

On the Distortion of Committee Election with 1-Euclidean Preferences and Few Distance Queries^{*}

Dimitris Fotakis^{1,2}, Laurent Gourvès³, and Panagiotis Patsilinakos⁴

¹ School of Electrical and Computer Engineering
National Technical University of Athens, 15780 Athens, Greece

² Archimedes Research Unit, Athena RC, 15121 Athens, Greece

³ Université Paris Dauphine-PSL, CNRS, LAMSADE, 75016, Paris, France

⁴ Department of Informatics, Athens University of Economics and Business, Athens 10434, Greece
Emails: fotakis@cs.ntua.gr, laurent.gourves@dauphine.fr, patsilinak@mail.ntua.gr

Abstract. We consider committee election of $k \geq 3$ (out of $m \geq k + 1$) candidates, where the voters and the candidates are associated with locations on the real line. Each voter’s cardinal preferences over candidates correspond to her distance to the candidate locations, and each voter’s cardinal preferences over committees is defined as her distance to the nearest candidate elected in the committee. We consider a setting where the true distances and the locations are unknown. We can nevertheless have access to degraded information which consists of an order of candidates for each voter. We investigate the best possible distortion (a worst-case performance criterion) wrt. the social cost achieved by deterministic committee election rules based on ordinal preferences submitted by n voters and few additional distance queries. We show that for any $k \geq 3$, the best possible distortion of any deterministic algorithm that uses at most $k - 3$ distance queries cannot be bounded by any function of n , m and k . We present deterministic algorithms for k -committee election with distortion of $O(n)$ with $O(k)$ distance queries and $O(1)$ with $O(k \log n)$ distance queries.

Keywords: 1-Euclidean preferences; multiwinner voting; metric distortion; k -facility location

1 Introduction

Electing a set of representatives based on the preferences submitted by a set of voters is a central problem in social choice. Applications span over a wide range of settings, from single and multi-winner elections to recommendation systems and machine learning (see e.g., (Enelow and Hinich, 1984; Elkind et al., 2017a; Volkovs and Zemel, 2014; Fürnkranz and Hüllermeier, 2010; Lu and Boutilier, 2014)). In typical applications, voters express *ordinal* preferences over the set of candidates, which are consistent with their *cardinal* preferences, but do not include any quantitative information about the *strength* of each preference. An important reason for resorting to ordinal information has to do with the cognitive difficulty of quantifying preferences. Arguably, it is much easier for a voter to rank a set of candidates from most to least preferable, than to assign an exact utility to each of them. However, crucial information may be lost when voters summarize cardinal to ordinal preferences.

Procaccia and Rosenschein (2006) introduced the framework of *utilitarian distortion* as a means to quantify the efficiency loss, due to the fact that elections are based on ordinal information only, and to investigate the sensitivity of voting rules to the absence of cardinal information. The distortion of a voting rule is the worst-case approximation ratio of its social welfare to the optimal

^{*} This work has been supported by project MIS 5154714 of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan Greece 2.0 funded by the European Union under the NextGenerationEU Program and by the Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation (H.F.R.I.) under the “First Call for H.F.R.I. Research Projects to support Faculty members and Researchers and the procurement of high-cost research equipment grant”, project BALSAM, HFRI-FM17-1424. Most of this work was done while Panagiotis Patsilinakos was with the National Technical University of Athens.

social welfare achievable when cardinal information is available. Previous work has quantified the best possible distortion of single and multi-winner voting rules (often assuming normalized cardinal utilities, see e.g., (Boutilier et al., 2015; Caragiannis and Procaccia, 2011; Caragiannis et al., 2017)).

Motivated by the frequent use of spatial preferences in social choice (see e.g., (Enelow and Hinich, 1984)), Anshelevich et al. (2018) introduced the framework of *metric distortion*, where the voters and the candidates are associated with locations in an underlying metric space. The voters’ cardinal preferences over candidates correspond to their distance to the candidate locations. The voters rank the candidates in increasing order of distance and submit this information to the voting rule. Without knowledge of the voter and candidate locations and distances, the voting rule aims to minimize the sum of distances (a.k.a. the *social cost*) of the voters to the candidate elected. Distortion is now defined wrt. the social cost, instead of the social welfare. In the last few years, there has been significant interest in analyzing the metric distortion of prominent voting rules (see e.g., (Anshelevich et al., 2018; Skowron and Elkind, 2017; Goel, Krishnaswamy, and Munagala, 2017; Kempe, 2020; Anagnostides, Fotakis, and Patsilinakos, 2022)) and in designing voting rules with optimal metric distortion for single-winner elections (Gkatzelis, Halpern, and Shah, 2020; Kizilkaya and Kempe, 2023).

Interestingly, there has not been much previous work on the metric distortion of multiwinner voting, where we elect a committee of $k \geq 2$ (out of $m \geq k + 1$) candidates based on ordinal preferences submitted by n voters. As before, the voters and the candidates are associated with locations in a metric space and the voters’ cardinal preferences correspond to their distance to the candidate locations. However, there are many different ways to define the voter cardinal preferences over committees, resulting in different types and desirable properties of multiwinner elections (see e.g., (Elkind et al., 2017b; Faliszewski et al., 2017)).

Goel, Hulett, and Krishnaswamy (2018) and Chen, Li, and Wang (2020) were the first to consider the metric distortion of committee elections, in a setting where the cost of each voter for a committee is defined as the sum of her distances to all committee members. Goel, Hulett, and Krishnaswamy (2018) proved that the best possible distortion in this setting is equal to the best possible distortion of single-winner voting and can be achieved by repeatedly applying an optimal (wrt. metric distortion) single-winner voting rule. Chen, Li, and Wang (2020) proved that single-vote rules achieve a best possible distortion for the case where $k = m - 1$, i.e., when we have to exclude a single candidate from the committee.

Caragiannis, Shah, and Voudouris (2022) considered the metric distortion of k -committee election with the cost of each voter for a committee defined as her distance to the q -th nearest member. They proved an interesting trichotomy: the distortion is unbounded, if $q \leq k/3$, $\Theta(n)$, if $q \in (k/3, k/2]$, and equal to the best possible metric distortion of single-winner election, if $q > k/2$. For the most interesting case where $q = 1$ and each voter’s cost is her distance to the nearest committee member, their results imply that the distortion is $\Theta(n)$ if $k = 2$, and unbounded for all $k \geq 3$, with their lower bounds standing even if the voters and the candidates are embedded in the real line.

Subsequently, Burkhardt et al. (2024); Pulyassary (2022) considered the metric distortion of classical clustering problems, such as k -median (which corresponds to k -committee election with $q = 1$) and k -center, for $k \geq 2$, in a setting where the clustering algorithm receives only ordinal information about demand points’ locations and may query few distances. They focused on the case where the voter and the candidate locations coincide (a.k.a. *peer selection*), and asked about the minimum number of distance queries required for constant distortion. For k -median, Pulyassary (2022) proved that $O(1)$ distortion can be achieved deterministically with $O(n \text{poly}(\log n))$ distance queries and by a randomized algorithm with $O(nk)$ queries. Burkhardt et al. (2024) gave a random-

ized $O(1)$ -distortion algorithm with $O(k^4 \log^5 n)$ queries. As for k -center, [Burkhardt et al. \(2024\)](#) showed how to implement the classical 2-approximate greedy algorithm with $k(k-1)/2$ queries and presented a deterministic 4-distortion algorithm with only $2k$ distance queries. [Burkhardt et al. \(2024\)](#) also proved lower bounds showing that in general metric spaces, their query bounds are not far from best possible.

Motivation and Objective. In this work, we study the metric distortion of k -committee elections where the cost of each voter for a committee is defined as her distance to the nearest member (i.e., we have $q = 1$; it corresponds to the k -median setting in ([Burkhardt et al., 2024](#); [Pulyassary, 2022](#))). Our setting is conceptually close to (and strongly motivated by) the prominent committee election rules of ([Chamberlin and Courant, 1983](#); [Monroe, 1995](#)), which aim to elect a diverse committee that best reflects the preferences of the entire population of voters, see also ([Elkind et al., 2017b](#); [Faliszewski et al., 2017](#)).

Our approach is rather orthogonal to ([Burkhardt et al., 2024](#); [Pulyassary, 2022](#)). We consider the more general (technically more demanding and standard in computational social choice) setting where the sets (and the locations) of voters and candidates may be different, and focus on deterministic rules and on the simplest (but nevertheless interesting and challenging enough) case of 1-*Euclidean preferences*, where the voters and the candidates are embedded in the real line. As in ([Burkhardt et al., 2024](#); [Pulyassary, 2022](#)) (and also motivated by the success of [Amanatidis et al. \(2021, 2022a,b\)](#) in improving the utilitarian distortion for single-winner elections and one-sided matchings with cardinal queries), we aim to shed light on the following:

Question 1. How many distance queries are required for a bounded (or even constant) distortion in k -committee election with 1-Euclidean preferences, for $k \geq 3$?

The case of 1-Euclidean preferences is particularly interesting because it allows for a maximum possible exploitation of ordinal preferences towards achieving low distortion with a small number of distance queries. Moreover, the lower bounds of ([Burkhardt et al., 2024](#)) are based on tree metrics and do not apply to 1-Euclidean preferences. As for the upper bounds of [Burkhardt et al. \(2024\)](#); [Pulyassary \(2022\)](#), though very strong and informative about the power of distance queries in k -median and k -center, there are two key difficulties towards applying them to our setting where the voter and candidate locations do not coincide: (i) in general metric spaces, we do not know how to extract (even approximate) information about candidate-to-candidate or voter-to-voter distances from “regular” voter-to-candidate distance queries (the latter request information present in voter cardinal preferences); and (ii) to the best of our understanding, the algorithms of [Burkhardt et al. \(2024\)](#); [Pulyassary \(2022\)](#) require ordinal information about how candidate and/or voter locations are ranked in increasing order of distance to certain candidate locations; we do not know how such ordinal information can be extracted from voter ordinal preferences, if the voter and the candidate locations are different.

Contribution and Techniques. We consider the general metric distortion setting, where the voter and the candidate locations may be different, focus on the simplest case of the line metric (and deal with difficulties (i) and (ii) above), and provide almost best possible answers to [Question 1](#).

In [Section 3](#), we review three different query types (voter-to-candidate, candidate-to-candidate and voter-to-voter). We show that the answer to queries of the second and the third types can be obtained from a small constant number of “regular” voter-to-candidate distance queries. Thus, we can rely on the more convenient candidate-to-candidate distance queries by losing a small constant factor in the number of queries.

In [Section 5](#), we lower bound the number of distance queries required for bounded distortion. We show that for any $k \geq 3$, the distortion of any deterministic rule that uses at most $k-3$ distance

queries and selects k out of $m \geq 2(k-1)$ candidates on the real line is not bounded by any function of n , m and k (Theorem 1). Our construction shows that a bounded distortion is not possible if we restrict distance queries to few top candidates of each voter.

In Section 6, we asymptotically match the lower bound above with a greedy voting rule, which uses at most $6(k-3) + 3$ queries and achieves a distortion of at most $5n$ (Theorem 2). It is based on the classical greedy algorithm for k -center (Williamson and Shmoys, 2010, Section 2.2) (as it also happens with Polar-Opposites in (Caragiannis, Shah, and Voudouris, 2022) and the k -center algorithm in (Burkhardt et al., 2024, Section 3.1)). In our 1-dimensional setting, the greedy algorithm starts with the leftmost and the rightmost candidates. Then, in each iteration, it includes in the committee the furthest candidate to the set of candidates already elected. Exploiting the 1-dimensional structure of the instance, we show how to compute the furthest candidate in each interval defined by a pair of elected candidates that are consecutive on the real line, using the voters’ ordinal preferences and at most 3 distance queries. We observe that the next candidate to be elected in the committee is one of these furthest candidates. Interestingly, greedy achieves a distortion of at most 5 for the egalitarian cost, where we aim to minimize the maximum voter cost (and corresponds to the k -center objective, but with different candidate / potential center and voter / demand locations).

In Section 7, we show how to achieve low distortion with a small number of distance queries by selecting a small representative set of candidates and focusing on the restricted instance induced by them (Theorem 3). To demonstrate the usefulness of this reduction, in Section 8, we exploit a generalization of the greedy rule. Our construction for selecting a small representative set of candidates is inspired by the notion of *coresets*, extensively used for k -median in computational geometry (see e.g., (Frahling and Sohler, 2005)). Our construction uses $O(k \log n)$ distance queries and computes a set of $O(k \log n)$ representative candidates that allow for a distortion of 5 (Theorem 4). The idea is to maintain a hierarchical partitioning of the candidate axis into a set of intervals, so that we can upper bound the contribution of the voters associated with each interval to the social cost. In each iteration, the most expensive interval, wrt. its contribution to the social cost, is split into two subintervals, defined by the two candidates on the left and on the right of the interval’s midpoint. The key step is to show that interval subdivision can be implemented using the voter ordinal preferences and at most 4 distance queries.

Related Work. Metric distortion was introduced in (Anshelevich et al., 2018), where the distortion of many popular voting rules for single-winner elections was studied. Subsequent work analyzed the metric distortion of popular voting rules, such as STV (Skowron and Elkind, 2017; Anagnostides, Fotakis, and Patsilinos, 2022). Munagala and Wang (2019) and Kempe (2020) presented deterministic rules with distortion $2 + \sqrt{5}$, breaking the barrier of 5 achieved by Copeland. Gkatzelis, Halpern, and Shah (2020) introduced Plurality Matching and proved that it achieves an optimal distortion of 3 in general metric spaces (see also (Kizilkaya and Kempe, 2023)). Anshelevich and Zhu (2021) studied the distortion of single and multiwinner elections with known candidate locations. Abramowitz, Anshelevich, and Zhu (2019) resorted to additional information about the strength of voter preferences in order to improve on the best known distortion for single-winner elections. The reader is referred to the survey of Anshelevich et al. (2021) for a detailed overview.

Boutilier et al. (2015) and Caragiannis et al. (2017) studied the best possible utilitarian distortion of single and multiwinner elections, respectively. Amanatidis et al. (2021) significantly improved on the best possible utilitarian distortion for single-winner elections using cardinal information. They introduced a family of single-winner voting rules with distortion $O(m^{1/(\ell+1)})$ using $O(n\ell \log m)$ value queries. Subsequently, Amanatidis et al. (2022a,b) significantly improved on the

best possible utilitarian distortion for one-sided matchings using algorithms that resort to a small number of value queries per voter. Interestingly, our query bounds are linear in the size k of the committee and only logarithmic in the number n of voters (instead of linear in n in the query bounds of (Amanatidis et al., 2021, 2022a,b)).

The main result of (Fotakis, Gourvès, and Monnot, 2016) implies that the metric distortion for the utilitarian version of k -committee election with 1-Euclidean preferences is 3, for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, and at most $\frac{2k-1}{2k-3}$, for any $k \geq 3$. Namely, the distortion for the utilitarian version of k -committee election on the real line tends to 1 as the committee size k increases.

Multiwinner voting is a significant research direction in social choice and has been studied from many different viewpoints, e.g., proportional representation (Aziz et al., 2017; Peters and Skowron, 2020), axiomatic justification (Elkind et al., 2017b), core-stability in restricted domains (Pierczyński and Skowron, 2022). Selection of a single candidate or a committee of candidates based on 1-Euclidean preferences submitted by voters (or agents) is a typical setting in social choice and mechanism design and has been the topic of previous work (see e.g., (Miyagawa, 2001; Procaccia and Tennenholtz, 2013; Fotakis and Tzamos, 2014; Feldman, Fiat, and Golomb, 2016) for representative previous work on mechanism design, and (Fotakis, Gourvès, and Monnot, 2016; Fotakis and Gourvès, 2022) and few references in (Anshelevich et al., 2021) for representative previous work on social choice and distortion).

2 Model and Notation

We consider a set $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$ of m candidates and a set $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ of n voters. We assume that they are all located on the real line \mathbb{R} , i.e., each candidate c_i (resp. voter v_j) is associated with a location $x(c_i) \in \mathbb{R}$ (resp. $x(v_j) \in \mathbb{R}$). For brevity, we usually let c_i (resp. v_j) denote both the candidate (resp. the voter) and her location $x(c_i)$ (resp. $x(v_j)$). We always index candidates in increasing order of their real coordinates, i.e., $c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_m$, which is also the order they appear on the candidate axis from left to right. We let $\mathcal{C}[c, c'] = \mathcal{C} \cap [c, c']$ be the set (or interval) of candidates in \mathcal{C} between c and c' on the candidate axis.

For each voter v , we let her L_1 distance to the candidate locations quantify her cardinal preferences over \mathcal{C} . I.e., v 's cost for being represented by a candidate c is

$$\text{cost}_v(c) = d(v, c) = |v - c| = |x(v) - x(c)|.$$

For a voter v and a set $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ of candidates, we let $d(v, S) = \min_{c \in S} \{d(v, c)\} = \min_{c \in S} \{|v - c|\}$. Motivated by the Chamberlin and Courant (1983) rule for k -committee election, we assume that each voter v is represented by (or is assigned to) her nearest candidate in any given set S of elected candidates. Formally, for any $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, we let $\text{cost}_v(S) = d(v, S) = \min_{c \in S} \{d(v, c)\}$ be the cost experienced by v from the set S of elected candidates.

Problem Definition. The problem of **k -Committee Election** is to select a candidate set (a.k.a. committee) $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, with $|S| = k \leq m - 1$, that minimizes the (utilitarian) *social cost* $\text{SC}(S) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \text{cost}_v(S)$ of the voters. We also consider the *egalitarian cost* $\text{EC}(S) = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \text{cost}_v(S)$ of the voters for a k -committee S of elected candidates. We often refer to $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$, where \mathcal{C} is the set of candidates and \mathcal{V} is the set of voters, along with their locations on the real line (which are assumed fixed, but unknown to the voting rule), as an *instance* of k -Committee Election.

Committee Election with 1-Euclidean Preferences and Distance Queries. k -Committee Election can be solved in $O(nk \log n)$ time, by dynamic programming (Hassin and Tamir, 1991), if we have access to the voter and the candidate locations on the real line (or to all voter-candidate distances). However, in our setting, every voter v provides only a ranking \succ_v over the set \mathcal{C} of

candidates that is consistent with the function $\text{cost}_v : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Namely, for every two candidates c and c' , $c \succ_v c'$ (i.e., v prefers c to c') if and only if $d(v, c) < d(v, c')$. As usual in relevant literature (see e.g., (Anshelevich et al., 2021, Section 2)), we assume that for every voter v , \succ_v is a strict total order, i.e., that for every pair of candidates c and c' , $d(v, c) \neq d(v, c')$.

Our committee election rules receive a ranking profile $\vec{\succ} = (\succ_1, \dots, \succ_n)$ consisting of a strict total order \succ_j over \mathcal{C} for each voter $v_j \in \mathcal{V}$. We only consider 1-*Euclidean* ranking profiles $\vec{\succ}$, in the sense that all \succ_v in $\vec{\succ}$ are consistent with a cost function cost_v computed wrt. some fixed (and common) collection of voter and candidate locations on the real line. Under the assumption that total orders \succ_v are strict, 1-Euclidean ranking profiles are *single-peaked* (Black, 1948) and *single-crossing* (Karlin, 1968; Mirrlees, 1971), properties that have received significant attention in computational social choice (see e.g., (Escoffier, Lang, and Öztürk, 2008; Elkind and Faliszewski, 2014) and the references therein). Fotakis and Gourvès (2022, Section 3) present simple examples, where candidates and voters are embedded in the real line and different tie breaking in voter ordinal preferences results in ranking profiles that are not single-peaked or single-crossing. Elkind and Faliszewski (2014) show that given a ranking profile $\vec{\succ}$, we can verify if $\vec{\succ}$ is 1-Euclidean and compute in polynomial time a strict ordering of the candidates on the real line, from left to right, that is consistent with $\vec{\succ}$. We refer to such an ordering as the *candidate axis*.

A *deterministic rule* R for k -committee election receives a 1-Euclidean ranking profile $\vec{\succ} = (\succ_1, \dots, \succ_n)$ over a set \mathcal{C} of m candidates, the desired committee size k and a non-negative integer q . Then, using $\vec{\succ}$ and information about the distance of at most q candidate pairs on the real line, R computes a committee $R(\vec{\succ}, k, q) = S \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ with k candidates. Our committee election rules assume availability of the candidate axis corresponding to $\vec{\succ}$ and may ask distance queries *adaptively*. We assume that the responses to all distance queries are consistent with a fixed collection of voter and candidate locations on \mathbb{R} that result in $\vec{\succ}$.

Distortion. We evaluate the performance of a committee election rule R (often called *rule* or *algorithm*, for brevity) for given ranking profile $\vec{\succ}$, committee size k and query number q in terms of its *distortion* (Boutilier et al., 2015; Procaccia and Rosenschein, 2006), i.e., the worst-case approximation ratio that R achieves wrt. the social cost:

$$\text{dist}(R, \vec{\succ}, k, q) = \sup \frac{\text{SC}(R(\vec{\succ}, k, q))}{\min_{S: |S|=k} \text{SC}(S)}, \quad (1)$$

where the supremum is taken over all collections of voter and candidate locations on the real line that are consistent with $\vec{\succ}$ and with the responses to the q candidate distance queries asked by R . The distortion of a deterministic k -committee rule R is the maximum of $\text{dist}(R, \vec{\succ}, k, q)$ over all linear ranking profiles $\vec{\succ}$ with n voters and m candidates. We sometimes also consider the distortion wrt. the egalitarian cost $\text{EC}(S)$ by explicitly referring to it.

Notation. We let $\text{top}(v)$ be the top candidate of voter v in \succ_v . A candidate's c cluster $\text{Cluster}(c)$ consists of all voters in \mathcal{V} with c as their top candidate. We say that a candidate c is *active* if $\text{Cluster}(c) \neq \emptyset$, i.e., there is some voter v with c as her top choice. We assume *non-degenerate* ranking profiles $\vec{\succ}$, where $n \geq k + 1$ and all candidates are located between the leftmost and the rightmost active candidate. We justify this assumption in Appendix A. We note that the candidate axis, determined from $\vec{\succ}$ by the algorithm of (Elkind and Faliszewski, 2014), is guaranteed to be unique (up to symmetries) for non-degenerate ranking profiles $\vec{\succ}$.

We always assume that the candidate set \mathcal{C} given as input to our algorithms consists of *active candidates only*. An instance is *candidate-restricted*, if all candidates are active and all voters are moved to the location of their top candidate. Assuming that all voters are collocated with their top candidates (and then removing inactive candidates, see Appendix C) increases the distortion by a factor of at most 3 (see Theorem 3 for the social cost and Appendix B for the egalitarian cost).

By stating that explicitly, the analysis of our distortion bounds sometimes uses candidate-restricted instances. We should highlight that our algorithms work without assuming anything about voter and candidate locations and our distortion bounds hold against an optimal solution for the original instance, where candidates may be inactive and candidate and voter locations may be different.

There is a delicate issue that restricts the use of candidate-restricted instances in our algorithms (and with which our algorithms carefully deal): When we use a ranking \succ_v in an algorithm, we have to take care of the fact that \succ_v may be different from the ranking $\succ_{\text{top}(v)}$, where the candidates are ranked in increasing order of distance to $\text{top}(v)$ (because the locations of v and $\text{top}(v)$ may be different). The difficulty of deducing useful information about the rankings \succ_c at candidate locations c from a voter ranking profile \succ imposes a significant difference between our setting and the clustering setting in (Burkhardt et al., 2024; Pulyassary, 2022).

3 Distance Query Types

Before moving on to analyze the distortion of committee election rules that can use a small number of distance queries, we discuss three different types of them:

Regular queries. Given a voter $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and a candidate $c \in \mathcal{C}$, we ask for the distance $d(v, c) = |v - c|$.

Candidate queries. Given two candidates $c, c' \in \mathcal{C}$, we ask for the distance $d(c, c') = |c - c'|$.

Voter queries. Given two voters $v, v' \in V$, we ask for the distance $d(v, v') = |v - v'|$.

Regular queries ask for information available in the voter cost functions $\text{cost}_v : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ quantifying their cardinal utilities. In Appendix E, we show how to simulate candidate queries and voter queries with 4 and 2 regular queries, respectively.

Therefore, as long as we care about the asymptotics of the number of queries used by a committee election rule, we may use these types of queries interchangeably. Hence, we state and analyze our committee election rules assuming access to candidate queries, with the understanding that they can be implemented using asymptotically the same number of regular queries. In fact, the exact number of regular queries can be slightly improved via a more careful implementation that uses regular queries directly.

4 Constant Distortion with $\Theta(m)$ Queries

We next observe that for any $k \geq 2$ and any $m \geq k + 1$, we can fully reconstruct the candidate axis using $m - 1$ distance queries and find the optimal k -committee for the corresponding candidate-restricted instance using dynamic programming. This implies a distortion of 3 (for both the social and the egalitarian cost) using $m - 1$ distance queries.

Observation 1 (Reconstructing the Candidate Axis) *The distances between all pairs of consecutive active candidates on the real line can be extracted from $m - 1$ candidate (or from $3m - 2$ regular) distance queries.*

Proof. Let $c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_m$ be the active candidates as they appear on the real line from left to right. If we have access to candidate queries, we query the distances $d(c_1, c_2), d(c_2, c_3), \dots, d(c_{m-1}, c_m)$.

Otherwise, for every $i \in [m]$, let $v_i \in \text{Cluster}(c_i)$ be any voter with $\text{top}(v_i) = c_i$. We ask v_1 for the distances $d(v_1, c_1)$ and $d(v_1, c_2)$, each $v_i, 2 \leq i \leq m - 1$, for the distances $d(v_i, c_{i-1}), d(v_i, c_i)$




Fig. 1. The basic instance used in the lower bound of Theorem 1 for $k = 6$.

and $d(v_i, c_{i+1})$, and v_m for the distances $d(v_m, c_{m-1})$ and $d(v_m, c_m)$ for v_m . Inspecting the proof of Proposition 5, we conclude that these $3m - 2$ distances provide all the information required to compute the distances $d(c_i, c_{i+1})$, $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$, for all pairs c_i and c_{i+1} of consecutive candidates on the line. \square

We note that as soon as we have the distances between all consecutive active candidates, an optimal k -committee for the candidate-restricted instance \mathcal{C}_{cr} induced by \mathcal{C} can be computed in polynomial time by dynamic programming (Hassin and Tamir, 1991). Then, Proposition 3 and Theorem 3 (resp. Theorem 6) imply that $m - 1$ candidate (or $3m - 2$ regular) queries are enough for a distortion of at most 3, for any $k \geq 2$ and any $m \geq k + 1$ for both the utilitarian cost and the egalitarian cost.

5 Lower Bound on the Number of Queries Required for Bounded Distortion

We next show that when we select $k \geq 3$ out of $m \geq 2(k - 1)$ candidates, achieving a bounded distortion requires at least $k - 2$ distance queries.

Theorem 1. *For any $k \geq 3$, the distortion of any deterministic k -committee election rule that uses at most $k - 3$ distance queries and selects k out of at least $2(k - 1)$ candidates on the real line cannot be bounded by any function of n , m and k (for both the social and the egalitarian cost).*

Proof. For every $k \geq 3$, we construct a family of $2(k - 1)$ instances on the real line with $k - 1$ candidate pairs each that cannot be distinguished with less than $k - 2$ distance queries. The distances are chosen so that in any committee with a bounded distortion, both candidates of a particular pair must be chosen, along with one candidate from each of the remaining pairs. Any deterministic rule cannot tell that particular pair, unless it asks at least $k - 2$ distance queries in the worst case.

For the construction, we consider $m = 2(k - 1)$ candidates, $c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_{2k-3} < c_{2k-2}$. We let D sufficiently large, so that $D^2 \gg \max\{2D + 1, k\}$, and an $\epsilon \in (0, 1/k)$ sufficiently small used for tie breaking. In the basic instance, we let $d(c_{2i-1}, c_{2i}) = 1$, for all $i \in [k - 1]$, and let $d(c_{2i}, c_{2i+1}) = D^2 + (i - 1)\epsilon$, for all $i \in [k - 2]$ (see also Figure 1). There are $n = m$ voters, each with a different top candidate. The voters are collocated with their top candidate in the basic instance and its variants presented below.

We construct a family of $2(k - 1)$ different variants of the basic instance, by moving candidate c_j , $j = 1, \dots, 2(k - 1)$, by D , while keeping every other candidate at her original location. Specifically, in the j -th variant, if j is odd, we increase the distance $d(c_j, c_{j+1})$ from 1, in the basic instance, to $D + 1$, by moving candidate c_j by D on the left. In the j -th variant, if j is even, we increase the distance $d(c_{j-1}, c_j)$ from 1, in the basic instance, to $D + 1$, by moving candidate c_j by D on the right. All other candidates maintain the locations that they have in the basic instance (see also Figure 2). As a result, in the j -th variant, if j is odd, all distances $d(c_i, c_j)$, for $i = 1, \dots, j - 1$, decrease by D , while all distances $d(c_j, c_i)$, for $i = j + 1, \dots, 2(k - 1)$, increase by D . If j is even, all distances $d(c_i, c_j)$, for $i = 1, \dots, j - 1$, increase by D , while all distances $d(c_j, c_i)$, for $i = j + 1, \dots, 2(k - 1)$, decrease by D . These changes affect the distance of candidate c_j to all other candidates, but do




Fig. 2. The $2(k-1) = 10$ variants obtained from the basic instance used in the lower bound of Theorem 1 for $k = 6$.

not affect the distances between other candidate pairs, which remain as in the basic instance (see also Example 1).

Example 1. For $k = 6$, the basic instance used in our construction is shown in Figure 1 and the $2(k-1) = 10$ variants obtained from the basic instance are shown in Figure 2.

In the basic instance and its variants, the preference list (the same for all of them) of each of the $n = 10$ voters collocated with the $m = 10$ candidates is:

1. $(c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5, c_6, c_7, c_8, c_9, c_{10})$
2. $(c_2, c_1, c_3, c_4, c_5, c_6, c_7, c_8, c_9, c_{10})$
3. $(c_3, c_4, c_2, c_1, c_5, c_6, c_7, c_8, c_9, c_{10})$
4. $(c_4, c_3, c_5, c_2, c_6, c_1, c_7, c_8, c_9, c_{10})$
5. $(c_5, c_6, c_4, c_3, c_7, c_8, c_2, c_1, c_9, c_{10})$
6. $(c_6, c_5, c_7, c_4, c_8, c_3, c_9, c_2, c_{10}, c_1)$
7. $(c_7, c_8, c_6, c_5, c_9, c_{10}, c_4, c_3, c_2, c_1)$
8. $(c_8, c_7, c_9, c_6, c_{10}, c_5, c_4, c_3, c_2, c_1)$
9. $(c_9, c_{10}, c_8, c_7, c_6, c_5, c_4, c_3, c_2, c_1)$
10. $(c_{10}, c_9, c_8, c_7, c_6, c_5, c_4, c_3, c_2, c_1)$

We note that the ranking of each voter in each variant is identical to her ranking over the candidates in the basic instance. Therefore, a voting rule cannot identify the particular variant by only considering the rankings over candidates submitted by the voters.

Moreover, the distance change in the j -th variant only affects the distance of candidate c_j to the remaining candidates. E.g., for $j = 1$, all distances $d(c_1, c_i)$, $i = 2, \dots, 10$ increase by D . For $j = 2$, the distance $d(c_1, c_2)$ increases by D , while the distances $d(c_2, c_i)$, $i = 3, \dots, 10$ decrease by D . In general, in the j -th variant, for $j = 1, \dots, 10$, if j is odd, the distances $d(c_i, c_j)$, for $i = 1, \dots, j-1$, decrease by D , while all distances $d(c_j, c_i)$, for $i = j+1, \dots, 10$, increase by D . Symmetrically, if j is even, all distances $d(c_i, c_j)$, for $i = 1, \dots, j-1$, increase by D , while all distances $d(c_j, c_i)$, for $i = j+1, \dots, 2(k-1)$, decrease by D . \square

Intuitively, the basic instance (and each variant) consists of $k-1$ essentially isolated candidate pairs. In each variant, the candidates of exactly one pair are far away from each other (so for a

bounded distortion, we need to identify this pair and elect both candidates), while the candidates of the remaining pairs are quite close to each other (so we may elect any of them). Since the $2(k - 1)$ variants are symmetric otherwise, any distance query that discovers that the distance of a candidate pair is as in the basic instance can exclude at most two variants (from the list of all possible instances used in this proof). Therefore, any deterministic rule requires at least $k - 2$ distance queries in the worst case, before it is able to identify the candidate pair at distance D to each other.

More formally, the optimal committee (for both the social cost and the egalitarian cost) for the j -th variant of the basic instance is to select the candidates c_j and c_{j+1} , if j is odd, and c_{j-1} and c_j , if j is even, which candidates are at distance D to each other, and any candidate from each of the remaining candidate pairs (c_{2i-1}, c_{2i}) . The social cost of the optimal committee is $k - 2$ (and the egalitarian cost of the optimal committee is 1). Any other committee for the j -th variant has social (resp. egalitarian) cost at least D , which can become arbitrarily larger than $k - 2$ (resp. than 1). Therefore, a deterministic committee election rule with a bounded distortion must be able to identify the candidate pair at distance D (or equivalently, to identify the right variant) and to add both these candidates to the remaining $k - 2$ candidates elected by the rule.

We next show that this is not possible, unless the algorithm asks for at least $k - 2$ distance queries. We first observe that the ranking of any voter in the basic instance is identical to her ranking over candidates in each of the $2(k - 1)$ variants obtained from the basic instance (see also Example 1). Therefore, a voting rule cannot tell the right variant by only looking at the rankings submitted by the voters.

We also observe that in the j -th variant, the distances of candidate c_j to all other candidates differ from the corresponding distances in the basic instance, but the distances between all other candidate pairs are as in the basic instance. Therefore, every time we query the distance between a pair of candidates and find it unchanged with respect to the basic instance, we can exclude at most two variants from the family of $2(k - 1)$ variants defined above. Consequently, for any $k \geq 3$, any deterministic committee election rule needs at least $k - 2$ distance queries in the worst case, before it is able to identify the pair of candidates (c_{2i-1}, c_{2i}) that are at distance D in the input variant (and we need to elect both). \square

An interesting question is if bounded distortion is possible with distance queries restricted to the few top candidates of each voter. In the proof of Theorem 1, we can embed a large group of candidates, located extremely close to each other, in each location c_i in the basic instance and its variants (and also have a voter collocated with each of them). The (many) candidates of each group are ranked first by each voter in the same group. Hence, unless we are allowed to query distances to candidates further down the voters' rankings, we cannot get any useful information about these instances.

6 Bounded Distortion with $\Theta(k)$ Queries

In this section, we present a simple greedy rule for k -committee election that achieves bounded distortion with $\Theta(k)$ distance queries, thus asymptotically matching the lower bound of Theorem 1 wrt. the number of queries required for bounded distortion.

We show that the classical 2-approximate greedy algorithm for k -center can be implemented with few distance queries. The Greedy algorithm (Williamson and Shmoys, 2010, Section 2.2) iteratively maintains a set S of candidates, starting with any candidate, and adding the candidate c with maximum distance $d(c, S)$ to the current set S in each iteration. When applied to 1-Euclidean

Algorithm 1 The greedy algorithm for k -committee election

Input: Candidates $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$, $k \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$, distance function $d : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

Output: Set $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ of k candidates.

- 1: $S \leftarrow \{c_1, c_m\}$ {pick leftmost and rightmost candidates}
 - 2: **while** $|S| < k$ **do**
 - 3: $\hat{c} \leftarrow \arg \max_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \{d(c, S)\}$
 - 4: $S \leftarrow S \cup \{\hat{c}\}$
 - 5: **end while**
 - 6: **return** S
-

Algorithm 2 Query-efficient implementation of the greedy algorithm

Input: Candidates $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$, $k \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$, voter ranking profile $\succ = (\succ_1, \dots, \succ_n)$

Output: Set $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ of k candidates

- 1: $S \leftarrow \{c_1, c_m\}$ {pick leftmost and rightmost candidates}
 - 2: $\hat{\mathcal{C}} \leftarrow \{\text{Distant-Candidate}(\mathcal{C}[c_1, c_m])\}$
 - 3: **while** $|S| < k$ **do**
 - 4: Let c be s.t. $(c, \delta) \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\delta \geq \delta'$ for all $(c', \delta') \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}$
 - 5: $S \leftarrow S \cup \{c\}$
 - 6: $\hat{\mathcal{C}} \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \{(c, \delta)\}$
 - 7: **if** $|S| < k$ **then**
 - 8: Let c_i be the rightmost candidate in S on c 's left
 - 9: Let c_{i+1} be the leftmost candidate in S on c 's right
 - 10: $\hat{\mathcal{C}} \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{C}} \cup \{\text{Distant-Candidate}(\mathcal{C}[c_i, c])\} \cup \{\text{Distant-Candidate}(\mathcal{C}[c, c_{i+1}])\}$
 - 11: **end if**
 - 12: **end while**
 - 13: **return** S
-

instances, Algorithm 1 starts with the leftmost candidate c_1 and the rightmost candidate c_m . Then, for the next $k-2$ iterations, it adds to S the candidate $c \in \mathcal{C}$ with maximum $d(c, S)$.

To implement Algorithm 1 with distance queries (see Algorithm 2), we need to compute the most distant candidate in \mathcal{C} to current candidate set $S = \{c_1, \dots, c_\ell\}$, while $\ell < k$. For convenience, we let the candidates in S be indexed as they appear on the candidate axis, from left to right, i.e., $c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_\ell$, and c_1 (resp. c_ℓ) is the leftmost (resp. rightmost) candidate in S .

Algorithm 2 maintains a set $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ with $\ell-1$ candidate-distance pairs (\hat{c}_i, δ_i) , where for each $i \in [\ell-1]$, \hat{c}_i is the most distant candidate in the interval $\mathcal{C}[c_i, c_{i+1}]$ to its endpoints $c_i, c_{i+1} \in S$ and $\delta_i = d(\hat{c}_i, \{c_i, c_{i+1}\})$ is its distance to the endpoints of $\mathcal{C}[c_i, c_{i+1}]$. More formally, for each $i \in [\ell-1]$, we let

$$\hat{c}_i = \arg \max_{c \in \mathcal{C}[c_i, c_{i+1}]} \{d(c, \{c_i, c_{i+1}\})\} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_i = d(\hat{c}_i, \{c_i, c_{i+1}\}). \quad (2)$$

This information is provided by the Distant-Candidate algorithm (Algorithm 3). Every time a new candidate c , lying between $c_i, c_{i+1} \in S$ on the axis, is added to S , the most distant candidates \hat{c}_i and its distance δ_i to $\{c_i, c\}$ and \hat{c}_{i+1} and its distance δ_{i+1} to $\{c, c_{i+1}\}$ are computed by two calls to the Distant-Candidate algorithm and are added to $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ (Algorithm 2, step 10), and the pair (c, δ) corresponding to c is removed from $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ (step 6).

In the next iteration, the most distant candidate in \mathcal{C} to the current set S is computed (step 4) and added to S (step 5). For step 4, we observe that the most distant candidate to S corresponds to the pair $(c, \delta) \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}$, where c maximizes the distance δ to its neighbor candidates in S among all $(c', \delta') \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}$. This observation is formalized by the following:

Algorithm 3 The Distant-Candidate algorithm

Input: Candidate interval $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$, a voter $v \in \text{Cluster}(c'')$ for every $c'' \in \mathcal{C}[c, c']$.

Output: Candidate $\hat{c} \in \mathcal{C}[c, c']$ with maximum $d(\hat{c}, \{c, c'\})$

```
1: if  $|\mathcal{C}[c, c']| = 3$  then
2:    $c'' \leftarrow \mathcal{C}[c, c'] \setminus \{c, c'\}$ 
3:   return  $(c'', \min\{d(c'', c), d(c'', c')\})$ 
4: end if
5: Let  $c''$  be the leftmost candidate in  $\mathcal{C}[c, c'] \setminus \{c\}$ 
6: while  $c'' \in \mathcal{C}[c, c']$  do
7:   Let  $\succ_{c''}$  be the ranking  $\succ_v$  of any  $v \in \text{Cluster}(c'')$ 
8:   if  $c' \succ_{c''} c$  then
9:     Let  $c_r$  be  $c''$  and  $c_l$  be next candidate on  $c''$ 's left  $\{c_l$  and  $c_r$  found, while-loop terminates}
10:    break-while-loop
11:   else
12:      $c'' \leftarrow$  the next candidate on  $c''$ 's right {proceed to the next candidate on the right}
13:   end if
14: end while
15: if  $d(c, c_l) \geq d(c_r, c')$  then
16:   return  $(c_l, \min\{d(c, c_l), d(c', c_l)\})$ 
17: else
18:   return  $(c_r, \min\{d(c_r, c), d(c_r, c')\})$ 
19: end if
```

Proposition 1. Let $S = \{c_1, \dots, c_\ell\}$ be the set of currently elected candidates in Algorithm 2, and let $(\hat{c}_1, \delta_1), \dots, (\hat{c}_{\ell-1}, \delta_{\ell-1})$ be the candidate-distance pairs maintain in \hat{C} , as defined in (2). Then,

$$\max_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \{d(c, S)\} = \max_{i \in [\ell-1]} \{d(\hat{c}_i, \{c_i, c_{i+1}\})\} = \max_{i \in [\ell-1]} \{\delta_i\}$$

Proof. Since c_1 (resp. c_ℓ) is the leftmost (resp. rightmost) candidate in \mathcal{C} , every candidate in $\mathcal{C} \setminus S$ belongs to one of the intervals $\mathcal{C}[c_1, c_2], \dots, \mathcal{C}[c_{\ell-1}, c_\ell]$. We let the furthest candidate c to S lie in the interval $\mathcal{C}[c_i, c_{i+1}]$. Then, c has to be the candidate $\hat{c}_i \in \mathcal{C}[c_i, c_{i+1}]$ with maximum distance to the endpoints $\{c_i, c_{i+1}\}$ and $d(\hat{c}_i, S) = d(\hat{c}_i, \{c_i, c_{i+1}\})$. \square

6.1 The Distant-Candidate Algorithm

The Distant-Candidate algorithm, formally described in Algorithm 3, receives as input two candidates c, c' , makes at most 3 distance queries, and returns a pair (\hat{c}, δ) , where $\hat{c} \in \mathcal{C}[c, c']$ is the most distant candidate to $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$'s endpoints and $\delta = d(\hat{c}, \{c, c'\})$.

For the intuition, we initially assume access to the rankings \succ_c and $\succ_{c'}$, where all candidates in \mathcal{C} are listed in increasing order of distance to c and c' , respectively. Due to the 1-dimensional structure of \mathcal{C} , for every $c, c' \in \mathcal{C}$, with $c < c'$ and $|\mathcal{C}[c, c']| \geq 4$, the most distant candidate $\hat{c} = \arg \max_{c'' \in \mathcal{C}[c, c']} \{d(c'', \{c, c'\})\}$ can be computed as follows: Starting with c and moving from left to right on the candidate interval $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$, we find the rightmost candidate $c_l \in \mathcal{C}[c, c']$ that prefers c to c' and the leftmost candidate $c_r \in \mathcal{C}[c, c']$ that prefers c' to c . We note that c_l and c_r can be found using only ordinal information, that they are next to each other on the candidate axis, and that \hat{c} must be either c_l or c_r . Then, $d(c_l, \{c, c'\}) = d(c_l, c)$ and $d(c_r, \{c, c'\}) = d(c_r, c')$. Hence, \hat{c} is c_l , if $d(c_l, c) > d(c_r, c')$, and c_r otherwise, which can be determined by 2 distance queries $d(c_l, c)$ and $d(c_r, c')$.

The implementation of Distant-Candidate in Algorithm 3, computes $(\hat{c}, d(\hat{c}, \{c, c'\}))$ based on the ordinal information submitted by the voters. More precisely, Algorithm 3 uses a ranking \succ_v ,

submitted by a voter $v \in \text{Cluster}(c)$, instead of the ranking \succ_c above (to which the algorithm does not have access). Since \succ_v and \succ_c may differ (because the locations of v and c may be different), the algorithm needs to use some additional information provided by a 3rd distance query. The correctness of the Distant-Candidate algorithm is formally established by the following:

Lemma 1. *For any $c, c' \in \mathcal{C}$, with $c < c'$ and $|\mathcal{C}[c, c']| \geq 3$, Algorithm 3 correctly returns the candidate $\hat{c} \in \mathcal{C}[c, c']$ with maximum distance to the interval's endpoints $\{c, c'\}$, i.e., the candidate*

$$\hat{c} = \arg \max_{c'' \in \mathcal{C}[c, c']} \{d(c'', \{c, c'\})\},$$

along with its distance $d(\hat{c}, \{c, c'\}) = d(\hat{c}, S)$ to S .

Proof. If $|\mathcal{C}[c, c']| = 3$, then there is a single $c'' \in \mathcal{C}[c, c'] \setminus \{c, c'\}$ that is necessarily the most distant candidate. Algorithm 3 returns c'' and its distance $d(c'', \{c, c'\})$ (computed using 2 distance queries).

To give the intuition for the most interesting case where $|\mathcal{C}[c, c']| \geq 4$, we first consider candidate-restricted instances, where for any candidate $c'' \in \mathcal{C}[c, c']$, all voters $v \in \text{Cluster}(c'')$ are collocated with c'' . Hence, the ranking \succ_v submitted by some voter $v \in \text{Cluster}(c'')$ and used in step 7 of Algorithm 3 is identical to the ranking $\succ_{c''}$, where all candidates in \mathcal{C} appear in increasing order of their distance to c'' .

We consider the midpoint $\mu = (c + c')/2 \in \mathbb{R}$, which is the point in the real interval $[c, c']$ with maximum distance $d(\mu, \{c, c'\})$ to the endpoints $\{c, c'\}$. In Algorithm 3, c_r is the leftmost candidate in $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$ that is closer to the right endpoint c' than to the left endpoint c (and thus $d(c_r, \{c, c'\}) = d(c_r, c')$). By the definition of c_r , c_l is the rightmost candidate in $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$ that is closer to the left endpoint c than to the right endpoint c' (and thus $d(c_l, \{c, c'\}) = d(c_l, c)$). Therefore, $c_l \leq \mu \leq c_r$, with at least one inequality strict, and with no other candidate between c_l and c_r . Hence, c_l and c_r are the candidates in $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$ closest to μ . Then the maximum of $d(c_l, c) = d(c_l, S)$ and $d(c_r, c') = d(c_r, S)$ determines the candidate in $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$ with maximum distance to its endpoints.

We next remove the assumption that Algorithm 3 has access to $\succ_{c''}$. Let \hat{c} be the candidate in $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$ with maximum distance to the endpoints $\{c, c'\}$. \hat{c} is the closest candidate to the midpoint μ . Without loss of generality, we assume that $\hat{c} \leq \mu$ (the case where $\hat{c} > \mu$ is symmetric). We show that $\hat{c} \in \{c_l, c_r\}$ and that Algorithm 3 correctly returns \hat{c} .

Let $\hat{v} \in \text{Cluster}(\hat{c})$ be the voter whose preference list $\succ_{\hat{v}}$ is used in place of $\succ_{\hat{c}}$ in Algorithm 3 (\hat{v} can be any voter in $\text{Cluster}(\hat{c})$). Moreover, let c_a (resp. c_b) be the next candidate on the left (resp. right) of \hat{c} in $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$ (we note that c_a can be c and c_b can be c' , but not both). Let v_a (resp. v_b) be the voter in $\text{Cluster}(c_a)$ (resp. $\text{Cluster}(c_b)$) whose preference list \succ_{v_a} (resp. \succ_{v_b}) is used in place of \succ_{c_a} (resp. \succ_{c_b}).

Since $\hat{c} \leq \mu$, we have that $c \succ_{v_a} c'$, because $c_a < \hat{c} \leq \mu$ and $d(v_a, c_a) < d(v_a, \hat{c})$. Therefore, $v_a < \hat{c} \leq \mu$. Moreover, we have that $c' \succ_{v_b} c$, which holds because $\hat{c} \leq \mu < c_b$, \hat{c} is the closest candidate to μ and $d(v_b, c_b) < d(v_b, \hat{c})$ (also recall that we do not allow any ties). Hence $\mu < v_b$ (due to the fact that μ is closer to \hat{c} ; if $v_b \leq \mu$, it would be $d(\hat{c}, v_b) < d(c_b, v_b)$ and v_b would be in $\text{Cluster}(\hat{c})$).

Because $c \succ_{v_a} c'$ (and thus c_a is not c_r) and $c' \succ_{v_b} c$ (and thus c_r is either \hat{c} or c_b), \hat{c} is either c_l or c_r . We distinguish two cases depending on the placement of \hat{v} with respect to μ .

If $\hat{v} \leq \mu$, $c \succ_{\hat{v}} c'$ (recall that we do not allow any ties in the rankings profile), which implies that $c_r = c_b$ and $c_l = \hat{c}$. Moreover, $d(\hat{c}, c) \geq d(c_b, c')$, because \hat{c} is the furthest candidate to $\{c, c'\}$. Therefore, Algorithm 3 returns \hat{c} as the furthest candidate and the distance $d(\hat{c}, c) = d(\hat{c}, S)$.

If $\mu < \hat{v}$ and $c' \succ_{\hat{v}} c$. Then, $c_r = \hat{c}$ and $c_l = c_a$. Furthermore, $d(\hat{c}, c') > d(c_a, c)$, due to the fact that $c \leq c_a < \hat{c} \leq \mu < c'$. Therefore, Algorithm 3 returns \hat{c} as the furthest candidate and the distance $\min\{d(\hat{c}, c), d(\hat{c}, c')\} = d(\hat{c}, S)$. \square

6.2 Putting Everything Together: The Distortion of Algorithm 2

The following formally establishes the distortion achieved by the query-efficient implementation of the greedy algorithm for k -center (Algorithm 1) presented in Algorithm 2.

Theorem 2. *For any $k \geq 3$, Algorithm 2 achieves a distortion of at most $5n$ for the social cost (and at most 5 for the egalitarian cost) for k -Committee Election with 1-Euclidean preferences using at most $6k - 15$ candidate distance queries.*

Proof. Algorithm 2 adapts Algorithm 1 to unknown candidate locations. It calls Distant-Candidate, which computes the most distant candidate \hat{c}_i in each interval $\mathcal{C}[c_i, c_{i+1}]$ defined by the candidates already elected in S . Proposition 1 shows that the candidate \hat{c}_i with maximum distance δ_i among them is the most distant candidate to S , which is added to S in step 5.

The Distant-Candidate algorithm is called once in step 2 and $2(k - 3)$ times in step 10 (twice in each while-loop iteration, for $|S| = 3, \dots, k - 1$). So, the total number of distance queries is at most $6(k - 3) + 3$. The correctness of Algorithm 2 (i.e., the fact that in each iteration, the candidate c with maximum $d(c, S)$ is added to S) follows from Lemma 1 and Proposition 1. The distortion bound for the egalitarian cost uses that Algorithm 1 is 2-approximate for the egalitarian cost in candidate-restricted instances (Williamson and Shmoys, 2010, Theorem 2.3). Then, Theorem 6, in Suppl. B, implies an upper bound of 5 on the distortion for the egalitarian cost in the original instances. The bound of $5n$ on the distortion for the social cost holds because for any $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, $\text{EC}(S) \leq \text{SC}(S) \leq n \text{EC}(S)$. \square

Remark 1. We next show that the distortion of Algorithm 2 (in fact, the distortion of the voter clustering computed by Algorithm 2) is $\Omega(n)$, for any $k \geq 3$.

We consider an instance with a committee of size $k = 3$, $m = 5$ candidates, a located at 0, b located at 1, c located at $2 + \epsilon$, d located at $4 + 3\epsilon$ and e located at $8 + 4\epsilon$, where $\epsilon > 0$ is small and used for tie-breaking, and n voters, the leftmost voter is collocated with candidate a , $n/2 - 1$ voters are collocated with candidate b , $n/2 - 2$ other voters are collocated with candidate c , another voter is collocated with candidate d and the rightmost voter is collocated with candidate e .

The optimal 3-committee is $\{b, c, e\}$ with social cost $3 + 2\epsilon \approx 3$. The 3-committee elected by Algorithm 2 is $\{a, d, e\}$ with social cost $3n/2 - 5 + (n/2 - 2)\epsilon \approx 3n/2$ and distortion that tends to $n/2$ as n tends to infinity and ϵ tends to 0.

Let us make the reasonable assumption that after Algorithm 2 has elected its committee, which imposes a clustering on the set of voters, we consider the corresponding clusters and elect the median candidate for each cluster, aiming to improve the social cost. In our example, we consider the voters collocated with a , b and c , who are all assigned to candidate a in the committee elected by Algorithm 2, and replace candidate a with their median candidate b . Then, we obtain the committee $\{b, d, e\}$ with social cost $1 + (n/2 - 2)(1 + \epsilon) \approx n/2$ and distortion that tends to $n/6$ as n tends to infinity and ϵ tends to 0. \square

7 Low Distortion via Good Candidate Subsets

We next analyze the distortion achieved by the optimal k -committee of the candidate-restricted instance induced by a small representative set of candidates.

We say that a candidate subset $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is (ℓ, β) -**good**, for some $\ell \geq k$ and some $\beta \geq 1$, if $|\mathcal{C}'| = \ell$ and $\text{SC}(\mathcal{C}') \leq \beta \text{SC}(S^*)$, where S^* is an optimal k -committee for the original instance. Namely, \mathcal{C}' is ℓ -sparse, in the sense that \mathcal{C}' includes $\ell \leq m$ candidates (ideally $\ell \ll m$), and is β -good, in the sense that representing each voter by her top candidate in \mathcal{C}' imposes a social cost at most β times

the optimal social cost. The original set \mathcal{C} of candidates is $(m, 1)$ -good, while any k -committee with distortion β is (k, β) -good.

Given an (ℓ, β) -good set of candidates \mathcal{C}' , we let $\mathcal{C}'_{\text{cr}} = \{(c_1, n_1), \dots, (c_\ell, n_\ell)\}$ denote the candidate-restricted instance induced by \mathcal{C}' . Then, $c_1 < \dots < c_\ell$ denote the locations of candidates in \mathcal{C}' on the line, and $n_i = |\text{Cluster}(c_i)|$ is the number of voters with c_i as their top candidate in \mathcal{C}' . We maintain that $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n$ and that each $n_i > 0$ (the latter by removing inactive candidates from \mathcal{C}').

The following shows that an optimal k -committee for the candidate-restricted instance \mathcal{C}'_{cr} induced by an (ℓ, β) -good set \mathcal{C}' achieves a distortion of $1 + 2\beta$ for the original instance.

Theorem 3. *Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ be an instance of the k -Committee Election, let $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ be an (ℓ, β) -good set, let \mathcal{C}'_{cr} be the candidate-restricted instance induced by \mathcal{C}' and let S (resp. S^*) be an optimal k -committee for \mathcal{C}'_{cr} (resp. for $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$). Then, $\text{SC}(S) \leq (1 + 2\beta)\text{SC}(S^*)$.*

Proof. For each voter v (with her location v as in the original instance), we let $\text{top}'(v) \in \mathcal{C}'$ be v 's top candidate in \mathcal{C}' . Then, by the triangle inequality, $d(v, S) \leq d(v, \text{top}'(v)) + d(\text{top}'(v), S)$. Summing up over all voters $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we obtain:

$$\text{SC}(S) \leq \text{SC}(\mathcal{C}') + \text{SC}(\mathcal{C}'_{\text{cr}}, S), \quad (3)$$

where $\text{SC}(\mathcal{C}'_{\text{cr}}, S) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} d(\text{top}'(v), S) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} n_i d(c_i, S)$ is the social cost of S for the candidate-restricted instance \mathcal{C}'_{cr} induced by \mathcal{C}' , and $\text{SC}(\mathcal{C}') = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} d(v, \text{top}'(v)) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} d(v, \mathcal{C}')$.

We observe that $\text{SC}(\mathcal{C}'_{\text{cr}}, S) \leq \text{SC}(\mathcal{C}'_{\text{cr}}, S^*)$, because, as shown in Proposition 3, Suppl. C (and since voters are collocated with their top candidate in \mathcal{C}'_{cr}), in the candidate-restricted instance \mathcal{C}'_{cr} , we can replace candidates in $S^* \setminus \mathcal{C}'$ with candidates in S without increasing the social cost. Moreover, since $d(\text{top}'(v), S^*) \leq d(\text{top}'(v), v) + d(v, S^*)$, we obtain that $\text{SC}(\mathcal{C}'_{\text{cr}}, S^*) \leq \text{SC}(\mathcal{C}') + \text{SC}(S^*)$.

Combined with the observations above, (3) implies that:

$$\text{SC}(S) \leq 2\text{SC}(\mathcal{C}') + \text{SC}(S^*) \leq (1 + 2\beta)\text{SC}(S^*),$$

where the second inequality holds because \mathcal{C}' is a (ℓ, β) -good set of candidates. \square

As noted in Suppl. 4, as soon as we have the distances between all active candidates in an (ℓ, β) -good set \mathcal{C}' , which requires $\ell - 1$ distance queries, an optimal k -committee for the candidate-restricted instance \mathcal{C}'_{cr} induced by \mathcal{C}' can be computed in polynomial time by dynamic programming.

8 Hierarchical Partitioning for Good Candidate Subsets

Next, we use hierarchical partitioning of the candidate axis (see Algorithm 4) and compute a $(O(k \log n), O(1))$ -good set of candidates with $O(k \log n)$ distance queries.

In Algorithm 4, each triple (or *interval*) in \mathcal{I} consists of a candidate interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$, the number n_{ab} of voters v with $\text{top}(v) \in \mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$, and the interval length $d(c_a, c_b)$. We refer to $\text{wt}(c_a, c_b) = n_{ab}d(c_a, c_b)$ as the *weight* of interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$. Algorithm 4 computes a partitioning \mathcal{I} of the candidate axis $\mathcal{C}[c_1, c_m]$ into at most $7k(\log_2(5nk) + 2)$ intervals by repeatedly splitting the interval in \mathcal{I} with largest weight (and at least 4 candidates) into two intervals.

Algorithm 4 starts with the partitioning induced by the k -committee $S = \{c^1, \dots, c^k\}$ computed by Algorithm 2 (we let $c^1 < c^2 < \dots < c^k$). In step 2, for each $i \in [k]$, $\mathcal{C}[c_a^i, c_b^i]$ is the interval that includes all candidates in \mathcal{C} closer to c^i than to any other candidate in S (c_a^i , resp. c_b^i , is the leftmost, resp. the rightmost, such candidate), n_i is the number of voters v with $\text{top}(v) \in \mathcal{C}[c_a^i, c_b^i]$,

Algorithm 4 Hierarchical partitioning of $\mathcal{C}[c_1, c_m]$

Input: Candidates $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$, $k \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$, voter ranking profile $\succ = (\succ_1, \dots, \succ_n)$

Output: Partitioning \mathcal{I} of \mathcal{C} into $O(k \log n)$ intervals.

- 1: Let $S = \{c^1, \dots, c^k\}$ be the result of Algorithm 2
 - 2: $\mathcal{I} \leftarrow \{(\mathcal{C}[c_a^1, c_b^1], n_1, d(c_a^1, c_b^1)), \dots, (\mathcal{C}[c_a^k, c_b^k], n_k, d(c_a^k, c_b^k))\}$ {Start with the partitioning of $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ induced by S }
 - 3: $\delta^* \leftarrow \max_{i \in [k]} \{d(c_a^i, c_b^i)\}$
 - 4: **while** $|\mathcal{I}| \leq 7k(\log_2(5nk) + 2)$ **do**
 - 5: Let $(\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b], n_{ab}, d(c_a, c_b)) \in \mathcal{I}$ with $|\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]| \geq 4$ and maximum weight $\text{wt}(c_a, c_b) = n_{ab}d(c_a, c_b)$
 - 6: **if** $\text{wt}(c_a, c_b) \leq \delta^*/(5k)$ **then break-while-loop**
 - 7: $\mathcal{I} \leftarrow (\mathcal{I} \setminus \{(\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b], n_{ab}, d(c_a, c_b))\}) \cup \text{Partitioning}(\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b])$
 - 8: **end while**
 - 9: **return** \mathcal{I}
-

and $d(c_a^i, c_b^i)$ is the length of $\mathcal{C}[c_a^i, c_b^i]$. We let $\delta^* = \max_{i \in [k]} \{d(c_a^i, c_b^i)\}$. Then, $\text{SC}(S^*) \geq \delta^*/5$, where S^* is an optimal k -committee for the original instance, because S has distortion 5 for the egalitarian cost and we assume that all candidates in \mathcal{C} are active.

For the interval split, in step 4, we use the Partitioning algorithm (Algorithm 5), which is a modification of the algorithm Distant-Candidate used in Section 6. The Partitioning algorithm uses at most 4 distance queries and splits each interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$ into two intervals $(\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_l], n_{al}, d(c_a, c_l))$ and $(\mathcal{C}[c_r, c_b], n_{rb}, d(c_r, c_b))$, where c_l (resp. c_r) is the rightmost (resp. leftmost) candidate in $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$ on the left (resp. right) of the interval's midpoint $(c_a + c_b)/2$. We defer the detailed description and the analysis of the Partitioning algorithm to Section 8.1, at the end of this section.

We note that $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_l] \cup \mathcal{C}[c_r, c_b] = \mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$. Therefore, since initially, in step 2, \mathcal{I} is a partitioning of $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$, the collection of intervals \mathcal{I} maintained by Algorithm 4 always remains a partitioning of \mathcal{C} . To obtain an $(O(k \log n), O(1))$ -good set $\mathcal{C}'(\mathcal{I}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ from \mathcal{I} , we include in $\mathcal{C}'(\mathcal{I})$ the endpoints c_a and c_b of (resp. all candidates in) each interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$ in \mathcal{I} with more than (resp. at most) 3 candidates. Since $|\mathcal{I}| = O(k \log n)$, $\mathcal{C}'(\mathcal{I})$ consists of $O(k \log n)$ candidates. The following shows that $\text{SC}(\mathcal{C}'(\mathcal{I})) \leq 2\text{SC}(S^*)$, where S^* is an optimal k -committee for the original instance.

Theorem 4. *Let \mathcal{I} be the partitioning of \mathcal{C} computed by Algorithm 4. Then, the resulting set $\mathcal{C}'(\mathcal{I}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is a $(O(k \log n), 2)$ -good set of candidates.*

Proof. We first upper bound $\text{SC}(\mathcal{C}'(\mathcal{I}))$. We call an interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b] \in \mathcal{I}$ *expensive*, if $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b] \cap S^* \neq \emptyset$ (i.e., $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$ includes an optimal candidate), and *cheap* otherwise. For each voter v with $\text{top}(v)$ in a cheap interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$, $\text{cost}_v(\mathcal{C}') \leq \text{cost}_v(S^*)$, because the interval's endpoints $c_a, c_b \in \mathcal{C}'$ and v 's nearest candidate in S^* is outside $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$. Therefore, the total contribution to $\text{SC}(\mathcal{C}'(\mathcal{I}))$ of all voters associated with cheap intervals in \mathcal{I} is at most their contribution to $\text{SC}(S^*)$. The contribution to $\text{SC}(\mathcal{C}'(\mathcal{I}))$ of the voters v with $\text{top}(v)$ in an expensive interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$ is at most their contribution to $\text{SC}(S^*)$ plus $\text{wt}(c_a, c_b)$. Moreover, since each expensive interval includes a candidate of S^* , there are at most k expensive intervals in \mathcal{I} . We next show, by adapting an argument of (Frahling and Sohler, 2005), that as soon as $|\mathcal{I}| > 7k(\log_2(5nk) + 1)$, each interval in \mathcal{I} has weight at most $\text{SC}(S^*)/k$. Therefore, at this point, the additional cost due to the total weight of expensive intervals is at most $\text{SC}(S^*)$.

We refer to an interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$ as *light*, if $\text{wt}(c_a, c_b) \leq \text{SC}(S^*)/k$, and as *heavy*, otherwise. We observe that splitting an interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$ of weight $\text{wt}(c_a, c_b)$ results in two intervals $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_l]$ and $\mathcal{C}[c_r, c_b]$ each of length (resp. weight) at most $d(c_a, c_b)/2$ (resp. $\text{wt}(c_a, c_b)/2$). Therefore, splitting a light interval replaces it with two light intervals in \mathcal{I} . Moreover, since Algorithm 4 always splits the heaviest interval in \mathcal{I} , from the first iteration that Algorithm 4 splits a light interval and on, all intervals in \mathcal{I} are light.

A heavy interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$ is *close*, if $d(\{c_a, c_b\}, S^*) < d(c_a, c_b)$, and is *far* otherwise. We say that an interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$ is *encountered* by Algorithm 4, if there is a point during its execution where $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b] \in \mathcal{I}$. We next show that (i) the total number of far heavy intervals encountered by Algorithm 4 is at most $2k(\log_2(5nk) + 1)$; and (ii) that the total number of close heavy intervals encountered by Algorithm 4 is at most $5k(\log_2(5nk) + 1)$.

To upper bound the number of heavy intervals, we partition the intervals encountered by Algorithm 4 in levels according to their length. An interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$ is *level- i* , if $2^{i-1}\delta^* < d(c_a, c_b) \leq 2^i\delta^*$. Algorithm 4 starts with intervals at a level $i \leq 0$, because initially all intervals created in step 2 have $d(c_a^i, c_b^i) \leq \delta^*$. Algorithm 4 can encounter intervals until levels down to $i = -\log_2(5nk)$. A level- $(-\log_2(5nk))$ interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$ has length $d(c_a, c_b) \leq \delta^*/(5nk)$ and weight $\text{wt}(c_a, c_b) \leq nd(c_a, c_b) \leq \delta^*/(5k)$. Since $\text{SC}(S^*) \geq \delta^*/5$, if the weight of the heaviest interval in \mathcal{I} is at most $\delta^*/(5k) \leq \text{SC}(S^*)/k$, all intervals in \mathcal{I} are light and Algorithm 4 terminates through step 6. We note that we treat intervals with at most 3 candidates as light, because all candidates in such intervals are included in $\mathcal{C}'(\mathcal{I})$.

Thus, level- $(-\log_2(5nk))$ intervals never split and stay in \mathcal{I} . Moreover, the set of level- i intervals encountered by Algorithm 4, for any $i = -\log_2(5nk), \dots, 0$, form a partitioning of a subset of \mathcal{C} (assuming that this set is non-empty).

The voters associated with a far heavy interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$ contribute to $\text{SC}(S^*)$ a total cost no less than $\text{wt}(c_a, c_b)/2$. This holds because for any voter v with $\text{top}(v)$ in a far heavy interval $\mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$, $d(c_a, c_b)$, which is v 's contribution to $\text{wt}(c_a, c_b)$, is at most $2d(v, S^*)$.

Specifically, let $c_v^* \in S^*$ be v 's closest candidate in S^* . If $c_v^* < c_a < v$ (or symmetrically, $v > c_b > c_v^*$), then

$$d(S^*, v) = d(c_v^*, v) \geq d(S^*, \{c_a, c_b\}) \geq d(c_a, c_b),$$

due to definition of far heavy intervals. If $c_v^* < v < c_a$ (or symmetrically, $c_b > v > c_v^*$), then $d(c_v^*, v) \geq d(v, \{c_a, c_b\})$, because $\text{top}(v) \in \mathcal{C}[c_a, c_b]$. Hence,

$$d(c_v^*, \{c_a, c_b\}) = d(c_v^*, v) + d(v, \{c_a, c_b\}) \geq 2d(c_v^*, v).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} d(S^*, v) &= d(c_v^*, v) \geq d(c_v^*, \{c_a, c_b\})/2 \\ &\geq d(S^*, \{c_a, c_b\})/2 \geq d(c_a, c_b)/2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of far heavy intervals.

The far heavy level- i intervals encountered by Algorithm 4, at any fixed level i , induce a partitioning of a subset of voters. Since each far heavy interval has $\text{wt}(c_a, c_b) \geq \text{SC}(S^*)/k$, the total number of far heavy intervals encountered by Algorithm 4 at any fixed level- i is at most $2k$, and at most $2k(\log_2(5nk) + 1)$ in total, which concludes the proof of (i) above.

Furthermore, each candidate in the optimal k -committee S^* can be associated with at most 5 close heavy level- i intervals, for any level i . This holds due to the definition of close heavy intervals as $d(\{c_a, c_b\}, S^*) < d(c_a, c_b)$, the fact that the lengths of level- i intervals are within a factor of at most 2 from each other, and the fact that the close heavy level- i intervals encountered by Algorithm 4, at any fixed level i , induce a partitioning of a subset of \mathcal{C} . Therefore, the total number of close heavy intervals encountered by Algorithm 4 is at most $5k(\log_2(5nk) + 1)$, which concludes the proof of (ii) above.

Algorithm 4 keeps splitting heavy intervals, as long as they exist in \mathcal{I} . Light intervals created by such splits are accumulated in \mathcal{I} and are not split, as long as heavy intervals exist in \mathcal{I} . Since the total number of heavy intervals encountered by Algorithm 4 is at most $7k(\log_2(5nk) + 1)$, the

first split of a light interval happens no later than iteration $7k(\log_2(5nk) + 1) + 1$. At that point all intervals in \mathcal{I} are light. Moreover, since we start with $|\mathcal{I}| = k$, the total number of intervals in \mathcal{I} at that point is at most $7k(\log_2(5nk) + 1) + k + 1 < 7k(\log_2(5nk) + 2) = O(k \log n)$ (since $n \geq k$). \square

Algorithm 4 performs $O(k \log n)$ splits during its execution. Since the Partitioning algorithm uses at most 4 distance queries per interval split, the total number of distance queries used by Algorithm 4 is at most $O(k \log n)$. Combining Theorem 3 (and the discussion below it) with the analysis of Algorithm 4 in Theorem 4, we obtain that:

Theorem 5. *There is a polynomial-time deterministic rule for k -Committee Election that uses $O(k \log n)$ distance queries and achieves a distortion of at most 5.*

8.1 Description and Analysis of the Partitioning Algorithm

We conclude this section by describing the Partitioning algorithm (Algorithm 5) and verifying its main properties used by Algorithm 4. Lemma 2 below shows that for any candidate interval $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$ with $|\mathcal{C}[c, c']| \geq 4$, Algorithm 5 correctly computes the candidate c_l , which is the rightmost candidate on the left of the midpoint $(c + c')/2$, and the candidate c_r , which is the leftmost candidate on the right of the midpoint $(c + c')/2$. Therefore, the two intervals $\mathcal{C}[c, c_l]$ and $\mathcal{C}[c_r, c']$ form a partitioning of the input interval $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$ and have length $\max\{d(c, c_l), d(c_r, c')\} \leq d(c, c')/2$.

Algorithm 5 The Partitioning algorithm

Input: Candidate interval $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$, rankings \succ_v for all voters $v \in \bigcup_{c'' \in \mathcal{C}[c, c']} \text{Cluster}(c'')$

Output: Intervals $(\mathcal{C}[c, c_l], n_l, d(c, c_l))$ and $(\mathcal{C}[c_r, c'], n_r, d(c_r, c'))$ subdividing interval $(\mathcal{C}[c, c'], n, d(c, c'))$

```

1: Let  $c''$  be the leftmost candidate in  $\mathcal{C}[c, c'] \setminus \{c\}$ 
2: while  $c'' \in \mathcal{C}[c, c']$  do
3:   Let  $\succ_{c''}$  be the ranking  $\succ_v$  of any  $v \in \text{Cluster}(c'')$ 
4:   if  $c' \succ_{c''} c$  then
5:     Let  $c_r$  be  $c''$  and  $c_l$  be next candidate on  $c''$ 's left  $\{c_l$  and  $c_r$  found, while-loop terminates}
6:     break-while-loop
7:   else
8:      $c'' \leftarrow$  the next candidate on  $c''$ 's right {proceed to the next candidate on the right}
9:   end if
10: end while
11: if  $d(c, c_l) \geq d(c_r, c')$  then
12:    $\{c_l$  is the most distant candidate to  $\{c, c'\}$ }
13:   if  $d(c, c_l) > d(c_l, c')$  then
14:      $c_r \leftarrow c_l$   $\{c_l$  is the first candidate on the right of  $(c + c')/2\}$ 
15:     Let  $c_l$  be the first candidate on  $c_r$ 's left
16:   end if
17: else
18:    $\{c_r$  is the most distant candidate to  $\{c, c'\}$ }
19:   if  $d(c, c_r) < d(c_r, c')$  then
20:      $c_l \leftarrow c_r$   $\{c_r$  is the first candidate on the left of  $(c + c')/2\}$ 
21:     Let  $c_r$  be the first candidate on  $c_l$ 's right
22:   end if
23: end if
24:  $n_l \leftarrow \sum_{\tilde{c} \in \mathcal{C}[c, c_l]} |\text{Cluster}(\tilde{c})|$   $\{c_l$  is the first candidate on the left of  $(c + c')/2\}$ 
25:  $n_r \leftarrow \sum_{\tilde{c} \in \mathcal{C}[c_r, c']} |\text{Cluster}(\tilde{c})|$   $\{c_r$  is the first candidate on the right of  $(c + c')/2\}$ 
26: return  $\{(\mathcal{C}[c, c_l], n_l, d(c, c_l)), (\mathcal{C}[c_r, c'], n_r, d(c_r, c'))\}$ 

```

Lemma 2. *For any $c, c' \in \mathcal{C}$, with $c < c'$ and $|\mathcal{C}[c, c']| \geq 4$. Algorithm 5 computes the rightmost candidate c_l on the left of the midpoint $(c + c')/2$ and the leftmost candidate c_r on the right of the midpoint $(c + c')/2$ of interval $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$.*

Proof. We note that if $|\mathcal{C}[c, c']| \geq 4$, the first ten steps of Algorithm 5 are identical to the first ten steps of Algorithm 3 (i.e., steps 5 to 14, applied to this case). Therefore, by the proof of Lemma 1, when Algorithm 5 reaches step 10, either c_l or c_r is the candidate $\hat{c} \in \mathcal{C}[c, c']$ with largest distance to $\{c, c'\}$. Then, by the proof of Lemma 1, if $d(c, c_l) \geq d(c_r, c')$, \hat{c} is c_l , otherwise, \hat{c} is c_r . In both cases, \hat{c} is the candidate in $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$ closest to the midpoint $\mu = (c + c')/2$. In each case (i.e., either if $\hat{c} = c_l$, where steps 13 - 16 are executed, or if $\hat{c} = c_r$, where steps 19 - 22 are executed), Algorithm 5 distinguishes two subcases depending on whether \hat{c} is on the left or on the right of μ .

In case where $d(c, c_l) \geq d(c_r, c')$ and $\hat{c} = c_l$, if $d(c, c_l) > d(c_l, c')$, c_l is on the right of the midpoint μ . Then, c_l is in fact c_r (i.e., the leftmost candidate on the right of μ ; so the value of the algorithm's variable c_r is set to c_l in step 14), and c_l (i.e., the rightmost candidate on the left of μ) is the first candidate on the left of c_r on the candidate axis (step 15). Otherwise (i.e., if $d(c, c_l) \leq d(c_l, c')$), since $\hat{c} = c_l$ and c_l and c_r are consecutive on the candidate axis, c_l is indeed the rightmost candidate on the left of μ and c_r is the leftmost candidate on the right of μ (so the values of the corresponding algorithm's variables are set correctly).

In case where $d(c, c_l) < d(c_r, c')$ and $\hat{c} = c_r$, if $d(c, c_r) < d(c_r, c')$, c_r is on the left of the midpoint μ . Then, c_r is in fact c_l (i.e., the rightmost candidate on the left of μ ; so the value of the algorithm's variable c_l is set to c_r in step 20), and c_r (i.e., the leftmost candidate on the right of μ) is the first candidate on the right of c_l on the candidate axis (step 15). Otherwise (i.e., if $d(c, c_r) \geq d(c_r, c')$), since $\hat{c} = c_r$ and c_l and c_r are consecutive on the candidate axis, c_r is indeed the leftmost candidate on the right of μ and c_l is the rightmost candidate on the left of μ (so the values of the corresponding algorithm's variables are set correctly).

Therefore, when Algorithm 5 reaches step 23, the value of the variable c_l corresponds to the rightmost candidate on the left of the midpoint $(c + c')/2$ and the value of the variable c_r corresponds to the leftmost candidate on the right of the midpoint $(c + c')/2$ of the interval $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$. \square

The numbers of voters n_l and n_r associated with the two subintervals $\mathcal{C}[c, c_l]$ and $\mathcal{C}[c_r, c']$ are correctly computed in steps 24 and 25 using information from the voters' rankings profile $\vec{\succ}$. As for the lengths $d(c, c_l)$ and $d(c_r, c')$ of the two subintervals $\mathcal{C}[c, c_l]$ and $\mathcal{C}[c_r, c']$, if either the steps 14-15 or the steps 20-21 are executed, we need an additional distance query to get them right. If the steps 14-15 are executed, the distance $d(c_r, c')$ is equal to the distance $d(c_l, c')$ in step 13, and we need an additional query for the distance $d(c, c_l)$. If the steps 20-21 are executed, the distance $d(c, c_l)$ is equal to the distance $d(c, c_r)$ in step 19, and we need an additional query for $d(c_r, c')$.

In all cases, Algorithm 5 correctly partitions $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$ into $\mathcal{C}[c, c_l]$ and $\mathcal{C}[c_r, c']$, where c_l (resp. c_r) is the rightmost (resp. leftmost) candidate on the left (resp. right) of $\mathcal{C}[c, c']$'s midpoint $\mu = (c + c')/2$ and correctly determines n_l , $d(c, c_l)$, n_r and $d(c_r, c')$ with at most 4 distance queries.

9 Directions for Further Research

Our work opens several interesting directions for further research. First, in the proof of Theorem 4, dependence on $\log n$ seems necessary in order to obtain enough information about the locations of the optimal candidates. Hence, we conjecture a lower bound of $\Omega(k \log n)$ on the number of distance queries required for constant distortion.

Our results crucially exploit the linear structure of the instance. It would be interesting if bounded distortion can be achieved with a reasonable number of distance queries for the case

where the voters and the candidates are embedded in \mathbb{R}^d and the voters provide a ranking of the candidates in each dimension (since otherwise it is hard to recognize multidimensional Euclidean preferences (Peters, 2017)).

For general metric spaces, it would be interesting if constant distortion can be achieved with $O(k \log n)$ queries for *perturbation-stable* instances (e.g., (Makarychev and Makarychev, 2021)), where the different clusters of voters are somewhat easier to identify (see also (Fotakis and Patsilina, 2021) for applications of perturbation stability to mechanism design for k -facility location).

Appendix

A Assuming Non-Degenerate Profiles

We next justify why assuming non-degenerate ranking profiles \succsim is without loss of generality. Using the polynomial-time algorithm of (Elkind and Faliszewski, 2014), we can deduce from a linear ranking profile \succsim the linear ordering of the set of candidates $\hat{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{C}[c_l, c_r]$ whose location is between the locations of the leftmost active candidate c_l and the rightmost active candidate c_r . The next proposition indicates that the set $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ includes the most interesting candidates to elect, in the sense that electing a candidate that is not in $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ is not beneficial for the social cost.

Proposition 2. *For every k -committee S such that $S \not\subseteq \hat{\mathcal{C}}$, there exists a k -committee $S' \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{C}}$ with $\text{SC}(S') \leq \text{SC}(S)$.*

Proof. Consider a committee S with a candidate $c \notin \hat{\mathcal{C}}$. We first assume without loss of generality that c is on the left of the leftmost active candidate c_l (the case where c is on the right of the rightmost active candidate c_r is symmetric). No voter prefers c over c_l , because by the definition of c_l , the top choice of that voter is either c_l or a candidate on the right of c_l . If $c_l \in S$, then no voter is assigned to c , and $S \setminus \{c\}$ has social cost $\text{SC}(S \setminus \{c\}) = \text{SC}(S)$. We may add any candidate of $\hat{\mathcal{C}} \setminus S$ to $S \setminus \{c\}$, so that we obtain a k -committee, without increasing the social cost. If $c_l \notin S$, then $(S \setminus \{c\}) \cup \{c_l\}$ is a k -committee with social cost at most $\text{SC}(S)$. We can apply the argument above repeatedly, until we obtain a k -committee $S' \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{C}}$ with $\text{SC}(S') \leq \text{SC}(S)$. \square

We note that the equivalent of Proposition 2 for the egalitarian cost is also true and can be proven similarly.

B Low Distortion via Good Subsets of Candidates for the Egalitarian Cost

We next show that a β -approximate k -committee S wrt. the egalitarian cost for the candidate-restricted instance \mathcal{C}_{cr} induced by the original set of candidates \mathcal{C} (i.e., \mathcal{C}_{cr} is the modified instance where each voter is collocated with her top candidate and all inactive candidates are removed) achieves a distortion of at most $1 + 2\beta$ wrt. the egalitarian cost for the original instance. We note that in the proof of Theorem 6, the optimal solution $S^\#$ for \mathcal{C}_{cr} wrt. the egalitarian cost ($S^\#$ is used as benchmark for the definition of the β -approximation ratio of S) may include inactive candidates from \mathcal{C} (that are not present in \mathcal{C}_{cr}).

Theorem 6. *Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ be an instance of the k -Committee Election, let $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ (resp. $S^* \subseteq \mathcal{C}$) be a β -approximate (resp. an optimal) k -committee wrt. the egalitarian cost for the candidate-restricted instance \mathcal{C}_{cr} (resp. original instance). Then, $\text{EC}(S) \leq (1 + 2\beta)\text{EC}(S^*)$.*

Proof. We recall that for each voter $v \in \mathcal{V}$, $\text{top}(v)$ is v 's top candidate in \mathcal{C} . Then, by the triangle inequality, $d(v, S) \leq d(v, \text{top}(v)) + d(\text{top}(v), S)$. Taking the maximum over all voters $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we obtain that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{EC}(S) &\leq \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}) + \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cr}}, S), \quad \text{where} \\ \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}) &= \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \{d(v, \text{top}(v))\} = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \{d(v, \mathcal{C})\} \quad \text{and} \\ \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cr}}, S) &= \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \{d(\text{top}(v), S)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

$\text{EC}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cr}}, S)$ is the egalitarian cost of S for the candidate-restricted instance \mathcal{C}_{cr} induced by \mathcal{C} . We observe that

$$\text{EC}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cr}}, S) \leq \beta \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cr}}, S^\sharp) \leq \beta \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cr}}, S^*),$$

because S is a β -approximate k -committee for \mathcal{C}_{cr} . For the second inequality, we use that the β -approximation ratio of S in the candidate-restricted instance \mathcal{C}_{cr} is established against an (unrestricted) optimal solution S^\sharp that may also include inactive candidates from \mathcal{C} not included in \mathcal{C}_{cr} . Hence, S^* is also a feasible alternative to S^\sharp as an (unrestricted) optimal solution for \mathcal{C}_{cr} . Therefore, $\text{EC}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cr}}, S^\sharp) \leq \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cr}}, S^*)$, because S^\sharp is an optimal solution for \mathcal{C}_{cr} wrt. the egalitarian cost, and the β -approximation ratio of S in \mathcal{C}_{cr} also holds against S^* .

Moreover, since $d(\text{top}(v), S^*) \leq d(\text{top}(v), v) + d(v, S^*)$, by the triangle inequality, we take the maximum over all voters v and obtain that $\text{EC}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cr}}, S^*) \leq \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}) + \text{EC}(S^*)$.

Combined with the observations above, (4) implies that:

$$\text{EC}(S) \leq (1 + \beta)\text{EC}(\mathcal{C}) + \beta \text{EC}(S^*) \leq (1 + 2\beta)\text{EC}(S^*),$$

where we use that $\text{EC}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cr}}, S) \leq \beta \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{cr}}, S^*)$. □

In the proof of Theorem 2, we can use Theorem 6 and obtain a distortion of 5 for the egalitarian cost (and a distortion of $5n$ for the social cost), because the 2-approximation ratio of Algorithm 1 (see e.g., (Williamson and Shmoys, 2010, Theorem 2.3)) holds against an optimal solution that may also include “inactive candidates” (i.e., optimal candidates associated with any demand points).

For completeness, we next show the equivalent of Theorem 3 for the egalitarian cost (even though we do not use it anywhere). We say that a set $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is an (ℓ, β) -good set wrt. the egalitarian cost, if $|\mathcal{C}'| = \ell$ and $\text{EC}(\mathcal{C}') \leq \beta \text{EC}(S^*)$, where $S^* \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is a k -committee with optimal egalitarian cost for the original instance. The following shows that computing an optimal k -committee $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$ for the candidate-restricted \mathcal{C}'_{cr} instance induced by an (ℓ, β) -good set \mathcal{C}' wrt. the egalitarian cost implies a distortion of $2 + 3\beta$ wrt. the egalitarian cost for the original instance.

The crucial difference between Theorem 6 and Theorem 7 is that in Theorem 6, the β -approximation of S in the candidate-restricted instance \mathcal{C}_{cr} holds against an optimal k -committee S^\sharp that can include both active and inactive candidates from \mathcal{C} (even though inactive candidates are not present in \mathcal{C}_{cr}); while in Theorem 7, the optimality of S for the candidate-restricted instance \mathcal{C}'_{cr} holds against restricted k -committees that can include only active candidates present in \mathcal{C}'_{cr} .

Theorem 7. *Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ be an instance of the k -Committee Election, let $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ be an (ℓ, β) -good set of candidates wrt. the egalitarian cost, let \mathcal{C}'_{cr} be the candidate-restricted instance induced by \mathcal{C}' and let S (resp. S^*) be an optimal k -committee for \mathcal{C}'_{cr} (resp. for $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$) wrt. the egalitarian cost. Then, $\text{EC}(S) \leq (2 + 3\beta)\text{EC}(S^*)$.*

Proof. The proof is quite similar to the proof of Theorem 6. For each voter $v \in \mathcal{V}$ (with her location v as in the original instance), we let $\text{top}'(v) \in \mathcal{C}'$ be v 's top candidate in \mathcal{C}' . By the triangle

inequality, $d(v, S) \leq d(v, \text{top}'(v)) + d(\text{top}'(v), S)$. Taking the maximum over all voters $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we obtain that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{EC}(S) &\leq \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}') + \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}'_{\text{cr}}, S), \quad \text{where} \\ \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}') &= \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \{d(v, \text{top}'(v))\} = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \{d(v, \mathcal{C}')\} \quad \text{and} \\ \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}'_{\text{cr}}, S) &= \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \{d(\text{top}'(v), S)\} = \max_{i \in [\ell]} \{d(c_i, S)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $\text{EC}(\mathcal{C}'_{\text{cr}}, S)$ is the egalitarian cost of S for the candidate-restricted instance \mathcal{C}'_{cr} induced by \mathcal{C}' .

For each candidate $c_i \in \mathcal{C}'$, let $\text{top}_S(c_i) \in S \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$ be the nearest candidate of c_i in S . Then, by the triangle inequality,

$$d(c_i, \text{top}_S(c_i)) \leq d(c_i, S^*) + d(S^*, \text{top}_S(c_i)).$$

Taking the maximum over all $c_i \in \mathcal{C}'$, and since $\text{top}_S(c_i) \in \mathcal{C}'$, we obtain that

$$\text{EC}(\mathcal{C}'_{\text{cr}}, S) \leq 2 \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}'_{\text{cr}}, S^*) \tag{6}$$

Since $d(\text{top}'(v), S^*) \leq d(\text{top}'(v), v) + d(v, S^*)$, by the triangle inequality, $\text{EC}(\mathcal{C}'_{\text{cr}}, S^*) \leq \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}') + \text{EC}(S^*)$.

Combined with the observations above, (5) implies that:

$$\text{EC}(S) \leq 3 \text{EC}(\mathcal{C}') + 2 \text{EC}(S^*) \leq (2 + 3\beta) \text{EC}(S^*),$$

where we first use (6) and then use the hypothesis that \mathcal{C}' is an (ℓ, β) -good set of candidates wrt. the egalitarian cost. \square

C Ignoring Inactive Candidates

The following shows that in instances where *every voter is collocated with a her top candidate*, we can ignore inactive candidates, i.e., candidates c with $\text{Cluster}(c) = \emptyset$ in the rankings profile $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, without increasing the social cost of k -committees. Hence, when we deal with the distortion wrt. the social cost and compute the optimal k -committee of a candidate-restricted instance induced by an (ℓ, β) -good set of candidates, we do not need to consider inactive candidates. Then, when we state and prove the distortion bounds in Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, we make sure that they hold against an optimal solution for the original instance, where some candidates may be inactive and candidate and voter locations may be different.

Proposition 3. *Let \mathcal{C} be the set of all candidates and let $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} \subset \mathcal{C}$ be the set of active candidates. In instances where every voter is collocated with her top candidate, for every committee S that includes inactive candidates, there exists another committee $S' \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ with $\text{SC}(S') \leq \text{SC}(S)$.*

Proof. Let S be a k -committee that includes an inactive candidate $c \notin \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. If no voter is assigned to c , we can remove c from S . We get a new committee with $k - 1$ candidates, less inactive candidates than S , and $\text{SC}(S \setminus \{c\}) \leq \text{SC}(S)$. We may add any candidate of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} \setminus S$ to $S \setminus \{c\}$, so that we obtain a k -committee, without increasing the social cost.

Otherwise, let $\mathcal{V}_{\text{left}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{V}_{\text{right}}$) be the set of voters on the left (resp. right) of c that are assigned to c under the k -committee S . By hypothesis, every voter in $\mathcal{V}_{\text{left}} \cup \mathcal{V}_{\text{right}}$ is collocated with a candidate. If $|\mathcal{V}_{\text{left}}| > |\mathcal{V}_{\text{right}}|$, we replace c in S with the candidate c' collocated with the rightmost voter of $\mathcal{V}_{\text{left}}$. Otherwise, we replace c in S with the candidate c' collocated with the leftmost voter of $\mathcal{V}_{\text{right}}$. In both cases, we obtain a new k -committee $S' = (S \setminus \{c\}) \cup \{c'\}$ with less inactive candidates than S and $\text{SC}(S') \leq \text{SC}(S)$. We can apply the argument above repeatedly, until we obtain a k -committee $S' \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ with $\text{SC}(S') \leq \text{SC}(S)$. \square

D Distortion without Distance Queries

In this section, we consider deterministic rules that do not use distance queries. The results of (Caragiannis, Shah, and Voudouris, 2022) imply that for $k = 2$, the best possible distortion is $\Theta(n)$, where their lower bound holds for 1-dimensional instances and their upper bound holds for general metric spaces. The upper bound is achieved by a deterministic rule that when applied to our setting with 1-Euclidean preferences boils down to selecting the leftmost and the rightmost active candidates. Moreover, (Caragiannis, Shah, and Voudouris, 2022) proved that the distortion of any rule for k -committee election is unbounded for any $k \geq 3$.

As a warmup and for sake of completeness, we present simple proofs of the above bounds for the special case of 1-Euclidean preferences. We note that similar results have been obtained by Anshelevich and Zhu (2021); Caragiannis, Shah, and Voudouris (2022); Pulyassary (2022). Our proofs carefully determine the constants involved.

D.1 Linear Lower Bound on the Distortion of 2-Committee Election

Theorem 8. *The distortion of any deterministic rule for electing $k = 2$ (out of $m \geq 4$) candidates, in a setting where n voters have 1-Euclidean preferences, is at least $n - 1$.*

Proof. Wlog., we consider an instance with only 4 candidates a, b, c, d , appearing in this order from left to right on the real line. We let:

$$\begin{aligned} d(a, b) &= x \\ d(b, c) &= y \\ d(c, d) &= z, \end{aligned}$$

with $x \geq y + z$ and $y \geq z$. For simplicity, we consider $n = 2t + 2$ voters, with the following rankings:

- t voters rank the candidates as $b \succ c \succ d \succ a$.
- t voters rank the candidates as $c \succ d \succ b \succ a$.
- 1 voter ranks the candidates as $a \succ b \succ c \succ d$.
- 1 voter ranks the candidates as $d \succ c \succ b \succ a$.

We distinguish 6 different cases, depending on the pair of candidates selected by the deterministic rule for 2-committee election. Choosing the distances x, y, z appropriately, we end up with a different optimal solution in each case. Taking the ratio of the rule’s social cost to the optimal social cost, we lower bound the distortion in each case. The theorem follows by taking the minimum of these lower bounds.

In the following, we consider all possible candidate pairs that can be elected by the voting rule:

- $\{a, b\}$ or $\{a, c\}$ or $\{a, d\}$:** Let $x = 1 + \epsilon$, $y = 1$ and $z = \epsilon$, for some small $\epsilon > 0$. Thus, the candidates c and d are almost co-located. Suppose that the voter with profile $a \succ b \succ c \succ d$ is in the middle of $[a, b]$, whereas the other voters are co-located with their top choice. The optimal solution is to elect $\{b, c\}$. If $\{a, b\}$ is elected by the voting rule, then the distortion becomes $2t + 3$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. If $\{a, c\}$ or $\{a, d\}$ is elected by the voting rule, then the distortion becomes $2t + 1$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.
- $\{b, c\}$:** Suppose that every voter is co-located with her top candidate. The rule’s social cost is $x + z$. The optimal solution is to elect $\{a, c\}$ and has social cost $ty + z$. Then, x can become arbitrarily large (compared against t, y and z), which implies that the distortion cannot be bounded by any function of t (or n).

$\{b, d\}$ or $\{c, d\}$: Suppose that every voter is co-located with her top candidate. The rule's social cost is at least $x + ty$. The optimal solution is to elect $\{a, c\}$ and has social cost $ty + z$. As before, x can become arbitrarily large (compared against t, y and z), which implies that the distortion that cannot be bounded by any function of t (or n).

Hence, we get a distortion of at least $2t + 1 = n - 1$. \square

An interesting corollary of the proof of Theorem 8 is that the distortion can be unbounded, unless we select the top candidate of the most distant extreme voter. Since in general we cannot identify the most distant extreme voter without resorting to distance queries, a safe choice is to elect the leftmost and the rightmost active candidates.

D.2 The Distortion of Electing the Two Extreme Candidates

Theorem 9. *In a setting where n voters have 1-Euclidean preferences, the 2-committee rule that elects the leftmost and the rightmost active candidates achieves a distortion of at most $2n - 2$.*

Proof. We next show that electing the leftmost active candidate and the rightmost active candidate achieves a distortion at most $2n - 2$, where $n \geq 3$ is the number of voters (we note that for $n = 2$ voters, we can elect their top candidates, getting an optimal committee).

Let $\{c, c'\}$, with $c < c'$, be the optimal committee, and let C_1 (resp., C_2) be the set of voters preferring c to c' (resp., c' to c). We analyze each optimal cluster of voters, C_1 and C_2 , separately.

We let v (resp. v') be the leftmost (resp. rightmost) voter in C_1 (resp. C_2), and let c_l be v 's (resp. c_r be v' 's) top candidate, which is the leftmost (resp. rightmost) candidate appearing as a top candidate of some voter in C_1 (resp. C_2). Hence, c_l is the leftmost active candidate and c_r is the rightmost active candidate, and thus, $\{c_l, c_r\}$ is the committee elected by our voting rule.

Let $|C_1| = n_1$, let $\text{OPT}_1 = \sum_{x \in C_1} d(c, x)$ be the social cost of the voter cluster C_1 in the optimal committee. We let $\text{Alg}_1 = \sum_{x \in C_1} d(c_l, x)$ be an upper bound on the social cost of the voter cluster C_1 for committee $\{c_l, c_r\}$. Then, observing that $d(v, c_l) \leq d(v, c)$, we get that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Alg}_1 &= d(v, c_l) + \sum_{x \in C_1 \setminus \{v\}} d(x, c_l) \\ &\leq d(v, c_l) + \sum_{x \in C_1 \setminus \{v\}} (d(x, c) + d(c, c_l)) \\ &\leq \text{OPT}_1 + (n_1 - 1)d(c, c_l) \\ &\leq \text{OPT}_1 + (n_1 - 1)(d(c, v) + d(v, c_l)) \\ &\leq \text{OPT}_1 + 2(n_1 - 1)d(c, v) \\ &\leq (2n_1 - 1)\text{OPT}_1. \end{aligned}$$

The first and the third inequalities follow from the triangle inequality. The fourth inequality holds because $d(v, c_l) \leq d(v, c)$. The last inequality follows from the fact that $\text{OPT}_1 \geq d(v, c)$. The second inequality holds because

$$\text{OPT}_1 = \sum_{x \in C_1} d(x, c) \geq d(v, c_l) + \sum_{x \in C_1 \setminus \{v\}} d(x, c),$$

since $d(v, c_l) \leq d(v, c)$.

Similarly, we let $|C_2| = n_2$ and let $\text{OPT}_2 = \sum_{x \in C_2} d(c', x)$ denote the social cost of the voter cluster C_2 in the optimal committee. We let $\text{Alg}_2 = \sum_{x \in C_2} d(c_r, x)$ be an upper bound on the social

cost of the voter cluster C_2 for committee $\{c_l, c_r\}$. Applying the same analysis for the voters in C_2 , we get that $\text{Alg}_2 \leq (2n_2 - 1)\text{OPT}_2$.

Summing everything up, we get that the social cost of our voting rule is at most:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Alg}_1 + \text{Alg}_2 &\leq (2n_1 - 1)\text{OPT}_1 + (2n_2 - 1)\text{OPT}_2 \\ &\leq (2(n_1 + n_2) - 2)\text{OPT} \\ &= 2(n - 1)\text{OPT}. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality above follows from $\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}_1 + \text{OPT}_2 \geq \max\{\text{OPT}_1, \text{OPT}_2\}$. For the equality, we use that $n = n_1 + n_2$. \square

The analysis of Theorem 9 is practically tight. This is shown by an instance with 3 candidates a, b, c located at 0, 2 and x , respectively, where $x \gg 2$, and n voters, one voter located at $1 - \epsilon$, $n - 2$ voters located at 2 and one voter located at x . The optimal committee is to elect $\{b, c\}$ and has social cost $1 + \epsilon$. Our voting rule elects $\{a, c\}$ and has social cost $2(n - 2) + (1 - \epsilon) = 2n - 3 - \epsilon$. Hence, we get a distortion of $2n - 3$, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. In fact, for $\text{OPT}_2 = 0$ and $n_2 = 1$, which hold for this instance, the analysis of Theorem 9 gives an upper bound of $2n - 3$ on the distortion.

D.3 Tight Bound of the Distortion of Electing 2 out of 3 Candidates

Proposition 4. *For any number of voters $n \geq 3$ with 1-Euclidean preferences, the distortion of electing $k = 2$ out of $m = 3$ candidates on the real line is 3.*

Proof. For the proof, we consider 3 active candidates a, b, c , which are arranged as $a < b < c$ on the line from left to right.

Lower Bound. We consider 3 voters with preferences $a \succ b \succ c$, $b \succ c \succ a$, and $c \succ b \succ a$, respectively. If we do not elect a , the distortion can be unbounded when $d(a, b) \gg d(b, c)$ and each voter is collocated with her top candidate. If we do not elect b , the distortion can be arbitrary close to 3, when $d(a, b) = d(b, c) = 2$, voter 1 is on a , voter 2 is on b , and voter 3 is on $(b+c)/2 + \epsilon$, for some small $\epsilon > 0$. The social cost of $\{a, c\}$ is $3 - \epsilon$, while the social cost of the optimal 2-committee $\{a, b\}$ is $1 + \epsilon$. If we do not elect c , the distortion can be arbitrary close to 3, when $d(a, b) = d(b, c) = 2$, voter 1 is on a , voter 2 is on $(b+c)/2 - \epsilon$, for some small $\epsilon > 0$, and voter 3 is on c . The social cost of $\{a, b\}$ is $3 - \epsilon$, while the social cost of the optimal 2-committee $\{a, c\}$ is $1 + \epsilon$. Hence for any deterministic 2-committee election rule, there is a 3-voter ranking profile for which the distortion is arbitrarily close to 3.

Upper Bound. We assume that all 3 candidates are active (otherwise, it is optimal to elect the two active candidates). We observe that there are only 4 possible rankings $a \succ b \succ c$, $b \succ a \succ c$, $b \succ c \succ a$, and $c \succ b \succ a$, which are consistent with the candidate axis $a < b < c$. A deterministic voting rule with distortion 3 is the following:

- If the number of voters with ranking $a \succ b \succ c$ is at least the number of voters with ranking $b \succ a \succ c$, we elect a ; otherwise, we elect b .
- If the number of voters with ranking $b \succ c \succ a$ is at least the number of voters with profile $c \succ b \succ a$, we elect b , otherwise, we elect c .
- If b is elected in both steps, also elect a .

Namely, for each pair of consecutive candidates on the axis, we elect the candidate with largest support, if we restrict our attention to the subset of voters with those two candidates as their top two preferences.

To show that an upper bound of 3 on the distortion, we partition the voters into those with c as their last candidate and those with a as their last candidate. For both groups, we use the fact that the distortion is at most 3 (see e.g., (Anshelevich et al., 2018)), when we elect 1 out of 2 candidates (elect one candidate out of a and b for the former group of voters and elect one candidate out of b and c for the latter group). Therefore, the distortion for the entire set of voters is at most 3. \square

D.4 Unbounded Distortion of Election $k \geq 3$ Candidates

Theorem 10. *The distortion of any deterministic rule for electing $k \geq 3$ out of $m \geq 4$ candidates arranged on the real line cannot be bounded by any function of n and m .*

Proof. The proof is a simplified version of our more general lower bound in Theorem 1. For the proof, we consider $m = 4$ candidates a, b, c and d , which are arranged as $a < b < c < d$ on the line from left to right, and $n = 4$ voters, each collocated with one of the candidates.

The first voter is collocated with candidate a and has ranking $a \succ_a b \succ_a c \succ_a d$, the second voter is collocated with b and has ranking $b \succ_b a \succ_b c \succ_b d$, the third voter is collocated with c and has ranking $c \succ_c d \succ_c b \succ_c a$, and the fourth voter is collocated with d and has ranking $d \succ_d c \succ_d b \succ_d a$.

Since we elect $k = 3$ candidates out of $m = 4$, we just need to identify which one is dropped. If either a or b is dropped (the case where either c or d is dropped is symmetric), then we let $d(a, b) = d(b, c) = B \gg 1$ and $d(c, d) = 1$. The optimal choice is to drop d , resulting in a distortion of B , which can become arbitrarily large. The number of active candidates can be increased to any $m \geq 4$ by introducing $m - 4$ additional candidates (and $m - 4$ additional voters, each collocated with a different new candidate). We divide the new candidates among the 4 original ones, each placed in a different location essentially collocated with a, b, c or d . Clearly, any of them can be selected in place of the corresponding original candidate, so this modification does not affect the lower bound construction. \square

We also observe that the proof of Theorem 10 can be extended to the case where we want to elect $k = m - 1$ candidates out of m , for any $m \geq 4$.

E Simulation among Different Query Types

We first show how to obtain the answer to a candidate query by combining the answers to four regular queries.

Proposition 5 (Candidate Query Simulation). *The distance $d(c, c')$ of any two candidates c and c' can be obtained from four regular queries $d(v, c)$, $d(v, c')$, $d(v', c)$ and $d(v', c')$, where v is any voter in $\text{Cluster}(c)$ and v' is any voter in $\text{Cluster}(c')$ (in fact, v and v' can be any voters).*

Proof. For brevity, we let $a = d(v, c)$, $b = d(v, c')$, $c = d(v', c')$ and $d = d(v', c)$ throughout this proof. We let $z = d(c, c')$ be the information we aim to extract from a, b, c and d . By symmetry, we can assume that $c < c'$. Then, due to fact that the agents are located on the real line, we have that $\min\{v, c\} \leq \max\{v, c\} < \min\{v', c'\} \leq \max\{v', c'\}$. We distinguish four cases about how z can be obtained from a, b, c and d , depending on the relative order of v, c, v' and c on the real line.

1. $v \leq c < c' \leq v'$. Then, $z = b - a = d - c$.
2. $v \leq c < v' \leq c'$. Then, $z = b - a = d + c$.
3. $c \leq v < c' \leq v'$. Then, $z = b + a = d - c$.

4. $c \leq v < v' \leq c'$. Then, $z = b + a = d + c$.

Since we do not have ties, $b > 0$ and $d > 0$. If both $a > 0$ and $c > 0$, the four cases above are mutually exclusive. We compute $b - a$, $b + a$, $d - c$ and $d + c$, check which of the first pair is equal to which of the second pair, and output the value of the two equal quantities as the value of z .

If both $a = 0$ and $c = 0$, we output $z = b = d$. If $a = 0$ and $c > 0$, we output $z = b$ (in this case, either $c' < v'$ and $z = b = d - c$, or $v' < c'$ and $z = b = d + c$). If $a > 0$ and $c = 0$, we output $z = d$ (in this case, either $c < v$ and $z = d = b - a$, or $v < c$ and $z = d = b + 1$).

In all cases, we obtain the value of z from the responses to two regular queries about the distance of a voter $v \in \text{Cluster}(c)$ to c and c' and two regular queries about the distance of a voter $v' \in \text{Cluster}(c')$ to c and c' .

We next show how to obtain the answer to a voter distance query by combining the answers to two regular queries.

Proposition 6 (Voter Query Simulation). *The distance between any two voters v and v' can be obtained from two regular cardinal queries, one for v and one for v' .*

Proof. Let $y = d(v, v')$ be the distance of v to v' . We distinguish three cases depending on the candidate clusters to which v and v' belong.

1. If v and v' have the same top candidate c (i.e., $v, v' \in \text{Cluster}(c)$), let c' be any candidate different from c (i.e., c' may be the first candidate to the right of c or the first candidate to the left of c). Then, $y = |d(v, c') - d(v', c')|$.
2. If v 's top candidate is c and v' 's top candidate is $c' \neq c$, and c and c' are consecutive on the line, let c'' be any candidate different from both c and c' (i.e., c'' may be the first candidate to the right of the rightmost of c and c' or the first candidate to the left of the leftmost of c and c'). Then, $y = |d(v, c'') - d(v', c'')|$.
3. If v 's top candidate is c and v' 's top candidate is $c' \neq c$, and c and c' are not consecutive on the line, let $c'' \notin \{c, c'\}$ be any candidate lying between c and c' on the line. Then, $y = d(v, c'') + d(v', c'')$.

In all cases, we can obtain the value of y from the responses to two regular queries, one about the distance of v to a carefully chosen candidate and another about the distance of v' to the same candidate.

Bibliography

- Abramowitz, B.; Anshelevich, E.; and Zhu, W. 2019. Awareness of Voter Passion Greatly Improves the Distortion of Metric Social Choice. In *Proc. of the 15th Conference on Web and Internet Economics (WINE 2019)*, volume 11920 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 3–16. Springer.
- Amanatidis, G.; Birmpas, G.; Filos-Ratsikas, A.; and Voudouris, A. A. 2021. Peeking behind the ordinal curtain: Improving distortion via cardinal queries. *Artificial Intelligence*, 296: 103488.
- Amanatidis, G.; Birmpas, G.; Filos-Ratsikas, A.; and Voudouris, A. A. 2022a. Don’t Roll the Dice, Ask Twice: The Two-Query Distortion of Matching Problems and Beyond. In *Proc. of the 35th Conference on Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2022)*.
- Amanatidis, G.; Birmpas, G.; Filos-Ratsikas, A.; and Voudouris, A. A. 2022b. A Few Queries Go a Long Way: Information-Distortion Tradeoffs in Matching. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 74.
- Anagnostides, I.; Fotakis, D.; and Patsilinafos, P. 2022. Dimensionality and Coordination in Voting: The Distortion of STV. In *Proc. of the 36th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2022)*, 4776–4784. AAAI Press.
- Anshelevich, E.; Bhardwaj, O.; Elkind, E.; Postl, J.; and Skowron, P. 2018. Approximating optimal social choice under metric preferences. *Artificial Intelligence*, 264: 27–51.
- Anshelevich, E.; Filos-Ratsikas, A.; Shah, N.; and Voudouris, A. A. 2021. Distortion in Social Choice Problems: The First 15 Years and Beyond. In *Proc. of the 30th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI 2021)*, 4294–4301.
- Anshelevich, E.; and Zhu, W. 2021. Ordinal Approximation for Social Choice, Matching, and Facility Location Problems Given Candidate Positions. *ACM Transactions in Economics and Computation*, 9(2): 9:1–9:24.
- Aziz, H.; Brill, M.; Conitzer, V.; Elkind, E.; Freeman, R.; and Walsh, T. 2017. Justified representation in approval-based committee voting. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 48(2): 461–485.
- Black, D. 1948. On the rationale of group decision-making. *Journal of Political Economy*, 56(1): 23–34.
- Boutilier, C.; Caragiannis, I.; Haber, S.; Lu, T.; Procaccia, A. D.; and Sheffet, O. 2015. Optimal social choice functions: A utilitarian view. *Artificial Intelligence*, 227: 190–213.
- Burkhardt, J.; Caragiannis, I.; Fehrs, K.; Russo, M.; Schwiegelshohn, C.; and Shyam, S. 2024. Low-Distortion Clustering with Ordinal and Limited Cardinal Information. In *Proc. of the 38th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2024)*, 9555–9563. AAAI Press.
- Caragiannis, I.; Nath, S.; Procaccia, A. D.; and Shah, N. 2017. Subset selection via implicit utilitarian voting. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 58: 123–152.
- Caragiannis, I.; and Procaccia, A. D. 2011. Voting almost maximizes social welfare despite limited communication. *Artificial Intelligence*, 175(9-10): 1655–1671.
- Caragiannis, I.; Shah, N.; and Voudouris, A. A. 2022. The metric distortion of multiwinner voting. *Artificial Intelligence*, 313: 103802.
- Chamberlin, J. R.; and Courant, P. N. 1983. Representative Deliberations and Representative Decisions: Proportional Representation and the Borda Rule. *American Political Science Review*, 77(3): 718–733.
- Chen, X.; Li, M.; and Wang, C. 2020. Favorite-candidate voting for eliminating the least popular candidate in a metric space. In *Proc. of the 34th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2020)*, 1894–1901. AAAI Press.
- Elkind, E.; and Faliszewski, P. 2014. Recognizing 1-Euclidean Preferences: An Alternative Approach. In *Proc. of the 7th Symposium on Algorithmic Game Theory (SAGT 2014)*, 146–157.

- Elkind, E.; Faliszewski, P.; Laslier, J.-F.; Skowron, P.; Slinko, A.; and Talmon, N. 2017a. What do multiwinner voting rules do? An experiment over the two-dimensional Euclidean domain. In *Proc. of the 31st AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2017)*, 494–501.
- Elkind, E.; Faliszewski, P.; Skowron, P.; and Slinko, A. 2017b. Properties of multiwinner voting rules. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 48(3): 599–632.
- Enelow, J. M.; and Hinich, M. J. 1984. *The spatial theory of voting: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Escoffier, B.; Lang, J.; and Öztürk, M. 2008. Single-peaked consistency and its complexity. In *Proc. of the 18th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI 2008)*, 366–370.
- Faliszewski, P.; Skowron, P.; Slinko, A.; and Talmon, N. 2017. *Multiwinner voting: A new challenge for social choice theory*, volume 74 of *Trends in Computational Social Choice*, 27–47. Lulu Publisher.
- Feldman, M.; Fiat, A.; and Golomb, I. 2016. On Voting and Facility Location. In *Proc. of the 17th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC 2016)*, 269–286. ACM.
- Fotakis, D.; and Gourvès, L. 2022. On the distortion of single winner elections with aligned candidates. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 36(2): 37.
- Fotakis, D.; Gourvès, L.; and Monnot, J. 2016. Conference Program Design with Single-Peaked and Single-Crossing Preferences. In *Proc. of the 12th Conference on Web and Internet Economics (WINE 2016)*, volume 10123 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 221–235. Springer.
- Fotakis, D.; and Patsilina, P. 2021. Strategyproof Facility Location in Perturbation Stable Instances. In *Proc. of the 17th Conference on Web and Internet Economics (WINE 2021)*, volume 13112 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 95–112. Springer.
- Fotakis, D.; and Tzamos, C. 2014. On the Power of Deterministic Mechanisms for Facility Location Games. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation*, 2(4): 15:1–15:37.
- Frahling, G.; and Sohler, C. 2005. Coresets in dynamic geometric data streams. In *Proc. of the 37th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2005)*, 209–217. ACM.
- Fürnkranz, J.; and Hüllermeier, E. 2010. *Preference Learning*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Gkatzelis, V.; Halpern, D.; and Shah, N. 2020. Resolving the optimal metric distortion conjecture. In *Proc. of the 61st IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2020)*, 1427–1438. IEEE.
- Goel, A.; Hulett, R.; and Krishnaswamy, A. K. 2018. Relating Metric Distortion and Fairness of Social Choice Rules. In *Proc. of the 13th Workshop on Economics of Networks, Systems and Computation (NetEcon@SIGMETRICS 2018)*, 4:1. ACM.
- Goel, A.; Krishnaswamy, A. K.; and Munagala, K. 2017. Metric distortion of social choice rules: Lower bounds and fairness properties. In *Proc. of the 18th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC 2017)*, 287–304.
- Hassin, R.; and Tamir, A. 1991. Improved complexity bounds for location problems on the real line. *Operations Research Letters*, 10(7): 395–402.
- Karlin, S. 1968. *Total Positivity*. Stanford University Press.
- Kempe, D. 2020. An Analysis Framework for Metric Voting based on LP Duality. In *Proc. of the 34th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2020)*, 2079–2086. AAAI Press.
- Kizilkaya, F. E.; and Kempe, D. 2023. Generalized Veto Core and a Practical Voting Rule with Optimal Metric Distortion. In *Proc. of the 24th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC 2023)*, 913–936. ACM.
- Lu, T.; and Boutilier, C. 2014. Effective sampling and learning for mallows models with pairwise-preference data. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1): 3783–3829.
- Makarychev, K.; and Makarychev, Y. 2021. *Perturbation Resilience*, chapter 5, 95–119. Beyond the Worst-Case Analysis of Algorithms. Cambridge University Press.

- Mirrlees, J. A. 1971. An exploration in the theory of optimal income taxation. *Review of Economic Studies*, 38: 175–208.
- Miyagawa, E. 2001. Locating Libraries on a Street. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 18: 527–541.
- Monroe, B. L. 1995. Fully proportional representation. *American Political Science Review*, 89(4): 925–940.
- Munagala, K.; and Wang, K. 2019. Improved Metric Distortion for Deterministic Social Choice Rules. In *Proc. of 20th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC 2019)*, 245–262. ACM.
- Peters, D. 2017. Recognising Multidimensional Euclidean Preferences. In *Proc. of the 31st AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2017)*, 642–648. AAAI Press.
- Peters, D.; and Skowron, P. 2020. Proportionality and the Limits of Welfarism. In *Proc. of the 21st ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC 2020)*, 793–794. ACM.
- Pierczyński, G.; and Skowron, P. 2022. Core-Stable Committees Under Restricted Domains. In *Proc. of the 18th Conference on Web and Internet Economics (WINE 2022)*, volume 13778 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 311–329. Springer.
- Procaccia, A. D.; and Rosenschein, J. S. 2006. The Distortion of Cardinal Preferences in Voting. In *Proc. of the 10th Workshop on Cooperative Information Agents (CIA 2006)*, 317–331.
- Procaccia, A. D.; and Tennenholtz, M. 2013. Approximate Mechanism Design without Money. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation*, 1(4): 18:1–18:26.
- Pulyassary, H. 2022. *Algorithm Design for Ordinal Settings*. Master’s thesis, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. Available at <http://hdl.handle.net/10012/18668>.
- Skowron, P. K.; and Elkind, E. 2017. Social Choice Under Metric Preferences: Scoring Rules and STV. In *Proc. of the 31st AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2017)*, 706–712. AAAI Press.
- Volkovs, M.; and Zemel, R. S. 2014. New learning methods for supervised and unsupervised preference aggregation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1): 1135–1176.
- Williamson, D.; and Shmoys, D. 2010. *The Design of Approximation Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press.