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ABSTRACT

The computational complexity of the problem of finding a minimum convex cover for a polygon is reviewed. Although an NP-hard lower bound has been proven, no upper bound on the complexity is known. The lack of known restrictions on the Steiner points that may be necessary prevents naive searching algorithms from establishing the solvability of the problem. In this paper the problem is proven to be decidable by using Tarjan's decision procedure for graphs.

1. Introduction

Given an arbitrary polygonal region of the plane, perhaps with polygonal holes, it is frequently useful to decompose the region into convex polygons. Such decompositions find applications in pattern recognition [17-20] [21], artificial intelligence and graphics [15], and VLSI design [6]. If the convex polygons used in the decomposition are permitted to overlap, the decomposition is called a convex cover. The problem discussed in this paper is the computational complexity of finding the minimum convex cover, minimum in the sense of having the fewest number of pieces.

The problem formulation in the style of Garey and Johnson [5] is as follows [6]:

COVERING BY CONVEX POLYGONS (CCP)

INSTANCE: A polygon \( P \) (not necessarily simply-connected), described by a sequence of pairs of integer coordinate points in the plane, such that representing the endpoints of a line segment on the boundary of \( P \), and a positive integer \( K \).

QUESTION: Are there convex polygons \( C_1, \ldots, C_k \) whose union (as planar figures) is \( P \) and such that each \( C_i \) has at most \( K \) points, whose union (as planar figures) is \( P \) and such that each \( C_i \) has at most \( K \) points?

Decomposing a polygonal region into non-overlapping convex sets (a convex partition) is a closely related but distinct problem. Minimum partitions of both simply-connected [13-12] and multiply-connected regions can be found in polynomial time. These results unfortunately do not extend directly to minimum covers.

The use of Steiner points is discussed in the next section, and Section 3 shows that naive algorithms would miss finding the true minimum cover. Section 4 summarizes a proof of NP-hardness for the problem, establishing a lower bound, and the section following proves that the problem is decidable (a new result), establishing an upper bound. Open problems are formulated in the last section.

2. Steiner Points and Naive Algorithms

It is instructive to consider brute-force searching algorithms for finding minimum convex covers; such algorithms at least establish that the problem they solve is decidable. In general, Steiner points, points that are not vertices of the polygon being decomposed, may be required as vertices of the convex pieces of a minimum cover. If the problem is restricted to finding minimum covers without the use of Steiner points, then a searching algorithm is possible consisting of:
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struct all possible convex pieces from the vertices, and then check subsets of these pieces for complete coverage. If the search examines smaller cardinality subsets first, the first cover found will be a minimum cover. Clearly this algorithm requires exponential time.

If Steiner points are allowed, it seems natural to restrict the convex pieces to be bounded by extensions of the polygon’s edges (see Figure 1). Pavlidis observed that only maximal convex subsets need to be considered [17], those which are not enclosed within any other internal convex subset. It is then clear that there are only a finite number of possible covers, and a searching algorithm is possible. Pavlidis investigated such algorithms for pattern recognition applications [17-20], although he was not interested in minimum covers. In [11] it is shown that searching for minimum covers under the edge-extension restriction can be accomplished by minimizing a Boolean expression, a known NP-complete problem. This does not, however, establish that the restricted minimum cover problem is NP-complete, and the complexity of this problem remains unknown.

A special case where the restriction to edge extensions is especially appropriate is the class of rectilinear polygons: those whose edges are parallel to one of two orthogonal directions. The restriction in this case implies that each piece must be a rectangle. Again it is clear that the problem is decidable by a searching algorithm. Masek showed that finding a minimum rectangle cover of a multiply-connected rectilinear polygon is NP-complete [9]. Recently, Chaiken et al. have shown that if the class of rectilinear polygons is further restricted to be “convex” in the sense that every horizontal and vertical line meets the region in an interval, then a minimum rectangle cover can be found in polynomial time [7]. The problem for the important class of simply-connected rectilinear polygons remains open.

3. Counterexamples to Steiner Point Restrictions

Although the restriction that the pieces be bounded by edge extensions may seem natural for pattern recognition applications, it is a true restriction, in that there are polygons whose minimum covers require the use of pieces that are not bounded by such edge extensions. In fact there are rectilinear polygons that need edges in their minimum covers that are neither horizontal nor vertical. Figure 1 shows a simply-connected example. As 9 mutually invisible points can be located in the interior of the polygon, any convex cover must use at least 9 pieces. The eight horizontal and vertical rectangles shown in Figure 3 can be proven to be necessary, leaving the ninth piece to use diagonal edges, as illustrated [12].

Although the diamond region in Figure 3 is not bounded by extensions of the polygon’s edges, its vertices can be chosen to be at intersections of edge extensions. It is natural to ask, then, whether restricting the Steiner points in this way is a true restriction. In fact it is, as can be verified by merging two copies of the polygon of Figure 3, the result is shown in Figures 4 and 5. The left diamond region requires a vertex somewhere along the segment labeled a in Figure 3, but no two edge extensions intersect there.
One could also restrict Steiner points to the following recursively defined class: a vertex of the polygon is of order 0, a point is of order 0 if it lies at the intersection of lines determined by points of no more than order \(k - 1\), at least one of which is exactly order \(k - 1\). Under this definition, points at the intersection of edge extensions are of order 1. A simply-connected polygon can be constructed that requires in its cover at least one vertex of order 2 or more [13], and 1 conjecture that restricting Steiner points to any finite order is a true restriction.

The implication of these examples is that no naive searching algorithm for finding general minimum covers is known, since the possible Steiner points are not known to be recognizable in a finite case.

4. Covering by Convex Polygons is NP-Hard

It has recently been established that the problem of finding minimum convex covers of multiply-connected polygons is NP-hard, with or without the use of Steiner points [14]. This proof is by reduction of 3SAT, a known NP-complete problem. Subsequently, Lingas simplified the proof by reducing from Planar 3SAT, which simultaneously established this minimum partition of multiply-connected polygons is NP-complete, again with or without the use of Steiner points [18].

These NP-hardness results use multiply-connected polygons in their proofs, and so they do not establish any complexity results forSimply-connected polygons. Also, the cover problem is not known to be in NP, for the reasons discussed in the previous two sections. Thus the NP-hard result establishes a lower bound on the complexity; it is possible for an NP-hard problem of the same order.

5. Decidability of Covering by Convex Polygons

5.1 Proof Sketch

We now show that CCP is decidable by using a technique that Chazelle employed on a similar problem [12]. A proof sketch is as follows [14]. It is first established that the number of vertices of each piece of a cover can be bounded by a function of \(n\). This ensures that a searching algorithm need only try pieces up to a certain size. Similarly, it is shown that the property of having a valid cover is equivalent to a set of algebraic equations in the vertex coordinates. Finally, Tachi's decision procedure for first-order sentences in the field of real numbers is invoked to determine whether the set of equations has a solution.

Thus to determine whether a polygon has a cover of \(k\) or fewer pieces, a generic cover of \(k\) pieces is constructed, and Tachi's procedure is used to see if there exist vertex coordinates that satisfy the covering equations.

5.2 Bounded Size of Covers

First it is shown that the number of pieces needed to cover a polygon is never more than \(O(n)\).

Lemma 1. A polygon (perhaps multiply-connected) with \(n\) vertices has a cover with at most \(5n/4\) convex pieces.

Proof Sketch. It is easily established by induction that a polygon with \(n\) vertices and \(k\) holes can be triangulated into \(2n - 3\) triangles. Since each triangle must have at least 3 vertices, \(3n/2\) triangles are needed. Substitution then establishes that the number of triangles satisfies the bound in the Lemma.

5.3 The Covering Property

The following two lemmas establish that every cover of at most \(O(n)\) pieces, each of at most \(O(1)\) vertices, need be considered. Coupling these two lemmas together allows the representation of the property of covering to be simpler. The cover is first refined or fragmented. Given any cover, introduce versions whenever two edges of \(P\) are in the cover (except for cases when there is no already a vertex). Make the introduced versions part of both intersecting parts. This fragmentation ensures that every edge is entirely contained within at least one convex piece. After refinement, each of the \(O(n)\) pieces has at most \(O(1)\) vertices, and the polygon \(P\) has at most \(O(n^2)\) versions.

Let a refined polygon \(P\) have vertices \((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \ldots, (x_m, y_m)\), with \(m = O(n^2)\), and let a refined cover \(C\) be represented by \(C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_l\), where each \(C_i\) is a convex polygon with vertices \((x_{i1}, y_{i1}), (x_{i2}, y_{i2}), \ldots, (x_{in}, y_{in})\), with \(m = O(n^2)\). Boundary lists are assumed to

Lemma 2. Any convex polygonal subset \(C\) of an \(n\) vertex polygon \(P\) is itself enclosed within a subset \(C'\) that has no more than \(n\) vertices.

Proof. Perform the following expansion procedure for each edge \(e\) of \(C\). Let \(BP\) be the boundary of \(P\). If \(e\) does not touch \(BP\), move it parallel to itself away from the centroid of \(C\), adjusting its length to make it entirely contained within \(BP\). If it touches \(BP\) at a single point that is not an endpoint of \(e\) or at two more points, then halt. If it touches \(BP\) at just one endpoint, then swing a about this endpoint, again adjusting its length to match the extension of its neighboring edge. Stop when another point of \(BP\) is hit or \(e\) becomes collinear with its adjacent edge (see Figure 7). This expansion procedure halts either when \(e\) disappears or it touches against \(BP\). The possible "abutments" are the vertices and edges of \(P\). No two non-colinear edges can be stepped in the expansion process by the same edge or vertex, nor even by an adjacent edge and vertex. Since there are \(n\) vertices and edges in \(BP\), there can be no more than \(n\) non-colinear edges in the expanded polygon \(C'\).

Clearly the method of construction guarantees that \(C' \subseteq C\).

This bound is tight: an \(n\) edge convex polygon \(P\) has a convex subset, namely itself, that is not enclosed in a polygon of fewer edges.

5.4 Boundary List

The boundary lists are assumed to be simple: the list contains no repeated vertices. The only vertices on a boundary list that are not adjacent in the polygon are the vertices of the boundary that are on the polygon boundary and not on the polygon.

5.5 The Covering Property

The following two lemmas establish that every cover of at most \(O(n)\) pieces, each of at most \(O(1)\) vertices, need be considered. Coupling these two lemmas together allows the representation of the property of covering to be simpler. The cover is first refined or fragmented. Given any cover, introduce versions whenever two edges of \(P\) are in the cover (except for cases when there is no already a vertex). Make the introduced versions part of both intersecting parts. This fragmentation ensures that every edge is entirely contained within at least one convex piece. After refinement, each of the \(O(1)\) pieces has at most \(O(1)\) vertices, and the polygon \(P\) has at most \(O(n^2)\) versions.

Let a refined polygon \(P\) have vertices \((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \ldots, (x_m, y_m)\), with \(m = O(n^2)\), and let a refined cover \(C\) be represented by \(C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_l\), where each \(C_i\) is a convex polygon with vertices \((x_{i1}, y_{i1}), (x_{i2}, y_{i2}), \ldots, (x_{in}, y_{in})\), with \(m = O(n^2)\). Boundary lists are assumed to
be oriented so that traversal always keeps the interior to the left. Thus outer boundary chains are oriented counterclockwise, and hole chains clockwise. All sets will be considered closed regions, including their boundaries, unless otherwise mentioned. The next task is to construct a set of algebraic relations that express the fact that C is a cover for P. The key idea is contained in the following Lemma.

Lemma J. The following two conditions are necessary and sufficient for C to be a refined cover for a refined polygon P.

1. For every edge e of some C_i in C, either
   (a) e is equal to some edge of P, oriented in the same direction, or
   (b) e is inside of some C_j (different from C_i), but if it lies on B_C, it is oriented in the opposite direction.

2. None of the vertices of P are inside the interiors of any of the C_i.

Proof.

Necessity. Suppose C is a refined cover for P. We will first show that condition (1) holds for an arbitrary edge e of C_i in C, where p_1 and p_2 are two arbitrary points on the interior of e, and let N_1 and N_2 be neighborhoods of p_1 and p_2 outside of C (see Figure 8). It cannot be the case that N_1 is inside of P and N_2 is outside of P, because then e would cross the refinement procedure would have split e. Consider each remaining case separately.

Case 1: N_1 is inside of P and N_2 is outside of P.

Since the points in the neighborhood are in P, and C_i is a cover, p_1 \in P and p_2 \in P. The boundary of the neighborhood is contained within the boundary of P, and the boundary collision would have split e. Consider the remaining case separately.

Case 2: N_2 is inside of P and N_1 is outside of P.

Since the points in the neighborhood are in P, and C_i is a cover, p_1 \in P and p_2 \in P. The boundary of the neighborhood is contained within the boundary of P, and the boundary collision would have split e. Consider the remaining case separately.

Sufficiency. Suppose the two conditions hold but, C is not a valid cover. Then either \exists p \in P \setminus C_i or \exists p_1 \in P \setminus C_i for some i.

Case 1: \exists p \in P \setminus C_i.

Let Q be the unconnected components of P - C_i in which p lies. Q's boundary consists of edges from either P or the C_i's (see Figure 9). Suppose all the edges of Q come from P. Then Q must be the same as P, and all the C_i are outside of P. But then one edge that forms the boundary of U_C_i does not satisfy either clause (a) or (b) of condition (1). Suppose at least one edge e of Q comes from C_i. Clause (a) of condition (1) cannot be true for e, because the subtraction P - C_i would eliminate e from Q_i's boundary. Similarly clause (b) cannot be true because the subtraction P - C_i would eliminate e. Thus all possibilities contradict condition (1).

Case 2: \exists p \in P \setminus C_i for some i.

Let Q be the connected component of U_C_i - P that includes p. If all the edges of Q come from P, then Q coincides with a hole of P. Any vertex on the boundary of this hole must be inside some C_i, contradicting condition (2). So suppose at least one edge e of Q comes from P. This would contradict the subtraction of Q_i from C_i, because the first case it would be absorbed by the subtraction of P_i and in the second case it would be absorbed by the inclusion with C_i. Thus all cases contradict the lemma.

A set of relations for expressing the proposition that C is a refined cover for P thus checks three conditions:

1. Each polygon C_i must be convex.
2. Each edge of C_i must satisfy condition (1) of Lemma J.
Theorem.

Formulations of Tarski's procedure \[10\] appear to require \(O(2^n)\) time. Despite this slowness, Tarski developed a decision procedure for all first-order sentences of no free variables in the field of real numbers \[22\] \[4\] \[21\]. The expression above is such a sentence, and is there­fore decidable by his procedure. The procedure eliminates quantifiers and reduces the sentence to a single polynomial relation of no variables, which can be eas­ily checked for validity. Modern algorithms, \[8\] \[4\] \[9\], can be expressed by a series of algebraic equations of the form (1), (2), or (3), coupled by the logical connectives and or.

The minimum convex cover problem is decidable. The bounds derived in Section 3 and the equations constructed in Section 4 can be can­combincd to write a single algebraic relation that precisely captures the question "Is there a cover of equation (3).

(3) Each vertex of \(P\) must satisfy condition (2) of Lemma 3.

The first check can be accomplished by computing the cross products of all edges of \(P\). The first check can be accomplished by computing the cross products of all edges of \(P\). Thus all these minimum covering (and partition) problems are decidable.

It should now be clear that the property that \(C\) is a cover for \(P\) can be expressed by a series of algebraic equations of the form (1), (2), or (3), coupled by the logical connectives and or. The check that no vertex of \(P\) should be inside any \(C\), can be made by slight modification of equation (3).

5.4 Tarski's Deduction Theorem

The bounds derived in Section 3 and the equations constructed in Section 4 can be combined to write a single algebraic relation that precisely captures the question "Is there a cover of \(P\) with \(K\) or fewer convex pieces?"

We know that each of the \(K\) pieces cannot have more than \(m = O(2^n)\) vertices. So set \(C\) to consist of \(C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_k\), where \(C = (C(1), \ldots, C(k))\). Thus the \(x\)'s and \(y\)'s are real variables. Now, using the particular integer coordinate vertices of the given \(P\), construct the equations that express the cover property for \(C\). Then the answer to the question is "Yes" if

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
| x_1 - y_1 | > | x_2 - y_2 | \quad \cdots \quad | x_3 - y_3 | > | x_3 - y_3 | \\
| x_2 - y_2 | > | x_3 - y_3 | \quad \cdots \quad | x_{n-1} - y_{n-1} | > | x_{n-1} - y_{n-1} | \\
| x_{n-1} - y_{n-1} | > | x_{n-2} - y_{n-2} | \quad \cdots \quad | x_{n-2} - y_{n-2} | > | x_{n-2} - y_{n-2} | \\
| x_{n-2} - y_{n-2} | > | x_{n-3} - y_{n-3} | \quad \cdots \quad | x_{n-3} - y_{n-3} | > | x_{n-3} - y_{n-3} | \\
| x_{n-3} - y_{n-3} | > | x_{n-4} - y_{n-4} | \quad \cdots \quad | x_{n-4} - y_{n-4} | > | x_{n-4} - y_{n-4} | \\
\end{array} \right.
\]

such that the equations are satisfied. The fact that there may be covers with less than \(K\) pieces or with pieces using less than \(n\) vertices clearly will not affect the validity of a cover of the size of \(C\).

Tarski developed a decision procedure for all first-order sentences of no free variables in the field of real numbers \[12\] \[11\]. The expression above is such a sentence, and is there­fore decidable by his procedure. The procedure eliminates quantifiers and reduces the sentence to a single polynomial relation of no variables, which is easily checked for validity. Modern algorithms, \[8\] \[4\] \[9\], can be expressed by a series of algebraic equations of the form (1), (2), or (3), coupled by the logical connectives and or.

Thus all these minimum covering (and partition) problems are decidable.

The current state of knowledge on the complexity of the various problems is displayed in the Table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polygon Class</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Cover</th>
<th>Partition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>multiply-connected</td>
<td>convex</td>
<td>(O(n^2))</td>
<td>(O(n^2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simply-connected</td>
<td>rectilinear, multiple-connected</td>
<td>(O(n))</td>
<td>(O(n))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convex</td>
<td>rectilinear</td>
<td>(O(n))</td>
<td>(O(n))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convex</td>
<td>rectangular</td>
<td>(O(n))</td>
<td>(O(n))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convex</td>
<td>(O(n))</td>
<td>(O(n))</td>
<td>(O(n))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is an outstanding open problem to determine whether a simply-connected polygon can be minimally covered in polynomial time, even when restricted to the rectilinear case. It would also be of interest to derive some restrictions on the class of convex pieces that are required in general minimum covers. For example, if the vertices of the original polygon have rational coordinates, are irrational coordinates ever required in a minimum cover?
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ABSTRACT

This paper presents an algorithm that constructs all Voronoi diagrams for k nearest neighbor searching simultaneously. Its space and time complexity of O(N log N) is shown to be optimal.

1. INTRODUCTION

In [4] Shamos and Hoey introduce the idea of generalized Voronoi diagrams to get an optimal solution of the k nearest neighbor problem and give an O(N log N) algorithm to construct the order one diagram. Lee ([2]) extends this to an algorithm, that computes an order k diagram in O(kN log N).

To answer k nearest neighbor queries with arbitrary k we now want to construct all Voronoi diagrams.

This paper presents a simple solution of this problem. The given algorithm has time and space complexity O(N log N) and is shown to be optimal. Its implementation is not very difficult and the constant factors for the complexity are expected to be quite good.