

Faster, Deterministic and Space Efficient Subtrajectory Clustering

Ivor van der Hoog ✉ 

Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science, Technical University of Denmark, Denmark

Thijs van der Horst ✉

Department of Information and Computing Sciences, Utrecht University, the Netherlands
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, TU Eindhoven, the Netherlands

Tim Ophelders ✉

Department of Information and Computing Sciences, Utrecht University, the Netherlands
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, TU Eindhoven, the Netherlands

Abstract

Given a trajectory T and a distance Δ , we wish to find a set C of curves of complexity at most ℓ , such that we can cover T with subcurves that each are within Fréchet distance Δ to at least one curve in C . We call C an (ℓ, Δ) -clustering and aim to find an (ℓ, Δ) -clustering of minimum cardinality. This problem variant was introduced by Akitaya *et al.* (2021) and shown to be NP-complete. The main focus has therefore been on bicriterial approximation algorithms, allowing for the clustering to be an $(\ell, \Theta(\Delta))$ -clustering of roughly optimal size.

We present algorithms that construct $(\ell, 4\Delta)$ -clusterings of $\mathcal{O}(k \log n)$ size, where k is the size of the optimal (ℓ, Δ) -clustering. We use $\mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n + n \cdot (k + \ell) \log n)$ space and $\mathcal{O}(kn^3 \log^4 n)$ time. Our algorithms significantly improve upon the clustering quality (improving the approximation factor in Δ) and size (whenever $\ell \in \Omega(\log n)$). We offer deterministic running times comparable to known expected bounds. Additionally, we give a near-quadratic improvement upon the dependency on n in the space usage.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation \rightarrow Computational Geometry

Keywords and phrases Fréchet distance, clustering, set cover

Funding *Ivor van der Hoog*: This project has additionally received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 899987.

Tim Ophelders: Partially supported by the Dutch Research Council (NWO) under the project number VI.Veni.212.260.

Acknowledgements We want to thank Jacobus Conradi, who pointed out an error in a previous version of this paper.

1 Introduction

Buchin, Buchin, Gudmundsson, Löffler, and Luo [8] proposed the subtrajectory clustering problem. The goal is to partition an input trajectory T of n vertices into subtrajectories, and to group these subtrajectories into *clusters* such that all subtrajectories in a cluster have low Fréchet distance to one another. The clustering under the Fréchet distance is a natural application of Fréchet distance and a well-studied topic [9, 10, 11, 15, 16] that has applications in for example map reconstruction [6, 7]. Throughout recent years, several variants of the algorithmic problem have been proposed [1, 3, 5, 8]. Agarwal, Fox, Munagala, Nath, Pan, and Taylor [1] aim to give a general definition for subtrajectory clustering by defining a function f that evaluates the quality of a set of clusters C . Their definition does not encompass the definition in [8] and has nuances with respect to [3, 5, 13].

# Clusters	$\Delta' =$	Time	Space	Source
$\mathcal{O}(k\ell^2 \log(k\ell))$	19Δ	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k\ell^4\lambda^2 + n\lambda)$	$\mathcal{O}(n + \lambda)$	[3]
$\mathcal{O}(k\ell \log k)$	11Δ	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(kn^3\ell)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^3)$	[5]
$\mathcal{O}(k \log n)$	11Δ	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(kn^4\ell + n^4\ell^2)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^4\ell)$	[13]
$\mathcal{O}(k \log n)$	4Δ	$\mathcal{O}(kn^3 \log^4 n)$	$\mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n + n \cdot (k + \ell) \log n)$	Thm. 13

■ **Table 1** Prior work and our result. The first two (red) rows indicate randomized results. k denotes the smallest (ℓ, Δ) -clustering size of T . λ denotes the relative arclength of the curve.

Regardless of variant, the subtrajectory clustering problem has been shown to be NP complete [1, 3, 8]. Agarwal, Fox, Munagala, Nath, Pan, and Taylor [1] therefore propose a bicriterial approximation scheme. They present a heuristic algorithm for the following. Suppose that we are given some $\Delta \geq 0$. Let k denote the smallest integer such that there exists a clustering C with k clusters with score $f(C) \leq \Delta$. The goal is to compute a clustering C' with $\mathcal{O}(k \text{ polylog } n)$ clusters and score $f(C') \in \Theta(\Delta)$.

Akitaya, Brüning, Chambers, and Driemel [3] present a less general, but more computable, bicriterial approximation problem: suppose that we are given some $\Delta \geq 0$ and integer $\ell \geq 1$. An (ℓ, Δ) -clustering is a set C^* of clusters (sets of subtrajectories) where:

- C^* covers T : for all points t on T , there is a cluster $Z \in C^*$ with a curve containing t ,
- every cluster $Z \in C^*$ contains a “reference curve” P_Z with at most ℓ vertices, and
- for every $Z \in C^*$, all subtrajectories $Q \in Z$ have $d_F(P_Z, Q) \leq \Delta$.

This paradigm was studied in [3, 5, 13] and previous results are summarised in Table 1. Under the discrete Fréchet distance, Akitaya *et al.* [3] compute an $(\ell, 18\Delta)$ -clustering C of $\mathcal{O}(k\ell^2 \log(k\ell))$ size, using $\mathcal{O}(n)$ space and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(kn^2)$ expected running time. By subdividing T with Δ -spaced breakpoints, their discrete algorithm can be applied to the continuous case, yielding an $(\ell, 19\Delta)$ -clustering. The running time and space bounds depend on the *relative arclength* of T with respect to Δ . Brüning, Conradi and Driemel [5] compute, under the continuous Fréchet distance, an $(\ell, 11\Delta)$ -clustering of $\mathcal{O}(k\ell \log k)$ size (where the constant in the number of clusters is considerably large¹). Their algorithm uses $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^3)$ space and has $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(kn^3)$ expected running time. Recently, Conradi and Driemel [13] improve both the size and the distance of the clustering. Under the continuous Fréchet distance, they can compute an $(\ell, 11\Delta)$ -clustering of $\mathcal{O}(k \log n)$ size in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^4\ell)$ space and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(kn^4\ell + n^4\ell^2)$ time.

Contribution. We consider the problem by Akitaya *et al.* [3] using the continuous Fréchet distance. Our algorithm uses $\mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n + n \cdot (k + \ell) \log n)$ space and $\mathcal{O}(kn^3 \log^4 n)$ time, and computes an $(\ell, 4\Delta)$ -clustering of size at most $51k \ln(6n) + 1$. Our results (when compared to previous works [3, 5, 13]) significantly improve upon the quality of the clustering (whenever $\ell \in \Omega(\log n)$, see Table 1). In addition, we offer deterministic running times. We additionally offer a near-linear improvement upon the space usage. When compared only to deterministic results, we offer a near-linear speedup and a near-quadratic improvement in the space usage. For practical purposes, our constants are significantly lower than those in previous works.¹ We refer to Table 1 for an overview of the results.

Methodology. Our algorithm iteratively constructs a clustering by greedily adding a cluster that covers an approximately maximum set of uncovered points on T . The main focus

¹ The asymptotic size of the clustering in [5] hides the constant 16γ , where $\gamma = 110d + 412$.

computing an approximately maximum cluster. We present a simplification algorithm that computes a curve S that allows us to restrict reference curves of clusters to be subcurves of S . We then restrict reference curves further, to be of one of four types: vertex-subcurves of S , prefixes or suffixes of edges of S , or subedges of edges of S . For each type, we provide an algorithm for constructing a near-optimal cluster of that type. Our algorithm carefully avoids iterating over all candidate clusters. We compare this methodology to previous results:

In [3, 5] the authors present a randomized algorithm based on ε -net sampling over the set of all candidate clusters. They shatter the set of candidate clusters and show that it has bounded VC dimension which leads to their asymptotic approximation of k — the minimum size of an (ℓ, Δ) -clustering. The algorithm in [13] is more similar to ours. The authors also simplify the input and iteratively select the cluster with the (exact) maximum coverage to obtain an (ℓ, Δ) -clustering of size $\mathcal{O}(k \log n)$. The key difference is in how we find the next cluster. In [13] they explicitly consider a set of $\mathcal{O}(n^3 \ell)$ candidate clusters, which takes $\mathcal{O}(n^4 \ell)$ time and space to construct. In contrast, we work with a candidate set of size $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$, and our argument that includes only approximately maximal clusters requires us to compute only a subset of all candidate elements on the fly. This leads to more efficient space and time usage. The key difficulty is to efficiently find approximately maximal clusters, avoiding inspecting all candidates.

2 Preliminaries

Curves and subcurves. A *curve* (or *polyline*) with ℓ vertices is a piecewise-linear map $P: [1, \ell] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ whose breakpoints (called *vertices*) are at each integer parameter, and whose pieces are called *edges*. We denote by $P[a, b]$ the subcurve of P that starts at $P(a)$ and ends at $P(b)$. If a and b are integers, we call $P[a, b]$ a *vertex-subcurve* of P . Let $|P|$ denote the number of vertices of a curve P .


Fréchet distance. A *reparameterization* of $[1, n]$ is a non-decreasing, continuous surjection $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow [1, n]$ with $f(0) = 1$ and $f(1) = n$. Two reparameterizations f and g of $[1, m]$ and $[1, n]$, respectively, describe a *matching* (f, g) between two curves P and Q with m and n vertices, where for any $t \in [0, 1]$, point $P(f(t))$ is matched to $Q(g(t))$. A matching (f, g) is said to have *cost*

$$\max_t \|P(f(t)) - Q(g(t))\|,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm. A matching with cost at most Δ is called a Δ -*matching*. The (continuous) *Fréchet distance* $d_F(P, Q)$ between P and Q is the minimum cost over all matchings.

Free space diagram and matchings. The Δ -*free space diagram* $\Delta\text{-FSD}(P, Q)$ of P and Q is the set of points $(x, y) \in [1, m] \times [1, n]$ in their parameter space with $\|P(x) - Q(y)\| \leq \Delta$. The *grid cells* of the free space diagram are the squares $[i, i+1] \times [j, j+1]$ where $i \in [1, m]$ and $j \in [1, n]$ are integers. The *obstacles* of $\Delta\text{-FSD}(P, Q)$ are the connected components of $([1, m] \times [1, n]) \setminus \Delta\text{-FSD}(P, Q)$.

Alt and Godau [4] observe that the Fréchet distance between $P[x_1, x_2]$ and $Q[y_1, y_2]$ is at most Δ if and only if there is a bimonotone path in $\Delta\text{-FSD}(P, Q)$ from (x_1, y_1) to (x_2, y_2) .



■ **Figure 1** The trajectory T (blue, left) is covered by three pathlets. Each pathlet is given by a reference curve (green, red, yellow) and the subcurve(s) of T the curve covers.

Input and output. We consider subtrajectory clustering as by Akitaya *et al.* [3]. Our input is a curve T with n vertices that we will call the *trajectory*, some integer parameter $\ell \geq 2$,² and some distance parameter $\Delta \geq 0$. The output is an (ℓ, Δ) -clustering of T which is a set of (ℓ, Δ) -pathlets:

► **Definition 1 (Pathlet).** An (ℓ, Δ) -pathlet is a tuple (P, \mathcal{I}) where P is a curve with $|P| \leq \ell$ and \mathcal{I} is a set of intervals in $[1, n]$, where $d_F(P, T[a, b]) \leq \Delta$ for all $[a, b] \in \mathcal{I}$.

We call P the reference curve of (P, \mathcal{I}) . The coverage of a pathlet is $\text{Cov}(P, \mathcal{I}) = \bigcup \mathcal{I}$. For a set of pathlets C , the coverage is $\text{Cov}(C) = \bigcup_{(P, \mathcal{I}) \in C} \text{Cov}(P, \mathcal{I})$.

► **Definition 2 (Optimal pathlets).** Given a set of pathlets C . An (ℓ, Δ) -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) is reference-optimal if the sum of lengths of intervals in $\text{Cov}(P, \mathcal{I}) \setminus \text{Cov}(C)$ is maximum over all (ℓ, Δ) -pathlets (P, \mathcal{I}') . A (ℓ, Δ) -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) is optimal whenever the sum of lengths of intervals in $\text{Cov}(P, \mathcal{I}) \setminus \text{Cov}(C)$ is maximum over all (ℓ, Δ) -pathlets.

We can see a pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) as a cluster, where the center is P and all subtrajectories induced by \mathcal{I} get mapped to P . See Figure 1. A set of pathlets is then a set of clusters. An (ℓ, Δ) -clustering of T is defined as follows:

► **Definition 3 (Clustering).** An (ℓ, Δ) -clustering C of T is a set of (ℓ, Δ) -pathlets with $\text{Cov}(C) = [1, n]$.

Let $k_\ell(\Delta)$ denote the smallest integer for which there exists an (ℓ, Δ) -clustering of size $k_\ell(\Delta)$. The goal is to find an (ℓ, Δ') -clustering C where

- the size $k = |C|$ is not too large compared to $k_\ell(\Delta)$, and
- the ‘cost’ Δ' of the clustering is in $\mathcal{O}(\Delta)$.

3 The interior-disjoint setting

Previous definitions of subtrajectory clustering imposed various restrictions on the pathlets in the clustering. For example, in [6, 7, 8, 16] the pathlets must be *interior-disjoint*. A pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) is interior-disjoint whenever the intervals in \mathcal{I} are pairwise interior-disjoint. While we do not give dedicated algorithms for the interior-disjoint setting, we show in Lemma 5 that we can efficiently convert any pathlet into two interior-disjoint pathlets with the same coverage. This gives a post-processing algorithm for converting a clustering C into an interior-disjoint clustering C' with at most twice the number of pathlets. We first show the following auxiliary lemma.

² We make the assumption that $\ell \geq 2$, and do not investigate the $\ell = 1$ case.

► **Lemma 4.** *Given a set of intervals \mathcal{I} , we can compute a subset $\mathcal{I}' \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ with ply³ at most two and with $\bigcup \mathcal{I}' = \bigcup \mathcal{I}$ in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{I}| \log |\mathcal{I}|)$ time.*

Proof. We first sort the intervals of \mathcal{I} based on increasing lower bound. We then remove all intervals in \mathcal{I} that are contained in some other interval in \mathcal{I} , which can be done in a single scan over \mathcal{I} by keeping track of the largest endpoint of an interval encountered so far. We initially set $\hat{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$ and iterate over the remaining intervals in order of increasing lower bound. During iteration, we keep the invariant that $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ has ply at most two. Let I_1, \dots, I_k be the intervals in $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ in order of increasing lower bound. Suppose we consider adding an interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$ to $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$. If $I \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{I}}$, then we ignore I , since it does not add anything to the coverage of $(P, \hat{\mathcal{I}})$. Otherwise, we set $\hat{\mathcal{I}} \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{I\}$. This may have increased the ply of $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ to three, however. We next show that in this case, we can remove an interval from $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ to decrease the ply back to two, without altering $\bigcup \hat{\mathcal{I}}$.

Observe that if the ply of $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ increases to three, then I_{k-1} , I_k and I must intersect. Indeed, I must have a common intersection with two other intervals in $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$. Suppose for sake of contradiction that there is some $I_i \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}$ that intersects I_i for some $i < k-1$. Then I_i must contain the lower bounds of I_{k-1} and I_k . However, I_{k-1} must then also contain the lower bound of I_k , as otherwise $I_{k-1} \subset I_i$, which means that I_{k-1} was already filtered out at the beginning of the algorithm. Thus, I_i , I_{k-1} and I_k have a common intersection (the lower bound of I_k), which contradicts our invariant that $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ has ply at most two. Now that we know that I_{k-1} , I_k and I intersect, note that $I_k \subseteq I_{k-1} \cup I$, since the lower bound of I_k lies between those of I_{k-1} and I , and $I \not\subseteq I_k$, so the upper bound of I_k lies between those of I_{k-1} and I as well. Hence we can set $\hat{\mathcal{I}} \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{I}} \setminus \{I_k\}$ to reduce the ply back to two, while keeping $\bigcup \hat{\mathcal{I}}$ the same. After sorting \mathcal{I} , the above algorithm constructs $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{I}|)$ time. This gives a total running time of $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{I}| \log |\mathcal{I}|)$. ◀

► **Lemma 5.** *Given an (ℓ, Δ) -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) , we can construct two interior-disjoint (ℓ, Δ) -pathlets (P_1, \mathcal{I}_1) and (P_2, \mathcal{I}_2) with $\mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_2 = \mathcal{I}$ in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{I}| \log |\mathcal{I}|)$ time.*

Proof. First construct a subset $\mathcal{I}' \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ with ply at most two and $\bigcup \mathcal{I}' = \bigcup \mathcal{I}$ using Lemma 4. Then sort \mathcal{I}' based on increasing lower bound. Construct \mathcal{I}_1 by iterating over \mathcal{I}' and greedily taking any interval that is interior-disjoint from the already picked intervals. Finally, set $\mathcal{I}_2 \leftarrow \mathcal{I}' \setminus \mathcal{I}_1$. ◀

4 Algorithmic outline

Our algorithmic input is a trajectory T , an integer $\ell \geq 2$ and value $\Delta \geq 0$. We provide a high-level overview of our algorithm here. Our approach can be decomposed as follows:

1. There may exist infinitely many reference curves to form a pathlet with. In Section 5 we construct a 2Δ -simplification S of T , and prove that for any (ℓ, Δ) -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) , there exists a subcurve $S[a, d]$ of S for which $(S[a, d], \mathcal{I})$ is an $(\ell + 2 - |\mathbb{N} \cap \{a, d\}|, \Delta')$ -pathlet, where $\Delta' = 4\Delta$. Hence we may restrict our attention to pathlets where the reference curve is a subcurve of S , if we allow for a slightly higher complexity. This higher complexity is circumvented later on, to still give an (ℓ, Δ') -clustering.
2. In Section 6 we give the general algorithm. We iteratively construct an (ℓ, Δ') -clustering of size at most $51k_\ell(\Delta) \ln(6n) + 1$. Our greedy iterative algorithm maintains a set C of pathlets and adds at every iteration an (ℓ, Δ') -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) to C .

³ The ply of a set of intervals is the maximum number of intervals with a common intersection.

Consider having a set of pathlets $C = \{(P_i, \mathcal{I}_i)\}$. We greedily select a pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) that covers as much of $[1, n] \setminus \text{Cov}(C)$ as possible, and add it to C . Formally, we select a $(\Delta, \frac{1}{17})$ -maximal (ℓ, Δ') -pathlet: a pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) with

$$\|\text{Cov}(P, \mathcal{I}) \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\| \geq \frac{1}{17} \|\text{Cov}(P', \mathcal{I}') \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\|$$

for all (ℓ, Δ) -pathlets (P', \mathcal{I}') . We prove that this procedure gives an (ℓ, Δ') -clustering with the claimed number of pathlets.

3. The subsequent goal is to compute $(\Delta, \frac{1}{17})$ -maximal pathlets. We first restrict pathlets to be one of two types, namely pathlets where the reference curve is 1) a vertex-subcurve of S , or 2) a subsegment of an edge of S . Then we give algorithms for constructing pathlets of these types with a certain quality guarantee, i.e., pathlets that cover at least a constant fraction of what the optimal pathlet of that type covers. These algorithms are given in Sections 8 and 9.

Reachability graph. A crucial ingredient for our pathlet construction algorithm is the *reachability graph*, which we introduce in Section 7. The graph is defined on a “window” subcurve W of S and a set Z of points in Δ' -FSD(W, T). The reachability graph $G(W, T, Z)$ is a directed acyclic graph whose vertices are the set of points Z , together with certain boundary points of the free space Δ' -FSD(W, T) and a collection of *steiner points*. Given two points (x, y) and (x', y') in Z , the graph contains a directed path from (x, y) to (x', y') if and only if $d_F(W[x, x'], T[y, y']) \leq \Delta'$.


We consider the free space diagram as a rectilinear polygon with rectilinear holes \mathcal{R} , obtained by reducing all obstacles of Δ' -FSD(W, T) to their intersections with the boundaries of the grid cells. We show that there exists a bimonotone path between two points p and q in Δ' -FSD(W, T) if and only if a rectilinear shortest path between p and q in the polygon has length equal to $\|p - q\|_1$, the L_1 -distance between p and q . The reachability graph $G(W, T, Z)$ is defined as the *shortest paths preserving graph* [20] for the set Z with respect to \mathcal{R} , made into a directed graph by directing edges, which are all horizontal or vertical, to the right or top. This graph has $\mathcal{O}((|W|n + |Z|) \log(n + |Z|))$ complexity, and a shortest path in the graph between points in Z is also a rectilinear shortest path between the corresponding points in \mathcal{R} .

Vertex-to-vertex pathlets. In Section 8 we construct a pathlet where the reference curve is a vertex-subcurve of S . For a given vertex $S(i)$ of S , we construct reference-optimal (ℓ, Δ') -pathlets $(S[i, i + j], \mathcal{I}_j)$ for all $j \in [\ell]$. We first identify a set Z of $\mathcal{O}(n\ell)$ *critical points* in Δ' -FSD($S[i, i + \ell], T$). We show that for every reference curve $S[i, i + j]$, there is a reference-optimal (ℓ, Δ') -pathlet $(S[i, i + j], \mathcal{I}_j)$ where for each interval $[y, y'] \in \mathcal{I}_j$, the points (i, y) and $(i + j, y')$ are critical points.

We construct the intervals \mathcal{I}_j through a sweepline algorithm over the reachability graph $G(S[i, i + \ell], T, Z)$, which has $\mathcal{O}(n\ell \log n)$ complexity. Our sweepline computes, for all $j \in [\ell]$, a reference-optimal (j, Δ') -pathlet $(S[i, i + j], \mathcal{I}_j)$ by iterating over all in-edges to critical points $(i + j, y)$ in $G(S[i, i + \ell], T, Z)$.

Doing this for all i (and remembering the optimal pathlet seen so far) thereby takes $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \ell \log^2 n)$ total time and $\mathcal{O}(n\ell \log n)$ space.

Subedge pathlets. In Section 9 we construct a pathlet where the reference curve is a subsegment of an edge of S . For a given edge e of S , we first identify a set Z of $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ *critical points* in Δ' -FSD(e, T). There are $m = \mathcal{O}(n)$ unique x -coordinates of points in Z , which we order as x_1, \dots, x_m . We show that by allowing for pathlets to use subsegments of the reversal \overleftarrow{e} of e as reference curves, for every reference curve $e[x, x']$, there is a $(2, \Delta')$ -pathlet



■ **Figure 2 Top left:** A simplification S (red) of the trajectory T (blue). **Right:** The free space diagram Δ' -FSD(S, T). The clustering of T corresponds to a set of colored bimonotone paths, where paths of a given color are horizontally aligned, and the paths together span the entire vertical axis.

$(e[x_i, x_{i'}], \mathcal{I})$ or $(\overleftarrow{e}[x_i, x_{i'}], \mathcal{I})$ that covers at least one-fourth of what any other $(2, \Delta')$ -pathlet using a subsegment of e as a reference curve covers.

The remainder of our subedge pathlet construction algorithm follows the same procedure as for vertex-to-vertex pathlets, though with the following optimization. We consider every x_i separately, for $i \in [m]$. However, rather than considering all reference curves $e[x_i, x_{i'}]$, of which there are $m - i$, we consider only $\mathcal{O}(\log(m - i))$ reference curves. The main observation is that we may split a pathlet $(e[x_i, x_{i'}], \mathcal{I})$ into two: $(e[x_i, x_{i+2^j}], \mathcal{I}_1)$ and $(e[x_{i'-2^j}, x_{i'}], \mathcal{I}_2)$, for some $j \leq \log(m - i)$. One of the two pathlets covers at least half of what $(e[x_i, x_{i'}], \mathcal{I})$ covers, so an optimal $(2, \Delta')$ -pathlet $(e[x_i, x_{i+2^j}], \mathcal{I})$ that is defined by critical points covers at least one-eighth of any other subedge $(2, \Delta')$ -pathlet $(e[x, x'], \mathcal{I}')$.

For every $i \in [m]$, we let $Z_i \subseteq Z$ be the subset of critical points with x -coordinate equal to x_i or x_{i+2^j} for some $j \leq \log(m - i)$. We construct the reachability graph $G(e, T, Z_i)$, which has $\mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n)$ complexity. We then proceed as with the vertex-to-vertex pathlets, with a swepline through the reachability graph.

Doing this for all i (and remembering the optimal pathlet seen so far) thereby takes $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log^3 n)$ total time and $\mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n)$ space. Taken over all edges of S , we obtain a subedge pathlet in $\mathcal{O}(n^3 \log^3 n)$ time and $\mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n)$ space.

5 Pathlet-preserving simplifications

For computational convenience, we would like to limit our attention to $(\ell, 4\Delta)$ -pathlets (P, \mathcal{I}) where P is a subcurve of some curve S . This way, we may design an algorithm that considers all subcurves of S (as opposed to all curves in \mathbb{R}^d). This has the additional benefit of allowing the use of the free space diagram 4Δ -FSD(S, T) to construct pathlets, as seen in Figure 2.

For any (ℓ, Δ) -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) there exists an $(n, 2\Delta)$ -pathlet (P', \mathcal{I}) where P' is a subcurve of T . Indeed, consider any interval $[a, b] \in \mathcal{I}$ and choose $P' = T[a, b]$. However, restricting the subcurves of T to have complexity at most ℓ may significantly reduce the maximum coverage, see for example Figure 3. Instead of restricting pathlets to be subcurves of T , we will restrict them to be subcurves of a different curve S which has the following property:

► **Definition 6.** For a trajectory T and value $\Delta \geq 0$, a pathlet-preserving simplification is a curve S together with a 2Δ -matching (f, g) , where for any subtrajectory $T[a, b]$ of T and all curves P with $d_F(P, T[a, b]) \leq \Delta$, the subcurve $S[s, t]$ matched to $T[a, b]$ by (f, g) has complexity $|S[s, t]| \leq |P| + 2 - |\mathbb{N} \cap \{s, t\}|$.

► **Theorem 7.** Let (S, f, g) be a pathlet-preserving simplification of T . For any (ℓ, Δ) -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) , there exists a subcurve $S[s, t]$ such that $(S[s, t], \mathcal{I})$ is an $(\ell + 2 - |\mathbb{N} \cap \{s, t\}|, 4\Delta)$ -pathlet.


Proof. Consider any (ℓ, Δ) -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) and choose some interval $[a, b] \in \mathcal{I}$. For all $[c, d] \in \mathcal{I}$, via the triangle inequality, $d_F(T[a, b], T[c, d]) \leq 2\Delta$. Let $S[s, t]$ be the subcurve of S matched to $T[a, b]$ by (f, g) . Naturally, $d_F(S[s, t], T[a, b]) \leq 2\Delta$, and so by the triangle inequality $d_F(S[s, t], T[c, d]) \leq 4\Delta$. By the definition of a pathlet-preserving simplification, we obtain that for every curve P' with $d_F(P', T[a, b]) \leq \Delta$, we have $|P'| \geq |S[s, t]| - 2 + |\mathbb{N} \cap \{s, t\}|$. In particular, setting $P' \leftarrow P$ implies that $|S[s, t]| \leq \ell + 2 - |\mathbb{N} \cap \{s, t\}|$. Thus $(S[s, t], \mathcal{I})$ is an $(\ell + 2 - |\mathbb{N} \cap \{s, t\}|, 4\Delta)$ -pathlet. ◀

Prior curve simplifications. The curve S that we construct is a *curve-restricted* $\alpha\Delta$ -simplification of T ; a curve whose vertices lie on T , where for every edge $s = \overline{T(a)T(b)}$ of S we have $d_F(s, T[a, b]) \leq \alpha\Delta$. Various $\alpha\Delta$ -simplification algorithms have been proposed before [2, 14, 17, 19].

If T is a curve in \mathbb{R}^2 , Guibas *et al.* [17] give an $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time algorithm that constructs a 2Δ -simplification S for which there is no Δ -simplification S' with $|S'| < |S|$. Their algorithm unfortunately is not efficient in higher dimensions, as it relies on maintaining the intersection of wedges to encode all line segments that simplify the currently scanned prefix curve. These wedges are formed by the tangents of a point to the various disks of radius Δ around the vertices of T . In higher dimensions, these wedges form cones, whose intersection is not of constant complexity.

Agarwal *et al.* [2] also construct a 2Δ -simplification S of T in $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time. This was applied by Akitaya *et al.* [3] for their subtrajectory clustering algorithm under the discrete Fréchet distance. The simplification S has a similar guarantee as the simplification of [17]: there exists no *vertex-restricted* Δ -simplification S' with $|S'| < |S|$. This guarantee is weaker than that of [17], as vertex-restricted simplifications are simplifications formed by taking a subsequence of vertices of T as the vertices of the simplification. This simplification can be constructed efficiently in higher dimensions, but does not give guarantees with respect to arbitrary simplifications.

As we show in Figure 3, the complexity of a vertex-restricted Δ -simplification can be arbitrarily bad compared to the (unrestricted) Δ -simplification with minimum complexity. Brüning *et al.* [5] note that for the subtrajectory problem under the continuous Fréchet distance, one requires an $\alpha\Delta$ -simplification whose complexity has guarantees with respect



■ **Figure 3** There exists a segment P where $d_F(P, T[a, b]) \leq \Delta$. In contrast, for any vertex-restricted S with $d_F(T[a, b], S) \leq \Delta$, the complexity of S is $\Theta(|T[a, b]|)$.

to the optimal (unrestricted) simplification. They present a 3Δ -simplification S (whose definition was inspired by de Berg, Gudmundsson and Cook [14]) with the following property: for any subcurve $T[a, b]$ of T within Fréchet distance Δ of some line segment, there exists a subcurve $S[s, t]$ of S with complexity at most 4 that has Fréchet distance at most 3Δ to $T[a, b]$. Thus, there exists no Δ -simplification S' with $|S'| < |S|/2$.

Our new curve simplification. In Definition 6 we presented yet another curve simplification under the Fréchet distance for curves in \mathbb{R}^d . Our simplification has a stronger property than the one that is realized by Brüning *et al.* [5]: for any subcurve $T[a, b]$ and *any* curve P with $d_F(P, T[a, b]) \leq \Delta$, we require that there exists a subcurve $S[s, t]$ with $d_F(S[s, t], T[a, b]) \leq 2\Delta$ that has at most two more vertices than P . This implies both the property of Brüning *et al.* [5] and that there exists no Δ -simplification S' with $|S'| < |S| - 2$.

We give an efficient algorithm for constructing pathlet-preserving simplifications in Section 10. The algorithm can be seen as an extension of the vertex-restricted simplification of Agarwal *et al.* [2] to construct a curve-restricted simplification instead. For this, we use the techniques of Guibas *et al.* [17] to quickly identify if an edge of T is suitable to place a simplification vertex on. Then we combine this check with the algorithm of [2]. This results in the following:

► **Theorem 8.** *For any trajectory T with n vertices and any $\Delta \geq 0$, we can construct a pathlet-preserving simplification S in $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time.*

6 A greedy algorithm

6.1 Greedy set cover

Subtrajectory clustering is closely related to the *set cover* problem. In this problem, we have a discrete universe \mathcal{U} and a family of sets \mathcal{S} in this universe, and the goal is to pick a minimum number of sets in \mathcal{S} such that their union is the whole universe. The decision variant of set cover is NP-complete [18]. However, the following greedy strategy gives an $\mathcal{O}(\log |\mathcal{U}|)$ approximation of the minimal set cover size [12]. Suppose we have picked a set $\hat{\mathcal{S}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ that does not yet cover all of \mathcal{U} . The idea is then to add a set $S \in \mathcal{S}$ that maximizes $|S \cap (\mathcal{U} \setminus \bigcup \hat{\mathcal{S}})|$, and repeat the procedure until \mathcal{U} is fully covered.

We apply this greedy strategy to subtrajectory clustering, putting the focus on constructing a pathlet that covers the most uncovered edges of T . In other words, we grow a set of pathlets C by repeatedly adding an (ℓ, Δ) -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) that (approximately) maximizes the coverage $\|\text{Cov}(P, \mathcal{I}) \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\|$ among the uncovered points. The universe \mathcal{U} is in principle infinite, but we ensure that the intervals in our pathlets come from a discrete set of $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$ values. This restricts the universe to be of size $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$.

We generalize the analysis of the greedy set cover argument to pathlets that cover a (constant) fraction of what the optimal pathlet covers. For this we introduce the following:

► **Definition 9 (Maximal pathlets).** *Given a set C of pathlets, a $(\Delta, \frac{1}{c})$ -maximal (ℓ, Δ') -pathlet (P', \mathcal{I}') is a pathlet for which there exists no (ℓ, Δ) -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) with*

$$\frac{1}{c} \|\text{Cov}(P, \mathcal{I}) \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\| \geq \|\text{Cov}(P', \mathcal{I}') \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\|.$$

In Lemma 10, we show that if we keep greedily selecting $(\Delta, \frac{1}{c})$ -maximal pathlets for our clustering, the size of the clustering stays relatively small compared to the optimum size. The bound closely resembles the bound obtained by the argument for greedy set cover.

► **Lemma 10.** *Let $\mathcal{N} \supseteq \{1, n\}$ be a set of N values. Iteratively adding $(\Delta, \frac{1}{c})$ -maximal pathlets whose intervals start and end at values in \mathcal{N} yields a clustering of size at most $c \cdot k_\ell(\Delta) \ln N + 1$.*

Proof. Let $C^* = \{(P_i, \mathcal{I}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ be an (ℓ, Δ) -clustering of T of minimal size. Then $k := |C^*| = k_\ell(\Delta)$. We add vertices to T at every point $T(y)$ indexed by a value $y \in \mathcal{N}$, making T a function over the domain $[1, N]$.

Consider iteration j of the algorithm, where we have some set of (ℓ, Δ') -clusters C_j . Denote by $W_j = \|[1, N] \setminus \text{Cov}(C_j)\|$ the remaining length that needs to be covered. Since C^* covers $[1, N]$, it must cover $[1, N] \setminus \text{Cov}(C_j)$. It follows via the pigeonhole principle that there is at least one (ℓ, Δ) -pathlet $(P_i, \mathcal{I}_i) \in C^*$ for which the length $\|\text{Cov}(P_i, \mathcal{I}_i) \setminus \text{Cov}(C_j)\|$ is at least W_j/k . Per definition of being $(\Delta, \frac{1}{c})$ -maximal, our greedy algorithm finds a pathlet (P_j, \mathcal{I}_j) that covers at least a $\frac{1}{c}$ fraction of the length that (P_i, \mathcal{I}_i) covers. Thus:

$$W_{j+1} = \|[1, N] \setminus (\text{Cov}(C_j) \cup \text{Cov}(P_j, \mathcal{I}_j))\| \leq W_j - \frac{W_j}{c \cdot k} = W_j \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{c \cdot k}\right).$$

We have that $W_0 = N - 1$. Suppose it takes $k' + 1$ iterations to cover all of T' with the greedy algorithm. Then before the last iteration, at least one edge of T remained uncovered. That is, $(N - 1) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{c \cdot k}\right)^{k'} \geq 1$. From the inequality that $e^x \geq 1 + x$ for all real x , we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{e} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{x}\right)^x$$

for all $x \geq 1$. Plugging in $x \leftarrow c \cdot k$, it follows that

$$1 \leq (N - 1) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{c \cdot k}\right)^{k'} = (N - 1) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{c \cdot k}\right)^{c \cdot k \cdot \frac{k'}{c \cdot k}} \leq (N - 1) \cdot e^{-\frac{k'}{c \cdot k}}.$$

Hence $e^{\frac{k'}{c \cdot k}} \leq N$, showing that $k' \leq c \cdot k \ln N$. Thus after $k' + 1 \leq c \cdot k_\ell(\Delta) \ln N + 1$ iterations, all of T' , and therefore T , is covered. ◀


6.2 Further restricting pathlets

Recall that with the pathlet-preserving simplification S of T , we may restrict our attention to reference curves that are subcurves of S . Still, the space of possible reference curves is infinite. We wish to discretize this space by identifying certain finite classes of reference curves that contain a “good enough” reference curve, i.e., one with which we can construct a pathlet that is $(\Delta, \frac{1}{c})$ -maximal for some small constant c .

We distinguish between two types of pathlets, based on their reference curves (note that not all pathlets fit into a class, and that some may fit into both classes):

1. Vertex-to-vertex pathlets: A pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) is a vertex-to-vertex pathlet if P is a vertex-subcurve of S .
2. Subedge pathlets: A pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) is a subedge pathlet if P is a subsegment of an edge of S .

We construct pathlets of the above types that all cover at least some constant fraction of the optimal coverage for pathlets of the same type. Let $(P_{\text{ver}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{ver}})$ and $(P_{\text{sub}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{sub}})$ respectively be a vertex-to-vertex and subedge (ℓ, Δ') -pathlet, that respectively cover at least a factor $\frac{1}{c_{\text{ver}}}$ and $\frac{1}{c_{\text{sub}}}$ of an optimal pathlet of the same type. We show that among these two pathlets is a $(\Delta, \frac{1}{c})$ -maximal pathlet, for $c = c_{\text{ver}} + 2c_{\text{sub}}$. For intuition, refer to Figure 4.



■ **Figure 4** A pathlet (left), corresponding to the red Δ' -matching (right), gets split into a vertex-to-vertex and two subedge pathlets. The new pathlets correspond to the parts of the red matching that are vertically above the part of the x -axis corresponding to the new reference curve.

► **Lemma 11.** *Given a collection C of pathlets, let*

$$(P, \mathcal{I}) \in \{(P_{\text{ver}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{ver}}), (P_{\text{sub}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{sub}})\}$$

be a pathlet with maximal coverage among the uncovered points. Then (P, \mathcal{I}) is $(\Delta, \frac{1}{c})$ -maximal with respect to C , for $c = c_{\text{ver}} + 2c_{\text{sub}}$.

Proof. Let (P^*, \mathcal{I}^*) be an optimal (ℓ, Δ) -pathlet. By Theorem 7, there exists a subcurve $S[x, x']$ of S such that $(S[x, x'], \mathcal{I}^*)$ is a $(\ell + 2 - |\mathbb{N} \cap \{x, x'\}|, \Delta')$ -pathlet. Suppose first that $S[x, x']$ is a subsegment of an edge of S , making $(S[x, x'], \mathcal{I}^*)$ a subedge pathlet with $|S[x, x']| \leq 2$. In this case, the coverage of $(P_{\text{sub}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{sub}})$ is at least $\frac{1}{c_{\text{sub}}}$ times the coverage of $(S[x, x'], \mathcal{I}^*)$ over the uncovered points. Hence $(P_{\text{sub}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{sub}})$ is $(\Delta, \frac{1}{c_{\text{sub}}})$ -maximal. Since the pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) has at least as much coverage as $(P_{\text{sub}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{sub}})$, it must also be $(\Delta, \frac{1}{c_{\text{sub}}})$ -maximal.

Next suppose that $S[x, x']$ is not a subsegment of an edge of S , meaning $S[x, x']$ contains at least one vertex of S . In this case, we split $S[x, x']$ into three subcurves:

- A suffix $P_{\text{suf}} = S[x, [x]]$ of an edge,
- A vertex-subcurve $P_{\text{ver}} = S[[x], [x']]$, and
- A prefix $P_{\text{pre}} = S[[x'], x']$ of an edge.

Observe that every subcurve has at most ℓ vertices. The suffix and prefix both trivially have at most $2 \leq \ell$ vertices. The vertex-subcurve has at most the number of vertices of $S[x, x']$, but if x , respectively x' , is not an integer, then the vertex-subcurve loses a vertex compared to $S[x, x']$. That is, the vertex-subcurve has at most

$$\ell + 2 - |\mathbb{N} \cap \{x, x'\}| - |\{x, x'\} \setminus \mathbb{N}| = \ell + 2 - |\{x, x'\}| = \ell \quad \text{vertices.}$$

Since every interval $[y, y'] \in \mathcal{I}^*$ corresponds to a Δ' -matching M between $S[x, x']$ and $T[y, y']$, we can decompose $[y, y']$ into three intervals $[y, y_1]$, $[y_1, y_2]$ and $[y_2, y']$, such that M decomposes into three Δ' -matchings, one between P_{suf} and $T[y, y_1]$, one between P_{ver} and $T[y_1, y_2]$, and one between P_{pre} and $T[y_2, y']$. By decomposing all intervals in \mathcal{I}^* in this manner, we obtain that there are three (ℓ, Δ) -pathlets $(P_{\text{suf}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{suf}}^*)$, $(P_{\text{ver}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{ver}}^*)$ and $(P_{\text{pre}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{pre}}^*)$ that together have the same coverage as (P^*, \mathcal{I}^*) .

We have at least one of the following:

- $(P_{\text{suf}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{suf}}^*)$ covers at least a factor $\frac{c_{\text{sub}}}{c_{\text{ver}} + 2c_{\text{sub}}}$ of what (P^*, \mathcal{I}^*) covers, or
 - $(P_{\text{ver}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{ver}}^*)$ covers at least a factor $\frac{c_{\text{ver}}}{c_{\text{ver}} + 2c_{\text{sub}}}$ of what (P^*, \mathcal{I}^*) covers, or
 - $(P_{\text{pre}}, \mathcal{I}_{\text{pre}}^*)$ covers at least a factor $\frac{c_{\text{sub}}}{c_{\text{ver}} + 2c_{\text{sub}}}$ of what (P^*, \mathcal{I}^*) covers.
- Regardless of what statement holds, the pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) covers at least a factor $\frac{1}{c_{\text{ver}} + 2c_{\text{sub}}}$ of what (P^*, \mathcal{I}^*) covers. Thus we have that (P, \mathcal{I}) is $(\Delta, \frac{1}{c_{\text{ver}} + 2c_{\text{sub}}})$ -maximal. ◀

6.3 Subtrajectory clustering

We finish this section by combining the previous ideas on simplification and greedy algorithms to give our algorithm for subtrajectory clustering. The algorithm uses subroutines for constructing the four types of pathlets given in Section 6.2, as well as a data structure for comparing their coverages to pick the best pathlet for the clustering.

Our pathlet construction algorithms guarantee that $c_{\text{ver}} = 1$ and $c_{\text{sub}} = 8$. By Lemma 11, the pathlet with most coverage is therefore $(\Delta, \frac{1}{c})$ -maximal with respect to the uncovered points, for $c = 1 + 2 \cdot 8 = 17$. By Lemma 10, the resulting (ℓ, Δ') -clustering has size at most $17k_\ell(\Delta) \ln N + 1$, where N is the number of values that the intervals in a pathlet can use for their bounds. We show in our constructions of the pathlets that $N \leq 2n + 4n^3 \leq 6n^3$.

6.3.1 A data structure for comparing pathlets

In each iteration of our greedy algorithm, we pick one of four pathlets whose coverage is the maximum over $[1, n] \setminus \text{Cov}(C)$, given the current set of picked pathlets C . Computing the coverage of a pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) can be done by first constructing $\bigcup \mathcal{I}$ and $\text{Cov}(C)$, and then computing $\|I \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\|$ for every component I of $\bigcup \mathcal{I}$ separately, adding up the results. In Lemma 12, we present a data structure for efficiently computing $\|I \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\|$.

The complexities of the data structure depend on the complexity of $\text{Cov}(C)$, which in turn depends on how complex the pathlets in C are. If the endpoints of pathlets in C come from a discrete set of N values, then the number of connected components of $\text{Cov}(C)$ is at most $\min\{\sum_{(P, \mathcal{I}) \in C} |\mathcal{I}|, N\}$. All our constructed pathlets (P, \mathcal{I}) have $|\mathcal{I}| \leq n$ and $N = \mathcal{O}(n^3)$. As there are $\mathcal{O}(k_\ell(\Delta) \log n)$ iterations, where trivially $k_\ell(\Delta) \leq n$, we obtain that


$$|\text{Cov}(C)| = \min\{\mathcal{O}(k_\ell(\Delta) \log n), \mathcal{O}(n^3)\} = \mathcal{O}(n \cdot k_\ell(\Delta) \log n) = \mathcal{O}(n^2 \log n).$$

We assume for the data structure that this bound on the complexity of $\text{Cov}(C)$ holds.

► **Lemma 12.** *Suppose $\text{Cov}(C)$ has $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot k_\ell(\Delta) \log n)$ connected components. In $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot k_\ell(\Delta) \log^2 n)$ time, we can preprocess $\text{Cov}(C)$ into a data structure of $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot k_\ell(\Delta) \log n)$ size, such that given an interval I , the value $\|I \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\|$ can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ time.*

Proof. We store the connected components of $\text{Cov}(C)$ in a binary search tree, ordering the intervals by endpoints. This ordering is well-defined, since the connected components are disjoint. We annotate each node of the tree with the total length of the intervals stored in it. The tree takes $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot k_\ell(\Delta) \log^2 n)$ time to construct and uses $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot k_\ell(\Delta) \log n)$ space.

To compute $\|I \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\|$ for a given query interval I , we compute $\|I \cap \text{Cov}(C)\|$ and subtract this value from the length of I . Because the components of $\text{Cov}(C)$ are disjoint, there are at most two intervals that I intersects but does not contain. These intervals can be reported in $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ time with a range reporting query with the endpoints of I . In the same time bound, we can retrieve all intervals contained in I as a set of $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ nodes of the tree. By counting up the lengths these nodes are annotated with, we compute the total length of the intervals contained in I . Combined with the length of the overlap between the two intervals intersecting I at its endpoints, we compute $\|I \cap \text{Cov}(C)\|$ in $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ time. ◀



■ **Figure 5** (left) The Δ' -free space diagram of W and T with points p and q connected by a bimonotone path. (right) The obstacles of \mathcal{R} are made up of all grid edges that are entirely contained in the obstacles of Δ' -FSD(W, T) (shown in black) plus the gray segments. We may transform any bimonotone path between p and q into one that lies in Δ' -FSD(W, T).

6.3.2 Asymptotic complexities

Our construction algorithms assume that the data structure of Lemma 12 is available. Constructing the vertex-to-vertex pathlet then takes $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \ell \log^2 n)$ time and uses $\mathcal{O}(n \ell \log n)$ space (Theorem 16). The subedge pathlet takes $\mathcal{O}(n^3 \log^3 n)$ time and $\mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n)$ space to construct (Theorem 19).

To decide which pathlet to use in the clustering, we make further use of the data structure of Lemma 12. To compute the coverage of a pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) , we first construct $\bigcup \mathcal{I}$ in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{I}| \log |\mathcal{I}|)$ time, and subsequently query the data structure $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{I}|)$ times, taking a total of $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{I}| \log n)$ time. Adding up all complexities, we obtain our main theorem:

► **Theorem 13.** *Given a trajectory T with n vertices, as well as an integer $\ell \geq 2$ and value $\Delta \geq 0$, we can construct an $(\ell, 4\Delta)$ -clustering of size at most $51k_\ell(\Delta) \ln(6n) + 1$ in $\mathcal{O}(k_\ell(\Delta)n^3 \log^4 n)$ time and using $\mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n + n \cdot (k_\ell(\Delta) + \ell) \log n)$ space.*

7 The reachability graph

Let $\Delta' = 4\Delta$. For any “window” subcurve W of S and set of points Z in Δ' -FSD(W, T) we define the *reachability graph* $G(W, T, Z)$. The vertices of this graph are the set of points Z , together with some Steiner points in $[1, |W|] \times [1, |T|]$. The reachability graph $G(W, T, Z)$ is a directed graph where, for any two $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in Z$, there exists a directed path from μ_1 to μ_2 if and only if μ_2 is reachable from μ_1 in the free space Δ' -FSD(W, T).

In Lemma 14 we observe that when focusing on reachability between points in Δ' -FSD(W, T), we can simplify the obstacles of the free space diagram to the set of grid-lines minus the free space. See Figure 5 for an illustration. This simplified representation of the obstacles can be represented in $\mathcal{O}(|W|n)$ time as a set of horizontal and vertical line segments (whose endpoints are not included, except possibly some that meet the boundary of $[1, |W|] \times [1, |T|]$). The parameter space $[1, |W|] \times [1, |T|]$ minus all these segments gives a rectilinear polygon with rectilinear holes \mathcal{R} .

► **Lemma 14.** *Let p and q be two points in Δ' -FSD(W, T). There is a bimonotone path from p to q in Δ' -FSD(W, T) if and only if there is a bimonotone path from p to q in \mathcal{R} .*

Proof. Since Δ' -FSD(W, T) is completely contained in \mathcal{R} , we immediately have that any path in Δ' -FSD(W, T) is also a path in \mathcal{R} . To transform a path from p to q in \mathcal{R} to a path in Δ' -FSD(W, T), replace each maximal subpath π that lies inside a cell of Δ' -FSD(W, T) by the segment connecting its endpoints. The obstacles of \mathcal{R} agree with the obstacles of Δ' -FSD(W, T) on the boundary of cells, and thus if π starts or ends on the boundary of a cell, the respective endpoint lies in Δ' -FSD(W, T). Additionally, because p and q lie in Δ' -FSD(W, T), we have that π must always start and end at points in Δ' -FSD(W, T). By convexity of the free space inside a cell, the line segment connecting the endpoints of π lies in Δ' -FSD(W, T), and so does the resulting path. This replacement preserves bimonotonicity, completing the proof. \blacktriangleleft

To obtain $G(W, T, Z)$ we first construct an undirected graph $G(Z)$. This graph is the *shortest paths preserving graph* by Widmayer [20]. The vertices of $G(Z)$ are the points in Z , together with the vertices of \mathcal{R} and some Steiner points. By assigning each edge a weight equal to its length, the graph perfectly encodes rectilinear distances between points in Z . That is, the rectilinear distance in \mathcal{R} between two points in Z is equal to their distance in $G(Z)$.

The number of vertices of \mathcal{R} is $\mathcal{O}(n|W|)$, giving the graph a complexity of $\mathcal{O}((n|W| + |Z|) \log(n + |Z|))$. The graph can be constructed in $\mathcal{O}((n|W| + |Z|) \log(n + |Z|))$ time [20].

The edges of $G(Z)$ are all horizontal or vertical line segments. We set $G(W, T, Z)$ to be the graph $G(Z)$, but with each edge directed towards the right (if horizontal) or top (if vertical). Observe that $G(W, T, Z)$ perfectly encodes reachability: for two points $p = (x, y)$ and $q = (x', y')$ in Z , if there is a bimonotone rectilinear path from p to q in \mathcal{R} , then any rectilinear shortest path from p to q must be bimonotone, and hence there must be a (bimonotone) path between them in $G(W, T, Z)$. Conversely, any path in $G(W, T, Z)$ is also a path in \mathcal{R} . Thus $d_F(P[x, x'], T[y, y']) \leq \Delta'$ if and only if there is a (bimonotone) path from (x, y) to (x', y') in $G(W, T, Z)$.

► Theorem 15. *Let W be a subcurve of S and Z a set of points in Δ' -FSD(W, T). In $\mathcal{O}((n|W| + |Z|) \log(n + |Z|))$ time, we can construct a directed graph $G(W, T, Z)$ of complexity $\mathcal{O}((n|W| + |Z|) \log(n + |Z|))$, such that for any two points $(x, y), (x', y') \in Z$, there is a path from (x, y) to (x', y') in $G(W, T, Z)$ if and only if $d_F(W[x, x'], T[y, y']) \leq \Delta'$. The arcs of $G(W, T, Z)$ are all horizontal or vertical and point up or to the right.*

8 Vertex-to-vertex pathlets

Let $\Delta' = 4\Delta$ and let C be a set of pathlets. We assume that $\text{Cov}(C)$ has at most $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log n)$ connected components. We give an algorithm for constructing a vertex-to-vertex (ℓ, Δ') -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) whose coverage – (the sum of lengths in $\text{Cov}(P, \mathcal{I}) \setminus \text{Cov}(C)$) – is maximum.

We find for each subcurve S' of S of length at most ℓ a reference-optimal (ℓ, Δ') -pathlet. To this end, we consider each vertex $S(i)$ of S separately. We construct a set of reference-optimal pathlets $(S[i, i + 1], \mathcal{I}_1), \dots, (S[i, i + j], \mathcal{I}_j), \dots, (S[i, i + \ell], \mathcal{I}_\ell)$. We let each interval \mathcal{I}_j contain all maximal intervals $[y, y']$ for which $d_F(S[i, i + j], T[y, y']) \leq \Delta'$, and thus all maximal intervals for which (i, y) can reach $(i + j, y')$ by a bimonotone path in Δ' -FSD(S, T).

We first discretize the problem, identifying a set of $\mathcal{O}(n\ell)$ *critical points* in Δ' -FSD($S[i, i + \ell], T$). This set has the property that for every reference curve $S[i, i + j]$ starting at $S(i)$, there exists a reference-optimal (ℓ, Δ') -pathlet $(S[i, i + j], \mathcal{I})$, where for all $[y, y'] \in \mathcal{I}$, the points (i, y) and $(i + j, y')$ are both critical points.

For $j \in [\ell]$, we call every point $(i + j, y)$ that is an endpoint of a connected component (vertical line segment) of Δ' -FSD(S, T) $\cap (\{i + j\} \times [1, n])$ a critical point. Let Z be the set of at most $2n\ell = \mathcal{O}(n\ell)$ critical points.

We create a sweepline algorithm that, for each $S[i, i + j]$ (with $j \leq \ell$), constructs a reference-optimal (ℓ, Δ') -pathlet $(S[i, j], \mathcal{I}_j)$. We let each interval \mathcal{I}_j contain all maximal intervals $[y, y']$ for which $d_F(S[i, i + j], T[y, y']) \leq \Delta'$, and thus all maximal intervals for which (i, y) can reach $(i + j, y')$ by a bimonotone path in Δ' -FSD(S, T). Note that both (i, y) and $(i + j, y')$ are critical points. Thus we aim to find all maximal intervals $[y, y']$ for which the critical point (i, y) can reach the critical point $(i + j, y')$ by a bimonotone path in Δ' -FSD(S, T).

To this end, we construct, for each $i \in [n]$, the reachability graph $G(S[i, i + \ell], T, Z)$ from Section 7, which encodes reachability between all critical points. This graph takes $\mathcal{O}((n\ell + |Z|) \log(n + |Z|)) = \mathcal{O}(n\ell \log n)$ time to construct and has complexity $\mathcal{O}(n\ell \log n)$. We aim to annotate each vertex μ (note that μ does not have to be a critical point) in $G(S[i, i + \ell], T, Z)$ with the minimum y , such that there exists a critical point (i, y) that can reach μ . We annotate μ with ∞ if no such y exists.


Annotating vertices and asymptotic analysis. We first annotate the vertices (i, y) in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time by scanning over them in order of increasing y -coordinate. We go over the remaining vertices in yx -lexicographical order, where we go over the vertices based on increasing y -coordinate, and increasing x -coordinate when ties arise. Each vertex μ that we consider has only incoming arcs that originate from vertices below and left of μ . By our lexicographical ordering, each of these vertices are already annotated. The minimal y for which there exists a path from (i, y) to μ , must be the minimum over all its incoming arcs which we compute in time proportional to the in-degree of μ . If μ has no incoming arcs, we annotate it with ∞ .

Let V and A be the sets of $\mathcal{O}(n\ell \log n)$ vertices and arcs of $G(S[i, i + \ell], T, Z)$. For the above annotation procedure, we first compute the yx -lexicographical ordering of the vertices, based on their corresponding points in the parameter space. This takes $\mathcal{O}(|V| \log |V|)$ time. Afterwards, we go over each vertex and each incoming arc exactly once, so we take an additional $\mathcal{O}(|V| + |A|)$ time. In total, we annotate all vertices in $\mathcal{O}(n\ell \log^2 n)$ time.

Constructing the pathlets. With the annotations, constructing the pathlets becomes straight-forward. For each $j \in [\ell]$, we construct \mathcal{I}_j as follows. We iterate over all critical point $(i + j, y')$ in the graph $G(S[i, i + \ell], T, Z)$. For each critical point $(i + j, y')$ with a finite annotation y , we add the interval $[y, y']$ to \mathcal{I}_j . This procedure ensures that \mathcal{I}_j contains all maximal intervals $[y, y']$ for which $d_F(S[i, i + j], T[y, y']) \leq \Delta'$, making an optimal pathlet $(S[i, i + j], \mathcal{I}_j)$ with respect to its reference curve. Since there are $\mathcal{O}(n)$ critical points per j , this algorithm uses $\mathcal{O}(n\ell)$ time. Storing the pathlets takes $\mathcal{O}(n\ell)$ space. Thus, we conclude the following:

► **Theorem 16.** *Let C be a set of pathlets where $\text{Cov}(C)$ has $\mathcal{O}(k_\ell(\Delta) \log n)$ connected components. Suppose $\text{Cov}(C)$ is preprocessed into the data structure of Lemma 12. In $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \ell \log^2 n)$ time and using $\mathcal{O}(n\ell \log n)$ space, we can construct an optimal vertex-to-vertex (ℓ, Δ') -pathlet.*

Proof. For a given vertex $S(i)$, we compute optimal pathlets $(S[i, i + j], \mathcal{I}_j)$ with respect to their reference curves for $j \in [\ell]$ in $\mathcal{O}(n\ell \log^2 n)$ time, using $\mathcal{O}(n\ell \log n)$ space. With the data structure of Lemma 12, we subsequently compute the coverage of one of these pathlets $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time, so $\mathcal{O}(n\ell \log n)$ time for all. We pick the best pathlet and remember its



■ **Figure 6** The connected components of Δ' -FSD(e', T) fall into these four cases, based on where the minima and maxima of the bottom and top parabolic arcs lie. In the first three cases, there is a clear matching with optimal coverage (purple). In the fourth case, the matching is only valid when mirroring the free space, achieved by using \overleftarrow{e} instead of e .

coverage. Doing so for all vertices $S(i)$ of S , we obtain $|S|$ pathlets, of which we report the best. By only keeping the best pathlet in memory, rather than all $|S|$, the space used by these pathlets is lowered from $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ to $\mathcal{O}(n)$. ◀

9 Subedge pathlets

Let $\Delta' = 4\Delta$ and let C be a set of pathlets. We assume that $\text{Cov}(C)$ has at most $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log n)$ connected components. We give an algorithm for constructing a subedge $(2, \Delta')$ -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) whose coverage – (the sum of lengths in $\text{Cov}(P, \mathcal{I}) \setminus \text{Cov}(C)$) – is at least one-eighth the optimum.

Recall that a subedge pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) is a pathlet where $P = e[x, x']$ is a subsegment of some edge e of S . We construct a subedge pathlet given the edge e . We first discretize the problem, identifying a set of $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ *critical points* in Δ' -FSD(e, T). This set has the property that there exists a subedge pathlet $(e[x, x'], \mathcal{I})$ with at least one-fourth the coverage of any pathlet using a subedge of e as a reference curve, where for all $[y, y'] \in \mathcal{I}$, the points (x, y) and (x', y') are both critical points.

For $j \in [n-1]$, consider the following six extreme points of Δ' -FSD(e, T) $\cap ([1, 2] \times [j, j+1])$ (where some points may not exist):

- A leftmost point of Δ' -FSD(e, T) $\cap ([1, 2] \times [j, j+1])$,
- A rightmost point of Δ' -FSD(e, T) $\cap ([1, 2] \times [j, j+1])$,
- The leftmost and rightmost points of Δ' -FSD(e, T) $\cap ([1, 2] \times \{j\})$, and
- The leftmost and rightmost points of Δ' -FSD(e, T) $\cap ([1, 2] \times \{j+1\})$.

Let X_j be the set of x -coordinates of these points, and let $X = \bigcup X_j$ be the set of all these coordinates. Let x_1, \dots, x_m be the set of values in X , sorted in increasing order. We call every point (x_i, y) that is an endpoint of a connected component (vertical segment) of Δ' -FSD(e, T) $\cap (\{x_i\} \times [1, n])$ a *critical point*. Let Z be the set of at most $4n^2 = \mathcal{O}(n^2)$ critical points.

Before we restrict pathlets to be defined by these critical points, we first allow a broader range of pathlets. We consider the edge \overleftarrow{e} , obtained by reversing the direction of e , and look at constructing a pathlet that is a subedge of either e or \overleftarrow{e} . We show that by restricting pathlets to be defined by Z , allowing for reference curves that are subcurves of \overleftarrow{e} , we lose only a factor four in the maximum coverage.

► **Lemma 17.** *Let C be a set of pathlets. For any subedge $(2, \Delta')$ -pathlet $(e[x, x'], \mathcal{I})$, there exists a subedge $(2, \Delta')$ -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}') with*

$$\|\text{Cov}(P, \mathcal{I}') \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\| \geq \frac{1}{4} \|\text{Cov}(e[x, x'], \mathcal{I}) \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\|,$$

where P is equal to $e[x_i, x_j]$ or $\overleftarrow{e}[x_i, x_j]$ for some i and j , and for every interval $[y, y'] \in \mathcal{I}'$, the points (x_i, y) and (x_j, y') are contained in Z .

Proof. Consider a subedge $(2, \Delta')$ -pathlet $(e[x, x'], \mathcal{I})$. Any interval $[a, b] \in \mathcal{I}$ corresponds to a bimonotone path from (x, a) to (x', b) in Δ' -FSD(e, T). Consider such an interval $[a, b]$ and a corresponding path π .

Suppose first that $x_i \leq x \leq x' \leq x_{i+1}$ for some i . Observe that every connected component of Δ' -FSD(e, T) \cap ($[x_i, x_{i+1}] \times [1, n]$) is bounded on the left and right by (possibly empty) vertical line segments, and that the bottom and top chains are parabolic curves whose extrema are the endpoints of these segments. In particular, these connected components are convex. Thus there is a straight line segment e' from (x, a) to (x', b) in the free space. The line segment e^* connecting the extrema of the parabolic curves bounding the connected component containing (x, a) and (x', b) is necessarily longer than e' . The endpoints of e^* are both critical points, and e^* describes a valid matching between a subcurve of T and either a subcurve of e , or a subcurve of e' . See Figure 6. Because there are four different reference curves we choose from for the intervals in \mathcal{I} , the resulting intervals are spread over four different pathlets. One of the pathlets must therefore have at least one-fourth the coverage of any subedge pathlet.

Next suppose that $x_i \leq x \leq x_{i+1} < x'$ for some i . At some point, π reaches a point (x_{i+1}, a') . Let (x^*, y^*) be the lowest point in the connected component containing (x, a) . This point is a critical point. By convexity of the connected components, the segment e^* from (x^*, y^*) to (x_{i+1}, a') lies in the free space. Because $y^* \leq a$ by our choice of (x^*, y^*) , we may connect e^* to the suffix of π that starts at (x_{i+1}, a') to obtain a matching that starts at a critical point and that covers at least as much of T as the original matching. Applying a symmetric procedure to the end (x', b) of π yields a matching that starts and ends at critical points without losing coverage. Again, there are four different reference curves we choose from for the intervals in \mathcal{I} , the resulting intervals are spread over four different pathlets. One of the pathlets must therefore have at least one-fourth the coverage of any subedge pathlet. ◀

We find for each point $e(x_i)$ of e corresponding to a critical point a subedge pathlet whose reference curve starts at $e(x_i)$ and ends at some point $e(x_j)$ that also corresponds to a critical point. To this end, we consider each point $e(x_i)$ separately. We proceed akin to the construction for vertex-to-vertex pathlets Section 8, with some optimization steps.

It proves too costly to consider each reference curve $e[x_i, x_{i'}]$ for every x_i we consider. By sacrificing the quality of the pathlet slightly, settling for a pathlet with at least one-eighth the coverage of any subedge pathlet rather than one-fourth, we can reduce the number of reference curves we have to consider from $\Theta(m^2) = \mathcal{O}(n^2)$ to $\mathcal{O}(m \log m)$. Let $(e[x_i, x_{i'}], \mathcal{I})$ be a subedge pathlet. We can split $e[x_i, x_{i'}]$ into two subedges $e[x_i, x_{i+2^j}]$ and $e[x_{i'-2^j}, x_{i'}]$. The matchings corresponding to \mathcal{I} naturally decompose into two sets of matchings (whose matched subcurves may overlap), giving rise to two pathlets $(e[x_i, x_{i+2^j}], \mathcal{I}_1)$ and $(e[x_{i'-2^j}, x_{i'}], \mathcal{I}_2)$ with $\mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_2 = \mathcal{I}$. Thus at least one of these pathlets has at least half the coverage that $(e[x_i, x_{i'}], \mathcal{I})$ has. By Lemma 17, a pathlet $(e[x_i, x_{i+2^j}], \mathcal{I})$ that has maximum coverage out of all such pathlets then covers at least one-eighth of what any other subedge pathlet $(e[x, x'], \mathcal{I}')$ covers.

We create a sweepline algorithm that, for each $e[x_i, x_{i+2j}]$ (with $j \leq \log(m-i)$), constructs a reference-optimal (ℓ, Δ') -pathlet $(e[x_i, x_{i+2j}], \mathcal{I}_j)$. We let each interval \mathcal{I}_j contain all maximal intervals $[y, y']$ for which $d_F(e[x_i, x_{i+2j}], T[y, y']) \leq \Delta'$, and thus all maximal intervals for which (x_i, y) can reach (x_{i+2j}, y') by a bimonotone path in Δ' -FSD(S, T). Note that both (x_i, y) and (x_{i+2j}, y') are critical points. Thus we aim to find all maximal intervals $[y, y']$ for which the critical point (x_i, y) can reach the critical point (x_{i+2j}, y') by a bimonotone path in Δ' -FSD(S, T).

Let Z_i be the subset of $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ critical points with x -coordinate equal to x_i or x_{i+2j} for some $j \leq \log(m-i)$. We construct, for each $i \in [n]$, the reachability graph $G(e, T, Z_i)$ from Section 7, which encodes reachability between the critical points in Z_i . This graph takes $\mathcal{O}((n + |Z_i|) \log(n + |Z_i|)) = \mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n)$ time to construct and has complexity $\mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n)$. We aim to annotate each vertex μ (note that μ does not have to be a critical point) in $G(e, T, Z_i)$ with the minimum y , such that there exists a critical point (x_i, y) that can reach μ . We annotate μ with ∞ if no such y exists.

Annotating vertices and asymptotic analysis. We first annotate the vertices (x_i, y) in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time by scanning over them in order of increasing y -coordinate. We go over the remaining vertices in yx -lexicographical order, where we go over the vertices based on increasing y -coordinate, and increasing x -coordinate when ties arise. Each vertex μ that we consider has only incoming arcs that originate from vertices below and left of μ . By our lexicographical ordering, each of these vertices are already annotated. The minimal y for which there exists a path from (x_i, y) to μ , must be the minimum over all its incoming arcs which we compute in time proportional to the in-degree of μ . If μ has no incoming arcs, we annotate it with ∞ .

Let V and A be the sets of $\mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n)$ vertices and arcs of $G(e, T, Z_i)$. For the above annotation procedure, we first compute the yx -lexicographical ordering of the vertices, based on their corresponding points in the parameter space. This takes $\mathcal{O}(|V| \log |V|)$ time. Afterwards, we go over each vertex and each incoming arc exactly once, so we take an additional $\mathcal{O}(|V| + |A|)$ time. In total, we annotate all vertices in $\mathcal{O}(n \log^3 n)$ time.


Constructing the pathlets. With the annotations, constructing the pathlets becomes straight-forward. For each $j \in [\log(m-i)]$, we construct \mathcal{I}_j as follows. We iterate over all critical point (x_{i+2j}, y') in the graph $G(e, T, Z_i)$. For each critical point (x_{i+2j}, y') with a finite annotation y , we add the interval $[y, y']$ to \mathcal{I}_j . This procedure ensures that \mathcal{I}_j contains all maximal intervals $[y, y']$ for which $d_F(e[x_i, x_{i+2j}], T[y, y']) \leq \Delta'$, making an optimal pathlet $(e[x_i, x_{i+2j}], \mathcal{I}_j)$ with respect to its reference curve. Since there are $\mathcal{O}(n)$ critical points per j , this algorithm uses $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time. Storing the pathlets takes $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ space. Thus, we conclude the following:

► **Lemma 18.** *Let C be a set of pathlets where $\text{Cov}(C)$ has $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log n)$ connected components. Suppose $\text{Cov}(C)$ is preprocessed into the data structure of Lemma 12. In $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log^3 n)$ time and using $\mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n)$ space, we can construct a $(2, \Delta')$ -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) with*

$$\|\text{Cov}(P, \mathcal{I}) \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\| \geq \frac{1}{8} \|\text{Cov}(P', \mathcal{I}') \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\|$$

for any $(2, \Delta')$ -pathlet (P', \mathcal{I}') where P' is a subsegment of a given directed line segment e . The intervals in \mathcal{I} all have endpoints that come from a set of at most $4n^2$ values.

Proof. For a given point $e(x_i)$, we compute optimal pathlets $(e[x_i, x_{i+2j}], \mathcal{I}_j)$ with respect to their reference curves for $j \in [\log(m-i)]$ in $\mathcal{O}(n \log^3 n)$ time, using $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ space.



■ **Figure 7** Consider the trajectory T and some point $T(a)$. For some Δ , we can indicate all $T(b) \in T$ with $a \leq b$ where for line $s = \overline{T(a)T(b)}$, $d_F(s, T[a, b]) \leq 2\Delta$. Note that this set $\mathbb{B}(a)$ is not a connected set of intervals on $[1, n]$.

With the data structure of Lemma 12, we subsequently compute the coverage of one of these pathlets $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time, so $\mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n)$ time for all. We pick the best pathlet and remember its coverage. Doing so for all points $e(x_i)$, we obtain m pathlets, of which we report the best. This pathlet has at least one-eighth the coverage of any other subedge $(2, \Delta')$ -pathlet $(e[x, x'], \mathcal{I})$. By only keeping the best pathlet in memory, rather than all m , the space used by these pathlets is lowered from $\mathcal{O}(mn)$ to $\mathcal{O}(n)$. ◀

► **Theorem 19.** *Let C be a set of pathlets where $\text{Cov}(C)$ has $\mathcal{O}(k_\ell(\Delta) \log n)$ connected components. Suppose $\text{Cov}(C)$ is preprocessed into the data structure of Lemma 12. In $\mathcal{O}(n^3 \log^3 n)$ time and using $\mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n)$ space, we can construct a $(2, \Delta')$ -pathlet (P, \mathcal{I}) with*

$$\|\text{Cov}(P, \mathcal{I}) \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\| \geq \frac{1}{8} \|\text{Cov}(P', \mathcal{I}') \setminus \text{Cov}(C)\|$$

for any subedge $(2, \Delta')$ -pathlet (P', \mathcal{I}') . The intervals in \mathcal{I} all have endpoints that come from a set of at most $4n^3$ values.

10 Constructing a pathlet-preserving simplification

10.1 Defining our 2Δ -simplification S

We consider the vertex-restricted simplification defined by Agarwal *et al.* [2] and generalize their 2Δ -simplification definition, allowing vertices to lie anywhere on T (whilst still appearing in order along T). This way, we obtain a simplification with at most as many vertices as the optimal unrestricted Δ -simplification (see Figure 7).

► **Definition 20.** *Let T be a trajectory with n vertices, $\Delta \geq 0$ and $a \in [1, n]$. We define the set $\mathbb{B}(a) = \{b \geq a \mid d_F(\overline{T(a)T(b)}, T[a, b]) \leq 2\Delta\}$.*

► **Definition 21.** *Let T be a trajectory with n vertices and $\Delta \geq 0$. We define our 2Δ -simplified curve S as follows: the first vertex of S is $T(1)$. The second vertex of S may be any point $T(a)$ with a as a rightmost endpoint of an interval in $\mathbb{B}(1)$. The third vertex of S may be any point $T(b)$ with b as a rightmost endpoint of an interval in $\mathbb{B}(a)$, and so forth.*

Per definition of the set $\mathbb{B}(a)$, the resulting curve S is a 2Δ -simplified curve. Let (f, g) be any 2Δ -matching between S and T that matches the vertices of S to the points on T that define them. We prove that (S, f, g) is a pathlet-preserving simplification.

► **Lemma 22.** *The curve S as defined above, together with the matching (f, g) , forms a pathlet-preserving simplification.*

Proof. We show that for any subcurve $T[a, b]$ and all curves P with $d_F(P, T[a, b]) \leq \Delta$, the subcurve $S[s, t]$ matched to $T[a, b]$ by (f, g) has complexity $|S[s, t]| \leq |P| + 2 - |\mathbb{N} \cap \{s, t\}|$. For brevity, we write $X = T[a, b]$.

Fix any curve P with $d_F(P, X) \leq \Delta$. There exists a Δ -matchings (f', g') between P and X . Per construction, the subcurve $S[s, t]$ has Fréchet distance $d_F(S[s, t], X) \leq 2\Delta$ to X . Any vertex of T that is a vertex of $S[s, t]$ is also a vertex of $T[a, b]$. Let $S[x, y]$ be the maximal vertex-subcurve of $S[s, t]$. This curve naturally has $|S[s, t]| - 2 + |\mathbb{N} \cap \{s, t\}|$ vertices. We argue that $|P| \geq |S[x, y]|$.

Suppose for sake of contradiction that $|P| < |S[x, y]|$. By the pigeonhole principle, there must exist an edge $e_S = \overline{T(\alpha)T(\beta)}$ of $S[x, y]$, as well as an edge e_P of P matched to some subcurve $T[c, d]$ of T by (f', g') , such that $c \leq \alpha \leq \beta < d$. We claim that $\beta' \in \mathbb{B}(\alpha)$ for all $\beta' \leq d$.

The proof is illustrated in Figure 8. For any $\beta' \leq d$ there exists a subedge $e = e_P[x_1, x_2]$ of e_P that is matched to $T[\alpha, \beta']$ by (f, g) . Per definition of a Δ -matching we have that $d_F(T[\alpha, \beta'], e) \leq \Delta$. The 2Δ -matching implies that $\|e(1) - T(\alpha)\| \leq 2\Delta$ and $\|e(2) - T(\beta')\| \leq 2\Delta$. We use this fact to apply [2, Lemma 3.1] and note that $d_F(e, \overline{T(\alpha)T(\beta')}) \leq \Delta$. Applying the triangle inequality, we conclude that $d_F(T[\alpha, \beta'], \overline{T(\alpha)T(\beta')}) \leq 2\Delta$. It follows that $\beta' \in \mathbb{B}(\alpha)$.

We obtain that $[\alpha, d]$ is contained in the first connected component of $\mathbb{B}(\alpha)$. However, per construction of S , β is a rightmost endpoint of a connected component in $\mathbb{B}(\beta)$. This contradicts the fact that $\beta \in [\alpha, d]$. \blacktriangleleft




Figure 8 (a) The construction in the proof of Lemma 22. We have an edge e with $d_F(e, T[c, d]) \leq \Delta$. Moreover, for some $\alpha \in [c, d]$ we show $\mathbb{B}(\alpha)$ in orange where β is the last value in some connected component of $\mathbb{B}(\alpha)$. (b) For any $\beta' \in [\alpha, d]$, there exists a sub-edge e' of e with $d_F(e', T[a, \beta']) \leq \Delta$.

10.2 Constructing the simplification

We give an $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time algorithm for constructing our greedy simplification S (Definition 21). Given any point $T(a)$ on T , we decompose the problem of finding a $b \in \mathbb{B}(a)$ over all edges of T . That is, given an $a \in [1, n]$, we consider an individual edge $T[i, i+1]$ of T . We show how to report the maximal $b \in [i, i+1] \cap \mathbb{B}(a)$. Our procedure is based off of the work by Guibas *et al.* [17] on ordered stabbing of disks in \mathbb{R}^2 , and takes $\mathcal{O}(i - a)$ time. We fix a plane H in \mathbb{R}^d that contains $T(a)$ and $T[i, i+1]$. On a high-level, we apply the argument by Guibas *et al.* in \mathbb{R}^d by restricting the disks to their intersection with H :

Definition 23. Let H be some fixed two-dimensional plane in \mathbb{R}^d . For any $x \in [1, n]$ denote by B_x be the ball in H that is obtained by intersecting a ball of radius 2Δ centered at $T(x)$ with H . For $a \leq b$ we say that a directed line segment e in H stabs all balls in $[a, b]$ in order if for all $k \in \{a\} \cup ([a, b] \cap \mathbb{N}) \cup \{b\}$ there are points $p_k \in e \cap B_k$ such that p_k comes before $p_{k'}$ on e whenever $k \leq k'$ (see Figure 9 (a)).

► **Lemma 24** ([17, Theorem 14]). *A line segment e is within Fréchet distance 2Δ of a subcurve $T[a, b]$ of T if and only if the following conditions are met:*

1. e starts within distance 2Δ of $T(a)$,
2. e ends within distance 2Δ of $T(b)$, and
3. e stabs all balls in $[a, b]$ in order.

Computing the maximal $b \in [i, i+1] \cap \mathbb{B}(a)$. For any edge $e = \overline{T(a)T(b)}$ of Z , the endpoints lie on T and thus e trivially satisfies the first two criteria. It follows that if we fix some $T(a)$ on S and some edge $T[i, i+1]$, then the maximal $b \in [i, i+1]$ (with $b \geq a$) for which $\overline{T(a)T(b)}$ stabs balls $[a, b]$ in order is also the maximal $b \in [i, i+1] \cap \mathbb{B}(a)$. We consider the following (slightly reformulated) lemma by Guibas *et al.* [17]:

► **Lemma 25** ([17, Lemma 8]). *Let $[a_j, b_j]$ be a sequence of intervals. There exist $p_j \in [a_j, b_j]$ with $p_j \leq p_k$ for all $j \leq k$, if and only if there is no pair $j \leq k$ with $b_k < a_j$.*

The above lemma is applicable to segments in H stabbing balls in H . Indeed, consider all integers $j \in [a, i]$. We may view any directed line segment e in H as (part of) the real number line, and view the intersections between e and the disks D_j as intervals. Lemma 25 then implies that e stabs $[[a], i]$ in order, if and only if no integers $j, k \in [a, i]$ exist with $j \leq k$ such that e leaves D_k before it enters D_j (assuming e intersects all disks).

For all integers $j \in [a, i]$, let $W_j := \{p \in H \mid \overline{T(a)p} \text{ intersects } D_j\}$. We define the *stabbing wedge* $SW_j := \{p \in H \mid \overline{T(a)p} \text{ intersects } [a, j] \text{ in order}\}$. We prove the following:

► **Lemma 26.** *Either $SW_j = \bigcap_{k \in [a, j] \cap \mathbb{N}} W_k$, or $SW_j = \emptyset$.*

Proof. The proof is by induction. The base case is that, trivially, $SW_{[a]} = W_{[a]}$. Any line $\overline{T(a)p}$ that intersects $[a, j]$ also intersects $[a, j-1]$, thus whenever SW_{j-1} is empty, then SW_j must also be empty. Suppose now that $SW_{j-1} = \bigcap_{k \in [a, j-1] \cap \mathbb{N}} W_k$. We show that SW_j is either equal to $SW_{j-1} \cap W_j$, or it is empty (which, by induction, shows the lemma).


First we show that $SW_j \subseteq SW_{j-1} \cap W_j$. Suppose SW_j is non-empty, and take a point $p \in SW_j$. By definition of stabbing wedge SW_j , the segment $\overline{T(a)p}$ stabs $[a, j]$ in order, and thus $[a, j-1]$ in order. Furthermore, p must lie in W_j for $\overline{T(a)p}$ to be able to stab disk D_j .

Next we show that $SW_{j-1} \cap W_j \subseteq SW_j$. By Lemma 25, $p \in SW_j$ if and only if $\overline{T(a)p}$ first enters all disks $D_{[a]}, \dots, D_{j-1}$ before exiting disk D_j . Fix some $p \in SW_{j-1} \cap W_j$, for all $k < j$ the line $\overline{T(a)p}$ intersects D_k . If $p \notin SW_j$ then there must exist a $k < j$ where $\overline{T(a)p}$ exists D_j before it enters D_k . The area SW_{j-1} must be contained in the cone $C \subset H$ given by $T(a)$ and the two tangents of D_k to $T(a)$ (Figure 9 (b)) and thus $\overline{T(a)p}$ is contained in C . Since $\overline{T(a)p}$ intersects D_k in C after D_j , it must be that $D_j \cap C$ is contained in a triangle C^* formed by the boundary of C and another tangent of D_k . However, this means that any segment $\overline{T(a)q}$ (for $q \in SW_{j-1} \cap W_j$) that stabs the disks $[a, j-1]$ in order must intersect C^* before it intersects D_k . Thus, by Lemma 25, there is no segment $\overline{T(a)q}$ that stab the disks $[a, j]$ in order and SW_j is empty.

Thus, either SW_j is empty or $SW_j = \bigcap_{[a] \leq k \leq j} W_k$. ◀

► **Lemma 27.** *Given $a \in [1, n]$ and edge $T[i, i+1]$ of T , we can compute the maximum $b \in [i, i+1] \cap \mathbb{B}(a)$, or report that no such b exists, in $\mathcal{O}(1 + i - a)$ time.*

Proof. By Lemma 24 (and the fact that $T(a)$ and $T(b)$ always lie on T) $b \in [i, i+1] \cap \mathbb{B}(a)$ if and only if $T(b) \in SW_i$. For any edge $T[i, i+1]$, we compute the maximal $b \in [i, i+1] \cap \mathbb{B}(a)$ by first assuming that SW_i is non-empty. We check afterwards whether this assumption was correct, and if not, we know that no $b \in [i, i+1]$ exists with $d_F(T[a, b], \overline{T(a)T(b)}) \leq 2\Delta$.



■ **Figure 9** (a) For two points $T(a)$ and $T(b)$ on T , we consider all $j \in [a, b] \cap N$ and draw a ball with radius 2Δ around them in green. (b) For all $k \in [a, j - 1] \cap N$, the area SW_{j-1} must be contained in the orange cone.

For all $j \in [a, i] \cap N$, we compute the last value $b_j \in [i, j]$ such that $T(b_j) \in W_j$. This can be done in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time per integer j , as wedges in the plane are formed by two rays and a circular arc in H , which we can intersect in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time. Then we set $b = \min_j b_j$.

To check whether SW_i is non-empty, we determine if $d_F(T[a, b], \overline{T(a)T(b)}) \leq 2\Delta$. This takes $\mathcal{O}(1 + i - a)$ time with the algorithm of Alt and Godau [4]. The assumption that SW_i is non-empty is correct precisely if $d_F(T[a, b], \overline{T(a)T(b)}) \leq 2\Delta$. If SW_i is empty, $[i, i + 1] \cap \mathbb{B}(a)$ is empty and no output exists. If SW_i is non-empty, then by Lemma 26, the b we choose is the maximal $b \in [i, i + 1] \cap \mathbb{B}(a)$. ◀

► **Lemma 28.** *Given $a \in [1, n]$, we can compute a value b^* that is the maximum of some connected component of $\mathbb{B}(a)$ in $\mathcal{O}((1 + b^* - a) \log n)$ time.*

Proof. We use Lemma 27 in conjunction with exponential and binary search to compute the maximum b^* of some connected component of $\mathbb{B}_{2\Delta}(a)$:

We search over the edges $T[i, i + 1]$ of T . For each considered edge we apply Lemma 27 which returns some $b \in [i, j + 1] \cap \mathbb{B}(a)$ (if the set is non-empty). We consider three cases:

If $b \in [i, i + 1]$, then this value is the maximum of some connected component of $\mathbb{B}(a)$. We stop the search and output b .

If the procedure reports the value $b = i + 1$ then this value may not necessarily be the maximum of a connected component. However, there is sure to be a maximum of at least b . Hence we continue the search among later edges of T and discard all edges before, and including, $T[i, i + 1]$.

If the procedure reports no value then $[i, i + 1] \cap \mathbb{B}(a) = \emptyset$. Since trivially $a \in \mathbb{B}(a)$, it must be that there is a connected component whose maximum is strictly smaller than i . We continue the search among earlier edges of T and discard all edges after, and including, $T[i, i + 1]$.

The above algorithm returns the maximum $b^* \in [i^*, i^* + 1]$ of some connected component of $\mathbb{B}(a)$. By applying exponential search first, the edges $T[i, i + 1]$ considered all have $i \leq 2i^* - a$. Hence we compute b^* in $\mathcal{O}((1 + b^* - a) \log n)$ time. ◀

We now iteratively apply Lemma 28 to construct our curve S . We obtain a 2Δ -matching (f, g) by constructing separate matchings between the edges $\overline{T(a)T(b)}$ of S and the subcurves $T[a, b]$ that they simplify. By Lemma 22 this gives a pathlet-preserving simplification (S, f, g) .

► **Theorem 8.** *For any trajectory T with n vertices and any $\Delta \geq 0$, we can construct a pathlet-preserving simplification S in $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time.*

References

- 1 Pankaj K. Agarwal, Kyle Fox, Kamesh Munagala, Abhinandan Nath, Jiangwei Pan, and Erin Taylor. Subtrajectory clustering: Models and algorithms. In *proc. 37th ACM SIGMOD-*

- SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*, pages 75–87, 2018. doi:10.1145/3196959.3196972.
- 2 Pankaj K. Agarwal, Sarel Har-Peled, Nabil H. Mustafa, and Yusu Wang. Near-linear time approximation algorithms for curve simplification. *Algorithmica*, 42(3):203–219, 2005. doi:10.1007/s00453-005-1165-y.
 - 3 Hugo A. Akitaya, Frederik Brünig, Erin Chambers, and Anne Driemel. Subtrajectory clustering: Finding set covers for set systems of subcurves. *Computing in Geometry and Topology*, 2(1):1–1:48, 2023. doi:10.57717/cgt.v2i1.7.
 - 4 Helmut Alt and Michael Godau. Computing the Fréchet distance between two polygonal curves. *International Journal of Computational Geometry & Applications*, 5:75–91, 1995. doi:10.1142/S0218195995000064.
 - 5 Frederik Brünig, Jacobus Conradi, and Anne Driemel. Faster approximate covering of subcurves under the Fréchet distance. In *proc. 30th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA)*, volume 244 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 28:1–28:16, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2022. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ESA.2022.28.
 - 6 Kevin Buchin, Maike Buchin, David Duran, Brittany Terese Fasy, Roel Jacobs, Vera Sacristan, Rodrigo I. Silveira, Frank Staals, and Carola Wenk. Clustering trajectories for map construction. In *proc. 25th ACM SIGSPATIAL International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems*, pages 1–10, 2017. doi:10.1145/3139958.3139964.
 - 7 Kevin Buchin, Maike Buchin, Joachim Gudmundsson, Jorren Hendriks, Erfan Hosseini Sereshgi, Vera Sacristán, Rodrigo I. Silveira, Jorrick Sleijster, Frank Staals, and Carola Wenk. Improved map construction using subtrajectory clustering. In *proc. 4th ACM SIGSPATIAL Workshop on Location-Based Recommendations, Geosocial Networks, and Geoadvertising*, pages 1–4, 2020. doi:10.1145/3423334.3431451.
 - 8 Kevin Buchin, Maike Buchin, Joachim Gudmundsson, Maarten Löffler, and Jun Luo. Detecting commuting patterns by clustering subtrajectories. *International Journal of Computational Geometry & Applications*, 21(03):253–282, 2011. doi:10.1142/S0218195911003652.
 - 9 Kevin Buchin, Anne Driemel, Joachim Gudmundsson, Michael Horton, Irina Kostitsyna, Maarten Löffler, and Martijn Struijs. Approximating (k, ℓ) -center clustering for curves. In *proc. Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2922–2938, 2019.
 - 10 Maike Buchin and Dennis Rohde. Coresets for (k, ℓ) -median clustering under the Fréchet distance. In *proc. Conference on Algorithms and Discrete Applied Mathematics*, pages 167–180, 2022.
 - 11 Siu-Wing Cheng and Haoqiang Huang. Curve simplification and clustering under Fréchet distance. In *proc. 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1414–1432, 2023.
 - 12 Vasek Chvátal. A greedy heuristic for the set-covering problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 4(3):233–235, 1979. doi:10.1287/MOOR.4.3.233.
 - 13 Jacobus Conradi and Anne Driemel. Finding complex patterns in trajectory data via geometric set cover. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14865*, 2023.
 - 14 Mark de Berg, Atlas F. Cook, and Joachim Gudmundsson. Fast Fréchet queries. *Computational Geometry*, 46(6):747–755, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.comgeo.2012.11.006.
 - 15 Anne Driemel, Amer Krivošija, and Christian Sohler. Clustering time series under the Fréchet distance. In *proc. twenty-seventh annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms (SODA)*, pages 766–785, 2016.
 - 16 Joachim Gudmundsson and Sampson Wong. Cubic upper and lower bounds for subtrajectory clustering under the continuous Fréchet distance. In *proc. 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 173–189, 2022.
 - 17 Leonidas J. Guibas, John Hershberger, Joseph S. B. Mitchell, and Jack Snoeyink. Approximating polygons and subdivisions with minimum link paths. *International Journal of Computational Geometry & Applications*, 3(4):383–415, 1993. doi:10.1142/S0218195993000257.

- 18 Richard M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In *proc. Symposium on the Complexity of Computer Computations*, The IBM Research Symposia Series, pages 85–103, 1972. doi:10.1007/978-1-4684-2001-2_9.
- 19 Mees van de Kerkhof, Irina Kostitsyna, Maarten Löffler, Majid Mirzanezhad, and Carola Wenk. Global curve simplification. *European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA)*, 2019.
- 20 Peter Widmayer. On graphs preserving rectilinear shortest paths in the presence of obstacles. *Annals of Operations Research*, 33(7):557–575, 1991. doi:10.1007/BF02067242.