



Guarding Polyominoes under k -Hop Visibility

Omrit Filtser ✉ 🏠 

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, The Open University of Israel, Israel

Erik Krohn ✉ 

Department of Computer Science, University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh, Oshkosh, WI, USA

Bengt J. Nilsson ✉ 🏠 

Department of Computer Science and Media Technology, Malmö University, Sweden

Christian Rieck ✉ 

Department of Computer Science, TU Braunschweig, Germany

Christiane Schmidt ✉ 🏠 

Department of Science and Technology, Linköping University, Sweden

Abstract

We study the ART GALLERY PROBLEM under k -hop visibility in polyominoes. In this visibility model, two unit squares of a polyomino can see each other if and only if the shortest path between the respective vertices in the dual graph of the polyomino has length at most k .

In this paper, we show that the VC dimension of this problem is 3 in simple polyominoes, and 4 in polyominoes with holes. Furthermore, we provide a reduction from PLANAR MONOTONE 3SAT, thereby showing that the problem is NP-complete even in thin polyominoes (i.e., polyominoes that do not contain a 2×2 block of cells). Complementarily, we present a linear-time 4-approximation algorithm for simple 2-thin polyominoes (which do not contain a 3×3 block of cells) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation \rightarrow Computational geometry

Keywords and phrases Art Gallery problem, k -hop visibility, polyominoes, VC dimension, approximation, k -hop dominating set

Funding B. J. N. and C. S. are supported by grant 2021-03810 (Illuminate: provably good algorithms for guarding problems) and by grant 2018-04001 (New paradigms for autonomous unmanned air traffic management) from the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet). C. S. was supported by grant 2018-04101 (NETworK Optimization for CarSharing Integration into a Multimodal TRANSPORTATION System) from Sweden's innovation agency VINNOVA.


1 Introduction

“How many guards are necessary and sufficient to guard an art gallery?” This question was posed by Victor Klee in 1973, and led to the classic ART GALLERY PROBLEM: Given a polygon P and an integer ℓ , decide whether there is a guard set of cardinality ℓ such that every point $p \in P$ is seen by at least one guard, where a point is seen by a guard if and only if the connecting line segment is inside the polygon.

Now picture the following situation: A station-based transportation service (e.g., carsharing) wants to optimize the placement of their service stations. Assume that the demand is given in a granularity of (square) cells, and that customers are willing to walk a certain distance (independent of where they are in the city) to a station. Then, we aim to place as few stations as possible to serve an entire city for a given maximum walking range of k cells. We thus represent the city as a polyomino, potentially with holes, and only walking within the boundary is possible (e.g., holes would represent water bodies or houses, which pedestrians cannot cross).

Our real-world example therefore motivates the following type of visibility. Two cells u and v of a polyomino P can see each other if the shortest geodesic path from u to v in the

polyomino has length at most k . For $k \geq 2$, this allows for the situation that a cell sees other cells that are around or behind corners of the polyomino, as visualized in Figure 1.



■ **Figure 1** A unit square in green with its k -hop-visibility region for $k = 6$ (shaded in dark green) within a polyomino—a subset of the diamond shown in light green.

In this paper, we investigate the following problem.

► **Problem 1** (MINIMUM k -HOP GUARDING PROBLEM IN POLYOMINOES ($MkGP$)). *Given a polyomino P and an integer k , find a minimum-cardinality unit-square guard cover in P under k -hop visibility.*

As the dual graph of a polyomino is a grid graph, we analogously state the following problem.

► **Problem 2** (MINIMUM k -HOP DOMINATING SET PROBLEM IN GRID GRAPHS ($MkDSP$)). *Given a grid graph G and an integer k , find a minimum-cardinality subset $D_k \subseteq V(G)$, such that for any vertex $v \in V(G)$ there exists a vertex $u \in D_k$ within hop distance of at most k .*

While we formulated the optimization problems, the associated decision problems are defined as expected with an upper bound on the number of guards or dominating vertices.

Our Contributions.

In this paper, we investigate the MINIMUM k -HOP GUARDING PROBLEM IN POLYOMINOES and give the following results.

- In Section 3, we analyze the VC dimension of the problem and give tight bounds. In particular, we prove that inside a simple polyomino exactly 3 squares can be shattered by k -hop visibility, see Theorem 6. For polyominoes with holes, we show that the VC dimension of k -hop visibility is 4, see Theorem 7.
- In Section 4, we study the computational complexity of the respective decision version of the problem. We show that the problem is NP-complete for $k \geq 2$, even in 1-thin polyominoes with holes (polyominoes that do not contain a 2×2 block of unit squares), see Theorem 8.
- In Section 5, we provide a linear-time 4-approximation for simple polyominoes that do not contain a 3×3 block of unit squares (i.e., 2-thin polyominoes), see Theorem 12.

Related Work.

The classic ART GALLERY PROBLEM (AGP) is NP-hard [24, 26], even in the most basic problem variant. Abrahamsen, Adamaszek, and Miltzow [1] recently showed that the AGP is $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete, even when the corners of the given polygon are at integer coordinates.

Guarding polyominoes and thin (orthogonal) polygons has been considered for different definitions of visibility. Tomás [28] showed that computing a minimum guard set under the original definition of visibility is NP-hard for point guards and APX-hard for vertex or boundary guards in thin orthogonal polygons; an orthogonal polygon is defined as *thin* if the dual graph of the partition obtained by extending all edges of P through incident reflex vertices is a tree. Biedl and Mehrabi [8] considered guarding thin orthogonal polygons under rectilinear visibility (two points can see each other if the axis-aligned rectangle spanned by these points is fully contained in the polygon). They showed that the problem is NP-hard in orthogonal polygons with holes, and provided an algorithm that computes a minimum set of guards under rectilinear vision for tree polygons in $\tilde{O}(n^{17})$ time. Their approach generalizes to polygons with h holes or thickness t (the dual graph of the polygon does not contain an induced $(t+1) \times (t+1)$ grid); hence, the problem is fixed-parameter tractable in $t+h$. Biedl and Mehrabi [9] extended this study to orthogonal polygons with bounded treewidth under different visibility definitions usually used in orthogonal polygons: rectilinear visibility, staircase visibility (guards see along an axis-parallel staircase), and limited-turn path visibility (guards see along axis-parallel paths with at most b bends). Under these visibility definitions, they showed the guarding problem to be linear-time solvable. For orthogonal polygons, Worman and Keil [30] gave a polynomial time algorithm to compute a minimum guard cover under rectilinear visibility by showing that an underlying graph is perfect.

Biedl et al. [6] proved that determining the guard number of a given simple polyomino with n unit squares is NP-hard even in the all-or-nothing visibility model (a unit square s of the polyomino is visible from a guard g if and only if g sees all points of s under ordinary visibility), and under ordinary visibility. They presented polynomial time algorithms for thin polyominoes, for which the dual is a tree, and for the all-or-nothing model with limited range of visibility. Iwamoto and Kume [20] complemented the NP-hardness results by showing NP-hardness for polyominoes with holes also for rectilinear visibility. Pinciu [27] generalized this to polycubes, and gave simpler proofs for known results and for guarding polyhypercubes.

The MINIMUM k -HOP DOMINATING SET PROBLEM is NP-complete in general graphs [3, 5]. For trees, Kundu and Majunder [22] showed that the problem can be solved in linear time. Recently, Abu-Affash et al. [2] simplified that algorithm, and provided a linear-time algorithm for cactus graphs. Borradaile and Le [10] presented an exact dynamic programming algorithm that runs in $O((2k+1)^{tw} \cdot n)$ time on graphs with treewidth tw . Demaine et al. [13] considered the (ℓ, k) -center problem on planar and map graphs, i.e., the question whether a graph has at most ℓ many *center* vertices such that every vertex of the graph is within hop distance at most k from some center. They showed that for these graph families, the problem is fixed-parameter tractable by providing an exact $2^{O(k \log k) \sqrt{\text{OPT}}} \cdot \text{poly}(n)$ time algorithm, where OPT is the size of an optimal solution. They also obtained a $(1+\varepsilon)$ -approximation for these families that runs in $k^{O(k/\varepsilon)} \cdot m$ time, where m is the number of edges in the graph.

In the general case where the edges of the graph are weighted, the problem is typically called the ρ -DOMINATING SET PROBLEM. Katsikarelis et al. [21] provided an FPT approximation scheme parameterized by the graphs treewidth tw , or its clique-width cw . In particular, if there exists a ρ -dominating set of size s in a given graph, the approximation scheme computes a $(1+\varepsilon)\rho$ -dominating set of size at most s in time $(tw/\varepsilon)^{O(tw)} \cdot \text{poly}(n)$, or $(cw/\varepsilon)^{O(cw)} \cdot \text{poly}(n)$, respectively. Fox-Epstein et al. [16] provided a bicriteria EPTAS for ρ -domination in planar graphs (later improved and generalized by Filtser and Le [15]). Their algorithm runs in $O(n^c)$ time (for some constant c), and returns a $(1+\varepsilon)\rho$ -dominating set of size $s \leq (1+\varepsilon)\text{OPT}_\rho$, where OPT_ρ is the size of a minimum ρ -dominating set. Filtser and Le [14] provided a PTAS for ρ -dominating set in H -minor-free graphs, based on local search.

Their algorithm has a runtime of $n^{O_H(\varepsilon^{-2})}$ and returns a ρ -dominating set of size at most $(1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}_\rho$. Meir and Moon [25] showed an upper bound of $\lfloor \frac{n}{k+1} \rfloor$ on the number of vertices in a k -hop dominating set of any tree with n vertices. This bound trivially holds for general graphs by using any spanning tree.

2 Notation and Preliminaries

A *polyomino* P is a connected polygon in the plane formed by joining together $|P| = n$ unit squares (also called *cells*) on the square lattice. The dual graph G_P of a polyomino has a vertex at the center point of each cell of P , and there is an edge between two center points if their respective cells share an edge. Note that G_P is a *grid graph*. A polyomino is *simple* if it has no holes, that is, every inner face of its dual graph has unit area. A polyomino P is *t -thin* if it does not contain a block of squares of size $(t + 1) \times (t + 1)$, and analogously, a grid graph G is *t -thin* if P_G is t -thin, where P_G denotes the polyomino (that is unique except for rotation) for which G is the dual graph. Note, any vertex in G has at most four neighbors.

A unit square $v \in P$ is *k -hop-visible* to a unit square $u \in P$ if the shortest path from u to v in G_P has length at most k . The *k -hop-visibility region* of a unit square $u \in P$, is the set of all unit squares that are k -hop-visible from u . It is a subset of the diamond with diameter $2k$ —the maximal k -hop-visibility region, see Figure 1. A *witness set* is a set of unit squares W , such that the k -hop-visibility regions of the elements in W are pairwise disjoint. A *witness* placed at the unit square u vouches that at least one *guard* has to be placed in its k -hop-visibility region.

As mentioned, Meir and Moon [25] showed an upper bound of $\lfloor \frac{n}{k+1} \rfloor$ for k -hop dominating sets for graphs with n vertices. To the best of our knowledge, no matching lower bound is provided, so we catch up by showing that there is, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a simple 1-thin grid graph that requires that many dominating vertices. Stated in context of the guarding problem, we show the following.

► **Proposition 3.** *For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist simple polyominoes with n unit squares that require $\lfloor \frac{n}{k+1} \rfloor$ guards to cover their interior under k -hop visibility.*

Proof. We construct a double-comb like polyomino by alternately adding teeth of length k to the top and bottom of a row of unit squares (the handle). Figure 2 depicts the construction for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$.



■ **Figure 2** Lower bound construction for simple polyominoes that require $\lfloor \frac{n}{k+1} \rfloor$ guards under k -hop visibility for (a) $k = 1$ and (b) $k = 2$. Witnesses are shown in pink.

If n is not divisible by $k + 1$, we add $m = (n \bmod k + 1)$ unit squares to the right of the handle. Witnesses placed at the last unit square of each tooth (shown in pink) have disjoint k -hop-visibility regions (of the handle only the unit square to which the tooth is attached belongs to the k -hop-visibility region), hence, we need a single guard per witness. The m cells to the right of the handle can be covered by the rightmost guard if placed in the handle. Let t be the number of teeth, $n = t \cdot (k + 1) + m$, we need $t = \lfloor \frac{n}{k+1} \rfloor$ guards. ◀

3 VC Dimension

The *VC dimension* is a measure of complexity of a set system. In our setting, we say that a finite set of (guard) unit squares D in a polyomino P is *shattered* if for any of the $2^{|D|}$ many subsets $D_i \subseteq D$ there exists a unit square $u \in P$, such that from u every unit square in D_i but no unit square in $D \setminus D_i$ is k -hop visible (or symmetrically: from every unit square in D_i the unit square $u \in P$ is k -hop visible, but u is not k -hop visible from any square in $D \setminus D_i$). We then say that the unit square u is a *viewpoint*. The VC dimension is the largest d , such that there exists a polyomino P and a set of d unit-square guards D that can be shattered. For detailed definitions, we refer to Haussler and Welzl [19].

In this section, we study the VC dimension of the MkGP in both simple polyominoes and polyominoes with holes, and provide exact values for both cases. The VC dimension has been studied for different guarding problems, e.g., Langetepe and Lehmann [23] showed that the VC dimension of L_1 -visibility in a simple polygon is exactly 5, Gibson et al. [17] proved that the VC dimension of visibility on the boundary of a simple polygon is exactly 6. For line visibility in a simple polygon, the best lower bound of 6 is due to Valtr [29], the best upper bound of 14 stems from Gilbers and Klein [18]. Furthermore, given any set system with constant VC dimension, Brönnimann and Goodrich [11] presented a polynomial time $O(\log \text{OPT})$ -approximation for SET COVER.


For analyzing the VC dimension, we define the *rest budget* of a unit square $g \in P$ at a unit square $c \in P$ to be $\text{rb}(g, c) = \max\{k - d(g, c), 0\}$, where $d(g, c)$ is the minimum distance between g and c in G_P , and k the respective hop distance. We first state two structural properties which are helpful in several arguments.

► **Observation 4** (Rest-Budget Observation). *Let P be a polyomino, and let g and u be two unit squares in P such that a shortest path between them contains a unit square c . Then the following holds:*

1. *The unit square g covers u , if and only if u is within distance $\text{rb}(g, c)$ from c .*
2. *For any unit square g' with $\text{rb}(g', c) > \text{rb}(g, c)$, if g' covers u , then so does g .*

► **Lemma 5** (Rest-Budget Lemma). *Let a, c be two unit squares in a simple polyomino P , such that the boundary of P does not cross the line segment \overline{ac} that connects their center points. Let P_{ac} be some path in the dual graph G_P between the center points of a and c , and let b be a unit square whose center point belongs to the area enclosed within $P_{ac} \circ \overline{ac}$. Then, there exists a unit square x on P_{ac} such that $\text{rb}(b, x) \geq \text{rb}(a, x)$ and $\text{rb}(b, x) \geq \text{rb}(c, x)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that the center of a is placed on the origin, c lies in the first quadrant, and b is above the line through the centers of a, c ; see Figure 3.



■ **Figure 3** Location of unit squares used in the proof of Lemma 5.

If b is above c , then let x be the unit square on P_{ac} directly above b . As P is simple, and the boundary of P does not cross \overline{ac} , the area enclosed within $P_{ac} \circ \overline{ac}$ does not contain any boundary piece of P . Thus, the path in G_P from b to x is a straight line segment, and

we have $\text{rb}(b, x) \geq \text{rb}(a, x)$ and $\text{rb}(b, x) \geq \text{rb}(c, x)$, as required. Symmetrically, if b is to the left of a , then let x be the unit square on P_{ac} directly to the left of b , and again we have $\text{rb}(b, x) \geq \text{rb}(a, x)$ and $\text{rb}(b, x) \geq \text{rb}(c, x)$, as required.

The only case left is when b lies in the axis-aligned bounding box of a, c . In this case, let b_c (resp. b_a) be the unit square on P_{ac} directly above (resp. to the left of) b . Denote the center point of b by (b_x, b_y) , and the center point of c by (c_x, c_y) . As b is above the line through a, c , we get that (i) $b_y \geq \frac{c_y}{c_x} b_x$. If both $d(b, b_a) > d(a, b_a)$ and $d(b, b_c) > d(c, b_c)$ hold, then (ii) $b_x > b_y$ and (iii) $c_y - b_y > c_x - b_x$. By (ii) and (iii) we get $c_y > c_x$. On the other hand, by (i) and (ii) we get $b_y > \frac{c_y}{c_x} b_x$, and thus $c_y < c_x$, a contradiction.


We conclude that either $d(a, b_a) \geq d(b, b_a)$ or $d(c, b_c) \geq d(b, b_c)$ holds, which means that either $\text{rb}(b, b_a) \geq \text{rb}(a, b_a)$ or $\text{rb}(b, b_c) \geq \text{rb}(c, b_c)$. Furthermore, as b lies above a , we have $d(a, b_c) > d(b, b_c)$, and as b lies also to the left of c , we have $d(c, b_a) > d(b, b_a)$. Therefore, the claim holds for one of b_a or b_c . ◀

3.1 Simple Polyominoes

In this section, we investigate the VC dimension of k -hop visibility of simple polyominoes. In particular, we show the following.

► **Theorem 6.** *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the VC dimension of k -hop visibility of a simple polyomino is 3.*


Proof. A lower bound construction with $k = 1$ and three guards, indicated by the green 1, the blue 2, and the red 3, is visualized in Figure 4. All $2^3 = 8$ viewpoints are highlighted, and we denote the guards that see each viewpoint. For larger k , we keep the placement of guards, but the polyomino will be a large rectangle that contains all k -hop-visibility regions. Because of the relative position of the guards they are shattered as before.



■ **Figure 4** A lower bound construction for the VC dimension of k -hop visibility of simple polyominoes with $k = 1$. The positions of the guards 1, 2, 3 are shown as squares in green, blue, and red, respectively. The k -hop-visibility regions are shown in a light shade of those colors. The 8 viewpoints are indicated by circles, and labeled accordingly.

We now show that four guards cannot be shattered in simple polyominoes. To this end, consider four guards g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4 to be placed in the simple polyomino, and denote the potential viewpoints as v_S with $S \subseteq \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. For two unit squares $x, y \in P$, we denote by $sp(x, y)$ a shortest path between x and y in G_P . For $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, let $P_{i,j} = sp(g_i, v_{i,j}) \circ sp(v_{i,j}, g_j)$. We now distinguish two cases depending on how many of the four guards lie on their convex hull.

Case 1: All four guards lie in convex position. That is, the four center points of their corresponding grid squares are in convex position. Pick any guard and label it g_1 and then label the other in clockwise order around the convex hull g_2, g_3 and g_4 , see Figure 5(a).



■ **Figure 5** Case 1 in the proof of Theorem 6, with $P_{1,3}$, $P_{2,4}$ and $P_{2,3}$ shown in orange, pink and turquoise, respectively. (a) $P_{1,3}$ and $P_{2,4}$ cannot cross. (b) $P_{2,4}$ goes around g_1 . (c) The boundary of P must pierce $\overline{g_2g_4}$ and both $P_{2,4}$ and $P_{2,3}$ must go around a square \hat{x} in the exterior of P .

Assume, without loss of generality, that g_4 is to the left of g_1 and that g_1 is above the line through g_2 and g_4 .

First, we claim that the paths $sp(g_i, v_{1,3})$ and $sp(g_j, v_{2,4})$ cannot cross each other for $i \in \{1, 3\}, j \in \{2, 4\}$. Indeed, if the paths have unit square x in common (see Figure 5(a)), then one of g_i, g_j has a larger rest budget at x (or an equal rest budget). Assume, without loss of generality, that $rb(g_i, x) \geq rb(g_j, x)$, then g_i would also cover $v_{2,4}$, which is a contradiction as $i \notin \{2, 4\}$. Therefore, the paths $P_{1,3} = sp(g_1, v_{1,3}) \circ sp(v_{1,3}, g_3)$ and $P_{2,4} = sp(g_2, v_{2,4}) \circ sp(v_{2,4}, g_4)$ cannot cross, and one of them must “go around” a guard in order to avoid a crossing. Without loss of generality, assume that $P_{2,4}$ goes around g_1 , that is, g_1 belongs to the area enclosed within $P_{2,4} \circ \overline{g_2g_4}$; see Figure 5(b). Assume that the boundary of P does not pierce $\overline{g_2g_4}$. In this case, as P is simple, we get by Lemma 5 that there exists a square x on $P_{2,4}$ such that $rb(g_1, x) \geq rb(g_2, x)$ and $rb(g_1, x) \geq rb(g_4, x)$. Hence, g_1 covers $v_{2,4}$, a contradiction.

We therefore assume that the boundary of P does pierce $\overline{g_2g_4}$ (see Figure 5(c)), and, hence, there exists a square $\hat{x} \notin P$, which blocks g_1 from reaching the square x on $P_{2,4}$ from Lemma 5. As P is simple, the boundary of P must also cross either $\overline{g_2g_3}$ or $\overline{g_3g_4}$ in a way that any path in P between the endpoints of this segment must go around \hat{x} . In other words, assume, without loss of generality, that the boundary of P crosses $\overline{g_2g_3}$. Then there exists a path in the exterior of P connecting $\overline{g_2g_3}$ and \hat{x} , and because P is simple, any path in P from g_2 to g_3 must go around \hat{x} (see Figure 5(c)). In particular, the path $P_{2,3} = sp(g_2, v_{2,3}) \circ sp(v_{2,3}, g_3)$ also goes around \hat{x} . We get that both $P_{2,3}$ and $P_{2,4}$ go around \hat{x} ; however, $sp(g_3, v_{2,3})$ and $sp(g_4, v_{2,4})$ cannot intersect. Moreover, consider the region $A_{3,4}^2$ enclosed by $\overline{g_3g_4} \circ sp(g_3, v_{2,3}) \circ sp(v_{2,3}, v_{2,4}) \circ sp(g_4, v_{2,4})$, and assume that $sp(g_3, v_{2,3})$ is above $sp(g_4, v_{2,4})$ (the other case is argued analogously). As P is simple, the region $A_{3,4}^2$ does not contain any polyomino boundary. Consider the line ℓ through g_4 of slope -1 . If g_3 is below ℓ , then for any unit square s to the right of g_4 inside $A_{3,4}^2$, we have $rb(g_4, s) \geq rb(g_3, s)$. As g_3 also lies below $\overline{g_2g_4}$ and to the left of g_4 (and because k -hop-visibility regions are diamond-shaped without boundary), we get that g_4 reaches $v_{2,3}$, a contradiction. On the other hand, if g_3 is above ℓ , consider the region $A_{3,4}^1$ enclosed by $\overline{g_3g_4} \circ sp(g_3, v_{1,3}) \circ sp(v_{1,3}, v_{1,4}) \circ sp(g_4, v_{1,4})$ and assume that $sp(g_3, v_{1,3})$ is below $sp(g_4, v_{1,4})$. By the same arguments, the region $A_{3,4}^1$ does not contain any polyomino boundary, and for any square s below g_4 inside $A_{3,4}^1$, we have $rb(g_4, s) \geq rb(g_3, s)$. In this case, g_4 reaches $v_{1,3}$, a contradiction.


Case 2: Exactly three guards lie on their convex hull. That is, the three center points of their corresponding grid squares are in convex position, and the center point of the fourth

guard lie in the convex hull. We label the three guards on the convex hull g_1, g_2, g_3 , and g_4 is the guard placed inside the convex hull. We show that the viewpoint $v_{1,2,3}$ is not realizable.

Let T be the triangle of grid points that connects the centers of g_1, g_2 , and g_3 . Consider the three shortest paths connecting g_1, g_2, g_3 to $v_{1,2,3}$. As g_4 lies in T , for any placement of $v_{1,2,3}$, we would get that for some $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, the area enclosed within $sp(g_i, v_{1,2,3}) \circ sp(v_{1,2,3}, g_j) \circ \overline{g_i g_j}$ contains the center point of g_4 . If the boundary of P does not pierce T , then, similar to Case 1, we get by Lemma 5 that g_4 reaches $v_{1,2,3}$, a contradiction. Otherwise, assume that the convex hull of the three guards is pierced by the boundary. Then it is possible to realize the $v_{1,2,3}$ viewpoint. However, similar to the argument in Case 1, the boundary will prevent the realization of a viewpoint of g_4 and one of the other guards (g_4 taking the role of g_1 from Case 1 here). ◀

3.2 Polyominoes with Holes

Aronov et al. [4] showed an upper bound of 4 for the VC dimension of hypergraphs of pseudo disks. And while, intuitively, one might suspect that k -hop-visibility regions of unit squares in polyominoes with holes are pseudo disks; that is not the case, as illustrated in Figure 6(a).



■ **Figure 6** (a) The k -hop-visibility regions (for $k = 6$) of the two guards intersect more than twice. (b) The lower bound construction for the VC dimension of non-simple polyominoes for $k = 18$. The positions of the four guards 1, 2, 3, 4 are shown as squares in green, blue, red, and yellow, respectively. Visibility regions are shown in a light shade of those colors. The 16 viewpoints are indicated by circles, and labeled accordingly. The gray and black \times 's and boxed \times 's indicates where we insert 2 and 1 unit squares, respectively, to increase the value of k by 2. We alternate between using the gray and black markings. (c) The graph G_{4p} with vertices g_1, \dots, g_4 shown in green, blue, red, and yellow, respectively. Gray circles indicate the “pair”-viewpoints, and are not vertices of the graph.

Hence, we need to show an upper bound for the VC dimension in this case in another way. In fact, even here, we provide matching upper and lower bounds. These are valid for large enough values of k (e.g., for $k = 1$ we do not gain anything from the holes). In particular, we show the following.

► **Theorem 7.** *For large enough $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the VC dimension of k -hop visibility of a polyomino with holes is 4.*

Proof. A lower bound with $k = 18$ is visualized in Figure 6(b): the four guards are indicated by the green 1, the blue 2, the red 3, and the yellow 4. We highlighted the $2^4 = 16$ viewpoints, and denoted the guards that see each viewpoint. For larger (even) values of k , we extend the corridors in Figure 6(b) at the location marked by “ \times ”: We alternate between using the

gray and black unit squares. At locations with a simple “ \times ”, we insert two unit squares, at locations with a boxed “ \times ”, we insert a single unit square. One can verify that by alternating between the gray and black insertions for $k = 18 + 2i$, all viewpoints are realized.

For the upper bound, assume that we can place a set with five unit-square guards g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4, g_5 that can be shattered. We denote viewpoints as v_S with $S \subseteq \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. Let $P_{i,j}, i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$ denote the shortest path from guard g_i to g_j along which the viewpoint $v_{\{i,j\}}$ is located. In particular, $P_{i,j}$ includes the shortest paths from g_i to $v_{\{i,j\}}$ and from g_j to $v_{\{i,j\}}$ (as this determines the rest budget for both guards at $v_{\{i,j\}}$).

We start with four guards g_1, \dots, g_4 . To generate all the “pair” viewpoints, $v_{\{i,j\}}, \{i, j\} \subseteq \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we need to embed the graph G_{4p} shown in Figure 6(c) where each edge represents a path $P_{i,j}$ (the color of each guard reaches equally far into each edge, e.g., some of the paths reflected in these edges include wiggles).

Of course, in the resulting polyomino, the edges could be embedded in larger blocks of unit squares. However, given the upper bound of 3 on the VC dimension for simple polyominoes, we know that at least one of the four faces f_1, \dots, f_4 (and in fact one of f_1, f_2, f_3) of G_{4p} must contain a hole. A fifth guard g_5 must be located in one of the four faces. Let this be face f_i . As g_i is not incident to f_i , the path from g_5 to g_i , $P_{i,5}$, must intersect one of the other paths represented by the edges in G_{4p} , let this be the path $P_{j,\ell}$. By Observation 4, one of the viewpoints $v_{\{i,5\}}$ and $v_{\{j,\ell\}}$ cannot be realized, as a guard from the other pair will always see such a viewpoint too; a contradiction to our assumption. \blacktriangleleft

4 NP-completeness for 1-Thin Polyominoes with Holes

In this section, we show that the decision version of the MkGP is NP-complete, even in 1-thin polyominoes with holes. However, as the dual graph of a 1-thin polyomino without holes is a tree, an optimal solution can be obtained in linear time [2, 22].

► **Theorem 8.** *The decision version of the MkGP is NP-complete for $k \geq 2$, even in 1-thin polyominoes with holes.*


Proof. Membership in NP follows easily, as we can verify in polynomial time for a given proposed solution whether each square of the respective polyomino is covered by the guards.

Hence, it remains to show NP-hardness of the problem. Our reduction is from PLANAR MONOTONE 3SAT, which de Berg and Khosravi [12] proved to be NP-complete.

► **Problem 9** (PLANAR MONOTONE 3SAT). *Let $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be a set of Boolean variables and $\varphi = C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge \dots \wedge C_m$ be a formula in conjunctive normal form defined over these variables, where each clause C_i is the disjunction of at most three variables. Let each clause be monotone, i.e., each clause consists of only negated or unnegated literals, and let the bipartite variable-clause incidence graph be planar with a rectilinear embedding. This constitutes a monotone, rectilinear representation of a PLANAR MONOTONE 3SAT instance. Decide whether the instance is satisfiable.*

Given an instance φ of PLANAR MONOTONE 3SAT with incidence graph G_φ , we show how to turn a rectilinear, planar embedding of G_φ into a polyomino P , such that a solution to the MkGP in P yields a solution to φ , thereby showing NP-hardness. At a high level, our reduction consists of four gadgets: variable gadgets to represent the variables of φ , split gadgets to duplicate variable assignments, wire gadgets to connect variables to clauses, and clause gadgets to form the clauses of φ .


Variable Gadget. The *variable gadget* is shown in Figure 7(a) for $k = 2$: a polyomino structure with two vertical corridor exits.



■ **Figure 7** (a) Variable gadget for $k = 2$; (b) to cover the two marked squares, the furthest into the gadget we can place guards are the two locations shown in (c); (d) the two turquoise squares within distance $2(k + 1)$ are then still uncovered and a single guard cannot cover both of these; (e) if a guard in the lower corridor covers the right turquoise square, the visibility region of the right guard extends two squares into the right corridor, the red guard must cover the left turquoise square and cannot see into the left corridor; (f) mirrored situation to that in (e).


To cover the two marked squares in Figure 7(b), the guard positions that cover the largest number of squares of the gadget are given in Figure 7(c). The k -hop-visibility regions of these guards leave a width- $(2k + 2)$ corridor of uncovered squares at the bottom of the gadget. The two extremal squares of that corridor, highlighted in turquoise in Figure 7(d), cannot be covered by a single guard. Because of the two square niches attached to the width- $(2k + 2)$ corridor, the only two positions for a potential guard that allow us to cover all of the variable gadget with five guards are vertically below and over these two niches. If we pick the right of these positions, as in Figure 7(e), we cover the right turquoise square, the last uncovered square on that side has distance 2 to this turquoise square, and we can place a (blue) guard that sees distance 2 into the right vertical corridor exiting the gadget. The left turquoise square remains uncovered by the guard in the width- $(2k + 2)$ corridor, hence, a guard placed in the left horizontal corridor that covers this square cannot extend into the left corridor exiting the gadget. Figure 7(f) shows the mirrored case. We have exactly two sets of five guards placed within the variable gadget that cover the complete gadget (four guards are not sufficient), one refers to setting the variable to true (Figure 7(e)), the other to setting it to false (Figure 7(f)).

Wire and Split Gadget. The *wire gadget* is simply an extended corridor from the two vertical corridor exits of a variable gadget. A wire may be split using the *split gadget* shown in Figures 8(a) and 8(b). The split is located at a guard position of one truth setting (here the blue in Figure 8(a)), hence, that square is the last square covered by a guard representing the other assignment. Given that our guards can look around an arbitrary number of corners (depending on k), we can bend our wires at any position.



■ **Figure 8** Split gadget for $k = 2$ with the two possible truth assignments.

Clause Gadget. The *clause gadget* is shown in Figure 9(a) for $k = 2$: a trident, with distance $k + 1$ between its prongs.




■ **Figure 9** (a) Clause gadget for $k = 2$. (b) positions for all possible guards for truth assignments fulfilling the clause (blue, “T”) and truth assignments not fulfilling the clause (red, “F”). (c)-(j) show the different truth settings, in all but FFF, two guards in the clause are sufficient and necessary to cover the clause, in the FFF case, two additional guards in the clause gadget are not enough; (c) TTT; (d) TTF; (e) TFT; (f) FTT; (g) FFT; (h) FTF; (i) TFF; (j) FFF.

Each prong is connected (by a wire) to a variable gadget. In Figure 9(b), we depict all possible positions of guards in corridors that connect to a variable gadget with an assignment fulfilling the clause in blue, and all possible positions of guards in corridors that connect to a variable gadget with an assignment not fulfilling the clause in red. The guards in the center prong are one square further into their corridor than those in the outer prongs. For odd k this yields an odd distance between guard positions in the center and in either of the outer prongs, which we cannot achieve automatically in a square grid. However, in a corridor, a guard’s visibility region spans $2k + 1$ squares, which is odd for all k . Hence, depending on whether we construct a corridor with a length that requires an even or an odd number of guards, we can cover an even or an odd distance.

After having settled that we can achieve the odd distance between guard positions in the center prong and either of the outer prongs, we check the clause gadget: As depicted in Figures 9(c) to 9(i), in all but one cases of truth-value assignments, two additional guards in the clause gadget are necessary and sufficient to cover the gadget. If the assignment does not fulfill the clause as shown in Figure 9(j), we obtain a path of uncovered squares of length $(2 \cdot (2k + 1) + 1)$, which is impossible to cover with two guards. Hence, we need three guards for the clause gadget if and only if no variable has a truth setting fulfilling the clause.

Global Construction. We start from a planar, rectilinear embedding of G_φ on an $O(n) \times O(n)$ grid [7], scaled by a constant factor. Then, we locally replace each clause by one clause gadget, each variable by one variable gadget, and edges either by a single corridor from a clause gadget to a variable gadget (if the literal appears only in one clause), or by corridors with additional split gadgets. Because we can steer a corridor's length to be even or odd by requiring an even or odd number of guards, we can always place all gadgets and connect them as desired. This construction requires a guard set of size $\Gamma = 5V + 5C + W/(2k+1)$, where V and C is the number of variables and clauses, respectively, and W is the number of unit squares that make up all wire and split gadgets.

Figure 10 depicts an exemplary construction of the polyomino for the Boolean formula $\varphi = (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_4) \vee (\bar{x}_1 \wedge \bar{x}_2 \wedge \bar{x}_3) \vee (\bar{x}_1 \wedge \bar{x}_3 \wedge \bar{x}_4)$ for $k = 2$.



■ **Figure 10** The polyomino P as an instance of the $MkGP$ derived from the Boolean formula $\varphi = (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_4) \vee (\bar{x}_1 \wedge \bar{x}_2 \wedge \bar{x}_3) \vee (\bar{x}_1 \wedge \bar{x}_3 \wedge \bar{x}_4)$, $k = 2$. We set $x_1 = T$, and $x_2 = x_3 = x_4 = F$.

▷ **Claim 10.** If φ is satisfiable, then there is a guard set of size Γ under k -hop visibility.

Proof. Consider a satisfying assignment α for the Boolean formula φ , and the respective polyomino P derived from φ according to the described construction. For each variable in φ , we place five guards within the corresponding variable gadget in P (where we place according to the truth assignment in α , see also Figure 7). After placing these guards, there is a unique placement of guards within the wire and split gadgets (as every cell must be guarded). As we assume that φ is satisfied by the assignment α , placing additional five guards according to Figure 9 suffices to cover P .

▷ **Claim 11.** If there is a guard set of size Γ under k -hop visibility, then φ is satisfiable.

Proof. Consider a guard set of size Γ under k -hop visibility for the polyomino P . To cover all cells that belong to wire and split gadgets, we require at least W many guards. As described previously, every variable gadget requires at least five guards; this accumulates in a total of $5V$ guards, where V again is the number of variables. So, we only have $5C$ guards left, where C is the number of clauses. As we considered a feasible guard set, every clause needs at least five guards, and every clause can be covered with five guards only if parts of them are already covered by guards placed in incident wires, this induces a corresponding placement of guards within the variables gadgets. This placement provides a satisfying assignment for φ .

Claims 10 and 11 complete the proof of Theorem 8. ◀

5 A Linear Time 4-Approximation for Simple 2-Thin Polyominoes

As already mentioned, there exists a PTAS for k -hop domination in H -minor free graphs [14]. However, the exponent of n in the runtime may be infeasible for realistic applications, where n is extremely large. On the other hand, the exact algorithm for graphs with treewidth tw has running time $O((2k+1)^{tw} \cdot n)$ [10], which may be too large if $k = \Omega(n)$, even for small tw (in fact, it is not hard to show that 2-thin polyominoes have constant tw : K_4 is not a minor, hence, we have $tw = 2$ for 2-thin polyominoes).

Therefore, we present a linear-time 4-approximation algorithm for the $MkGP$ in simple 2-thin polyominoes, for any value of $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The runtime of our algorithm does not depend on k . The overall idea is to construct a tree T on P , and let T lead us in placing guards in P (inspired by the linear-time algorithm for trees by Abu-Affash et al. [2] for the equivalent problem of k -hop dominating set). In each iteration step, we place 1, 2, or 4 guards and 1 witness. Because the cardinality of a witness set is a lower bound on the cardinality of any guard set, this yields a 4-approximation.

Skeleton Graph Construction. Let P be a simple 2-thin polyomino. A vertex v of a cell $s \in P$ is called *internal* if it does not lie on the boundary of P . Because P is 2-thin, any square $s \in P$ can have at most 3 internal vertices. Let I be the set of internal vertices of unit squares in P . For any $u, v \in I$, we add the edge $\{u, v\}$ to E_I if one of the following holds:

1. u, v belong to the same cell and $\|u - v\| = 1$.
2. u, v belong to two different cells that share an edge and both vertices of this edge are not internal.
3. u, v belong to the same cell s and both other vertices belonging to s are not internal.

Because P is a simple 2-thin polyomino, the edges of E_I form a forest T_I on I .

For each unit square $s \in P$ that does not have any internal vertex, place a point b_s in the center of s . We call s a boundary square, b_s a boundary node, and denote by B the set of all boundary nodes. For any $b_s, b_{s'} \in B$ such that $s, s' \in P$ share an edge, add the edge $\{b_s, b_{s'}\}$ to E_B . Notice that the edges of E_B form a forest T_B on B .

We now connect T_B and T_I . Let s be a boundary square that shares an edge with a non-boundary square s' . Then, b_s must be a leaf in T_B , and s' has at most two internal vertices. If s' has a single internal vertex v , we simply add $\{b_s, v\}$ to E_{con} . Else, s' has two internal vertices v, u , and we add an artificial node $x_{v,u}$ to the set X , and the edges $\{b_s, x_{v,u}\}$, $\{u, x_{v,u}\}$, and $\{v, x_{v,u}\}$ to E_{con} .

Let T be the graph on the vertex set $V = I \cup B \cup X$ and the edge set $E = E_I \cup E_B \cup E_{con}$. Note that, as P is simple, no cycles are created when connecting T_I and T_B ; thus, T is a tree. Moreover, the maximum degree of a node in T is 4 (for some nodes in X and I).

Associated Squares. Associate with each node $v \in T$ a block $S(v)$ of unit squares from P as follows:

1. For $v = x_{u,v} \in X$, $S(v)$ consists of a two unit squares with the edge $\{u, v\}$.
2. For $v \in I$, $S(v)$ consists of a 2×2 block of unit squares with internal vertex v .
3. For $v = b_s \in B$, $S(v) = \{s\}$.

The Algorithm. As already mentioned, we basically follow the lines of the algorithm of [2] for k -hop dominating sets in trees, with several important changes.

We start by picking an arbitrary node r from T as a root. For a node $u \in T$, denote by T_u the subtree of T rooted at u . Notice that any path between a unit square associated with a node in T_u , and a unit square associated with a node in $T \setminus T_u$, includes a unit square from $S(u)$. For every node $u \in T$, let $h(T_u) = \max_{v \in T_u, s \in S(v)} \min_{s' \in S(u)} d_P(s, s')$, where $d_P(s, s')$ denotes the hop distance between the cells s and s' in P . In other words, $h(T_u)$ is the largest hop distance from a unit square in $\bigcup_{v \in T_u} S(v)$ to its closest unit square from $S(u)$.

For each cell $s' \in \bigcup_{v \in T_u} S(v)$, the minimum distance $\min_{s \in S(u)} d_P(s, s')$ is assumed at a particular unit square s , we denote by $M(s)$ the set of all these cells for which that distance is assumed for s , and set $h_s(T_u) = \max_{s' \in M(s)} d_P(s, s')$. Note that if $h(T_u) = k$, and we pick $S(u)$ for our guard set, then every unit square associated with a node in T_u is guarded.

Initialize an empty set D (for the k -hop-visibility guard set), and compute $h(T_u)$ for every $u \in T$ and $h_s(T_u)$ for every $s \in S(u)$. In addition, for every unit square $s \in P$ set $\text{rb}_D(s) = -1$ (up to a rest budget of 0, s is k -hop visible to the nodes in D). This parameter marks the maximum rest budget of the unit square s over all squares in the guard set D . We run a DFS algorithm starting from r , as follows; let u be the current node in the DFS call.


1. If $h(T_u) = k$, we add $S(u)$ to D , remove T_u from T , and set $\text{rb}_D(s) = k$ for every $s \in S(u)$.
2. Else if, $h(T_u) \geq k - 2$ and $\min_{s \in S(p(u))} d(s, s') > k$ for the parent $p(u)$ of u and $s' \in T_u$ being the unit square that realizes $h(T_u)$, we add $S(u)$ to D , remove T_u from T , and set $\text{rb}_D(s) = k$ for every $s \in S(u)$.
3. Else, for each child v of u with $h(T_v) \geq k - 2$, we run the DFS algorithm on v . Then we update $h(T_u)$ and $h_s(T_u)$, $\text{rb}_D(s)$ for every $s \in S(u)$, according to the values calculated for all children of u .
4. We check if the remaining T_u is already guarded by D , by considering $h_s(T_u)$ and $\text{rb}_D(s)$ for every $s \in S(u)$, where we only consider associated unit squares with negative rest budget.
5. Else, if the new $h(T_u)$ is now exactly k or if the condition from point 2 holds, then again we add $S(u)$ to D , remove T_u from T , and set $\text{rb}_D(s) = k$ for every $s \in S(u)$.

If, at the end of the DFS run for r , we have $\text{rb}_D(s) = -1$ for some $s \in S(r)$, then we add $S(r)$ to D . We give an example of our algorithm in Figure 11.

We show that, after termination of the algorithm, D is a k -hop-visibility guard set for the given polyomino P of size at most $4 \cdot \text{OPT}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where OPT is the size of an optimal solution.

► **Theorem 12.** *There is a linear-time 4-approximation for the MkGP in simple 2-thin polyominoes.*

Proof. During the algorithm, we remove a node v from T only if $S(v)$ is covered by cells in D . Since $\bigcup_{v \in T} S(v) = P$, D is a k -hop-visibility guard set for P .



■ **Figure 11** Example for our algorithm for $k = 3$: (a) Polyomino P , in black, with the associated vertices: vertices in I in blue (\bullet), vertices in B in red (\bullet), the root r is indicated in magenta (\bullet), the trees T_I and T_B with edges in E_I are shown in blue, edges in E_B are shown in red; (b) connecting T_I and T_B , vertices $x_{v,u}$ and their incident edges are shown in green (\bullet), all other connecting edges are shown in black; (c) unit squares added to D in light pink; (d) placement of witnesses from the proof of Theorem 12 in turquoise.

Next, let u_1, \dots, u_ℓ be the sequence of nodes of T such $S(u_i)$ was added to the set D during the algorithm. We show that in each T_{u_i} we can find a witness unit square s_i , such that no two witness unit squares $s_i \neq s_j$ have a single unit square in P within hop distance k from both s_i and s_j . This means that any optimal solution has size at least ℓ ($W = \{s_1, \dots, s_\ell\}$ is a witness set with $|W| = \ell$). Because we add at most 4 unit squares to D in each step of the algorithm, we get a solution of size at most 4ℓ , as required.

We choose s_i to be the unit square from T_{u_i} with maximum distance to its closest unit square from $S(u_i)$, i.e., the unit square that realizes $h(T_{u_i})$. We claim that there is no cell in P within hop distance k from both s_i and s_j for any $j < i$.

If $S(u_i)$ was added to D because $T_{u_i} = k$, we had s_i being the node realizing T_{u_i} . Hence, we have $\text{rb}_{D \setminus \{u_i\}}(s_i) = -1$, and thus, the distance from s_i to any $s_j, j < i$ is at least $2k + 1$.

If $S(u_i)$ was added to D because $h(T_{u_i}) \geq k - 2$ and $\min_{s \in S(p(u))} d(s, s_i) > k$ for the parent $p(u)$ of u and $s_i \in T_{u_i}$ being the unit square that realizes $h(T_{u_i})$, we know (because each unit square of the polyomino is an associated unit square of at least one node) that there is a unit square $s'' \in S(u_i)$ with $d(s'', s_i) = k$. Thus, any witness placed after s_i has distance to it of at least $2k + 1$. Moreover, $\text{rb}_{D \setminus \{u_i\}}(s_i) = -1$ and, thus, s_i 's distance to any $s_j, j < i$ is at least $2k + 1$.

We initialize $h(T_u)$ for every $u \in T$ and $h_s(T_u)$ for every $s \in S(u)$ with a BFS-call, and we update the values at most once for each square in linear time. ◀

References

- 1 Mikkel Abrahamsen, Anna Adamaszek, and Tillmann Miltzow. The art gallery problem is $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete. *Journal of the ACM*, 69(1):4:1–4:70, 2022. doi:10.1145/3486220.
- 2 A. Karim Abu-Affash, Paz Carmi, and Adi Krasin. A linear-time algorithm for minimum k -hop dominating set of a cactus graph. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 320:488–499, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2022.06.006.
- 3 Alan D. Amis, Ravi Prakash, Dung T. Huynh, and Thai H.P. Vuong. Max-min d -cluster formation in wireless ad hoc networks. In *Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 32–41, 2000. doi:10.1109/INFCOM.2000.832171.
- 4 Boris Aronov, Anirudh Donakonda, Esther Ezra, and Rom Pinchasi. On pseudo-disk hypergraphs. *Computational Geometry*, 92:101687, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.comgeo.2020.101687.
- 5 Partha Basuchowdhuri and Subhashis Majumder. Finding influential nodes in social networks using minimum k -hop dominating set. In *International Conference on Applied Algorithms (ICAA)*, pages 137–151, 2014. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-04126-1_12.
- 6 Therese C. Biedl, Mohammad Tanvir Irfan, Justin Iwerks, Joondong Kim, and Joseph S. B. Mitchell. Guarding polyominoes. In *Symposium on Computational Geometry*, pages 387–396, 2011. doi:10.1145/1998196.1998261.
- 7 Therese C. Biedl and Goos Kant. A better heuristic for orthogonal graph drawings. *Computational Geometry*, 9(3):159–180, 1998. doi:10.1016/S0925-7721(97)00026-6.
- 8 Therese C. Biedl and Saeed Mehrabi. On r -guarding thin orthogonal polygons. In *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC)*, pages 17:1–17:13, 2016. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ISAAC.2016.17.
- 9 Therese C. Biedl and Saeed Mehrabi. On orthogonally guarding orthogonal polygons with bounded treewidth. *Algorithmica*, 83(2):641–666, 2021. doi:10.1007/s00453-020-00769-5.
- 10 Glencora Borradaile and Hung Le. Optimal dynamic program for r -domination problems over tree decompositions. In *International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation (IPEC)*, pages 8:1–8:23, 2017. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.IPEC.2016.8.
- 11 Hervé Brönnimann and Michael T. Goodrich. Almost optimal set covers in finite VC-dimension. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 14(4):463–479, 1995. doi:10.1007/BF02570718.
- 12 Mark de Berg and Amirali Khosravi. Optimal binary space partitions for segments in the plane. *International Journal of Computational Geometry & Applications*, 22(03):187–205, 2012. doi:10.1142/S0218195912500045.
- 13 Erik D. Demaine, Fedor V. Fomin, Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Fixed-parameter algorithms for (k, r) -center in planar graphs and map graphs. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 1(1):33–47, 2005. doi:10.1145/1077464.1077468.
- 14 Arnold Filtser and Hung Le. Clan embeddings into trees, and low treewidth graphs. In *Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 342–355, 2021. doi:10.1145/3406325.3451043.
- 15 Arnold Filtser and Hung Le. Low treewidth embeddings of planar and minor-free metrics. In *Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1081–1092, 2022. doi:10.1109/FOCS54457.2022.00105.
- 16 Eli Fox-Epstein, Philip N. Klein, and Aaron Schild. Embedding planar graphs into low-treewidth graphs with applications to efficient approximation schemes for metric problems. In *Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1069–1088, 2019. doi:10.1137/1.9781611975482.66.
- 17 Matt Gibson, Erik Krohn, and Qing Wang. The VC-dimension of visibility on the boundary of a simple polygon. In *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC)*, pages 541–551, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-48971-0_46.
- 18 Alexander Gilbers and Rolf Klein. A new upper bound for the VC-dimension of visibility regions. *Computational Geometry*, 47(1):61–74, 2014. doi:10.1016/j.comgeo.2013.08.012.
- 19 David Haussler and Emo Welzl. ε -nets and simplex range queries. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 2(2):127–151, 1987. doi:10.1007/BF02187876.

- 20 Chuzo Iwamoto and Toshihiko Kume. Computational complexity of the r -visibility guard set problem for polyominoes. In *Japanese Conference on Discrete and Computational Geometry and Graphs (JCDCGG)*, pages 87–95, 2013. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-13287-7_8.
- 21 Ioannis Katsikarelis, Michael Lampis, and Vangelis Th. Paschos. Structural parameters, tight bounds, and approximation for (k, r) -center. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 264:90–117, 2019. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2018.11.002.
- 22 Sukhamay Kundu and Subhashis Majumder. A linear time algorithm for optimal k -hop dominating set of a tree. *Information Processing Letters*, 116(2):197–202, 2016. doi:10.1016/j.ipl.2015.07.014.
- 23 Elmar Langetepe and Simone Lehmann. Exact VC-dimension for L_1 -visibility of points in simple polygons, 2017. doi:10.48550/arXiv.1705.01723.
- 24 Der-Tsai Lee and Arthur K. Lin. Computational complexity of art gallery problems. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 32(2):276–282, 1986. doi:10.1109/TIT.1986.1057165.
- 25 A. Meir and John W. Moon. Relations between packing and covering numbers of a tree. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 61(1):225–233, 1975. doi:10.2140/pjm.1975.61.225.
- 26 Joseph O’Rourke and Kenneth Supowit. Some NP-hard polygon decomposition problems. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 29(2):181–190, 1983. doi:10.1109/TIT.1983.1056648.
- 27 Val Pinciu. Guarding polyominoes, polycubes and polyhypercubes. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 49:159–166, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.endm.2015.06.024.
- 28 Ana Paula Tomás. Guarding thin orthogonal polygons is hard. In *Fundamentals of Computation Theory (FCT)*, pages 305–316, 2013. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-40164-0_29.
- 29 Pavel Valtr. Guarding galleries where no point sees a small area. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 104(1):1–16, 1998. doi:10.1007/BF02897056.
- 30 Chris Worman and J. Mark Keil. Polygon decomposition and the orthogonal art gallery problem. *International Journal of Computational Geometry & Applications*, 17(2):105–138, 2007. doi:10.1142/S0218195907002264.