






Minimum k -Hop Dominating Sets in Grid Graphs

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

Given a graph G , the k -hop dominating set problem asks for a vertex subset D_k such that every vertex of G is in distance at most k to some vertex in D_k ($k \in \mathbb{N}$). For $k = 1$, this corresponds to the classical dominating set problem in graphs.

We study the k -hop dominating set problem in grid graphs (motivated by generalized guard sets in polyominoes). We show that the VC dimension of this problem is 3 in grid graphs without holes, and 4 in general grid graphs. Furthermore, we provide a reduction from planar monotone 3SAT, thereby showing that the problem is NP-complete even in thin grid graphs (i.e., grid graphs that do not contain an induced C_4). Complementary, we present a linear-time 4-approximation algorithm for 2-thin grid graphs (which do not contain a 3×3 -grid subgraph) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation \rightarrow Computational geometry


Keywords and phrases k -hop dominating sets, grid graphs, Art Gallery problem, k -hop visibility, polyominoes, VC dimension

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. is supported by grant 2018-04101 (NETwork Optimization for CarSharing Integration into a Multimodal TRANSPORTation System) from Sweden's innovation agency VINNOVA.

1 Introduction

A *dominating set* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a vertex subset $D \subseteq V$, such that each vertex of G is either in D , or has a neighbor in D . A k -hop dominating set of G , for $k \geq 1$, is a vertex subset $D_k \subseteq V$, such that each vertex is connected to a vertex in D_k with a path of length at most k , i.e., the *hop distance* from every graph vertex to a vertex in D_k is at most k .

In this paper, we are interested in the *minimum k -hop dominating set problem in grid graphs*. Because grid graphs are dual graphs of polyominoes, another interpretation of the problem is in terms of a guarding problem in polyominoes: A unit-square u in a polyomino P is k -hop visible to a unit-square guard $v \in P$ if the shortest path from u to v in the dual grid graph of P has length at most k . For $k \geq 2$, this visibility definition allows a guard to look around corners of a polyomino, as visualized in Figure 1. We aim to find a minimum-cardinality unit-square guard cover under k -hop visibility. A possible motivation for this type of visibility comes from optimizing a station-based transportation service (e.g., carsharing) in a city: 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)



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

to a station—a simplified assumption. Then, we aim to place as few stations as possible to serve a complete city for a given maximum walking range of k cells. We represent the city as a polyomino, potentially with holes, and only walking within the boundary is possible (e.g., in Stockholm, holes would represent water bodies, which pedestrians cannot cross).

Related Work.

The minimum k -hop dominating set is shown to be NP-complete in general graphs [3, 5]. For trees, Kundu and Majunder [24] showed that the k -hop dominating set 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 as well. Borradaile and Le [11] presented an exact dynamic programming algorithm that runs in $O((2k + 1)^{tw} \cdot n)$ time on graphs with treewidth tw . Demaine et al. [15] considered k -hop dominating sets¹ on planar graphs and map graphs. 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 algorithm 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 more general case where the edges of the graph are weighted, the problem is typically called ρ -dominating set. Katsikarelis et al. [23] provided an FPT approximation scheme parameterized by the graphs treewidth tw , or its clique-width cw : if a ρ -dominating set of size s exists, they compute 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. [18] provided a bicriteria EPTAS for ρ -domination in planar graphs (later improved and generalized by Filtser and Le [17]). 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 [16] provided a PTAS for ρ -dominating set in H -minor-free graphs, based on local search. Their algorithm runs in $n^{O_H(\varepsilon^{-2})}$ time, and returns a ρ -dominating set of size at most $(1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}_\rho$.

Meir and Moon [28] showed an upper bound of $\lfloor \frac{n}{k+1} \rfloor$ for the k -hop dominating set for any tree, the bound holds for general graphs using any spanning tree. To the best of our knowledge, no matching lower bounds are provided; hence, we catch up by providing simple polyominoes requiring that many guards in Section 2.

¹ More precisely, they considered the (ℓ, k) -center problem: Does the graph G have $\leq \ell$ vertices, so-called centers, such that every vertex of G is within hop distance at most k from some center.

In the classical art gallery problem (AGP), we aim to place guards in a polygon, such that every point of the polygon is visible to at least one guard. Visibility is defined by analogy to human vision: point $p \in P$ sees point $q \in P$ if the line segment \overline{pq} contains no point that is not in P . Various variants for the classical AGP have been considered (varying both the capabilities of the guards and the environment to be guarded), and usually we are interested in two types of questions:

- (1) Can we compute the minimum cardinality guard set for a polygon P ?
- (2) What are lower and upper bounds on the number of guards needed to cover a polygon from a given class?

For the classical AGP, Question (1) was answered with several complexity results: already the most basic problem variants are proven to be NP-hard [26, 29]. The complexity of the AGP was recently fully resolved by Abrahamsen, Adamaszek, and Miltzow [1] showing that it is $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete. Answers to Question (2) are often referred to as “Art Gallery theorems”. Chvátal [13] provided the first such result: a tight bound of $\lfloor \frac{n}{3} \rfloor$ for simple polygons.

Guarding polyominoes and thin (orthogonal) polygons has been considered for different definitions of visibility. Tomás [31] 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 [9] considered guarding thin orthogonal polygons under rectilinear visibility (two points can see each other if the axis-parallel rectangle spanned by these two 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 $\tilde{O}(n^{17})$. 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)—the problem is fixed-parameter tractable in $t+h$. Biedl and Mehrabi [10] extended this study to orthogonal polygons with bounded treewidth under different visibility definitions usually used in orthogonal polygons: rectilinear visibility, staircase visibility (guards can see along an axis-parallel staircase), limited-turn path visibility (guards can see along axis-parallel paths with at most b bends). Under all these visibility definitions, they showed the guarding problem to be solvable in linear time. For orthogonal (general, also non-thin) polygons, Worman and Keil [33] gave a polynomial time algorithm to compute a minimum guard cover under rectilinear visibility by showing that an underlying graph is perfect. Perfect graphs were also employed by Maßberg [27] to provide Art Gallery theorems for orthogonal polygons in terms of the number of vertices, area and perimeter.

Biedl et al. [7] studied Art Gallery theorems for polyominoes under three definitions of visibility: rectilinear visibility, all-or-nothing visibility (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), as well as ordinary visibility. They showed that $\lfloor \frac{m+1}{3} \rfloor$ guards are sometimes necessary and always sufficient to guard a polyomino with m unit squares—Maßberg [27] gave a new proof of that result. Biedl et al. [6] also proved that determining the guard number of a given simple polyomino with m unit squares is NP-hard even in the all-or-nothing visibility model (or 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 [22] complemented the NP-hardness results by showing NP-hardness for polyominoes with holes also for rectilinear visibility. Pinciu [30] generalized this to polycubes, and gave simpler proofs for known results and new results for guarding polyhypercubes.

Our Results.

In this paper, we study two analogous problems—the minimum k -hop dominating set problem in grid graphs, and the minimum-cardinality unit-square guard cover of polyominoes under k -hop visibility—and we vary between seeing our problem as the former or latter depending on the approach we take (in most cases, we consider the guarding problem).

- In Section 3, we analyze the VC dimension of our problem. We prove that inside a simple polyomino at most 3 squares can be shattered by k -hop visibility, and give an example where 3 squares are shattered. We prove that inside a polyomino (with holes) at most 4 squares can be shattered by k -hop visibility, and give an example (for large enough k) where 4 squares are shattered. Hence the VC dimension is exactly 3 or 4 in simple polyominoes, or polyominoes with holes, respectively.
- In Section 4, we study the complexity of our problem and show that it 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).
- 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).

2 Notation and Preliminaries

A *polyomino* is a connected polygon P in the plane formed by joining together $|P| = n$ unit squares on the square lattice. The dual graph G_P of a polyomino has a vertex for each unit square, and $\{u, v\} \in E(G_P)$ if unit squares u, v are adjacent. Note that G_P is a *grid graph*. A polyomino is *simple* if it has no holes, that is, if every minimal cycle in the dual grid graph is a 4-cycle. Given a grid graph G , we denote by P_G the polyomino (unique except for rotation) for which G is the dual graph; 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 the dual grid graph of P , G_P , has length at most k . The *k -hop-visibility region* of a unit square $u \in P$, $V_k(u)$, 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 unit square u vouches that at least one *guard* has to be placed in its k -hop-visibility region.

A polyomino P is *t -thin* if it does not contain a block of squares of size $(t + 1) \times (t + 1)$. A grid graph G is *t -thin* if P_G is t -thin.

The *rest budget* of a unit square $g \in P$ at a unit square c is $rb(g, c) = \max\{k - d(g, c), 0\}$, where $d(g, c)$ is the distance in P between g and c .

With these, we define the problems we consider in this paper:

► **Problem 1** (Minimum k -hop Dominating Set Problem in Grid Graphs (MkDSP-GG)). *Given a grid graph G and a hop factor k , find a minimum-cardinality subset $D_k \subseteq V(G)$, such that for any vertex $v \in V(G)$ there exists $u \in D_k$ within hop-distance at most k .*

► **Problem 2** (Minimum k -hop Guarding Problem in Polyominoes (MkGP-P)). *Given a polyomino P and a range k , find a minimum-cardinality unit-square guard cover in P under k -hop visibility.*

As mentioned, Meir and Moon [28] showed an upper bound of $\lfloor \frac{n}{k+1} \rfloor$ for k -hop dominating sets. We now provide simple polyominoes that match these bounds.

► **Proposition 3.** *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 shaft). Figure 2 depicts the construction for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$.



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

If n is not divisible by $k + 1$ we add $x = (n \bmod k + 1)$ unit squares to the right of the shaft. Witnesses placed at the last unit square of each tooth (shown in pink) have disjoint k -hop visibility regions (of the shaft only the unit square to which the tooth is attached belongs to the k -hop visibility region), hence, we need one guard per witness. The x unit squares to the right of the shaft can be covered by the rightmost guard if placed in the shaft. Let t be the number of teeth, $n = t \cdot (k + 1) + x$, 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 of polyominoes P , we say that a finite set of (guard) unit squares G in P is *shattered* if for any of the $2^{|G|}$ subsets $G_s \subseteq G$ there exists a unit square $u \in P$, such that from u every unit square in G_s but no unit square in $G \setminus G_s$ is k -hop visible (or, by symmetry: from every unit square in G_s the unit square u is k -hop visible, but from no unit square in $G \setminus G_s$ u is k -hop visible). We 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 G that can be shattered. For detailed definitions, we refer to Haussler and Welzl [21].

In this section, we study the VC dimension of the $MkGP$ -P in both simple polyominoes and polyominoes with holes, and give exact values in both cases. The VC dimension has been studied for different guarding problems, e.g., Langetepe and Lehmann [25] showed that the VC dimension of L_1 -visibility in a simple polygon is exactly 5, Gibson et al. [19] proved that the VC dimension of visibility on the boundary of a simple polygon is exactly 6. For visibility in a simple polygon, the best lower bound of 6 stems from Valtr [32], the best upper bound of 14 stems from Gilbers and Klein [20]. Furthermore, given any set system with constant VC dimension, Brönnimann and Goodrich [12] presented a polynomial time $O(\log \text{OPT})$ -approximation for set cover.


We first observe and prove two properties which are helpful in several arguments.

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

1. g covers u if and only if u is within distance $rb(g, c)$ from c .
2. Let $g' \neq g$ be a unit square such that $rb(g', c) > rb(g, c)$. 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} (i.e., the line segment through the center points of a and c). Let P_{ac} be some path in P between a and c , and denote by B the set of unit squares enclosed within $P_{ac} \circ \overline{ac}$. For any unit square $b \in B$, there exists a unit square x on P_{ac} such that either $rb(b, x) \geq rb(a, x)$ or $rb(b, x) \geq rb(c, x)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that c is to the right of and above a ; see Figure 3.



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

If b is not in the axis-aligned bounding box of a, c , then clearly either $rb(b, x) \geq rb(a, x)$ for any $x \in B$ to the left of b , or $rb(b, x) \geq rb(c, x)$ for any $x \in B$ above b .

Else, let $b_a \in P_{ac}$ be the unit square directly to the left of b , and $b_c \in P_{ac}$ the unit square directly above b . We claim that either $d(b, b_a) \leq d(a, b_a)$ or $d(b, b_c) \leq d(c, b_c)$, and, thus, either $rb(b, b_a) \geq rb(a, b_a)$ or $rb(b, b_c) \geq rb(c, b_c)$.


To show that $d(b, b_a) \leq d(a, b_a)$ or $d(b, b_c) \leq d(c, b_c)$, we view the unit squares a, b, c as points $(x_a, y_a), (x_b, y_b), (x_c, y_c)$ on the unit grid, and assume, without loss of generality, that a is located on the origin. Since b is above the line through a, c , we get that (i) $y_b \geq \frac{y_c}{x_c} x_b$. If both $d(b, b_a) > d(a, b_a)$ and $d(b, b_c) > d(c, b_c)$ hold, then (ii) $x_b > y_b$ and (iii) $y_c - y_b > x_c - x_b$. By (ii) and (iii) we get $y_c > x_c$. On the other hand, by (i) and (ii) we get $y_b > \frac{y_c}{x_c} y_b$, and thus $y_c < x_c$, a contradiction. ◀

3.1 Simple Polyominoes

In this section, we investigate the VC dimension of simple polyominoes, and show:

► **Theorem 6.** *The VC dimension of k -hop visibility of a simple polyomino is 3 for any k .*


Proof. A lower bound construction with $k = 1$ is visualized in Figure 4: we have three guards, indicated by the green 1, the blue 2, and the red 3. All $2^3 = 8$ viewpoints are highlighted, and we denote the guards that see each viewpoint.



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

For the upper bound, we consider the k -hop-visibility region of a unit-square guard g . Consider four guards in the polyomino, and denote viewpoints as v_S with $S \subseteq \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. We distinguish three cases.


Case 1: The guards lie in convex position, i.e., the four center points of their corresponding grid squares are in convex position. Pick any guard and label it g_1 and then label them in clockwise order around the convex hull g_2, g_3 and g_4 , see Figure 5(a). First assume that the convex hull of the four guards is not pierced by the boundary of the polygon. We show that in this case, not both $v_{1,3}$ and $v_{2,4}$ are realizable. For two unit squares $x, y \in P$, denote by $sp(x, y)$ a shortest path between x and y in P . For every unit square x on $sp(g_1, v_{1,3})$ ($sp(g_3, v_{1,3})$), the rest budget for g_1 (g_3) must be strictly larger than that of g_2 and g_4 ($rb(\{g_1, g_3\}, x) > rb(\{g_2, g_4\}, x)$). Otherwise, g_2 or g_4 would cover $v_{1,3}$. Similarly, for every unit square x on $sp(g_2, v_{2,4})$ ($sp(g_4, v_{2,4})$), the rest budget for g_2 (g_4) must be strictly larger than that of g_1 and g_3 ($rb(\{g_2, g_4\}, x) > rb(\{g_1, g_3\}, x)$). Therefore, the paths $P_{13} = sp(g_1, v_{1,3}) \circ sp(v_{1,3}, g_3)$ and $P_{24} = sp(g_2, v_{2,4}) \circ sp(v_{2,4}, g_4)$ cannot cross (they cannot have a unit square x in common). In other words, one of P_{13}, P_{24} must “go around” a guard in order to avoid a crossing. Without loss of generality, assume that P_{24} goes around g_1 ; see Figure 5(b). Consider the line through the centers of g_2, g_4 , and assume that g_1 is above and to the right of that line. Since P_{24} goes around g_1 , the guard g_1 is in the region enclosed within $P_{24} \circ \overline{g_2 g_4}$. Since the boundary of P does not pierce the convex hull, and P is simple, we get by Lemma 5 that there exists a square x on P_{24} such that either $rb(g_1, x) \geq rb(g_2, x)$ or $rb(g_1, x) \geq rb(g_4, x)$, a contradiction. If the boundary of the polygon does pierce the convex hull, then it is possible to place both $v_{1,3}$ and $v_{2,4}$ by having one of the guards “go around” the box. In other words, the boundary of the polygon must cross the horizontal ray directed right from g_1 , and the vertical ray directed up from g_1 . Without loss of generality, assume the polygon creates a “hook” around g_1 such that g_2 can go around g_1 to reach $v_{2,4}$, see Figure 5(c). However, in this case, it is clear that g_1 cannot create a viewpoint with g_2 , since any viewpoint that g_1 covers along with g_2, g_4 would also cover.



■ **Figure 5** Case 1 in the proof of Theorem 6 with the polygon boundary not piercing the convex hull of the four guards g_1, \dots, g_4 (a) and (b), and piercing it (c). In (c) the polygon interior is shown in light gray, with its boundary in black. The shortest paths p_{13} and p_{24} are shown in orange and pink, respectively.

Case 2: Exactly three guards lie on the convex hull and the boundary does not pierce the convex hull. Pick any guard and label it g_1 and then label them in clockwise order around the convex hull g_2 and g_3 . See Figure 6 for an example of the notation used in this case. Let T be the triangle of grid points that connects the centers of g_1, g_2 and g_3 . Let g_4 be the guard inside of T . Let v (h) be the vertical (horizontal) squares above/below (left/right) of g_4 . Let I, II, III, IV be the quadrants created by v and h . In order for g_1 to reach $v_{1,2,3}$ that is outside of its quadrant, it must cross either v or h . Let v_1 (h_1) be

the closest cell of v (h) to g_1 . If a guard g_a for $a \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ crosses both v and h to reach some viewpoint v_S , then g_4 will cover v_S .




■ **Figure 6** Example for the notation used in Case 2 of the proof of Theorem 6.

Assume, without loss of generality, that g_1 is in quadrant I. Let g_2 be in quadrant IV and g_3 be in quadrant II. Then viewpoint $v_{1,2,3}$ must be in quadrant I, otherwise some guard will have to cross both v and h . By Lemma 5, g_4 will cover $v_{1,2,3}$ since its rest budget at v_3 or h_2 will be larger than or equal to the rest budgets of g_3 or g_2 . If g_2 and g_3 are both in quadrant III, then the viewpoint must be in either quadrant II or IV. Since g_4 is to the left of the g_2g_1 ray, $rb(g_4, v_1) \geq rb(g_1, v_1)$ or $rb(g_4, h_2) \geq rb(g_2, h_2)$. Therefore, g_4 will cover $v_{1,2,3}$ if it is in quadrant II. Since g_4 is to the left of the g_1g_3 ray, $rb(g_4, v_3) \geq rb(g_3, v_3)$ or $rb(g_4, h_1) \geq rb(g_1, h_1)$. Therefore, g_4 will cover $v_{1,2,3}$ if it is in quadrant IV. All other guard placements in the quadrants are equivalent to the ones described. Therefore, if the boundary does not pierce the convex hull, the viewpoint $v_{1,2,3}$ cannot be placed. It is possible to place the $v_{1,2,3}$ viewpoint if the convex hull is pierced by the polygon boundary. However, in doing so, the polygon boundary prevents g_4 from covering too far and the boundary has cut g_4 off from at least one other guard similar to what happened in Case 1. Placing the viewpoint for g_4 and this other guard becomes impossible.

Case 3: Two guards, g_1, g_3 , lie at the corners of some bounding box. The convex hull of the four guards either produce a quadrilateral or a triangle with the 4th guard inside of it. We revert back to Case 1 or Case 2. ◀

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 7.




■ **Figure 7** The k -hop-visibility regions (for $k = 6$) for the two guards intersect more than twice.

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). We show:

► **Theorem 7.** *The VC dimension of k -hop visibility of a polyomino with holes is 4 (for large enough k).*

Proof. A lower bound construction with $k = 18$ is visualized in Figure 8(a): we have four guards, indicated by the green 1, the blue 2, the red 3, and the yellow 4. All $2^4 = 16$ viewpoints are highlighted, and we denote the guards that see each viewpoint.



■ **Figure 8** (a) The lower bound construction for the VC dimension of polyominoes with holes with $k = 18$. The positions of the four guards 1, 2, 3, 4 are shown as squares in green, blue, red, and yellow, respectively. The visibility polygons are shown in a light shade of those colors. The 16 viewpoints are indicated by circles, and labeled accordingly. (b) The graph G_{4p} . The vertices g_1, \dots, g_4 are shown in green, blue, red, and yellow, respectively. The gray circles indicate the “pair” viewpoints, they are not vertices of the graph.

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 8(b) where each edge represents a path $P_{i,j}$ (the color of each guard reaches equally far into each edge, e.g., because some of the paths reflected in these edges include wiggles).

Of course, in the resulting polygon, the edges could be embedded in larger blocks of unit squares. However, given the upper bound 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. If we now have a fifth guard, g_5 , this must be located in one of the four faces. Let this be face f_i . Because 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 (a guard from the other pair will always see such a viewpoint too), a contradiction to our assumption. ◀

4 NP-completeness for 1-Thin Polyominoes with Holes

In this section, we study the computational complexity of the $MkGP$ -P in 1-thin polyominoes with holes (and thereby, the minimum k -Dominating Set Problem in 1-thin grid graphs). Note that for 1-thin polyominoes without holes, the dual grid graph is a tree, and an optimal solution can be obtained in linear time [2, 24]. In particular, we show:

► **Theorem 8.** *The $MkGP$ -P and the $MkDSP$ -GG in 1-thin polyominoes and 1-thin grid graphs, respectively, are NP-complete for $k \geq 2$.*

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 [14] proved to be NP-complete.

► **Problem 9** (PLANAR MONOTONE 3SAT). *Let $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be a set of Boolean variables and $C = C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge \dots \wedge C_m$ 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 F of PLANAR MONOTONE 3SAT with incidence graph G_F , we show how to turn a rectilinear, planar embedding of G_F into a polyomino P , such that a solution to the $MkGP$ -P in P yields a solution to F , thereby showing NP-hardness. At a high level, our reduction consists of three gadgets: “variable” gadgets to represent the variables of F , “wire” gadgets to connect variables to clauses, and “clause” gadgets to form the clauses of F .


Variable Gadget. The *variable gadget* is shown in Figure 9(a) for $k = 2$: a polyomino structure with two vertical corridor exits.

To cover the two marked squares in Figure 9(b), the guard positions that cover the largest number of squares of the gadget are given in Figure 9(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 9(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 9(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 9(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 9(e)), the other to setting it to false (Figure 9(f)).



■ **Figure 9** (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).


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 10(a) and 10(b). The split is located at a guard position of one truth setting (here the blue in Figure 10(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 10** Split gadget for $k = 2$ with the two possible truth assignments.

Clause Gadget. The *clause gadget* is shown in Figure 11(a) for $k = 2$: a trident, with distance $k + 1$ between its prongs.

Each prong is connected (by a wire) to a variable gadget. In Figure 11(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.



■ **Figure 11** (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.

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 11(c) to 11(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 11(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_F on an $O(n) \times O(n)$ grid [8], 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.

An example of the construction for the formula $(x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_4) \vee (\overline{x_1} \wedge \overline{x_2} \wedge \overline{x_3}) \vee (\overline{x_1} \wedge \overline{x_3} \wedge \overline{x_4})$ for $k = 2$ is depicted in Figure 12.

▷ **Claim 10.** If F 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 F , and the respective polyomino P derived from F according to the described construction. For each variable in F we place five guards within the corresponding variable gadget in P (where we place according to the truth assignment in α , see also Figure 9). After placing these guards, there is a unique placement of guards within the wire and split gadgets (as every unit square must

be guarded). As F is satisfied by the assignment α , placing additional five guards according to Figure 11 suffices to cover P .

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

Proof. Consider a guard set of size Γ under k -hop visibility for the polyomino P . To cover all unit squares 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 F .

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



■ **Figure 12** The polyomino P as an instance of the $MkGP$ -P derived from the Boolean formula $(x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_4) \vee (\bar{x}_1 \wedge \bar{x}_2 \wedge \bar{x}_3) \vee (\bar{x}_1 \wedge \bar{x}_3 \wedge \bar{x}_4)$, $k = 2$. We set $x_1 = T$, and $x_2 = x_3 = x_4 = F$.

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

As mentioned in Section 1, there exists a PTAS for k -hop domination in minor free graphs. However, the exponent of n in the running time 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 $O((2k+1)^{tw} \cdot n)$ [11], 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, in this section, we present a linear-time 4-approximation algorithm for the $MkDSP$ -GG/ $MkGP$ -P for 2-thin grid graphs/polyominoes, for any value of $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The running time 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]). 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—and, in particular, of a minimum cardinality guard set—this yields a 4-approximation.

Skeleton Graph Construction. Let P be a simple 2-thin polyomino. A vertex v of a unit square $s \in P$ is called *internal* if it does not lie on ∂P . Since 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 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 unit square, and $\|u - v\| = 1$.
2. u, v belong to two different unit squares that share an edge, and both vertices of this edge are not internal.
3. u, v belong to the same unit square s , and both other vertices of s are not internal.

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

For each square $s \in P$ that does not have any internal vertex, place a point b_s in the middle of s . We call s a boundary square, and b_s a boundary vertex, and denote by B the set of all boundary vertices. 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 , then we simply add $\{b_s, v\}$ to E_{con} . Else, s' has two internal vertices v, u , and we add a vertex $x_{v,u}$ 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 vertices $V = I \cup B \cup X$ and edge set $E = E_I \cup E_B \cup E_{con}$. Note that, as P is simple, we did not create any cycles when connecting T_I and T_B , thus, T is a tree. Moreover, the maximum degree of a vertex in T is 4 (for some vertices in X and I).

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

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

The Algorithm. We basically follow the lines of the algorithm of [2] for k -hop domination in trees, with several important changes.

We start by picking an arbitrary vertex r from T as a root. For a vertex $u \in T$, denote by T_u the sub-tree of T rooted at u . Notice that any path between a square associated with a vertex in T_u , and a square associated with a vertex in $T \setminus T_u$, includes a square from $S(u)$.

For every $u \in T$, let $h(T_u) = \max_{v \in T_u, s \in S(v)} \min_{s' \in S(u)} d_P(s, s')$ where $d_P(s, s')$ is the hop-distance in P between the unit squares s and s' . In other words, $h(T_u)$ is the largest hop distance from a square in $\bigcup_{v \in T_u} S(v)$ to its closest square from $S(u)$.

For each square $s' \in \bigcup_{v \in T_u} S(v)$, the minimum distance $\min_{s \in S(u)} d_P(s, s')$ is assumed at a particular square s , we denote by $M(s)$ the set of all squares $s' \in \bigcup_{v \in T_u} S(v)$ 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 dominating set, then every square associated with a vertex in T_u is dominated.

Initialize an empty set D (for the k -hop dominating 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 square $s \in P$ set $rb_D(s) = -1$ (up to a rest budget of 0 unit square s is k -hop visible to the vertices in D). This parameter marks the maximum rest budget of the square s over all squares in the dominating set D . We run a DFS algorithm starting from r , as follows; let u be the current vertex in the DFS call.

1. If $h(T_u) = k$, we add $S(u)$ to D , remove T_u from T , and set $rb_D(s) = k$ 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 square that realizes $h(T_u)$, we add $S(u)$ to D , remove T_u from T , and set $rb_D(s) = k$ 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 $h_s(T_u)$, $rb_D(s)$ 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 covered by D , by considering $h_s(T_u)$ and $rb_D(s)$ for every $s \in S(u)$, where we only consider associated 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 $rb_D(s) = k$ for every $s \in S(u)$.

If, at the end of the DFS run for r , we have $rb_D(s) = -1$ for some $s \in S(r)$, then we add $S(r)$ to D .

► **Theorem 12.** *At the end of the algorithm, D contains a k -hop guard cover for P , and a k -hop dominating set of G_P , of size at most $4 \cdot \text{OPT}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where OPT is the size of an optimal solution. The runtime of the algorithm is $O(n)$.*


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

Next, let u_1, \dots, u_ℓ be the sequence of vertices 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 square s_i , such that no two witness square $s_i \neq s_j$ have a single 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 $|W| = \ell$). Since in each step of the algorithm we add at most 4 squares to D , we get a solution of size at most 4ℓ , as required.

We choose s_i to be the square from T_{u_i} with maximum distance to its closest square from $S(u_i)$. This is the square that realizes $h(T_{u_i})$. We claim that when adding $S(u_i)$ to D , there is no square in P within hop distance k from both s_i, 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 vertex realizing T_{u_i} . Hence, we have $rb_{D \setminus \{u_i\}}(s_i) = -1$, and, thus, s_i 's distance to any $s_j, j < i$ is at least $2k + 1$.

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 square that realizes $h(T_{u_i})$, we know (because each unit square of the polyomino is an associated square of at least on vertex) 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



■ **Figure 13** Example 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); (b) the trees T_I and T_B with edges in E_I are shown in blue, edges in E_B are shown in red; (c) 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; (d) unit squares added to D in light pink; (e) placement of witnesses from the proof of Theorem 12 in turquoise.

it of at least $2k + 1$. Moreover, $rb_{D \setminus \{u_i\}}(s_i) = -1$ and, thus, s_i 's distance to any $s_j, j < i$ is at least $2k + 1$.

We initialize all $h(T_u)$ for every $u \in T$ and $h_s(T_u)$ for every $s \in S(u)$ with BFS in linear time. We update the values at most once for each square, hence, this is also linear. ◀

► **Remark (Generalization to t -thin polyominoes).** The construction of a skeleton graph may be extended to t -thin polyominoes, by having an hierarchy of internal vertices, as follows. The first level contains all internal vertices from I as we defined above. For the second level, we consider the set of unit squares whose vertices are the points in I . For each connected component P' of unit squares, we remove their vertices from our skeleton, and recursively construct a skeleton for P' . We associate a proper block of unit squares with each vertex, depending on its level, and connect the trees obtained in each level to create one tree T . However, for $k \gg t$, adding the entire block $S(v)$ of a vertex $v \in T$ may result in a (t^2) -approximation, but we may add only its boundary, and get a (t) -approximation. On the other hand, for $k \ll t$ we may need to add $O((t/k)^2)$ squares to D from each block. We conjecture that, with some careful analysis, it is possible to generalize our approach to t -thin polyominoes, and obtain a constant approximation in $O(tn)$ time. This implies a constant approximation in $O(n^{1.5})$ time. We leave this problem open for future research.

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, Mohammad Tanvir Irfan, Justin Iwerks, Joondong Kim, and Joseph S. B. Mitchell. The art gallery theorem for polyominoes. *Discrete Computational Geometry*, 48(3):711–720, 2012. doi:10.1007/s00454-012-9429-1.
- 8 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.
- 9 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.
- 10 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.
- 11 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.
- 12 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.
- 13 Vasek Chvátal. A combinatorial theorem in plane geometry. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory*, 18(1):39–41, 1975. doi:10.1016/0095-8956(75)90061-1.
- 14 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.
- 15 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.
- 16 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.
- 17 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.
- 18 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.
- 19 Matt Gibson, Erik Krohn, and Qing Wang. The VC-dimension of visibility on the boundary of a simple polygon. In *International Symposium Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC)*, pages 541–551, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-48971-0_46.

- 20 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.
- 21 David Haussler and Emo Welzl. ϵ -nets and simplex range queries. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 2(2):127–151, 1987. doi:10.1007/BF02187876.
- 22 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.
- 23 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.
- 24 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.
- 25 Elmar Langetepe and Simone Lehmann. Exact VC-dimension for L_1 -visibility of points in simple polygons, 2017. arXiv preprint. doi:10.48550/arXiv.1705.01723.
- 26 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.
- 27 Jens Maßberg. Perfect graphs and guarding rectilinear art galleries. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 51(3):569–577, 2014. doi:10.1007/s00454-014-9587-4.
- 28 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.
- 29 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.
- 30 Val Pinciu. Guarding polyominoes, polycubes and polyhypercubes. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 49:159–166, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.endm.2015.06.024.
- 31 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.
- 32 Pavel Valtr. Guarding galleries where no point sees a small area. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 104(1):1–16, 1998. doi:10.1007/BF02897056.
- 33 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.