

# Observation Routes and External Watchman Routes

Adrian Dumitrescu\*

Csaba D. Tóth†

## Abstract

We introduce the Observation Route Problem (ORP) defined as follows: Given a set of  $n$  pairwise disjoint compact regions in the plane, find a shortest tour (route) such that an observer walking along this tour can see (observe) some point in each region from some point of the tour. The observer does *not* need to see the entire boundary of an object. The tour is *not* allowed to intersect the interior of any region (i.e., the regions are obstacles and therefore out of bounds). The problem exhibits similarity to both the Traveling Salesman Problem with Neighborhoods (TSPN) and the External Watchman Route Problem (EWRP). We distinguish two variants: the range of visibility is either limited to a bounding rectangle, or unlimited. We obtain the following results:

(I) Given a family of  $n$  disjoint convex bodies in the plane, computing a shortest observation route does not admit a  $(c \log n)$ -approximation unless  $P = NP$  for an absolute constant  $c > 0$ . (This holds for both limited and unlimited vision.)

(II) Given a family of disjoint convex bodies in the plane, computing a shortest external watchman route is NP-hard. (This holds for both limited and unlimited vision; and even for families of axis-aligned squares.)

(III) Given a family of  $n$  disjoint fat convex polygons, an observation tour whose length is at most  $O(\log n)$  times the optimal can be computed in polynomial time. (This holds for limited vision.)

(IV) For every  $n \geq 5$ , there exists a convex polygon with  $n$  sides and all angles obtuse such that its perimeter is *not* a shortest external watchman route. This refutes a conjecture by Absar and Whitesides (2006).

## 1 Introduction

Path planning and visibility are two central areas in computational geometry and robotics. In path planning, a short collision-free path between two specified points is desired, and the robot has to see or detect obstacles in order to avoid them in its path. Hence there is a close relation between short paths and visibility. Moreover, visibility of an object (say, an obstacle) can be accomplished at various degrees; for instance, sometimes it may suffice to simply detect the presence of an obstacle, and other times the robot may need to map or recognize (e.g., see) the entire boundary of an obstacle in order to select a meaningful action.

In the Traveling Salesman with Neighborhoods problem (TSPN), given a set of regions (neighborhoods) in the plane, one is to compute a shortest closed route (tour) that visits each neighborhood; whereas in the External Watchman Route Problem (EWRP), given a set of disjoint regions

---

\*AlgoResearch L.L.C., Milwaukee, WI, USA. Email: [ad.dumitrescu@algoResearch.org](mailto:ad.dumitrescu@algoResearch.org)

†Department of Mathematics, California State University Northridge, Los Angeles, CA; and Department of Computer Science, Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA. Email: [csaba.toth@csun.edu](mailto:csaba.toth@csun.edu). Research on this paper was supported, in part, by the NSF awards DMS-1800734 and DMS-2154347.

in the plane, one is to compute a shortest closed route (tour) in the exterior of a region (i.e., in the *free space*) so that every point on the boundary of every region is visible from some point of the tour. These problems were posed about three decades ago by Arkin and Hassin [3] and by Ntafos and Gewali [39], respectively. A small example that illustrates ORP and EWRP appears in Fig. 1. Here we introduce the following related problem we call the Observation Route Problem (ORP):

ORP: Given a set of  $n$  pairwise disjoint compact regions in the plane, find a shortest route (tour) such that an observer going along this tour can see (observe) each of the regions from at least one point of the tour. The tour cannot enter the interior of any region.




Figure 1: An observation route (the blue point) and an external watchman route (dotted, in red) for a set of five triangles.

**Related work.** In the Euclidean Traveling Salesman problem (ETSP), given a set of points in the plane (or in the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $d \geq 3$ ), one seeks a shortest tour (closed curve) that visits each point. In the *TSP with neighborhoods* (TSPN), each point is replaced by a (possibly disconnected) region [3]. The tour must visit at least one point in each of the given regions (i.e., it must intersect each region). Since ETSP is NP-hard in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for every  $d \geq 2$  [23, 24, 42], TSPN is also NP-hard for every  $d \geq 2$ .

At about the same time, Arora [4] and Mitchell [31] independently showed that ETSP in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , for constant  $d$ , admits a polynomial-time approximation scheme (PTAS). In contrast, TSPN is harder to approximate and certain instances are known to be APX-hard. However, better approximations can be obtained for neighborhoods with “nice” geometric properties: connected, pairwise disjoint, or fat, or of comparable sizes, etc. Arkin and Hassin [3] gave constant-factor approximations for translates of a connected region; Dumitrescu and Mitchell [16] extended the above result to connected neighborhoods of comparable diameters.

For  $n$  connected (possibly overlapping) neighborhoods in the plane, TSPN can be approximated with ratio  $O(\log n)$  by the algorithms of (i) Mata and Mitchell [30], (ii) Gudmundsson and Levkopoulos [26], and (iii) Elbassioni, Fishkin, and Sitters [20]. The  $O(\log n)$ -approximation stems from the following early result by Levkopoulos and Lingas [28]: Every (simple) rectilinear polygon  $P$  with  $n$  vertices,  $r$  of which are reflex, can be partitioned in  $O(n \log n)$  time into rectangles whose total perimeter is  $\log r$  times the perimeter of  $P$ . We will use any of the three algorithms mentioned above as a subroutine in our approximation algorithm for ORP in Section 3.

In the Watchman Route Problem (WRP), given a polygonal domain  $P$ , the goal is to find a shortest closed curve within  $P$  such that every point of  $P$  is seen from some point along the curve. Thus WRP is dual to EWRP in the sense that the former deals with the interior of a polygonal domain whereas the latter deals with the exterior of one or more polygons. The watchman route problem in a simple polygon  $P$  first considered by Chin and Ntafos as early as 1986 [7, 8, 9].

After more than one decade of being in a tangle [6, 46, 47], its polynomial status appears to have been settled by Tan et al. [48]. The current fastest algorithm, running in  $O(n^4 \log n)$  time, is due to Dror et al. [12]. A linear-time 2-approximation algorithm is due to Tan [47]. Ntafos and Gewali [39] showed that a shortest external watchman route for a  $n$ -vertex convex polygon can be found in  $O(n)$  time. The case of two convex polygons was studied in [25]. The first polynomial-time approximation algorithm for the watchman route problem in  $n$ -vertex polygons with holes was given by Mitchell [33]; its approximation ratio is  $O(\log^2 n)$ . Nilsson and Żyliński [37] showed that computing a shortest tour that sees  $k$  specified points in a polygon with  $h$  holes is fixed parameter tractable (FPT) with the parameter  $h + k$ , but the problem in general cannot be polynomially approximated better than by a factor of  $c \log n$  for some constant  $c > 0$ , unless  $\text{P} = \text{NP}$ .

Regarding the degree of approximation achievable, TSPN for arbitrary neighborhoods is APX-hard [10, 44], and approximating TSPN for connected regions in the plane within a factor smaller than 2 is intractable (NP-hard) [44]. The problem is also APX-hard for disconnected regions [44], the simplest case being point-pair regions [13]. It is conjectured that approximating TSPN for disconnected regions in the plane within a  $O(\log^{1/2} n)$  factor is intractable [44]. Computing the minimum number of point guards, vertex guards, or edge guards, are all APX-hard [19] and finding the minimum number of point guards is  $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete [1], even for simple polygons (without holes). That is, there is a constant  $\delta > 0$  such that no polynomial-time algorithm achieves an approximation ratio of  $1 + \delta$  for any of these problems unless  $\text{P} = \text{NP}$ . The survey by Urrutia [49] gives an introduction to these problems. See also [5] and [27] for recent approximations and parameterized hardness results. Historically, watchman routes under limited visibility have been considered by Ntafos [38]; see also [32, 34] for a survey of the many variants of WRP. Other variants are discussed in [32, 34]. As mentioned earlier, the problem of computing shortest *external* watchman routes for collections of disjoint polygons was suggested by Ntafos and Gewali [39].

**Definitions and notations.** A curve is called *simple* if it has no self-intersections. A *simple polygon*  $P$  is a polygon without holes, that is, the interior of the polygon is topologically equivalent to a disk. A *polygon with holes* is obtained by removing a set of nonoverlapping, strictly interior, simple subpolygons from  $P$  [41]. The Euclidean length of a curve  $\gamma$  is denoted by  $\text{len}(\gamma)$ , or just  $|\gamma|$  when there is no danger of confusion. Similarly, the total (Euclidean) length of the edges of a geometric graph  $G$  or a polygon  $P$  is denoted by  $\text{len}(G)$  and  $\text{per}(P)$ , respectively.

A TSP tour for a set  $\mathcal{F}$  of regions (neighborhoods) in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $d \geq 2$ , is a closed curve in the ambient space that intersects  $\mathcal{F}$  (i.e.,  $\gamma$  intersects each region in  $\mathcal{F}$ ). For  $\alpha \geq 1$ , an approximation algorithm (for ORP, EWRP, or TSPN) has ratio  $\alpha$  if its output tour  $\text{ALG}$  satisfies  $\text{len}(\text{ALG}) \leq \alpha \text{len}(\text{OPT})$ , where  $\text{OPT}$  is an optimal tour for the respective problem.

A *convex body*  $C \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is a compact convex set with nonempty interior. Its *boundary* is denoted by  $\partial C$  and its *interior* by  $\overset{\circ}{C}$ . The *width* of a convex body  $C$  is the minimum width of a strip of parallel lines enclosing  $C$ . Informally, a convex body is *fat* if its width is comparable with its diameter. More precisely, for  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ , a convex body  $C$  is  $\lambda$ -*fat* if its width  $w$  is at least  $\lambda$  times the diameter:  $w \geq \lambda \cdot \text{diam}(C)$ , and  $C$  is *fat* if the inequality holds for a constant  $\lambda$ . For instance, a square is  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ -fat, a  $3 \times 1$  rectangle is  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}}$ -fat and a segment is 0-fat. Let  $\gamma$  be a closed curve. The *geometric dilation* of  $\gamma$  is

$$\delta(\gamma) := \sup_{p, q \in \gamma} \frac{d_\gamma(p, q)}{|pq|},$$

where  $d_\gamma(p, q)$  is the shortest distance along  $\gamma$  between  $p$  and  $q$ . For example, the geometric dilation of the boundary of a square is 2 and that of a  $3 \times 1$  rectangle is 4.

Points  $p$  and  $q$  are mutually *visible* if the segment  $pq$  does not intersect the interior of any region

in  $\mathcal{F}$  [40]. An object  $O \in \mathcal{F}$  can be *seen* (or *observed*) from a point  $p$  if there is a point  $q \in \partial O$  such that  $p$  and  $q$  are mutually visible. The convex hull of a set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is denoted by  $\text{conv}(A)$ .

## 1.1 Our results

In Section 2, as a preliminary result, we show that given a set of convex polygons  $\mathcal{F}$ , determining whether  $\mathcal{F}$  can be observed from a single point can be done by a polynomial time algorithm. In Section 3 we show that given a set of  $n$  pairwise disjoint fat convex polygons, an observation tour whose length is at most  $O(\log n)$  times the optimal can be computed in polynomial time. The algorithm reduces the ORP problem to TSPN for polygons with holes and then executes additional local transformations of the tour that only increase the total length by at most a constant factor. In Subsection 3.1 we show that the case of translates (within the same class) allows for a simplification in the algorithm.

**Theorem 1.** *Given a family of  $n$  pairwise disjoint fat convex polygons, an observation tour whose length is at most  $O(\log n)$  times the optimal can be computed in polynomial time.*

In Section 4, we prove the NP-hardness of both ORP and EWRP for both limited and unlimited vision (Theorems 2 and 3). Throughout this paper, the term *limited vision* refers to unrestricted vision in a given bounding box of the family.

**Theorem 2.** *Given a family of disjoint convex bodies in the plane, computing a shortest observation route is NP-hard. (This holds for both limited and unlimited vision.) The problem remains so even for families of axis-aligned squares.*

**Theorem 3.** *Given a family of disjoint convex bodies in the plane, computing a shortest external watchman route is NP-hard. (This holds for both limited and unlimited vision.) The problem remains so even for families of axis-aligned squares.*

In Section 5, we prove that one cannot approximate the minimum length of an observation route for  $n$  convex bodies in the plane within a factor of  $c \log n$ , for some  $c > 0$ , unless  $P = NP$ . The inapproximability is reduced from Set Cover.

**Theorem 4.** *Given a family of  $n$  disjoint convex bodies in the plane, the length of a shortest observation route cannot be approximated within a factor of  $c \log n$  unless  $P = NP$ , where  $c > 0$  is an absolute constant. (This holds for both limited and unlimited vision.)*

In Section 6 we study the structure of shortest external watchman routes for a convex polygon (i.e.,  $|\mathcal{F}| = 1$ ). In 2006, Absar and Whitesides conjectured that all convex polygons with all angles *obtuse* have convex-hull routes as their shortest external watchman routes [2]. Theorem 5 below refutes this conjecture for every  $n \geq 5$ .

**Theorem 5.** *For every  $n \geq 5$  there exists a convex polygon with  $n$  sides and all angles obtuse such that its perimeter is not a shortest external watchman route.*

In Section 7 we compare the optimal solutions for the three problems discussed (ORP, EWRP, and TSPN). While the lengths of the optimal tours for these problems can differ substantially for a given input, we exhibit two natural scenarios when they are roughly the same.

**Theorem 6.** *Consider the two scenarios below:*

- (i) *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a maximal packing of unit disks in a large square  $S$ . (That is, one cannot extend this packing by adding new disks contained in  $S$ ). Then  $OPT_{ORP}(\mathcal{F}) = \Theta(n)$ ,  $OPT_{EWRP}(\mathcal{F}) = \Theta(n)$ , and  $OPT_{TSPN}(\mathcal{F}) = \Theta(n)$ .*

- (ii) Let  $\mathcal{F}$  the family of axis-aligned squares in the NP-hardness reduction from a set of  $n$  integer points in the proof of Theorem 2. Then  $|OPT_{TSPN}(\mathcal{F})| \geq n$ ,  $|OPT_{ORP}(\mathcal{F}) - OPT_{TSPN}(\mathcal{F})| < 1$ , and  $|OPT_{EWRP}(\mathcal{F}) - OPT_{TSPN}(\mathcal{F})| < 1$ .

## 2 Preliminaries

Throughout the paper we consider families of disjoint compact convex sets in the plane; and are only concerned with *external* visibility. See Fig. 2 for an example.




Figure 2: Left: three convex polygons in a bounding box. Right: the visibility region  $V$  of the triangle is a polygon with two holes.

For a set  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $n$  disjoint polygons in a rectangle  $R$ , the *visibility region* of a polygon  $P \in \mathcal{F}$ , denoted  $V(P)$ , is the set of all point  $p \in R$  such that there exists a point  $q \in \partial P$  such that the line segment  $pq$  is disjoint from  $\overset{\circ}{P'}$  for all  $P' \in \mathcal{F}$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Given a set  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $n$  disjoint convex polygons with a total of  $m$  vertices in a rectangle  $R$ , for every  $C \in \mathcal{F}$ , the visibility region  $V(C)$  is a polygon with  $O(m + n^2)$  vertices and  $O(n^2)$  holes.*

*Proof.* Note that  $C$  is always a hole of  $V(C)$ . The boundary of  $V(C)$  is contained in the union of the boundary of the free space  $R \setminus \bigcup_{C' \in \mathcal{F}} C'$  and all common inner and outer tangents between  $C$  and other polygons in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Consequently,  $V(C)$  is a polygon with  $O(m + n^2)$  vertices. Since the polygons in  $\mathcal{F}$  are disjoint, every hole of  $V(C)$  has a vertex at the intersection of two tangents or one tangent and the boundary  $\partial C'$ ,  $C' \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \{C\}$ . Now  $O(n)$  tangents and  $O(n)$  convex curves yield  $O(n^2)$  intersections, and so the number of holes in  $V(C)$  is also  $O(n^2)$ .

It remains to prove that  $V(C)$  is connected. Let  $p$  and  $q$  be any two points in  $V(C)$ . By definition, there exist  $p', q' \in \partial C$  such that  $p'$  is visible from  $p$ , and  $q'$  is visible from  $q$ . Let  $\rho(p', q')$  denote the shortest path connecting  $p'$  and  $q'$  on the boundary of  $C$ . Then one can reach  $q$  from  $p$  via the 3-leg path that connects  $p$  to  $p'$  via a straight-line segment, follows  $\rho(p', q')$  on  $C$ 's boundary and connects  $q'$  to  $q$  via a straight-line segment.  $\square$

Next we show that given a set  $\mathcal{F}$  of convex polygons, one can determine in polynomial-time whether all polygons in  $\mathcal{F}$  can be observed from a single point. Note that for the variant with unlimited visibility, visibility regions may be unbounded. We need a simple lemma regarding zero-instances of TSPN.

**Lemma 2.** *Given a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of (possibly unbounded) polygonal regions with a total of  $m$  vertices, one can determine whether there exists a point contained in all polygons in  $\mathcal{F}$  (i.e., whether  $OPT_{TSPN}(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ ) in time polynomial in  $m$ .*

*Proof.* This is equivalent to determining whether the intersection  $\bigcap_{P \in \mathcal{F}} P$  is empty. Since the total complexity of the visibility regions is polynomial in  $m$ , the complexity of the intersection is also polynomial in  $n$ . Consequently, the resulting algorithm takes time polynomial in  $m$ .  $\square$

Applying Lemma 2 to the visibility regions of the polygons in  $\mathcal{F}$  immediately yields the following.

**Corollary 1.** *Given a set  $\mathcal{F}$  of convex polygons with a total of  $m$  vertices, one can determine whether  $\mathcal{F}$  can be observed from a single point (i.e., whether  $OPT_{ORP}(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ ) in time polynomial in  $m$ .*

Lemma 3 below shows that optimizing the length of the route is sometimes impractical as it may produce routes that are arbitrarily far from the observed objects. However, we can enforce routes in the near vicinity of the family to be observed by constraining the observation tour to lie in a bounding box of the family (e.g., an axis-parallel rectangle).

**Lemma 3.** *For every  $\Delta > 0$ , there exists a configuration  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$  of  $O(1)$  axis-parallel unit squares such that: (i)  $\text{diam}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})) = O(1)$ , (ii)  $OPT_{ORP}(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ , i.e., the configuration can be observed from a single point, and (iii) every single observation point is at a distance at least  $\Delta$  from  $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$ . Alternatively,  $\mathcal{F}$  can be realized from unit disks.*

*Proof.* We exhibit and analyze a configuration (family  $\mathcal{F}$ ) of six axis-parallel unit squares; refer to Fig. 3. An analogous unit disk configuration (with six elements) can be derived from a piece of the hexagonal disk packing by slightly shrinking each disk from its center; its analysis is left to the reader.




Figure 3: Left: This family can be only observed from single points far away up or down. Right: This family can be observed from any single point on a horizontal line that separates the upper chain of squares from the lower one.

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be sufficiently small, as specified below. Successive squares (from left to right) are horizontally separated by  $\varepsilon$  and shifted vertically by  $2\varepsilon$ . Let  $\ell$  be a horizontal line separating the squares  $B$  and  $E$ . Without loss of generality let  $p$  be an observation point on or above  $\ell$ . If  $p$  lies inside  $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$ , depending on its position, either  $C$  or  $D$  is not observable from  $p$  (if  $\varepsilon > 0$  is sufficiently small). Suppose that  $p$  lies outside  $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$ , and on or to the right of the vertical axis of symmetry of  $B$ . Then  $D$  is not observable from  $p$  unless  $p$  is above the common internal tangent to  $A$  and  $B$  of positive slope and above the common internal tangent to  $B$  and  $C$  of negative slope. These tangents continuously depend on  $\varepsilon$  and are almost vertical as  $\varepsilon$  tends to zero, hence the lowest point in the intersection of the corresponding halfplanes can be arbitrarily high, as claimed. The case when  $p$  lies outside  $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$  on or to the left of the vertical axis of symmetry of  $B$  is similar. It is clear that one can always find a suitable  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\Delta)$ , as required.  $\square$

The following lemma relates fatness to geometric dilation for closed curves:

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $C$  be a  $\lambda$ -fat convex curve. Then  $\delta(C) \leq \min(\pi\lambda^{-1}, 2(\lambda^{-1} + 1))$ .*

*Proof.* If  $C$  is a convex curve, it is known [18, Lemma 11] that  $\delta(C) = \frac{|C|}{2h}$ . It is also known [14, Thm. 8] that  $h \geq w/2$ , where  $h = h(C)$  is the *minimum halving distance* of  $C$  (i.e., the minimum distance between two points on  $C$  that divide the length of  $C$  in two equal parts), and  $w = w(C)$  is the width of  $C$ . Putting these together one deduces that  $\delta(C) \leq \frac{|C|}{w}$ . Let  $D$  denote the diameter

of  $C$ . The isoperimetric inequality  $|C| \leq D\pi$  and the obvious inequality  $|C| \leq 2D + 2w$  lead to the following dilation bounds  $\delta(C) \leq \pi \frac{D}{w}$  and  $\delta(C) \leq 2 \left(\frac{D}{w} + 1\right)$ , see also [14, 45]. Since  $C$  is  $\lambda$ -fat, direct substitution yields the two bounds given in the lemma. Note that the latter bound is better for small  $\lambda$ .  $\square$

### 3 Fat convex polygons

In this section we prove Theorem 1. The following algorithm computes a tour for a family  $\mathcal{F} = \{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$  of convex polygons in a rectangle  $R$ .

**Algorithm 1.**

STEP 1: Compute the visibility regions  $V_i = V(C_i)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

STEP 2: Use the TSPN algorithm for connected regions as a subroutine (from [30],[26], or [20], as explained in Section 1) to obtain a  $O(\log n)$  approximation for a tour  $T$  that visits all  $V_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

STEP 3: Locally transform  $T$  by making detours that avoid the elements  $C_i \in \mathcal{F}$  that are crossed by  $T$ , if any. Specifically, for each  $C \in \mathcal{F}$  that is intersected by  $T$ , replace the subpath  $\varrho = C \cap T$  by the shortest path along  $\partial C$  connecting the start and end points of  $\varrho$ ; as shown in Fig. 4. Output the resulting tour  $T'$ .



Figure 4: Local replacements to obtain  $T'$  from  $T$ .

**Algorithm analysis.** By Lemma 1, all visibility regions  $V_i = V(C_i)$  are connected, and so  $\mathcal{F}$  represents a valid input for the TSPN algorithm. Recall that the tour  $T$  returned by the TSPN algorithm visits all visibility regions; this means that each  $C_i$  is seen from some point in  $T \setminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^n C_i)$ . The local replacements in STEP 3 ensure that the resulting tour  $T'$  does not intersect (the interior of) any obstacle, and maintain the property that the tour visits all visibility regions; i.e., each  $C_i$  is seen from some point in  $T' \setminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^n C_i)$ . Consequently,  $T'$  is an observation route for  $\mathcal{F}$ . Since each region  $V_i$  has polynomial complexity by Lemma 1 (i.e., polynomial in the total number of vertices of the polygons in  $\mathcal{F}$ ), Algorithm 1 runs in polynomial time.

It remains to bound  $\text{len}(T')$  from above. Let  $\mathcal{V} = \{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ . An observation route for  $\mathcal{F}$  must visit the visibility regions  $V_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , and so  $\text{OPT}_{\text{TSPN}}(\mathcal{V}) \leq \text{OPT}_{\text{ORP}}(\mathcal{F})$ , which implies

$$\text{len}(T) \leq O(\text{OPT}_{\text{TSPN}}(\mathcal{V}) \log n) \leq O(\text{OPT}_{\text{ORP}}(\mathcal{F}) \log n).$$

Recall that all  $C_i$  are fat and thus by Lemma 4, the local replacements in STEP 3 increase the length by at most a constant factor (that depends on  $\lambda = \Omega(1)$ ), that is,  $\text{len}(T') \leq O(\text{len}(T))$ . This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.

### 3.1 Translates of a fat convex polygon

In this subsection we restrict ourselves to families of translates of a fat convex body  $C$ . The visibility regions associated to the elements of  $\mathcal{F}$  are then restricted and this allows for a simplified input for the algorithm. Specifically, Corollary 2 below shows that each visibility region is a polygon with a unique hole (the convex body itself). The approximation ratio remains the same.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $C$  be a convex body and let  $op$  and  $oq$  be the two tangent rays incident to  $o$  and  $C$  so that  $\angle poq$  is oriented counterclockwise. Let  $C'$  be a translate of  $C$  further away from  $o$  that is tangent to  $op$  at  $p'$ : that is,  $C' = C + \overrightarrow{pp'}$ . Then the ray  $oq$  does not intersect  $C'$ .*

*Proof.* Assume for concreteness that  $op$  is a horizontal line, and so the points  $o, p, p'$  appear on the line in this order. Refer to Fig. 5.




Figure 5: Two translates of a convex polygon in a cone.

We may assume that  $\angle poq$  is acute (since otherwise the claim is obvious). Recall that  $C' = C + \overrightarrow{pp'}$ , and consider the following continuous motion:  $C$  moves right and so the contact between  $C$  and the ray  $oq$  disappears right after the start of the motion. Thus  $C$  remains strictly below this ray throughout the translation and the lemma follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.** *For every  $C \in \mathcal{F}$  and every point  $o \notin C \cup V(C)$ , there exists a ray  $\vec{\rho}$  emanating from  $o$  such that  $\vec{\rho}$  is disjoint from  $C \cup V(C)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $op$  and  $oq$  be the two tangents to  $C$  emanating from  $o$  such that the angle  $\angle poq$  is oriented counterclockwise. See Fig. 6 (right) where the angle is shaded. By Lemma 5, if a convex body  $C' \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $C' \neq C$ , intersects the triangle  $\Delta poq$ , then  $C'$  intersects at least one of the line segments  $op$  or  $oq$ . We distinguish between two cases.




Figure 6: Illustrations for Lemma 6: Two possible choices for ray  $\vec{\rho}$ .



**Case 1: There exists a convex body  $C' \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $C' \neq C$ , that intersects both  $op$  and  $oq$ .** Refer to Fig. 6 (left). Since  $C' \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $C' = C + \vec{v}$  for some vector  $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . Both common external tangents of  $C$  and  $C'$  are parallel to  $\vec{v}$ , and so they bound a parallel strip denoted by  $S$ . Let  $\vec{\rho}$  be a ray emanating from  $o$  in direction  $\vec{v}$ . Then  $\vec{\rho}$  lies in  $S$ , and  $C'$  separates  $C$  from  $\vec{\rho}$  within  $S$ . Consequently,  $\vec{\rho}$  is disjoint from  $C \cup V(C)$ .

**Case 2: There is no convex body  $C' \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $C' \neq C$ , that intersects both  $op$  and  $oq$ .** See Fig. 6 (right). Since  $o \notin V(C)$ , then  $op$  intersects the interior of some body in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Let  $C_p$  be the translate in  $\mathcal{F}$  that intersects  $op$  and maximizes the angle  $\angle poq_p$ , where  $oq_p$  is a tangent ray to  $C_p$ . Similarly, let  $C_q$  be the translate in  $\mathcal{F}$  that intersects  $oq$  and maximizes the angle  $\angle p_oq$ , where  $op_q$  is a tangent ray to  $C_q$ . Since  $o \notin V(C)$ , and for every  $c \in \partial C$ , the segment  $oc$  intersects the interior of some convex body in  $\mathcal{F}$  that also intersects  $op$  or  $oq$ , then the clockwise angle  $\angle q_p o p_q$  is nonzero. Let  $\vec{u}$  be the direction vector of the angle bisector of  $\angle q_p o p_q$ , and let  $\vec{\rho}$  be a ray emanating from  $o$  in direction  $-\vec{u}$ .

It remains to show that  $\vec{\rho}$  is disjoint from  $C \cup V(C)$ . Assume w.l.o.g. that  $o$  is the origin and  $\vec{\rho}$  is the negative  $x$ -axis. Let  $r$  be any point on  $\vec{\rho}$ . Consider the horizontal strip  $S_p$  bounded by the two horizontal tangent lines to  $C_p$ . Note that this strip contains the  $x$ -axis, and  $C_p$  separates  $\vec{\rho}$  from  $C$  within  $S_p$ . Consequently any line segment between  $r$  and a point  $c \in \partial C$  below the  $x$ -axis intersects the interior of  $C_p$ . Similarly, any line segment between  $r$  and a point  $c \in \partial C$  above the  $x$ -axis intersects the interior of  $C_q$ . Overall, no point in  $\vec{\rho}$  can see any point on  $\partial C$ . This implies that  $\vec{\rho}$  is disjoint from  $C \cup V(C)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.** *For every  $C \in \mathcal{F}$ , the visibility region  $V(C)$  is a polygon with exactly one hole, namely  $C$ .*

*Proof.* It is clear that  $C \in \mathcal{F}$  is a hole in  $V(C)$ , since every point in a small neighborhood of  $\partial C$  is in  $V(C)$ , but points in  $C$  are not in  $V(C)$ . Suppose, for contradiction, that  $V(C)$  has another hole  $H$ , i.e., a bounded connected component of  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus V(C)$ . Let  $p$  be an arbitrary point in the interior of  $H$ . By Lemma 6, there is a ray  $\vec{r}$  emanating from  $p$  that lies entirely in the exterior of  $V(C)$ , hence in  $H$ . Consequently,  $H$  is unbounded, which is a contradiction.  $\square$

See Figure 7 for an example with a family of translates.




Figure 7: Left: a family of seven translates. Right: The visibility region of the shaded translate is a polygon with one hole (in blue).

**Visibility from a single point.** The algorithm in Corollary 1 can be further simplified for families of translates of a convex polygon. Let  $V_i = V(C_i)$ . Observe that  $V_i \cup C_i$  is a simple polygon (without holes). Since  $\partial C_i \subset V_i$ , we have  $V_i \cup C_i = V_i \cup \overset{\circ}{C}_i$ . Moreover, we have  $V_i \cap \overset{\circ}{C}_j = \emptyset$

for every  $i \neq j$ . Consequently, by using the distributivity of intersection over union we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (V_i \cup C_i) \cap (V_j \cup C_j) &= (V_i \cup \overset{\circ}{C}_i) \cap (V_j \cup \overset{\circ}{C}_j) \\
 &= (V_i \cap V_j) \cup (V_i \cap \overset{\circ}{C}_j) \cup (V_j \cap \overset{\circ}{C}_i) \cup (\overset{\circ}{C}_i \cap \overset{\circ}{C}_j) \\
 &= (V_i \cap V_j) \cup \emptyset \cup \emptyset \cup \emptyset \\
 &= V_i \cap V_j.
 \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it suffices to work with simple polygons. Indeed,

$$\bigcap_{i=1, \dots, n} V_i = \bigcap_{i=1, \dots, n} (V_i \cup C_i),$$

and so it suffices to determine whether the intersection of the simple polygons  $(V_i \cup C_i)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , is non-empty.

## 4 NP-hardness results

In this section we prove that both ORP and EWRP are NP-hard. Both reductions are from Rectilinear TSP (RTSP) assuming limited vision. Essentially the same reductions also hold with unlimited vision. It is known [23, 42] that both ETSP and RTSP are NP-hard. The three relevant problems ORP, ETSP, and RTSP (see [24, 42]) can be formulated as decision problems as follows:

ORP: Given a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $k$  polygonal regions and a positive integer  $m$ , does there exist an observation tour of Euclidean length at most  $m$ ?

ETSP: Given a set of  $n$  points in the plane and a positive integer  $m$ , does there exist a tour of Euclidean length at most  $m$  that visits all the points?

RTSP: Given a set of  $n$  points in the plane and a positive integer  $m$ , does there exist a tour of rectilinear length at most  $m$  that visits all the points?




Figure 8: Left: point set  $S$  in  $R$ . Middle: family of axis-aligned squares in  $B$ . Right: a small cluster (gadget)  $G$  of 25 disjoint congruent squares for each point in  $S$ . The shaded square in the center of  $G$  cannot be observed (or watched) without entering the convex hull  $\text{conv}(G)$ .

It is known from that ETSP is NP-hard under both  $L_1$ - and  $L_2$ -norms [23, 42]. The NP-hardness of WRP was first announced by Chin and Ntafos [7, 8] via a reduction from ETSP under the  $L_2$ -norm. However, the first valid proof, due to Dumitrescu and Tóth [17], makes a reduction from RTSP. To show that ORP is NP-hard, we use a reduction based on a similar idea, as follows; refer to Fig. 8.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** Given a set  $S$  of  $n$  points of the integer lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , assume without loss of generality that the smallest axis-aligned rectangle containing  $S$  is  $R = [0, a] \times [0, b]$ , for some positive integers  $a \geq b$ ; see Fig. 8. Construct a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $ab + 25n$  axis-parallel squares contained in a rectangle  $B \supset R$  as follows. There are two types of squares: (i) large squares that correspond to the cells of the grid, and (ii) small squares grouped in clusters of 25, where each cluster corresponds to a point in  $S$ . More precisely, we have  $ab$  large squares formed by the cells of the grid, but only slightly smaller so that they are disjoint. We also have  $n$  small clusters of 25 small squares each. For each cluster, the middle square can only be seen by entering the convex hull of the cluster. The clusters are small enough so that they fit in the narrow corridors left by the big squares. The center of the central square in a cluster is the *reference* point of the cluster; for each point in  $p \in S$ , the corresponding cluster  $C(p)$  has its reference point at  $p$ .

The width of the narrow corridors formed by the large squares is set to  $w = 1/(10an)$ . The side-length of each small square is set to  $s = \frac{w}{100}$ . We set  $B = [-\frac{w}{2}, a + \frac{w}{2}] \times [-\frac{w}{2}, b + \frac{w}{2}]$ , where the  $ab$  large squares are defined as  $[i + \frac{w}{2}, i + 1 - \frac{w}{2}] \times [j + \frac{w}{2}, j + 1 - \frac{w}{2}]$  for  $0 \leq i \leq a - 1$  and  $0 \leq j \leq b - 1$ . Between any two adjacent large squares, there is a narrow rectangular corridor of length  $1 - w$  and width  $w$ . There are also narrow corridors of the same dimensions between the boundary of  $B$  and the adjacent large holes.

The reduction, hence the NP-hardness, follows via the following claim.

*Claim.* For a positive integer  $m$ , there exists a tour of  $S$  of rectilinear length  $m$  if and only if there exists an observation tour of  $\mathcal{F}$  of Euclidean length  $m + \delta$ , with  $-0.4 \leq \delta \leq 0.4$ .

To verify the claim observe first that the rectilinear distance between any two (lattice) points in  $S$  is an integer. Hence the total rectilinear length of the shortest tour of the points in  $S$  is an integer, say  $m$ . Observe also that any tour of the points can be converted into a tour of the family of squares, and vice versa, by visiting the points in  $S$  and the corresponding clusters in the same order. Moreover, we show below that the lengths of the two tours are very close to each other. Indeed, on the one hand, by making only small detours from any given TSP tour for  $S$  yields an ORP tour of  $\mathcal{F}$ . On the other hand, an ORP tour of  $\mathcal{F}$  can be converted into a TSP tour for  $S$  whose length is very close to the original one. Note the following two properties of sub-paths that visit two consecutive clusters :

1. If the  $L_1$ -distance between two points in  $S$  is an integer  $d$ ,  $1 \leq d \leq a + b$ , then any path between two points from which the central squares of the corresponding clusters are visible has length at least  $d(1 - w)$ , since any path has to traverse at least  $d$  narrow corridors.
2. If the  $L_1$ -distance between two points in  $S$  is an integer  $d$ , then there is a path of length at most  $d + w \leq d(1 + w)$  between any two points in the interiors of the corresponding clusters, since it takes a detour no longer than  $w$  to observe all the squares in a cluster. At most  $n$  such small detours are needed, and each adds at most  $w$  to the total length.

It follows that the rectilinear length of the shortest tour of the  $n$  points in  $S$  can differ from the (Euclidean) length of the shortest external watchman tour of  $\mathcal{F}$  by at most  $2n(a + b)w = 2n(a + b)/(10an) \leq 0.4$ , as required.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 3.** We proceed with the same reduction and a similar claim.

*Claim.* For a positive integer  $m$ , there exists a tour of  $S$  of rectilinear length  $m$  if and only if there exists an external watchman tour of  $\mathcal{F}$  of Euclidean length  $m + \delta$ , with  $-0.4 \leq \delta \leq 0.4$ .

It suffices to notice that (i) since  $R$  is the smallest axis-aligned rectangle containing  $S$ , visiting all the clusters will automatically guarantee seeing the entire boundary for each of the large squares,

and (ii) it takes a detour no longer than  $w$  to see the entire boundary for each square in a visited cluster.  $\square$

**Remarks.** Observe that the integrality requirement for  $m$  is crucial. Furthermore, as in the reduction from [17], no such claim holds if the length of the tour of the points in  $S$  is measured in the  $L_2$ -norm. Observe also that squares of only two different sizes are used in the reduction. We conjecture that both ORP and EWRP remain NP-hard even for axis-aligned unit squares.

## 5 Inapproximability results

We deduce the inapproximability of ORP from that of Set Cover. A *set system* is a pair  $(U, \mathcal{S})$ , where  $U$  is a set and  $\mathcal{S}$  is a collection of subsets of  $U$ . Given a set system  $(U, \mathcal{S})$ , the Set Cover problem asks for the minimum number of sets in  $\mathcal{S}$  whose union is  $U$ . Set Cover cannot be approximated within a factor of  $(1 - o(1)) \ln n$  unless  $\text{P} = \text{NP}$  [11], where  $n = |U|$ . Furthermore, for any  $c \in (0, 1)$ , Set Cover cannot be approximated within a factor of  $c \ln n$  over instances where  $m \leq O(n^{f(c)})$  for some function  $f : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , unless  $\text{P} = \text{NP}$  [11, 36]; see also [21, 29, 35, 36].

Given a set system  $(U, \mathcal{S})$  with  $|U| = n$  and  $|\mathcal{S}| = m$ , we construct a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of disjoint convex polygons in four stages. We first construct an arrangement of lines  $\mathcal{L}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , and then “thicken” the lines into narrow corridors. The family  $\mathcal{F}$  will consist of the convex faces of this arrangement and  $n + 3$  additional axis-parallel rectangles inserted in the corridors at strategic locations. We continue with the details; see Fig. 9.




Figure 9: Left: A line arrangement  $\mathcal{L}$  constructed in Stage 1; here  $n = 7$  and  $m = 4$ . Middle: A slab  $N_{i,j}$  and a wedge  $W_{i,j}$  for a line  $p_i q_j \in \mathcal{L}$ . Right: A schematic picture of the family  $\mathcal{F}$  (not to scale).

**Stage 1.** We are given a set system  $(U, \mathcal{S})$  with  $U = \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ . Let  $M = \max\{12m, n + 1\}$ , and consider the axis-aligned square  $B_0 = [0, M]^2$ . Each set  $S_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , is represented by the point  $p_i = (0, i)$  at the left side of  $B_0$ , and each element  $j \in U$  corresponds to the point  $q_j = (M, j)$  at the right side of  $B_0$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the set of lines  $p_i q_j$  such that  $j \in S_i$ .

**Stage 2.** For each line  $p_i q_j \in \mathcal{L}$ , let  $N_{i,j}$  be the  $\frac{1}{2} M^{-8}$ -neighborhood of  $\ell$ , which is a slab of width  $M^{-8}$ . For each line  $p_i q_j \in \mathcal{L}$ , we also create a cone  $W_{i,j}$  bounded by the ray  $\overrightarrow{p_i q_j}$  from below and the ray  $\overrightarrow{p_i q'_j}$  from above, where  $q'_j = (M, j + M^{-4})$  is a point at distance  $M^{-4}$  above  $q_j$ , and in particular  $q'_j \notin N_{i,j}$ . Note that  $N_{i,j} \cup W_{i,j}$  is a simply connected region; see Fig. 9(middle).

Consider the axis-aligned rectangle  $B_1 = [-M^{-2}, 2M] \times [-M, 2M] \supset B_0$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}_1$  be the bounded components of  $B_1 \setminus \bigcup_{i,j} (N_{i,j} \cup W_{i,j})$ , that is, we create a convex polygon for each bounded face of the arrangement  $\mathcal{L}$  within  $B_1$ .

**Stage 3.** Create a family  $\mathcal{F}_2$  of the following  $n + 3$  disjoint axis-aligned rectangles: a small square  $Q_j$  of side length  $M^{-8}$  centered at the midpoint of  $q_j q'_j$  for all  $j \in U$ ; two unit squares, denoted  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , resp., centered at  $(-1, -1)$  and  $(-1, M + 1)$ ; and a large rectangle  $B_2 = [-M, -M^{-2} - M^{-4}] \times [0, M]$ .

**Stage 4.** Apply the linear transformation  $T : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $T(x, y) = \left( \frac{M^2 x}{2}, \frac{M^{-1} y}{24} \right)$ , and let  $\mathcal{F} = \{T(C) : C \in \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2\}$ .

**Lemma 7.** *For an instance  $(U, \mathcal{S})$  of Set Cover with  $|U| = n$  and  $|\mathcal{S}| = m$ , let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the family of disjoint convex polygons constructed above.*

1. *There is a polynomial  $f(m, n)$  such that the total number of vertices of the polygons in  $\mathcal{F}$  is at most  $f(m, n)$ , each vertex has rational coordinates where both numerators and denominators are bounded by  $f(m, n)$ .*
2. *For every integer  $k$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq m$ , the union of  $k$  sets in  $\mathcal{S}$  covers  $U$  if and only if  $\mathcal{F}$  admits an observation tour of length at most  $k + \frac{1}{2}$ .*

*Proof.* (1) There are at most  $mn$  lines in the arrangement  $\mathcal{L}$  in Stage 1, each line can be written in the form  $ax + by = c$  with integer coefficients in the range  $[-M, M]$ . Each line  $p_i q_j \in \mathcal{L}$  corresponds to a narrow corridor  $N_{i,j} \cup W_{i,j}$  bounded by three lines. The vertices of the polygons in  $\mathcal{F}_1$  are intersection points of boundaries of such corridors:  $O(mn)$  lines yield  $O(m^2 n^2)$  intersection points, which all have rational coordinates bounded by a polynomial in  $m$  and  $n$ . The  $n + 3$  rectangles in  $\mathcal{F}_2$  are defined explicitly, and they also have rational coordinates bounded by polynomials in  $m$  and  $n$ . Finally, the linear transformation in Stage 4 maintains these properties.

(2a) Assume that  $k$  sets in  $\mathcal{S}$  jointly cover  $U$ , that is,  $\bigcup_{t=1}^k S_{i_t} = U$  for some  $i_1, \dots, i_k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . We construct an observation tour for  $\mathcal{F}$ . We describe the tour in terms of the polygons before Stage 4, since a linear transformation maintains visibility (but distorts distances). Let the initial tour  $\gamma_0$  traverse the left side of the rectangle  $B_1$  twice. The upper-left and lower-left corners of  $B_1$  see the squares  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , and every point in  $\gamma_0$  can see  $B_2$ . The tour  $\gamma_0$  intersects every line  $p_i q_j \in \mathcal{L}$ . The point  $\gamma_0 \cap p_i q_j$  can see all convex bodies in  $\mathcal{F}_1$  whose boundaries touch the slab  $N_{i,j}$ . Since the upper arc of every polygon in  $\mathcal{F}_1$ , other than the polygon containing the top side of  $B_1$ , is formed by the bottom sides of the slabs  $N_{i,j}$ , and so  $\gamma_0$  can see every polygon in  $\mathcal{F}_1$ .

We expand  $\gamma_0$  to a tour of  $\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2$  as follows: For  $t = 1, \dots, k$ , choose an arbitrary point  $q_{j_t} \in S_{i_t}$ , and add a loop from the point  $p_{i_t} q_{j_t} \cap \gamma_0$  to the point  $p_{i_t}$  in the corridor  $N(p_{i_t} q_{j_t})$ . The point  $p_{i_t}$  can see the small squares representing all  $j \in S_{i_t}$ . Since  $\bigcup_{t=1}^k S_{i_t} = U$ , every small square in  $\mathcal{F}_2$  is visible from some point in the tour. After the linear transformation in Stage 4, we obtain an observation tour  $\gamma$  for  $\mathcal{F}$ . We bound the length of  $\gamma$  using the  $L_1$ -norm of its edges. The linear transformation in Stage 4 compresses the  $y$ -extents of each edge, so the  $L_1$  norm is dominated by the  $x$ -extents: The  $x$ -extent of an edge between the left side of  $B_1$  and  $p_i$  is exactly  $M^{-2}$ , thus the sum of  $x$ -extents is  $2kM^{-2}$ . Accounting for the  $y$ -extents of these  $2k$  edges and  $\gamma_0$ , and applying the linear transformation in Stage 4, we obtain  $|\gamma| \leq k + \frac{1}{2}$ , as required.

(2b) Now assume that  $\mathcal{F}$  admits an observation tour  $\gamma$  with  $|\gamma| \leq k + \frac{1}{2}$ . We analyze the construction before Stage 4, hence the sum of  $x$ -extents of all edges of the tour is at most  $(2k + 1)M^{-2}$ . The observation tour intersects the visibility region  $V(Q_j)$  for all  $j \in U$ . A square  $Q_j$  lies in the corridor  $N_{i,j} \cup W_{i,j}$  iff  $j \in S_i$ , and  $Q_j$  is only visible from such corridors. Each line  $p_i q_j \in \mathcal{L}$  is incident

to two points on opposite vertical sides of a square, and so its slope is in the range  $[-1, 1]$ . By construction,  $Q_j \subset W_{i,j}$  and the cone  $W_{i,j}$  is convex, consequently  $W_{i,j} \subset V(Q_j)$ . However,  $Q_j$  is above the slab  $N_{i,j}$ , every vertical segment between them has length at least  $\frac{1}{3}M^{-4}$ , and so the  $x$ -coordinate of the leftmost point in  $V(Q_j) \cap N_{i,j}$  is at least  $-M \cdot M^{-8}/(\frac{1}{3}M^{-4}) = -3M^{-3}$ . Overall, the  $x$ -coordinate of the leftmost point in  $V(Q_j)$  is at least  $-3M^{-3}$ .

Note that the visibility region  $V(C_1)$  is disjoint from  $V(Q_j)$  for all  $j \in U$ . Since  $|\gamma| \leq (2k + 1)M^{-2} < M^{-1}$ ,  $\gamma$  must be contained in the vertical slab  $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| < M^{-1}\}$ . Consequently,  $\gamma$  visits each visibility region  $V(Q_j)$  in the vertical slab  $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -3M^{-3} < x < M^{-1}\}$ .

Let  $I$  be the set of indices  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $\gamma$  visits a point  $g_i \in (N_{i,j} \cup W_{i,j}) \cap V(Q_j)$  for some  $j \in U$ . Since  $\gamma$  is an observation tour, we have  $U = \cup_{i \in I} S_i$ . It remains to show that  $|I| \leq k$ .

The tour  $\gamma$  determines a cyclic order on the points  $G = \{g_i : i \in I\}$ . We claim that the  $x$ -extent of the arc of  $\gamma$  between two consecutive points in  $G$  is at least  $2M^{-2} - 6M^{-3}$ . To prove the claim, note that every point  $p_i = (0, 2i)$  has integer coordinates, and the slope of every line  $p_i q_j \in \mathcal{L}$  is in the range  $[-1, 1]$ . This implies that if two lines in  $\mathcal{L}$  cross in the slab  $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| < M^{-1}\}$ , then they cross at  $p_i$  for some  $i \in U$ . Consequently, if visibility corridors, say  $N_{i,j} \cup W_{i,j}$  and  $N_{i',j'} \cup W_{i',j'}$  intersect, then the intersection is in a  $M^{-8}$ -neighborhood of  $p_i$  for some  $i \in U$ . It follows that the arc of  $\gamma$  between any two points in  $G$  must reach the line  $x = -M^{-2}$  on the left or the line  $x = 1$  on the right. In both cases, its arclength is at least  $2M^{-2} - 6M^{-3}$ , as claimed. We can bound the length of  $\gamma$  by the summation of the arcs between consecutive points in  $G$ :

$$|\gamma| \geq |I|(2M^{-2} - 6M^{-3}) \geq (2|I|)M^{-2} - 6mM^{-3} \geq \left(2|I| - \frac{1}{2}\right)M^{-2}.$$

In combination with  $|\gamma| \leq (2k + 1)M^{-2}$  and  $M \geq 12m$ , we obtain that  $|I| \leq k + \frac{3}{4}$ . As both  $k$  and  $|I|$  are integers,  $|I| \leq k$  follows.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 4.** As noted above [11], there exists a constant  $\kappa > 0$  such that **Set Cover** cannot be approximated within a factor of  $\kappa \log n$  on instances  $(U, \mathcal{S})$  with  $n = |U|$ ,  $m = |\mathcal{S}|$ , and  $m \leq O(n^\alpha)$  for a constant  $\alpha > 0$  unless  $\text{P} = \text{NP}$ . By Lemma 7, for every such instance  $(U, \mathcal{S})$  of **Set Cover**, there is a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $N$  disjoint convex polygons in the plane such that (i) for every  $k \leq n$ , there is a set cover of size  $k$  iff  $\mathcal{F}$  admits a observation route of length at most  $k + \frac{1}{2}$ , and (ii)  $N \leq \binom{mn}{2} + n + 3 \leq m^2 n^2 = O(n^{2\alpha+2})$ .

Suppose that for  $\delta = \kappa(2\alpha + 2)^{-1} > 0$ , there exists a polynomial-time  $(\delta \log N)$ -factor approximation algorithm for **ORP** with  $N$  convex bodies. Since  $\delta \log N \leq \delta(2\alpha + 2) \log n = \kappa \log n$ , this yields a  $(\kappa \log n)$ -approximation for **Set Cover**, which is a contradiction unless  $\text{P} = \text{NP}$ .  $\square$

## 6 External watchman tours for a convex polygon

Given a polygon, the External Watchman Route problem (EWRP) is that of finding a shortest route such that each point in the exterior of the polygon is visible from some point along the route. For a convex polygon, this requirement is tantamount to requiring that each point on the boundary of the polygon is visible from some point along the route.

Let  $P$  be a convex polygon. Ntafos and Gewali [39] distinguished between two types of external watchman tours: those that wrap around the perimeter and those that do not. They also showed that the second type of route can be obtained by doubling a simple open curve that wraps around a part of  $P$ 's boundary and is extended at both ends until the vision encompasses the entire boundary of  $P$ ; see Fig. 10 for an example. They referred to the second type as ‘‘a 2-leg watchman route’’, see [39].




Figure 10: The two types of external watchman tours.

**Proof of Theorem 5.** Let  $P$  be a convex pentagon whose angles listed in clockwise order from the top are  $120^\circ, 120^\circ, 90^\circ, 90^\circ, 120^\circ$ ; refer to Fig 11. Its horizontal base has length 2 and each of its vertical sides is of length  $\varepsilon$ , for a small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Note that the length of each slanted top side is  $a = 2/\sqrt{3}$ . Observe that all angles are at least  $90^\circ$ . By slightly shortening the base to  $2(1 - \varepsilon^2)$  the pentagon becomes one with all angles obtuse, say  $P'$ , whose angles are  $120^\circ, (120 - \delta)^\circ, (90 + \delta)^\circ, (90 + \delta)^\circ, (120 - \delta)^\circ$ , for some small  $\delta > 0$ . Its side lengths (listed in the same order) are  $a, \varepsilon(1 + \varepsilon^2)^{1/2}, 2(1 - \varepsilon^2), \varepsilon(1 + \varepsilon^2)^{1/2}, a$ . Thus

$$\text{per}(P') = 2(a + (1 - \varepsilon^2) + \varepsilon(1 + \varepsilon^2)^{1/2}) > 2(1 + a - \varepsilon).$$



Figure 11: Left: a pentagon with all angles obtuse can be obtained by slightly perturbing this one. Right: a second type of watchman route can be obtained by doubling the red 3-chain polygonal curve; its two legs are perpendicular to the extensions of the two top sides. The figure is not to scale.

Observe that the red curve in the figure is a 3-polygonal chain that makes a valid watchman path for  $P'$ . Its length is  $< 2(1 + \varepsilon)$  and thus doubling it yields an external watchman route of length  $< 4(1 + \varepsilon)$ . It remains to show that  $4(1 + \varepsilon) < 2(1 + a - \varepsilon)$  or  $\varepsilon < (a - 1)/3 = \frac{2 - \sqrt{3}}{3\sqrt{3}}$ , which clearly holds for small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Note that the ratio between the length of the double red curve and the perimeter is in fact smaller than some absolute constant  $< 1$ , e.g.,  $0.93 < 1$  in the range  $\varepsilon \leq 0.001$ .

Alternatively, by cutting two small right-angled isosceles triangles, one from each side of the base of the pentagon one gets a convex heptagon all whose angles are at least  $120^\circ$ . A similar calculation as above shows that this heptagon provides yet another counterexample in which all angles are even larger, here at least  $120^\circ$ .

By slightly 'shaving' the pentagon in a repeated manner, one can increase the number of vertices while maintaining all angles obtuse and thereby obtain counterexamples to Conjecture 1 in [2] for every  $n \geq 5$ . Note, however, that since every triangle or convex quadrilateral has at least one nonobtuse angle, the range for  $n$  in Theorem 5 cannot be improved.  $\square$

## 7 Problem comparison

In this section we compare the optimal solutions to the three problems (ORP, EWRP, and TSPN) on various instances. While such solutions can differ substantially, they can be also close to each other in certain natural scenarios (as in Theorem 6). As a result, we get a better understanding of these problems.

**Observation 1.** Let  $\mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_2$  be two families of convex bodies. Then

1.  $OPT_{TSPN}(\mathcal{F}_1) \leq OPT_{TSPN}(\mathcal{F}_2)$
2.  $OPT_{ORP}(\mathcal{F}_1) \leq OPT_{ORP}(\mathcal{F}_2)$
3.  $OPT_{EWRP}(\mathcal{F}_1) \leq OPT_{EWRP}(\mathcal{F}_2)$

We start by observing a key difference between the range of optimal solutions for these problems. Specifically, we have the following lower bound on the length of an external watchman route.

**Lemma 8.** *Let  $C$  be a convex body and  $W$  be an external watchman route for  $C$ . Then  $\text{len}(W) > 0$ . Similarly, let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of disjoint convex bodies. Then  $OPT_{EWRP}(\mathcal{F}) > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that the boundary  $\partial C$  is visible from a single point  $o$ . Take a ray from  $o$  that goes through the interior of  $C$  and intersects  $\partial C$  at  $p$  and  $q$ , respectively. Then  $q$  is not visible from  $o$ , a contradiction, and the first part in the lemma follows. For the second part, let  $C$  denote an arbitrary element of  $\mathcal{F}$ . By Observation 1,  $OPT_{EWRP}(\mathcal{F}) \geq OPT_{EWRP}(\{C\}) > 0$ , as claimed.  $\square$

We next confirm the intuition “observing is easy, traveling is expensive”.

**Lemma 9.** *There exist families  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $n$  congruent disks for which  $OPT_{EWRP}(\mathcal{F}) \ll OPT_{TSPN}(\mathcal{F})$ . In particular  $OPT_{EWRP}(\mathcal{F}) = \Theta(1)$  and  $OPT_{TSPN}(\mathcal{F}) = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $n$  is a perfect square. Place a disk of radius  $\varepsilon > 0$  centered at each point of the integer lattice  $[1, \sqrt{n}]^2$ . Scale down the construction so that it fits inside the unit square  $[0, 1]^2$ . If the radius is sufficiently small, there is a watchman route for  $\mathcal{F}$  of length  $\Theta(1)$  that goes around and close to the perimeter of  $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$ ; for a similar setup recall the classical *orchard visibility problem* due to Pólya [43]. On the other hand, the length of the shortest tour visiting each disk is clearly  $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$  (recall also Few’s result [22]).  $\square$

On the other hand, when disks are densely packed, one expects that the length of an optimal TSPN tour approximates well the length of an optimal watchman tour. Indeed, the intuition is that one cannot see too far in a densely packed forest of congruent trees and in order to see each tree one essentially needs to visit the entire forest. Moreover, we show that in this scenario the length of a shortest ORP tour, EWRP tour, and TSPN tour are roughly the same, namely within constant factors from each other. We recall the following result of Dumitrescu and Jiang [15] confirming a conjecture by Mitchell. (It is likely that the result holds for a much smaller radius threshold, possibly  $< 100$ .)

**Theorem 7.** [15] *Any dense (circular) forest with congruent trees (of unit diameter) that is deep enough has a hidden point.*

Using Theorem 7 on one hand and Few’s technique [22] for traversing points in a square, layer by layer, on the other hand, we can prove that the optimal solutions for the three problems are roughly the same in this setting.

**Proof of Theorem 6.** (i) Recall that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a maximal packing of unit disks in a large square  $S$ . Observe that  $OPT_{ORP}(\mathcal{F}) \leq OPT_{EWRP}(\mathcal{F})$  (by problem definition). We start with the lower bounds. Let  $A = 10^{109}$  and  $s$  denote the side length of  $S$ . We may assume without loss of generality that  $n$  and  $s$  are large enough, in particular that  $s$  is a multiple of  $A$ . Thus  $S$  can be partitioned into  $s^2/A^2$  subsquares of side  $A$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is a maximal packing we have  $n = \Theta(s^2)$ . Let  $T$  be an observation tour for  $\mathcal{F}$ . Since each of the  $s^2/A^2$  subsquares of side  $A$  has a hidden point,  $T$  must visit every



subsquare. Moreover, this implies that  $\text{len}(T) = \Omega(s^2/A^2) - O(s) = \Omega(s^2/A^2) = \Omega(n)$ . By the inequality in the beginning, it follows that  $\text{OPT}_{\text{EWRP}}(\mathcal{F}) \geq \text{OPT}_{\text{ORP}}(\mathcal{F}) = \Omega(n)$ .

Next we show that  $\text{OPT}_{\text{TSPN}}(\mathcal{F}) = \Omega(n)$ . Let  $T$  be a TSPN tour for  $\mathcal{F}$ . A standard disk packing argument (see [16, Prop. 1] for details) yields  $\text{len}(T) \geq \pi(n-4)/4$ , whence  $\text{OPT}_{\text{TSPN}}(\mathcal{F}) = \Omega(n)$ , as claimed.

To prove the upper bounds, we first consider EWRP. Subdivide  $S$  into horizontal strips (rectangles)  $s \times 4$  and traverse the strips in a zig-zag manner, say, from top to bottom. Finally return to the start position by following the boundary  $\partial S$ . In every strip, move from left to right or from right to left and circle around the boundary of each disk in increasing (resp., decreasing) order of the  $x$ -coordinates of their centers. Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is a maximal packing, each disk-to-disk move is bounded from above by  $O(1)$  in length and thus the total length is  $O(n)$ , whence  $\text{OPT}_{\text{ORP}}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \text{OPT}_{\text{EWRP}}(\mathcal{F}) = O(n)$ . Following the same (strip visitation) algorithm while visiting each disk instead of circling around it, yields  $\text{OPT}_{\text{TSPN}}(\mathcal{F}) = O(n)$ , as claimed.

(ii) The stated inequalities have been established when proving Theorems 2 and 3. □

## 8 Concluding remarks

We conclude with a few open problems regarding the remaining gaps and the quality of approximation.

1. Is there a constant-ratio approximation algorithm for the shortest observation tour problem for families of disjoint axis-aligned unit squares (or unit disks, or translates of a convex polygon)?
2. What approximations can be computed for the shortest observation tour for families of disjoint convex polygons?
3. Is there a constant-ratio approximation algorithm for the shortest external watchman route for families of disjoint axis-aligned unit squares (or unit disks or translates of a convex polygons)?
4. What approximations can be computed for the shortest external watchman route for families of disjoint convex polygons? Is the problem APX-hard?

## References

- [1] Mikkel Abrahamsen, Anna Adamaszek, and Tillmann Miltzow. The art gallery problem is  $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete. *J. ACM*, 69(1):4:1–4:70, 2022. doi:10.1145/3486220.
- [2] Rafa Absar and Sue Whitesides. On computing shortest external watchman routes for convex polygons. In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry (CCCG)*, Kingston, ON, 2006. URL: <http://www.cs.queensu.ca/cccg/papers/cccg16.pdf>.
- [3] Esther M. Arkin and Refael Hassin. Approximation algorithms for the geometric covering salesman problem. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 55(3):197–218, 1994. doi:10.1016/0166-218X(94)90008-6.
- [4] Sanjeev Arora. Polynomial time approximation schemes for Euclidean traveling salesman and other geometric problems. *J. ACM*, 45(5):753–782, 1998. doi:10.1145/290179.290180.
- [5] Édouard Bonnet and Tillmann Miltzow. Parameterized hardness of art gallery problems. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 16(4):42:1–42:23, 2020. doi:10.1145/3398684.

- [6] Svante Carlsson, Håkan Jonsson, and Bengt J. Nilsson. Finding the shortest watchman route in a simple polygon. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 22(3):377–402, 1999. doi:10.1007/PL00009467.
- [7] Wei-pang Chin and Simeon C. Ntafos. Optimum watchman routes. In *Proc. 2nd ACM Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG)*, pages 24–33, 1986. doi:10.1145/10515.10518.
- [8] Wei-pang Chin and Simeon C. Ntafos. Optimum watchman routes. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 28(1):39–44, 1988. doi:10.1016/0020-0190(88)90141-X.
- [9] Wei-pang Chin and Simeon C. Ntafos. Shortest watchman routes in simple polygons. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 6:9–31, 1991. doi:10.1007/BF02574671.
- [10] Mark de Berg, Joachim Gudmundsson, Matthew J. Katz, Christos Levcopoulos, Mark H. Overmars, and A. Frank van der Stappen. TSP with neighborhoods of varying size. *J. Algorithms*, 57(1):22–36, 2005. doi:10.1016/j.jalgor.2005.01.010.
- [11] Irit Dinur and David Steurer. Analytical approach to parallel repetition. In *Proc. 46th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 624–633, 2014. doi:10.1145/2591796.2591884.
- [12] Moshe Dror, Alon Efrat, Anna Lubiw, and Joseph S. B. Mitchell. Touring a sequence of polygons. In *Proc. 35th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 473–482, 2003. doi:10.1145/780542.780612.
- [13] Moshe Dror and James B. Orlin. Combinatorial optimization with explicit delineation of the ground set by a collection of subsets. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 21(4):1019–1034, 2008. doi:10.1137/050636589.
- [14] Adrian Dumitrescu, Annette Ebberts-Baumann, Ansgar Grüne, Rolf Klein, and Günter Rote. On the geometric dilation of closed curves, graphs, and point sets. *Comput. Geom.*, 36(1):16–38, 2007. doi:10.1016/j.comgeo.2005.07.004.
- [15] Adrian Dumitrescu and Minghui Jiang. The forest hiding problem. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 45(3):529–552, 2011. doi:10.1007/s00454-010-9261-4.
- [16] Adrian Dumitrescu and Joseph S. B. Mitchell. Approximation algorithms for TSP with neighborhoods in the plane. *J. Algorithms*, 48(1):135–159, 2003. doi:10.1016/S0196-6774(03)00047-6.
- [17] Adrian Dumitrescu and Csaba D. Tóth. Watchman tours for polygons with holes. *Comput. Geom.*, 45(7):326–333, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.comgeo.2012.02.001.
- [18] Annette Ebberts-Baumann, Ansgar Grüne, and Rolf Klein. Geometric dilation of closed planar curves: New lower bounds. *Comput. Geom.*, 37(3):188–208, 2007. doi:10.1016/j.comgeo.2004.12.009.
- [19] Stephan J. Eidenbenz, Christoph Stamm, and Peter Widmayer. Inapproximability results for guarding polygons and terrains. *Algorithmica*, 31(1):79–113, 2001. doi:10.1007/s00453-001-0040-8.
- [20] Khaled M. Elbassioni, Aleksei V. Fishkin, and René Sitters. Approximation algorithms for the Euclidean traveling salesman problem with discrete and continuous neighborhoods. *Int. J. Comput. Geom. Appl.*, 19(2):173–193, 2009. doi:10.1142/S0218195909002897.

- [21] Uriel Feige. A threshold of  $\ln n$  for approximating set cover. *J. ACM*, 45(4):634–652, 1998. doi:10.1145/285055.285059.
- [22] Leonard Few. The shortest path and shortest road through  $n$  points. *Mathematika*, 2:141–144, 1955. doi:10.1112/S0025579300000784.
- [23] Michael R. Garey, Ronald L. Graham, and David S. Johnson. Some NP-complete geometric problems. In *Proc. 8th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 10–22, 1976. doi:10.1145/800113.803626.
- [24] Michael R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, NY, 1979.
- [25] Laxmi P. Gewali and Simeon C. Ntafos. Watchman routes in the presence of a pair of convex polygons. *Journal of Information Sciences*, 105(1-4):123–149, 1998. doi:10.1016/S0020-0255(97)10033-0.
- [26] Joachim Gudmundsson and Christos Levcopoulos. A fast approximation algorithm for TSP with neighborhoods. *Nord. J. Comput.*, 6(4):469, 1999.
- [27] David G. Kirkpatrick. An  $o(\lg \lg \text{opt})$ -approximation algorithm for multi-guarding galleries. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 53(2):327–343, 2015. doi:10.1007/s00454-014-9656-8.
- [28] Christos Levcopoulos and Andrzej Lingas. Bounds on the length of convex partitions of polygons. In *Proc. 4th Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS)*, volume 181 of *LNCS*, pages 279–295. Springer, 1984. doi:10.1007/3-540-13883-8\_78.
- [29] Carsten Lund and Mihalis Yannakakis. On the hardness of approximating minimization problems. *J. ACM*, 41(5):960–981, 1994. doi:10.1145/185675.306789.
- [30] Cristian S. Mata and Joseph S. B. Mitchell. Approximation algorithms for geometric tour and network design problems (extended abstract). In *Proc. 11th ACM Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG)*, pages 360–369, 1995. doi:10.1145/220279.220318.
- [31] Joseph S. B. Mitchell. Guillotine subdivisions approximate polygonal subdivisions: A simple polynomial-time approximation scheme for geometric TSP,  $k$ -MST, and related problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 28(4):1298–1309, 1999. doi:10.1137/S0097539796309764.
- [32] Joseph S. B. Mitchell. Geometric shortest paths and network optimization. In Jörg-Rüdiger Sack and Jorge Urrutia, editors, *Handbook of Computational Geometry*, pages 633–701. North Holland / Elsevier, 2000. doi:10.1016/b978-044482537-7/50016-4.
- [33] Joseph S. B. Mitchell. Approximating watchman routes. In *Proc. 24th ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 844–855, 2013. doi:10.1137/1.9781611973105.60.
- [34] Joseph S. B. Mitchell. Shortest paths and networks. In J.E. Goodman, J. O’Rourke, and C.D. Tóth, editors, *Handbook of Discrete and Computational Geometry*, chapter 31, pages 811–848. CRC Press, 3rd edition, 2017.
- [35] Dana Moshkovitz. The projection games conjecture and the NP-hardness of  $\ln n$ -approximating set-cover. *Theory Comput.*, 11:221–235, 2015. doi:10.4086/toc.2015.v011a007.

- [36] Jelani Nelson. A note on set cover inapproximability independent of universe size. *Electron. Colloquium Comput. Complex.*, TR07-105, 2007. URL: <https://eccc.weizmann.ac.il/eccc-reports/2007/TR07-105/index.html>, arXiv:TR07-105.
- [37] Bengt J. Nilsson and Paweł Żyliński. How to keep an eye on small things. *International Journal of Computational Geometry & Applications*, 30(02):97–120, 2020. doi:10.1142/S0218195920500053.
- [38] Simeon C. Ntafos. Watchman routes under limited visibility. *Comput. Geom.*, 1:149–170, 1992. doi:10.1016/0925-7721(92)90014-J.
- [39] Simeon C. Ntafos and Laxmi P. Gewali. External watchman routes. *Vis. Comput.*, 10(8):474–483, 1994. doi:10.1007/BF01910637.
- [40] J. O’Rourke. Visibility. In J.E. Goodman, J. O’Rourke, and C.D. Tóth, editors, *Handbook of Discrete and Computational Geometry*, chapter 33, pages 875–896. CRC Press, 3rd edition, 2017.
- [41] Joseph O’Rourke and Subhash Suri and Csaba D. Tóth. Polygons. In J.E. Goodman, J. O’Rourke, and C.D. Tóth, editors, *Handbook of Discrete and Computational Geometry*, chapter 30, pages 787–810. CRC Press, 3rd edition, 2017.
- [42] Christos H. Papadimitriou. The Euclidean traveling salesman problem is NP-complete. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 4(3):237–244, 1977. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(77)90012-3.
- [43] George Pólya. Zahlentheoretisches und Wahrscheinlichkeitstheoretisches über die Sichtweite im Walde. *Arch. Math. Phys. Series 2*, 27:135–142, 1918.
- [44] Shmuel Safra and Oded Schwartz. On the complexity of approximating tsp with neighborhoods and related problems. *Comput. Complex.*, 14(4):281–307, 2006. doi:10.1007/s00037-005-0200-3.
- [45] Paul R. Scott and Poh Wah Awyong. Inequalities for convex sets. *Journal of Inequalities in Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 1:article 6, 2000.
- [46] Xuehou Tan. Fast computation of shortest watchman routes in simple polygons. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 77(1):27–33, 2001. doi:10.1016/S0020-0190(00)00146-0.
- [47] Xuehou Tan. A linear-time 2-approximation algorithm for the watchman route problem for simple polygons. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 384(1):92–103, 2007. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2007.05.021.
- [48] Xuehou Tan, Tomio Hirata, and Yasuyoshi Inagaki. Corrigendum to ”An incremental algorithm for constructing shortest watchman routes”. *Int. J. Comput. Geom. Appl.*, 9(3):319–323, 1999. doi:10.1142/S0218195999000212.
- [49] Jorge Urrutia. Art gallery and illumination problems. In Jörg-Rüdiger Sack and Jorge Urrutia, editors, *Handbook of Computational Geometry*, pages 973–1027. North Holland / Elsevier, 2000. doi:10.1016/b978-044482537-7/50023-1.