

Restriction and interpolation operators for digital images and their boundaries

Janosch Rieger* Kyria Wawryk[†]

July 29, 2024

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to provide a coherent framework for transforming boundary pairs of digital images from one resolution to another without knowledge of the full images. It is intended to facilitate the simultaneous usage of multiresolution processing and boundary reduction, primarily for algorithms in computational dynamics and computational control theory.

Keywords: digital images, multiresolution processing, boundary reduction, computational dynamics, computational control theory

Mathematics Subject Classification: 68U05, 37M22, 93B03, 65D18

1 Introduction

Digital images are not only of interest in digital geometry [9]. They also occur, often under the name *box covering* [4] or *grid covering* [10], in completely unrelated disciplines like computational dynamics, computational control theory and rigorous computing. The data structure underlying the software package GAIO for the computation of invariant objects [3, 13], the viability kernel algorithm [14], and algorithms for the computation of reachable sets [12], is indeed a digital image.

*janosch.rieger@monash.edu, Monash University, Australia (corresponding author)

[†]kyria.wawryk@monash.edu, Monash University, Australia

Multiresolution processing and boundary reduction are techniques for speeding up algorithms based on digital image representations: Algorithms derived from GAIO, in the field of computational dynamics [1, 2, 8, 11] and beyond [5, 15], as well as many algorithms in rigorous computing [7], all start with a very crude box covering of the region of interest, and alternate between an elimination step in which boxes are deleted from the cover, and a refinement step in which the remaining boxes are subdivided. This approach allows for large gains at low cost in the early stages of the algorithm. On the other hand, the boundary tracking algorithm [12] reduces the complexity of reachable set computation by storing and manipulating a *boundary pair*, i.e. the boundary of a digital image together with one adjacent layer in the complement, instead of working with the full digital image.

The aim of this paper is to provide a coherent framework for transforming the boundary pairs of digital images from one resolution to another without knowledge of the full image. It is intended to facilitate the simultaneous usage of multiresolution processing and boundary reduction. We contribute mainly the following insights:

- i) We explore the structure of digital images in terms of inner and outer layers. This is related to the so-called distance transform [9, Section 3.4.2], but we are interested in the geometry of the layers rather than their computation, which we aim to avoid.
- ii) We characterize the space of all boundary pairs of digital images.
- iii) We identify a restriction operator R that projects a digital image living on a fine grid onto a coarser grid, and an interpolation operator I that refines digital images, such that both operators satisfy a number of desirable properties, individually and as a pair.
- iv) We lift the operators R and I to mappings ∂R and ∂I between the spaces of boundary pairs corresponding to the coarse and fine grids from iii), and provide implementations of these lifts that neither require knowledge of the full images nor compute this information implicitly.

A more detailed outline of the paper is postponed to Section 2.2, when the definitions and the terminology have been fixed.

2 Definitions and outline

We collect most definitions from this paper in Section 2.1. They serve as the vocabulary for presenting a technical outline in Section 2.2.

2.1 Definitions

We denote $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, $\mathbb{N}_1 = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ and $\mathbb{N}_2 = \{2, 3, 4, \dots\}$. When $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an interval, and when it is clear that $k \in \mathbb{N}$ or $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we will write $k \in J$ instead of $k \in J \cap \mathbb{N}$ or $k \in J \cap \mathbb{Z}$. For every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote

$$\lfloor x \rfloor := \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z} : k \leq x\} \quad \text{and} \quad \lceil x \rceil := \min\{k \in \mathbb{Z} : x \leq k\}.$$

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}_1$. We equip \mathbb{R}^m with the norm $\|x\|_\infty := \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, m\}} |x_j|$. For any $\emptyset \neq M, M' \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ we consider the Hausdorff semi-distance and the full Hausdorff distance

$$\begin{aligned} d(M, M') &:= \sup_{x \in M} \inf_{x' \in M'} \|x - x'\|_\infty, \\ d_H(M, M') &:= \max\{d(M, M'), d(M', M)\}, \end{aligned}$$

with the additional convention that $d(M, \emptyset) = \infty$ for all $\emptyset \neq M \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. For all $M \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\delta > 0$, we will denote $B_\delta(M) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : d(x, M) \leq \delta\}$.

We introduce grids, their subsets, and boundary layers of these sets. Definitions (1) through (3) are as in [12]. For an illustration see Figure 1.

Definition 1. *For every $\rho > 0$, consider the grid*

$$\Delta_\rho := \rho\mathbb{Z}^m$$

as well as the collections

$$S_\rho^- := \{M \subset \Delta_\rho : \emptyset \neq M \neq \Delta_\rho\}, \quad S_\rho := \{M \subset \Delta_\rho : M \neq \emptyset\}, \quad S_\rho^+ := 2^{\Delta_\rho}.$$

For every $M \in S_\rho^+$ we define the (possibly empty) sets

$$\partial_\rho^0 M := \{x \in M : \exists z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho \text{ with } \|x - z\|_\infty = \rho\}, \quad (1)$$

$$\partial_\rho^k M := \{z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho : d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M) = k\rho\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_1, \quad (2)$$

$$\partial_\rho^{-k} M := \{x \in M : d(x, \partial_\rho^0 M) = k\rho\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_1. \quad (3)$$




Figure 1: Anatomy of a digital image from Definition 1.

Paths help describe the topology of sets in S_ρ . It is easy to check that their concatenation is well-defined.

Definition 2. Let $\rho > 0$, and let $x, z \in \Delta_\rho$. A finite sequence

$$p = (\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_k) \in \Delta_\rho^{k+1}$$

with $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ satisfying $\xi_0 = x$, $\xi_k = z$ and

$$\|\xi_\ell - \xi_{\ell-1}\|_\infty \leq \rho \quad \forall \ell \in (0, k]$$

is called a path from x to z of length $L(p) := k$. We write $p(\ell) := \xi_\ell$ for $\ell \in [0, k]$, and we denote the space of all paths from x to z by $P_\rho(x, z)$.

For any $x, y, z \in \Delta_\rho$, $p_0 \in P_\rho(x, y)$ and $p_1 \in P_\rho(y, z)$ we define the concatenation $p_1 \circ p_0 \in P_\rho(x, z)$ by

$$(p_1 \circ p_0)(\ell) := \begin{cases} p_0(\ell), & \ell \in [0, L(p_0)], \\ p_1(\ell - L(p_0)), & \ell \in (L(p_0), L(p_0) + L(p_1)]. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

The space bd_ρ is a central object of this paper. Much of the content of Sections 4 and 5 will be used in showing that it is the collection of all pairs $(\partial_\rho^0 M, \partial_\rho^1 M)$ of sets $M \in S_\rho$. For the significance of axiom (9) see Figure 2.

Definition 3. Let $\rho > 0$. Then $\text{bd}_\rho^- \subset S_\rho^+ \times S_\rho^+$ is the space of all pairs (D_0, D_1) satisfying

$$D_0 \neq \emptyset \neq D_1, \quad (5)$$

$$D_0 \cap D_1 = \emptyset, \quad (6)$$

$$(\forall x \in D_0)(\exists z \in D_1) : \|x - z\|_\infty = \rho, \quad (7)$$

$$(\forall z \in D_1)(\exists x \in D_0) : \|x - z\|_\infty = \rho, \quad (8)$$

$$(\forall x \in D_0)(\forall z \in D_1)(\forall p \in P_\rho(x, z)) : \\ (L(p) > 1) \Rightarrow (\exists \ell \in (0, L(p))) : p(\ell) \in D_0 \cup D_1, \quad (9)$$




Figure 2: Examples of pairs $(D_0, D_1) \in S_\rho^+ \times S_\rho^+$ satisfying axioms (5) through (8), but not axiom (9) from Definition 3.

and $\text{bd}_\rho := \text{bd}_\rho^- \cup \{(\emptyset, \emptyset)\}$.

We also introduce collections of sets that will allow to formalize desirable properties of restriction and interpolation operators.

Definition 4. Let $\rho > 0$ and $\rho' > 0$. Then we call

$$C_\rho := \{M \in S_\rho : (\forall x, x' \in M)(\exists p \in P_\rho(x, x'))(\forall \ell \in [0, L(p)]) : (p(\ell) \in M)\}$$

the collection of all connected sets in S_ρ , and for every $M \in S_\rho$, we call

$$A_{\rho'}(M) := \text{argmin}\{d_H(M', M) : M' \in S_{\rho'}\}, \quad (10)$$

$$V_{\rho'}^{\rho'}(M) := \{M' \in S_{\rho'} : B_{\rho/2}(M) \subset B_{\rho'/2}(M')\} \quad (11)$$

the collection of all best approximations to M in $S_{\rho'}$ and the collection of all Voronoi covers of M in $S_{\rho'}$, respectively.

The collection $V_{\rho'}^{\rho'}(M)$ consists of all $M' \in S_{\rho'}$ such that the Voronoi cells generated by M' in the Voronoi diagram generated by $\Delta_{\rho'}$ cover the Voronoi cells generated by M in the Voronoi diagram generated by Δ_ρ . For an illustration see Figure 3.




Figure 3: Illustration of covering property encoded in (11) from Definition 4 with $\rho = \check{\rho}$ and $\rho' = \hat{\rho} = 2\check{\rho}$: Set from (d) covers set from (b). White lines in (b) and (d) are visual aids only.

2.2 Outline

Section 3 introduces basic tools, and Section 4 explores various aspects of the geometry of digital images. In Section 5, we use the insights gathered to prove that for every $\rho > 0$, the mapping

$$\text{Tr}_\rho : S_\rho \rightarrow S_\rho^+ \times S_\rho^+, \quad \text{Tr}_\rho(M) = (\partial_\rho^0 M, \partial_\rho^1 M), \quad (12)$$

is injective, and that

$$\text{Tr}_\rho(S_\rho) = \text{bd}_\rho,$$

i.e. that the collection bd_ρ from Definition 3 is the space of all boundary pairs of sets from S_ρ . In particular, its inverse $\text{Tr}_\rho^{-1} : \text{bd}_\rho \rightarrow S_\rho$ is well-defined. From then on, we consider fixed grids

$$\Delta_{\hat{\rho}} \subsetneq \Delta_{\check{\rho}}, \quad \check{\rho}, \hat{\rho} > 0, \quad \hat{\rho} \in \check{\rho}\mathbb{N}_2. \quad (13)$$

In Section 6, we investigate the restriction and interpolation operators

$$R : S_{\hat{\rho}} \rightarrow S_{\check{\rho}}, \quad R(M) = B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(M) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}, \quad (14)$$

$$I : S_{\hat{\rho}} \rightarrow S_{\check{\rho}}, \quad I(M) = B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(M) \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}}. \quad (15)$$

The operator R is referred to as *outer Jordan digitization* [9, Definition 2.8] in digital geometry, and when $\hat{\rho}/\check{\rho} \in 2\mathbb{N}_1 + 1$, the operator I coincides with the *subdivision operation* from computational dynamics [3, Section 3]. We prefer them over other operator pairs for the following reasons:

- i) They are easily implementable (properties (59), (61), (74) and (76)).
- ii) They have good approximation properties. For any $\check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}}$, the image $R(\check{M})$ is the maximal best approximation to \check{M} in $S_{\hat{\rho}}$ (properties (63) and (64)), and I satisfies a similar error estimate (77). (For a brief discussion of why choosing the best approximation $I = \text{id}$ is not an option, see Example 26.)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{bd}_{\hat{\rho}} & \overset{\partial I}{\dashrightarrow} & \text{bd}_{\check{\rho}} & \overset{\partial R}{\dashrightarrow} & \text{bd}_{\hat{\rho}} \\ \text{Tr}_{\hat{\rho}} \uparrow & & \text{Tr}_{\check{\rho}} \uparrow & & \uparrow \text{Tr}_{\hat{\rho}} \\ S_{\hat{\rho}} & \xrightarrow{I} & S_{\check{\rho}} & \xrightarrow{R} & S_{\hat{\rho}} \end{array}$$

Figure 4: Overview of spaces and mappings.

- iii) They map any $\check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}}$ and $\hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$ to the minimal elements of $V_{\check{\rho}}^{\hat{\rho}}(\check{M})$ and $V_{\hat{\rho}}^{\check{\rho}}(\hat{M})$, respectively (properties (65), (66), (78) and (79)). This covering property is crucial for applications in computational dynamics and control theory such as [3] and [14].
- iv) They map any connected $\check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}}$ and $\hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$ to a connected set (properties (67) and (80)). Algorithms such as the boundary tracking method from [12] cannot dispense with connectedness.
- v) The boundaries of their images are close to the boundaries of their preimages (properties (68) and (81)). It is essential for the aim of this paper, i.e. for working with boundaries instead of full sets to reduce computational complexity, that the boundaries of the images are not more complicated than those of the preimages.
- vi) We have $R \circ I = \text{id}$ when $\hat{\rho}/\check{\rho} \in 2\mathbb{N}_1 + 1$ by (82), and we *almost* have $R \circ I = \text{id}$ when $\hat{\rho}/\check{\rho} \in 2\mathbb{N}_1$ by (83). Theorem 25 shows that equality cannot be achieved in the latter case without sacrificing properties (65), (66), (78) and (79).

In Section 7, we propose algorithms for the evaluation of the lifted restriction and interpolation operators

$$\partial R : \text{bd}_{\check{\rho}} \rightarrow \text{bd}_{\hat{\rho}}, \quad \partial R := \text{Tr}_{\hat{\rho}} \circ R \circ \text{Tr}_{\check{\rho}}^{-1}, \quad (16)$$

$$\partial I : \text{bd}_{\hat{\rho}} \rightarrow \text{bd}_{\check{\rho}}, \quad \partial I := \text{Tr}_{\check{\rho}} \circ I \circ \text{Tr}_{\hat{\rho}}^{-1}, \quad (17)$$

which complete the diagram in Figure 4. The algorithms do not evaluate the operators $\text{Tr}_{\check{\rho}}$, $\text{Tr}_{\hat{\rho}}$, R , I , $\text{Tr}_{\check{\rho}}^{-1}$ and $\text{Tr}_{\hat{\rho}}^{-1}$, but compute the desired boundary pair directly from the input. A small computational example that illustrates the above commutative diagram is provided in Figure 5 at the end of the paper.

3 Straight paths

The proof of the following lemma is elementary. Note that the usual rounding function does not have properties (19) and (22).

Lemma 5. *The specific rounding function*

$$\text{rd} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{rd}(x) := \begin{cases} \lfloor x \rfloor, & x - \lfloor x \rfloor \in [0, 1/2), \\ \lceil x \rceil, & x - \lfloor x \rfloor \in [1/2, 1), \end{cases}$$

has the following properties:

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{Z} : \quad \text{rd}(k) = k, \quad (18)$$

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \forall k \in \mathbb{Z} : \quad \text{rd}(x) + k = \text{rd}(x + k), \quad (19)$$

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R} : \quad |\text{rd}(x)| \leq \text{rd}(|x|), \quad (20)$$

$$\forall x, z \in \mathbb{R} : \quad (x \leq z) \Rightarrow (\text{rd}(x) \leq \text{rd}(z)). \quad (21)$$

$$\forall x, z \in \mathbb{R}, \forall k \in \mathbb{N} : \quad (|x - z| \leq k) \Rightarrow |\text{rd}(x) - \text{rd}(z)| \leq k. \quad (22)$$

The following path will be used frequently throughout the paper. It is a special case of the digital ray from Definition 9.1 in [9].

Lemma 6. *Let $\rho > 0$, let $x, z \in \Delta_\rho$, and let $k := \|x - z\|_\infty / \rho$. Then the mapping $\phi(\cdot; x, z) : [0, k] \rightarrow \Delta_\rho$ given by $\phi(\cdot; x, z; \rho) = (x)$ when $x = z$ and*

$$\phi(\ell; x, z; \rho)_j := \text{rd}\left(\frac{k-\ell}{k} \frac{x_j}{\rho} + \frac{\ell}{k} \frac{z_j}{\rho}\right) \rho \quad \forall j \in [1, m], \quad \forall \ell \in [0, k]$$

otherwise has the properties

$$\phi(0; x, z; \rho) = x \quad (23)$$

$$\phi(k; x, z; \rho) = z \quad (24)$$

$$\|\phi(\ell; x, z; \rho) - x\|_\infty = \ell \rho \quad \forall \ell \in [0, k], \quad (25)$$

$$\|\phi(\ell; x, z; \rho) - z\|_\infty = (k - \ell) \rho \quad \forall \ell \in [0, k], \quad (26)$$

$$\|\phi(\ell + 1; x, z; \rho) - \phi(\ell; x, z; \rho)\|_\infty = \rho \quad \forall \ell \in [0, k]. \quad (27)$$

In particular, we have $\phi(\cdot; x, z; \rho) \in P_\rho(x, z)$ and $L(\phi(\cdot; x, z; \rho)) = k$. In addition, for every $y \in \Delta_\rho$, we have

$$\|\phi(\ell; x, z; \rho) - y\|_\infty \leq \max\{\|x - y\|_\infty, \|y - z\|_\infty\} \quad \forall \ell \in [0, k]. \quad (28)$$

Proof. Since $x_j/\rho \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $z_j/\rho \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $j \in [1, m]$, statement (18) implies (23) and (24).

We show statement (25). Let $j \in [1, m]$. Since $x_j/\rho \in \mathbb{Z}$, we obtain from (19), (20) and (21) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi(\ell; x, z; \rho)_j - x_j| &= \left| \text{rd}\left(\frac{k-\ell}{k} \frac{x_j}{\rho} + \frac{\ell}{k} \frac{z_j}{\rho}\right) - \frac{x_j}{\rho} \right| \rho = \left| \text{rd}\left(\frac{\ell}{k} \frac{z_j - x_j}{\rho}\right) \right| \rho \\ &\leq \text{rd}\left(\frac{\ell}{k} \frac{|z_j - x_j|}{\rho}\right) \rho \leq \text{rd}\left(\frac{\ell}{k} \frac{\|z - x\|_\infty}{\rho}\right) \rho = \text{rd}(\ell) \rho = \ell \rho. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, there exists $j \in [1, m]$ with $z_j - x_j = \pm \|z - x\|_\infty$, and the same computation yields for this j that

$$|\phi(\ell; x, z; \rho)_j - x_j| = |\text{rd}(\frac{\ell \pm \|z - x\|_\infty}{\rho})| \rho = |\text{rd}(\pm \ell)| \rho = |\pm \ell| \rho = \ell \rho.$$

All in all, we have shown that $\|\phi(\ell; x, z; \rho) - x\|_\infty = \ell \rho$. A similar argument shows that statement (26) holds as well.

We show statement (27). Let $j \in [1, m]$. It follows from (19) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi(\ell + 1; x, z; \rho)_j - \phi(\ell; x, z; \rho)_j \\ &= \text{rd}(\frac{x_j}{\rho} + \frac{\ell + 1}{k} \frac{z_j - x_j}{\rho}) \rho - \text{rd}(\frac{x_j}{\rho} + \frac{\ell}{k} \frac{z_j - x_j}{\rho}) \rho \\ &= \text{rd}(\frac{\ell + 1}{k} \frac{z_j - x_j}{\rho}) \rho - \text{rd}(\frac{\ell}{k} \frac{z_j - x_j}{\rho}) \rho. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Since

$$|\frac{\ell + 1}{k} \frac{z_j - x_j}{\rho} - \frac{\ell}{k} \frac{z_j - x_j}{\rho}| = \frac{1}{k} \frac{|z_j - x_j|}{\rho} \leq \frac{1}{k} \frac{\|z - x\|_\infty}{\rho} = 1$$

it follows from (29) and (22) that

$$|\phi(\ell + 1; x, z; \rho)_j - \phi(\ell; x, z; \rho)_j| = |\text{rd}(\frac{\ell + 1}{k} \frac{z_j - x_j}{\rho}) - \text{rd}(\frac{\ell}{k} \frac{z_j - x_j}{\rho})| \rho \leq \rho.$$

By definition, there exists $j \in [1, m]$ with $z_j - x_j = \pm \|z - x\|_\infty$, for which

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi(\ell + 1; x, z; \rho)_j - \phi(\ell; x, z; \rho)_j = \text{rd}(\frac{\ell + 1}{k} \frac{z_j - x_j}{\rho}) \rho - \text{rd}(\frac{\ell}{k} \frac{z_j - x_j}{\rho}) \rho \\ &= \text{rd}(\frac{\ell + 1}{k} \frac{\pm \|z - x\|_\infty}{\rho}) \rho - \text{rd}(\frac{\ell}{k} \frac{\pm \|z - x\|_\infty}{\rho}) \rho = \text{rd}(\pm(\ell + 1)) \rho - \text{rd}(\pm \ell) \rho = \pm \rho, \end{aligned}$$

and thus statement (27) holds.

We check (28). For every $j \in [1, m]$, statements (19), (20) and (21) yield

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi(\ell; x, z; \rho)_j - y_j| &= |\text{rd}(\frac{k - \ell}{k} \frac{x_j}{\rho} + \frac{\ell}{k} \frac{z_j}{\rho}) \rho - y_j| = |\text{rd}(\frac{k - \ell}{k} \frac{x_j}{\rho} + \frac{\ell}{k} \frac{z_j}{\rho}) - \frac{y_j}{\rho}| \rho \\ &= |\text{rd}(\frac{k - \ell}{k} \frac{x_j - y_j}{\rho} + \frac{\ell}{k} \frac{z_j - y_j}{\rho})| \rho \leq \text{rd}(\frac{k - \ell}{k} \frac{|x_j - y_j|}{\rho} + \frac{\ell}{k} \frac{|z_j - y_j|}{\rho}) \rho \\ &\leq \text{rd}(\frac{\max\{\|x - y\|_\infty, \|y - z\|_\infty\}}{\rho}) \rho = \max\{\|x - y\|_\infty, \|y - z\|_\infty\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We use the path ϕ to locate elements of $\partial_\rho^0 M$ and $\partial_\rho^1 M$.

Lemma 7. *Let $\rho > 0$, let $M \in S_\rho^-$, let $x \in M$ and $z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$, and let $\phi(\cdot) = \phi(\cdot; x, z; \rho)$ be the path from Lemma 6. Then the following statements hold:*

- a) There exists $\ell \in [0, L(\phi))$ with $\phi(\ell) \in \partial_\rho^0 M$ and $\phi(\ell + 1) \in \partial_\rho^1 M$.
- b) If $\|z - x\|_\infty = d(z, M)$, then we have $x \in \partial_\rho^0 M$ and $\phi(1) \in \partial_\rho^1 M$ as well as $\|z - \phi(1)\|_\infty = \|z - x\|_\infty - \rho$ and $\|\phi(1) - x\|_\infty = \rho$.
- c) If $\|x - z\|_\infty = d(x, M^c \cap \Delta_\rho)$, then $z \in \partial_\rho^1 M$ and $\phi(L(\phi) - 1) \in \partial_\rho^0 M$ as well as $\|z - \phi(L(\phi) - 1)\|_\infty = \rho$ and $\|\phi(L(\phi) - 1) - x\|_\infty = \|x - z\|_\infty - \rho$.

Proof. a) Since $x \neq z$ we have $\|x - z\|_\infty \geq \rho$, and (27) implies that $L(\phi) > 0$. By (23), we have $\phi(0) = x \in M$, so there exists a maximal index $\ell \in [0, L(\phi)]$ with $\phi(\ell) \in M$. By (24), we have

$$\phi(L(\phi)) = z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho,$$

and hence $\ell < L(\phi)$. By maximality, we have $\phi(\ell + 1) \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$. We conclude from (27), (1) and (2) that $\phi(\ell) \in \partial_\rho^0 M$ and $\phi(\ell + 1) \in \partial_\rho^1 M$.

b) According to (26), we have

$$\|z - \phi(1)\|_\infty = \|z - x\|_\infty - \rho = d(z, M) - \rho,$$

which implies $\phi(1) \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$. By (23) and (25), we have

$$\|\phi(1) - x\|_\infty = \|\phi(1) - \phi(0)\|_\infty = \rho,$$

so by (1) and (2), we have $x \in \partial_\rho^0 M$ and $\phi(1) \in \partial_\rho^1 M$.

The proof of part c) is similar to the proof of part b). □

4 Geometry of digital images

The following statement is trivial, but helps shorten some arguments.

Lemma 8. *Let $\rho > 0$, and let $M \in S_\rho$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \in M : & \quad (x \in \partial_\rho^0 M) \Leftrightarrow (\exists z \in \partial_\rho^1 M \cap B_\rho(x)), \\ \forall z \in M^c : & \quad (z \in \partial_\rho^1 M) \Leftrightarrow (\exists x \in \partial_\rho^0 M \cap B_\rho(z)). \end{aligned}$$

We have the following alternative.

Lemma 9. *Let $\rho > 0$ and let $M \in S_\rho$. Then the following statements are equivalent: (a) we have $M = \Delta_\rho$; (b) we have $\partial_\rho^0 M = \emptyset$ and $\partial_\rho^1 M = \emptyset$; (c) we have $\partial_\rho^0 M = \emptyset$ or $\partial_\rho^1 M = \emptyset$. In particular, we have*

$$(M \in S_\rho^-) \Leftrightarrow (\partial_\rho^0 M \neq \emptyset \neq \partial_\rho^1 M), \quad (30)$$

$$(M = \Delta_\rho) \Leftrightarrow (\partial_\rho^0 M = \emptyset = \partial_\rho^1 M). \quad (31)$$

Proof. Statement a) implies that $M^c \cap \Delta_\rho = \emptyset$, which, in view of (1) and (2), implies b). Statement b) clearly implies c). Now assume that c) holds. Since $M \in S_\rho$, there exists $x \in M$. If there exists $z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$, then Lemma 7a) yields $\partial_\rho^0 M \neq \emptyset \neq \partial_\rho^1 M$. This is false, so $M^c \cap \Delta_\rho = \emptyset$, which implies a). The equivalences (30) and (31) follow from a) through c). \square

We investigate definitions (1) and (2) for $k = 1$ under complementation.

Lemma 10. *Let $\rho > 0$ and $M \in S_\rho^+$. Then*

$$M = (M^c \cap \Delta_\rho)^c \cap \Delta_\rho, \quad (32)$$

$$\partial_\rho^0 M = \partial_\rho^1(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho), \quad (33)$$

$$\partial_\rho^1 M = \partial_\rho^0(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho). \quad (34)$$

Proof. By the distributive law and by De Morgan's laws, we have

$$M = M \cap \Delta_\rho = (M \cap \Delta_\rho) \cup (\Delta_\rho^c \cap \Delta_\rho) = (M \cup \Delta_\rho^c) \cap \Delta_\rho = (M^c \cap \Delta_\rho)^c \cap \Delta_\rho,$$

which is (32). If $M = \emptyset$ or $M = \Delta_\rho$, then, by (31), (1) and (2), we have

$$\partial_\rho^0 M = \partial_\rho^1 M = \partial_\rho^0(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho) = \partial_\rho^1(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho) = \emptyset,$$

and statements (33) and (34) are trivial. Now let $M \in S_\rho^-$. We check (33).

Let $x \in \partial_\rho^0 M$. Then by (32), we have $x \in M = (M^c \cap \Delta_\rho)^c \cap \Delta_\rho$, and by (1) there exists $z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$ with $\|x - z\|_\infty = \rho$. Again by (1), we have $z \in \partial_\rho^0(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho)$, and it follows that $x \in \partial_\rho^1(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho)$.

Conversely, let $x \in \partial_\rho^1(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho)$. Then (2) and (32) imply $x \in M$, and by Lemma 8 there exists $z \in \partial_\rho^0(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho)$ with $\|x - z\|_\infty = \rho$. Since $z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$, it follows that $x \in \partial_\rho^0 M$.

All in all, statement (33) holds. Statement (34) follows from (33) with $M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$ in lieu of M , and with (32). \square

It is possible to distinguish between points in M and $M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$ when only $\partial_\rho^0 M$ and $\partial_\rho^1 M$ are known.

Theorem 11. *Let $\rho > 0$, and let $M \in S_\rho^-$. Then*

$$\forall x \in M : \quad d(x, M^c \cap \Delta_\rho) = d(x, \partial_\rho^1 M), \quad (35)$$

$$\forall z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho : \quad d(z, M) = d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M), \quad (36)$$

and we have

$$\forall x \in \Delta_\rho : \quad (x \in M) \iff (d(x, \partial_\rho^0 M) < d(x, \partial_\rho^1 M)), \quad (37)$$

$$\forall z \in \Delta_\rho : \quad (z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho) \iff (d(z, \partial_\rho^1 M) < d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M)). \quad (38)$$

Proof. First recall from (30) that $\partial_\rho^0 M \neq \emptyset \neq \partial_\rho^1 M$.

We prove statement (36). Let $z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$ and take $x \in M$ with $\|z - x\|_\infty = d(z, M)$. By Lemma 7b), we have $x \in \partial_\rho^0 M$, and hence

$$d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M) \leq \|z - x\|_\infty = d(z, M).$$

Since $\partial_\rho^0 M \subset M$ implies $d(z, M) \leq d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M)$, statement (36) holds.

Since $M \in S_\rho^-$, we have $M^c \cap \Delta_\rho \in S_\rho^-$. Hence statement (35) follows from statement (36) with $M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$ in lieu of M by using (32) and (34).

Now we prove that

$$(z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho) \Rightarrow (d(z, \partial_\rho^1 M) < d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M)). \quad (39)$$

Let $z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$ and take $x \in \partial_\rho^0 M$ with $\|z - x\|_\infty = d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M)$. By (36), we have $\|z - x\|_\infty = d(z, M)$, so by Lemma 7b), there exists $y \in \partial_\rho^1 M$ with $\|z - y\|_\infty = \|z - x\|_\infty - \rho$. It follows, as desired, that

$$d(z, \partial_\rho^1 M) \leq \|z - y\|_\infty < \|z - x\|_\infty = d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M).$$

We may read statement (39) with $M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$ in lieu of M . Applying statements (32), (33) and (34) yields

$$(x \in M) \Rightarrow (d(x, \partial_\rho^0 M) < d(x, \partial_\rho^1 M)). \quad (40)$$

Combining statements (39) and (40) yields statements (37) and (38). \square

Statements (33) and (34) generalize to arbitrary indices.

Proposition 12. *Let $\rho > 0$ and $M \in S_\rho^-$. Then*

$$\partial_\rho^k M = \partial_\rho^{1-k}(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (41)$$

Proof. When $k = 0$, statement (41) is just statement (33), and when $k = 1$, statement (41) is just (34).

Let $k > 1$. It follows from (2) and (36) that

$$\partial_\rho^k M = \{z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho : d(z, M) = k\rho\}, \quad (42)$$

and we know from (3) and (34) that

$$\partial_\rho^{1-k}(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho) = \{z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho : d(z, \partial_\rho^1 M) = (k-1)\rho\}. \quad (43)$$

We show $\partial_\rho^k M \subset \partial_\rho^{1-k}(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho)$. Let $z \in \partial_\rho^k M$. There exists $x \in \partial_\rho^0 M$ with $\|z - x\|_\infty = d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M)$. Statements (36) and (42) yield

$$\|z - x\|_\infty = d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M) = d(z, M) = k\rho. \quad (44)$$

By Lemma 7b), there exists $y \in \partial_\rho^1 M$ with $\|z - y\|_\infty = \|z - x\|_\infty - \rho$, so that

$$d(z, \partial_\rho^1 M) \leq \|z - y\|_\infty = (k-1)\rho.$$

Assume that there exists $z' \in \partial_\rho^1 M$ with $\|z - z'\|_\infty < (k-1)\rho$. Then, by Lemma 8, there exists $x' \in \partial_\rho^0 M$ with $\|z' - x'\|_\infty = \rho$. It follows that

$$d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M) \leq \|z - z'\|_\infty + \|z' - x'\|_\infty < k\rho,$$

which contradicts (44). All in all, we have $d(z, \partial_\rho^1 M) = (k-1)\rho$, and in view of (43), we have confirmed that $z \in \partial_\rho^{1-k}(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho)$.

Now we show that $\partial_\rho^{1-k}(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho) \subset \partial_\rho^k M$. Let $z \in \partial_\rho^{1-k}(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho)$. By the triangle inequality, by (43) and in view of (2), we have

$$d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M) \leq d(z, \partial_\rho^1 M) + d(\partial_\rho^1 M, \partial_\rho^0 M) = (k-1)\rho + \rho = k\rho.$$

Assume that $d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M) < k\rho$. Take $x \in \partial_\rho^0 M$ with $\|z - x\|_\infty = d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M)$. By (36) we have $\|z - x\|_\infty = d(z, M)$, so by Lemma 7b), there exists $y \in \partial_\rho^1 M$ with $\|z - y\|_\infty = \|z - x\|_\infty - \rho$, and hence

$$d(z, \partial_\rho^1 M) \leq \|z - y\|_\infty = \|z - x\|_\infty - \rho < (k-1)\rho,$$

which contradicts (43). Therefore $d(z, \partial_\rho^0 M) = k\rho$, and hence $z \in \partial_\rho^k M$.

Now let $k < 0$. But then $1 - k \geq 0$, so we have already proved (41) with $1 - k$ in lieu of k and with $M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$ in lieu of M . Applying (32) yields

$$\partial_\rho^{1-k}(M^c \cap \Delta_\rho) = \partial_\rho^{1-(1-k)}((M^c \cap \Delta_\rho)^c \cap \Delta_\rho) = \partial_\rho^k M.$$

□

Both $\partial_\rho^k M$ and $\partial_\rho^{-k} M$ can be represented in terms of the distance to M and $M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$, respectively.

Theorem 13. *Let $\rho > 0$, and let $M \in S_\rho^-$. Then*

$$\partial_\rho^k M = \{z \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho : d(z, M) = k\rho\} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_1, \quad (45)$$

$$\partial_\rho^{-k} M = \{x \in M : d(x, M^c \cap \Delta_\rho) = (k+1)\rho\} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (46)$$

Proof. Statement (45) follows directly from the definition (2) and (36), and statement (46) follows from identities (41), (45) and (32). □

Finally, it is possible to recover $\partial_\rho^0 M$ and $\partial_\rho^1 M$ from supersets.

Lemma 14. *Let $\rho > 0$, and let $M \in S_\rho$. If two sets $H_0, H_1 \subset \Delta_\rho$ satisfy*

$$\partial_\rho^0 M \subset H_0 \subset M \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_\rho^1 M \subset H_1 \subset M^c \cap \Delta_\rho, \quad (47)$$

then we have

$$\partial_\rho^0 M = \{x \in H_0 : d(x, H_1) = \rho\} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_\rho^1 M = \{z \in H_1 : d(z, H_0) = \rho\}.$$

Proof. If $M = \Delta_\rho$, then (31) yields $\partial_\rho^0 M = \partial_\rho^1 M = M^c \cap \Delta_\rho = \emptyset$, and (47) implies that $H_1 = \emptyset$. It follows that

$$\{x \in H_0 : d(x, H_1) = \rho\} = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \{z \in H_1 : d(z, H_0) = \rho\} = \emptyset,$$

so the desired statement holds.

Now let $M \in S_\rho^-$. We prove that $\partial_\rho^0 M = \{x \in H_0 : d(x, H_1) = \rho\}$. Let $x \in H_0$ with $d(x, H_1) = \rho$. Then $x \in M$ by (47) and $x \in \partial_\rho^0 M$ by (1) because

$$d(x, M^c \cap \Delta_\rho) \leq d(x, H_1) = \rho.$$

Conversely, let $x \in \partial_\rho^0 M$. Then $x \in H_0$ by (47), and by Lemma 8 and (47) there exists $z \in \partial_\rho^1 M \subset H_1$ with $\|x - z\|_\infty = \rho$. Since $x \in M$, by (47) and by the above, we have

$$\rho \leq d(x, M^c \cap \Delta_\rho) \leq d(x, H_1) \leq \|x - z\|_\infty = \rho,$$

which implies that $d(x, H_1) = \rho$.

The proof of the identity $\partial_\rho^1 M = \{z \in H_1 : d(z, H_0) = \rho\}$ is similar. □

5 Boundary pairs of digital images

The following lemma refines Lemma 9. Recall bd_ρ^- from Definition 3.

Lemma 15. *Let $\rho > 0$, and let $M \in S_\rho^-$. Then $(\partial_\rho^0 M, \partial_\rho^1 M) \in \text{bd}_\rho^-$.*

Proof. By Lemma 9, the sets $\partial_\rho^0 M$ and $\partial_\rho^1 M$ satisfy axiom (5). Axiom (6) follows from (1) and (2). Lemma 8 yields axioms (7) and (8).

We check axiom (9). Let $x \in \partial_\rho^0 M$, let $z \in \partial_\rho^1 M$, and let $p \in P_\rho(x, z)$ with $L(p) > 1$. Since $p(L(p)) = z \in \partial_\rho^1 M$, there exists a smallest index $\ell \in (0, L(p)]$ with $p(\ell) \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$.

Case 1: If $\ell = L(p)$, then $L(p) - 1 \in (0, L(p))$. By Definition 2, we have $\|p(L(p) - 1) - p(L(p))\|_\infty \leq \rho$, and since we have $p(L(p) - 1) \in M$ and $p(L(p)) \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$, it follows that $\|p(L(p) - 1) - p(L(p))\|_\infty = \rho$. Hence by (1), we have $p(L(p) - 1) \in \partial_\rho^0 M$.

Case 2: If $\ell < L(p)$, then $\ell \in (0, L(p))$. Again by Definition 2, we have $\|p(\ell - 1) - p(\ell)\|_\infty \leq \rho$, and since $p(\ell - 1) \in M$ and $p(\ell) \in M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$, it follows that $\|p(\ell - 1) - p(\ell)\|_\infty = \rho$. Hence by (2), we have $p(\ell) \in \partial_\rho^1 M$. \square

Conversely, we check that every pair $(D_0, D_1) \in \text{bd}_\rho$ indeed corresponds to the pair $(\partial_\rho^0 M, \partial_\rho^1 M)$ of a set $M \in S_\rho$.

Definition 16. *For any two sets $D_0, D_1 \in \text{bd}_\rho^-$ we define*

$$M(D_0, D_1) := \{x \in \Delta_\rho : d(x, D_0) < d(x, D_1)\}.$$

Given a pair $(D_0, D_1) \in \text{bd}_\rho^-$, we can partition Δ_ρ into the disjoint union of the points closer to D_0 and the points closer to D_1 .

Lemma 17. *Let $(D_0, D_1) \in \text{bd}_\rho^-$. Then we have $M(D_0, D_1) \in S_\rho^-$ and $M(D_1, D_0) \in S_\rho^-$ as well as*

$$D_0 \subset M(D_0, D_1), \quad D_1 \subset M(D_1, D_0), \quad M(D_1, D_0) = M(D_0, D_1)^c \cap \Delta_\rho.$$

Proof. Definition 16 clearly implies that

$$M(D_0, D_1) \cap M(D_1, D_0) = \emptyset. \tag{48}$$

By (5) and (6), and by Definition 16, we have $\emptyset \neq D_0 \subset M(D_0, D_1)$ and $\emptyset \neq D_1 \subset M(D_1, D_0)$. Together with (48), this implies $M(D_0, D_1) \in S_\rho^-$ and $M(D_1, D_0) \in S_\rho^-$.

Assume that there exists $y \in M(D_0, D_1)^c \cap M(D_1, D_0)^c \cap \Delta_\rho$. Then Definition 16 yields $d(y, D_0) = d(y, D_1)$, and there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in D_0$ and $z \in D_1$ with

$$\|x - y\|_\infty = d(y, D_0) = k\rho = d(y, D_1) = \|y - z\|_\infty. \quad (49)$$

Since $D_0 \cap D_1 = \emptyset$ by axiom (5), statement (49) implies $k > 0$. With ϕ as in Lemma 6, consider the paths $p_0 := \phi(\cdot; x, y; \rho)$ and $p_1 := \phi(\cdot; y, z; \rho)$ with $L(p_0) = L(p_1) = k$. Since $p := p_1 \circ p_0 \in P_\rho(x, z)$ and $L(p) = 2k > 1$, axiom (9) yields an index $\ell \in (0, 2k)$ with $p(\ell) \in D_0 \cup D_1$. By (4), and by statement (26) applied to p_0 and statement (25) applied to p_1 , we have

$$\|p(\ell) - y\|_\infty = \begin{cases} \|p_0(\ell) - y\|_\infty, & \ell \in (0, k], \\ \|y - p_1(\ell - k)\|_\infty, & \ell \in (k, 2k) \end{cases} = \begin{cases} (k - \ell)\rho, & \ell \in (0, k], \\ (\ell - k)\rho, & \ell \in (k, 2k). \end{cases}$$

Hence $\|p(\ell) - y\|_\infty < k\rho$, which contradicts (49). Consequently, the initial assumption is false, and we have

$$M(D_0, D_1)^c \cap M(D_1, D_0)^c \cap \Delta_\rho = \emptyset. \quad (50)$$

Combining (48) and (50) yields $M(D_1, D_0) = M(D_0, D_1)^c \cap \Delta_\rho$. \square

The restriction of Tr_ρ from (12) to S_ρ^- is a surjection onto bd_ρ^- .

Lemma 18. *For all $(D_0, D_1) \in \text{bd}_\rho^-$, we have $\partial_\rho^i M(D_0, D_1) = D_i$, $i = 0, 1$.*

Proof. Let $M := M(D_0, D_1)$. By Lemma 17, we have $M^c \cap \Delta_\rho = M(D_1, D_0)$ as well as $D_0 \subset M$ and $D_1 \subset M^c \cap \Delta_\rho$. In view of statements (1) and (2), properties (7) and (8) yield $D_i \subset \partial_\rho^i M$, $i = 0, 1$.

Conversely, let $x \in \partial_\rho^0 M$. By Lemma 8, there exists $z \in \partial_\rho^1 M$ with $\|x - z\|_\infty = \rho$. Since

$$x \in \partial_\rho^0 M \subset M = M(D_0, D_1) \quad \text{and} \quad z \in \partial_\rho^1 M \subset M^c \cap \Delta_\rho = M(D_1, D_0),$$

we obtain using Definition 16 and the triangle inequality that

$$d(x, D_0) < d(x, D_1) \leq \|x - z\|_\infty + d(z, D_1) = \rho + d(z, D_1), \quad (51)$$

$$d(z, D_1) < d(z, D_0) \leq \|z - x\|_\infty + d(x, D_0) = \rho + d(x, D_0). \quad (52)$$

In the following, note that $d(x, D_0) \in \rho\mathbb{N}_0$ and $d(z, D_1) \in \rho\mathbb{N}_0$. Combining (51) and (52), we see that $d(x, D_0) \leq d(z, D_1) \leq d(x, D_0)$, and hence there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$d(x, D_0) = d(z, D_1) = k\rho. \quad (53)$$

Substituting (53) back into (51) and (52) yields

$$\begin{aligned} k\rho &< d(x, D_1) \leq (k+1)\rho, \\ k\rho &< d(z, D_0) \leq (k+1)\rho, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$d(x, D_1) = d(z, D_0) = (k+1)\rho. \quad (54)$$

Assume that $k > 0$. By (53), there exist $x' \in D_0$ and $z' \in D_1$ with

$$\|x - x'\|_\infty = k\rho = \|z - z'\|_\infty.$$

Let ϕ as in Lemma 6, and consider the paths $p_0 := \phi(\cdot; x', x; \rho)$, $p_1 := (x, z)$ and $p_2 := \phi(\cdot; z, z'; \rho)$ with $L(p_0) = L(p_2) = k$ and $L(p_1) = 1$. Since

$$p := p_2 \circ p_1 \circ p_0 \in P_\rho(x', z') \quad \text{and} \quad L(p) = 2k + 1 > 1,$$

axiom (9) yields an index $\ell \in (0, 2k + 1)$ with $p(\ell) \in D_0 \cup D_1$. If $\ell \in (0, k]$, then statement (26) yields

$$\|p(\ell) - x\|_\infty = \|p_0(\ell) - x\|_\infty \leq (k - \ell)\rho \leq k\rho.$$

Alternatively, if $\ell \in [k + 1, 2k + 1)$, then statement (25) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|p(\ell) - x\|_\infty &= \|x - p_2(\ell - k - 1)\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|x - z\|_\infty + \|z - p_2(\ell - k - 1)\|_\infty \leq \rho + (\ell - k - 1)\rho \leq k\rho. \end{aligned}$$

We summarize that

$$\|p(\ell) - x\|_\infty \leq k\rho, \quad (55)$$

and the same computation with reversed roles yields

$$\|p(\ell) - z\|_\infty \leq k\rho. \quad (56)$$

Finally, we observe that when $p(\ell) \in D_0$, then (56) contradicts (54), and when $p(\ell) \in D_1$, then (55) contradicts (54). All in all, the assumption $k > 0$ is false. Hence $k = 0$, and by (53), we have $x \in D_0$. This shows $\partial_\rho^0 M \subset D_0$.

The same argument shows that $\partial_\rho^1 M \subset D_1$ holds as well. \square

The following theorem is the main result of this section. Recall the operator Tr_ρ from (12).

Theorem 19. *We have $\text{Tr}_\rho(S_\rho) = \text{bd}_\rho$, and $\text{Tr}_\rho : S_\rho \rightarrow \text{bd}_\rho$ is a bijection with inverse*

$$\text{Tr}_\rho^{-1}(D_0, D_1) = \begin{cases} M(D_0, D_1), & (D_0, D_1) \in \text{bd}_\rho^-, \\ \Delta_\rho, & (D_0, D_1) = (\emptyset, \emptyset). \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Lemma 15, we have $\text{Tr}_\rho(S_\rho^-) \subset \text{bd}_\rho^-$, and by Lemma 18, we have $\text{bd}_\rho^- \subset \text{Tr}_\rho(S_\rho^-)$. Hence the operator $\text{Tr}_\rho : S_\rho^- \rightarrow \text{bd}_\rho^-$ is surjective, and by statement (37), it is injective. In view of Lemma 9, we have $\text{Tr}_\rho(S_\rho) = \text{bd}_\rho$, and that $\text{Tr}_\rho : S_\rho \rightarrow \text{bd}_\rho$ is a bijection. Finally, by Lemmas 18 and 9, the inverse admits the above representation. \square

6 Restriction and interpolation operators

From now on, we work with the two distinct nested grids from (13).

We present an auxiliary result that will be used in Theorems 21 and 29.

Lemma 20. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, all $\tilde{x} \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ and all $v \in B_{(k+1)\hat{\rho}/2}(\tilde{x})$, there exists*

$$\hat{x} \in B_{(\hat{\rho}+k\hat{\rho})/2}(\tilde{x}) \cap B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(v) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}.$$

Proof. Consider the point $\hat{x} \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ given by

$$\hat{x}_j := \begin{cases} \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor \hat{\rho}, & \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor < \frac{1}{2}, \\ \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor \hat{\rho}, & \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor = \frac{1}{2}, \tilde{x}_j < v_j, \\ \lceil \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rceil \hat{\rho}, & \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor = \frac{1}{2}, v_j \leq \tilde{x}_j, \\ \lceil \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rceil \hat{\rho}, & \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor > \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$$

for all $j \in [1, m]$. We first check that for all $j \in [1, m]$, we have

$$|\hat{x}_j - \tilde{x}_j| < \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} + \frac{(k+1)\hat{\rho}}{2}, \quad (57)$$

$$|v_j - \hat{x}_j| \leq \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2}. \quad (58)$$

Case 1: When $\frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor < \frac{1}{2}$, then (57) follows from $\hat{x}_j - \tilde{x}_j = \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor \hat{\rho} - \tilde{x}_j$ and

$$-\frac{(k+1)\hat{\rho}}{2} - \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} \leq v_j - \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} - \tilde{x}_j < \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor \hat{\rho} - \tilde{x}_j \leq v_j - \tilde{x}_j \leq \frac{(k+1)\hat{\rho}}{2}.$$

Inequality (58) holds because $|v_j - \hat{x}_j| = |v_j - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor \hat{\rho}| = |\frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor| \hat{\rho} < \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2}$.

Case 2: When $\frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\check{x}_j < v_j$, then inequality (57) follows from $\hat{x}_j - \check{x}_j = \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor \hat{\rho} - \check{x}_j = v_j - \check{x}_j - \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2}$ and

$$-\frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} < v_j - \check{x}_j - \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} < v_j - \check{x}_j \leq \frac{(k+1)\check{\rho}}{2}.$$

Inequality (58) holds because $|v_j - \hat{x}_j| = |\frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor| \hat{\rho} = \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2}$.

Case 3: When $\frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor = \frac{1}{2}$ and $v_j \leq \check{x}_j$, then inequality (57) follows from $\hat{x}_j - \check{x}_j = \lceil \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rceil \hat{\rho} - \check{x}_j = v_j + \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} - \check{x}_j$ and

$$-\frac{(k+1)\check{\rho}}{2} + \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} \leq v_j + \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} - \check{x}_j \leq \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2}.$$

Inequality (58) follows from $|v_j - \hat{x}_j| = |\frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} - \lceil \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rceil| \hat{\rho} = \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2}$.

Case 4: When $\frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rfloor > \frac{1}{2}$, then (57) follows from $\hat{x}_j - \check{x}_j = \lceil \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rceil \hat{\rho} - \check{x}_j$ and

$$-\frac{(k+1)\check{\rho}}{2} \leq v_j - \check{x}_j < \lceil \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rceil \hat{\rho} - \check{x}_j < v_j + \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} - \check{x}_j \leq \frac{(k+1)\check{\rho}}{2} + \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2}.$$

Inequality (58) follows from $|v_j - \hat{x}_j| = |\frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} - \lceil \frac{v_j}{\hat{\rho}} \rceil| \hat{\rho} < \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2}$.

Since $\|\hat{x} - \check{x}\|_\infty \in \check{\rho}\mathbb{N}_0$, the statement of the lemma follows from inequalities (57) and (58). \square

The operator R has several properties that make it stand out among the operators that map $S_{\check{\rho}}$ to $S_{\hat{\rho}}$. Some of the notation is from Definition 4.

Theorem 21. *The operator $R : S_{\check{\rho}} \rightarrow S_{\hat{\rho}}$ satisfies $R(\Delta_{\check{\rho}}) = \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$. It has the set-theoretical properties*

$$\forall \check{M}, \check{M}' \in S_{\check{\rho}} : \quad R(\check{M} \cup \check{M}') = R(\check{M}) \cup R(\check{M}'), \quad (59)$$

$$\forall \check{M}, \check{M}' \in S_{\check{\rho}} : \quad (\check{M} \subset \check{M}') \Rightarrow (R(\check{M}) \subset R(\check{M}')), \quad (60)$$

$$\forall \check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}}, \forall \hat{x} \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}} : \quad R(\hat{x} + \check{M}) = \hat{x} + R(\check{M}), \quad (61)$$

the approximation properties

$$\forall \check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}} : \quad d_H(R(\check{M}), \check{M}) \leq \hat{\rho}/2, \quad (62)$$

$$\forall \check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}} : \quad R(\check{M}) \in A_{\hat{\rho}}(\check{M}), \quad (63)$$

$$\forall \check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}}, \forall \hat{M} \in A_{\hat{\rho}}(\check{M}) : \quad \hat{M} \subset R(\check{M}), \quad (64)$$

$$\forall \check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}} : \quad R(\check{M}) \in V_{\hat{\rho}}^{\hat{\rho}}(\check{M}), \quad (65)$$

$$\forall \check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}}, \forall \hat{M} \in V_{\hat{\rho}}^{\hat{\rho}}(\check{M}) : \quad R(\check{M}) \subset \hat{M}, \quad (66)$$

and the topology-related properties

$$\forall \check{M} \in C_{\hat{\rho}} : \quad R(\check{M}) \in C_{\hat{\rho}}, \quad (67)$$

$$\forall \check{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}} : \quad \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 R(\check{M}) \subset R(\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \check{M}). \quad (68)$$

Proof. The proofs of statements (59), (60) and (61) are elementary, and it is obvious that $R(\Delta_{\hat{\rho}}) = \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$.

We check (62). Let $\check{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$. By (14), we have

$$d(R(\check{M}), \check{M}) \leq \hat{\rho}/2.$$

Conversely, let $\check{x} \in \check{M}$. Then the point $\hat{x} \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ given by $\hat{x}_j = \text{rd}(\check{x}_j/\hat{\rho})\hat{\rho}$ for all $j \in [1, m]$ satisfies $\|\hat{x} - \check{x}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}/2$, which implies $\hat{x} \in R(\check{M})$. Hence

$$d(\check{M}, R(\check{M})) \leq \hat{\rho}/2,$$

and the proof of (62) is complete. The fact that $\hat{x} \in R(\check{M})$ also shows that $R(\check{M}) \neq \emptyset$, and hence that R is well-defined.

In the following, we check (63) and (64). First note that for every $\check{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$, we have $\emptyset \neq \{d_H(\hat{M}, \check{M}) : \hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}\} \subset \hat{\rho}\mathbb{N}_0$, and it follows from the well-ordering principle that

$$\forall \check{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}} : \quad A_{\hat{\rho}}(\check{M}) \neq \emptyset. \quad (69)$$

Assume that (64) is false. Then there exist $\check{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$, $\hat{M} \in A_{\hat{\rho}}(\check{M})$ and $\hat{x} \in \hat{M} \cap (R(\check{M}))^c$. Hence $\hat{x} \notin B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{M})$, and we find

$$d(\hat{M}, \check{M}) \geq d(\hat{x}, \check{M}) > \hat{\rho}/2 \geq d_H(R(\check{M}), \check{M}),$$

which contradicts $\hat{M} \in A_{\hat{\rho}}(\check{M})$. All in all, statement (64) holds.

Assume that (63) is false. Then there is $\check{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$ with $R(\check{M}) \notin A_{\hat{\rho}}(\check{M})$. By (69), there exists $\hat{M} \in A_{\hat{\rho}}(\check{M})$, and by (10), since $R(\check{M}) \notin A_{\hat{\rho}}(\check{M})$, and by (62), we have

$$d_H(\check{M}, \hat{M}) < d_H(\check{M}, R(\check{M})) \leq \hat{\rho}/2.$$

The triangle inequality, statement (62), and the above inequality yield

$$d(R(\check{M}), \hat{M}) \leq d(R(\check{M}), \check{M}) + d(\check{M}, \hat{M}) < \hat{\rho}.$$

Since $d(R(\check{M}), \hat{M}) \in \hat{\rho}\mathbb{N}_0$, this implies $d(R(\check{M}), \hat{M}) = 0$ and $R(\check{M}) \subset \hat{M}$. By (64) we also have $\hat{M} \subset R(\check{M})$, and hence $\hat{M} = R(\check{M})$, which contradicts the definition of these sets. All in all, statement (63) holds.

In view of (14) and (11), statement (65) is equivalent with

$$B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{M}) \subset B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{M}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}) \quad \forall \check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}}.$$

To check the above inclusion, let $\check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}}$ and $v \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{M})$. Then there exists $\check{x} \in \check{M}$ with $v \in B_{\check{\rho}/2}(\check{x})$. By Lemma 20 (with $k = 0$), there exists $\hat{x} \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{x}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ with $v \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x})$. But then, as desired, we have

$$v \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}) \subset B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{x}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}) \subset B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{M}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}).$$

We show (66). Let $\check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}}$, let $\hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$, and assume that there exists $\hat{x} \in R(\check{M}) \cap \hat{M}^c$. By (14), there exists $\check{x} \in \check{M}$ with $\|\check{x} - \hat{x}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}/2$, and the point

$$v := \begin{cases} \check{x} + \frac{\check{\rho}}{2} \frac{\hat{x} - \check{x}}{\|\hat{x} - \check{x}\|_{\infty}}, & \check{x} \neq \hat{x}, \\ \hat{x}, & \check{x} = \hat{x} \end{cases}$$

satisfies $v \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{x})$ and hence

$$v \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{M}). \quad (70)$$

If $\check{x} = \hat{x}$, then $\|v - \hat{x}\|_{\infty} = 0$. If $\check{x} \neq \hat{x}$, then $\|\check{x} - \hat{x}\|_{\infty} \geq \check{\rho}$ and

$$\|v - \hat{x}\|_{\infty} = \|(1 - \frac{\check{\rho}}{2\|\hat{x} - \check{x}\|_{\infty}})(\check{x} - \hat{x})\|_{\infty} < \|\check{x} - \hat{x}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}/2.$$

In both cases, we have $\|v - \hat{x}\|_{\infty} < \hat{\rho}/2$. Because of $\hat{x} \in \hat{M}^c \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$, we have $d(\hat{x}, \hat{M}) \geq \hat{\rho}$, and the triangle inequality yields

$$d(v, \hat{M}) \geq d(\hat{x}, \hat{M}) - \|v - \hat{x}\|_{\infty} > \hat{\rho}/2.$$

Hence we have

$$v \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{M})^c. \quad (71)$$

In view of (11), statements (70) and (71) mean that $\hat{M} \notin V_{\hat{\rho}}^{\hat{\rho}}(\check{M})$. This completes the proof of (66).

We check (67). Let $\check{M} \in C_{\check{\rho}}$, and let $\hat{x} \in R(\check{M})$ and $\hat{x}' \in R(\check{M})$. By (14), there exist $\check{x} \in \check{M}$ and $\check{x}' \in \check{M}$ with $\|\hat{x} - \check{x}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}/2$ and $\|\hat{x}' - \check{x}'\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}/2$.

Since $\check{M} \in C_{\check{\rho}}$, there exists $\check{p} \in P_{\check{\rho}}(\check{x}, \check{x}')$ with $\check{p}(\ell) \in \check{M}$ for all $\ell \in [0, L(\check{p})]$. Let $\hat{\xi} = (\hat{\xi}_0, \dots, \hat{\xi}_{L(\check{p})}) \in (\Delta_{\hat{\rho}})^{L(\check{p})+1}$ be given by $\hat{\xi}_0 := \hat{x}$, $\hat{\xi}_{L(\check{p})} := \hat{x}'$, and

$$(\hat{\xi}_\ell)_j := \text{rd}(\check{p}(\ell)_j / \hat{\rho}) \hat{\rho} \quad \forall \ell \in (0, L(\check{p})), \quad \forall j \in [1, m]$$

with rd as in Lemma 5. Then $\|\hat{\xi}_\ell - \check{p}(\ell)\|_\infty \leq \hat{\rho}/2$ for all $\ell \in [0, L(\check{p})]$, and since $\check{p}(\ell) \in \check{M}$ for all $\ell \in [0, L(\check{p})]$, we have $\hat{\xi}_\ell \in R(\check{M})$ for all $\ell \in [0, L(\check{p})]$. In addition, we have

$$\|\hat{\xi}_\ell - \hat{\xi}_{\ell-1}\|_\infty \leq \|\hat{\xi}_\ell - \check{p}(\ell)\|_\infty + \|\check{p}(\ell) - \check{p}(\ell-1)\|_\infty + \|\check{p}(\ell-1) - \hat{\xi}_{\ell-1}\|_\infty \leq \hat{\rho} + \check{\rho}$$

for all $\ell \in (0, L(\check{p}))$. Since $\hat{\xi}_\ell \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ for all $\ell \in [0, L(\check{p})]$, it follows that

$$\|\hat{\xi}_\ell - \hat{\xi}_{\ell-1}\|_\infty \leq \hat{\rho} \quad \forall \ell \in (0, L(\check{p})).$$

Hence $\hat{p} := (\hat{\xi}_0, \hat{\xi}_1, \dots, \hat{\xi}_{L(\check{p})}) \in (\Delta_{\hat{\rho}})^{L(\check{p})+1}$ is a path $\hat{p} \in P_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{x}, \hat{x}')$ of length $L(\hat{p}) = L(\check{p})$ and $\hat{p}(\ell) \in R(\check{M})$ for all $\ell \in [0, L(\hat{p})]$. Since \hat{x} and \hat{x}' were arbitrary, it follows that $R(\check{M}) \in C_{\hat{\rho}}$. All in all, statement (67) holds.

Finally, we show (68). Let $\check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}}$ and let $\hat{x} \in \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 R(\check{M})$. By (1), there exists $\hat{z} \in R(\check{M})^c \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ with $\|\hat{z} - \hat{x}\|_\infty = \hat{\rho}$. By (14), there exists $\check{x} \in \check{M}$ with $\|\check{x} - \hat{x}\|_\infty \leq \hat{\rho}/2$.

Case 1: If $\hat{\rho}/\check{\rho} \in 2\mathbb{N}_1$, then let $\check{z} := (\hat{x} + \hat{z})/2$. Since both $\check{z} \in \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$ and $\|\check{z} - \hat{z}\|_\infty = \hat{\rho}/2$, it follows from $\hat{z} \in R(\check{M})^c \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ and (14) that $\check{z} \in \check{M}^c \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$. Let $\phi(\cdot) = \phi(\cdot; \check{x}, \check{z}; \check{\rho})$ be the path from Lemma 6. By Lemma 7a), there exists $\ell \in [0, L(\phi))$ with $\phi(\ell) \in \partial_{\check{\rho}}^0 \check{M}$. Because of $\|\check{x} - \hat{x}\|_\infty \leq \hat{\rho}/2$ and $\|\hat{x} - \check{z}\|_\infty = \hat{\rho}/2$, and by (28), we have

$$\|\phi(\ell) - \hat{x}\|_\infty \leq \max\{\|\check{x} - \hat{x}\|_\infty, \|\hat{x} - \check{z}\|_\infty\} = \hat{\rho}/2.$$

Again with (14), it follows that $\hat{x} \in R(\partial_{\check{\rho}}^0 \check{M})$.

Case 2: If $\hat{\rho}/\check{\rho} \in 2\mathbb{N}_1 + 1$, then let $n \in \mathbb{N}_1$ with $\hat{\rho} = (2n + 1)\check{\rho}$. Consider the point $\check{x}' := \frac{\hat{\rho} + \check{\rho}}{2\hat{\rho}}\hat{x} + \frac{\hat{\rho} - \check{\rho}}{2\hat{\rho}}\hat{z}$. Since $\hat{z}_j - \hat{x}_j \in \hat{\rho}\mathbb{Z}$ for all $j \in [1, m]$, we have

$$\check{x}'_j = \frac{\hat{\rho} + \check{\rho}}{2\hat{\rho}}\hat{x}_j + \frac{\hat{\rho} - \check{\rho}}{2\hat{\rho}}\hat{z}_j = \hat{x}_j + \frac{\hat{\rho} - \check{\rho}}{2\hat{\rho}}(\hat{z}_j - \hat{x}_j) = \hat{x}_j + \frac{n\check{\rho}}{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{z}_j - \hat{x}_j) \in \check{\rho}\mathbb{Z}$$

for all $j \in [1, m]$, and hence $\check{x}' \in \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$. We also compute

$$|\hat{x}_j - \check{x}'_j| = |\hat{x}_j - \frac{\hat{\rho} + \check{\rho}}{2\hat{\rho}}\hat{x}_j - \frac{\hat{\rho} - \check{\rho}}{2\hat{\rho}}\hat{z}_j| = \frac{\hat{\rho} - \check{\rho}}{2\hat{\rho}}|\hat{x}_j - \hat{z}_j| \quad \forall j \in [1, m],$$

which implies $\|\hat{x} - \check{x}'\|_\infty = \frac{\hat{\rho} - \check{\rho}}{2\hat{\rho}}\|\hat{x} - \hat{z}\|_\infty = (\hat{\rho} - \check{\rho})/2$.

Case 2a: If $\check{x}' \in \check{M}$, consider $\check{z}' := \frac{\hat{\rho}-\check{\rho}}{2\hat{\rho}}\hat{x} + \frac{\hat{\rho}+\check{\rho}}{2\hat{\rho}}\hat{z}$. Similar computations as above show that $\check{z}' \in \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$, that $\|\check{z}' - \hat{z}\|_\infty = (\hat{\rho} - \check{\rho})/2$, and that $\|\check{z}' - \check{x}'\|_\infty = \check{\rho}$. Since $\|\check{z}' - \hat{z}\|_\infty < \hat{\rho}/2$, it follows from $\hat{z} \in R(\check{M})^c \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ and (14) that $\check{z}' \in \check{M}^c \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$. Hence $\|\check{z}' - \check{x}'\|_\infty = \check{\rho}$ and (1) yield $\check{x}' \in \partial_{\check{\rho}}^0 \check{M}$. Since $\|\check{x}' - \hat{x}\|_\infty < \hat{\rho}/2$, it follows with (14) that $\hat{x} \in R(\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \check{M})$.

Case 2b: If $\check{x}' \in \check{M}^c \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$, then let $\phi(\cdot) = \phi(\cdot; \check{x}, \check{x}'; \check{\rho})$ be the path from Lemma 6. By Lemma 7a), there exists $\ell \in [0, L(\phi))$ with $\phi(\ell) \in \partial_{\check{\rho}}^0 \check{M}$, and by (28), we have

$$\|\phi(\ell) - \hat{x}\|_\infty \leq \max\{\|\check{x} - \hat{x}\|_\infty, \|\hat{x} - \check{x}'\|_\infty\} \leq \hat{\rho}/2.$$

Again with (14), it follows that $\hat{x} \in R(\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \check{M})$. \square

The proof of the following auxiliary result is similar to that of Lemma 20.

Lemma 22. *For all $\hat{x} \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ and $v \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x})$, there exists*

$$\check{x} \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}) \cap B_{\check{\rho}/2}(v) \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}}.$$

Proof. Consider the point $\check{x} \in \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$ given by

$$\check{x}_j := \begin{cases} \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor \check{\rho}, & \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor < \frac{1}{2}, \\ \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor \check{\rho}, & \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor = \frac{1}{2}, \hat{x}_j < v_j, \\ \lceil \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rceil \check{\rho}, & \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor = \frac{1}{2}, v_j \leq \hat{x}_j, \\ \lceil \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rceil \check{\rho}, & \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor > \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$$

for all $j \in [1, m]$. We first check that for all $j \in [1, m]$, we have

$$|\check{x}_j - \hat{x}_j| < \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} + \frac{\check{\rho}}{2}, \quad (72)$$

$$|v_j - \check{x}_j| \leq \frac{\check{\rho}}{2}. \quad (73)$$

Case 1: When $\frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor < \frac{1}{2}$, then (72) follows from $\check{x}_j - \hat{x}_j = \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor \check{\rho} - \hat{x}_j$ and

$$-\frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} - \frac{\check{\rho}}{2} \leq v_j - \frac{\check{\rho}}{2} - \hat{x}_j < \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor \check{\rho} - \hat{x}_j \leq v_j - \hat{x}_j \leq \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2}.$$

Inequality (73) holds because $|v_j - \check{x}_j| = |v_j - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor \check{\rho}| = |\frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor| \check{\rho} < \frac{\check{\rho}}{2}$.

Case 2: When $\frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\hat{x}_j < v_j$, then inequality (72) follows from $\check{x}_j - \hat{x}_j = \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor \check{\rho} - \hat{x}_j = v_j - \hat{x}_j - \frac{\check{\rho}}{2}$ and

$$-\frac{\check{\rho}}{2} < v_j - \hat{x}_j - \frac{\check{\rho}}{2} < v_j - \hat{x}_j \leq \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2}.$$

Inequality (73) holds because $|v_j - \check{x}_j| = |\frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor| \check{\rho} = \frac{\check{\rho}}{2}$.

Case 3: When $\frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor = \frac{1}{2}$ and $v_j \leq \hat{x}_j$, then inequality (72) follows from $\check{x}_j - \hat{x}_j = \lceil \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rceil \check{\rho} - \hat{x}_j = v_j + \frac{\check{\rho}}{2} - \hat{x}_j$ and

$$-\frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} + \frac{\check{\rho}}{2} \leq v_j + \frac{\check{\rho}}{2} - \hat{x}_j \leq \frac{\check{\rho}}{2}.$$

Inequality (73) holds because $|v_j - \check{x}_j| = |\frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} - \lceil \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rceil| \check{\rho} = \frac{\check{\rho}}{2}$.

Case 4: When $\frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} - \lfloor \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rfloor > \frac{1}{2}$, then (72) follows from $\check{x}_j - \hat{x}_j = \lceil \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rceil \check{\rho} - \hat{x}_j$ and

$$-\frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} \leq v_j - \hat{x}_j \leq \lceil \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rceil \check{\rho} - \hat{x}_j < v_j + \frac{\check{\rho}}{2} - \hat{x}_j \leq \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} + \frac{\check{\rho}}{2}.$$

Inequality (73) holds because $|v_j - \check{x}_j| = |\frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} - \lceil \frac{v_j}{\check{\rho}} \rceil| \check{\rho} < \frac{\check{\rho}}{2}$.

Since $\|\check{x} - \hat{x}\|_\infty \in \check{\rho}\mathbb{N}_0$, the statement of the lemma follows from inequalities (72) and (73). \square

The properties of the operator I complement those of the operator R .

Theorem 23. *The operator $I : S_{\hat{\rho}} \rightarrow S_{\check{\rho}}$ satisfies $I(\Delta_{\hat{\rho}}) = \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$. It has the set-theoretical properties*

$$\forall \hat{M}, \hat{M}' \in S_{\hat{\rho}} : \quad I(\hat{M} \cup \hat{M}') = I(\hat{M}) \cup I(\hat{M}'), \quad (74)$$

$$\forall \hat{M}, \hat{M}' \in S_{\hat{\rho}} : \quad (\hat{M} \subset \hat{M}') \Rightarrow (I(\hat{M}) \subset I(\hat{M}')), \quad (75)$$

$$\forall \hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}, \forall \hat{x} \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}} : \quad I(\hat{x} + \hat{M}) = \hat{x} + I(\hat{M}), \quad (76)$$

the approximation properties

$$\forall \hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}} : \quad d_H(I(\hat{M}), \hat{M}) \leq \hat{\rho}/2, \quad (77)$$

$$\forall \hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}} : \quad I(\hat{M}) \in V_{\check{\rho}}^{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{M}), \quad (78)$$

$$\forall \hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}, \forall \check{M} \in V_{\check{\rho}}^{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{M}) : \quad I(\hat{M}) \subset \check{M}, \quad (79)$$

and the topology-related properties

$$\forall \hat{M} \in C_{\hat{\rho}} : \quad I(\hat{M}) \in C_{\check{\rho}}, \quad (80)$$

$$\forall \hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}} : \quad \partial_{\check{\rho}}^0 I(\hat{M}) \subset I(\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \hat{M}). \quad (81)$$

Proof. The proofs of the statements (74), (75) and (76) are elementary, and it is obvious that $I(\Delta_{\hat{\rho}}) = \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$.

Let $\hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$. Since $\hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$, we have $\hat{M} \subset I(\hat{M})$, so the operator I is well-defined and we have $d(\hat{M}, I(\hat{M})) = 0$. We see directly from (15) that $d(I(\hat{M}), \hat{M}) \leq \hat{\rho}/2$. All in all, we have verified (77).

In view of (15) and (11), statement (78) is equivalent with

$$B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{M}) \subset B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{M}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}) \quad \forall \hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}.$$

To check the above inclusion, let $\hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$ and $v \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{M})$. Then there exists $\hat{x} \in \hat{M}$ with $v \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x})$. By Lemma 22, there exists $\check{x} \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ with $v \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{x})$. But then, as desired, we have

$$v \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{x}) \subset B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}) \subset B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{M}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}).$$

We check (79). Let $\hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$, let $\check{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$, and assume that there exists $\check{x} \in I(\hat{M}) \cap \check{M}^c$. Then $\check{x} \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ and $\check{M} \subset \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ imply $\check{x} \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{M})^c$. Since $\check{x} \in I(\hat{M}) \subset B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{M})$, it follows that $\check{M} \not\subset V_{\hat{\rho}}^{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{M})$.

We check (80). Let $\hat{M} \in C_{\hat{\rho}}$, and let $\check{x} \in I(\hat{M})$ and $\check{x}' \in I(\hat{M})$. By (15) there exist $\hat{x} \in \hat{M}$ and $\hat{x}' \in \hat{M}$ with $\|\hat{x} - \check{x}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}/2$ and $\|\hat{x}' - \check{x}'\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}/2$. Since $\hat{M} \in C_{\hat{\rho}}$, there exists $\hat{p} \in P_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{x}, \hat{x}')$ with $\hat{p}(\ell) \in \hat{M}$ for all $\ell \in [0, L(\hat{p})]$. With ϕ as in Lemma 6, we define the paths

$$\check{p}_{\ell} := \phi(\cdot; \hat{p}(\ell), \hat{p}(\ell+1); \check{\rho}), \quad \ell \in [0, L(\hat{p})],$$

and using concatenation as specified in Definition 2, we define

$$\check{p} := \phi(\cdot; \check{x}', \check{x}'; \check{\rho}) \circ \check{p}_{L(\hat{p})-1} \circ \dots \circ \check{p}_1 \circ \check{p}_0 \circ \phi(\cdot; \check{x}, \hat{x}; \check{\rho}) \in P_{\check{\rho}}(\check{x}, \check{x}').$$

By construction, for all $\ell \in [0, L(\hat{p})]$, we have $\check{p}_{\ell}(0) = \hat{p}(\ell) \in \hat{M} \subset I(\hat{M})$ and $\check{p}_{\ell}(L(\check{p}_{\ell})) = \hat{p}(\ell+1) \in \hat{M} \subset I(\hat{M})$. For all $\ell \in [0, L(\hat{p})]$ and every $\ell' \in (0, L(\check{p}_{\ell}))$, statements (25) and (26) imply that

$$\|\check{p}_{\ell}(\ell') - \hat{p}(\ell)\|_{\infty} + \|\check{p}_{\ell}(\ell') - \hat{p}(\ell+1)\|_{\infty} = \|\hat{p}(\ell) - \hat{p}(\ell+1)\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}.$$

As a consequence, we have

$$\check{p}_{\ell}(\ell') \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{p}(\ell)) \cup B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{p}(\ell+1)) \subset B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{M}).$$

Since $\check{p}_{\ell}(\ell') \in \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$, we have $\check{p}_{\ell}(\ell') \in I(\hat{M})$. Similarly, statement (26) yields

$$\|\phi(\ell'; \check{x}, \hat{x}; \check{\rho}) - \hat{x}\|_{\infty} \leq \|\check{x} - \hat{x}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}/2 \quad \forall \ell' \in [0, L(\phi(\cdot; \check{x}, \hat{x}; \check{\rho}))],$$

and since $\phi(\ell'; \check{x}, \hat{x}; \check{\rho}) \in \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$, we find that $\phi(\ell'; \check{x}, \hat{x}; \check{\rho}) \in I(\hat{M})$ for every $\ell' \in [0, L(\phi(\cdot; \check{x}, \hat{x}; \check{\rho}))]$. The same arguments apply to $\phi(\cdot; \hat{x}', \check{x}'; \check{\rho})$. All in all, we have $\check{\rho}(\ell') \in I(\hat{M})$ for all $\ell' \in [0, L(\check{\rho})]$, and hence $I(\hat{M}) \in C_{\check{\rho}}$.

We check (81). Let $\check{x} \in \partial_{\check{\rho}}^0 I(\hat{M})$. By (1) and (15), there exists $\hat{x} \in \hat{M}$ with $\|\hat{x} - \check{x}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}/2$. By (1), there exists $\check{z} \in I(\hat{M})^c \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$ with $\|\check{x} - \check{z}\|_{\infty} = \check{\rho}$. By (15), we have $d(\check{z}, \hat{M}) > \hat{\rho}/2$. The point $\hat{z} \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ given by $\hat{z}_j = \text{rd}(\check{z}_j/\hat{\rho})\hat{\rho}$ for all $j \in [1, m]$ satisfies $\|\hat{z} - \check{z}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}/2$. Since

$$d(\hat{z}, \hat{M}) \geq d(\check{z}, \hat{M}) - \|\hat{z} - \check{z}\|_{\infty} > 0,$$

we have $\hat{z} \in \hat{M}^c \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$. Since $\hat{x} \neq \hat{z}$, since

$$\|\hat{x} - \hat{z}\|_{\infty} \leq \|\hat{x} - \check{x}\|_{\infty} + \|\check{x} - \check{z}\|_{\infty} + \|\check{z} - \hat{z}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho} + \check{\rho} < 2\hat{\rho}$$

and since $\|\hat{x} - \hat{z}\|_{\infty} \in \hat{\rho}\mathbb{N}$, we have $\|\hat{x} - \hat{z}\|_{\infty} = \hat{\rho}$. Again by (1), we have $\hat{x} \in \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \hat{M}$. All in all, we have shown that $\check{x} \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}) \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}} \subset I(\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \hat{M})$. \square

Ideally, the composition $R \circ I : S_{\check{\rho}} \rightarrow S_{\hat{\rho}}$ should be the identity.

Theorem 24. *The operators $R : S_{\check{\rho}} \rightarrow S_{\hat{\rho}}$ and $I : S_{\check{\rho}} \rightarrow S_{\check{\rho}}$ satisfy*

$$(\hat{\rho}/\check{\rho} \in 2\mathbb{N}_1 + 1) \quad \Rightarrow \quad (\forall \hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}} : R(I(\hat{M})) = \hat{M}), \quad (82)$$

$$(\hat{\rho}/\check{\rho} \in 2\mathbb{N}_1) \quad \Rightarrow \quad (\forall \hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}} : R(I(\hat{M})) = B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{M}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}). \quad (83)$$

Proof. We check (82). Let $\hat{\rho}/\check{\rho} \in 2\mathbb{N}_1 + 1$, let $\hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$, and let $\hat{x} \in R(I(\hat{M}))$. By (14), we have $\hat{x} \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$, and there exists $\check{x} \in I(\hat{M})$ with $\|\hat{x} - \check{x}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}/2$. By (15), we have $\check{x} \in \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$, and there exists $\hat{x}' \in \hat{M}$ with $\|\check{x} - \hat{x}'\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}/2$. Since $\hat{x} \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ and $\check{x} \in \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$, we have $\|\hat{x} - \check{x}\|_{\infty} \in \check{\rho}\mathbb{N}_0 \cap [0, \hat{\rho}/2]$, and since $\hat{\rho}/2 \notin \check{\rho}\mathbb{N}_0$, we have $\|\hat{x} - \check{x}\|_{\infty} < \hat{\rho}/2$. Hence

$$\|\hat{x} - \hat{x}'\|_{\infty} \leq \|\hat{x} - \check{x}\|_{\infty} + \|\check{x} - \hat{x}'\|_{\infty} < \hat{\rho},$$

and since $\hat{x} \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ and $\hat{x}' \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$, this implies $\hat{x} = \hat{x}'$. All in all, we see that

$$R(I(\hat{M})) \subset \hat{M}. \quad (84)$$

Conversely, when $\hat{x} \in \hat{M}$, then by (15), we have $\hat{x} \in I(\hat{M})$, and by (14), we have $\hat{x} \in R(I(\hat{M}))$. Hence

$$\hat{M} \subset R(I(\hat{M})). \quad (85)$$

Combining (84) and (85) yields (82).

We check (83). Let $\hat{\rho}/\check{\rho} \in 2\mathbb{N}_1$, and let $\hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$. It follows from (14) and (15) that

$$R(I(\hat{M})) \subset B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{M}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}. \quad (86)$$

Let $\hat{z} \in B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{M}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$, and let $\hat{x} \in \hat{M}$ with $\|\hat{x} - \hat{z}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}$. Since $\hat{\rho}/\check{\rho} \in 2\mathbb{N}_1$, we have $\check{x} := (\hat{x} + \hat{z})/2 \in \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$, and hence $\check{x} \in B_{\check{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}) \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}} \subset I(\hat{M})$. It follows that $\hat{z} \in B_{\check{\rho}/2}(\check{x}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}} \subset R(I(\hat{M}))$, and we have shown that

$$B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{M}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}} \subset R(I(\hat{M})). \quad (87)$$

Combining (86) and (87) yields (83). \square

Property (83) could be considered a flaw in the construction of the operators R and I . However, it is impossible to improve (83) without sacrificing the covering properties (65) and (78).

Theorem 25. *When $\hat{\rho}/\check{\rho} \in 2\mathbb{N}$, there is no pair of operators $R' : S_{\hat{\rho}} \rightarrow S_{\check{\rho}}$ and $I' : S_{\check{\rho}} \rightarrow S_{\hat{\rho}}$ such that*

$$\forall \check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}} : \quad R'(\check{M}) \in V_{\check{\rho}}^{\hat{\rho}}(\check{M}), \quad (88)$$

$$\forall \hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}} : \quad I'(\hat{M}) \in V_{\hat{\rho}}^{\check{\rho}}(\hat{M}), \quad (89)$$

$$\forall \hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}} : \quad R'(I'(\hat{M})) = \hat{M}. \quad (90)$$

Proof. Assume that R' and I' satisfy (88) and (89), and let $\hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$. By (89) and (79), we have $I(\hat{M}) \subset I'(\hat{M})$. By statement (60), it follows that $R(I(\hat{M})) \subset R(I'(\hat{M}))$. By (88) and (66), we have $R(I'(\hat{M})) \subset R'(I'(\hat{M}))$. Since $\hat{M} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$, and because of (83), we obtain

$$\hat{M} \subsetneq B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{M}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}} = R(I(\hat{M})) \subset R'(I'(\hat{M})),$$

and hence statement (90) is invalid. \square

While R selects for every $\check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}}$ an element $R(\check{M}) \in A_{\hat{\rho}}(\check{M})$, i.e. a best approximation to \check{M} in $S_{\hat{\rho}}$, this approach leads to undesirable outcomes for the operator I .

Example 26. *For $\Delta_{\hat{\rho}} \in S_{\hat{\rho}}$, we also have $\Delta_{\hat{\rho}} \in S_{\check{\rho}}$ and hence*

$$\Delta_{\hat{\rho}} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\check{M} \in S_{\check{\rho}}} d_H(\check{M}, \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}).$$

However, we have $\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \Delta_{\hat{\rho}} = \emptyset$ and $\partial_{\check{\rho}}^0 \Delta_{\hat{\rho}} = \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$, which means that the best approximation of $\Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ in $S_{\check{\rho}}$ violates condition (81) in an extreme way. It also fails to meet conditions (78) and (80).

7 Algorithms evaluating lifted operators

Algorithms 1 and 2 are optimized for readability in conjunction with the theory presented so far, and not for performance. Note that the distances in Algorithm 1 are always small and hence can be determined by querying a small number of points. A small computational example is provided in Figure 5.

Given trivial input, our algorithms must compute trivial output. Recall the operators ∂R and ∂I from (16) and (17).

Lemma 27. *We have $\partial R(\emptyset, \emptyset) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ and $\partial I(\emptyset, \emptyset) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 19, we have $\text{Tr}_{\bar{\rho}}^{-1}(\emptyset, \emptyset) = \Delta_{\bar{\rho}}$ and $\text{Tr}_{\hat{\rho}}^{-1}(\emptyset, \emptyset) = \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$. By Theorems 21 and 23, we have $R(\Delta_{\hat{\rho}}) = \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ and $I(\Delta_{\bar{\rho}}) = \Delta_{\bar{\rho}}$. By (31), we have $\text{Tr}_{\hat{\rho}}(\Delta_{\hat{\rho}}) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ and $\text{Tr}_{\bar{\rho}}(\Delta_{\bar{\rho}}) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$, so by (16) and (17), the desired statements hold. \square

Algorithm 1: Evaluates ∂R from (16).

Input: $(\check{D}_0, \check{D}_1) \in \text{bd}_{\bar{\rho}}$
Output: $(\hat{D}_0, \hat{D}_1) \in \text{bd}_{\hat{\rho}}$

- 1 $\hat{H}_0 \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2 $\hat{H}_1 \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 3 **for** $\hat{x} \in B_{3\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{D}_0) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ **do**
- 4 **if** $d(\hat{x}, \check{D}_0) \leq \hat{\rho}/2$ **then**
- 5 $\hat{H}_0 \leftarrow \hat{H}_0 \cup \{\hat{x}\}$
- 6 **else if** $d(\hat{x}, \check{D}_1) \leq d(\hat{x}, \check{D}_0)$ **then**
- 7 $\hat{H}_1 \leftarrow \hat{H}_1 \cup \{\hat{x}\}$
- 8 $\hat{D}_1 \leftarrow \{\hat{x} \in \hat{H}_1 : d(\hat{x}, \hat{H}_0) = \hat{\rho}\}$
- 9 $\hat{D}_0 \leftarrow \{\hat{x} \in \hat{H}_0 : d(\hat{x}, \hat{H}_1) = \hat{\rho}\}$

We prove that Algorithm 1 evaluates ∂R correctly.

Theorem 28. *Let $(\check{D}_0, \check{D}_1) \in \text{bd}_{\bar{\rho}}$ and $(\hat{D}_0, \hat{D}_1) = \partial R(\check{D}_0, \check{D}_1)$. Then the sets $\hat{H}_0 \subset \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ and $\hat{H}_1 \subset \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ generated by Algorithm 1 satisfy*

$$\hat{D}_0 = \{\hat{x} \in \hat{H}_0 : d(\hat{x}, \hat{H}_1) = \hat{\rho}\}, \quad (91)$$

$$\hat{D}_1 = \{\hat{x} \in \hat{H}_1 : d(\hat{x}, \hat{H}_0) = \hat{\rho}\}. \quad (92)$$

Proof. If $(\check{D}_0, \check{D}_1) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$, then the loop in Algorithm 1 is void, and thus we have $(\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$. By Lemma 27, we also have $(\hat{D}_0, \hat{D}_1) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$, and statements (91) and (92) hold.

From now on let $(\check{D}_0, \check{D}_1) \in \text{bd}_{\check{\rho}}^-$. Inspecting Algorithm 1 reveals that

$$\hat{H}_0 = B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{D}_0) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}, \quad (93)$$

$$\hat{H}_1 = \{\hat{x} \in B_{3\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{D}_0) \cap B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{D}_0)^c \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}} : d(\hat{x}, \check{D}_1) \leq d(\hat{x}, \check{D}_0)\}. \quad (94)$$

Let $\check{M} := \text{Tr}_{\check{\rho}}^{-1}(\check{D}_0, \check{D}_1)$. Then Theorem 19 and (16) yield

$$\check{D}_0 = \partial_{\check{\rho}}^0 \check{M}, \quad \check{D}_1 = \partial_{\check{\rho}}^1 \check{M}, \quad \hat{D}_0 = \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 R(\check{M}), \quad \hat{D}_1 = \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^1 R(\check{M}). \quad (95)$$

We first argue that

$$\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 R(\check{M}) \subset \hat{H}_0 \subset R(\check{M}). \quad (96)$$

Using (68), (14), (95) and (93), we see that

$$\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 R(\check{M}) \subset R(\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \check{M}) = B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \check{M}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}} = B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{D}_0) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}} = \hat{H}_0,$$

so the first inclusion in (96) holds. Using (93), (95) and (14), we obtain, partly repeating the above computation, that

$$\hat{H}_0 = B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{D}_0) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}} = B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \check{M}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}} \subset B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{M}) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}} = R(\check{M}),$$

and hence the second inclusion in (96) holds.

In the following, we argue that

$$\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^1 R(\check{M}) \subset \hat{H}_1 \subset R(\check{M})^c \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}. \quad (97)$$

Since $\Delta_{\hat{\rho}} \subset \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$, statements (37) and (38) allow us in conjunction with (95) to represent (94) in the form

$$\hat{H}_1 = B_{3\hat{\rho}/2}(\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \check{M}) \cap B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \check{M})^c \cap \check{M}^c \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}. \quad (98)$$

Now let $\hat{z} \in \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^1 R(\check{M})$. It follows from the triangle inequality, from (1), from (68) and from (14) that

$$\begin{aligned} d(\hat{z}, \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \check{M}) &\leq d(\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^1 R(\check{M}), \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 R(\check{M})) + d(\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 R(\check{M}), \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \check{M}) \\ &\leq \hat{\rho} + d(R(\partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \check{M}), \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \check{M}) \leq 3\hat{\rho}/2. \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

Also, since $\partial_\rho^0 \check{M} \subset \check{M}$, since $\hat{z} \in R(\check{M})^c \cap \Delta_\rho$ and by (14), it follows that

$$d(\hat{z}, \partial_\rho^0 \check{M}) \geq d(\hat{z}, \check{M}) > \hat{\rho}/2. \quad (100)$$

Finally, by triangle inequality, since $\hat{z} \in R(\check{M})^c \cap \Delta_\rho$ and by (62), we have

$$d(\hat{z}, \check{M}) \geq d(\hat{z}, R(\check{M})) - d(\check{M}, R(\check{M})) \geq \hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho}/2 \geq \check{\rho},$$

and hence

$$\hat{z} \in \check{M}^c \cap \Delta_\rho. \quad (101)$$

Comparing statements (99), (100) and (101) with representation (98) shows that $\hat{z} \in \hat{H}_1$. Hence the first inclusion in (97) holds.

We check the second inclusion in (97). Let $\hat{z} \in \hat{H}_1$. By (98), we have $\hat{z} \in \check{M}^c \cap \Delta_\rho \subset \check{M}^c \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$. Using (36) and (98), we conclude that

$$d(\hat{z}, \check{M}) = d(\hat{z}, \partial_\rho^0 \check{M}) > \hat{\rho}/2.$$

Because of (62), it follows that $\hat{z} \notin R(\check{M})$, and since $\hat{z} \in \Delta_\rho$, the second inclusion in statement (97) holds as well.

Now statements (91) and (92) follow from (95), from Lemma 14 (with $\hat{\rho}$ and $R(\check{M})$ in lieu of ρ and M) and from statements (96) and (97). \square

We prove that Algorithm 2 evaluates ∂I correctly. An inspection of the algorithm shows that it computes the unions in equations (102) and (103).

Algorithm 2: Evaluates ∂I from (17).

Input: $(\hat{D}_0, \hat{D}_1) \in \text{bd}_\rho$

Output: $(\check{D}_0, \check{D}_1) \in \text{bd}_\rho$

1 $\check{D}_0 \leftarrow \emptyset$

2 $\check{D}_1 \leftarrow \emptyset$

3 **for** $\hat{z} \in \hat{D}_1$ **do**

4 **for** $\hat{x} \in \hat{D}_0 \cap B_\rho(\hat{z})$ **do**

5 $\check{D}_0 \leftarrow \check{D}_0 \cup (B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}) \cap B_{(\hat{\rho}+\hat{\rho})/2}(\hat{z}) \cap \Delta_\rho)$

6 $\check{D}_1 \leftarrow \check{D}_1 \cup (B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{z}) \cap B_{\hat{\rho}/2+\hat{\rho}}(\hat{x}) \cap (\bigcap_{\hat{x}' \in \hat{D}_0 \cap B_\rho(\hat{z})} B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}')^c) \cap \Delta_\rho)$

Theorem 29. Let $(\hat{D}_0, \hat{D}_1) \in \text{bd}_{\hat{\rho}}$ and $(\check{D}_0, \check{D}_1) = \partial I(\hat{D}_0, \hat{D}_1)$. Then

$$\check{D}_0 = \bigcup_{\hat{x} \in \hat{D}_0} \bigcup_{\hat{z} \in \hat{D}_1 \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{x})} \left(B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}) \cap B_{(\hat{\rho}+\check{\rho})/2}(\hat{z}) \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}} \right), \quad (102)$$

$$\check{D}_1 = \bigcup_{\hat{z} \in \hat{D}_1} \bigcup_{\hat{x} \in \hat{D}_0 \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{z})} \left(B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{z}) \cap B_{\hat{\rho}/2+\check{\rho}}(\hat{x}) \cap \left(\bigcap_{\hat{x}' \in \hat{D}_0 \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{z})} B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}')^c \right) \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}} \right). \quad (103)$$

Proof. If $(\hat{D}_0, \hat{D}_1) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$, then Lemma 27 yields $(\check{D}_0, \check{D}_1) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$, and the unions in equations (102) and (103) are empty. Hence (102) and (103) hold.

From now on let $(\hat{D}_0, \hat{D}_1) \in \text{bd}_{\hat{\rho}}^-$. Let $\hat{M} := \text{Tr}_{\hat{\rho}}^{-1}(\hat{D}_0, \hat{D}_1)$. Then Theorem 19 and (15) yield

$$\hat{D}_0 = \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \hat{M}, \quad \hat{D}_1 = \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^1 \hat{M}, \quad \check{D}_0 = \partial_{\check{\rho}}^0 I(\hat{M}), \quad \check{D}_1 = \partial_{\check{\rho}}^1 I(\hat{M}). \quad (104)$$

We check (102). Let $\check{x} \in \check{D}_0$. By (104), we have $\check{x} \in \partial_{\check{\rho}}^0 I(\hat{M})$. By (81), (15) and (104), there exists $\hat{x} \in \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \hat{M} = \hat{D}_0$ with

$$\check{x} \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}) \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}}. \quad (105)$$

By (1), there exists $\check{z} \in I(\hat{M})^c \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$ with

$$\|\check{x} - \check{z}\|_{\infty} = \check{\rho}. \quad (106)$$

In view of (15), we have

$$d(\check{z}, \hat{M}) > \hat{\rho}/2. \quad (107)$$

By (106) and by Lemma 20 with $k = 1$ and with \check{z} in lieu of v , there exists a point

$$\hat{z} \in B_{(\hat{\rho}+\check{\rho})/2}(\check{x}) \cap B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\check{z}) \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}}. \quad (108)$$

Combining (107) and (108) yields $\hat{z} \in \hat{M}^c \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$, and combining (105) with (108) yields $\|\hat{x} - \hat{z}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho} + \check{\rho}/2$. Since $\|\hat{x} - \hat{z}\|_{\infty} \in \hat{\rho}\mathbb{N}_0$, we conclude that $\|\hat{x} - \hat{z}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}$. In particular, we have

$$\hat{z} \in \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^1 \hat{M} \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{x}) = \hat{D}_1 \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{x}). \quad (109)$$

Using (105), (108) and (109), we conclude that

$$\check{x} \in \bigcup_{\hat{x} \in \hat{D}_0} \bigcup_{\hat{z} \in \hat{D}_1 \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{x})} \left(B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}) \cap B_{(\hat{\rho}+\check{\rho})/2}(\hat{z}) \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}} \right).$$

Conversely, let $\hat{x} \in \hat{D}_0$, let $\hat{z} \in \hat{D}_1 \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{x})$, and let

$$\check{x} \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}) \cap B_{(\hat{\rho}+\check{\rho})/2}(\hat{z}) \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}}. \quad (110)$$

By (104), we have $\hat{x} \in \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \hat{M}$ and $\hat{z} \in \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^1 \hat{M} \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{x})$, and by (15) and (110), we have

$$\check{x} \in I(\hat{M}). \quad (111)$$

Again in view of (110), the point $\check{z} \in \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$ given by

$$\check{z}_j := \begin{cases} \check{x}_j + \check{\rho}, & \check{x}_j \in [\hat{z}_j - \hat{\rho}/2 - \check{\rho}/2, \hat{z}_j - \hat{\rho}/2], \\ \check{x}_j, & \check{x}_j \in (\hat{z}_j - \hat{\rho}/2, \hat{z}_j + \hat{\rho}/2), \\ \check{x}_j - \check{\rho}, & \check{x}_j \in [\hat{z}_j + \hat{\rho}/2, \hat{z}_j + \hat{\rho}/2 + \check{\rho}/2] \end{cases}$$

for $j \in [1, m]$ is well-defined, and we have

$$\|\check{x} - \check{z}\|_{\infty} \leq \check{\rho} \quad (112)$$

as well as $\check{z}_j \in (\hat{z}_j - \hat{\rho}/2, \hat{z}_j + \hat{\rho}/2)$ for all $j \in [1, m]$, and thus $\|\hat{z} - \check{z}\|_{\infty} < \hat{\rho}/2$. Since $\hat{z} \in \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^1 \hat{M}$, we see, using (45), that

$$\hat{\rho} = d(\hat{z}, \hat{M}) \leq \|\hat{z} - \check{z}\|_{\infty} + d(\check{z}, \hat{M}) < \hat{\rho}/2 + d(\check{z}, \hat{M}),$$

which shows that $d(\check{z}, \hat{M}) > \hat{\rho}/2$, and hence, in view of (15) that

$$\check{z} \in I(\hat{M})^c \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}}. \quad (113)$$

In view of (1), combining (111) with (112) and (113) yields $\check{x} \in \partial_{\check{\rho}}^0 I(\hat{M})$, and by (104), we have $\check{x} \in \check{D}_0$. All in all, we have verified statement (102).

We check statement (103). Let $\check{z} \in \check{D}_1$. By (104), we have $\check{z} \in \partial_{\check{\rho}}^1 I(\hat{M})$. Hence we have $\check{z} \in \Delta_{\check{\rho}}$, we see with (2) and (15) that (107) holds, and by Lemma 8, there exists $\check{x} \in \partial_{\check{\rho}}^0 I(\hat{M})$ with (106). By (81) and (104), there exists

$$\hat{x} \in \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \hat{M} = \hat{D}_0 \quad (114)$$

with $\check{x} \in I(\hat{x})$. By (15), we have (105), and thus, with (106), that

$$\|\check{z} - \hat{x}\|_{\infty} \leq \|\check{z} - \check{x}\|_{\infty} + \|\check{x} - \hat{x}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}/2 + \check{\rho}.$$

We combine this with (107) and summarize

$$\check{z} \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2+\check{\rho}}(\hat{x}) \cap \left(\bigcap_{\hat{x}' \in \hat{D}_0} B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}')^c \right) \cap \Delta_{\check{\rho}}. \quad (115)$$

Again by (106) and by Lemma 20 with $k = 1$, there exists $\hat{z} \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}$ with (108), and (109) holds for the same reasons as before. From (108), (109), (114) and (115), we obtain that

$$\check{z} \in \cup_{\hat{x} \in \hat{D}_0} \cup_{\hat{z} \in \hat{D}_1 \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{x})} (B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{z}) \cap B_{\hat{\rho}/2+\hat{\rho}}(\hat{x}) \cap (\cap_{\hat{x}' \in \hat{D}_0} B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}')^c) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}).$$

Since

$$(\cap_{\hat{x}' \in \hat{D}_0} B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}')^c) \subset (\cap_{\hat{x}' \in \hat{D}_0 \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{z})} B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}')^c) \quad \forall \hat{z} \in \Delta_{\hat{\rho}},$$

it follows that

$$\check{z} \in \cup_{\hat{z} \in \hat{D}_1} \cup_{\hat{x} \in \hat{D}_0 \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{z})} (B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{z}) \cap B_{\hat{\rho}/2+\hat{\rho}}(\hat{x}) \cap (\cap_{\hat{x}' \in \hat{D}_0 \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{z})} B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}')^c) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}).$$

Conversely, let $\hat{z} \in \hat{D}_1$, let $\hat{x} \in \hat{D}_0 \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{z})$, and let

$$\check{z} \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{z}) \cap B_{\hat{\rho}/2+\hat{\rho}}(\hat{x}) \cap (\cap_{\hat{x}' \in \hat{D}_0 \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{z})} B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}')^c) \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}. \quad (116)$$

By (104), we have $\hat{x} \in \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \hat{M}$ and $\hat{z} \in \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^1 \hat{M}$. We claim that

$$\check{z} \in I(\hat{M})^c \cap \Delta_{\hat{\rho}}. \quad (117)$$

Assume that statement (117) is false. Then $\check{z} \in I(\hat{M})$, and by (15), there exists $\hat{x}' \in \hat{M}$ with $\check{z} \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}')$. If $\|\hat{x}' - \hat{z}\|_{\infty} > \hat{\rho}$, then (116) yields

$$\hat{\rho} < \|\hat{x}' - \hat{z}\|_{\infty} \leq \|\hat{x}' - \check{z}\|_{\infty} + \|\check{z} - \hat{z}\|_{\infty} \leq \|\hat{x}' - \check{z}\|_{\infty} + \hat{\rho}/2,$$

and hence the contradiction $\|\hat{x}' - \check{z}\|_{\infty} > \hat{\rho}/2$. If $\|\hat{x}' - \hat{z}\|_{\infty} \leq \hat{\rho}$, then Lemma 8, with $\hat{x}' \in \hat{M}$ and $\hat{z} \in \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^1 \hat{M}$, yields $\hat{x}' \in \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^0 \hat{M} \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{z})$. By (104), it follows that $\hat{x}' \in \hat{D}_0 \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{z})$, which, with $\check{z} \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2}(\hat{x}')$, contradicts (116). All in all, statement (117) holds.

Let $\phi(\cdot) = \phi(\cdot; \hat{x}, \check{z}, \hat{\rho})$ be the path from Lemma 6. By (116) and since $\hat{x} \in \hat{D}_0 \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{z})$, we have $\|\check{z} - \hat{x}\|_{\infty} > \hat{\rho}/2 \geq \hat{\rho}$, and hence that $L(\phi) > 1$. Consider $\check{x} := \phi(L(\phi) - 1)$. By (24) and (27), we have

$$\|\check{z} - \check{x}\|_{\infty} = \hat{\rho}, \quad (118)$$

and by (25), by (24) and (25), and by recalling $\check{z} \in B_{\hat{\rho}/2+\hat{\rho}}(\hat{x})$ from (116), we see that

$$\|\check{x} - \hat{x}\|_{\infty} = \|\check{z} - \hat{x}\|_{\infty} - \hat{\rho} \leq \hat{\rho}/2. \quad (119)$$

Now $\hat{x} \in \hat{M}$ and (119) yield $\check{x} \in I(\hat{M})$, and with (117), (118) and (104), it follows that $\check{z} \in \partial_{\hat{\rho}}^1 I(\hat{M}) = \check{D}_1$. All in all, we have verified (103). \square




Figure 5: Small computational example with layout as in commutative diagram in Figure 4. Pair (b) computed from (a) by Algorithm 2, pair (c) computed from (b) by Algorithm 1. Also illustrates stability properties (68) and (81), as well as the effect from equation (83).

Acknowledgements

This partly is partly supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP) Scholarship. The TikZ code from [6] was very helpful for generating the graphics in Figures 1, 2, 3 and 5.

References

- [1] Z. Arai and K. Mischaikow. Rigorous computations of homoclinic tangencies. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 5(2):280–292, 2006.
- [2] S. Day, O. Junge, and K. Mischaikow. A rigorous numerical method for the global analysis of infinite-dimensional discrete dynamical systems. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 3(2):117–160, 2004.
- [3] M. Dellnitz and A. Hohmann. A subdivision algorithm for the computation of unstable manifolds and global attractors. *Numer. Math.*, 75(3):293–317, 1997.
- [4] M. Dellnitz and O. Junge. On the approximation of complicated dynamical behavior. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 36(2):491–515, 1999.
- [5] M. Dellnitz, O. Schütze, and T. Hestermeyer. Covering Pareto sets by multilevel subdivision techniques. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 124(1):113–136, 2005.
- [6] P. Gaborit. Answer to *Typeset large Go boards*. TeX Stack Exchange, 14 May 2018. <https://tex.stackexchange.com/questions/431443/typeset-large-go-boards>.
- [7] L. Jaulin, M. Kieffer, O. Didrit, and É. Walter. *Applied interval analysis*. Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2001.
- [8] W.D. Kalies, K. Mischaikow, and R.C. Vandervorst. An algorithmic approach to chain recurrence. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 5(4):409–449, 2005.
- [9] R. Klette and A. Rosenfeld. *Digital geometry*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, San Francisco, CA; Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, 2004. Geometric methods for digital picture analysis.

- [10] K. Mischaikow. Topological techniques for efficient rigorous computation in dynamics. *Acta Numer.*, 11:435–477, 2002.
- [11] C. Pötzsche and M. Rasmussen. Computation of nonautonomous invariant and inertial manifolds. *Numer. Math.*, 112(3):449–483, 2009.
- [12] J. Rieger. Robust boundary tracking for reachable sets of nonlinear differential inclusions. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 15(5):1129–1150, 2015.
- [13] J. Rieger. Provably convergent implementations of the subdivision algorithm for the computation of invariant objects. *Numer. Math.*, 142(1):149–165, 2019.
- [14] P. Saint-Pierre. Approximation of the viability kernel. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 29(2):187–209, 1994.
- [15] S. Sertl and M. Dellnitz. Global optimization using a dynamical systems approach. *J. Global Optim.*, 34(4):569–587, 2006.