

# Tight Lower Bounds for Approximate & Exact $k$ -Center in $\mathbb{R}^{d*}$

Rajesh Chitnis<sup>1</sup> and Nitin Saurabh<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham, UK. Email: rajeshchitnis@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Indian Institute of Technology Hyderabad, Sangareddy, India. nitin@cse.iith.ac.in

## Abstract

In the discrete  $k$ -CENTER problem, we are given a metric space  $(P, \text{dist})$  where  $|P| = n$  and the goal is to select a set  $C \subseteq P$  of  $k$  centers which minimizes the maximum distance of a point in  $P$  from its nearest center. For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , Agarwal and Procopiuc [SODA '98, Algorithmica '02] designed an  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm<sup>1</sup> for this problem in  $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space<sup>2</sup> which runs in  $O(dn \log k) + \left(\frac{k}{\varepsilon}\right)^{O(k^{1-1/d})} \cdot n^{O(1)}$  time. In this paper we show that their algorithm is essentially optimal: if for some  $d \geq 2$  and some computable function  $f$ , there is an  $f(k) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{o(k^{1-1/d})} \cdot n^{o(k^{1-1/d})}$  time algorithm for  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximating the discrete  $k$ -CENTER on  $n$  points in  $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space then the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH) fails.

We obtain our lower bound by designing a gap reduction from a  $d$ -dimensional constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) to discrete  $d$ -dimensional  $k$ -CENTER. This reduction has the property that there is a fixed value  $\varepsilon$  (depending on the CSP) such that the optimal radius of  $k$ -CENTER instances corresponding to satisfiable and unsatisfiable instances of the CSP is  $< 1$  and  $\geq (1 + \varepsilon)$  respectively. Our claimed lower bound on the running time for approximating discrete  $k$ -CENTER in  $d$ -dimensions then follows from the lower bound due to Marx and Sidiropoulos [SoCG '14] for checking the satisfiability of the aforementioned  $d$ -dimensional CSP.

As a byproduct of our reduction, we also obtain that the exact algorithm of Agarwal and Procopiuc [SODA '98, Algorithmica '02] which runs in  $n^{O(d \cdot k^{1-1/d})}$  time for discrete  $k$ -CENTER on  $n$  points in  $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space is asymptotically optimal. Formally, we show that if for some  $d \geq 2$  and some computable function  $f$ , there is an  $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k^{1-1/d})}$  time exact algorithm for the discrete  $k$ -CENTER problem on  $n$  points in  $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space then the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH) fails. Previously, such a lower bound was only known for  $d = 2$  and was implicit in the work of Marx [IWPEC '06].

## 1 Introduction

The  $k$ -CENTER problem is a classical problem in theoretical computer science and was first formulated by Hakimi [21] in 1964. In this problem, given a metric space  $(P, \text{dist})$  and an integer  $k \leq |P|$  the goal is to select a set  $C$  of  $k$  centers which minimizes the maximum distance of a point in  $P$  from its nearest center, i.e., select a set  $C$  which minimizes the quantity  $\max_{p \in P} \min_{c \in C} \text{dist}(p, c)$ . A geometric way to view the  $k$ -CENTER problem is to find the minimum radius  $r$  such that  $k$  closed balls of radius  $r$  located

\*An extended abstract of this paper appears in SoCG 2022.

<sup>1</sup>The algorithm of Agarwal and Procopiuc [2] also works for the non-discrete, i.e., continuous, version of the problem when  $C$  need not be a subset of  $P$ , but our lower bounds only hold for the discrete version.

<sup>2</sup>The algorithm of Agarwal and Procopiuc [2] also works for other metrics such as  $\ell_\infty$  or  $\ell_q$  metric for  $q \geq 1$ . Our construction also works for  $\ell_\infty$  (in fact, some of the bounds are simpler to derive!) but we present only the proof for  $\ell_2$  to keep the presentation simple.

at each of the points in  $C$  cover all the points in  $P$ . In most applications, we require that  $C \subseteq P$  and this is known as the discrete version of the problem.

As an example, one can consider the set  $P$  to be important locations in a city and solving the  $k$ -CENTER problem (where  $k$  is upper bounded by budget constraints) establishes the locations of fire stations which minimize the response time in event of a fire. In addition to other applications in facility location, transportation networks, etc. an important application of  $k$ -CENTER is in clustering. With the advent of massive data sets, the problem of efficiently and effectively summarizing this data is crucial. A standard approach for this is via centroid-based clustering algorithms of which  $k$ -CENTER is a special case. Clustering using  $k$ -CENTER has found applications in text summarization, robotics, bioinformatics, pattern recognition, etc [19, 22, 29, 40].

## 1.1 Prior work on exact & approximate algorithms for discrete $k$ -CENTER

The discrete<sup>3</sup>  $k$ -CENTER problem is NP-hard [43], and admits a 2-approximation [20, 23] in  $n^{O(1)}$  time where  $n$  is the number of points. This approximation ratio is tight and the  $k$ -CENTER problem is NP-hard to approximate in polynomial time to a factor  $(2 - \varepsilon)$  for any constant  $\varepsilon > 0$  [20, 24]. Given this intractability, research was aimed at designing parameterized algorithms [9] and parameterized approximation algorithms for  $k$ -center. The  $k$ -CENTER problem is W[2]-hard to approximate to factor better than 2 even when allowing running times of the form  $f(k) \cdot n^{O(1)}$  for any computable function  $f$  [12, 14]. The  $k$ -CENTER problem remains W[2]-hard even if we combine the parameter  $k$  with other structural parameters such as size of vertex cover or size of feedback vertex set [30]. Agarwal and Procopiuc [2] designed an algorithm for discrete  $k$ -CENTER on  $n$  points in  $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space which runs in  $n^{O(d \cdot k^{1-1/d})}$  time.

The paradigm of combining parameterized algorithms & approximation algorithms has been successful in designing algorithms for  $k$ -center in special topologies such as  $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space [2], planar graphs [18], metrics of bounded doubling dimensions [15], graphs of bounded highway dimension [4, 14], etc. Of particular relevance to this paper is the  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm<sup>4</sup> of Agarwal and Procopiuc [2] which runs in  $O(dn \log k) + \left(\frac{k}{\varepsilon}\right)^{O(k^{1-1/d})} \cdot n^{O(1)}$  time. This was generalized by Feldmann and Marx [15] who designed an  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm running in  $\left(\frac{k^k}{\varepsilon^{O(kD)}}\right) \cdot n^{O(1)}$  time for discrete  $k$ -CENTER in metric spaces of doubling dimension  $D$ .

## 1.2 From 2-dimensions to higher dimensions

**Square root phenomenon for planar graphs and geometric problems in the plane:** For a wide range of problems on planar graphs or geometric problems in the plane, a certain *square root phenomenon* is observed for a wide range of algorithmic problems: the exponent of the running time can be improved from  $O(\ell)$  to  $O(\sqrt{\ell})$  where  $\ell$  is the parameter, or from  $O(n)$  to  $O(\sqrt{n})$  where  $n$  is in the input size, and lower bounds indicate that this improvement is essentially best possible. There is an ever increasing list of such problems known for planar graphs [1, 7, 13, 17, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 39, 41] and in the plane [3, 16, 25, 26, 35, 37, 42]

**Bounds for higher dimensional Euclidean spaces:** Unlike the situation on planar graphs and in two-dimensions, the program of obtaining tight bounds for higher dimensions is still quite nascent with relatively fewer results [5, 8, 10, 11, 38]. Marx and Sidiropoulos [38] showed that for some problems there is a *limited blessing of low dimensionality*: that is, for  $d$ -dimensions the running time can be

<sup>3</sup>Here we mention the known results only for the discrete version of  $k$ -CENTER. A discussion about results for the continuous version of the problem is given in Section 1.4.

<sup>4</sup>This is also known as an efficient parameterized approximation scheme (EPAS) as the running time is a function of the type  $f(k, \varepsilon, d) \cdot n^{O(1)}$ .

improved from  $n^\ell$  to  $n^{\ell^{1-1/d}}$  or from  $2^n$  to  $2^{n^{1-1/d}}$  where  $\ell$  is a parameter and  $n$  is the input size. In contrast, Cohen-Addad et al. [8] showed that the two problems of  $k$ -MEDIAN and  $k$ -MEANS suffer from the *curse of low dimensionality*: even for 4-dimensional Euclidean space, assuming the Exponential Time Hypothesis<sup>5</sup> (ETH), there is no  $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$  time algorithm, i.e., the brute force algorithm which runs in  $n^{O(k)}$  time is asymptotically optimal.

### 1.3 Motivation & Our Results

In two-dimensional Euclidean space there is an  $n^{O(\sqrt{k})}$  algorithm [2, 25, 26], and a matching lower bound of  $f(k) \cdot n^{o(\sqrt{k})}$  under Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH) for any computable function  $f$  [35]. Our motivation in this paper is to investigate what is the *correct* complexity of exact and approximate algorithms for the discrete  $k$ -CENTER for higher dimensional Euclidean spaces. In particular, we aim to answer the following two questions:

**(Question 1)** Can the running time of the  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm of [2] be improved from

$$O(dn \log k) + \left(\frac{k}{\varepsilon}\right)^{o(k^{1-1/d})} \cdot n^{O(1)}, \text{ or is there a (close to) matching lower bound?}$$

**(Question 2)** The  $n^{O(d \cdot k^{1-1/d})}$  algorithm of [2] for  $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space shows that there is a *limited blessing of low dimensionality* for  $k$ -CENTER. But can the term  $k^{1-1/d}$  in the exponent be improved, or is it asymptotically tight?

We make progress towards answering both these questions by showing the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.** For any  $d \geq 2$ , under the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH), the discrete  $k$ -CENTER problem in  $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space

- **(Inapproximability result)** does not admit an  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in  $f(k) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{o(k^{1-1/d})} \cdot n^{o(k^{1-1/d})}$  time where  $f$  is any computable function and  $n$  is the number of points.
- **(Lower bound for exact algorithm)** cannot be solved in  $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k^{1-1/d})}$  time where  $f$  is any computable function and  $n$  is the number of points.

[Theorem 1](#) answers Question 1 by showing that the running time of the  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm of Agarwal and Procopiuc [2] is essentially tight, i.e., the dependence on  $\varepsilon$  cannot be improved even if we allow a larger dependence on both  $k$  and  $n$ . [Theorem 1](#) answers Question 2 by showing that the running time of the exact algorithm of Agarwal and Procopiuc [2] is asymptotically tight, i.e., the exponent of  $k^{1-1/d}$  cannot be asymptotically improved even if we allow a larger dependence on  $k$ .

### 1.4 Discussion of the continuous $k$ -CENTER problem

In the continuous version of the  $k$ -CENTER problem, the centers are not required to be picked from the original set of input points. The  $n^{O(d \cdot k^{1-1/d})}$  algorithm of Agarwal and Procopiuc [2] also works for this continuous version of the  $k$ -CENTER problem in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Marx [36] showed the W[1]-hardness of  $k$ -CENTER in  $(\mathbb{R}^2, \ell_\infty)$  parameterized by  $k$ . Cabello et al. [6] studied the complexity of this problem parameterized by the dimension, and showed the W[1]-hardness of 4-CENTER in  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \ell_\infty)$  parameterized by  $d$ . Additionally, they also obtained the W[1]-hardness of 2-CENTER in  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \ell_2)$  parameterized by  $d$ ; this reduction also rules out existence of  $n^{o(d)}$  algorithms for this problem under the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH). It is an interesting open question whether the  $n^{O(d \cdot k^{1-1/d})}$  algorithm of Agarwal and

<sup>5</sup>Recall that the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH) has the consequence that  $n$ -variable 3-SAT cannot be solved in  $2^{o(n)}$  time [27, 28].

Procopiuć [2] is also asymptotically tight for the continuous version of the problem: one way to possibly prove this would be to extend the W[1]-hardness reduction of Marx [36] for continuous  $k$ -CENTER in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  (parameterized by  $k$ ) to higher dimensions using the framework of Marx and Sidiropoulos [38]. Our reduction in this paper does not extend to the continuous version.

## 1.5 Notation

The set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  is denoted by  $[n]$ . All vectors considered in this paper have length  $d$ . If  $\mathbf{a}$  is a vector then for each  $i \in [d]$  its  $i$ -th coordinate is denoted by  $\mathbf{a}[i]$ . Addition and subtraction of vectors is denoted by  $\oplus$  and  $\ominus$  respectively. The  $i$ -th unit vector is denoted by  $\mathbf{e}_i$  and has  $\mathbf{e}_i[i] = 1$  and  $\mathbf{e}_i[j] = 0$  for each  $j \neq i$ . The  $d$ -dimensional vector whose every coordinate equals 1 is denoted by  $\mathbf{1}^d$ . If  $u$  is a point and  $X$  is a set of points then  $\text{dist}(u, X) = \min_{x \in X} \text{dist}(u, x)$ . We will sometimes abuse notation slightly and use  $x$  to denote both the name and location of the point  $x$ .

## 2 Lower bounds for exact & approximate $k$ -CENTER in $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space

The goal of this section is to prove [Theorem 1](#) which is restated below:

**Theorem 1.** For any  $d \geq 2$ , under the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH), the discrete  $k$ -CENTER problem in  $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space

- **(Inapproximability result)** does not admit an  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in  $f(k) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{o(k^{1-1/d})} \cdot n^{o(k^{1-1/d})}$  time where  $f$  is any computable function and  $n$  is the number of points.
- **(Lower bound for exact algorithm)** cannot be solved in  $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k^{1-1/d})}$  time where  $f$  is any computable function and  $n$  is the number of points.

**Roadmap to prove [Theorem 1](#):** To prove [Theorem 1](#), we design a gap reduction (described in [Section 2.2](#)) from a constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) to the  $k$ -CENTER problem. The definition and statement of the lower bound for the CSP due to Marx and Sidiropoulos [38] is given in [Section 2.1](#). The correctness of the reduction is shown in [Section 2.3](#) and [Section 2.4](#). Finally, everything is tied together in [Section 2.5](#) which contains the proof of [Theorem 1](#).

### 2.1 Lower bound for $d$ -dimensional geometric $\geq$ -CSP [38]

This section introduces the  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP problem of Marx and Sidiropoulos [38]. First we start with some definitions before stating the formal lower bound ([Theorem 5](#)) that will be used to prove [Theorem 1](#). Constraint Satisfaction Problems (CSPs) are a general way to represent several important problems in theoretical computer science. In this paper, we will only need a subclass of CSPs called binary CSPs which we define below.

**Definition 2.** An instance of a binary constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) is a triple  $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C})$  where  $\mathcal{V}$  is a set of variables,  $\mathcal{D}$  is a domain of values and  $\mathcal{C}$  is a set of constraints. There are two types of constraints:

- Unary constraints: For some  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  there is a unary constraint  $\langle v, R_v \rangle$  where  $R_v \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ .
- Binary constraints: For some  $u, v \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $u \neq v$ , there is a binary constraint  $\langle (u, v), R_{u,v} \rangle$  where  $R_{u,v} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}$ .

Solving a given CSP instance  $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C})$  is to check whether there exists a satisfying assignment for it, i.e., a function  $f : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  such that all the constraints are satisfied. For a binary CSP, a satisfying assignment  $f$  has the property that for each unary constraint  $\langle v, R_v \rangle$  we have  $f(v) \in R_v$  and for each binary constraint  $\langle (u, v), R_{u,v} \rangle$  we have  $(f(u), f(v)) \in R_{u,v}$ .

The constraint graph of a given CSP instance  $\mathcal{I} = (V, D, C)$  is an undirected graph  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  whose vertex set is  $V$  and the adjacency relation is defined as follows: two vertices  $u, v \in V$  are adjacent in  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  if there is a constraint in  $\mathcal{I}$  which contains both  $u$  and  $v$ . Marx and Sidiropoulos [38] observed that binary CSPs whose primal graph is a subgraph of the  $d$ -dimensional grid are useful in showing lower bounds for geometric problems in  $d$ -dimensions.

**Definition 3.** The  $d$ -dimensional grid  $\mathbb{R}[N, d]$  is an undirected graph with vertex set  $[N]^d$  and the adjacency relation is as follows: two vertices  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_d)$  and  $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_d)$  have an edge between them if and only if  $\sum_{i=1}^d |a_i - b_i| = 1$ .

**Definition 4.** A  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP  $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C})$  is a binary CSP whose

- set of variables  $\mathcal{V}$  is a subset of  $\mathbb{R}[N, d]$  for some  $N \geq 1$ ,
- domain is  $[\delta]^d$  for some integer  $\delta \geq 1$ ,
- constraint graph  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  is an *induced* subgraph of  $\mathbb{R}[N, d]$ ,
- unary constraints are arbitrary, and
- binary constraints are of the following type: if  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}' \in \mathcal{V}$  such that  $\mathbf{a}' = \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i$  for some  $i \in [d]$  then there is a binary constraint  $\langle (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'), R_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'} \rangle$  where  $R_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'} = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in R_{\mathbf{a}} \times R_{\mathbf{a}'} \mid \mathbf{x}[i] \geq \mathbf{y}[i]\}$ .

Observe that the set of unary constraints of a  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP is sufficient to completely define it. The size  $|\mathcal{I}|$  of a binary CSP  $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C})$  is the combined size of the variables, domain and the constraints. With appropriate preprocessing (e.g., combining different constraints on the same variables) we can assume that  $|\mathcal{I}| = (|\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{D}|)^{O(1)}$ . We now state the result of Marx and Sidiropoulos [38] which gives a lower bound on the complexity of checking whether a given  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP has a satisfying assignment.

**Theorem 5.** [38, Theorem 2.10] If for some fixed  $d \geq 2$ , there is an  $f(|\mathcal{V}|) \cdot |\mathcal{I}|^{o(|\mathcal{V}|^{1-1/d})}$  time algorithm for solving a  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP  $\mathcal{I}$  for some computable function  $f$ , then the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH) fails.

**Remark 6.** The problem defined by Marx and Sidiropoulos [38] is actually  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\leq$ -CSP which has  $\leq$ -constraints instead of the  $\geq$ -constraints. However, for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  by replacing each unary constraint  $\mathbf{x} \in R_{\mathbf{a}}$  by  $\mathbf{y}$  such that  $\mathbf{y}[i] = N + 1 - \mathbf{x}[i]$  for each  $i \in [d]$ , it is easy to see that  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\leq$ -CSP and  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP are equivalent.

## 2.2 Reduction from $d$ -dimensional geometric $\geq$ -CSP to $k$ -CENTER in $\mathbb{R}^d$

We are now ready to describe our reduction from  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP to  $k$ -CENTER in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Fix any  $d \geq 2$ . Let  $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C})$  be a  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP instance on variables  $\mathcal{V}$  and domain  $[\delta]^d$  for some integer  $\delta \geq 1$ . We fix<sup>6</sup> the following two quantities:

$$r := \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon := \frac{r^2}{(d-1)\delta^2} = \frac{1}{16(d-1)\delta^2}. \quad (1)$$

Since  $d \geq 2$  and  $\delta \geq 1$ , we obtain the following bounds from Equation 1,

$$0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon \delta \leq \varepsilon \delta^2 \leq \varepsilon \delta^2 (d-1) = r^2 = \frac{1}{16}. \quad (2)$$

Given an instance  $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C})$  of  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP, we add a set  $\mathcal{U}$  of points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  as described in Table 1 and Table 2. These set of points are the input for the instance of the  $|\mathcal{V}|$ -CENTER problem.

Note that we add at most  $|\mathcal{V}| \cdot 2d$  many border points, at most  $|\mathcal{C}|$  many core points, and at most  $|\mathcal{V}|^2 \cdot \delta$  many secondary points. Hence, the total number of points  $n$  in the instance  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $\leq |\mathcal{V}| \cdot 2d + |\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{V}|^2 \cdot \delta = |\mathcal{I}|^{O(1)}$  where  $|\mathcal{I}| = |\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{D}| + |\mathcal{C}|$ . We now prove some preliminary lemmas to be later used in Section 2.3 and Section 2.4.

<sup>6</sup>For simplicity of presentation, we choose  $r = 1/4$  instead of  $r = 1$ : by scaling the result holds also for  $r = 1$ .

- (1) Corresponding to variables: If  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  then we add the following set of points which are collectively called as  $\text{BORDER}[\mathbf{a}]$
- For each  $i \in [d]$ , the point  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  which is located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot r(1 - \varepsilon) \oplus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$ .
  - For each  $i \in [d]$ , the point  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{-i}$  which is located at  $\mathbf{a} \ominus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot r(1 - \varepsilon) \ominus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$ .
- This set of points are referred to as *border* points.
- (2) Corresponding to unary constraints: If  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $\langle (\mathbf{a}), R_{\mathbf{a}} \rangle$  is the unary constraint on  $\mathbf{a}$ , then we add the following set of points which are collectively called as  $\text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}]$ :
- for each  $\mathbf{x} \in R_{\mathbf{a}} \subseteq [\delta]^d$  we add a point called  $C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{x}}$  located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}$ .
- This set of points are referred to as *core* points.
- (3) Corresponding to adjacencies in  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$ : For every edge  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}')$  in  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  we add a collection of  $\delta$  points denoted by  $\mathcal{S}_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}$ . Assume, without loss of generality, that  $\mathbf{a}' = \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i$  for some  $i \in [d]$ . Then the set of points  $\mathcal{S}_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}$  is defined as follows:
- for each  $\ell \in [\delta]$  we add a point  $S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\ell}$  which is located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot ((1 - \varepsilon)2r + \varepsilon\ell)$ .
- This set of points are referred to as *secondary* points.

**Table 1:** The set  $\mathcal{U}$  of points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (which gives an instance of  $k$ -CENTER) constructed from an instance  $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C})$  of  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP.

$$\text{For each } \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}, \text{ let } \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}] := \text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}] \cup \text{BORDER}[\mathbf{a}]. \quad (3)$$

$$\text{The set of primary points is } \text{PRIMARY} := \bigcup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}]. \quad (4)$$

$$\text{The set of secondary points is } \text{SECONDARY} := \bigcup_{\mathbf{a} \ \& \ \mathbf{a}' \text{ forms an edge in } G_{\mathcal{I}}} \mathcal{S}_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}. \quad (5)$$

$$\text{The final collection of points is } \mathcal{U} := \text{PRIMARY} \cup \text{SECONDARY}. \quad (6)$$

**Table 2:** Notation for some special subsets of points from  $\mathcal{U}$ . Note that a primary point is either a core point or a border point.

### 2.2.1 Preliminary lemmas

**Lemma 7.** For each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $i \in [d]$ , we have  $\text{dist}(B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{-i}) \geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ .

*Proof.* Fix any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $i \in [d]$ . By [Table 1](#), the points  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{-i}$  are located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot r(1 - \varepsilon) \oplus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$  and  $\mathbf{a} \ominus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot r(1 - \varepsilon) \ominus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$  respectively. Hence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{-i})^2 &= (2r(1 - \varepsilon))^2 + (d - 1) \cdot (4\varepsilon\delta)^2 = (2r(1 - \varepsilon))^2 + 16\varepsilon \cdot (d - 1)\varepsilon\delta^2, \\ &= (2r(1 - \varepsilon))^2 + 16\varepsilon \cdot r^2, && \text{(by definition of } \varepsilon \text{ in Equation 1)} \\ &= (2r)^2[(1 - \varepsilon)^2 + 4\varepsilon] = (2r(1 + \varepsilon))^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 8.** For each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$ , the distance between any two points in  $\text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}]$  is  $< r$ .

*Proof.* Fix any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$ . Consider any two points in  $\text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}]$ , say  $C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{x}}$  and  $C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{y}}$ , for some  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$ . By [Table 1](#),



these points are located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{y}$  respectively. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{x}}, C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{y}})^2 &= (\varepsilon \cdot \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))^2, \\ &\leq \varepsilon^2 \cdot d \cdot (\delta - 1)^2, && \text{(since } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in R_{\mathbf{a}} \subseteq [\delta]^d) \\ &= \frac{d(\delta - 1)^2}{(d - 1)^2 \delta^4} \cdot r^4, && \text{(by definition of } \varepsilon \text{ in Equation 1)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8} \cdot r^4 < r. && \text{(since } d \geq 2 \text{ and } \delta \geq 1) \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 9.** For each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$ , the distance of any point from  $\text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}]$  to any point from  $\text{BORDER}[\mathbf{a}]$  is  $< 2r$ .

*Proof.* Fix any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  and consider any point  $C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{x}} \in \text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}]$  where  $\mathbf{x} \in R_{\mathbf{a}} \subseteq [\delta]^d$ . We prove this lemma by showing that, for each  $i \in [d]$ , the point  $C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{x}}$  is at distance  $< 2r$  from both the points  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{-i}$ . Fix some  $i \in [d]$ .

(i) By Table 1, the points  $C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{x}}$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  are located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot r(1 - \varepsilon) \oplus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$  respectively. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{x}}, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i})^2 &= (r(1 - \varepsilon) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[i])^2 + \sum_{j=1: j \neq i}^d (2\varepsilon\delta - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[j])^2, \\ &\leq (r(1 - \varepsilon))^2 + (d - 1)(2\varepsilon\delta)^2, && \text{(since } \mathbf{x}[i], \mathbf{x}[j] \geq 1) \\ &= (r(1 - \varepsilon))^2 + 4\varepsilon r^2, && \text{(by definition of } \varepsilon \text{ in Equation 1)} \\ &= (r(1 + \varepsilon))^2 < (2r)^2. && \text{(since } \varepsilon < 1) \end{aligned}$$

(ii) By Table 1, the points  $C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{x}}$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{-i}$  are located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{a} \ominus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot r(1 - \varepsilon) \ominus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$  respectively. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{x}}, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{-i})^2 &= (r(1 - \varepsilon) + \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[i])^2 + \sum_{j=1: j \neq i}^d (\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[j] + 2\varepsilon\delta)^2, \\ &\leq (r(1 - \varepsilon) + \varepsilon\delta)^2 + (d - 1)(3\varepsilon\delta)^2, && \text{(since } \mathbf{x}[i], \mathbf{x}[j] \leq \delta) \\ &= (r(1 - \varepsilon) + \varepsilon\delta)^2 + 9\varepsilon r^2, && \text{(by definition of } \varepsilon) \\ &\leq 2r^2(1 - \varepsilon)^2 + 2\varepsilon^2 \delta^2 + 9\varepsilon r^2, && \text{(since } (\alpha + \beta)^2 \leq 2\alpha^2 + 2\beta^2) \\ &\leq 2r^2(1 - \varepsilon)^2 + 11\varepsilon r^2, && \text{(since } \varepsilon\delta^2 \leq r^2) \\ &= 2r^2((1 - \varepsilon)^2 + 5.5\varepsilon) < 2r^2(1 + 1.75\varepsilon)^2 < (2r)^2. && \text{(since } \varepsilon \leq 1/16) \end{aligned}$$

□

**Claim 10.** For each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$ , the distance of  $\mathbf{a}$  to any point in  $\text{BORDER}[\mathbf{a}]$  is  $r(1 + \varepsilon)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $p$  be any point in  $\text{BORDER}[\mathbf{a}]$ . Then we have two choices for  $p$ , namely  $p = B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  or  $p = B_{\mathbf{a}}^{-i}$ . In both cases, we have

$$\text{dist}(p, \mathbf{a})^2 = (r(1 - \varepsilon))^2 + (d - 1)(2\varepsilon\delta)^2 = r^2(1 - \varepsilon)^2 + 4\varepsilon r^2 = (r(1 + \varepsilon))^2,$$

where the second equality is obtained by the definition of  $\varepsilon$  (Equation 1). □

**Lemma 11.** For each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  and each  $i \in [d]$ ,

- If  $w \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $\text{dist}(w, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}) < 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$  then  $w \in (\mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}] \cup \mathcal{S}_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i\}})$ .
- If  $w \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $\text{dist}(w, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{-i}) < 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$  then  $w \in (\mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}] \cup \mathcal{S}_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \ominus \mathbf{e}_i\}})$ .

*Proof.* The proof of this lemma is quite long, and is hence deferred to [Appendix A](#) to maintain the flow of the paper.  $\square$

**Remark 12.** [Lemma 11](#) gives a necessary but not sufficient condition. Also, it might be the case that for some  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $i \in [d]$  the vector  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \notin \mathcal{V}$  (resp.,  $\mathbf{a} \ominus \mathbf{e}_i \notin \mathcal{V}$ ) in which case the set  $\mathcal{S}_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i\}}$  (resp.,  $\mathcal{S}_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \ominus \mathbf{e}_i\}}$ ) is empty.

**Lemma 13.** Let  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $i \in [d]$  be such that  $\mathbf{a}' := (\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i) \in \mathcal{V}$ . For each  $\ell \in [\delta]$ ,

- (1) If  $\mathbf{x} \in R_{\mathbf{a}}$  and  $\ell \leq \mathbf{x}[i]$ , then  $\text{dist} \left( C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{x}}, S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\ell} \right) < 2r$ .
- (2) If  $\mathbf{x} \in R_{\mathbf{a}}$  and  $\ell > \mathbf{x}[i]$ , then  $\text{dist} \left( C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{x}}, S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\ell} \right) \geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ .
- (3) If  $\mathbf{y} \in R_{\mathbf{a}'}$  and  $\ell > \mathbf{y}[i]$ , then  $\text{dist} \left( C_{\mathbf{a}'}^{\mathbf{y}}, S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\ell} \right) < 2r$ .
- (4) If  $\mathbf{y} \in R_{\mathbf{a}'}$  and  $\ell \leq \mathbf{y}[i]$ , then  $\text{dist} \left( C_{\mathbf{a}'}^{\mathbf{y}}, S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\ell} \right) \geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ .

*Proof.* Recall from [Table 1](#) that the points  $C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{x}}$  and  $S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\ell}$  are located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot ((1 - \varepsilon)2r + \varepsilon\ell)$  respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) \text{ If } \ell \leq \mathbf{x}[i], \text{ then } \text{dist} \left( C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{x}}, S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\ell} \right)^2 & \\
&= (2r(1 - \varepsilon) + \varepsilon(\ell - \mathbf{x}[i]))^2 + \sum_{j=1: j \neq i}^d (\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[j])^2, \\
&\leq (2r(1 - \varepsilon))^2 + (d - 1)\varepsilon^2 \delta^2 = (2r(1 - \varepsilon))^2 + \varepsilon r^2 && \text{(since } \ell \leq \mathbf{x}[i] \text{ and } \mathbf{x}[j] \leq \delta) \\
&= (2r)^2 \left( (1 - \varepsilon)^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right) < (2r)^2. && \text{(since } 0 < \varepsilon < 1)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(2) \text{ If } \ell > \mathbf{x}[i], \text{ then } \text{dist} \left( C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{x}}, S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\ell} \right)^2 & \\
&= (2r(1 - \varepsilon) + \varepsilon(\ell - \mathbf{x}[i]))^2 + \sum_{j=1: j \neq i}^d (\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[j])^2, \\
&\geq (2r(1 - \varepsilon) + \varepsilon)^2 = (2r(1 - \varepsilon) + 4r\varepsilon)^2 = (2r(1 + \varepsilon))^2. && \text{(since } \ell > \mathbf{x}[i] \text{ and } 4r = 1)
\end{aligned}$$

We now show the remaining two claims: recall from [Table 1](#) that the points  $C_{\mathbf{a}'}^{\mathbf{y}}$  and  $S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\ell}$  are located at  $(\mathbf{a}' \oplus \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \oplus \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{y}$  and  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot ((1 - \varepsilon)2r + \varepsilon\ell)$  respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}
(3) \text{ If } \ell > \mathbf{y}[i], \text{ then } \text{dist} \left( C_{\mathbf{a}'}^{\mathbf{y}}, S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\ell} \right)^2 & \\
&= (1 + \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{y}[i] - (1 - \varepsilon)2r - \varepsilon\ell)^2 + \sum_{j=1: j \neq i}^d (\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{y}[j])^2, \\
&\leq (4r + \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{y}[i] - (1 - \varepsilon)2r - \varepsilon\ell)^2 + (d - 1)\varepsilon^2 \delta^2, && \text{(since } 4r = 1 \text{ and } \mathbf{y}[j] \leq \delta) \\
&= (2r(1 + \varepsilon) - \varepsilon(\ell - \mathbf{y}[i]))^2 + \varepsilon r^2, && \text{(since } (d - 1)\varepsilon \delta^2 = r^2) \\
&\leq (2r(1 + \varepsilon) - \varepsilon)^2 + \varepsilon r^2, && \text{(since } \ell > \mathbf{y}[i]) \\
&= (2r(1 - \varepsilon))^2 + \varepsilon r^2, && \text{(since } 4r = 1) \\
&= (2r)^2 \left( (1 - \varepsilon)^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right) < (2r)^2. && \text{(since } 0 < \varepsilon < 1)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(4) \text{ If } \ell \leq \mathbf{y}[i], \text{ then } \text{dist} \left( C_{\mathbf{a}'}^{\mathbf{y}}, S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\ell} \right)^2 & \\
&= (1 + \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{y}[i] - (1 - \varepsilon)2r - \varepsilon\ell)^2 + \sum_{j=1: j \neq i}^d (\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{y}[j])^2, \\
&\geq (2r(1 + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon(\mathbf{y}[i] - \ell))^2, && \text{(since } 4r = 1) \\
&\geq (2r(1 + \varepsilon))^2. && \text{(since } \mathbf{y}[i] \geq \ell)
\end{aligned}$$



□

**Lemma 14.** Let  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $i \in [d]$  be such that  $\mathbf{a}' := (\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i) \in \mathcal{V}$ . If  $\mathbf{a}'' \notin \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}$  then the distance between any point in  $\text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}'']$  and any point in  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'}$  is at least  $2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  be two arbitrary points from  $\text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}'']$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'}$ , respectively. By Table 1,  $\mathbf{p}$  is located at  $\mathbf{a}'' \oplus \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}$  for some  $\mathbf{x} \in R_{\mathbf{a}} \subseteq [\delta]^d$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  is located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot ((1 - \varepsilon)2r + \varepsilon\ell)$  for some  $\ell \in [\delta]$ .

Since  $\mathbf{a}' = \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i$  and  $\mathbf{a}'' \notin \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}$ , we have three cases to consider:

- $\mathbf{a}''[j] = \mathbf{a}[j]$  for all  $j \neq i$  and  $\mathbf{a}''[i] \leq \mathbf{a}[i] - 1$ : In this case, we have  $\text{dist}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})^2$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq ((\mathbf{a}[i] + (1 - \varepsilon)2r + \varepsilon\ell) - (\mathbf{a}''[i] + \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[i]))^2, && \text{(only considering the } i\text{-th coordinate)} \\ &= (\mathbf{a}[i] - \mathbf{a}''[i] + (1 - \varepsilon)2r + \varepsilon\ell - \varepsilon\mathbf{x}[i])^2, \\ &\geq (1 + (1 - \varepsilon)2r + \varepsilon \cdot 4r - \varepsilon\delta)^2, && \text{(since } \mathbf{a}[i] - \mathbf{a}''[i] \geq 1, \ell \geq 1 = 4r \text{ and } \mathbf{x}[i] \leq \delta) \\ &> (2r(1 + \varepsilon))^2. && \text{(since } 1 - \varepsilon\delta \geq 1 - \frac{1}{16} > 0) \end{aligned}$$

- $\mathbf{a}''[j] = \mathbf{a}[j]$  for all  $j \neq i$  and  $\mathbf{a}''[i] \geq \mathbf{a}[i] + 2$ : In this case, we have  $\text{dist}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})^2$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq ((\mathbf{a}''[i] + \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[i]) - (\mathbf{a}[i] + (1 - \varepsilon)2r + \varepsilon\ell))^2, && \text{(only considering the } i\text{-th coordinate)} \\ &= (\mathbf{a}''[i] - \mathbf{a}[i] - (1 - \varepsilon)2r + \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[i] - \varepsilon\ell)^2, \\ &\geq (2 - (1 - \varepsilon)2r + \varepsilon - \varepsilon\delta)^2, && \text{(since } \mathbf{a}''[i] - \mathbf{a}[i] \geq 2, \mathbf{x}[i] \geq 1 \text{ and } \ell \leq \delta) \\ &= (4r - (1 - \varepsilon)2r + 1 + \varepsilon - \varepsilon\delta)^2, && \text{(since } 4r = 1) \\ &> (2r(1 + \varepsilon))^2. && \text{(since } 1 - \varepsilon\delta \geq 1 - \frac{1}{16} > 0) \end{aligned}$$

- There exists  $j \neq i$  such that  $\mathbf{a}''[j] \neq \mathbf{a}[j]$ : In this case, we have  $\text{dist}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq |\mathbf{a}[j] - (\mathbf{a}''[j] + \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[j])|, && \text{(only considering the } j\text{-th coordinate)} \\ &\geq |\mathbf{a}[j] - \mathbf{a}''[j]| - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[j], && \text{(by triangle inequality)} \\ &\geq 1 - \varepsilon \cdot \delta, && \text{(since } \mathbf{a}[j] \neq \mathbf{a}''[j] \text{ and } \mathbf{x}[j] \leq \delta) \\ &\geq 2r + 2r - r^2 = 2r + 2r \left(1 - \frac{r}{2}\right), && \text{(since } 4r = 1 \text{ and } \varepsilon\delta \leq r^2) \\ &> 2r(1 + \varepsilon). && \text{(since } 1 - \frac{r}{2} > \frac{1}{16} \geq \varepsilon) \end{aligned}$$

□

### 2.3 $\mathcal{I}$ has a satisfying assignment $\Rightarrow$ OPT for the instance $\mathcal{U}$ of $|\mathcal{V}|$ -CENTER is $< 2r$

Suppose that the  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP  $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C})$  has a satisfying assignment  $f : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ . Consider the set of points  $F$  given by  $\left\{C_{\mathbf{a}}^{f(\mathbf{a})} : \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}\right\}$ . Since  $f : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  is a satisfying assignment for  $\mathcal{I}$ , it follows that  $f(\mathbf{a}) \in R_{\mathbf{a}}$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  and hence the set  $F$  is well-defined. Clearly,  $|F| = |\mathcal{V}|$ . We now show that

$$\text{OPT}(F) := \left( \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \left( \min_{v \in F} \text{dist}(u, v) \right) \right) < 2r$$

This implies that OPT for the instance  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $|\mathcal{V}|$ -CENTER is  $< 2r$ . We show  $\text{OPT}(F) < 2r$  by showing that  $\text{dist}(p, F) < 2r$  for each  $p \in \mathcal{U}$ . From Table 1 and Table 2, it is sufficient to consider the two cases depending on whether  $p$  is a primary point or a secondary point.

**Lemma 15.** If  $p$  is a primary point, then  $\text{dist}(p, F) < 2r$ .

*Proof.* If  $p$  is a primary point, then by Table 1 and Table 2 it follows that  $p$  is either a core point or a border point:

- **$p$  is a core point:** By Table 1,  $p \in \text{CORE}[\mathbf{b}]$  for some  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{V}$ . Then, Lemma 8 implies that  $\text{dist}(p, C_{\mathbf{b}}^{f(\mathbf{b})}) < r$ . Since  $C_{\mathbf{b}}^{f(\mathbf{b})} \in F$ , we have  $\text{dist}(p, F) \leq \text{dist}(p, C_{\mathbf{b}}^{f(\mathbf{b})}) < r$ .
- **$p$  is a border point:** By Table 1,  $p \in \text{BORDER}[\mathbf{b}]$  for some  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{V}$ . Then, Lemma 9 implies that  $\text{dist}(p, C_{\mathbf{b}}^{f(\mathbf{b})}) < 2r$ . Since  $C_{\mathbf{b}}^{f(\mathbf{b})} \in F$ , we have  $\text{dist}(p, F) \leq \text{dist}(p, C_{\mathbf{b}}^{f(\mathbf{b})}) < 2r$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 16.** If  $p$  is a secondary point, then  $\text{dist}(p, F) < 2r$ .

*Proof.* If  $p$  is a secondary point, then by Table 1 and Table 2 it follows that there exists  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}, i \in [d]$  and  $\ell \in [\delta]$  such that  $p = S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i\}}^\ell$ . Note that  $C_{\mathbf{a}}^{f(\mathbf{a})} \in F$  and  $C_{\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i}^{f(\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i)} \in F$ . We now prove the lemma by showing that  $\min \left\{ \text{dist}(p, C_{\mathbf{a}}^{f(\mathbf{a})}); \text{dist}(p, C_{\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i}^{f(\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i)}) \right\} < 2r$ . Since  $f: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  is a satisfying assignment, the binary constraint on  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i$  is satisfied, i.e.,  $\delta \geq f(\mathbf{a})[i] \geq f(\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i)[i] \geq 1$ . Since  $\ell \in [\delta]$  this implies that either  $\ell \leq f(\mathbf{a})[i]$  or  $\ell > f(\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i)[i]$ . The following implications complete the proof:

- If  $\ell \leq f(\mathbf{a})[i]$ , then Lemma 13(1) implies that  $\text{dist}(C_{\mathbf{a}}^{f(\mathbf{a})}, p) < 2r$ .
- If  $\ell > f(\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i)[i]$ , then Lemma 13(3) implies that  $\text{dist}(C_{\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i}^{f(\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i)}, p) < 2r$ .  $\square$

From Table 2, Lemma 15 and Lemma 16 it follows that OPT for the instance  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $|\mathcal{V}|$ -CENTER is  $< 2r$ .

## 2.4 $\mathcal{I}$ does not have a satisfying assignment $\Rightarrow$ OPT for the instance $\mathcal{U}$ of $|\mathcal{V}|$ -CENTER is $\geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$

Suppose that the instance  $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C})$  of  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP does not have a satisfying assignment. We want to now show that OPT for the instance  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $|\mathcal{V}|$ -CENTER is  $\geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ . Fix any set  $Q \subseteq \mathcal{U}$  of size  $|\mathcal{V}|$ : it is sufficient to show that

$$\text{OPT}(Q) := \left( \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \left( \min_{v \in Q} \text{dist}(u, v) \right) \right) \geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon) \quad (7)$$

We consider two cases: either  $|Q \cap \text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}]| = 1$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  (Lemma 17) or not (Lemma 18).

**Lemma 17.** If  $|Q \cap \text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}]| = 1$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  then  $\text{OPT}(Q) \geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ .

*Proof.* Since  $|Q| = |\mathcal{V}|$  and  $|Q \cap \text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}]| = 1$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  it follows that the only points in  $Q$  are core points (see Table 1 for definition) and moreover  $Q$  contains exactly one core point corresponding to each element from  $\mathcal{V}$ . Let  $\phi: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow [\delta]^d$  be the function such that  $Q \cap \text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}] = C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\phi(\mathbf{a})}$ . By Table 1, it follows that  $\phi(\mathbf{a}) \in R_{\mathbf{a}}$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$ .

Recall that we are assuming in this section that the instance  $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C})$  of  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP does not have a satisfying assignment. Hence, in particular, the function  $\phi: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow [\delta]^d$  is not a satisfying assignment for  $\mathcal{I}$ . All unary constraints are satisfied since  $\phi(\mathbf{a}) \in R_{\mathbf{a}}$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$ . Hence, there is some binary constraint which is not satisfied by  $\phi$ : let this constraint be violated for the pair  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i$  for some  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $i \in [d]$ . Let us denote  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i$  by  $\mathbf{a}'$ . The violation of the binary constraint on  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i$  by  $\phi$  implies that  $1 \leq \phi(\mathbf{a})[i] < \phi(\mathbf{a}')[i] \leq \delta$ . We now show that  $\text{dist}(Q, S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\phi(\mathbf{a}') [i]}) \geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$  which, in turn, implies that  $\text{OPT}(Q) \geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ . The following implications complete the proof:

- Lemma 13(2) implies that  $\text{dist}(S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\phi(\mathbf{a}') [i]}, C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\phi(\mathbf{a})}) \geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ .
- Lemma 13(4) implies that  $\text{dist}(S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\phi(\mathbf{a}') [i]}, C_{\mathbf{a}'}^{\phi(\mathbf{a}')}) \geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ .
- Consider any point  $s \in Q \setminus \{C_{\mathbf{a}}^{\phi(\mathbf{a})}, C_{\mathbf{a}'}^{\phi(\mathbf{a}')}\}$ . Then  $s \in \text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}']$  for some  $\mathbf{a}'' \notin \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}$ . Lemma 14 implies  $\text{dist}(S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'\}}^{\phi(\mathbf{a}') [i]}, s) \geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 18.** If there exists  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  such that  $|Q \cap \text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}]| \neq 1$  then  $\text{OPT}(Q) \geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\text{OPT}(Q) < 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ . To prove the lemma, we will now show that this implies  $|Q \cap \text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}]| = 1$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$ . This is done via the following two claims, namely Claim 19 and Claim 20.

**Claim 19.**  $|Q \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}]| = 1$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$

*Proof.* Define three sets  $I_0, I_1$  and  $I_{\geq 2}$  as follows:

$$I_0 := \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V} : |Q \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}]| = 0\} \quad (8)$$

$$I_1 := \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V} : |Q \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}]| = 1\} \quad (9)$$

$$I_{\geq 2} := \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V} : |Q \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}]| \geq 2\} \quad (10)$$

By definition, we have

$$|I_0| + |I_1| + |I_{\geq 2}| = |\mathcal{V}| \quad (11)$$

Consider a variable  $\mathbf{b} \in I_0$ . Since  $\text{dist}(Q, B_{\mathbf{b}}^{+i})$  and  $\text{dist}(Q, B_{\mathbf{b}}^{-i}) < 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ , and  $Q \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{b}] = \emptyset$ , [Lemma 11](#) implies that for each  $i \in [d]$

(i)  $Q$  must contain a point from  $\mathcal{S}_{\{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i\}}$  since  $Q \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{b}] = \emptyset$ , and

(ii)  $Q$  must contain a point from  $\mathcal{S}_{\{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i\}}$  since  $Q \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{b}] = \emptyset$

Since each secondary point can be “charged” to two variables in  $\mathcal{V}$  (recall the definition of secondary points from [Table 1](#): each secondary point is indexed by a set of two variables  $\{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}'\}$  such that  $\mathbf{b}' = \mathbf{b} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i$  for some  $i \in [d]$ ), it follows that  $Q$  contains  $\geq \frac{2d}{2} = d \geq 2$  distinct secondary points corresponding to each variable in  $I_0$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_0| + |I_1| + |I_{\geq 2}| &= |\mathcal{V}| && \text{(from Equation 11)} \\ &= |Q| \\ &\geq |Q \cap \text{PRIMARY}| + |Q \cap \text{SECONDARY}| && \text{(since PRIMARY} \cap \text{SECONDARY} = \emptyset) \\ &\geq (|I_1| + 2|I_{\geq 2}|) + |Q \cap \text{SECONDARY}| && \text{(by definition of } I_1 \text{ and } I_{\geq 2}) \\ &\geq (|I_1| + 2|I_{\geq 2}|) + 2|I_0| && (12) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows because  $Q$  contains at least 2 secondary points corresponding to each variable in  $I_0$ . Hence, we have  $|I_0| + |I_1| + |I_{\geq 2}| \geq 2|I_0| + |I_1| + 2|I_{\geq 2}|$  which implies  $|I_0| = 0 = |I_{\geq 2}|$ . From [Equation 11](#), we get  $|I_1| = |\mathcal{V}|$ , i.e.,  $|Q \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}]| = 1$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$ . This concludes the proof of [Claim 19](#).  $\square$

Since  $|Q| = |\mathcal{V}|$  and  $\mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}] \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{b}] = \emptyset$  for distinct  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{V}$ , [Claim 19](#) implies that

$$Q \text{ contains no secondary points} \quad (13)$$

We now prove that  $Q$  doesn't contain border points either.

**Claim 20.**  $|Q \cap \text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}]| = 1$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$

*Proof.* Fix any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$ . From [Claim 19](#), we know that  $|Q \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}]| = 1$ . Suppose that this unique point in  $Q \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}]$  is from  $\text{BORDER}[\mathbf{a}]$ . Without loss of generality, let  $Q \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}] = \{B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}\}$  for some  $i \in [d]$ . Since  $\text{OPT}(Q) < 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ , it follows that  $\text{dist}(Q, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{-i}) < 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ . Hence, [Lemma 11\(2\)](#) implies that  $Q \cap (\mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}] \cup \mathcal{S}_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i\}}) \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $Q$  contains no secondary points ([Equation 13](#)), we have  $Q \cap (\mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}] \cup \mathcal{S}_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i\}}) = Q \cap \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}] = \{B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}\}$ . But from [Lemma 7](#) we know  $\text{dist}(B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{-i}) \geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ . We thus obtain a contradiction. This concludes the proof of [Claim 20](#).  $\square$

Therefore, we have shown that  $\text{OPT}(Q) < 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$  implies  $|Q \cap \text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}]| = 1$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$ . This concludes the proof of [Lemma 18](#).  $\square$

## 2.5 Finishing the proof of [Theorem 1](#)

Finally, we are ready to prove [Theorem 1](#) which is restated below:

**Theorem 1.** For any  $d \geq 2$ , under the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH), the discrete  $k$ -CENTER problem in  $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space

- **(Inapproximability result)** does not admit an  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in  $f(k) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{o(k^{1-1/d})} \cdot n^{o(k^{1-1/d})}$  time where  $f$  is any computable function and  $n$  is the number of points.

- **(Lower bound for exact algorithm)** cannot be solved in  $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k^{1-1/d})}$  time where  $f$  is any computable function and  $n$  is the number of points.

*Proof.* Given an instance  $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C})$  of a  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP, we build an instance  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $|\mathcal{V}|$ -CENTER in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  given by the reduction in [Section 2.2](#). This reduction has the property that

- if  $\mathcal{I}$  has a satisfying assignment then OPT for the instance  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $|\mathcal{V}|$ -CENTER is  $< 2r$  ([Section 2.3](#)), and
- if  $\mathcal{I}$  does not have a satisfying assignment then OPT for the instance  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $|\mathcal{V}|$ -CENTER is  $\geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon^*)$  ([Section 2.4](#))

where  $r = 1/4$  and  $\varepsilon^* = \frac{r^2}{(d-1)\delta^2} \geq \frac{1}{16(d-1)|\mathcal{D}|}$ , since  $|\mathcal{D}| = \lceil |\delta|^d \rceil \geq \delta^2$ . Hence, any algorithm for the  $|\mathcal{V}|$ -center problem which has an approximation factor  $\leq (1 + \varepsilon^*)$  can solve the  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP. Note that the instance  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $k$ -CENTER in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  has  $k = |\mathcal{V}|$  and the number of points  $n \leq |\mathcal{V}| \cdot 2d + |\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{V}|^2 \cdot \delta = |\mathcal{I}|^{O(1)}$  where  $|\mathcal{I}| = |\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{D}| + |\mathcal{C}|$ . We now derive the two lower bounds claimed in the theorem:

- **(Inapproximability result)** Suppose that there exists  $d \geq 2$  such that the  $k$ -center on  $n$  points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  admits an  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm in  $f(k) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{o(k^{1-1/d})} \cdot n^{o(k^{1-1/d})}$  time for some computable function  $f$ . As argued above, using a  $(1 + \varepsilon^*)$ -approximation for the  $k$ -center problem with  $k = |\mathcal{V}|$  and  $n = |\mathcal{I}|^{O(1)}$  points can solve the  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP problem. Recall that  $16(d-1)|\mathcal{I}| \geq 16(d-1)|\mathcal{D}| \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^*}$  since  $|\mathcal{I}| = |\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{D}| + |\mathcal{C}|$ , and hence we have an algorithm for the  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP problem which runs in time  $f(|\mathcal{V}|) \cdot (16d)^{o(k^{1-1/d})} \cdot |\mathcal{I}|^{o(k^{1-1/d})}$  which contradicts [Theorem 5](#).

- **(Lower bound for exact algorithm)** Suppose that there exists  $d \geq 2$  such that the  $k$ -center on  $n$  points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  admits an exact algorithm in  $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k^{1-1/d})}$  time for some computable function  $f$ . As argued above<sup>7</sup>, solving the  $k$  center problem with  $k = |\mathcal{V}|$  and  $n = |\mathcal{I}|^{O(1)}$  points can solve the  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP problem. Hence, we have an algorithm for the  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP problem which runs in time  $f(|\mathcal{V}|) \cdot |\mathcal{I}|^{o(k^{1-1/d})}$  which again contradicts [Theorem 5](#).  $\square$

---

<sup>7</sup>The argument above is actually stronger: even a  $(1 + \varepsilon^*)$ -approximation algorithm for  $k$ -center can solve  $d$ -dimensional geometric  $\geq$ -CSP

## References

- [1] Pierre Aboulker, Nick Brettell, Frédéric Havet, Dániel Marx, and Nicolas Trotignon. Coloring graphs with constraints on connectivity. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 85(4):814–838, 2017.
- [2] Pankaj K. Agarwal and Cecilia Magdalena Procopiuc. Exact and approximation algorithms for clustering. *Algorithmica*, 33(2):201–226, 2002.
- [3] Jochen Alber and Jirí Fiala. Geometric separation and exact solutions for the parameterized independent set problem on disk graphs. *J. Algorithms*, 52(2):134–151, 2004.
- [4] Amariah Becker, Philip N. Klein, and David Saulpic. Polynomial-Time Approximation Schemes for  $k$ -center,  $k$ -median, and Capacitated Vehicle Routing in Bounded Highway Dimension. In *ESA 2018*, volume 112, pages 8:1–8:15.
- [5] Csaba Biró, Édouard Bonnet, Dániel Marx, Tillmann Miltzow, and Pawel Rzazewski. Fine-grained complexity of coloring unit disks and balls. *J. Comput. Geom.*, 9(2):47–80, 2018.
- [6] Sergio Cabello, Panos Giannopoulos, Christian Knauer, Dániel Marx, and Günter Rote. Geometric clustering: Fixed-parameter tractability and lower bounds with respect to the dimension. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 7(4):43:1–43:27, 2011.
- [7] Rajesh Hemant Chitnis, Andreas Emil Feldmann, Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, and Dániel Marx. Tight Bounds for Planar Strongly Connected Steiner Subgraph with Fixed Number of Terminals (and Extensions). *SIAM J. Comput.*, 49(2):318–364, 2020.
- [8] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Arnaud de Mesmay, Eva Rotenberg, and Alan Roytman. The Bane of Low-Dimensionality Clustering. In *SODA 2018*, pages 441–456.
- [9] Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015. ISBN 978-3-319-21274-6.
- [10] Mark de Berg, Hans L. Bodlaender, Sándor Kisfaludi-Bak, and Sudeshna Kolay. An ETH-Tight Exact Algorithm for Euclidean TSP. In *FOCS 2018*, pages 450–461.
- [11] Mark de Berg, Hans L. Bodlaender, Sándor Kisfaludi-Bak, Dániel Marx, and Tom C. van der Zanden. A Framework for Exponential-Time-Hypothesis-Tight Algorithms and Lower Bounds in Geometric Intersection Graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 49(6):1291–1331, 2020.
- [12] Erik D. Demaine, Fedor V. Fomin, Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Fixed-parameter algorithms for  $(k, r)$ -center in planar graphs and map graphs. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 1(1):33–47, 2005.
- [13] Erik D. Demaine, Fedor V. Fomin, Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Subexponential parameterized algorithms on bounded-genus graphs and  $H$ -minor-free graphs. *J. ACM*, 52(6):866–893, 2005.
- [14] Andreas Emil Feldmann. Fixed-parameter approximations for  $k$ -center problems in low highway dimension graphs. *Algorithmica*, 81(3):1031–1052, 2019.
- [15] Andreas Emil Feldmann and Dániel Marx. The parameterized hardness of the  $k$ -center problem in transportation networks. *Algorithmica*, 82(7):1989–2005, 2020.
- [16] Fedor V. Fomin, Sudeshna Kolay, Daniel Lokshtanov, Fahad Panolan, and Saket Saurabh. Subexponential Algorithms for Rectilinear Steiner Tree and Arborescence Problems. In *SoCG 2016*, pages 39:1–39:15, .

- [17] Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. Subexponential Parameterized Algorithms for Planar and Apex-Minor-Free Graphs via Low Treewidth Pattern Covering. In *FOCS 2016*, pages 515–524, .
- [18] Eli Fox-Epstein, Philip N. Klein, and Aaron Schild. Embedding Planar Graphs into Low-Treewidth Graphs with Applications to Efficient Approximation Schemes for Metric Problems. In *SODA 2019*, pages 1069–1088.
- [19] Yogesh A. Girdhar and Gregory Dudek. Efficient on-line data summarization using extremum summaries. In *ICRA 2012*, pages 3490–3496.
- [20] Teofilo F. Gonzalez. Clustering to minimize the maximum intercluster distance. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 38:293–306, 1985.
- [21] S. Louis Hakimi. Steiner’s problem in graphs and its implications. *Networks*, 1(2):113–133, 1971.
- [22] Christian Hennig, Marina Meila, Fionn Murtagh, and Roberto Rocci. *Handbook of cluster analysis*. CRC Press, 2015.
- [23] Dorit S. Hochbaum and David B. Shmoys. A best possible heuristic for the  $k$ -center problem. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 10(2):180–184, 1985.
- [24] Wen-Lian Hsu and George L. Nemhauser. Easy and hard bottleneck location problems. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 1(3):209–215, 1979.
- [25] R. Z. Hwang, R. C. Chang, and Richard C. T. Lee. The Searching over Separators Strategy To Solve Some NP-Hard Problems in Subexponential Time. *Algorithmica*, 9(4):398–423, 1993.
- [26] R. Z. Hwang, Richard C. T. Lee, and R. C. Chang. The Slab Dividing Approach To Solve the Euclidean  $p$ -Center Problem. *Algorithmica*, 9(1):1–22, 1993.
- [27] Russell Impagliazzo and Ramamohan Paturi. On the Complexity of  $k$ -SAT. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 62(2):367–375, 2001.
- [28] Russell Impagliazzo, Ramamohan Paturi, and Francis Zane. Which Problems Have Strongly Exponential Complexity? *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 63(4):512–530, 2001.
- [29] Daxin Jiang, Chun Tang, and Aidong Zhang. Cluster analysis for gene expression data: a survey. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 16(11):1370–1386, 2004.
- [30] Ioannis Katsikarelis, Michael Lampis, and Vangelis Th. Paschos. Structural parameters, tight bounds, and approximation for  $(k, r)$ -center. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 264:90–117, 2019.
- [31] Philip N. Klein and Dániel Marx. Solving Planar  $k$ -Terminal Cut in  $O(n^{c\sqrt{k}})$  Time. In *ICALP 2012*, pages 569–580, .
- [32] Philip N. Klein and Dániel Marx. A subexponential parameterized algorithm for Subset TSP on planar graphs. In *SODA 2014*, pages 1812–1830, .
- [33] Daniel Lokshtanov, Saket Saurabh, and Magnus Wahlström. Subexponential Parameterized Odd Cycle Transversal on Planar Graphs. In *FSTTCS 2012*, pages 424–434.
- [34] Dániel Marx. A Tight Lower Bound for Planar Multiway Cut with Fixed Number of Terminals. In *ICALP 2012*, pages 677–688, .
- [35] Dániel Marx. Parameterized complexity of independence and domination on geometric graphs. In Hans L. Bodlaender and Michael A. Langston, editors, *IWPEC 2006*, pages 154–165, .



- [36] Dániel Marx. Efficient Approximation Schemes for Geometric Problems? In *ESA 2005*, pages 448–459, .
- [37] Dániel Marx and Michal Pilipczuk. Optimal Parameterized Algorithms for Planar Facility Location Problems Using Voronoi Diagrams. In *ESA 2015*, pages 865–877.
- [38] Dániel Marx and Anastasios Sidiropoulos. The limited blessing of low dimensionality: when  $1 - 1/d$  is the best possible exponent for  $d$ -dimensional geometric problems. In *SoCG 2014*, page 67.
- [39] Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, and Michal Pilipczuk. On Subexponential Parameterized Algorithms for Steiner Tree and Directed Subset TSP on Planar Graphs. In *FOCS 2018*, pages 474–484.
- [40] Marie-Francine Moens, Caroline Uyttendaele, and Jos Dumortier. Abstracting of legal cases: The potential of clustering based on the selection of representative objects. *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci.*, 50(2): 151–161, 1999.
- [41] Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, Piotr Sankowski, and Erik Jan van Leeuwen. Subexponential-Time Parameterized Algorithm for Steiner Tree on Planar Graphs. In *STACS 2013*, pages 353–364.
- [42] Warren D. Smith and Nicholas C. Wormald. Geometric separator theorems & applications. In *FOCS 1998*, pages 232–243.
- [43] Vijay V. Vazirani. *Approximation algorithms*. Springer, 2001. ISBN 978-3-540-65367-7.

## A Proof of Lemma 11

*Proof.* Fix some  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $i \in [d]$ . To show the first part of lemma, it suffices to show that if  $w \in \mathcal{U} \setminus (\mathcal{D}[\mathbf{a}] \cup \mathcal{S}_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i\}})$  then  $\text{dist}(w, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}) \geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ . We argue based on whether  $w$  is a primary or secondary point. Recall,  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i} = \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot r(1 - \varepsilon) \oplus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$ .

We begin with the following two cases which arise when  $w$  is a **primary** point.

- (1)  $w \in \text{CORE}[\mathbf{a}']$  for some  $\mathbf{a}' \neq \mathbf{a}$ : From Table 1, we know  $w = C_{\mathbf{a}'}^{\mathbf{x}}$  for some  $\mathbf{x} \in R_{\mathbf{a}'} \subseteq [\delta]^d$ . That is,  $w = \mathbf{a}' \oplus \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}$ . Since  $\mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{a}'$ , it follows that  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{a}'$  differ in at least one coordinate, say the  $j$ -th coordinate.

- (i)  $i \neq j$ : In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(w, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}) &\geq |(\mathbf{a}'[j] + \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[j]) - (\mathbf{a}[j] + 2\varepsilon\delta)|, && \text{(only considering the } j\text{-th coordinate)} \\ &\geq |\mathbf{a}'[j] - \mathbf{a}[j]| - |2\varepsilon\delta - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[j]|, && \text{(by triangle inequality)} \\ &\geq 1 - 2\varepsilon\delta, && \text{(since } \mathbf{a}'[j] \neq \mathbf{a}[j] \text{ and } \mathbf{x}[j] \in [\delta]) \\ &\geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon). && \text{(from Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \end{aligned}$$

- (ii)  $i = j$ : In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(w, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}) &\geq |\mathbf{a}'[i] + \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[i] - \mathbf{a}[i] - r(1 - \varepsilon)|, && \text{(only considering the } i\text{-th coordinate)} \\ &\geq |\mathbf{a}'[i] - \mathbf{a}[i]| - |r(1 - \varepsilon) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{x}[i]|, && \text{(by triangle inequality)} \\ &\geq 4r - r(1 - 5\varepsilon), && \text{(since } \mathbf{a}'[i] \neq \mathbf{a}[i], 4r = 1, \text{ and } \mathbf{x}[i] \geq 1) \\ &\geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon). && \text{(from Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \end{aligned}$$

- (2)  $w \in \text{BORDER}[\mathbf{a}']$  for some  $\mathbf{a}' \neq \mathbf{a}$ : From Table 1,  $w \in \{B_{\mathbf{a}'}^{+q}, B_{\mathbf{a}'}^{-q}\}$  for some  $q \in [d]$ . Since  $\mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{a}'$ , they differ in at least one coordinate, say the  $j$ -th coordinate. We now consider two cases depending on  $\text{dist}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}')$ .

- (i)  $\text{dist}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}') \geq \sqrt{2}$ : By the triangle inequality we have

$$\sqrt{2} \leq \text{dist}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}') \leq \text{dist}(\mathbf{a}, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}) + \text{dist}(B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}, w) + \text{dist}(w, \mathbf{a}').$$

By Claim 10, it follows that  $\text{dist}(\mathbf{a}, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}) = r(1 + \varepsilon)$  and  $\text{dist}(w, \mathbf{a}') = r(1 + \varepsilon)$  (since  $w \in \text{BORDER}[\mathbf{a}']$ ). Hence, we have  $\text{dist}(B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}, w) \geq \sqrt{2} - 2r(1 + \varepsilon) = 4\sqrt{2}r - 2r(1 + \varepsilon) \geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon)$ , where in the last bound we have used Equation 1 and Equation 2.

- (ii)  $\text{dist}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}') = 1$ : In this case, we have  $\text{dist}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}') = |\mathbf{a}[j] - \mathbf{a}'[j]| = 1$ . Recall  $w \in \{B_{\mathbf{a}'}^{+q}, B_{\mathbf{a}'}^{-q}\}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\mathbf{a}'}^{+q} &= \mathbf{a}' \oplus \mathbf{e}_q \cdot r(1 - \varepsilon) \oplus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_q) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta \quad \text{and} \\ B_{\mathbf{a}'}^{-q} &= \mathbf{a}' \ominus \mathbf{e}_q \cdot r(1 - \varepsilon) \ominus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_q) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Further recall  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i} = \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot r(1 - \varepsilon) \oplus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$ . There are four cases to consider:

- $j \notin \{i, q\}$ : In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(w, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}) &\geq |\mathbf{a}'[j] - \mathbf{a}[j] - 4\varepsilon\delta|, && \text{(only considering the } j\text{-th coordinate)} \\ &\geq 1 - 4\varepsilon\delta, && \text{(by triangle inequality and } \mathbf{a}[j] \neq \mathbf{a}'[j]) \\ &\geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon). && \text{(from Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \end{aligned}$$

- $j = i = q$ : In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(w, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}) &\geq |\mathbf{a}'[j] - \mathbf{a}[j] - 2r(1 - \varepsilon)|, && \text{(only considering the } j\text{-th coordinate)} \\ &\geq 4r - 2r(1 - \varepsilon), && \text{(by triangle inequality, } \mathbf{a}[j] \neq \mathbf{a}'[j], \text{ and } 4r = 1) \\ &\geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

–  $j = i$  and  $i \neq q$ : In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(w, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}) &\geq |\mathbf{a}'[j] - \mathbf{a}[j] - r(1 - \varepsilon) - 2\varepsilon\delta|, && \text{(only considering the } j\text{-th coordinate)} \\ &\geq 1 - r(1 - \varepsilon) - 2\varepsilon\delta, && \text{(since } \mathbf{a}[j] \neq \mathbf{a}'[j]) \\ &\geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon). && \text{(from Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \end{aligned}$$

–  $j = q$  and  $q \neq i$ : In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(w, B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}) &\geq |\mathbf{a}'[j] - \mathbf{a}[j] - r(1 - \varepsilon) - 2\varepsilon\delta|, && \text{(only considering the } j\text{-th coordinate)} \\ &\geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon). && \text{(same as the previous case)} \end{aligned}$$

We now consider the following three cases which arise when  $w$  is a **secondary** point.

(3)  $w \in S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}^*\}}$  for some  $\mathbf{a}^* \neq (\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i)$ : Let  $w = S_{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}^*\}}^\ell$  for some  $\ell \in [\delta]$ . By definition of SECONDARY (see Table 2), the variables  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{a}^*$  must form an edge in the constraint graph  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$ . Since  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  is a subgraph of the  $d$ -dimensional grid, it suffices to consider the following three cases:

(i)  $\mathbf{a}^* = \mathbf{a} \ominus \mathbf{e}_i$ : From Table 1, the point  $w = S_{\{\mathbf{a}^*, \mathbf{a}\}}^\ell$  is located at  $\mathbf{a}^* \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot ((1 - \varepsilon)2r + \varepsilon\ell) = (\mathbf{a} \ominus \mathbf{e}_i) \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot ((1 + \varepsilon)2r + \varepsilon\ell)$  and the point  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot r(1 - \varepsilon) \oplus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$ . Therefore, the distance between  $w$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq |(r(1 - \varepsilon) + 2r - \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r))|, && \text{(considering only the } i\text{-th coordinate and using } 4r = 1) \\ &= |(2r(1 + \varepsilon) + r(1 - \varepsilon) - \varepsilon\ell)|, \\ &> 2r(1 + \varepsilon). && \text{(from } \ell \leq \delta, \text{ Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \end{aligned}$$

(ii)  $\mathbf{a}^* = \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_j$  for some  $j \neq i$ : From Table 1, the point  $w = S_{\{\mathbf{a}^*, \mathbf{a}\}}^\ell$  is located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_j \cdot (2r + \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r))$  and the point  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot (r - \varepsilon/4) \oplus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$ . Therefore, square of the distance between  $w$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq (2r + \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r) - 2\varepsilon\delta)^2 + (r - \varepsilon/4)^2 && \text{(ignoring all coordinates except } i\text{-th \& } j\text{-th)} \\ &\geq (2r - 2\varepsilon\delta)^2 + (r - \varepsilon/4)^2 && \text{(from } \ell \geq 1 \text{ and Equation 1)} \\ &> (2r(1 + \varepsilon))^2 && \text{(from Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \end{aligned}$$

(iii)  $\mathbf{a}^* = \mathbf{a} \ominus \mathbf{e}_j$  for some  $j \neq i$ : From Table 1, the point  $w = S_{\{\mathbf{a}^*, \mathbf{a}\}}^\ell$  is located at  $\mathbf{a}^* \oplus \mathbf{e}_j \cdot (2r + \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r)) = (\mathbf{a} \ominus \mathbf{e}_j) \oplus \mathbf{e}_j \cdot (2r + \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r))$  and the point  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot (r - \varepsilon/4) \oplus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$ . Therefore, square of the distance between  $w$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq (2\varepsilon\delta + 2r - \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r))^2 + (r - \varepsilon/4)^2 && \text{(only considering coordinates } i \text{ and } j) \\ &> (2r + \varepsilon \cdot \delta)^2 + (r - \varepsilon/4)^2 && \text{(from } \ell \leq \delta, \text{ Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \\ &> (2r(1 + \varepsilon))^2 && \text{(from Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \end{aligned}$$

(4)  $w \in S_{\{\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{a}^{**}\}}$  for some  $\mathbf{a}^{**} \neq \mathbf{a}$ : Let  $w = S_{\{\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{a}^{**}\}}^\ell$  for some  $\ell \in [\delta]$ . By definition of SECONDARY (see Table 2), the variables  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i$  and  $\mathbf{a}^{**}$  must form an edge in the constraint graph  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$ . Since  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  is a subgraph of the  $d$ -dimensional grid, it suffices to consider the following three cases:

(i)  $\mathbf{a}^{**} = (\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i) \oplus \mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{a} \oplus 2\mathbf{e}_i$ : From Table 1, the point  $w = S_{\{\mathbf{a}^{**}, \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i\}}^\ell$  is located at  $(\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i) \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot (2r + \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r))$  and the point  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot (r - \varepsilon/4) \oplus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$ . Therefore, square of the distance between  $w$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq (1 + 2r + \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r) - (r - \varepsilon/4))^2 && \text{(ignoring all coordinates except } i\text{-th)} \\ &> (1 + 2r - (r - \varepsilon/4))^2 && \text{(since } \ell \geq 1 > 2r) \\ &> (2r(1 + \varepsilon))^2 && \text{(from Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \end{aligned}$$

(ii)  $\mathbf{a}^{**} = (\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i) + \mathbf{e}_j$  for some  $j \neq i$ : From Table 1, the point  $w = S_{\{\mathbf{a}^{**}, \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i\}}^\ell$  is located at  $(\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i) \oplus \mathbf{e}_j \cdot (2r + \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r))$  and the point  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot (r - \varepsilon/4) \oplus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$ . Therefore, square of the distance between  $w$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq (1 - (r - \varepsilon/4))^2 && \text{(ignoring all coordinates except } i\text{-th)} \\ &> (2r(1 + \varepsilon))^2 && \text{(from Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \end{aligned}$$

(iii)  $\mathbf{a}^{**} = (\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i) \ominus \mathbf{e}_j$  for some  $j \neq i$ : From Table 1, the point  $w = S_{\{\mathbf{a}^{**}, \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i\}}^\ell$  is located at  $(\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i) \ominus \mathbf{e}_j \cdot (2r + \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r))$  and the point  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot (r - \varepsilon/4) \oplus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$ . Therefore, square of the distance between  $w$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq (1 - (r - \varepsilon/4))^2 && \text{(ignoring all coordinates except } i\text{-th)} \\ &> (2r(1 + \varepsilon))^2 && \text{(from Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \end{aligned}$$

(5)  $w \in \mathcal{S}_{\{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b} \oplus \mathbf{e}_j\}}$  for some  $\mathbf{b}$  and index  $j \in [d]$  such that  $\{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b} \oplus \mathbf{e}_j\} \cap \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i\} = \emptyset$ :

From Table 1, the point  $w = S_{\{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b} \oplus \mathbf{e}_j\}}^\ell$  is located at  $\mathbf{b} \oplus \mathbf{e}_j \cdot (2r + \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r))$  for some  $\ell \in [\delta]$  and the point  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is located at  $\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{e}_i \cdot (r - \varepsilon/4) \oplus (\mathbf{1}^d - \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot 2\varepsilon\delta$ . Since  $\mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{b}$  there exists an index  $i' \in [d]$  such that  $\mathbf{a}[i'] \neq \mathbf{b}[i']$ . We have the following four cases:

- (i)  $i' \notin \{i, j\}$ : By only considering the  $i'$ -th coordinate, it follows that square of the distance between  $w$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is  $\geq 1 > (2r(1 + \varepsilon))^2$  since  $r = \frac{1}{4}$  (Equation 1) and  $\varepsilon \leq 1/16$  (Equation 2).
- (ii)  $i' = i$  and  $i' \neq j$ : By only considering the  $i$ -th coordinate, it follows that distance between  $w$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq |\mathbf{a}[i] + r - \varepsilon/4 - \mathbf{b}[i]| && \text{(only considering the } i^{\text{th}}\text{-coordinate)} \\ &\geq |\mathbf{a}[i] - \mathbf{b}[i]| - |r - \varepsilon/4| && \text{(by triangle inequality)} \\ &\geq 1 - (r - \varepsilon/4) && \text{(from Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \\ &\geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon) && \text{(from Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \end{aligned}$$

(iii)  $i' = j$  and  $i' \neq i$ : The absolute value of difference between  $i$ -th coordinates of  $w$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is  $|(\mathbf{a}[i] + r - \varepsilon/4) - \mathbf{b}[i]| \geq (r - \varepsilon/4)$  since  $r = \frac{1}{4}$  and  $\mathbf{a}[i], \mathbf{b}[i] \in [\delta]$ . The absolute value of difference between  $j$ -th coordinates of  $w$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is  $|(\mathbf{b}[j] + 2r + \varepsilon(\ell - 2r)) - (\mathbf{a}[j] + 2\varepsilon\delta)| \geq |\mathbf{a}[j] - \mathbf{b}[j]| - |2r + \varepsilon(\ell - 2r) - 2\varepsilon\delta| \geq (1 - 2r - \varepsilon(\ell - 2r) + 2\varepsilon\delta) \geq 2r + \varepsilon\delta$  where we have used the triangle inequality along with the bounds  $r = \frac{1}{4}, |\mathbf{a}[j] - \mathbf{b}[j]| \geq 1, \ell \in [\delta]$  and  $\varepsilon\delta = \frac{1}{8\delta} \leq \frac{1}{8}$ . Hence, square of the distance between the points  $w$  and  $B_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq (2r + \varepsilon\delta)^2 + (r - \varepsilon/4)^2 && \text{(only considering coordinates } i \text{ and } j) \\ &\geq (2r + \varepsilon\delta)^2 \\ &\geq (2r(1 + \varepsilon))^2 && \text{(from Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \end{aligned}$$

(iv)  $i = i' = j$ : Since  $\mathbf{a}[i'] \neq \mathbf{b}[i']$  it follows that  $|\mathbf{a}[i] - \mathbf{b}[i]| \geq 1$ . Hence, the distance between centers of  $T$  and  $C_{\mathbf{a}}^{+i}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq |(\mathbf{a}[i] + r - \varepsilon/4) - (\mathbf{b}[i] + 2r + \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r))| && \text{(only considering } i\text{-th coordinate)} \\ &= |(\mathbf{a}[i] - \mathbf{b}[i]) - (r + \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r) + \varepsilon/4)| \\ &\geq |\mathbf{a}[i] - \mathbf{b}[i]| - |r + \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r) + \varepsilon/4| && \text{(by triangle inequality)} \\ &\geq 1 - (r + \varepsilon \cdot (\ell - 2r) + \varepsilon/4) && \text{(from } |\mathbf{a}[i] - \mathbf{b}[i]| \geq 1, \ell \in [\delta] \text{ and Equation 1)} \\ &\geq 2r(1 + \varepsilon) && \text{(from } \ell \in [\delta], \text{ Equation 1 and Equation 2)} \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the first part of the lemma. The proof of the second part of the lemma is similar, and we omit the details here.  $\square$