

Binary k -Center with Missing Entries: Structure Leads to Tractability

Farehe Soheil^{*}, Kirill Simonov[†], Tobias Friedrich[‡]

Hasso Plattner Institute, University of Potsdam, Germany

March 4, 2025

Abstract

k -CENTER clustering is a fundamental classification problem, where the task is to categorize the given collection of entities into k clusters and come up with a representative for each cluster, so that the maximum distance between an entity and its representative is minimized. In this work, we focus on the setting where the entities are represented by binary vectors with missing entries, which model incomplete categorical data. This version of the problem has wide applications, from predictive analytics to bioinformatics.

Our main finding is that the problem, which is notoriously hard from the classical complexity viewpoint, becomes tractable as soon as the known entries are sparse and exhibit a certain structure. Formally, we show fixed-parameter tractable algorithms for the parameters vertex cover, fracture number, and treewidth of the row-column graph, which encodes the positions of the known entries of the matrix. Additionally, we tie the complexity of the 1-cluster variant of the problem, which is famous under the name Closest String, to the complexity of solving integer linear programs with few constraints. This implies, in particular, that improving upon the running times of our algorithms would lead to more efficient algorithms for integer linear programming in general.

1 Introduction

Clustering is a fundamental problem in computer science with a wide range of applications [Hansen and Jaumard, 1997, Hsu and Nemhauser, 1979, Shi and Malik, 2000, Ge et al., 2008, Tan et al., 2013], and has been thoroughly explored [Lloyd, 1982, Baker et al., 2020, Kar et al., 2023, Cohen-Addad et al., 2022, Wu et al., 2024, Bandyapadhyay et al., 2024]. In its most general formulation, given n data points, the aim of a clustering algorithm is to partition these points into groups, called clusters, based on the similarity. The degree of similarity or dissimilarity between points is modeled by a given distance function. Depending on the representation of the data points, several computationally different variants of the clustering problem arise. Commonly, the points are embedded in the d -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d with the standard Euclidean distance or the distance given by L_p norms, or in the space of binary strings equipped with the Hamming distance, or in a general metric space where the distance function is given explicitly.

Additionally, there exist different approaches to how the similarity is aggregated. For the purpose of this work, we focus on the classical center-based clustering objectives. In k -Center clustering, given a set of data points and the parameter k , the objective is to partition the points into k clusters and identify for each cluster a point called the *center*, so that the *maximum* distance between the center and any point within its cluster is minimized. k -Median clustering is defined in the same way, except that the *sum* of distances between the data points and their respective centers is minimized, and k -Means clustering aims to minimize the sum of *squared* distances instead.

Unfortunately, virtually all versions of clustering are computationally hard, in the classical sense. k -Means in \mathbb{R}^d is NP-hard even on the plane (dimension $d = 2$) [Mahaajan et al., 2009], and it is also NP-hard for $k = 2$ clusters even when the vectors have binary entries [Aloise et al., 2009, Feige, 2014]. k -Median and k -Center are NP-hard in \mathbb{R}^2 as well [Megiddo and Supowit, 1984]. Moreover, k -Center on binary strings under the Hamming distance is NP-hard even for $k = 1$ cluster; that is, the problem of finding the binary string that minimizes the maximum distance to a given collection of strings is already

^{*}farehe.soheil@hpi.de

[†]kirill.simonov@gmail.com

[‡]tobias.friedrich@hpi.de

NP-hard [Frances and Litman, 1997, Lanctôt et al., 2003]. The latter problem is well-studied in the literature under the name of CLOSEST STRING, given its importance for applications ranging from coding theory [Kochman et al., 2012] to bioinformatics [Stojanovic et al., 1997].

In order to circumvent the general hardness results and simultaneously increase the modeling power of the problem, we consider the following variant of clustering with missing entries. We assume that the data points are represented by vectors, where each entry is either an element of the original domain (e.g., in \mathbb{R} or $\{0, 1\}$), or the special element “?”, which corresponds to an unknown entry. For the clustering objective, the distance is computed normally between the known entries, but the distance to an unknown entry is always zero. In this way, we can define the problems k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES and k -MEANS WITH MISSING ENTRIES. For formal definitions see Section 2.

These problems have a wide range of applications. For an example in predictive analytics, consider the setting of the classical Netflix Prize challenge¹. The input is a collection of user-movie ratings, and the task is to predict unknown ratings. The data can be represented in the matrix form, where the rows correspond to the users and the columns to the movies, and naturally most of the entries in this matrix would be unknown. Clustering in this setting is then an important tool for grouping/labelling similar users or similar movies, based on the available data.

Clustering with missing entries is also closely related to string problems that arise in bioinformatics applications. In the fundamental genome phasing problem (known also as “haplotype assembly”), the input is a collection of *reads*, i.e., short subsequences of the two copies of the genome, and the task is to reconstruct both of the original sequences. Finding the best possible reconstruction in the presence of errors is then naturally modeled as an instance of k -MEANS WITH MISSING ENTRIES with $k = 2$, where the data points correspond to the individual reads, using missing entries to mark the unknown parts of each read; the target centers represent the desired complete genomic sequences; and the clustering objective represents the total number of errors between the known reads and the desired sequences, which needs to be minimized. In fact, Patterson et al. [2015] use exactly this formalization of the phasing problem (under the name of “Weighted Minimum Error Correction”) as the algorithmic core of their WhatsHap phasing software. Note that in both examples above, the known entries lie in a finite, small domain. For the technical results in this work, we focus on vectors where the vectors have binary values, e.g., in $\{0, 1\}$; the results however can be easily extended to the bounded domain setting.

Generally speaking, k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES and k -MEANS WITH MISSING ENTRIES cannot be easier than their fully-defined counterparts. While greatly increasing the modeling power of the problem, the introduction of missing entries poses also additional technical challenges. In particular, most of the methods developed for the standard, full-information versions of clustering are no longer applicable, since the space formed by vectors with missing entries is not necessarily metric: the distances may violate triangle inequality. On the positive side, one can observe that in practical applications the structure of the missing entries is not completely arbitrary. In particular, the known entries are often *sparse*—for example, in the above-mentioned Netflix Prize challenge, only about 1% of the user-movie pairs have a known rating. Therefore, the “hard” cases coming from the standard fully-defined versions of k -Center/ k -Means are quite far from the instances arising in applications of clustering with missing entries. This motivates the aim to identify tractable cases of k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES based on the structure of the missing entries, since the general hardness results for k -Center are not applicable in this setting.

Formally, we use the framework of *parameterized complexity* in order to characterize such cases. We are looking for algorithms that run in time $f(t) \cdot \text{poly}(n)$, where t is a *parameter* associated with the instance, which could be any numerical property of the input, and $f(\cdot)$ is some function of this parameter. That is, the running time may be exponential in the parameter t , but needs to be polynomial in the size of input for every fixed t . Such algorithms are called fixed-parameter tractable (FPT), and this property heavily depends on the choice of the parameter t . On the one hand, the parameter should capture the “complexity” of the instance, allowing for FPT algorithms to be possible; on the other hand, the parameter should be small on a reasonably broad class of instances, so that such an algorithm is applicable. We refer to standard textbooks on parameterized complexity for a more thorough introduction to the subject [Downey and Fellows, 2013, Cygan et al., 2015].

In order to apply the existing machinery and to put the parameters we consider into perspective, we encode the arrangement of the missing entries into a graph. We say that the *incidence graph* of a given instance is the following bipartite graph: the vertices are the data points and the coordinates, and the edge between a point and a coordinate is present when the respective entry is *known*. When interpreting the input as a matrix, where the data points are the rows, replacing the known entries by “1” and missing

¹The problem description and the dataset is available at <https://www.kaggle.com/netflix-inc/netflix-prize-data>.

entries by “0” results exactly in the biadjacency matrix of the incidence graph. We call this matrix the *mask* matrix of the instance, denoted by M , and denote the incidence graph of the instance by G_M ; see Figure 1 for an illustration.




Figure 1: On the left, the mask matrix M and on the right, its corresponding incidence graph. The *row* vertices, R_M , are in grey and the *column* vertices C_M are in black.

We mainly consider the following three fundamental sparsity parameters of the incidence graph G_M :

- vertex cover number $vc(G_M)$, which is the smallest number of vertices that are necessary to cover all edges of the graph;
- fracture number $fr(G_M)$, which is the smallest number of vertices one needs to remove so that the connected components of the remaining graph are small, i.e., their size is bounded by the same number;
- treewidth $tw(G_M)$, which is a classical decomposition parameter measuring how “tree-like” the graph is.

See Figures 5 and 7 for a visual representation of instances with small vertex cover and fracture number, respectively. Treewidth is the most general parameter out of the three, and it encompasses a wide range of instances. For example, the main algorithmic ingredient in the WhatsHap genomic phasic software [Patterson et al., 2015] is the FPT algorithm for k -MEANS WITH MISSING ENTRIES parameterized by the maximum number of known entries per column², in the special case where $k = 2$ and the known entries in each row form a continuous subinterval; treewidth of the incidence graph is never larger than this parameter. Vertex cover, on the other hand, is the most restrictive of the three; however, comparatively small vertex cover may be a feasible model in settings such as the Netflix Prize challenge, where most users would only have ratings for a relatively small collection of the most popular movies. The fracture number aims to generalize the setting of small vertex cover, to also allow for an arbitrary number of small local “information patches”, outside of the few “most popular” rows and columns. Note that fracture number is a strictly more general parameter than vertex cover number, since removing any vertex cover from the graph results in connected components of size one; that is, for any instance, $fr(G_M) \leq vc(G_M)$. It also holds that $tw(G_M) \leq 2 fr(G_M)$, see Section 8 for the details.

Previously, the perspective outlined above has been successfully applied for k -MEANS WITH MISSING ENTRIES. [Ganian et al., 2022] show that the problem admits an FPT algorithm parameterized by treewidth of the incidence graph in case of the bounded domain, as well as further FPT algorithms for real-valued vectors in more restrictive parametrization. However, similar questions for k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES remain widely open.

In this work, we aim to close this gap and investigate parameterized algorithms for the k -Center objective on classes of instances where the known entries are “sparse”, in the sense of the structural parameters above. Our motivation stems from the following. First, k -Center is a well-studied and widely applicable similarity objective, which in certain cases might be preferable over k -Means; specifically, whenever the cost of clustering is associated with each individual data point and has to be equally small, as opposed to minimizing the total, “social”, cost spread out over all data points. Second, k -Center is interesting from a theoretical perspective, being a natural optimization target that on the technical level behaves very differently from k -Means. Our findings, as described next, show that the k -Center objective is in fact more challenging than k -Means in this context, and we prove that k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES is as general as a wide class of integer linear programs.

²Called *coverage* in their work.

Our contribution. We present several novel parameterized algorithms for k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES. First, we show that k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES is FPT when parameterized by the vertex cover number $\text{vc}(G_M)$ of the incidence graph plus k . Specifically, we prove the following result. Here and next, n is the number of data points in the instance and m is their dimension.

Theorem 1.1. k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES admits an algorithm with running time

$$2^{\mathcal{O}(k \cdot \text{vc}(G_M) + \text{vc}(G_M)^2 \cdot \log \text{vc}(G_M))} \text{poly}(nm).$$

This result can be compared to the result of [Eiben et al., 2023], who considered the complementary parametrization of the same problem (under the name of ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION). That is, they consider the minimum number of rows and columns that are needed to cover all *missing* entries. Interestingly, for their FPT algorithm, it was also necessary to include the target distance d in the parameter—we do not need this restriction in our setting, which highlights the property that instances of k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES, where missing entries are dense, are, in a sense, easier.

Moving further, we extend the result of Theorem 1.1 to the more general setting where the parameter is the fracture number of the incidence graph G_M . We show that one can achieve the running time of Theorem 1.1 even for fracture number, which is the most technical result of this paper.

Theorem 1.2. k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES admits an algorithm with running time

$$2^{\mathcal{O}(k \cdot \text{fr}(G_M) + \text{fr}(G_M)^2 \cdot \log \text{fr}(G_M))} \text{poly}(nm).$$

To the best of our knowledge, no previous work on clustering problems considers the fracture number as the parameter; however it has been successfully applied to other fundamental problems such as Integer Linear Programs (ILPs) [Gavenčiak et al., 2022] and Edge Disjoint Paths [Ganian et al., 2021]. Furthermore, a very similar parameter, equivalent to fracture number, has been studied in the literature under the name *vertex integrity*, for example in the context of Subgraph Isomorphism [Bodlaender et al., 2020] and algorithmic metatheorems [Lampis and Mitsou, 2024].

In order to prove Theorem 1.2, we also need an algorithm with respect to the treewidth of the incidence graph G_M , stated in the next theorem. We denote by d the target radius of the cluster, i.e., the maximum distance between a point and its cluster center.

Theorem 1.3. k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES admits an algorithm with running time

$$d^{\mathcal{O}(\text{tw}(G_M))} 2^{\mathcal{O}(k \cdot \text{tw}(G_M))} \text{poly}(nm).$$

In other words, the problem is FPT when parameterized by $\text{tw}(G_m) + d + k$, or XP when parameterized by $\text{tw}(G_m) + k$. Note that, as opposed to Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, here we need the dependence on d in the exponential part of the running time. This is, however, still sufficient to enable the algorithm claimed by Theorem 1.2.

While we are not aware of matching hardness results based on standard complexity assumptions, we can nevertheless argue that improving the running time in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 resolves a fundamental open question. Specifically, we show a parameterized equivalence between CLOSEST STRING, parameterized by the number of strings, and Integer Linear Program (ILP) with bounded variables, parameterized by the number of rows. While we use the reduction from CLOSEST STRING to ILP as a building block in the algorithm of Theorem 1.1, the reduction in the other direction, i.e., from ILP to CLOSEST STRING, is most relevant here. Formally, it yields the following statement:

Theorem 1.4. For any $\alpha > 0$, assume that CLOSEST STRING admits an algorithm with running time $2^{\mathcal{O}(n^{1+\alpha})} \cdot \text{poly}(n\ell)$, where n is the number of strings and ℓ is their length. Then the ILP $\{\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b} : \forall i, \ell_i \leq x_i \leq u_i\}$, where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{r \times c}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, and $\ell_i \leq u_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, can be solved in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(r^{1+\alpha+o(1)})} \cdot \text{poly}(rc)$, assuming that $\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty = \mathcal{O}(r)$ and $\delta = 2^{\mathcal{O}(r)}$, where $\delta = \max_{i \in [c]} (u_i - \ell_i)$.

Note that CLOSEST STRING is a special case of k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES with $k = 1$ and no missing entries, where also the number of strings matches with the vertex cover of the known entries. Therefore, we immediately get that improving the $\text{vc}(G_M)^2$ term in the exponent of Theorem 1.1 to $\text{vc}(G_M)^{1+\alpha}$ implies the same improvement for this class of ILP instances, and the same holds for the result of Theorem 1.2. Notably, the result of Theorem 1.4 was independently discovered by [Rohwedder and Wegryzcki, 2024] in a recent preprint; they also provide further examples of problems, where such an improvement implies breaking long-standing barriers in terms of the best-known running time, and conjecture that this might be impossible.

Related work. Clustering problems are also extensively studied from the approximation perspective. The k -Center problem classically admits 2-approximation in poly-time [Gonzalez, 1985, Feder and Greene, 1988]. On the other hand, approximating k -CENTER in \mathbb{R}^2 within a factor of 1.82 is NP-hard [Mentzer, 2016, Chen, 2021].

CLOSEST STRING is well-studied under various parameters [Li et al., 2002a, Gramm et al., 2003, Ma and Sun, 2008, Chen et al., 2014] and in the area of approximation algorithms [Gasieniec et al., 1999, Li et al., 2002b, Ma and Sun, 2009, Mazumdar et al., 2013]. Abboud et al. [Abboud et al., 2023] have shown that CLOSEST STRING on binary strings of length ℓ can not be solved in time $(2 - \varepsilon)^\ell \cdot \text{poly}(n\ell)$ under the SETH, for any $\varepsilon > 0$. This can be seen as a tighter analogue of Theorem 1.4 for the parametrization of CLOSEST STRING by the lengths of the strings. A version of the CLOSEST STRING with wildcards was studied from the viewpoint of parameterized complexity [Hermelin and Rozenberg, 2015]; the wildcards behave exactly like missing entries in our definition, therefore this problem is equivalent to k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES for $k = 1$.

[Knop et al., 2020a] studied combinatorial n -fold integer programming, yielding in particular $n^{\mathcal{O}(n^2)} \text{poly}(m)$ algorithms for CLOSEST STRING, CLOSEST STRING with wildcards, and k -CENTER (with binary entries), where n is the number of strings/rows and m is the length of the strings/number of coordinates. These results can be seen as special cases of our Theorem 1.2.

The versions of k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES/ k -MEANS WITH MISSING ENTRIES with zero target cost of clustering is considered in the literature under the class of “matrix completion” problems. There, given a matrix with missing entries, the task is to complete it to achieve certain structure, such as few distinct rows (resulting in the same objective as in the clustering problems) or small rank. Parameterized algorithms for matrix completion problems were also studied [Ganian et al., 2018].

Finally, k -MEANS WITH MISSING ENTRIES has been studied in \mathbb{R}^d from a parameterized approximation perspective. Geometrically, each data point with missing entries can be seen as an axis-parallel linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^d , and the task is to identify k centers as points in \mathbb{R}^d that minimize the total squared distance to the assigned subspaces. [Eiben et al., 2021] show that this problem admits a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ approximation in time $2^{\text{poly}(k, \varepsilon, \Delta)} \cdot \text{poly}(nd)$, where Δ is the maximum number of missing entries per row, meaning that the subspaces have dimension at most Δ .

Paper organization. We define the necessary preliminaries in Section 2. Then we show the reduction from CLOSEST STRING to ILP in Section 3, and the reduction from ILP to CLOSEST STRING in Section 5. Sections 6 to 8 are dedicated to the respective FPT results for the parameters vertex cover, treewidth and fracture number. We conclude in Section 9. Due to space constraints, most of the technical proofs are deferred to the appendix.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce key definitions and notations used throughout the paper. For an integer n we write $[n]$ to denote the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$. We use \mathbb{Z}_+ to denote the set of non-negative integers. For a vector of real numbers $v \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$ with length ℓ , its i -th entry is denoted by $v[i]$ and v_i interchangeably. Similarly, for a binary string $s \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$ of length ℓ , its i -th bit is denoted by $s[i]$, and s_i and we write $s = [s_1, \dots, s_\ell]$ to denote the whole string. For a set $I \subseteq [\ell]$, the substring of s restricted to the indices in I is written as $s[I] \in \{0, 1\}^{|I|}$. For two indices $i, j \in [\ell]$, the substring from $s[i]$ throughout $s[j]$ (inclusive) is denoted by $s[i, j] \in \{0, 1\}^{j-i+1}$. The complement of s is represented by \bar{s} . The Hamming distance between two binary strings $s_1, s_2 \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$ is denoted by $d_H : \{0, 1\}^\ell \times \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ with $d_H(s_1, s_2) = |\{i \in [\ell] : s_1[i] \neq s_2[i]\}|$. For a graph G , the set of vertices and edges are denoted by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ respectively.

Consider a matrix \mathbf{A} with n rows and m coordinates. The sets of rows and coordinates of \mathbf{A} are denoted by $R_{\mathbf{A}} = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$ and $C_{\mathbf{A}} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m\}$ respectively. For $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$, the i -th row of \mathbf{A} is denoted by $\mathbf{A}[i]$ and the j -th entry of $\mathbf{A}[i]$ is written as $\mathbf{A}[i][j]$. We may also use a_i and a_{ij} respectively to refer to $\mathbf{A}[i]$ and $\mathbf{A}[i][j]$, when clear from context. For matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , their entry-wise subtraction is written as $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$, meaning $(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})[i][j] = \mathbf{A}[i][j] - \mathbf{B}[i][j]$. Similarly, their entry-wise product is denoted by $\mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{B}$, where $(\mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{B})[i][j] = \mathbf{A}[i][j] \cdot \mathbf{B}[i][j]$. For two binary matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , we define their row-wise Hamming distance as a vector $d_H(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$, i.e., $d_H(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})[i] = d_H(\mathbf{A}[i], \mathbf{B}[i])$. Moreover, a missing entry is denoted by “?”.

For a binary matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times m}$, its *incidence graph* is an undirected bipartite graph defined as $G_{\mathbf{M}} = (V_{\mathbf{M}}, E_{\mathbf{M}})$, where $V_{\mathbf{M}} = (R_{\mathbf{M}} \cup C_{\mathbf{M}})$ and $E_{\mathbf{M}} = \{(u, v) : u \in R_{\mathbf{M}}, v \in C_{\mathbf{M}}, \mathbf{M}[u][v] = 1\}$.

We use *row* (resp. *coordinate*) vertices to represent the vertices in $G_{\mathbf{M}}$ that correspond to the rows (coordinates) of \mathbf{M} . For a visual representation of the incidence graph, refer to Figure 1.

With these definitions, we can now proceed to formalize the main problem in question.

Definition 2.1 (*k-CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES*). *Given matrices $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1, ?\}^{n \times m}$, and $\mathbf{M} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times m}$, an integer k and a column vector $\mathbf{d} = (d, d, \dots, d) \in \{d\}^n$. The task is to determine if there exists a binary matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times m}$ with at most k distinct rows such that*

$$d_H((\mathbf{M} \circ \mathbf{A}), (\mathbf{M} \circ \mathbf{B})) \leq \mathbf{d}.$$

Note that in the context of a *k-CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES* instance, we use the term “point” interchangeably with “row” and “coordinate” interchangeably with “column”, since the points to be clustered are represented as rows of the matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{M} .

We also define here the related problems.

Definition 2.2 (*CLOSEST STRING*). *Given a set of $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ binary strings $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ each of length ℓ and a non-negative integer $d \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, determine whether there exist a binary string s of length ℓ such that for all $i \in [n]$,*

$$d_H(s, s_i) \leq d.$$

Definition 2.3 (*NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING*). *Given a set of $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ binary strings $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ each of length ℓ and a distance vector $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, determine whether there exist a binary string s of length ℓ such that for all $i \in [n]$,*

$$d_H(s, s_i) \leq d_i.$$

Definition 2.4 (*ILP FEASIBILITY*). *Given a constraint matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{r \times c}$, a column vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, and integers $\ell_i \leq u_i$ for each $i \in [c]$, determine whether there exists a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^c$ such that*

$$\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$$

and $\ell_i \leq x_i \leq u_i$ for each $i \in [c]$.

3 Reduction from CLOSEST STRING to ILP FEASIBILITY

In this section, we show an ILP formulation of the CLOSEST STRING problem, which will be used in later sections as a building block for our algorithms. Given an instance $I = (S, d)$ of the CLOSEST STRING problem where $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ denotes the number of binary strings in $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$, each of length ℓ , the objective is to determine whether there exists a binary string s of length ℓ , such that $\max_i (d_H(s, s_i)) \leq d$. We formulate this problem as an ILP FEASIBILITY instance with p variables and n constraints where $p = \min(\ell, 2^n)$.

Theorem 3.1. *An instance $I = (S, d)$ of the CLOSEST STRING problem with n binary strings of length ℓ , can be reduced to an ILP FEASIBILITY instance $\{\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b} : \forall i, 0 \leq x_i \leq u_i\}$ where $\mathbf{A} \in \{-1, 1\}^{n \times p}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in [d]^n$ with $p \leq \min(\ell, 2^n)$, in time $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot \ell)$.*

Proof. To begin with, observe that the input strings can be represented as a binary matrix \mathbf{M} . This matrix has n rows and ℓ coordinates, where for $i \in [n]$, $\mathbf{M}[i]$ corresponds to the string s_i , and for $j \in [\ell]$, the entry $\mathbf{M}[i][j]$ represents the j -th character of the string s_i . For each coordinate $j \in [\ell]$, let c_j denote the binary string of length n induced by the j -th coordinate across all strings in \mathbf{M} , that is $c_j = \mathbf{M}[-][j]$. We call c_j , the j -th column of \mathbf{M} . Note that, each c_j can take one of up to 2^n distinct binary string configurations. However, certain configurations may repeat across different c_j 's, meaning multiple instances of c_j may share the same binary string value. Additionally, some potential configurations might not be realized by any c_j . Thus, while there are 2^n possible binary strings, not all will necessarily appear, nor will they be unique across all c_j 's. To illustrate this more clearly, consider the input set of binary strings $S = \{“0110110”, “1001001”, “1011011”, “1111111”\}$. The corresponding binary matrix \mathbf{M} is depicted in Figure 2 (a). The columns c_1, c_4 , and c_7 are of type “0111” and $c_2 = “1001”$ provided as examples of the strings induced by coordinates 1, 4 and 7 of \mathbf{M} , respectively. Let $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_p\} = \{c_j | j \in [\ell]\}$, denote the set of all binary strings of length n that appear as the columns of \mathbf{M} , ordered in increasing value based on their binary representation. Note that $p \leq 2^n$. We refer to each t_i as a *column type*. For each column type t_i , define n_i as the number of coordinates j in \mathbf{M} , where the column c_j is of type t_i . In




Figure 2: On the left is matrix M , with each row corresponding to a string in S . Columns c_1 , c_4 , and c_7 are represented in bold. The *reordered* input matrix M' is on the right. Strings of the same *type*, are grouped as *blocks*, with each block colored in gray. In each block, the rows are either consecutive ones or consecutive zeros. The first and second row restricted to the block of type t_1 , represented in bold font, are “000” and “111” respectively

other words, $n_i = |\{j : j \in [\ell], c_j = t_i\}|$ with $\sum_{i=1}^p n_i = \ell$. For each $i \in [p]$, the *range* of column type t_i is defined as $[\ell_i, r_i]$ where

$$\ell_i = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} n_j \right) + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad r_i = \sum_{j=1}^i n_j.$$

In Figure 2(a), column types are $T = \{“0111”, “1001”, “1010”\}$ with $n_1 = 3$, $n_2 = 2$, and $n_3 = 2$. Additionally, the ranges of the column types in Figure 2(a) are given by $[\ell_1, r_1] = [1, 3]$, $[\ell_2, r_2] = [4, 5]$, and $[\ell_3, r_3] = [6, 7]$. Intuitively, the range $[\ell_i, r_i]$ of a column type t_i , specifies the interval where columns of type t_i are placed after the *reordering* of matrix M , which will be detailed in the following explanation. Define the permutation $\pi : [\ell] \rightarrow [\ell]$ as a rearrangement of the coordinates of the matrix M , such that all columns c_j , for $j \in [\ell]$, that share the same column type t_i (i.e. $c_j = t_i$) are positioned consecutively between the coordinates ℓ_i and r_i . Let M' denote the *reordered* matrix obtained by applying the permutation π to the coordinates of matrix M . Then, *blocks* are defined as contiguous groups of columns in M' that correspond to the same type. Thus there are p blocks in matrix M' . These blocks of columns appear in sequence according to the binary value of their types $\{t_1, \dots, t_p\}$, with the size of each block determined by the corresponding value n_i . More formally, for each type t_i with $i \in [p]$ and for every $j \in [\ell_i, r_i]$, it holds that $M'[-][j] = t_i$. In other words, π rearranges the coordinates of M so that, each column c'_j of M' with $j \in [\ell_i, r_i]$, induces a string of type t_i . Applying π to coordinates of matrix M in Figure 2 (a), results in matrix M' depicted in Figure 2 (b). For convenience, we write $\pi(S)$ to denote the application of permutation π to a set of strings S , and $\pi(s_i)$ when applying it to a single string s_i . With the necessary tools and the permutation π outlined above, it is easy to verify the following observation:

Observation 4. Assume $s \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$ is a solution to the given instance $I = (S, d)$ of binary CLOSEST STRING, then $\pi(s)$ is a solution to the permuted instance $I' = (S', d)$ where $S' = \pi(S)$.

As a direct result of Observation 4, we can now address the permuted instance $I' = (S', d)$, where $S' = \{s'_1, \dots, s'_n\}$, rather than the original instance $I = (S, d)$. Let s^* be a solution to I' . For each input string $s'_k \in S'$, we can express the Hamming distance between s'_k and s^* as follows:

$$d_H(s^*, s'_k) = \sum_{i=1}^p d_H(s^*[\ell_i, r_i], s'_k[\ell_i, r_i]) \quad (1)$$

Let M' denote the permuted matrix consisting of the strings in S' . It is important to note that, by the definition of the permutation π , for any $i \in [p]$, column type t_i appears consecutively $(r_i - \ell_i + 1)$ times throughout the coordinates $[\ell_i, r_i]$. As a result, the rows restricted to every block $i \in [p]$, are either strings of consecutive zeros or consecutive ones, each of length $(r_i - \ell_i + 1)$. In simpler terms, the rows of M' restricted to the coordinates in $[\ell_i, r_i]$ (i.e the range associated with column type t_i), consist of either $(r_i - \ell_i + 1)$ consecutive zeros or $(r_i - \ell_i + 1)$ consecutive ones. For further illustration, refer to Figure 2. Thus, for every input string $s'_k \in S'$, the Hamming distance between s^* and s'_k along the coordinates in $[\ell_i, r_i]$ is determined by the number of zeros and ones in $s^*[\ell_i, r_i]$. Therefore, we can disregard specific positions of ones and zeros within $s^*[\ell_i, r_i]$, and only take into account the number of their occurrence. For each column type t_i , let $z_i = |\{j \in [\ell_i, r_i] : s^*[j] = 0\}|$ denote the number of zeros that will appear in

$s^*[\ell_i, r_i]$. Then, for each $i \in [p]$ and $s'_k \in S'$, it follows that:

$$d_H(s^*[\ell_i, r_i], s'_k[\ell_i, r_i]) = \begin{cases} z_i & \text{if } s'_k[\ell_i, r_i] = \bar{1} \\ n_i - z_i & \text{if } s'_k[\ell_i, r_i] = \bar{0}. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Define $y_i : S' \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, for $i \in [p]$, as follows:

$$y_i(s'_k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s'_k[\ell_i, r_i] = \bar{1} \\ 1 & \text{if } s'_k[\ell_i, r_i] = \bar{0}. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Let $\mu_k = \sum_{i=1}^p y_i(s'_k) \cdot n_i$ denote the number of zeros in s'_k . Then using Equation (1), Equation (2), and Equation (3), the Hamming distance between s^* and $s'_k \in S'$ can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(s^*, s'_k) &= \sum_{i=1}^p y_i(s'_k) \cdot n_i + (-1)^{y_i(s'_k)} \cdot z_i \\ &= \mu_k + \sum_{i=1}^p (-1)^{y_i(s'_k)} \cdot z_i \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

To put it simply, consider now an ILP FEASIBILITY instance where z_i 's, for $i \in [p]$, form the variables subject to the bounds $0 \leq z_i \leq n_i$. Moreover, for each input string s'_k , there is a corresponding constraint of the form $d_H(s^*, s'_k) \leq d$ based on the equivalence in Equation (3). For every $s'_k \in S'$, this results in a constraint of form $\mu_k + \sum_{i=1}^p (-1)^{y_i(s'_k)} \cdot z_i \leq d$. However, these constraints are not yet in the standard form. The reason is that an integer μ_k appears on the left-hand side of each constraint. The next step, therefore, is to shift this integer to the right-hand side while retaining the variables on the left. This transformation, yields an ILP FEASIBILITY instance represented as:

$$\{\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{b} : \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^p, 0 \leq z_i \leq n_i\} \quad (5)$$

where, for $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [p]$, the constraint matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \{-1, 1\}^{n \times p}$ is defined by $\mathbf{A}[i][j] = (-1)^{y_j(s'_i)}$, and the constant matrix $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, is given by $\mathbf{b}[i] = d - \mu_i$. Note that all the columns types, their ranges and sizes can be determined in time $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot \ell)$. Also, the values of μ_i , for $i \in [p]$ and $y_j(s_i)$, for $j \in [p]$ can be computed with the same running time. \square

In [Eisenbrand and Weismantel, 2020], Eisenbrand and Weismantel designed a fast dynamic programming approach that solves an ILP instance of the form

$$\max\{\mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}, 0 \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n\} \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ with $\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \leq \Delta$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, and $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ in time

$$n \cdot \mathcal{O}(m)^{(m+1)^2} \cdot \mathcal{O}(\Delta)^{m \cdot (m+1)} \cdot \log^2 m \cdot \Delta. \quad (7)$$

Note that, by introducing a slack variable for each constraint, an ILP instance of the form $\{\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}, 0 \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^p\}$ can be transferred into form (6). Therefore, putting Theorem 3.1 and Equation (7) together, we arrive at the following corollary.

Corollary 4.1. *An instance of CLOSEST STRING $I = (S, d)$ with n binary strings of length ℓ can be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(\ell) \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(n^2)} \log^2 n$. This also holds for non-uniform distances and in the presence of missing entries.*

In Corollary 4.1, different distances and missing entries are accommodated by a straightforward change in the ILP formulation. Notably, running time similar to Corollary 4.1 has been previously shown [Knop et al., 2020a] for all listed CLOSEST STRING versions. The goal of this section is to state the ILP formulation explicitly.

5 Reduction from ILP FEASIBILITY to CLOSEST STRING

This section is dedicated to the reduction from ILP FEASIBILITY to CLOSEST STRING that preserves the number of rows up to a factor of $\mathcal{O}(\log \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty)$, where \mathbf{A} is the constraint coefficient matrix in the ILP FEASIBILITY instance. More precisely, in this section, we outline the sequence of reductions that leads to the proof of the following theorem, which is then used to establish Theorem 1.4.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\{\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b} : \forall i, \ell_i \leq x_i \leq u_i\}$ be an ILP FEASIBILITY instance, with $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{r \times c}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, and $\ell_i, u_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for each $i \in [c]$. In polynomial time, one can construct an equivalent instance of CLOSEST STRING with $n = \mathcal{O}(\log \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot r)$, $\ell = \mathcal{O}(\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot \log^2 \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot r \cdot c \cdot \delta)$, and $d = \mathcal{O}(\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot \log \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot c \cdot \delta)$; here, $\delta = \max_{i \in [c]}(u_i - \ell_i)$.*

We begin by showing that a general ILP FEASIBILITY instance, where the coefficients may be negative, and variables may have negative lower bounds, can be transformed, in linear time with respect to the number of variables, into an equivalent instance with non-negative variable domains, i.e., of form $0 \leq y_i \leq u'_i$, non-negative coefficient matrix and non-negative right-hand side, while mostly preserving the number of constraints, variables and the magnitude of the entries.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\{\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b} : \forall i, \ell_i \leq x_i \leq u_i\}$ be an ILP FEASIBILITY instance with $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{r \times c}$, and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, an integer column vector. In time $\mathcal{O}(r \cdot (r + c))$, we can construct an equivalent instance of ILP FEASIBILITY $\{\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b}' : \forall i, 0 \leq y_i \leq u'_i\}$, with $\mathbf{b}' \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{2r}$, $\mathbf{A}' \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{2r \times (r+c)}$ such that $\|\mathbf{A}'\|_\infty = \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty$, $\|\mathbf{b}'\|_\infty = \mathcal{O}(c \cdot \delta \cdot \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty)$ and $\max\{u'_i\} = \mathcal{O}(c \cdot \delta \cdot \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty)$, where $\delta = \max_{i \in [c]}(u_i - \ell_i)$.*

Proof. To show the lemma, consider the following two transformations. First, for each variable $\ell_i \leq x_i \leq u_i$, replace it with a new variable $y_i = x_i - \ell_i$. This will shift the lower bound to 0, so the new variable y_i equivalently satisfies $0 \leq y_i \leq u'_i$, where $u'_i = u_i - \ell_i$. Note that the right-hand side in the corresponding constraints has to be changed accordingly. That is, each constraint $\mathbf{A}[j]^T \cdot \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}[j]$, equivalently, $\sum_{i=1}^c \mathbf{A}[i][j] \cdot x_i = \mathbf{b}[j]$, is replaced by an equivalent constraint $\sum_{i=1}^c \mathbf{A}[i][j] \cdot y_i = \mathbf{b}[j] - \sum_{i=1}^c \mathbf{A}[i][j] \cdot \ell_i$. Therefore, by setting $\mathbf{b}''[j] = \mathbf{b}[j] - \sum_{i=1}^c \mathbf{A}[i][j] \cdot \ell_i$, the ILP FEASIBILITY instance $\{\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b}'' : \forall i, 0 \leq y_i \leq u'_i\}$ is equivalent to the original instance, while having all variable domains non-negative and the same coefficient matrix \mathbf{A} . Also note that for each $j \in [r]$, $|\mathbf{b}''[j]|$ should be at most $c \cdot \delta \cdot \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty$, as otherwise the j -th constraint is clearly infeasible. Therefore, if for some $j \in [r]$, the value of $|\mathbf{b}''[j]|$ exceeds the value above, return a trivial no-instance, and for the rest of the proof assume that the bound holds.

The next step is to deal with the negative coefficients in the constraint matrix \mathbf{A} . To do so, consider each constraint $\mathbf{A}[j]^T \cdot \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b}''[j]$. Let $\Sigma_- + \Sigma_+ = \mathbf{b}''[j]$, be the equivalent expression of the constraint, where Σ_- collects the terms in $\mathbf{A}[j]^T \cdot \mathbf{y}$ with negative coefficients and Σ_+ collects the terms with positive coefficients. Now replace the constraint $\Sigma_- + \Sigma_+ = \mathbf{b}''[j]$ with two new constraints: $\Sigma_+ + y_{c+i} = \mathbf{b}[i] + N$ and $y_{c+i} - \Sigma_- = N$ where N is a sufficiently large positive integer: $N = c \cdot \delta \cdot \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty$ and $\mathbf{y}[c+i]$ is a new variable with bounds $0 \leq y_{c+i} \leq N$. It is easy to see that by subtracting the second constraint from the first one, we obtain the original constraint. On the other hand, any variable assignment in the original instance fixes exactly one possible assignment for y_{c+i} in each of the two new constraints. Therefore, these two constraints are equivalent to the original constraint. Now note that in the constraint $\Sigma_+ + y_{c+i} = \mathbf{b}[i] + N$, all the variables on the left-hand side have positive coefficients. Also, since Σ_- consists only of negative terms, the left-hand side of the constraint $y_{c+i} - \Sigma_- = N$ has only non-negative coefficients as well. Moreover, if there is a negative entry in the right-hand side of any constraint after the transformation, the original ILP FEASIBILITY instance is infeasible, so it suffices to return a trivial no-instance. Otherwise, the right-hand sides of all new constraints are non-negative. Denote by \mathbf{A}' the coefficient matrix of the new constraints, and by \mathbf{b}' the vector of the right-hand sides; by construction, $\mathbf{A}' \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{2r \times (r+c)}$, $\mathbf{b}' \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{2r}$. From the above, the ILP FEASIBILITY instance $\{\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b}' : \forall i, 0 \leq y_i \leq u'_i\}$ is equivalent to the original one, where $u'_i = N$ for $c+1 \leq i \leq r+c$. It holds that $\|\mathbf{A}'\|_\infty = \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty$, and by the choice of N and \mathbf{b}'' , $\|\mathbf{b}'\|_\infty = \mathcal{O}(c \cdot \delta \cdot \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty)$. \square

By lemma Lemma 5.2, we observe that a general ILP FEASIBILITY instance is equivalent to an instance where everything is non-negative, with a bounded blow-up in the number of constraints, variables and the magnitude of values. Thus, we continue our chain of reductions from a non-negative ILP. In the next step, we reduce from arbitrary bounds on the variables to binary variables, as stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\{\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b} : \forall i, 0 \leq x_i \leq u_i\}$ be an ILP FEASIBILITY instance with $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{r \times c}$, a non-negative integer matrix with r rows and c columns and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^r$, a column vector. In polynomial time,*

this instance can be reduced to an equivalent instance $\{\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b}' : \forall i, y_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$ of ILP FEASIBILITY where $\mathbf{A}' \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{r \times c'}$ is a matrix with r rows, $c' \leq c \cdot \max\{u_i + 1\}$ columns and $\|\mathbf{A}'\|_\infty = \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty$, and $\mathbf{b}' \in \mathbb{Z}_+^r$ is a vector with $\|\mathbf{b}'\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{b}\|_\infty$.

Proof. For each variable x_i , replace each occurrence with $z_i^1 + \dots + z_i^{u_i}$, where $z_i^1, \dots, z_i^{u_i}$ are u_i new $\{0, 1\}$ -variables. After this procedure, every constraint

$$a_1x_1 + \dots + a_cx_c = b$$

is replaced by

$$a_1z_1^1 + \dots + a_1z_1^{\delta_1} + \dots + a_cz_c^1 + \dots + a_cz_c^{\delta_c} = b.$$

The properties of the resulting instance are straightforward to verify. \square

Next, we show that an instance of ILP FEASIBILITY with non-negative coefficients and binary variables can be reduced to an instance with binary coefficients. The proof is similar in spirit to the proof of Lemma 8 in Knop et al. [2020b], however we are interested in ILP FEASIBILITY instances where variables are only allowed to take values in $\{0, 1\}$, which is the main technical difference.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\{\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b} : \forall i, x_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$ be an ILP FEASIBILITY instance with $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{r \times c}$, a non-negative integer matrix with r rows and c columns and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^r$, a column vector. In polynomial time, this instance can be reduced to an equivalent instance $\{\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b}' : \forall i, y_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$ of ILP FEASIBILITY where \mathbf{A}' is a $\{0, 1\}$ -matrix with $r' = \mathcal{O}(\log \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot r)$ rows and $c' = \mathcal{O}(\log \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot (c + \|\mathbf{b}\|_\infty))$ columns, where $\mathbf{b}' \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{r'}$ is a vector with $\|\mathbf{b}'\|_\infty = \mathcal{O}(\|\mathbf{b}\|_\infty)$.*

Proof. Consider the ILP constraints row by row, then every row can be written as $\mathbf{a}^T \cdot \mathbf{x} = b$ with $\mathbf{a} = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_c] \in \mathbb{Z}_+^c$ and $b \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ being a row of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{b} respectively, where a_i denotes the i -th column of \mathbf{a} . By choosing $\delta = \lceil \log(\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty + 1) \rceil$, we will have $a_i \leq 2^\delta - 1$ and as a result, each a_i can be expressed with δ bits in binary. Now let $a_i[j]$ and $b[j]$ be the j -th bit of a_i and b in their binary representations, then $\mathbf{a}^T \cdot \mathbf{x} = b$ can be written as:

$$\sum_{i=1}^c \sum_{j=0}^{\delta-1} 2^j a_i[j] x_i = \sum_{j=0}^{\delta-1} 2^j b[j] \quad (8)$$

where x_i is the i -th row of \mathbf{x} . In order to achieve $\{0, 1\}$ -coefficients, we would like to replace the constraint (8) with δ “bit-wise” constraints $\sum_{i=1}^c a_i[j] x_i = b[j]$; this is, however, not equivalent to (8), as carry-over might occur. Therefore, we additionally introduce carry variables $y_{-1}, y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{\delta-1}$ such that y_j represents the carry-over obtained from summing (8) up to the j -th bit; we set $y_{-1} = 0$ and $y_{\delta-1} = \sum_{j \geq \delta} 2^{j-1} b[j]$ to be fixed values in order to unify the first and the last constraint with the rest. As a result, 8 can be replaced with $\delta + 1$ new equations as follows:

$$y_{j-1} + \sum_{i=1}^c a_i[j] x_i = b[j] + 2y_j \text{ for } j \in \{0, 1, \dots, \delta - 1\} \quad (9)$$

Note that $a_i[j] \in \{0, 1\}$, so to make (9) a linear constraint with all coefficients being in $\{0, 1\}$, we only need to deal with the $2y_j$ term. To this end, for every y_j we introduce two variables y_j' and y_j'' with constraints $y_j' + y_j = 2^{\lceil \log(b) \rceil}$ and $y_j'' + y_j = 2^{\lfloor \log(b) \rfloor}$. Now since $y_j' + y_j'' = 2^{\lceil \log(b) \rceil + 1} - 2y_j$, we can rewrite (9) as:

$$y_{j-1} + y_j' + y_j'' + \sum_{i=1}^c a_i[j] x_i = b[j] + 2^{\lceil \log(b) \rceil + 1} \quad (10)$$

Note that $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$ while for every $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, \delta\}$ the variables y_j, y_j' and y_j'' are not necessarily in $\{0, 1\}$. Since $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $a_i[j] \in \{0, 1\}$, we can safely assume $y_j \leq c$, and also $y_j', y_j'' \leq 2b \leq 2\|\mathbf{b}\|_\infty$. Leaving $H = 2\|\mathbf{b}\|_\infty$, we obtain an ILP with $\{0, 1\}$ coefficients and $\{0, 1\}$ variables by applying the following replacements of variables:

- replacing y_j with the sum of c new variables $z_{1,j}, z_{2,j}, \dots, z_{c,j}$ with $z_{k,j} \in \{0, 1\}$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, c\}$.
- replacing y_j' and y_j'' , respectively, with the sum of new variables $z'_{1,j}, \dots, z'_{H,j}$ and $z''_{1,j}, \dots, z''_{H,j}$ with $z'_{k,j} \in \{0, 1\}$ and $z''_{k,j} \in \{0, 1\}$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, H\}$.

that is, each constraint of the form (10) is replaced with another constraint as follows:

$$\sum_{k=1}^c z_{k,j-1} + \sum_{k=1}^H \left(z'_{k,j} + z''_{k,j} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^r a_i[j] x_i = b[j] + 2^{\lceil \log(b) \rceil + 1} \quad (11)$$

Note that $b[j] + 2^{\lceil \log(b) \rceil + 1} = \mathcal{O}(\|\mathbf{b}\|_\infty)$. As a result, we have an ILP FEASIBILITY $\{\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}' : \mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{c'}\}$ with $\mathbf{A}' \in \{0, 1\}^{r' \times c'}$ and $\mathbf{b}' \in \mathbb{N}^{r'}$ where $c' = c + (\delta + 1)(c + 2\|\mathbf{b}\|_\infty) = \mathcal{O}(\delta(c + \|\mathbf{b}\|_\infty))$, $r' = (\delta + 1)r = \mathcal{O}(\delta \cdot r)$ and $\|\mathbf{b}'\|_\infty = \mathcal{O}(\|\mathbf{b}\|_\infty)$. \square

Now we introduce a lemma that allows to reduce a $\{0, 1\}$ -coefficient matrix to a matrix with values only in $\{-1, 1\}$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\{\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b} : x_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$ be an ILP FEASIBILITY instance with $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{r \times c}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^r$. In polynomial time, this instance can be reduced to an equivalent instance $\{\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b}' : \forall i, y_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$ of ILP FEASIBILITY where \mathbf{A}' is a $\{-1, 1\}$ -matrix with $r' = r + 1$ rows and $c' = 2c$ columns and $\mathbf{b}' \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{r'}$ is a vector with $\|\mathbf{b}'\|_\infty = 2\|\mathbf{b}\|_\infty$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{J}_{r \times c}$ be a matrix with r rows and c columns such that every entry of this matrix is equal to 1. Also, let $\mathbb{1}_r$ be a vector of r entries all equal to 1. Then we have the following equality for any solution $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^c$ of $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$:

$$(2\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{J}_{r \times c})\mathbf{x} = 2\mathbf{b} - \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \cdot \mathbb{1}_r. \quad (12)$$

Note that since $x \in \{0, 1\}^c$ we have $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^c x_i$, which is at most c . By introducing c new variables z_1, z_2, \dots, z_c with $z_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, c\}$ we can rewrite the constraint Equation (12) as:

$$\begin{aligned} (2\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{J}_{r \times c})\mathbf{x} + \mathbb{1}_r \cdot \sum_{i=1}^c z_i &= 2\mathbf{b} \\ \sum_{i=1}^c x_i - \sum_{i=1}^c z_i &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Let \mathbf{A}' be a matrix with $r + 1$ rows and $2c$ columns such that the first $r \times c$ entries are equal to $2\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{J}$, the second $r \times c$ entries are all 1, the first c entries of the $(r + 1)$ -th row are equal to 1 and the second c entries are all -1 (see Figure 3 for an illustration). Let \mathbf{b}' be a vector with $r + 1$ rows such that its first r entries are equal to $2\mathbf{b}$ and the last entry is 0. Also, let \mathbf{y} be a vector with $2c$ variables $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, 2c\}$. Then the feasibility ILP $\{\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b} : \mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^c\}$ with $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{r \times c}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^r$ is equivalent to $\{\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b}' : \mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^{2c}\}$ with $\mathbf{A}' \in \{-1, 1\}^{(r+1) \times 2c}$ and $\mathbf{b}' = 2\mathbf{b}$. \square

$$\mathbf{A}' = \left[\begin{array}{c|cccc} \overbrace{\hspace{10em}}^c & & & & \\ \hline & \mathbf{A} - \mathbb{J} & & & \\ & & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ & & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ & & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ & & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ & & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ & & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ \hline & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & \\ \hline & & & & & -1 & -1 & \cdots & -1 & -1 \end{array} \right] \quad \mathbf{b}' = \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{b} \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{array} \right]$$

Figure 3: The target instance $(\mathbf{A}', \mathbf{b}')$ in the construction of Lemma 5.5.

It will be more convenient to work with ILP instances of form $\mathbf{Ax} \leq \mathbf{b}$, which motivates the following lemma.

Lemma 5.6. *Every ILP FEASIBILITY instance $\{\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b} : \forall i, x_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$ with $\mathbf{A} \in \{-1, +1\}^{r \times c}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^r$ can be reduced to an equivalent ILP instance $\{\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{b}' : \forall i, y_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$ with $\mathbf{A}' \in \{-1, +1\}^{2r \times c}$ and $\mathbf{b}' \in \mathbb{Z}^{2r}$, where $\|\mathbf{b}'\|_\infty = \|\mathbf{b}\|_\infty$.*

Proof. By changing the constraints to $\mathbf{Ax} \leq \mathbf{b}$ and $-\mathbf{Ax} \leq -\mathbf{b}$ we get the desired ILP FEASIBILITY instance. \square

Before we can reduce to CLOSEST STRING itself, we first show a reduction to a slightly more general version of the problem NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING, where each string has its own upper bound on the distance to the closest string. For more convenience, we restate the problem.

Definition 5.7 (NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING). *Given a set of $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ binary strings $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ each of length ℓ and a distance vector $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, determine whether there exist a binary string s of length ℓ such that for all $i \in [n]$:*

$$d_H(s, s_i) \leq d_i.$$

Lemma 5.8. *Every ILP instance $\{\mathbf{Ax} \leq \mathbf{b} : \forall i, x_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$ with $\mathbf{A} \in \{-1, +1\}^{r \times c}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ can be reduced, in polynomial time, to a NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING instance with r strings of length c , where $d_i \leq (c + \|\mathbf{b}\|_\infty)$ for each $i \in [r]$.*

Proof. Let a_i and b_i denote the i -th row and i -th entry of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{b} respectively. Define s to be the binary string such that its i -th bit corresponds to the value of x_i in the ILP, that is $s = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_c]$. Also, for each row a_i in \mathbf{A} let $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}(a_i) = |\{j \in \{1, \dots, c\} : a_i[j] = -1\}|$ denote the number of -1 entries in a_i . Construct a binary string $s_i \in \{0, 1\}^c$ of length c as follows

$$s_i[j] = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a_i[j] = 1 \\ 1 & \text{if } a_i[j] = -1 \end{cases}$$

and for $j \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, define variables

$$z_{s_i}^j = \begin{cases} x_j & \text{if } s_i[j] = 0 \\ 1 - x_j & \text{if } s_i[j] = 1 \end{cases}$$

then, the Hamming distance between strings s and s_i can be expressed in terms of variables $z_{s_i}^j$ as follows:

$$d_H(s, s_i) = \sum_{j=1}^c z_{s_i}^j = a_i \cdot x + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}(a_i) \leq b_i + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}(a_i)$$

Now let $d_i = b_i + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}(a_i)$. Note that since $x \in \{0, 1\}^c$ and $a_i \in \{-1, +1\}^c$, if $b_i < 0$ then in order for the ILP instance to be feasible we should have $|b_i| \leq \tilde{\mathcal{K}}(a_i)$. So in a feasible ILP instance, $b_i + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}(a_i) \geq 0$. So from the ILP instance $\{\mathbf{Ax} \leq \mathbf{b} : x_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$ with $\mathbf{A} \in \{-1, +1\}^{r \times c}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, we construct a NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING instance with the set of strings $\{s_1, \dots, s_r\}$ and the distance vector $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_r)$ as described above. If for any $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ it holds that $d_i < 0$, we get an infeasible instance which indicates that the ILP instance was infeasible in the first place. Suppose the ILP instance is feasible, then there is a solution $x \in \{0, 1\}^c$ such that $a_i \cdot x \leq b_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. As a result $a_i \cdot x + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}(a_i) = d_H(s, s_i) \leq b_i + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}(a_i) = d_i$ holds which implies that $s = [x_1, \dots, x_c]$ is a solution to the NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING with set of strings $\{s_1, \dots, s_r\}$ and distance vector $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_r)$. Now suppose that $s = [x_1, \dots, x_c]$ is a solution to the NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING with set of strings $\{s_1, \dots, s_r\}$ and distance vector $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_r)$. Then $d_H(s, s_i) = a_i \cdot x + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}(a_i) \leq d_i = b_i + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}(a_i)$ holds for all $i \in [r]$, which implies $a_i \cdot x \leq b_i$. Thus, $x = [x_1, \dots, x_c]$ is a solution to the original ILP instance. So if $d_i < 0$ for any $i \in [r]$, the ILP instance is infeasible. \square

Finally, we show a reduction from NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING to CLOSEST STRING.

Lemma 5.9. *Every NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING instance with strings $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ of length $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and distance vector $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$ can be reduced to a CLOSEST STRING instance with $2n$ strings $S' = \{s'_1, \dots, s'_{2n}\}$ and distance $d = \max_{i=1}^n d_i$ in time $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot \ell)$, where length of the constructed strings is at most $\ell + 2n \cdot d$.*

Proof. For any binary string s of length ℓ and $i, j \in [\ell]$ with $i < j$, let $s[i, j]$ be the substring obtained from s that is restricted to indices i through j , inclusive. We write $s[i, j] = \bar{0}$ (and $s[i, j] = \bar{1}$) to set the bits from index i to index j (inclusive) in the string s to 0 (and 1 respectively). Without loss of generality assume that $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_n$, then $d = \max_{i=1}^n d_i = d_n$. Also define $\Delta_i = d - d_i$, $p_i = \ell + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \Delta_j$ and $\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i$. For each string s_i in the NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING instance, we construct two corresponding strings s_i^1 and s_i^2 each of length $\ell + 2\Delta$ in our CLOSEST STRING instance, as follows:




Figure 4: Construction of strings in the Closest String instance, Lemma 5.9.

- Set the first ℓ bits of s_i^1 and s_i^2 to s_i , i.e. $s_i^1[1, \ell] = s_i^2[1, \ell] = s_i$.
- Among the remaining 2Δ bits of s_i^1 , set the Δ_i bits from index $(p_i + 1)$ through $(p_i + \Delta_i)$ to 1 and the rest to 0. i.e. $s_i^1[\ell + 1, p_i] = \bar{0}$, $s_i^1[p_i + 1, p_i + \Delta_i] = \bar{1}$ and $s_i^1[p_i + \Delta_i + 1, \ell + 2\Delta] = \bar{0}$.
- For s_i^2 , set the Δ_i bits from index $(p_i + \Delta_i + 1)$ through (p_{i+1}) to 1. i.e. $s_i^2[\ell + 1, p_i + \Delta_i] = \bar{0}$, $s_i^2[p_i + \Delta_i + 1, p_{i+1}] = \bar{1}$ and $s_i^2[p_{i+1} + 1, \ell + 2\Delta] = \bar{0}$.

the resulting strings are illustrated in Figure(4). Note that $\Delta_n = d - D_n = 0$.

Define $S' = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{s_i^1, s_i^2\}$ to be the set of all $2n$ strings we have constructed. Let s be a solution to the NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING instance. We construct a string s' of length $\ell + 2\Delta$ that is obtained by appending 2Δ zeros to s . Obviously s' is a valid solution to the CLOSEST STRING instance, since for every $i \in [n]$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(s', s_i^j) &= d_H(s'[1, \ell], s_i^j[1, \ell]) + d_H(s'[\ell + 1, \ell + 2\Delta], s_i^j[\ell + 1, \ell + 2\Delta]) \\ &= d_H(s, s_i^j[1, \ell]) + \Delta_i \leq d_i + \Delta_i = d \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality holds since $s_i^j[1, \ell] = s_i$. Thus the binary string s' has Hamming distance of at most d to all the strings in the set S' . Now let s' be a valid solution to the CLOSEST STRING instance. Define sets $I, \bar{I} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ as $I = \{p_i + 1, \dots, p_{i+1}\}$ and $\bar{I} = \{\ell + 1, \dots, \ell + 2\Delta\} \setminus I$. For $i \in [n]$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$, we partition $d_H(s', s_i^j)$ as follows:

$$d_H(s', s_i^j) = d_H(s'[1, \ell], s_i^j[1, \ell]) + d_H(s'[\bar{I}], s_i^j[\bar{I}]) + d_H(s'[I], s_i^j[I])$$

According to the construction, the first l bits of s_i^1 and s_i^2 have the same values as s_i , therefore

$$d_H(s'[1, \ell], s_i^j[1, \ell]) = d_H(s'[1, \ell], s_i).$$

Moreover, among the remaining 2Δ bits, it holds that $s_i^1[\bar{I}] = s_i^2[\bar{I}]$ and $s_i^1[I] = \overline{s_i^2[I]}$ since both s_i^1 and s_i^2 are zero on indices indicated by the set \bar{I} and are complement of each other on indices indicated by the set I . Thus, $d_H(s'[\bar{I}], s_i^1[\bar{I}]) = d_H(s'[\bar{I}], s_i^2[\bar{I}])$ and $d_H(s'[I], s_i^1[I]) = 2\Delta_i - d_H(s'[I], s_i^2[I])$. As a result, using Equation (13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^2 d_H(s', s_i^j) &= 2d_H(s'[1, \ell], s_i) + 2d_H(s'[\bar{I}], s_i^1[\bar{I}]) + 2\Delta_i \leq 2d \\ &\Rightarrow d_H(s'[1, \ell], s_i) + d_H(s'[\bar{I}], s_i^1[\bar{I}]) \leq d - \Delta_i = d_i \end{aligned}$$

and since $d_H(s'[\bar{I}], s_i^1[\bar{I}]) \geq 0$, we have that $d_H(s'[1, \ell], s_i) \leq d_i$. So the string $s = s'[1, \ell]$ (the first l bits of s') is a valid solution to the original instance of NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING. \square

With the reductions above at hand, we can conclude with the proof of Theorem 5.1 as outlined below.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We start by applying Lemma 5.2, to obtain an equivalent ILP FEASIBILITY instance where the coefficients, constraints and variable domains are all non-negative integers. Next, by applying Lemma 5.3, we get an equivalent instance of ILP FEASIBILITY with binary variables. Then,

with the help of Lemma 5.4, we get that also the coefficients in the constraints are binary. After applying Lemma 5.5, we get that all coefficients are either -1 or $+1$, and additionally that the ILP instance is of the form $\mathbf{Ax} \leq \mathbf{b}$ by applying Lemma 5.6. Finally, we reduce to NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING via Lemma 5.8, and then to CLOSEST STRING via Lemma 5.9.

We now argue about the size of the constructed instance. The number of rows is increased by a factor of $\mathcal{O}(\log \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty)$ by the reduction of Lemma 5.4, and by at most a constant factor in all other reductions. Therefore, $n = \mathcal{O}(\log \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot r)$. The number of columns is increased by the original number of rows in Lemma 5.2, by a factor of δ in Lemma 5.3, where $\delta = \max u_i - \ell_i + 1$, and then $\mathcal{O}(c \cdot \delta \cdot \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty)$ additional columns are added in Lemma 5.4, along with an additional factor of $\mathcal{O}(\log \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty)$. Lemma 5.5 only increases the number of columns by at most a constant factor, and Lemmata 5.6, 5.8 do not change the number of columns. Finally, in Lemma 5.9, d is set to at most $\mathcal{O}(\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot \log \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot c \cdot \delta)$ and additional $2n \cdot d$ columns are attached, where $n = \mathcal{O}(\log \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot r)$. Therefore, the final length of the strings ℓ is at most $\mathcal{O}(\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot \log^2 \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot r \cdot c \cdot \delta)$. \square

As mentioned in the previous section, ILP FEASIBILITY admits an algorithm with running time $(r\Delta)^{(r+1)^2} \cdot \text{poly}(rc)$ [Eisenbrand and Weismantel, 2020], where $\Delta = \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty$. On the other hand, a version of ILP FEASIBILITY without upper bounds on the variables can be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(c \cdot (r\Delta)^{2r} \cdot \|\mathbf{b}\|_1^2)$ [Eisenbrand and Weismantel, 2020], and this is tight under the ETH [Knop et al., 2020b]. This raises a natural question whether the gap in the running time between the two versions is necessary. As CLOSEST STRING admits a straightforward reduction to ILP FEASIBILITY, it also makes sense to ask whether running time better than $n^{\mathcal{O}(n^2)} \cdot \text{poly}(n\ell)$ can be achieved for CLOSEST STRING. From Theorem 5.1, it follows that an improved CLOSEST STRING algorithm would automatically improve the best-known running time for ILP FEASIBILITY (with upper bounds). Formally, we prove Theorem 1.4, as stated in Section 1.

Theorem 1.4. *For any $\alpha > 0$, assume that CLOSEST STRING admits an algorithm with running time $2^{\mathcal{O}(n^{1+\alpha})} \cdot \text{poly}(n\ell)$, where n is the number of strings and ℓ is their length. Then the ILP $\{\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b} : \forall i, \ell_i \leq x_i \leq u_i\}$, where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{r \times c}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, and $\ell_i \leq u_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, can be solved in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(r^{1+\alpha+o(1)})} \cdot \text{poly}(rc)$, assuming that $\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty = \mathcal{O}(r)$ and $\delta = 2^{\mathcal{O}(r)}$, where $\delta = \max_{i \in [c]} (u_i - \ell_i)$.*

Proof. We construct a CLOSEST STRING instance following Theorem 5.1, and then by applying the assumed algorithm for CLOSEST STRING on the obtained instance, we obtain an algorithm for the original ILP FEASIBILITY with running time:

$$2^{\mathcal{O}(n^{1+\alpha})} \cdot \text{poly}(n\ell),$$

where $n = \mathcal{O}(\log \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot r)$, $\ell = \mathcal{O}(\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot \log^2 \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot r \cdot c \cdot \delta)$. This can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{\mathcal{O}(n^{1+\alpha})} \text{poly}(n\ell) &= 2^{\mathcal{O}((\log \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot r)^{1+\alpha})} \cdot (\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \cdot r \cdot c \cdot \delta)^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \\ &= 2^{\mathcal{O}(r^{1+\alpha+o(1)})} \cdot r^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot c^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(r)} \\ &= 2^{\mathcal{O}((r^{1+\alpha+o(1)})+1)} \cdot \text{poly}(rc). \\ &= 2^{\mathcal{O}(r^{1+\alpha+o(1)})} \cdot \text{poly}(rc). \end{aligned}$$

\square

From Theorem 1 in Knop et al. [2020b], and the chain of reductions in the proof of Theorem 5.1, we can also get the following hardness result for CLOSEST STRING, that at least the running time of $2^{\mathcal{O}(n \log n)} \cdot \text{poly}(n\ell)$ is necessary, similarly to ILP FEASIBILITY with unbounded variables.

Corollary 5.10. *Assuming ETH, there is no algorithm that solves CLOSEST STRING in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(n \log n)} \cdot \text{poly}(n\ell)$.*

6 Vertex Cover

In this section, we describe an FPT algorithm for k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES parameterized by the vertex cover number of the incidence graph, G_M , derived from mask matrix M . More formally, we prove the following:

Theorem 1.1. k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES admits an algorithm with running time

$$2^{\mathcal{O}(k \cdot \text{vc}(G_M) + \text{vc}(G_M)^2 \cdot \log \text{vc}(G_M))} \text{poly}(nm).$$

Proof. Let S denote the minimum vertex cover of G_M , which can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(1.2738^{\text{vc}(G_M)} + (\text{vc}(G_M) \cdot nm))$ by the state-of-the-art algorithm of Chen et al. [2006]. We define the sets $R_S = (S \cap R_M)$ and $C_S = (S \cap C_M)$, to represent the rows and coordinates in M that are part of the vertex cover S . Additionally, we define $\overline{C_S} = C_M \setminus C_S$, and $\overline{R_S} = \{r \in (R_M \setminus R_S) : \mathbf{A}[r][C_S] \neq \mathbf{0}\}$ as the set of rows outside R_S whose substring induced by the coordinates in C_S contains at least one non-zero entry. Remember that, by the definition of G_M , for every $r \in \overline{R_S}$ and $c \in \overline{C_S}$, it follows that $M[r][c] = 0$. To see this, assume there exist $r_0 \in \overline{R_S}, c_0 \notin \overline{C_S}$ such that $M[r_0][c_0] = 1$. Then, the edge (r_0, c_0) exists in G_M that is not covered by S , as neither r_0 nor c_0 belong to S , which contradicts that S is a vertex cover of G_M .

Consequently, the rows and coordinates in $(\overline{R_S} \cap \overline{C_S})$ do not contribute to the radius of any cluster, since $M[\overline{R_S}][\overline{C_S}] = 0$ which means that $\mathbf{A}[\overline{R_S}][\overline{C_S}] = ?$. Therefore, we only need to focus on the entries in $(R_S \cap C_S)$ for cluster assignments. For further clarification, refer to Figure 5. The rows contained in R_S will be referred to as *long rows*, and the rows within $\overline{R_S}$ will be called *short rows*, as they contain values solely along the coordinates within C_S . See Figure 5 for an illustration of the instance structure; rows and coordinates may need to be reordered to reflect this structure, but this does not affect the problem's objective or the algorithm.




Figure 5: The mask matrix M . The non-zero entries are distributed only within R_S and C_S . For every $r \in \overline{R_S}$ and $c \in \overline{C_S}$ it holds that $M[r][c] = 0$.

We also define the mappings:

- $\text{part} : R_S \rightarrow [k]$,
- $\text{cent} : [k] \times C_S \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$

which we refer to as a *partial cluster assignment* and a *partial center assignment*, respectively. Intuitively, part assigns each long row $r \in R_S$ to one of the k clusters, and cent assigns values to the centers of *all* clusters, only along the coordinates in C_S . We call a pair $(\text{part}, \text{cent})$, a *partial assignment* and say it is *valid* if, for every $r \in R_S$, the condition $d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_S], \text{cent}[\text{part}[r], C_S]) \leq d$ holds. Let P denote the set of all possible partial assignments, and for a valid $(\text{part}, \text{cent}) \in P$, define $J = \bigcup_{r \in R_S} \text{part}[r]$, as the set of clusters assigned to the long rows by part . For a cluster $j \in J$ with cardinality p_j , let $T_j = \{r_{j_1}, r_{j_2}, \dots, r_{j_{p_j}}\} \subseteq R_S$ be the set of long rows that part assigns to cluster j .

Note that, in order to ensure a correct cluster assignment, we must verify that the distance between each long row and its cluster center along the coordinates in C_M does not exceed d , and that the distance between each short row and its cluster center along the coordinates in C_S also remains within d .

With the necessary definitions set, we now proceed to outline Algorithm 1:

First, we start by obtaining the minimum vertex cover of G_M . Then we establish a valid partial assignment $(\text{part}, \text{cent})$ for the *long* rows along coordinates in C_S (*lines 1-4*). At this point, each long row has some distance to its corresponding cluster center along the coordinates in C_S , that is $d_H(r[C_S], \text{cent}[\text{part}[r]])$. Consequently, the remaining distance that each long row $r_{j_i} \in T_j$ can have to its respective cluster center along coordinates in $\overline{C_S}$ is bounded by $d'_{j_i} = d - d_H(\mathbf{A}[r_{j_i}][C_S], \text{cent}[j, C_S])$ (*lines 5-11*).

As the next step, for the clusters that have been assigned to the *long* rows, we try to determine if

there exists a valid center assignment along the remaining coordinates, $\overline{C_S}$. To do so, we solve a binary NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING instance (denoted as *NUCS* on line 14) for each cluster $j \in J$, with the distance vector $\mathbf{d}'_j = (d'_{j_1}, \dots, d'_{j_{p_j}})$, and the strings $r'_{i_j} = \mathbf{A}[r_{i_j}][\overline{C_S}]$, for $i \in [p_j]$ (lines 12-16). At this stage, we have a valid cluster assignment for the long rows, and the remaining task is to assign the short rows to appropriate clusters.

Finally, we decide whether a valid cluster assignment is also possible for the *short* rows. So, we assign each $\bar{r} \in \overline{R_S}$, to the smallest $j \in [k]$ such that $d_H(\mathbf{A}[\bar{r}][C_S], \text{cent}[j, C_S]) \leq d$ (lines 17-24). If at this step, we can assign all the *short* rows ($\overline{R_S}$) to some cluster center defined by cent , then the given k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES instance is a feasible (lines 25-26). Otherwise, we repeat the process for another valid partial assignment.

For correctness, first assume there is a solution, we show that our algorithm correctly finds it. Let $\text{part}^* : R_M \rightarrow [k]$ be the solution cluster assignment and $\text{cent}^* : [k] \times C_M \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the solution center assignment. Then for each cluster $i \in [k]$ and each long row $r \in R_S$ assigned to it, that is $\text{part}^*[r] = i$, it holds that

$$d_H(\mathbf{A}[r], \text{cent}^*[i]) = d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_S], \text{cent}^*[i][C_S]) + d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][\overline{C_S}], \text{cent}^*[i][\overline{C_S}]) \leq d$$

Since we consider all the possible valid partial assignments for long rows in our algorithm, $\text{cent}^*[\text{part}^*[r]][C_S]$ is captured by at least one of the partial assignments $(\text{part}, \text{cent}) \in P$. In other words, there is at least one partial assignments $(\text{part}, \text{cent}) \in P$ such that $\text{part} = \text{part}^*|_{R_S}$ and $\text{cent} = \text{cent}^*|_{C_S}$, where $|$ denotes restriction to a set. Thus, by definition, it holds that $d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][\overline{C_S}], \text{cent}^*[\text{part}^*[r]][\overline{C_S}]) \leq d'$. Consequently, the NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING instance for cluster i and the long rows assigned to it, will correctly output feasible. As a result, for the long rows, we correctly output that a k -cluster with radius at most d is feasible. For the short rows, note that they have non-missing entries only along coordinates in C_S , so for each short row $\bar{r} \in R_S$ assigned to cluster $i \in [k]$, that is $\text{part}^*[\bar{r}] = i$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(\mathbf{A}[\bar{r}], \text{cent}^*[i]) &= d_H(\mathbf{A}[\bar{r}][C_S], \text{cent}^*[i, C_S]) \\ &= d_H(\mathbf{A}[\bar{r}][C_S], \text{cent}[i, C_S]) \leq d. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, \bar{r} will at least be assigned to cluster i . Therefore if there is a solution to this instance of k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES, then our algorithm will successfully output feasible. The other direction can similarly be showed.

As of the running time, in the first step, we obtain the minimum vertex cover of G_M in time $\mathcal{O}(1.2738^{\text{vc}(G_M)} + (\text{vc}(G_M) \cdot nm))$ using the algorithm described in Chen et al. [2006]. For the following steps, note that there are at most $k^{|R_S|} = k^{\mathcal{O}(\text{vc}(G_M))}$ possible mappings for part and $2^{(|C_S| \cdot |J|)} = 2^{\mathcal{O}(\text{vc}(G_M) \cdot k)}$ for cent . The NON-UNIFORM CLOSEST STRING instances are solved via ILP formulation described in Section 3 in time $m \cdot \mathcal{O}(\text{vc}(G_M))^{(\text{vc}(G_M)+1)^2+1} \cdot \log^2 \text{vc}(G_M)$, according to Corollary 4.1. Note that because the distance of each short row $\bar{r} \in \overline{R_S}$ to a cluster center can be checked in time $(k' \cdot |C_S|) = \mathcal{O}(k \cdot \text{vc}(G_M))$, the final step can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot k \cdot \text{vc}(G_M) \cdot 2^{(\text{vc}(G_M) \cdot k)})$. In total, the running time of the algorithm is dominated by $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \cdot \text{vc}(G_M) + \text{vc}(G_M)^2 \cdot \log \text{vc}(G_M))} \text{poly}(nm)$. \square

7 Treewidth

This section is dedicated to a fixed-parameter algorithm for the problem parameterized by the treewidth of the incidence graph G_M , the number of clusters k and the maximum permissible radius of the cluster, d . We restate the formal result next for convenience.

Theorem 1.3. *k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES admits an algorithm with running time*

$$d^{\mathcal{O}(\text{tw}(G_M))} 2^{\mathcal{O}(k \cdot \text{tw}(G_M))} \text{poly}(nm).$$

First, we briefly sketch the intuition of our approach. Informally, the fact that G_M has treewidth at most t means that the graph can be constructed in a tree-like fashion, where at each point only a vertex subset of size at most t is “active”. This small subset is called a *bag*, and in particular is a separator for the graph: there are no edges between the “past”, already constructed part of the graph and the “future”, not encountered yet part of the graph; all connections between these parts are via the bag itself. In terms of the k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES instance, this means that for each “past” row, all its entries

Algorithm 1: k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES parameterized by $\text{vc}(G_M)$

Input: $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1, ?\}^{n \times m}$ and $\mathbf{M} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times m}$
Output: Yes/No

- 1 $S \leftarrow$ Minimum Vertex Cover of G_M
- 2 $P \leftarrow \{(\text{part}, \text{cent}) \in (R_S \rightarrow [k]) \times ([k] \times C_S \rightarrow \{0, 1\})\}$
- 3 **for** $(\text{part}, \text{cent}) \in P$ **do**
- 4 **if** $\text{isValid}(\text{part}, \text{cent})$ **then**
- 5 $J \leftarrow \bigcup_{r \in R_S} \text{part}[r]$
- 6 $\text{soln} \leftarrow \text{true}$
- 7 **for** $j \in J$ **do**
- 8 $T_j \leftarrow \{r_{j_1}, r_{j_2}, \dots, r_{j_{p_j}}\}$
- 9 **for** $r_{j_i} \in T_j$ **do**
- 10 $d'_{j_i} = d - d_H(\mathbf{A}[r_{j_i}][C_S], \text{cent}[j, C_S])$
- 11 $r'_{j_i} = \mathbf{A}[r_{j_i}][\overline{C_S}]$
- 12 $d' \leftarrow (d'_{j_1}, \dots, d'_{j_{p_j}})$
- 13 $r' \leftarrow (r'_{j_1}, \dots, r'_{j_{p_j}})$
- 14 $\text{soln} \leftarrow \text{soln} \wedge \text{NUCS}(k, d', r')$
- 15 **if** $!\text{soln}$ **then**
- 16 **break**
- 17 **if** soln **then**
- 18 $\overline{R_S} = \{r \in (R_M \setminus R_S) : \mathbf{A}[r][C_S] \neq \overline{0}\}$
- 19 $\text{counter} \leftarrow 0$
- 20 **for** $r \in \overline{R_S}$ **do**
- 21 **for** $j \in [k]$ **do**
- 22 **if** $d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_S], \text{cent}[j, C_S]) \leq d$ **then**
- 23 $\text{counter}++$
- 24 **break**
- 25 **if** $\text{counter} = |\overline{R_S}|$ **then**
- 26 **return YES**
- 27 **return NO**

that correspond to “future” columns are missing (as the respective entry of the mask matrix \mathbf{M} has to be 0), and the same holds for “past” columns and “future” rows.

Our algorithm performs dynamic programming over this decomposition, supporting a collection of records for the current bag. For the rows of the current bag, we store the partition of the rows into clusters, and additionally for each row the distance to its center vector among the already encountered columns. For each cluster and for each column of the bag, we store the value of the cluster center in this column. These three characteristics (called together a *fragment*) act as a “trace” of a potential solution on the current bag. In our DP table, we store whether there exists a partial solution for each choice of the fragment. Because of the separation property explained above, only knowing the fragments is sufficient for computing the records for every possible update on the bag. The claimed running time follows from upper-bounding the number of possible fragments for a bag of size at most t .

Now we proceed with the formal proof. We first recall the definition of a nice tree decomposition, which is a standard structure for performing dynamic programming in the setting of bounded treewidth.

Nice Tree Decomposition. A nice tree decomposition of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{X})$ where \mathcal{T} is a rooted tree at node r and \mathcal{X} is a mapping that assigns to each node $t \in \mathcal{T}$ a set $X(t) \subseteq V(G)$, referred to as the bag of at node t . A nice tree decomposition satisfies the following properties for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$:

1. $X(r) = \emptyset$ and for every leaf l , it holds that $|X(l)| = 1$.
2. For every $uv \in E$, there is a node $t \in \mathcal{T}$ such that both $u \in X(t)$ and $v \in X(t)$ hold.

3. For every $v \in V$, the set of nodes $t \in T$ such that $v \in X(t)$, induces a connected subtree of \mathcal{T} .
4. There are only three kinds of nodes (aside from root and the leaves) in \mathcal{T} :
 - (a) **Introduce Node:** An introduce node t has exactly one child t' such that there is a vertex $v \notin X(t')$ satisfying $X(t) = \{v\} \cup X(t')$. We call v , the introduced vertex.
 - (b) **Forget Node:** A forget node t has exactly one child t' such that there is a vertex $v \notin X(t)$ satisfying $X(t) = X(t') \setminus \{v\}$. We call v , the forgotten vertex.
 - (c) **Join Node:** A join node t has exactly two children t_1 and t_2 such that $X(t) = X(t_1) = X(t_2)$.

Note that by properties 2 and 3, while traversing from leaves to the root, a vertex $v \in V(G)$ can not be introduced again after it has already been forgotten. Otherwise the subtree of \mathcal{T} induced by the nodes whose bags contain v , will be disconnected. The *width* of a nice tree decomposition $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{X})$ is defined as $\max_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (|X(t)| - 1)$ and the *treewidth* of a graph G is defined to be the smallest width of a nice tree decomposition of G and is denoted by $\text{tw}(G)$.

One can use fixed-parameter algorithms described in Bodlaender [1996] and Kloks [1994] to obtain a nice tree decomposition with the optimal width and linearly many nodes. However for a better running time, fixed-parameter approximation algorithms are often used. Specifically, in this paper we apply the 5-approximation algorithm established in Bodlaender et al. [2016] to obtain a nice tree decomposition of G_M with width $q \leq 5 \cdot \text{tw}(G_M)$ in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(\text{tw}(G_M))} (n + m)$.

So let $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{X})$ be the nice tree decomposition of G_I rooted at r with treewidth $q \leq 5 \cdot \text{tw}(G)$. Remember that $V(G_I)$ corresponds to the rows and coordinates of the mask matrix M , so for a node $t \in \mathcal{T}$, we denote the rows and coordinates in $X(t)$ by R_t and C_t respectively. At each node t , we write n_{R_t} and n_{C_t} to denote the cardinality of the sets R_t and C_t , respectively. Also, we denote by \mathcal{T}_t , the subtree of \mathcal{T} rooted at t and define the set of all bags in \mathcal{T}_t by X_t^\downarrow , that is $X_t^\downarrow = \bigcup_{t' \in \mathcal{T}_t} X(t')$. Moreover we extend the notation and denote the set of rows and coordinates in \mathcal{T}_t respectively by R_t^\downarrow and C_t^\downarrow .

We now recall the statement of Theorem 1.3 and start with formally explaining the dynamic programming approach that starts from the leaves and traverses toward the root r , computing and storing the relevant records at each node $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Once the records at r are computed, they are used to derive the correct solution. Intuitively, at each node $t \in \mathcal{T}$, these records will store: a partitioning of rows in $X(t)$ into clusters, the cluster centers limited to the coordinates present in $X(t)$, and the potential distances between the rows in the bag and their cluster centers along all the coordinates visited up to that node.

Proof. We continue to formally explain the records and how the dynamic programming proceeds. At every node t , we define the following mappings:

- $\text{part} : R_t \rightarrow [k]$,
- $\text{cent} : [k] \times C_t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$,
- $\text{dist} : R_t \rightarrow [d]$,

and call a triple $(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist})$ a *fragment* in t . Intuitively, at node t , part defines a (partial) clustering of the rows within the bag, cent assigns value to all cluster centers along the coordinates in the bag and dist considers, for each row r_i in the bag, all possible Hamming distances to its corresponding cluster center, along the coordinates in C_t^\downarrow . We say dist is valid if for all $j \in R_t$ it holds that $0 \leq d_j \leq d$. Moreover, let \mathcal{B}_t be the set of all binary matrices with row labels in R_t^\downarrow and coordinate labels in C_t^\downarrow . We say $(\text{part}, \text{cent})$ is a *partial fragment* of $B_t \in \mathcal{B}_t$ at t , if there is a cluster assignment ϕ with respect to B_t such that:

- $\text{part} = \phi|_{R_t}$,
- For every $c \in C_t$, and $r \in R_t^\downarrow : B_t[r][c] = \text{cent}[\phi(r), c]$.

Recall that the existence of a cluster assignment implies, in particular, that B_t has at most k distinct rows. For a mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and a set S , we use the notation $f|_S$ to denote the restriction of f to the elements of S . Let $P(t)$ be the set of all fragments at t , then our dynamic programming records, $D_t : P(t) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ will be a mapping from each fragment at t to a number in $\{0, 1\}$, as follows. For a fragment $(\text{cent}, \text{part}, \text{dist})$, with $\text{dist} = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{n_{R_t}})$, we set $D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) = 1$ if there is a $B_t \in \mathcal{B}_t$ such that:

- a) (part, cent) is a partial fragment of \mathbf{B}_t at t ,
- b) $\forall r \in R_t : d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_t^\dagger], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_t^\dagger]) = \text{dist}[r]$,
- c) $\forall r \in R_t^\dagger \setminus R_t : d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_t^\dagger], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_t^\dagger]) \leq d$,

and we say dist fits \mathbf{B}_t and \mathbf{B}_t confirms $D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) = 1$. Observe that, according to the definition of the nice tree decomposition, at the root node r , we have $X(r) = R_r = C_r = \emptyset$, which implies that $P(r) = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$. Furthermore, $R_r^\dagger = R_M = R_A$ and $C_r^\dagger = C_M = C_A$. Therefore, by properties a) and c) of the dynamic programming, $D_r(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) = 1$ indicates that there exists a matrix B_r defined over rows R_A and coordinates C_A with at most k distinct rows, such that for all $r \in R_A$ it holds that $d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_A], \mathbf{B}_r[r][C_A]) \leq d$, which represents a valid k -center cluster assignment. The reverse direction follows directly from the construction of our dynamic programming approach. As a result, the k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES instance is feasible, if $D_r(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) = 1$. Thus it remains to show that all records can be computed in a leaf-to-root order by traversing the nodes of \mathcal{T} . When visiting a node $t \in \mathcal{T}$, one of the following cases may arise:

t is a leaf node. First assume that $X(t)$ contains only a row r_0 , i.e. $X(t) = \{r_0\}$. In this case we have $C_t = \emptyset$, which leads to $P(t) = \{(\text{part}, \emptyset, \text{dist}) \mid \text{part} : \{r\} \rightarrow [k], \text{dist} : \{r\} \rightarrow [d]\}$. Since there are no coordinates in C_t^\dagger along which we can compute the Hamming distance of $\mathbf{A}[r_0]$ to its cluster center, by definition $D_t(\text{part}, \emptyset, (0)) = 1$. For every other fragment $(\text{part}, \emptyset, \text{dist}) \in P(t)$ with $\text{dist} \neq (0)$, we will have $D_t(\text{part}, \emptyset, \text{dist}) = 0$. On the other hand if $X(t) = \{c_0\}$, where c_0 is a coordinate, then $R_t = \emptyset$ which results in $P(t) = \{(\emptyset, \text{cent}, \emptyset) \mid \text{cent} : [k] \times \{c_0\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}\}$. For every $(\emptyset, \text{cent}, \emptyset) \in P(t)$, we have $D_t(\emptyset, \text{cent}, \emptyset) = 1$.

t introduces a row. Let t' be the child of t and assume that t introduces a row, meaning $X(t) = X(t') \cup \{r_0\}$. Consequently we have $C_t = C_{t'}$ and $R_t = R_{t'} \cup \{r_0\}$. For every $\text{part}' : R_{t'} \rightarrow [k]$, define $\text{part}'_i = \text{part}' \cup (r_0, i)$ with $i \in [k]$, where part'_i assigns the new row r_0 to cluster i . For every $\text{dist}' : R_{t'} \rightarrow [d]$, let $\text{dist}'_i = \text{dist}' \cup (r_0, d_0)$, where $d_0 = d_H(\mathbf{A}[r_0][C_t], \text{cent}[i, C_t])$. If $0 \leq d_0 \leq d$ then for all $i \in [k]$, we set:

$$D_t(\text{part}'_i, \text{cent}, \text{dist}'_i) := D_{t'}(\text{part}', \text{cent}, \text{dist}')$$

To see the correctness, first assume $D_{t'}(\text{part}', \text{cent}, \text{dist}') = 1$, then by the definition there is a matrix $\mathbf{B}_{t'} \in \mathcal{B}_{t'}$ that confirms this. We construct a matrix \mathbf{B}_t from $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$ which confirms $D_t(\text{part}'_i, \text{cent}, \text{dist}'_i) = 1$, and also dist'_i fits it. Observe that $R_t^\dagger = R_{t'}^\dagger \cup \{r_0\}$, so each $\mathbf{B}_t \in \mathcal{B}_t$ contains one more row than each $\mathbf{B}_{t'} \in \mathcal{B}_{t'}$ with the additional row labeled r_0 . So for every $r \in R_{t'}^\dagger$, set $\mathbf{B}_t[r] := \mathbf{B}_{t'}[r]$. Let $\overline{C}_t = C_t^\dagger \setminus C_t$. By property 3 of a nice tree decomposition, $\mathbf{M}[r_0][\overline{C}_t] = 0$, other wise $\overline{C}_t \cup \{r_0\}$ would appear together in a later bag, which can not happen since forgotten coordinates and rows can not be reintroduced. Now it only remains to fill the values for row $\mathbf{B}_t[r_0]$ along coordinates in C_t and also to adjust dist' . Let ϕ' be the cluster assignment with respect to $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$ and dist' be the distance vector that fits $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$. If for some $r \in R_{t'}^\dagger$, it holds that $i = \phi'(r)$, then set $\mathbf{B}_t[r_0] := \mathbf{B}_{t'}[r]$, otherwise for every $c \in C_t$, set $\mathbf{B}_t[r_0][c] := \text{cent}[i, c]$ and for the rest of the coordinates in $c \in \overline{C}_t$ set $\mathbf{B}_t[r_0][c] := 0$. Note that in both cases, for every $c \in C_t$, $\mathbf{B}_t[r_0][c] = \text{cent}[i, c]$: in the first case we have $\mathbf{B}_t[r_0][c] := \mathbf{B}_{t'}[r][c] = \text{cent}[\phi'(r), c] = \text{cent}[i, c]$ and in the second case it follows immediately from the definition. So $(\text{part}'_i, \text{cent})$ is a partial fragment of \mathbf{B}_t . By assigning r_0 to cluster i we have:

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(\mathbf{A}[r_0][C_t^\dagger], \mathbf{B}_t[r_0][C_t^\dagger]) &= d_H(\mathbf{A}[r_0][\overline{C}_t], \mathbf{B}_t[r_0][\overline{C}_t]) + d_H(\mathbf{A}[r_0][C_t], \mathbf{B}_t[r_0][C_t]) \\ &= 0 + d_H(\mathbf{A}[r_0][C_t], \text{cent}[i, C_t]) = d_0 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{M}[r_0][\overline{C}_t] = 0$ holds, $d_0 = d_H(\mathbf{A}[r_0][C_t], \text{cent}[i, C_t])$, represents the Hamming distance of $\mathbf{A}[r_0]$ to the center of cluster i along coordinates in C_t^\dagger . As a result $\text{dist}'_i = \text{dist}' \cup (r_0, d_0)$ fits \mathbf{B}_t , leading to \mathbf{B}_t confirming $D_t(\text{part}'_i, \text{cent}, \text{dist}'_i) = 1$.

In the other direction, suppose that $D_t(\text{part}'_i, \text{cent}, \text{dist}'_i) = 1$, then there exists a $\mathbf{B}_t \in \mathcal{B}_t$ that confirms it and also dist'_i fits \mathbf{B}_t . Let ϕ be the cluster assignment w.r.t \mathbf{B}_t with $(r_0, i) \in \phi$, then $\phi' = \phi \setminus (r_0, i)$ is still a cluster-assignment for \mathbf{B}_t on rows $R_t^\dagger \setminus \{r_0\} = R_{t'}^\dagger$. Also when dist'_i with $(r_0, d_0) \in \text{dist}'_i$ fits \mathbf{B}_t , then $\text{dist}' = \text{dist}'_i \setminus (r_0, d_0)$ fits \mathbf{B}_t on rows $R_t^\dagger \setminus \{r_0\} = R_{t'}^\dagger$. So the matrix $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$ obtained by removing row r_0 from matrix \mathbf{B}_t confirms $D_{t'}(\text{part}', \text{cent}, \text{dist}') = 1$ and dist' fits it.




Figure 6: Illustration of the mask matrix M , when visiting node t that introduces a new row r_0 in the nice tree decomposition. Note that r_0 contains zero along forgotten coordinates, i.e. C_{t^\downarrow}

t introduces a coordinate. If $X(t) = X(t') \cup \{c_0\}$ for some coordinate c_0 , then $R_t = R_{t'}$ and $C_t = C_{t'} \cup \{c_0\}$. For every $\text{cent} : [k] \times C_t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, let $\text{cent}' = \text{cent}|_{C_{t'}}$ be the restriction of cent to all the coordinates in $C_{t'}$. Also for each $\text{dist}' : R_{t'} \rightarrow [d]$, define dist such that for all $r \in R_t$ we have $\text{dist}[r] = \text{dist}'[r] + (\mathbf{A}[r][c_0] \oplus \text{cent}[\text{part}[r], c_0])$, where \oplus is the bit-wise XOR. Now if dist is valid, then we set:

$$D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) := D_{t'}(\text{part}, \text{cent}', \text{dist}')$$

For correctness, first assume that $D_{t'}(\text{part}, \text{cent}', \text{dist}') = 1$, then there is a matrix $\mathbf{B}_{t'} \in \mathcal{B}_{t'}$ that confirms this with fitness distance function dist' . We construct a matrix \mathbf{B}_t from $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$ that confirms $D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) = 1$ while dist fits it. Observe that $R_t^\downarrow = R_{t'}^\downarrow$ and $C_t^\downarrow = C_{t'}^\downarrow \cup \{c_0\}$, so each $\mathbf{B}_t \in \mathcal{B}_t$ contains one more coordinate than each $\mathbf{B}_{t'} \in \mathcal{B}_{t'}$ with the additional coordinate labeled c_0 . So for every $r \in R_{t'}^\downarrow$ and $c \in C_{t'}^\downarrow$, set $\mathbf{B}_t[r][c] := \mathbf{B}_{t'}[r][c]$. Now it only remains to fill the value for the coordinate c_0 along all rows $r \in R_t^\downarrow$ and also to adjust dist . Let $\overline{R}_t = R_t^\downarrow \setminus R_t$, then by property 3 of a nice tree decomposition, for all of the forgotten rows $r_f \in \overline{R}_t$, it holds that $M[r_f][c_0] = 0$. So we can simply put $\mathbf{B}_t[r_f][c_0] := 0$, for each forgotten row $r_f \in \overline{R}_t$. Let ϕ' be the cluster assignment with respect to $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$ (i.e. $\text{part} = \phi'|_{R_{t'}}$). For $r \in R_{t'}$, set $\mathbf{B}_t[r][c_0] := \text{cent}[\phi'(r), c_0]$. Note that, for every $c \in C_t$ and $r \in R_{t'}^\downarrow$, it holds that $\mathbf{B}_t[r][c] = \text{cent}[\phi'(r), c]$: in the first case we have $\mathbf{B}_t[r][c] := \mathbf{B}_{t'}[r][c] = \text{cent}'[\phi'(r), c] = \text{cent}[\phi'(r), c]$ and in the second case it follows immediately from the definition. As a result $(\text{part}, \text{cent})$ with the same cluster assignment ϕ' is a partial fragment of \mathbf{B}_t . Let $\text{dist}' = (d'_1, \dots, d'_{n_{R_{t'}}$) be the distance vector that fits $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$. Since for $r_f \in \overline{R}_t$ it holds that $M[r_f][c_0] = 0$, only the distances between rows in the bag i.e. R_t and their assigned cluster centers, as defined by ϕ' , are updated. Hence, for $r \in R_t$

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_t^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_t^\downarrow]) &= d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_t^\downarrow \setminus c_0], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_t^\downarrow \setminus c_0]) + d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][c_0], \mathbf{B}_t[r][c_0]) \\ &= d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_{t'}^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_{t'}^\downarrow]) + d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][c_0], \mathbf{B}_t[r][c_0]) \\ &= \text{dist}'[r] + (\mathbf{A}[r][c_0] \oplus \text{cent}[\text{part}[r], c_0]) \\ &= \text{dist}[r], \end{aligned}$$

as a result $\text{dist}[r]$ for all $r \in R_t$, fits \mathbf{B}_t leading to \mathbf{B}_t confirming $D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) = 1$.

On the other hand, suppose that $D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) = 1$, then there exists a $\mathbf{B}_t \in \mathcal{B}_t$ that confirms it and also a dist which fits \mathbf{B}_t . Let ϕ be the cluster assignment w.r.t \mathbf{B}_t , that is $\text{part} = \phi|_{R_t}$. Then removing coordinate c_0 from \mathbf{B}_t , yields a matrix $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$ with the same cluster assignment ϕ where $\mathbf{B}_{t'}[r][C_{t'}^\downarrow] = \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_t^\downarrow \setminus c_0] = \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_{t'}^\downarrow]$ for every $r \in R_{t'}^\downarrow$. So for every $c' \in C_{t'}$ and $r \in R_{t'}$, it holds that:

$$\mathbf{B}_{t'}[r][c'] = \mathbf{B}_t[r][c'] = \text{cent}[\phi(r), c'] = \text{cent}'[\phi(r), c']$$

Thus $(\text{part}, \text{cent}')$ is a partial fragment of $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$ at t' . Moreover, the distance between each $r \in R_{t'}$ to its respective cluster center, as determined by $(\text{part}, \text{cent}')$ is calculated as $\text{dist}[r] - (\mathbf{A}[r][c_0] \oplus \text{cent}[\text{part}[r], c_0])$. So dist' fits $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$ leading to $D_{t'}(\text{part}, \text{cent}', \text{dist}') = 1$ being confirmed by $(\text{part}, \text{cent}', \text{dist}')$.

t forgets a row. Let t' be the child of t , and assume that t forgets a row, that is, $X(t) = X(t') \setminus \{r_0\}$. For each part $: R_t \rightarrow [k]$ and dist $: R_{t'} \rightarrow [d]$, respectively define sets $Y_{part} = \{\text{part}'_i : R_{t'} \rightarrow [k] \mid \text{part}'_i = \text{part} \cup (r_0, i), \forall i \in [k]\}$ and $D_{dist} = \{\text{dist}'_j : R_{t'} \rightarrow [d] \mid \text{dist}'_j = \text{dist} \cup (r_0, j), \forall j \in [d]\}$ to be their respective extensions at node t' . For a fragment $(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) \in P(t)$, we set:

$$D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) := \bigvee_{\substack{\forall \text{part}'_i \in Y_{part}, \\ \forall \text{dist}'_j \in D_{dist}}} D_{t'}(\text{part}'_i, \text{cent}, \text{dist}'_j)$$

To start with correctness, assume that there exists at least one fragment $(\text{part}'_i, \text{cent}, \text{dist}'_j) \in P(t')$ such that $D_{t'}(\text{part}'_i, \text{cent}, \text{dist}'_j) = 1$. This implies that there is a matrix $\mathbf{B}_{t'} \in \mathcal{B}_{t'}$ confirming it. Since $R_t^\downarrow = R_{t'}^\downarrow$ and $C_t^\downarrow = C_{t'}^\downarrow$, keep in mind that $\mathcal{B}_t = \mathcal{B}_{t'}$. Therefor, for every $r \in R_t^\downarrow$ and $c \in C_t^\downarrow$, we set $\mathbf{B}_t[r][c] := \mathbf{B}_{t'}[r][c]$. Let ϕ' be the cluster assignment corresponding to $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$ where $\text{part}'_i = \phi' \upharpoonright_{R_{t'}}$, then, $(\text{part}, \text{cent})$ with $\text{part} = \text{part}'_i \setminus (r_0, i)$ becomes a partial fragment of \mathbf{B}_t at t . Regarding the distances, let $\text{dist} = \text{dist}'_j \setminus (r_0, j)$. Since $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$ confirms $D_{t'}(\text{part}'_i, \text{cent}, \text{dist}'_j) = 1$, by definition b) of our dynamic programming record, for all $r \in R_{t'}$ we have

$$d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_{t'}^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_{t'}[r][C_{t'}^\downarrow]) = \text{dist}'_j[r].$$

Which ensures that for all $r \in R_t$:

$$d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_t^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_t^\downarrow]) = \text{dist}[r]$$

and

$$d_H(\mathbf{A}[r_0][C_t^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r_0][C_t^\downarrow]) \leq d \tag{13}$$

Similarly, by definition c) of our dynamic programming record, for all $r \in (R_t^\downarrow \setminus R_{t'})$, we have

$$d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_{t'}^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_{t'}[r][C_{t'}^\downarrow]) \leq d$$

which for all $r \in (R_t^\downarrow \setminus R_t)$ along with Equation (13) translates to ,

$$d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_t^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_t^\downarrow]) \leq d.$$

As a result \mathbf{B}_t confirms that $D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) = 1$.

Conversely, if for a fragment $(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) \in P(t)$ it holds that $D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) = 1$, then there is a matrix $\mathbf{B}_t \in \mathcal{B}_t$ that confirms this. Let ϕ denote the cluster assignment w.r.t \mathbf{B}_t . Then $(\text{part}', \text{cent})$ with $\text{part}'_i = (\text{part} \cup (r_0, \phi(r_0)))$ forms a partial fragment of $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$ at t' . Let $d_0 = d_H(\mathbf{A}[r_0][C_t^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r_0][C_t^\downarrow])$, by property c) we have $d_0 \leq d$ and:

$$d_H(\mathbf{A}[r_0][C_t^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r_0][C_t^\downarrow]) \leq d,$$

so define $\text{dist}' = \text{dist} \cup (r_0, d_0)$, then for all $r' \in R_{t'}$ it holds that:

$$d_H(\mathbf{A}[r'][C_t^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r'][C_t^\downarrow]) = \text{dist}'[r']$$

and for all $r' \in (R_t^\downarrow \setminus R_{t'})$:

$$d_H(\mathbf{A}[r'][C_t^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r'][C_t^\downarrow]) \leq d$$

As a result, \mathbf{B}_t confirms that $D_t(\text{part}'_i, \text{cent}, \text{dist}') = 1$.

t forgets a coordinate. Assume that t forgets a coordinate, that is, $X(t) = X(t') \setminus \{c_0\}$. For each cent $: [k] \times C_t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, let the $C_{cent} = \{\text{cent}' : [k] \times C_{t'} \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \mid \text{cent} = \text{cent}' \upharpoonright_{C_t}\}$ to be the set of its respective extensions at node t' . For a fragment $(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) \in P(t)$, we set:

$$D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) := \bigvee_{\text{cent}' \in C_{cent}} D_{t'}(\text{part}, \text{cent}', \text{dist})$$

For correctness, first assume that $D_{t'}(\text{part}, \text{cent}', \text{dist}) = 1$, for a fragment $(\text{part}, \text{cent}', \text{dist}) \in P(t')$ with $\mathbf{B}_{t'} \in \mathcal{B}_{t'}$ confirming it. Again note that $\mathcal{B}_t = \mathcal{B}_{t'}$. For each $r \in R_t^\downarrow$ and $c \in C_t^\downarrow$, we assign $\mathbf{B}_t[r][c] := \mathbf{B}_{t'}[r][c]$. Let ϕ' represent the cluster assignment associated with $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$, then by a), for every

$r \in R_t^\downarrow$ and $c \in C_t$, we have $\mathbf{B}_t[r][c] = \text{cent}'[\phi'(r), c]$. Thus (part, cent) with $\text{cent} = \text{cent}'|_{C_t}$, forms a partial fragment for \mathbf{B}_t at node t . Furthermore, based on the fact that $R_t = R_{t'}$, $R_t^\downarrow = R_{t'}^\downarrow$, and $C_t^\downarrow = C_{t'}^\downarrow$, it follows from definitions b) and c) that $d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_t^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_t^\downarrow]) = \text{dist}[r]$, for all $r \in R_t$. Additionally, for all $r \in R_t^\downarrow \setminus R_t$, $d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_t^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_t^\downarrow]) \leq d$. Consequently \mathbf{B}_t confirms that $D(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) = 1$. Alternatively if for a fragment (part, cent, dist) $\in P(t)$, it holds that $D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) = 1$, then there is a matrix $\mathbf{B}_t \in \mathcal{B}_t$ that confirms this. Again for each $r \in R_t^\downarrow$ and $c \in C_t^\downarrow$, set $\mathbf{B}_{t'}[r][c] := \mathbf{B}_t[r][c]$. Let $\hat{C} = \bigcup_{r \in R_t} ((c_0, \phi(r)), \mathbf{B}_t[\phi(r)][c_0])$ and set $\text{cent}' := \text{cent} \cup \hat{C}$, then (part, cent') is a partial fragment of $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$ at t' . It is easy to conclude that b) and c) directly hold for $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$. Consequently, $\mathbf{B}_{t'}$ confirms that $D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}', \text{dist}) = 1$.

t is a join node. Assume that t_1 and t_2 are the children of t , meaning, $X(t) = X(t_1) = X(t_2)$. Define $Y_t = \{(\text{part}, \text{cent}) \mid \text{part} : R_t \rightarrow [k], \text{cent} : [k] \times C_t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}\}$ be the set of all partial fragments at t . Also, let $\Delta : Y_t \rightarrow [d]$ be the function such that for every (part, cent) $\in Y_t$, it holds that $\Delta(\text{part}, \text{cent}) = (\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_{n_{R_t}})$, where $\delta_i = d_H(\mathbf{A}[r_i][C_t], \text{cent}[\text{part}[r_i], C_t])$ for every $r_i \in R_t$. Then for each (part, cent, dist) $\in P(t)$, we set:

$$D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) := D_{t_1}(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}_1) \wedge D_{t_2}(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}_2)$$

where $\text{dist} = \text{dist}_1 + \text{dist}_2 - \Delta(\text{part}, \text{cent})$ with $\text{dist}_i : R_t \rightarrow [d]$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

For correctness, first assume $D_{t_i}(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}_i) = 1$ and that \mathbf{B}_{t_i} confirms it, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We obtain a matrix $\mathbf{B}_t \in \mathcal{B}_t$ that confirms $D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) = 1$ with dist that fits \mathbf{B}_t . Note that $R_t^\downarrow = R_{t_1}^\downarrow \cup R_{t_2}^\downarrow$ and $C_t^\downarrow = C_{t_1}^\downarrow \cup C_{t_2}^\downarrow$. Let ϕ_i be the cluster assignment corresponding to \mathbf{B}_{t_i} , then $\text{part} = \phi_1|_{R_{t_1}} = \phi_2|_{R_{t_2}}$. Consequently, we have $\mathbf{B}_{t_1}[r][c] = \text{cent}[\text{part}[r], c] = \mathbf{B}_{t_2}[r][c]$, for each $r \in R_t$ and $c \in C_t$. Also remember that, for every $r \in (R_{t_i}^\downarrow \setminus R_{t_i})$ and $c \in (C_t^\downarrow \setminus C_{t_i}^\downarrow)$, the mask matrix $\mathbf{M}[r][c] = 0$, since otherwise the forgotten row r and the forgotten coordinate c would need to appear later in a bag, which would contradict property 3 of the nice tree decomposition. Thus, the entries of \mathbf{B}_t can be filled as follows:

- For every $r \in R_{t_i}^\downarrow$ and $c \in C_{t_i}^\downarrow$, set $\mathbf{B}_t[r][c] := \mathbf{B}_{t_i}[r][c]$
- For every $r \in (R_{t_i}^\downarrow \setminus R_{t_i})$ and $c \in (C_t^\downarrow \setminus C_{t_i}^\downarrow)$, set $\mathbf{B}_t[r][c] := 0$,

As a result, (part, cent) with cluster assignment $\phi = (\phi_1 \cup \phi_2)$, will be a partial fragment for \mathbf{B}_t . Based on the assignment of \mathbf{B}_t , only the distances between the rows within the current bag to their corresponding cluster centers will change while for the remaining rows, the distances stay unchanged. Therefore, for all $r \in (R_t^\downarrow \setminus R_t)$, it holds that $d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_t^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_t^\downarrow]) \leq d$. Let \overline{C}_{t_i} represent the forgotten coordinates at node t_i . Then, for the rows inside the current bag, $r \in R_t$, the distance to their cluster centers over C_t^\downarrow can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_t^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_t^\downarrow]) &= \sum_{i=1}^2 d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][\overline{C}_{t_i}], \mathbf{B}_t[r][\overline{C}_{t_i}]) + d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_t], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_t]) \\ &= \text{dist}_1[r] + \text{dist}_2[r] - d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_t], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_t]) \\ &= \text{dist}_1[r] + \text{dist}_2[r] - \delta_r, \end{aligned}$$

since for each $r \in R_t$, we have

$$\text{dist}_i[r] = d_H(r[\overline{C}_{t_i}]) + d_H(r[C_t], \mathbf{B}_t[r, C_t]),$$

it follows that $\text{dist} = \text{dist}_1 + \text{dist}_2 - \Delta$, fits \mathbf{B}_t . As a result, \mathbf{B}_t confirms $D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) = 1$. Now suppose there is a matrix $\mathbf{B}_t \in \mathcal{B}_t$ with cluster assignment ϕ , confirming that $D_t(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}) = 1$ for a fragment (part, cent, dist) $\in P(t)$. We show there is a partial solution \mathbf{B}_{t_i} at node t_i with distance vector dist_i such that $D_{t_i}(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}_i) = 1$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. With an abuse of notation, let $\phi|_{X_{t_i}}$, denote the restriction of ϕ to rows and coordinates within the bag of node t_i . Now assign $\mathbf{B}_{t_i} = \mathbf{B}_t|_{R_{t_i}^\downarrow \times C_{t_i}^\downarrow}$. Since $X_{t_i}^\downarrow \subset X_t^\downarrow$, according to property a) at node t , $\phi_i = \phi|_{X_{t_i}}$ is a valid cluster assignment for \mathbf{B}_{t_i} . Consequently, (part, cent) is a partial fragment for both \mathbf{B}_1 and \mathbf{B}_2 . Moreover, according to property b) at node t and the fact that $C_{t_i}^\downarrow \subset C_t^\downarrow$, for every $r \in R_{t_i}^\downarrow \setminus R_{t_i}$, it holds that $d_H(r[C_{t_i}^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_{t_i}[r, C_{t_i}^\downarrow]) \leq d$. On the other hand, for $r \in R_t = R_{t_i}$, by property c) of dist , we know that $\sum_{i=1}^2 d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][\overline{C}_{t_i}], \mathbf{B}_t[r][\overline{C}_{t_i}]) + d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_t], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_t]) = \text{dist}[r]$, which translates

to $d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_{t_i}^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_{t_i}^\downarrow]) \leq \text{dist}[r]$ for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$. So there is $\text{dist}_i : R_{t_i} \rightarrow [d]$, such that for $r \in R_{t_i}$ it holds that $d_H(\mathbf{A}[r][C_{t_i}^\downarrow], \mathbf{B}_t[r][C_{t_i}^\downarrow]) = \text{dist}_i[r]$. As a result, there was already a fragment $(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}_i) \in P(t_i)$ for which $D_{t_i}(\text{part}, \text{cent}, \text{dist}_i) = 1$ and a partial solution \mathbf{B}_{t_i} to confirm it.

The nice tree decomposition can be obtained in $2^{\mathcal{O}(\text{tw}(G_M))}(n+m)$. Furthermore, when filling the records D_t in our dynamic programming, at each step we need to evaluate $k^{\text{tw}(G_M)} = 2^{k \cdot \text{tw}(G_M)}$ possible mappings for part, $2^{k \cdot \text{tw}(G_M)}$ mappings for cent and $d^{\text{tw}(G_M)}$ different vectors for dist. Even that the number of nodes in the nice tree decomposition is linear in n , the overall running time of the algorithm is bounded above by $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \cdot \text{tw}(G_M))} \cdot d^{\mathcal{O}(\text{tw}(G_M))} \text{poly}(n)$. \square

8 Fracture number

In this section, we present a fixed-parameter algorithm for the k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES, where the parameter is the fracture number of the incidence graph G_M . To provide context, we first define the key concepts of *fracture modulator* and *fracture number*. Following this, we exploit the relevant results from Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3, which lead to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.2. *k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES admits an algorithm with running time*

$$2^{\mathcal{O}(k \cdot \text{fr}(G_M) + \text{fr}(G_M)^2 \cdot \log \text{fr}(G_M))} \text{poly}(nm).$$

For a graph $G = (V, E)$, a *fracture modulator* is a subset of vertices $F \subseteq V$ such that, after removing the vertices in F , each remaining connected component contains at most $|F|$ vertices; the size of the smallest fracture modulator is denoted by $\text{fr}(G)$. Consider the incidence graph G_M corresponding to the mask matrix \mathbf{M} , and let F represent the fracture modulator of G_M with the smallest cardinality. We note that F can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}((\text{fr}(G) + 1)^{\text{fr}(G)} nm)$ by the algorithm of [Dvorák et al., 2021]. Let $R_F = (R_M \cap F)$ and $C_F = (C_M \cap F)$ represent the row and column vertices of G_M that belong to the fracture modulator F , respectively. Additionally, define $\overline{R}_F = R_M \setminus R_F$ and $\overline{C}_F = C_M \setminus C_F$. We refer to the rows in R_F as *long* rows while the rows corresponding to \overline{R}_F are called *short* rows. See Figure 7 for an illustration of the structure of the instance. Now, the algorithm considers two cases.




Figure 7: The rows R_F and columns C_F of the fracture modulator are in light gray, the “blocks” induced by the connected components of $G_M \setminus F$ are in dark gray. All entries of \mathbf{M} outside of the gray areas are 0.

$2 \text{fr}(G_M) \leq d$. In this case, each of the short rows has distance at most d to any fixed vector. This holds since for each row $i \in \overline{R}_F$, $\mathbf{M}[i][j] = 1$ only for $j \in C_F$ or j in the same connected component of $G_M \setminus F$ as i ; this is at most $2 \text{fr}(G_M) \leq d$ entries, and all other entries in the row are missing. Therefore, the short rows are essentially irrelevant for the solution, as they can be assigned to any cluster with any center vector. We run the algorithm of Theorem 1.1 on the instance restricted to the long rows R_F , and complement the resulting solution with an arbitrary assignment of the short rows to the k clusters. Since the vertex cover of the restricted instance is at most $|R_F| \leq \text{fr}(G_M)$, the running time bound holds as desired.

$2 \text{fr}(G_M) > d$. Here, we use the algorithm of Theorem 1.3 to solve the given instance. We observe that a tree decomposition of width at most $2 \text{fr}(G_M)$ can be constructed for G_M in a straightforward fashion: create a bag for each connected component of $G_M \setminus F$ containing all vertices of this component together with F , and arrange these bags on a path in arbitrary order. Since $d < 2 \text{fr}(G_M)$, the running time of Theorem 1.3 gives the desired bound.

9 Conclusion

We have investigated the algorithmic complexity of k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES in the setting where the missing entries are sparse and exhibit certain graph-theoretic structure. We have shown that the problem is FPT when parameterized by $vc+k$, $\text{fr}+k$ and $\text{tw}+k+d$, where vc is the vertex cover number, fr is the fracture number, and tw is the treewidth of the incidence graph. In fact, it is not hard to get rid of k in the parameter; for example, in the enumeration of partial center assignments in the algorithm of Theorem 1.1 it can be assumed that $k \leq 2^{vc}$, as multiple centers that have the same partial assignment are redundant. However, this would increase the running time as a function of the parameter to doubly exponential, therefore we state the upper bounds with explicit dependence on k . It is, on the other hand, an interesting open question, whether d in the parameter is necessary for the algorithm parameterized by tw . As shown by [Ganian et al., 2022], this is not necessary for k -MEANS WITH MISSING ENTRIES, since the problem admits an FPT algorithm when parameterized by treewidth alone. Yet, it does not seem that the dynamic programming approaches used in their work and in our work, can be improved to avoid the factor of $d^{\mathcal{O}(\text{tw})}$ in the case of k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES. Therefore, it is natural to ask whether it can be shown that k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES is W[1]-hard in this parameterization.

Another intriguing open question is the tightness of our algorithm in the parameterization by the vertex cover number (and fracture number). On the one hand, the running time we show is $2^{vc^{2+o(1)}} \cdot \text{poly}(nm)$ (for values of k in $\mathcal{O}(vc)$), exceeding the “natural” single-exponential in vc time, and we are not aware of a matching lower bound that is based on standard complexity assumptions. On the other hand, we show that improving this running time improves also the best-known running time for ILP FEASIBILITY when parameterized by the number of constraints and CLOSEST STRING parameterized by the number of strings. The latter are major open questions; [Rohwedder and Wegrzycki, 2024] show also that several other open problems are equivalent to these. On the positive side, our algorithm in fact reduces k -CENTER WITH MISSING ENTRIES to just 2^{vc} instances of ILP FEASIBILITY. Since practical ILP solvers are quite efficient, coupling our reduction with an ILP solver is likely to result in the running time that is much more efficient than prescribed by the upper bound of Theorem 1.1.

References

- Amir Abboud, Nick Fischer, Elazar Goldenberg, Karthik C. S., and Ron Safier. Can you solve closest string faster than exhaustive search? In Inge Li Gørtz, Martin Farach-Colton, Simon J. Puglisi, and Grzegorz Herman, editors, *31st Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2023, September 4-6, 2023, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*, volume 274 of *LIPICs*, pages 3:1–3:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. doi: 10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2023.3. URL <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2023.3>.
- Daniel Aloise, Amit Deshpande, Pierre Hansen, and Preyas Popat. Np-hardness of euclidean sum-of-squares clustering. *Mach. Learn.*, 75(2):245–248, 2009. doi: 10.1007/S10994-009-5103-0. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-009-5103-0>.
- Daniel N. Baker, Vladimir Braverman, Lingxiao Huang, Shaofeng H.-C. Jiang, Robert Krauthgamer, and Xuan Wu. Coresets for clustering in graphs of bounded treewidth. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2020, 13-18 July 2020, Virtual Event*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 569–579. PMLR, 2020. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/baker20a.html>.
- Sayan Bandyapadhyay, Fedor V. Fomin, and Kirill Simonov. On coresets for fair clustering in metric and euclidean spaces and their applications. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 142:103506, 2024. doi: 10.1016/J.JCSS.2024.103506. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2024.103506>.
- Hans L. Bodlaender. A linear-time algorithm for finding tree-decompositions of small treewidth. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 25(6):1305–1317, 1996. doi: 10.1137/S0097539793251219. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539793251219>.
- Hans L Bodlaender, Pål Grønås Drange, Markus S Dregi, Fedor V Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, and Michał Pilipczuk. A $c^k n$ 5-approximation algorithm for treewidth. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 45(2):317–378, 2016.
- Hans L. Bodlaender, Tesshu Hanaka, Yasuaki Kobayashi, Yusuke Kobayashi, Yoshio Okamoto, Yota Otachi, and Tom C. van der Zanden. Subgraph isomorphism on graph classes that exclude a substructure. *Algorithmica*, 82(12):3566–3587, 2020. doi: 10.1007/S00453-020-00737-Z. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-020-00737-z>.
- Jianer Chen, Iyad A. Kanj, and Ge Xia. Improved parameterized upper bounds for vertex cover. In Rastislav Kráľovič and Paweł Urzyczyn, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2006*, pages 238–249, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-37793-1.
- Raymond Chen. On mentzer’s hardness of the k-center problem on the euclidean plane. Technical Report 383, Dartmouth College, 2021. URL https://digitalcommons.dartmouth.edu/cs_tr/383/.
- Zhi-Zhong Chen, Bin Ma, and Lusheng Wang. Randomized and parameterized algorithms for the closest string problem. In Alexander S. Kulikov, Sergei O. Kuznetsov, and Pavel A. Pevzner, editors, *Combinatorial Pattern Matching - 25th Annual Symposium, CPM 2014, Moscow, Russia, June 16-18, 2014. Proceedings*, volume 8486 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 100–109. Springer, 2014. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-07566-2_11. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-07566-2_11.
- Vincent Cohen-Addad, Kasper Green Larsen, David Saulpic, and Chris Schwiegelshohn. Towards optimal lower bounds for k-median and k-means coresets. In Stefano Leonardi and Anupam Gupta, editors, *STOC ’22: 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Rome, Italy, June 20 - 24, 2022*, pages 1038–1051, Rome, 2022. ACM. doi: 10.1145/3519935.3519946. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3519935.3519946>.
- Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015. ISBN 978-3-319-21274-6. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-21275-3. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21275-3>.
- Rodney G. Downey and Michael R. Fellows. *Fundamentals of Parameterized Complexity*. Texts in Computer Science. Springer, 2013. ISBN 978-1-4471-5558-4. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4471-5559-1. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-5559-1>.

- Pavel Dvorák, Eduard Eiben, Robert Ganian, Dusan Knop, and Sebastian Ordyniak. The complexity landscape of decompositional parameters for ILP: programs with few global variables and constraints. *Artif. Intell.*, 300:103561, 2021. doi: 10.1016/J.ARTINT.2021.103561. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2021.103561>.
- Eduard Eiben, Fedor V. Fomin, Petr A. Golovach, William Lochet, Fahad Panolan, and Kirill Simonov. EPTAS for k -means clustering of affine subspaces. In Dániel Marx, editor, *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2021, Virtual Conference, January 10 - 13, 2021*, pages 2649–2659. SIAM, 2021. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611976465.157. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611976465.157>.
- Eduard Eiben, Robert Ganian, Iyad Kanj, Sebastian Ordyniak, and Stefan Szeider. On the parameterized complexity of clustering problems for incomplete data. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 134:1–19, 2023. doi: 10.1016/J.JCSS.2022.12.001. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2022.12.001>.
- Friedrich Eisenbrand and Robert Weismantel. Proximity results and faster algorithms for integer programming using the steinitz lemma. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 16(1):5:1–5:14, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3340322. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3340322>.
- Tomás Feder and Daniel H. Greene. Optimal algorithms for approximate clustering. In Janos Simon, editor, *Proceedings of the 20th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 2-4, 1988, Chicago, Illinois, USA*, pages 434–444. ACM, 1988. doi: 10.1145/62212.62255. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/62212.62255>.
- Uriel Feige. Np-hardness of hypercube 2-segmentation. *CoRR*, abs/1411.0821, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1411.0821>.
- Moti Frances and Ami Litman. On covering problems of codes. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 30(2):113–119, 1997. doi: 10.1007/S002240000044. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002240000044>.
- Robert Ganian, Iyad A. Kanj, Sebastian Ordyniak, and Stefan Szeider. Parameterized algorithms for the matrix completion problem. In Jennifer G. Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1642–1651. PMLR, 2018. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/ganian18a.html>.
- Robert Ganian, Sebastian Ordyniak, and M. S. Ramanujan. On structural parameterizations of the edge disjoint paths problem. *Algorithmica*, 83(6):1605–1637, 2021. doi: 10.1007/S00453-020-00795-3. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-020-00795-3>.
- Robert Ganian, Thekla Hamm, Viktoriia Korchemna, Karolina Okrasa, and Kirill Simonov. The complexity of k -means clustering when little is known. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvári, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2022, 17-23 July 2022, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 6960–6987. PMLR, 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/ganian22a.html>.
- Leszek Gąsieniec, Jesper Jansson, and Andrzej Lingas. Efficient approximation algorithms for the hamming center problem. In Robert Endre Tarjan and Tandy J. Warnow, editors, *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, 17-19 January 1999, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*, pages 905–906. ACM/SIAM, 1999. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=314500.315081>.
- Tomáš Gavenčiak, Martin Koutecký, and Dušan Knop. Integer programming in parameterized complexity: Five miniatures. *Discrete Optimization*, 44:100596, 2022. ISSN 1572-5286. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disopt.2020.100596>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S157252862030030X>. Optimization and Discrete Geometry.
- Rong Ge, Martin Ester, Byron J Gao, Zengjian Hu, Binay Bhattacharya, and Boaz Ben-Moshe. Joint cluster analysis of attribute data and relationship data: The connected k -center problem, algorithms and applications. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 2(2):1–35, 2008.
- Teofilo F. Gonzalez. Clustering to minimize the maximum intercluster distance. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 38: 293–306, 1985. doi: 10.1016/0304-3975(85)90224-5. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(85\)90224-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(85)90224-5).

- Jens Gramm, Rolf Niedermeier, and Peter Rossmanith. Fixed-parameter algorithms for CLOSEST STRING and related problems. *Algorithmica*, 37(1):25–42, 2003. doi: 10.1007/S00453-003-1028-3. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-003-1028-3>.
- Pierre Hansen and Brigitte Jaumard. Cluster analysis and mathematical programming. *Mathematical programming*, 79(1):191–215, 1997.
- Danny Hermelin and Liat Rozenberg. Parameterized complexity analysis for the closest string with wildcards problem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 600:11–18, 2015. ISSN 0304-3975. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2015.06.043>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304397515005538>.
- Wen-Lian Hsu and George L Nemhauser. Easy and hard bottleneck location problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 1(3):209–215, 1979.
- Debajyoti Kar, Mert Kosan, Debmalya Mandal, Sourav Medya, Arlei Silva, Palash Dey, and Swagato Sanyal. Feature-based individual fairness in k-clustering. In *Proceedings of the 2023 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, AAMAS '23*, page 2772–2774, Richland, SC, 2023. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems. ISBN 9781450394321.
- Ton Kloks. *Treewidth, Computations and Approximations*, volume 842 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 1994. ISBN 3-540-58356-4. doi: 10.1007/BFB0045375. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFB0045375>.
- Dusan Knop, Martin Koutecký, and Matthias Mnich. Combinatorial n-fold integer programming and applications. *Math. Program.*, 184(1):1–34, 2020a. doi: 10.1007/S10107-019-01402-2. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-019-01402-2>.
- Dusan Knop, Michal Pilipczuk, and Marcin Wrochna. Tight complexity lower bounds for integer linear programming with few constraints. *ACM Trans. Comput. Theory*, 12(3):19:1–19:19, 2020b. doi: 10.1145/3397484. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397484>.
- Yuval Kochman, Arya Mazumdar, and Yury Polyanskiy. The adversarial joint source-channel problem. In *Proceedings of the 2012 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, ISIT 2012, Cambridge, MA, USA, July 1-6, 2012*, pages 2112–2116. IEEE, 2012. doi: 10.1109/ISIT.2012.6283735. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISIT.2012.6283735>.
- Michael Lampis and Valia Mitsou. Fine-grained meta-theorems for vertex integrity. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 20(4), 2024. doi: 10.46298/LMCS-20(4:18)2024. URL [https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-20\(4:18\)2024](https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-20(4:18)2024).
- J. Kevin Lanctôt, Ming Li, Bin Ma, Shaojiu Wang, and Louxin Zhang. Distinguishing string selection problems. *Inf. Comput.*, 185(1):41–55, 2003. doi: 10.1016/S0890-5401(03)00057-9. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0890-5401\(03\)00057-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0890-5401(03)00057-9).
- Ming Li, Bin Ma, and Lusheng Wang. On the closest string and substring problems. *J. ACM*, 49(2):157–171, 2002a. doi: 10.1145/506147.506150. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/506147.506150>.
- Ming Li, Bin Ma, and Lusheng Wang. On the closest string and substring problems. *J. ACM*, 49(2):157–171, 2002b. doi: 10.1145/506147.506150. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/506147.506150>.
- Stuart P. Lloyd. Least squares quantization in PCM. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 28(2):129–136, 1982. doi: 10.1109/TIT.1982.1056489. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.1982.1056489>.
- Bin Ma and Xiaoming Sun. More efficient algorithms for closest string and substring problems. In Martin Vingron and Limsoon Wong, editors, *Research in Computational Molecular Biology, 12th Annual International Conference, RECOMB 2008, Singapore, March 30 - April 2, 2008. Proceedings*, volume 4955 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 396–409. Springer, 2008. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-78839-3_33. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78839-3_33.
- Bin Ma and Xiaoming Sun. More efficient algorithms for closest string and substring problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(4):1432–1443, 2009. doi: 10.1137/080739069. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/080739069>.

- Meena Mahajan, Prajakta Nimbhorkar, and Kasturi Varadarajan. The planar k -means problem is NP-hard. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Algorithms and Computation (WALCOM)*, Incs, pages 274–285. Springer, 2009. ISBN 978-3-642-00201-4. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-00201-4_24. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-00201-4_24.
- Arya Mazumdar, Yury Polyanskiy, and Barna Saha. On chebyshev radius of a set in hamming space and the closest string problem. In *Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, Istanbul, Turkey, July 7-12, 2013*, pages 1401–1405. IEEE, 2013. doi: 10.1109/ISIT.2013.6620457. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISIT.2013.6620457>.
- N. Megiddo and K. Supowit. On the complexity of some common geometric location problems. *siamjc*, 13(1):182–196, 1984. doi: 10.1137/0213014. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/0213014>.
- Stuart G Mentzer. Approximability of metric clustering problems. *Unpublished manuscript, March*, 2016.
- Murray Patterson, Tobias Marschall, Nadia Pisanti, Leo van Iersel, Leen Stougie, Gunnar W Klau, and Alexander Schönhuth. WhatsHap: Weighted haplotype assembly for Future-Generation sequencing reads. *J Comput Biol*, 22(6):498–509, February 2015.
- Lars Rohwedder and Karol Wegrzycki. Fine-grained equivalence for problems related to integer linear programming. *CoRR*, abs/2409.03675, 2024. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2409.03675. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2409.03675>.
- Jianbo Shi and Jitendra Malik. Normalized cuts and image segmentation. *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 22(8):888–905, 2000.
- Nikola Stojanovic, Piotr Berman, Deborah Gumucio, Ross Hardison, and Webb Miller. A linear-time algorithm for the 1-mismatch problem. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures, WADS '97*, page 126–135, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1997. Springer-Verlag. ISBN 3540633073.
- Pang-Ning Tan, Michael Steinbach, and Vipin Kumar. Data mining cluster analysis: basic concepts and algorithms. *Introduction to data mining*, 487:533, 2013.
- Xiaoliang Wu, Qilong Feng, Ziyun Huang, Jinhui Xu, and Jianxin Wang. New algorithms for distributed fair k -center clustering: Almost accurate as sequential algorithms. In Mehdi Dastani, Jaime Simão Sichman, Natasha Alechina, and Virginia Dignum, editors, *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, AAMAS 2024, Auckland, New Zealand, May 6-10, 2024*, pages 1938–1946, Auckland, 2024. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems / ACM. doi: 10.5555/3635637.3663057. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/3635637.3663057>.