

Proportional Clustering, the β -Plurality Problem, and Metric Distortion

Leon Kellerhals

TU Clausthal, Germany

leon.kellerhals@tu-clausthal.de

Jannik Peters

National University of Singapore

peters@nus.edu.sg

Abstract

We show that the proportional clustering problem using the Droop quota for $k = 1$ is equivalent to the β -plurality problem. We also show that the PLURALITY VETO rule can be used to select $(\sqrt{5} - 2)$ -plurality points using only ordinal information about the metric space and resolve an open question of Kalaycı et al. [2024] by proving that $(2 + \sqrt{5})$ -proportionally fair clusterings can be found using purely ordinal information.

1 Introduction

In this research note, we uncover a connection between the proportional clustering [Chen et al., 2019] and the β -plurality problem [Aronov et al., 2021]. The proportional clustering problem is concerned with finding a fairness measure for clustering/facility location problems, ensuring that each sufficiently large set of points to be clustered has a cluster center nearby. If we have n points to cluster and k cluster centers to choose, a natural threshold, or *quota*, for “sufficiently large” is $\frac{n}{k}$. In the literature on multiwinner voting, this is historically known as the Hare quota [Tideman, 1995]. This quota serves as the basis for most works on modern multiwinner voting and proportional clustering [Aziz et al., 2017, Peters and Skowron, 2020, Brill and Peters, 2023, Masařík et al., 2024, Kellerhals and Peters, 2024, Aziz et al., 2024]. However, it is neither the “smallest possible” quota nor the quota most frequently used in real-life elections. Instead, this is the Droop quota $\frac{n}{k+1}$ [Droop, 1881], which is also being used (with slight modifications) in real-life elections, for instance in council elections in Scotland [McCune and Graham-Squire, 2024].

We give a connection between proportional clustering using the Droop quota and the β -plurality problem and show that the two are equivalent when fixing the number of cluster centers to $k = 1$. We additionally uncover a relationship to the metric distortion problem and show that β -plurality points achieve constant distortion. Further, we show that the PLURALITY VETO rule of Kızılkaya and Kempe [2022] (originally designed to achieve good distortion) can be used to find $\Omega(1)$ -plurality points, even if the actual distances are unknown and only ordinal preferences are given. Our observations from the last result also allow us to show that one can always find a k -clustering satisfying $(2 + \sqrt{5})$ -proportionality using only ordinal information, thereby answering an open question of Kalaycı et al. [2024].

2 Proportional Clustering and Plurality Points

In this section, we give a connection between plurality points and proportional clustering with $k = 1$ and when using the Droop quota. We first define the two concepts before proving the connection.

2.1 Proportional clustering

The proportional clustering problem was introduced by Chen et al. [2019] as a fairness measure for clustering and facility location problems. They introduced the following notion for the fixed quota $\ell = \frac{n}{k}$.

Definition 1 (α -approximate ℓ -proportionality). *Let $\alpha, \ell \geq 1$. For a metric space (\mathcal{X}, d) and a set $N \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ of agents, a k -clustering $W \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, $|W| = k$, satisfies (α, ℓ) -proportionality if there is no group $N' \subseteq N$ of at least $|N'| \geq \ell$ agents for which there exists a point $c \in \mathcal{X}$ such that, for all $i \in N'$,*

$$\alpha \cdot d(i, c) < d(i, W).$$

If $\ell = n/k$, then we say the outcome satisfies α -proportionality. If $\ell = \lfloor n/(k+1) \rfloor + 1$, then we say the outcome satisfies α -Droop proportionality.

Note that $\ell = \lfloor n/(k+1) \rfloor + 1$ is the smallest integer value such that after removing k blocks of agents each of size ℓ there are less than ℓ agents left.

To show that there always exists a clustering satisfying α -proportionality, Chen et al. [2019] introduced the GREEDY CAPTURE algorithm: Place a ball with radius $y = 0$ around each point $p \in \mathcal{X}$, then smoothly increase y . Once the ball around a point p contains ℓ unassigned agents, open a cluster center at p and assign the agents within the ball to p . If the ball around an open center p reaches further unassigned agents, these are also assigned to p .

For $\ell = \frac{n}{k}$ Chen, Fain, Lyu, and Munagala [2019] showed that the outcome of GREEDY CAPTURE always satisfies $(1 + \sqrt{2})$ -approximate ℓ -proportionality, while additionally giving instances for any $\varepsilon > 0$ that do not admit clusterings satisfying $(2 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate ℓ -proportionality. These results were improved by Micha and Shah [2020] for Euclidean metric spaces (with the ℓ_2 norm) for which GREEDY CAPTURE always selects a 2-proportional outcome, with the corresponding lower bound being $\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}$.

We first note that the upper bounds and proofs of Chen et al. [2019] and by Micha and Shah [2020] also translate to any integral $\ell > \frac{n}{k+1}$ and thus also to Droop proportionality. Indeed, the proofs work for any value of ℓ as long as for that ℓ , GREEDY CAPTURE returns at most k centers.

Theorem 1. *Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\ell > \frac{n}{k+1}$. Then GREEDY CAPTURE returns an outcome satisfying α -approximate ℓ -proportionality, where $\alpha \leq (1 + \sqrt{2})$ in general metric spaces and $\alpha \leq 2$ in Euclidean spaces.*

Despite the many follow-up works studying several aspects of proportional clustering [Kalaycı, Kempe, and Kher, 2024, Aziz, Lee, Morota Chu, and Vollen, 2024, Kellerhals and Peters, 2024, Caragiannis, Micha, and Shah, 2024], no work has been able to improve either the lower or upper bounds of Chen, Fain, Lyu, and Munagala [2019] and Micha and Shah [2020] so far.

2.2 β -plurality points

Independently of the previous discussion, Aronov et al. [2021] introduced the concept of a β -Plurality point inspired by works on Voronoi games and the spatial theory of voting [Black, 1948, Downs, 1957, Enelow and Hinisch, 1983]. We are given a population of agents, each corresponding to a point in a metric space, who want to elect another point in the space. The goal is to find a point such that no other point is “strongly” preferred to it by a majority of the agents. If the goal was to simply find a point such that no other

	Arbitrary Metric	\mathbb{R}^2	\mathbb{R}^d
α -proportionality	$2 \leq \alpha \leq 1 + \sqrt{2}^{\clubsuit}$	$\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \leq \alpha \leq 2^{\spadesuit}$	$\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \leq \alpha \leq 2^{\spadesuit}$
β -Plurality	$2 \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \leq 1 + \sqrt{2}^{\heartsuit}$	$\frac{1}{\beta} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}^{\diamond}$	$\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}^{\diamond} \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \leq \min(\sqrt{d}^{\diamond}, 1.8^{\heartsuit})$

Table 1: Comparison of the previously known results. For better comparability, we state the results on β -plurality in terms of $\frac{1}{\beta}$. Results marked with a \clubsuit are by Chen, Fain, Lyu, and Munagala [2019], with a \spadesuit by Micha and Shah [2020], \heartsuit by Filtser and Filtser [2024], and \diamond by Aronov, de Berg, Gudmundsson, and Horton [2021].

point is preferred by a majority, this would be the classical Condorcet winner problem. It is commonly known that such a Condorcet winner need not exist, even in \mathbb{R}^2 , [see e.g. Lassota et al., 2024]. Aronov et al. relax this condition by requiring that no point should be preferred by a majority by at least a factor of β .¹

Definition 2. Let $\beta \leq 1$. For a metric space (\mathcal{X}, d) and a set $N \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ of agents, a point $p \in \mathcal{X}$ is a β -plurality point if

$$|\{i \in N : \beta \cdot d(i, p) \leq d(i, q)\}| \geq \frac{|N|}{2} \text{ for all } q \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Aronov et al. [2021] showed that in $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^2$ the best possible achievable β is $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ and gave an additional lower bound of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$ for $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$. In a follow-up work, Filtser and Filtser [2024] showed that for arbitrary metric spaces, the best possible β is between $\sqrt{2} - 1$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and improved the lower bound for \mathbb{R}^d (for $d \geq 4$) to 0.557.

2.3 Connecting plurality points and proportionality

Indeed, if one compares the results achieved for proportional clustering and β -plurality points, they look very similar, see Table 1. This is not a coincidence, as it is easy to show that plurality points are equivalent to proportional clusterings of size one (when using the Droop quota).

Theorem 2. A point p is a β -plurality point if and only if the clustering $\{p\}$ satisfies $\frac{1}{\beta}$ -Droop proportionality.

Proof. Let p be a β -plurality point, $N' \subseteq N$ of size $\lfloor \frac{|N|}{2} \rfloor + 1$, and $q \in \mathcal{X}$. Since p is a β -plurality point, we know that $|\{i \in N : d(i, p) \leq \frac{1}{\beta}d(i, q)\}| \geq \frac{|N|}{2}$. Thus, there must exist a point in N' not preferring q by a factor of more than $\frac{1}{\beta}$ and thus $\{p\}$ is $\frac{1}{\beta}$ -Droop proportional. Similarly, if p is not a β -plurality point, the set $N \setminus \{i \in N : d(i, p) \leq \frac{1}{\beta}d(i, q)\}$ of more than $\frac{|N|}{2}$ agents can deviate to q ; thus p does not satisfy $\frac{1}{\beta}$ -Droop proportionality. \square

Thus, the stronger framework of proportional clustering provides a generalization of β -plurality points, and has interestingly enough mostly arrived to the same existential results.²

¹Here, we state the definition as in Filtser and Filtser [2024, Definition 2.1]. The original version [Aronov et al., 2021] requires that $|\{i \in N : \beta \cdot d(i, p) < d(i, q)\}| \geq |\{i \in N : \beta \cdot d(i, p) > d(i, q)\}|$. However, existence results for these two versions were shown to be equivalent by Filtser and Filtser [2024].

²Sadly, we do not find a way to apply the methods of Filtser and Filtser [2024] and Aronov et al. [2021] to find stronger bounds for the proportional clustering problem, as they explicitly construct only a single point.

3 Plurality Points and Distortion

The (*metric*) *distortion* of a point measures how well a given point approximates the “social cost”, i.e., the total distance to all agents. When the distance metric is given, finding the minimum distortion point (candidate) is equivalent to the 1-median problem and thus trivial. However, when we are only given *ordinal* information, i.e., an ordering of the distances from each point, from closest to furthest, finding the minimum distortion point is more challenging and has gained significant attention in recent years [Gkatzelis et al., 2020, Kızılkaya and Kempe, 2022]. Formally, distortion is defined as follows.

Definition 3. For a metric space (\mathcal{X}, d) and a set $N \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ of agents, the social cost of a point $p \in \mathcal{X}$ is $d(N, p) = \sum_{i \in N} d(i, p)$. The distortion of p is

$$\sup_{q \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{d(N, p)}{d(N, q)}.$$

It is well known that a 1-plurality point (i.e., a Condorcet winner) has a distortion of 3 [Anshelevich et al., 2018]. We generalize this to the case of arbitrary β .

Theorem 3. Every β -plurality point has a distortion of $2\frac{1}{\beta} + 1$.

Proof. Let p be a β -plurality point and q be any other point. Let $N' = \{i \in N : \beta \cdot d(i, p) \leq d(i, q)\}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(N, p) &= \sum_{i \in N} d(i, p) = \sum_{i \in N'} d(i, p) + \sum_{i \in N \setminus N'} d(i, p) \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in N'} d(i, p) + \sum_{i \in N \setminus N'} (d(i, q) + d(q, p)) \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in N'} (d(i, p) + d(q, p)) + \sum_{i \in N \setminus N'} d(i, q) \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in N'} (2d(i, p) + d(i, q)) + \sum_{i \in N \setminus N'} d(i, q) \leq \left(2\frac{1}{\beta} + 1\right) d(N, q). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that $|N'| \geq |N \setminus N'|$ and the triangle inequality. \square

It is, however, easy to see that a constant factor distortion does not imply that a point is a constant plurality point. Consider an instance on the line, with $\frac{n}{2} - 1$ points at 0, $\frac{n}{2} + 1$ points at 1. Here, any point at location 0 has a distortion of at most 2. However, the $\frac{n}{2} + 1$ agents are a witness that this is not any finite plurality point.

4 Plurality Points Using Only Ordinal Information

In their seminal work, Kızılkaya and Kempe [2022] introduced PLURALITY VETO (as a simple variant of the rule of Gkatzelis et al. [2020], see also Kızılkaya and Kempe [2023]) as a voting rule that uses only ordinal information and always selects a point with distortion 3. The rule works in two phases. In the first phase, each agent nominates their top choice, i.e., each point receives a score equal to its plurality score. Then the agents go one-by-one and decrement the score of the point with the lowest positive score. The last point to get decremented wins. We show that the point selected by PLURALITY VETO also is an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ -plurality point.

Theorem 4. PLURALITY VETO *always selects a $(\sqrt{5} - 2)$ -plurality point.*

Proof. Let p be the point selected by PLURALITY VETO and let q be any other point. We choose $\beta' \leq 1$ to be the smallest value such that p is not a β' -plurality point. Then $S = \{i \in N : \beta' d(i, p) > d(i, q)\}$ contains more than $n/2$ points. Let $C \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be the set of candidates nominated by points in S in the first phase and note that $p \notin C$ by definition of S . Moreover, the sum of plurality scores of C is greater than $n/2$ (and the score sum of $\mathcal{X} \setminus C$ is less than $n/2$). If all agents in S only decrement scores of candidates outside of C , then p will not be selected. Thus, some agent in S decrements the score of some $r \in C$. Let $j \in S$ be the agent that nominated r . Then we have $d(i, p) \leq d(i, r) \leq d(i, q) + d(q, j) + d(j, r) \leq d(i, q) + 2d(j, q)$. Similarly, $d(j, p) \leq d(j, q) + d(q, i) + d(i, p)$. By definition of S , $\frac{1}{\beta'}$ is less than

$$\begin{aligned} \min \left(\frac{d(i, p)}{d(i, q)}, \frac{d(j, p)}{d(j, q)} \right) &\leq \min \left(\frac{d(i, q) + 2d(j, q)}{d(i, q)}, \frac{d(j, q) + d(i, q) + d(i, p)}{d(j, q)} \right) \\ &\leq \min \left(\frac{d(i, q) + 2d(j, q)}{d(i, q)}, \frac{3d(j, q) + 2d(i, q)}{d(j, q)} \right) \\ &\leq \max_{x \geq 0} \min \left(1 + 2x, 3 + \frac{2}{x} \right) = 2 + \sqrt{5} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5} - 2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, PLURALITY VETO always selects a $(\sqrt{5} - 2)$ -plurality point. \square

5 Proportional Clusterings Using Only Ordinal Information

We next turn to the problem of finding proportional clusterings when we only have ordinal information at hand. This problem was considered by Kalaycı et al. [2024] who showed that one can always find a $\frac{5+\sqrt{41}}{2}$ -proportional clustering, but there are instances where no (purely ordinal) algorithm can satisfy α -proportionality for $\alpha < 2 + \sqrt{5}$. For their upper-bound, they employed the Expanding Approvals Rule (EAR) by Aziz and Lee [2020].

We close the gap by showing that one can always find a $(2 + \sqrt{5})$ -proportional clustering using only ordinal information. Indeed, to prove this, it suffices to use the property of *rank-JR*, which was conceptually introduced by Brill and Peters [2023]. We again define an ℓ -quota version of the notion. To this end, we say that an agent i has $\text{rank}(i, c)$ for candidate c if this candidate is the $\text{rank}(i, c)$ -th closest candidate to this agent. An outcome W of size k satisfies ℓ -rank-JR, if for every rank r , every set $N' \subseteq N$ of size at least ℓ such that there is a candidate c with $\text{rank}(i, c) \leq r$ for each $j \in N'$, there is at least one $w \in W$ and $i \in N'$ such that $\text{rank}(i, w) \leq r$. We remark that an outcome returned by EAR satisfies ℓ -rank-JR with $\ell \geq \frac{n}{k}$.

Theorem 5. *Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\ell > \frac{n}{k+1}$ and W be an outcome satisfying ℓ -rank-JR. Then W satisfies $(2 + \sqrt{5})$ -approximate ℓ -proportionality.*

Proof. Let $c \notin W$ be an unchosen candidate and $N' \subseteq N$ be a subset of agents of size at least ℓ . Let $i \in N'$ be the agent that gives the greatest rank to c , let $r = \text{rank}(i, c)$, and let C_r be the set of the r candidates that are closest to i . Note that $d(i, c_r) \leq d(i, c)$ for any $c_r \in C_r$. As W satisfies ℓ -rank-JR, there is an agent $j \in N$ and a candidate $w \in W$ such that $\text{rank}(j, w) \leq r$. Then, for each $c_r \in C_r$ we have $d(j, c_r) \leq d(j, c) + d(c, i) + d(i, c_r) \leq d(j, c) + 2d(i, c) =: y$. As there are r candidates in C_r , the distance of j to its r -th ranked candidate is at most y ; thus also $d(j, w) \leq y$. Putting this together, we obtain that W

satisfies α -proportionality, where α is at most

$$\begin{aligned} \min \left(\frac{d(i, w)}{d(i, c)}, \frac{d(j, w)}{d(j, c)} \right) &\leq \min \left(\frac{d(i, c) + d(j, c) + d(j, w)}{d(i, c)}, \frac{d(j, w)}{d(j, c)} \right) \\ &\leq \min \left(\frac{3d(i, c) + 2d(j, c)}{d(i, c)}, \frac{d(j, c) + 2d(i, c)}{d(j, c)} \right) \\ &\leq \max_{x \geq 0} \min \left(3 + \frac{2}{x}, 1 + 2x \right) = 2 + \sqrt{5}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

In fact we can also show that rank-PJR (a slightly stricter notion than rank-JR) implies an approximation to the core of Ebadian and Micha [2025]. As this result is mostly a modification of the previous theorem as well as the proofs of Kellerhals and Peters [2024] we defer definitions and proof to the appendix.

Theorem 6. *Let W be a committee satisfying rank-PJR. Then W is in the $(4 + \sqrt{13})$ - q -core for all $q \leq k$.*

6 Conclusion

We observed a simple equivalence between the Droop proportional clustering problem and the β -plurality problem. At the moment, for arbitrary metric spaces, both problems are stuck at the exact same bounds. Is it perhaps possible to first “attack” the simpler β -plurality problem, e.g., can maybe more sophisticated methods lead to improved bounds for $k = 1$ and can these be translated to larger k ? Relatedly, can the methods of Aronov et al. [2021] and Filtser and Filtser [2024] for Euclidean spaces be generalized to the clustering problem? Finally, Micha and Shah [2020] showed that for the ℓ_1 and ℓ_∞ norms GREEDY CAPTURE does not improve upon the $1 + \sqrt{2}$ bound. Is it still possible to obtain better bounds in these spaces?

7 Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the Singapore Ministry of Education under grant number MOE-T2EP20221-0001. We thank Warut Suksompong for helpful comments.

References

- E. Anshelevich, O. Bhardwaj, E. Elkind, J. Postl, and P. Skowron. Approximating optimal social choice under metric preferences. *Artificial Intelligence*, 264:27–51, 2018. 4
- B. Aronov, M. de Berg, J. Gudmundsson, and M. Horton. On *beta*-plurality points in spatial voting games. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 17(3):1–21, 2021. 1, 2, 3, 6
- H. Aziz and B. E. Lee. The expanding approvals rule: improving proportional representation and monotonicity. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 54:1–45, 2020. 5
- H. Aziz, M. Brill, V. Conitzer, E. Elkind, R. Freeman, and T. Walsh. Justified representation in approval-based committee voting. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 48(2):461–485, 2017. 1

- H. Aziz, B. E. Lee, S. Morota Chu, and J. Vollen. Proportionally representative clustering. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Web and Internet Economics (WINE)*, 2024. Forthcoming. 1, 2
- D. Black. On the rationale of group decision-making. *Journal of Political Economy*, 56(1): 23–34, 1948. 2
- M. Brill and J. Peters. Robust and verifiable proportionality axioms for multiwinner voting. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (ACM-EC)*, page 301. ACM Press, 2023. Full version arXiv:2302.01989 [cs.GT]. 1, 5
- I. Caragiannis, E. Micha, and N. Shah. Proportional fairness in non-centroid clustering. In *Proceedings of the 38th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2024. Forthcoming. 2
- X. Chen, B. Fain, L. Lyu, and K. Munagala. Proportionally fair clustering. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 1032–1041, 2019. 1, 2, 3
- A. Downs. An economic theory of political action in a democracy. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 65(2):135–150, 1957. 2
- H. R. Droop. On methods of electing representatives. *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, 44(2):141–202, 1881. 1
- S. Ebadian and E. Micha. Boosting sortition via proportional representation. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS)*, 2025. Forthcoming. 6
- J. Enelow and M. Hinisch. On plott’s pairwise symmetry condition for majority rule equilibrium. *Public Choice*, 40(3):317–321, 1983. 2
- A. Filtser and O. Filtser. Plurality in spatial voting games with constant β . *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, pages 1–16, 2024. 3, 6
- V. Gkatzelis, D. Halpern, and N. Shah. Resolving the optimal metric distortion conjecture. In *Proceedings of the 61st Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1427–1438, 2020. 4
- Y. H. Kalaycı, D. Kempe, and V. Kher. Proportional representation in metric spaces and low-distortion committee selection. In *Proceedings of the 38th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, pages 9815–9823. AAAI Press, 2024. 1, 2, 5
- L. Kellerhals and J. Peters. Proportional fairness in clustering: A social choice perspective. In *Proceedings of the 38th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 111299–111317, 2024. 1, 2, 6
- F. E. Kızılkaya and D. Kempe. PluralityVeto: A simple voting rule achieving optimal metric distortion. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 349 – 355, 2022. 1, 4
- F. E. Kızılkaya and D. Kempe. Generalized veto core and a practical voting rule with optimal metric distortion. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (ACM-EC)*, pages 913–936. ACM Press, 2023. 4

- A. Lassota, A. Vetta, and B. von Stengel. The condorcet dimension of metric spaces. Technical report, arXiv:2410.09201 [cs.GT], 2024. 3
- T. Masařík, G. Pierczyński, and P. Skowron. A generalised theory of proportionality in collective decision making. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (ACM-EC)*, pages 734–754. ACM Press, 2024. 1
- D. McCune and A. Graham-Squire. Monotonicity anomalies in scottish local government elections. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 63(1):69–101, 2024. 1
- E. Micha and N. Shah. Proportionally fair clustering revisited. In *Proceedings of the 47th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP)*, pages 85:1–85:16, 2020. 2, 3, 6
- D. Peters and P. Skowron. Proportionality and the limits of welfarism. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (ACM-EC)*, pages 793–794. ACM Press, 2020. 1
- N. Tideman. The single transferable vote. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9(1):27–38, 1995. 1

A A connection between rank-PJR and the core

We first define the q -core notion—a generalization of proportionality in which an agent is not represented by the closest center but the q closest centers. For $W \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $q \leq |W|$, define $d^q(i, W)$ be the distance of i to the q -th closest point in W . By the triangle inequality, $d^q(i, W) = d(i, j) + d^q(j, W)$, for $i, j \in \mathcal{X}$.

As with the previous notions, we can also lift the core notion to any quota $\ell > \frac{n}{k+1}$.

Definition 4. For $\alpha, \ell \geq 1$ an outcome W is in the α -approximate ℓ -quota q -core, if there is no $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ and no $N' \subseteq N$ with $|N'| \geq \mu \cdot \ell$ and set $C' \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ with $q \leq |C'| \leq \mu$ such that $\alpha \cdot d^q(i, C') < d^q(i, W)$ for all $i \in N'$.

Let us further define ℓ -rank-PJR, which is a restriction of ℓ -rank-JR. An outcome W of size k satisfies ℓ -rank-PJR, if for every rank r , every $\mu \geq 1$, and every set $N' \subseteq N$ of size at least $\mu \cdot \ell$ such that there is a set C' of at least μ candidates with $\text{rank}(i, c) \leq r$ for each $i \in N'$ and $c \in C'$, there is a set $W' \subseteq W$ of at least μ winners such that for each $w \in W'$ there is an agent $i' \in N'$ with $\text{rank}(i', w) \leq r$.

Theorem 7. Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $\ell > \frac{n}{k+1}$, and let W be an outcome satisfying ℓ -rank-PJR. Then W is in the $(4 + \sqrt{13})$ -approximate ℓ -quota q -core for every $q \leq k$.

Proof. Let $N' \subseteq N$ be a subset of at least $\mu \cdot \ell$ agents and let $C' \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ with $q \leq |C'| \leq \mu$. Assume that each agent in N' marks their q favorite candidates that are in C' . This places $|N'| \cdot q \geq \mu \cdot \ell \cdot q \geq |C'| \cdot \ell \cdot q$ marks on the candidates in C' ; thus there exists a candidate $c \in C'$ with at least $\ell \cdot q$ marks, and each mark is by a unique agent in N' . Let N'' be the set of at least $\ell \cdot q$ agents that marked c and note that each $j \in N''$ has c among their q favorite candidates among C' , that is, $d(j, c) \leq d^q(j, C')$.

Let $i \in N''$ be the agent maximizing $d(i, c)$ and let C_i^q be the set of i 's q favorite candidates in C' . Let $j = \arg \max_{j \in N''} \max_{c' \in C_i^q} \text{rank}(j, c')$ be the agent assigning the maximum rank to any candidate in C_i^q and let $r = \max_{c' \in C_i^q} \text{rank}(j, c')$ be the corresponding rank.

Then every of the at least $q \cdot \ell$ agents in N'' must assign rank at most r to all candidates in C_i^q . As W satisfies ℓ -rank-PJR, there are at least q candidates $W_i^q \subseteq W$ such that for each $w \in W_i^q$ there is an agent $i' \in N''$ with $\text{rank}(i', w) \leq r$.

For any agent $h \in N''$ let c_h^r be their candidate at rank r . Then

$$\begin{aligned} d(h, c_h^r) &\leq d(h, j) + \max_{c' \in C_i^q} d(j, c') \\ &\leq d(h, c) + d(c, j) + d(j, c) + d(i, c) + \max_{c' \in C_i^q} d(i, c') \\ &\leq d^q(i, C') + 2d^q(j, C') + 2d^q(i, C') = 3d^q(i, C') + 2d^q(j, C'). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using that $d(i, h) \leq d(i, c) + d(c, h) \leq 2d^q(i, C')$, we obtain

$$d^q(i, W) \leq \max_{h \in N''} (d(i, h) + d(h, c_h^r)) \leq 5d^q(i, C') + 2d^q(j, C').$$

Lastly, as $d(j, i) \leq d(j, c) + d(c, i) \leq d^q(j, C') + d^q(i, C')$, we have

$$d^q(j, W) \leq d(j, i) + d^q(i, W) \leq 6d^q(i, C') + 3d^q(j, C').$$

Putting this together, W is in the α -approximate ℓ -quota q -core where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\leq \min \left(\frac{d^q(i, W)}{d^q(i, C')}, \frac{d^q(j, W)}{d^q(j, C')} \right) \\ &\leq \min \left(\frac{5d^q(i, C') + 2d^q(j, C')}{d^q(i, C')}, \frac{6d^q(i, C') + 3d^q(j, C')}{d^q(j, C')} \right) \\ &\leq \max_{x \geq 0} \min \left(5 + \frac{2}{x}, 6x + 3 \right) = 4 + \sqrt{13}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$