$  by lines 8–14. So by lines 9–14,  $P_i$  exists in  $G^{(j)}$  for all  $j \geq i$ .<sup>3</sup> Therefore, the length of  $P_i$  is at least  $d_{G^{(q)}}(a_i, b_i)$  (in fact, at least  $d_{G^{(j)}}(a_i, b_i)$  for all  $j \geq i$ ). In summary,  $\text{ans}_i \geq d_{G^{(q)}}(a_i, b_i)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 10** (Implicit in [4]). *For each  $v \in M$ , each run of line 8 marks as permanent at most two edges incident to  $v$ .*

<sup>2</sup>As  $G^{\text{exp}}$  is an expander,  $d_{G^{(i-1)}}(a_i, b_i) < \infty$  by Lemma 8.

<sup>3</sup>Note that once an edge is marked as permanent, it cannot be removed by line 12.



*Proof (included for completeness).* In line 6,  $P_i$  has at most two edges incident to  $v$ .  $\square$

Let  $E^{\text{perm}}$  be the set of edges ever marked as permanent, and  $G^{\text{perm}} = (M, E^{\text{perm}})$ . Denote by  $z^* \in M$  the output of **Alg** with all queries answered by **Adv**. By padding dummy queries, assume without loss of generality that **Alg** queries for the distance between  $z^*$  and each point in  $M$ .

**Lemma 11** (Implicit in [4]).

$$\sum_{x \in M} d_{G^{(q)}}(z^*, x) = \Omega(n \log n).$$

*Proof (included for completeness).* By lines 7–8, **Adv** answers each query of **Alg** by the length of a path whose edges are all in  $E^{\text{perm}}$ . So for all  $i \geq 1$ , the answer to the  $i$ th query is at least  $d_{G^{\text{perm}}}(a_i, b_i)$ . Therefore,  $d_{G^{(q)}}(a_i, b_i) \geq d_{G^{\text{perm}}}(a_i, b_i)$  by Lemma 9, where  $i \geq 1$ . This and the assumption that **Alg** queries for all distances between  $z^*$  and the points in  $M$  give

$$\sum_{x \in M} d_{G^{(q)}}(z^*, x) \geq \sum_{x \in M} d_{G^{\text{perm}}}(z^*, x). \quad (5)$$

Consider the instant  $t$  when the number of permanent edges incident to a vertex  $v \in M$  exceeds  $C$ . By Lemma 10,  $v$  is incident to at most  $C + 2$  permanent edges at time  $t$ . Then lines 9–14 remove from  $G^{(i)}$  all non-permanent edges incident to  $v$  (and will not put them back to  $G^{(j)}$  for any  $j > i$ ). So no more edges incident to  $v$  will be marked as permanent after time  $t$ . In summary,  $v$  has degree at most  $C + 2$  in  $G^{\text{perm}}$ . In the above argument,  $v$  can be any vertex whose number of incident permanent edges ever exceeds  $C$ . So  $G^{\text{perm}}$  has maximum degree at most  $C + 2$ .<sup>4</sup> So for all  $k \geq 1$ , at most  $\sum_{h=0}^k (C + 2)^h$  vertices in  $G^{\text{perm}}$  can be within distance  $k$  (inclusive) from  $z^*$ . Taking  $k = \epsilon \log n$  for a small constant  $\epsilon > 0$  depending on  $C$ ,  $\sum_{h=0}^k (C + 2)^h \leq \sqrt{n}$ . I.e., at least  $n - \sqrt{n}$  vertices are of distance greater than  $\epsilon \log n$  from  $z^*$  in  $G^{\text{perm}}$ . So

$$\sum_{x \in M} d_{G^{\text{perm}}}(z^*, x) \geq (n - \sqrt{n}) \cdot \epsilon \log n.$$

This and inequality (5) complete the proof.  $\square$

---

<sup>4</sup>Clearly, a vertex whose number of incident permanent edges never exceeds  $C$  will have degree  $\leq C$  in  $G^{\text{perm}}$ .

Let  $\text{Bad} \subseteq M$  be the set of vertices with degrees at least  $C$  in  $G^{\text{perm}}$ .

**Lemma 12** (Implicit in [4]). *For all distinct  $y, z \in M \setminus \text{Bad}$ ,  $d_{G^{(q)}}(y, z) = 1$ .*

*Proof (included for completeness).* By line 1,  $(y, z)$  is an edge of  $G^{(0)}$ . As  $y, z \notin \text{Bad}$ ,  $y$  and  $z$  are incident to fewer than  $C$  edges ever marked as permanent. So lines 9–14 preserve the edge  $(y, z)$  in  $G^{(i)}$  for all  $i \geq 1$ .  $\square$

By convention,  $d(x, S) \equiv \inf_{s \in S} d(x, s)$  for all  $x \in M$  and  $S \subseteq M$ .

**Corollary 13.** *For all  $y \in M \setminus \text{Bad}$ ,*

$$\sum_{x \in M} d_{G^{(q)}}(x, y) \leq \sum_{x \in M} (d_{G^{(q)}}(x, M \setminus \text{Bad}) + 1).$$

*Proof.* Assume  $M \setminus \text{Bad} \neq \emptyset$  to avoid vacuous truth. For each  $x \in M$ , let  $z_x \in M \setminus \text{Bad}$  satisfy

$$d_{G^{(q)}}(x, M \setminus \text{Bad}) = d_{G^{(q)}}(x, z_x).$$

By Lemma 12,  $d_{G^{(q)}}(y, z_x) \leq 1$  for all  $x \in M$ . By the triangle inequality,

$$d_{G^{(q)}}(x, y) \leq d_{G^{(q)}}(x, z_x) + d_{G^{(q)}}(y, z_x),$$

where  $x \in M$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 14** (Implicit in [4]). *For all  $1 \leq i \leq q$  and when line 6 picks  $P_i$ ,  $P_i$  has at most one non-permanent edge.*

*Proof (included for completeness).* Write  $P_i = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_t)$ . Assume for contradiction that  $(v_h, v_{h+1})$  and  $(v_k, v_{k+1})$  are both non-permanent when line 6 picks  $P_i$  from  $G^{(i-1)}$ , for some  $1 \leq h < k < t$ . By line 1,  $G^{(0)}$  has the edge  $(v_h, v_{k+1})$ . But by the optimality of  $P_i$  in line 6,  $G^{(i-1)}$  cannot have the edge  $(v_h, v_{k+1})$ . So there exists  $1 \leq \ell \leq i - 1$  such that line 12 runs with  $v \in \{v_h, v_{k+1}\}$  in the  $\ell$ th iteration of the loop in lines 4–15.<sup>5</sup> Being non-permanent when line 6 picks  $P_i$  from  $G^{(i-1)}$ ,  $(v_h, v_{h+1})$  and  $(v_k, v_{k+1})$  must have remained non-permanent throughout the first  $i - 1$  iterations (including the  $\ell$ th iteration) of the loop in lines 4–15 (because of the irreversibility of

<sup>5</sup>Let  $\ell$  be the smallest index such that  $G^{(\ell)}$  does not have  $(v_h, v_{k+1})$ . Line 9 initializes  $G^{(\ell)}$  to be  $G^{(\ell-1)}$ , which has  $(v_h, v_{k+1})$ . So line 12 must remove  $(v_h, v_{k+1})$  from  $G^{(\ell)}$ . This happens only by running line 12 with  $v \in \{v_h, v_{k+1}\}$ .

permanence). Therefore, when line 12 runs with  $v \in \{v_h, v_{k+1}\}$  in the  $\ell$ th iteration of the loop in lines 4–15,  $(v_h, v_{h+1})$  or  $(v_k, v_{k+1})$  must be removed from  $G^{(\ell)}$ . By symmetry, assume  $G^{(\ell)}$  to not have  $(v_h, v_{h+1})$ . By lines 9–14 and as  $\ell \leq i - 1$ ,  $G^{(i-1)}$  cannot have  $(v_h, v_{h+1})$ , either. As  $P_i$  is picked from  $G^{(i-1)}$  by line 6,  $G^{(i-1)}$  must have  $(v_h, v_{h+1})$  (which is on  $P_i$ ), a contradiction.  $\square$

**Corollary 15** (Implicit in [4]). *Each run of line 8 increases the number of permanent edges by at most one.*

*Proof (included for completeness).* Immediate from Lemma 14.  $\square$

**Lemma 16.**  $|\text{Bad}| \leq n/2$ .

*Proof.* As  $G^{\text{exp}}$  is  $d$ -regular by line 2, line 3 marks  $dn/2$  edges as permanent by the handshaking lemma. By Corollary 15, at most  $q$  edges are ever marked as permanent by line 8. To sum up,  $G^{\text{perm}}$  has at most  $dn/2 + q$  edges. So by the handshaking lemma, the average degree in  $G^{\text{perm}}$  is at most  $d + 2q/n$ . This and Markov’s inequality imply that at most  $n/2$  vertices have degrees at least  $2d + 4q/n$  in  $G^{\text{perm}}$ . As  $C > 2d + 4q/n$ , at most  $n/2$  vertices have degrees at least  $C$  in  $G^{\text{perm}}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 17.** *For all  $y \in M \setminus \text{Bad}$ ,  $\sum_{x \in M} d_{G^{(q)}}(x, y) = O(n)$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemmas 16 and 25 (in Appendix A),

$$\sum_{x \in \text{Bad}} d_{G^{\text{exp}}}(x, M \setminus \text{Bad}) = O(n).$$

This and Lemma 8 give

$$\sum_{x \in \text{Bad}} d_{G^{(q)}}(x, M \setminus \text{Bad}) = O(n). \quad (6)$$

Clearly,

$$\sum_{x \in M \setminus \text{Bad}} d_{G^{(q)}}(x, M \setminus \text{Bad}) \leq \sum_{x \in M \setminus \text{Bad}} d_{G^{(q)}}(x, x) = 0. \quad (7)$$

Now sum up equations (6)–(7) and invoke Corollary 13.  $\square$

**Theorem 18.** *Each deterministic  $O(n)$ -query algorithm for METRIC 1-MEDIAN is not  $(\delta \log n)$ -approximate for a sufficiently small constant  $\delta > 0$ .*

```

1: cnt ← 0;
2: for  $i = 1$  up to  $q$  do
3:   Receive the  $i$ th query of Alg, denoted by  $(a_i, b_i) \in M^2$ ;
4:   if  $a_i \notin \{a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, \dots, a_{i-1}, b_{i-1}\}$  then
5:     cnt ← cnt + 1;
6:      $\pi(a_i) \leftarrow$  cnt;
7:   end if
8:   if  $b_i \notin \{a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, \dots, a_{i-1}, b_{i-1}\} \cup \{a_i\}$  then
9:     cnt ← cnt + 1;
10:     $\pi(b_i) \leftarrow$  cnt;
11:  end if
12:  Query for the distance between  $\pi(a_i)$  and  $\pi(b_i)$ , and return the answer
    to Alg;
13: end for
14: Receive the output  $z^*$  of Alg;
15: if  $z^* \notin \{a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, \dots, a_q, b_q\}$  then
16:   cnt ← cnt + 1;
17:    $\pi(z^*) \leftarrow$  cnt;
18: end if
19: return  $\pi(z^*)$ ;

```

Figure 2: Algorithm Sim for simulating Alg with points renamed

*Proof.* By Lemma 9, Adv answers consistently with  $d_{G^{(q)}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ . By Lemmas 11 and 16–17, Alg’s output,  $z^*$ , satisfies

$$\sum_{x \in M} d_{G^{(q)}}(z^*, x) = \Omega(\log n) \cdot \sum_{x \in M} d_{G^{(q)}}(y, x)$$

for some  $y \in M$ . Finally, recall that Alg is an arbitrary deterministic  $O(n)$ -query algorithm.  $\square$

### 3.1 Even fewer queries

For all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ ,  $[n] \equiv \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . This subsection assumes  $q = o(n)$  and  $M = [n]$ . An algorithm is said to be tame if its queries are in  $[2q+1] \times [2q+1]$  and its output in  $[2q+1]$ .

**Lemma 19.** *When Sim (in Fig. 2) terminates,  $\pi(\cdot)$  is injective.*

*Proof.* Before lines 6, 10 and 17, cnt increments.  $\square$

**Lemma 20.** *When Sim terminates,  $\pi(a_i), \pi(b_i), \pi(z^*) \in [2q + 1]$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq q$ .*

*Proof.* Each query increases cnt by at most two in lines 4–11. Lines 15–18 may also increase cnt. Lines 6, 10, and 17 set  $\pi(x)$  to be cnt for some  $x \in M$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 21.** *If Alg is  $h(n)$ -approximate for METRIC 1-MEDIAN, where  $h: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , then Sim is a tame  $q$ -query  $h(n)$ -approximation algorithm for METRIC 1-MEDIAN.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 19, Sim simulates Alg with an injective renaming of points. So, inheriting from Alg, Sim is  $h(n)$ -approximate and makes  $q$  queries. By Lemma 20 and lines 12 and 19 of Sim, Sim is tame.  $\square$

The following result complements Theorems 7.

**Theorem 22.** *Each deterministic  $o(n)$ -query algorithm for METRIC 1-MEDIAN fails to be  $o(f(n) \cdot \log n)$ -approximate for some computable function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$  satisfying  $f(n) = \omega(1)$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 21, assume Alg to be tame without loss of generality (otherwise, prove the theorem against Sim instead of Alg). Let  $z^*$  the Alg's output when the queries are answered by Adv with  $M$  (resp.,  $n$ ) substituted by  $[2q + 1]$  (resp.,  $2q + 1$ ). By Lemma 11 with  $M$  (resp.,  $n$ ) substituted by  $[2q + 1]$  (resp.,  $2q + 1$ ),

$$\sum_{x \in [2q+1]} d_{G^{(q)}}(z^*, x) = \Omega((2q + 1) \log(2q + 1)), \quad (8)$$

where  $G^{(q)}$  is a graph on  $[2q + 1]$  as in Adv. By Lemmas 16–17 with  $M$  (resp.,  $n$ ) substituted by  $[2q + 1]$  (resp.,  $2q + 1$ ), there exists  $y \in [2q + 1]$  satisfying

$$\sum_{x \in [2q+1]} d_{G^{(q)}}(y, x) = O(q). \quad (9)$$

Equations (8)–(9) and the triangle inequality imply

$$d_{G^{(q)}}(z^*, y) = \Omega(\log q). \quad (10)$$

Recall that  $y \in [2q + 1]$ . Put all points in  $[n] \setminus [2q + 1]$  extremely close to  $y$ : For all distinct  $a, b \in [n]$ ,  $d(a, a) \equiv 0$  and

$$d(a, b) \equiv \begin{cases} 1/2^n, & \text{if } a, b \in \{y\} \cup ([n] \setminus [2q + 1]), \\ d_{G^{(q)}}(a, y), & \text{if } a \notin \{y\} \cup ([n] \setminus [2q + 1]) \text{ and } b \in \{y\} \cup ([n] \setminus [2q + 1]), \\ d_{G^{(q)}}(y, b), & \text{if } a \in \{y\} \cup ([n] \setminus [2q + 1]) \text{ and } b \notin \{y\} \cup ([n] \setminus [2q + 1]), \\ d_{G^{(q)}}(a, b), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

It is not hard to see that  $d$  is induced by the weighted graph obtained in the following way: (1) Add all vertices in  $[n] \setminus [2q + 1]$  to  $G^{(q)}$ . (2) Add an edge between each  $v \in [n] \setminus [2q + 1]$  and each neighbor (in  $G^{(q)}$ ) of  $y$ . (3) Connect any two vertices in  $\{y\} \cup ([n] \setminus [2q + 1])$  by an edge of weight  $1/2^n$ , all other edge weights being 1.

As Alg is tame,  $(a_i, b_i) \in [2q + 1] \times [2q + 1]$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq q$ , implying  $d(a_i, b_i) = d_{G^{(q)}}(a_i, b_i)$  by equation (11). So by Lemma 9, Adv answers queries consistently with  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ .

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus \{y\}} d(y, x) &= \sum_{x \in [2q+1] \setminus \{y\}} d(y, x) + \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus ([2q+1] \cup \{y\})} d(y, x) \quad (12) \\ &\stackrel{(11)}{=} \sum_{x \in [2q+1] \setminus \{y\}} d(y, x) + \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus ([2q+1] \cup \{y\})} \frac{1}{2^n} \\ &\stackrel{(11)}{=} \sum_{x \in [2q+1] \setminus \{y\}} d_{G^{(q)}}(y, x) + \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus ([2q+1] \cup \{y\})} \frac{1}{2^n} \\ &\stackrel{(9)}{=} O(q). \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

As Alg is tame,  $z^* \in [2q + 1]$ . By equation (10),  $z^* \neq y$ .<sup>6</sup> So  $z^* \in [2q + 1] \setminus \{y\}$ . Now,

$$\sum_{x \in [n]} d(z^*, x) \geq \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus [2q+1]} d(z^*, x) \stackrel{(11)}{=} \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus [2q+1]} d_{G^{(q)}}(z^*, y) \stackrel{(10)}{=} \Omega((n - (2q + 1)) \log q).$$

This and equations (12)–(13) show  $z^*$  to be no better than  $((\delta n/q) \cdot \log q)$ -approximate for some constant  $\delta > 0$ . Clearly,  $(\delta n/q) \cdot \log q = \omega(\log n)$ . So taking  $f(n) = \lfloor (n/q) \cdot (\log q) / (\log n) \rfloor$  completes the proof except that

<sup>6</sup>For proving the theorem, we may assume  $q > \sqrt{n}$  without loss of generality. So  $\Omega(\log q)$  is nonzero.

$f(n)$  may be uncomputable. Gladly,  $d$  has codomain  $\{1/2^n, 0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$  by equation (11).<sup>7</sup> So we may pretend as if  $q$  is Alg's worst-case query complexity w.r.t. metrics with codomain  $\{1/2^n, 0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ . This makes  $q$ , and thus  $f(n)$ , computable.  $\square$

**Corollary 23.** METRIC 1-MEDIAN has no deterministic  $o(n)$ -query  $O(\log n)$ -approximation algorithms.

*Proof.* Immediate from Theorem 22.  $\square$

**Corollary 24.** METRIC 1-MEDIAN has no deterministic  $o(n)$ -query algorithms with an asymptotically best approximation ratio.

*Proof.* Take any deterministic  $o(n)$ -query algorithm  $A$ . By Theorem 22, there exists a computable  $f_A(n) = \omega(1)$  forbidding  $A$  to be  $o(f_A(n) \cdot \log n)$ -approximate. But Theorem 7 asserts the existence of a deterministic  $o(n)$ -query  $o(\sqrt{f_A(n)} \cdot \log n)$ -approximation algorithm.  $\square$

## A Distances in expanders

It is well-known that an  $O(1)$ -regular expander graph  $G^{\text{exp}}$  on  $M$  exists. I.e., there exist constants  $d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  and  $0 < \alpha < 1$  such that

- (i)  $G^{\text{exp}}$  is  $d$ -regular, and
- (ii) for each  $S \subseteq M$  of size at most  $n/2$ , at least  $\alpha d |S|$  edges of  $G^{\text{exp}}$  are in  $S \times (M \setminus S)$ .

**Lemma 25.** For each nonempty  $U \subseteq M$  of size at most  $n/2$ ,

$$\sum_{x \in U} d_{G^{\text{exp}}}(x, M \setminus U) = O(|U|).$$

*Proof.* For each  $i \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} L_0 &\equiv M \setminus U, \\ L_i &\equiv \{x \in U \mid d_{G^{\text{exp}}}(x, M \setminus U) = i\}, \\ S_i &\equiv L_i \cup L_{i+1} \cup \dots \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>7</sup>Any graph on a subset of  $[n]$  induces distances in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1, \infty\}$ . But equations (12)–(13) forbid  $\infty$  as a distance.

So  $L_i$  is the set of vertices at level  $i$  of the BFS tree rooted at  $M \setminus U$ .<sup>8</sup>

Now fix any  $i \geq 1$ . Because edges cannot cross non-adjacent levels of a BFS tree,  $S_i \times (M \setminus S_i) \subseteq L_i \times L_{i-1}$ . By item (ii) (with  $S$  replaced by  $S_i$  and noting that  $S_i \subseteq U$  has size at most  $n/2$ ), at least  $\alpha d |S_i|$  edges of  $G^{\text{exp}}$  are in  $S_i \times (M \setminus S_i)$ . In summary, at least  $\alpha d |S_i|$  edges are in  $L_i \times L_{i-1}$  (and are thus incident to a vertex in  $L_i$ ). As  $G^{\text{exp}}$  is  $d$ -regular, therefore,  $|L_i| \geq \alpha |S_i|$ . Hence

$$|S_{i+1}| = |S_i \setminus L_i| \leq (1 - \alpha)|S_i|. \quad (14)$$

Iterating inequality (14),

$$|S_j| \leq (1 - \alpha)^{j-1} |S_1| = (1 - \alpha)^{j-1} |U|$$

for all  $j \geq 1$ . So

$$|L_j| \leq |S_j| \leq (1 - \alpha)^{j-1} |U| \quad (15)$$

for all  $j \geq 1$ . Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in U} d_{G^{\text{exp}}}(x, M \setminus U) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{x \in L_j} d_{G^{\text{exp}}}(x, M \setminus U) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{x \in L_j} j \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |L_j| \cdot j \\ &\stackrel{(15)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 - \alpha)^{j-1} |U| \cdot j \\ &= O(|U|), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses the convergence of  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 - \alpha)^{j-1} j$ .  $\square$

## B Acknowledgments

The author is supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology of Taiwan under grant 110-2221-E-155-012-.

---

<sup>8</sup>Generalize BFS in the obvious way to allow the root to be a set of vertices.



## References

- [1] P. Bose, A. Maheshwari, and P. Morin. Fast approximations for sums of distances, clustering and the Fermat–Weber problem. *Computational Geometry*, 24(3):135–146, 2003.
- [2] C.-L. Chang. A lower bound for metric 1-median selection. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 84:44–51, 2017.
- [3] C.-L. Chang. Metric 1-median selection with fewer queries. In *Proceedings of the 2017 International Conference on Applied System Innovation*, pages 1056–1059, 2017.
- [4] C.-L. Chang. Metric 1-median selection: Query complexity vs. approximation ratio. *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory*, 9(4):1–23, 2018. Article 20.
- [5] C.-L. Chang. A note on metric 1-median selection. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Computer Symposium*, pages 457–459, Yunlin, Taiwan, 2018.
- [6] T. H. Cormen, C. E. Leiserson, R. L. Rivest, and C. Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms*. The MIT Press, 3rd edition, 2001.
- [7] A. Czumaj and C. Sohler. Sublinear-time approximation algorithms for clustering via random sampling. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 30(1–2):226–256, 2007.
- [8] D. Eppstein and J. Wang. Fast approximation of centrality. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications*, 8(1):39–45, 2004.
- [9] O. Goldreich and D. Ron. Approximating average parameters of graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 32(4):473–493, 2008.
- [10] S. Guha, A. Meyerson, N. Mishra, R. Motwani, and L. O’Callaghan. Clustering data streams: Theory and practice. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 15(3):515–528, 2003.
- [11] P. Indyk. Sublinear time algorithms for metric space problems. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 428–434, 1999.

- [12] P. Indyk. *High-dimensional computational geometry*. PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2000.
- [13] K. Jain, M. Mahdian, and A. Saberi. A new greedy approach for facility location problems. In *Proceedings of the 34th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 731–740, 2002.
- [14] A. Kumar, Y. Sabharwal, and S. Sen. Linear-time approximation schemes for clustering problems in any dimensions. *Journal of the ACM*, 57(2):5, 2010.
- [15] R. R. Mettu and C. G. Plaxton. Optimal time bounds for approximate clustering. *Machine Learning*, 56(1–3):35–60, 2004.
- [16] W. Rudin. *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. McGraw-Hill, 3rd edition, 1976.
- [17] S. Wasserman and K. Faust. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [18] B. Y. Wu. On approximating metric 1-median in sublinear time. *Information Processing Letters*, 114(4):163–166, 2014.