

FPT approximations for Capacitated Sum of Radii and Diameters

Arnold Filtser^{*1} and Ameet Gadekar¹

¹Bar-Ilan University. Emails: {arnold.filtser, ameer.gadekar}@biu.ac.il

Abstract

The Capacitated Sum of Radii problem involves partitioning a set of points P , where each point $p \in P$ has capacity U_p , into k clusters that minimize the sum of cluster radii, such that the number of points in the cluster centered at point p is at most U_p . We begin by showing that the problem is APX-hard, and that under gap-ETH there is no parameterized approximation scheme (FPT-AS). We then construct a ≈ 5.83 -approximation algorithm in FPT time (improving a previous ≈ 7.61 approximation in FPT time). Our results also hold when the objective is a general monotone symmetric norm of radii. We also improve the approximation factors for the uniform capacity case, and for the closely related problem of Capacitated Sum of Diameters.

Contents

1	Introduction	1	4.2	Extension to Cluster CAPSOR	23
1.1	Other Norm Objectives	3	4.3	Extension to Non-Uniform CAP-SOD	23
1.2	Sum of Diameters and cluster capacities	4	5	Hardness of Approximation	25
1.3	Further Related Work	6	5.1	Preliminaries	27
2	Overview of Techniques	7	5.2	Hardness of FPT-approximation for Uniform CAPSOR	28
2.1	Non-Uniform Capacited Sum of Radii	8	5.3	NP-hardness of approximation for Uniform CAPSOR	33
2.2	Hardness of FPT-Approximation for Uniform Capacities	9	A	Uniform Capacities	33
2.3	Uniform Capacities	11	A.1	Technical Overview	34
3	Preliminaries	13	A.2	Notations and definitions	37
4	Non-Uniform Capacities	16	A.3	CAPSOD	37
4.1	Node CAPSOR	17	A.4	CAPSOR	41
			B	Omitted Proof	47

^{*}This research was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant No. 1042/22).

1 Introduction

Clustering is a fundamental problem in several domains of computer science, including, data mining, operation research, and computational geometry, among others. In particular, center based clustering problems such as k -median, k -means, and k -center have received significant attention from the research community for more than half a century [Llo82, HS85, Meg90, BHI02, AGK⁺04, KSS10, Das08, HM04, Mat00, KMN⁺04, BPR⁺17, BJK18, CK19, CGK⁺19, CGH⁺22, CKL22b, BSS18, ABB⁺23, GPST23]. In these problems, we are given a set P of n points together with a distance function (metric) and a positive integer k . The goal is to partition P into k parts called *clusters* and choose a *center* point for each cluster, so that to minimize a clustering objective that is a function of the point distances to their centers. A related fundamental problem that helps reduce *dissection effect* due to k -center [MS89, CP04] is called Sum of Radii. Here the goal is to choose k -size subset X of P (called centers, as before) and assign every point to an element in X . This partitions the set P into possible k clusters, C_1, \dots, C_k , where cluster C_i corresponds to the set of points assigned to $x_i \in X$. The radius of cluster C_i centered at $x_i \in X$ is the maximum distance of a point in P_i to x_i . The objective is the sum of radii of the clusters C_1, \dots, C_k .¹

In the recent years Sum of Radii received a great share of interest in all aspects [CP04, GKK⁺10, GKK⁺12, GKK⁺12, BS15, FJ22, BERW24, CXXZ24, IV20, BLS23, JKY24, BV16, AS16, BIV21, FK14, BCKK05]. Nevertheless, its computational landscape is not yet fully understood. While, the problem is NP-hard [GKK⁺10] even in weighted planar graphs and in metrics of bounded doubling dimensions, it is known to admit a QPTAS (quasi polynomial time approximation scheme) [GKK⁺10] in general metrics, thus prompting a possibility of PTAS (polynomial time approximation scheme).² This is in contrast to related clustering problems like k -center, k -median, and k -means which are all known to be APX-hard [HS85, JMS02, ACKS15]. Currently, the present best known approximation factor in polynomial time is $(3 + \varepsilon)$ due to Buchem *et. al.* [BERW24] (improving over previous results of [CP04, FJ22]). Additionally, there is a recent $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm [CXXZ24] that runs in FPT time³ (fixed parameter tractable).

Capacitated Clustering. We are interested in a much more challenging generalization where each point p has an inherent capacity $U_p \geq 0$, indicating an upper bound on the number of points it can serve as a center of a cluster in the solution.⁴ This is known as the *Non-Uniform Capacitated* clustering problem. If all the points have the same capacity U , the problem is referred to as the *Uniform Capacitated* clustering problem. Capacitated clustering models various applications, e.g. load balancing (where each cluster representative can handle only bounded number of objects). Capacitated clustering were thoroughly studied: Capacitated k -center admits a constant factor approximation in polynomial time for both uniform [KS00] and non-uniform capacities [CHK12, ABC⁺15]. There are several bi-criteria polytime approximations for k -median [CR05, BFRS15, BRU16, DL16, Li16, Li17].

There are FPT approximation algorithms for capacitated k -median and capacitated k -means

¹Alternatively, in the Sum of Radii problem we choose centers $x_1, \dots, x_k \in X$, and radii $r_1, \dots, r_k \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ so that $P \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^k \text{ball}(x_i, r_i)$. The objective is to minimize $\sum_{i=1}^k r_i$.

²If Sum of Radii is APX-hard (equivalently, does not admit a PTAS) then $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{QP}$ (in particular there is a quasi-polynomial time algorithm solving SAT). It is widely believed that $\text{NP} \not\subseteq \text{QP}$.

³In this paper, by FPT time, we mean FPT w.r.t. the parameter k .

⁴Formally, following footnote 1, a valid solution to the capacitated version also contains an assignment $\sigma : P \rightarrow \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ such that if $\sigma(p) = x_i$ then $\delta(p, x_i) \leq r_i$, and for every i , $|\sigma^{-1}(x_i)| \leq U_{x_i}$.

with approximation factors $(3 + \varepsilon)$ and $(9 + \varepsilon)$ respectively [CL19] (improving over [ABM⁺19, XZZ19]). From the other hand, assuming gap-ETH^5 , in FPT time it is impossible to approximate k -median and k -means with factors better than $(1 + \frac{2}{e})$ and $(1 + \frac{8}{e})$, respectively (even without capacities) [CGK⁺19]. There is a $4 + \varepsilon$ FPT-approximation for uniform capacitated k -center [JKY24, GJ23]⁶.

For capacitated Sum of Radii (CAPSOR) (see Table 1 for a summary of previous and new results) Inamdar and Varadarajan [IV20] constructed an FPT time algorithm providing an 28-approximation for Sum of Radii with uniform capacities. This was later improved to $4 + \varepsilon$ by Bandyapadhyay, Lochet, and Saurabh [BLS23], and finally to $3 + \varepsilon$ by Jaiswal, Kumar, and Yadav [JKY24]. For non-uniform capacities, Jaiswal *et. al.* obtained $(4 + \sqrt{13} + \varepsilon) \approx 7.61$ approximation in FPT time, improving a previous approximation of $15 + \varepsilon$ [BLS23].

From the lower bound side, Jaiswal *et. al.* [JKY24] showed that assuming ETH^7 , there is some constant $\beta > 0$, such that any β -approximation for CAPSOR (with non-uniform capacities) requires $2^{\Omega(k/\text{poly log } k)} n^{O(1)}$ time. The first contribution of this paper is to show that CAPSOR is APX hard even with uniform capacities. That is compared to [JKY24] we removed the ETH assumption, and used only uniform capacities. This is in contrast to the uncapacitated version which is believed to admit a PTAS (assuming $NP \not\subseteq QP$).

Theorem 1 (APX-hard). *There exists $\alpha > 1$ such that it is NP-hard to approximate Uniform CAPSOR better than factor α .*

Earlier, Bandyapadhyay *et. al.* [BLS23] showed that assuming ETH^7 , no FPT algorithm can solve CAPSOR exactly (even with uniform capacities). However, until this point, nothing ruled out the existence of an FPT-Approximation Scheme (FPT-AS) or PAS for Parameterized Approximation Scheme⁸. The second contribution of this paper is to show that assuming gap-ETH^5 , no such FPT-AS exists.

Theorem 2 (No FPT-AS). *Assuming gap-ETH , there is a fixed $\alpha > 1$ such that there is no $f(k)n^{o(k)}$ time α -approximation algorithm for Uniform CAPSOR.*

Note that if we allow $n^{O(k)}$ time, then we can exactly solve Sum of Radii using brute-force, even with non-uniform capacities (see footnote 13). Therefore, Theorem 2 not only rules out FPT-approximation algorithms for achieving an α -approximation for this problem but also implies that in this context, the best algorithm for obtaining α -approximation is the naive brute-force algorithm, which runs in $n^{O(k)}$ time.

Next, as the best we can hope for is a constant factor approximation in FPT time, we turn to improving this factor. The main result of the paper is a $(3 + \sqrt{8} + \varepsilon) \approx 5.83$ FPT-approximation for non-uniform CAPSOR, significantly improving the present best [JKY24] factor of $(4 + \sqrt{13} + \varepsilon) \approx 7.61$. The theorem also mentions cluster capacities and other objectives. These will be explained in the following sub-sections.

⁵Informally, gap-ETH says that there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that no sub-exponential time algorithm for 3-SAT can distinguish whether a given 3-SAT formula has a satisfying assignment or every assignment satisfies at most $(1 - \varepsilon)$ fraction of the clauses.

⁶In fact, [GJ23] obtained a 2-approximation for capacitated k -center under *soft* assignments (where different centers can be co-located). In contrast, in this paper we consider only *hard* assignments (where we can open only a single center at each point). One can use [GJ23] to obtain a 4-approximation for uniform capacitated k -center w.r.t. hard assignments. See Section 1.3 for a further discussion.

⁷Informally, ETH (Exponential Time Hypothesis), says that there is no subexponential time algorithm for 3-SAT

⁸Such algorithms find $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in time $f(k, \varepsilon)n^{g(\varepsilon)}$ for some fixed functions f and g .

Theorem 3 (Main Theorem). *There is a (deterministic) FPT-approximation algorithm that finds a $(3 + 2\sqrt{2} + \varepsilon)$ -approximation for Non-uniform CAPSOR for any $\varepsilon > 0$, and runs in time $2^{O(k^2 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$. Furthermore, the algorithm yields $(3 + 2\sqrt{2} + \varepsilon)$ -approximation for non-uniform capacities even when the objective is a monotone symmetric norm of the radii. Both results hold also w.r.t. cluster capacities.*

Capacities	Norm	Approx. factor	Run time	Reference
Sum of Radii				
Uniform	ℓ_1	28	$2^{O(k^2)} n^{O(1)}$	[IV20]
		$4 + \varepsilon$	$2^{O(k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$	[BLS23]
		$3 + \varepsilon$	$2^{O(k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$	[JKY24]
	ℓ_p	$(1 + \varepsilon)(2 \cdot 4^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p}$	$2^{O(k^2 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$	Theorem 4
		$(1 + \varepsilon)(2 \cdot 3^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p}$	$2^{O(k^2 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$	Theorem 4
general	$3 + \varepsilon$	$2^{O(k^2 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$	Theorem 4	
Lower Bound	ℓ_1	$\beta > 1$	$2^{\Omega(\frac{k}{\text{polylog} k})} \cdot \text{poly}(n)$ (ETH)	[JKY24]
Uniform Lower Bound	ℓ_1	exact	$n^{\Omega(k)}$ (ETH)	[BLS23]
		APX-hard	$n^{\Omega(k)}$ (gap-ETH)	Theorem 1 Theorem 2
Non-Uniform Capacities	ℓ_1	$15 + \varepsilon$	$2^{O(k^2 \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$	[BLS23]
	ℓ_p	$4 + \sqrt{13} + \varepsilon \approx 7.61$	$2^{O(k^3 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$	[JKY24]
	general	$3 + \sqrt{8} + \varepsilon \approx 5.83$	$2^{O(k^2 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$	Theorem 3
Sum of Diameters				
Uniform	ℓ_1	$6 + \varepsilon$	$2^{O(k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$	[JKY24]
		$4 + \varepsilon$	$2^{O(k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$	Theorem 5
	ℓ_p	$(2 + \varepsilon)(2 \cdot 4^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p}$	$2^{O(k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$	[JKY24]
		$(2 + \varepsilon)(2^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p}$	$2^{O(k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$	Theorem 5
	general	$4 + \varepsilon$	$2^{O(k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$	Theorem 5
Non-Uniform	general	$7 + \varepsilon$	$2^{O(k^2 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$	Theorem 6

Table 1: Summary of our results and previous results for CAPSOR and CAPSOD. The results for CAPSOD are implicit in the corresponding references. Furthermore, CAPSOD makes sense only for the cluster capacities. While CAPSOR with the ℓ_∞ objective corresponds to the Capacitated k -CENTER problem, CAPSOD with the ℓ_∞ objective corresponds to the Capacitated MAX- k -DIAMETER problem. The inapproximability result, assuming gap-ETH, rules out any $f(k)n^{o(k)}$ time algorithm for uniform CAPSOR (ℓ_1 objective) that obtains an α -approximation, for some fixed constant α bounded away from 1.

1.1 Other Norm Objectives

In the Sum of Radii problem the goal is to choose k balls covering all the metric points such that the sum of radii $\sum_i r_i$ is minimized. A natural generalization is to optimize some other objectives. Specifically, given a norm $\|\cdot\| : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, choose balls covering all metric points so that to minimize the norm of the radii vector $\|(r_1, \dots, r_k)\|$. One natural example is the ℓ_p norm where $\|(r_1, \dots, r_k)\|_p = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k r_i^p\right)^{1/p}$. Note that the ℓ_1 norm objective is exactly the Sum of Radii

problem, while the ℓ_∞ norm objective ($\|(r_1, \dots, r_k)\|_\infty = \max_{i \in [1, k]} r_i$) is the k -center problem. The other ℓ_p -norm objectives interpolate between these two fundamental problems in clustering. The power of such generalizations have been recently studied [CS19, ABB⁺23], which surprisingly not only unifies the existing FPT-AS for several different problems such as k -median, k -means, and k -center, but also yields FPT-AS for advanced problems such as priority k -center [GW06, BCCN21, Ple87], ℓ -centrum [NP05, LNG15], ordered k -median [BSS18, BJKW19], and Socially Fair k -median [AGGN10, BCMN14, MV21, GSV21], which were previously unresolved.

Jaiswal *et al.* [JKY24] constructed an algorithm for the uniform capacitated Sum of Radii with ℓ_p norm of radii with approximation factor $(1 + \varepsilon)(2 \cdot 4^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p}$ in FPT time. In particular, this implies a $(3 + \varepsilon)$ FPT-approximation for uniform capacitated Sum of Radii ($p = 1$) and $(4 + \varepsilon)$ FPT-approximation⁶ for uniform capacitated k -center ($p = \infty$). In our work, we generalize and improve these results. Specifically, we obtain a $(3 + \varepsilon)$ FPT-approximation w.r.t. any monotone symmetric norm (see Section 3 for definitions) of radii, thus generalizing the ℓ_p norm objective of [JKY24]. Further, we also improve the approximation ratio for the ℓ_p norm objective to $(1 + \varepsilon)(2 \cdot 3^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p}$.

Theorem 4 (Uniform). *There is a randomized algorithm for Uniform CAPSOR, oblivious to the objective, that runs in $2^{O(k^2 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$ time, and with probability at least $3/5$ returns a solution Sol, such that Sol is a $(3 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation w.r.t. any monotone symmetric norm objective (simultaneously). Furthermore, for $1 < p < \infty$, Sol is a $(1 + \varepsilon)(2 \cdot 3^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p}$ -approximation w.r.t. the ℓ_p norm objective.*

For the special case of $p = \infty$, the ℓ_∞ norm objective is simply the k -center problem. Here a simple corollary of Theorem 4 implies $(3 + \varepsilon)$ FPT-approximation algorithm for k -center with uniform capacities, improving the state of the art factor of 4 due to [JKY24, GJ23]. Note that for $p \in (1, \infty]$, the approximation factor of our Theorem 4 is better than that of [JKY24]. In fact, the approximation factor of our algorithm for ℓ_p norm objective equals $\max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} \left(\frac{(2+\alpha)^p + 1}{1+\alpha^p} \right)^{1/p}$, which is slightly better than the stated factor. For example, it equals ≈ 2.414 and ≈ 2.488 for $p = 2$ and $p = 3$, respectively (instead of the stated ≈ 2.65 and ≈ 2.67). Similarly, [JKY24] explicitly claimed approximation factors of 3 and ≈ 3.2 , respectively. However, if we optimize their final expression, it yields factors ≈ 2.92 and ≈ 3.191 for $p = 2$ and $p = 3$, respectively. See Remark 25 for further discussion.

For non-uniform Capacitated Sum of Radii, Jaiswal *et al.* [JKY24] obtained approximation factor of $(4 + \sqrt{13} + \varepsilon) \approx 7.61$ w.r.t. any ℓ_p -norm objective in $2^{O(k^3 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$ time. As stated in Theorem 3 above, for non-uniform Capacitated Sum of Radii, we obtain approximation factor of $(3 + \sqrt{8} + \varepsilon) \approx 5.83$ w.r.t. any monotone symmetric norm objective, in $2^{O(k^2 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$ time. Thus we improve over [JKY24] on three fronts (see Table 1): (1) approximation factor, (2) generalizing to any monotone symmetric norm from ℓ_p norms, and (3) running time.

1.2 Sum of Diameters and cluster capacities

A closely related problem is the Sum of Diameters problem, which has been studied extensively and predates Sum of Radii [HJ87, HJ97, MS89, CRW91, DMR⁺00, CP04, BS15, DMR⁺00, FJ22]. Here, the goal is to partition the point set P into k clusters C_1, \dots, C_k , and the objective is to minimize the sum of cluster diameters $\sum_{i=1}^k \text{diam}(C_i)$, where the diameter of a cluster is $\text{diam}(C_i) = \max_{x, y \in C_i} \delta(x, y)$ the maximum pairwise distance between two cluster points. Note that, unlike Sum of Radii, in this problem, there are no centers representing the clusters. Furthermore, this problem

is NP-hard to approximate to a factor better than 2 in polynomial time [DMR⁺00] (unlike Sum of Radii, which admits a QPTAS). A simple observation shows that any α -factor approximation for Sum of Radii implies 2α -factor approximation for Sum of Diameters in a black-box way (and vice-versa).⁹ This trick has often been used to design approximation algorithms for Sum of Diameters. In fact, the current state-of-the-art algorithms for Sum of Diameters, including a polynomial-time $(6 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation [BERW24] and a quasi-polynomial-time $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation [GKK⁺10], are based on this implicit trick by applying it to the polynomial-time $(3 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation and QPTAS for Sum of Radii, respectively.

Capacitated Sum of Diameters. We introduce the problem of Capacitated Sum of Diameters (CAPSOD). Here we are initially given k capacities U_1, \dots, U_k , the goal is to partition the point set P into k clusters C_1, \dots, C_k , such that for every i , $|C_i| \leq U_i$, while the objective is to minimize the sum of cluster diameters. If all the capacities are equal $U_1 = \dots = U_k$, we will call the capacities uniform (and otherwise as non-uniform). Under uniform capacities, the reduction mentioned in footnote 9 goes through. Thus an α approximation algorithm to uniform capacitated Sum of Radii transfers in a black-box manner into a 2α approximation algorithm for the uniform capacitated Sum of Diameters, with the same running time. In particular, by using [JKY24], one can obtain a $6 + \varepsilon$ -approximation for uniform capacitated Sum of Diameters in FPT time. In fact, similarly to Sum of Radii, one can study Capacitated Sum of Diameters w.r.t. any norm objective, and the reduction will still go through. Thus it follows from [JKY24] that for any ℓ_p norm objective, uniform capacitated Sum of Diameters admits $2(1 + \varepsilon)(4^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p}$ FPT approximation. Similarly, using our Theorem 4, we can obtain FPTtime $6 + \varepsilon$ approximation for uniform capacitated Sum of Diameters w.r.t. to any monotone symmetric norm, or $2(1 + \varepsilon)(3^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p}$ -approximation w.r.t. ℓ_p norm objective. Sum of Diameters is a fundamental and important problem. Its capacitated version was not previously explicitly studied simply because there was nothing to say beyond this simple reduction.

In our work, we go beyond this reduction and directly design novel approximation algorithms for capacitated Sum of Diameters with significantly better approximation factors than twice that of Sum of Radii.

Theorem 5 (Uniform Diameters). *There is a randomized algorithm that given an instance of the Uniform CAPSOD runs in $2^{O(k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$ time, and with probability at least $3/5$ returns a solution Sol, such that Sol is a $(4 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation w.r.t. any monotone symmetric norm objective (simultaneously). Furthermore, for $1 < p < \infty$, Sol is a $(2 + \varepsilon)(2^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p}$ -approximation w.r.t. the ℓ_p norm objective.*

Finally, we proceed to consider the more challenging problem of non-uniform Capacitated Sum of Diameters. Here we obtain a $7 + \varepsilon$ approximation w.r.t. to any monotone symmetric norm objective.

Theorem 6 (Non-Uniform Diameters). *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a (deterministic) algorithm running $2^{O(k^2 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$ -time and returns a $(7 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation for Non-uniform CAPSOD w.r.t. any monotone symmetric norm objective.*

⁹Given a set of points P , denote by \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{D} the value of the optimal solutions to Sum of Radii and Sum of Diameters respectively. It holds that $\mathcal{R} \leq \mathcal{D} \leq 2 \cdot \mathcal{R}$. Indeed, consider an optimal solution to Sum of Diameters of cost \mathcal{D} , then by picking arbitrary center in each cluster we obtain a solution for Sum of Radii of cost at most \mathcal{D} (thus $\mathcal{R} \leq \mathcal{D}$). From the other hand, given a solution to Sum of Radii of cost \mathcal{R} , the clusters induced by the balls constitute a solution to Sum of Diameters of cost at most $2 \cdot \mathcal{R}$ (thus $\mathcal{D} \leq 2 \cdot \mathcal{R}$).

1.2.0.1 Cluster Capacities. Bandyopadhyay *et. al.* [BLS23] introduced the problem of Capacitated Sum of Radii where each point $p \in P$ has a capacity U_p , and a cluster centered in p can contain at most U_p points. This corresponds for example to a scenario where we want to construct water wells, and a well constructed at point p can serve up to U_p clients. However, an equally natural problem is where one is given k capacities U_1, \dots, U_k , and the goal is to construct k clusters with arbitrarily centers, such that the i 'th cluster contains at most U_i points. This problem is similar to our capacitated Sum of Diameters, and can correspond to a scenario where one want to distribute already existing k water tanks (for example in a tent village during a festival). We refer to the two versions of the problem as node capacities, and cluster capacities, respectively. Note that for uniform capacities the two versions coincide. Further, note that the reduction from Sum of Radii to Sum of Diameters mentioned in footnote 9 holds in the capacitated version w.r.t. cluster capacities. Our results on node capacities in Theorem 3 hold for cluster capacities as well ($3 + 2\sqrt{2} + \varepsilon$ approximation for any monotone symmetric norm objective). No results on Sum of Radii with non-uniform cluster capacities were previously known.

1.3 Further Related Work

We begin with further background on the (uncapacitated) Sum of Radii and Sum of Diameters problems. When the point set P is from either ℓ_1 or ℓ_2 there is an exact poly-time algorithm [GKK⁺10], while there is also an EPTAS for the Euclidean (ℓ_2) case [GKK⁺10]. Another interesting case is when the metric between the input points P corresponds to the shortest path metric of an unweighted graph G . Here, assuming the optimal solution does not contain singeltons (clusters with only a single point), there is a polynomial time algorithm finding optimal solution [BS15]. The Sum of Diameters with fixed k admits exact polytime algorithm [BS15] (see also [HJ87, CRW91]). Further, there is a PTAS for Sum of Diameters where the input points are from the Euclidean plane [BS15]. The Sum of Radii problem was also studied in the fault tolerant regime [BIV21], considering outliers [AS16], and in an online (competitive analysis) setting [FK14, CEIL13].

Capacitated k -Center is a special case of capacitated ℓ_p norm of radii when $p = \infty$. The uniform Capacitated k -CENTER problem has been explicitly studied by Goyal and Jaiswal [GJ23], and is also implicitly captured by the results of Jaiswal *et. al.* [JKY24]. Goyal and Jaiswal design a factor 2 FPT-approximation for the soft assignment setting, where multiple centers can be opened at a single point, enabling it to serve more than U points. For instance, the algorithm can opt to open two centers at a point $p \in P$, thereby allowing up to $2U$ points to be served from location p . In contrast, similar to this paper, Jaiswal *et. al.* focus on the hard assignment scenario, where at most one center can be opened at a given point, and they present a $(4 + \varepsilon)$ FPT-approximation for this case. We are not aware of any approximation preserving subroutines that transform a soft assignment algorithm to a hard assignment algorithm. However, by replacing the chosen center with any other point in the cluster one can obtain a solution with hard assignments while incurring a factor 2 multiplicative loss in approximation. Consequently, the algorithm of [GJ23] can only yield 4 FPT-approximation using this approach, which matches the factor of [JKY24].

Capacitated Max- k -Diameter is a special case of capacitated ℓ_p norm of diameters problem when $p = \infty$. Its uncapacitated version turns out to be computationally very challenging. While there is a simple 2-approximation for MAX- k -DIAMETER [Gon85], it is NP-hard to approximate the problem better than factor 2 in ℓ_∞ metric even for $k = 3$ [Meg90]. Very recently, Fleischmann [FKK⁺23] showed that, even for $k = 3$, the problem is NP-hard to approximate better than factors 1.5 and 1.304 when the points come from ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 metrics, respectively. Given

that these hardness results hold for constant k (i.e., even for $k = 3$), they also translate to FPT lower bounds. Thus, these hardness results imply that no FPT algorithm can beat these lower bounds for MAX- k -DIAMETER, unless $P = NP$. Of course, the corresponding capacitated version of MAX- k -DIAMETER is a generalization of MAX- k -DIAMETER, and hence these FPT-hardness of approximations also hold for the capacitated version. For upper bounds, it is interesting to note that the reduction from Sum of Radii to Sum of Diameters mentioned in footnote 9 works even when solving Sum of Radii w.r.t. soft assignments. Thus using [GJ23] one can obtain a 4 FPT-approximation for the uniform Capacitated MAX- k -DIAMETER problem, matching our Theorem 5 for this case.

2 Overview of Techniques

In this section, we highlight our conceptual and technical contributions. Due to space constraints, we begin with our main theorem (Theorem 3) and present the key ideas behind our algorithm for non-uniform capacities in Section 2.1. Subsequently, in Section 2.2, we outline the techniques used to establish our hardness result. Finally, in Section 2.3, we delve into the algorithmic ideas for uniform capacities. Note however, that from a pedagogical viewpoint, it is easier to begin reading first Section 2.3, followed by Section 2.1. We now set up basic notations required for the exposition.

Notations. We denote by \mathcal{I} an instance of capacitated Sum of Radii or capacitated Sum of Diameters, depending upon the context. For uniform capacities, \mathcal{I} consists of metric space (P, δ) , a positive integer k , and a uniform capacity $U > 0$. The elements in P are called points. For non-uniform node capacities, U is replaced by corresponding node capacities $\{U_p\}_{p \in P}$, and for non-uniform cluster capacities, U is replaced by corresponding cluster capacities $\{U_1, \dots, U_k\}$. We denote by $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_k\}$ an optimal (but fixed) clustering for \mathcal{I} . For ease of analysis, we assume that $|\mathcal{C}| = k$, otherwise, we can add zero radius clusters to make it k , without increasing the cost of \mathcal{I} . Note that the clusters in \mathcal{C} are disjoint. When \mathcal{I} is an instance of capacitated Sum of Radii, we denote by r_i^* and o_i as the radius and the center of cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$, respectively, and let $O = \{o_1, \dots, o_k\}$. In this case, we let $\text{OPT} = r_1^* + \dots + r_k^*$. When \mathcal{I} is an instance of capacitated Sum of Diameters, we denote by d_i^* as the diameter of cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$. In this case, we let $\text{OPT} = d_1^* + \dots + d_k^*$. It is known that we can guess in FPT time in k , a set (ε -approximation) $\{r_1, \dots, r_k\}$ corresponding to $\{r_1^*, \dots, r_k^*\}$ such that $\sum_{i \in [k]} r_i \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot \sum_{i \in [k]} r_i^*$ and $r_i \geq r_i^*$. Similarly, let $\{d_1, \dots, d_k\}$ denote ε -approximation of $\{d_1^*, \dots, d_k^*\}$. A feasible solution to \mathcal{I} is a partition of P (along with centers for Sum of Radii) such that the capacities are respected. For a point $p \in P$ and a positive real r , denote by $\text{ball}(p, r)$ as the set of points from P that are at a distance at most r from p .

Remark 1 (Point assignment using matching and flows). *In this section (and throughout the paper), we will focus on presenting a set of centers and their corresponding radii as our solution. This approach suffices because, given such a set of centers and radii, we can determine in polynomial time whether there exists a corresponding feasible solution (i.e., feasible assignment of points to the centers/clusters) with the same cost. Moreover, we can also find such a solution by defining an appropriate flow problem (see Lemmas 3 and 5).*

Remark 2 (FPT and bounded guessing). *We assume that our algorithms have a power to make $\text{poly}(k)$ guesses each with success probability $p(k)$. Such algorithms can be transformed into a*

randomized FPT algorithms that are correct with constant probability. See Remark 7 for more details.

2.1 Non-Uniform Capacitied Sum of Radii

For ease of exposition, in this technical overview we highlight our ideas for cluster capacities (see paragraph 1.2.0.1). Transitioning to node capacities introduces several more challenges which we will not discuss here. Other than the basic FPT framework mentioned in the preliminaries above, our algorithm is fundamentally different from these of [BLS23, JKY24], and hence we do not attempt to compare them (in contrast, for uniform capacities the algorithms are similar).

Consider the following simple and natural strategy of processing clusters in \mathcal{C} iteratively (see Algorithm 1 for pseudo-code). Initially all the clusters in \mathcal{C} are unprocessed. We will process the clusters in \mathcal{C} in non-decreasing order of their radii, denoted as C_1, \dots, C_k . Let U_1, \dots, U_k be the corresponding cluster capacities. Consider the first iteration when we process C_1 . Suppose we could find a dense ball $D_1 = \text{ball}(y_1, r_1)$ of radius r_1 in P such that $|D_1| \geq |C_1|$. Then, we could create a cluster $C'_1 \subseteq D_1$ of size $|C_1|$ ¹⁰ with radius r_1 , matching the optimal cost. To make this cluster permanent, we delete the points from D_1 to prevent them from being reassigned in later iterations. However, this could create problems — (i) C'_1 may contain points from other clusters, so in the future iterations when we process these clusters then the densest ball may not have enough points, and (ii) we need to make sure the points of C_1 are taken care by some cluster in our solution. Our algorithm is based on the following two key ideas that handle these two issues:

Invariant: do not touch the unprocessed. We ensure that, throughout the algorithm, every unprocessed cluster in \mathcal{C} has all of its points intact. In other words, during the processing iteration of C_i , all its points are present.

Making progress: Good dense balls. An immediate implication of the above invariant is that when we process C_i , there is a ball of radius r_i containing at least $|C_i|$ points. Let $D_i = \text{ball}(y_i, r_i)$ be the densest ball w.r.t. the remaining points during the iteration of C_i . Note that such a ball contains at least $|C_i|$ points due to the above invariant. Consider the smallest radius cluster $C_j \in \mathcal{C}$ that intersects¹¹ D_i , and call C_j the *anchor* for D_i . See Figure 1a, where D_i is the ball centered at y with radius r_i , $C_i = C_5$ and $C_j = C_8$. Now, consider the extended ball $D'_i := \text{ball}(y_i, r_i + 2r_j)$, and note that $C_j \subseteq D'_i$. Now, if C_i intersects D'_i , then C_i is not far from y_i (see Figure 1b). In this case, we call D_i a good dense ball (see Definition 12), and will be able to process C_i . Thus, our first goal when processing the cluster C_i is to find a good dense ball (see Algorithm 2).

Finding good dense ball in FPT time. Suppose D'_i does not intersect C_i , then we can temporarily delete $D'_i = \text{ball}(y_i, r_i + 2r_j)$ since this ball does not contain any point of C_i (see Figure 1a, where $C_i = C_5$ and $C_j = C_8$). Furthermore, we end up deleting at least one cluster (specifically, C_j), so this process of temporarily deleting balls can repeat at most k times before C_i intersects the extended ball D'_i (see Algorithm 3). Once we have a good dense ball $D_i = \text{ball}(y_i, r_i)$ for C_i , consider the extended ball $D'_i := \text{ball}(y_i, r_i + 2r_j)$, where r_j is the radius of the anchor C_j for D_i . There are two cases:

Case 1: Hop through the anchors. Suppose we are lucky, and it turns out that $r_j \leq r_i$. Then, y_i can serve all the points of C_i within radius $3r_i + 2r_j \leq 5r_i$. See Figure 1b, where $C_j = C_3$. We

¹⁰Even though $|C_1|$ is unknown, in retrospect, we will be able to use Remark 1 to obtain such a clustering.

¹¹In fact, we use a weaker notion of a *reachable* set (see Definition 10).

now mark C_i as processed. Note that, in this case, we do not delete any points.

Case 2: Otherwise “Exchange”. Suppose we are not lucky, and it turns out that $r_j > r_i$ (see [fig. 1c](#) where $r_i = r_5 > r_8 = r_j$). In this case, our basic approach is to open the cluster C_i at D_i , and thus relieving the clusters intersecting D_i from their responsibility for these points. In exchange, these clusters will become responsible for C_i points. The crux is that as the anchor C_j has the minimal radius among the clusters intersecting D_i , each such cluster C_q has radius larger than r_i . Thus from C_q ’s perspective, the points of C_i are “nearby”. Hence C_q can accept responsibility for a number of C_i points proportional to the number of C_q points taken (and thus everybody is taken care of).

In more details: we create a new cluster $C'_i \subseteq D_i$ out of the points in D_i (recall $|D_i| \geq |C_i|$ and see [footnote 10](#)). To make this assignment permanent, we delete D_i , and mark C_i as processed. However, we end up taking points from other clusters (and also end up deleting points from these clusters). The key observation is that as we process the clusters in non-decreasing order and $r_j > r_i$, D_i does not contain points from clusters processed via Case 1. Since we maintain the invariant that the points of unprocessed clusters are not deleted, we have to mark the clusters intersecting D_i as processed. However, before marking these clusters as processed, we need to ensure that they are accounted for in our solution. To this end, we use a novel idea of exchanging points. Since we have created a new cluster C'_i out of D_i , any cluster $C_{j'}$ that has lost, say, $n_{j'} > 0$ points in this process, can instead claim back $n_{j'}$ points from the original cluster C_i (depicted by islands in C_5 in [Figure 1c](#)) by paying slightly more cost since, in this case, we have $r_i < r_j \leq r_{j'}$. Here, we use the fact that C_j is the anchor for D_i , and hence r_j is the smallest radius intersecting D_i . We call such clusters partitioned clusters. Specifically, the radius of the partitioned $C_{j'}$ is at most $\delta(o_{j'}, y_i) + \delta(y_i, p) \leq (r_{j'} + r_i) + (r_i + 2r_j + 2r_i) \leq 7r_{j'}$, for $p \in C_i$, as $r_j \leq r_{j'}$. See [Figure 1c](#) for an illustration. Note that a cluster $C_{j'}$ can be partitioned multiple times by different C_i ’s, as shown in [Figure 1d](#). However, $o_{j'}$ can still serve all the points of the modified $C_{j'}$ within cost $7r_{j'}$, since, in this case, the radii of the clusters partitioning $C_{j'}$ are strictly less than $r_{j'}$. While it is hard to find $o_{j'}$, in the technical [Section 4](#), we show how to find another point that can serve all the points of the partitioned cluster $C_{j'}$ within radius $7r_{j'}$.

Note that, we get different approximation factors in Case 1 and Case 2. In the technical section, we interpolate between these two factors to obtain an improved approximation factor for the algorithm.

2.2 Hardness of FPT-Approximation for Uniform Capacities

Our hardness result is based on **gap-ETH** (gap-Exponential Time Hypothesis), introduced by [\[MR17, Din16\]](#). On a high level, **gap-ETH** says that there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that given an instance ϕ of 3-SAT on N variables and M clauses, no algorithm running in time $2^{o(N)}$ can distinguish if there is an assignment to the variables of ϕ that satisfy all the clauses in ϕ , or if every assignment satisfies $< (1 - \varepsilon)M$ clauses in ϕ , even when $M = O(N)$. In fact, using a result from Feige [\[Fei98\]](#), we can assume that ϕ is regular — each variable appears in exactly 5 clauses and no variable occurs more than once in a clause. This key property of ϕ allows us to create an instance of CAPSOR with uniform capacities.

Reduction from 3-SAT. We reduce ϕ to an instance \mathcal{I} of uniform CAPSOR, whose points are described by the vertices of a graph $H = (V, E)$ and the metric is the shortest path distances on H . See [Figure 2](#) for an example. We begin by partitioning the variables arbitrarily into k groups G_1, \dots, G_k , each consisting of roughly N/k variables. For each group G_i , and each assignment





Figure 1: Figure 1a shows a dense ball $\text{ball}(y, r_5)$, colored in black, that is not good for cluster C_5 , because $\text{ball}(y, r_5 + 2r_8)$ is disjoint from C_5 . Hence, it is safe to (temporary) delete $\text{ball}(y, r_5 + 2r_8)$ without affecting cluster C_5 , and recursively search for good dense ball for C_5 in the remaining points. On the other hand, the $\text{ball}(y, r_5)$ of Figure 1b is good dense ball for C_5 . Furthermore, note that in this case the radius of the anchor $r_3 \leq r_5$, and hence y can serve all the points of C_5 within distance $3r_5 + 2r_3 \leq 5r_5$. In Figure 1c, the radius of the anchor is $r_8 > r_5$, and hence the previous argument fails. However, in this case, since $\text{ball}(y, r_5)$ is a good dense ball for C_5 , so we can open a new cluster $C'_5 \subseteq \text{ball}(y, r_5)$ of appropriate size, instead of serving the points of C_5 . Note that, in this case, the new cluster C'_5 ends up taking points from clusters C_8, C_9 and C_{10} . However, these clusters can claim back the lost points from the original cluster C_5 (depicted by islands in C'_5), which is not too far from them. In this case, we say that C_8, C_9 and C_{10} are partitioned by C'_5 . Figure 1d shows cluster C_8 partitioned by C_2, C_4 and C_5 , and it has to collect its lost points the respective clusters.

Figure 2: *Example of the reduction from 3-SAT to uniform capacitated Sum of Radii with $k = 3$. Here we have a formula ϕ with 10 clauses over $N = 6$ variables. Each variable appears in exactly 5 clauses. We create a graph whose corresponding shortest path metric will be the Sum of Radii instance. The variables are partitioned into $k = 3$ groups of size 2 each. For each group G_i we add a vertex for each of the 4 possible assignments to the corresponding variables (surrounded by rectangles). We add also 4 auxiliary vertices to each group (on the left). All possible edges are added between the vertices in each group, and their auxiliary vertices. In addition, we add a vertex corresponding to each clause (on the right), and all possible edges between those vertices. Finally, we add an edge between every (partial) assignment to the clauses it satisfies.*



to the variables of G_i : $\alpha|_{G_i} : G_i \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, we create a vertex in V , and we call them assignment vertices. Additionally, for each group G_i , add (roughly) $2^{N/k}$ auxiliary vertices. Let V_i denote the set of vertices corresponding to G_i (including auxiliaries). Note that $|V_i| = 2^{O(N/k)}$. We add all possible edges between V_i vertices. For each clause, we create a vertex in V and call it clause vertex. Let V_c be the set of vertices corresponding to the clauses. We add all possible edges between V_c vertices. Finally, for every pair of assignment and clause vertices, we add an edge between them if the partial assignment corresponding to the assignment vertex satisfies the clause corresponding to the clause vertex. We set the uniform capacity $U = |V_i| + 5N/k$.

For correctness, suppose that there is a satisfying assignment α to ϕ , we claim that the cost of the optimal solution to \mathcal{I} is at most k . Indeed, for every V_i , we open a cluster at the unique vertex corresponding to a partial assignment agreeing with α . Let X be this set (of centers), and we define the clusters by assigning a vertex to the closest center in X . Since α satisfies all the clauses in ϕ , we have that every clause vertex in V_c is at a distance 1 from X . Each center $x_i \in X \cap V_i$ will be responsible for the points in V_i , and in addition to at most $5N/k$ clause vertices (as each variable belongs to at most 5 clauses), and thus overall to at most U points. Hence the radii of each cluster is at most 1, and the total cost is k .


For the other direction, we show that if there is a feasible solution X with cost at most $(1 + \varepsilon/66)k$ to \mathcal{I} , then there is an assignment α_X that satisfies more than $(1 - \varepsilon)M$ clauses, thus yielding a gap between both the cases. The crux of the argument in this case is that the auxiliary vertices force X to have the following important properties: (1) X does not have zero radius clusters. (2) There are not too many centers in X that serve points at distance more than 2 from them. These two properties together ensure that essentially we have a single center per set V_i with radius 1, and thus we can recover an assignment α_X satisfying more than $(1 - \varepsilon)M$ clauses.

2.3 Uniform Capacities

Our algorithm builds upon the algorithm of [JKY24]. The algorithm divides the clusters in \mathcal{C} into two categories: heavy and light. A cluster $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is *heavy* if $|C| > U/k^3$; otherwise, it is a *light* cluster. The intuition behind this partition is the following: some heavy cluster must exist, and

given such heavy cluster $C \in \mathcal{C}$, a randomly selected point from P belongs to C with probability at least $\text{poly}(1/k)$. Therefore, with probability at least $k^{-O(k)}$, we can obtain a set $X \subseteq P$ containing a single point x_i from every heavy cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$. For every heavy cluster C_i , we wish to open a cluster $B_i = \text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i)$ that will take care of C_i points (note $C_i \subseteq B_i$). We will assume that the union of these balls, $\cup_{x_i \in X} B_i$, covers the point set P (this assumption catches the essence of the problem, as we can greedily take care of light clusters not covered by this union). Let $\mathcal{L} \subseteq P$ be the set of points corresponding to the light clusters in \mathcal{C} . For each light cluster $C_t \in \mathcal{C}$, arbitrarily assign it to a heavy cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ such that C_t intersects B_i . Then, for each heavy cluster C_i , consider the set $S_i := C_i \cup (\text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i + 2r_{\ell(i)}) \cap \mathcal{L})$, where $r_{\ell(i)}$ is the maximum radius of a light cluster assigned to C_i . Note that S_i contains C_i , and all the light clusters assigned to C_i . If $|S_i| \leq U$, then we can open cluster $C'_i = S_i$ without violating the uniform capacity. For the other case, note that $|S_i| \leq (1 + 1/k^2)U$ since there can be at most k light clusters assigned to C_i , each of which has at most U/k^3 points. Let $I \subseteq [k]$ be the indices of heavy clusters, and let $I' \subseteq I$ be the indices of heavy clusters for whom S_i violated the capacity constraint. [JKY24] used a very neat matching based argument to construct $|I'|$ balls $\{\hat{C}_i\}_{i \in I'}$ each with a unique radius from $\{r_i\}_{i \in I}$ (the heavy clusters) such that $\cup_{i \in I'} \hat{C}_i$ contains at least U/k^2 points from each S_i (for $i \in I'$). These clusters $\{\hat{C}_i\}_{i \in I'}$ are then used to unload enough points from the overloaded heavy clusters. Now, $\{\text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i + 2r_{\ell(i)})\}_{i \in I}$ together with $\{\hat{C}_i\}_{i \in I'}$ is a valid feasible solution. The ℓ_1 norm cost (CAPSOR cost) of this solution is bounded by $\sum_{i \in I} (2r_i + 2r_{\ell(i)}) + \sum_{j \in I'} r_j \leq 3 \sum_{i \in [k]} r_i \leq (3 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}$, where we used that fact that $C_{\ell(i)}$ is distinct for each C_i , and that in $\cup_{i \in I'} \hat{C}_i$ we used the radius of every heavy cluster at most once. From the other hand, the ℓ_∞ cost (Capacitated k -CENTER) can only be bounded by $(4 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}$. It is also possible to bound the approximation factor for general ℓ_p norm objective.

Improvement for ℓ_p norm objectives. Our modification to get a better factor is very small, but leads to a significant improvement. Specifically, we fine tune the definition of $C_{\ell(i)}$ for C_i . [JKY24] assigned each light cluster C_j to an arbitrary heavy cluster C_i such that C_j intersects the extended ball B_i , and let $r_{\ell(i)}$ to be the maximum radius of a light cluster assigned to C_i . Instead, we assign each light cluster C_j to an arbitrary heavy cluster C_i such that B_i contains its center o_i , while $r_{\ell(i)}$ remains the maximum radius of a light cluster assigned to C_i . The crux is that now the ball $\text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i + r_{\ell(i)})$ contains the heavy cluster C_i and all the light clusters assigned to it. In the example on the right we consider a heavy cluster C_i , where we sampled a point $x_i \in C_i$ and consider the ball $B_i = \text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i)$. B_i intersects 3 light clusters (C_1, C_2, C_3) with radii $r_1 < r_2 < r_3$. Now $r_{\ell(i)} = r_2$ because $o_2 \in B_i$, while $o_3 \notin B_i$. As previously, we open clusters of two types: (1) for every heavy cluster C_i , a cluster C'_i centered at x_i of radius $2r_i + r_{\ell(i)}$, and (2) the clusters $\{\hat{C}_i\}_{i \in I'}$ relieving the extra load. Overall, we save a factor of $r_{\ell(i)}$ in the radius of the cluster centered at x_i . Note that this solution yields a 3 approximation w.r.t. the ℓ_∞ norm objective (Capacitated k -CENTER), and yields a similar improvement w.r.t. other ℓ_p norm objectives.



3 Preliminaries

3.1 Problems

In this section, we define the problems of interest. We start with defining capacitated versions of Sum of Radii.

Definition 1 (Uniform CAPACITATED SUM OF RADII). *Given a set P of n points in a metric space with distance δ and non-negative integers U and k , the Uniform CAPACITATED SUM OF RADII (Uniform CAPSOR) problem asks to find a set of centers $S \subseteq P$ of size k and an assignment function $\sigma : P \rightarrow S$ such that $|\sigma^{-1}(s)| \leq U$ for all $s \in S$ and the objective $\sum_{s \in S} \text{rad}(s)$ is minimized, where $\text{rad}(s) := \max_{p \in \sigma^{-1}(s)} \delta(s, p)$ is the radius of cluster centered at $s \in S$.*

Definition 2 (Non-Uniform Node CAPSOR). *Given a set P of n points in a metric space with distance δ , a non-negative integer U_p for every $p \in P$ and a non-negative integer k , the Non-Uniform Node CAPSOR problem asks to find a set of centers $S \subseteq P$ of size k and an assignment function $\sigma : P \rightarrow S$ such that $|\sigma^{-1}(s)| \leq U_s$ for all $s \in S$ and the objective $\sum_{s \in S} \text{rad}(s)$ is minimized, where $\text{rad}(s) := \max_{p \in \sigma^{-1}(s)} \delta(s, p)$.*

Definition 3 (Non-Uniform Cluster CAPSOR). *Given a set P of n points in a metric space with distance δ , a set of cluster capacities $\{U_1, \dots, U_k\}$ and a non-negative integer k , the Non-Uniform Cluster CAPSOR problem asks to find a set of centers $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \subseteq P$ of size k and an assignment function $\sigma : P \rightarrow S$ such that $|\sigma^{-1}(s_i)| \leq U_i$ for all $i \in [k]$ and the objective $\sum_{i \in [k]} \text{rad}(s_i)$ is minimized, where $\text{rad}(s_i) := \max_{p \in \sigma^{-1}(s_i)} \delta(s_i, p)$.*


Next, we define capacitated version of Sum of Diameters.

Definition 4 (Uniform CAPACITATED SUM OF DIAMETERS). *Given a set P of n points in a metric space with distance δ and non-negative integers U and k , the Uniform CAPACITATED SUM OF DIAMETERS (Uniform CAPSOD) problem asks to find k partitions (clusters) C_1, \dots, C_k of P such that $|C_i| \leq U$ for all $i \in [k]$ and the objective $\sum_{i \in [k]} \text{diam}(C_i)$ is minimized, where $\text{diam}(C_i) := \max_{p, q \in C_i} \delta(p, q)$, is the diameter of cluster C_i .*

Definition 5 (Non-Uniform CAPSOD). *Given a set P of n points in a metric space with distance δ , a set of cluster capacities $\{U_1, \dots, U_k\}$ and a positive integer k , the Non-Uniform CAPSOD problem asks to find k partitions (clusters) C_1, \dots, C_k of P such that $|C_i| \leq U_i$ for all $i \in [k]$ and the objective $\sum_{i \in [k]} \text{diam}(C_i)$ is minimized, where $\text{diam}(C_i) := \max_{p, q \in C_i} \delta(p, q)$.*

3.2 Norm objectives

A norm $\|\cdot\| : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is monotone if for every two vectors $(x_1, \dots, x_k), (y_1, \dots, y_k)$ such that $\forall i, |x_i| \leq |y_i|$, it holds that $\|(x_1, \dots, x_k)\| \leq \|(y_1, \dots, y_k)\|$. A norm $\|\cdot\|$ is symmetric if for every permutation $\pi : [k] \rightarrow [k]$ it holds that $\|(x_1, \dots, x_k)\| = \|(x_{\pi(1)}, \dots, x_{\pi(k)})\|$. Interestingly, as pointed out by [CS19], a symmetric norm is not necessarily monotone. Indeed, consider the set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, which is the convex hull of the points $\{(1, 1), (-1, -1), (0, 0.5), (0.5, 0), (0, -0.5), (-0.5, 0)\}$ (illustrated on the right), and define $\|x\|_C$ to be the smallest λ such that $x/\lambda \in C$. Then $\|\cdot\|_C$ is a symmetric norm over \mathbb{R}^2 , and $\|(0, 0.5)\|_C = 1$, while $\|(0.5, 0.5)\|_C = 0.5$, and thus $\|\cdot\|_C$ is not monotone.



In this paper, we generalize the above problems to objective that is a monotone symmetric norm of radii and diameters.

3.3 Preliminary claims

In this section, we first define feasible solutions for CAPSOR and CAPSOD. Then, we show how to recover a feasible solution from a set of centers and radii (diameters). Finally, we show how to guess a close approximation of optimal radii and diameters in FPT time.

3.3.1 Recovering feasible clusters

We show how to recover feasible clusters given a set of centers and radii (diameters). For simplicity, we work with sum objective, but the same ideas extend to any monotone symmetric norm objective.

Definition 6 (Feasible solution for CAPSOR). *Let $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, \{U_p\}_{p \in P})$ be an instance of CAPSOR. A solution to \mathcal{I} is given by a pair (S, σ) , where $S \subseteq P$ and $\sigma : P \rightarrow S$. Furthermore, we say solution (S, σ) is feasible for \mathcal{I} if $|S| \leq k$ and $|\sigma^{-1}(s)| \leq U_s$, for every $s \in S$. Moreover, the cost of a feasible solution (S, σ) is given by $\text{cost}((S, \sigma)) = \sum_{s \in S} \text{rad}(s)$. For a monotone norm objective, $\text{cost}((S, \sigma))$ denotes the norm of the radii.*

Definition 7. *Let $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, \{U_p\}_{p \in P})$ be an instance of CAPSOR and let $k' \leq k$. Let $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_{k'}\} \subseteq P$ and let $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{k'}\}$ such that $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, for $i \in [k']$. We say $\mathcal{S} = \{(s_1, \gamma_1), \dots, (s_{k'}, \gamma_{k'})\}$ is feasible for \mathcal{I} if there exists an assignment $\sigma : P \rightarrow S$ such that for all $s_i \in S$ it holds that $|\sigma^{-1}(s_i)| \leq U_{s_i}$ and $\text{rad}(s_i) \leq \gamma_i$. Furthermore, the cost of \mathcal{S} is $\text{cost}(\mathcal{S}) = \sum_{i \in [k']} \gamma_i$.*

The following lemma states that, given a set of centers and their corresponding radii, we can find a feasible assignment of points to centers that has the same cost without violating the capacity constraints.

Lemma 3. *Let $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, \{U_p\}_{p \in P})$ be an instance of CAPSOR, $k' \leq k$, and let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq P \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $|\mathcal{S}| = k'$. Then, the following can be done in time $\text{poly}(n)$. We can verify whether or not \mathcal{S} is feasible for \mathcal{I} , and if \mathcal{S} is feasible for \mathcal{I} , then we can find a feasible solution (S, σ) to \mathcal{I} such that $\text{cost}((S, \sigma)) \leq \text{cost}(\mathcal{S})$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{(s_1, \gamma_1), \dots, (s_{k'}, \gamma_{k'})\}$, where for $i \in [k']$, $s_i \in P$ and $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and hence, $\beta = \text{cost}(\mathcal{S}) = \sum_{i \in [k']} \gamma_i$. Denote by $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_{k'}\}$. We create a bipartite graph $G = (A \cup B, E)$, with left partition A that contains U_{s_i} many vertices $\{s_i^1, \dots, s_i^{U_{s_i}}\}$ for each $s_i \in S$ and right partition $B = P$. Then, for every $p \in B$ and $s_i \in S$, we add edges from p to $s_i^1, \dots, s_i^{U_{s_i}}$ if $\delta(p, s_i) \leq \gamma_i$. Now, note that there is an assignment $\sigma : P \rightarrow S$ such that (S, σ) is feasible for \mathcal{I} if and only if there is a matching on size $|P|$. To see this, suppose there is a matching \mathcal{M} of size $|P|$, we define $\sigma(p) = s_i$ for $p \in B = P$ such that $(p, s_i^j) \in \mathcal{M}$ for some $s_i^j \in A$. Since s_i has U_{s_i} many vertices in A , we have $|\sigma^{-1}(s_i)| \leq U_{s_i}$, and hence (S, σ) is feasible for \mathcal{I} . For the other direction, suppose there exists an assignment $\sigma : P \rightarrow S$ such that (S, σ) is feasible for \mathcal{I} . Then, since, for every $s_i \in S$, we have $|\sigma^{-1}(s_i)| \leq U_{s_i}$, we can match every $p \in \sigma^{-1}(s_i)$ to a unique copy s_i^j to obtain a matching of size $|P|$. Finally, we can find maximum matching in G in $\text{poly}(n)$ time using the algorithm of Hopcroft and Karp [HK73]. The cost of solution (S, σ) thus obtained is $\text{cost}((S, \sigma)) \leq \sum_{i \in [k']} \gamma_i = \text{cost}(\mathcal{S})$, as desired. \square

In fact, instead of solving a matching problem, we can solve a flow problem and use the recent result of [CKL⁺22a] to improve the running time to almost-linear time, specifically $(nk)^{1+o(1)}$.

Remark 4. *Lemma 3 is stated for node capacities. However, it can be easily adapted to cluster capacities if we are given the mapping of the elements of \mathcal{S} and the cluster capacities.*

Definition 8 (Feasible solution for CAPSOD). *Let $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, \{U_i\}_{i \in [k]})$ be an instance of CAPSOD. A solution to \mathcal{I} is given by a partition \mathcal{C} of P . We say that \mathcal{C} is feasible for \mathcal{I} if $|\mathcal{C}| \leq k$ and $|C_i| \leq U_i$ for $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$. Moreover, the cost of a feasible solution \mathcal{C} is given by $\text{diamcost}(\mathcal{C}) = \sum_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}} \text{diam}(C_i)$, where $\text{diam}(C_i) := \max_{p, p' \in C_i} \delta(p, p')$, is the diameter of cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$. Furthermore, when the objective is a monotone norm of diameters, $\text{diamcost}(\mathcal{C})$ denotes the corresponding norm of diameters.*

Definition 9 (Feasible set for CAPSOD). *Let $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, \{U_i\}_{i \in [k]})$ be an instance of CAPSOD and let $k' \leq k$. Let $\mathcal{C}' = \{C'_1, \dots, C'_{k'}\}$ such that $C'_i \subseteq P, i \in [k']$. Note that the sets in \mathcal{C}' are not necessarily disjoint. We say \mathcal{C}' is feasible set for \mathcal{I} if there exists a feasible solution $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \{\tilde{C}_1, \dots, \tilde{C}_{k'}\}$ to \mathcal{I} such that $\tilde{C}_i \subseteq C'_i$, for $i \in [k']$. Furthermore, the cost of \mathcal{C}' is $\text{diamcost}(\mathcal{C}') = \sum_{i \in [k']} \text{diam}(C'_i)$.*

Similar to CAPSOR, given a collection of subsets of points covering P , we can find a feasible clustering whose sum of diameters is bounded by the sum of diameters of the subsets.

Lemma 5. *Let $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, \{U_i\}_{i \in [k]})$ be an instance of CAPSOD and $k' \leq k$. Let $\mathcal{C}' = \{C'_1, \dots, C'_{k'}\}$ such that $C'_i \subseteq P, i \in [k']$. Then, the following can be done in time $\text{poly}(n)$. We can verify whether or not \mathcal{C}' is a feasible set for \mathcal{I} , and if \mathcal{C}' is a feasible set for \mathcal{I} , then we can find a feasible solution $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ to \mathcal{I} such that $\text{diamcost}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \text{diamcost}(\mathcal{C}')$.*

Proof. Then, we create a bipartite graph $G = (A \cup B, E)$, with left partition A that contains U_i many vertices $\{c_i^1, \dots, c_i^{U_i}\}$ for each $i \in [k']$ and right partition $B = P$. Then, for every $p \in C'_i$, we add edges from $p \in B$ to $c_i^1, \dots, c_i^{U_i}$. Now, note that \mathcal{C}' is feasible for \mathcal{I} if and only if there is a matching on size $|P|$. To see this, suppose there is a matching \mathcal{M} of size $|P|$, then for $i \in [k']$, we define, $\tilde{C}_i = \{p \in B \mid \exists c_i^j \in A, (p, c_i^j) \in \mathcal{M}\}$. It is easy to see that $|\tilde{C}_i| \leq U_i$ and hence $\{\tilde{C}_1, \dots, \tilde{C}_{k'}\}$ is feasible for \mathcal{I} . For the other direction, suppose there exists a feasible solution $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \{\tilde{C}_1, \dots, \tilde{C}_{k'}\}$ for \mathcal{I} , i.e., $\tilde{C}_i \subseteq C'_i$ for $i \in [k']$. Then, since, for every $\tilde{C}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, we have $|\tilde{C}_i| \leq U_i$, we can match $p \in \tilde{C}_i$ to a unique copy c_i^j to obtain a matching of size $|P|$. Finally, we can find maximum matching in G in $\text{poly}(n)$ time using the algorithm of Hopcroft and Karp [HK73]. The cost of solution $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ thus obtained is $\text{diamcost}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \sum_{i \in [k']} \text{diam}(\tilde{C}_i) \leq \text{cost}(\mathcal{C}')$, as desired. \square

Note that Lemma 3 and Lemma 5 also work when the objective is a monotone symmetric norm of radii and diameters, respectively.

3.3.2 ε -approximation of radii and diameters

In our algorithms, we will assume that we have a close approximations of the optimal radii/diameters. Consider a (unknown) multi-set $T^* = \{t_1^*, \dots, t_k^*\}$ of k non-negative reals such that $t_1^* \leq \dots \leq t_k^*$ and the largest entry t_k^* is known. We say that a multi-set $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_k\}$ of non-negative reals is an ε -approximation of T^* if for all $i \in [k]$, it holds that $\|(t_1^*, \dots, t_k^*)\| \leq \|(t_1, \dots, t_k)\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|(t_1^*, \dots, t_k^*)\|$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is a monotone symmetric norm. The following lemma says that we can guess an ε -approximation in $2^{O(k \log(k/\varepsilon))}$ time, when the largest entry t_k^* is known.

Lemma 6. *Suppose there is an unknown multi-set $T^* = \{t_1^*, \dots, t_k^*\}$ of non-negative reals such that the largest entry is known. Then, there is an algorithm, that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, runs in time $2^{O(k \log(k/\varepsilon))}$ and outputs a list \mathcal{L} of k -multi-set non-negative reals of size $2^{O(k \log(k/\varepsilon))}$ such that \mathcal{L} contains an ε -approximation of T^* .*

Proof. Let $\delta = \varepsilon/k$. Given t_k^* , it is known that one compute (see [BLS23, JKY24]), in time $2^{O(k \log(k/\delta))}$, a list \mathcal{L} of k -multi-set non-negative reals of size $2^{O(k \log(k/\delta))}$ such that there exists $(t_1, \dots, t_k) \in \mathcal{L}$ with $t_i^* \leq t_i \leq t_i^* + \delta \cdot t_k^*$, for $i \in [k]$. First, note that $\|(t_k^*, \dots, t_k^*)\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \|t_k^* \cdot e_i\| = k \cdot \|t_k^* \cdot e_k\| \leq k \cdot \|(t_1^*, \dots, t_k^*)\|$, where the first inequality follows from triangle inequality, the equality is because $\|\cdot\|$ is symmetric, and the last inequality follows due to monotonicity. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(t_1^*, \dots, t_k^*)\| &\leq \|(t_1, \dots, t_k)\| \leq \|(t_1^*, \dots, t_k^*)\| + \delta \cdot \|(t_k^*, \dots, t_k^*)\| \quad \text{by triangle inequality} \\ &\leq \|(t_1^*, \dots, t_k^*)\| + \delta \cdot k \cdot \|(t_1^*, \dots, t_k^*)\| \\ &= (1 + \delta \cdot k) \cdot \|(t_1^*, \dots, t_k^*)\| \\ &= (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot \|(t_1^*, \dots, t_k^*)\| \end{aligned}$$

□

3.3.3 Algorithms with bounded guesses.

For ease of exposition, we assume that our algorithms can make a bounded guesses. Such algorithms can be transformed into a (randomized) FPT algorithms, as mentioned in the following remark.

Remark 7. *We assume that our algorithms have a power to make guesses in constant time. In particular, it can guess an element correctly from with probability $p(k)$ in constant time, for some computable function p . It can be easily verified that an algorithm for a minimization (maximization) problem with such guesses running in $f(k)n^{O(1)}$ time can be transformed into a randomized algorithm without guesses that runs in time $h(k)n^{O(1)}$, for some h , by replacing each guess either with a procedure that enumerates all elements of the sample space when the size of the sample space is bounded by a function of k or the corresponding sampling procedure, and returning a minimum (maximum) cost solution.*

In our algorithms, we explicitly show subroutines that can replace corresponding guess calls in FPT time.

4 Non-Uniform Capacities

In this section, we provide improved FPT-approximation algorithms for non-uniform capacities. The main theorem is restated for convenience.

Theorem 3 (Main Theorem). *There is a (deterministic) FPT-approximation algorithm that finds a $(3 + 2\sqrt{2} + \varepsilon)$ -approximation for Non-uniform CAPSOR for any $\varepsilon > 0$, and runs in time $2^{O(k^2 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$. Furthermore, the algorithm yields $(3 + 2\sqrt{2} + \varepsilon)$ -approximation for non-uniform capacities even when the objective is a monotone symmetric norm of the radii.*

Both results hold also w.r.t. cluster capacities.

As mentioned before, the above theorem implies, in a black-box way, a factor $2(3 + 2\sqrt{2} + \varepsilon) \approx 11.656 + \varepsilon$ FPT-approximation algorithm for Non-uniform CAPSOD. Interestingly, our algorithmic framework [Theorem 3](#) can be adapted to Non-uniform CAPSOD to obtain a significantly better factor of $(7 + \varepsilon)$ ([Theorem 6](#) restated below for convenience).

Theorem 6 (Non-Uniform Diameters). *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a (deterministic) algorithm running $2^{O(k^2 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$ -time and returns a $(7 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation for Non-uniform CAPSOD w.r.t. any monotone symmetric norm objective.*

In the next section, we will present a detailed exposition of the algorithm of [Theorem 3](#) for node capacities. In [Section 4.2](#) and [Section 4.3](#), we explain the changes required in the algorithm to adapt it to cluster capacities and CAPSOD, respectively.

4.1 Node CapSoR

In this section, we prove [Theorem 3](#) for node capacities. Let $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, \{U_p\}_{p \in P})$ be a given instance of non-uniform node CAPSOR. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_k\}$ be an optimal clustering of \mathcal{I} such that C_i has radius r_i^* with center o_i and $r_1^* \leq \dots \leq r_k^*$. Let $O = \{o_1, \dots, o_k\}$, and let $\text{OPT} = r_1^* + \dots + r_k^*$ be the cost of clustering \mathcal{C} . Let $r_1 \leq \dots \leq r_k$ be an ε -approximation of the optimal radii of \mathcal{C} . [Algorithm 1](#) describes the pseudo-code of our algorithm for [Theorem 3](#) that is based on the ideas presented in [Section 2](#). [Algorithm 1](#) makes guesses, and hence, we make the following assumption for brevity. Later, when we prove [Theorem 3](#) in [Section 4.1.2](#), we show how to remove this assumption.

Assumption 1. *All the guesses of [Algorithm 1](#) are correct.*

As mentioned in [Section 2](#), we process the clusters in \mathcal{C} in non-decreasing order of their radii. The first thing we do when we process a cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ ([Algorithm 2](#)) is to find a good dense ball, which we define next. However, we need the following definitions first.

Definition 10 (reachable set, anchor). *Given a ball $B := \text{ball}(y, r)$, for $y \in P$ and radius r , we say that a cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ is reachable from B if $\delta(y, p) \leq r + 2r_i$, for all $p \in C_i$. Let $\text{reachable}(B)$ denote the set of all clusters in \mathcal{C} reachable from B . Furthermore, by breaking the ties arbitrary, the cluster with smallest radius in $\text{reachable}(B)$ is called anchor for B .*

See [Figure 1a](#) for an illustration, where clusters C_8 and C_{10} are reachable from $\text{ball}(y, r_5)$, while C_2 and C_5 are not. Furthermore, cluster C_8 is anchor for $\text{ball}(y, r_5)$.

Definition 11. *$y \in P$ is said to be available for C_i if (i) $U_y \geq |C_i|$ and (ii) $y \notin O \setminus \{o_i\}$.*

Now we are ready to define good dense ball for C_i . For simplicity, we assume we have a copy F of P from which we pick our solution. Our algorithm sometimes works on subsets of P and F . Furthermore, for $P' \subseteq P, y \in P$ and a positive real r , let $\text{ball}_{P'}(y, r) = \text{ball}(y, r) \cap P'$.

Definition 12 (Good Dense ball for C_i). *For $P', F' \subseteq P$, we say a ball $D_i = \text{ball}_{P'}(y_i, r_i), y_i \in F'$ is a good dense ball for C_i in (P', F') if*

- $|\text{ball}_{P'}(y_i, r_i)| \geq |C_i|$ and
- y_i is available for C_i and

- $C_i \in \text{reachable}(\text{ball}(y_i, r_i + 2r_j))$, where r_j is the radius of anchor C_j for D_i .

Note that, for every $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$, we have that $\text{ball}_{P'}(o_i, r_i)$ is a good dense ball for C_i in every (P', F') such that $C_i \subseteq P' \subseteq P$ and $F' \subseteq F$ containing o_i . See Figure 1b for an illustration, where $\text{ball}(y, r_5)$ is a good dense ball for C_5 (assuming $|\text{ball}(y, r_5)| \geq |C_5|$). On the other hand, in Figure 1a, the $\text{ball}(y, r_5)$ is not a good dense ball for C_5 .

Algorithm 1: $(3 + 2\sqrt{2} + \varepsilon)$ FPT approximation for Non Uniform CAPSOR (node capacities)

Data: Instance $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, \{U_p\}_{p \in P})$ of Non Uniform CAPSOR, $\varepsilon > 0$

Result: A $(3 + 2\sqrt{2} + \varepsilon)$ approximate solution

```

1  $F \leftarrow P, Q \leftarrow P$ ; //  $F$  is a set of potential centers
2  $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ ;
3 Guess  $R = (r_1, \dots, r_k)$ , an  $\varepsilon$ -approximation of optimal radii such that  $r_i \leq r_{i+1}$  for
   $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$ ;
4 Let  $\alpha \leftarrow 1 + 2\sqrt{2}$ ; // constant for extended balls
5 Color each cluster  $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$  red;
6 Set  $\text{Partitions-of}(C_t) = \emptyset$  for  $C_t \in \mathcal{C}$ ;
7 while  $\exists$  a red cluster do
8    $C_i \leftarrow$  smallest radius red cluster;
9   SETTLE-CLUSTER ( $C_i$ );
10 end
11 foreach black cluster  $C_t$  such that  $\text{Partitions-of}(C_t) \neq \emptyset$  do
12   Guess available  $y_t \in \cap_{r_j \in \text{Partitions-of}(C_t)} \text{ball}_F(y_j, r_j + r_t)$  for  $C_t$ ; //  $U_{y_t} \geq |C_t|$ 
13   Add  $(y_t, (\alpha + 2)r_t)$  to  $\mathcal{S}$ ;
14   Delete  $y_t$  from  $F$ ;
15 end
16 if  $\mathcal{S}$  is feasible for  $\mathcal{I}$  then return  $(S, \sigma)$  obtained from Lemma 3;
17 fail;
```

4.1.1 Analysis

For the analysis, we suppose that Assumption 1 is true. The following lemma says that the subroutine FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL (Algorithm 3) finds a good dense ball for every $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ that is processed by the algorithm.

Lemma 8. *Let $\mathcal{C}_p = \{C_{i_1}, C_{i_2}, \dots, C_{i_t}\}, t \leq k'$ be the red clusters processed by Algorithm 1 in Step 7 in that order, which is also the same order in which the subroutine FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL is invoked. Then, Assumption 1 implies the following. For iteration $s \in [t]$, consider the cluster $C_{i_s} \in \mathcal{C}_p$ for which FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL is invoked on $(r_{i_s}, (Q_{i_s}, F_{i_s}))$. Then, the following is true.*

1. *At the beginning of iteration s , the ball $G_{i_s} := \text{ball}_P(o_{i_s}, r_{i_s}) \cap C_{i_s}$ is a good dense ball for C_{i_s} in (Q_{i_s}, F_{i_s}) . Therefore, FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL returns a good dense ball D_{i_s} for C_{i_s} in (Q_{i_s}, F_{i_s}) within $2k$ iterations.*

Algorithm 2: SETTLE-CLUSTER (C_i)

```
1 Let  $D_i = \text{ball}_Q(y_i, r_i)$  be the ball returned by FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL( $r_i, (Q, F)$ ) ;
2 Let  $C_j$  be an anchor for  $D_i$ ;
3 if  $C_i \in \text{reachable}(\text{ball}(y_i, \alpha r_i))$  then
4   |   Color  $C_i$  black;
5   |   Delete  $y_i$  from  $F$ ;
6   |   Add  $(y_i, (\alpha + 2)r_i)$  to  $S$ ;
7 else
8   |   EXCHANGE( $D_i$ ); //  $r_j > \frac{(\alpha-1)r_i}{2} = \sqrt{2}r_i$ 
9 end
10 return
```

Algorithm 3: FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL($r_i, (Q, F)$)

```
1  $F' \leftarrow F, P' \leftarrow Q$ ;
2 for  $2k$  times do
3   |   Let  $D_i = \text{ball}_{P'}(y_i, r_i), y_i \in F'$  be the argument that maximizes the function
   |    $\max_{y_j \in F'} \min\{U_{y_j}, |\text{ball}_{P'}(y_j, r_i)|\}$ ;
4   |   Let  $C_j$  be a cluster with smallest radii in  $\text{reachable}(D_i)$ ;
5   |   if  $C_i \notin \text{reachable}(\text{ball}(y_i, r_i + 2r_j))$  then  $P' \leftarrow P' \setminus \text{ball}(y_i, r_i + 2r_j)$ ;
6   |   else
7   |   |   if  $y_i$  is not available for  $C_i$  then  $F' \leftarrow F' \setminus \{y_i\}$ ;
8   |   |   else return  $D_i$ ;
9   |   end
10 end
11 fail;
```

2. Iteration s neither deletes any point from C_{i_s} for $\hat{s} > s$ nor deletes a center from $O \setminus \{o_{i_s}\}$.

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on $s \in [t]$. For the base case, note that the first cluster in \mathcal{C}_p is C_1 and hence $Q_{i_1} = P$ and $F_{i_1} = P$. Thus, $G_{i_1} = \text{ball}_P(o_1, r_1) \cap C_1$ is a good dense ball for C_1 in (P, P) , as required. Furthermore, FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL either deletes one cluster from $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{C_1\}$ in P at Step 5 or deletes one center from $O \setminus \{o_{i_s}\}$ at Step 7. Thus, the for loop FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL runs at most $2k$ times. However, in both the cases, neither any point in $C_1 = G_{i_1}$ is deleted nor o_1 is deleted. Hence, G_{i_1} is a candidate for the maximizer of the function at Step 3 of FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL for $F' \subseteq F, P' \subseteq Q$ considered in any iteration. Therefore, $\min\{U_{y_1}, |\text{ball}_{P'}(y_1, r_1)|\} \geq \min\{U_{o_1}, |G_{i_1}|\}$. However, note that $\min\{U_{o_1}, |G_{i_1}|\} \geq |C_1|$. Thus, we have $U_{y_1} \geq |C_1|$ and $|\text{ball}_{P'}(y_1, r_1)| \geq |C_1|$. Hence, FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL returns a good dense ball for C_1 within $2k$ iterations. Finally, note that if iteration 1 deletes D_1 from Q at Step 1 of subroutine EXCHANGE, then it colors all the clusters in $\text{reachable}(D_1)$ black and hence $\text{reachable}(D_1) \cap \mathcal{C}_p = \emptyset$. Hence, no point from $C_{i_{s'}}$ is deleted for $s' > 1$. Similarly, whenever iteration 1 deletes the center y_1 of D_1 (in Step 5 of SETTLE-CLUSTER and Step 3 of EXCHANGE), it is the case that $y_1 \notin O \setminus \{o_1\}$ since D_1 is good dense ball for C_1 .

Now, assume that the lemma is true for all iterations $s' < s$, and consider the iteration s

Algorithm 4: EXCHANGE(D_i)

```
1 Delete  $D_i$  from  $Q$ ;  
2 Color  $C_i$  black;  
3 Add  $(y_i, r_i)$  to  $\mathcal{S}$  and delete  $y_i$  from  $F$ ;  
4 foreach  $C_t \in \text{reachable}(D_i)$  do  
5   |   Add  $r_i$  to Partitions-of( $C_t$ );  
6   |   Color  $C_t$  black;  
7 end  
8 return
```

and the ball $G_{i_s} = \text{ball}_P(o_{i_s}, r_{i_s}) \cap C_{i_s}$. Induction hypothesis implies that none of the previous iteration $s' < s$ deleted any point from C_{i_s} nor did they delete o_{i_s} . Hence, all the points of G_{i_s} remain as they were at the start of the algorithm. Using the above arguments, since every iteration FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL either deletes a cluster or a optimal center, the for loop of FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL runs at most $2k$ times. Again, using same arguments, since, in both the cases, neither any point in $C_{i_s} = G_{i_s}$ is deleted nor o_{i_s} is deleted, we have that G_{i_s} is a candidate for the maximizer of the function at Step 3 of FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL for $F' \subseteq F, P' \subseteq Q$ considered in any iteration. Therefore, $\min\{U_{y_1}, |\text{ball}_{P'}(y_1, r_1)|\} \geq \min\{U_{o_1}, |G_{i_1}|\} \geq |C_{i_s}|$. Thus, we have $U_{y_{i_s}} \geq |C_{i_s}|$ and $|\text{ball}_{P'}(y_{i_s}, r_{i_s})| \geq |C_{i_s}|$. Hence, FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL returns a good dense ball for C_{i_s} within $2k$ iterations. Finally, note that if iteration i_s deletes D_{i_s} from Q at Step 1 of subroutine EXCHANGE, then it colors all the clusters in $\text{reachable}(D_{i_s})$ black and hence $\text{reachable}(D_{i_s}) \cap \mathcal{C}_p = \emptyset$. Hence, no point from C_{i_s} is deleted for $\hat{s} > 1$. Similarly, whenever iteration i_s deletes the center y_{i_s} of D_{i_s} (in Step 5 of SETTLE-CLUSTER and Step 3 of EXCHANGE), it is the case that $y_{i_s} \notin O \setminus \{o_{i_s}\}$ since D_{i_s} is good dense ball for C_{i_s} . \square

Now, consider Step 3 of SETTLE-CLUSTER (C_i), for some red cluster C_i . Let $a(r_i)$ denote the radius of anchor for D_i , where D_i is the ball obtained in Step 1. Now, if $C_i \in \text{reachable}(\text{ball}(y_i, \alpha r_i))$, then we call C_i as *Type-1 cluster*, otherwise we call it *Type-2 cluster*. Note that when Type-2 cluster C_i is processed in EXCHANGE(D_i), it turns all the clusters in $\text{reachable}(D_i)$ black (some of them may have been already black). We call a cluster $C_t \in \text{reachable}(D_i)$, a *Type-3 cluster*. We also say that the cluster $C_t \in \text{reachable}(C_i)$ is *partitioned* by C_i . Since, $r_t > r_i$, for every $C_t \in \text{reachable}(D_i)$, we have the following observation.

Observation 1. *None of Type-1 or Type-2 clusters are turned Type-3 by this process, and moreover, a Type-3 cluster remains a Type-3 cluster throughout the execution of the algorithm.*

Now, we are ready to prove the guarantees of Algorithm 1.

Lemma 9. *Assumption 1 implies that Step 16 successfully finds a feasible solution (S, σ) using \mathcal{S} with cost $(3 + 2\sqrt{2} + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}$ in time $n^{O(1)}$.*

Proof. Let Y be the set of centers that the algorithm added to \mathcal{S} . Then, note that $|Y| = k'$ since we add a center for every cluster in \mathcal{C} . More precisely, for Type-1 cluster, we add a center at Step 6 of Algorithm 2, for Type-2 cluster, we add a center at Step 3 of Algorithm 4, and for Type-3 cluster, we add a center at Step 13 of Algorithm 1. We will show an assignment $\sigma' : P \rightarrow Y$ such that

(Y, σ') is feasible for \mathcal{I} with $\text{cost}((Y, \sigma')) \leq \text{cost}(\mathcal{S})$. Therefore, Step 16 is successful and returns a feasible solution (S, σ) for \mathcal{I} such that $\text{cost}((S, \sigma)) \leq \text{cost}(\mathcal{S})$.

Let $\mathcal{C}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ be the collection of Type-1 clusters. Let $P_1 = \cup_{C \in \mathcal{C}_1} C$ and let $P_2 = P \setminus P_1$. Since P_1 and P_2 are disjoint, we show $\sigma' : P_1 \cup P_2 \rightarrow Y$. Consider a Type-1 cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ and let $y_i \in Y$ be the corresponding center in Y . Then, for every $p \in C_i$, we let $\sigma'(p) = y_i$. Since, y_i is the center of good dense ball D_i returned by FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL, we have that $U_{y_i} \geq |C_i|$, as required. Furthermore, $\text{rad}(\sigma'^{-1}(y_i)) \leq (\alpha + 2)r_i$, as $C_i \in \text{reachable}(\text{ball}(y_i, \alpha r_i))$.

Now consider the points in P_2 which are due to Type-2 and Type-3 clusters. Consider a Type-2 cluster C_i and consider the good dense ball D_i for C_i centered at y_i returned by FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL. Since $|D_i| \geq |C_i|$, let $E_i \subseteq D_i$ such that $|E_i| = |C_i|$, for $t \in [t_i]$. For each Type-3 cluster $C_t \in \text{reachable}(D_i)$, let $E_i^t = E_i \cap C_t$. Since $|E_i| = |C_i|$, we can consider a partition $\{C_i^t\}_{C_t \in \text{reachable}(D_i)}$ of C_i such that $|C_i^t| = |E_i^t|$. Note that since $|C_i| = |E_i| = \cup_{C_t \in \text{reachable}(D_i)} |E_i^t| = \cup_{C_t \in \text{reachable}(D_i)} |C_i^t| = |C_i|$, such a partition of C_i is possible. Finally, for a Type-3 cluster C_t , let $C_t' = \cup_{C_i \in \text{Partitions-of}(C_t)} E_i^t$ and let $C_t'' = \cup_{C_i \in \text{Partitions-of}(C_t)} C_i^t$. Now, we assign the points of P_2 to Y as follows. For $p \in E_i$, we let $\sigma'(p) = y_i$. As before, we have $|U_{y_i}| \geq |C_i|$. Furthermore, $\text{rad}(\sigma'^{-1}(y_i)) \leq r_i$. Note that $E_i^t \subseteq E_i$, for $C_t \in \text{reachable}(D_i)$, is the subset of C_t that has been assigned to y_i instead of y_t . However, we can assign $C_i^t \subseteq C_i$ to y_t , noting that $|C_i^t| = |E_i^t|$, and hence y_t serves exactly $|C_t|$ many points. More formally, for $p \in (C_t \setminus C_t') \cup C_t''$, we let $\sigma(p) = y_t$. The number of points assigned to y_t is $|(C_t \setminus C_t') \cup C_t''| = C_t = U_{y_t}$ due to Step 12 of Algorithm 1. Finally, for $p \in \sigma'^{-1}(y_t) \cap C_t$, we have $\delta(y_t, p) \leq r_t$. Consider $p \in \sigma'^{-1}(y_t) \cap C_i$, where $C_i \in \text{Partitions-of}(C_t)$. Then,

$$\delta(p, y_t) \leq d(y_t, y_i) + \delta(y_i, p) \leq r_t + r_i + 3r_i + 2r_t = 4r_i + 3r_t$$

However, we know that C_t was partitioned due to $D_i = \text{ball}(y_i, r_i)$ because $C_i \notin \text{reachable}(\text{ball}(y_i, \alpha r_i))$ (Step 3 of SETTLE-CLUSTER). This means that $\alpha r_i < r_i + 2a(r_i)$, where $a(r_i)$ is the radius of anchor of D_i . Since, $C_t \in \text{reachable}(D_i)$, we have that $r_t \geq a(r_i)$. Hence, we have that $r_i < 2r_t/\alpha - 1$. Therefore, $\delta(p, y_t) \leq 8r_t/\alpha - 1 + 3r_t = (\alpha + 2)r_t$. Thus, we have $\text{rad}(\sigma'^{-1}(y_t)) \leq (\alpha + 2)r_t$.

Cost of (Y, σ) . We have,

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{cost}(Y, \sigma'))^p &= \sum_{C_i \text{ is Type-1}} \text{rad}(\sigma'^{-1}(y_i))^p + \sum_{C_i \text{ is Type-2}} \text{rad}(\sigma'^{-1}(y_i))^p + \sum_{C_i \text{ is Type-3}} \text{rad}(\sigma'^{-1}(y_i))^p \\ &\leq \sum_{C_i \text{ is Type-1}} ((\alpha + 2)r_i)^p + \sum_{C_i \text{ is Type-1}} (r_i)^p + \sum_{C_i \text{ is Type-1}} ((\alpha + 2)r_i)^p \\ &\leq (\alpha + 2)^p \sum_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}} (r_i)^p \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon)^p (\alpha + 2)^p \sum_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}} (r_i^*)^p \quad \text{using Lemma 6} \end{aligned}$$

In fact, we get $(\alpha + 2 + \varepsilon) = (3 + 2\sqrt{2} + \varepsilon)$ -approximation when the objective is a monotone symmetric norm of radii.

Running time. We have the following claim that bounds the number of iterations of Algorithm 1 by $n^{O(1)}$.

Claim 10. *During each iteration of while loop (Step 7) of Algorithm 1, at least one red cluster is turned black. Hence, the while loop runs at most k times.*

Proof. From Lemma 8, we have that $\text{FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL}(r_i, (P, F))$ never fails for every red cluster C_i processed by the while loop of Algorithm 1. If C_i is a Type-1 cluster, then C_i is colored black in Step 4 of $\text{SETTLE-CLUSTER}(C_i)$. Otherwise, C_i is Type-2 cluster and hence it is colored black in Step 2 of $\text{EXCHANGE}(D_i)$. \square

\square

4.1.2 Proof of Theorem 3

Note that it is sufficient to show how to remove Assumption 1 in Lemma 9. We think of Algorithm 1 as a linear program that has access to a guess function and we will transform it to a branching program without guess function. We show how to replace the guess function.

The algorithm makes the following guesses.

- E1 Guess an ε -approximate radius profile of the clusters in \mathcal{C} . This can be obtained by enumerating $(k/\varepsilon)^{O(k)}n^2$ choices using Lemma 6.
- E2 Guesses in $\text{FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL}$. Each time $\text{FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL}$ is invoked, the for loop runs $2k$ iterations and each iteration makes two guesses. First one is whether or not $C_i \in \text{reachable}(\text{ball}(y_i, r_i + 2r_j))$. For this, we create two branches – one for each outcome. Second guess is whether or not y_i is available for C_i . Again, we create two branches for this guess. Since these two guesses are mutually exclusive, we create at most two branches in each iteration. Hence, we create 2^{2k} many branches of execution for each invocation of $\text{FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL}$.
- E3 Guesses in SETTLE-CLUSTER . The first guess is of the radius of anchor of D_i returned by $\text{FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL}$. Hence, we create k branches for this step. Next guess is whether or not $C_i \in \text{reachable}(\text{ball}(y_i, \alpha r_i))$, which results in 2 branches. Thus, totally, we create $2k$ branches for each invocation of SETTLE-CLUSTER .
- E4 Guesses in EXCHANGE . This subroutine requires the set $\text{reachable}(D_i)$. This can be done by creating 2^k many branches of execution, one for each possible outcome.
- E5 Guess available $y_t \in \cap_{r_j \in \text{Partitions-of}(C_t)} \text{ball}_F(y_j, r_j + r_t)$ for C_t at Line 12 of Algorithm 1. We need to show how to find such an available point y_t for C_t . First note that $o_t \in \cap_{r_j \in \text{Partitions-of}(C_t)} \text{ball}_F(y_j, r_j + r_t)$, and hence such a point exists. Let \hat{Y}_t be a set of k maximum capacity points in $\cap_{r_j \in \text{Partitions-of}(C_t)} \text{ball}_F(y_j, r_j + r_t)$. We claim that \hat{Y}_t contains such a point y_t . If $o_t \in \hat{Y}_t$, then we are done since o_t is available for C_t . For the other case when $o_t \notin \hat{Y}_t$, then note that $U_y \geq U_{o_t} \geq |C_t|$, for every $y \in \hat{Y}_t$. Since $|\hat{Y}_t| = k$ and $o_t \notin \hat{Y}_t$, there is a point $y_t \in \hat{Y}_t$ such that $y_t \notin O$ and $U_{y_t} \geq |C_t|$. Hence, in either case, there is a point as required by Line 12 of Algorithm 1. Since, $|\hat{Y}_t| = k$, we can branch on all k possibilities.

Since Algorithm 1 calls SETTLE-CLUSTER at most k times and each execution of SETTLE-CLUSTER creates $2^{O(k)}$ branches of execution, we have that the total running time of Algorithm 1 is bounded by $2^{O(k^2 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))}n^{O(1)}$.

Remark 11. Since Algorithm 1 explicitly maintains a set (F) from which it selects the center, it also yields $(3 + \sqrt{8} + \varepsilon)$ FPT-approximation for the supplier (facility) version of CAPSOR, where

points are from $Q \subseteq P$ and the solution of centers must come from another set $F \subseteq P$. For many fundamental problems, such as k -CENTER, k -MEDIAN, it is known that the supplier version is harder to approximate than the non-supplier version [HS85, GJ23, AL24].

4.2 Extension to Cluster CapSoR

In this section, we highlight changes required to Algorithm 1 for cluster capacities. Let $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, \{U_1, \dots, U_k\})$ be an instance of Non Uniform cluster CAPSoR. The idea is to let Algorithm 1 run on \mathcal{I} with the following modifications at the places that depended on the node capacities.

M1 Definition 11 for available point:

$y \in P$ is said to be *available* for C_i if $y \notin O \setminus \{o_i\}$.

M2 Line 3 of FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL:

Let $D_i = \text{ball}_{P'}(y_i, r_i), y_i \in F'$ be the argument that maximizes the function $\max_{y_j \in F'} |\text{ball}_{P'}(y_j, r_i)|$;

M3 Line 24 of Algorithm 1 needs the correct permutation of capacities for \mathcal{S} . Then Remark 4 allows us to use Lemma 3:

Guess the capacities of the elements in \mathcal{S} ;

If \mathcal{S} is feasible for \mathcal{I} then return (S, σ) obtained from Lemma 3;

Note that the capacities are now on the cluster, instead of on the nodes, and hence it makes sense to run Algorithm 1 with above modifications. (M1) is easy to see. For (M2), since we only want to make sure that D_i contains as many points as C_i , it is sufficient to look for a densest ball of radius r_i , as the algorithm maintains the invariant that all the points of C_i are intact (Lemma 8). Next, once we have \mathcal{S} at Line 24 of Algorithm 1, we need to also guess the capacities of the clusters in \mathcal{S} , in order to use Lemma 3 (see Remark 4). This will incur an additional multiplicative factor of $k!$ to the running time. Finally, we need to guess available $y_t \in \bigcap_{r_j \in \text{Partitions-of}(C_t)} \text{ball}_F(y_j, r_j + r_t)$ for C_t at Line 12 of Algorithm 1 (E5). In this case, we define \hat{Y}_t to be an arbitrary set of k facilities in $\bigcap_{r_j \in \text{Partitions-of}(C_t)} \text{ball}_F(y_j, r_j + r_t)$. It is easy to see that \hat{Y}_t must contain an available point for C_t .

4.3 Extension to Non-Uniform CapSoD

In this section, we modify Algorithm 1 for Non-Uniform CAPSoD. The pseudo-code is shown in Algorithm 5.

4.3.1 Overview of Algorithm 5

The idea of Algorithm 5 is similar to Algorithm 1, where it starts processing the clusters in \mathcal{C} in non-decreasing order of diameters. As before, the key invariant of the algorithm is that whenever cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ is being processed, there is a good dense ball for C_i in the remaining points. Specifically, suppose we could find a ball $D_i = \text{ball}(y_i, d_i)$, during the processing of C_i such that $|D_i| \geq |C_i|$. Then, letting C_j be an anchor for D_i , i.e., C_j has the smallest diameter in $\text{reachable}(D_i)$, note that if $C_i \notin \text{reachable}(\text{ball}(y_i, d_i + d_j))$, then we can (temporary) delete the $\text{ball}(y_i, d_i + d_j)$, since this ball does not contain any point of C_i . Furthermore, note that in this case we end up deleting at

least one cluster (namely, C_j), and hence this process of temporary deleting balls can repeat at most k times before the event that C_i is in the reachable set of the extended ball happens. We call such ball a good dense ball. Once, we find a good dense ball $D_i = \text{ball}(y_i, d_i)$ for C_i , i.e., $C_i \in \text{reachable}(\text{ball}(y_i, d_i + d_j))$, then note that if $d_j \leq d_i$, then all the points of C_i are within distance $3d_i$ from y_i . This means we can create a cluster $C'_i \subseteq \text{ball}(y_i, 3d_i)$ of diameter $6d_i$ that contains points of C_i .

Unfortunately, the hard case is when $d_j > d_i$, and hence we can not charge d_j anymore to pay for the cost of d_i . In this case, we create a new cluster $C'_i \subseteq D_i$ out of the points of D_i . However, in this case, we end up taking points from other clusters. But, note that this process does not take points from the clusters that have already been processed and have diameter smaller than d_i . This is because we process the clusters in the non-decreasing order and we are in the case when $d_j > d_i$. Hence, this process ends up taking points from the unprocessed clusters. Since, the algorithm needs the guarantee that the points of the unprocessed clusters are not disturbed, we mark these clusters processed. However, we need to make sure that all the affected clusters are taken care of. Towards this, we use a novel idea of exchanging points using the subroutine **EXCHANGE**. Since, we have created a new cluster C'_i out of D_i , any cluster $C_{j'} \in \text{reachable}(D_i)$ that has lost, say $n_{j'} > 0$, points in this process, can instead claim $n_{j'}$ points from the original cluster C_i , by paying slightly more cost since, in this case, we can charge to d_i as $d_i < d_{j'} \leq d_j$. Here, we used the fact that C_j is anchor for D_i , and hence d_j is a smallest diameter in $\text{reachable}(D_i)$. We call such clusters partitioned clusters. More specifically, the diameter of the modified $C'_{j'}$ is at most $\text{diam}(C_{j'}) + d_i + \delta(y_i, p) \leq d_{j'} + d_i + 2d_i + d_j \leq 5d_{j'}$, for $p \in C_i$, as $d_j \leq d_{j'}$. Note that a cluster $C_{j'}$ can be partitioned multiple times by different C_i 's, as shown in [Figure 3](#). However, in this case, the diameter of $C'_{j'}$ is at most $9d_{j'}$ as shown in [Figure 3](#). On the other hand, the diameter of the new cluster C'_i is only $2d_i$. We use this gap between the costs to obtain improved approximation factor of 7.

4.3.2 Analysis

The analysis is exactly same as that of Non-Uniform Node CAPSOR, except for changing definitions and calculations for the diameter case. We only highlight the required changes. First, we say a cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ is reachable from a ball $B := \text{ball}(y, r)$ if $\delta(y, p) \leq r + d$, for $p \in C_i$. The definitions of $\text{reachable}(B)$ and anchor for B remain same. Similarly, a ball $D_i := \text{ball}(y_i, d_i)$ is a good dense ball for C_i if $|D_i| \geq |C_i|$ and $C_i \in \text{reachable}(y_i, d_i + d_j)$, where d_j is the diameter of anchor C_j for C_i .

Note that [Lemma 8](#) can be adapted to show that **FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL**([Algorithm 7](#)) returns a good dense ball for C_i within k iterations. Next, as before, we partition the clusters in \mathcal{C} into three types depending on [Step 3](#) of **SETTLE-CLUSTER** (C_i). Let $a(d_i)$ denote the diameter of anchor for D_i , where D_i is the ball obtained in [Step 1](#). Now, if $C_i \in \text{reachable}(\text{ball}(y_i, \beta d_i))$, then we call C_i as *Type-1 cluster*, otherwise we call it *Type-2 cluster*. Note that in this case $a(d_i) > (\beta - 1)d_i$ since $\beta d_i < d_i + a(d_i)$. Furthermore, when Type-2 cluster C_i is processed in **EXCHANGE**(D_i), it turns all the clusters in $\text{reachable}(D_i)$ black (some of them may have been already black). We call a cluster $C_t \in \text{reachable}(D_i)$, a *Type-3 cluster*. We also say that the cluster $C_t \in \text{reachable}(C_i)$ is *partitioned* by C_i . Again, it is easy to see that [Observation 1](#) also holds in this case.

Now, we define the clusters as follows. When C_i is a Type-1, we define $C'_i = \text{ball}(y_i, (\beta + 1)d_i)$. When C_i is a Type-2 cluster, then we define $C'_i \subseteq \text{ball}(y_i, d_i)$. Finally, for a Type-3 cluster C_t , we define $C'_t = \cup_{d_j \in \text{Partitions-of}(C_t)} \text{ball}_Q(y_j, 2d_j + d_t)$. Let $\mathcal{C}' = \{C'_i \mid i \in [k]\}$.

Algorithm 5: $(7 + \varepsilon)$ FPTapproximation for Non Uniform CAPSOD

Data: Instance $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, \{U_p\}_{p \in P})$ of Non Uniform CAPSOD, $\varepsilon > 0$

Result: A $(7 + \varepsilon)$ approximate solution

```
1  $F \leftarrow P, Q \leftarrow P$ ; //  $F$  is a set of potential centers
2 Let  $C'_i \leftarrow \emptyset$  for  $i \in [k]$ ;
3 Guess  $D = (d_1, \dots, d_k)$ , an  $\varepsilon$ -approximation of optimal diameters such that  $d_i \leq d_{i+1}$  for
   $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$ ;
4 Let  $\beta \leftarrow 5/2$ ; // constant for extended balls
5 Color each cluster  $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$  red;
6 Set  $\text{Partitions-of}(C_t) = \emptyset$  for  $C_t \in \mathcal{C}$ ;
7 while  $\exists$  a red cluster do
8    $C_i \leftarrow$  smallest radius red cluster;
9   SETTLE-CLUSTER ( $C_i$ );
10 end
11 foreach black cluster  $C_t$  such that  $\text{Partitions-of}(C_t) \neq \emptyset$  do
12   Set  $C'_t = \cup_{d_j \in \text{Partitions-of}(C_t)} \text{ball}_Q(y_j, 2d_j + d_t)$ ;
13 end
14 Let  $\mathcal{C}'$  be the collection of  $C'_i$ ;
15 if  $\mathcal{C}'$  is feasible for  $\mathcal{I}$  then return  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  obtained from Lemma 5;
16 fail;
```

To show that Algorithm 5 returns a feasible solution in Line 15 using Lemma 5, we will show that the set \mathcal{C}' constructed by the algorithm is a feasible set with cost $(7 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}$, i.e., there exists a feasible solution $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \{\tilde{C}_1, \dots, \tilde{C}_k\}$ to \mathcal{I} such that $\tilde{C}_i \subseteq C'_i$, for $i \in [k]$. Note that, we only need to show an existence of such a feasible solution $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, since in this case Lemma 5, together with Remark 4, recovers some feasible solution whose cost is at most $\text{diam}(\mathcal{C}')$, which we is bounded by $(7 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}$. We define $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ as follows. For a Type-1 cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$, we define $\tilde{C}_i = C_i$. As $C'_i = \text{ball}(y_i, (\beta + 1)d_i)$ and since $C_i \in \text{reachable}(\text{ball}(y_i, \beta d_i))$, we have that $\tilde{C}_i \subseteq C'_i$, as required. Furthermore, $|\tilde{C}_i| = |C_i|$ and the diameter of \tilde{C}_i is at most the diameter of C'_i which is bounded by $2(\beta + 1)d_i = 7d_i$. For a Type-2 cluster C_i , we define $\tilde{C}_i \subseteq D_i = C'_i$ such that $|\tilde{C}_i| = |C_i|$, where $D_i = \text{ball}(y_i, d_i)$ is a good dense ball for C_i . It is easy to see that the diameter of \tilde{C}_i is at most the diameter of D_i , which is bounded by $2d_i$. Finally, when C_i is a Type-3 cluster (partitioned by other clusters; see Figure 3), we define \tilde{C}_i to be the points of C_i that are not taken by any Type-2 cluster union the points claimed back from the Type-2 clusters. Thus, $|\tilde{C}_i| = |C_i|$ and $\tilde{C}_i \subseteq C'_i$. Furthermore, we have $\text{diam}(\tilde{C}_i) \leq d_i + 2 \cdot \max_{C_t \in \text{Partitions-of}(C_i)} (3d_t + d_i) = 3d_i + 6 \cdot \max_{C_t \in \text{Partitions-of}(C_i)} d_t \leq 7d_i$, where we used the fact that $d_t < \frac{d_i}{\beta - 1}$ since $\beta d_t < d_i + d_t$. Finally, note that $P = \cup_{i \in [k]} \tilde{C}_i$, and hence $\text{diamcost}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) = \sum_{i \in [k]} \text{diam}(\tilde{C}_i) \leq \sum_{i \in [k]} 2(\beta + 1)d_i \leq 7(1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}$, which also holds in the case of a monotone symmetric norm of diameters.

5 Hardness of Approximation

In this section, we prove the following hardness of approximation result for uniform CAPSOD (restated for convenience). Recall that, informally, gap-ETH says that there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such

Algorithm 6: SETTLE-CLUSTER (C_i)

```
1 Let  $D_i = \text{ball}_Q(y_i, d_i)$  be the ball returned by FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL( $d_i, (Q, F)$ ) ;
2 Let  $C_j$  be an anchor for  $D_i$  ;
3 if  $C_i \in \text{reachable}(\text{ball}(y_i, \beta d_i))$  then
4   | Color  $C_i$  black;
5   | set  $C'_i = \text{ball}(y_i, (\beta + 1)d_i)$  to  $\mathcal{S}$ ;
6 else
7   | EXCHANGE( $D_i$ ); //  $d_j > (\beta - 1)d_i$ 
8 end
9 return
```

Algorithm 7: FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL($d_i, (Q, F)$)

```
1  $P' \leftarrow Q$ ;
2 for  $k$  times do
3   | Let  $D_i = \text{ball}_{P'}(y_i, d_i)$ ,  $y_i \in P'$  be the argument for  $\max_{y_j \in P'} |\text{ball}_{P'}(y_j, d_i)|$ ;
4   | Let  $C_j$  be a cluster with smallest diameter in  $\text{reachable}(D_i)$ ;
5   | if  $C_i \notin \text{reachable}(\text{ball}(y_i, d_i + d_j))$  then  $P' \leftarrow P' \setminus \text{ball}(y_i, d_i + d_j)$ ;
6   | else return  $D_i$ ;
7 end
8 fail;
```

that there is no sub-exponential time algorithm for 3-SAT can distinguish whether a given 3-SAT formula has a satisfying assignment or every assignment satisfies at most $(1 - \varepsilon)$ fraction of the clauses (see [Hypothesis 1](#) for a formal statement).

Theorem 2 (No FPT-AS). *Assuming gap-ETH, there is a fixed $\alpha > 1$ such that there is no $f(k)n^{o(k)}$ time α -approximation algorithm for Uniform CAPSOR.*

The above theorem implies that there is no $f(k, \varepsilon)n^{g(\varepsilon)}$ time algorithm that finds a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, for uniform CAPSOR. Such algorithms are called PAS for Parameterized Approximation Scheme [[FKLM20](#)] or FPT Approximation Scheme. Therefore, [Theorem 2](#) implies that, assuming gap-ETH, there is no PAS for Uniform CAPSOR.

In fact, our reduction can be modified to rule out PTAS for Uniform CAPSOR, assuming a weaker hypothesis of $P \neq NP$ (restated for convenience).

Theorem 1 (APX-hard). *There exists $\alpha > 1$ such that it is NP-hard to approximate Uniform CAPSOR better than factor α .*

Towards proving [Theorem 1](#) and [Theorem 2](#), we show a gap preserving reduction from MAX3-SAT5 to Uniform CAPSOR. An instance of MAX3-SAT5 is same as that of 3-SAT, but has an additional regularity property that every variable appears exactly in 5 clauses.

We setup the required preliminaries in [Section 5.1](#). Then, in [Section 5.2](#), we prove [Theorem 2](#) by showing a reduction from MAX3-SAT5 to uniform CAPSOR. Finally, in [Section 5.3](#), we extend this reduction to prove [Theorem 1](#).

Algorithm 8: EXCHANGE(D_i)

```
1 Delete  $D_i$  from  $Q$ ;  
2 Color  $C_i$  black;  
3 Set  $C'_i = \text{ball}(y_i, d_i)$ ;  
4 foreach  $C_t \in \text{reachable}(D_i)$  do  
5   |   Add  $d_i$  to Partitions-of( $C_t$ );  
6   |   Color  $C_t$  black;  
7 end  
8 return
```

5.1 Preliminaries

The starting point of our reduction is MAX3-SAT5, a special case of MAX3-SATB, which is defined below.

Definition 13 (MAX3-SATB). *Given a 3-SAT formula ϕ on N variables such that each variable occurs in constant number of clauses, the MAX3-SATB problem asks the maximum number of clauses that can be satisfied by an assignment to the variables. Furthermore, denote by MAX3-SAT5 when each variable in ϕ occurs in exactly 5 clauses and no variable occurs more than once in a clause.*

It is known that MAX3-SATB is APX-hard, and in particular, MAX3-SAT5 is also APX-hard.

Theorem 7 (Proposition 2.1.2 of [Fei98]). *MAX3-SAT5 is APX-hard (in particular there is no PTAS, unless $P = NP$). Specifically, there is some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that it is NP-hard to decide if a given instance ϕ of MAX3-SAT5 is satisfiable, or every assignment satisfies at most $(1 - \varepsilon)$ fraction of the clauses.*

This hardness of approximation is based on the following polynomial time transformation from MAX3-SATB to MAX3-SAT5.

Lemma 12 ([Fei98]). *Given an instance ψ of MAX3-SATB on N variables and M clauses, there is polynomial time algorithm that produces an instance ϕ of MAX3-SAT5 on N' variables and M' clauses such that:*

1. $N' = O(M)$ and $M' = 5N'/3 = O(M)$
2. Every variable in ϕ appears in exactly 5 clauses and every clause contain exactly 3 variables.
3. If ψ is satisfiable, then ϕ is satisfiable.
4. If every assignment of ψ satisfies at most $(1 - \delta)M$ clauses for some $\delta > 0$, then every assignment of ϕ satisfies at most $(1 - \varepsilon)M'$ clauses, for some $\varepsilon > 0$ depending on δ .

To rule out FPT algorithms, we will use the following assumption, called **gap-ETH**, introduced by Manurangsi and Raghavendra [MR17], and independently by Dinur [Din16]. **gap-ETH** has been instrumental in obtaining tight FPT lower bounds for many fundamental problems [CCK⁺20, Man20], including k -median, k -means [CGK⁺19], k -center [GJ23] in clustering.




Figure 3: The good dense ball $\text{ball}(y_2, d_2)$ for C_2 partitions C_8 . Similarly, C_8 is also partitioned by good dense ball $\text{ball}(y_4, d_4)$ for C_4 . However, note that the diameter of the new cluster C'_8 is bounded by $9d_8$.

Hypothesis 1 ((Randomized) Gap Exponential Time Hypothesis (gap-ETH) [Din16, Man20, MR17]). *There exists constants $\varepsilon', \tau > 0$ such that no randomized algorithm when given an instance ϕ of MAX3-SATB on N variables and M clauses can distinguish the following cases correctly with probability $2/3$ in time $O(2^{\tau N})$.*

- *there exists an assignment for ϕ that satisfies all M clauses*
- *every assignment satisfies $< (1 - \varepsilon')M$ clauses in ϕ .*

Combining [Hypothesis 1](#) with [Lemma 12](#), we have the following theorem that will be used in our hardness reductions.

Theorem 8 ((Randomized) Gap Exponential Time Hypothesis (gap-ETH) for MAX3-SAT5). *Assuming gap-ETH, there exists $\varepsilon' > 0$ such that no randomized algorithm when given an instance ϕ of MAX3-SAT5 on N variables running in time $2^{o(N)}$ can distinguish correctly with probability $2/3$ if it is satisfiable or every assignment satisfies $< (1 - \varepsilon')$ fraction of clauses.*

5.2 Hardness of FPT-approximation for Uniform CapSoR

In this section, we prove [Theorem 2](#). Recall that for an instance $((P, \delta), k, U)$ of uniform CAPSOR, we say that a solution $(S \subseteq P, \sigma : P \rightarrow S)$ is feasible if $|S| \leq k$ and $|\sigma^{-1}(s)| \leq U$, for every $s \in S$. Towards proving [Theorem 2](#), we show the following reduction.

Lemma 13. *Let ϕ be an instance of MAX3-SAT5 on N variables and M clauses. Let $\varepsilon' > 0$ be a constant and $k \leq N$ be a positive integer. Furthermore, let $w = \max\{10N, 2^{\lceil N/k \rceil}\}$. Then, in $\text{poly}(k2^{N/k})$ time one can compute an instance $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, U)$ of uniform CAPSOR with $|P| = k(2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + w) + M$ points and uniform capacity constrain $U = w + 2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + 5\lceil N/k \rceil$, such that*

- *If ϕ is satisfiable then there exist a feasible solution (S, σ) with $\text{cost}(S, \sigma) \leq k$*
- *If every assignment satisfies less than $(1 - \varepsilon')M$ clauses, then for every feasible solution (S, σ) it holds that $\text{cost}(S, \sigma) > (1 + \varepsilon'/66)k$.*

Proof. Given a MAX3-SAT5 instance ϕ on N variables and M clauses and a positive integer $k \leq n$, partition the variables (arbitrarily) into k groups G_1, \dots, G_k such that each G_i has at most $\lceil N/k \rceil$ variables. We create the point set $P = P_1 \cup P_2 \cup P_3$ of CAPSOR as follows.

- *Assignment points of G_i .* For every group G_i and every assignment $a(i, j)$ to the variables of G_i , we create a point $p(i, j)$ in P . Let P_1^i denote the set of all assignment points of G_i . If $|G_i| < 2^{\lceil N/k \rceil}$, add dummy points to P_1^i to make $|P_1^i| = 2^{\lceil N/k \rceil}$. Let $P_1 = \cup_{i \in [k]} P_1^i$.
- *Clause points.* We create a point in P for every clause in ϕ . Let P_2 denote the set of all clause points.
- *Auxiliary points.* We create $w = \max\{10N, 2^{\lceil N/k \rceil}\}$ auxiliary points for every G_i . Let P_3^i denote the set of all auxiliary points of G_i and let $P_3 = \cup_{i \in [k]} P_3^i$.

Note that $|P| = k(2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + w) + M$.

Distance function δ . It is convenient to think of the distance function δ as the shortest path metric of an unweighted graph $G = (V, E)$, where $V = P$, and add edges in E between (1) every pair of clause points, (2) every pair of vertices in $P_1^i \cup P_3^i$ for every i , (3) between every assignment point and every clause point it satisfies. Note that the distance aspect ratio Δ of (P, δ) is 5. See Figure 4 for an illustration.

Uniform capacity. Set $U = w + 2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + 5\lceil N/k \rceil$.

Lemma 14. *If ϕ is satisfiable, then there exists a feasible solution (S, σ) to \mathcal{I} such that $\text{cost}(S, \sigma) \leq k$.*

Proof. Suppose $\alpha : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a satisfying assignment for ϕ . For each $i \in [k]$, pick $s_i \in P_1^i$ such that s_i corresponds to the assignment to the variables of G_i given by α . Let $S = \{s_i\}_{i \in [k]}$ and note that $|S| = k$. Now, we define the clusters $\sigma : P \rightarrow S$ as follows. For $p \in P_1^i \cup P_3^i$, set $\sigma(p) = s_i$. For every clause point $p \in P_2$, set $\sigma(p) = s_i$ (breaking ties for s_i arbitrary) such that the assignment corresponding to s_i satisfies the clause corresponding to p .

First note that, for $s_i \in S$, we have $|\sigma^{-1}(s_i)| \leq 2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + w + 5\lceil N/k \rceil = U$ since each s_i is assigned at most $5\lceil N/k \rceil$ clause points corresponding to the clauses satisfied the assignment of s_i . Finally, note that $\text{rad}(s_i) = 1$ since the points in $\sigma^{-1}(s_i)$ are neighbors of s_i (at distance 1 from s_i). Hence, $\text{cost}(S, \sigma) = k$. \square

Lemma 15. *Suppose that every assignment satisfies less than $(1 - \varepsilon')M$ clauses in ϕ . Then for every feasible solution (S, σ) , it holds that $\text{cost}(S, \sigma) > (1 + \varepsilon)k$, for $\varepsilon = \varepsilon'/66$.*




Figure 4: A pictorial illustration of the graph G obtained from the reduction, showing assignment points, auxiliary points, and clause points, along with partial edges.

Proof. We prove the contraposition. Suppose there exists $S \subseteq P$, $|S| \leq k$ and a feasible assignment $\sigma : P \rightarrow S$ such that $\text{cost}(S, \sigma) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)k$. We will show an assignment that satisfies at least $(1 - \varepsilon')M$ clauses in ϕ . To this end, first, we show that $|S| = k$ and there are no zero radius centers in S .

Claim 16. $|S| = k$ and for every $s \in S$, we have that $\text{rad}(s) \geq 1$.

Proof. First, suppose $|S| \leq (k - 1)$. Then, the number of points served by S is

$$|\sigma^{-1}(S)| \leq (k - 1)U = (k - 1)(2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + w + 5\lceil N/k \rceil) < k(2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + w) + 5k\lceil N/k \rceil - w < |P| ,$$

since $5k\lceil N/k \rceil \leq 10N \leq w$. Now, assume that there is a zero radius center in S . Hence, the number of points served by S is

$$\leq (k - 1)U + 1 = (k - 1)(2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + w + 5\lceil N/k \rceil) + 1 < k(2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + w) + 5k\lceil N/k \rceil - w < |P| ,$$

since $\lceil N/k \rceil \geq 1$. □

We will need the following definitions.

Definition 14 (Block). For $i \in [k]$, the i^{th} block B_i is the set of points in $P_1^i \cup P_3^i$. Block B_i is said to be covered by S if $|B_i \cap S| \geq 1$, otherwise it is uncovered by S . Block B_i is a cheating block with respect to S if $|B_i \cap S| \geq 2$. Accordingly, B_i is a good block if B_i is covered by S and is non-cheating, i.e., $|B_i \cap S| = 1$. We say a center $s \in S$ cheating if s belongs to a cheating block. $s \in S$ is a bad center if $s \in P_2$. Finally, a center is good if it is neither cheating nor bad.

Without loss of generality, we assume that for every good block B_i , we have $|S \cap P_1^i| = 1$, i.e., S contains a center only from the assignment points of B_i . To see this, suppose S contains a center $s \in P_3^i$. Then, note that since P_1^i separates s from the rest of the graph and the neighbors of s are subset of the neighbors of any point $s' \in P_1^i$, s' can serve the points served by s within the radius of s . Hence we can replace s with s' in S without increasing its cost and violating the capacities.

Definitions:

ℓ_0 : number of uncovered blocks.
 ℓ_1 : number of cheating blocks.
 ℓ_2 : number of cheating centers.
 ℓ_3 : number of bad centers.
 ℓ_4 : number of good centers in S .

Observations:

$\ell_2 \geq \ell_1$
 $\ell_0 = \ell_2 - \ell_1 + \ell_3$
 $k = |S| = \ell_2 + \ell_3 + \ell_4$

The next claim says that the number of uncovered blocks by S are bounded.

Claim 17. $\ell_0 \leq 2\epsilon k$

Proof. Suppose the number of uncovered blocks $\ell_0 > 2\epsilon k$. Consider an uncovered block $B_i, i \in [k]$. Then, note that any center in S that serves points of B_i must have radius at least 2. Since U is the uniform capacity, there are at least $t = \ell_0(2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + w)/U$ centers in S that have radius at least 2. Hence, using Claim 16, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cost}(S, \sigma) &\geq 2t + (k - t) \\ &= k + \frac{\ell_0(2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + w)}{U} \\ &\geq k + \ell_0/2 \quad \text{since } U \leq 2(2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + w) \\ &> (1 + \epsilon)k, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second last inequality we used that $5\lceil N/k \rceil \leq w$ and in the last inequality we used $\ell_0 > 2\epsilon k$. \square

Now, we will massage S to get S' such that every block is good with respect to S' and the cost of S' is not much larger than that of S .

Claim 18. *Given a feasible solution (S, σ) with $\text{cost}(S, \sigma) \leq (1 + \epsilon)k$, we can obtain another feasible solution (S', σ') such that $\text{cost}(S', \sigma') \leq (1 + 11\epsilon)k$ and every block is good with respect to S' .*

Proof. The idea is simple - redistribute the cheating and bad centers in S so that every block is good. Since, the number of such centers is small and the diameter of (P, δ) is bounded, the new solution S' also has bounded cost. More formally, for every $s \in S$, we add $\gamma(s) \in P$ to S' as follows. For every good block B_i , we add the center $S \cap B_i$ to S' . Hence, we add ℓ_4 centers to S' and thus, S' covers ℓ_4 blocks. For every cheating block B_i with respect to S , we arbitrarily select a center in $s_i \in S \cap B_i$ as the leader for B_i and call the other centers in $S \cap B_i$ as the excess centers in B_i . We add all the leaders from S to S' . Hence, we add ℓ_1 many points to S' and thus S' covers $\ell_1 + \ell_4$ blocks. Now, we have to add $k - (\ell_1 + \ell_4)$ centers to S' and we have to cover $k - (\ell_1 + \ell_4)$ blocks. For every bad center $s \in S$, we select an arbitrary uncovered block B_j and add an arbitrary point $\gamma(s) \in P_1^j$ to S' . Thus, we add ℓ_3 many points to S' and hence S' covers ℓ_3 more blocks. For every excess center $s \in S$, we select an arbitrary uncovered block B_j and add an arbitrary point $\gamma(s) \in P_1^j$ to S' . Thus, we add $\ell_2 - \ell_1$ many points to S' and hence S' covers $\ell_2 - \ell_1$ more blocks. Now, $|S'| = \ell_1 + \ell_4 + \ell_3 + (\ell_2 - \ell_1) = \ell_2 + \ell_3 + \ell_4 = k$, which is also the number of covered blocks.

Next, we define σ' as follows. For every $\gamma(s) \in S'$, we set $\sigma'(p) = \gamma(s)$ for every $p \in \sigma^{-1}(s)$. Thus, (S', σ') is a feasible solution. Furthermore, since we redistributed $\ell_2 - \ell_1 + \ell_3$ centers in S to

obtain S' , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cost}(S', \sigma') &\leq \text{cost}(S, \sigma) + 5 \cdot (\ell_2 - \ell_1 + \ell_3) \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon)k + 10\varepsilon k \\ &\leq (1 + 11\varepsilon)k, \end{aligned}$$

using [Claim 17](#) and the facts: $\Delta = 5$, $\ell_0 = \ell_2 - \ell_1 + \ell_3$. \square

Now, let S'_g denote the set of centers in S' with radius 1 and let $S'_b = S' \setminus S'_g$. Let B_g and B_b be the set of blocks containing centers in S'_g and S'_b , respectively. Next claim says that S'_b serves small number of clause points.

Claim 19. *Let \tilde{M} be the number of clause points served by the centers in S'_b . Then, $\tilde{M} \leq 66\varepsilon M$.*

Proof. First note that $|S'_b| \leq 11\varepsilon k$ otherwise $\text{cost}(S') \geq 2|S'_b| + (k - |S'_b|) = k + |S'_b| > (1 + 11\varepsilon)k$. As the centers in S'_g have radius 1, they can not serve points from blocks in B_b . Thus, the centers in S'_b serve at least $|S'_b|(2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + w) + \tilde{M}$ points. Thus, there is a center in $s' \in S'_b$ that serves at least $(2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + w) + \tilde{M}/|S'_b|$ points. Hence, using $M = 5N/3$, we have,

$$w + 2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + 5\lceil N/k \rceil = U \geq |\sigma'^{-1}(s')| \geq (2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} + w) + \frac{\tilde{M}}{|S'_b|}$$

it follows that $\tilde{M} \leq |S'_b| \cdot 5\lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil < 11\varepsilon k \cdot (5 \cdot \frac{N}{k} + 5) \leq 110\varepsilon N = 66\varepsilon M$. \square

Finally, we are ready to show an assignment $\alpha_{S'} : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ that satisfies at least $(1 - \varepsilon')M$ clauses in ϕ . Let $S''_g \subseteq S'_g$ consists of centers in S'_g that correspond to valid assignment points. Consider $s_i \in S''_g$ corresponding to the assignment $\beta_1 \cdots \beta_{\lceil N/k \rceil}$ to the variables $x_1^i, \dots, x_{\lceil N/k \rceil}^i$ of G_i . Then, define $\alpha_{S'}(x_j^i) = \beta_j$ for $j \in \lceil N/k \rceil$. Define $\alpha_{S'}$ arbitrary for other variables. Then, since centers in S''_g serve at least $(1 - 66\varepsilon)M$ clause points at distance 1, we have that $\alpha_{S'}$ satisfy at least $(1 - 66\varepsilon)M = (1 - \varepsilon')M$ clauses in ϕ . \square

\square

Proof of Theorem 2. Let ϕ be the instance MAX3-SAT5 on N variables and M clauses obtained from [Theorem 8](#) and let ε' be the corresponding parameter. Suppose there is algorithm \mathcal{A} that takes an instance $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, U)$ of Uniform CAPSOR as input and finds a $(1 + \varepsilon'/66)$ -approximate solution, in time $f(k)n^{k/h(k)}$, for some non-decreasing and unbounded function h . We will use \mathcal{A} to decide whether ϕ has a satisfying assignment or all assignments satisfy less than $(1 - \varepsilon')M$ clauses in time $2^{o(n)}$, refuting gap-ETH. Without loss of generality, we assume that f is non-decreasing and unbounded, and that $f(k) \geq 2^k$. Towards this, we will use reduce ϕ to an instance $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, U)$ of Uniform CAPSOR using [Lemma 13](#) for a particularly chosen value of k as follows. We choose k to be the largest value such that $f(k) \leq N$ and computing such k can be done in $O(N)$ time [[CFK+15](#)]. Thus, the value of k selected depends on N , and hence let $k = g(N)$ for some computable function g that is non-decreasing and unbounded. Furthermore, using the facts $f(k) \geq 2^k \geq k$ and $2^k \leq f(g(N)) \leq N$, we have that $g(N) \leq N$ and $k \leq 2 \log N$. Let $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, U)$ be the instance of Uniform CAPSOR obtained using [Lemma 13](#) on ϕ and $k = g(N)$. We now run Algorithm \mathcal{A} on \mathcal{I} to decide whether ϕ has a satisfying assignment or all

assignments satisfy less than $(1 - \varepsilon')M$ clauses. The total running time of our algorithm is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
(k2^{N/k} + M)^{O(1)} + f(k)|P|^{o(k)} &\leq (k2^{N/k} + M)^{O(1)} + f(k)(k(2^{2N/k} + w) + M)^{k/h(k)} \\
&\leq 2^{o(N)} + Nk^{k/h(k)}(2^{2N/k} + w + M)^{k/h(k)} \\
&= 2^{o(N)} + 2^{o(N)}(2^{2N/k} + w + M)^{k/h(k)} \quad \text{using } k \leq 2 \log N \\
&= 2^{o(N)},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step, we used the fact that if $w = 2^{\lceil N/k \rceil} \geq M$ then $(2^{2N/k} + w + M)^{k/h(k)} \leq (3 \cdot 2^{2N/k})^{k/h(k)} = 2^{o(N)}$, otherwise $(2^{2N/k} + w + M)^{k/h(k)} = (O(N))^{k/h(k)} = 2^{o(N)}$. \square

5.3 NP-hardness of approximation for Uniform CapSoR

In this section, we prove [Theorem 1](#).

Proof of [Theorem 1](#). We show the following reduction that is similar in construction to [Lemma 13](#).

Lemma 20. *There is a reduction algorithm that for given an instance ϕ of MAX3-SAT5 on N variables and M clauses produces an instance $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, U)$ of uniform CAPSOR in time $N^{O(1)}$ such that the following holds.*

- $|P| = 5N^2 + 11N/3$
- $U = 10N + 7$
- $k = N$
- If ϕ is satisfiable then there exist a feasible solution (S, σ) such that $\text{cost}(S, \sigma) \leq k$
- If every assignment satisfies less than $(1 - \varepsilon')M$ clauses, for some fixed $\varepsilon' > 0$, then for every feasible solution (S, σ) it holds that $\text{cost}(S, \sigma) < (1 + \varepsilon'/66)k$.

Proof Sketch. We create an instance $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), F, k, U)$ of uniform CAPSOR from ϕ by applying [Lemma 13](#) using $k = N$. Note that, since $w = 10N$, the capacity of every point $U = 7 + w = 10N + 7$ and the number of points in \mathcal{I} is $|P| = N(2 + w) + m = 5N^2 + 2N + M = 5N^2 + 11N/3$, as $M = 5N/3$. The running time of the reduction is $N^{O(1)}$. The completeness and soundness follows from [Lemma 14](#) and [Lemma 15](#), respectively. \square

This finishes the proof of [Theorem 1](#). \square

A Uniform Capacities

Our first main result of this section is the following (restated for convenience).

Theorem 4 (Uniform). *There is a randomized algorithm for Uniform CAPSOR, oblivious to the objective, that runs in $2^{O(k^2 + k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$ time, and with probability at least $3/5$ returns a solution Sol, such that Sol is a $(3 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation w.r.t. any monotone symmetric norm objective (simultaneously). Furthermore, for $1 < p < \infty$, Sol is a $(1 + \varepsilon)(2 \cdot 3^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p}$ -approximation w.r.t. the ℓ_p norm objective.*

As mentioned previously, [Theorem 4](#) implies $(6 + \varepsilon)$ -FPT approximation algorithm for uniform CAPSOD. Interestingly, our algorithmic framework for uniform CAPSOR can be easily adapted for uniform CAPSOD, incurring only an additional factor in the approximation, and thereby yielding $(4 + \varepsilon)$ -FPT approximation.

Theorem 5 (Uniform Diameters). *There is a randomized algorithm that given an instance of the Uniform CAPSOD runs in $2^{O(k \log(k/\varepsilon))} n^{O(1)}$ time, and with probability at least $3/5$ returns a solution Sol , such that Sol is a $(4 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation w.r.t. any monotone symmetric norm objective (simultaneously). Furthermore, for $1 < p < \infty$, Sol is a $(2 + \varepsilon)(2^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p}$ -approximation w.r.t. the ℓ_p norm objective.*

See [Table 1](#) for summary of our results for uniform CAPSOR and CAPSOD. After setting up the notations and definitions, in [Appendix A.3](#) we begin with the proof of [Theorem 5](#) as it is simpler and serves as a warm-up for the more complicated proof of [Theorem 4](#), which appears in [Appendix A.4](#).

A.1 Technical Overview

We overview our algorithms for uniform capacities in more details here. For the sake of ease of exposition, the details here differ from the actual algorithms. We remark that our algorithms slightly differ from those in [\[JKY24\]](#), and in fact [\[JKY24\]](#) have superior running time. Nonetheless, we designed these algorithms before the publication [\[JKY24\]](#), and choose to keep them as is.

Note that the uniform capacity is at least $U \geq \frac{n}{k}$, as otherwise, there will be not feasible solution. Our algorithm divides the clusters in \mathcal{C} into two categories: heavy and light (denoted \mathcal{C}_H and \mathcal{C}_L respectively). A cluster $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is *heavy* if $|C| > n/20k^3$; otherwise, it is a *light* cluster. The intuition behind this partition is the following: some heavy cluster must exist, and given such $C \in \mathcal{C}_H$, a randomly selected point from P belongs to C with probability at least $\text{poly}(1/k)$. Therefore, with probability at least $k^{-O(k)}$, we can obtain a set $X \subseteq P$ containing a single point from each heavy cluster $C \in \mathcal{C}_H$. From the other hand, the total number of points belonging to light clusters is at most $n/20k^2$, and thus it is often the case that all the points belonging to light clusters can be easily “absorbed”. We begin by highlighting our algorithm for the capacitated Sum of Diameters, which also serves as a warm-up for the algorithm we will present for the capacitated Sum of Radii.

Sum of Diameters. Let $\mathcal{L} = \cup \mathcal{C}_L$ be all the points in light clusters. Initially all the light clusters \mathcal{C}_L are unsatisfied. We consider the heavy clusters iteratively. Consider a point $x_i \in X$ such that x_i belongs to a heavy cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_H$. The ball $B_i := \text{ball}(x_i, d_i)$ contains the entire cluster C_i , i.e., $C_i \subseteq B_i$. Let d_j be the maximum diameter of an unsatisfied light cluster C_j intersecting B_i (if there is no such cluster, $d_j = 0$). We call such C_j , the *leader* of B_i . Let $S_i = C_i \cup (\text{ball}(x_i, d_i + d_j) \cap \mathcal{L})$ be the points in the heavy cluster C_i and all the points in light clusters intersecting the ball $\text{ball}(x_i, d_i + d_j)$. The set S_i has diameter at most $2d_i + 2d_j$, and contains all the light clusters intersecting B_i . If $|S_i| \leq U$, we will form a new cluster C'_i corresponding to S_i that includes points from at least one cluster (specifically, C_i) from \mathcal{C} . Next, consider the scenario where $|S_i| > U$. As $|C_i| \leq U$, S_i contains points from at least two clusters, thus we can open two clusters to serve the points in S_i without exceeding the limit of k clusters. We divide the points in S_i into two clusters: (1) \hat{C}_i containing all the points in C_i with diameter $2d_i$, and (2) C'_i containing all the points in $\text{ball}(x_i, d_i + d_j) \cap \mathcal{L}$ with diameter $2d_i + 2d_j$ (there are at most $|\mathcal{L}| \leq U$ such points). The total cost of these two clusters is bounded by $4d_i + 2d_j$. At the end of processing C_i all the light clusters intersecting $B_i := \text{ball}(x_i, d_i)$ become satisfied, and we update $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{L} \setminus S_i$.

After we finished going over all the heavy clusters (represented by points in X), all the points in $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{x_i \in X} S_i$ have been taken care of. The set \mathcal{L} consist of points belonging to light clusters, not yet taken care of. We proceed greedily: while there is an unclustered point $z \in \mathcal{L}$, guess its cluster $C_z \in \mathcal{C}_L$, where d_z is the diameter of C_z . As all remaining clusters are light, we can form a cluster $C'_z := \text{ball}(z, d_z) \cap \mathcal{L}$ without violating the uniform capacity constraint, while ensuring it contains at least one cluster C_z from \mathcal{C} . The diameter of C'_z is at most $2d_z$. Next we remove $\text{ball}(z, d_z)$ from \mathcal{L} . Continue until all the points are clustered, i.e. $\mathcal{L} = \emptyset$. See Figure 5 for an illustration.

Sum of Radii. We can follow the same ideas from Sum of Diameters to obtain a $4+\varepsilon$ -approximation for Sum of Radii with uniform capacities. For each $x_i \in X \cap C_i$ where $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_H$, we have $B_i := \text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i) \supseteq C_i$. Now, as before, consider the unsatisfied light clusters intersecting B_i , and consider the set $S_i = C_i \cup (\text{ball}(x_i, d_i + d_j) \cap \mathcal{L})$, where r_j is the maximum radius of such unsatisfied light cluster C_j intersecting B_i (leader of B_i). If $|S_i| \leq U$, then a single cluster centered in x_i of radius $2r_i + 2r_j$ can serve all the points in S_i . Otherwise, $|S_i| > U$. As previously, we want to serve the points in S_i using two clusters. However, we can use x_i as a cluster center only once. Nevertheless, we can sample another point \hat{x}_i from C_i (as C_i is heavy). Next, we open two clusters: (1) $\text{ball}(\hat{x}_i, 2r_i)$ to serve all the points in C_i , and (2) $\text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i + 2r_j)$ to serve all the points in $S_i \setminus C_i$. This gives a $4 + \varepsilon$ -approximation. We introduce a concept of *good dense ball*.

Shaving a factor using Good Dense Balls. In the algorithm above, the expensive case responsible for the factor 4 in the approximation is when the set S_i contains more than U points. Note that as $|\mathcal{L}| < n/20k^2$, it must be the case that the cluster C is very big $|C_i| \geq n/2k$. We created a cluster centered at an arbitrary center $\hat{x}_i \in C_i$, and thus in order to cover all the points in C_i it had to have radius $2r_i$ - twice that of the optimal. Suppose that instead, we could find a small ball D_i that contains enough points from S_i (which we call a good dense ball) so that x_i can serve the points of $S_i \setminus D_i$ without violating the uniform capacity. Then, we would only pay the radius of D_i for serving the points of D_i , in addition to the radius $2r_i + 2r_j$ for x_i . While [JKY24] rely on a matching argument to find low-cost balls, we use a concept of good dense balls and show that one can find them in FPT time. The key observation is that using the fact that C_i is so big, in FPT time we can find a dense ball D_i containing at least $n/20k^2$ points from C_i , with a radius of only r_i . As $|S_i| \leq |C_i| + |\mathcal{L}| \leq U + n/20k^2$, given such a dense ball D_i , we can serve the points in S_i using D_i and another ball centered at x_i of radius $2r_i + 2r_j$, and thus a total of $3r_i + 2r_j$ (compared to the $4r_i + 2r_j$ cost in our previous approach).

The crux of the above argument lies in efficiently finding such a good dense ball D_i . First note that such a dense ball exist: indeed, the ball of radius r_i centered at o_i contains $|C_i| \geq n/2k$ points from C_i . We begin by finding the densest ball \hat{D}_i of radius r_i in P . If we are lucky, it happens that $|\hat{D}_i \cap C_i| \geq n/20k^2$, meaning \hat{D}_i is a good dense ball for C_i , and we are done. If not, we temporarily delete all the points from \hat{D}_i and recursively find the densest ball of radius r_i among the remaining points. The key observation is that such recursion always finds a good dense ball within a depth of $4k$. To see this, note that each time we are unlucky, we delete fewer than $n/20k^2$ points from C_i . After $4k$ recursion levels, the number of points remaining in C_i is at least $n/2k - 4k \cdot n/20k^2 \geq n/4k$. This implies that $|\hat{D}_i| \geq n/4k$ at every recursion (as we are picking the densest possible ball), and hence the total number of points deleted after $4k$ levels of recursion is at least $4k \cdot n/4k = n$, which is a contradiction since C_i still contains $n/4k$ points.





Figure 5: Illustration of our algorithm for uniform Capacitated Sum of Diameters. The optimal solution consist of 3 heavy clusters $\mathcal{C}_H = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$, and 6 light clusters $\mathcal{C}_L = \{C_4, \dots, C_9\}$. Initially the algorithm guesses a set $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ of a single point from each heavy cluster, and let \mathcal{L} be all the points in light clusters. The ball $B_1 = \text{ball}(x_1, d_1)$ intersects the unsatisfied light clusters C_4, C_8 . $S_1 = C_1 \cup (\text{ball}(x_1, d_1 + d_4) \cap \mathcal{L})$ contains the points in C_1, C_4, C_5, C_8 , and subset of the points in C_6 . It holds that $|S_1| > U$ and hence we create two clusters to take care of all these points: C'_1 for C_1 , and \hat{C}_1 for $S_1 \setminus C_1$. C_4 and C_8 become satisfied, and we update $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{L} \setminus S_1$. Next we consider the ball $B_2 = \text{ball}(x_2, d_2)$. The ball B_2 does not intersects any unsatisfied cluster (C_8 is satisfied), and hence $S_2 = B_2$ and we create a single cluster C'_2 containing C_2 points only. Next we consider the ball $B_3 = \text{ball}(x_3, d_3)$ that intersects the unsatisfied light cluster C_7 . The set $S_3 = C_3 \cup (\text{ball}(x_3, d_3 + d_7) \cap \mathcal{L})$ contains the clusters C_3, C_7 and some of the points in C_8 . $|S_3| \leq U$, and thus we cover all S_3 points using a single cluster C'_3 . Finally, the set \mathcal{L} consist of subsets of points from C_6 and C_8 . We take care of those greedily by creating the clusters C'_{z_6} and C'_{z_8} .

Improvement for ℓ_p norm objectives. For CAPSOR with ℓ_p norm objective, our idea to get a better factor for ℓ_p norm is to fine tune the definition of a leader. Recall that for $B_i = \text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i)$, where $x_i \in X$ belongs to a heavy cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_H$, the leader C_j of B_i was chosen to be the cluster with maximum radius r_j among the unsatisfied light cluster intersecting B_i . Instead, we now define the leader of B_i to be an unsatisfied light cluster C_j intersecting $B_i = \text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i)$ with maximum radius such that its center o_j is in B_i . In the example on the right we consider a heavy cluster C_i , where we sampled a point $x_i \in C_i$ and consider the ball $B_i = \text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i)$. B_i intersects 3 light clusters (C_1, C_2, C_3) with radii $r_1 < r_2 < r_3$. The leader is C_2 because $o_2 \in B_i$ while $o_3 \notin B_i$. Thus, for a light cluster C_j , if its center o_j belongs to some “heavy ball” $\text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i)$ then C_j will be covered in this first phase of the algorithm. From the other hand, if C_j was not yet taken care of, then the eventual greedy process will take care of C_j . We formalize this notion by a concept called *Responsibility function* (see Definition 22). Note that in this case, we open two clusters: (1) D_i a cluster of radius at most r_i containing at least $n/20k^2$ points from C_i (good dense ball), and (2) a cluster C'_i containing the remaining points of C_i , and all the points from light clusters within the ball $\text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i + r_j)$, with radius $2r_i + r_j$ (instead of $2r_i + 2r_j$). Note that C'_i fully contain the leader of C_i , and thus we fully covered at least two clusters (and hence have enough budget on centers). Overall, we save a factor of r_j in the radius of the cluster centered at x_i . Note that this solution yields a 3 approximation w.r.t. the ℓ_∞ norm objective (Capacitated k -CENTER), which is our most significant contribution in this context (improving the 4-factor from [JKY24]). More generally, we get improvement for any ℓ_p norm objective (see inequality 1).



A.2 Notations and definitions

We denote by $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, U)$ an instance of uniform CAPSOR or uniform CAPSOD, depending upon the context. We denote by $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_k\}$ an optimal (but fixed) clustering¹² of \mathcal{I} . Without loss of generality, we assume that the clusters in \mathcal{C} are disjoint. When \mathcal{I} is an instance of uniform CAPSOR, we denote by r_i^* and o_i as the radius and the center of cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$, respectively, and let $O = \{o_1, \dots, o_k\}$. In this case, we let $\text{OPT} = r_1^* + \dots + r_k^*$. Note that, here \mathcal{C} is obtained from the assignment function $\sigma : P \rightarrow O$ of the optimal solution (O, σ) . When \mathcal{I} is an instance of uniform CAPSOD, we denote by d_i^* as the diameter of cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$. In this case, we let $\text{OPT} = d_1^* + \dots + d_k^*$. Finally, we assume we have ε -approximation $\{r_1, \dots, r_k\}$ of $\{r_1^*, \dots, r_k^*\}$ (for e.g., using Lemma 6). Similarly, let $\{d_1, \dots, d_k\}$ denote ε -approximation of $\{d_1^*, \dots, d_k^*\}$.

Once we have fixed an optimal clustering \mathcal{C} for \mathcal{I} , we can partition the clusters in \mathcal{C} depending upon their size as follows.

Definition 15 (Heavy, light, and almost-full clusters). *A cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ is said to be a heavy cluster if $|C_i| > n/20k^3$, otherwise it is said to be a light cluster. Furthermore, a heavy cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ is said to be almost-full if $|C_i| \geq n/2k$.*

Definition 16. *For $T \subseteq P$ and a cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$, we say T hits C_i if $T \cap C_i \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore, for $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, we say that T is a hitting set for \mathcal{C}' if T hits every cluster in \mathcal{C} .*

Remark 21. *We assume that $k \leq \sqrt[4]{n/30}$ (and hence, $n \geq 30$), otherwise $n < 30k^4$, and hence the brute force algorithm along with Lemma 3, running in FPT time in k exactly solves uniform CAPSOR. To see this, note that for CAPSOR, we can guess the set of optimal centers and the corresponding radii correctly in time¹³ $\binom{n}{k} n^{k+O(1)}$ which, in this case, is bounded by $2^{O(k \log k)}$.*

For the CAPSOD problem where $n < 30k^4$, we simply run the same algorithm as above (for CAPSOR) and return the obtained balls with matching as clusters (with the same matching) using Lemma 5. This will be a 2-approximation (which is better than the guaranteed $4+\varepsilon$ approximation).

A.3 CapSoD

The psuedo-code of our algorithm is presented in Algorithm 9, which is based on the ideas presented in Section 2. For the analysis of the algorithm, we make the following assumption. Later, when we prove Theorem 5 in Appendix A.3.2, we show how to remove this assumption.

Assumption 2. *All the guesses of Algorithm 9 are correct.*

A.3.1 Analysis

Consider $X \subseteq P$, the hitting set for heavy clusters \mathcal{C}_H obtained by the Algorithm 9 at Step 6, and $Z \subseteq P$, the hitting set for subset \mathcal{C}'_L of light clusters in \mathcal{C}_L processed by the algorithm at Step 9. Let \mathcal{C}_{hit} be the set of clusters hit by $X \cup Z$. Then, note that each cluster in \mathcal{C}_{hit} is hit exactly by one point in $X \cup Z$. We will use the following definitions that simplify the exposition.

¹²For ease of analysis, we assume that $|\mathcal{C}| = k$, otherwise, we can add zero radius clusters to make it k , without increasing the cost. Another way, which is used in Algorithm 9 and Algorithm 10, is to guess $|\mathcal{C}|$ which results into at most k different choices.

¹³First guess the centers, there are $\binom{n}{k}$ options. Next for each center x , guess the furthest points p assigned to x . There are n options (and each such choice determines the corresponding cluster radius). Overall, there are $\binom{n}{k} n^k$ possible guesses. We can go over them one by one, checking for each guess whether it is feasible using Lemma 3, and thus find the optimum.

Definition 17. For a heavy cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$, let $x_i \in X$ such that $X \cap C_i = x_i$. We call $\text{ball}(x_i, d_i)$, the ball of C_i with respect to X and denote it by B_i . Similarly, for a light cluster $C_t \in \mathcal{C}$ hit by Z , we call $B_t := \text{ball}(z_t, d_t)$, the ball of C_t with respect to Z , where $z_t = Z \cap C_t$.

Algorithm 9: $4 + \varepsilon$ approximation algorithm for uniform CAPSOD

Data: Instance $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, U)$ of Uniform CAPSOD, $\varepsilon > 0$
Result: A $4 + \varepsilon$ approximate solution $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$

- 1 Guess the number of clusters k' in \mathcal{C} ;
- 2 Guess $\mathcal{C}_H, \mathcal{C}_F, \mathcal{C}_L$, the set of heavy, almost-full, and light clusters in \mathcal{C} , respectively;
- 3 Let $C'_i, \hat{C}_i \leftarrow \emptyset, i \in [k']$;
- 4 Let $X \leftarrow \emptyset, Z \leftarrow \emptyset$;
- 5 Guess $D = \{d_1, \dots, d_{k'}\}$, an ε -approximation of optimal diameters;
- 6 **foreach** $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_H$ **do** guess a point x_i from C_i and add x_i to X ;
- 7 Let $P' \leftarrow P \setminus \bigcup_{x_i \in X} \text{ball}(x_i, d_i)$;
- 8 **while** $P' \neq \emptyset$ **do**
- 9 pick a point $z \in P'$ and add z to Z ;
- 10 guess the cluster $C_z \in \mathcal{C}$ containing z and $P' \leftarrow P' \setminus \text{ball}(z, d_z)$;
- 11 **end**
- 12 Guess the responsibility function $\Gamma : \mathcal{C}_L \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{hit}$; // $\mathcal{C}_{hit} := \{C \in \mathcal{C} \text{ hit by } X \cup Z\}$
- 13 **foreach** $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}$ **do**
- 14 let $a \in X \cup Z$ such that $a \in C_i$;
- 15 set $C'_i = \text{ball}(a, d_i + \ell(d_i))$; // $\ell(d_i) := \max_{C_t \in \Gamma^{-1}(C_i)} \text{diam}(C_t)$
- 16 **if** $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_F$ **and** $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i) \neq \emptyset$ **then** set $\hat{C}_i = \text{ball}(a, d_i)$;
- 17 **end**
- 18 Let \mathcal{C}' be the collection of C'_i and \hat{C}_i which are non-empty;
- 19 **if** \mathcal{C}' is feasible for \mathcal{I} **then return** $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ obtained from Lemma 5;
- 20 **fail**;

Definition 18 (Responsibility function, leader). Consider a cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ hit by $a_i \in X \cup Z$ and the corresponding ball B_i of C_i with respect to $X \cup Z$. For a light cluster $C_t \in \mathcal{C}$, we say that C_i is responsible for C_t in $X \cup Z$ if $\delta(p, a_i) \leq d_i + d_t$ for every $p \in C_t$. If there are multiple responsible clusters for C_t , then we break ties arbitrarily and pick one. Without loss of generality, we assume that a light cluster hit by Z is responsible for itself. Also, note that by construction of X and Z , we have that for every light cluster, there is a responsible cluster hit by $X \cup Z$. For a light cluster C_t , let $\Gamma(C_t)$ denote the responsible cluster in $X \cup Z$ and hence, $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i)$ denotes the set of responsibilities (light clusters) of cluster C_i that is hit by $X \cup Z$. Finally, we call a cluster with maximum diameter in $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i)$ as a leader of clusters in $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i)$ and denote its diameter by $\ell(d_i)$. If $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i) = \emptyset$, we define $\ell(d_i) = 0$.

See Figure 6 for a pictorial illustration. The following lemma bounds the guarantee of Algorithm 9.

Lemma 22. Assumption 2 implies that Step 19 successfully finds a feasible solution $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ using \mathcal{C}' with cost $4(1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}$ in time $n^{O(1)}$.

Proof. First note that $|\mathcal{C}'| \leq k'$, since any \hat{C}_i that is added to \mathcal{C}' can be charged to a cluster in $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i)$, as $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i) \neq \emptyset$. We partition the clusters in \mathcal{C}_{hit} into two parts, as follows.




Figure 6: Figure 6a shows an example with $k = 4$ clusters – each corresponding to a specific shape. Furthermore, the clusters with dark blue points correspond to heavy clusters, while cluster with green points correspond to light clusters. In Figure 6b, the red colored points are the sampled points from the heavy clusters and the red dotted balls correspond to balls centered at the sampled points of radius equal to the diameter of the corresponding cluster. Note that, in this case, the light clusters are hidden since they are completely covered by the red dotted balls. Figure 6c illustrates different choice of sampled points (marked in red) from the heavy clusters. As it can be seen, the red dotted balls of the heavy clusters do not cover all the points and hence, the light cluster of squares is exposed and a point from it is chosen to cover it. In Figure 6d, the first row and second row shows the responsibility function Γ due to the red points of Figure 6b and Figure 6c, respectively.

Definition 19. We call cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ hit by $X \cup Z$, a special cluster if $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_F$ and $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i) \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise, we call C_i , a regular cluster.

For $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}$, let $\mathcal{T}_i = C_i \cup \bigcup_{C_t \in \Gamma^{-1}(C_i)} C_t$. Then, note that $\{\mathcal{T}_i\}_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}}$ partitions the set P . Also, note that $|\mathcal{T}_i| \leq U$ for a regular cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}$. This is because, in this case, $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_L$ or $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_H \setminus \mathcal{C}_F$ or $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i) = \emptyset$, and hence $|\mathcal{T}_i| \leq U$. Consider \mathcal{C}' constructed by the algorithm. Then, note that for every cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}$, there is a set $C'_i \in \mathcal{C}'$. Further, if C_i is a special cluster, then there is an additional set $\hat{C}_i \in \mathcal{C}'$.

We show that \mathcal{C}' is a feasible set for \mathcal{I} (see Definition 9) by showing a feasible solution $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ corresponding to \mathcal{C}' , abusing the notation that is used in Step 19. Therefore, Step 19 is successful and returns a feasible solution $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ for \mathcal{I} such that $\text{diamcost}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \text{diamcost}(\mathcal{C}')$. As argued before, we have $|\mathcal{C}'| \leq k' \leq k$. Hence, it is sufficient to assign points from each \mathcal{T}_i 's to a specific cluster $\tilde{C}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ without violating the uniform capacity, since \mathcal{T}_i 's form a partition of P and $\mathcal{T}_i \subseteq C'_i$ or $\mathcal{T}_i \subseteq \hat{C}_i$. Consider a regular cluster C_i , then define $\tilde{C}_i = \mathcal{T}_i$. Note that the number of points in the cluster \tilde{C}_i is at most $|\mathcal{T}_i| \leq U$, since C_i is a regular cluster. Also, $\text{diam}(\tilde{C}_i) \leq 2(d_i + \ell(d_i))$.

Now, consider a special cluster C_i and the corresponding sets C'_i and \hat{C}_i in \mathcal{C}' . Let $C_j \in \mathcal{C}$

be the leader of $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i)$. Let $D'_i \subseteq C_i$ such that¹⁴ $|D'_i| = n/20k^2$. Then, define $\tilde{C}_i = D'_i$ and define $\tilde{C}_j = \mathcal{T}_j \setminus D'_i$. In this case, we have $|\tilde{C}_i| \leq n/20k^2 \leq U$ and $|\tilde{C}_j| \leq |\mathcal{T}_j \setminus D'_i| \leq U$. Finally, $\text{diam}(\tilde{C}_j) \leq 2d_i$ and $\text{diam}(\tilde{C}_i) \leq 2d_i + 2d_j$.

Cost of \mathcal{C}' . We first analyze the cost \mathcal{C}' for ℓ_1 objective function, which is uniform CAP-SOD. We have, in this case, $\text{diamcost}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \sum_{C'_i \in \mathcal{C}'} \text{diam}(C'_i) + \sum_{\hat{C}_i \in \mathcal{C}'} \text{diam}(\hat{C}_i) = \text{diamcost}(\mathcal{C}')$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{diamcost}(\mathcal{C}') &= \sum_{C'_i \in \mathcal{C}'} \text{diam}(C'_i) + \sum_{\hat{C}_i \in \mathcal{C}'} \text{diam}(\hat{C}_i) \leq \sum_{C'_i \in \mathcal{C}'} (2d_i + 2\ell(d_i)) + \sum_{\hat{C}_i \in \mathcal{C}'} 2d_i \\ &\leq \sum_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}} (4d_i + 2\ell(d_i)) \leq 4 \sum_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}} d_i, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows since the leaders are pairwise disjoint as $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i)$ are pairwise disjoint, for $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}$. Therefore, $\text{diamcost}(\mathcal{C}') \leq 4(1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}$, and hence the cost of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ returned by the algorithm at Step 19 is $\text{diamcost}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq 4(1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}$.

Now consider ℓ_p objective function, for $p \geq 1$. We have, $\text{diamcost}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq (\sum_{C'_i \in \mathcal{C}'} \text{diam}(C'_i)^p + \sum_{\hat{C}_i \in \mathcal{C}'} \text{diam}(\hat{C}_i)^p)^{1/p} = \text{diamcost}(\mathcal{C}')$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{diamcost}(\mathcal{C}')}{(\sum_{i \in [k']} (d_i)^p)^{1/p}} &\leq \left(\frac{\sum_{C'_i \in \mathcal{C}'} (2d_i + 2\ell(d_i))^p + \sum_{\hat{C}_i \in \mathcal{C}'} 2^p (d_i)^p}{\sum_{i \in [k']} (d_i)^p} \right)^{1/p} \\ &= 2^p \left(\frac{\sum_{C'_i \in \mathcal{C}'} (d_i + \ell(d_i))^p + \sum_{\hat{C}_i \in \mathcal{C}'} (d_i)^p}{\sum_{i \in [k']} (d_i)^p} \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq 2^p \left(\frac{\sum_{C'_i \in \mathcal{C}'} 2^{p-1} ((d_i)^p + (\ell(d_i))^p) + \sum_{\hat{C}_i \in \mathcal{C}'} (d_i)^p}{\sum_{i \in [k']} (d_i)^p} \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq 2^p (2^{p-1} + 1) \left(\frac{\sum_{i \in [k']} (d_i)^p}{\sum_{i \in [k']} (d_i)^p} \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq 2(2^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\text{diamcost}(\mathcal{C}') \leq 2(2^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{i \in [k']} (d_i)^p \right)^{1/p} \leq 2(1 + \varepsilon)(2^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{i \in [k']} (d_i^*)^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

When the objective is a monotone symmetric norm of the cluster diameters, then this gives $(4 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation.

Finally, note that the running time of Algorithm 10 is $n^{O(1)}$, since the overall algorithm is linear except Step 19 which requires time $n^{O(1)}$. \square

A.3.2 Proof of Theorem 5

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 5. Note that it is sufficient to show how to remove Assumption 2 in Lemma 22. We think of Algorithm 9 as a linear program that has access to a guess

¹⁴Such D'_i is feasible since $|C_i| \geq n/2k$.

function and we will transform it to a branching program without guess function. We show how to replace the guess function. The algorithm makes the following guesses.

- E1 Guess $|O|$ and the clusters in $\mathcal{C}_H, \mathcal{C}_F$, and \mathcal{C}_L . This can be done by enumerating $k2^k2^k = 2^{O(k)}$ choices.
- E2 Guess an ε -approximation of optimal diameters. This can be obtained by enumerating $(k/\varepsilon)^{O(k)}n^2$ choices given by [Lemma 6](#).
- E3 Guess the responsibility function $\Gamma : \mathcal{C}_L \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{hit}$. Although, this process depends on (E4) $(X \cup Z)$, but we can enumerate all k^k choices for Γ and later work with only those that are compatible with (E4)
- E4 Guess a point from each heavy cluster. Towards this, we sample a point from every heavy cluster with probability at least $(20k^3)^{-k}$, since a heavy cluster contains at least $n/20k^3$ points. We repeat this sampling procedure $t = (20k^3)^k$ times and create a branch for each repetition. Hence, the probability that at least one branch of the executions correspond to hitting set for \mathcal{C}_H (good branch) is $\geq 1 - (1 - (20k^3)^{-k})^t \geq 1 - e^{t(20k^3)^{-k}} > 3/5$. Thus (E4) results in $(20k^3)^k$ branches such that the probability that there exists a good branch in these executions is $3/5$.

As mentioned above, we transform the linear execution of [Algorithm 9](#) into a branching program by replacing each guess function with a (probabilistic) branching subroutine. Hence, we obtain an algorithm that successfully finds a $4(1+\varepsilon)$ -approximate solution \tilde{C} with probability $3/5$ with running time $2^{O(k)}(k/\varepsilon)^{O(k)}k^k(20k^3)^kn^{O(1)} = 2^{O(k \log(k/\varepsilon))}n^{O(1)}$.

A.4 CapSoR

The psuedo-code of our algorithm is presented in [Algorithm 10](#). The basic framework is similar to [Algorithm 9](#) for uniform CAPSOD. First, find a hitting set for heavy clusters and uncovered light clusters. Then, for regular clusters, assign the points from the corresponding clusters to the hitting set. For special clusters, open another cluster (center) to serve the extra points. It is not hard to see that [Algorithm 9](#) can be easily modified to get $(4 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation even for uniform CAPSOR. However, to get factor $(3 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation, we use the following crucial concept of good dense ball.

Definition 20 (Good Dense Ball for C_i). *For a cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}, p \in P$, and a positive real r , we say that $\text{ball}(p, r)$ is a good dense ball for C_i if $|\text{ball}(p, r) \cap C_i| \geq n/20k^2$ and $p \notin O \setminus \{o_i\}$.*

For the analysis of the algorithm, we make the following assumption. Later, when we prove [Theorem 4](#) in [Appendix A.4.2](#), we show how to remove this assumption.

Assumption 3. *All the guesses of [Algorithm 10](#) are correct. Moreover, the points guessed by the algorithm at Step 5 from heavy clusters are disjoint from the optimal centers O , i.e., $X \cap O = \emptyset$.*

Algorithm 10: $3 + \varepsilon$ approximation algorithm for uniform CAPSOR

Data: Instance $\mathcal{I} = ((P, \delta), k, U)$ of Uniform CAPSOR. $\varepsilon > 0$

Result: A $3 + \varepsilon$ approximate solution (S, σ)

```
1 Guess the number of clusters  $k'$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ ;  
2 Guess  $\mathcal{C}_H, \mathcal{C}_F, \mathcal{C}_L$  the set of heavy, almost-full, and light clusters in  $\mathcal{C}$ , respectively;  
3 Let  $\mathcal{S} = (\emptyset, 0), F \leftarrow P, X \leftarrow \emptyset, Z \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;;  
4 Guess  $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_{k'}\}$ , an  $\varepsilon$ -approximation of optimal radii;  
5 foreach  $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_H$  do guess a point  $x_i$  from  $C_i$  and add  $x_i$  to  $X$ ;  
6 Let  $P' \leftarrow P \setminus \bigcup_{x_i \in X} \text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i)$ ;  
7 while  $P' \neq \emptyset$  do  
8   | pick a point  $z \in P'$ ;  
9   | add  $z$  to  $Z$ ;  
10  | guess the cluster  $C_z \in \mathcal{C}$  containing  $z$  and  $P' \leftarrow P' \setminus \text{ball}(z, 2r_z)$ ;  
11 end  
12 Guess the responsibility function  $\Gamma : \mathcal{C}_L \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{hit}$ ; //  $\mathcal{C}_{hit} := \{C \in \mathcal{C} \text{ hit by } X \cup Z\}$   
13 foreach  $a_i \in X \cup Z$  do  
14   | let  $C_i$  be the cluster hit by  $a_i$ ;  
15   | add  $(a_i, 2r_i + \ell(r_i))$  to  $\mathcal{S}$ ; //  $\ell(r_i) := \max_{C_t \in \Gamma^{-1}(C_i)} \text{rad}(o_t)$   
16 end  
17  $F \leftarrow F \setminus (X \cup Z)$ ;  
18 Mark all  $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_F$  such that  $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i) \neq \emptyset$ ;  
19 while  $\exists$  a marked cluster  $C_i$  do  
20   |  $\text{ball}(y_i, r_i) \leftarrow \text{FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL}(\text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i), r_i)$ ;  
21   | add  $(y_i, r_i)$  to  $\mathcal{S}$ ;  
22   | unmark  $C_i$  and  $F \leftarrow F \setminus \{y_i\}$ ;  
23 end  
24 if  $\mathcal{S}$  is feasible for  $\mathcal{I}$  then return  $(S, \sigma)$  obtained from Lemma 3;  
25 fail;
```

Algorithm 11: FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL($\text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i), r_i$)

```
1  $P'' \leftarrow P$ ;  
2 for  $4k$  times do  
3   | Let  $D_i = \text{ball}_{P''}(y_i, r_i), y_i \in F$  be a densest ball contained within  $\text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i)$ ;  
4   | guess if  $|D_i \cap C_i| \geq n/20k^2$  and  $y_i \notin O \setminus \{o_i\}$  then return  $D_i$ ;  
5   | else  $P'' \leftarrow P'' \setminus D_i$ ;  
6 end  
7 fail;
```

A.4.1 Analysis

The analysis is similar to that of uniform CAPSOD. Consider $X \subseteq P$, the hitting set for heavy clusters \mathcal{C}_H obtained by the Algorithm 10 at Step 5, and $Z \subseteq P$, the hitting set for subset \mathcal{C}'_L of light clusters in \mathcal{C}_L processed by the algorithm at Step 10. We have the similar definitions from the

analysis of uniform CAPSOD.

Definition 21. For a heavy cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$, let $x_i \in X$ such that $X \cap C_i = x_i$. We call $\text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i)$, the ball of C_i with respect to X and denote it by B_i . Similarly, for a light cluster $C_t \in \mathcal{C}$ hit by Z , we call $B_t := \text{ball}(z_t, 2r_t)$, the ball of C_t with respect to Z , where $z_t = Z \cap C_t$.

Definition 22 (Responsibility function, leaders). Consider a cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ hit by $X \cup Z$ and the corresponding ball B_i of C_i with respect to $X \cup Z$. For a light cluster $C_t \in \mathcal{C}$, we say that C_i is responsible for C_t in $X \cup Z$ if $o_t \in B_i$. If there are multiple responsible clusters for C_t , then we break ties arbitrarily and pick one. Without loss of generality, we assume that a light cluster hit by Z is responsible for itself. Also, note that by construction of X and Z , we have that for every light cluster, there is a responsible cluster hit by $X \cup Z$. For a light cluster C_t , let $\Gamma(C_t)$ denote the responsible cluster in $X \cup Z$ and hence, $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i)$ denotes the set of responsibilities (light clusters) of cluster C_i that is hit by $X \cup Z$. Finally, we say a cluster with maximum radius in $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i)$ as a leader of clusters in $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i)$ and denote its radius by $\ell(r_i)$. If $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i) = \emptyset$, we define $\ell(r_i) = 0$.

The following claim asserts that **FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL**(Algorithm 11) runs at most $4k$ times before finding a good dense ball for $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$, when invoked on input $(\text{ball}(x_i, 2r_i), r_i)$.

Claim 23. Let $\mathcal{C}_p = \{C_{i_1}, C_{i_2}, \dots\}$ be the almost-full clusters processed by Algorithm 10 in that order, and let $x_{i_j} \in C_{i_j} \cap X$. Then, Assumption 3 implies that on input $(\text{ball}(x_{i_j}, 2r_{i_j}), r_{i_j})$, the subroutine **FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL** finds a good dense ball for $C_{i_j} \in \mathcal{C}_p$ within $4k$ iterations.

Proof. We prove that Assumption 3 implies the following during the execution of while loop at Step 19. For $j \in [|\mathcal{C}_p|]$, when the while loop at Step 19 is processing C_{i_j} , it holds that

1. On input $(\text{ball}(x_{i_j}, 2r_{i_j}), r_{i_j})$, the subroutine **FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL** finds a good dense ball for C_{i_j} within $4k$ iterations.
2. For $j' > j$, we have $o_{i_{j'}} \in F$, after Step 22. That is, $o_{i_{j'}}$ is available in F when $C_{i_{j'}}$ is processed in the future iterations.

Let $S_{i_j} = \text{ball}(x_{i_j}, 2r_{i_j})$ and note that $C_{i_j} \subseteq S_{i_j}$. Also, let $F_j \subseteq F$ denote the points in F when C_{i_j} is processed at Step 19. Consider $j = 1$ and note that $o_{i_1} \notin X \cup Z$ due to Assumption 3, and hence $o_{i_1} \in F_1$. Now, consider the execution of **FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL** $(\text{ball}(x_{i_1}, r_{i_1}), r_{i_1})$ for the first $4k$ iterations. Let d_1^ℓ be the size of the densest ball within $S_{i_1} \cap P''$ centered at a point in $((S_{i_1} \cap F_1) \setminus O) \cup \{o_{i_1}\}$ after iteration $\ell \leq 4k$. Then, note that $d_1^\ell > \max\{\frac{n}{2k} - \frac{n\ell}{20k^2}, 0\} \geq 1$, since the number of points remaining in C_{i_1} after ℓ iterations is at least $\max\{\frac{n}{2k} - \frac{n\ell}{20k^2}, 0\} \geq 1$ and $o_i \in F_1$, due to Assumption 3. Thus, after every iteration $\ell \in [4k]$, the algorithm deletes at least $\frac{n}{2k} - \frac{n\ell}{20k^2} > \frac{3n}{10k} \geq 1$ many points from S_{i_1} . Hence, after $\ell = 4k$ iterations, the total number of points deleted from S_{i_1} is

$$> \sum_{t=1}^{4k} \left(\frac{n}{2k} - \frac{nt}{20k^2} \right) > \frac{3n}{10k} \cdot 4k > n.$$

On the other hand, the number of points remaining in C_{i_1} is at least $\frac{n}{2k} - \frac{4n}{20k} > \frac{n}{20k^2} \geq 1$, resulting in a contradiction. Furthermore, note that the center y_{i_1} of the good dense ball for C_{i_1} returned by **FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL** is such that $y_{i_1} \notin O \setminus \{o_{i_1}\}$, and hence for $j' > 1$, we have $o_{i_{j'}} \in F$, after Step 22. This concludes the base case of the induction. Now we assume that the above two points

are true for all $j < |\mathcal{C}_p|$, and consider the processing of C_{i_j} at Step 19. From induction hypothesis (2), we have that $o_{i_j} \in F_j$. And hence, the above argument implies that $d_j^\ell > \max\{\frac{n}{2k} - \frac{n\ell}{20k^2}, 0\} \geq 1$, since the number of points remaining in C_{i_j} after ℓ iterations is at least $\max\{\frac{n}{2k} - \frac{n\ell}{20k^2}, 0\} \geq 1$. Thus, after every iteration $\ell \in [4k]$, the algorithm deletes at least $\frac{n}{2k} - \frac{n\ell}{20k^2} > \frac{3n}{10k} \geq 1$ many points from S_{i_j} . Hence, after $\ell = 4k$ iterations, the total number of points deleted from S_{i_j} is

$$> \sum_{t=1}^{4k} \left(\frac{n}{2k} - \frac{nt}{20k^2} \right) > \frac{3n}{10k} \cdot 4k > n.$$

On the other hand, the number of points remaining in C_{i_j} is at least $\frac{n}{2k} - \frac{4n}{20k} > \frac{n}{20k^2} \geq 1$, resulting in a contradiction. Finally, note that the center y_{i_j} of the good dense ball for C_{i_j} returned by FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL is such that $y_{i_j} \notin O \setminus \{o_{i_j}\}$, and hence for $j' > j$, we have $o_{i_{j'}} \in F$, after Step 22. □

Now we can bound the guarantee of Algorithm 10.

Lemma 24. *Assumption 3 implies that Step 24 successfully finds a feasible solution (S, σ) using \mathcal{S} with cost $3(1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}$ in time $n^{O(1)}$.*

Proof. We partition the clusters in \mathcal{C}_{hit} into two parts, as follows.

Definition 23. *We call cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ hit by $X \cup Z$, a special cluster if $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_F$ and $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i) \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise, we call C_i , a regular cluster.*

For $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}$, let $\mathcal{T}_i = C_i \cup \bigcup_{C_t \in \Gamma^{-1}(C_i)} C_t$. Then, note that $\{\mathcal{T}_i\}_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}}$ partitions the set P . Also, note that $|\mathcal{T}_i| \leq U$ for a regular cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}$. This is because, in this case, $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_L$ or $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_H \setminus \mathcal{C}_F$ or $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i) = \emptyset$, and hence $|\mathcal{T}_i| \leq U$. Consider \mathcal{S} constructed by the algorithm. Then, note that for every cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}$, there is a entry $(a_i, 2r_i + \ell(r_i))$ in \mathcal{S} , added by the algorithm at Step 15. Further, if C_i is a special cluster, then there is an additional entry (y_i, r_i) in \mathcal{S} , added at Step 21. Let Y be the set of points y_i corresponding to the additional entries of special clusters. Note that by construction, the sets X , Y , and Z are pairwise disjoint.

Intuition. Consider $a_i \in X \cup Z$ and let $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}$ hit by a_i . The key idea is that if C_i is a regular cluster, then a_i can serve all the points in \mathcal{T}_i without violating the uniform capacity and within radius $2r_i + \ell(r_i)$, since $|\mathcal{T}_i| \leq U$, as reasoned above. If C_i is special, then it can happen that the number of points in \mathcal{T}_i is larger than U , violating the uniform capacity. But, in this case, as mentioned above, there is an additional entry (y_i, r_i) in \mathcal{S} . Further, Claim 23 guarantees that $\text{ball}(y_i, r_i)$ is a good dense ball for C_i , and hence we have $|\text{ball}(y_i, r_i) \cap C_i| \geq n/20k^2$. Therefore, in this case $y_i \in Y$ can serve $n/20k^2$ points D'_i from C_i within radius r_i , while a_i can serve the remaining points in \mathcal{T}_i . Note that, $|\mathcal{T}_i \setminus D'_i| \leq |\mathcal{T}_i| - |D'_i| \leq |C_i|$. Since, \mathcal{T}_i 's form a partition of P , the total cost of this assignment is at most $3 \sum_{i \in [k']} r_i \leq 3(1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}$, as desired. Also, note that the number of centers opened is at most $k' \leq k$.

Now, we prove the above intuition formally. Let $S = X \cup Y \cup Z$ and note that $|S| \leq k'$ since $|X| + |Z| \leq k'$ and $|Y| \leq k' - (|X| + |Z|)$. We will show an assignment $\sigma' : P \rightarrow S$ such that (S, σ') is feasible for \mathcal{I} with $\text{cost}((S, \sigma')) \leq \text{cost}(\mathcal{S})$. Therefore, Step 24 is successful and returns a feasible solution (S, σ) for \mathcal{I} such that $\text{cost}((S, \sigma)) \leq \text{cost}(\mathcal{S})$. Towards this, it is sufficient to assign points

from each \mathcal{T}_i 's to a specific center in S without violating the uniform capacity, since \mathcal{T}_i 's form a partition of P . Consider a regular cluster C_i and let $s_i \in S$ be such that $s_i \in C_i$. For $p \in \mathcal{T}_i$, define,

$$\sigma'(p) = s_i.$$

Note that $|\sigma'^{-1}(s_i)| \leq |\mathcal{T}_i| \leq U$, since C_i is a regular cluster. Also, $\text{rad}(s_i) \leq 2r_i + \ell(r_i)$. Now, consider a special cluster C_i and let $(s_i, 2r_i + \ell(r_i))$ and (y_i, r_i) be the entries corresponding to C_i in \mathcal{S} , where $s_i \in X$ and $y_i \in Y$. Recall that $\text{ball}(y_i, r_i)$ returned by the subroutine **FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL**($\text{ball}(s_i, 2r_i), r_i$) at Step 20 is a good dense ball for C_i , due to Claim 23. Hence, we have $|\text{ball}(y_i, r_i) \cap C_i| \geq n/20k^2$. Let $D'_i \subseteq D_i \cap C_i$ such that $|D'_i| = n/20k^2$. For $p \in \mathcal{T}_i$, define

$$\sigma'(p) = \begin{cases} y_i & \text{if } p \in D'_i, \\ s_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In this case, we have $|\sigma'^{-1}(y_i)| \leq n/20k^2 \leq U$ and $|\sigma'^{-1}(s_i)| \leq |\mathcal{T}_i \setminus D'_i| \leq U$. Finally, $\text{rad}(y_i) \leq r_i$ and $\text{rad}(s_i) \leq 2r_i + \ell(r_i)$.

Cost of (S, σ') . We first analyze the cost (S, σ) for ℓ_1 objective function, which is uniform CAPSOR. We have, in this case, $\text{cost}((S, \sigma')) \leq \sum_{s_i \in X \cup Z} \text{rad}(s_i) + \sum_{y_i \in Y} \text{rad}(y_i) = \text{cost}(\mathcal{S})$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cost}(\mathcal{S}) &= \sum_{s_i \in X \cup Z} \text{rad}(s_i) + \sum_{y_i \in Y} \text{rad}(y_i) \leq \sum_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}} (2r_i + \ell(r_i)) + \sum_{C_j \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}: C_j \text{ is special}} r_j \\ &\leq \sum_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}} (3r_i + \ell(r_i)) \leq 3 \sum_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}} r_i, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows since the leaders are pairwise disjoint as $\Gamma^{-1}(C_i)$ are pairwise disjoint, for $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}$. Therefore, $\text{cost}(\mathcal{S}) \leq 3(1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}$, and hence the cost of (S, σ) returned by the algorithm at Step 24 is $\text{cost}((S, \sigma)) \leq 3(1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}$.

Now consider ℓ_p objective function, for $p \geq 1$. We have, $\text{cost}((S, \sigma')) \leq (\sum_{s_i \in X \cup Z} \text{rad}(s_i)^p + \sum_{y_i \in Y} \text{rad}(y_i)^p)^{1/p} = \text{cost}(\mathcal{S})$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{cost}(\mathcal{S})}{(\sum_{i \in [k']} (r_i)^p)^{1/p}} &\leq \left(\frac{\sum_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}} (2r_i + \ell(r_i))^p + \sum_{C_j \text{ is special}} r_j^p}{\sum_{i \in [k']} (r_i)^p} \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \max_{C_i \text{ is special}} \left(\frac{(2r_i + \ell(r_i))^p + r_i^p}{(r_i)^p + (\ell(r_i))^p} \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq (2 \cdot 3^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Please refer Appendix B for details about the last step. Hence, we have

$$\text{cost}(\mathcal{S}) \leq (2 \cdot 3^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{i \in [k']} (r_i)^p \right)^{1/p} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) (2 \cdot 3^{p-1} + 1)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{i \in [k']} (r_i^*)^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

In fact, for specific values of p , we obtain better factors than the one obtained from the above closed form.

Remark 25. For specific values of p , we obtain better factors than the above mentioned closed form. For instance, for $p = 2$ and 3 , we obtain factors ≈ 2.414 and ≈ 2.488 , respectively, instead of ≈ 2.65 and ≈ 2.67 obtained from the closed form. For comparison, optimizing the final expression of [JKY24], $\left(\frac{\sum_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{hit}} (2r_i + 2\ell(r_i))^p + \sum_{C_j \text{ is special}} r_j^p}{\sum_{i \in [k']} (r_i^*)^p}\right)^{1/p}$, for $p = 2$ and 3 , yields factors ≈ 2.92 and ≈ 3.191 .

When the objective is a monotone symmetric norm of the cluster radii, then this gives $(3 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation.

Finally, note that the running time of Algorithm 10 is $n^{O(1)}$, since each iteration of the *while* loop unmarks at least one marked cluster, and hence runs at most k times. □

A.4.2 Proof of Theorem 4

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 4. Again, as in Appendix A.3, note that it is sufficient to show how to remove Assumption 3 in Lemma 24. We think of Algorithm 10 as a linear program that has access to a guess function and we will transform it to a branching program without guess function. We show how to replace the guess function. The algorithm makes the following guesses.

- E1 Guess $|O|$ and the clusters in $\mathcal{C}_H, \mathcal{C}_F$, and \mathcal{C}_L . This can be done by enumerating $k2^k2^k = 2^{O(k)}$ choices.
- E2 Guess an ε -approximate radius profile of the clusters in \mathcal{C} . This can be obtained by enumerating $(k/\varepsilon)^{O(k)}n^2$ choices using Lemma 6.
- E3 Guess the responsibility function $\Gamma : \mathcal{C}_L \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{hit}$. Although, this process depends on (E4) $(X \cup Z)$, but we can enumerate all k^k choices for Γ and later work with only those that are compatible with (E4)
- E4 Guess a point from each heavy cluster. We sample a point from every heavy cluster with probability at least $(20k^3)^{-k}$, since a heavy cluster contains at least $n/20k^3$ points. However, for Assumption 3, we want that $X \cap O = \emptyset$. But, since $|O| \leq k$, we have

$$\Pr_{x_i \sim P} [x_i \in C_i \text{ and } x_i \notin O] \geq \frac{n/20k^3 - k}{n} \geq \frac{1}{60k^3},$$

since $k \leq \sqrt[4]{n/30}$. Therefore, with probability at least $(60k^3)^{-k}$, we sample X that hits every heavy cluster such that $X \cap O = \emptyset$. Let $k'' \leq k$ be the number of heavy clusters in \mathcal{C} . We say a k'' -tuple $A \in P^{k''}$ is *good* if $|A \cap C_i| = 1$ for all $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_H$ and $X \cap O = \emptyset$. We repeat the above sampling $t = (60k^3)^k$ times and create a branch for each repetition. Hence, the probability that at least one branch of the executions correspond to good k'' -tuples is $\geq 1 - (1 - (60k^3)^{-k})^t \geq 1 - e^{-t(60k^3)^{-k}} > 3/5$. Thus (E4) results in $(60k^3)^k$ branches such that the probability that there exists a good k'' -tuple in these executions is $3/5$.

- E5 Guesses in FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL. Note that there are two sub-conditions in the *if* statement - event (A) when $|D_i \cap C_i| \geq n/20k^2$ and event (B) when $y_i \notin O \setminus \{o_i\}$. Hence, for each D_i obtained at Step 3, there are 4 possible outcomes - $(A, B), (\neg A, B), (A, \neg B), (\neg A, \neg B)$. Thus, for each iteration of the *for* loop, we create 4 branches. Since, there are $4k$ iterations, we have

at most 4^{4k} many different executions such that at least one of them correctly computes a good dense ball for C_i ([Claim 23](#)). Furthermore, `FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL` is invoked at most k times, and hence, we have at most 4^{4k^2} many executions such that at least one of them computes a good dense ball for every C_i for which `FIND-GOOD-DENSE-BALL` is invoked.

As mentioned above, we transform the linear execution of [Algorithm 10](#) (and [Algorithm 3](#)) into a branching program by replacing each guess function with a (probabilistic) branching subroutine. Hence, we obtain an algorithm that successfully finds a $3(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution (S, σ) with probability $3/5$ with running time $2^{O(k)}(k/\varepsilon)^{O(k)}k^k(60k^3)^k4^{4k^2}n^{O(1)} = 2^{O(k^2+k \log(k/\varepsilon))}n^{O(1)}$.

B Omitted Proof

We want to show the following.

Lemma 26. *For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $p \geq 1$,*

$$\left(\frac{(2x + y)^p + x^p}{x^p + y^p} \right) \leq (2 \cdot 3^{p-1} + 1)$$

Proof. Consider the case when $y \geq x$. In this case, we will “charge” the cost of x to y as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} (2x + y)^p + x^p &\leq (x/2 + 3x/2 + y)^p + x^p \\ &\leq (3y/2 + 3x/2)^p + x^p \quad \text{since } x \leq y \\ &\leq \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^p 2^{p-1}(x^p + y^p) + x^p \\ &\leq \left(\frac{3^p}{2} + 1\right)(x^p + y^p) \\ &\leq (2 \cdot 3^{p-1} + 1)(x^p + y^p), \end{aligned}$$

where in the third step we used the Minkowski inequality, which states that $(a + b)^p \leq 2^{p-1}(a^p + b^p)$, for $a, b \geq 0$.

Now, suppose $x > y$. If $y = 0$, then, $(2x + y)^p + x^p \leq (2^p + 1)x^p \leq (2 \cdot 3^{p-1} + 1)$, for $p \geq 1$. Assume $y > 0$, and let $\beta = x/y > 1$. We need the following claim.

Claim 27. $(2\beta + 1)^p \leq 2 \cdot 3^{p-1}(\beta^p + 1) - 1$, for $p \geq 1$.

Before proving the claim, we finish the proof of the lemma as follows.

$$(2x + y)^p + x^p = y^p(2\beta + 1)^p + x^p \leq y^p(2 \cdot 3^{p-1}(\beta^p + 1) - 1) + x^p \leq (2 \cdot 3^{p-1} + 1)(x^p + y^p),$$

as desired.

Proof of Claim 27. Note that for $p = 1$, the claim holds with equality. Therefore, assume $p > 1$. Consider the function $f(\beta) = (2\beta + 1)^p - 2 \cdot 3^{p-1}(\beta^p + 1) + 1$. We will show that $f(\beta)$ is non-increasing for $\beta \geq 1$. Since $f(1) \leq 0$, this implies, $f(\beta) \leq 0$ for $\beta \geq 1$, finishing the proof. First note that $(2\beta + 1) < 3\beta$ since $\beta > 1$. Now, consider the derivative of $f(\beta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} f'(\beta) &= 2p(2\beta + 1)^{p-1} - 2p \cdot 3^{p-1}\beta^{p-1} \\ &< 2p(3\beta)^{p-1} - 2p \cdot 3^{p-1}\beta^{p-1} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

□

References

- [ABB⁺23] Fateme Abbasi, Sandip Banerjee, Jarosław Byrka, Parinya Chalermsook, Ameet Gadekar, Kamyar Khodamoradi, Dániel Marx, Roohani Sharma, and Joachim Spoerhase. Parameterized approximation schemes for clustering with general norm objectives. In *2023 IEEE 64th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1377–1399, 2023. 1, 4
- [ABC⁺15] Hyung-Chan An, Aditya Bhaskara, Chandra Chekuri, Shalmoli Gupta, Vivek Madan, and Ola Svensson. Centrality of trees for capacitated k-center. *Math. Program.*, 154(1-2):29–53, 2015. 1
- [ABM⁺19] Marek Adamczyk, Jaroslaw Byrka, Jan Marcinkowski, Syed Mohammad Meesum, and Michal Włodarczyk. Constant-factor FPT approximation for capacitated k-median. In Michael A. Bender, Ola Svensson, and Grzegorz Herman, editors, *27th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2019, September 9-11, 2019, Munich/Garching, Germany*, volume 144 of *LIPICs*, pages 1:1–1:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019. 2
- [ACKS15] Pranjali Awasthi, Moses Charikar, Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, and Ali Kemal Sinop. The hardness of approximation of euclidean k-means. In *31st International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG’15)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2015. 1
- [AGGN10] Barbara Anthony, Vineet Goyal, Anupam Gupta, and Viswanath Nagarajan. A plant location guide for the unsure: Approximation algorithms for min-max location problems. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 35(1):pages 79–101, 2010. 4
- [AGK⁺04] Vijay Arya, Naveen Garg, Rohit Khandekar, Adam Meyerson, Kamesh Munagala, and Vinayaka Pandit. Local search heuristics for k-median and facility location problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 33(3):544–562, 2004. 1
- [AL24] Aditya Anand and Euiwoong Lee. Separating k -sc median from the supplier version. In Jens Vygen and Jaroslaw Byrka, editors, *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization - 25th International Conference, IPCO 2024, Wrocław, Poland, July 3-5, 2024, Proceedings*, volume 14679 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 14–27. Springer, 2024. 23
- [AS16] Sara Ahmadian and Chaitanya Swamy. Approximation algorithms for clustering problems with lower bounds and outliers. In Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Michael Mitzenmacher, Yuval Rabani, and Davide Sangiorgi, editors, *43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2016, July 11-15, 2016, Rome, Italy*, volume 55 of *LIPICs*, pages 69:1–69:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016. 1, 6

- [BCCN21] Tanvi Bajpai, Deeparnab Chakrabarty, Chandra Chekuri, and Maryam Negahbani. Revisiting priority k -center: Fairness and outliers. In *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP'21)*, page 21. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. 4
- [BCKK05] Vittorio Bilò, Ioannis Caragiannis, Christos Kaklamanis, and Panagiotis Kanellopoulos. Geometric clustering to minimize the sum of cluster sizes. In Gerth Stølting Brodal and Stefano Leonardi, editors, *Algorithms - ESA 2005, 13th Annual European Symposium, Palma de Mallorca, Spain, October 3-6, 2005, Proceedings*, volume 3669 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 460–471. Springer, 2005. 1
- [BCMN14] Sayan Bhattacharya, Parinya Chalermsook, Kurt Mehlhorn, and Adrian Neumann. New approximability results for the robust k -median problem. In *Scandinavian Workshop on Algorithm Theory (SWAT'14)*, pages 50–61. Springer, 2014. 4
- [BERW24] Moritz Buchem, Katja Ettmayr, Hugo K. K. Rosado, and Andreas Wiese. A $(3 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for the minimum sum of radii problem with outliers and extensions for generalized lower bounds. In David P. Woodruff, editor, *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2024, Alexandria, VA, USA, January 7-10, 2024*, pages 1738–1765. SIAM, 2024. 1, 5
- [BFRS15] Jaroslaw Byrka, Krzysztof Fleszar, Bartosz Rybicki, and Joachim Spoerhase. Bi-factor approximation algorithms for hard capacitated k -median problems. In Piotr Indyk, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, January 4-6, 2015*, pages 722–736. SIAM, 2015. 1
- [BHI02] Mihai Badöiu, Sariel Har-Peled, and Piotr Indyk. Approximate clustering via core-sets. In John H. Reif, editor, *Proc. 34th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'02)*, pages 250–257. ACM, 2002. 1
- [BIV21] Santanu Bhowmick, Tanmay Inamdar, and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. Fault-tolerant covering problems in metric spaces. *Algorithmica*, 83(2):413–446, 2021. 1, 6
- [BJK18] Anup Bhattacharya, Ragesh Jaiswal, and Amit Kumar. Faster algorithms for the constrained k -means problem. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 62(1):93–115, 2018. 1
- [BJKW19] Vladimir Braverman, Shaofeng H-C Jiang, Robert Krauthgamer, and Xuan Wu. Core-sets for ordered weighted clustering. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML'19)*, pages 744–753. PMLR, 2019. 4
- [BLS23] Sayan Bandyapadhyay, William Lochet, and Saket Saurabh. FPT Constant-Approximations for Capacitated Clustering to Minimize the Sum of Cluster Radii. In Erin W. Chambers and Joachim Gudmundsson, editors, *39th International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2023)*, volume 258 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 12:1–12:14, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2023. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 16

- [BPR⁺17] Jarosław Byrka, Thomas W. Pensyl, Bartosz Rybicki, Aravind Srinivasan, and Khoa Trinh. An improved approximation for k -median and positive correlation in budgeted optimization. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 13(2):23:1–23:31, 2017. 1
- [BRU16] Jarosław Byrka, Bartosz Rybicki, and Sumedha Uniyal. An approximation algorithm for uniform capacitated k -median problem with $1+\epsilon$ capacity violation. In Quentin Louveaux and Martin Skutella, editors, *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization - 18th International Conference, IPCO 2016, Liège, Belgium, June 1-3, 2016, Proceedings*, volume 9682 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 262–274. Springer, 2016. 1
- [BS15] Babak Behsaz and Mohammad R. Salavatipour. On minimum sum of radii and diameters clustering. *Algorithmica*, 73(1):143–165, 2015. 1, 4, 6
- [BSS18] Jarosław Byrka, Krzysztof Sornat, and Joachim Spoerhase. Constant-factor approximation for ordered k median. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'18)*, pages 620–631, 2018. 1, 4
- [BV16] Sayan Bandyapadhyay and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. Approximate clustering via metric partitioning. In Seok-Hee Hong, editor, *27th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC 2016, December 12-14, 2016, Sydney, Australia*, volume 64 of *LIPICs*, pages 15:1–15:13. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016. 1
- [CCK⁺20] Parinya Chalermsook, Marek Cygan, Guy Kortsarz, Bundit Laekhanukit, Pasin Manurangsi, Danupon Nanongkai, and Luca Trevisan. From gap-exponential time hypothesis to fixed parameter tractable inapproximability: Clique, dominating set, and more. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 49(4):772–810, jan 2020. 27
- [CEIL13] János Csirik, Leah Epstein, Csanád Imreh, and Asaf Levin. Online clustering with variable sized clusters. *Algorithmica*, 65(2):251–274, 2013. 6
- [CFK⁺15] Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Daniel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 1st edition, 2015. 32
- [CGH⁺22] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Anupam Gupta, Lunjia Hu, Hoon Oh, and David Saulpic. An improved local search algorithm for k -median. In Joseph (Seffi) Naor and Niv Buchbinder, editors, *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2022, Virtual Conference / Alexandria, VA, USA, January 9 - 12, 2022*, pages 1556–1612. SIAM, 2022. 1
- [CGK⁺19] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Anupam Gupta, Amit Kumar, Euiwoong Lee, and Jason Li. Tight FPT approximations for k -median and k -means. In Christel Baier, Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Paola Flocchini, and Stefano Leonardi, editors, *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2019, July 9-12, 2019, Patras, Greece*, volume 132 of *LIPICs*, pages 42:1–42:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019. 1, 2, 27

- [CHK12] Marek Cygan, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, and Samir Khuller. LP rounding for k -centers with non-uniform hard capacities. In *53rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2012, New Brunswick, NJ, USA, October 20-23, 2012*, pages 273–282. IEEE Computer Society, 2012. 1
- [CK19] Vincent Cohen-Addad and Karthik C. S. Inapproximability of clustering in l_p metrics. In David Zuckerman, editor, *60th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2019, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, November 9-12, 2019*, pages 519–539. IEEE Computer Society, 2019. 1
- [CKL⁺22a] Li Chen, Rasmus Kyng, Yang P. Liu, Richard Peng, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, and Sushant Sachdeva. Maximum flow and minimum-cost flow in almost-linear time. In *2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 612–623, 2022. 14
- [CKL22b] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Karthik C. S., and Euiwoong Lee. Johnson coverage hypothesis: Inapproximability of k -means and k -median in l_p -metrics. In Joseph (Seffi) Naor and Niv Buchbinder, editors, *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2022, Virtual Conference / Alexandria, VA, USA, January 9 - 12, 2022*, pages 1493–1530. SIAM, 2022. 1
- [CL19] Vincent Cohen-Addad and Jason Li. On the fixed-parameter tractability of capacitated clustering. In Christel Baier, Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Paola Flocchini, and Stefano Leonardi, editors, *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2019, July 9-12, 2019, Patras, Greece*, volume 132 of *LIPICs*, pages 41:1–41:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019. 2
- [CP04] Moses Charikar and Rina Panigrahy. Clustering to minimize the sum of cluster diameters. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 68(2):417–441, 2004. Special Issue on STOC 2001. 1, 4
- [CR05] Julia Chuzhoy and Yuval Rabani. Approximating k -median with non-uniform capacities. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2005, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, January 23-25, 2005*, pages 952–958. SIAM, 2005. 1
- [CRW91] Vasilis Capoyleas, Günter Rote, and Gerhard J. Woeginger. Geometric clusterings. *J. Algorithms*, 12(2):341–356, 1991. 4, 6
- [CS19] Deeparnab Chakrabarty and Chaitanya Swamy. Approximation algorithms for minimum norm and ordered optimization problems. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2019*, page 126–137, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. 4, 13
- [CXXZ24] Xianrun Chen, Dachuan Xu, Yicheng Xu, and Yong Zhang. Parameterized approximation algorithms for sum of radii clustering and variants. In Michael J. Wooldridge, Jennifer G. Dy, and Sriraam Natarajan, editors, *Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2024, Thirty-Sixth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2024, Fourteenth Symposium on Educational Advances*

- in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2014, February 20-27, 2024, Vancouver, Canada*, pages 20666–20673. AAAI Press, 2024. 1
- [Das08] Sanjoy Dasgupta. The hardness of k -means clustering. Technical Report CS2008-0916, University of California, San Diego, San Diego, CA, 2008. 1
- [Din16] Irit Dinur. Mildly exponential reduction from gap-3sat to polynomial-gap label-cover. *Electronic colloquium on computational complexity ECCC ; research reports, surveys and books in computational complexity*, August 2016. 9, 27, 28
- [DL16] H. Gökalp Demirci and Shi Li. Constant approximation for capacitated k -median with $(1+\epsilon)$ -capacity violation. In Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Michael Mitzenmacher, Yuval Rabani, and Davide Sangiorgi, editors, *43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2016, July 11-15, 2016, Rome, Italy*, volume 55 of *LIPICs*, pages 73:1–73:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016. 1
- [DMR⁺00] Srinivas Doddi, Madhav V. Marathe, S. S. Ravi, David Scot Taylor, and Peter Widmayer. Approximation algorithms for clustering to minimize the sum of diameters. *Nordic J. of Computing*, 7(3):185–203, sep 2000. 4, 5
- [Fei98] Uriel Feige. A threshold of $\ln n$ for approximating set cover. *J. ACM*, 45(4):634–652, jul 1998. 9, 27
- [FJ22] Zachary Friggstad and Mahya Jamshidian. Improved Polynomial-Time Approximations for Clustering with Minimum Sum of Radii or Diameters. In Shiri Chechik, Gonzalo Navarro, Eva Rotenberg, and Grzegorz Herman, editors, *30th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2022)*, volume 244 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 56:1–56:14, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2022. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. 1, 4
- [FK14] Dimitris Fotakis and Paraschos Koutris. Online sum-radii clustering. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 540:27–39, 2014. 1, 6
- [FKK⁺23] Henry L. Fleischmann, Kyrilo Karlov, Karthik C. S., Ashwin Padaki, and Stepan Zharkov. Inapproximability of maximum diameter clustering for few clusters. *CoRR*, abs/2312.02097, 2023. 6
- [FKLM20] Andreas Emil Feldmann, Karthik C. S., Euiwoong Lee, and Pasin Manurangsi. A survey on approximation in parameterized complexity: Hardness and algorithms. *Algorithms*, 13(6):146, 2020. 26
- [GJ23] Dishant Goyal and Ragesh Jaiswal. Tight fpt approximation for constrained k -center and k -supplier. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 940:190–208, 2023. 2, 4, 6, 7, 23, 27
- [GKK⁺10] Matt Gibson, Gaurav Kanade, Erik Krohn, Imran A. Pirwani, and Kasturi Varadarajan. On metric clustering to minimize the sum of radii. *Algorithmica*, 57(3):484–498, jul 2010. 1, 5, 6

- [GKK⁺12] Matt Gibson, Gaurav Kanade, Erik Krohn, Imran A. Pirwani, and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. On clustering to minimize the sum of radii. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 41(1):47–60, 2012. 1
- [Gon85] Teofilo F. Gonzalez. Clustering to minimize the maximum intercluster distance. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 38:293–306, 1985. 6
- [GPST23] Kishen N. Gowda, Thomas W. Pensyl, Aravind Srinivasan, and Khoa Trinh. Improved bi-point rounding algorithms and a golden barrier for k -median. In Nikhil Bansal and Viswanath Nagarajan, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2023, Florence, Italy, January 22-25, 2023*, pages 987–1011. SIAM, 2023. 1
- [GSV21] Mehrdad Ghadiri, Samira Samadi, and Santosh Vempala. Socially fair k -means clustering. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 438–448, 2021. 4
- [GW06] Inge Li Gørtz and Anthony Wirth. Asymmetry in k -center variants. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 361(2-3):188–199, 2006. 4
- [HJ87] Pierre Hansen and Brigitte Jaumard. Minimum sum of diameters clustering. *Journal of Classification*, 4(2):215–226, 1987. 4, 6
- [HJ97] Pierre Hansen and Brigitte Jaumard. Cluster analysis and mathematical programming. *Math. Program.*, 79:191–215, 1997. 4
- [HK73] John E. Hopcroft and Richard M. Karp. An $n^{5/2}$ algorithm for maximum matchings in bipartite graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 2(4):225–231, 1973. 14, 15
- [HM04] Sariel Har-Peled and Soham Mazumdar. On coresets for k -means and k -median clustering. In László Babai, editor, *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, Chicago, IL, USA, June 13-16, 2004*, pages 291–300. ACM, 2004. 1
- [HS85] Dorit S. Hochbaum and David B. Shmoys. A best possible heuristic for the k -center problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 10(2):180–184, 1985. 1, 23
- [IV20] Tanmay Inamdar and Kasturi Varadarajan. Capacitated Sum-Of-Radii Clustering: An FPT Approximation. In Fabrizio Grandoni, Grzegorz Herman, and Peter Sanders, editors, *28th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2020)*, volume 173 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 62:1–62:17, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2020. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. 1, 2, 3
- [JKY24] Ragesh Jaiswal, Amit Kumar, and Jatin Yadav. FPT Approximation for Capacitated Sum of Radii. In Venkatesan Guruswami, editor, *15th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2024)*, volume 287 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 65:1–65:21, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2024. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 16, 34, 35, 36, 46

- [JMS02] Kamal Jain, Mohammad Mahdian, and Amin Saberi. A new greedy approach for facility location problems. In John H. Reif, editor, *Proceedings on 34th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 19-21, 2002, Montréal, Québec, Canada*, pages 731–740. ACM, 2002. 1
- [KMN⁺04] Tapas Kanungo, David M. Mount, Nathan S. Netanyahu, Christine D. Piatko, Ruth Silverman, and Angela Y. Wu. A local search approximation algorithm for k-means clustering. *Comput. Geom.*, 28(2-3):89–112, 2004. 1
- [KS00] Samir Khuller and Yoram J. Sussmann. The capacitated K -center problem. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 13(3):403–418, 2000. 1
- [KSS10] Amit Kumar, Yogish Sabharwal, and Sandeep Sen. Linear-time approximation schemes for clustering problems in any dimensions. *J.ACM*, 57(2):1–32, 2010. 1
- [Li16] Shi Li. Approximating capacitated k -median with $(1 + \varepsilon)k$ open facilities. In Robert Krauthgamer, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2016, Arlington, VA, USA, January 10-12, 2016*, pages 786–796. SIAM, 2016. 1
- [Li17] Shi Li. On uniform capacitated k -median beyond the natural LP relaxation. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 13(2):22:1–22:18, 2017. 1
- [Llo82] S. Lloyd. Least squares quantization in pcm. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 28(2):129–137, March 1982. 1
- [LNG15] G. Laporte, S. Nickel, and F. S. da Gama. *Location Science*. Springer, 2015. 4
- [Man20] Pasin Manurangsi. Tight running time lower bounds for strong inapproximability of maximum k-coverage, unique set cover and related problems (via t-wise agreement testing theorem). In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '20*, page 62–81, USA, 2020. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics. 27, 28
- [Mat00] Jiri Matoušek. On approximate geometric k -clustering. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 24(1):61–84, 2000. 1
- [Meg90] Nimrod Megiddo. On the complexity of some geometric problems in unbounded dimension. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 10(3):327–334, 1990. 1, 6
- [MR17] Pasin Manurangsi and Prasad Raghavendra. A Birthday Repetition Theorem and Complexity of Approximating Dense CSPs. In Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Piotr Indyk, Fabian Kuhn, and Anca Muscholl, editors, *44th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2017)*, volume 80 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 78:1–78:15, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2017. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. 9, 27, 28
- [MS89] Clyde Monma and Subhash Suri. Partitioning points and graphs to minimize the maximum or the sum of diameters. In *Graph Theory, Combinatorics and Applications (Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. Theory Appl. Graphs)*, volume 2, pages 899–912, 1989. 1, 4

- [MV21] Yury Makarychev and Ali Vakilian. Approximation algorithms for socially fair clustering. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT'21)*, pages 3246–3264. PMLR, 2021. 4
- [NP05] S. Nickel and J. Puerto. *Location Theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005. 4
- [Ple87] Ján Plesník. A heuristic for the p -center problems in graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 17(3):263–268, 1987. 4
- [XZZ19] Yicheng Xu, Yong Zhang, and Yifei Zou. A constant parameterized approximation for hard-capacitated k-means. *CoRR*, abs/1901.04628, 2019. 2