

Online Geometric Covering and Piercing*

Minati De^{†1}, Saksham Jain¹, Sarat Varma Kallepalli¹, and Satyam Singh^{*†1}

¹Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, India,
{minati,satyam.singh*}@maths.iitd.ac.in, sakshampv@gmail.com,
saratvarmakallepalli@gmail.com

July 4, 2024

Abstract

We consider the online version of the piercing set problem, where geometric objects arrive one by one, and the online algorithm must maintain a valid piercing set for the already arrived objects by making irrevocable decisions. It is easy to observe that any deterministic algorithm solving this problem for intervals in \mathbb{R} has a competitive ratio of at least $\Omega(n)$. This paper considers the piercing set problem for similarly sized objects. We propose a deterministic online algorithm for similarly sized fat objects in \mathbb{R}^d . For homothetic hypercubes in \mathbb{R}^d with side length in the range $[1, k]$, we propose a deterministic algorithm having a competitive ratio of at most $3^d \lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 2^d$. In the end, we show deterministic lower bounds of the competitive ratio for similarly sized α -fat objects in \mathbb{R}^2 and homothetic hypercubes in \mathbb{R}^d . Note that piercing translated copies of a convex object is equivalent to the unit covering problem, which is well-studied in the online setup. Surprisingly, no upper bound of the competitive ratio was known for the unit covering problem when the corresponding object is anything other than a ball or a hypercube. Our result yields an upper bound of the competitive ratio for the unit covering problem when the corresponding object is any convex object in \mathbb{R}^d .

Keywords. Competitive ratio, Fat objects, Geometric objects, Online algorithm, Piercing set problem, Unit covering problem.

1 Introduction

Piercing is one of the most important problems in computational geometry. A set $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ of points is defined as a *piercing set* for a set \mathcal{S} of geometric objects in \mathbb{R}^d if each object in \mathcal{S} contains at least one point from \mathcal{P} . Given a set \mathcal{S} of objects, the problem is to find a piercing set \mathcal{P} of the minimum cardinality.

In this paper, we study the *online version* of the problem in which geometric objects arrive one by one, and the online algorithm needs to maintain a valid piercing set for the already arrived objects. Once a new geometric object σ arrives, the online algorithm needs to place a point $p \in \sigma$ if the existing piercing set does not already pierce it. Note that an online algorithm may add points to the piercing set but cannot remove points from it, i.e., the online algorithm needs to make irrevocable decisions. The goal of the problem is to minimize the cardinality of the piercing set. We analyze the quality of our online algorithm by competitive analysis [5]. The *competitive ratio* of an online algorithm is $\sup_{\beta} \frac{A_{\beta}}{O_{\beta}}$, where β is an input sequence, and O_{β} and A_{β} are the cost of the solution produced by an optimal offline algorithm and the online algorithm, respectively, for the input sequence β . Here, the supremum is taken over all possible input sequences β .

*Preliminary version of this paper has appeared in the proceedings of the 42nd IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS), 2022 [11].

[†]Partially supported by SERB-MATRICS grant MTR/2021/000584.

[‡]Supported by CSIR (File Number-09/086(1429)/2019-EMR-1).

*Corresponding author

An application in wireless networks inspires the online version of this problem [19]. Here, the points model base stations and the centers of objects model clients. The reception range of each client has some geometric shape (e.g., disks, hexagons, etc.). The algorithm must place a base station serving a new uncovered client. Since installing the base station is expensive, the overall goal is to place the minimum number of base stations.

1.1 Related Work

In the offline setting, the piercing set problem is a well-studied problem [8, 18, 24]. For one-dimensional intervals, a minimum piercing set can be found in $O(n \log c)$ time, where n is the number of one-dimensional intervals and c is the size of a minimum piercing set [26]. On the other hand, computing a minimum piercing set is NP-complete for unit squares [22]. Chan [8] proposed a polynomial-time approximation scheme for α -fat convex objects. Though the piercing set problem is well-studied in the offline setup, surprisingly, there is a lack of study for this problem in other models. Katz et al. [24] studied this problem for one-dimensional intervals in the dynamic setup. In this setup, the object can arrive as well as depart, but unlike the online model, here, the decisions can be reverted. For a set \mathcal{S} of intervals in \mathbb{R} , they proposed a linear-size dynamic data structure that allows computing a new minimum piercing set in $O(c(\mathcal{S}) \log |\mathcal{S}|)$ time per insertion or deletion, where $c(\mathcal{S})$ is the size of a minimum piercing set for \mathcal{S} .

The set cover and hitting set problems are closely related to the piercing set problem. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of elements, and let \mathcal{S} be a family of subsets of \mathcal{P} . A *set cover* is a subset $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ such that the union of sets in \mathcal{C} covers all elements of \mathcal{P} and a *hitting set* is a collection of points $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ such that the set \mathcal{H} intersects every set s in \mathcal{S} . The set cover (respectively, hitting set) problem aims to find a set cover \mathcal{C} (respectively, hitting set \mathcal{H}) of the minimum cardinality. If $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{R}^d$ and \mathcal{S} is a family of objects in \mathbb{R}^d , then the corresponding hitting set problem is the same as the piercing set problem. It is well known that a set cover of the tuple $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S})$ is a hitting set of the tuple $(\mathcal{P}^\perp, \mathcal{S}^\perp)$ [1]. Here, for each set $s \in \mathcal{S}$ there is an element in \mathcal{P}^\perp and for each element $p \in \mathcal{P}$ there is a set s_p , namely, $s_p = \{s \in \mathcal{S} \mid p \in s\}$, in \mathcal{S}^\perp . In the offline setup, if $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and the set \mathcal{S} consists of intervals in \mathbb{R} , the set cover problem can be solved in polynomial time. However, both the set cover and hitting set problems are NP-hard, when \mathcal{S} consists of simple geometric objects like unit disks in \mathbb{R}^2 and $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ [20]. Alon et al. [2] initiated the study of the online set cover problem. In their model, the finite sets \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{S} are already known. However, the order of arrival of points from the set \mathcal{P} is unknown. Upon the arrival of an uncovered point in \mathcal{P} , the online algorithm must choose a set $s \in \mathcal{S}$ that covers the point. The algorithm presented by Alon et al. [2] has a competitive ratio of $O(\log n \log m)$, where $|\mathcal{P}| = n$ and $|\mathcal{S}| = m$. Recently, in the same model, Khan et al. [25] proposed an algorithm having an optimal competitive ratio of $\Theta(\log n)$ for the set cover problem when \mathcal{S} consists of homothetic (translated and scaled) squares and \mathcal{P} consists of n points in \mathbb{R}^2 . Even and Smorodinsky [19] studied the online hitting set problem, where both sets \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{S} are known in advance, but the order of the arrival of input objects in \mathcal{S} is unknown. In this model, they proposed an algorithm having an optimal competitive ratio of $\Theta(\log n)$ for intervals, half-planes or unit disks, where n is the cardinality of the set \mathcal{S} . Recently, Khan et al. [25] studied the hitting set problem, where for a given positive integer N , the point set \mathcal{P} is a subset of integral points from $[0, N]^2$ and \mathcal{S} consists of axis-parallel squares in \mathbb{R}^2 whose vertices are from $[0, N]^2$. They obtained an optimal $\Theta(\log N)$ -competitive algorithm for this variant. Extending the result of Even and Smorodinsky [19], recently, De et al. [12] studied the set cover (respectively, hitting set) problem in an online model where only the set \mathcal{S} (respectively, \mathcal{P}) is known in advance. The set \mathcal{P} (respectively, \mathcal{S}) is unknown a priori, and the elements of the set \mathcal{P} (respectively, \mathcal{S}) are revealed one after another. In this model, they propose an optimal $\Theta(\log n)$ -competitive algorithm when objects in \mathcal{S} are translated copies of a regular k -gon ($k \geq 4$) or a disk, and \mathcal{P} consists of points in \mathbb{R}^2 . When $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{Z}^d$ and \mathcal{S} is a family of geometric objects in \mathbb{R}^d , the corresponding online hitting set problem is studied in [13].

A related problem is the *unit covering* problem (a special variant of the set cover problem), where \mathcal{P} is a set of points, and the set \mathcal{S} consists of all (infinite) possible translated copies of a given object s . Note that when the object s is convex, the unit covering problem is equivalent to the special case of the piercing set problem, where objects are translated copies of a convex object $-s$ (see Section 2.2). In the online version of the unit covering problem, the set \mathcal{S} is not known in advance. Charikar et al. [10] studied the online version of the unit covering problem, where $s \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a unit ball. They proposed an online algorithm having a competitive ratio of $O(2^d d \log d)$. They also proved $\Omega(\log d / \log \log \log d)$ as the deterministic lower bound

of the competitive ratio for this problem. Dumitrescu et al. [16] improved both the upper and lower bounds of the competitive ratio to $O(1.321^d)$ and $\Omega(d+1)$, respectively. When $s \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a centrally symmetric convex object, they proved that the competitive ratio of every deterministic online algorithm is at least $I(s)$, where $I(s)$ is the illumination number (for definition, see Section 2) of the object s . Recently, Dumitrescu and Tóth [17] proved that the competitive ratio of any deterministic online algorithm for the unit covering problem is at least 2^d when $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{R}^d$ and s is a hypercube in \mathbb{R}^d . Surprisingly, we did not find any upper bound of the competitive ratio when s is anything other than a ball or a hypercube. In this paper, we raise this question and obtain a very general upper bound for the same.

Another relevant problem is the *chasing convex objects*, initiated by Friedman and Linial [21]. Here, similar to the piercing set problem, convex object σ_i arrives at time i , and the online algorithm needs to place a piercing point $p_i \in \sigma_i$, and it pays a cost of the distance between the currently placed point p_i and the last placed point p_{i-1} , i.e., $d(p_i, p_{i-1})$. Note that the objective of this problem is different from the piercing set problem. Here, the aim is to minimize the total distances between successive piercing points $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} d(p_i, p_{i+1})$, where n is the number of input objects. Friedman and Linial [21] proved that no deterministic online algorithm could achieve a competitive ratio better than \sqrt{d} for chasing convex objects in \mathbb{R}^d . They gave an online algorithm with a competitive ratio of at most $9\sqrt{2} + 5\sqrt{10}$ for chasing lines in \mathbb{R}^2 . Later, Bienkowski et al. [4] improved this result by presenting an algorithm with a competitive ratio of at most 3 for chasing lines in \mathbb{R}^d . Bubeck et al. [7] presented an online algorithm with a competitive ratio of $2^{O(d)}$ for chasing convex objects in \mathbb{R}^d . Parallel to this, Bubeck et al. [6] presented an online algorithm having competitive ratio of $O(\min(d, \sqrt{d \log n}))$ when convex objects in \mathbb{R}^d are nested. Later, Sellke [28] and Argue et al. [3] independently improved the result by showing that there exists an online algorithm having a competitive ratio of $O(\sqrt{d \log n})$ and $O(\min(d, \sqrt{d \log n}))$, respectively, for chasing convex objects in \mathbb{R}^d .

1.2 Our Contributions

First, we observe that the competitive ratio of every deterministic online algorithm for piercing intervals in \mathbb{R} is at least $\Omega(n)$, where n is the length of the input sequence. (Theorem 1). Next, we show that piercing translated copies of a convex object is equivalent to the unit covering problem (Theorem 2). As an implication, all the results available in the literature [9, 10, 16, 17] for the online unit covering problem using translates of a convex object would carry forward to the piercing set problem for translates of a convex object. As a result, due to [16], for translates of a centrally symmetric convex object C , the competitive ratio of any deterministic online algorithm is at least the illumination number of the object C (Theorem 3).

Next, we ask what would happen when objects are similarly sized. We consider similarly sized fat objects. For our purpose, we define α -fat and α -aspect $_{\infty}$ fat objects in Section 2.3. For α -fat objects, the value of α is invariant under translation, rotation, reflection and scaling, whereas for α -aspect $_{\infty}$ fat objects, the value of α is invariant under translation, reflection and scaling. For any object in \mathbb{R}^d , the value of α is in the interval $(0, 1]$.

To obtain an upper bound, we consider a well-studied [16, 17] algorithm, ALGORITHM-CENTER, that works as follows. On receiving a new input object σ , if the existing piercing set does not pierce it, our online algorithm adds the center of σ to the piercing set. For a hypercube σ , a point in σ is a *center* from which the maximum distance from any point of σ is minimized. For α -fat and α -aspect $_{\infty}$ fat objects, a generalized definition of the center is given in Section 2.3. We refer to Section 2.3 for the definition of the width of a fat object.

1. First, we prove that for piercing similarly sized α -aspect $_{\infty}$ fat objects in \mathbb{R}^d , having width in the range $[1, k]$, ALGORITHM-CENTER achieves a competitive ratio of at most $\left(\left[2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \right]^d - \left[\frac{2}{\alpha} \right]^d \right) \left\lceil \log_{1+\alpha} \left(\frac{2k}{\alpha} \right) \right\rceil + 1$ (Theorem 4).
2. Next, we show that for piercing similarly sized α -fat objects in \mathbb{R}^3 , having width in the range $[1, k]$, ALGORITHM-CENTER achieves a competitive ratio of at most $\left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sin(\theta/2)} \right)^3 - 1 \right) \left\lceil \log_{1+x} \left(\frac{2k}{\alpha} \right) \right\rceil + 1$, where $\theta = \frac{1}{2} \cos^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1+\sqrt{1+4\alpha^2}} \right)$ and $x = \frac{\sqrt{1+4\alpha^2}-1}{2}$ (Theorem 5). We achieve a similar result for piercing similarly sized α -fat objects in \mathbb{R}^2 having width in the range $[1, k]$ (Theorem 6).

3. Then, for piercing homothetic hypercubes in \mathbb{R}^d , having side length in the range $[1, k]$, we propose an algorithm, ALGORITHM-VERTEX, that achieves a competitive ratio of at most $3^d \lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 2^d$ (Theorem 7).
4. Next, we consider the lower bound for the problem. We prove that the competitive ratio of every deterministic online algorithm for piercing similarly sized α -fat objects in \mathbb{R}^2 , having width in the range $[1, k]$, is at least $\left\lceil \log_{\frac{2+\epsilon}{\alpha}}(k) \right\rceil + 1$, where $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ is a sufficiently small constant close to 0 (Theorem 8).
5. Later, generalizing this lower bound result to higher dimensions, we show that the competitive ratio of every deterministic online algorithm for piercing homothetic hypercubes in \mathbb{R}^d , having side length in the range $[1, k]$, is at least $d \left\lceil \log_{(2+\epsilon)^2} k \right\rceil + 2^d$, where $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ is a sufficiently small constant close to 0 (Theorem 9).

1.3 Organization

The paper is organized as follows. First, we give some relevant definitions and preliminaries in Section 2. The relationship between the unit covering and the unit piercing problem is discussed in Section 2.2. Definitions related to the fat object are given in Section 2.3. We present all the upper bound related results in Section 3. All the lower bound related results are in Section 4. Finally, in Section 5, we give a conclusion.

2 Preliminaries

We use \mathbb{Z}^+ and \mathbb{R}^+ to denote the set of positive integers and positive real numbers. For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we use $[n]$ to denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For any $i \in [d]$, the i th coordinate of a point $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by $p(x_i)$. If not explicitly mentioned, we use the term *object* to denote a compact set in \mathbb{R}^d with a nonempty interior. The interior of an object σ is denoted by $\text{int}(\sigma)$. A set \mathcal{S} of objects is said to be *similarly sized* if the ratio of the largest diameter of an object in \mathcal{S} to the smallest diameter of an object in \mathcal{S} is bounded by a fixed constant. Any set of the form $\lambda\sigma + x = \{\lambda c + x \mid c \in \sigma\}$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$, is called a *homothetic copy* of σ . A set \mathcal{S} of objects is said to be *homothetic* if each object $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ is a homothetic copy of every other object $\sigma' \in \mathcal{S}$. The *illumination number* of an object σ , denoted by $I(\sigma)$, is the minimum number of smaller homothetic copies ($\lambda < 1$) of σ whose union contains σ [27]. A point y' is a *reflection of a point y* in a plane over a point x if the midpoint of the line segment $\overline{yy'}$ is x . Now, we define the *reflection of an object σ* over a point $c \in \mathbb{R}^d$, denoted by $-\sigma(c)$, as $-\sigma(c) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \frac{x+y}{2} = c \text{ and } x \in \sigma\} = \{2c - x \mid x \in \sigma\}$ (see Figure 1). Note that for any $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $-\sigma(c_1) = -\sigma(c_2) + \tau$, where $\tau = 2(c_1 - c_2)$ is a translating vector. We use $-\sigma$ to denote a translated copy of $-\sigma(c)$. An object is considered *centrally symmetric* if there exists a point $c \in \sigma$ such that $\sigma = -\sigma(c)$.

Let x and y be any two points in \mathbb{R}^d . We use $d(x, y)$ (respectively, $d_\infty(x, y)$) to denote the distance between x and y under the L_2 (respectively, L_∞) norm. Let C be a convex object containing the origin in its interior. We translate C by vector x and consider the ray from x through y . Let v denote the unique point on the boundary of C hit by this ray. The function $d_C(x, y)$, induced by the object C , is defined as $d_C(x, y) = \frac{d(x, y)}{d(x, v)}$ [23]. Note that the function d_C is a metric (distance function) when C is a centrally symmetric convex object, and in general, the following property is well-known.

Property 1. *Let C be any convex object and x, y be any two points in \mathbb{R}^d . Then, $d_C(x, y) = d_{-C}(y, x)$.*

2.1 Lower Bound

First, we observe that the competitive ratio of the piercing set problem has a pessimistic lower bound of $\Omega(n)$, for one-dimensional intervals.

Theorem 1. *The competitive ratio of every deterministic online algorithm for piercing intervals in \mathbb{R} is at least $\Omega(n)$, where n is the length of the input sequence.*




Figure 1: Reflection of an object σ through the point o .

Proof. Let σ_1 be the first interval presented by the adversary to the online algorithm. Let p_1 be a point placed by the online algorithm to pierce the interval σ_1 . The point p_1 partitions the interval σ_1 into two parts, of which, let σ_1^L be a larger part that does not contain the point p_1 . Now, the adversary can place an interval σ_2 completely contained in σ_1^L . For the new interval σ_2 , any online algorithm needs a new piercing point p_2 . Now again, one can define a partition σ_2^L of σ_2 depending on the position of the point p_2 such that σ_2^L does not contain p_2 , and the adversary will place an interval σ_3 completely contained in σ_2^L . In this way, the adversary can adaptively construct n intervals for which any online algorithm needs n distinct points to pierce, while an offline optimum needs only one point. Hence, the lower bound of the competitive ratio is $\Omega(n)$. \square

2.2 Unit Covering vs Unit Piercing

Definition 1 (Unit Piercing Problem). *For any $d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, given a family \mathcal{S} of translated copies of a convex object $C \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, in the unit piercing problem, we need to pierce each object in \mathcal{S} by placing the minimum number of points in \mathbb{R}^d .*

Definition 2 (Unit Covering Problem). *For any $d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, given a set of points $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, in the unit covering problem, we need to place the minimum number of translated copies of a convex object $-C \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ to cover all the points in \mathcal{P} .*

The following theorem connects the above two problems.

Theorem 2. *The unit piercing problem is equivalent to the unit covering problem.*

To prove this, first, we demonstrate the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let x and y be any two points in \mathbb{R}^d . Then x lies in $y + C$ if and only if y lies in $x + (-C)$.*

Proof. If x lies in $y + C$, then $d_C(y, x) \leq 1$. Due to Property 1, $d_{-C}(x, y) = d_C(y, x) \leq 1$. Therefore, y lies in $x + (-C)$. Similarly, one can prove the converse. Hence, the lemma follows. An alternative geometry-based proof is as follows. Let x lies in $y + C$. Note that x lies in $y + C$ if and only if $x - y$ lies in C if and only if $y - x$ lies in $-C$ if and only if y lies in $x + (-C)$. The first and third equivalences are easy to follow; the second equivalence follows by reflecting on the origin. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. For the unit piercing problem, let us assume that each unit object in \mathcal{S} is a translated copy of $C \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Due to Lemma 1, we know that some point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ pierces an object $y + C$ if and only if the object $x + (-C)$ covers the point y . Thus, we can convert this problem to an equivalent unit covering problem, where the set \mathcal{P} of points are the center of all the objects in \mathcal{S} , and we need to cover them by translates of $(-C)$. In a similar fashion, one can prove the other side of the equivalence. \square

As a consequence of Theorem 2, all the results related to the online unit covering problem (summarized in Table 1) studied in [9, 10, 16, 17] are carried for the online piercing problem. Specifically, due to [16, Theorem 4], we have the following lower bound result for centrally symmetric convex objects. A proof adapted from [ibid.], which might be of independent interest, is given for the sake of completeness.




Figure 2: (a) A centrally symmetric convex object $C + v_{i-1}$ (colored yellow) contains points c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{i-1} . Note that $(1 + \epsilon_{i-1})C + v_{i-1}$ is ϵ_{i-1} -neighbourhood of $C + v_{i-1}$. The distance $d_C(q, x) < \epsilon_{i-1}$, where $q \in \text{int}((1 + \epsilon_{i-1})C + v_{i-1})$ and $x \in \text{int}(C + v_{i-1})$. The translate $C + v_{i-1} + v_{xq}$ (in dotted lines) contains c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{i-1} and q . (b) Cyan colored region, denotes the intersection region A , i.e., $\cap_{k=1}^{i-1} \sigma_k$.

Theorem 3. *The competitive ratio of every deterministic online algorithm for piercing a set of translated copies of a centrally symmetric convex object C is at least $I(C)$, where $I(C)$ denotes the illumination number of C .*

Proof. To prove the lower bound, we can think of a game between Alice and Bob. Here, Alice plays the role of the adversary, and Bob plays the part of the online algorithm. Alice presents a translated copy σ_i of C to Bob, and Bob needs to place a piercing point p_i to pierce σ_i if some previously placed piercing points do not already pierce it, for $i \in [I(C)]$. We claim that Alice can find an object σ_i centered at c_i such that the following invariants hold.

- (I) The object σ_i is not pierced by any of the previously placed piercing point p_j , where $j \in [i - 1]$.
- (II) The set of objects $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_i\}$ can be pierced by a single point. In other words, $\bigcap_{k=1}^i \sigma_k \neq \emptyset$.

Invariant (I) implies that Bob is forced to place $I(C)$ many piercing points, while invariant (II) ensures that the set of objects $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_i\}$ can be pierced by a single point. Consequently, an offline optimum needs just one piercing point, while any online algorithm needs $I(C)$ many piercing points to pierce $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{I(C)}$. Hence, the competitive ratio of any deterministic online algorithm is at least $I(C)$. We prove this claim by induction on i . For $i = 1$, both invariants (I) and (II) trivially hold (Base case). For $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, I(C) - 1\}$, assume that both invariants hold (Induction hypothesis). Now it is enough to show that Alice can find an object σ_i centered at c_i such that both invariants hold for $i = I(C)$.

Claim 1. *Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{i-1}$ be translated copies of a centrally symmetric convex object C , centered at c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{i-1} , respectively. Here, $\bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} \sigma_j$ is nonempty if and only if there exists a translating vector v_{i-1} such that $C + v_{i-1}$ contains all the centers c_1, \dots, c_{i-1} .*

Proof. Let us assume that $\bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} \sigma_j$ is nonempty, and let x be any point in $\bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} \sigma_j$ (see Figure 2b). For each $j \in [i - 1]$, the d_C distance of x to all centers c_j is less than one, i.e., $d_C(x, c_j) < 1$. Therefore, a translate of C , centered at x , will contain all the centers c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{i-1} of the objects $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{i-1}$, respectively. For the converse, let us assume that a translate of C (say $C + v_{i-1}$), centered at c , contains all the centers c_1, \dots, c_{i-1} . Here, for each $j \in [i - 1]$, $d_C(c, c_j)$ is less than one. Since C is a centrally symmetric object, for each $j \in [i - 1]$, $d_C(c_j, c)$ is also less than one. As a result, the point c lies in σ_j , for each $j \in [i - 1]$. Therefore, $\bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} \sigma_j$ is nonempty. \square

Let $C + v_{i-1}$ be a translate of C containing all the centers c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{i-1} . Let ϵ_{i-1} be the largest value such that translates of $\epsilon_{i-1}C$ centered at c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{i-1} are contained in $C + v_{i-1}$, where $v_{i-1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a translation vector (see Figure 2a). Note that $(1 + \epsilon_{i-1})C + v_{i-1}$ is the ϵ_{i-1} -neighbourhood of $C + v_{i-1}$ in the L_C norm.

Since p_j is a piercing point for σ_j , the d_C distance between the center c_j and the piercing point p_j for the object σ_j is at most one, i.e., $d_C(c_j, p_j) \leq 1$, for each $j \in [i-1]$. Since $d_C(p_j, c_j) \leq 1$, so all the piercing points p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{i-1} are going to lie in the C -neighbourhood of C (see Figure 2a).

Claim 2. *Let P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{i-1} be translates of C , centered at p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{i-1} , respectively. Then $\cup_{j=1}^{i-1} P_j$ will not entirely cover $(1 + \epsilon_{i-1})C + v_{i-1}$.*

Proof. If $\cup_{j=1}^{i-1} P_j$ covers the entire region $(1 + \epsilon_{i-1})C + v_{i-1}$, then it contradicts the definition of illumination number. \square

Due to Claim 2, we can place a point c_i (center of the object σ_i) in $\text{int}((1 + \epsilon_{i-1})C + v_{i-1})$ such that $d_C(p_j, c_i) > 1$, for all $j \in [i-1]$. Now, if we can show that some translate of C covers c_i along with all the previous c_j 's, where $j \in [i-1]$, then we are done.

Claim 3. *For any point $q \in (1 + \epsilon_{i-1})C + v_{i-1}$, there exists some translate of C (say σ_{new}) such that the interior of σ_{new} contains all centers $\{c_1, \dots, c_{i-1}, q\}$.*

Proof. If $q \in \text{int}(C + v_{i-1})$ (colored yellow, see Figure 2a), then $C + v_{i-1}$ contains all the previous centers c_1, \dots, c_{i-1} as well as q . Without loss of generality, assume that q lies in the annular region $\text{int}((1 + \epsilon_{i-1})C + v_{i-1}) \setminus \text{int}(C + v_{i-1})$ (colored blue, see Figure 2a). It is easy to see that there exists a point $x \in \text{int}(C + v_{i-1})$ such that the vector $v_{xq} = q - x$ is less than ϵ_{i-1} (under the L_C norm). Note that $q \in \text{int}(C + v_{i-1} + v_{xq})$ (see Figure 2a).

By choice of $\epsilon_{i-1} > 0$, the d_C distance between the points c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{i-1} and $\partial(C + v_{i-1})$ is at least ϵ_{i-1} , and v_{xq} is also less than ϵ_{i-1} . It implies that the $\text{int}(C + v_{i-1} + v_{xq})$ contains the centers c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{i-1} as well as q . \square

By the above Claim 3, one can find a translate of C such that it covers the point c_i along with all the previous points c_j , where $j \in [i-1]$. From Claim 1, $\cap_{j=1}^i \sigma_j$ is also nonempty. Hence, the theorem follows. \square

It is known that $I(C) = 2^d$ for any full-dimensional parallelepiped in \mathbb{R}^d [16, 27]. Consequently, the value of $I(C) = 2^d$, for hypercubes in \mathbb{R}^d . Therefore, we have the following.

Corollary 1. *The competitive ratio of every deterministic online algorithm for piercing translates of a hypercube in \mathbb{R}^d is at least 2^d .*

Geometric Objects	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Translated copies of an interval	2 [10]	2 [9]
Translated copies of a square	4 [16, 17]	4 [9]
Translated copies of a hypercube in \mathbb{R}^d	2^d [17]	2^d [9]
Congruent disks	4 [16]	5 [16]
Congruent balls in \mathbb{R}^3	5 [16]	12 [16]
Congruent balls in \mathbb{R}^d , $d > 3$	$d + 1$ [16]	$O(1.321^d)$ [16]
Translated copies of a centrally symmetric convex object $C \subset \mathbb{R}^d$	$I(C)$ [16]	★ [Corollary 3]

★ Result obtained in this paper.

Table 1: Summary of known results for the online piercing set problem.

2.3 Fat Object

A number of different definitions of fatness (not extremely long and skinny) are available in the geometry literature [8]. For example, see many references in [14, 18]. For our purpose, we give the following appropriate definition.

Let σ be an object and x be any point in σ . Let $\alpha(x)$ be the ratio between the minimum and maximum distance (under the L_2 norm) from x to the boundary $\delta(\sigma)$ of the object σ . In other words, $\alpha(x) = \frac{\min_{y \in \delta(\sigma)} d(x,y)}{\max_{y \in \delta(\sigma)} d(x,y)}$, where $d(x,y)$ is the distance between x and y . The *aspect ratio* $\alpha(\sigma)$ of an object σ is defined as the maximum value of $\alpha(x)$ for any point $x \in \sigma$, i.e., $\alpha(\sigma) = \max\{\alpha(x) : x \in \sigma\}$. An object is said to be an α -fat object if its aspect ratio is exactly α . A point $c \in \sigma$ with $\alpha(c) = \alpha(\sigma)$ is defined as a *center* of the object σ (see Figure 3b). Note that the center of an α -fat object might not be unique. For an example, see Figure 3a. If an object σ has multiple points satisfying the property of a center, then for our purpose, we can arbitrarily choose any one of them as the center of σ . The minimum (respectively, maximum) distance from the center to the boundary of the object is referred to as the *width* (respectively, *height*) of the object.

Note that for any object σ , we have $0 < \alpha(\sigma) \leq 1$. The maximum possible value of α is attained when the object is a ball in \mathbb{R}^d , while the value of α is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$ when the object is a hypercube in \mathbb{R}^d . We say that a set \mathcal{S} of objects is *fat* if there exists a constant $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ such that each object in \mathcal{S} is α -fat. For a set \mathcal{S} of fat objects, each object $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ need not be convex, and it does not need to be connected. The set \mathcal{S} of α -fat objects is said to be *similarly sized fat objects* when the ratio of the largest width of an object in \mathcal{S} to the smallest width of an object in \mathcal{S} is bounded by a fixed constant.




Figure 3: (a) The object colored green has two centers at p and q . (b-c) Geometric interpretation of aspect ratio and aspect_∞ ratio, respectively.

Observe the following properties of an α -fat object.

Property 2. Let $\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an α -fat object, then

- any rotated copy σ' of σ is an α -fat object;
- any translated copy σ' of σ is an α -fat object;
- any reflected copy $-\sigma$ of σ is an α -fat object;
- the scaled copy $\lambda\sigma$ is an α -fat object, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

Property 3. Let $\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an α -fat object centered at a point c with width w , then

- a ball of radius w centered at c is completely contained in σ , and
- a ball of radius $\frac{w}{\alpha}$ centered at c contains the object σ .

Considering the L_∞ norm instead of the L_2 norm, similar to the above, one can define the aspect_∞ ratio, center, width and height of an object. An object with aspect_∞ ratio α is said to be an α -*aspect $_\infty$ fat object* (see Figure 3c). Note that for any object σ , the value of $\alpha_\infty(\sigma)$ is also strictly greater than zero and the maximum possible value of $\alpha_\infty(\sigma)$ is attained for an axis-aligned hypercube. Analogous to similarly sized

fat objects, we can define similarly sized aspect_∞ fat objects. Similar to properties 2 and 3, we have the following properties.

Property 4. Let $\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an α - aspect_∞ fat object, then

- any translated copy σ' of σ is an α - aspect_∞ fat object;
- any reflected copy $-\sigma$ of σ is an α - aspect_∞ fat object;
- the scaled copy $\lambda\sigma$ is an α - aspect_∞ fat object, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

Property 5. Let $\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an α - aspect_∞ fat object centered at a point c with width w , then

- a hypercube of side length $2w$ centered at c is completely contained in σ , and
- a hypercube of side length $\frac{2w}{\alpha}$ centered at c contains the object σ .

3 Upper Bound

In subsections 3.1 and 3.2, we analyse the performance of ALGORITHM-CENTER for piercing similarly sized α - aspect_∞ fat objects and α -fat objects, respectively, having width in the range $[1, k]$. The analysis is similar in nature for both. To bound the competitive ratio, we determine the number of points placed by ALGORITHM-CENTER against each point p in an offline optimum. To compute the number of piercing points placed by our algorithm, we consider the region containing the centers of all objects that can be pierced by the point p . We have partitioned this region into $\lceil \log k \rceil$ annular regions such that ALGORITHM-CENTER places the same number of piercing points in each of these annular regions. Finally, we give an upper bound on the total number of points placed by our algorithm in each of these annular regions. The competitive ratio is $\lceil \log k \rceil$ multiplied by this number.

3.1 For Similarly Sized Aspect_∞ Fat Objects

This section presents an upper bound of the competitive ratio for piercing similarly sized α - aspect_∞ fat objects in \mathbb{R}^d . In the proof of the following theorem, all the distances, if explicitly not mentioned, are under the L_∞ norm, and all the hypercubes are axis-parallel.

Theorem 4. For piercing similarly sized α - aspect_∞ fat objects in \mathbb{R}^d having width in the range $[1, k]$, ALGORITHM-CENTER achieves a competitive ratio of at most $\left(\left[2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \right]^d - \left[\frac{2}{\alpha} \right]^d \right) \lceil \log_{1+\alpha} \left(\frac{2k}{\alpha} \right) \rceil + 1$.




Figure 4: (a) Illustration of annular region $A_i = H_i \setminus H_{i+1}$. (b) The cells of Δ' are depicted, where one of the corners of a cell $c \in \Delta'$ coincides with one of the corners of H_i .

Proof. Let \mathcal{I} be the set of α -aspect $_{\infty}$ fat objects presented to the algorithm. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{O} be the piercing set returned by ALGORITHM-CENTER and an offline optimal for \mathcal{I} . Let $p \in \mathcal{O}$ be a piercing point and let $\mathcal{I}_p \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be the collection of all input α -aspect $_{\infty}$ fat objects pierced by the point p . Let $\mathcal{A}_p \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ be the set of piercing points placed by ALGORITHM-CENTER to pierce all the input objects in \mathcal{I}_p . It is easy to see that $\mathcal{A} = \cup_{p \in \mathcal{O}} \mathcal{A}_p$. Therefore, the competitive ratio of our algorithm is upper bounded by $\max_{p \in \mathcal{O}} |\mathcal{A}_p|$.

Let us consider any point $a \in \mathcal{A}_p$. Since a is the center of an α -aspect $_{\infty}$ fat object $\sigma \in \mathcal{I}_p$ containing the point p and having width at most k , the distance between a and p is at most $\frac{k}{\alpha}$. Therefore, a hypercube H_1 of side length $\frac{2k}{\alpha}$, centered at p , contains all the points in \mathcal{A}_p . Let H_i be a hypercube centered at p having side length of $\frac{2k}{\alpha(1+\alpha)^{i-1}}$, where $i \in [m]$ and m is the smallest integer such that $\frac{2k}{\alpha(1+\alpha)^{m-1}} \leq 1$. Note that H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m are concentric hypercubes. Let us define the annular region $A_i = H_i \setminus H_{i+1}$, where $i \in [m-1]$ (see Figure 4a). Let $\mathcal{A}_{p,m} = \mathcal{A}_p \cap H_m$, and $\mathcal{A}_{p,i} = \mathcal{A}_p \cap A_i$ be the subset of \mathcal{A}_p that is contained in the region A_i , for $i \in [m-1]$. Since the distance between any two points in H_m is at most one and the width of any object in \mathcal{I}_p is at least one, any object belonging to \mathcal{I}_p having center in H_m contains the entire hypercube H_m . As a result, our online algorithm places at most one piercing point in H_m . Thus, $|\mathcal{A}_{p,m}| \leq 1$.




Figure 5: Points of Π_d are drawn for (a) $d = 1$, (b) $d = 2$, and (c) $d = 3$. Let P_q be the hyperplane $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid x(x_3) = q\}$. In Figure (c), the projection of Π_3 over planes $P_{\frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i}}$ (colored yellow), P_0 (colored green) and $P_{\frac{-k}{(1+\alpha)^i}}$ (colored orange) over a rectangular region is depicted.

Lemma 2. $|\mathcal{A}_{p,i}| \leq \left\lceil 2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \right\rceil^d - \left\lfloor \frac{2}{\alpha} \right\rfloor^d$, where $i \in [m-1]$.

Proof. Let H be any hypercube of side length $\frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i}$ such that $H \cap A_i \neq \emptyset$. First, we argue that our online algorithm places at most one piercing point in $H \cap A_i$ to pierce the objects in \mathcal{I}_p . Let q_1 be the first piercing point placed by our online algorithm in $H \cap A_i$. For a contradiction, let us assume that our online algorithm places another piercing point $q_2 \in H \cap A_i$. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{I}_p$ be the object centering at q_2 for which this piercing point was placed. Since the object σ contains p and the distance between p and q_2 is at least $\frac{k}{\alpha(1+\alpha)^i}$, the height of the object σ is at least $\frac{k}{\alpha(1+\alpha)^i}$ and the width is at least $\frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i}$. Note that the distance between any two points in H is at most $\frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i}$. Therefore, the distance between q_1 and q_2 is at most $\frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i}$. Since the width of σ is at least $\frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i}$, the object σ is already pierced by q_1 . This contradicts our algorithm. Thus, the region $H \cap A_i$ contains at most one piercing point of $\mathcal{A}_{p,i}$. To complete the proof, next, we will show that one can cover annular region A_i using at most $\left(\left\lceil 2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \right\rceil^d - \left\lfloor \frac{2}{\alpha} \right\rfloor^d \right)$ interior disjoint hypercubes of

side length $\frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i}$.

We can partition \mathbb{R}^d using hypercubes having side length $\frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i}$. Formally, let $\Pi_d = \left\{ \alpha_1 \frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i} \mathbf{e}_1 + \alpha_2 \frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i} \mathbf{e}_2 + \dots + \alpha_d \frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i} \mathbf{e}_d \mid (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \right\}$ be a lattice, where $\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \dots, \mathbf{e}_d$ are the standard unit vectors (for an illustration of the lattice in \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^2 and \mathbb{R}^3 , see Figure 5).

Claim 4. *For any point q in \mathbb{R}^d , there exists a point r in Π_d such that $d_\infty(q, r) \leq \frac{k}{2(1+\alpha)^i}$.*

Proof. Notice that for any point $r \in \Pi_d$, each coordinate of r is an integral multiple of $\frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i}$. For any point $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for each $j \in [d]$, the j th coordinate of the point q can be uniquely written as $q(x_j) = z_j + y_j$, where $z_j \in \left(\frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i} \right) \mathbb{Z}$ and $y_j \in \left[0, \frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i} \right)$. Here, by $\beta\mathbb{Z}$ we mean the set $\left\{ \beta z \mid z \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$. Now, we define a point r of Π_d depending on the coordinates of q . For each $j \in [d]$, we set the j th coordinate of r as follows.

$$r(x_j) = \begin{cases} z_j, & \text{if } y_j \in \left[0, \frac{k}{2(1+\alpha)^i} \right) \\ z_j + \frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i}, & \text{if } y_j \in \left[\frac{k}{2(1+\alpha)^i}, \frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i} \right). \end{cases}$$

As per the construction of the point r , we have $|r(x_j) - q(x_j)| \leq \frac{k}{2(1+\alpha)^i}$ for each $j \in [d]$. As a result, $d_\infty(r, q) = \max_{j \in [d]} |r(x_j) - q(x_j)| \leq \frac{k}{2(1+\alpha)^i}$. \square

Let Δ be the collection of hypercubes of side length $\frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i}$ centered at the points Π_d . Each hypercube of Δ is known as a *cell*. As per the construction of the lattice, the distance between any two distinct points in Π_d is at least $\frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i}$. Thus, the cells in Δ are pairwise interior disjoint. Due to Claim 4, the cells in Δ covers the entire \mathbb{R}^d .

We create a copy Δ' of Δ by translating each cell of Δ by a translation vector such that one of the corners of a cell $c \in \Delta'$ coincides with one of the corners of H_i (see Figure 4b). For an instance, if the translation vector is $\left(\left(p(x_1) + \frac{k}{\alpha(1+\alpha)^{i-1}} - \frac{k}{2(1+\alpha)^i} \right), \left(p(x_2) + \frac{k}{\alpha(1+\alpha)^{i-1}} - \frac{k}{2(1+\alpha)^i} \right), \dots, \left(p(x_d) + \frac{k}{\alpha(1+\alpha)^{i-1}} - \frac{k}{2(1+\alpha)^i} \right) \right)$, then the corner point $\left(\left(p(x_1) + \frac{k}{\alpha(1+\alpha)^{i-1}} \right), \left(p(x_2) + \frac{k}{\alpha(1+\alpha)^{i-1}} \right), \dots, \left(p(x_d) + \frac{k}{\alpha(1+\alpha)^{i-1}} \right) \right)$ of H_i coincides with one of the corners of a cell $c \in \Delta'$. Let \mathcal{C} be the minimal collection of cells of Δ' that cover the hypercube H_i . It is easy to observe that the cardinality of \mathcal{C} is at most $\left\lceil 2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \right\rceil^d$. Notice that, as per the construction of the lattice, there exists a cell $c' \in \Delta'$, completely contained in H_{i+1} , whose one of the corners coincides with one of the corners of H_{i+1} . As a result, from the set \mathcal{C} , at least $\left\lfloor \frac{2}{\alpha} \right\rfloor^d$ cells are contained in H_{i+1} . Thus, the union of at most $\left(\left\lceil 2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \right\rceil^d - \left\lfloor \frac{2}{\alpha} \right\rfloor^d \right)$ hypercubes, each having side length $\frac{k}{(1+\alpha)^i}$, totally cover the annular region A_i . Hence, the lemma follows. \square

Since $\cup \mathcal{A}_{p,i} = \mathcal{A}_p$, we have $|\mathcal{A}_p| \leq \left(\left\lceil 2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \right\rceil^d - \left\lfloor \frac{2}{\alpha} \right\rfloor^d \right) (m-1) + 1$. As the value of $m-1 \leq \left\lceil \log_{1+\alpha} \left(\frac{2k}{\alpha} \right) \right\rceil$, the theorem follows. \square

The value of aspect_∞ ratio is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$ for balls in \mathbb{R}^d . As a result, we have the following.

Corollary 2. *For piercing balls in \mathbb{R}^d with radius in the range $[1, k]$, ALGORITHM-CENTER achieves a competitive ratio of at most $\left(\left\lceil 2 \left(1 + \sqrt{d} \right) \right\rceil^d - \left\lfloor 2\sqrt{d} \right\rfloor^d \right) \left\lceil \log_{1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}} (2k\sqrt{d}) \right\rceil + 1$.*

Unit Covering Problem in \mathbb{R}^d

In Theorem 4, if we fix the value of $k = 1$, then due to Theorem 2, we have the following result for the unit covering problem.

Corollary 3. *For the unit covering problem using translates of a convex object C in \mathbb{R}^d , there exists a deterministic online algorithm whose competitive ratio is at most $\left(\left\lceil 2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \right\rceil^d - \left\lfloor \frac{2}{\alpha} \right\rfloor^d \right) \left\lceil \log_{1+\alpha} \left(\frac{2}{\alpha} \right) \right\rceil + 1$, where α is the aspect_∞ ratio of C .*

3.2 For Similarly Sized Fat Objects in \mathbb{R}^3

Theorem 5. For piercing similarly sized α -fat objects in \mathbb{R}^3 having width in the range $[1, k]$, ALGORITHM-CENTER achieves a competitive ratio of at most $\left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sin(\theta/2)} \right)^3 - 1 \right) \left\lceil \log_{1+x} \left(\frac{2k}{\alpha} \right) \right\rceil + 1$, where $\theta = \frac{1}{2} \cos^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1+\sqrt{1+4\alpha^2}} \right)$ and $x = \frac{\sqrt{1+4\alpha^2}-1}{2}$.




Figure 6: (a) Partitioning a ball B of radius r using spherical sector $S(\theta, r)$. (b) Description of a spherical sector $S(\theta, r_i)$ and a spherical block $T_{i,\theta}$. (c) Projection of a spherical sector $S(\theta, r_i)$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{I} be the set of similarly sized α -fat objects in \mathbb{R}^3 presented to the algorithm. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{O} be two piercing sets for \mathcal{I} returned by ALGORITHM-CENTER and an offline optimal, respectively. Let p be any piercing point of \mathcal{O} . Let $\mathcal{I}_p \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be the set of input objects pierced by the point p . Let \mathcal{A}_p be the set of piercing points placed by our algorithm to pierce all the objects in \mathcal{I}_p . To prove the theorem, we will give an upper bound of $|\mathcal{A}_p|$.

Let us consider any point $a \in \mathcal{A}_p$. Since a is the center of an α -fat object $\sigma \in \mathcal{I}_p$ (containing the point p) having width at most k (height at most $\frac{k}{\alpha}$), the distance between a and p is at most $\frac{k}{\alpha}$. Therefore, a ball B_1 of radius $\frac{k}{\alpha}$, centered at p , contains all the points in \mathcal{A}_p . Let $x = \frac{\sqrt{1+4\alpha^2}-1}{2}$ be a positive constant. Let B_i be a ball centered at p having radius $r_i = \frac{k}{\alpha(1+x)^{i-1}}$, where $i \in [m]$ and m is the smallest integer such that $\frac{k}{\alpha(1+x)^{m-1}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Note that B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m are concentric balls, centered at p . Let $\theta = \frac{1}{2} \cos^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1+\sqrt{1+4\alpha^2}} \right)$ be a constant angle in $(0, \frac{\pi}{10}]$. Since $\theta = \frac{1}{2} \cos^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1+\sqrt{1+4\alpha^2}} \right)$, and $x = \frac{\sqrt{1+4\alpha^2}-1}{2}$, we have $\cos(2\theta) = \frac{(x+2)}{2(x+1)}$ and $x^2 + x = \alpha^2$. Let $S(\theta, r_i)$ be a spherical sector obtained by taking the portion of the ball B_i by a conical boundary with the apex at the center p of the ball and θ as the half of the cone angle (for an illustration, see Figure 6a). For any $i \in [m-1]$, let us define the i th spherical block $T_{i,\theta} = S(\theta, r_i) \setminus S(\theta, r_{i+1})$.

Claim 5. The distance between any two points in $T_{i,\theta}$ is at most αr_{i+1} .




Figure 7: (a) Description of the plane \mathbb{P} . (b) Illustration of triangles $\Delta my'x'$ and $\Delta ny'x'$. (c) Illustration of triangles $\Delta oox'n$ and $\Delta lx'n$ (d) Illustration of triangles $\Delta ox'm$ and $\Delta x'lm$, in $T_{i,\theta}$.

Proof. Let x' and y' be a farthest pair of points in $T_{i,\theta}$. Let \mathbb{P} be the plane passing through the points p , x' and y' (see Figure 7c). Let ℓ, m, n, o be the corner points of $T_{i,\theta} \cap \mathbb{P}$ (see Figure 7(b-d)). If $\angle x'py' < 2\theta$, then we can find two points $x'', y'' \in \mathbb{P} \cap T_{i,\theta}$ such that $d(p, x') = d(p, x'')$, $d(p, y') = d(p, y'')$ and $\angle x''py'' = 2\theta$ (see Figure 7a). Due to the law of cosines, it is easy to observe that $d(x'', y'') > d(x', y')$. Therefore, the angle $\angle x'py' = 2\theta$. In other words, x' and y' must lie on the line segment $\overline{\ell o}$ and $\overline{m n}$, respectively. In this case, we have $d(x', y')$ is at most $\max\{d(o, n), d(\ell, n)\}$. To see this, consider triangles $\triangle my'x'$ and $\triangle ny'x'$ (see Figure 7b). Since the point y' lies on the line segment $\overline{m n}$, either the angle $\angle x'y'n$ or the angle $\angle x'y'm$ is at least $\frac{\pi}{2}$. Now, due to the law of sines, we have $d(x', y') \leq \max\{d(x', n), d(x', m)\}$. For similar reasons, we have $d(x', n) \leq \max\{d(o, n), d(\ell, n)\}$ (see Figure 7c), and $d(x', m) \leq \max\{d(o, m), d(\ell, m)\} = d(o, m)$ (see Figure 7d). Due to the law of cosine, we have $d(\ell, n) = d(o, m)$. Therefore, $d(x', y')$ is at most $\max\{d(o, n), d(\ell, n), d(o, m)\} = \max\{d(o, n), d(\ell, n)\}$.

Now, we will prove that $d(o, n) = d(\ell, n) = \alpha r_{i+1}$. First, consider the triangle $\triangle \ell p n$ (see Figure 6b and 6c). Here, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d^2(\ell, n) &= d^2(p, \ell) + d^2(p, n) - 2d(p, \ell)d(p, n) \cos(2\theta) && \text{(Due to the law of cosines)} \\
&= r_{i+1}^2 + r_i^2 - 2r_{i+1}r_i \cos(2\theta) && \text{(Since } d(p, \ell) = r_{i+1} \text{ and } d(p, n) = r_i\text{)} \\
&= \left(\frac{k}{\alpha(1+x)^i}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{k}{\alpha(1+x)^{i-1}}\right)^2 - 2\left(\frac{k}{\alpha(1+x)^i}\right)\left(\frac{k}{\alpha(1+x)^{i-1}}\right) \cos(2\theta) \\
&&& \text{(Since } r_{i+1} = \frac{k}{\alpha(1+x)^i} \text{ and } r_i = \frac{k}{\alpha(1+x)^{i-1}}\text{)} \\
&= \left(\frac{k}{\alpha(1+x)^i}\right)^2 (1 + (1+x)^2 - 2(1+x) \cos(2\theta)) \\
&= r_{i+1}^2 (1 + (1+x)^2 - 2(1+x) \cos(2\theta)) && \text{(Since } r_{i+1} = \frac{k}{\alpha(1+x)^i}\text{)} \\
&= r_{i+1}^2 (1 + (1+x)^2 - (x+2)) && \text{(Since } \cos(2\theta) = \frac{x+2}{2(x+1)}\text{)} \\
&= r_{i+1}^2 (1 + 1 + x^2 + 2x - x - 2) = r_{i+1}^2 (x^2 + x) \\
&= (\alpha r_{i+1})^2. && \text{(Since } x^2 + x = \alpha^2\text{)}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, consider the triangle $\triangle o p n$ (see Figure 6b and 6c). Here, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d^2(o, n) &= d^2(p, o) + d^2(p, n) - 2d(p, o)d(p, n) \cos(2\theta) && \text{(Due to the law of cosines)} \\
&= r_i^2 + r_i^2 - 2r_i r_i \cos(2\theta) && \text{(Since } d(p, o) = d(p, n) = r_i\text{)} \\
&= 2r_i^2 (1 - \cos(2\theta)) \\
&= 2r_{i+1}^2 (1+x)^2 (1 - \cos(2\theta)) && \text{(Since } r_i = r_{i+1}(1+x)\text{)} \\
&= 2r_{i+1}^2 (1+x)^2 \left(1 - \frac{(x+2)}{2(x+1)}\right) && \text{(Since } \cos(2\theta) = \frac{x+2}{2(x+1)}\text{)} \\
&= 2r_{i+1}^2 (1+x)^2 \left(\frac{2(x+1) - (x+2)}{2(x+1)}\right) = r_{i+1}^2 (x^2 + x) \\
&= (\alpha r_{i+1})^2. && \text{(Since } x^2 + x = \alpha^2\text{)}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $d(o, n) = d(\ell, n) = \alpha r_{i+1}$. Therefore αr_{i+1} is the maximum distance between any two points in the region $T_{i,\theta}$. \square

Claim 6. For each $i \in [m]$, our algorithm places at most one piercing point in the spherical block $T_{i,\theta}$ to pierce any object in \mathcal{I}_p .

Proof. Let q_1 be the first piercing point placed by ALGORITHM-CENTER in $T_{i,\theta}$. For a contradiction, let us assume that ALGORITHM-CENTER places another piercing point $q_2 \in T_{i,\theta}$, where q_2 is the center of some object $\sigma \in \mathcal{I}_p$. Since σ contains the point p , and the distance between p and q_2 is at least r_{i+1} , the height and width of σ are at least r_{i+1} and αr_{i+1} , respectively. Due to Claim 5, the distance between any two points in the spherical block $T_{i,\theta}$ is at most αr_{i+1} . Therefore, the distance between q_1 and q_2 is at most αr_{i+1} . Since the width of σ is at least αr_{i+1} , the object σ is already pierced by q_1 . This contradicts our

algorithm. Hence, ALGORITHM-CENTER places at most one piercing point in a spherical block $T_{i,\theta}$ to pierce objects in \mathcal{I}_p . \square

Due to [15, Lemma 5.3], for any fixed $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$, we need at most $\left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sin(\theta/2)}\right)^3 - 1\right)$ spherical sectors $S(1, \theta)$ to completely cover the ball B_1 . Combining this with Claim 6, we have $|\mathcal{A}_p| \leq \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sin(\theta/2)}\right)^3 - 1\right)m$. We can give a slightly better estimation as follows. Since the distance between any two points in the innermost ball B_m is at most one, any object in \mathcal{I}_p having center $q \in B_m$ contains the entire ball B_m . As a result, our online algorithm places at most one piercing point in B_m . Thus, $|\mathcal{A}_p| \leq \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sin(\theta/2)}\right)^3 - 1\right)(m - 1) + 1 \leq \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sin(\theta/2)}\right)^3 - 1\right) \left\lceil \log_{1+x} \left(\frac{2k}{\alpha}\right) \right\rceil + 1$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Analogous to Theorem 5, we have a similar result for α -fat objects in \mathbb{R}^2 . Here, we consider circular sector $C(\theta, r)$ with central angle 2θ instead of spherical sector $S(\theta, r)$ with central angle 2θ .

Theorem 6. *For piercing similarly sized α -fat objects in \mathbb{R}^2 having width in the range $[1, k]$, ALGORITHM-CENTER achieves a competitive ratio of at most $\left\lceil \frac{\pi}{\theta} \right\rceil \left\lceil \log_{1+x} (2k/\alpha) \right\rceil + 1$, where $\theta = \frac{1}{2} \cos^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\alpha^2}} \right)$ and $x = \frac{\sqrt{1 + 4\alpha^2} - 1}{2}$.*




Figure 8: Partitioning the disk D of radius r using circular sector $C(\theta, r)$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{I} be the set of input α -fat objects in \mathbb{R}^2 presented to the algorithm. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{O} be two piercing sets for \mathcal{I} returned by ALGORITHM-CENTER and an offline optimal, respectively. Let p be any piercing point of an offline optimal \mathcal{O} (see Figure 8). Let $\mathcal{I}_p \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be the set of input objects pierced by the point p . Let \mathcal{A}_p be the set of piercing points placed by our algorithm to pierce all the objects in \mathcal{I}_p . We will give an upper bound of $|\mathcal{A}_p|$ to prove the theorem.

Let us consider any point $a \in \mathcal{A}_p$. Since a is the center of an α -fat object $\sigma \in \mathcal{I}_p$ having width at most k (height at most $\frac{k}{\alpha}$), the distance between a and p is at most $\frac{k}{\alpha}$. Therefore, a disk D_1 of radius $\frac{k}{\alpha}$, centered at p , contains all the points in \mathcal{A}_p . Let $x = \frac{\sqrt{1 + 4\alpha^2} - 1}{2}$ be a positive constant. Let D_i be a disk centered at p having radius $r_i = \frac{k}{\alpha(1+x)^{i-1}}$, where $i \in [m]$ and m is the smallest integer such that $\frac{k}{\alpha(1+x)^{m-1}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Note that D_1, D_2, \dots, D_m are concentric disks, centered at p . Let $2\theta = \cos^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\alpha^2}} \right)$ be a constant angle in $(0, \frac{\pi}{3}]$. Let $C(\theta, r_i)$ be a *circular sector* obtained by taking the portion of the disk D_i by a conical boundary with the apex at the center p of the disk and θ as the half of the cone angle. For any $i \in [m - 1]$, let us define a *i th circular block* $T_{i,\theta} = C(\theta, r_i) \setminus C(\theta, r_{i+1})$.

Similar to the proof of Claims 5 and 6, one can prove the following.

Claim 7. *The distance between any two points in $T_{i,\theta}$ is at most αr_{i+1} .*

Claim 8. *For each $i \in [m]$, our algorithm places at most one piercing point in a circular block $T_{i,\theta}$ to pierce any object in \mathcal{I}_p .*

Since $\left\lceil \frac{2\pi}{\theta} \right\rceil$ circular sectors will entirely cover D_1 , the total number of piercing points \mathcal{A}_p placed by our online algorithm to pierce objects in \mathcal{I}_p is at most $\left\lceil \frac{\pi}{\theta} \right\rceil \left\lceil \log_{1+x}(2k/\alpha) \right\rceil + 1$. Note that the disk of radius $\leq 1/2$ is common to all circular sectors. Only one piercing point is sufficient for that disk. Hence, one is not multiplied with $\left\lceil \frac{\pi}{\theta} \right\rceil$. Thus, the theorem follows. \square

Observe that for hypercubes in \mathbb{R}^d , the value of α is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$. As a corollary to Theorem 5 (respectively, Theorem 6), we have the following.

Corollary 4. *For piercing similarly sized hypercubes in \mathbb{R}^3 (respectively, \mathbb{R}^2) with side length in the range $[1, k]$, ALGORITHM-CENTER achieves a competitive ratio of at most $909 \left\lceil \log_{\frac{\sqrt{7}-\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{3}}}(2\sqrt{3}k) \right\rceil + 1$ (respectively, $12 \left\lceil \log_{\frac{\sqrt{7}-\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{3}}}(2\sqrt{2}k) \right\rceil + 1$).*

Observe that the value of α is 1 for balls. As a corollary to Theorem 6, we have the following upper bound that gives a better bound than Corollary 2 for balls in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Corollary 5. *For piercing balls in \mathbb{R}^2 with radius in the range $[1, k]$, ALGORITHM-CENTER achieves a competitive ratio of at most $10 \left\lceil \log_{\frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2}}(2k) \right\rceil + 1$.*

3.3 For Homothetic Hypercubes in \mathbb{R}^d

Since the value of aspect_∞ ratio is 1 for (axis-aligned) hypercube and the fact that a hypercube with a side length in the range $[1, k]$ is equivalent to a hypercube with a width in the range $[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{k}{2}]$, as a corollary to Theorem 4, ALGORITHM-CENTER has a competitive ratio of at most $2^d (2^d - 1) \lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1$ for piercing homothetic hypercubes having a side length in the range $[1, k]$. Here, we propose an algorithm that has a better competitive ratio.

Let $\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a hypercube having side length ℓ . We partition the hypercube σ into 2^d smaller sub-hypercubes, each having side length $\ell/2$. Let P_σ^j be a j th sub-hypercube of σ , where $j \in [2^d]$.

Observation 1. *For each $j \in [2^d]$, if we place points at the vertices of P_σ^j , then σ contains exactly 3^d distinct points.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let the center of σ coincide with the origin, and the side length of σ is two. Note that the sub-hypercube P_σ^j is a hypercube of side length one. Thus, the corner points of P_σ^j are integer points. To prove the observation, it suffices to calculate the number of distinct integer points contained in the hypercube σ . Since σ is centered at the origin and has side length two, each coordinate of any integer point in σ has three possible values from $\{-1, 0, 1\}$. As a result, σ contains exactly 3^d integer points. \square

ALGORITHM-VERTEX: Let \mathcal{A} be the piercing set maintained by our algorithm to pierce the incoming hypercubes. Initially, $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$. Our algorithm does the following on receiving a new input hypercube σ .

- If the existing piercing set pierces σ , do nothing.
- Otherwise,
 - if σ is a unit hypercube, our online algorithm adds all the vertices of σ to \mathcal{A} .
 - else, our online algorithm adds all vertices of P_σ^j to \mathcal{A} , for all $j \in [2^d]$.

Due to Observation 1, upon the arrival of a hypercube in \mathbb{R}^d , ALGORITHM-VERTEX adds at most 3^d distinct points.

Theorem 7. *For piercing homothetic hypercubes in \mathbb{R}^d having side length in the range $[1, k]$, ALGORITHM-VERTEX has a competitive ratio of at most $3^d \lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 2^d$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{I} be a set of input hypercubes in \mathbb{R}^d presented to the algorithm. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{O} be two piercing sets for \mathcal{I} returned by our algorithm and an offline optimal, respectively. Let p be any piercing point of an offline optimal \mathcal{O} . Let $\mathcal{I}_p \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be the set of input objects pierced by the point p . Let \mathcal{A}_p be the set of piercing points placed by our algorithm to pierce all the objects in \mathcal{I}_p . We will give an upper bound of $|\mathcal{A}_p|$ to prove the theorem. Let $H_i \subset \mathcal{I}_p$ be the collection of hypercubes in \mathcal{I}_p having side length $(\frac{k}{2^i}, \frac{k}{2^{i-1}}]$, where $i \in [\lceil \log_2 k \rceil]$, and let $H_{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1}$ be the collection of all hypercubes in \mathcal{I}_p having side length one. Note that $\mathcal{I}_p = \cup_{j=1}^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1} H_j$.

For each $j \in [\lceil \log_2 k \rceil]$, we claim that our online algorithm places at most 3^d piercing points for all hypercubes in H_j . Without loss of generality, let us assume that $\sigma \in H_j$ is the first hypercube that is not pierced upon its arrival. To pierce σ , our online algorithm adds vertices of all P_σ^j , where $j \in [2^d]$ to \mathcal{A}_p . Let P_σ^t contains the point p , where $t \in [2^d]$. Let $\sigma' (\neq \sigma) \in H_j$ be any hypercube. Observe that the side length of P_σ^t is at most $\frac{k}{2^j}$ and the side length of $\sigma' \in H_j$ is at least $\frac{k}{2^j}$, and $\sigma' \cap P_\sigma^t \neq \emptyset$. As a result, σ' contains at least one vertex of P_σ^t . Hence, our algorithm does not add any point to \mathcal{A}_p for σ' . In other words, due to Observation 1, our online algorithm adds 3^d distinct points to \mathcal{A}_p for all hypercubes in H_j , where $j \in [\lceil \log_2 k \rceil]$.

Now, we will show that our online algorithm places at most 2^d piercing points for all hypercubes in $H_{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1}$. Let us assume that the unit hypercube $\sigma \in H_{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1}$ is the first hypercube that is not pierced upon its arrival. To pierce σ , our online algorithm adds all the vertices of σ to \mathcal{A}_p . Note that any hypercube σ' in $H_{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1}$ is a translated copy of σ , and p is the common intersection point between them. Thus, the hypercube σ' contains at least one corner point of σ . Consequently, our algorithm adds at most 2^d piercing points to \mathcal{A}_p to pierce all hypercubes in $H_{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1}$.

As a result, \mathcal{A}_p contains at most $3^d \lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 2^d$ points. Therefore, the theorem follows. \square

Remark. Note that for piercing translates of a hypercube, ALGORITHM-VERTEX matches the best-known result for the unit covering problem using translates of a hypercube [9].

4 Lower Bound

To obtain a lower bound, we think of a game between two players: Alice and Bob. Here, Alice plays the role of an adversary, and Bob plays the role of an online algorithm. In each round of the game, Alice presents an object such that Bob needs to place a new piercing point, i.e., the object does not contain any of the previously placed piercing points. To obtain a lower bound of the competitive ratio of $\Omega(z)$, it is enough to show that Alice can present a sequence of z nested objects in a sequence of z consecutive rounds of the game such that an offline optimum algorithm uses only one point to pierce all of these objects. Throughout the section, $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ is an arbitrary constant close to 0. For example, $\epsilon = 10^{-10}$ will also work. We consider similarly sized α -fat objects in \mathbb{R}^2 , followed by homothetic hypercubes in \mathbb{R}^d .

4.1 Similarly Sized Fat Objects in \mathbb{R}^2

Theorem 8. *For $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $k \geq 1$, the competitive ratio of every deterministic online algorithm for piercing similar sized α -fat objects in \mathbb{R}^2 having width in the range $[1, k]$ is at least $\left\lfloor \log_{\frac{2+\epsilon}{\alpha}} k \right\rfloor + 1$, where $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ is a sufficiently small constant close to 0.*

Proof. To prove the lower bound, Alice adaptively construct a sequence of $m = \left\lfloor \log_{\frac{2+\epsilon}{\alpha}} k \right\rfloor + 1$ objects, each with aspect ratio α and width in the range $[1, k]$ such that Bob needs at least m piercing points to pierce them, while an offline optimum needs just one point. Let $w(\sigma)$ and $h(\sigma)$ be the width and height of an object σ . Let σ_1 , having width $w(\sigma_1) = k$, be the first input object presented by Alice. For the sake of simplicity, let us assume that the center c_1 of σ_1 coincides with the origin. All remaining objects $\sigma_2, \sigma_3, \dots, \sigma_m$ are presented by Alice adaptively depending on the position of the piercing points p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{m-1} placed by Bob. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, m = \left\lfloor \log_{\frac{2+\epsilon}{\alpha}} k \right\rfloor + 1$, we maintain the following two invariants.

- (1) The object σ_i having width $k \left(\frac{\alpha}{2+\epsilon} \right)^{i-1}$ is not pierced by any of the previously placed piercing point p_j , where $j \in [i-1]$;
- (2) the object σ_i is totally contained in the object σ_{i-1} .

Invariant (1) ensures that Bob needs m piercing points, while invariant (2) ensures that all the objects $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_m$ can be pierced by a single point. For $i = 1$, both invariants hold trivially. At the end of round $i = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$, assume that both invariants hold. At the end of round $i = m$, we will show that both invariants hold. Depending on the position of the previously placed piercing point p_{i-1} , in the i th round of the game, an object σ_i , having width $w(\sigma_i) = k \left(\frac{\alpha}{2+\epsilon} \right)^{i-1}$ is presented by Alice to Bob. The center c_i of σ_i is defined as the following.

$$c_i = \begin{cases} c_{i-1} + \frac{w(\sigma_{i-1})}{2}, & \text{if } p_{i-1}(x_1) \leq c_{i-1}(x_1), \\ c_{i-1} - \frac{w(\sigma_{i-1})}{2}, & \text{otherwise (i.e., } p_{i-1}(x_1) > c_{i-1}(x_1)), \end{cases}$$

where $p_{i-1}(x_1)$ and $c_{i-1}(x_1)$ denotes the first coordinate of p_{i-1} and c_{i-1} , respectively.

First, we show that σ_i is totally contained in σ_{i-1} . Observe that, depending on the position of p_{i-1} , the center of σ_i is either $c_{i-1} + \frac{w(\sigma_{i-1})}{2}$ or $c_{i-1} - \frac{w(\sigma_{i-1})}{2}$. In both cases, we have $d(c_{i-1}, c_i) = \frac{w(\sigma_{i-1})}{2}$. On the other hand, $h(\sigma_i) = \frac{k}{2+\epsilon} \left(\frac{\alpha}{2+\epsilon} \right)^{i-2} < \frac{k}{2} \left(\frac{\alpha}{2+\epsilon} \right)^{i-2} = \frac{w(\sigma_{i-1})}{2}$. Hence, σ_i is totally contained in σ_{i-1} . Thus, invariant (2) is maintained.

Note that $d(p_{i-1}, c_i)$ is greater than the height of σ_i since

$$d(p_{i-1}, c_i) > \frac{w(\sigma_{i-1})}{2} = \frac{k}{2} \left(\frac{\alpha}{2+\epsilon} \right)^{i-2} > \frac{k}{2+\epsilon} \left(\frac{\alpha}{2+\epsilon} \right)^{i-2} = h(\sigma_i).$$

The first inequality follows from the definition of c_i . Thus, σ_i does not contain the point p_{i-1} . Due to the induction hypothesis, σ_{i-1} does not contain any of the previously placed piercing point p_j for $j \in [i-2]$, and from invariant (2), we know that σ_i is contained in σ_{i-1} . Hence, σ_i does not contain any of the previously placed piercing point p_j , for $j \in [i-1]$. Thus, invariant (1) is maintained.

Note that when $m > \log_{\frac{2+\epsilon}{\alpha}} k + 1$, the width of the object σ_m , i.e., $k \left(\frac{\alpha}{2+\epsilon} \right)^{m-1}$ is less than one. In other words, for any $\log_{\frac{2+\epsilon}{\alpha}} k < m \leq \log_{\frac{2+\epsilon}{\alpha}} k + 1$, we can construct the input sequence satisfying both invariants. Since the value of m needs to be integer, we have $m = \left\lfloor \log_{\frac{2+\epsilon}{\alpha}} k \right\rfloor + 1$. Hence, the theorem follows. \square

We know that the value of α is 1 for balls in \mathbb{R}^2 . As a result, we have

Corollary 6. *For $k \geq 1$, the competitive ratio of every deterministic online algorithm for piercing balls in \mathbb{R}^2 having radius in the range $[1, k]$ is at least $\lfloor \log_{2+\epsilon} k \rfloor - 1$, where $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ is a sufficiently small constant close to 0.*

4.2 Homothetic Hypercubes in \mathbb{R}^d

In this subsection, all the hypercubes are axis-aligned. First, we establish the following essential ingredients to prove our main result.

Lemma 3. *GAME-OF-SAME-SIDE(r) (GSS(r)):*

For any $r \geq 1$, in d consecutive rounds of the game, Alice can adaptively present d hypercubes $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_d$, each having side length r contained inside a hypercube S having side length $r(2+\epsilon)$, such that

- (i) *Bob needs to place d points to pierce them;*
- (ii) *the common intersection region $Q = \bigcap_{i=1}^d \sigma_i$ is nonempty;*
- (iii) *moreover, Q contains an empty hypercube E , of side length at least $\frac{r}{2+\epsilon}$, not containing any of the d piercing points placed by Bob, where $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ is a sufficiently small constant close to 0.*

We refer to d consecutive rounds of the game satisfying the above lemma as a $GSS(r)$. The hypercube S is denoted as the *starter*, and the hypercube E is the *empty hypercube* since it does not contain any of the piercing points placed by Bob in $GSS(r)$.

Proof. Throughout the proof of this lemma, for the sake of simplicity, we assume that the center of S is the origin. Let σ_1 be a hypercube of side length r presented by Alice in the first round of the game. Let the center of σ_1 be the same as the center of S . Alice presents the remaining hypercubes $\sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_d$, adaptively depending on Bob's moves. We maintain the following two invariants: For $i = 1, \dots, d$, when Alice presents hypercubes $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_i$ each of side length r , and Bob presents piercing points p_1, \dots, p_i ,

- (I) the hypercube σ_i is contained inside S and σ_i is not pierced by any of the previously placed piercing point p_j , where $j \in [i - 1]$;
- (II) the common intersection region $Q_i = \cap_{j=1}^i \sigma_j$ is a hyperrectangle whose first $(i - 1)$ sides are of length $\frac{r}{2+\epsilon}$ each, and each of the remaining sides are of length r . Moreover, Q_i does not contain any points p_j , where $j \in [i - 1]$.

An illustration of the planar version of the game appears in Figure 9. For $i = 1$, both the invariants trivially hold. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, d - 1$, assume that both invariants hold. Now, for $i = d$, we will show that both invariants hold. Let us define a translation vector $\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as $\mathbf{v}_i = \left(s(1) \left(\frac{r}{2-\epsilon} \right), s(2) \left(\frac{r}{2-\epsilon} \right), \dots, s(i - 1) \left(\frac{r}{2-\epsilon} \right), 0, \dots, 0 \right)$, where $s(j)$, for $j \in [i - 1]$, is defined as follows

$$s(j) = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{if } p_j(x_j) < 0, \text{ where } p_j(x_j) \text{ is } j\text{th coordinate of } p_j, \\ -1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We define $\sigma_i = \sigma_1 + \mathbf{v}_i$. First, we will prove that σ_i is contained inside the hypercube S . Since $\sigma_i = \sigma_1 + \mathbf{v}_i$, the L_∞ distance between the center of σ_1 and any point in σ_i is at most $\frac{r + \frac{r}{2-\epsilon}}{2}$, which is strictly less than $\frac{r(2+\epsilon)}{2}$. As a result, σ_i is contained inside S . Now, we will show that σ_i does not contain the point p_j . For any $j < i$, due to the definition of the j th component of the translation vector \mathbf{v}_i , the hypercube σ_i does not contain the point p_j . Hence, invariant (I) is maintained.

Note that $\sigma_1 \cap \sigma_i$ is a hyperrectangle whose first $(i - 1)$ sides are of length $\frac{r}{2+\epsilon}$ each, and each of the remaining sides is of length r . On the other hand, from the assumption, we know that Q_{i-1} is a hyperrectangle whose first $(i - 2)$ sides are of length $\frac{r}{2+\epsilon}$ each, and each of the remaining sides are of length r . Therefore, $Q_i = Q_{i-1} \cap \sigma_i$ is a hyperrectangle whose first $(i - 1)$ sides are of length $\frac{r}{2+\epsilon}$ each, and each of the remaining sides are of length r . Since σ_i does not contain any of the point p_j where $j < i$, the hyperrectangle $Q_i \subseteq \sigma_i$ also does not contain any of them. Therefore, invariant (II) is maintained.

At the end of the d th round of the game, we have the hyperrectangle $Q = Q_d$ (whose d th side is only of length r , other sides are of length $\frac{r}{2+\epsilon}$ each) that does not contain any of the point p_j where $j < d$, but it may contain the point p_d . Depending on the d th coordinate of the point p_d , we can construct a hypercube $E \subset Q$ of side length $\frac{r}{2+\epsilon}$ that does not contain the point p_d . Hence, the lemma follows. \square

Now, we prove the following main theorem.

Theorem 9. *For $k \geq 1$, the competitive ratio of every deterministic online algorithm for piercing homothetic hypercubes in \mathbb{R}^d with side length in the range $[1, k]$ is at least $d \left\lceil \log_{(2+\epsilon)^2} k \right\rceil + 2^d$, where $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ is a sufficiently small constant close to 0.*

Proof. We maintain the following two invariants: For $i = 1, \dots, z = d \left\lceil \log_{(2+\epsilon)^2} k \right\rceil + 2^d$, when Alice presents hypercubes $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_i$ and Bob presents piercing points p_1, \dots, p_i ,

- (III) the hypercube σ_i is not pierced by any of the previously placed piercing point p_j , where $j \in [i - 1]$;
- (IV) the intersection region $\cap_{j=1}^i \sigma_j$ is nonempty.




Figure 9: Illustration of the $GSS(r)$ for $d = 2$. Initially, Alice presented hypercube σ_1 of side length r in the first round of the game. Then, Alice presents the second hypercube σ_2 adaptively, depending on Bob's moves, such that $p_1 \notin \sigma_2$. Also, the common intersection region $\cap_{j=1}^2 \sigma_j$ is a rectangle whose sides are of length $\frac{r}{2+\epsilon}$ and r . Moreover, the intersection region contains an *empty* hypercube E , of side length at least $\frac{r}{2+\epsilon}$, not containing p_1 and p_2 .

Invariant (III) implies that Bob is forced to place z piercing points, while invariant (IV) ensures that all the hypercubes $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_z$ can be pierced by a single piercing point.

We evoke the $GSS(r)$ for $t = \lceil \log_{(2+\epsilon)^2} k \rceil$ time with different values of $r = k, \frac{k}{(2+\epsilon)^2}, \dots, \frac{k}{(2+\epsilon)^{2^{t-1}}}$. More specifically, for any $t' \in [t-1]$, the empty hypercube $E_{t'}$ having side length $\frac{k}{(2+\epsilon)^{2^{t'-1}}}$ generated by the t' th GSS game, $GSS\left(\frac{k}{(2+\epsilon)^{2^{t'-1}}}\right)$, plays the role of the starter for the $(t'+1)$ th evocation of the GSS game, $GSS\left(\frac{k}{(2+\epsilon)^{2^{t'}}}\right)$. Since all the d hypercubes of $(t'+1)$ th game lie in the interior of the empty hypercube $E_{t'}$, it is straightforward to see that the set of td hypercubes $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{td}$ and set of td points p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{td} satisfy both invariants (III) and (IV). At the end of the t th GSS, the empty hypercube E_t has a side length of at least $(2+\epsilon)$. Observe that, Due to Corollary 1, Alice can adaptively present 2^d hypercubes, each of side length one, such that Bob needs to place 2^d different piercing points, whereas an offline optimum needs one point to pierce all these 2^d hypercubes. Since all these 2^d hypercubes having side length one has a common intersection region, all of these hypercubes can be placed inside a hypercube of side length two. As a result, Alice can adaptively present 2^d hypercubes each of side length one inside E_t such that both invariants (III) and (IV) are maintained. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

5 Conclusion

No deterministic online algorithm can obtain a competitive ratio lower than $\Omega(n)$ for piercing n intervals. Due to this pessimistic result, we restricted our attention to similarly sized objects. We propose upper bounds for piercing similarly sized α -aspect $_\infty$ fat objects in higher dimensions. By placing specific values of α , the tight asymptotic bounds can be obtained for similarly sized objects (like intervals, squares, disks, and α -aspect polygons) in \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{R}^2 . There are gaps between the lower and the upper bounds in higher dimensions. We propose bridging these gaps as a future direction of research. We only consider the deterministic model, which raises the question of whether randomization helps.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback that enhanced the quality of the article.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that no financial and non-financial competing interests are relevant to this article's content.

References

- [1] Pankaj K. Agarwal and Jiangwei Pan. Near-linear algorithms for geometric hitting sets and set covers. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 63(2):460–482, 2020.
- [2] Noga Alon, Baruch Awerbuch, Yossi Azar, Niv Buchbinder, and Joseph Naor. The online set cover problem. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(2):361–370, 2009.
- [3] Charles J. Argue, Anupam Gupta, Ziyi Tang, and Guru Guruganesh. Chasing convex bodies with linear competitive ratio. *J. ACM*, 68(5):32:1–32:10, 2021.
- [4] Marcin Bienkowski, Jaroslaw Byrka, Marek Chrobak, Christian Coester, Lukasz Jez, and Elias Koutsoupias. Better bounds for online line chasing. In *44th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS 2019, August 26-30, 2019*, volume 138 of *LIPICs*, pages 8:1–8:13. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019.
- [5] Allan Borodin and Ran El-Yaniv. *Online computation and competitive analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [6] Sébastien Bubeck, Bo'az Klartag, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, and Mark Sellke. Chasing nested convex bodies nearly optimally. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2020, January 5-8, 2020*, pages 1496–1508. SIAM, 2020.
- [7] Sébastien Bubeck, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, and Mark Sellke. Competitively chasing convex bodies. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2019, June 23-26, 2019*, pages 861–868. ACM, 2019.
- [8] Timothy M. Chan. Polynomial-time approximation schemes for packing and piercing fat objects. *J. Algorithms*, 46(2):178–189, 2003.
- [9] Timothy M. Chan and Hamid Zarrabi-Zadeh. A randomized algorithm for online unit clustering. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 45(3):486–496, 2009.
- [10] Moses Charikar, Chandra Chekuri, Tomás Feder, and Rajeev Motwani. Incremental clustering and dynamic information retrieval. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 33(6):1417–1440, 2004.
- [11] Minati De, Saksham Jain, Sarat Varma Kallepalli, and Satyam Singh. Online piercing of geometric objects. In *42nd IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2022, December 18-20, 2022*, volume 250 of *LIPICs*, pages 17:1–17:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [12] Minati De, Ratnadip Mandal, and Satyam Singh. Online geometric hitting set and set cover beyond unit balls in \mathbb{R}^2 . *CoRR*, abs/2304.06780, 2023.
- [13] Minati De and Satyam Singh. Hitting geometric objects online via points in \mathbb{Z}^d . In *Computing and Combinatorics - 28th International Conference, COCOON 2022, October 22-24, 2022*, volume 13595 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 537–548. Springer, 2022.
- [14] Mark de Berg, A. Frank van der Stappen, Jules Vleugels, and Matthew J. Katz. Realistic input models for geometric algorithms. *Algorithmica*, 34(1):81–97, 2002.
- [15] Luc Devroye, László Györfi, and Gábor Lugosi. *A Probabilistic Theory of Pattern Recognition*. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability. Springer New York, 1997.

- [16] Adrian Dumitrescu, Anirban Ghosh, and Csaba D. Tóth. Online unit covering in Euclidean space. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 809:218–230, 2020.
- [17] Adrian Dumitrescu and Csaba D. Tóth. Online unit clustering and unit covering in higher dimensions. *Algorithmica*, 84(5):1213–1231, 2022.
- [18] Alon Efrat, Matthew J. Katz, Frank Nielsen, and Micha Sharir. Dynamic data structures for fat objects and their applications. *Comput. Geom.*, 15(4):215–227, 2000.
- [19] Guy Even and Shakhar Smorodinsky. Hitting sets online and unique-max coloring. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 178:71–82, 2014.
- [20] Robert J. Fowler, Mike Paterson, and Steven L. Tanimoto. Optimal packing and covering in the plane are np-complete. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 12(3):133–137, 1981.
- [21] Joel Friedman and Nathan Linial. On convex body chasing. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 9:293–321, 1993.
- [22] Michael R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, 1979.
- [23] Christian Icking, Rolf Klein, Ngoc-Minh Lê, and Lihong Ma. Convex distance functions in 3-space are different. *Fundam. Informaticae*, 22(4):331–352, 1995.
- [24] Matthew J. Katz, Frank Nielsen, and Michael Segal. Maintenance of a piercing set for intervals with applications. *Algorithmica*, 36(1):59–73, 2003.
- [25] Arindam Khan, Aditya Lonkar, Saladi Rahul, Aditya Subramanian, and Andreas Wiese. Online and dynamic algorithms for geometric set cover and hitting set. In *39th International Symposium on Computational Geometry, SoCG 2023, June 12-15, 2023*, volume 258 of *LIPICs*, pages 46:1–46:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [26] Frank Nielsen. Fast stabbing of boxes in high dimensions. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 246(1-2):53–72, 2000.
- [27] János Pach, Peter Brass, and William Moser. Research problems in discrete geometry. *Research Problems in Discrete Geometry*, 01 2005.
- [28] Mark Sellke. Chasing convex bodies optimally. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2020, January 5-8, 2020*, pages 1509–1518. SIAM, 2020.