

A PTAS for vertex guarding weakly-visible polygons — An extended abstract

Matthew J. Katz¹

¹ Department of Computer Science, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev,
Beer-Sheva 84105, Israel;
matya@cs.bgu.ac.il.

Abstract

In this extended abstract, we present a PTAS for guarding the vertices of a weakly-visible polygon P from a subset of its vertices, or in other words, a PTAS for computing a minimum dominating set of the visibility graph of the vertices of P . We then show how to obtain a PTAS for vertex guarding P 's boundary.

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs...

1 Introduction

Let P be a polygon and let $e = (u, v)$ be one of its edges. We say that P is *weakly visible* from e , if every point in P is visible from a point on e . Notice that if the angles at u and at v are both convex, then $P \setminus e$ is contained in one of the open half planes defined by the line containing e . In this paper, we first consider an n -gon P , which is weakly visible from one of its edges $e = (u, v)$ where the angles at both u and v are convex. Without loss of generality, we assume that e is contained in the x -axis and that $P \setminus e$ is contained in the open half plane above the x -axis. We study the problem of guarding the vertices of P from a subset of its vertices. That is, we seek a minimum-cardinality subset Q of the vertices of P , such that for each vertex w of P there exists a vertex in Q that sees w . We present a PTAS for this problem, i.e., we present a polynomial-time algorithm that computes such a guarding set of size $O(1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, where OPT is the size of a minimum-cardinality such guarding set. We then show how to remove the assumption that the angles at both u and v are convex. Finally, we show how to obtain a PTAS for vertex guarding P 's boundary.

Our PTAS is a standard local search algorithm. Its proof is based on the observation that the, so called, *order claim*, which was originally stated for 1.5D terrains (see [1]), also holds for weakly visible polygons. We then adapt the proof of Krohn et al. [7], who presented a PTAS for vertex guarding the vertices of a 1.5D terrain, to our setting. The proof of Krohn et al. [7], in turn, is based on the proof scheme of Mustafa and Ray [8], which is used to show that a local search algorithm is a PTAS (see also [4]).

Related results. The most relevant results are due to Bhattacharya et al. [3], who presented a 4-approximation algorithm for vertex guarding the vertices of a weakly-visible polygon and a 6-approximation algorithm for vertex guarding such a polygon. Recently, by applying these results, Bhattacharya et al. [2] managed to obtain the first constant approximation algorithm for vertex guarding a simple polygon. By an inapproximability result of Eidenbenz et al. [5], this latter problem does not admit a PTAS, even if the goal is only to guard the polygon's boundary. Bhattacharya et al. [3] also showed that vertex guarding a weakly-visible polygon with holes does not admit a polynomial-time approximation algorithm with approximation ratio better than $((1 - \varepsilon)/12) \ln n$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$. As mentioned above, our main result builds on the result of Krohn et al. [7], who presented a PTAS for vertex guarding the vertices of a 1.5D terrain.



licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

LIPICs Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

2 Algorithm

Let V denote the set of vertices of P . Given $\varepsilon > 0$, set $k = \frac{\alpha}{\varepsilon^2}$, for an appropriate constant $\alpha > 0$.


1. $Q \leftarrow V$.
2. Determine whether there exist subsets $S \subseteq Q$ of size at most k and $S' \subseteq (V \setminus Q)$ of size at most $|S| - 1$, such that $(Q \setminus S) \cup S'$ guards V .
3. If such S and S' exist, set $Q \leftarrow (Q \setminus S) \cup S'$, and go back to Step 2. Otherwise, return Q .

As usual, the running time of the algorithm is $O(n^{O(1/\varepsilon^2)})$.

3 Analysis

For two points a and b on P 's boundary, $a \neq b$, we say that a precedes b (or b succeeds a) and write $a \prec b$ (or $b \succ a$), if when traversing P 's boundary clockwise from u , one reaches a before b .

We first observe that the following claim, which was formulated for 1.5D terrains and is known as the *order claim*, also holds for weakly visible polygons.




■ **Figure 1** A polygon weakly visible from $e = (u, v)$. The order claim: $a \prec b \prec c \prec d$, a sees c , b sees $d \implies a$ sees d .

► **Claim 1** ((Clockwise) order claim). *Let a, b, c, d be four vertices (or points on P 's boundary) such that $a \prec b \prec c \prec d$, and assume that a sees c and b sees d . Then a must also see d .*

Proof. If a does not see d , then either a or d is not visible from a point on e , see Figure 1. Let o denote the intersection point of \overline{ac} and \overline{bd} . If the ray from a in the direction of d hits P 's boundary before reaching d , then P 's boundary enters and leaves the triangle Δaod through the edge ad without intersecting the edges ao and od . If this happens before the boundary ‘reaches’ a (advancing clockwise from u), then a cannot be seen from e , and if this happens before the boundary ‘reaches’ d (advancing counterclockwise from v), then d cannot be seen from e . ◀

Let R (the red set) be a minimum-cardinality guarding set and let B (the blue set) be the guarding set obtained by the algorithm above. We need to prove that $|B| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot |R|$. We may assume that $R \cap B = \emptyset$; otherwise, we prove that $|B'| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot |R'|$, where $R' = R \setminus B$ and $B' = B \setminus R$. We construct a bipartite graph $G = (R \cup B, E)$, and prove that (i) G is

planar and (ii) G satisfies the *locality condition*, that is, for any vertex w , there exist vertices $r \in R$ and $b \in B$, such that r sees w , b sees w , and $(r, b) \in E$. By the proof scheme of Mustafa and Ray [8], this implies that $|B| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot |R|$.



■ **Figure 2** The sets R and B in red and blue, and vertices x, y, z of P and their corresponding λ -vertices in $R \cup B$.

For a vertex w of P , if there exists a vertex in $R \cup B$ that sees w and precedes it, then let $\lambda(w)$ be the first such vertex (i.e., when traversing the boundary clockwise from u); see Figure 2. Similarly, if there exists a vertex in $R \cup B$ that sees w and succeeds it, then let $\rho(w)$ be the last such vertex. Notice that since $R \cap B = \emptyset$ at least one of the two exists.

Constructing G . Let $A_1 = \{\overline{\lambda(w)w} \mid w \text{ a vertex of } P \text{ for which } \lambda(w) \text{ is defined}\}$.


► **Claim 2.** *The segments in A_1 are non-crossing.*

Proof. Let $\overline{\lambda(x)x}$ and $\overline{\lambda(y)y}$ be two segments in A_1 , such that $\lambda(x) \neq \lambda(y)$. Assume, w.l.o.g., that $\lambda(x) \prec \lambda(y)$. We first notice that it is impossible that $\lambda(x) \prec \lambda(y) \prec x \prec y$, since by the order claim, this would imply that $\lambda(x)$ sees y , which is impossible by the definition of $\lambda(y)$. Therefore, either (i) $\lambda(x) \prec \lambda(y) \prec y \prec x$, or (ii) $\lambda(x) \prec x \prec \lambda(y) \prec y$. But, clearly, in both these cases the two segments cannot cross each other, even if the polygon is not weakly visible. ◀

For each vertex $x \in R \cup B$, do the following. If $\lambda(x)$ is defined and $\text{color}(\lambda(x)) \neq \text{color}(x)$, add the edge $(\lambda(x), x)$ to E_1 . If there exists a segment $\overline{ab} \in A_1$, such that $a \prec x \prec b$, then let $\overline{\lambda(w)w} \in A_1$ be the sole such segment that can be reached from x without existing P and without intersecting any other segment in A_1 (except possibly at x). Now, if $\text{color}(\lambda(w)) \neq \text{color}(x)$, add the edge $(\lambda(w), x)$ to E_1 .

3.1 G is planar

We now prove that the bipartite graph $G_1 = (R \cup B, E_1)$ is planar, by describing an embedding of G_1 or, more precisely, of the graph $\overline{G}_1 = (V, A_1 \cup E_1)$. Let C be the unit circle centered at the origin. We map the vertices in V to equally-spaced points on C and the edges in $A_1 \cup E_1$ to line segments between pairs of points, see Figure 3. We claim that the resulting set of line segments is non-crossing, i.e., we have obtained an embedding of \overline{G}_1 and therefore also of G_1 . This follows from Claim 2 and by observing that the edges in $E_1 \setminus A_1$ can be partitioned into a collection of ‘fans’, where each fan is associated with a segment $\overline{\lambda(w)w}$ of A_1 and lies to its left (when traversing the segment from $\lambda(w)$ to w).



■ **Figure 3** Left: The dashed segments, including the two marked edges of P , are the segments in A_1 . The segments in A_1 that are added to E_1 are drawn in orange. The dotted curves connect w_4 , w_6 , and w_8 to their corresponding segments in A_1 , but only the one connecting w_6 induces an edge in E_1 and is therefore drawn in orange. Right: The embedding of $\bar{G}_1 = (V, A_1 \cup E_1)$.

We now define the sets A_2 and E_2 by replacing λ with ρ , that is, $A_2 = \{\overline{w\rho(w)} \mid w \text{ a vertex of } P \text{ for which } \rho(w) \text{ is defined}\}$ and E_2 is defined w.r.t. A_2 . We then observe that the bipartite graph $G_2 = (R \cup B, E_2)$ is planar, by describing an embedding of $\bar{G}_2 = (V, A_2 \cup E_2)$. Moreover, we claim that the graph $G_1 \cup G_2$ is planar, since we can embed the graph $\bar{G}_1 \cup \bar{G}_2$ by drawing the edges of \bar{G}_1 inside C and the edges of \bar{G}_2 outside C .

Finally, we define the set E_3 as follows. For each vertex $x \notin R \cup B$, if both $\lambda(x)$ and $\rho(x)$ are defined and $\text{color}(\lambda(x)) \neq \text{color}(\rho(x))$, then add the edge $(\lambda(x), \rho(x))$ to E_3 . The final graph $G = (R \cup B, E)$ where $E = E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3$ is planar, since $\bar{G}_1 \cup \bar{G}_2$ is planar and each edge $(\lambda(x), \rho(x)) \in E_3$ can be drawn as the union of the segments $\overline{\lambda(x)x} \in A_1$ and $x\rho(x) \in A_2$.

3.2 G satisfies the locality condition

We prove that the locality condition holds.


► **Lemma 3.** *For any vertex $w \in V$, there exist vertices $r \in R$ and $b \in B$, such that r sees w , b sees w , and $(r, b) \in E$.*

Proof. Let x be a vertex of P . We distinguish between two cases:

$x \notin R \cup B$: If both $\lambda(x)$ and $\rho(x)$ are defined and $\text{color}(\lambda(x)) \neq \text{color}(\rho(x))$, then $(\lambda(x), \rho(x)) \in E_3$ and the condition holds. If both $\lambda(x)$ and $\rho(x)$ are defined but $\text{color}(\lambda(x)) = \text{color}(\rho(x))$, then there exists a vertex $w \in R \cup B$, such that w sees x and $\text{color}(w) \neq \text{color}(\lambda(x)), \text{color}(\rho(x))$. Assume, w.l.o.g., that $\lambda(x) \prec w \prec x$ and let z be the first such vertex (when traversing P 's boundary clockwise from u). Let $(\lambda(y), y)$ be the segment in A_1 associated with z . Then $\lambda(x) \preceq \lambda(y) \prec z \prec y \preceq x$. Notice the $\lambda(y)$ sees x , since if $y \neq x$, then by the order claim (applied to $\lambda(y), z, y, x$) $\lambda(y)$ sees x , and if $y = x$, then $\lambda(y) = \lambda(x)$ so $\lambda(y)$ sees x . Now, since z is the “first such vertex”, $\text{color}(z) \neq \text{color}(\lambda(y))$, so the edge $(\lambda(y), z) \in E_1$ and the condition holds. If only $\lambda(x)$ is defined, then we proceed as above.

$x \in R \cup B$: If $\lambda(x)$ is defined and $\text{color}(x) \neq \text{color}(\lambda(x))$, then $(\lambda(x), x) \in E_1$ and the condition holds. Similarly, if $\rho(x)$ is defined and $\text{color}(x) \neq \text{color}(\rho(x))$, then $(x, \rho(x)) \in E_2$ and the condition holds. Otherwise, we conclude w.l.o.g. that there exists a vertex $w \in R \cup B$, such that w sees x and $\lambda(x) \prec w \prec x$ and $\text{color}(w) \neq \text{color}(\lambda(x))$. Let z be the first such vertex (when traversing P 's boundary clockwise from u), and proceed exactly as in the previous case.

4 Extensions



■ **Figure 4** Removing the convexity assumption.

Removing the convexity assumption. We show how to remove the assumption that the angles at u and at v are convex. Assume, e.g., that the angle at u is concave, and let a be the first point on P 's boundary (moving clockwise from u) that lies on the x -axis; see Figure 4. Then, every point in the open portion of the boundary between u and a is visible from u and is not visible from any other point on the edge $e = (u, v)$. Moreover, by the order claim, for any vertex w in this portion of P 's boundary, if w sees some point on P 's boundary, then so does u . Therefore, we may assume that an optimal guarding set does not include a vertex from this portion. Now, let w_a be the first vertex following a . We place a guard at u and replace the portion of P 's boundary between u and w_a by the edge (u, w_a) . Similarly, if the angle at v is concave, we define the point b and the vertex w_b (by moving counterclockwise from v), place a guard at v , and replace the portion of P 's boundary between v and w_b by the edge (v, w_b) . Finally, we apply our local search algorithm to the resulting polygon P' , after adjusting k so that together with u and v we still get a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation of an optimal guarding set for P .

Guarding the polygon's boundary from its vertices. In this paragraph we continue to assume that the angles at u and v are convex. We have described a PTAS for vertex guarding the vertices of P , however, with minor modifications, one can obtain a PTAS for vertex guarding a polynomial-size set W of points on P 's boundary. To obtain a PTAS for vertex guarding the polygon's boundary, we generate a polynomial-size set of *witness* points W on P 's boundary, such that any subset of vertices that guards W , guards the entire boundary. This is done using ideas similar to those used in Friedrichs et al. [6], who did it for 1.5D terrains.

Concluding remarks. It would be interesting to find other families of polygons for which a PTAS exists for vertex guarding the polygon's set of vertices (or its boundary or its boundary plus interior). In particular, does there exist a PTAS for vertex guarding the vertices of a simple polygon? Finally, it would be interesting to examine whether our results can be used to improve the constants of approximation obtained by Bhattacharya et al. [3] for vertex guarding a weakly-visible polygon and by Bhattacharya et al. [2] for the three versions of vertex guarding a simple polygon.

Acknowledgment. We wish to thank Nandhana Duraisamy, Ramesh Kumar, Anil Maheshwari, and Subhas Nandy for pointing out an error in Section 4 (Extensions) of the

previous version of this manuscript.

References

- 1 B. Ben-Moshe, M. J. Katz, and J. S. B. Mitchell. A constant-factor approximation algorithm for optimal 1.5D terrain guarding. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 36(6):1631–1647, 2007.
- 2 P. Bhattacharya, S. K. Ghosh, and S. P. Pal. Constant approximation algorithms for guarding simple polygons using vertex guards. *CoRR*, abs/1712.05492, 2017.
- 3 P. Bhattacharya, S. K. Ghosh, and B. Roy. Approximability of guarding weak visibility polygons. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 228:109–129, 2017.
- 4 T. M. Chan and S. Har-Peled. Approximation algorithms for maximum independent set of pseudo-disks. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 48(2):373–392, 2012.
- 5 S. Eidenbenz, C. Stamm, and P. Widmayer. Inapproximability results for guarding polygons and terrains. *Algorithmica*, 31(1):79–113, 2001.
- 6 S. Friedrichs, M. Hemmer, J. King, and C. Schmidt. The continuous 1.5D terrain guarding problem: Discretization, optimal solutions, and PTAS. *JoCG*, 7(1):256–284, 2016.
- 7 E. Krohn, M. Gibson, G. Kanade, and K. R. Varadarajan. Guarding terrains via local search. *JoCG*, 5(1):168–178, 2014.
- 8 N. H. Mustafa and S. Ray. PTAS for geometric hitting set problems via local search. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM Symposium on Computational Geometry, Aarhus, Denmark, June 8-10, 2009*, pages 17–22, 2009.