

Almost-linear Time Approximation Algorithm to Euclidean k -median and k -means

Max Dupré la Tour, David Saulpic

Abstract

Clustering is one of the staples of data analysis and unsupervised learning. As such, clustering algorithms are often used on massive data sets, and they need to be extremely fast. We focus on the Euclidean k -median and k -means problems, two of the standard ways to model the task of clustering.

For these, the go-to algorithm is k -means++, which yields an $O(\log k)$ -approximation in time $\tilde{O}(nkd)$. While it is possible to improve either the approximation factor [Lattanzi and Sohler, ICML19] or the running time [Cohen-Addad et al., NeurIPS 20], it is unknown how precise a linear-time algorithm can be.

In this paper, we almost answer this question by presenting an almost linear-time algorithm to compute a constant-factor approximation.

1 Introduction

The k -means objective function was introduced by Lloyd in 1957 (and published later in [Llo82]) as a measure of the quality of compression. Given a set of points P and an integer k , minimizing the k -means objective yields a set of k centers that provide a good compressed representation of the original dataset P . Lloyd’s original motivation was to compress analog audio signals into numerical ones: numerical signals have to be discrete, and Lloyd proposed a method to find which frequencies should be kept in the discretization. His method was a heuristic trying to minimize what he called the *quantization error*, which is the sum, for each point, of the squared distance to its representative. This is precisely the k -means cost, and the goal of the k -means problem is to find the set of k representatives (or *centers*) that minimizes this cost. In contrast, the k -median cost function is the sum, for each point, of the distance to its closest center, inherently giving less weight to the outliers in the dataset.

Since 1957, these compression methods have been widely adopted, extended to clustering tasks, and have become one of the prominent unsupervised learning techniques. This has entirely changed the size and shape of the datasets involved. It is now common to have billions of input points and a target compression size k in the hundreds of thousands, and to solve k -means or k -median to extract the essence of the dataset.

This fundamentally changes the nature of the algorithms that can be used to solve the compression task. Simple polynomial-time algorithms, even with small polynomial running times like Lloyd’s original method (which runs in time $\Theta(ndk)$), are no longer applicable, and there is a crucial need for linear-time algorithms. The question we ask in this paper is: *How fast can we solve k -means and k -median?*

The complexity of these problems naturally depends on the metric space from which the input is drawn. In general metric spaces, this complexity is well understood: it is not possible to compute any approximation in time $o(nk)$, and there is a constant-factor approximation algorithm—i.e., an algorithm that computes a solution with a cost $O(1)$ times the optimal cost—with this running time [MP04].

The picture is not as clear in Euclidean space, which is arguably the most common case in practice. The problem remains NP-hard even in dimension 2 (see [MNV12] for k -means, [MS84] for k -median) or when $k = 2$ [DF09], but there exist fast approximation algorithms. The success of the famous k -means++ algorithm [AV07] is due to its $O(nkd)$ running time combined with an approximation guarantee of $O(\log k)$. This has become the method of choice for practitioners and is often used as a baseline when evaluating the quality of a clustering algorithm.

Both the running time and the approximation guarantee of k -means++ can be improved. The running time of this algorithm has been improved to almost linear time $\tilde{O}(nd + (n \log \Delta)^{1+\epsilon})$ by [CLN⁺20], with an approximation factor of $O(f(\epsilon) \log k)$ and an extra small dependency on the aspect ratio of the dataset Δ , which is the ratio between the largest and smallest distance between input points. The algorithm of [CHH⁺23] has a slightly better running time $\tilde{O}(nd)$ but an exponentially worse approximation ratio of $O(k^4)$. On the other hand, it is possible to improve the approximation guarantee from k -means++ by combining it with local search: this provides a constant-factor approximation while preserving a running time of $\tilde{O}(nkd)$ [LS19].

However, no algorithm combines the best of both worlds, namely, a really fast algorithm with a constant-factor approximation guarantee.

1.1 Our contribution

We provide an almost optimal answer to our question and demonstrate the existence of an almost linear-time algorithm that computes a constant-factor approximation for the (k, z) -clustering problem. This problem is a generalization of k -median and k -means, which seeks to minimize the sum of the z -th power of the distance from each client to its center (k -means for $z = 2$, k -median for $z = 1$).

Furthermore, our algorithm not only computes a solution to (k, z) -clustering, but it also provides an ordering of the input points p_1, \dots, p_n such that for any k , the set $\{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$ forms an $O(1)$ -approximation to (k, z) -clustering. This variant of (k, z) -clustering is referred to as online [MP03] or incremental [She16][CH11] in the literature. This is a shared feature with algorithms based on k -means++, where each prefix is an $O(\text{polylog } k)$ approximation.

Theorem 1.1. *For any $c > 5$, there exists an algorithm with running time $\tilde{O}(d \log \Delta \cdot n^{1+1/c^2+o(1)})$ that computes a $\text{poly}(c)$ -approximation to the incremental (k, z) -clustering problem.*

We note that, in time $\tilde{O}(nd)$, the dimension can be reduced to $O(\log n)$ using Johnson-Lindenstrauss embedding [JL84]. Furthermore, in time $\tilde{O}(nd)$, the aspect ratio can be reduced to $\text{poly}(n)$ (by combining the approximation algorithm from [CHH⁺23] and the diameter reduction from [DSS24]). This leads to the following corollary.

Corollary 1.2. *For any $c > 5$, there exists an algorithm with running time $\tilde{O}(nd + n^{1+1/c^2+o(1)})$ that computes a $\text{poly}(c)$ -approximation to the (k, z) -clustering problem.*

Note that we lose the incremental property in this corollary because the reduction of the aspect ratio depends on an estimate of the (k, z) -clustering cost and therefore on k .

Very recently, [DITHS24] showed how to maintain a coreset of size $O(k)$ in the fully dynamic setting with update time $\tilde{O}(d)$ and query time $\tilde{O}(kd)$. Combined with our theorem, this leads to the following corollary.

Corollary 1.3. *There is an algorithm in the fully dynamic setting on \mathbb{R}^d that maintains a $\text{poly}(c)$ -approximation of the (k, z) -clustering with update time $\tilde{O}(d)$ and query time $\tilde{O}(kd + k^{1+1/c^2+o(1)})$.*

This means the query time is almost the same as the running time to output a solution.

1.2 Sketch of our techniques

Our algorithm builds upon the hierarchically greedy algorithm developed by Mettu and Plaxton [MP03] for the incremental k -median problem. Their algorithm selects k sequences of balls greedily: each sequence has geometrically decreasing radii, and the algorithm places a center in the last ball of each sequence. The process begins by selecting the first ball in a sequence to maximize a function Value_{MP} among balls that are "very distant" from all previously placed centers. Then, the $(i + 1)$ -th ball in the sequence is chosen as the one with the highest Value_{MP} value among balls with a radius geometrically smaller than the i -th ball and located "close" to it. A sequence terminates when a ball contains a unique point that is "very distant" from all other points. This unique point is then designated as a center, and the algorithm initiates a new sequence.

The original Value_{MP} in Mettu and Plaxton's algorithm comes from the dual of the Lagrangian relaxation of the standard k -median linear program. For a ball $B(x, R)$, it is $\text{Value}_{\text{MP}}(B(x, R)) :=$

$\sum_{p \in P \cap B(x, R)} (R^z - d(x, p))$ where P is the input dataset.

Our first and crucial improvement is to replace their value $\text{Value}_{\text{MP}}(B(x, R))$ with simply the number of points in the ball: $\text{Value}(B(x, R)) = |P \cap B(x, R)| \cdot R^z$. These two quantities are related: $\text{Value}_{\text{MP}}(B(x, R)) \leq \text{Value}(B(x, R)) \leq \text{Value}_{\text{MP}}(B(x, 2R))$. Our main technical contribution is to show that the algorithm that uses Value instead of Value_{MP} still computes a constant-factor approximation, if we carefully adjust the definitions of "close" and "very distant".

As our proof shows that, in the particular case of the algorithm we analyze, the quantities Value_{MP} and Value are equivalent, we believe that our results may shed new light on the standard linear program.

We start by briefly explaining why such a greedy algorithm provides a good solution and will explain later how to implement it in linear time. We let $C_k = \{c_1, \dots, c_k\}$ be the set of centers computed by the algorithm. The first part of the proof relates the cost of each cluster of the optimal solution to the value of a particular ball. For a center γ in the optimal solution with cluster P_γ , the analysis chooses a radius R_γ such that $R_\gamma = \text{dist}(\gamma, C_k)/\alpha$, where α is a large constant: points in $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$ are much closer to γ than to any center in C . On the other hand, points of P_γ that are *not* in $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$ are roughly at the same distance from γ and from C_k , and their cost is well approximated by C_k . Thus, we only focus on points lying in that ball – we call them $\text{In}(P_\gamma)$.

The first crucial property is that the cost of the points in the solution C_k is at most $O(1) \cdot \text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_\gamma))$ (i.e., $|\text{In}(P_\gamma)| \cdot R_\gamma^z$). This is due to the definition of R_γ : there is a center of C_k at distance $\alpha \cdot R_\gamma$ from γ . Thus, by the triangle inequality, each point of $\text{In}(P_\gamma)$ is at distance $O(R_\gamma)$ from C_k . Therefore, the cost of $\text{In}(P_\gamma)$ in the solution C is roughly $\text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_\gamma))$: this is where the values come into play.

The clustering cost of C_k is therefore essentially bounded by the sum of values of the balls $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$, for all centers γ of the optimal solution Γ . To bound this sum, we must relate the value of balls to their cost in the optimal solution: this is easy to do when the ball is far from Γ . Indeed, for any point x , if $\text{dist}(x, \Gamma) \geq 2R$ – we then say that $B(x, R)$ is *uncovered* – then each point in the ball $B(x, R)$ pays at least R in the optimal solution, and therefore $\text{Value}(B(x, R)) \approx \text{COST}(B(x, R) \cap P, \Gamma)$.

All the above is true regardless of the algorithm used to compute C_k . To continue the proof, the issue is that the balls $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$ are not far from Γ , and we cannot directly relate their values to the cost in Γ . This is precisely where we rely on the greedy choices of the algorithm, which selects balls with maximal value, in order to match each $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$ with balls that have larger value. We also want two extra properties: (1) that those balls are far from Γ – to be able to apply the previous inequality to relate their value to the cost in Γ – and (2) that they are disjoint – so that the sum of their costs is at most the total cost in Γ .

Building this matching is the key ingredient of the proof and heavily relies on the structure of the greedy choices. Our proof shows that k balls satisfying the above conditions can be found, one in each sequence of balls chosen by the algorithm.

This concludes the proof of the accuracy of our algorithm. This proof is similar to the original one by [MP03]; however, the proof requires some crucial and non-trivial adjustments to work with Value instead of Value_{MP} , and we believe these make the proof more understandable.

More than a mere simplification of the algorithm, this change allows for very fast computation of the values of balls: using locality-sensitive hashing (LSH) and sketching techniques, we show how

to compute in almost-linear time an approximation to the value of every ball. More precisely, for any radius R and constant $c > 1$, we can efficiently build, using LSH, $\ell = n^{o(1)}$ functions f_1, \dots, f_ℓ with the following guarantee: if $T_i[u] = f_i^{-1}(u)$, then for any point x , $B(x, R) \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^\ell T_i[f_i(x)] \subseteq B(x, c \cdot R)$. The sets $T_i[f_i(x)]$, $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ are, of course, not disjoint, but we can compute the size of $\cup_{i=1}^\ell T_i[f_i(x)]$ for all x using *mergeable sketches* (e.g., the AMS algorithm): we can compute the sketch of each $T_i[u]$ in almost linear time, and then for any x compute the sketch of $\cup_{i=1}^\ell T_i[f_i(x)]$ in time $O(\ell)$ by merging the sketches of $T_i[f_i(x)]$.

This incurs new approximations: the sketches only provide a multiplicative approximation of the true size of the sets, and instead of computing exactly $|B(x, R)|$, we estimate $|\cup_{i=1}^\ell T_i[f_i(x)]|$. In turn, we need to show that these approximations do not add up, and that the greedy algorithm still computes a good solution to k -means.

Lastly, computing the values quickly does not suffice to show that the greedy algorithm is fast: we still need to show that, although the algorithm has k main loops, it runs in almost linear time. To achieve this, we show that every ball considered in the algorithm to find the next center is then forbidden by this center; hence, each ball contributes only once to the total complexity. This ensures linear time and concludes the proof.

1.3 Further related work

As mentioned earlier, the problem is still NP-hard even when the input is in the Euclidean plane \mathbb{R}^2 [MS84, MNV12]. However, in low-dimensional spaces, it is possible to compute a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, in time $f(\varepsilon, d)\tilde{O}(n)$ [CFS21]. If the target is a complexity polynomial in the dimension d , the problem becomes NP-hard to approximate: within a factor of 1.015 for k -median and 1.06 for k -means [CKL22]. The best approximation ratios are $1 + \sqrt{2}$ for k -median and 5.912 for k -means, based on a primal-dual algorithm running in large polynomial time [CEMN22]. For faster algorithms, we already covered the algorithms of [CLN⁺20, CHH⁺23] that improve the running time of k -means++ to almost linear, while roughly preserving the approximation guarantee, and the algorithm of [LS19] that improves the approximation guarantee with a running time of $O(nkd)$.

Some sketching techniques are also applicable to clustering in Euclidean space: it is possible to reduce the dimension to $O(\varepsilon^{-2} \log k)$ in near-linear time $\tilde{O}(nd)$, while preserving the cost of any clustering up to a multiplicative $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$ factor. It is also possible to build coresets in time $\tilde{O}(nd + n \log \log \Delta)$, which reduces the number of distinct points to $O(k\varepsilon^{-2-z})$ (see [DSS24] for the specific running time, which uses the coreset algorithms from [CSS21, CLSS22]). Using these techniques, it is possible to compute an $O(1)$ -approximation to (k, z) -clustering in time $\tilde{O}(nd + k^2)$. Our work improves on this for large values of k .

Beyond Euclidean space, k -median is NP-hard to approximate within a factor of $1 + 2/e$ and k -means within $1 + 8/e$ [GK99]. The best approximation algorithms have huge polynomial running times and achieve approximation ratios of 2.613 [GPST23] and 9 [ANSW20], respectively.

For the incremental version of k -median, the best known approximation ratio is 7.656 for general metric spaces [CH11] and 7.076 for Euclidean spaces [She16]. The approximation ratio cannot be better than 2.01 [CH11].

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Definitions

The Euclidean (k, z) -clustering problem is defined as follows: the input is a multiset $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, an integer k , and a $z \geq 1$. The goal is to find a set of k points S that minimizes $\text{COST}(P, S) := \sum_{p \in P} \text{dist}(p, S)^z$, where $\text{dist}(p, S) := \min_{s \in S} \text{dist}(p, s)$ and dist is the Euclidean distance. We say that a set of k points C_k is an α -approximation to (k, z) -clustering when $\text{COST}(P, C_k) \leq \alpha \cdot \min_{S, |S|=k} \text{COST}(P, S)$.

A list of n points c_1, \dots, c_n is an α -approximation to the incremental (k, z) -clustering problem on input P when for any $k = 1, \dots, n$, the prefix c_1, \dots, c_k is an α -approximation to (k, z) -clustering on P .

In the following, we fix a $c \geq 5$, which will govern the trade-off between run-time and approximation ratio.

We let Δ be an upper bound on the diameter of the input P (i.e., the largest pairwise distance). We assume for simplicity that Δ is a power of $2c$, and that the smallest pairwise distance is at least 1.

For (k, z) -clustering, we can assume $\Delta = \text{poly}(n)$: [DSS24] showed how to transform any input P to reduce the diameter. Their algorithm runs in time $O(nd \log \log \Delta)$, which is the running-time of their algorithm to compute a $\text{poly}(n)$ -approximation: this has been improved to $\tilde{O}(nd)$ by [CHH⁺23], hence we can reduce to $\Delta = \text{poly}(n)$ in time $\tilde{O}(nd)$.

2.2 Basic tools

The first tool we use to speed-up the algorithm is Locality-sensitive hashing [AI06]. The precise result we use is the following:

Lemma 2.1 (See section D in [CLN⁺20]). *Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\ell = (n/\delta)^{1/c^2}$; there is a family of hash functions from \mathbb{R}^d to some universe U such that, with probability $1 - \delta$, if f_1, \dots, f_ℓ are drawn from this family:*

- For any $p, q \in P$ with $\text{dist}(p, q) \geq c \cdot R$, then for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ $f_i(p) \neq f_i(q)$
- For any $p, q \in P$ with $\text{dist}(p, q) \leq R$, then there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ with $f_i(p) = f_i(q)$.

Furthermore, the hash functions satisfy the following:

- for any $i, p \in \mathbb{R}^d$, computing $f_i(p)$ takes time $O(dn^{o(1)})$,
- after preprocessing time $O(\ell d \cdot n^{1+o(1)})$, one can compute for any i, p the set $T_i[u] := \{p : f_i(p) = u\}$ in time $O(|T_i[u]|)$.

We use the previous lemma in two ways: first, it allows us to compute an approximate neighborhood of each point quickly, and second, combined with streaming techniques, to estimate the size of this neighborhood efficiently. We start with the former (where we replaced, for simplicity of notation, the success probability $1 - \delta$ with $1 - 1/n^2$):

Corollary 2.2. *For any $R \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, there is a datastructure with preprocessing time $O(dn^{1+3/c^2+o(1)})$ that can, with probability $1 - 1/n^2$:*

- remove a point from P in time $O(n^{3/c^2})$

- answer the following query: for any point $p \in P$, compute a set $N(p, R)$ of points of P such that $B(p, R) \cap P \subseteq N(p, R) \subseteq B(p, c \cdot R) \cap P$. The query time is $O(n^{3/c^2} |N(p, R)|)$.

Proof. This is a direct application of Lemma 2.1: given R and $\delta = 1/n^2$, compute $f_i(p)$ for all i and p , in time $O(dn^{1+3/c^2+o(1)})$. First, to remove a point p from P , simply remove it from all the tables $T_i[f_i(p)]$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$: this takes time $O(\ell) = O(n^{3/c^2})$.

To answer a query given a point p , compute $T_i[f_i(p)]$ for all i , in time $O(|T_i[f_i(p)]|)$ and define $N(p, R) := \cup_{i=1}^{\ell} T_i[f_i(p)]$. The running time to compute the union is at most $\ell \cdot O(|N(p, R)|) = O(n^{3/c^2} |N(p, R)|)$. The first two bullets of Lemma 2.1 ensure the desired accuracy guarantee. \square

Combining Lemma 2.1 with the sketching techniques of [FM85, AMS96] to estimate the number of distinct elements in a stream yields the following:

Lemma 2.3. *Given a radius R , there is an algorithm that runs in time $O(dn^{1+3/c^2+o(1)})$ and computes for all $p \in P$ a value $\text{Value}(B(p, R))$ such that, with probability $1 - 1/n^2$, it holds that $\forall p, R^z \cdot |B(p, R) \cap P|/3 \leq \text{Value}(B(p, R)) \leq 3R^z \cdot |B(p, c \cdot R) \cap P|$.*

Proof. We show how to compute, for all $p \in P$, an approximate count of the number of points in $B(p, R)$, namely a value $\text{Count}(p, R)$ such that $|B(p, R) \cap P|/3 \leq \text{Count}(p, R) \leq 3R \cdot |B(p, c \cdot R) \cap P|$. Multiplying Count by R^z gives the lemma.

To build the estimates $\text{Count}(p, R)$, the first step of the algorithm is to compute $f_i(p)$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and all $p \in P$, using Lemma 2.1 with R and $\delta = 1/n^2$. This takes time $O(dn^{1+3/c^2+o(1)})$. Due to Lemma 2.1, we have the guarantee that, with probability $1 - 1/n^2$,

$$|B(p, R) \cap P| \leq |\cup_{i=1}^{\ell} T_i[f_i(p)]| \leq |B(p, c \cdot R) \cap P|.$$

Therefore, we seek to estimate $|\cup_{i=1}^{\ell} T_i[f_i(p)]|$.

For this, we rely on the sketching technique introduced by [FM85, AMS96]. They show that there is a function $r : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that, for any fixed set U , $|U|$ is well approximated by $2^{Y_U} := 2^{\max_{u \in U} r(u)}$. Formally, with probability $2/3$, it holds that $\frac{1}{3} \leq \frac{|U|}{2^{Y_U}} \leq 3$. (See Proposition 2.3 in [AMS96]). The running time to compute the function r is the time to evaluate a pairwise independent hash function, e.g. $O(d)$.

Our algorithm therefore computes, for each $T_i[u]$, the value $Y_i[u] := \max_{p \in T_i[u]} r(p)$ in times $O(nd\ell)$. For any p , it holds that $Y_p := \max_{i=1}^{\ell} Y_i[f_i(p)]$ satisfies with probability $2/3$ that

$$\frac{1}{3} \leq \frac{|\cup_{i=1}^{\ell} T_i[f_i(p)]|}{2^{Y_p}} \leq 3$$

It only remains to boost the probability to ensure the guarantee holds for all p simultaneously: for this, we run in parallel $3 \log(n)$ many copies of the algorithm and let $\text{Count}(p, R)$ be the median of those estimates. A standard argument shows that, with probability $1 - 1/n^2$, it holds for all $p \in P$ that $\frac{1}{3} \leq \frac{|\cup_{i=1}^{\ell} T_i[f_i(p)]|}{\text{Count}(p, R)} \leq 3$, which implies the lemma.

The overall running time is $O(dn^{1+3/c^2+o(1)}) + O(nd\ell \log(n/\delta)) = O(dn^{1+3/c^2+o(1)} \log(1/\delta))$. \square

3 The Algorithm

Here, we describe our algorithm, for which we give a pseudocode in Algorithm 1.

Input: The algorithm is given a set of points $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a target number of clusters k .

Output: A set $C_k = \{c_1, \dots, c_k\}$ of centers.

Preprocessing: The algorithm will consider all the balls of the form $B(p, R)$, where $p \in P$ is an input point and R is a power of $2c$ such that $1/(2c)^7 \leq R \leq \Delta$. All these balls are marked as *available* when the algorithm starts. Using Lemma 2.3, the algorithm computes $\text{Value}(B(p, R))$ for each ball $B(p, R)$. The algorithm then preprocesses the data structure of Corollary 2.2 in order to have access to all $N(p, 10c \cdot R)$ and $N(p, 100c^4 \cdot R)$ for all radii R power of $2c$ such that $1/(2c)^7 \leq R \leq \Delta$.

Iterative Greedy Choices: The algorithm selects the centers one by one. After one center is chosen, the balls that are close to this center (relative to their radius) are removed from the set of available balls. More formally:

j -th Iteration – Selecting a Center: Each iteration starts by selecting the available ball $B(x_j^1, R_j^1)$ that maximizes Value. If no balls are available, the algorithm stops and outputs the current set of centers. Otherwise, the algorithm inductively constructs a sequence of balls $(B(x_j^\ell, R_j^\ell))_\ell$, beginning with $B(x_j^1, R_j^1)$. While R_j^ℓ is not the minimum radius $1/(2c)^7$, the algorithm computes the set $N(x_j^\ell, 10c \cdot R_j^\ell)$ (using the data structure from corollary 2.2) and selects the next ball of the sequence $B(x_j^{\ell+1}, R_j^{\ell+1})$ that maximizes Value among the balls of the form $B(p, R_j^\ell/2)$ with $p \in N(x_j^\ell, 10c \cdot R_j^\ell)$. At the end, the center of the last ball, c_j , is selected as the j -th center for the clustering solution.

j -th Iteration – Removing Balls: After selecting c_j , the algorithm computes, for all R powers of $2c$ such that $1/(2c)^7 \leq R \leq \Delta$, the set $N(c_j, 100c^4 \cdot R)$ (using again the data structure from corollary 2.2). It removes from the set of available balls all balls of the form $B(p, R)$ with $p \in N(c_j, 100c^4 \cdot R)$ and removes p from the data structure of Corollary 2.2 computing $N(c_j, 100c^4 \cdot R)$.

Algorithm 1 Fast- k -Clustering

Input: a multiset $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and a number of clusters k .

Output: a set of k centers $C_k = \{c_1, \dots, c_k\}$

- 1: Define the set of *available* balls to be $\{B(p, \Delta/(2c)^\ell), p \in P, \ell \in \{0, \dots, \log_{2c}(\Delta) + 7\}\}$.
 - 2: Using Lemma 2.3, computes $\text{Value}(B(p, R))$ for all the available balls.
 - 3: Preprocess the data structure of Corollary 2.2 for all radii of the form $10c \cdot R$ and $100c^4 \cdot R$, with R being a power of $2c$ such that $1/(2c)^7 \leq R \leq \Delta$.
 - 4: **for** j from 1 to k **do**
 - 5: $\ell \leftarrow 1$.
 - 6: **if** The set of available ball is not empty **then**
 - 7: Let $B(x_j^1, R_j^1)$ be the available ball with largest Value.
 - 8: **while** $R_j^\ell > 1/(2c)^7$ **do**
 - 9: Using Corollary 2.2, compute the set $N(x_j^\ell, 10c \cdot R_j^\ell)$.
 - 10: Let $B(x_j^{\ell+1}, R_j^{\ell+1})$ be the ball of $\{B(p, R_j^\ell/2c), p \in N(x_j^\ell, 10c \cdot R_j^\ell)\}$ with largest Value.
 - 11: $\ell \leftarrow \ell + 1$
 - 12: **end while**
 - 13: $c_j \leftarrow x_j^\ell$
 - 14: **for** all radius $R \in \{\Delta/(2c)^\ell, \ell \in \{0, \dots, \log_{2c}(\Delta) + 7\}\}$ **do**
 - 15: Using Corollary 2.2, compute the set $N(c_j, 100c^4 \cdot R)$.
 - 16: **for** $p \in N(c_j, 100c^4 \cdot R)$ **do**
 - 17: Remove $B(p, R)$ from the set of available balls.
 - 18: Remove p from the data structure of Corollary 2.2 computing $N(c_j, 100c^4 \cdot R)$.
 - 19: **end for**
 - 20: **end for**
 - 21: **else**
 - 22: Terminate the algorithm and output the solution $C_{j-1} = \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}$.
 - 23: **end if**
 - 24: **end for**
 - 25: Output the solution $C_k = \{c_1, \dots, c_k\}$.
-

To clarify the analysis, we stop the algorithm after k iterations and prove that the set of centers C_k is a $\text{poly}(c)$ -approximation of the optimal (k, z) -clustering. However, the algorithm does not depend on k , and therefore the set of centers after k' iterations for $k' \leq k$ is also a $\text{poly}(c)$ -approximation of the optimal (k', z) -clustering. In particular, if we modify the algorithm to stop after n iterations instead, it provides a $\text{poly}(c)$ -approximation of the *incremental* (k, z) -clustering problem.

3.1 Basic properties of the algorithm

We start with a simple property of the function Value.

Lemma 3.1. *For any point $p \in P$ the function $\ell \mapsto \text{Value}(B(p, \Delta/(2c)^\ell))$ is decreasing.*

Proof. Let R, R' be two power of $2c$ such that $R \geq 2c \cdot R'$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Value}(B(p, R)) &\geq R^z \cdot \frac{|B(p, R) \cap P|}{3} \\
&= 3(R/2c)^z \cdot |B(p, R) \cap P| \cdot \frac{(2c)^z}{9} \\
&\geq 3R'^z \cdot |B(p, c \cdot R') \cap P| \cdot \frac{(2c)^z}{9} \\
&\geq \text{Value}(B(p, c \cdot R')) \cdot \frac{(2c)^z}{9} \\
&\geq \text{Value}(B(p, R')).
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality comes from $c \geq 5$ and $z \geq 1$. \square

We say that a ball $B(y, R_y)$ is *descendant* of $B(x, R_x)$ if there is a sequence $x_0 = x, x_1, \dots, x_\ell = y$ such that $R_y = R_x/(2c)^\ell$ and, for all i , $x_{i+1} \in N(x_i, 10c \cdot R_x/(2c)^i)$. In this case, we say $B(x, R_x)$ is an ancestor of $B(y, R_y)$.

Lemma 3.2. *If $B(y, R_y)$ is a descendant of $B(x, R_x)$, then $\text{dist}(x, y) \leq 20c^2 \cdot R_x$.*

Proof. Let $B(y, R_y)$ be a descendant of $B(x, R_x)$, and let $x_0 = x, \dots, x_\ell = y$ be the sequence from the definition of descendant. For every i , we have $x_{i+1} \in N(x_i, \frac{10c \cdot R_x}{(2c)^i})$ and therefore, by definition of $N(x_i, \frac{10c \cdot R_x}{(2c)^i})$, it holds that $\text{dist}(x_i, x_{i+1}) \leq \frac{10c^2 \cdot R_x}{(2c)^i}$. By triangle inequality, this implies

$$\text{dist}(x, y) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{10c^2 \cdot R_x}{(2c)^i} \leq 20c^2 \cdot R_x.$$

\square

Lemma 3.3. *If, at the beginning of an iteration of the loop line 4, a ball $B(x, R_x)$ is available, then all its descendant are available.*

Proof. Let $B(x, R_x)$ be any ball, and let $B(y, R_y)$ be a descendant of $B(x, R_x)$. Suppose that $B(y, R_y)$ is not available at the beginning of an iteration of the loop in line 4. Then there exists a center c_j selected by the algorithm such that $y \in N(c_j, 100c^4 \cdot R_y)$ and therefore $\text{dist}(y, c_j) \leq 100c^5 \cdot R_y$. Because $B(y, R_y)$ is a descendant of $B(x, R_x)$, we know by Lemma 3.2 that $\text{dist}(x, y) \leq 20c^2 \cdot R_x$. Using the triangle inequality, we get $\text{dist}(x, c_j) \leq \text{dist}(x, y) + \text{dist}(y, c_j) \leq 20c^2 \cdot R_x + 100c^5 \cdot R_y$. We also know that $R_y \leq R_x/2c$ and therefore $\text{dist}(x, c_j) \leq (50c^4 + 20c^2) \cdot R_x \leq 100c^4 \cdot R_x$. Hence $x \in B(c_j, 100c^4 \cdot R_x) \subset N(c_j, 100c^4 \cdot R_x)$, and $B(x, R_x)$ also becomes unavailable when c_j is selected. \square

4 Running time analysis

The running time of the algorithm is mostly determined by the running time of the two inner loops, namely the while loop line 8 of Algorithm 1, and the for loop line 14.

We first show in Fact 4.1 that any p that appears in a set $N(x, 10c \cdot R_j^\ell)$ for some iteration j and ℓ of the algorithm, is close to the center c_j . This will be used to show that $B(p, R_j^\ell/2c)$, and all its ancestors by Lemma 3.3, is removed from the available balls line 17 after c_j is selected.

Fact 4.1. *Suppose that, at step j of the loop of line 4 and step ℓ of the loop of line 8, $p \in N(x_j^\ell, 10c \cdot R_j^\ell)$. Then, $\text{dist}(p, c_j) \leq 30c^2 \cdot R_j^\ell$, where c_j is the center defined line 13 at the j -th iteration.*

Proof. The algorithm ensures that $B(c_j, 1/(2c)^7)$ is a descendent of $B(x_j^\ell, r_j^\ell)$. By lemma 3.2, this implies $\text{dist}(c_j, x_j^\ell) \leq 20c^2 R_j^\ell$. Since $p \in N(x_j^\ell, 10c \cdot R_j^\ell)$, then it also holds that $\text{dist}(p, x_j^\ell) \leq 10c^2 \cdot R_j^\ell$. We conclude with triangle inequality. \square

From this, we can compute the running time of the full algorithm:

Lemma 4.2. *The total running-time of the algorithm is $O\left(n^{1+3/c^2+o(1)} d \log \Delta\right)$.*

Proof. First, the time required to compute the value of all balls is $O\left(n^{1+3/c^2+o(1)} d \log \Delta\right)$, using Lemma 2.3: there are $O(\log \Delta)$ many radius R considered, and each of them takes time $n^{1+3/c^2+o(1)} d$.

Initializing the datastructures for computing $N(x, 10c \cdot R)$ and $N(x, 100c^4 \cdot R)$ for all R powers of $2c$ also takes time $O\left(n^{1+3/c^2+o(1)} d \log \Delta\right)$, using Corollary 2.2.

We now analyze the running time due to the while loop of line 8: first, if p appears in some $N(x_j^\ell, 10c \cdot R_j^\ell)$ at the j -th iteration, then by Fact 4.1 $\text{dist}(p, c_j) \leq 30c^2 \cdot R_j^\ell$, and therefore $p \in B(c_j, 30c^2 \cdot R_j^\ell) \subseteq B(c_j, 100c^4 \cdot R_j^\ell/2c) \subseteq N(c_j, 100c^4 R_j^\ell/2c)$ and the ball $B(p, R_j^\ell/2c)$ is removed from the available balls on line 17, after c_j is selected. From Lemma 3.3, this ensures that all ancestors of $B(p, R_j^\ell/2c)$ are not available, and therefore that p does not appear in any other $N(x, 10c \cdot R_j^\ell)$ (with the same value for R_j^ℓ) as in the current iteration) later in the algorithm. Therefore, for each of the $O(\log \Delta)$ radius R used by the algorithm, p appears line 9 in at most one ball of the type $N(x, 10c \cdot R)$.

Since the running time of the while loop is $O\left(n^{3/c^2} d\right)$ times the number of points appearing in some $N(x, 10c \cdot R)$, the total running time for this loop is $O\left(n^{1+3/c^2} d \log \Delta\right)$.

Finally, we analyze the running time of the for loop: for this, we for each radius R , any points appears just once in a ball $N(x, 100c^4 \cdot R)$, as it is removed after its first appearance. The running time to remove a point from $N(x, 100c^4 \cdot R)$ is $O\left(n^{3/c^2}\right)$, following Corollary 2.2. Therefore, the total running time for those for loops is $O(\log \Delta) n^{1+3/c^2}$.

We conclude that the total running time is $O\left(n^{1+3/c^2+o(1)} d \log \Delta\right)$. \square

5 Proof of Correctness

The goal of this section is to prove that the outcome of the algorithm is a good approximation to (k, z) -clustering, which combined with Lemma 4.2, concludes the proof of Theorem 1.1. This is formally stated in the following theorem:

Theorem 5.1. *For any k , the set C_k output by the algorithm gives a $O(\text{poly}(c))$ -approximation of the optimal (k, z) -clustering solution.*

In what follows, we consider a fixed set of k centers $\Gamma \subseteq P$. Our objective is to compare the cost of C_k with the cost of Γ and demonstrate that $\text{COST}(P, C_k) \leq O(\text{poly}(c)) \cdot \text{COST}(P, \Gamma)$. By setting Γ as the optimal (k, z) -clustering solution, we can finalize our analysis. It is important to note that Γ is restricted to be a subset of the input P . However, it is well known that the optimal (k, z) -clustering, constrained to be a subset of the input, is a 2^z -approximation of the optimal (k, z) -clustering that allows centers to be placed outside of the input points; thus this assumption make us lose a mere factor $O(2^z)$.

For $\gamma \in \Gamma$, let P_γ be the cluster of γ , consisting of all points in P assigned to γ in Γ . We analyze the cost of each cluster independently as follows. We split Γ into two parts: Γ_0 and Γ_1 . Γ_0 is the set of $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that no ball in $\left\{ B\left(\gamma, \frac{\Delta}{(2c)^\ell}\right) \mid \ell \in \{0, \dots, \log_{2c}(\Delta) + 7\} \right\}$ is available at the end of the algorithm. Let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \Gamma_0$.

The easy case, dealing with Γ_0 : The next lemma shows that if a ball $B\left(p, \frac{1}{(2c)^\tau}\right)$ is not available, then $p \in C_k$. This directly implies that centers of Γ_0 are also in C_k .

Lemma 5.2. *Let $p \in P$, if the ball $B\left(p, \frac{1}{(2c)^\tau}\right)$ is not available at the end of the algorithm, then there exists a center $c_j \in C_k$ such that $c_j = p$.*

Proof. We know that there exists a center $c_j \in C_k$ such that

$$p \in N\left(c_j, 100c^4 \cdot \frac{1}{(2c)^\tau}\right) \subseteq B\left(c_j, c \cdot \frac{100c^4}{(2c)^\tau}\right) = B\left(c_j, \frac{100}{128c^2}\right).$$

Therefore, $\text{dist}(c_j, p) \leq \frac{100}{128c^2} < 1$. However, both c_j and p are in P , and the minimum distance between two distinct input points is assumed to be 1. Therefore, $c_j = p$. \square

Corollary 5.3. $\Gamma_0 \subseteq C_k$. *In particular for all $\gamma \in \Gamma_0$, we have $\text{COST}(P_\gamma, C_k) \leq \text{COST}(P_\gamma, \Gamma)$.*

Corollary 5.4. *If none of the balls are available at the end of the algorithm, $\text{COST}(P, C_k) = 0$.*

We can specifically apply Corollary 5.4 if the algorithm terminates early at line 22 (i.e., before selecting k centers) because none of the balls are available. For the remainder of the proof, we assume the algorithm terminates after selecting k centers.

First step to bound the cost(P_γ, C_k) for $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$: The main task is to demonstrate that clusters in Γ_1 are also well approximated. For any center $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$, let $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$ be the largest ball that remains available at the end of the algorithm. Such a ball exists by the definition of Γ_1 . We divide the cluster P_γ into two parts: $\text{In}(P_\gamma) := P_\gamma \cap B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$ and $\text{Out}(P_\gamma) := P_\gamma \setminus \text{In}(P_\gamma)$.

By the definition of R_γ , we know that there exists a center in C_k “not too far” from γ . Otherwise, a larger ball would be available. This allows us to bound the cost of $\text{Out}(P_\gamma)$ in the clustering C_k . Furthermore, we can relate the cost of $\text{In}(P_\gamma)$ to the value of $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$, as demonstrated in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.5. *For all $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$, we have:*

$$\text{COST}(\text{In}(P_\gamma), C_k) \leq 2^{z-1} \left((200c^6)^z + 1 \right) \cdot 3 \text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_\gamma)) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{COST}(\text{Out}(P_\gamma), C_k) \leq 2^{z-1} \left((200c^6)^z + 1 \right) \cdot \text{COST}(\text{Out}(P_\gamma), \Gamma) \quad (2)$$

Proof. Fix a $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$. For any $x \in P_\gamma$, we have

$$\text{COST}(x, C_k) = \text{dist}(x, C_k)^z \leq (\text{dist}(\gamma, C_k) + \text{dist}(\gamma, x))^z \leq 2^{z-1}(\text{dist}(\gamma, C_k)^z + \text{dist}(\gamma, x)^z)$$

Thus, the first step of the proof is to establish the existence of a center in C_k at a distance of $O(R_\gamma)$ from γ . By the definition of R_γ , the ball $B(\gamma, 2c \cdot R_\gamma)$ is not available. Therefore, there is a point $c_j \in C_k$ such that $\gamma \in N(c_j, 200c^5 \cdot R_\gamma)$, and $\text{dist}(\gamma, c_j) \leq 200c^6 \cdot R_\gamma$.

We can now bound the cost of $In(P_\gamma)$ and prove Equation (1). If $x \in B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$, we have $\text{dist}(\gamma, x) \leq R_\gamma$, and therefore $\text{COST}(x, C_k) \leq 2^{z-1}((200c^6)^z + 1) \cdot R_\gamma^z$. Summing this inequality over all $x \in In(P_\gamma)$ yields

$$\text{COST}(In(P_\gamma), C_k) \leq 2^{z-1}((200c^6)^z + 1) \cdot \sum_{x \in B(\gamma, R_\gamma) \cap P} R_\gamma^z \leq 2^{z-1}((200c^6)^z + 1) \cdot 3 \text{Value}(B(p_\gamma, R_\gamma)).$$

We turn to $Out(P_\gamma)$. If x is outside $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$, we have $\text{dist}(\gamma, x) \geq R_\gamma$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{COST}(x, C_k) &\leq 2^{z-1}((200c^6 R_\gamma)^z + \text{dist}(\gamma, x)^z) \\ &\leq 2^{z-1}((200c^6 \text{dist}(\gamma, x))^z + \text{dist}(\gamma, x)^z) \\ &\leq 2^{z-1}((200c^6)^z + 1) \cdot \text{dist}(\gamma, x)^z \\ &\leq 2^{z-1}((200c^6)^z + 1) \cdot \text{COST}(x, \Gamma) \end{aligned}$$

Summing this inequality over all $x \in Out(P_\gamma)$ we get Equation (2) \square

Lemma 5.5 shows that points in $Out(P_\gamma)$ have roughly the same cost in the solution Γ as in C_k , up to a factor of $O(\text{poly}(c))$, and the cost of points in $In(P_\gamma)$ is bounded by $O(\text{poly}(c)) \cdot \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{Value}(B_\gamma)$. Therefore, we only need to bound this sum of values.

5.1 Bounding the sum of values

To do so, we start by showing a simple lemma that provides a lower bound for the cost of the balls that do not intersect Γ . We say that a ball $B(x, R)$ is *covered* by Γ if $B(x, 2c \cdot R) \cap \Gamma \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 5.6. *If a ball $B(x, R)$ is not covered by Γ , then $\text{COST}(B(x, c \cdot R) \cap P, \Gamma) \geq c^z/3 \cdot \text{Value}(B(x, R))$.*

Proof. Consider $B(x, R)$, a ball not covered by Γ . Here, $\text{dist}(x, \Gamma) \geq 2c \cdot R$. For any $p \in B(x, c \cdot R) \cap P$, the triangle inequality implies $\text{dist}(p, \Gamma) \geq \text{dist}(x, \Gamma) - \text{dist}(x, p) \geq 2c \cdot R - c \cdot R = c \cdot R$. Raising both sides to the power of z and summing for all $p \in B(x, c \cdot R) \cap P$, we get $\text{COST}(B(x, c \cdot R) \cap P, \Gamma) = \sum_{p \in B \cap P} \text{dist}(p, \Gamma)^z \geq \sum_{p \in B \cap P} (c \cdot R)^z \geq c^z \cdot R^z \cdot |B(x, c \cdot R) \cap P| \geq c^z/3 \cdot \text{Value}(B(x, R))$. \square

From $In(P_\gamma)$ to uncovered balls: The strategy for bounding the sum of values $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_\gamma))$ relies on the preceding lemma. Our objective is to match each $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$ (for $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$) with a ball $B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)})$ that satisfies the following properties: the balls $B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)})$

1. are uncovered,
2. have at least the same value as the balls $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$, and
3. they are disjoint.

Consequently, due to property 2, we can upper bound $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_\gamma))$ by the sum of the values of the matched balls. According to property 1, this sum of values is at most the cost of the points in the ball in the solution Γ , as established in Lemma 5.6. Additionally, property 3 ensures that there is no double counting, making this sum at most the cost of the entire dataset in the solution Γ .

In order to build this matching, the first step is to find k balls that satisfy properties 2 and 3. To achieve this, we rely on the greedy choices made by the algorithm. Consider the balls $B(x_i^1, R_i^1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$: each of these balls is chosen as the ball currently available with the maximum value. Therefore, they all have a value larger than that of $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$, as this ball is still available at the end of the algorithm, thus satisfying property 3.

However, these balls may be too close to each other, and property 2 may not be satisfied. The idea is that if two balls $B(x_i^1, c \cdot R_i^1)$ and $B(x_j^1, c \cdot R_j^1)$ intersect (with $j > i$), then we can preserve property 2 while reducing the diameter of one of the balls by considering $B(x_j^2, c \cdot R_j^2)$ instead. This approach is formalized and generalized in the next lemma:

Lemma 5.7. *For every i, i', ℓ, ℓ' such that $i < i'$ and $B(x_i^\ell, 2c \cdot R_i^\ell) \cap B(x_{i'}^{\ell'}, 2c \cdot R_{i'}^{\ell'}) \neq \emptyset$, it holds that:*

- $R_i^\ell \geq 4c^2 \cdot R_{i'}^1$
- $\text{Value}(B(x_i^{\ell+1}, R_i^{\ell+1})) \geq \text{Value}(B(x_{i'}^1, R_{i'}^1))$.

Proof. Let i, i', ℓ, ℓ' be such that $i < i'$ and $B(x_i^\ell, 2c \cdot R_i^\ell) \cap B(x_{i'}^{\ell'}, 2c \cdot R_{i'}^{\ell'}) \neq \emptyset$. We start by proving the first point by contradiction: suppose that $R_i^\ell < 4c^2 \cdot R_{i'}^1$. We then bound the distance between $x_{i'}^1$ and x_i to show that $B(x_{i'}^1, R_{i'}^1)$ became unavailable when x_i was selected, contradicting the fact that it was later selected by the algorithm.

Since $B(x_i^\ell, 2c \cdot R_i^\ell) \cap B(x_{i'}^{\ell'}, 2c \cdot R_{i'}^{\ell'}) \neq \emptyset$, we have

$$\text{dist}(x_i^\ell, x_{i'}^{\ell'}) \leq 2c \cdot R_i^\ell + 2c \cdot R_{i'}^{\ell'} \leq 8c^3 \cdot R_{i'}^1 + 2c \cdot R_{i'}^1 = (8c^3 + 2c) \cdot R_{i'}^1.$$

Moreover, applying Lemma 3.2 twice, we get

$$\text{dist}(c_i, x_i^\ell) \leq 20c^2 \cdot R_i^\ell \leq 80c^4 \cdot R_{i'}^1$$

and

$$\text{dist}(x_{i'}^{\ell'}, x_{i'}^1) \leq 20c^2 \cdot R_{i'}^1.$$

Combining these three inequalities using the triangle inequality, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(c_i, x_{i'}^1) &\leq \text{dist}(c_i, x_i^\ell) + \text{dist}(x_i^\ell, x_{i'}^{\ell'}) + \text{dist}(x_{i'}^{\ell'}, x_{i'}^1) \\ &\leq 80c^4 \cdot R_{i'}^1 + (8c^3 + 2c) \cdot R_{i'}^1 + 20c^2 \cdot R_{i'}^1 \\ &\leq (80c^4 + 8c^3 + 20c^2 + 2c) \cdot R_{i'}^1 \\ &\leq 100c^4 \cdot R_{i'}^1. \end{aligned}$$

The last step follows from $c \geq 5$. Therefore, we have $x_{i'}^1 \in B(c_i, 100c^4 \cdot R_{i'}^1) \subseteq N(c_i, 100c^4 \cdot R_{i'}^1)$, and $B(x_{i'}^1, R_{i'}^1)$ is removed from the available balls after c_i is selected, contradicting the fact that it was later picked by the algorithm.

We now turn to the second point. The inequality $R_i^\ell \geq 4c^2 \cdot R_{i'}^1$ leads to $\text{dist}(x_i^\ell, x_{i'}^{\ell'}) \leq 2c \cdot R_i^\ell + 2c \cdot R_{i'}^{\ell'} \leq 2c \cdot R_i^\ell + 2c \cdot R_{i'}^1 \leq (2c + \frac{1}{2c^2}) R_i^\ell$. On the other hand, reusing the inequality given by Lemma 3.2, we have $\text{dist}(x_{i'}^{\ell'}, x_{i'}^1) \leq 20c^2 \cdot R_{i'}^1 \leq 5 \cdot R_i^\ell$. Hence, using the triangle inequality, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(x_i^\ell, x_{i'}^1) &\leq \text{dist}(x_i^\ell, x_{i'}^{\ell'}) + \text{dist}(x_{i'}^{\ell'}, x_{i'}^1) \\ &\leq \left(2c + \frac{1}{2c^2}\right) \cdot R_i^\ell + 5 \cdot R_i^\ell \\ &\leq \left(2c + \frac{1}{2c^2} + 5\right) \cdot R_i^\ell \\ &\leq 10c \cdot R_i^\ell. \end{aligned}$$

The last step follows from $c \geq 5$. Therefore, we have $x_{i'}^1 \in B(x_i^\ell, 10c \cdot R_i^\ell) \subseteq N(x_i^\ell, 10c \cdot R_i^\ell)$, and $B(x_{i'}^1, R_i^\ell/2c)$ could have been selected by the algorithm instead of $B(x_i^{\ell+1}, R_i^{\ell+1})$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Value}(B(x_i^{\ell+1}, R_i^{\ell+1})) &\geq \text{Value}(B(x_{i'}^1, R_i^\ell/2c)) \\ &\geq \text{Value}(B(x_{i'}^1, R_{i'}^1)). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality comes from $R_i^\ell \geq 4c^2 \cdot R_{i'}^1$ and Lemma 3.1. \square

Pruning the sequences: Let M be the maximum value of balls that are still available at the end of the algorithm (if no ball is still available at the end of the algorithm, we can directly conclude with Corollary 5.4). By definition, we have $\text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_\gamma)) \leq M, \forall \gamma \in \Gamma_1$.

The next step to define the matching is to show that we can *prune* all the k sequences (x_i^1, x_i^2, \dots) to establish a separation property. The pruning procedure, based on Lemma 5.7, removes some balls from each sequence, ensuring that the value of the first remaining ball in each sequence is at least M , while also guaranteeing that the remaining balls are sufficiently far apart from each other. This is formalized in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.8. *There exists indices ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k such that:*

- for all $i \in \{1, k\}$, $\text{Value}(B(x_i^{\ell_i}, R_i^{\ell_i})) \geq M$.
- For all $i, i' \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and for all $\ell \geq \ell_i, \ell' \geq \ell_{i'}$, $B(x_i^\ell, 2c \cdot R_i^\ell) \cap B(x_{i'}^{\ell'}, 2c \cdot R_{i'}^{\ell'}) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Initially, set $\ell_i = 1$ for all i . This choice ensures that the first condition is satisfied: when $B(x_i^1, R_i^1)$ is selected, it maximizes the value among all available balls. Therefore $\text{Value}(B(x_i^1, R_i^1)) \geq M$.

To satisfy the second condition, we follow this procedure: whenever there exist $i < i'$ and $\ell \geq \ell_i, \ell' \geq \ell_{i'}$ such that $B(x_i^\ell, 2c \cdot R_i^\ell) \cap B(x_{i'}^{\ell'}, 2c \cdot R_{i'}^{\ell'}) \neq \emptyset$, update ℓ_i to $\ell + 1$. According to the first item of Lemma 5.7, this procedure is well-defined because $B(x_i^\ell, R_i^\ell)$ is not the last ball in the sequence, ensuring that $B(x_i^{\ell+1}, R_i^{\ell+1})$ exists. Additionally, the second item of the lemma guarantees that $\text{Value}(B(x_i^{\ell+1}, R_i^{\ell+1})) \geq \text{Value}(B(x_i^1, R_i^1)) \geq M$, thereby maintaining the first condition after each update.

Since one of the ℓ_i is incremented at each step, the procedure must eventually terminate, as the maximum length of the sequences is $\log_{2c}(\Delta) + 7$. When the procedure ends, both conditions are satisfied, thus concluding the proof. \square

Defining the matching: Starting from the pruned sequences and Lemma 5.6, we can conclude the construction of the desired matching:

Lemma 5.9. *There exists a matching $B(\gamma, R_\gamma) \mapsto B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)})$ defined for all $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$ such that:*

1. $B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)})$ is not covered by Γ .
2. For all γ' with $\gamma \neq \gamma'$, $B(\phi(\gamma), c \cdot R_{\phi(\gamma)}) \cap B(\phi(\gamma'), c \cdot R_{\phi(\gamma')}) = \emptyset$.
3. $\text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_\gamma)) \leq \text{Value}(B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)}))$.

Proof. Let ℓ_i be the indices provided by Lemma 5.8. The construction of the matching proceeds in three steps:

- First, note that if the last ball $B(c_i, 1/(2c)^7)$ of the i -th sequence is covered by an element $\gamma \in \Gamma$, then $\gamma \in \Gamma_0$ and we don't need to define the matching for γ .
- Second, for any i such that at least one ball in the pruned sequence $(B(x_i^\ell, R_i^\ell))_{\ell \geq \ell_i}$ is covered by Γ but not the last one, we define $\lambda_i \geq \ell_i$ as the smallest index such that $B(x_i^\ell, R_i^\ell)$ is not covered for all $\ell \geq \lambda_i$. Let γ be an arbitrary element of Γ that covers $B(x_i^{\lambda_i-1}, R_i^{\lambda_i-1})$. We then define $B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)}) = B(x_i^{\lambda_i}, R_i^{\lambda_i})$.
- Last, for any element γ in Γ_1 that is still unmatched, we define $B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)}) = B(x_i^{\ell_i}, R_i^{\ell_i})$, where i is chosen arbitrarily such that none of the balls in the pruned sequence $(B(x_i^\ell, R_i^\ell))_{\ell \geq \ell_i}$ are covered and such that the matching is one-to-one.

Note that the second item of Lemma 5.8 guarantees that if $\gamma \in \Gamma$ covers a ball of a pruned sequence, it cannot cover a ball of another pruned sequence: this ensures that our definition of the matching is consistent. We can now verify it satisfies the three desired properties.

1. For any $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$, $B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)})$ is not covered by Γ by construction.
2. For any $\gamma, \gamma' \in \Gamma_1$, there exist indices i, i' such that $i \neq i'$, $B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)})$ is a ball of the pruned sequence $(B(x_i^\ell, R_i^\ell))_{\ell \geq \ell_i}$, and $B(\phi(\gamma'), R_{\phi(\gamma')})$ is a ball of the pruned sequence $(B(x_{i'}^\ell, R_{i'}^\ell))_{\ell \geq \ell_{i'}}$. Therefore, the second item of Lemma 5.8 ensures that $B(\phi(\gamma), 2c \cdot R_{\phi(\gamma)}) \cap B(\phi(\gamma'), 2c \cdot R_{\phi(\gamma')}) = \emptyset$.
3. Let $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$. We distinguish two cases, based on whether $B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)})$ was defined at the second or last step of the procedure.

If $B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)})$ is defined in the last step, then it is of the form $B(x_i^{\ell_i}, R_i^{\ell_i})$. By Lemma 5.8, we have $\text{Value}(B(x_i^{\ell_i}, R_i^{\ell_i})) \geq M$. Combined with the fact that $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$ is available at the end of the algorithm, we directly obtain $\text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_\gamma)) \leq \text{Value}(B(x_i^{\ell_i}, R_i^{\ell_i}))$.

Otherwise, $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$ is defined in the second step, and $B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)}) = B(x_i^{\lambda_i}, R_i^{\lambda_i})$ for some i . We know that γ covers $B(x_i^{\lambda_i-1}, R_i^{\lambda_i-1})$; therefore, $\gamma \in B(x_i^{\lambda_i-1}, 2c \cdot R_i^{\lambda_i-1}) \subseteq B(x_i^{\lambda_i-1}, 10c \cdot R_i^{\lambda_i-1}) \subseteq N(x_i^{\lambda_i-1}, 10c \cdot R_i^{\lambda_i-1})$. Hence, the algorithm could have picked $B(\gamma, R_i^{\lambda_i})$ instead of $B(x_i^{\lambda_i}, R_i^{\lambda_i})$, and therefore $\text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_i^{\lambda_i})) \leq \text{Value}(B(x_i^{\lambda_i}, R_i^{\lambda_i}))$.

It remains to prove that $R_\gamma \leq R_i^{\lambda_i}$ to conclude with Lemma 3.1.

Assume, for contradiction, that $R_i^{\lambda_i} < R_\gamma$. Because γ covers $B(x_i^{\lambda_i-1}, R_i^{\lambda_i-1})$, we know that $\text{dist}(\gamma, x_i^{\lambda_i-1}) \leq 2c \cdot R_i^{\lambda_i-1} = 4c^2 \cdot R_i^{\lambda_i} < 4c^2 \cdot R_\gamma$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.2, we have

$\text{dist}(x_i^{\lambda_i-1}, c_i) \leq 20c^2 \cdot R_i^{\lambda_i-1} = 40c^3 \cdot R_i^{\lambda_i} < 40c^3 \cdot R_\gamma$. Hence, using the triangle inequality, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(\gamma, c_i) &\leq \text{dist}(\gamma, x_i^{\lambda_i-1}) + \text{dist}(x_i^{\lambda_i-1}, c_i) \\ &< (4c^2 + 40c^3) \cdot R_\gamma \\ &< 100c^4 \cdot R_\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\gamma \in B(c_i, 100c^4 R_\gamma) \subseteq N(c_i, 100c^4 R_\gamma)$. Thus, $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$ is removed from the set of available balls after c_i is selected, contradicting the fact that $B(\gamma, R_\gamma)$ is still selected at the end of the algorithm. This completes the proof that $R_\gamma \leq R_i^{\lambda_i}$.

Now, applying Lemma 3.1, we get $\text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_\gamma)) \leq \text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_i^{\lambda_i}))$. Combining this with the inequality $\text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_i^{\lambda_i})) \leq \text{Value}(B(x_i^{\lambda_i}, R_i^{\lambda_i}))$ obtained earlier, we conclude the proof. □

5.2 Putting things together: proof of Theorem 5.1

We conclude the proof of our main theorem as follows:

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Given the matching ϕ of Lemma 5.9, we can conclude as follows. Summing the inequality of the third property of ϕ gives

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_\gamma)) \leq \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{Value}(B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)})).$$

Each $B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)})$ is not covered by Γ by the first property of ϕ . Therefore, we can apply Lemma 5.6 and obtain

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{Value}(B(\phi(\gamma), R_{\phi(\gamma)})) \leq \frac{3}{c^z} \cdot \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{COST}(B(\phi(\gamma), c \cdot R_{\phi(\gamma)}) \cap P, \Gamma).$$

The second property of ϕ ensures that the balls in the set $\{B(\phi(\gamma), c \cdot R_{\phi(\gamma)}) \mid \gamma \in \Gamma_1\}$ are disjoint. Therefore,

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{COST}(B(\phi(\gamma), c \cdot R_{\phi(\gamma)}) \cap P, \Gamma) = \text{COST}\left(\bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} B(\phi(\gamma), c \cdot R_{\phi(\gamma)}) \cap P, \Gamma\right).$$

Combining everything yields

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_\gamma)) \leq \frac{3}{c^z} \cdot \text{COST}\left(\bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} B(\phi(\gamma), c \cdot R_{\phi(\gamma)}) \cap P, \Gamma\right).$$

Combining this inequality with Lemma 5.5 and Corollary 5.3 finishes the proof of Theorem 5.1:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{COST}(P, C_k) &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_0} \text{COST}(P_\gamma, C_k) + \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{COST}(\text{Out}(P_\gamma), C_k) + \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{COST}(\text{Out}(P_\gamma), C_k) \\
&\leq \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_0} \text{COST}(P_\gamma, \Gamma) + 2^{z-1}((200c^6)^z + 1) \cdot \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{COST}(\text{Out}(P_\gamma), \Gamma) \\
&\quad + 2^{z-1}((200c^6)^z + 1) \cdot 3 \cdot \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{Value}(B(\gamma, R_\gamma)) \\
&\leq \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_0} \text{COST}(P_\gamma, \Gamma) + 2^{z-1}((200c^6)^z + 1) \cdot \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{COST}(\text{Out}(P_\gamma), \Gamma) \\
&\quad + 2^{z-1}((200c^6)^z + 1) \cdot 3 \cdot \frac{3}{c^z} \cdot \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} \text{COST}\left(\bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_1} B(\phi(\gamma), c \cdot R_{\phi(\gamma)}) \cap P, \Gamma\right) \\
&\leq (1 + 2^{z-1}((200c^6)^z + 1)(1 + \frac{9}{c^z})) \text{COST}(P, \Gamma).
\end{aligned}$$

□

References

- [AI06] Alexandr Andoni and Piotr Indyk. Near-optimal hashing algorithms for approximate nearest neighbor in high dimensions. pages 459–468, 2006.
- [AMS96] Noga Alon, Yossi Matias, and Mario Szegedy. The space complexity of approximating the frequency moments. In *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 20–29, 1996.
- [ANSW20] Sara Ahmadian, Ashkan Norouzi-Fard, Ola Svensson, and Justin Ward. Better guarantees for k-means and euclidean k-median by primal-dual algorithms. volume 49, 2020.
- [AV07] David Arthur and Sergei Vassilvitskii. k-means++: the advantages of careful seeding. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2007, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, January 7-9, 2007*, pages 1027–1035, 2007.
- [CEMN22] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Hossein Esfandiari, Vahab S. Mirrokni, and Shyam Narayanan. Improved approximations for euclidean k -means and k -median, via nested quasi-independent sets. In Stefano Leonardi and Anupam Gupta, editors, *STOC '22: 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Rome, Italy, June 20 - 24, 2022*, pages 1621–1628. ACM, 2022.
- [CFS21] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Andreas Emil Feldmann, and David Saulpic. Near-linear time approximation schemes for clustering in doubling metrics. In *J. ACM*, volume 68, 2021.
- [CH11] Marek Chrobak and Mathilde Hurand. Better bounds for incremental medians. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(7):594–601, 2011. Selected papers from WAOA 2007: Fifth Workshop on Approximation and Online Algorithms.

- [CHH⁺23] Moses Charikar, Monika Henzinger, Lunjia Hu, Maximilian Vötsch, and Erik Waingarten. Simple, scalable and effective clustering via one-dimensional projections. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:64618–64649, 2023.
- [CKL22] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Karthik C. S., and Euiwoong Lee. Johnson coverage hypothesis: Inapproximability of k-means and k-median in ℓ_p -metrics. In *Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 1493–1530, 2022.
- [CLN⁺20] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Silvio Lattanzi, Ashkan Norouzi-Fard, Christian Sohler, and Ola Svensson. Fast and accurate k -means++ via rejection sampling. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020.
- [CLSS22] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Kasper Green Larsen, David Saulpic, and Chris Schwiegelshohn. Towards optimal lower bounds for k-median and k-means coresets. In Stefano Leonardi and Anupam Gupta, editors, *STOC ’22: 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Rome, Italy, June 20 - 24, 2022*, pages 1038–1051. ACM, 2022.
- [CSS21] Vincent Cohen-Addad, David Saulpic, and Chris Schwiegelshohn. A new coreset framework for clustering. In Samir Khuller and Virginia Vassilevska Williams, editors, *STOC ’21: 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Virtual Event, Italy, June 21-25, 2021*, pages 169–182. ACM, 2021.
- [DF09] Sanjoy Dasgupta and Yoav Freund. Random projection trees for vector quantization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(7):3229–3242, 2009.
- [DITHS24] Max Dupré la Tour, Monika Henzinger, and David Saulpic. Fully dynamic k-means coreset in near-optimal update time, 2024.
- [DSS24] Andrew Draganov, David Saulpic, and Chris Schwiegelshohn. Settling time vs. accuracy tradeoffs for clustering big data. *SIGMOD 2024*, 2024.
- [FM85] Philippe Flajolet and G Nigel Martin. Probabilistic counting algorithms for database applications. *Journal of computer and system sciences*, 31(2):182–209, 1985.
- [GK99] Sudipto Guha and Samir Khuller. Greedy strikes back: Improved facility location algorithms. *J. Algorithms*, 31(1):228–248, 1999.
- [GPST23] Kishen N. Gowda, Thomas W. Pensyl, Aravind Srinivasan, and Khoa Trinh. Improved bi-point rounding algorithms and a golden barrier for k -median. pages 987–1011, 2023.
- [JL84] William Johnson and Joram Lindenstrauss. Extensions of lipschitz maps into a hilbert space. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 26:189–206, 01 1984.
- [Llo82] Stuart Lloyd. Least squares quantization in pcm. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 28(2):129–137, 1982.
- [LS19] Silvio Lattanzi and Christian Sohler. A better k-means++ algorithm via local search. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019, 9-15 June 2019, Long*

Beach, California, USA, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3662–3671. PMLR, 2019.

- [MNV12] Meena Mahajan, Prajakta Nimbhorkar, and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. The planar k-means problem is np-hard. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 442:13–21, 2012.
- [MP03] Ramgopal R. Mettu and C. Greg Plaxton. The online median problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 32(3):816–832, 2003.
- [MP04] Ramgopal R. Mettu and C. Greg Plaxton. Optimal time bounds for approximate clustering. *Mach. Learn.*, 56(1-3):35–60, 2004.
- [MS84] Nimrod Megiddo and Kenneth J Supowit. On the complexity of some common geometric location problems. *SIAM journal on computing*, 13(1):182–196, 1984.
- [She16] Vladimir Shenmaier. An approximation algorithm for the euclidean incremental median problem. *Discrete Optimization*, 22:312–327, 2016.