

The Parameterized Complexity of Clustering Incomplete Data

Eduard Eiben,¹ Robert Ganian,² Iyad Kanj,³ Sebastian Ordyniak,⁴ Stefan Szeider²

¹Department of Computer Science, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, UK

²Algorithms and Complexity Group, TU Wien, Vienna, Austria

³School of Computing, DePaul University, Chicago, USA

⁴University of Leeds, School of Computing, Leeds, UK

{eduard.eiben,rganian}@gmail.com, ikanj@cdm.depaul.edu, sordyniak@gmail.com, stefan@szeider.net

Abstract

We study fundamental clustering problems for incomplete data. Specifically, given a set of incomplete d -dimensional vectors (representing rows of a matrix), the goal is to complete the missing vector entries in a way that admits a partitioning of the vectors into at most k clusters with radius or diameter at most r . We give tight characterizations of the parameterized complexity of these problems with respect to the parameters k , r , and the minimum number of rows and columns needed to cover all the missing entries. We show that the considered problems are fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by the three parameters combined, and that dropping any of the three parameters results in parameterized intractability. A byproduct of our results is that, for the complete data setting, all problems under consideration are fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by $k + r$.

Introduction

We study fundamental clustering problems for incomplete data. In this setting, we are given a set of d -dimensional Boolean vectors (regarded as rows of a matrix), some of whose entries might be missing. The objective is to complete the missing entries in order to enable a “clustering” of the d -dimensional vectors such that elements in the same cluster are “similar.”

There is a wealth of research on data completion problems (Candès and Plan 2010; Candès and Recht 2009; Candès and Tao 2010; Elhamifar and Vidal 2013; Ganian et al. 2018; Hardt et al. 2014) due to their ubiquitous applications in recommender systems, machine learning, sensing, computer vision, data science, and predictive analytics, among others. In these areas, data completion problems naturally arise after observing a sample from the set of vectors, and attempting to recover the missing entries with the goal of optimizing certain criteria. Some of these criteria include minimizing the number of clusters into which the completed vectors can be partitioned, or forming a large cluster, where the definition of what constitutes a cluster varies from one application to another (Balzano et al. 2012; Elhamifar 2016; Elhamifar and Vidal 2013; Yi et al. 2012).

Needless to say, the clustering problem itself (*i.e.*, for complete data) is a fundamental problem whose applications span several areas of computing, including data mining, machine learning, pattern recognition, and recommender sys-

tems; there are several recent books (Aggarwal and Reddy 2013; Gan, Ma, and Wu 2007; Leskovec, Rajaraman, and Ullman 2014; Mirkin 2005) that provide an introduction to clustering and its applications. Clustering is the focus of extensive research in the Machine Learning and Neural Information Processing communities, with numerous papers studying application-focused (Betancourt et al. 2016; Hu et al. 2018; Mao, Sarkar, and Chakrabarti 2018) as well as purely theoretical (Harris et al. 2018; Cohen-Addad, Kanade, and Mallmann-Trenn 2018; Ryabko 2017; Yun and Proutière 2016) aspects of clustering. The clustering problem is formulated by representing each element in the given set as a d -dimensional vector each of whose coordinates corresponds to a feature/characteristic, and the value of the vector at that coordinate reflects the score of the element with respect to that characteristic.

In many cases, the goal of clustering is to optimize the number of clusters and/or the degree of similarity within a cluster (*intra-cluster similarity*). To measure the intra-cluster similarity, apart from using an aggregate measure (*e.g.*, the variance in k -means clustering), two measures that have been studied use the *radius* (maximum distance to a selected “center” vector) and *diameter* (maximum distance between any two cluster-vectors) of the cluster (Charikar and Panigrahy 2004; Dyer and Frieze 1985; Feder and Greene 1988; Gąsieniec, Jansson, and Lingas 1999, 2004; Gonzalez 1985; Gramm, Niedermeier, and Rossmann 2003). The radius is computed either with respect to a vector in the cluster itself or an arbitrary d -dimensional vector (Leskovec, Rajaraman, and Ullman 2014).

Regardless of which of the above measures of intra-cluster similarity is used, the vast majority of the clustering problems that arise are NP-hard. Consequently, heuristics are often used to cope with the hardness of clustering problems, trading in a suboptimal clustering for polynomial running time. In this paper we take a different approach: we maintain the optimality of the obtained clustering by relaxing the notion of tractability from polynomial-time to *fixed-parameter tractability* (FPT) (Cygan et al. 2015; Downey and Fellows 2013; Gottlob and Szeider 2008), where the running time is polynomial in the instance size but may involve a super-polynomial factor that depends only on some *problem parameter*, which is assumed to be small for certain instances of interest. In the context of clustering, two

natural parameters that are desirable to be small are upper bounds on the number of clusters and the radius/diameter. Such clusterings are suitable for many applications, as one would like the similarity level within each cluster to be high and the number of clusters not to be very large.

Contributions. Motivated by the above, we consider several fundamental clustering problems in the incomplete data setting. Namely, we consider the following three problems, referred to as IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, and DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, that share a similar setting: In all three problems, the input is a (multi)set M of d -dimensional vectors over the Boolean domain¹, some of whose entries might be missing, and two parameters $r, k \in \mathbb{N}$.

For IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, the goal is to complete the missing entries so as to enable a partitioning of the set M into at most k clusters such that all vectors in the same cluster are within distance at most r from some “center” vector that belongs to the cluster itself. The goal for ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION is the same as that for IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, except that the center vectors need not be in the set M (i.e., are chosen from $\{0, 1\}^d$). For DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, the goal is to complete the missing entries so as to enable a partitioning of M into at most k clusters such that the diameter of each cluster is at most r . The formal problem definitions are given in Section .

Our first order of business is to obtain a detailed map of the parameterized complexity of the above three data completion problems. As we show in this paper, parameterization by $k + r$ is not sufficient to achieve tractability for any of these three problems: one needs to restrict the occurrences of the unknown entries in some way as well. We do so by adopting a third parameter defined as the minimum number of vectors and coordinates (or, equivalently, rows and columns in a matrix representation of M) needed to cover all the missing entries. This parameter, which we call the *covering number* or simply *cover*, is guaranteed to be small when the unknown entries arise from the addition of a small number of new rows and columns (e.g., new users and attributes) into a known data-set; in particular, the parameter may be small even in instances with a large number of rows and columns that contain missing entries. The covering number has previously been used in the context of matrix completion (Ganian et al. 2018) and is in fact the least restrictive parameter considered in that paper.

Our main contribution is a complete parameterized complexity landscape for the complete and incomplete versions of all three clustering problems w.r.t. all combinations of the parameters k, r , and *cover*. Our main algorithmic contribution shows that the incomplete variants of all three clustering problems are fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by $k + r + \text{cover}$, and as a consequence the complete variants are fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by $k + r$. Notably, our tractability results are obtained using *kernelization* (Fomin et al. 2019; Gaspers and Szeider 2014) and therefore provide efficient polynomial-time preprocessing

procedures, which can be applied before the application of any available (even heuristic) clustering algorithm. To perform the kernelization, we apply a two-step approach: first we build on the well-known Sunflower Lemma (Erdős and Rado 1960) to develop new tools that allow us to reduce the number of rows in the target instance, and after that we use entirely different techniques to identify a small set of “distance-preserving” relevant coordinates. Together with a set of algorithmic lower bound results (and an XP algorithm for IN-CLUSTERING parameterized by k), this provides the comprehensive parameterized complexity landscape illustrated in Table 1. We also show that all our tractability results can be lifted from the Boolean domain to any finite domain, for the Hamming as well as Manhattan distance.

Related Work. In previous work, Hermelin and Rozenberg (2015) studied the CLOSEST STRING WITH WILDCARDS problem, which corresponds to ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION with $k = 1$. Independently of our work, Koana et al. (2020b) very recently revisited the earlier work of Hermelin and Rozenberg (2015) and obtained, among other results, a fixed-parameter algorithm for that problem parameterized by r plus the maximum number of missing entries per row; in that same paper, they also studied IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION with $k = 1$. Even more recently, the same group (Koana, Froese, and Niedermeier 2020a) also studied a problem related to DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION for a single cluster, i.e., for $k = 1$. They obtain a classification orthogonal to ours w.r.t. constant lower and upper bounds on the diameter and the maximum number of missing entries per row.

The main differences between the problems studied by Koana et al. (2020b; 2020a) and the restrictions of ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION (studied in this paper) to $k = 1$ (i.e., the restriction to the special case where we seek precisely 1 cluster) is the parameter used to capture the number of missing entries per row. Indeed, the authors of these works consider the maximum number of missing entries (over all rows), whereas we consider the parameter *cover*. The two parameters are orthogonal: there are instances in which the maximum number of missing entries per row is very small yet *cover* is large, and vice versa.

The parameterized complexity of a related problem—MATRIX COMPLETION—has been studied in a different context than that of clustering (Ganian et al. 2018); the problem considered therein corresponds to the special case of IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION in which the clustering radius r is 0. There is also an extensive body of research on clustering problems for complete data. Examples include the work of Frances and Litman (1997), Gramm, Niedermeier and Rossmann (2003), as well as many other works (Boucher and Ma 2011; Cabello et al. 2011; Fomin et al. 2020; Fomin, Golovach, and Panolan 2020; Fomin, Golovach, and Simonov 2019; Gąsieniec, Jansson, and Lingas 1999, 2004; Gonzalez 1985). Note also that IN-CLUSTERING and ANY-CLUSTERING are special instances of the well-known k -center problem.

We remark that related problems have also been studied by a variety of other authors, such as, e.g., Chen, Hermelin,

¹We view M as the (multi)set of rows of a Boolean matrix.

Parameter:	k	r	$k + r$	$k + r + \text{cover}$
IN-CLUSTERING	W[2]-c	paraNP-c	FPT	N/A
ANY/DIAM-CLUSTERING	paraNP-c	paraNP-c	FPT	N/A
IN/ANY/DIAM-CLUSTERING-C	paraNP-c	paraNP-c	paraNP-c	FPT

Table 1: Parameterized complexity results for exact clustering with complete data (top) and incomplete data (bottom). FPT means fixed-parameter tractability, while paraNP-c and W[2]-c mean completeness for these complexity classes and indicate fixed-parameter intractability (see Section).

Sorge (2019).

Paper Organization. The paper is structured as follows. After introducing the relevant preliminaries in Section we introduce the tools that lie at the core of our approach in Section . Section then employs these tools to obtain FPT-algorithms for IN/ANY/DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION. Section is where we present all the lower bounds required to obtain the complexity classification presented in Table 1. The final two sections deal with general implications of our results: Section shows how our results generalize to matrices (vectors) over any bounded domain, while Section ?? discusses implications for graph problems. We conclude the paper in Section with some remarks and open questions.

Preliminaries

Let \vec{a} and \vec{b} be two vectors in $\{0, 1, \square\}^d$, where \square is used to represent coordinates whose value is unknown (*i.e.*, missing entries). We denote by $\Delta(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ the set of coordinates in which \vec{a} and \vec{b} are guaranteed to differ, *i.e.*, $\Delta(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \{i \mid (\vec{a}[i] = 1 \wedge \vec{b}[i] = 0) \vee (\vec{a}[i] = 0 \wedge \vec{b}[i] = 1)\}$, and we denote by $\delta(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ the *Hamming distance* between \vec{a} and \vec{b} measured only between known entries, *i.e.*, $|\Delta(\vec{a}, \vec{b})|$. Moreover, for a subset $D' \subseteq [d]$ of coordinates, we denote by $\vec{a}[D']$ the vector \vec{a} restricted to the coordinates in D' .

There is a one-to-one correspondence between vectors in $\{0, 1\}^d$ and subsets of coordinates, *i.e.*, for every vector, we can associate the unique subset of coordinates containing all its one-coordinates and vice-versa. We introduce the following notation for vectors to switch between their set-representation and vector-representation. We denote by $\Delta(\vec{a})$ the set $\Delta(\vec{0}, \vec{a})$, and for a set C of coordinates, we denote by $\Delta^{-1}(C)$ the vector that is 1 at precisely the coordinates in C and 0 at all other coordinates. We extend this notation to sets of vectors and a family of coordinate sets, respectively. For a set N of vectors in $\{0, 1\}^d$ and a family \mathcal{C} of coordinate sets, we denote by $\Delta(N)$ the set $\{\Delta(\vec{v}) \mid \vec{v} \in N\}$ and by $\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{C})$ the set $\{\Delta^{-1}(C) \mid C \in \mathcal{C}\}$. We say that a vector $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^d$ is a *t-vector* if $|\Delta(\vec{a})| = t$ and we say that \vec{a} *contains* a subset S of coordinates if $S \subseteq \Delta(\vec{a})$. For a subset $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ and a vector $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^d$, we denote by $\delta(S, \vec{a})$ the minimum Hamming distance between \vec{a} and the vectors in S , *i.e.*, $\delta(S, \vec{a}) = \min_{\vec{s} \in S} \delta(\vec{s}, \vec{a})$. We denote by $\gamma(S)$ the *diameter* of S , *i.e.*, $\gamma(S) := \max_{\vec{s}_1, \vec{s}_2 \in S} \delta(\vec{s}_1, \vec{s}_2)$.

Let $M \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ and let $[d] = \{1, \dots, d\}$. For a vector

$\vec{a} \in M$, we denote by $N_r(\vec{a})$ the *r-Hamming neighborhood* of \vec{a} , *i.e.*, the set $\{\vec{b} \in M \mid \delta(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) \leq r\}$ and by $N_r(M)$ the set $\bigcup_{\vec{a} \in M} N_r(\vec{a})$. Similarly, we denote by $N_{=r}(\vec{a})$ the set $\{\vec{b} \in M \mid \delta(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = r\}$ and by $N_{=r}(M)$ the set $\bigcup_{\vec{a} \in M} N_{=r}(\vec{a})$. We say that $M^* \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ is a *completion* of $M \subseteq \{0, 1, \square\}^d$ if there is a bijection $\alpha : M \rightarrow M^*$ such that for all $\vec{a} \in M$ and all $i \in [d]$ it holds that either $\vec{a}[i] = \square$ or $\alpha(\vec{a})[i] = \vec{a}[i]$.

We now proceed to give the formal definitions of the problems under consideration.

IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION

Input: A subset M of $\{0, 1, \square\}^d$ and $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$.
Question: Is there a completion M^* of M and a subset $S \subseteq M^*$ with $|S| \leq k$ such that $\delta(S, \vec{a}) \leq r$ for every $\vec{a} \in M^*$?

ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION

Input: A subset M of $\{0, 1, \square\}^d$ and $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$.
Question: Is there a completion M^* of M and a subset $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ with $|S| \leq k$ such that $\delta(S, \vec{a}) \leq r$ for every $\vec{a} \in M^*$?

DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION

Input: A subset M of $\{0, 1, \square\}^d$ and $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$.
Question: Is there a completion M^* of M and a partition \mathcal{P} of M^* with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq k$ such that $\gamma(P) \leq r$ for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$?

Observe that in a matrix representation of the above problems, we can represent the input matrix as a *set* of vectors where each row of the matrix corresponds to one element in our set. Of course, to precisely capture the input it seems more appropriate to consider multisets of vectors—however this is not an issue here, since even if the initial matrix contained multiple copies of a row, removing any such row from the instance will not change the outcome for any of the three clustering problems considered above. Note that this is not the case for the remaining problems considered in this paper: there it will be important to keep track of repeated rows, and so we will correctly treat M as a multiset. In the few cases where we perform a union of two multisets, we will assume it to be a disjoint union.

We remark that even though the statements are given in the form of decision problems, all tractability results presented in this paper are constructive and the associated algo-

rithms can also output a solution (when it exists) as a witness, along with the decision. In the case where we restrict the input to vectors over $\{0, 1\}^d$ (i.e., where all entries are known), we omit “-COMPLETION” from the problem name.

In some of the proofs, it will sometimes be useful to argue using the *compatibility graph* associated with an instance \mathcal{I} . This graph, denoted by $G(\mathcal{I})$, is the undirected graph that has a vertex for every vector in M , and an edge between two vectors \vec{a} and \vec{b} if and only if:

- $\delta(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) \leq r$ (if \mathcal{I} is an instance of IN-CLUSTERING or DIAM-CLUSTERING), or
- $\delta(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) \leq 2r$ (if \mathcal{I} is an instance of ANY-CLUSTERING).

We observe that vectors in different connected components of G cannot interact with each other at all: every cluster containing vectors from one connected component cannot contain a vector from any other connected component.

Parameterized Complexity. In parameterized complexity (Flum and Grohe 2006; Downey and Fellows 2013; Cygan et al. 2015), the complexity of a problem is studied not only with respect to the input size, but also with respect to some problem parameter(s). The core idea behind parameterized complexity is that the combinatorial explosion resulting from the NP-hardness of a problem can sometimes be confined to certain structural parameters that are small in practical settings. We now proceed to the formal definitions.

A *parameterized problem* Q is a subset of $\Omega^* \times \mathbb{N}$, where Ω is a fixed alphabet. Each instance of Q is a pair (I, κ) , where $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$ is called the *parameter*. A parameterized problem Q is *fixed-parameter tractable* (FPT) (Flum and Grohe 2006; Downey and Fellows 2013; Cygan et al. 2015), if there is an algorithm, called an *FPT-algorithm*, that decides whether an input (I, κ) is a member of Q in time $f(\kappa) \cdot |I|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where f is a computable function and $|I|$ is the input instance size. The class FPT denotes the class of all fixed-parameter tractable parameterized problems.

A parameterized problem Q is *FPT-reducible* to a parameterized problem Q' if there is an algorithm, called an *FPT-reduction*, that transforms each instance (I, κ) of Q into an instance (I', κ') of Q' in time $f(\kappa) \cdot |I|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, such that $\kappa' \leq g(\kappa)$ and $(I, \kappa) \in Q$ if and only if $(I', \kappa') \in Q'$, where f and g are computable functions. By *FPT-time*, we denote time of the form $f(\kappa) \cdot |I|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where f is a computable function. Based on the notion of FPT-reducibility, a hierarchy of parameterized complexity, the *W-hierarchy* $= \bigcup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{W}[t]$, where $\mathbf{W}[t] \subseteq \mathbf{W}[t+1]$ for all $t \geq 0$, has been introduced, in which the 0-th level $\mathbf{W}[0]$ is the class FPT. The notions of hardness and completeness have been defined for each level $\mathbf{W}[i]$ of the W-hierarchy for $i \geq 1$. It is commonly believed that $\mathbf{W}[1] \neq \text{FPT}$, and the $\mathbf{W}[1]$ -hardness has served as the main working hypothesis of fixed-parameter intractability. The class XP contains parameterized problems that can be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(|I|^{f(\kappa)})$, where f is a computable function; it contains the class $\mathbf{W}[t]$, for $t \geq 0$, and every problem in XP is polynomial-time solvable when the parameters are bounded by a constant. The class paraNP is the class of parameterized problems that can be solved by non-deterministic algorithms in time $f(\kappa) \cdot |I|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where f is a

computable function. A problem is *paraNP-hard* if it is NP-hard for a constant value of the parameter (Flum and Grohe 2006).

A parameterized problem is *kernelizable* if there exists a polynomial-time reduction that maps an instance (I, κ) of the problem to another instance (I', κ') such that (1) $|I'| \leq f(\kappa)$ and $\kappa' \leq g(\kappa)$, where f is a computable function, and (2) (I, κ) is a YES-instance of the problem if and only if (I', κ') is. The instance (I', κ') is called the *kernel* of I . It is well known that a decidable problem is FPT if and only if it is kernelizable (Downey and Fellows 2013). A *polynomial kernel* is a kernel whose size can be bounded by a polynomial in the parameter.

Structure of Missing Entries. As we will later show, it is not possible to obtain fixed-parameter tractability for clustering or finding a large cluster when the occurrence of missing entries (i.e., \square 's) is not restricted in any way. On the other hand, when we restrict the total number of missing entries to be upper bounded by a constant or a parameter, our problems trivially reduce to the complete-data setting, since one can enumerate all values in these few missing entries by brute force. Hence, the interesting question is whether we can solve the problems when the number of \square 's is large but also restricted in a natural way. We do so by using the so-called *covering number* as a parameter, a setting which naturally captures instances where incomplete data is caused by the addition of a few new vectors (i.e., rows) and/or coordinates (i.e., columns) (Ganian et al. 2018).

Formally, let $\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_n\}$ be an arbitrary but fixed ordering of a subset M of $\{0, 1, \square\}^d$. If $\vec{v}_i[j] = \square$, we say that \square at $\vec{v}_i[j]$ is *covered* by row i and column j . The *covering number* of M , denoted as $\text{cover}(M)$ or simply cover where it is clear from the context, is the minimum value of $r + c$ such that there exist r rows and c columns in M with the property that each occurrence of \square is covered by one of these rows or columns. We will generally assume that for a set $M \in \{0, 1, \square\}^d$ we have computed sets T_M and R_M such that $\text{cover}(M) = |T_M| + |R_M|$ and each \square occurring in a vector $\vec{v} \in M$ is covered by a row in R_M or a column in T_M ; we note that this computation may be done in polynomial time (Ganian et al. 2018, Proposition 1), and in our algorithms parameterized by $\text{cover}(M)$ we will generally assume that T_M and R_M have already been pre-computed.

The Toolkit

In this section, we present key structural results that are employed in several algorithms and lower bounds in the paper. The first part of our toolkit and structural results for matrices are obtained by exploiting the classical sunflower lemma of Erdős and Rado, a powerful combinatorial tool that has been used to obtain kernelization algorithms for many fundamental parameterized problems (Fomin et al. 2019). A *sunflower* in a set family \mathcal{F} is a subset $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that all pairs of elements in \mathcal{F}' have the same intersection.

Lemma 1 (Erdős and Rado 1960; Flum and Grohe 2006). *Let \mathcal{F} be a family of subsets of a universe U , each of cardinality exactly b , and let $a \in \mathbb{N}$. If $|\mathcal{F}| \geq b!(a-1)^b$, then \mathcal{F}*




Figure 1: The figure shows an example for the setting in Lemma 3. Here $r = 3$ and $t = 2$ and the figure shows the vectors \vec{v} and \vec{a} as well as the sunflower resulting from the vectors $\vec{p}_1, \dots, \vec{p}_7$ with $\vec{p}_i[j] = 1$ if and only if either $j = 1$ or $j = i + 1$. In this example three of the petals, *i.e.*, the white petals $\vec{p}_5, \vec{p}_6,$ and \vec{p}_7 , only share the core of the sunflower with \vec{a} , which implies that all three of these petals are of maximum Hamming distance to \vec{a} .

contains a sunflower \mathcal{F}' of cardinality at least a . Moreover, \mathcal{F}' can be computed in time polynomial in $|\mathcal{F}|$.

Finding Irrelevant Vectors. The first structural lemma we introduce is Lemma 3, which is also illustrated in Figure 1. Intuitively speaking, the lemma says that if the t -Hamming neighborhood of a vector \vec{v} contains a large sunflower, then at least one of its elements can be removed without changing the maximum distance to any vector \vec{a} that is of distance at most r to the elements in the sunflower. The proof of Lemma 3 utilizes the straightforward Lemma 2, which captures a useful observation that is also used in other proofs.

We note that the idea of applying the Sunflower Lemma on a similar set representation of an instance was also used in a previous work by Marx (2005) (see also Kratsch, Marx and Wahlström, 2016) to obtain FPT and kernelization results, albeit in the context of studying the weighted satisfiability of CSPs. There, the authors used the sunflower to reduce the arity of constraints by replacing the sets in the sunflower (which correspond to the scope of the constraints) by constraints defined over the petals without the core plus one additional constraint defined only on the variables of the core. We, however, use the sunflower in a different manner, namely to identify irrelevant vectors that can be safely removed from the instance. Note also that in contrast to many other applications of the sunflower, where all petals are removed and replaced by the core, this is not possible in our setting since we need to keep a certain number of petals in order to maintain the clustering properties of the instance.

Lemma 2. *Let $t, r \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $N \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ be a set of t -vectors such that $\mathcal{F} := \Delta(N)$ is a sunflower with core C . If $|N| > r$, then for every vector $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^d$ with $|\Delta(\vec{a})| \leq r$, N contains a vector that has maximum distance to \vec{a} among all t -vectors that contain C .*

Proof. Let $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^d$ with $|\Delta(N, \vec{a})| \leq r$ be arbitrary. Since $|N| > r$, there is a vector $\vec{n} \in N$ such that $\Delta(\vec{n}) \cap \Delta(\vec{a}) \subseteq C$, which implies that the distance of \vec{n} to \vec{a} is maximum among all t -vectors that contain C . \square

Lemma 3. *Let $t, r \in \mathbb{N}$, $\vec{v} \in \{0, 1\}^d$, $N \subseteq N_{=t}(\vec{v})$, and $\mathcal{F} := \{\Delta(\vec{v}, \vec{x}) \mid x \in N\}$ such that \mathcal{F} is a sunflower with core C . Then for every subset N' of N with $|N'| \geq r + t + 2$ and every vector $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^d$ such that $\delta(N', \vec{a}) \leq r$, we have $\delta(\vec{f}, \vec{a}) \leq \max_{\vec{x} \in N' \setminus \{\vec{f}\}} \delta(\vec{x}, \vec{a})$ for every $\vec{f} \in N$.*

Proof. Figure 1 illustrates an example situation for this lemma. Since $\delta(N', \vec{a}) \leq r$ and $\delta(\vec{x}, \vec{v}) = t$ for every $\vec{x} \in N$, we obtain that $\delta(\vec{v}, \vec{a}) \leq r + t$. Since $|N' \setminus \{\vec{f}\}| > r + t$, we obtain from Lemma 2 that $N' \setminus \{\vec{f}\}$ contains a vector that has maximum distance to \vec{a} among all t -vectors that contain C , and hence in particular to all vectors in N . \square

The following lemma now employs Lemmas 3 and 1 to show that if the t -Hamming neighborhood of a vector \vec{v} is large enough, at least one of its elements can be removed without changing the clustering properties of the instance.

Lemma 4. *Let $k, r, t \in \mathbb{N}$, $M \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$, $\vec{v} \in M$, and $N := N_{=t}(\vec{v}) \cap M$. If $|N| \geq t!(k(r+t+2))^t$, then there is a vector $\vec{f} \in N$ satisfying the following two properties:*

- (P1) *for every set $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ with $|S| \leq k$ and satisfying $\delta(S, \vec{m}) \leq r$ for every $\vec{m} \in M$, it holds that $\max_{\vec{y} \in M} \delta(S, \vec{y}) = \max_{\vec{y} \in M \setminus \{\vec{f}\}} \delta(S, \vec{y})$; and*
- (P2) *M has a partition into at most k clusters, each of diameter at most r , if and only if $M \setminus \{\vec{f}\}$ does.*

Moreover, \vec{f} can be determined in time polynomial in M .

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F} := \{\Delta(\vec{v}, \vec{x}) \mid \vec{x} \in N\}$. Then $|\mathcal{F}| = |N| \geq t!(k(r+t+2))^t$ and $|F| = t$ for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$. By Lemma 1, \mathcal{F} contains a sunflower, say \mathcal{F}' , of size larger than $k(r+t+2)$ (with core C).

We denote by $N(F)$ the vector in N giving rise to the element $F \in \mathcal{F}$, *i.e.*, $F = \Delta(\vec{v}, N(F))$. Moreover, for a subset \mathcal{F}'' of \mathcal{F} we denote by $N(\mathcal{F}'')$ the set $\{N(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{F}''\}$. Let $F \in \mathcal{F}'$ be arbitrarily chosen. We claim that setting \vec{f} to the vector $N(F)$ satisfies the claim of the lemma. Since $|\mathcal{F}' \setminus \{F\}| \geq k(r+t+2)$, we obtain that:

- (1) for every set $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ with $|S| \leq k$ there is a vector $\vec{s} \in S$ such that $|N'| \geq r + t + 2$, where $N' := \{\vec{u} \in \{0, 1\}^d \mid \delta(\vec{s}, \vec{u}) = \delta(S, \vec{u})\} \cap N(\mathcal{F}')$.
- (2) For every partition \mathcal{P} of $M \setminus \{\vec{f}\}$ into at most k sets there is a set $P \in \mathcal{P}$ with $|P \cap N(\mathcal{F}' \setminus \{F\})| \geq r + t + 2$.

Towards showing (P1), let $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ with $|S| \leq k$. By (1), there is a vector $\vec{s} \in S$ with $|N'| \geq r + t + 2$. Then t, r, \vec{v}, N , and N' satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3. By observing that $\delta(N', \vec{s}) \leq r$, we obtain that $\delta(\vec{f}, \vec{s}) \leq \max_{\vec{x} \in N' \setminus \{\vec{f}\}} \delta(\vec{x}, \vec{s})$. Consequently, $\max_{\vec{y} \in M} \delta(S, \vec{y}) = \max_{\vec{y} \in M \setminus \{\vec{f}\}} \delta(S, \vec{y})$, which shows (P1).

Towards showing (P2), first note that the forward direction holds trivially. Towards showing the other direction, let \mathcal{P} be any partition of $M \setminus \{\vec{f}\}$ into at most k sets, each of diameter at most r . By (2), there is a set $P \in \mathcal{P}$ with $|P \cap N(\mathcal{F}' \setminus \{F\})| \geq r + t + 2$. Let N' be the set $(P \cap N(\mathcal{F}' \setminus \{F\}) \cup \{\vec{f}\})$. Then t, r, \vec{v}, N, N' satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3. By observing that $\delta(N', \vec{p}) \leq r$ for

every $\vec{p} \in P$, we obtain that $\delta(\vec{f}, \vec{p}) \leq \max_{x \in N' \setminus \{\vec{f}\}} \delta(\vec{x}, \vec{p})$ for every $\vec{p} \in P$. Hence $P \cup \{\vec{f}\}$ has diameter at most r , which implies that the partition obtained from \mathcal{P} after adding \vec{f} to P is a partition of M into at most k clusters, each of diameter at most r . \square

Irrelevant Coordinates and Diameter Bound. Our clustering algorithms for IN/ANY/DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION will broadly proceed in two steps. Given an instance $\mathcal{I} = (M, k, r)$ of IN/ANY/DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, we will first compute an equivalent instance (M', k, r) such that the size of M' can be bounded by a function of the parameter $k + r + \text{cover}(M)$ (this is done by the *irrelevant vector technique*). However, since our aim is to obtain a kernel, we then still need to reduce the number of coordinates for every vector in M' . That is where we use our *irrelevant coordinate technique*. This subsection introduces the tools and notions that are central to this technique. Throughout this section, we will assume that $\mathcal{I} = (M, k, r)$ is the considered input instance of IN/ANY/DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION.

Let $Z(M)$ for $M \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ be the set of all coordinates i such that at least two vectors in M disagree on their i -th coordinate, *i.e.*, there are two vectors $\vec{y}, \vec{y}' \in M$ such that $\{\vec{y}[i], \vec{y}'[i]\} = \{0, 1\}$. Intuitively, $Z(M)$ is the set of *important coordinates*, since all other coordinates can be safely removed from the instance; this is because they can always be completed to the same value and hence do not influence the properties of a clustering of M . Note that if we could show that the number of important coordinates is bounded by a function of M' and our parameter $k + r + \text{cover}(M)$, then we would obtain a kernel by simply removing all coordinates that are not important. Unfortunately, this is not the case for two reasons: First the compatibility graph $G(\mathcal{I})$ can consist of more than one component and the vectors in different components can differ in arbitrary coordinates. Furthermore, even inside a component the number of important coordinates can be arbitrary large. For instance, a component could consist of the all-zero vector, the all-one vector, and the all \square vector. Note that the all \square vector is crucial for this example and indeed, the next lemma shows that if we restrict ourselves to a component containing only vectors in $M \setminus R_M$, then the number of important coordinates can be bounded in terms of the diameter and the number of vectors inside the component.

Lemma 5. *Let $M' \subseteq M \setminus R_M$ such that $G(\mathcal{I})[M']$ is connected. Then $|Z(M') \setminus T_M| \leq \gamma(M')(|M'| - 1)$.*

Proof. Let $\vec{m} \in M'$ be arbitrary. Then for every vector $\vec{m}' \in M'$, there are at most $\gamma(M')$ coordinates in $[d] \setminus T_M$ such that $\vec{m}[i] \neq \vec{m}'[i]$. Therefore in total there are at most $(\gamma(M'))(|M'| - 1)$ coordinates in $[d] \setminus T_M$ for which any vector in M' differs from \vec{m} and hence $|Z(M') \setminus T_M| \leq \gamma(M')(|M'| - 1)$. \square

The next lemma now shows how to bound the diameter of every component in $M \setminus R_M$ in terms of our parameter $k + r + \text{cover}(M)$.

Lemma 6. *Let $\mathcal{I} = (M, k, r)$ be an instance of IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, or DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and let $M' \subseteq M \setminus R_M$ be such that $G(\mathcal{I})[M']$ is connected. Then \mathcal{I} is a NO-instance if either:*

- \mathcal{I} is an instance of IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and $\gamma(M') > 3rk - r + |T_M|$;
- \mathcal{I} is an instance of ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and $\gamma(M') > 4rk - r + |T_M|$; or
- \mathcal{I} is an instance of DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and $\gamma(M') > 2rk - r + |T_M|$.

Proof. We start by showing the statement for the case of IN-CLUSTERING. Assume for a contradiction that \mathcal{I} is a YES-instance of IN-CLUSTERING and let C_1, \dots, C_k be a partitioning of M into k clusters, each of radius at most r . Consider any two vectors $\vec{a}, \vec{b} \in M'$; let v_a and v_b be their corresponding vertices in $G(\mathcal{I})$, and let P_{ab} be a shortest path between v_a and v_b in $G(\mathcal{I})[M']$, which exists since $G(\mathcal{I})[M']$ is connected. By minimality of P_{ab} , P_{ab} cannot contain more than three vertices corresponding to vectors in the same cluster, as otherwise, P_{ab} could be shortcut by going through the center of that cluster. It follows that the length of P_{ab} is at most $3k - 1$. Since every edge in $G(\mathcal{I})$ represents a Hamming distance of at most r between the two vectors to the endpoints of the edge and all \square -entries of every vector in M' is contained in T_R , the lemma follows. The proofs for ANY-CLUSTERING and DIAM-CLUSTERING are analogous. \square

We now already know how to bound the number of important coordinates inside a component of $M \setminus R_M$. Unfortunately, as we have illustrated previously, it is not possible to do the same for $M \setminus R_M$, let alone for the complete vector set M . However, the following lemma shows that there is a (small) set D' of coordinates that satisfy a slightly weaker property: it preserves distances up to r within components of $M \setminus R_M$ as well as to and between the vectors in R_M .

Lemma 7. *Let $M' \subseteq M$ and r' be a natural number. Then there is a subset $D' \subseteq [d]$ of coordinates such that:*

- (C1) $|D'| \leq (k\gamma_{\max}(M') + |R_M|(|M'| - 1))(r' + 1) + |T_M|$ and
- (C2) for any two vectors \vec{m} and \vec{m}' in M' such that \vec{m} and \vec{m}' are in the same component of $G(\mathcal{I})[M']$ or one of \vec{m} or \vec{m}' is in R_M , it holds that $\delta(\vec{m}, \vec{m}') = \delta(\vec{m}[D'], \vec{m}'[D'])$ if $\delta(\vec{m}, \vec{m}') \leq r'$ and $\delta(\vec{m}[D'], \vec{m}'[D']) > r'$, otherwise.

Here $\gamma_{\max}(M')$ is equal to the maximum diameter of any connected component of $G(\mathcal{I})[M']$.

Proof. Note that we can assume w.l.o.g. that $G(\mathcal{I})[M']$ has at most k components, since otherwise \mathcal{I} is a trivial NO-instance. But then, we obtain from Lemma 5 that the set

$$D_0 = \bigcup_{C \text{ is a component of } G(\mathcal{I})[M']} Z(C)$$

has size at most $k\gamma_{\max}(M')(|M'| - 1) + |T_M|$. Moreover, $\delta(\vec{m}, \vec{m}') = \delta(\vec{m}[D_0], \vec{m}'[D_0])$ for any two vectors \vec{m} and \vec{m}' in $M' \setminus R_M$ that are in the same component of $G(\mathcal{I})[M']$.

Hence it only remains to ensure that condition (C2) is satisfied if (at least) one of \vec{m} and \vec{m}' is in R_M . To achieve this we add the following coordinates to D_0 for every two vectors $\vec{m} \in R_M$ and $\vec{m}' \in M' \setminus \{\vec{m}\}$:

- if $\delta(\vec{m}, \vec{m}') \leq r'$, then we add the (at most r') coordinates in $\Delta(\vec{m}, \vec{m}')$ to D_0 , otherwise
- we add an arbitrary subset of $\Delta(\vec{m}, \vec{m}')$ of size exactly $r' + 1$ to D_0 .

Let D' be the set obtained from D_0 in this manner. Then D' clearly satisfies (C2). Finally, $|D'| \leq |D_0| + |R_M|(|M'| - 1)(r' + 1)$ since we add at most $r' + 1$ coordinates to D_0 for every $\vec{m} \in R_M$ and $\vec{m}' \in M' \setminus \{\vec{m}\}$. \square

The following lemma now shows that keeping only the set D' of coordinates is sufficient to preserve the equivalence for our three clustering problems.

Lemma 8. *Let $M' \subseteq M$. Then we can compute a set $D' \subseteq [d]$ of coordinates in polynomial-time such that:*

- $|D'| \leq (k\gamma_{\max}(M') + |R_M|(|M'| - 1))(2r + 1) + |T_M|$ and (M', k, r) is a YES-instance of ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION if and only if $(M'_{D'}, k, r)$ is.
- $|D'| \leq (k\gamma_{\max}(M') + |R_M|(|M'| - 1))(r + 1) + |T_M|$ and for $X \in \{\text{IN, DIAM}\}$: (M', k, r) is a YES-instance of X-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION if and only if $(M'_{D'}, k, r)$ is.

Here, $M'_{D'}$ is the matrix obtained from M' after removing all coordinates (columns) that are not in D' .

Proof. We start by showing the result for ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION. Let D' be the set of coordinates obtained from Lemma 7 for M' and $r' = 2r$ satisfying (C1) and (C2). Because of (C1), it holds that $|D'| \leq (k\gamma(M') + |R_M|(|M'| - 1))(2r + 1) + |T_M|$. It remains to show that (M', k, r) and $(M'_{D'}, k, r)$ are equivalent instances of ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION.

Clearly any solution (i.e., a completion and k -clustering for that completion) for (M', k, r) is also a solution for $(M'_{D'}, k, r)$; since all we did was remove a set of coordinates, all distances in the completion can only become smaller. For the forward direction, let $M''_{D'}$ be a completion of $M'_{D'}$ leading to a solution with at most k centers $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{|D'|}$ for $(M''_{D'}, k, r)$, and assume that S is inclusion-minimal. Consider a cluster given by a center $\vec{s} \in S$ and let $\vec{m} \in M''_{D'}$ be a vector in that cluster, i.e., $\delta(\vec{s}, \vec{m}) \leq r$; note that \vec{m} exists since S is inclusion-wise minimal. Let $\vec{m}' \in M'_{D'}$ be any other vector in that cluster; if the cluster consists only of the vector \vec{m} , we can replace it with a cluster with center \vec{m} for the instance (M', k, r) . Then $\delta(\vec{m}, \vec{m}') \leq 2r$ and because D' satisfies (C2) with $r' = 2r$ also $\delta(\vec{m}_+, \vec{m}'_+) \leq 2r$, where \vec{m}_+ and \vec{m}'_+ are the vectors in M' corresponding to \vec{m} and \vec{m}' , respectively. Therefore, all coordinates where \vec{m}_+ and \vec{m}'_+ differ are contained in D' , which implies that both vectors can be completed to be equal in all other coordinates, i.e., the coordinates in $[d] \setminus \Delta(\vec{m}_+, \vec{m}'_+)$; let \vec{m}_+^c be one such completion of \vec{m}_+ . Since we choose \vec{m}'_+ arbitrarily this is true also for all other vectors in the cluster. Hence, the vector $\vec{s}' \in \{0, 1, \square\}^d$,

which is equal to \vec{s} for all coordinates in D' and equal to \vec{m}_+^c on all other coordinates can be used as a center for (M', k, r) replacing \vec{s} . Applying the same procedure for all centers in S , we obtain a solution for (M', k, r) , as required.

We now show the result for IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION. Let D' be the set of coordinates obtained from Lemma 7 for M' and $r' = r$ satisfying (C1) and (C2). Because of (C1), it holds that $|D'| \leq (k\gamma(M') + |R_M|(|M'| - 1))(r + 1) + |T_M|$. It remains to show that (M', k, r) and $(M'_{D'}, k, r)$ are equivalent instances of IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION respectively DIAM-CLUSTERING.

Note that the forward direction of the claim is again trivial for both IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, since we are only removing coordinates and hence the distances can only become smaller. Towards showing the backward direction, we will distinguish between the case for IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION. In the former case, let $M''_{D'}$ be a completion of $M'_{D'}$ leading to the (inclusion-wise minimal) solution $S \subseteq M''_{D'}$ for $(M''_{D'}, k, r)$, i.e., a set of at most k centers, and consider a cluster given by a center $\vec{s} \in S$. If the cluster does not contain any other vector apart from \vec{s} , then we can replace \vec{s} with the corresponding vector in M' (and use any completion). Otherwise, let $\vec{m} \in M''_{D'}$ be a vector in the cluster distinct from \vec{s} , i.e., $\delta(\vec{s}, \vec{m}) \leq r$. Because D' satisfies (C2) with $r' = r$ also $\delta(\vec{s}_+, \vec{m}_+) \leq r$, where \vec{s}_+ and \vec{m}_+ are the vectors in M' corresponding to \vec{s} and \vec{m} , respectively. Therefore, all coordinates where \vec{s}_+ and \vec{m}_+ differ are contained in D' , which implies that both vectors can be completed to be equal in all other coordinates, i.e., the coordinates in $[d] \setminus \Delta(\vec{s}_+, \vec{m}_+)$; let \vec{s}_+^c be one such completion for \vec{s}_+ . Since we choose \vec{m}_+ arbitrarily this is true also for all other vectors in the cluster. Hence, we can use the vector \vec{s}_+^c as a replacement for the vector \vec{s} and complete all vectors inside the cluster for \vec{s} according to \vec{s}_+^c . Applying the same procedure for all centers in S , we obtain a solution for (M', k, r) , as required.

In the latter case, i.e., the case of DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, let $M''_{D'}$ be a completion of $M'_{D'}$ leading to the (inclusion-wise minimal) solution \mathcal{P} for $(M''_{D'}, k, r)$, i.e., a partition of $M''_{D'}$ into at most k clusters, and consider a cluster $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Let \vec{m} be any vector in P ; which exists since \mathcal{P} is inclusion-wise minimal. Then $\delta(\vec{m}, \vec{m}') \leq r$ for every other vector $\vec{m}' \in P$. Moreover, since D' satisfies (C2) also $\delta(\vec{m}_+, \vec{m}'_+) \leq r$ for the vectors \vec{m}_+ and \vec{m}'_+ in M' corresponding to \vec{m} and \vec{m}' , respectively. Hence both vectors can be completed to be equal in all other coordinates, i.e., the coordinates in $[d] \setminus \Delta(\vec{m}_+, \vec{m}'_+)$; let \vec{m}_+^c be one such completion for \vec{m}_+ . Since we choose \vec{m}'_+ arbitrarily this is true also for all other vectors in the cluster. Hence, completing all vectors corresponding to vectors in P according to \vec{m}_+^c and obtain a cluster for (M', k, r) containing the same vectors. Applying the same procedure for all sets in \mathcal{P} , we obtain a solution for (M', k, r) , as required. \square

A Generic Reduction

Here, we present a generic construction that is used in several hardness proofs throughout the paper.

Let G be a graph, where $V(G) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and $m = |E(G)|$, and let $\deg(v_i) \leq n - 1$ denote the degree of v_i in G . Fix an arbitrary ordering $\mathcal{O} = (e_1, \dots, e_m)$ of the edges in $E(G)$. For each vertex $v_i \in V(G)$, define a vector $\vec{a}_i \in \{0, 1\}^m$ to be the incidence/characteristic vector of v_i w.r.t. \mathcal{O} ; that is, $\vec{a}_i[j] = 1$ if v_i is incident to e_j and $\vec{a}_i[j] = 0$ otherwise. Afterwards, expand the set of coordinates of these vectors by adding to each of them $n(n - 1)$ “extra” coordinates, $n - 1$ coordinates for each v_i , $i \in [n]$; we refer to the $n - 1$ (extra) coordinates of v_i as the “private” coordinates of v_i . For each v_i , $i \in [n]$, we will choose a number $x_i \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\}$, where the choice of the number x_i will be problem dependent, and we will set x_i many coordinates among the private coordinates of v_i to 1, and all other extra private coordinates of v_i to 0. Let $M = \{\vec{a}_i \mid i \in [n]\}$ be the set of expanded vectors, where $\vec{a}_i \in \{0, 1\}^{m+n(n-1)}$ for $i \in [n]$. We have the following straightforward observation:

Observation 9. *For each v_i , where $i \in [n]$, the number of coordinates in \vec{a}_i that are equal to 1 is exactly $\deg(v_i) + x_i$, and two distinct vertices v_i, v_j satisfy $\delta(\vec{a}_i, \vec{a}_j) = \deg(v_i) + x_i + \deg(v_j) + x_j$ if v_i and v_j are nonadjacent in G and $\delta(\vec{a}_i, \vec{a}_j) = \deg(v_i) + x_i + \deg(v_j) + x_j - 2$ if v_i and v_j are adjacent.*

Throughout the paper, we denote by \mathcal{R} the polynomial-time reduction that takes as input a graph G and returns the set of vectors M described above.

Clustering with Incomplete Data

We will show that IN/ANY/DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION are fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by $k + r + \text{cover}(M)$. Our algorithmic results are achieved via kernelization: we will apply the irrelevant vector and irrelevant coordinate techniques to obtain an equivalent instance of size upper bounded by a function of $k + r + \text{cover}(M)$.

Note that this implies that also the variants IN/ANY/DIAM-CLUSTERING for complete data are fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by only $k + r$ (and also have a polynomial kernel) and, as we will show in a later section, both parameters are indeed required. To explain how we obtained our results, we will start by considering the general procedures for complete data first and then provide the necessary changes for the case of incomplete data. Throughout the section we will assume that (M, k, r) is the given instance of IN/ANY/DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION. Recall that, when using the parameter $\text{cover}(M)$, we will use the sets T_M and R_M (as defined in the preliminaries), where $T_M \subset [d]$, $R_M \subset M$, and $|T_M| + |R_M| = \text{cover}(M)$, and such that all \square 's in $M \setminus R_M$ occur only in coordinates in T_M .

Informal description of the algorithm for complete data.

To perform kernelization, we start by identifying and removing irrelevant vectors; those are vectors that can be removed

from the instance and safely added back to any valid clustering of the reduced instance to yield a valid clustering of the original instance. One caveat is that, for IN-CLUSTERING, the removed vectors may serve as cluster centers, and hence, such vectors will have to be represented in the reduced instance; we will discuss later (below) how this issue is dealt with. To identify irrelevant vectors, we first show that, for each vector, we can compute a “representative set” of vectors of its ($\leq r$)-neighborhood whose size is upper bounded by a function of the parameter. The identification of representative sets is achieved via a non-trivial application of the Sunflower Lemma (and several other techniques) in Lemmas 3, 4 as well as Lemma 10 for ANY-CLUSTERING, Lemma 10 and 12 for IN-CLUSTERING, and Lemma 15 for ANY-CLUSTERING. The union of these representative sets yields a reduced instance whose number of vectors is upper bounded by a function of the parameter. For the final step of our algorithm we use our toolkit to reduce the number of dimensions for every vector in the reduced instance. This is already sufficient to solve ANY-CLUSTERING.

As for IN-CLUSTERING, we need to ensure that the centers of the clusters in any valid solution are represented in the reduced instance (whose size is now bounded by a function of the parameter). To do so, we partition the set of vectors removed from the reduced instance into equivalence classes based on their “trace” on the set of important coordinates; the number of equivalence classes is upper bounded by a function of the parameter. Since each potential center must be within distance r from some vector in the reduced instance, for each (irrelevant) vector \vec{x} that differs in at most r important coordinates from some vector in the reduced instance, we add a vector from the equivalence class of \vec{x} (that represents \vec{x}) whose distance to the vectors in the reduced instance w.r.t. nonimportant coordinates (which all vectors in the reduced instance agree on) is minimum. Lemma 12 provides a bound on the number of these added vectors.

Finding Redundancy when Data is Missing. In the case of incomplete data, we will in principle employ the same general strategy that we used for clustering problems with complete data. Namely, we will again identify irrelevant vectors and coordinates whose removal results in an instance whose size can be bounded by our parameter. However, due to the presence of incomplete data, we need to make significant adaptations at every step of the algorithm.

Consider the first step of the algorithm, which allowed us to identify and remove irrelevant vectors. For this step, we can focus only on the vectors in $M \setminus R_M$, since $|R_M|$ is already bounded by $\text{cover}(M)$; crucially, this allows us to assume that vectors only have \square -entries at positions in T_M .

Now consider Lemma 4, which allowed us to remove any vector, say \vec{f} , in a sufficiently large sunflower occurring in the t -Hamming neighborhood of some vector \vec{v} . Informally, this was because in every solution of the reduced instance, a large part of the sunflower must end up together in one of the clusters; this in turn meant that for every vector in the cluster there is a vector in the sunflower that is at least as far as \vec{f} . This is what allowed us to argue that \vec{f} can always be safely added back into that cluster. But this can no longer be

guaranteed once \square -entries are allowed, since whether \vec{f} can be added back into the cluster or not depends on how the other vectors in the sunflower have been completed.

Note that the problem above would disappear if we could ensure that a sufficiently large number of vectors from the initial sunflower that end up together in the same cluster have the \square -entries at the *exact same positions*. Since we observed earlier that we can assume that all vectors have their \square -entries only in T_M , and consequently there are at most $2^{|T_M|}$ different allocations of the \square -entries to these vectors, we can now enforce this by enlarging the initial sunflower by a factor of $2^{|T_M|}$. This approach allows us to obtain the following lemma, which uses Lemma 4 in a way that allows us to reduce the number of vectors for IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION.

Lemma 10. *Let $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M \subseteq \{0, 1, \square\}^d$. Then there is a subset M' of M with $R_M \subseteq M'$ satisfying:*

- (P1) *For every $\vec{v} \in M \setminus R_M$ it holds that $|N_r(\vec{v}) \cap M' \setminus R_M| \leq 2^{|T_M|} (\sum_{t=1}^r t!(k(r+t)+2)^t)$; and*
- (P2) *for every set $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ with $|S| \leq k$ and satisfying $\delta(S, \vec{m}) \leq r$ for every $\vec{m} \in M$ it holds that $\max_{\vec{y} \in M} \delta(S, \vec{y}) = \max_{\vec{y} \in M'} \delta(S, \vec{y})$.*

Moreover, M' can be computed in time polynomial in M .

Proof. We obtain M' using the following algorithm. Initially, we set M' to M . Then for every $\vec{v} \in M \setminus R_M$, every $Q \subseteq T_M$, and every t with $1 \leq t \leq r$ we do the following.

We denote by M_Q the subset of $M \setminus R_M$ with $\{i \mid \vec{a}[i] = \square\} = Q$ for every vector $\vec{a} \in M_Q$. Moreover, let $\sigma_Q : \{0, 1, \square\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{d-|Q|}$ be the mapping that given a vector $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1, \square\}^d$ outputs the vector $\sigma_Q(\vec{a})$ which skips all the coordinates of \vec{a} in Q , or more formally, for all $i \in [d]$ and $j = |Q \cap [i]|$, we let $\sigma_Q(\vec{a})[i-j] = \vec{a}[i]$. Note that for a $\vec{a} \in M_Q$, the mapping σ_Q skips exactly all the coordinates with \square . Therefore, for every pair of vectors $\vec{a} \in M_Q$ and $\vec{s} \in \{0, 1\}^d$ it holds $\delta(\vec{a}, \vec{s}) = \delta(\sigma_Q(\vec{a}), \sigma_Q(\vec{s}))$.

We denote by M'_Q the set $M' \cap M_Q$. Now we apply Lemma 4 to $\sigma_Q(\vec{v})$ and $\sigma_Q(M'_Q)$ exhaustively, *i.e.*, as long as $|N| = |N_{=t}(M')| \geq t!(k(r+t)+2)^t$, we use the lemma to find the vector $\vec{f} \in \sigma_Q(M'_Q)$, we remove from M' the vector $\vec{g} \in M'_Q$ such that $\sigma_Q(\vec{g}) = \vec{f}$, and apply the lemma again. Let M' be the subset of M obtained in this manner. Then (P1) clearly holds and (P2) follows from (P1) in Lemma 4 and the observation that, for every pair of vectors $\vec{a} \in M_Q$ and $\vec{s} \in \{0, 1\}^d$, it holds that $\delta(\vec{a}, \vec{s}) = \delta(\sigma_Q(\vec{a}), \sigma_Q(\vec{s}))$. Finally, $R_M \subseteq M'$ since we did not removed any vector in R_M from M . \square

Using the above Lemma 10 together with our toolbox (for reducing the number of relevant coordinates), we are now ready to show our first fixed-parameter algorithm for ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION.

Theorem 11. ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION is FPT parameterized by $k + r + \text{cover}(M)$.

Proof. Let (M, k, r) be the given instance of ANY-CLUSTERING and let M' be the set obtained using

Lemma 10 for M , k , and $2r$. Because M' satisfies (P2), it holds that (M, k, r) and (M', k, r) are equivalent instances of ANY-CLUSTERING. Consider a solution $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ for (M', k, r) , with $|S| \leq k$, and a vector $\vec{s} \in S$. Since we can assume that S is minimal, it holds that $N_r(\vec{s}) \cap M' \neq \emptyset$ for every $\vec{s} \in S$. Let $\vec{y} \in N_r(\vec{s}) \cap M'$ be arbitrarily chosen. Then $N_r(\vec{s}) \cap M' \subseteq N_{2r}(\vec{y}) \cap M'$. Moreover, since M' satisfies (P1), it follows that $N_{2r}(\vec{y}) \cap M'$ and thus also $N_r(\vec{s}) \cap M'$ has size at most $\sum_{t=1}^{2r} t!(k(2r+t+2))^t + 1$. Consequently, if $|M'| > k((\sum_{t=1}^{2r} t!(k(2r+t+2))^t) + 1)$, we can safely return that (M, k, r) is a NO-instance of ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION. Thus, $|M'| \leq k((\sum_{t=1}^{2r} t!(k(2r+t+2))^t) + 1)$ and it remains to reduce the number of coordinates for each vector in M' . Let D' be the set of coordinates obtained from Lemma 8 for M' . Then (M', k, r) and $(M'_{D'}, k, r)$ are equivalent instances of ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and moreover we obtain from Lemma 6 that $\gamma_{\max}(M') \leq 4rk - r + |T_M|$. Therefore, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} |D'| &\leq (k\gamma_{\max}(M') + |R_M|(|M'| - 1))(r' + 1) \\ &\leq (k(4rk - r + |T_M|) + |R_M|(|M'| - 1))(2r + 1) \end{aligned}$$

showing that the size of D' is bounded by our parameter $k + r + \text{cover}(M)$. Hence $(M'_{D'}, k, r)$ is a kernel for (M, k, r) and ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION is fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by $k + r + \text{cover}(M)$. \square

Towards showing our kernelization result for IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, we need to add back some vectors that can be potential centers for the clusters containing vectors of M' . The main idea for the case of complete data is the observation that every vector in M that can act as a potential center for the instance on M' must be within the r -neighborhood of some vector in M' and moreover among all (potentially many vectors within the r -neighborhood of a vector in M'), we can chose any vector, which is closest w.r.t. the unimportant coordinates, *i.e.*, the coordinates in $[d] \setminus Z(M')$. This way the number of potential vectors that can act as a center for a vector in M' can be bounded by the parameter. For the case of incomplete data we need to consider an additional complication, namely, that the \square entries of the vectors in M' (which can be changed without increasing the Hamming distance to the vector), can increase the size of the r -Hamming neighborhood of every such vector now significantly. For instance, the potential r -Hamming neighborhood of a vector in $M' \setminus R_M$ increases by a factor of $2^{|T_M|}$ and the potential r -Hamming neighborhood of a vector \vec{x} in R_M can only be bounded by $2^{\gamma(M')(|M'| - 1)} 3^{|T_M|}$, since every important coordinate of \vec{x} could be a \square .

Lemma 12. *Let (M, k, r) be an instance of IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and $M' \subseteq M$ with $R_M \subseteq M'$. Then there is a set M'' with $M' \subseteq M'' \subseteq M$ of size at most $|M'| + 3^{|T_M|} |R_M| + k 3^{2|T_M|} |R_M| 2^{\gamma_{\max}(M')(|M'| - 1)}$ such that there is a set $S \subseteq M$ with $|S| \leq k$ satisfying $\max_{\vec{y} \in M'} \delta(S, \vec{y}) \leq r$ if and only if there is a set $S \subseteq M''$ with $|S| \leq k$ satisfying $\max_{\vec{y} \in M'} \delta(S, \vec{y}) \leq r$. Moreover, M'' can be computed in polynomial time.*

Proof. First note that if $|R_M| = |M|$, then $M'' = M$ trivially satisfies the conditions of the lemma. Let $S \subseteq M$ with $|S| \leq k$ satisfying $\max_{\vec{y} \in M'} \delta(S, \vec{y}) \leq r$ and let $\vec{s} \in S$. Since we can assume that S is minimal (w.r.t. satisfying $\max_{\vec{y} \in M'} \delta(S, \vec{y}) \leq r$), we obtain that \vec{s} must be within the r -Hamming neighborhood of some vector $\vec{y} \in M'$, i.e., for every $\vec{s} \in S$ there is a vector $\vec{y} \in M'$ such that $\delta(\vec{s}, \vec{y}) \leq r$.

We start by defining what it means for two vectors \vec{m} and \vec{m}' to be equivalent w.r.t. the vectors in R_M in the sense that if \vec{m} can be used as a center containing a vector in R_M then so can \vec{m}' and vice versa. Namely, we say that two vectors \vec{m} and \vec{m}' are *equivalent w.r.t. R_M* , denoted \equiv^{R_M} , if and only if they agree on the coordinates in T_M , i.e., $\vec{m}[i] = \vec{m}'[i]$ for every $i \in T_M$, and for every \vec{x} in R_M it holds that:

- $\delta(\vec{m}, \vec{x}) = \delta(\vec{m}', \vec{x})$ if $\delta(\vec{m}, \vec{x}) \leq r$ and
- $\delta(\vec{m}', \vec{x}) > r$ otherwise.

Clearly, this guarantees that if a vector \vec{x} is part of a cluster with center \vec{m} , then \vec{x} will still be contained in the cluster if \vec{m} is replaced by \vec{m}' and completed in the same manner as \vec{m} . Note also that this defines an equivalence relation for the vectors in $M \setminus R_M$ and that the number of equivalence classes is at most $3^{|T_M| \cdot |R_M|}$.

We now have to define what it means for two vectors \vec{m} and \vec{m}' to be equivalent w.r.t. the remaining vectors in M , i.e., the vectors in $M \setminus R_M$. Towards this aim let C be a component of $G(\mathcal{I})[M' \setminus R]$. Then it follows from Lemma 5 that $|Z(C) \cup T_M| \leq \gamma(C)(|C| - 1) + |T_M|$ and hence all vectors in C agree on all coordinates outside of $|Z(C) \cup T_M|$. We say that two vectors \vec{m} and \vec{m}' in $M \setminus R_M$ that are in the r -Hamming neighborhood of some vector in C are *equivalent w.r.t. C* , denoted \equiv_C , if and only if they agree on all coordinates in $Z(C) \cup T_M$. Then \equiv_C is also an equivalence relation for all vectors that are in the r -Hamming neighborhood of some vector in C and moreover the number of equivalence classes is at most $2^{|Z(C) \cup T_M|} 3^{|T_M|}$. Note, however, that even if $\vec{m} \equiv_C \vec{m}'$ and some vector $\vec{c} \in C$ is contained in a cluster with center \vec{m} , we cannot simply replace \vec{m} by \vec{m}' because \vec{m} and \vec{m}' might have a different Hamming distance to \vec{c} when considering the coordinates outside of $Z(C) \cup T_M$. Nevertheless, it still suffices to keep only one vector from every equivalence class, namely, a vector that is closest to any (all) vectors in C w.r.t. the coordinates in $[d] \setminus (Z(C) \cup T_M)$; recall that all vectors in C agree on all coordinates in $[d] \setminus (Z(C) \cup T_M)$. Note that \equiv has at most $3^{|T_M| \cdot |R_M|} 2^{|Z(C) \cup T_M|} 3^{|T_M|} = 3^{2|T_M| \cdot |R_M|} 2^{|Z(C) \cup T_M|}$ equivalence classes.

We can now combine these two equivalence relations into one. Namely, we say that two vectors \vec{m} and \vec{m}' in $M \setminus R_M$ are *equivalent w.r.t. C and R_M* , denoted by $\vec{m} \equiv_C^{R_M} \vec{m}'$, if and only if $\vec{m} \equiv^{R_M} \vec{m}'$ and $\vec{m} \equiv_C \vec{m}'$.

Let M_0 be the set of all vectors (in $M \setminus M'$) defined as follows. First for every component C of $G(\mathcal{I})[M']$ and every equivalence class P of $\equiv_C^{R_M}$, the set M_0 contains a vector that is closest to any/every vector in C w.r.t. the coordinates in $[d] \setminus (Z(C) \cup T_M)$ among all vectors in P . Finally, we also add to M_0 an arbitrary vector for every equivalence class of \equiv^{R_M} . We claim that setting M''

to $M' \cup M_0$ satisfies the claim of the lemma. We start by showing that there is a set $S \subseteq M$ with $|S| \leq k$ satisfying $\max_{\vec{m} \in M'} \delta(S, \vec{m}) \leq r$ if and only if there is a set $S \subseteq M''$ with $|S| \leq k$ satisfying $\max_{\vec{m} \in M'} \delta(S, \vec{m}) \leq r$. The reverse direction is trivial since M'' is a subset of M . Towards showing the forward direction let $S \subseteq M$ with $|S| \leq k$ satisfying $\max_{\vec{m} \in M'} \delta(S, \vec{m}) \leq r$ and let $\vec{s} \in S$. Then $\vec{s} \in M \setminus R_M$ since $R_M \subseteq M''$. Let $P_{\vec{s}}$ be the set of all vectors in M' that are in the cluster with center \vec{s} . If $P_{\vec{s}} \subseteq R_M$ and we replace \vec{s} with a vector $\vec{s}' \in M''$ such that $\vec{s} \equiv^{R_M} \vec{s}'$. Since \vec{s} and \vec{s}' agree on all coordinates in T_M , we can complete \vec{s}' in the same way as \vec{s} . Moreover, because $\delta(\vec{s}, \vec{m}) \leq r$ for every $\vec{m} \in P_{\vec{s}}$ and $\vec{m} \in R_M$, we obtain that $\delta(\vec{s}', \vec{m}) = \delta(\vec{s}, \vec{m}) \leq r$, as required. Otherwise, let $\vec{m} \in P_{\vec{s}}$ be a vector with $\vec{m} \in M' \setminus R_M$ and let C be the component of $G(\mathcal{I})[M']$ containing \vec{m} . Then $P_{\vec{s}} \setminus R_M \subseteq C$. We claim that we can replace \vec{s} with the vector \vec{s}' in M'' such that $\vec{s}' \equiv_C^{R_M} \vec{s}$. Since \vec{s}' agrees with \vec{s} on all coordinates in T_M , we can complete \vec{s}' in the same manner as \vec{s} . Let \vec{x} be a vector in $P_{\vec{s}}$. If $\vec{x} \notin R_M$, then $\delta(\vec{s}', \vec{x}) \leq \delta(\vec{s}, \vec{x})$, because \vec{s} and \vec{s}' agree on all coordinates in $Z(C) \cup T_M$ and \vec{s}' is closest to all vectors in C (and in particular to \vec{x}) w.r.t. to all other coordinates. Moreover, if $\vec{x} \in R_M$, then $\delta(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) \leq r$ and hence $\delta(\vec{s}', \vec{x}) = \delta(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) \leq r$, as required.

We are now ready to bound the size of M_0 in terms of our parameter $k+r+\text{cover}(M)$ and the size of M' . Apart from the $3^{|T_M| \cdot |R_M|}$ vectors (one for every equivalence class of \equiv^{R_M}), M_0 contains $3^{2|T_M| \cdot |R_M|} 2^{|Z(C) \cup T_M|}$ vectors for every component C of $G(\mathcal{I})[M']$ (one for every equivalence class of $\equiv_C^{R_M}$). Since $G(\mathcal{I})[M']$ can have at most k components, since otherwise \mathcal{I} is a NO-instance, and using the fact that $|Z(C) \cup T_M| \leq \gamma_{\max}(M')(|M'| - 1)$ for every component C of $G(\mathcal{I})[M']$ (Lemma 5), we obtain that:

$$|M_0| \leq 3^{|T_M| \cdot |R_M|} + k 3^{2|T_M| \cdot |R_M|} 2^{\gamma_{\max}(M')(|M'| - 1)}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that M_0 can be computed in polynomial time. \square

With Lemma 12 in hand, we can establish the fixed-parameter tractability of IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION.

Theorem 13. IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION is FPT parameterized by $k + r + \text{cover}(M)$.

Proof. Let (M, k, r) be the given instance of IN-CLUSTERING and let M' be the set obtained using Lemma 10. Since M' satisfies (P2), it holds that (M, k, r) has a solution if and only if there is a set $S \subseteq M$ with $|S| \leq k$ such that $\max_{\vec{y} \in M'} \delta(S, \vec{y}) \leq r$. Since M' satisfies (P1), we can safely return that (M', k, r) is a NO-instance if $|M'| > k(2^{|T_M|} (\sum_{t=1}^r t!(k(r+t)+1)^t) + |R_M| + 1) = f(k, r, \text{cover}(M))$. Hence, w.l.o.g., we can assume that $|M'| \leq f(k, r, \text{cover}(M))$, and it only remains to bound the number of vectors in $M \setminus M'$ that could potentially be in a solution. Let M'' be the set obtained from Lemma 12 for M and M' . Then (M, k, r) and $(M'' \cup M', k, r) = (M'', k, r)$ are equivalent instances of IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION. Moreover, $|M''| \leq |M'| +$

$3^{|T_M|_r|R_M|} + k3^{2|T_M|_r|R_M|}2^{\gamma_{\max}(M')(|M'|-1)}$, which together with Lemma 6 implies that $|M''|$ is also bounded by a function of $k+r+\text{cover}(M)$. Finally, it remains to reduce the number of coordinates for each vector in M'' . Let D' be the set of coordinates obtained from Lemma 8 for M'' . Then (M'', k, r) and $(M''_{D'}, k, r)$ are equivalent instances of IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and moreover we obtain from Lemma 6 that $\gamma_{\max}(M'') \leq 3rk-r+|T_M|$. Therefore, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} |D'| &\leq (k\gamma_{\max}(M'') + |R_M|(|M''| - 1))(r' + 1) \\ &\leq (k(3rk - r + |T_M|) + |R_M|(|M''| - 1))(r + 1) \end{aligned}$$

showing that the size of D' is bounded by our parameter $k+r+\text{cover}(M)$. Hence, $(M''_{D'}, k, r)$ is a kernel for (M, k, r) and IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION is fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by $k+r+\text{cover}(M)$. \square

We now proceed to the last of the three problems considered in this section, DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION. Apart from the issue that we already had for IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION that we require a sunflower of vectors with all \square s in the same position, we now have the additional complication that we can no longer assume that the \square -entries of vectors that end up in the same cluster are completed in the same way; note that this is not an issue for IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION since there one can always assume that all elements in a cluster are completed the same way as the center vector. We show that this problem can be handled by increasing the size of the sunflower by an additional factor of $2^{|T_M|}$. Because of the same issue, we also need to take into account the potential distance between different vectors in the same cluster arising from the possibility of different completions of the coordinates in T_M . This leads to the following version of Lemma 10 for DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION.

Lemma 14. *Let $k, r, t \in \mathbb{N}$, $M \subseteq \{0, 1, \square\}^d$, $\vec{v} \in M$, and let $N := N_{=t}(\vec{v}) \cap M \setminus R_M$. If $|N| \geq 2^{|T_M|}t!(2^{|T_M|}k(r+t+|T_M|+2))^t + 1$, then there is a vector $\vec{f} \in N$ satisfying the following property:*

M has a completion $M' \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ with a partition into at most k clusters, each of diameter at most r , if and only if $M \setminus \{\vec{f}\}$ does.

Moreover, \vec{f} can be determined in time polynomial in M .

Proof. Let us first define an equivalence relation \sim over $N \setminus R_M$ depending on which subset of T_M contains \square . That is, for two vectors $\vec{a}, \vec{b} \in N$, we say $\vec{a} \sim \vec{b}$ if and only if $\{i \mid \vec{a}[i] = \square\} = \{i \mid \vec{b}[i] = \square\}$.

Now let N^\square be a maximum size equivalence class of \sim , and let $\mathcal{F} := \{\Delta(\vec{v}, \vec{x}) \mid \vec{x} \in N^\square\}$. Then $|\mathcal{F}| = |N^\square| \geq t!(2^{|T_M|}k(r+t+|T_M|+2))^t$, $|F| = t$ for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$, and all the vectors of N^\square have \square -entries at the same indices. By Lemma 1, \mathcal{F} contains a sunflower, say \mathcal{F}' , of size at least $2^{|T_M|}k(r+t+|T_M|+2)$ (and core C).

We denote by $N^\square(F)$ the vector in N^\square giving rise to the element $F \in \mathcal{F}$, i.e., $F = \Delta(\vec{v}, N^\square(F))$. Moreover, for a subset \mathcal{F}' of \mathcal{F} we denote by $N^\square(\mathcal{F}')$ the set $\{N^\square(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{F}'\}$. Let $F \in \mathcal{F}'$ be arbitrarily chosen. We claim that setting \vec{f} to the vector $N^\square(F)$ satisfies the claim of the lemma. Since $|\mathcal{F}' \setminus \{F\}| \geq 2^{|T_M|}k(r+t+|T_M|+2)$, we observe the following:

for every partition \mathcal{P} of $M \setminus \{\vec{f}\}$ into at most k sets there is a set $P \in \mathcal{P}$ with $|P \cap N^\square(\mathcal{F}' \setminus \{F\})| \geq 2^{|T_M|}(r+t+|T_M|+1) + 1$.

We are now ready to prove the lemma. First note that the forward direction of the lemma holds trivially. Towards showing the other direction, let $M'_f \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ be a completion of $M \setminus \vec{f}$ with the bijection $\alpha : M \setminus \vec{f} \rightarrow M'_f$ as the completion witness, and let \mathcal{P} be any partition of M'_f into at most k sets, each of diameter at most r . By the above observation, there is a set $P \in \mathcal{P}$ with $|\alpha^{-1}(P) \cap N^\square(\mathcal{F}' \setminus \{F\})| \geq 2^{|T_M|}(r+t+|T_M|+2)$. Note that all the vectors in $N^\square(\mathcal{F}' \setminus \{F\})$ have \square exactly at the indices in T_M . Hence there is a set $P' \subseteq P$ of size $r+t+|T_M|+2$ which was completed the same way, e.g., $\vec{a}[i] = \vec{b}[i]$ for all $\vec{a}, \vec{b} \in P'$ and all i such that $\alpha^{-1}(\vec{a})[i] = \alpha^{-1}(\vec{b})[i] = \square$. Let $\alpha(\vec{f})$ be the completion of \vec{f} in the same way as all the other vectors in P' . Note that, since for all $\vec{a} \in \alpha^{-1}(P')$ it holds that $\delta(\vec{a}, \vec{v}) = t$ and all the vectors in $\alpha^{-1}(P')$ are completed the same way, it follows that there is an integer t' with $t - |T_M| \leq t' \leq t + |T_M|$ such that, for every vector $\vec{a} \in \alpha^{-1}(P')$, we have $\delta(\vec{a}, \alpha(\vec{v})) = t'$. Moreover, $\mathcal{F}_{P'} := \{\Delta(\alpha(\vec{v}), \vec{x}) \mid \vec{x} \in P'\}$ is a sunflower with $|\mathcal{F}_{P'}| \geq r+t'+2$.

Let N' be the set $(P' \cap \alpha(N^\square(\mathcal{F}' \setminus \{F\}))) \cup \{\alpha(\vec{f})\}$. Then $t', r, \alpha(\vec{v}), N'$, N' satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3. By observing that $\delta(N', \vec{p}) \leq r$ for every $\vec{p} \in P$, we obtain that $\delta(\alpha(\vec{f}), \vec{p}) \leq \max_{\vec{x} \in N' \setminus \{\alpha(\vec{f})\}} \delta(\vec{x}, \vec{p})$ for every $\vec{p} \in P$. Hence $P \cup \{\alpha(\vec{f})\}$ has diameter at most r , which implies that the partition obtained from \mathcal{P} after adding $\alpha(\vec{f})$ to P is a partition of $M'_f \cup \alpha(\vec{f})$, which is a completion of M , into at most k clusters, each of diameter at most r . \square

Lemma 15. *Let $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$, and $M \subseteq \{0, 1, \square\}^d$. Then there is a subset M' of M with $R_M \subseteq M'$ satisfying:*

- (P1) *For every $\vec{v} \in M \setminus R_M$ it holds that $|N_r(\vec{v}) \cap (M' \setminus R_M)| \leq 2^{|T_M|}(\sum_{t=1}^{r+|T_M|} t!(2^{|T_M|}k(r+t+|T_M|+2))^t) + 1$; and*
- (P2) *M has a completion with a partition into at most k clusters of diameter at most r if and only if M' does.*

Moreover, M' can be computed in time polynomial in M .

Proof. Initially, we set M' to M . Then for every $\vec{v} \in M \setminus R_M$ and every t with $1 \leq t \leq r + |T_M|$, we apply Lemma 14 to \vec{v} and M' exhaustively, i.e., as long as $|N| = |N_{=t}(M')| \geq 2^{|T_M|}t!(2^{|T_M|}k(r+t+|T_M|+2))^t + 1$,

we use the lemma to find the vector \vec{f} , remove it from M' and apply the lemma again. Let M' be the subset of M obtained in this manner. Then $R_M \subseteq M'$ and (P1) clearly holds. Moreover, (P2) follows from Lemma 14. \square

We can now prove that DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION is FPT w.r.t. the three parameters.

Theorem 16. DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION is FPT parameterized by $k + r + \text{cover}(M)$.

Proof. Let (M, k, r) be the given instance of DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and let M' be the set obtained using Lemma 15. Because M' satisfies (P2), it holds that (M, k, r) and (M', k, r) are equivalent instances of DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION. Moreover, because M' satisfies (P1), we obtain that every cluster of diameter at most r can contain at most $(2^{|T_M|}(\sum_{t=1}^{r+|T_M|} t!(2^{|T_M|}k(r+t+|T_M|)+1)^t) + |R_M| + 1)$ vectors, which implies that if $|M'| > k(2^{|T_M|}(\sum_{t=1}^{r+|T_M|} t!(2^{|T_M|}k(r+t+|T_M|)+1)^t) + |R_M| + 1)$, we can safely return that (M, k, r) is a NO-instance. Consequently, $|M'| \leq k((\sum_{t=1}^r t!(k(r+t+2))^t) + 1)$ and it remains to reduce the number of coordinates for each vector in M' . Let D' be the set of coordinates obtained from Lemma 8 for M' . Then (M', k, r) and $(M'_{D'}, k, r)$ are equivalent instances of DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION and moreover we obtain from Lemma 6 that $\gamma_{\max}(M') \leq 2rk - r + |T_M|$. Therefore, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} |D'| &\leq (k\gamma_{\max}(M') + |R_M|(|M'| - 1))(r' + 1) \\ &\leq (k(2rk - r + |T_M|) + |R_M|(|M'| - 1))(r + 1) \end{aligned}$$

showing that the size of D' is bounded by our parameter $k + r + \text{cover}(M)$. Hence $(M'_{D'}, k, r)$ is a kernel for (M, k, r) and IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION is fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by $k + r + \text{cover}(M)$. \square

Lower-Bound Results

We dedicate this section to showing that the parameterizations used in the presented FPT algorithms presented in Section , are necessary to achieve tractability. Obviously, lower-bound results for clustering problems for complete data carry over to their counterparts for incomplete data. Therefore, we will omit restating these results for the incomplete data case.

Lower-Bound Results for Complete Data

It is known that ANY-CLUSTERING is NP-complete for $r = 2$ (see Section 3 of previous work by Jiao *et al.* (2004)). Our first hardness results show that the other two clustering problems are also NP-complete for constant values of r .

Theorem 17. IN-CLUSTERING is NP-complete for $r = 4$, and DIAM-CLUSTERING is NP-complete for $r = 6$.

Proof. For IN-CLUSTERING, we give a polynomial-time reduction from the DOMINATING SET problem on 3-regular graphs (3-DS), which is NP-complete (Kikuno, Yoshida, and Kakuda 1980; Garey and Johnson 1979), to the restriction of IN-CLUSTERING to instances where $r \leq 4$. Given

an instance (G, k) of 3-DS, where $V(G) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, set $x_i = 0$ for $i \in [n]$, and apply the reduction \mathcal{R} (described in Subsection) to G to obtain the set of vectors M . By Observation 9, for any two vertices $v_i, v_j \in V(G)$, where $i \neq j$, we have $\delta(\vec{a}_i, \vec{a}_j) = 6$ if $v_i v_j \notin E(G)$ and $\delta(\vec{a}_i, \vec{a}_j) = 4$ if v_i and v_j are adjacent. The reduction from 3-DS to IN-CLUSTERING produces the instance $(M, k, 4)$ of IN-CLUSTERING.

It is easy to see that if D is dominating set of G of size k , then we can cluster M into k clusters, each containing a vector \vec{a}_i corresponding to a vertex $v_i \in D$ and vectors corresponding to neighbors of v_i in G ; if a vertex v_j in G has multiple neighbors in D , then pick a neighbor $v_i \in D$ of v_j arbitrarily, and place \vec{a}_j in the cluster containing \vec{a}_i . Since each cluster C contains a vector corresponding to a vertex v_i in D , and all other vectors in C correspond to neighbors of v_i in G , the distance between any vector in C and \vec{a}_i is at most 4. This shows that $(M, k, 4)$ is a YES-instance of IN-CLUSTERING. Conversely, if $(M, k, 4)$ is a YES-instance of IN-CLUSTERING, let C_1, \dots, C_k be a partitioning of M into k clusters, each of radius at most 4, and let $\vec{a}_{j_1}, \dots, \vec{a}_{j_k}$ be their centers, respectively. Consider the set of vertices $D = \{v_{j_1}, \dots, v_{j_k}\}$. For a vertex $v_i \in V(G)$, its vector \vec{a}_i belongs to a cluster C_p , $p \in [k]$, and hence its distance from \vec{a}_{j_p} is at most 4. This implies that either $v_i = v_{j_p}$, or v_i is adjacent to v_{j_p} in D . It follows that (G, k) is a YES-instance of 3-DS.

The proof for DIAM-CLUSTERING uses similar ideas, but the starting point of the reduction is different. Here, we reduce from the problem of determining whether a K_4 -free 4-regular graph can be partitioned into triangles; we will simply refer to this problem as Δ -PARTITION.

We begin by arguing the NP-hardness of Δ -PARTITION. First, Theorem 10 in (van Rooij, van Kooten Niekerk, and Bodlaender 2013) establishes the NP-hardness of determining whether a graph of maximum degree 4 can be partitioned into triangles. By Lemma 3 in (van Rooij, van Kooten Niekerk, and Bodlaender 2013), this problem then admits a polynomial-time reduction to determining whether a 4-regular graph can be partitioned into triangles. Finally, if a 4-regular graph contains a K_4 , then in any partitioning of the graph into triangles, the vertices of the K_4 belong to two triangles, T_1, T_2 , such that T_1 consists of an edge e_1 of the K_4 and a vertex v_1 not in the K_4 , and T_2 consists of an edge e_2 of the k_4 (such that e_1 and e_2 share no endpoints) and a vertex v_2 not in the K_4 . Notice that in such case T_1 and T_2 are unique and can be determined and removed by pre-processing the instance. The above combined implies the NP-hardness of our Δ -PARTITION problem.

Now given an instance G of Δ -PARTITION, where $V(G) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, we again set $x_i = 0$ for $i \in [n]$, and apply the reduction \mathcal{R} to G to obtain the set of vectors M . The polynomial-time reduction from Δ -PARTITION to DIAM-CLUSTERING produces the instance $(M, n/3, 6)$ of DIAM-CLUSTERING. By Observation 9, since G is 4-regular, we have: for any two distinct vertices $v_i, v_j \in V(G)$, $\delta(\vec{a}_i, \vec{a}_j) = 8$ if v_i and v_j are nonadjacent and $\delta(\vec{a}_i, \vec{a}_j) = 6$ if v_i and v_j are adjacent.

If G can be partitioned into $n/3$ triangles, then the three

vectors in M corresponding to each triangle form a cluster of diameter 6, and hence $(M, n/3, 6)$ is a YES-instance of DIAM-CLUSTERING. Conversely, if $(M, n/3, 6)$ is a YES-instance of DIAM-CLUSTERING, then since G is K_4 -free, no cluster can contain more than three vectors. Since M can be partitioned into $n/3$ clusters, it follows that each cluster contains exactly three vectors. The three vertices in G corresponding to the three vectors in any of the $n/3$ clusters are pairwise adjacent, and hence form a triangle in G . It follows that G can be partitioned into $n/3$ triangles, and G is a YES-instance of \triangle -PARTITION. \square

Having ruled out fixed-parameter tractability when parameterizing only by r , we turn to the case where the parameter is k alone. First of all, for $k = 1$ ANY-CLUSTERING is equivalent to CLOSEST STRING, a well-studied NP-complete problem (Gramm, Niedermeier, and Rossmanith 2003). Below we show that DIAM-CLUSTERING is also NP-complete even when restricted to a fixed value of k .

Theorem 18. DIAM-CLUSTERING is NP-complete for $k = 3$.

Proof. Consider the problem of deciding whether a graph on n vertices can be partitioned into three cliques, referred to as 3-CLIQUE PARTITIONING henceforth. This problem is NP-hard via a trivial reduction (that complements the edges of the graph) from the NP-hard problem (Dailey 1980) 3-COLORING. We can now reduce 3-CLIQUE PARTITIONING to the restriction of DIAM-CLUSTERING to instances in which the number of desired clusters, k , is 3, using the generic construction given in Subsection .

Given an instance G of 3-CLIQUE PARTITIONING, where $V(G) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, we set $x_i = n - 1 - \deg(v_i)$ for $i \in [n]$, and apply the polynomial-time reduction \mathcal{R} to G to produce the set of vectors M . The polynomial-time reduction from 3-CLIQUE PARTITIONING produces the instance $(M, 3, 2n - 4)$ of DIAM-CLUSTERING. By Observation 9, for any two distinct vertices $v_i, v_j \in V(G)$, $\delta(\vec{a}_i, \vec{a}_j) = 2n - 2$ if v_i and v_j are nonadjacent and $\delta(\vec{a}_i, \vec{a}_j) = 2n - 4$ if v_i and v_j are adjacent.

If G can be partitioned into 3 cliques, then the vectors in M corresponding to the vertices in each clique form a cluster of diameter $2n - 4$, and hence $(M, 3, 2n - 4)$ is a YES-instance of DIAM-CLUSTERING. Conversely, if $(M, 3, 2n - 4)$ is a YES-instance of DIAM-CLUSTERING, M can be partitioned into 3 clusters, each of diameter at most $2n - 4$. The vertices in G corresponding to the vectors in each of the 3 clusters are pairwise adjacent, and hence form a clique in G . It follows that G can be partitioned into 3 cliques, and G is a YES-instance of 3-CLIQUE PARTITIONING. \square

Finally, we note that, unlike the previous two problems, IN-CLUSTERING admits a simple polynomial-time brute-force algorithm for every fixed value of k where the order of the polynomial depends on k . However, one can still exclude fixed-parameter tractability via a reduction from DOMINATING SET.

Observation 19. IN-CLUSTERING can be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(|M|^k |M|kd)$.

Proof. The result follows using a brute-force algorithm that enumerates each subset of k vectors in M as the potential centers of the k clusters sought. For each such subset $S \subseteq M$ of k vectors, the algorithm iterates through the vectors in M , placing each vector $\vec{a} \in M$ into the cluster containing the vector in S whose distance to \vec{a} is minimum and is at most r ; if no vector in S has distance at most r to \vec{a} , the enumeration is discarded, as it does not lead to a solution. If the algorithm manages to place each vector $\vec{a} \in M$ into a cluster containing a vector in S whose distance to \vec{a} is at most r , the algorithm accepts. Enumerating all subsets of k vectors in M takes time $\mathcal{O}(|M|^k)$. Iterating through each vector in M , and finding its closest vector in the enumerated k -subset of M , takes time $\mathcal{O}(|M|kd)$. The theorem follows. \square

Theorem 20. IN-CLUSTERING is W[2]-complete parameterized by k . Moreover, there is no algorithm solving IN-CLUSTERING in time $|M|^{o(k)}$ unless the Exponential Time Hypothesis fails.

Proof. We prove the statement by giving a reduction from DOMINATING SET (DS), which is W[2]-hard and cannot be solved in subexponential time unless the Exponential Time Hypothesis fails (Downey and Fellows 2013), to IN-CLUSTERING parameterized by k . The reduction is very similar to that in the proof of Theorem 17, albeit that its starting point is DOMINATING SET (on general graphs) rather than 3-DS. Given an instance (G, k) of DS, where $V(G) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, we set $x_i = n - 1 - \deg(v_i)$ for $i \in [n]$, and apply the polynomial-time reduction \mathcal{R} to G to produce the set of vectors M . The reduction from DS to IN-CLUSTERING produces the instance $\mathcal{I} = (M, k, 2n - 4)$ of IN-CLUSTERING.

By Observation 9, for any two distinct vertices $v_i, v_j \in V(G)$, $\delta(\vec{a}_i, \vec{a}_j) = 2n - 2$ if v_i and v_j are nonadjacent and $\delta(\vec{a}_i, \vec{a}_j) = 2n - 4$ if v_i and v_j are adjacent. The proof that (G, k) is a YES-instance of DS iff $(M, k, 2n - 4)$ is a YES-instance of IN-CLUSTERING now follows by similar arguments to those in the proof of the same statement in Theorem 17.

Finally, membership in W[2] can be shown via a reduction from IN-CLUSTERING to DS that constructs the compatibility graph $G(\mathcal{I})$ of the given instance \mathcal{I} in polynomial time, and uses the observation that there is a direct correspondence between a dominating set in G of size k and a solution for \mathcal{I} . \square

Lower-Bound Results for Incomplete Data

The earlier results in this section already show that out of the three considered parameters, k and r must both be used if one wishes to obtain fixed-parameter algorithms for the clustering problems under consideration. In the case of clustering of incomplete data, the only two questions that remain are whether one also needs to use the covering number $\text{cover}(M)$, and whether it is possible to extend

the polynomial-time algorithm for IN-CLUSTERING to IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION. We resolve these questions below.

Theorem 21. IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION are NP-complete even if $k = 3$ and $r = 0$.

Proof. We give a polynomial-time reduction from 3-COLORING as follows. Let G be the given instance of 3-COLORING with edges $e_1, \dots, e_{|E(G)|}$ and let M be the set of vectors containing a vector $\vec{v} \in \{0, 1, \square\}^{|E(G)|}$ for every $v \in V(G)$ such that $\vec{v}[i] = \square$ if e_i is not incident with v , $\vec{v}[i] = 0$ if $e_i = \{u, v\}$ is incident with v and $v < u$, and $\vec{v}[i] = 1$ otherwise; here we assume an arbitrary but fixed ordering $<$ of the vertices of G . It is now straightforward to verify that G has a 3-coloring if and only if the vectors in M can be partitioned into three sets such that $\delta(x, y) = 0$ for every $x, y \in M$ contained in the same set, which in turn is true if and only if $(M, 3, 0)$ is a YES-instance of IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, ANY-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION, or DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION. \square

Theorem 22. IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION is NP-complete even if $k = 1$ and there is only one row containing \square -entries.

Proof. We give a polynomial-time reduction from CLOSEST STRING, which is well-known to be NP-hard even for binary alphabets (Frances and Litman 1997). Let (S, r) with $S = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ and $s_i \in \{0, 1\}^L$ for every $i \in [n]$ be the given instance of CLOSEST STRING. Then the set M of vectors contains one vector s_i for every $i \in [n]$ and additionally the vector $\vec{q} = \{\square\}^L$. It is easy to observe that for every YES-instance of $(M, 1, r)$ there exists a solution which completes \vec{q} to the closest string of (S, r) , and hence (S, r) is a YES-instance of CLOSEST STRING if and only if $(M, 1, r)$ is a YES-instance of IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION. \square

Going Beyond Boolean Domain

In this section, we briefly discuss two generalizations of the clustering problems under consideration that allow for larger domain size, where each generalization is based on a different way of measuring distance between vectors in higher domains. In particular, we discuss the Hamming distance and the Manhattan distance over a domain $Q = \{0, 1, \dots, q - 1, \square\}$, for some $q \geq 2$.

HAM-IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION_q

Input: A subset M of $\{0, 1, \dots, q - 1, \square\}^d$ and $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$.
Question: Is there a completion M^* of M and subset $S \subseteq M$ with $|S| \leq k$ such that $\delta(S, \vec{a}) \leq r$ for every $\vec{a} \in M$?

MAN-IN-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION_q

Input: A subset M of $\{0, 1, \dots, q - 1, \square\}^d$ and $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$.
Question: Is there a subset $S \subseteq M$ with $|S| \leq k$ such that for every $\vec{a} \in M$ there exists $\vec{s} \in S$ such that $\sum_{t=1}^d |a[t] - s[t]|$ is at most r ?

The generalizations of the other problems to higher domains w.r.t. the Hamming and Manhattan distance, respectively, are defined analogously. Observe that for $q = 2$, the problems we obtain are precisely those we introduced in Section .

Our aim in this section is to extend our results from matrices over the Boolean domain to these generalizations, and the main tools we use are two encodings of domain values. We define the two encodings $\alpha : [q] \cup \{\square\} \rightarrow \{0, 1, \square\}^q$ and $\beta : [q] \cup \{\square\} \rightarrow \{0, 1, \square\}^q$, where $\alpha(i)$ is the binary encoding of 2^i and $\beta(i)$ is the unary encoding of i if $i \neq \square$ and $\alpha(i) = \beta(i) = \square^q$, otherwise. Moreover, for $\vec{v} \in \{0, 1, \square\}^d$, we let $\alpha(\vec{v})$ and $\beta(\vec{v})$ be the vectors in $\{0, 1, \square\}^{qd}$ obtained from \vec{v} by replacing each coordinate $i \in [d]$ with a block of q coordinates equal to $\alpha(i)$ and $\beta(i)$, respectively. For example, if $Q = \{0, 1, 2, \square\}$ and $d = 2$, then $\alpha((0, 2)) = (0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0)$ and $\beta((0, 2)) = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$.

It is easy to verify that there is a direct correspondence between the vector distances in a matrix M over Q^d and the Hamming vector distances in the matrix over $\{0, 1, \square\}^{qd}$ obtained by applying the respective encoding function to M .

Observation 23. For each $\vec{a}, \vec{b} \in Q^d$ it holds that $\delta(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) \cdot 2 = \delta(\alpha(\vec{a}), \alpha(\vec{b}))$ and that $\sum_{t=1}^d |a[t] - b[t]| = \delta(\beta(\vec{a}), \beta(\vec{b}))$.

For each $i \in [d]$, we will call the set of coordinates $\{(i - 1) \cdot q + 1, (i - 1) \cdot q + 2, \dots, (i - 1) \cdot q + q\}$ a *block*. Consider a matrix M obtained by applying α (or β) to a matrix M' . A completion M^* of M is *block-preserving* w.r.t. α (respectively β) if for each vector $\vec{v} \in M^*$ the i -th block of \vec{v} is equal to $\alpha(i)$ (respectively $\beta(i)$) for some $i \in Q$. Equivalently, M^* is block-preserving w.r.t. α (or β) if it can be obtained by applying α (or β , respectively) to the elements of some completion of the matrix M' .

For $\text{PROB} \in \text{IN}/\text{ANY}/\text{DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION}$, let PROB_α and PROB_β be the adaptation of PROB to the case where we additionally require the completion M^* of M to be block-preserving (w.r.t. α or β). Since both encodings only increase the dimension of the vectors by a constant factor, Observation 23 allows us to reduce the completion problems over Q to the question of finding block-preserving completions of Boolean matrices. It is easy to argue that all the developed algorithmic techniques can be extended to the block-preserving variants of the problems. For instance, finding and removing irrelevant vectors is not affected by blocks. Additionally, finding and removing irrelevant coordinates is safe as long as one always treats all coordinates of a block in the same manner. Moreover, when we need to consider a completion of certain \square -entries, we will only consider the completions that are block-preserving.

Corollary 24. Let $\text{PROB} \in \text{IN/ANY/DIAM-CLUSTERING-COMPLETION}$ with parameterization $\iota \subseteq \{k, r, \text{cover}\}$:

- If PROB_α is FPT (or XP) parameterized by ι , then so is HAM-PROB_q .
- If PROB_β is FPT (or XP) parameterized by ι , then so is MAN-PROB_q .

In other words, all our FPT-results and XP-results also carry over to the finite domain case.

Conclusion

We provided a systematic study of the parameterized complexity of fundamental clustering problems for incomplete data. Our results draw a detailed map of the complexity landscape for the studied problems and showcase a sharp contrast between the settings that are fixed-parameter tractable and those which are not.

Finally, we believe that the insights and techniques showcased in this paper are of general interest. Indeed, in essence they show that vectors over a bounded domain which are packed in dense clusters have non-trivial combinatorial properties that only become accessible through a suitable set representation. We hope that these insights and techniques turn out to be useful in other settings as well.

Acknowledgements

Robert Ganian acknowledges support by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF, projects P31336 and Y 1329). Stefan Szeider acknowledges support by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF, project P32441) and the Vienna Science and Technology Fund (WWTF, project ICT19-065). Sebastian Ordyniak acknowledges support from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC, project EP/V00252X/1).

References

Aggarwal, C. C.; and Reddy, C. K. 2013. *Data Clustering: Algorithms and Applications*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 1st edition.

Balzano, L.; Szlam, A.; Recht, B.; and Nowak, R. D. 2012. K -subspaces with missing data. *2012 IEEE Statistical Signal Processing Workshop (SSP)* 612–615.

Betancourt, B.; Zanella, G.; Miller, J. W.; Wallach, H. M.; Zaidi, A.; and Steorts, B. 2016. Flexible Models for Microclustering with Application to Entity Resolution. In Lee, D. D.; Sugiyama, M.; von Luxburg, U.; Guyon, I.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2016, December 5-10, 2016, Barcelona, Spain*, 1417–1425.

Boucher, C.; and Ma, B. 2011. Closest String with Outliers. *BMC Bioinformatics* 12(S-1): S55.

Cabello, S.; Giannopoulos, P.; Knauer, C.; Marx, D.; and Rote, G. 2011. Geometric clustering: Fixed-parameter tractability and lower bounds with respect to the dimension. *ACM Trans. Algorithms* 7(4): 43:1–43:27.

Candès, E. J.; and Plan, Y. 2010. Matrix Completion With Noise. *Proceedings of the IEEE* 98(6): 925–936.

Candès, E. J.; and Recht, B. 2009. Exact Matrix Completion via Convex Optimization. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 9(6): 717–772.

Candès, E. J.; and Tao, T. 2010. The power of convex relaxation: near-optimal matrix completion. *IEEE Trans. Information Theory* 56(5): 2053–2080.

Charikar, M.; and Panigrahy, R. 2004. Clustering to minimize the sum of cluster diameters. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 68(2): 417 – 441.

Chen, J.; Hermelin, D.; and Sorge, M. 2019. On Computing Centroids According to the p -Norms of Hamming Distance Vectors. In Bender, M. A.; Svensson, O.; and Herman, G., eds., *27th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2019, September 9-11, 2019, Munich/Garching, Germany*, volume 144 of *LIPICs*, 28:1–28:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.

Cohen-Addad, V.; Kanade, V.; and Mallmann-Trenn, F. 2018. Clustering Redemption-Beyond the Impossibility of Kleinberg’s Axioms. In Bengio, S.; Wallach, H. M.; Larochelle, H.; Grauman, K.; Cesa-Bianchi, N.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, 3-8 December 2018, Montréal, Canada.*, 8526–8535.

Cygan, M.; Fomin, F. V.; Kowalik, L.; Lokshtanov, D.; Marx, D.; Pilipczuk, M.; Pilipczuk, M.; and Saurabh, S. 2015. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer.

Dailey, D. P. 1980. Uniqueness of colorability and colorability of planar 4-regular graphs are NP-complete. *Discrete Mathematics* 30(3): 289 – 293.

Downey, R. G.; and Fellows, M. R. 2013. *Fundamentals of Parameterized Complexity*. Texts in Computer Science. Springer. ISBN 978-1-4471-5558-4, 978-1-4471-5559-1.

Dyer, M.; and Frieze, A. 1985. A Simple Heuristic for the p -centre Problem. *Oper. Res. Lett.* 3(6): 285–288.

Elhamifar, E. 2016. High-Rank Matrix Completion and Clustering under Self-Expressive Models. In Lee, D. D.; Sugiyama, M.; Luxburg, U. V.; Guyon, I.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, 73–81. Curran Associates, Inc.

Elhamifar, E.; and Vidal, R. 2013. Sparse Subspace Clustering: Algorithm, Theory, and Applications. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.* 35(11): 2765–2781.

Erdős, P.; and Rado, R. 1960. Intersection theorems for systems of sets. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* 1(1): 85–90.

Feder, T.; and Greene, D. 1988. Optimal Algorithms for Approximate Clustering. In *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC ’88*, 434–444. ACM.

Flum, J.; and Grohe, M. 2006. *Parameterized Complexity Theory*, volume XIV of *Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series*. Berlin: Springer.

- Fomin, F. V.; Golovach, P. A.; Lokshantov, D.; Panolan, F.; and Saurabh, S. 2020. Approximation Schemes for Low-rank Binary Matrix Approximation Problems. *ACM Trans. Algorithms* 16(1): 12:1–12:39.
- Fomin, F. V.; Golovach, P. A.; and Panolan, F. 2020. Parameterized low-rank binary matrix approximation. *Data Min. Knowl. Discov.* 34(2): 478–532. doi:10.1007/s10618-019-00669-5. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10618-019-00669-5>.
- Fomin, F. V.; Golovach, P. A.; and Simonov, K. 2019. Parameterized k-Clustering: Tractability Island. In Chattopadhyay, A.; and Gastin, P., eds., *39th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2019, December 11-13, 2019, Bombay, India*, volume 150 of *LIPICs*, 14:1–14:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- Fomin, F. V.; Lokshantov, D.; Saurabh, S.; and Zehavi, M. 2019. *Kernelization: Theory of Parameterized Preprocessing*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781107415157.
- Frances, M.; and Litman, A. 1997. On covering problems of codes. *Theory of Computing Systems* 30(2): 113–119.
- Gan, G.; Ma, C.; and Wu, J. 2007. *Data clustering - theory, algorithms, and applications*. SIAM.
- Ganian, R.; Kanj, I.; Ordyniak, S.; and Szeider, S. 2018. Parameterized Algorithms for the Matrix Completion Problem. In *ICML*, volume 80 of *JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, 1642–1651.
- Garey, M.; and Johnson, D. 1979. *Computers and Intractability*. W.H. Freeman.
- Gaspers, S.; and Szeider, S. 2014. Guarantees and limits of preprocessing in constraint satisfaction and reasoning. *Artificial Intelligence* 216: 1–19.
- Gąsieniec, L.; Jansson, J.; and Lingas, A. 1999. Efficient Approximation Algorithms for the Hamming Center Problem. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 905–906.
- Gąsieniec, L.; Jansson, J.; and Lingas, A. 2004. Approximation algorithms for Hamming clustering problems. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms* 2(2): 289 – 301.
- Gonzalez, T. F. 1985. Clustering to minimize the maximum intercluster distance. *Theoretical Computer Science* 38: 293 – 306.
- Gottlob, G.; and Szeider, S. 2008. Fixed-parameter algorithms for artificial intelligence, constraint satisfaction, and database problems. *The Computer Journal* 51(3): 303–325. Survey paper.
- Gramm, J.; Niedermeier, R.; and Rossmanith, P. 2003. Fixed-Parameter Algorithms for CLOSEST STRING and Related Problems. *Algorithmica* 37(1): 25–42.
- Hardt, M.; Meka, R.; Raghavendra, P.; and Weitz, B. 2014. Computational Limits for Matrix Completion. In *Proceedings of The 27th Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 35 of *JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, 703–725. JMLR.org.
- Harris, D. G.; Li, S.; Srinivasan, A.; Trinh, K.; and Pensyl, T. 2018. Approximation algorithms for stochastic clustering. In Bengio, S.; Wallach, H. M.; Larochelle, H.; Grauman, K.; Cesa-Bianchi, N.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, 3-8 December 2018, Montréal, Canada.*, 6041–6050.
- Hermelin, D.; and Rozenberg, L. 2015. Parameterized complexity analysis for the Closest String with Wildcards problem. *Theoretical Computer Science* 600: 11–18.
- Hu, S.; Chen, Z.; Nia, V. P.; Chan, L.; and Geng, Y. 2018. Causal Inference and Mechanism Clustering of A Mixture of Additive Noise Models. In Bengio, S.; Wallach, H. M.; Larochelle, H.; Grauman, K.; Cesa-Bianchi, N.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, 3-8 December 2018, Montréal, Canada.*, 5212–5222.
- Jiao, Y.; Xu, J.; and Li, M. 2004. On the k -Closest Substring and k -Consensus Pattern Problems. In Sahinalp, S. C.; Muthukrishnan, S.; and Dogrusöz, U., eds., *Combinatorial Pattern Matching, 15th Annual Symposium, CPM 2004, Istanbul, Turkey, July 5-7, 2004, Proceedings*, volume 3109 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 130–144. Springer.
- Kikuno, T.; Yoshida, N.; and Kakuda, Y. 1980. The NP-Completeness of the dominating set problem in cubic planer graphs. *IEICE TRANSACTIONS (1976-1990)* 63(6): 443–444.
- Koana, T.; Froese, V.; and Niedermeier, R. 2020a. Complexity of Combinatorial Matrix Completion With Diameter Constraints. *CoRR* abs/2002.05068.
- Koana, T.; Froese, V.; and Niedermeier, R. 2020b. Parameterized Algorithms for Matrix Completion with Radius Constraints. In Gørtz, I. L.; and Weimann, O., eds., *31st Annual Symposium on Combinatorial Pattern Matching, CPM 2020, June 17-19, 2020, Copenhagen, Denmark*, volume 161 of *LIPICs*, 20:1–20:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- Kratsch, S.; Marx, D.; and Wahlström, M. 2016. Parameterized Complexity and Kernelizability of Max Ones and Exact Ones Problems. *TOCT* 8(1): 1:1–1:28.
- Leskovec, J.; Rajaraman, A.; and Ullman, J. D. 2014. *Mining of Massive Datasets*. New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition.
- Mao, X.; Sarkar, P.; and Chakrabarti, D. 2018. Overlapping Clustering Models, and One (class) SVM to Bind Them All. In Bengio, S.; Wallach, H. M.; Larochelle, H.; Grauman, K.; Cesa-Bianchi, N.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, 3-8 December 2018, Montréal, Canada.*, 2130–2140.
- Marx, D. 2005. Parameterized complexity of constraint satisfaction problems. *Computational Complexity* 14(2): 153–183.
- Mirkin, B. 2005. *Clustering For Data Mining: A Data Recovery Approach*. Chapman & Hall/CRC.

Ryabko, D. 2017. Independence clustering (without a matrix). In Guyon, I.; von Luxburg, U.; Bengio, S.; Wallach, H. M.; Fergus, R.; Vishwanathan, S. V. N.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, 4-9 December 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, 4016–4026.

van Rooij, J. M. M.; van Kooten Niekerk, M. E.; and Bodlaender, H. L. 2013. Partition Into Triangles on Bounded Degree Graphs. *Theory of Computing Systems* 52(4): 687–718.

Yi, J.; Yang, T.; Jin, R.; Jain, A. K.; and Mahdavi, M. 2012. Robust Ensemble Clustering by Matrix Completion. In *2012 IEEE 12th International Conference on Data Mining*, 1176–1181.

Yun, S.; and Proutière, A. 2016. Optimal Cluster Recovery in the Labeled Stochastic Block Model. In Lee, D. D.; Sugiyama, M.; von Luxburg, U.; Guyon, I.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2016, December 5-10, 2016, Barcelona, Spain*, 965–973.